UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 14

AUGUST 3, 1966, TO AUGUST 15, 1966
(PAGES 17999 TO 19440)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v.112
pt. 14

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast made this world so fair and given it to all men rightly to enjoy, help us never to grow dull to all its wonder. Because so many of its glories are familiar, let us not forget how wonderful they are.

Keep our eyes open to the beauty of blue sky, to the changing pageant of the clouds, to the silver mystery of moonlight, and to the majesty of silent stars.

May we feel in every sunrise a daily miracle of life and light renewed, and in every sunset a pledge of Thine unfading light without which we cannot face the dark.

Give us such reverence for the real tasks of life that we may know that they are above our own unaided strength; that so with a clean mind and a pure heart we may turn to Thee for the help by which alone we may stand unashamed when the day is done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 2, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 2, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAYS, Mr. JONES of Missouri, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAYS, Mr. JONES of Missouri, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 642) for the relief of Chung K. Won, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Maj. Lloyd N. Campbell;

H.R. 3557. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi;

H.R. 3671. An act for the relief of Josephine Ann Bellizia;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 4861. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover;

H.R. 5912. An act for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6606. An act for the relief of Li Tsu (Nako) Chen;

H.R. 7671. An act for the relief of Sophia Soliwoda;

H.R. 10656. An act for the relief of Kimberly Ann Yang;

H.R. 11312. An act relating to certain Indian claims;

H.R. 11347. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Piotrowski, formerly Czeslawa Marek;

H.R. 11844. An act for the relief of Maria Giuseppina Innalfo Feole;

H.R.12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12950. An act for the relief of Kazimierz (Casimer) Krzykowski;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 14379. An act for the relief of John R. McKinney; and

H.R. 14514. An act for the relief of Vernon M. Nichols.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1328. An act for the relief of Glenn D. Humes;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Maj. Lloyd N. Campbell;

H.R. 3557. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi;

H.R. 3671. An act for the relief of Josephine Ann Bellizia;

H.R. 4077. An act for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance;

H.R. 5912. An act for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band;

H.R. 6035. An act for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6606. An act for the relief of Li Tsu (Nako) Chen;

H.R. 7671. An act for the relief of Sophia Soliwoda;

H.R. 10656. An act for the relief of Kimberly Ann Yang;

H.R. 11312. An act relating to certain Indian claims;

H.R. 11347. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Piotrowski, formerly Czeslawa Marek;

H.R. 11844. An act for the relief of Maria Giuseppina Innalfo Feole;

H.R. 12512. An act for the relief of Carl V. Elliott;

H.R. 12950. An act for the relief of Kazimierz (Casimer) Krzykowski;

H.R. 13682. An act for the relief of Donald E. Auseon;

H.R. 13683. An act for the relief of Robert A. Ivins;

H.R. 14379. An act for the relief of John R. McKinney; and

H.R. 14514. An act for the relief of Vernon M. Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4861. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Establishment of National Park Foundation

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the National Park Foundation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions According Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classification to Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions according third preference and sixth preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 3421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska (Rept No. 1426).

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (Rept. No. 1427).

STIMULATION OF FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FHA- AND VA-ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1428)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill was placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3683. A bill for the relief of the Madison County Board of Education of Madison County, Ala., and

S. 3684. A bill for the relief of Nina B. Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3685. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patrick H. Harrington, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3686. A bill to make certain expenditures by Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Scarrit College eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request):

S. 3687. A bill to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3688. A bill to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND RATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with certain letters from the agencies, relating to this subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3687) to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

RESERVES AND RATE CEILINGS—MEMBER BANKS

SECTION 1. (a) Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking the first six paragraphs (12 U.S.C. 461, 462, and 462b) and inserting:

"(a) The Board is authorized for the purposes of this section to define the term used in this section, to determine what shall be deemed a payment of interest, and to prescribe such regulations as it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and to prevent evasions thereof.

"(b) Every member bank shall maintain reserves against its deposits in such ratios as shall be determined by the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Board within the following limitations:

"(1) In the case of any member bank in a reserve city, the minimum reserve ratio for any demand deposit shall be not less than 10 per centum and not more than 22 per centum, except that the Board, either in individual cases or by regulation, on such basis as it may deem reasonable and appropriate in view of the character of business transacted by such bank, may make applicable the reserve ratios prescribed for banks not in reserve cities.

"(2) In the case of any member bank not in a reserve city, the minimum reserve ratio for any demand deposit shall be not less than 7 per centum and not more than 14 per centum.

"(3) In the case of any deposit other than a demand deposit, the minimum reserve ratio shall be not less than 3 per centum and not more than 10 per centum.

"(c) Reserves held by any member bank to meet the requirements imposed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall be in the form of—

"(1) balances maintained for such purpose by such bank in the Federal Reserve Bank of which it is a member, and

"(2) the currency and coin held by such bank, or such part thereof as the Board may by regulation prescribe."

(b) The paragraphs which, prior to the amendments made by this Act, were the seventh (12 U.S.C. 374a), eighth (12 U.S.C. 374, 463), ninth (12 U.S.C. 464), tenth (12 U.S.C. 465), eleventh (12 U.S.C. 466), twelfth (12 U.S.C. 371a), and thirteenth (12 U.S.C. 371b) paragraphs of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act are respectively redesignated as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of that section.

(c) Such section is further amended by striking the first sentence of subsection (j) as redesignated (12 U.S.C. 371b) and inserting: "The Board may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, limit by regulation the rates of interest which may be paid by member banks on time and savings deposits. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, for deposits of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of member banks or their depositors, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest."

(d) The last paragraph of such section (12 U.S.C. 462a-1) and the proviso in section 8 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 771) are repealed.

RATE CEILINGS—INSURED NONMEMBER BANKS

SEC. 2. The second and third sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are amended to read as follows: "The Board of Directors may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, limit by regulation the rates of interest or dividends that may be paid by insured nonmember banks (including insured mutual savings banks) on time and savings deposits. The Board of Directors may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, for deposits of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of insured nonmember banks or their depositors, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board of Directors may deem desirable in the public interest."

RATE CEILINGS—SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 3. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act is amended by adding after section 5A thereof (12 U.S.C. 1425a) the following new section:

"SEC. 5B. The Board may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, limit by regulation the rates of interest or dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts that may be paid by members, other than those the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and by institutions which are insured institutions as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, for deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of such members or institutions or their depositors, shareholders, or withdrawable accountholders, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest."

OUTSTANDING RATE REGULATIONS

SEC. 4. Any regulation prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon by member banks or insured nonmember banks which is in effect when this Act is enacted shall continue in effect unless and until it is modified or rescinded after consultation with the Board of Directors or the Board of Governors, as the case may be, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS

SEC. 5. Section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 355) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)" and by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"(2) To buy and sell in the open market, under the direction and regulations of the Federal Open Market Committee, any obligation which is a direct obligation of, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, any agency of the United States."

SEC. 6. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "when the entire amount of such obligation is sold to the association" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "in whole or in part and at any time or times prior to the maturity of such obligation";

(2) by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount of any such loan hereafter made shall not exceed 50 per centum of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and no such loan shall be made for a longer term than five years; except that (1) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than ten years, if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize 40 per centum or more of the principal of the loan within a period of not more than ten years; (2) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than twenty years, if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than twenty years; (3) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 80 per centum of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than twenty-five years, if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within twenty-five years from its date: *Provided*, That any such loan made to finance the construction of one or more buildings on such real estate may be made for a term not longer than twenty-eight years, if such installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within twenty-eight years from its date, and such amortization commences within three years from the date of the loan; and (4) such loan may be made on one- to four-family residential buildings and on farm and ranch property in an amount not to exceed 80 per centum of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a terms not longer than thirty years, if the loan is being made for resale to another lender and is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payment are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within thirty years from its date: *Provided*, That no association shall hold such loans in an aggregate sum in excess of 10 per centum of the capital stock of such association paid in and unimpaired plus 10 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund. The foregoing limitations and restrictions shall not prevent the renewal or extension of loans heretofore made and shall not apply to real estate loans which are insured under the provisions of title II, title VI, title VIII, section 8 of title I, or title IX of the National Housing Act, or which are insured by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the Act entitled 'An Act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes', approved August 28, 1937, as amended, or title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and shall not apply to real estate loans which are fully guaranteed or insured by a State, or by a State authority for the payment of the obligations of which the faith and credit of the State is pledged, if under the terms of the guaranty or insurance agreement the association will be assured of repayment in accordance with the terms of the loan.";

(3) by striking out "when the entire amount of such obligation is sold to the association" in the second sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "in whole or in part and at any time or times prior to the maturity of such obligation"; and

(4) by striking out the last paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Loans made to any borrower (i) where the association looks for repayment by relying primarily on the borrower's general credit standing and forecast of income, with or without other security, or (ii) where the association relies on other security as collateral for the loans (including but not limited to a guaranty of a third party), and where, in either case described in clause (i) or (ii) above, the association wishes to take a mortgage, deed of trust, or other instrument upon real estate (whether or not constituting a first lien) as a precaution against contingencies, such loans shall not be considered as real estate loans within the meaning of this section but shall be classed as ordinary nonreal estate loans."

The letters, presented by Mr. ROBERTSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, August 2, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciated very much your letter of July 28, 1966, advising me of your agreement to expedite action on bills relating to financial institutions in which the Administration is interested. I welcome the opportunity you have afforded me to advise you of the Administration's position on the important legislation pending with regard to such institutions.

As you know, there has been a great deal of discussion of ways and means to insure that a significant part of the country's savings will continue to be available for investment in home mortgages, and to insure stability in the interest rate structure within the financial community. It is the view of the Administration, and I am pleased to note that it is yours also, that the present authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to establish maximum interest rates which may be paid on bank deposits should be broadened to enable those agencies to establish different categories of deposits for interest rate limitations and should be made discretionary. For example, they should be permitted to fix different limitations for different size deposits, an authority that is now lacking.

The recent action of the Federal Reserve Board in limiting interest rates payable on "multiple maturity" time deposits and the fact it has recommended enactment of S. 3627 indicates, in my opinion, a willingness on its part to take action to limit undue rate competition. Therefore, I believe it is possible to return to the original idea of granting discretionary authority to the bank regulatory agencies rather than involving Congress in legislating interest rate ceilings.

It is the Administration view also that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board should be granted stand-by authority to establish maximum rates of interest which may be paid on the share accounts of savings and loan associations; and that provision should be made for coordination of the actions of the three agencies in the exercise of discretionary powers relating to interest rates.

In addition to these provisions, all of which are incorporated in the Federal Reserve Board bill, S. 3627, it is the view of the Administration that (1) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should be authorized to raise reserve requirements on time and savings deposits to a maximum of 10% rather than the present 6%; and (2) the authority of the Federal Reserve System should be broadened so that it can purchase the obligations of any agency of the United States. This would enable it to acquire obligations of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal National Mortgage Association, among others.

I am sure that I can speak for the entire Coordinating Committee on Bank Regulation, as well as myself, in expressing our gratification that your subcommittee will consider on August 2, 1966, the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966. As you know, we believe there is a substantial need for this legislation and we are very hopeful that it can be enacted in satisfactory form at this session of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 3627, a bill "To provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation would:

(1) Grant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System flexible authority to establish different categories of deposits for interest rate limitations.

(2) Give the same authority to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(3) Grant stand-by authority to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set maximum rates of interest on the share accounts of savings and loans.

(4) Provide for coordinated use of these flexible authorities by the agencies named above.

All of these proposals were included in the Administration program announced on July 26, 1966, by Secretary Weaver. In addition to the above proposals, however, Secretary Weaver recommended on behalf of the Administration that there be incorporated in legislation provisions which would:

1. Grant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System the authority to raise reserve requirements on time and savings deposits to a maximum of 10 percent.

2. Broaden the authority of the Federal Reserve System so that it can purchase the obligations of any agency of the United States Government.

It is believed that enactment of the proposed legislation amended to incorporate the authority for the Federal Reserve System to raise reserve requirements and to purchase agency obligations as indicated above would protect a part of the local savers' market for investment in home mortgages and tend to stabilize the rate structure within the financial community. The Treasury Department strongly urges its enactment.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee and that enactment of the proposed legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

FRED B. SMITH,
General Counsel.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, August 2, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of July 25, 1966, for a report on S. 3627, which you and Senator BENNETT were kind enough to introduce at the Board's request. In my letter of July 15, I outlined the reasons why the Board recommends more flexible authority to set ceilings on interest rates on time deposits at commercial banks, together with parallel authority in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with respect to rates paid by savings and loan associations.

We further recommend that, in addition to the authority provided in S. 3627, the Board be empowered to increase reserve requirements on time deposits up to a maximum of 10 per cent and the Federal Reserve Banks be authorized to buy and sell in the open market obligations issued or guaranteed by agencies of the United States.

Enclosed is a draft of legislation that would add these two authorizations to the provisions already incorporated in S. 3627.

Sincerely,

J. L. ROBERTSON.

Enclosure.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board hereby submits its views as to S. 3627, which you introduced (by request) on July 19, 1966, for yourself and Senator BENNETT, and which relates to the regulation of rates of return on deposits in banks which are Federal Reserve System members or which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts in institutions which are Federal Home Loan Bank members (other than those whose deposits are insured by FDIC) or are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The Board favors enactment of the bill with an amendment as hereinafter mentioned.

The three sections of the bill are, except as hereinafter noted, substantially the same as those of sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively, of S. 2561 of the present Congress, which you introduced (by request) on September 23, 1965, on the basis of a draft bill transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury with the statement that the Treasury Department had been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that its enactment would be consistent with the Administration's objectives. They would, in brief, convert the existing mandatory authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation into standby authority on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and require each agency to consult with the others before exercising such authority.

Differences between the present bill and the above three sections of S. 2561 are the following. First, classification of deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts on the basis of different amounts is expressly recognized by the present bill. This appears to be a desirable change. Second, the present bill is more flexible in that it omits the requirements of S. 2561 that the regulatory authority be exercised only if the regulating agency determines that such action is required by general credit conditions or to prevent unsound banking practices among the institutions involved. Third, the present bill omits the requirements of S. 2561 for consultation with the Comptroller of the Currency. It is to be noted that the Comptroller of the Currency is not an official in whom the provisions of either the present bill or the above-mentioned sections of S. 2561 would vest any regulatory authority in this field.

The present bill contains a provision that any regulation prescribed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board "with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon by member banks in effect prior to the effective date of this Act shall continue in effect unless and until the Board, after consultation with the other agencies above named, shall modify or rescind such regulation". Although this language parallels similar language in the bill with respect to the Board of Governors and the Board of Directors of FDIC, such language is, in the case of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, neither needed as a matter of substance nor compatible as a matter of form with the legal terminology applicable to savings and loan associations. The Board therefore proposes the following amendment to S. 3627:

"Pages 3 and 4, strike out colon in line 24 of page 3 and all matter that follows, down to but not including the period at page 4, line 5."

With this amendment, the Board favors the bill as implementing the first four of the following six legislative objectives agreed upon at a recent meeting of the Coordinating Committee on Bank Regulation appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury (and comprising the Chairman of the Board of Governors, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board). Said six objectives as set forth in the press release of July 26, 1966, of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are:

"1. Grant to the Federal Reserve Board flexible authority to establish different categories of deposits for interest rate limitations.

"2. Give the same authority to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"3. Grant stand-by authority to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set maximum rates of interest on the share accounts of savings and loans.

"4. Provide for coordinated use of these flexible authorities by the agencies named above.

"5. Grant to the Federal Reserve Board the authority to raise reserve requirements on time and savings deposits to a maximum of 10 percent.

"6. Broaden the authority of the Federal Reserve System so that it can purchase the obligations of any agency of the United States Government. (The Federal Reserve System now has legal authority to purchase the obligations of certain Federal agencies.)"

The Board further recommends that the present bill, S. 3627, be amended to include implementation of items 5 and 6 of the above objectives.

Informal advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our comments on S. 3529, a bill "To stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for residential construction."

Sections 2 and 3 of that bill are also included as sections 301 and 302 of Banking and Currency Committee Print "C" of August 2, 1966. This report is directed primarily to those sections.

Section 301 of the Committee Print would increase FNMA's borrowing authority under its secondary market operations from 10 to 15 times its capital account. Section 302 would authorize FNMA to utilize $1 billion of special assistance funds to purchase FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed residential mortgage loans of less than $15,000. Of this $1 billion, $500 million would be obtained by transfer from outstanding special assistance authority.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is in full accord with the objectives of S. 3529 and the provisions of sections 301 and 302 of Committee Print "C." The Department is deeply concerned with the harmful effects which the shortage of available mortgage credit has had upon housing starts, the consumers of housing, and the housing industry.

This Department recommends enactment of section 301 of Committee Print "C" which would increase FNMA's borrowing authority under its secondary market operations. Enactment of this section would increase, by approximately $2 billion, FNMA's authority to borrow money to be used in its secondary market operations.

However, this Department recommends against enactment of section 302 of the Committee Print. We do not believe that the provision of additional special assistance funds which would be authorized by that section would be an effective or desirable way to remedy the shortage of available mortgage credit.

The amount of special assistance authorized by section 302 is far from adequate to meet existing credit needs. Therefore, administration of the proposed special assistance program would necessarily involve very complicated machinery for rationing the funds provided. There would be great problems in allocating funds as among regions and areas of the country, and problems of equity in rationing funds as among individual builders in each of the different regions and areas of the country.

In addition, the $15,000 ceiling on the mortgages which could be with these special assistance funds would defeat the objectives of the proposal in the cities of the North, Middle West, and the Pacific Coast. In these areas, existing land and construction costs prevent the construction of any substantial amount of new housing at less than $15,000. On the other hand, in some areas of the country where housing can be constructed within the $15,000 limitation, there is an existing supply of such housing which has not been absorbed by the market.

To the extent that section 302 contemplates the transfer of $500 million from the regular FNMA special assistance authority to the proposed new program under that section, it would take away special assistance funds which would otherwise be used for the 221(d)(3) program of rental housing for low- and moderate-income families and other desirable special assistance programs. The net result of this transfer would in no way increase the total amount of funds available for mortgage credit.

This Department believes that the objectives of section 302 could better be accomplished by further increasing FNMA's borrowing authority under its secondary market operations. In addition to the provisions of section 301, it is recommended that this borrowing authority be enlarged by increasing, by $110 million, the amount of preferred stock which the FNMA can issue for delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury. This recommendation would provide approximately $1.6 billion of additional funds for these operations. When this amount is added to the amount made available by the present provision in section 301, a total of $3.6 billion new secondary market funds would be provided.

The availability of this substantially increased amount of borrowing authority for FNMA's secondary market operations would enable us to purchase mortgages at a rate which would no longer require the imposition of a ceiling as low as the $15,000 which is now imposed.

This substantial amount of purchasing authority would also permit the use of the regular secondary market facilities without other rationing restrictions that would be required under the special assistance provisions of existing section 302.

Of course, this secondary market program uses funds acquired by FNMA in the private market rather than from the Treasury. The proposed use of of this program would avoid the further pressure on Treasury funds which would result from increases in the FNMA special assistance borrowing authority. The proposal would result also in much less impact on budget expenditures.

This proposed use of the secondary market would not disturb the existing (d)(3) rental housing program for low- and moderate-income families.

This Department also recommends that a new section 302 be added to the Committee Print empowering Federal Reserve banks to conduct open market operations in obligations of FNMA under its secondary market and in obligations of the Federal home loan banks. This will assist both the FNMA and the Federal home loan banks to bring private funds into mortgage credit for residential housing.

Enclosed is a draft of the amendments we have proposed in this report to Committee Print "C".

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and that legislation along the lines of the enclosed draft would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER.

Enclosure.

AUGUST 2, 1966.

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE PRINT "C" TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL HOUSING CREDIT

1. On page 17, line 11, amend section 301 to read as follows:

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 303 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out in the second sentences of subsections (d) and (e) '$115,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$225,000,000'.

"(b) The first sentence of section 304(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'ten' and inserting in lieu thereof 'fifteen'."

2. On page 17, strike from line 14 to the end of the page; on page 18, strike lines 1 through 13; and insert in lieu thereof:

"OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS

"SEC. 302. Section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' and by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"'(2) To buy and sell in the open market, under the direction and control of the Federal Open Market Committee, any obligation which is—

"'(A) a direct obligation of, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, any Federal home loan bank;

"'(B) sold, issued, or guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association in connection with, or to finance, its secondary mortgage market operations.'

"The Federal Open Market Committee may not authorize purchases or sales pursuant to this paragraph except in accordance with a request by the Secretary of the Treasury."

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 723

Mr. MORTON submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 724

Mr. GRIFFIN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 725

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. MANSFIELD) proposed an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 186, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INTEREST AND DIVIDEND RATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on administration proposals concerning the regulation of rates of dividends and interest paid by banks and other institutions on deposits and share accounts and related proposals.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, August 4, 1966, at 9:30 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that no Senator is seeking recognition at the present time, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before we plunge too deeply into further consideration of the pending business, I should like the brief indulgence of the Senate so that I may try to put the question into a reasonable perspective. May I say that we would do well to put aside questions of political advantage in approaching this question. Democrats or Republicans—all of us—use the same airlines. Democrats or Republicans all are equally affected by this situation.

As I see it, a labor-management dispute has stove a gaping hole in the air-transport system of the Nation. Five major airlines are grounded. The companies are losing very large operating revenues. Thirty-five thousand machinists are on strike.

That aspect of the problem, may I say, with all due respect, is primarily the worry of the companies and the union. It is not the function of Government to support the one against the other, either way, in contract negotiations. In the end, the wage and other issues in dispute are for them to solve together. Nevertheless, the Government is properly concerned in this partial breakdown in the Nation's air transport system. It is properly concerned because many thousands of employees, other than machinists, in the airlines and in related industries are also thrown out of work and out of wage by the dispute in which they are not involved. It is properly concerned because the traveling public is both irritated and inconvenienced. It is properly concerned because, in certain areas of the country—in States such as Alaska and Hawaii, for example, which are heavily dependent on air transport—the situation is more than one of irritation and inconvenience; it is one of downright hardship. It has produced adverse economic consequences which range from the serious to the disastrous. The longer the breakdown continues, moreover, the more painful will be the effects in these regions.

That is the situation as it appears to me. I do not believe anything is gained, except heat, by overstating it. I do not believe anything is gained, except evasion, by understating it. To put it briefly, the airlines strike does not constitute, at this time, a national emergency as that term is usually used, although it may well be moving in that direction. Most certainly, however, the strike has created regional emergencies in some areas as well as a growing problem for the Nation as a whole which has already reached serious proportions.

To put it another way, the Nation is not confronted with a problem of absolute and overwhelming urgency. But neither is the problem one to which the Nation can remain indifferent for very much longer.

What the Senate is trying to determine, then, in considering the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and such modifications as may be offered, is what contribution, if any, may be appropriate and useful for the Government of the United States to make at this time to a solution of the problem.

If I find fault with the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]—and I do—it is because it offers a remedy for a situation which does not now exist. It grants powers to the President which he has not sought. And most serious, it dumps the problem in the lap of the President on the ground that only he, and not Congress, has a role and responsibility in these matters.

The fact is that the President of the United States has tried everything that could be tried. He has done everything that could be done. He has followed every avenue open under the Railroad Labor Act, which is the pertinent statute. In this connection, the Senate will recall that when the strike threatened, he invoked this law, and this had the effect of postponing the strike for 60 days. Mr. Johnson then appointed a distinguished factfinding Board headed by our colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, as the Senate knows, is one of the outstanding labor lawyers and mediators in the Nation and the leading authority in the Senate on labor-management questions. Under his chairmanship, the Board worked with great conscientiousness to resolve the difficulty. When the Board made its recommendations, President Johnson went down the line in support of them. Even when these recommendations proved inacceptable, the President did not abandon the effort. On the contrary, he seized a subsequent opportunity to bring the negotiators together at the White House so that they might try once again to close the gap between the parties. The negotiators did reach agreement with the help of the administration, only to have the solution rejected by an overwhelming vote of the rank-and-file of the union.

I do not know what else the President could have done. In the absence of a national emergency, moreover, I do not know what else he can do at this time. Why urge him to act or empower him to act in a situation in which he has exhausted the possibilities of effective Presidential action? I do not think it serves a useful purpose to assign to him, as the Clark resolution does, an authority which he does not seek and which he cannot use and which, in any event—on the basis of the best legal advice I have been able to obtain—would be an authority which would probably be rejected by the courts if he attempted to use it.

I can appreciate the objective of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this situation. His intentions are of the very best. He thinks the President alone and not Congress is competent to act for the Government in these matters. He would like the President to act to settle this strike. But, I repeat, the President has done everything he can do in present circumstances. The responsibility can no longer be vested in him at this time. All the pleading of the Senator from Pennsylvania will not change that one iota. All the grants of power, however generous—in my opinion they are overgenerous to the point of being dictatorial—all the grants of power to the President to deal with a nonexistent situation will be useless for dealing with the existing situation.

I do not know—I have not yet reached a personal conclusion as to whether or not any action by the Government can be helpful at this time in coping with the situation. If it can be, however, I am persuaded that the responsibility for taking it rests with us, with the Congress and not with the President. That is why, Mr. President, without prejudging the final disposition of the matter, I am delighted to cosponsor the substitute resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I cosponsor it, may I say, because I know that the author has lived with this question day and night for weeks and that he is alert to every nuance of the problem.

I cosponsor it because the legal philosophy and experience of the Senator from Oregon in these specialized questions insures legislation that will be fully adequate and completely correct in a constitutional sense and zealous of the rights of all concerned.

I cosponsor it because the resolution of the Senator from Oregon would put the planes back in the skies, promptly, but without prejudice in any way, shape or form, to the position of labor or management in this situation; that is so because the settlement eventually reached—and one will be eventually reached—will be retroactive.

I support the substitute resolution because its 180-day provision allows ample time to dissipate the frustrations of the past few pressured weeks and to reassert the rational approach of collective bargaining.

I support it, finally, because, under the substitute, Congress assumes the responsibilities which it should and must assume if any effective role is to be exercised by Government in this situation at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was most interested in listening to the Senator's statement. I wonder if the Senator could enlighten the Senate as to whether or not the administration at this point has decided that it does want legislation since, as the Senator has said, the President said he cannot do any more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will refer to the testimony before his committee by the Secretary of Labor, it was the contention of the administration that it did not desire any legislation. However, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has acted, and, as the majority leader, it is my duty and responsibility to bring the bill reported by that committee to the floor of the Senate for immediate consideration.

I must say that for something which is supposedly of an emergency nature this legislation is moving at a very slow pace.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree that it is moving at a very slow pace. It is a very contentious measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is, indeed.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would say, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that I listened to the testimony of the Secretary of Labor very closely. As I understand his testimony on the question of recommendations, although he was not recommending legislation, neither was he opposing it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. He was taking a completely neutral position.

It seems to me somewhat ironic to have the administration take this position when it is apparent that they have used all the available machinery they have under existing law in trying to gain a settlement but have been unable to get it; and here we are faced with a breakdown in the essential transportation services to many sections of the country.

It strikes me that we have to do something and I would think that the administration would want to take some position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The administration had hopes that collective bargaining could, in the final analysis, bring a solution to the present difficulty between the Machinists and the five struck airlines.

As the Senator indicated, and as I tried to point out, the President used every possibility under the Railway Labor Act which was within his power. He has not requested the Congress for legislation. He has had the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on two occasions.

It is my understanding, not from reading the record, but from reading the newspapers, that when the Secretary was almost pinned down, after trying to avoid the issue with some degree of skill, he made the statement that if there was to be any legislation he would personally lean toward the Morse resolution. I stand open for correction if I am wrong in that remark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would say that that is completely accurate. As between the two proposals he preferred the Morse proposal.

I, personally, do not favor either of them. It seems to me that we should have some kind of compromise.

I know that the majority leader is in a difficult spot in connection with this matter. But it seems incredible to me that the administration would say that there has been, as the Secretary of Labor said, an essential breakdown in transportation services; that they have no legislative weapons with which to do anything about it; but then they say they do not want any legislation and they are going to sit tight. To me that is an incredible position, and I do not understand it. It means that they are washing their hands of the problem and are doing nothing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The administration does nothing because in the present circumstances it can do nothing. That is why the question is now in the lap of the Senate, and that is where it should be because if the administration is helpless I think it is up to the Senate and the Congress to take action, if it is necessary, and I hope that that will be decided without too much delay, and shortly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer my 2 cents worth for whatever it may be worth. I wish to commend the majority leader for his statement of the issue and for his cosponsorship of the resolution which I have at the desk as a substitute for the Clark resolution. I shall be perfectly willing to modify the resolution in accordance with any understanding we can reach among us, provided that the modification places the direct responsibility upon the Congress to pass a resolution that brings the strike to an end, to be signed by the President. When the President signs that resolution, he joins us in a decision to bring the strike to an end.

My so-called 2 cents worth is this, Mr. President. In my judgment, unless legislation which orders the men back to work is passed, they are not going to go back to work. The strike is going to continue and that means it will continue until the carriers capitulate to the naked economic power of the union, which is being used at this time, in my opinion, as a strike against the public interest, as well as against the carriers.

I have said so many times that if we sit idly by and permit the union to exercise its naked economic power in connection with a regulated industry, the end will be that the carriers will be forced to capitulate. Then we, the Congress, had better get ready for the legislation we are going to have to pass to try to bring to a halt an inflationary tornado that such a settlement will let loose upon the economic interest of the American people.

That this case will be the bellwether case cannot be denied successfully by anyone. The outcome will inevitably be followed by every major industrial labor union in the country which is waiting to have its wage demands considered. Among them are the communications workers; the electrical workers in such industries as General Electric and Westinghouse; the trucking industry; and most of the transportation industry, including the maritime industry. In fact, the labor unions of a great cross section of the major industries of the country are awaiting the outcome of this case.

Therefore, if Congress is to protect the public interest—and that should be our interest—we must support the President by passing a joint resolution, under our constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce. On the basis of the facts, a serious emergency exists, namely, the interruption of essential transportation in various sections of the country, not only in Alaska and Hawaii, but in other sections as well, which are dependent upon one or more of the airlines for continental air transportation.

This proposal is not against the best interests of labor, although labor thinks so at the present time. But I have been through crises such as this so many times that I believe Senators should not be unduly disturbed about telegrams they receive from George Meany or by representations made by other labor leaders that the ceiling of free collective bargaining and the free right of American labor will cave in on us if Congress fulfills its clear duty to protect the interests of the public, and does so in a manner that will protect the legitimate interests of labor.

I respectfully submit that my joint resolution in its present form will do that. I am satisfied that such modifications as I am perfectly willing to accept will also offer such protection, if we can reach an understanding with Senators who do not want to vote for the Clark amendment and do not want to vote for the Morse amendment in its present form. If such modifications can be made, the Senator from Oregon will go along with them.

I have received instructions from the so-called Democratic senatorial negotiating group to take this matter up with the negotiating group from the Republican side of the aisle. I thought last night that we were closely approaching an understanding. It would be an understanding along the lines of the Dominick amendment, whereby for 60 days Congress would send the workers back to work. I think that is a reasonable compromise.

Still in the stage of negotiation at the beginning of the session today is language in regard to what would be the effect of a recommendation made prior to the end of 60 days by a special airlines board created under the joint resolution, if that board found that unless there were a continuation of the application of the joint resolution for the total 180 days, the strike would recur.

I think we should recognize that 180 days should be considered a "must" period of time. I do not think that passage of sound legislation should bog down and the public interest sacrificed because of semantics over just what effect the finding of the Special Airline Board would be.

Mr. President, I shall say no more at this time, but I did think that the public was entitled to know, through the press gallery and the other media of information, exactly where we are in the present state of negotiations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GORE, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

THE CURRENT INFLATIONARY STRUGGLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is now obvious to the most obtuse that we are in an inflationary struggle, although, as so often happens, the economic indicators are ragged and various segments of the economy are affected differently. Corporate profits are high and still rising. Personal income is high and pressures to push it higher will undoubtedly result in more than usual labor stoppages of one kind or another. President Johnson's highly publicized 3.2-percent guidepost formula has been proven unworkable and ineffective. Indeed, with the cost of living rising at an annual rate of 3.5 percent thus far this year, this formula could hardly be expected to work. Housing is hurting and the future of the automobile industry is uncertain. Wage earners are chafing and restless with the pinch between income and outgo. The cost of interest for business is increasingly burdensome.

Yet, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System continues to tighten credit and push up interest rates. Banker oriented, most members of the Board always seem happy to find an excuse to run up rates. But I must say, however, that the administration has lent encouragement to the Board's efforts by failing to act positively and forthrightly.

In the national income accounts, interest income has gone up, since 1963, by more than 40 percent. This is the sharpest advance of any of the major items in the national income accounts, although corporate profits have moved up almost as fast. Compensation of employees has not kept pace, having gone up by some 25 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, all the while, the interest rate burden continues to mount. Interest rates constitute an important cost of doing business. Rising interest rates tend to push prices up. They increase the cost of living for the many who must borrow and buy on time.

Consider the burden placed on every taxpayer by increases in the cost of carrying the national debt. Interest paid on the Federal Government's debt is now running at the rate of about $9.5 billion per year, and still rising. As recently as 1963, when President Johnson assumed office, interest paid on the national debt was some $7.7 billion. If the rate of interest paid on the national debt could be lowered by only 1 percentage point, taxpayers would be saved more than $3 billion each year.

Consider the burden placed on those who must buy on the installment plan. Total consumer credit amounts to more than $39 billion. A reduction of 1 percentage point in interest rates would save these consumers almost a billion dollars each year.

Mortgage debt on homes amounts to more than $200 billion. Lowering interest rates on this amount by 1 percentage point would save homeowners $2 billion per year.

Onerous as is the burden we must all carry because of excessive interest rates—that is, most of us must carry it, the profits being reaped by a few lenders and owners of accumulated wealth—even worse is the fact that a tight money and high interest rate policy is not beneficially effective in our current situation. The most noticeable pressures are in plant and equipment spending by corporations. They have the money, or can get it as preferred customers of the big banks. Pressure is also being exerted by defense industries, and the cost of borrowing money in this case is simply passed on to the Federal Government—to all taxpayers. There is some pressure as a result of a shortage in skilled labor of certain categories. Tight money and high interest rates do not help here. Appropriate positive programs of social and economic betterment, particularly in education and retraining would help, but we see on every hand slowdowns and cutbacks in these programs.

Mr. President, action in the public interest is required to fight inflation, but the sole reliance on monetary policy is ineffective and hurtful. It would be helpful if President Johnson would return to the traditions of the Democratic Party. Johnson interest rates are now higher than Hoover rates. They must be brought down.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not in excess of 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I came in as my good friend from Tennessee was concluding his remarks, and I want to congratulate him on the sound economic analysis he has made of this present—to my way of thinking—futile effort by the Federal Reserve Board to clamp down on the threat of inflation and improve the balance-of-payments situation.

This would be done by reverting to the conventional wisdom of the pre-Keynesian economic days—that is to say, if we make money tight enough and interest rates high enough, we will be able to trigger certain economic forces into action which will cool off an incipient inflation.

In my judgment—and I take it also in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee—this sort of monetary policy has really never worked, is not working now, and, to my way of thinking, the Federal Reserve Board has compounded a historic and chronic error in reverting to this conventional wisdom.

Perhaps in an earlier part of his speech the Senator mentioned the frightening havoc which this policy is wreaking on efforts to assure, in the words of the late Robert A. Taft, "a decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family."

The cost of this tight money and high interest policy is, to my way of thinking, far higher than any possible benefit which could come from the cooling off of inflationary forces. But in spite of the tight money and high interest program of the administration—following the lead of the Federal Reserve Board—which has resulted in a shocking decline in badly needed housing starts, there is the news this morning of the Inland Steel Co. price increase. This is clearly an inflationary measure which, in my judgment, will make even more serious the present threat of inflation.

It is true, as the Senator from Tennessee and others have suggested, that there are certain areas of slack in the economy. Housing starts is one area where we should not be trying to dampen down activities. We should make it feasible to meet the housing needs of the American people. This is equally true with respect to the education program, the poverty program, the conservation program, and programs for the renewal of our cities.

To my way of thinking, there is no reason in the world why these efforts should be discouraged through the current monetary policy, or, indeed, by efforts of the President to cut back on the national budget so that we are unable to continue programs which are appropriate and which are needed by the American people.

Having made that criticism, I feel, in conscience, I should make a constructive suggestion. I should like to call the attention of Senators to the splendid report and recommendations issued on March 17 by the Joint Economic Committee, which contained a whole series of recommendations of general interest which, in my opinion, should be brought to the floor and passed as legislation in order to help resolve the dilemma.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has introduced a bill to repeal the 7-percent investment tax credit for corporations. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I sought such a repeal earlier this year.

Mr. CLARK. It is too bad the Senator's advice was not taken.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. It would have been very beneficial to the economy, in my opinion, to have repealed the investment credit. We see now the pressures arising from plant and equipment expansion. Indeed, I just read a statement from a member of the Federal Reserve Board today that bank lendings had increased more sharply to corporations for expansion of plant and equipment than any other.

Mr. CLARK. And, of course, that bank lending is made at current high interest rates, which will therefore increase the costs of corporations, and therefore result in inflationary prices in order to pay back those loans.

Mr. GORE. Yes. Inflation feeds upon itself, and so does greed, and when the corporations which have experienced unprecedented profits look around and see that their interest costs have increased by 40 percent since 1963, and that the cost of doing business is being increased by still higher and higher rates of interest, it is natural that they seek ways of reaping greater profits.

Is it any wonder that wage earners who are being pinched by higher interest rates on home mortgages, loans for automobiles, and home appliances are restless?

Mr. CLARK. And the price of what they buy.

Mr. GORE. And the price of what they buy, which, in turn, increases the pinch between income and outgo. Is it any wonder when they look around and see the preferred, relatively few who have accumulated wealth, and who are involved in lending, are reaping a richer and richer harvest, as the Government makes credit tighter, they are chafing and are reluctant to abide by the guidelines urged?

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Tennessee.

I turn to a suggested partial solution of this problem, which goes back to legislation introduced by Representative Reuss, of Wisconsin, and myself, several years ago. At that time we were dealing with steel prices, and there was concern about the inflationary effect of such price increases and the impact on the economy of the country——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Before permitting the debate on this matter to close, I would like to express regret and disappointment at the action of Inland Steel. It is clearly inflationary. I hope it is not permitted to stand. I must say, however, that unless President Johnson, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Congress formulate and prosecute an effective and equitable economic policy, then more of these distortions can be expected, more steps to break the line can be anticipated. One privileged group cannot be free to levy upon the American people an intolerable burden without the consequences being eruptions throughout our society.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee. I believe if Congress and the administration would dig out the recommendations made by the report of the majority of the Joint Economic Committee, which was rendered last March 17, they would find in those proposals good guidelines for the policies which are needed.

Representative Reuss last January reintroduced, in almost identical form, legislation we had brought before the Congress previously. My bill, which is similar, is S. 2818. It provides for hearings by the Joint Economic Committee to review the wage-price guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers, and it would authorize the committee to hold public hearings on wage or price increases which might threaten the national economic stability by causing inflation.

Under date of January 24, I issued a release on this proposed legislation, to which is attached the text of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release and a copy of the bill may be introduced into the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and bill were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clark Introduces Bill To Combat Inflationary Increases in Prices, Wages

Senator Joseph S. Clark (D. Pa.) today introduced legislation to enable Congress, through its Joint Economic Committee, to play a more effective role in the battle against inflation.

Clark's bill, which parallels, with minor differences, a bill introduced by Congressman Henry S. Reuss (D. Wisc.) in the House of Representatives on January 10, would authorize the Joint Economic Committee to review the wage-price guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers and to hold public hearings on wage or price increases which might threaten national economic stability by causing inflation.

In his remarks prepared for delivery on the Senate floor, Clark said:

"We have enjoyed the longest period of peacetime economic growth in our history. For the fifty-ninth consecutive month we are witnessing unprecedented prosperity fostered by the sound expenditure and tax policies of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

"Yet, unjustified price increases and wage settlements can threaten our economic stability and our steady progress toward full employment.

"A more effective mechanism is needed to assure that the individual actions of industry and labor in the public interest and that an informed public is aware of the significance of major price and wage decisions. This legislation would enable the Congress to aid the Executive branch by authorizing the Joint Economic Committee to review each year the wage-price guideposts recommended by the Council of Economic Advisers.

"The Committee would also be advised by the Council of Economic Advisers of possible breaches of the guideposts which threaten national economic stability. Public hearings would afford both industry and labor an opportunity to make their views known, and the Committee would make advisory recommendations to the President or the parties involved for action which would be in the public interest.

"Thus, Congress, through its Joint Economic Committee, would bring its opinion to bear on potentially inflationary wage and price actions; the public would be made aware of the significance and effect of major price and wage decisions; and the parties involved will be encouraged to make responsible decisions in the national interest."

S. 2818

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. The Congress hereby declares that a new mechanism is needed to carry out the aims of the Employment Act of 1946 to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power (which includes the concept of reasonable price stability). Restrictive fiscal and monetary measures are appropriate and effective for controlling price and wage behavior caused by overall excessive demand. But in the absence of overall excessive demand, restrictive fiscal and monetary measures may be both harmful and ineffective. Such measures are harmful because they dampen the demand necessary for maximum employment and production. They may be ineffective with respect to individual price and wage behavior in industries with large firms or unions. This act provides a mechanism for bringing to bear an informed public opinion in order to restrain such price or wage behavior when it threatens national economic stability by causing inflation.

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS

Sec. 2. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to transmit to the joint committee not later than 40 days from the enactment of this paragraph, and not later than January 20 of each year thereafter, price-wage guideposts which would, if observed, achieve noninflationary price and wage behavior;".

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) to review the price-wage guideposts transmitted to it by the Council, and to make such reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to said guideposts as it deems advisable, and".

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE BEHAVIOR INCONSISTENT WITH GUIDEPOSTS

Sec. 3. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) to study actual or imminent price and wage behavior, in industries with large firms or unions, inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts; and to report promptly to the joint committee any such price or wage behavior which threatens national economic stability."

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) promptly upon receipt of a report from the Council pursuant to section 4(c) (7) if it deems it advisable, or upon its own initiative, to hold public hearings to determine whether price or wage behavior is inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts, and threatens national economic stability; and promptly file a report with the Senate and House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations of actions in the public interest to be taken by the President or the parties concerned."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a portion of pages 10 and 11 of the Joint Economic Report for 1966.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WAGE AND PRICE POLICIES

When the economy reaches full employment and our problem becomes one of maintaining stable prices and economic growth, private policymakers must carry an increasing share of the burden of policy formulation and execution. But this does not lessen the Government's responsibility to follow sound fiscal and monetary policies, and to prevent the injustices brought about by wage rates below a minimum standard of health and decency.

As the economy pulled out of the doldrums of the late 1950's and early 1960's, the possibility that wages and prices would get out of line brought a widespread discussion of wage-price guideposts, particularly in the reports of the Council of Economic Advisers since 1962.

These guideposts deal essentially with the problem of what kind of wage and price behavior by private individuals and organizations will best contribute to overall price stability at full employment. Full employment, stable prices, and economic growth cannot be realized year after year if private wage-price policies are inconsistent with these objectives. After all, decisionmakers are no more infallible when in private employment than when on a public payroll. But discussion of these "rules of the game" cannot be substituted for sound fiscal and monetary policies. The problems at which the guideposts are directed are essentially private, though colored with a public interest, whereas fiscal and monetary policies are public functions. We have stated elsewhere our convictions as to the necessary mix of Government programs for a noninflationary full employment economy.

Perhaps Congress might usefully assign to an existing committee, or to a newly established independent board or commission, the task of studying such issues and helping private parties come to conclusions consistent with both the public and private interest. Such a body might be empowered to make a continuing review of the guidelines and to require, on a selected basis, advance reports of wage and price decisions in industries or situations where it is likely that decisions would be of critical importance. With advance notice and facilities for advance investigation it might be able to help private policymakers of good will to reach better decisions. But we hardly think that such "jawbone" procedures alone will prevent inflation. So far as the Government has any responsibility, it is mainly to see that fiscal and monetary policies do not create the troubles.

At the same time, we are very well aware that there is always with us the problem of the marginal operator who will attempt to make a profit from exploiting workers by paying them wages far below that necessary to support individuals and families at a minimum standard of health and decency. We are convinced that caring for these cases by requiring a statutory minimum wage and extending this coverage to the maximum of our labor force is not inflationary so long as the increases are not too abrupt or extravagant—and this hardly seems likely.

Therefore we recommend that Congress at this session enact amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act extending its coverage to as much of the labor force as possible, and provide for planned raising of the minimum wage toward a level of health and decency over the next several years.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Tennessee that I shall continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with both of them on this issue, as I have on every occasion that it has been raised here on the floor of the Senate. I think there is no answer to the position they take. Their arguments continue to be sound, and I shall continue to support them.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Oregon, and point out that while there are occasionally differences between us as to pending legislation, 90 to 95 percent of the time the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon find themselves in the same corner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

IRRESPONSIBLE JOURNALISM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think in view of the very serious nature of the debate that will take place during the remainder of the day, there should be at least a light moment in the morning hour. So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Morse and the Machinists," written by John Herling, and published in the Washington Daily News of August 2, 1966. I think there should be a permanent historic record made of this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Morse and the Machinists

(By John Herling)

Senator Wayne Morse (D. Ore.) is an indegodempendent character who will say what he thinks needs saying, do what he thinks needs doing. He is also capable of turning right around to say and do the opposite, with the same fervor and appearance of rationality which accompanied his earlier position. He is a great advocate and his own worst enemy.

When he rides his high horse the groundlings below him sometimes are able to run for cover. But if they are herded into a hollow, he tries to seal off every avenue of escape—except perhaps one. By providing that one, he gives himself and others an out. He thereby hopes to win the gratitude of the nearly-annihilated. For had he not spared them when he could crush them? Had he not tempered justice with mercy?

Sen. Morse's latest feud is now raging with the Machinists Union. In fact, so great are the angers and the rancors generated between him and them, eyebrows and questions have been raised in many quarters as to why.

After all, as Sen. Morse himself has said, his relations with organized labor have always been cordial and close. Unions have been his close supporters in campaign after campaign. In fact when he abandoned the Republican Party for the Democratics, organized labor helped him in his fight to switch. But nowadays he talks about "the naked economic power of the union." By "opposing organized labor when it is wrong and supporting it when it is right," says Morse, he has proved himself a man of integrity. Such a position, even if adopted intermittently, is laudable.

But that's not all there is to it. The Senator is sensitive, proud and vain. He has been particularly mad at the AFL–CIO ever since it supported the late Sen. Pat McNamara rather than Mr. Morse for the chairmanship of the Senate Labor subcommittee. This infuriated Sen. Morse. He felt that organized labor owed him support for the higher post. Later, when Sen. McNamara fell ill, AFL–CIO's legislative director, Andrew J. Biemiller, suggested that he take over the chairmanship, with organized labor's blessing. "No," said Sen. Morse, furious, "you're making me your second choice. Besides, what do the labor bosses mean by sending their 'hired help' to communicate with me?"

Then came the recent Democratic Oregon primary in which Sen. Morse supported Howard Morgan against Rep. Robert Blackford Duncan to replace the retiring Sen. Maurine Neuberger. In this hard fought contest, Sen. Morse put his prestige on the line for Mr. Morgan on the issue of the Administration's Viet Nam policy which Rep. Duncan strongly supported. Again Sen. Morse was furious. Observers say he "raved and ranted" at labor's base ingratitude.

Just about this time, the President appointed Sen. Morse to the chairmanship of the Emergency Board to handle the airlines dispute between the five airlines and the Machinists Union. Because of labor's already strained relations with Sen. Morse, the Machinists were not particularly enamored of LBJ's choice.

Then came the primary, and the Morse candidate, Howard Morgan, was beaten badly by Rep. Duncan 3 to 1. The night of the primary, Rep. Duncan glowing and grateful in victory, announced that he could not have won the nomination without Machinists' support. Whereupon, as somebody said, "Morse split a gut."

Mr. MORSE. The article shows how yellow an "exceptional" journalist—because he is not typical of journalists as a group—can become. This particular journalist, again, as he has so many times in the past, has dipped his poisonous pen in my blood and written an article that bears no relationship to the primary responsibility of a journalist, under the constitutional guarantee of a free press, which is to print the truth.

But I want the article in the Record, so that I may answer it, because a dead man cannot answer for himself. In my judgment, some of the remarks he makes in this article do a gross injustice to the late Senator Pat McNamara, as when he says, speaking of me:

> He has been particularly mad at the AFL–CIO ever since it supported the late Sen. Pat McNamara rather than Mr. Morse for the chairmanship of the Senate Labor Subcommittee.

May I say that I urged the Senator from Michigan to be chairman of the subcommittee. I urged it not only because of his seniority rights, but because I thought he was the one who should be chairman of that subcommittee. But the fact is that Senator McNamara did not wish to be chairman of the Labor Subcommittee. As the chairman of the full committee and the majority leader can testify Senator McNamara urged that the Senator from Oregon be made chairman of the Labor Subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The then President-elect of the United States, John Kennedy, under the impression that I would be designated chairman of the Labor Subcommittee talked to me about what he wanted me to do by way of handling the Kennedy labor program that he would present at the beginning of the session of Congress after the President was sworn in.

The AFL urged Senator McNamara to become the chairman of the Labor Subcommittee. I urged him also. Therefore, Mr. Herling just does not have his facts at all. But because of his desire in some way to prejudice the Senator from Oregon whenever he can, he wrote his lies about the situation.

Let me add that for some reason there also was opposition to my becoming chairman of the Education Subcommittee. I was at a loss to understand why some AFL–CIO leaders were opposed to that. I was entitled to it as a matter of committee seniority rights, and I was made chairman of the Subcommittee on Education.

I do wish to say, to the credit of the AFL–CIO, that once I was made chairman of that subcommittee, I could not have had better cooperation than I have received from the legislative representatives of the AFL–CIO in respect to the education legislation that we have passed beginning with the first year of the Kennedy administration.

A further falsification in this article—which was also contained in the story from the Machinist newspaper which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday. Both articles falsely allege that I am carrying on a feud against the Machinists. Labor supported a certain candidate for the Senate in the recent Oregon primary while I opposed him.

The fact is that I have, in recent weeks, been the leader here on the floor of the Senate in connection with major labor legislation, such as the metallic mine safety bill and the coal mine safety bill.

I am never, may I say, influenced one whit by opposition to me on any issue, when the merits call for my support of the issue. I am perfectly willing to let my record in support of the legitimate rights of labor during my years in the Senate and my years before coming to the Senate speak for itself. I do not have to make any apology for that record. I shall continue to oppose what I consider to be any illegitimate demand of the unions, in any case, as I have throughout my career.

I happen to think that in this instance, the Machinists have gone far beyond their legitimate rights in the solution of this case, and that is the basis of my position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield. I ask for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. I have not heretofore taken part in the debate on the current strike. In view of the remarks which I made earlier today, and in view of the remarks that the Senator from Oregon has just made, I should like to suggest that another defalcation in our society and our Government structure rests with the independent agencies.

I do not know exactly how the wage levels of the workers in the Machinists Union compare with wage levels nationally. I can see that with the inordinate profits of the airlines, it is but human and natural that the workers wish to share to a greater degree in those profits.

But, Mr. President, what about the American public, the traveling public? The fares and rates of the airlines, which have profited so greatly by taxpayer expense in development of planes and in construction of airports and runways, should be brought into line with a reasonable profit. What is wrong with the CAB, may I inquire of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon? Why is not action forthcoming to lower rates, to give to the American people, the traveling public, a share of the lowered cost of travel through the use of jet planes, through improved airports, and through technological progress?

Mr. MORSE. The matter is under consideration, and the answer in part—though not the total answer—is that for more than a year, the CAB has been issuing certain regulations and rulings aimed at distributing to the public certain benefits. But the main rate case is still ahead of us.

There is no question about the fact that the CAB should proceed with its rate consideration. I shall dwell on that at greater length this afternoon, when I discuss some of the substantive issues involved.

But I believe the workers are entitled to consideration, in connection with their wages, of the earnings of the companies, and they are being given that consideration.

Mr. GORE. That is particularly true when the cost of living of the workers is rising, and when, due to increasing interest rates the monthly payments on their homes, their automobiles, their refrigerators, and their wives' sewing machines are greater and greater. The cost of interest at the bank is higher. When they go to borrow money to buy a home, they not only have to pay a high interest rate, but a big discount under the table. No wonder they chafe.

Mr. MORSE. That is also true in connection with the traveling public. But the question the Senator raises is whether or not the proposed settlement that the union negotiators entered into last Friday night is a fair and equitable settlement. I respectfully submit that it is. So that raises the question as to whether or not the union is seeking more than a fair settlement. In my judgment, they have been seeking that from the beginning. They have been seeking a 7- to 8-percent increase in wages and I say they cannot justify that from the standpoint of the public interest in a regulated industry.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps the members would, even yet, show a greater willingness to accept what the Senator has described as a reasonable settlement, if they had confidence that the Government of the United States would act forthrightly and effectively in distributing to the public the benefits of the improved technology and the increased traffic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we certainly could not justify allowing them to force an inflationary wage increase, because to this moment some other steps have not been taken. I join the Senator from Tennessee in insisting that other steps be taken, too.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, collective bargaining to settle labor-management disputes is a fundamental process in America, basic to the freedom of the American people and essential to progress and prosperity in our land.

As a general rule, I believe neither the Congress of the United States nor the President should intervene in labor-management disputes, except in those rare instances where collective bargaining has broken down, an impasse has been reached, and the public interest is substantially affected.

In the current dispute between the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers and five domestic scheduled airlines, collective bargaining has been underway over an extended period of time. When it became clear that the negotiators could not reach any agreement, the President of the United States, whose legal powers had been exhausted in this dispute, took the extraordinary step of personal intervention. Within the same day, last Friday, an agreement was reached by the negotiators, but when submitted on Sunday to members of the union it was rejected by a vote of approximately three to one.

The strike, which has grounded airlines normally carrying 60 percent of the Nation's air passengers and 70 percent of the Nation's airfreight, has been in effect since 6 a.m., July 8. It is now entering the 27th day.

With every passing day, the economic toll is accelerating. In addition to the 35,000 striking employees, some 36,000 to 37,000 other airline employees have been put out of work, according to testimony July 27 by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. Airline employees are losing some $1.6 million in wages a day. Unemployment in other industries has resulted—such as tour guide operators, hotels, restaurants—as the effects of the strike widen to other sectors of our economy.

Some 150,000 passengers each day have been grounded, resulting not only in personal inconvenience and hardships but also in a slowdown in thousands of enterprises that depend on rapid air service. Thousands of small businesses have seen their daily sales drop drastically and their income fall sharply off.

Airlines are losing gross revenues of approximately $7 million a day.

Defense contractors have difficulty moving their personnel to testing sites and laboratories. Production and delivery schedules in vital defense items have been delayed.

The Federal Government is losing tax revenue every day, and there was testimony that the Treasury is losing $1 million weekly in our balance of payments.

Secretary Wirtz testified that mail deliveries were delayed from 24 hours to 4 to 5 days and that some drugs and pharmaceuticals were not being delivered.

There is no question about it. The adverse economic impact has widened relentlessly day by day.

Some areas, such as Hawaii, which is almost totally dependent upon air service for transportation of persons between Hawaii and the U.S. mainland, have been dealt a tremendous economic blow. Hawaii has lost the services of two of the three major domestic scheduled air carriers rendering mainland-Hawaii service.

Pan American World Airways, the only remaining domestic airline serving this route, has performed magnificently during the past several weeks to try to accommodate as many passengers as possible. Certainly, Pan American employees and management deserve a resounding vote of gratitude and appreciation for their valiant efforts to cope with this emergency of such enormous proportions in Hawaii.

Direct and indirect losses to Hawaii's economy so far caused by the strike have been estimated between $7.5 million and $9 million by the Bank of Hawaii department of business research. I believe the actual loss will prove even higher, and the effects will plague Hawaii long after the planes start flying again. Furthermore, losses are escalating at a steep rate.

Hotels, restaurants, tour guide operators, retail shops, our interisland air carriers, and all the tourist-related enterprises have been hurt by this strike during our peak tourist season. Many small businesses need peak-season business to tide them over the slack seasons, so this is a real to blow to them.

On July 27, I received a cable from Mr. William H. Charlock III, president of the Hawaii Hotel Association, who informed me that as of that date the airline strike caused $1,200,000 in losses, plus $2 million in losses for the rest of the tourist industry in Hawaii.

Our interisland airlines have suffered heavily, too. They provide the only mode of transportation among our islands. Aloha Airlines reported it lost 578 passengers during the first week of the strike, but cancellations last week were running at 480 per day, and cancellations for August are running at what is called "an alarmingly higher rate." As of last Wednesday, Aloha's loss was about $100,000.

Hawaiian Airlines estimates its losses ran at 300 passengers a day during the first week, rising to 700 a day the second week, then to 850 a day, and by July 26 and 27, to 1,000 a day. Hawaiian Airlines estimated its loss at about $150,000 as of the morning of July 28.

What is directly, immediately, and heavily involved is Hawaii's tourist industry. This is our second largest industry, next to agriculture, and it is the industry offering the greatest hope for rapid growth and expansion.

Until the airline strike, it was estimated 700,000 visitors would journey to Hawaii this year. This would bring in $302 million in income to our local economy. Since the strike, we have been losing 1,200 to 1,400 visitors a day. The average visitor stays 2 weeks and spends $450. It now looks as if, because of the strike, our estimates for this industry will have to be scaled sharply down.

But this not the only industry in Hawaii suffering because of the airline strike. Our fresh fruit and flower industries require air service to move their products to markets. Hawaii is a major producing area for papayas, orchids, anthurium, and other floral products. Exports of these cash crops depend upon air transportation which has been severely curtailed by the strike.

Mr. Andy Hayashi, president of the Papaya Industry of Hawaii, and Mr. Baron Ebesugawa, president of the Hilo Florists and Shippers Association, advised me that on July 29 their organizations adopted a resolution stating that "the present curtailment in air transportation is adversely affecting volume movement and speedy delivery" of papayas, orchids, anthurium, and other products. These are million-dollar industries and very important to the economy of Hawaii.

I cannot overemphasize the devastating effect this prolonged strike is having on Hawaii. It is now reaching into almost every segment of our economic life, affecting wholesalers as well as retailers; importers as well as exporters; cattle farmers as well as fruit, vegetable, and flower growers. With a sharp drop in tourists, laundries, drycleaners, apparel shops, restaurants, grocers, flower lei sellers, souvenir shops, travel bureaus, entertainers, busdrivers, businessmen, bankers—all are adversely affected.

I have already put into the RECORD considerable data on the impact on Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that various correspondence and news articles further documenting this be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FONG. Some Members of the Senate have expressed doubt that the airline strike, now nearly 4 weeks long, constitutes an emergency.

Because of the strike, Hawaii is losing about 10,000 tourists a week.

It is certainly an emergency to tour guides in Hawaii who have thousands fewer of tourists to guide.

It is certainly an emergency to hotels with many rooms vacant at a time when all are usually full.

It is certainly an emergency to hotel workers who are losing tips and even their jobs.

It is certainly an emergency to retail stores and restaurants—like those on Waikiki and on our neighbor islands—who have lost many customers.

It is certainly an emergency to clerks, waiters, and waitresses who are being laid off for lack of business.

It is certainly an emergency to importers and exporters of perishable items which depend on air transportation. It is certainly an emergency to papaya growers and flower exporters in Hawaii.

It is certainly an emergency to laundries and dry cleaning establishments and their employees, whose business has dropped sharply.

It is certainly an emergency to our interisland airlines and their employees who are losing fares of hundreds of passengers every single day.

It is certainly an emergency to the mother with a sick child and only 35 cents in her pocketbook, stranded at Honolulu Airport until flight space could be found.

It was an emergency for three young girls without a cent in their pockets waiting for 3 days at the airport. All they had to eat were free coffee and cookies distributed by Host International to stranded passengers.

It was an emergency for a honeymooning couple forced to stay 2 days and nights at the airport, standing by for seats on a plane to the mainland.

So to those who say this is no emergency, I say it is an emergency when the livelihood of so many people is being jeopardized and when tourism—a leading industry of Hawaii and several other States—is badly hurt.

With negotiations at an impasse, with the legal remedies of the President under the Railway Labor Act exhausted, with the agreement reached under Presidential auspices turned down by the union members, and with the ever-growing impact on the entire Nation, the time has come for Congress to act. It is time for Congress to intercede in behalf of the public interest.

While, as I indicated before, I believe it is bad policy generally for Congress or for the President to intervene in labor-management disputes, there comes a time when the public interest is overriding. This is such a time.

I believe the current dispute, in the words of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act which governs airlines disputes, "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service." It not only threatens, it has already had this effect.

The National Mediation Board last April notified the President that in its judgment this dispute threatened to substantially interrupt interstate commerce and deprive the Nation of essential transportation.

In creating the Emergency Board in this dispute on April 21 and in the American Airlines-Transportation Union dispute on July 27, the President made the same determination. Secretary Wirtz yesterday acknowledged this threat unequivocally in his testimony before the Senate Labor Committee.

After hearings and due deliberation, the committee arrived at the same conclusion. Thereupon, the committee approved legislation which we are considering this afternoon to deal with this critical situation.

With the President and Federal agencies directly involved in agreement with the committee that the airline mechanics strike meets the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, there can be no doubt that the public interest is involved.

I believe the public interest requires resumption of full air service.

Mr. President, I have spoken six or seven times in the Senate citing the seriousness of the airline strike, particularly as it affects my State of Hawaii. Air transportation is literally our lifeline for mainland Hawaii travel.

Air transportation is crucial also to our sister State, Alaska.

Many other States—California, Florida, and New York, for example—rely heavily on air transportation for people and freight, although they are more fortunate than Alaska and Hawaii in that they can turn to other modes of transportation.

Because the airline strike is so crucial to Hawaii and other areas, as early as July 12, I urged the President to intervene in behalf of the public interest. I asked him to call the disputants to around-the-clock sessions at the White House, as he did in the impending steel strike last year. I regret he waited until July 29 to take this step. But he did intervene in the early morning hours, and agreement was reached between union representatives and airline negotiators by midevening.

Just when it appeared the strike was over, a majority of the union members rejected the agreement. I am sure the President was as sorely disappointed as all the rest of us were.

So the President is now in the position of having exhausted his legal authority under the Railway Labor Act and of having his personal attempts at settlement thwarted.

On July 19, I wrote to the chairmen of the Senate Labor Committee, the Labor Subcommittee, and the Commerce Committee, urging that action be initiated looking to legislation to deal with the airline strike should that become necessary.

On July 27, the Senate Labor Committee held a hearing on the issue of whether an emergency exists because of the strike. To assist the committee, I submitted for the record all the information available to me showing the devastating effect of the strike on Hawaii. On July 28 and 29 and on August 1, the Senate Labor Committee worked on legislation, and Monday approved by majority vote the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 186.

The purpose of the resolution is to allow the President discretionary authority to order the airline mechanics back to work and to prevent a lockout for up to 180 days. He would also be empowered to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board, if he wished to do so, which would conduct mediation to promote agreement between the airlines and the union.

The heart of the resolution is the discretionary grant of power from Congress. Under this resolution, Congress would leave up to the President to decide whether to order the strike ended while negotiations ensued. On enactment of this resolution, the American people would have no assurance that air service of these five major airlines would, in fact, be resumed, or for how long.

I have already stated I believe the public interest requires resumption of full air service.

I have already stated that I believe resumption of air service is critically important to Hawaii and other States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe the Congress should enact legislation that will insure a resumption of air service by the struck airlines.

The proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] assures resumption of air service for 180 days. Enactment of this approach by Congress would trigger a prompt return to work by airline employees while a special mediation board continued negotiations.

Whatever Congress does, it ought to make certain that air transportation is restored and not leave the question undecided.

My prime concern, and I believe it should be the prime concern of Congress, is to restore air transportation while collective bargaining continues.

I appreciate the desire of the committee members that the President should have flexibility, but I believe this dispute has reached the stage where Congress must hand down a mandate that air service must be promptly restored. The very fact that the Senate is considering legislation to deal with this dispute argues that the Senate and Congress should decide the question, not leave it dangling.

Mr. President, I plan to support the Morse proposal in preference to the committee proposal.

If the Morse proposal fails, I plan to support the committee proposal.

If another proposal is offered which will make certain the airlines will promptly return to full operation and which will allow collective bargaining and negotiation to continue, I plan to support it.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 28, 1966]

ISLE STRIKE LOSSES PASS $7 MILLION

(By Shurei Hirozawa)

Direct and indirect losses caused by the strike against five major air carriers have been running from $2.5 to $3 million a week in Hawaii, the Bank of Hawaii Department of Business Research estimated today.

This means the loss to the Islands' economy has been between $7.5 and $9 million so far.

The big fear is that losses are escalating at a steep rate, and that some businesses will really be hurt if the strike continues more than a week longer.

Feeling the effects are the hotels, local airlines, curio shops, restaurants, bars and car rentals.

The loss to the hotels is estimated at $3 million so far by the Bank of Hawaii's economists.

Instead of an expected occupancy rate of 98 percent for the major hotels, the figure is down to 87 percent or lower.

This may not seem serious, but it is. The hotels depend on good summer months for a good year. Additionally, the loss in revenue comes off the top which means net income takes a severe beating.

A further cause of concern is that the effect of the strike will be prolonged far into the future after the airlines resume flying, because people may cancel future vacations and conventions. This multiple effect will not be known for some time, but economists feel it may gouge the economy this year.

Where escalating losses are concerned, Hawaiian Airlines and Aloha Airlines face a serious situation.

Hawaiian estimates that its loss ran at 300 passengers a day during the first week, went up to 700 a day the second week, and is running at 850 a day now. It estimates a loss to date of $120,000.

Aloha said it lost 578 passengers during the first week of the strike. But cancellations are running at 480 a day now, and cancellations into August are coming in at an alarmingly higher rate.

Aloha considers its situation very serious, a spokesman said. Its loss to date is approximately $100,000.

If the drive to get residents to vacation now on other Islands has helped, it is not apparent to Hawaiian or Aloha.

John Felix, president of the Hawaii Restaurant Association, said Waikiki restaurants have experienced a very definite dropoff in customers since the strike began July 8.

In mid-June, when hotels were almost fully occupied, Felix said restaurants were bulging with customers. In the past few weeks, the bulge has deflated quite a bit, he said.

Felix's own La Ronde is another graphic example of how losses are beginning to escalate.

The revolving restaurant atop the Ala Moana Building caters mainly to visitors for lunch and mostly to residents for dinner.

La Ronde served 7,325 lunches in the first 27 days of this month, down 356 from last July.

Felix said only 10 days ago, the number of lunches served was ahead of last July's figure, but in the last five days the decline set in and has been accelerating.

On the other hand, dinners served so far this month totaled 7,478 compared with 6,432 for the same 27 days last July. This gain of 1,046 is attributed mainly to residents, who make up the bulk of the dinner trade, he said.

Edmund A. Attebury, general manager of Liberty House stores, said sales are about 12 percent less than had been expected.

He estimated the loss from the beginning of July to date at $125,000.

He said: "As a matter of fact, all of our stores have been affected. The Waikiki Pharmacy and the Waikiki Liberty House, which attracts tourist business, are the two that have been hurt the most."

C. J. Cavanaugh, executive vice-president of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, said that while he has no detailed statistics as yet, "We know that the Waikiki shops are particularly hurting and also some Ala Moana Center shops."

However, spokesman for Andrade, McInerny, Pennys and F. W. Woolworth, said they have not been affected by the strikes thus far.

Richard H. Wheeler, Andrade manager, said his stores in fact realized "satisfactory increases."

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 28, 1966]

STANDBYS DISCOURAGED AT AIRPORT

Standbys swamped the Honolulu Airport again today as traffic built up for weekend flights to the West Coast, and Pan American Airways discouraged passengers from coming to the airport.

Early today there were 440 passengers on Pan Am's standby list. About 350 of them were expected to find seats on today's flights.

But a Pan Am spokesman said that more space could suddenly become available if extra flights can be located for the Hawaii-West Coast flights.

About 250 standbys found seats on outgoing flights yesterday.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 27, 1966]

ISLES FEAR RISE IN AIRLINE STRIKE LOSSES

(By Emil A. Schneider)

Hawaii's economy is estimated to be losing upwards of $2 million or more a week because of the airline strike, and the loss is expected to mount as the effects spread from the tourist industry to the rest of the economy here.

The loss figures might best be described as "guesstimates" because they range from a low of $1⅔ million weekly (from an economist) to as high as $4½ million weekly (by Sen. HIRAM FONG). In between is a figure of $2¼ million weekly from the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

One economist here thinks the effects of the strike are not as bad as some reports indicate.

He notes that hotel occupancy is down 10 to 15 per cent from normal summer levels, but he adds that unemployment compensation claims are up only 80 to 100 claims and part of this increase is seasonal.

Furthermore, he thinks part of the current visitor loss may be recovered in the fall by people who are able to re-schedule their vacations.

However, William H. Charlock III, manager of the Hilton Hawaiian Village and president of the Hawaii Hotel Assn., disagrees strongly with this viewpoint.

"Tourism is just as perishable a commodity as fresh fruit and vegetables," he said. "I don't think we'll see any pickup at all in September or October over anticipated increases.

"In fact," he added, "I think there will be more lingering after effects of the strike, the longer the strike continues."

Many Waikiki merchants also are complaining about the strike, and there have been reports that sales are off as much as 30 percent from expected levels.

However, one observer noted that part of this decline could be due to the opening of the new Woolworth store in Waikiki as well as the new Phase II of the Ala Moana Center. These new stores, especially the new Woolworth unit, "are biting into the Waikiki retail sales pie," he explained.

Another possibility, he added, is that many tourists, hearing of visitors stranded here and running out of cash, may have curtailed their shopping activities so that the same thing wouldn't happen to them. This thinking should disappear, now that the prolonged delays for standby passengers have ended, he said.

The strike also is creating problems for merchants who use air cargo for bringing in part of their merchandise.

Sears, which uses United Air Lines extensively for incoming shipments of apparel and other soft goods, has had to shift this volume to ocean-going freight. But the delay is not expected to cause any shortage of goods here, George Gaugler, Sears manager, said.

Meanwhile, Hawaii business groups and hotel operators are sending messages to Hawaii's Congressional delegation and others in Congress, urging prompt settlement of the airline strike because of the crippling effects here.

The Hawaii Hotel Assn. sent the following wire:

"Entire membership Hawaii Hotel Assn., greatly concerned with present airline strike and adverse effects on economy of Hawaii. Your continued efforts to alleviate situation imperative."

The Honolulu Chamber of Commerce sent the following cable to Sen. Lister Hill, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare committee:

"Airline strike which initially affected only tourism now seriously apparent throughout economy of Hawaii. Legislation or other means to help us urgent."

And Stuart M. Cowan, partner in the law firm of Greenstein & Cowan, sent a letter to Hawaii's Congressional delegation that included the following:

"I would propose that during strike periods such as we now face, the State of Hawaii be placed on at least an approximate equal footing with the other 49 states. Why is it not feasible, as previously suggested by the Hawaii Chamber of Commerce, to allow foreign flag carriers, air and sea as necessary, to move passengers and freight between Hawaii and the West Coast during such times as normal traffic is blocked or otherwise restricted on account of these strikes?"

House Minority Leader Fred W. Rohlfing charged yesterday that the three Democrats in Hawaii's four-man congressional delegation have failed to try to end the current airline strike.

"Senator Hiram Fong, a Republican, immediately wired the President seeking the kind of action LBJ took when the steel strike threatened—around the clock negotiations at the White House," he said.

He also contended that Gov. John A. Burns had failed to "take advantage of his well-publicized friendship with the President" to urge him to take action to end the strike.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 29, 1966]

HAL, ALOHA FEEL PINCH OF STRIKE

The airlines strike is hurting Hawaiian Airlines so badly that the local carrier will be forced to furlough employes if it persists, Jack C. Tobin said yesterday.

"We have not curtailed our staff," said the HAL executive vice president. "And we are doing everything we can not to have to.

"But we had geared up for the biggest summer in our history. And it just isn't here. A study shows we lost 350 passengers a day the first week of the strike against the five trunk carriers.

"The losses jumped to 850 a day the second week. They've topped 1,000 a day this week."

Tobin explained that HAL's planes are making their inter-island runs with six out of ten seats empty—instead of 70 per cent full, as anticipated.

"Although we are keeping everyone on for now, we really don't need this many people to handle the dwindling number of passengers," he said.

Aloha Airlines senior vice president Richard H. King confirmed that Aloha's business was off so sharply that the carrier had canceled all extra sections for the duration of the strike.

There was also uneasiness about projected conventions to be held here next month.

If the strike can be settled within the next week, it probably won't seriously hurt convention and large group movements scheduled for August, according to Mary Jane Maples of Inter-Island Trade Wind Tours.

Mrs. Maples, who books most of the big movements to the Islands, reported that the 850 members of the American Association of Public Accountants appear to be holding firm to their plans to come to the Islands Aug. 10 from all over the U.S.

"I don't know how many of them are holding Pan American and how many United," she said. "But they are sitting tight with no signs of panic.

"But from the 2,250 Kiwanis Club members, who are booked about half on Pan Am and half United, starting about Aug. 10, you can see that some of them are beginning to feel desperate. I hope they can settle this thing before any substantial portion of this group panics."

If the strike runs on into late August, Mrs. Maples said, it would stand to hit hard the projected visit by 3,000 Ford dealers, most of whom are booked on United.

Yesterday, Honolulu International Airport terminal was crowded again with standby passengers.

Pan Am found seats for 204 standbys. Eight flights left with not a seat vacant.

Pan American said it would look into the chances for extra sections over the weekend, but held out small hope of trimming the backlog of would-be passengers much before Tuesday.

The end of the first semester of summer school at the University of Hawaii today is expected to contribute to the weekend jam at the terminal.

Honolulu,
July 27, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

To date airline strike has caused Hawaii's hotels alone $1,200,000 loss plus an additional $2,000,000 loss by the rest of the tourist industry. Hawaii Hotel Association urgently request settlement of airline strike. Present strike plus rumors of another airline strike to follow are destroying future bookings and confidence in travel to Hawaii. Please take immediate action.

William H. Charlock III,
President Hawaii Hotel Association.

Chambers of Commerce of Honolulu,
July 26, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hiram: We want to thank you for your efforts to find a solution to settlement of the airlines strike.

The real damage will be in the months to come because of the massive cancellations now being reported by travel agents incurred by the fear of people scheduled for visits at a later date.

Today's news indicated increased presidential pressure and the combined efforts of our team should certainly help to get some results.

I am writing this letter in Randy's absence. He has gone to Austria for three weeks on a business trip.

Mahalo and aloha,

C. J. Cavanagh,
Executive Vice President.

Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.,
Honolulu, Hawaii, July 28, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hiram: I know you are following the impact of the strike on the State of Hawaii, but most of the news releases tend to deal with generalities rather than specifics. As a consequence, I felt detailed information might be of value.

The anticipated compounding effect of the strike on the neighbor islands is easily measurable by Hawaiian Airlines' experience. The first week of the strike, we ran an average of 321 passengers per day below normal. The second week of the strike, our loss increased to an average of 700 passengers per day. As we entered the third week, traffic dropped 850 passengers per day below anticipated and normal levels; and for the last two days, it has been running about 1,000 passengers per day below normal. If you multiply this volume by the anticipated visitor spending, it is easy to measure the economic impact of the strike on the neighbor islands.

In terms of dollars, it appears as of this morning its cost to Hawaiian Airlines has been about $150,000 and even if it should end today, it clearly will have an effect on August traffic levels.

As you know, one of the extremely serious parts of this loss in revenue to our visitor economy is that Hawaiian Airlines, like many companies in the State, rely on July and August profits to weather the lean off-season months so the economic success of a year is directly dependent upon July and August traffic levels.

We are deeply appreciative of your efforts in bringing this total problem to the attention of both Congress and the Administration.

Sincerely,

John H. Magoon, Jr.,
President.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 1, 1966]

Many More Hotel Rooms Now Vacant

Oahu hotel occupancy rates this week will be down about 6 percent from last year at this time, the Hawaii Visitors Bureau said today.

This means hundreds of vacant hotel rooms and less work for visitor industry employees.

Oahu's average this week will be from 89 to nearly 91 percent, compared with 97 percent last August.

On the neighbor islands partial returns show Kailu-Kona with 58 to 72 percent occupancy, (last August, 90.4 percent); Hilo, 73 to 81 percent (last August, 86.1 percent); and Maui, 63 to 67 percent (last August, 74.7 percent).

Hawaii Hotel Association figures for Waikiki showed a downward trend, with rates last week below the July average.

Large hotels had an occupancy rate of 85.8 percent last week, and a July average of 89.8 percent, compared with 94.1 percent a year ago.

Smaller Waikiki hotels had 78.2 percent lst week, and a July average of 86.3 percent, compared with 93.1 percent a year ago.

Liberty House,
July 28, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fong: I want to thank you for your personal efforts in trying to conclude the Air Lines strike. From your cable, letters and many clippings and also local news I can see that you really have Hawaii at heart and you are to be congratulated.

We continue to feel the pinch and I certainly hope something can be done to end the strike. We did hear faint rumors today that it might come to an end soon but nothing definite has developed.

Thanks again for your help and keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

E. A. Attebury.

Honolulu, Hawaii.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, June 28, 1966]

Three Hundred and Fifty Wait for Seats to Mainland

Pan American World Airways reported at 5:45 p.m. yesterday that 350 passengers were listed as stand-bys and waiting at the airport.

"We are not encouraging anyone else to come to the airport tonight," a Pan American spokesman said.

"We don't expect to clear our entire list tonight, but we hope to handle a major portion of the stand-bys."

Pan American, the only scheduled air link between Hawaii and the Mainland while Northwest and United Air Lines are struck, accommodated 143 stand-by passengers on six flights which departed prior to 2 p.m. yesterday.

Five others were scheduled to depart. But Flight 842, which normally would have proceeded on to San Francisco last night, was held up in Guam 24 hours for an engine change.

Honolulu Japanese
Chamber of Commerce,
Honolulu, Hawaii, July 27, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Fong: We deeply appreciate your letter of July 16, 1966, informing us that you wired to the President and urged him to intervene personally and proposed him to call "around-the-clock" sessions of unions and airlines representatives.

At the Board of Directors meeting, held on July 25, 1966, we read your letter and part of your speech you delivered on July 20th at the Senate.

Our Board members appreciated your sincere efforts for the immediate settlement of the strike which is seriously hurting the economy of Hawaii, especially the Tourist Industry.

We ask again, that you do everything possible to bring immediate settlement of the strike.

Sincerely yours,
Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce.
Tsuyoshi Nishimoto, *President.*

Duarte's,
July 25, 1966.

Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate, Fourth Fir Finance Factors Building, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dear Hiram: As you know this airline strike is very costly to the islands. However, I am wondering if there is a possibility of congressional action so that the airlines may fly again.

Please kindly look into it. If there is anybody who can do it I know people like you, with the position that you hold, can do it.

Much Aloha, Come and see us.

Aloha,

Willie.

Honolulu,
August 1, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincere thanks for your vigorous effort in an attempt to bring an end to airline strike. Would appreciate your continued effort should congressional action be necessary.

Oliver Yanaga,
President, Hawaii Chapter American Society of Travel Agents.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 30, 1966]

UAL Ready in 6 Hours

(By James Cunningham)

United Air Lines jetliners will be ready to fly again six to eight hours after striking mechanics ratify their new contract, spokesmen said yesterday.

If the International Association of Machinists is able to approve the strike settlement by tomorrow evening, this means United's first trip could leave Honolulu early Monday.

Northwest Airlines, the other Hawaii-Mainland carrier grounded by the strike, may require as much as 72 hours to take off, a spokesman said.

The return to service of United and Northwest will more than double the air carrying capacity between Hawaii and the Mainland.

Pan American World Airways, which has struggled to handle the job alone for the past 22 days, offers 93 round-trips to the West Coast weekly.

United, which was offering 91 round-trips, will resume service on the basis of the 105 flights weekly scheduled to have started July 17.

Northwest will be flying 12 round-trips a week to Portland and Seattle.

Its Trans-Pacific charter operations for the military will give United an assist in a speedy return to normal in Honolulu. A United jet is due here today from California with a load of servicemen.

That plane and its crew will stand by for orders to take off for San Francisco or Los Angeles as the first commercial departure.

Another DC–8, which is at United's maintenance hangar at Honolulu International, will await the arrival of a crew from the West Coast, probably aboard the first outbound flight.

The settlement agreement was announced just as another passenger-jam was building at John Rodgers Terminal. More than 1,000 would-be travelers were standing by at the terminals as of 5 p.m. yesterday.

Pan American had been able to accommodate 243 stand-bys on its first seven flights yesterday. The carrier expected to handle more on its other eight regular trips and one extra section last night.

But the backlog, boosted by the end of the first summer session at the University of Hawaii, wasn't expected to be trimmed much today and tomorrow.

United reported that, as of yesterday, the strike had forced cancellation of 308 inbound passenger flights which would have had a total of 41,580 seats.

Its only operations through Honolulu during the strike were the military charter trips. These planes were serviced by the striking machinists as a patriotic duty.

United said it flew seven such passenger trips and 39 such cargo trips here from California during the strike. Two passenger and 37 cargo flights went on to the Orient.

Within 36 hours after formal notification that the machinists have okayed the contract, United spokesmen said, its operations should be on schedule nationwide.

Calls to the United switchboard had dwindled from the usual 200 to just 50 an hour. With news of the impending settlement, it suddenly was swamped.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, July 31, 1966]

What's Up Tomorrow? United Jets, They Hope

United Air Lines expects to start flying again at 9 a.m. tomorrow, with the first of 15 flights to the Mainland.

United has been grounded since the airline strike began 24 days ago.

"We're booking like mad for Monday," a spokesman said. "The ticket offices are mobbed."

United's ticket offices will be open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. today "with a beefed up crew," the spokesman said.

United schedules more than 100 round-trip flights to the Mainland each week.

At Northwest Orient Airlines—also grounded by the strike—reservations are being taken for flights after Tuesday. Flights through Tuesday were canceled as of last night, Northwest said.

Northwest flies to the Mainland 12 times a week.

Pan American World Airways—the only U.S. carrier flying to the Mainland during the strike—had another hectic day yesterday.

Nearly 1,000 persons were on stand-by lists.

About 800 of them jammed the Pan Am wing of the Honolulu International Airport terminal in what a spokesman called "as wild a day as we've had during the strike."

Pan Am accommodated 291 stand-bys Friday. Sixteen Mainland flights went out yesterday, and 15 will go today.

Kaoru Watanabe, Pan Am's airport service manager, said Pan Am filled every Mainland flight the last five days.

The stand-by lists were filled by hundreds of college students going home after spending six weeks of the first of two University of Hawaii summer sessions.

Watanabe said some Pan Am employes have worked 16 hours a day at times during the strike.

The strike is expected to end officially today, when members of the International Association of Machinists vote whether to accept contract agreements reached Friday.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Hawaii is the major producing area of papaya, orchids, anthurium, and other floral products; and

Whereas Hawaii depends upon air transportation in its export of the above mentioned agricultural products to the mainland United States; and

Whereas two of the five struck airlines constituting two-thirds of the domestic airlines serving Hawaii with the mainland, U.S., were equally carriers of Hawaii's export commodities; and

Whereas the present curtailment in air transportation is adversely affecting volume movement and speedy delivery of the above mentioned commodities; and

Whereas our island economy is greatly affected by decrease in sales of commodities: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the organized groups in the papaya and floral industries request their National Legislators to do everything possible through legislation or otherwise to bring about a speedy settlement and resumption of air transportation and services; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to:

The Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable PATSY T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

ANDY HAGAL,
President, Papaya Industry of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii.
BARON EBESUGAWA,
President, Hilo Florists and Shippers Association, Hilo, Hawaii.
JULY 29, 1966.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. May I have 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the very excellent statement he has made this morning regarding the effect of the present air strike on Hawaii. He has discussed in a very able and dedicated way the problems confronting his State. I know how effectively he represents the citizens of that great State.

However, I also wish to emphasize what he has mentioned: this strike is causing serious problems and serious difficulties in the other States. I share with him his concern about achieving early settlement. I hope that we can somehow, some way, secure a termination of this situation.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

SCIENCE, CAMPAIGN FINANCE, AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on July 28 the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress submitted its final report. Established on March 11, 1965, by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the committee has received the views of some 200 witnesses in public hearings, including over 100 Members of Congress. The committee staff has analyzed this testimony and in addition has carried out relevant studies of its own. The result is a report which contains some fruitful suggestions for the modernization and improvement of congressional operations. Today I wish to commend cochairmen MONRONEY and MADDEN and their colleagues for the excellence of their work and to comment on certain proposals in which I have had a particular interest.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

My own testimony before the committee focused on the matter of campaign finance—a problem which fortunately has recently become the object of Presidential initiative. The joint committee did not make specific recommendations in the area since campaign finance is not essentially an organizational matter. However, the report recognized that it has been a problem of great concern and expressed the hope that Congress will "have the opportunity to consider legislation which would provide more realistic reporting requirements and broaden the base of political campaign contributions."

I concur in this hope. Our present campaign regulations are a sham. They represent a negative and ineffective approach. Full and effective campaigning requires vast sums of money. The low ceilings contained in present law, if effective, would drastically curtail campaigns; in their present ineffective state they encourage evasion and penalize the conscientious. They should be revised upward or eliminated entirely. Negative statutes which limit expenditures should be replaced by provisions for full and effective reporting of the sources and recipients of funds. In addition, some provision must be made for the relief of hard-pressed candidates and for the reduction of their reliance on large donors. The President's proposed tax deduction to encourage small contributors is one promising approach. At some point, however, I am convinced that we will have to deal with what is fast becoming the major item in campaign budgets: television. In an 8-year period nationwide expenditures for political broadcasting have increased by 250 percent. It is in the public interest that TV time be made available to candidates at greatly reduced rates. Legislation which does not in some way deal with this need will necessarily fail to confront squarely the problems of political finance.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

The joint committee gave considerable attention to Congress need for accurate information and expert analysis. Several proposals have been submitted which would improve the performance of the Legislative Reference Service. LRS, it is suggested, should be redesignated the "Legislative Research Service." This is to be more than a mere change in name. It would point up the fact that Congress needs more than compilation and analysis; its informational arm must also supply viable and constructive alternatives to proposed programs and policies. I will say more about this shift in emphasis in a moment.

A necessary first step toward improving the quality of LRS's work is providing for a manageable workload. The Reference Service now labors under a burden of constituent requests—inquiries which are peripheral to the legislative business of the Congress and which drain away time and energy which should be expended on substantive research. As I said on the Senate floor last week, the most needed reform along these lines is simply for Members of Congress and their staffs to do their own work responsibly and to use the Reference Service properly. But the joint committee has made several recommendations also designed to give LRS additional time to devote to research projects and to generally improve the quality of its output.

The committee recommend that LRS be given the authority to create a new reference division to handle constituent requests and other routine inquiries. It is also suggested that the Service should be authorized to employ experts, consultants, and research organizations on a temporary basis to supplement its permanent staff. Finally, it is recommended that additional supergrade positions be authorized for LRS to allow for the employment of needed specialists and senior specialists. These suggestions, Mr. President, are eminently worthwhile. One of the most important factors in the formulation of wise public policy in a complex age—and in maintaining the essential hegemony of the legislative branch of Government—is Congress' access to high-grade sources of information. The strengthening of the LRS—and its proper utilization—are necessary and urgent first steps.

SCIENCE AND CONGRESS

A third and related set of problems which have concerned the committee have to do with congressional access to scientific expertise. The Federal involvement in and reliance upon science is increasing steadily, yet Congress has lacked the resources even to evaluate executive proposals—much less to do creative thinking or to formulate policy alternatives. This situation prompted me in 1963 to propose the establishment of a congressional Office of Science and Technology on the model of the legislative counsel. Three or four specialists would have served each House, advising and assisting members and committees and preparing on their own initiative such reports as they felt should come to Congress' attention. Congressional interest in the problem increased generally, and in 1964 funds were added to legislative appropriations to strengthen the Legislative Reference Service's scientific staff. Those of us who had advocated the establishment of scientific counsel agreed that such an arrangement had great potential for meeting some of the problems that had concerned us.

That potential has to a significant degree been fulfilled. LRS' Science Policy Research Division has turned out quality work and has in many respects become a model of how the entire Reference Service should operate. LRS is now handling 250 percent more requests of a scientific nature than they were some 12 months ago. In the year since its expansion, the

Science Policy Research Division has handled 1,175 legislative-related inquiries involving 57 Senators, 168 Representatives, and 35 committees. A number of major studies have been issued, including substantial volumes on aeronautical research and development policy, the role of the National Science Foundation, and programs of weather modification and control. These works, and the output of the Division generally, give some indication of what the joint committee anticipates when it speaks of a shift in LRS from a "reference" to a "research" orientation. It means comprehensive review of a policy area rather than answering narrowly conceived questions about policy proposals which come from elsewhere. It means orginal thinking about legislative alternatives and priorities. It means interdisciplinary research, considering in depth the many facets of intertwining policy areas. It means the furnishing of consultative services to committees and an extensive utilization of outside experts.

J. W. Finney, writing for the British magazine Discovery—December 1965—has described where Congress now stands in acquiring a scientific competence:

> Congress suffers from many limitations and defects as a policy-maker for science. In its jurisdictional authority, it is highly and jealously compartmentalized, with the result that jurisdiction over oceanography, for example, is scattered among several congressional committees. Programmes, therefore, which have been fairly well co-ordinated at the executive branch tend to become broken up among several committees, none of which has a clear picture or interest in the overall objective. Furthermore, as a group of politicians, Congress tends to lack the technical background or advice for deciding technical and scientific issues.
>
> Within the scientific community itself there has been a tendency to deprecate the ability of Congress to understand and decide scientific policy issues. This scientific scepticism about congress misses an essential point, namely that issues of science policy are not simply or solely technical in nature but also involve social, economic and political considerations. In weighing all these factors, the politician, because he is a politician, is probably better equipped to make a judgment than the scientist. The only condition is that the politician should also have an understanding of the technical factors involved. In the past years some definite progress has been made in reorganizing Congress in this respect. An office—headed significantly by a man who once served as secretary of the Federal Council on Science and Technology—has been created within the Library of Congress to assist congressional committees on scientific matters. In addition the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has worked out an arrangement with the National Academy of Science so that, like the executive branch, it can tap the advice and knowledge of leading scientists. Gradually, therefore, Congress is working out its own mechanism for advice on science, corresponding in many ways to the system that has evolved in the executive branch.
>
> In some ways, Congress has already assumed the initiative in setting science policy. For example, it was Congress, not the executive branch, which first began raising the issue of whether the time was coming when priorities should be established between various fields of scientific research. It was an issue that the office of the President's science adviser had been trying to avoid largely because it meant re-examining the established position of certain segments of the scientific community, which, in turn, had positions of influence in the President's Science Advisory Committee. It was also Congress which began raising the question of whether the scientific riches, if they were as beneficial in promoting the economic and educational growth of the nation as claimed by the scientific community, should not be spread a little more evenly throughout the nation. Thus with their political intuition, the Congressmen touched on probably the two most important scientific policy issues now confronting the nation.

Thus there is some grounds for encouragement. This is not to say our access to scientific expertise is adequate. The Science Policy Research Division is young, and we need to evaluate carefully the ways in which its performance can be sustained and improved. The Division is already overworked, but is wisely seeking to manage its workload not only through staff expansion but also by exercising some discretion in assigning priorities to requests. As a member of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, I expect to give careful attention to the staff and resource needs of the Division and of LRS generally. And I am hopeful that the recommendations of the joint committee will eventually result in the entire Reference Service's being enabled to spend more time on substantive and original research.

Many more of the joint committee's recommendations are worthy of notice, Mr. President. Today I have only mentioned some of those in which I have taken a particular interest. The committee report offers the Congress an opportunity to reflect upon and move to improve its operation. I hope we shall take advantage of the opportunity.

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ASKS FOR STUDY OF MILK PRICE INCREASES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Agriculture Committee passed a resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make an investigation of recent increases in the price of milk to the consumer. Recent newspaper reports have attributed the increases, amounting to 1 to 2 cents a quart, to the dairy farmer. However all the circumstantial evidence indicates that the middleman is using increased prices to the farmer for his milk as an excuse to jack up his share of the retail price.

The McGovern resolution as passed by the Agriculture Committee this morning should provide us with some positive evidence of exactly who is responsible for the bulk of the price increases.

No matter who is responsible, however, we must recognize that increases in the price of milk put an added strain on the special milk program for schoolchildren. The price of milk to the schoolchild will undoubtedly increase as the Federal reimbursement rate under the school milk program remains constant. I hope the House-Senate conferees on the agriculture appropriations bill will meet soon to provide at least $105 million for the school milk program in fiscal 1967. This will go part of the way toward restoring the 10-percent cut in the Federal reimbursement rate that took place last year. More importantly, it will prevent the cost to the schoolchild of the school milk program from going even higher than the recent increases in the cost of milk will undoubtedly force it.

PROPOSED DAMS ON THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the battle over the Grand Canyon of the Colorado seems to be nearing a climax.

In the weeks and months ahead the House, and perhaps the Senate, may be asked to decide whether to permit construction of two hydroelectric power dams in the world's most spectacular chasm.

If these dams are permitted, much of the canyon will be ruined and what remains will be radically changed.

It is important that all Americans understand the nature of the struggle over the Grand Canyon. For if the canyon cannot be protected, then is there any of our natural resources that stands a chance of survival?

In an excellent editorial on July 31, 1966, the New York Times said:

> Now and forever, the principle must be established that the Grand Canyon is inviolable. It is not for sale; it is not open to compromise; it is not available for dam sites or any other depredation. It does not belong to Arizona or to the states of the Colorado River Basin to haggle over and parcel out; it belongs to all of America and to mankind.

On the same day the Times carried a well-written article by William V. Shannon summarizing the facts in the Grand Canyon conflict. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the Times editorial and Mr. Shannon's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 31, 1966]

Shadow Over Grand Canyon

Despite repeated storm warnings of political danger ahead, Arizona and its political allies in the House Interior Committee have pushed ahead with their ruthless, shortsighted plan to build dams in the Grand Canyon.

These dams would drown nearly half of all the flowing water of the Colorado River beneath deep, silent lakes. Since the depth of these lakes would vary according to the seasonal operations of the dams, the canyon walls rising above the artificial water level would be discolored. Side canyons would become blocked by silt because the river would not be flowing freely.

It would be impossible to run the rushing river as hundreds of intrepid travelers do every year; what has been called "the grandest of all white-river runs" would be no more. Geologists and other scientists would be unable to study long stretches of the river as it now exists in its natural state. In short, another portion of America's beauty of its wilderness, of its magnificent natural heritage—and one that is unique in the world—would be ruined.

That cannot be allowed to happen. This gigantic piece of logrolling must be defeated.

Now and forever, the principle must be established that the Grand Canyon is inviolable. It is not for sale; it is not open to compromise; it is not available for dam sites or any other depredation. It does not belong to Arizona or to the states of the Colorado River Basin to haggle over and parcel out; it belongs to all of American and to mankind.

It is regrettable that Arizona and its neighbors have persisted in this irresponsible, destructive course against all the deepest feelings of the American people when sound and perfectly feasible alternatives are available. But the advocates of these dams have proved deaf to these alternatives. Apparently they will have to suffer a clear-cut defeat on this issue before they can rid themselves of the illusion that the Grand Canyon is theirs to despoil. Every member of Congress has a duty to see to it that they receive that defeat when the bill comes to a vote in August.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 31, 1966]

THE BATTLE OF THE CANYON IS JOINED

(By William V. Shannon)

After years of maneuvering and tense negotiations, the plan to build two dams in Grand Canyon is now nearing a showdown in Congress.

The House Interior Committee last week by a vote of 22 to 10 approved the Colorado River Basin Bill in an angry session. A sharp fight is expected when the bill reaches the floor of the House in late August.

"This is a scheme. It is a selfish move by some people to see to it that they and they alone get any benefit out of this," Representative JOHN SAYLOR, Pennsylvania Republican and the leader of the fight against the dams, declared.

"Nobody is being selfish here," Representative MORRIS UDALL, Arizona Democrat and the chief proponent of the bill, shot back.

Meanwhile, and significantly, Representative WALTER ROGERS, the Texas Democrat who chaired the subcommittee that originally drafted the bill, shifted to the opposition and denounced the way the bill had been "rammed through." His views could be decisive in determining the position of the other members of the 22-man Texas delegation when the bill comes to a vote.

TWO QUARRELS

There are two separate quarrels underway which are joined by this bill and which account for the harsh words and the intensity of feeling. One is a dispute between the representatives of water-hungry Arizona and conservationists around the nation who believe that the building of two dams on the Colorado River would desecrate the Grand Canyon, one of the world's unique scenic and geological wonders.

Representative SAYLOR, a big, rugged six-footer who looks as though he could easily be a Western outdoorsman but actually hails from Johnstown, Pa., is the tireless, redoubtable captain of the conservationist forces in the House. Representative UDALL, the brother of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, is himself a conservationist and SAYLOR's ally on most issues. But because he believes these dams are essential to the plan to bring water to his arid native state, he has parted company with the conservationists.

The second controversey is the struggle of the various states in the arid West for the largest share of the available water. California and Arizona have been the traditional rivals for the water of the Colorado River; their long competition went to the Supreme Court before it was resolved. But the states in the upper basin of the Colorado River—Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado—also have a legal claim on the water. So does Mexico under a treaty with the United States. In recent years, as its population and consequently its demand for water has grown, Texas has expressed an interest.

These rival claimants cannot posibly satisfy their optimum present water requirements from the Colorado River, not to mention their needs of 20 years from now. As a result, a grandiose and enormously expensive scheme has begun to take shape which involves the transfer of water to the Colorado Basin from the Columbia River in the Northwest. Naturally, the politicians from that section are less than enthusiastic about this project. Since one of them is Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington, the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, their objections may become critically important when the bill reaches the Senate.

At the moment, the bill represents a delicate compromise among the states in the Southwest. Arizona gets what it wants, which is an authorization for the Federal Government to spend $1.3-billion to divert water and erect two dams, one at Marble Canyon which is above Grand Canyon National Park, and one at Bridge Canyon which lies below the park. (In order to hold the support of an Indian tribe whose reservation would be affected, the dam at Bridge Canyon has now been renamed Hualapai Dam.) From the engineering standpoint, these dams are not necessary to divert the water of the Colorado into central Arizona. The actual waterworks would be elsewhere on the river. The justification of the dams is economic and political. They are, as the Bureau of Reclamation has termed them, "cash register dams" which would provide revenue from the sale of hydroelectricity, and that revenue would defray most of the cost of the total project. Since these dams enable the advocates to describe the project as virtually self-financing, they are therefore a political selling point in Congress.

To win the support of the states in the Upper Basin, the bill authorizes $360-million in reclamation projects in Utah, Wyoming and Colorado. The chairman of the House Interior Committee is Representative WAYNE ASPINALL of Colorado, and three of the projects are in his district.

The final element in the bill is included for California's benefit. It would establish a National Water Commission which is directed to make a preliminary study of diverting water to the Southwest from another river basin (presumably the Columbia). This study is to be completed by the end of 1969 and, if it is favorable, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed immediately with plans for drawing up a feasible project.

It is this water study provision to which the Northwest objects and which is sure to run into difficulty in the Senate. In order to mollify this opposition, the House committee 10 days ago almost eliminated any specific directive for the new Water Commission. But California, which is impatient to get more water for its booming but dry southern areas, protested vigorously. Representative UDALL and his allies capitulated and restored most of the desired language. The reason is not hard to find. California has 38 votes in the House and Arizona has only 3; without California's solid support, Arizona has little prospect of getting the bill approved on the floor.

Conservationists regard the entire bill as iniquitous. They argue that since a steam plant using coal or a nuclear power plant would make as much money as these hydroelectric projects, the two dams are not necessary. Arizonans counter that only hydroelectricity can provide "peaking power" when the demand for current rises sharply during the working day. Advocates also deny that the dams would kill a living river since the existing Glen Canyon Dam further upstream from Marble Canyon already regulates the flow of water artificially. Conservationists reply that there are long stretches of the river that are now relatively free-flowing and that would be adversely affected by the building of more dams.

Between those who want to slow the river by building "cash register" dams and those who want to keep it as nature evolved it, the issue is beyond compromise. Theodore Roosevelt summed up for the conservationists when he said of the Grand Canyon: "Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it."

Those words are likely to be quoted often in Congress in the weeks ahead.

THE WORLD FAMINE AND U.S. FOOD RESERVES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a significant article in the July 27, 1966, issue of the Washington Post by the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, comments on the mounting world food crisis and diminishing U.S. reserves.

Mr. Childs reports concern by Vice President HUMPHREY who has long been a leader in the field of national and international food matters over what the Vice President believes is an effort by the Soviet Union to corner the world wheat market. The Vice President very properly suggests that the United States should be deeply concerned over the maintenance of an adequate grain reserve.

Mr. Childs comments favorably on the House-passed expansion and improvement of our food-for-peace program—now pending before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 27, 1966]

THREAT OF FAMINE, HUNGER FOR WHEAT

(By Marquis Childs)

The Soviet Union is out to corner the world wheat market. With supplies falling in the West, Moscow is making huge purchases with a view to creating a reserve that will be a powerful lever in dealing with hungry nations.

This is the alarm sounded by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in talking privately with Government officials and agricultural leaders in Washington. Circumstantial evidence seems to support Humphrey's fear. It is related, of course, to the fact that the era of bulging surpluses in this country is long since past and the carryover of grains in storage is the lowest in many years.

The Soviet wheat crop this year is estimated by crop reporting specialists in the Department of Agriculture to be good. It may approach the 2.1 billion-bushel harvest of 1964. The prospects are up for the spring wheat crop.

Yet at the same time Moscow recently concluded what is said to have been the biggest wheat deal in history—the purchase from Canada for more than $800,000,000 of 336,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour over a period of three years beginning Aug. 1. Reports indicate that Moscow is going to France, Australia, Argentina and every possible source to buy any wheat available.

This comes as the carryover of the four leading exporters—the United States, Canada, Australia, and Argentina—fell to the lowest level since 1952. With a record drop of 811,000,000 bushels in one year the surplus is still being drained away. And to match this mass movement wheat prices are climbing.

In a speech to the American Agriculture Editors' Association last month, Humphrey came closest to giving public expression to growing concern over dwindling grain reserves. Much of this reserve is committed to India in line with President Johnson's word that despite poor crop years and failing monsoon rains the Indian people will not suffer from famine.

Humphrey put the "minimum desirable level" for the wheat carryover at 600,000,000 bushels. This was down to 550,000,000 bushels on July 1, with the likelihood that due to weather and other factors it will be reduced considerably below that level a year from now.

Weather is the key. The Vice President said he got a call from South Dakota, where he was born and reared, reporting the beginning of a drouth. Recalling the disastrous dust storms of his youth he warned that loss of feed grain production in the Dakotas alone would create a serious situation. According to the latest official crop report the outlook for spring wheat in the Dakotas and Minnesota is down 17 per cent.

Another warning little noted at the time came from Louis Bean, political and economic analyst. Speaking to the Federation of Grain Cooperatives he pointed to the weather cycle in the grain states. On the average of about every 20 years searing heat, such as is currently reported from the Midwest, brings low yields. Bean suggested that with the approach of the '70s a turn in the weather cycle is due.

Countering this gloom and doom on the agricultural outlook, the House has passed a Food for Freedom Bill calling for the most far-reaching attack on the problem of hunger. Closely paralleling a measure introduced by Sen. George McGovern last year, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to bring back into production acreage, in line with world needs, idled by the subsidy system. For this purpose the bill authorizes a whopping $3.53 billion.

McGovern, formerly head of the Food for Peace program, points out that to keep 60,000,000 acres of crop land idle the Government pays farmers $1.6 billion a year. Bringing this acreage back into production and buying up the crops grown on it as a weapon against worldwide hunger would cost $2.5 billion, McGovern figures. Therefore, with an increase of less than a billion dollars the Government would have a reserve of incalculable value and farmers a source of expanded income.

The measure ties population control directly into the distribution of American food in developing nations. It authorizes the use of local currency paid for food out of the American reserve for control measures and requires proof that efforts are being made to check the population explosion. In the same way the bill requires countries getting American food to show they are taking steps to increase their own production. The Senate will likely approve a similar bill.

The demographers regard famine as a major threat in the early '70s to world order and stability. If that threat is to be met there must be action now.

SENATOR MONDALE'S CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senate adopted a highly constructive amendment to the foreign aid bill, an amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator Mondale. This amendment provides that, in developing countries with severe food shortages, "high priority shall be given to efforts to increase agricultural production, particularly the establishment or expansion of adaptive research programs designed to increase acre-yields of the major food crops."

As a Senator long concerned with the world food crisis, I applaud my colleague for his highly constructive proposal.

It is particularly important in its recognition that farm improvement in hungry nations depends on the progress of their agricultural science, so that they can develop the techniques, fertilizers and pesticides, seeds, and farm implements best suited to their climate and soils.

As one who has worked closely with Senator Mondale on the Senate Agriculture Committee, I know that this amendment is no isolated example of his intelligence and effectiveness in farm matters.

He was one of the first Senators to speak out forcefully for an expanded and improved food-for-peace program. He is a strong advocate of improved farm income and his work on the 4-year farm program last year brought about substantial improvements in that legislation. He is, in my view, one of the most effective champions of the farmer to come to the Senate in many years.

I am most gratified, therefore, that Senator Mondale's farm research amendment has received highly favorable editorial comment in the national press. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials on Senator Mondale's amendment—one in the Denver Post, the other from the St. Paul Dispatch—be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Aug. 1, 1966]

Senator Takes Long View of Food Crisis

The world food crisis is growing steadily and there are two time-honored concepts Americans ought to throw out the window—or at least sharply modify.

One is the old-fashioned idea that the United States, with its land wealth, can play Lady Bountiful to hungry people around the world, that we'll rush out dried milk and cereal grains in the best humanitarian tradition and feel good inside.

The time is rapidly approaching when we cannot physically do it. Despite what Jimmy Stewart says on television, simply donating food overseas may only mean a crisis of greater dimensions when the reckoning does come.

The other concept that needs radical adjusting is an unreconstructed rural belief that food shortages overseas mean profits in the Farm Belt. It isn't necessarily so.

The point that makes this discussion timely is an amendment to the foreign aid bill offered by U.S. Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn. As passed last week, the Senate version of the foreign aid package contains a firm specification by Mondale that U.S. aid overseas put greater stress on self-help.

Mondale's amendment is both idealistic and practical. He understands that the United States cannot, by itself, avert world famine—that the countries involved must help themselves or disaster is inevitable.

At the same time, Mondale has in mind the welfare of his own Farm Belt constituents who would like to sell more products overseas. But he knows you can't sell food to a penniless man, no matter how hungry. Mondale says:

"Strange though it may seem, it is only through improving their own agriculture that these countries can, in the long run, grow into major dollar importers of American farm products."

The argument needs to be pounded home. Poverty abroad feeds more poverty. Neither donor nation nor recipient gain; the donor nation, in fact, loses its ability to help if there is no response overseas and the burden grows.

India is a good example. Under the stress of hunger, India has taken hundreds of millions of bushels of U.S. wheat in the last year. The U.S. farmer profited, we suppose, but the bill went not to the Indians but to the U.S. taxpayer.

An indication that the United States cannot allow itself to be overburdened came last week when the U.S. Department of Agriculture warned nations receiving U.S. wheat to expect 25 per cent less in the fiscal year which began July 1.

This is sound evidence that Senator Mondale's amendment is timely. He is not the first lawmaker to suggest stepped-up crop and livestock output overseas. But the more pressure in this direction, the better.

It is a tough job adapting U.S. research to a foreign environment. Yet, as Mondale points out, the vast resources of U.S. land grant colleges and other programs have revolutionized U.S. food production. It seems logical to put this capacity to work to a greater degree overseas.

There isn't much time left. The U.S. wheat carryover next spring may be as little as 200 million bushels. That would be the smallest in decades. Bread shortages are not likely at home but users of U.S. wheat abroad do have cause for worry—and reason to put out the biggest possible welcome mat to American technological aid in agriculture. The time for radical measures is at hand.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, July 23, 1966]

L.B.J. Foreign Aid Setback

A bipartisan rebellion in the Senate against President Johnson's foreign aid recommendations has severely cut back on financing prospects for economic development loans abroad. In addition the senators slapped down the President's proposal to authorize appropriations on a five year basis instead of one year.

These actions, in part at least, are of questionable merit and were motivated by resentment against various White House policies in other fields.

However, another action by the Senate on foreign aid Wednesday was highly constructive. This was approval of an amendment sponsored by Minnesota's Senator Walter Mondale. It puts greater emphasis on stimulating needy countries to increase their own food production. Foreign aid operations over the years have been seriously lax in this respect. India, for example, has been encouraged to rely on American wheat imports instead of raising its own crop yields.

Mondale, supported by numerous farm authorities, has criticized failure of American aid officials to establish local research programs to push up per acre yields of food crops in the manner this has been accomplished in the United States. His amendment directs that high priority be given in the future to such work. It urges that adequate funds be used to permit American university farm specialists and researchers to help counterparts in needy nations develop programs specially suited to their own conditions. This should have beneficial long-range results.

In other respects, Senate action on foreign aid showed sharp disagreement with the Johnson Administration, and even hostility. The Administration had asked authorization for $655 million for economic development loans. The Senate Foreign Relations committee cut this down to $620 million. Then, on the Senate floor, Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN moved to slash this figure by another $250 million, leaving a total of only $370 million.

Democratic Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations committee and the ostensible floor manager for the foreign aid bill, joined DIRKSEN in voting for the cut. Also supporting DIRKSEN were 30 other Democrats and 27 Republicans. Thus more Democrats than Republicans voted against the Administration. The amendment carried, 59 to 34.

Senator Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD explained the bipartisan opposition as expressing "a general feeling of disenchantment" and frustrations. A number of the opposition Democrats also are against President Johnson's Vietnam policies. DIRKSEN said the cut was needed to reduce overall Administration spending which invites inflation. The Republicans pointed out the President's own recent advice to Congress to cut down on appropriations.

Another Dirksen amendment adopted by the Senate would prohibit AID loans unless they are approved by the World Bank. A further restriction, also Republican sponsored, calls for raising interest or service charges on such loans.

Altogether, President Johnson suffered a politically remarkable setback and rebuke. The final form of the foreign aid program, however, will not be determined until the Senate finishes consideration of more amendments and the bill goes to a House-Senate conference.

ALASKA SIBERIA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1956 the Congress enacted the Alaska Mental Health Act transferring the responsibility for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill from the Interior Department to the Territory of Alaska. This law brought to an end what had long been described as an "archaic and inhumane" system for the care of Alaska's mentally ill.

The law provided authorization for an appropriation of $6 million over a 10-year period on a diminishing scale as grants to the Territory to assist in meeting costs until the end of the period when Alaska would have the entire financial responsibility.

The law also authorized a $6½ million appropriation for construction of hospital facilities.

A third major provision granted to the Territory the right to select 1 million acres of land with the revenues from such land to be applied first to the mental health program.

This modern program for Alaska's mentally ill was born in strife and engendered in the then 48 States one of the most vicious "hate" campaigns ever encountered by Members of Congress.

After passage in the House, the Senate was literally deluged with mounting protests that Congress was setting up a million-acre "Alaska Siberia."

The charges grew more reckless and unreasoning until Congress was accused of trying to establish in Alaska a barbed-wire enclosure of 1 million acres for political enemies.

Reason prevailed over the thousands of letters from all over the country, and the measure became law.

During the 10 years which have passed since the law was enacted, the old charges of an "Alaska Siberia" have cropped up from time to time throughout the country. Now the canard is repeated in the July issue of Common Sense.

I have written to the editor and ask unanimous consent that my letter be made part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 1, 1966.

EDITOR, COMMON SENSE,
Union, N.J.

DEAR SIR: I am surprised and shocked that Common Sense is still harping on the charge that a million acres of Alaska land is being held ready for internment of political "offenders". The word in quotation marks is yours.

You base this broadside on an article which appeared in the New York Times December 27, 1955 which stated that the United States "could intern 5000 spies and saboteurs almost immediately in the event of war, an invasion or an insurrection." No mention was made in that article about Alaska.

However, the following are words that Common Sense used in a caption which appeared below a partial reprint of the New York Times article:

"Just for whom are 'they' reserving these detention (concentration) camps?—Also the million acres set aside in Alaska 'for the construction of a mental hospital and other facilities . . . to provide an integrated health program.' Is perhaps the real purpose to establish concentration camps for Political Opponents, under the guise of care and treatment of mental cases."

This preposterous allegation was first made by a California newspaper when the Alaska Mental Health Act came before the Congress for consideration. It was repeated throughout the land by all too many people. A half hour devoted to research would be sufficient to demonstrate the absurdity of trying to couple the million acre land grant to a "plot" aimed at what you term political "offenders".

The Alaska Mental Health Act was passed before Alaska became a state. The million acre grant was made to help the Territory of Alaska finance a mental health program from the proceeds of the disposition of that land. Among other things, as a result of this act, Alaska now has a modern psychiatric institute and it is no longer necessary to send all Alaskans ill of mental diseases thousands of miles from their homes for treatment.

Common sense implies that the million acre tract is in one unit. It is not. It was never intended to be. The territorial government and subsequently the state government was entitled to choose land in large or small tracts. This it has done.

As of June 30, 1966 the state had applied for 976,720 acres out of the million acre grant. Tentative approval has been given to 308,262 acres and patent has been granted for 544,453 acres. I am advised by Mr. Phil R. Holdsworth, Commissioner of Natural Resources for the State of Alaska, that "the selections are located all over the state; i.e., within those areas eliminated from the national forest in southeastern Alaska as well as throughout the rest of the state. The size of tracts selected has varied from a few acres to several tens of thousands. There have been no restrictive acreage limitations on these selections.

"We have used our mental health selection authority as a means of not only providing maximum revenues to the state, but also protecting certain lands for continued use by the state and not subject to borough selection. You, no doubt, realize that all mental health lands are subject to competitive leasing for oil and gas, and we utilized our selection entitlement in cases where previously withdrawn land which appear valuable for oil and gas development suddenly became available for state selection."

That statement by Mr. Holdsworth ought to dispel any notion that the million acres of land is being held in a single unit and will be used one day as a concentration camp. But I doubt it. I predict that this baseless, incomprehensible allegation will continue to be made year after year, just as common sense has now made it.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, about 6 years ago the Alaska Psychiatric Institute was dedicated, and on September 26, 1962, I told the Senate of that event and reviewed the background of the Alaska Mental Health Act. Because it tells in detail the history of passage of that measure and because I hope it will lay to rest at long last the fabrications and charges surrounding the bill, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the Senate be made part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HOSPITAL OPENS IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Sunday, September 9, was a beautiful day in Anchorage, Alaska. The sky was clear. The sun was warm. The mountains stood out in bold relief. Nature was in an autumnal mood.

On the afternoon of that day the Alaska Psychiatric Institute was dedicated. This is the newest, most modern hospital in the world for the care of the mentally ill. It will begin to receive patients next month. Designed to care for 225 people at the outset, the institute is so planned that it may be expanded.

I traveled almost 9,000 miles in order to be at the dedication ceremony. I flew from Washington, D.C., to Anchorage and back over the weekend only so that I might be present for the dedicatory exercises. For everyone present it was a thrilling occasion. For some few of us it was even more meaningful. For three of us there on that day this was the culmination of an effort which began over a decade ago. For a fourth, this represented attainment of a goal which, for a time, seemed impossibly distant.

Winfred Overholser, M.D., the great psychiatrist who has been superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington, D.C., for a quarter of a century, was present. Jack Haldeman, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General of the United States was there. I had the good fortune to be present. And Marjorie Shearon, Ph. D., who made such a significant contribution to the passage of the act which made possible the building of the institute, honored us by her presence. It was Dr. Overholser who, in 1949, headed a committee which subsequently reported the need for Alaska mental health legislation. This was a forerunner of the draft bill which became law.

In those days Dr. Haldeman headed up Public Health Service work in Alaska. Then and later he worked hard for passage of adequate mental health legislation.

The Alaska Psychiatric Institute was constructed because the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of the Government saw an imperative need for it and responded to that need generously and helpfully.

The then Territory of Alaska was and had been throughout its existence strangely situated in respect to the treatment of the mentally ill. For reasons not entirely clear, the territorial government had been prohibited from passing any legislation at all on this subject. The Federal Government cared for those who had to be hospitalized at a contract institution in the State of Oregon. Modern opinion was strongly against this contract system, and only one State in the Union continued to use it, and then only to a very liimted extent. The Alaska Mental Health Act was signed into law by President Eisenhower on July 28, 1956. It proposed some far-reaching changes, all of which have become effective since then or are in the process of becoming effective. Throughout Alaska's territorial history until then, persons in poor mental health had been arrested as common criminals, tried before juries in the U.S. Commissioners' courts and, if found guilty, had been sent to this hospital far away from their homes. There was no psychiatric care in Alaska.

Public Law 830 of the 84th Congress changed all of this.

In the first instance, the territorial legislature was and, as has been noted, for the first time authorized to legislate on the subject of mental health.

In the second place, the Congress recognizing that a heavy financial load would be abruptly placed upon the territorial government for the first time, authorized a grant to Alaska, through the Surgeon General of the United States, aggregating $6 million over a period of years.

Next, the Congress made available $6,500,000 as the Federal contribution toward the construction of the hospital which was dedicated September 9.

Finally—and this is what started all the trouble—the territory of Alaska, which in its governmental capacity was land poor in the midst of the greatest land area in any U.S. political subdivision, was granted a million acres from the U.S. public domain. The purpose of this was so that the territorial government might obtain additional revenue through sale or lease of this land. I cannot say that the bill sailed through the House of Representatives. Objections were made there to its form and its philosophy. However, those objections were finally overcome and the bill was passed by the House. It was after this that the blow descended. And what a blow. Once before the Senate, the act became the focal point of a heated controversy. A tempest arose. The legislation was widely assailed. At that time I was Delegate to the House of Representatives from the territory of Alaska and I recall ever so well one Senator telling me that upon the subject of Alaska mental health legislation he had received more correspondence than on any other since the lend-lease bill was before the Senate. This was typical.

Undoubtedly, the act would have died in the Senate had not the members of its Interior and Insular Affairs Committee been men of judgment, of conviction, and of courage. For it would have been easier, I know very well, for them to have allowed the bill to gather dust in the committee files than to act upon it. All the trouble started when a paper in California editorially alleged that this was a bad bill, a wicked bill, a bill designed for sinister purposes. It asserted that the million-acre land grant was a device to create in Alaska a "Siberia—U.S.A." According to the editorial, the million-acre tract would be "fenced in" and then political prisoners would be sent to "Siberia" by corrupt and nasty officials in the States. How in the world anyone came to believe this is beside the point. The fact is that they did. This was attested to by the thousands and thousands of letters that rolled in to U.S. Senators, and by the number of witnesses who appeared before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee against the bill, some of them filled with strange venoms which they ejected. Of course, it was never intended that the land be chosen by the territory of Alaska in one huge block; it has not been. If any of it has been fenced it, it has been for the normal purposes of fencing.

In any case, the legislative history of the Alaska Mental Health Act makes, in retrospect at least, an absorbing political chapter in American history. Unbelievable as it now seems, it has to be believed. It happened. And it happened, not in some distant age, but in the mid-20th century.

Not everyone who made great contributions to this wonderful legislation could be at Anchorage on September 9, unfortunately. For example, Representative Edith Green, of Oregon, could not be there. It was she who did what few in political life would have the courage to do—she became from the outset one of the very strongest advocates of this legislation, despite the fact that it would have the eventual result of terminating the contract which had been in effect for so long with a hospital in her own community. And Representative Leo W. O'Brien, of New York, author of the Alaska Statehood Act, and always Alaska's friend, not only managed the bill in the House, but, when it was in grave danger in the Senate, came before the Senate committee to make an eloquent and logical appeal for its passage. Also there were Representatives Wayne Aspinall, of Colorado, now chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, now ranking Republican member of that same committee; also former Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, then ranking Republican member of the committee.

And in the Senate there were, among so many others, Senator James E. Murray, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Senator Arthur V. Watkins, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Senator Alan Bible, Senator Barry Goldwater, and ever so many others who defied criticism and took charge of the act and put it through.

Mr. President, I have mentioned some names. Not all can be mentioned, of course, but Alaskans were and are grateful. It certainly would be inappropriate for me to neglect to mention that M. W. Goding, Alaska-born and now High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, was instrumental, together with Dr. Overholser, in drawing up the 1949 report.

While in Anchorage I learned that many people there have forgotten, or do not know, the struggles and agonies and aberrations all of which were part of the legislative history of the Alaska Mental Health Act. I know of no better account of all this than that which was written by Dr. Shearon, who, as I have mentioned, was at Anchorage the other day for the dedication.

There were many of us who gave of time and effort in the legislative endeavor. As I recall, Dr. Shearon did not become involved in it until the act was before the Senate. From that time on she devoted almost exclusive attention to it. And because she early became convinced that it was good legislation, proper legislation, needed legislation, she made perhaps the greatest sacrifice of all in persisting in the bill's defense and advocacy. For she suffered heavy income loss on account of this. Some of her clients, and one in particular, were convinced the bill was bad. Dr. Shearon believed otherwise. They parted company. She would not compromise with her beliefs and principles, even though she suffered thereby a money loss which she could ill afford. For this, I have always honored her. And I was particularly glad that, because of all that had gone before, Dr. Shearon was able to be in Anchorage.

And for an historical account of what happened in the legislative history of the Alaska Mental Health Act, I know of no more factual or absorbing account than that written by Dr. Shearon, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"HOPE FOR ALASKA'S MENTALLY ILL

"(By Marjorie Shearon, Ph. D., editor, Challenge to Socialism, formerly consultant to the late Senator Robert A. Taft)

"This is Alaska

"Alaska is our last frontier and our first line of defense. One-fifth the size of the continental United States, it is a land rich in oil, minerals, and forests. Its coastal waters abound in seal and salmon, which have given the territory two great industries. Development of these natural resources has barely started. A million new settlers are needed to take up homesteads, to raise cattle, to explore mineral resources, and to expand the oil, fishing, fur, and lumber industries.

"Recognizing the strategic importance of Alaska, the United States has already spent $400 million on listening posts in the far North, up to and beyond the Arctic Circle. These constitute the DEW line—distant early warning line—which Air Force Secretary Quarles would now extend through the Aleutian Islands at an additional cost of $68 million. We in the States find further protection in the thousands of members of the armed services station in Alaska, for here the United States comes within 45 miles of Russia's Siberia.

"Alaska, so dimly known, so long neglected, and so little appreciated, is now of greatest strategic importance. Our very lives—yours and mine—may one day depend on the early information flashed from isolated, advance outposts along the DEW line in Alaska and Canada should Communist planes attempt a surprise attack on the United States across the North Pole.

"What sort of country is Alaska? What of its people? Are Alaskans citizens of the United States? Do they fight our wars, pay our taxes, share our joys and sorrows? What is this distant territory that has come in for such abuse in recent months? Why have some Americans stateside tried to thwart Alaskan hopes for control of the territory's mentally ill?

"This is Alaska. A wild, undeveloped country like our wonderful West of a century or more ago. But there are important differences. Alaskan cities, though small, are modern, with schools, general hospitals, airfields, railroad stations, electricity, post offices, taxis, bus lines, and chambers of commerce. It is a country where modern civilization abuts on a primeval wilderness.

"The University of Alaska, a land-grant college on a 2,250-acre tract at Fairbanks, boasts a new geophysical institute. This million-dollar building provides some of the finest facilities in the world for the study of the Arctic, the stratosphere, and regions beyond.

"The climate of Alaska is about like that of Norway, Sweden, Scotland, and Minnesota. Conditions in southern Alaska are comparable to those in our Northern States. Temperatures range from −78° to a maximum of 100° at Fort Yukon on the Arctic Circle. At Anchorage the range is from −36° to 92°.

"Alaska's greatest handicap is not her climate, but her lack of statehood. She is a territory clamoring for the right of self-determination, of self-government. She wishes to handle her own finances, to pass laws governing her own people. She seeks responsibility, not dependency. Alaska is neither a poor relation, nor a helpless child needing a guardian. She is a vast territory of latent wealth which has already yielded timber, waterpower, fur animals of the sea, gold, platinum, copper, coal, and silver; and of the land, fish, agriculture, trapping, fur farming, oil—sources of wealth barely tapped, awaiting development. This is Alaska.

"We stateside find it hard to picture Alaska. Accustomed as we are to cities of 100,000 to 7 or 8 million, we cannot easily imagine a country of over half a million square miles which does not have a single city with as many as 60,000 persons. Alaska's largest city, Anchorage, in 1955 had a population of 27,000 in the city, 32,000 in the metropolitan area. It compared favorably in size with Marion, Ind., Tucson, Ariz., as it was in 1940, and Hillsboro, Tex.

"On July 1, 1955, the civilian population of Alaska was only 168,000. On July 1, 1954, the combined civilian and military population was 208,000—a little less than the population of Syracuse, N.Y. Indeed, the territorial population is so sparse that if it were uniformly spread over the entire surface of 375,290,000 acres, every family of 4 would have 7,217 acres, or more than 11 square miles in which to roam. Looking at it another way, we may compare the density of population in the Nation's Capital in 1950, which was 13,150.5 persons per square mile, with that in Alaska, where it was 1 person per 5 square miles.

"Many Alaskans are aborigines—Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians—numbering about 33,000 or about one-fifth the civilian population. Alaskans are citizens of the United States, enjoying some of the privileges of citizenship and sharing in all the responsibilities. They pay income taxes and serve in the Armed Forces. Their Governor, however, is not elected by the Alaskans, but appointed by the President. And their Delegate to Congress cannot vote.

"Some of Alaska's problems stem from sparsity of population, inadequate road systems, lack of land transportation between towns and villages, the short growing season, and the low temperatures in winter. The presence or permafrost, permanently frozen ground, has accounted for much of the difficulty encountered in building roads, railroads and houses. Permafrost was found to a depth of 1,000 feet near Barrow, Alaska, when the Navy was drilling for oil. However, Alaska is not alone in having to face this problem. One-fifth the land surface of the world is underlain by permafrost. It is present in one-half of Russia.

"There are some 42 villages, cities, and districts in Alaska, but no counties. Of this number, 13 are villages with populations of less than 500, while 10 villages and towns have populations of 500 to 999. Of the 42 localities, 32 have populations of less than 2,500. In 1950, Fairbanks had 5,771; Juneau, the capital, 5,596; Ketchikan, 5,305, and Nome, 1,876.

"The principal means of transportation between the larger cities is by plane. Daily flights go out from the principal communities to scores of smaller places, carrying to them passengers, mail, and freight. Once a week a plane flies from Anchorage to the Pribilof Islands, center of the fur seal area, via the Aleutians.

"Alaska, presently, has only 560.1 miles of railroads. There is one main highway, the Alaska Highway, constructed as a military necessity by the United States and Canada at a cost of $113,824,220. Running from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, through the very heart of the peninsula, it is 1,523 miles long.

"Vast areas are still without roads or plane service. Many of the smaller villages are isolated and present health, sanitation, and other problems because of their inacessibility. Native settlements of 50 to 100 persons are often without any medical facilities, physicians, nurses, welfare agencies, courts, or jails.

"So extensive is this territory that when a map of Alaska is placed on a map of the continental United States, the Aleutian Islands touch the coast of California, while the southern Alaskan Pacific mountain region reaches to the eastern shores of South Carolina.

"Once called Seward's Folly and American Siberia, Alaska is now an invaluable frontier for young pioneers and the guardian of the international boundary between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"Russian interest in the Arctic North America led to the discovery of Alaska. Early in the 18th century Peter the Great commissioned a Danish sea captain, Vitus Bering, to explore the northwest coast of the American Continent. In 1728 he discovered the passage now known as Bering Strait. The Russians made their first settlement on Kodiak Island in 1784. Later they explored all the western coast of this arctic part of the North American Continent.

"On the strength of the two voyages by Bering, Russia laid claim to this northwestern portion of the New World. She warred on the Indians and Aleuts; her fur traders depleted the country of furs. In 1799 they created a trading corporation, the Russian-American Company. Under a 20-year concession, renewed periodically, the Russians assumed absolute domination in Alaska. They established a capital at Kodiak which they later moved to Sitka on Baranof Island, south of Juneau.

"A century ago, during the Crimean War, the Russians became worried about the possibility that England might try to seize this northwestern tip of the American Continent. In 1855 Russia made overtures to the United States for the sale of Alaska, but nothing came of the proposals for more than a decade. Finally, on October 18, 1867, after many delays, the sale was consummated by treaty and a congressional appropriation was made. Secretary of State William H. Seward signed the treaty for the United States. Thus we acquired a fabulously rich territory of 586,400 square miles (375,296,000 acres) for $7,200,000, or a little less than 2 cents an acre.

"For several decades the United States paid little attention to Alaska. There was scant appreciation of the value of the natural resources nor was there any immediate attempt to develop them. Alaskan affairs were administered first by the Army of the United States, then by the Treasury, and later by the Navy.

"It was not until May 17, 1884, that the Congress of the United States provided for appointment of a governor and the organization of a government in the District of Alaska. For the first time the Secretary of the Interior was empowered to enforce U.S. law relating to education and to mining claims.

"Under an act of May 7, 1906, Alaska was empowered to elect a nonvoting delegate to Congress, and by the organic act of August 24, 1912, the incorporated Territory of Alaska was created with a bicameral legislature.

"Alaska's mentally ill

"It was in this early period, before Alaska was incorporated as a Territory, that Congress enacted a law (June 6, 1900) providing that the Governor of Alaska should contract for the care and custody of persons adjudged insane in the district of Alaska. Five years later the powers of the Governor were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

"At first there was only one insane person to be sent to the States. For several years there were only four or five and these were cared for in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Then, in 1904, a private hospital, the Morningside Hospital, in Portland, Oreg., obtained the contract to care for Alaska's mentally ill. That arrangement has persisted for over 50 years. Recently there have been some 345 Alaskans at Morningside Hospital. The proprietor has taken a yearly fee of $30,000, his son $12,000. Over and above that the profit has been $69,000 a year. An audit demanded by Representative Green of Oregon this year revealed large-scale padding of the hospital's items of expense resulting in a much larger profit. The Federal Government has paid $184 a month per patient, the annual expense being about $800,000, not counting transportation charges to and from Oregon.

"The care at Morningside Hospital has been primarily custodial. There is some therapy, but the hospital has had only one psychiatrist, a physician who had not passed his board examinations. Nursing personnel has been quite inadequate. Furthermore, 115 of the 345 patients, or one-third, are mentally retarded and should not be in a hospital for mental illness.

"About 40 or 45 years ago Congress authorized the building of two hospitals for the insane in Alaska, one at Nome, the other at Fairbanks. The Nome hospital was never built, since funds were not appropriated. At Fairbanks a small, two-story frame detention house was constructed in lieu of a hospital.

"The building deteriorated so badly that it was finally closed as unfit for human use. About 25 years ago it burned down and was never replaced. Thus, there is not now and never has been a hospital for mental illness in the Territory of Alaska.

"The only other provisions which were ever made were the reservation of 18 beds in a general hospital in Anchorage. This hospital is under the Alaska Native Service which, unfortunately, does not have jurisdiction over the care of the mentally ill, not even the natives. Such jurisdiction has been vested exclusively in the Department of the Interior. Consequently, because of Federal prohibitions, those 18 beds, which might have been used for acute cases of mental illness, have remained vacant or have been used for other types of patients.

"Under the law as it has stood, the commitment procedures are those which were enacted 50 years ago by our Congress (33 Stat. 619; 48 U.S.C. 47). They were not out of line with similar procedures in the States at that time. But in the light of advances in psychiatry during the past half century, the old law seems barbaric and cruel. Under it, a person accused of being insane is subjected to procedures similar to those of a criminal trial. It has been impossible for Alaskans to improve the old law because when the Territory was created under the Organic Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512; found in 48 U.S.C. 24), the territorial legislature was expressly forbidden from changing the then existing law respecting commitment of the insane of Alaska.

"The law in the Territory, unchanged through the years, provided that a person who was charged with being insane should be thrown in jail to await a jury trial. The jury consisted of six residents, possibly trappers, miners, fishermen. A medical diagnosis might be made, but was not required. Persons were often adjudged insane without having a medical opinion. After the trial, if the person was adjudged guilty of insanity, he was returned to jail to await the long trip to Portland, Oreg., up to as much as 2,000 miles away. He might be kept in jail for weeks or months until enough prisoners were assembled to warrant the trip to the States by a U.S. marshal. Then the insane person might be forced to travel with murderers and other criminals.

"Young children adjudged insane were given the same treatment. They might be mentally retarded or epileptic; they might have cerebral palsy. As the law stood, if a lay jury decided the child was insane, it was sent to Oregon. Idiots were classed as insane. One extreme case was that of a 17-day-old baby which was adjudged insane and sent to Portland, Oreg.

"Congress held out hope

"Since the Federal law forbade Alaskans to improve the statutes respecting insane persons in the Territory, the Congress sought to divest the Government of its authority by transferring it back to Alaska where it was originally. All States and Hawaii are empowered to pass mental-health laws for the insane within their boundaries. Alaska alone has been prohibited by law from legislating for its mentally ill. For 50 years this prohibition has stood. Efforts have been underway for 8 years to correct this unfair situation. To this end several professional studies were made in Alaska by competent authorities.

"In 1948 the American Medical Association made the first field study of mental health in Alaska. The following year the Department of the Interior appointed a committee headed by the distinguished psychiatrist, Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of the largest and oldest Federal hospital for mental disease in the United States, St. Elizabeths in Washington, D.C.

"This committee spent 3 weeks in Alaska, holding public hearings at Juneau, Sitka, Palmer, Anchorage, Nome, and Fairbanks. On February 10, 1950, they submitted a report recommending:

"1. Development of a comprehensive mental health program under the territorial department of health;

"2. Emergency treatment and observation centers in most of the general hospitals to be operated by the territorial department of health;

"3. Drafting of model legislation for Alaska, and

"4. Amalgamation and unified direction of all public mental health services under the territorial department of health.

"While these field surveys were being made in Alaska, the Council of State Governments was expressing interest in mental health programs in all States. In June 1949, the Governors' conference directed the council to make a comprehensive, factual study of the activities and facilities of the several States in the field of mental health and to submit a report at the 1950 Governors' conference. Leaders in public welfare and psychiatry served as a technical advisory committee to the council. Representatives from State hospitals, the American Public Welfare Association, and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene served on the advisory committee along wtih such eminent psychiatrists as Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths, Dr. Karl Menninger, and Dr. George S. Stevenson.

"The council in 1950 produced a most helpful volume entitled: 'The Mental Health Programs of the 48 States.' This provides a wealth of comparative material on admission laws, financing of institutions, care and treatment of patients, and related matters.

"While the State governments were working on this project, a legislative drafting project was being undertaken at the request of the Advisory Mental Health Council. After the President had approved the National Mental Health Act on July 3, 1946, and the National Institute of Mental Health had been established in the U.S. Public Health Service, many States had asked for assistance in revising their outmoded mental health laws.

"As a result of this increased interest in State mental health laws, the Federal Security Agency early in 1949 undertook to write a model draft for a State law. The first 'Draft Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill' was completed in 1950 and revised in September 1952. It represented the work of attorneys inside and outside the Government aided by Dr. Winfred Overholser and Dr. R. H. Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health. Referring to this draft act, Dr. George S. Stevenson, medical director of the National Association for Mental Health, stated:

" 'The provisions of this draft act can be sincerely recommended as a forward step in our handling of the mentally ill and in the maximum utilization of our mental hospital facilities.'

"In 1952, the Governor of Alaska requested a further study of mental health conditions in the Territory. Former Surgeon General Thomas Parran and some 18 experts (sanitary engineers, physicians, an anthropologist, a biometrician, etc.) made an exhaustive study of social and economic conditions and of health problems in Alaska. Their report was published in 1954.

"On the basis of the several recommendations made by the professional groups which had studied the mental health problems of Alaska, Delegate E. L. Bartlett introduced H.R. 610 on January 5, 1955, and Representative Edith Green, of Oregon, introduced an identical bill, H.R. 5092, on March 21, 1955. These bills dealt with commitment procedures and other provisions for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill with a view to establishing 'an integrated, modern program for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of residents of and persons in Alaska who are mentally ill.'

"Mr. Bartlett and Mrs. Green also introduced two additional bills, H.R. 3991 and H.R. 5093, respectively, on February 14, 1955, and March 21, 1955. These identical bills provided 'for the location, equipment and operation of a hospital for the mentally ill of Alaska.' An open-end appropriation was authorized for the purpose of constructing a hospital and related buildings, 'together with such other in- or out-patient mental health facilities as may be required for the establishment and operation of a comprehensive mental health program in Alaska.' These four bills, two by Delegate Bartlett and two identical ones by Mrs. Green, would have served to provide funds for the care of Alaska's mentally ill and the construction of hospital and other facilities in the Territory. Commitment procedures were set forth based on the provisions in the Draft Act of 1952.

"These bills would have transferred authority from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. All expenses for construction and subsequent administration would have been the responsibility of the Federal Government.

"Since the bills related only to the Territory of Alaska and not to the people of the United States in general, they were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House. The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, headed by Representative Leo W. O'Brien, of New York, held hearings April 21, May 18, June 15, and July 7 and 8, 1955. There were no opposition witnesses.

"After the first day of hearings representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated they would prepare rather extensive amendments to the two pairs of bills. This they did, producing a single bill, H.R. 6334, which Representative O'Brien, as subcommittee chairman, introduced on May 18, 1955.

"In the light of subsequent violent accusations regarding plots of the HEW Department and of the Public Health Service to enter into some sort of world plot for the incarceration of U.S. citizens from the States in an Alaskan concentration camp, it is interesting to note that Mr. O'Brien's bill, drafted by administration officials, specifically divested the Federal Government of all future control of Alaska's mentally ill.

"The O'Brien bill was a great improvement over the prior bills inasmuch as it made more adequate and specific provision for funds for construction and for a land grant that would provide future sums for administration. Commitment procedures were carefully spelled out. Based on the Draft Act, they were modified in the light of conditions existing in Alaska. The draftsmen recognized that any realistic bill would have to take account of the sparsity of population in the Territory, the paucity of professional personnel while the program was being developed, and the difficulties of transportation. Critics of the mental health bill have given little or no thought to these practical problems which will beset the Alaskans for some years.

"H.R. 6334 was introduced into the hearings on May 18, 1955, by Mr. O'Brien. Witnesses from the Department of the Interior and from the HEW Department made it abundantly clear that they were trying to turn over to Alaska the entire responsibility for care of the Territory's mentally ill. Their willingness to accept language changes in the bill and their obvious wish to be helpful to the Alaskans precluded any possibility of their being involved in a diabolical plot, as later charged.

"Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, stated on May 18, 1955: 'I want to say that I heartily endorse the proposed bill by the Department of the Interior, drafted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a substitute for H.R. 610 and its associated bills.'

"On June 15, 1955, H.R. 6376 was introduced into the House hearings. This is the same as the O'Brien (administration) bill. There was general belief that an Alaskan mental health bill, which would ultimately void the contract of the Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg, would have to be sponsored by a Representative from Oregon if it were to be passed. This is the bill that was finally enacted by the House on January 18, 1956, with strong bipartisan support. Since the bill was not controversial in the House, it was passed by voice vote, as is customary in such cases. A rollcall vote in the House takes at least 20 minutes and is used only on demand in the case of hotly contested measures.

"After conclusion of the hearings in July 1955, the House Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs went to Alaska where they spent 3 weeks, visiting 22 cities. They took testimony on many of Alaska's problems, including mental health. Alaskans were unanimous in approving H.R. 6376 and in urging its enactment. There was also much testimony on public lands and on the great naval oil reserve (Pet. 4) in northern Alaska which had been set aside under Public Land Order 82 during World War II. Though no one thought about it at the time, this oil reserve was to figure in the final opposition to H.R. 6376 as it was reaching the end of its hectic history in the Senate.

"As the bill passed the House it:

"(1) Transferred from the Federal Government to the Territory of Alaska basic responsibility and authority for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska;

"(2) Modernized the procedures for such hospitalization (including commitment), care, and treatment and authorized the Territory to modify or supersede such procedures;

"(3) Authorized an appropriation of $6,500,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make payments to the Territory of Alaska as the total contribution of the Federal Government to be used in the construction of hospital and other facilities in Alaska needed for the carrying out of a comprehensive program for the mentally ill of Alaska;

"(4) Provided for a 10-year program of grants-in-aid to the Territory, in a total amount of $6 million, to enable the Territory gradually to assume the full operating costs of the program; and

"(5) Provided for a land grant of 1 million acres to the Territory to assist in placing the program on a firm long-term basis.

"In the House, debate was friendly, for there was no significant opposition. Representative Miller, Republican physician from Nebraska, had already proposed in committee an amendment to increase the land grant from 500,000 acres to 1 million, for he feared the smaller amount would be inadequate to provide funds for the continuing costs of a long-term mental health program. The House approved the amendment and the bill was passed by a voice vote.

"On the same day, January 18, Senator Arthur V. Watkins, Republican, of Utah, a minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced S. 2973 which was the same as the House-passed H.R. 6376. It contained the same money grants and the million-acre land grant and omitted the criminal procedures. Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, had previously introduced S. 2518 on July 15, 1955. This was the draft which had been prepared by the Department of the Interior. The two Senate bills and H.R. 6376 were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by Senator James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana. There they were assigned to the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs consisting of Henry M. Jackson, Washington, chairman; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Thomas H. Kuchel, California; William R. Laird III, West Virginia; Barry Goldwater, Arizona.

"Hearings were held on the three bills on February 20 and 21 and on March 5, 1956.

"A 'noisy small minority'

"Since the whole plan to transfer authority for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill from the Congress to the Territory had been under discussion for 7 or 8 years and since it was the Delegate from Alaska, E. L. Bartlett, who had introduced the basic bills in the House, no one anticipated any last-minute opposition to these humane proposals.

"Furthermore, the legislation had proceeded at a leisurely pace. House hearings had extended from late April to early July 1955. The House Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, headed by Representative Leo W. O'Brien, Democrat, New York, had held prolonged hearings in Alaska in September 1955, where there was universal support for the legislation. (Hearings, in 3 parts, comprised 871 pages). From April 1955, until the bill passed the House on January 18, 1956, there had been no opposition from any quarter.

"The Departments of Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare had been strongly in favor of divesting the Federal Government of its authority over Alaska's mentally ill and of transferring that authority to the Territory. All expert testimony had favored the proposals, including the commitment procedures. Support for H.R. 6376 had been bipartisan in the House.

"Senator Jackson had not even expected to hold subcommittee hearings on H.R. 6376 because of widespread approval of the bill and also because of the adequacy of the House hearings. However, suddenly a wild, irrational furor arose in California. As Representative O'Brien testified on March 5, 1956, before the Senate subcommittee:

" 'There has been, and I use the words advisedly, a "noisy, small minority" which have conjured up things in this bill which just do not exist.'

"Mr. O'Brien, stating that he had not intended to testify, pointed out that testimony had been given before the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs which, in effect, 'charged that a small group of men and women behind closed doors, concocted a sort of witches brew, a dark and fearsome thing which we suddenly set loose upon the American people.

" 'It was that it was all part of a plot close to treason under which we planned to send political prisoners to "Siberia," United States of American.

" 'I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if this is a vicious bill, if this is a plot against the people of this country who might disagree with our political thinking, then many stand indicted in connection with that plot.' Those so indicted are the House of Representatives, the administration, and the Departments of Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare which drafted the bill.

"Senator Jackson said to Mr. O'Brien:

" 'Frankly, we thought you had done such a good job over there that we would not need any further testimony over here.'

"Despite this general feeling in Congress, in both parties, that H.R. 6376 was an admirable bill, sudden opposition developed. Like an unheralded tornado, an outcry arose in California in January 1956, whirling across the country to strike the astonished Members of Congress and the White House staff. Nothing quite like it has ever happened before.

"A handful of patently ill-informed housewives in California became greatly disturbed shortly before H.R. 6376 passed the House. They had previously been fighting mental health bills in California. Now they centered their attack on H.R. 6376. Drawing upon their weird imaginations, they conjured up visions of an Alaskan Siberia for political dissidents in the United States. One woman, Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland, of Van Nuys, Calif., wrote a lurid description of H.R. 6376 early in January 1956, entitled 'Siberia, U.S.A.' Although Mrs. Burkeland's analysis of the bill was farfetched and imaginative, it made a great appeal in limited quarters.

"At about the same time, a group of some 100 housewives, known as the American Public Relations Forum, Inc., headed by Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president, took up the hue and cry against H.R. 6376. This group had sounded a warning against the bill late in 1955. But it was the Burkeland release that caught popular fancy in a few noisy quarters. This fantastic and untrue statement was mimeographed by the California State Chapter of the Minute Women of the U.S.A., Inc., sometime in January 1956. They mailed it out far and wide through the Nation.

"On January 24 the Santa Ana Register, California, one of the papers in the R.C. Hoiles Syndicate, published an editorial headed 'Now Siberia, U.S.A.' It was apparently a rewrite of the Burkeland release, although Mrs. Burkeland herself has refused to answer questions on the subject.

"Then, in rapid-fire succession, several individuals and organizations took up the 'Siberia' slogan, amplifying it as suited their fancies. On February 2, the Concordians, Box 16, Toluca Lake Station, North Hollywood, published a 5-page bulletin on mental health legislation with special reference to H.R. 6376. It gave a false analysis of the bill and ended with: 'Is this to be the Siberia of the United States?'

"A few days later, Dr. George A. Snyder, of Hollywood, issued a vitriolic letter addressed to all Members of Congress asking for a 'complete investigation of the Alaska Mental Health Act, H.R. 6376, for elements of treason against the American people behind the front of the mental health program.'

"In rapid succession across the country the Burkeland-Snyder charges were repeated. On February 15 Mervin K. Hart in New York City published an Economic Council Letter (No. 377) in which he spoke of the possibility of railroading dissenters to Alaskan mental institutions.

"As these scare bulletins appeared in different parts of the country they betrayed a common origin, for all referred to the railroading of persons from the States to Alaska and made horrified mention of 'Alaskan Siberia' or 'Siberia, U.S.A.' Next to pick up the slogans was Dan Smoot, of Dallas, Tex., who published a special issue on mental health on February 17, 1956. He spoke of the well-organized drive for mental-health legislation most of which would permit seizure, incarceration, and treatment of mentally ill people without trial by jury and without the due process of law prescribed by our Constitution.

"In a flippant, meaningless statement, Dan Smoot, referring to the definition of mental illness given in H.R. 6376, said: '* * * a mentally ill person is defined as a mentally ill person.' Mrs. Burkeland had been even more flippant, for she had said the definition of mental illness was so broad 'as to include anything from dandruff, headaches, toothaches, or fallen arches.' The Burkeland phraseology was lifted by the Greater Nebraskan magazine, published in Omaha by George J. Thomas, executive director of the Congress of Freedom at the same Omaha address. A variant of the Burkeland remarks turned up later when Dr. L. D. Sprague, of Tucson, Ariz., stated that the definition could cover 'anything from falling hair to ingrown toenails.' The Sprague variant was then sent out nationwide by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons in their March Newsletter.

The Burkeland-Dan Smoot criticisms of H.R. 6376, made prior to the Senate hearings in late February, were mailed to papers and organizations from coast to coast. They were rehashed and embellished. Individuals and extreme rightist groups initiated secondary mailings of the original 'Siberia, U.S.A.,' or the Smoot mental health release, or of the rewrites.

"These are the people referred to by Representative O'Brien as a noisy, small minority. It seems clear beyond any reasonable doubt that not one of these alarmists had studied the legislative history of the Alaska mental health bill. At that time—late January and early February—none of the House hearings was available in print. Five volumes (1,228 printed pages) appeared during March and April. Up to that time they had been available only in transcript form in Washington.

"There is no evidence that Mrs. Stefanie Williams or Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland or Dan Smoot came to Washington to study the legislative history of the bill or to acquaint themselves with the published research material and reports on Alaska mental health before writing their opposition releases. It is impossible to interpret any bill without attending the hearings or studying them in printed form. Federal attorneys and members of the Supreme Court rely heavily on the legislative history of any act, but Mrs. Burkeland, Mrs. Williams, and Dan Smoot presumably were able to form an opinion without this essential background information.

"Thus, this entire furor over the bill can be traced back to the fanciful interpretations placed upon it by two California women who publicly admitted their professional incompetence to form an opinion about Federal legislation. On February 20, 1956, when Mrs. Wiliams was testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Territorial Affairs, she stated: 'I am only a housewife.' This was her explanation for not knowing that 'State' is customarily defined in Federal and State laws as meaning 'any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.' (Sometimes Puerto Rico and one or more of the territories are omitted in a particular definition.)

"In the tortured mind of Mrs. Williams, inclusion of the customary definition of 'State' in H.R. 6376 meant that the legislation was 'an international bill * * * set up, I believe, I have been told that it comes under the United Nations World Health Organization.' This flimsy, undocumented type of testimony was characteristic of Mrs. Williams' objections.

"Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland, who wrote the 'Siberia, United States of America' article, presumably early in January 1956, before passage of H.R. 6376, directed much of her Senate Interior testimony to the 'hospital at Fairbanks, Alaska.' She wanted to know why mentally ill patients were being placed in jails instead of in the Fairbanks hospital. When pressed to state the improvements she would like to have made in the bill, she said: 'I would have to know the condition of the hospital [at Fairbanks], why it is not being used.'

"Later she said that the Congress 'would have to make an appropriation for doing over the Fairbanks hospital that already exists.'

"When Senator Malone, Republican, of Nevada, pressed Mrs. Burkeland to state which provisions in the bill should be deleted and what should be added, she replied: 'I am no expert.'

"That was clear. Mrs. Burkeland, while in Washington to testify, might easily have inquired about the Fairbanks hospital. She had only to ask Delegate BARTLETT why the Alaskans had not used the hospital she thought was at Fairbanks. On the same day Mrs. Burkeland testified, Mr. BARTETT told the subcommittee:

" 'Funds were appropriated and a so-called detention hospital was built at Fairbanks * * * I am sure it was built shortly after 1910. It was not a hospital, sir, at all. It was merely, in respect to this one community in all the communities in Alaska, a place where the patients were kept temporarily prior to their being sent to Morningside if they were found to be disturbed mentally. They were not treated there * * * It was a 2-story, ramshackle, frame building, but actually reference to that detention hospital has no pertinency to the debate now whatsoever because that was consumed by fire, Mr. Chairman, at least 25 years ago, to my knowledge, and probably somewhat longer.'

"Senator BIBLE asked: 'Nothing was ever rebuilt on the site?'

"Delegate BARTLETT replied: 'No, nothing was ever built on the site.

" 'As a matter of fact, because the U.S. marshal who had custody declared it to be unsafe for human habitation in any form, it was not in use for any purpose, as I recall it, for 2 or 3 years before fire destroyed it.'

"Senator BIBLE queried further: 'As of this date, you do not even have a so-called detention hospital at Fairbanks, because it has been burned?'

"Delegate BARTLETT replied: 'That is correct, we have nothing but jails.'

"This discussion about the 'hospital at Fairbanks' has been given in detail because it illustrates the type of misinformation about H.R. 6376 that was disseminated by Mrs. Burkeland. She chose to include in her original statement on 'Siberia, U.S.A.' false assertions, unverified charges, and fancied dangers. If she had been qualified to analyze the bill, she would have checked her statements carefully. She could easily have verified such a simple fact as whether or not there was a hospital at Fairbanks. She could easily have ascertained from the legislative history of the bill whether there was anything in the bill that would have enabled the Federal Government to railroad political dissidents to Alaska.

"It was unfortunate enough that Mrs. Burkeland should have written her misguided release early in January 1956, and that she should have taken the trouble to appear on February 21 before the Senate Interior Subcommittee where she rambled through a maze of incorrect assertions, beliefs, hearsay statements, and groundless fears.

"The real damage done by Mrs. Burkeland came through the circulation of her 'Siberia, U.S.A.' release to all parts of the United States by the California State Chapter of the Minutewomen, U.S.A., sometime during January. Although the release was palpably false, hysterical, and highly imaginative, it was picked up by a certain small segment of the population which developed into the opposition to H.R. 6376—the 'small, *noisy minority*.'

"Practically without exception, this opposition to the Alaska mental health bill came from individuals and organizations lacking in professional competence to pass on Federal legislation. They did not understand the customary language of Federal laws. Definitions, interlocking provisions, and general language appearing in nearly all bills were wholly unfamiliar to many critics. Sinister meanings were ascribed to harmless words and phrases. Mass hysteria developed among extreme conservatives whose opinions were molded by a steady stream of inflammatory releases, bulletins, and newsletters mailed from a few centers in California to secondary mailing centers in Texas, Arizona, Nebraska, Indiana, New York, Illinois, and a few other places.

"Although the Alaskans were uniformly in favor of the bills designed to give them control over their own mentally ill and while the Federal agencies directly involved were eager to divest themselves of authority over Alaska's mentally ill, a few excited, ill-informed, and, for the most part, nonprofessional alarmists sought to keep the Alaskans from gaining their goal. Competent psychiatric societies and psychiatrists, as well as attorneys, favored H.R. 6376. The American Medical Association gave strong endorsement to the bill. But there was a noisy medical minority that joined the bewildered housewives of California.

"A noisy medical minority

"Dr. George A. Snyder, of Hollywood, Calif., from early in February 1956 until the enactment of H.R. 6376, put on a one-man campaign against the bill. He appeared before the Senate Interior Subcommittee to testify against the bill and to serve as sponsor of Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland and the Finn twins of California. These twins, George C. and Charles Finn, had had considerable newspaper notoriety in California in connection with their difficulties with the Federal Government. Dr. Snyder is reported to have hired them at $100 a week to stay in Washington to fight the bill.

"The charge brought by Dr. Snyder against the Federal Government was made in a 4-page letter, dated February 6, 1956, which he mailed to Members of Congress and to individuals serving as secondary distributors of rightist material. He asked for a complete investigation of the Alaska Mental Health Act, H.R. 6376, for elements of treason against the American people behind the front of the mental-health program. He referred to medical fraud and medical atrocity.

"In addition to Dr. Snyder there was a single medical group that opposed H.R. 6376. This was the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, a small extremely conservative organization formed some 13 years ago to study and act on the social, economic, and legislative aspects of medicine. It is not a scientific group like the American Medical Association, the American Academy of General Practice, and the many specially societies. The AAPS has a small office in Chicago headed by an executive secretary, a high-school graduate with no professional training. He writes their legislative bulletins, subject to approval by AAPS officials in other cities, handles much of their correspondence, and has managerial responsibility for mailings, banquet arrangements, and the distribution of educational material. AAPS legislative bulletins are sent to all State medical societies and to a limited number of physicians in the several States.

"On February 25, 1956, a week after Dan Smoot issued his mental-health release against H.R. 6376, AAPS mailed out an emergency bulletin headed 'Mental Health Bill Is Incredible, Inane Legislation.' Referring to H.R. 6376 as 'another horrible and vicious bill' which is nearing enactment 'unless you and thousands of others act at once,' AAPS stated that the bill 'applies to every U.S. citizen—you and me.'

"Quoting from the customary reciprocal reimbursement provisions (the famous section 119(c), AAPS warned: 'This means the creation of a potential "American Siberia" where an "interested party," in disagreement with your libertarian views because they do not conform to "normal human behavior of liberals" could "send you away".'

"Commenting on the definition of a mentally ill person as given in the bill, AAPS said: 'Thus, a mentally ill person is defined as a mentally ill person.'

"They continued: 'The bill is backed by the United Nations and three of its agencies, UNESCO, World Health Organization, and the World Federation of Mental Health.'

"These quotations were taken directly from the Dan Smoot release without credit being given to him. All the statements were false and irresponsible, repeating the irrational fantasies which were being voiced at that time by the lunatic fringe and by Dan Smoot. For a national medical organization, however small, to adopt the slogans and misrepresentations of the bewildered California housewives must have given considerable comfort to the muddled opponents to H.R. 6376. Indeed, in response to the alarmist AAPS bulletin, many members of the organization sent telegrams of opposition to H.R. 6376. A staff member of the Senate Interior Committee said they were surprised and worried about this medical opposition. To be sure of their ground, they asked the American Medical Association to give its opinion of the bill.

"In the meantime, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons made its own position perfectly clear. It had adopted the Burkeland-Smoot 'Siberia' line, recklessly, without careful study.

"On February 24, Dr. Arthur G. Blazey, of Washington, Ind., cochairman of AAPS legislative committee, had sent out a completely irrational letter headed 'Alaskan Concentration Camp for Americans.' Presenting a false analysis of H.R. 6376, he wrote:

" 'Here are the salient features of an international Socialist plot foisted upon our sleepy Congressmen with the blessings of our new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, via the World Federation of Mental Health:

" '1. A section of Alaska larger than the State of Rhode Island is designated for confinement of individuals having psychiatric or other diseases which impair their mental health.' [Mrs. Burkeland in her early January 'Siberia, U.S.A.' had compared the size of the million-acre grant to the size of Rhode Island. Since when have reputable physicians taken their views from uninformed housewives?]

" '2. Commitment is expedited by removing the time-tested laws that require examination by three physicians for certification of insanity.' [Does Dr. Blazey think 3 psychiatrists could make a living in an Eskimo village of 50 persons, or 100, or 500?] 'We have long heard about how the Red Gestapo whisk deviationalists out of their living quarters to oblivion. * * * Now we are hearing some of these same stories in our own country, and are now faced with a cunning scheme, under the guise of mental health, to establish a facsimile of a Red Siberia for our own citizens.'

"This wild, irrational statement came from the legislative cochairman of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.

"Then, on February 25 the alarmist AAPS emergency bulletin, written, presumably by their office manager, who has only a high-school education and who lacks professional competence to analyze Federal legislation, was issued. On receipt of this bulletin on February 27, I protested vigorously to Dr. James L. Doenges, then president of AAPS. He telephoned the office manager, Mr. Harry

Northam, to call me. Mr. Northam telephoned five officers of AAPS and got them to agree to back his February 25 bulletin which, we may assume, they had previously hastily OK'd. On February 29 Mr. Northam called me, protesting my stand in favor of H.R. 6376. He stated cockily that he had on another occasion told the AMA that AAPS did not agree with them. Now he was telling me. He said: 'I don't care what happens to the Alaskans (as though they were citizens of Russia or China). I'm worried about what will happen to the citizens of the United States.' (As though the Alaskans were not.) He concluded his telephone conversation by stating: 'I hope we defeat the bill.'

"On March 1, 1956, 5 days after AAPS had taken a position against H.R. 6376, their then president, Dr. James L. Doenges, wrote me:

" 'I am sorry to see that you feel the AAPS is in error on the matter of the mental health bill, and I am impatiently awaiting the arrival of the copy of the present bill, since I certainly would not want AAPS to make that kind of an error.' (Obviously Dr. Doenges had OK'd the emergency bulletin of February 25 opposing H.R. 6376 without having seen the bill.)

"On March 2, Dr. Arthus G. Blazey wrote to Senator James E. Murray further denouncing H.R. 6376 and saying: 'Regardless of the above changes, H.R. 6376 should be tabled by your committee because it is a further transgression on the proper limitations of Federal authority.'

"The same Dr. Blazey on March 3 wrote me: 'The barbarism of Alaskan treatment of mental patients is Alaskan business until it affects these United States, as stipulated in H.R. 6376. The international activities of Overholser in connection with the U.N. (actually nonexistent), and his domestic activities in the instance of Lucille Miller (he released her from St. Elizabeths after her home State, Vermont, had sent her to the Federal hospital) and others does not render him an acceptable authority on mental health in my opinion—or others.'

"Dr. James L. Doenges wrote me on March 6: 'If AAPS is wrong, we will certainly admit our error and publish a correction. * * * If we should be proven wrong by the facts, we will retract. * * * We certainly have no intention of attempting to take credit for anything such as the rewording of a bill, so you need not worry about that.' (I had written Dr. Doenges that I thought they would try to claim credit if the committee made any changes in the bill for any reasons.)

"By March 17, Dr. Doenges had shifted his ground. He wrote me: '* * * if we are proven wrong, we of AAPS will publish a bulletin and will retract. However, if the committee or the Senate makes changes in the provisions of the bill to which we have objected, then you and all others must regard that our objections and criticisms are valid and correct.'

"On March 20 the American Medical Association sent a letter of approval of H.R. 6376 to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It became available to the public the following day. On March 22 the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons announced a shift of position. Moving away from their intransigent stand of opposition to the bill, which would also have placed them in opposition to the AMA, they wired a hastily drafted set of amendments to the committee, indicating that if these were adopted the bill would be satisfactory. Among other corrections, they asked for deletion of the customary 'and for other purposes' in the preamble.

"Six days later AAPS asked the Senate Interior Committee to disregard most of its former amendments and to substitute others. They showed unseemly haste and great indecision. So insistent were they to have their amendments accepted that they induced Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, to have them printed. (Committee print, Apr. 10, 1956). Officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed the AAPS amendments and condemned them as administratively incongruous and as inconsistent with other provisions in the bill. The definition of mental illness proposed by AAPS was described by the HEW Department as "in complete disagreement with all modern concepts for the care and treatment of the mentally ill," inasmuch as they would have refused hospital care to persons in the early stages of mental illness. (Committee Print No. 3, Apr. 19, 1956.)

"Other amendments proposed by AAPS with respect to commitment procedures showed their lack of understanding of modern medical opinion regarding such procedures. All told, their proposals were so unworkable and so inconsistent with current medical and legal practice in the care and commitment of the mentally ill, that the committee rejected the suggestions and did not even discuss them. Thus, the effort of the only medical organization that set out to defeat or mutilate the bill came to naught AAPS was discredited has having published an irresponsible and untrue bulletin on February 25, 1956, and for failing to retract as requested to by the Alaska Territorial Medical Association. The amendments which they proposed indicated clearly that the drafting of Federal legislation is not a task to be lightly undertaken by amateurs.

"Viewed as a whole, opposition to H.R. 6376 was stirred up by a noisy, ill-informed minority comprising housewives, a few editors, and a scattering of physicians. A partial list includes: The American Public Relations Forum, Inc.; Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president; Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, especially Dr. James L. Doenges and Dr. Arthur G. Blazey; Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland; the Concordians; the Finn twins; the Greater Nebraskan; Mervin K. Hart; the Hoiles Syndicate; Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, retired; Dan Smoot; Dr. George A. Snyder; and the Tablet.

"Ignorance bred fear of H.R. 6376

"In the main, opposition to H.R. 6376 stemmed from ignorance which bred fear and distrust. It centered on three or four provisions in the bill and on certain language which is standard in virtually all bills.

"Among the trivial objections was one to section 101(m): 'The term "State" or "States" includes the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.' Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president of the American Public Relations Forum, Inc., objected to the definition, saying that similar language appeared in the Connecticut and Illinois laws. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, said he saw no cause for alarm in the definition, since it was 'customary.' To which Mrs. Williams replied: 'You are so accustomed to this. I am only a housewife.'

"Of course, the term 'State' must be defined, since some laws apply to all States and territories while others exclude Alaska or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The definition is indeed customary in State and Federal laws and should not be considered alarming or sinister.

"Similarly, several individuals and the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons were alarmed at the phrase 'and for other purposes' in the preamble of the bill. The AAPS went so far as to wire the Senate Interior Committee to delete the phrase. Later they wired to leave it in.

"Actually, anyone who is alarmed at this phrase betrays woeful ignorance of Federal and State legislation. The phrase is to be found in the preamble of thousands of bills for the simple reason it is impossible to list all the purposes of most bills. This covering phrase 'and for other purposes' is found not only in bills and laws, but also in contracts, articles of incorporation, and other legal instruments. However, one opponent to the bill, Brig. Gen. Herber C. Holdridge, retired, vice presidential candidate on the Prohibition ticket, wrote to President Eisenhower on March 12, 1956, stating his own peculiar ideas of what 'and for other purposes' meant. He said that the bill was 'a dastardly attempt to establish a concentration camp in the Alaskan wastes.' In impassioned phrases he asserted: 'The bill establishes a weapon of violence against our citizenry far more wicked than anything ever known in recorded history—far worse than the Siberian prison camps of the Czars or the Communists, or the violences of the Spanish Inquisition. * * *' These are clearly the 'other purposes' stated in the title of the bill. He continued: 'The plot of wickedness revealed in this bill fairly reeks of the evil odor of the black forces of the Jesuits who dominate the Vatican, and, through affiliates in our Government, dominate our policies.'

"Later, on March 24, the same brigadier general wrote to Senator James B. Murray, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee: 'I shall retain your letter of March 21, 1956, as documentary evidence that you yourself are insane, subversive, or, at minimum, incompetent. It may prove useful if your reciprocal provisions ever become effective.'

"Many persons expressed alarm over various provisions in the commitment procedures, although these have been incorporated in the laws of many States and are working satisfactorily. Numerous critics demanded that compulsory jury trial be included in the procedures. This demand unquestionably arose from ignorance of current practice in the States. Compulsory jury trials have been abandoned by all States save Texas, which is even now working on that reform. A majority of States have optional trial by jury. As a rule, patients and their families wish to avoid the publicity and stigma which accompany jury trials.

"Furthermore, mental illness is no longer regarded as a crime in informed quarters. Enlightened thinkers in this field are endeavoring to do away with criminal procedures in handling such cases. One of the worst features about compulsory trials is that patients who desire voluntary commitment in the early stages of mental illness are deterred from applying and are likely to wait until they are in advanced stages of mental deterioration.

"One of the most hotly debated provisions of H.R. 6376 was that providing 1 million acres to aid Alaska in defraying future operating costs of the program. The California opponents and their followers reached the conclusion that Congress and Alaska were engaged in a Marxist plot to sell the million acres to Russia for a concentration camp. Mrs. Stephanie Williams was of that opinion and during May 1956 her organization went so far as to suggest that an oil lease which the Department of the Interior was negotiating with a Colorado oil company was part of the same plot to transfer the public domain to Russia, a million acres at a time, with the connivance of the Congress of the United States, the controlling committees in Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Legislature of Alaska.

"Other disturbed opponents thought Alaska might be planning to build a stockade around the million acres and to turn loose within the compound persons falsely adjudged insane in the States and railroaded to Alaska. The fact, there was nothing in the bill to justify such conclusions has not bothered the noisy, bewildered critics. These weird interpretations have been made almost exclusively by persons without adequate professional background in analyzing Federal legislation and without a knowledge of American history and the place of land grants in State organization.

"Unquestionably the section of the bill that was most generally misunderstood was the compact clause, section 119, which covered the customary reimbursement provisions between States. Such clauses antedate our Constitution and appear in one or another form throughout welfare legislation. Thus, States are in the habit of ascertaining the legal residence of all recipients of public charity. If the person in question does not have legal residence in the State where he becomes a public charge, he may be sent back to the State where he has such residence or that State may be charged for his care.

"Similar provisions are customary in State laws dealing with the mentally ill or with prisoners. If a State lacks adequate facilities or treatment centers, it may arrange with another State to incarcerate a prisoner or to provide for a mental patient needing special treatment. These arrangements are made on a reimbursable basis under a compact clause of a type which has been sanctioned in American jurisprudence for over 170 years. They antedate Marx, communism, and the United Nations by many decades. Such a compact clause was included routinely in section 119 of H.R. 6376.

"It is incomprehensible that a provision which has been in common use for over a century and a half in State and Federal laws should suddenly arouse such fears as did section 119. The compact clause was widely misunderstood as having something to do with commitment procedures. Yet it referred only to financial reimbursement. Failure to distinguish between a compact clause and commitment procedures led the noisy minority to claim that Congress was authorizing the States to railroad political dissidents to a Russian-owned corral in Alaska.

"Probably no bill has ever been so garbled, distorted, and misunderstood as H.R. 6376. Yet it was perfectly clear from the hearings in the House and Senate and from conversations with Federal officials who aided in the drafting of the measure that no one in Washington had any plot in mind. At no time did any Government official in the Interior Department or in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare make a particular point about the wording of any single provision. Nor was any Senator or Representative wedded to particular language as would have been the case if some deep plot were afoot.

"It was clear beyond any possibility of doubt that the only desire anyone connected with the drafting of the bill had in mind was to draft a good bill that would redress old wrongs and would transfer authority in the field of mental health from the Federal Government to the Territorial government. To these ends an original grant was proposed for the construction of facilities, while grants-in-aid on a decreasing scale were authorized for a 10-year period and a grant of 1 million acres was authorized to provide for long-term financing of the program. Old laws were repealed. Modern commitment procedures were set forth. The Federal Government was divested of power. These provisions attested the good faith of Congress.

"To impugn the motives of those who wrote and sponsored this legislation is to see plots and evil designs where none exist. It was the Alaskans who sought long-overdue redress of cruel treatment accorded their mentally ill and retarded. It was the Alaskan Delegate, E. L. Bartlett, who introduced the first bill in the present series and later introduced others. It was a respected Republican, Representative Miller, a physician, who fought for the million-acre grant and won necessary House approval. It was the Republican Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart, who disclaimed any scheme for Alaskan concentration camps. This is not to detract in any way from the fact that it was the Democrats who introduced and sponsored the bills. Representatives Leo W. O'Brien of New York and Edith Green of Oregon, as well as Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington, fought rationally and judiciously to give the Alaskans a fine mental health program.

"The entire history of this legislation attests the integrity of purpose and the high ideals motivating congressional action. For half a century the Alaskans had suffered a cruel form of inhumane punishment in seeing their loved ones railroaded to a hospital in some cases 2,000 miles or more from home. Then when Congress, after due and careful study and after obtaining the best available professional help in drafting this complex bill, was about to complete action, an avalanche of protests poured into Washington from persons who would in no way be affected by the bill.

"Protests voiced indifference to, or hatred for, the Alaskans. None of the opponents in January, February, and March 1956, seemed to have any interest in the plight of the Alaskans. Ignorance, fear, malice, and strange aberrations characterized the opposition to H.R. 6376. When before has a small, noisy minority of housewives in California, editors in Santa Ana, Calif., Dallas, Tex., McClellan, Tex., New York City, and Omaha, Nebr., bestirred itself over a small Alaskan bill? It is as bizarre a situation as has occurred in the memory of many an oldtimer in Washington.

"Historical precedents

"Alaska is eagerly awaiting statehood. Bit by bit the United States is giving more authority to the Territory. Historically the Federal Government has made large grants of land to all Territories as they approached statehood. Precedents in history and in American jurisprudence shaped the important provisions of H.R. 6376.

"Land grants for public purposes: Land grants for schools, colleges, and other public purposes go back more than 170 years in our history. They were established under the Ordinance of May 20, 1785, and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Those early grants were in Ohio where lot 16 in each township was set aside by the Government for schools. Later, land-grant colleges were endowed by the Government.

"Between 1880 and 1906 five Western States received land grants for the care of their insane. These Federal grants were made at the time of the enabling acts of Idaho (1890), Oklahoma (1906), South Dakota (1889), Utah (1894), and Wyoming (1890). The grants ranged from 30,000 acres in Wyoming to 200,000 acres in Oklahoma and constituted up to 0.3 percent of the State's area. The proposed Alaskan grant of 1 million acres is less than 0.3 percent of the land area of the Territory.

"This modest grant to Alaska actually looks small compared to the U.S. grants of 10 million acres of the public domain to Arizona, nearly 9 million acres to California, 24 million acres to Florida, 16 million acres to Minnesota, 7 million acres to Oregon, and 4 million acres to Indiana. These 6 States have a total land area of 548,809 square miles which is only 22,000 square miles less than Alaska's 571,000 square miles. The land grants to the 6 States in question have amounted to 70 million acres as against the 1 million now being proposed by Congress for Alaska. These 6 States have enjoyed land grants amounting to over 70 times the amount now being proposed for Alaska. Presently the Federal Government owns more than 99 percent of the Territory, thus having a stranglehold on one of the chief sources of revenue that might make Alaska more nearly self-sustaining. Since the United States paid only 2 cents an acre for Alaska, the proposed million-acre grant for a mental health program would represent only a $20,000 outlay.

"Elective jury trial for the insane: Although the new version of H.R. 6376, which was reported by the Senate Interior Committee and voted by the Senate (the Goldwater amendment), omitted the commitment procedures of the House-passed bill, many persons are demanding inclusion of provisions for compulsory jury trial.

"Such inclusion would go against modern judicial opinion and medical experience. The Council of State Governments, which has been devoting considerable attention to modernizing State mental health laws and procedures, published a valuable document in 1952 on the 'Mental Health Programs of the 48 States.' They give a table entitled 'Legal Provisions Governing Admissions and Commitments of the Mentally Ill, by States, 1949' (p. 52) which shows the following 26 States provide for trial by jury, but that only Texas makes this mandatory: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

"There is clear medical evidence that mandatory jury trial should be avoided. Where it is optional, patients show their preference by avoiding a jury commitment. In St. Elizabeths Hospital only 16 patients out of 1,700 asked for jury trial.

"Legal opposition to jury trials in such cases is that mental illness is not a crime and consequently constitutional protection under the 'due process' clause is not applicable. Court decisions support this view:

" 'Insanity is not a crime and therefore the constitutional guaranty of jury trial is not applicable.' (*Barry* v. *Hall*, 99 F. 2d 22, 225 (1938, C.A., D.C.).)

" 'It has been frequently announced by this and many other courts that due process of law, within the meaning of both the Federal and State Constitutions, does not necessarily imply a trial by jury.' (*In re Brewer* (Iowa, 1937), 276 N.W. 766, 768.)

" 'Since an insanity case is a civil case (*State ex. rel. Peper* v. *Holtcamp* (235 Mo. 232, 138 S.W. 521)), it would seem at least that due process of law does not require that there be a jury trial, whether demanded or not, and we so hold.' (In re Moynihan (Mo. 1933) (62 S.W. 2d 411, 413).)

"Involuntary detention for acutely ill mental patients: Members of Congress have been bombarded with protests over provisions in H.R. 6376 dealing with involuntary detention. Since the Senate had already voted to accept the Goldwater amendment which omits commitment procedures and since Senate and House conferees have accepted this version, none of the commitment procedures are at issue.

"However, in order to answer some of the most common objections which have been raised, we would point out that the common law rule has been that 'a dangerous maniac may be restrained temporarily until he can be safely released, or can be arrested upon legal process, or committed to the asylum under legal authority.' (*Kelcher* v. *Putnam* (1880) (6 N.H. 30, et al.).)

"Provisions authorizing temporary detention of dangerous insane persons are found in the statutes of most States. A compilation which appears in the 'Mental Health Programs of the 48 States' indicates that in 1949 30 States provided for emergency commitment without court order.

"The common-law rule, with certain limitations designed to protect the interests of both the patient and the arresting officer, is embodied in section 104(a) of H.R. 6376. Simply stated, this section says that if a licensed physician issues a certificate that an individual is mentally ill and because of illness is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, then any health, welfare, or police officer, or any person deputized by a U.S. commissioner shall have authority, upon medical certification, to take the individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto.

"However, there will be times when it is impossible to obtain medical certification. If a person who gives evidence of being mentally ill and seems likely to injure himself or others cannot be medically certified at once, any health, welfare, or police officer may take such individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto (sec. 104(b)).

"One opponent to this bill wanted to have this section deleted. We wonder what he would suggest for handling the case of a person who went beserk in Alaska 500 miles from the nearest physician—let alone 3 psychiatrists as he suggests.

"Another opponent to H.R. 6376 wanted this section deleted. However, that would be impractical, considering the conditions of travel in Alaska. If a person in a remote village of 50 or 100 persons should go beserk 500 miles from the nearest physician and 1,000 miles from a psychiatrist, some person in authority would have to act to protect the public and the patient. The proposal made by an official of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons that an Alaskan who became mentally ill should have his family physician accompany him and that three psychiatrists be consulted is wholly unrealistic.

"The following States have procedures substantially identical to those under section 104(a): Idaho, South Carolina, Utah, and Florida. Provisions similar to section 104(b) are to be found in the laws of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Utah, and Missouri.

"Criminal provisions of H.R. 6376: Several witnesses objected to the fact that when the bill was passed by the House, section 31, providing fines and imprisonment for persons conspiring to cause unwarranted hospitalization of anyone or denial of rights granted under the act, was omitted. This was not the result of a sinister plot to expedite hospitalization on false charges. Instead, there was a general feeling that criminal provisions belonged in the Criminal Code, not in a mental health bill.

"Conclusions: As one analyzes the objections to the Alaska mental health bill, one sees that they were based on ignorance of American history, of State and Federal laws, and of conditions in Alaska. These objections, raised by a noisy minority, represented the obsessions conjured up by extremists, fanatics, and gullible dupes who lacked professional competence to form a judgment about the bill.

"Reason prevailed

"The small minorities opposing H.R. 6376 made so much noise at first that they sounded like a large army marching on Washington. Then, as Members of Congress and their staffs began to compare notes, there was observed a similarity of wording in opposition letters, telegrams, releases, and bulletins. Over and over the same scare phrases appeared: 'American Siberia,' 'Alaskan concentration camps for Americans,' 'U.N. plot,' 'UNESCO plot,' 'Marxist plot' etc. Exception was taken to the million-acre grant, to the commitment procedures, to the absence of compulsory jury trial. The Siberia theme showed up in certain newspapers—never many.

"Congress began to realize that the opposition was not really nationwide. It had originated with one woman and one group of housewives in California. Across the country there had rolled an extreme rightist chant—'Siberia, U.S.A.' Housewives, retired Army officers, a few editors, and a scattering of physicians picked up the slogans, opposition arguments, and scareheads. In January, February, and early March 1956, the scaremongers seemed to have taken over.

"Then, in March, the tide began to turn. On March 1, Challenge to Socialism, a conservative weekly paper published by Marjorie Shearon, legislative analyst and former consultant to Senator Robert A. Taft, published a calm analysis of H.R. 6376, with an explanation of some of the more controversial sections. Dr. Shearon published four issues on Alaska mental health during March, explaining the reasons for the commitment procedures and pointing to the historical precedents for land grants and provisions for reimbursement for the care of public charges on a reciprocal basis by the several States. All told, Dr. Shearon published over a dozen issues, devoted in whole or in part to the historical background, legislative history, and legal precedents for this much-needed, humane, and entirely innocuous bill.

"On March 16, 1956, Leo H. Bartemeier, M.D., chairman of the Council of Mental Health of the American Medical Association, wrote to Delegate BARTLETT:

"'During the past fortnight I studied this bill, and I personally believe that it is in complete agreement with our procedures and our methods of caring for the mentally ill. It will be of great benefit to the people of Alaska.'

"Four days later, on March 20, the American Medical Association, which had made a careful study of the bill and of its legislative background, wrote to Senator Murray, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"'With the reservations hereinafter discussed, the American Medical Association supports and recommends the enactment of H.R. 6376, 84th Congress.

"'Three studies of the situation of the mentally ill in Alaska have been made in recent years. The earliest of these, in 1948, was conducted by the American Medical Association. The report of the group of physicians which visted Alaska in the course of this investigation was critical of the existing commitment procedures and the lack of facilities in Alaska for the care and treatment of mental patients. It recommended the establishment of a centrally located hospital for the needs of the Territory. * * *

"'* * * in our opinion, the procedures set forth in H.R. 6376 are on a par with the better procedures adopted by the several States, and are superior to those presently followed in Alaska.'

"The reservations of which the American Medical Association spoke were one dealing with possible inclusion in the bill of criminal procedures in the case of unwarranted hospitalization and one clarifying the language of section 119(c), the compact clause for reciprocal reimbursement.

"On March 15, the Alaska Hospital Association had urged Senator Murray to support the bill. On April 3, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia expressed its approval of the bill and stated:

"'In the opinion of our board this bill should receive high priority in health legislation because of the urgent need for improving the care of the mentally ill in Alaska.'

"One of the first health and medical groups to go on record as favoring H.R. 6376 was the Alaska Board of Health which passed a series of resolutions on October 12, 1955, urging that 'this legislation, so badly needed, be passed and approved without further delay.'

"Similar approval was given by the Juneau Parent-Teacher Association on February 23, 1956, by the Church of the Holy Trinity in the capital city of Alaska on February 10, and by the Juneau Chamber of Commerce on February 20.

"Dr. George S. Stevenson, national and international consultant for the National Association of Mental Health, supported the bill wholeheartedly, going into the major provisions in considerable detail. He said:

"'This bill will do much to advance the care of the mentally ill of Alaska from the present primitive provisions to that which is enjoyed by mentally ill persons in our most advanced States.

"'This bill will modernize the processes of admission of Alaska's mentally ill to a mental hospital. It will replace the mandatory jury adjudication by providing for a professional evaluation and still maintain the judicial safeguards. Many patients have been irreparably injured by the formal court process through which they have to pass. This bill guards against such damage.

"'The provisions made by this bill for the commitment of patients are those that are found in many of our States, and the anxieties which have been voiced by some as to what might happen because of the liberality of the provisions actually do not happen in those States where these same provisions obtain.

"'It also makes it possible for Alaska to care for residents of other States who happen to fall ill while in Alaska. This provision can be either by resources within Alaska or by transfer to another State. Again this makes it possible to do what is best for the patient. There have been criticisms of this aspect of the bill, but these criticisms reflect a lack of understanding of the provision and of the fact that this is already an approved procedure in some States has shown none of the dire results that are attributed to it.'

"Since the Alaskans were strongly in favor of H.R. 6376 and since the American Medical Association supported the bill, favorable action by the Senate Territorial Subcommittee and later by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was assured. There had been no informed, responsible medical opposition. The Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, which set out on February 25 to defeat the bill and which in its March newsletter repeated its false analysis of the bill, later attempted to introduce crippling and unworkable amendments. The committee paid no attention to the proposals and after the AMA had supported the bill, AAPS retreated from its untenable position although it failed to retract its early false bulletin.

"There had been two schools of thought about the best way to handle the legislation. One advocated repeal of the old laws dealing with mental illness in Alaska, transfer of authority from the Federal Government to Alaska, the grant of transitional funds, and a land grant. The other school of thought advocated all this and a spelling out of the commitment procedures. In the end, the Senate Territorial Subcommittee decided on the first line of action. Senator Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, introduced an amendment to H.R. 6376 which was virtually the same as the House-passed bill except that it omitted the commitment procedures.

"The feeling was that Alaska had progressed to such a point that it was capable of writing its own procedures. Furthermore, there was little point in Congress writing the procedures and then simultaneously giving Alaska authority to rewrite the procedures in any way it saw fit. As a practical reality, Alaska will undoubtedly enact the procedures as they were written into H.R. 6376, since much professional thought had gone into the drafting and since medical authorities in Alaska had already approved the language in the bill.

"On April 23 the Territorial Subcommittee voted to accept the Goldwater amendment in principle. On May 14 the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved the Goldwater amendment to H.R. 6376. The Senate unanimously approved the bill on June 7. House and Senate conferees were appointed. They accepted the Senate version with minor changes on July 16. The bill, as amended, was then unanimously approved by the Senate. The House on July 20, by a vote of 130 to 16, passed H.R. 6376 and it is now Public Law 830 of the 84th Congress.

"Thus, at long last, Congress, unmoved by the lunatic fringe, has passed a forward-looking piece of legislation, soundly conceived and wisely drafted. The Democrats sponsored and fought for the bill, but throughout it received bipartisan support. Hope, finally, has been vouchsafed to Alaska's mentally ill."

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, after reading the Washington Post story headed, "Original Sandstone Quarry Offered To Rebuild the Capitol's West Front," one cannot help but wonder whether the objections to the extension of the west front of the Capitol really go only to the type of building stone that will be used. The tenor of the story by Elsie Carper is that the owners of the quarry where the original sandstone was extracted would be willing to open it again so that the Architect of the Capitol could acquire similar sandstone to build the new walls of the Capitol. Apparently, this would resolve all of the objections that have been raised. Of course, this comes as a total surprise to me; I had understood that the great wail of objection had gone up simply because people felt that the original stones must remain in the Capitol wall and that not one change could be made without "desecrating our Nation's Capitol." Of course, it must be pointed out that the original surface is not going to be preserved in any event because the stone walls have been painted over many times and although the interior of the stones may have been in place for some time, the exterior is the paint that now is visible on the walls of the Capitol.

But does not this whole matter reduce to an absurdity when one finds that we are talking about whether to build with sandstone or marble? I return again to what I have said before about the east front. The marble walls that have been put in place are, in my opinion, greatly superior and certainly more beautiful than the sandstone walls which were there before. I would point out also, that the exact facade of the west front is not the original and therefore, would not be violated if modest changes were made. Of course, like everyone else, I believe that the general contours of the Capitol should not be changed, that the building should "look the same as it does now to the casual observer," but like the east front, the west front could be extended and the area within the Capitol altered to make room for further uses of the Capitol Building. This could be done without in any way changing the appearance or the architectural style of the Capitol Building. But for goodness sakes, let us not reduce this silly chorus of opposition to the factor of whether sandstone or some other building material should be used to replace the crumbling walls of the Capitol Building.

THE UNITED STATES–U.S.S.R. FISHERY CONFERENCE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the State Department announced today the results of a conference held in Moscow last week involving the United States and U.S.S.R. fishery officials.

This conference dealt, among other things, with two vexing problems involving Soviet fishing fleets fishing off the Atlantic coast of the United States and an equally serious problem involving Russian fishing fleets off the west coast.

For several years our Atlantic coast fishing States have been confronted by the presence of large Soviet fleets fishing off Georges Bank, the great traditional Massachusetts fishing ground. Indeed it is my understanding that at the present time the Russians take more fish from this area than do our own fishermen. More recently, within the last 3 years, the Russian fleets have moved immediately south and are now fishing off Cape Cod and to the south of Cape Cod in the mid-Atlantic area.

The presence of these fleets has posed a threat to the effective consideration of our fish stocks; but in addition the very presence in such large numbers of Russian ships in relatively small fishing areas have often created problems of crowding—with the result that our own fishermen are often effectively fenced out of those areas.

It is my understanding that as a result of last week's conference, the Russians have agreed to a complete exchange of scientific and statistical information in order to determine the exact extent to which depletion of our salmon runs is taking place off our shores.

I intend to recommend that the scientific meeting to be held this fall on this question be followed by a meeting with the Soviets which would include representatives of the administration, the Congress, and industry.

It is my hope that at this meeting an understanding can be reached with the Soviets which will ensure in the future the conservation of these precious fishing resources off our east coast. I also intend to urge the administration to follow through on the Russian agreement to consider the problem of "crowding," so that our fishermen will be able to pursue their livelihood fishing off our coast in traditional areas without harassment.

It is also my understanding that the Soviets have agreed not to fish within 12 miles of the Oregon and Washington coast lines. Such an agreement is particularly salutary at this time, when Russian hake boats are fishing almost to the 3-mile territorial limit within 4½ miles of our western coast.

I believe that our fishery limits should be 12 miles off both our coasts. The Senate has recently passed legislation which would provide that measure of protection for our fisheries on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, and I am hopeful that favorable House action will soon be forthcoming.

I am pleased with the encouraging reports that I have heard of the progress being made in our negotiations with the Soviets on this question, and I intend to follow these developments closely in order to insure that the interests of our fishing industry are adequately protected.

RASMUSSEN APPOINTMENT APPLAUDED

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that Boyd L. Rasmussen was sworn in this morning as Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Rasmussen has had a distinguished career in another leading resource agency, the U.S. Forest Service, of which he was deputy chief before his promotion. I regard him and his fine family as fellow Montanans. From 1961 to 1964 he served with distinction as regional forester in Missoula. His daughter, Mary, is a graduate of the University of Montana.

His experience covers a range of problems common to managers of public lands, whether they are administered by one Federal agency, another, or a State agency. He has been responsible for the Forest Service operations involving State and private forestry. He has had charge of that agency's cooperative forestry programs and insect and disease control throughout the 50 States. He has had responsible positions in fire control work and for a time was in charge of national forest resource management. He brings to his new position experience, enterprise, and enthusiasm.

VETS LOSING $26 MILLION ANNUALLY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article titled "Vets Losing $26 Million Annually," appeared in the August 2 edition of the Beckley, W. Va., Raleigh Register.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Don't Know Their Rights: Vets Losing $26 Million Annually

(By Ray Cromley)

Washington.—Some 100,000 veterans, widows and children are losing about $26 million a year in disability and death pension benefits.

New government estimates show that these benefits are being lost because qualified Americans haven't applied for the increased benefits to which they are entitled under a law effective in 1960 and amended in 1964.

These pensions are paid to wartime veterans (including Korea) permanently and totally disabled from causes not traceable to their military service.

Payments are also made to widows and children of wartime veterans, who have died of causes unrelated to their military service. Veterans of Viet Nam and their widows and orphans are not eligible.

All veterans, widows and orphans who came on the pension rolls after June 30, 1960 receive pensions under the new system. But qualified Americans already on the rolls on July 1, 1960, have continued to receive pensions under the old system unless they applied for transfer. They may be receiving less money than they should.

In general, six groups of veterans, widows and orphan pensioners are the greatest beneficiaries of a shift from the old system to the 1960 plan:

Group one—Veterans so helpless they require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Under the old plan, such a veteran drew a flat $135.45 a month pension. Under the new plan, such a veteran receives $100 a month plus a pension of from $43 to $115 a month, depending on the number of dependents.

Under the 1960 law, veterans receiving this regular aid and attendance allowance are also entitled to free prescription drugs and medicine, therapeutic or rehabilitative devices, invalid lifts and other medical equipment and supplies. These benefits are not available to those receiving pensions under the pre-1960 law.

Group two—Veterans helpless enough so that they are housebound, but not so badly off that they require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Under the pre-1960 plan, such a veteran drew only his pension of $66.15, or $78.75 a month after 10 years or age 65, whichever came sooner. Under the new plan such a veteran draws a pension of $43 to $115 a month, depending on the number of dependents, plus a $35-a-month "housebound" allowance.

Group three—Orphans whose veteran fathers have died of non-service-connected disabilities and whose mothers are dead—or are ineligible for pensions, because, say, they've remarried.

Under the pre-1960 law, one such child was entitled to $27.30 a month. Two in the same family were entitled to $40.95 and three, $54.60. A child was ineligible if his other income exceeded $1,400 a year, even if it was income he himself earned.

Under the new law, the first child is entitled to $38 a month, with $15 for each additional child. A child is eligible if his other income does not exceed $1,800 a year. Income he himself earns is not included in the $1,800 limit.

Group four—Single veterans with incomes of $600 a year or less and veterans with dependents with incomes of $1,000 a year or less.

Under the 1960 law, such a single veteran can draw $100 a month and a veteran with dependents up to $115. The less a veteran earns, the more he can receive.

Under the pre-1960 arrangements, a totally and permanently disabled wartime (including Korea) veteran whose disability was not traceable to service cause was entitled to a flat $66.15 a month, until he reached age 60 or had been on the pension rolls 10 years, whichever came first. After that he received $78.75 a month. He received the same amount, whether single or married. His other income could not exceed $1,400 a year, if single, and $2,700 a year, if married.

Group five—Single veterans with incomes of more than $1,400 a year but not more than $1,800, and veterans with dependents with incomes of more than $2,700 a year but not more than $3,000.

Under the pre-1960 law these veterans received no pensions at all. Under the new law the eligible single veteran in this group receives $43 a month and the veteran with dependents receives $48 a month.

Group six—Eligible widows of veterans who have died of non-service-connected causes.

Such widows are particularly better off under the new system if they have no children by the veteran and their other income is $600 a year or less or if they have one or more children by the veteran and their other income is $1,000 a year or less.

Under the pre-1960 law, widows without children by the veterans could receive $50.40 a month. Under the 1960 law they can receive $64.

Under the old arrangement, an eligible widow with one child could receive $63 a month and $7.56 for each additional child. Under the 1960 law, an eligible widow with one child could draw $80 a month and $15 for each additional child.

There are many veterans and widow pensioners not in the six groups above who would benefit by shifting to the new system. Conversely, some in these groups mentioned are merely representative samples.

Four types of veterans pensioners are unlikely to profit from a shift to the 1960 system, though, again, there are special individuals within these groups who might profit:

Group one—A single veteran pensioner with other annual income between $1,200 and $1,400 and a veteran pensioner with dependents with between $2,000 and $2,700 annual income.

Group two—A married veteran pensioner whose wife has an income other than earnings considerably greater than $1,200 a year or whose wife has a combined earned and unearned income considerably greater than $1,200 a year with a significant amount of that total being unearned income.

Under the pre-1960 law, a wife's income did not count as part of her veteran husband's income for pension purposes. Under the 1960 law, if her income is greater than $1,200 a year and part of it is from stocks, bonds, rents, annuities, pensions or Social Security, or is otherwise "not earned," a part of her income is counted as income of the veteran.

Group three—Under the 1960 law, an otherwise eligible veteran with a "sizable" estate, exclusive of his home and personal effects used in "ordinary" living.

The Veterans Administration has not defined what a "sizable" estate is. Officials say each case "will be judged on its individual merits." Under the pre-1960 law, the size of an eligible veteran's estate was not considered.

Group four—A single veteran who anticipates a long stay in a VA hospital may not profit by a shift to the new system.

Under the 1960 law, the pension of a veteran without a wife or child is reduced to $30 a month after two full calendar months of care. He would draw full pension payment upon release from the hospital or VA maintenance, but the money reduced from his pension during hospital or domiciliary care would not be recoverable.

STOP BY AND SEE US IN ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as an earnest advocate of seeing America, I again invite my colleagues of the Senate and all the people of America to stop by and see us in Alabama.

Our Alabama extends from the warm coast of the Gulf of Mexico to the brisk uplands of the Tennessee River Valley.

Today, I should like to invite everyone specifically to enjoy the year-round pleasures of Gulf Shores—with its 30 miles of sugar-fine glistening white sand beaches, its wealth of fishing pleasures, and its atmosphere of relaxation that lasts 365 days a year.

From Fort Morgan on the west to the very tip of Gulf State Park on the east, the Gulf Shores area offers wholesome, carefree vacationing in any season of the year to travelers from any part of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine article written by Richard Miles, entitled, "Gulf Shores Is Year-Round Paradise for Vacations" which was published in the Birmingham Post-Herald on July 21, 1966, and which details the varied vacationland features of Gulf Shores.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, July 21, 1966]

GULF SHORES IS YEAR-ROUND PARADISE FOR VACATIONS

(By Richard Miles)

Spanish moss curls down from giant oaks and lazy magnolias.

Thirty miles of glistening sugar-fine white sand beaches beckon both you and the Gulf of Mexico. Fishermen angle everything from sailfish—the king of sport fishing—to trout.

This is "El Elcantado"—the enchanted land—though you may know it as Gulf Shores.

Nowhere else in Alabama are you—the vacationer—offered so much relaxation for so little money, so little time spent in travel and for so long a vacation season—365 days.

From Fort Morgan on the west to the very tip of Gulf State Park on the east, the Gulf Shores area beckons vacationers from across the nation to its year-round paradise of carefree vacationing.

Get up with the sun and set out to tangle with the big ones. You can't find any better fishing than here in the warm waters of the Gulf.

SAILFISH AVAILABLE

Whether you want to fish for the king of sport fishing—sailfish—or you just want to angle with the little ones for eating, Gulf Shores is the place to do it.

If you want to be a "shell cracker" go out and get your own Gulf-fresh oysters. Have them on the half-shell or French fry them. Any way you do it, they're great.

If you are not the "do-it-yourself" type, try one of the man cozy little hide-aways featuring some of the best Gulf cooking to be found. Meme's is one of the best.

Either catch it yourself or get it in a restuarant, but any way you do it, you are sure to enjoy the utmost in sea food cousiene and variety here.

Mackerel, flounder, cobia, red snapper, sailfish, or any of the rest, they're all good eating and catching.

SPORT THE YEAR AROUND

A fleet of more than 30 charter boats leave for the open Gulf and man-made snapper-beds daily. You can rent them by the hour or the day.

If you are really adventuresome, spend the night out on the Gulf. This way you can get up when the sun rises and are ready to start a full day of the finest fishing in the Gulf.

With an average temperature of 68.6 degrees, no time of the year is a bad time at this family playground.

You are not baked to a crisp in the Summer and you are not frozen by any harsh Gulf winds in the Winter.

Gulf Shores is the all-family all-year playground. Take the day off from relaxing and try a round of golf. The Gulf Shores Golf Club is one of the best in the area.

NO TOURIST TRAP

Gulf Shores is not one of those glittering tourist traps. It doesn't flash on and off all night with loud neon signs. That's what makes it pleasant for everyone.

Living on what is called "Pleasure Island", the people of this area do their best to live up to their reputation for Southern hospitality.

Fresh water fishing is also one of the specialties of the area. With more than 6,800 acres of fresh water lakes, less than half a mile from the Gulf, you need not look very far. Here in Gulf State Park you find some 9,075 miles of deep-water channels.

On the east end of the Gulf Shores' "Pleasure Island" is Gulf State Park.

For those who really want to get away from it all, Gulf State Park has secluded beach areas. At any one of these personal beach areas, you can get the South Seas Island feeling.

On the more than one mile of snow white sand there are 21 cabins, trailer locations and tent camping areas with some 50 camp sites. Along the public beach you are protected by life guards.

Everything the fisherman needs is available at the park.

Boats, bait, launching ramps and all other fishing musts are here—including bitin' fish.

Water skiing is also one of the major sports of the area. With the skiing area clearly marked, the public lake provides excellent silky-smooth water for trying your hand at this increasingly popular sport.

LT. COL. EUGENE P. DEATRICK, WEST VIRGINIAN, PROVES HIMSELF AN AMERICAN OF SERVICE AND VALOR WHILE FLYING IN FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, newspapers and other news media daily report on the heroic and unselfish actions of our men and women in the Armed Forces who are carrying the battle for freedom in Vietnam.

We know that many of these patriots, the young soldier and the career veteran, are making the supreme sacrifice in the conflict to insure that the Vietnamese people will have the right to establish a government free from outside interference. The free world again is in the debt of the American serviceman as he wages the fight for freedom and liberty against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

In his farewell address at West Point in 1962, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur said of the American man-at-arms:

> I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man.

No truer tribute could be paid to the American soldier. Certainly, it applies to those who are serving in Vietnam.

Mr. President, West Virginia has sent many sons into the services in periods of peace and in times of war. I know this willingness to serve has been manifested in all parts of our country. I would point out, however, that in World War II and in Korea the percentage of West Virginians who served, and those who were wounded or killed, was higher than that of any other State.

The patriotic participation of West Virginians in Vietnam against the Communists is following a similar pattern of dedication and valor. Last week, newspapers carried accounts of a reconnaissance flight by Lt. Col. Eugene P. Deatrick, Jr., of Morgantown, W. Va. As he patrolled over the dense jungle near the North Vietnam border, Colonel Deatrick saw a flash of white and a solitary figure waving. Weighing whether or not it might be a Communist trap, he made several passes over the area to observe more closely the white markings and the person below. On the third pass, Colonel Deatrick noticed an uneven but distinguishable S.O.S. marked out in white cloth. Immediately a call was placed for rescue operations. The sighting by the West Virginia pilot led to the rescue within three-quarters of an hour of Navy Lt. (jg.) Dieter Dengler, of Pacifica, Calif.—the only American prisoner known to have escaped safely from North Vietnam. Navy Pilot Dengler had been downed in North Vietnam in February. He had managed recently to escape from a prison camp and, traveling by night, made his way to the point where he was spotted by Colonel Deatrick.

Mr. President, I am particularly proud of the achievements of Colonel Deatrick for he was my principal nominee to the U.S. Military Academy in 1943 and received his appointment under my quota. Since his graduation from West Point in 1946, we have maintained continuing contact. Colonel Deatrick has served with distinction as an officer in the World War II Army Air Corps and in the U.S. Air Force. His father, Dr. E. P. Deatrick, continues to reside in Morgantown, W. Va., while his wife and children reside in California.

I am informed that Colonel Deatrick volunteered for his assignment in Vietnam. As expressed in Armed Forces circles, "he fought for his tour of duty." It was necessary for him to transfer from bombers to the type of fighter plane being used in Vietnam. Persons familiar with military career patterns know that such a change, after 19 years of service, is not easy to achieve. But he successfully completed training at Maxwell Air Force Base and was assigned to Vietnam as commander of the 1st Air Commando Squadron at Pleiku.

Mr. President, I offer for the Record and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter written to me by Lieutenant Colonel Deatrick from his overseas base on July 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First Air Commando Squadron,
APO San Francisco, July 13, 1966.

Hon. Jennings Randolph,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Randolph: I had hoped very much to stop by and see you prior to my departure for Vietnam, but in the flurry of buying a home in Los Angeles for my family, attending schools, and flight training I just never got to Washington as I had hoped I might.

When I volunteered to come over here I was determined to try a tour in fighters. Personnel told me I couldn't be used since I was not "tactically" qualified. Fortunately, with much perserverance and General Estes' very kind faith in me and aid I did get what I wanted. I feel almost like a contemporary Benny Foulois—my first combat tour, my first command, and my first tour in fighters. Beyond all question this is proving to be one of the most rewarding tours—personally and professionally—that I shall ever experience. I shall never regret my insistence in fighting for this assignment and know that I am most fortunate in obtaining it. I shall always be most grateful to General Estes for his faith and backing.

I have command of the 1st Air Commando Squadron at Pleiku in the Central Highlands. We are flying A–1Es and though they are relatively old "fighters" they are certainly writing their legend in the history of this war. The officers and airmen in this squadron are the finest group I have ever associated with. Typical among them was Major Bernie Fisher who performed such a heroic act during our air battle at A Shau in early April. A finer man I have never met and I hope the recommendation for his Medal of Honor will be favorably acted upon. In my mind no American could wear it more proudly, represent the valor of an American man-at-arms more humbly, and is more deserving of its meaning. It was a privilege for me to serve along side such an outstanding individual.

I shall complete my tour in February 1967 and must come to Washington for an end of tour briefing in Headquarters USAF. I hope that I shall be able to find your schedule compatable so that I might stop by and visit with you at that time. My every effort is going into this assignment and I pray the end evaluation of my performance will fully justify the faith and backing so many of you fine gentlemen have placed upon me over the years. To you particularly I am indebted for the opportunity of this career and I hope my work shall always be a matter of pride to you.

Sincerely,
Eugene P. Deatrick, Jr.,
Lieutenant Colonel.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two articles and an editorial from the July 29, 1966, issue of the Morgantown, W. Va., Dominion-News, and one from the July 31, 1966, issue of the Sunday Dominion-Post, concerning Lieutenant Colonel Deatrick.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Morgantown Dominion-News, July 29, 1966]

Morgantown Hero Has Major Role in Rescue—Lieutenant Colonel Deatrick Spots POW Pilot in Viet Jungle

Saigon.—A flash of white suddenly slashing the dark green jungle foliage . . . a figure waving . . . and cloth that looked "just like a washline on the rocks."

That was all Lt. Col. Eugene P. Deatrick III of Morgantown, W. Va., could see as he piloted his reconnaissance plane over the lush jungle valley in Communist North Viet Nam.

But the one-in-a-million sighting, described Thursday by Deatrick, led to the needle-in-the-haystack rescue of Navy Lt. (jg) Dieter Dengler, 28, of Pacifica, Calif.—the only American prisoner to escape from North Viet Nam.

Deatrick was flying a routine visual reconnaissance of the remote valley just over the border in the Communist territory.

Suddenly, he said, the flash of white and the figure waving jolted his curiosity.

"I went by so quickly I wasn't sure just what it was . . .

Perhaps just a villager waving as we went by," he said. "But it was such a dense jungle that I made a turnaround and came back."

Hardly believing his eyes Deatrick said he made three passes over the figure and the white patch.

It was on the last pass that he noticed "that on the rocks was written in some white cloth a scraggly SOS."

No time was wasted, he recalled. "We immediately put in a call to get rescue on the way."

Down over North Viet Nam last February, Dengler managed to escape from a prison camp just north of the port of Vinh.

Traveling by night and hiding by day the Navy flier and a fellow U.S. Air Force pilot headed toward freedom.

Dengler made it safely to his unplanned rendezvous with Deatrick. His fellow escapee was beheaded when he fell into the hands of a Communist search party.

Upon the chance sighting, Deatrick said at first he was wary of a Communist trap but "it was such a dense area so remote from anything that the possibility of this being a trap was one in a million as far as I was concerned," he added.

"That cloth looked just like a washline on the rocks," he said. And after noticing the scraggy S.O.S. "We were fairly certain that it was one of the Allied people who were down."

The rescue call was fielded by Air Force Capt. William E. Cowell of Oahu, Hawaii, and the urgent request that he bring his "Jolly Green Giant" helicopter into the area was his second alert of the day.

Within three-quarters of an hour Dengler was in safe hands.

Cowell told it matter of factly. He said he piloted his rescue helicopter just inside the North Viet Nam border. He said the A1E Skyraiders had Dengler spotted "and they pointed out the area where he was down."

Cowell said he finally spotted Dengler "down in the bottom of a little streambed standing on some rocks." Dengler had stripped a parachute and made an S.O.S. using rocks from the stream to hold down the white strips of cloth.

"We went in and looked at him," Cowell said. "And then went in to pick him up."

The pararescue expert aboard Cowell's Jolly Green Giant was Airman 1c Mike Lenord of Fowler, Iowa.

Lenord, in recalling the mission, said: "On our second pass the hoist operator led the (rescue) cable out." It was lowered 150 or maybe 175 feet, he said.

Lenord said it took Dengler "a couple of seconds" to figure out how the hoist worked.

"He was excited and glad to be there and we just had a little problem," Lenord said.

But the problem quickly evaporated.

"He made it on the hoist all right and when we got him up I reached out and pulled him inside the aircraft . . . and at that moment he kind of went to pieces."

Lenord said Dengler—who has since been evacuated from Viet Nam—grabbed him about the legs and said several times, "Oh God!"

"He was just that happy to be aboard," Lenord said.

[From the Morgantown Dominion-News, July 29, 1966]

Dominion-News Gave Deatrick His Start

"He's going to be a general sure as hell."

"Never wanted anything in life but the military . . ."

"Brilliant career in the Air Force . . ."

In a nutshell, that sums up some local opinion on Lt. Col. Eugene P. Deatrick of Morgantown, the flier responsible for the rescue of a fellow pilot in Viet Nam.

And, small world that it is, The Dominion-News was responsible in a measure for starting Lt. Col. Deatrick in his military career. He was recommended by this newspaper to then Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who nominated him to West Point in 1943.

Young Deatrick finished the Academy well up in his graduating class, in the top 15 per cent.

Shortly afterward he was appointed aide to Gen. Everett Eastes, commanding officer of the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), under whom he served for eight years.

A year ago the Morgantown native decided that if he were ever to wear a star of his own he would have to get more experience, and he did it the hard way.

He literally began from scratch by transferring from bombers to become familiar with the type of fighters being flown in Viet Nam, which he did at Maxwell Field.

In February of this year he put that new knowledge to work in Viet Nam and was given what military circles regarded as the extraordinary (for a lieutenant colonel) command of the 1st Air Commando Squadron at Pleiku.

Since then, and until he was instrumental in the pilot rescue this week, he has flown some 133 missions.

[From the Morgantown Dominion-News, July 29, 1966]

Proud Moment in Morgantown

All of Morgantown must be proud of one of her own—Lt. Col. Eugene P. Deatrick of the U.S. Air Force. While on routine reconnaissance over the deep jungles of North Viet Nam, he spotted a figure, which turned out to be a Navy pilot who had escaped a prisoner of war camp. A helicopter was sent to complete the daring mission and the pilot was returned to the safety of the South.

Col. Deatrick realized it all could have been a North Viet Nam trap, but his courage took over where caution might have dictated otherwise. He made three or four passes over the area in disregard of possible danger. Only when he was satisfied that it was one of our men did he call in the extra assistance. The escaped pilot, (whose own courage is something to be marveled at) is alive and safe because Col. Deatrick did his job so well.

Col. Deatrick attended West Virginia University in 1942–43 and was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1946. He is a creditable addition to the long line of heroes who are making history in Viet Nam. With his family we rejoice in his gallant act, which makes us all proud of Morgantown and those who claim it home.

[From the Morgantown Dominion-Post, July 31, 1966]

Viet Air Hero Writes Dad Via Tapes

(By Ivan Pinnell)

Dr. E. P. Deatrick of the Stewartstown Road, Morgantown, was a busy man Thursday afternon as he gave out information to four news sources about his son, Lt. Col. E. P. Deatrick III, the hero of the rescue of a downed pilot who escaped from North Viet Nam.

"You would have thought I spotted that pilot," the elder Deatrick commented as he answered another telephone call.

Dr. Deatrick's son was flying a scouting mission over a remote valley just over the border in Communist North Viet Nam earlier this week when he spotted a man waving at his plane.

Lt. Col. Deatrick made another pass then reported the sighting to a helicopter which ultimately made the pickup. The man turned out to be downed Navy Lt. (j.g.) Dieter Dengler, so far the only downed pilot to escape from North Viet Nam.

The hero of the rescue, Lt. Col. Deatrick, 42, volunteered for combat action in Viet Nam where he arrived in February of this year. Two weeks ago he flew his 133rd combat mission in the war against the Viet Cong.

Lt. Col. Deatrick is commander of a Skyraider jet flight from the 1st Air Commando Squadron out of Pleiku, South Viet Nam. On June 13, he and his squadron was credited with killing at least seven or more VC and destroying at least 10 buildings during an attack on a VC base camp in the highlands.

Lt. Col. Deatrick attended Chestnut Ridge School, two doors away from the Deatrick home. He attended high school at Woodrow Wilson High School in Washington, D.C., while his father worked with the civil service as a soil specialist.

After graduation, young Deatrick returned to Morgantown and attended West Virginia University his freshman year, 1942–43. With an appointment by U.S. Sen. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, along with the aid of Circuit Court Judge Don J. Eddy, he was admitted July 1, 1943, to the U.S. Military Academy where he graduated in 1946, in the top 15 per cent of his class.

During his second year at West Point, young Deatrick began his career in aviation. Dr. Deatrick pointed out that his son has flown nearly all types of planes, but this is the first time he has seen combat duty.

Shortly after graduation he was appointed aide to Gen. Everett Eastes, commanding officer of the Military Air Transport Service, under whom he served for eight years.

Dr. Deatrick and his son communicate by taped recordings which they refer to as "letters."

"I get a tape from Payton about once or twice a month," Dr. Deatrick said.

Lt. Col. Deatrick's tapes to his father are about 30 minutes long and are not limited to tales of fighting the VC. His last tape was recorded July 10.

In it, Lt. Col. Deatrick began by pardoning himself for not "writing" sooner, mentioned that he was flying a great deal and that the time passed quickly.

Lt. Col. Deatrick told his father that he receives a tape from his wife, Jane, at least once a day and that she and their son William (Willie), 7, are fine.

The Morgantown hero mentioned visiting Hong Kong and meeting old friends, eating "fresh fruit, drinking fresh milk and enjoying a tub filled with hot water."

Lt. Col. Deatrick said that he was looking forward to coming home next February and promised his father that he would come to Morgantown for a few days as he went from Washington, D.C., to Los Angeles where his family lives.

RIOTS AND POLICE BRUTALITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, U.S. News & World Report, in its August 8, 1966, issue, presented a very timely and informative article titled "Can Riots Be Stopped?—The Next Move," together with related articles titled "Rouse the Masses" and "Police Brutality versus People Brutality."

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 8, 1966]

Can Riots Be Stopped?—The Next Move

(NOTE.—It's a record summer for riots—and still more riots are feared ahead. Signs grow that undercover plotters are calling riot signals. And a white backlash is developing. How can riots be controlled? A "U.S. News & World Report" survey shows what police are trying. But they say: The only effective answer is military power.)

Fear is taking over in more and more neighborhoods in more and more cities all across the American North.

The fear is of Negro riots, with arson, looting, shooting and assaults.

Riots in this summer of 1966 have been more numerous than in any year of the so-called Negro "revolution." More than a dozen cities already have been struck by outbursts of racial violence.

More to come? Still more riots are feared by city officials and predicted by Negro leaders.

The fear traces, in part, to the recent emergence of more-radical leaders among Negroes. There is concern that the new cry of "black power" is having an effect of stirring Negro youth to violent action.

More and more the charge is heard from officials and police that violence is being fomented deliberately.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE (Dem.), of Ohio, charged on July 27 that a "national conspiracy executed by experts" is responsible for the wave of riots.

In Cleveland especially, he said, the riot pattern "indicated design and organization," with "centrally managed tactics keeping the riot in progress." He demanded:

"Let us put a stop to the current campaign of the worst lawlessness in the history of America."

Cleveland Safety Director John N. McCormick said:

"There is no doubt in my mind that trouble was planned for Cleveland. The pattern here and in other cities is almost identical. I believe the whole thing was planned with a high degree of intelligence behind it."

A grand jury investigating the Cleveland riots is reported to have heard testimony backing up such charges.

"The Cleveland Press" reported that a 17-year-old Negro youth told the grand jury that a 200-member gang known as the Black Panthers planned much of the fire bombing, sniping and looting that marked the riots. He reportedly said he saw fire bombs—"Molotov cocktails"—being made, and attended meetings where acts of violence were planned.

Another Negro witness, described as an admitted "black nationalist," was reported by "The Cleveland Press" to have told the grand jury that there will be more riots in that city. He was quoted as saying:

"There will be riots here next week, next month, next year. Conditions which caused the riots haven't been eliminated. I have a gun. I don't trust any white man."

According to the reported testimony of the Negro youth, a gang similar to the Cleveland Black Panthers is also operating in Chicago, where Negroes rioted a week before the riots broke out in Cleveland.

Sabotage lessons reported. Another Negro organization, the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), is reported by officials to be teaching tactics of terror and sabotage in several big cities of the North.

Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron Koota has reported his office is investigating reports of organized efforts by "outside agitators" to spark racial unrest in New York.

In the South, Negroes are arming and banding together in an organization called Deacons for Defense.

The growing trend toward riots by Negroes is coming at a time when prosperity was never more widespread, when Negro rights were never more widely assured and when relief and other programs for the poor are more numerous and more liberal than ever before.

This trend, too, comes at a time when police find their powers more restricted by court rulings than ever before.

Police to whom communities must look for protection are also being subjected more and more to physical assault and to charges of "brutality" when they try to apply the law in Negro areas.

Out of all this are coming the questions: Can riots be stopped? If so, how? What is it going to take?

Bid for more aid. Negro leaders insist that the riots grow out of Negro resentment of the slum conditions under which they live, and they predict that the violence will not end—indeed, is more likely to grow—unless Negroes are given massive new programs of aid.

Congress, however, is tending to balk at expanded spending to meet Negro demands. Congress is tending to balk, as well, at any broad expansion of civil-rights laws to force the breakup of white neighborhoods in cities and white suburbs outside the cities.

House debate on President Johnson's proposed "open housing" bill has been peppered with criticism of Negro rioting. Sponsors of the bill agree that the rioting is undermining support for new civil-rights legislation.

It is this developing impasse that is causing even the more conservative Negro leaders to fear more riots and violence in the future.

What city officials say. How can law and order be enforced in the face of mobs?

To find what law-enforcement officials feel is necessary, members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report" talked to officials in major cities.

Most of these officials are convinced that police alone cannot cope with mass riots. Even arson and terrorism, when widespread as they are becoming in many cities, are viewed as overtaxing existing police forces.

If police are concentrated on mob violence, officials point out, then large areas of cities are left virtually unprotected against ordinary crime—which is also a growing problem in this country.

The only effective answer for a large-scale riot, police officials say, is military force.

"Riot control has become a matter for the military," says Detroit police commissioner Ray Girardin. "No city has a police force large enough to fight crime and riots at the same time."

"The only way to stop a riot is to send in the National Guard," says the acting Los Angeles police chief, Thad F. Brown. He agrees with his predecessor, the late Chief William H. Parker, that mobs and riots are things that the police departments are not designed or equipped to handle.

"There is no substitute for force in quelling civil disturbances," says Orlando W. Wilson, superintendent of police in Chicago. "And if the police are unable to provide the manpower to restore normalcy, then there is no alternative but to put in a call for the National Guard—and as quickly as possible."

Use of National Guard. Four times in the last three summers big cities have been forced to call on National Guard units to put down riots. Twelve hundred National Guardsmen and 450 State troopers were sent in to help 500 city police quell a three-day riot in Rochester, N.Y., in 1964. It took 13,900 National Guardsmen, as well as 934 policemen and 719 officers from the county sheriff's office, to halt a five-day riot in Los Angeles in 1965.

This year, Guardsmen have been called out twice. In Chicago, on July 15, after three nights of rioting, 4,200 National Guardsmen were mobilized. The Guard commander, Maj. Gen. Francis P. Kane, announced: "If anybody shoots at my men, my orders are to shoot back—shoot to kill." The rioting stopped soon after.

In Cleveland, on July 22, a detachment of 2,000 National Guardsmen went to the aid of embattled police. Again, the rioting ended soon.

New York City got by without calling in troops when street fighting erupted in the East New York area of Brooklyn in the third week of July. But sporadic violence went on for nearly a week, in spite of the presence of 1,000 especially trained riot police. And New York police officials agree that even that city's big police department would not be able to cope with riots erupting simultaneously in different sections of the city.

In New York, the nation witnessed the strange spectacle of the mayor, John V. Lindsay, personally negotiating a truce between rival gangs of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and whites. The mayor on July 23 announced he had obtained pledges from the gang leaders "to cool it off"—and quiet was restored soon in the troubled area.

All across the country, in city after city, police are building up their forces and taking steps to deal with the mounting danger of riots.

Some cities have formed military-style "commando" units and equipped them with special weapons, including tear gas. Special training in techniques of riot control is given such units, and often to regular police as well. Mobile communications centers, walkie-talkie radios and protective helmets are coming into wide use. Attempts are being made to improve relations between the police and Negroes.

Philadelphia, a riot scene in 1964, has since added 1,056 policemen and 204 radio-equipped police cars and expanded its system of police communications.

Cleveland maintains a mobile riot headquarters in a bus and uses helicopters to direct police and fire equipment during emergencies.

What New York City is doing. New York City has a specially trained tactical force of 400 men averaging 6 feet in height and chosen for outstanding physical and mental aptitudes. Chief Inspector Sanford D. Garelik describes the New York strategy for dealing with racial troubles in these words:

"When trouble occurs, we move in quickly. Then we act with resolution and good judgment."

Actions that would stir mob anger are avoided. A demonstration of the New York strategy was provided on July 22, when a mob of about 100 Negro youngsters was spotted heading toward an Italian neighborhood.

Instead of charging the mob, police pulled up behind and followed it. Other police blocked key intersections to keep the mob from reaching its target, carefully leaving a route open in another direction.

Although cursed, spat upon and hit by thrown objects, the policemen stood their ground without retaliating. Slowly, the frustrated mob broke up and dispersed.

"The new idea is to let angry mobs blow off steam without letting them get to the point of violence," a New York police department spokesman explains.

Chicago task force. Chicago has created a task force of 600 men that can be moved quickly into any trouble section without weakening police protection in other parts of the city. Police Superintendent Wilson stresses the necessity of quick and firm action. His ideas are reflected in a Chicago police handbook on dealing with civil disturbances. It says:

"Experience in Chicago and other parts of the country has shown that the result of temporizing is a worsening of the situation due to the fact that disorder tends to increase in size and become more aggressive."

Many people across the country have wondered at newspaper pictures showing looters at work during riots while policemen on the scene did nothing about the looting. One explanation may be found in the Chicago handbook's advice to police which says, in effect: "Don't make an arrest unless you can make it stick and unless you are sure you won't be overwhelmed by the crowd."

Detroit's Police Commissioner Girardin also cautions:

"Police can over enforce the law. An officer must use intelligence in enforcing minor laws. If giving a ticket for a violation could result in a riot, the situation must be taken into account."

In Cleveland, police did not attempt to deal with every law violation during the rioting. Safety director McCormick says the main police effort there was to confine the rioting, prevent it from expanding into wider areas. Another problem was to keep angry white people out of the trouble area and avoid a black-white confrontation that could turn into a pitched battle between the races.

California has a new antiriot law which makes it a misdemeanor to act intentionally to incite a riot under dangerous circumstances. Penalties up to six months in jail and a $500 fine are provided.

Los Angeles mayor Sam Yorty had urged such legislation after finding no law to deal with people distributing to Negroes in the Watts riot area pamphlets urging them to take over Los Angeles factories by force.

Cleveland's safety director thinks stronger laws are also needed in his city. Mr. McCormick says:

"We need a law that provides severe penalties for the organizer and participant in riots. The law must have teeth in it and above all should contain some penalty to protect the firemen answering alarms."

In both Cleveland and Chicago, firemen as well as police were objects of Negro attacks.

The human toll of this summer's rioting has grown to at least seven dead and hundreds injured. Property damage runs into millions of dollars.

As the rioting spreads, a dangerous new turn is seen in the nature of the rioting. Anger of Negro rioters appears to be turning more directly than ever against white people—and a backlash of anger is seen to be growing among whites.

Cries of "black power" are beginning to be answered by cries of "white power."

In Cleveland, two Negroes were shot in white neighborhoods. Police intercepted several carloads of white youths cruising through Negro neighborhoods.

In Baltimore, on July 28, gangs of white youths ranged through Negro neighborhoods, attacking Negroes.

In New York, there were street battles between white and Negro gangs. An organization called SPONGE—Society for the Prevention of Negroes Getting Everything—was reported to be stirring Negro youths to anger.

All the while, militancy of Negro leaders increases. Stokely Carmichael, head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, told a Chicago rally on July 28 that the disturbances in Chicago and Cleveland were "rebellions, not riots" and declared: "We have to protect ourselves. * * * If they touch one more black man in Mississippi and Los Angeles, we are going to disrupt this whole country."

Now evidence is growing that undercover organizers are at work, calling the signals for riots. And fear is spreading across the country.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 8, 1966]

Rouse the Masses

Many people are convinced that statements of leaders in politics, civil rights and religion have helped to spread a riot mood in the U.S. Some of the statements cited in this connection, in editorials, letters to the editor and other expressions of public opinion, are as follows:

President Lyndon Johnson: "I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. Neither you nor I are willing to accept the tyranny of poverty, nor the dictatorship of ignorance, nor the despotism of ill health, nor the oppression of bias and prejudice and bigotry. We want change. We want progress. We want it both abroad and at home—and we aim to get it. * * * I hope that you * * * will go out into the hinterland and arouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here; that we are on the march against the ancient enemies and we are going to be successful." (Aug. 3, 1965, speech at the White House to college students.)

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY: Describing what he would do if he had to live in slums—"I think you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions." The Vice President also said that unless Congress provides rent subsidies for the poor, "We will have open violence in every major city and county in America." (July 18 speech at New Orleans.)

Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development: "If the average white American put himself in the shoes of the average black American, he would be just as angry, just as prone to violence as the Negro is today. The thing that surprises me is that it hasn't happened before." (July 20 news conference in Washington.)

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY (Dem.), of New York: "There is no point in telling Negroes to obey the law" because "to many Negroes the law is the enemy," and in the New York City riot areas, the law "has almost always been used against Negroes." (Statement of Aug. 17, 1965.)

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL (Dem.), of New York: "It is almost a historical axiom that you can only trample on a people so long before that people reach up from the gutters and try to break both your feet. This is precisely what black people did in Los Angeles. I do not agree nor have I ever accepted violence as a solution. I have always condemned it. But, in Los Angeles, this was an oppressed people's last resort proclaiming to the world: 'Now hear this:' The world heard and listened carefully and with awed respect." (Address in Buffalo, N.Y., Aug. 27, 1965.)

Richard Shaull, professor of ecumenics, Princeton Theological Seminary: "There may in fact be some situations in which only the threat of use of violence can set the process of change in motion. Students and leaders of the poor in the urban ghettos in the United States soon find that they cannot solve their problems until fundamental changes occur in the whole structure." (Speech to World Conference on Church and Society in Geneva, Switzerland, July, 1966.)

Stokely Carmichael, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: "Negroes certainly see that this is the richest country in the world, and they want to share in the wealth. And the feeling—whether or not the white press likes this, whether or not the white liberals like it—is that if [Negroes] cannot enjoy part of that dream, they're going to burn the country down." (Interview in June 4, 1966, issue of "The National Guardian," which styles itself a "progressive newsweekly.")

"If you talk about Chicago, you talk about a Daley machinery [Mayor Richard J. Daley] that runs and controls the lives of millions of black people. . . . They need black power to deal with that man. They need to organize themselves and smash his machinery into a thousand pieces so the Democratic Party will never be able to pick it up again. . . ." (On NBC-TV "Today" show, July 26, 1966.)

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference: "Our power does not reside in Molotov cocktails [firebombs], rifles, knives and bricks. The ultimate weakness of a riot is that it can be halted by superior force. We have a nonviolent army that no violent force can halt and no political machine can resist. . . . This day we must commit ourselves to make any sacrifice necessary to change Chicago. This day we must decide to fill up the jails of Chicago if necessary in order to end slums." (Address at Negro rally in Chicago, July 10, 1966.)

"There are too many persons in white society who are more devoted to tranquillity and the *status quo* than to justice and humanity. Now these are the persons you lose along the wayside, but those who are devoted to the principle of the brotherhood of man . . . will certainly understand the necessity of having a militant movement." (On NBC-TV "Today" show, July 26, 1966.)

Floyd B. McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality: Nonviolence is "a dying philosophy" that no longer can "be sold to the black people." (At CORE convention, July 2, 1966.)

William Booth, chairman of the New York City Commission on Human Rights: "I don't preach violence. But if the people aren't getting what they need they should go out and take it." (At convention of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, July 5, 1966.)

Hardy Fry, field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: "I'm not going to stand around and let anybody beat me or anybody else on this march. I don't know the Lord's Prayer any more. I've got me a new prayer now—and it shoots six shots." (Statement on July 25, 1966, during the course of a march on the Brownsville, Tenn., courthouse.)

Disavowals of violence have been made repeatly by many top American officials. President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY, for example, have denounced rioting and rioters on a number of occasions, and so have many civil-rights figures. However, police officials, local political leaders and some members of Congress cite statements such as those above as part of the climate that has fostered violence. In addition are the pamphlets and other publications flowing into Negro areas and openly inciting slum dwellers to guerrilla war. One pamphlet from Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) says: "Weapons of defense employed by Afro-American freedom fighters must consist of a poor man's arsenal. Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails), lye or acid bombs (made by injecting lye or acid in the metal end of light bulbs) can be used extensively. . . . Extensive sabotage is possible."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 8, 1966]

Police Brutality Versus People Brutality—A Report From Atlanta, Ga.

(NOTE.—Following is an article by Bill Shipp of "The Atlanta Constitution," published in the July 10 issue of the Sunday "Journal and Constitution" and reprinted here with permission of that newspaper:)

Talk about brutality and police. Ask Atlanta Detective J. P. Arnold, member of the "good guy" Crime Prevention Bureau, what he thinks about brutality.

You may have difficulty understanding his reply. His face is held together by wire. He has difficulty opening his mouth to speak.

The mild-mannered Negro detective, assigned to the police department's helping-hand squad, recently talked with a father about a juvenile-delinquency problem. When the conversation ended the father beat Arnold up. The first blow shattered the detective's jaw so badly that he could not yell for help. Arnold finally shot the man in the leg to save himself from a possible fatal beating.

Talk about brutality. Ask the Atlanta patrolman who, in June, wrote matter of factly on a report form: "While attempting to unload prisoner at city hall, I was struck across the throat with a knife . . . six stitches."

Talk about brutality. Ask the Atlanta officer who was choked by two suspects wearing handcuffs. Or the one who was shot and had to crawl out of an alley yelling for help. Or the one severely bitten by a dog sicked on him by a woman suspect. Or the one severely bitten by a woman suspect. Or the one who broke a flying chair with the top of his head when he walked into a beer-joint free-for-all.

Talk about brutality to Lieut. C. W. Blackwell, keeper of police statistics and reports. He'll show a filing cabinet full of reports recounting acts of violence and mayhem directed at policemen that make Mickey Spillane novels seem as tame as Sunday-school lessons.

Disarm the police? Much has been said lately about police brutality. The American Civil Liberties Union of Georgia recently turned out a scathing report on mistreatment by Atlanta policemen.

Howard Moore, an ACLU official and general counsel for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, has called on local police officials to disarm Atlanta policemen and detectives to reduce "police brutality."

Detective Superintendent Clinton Chafin thinks Moore has a great idea "if they'd take all the guns away from everybody else." He pointed out that the Atlanta gun market is glutted with 10-dollar, 22-caliber pistols and "they can kill you."

Despite the talk about police brutality, there is good evidence that "people brutality" against policemen is a greater and faster-growing problem. Not only in Atlanta, but nationally.

In New York in 1965 the number of assaults against policemen increased 25 per cent over 1964.

If the present trend continues in Atlanta, more than one out of every 10 policemen and detectives will be injured this year while making an arrest.

Since 1961, 406 Atlanta officers have received a major injury while making an arrest.

"That figure doesn't count all the black eyes and bloody noses and scratched faces," Lieut. Blackwell points out. "That figure means an injury serious enough to require hospital treatment."

Last year 78 policemen were sent packing to the hospital after a bout with a suspect. During the first six months of this year, prisoners or would-be prisoners have sent 40 policemen to the hospital.

What's the reason for the increasing number of assaults against policemen?

Many officials cite a growing antagonism toward authority of any kind.

Atlanta Police Chief Herbert T. Jenkins agrees that is one factor. But he points out that a growing population means more arrests and more arrests automatically increase the number of assaults against arresting officers.

Brutality—or haste? What about the other side of the coin—policemen brutalizing suspects?

"This department uses force only when necessary," Jenkins said. "Police brutality—the kind you are talking about—simply does not exist here. Of course, we have cases when officers act too hastily."

Look at the policeman's side of it:

"A policeman called to the scene of a crime must make an instant decision on what action he must take, then take it," Blackwell said.

"A judge may be presented with the same set of facts a month later. He can take all the time he needs in deciding what to do about it. But not a policeman. He has to act—and act now. Naturally, his judgment may not always be the best in the world."

Jenkins added: "The charge of police brutality is as old as law enforcement. A prisoner's best defense often is to accuse the arresting officer of brutality. If he can discredit the officer, then he stands a good chance of winning the case."

Recent Supreme Court decisions have all but made legalized police strong-arm tactics a thing of the past.

Unlike many of his brother police chiefs, Jenkins said he has no criticism of the High Court.

"The Supreme Court has the same responsibility as the police—to guarantee the freedom of the individual and to furnish security to individuals and property," Jenkins said. "It's impossible to have 100 per cent security and 100 per cent individual freedom."

Right now, Jenkins added, the emphasis seems to be on individual freedom.

The one-man patrol car. Another measure against police brutality in Atlanta is the use of one-man patrol car, according to the chief. He says a man working alone is much more likely to try to talk, rather than slug, his way out of a bad situation.

It also would seem that a man alone is much more likely to be on the receiving end of an assault. But Jenkins says this is not true.

While the curbs against police brutality appear formidable, the controls against "people brutality" seem to crumble with increasing regularity.

Part of the reason for this, says Jenkins, is the growing "racial and social revolution."

The people caught up in this revolution see the police, rightly or wrongly, as the symbol for all they are against.

As a result, Jenkins' men and the men like them across the country will continue to be on the receiving end of shootings, bitings, sluggings, kickings and so forth. And their job, always a dirty and dangerous one, appears to be getting dirtier and more dangerous by the day.

FEDERAL JUDGES, CLERKS OBJECT TO TITLE I OF PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in a short time the Senate will have before it the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I am certain that every provision of this bill will be carefully considered by every Member of the Senate, and I do not wish to anticipate that debate. However, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues information which I believe warrants thoughtful study.

Because title IV and other provisions of S. 3296 are extremely controversial, I knew when it was introduced that title I, which reforms jury selection methods in Federal courts, would not receive the attention it deserves. Usually such legislation affecting the administration of the Federal courts is a long time in perfecting. However, because quick enactment of this proposal was being demanded, the subcommittee was unable to obtain the views of the Judicial Conference, the American Bar Association, and the other learned groups who usually assist in the consideration of legislation of this type.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights on June 7, therefore, requested the views of Chief Judge McGuire, of the District Court for the District of Columbia. Judge Holtzoff, who was asked to answer our inquiry, pointed out many serious defects in the bill as applied to his court. As a result of his remarks, the subcommittee then sought the views of other Federal judges. I wrote to every chief judge of every district and division of the Federal district courts. To date, we have received over 45 replies to the 90 inquiries we made. Not one has supported title I as drafted. Each of the 35 judges who had substantive comments raised objections. Many object strenuously to the added burdens that would be placed on them and their clerks; many more see no need for such legislation and no benefits from its enactment. Others protested strongly that Congress should take no action until the Judicial Conference has examined the proposal.

On Wednesday, July 27, the subcommittee heard testimony from 10 clerks of court, representing every circuit except the fourth. In addition to observing the unworkable and unrealistic provisions of the present draft, each clerk stated that he would recommend that the bill not be passed until the Judicial Conference had considered it. Each stated that the problems of title I are greater than any problems of uniformity or of discrimination which it seeks to correct. These 10 clerks have operated the jury selection machinery as it currently exists. They are familiar with the problems of obtaining competent juries and they would be responsible for directing the new methods set out in title I. These gentlemen are considered knowledgeable and capable clerks by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and were selected as an informal committee for purposes other than testifying on title I. Each of them possesses considerable legal training and experience. Two are graduates of my alma mater, Harvard Law School. Because they were to be in Washington on July 27, I asked them to give their views on the legislation. Their comments should carry great weight.

I shall not burden the Record by inserting the statements of all judges and clerks. These are available in the office of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I will, however, ask unanimous consent that my letter to Judge McGuire, the reply of Judge Holtzoff, and the statements of Chief Judges Thomsen, of Maryland; Kent, of Michigan; Bootle, of Georgia; Zavatt, of New York; Carswell, of Florida; Kerr, of Wyoming; Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania; Connally, of Texas; McManus, of Iowa; Miller, of Arkansas; Meredith, of Missouri; Register, of North Dakota; Stanley, of North Carolina; and Steckler, of Indiana, and the statements of Clerks Peck, of Nebraska; Keller, of New Jersey; Earl, of Connecticut; and Anderson, of Washington be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The description of the jury selection system used in each district which was appended to these statements has been made a part of the subcommittee's hearing record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, these statements were selected at random as a geographical cross section of opinion from Federal districts. No matter where their districts are located—no matter how urban or rural—there is almost unanimous agreement on the part of both Federal judges and Federal court clerks that title I is technically defective. Because of the importance of the jury to our system of justice, I believe that title I has an importance that transcends its specific objectives. I do not believe that the jury system should be changed

hastily by an ill-considered rider to emotion-laden legislation.

Members of the Judiciary Committee will recall that originally I interposed no objection to title I. However, after studying the comments of the chief judges, I concluded that title I must be postponed until the Judicial Conference and the other organizations I mentioned have an opportunity to review these proposals. The recent case of Rabinowitz against United States, in which the fifth circuit requires that clerks affirmatively seek a cross section of jurors, erases any urgency for imposition of the title on those districts in which the Attorney General alleges discrimination.

Chief Justice Warren has recently appointed Judge Irving Kaufman, of the second circuit, as Chairman of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Operation of the Jury Trial. A copy of title I has been forwarded to Judge Kaufman and he has assured the subcommittee that his committee will give careful consideration to the matter as promptly as possible. I trust the Senate will refrain from hasty action until the committee's views are received.

EXHIBIT 1

JUNE 7, 1966.

Hon. MATTHEW F. MCGUIRE,
Chief Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE MCGUIRE: Yesterday the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee began hearings on S. 3296 and a number of other bills relating to civil rights. Titles I and II of S. 3296, and various portions of some of the other bills would make significant changes in the jury selection methods of Federal and local courts. Because of the important place the jury system occupies in the administration of justice, any proposed legislation should be carefully and cautiously analyzed.

It is my belief that the proposed legislation dealing with jury selection has an importance far transcending civil rights objectives. It is my expressed hope that this legislation will be considered independently of the emotions or controversy attending other portions of the bills. Very helpful to such consideration would be an understanding of the actual operation of the jury selection process in the District of Columbia, and the possible effects that the suggested legislation would have on it.

For that reason may I request that you ask the Secretary of the District Jury Commission, Mr. Edward Bliss, to prepare a statement describing the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in the District, the advantages and disadvantages of the approach embodied in the bill, and the changes that might be made in that legislation to effectuate its objectives. Mr. Bliss has expressed his willingness to prepare such a statement if requested to do so by you.

Some of the matters of interest to the Subcommittee include a description of the methods by which the Commission insures that no racial, ethnic, religious or economic group is disproportionately absent from jury duty; the problems that exist from the economic impact that attends ordinary or extended jury duty; the measures that might be required to insure that no economic or other hardship attends jury duty; the extent to which the District's procedures have been or might be used as a model for other jurisdictions; and the lessons the District's experience has for the rest of the country. Of course, any other comments that the Commission might wish to make would also be appreciated.

For your information, I am enclosing copies of S. 3296, as proposed by the Administration, the statement of the Attorney General presented yesterday morning, and my comments on the jury legislation given at the opening of the hearings. With your permission, we should like to include the Commission's statement as a part of the record of the hearings on this legislation.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman.

JUNE 21, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: As Chief Judge McGuire of this Court has informed you, your letter to him concerning the bill S. 3296, "To assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service . . ." has been referred to me in view of the fact that I have had close contact with the operation of the jury system in our Court.

Title I of the bill relating to the selection of jurors for service in the Federal courts, would drastically modify the existing organization and practices. It would make no exception for any district. For the reasons about to be stated, we respectfully request that the bill be amended so as to exclude the District of Columbia, and we would appreciate favorable consideration of this matter.

Because of the unique position of this Court, due to its location in the Nation's capital, the Jury Commission of this Court is created and its activities are governed by local statutes found in the District of Columbia Code, Title 11, Sections 2303–2312. The provisions of the United States Code relating to jury commissions and the selection of jurors, while applicable in every other district, have never been extended to the District of Columbia and have not superseded the local statute on the subject. It has been the usual practice in framing legislation from time to time, modifying or amending the provisions of the United States Code relating to this matter, to exclude the District of Columbia, either expressly or by necessary implication.

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia has an exceedingly wide range of matters coming before it. In addition to its Federal jurisdiction, such as is possessed by all Federal courts, this Court also tries all local felonies and all civil cases involving more than $10,000 because of the fact that the District of Columbia has no local court of general jurisdiction corresponding to a State court, since the entire district is a Federal area. The local inferior court, known as the Court of General Sessions, has local jurisdiction as to misdemeanors and as to civil actions involving less than $10,000. The result is that the volume of business conducted in this Court is much larger than in any other Federal court. Several jury courts are continuously in session. For example, this month there are ten jury courts in daily operation. Obviously we require a much larger number of jurors than is the fact elsewhere.

The average number of jurors called for service for each month is about 3,000. Such a large number has to be summoned in view of the fact that many present excuses, and some are not found. The average number of jurors on our list at any one time amounts to about 33,000. The list is continuously in a state of flux, since names of persons who have died, or moved have to be stricken and new names added. Approximately 3,000 questionnaires are sent out each month to prospective jurors.

The Jury Commission instead of consisting of one Commissioner and the Clerk of the Court, is composed of three Commissioners appointed by the Court. They have no connection with the Clerk or his office, but maintain their own clerical staff. Names of prospective jurors are taken at random from the City Directory, which is the nearest to a complete list of residents of the District of Columbia. The practice is to go through the Directory and pick names out in accordance with a fixed arbitrary formula. After this process is completed, it is repeated with the use of a different formula. On this basis there can be no discrimination as to groups on any economic, racial or other basis. A questionnaire is sent out to every person whose name is so selected. If it appears from the questionnaire that a person is qualified for service, his name is put on the jury list. If it appears that he is not qualified, his name is rejected. If there is any doubt from the answers on the questionnaire, the juror is requested to come in for a personal interview. Such interviews are held every week.

An examination of Title I of the pending bill indicates that many of its provisions are entirely unsuitable for the District of Columbia. Section 1864(a) provides for the use of Voter Registration Lists for procuring names of prospective jurors. Since in the District of Columbia there is voting only at Presidential elections, such a list would soon become out of date especially in view of the mobility of the local population. Moreover, many persons who are inhabitants of the District of Columbia and eligible for jury service, do not vote in the District of Columbia since they maintain a technical voting residence elsewhere.

The provisions of Section 1864(f) requiring the master wheel to be emptied and refilled between November 15 and December 31, every other year, is impossible of fulfillment in this district. As stated above the jury list contains on the average of about 30,000 names at any one time. To discard such a list and prepare a new one in a period of about six weeks every other year, is impossible.

Section 1866(a) would require the Jury Commission to make its determination as to a juror's qualifications on the basis of the questionnaire and would seem to bar interviews, which have been very helpful in this district. It may be noted that a report of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Jury System in the Federal Courts, approved by the Judicial Conference in September 1960, recommends personal interviews in addition to the use of questionnaires.

The provisions of Section 1867 of the bill which would authorize parties in criminal or civil cases to challenge the method of jury selection and to demand the testimony of the jury commission, are likely to cause burdensome and unnecessary delays in view of the large number of jury cases in this Court. To permit any party in any case to subpoena members of the Jury Commission to testify orally and to produce their records for inspection, is likely to be used for purposes of obstruction and in a district with the volume of business as large as ours, it may greatly delay the progress of the docket.

It is understood to be the objective of the legislation to eliminate discrimination against persons of the colored race in connection with jury service. In this district, however, no such discrimination exists. At least fifty to sixty percent of our jurors are members of the colored race. We cannot furnish mathematical statistics since we do not keep a record of the race of each juror and do not believe that it is appropriate to do so. All that is necessary to do, however, is to walk into any courtroom where a jury trial is going on and observe the jury.

I venture to suggest that the result requested in this letter could be accomplished by striking from the bill Section 103(b), (c), (d) and (e), and inserting a provision in an appropriate place that this Title shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

You have requested Colonel Bliss, the Secretary of the Jury Commission, to furnish detailed information concerning its activities, and he is preparing and will shortly submit such a statement. If any further information is desired by you or your Committee, I should be glad to endeavor to supply it.

It is hoped that this request may receive favorable consideration.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF,
U.S. District Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND,
Baltimore, Md., July 29, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Replying to your letter of July 1 with respect to S. 3296, the Judges of our Court are opposed to the provisions of Title I of the Bill which would make significant changes in the jury selection methods of federal courts.

Our Court has been following the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States reported in 26 F.R.D. 409, at pages 421 et seq. The method of selection which we have used has been checked on a number of occasions by very competent attorneys representing defendants in criminal cases and others and have been considered fair to all concerned. We believe that the proposed changes would make it more difficult for us to get fair jurors and, in practice, would result in a panel of jurors which would be less satisfactory to almost all the litigants in our Court, whatever their race, color or creed.

Our Judges also feel that it would be most desirable for your Committee to obtain the considered opinion of the Judicial Conference of the United States before making such a radical change in a system which has been working well almost everywhere.

Very truly yours,

ROSZEL C. THOMSEN,
Chief Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN,
July 25, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: This letter is in reply to your letter of July 1, 1966, relative to the jury system used in the Western District of Michigan, and any view which I may have as to the merits of S. 3296, with particular attention to the provisions of that bill as they relate to the jury selection methods of Federal and State Courts.

In brief let me say that I see no merit in the jury selection methods proposed in the legislation in question. I agree with Chief Judge McGuire that there are serious problems in the use of the standards proposed in the bill. In this District we have used the key name system.

I enclose to you copies of the letters utilized by the Clerk and the Jury Commissioner in soliciting the names of persons who may be used as jurors in this court. Periodically, the jury wheel is completely emptied and a new group of names is inserted. In addition the Clerk and the Jury Commissioner will insert new names at frequent intervals to insure that there will be an up-to-date group of jurors.

After a name has been submitted to the Clerk and Jury Commissioner a letter is addressed to the prospective juror, and I enclose copies of the letter which is utilized under those circumstances. With this letter is included a questionnaire relative to the qualifications of the proposed juror.

Upon the drawing of names for a panel of jurors there is submitted the usual summons which includes a questionnaire on the back, and an additional questionnaire, copies of which are enclosed. You will note that each letter and each questionnaire is self-explanatory.

I call attention to the fact that the original letter to the so-called "key man" makes reference to the fact that jurors must be capable and impartial, and must be selected without regard to race, color, creed, politics, or station in life. Over the years we have been very proud of the quality of persons serving as jurors in this court. We have had laboring people, professional people, elderly people, young people, middle age people, colored people, white people, people with numerous college degrees, and persons who were not privileged to finish the elementary grades in school. Each of the persons who has been utilized as a juror in this District has demonstrated to his fellow citizens that he is capable, that he is impartial, and that he is a fit person to serve as a juror and to judge the merit of controversies between his fellow citizens and controversies between the Government and his fellow citizens.

During the 12 years that I have served on this Court I have never had a bad jury. There have been very rare instances when I have questioned the temperamental qualifications of certain of the jurors. These occasions have been so rare that I could not now recall the name of any such juror.

If jurors are drawn from the voting lists there will be numerous problems. In the first place, this is geographically a very extended district, it would be extremely difficult to obtain copies of the voter list from each municipality in which voters are registered and to keep such lists up-to-date. There would be no assurance that the person would be capable of understanding many of the matters which are determined in the United States District Courts.

I sincerely hope that this brief statement in support of the present system, and in opposition to the proposed system, will be of assistance to you and to the members of your committee and the Senate as a whole.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. WALLACE KENT,
Chief Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA,
Macon, Ga., July 12, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of July 1 inviting any comments I might wish to make concerning the desirability of Title I of S. 3296, and the changes it would require in our present operation.

First, let me say that our jury commissioners rely chiefly upon their personal knowledge of prospective jurors and upon information they obtain from all sources including key men or suggesters. They use to a limited extent state court jury lists and telephone directories, the latter being used only as a reminder of people known but forgotten.

I cannot help but wonder whether the emphasis of Title I may not be misplaced. Is it upon the *right* to serve on federal juries rather than the *qualifications* so to serve?

Those of us who take pride in the quality of justice administered in the federal courts would seriously regret any lowering of the qualifications of federal jurors, or any lowering of the collective intelligence of the jury panel. It seems to me that we are concerned here with much more than just a lesson in civics or a mere exercise in the principles of democracy. The administration of justice is serious business. It represents the actual functioning of democracy at one of its highest levels. It needs to be as efficient as possible. The importance of the jury in our jurisprudence would be hard to exaggerate. The jury has almost unlimited authority over property, liberty, and even life itself. It can deny property; it can deny liberty, and it can deny life. Nor is its importance diminishing. Technical and complicated issues formerly looked upon as equitable and triable without a jury now require jury verdicts. See, for instance, *Dairy Queen, Inc.* v. *Wood,* 369 U.S. 469 (1962); *Beacon Theatres, Inc.* v. *Westover,* 359 U.S. 500 (1959) . . .

As you know, the Judicial Conference of the United States in 1960 approved the report of its committee on the operation of the jury system. This committee study and report was exhaustive and is reported in 26 F.R.D. 409. I lift from this report two paragraphs which, as I understand it, reflect the thinking of the Judicial Conference of the United States upon this all important matter of the selection and composition of federal juries.

"The jury holds in its collective hands the life, the liberty and the welfare of individual defendants in criminal cases and the interests of litigants in civil cases. The importance of improving the calibre of these judges of the facts is therefore self evident. At the same time, jurors must be representative of the community in which they live. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the sources from which they are selected should include all social and economic groups in the community and the jury list should represent as high a degree of morality, integrity, intelligence and common sense as the jury commission can find in each social and economic group by the use of impartial methods of selection.

"In order that grand and petit jurors who serve in United States district courts may be truly representative of the community, the sources from which they are selected should include all economic and social groups of the community. The jury list should represent as high a degree of intelligence, morality, integrity, and common sense as possible."

This thinking, it seems to me, embraces two basic concepts; first, the sources from which jurors are selected should constitute a broad base including all economic and social groups of the community and; second, from the list of legally qualified voters compiled from this broad base, then the jury commissioners should make their selections by the use of impartial methods so as to put on the jury rolls only those who "represent as high a degree of morality, integrity, intelligence and common sense as the jury commission can find in each social and economic group." I fear that Title I of S. 3296 recognizes and provides for only concept 1 and not concept 2.

Moreover, as a part of the Judicial Conference action of 1960 it approved proposed legislation then known as H.R. 4343, Eighty-sixth Congress, First Session, which provided in part specifically as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the commission . . . to select . . . the names of qualified persons who may be called to serve as jurors in the district court and who in their opinion are intelligent, honest, fair-minded, of good reputation and capable of rendering satisfactory service. . . ."

Incidentally, that bill, as well as S. 3296, provided for questionnaires and for a subpoena or summons to prospective jurors to appear before the commission so that the commission could determine their qualifications. I believe that provisions should be made for the payment of jurors' expenses in so appearing. This would not be of much importance in a metropolitan area, but in some of our districts a juror might well have to travel 60 or 75 miles.

The present law I trust authorizes the jury commission to see to it that "the jury list should represent as high a degree of morality, integrity, intelligence and common sense as the jury commission can find in each social and economic group by use of impartial methods of selection." I fear that Title I of S. 3296 would allow the jury commission no sound legal impartial discretion in this matter, but would require them to place in the jury wheel names of all persons determined by them to possess the minimal qualifications prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1861, and repeated in proposed § 1886. Proposed § 1866 plainly says that.

"The jury commission shall deem any person qualified to serve on grand and petit juries in the district court unless he—

"(1) is not a citizen of the United States twenty-one years old who has resided for a period of one year within the judicial district;

"(2) is unable to read, write, speak, and understand the English language;

"(3) is incapable, by reason of mental or physical infirmity, to render efficient jury service; or

"(4) has been convicted in a State or Federal court of record of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year and his civil rights have not been restored by pardon or amnesty."

I am in thorough agreement with your observation that the jury provisions of this proposed legislation have an importance independent of its civil rights objectives. I agree also that legislation of this far-reaching importance should be submitted to the close scrutiny of the Judicial Conferences of the various Circuits, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Law Institute, and the American Bar Association.

As requested, am enclosing a copy of questionaire used by our jury commissioners, which, incidentally, I think is not quite as complete as the one approved by the Judicial Conference and found at 26 F.R.D. 507.

Respectfully,

W. A. Bootle.
U.S. District Judge.

U.S. District Court,
Eastern District of New York,
Brooklyn, N.Y., July 12, 1966.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: This is my reply to your letter of July 1st in which you ask for my comments as to Title I of S. 3296, which has been introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

If such a bill is enacted into law, the first thing that the Congress must do is to appropriate sufficient funds to increase the personnel in the office of Clerk of each United States district court.

The matter of maintaining a representative list of qualified jurors in this district court has concerned me for several years. I made a study of our jury system and filed a copy of my report with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in 1961. I have no extra copies available. I would hope that the Administrative Office would either loan you its copy or have a copy run off for you, if you care to read it.

In large metropolitan areas (in which citizens serve as jurors in municipal, county and state courts, in addition to the federal district court) many qualified jurors are subjected to unnecessary hardship. The same people are called again and again and again to serve as jurors. For example, I estimate that we have approximately two and one-half million qualified voters within this district whose population is somewhere between seven and one-half and eight million. Our jury list consists of approximately five thousand persons. Our report to the Administrative Office pointed up this fact and requested additional personnel in order to build up our jury list to the point where the same people would not be called upon as often as they are. To date, no such additional personnel have been provided.

As to the composition of the jury commission: the defintion of "Clerk" and "Clerk of the Court" should make it crystal clear that it is not the political affiliation of the jury commissioner and the Clerk that is important but, rather, that the jury commissioner and whatever deputy clerk serves with him from time to time should not be of the same political party. Every United States district court has a jury commissioner. He and a deputy clerk now draw names to be placed in the "qualified jury wheel." Section 1863(a) seems clear enough. I would suggest that Section 1870(a) be amended by adding "serving with the jury commissioner when names are placed in the master wheel, pursuant to Section 1864; are drawn from the master wheel, pursuant to Section 1865, and are placed in a "qualified jury wheel," pursuant to Section 1866.

As to the proposed "master jury wheel": such a master jury wheel would be quite cumbersome for it must contains names of at last 1% of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration list for a particular district; it would require approximately twenty-five thousand names to be placed in such a wheel in this district. That would be quite a wheel.

The bill suggests that there would have to be a juror's card for every qualified voter in the district; that, from that total, 1% of the cards be drawn and placed in the master jury wheel. This would require our Clerk to prepare approximately two and one-half million such cards. Not only would our Clerk's office need much more help but it might also need an IBM machine.

This feature of the bill is further complicated by the fact that, of the two and one-half million juror cards, we would not know how many are qualified to serve as jurors.

After you select "at random from the voter registration lists" the names of persons residing in the district, it is conceivable that the 1% of the total number of registered voters so selected might come from one particular area of the district. In a district as large as ours with residential areas ranging from poor to very rich, the 1% might represent the rich area or the poor area. We arrange our jury cards by county and election district categories in an attempt to obtain for our "qualified jury wheel" a list of jurors as representative as possible of the entire district.

I do not think that it is wise or practical to require the maintenance of a "master wheel" containing at least 1% of the total number of registered voters; selected at random. This requirement of Section 1864(a) and (b) can nullify Section 1864(e) which seems to suggest that the names that go in the master jury wheel should be representative of the persons residing in all of the political subdivisions of the district.

As to the drawing of names from the master jury wheel: this comes at a time when jurors are needed. Names are to be drawn from the master jury wheel and placed in the "qualified jury wheel." This seems to me to be a pretty late hour at which to begin to look into the qualifications of those whose names are in the master jury wheel. When the names are drawn from the master jury wheel, the Clerk will have to mail a qualification form. Then the addressee will have to appear in person before the Clerk or a deputy clerk to fill out the form. And after the form is filled out the jury commission will have to examine the forms and determine which of the potential jurors are qualified to serve. This is something that should be done months and months before the time comes to place the names of jurors in the qualified jury wheel.

Although the bill provides that the master wheel be emptied every two years, there is no provision as to how often the qualified jury wheel should be emptied and refilled.

I like the requirement of punishment for failure to respond to a notice from the Clerk. The bill should be amended so as to impose the same punishment when a qualified juror fails to appear to serve as a juror. We have this very problem here in the Eastern District of New York and would welcome such a provision.

I realize what the problems are that are sought to be met by S. 3296. These are not problems that prevail in this part of the country and, certainly, not in this district. But before legislation of nation-wide application is enacted into law, the Congress had better provide the funds with which to implement whatever bill becomes law.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Zavatt,
Chief Judge.

Chambers, U.S. District Judge,
Northern District of Florida,
Tallahassee, Fla., July 20, 1966.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: This is in response to your letter of July 1 requesting a short statement describing the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in this district. Since this district has four places of holding court Jury Commissioners are appointed for each of the four divisions. Each division has a geographical area of about 50 miles in diameter, and encompasses several counties around the places of holding court, i.e., Pensacola, Marianna, Tallahassee and Gainesville. I have sought the services of the best qualified people to undertake this serious responsibility. Since the position can scarcely be dubbed remunerative this can only be done by appeal to civic responsibility. The response, in my judgment, has been wholly commendable, for the Jury Commissioners have each tried to render their service conscientiously and in accordance with the spirit and letter of the law. I know that many of them have spent many, many hours of dedicated service in investigation and consideration of prospective jurors, in an attempt to have a body of jurors who are truly representative of the entire community and who would make conscientious triers of fact. The Jury Commissioner is given absolute authority to determine the names of the jurors placed in the box. In each instance this is done after considerable consultation with a number of individuals and groups representing all segments of the community, all areas, all religious denominations, races, and all national and economic backgrounds. Names are likewise removed from the box by the same standard. For example, if a man is convicted of embezzlement in state court the Jury Commissioner removes his name from the box. If information comes to the Jury Commissioner that a juror has lost his hearing or is otherwise so physically impaired or infirm that jury service is impossible or improbable, his name is removed from the box. The Jury Commissioner, together with the Clerk of the Court or one of the Deputy Clerks, actually draw the names upon written order of the Court of as many jurors for grand jury service or petit jury service as the Court orders. The first names drawn are issued summons. Unfortunately, a great many people immediately write the

Clerk or the Court asking to be excused for a multitude of reasons. Frequently we have to issue summons for nearly twice as many as ultimately report for duty. All the activities of the Jury Commissioner and the Clerk are subject to public inspection. As far as I know, there has never been a suggestion of impropriety in the selection of jurors in this district, nor have I heard any expressions of lack of confidence in the jury selection as it now operates here. (This, of course, excludes the lawyer who loses the case, and invariably I note even he recovers to try his fortune another day with another jury with complete aplomb.)

Certainly, there are things which might be done to improve our jury selection system. Notably, it is quite difficult to obtain information about one's previous criminal record. There is no central information bureau on the point, state or federal, short of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's fingerprint sheets which are ordinarily not accessible. In this connection I note that State Supervisors of Registration frequently call on the federal Court for names of persons who have lost their civil rights through conviction of felonious crime and this also poses a very difficult task. Even though the District Court records clearly show conviction, it must also be ascertained if appeal is pending, or if the individual were pardoned, before anyone could with assurance remove his name from the voting list—or the jury list for this reason. As a result there are undoubtedly many persons on state voting lists who have lost their federal civil rights and should not therefore be automatically placed in the federal jury box.

It is my personal view that the jury system would not be improved—indeed, it would be impaired by any automatic inclusion of every registered voter or every adult resident as a prospective juror. Perhaps there are isolated instances where the selection process has operated to exclude segments of the qualified population, and this, of course, should not be the case. There has been a most conscientious and successful effort, I think, in eliminating any appearance or vestige of discrimination of persons due to race, nationality, creed or religion.

Also in our federal courts there has been a significant increase in the percentage of women jurors. This poses a very difficult task for the Jury Commissioners for they find—and the Court ultimately finds—that a relatively small percentage of women called for duty serve. Most of them ask to be excused and, in my experience, most of their reasons are well-founded. There is, accordingly, an enormous inefficiency in calling dozens of women to court only to excuse them and start all over again. The Jury Commissioners here have tried to ascertain from the individual women the reasonable likelihood of their ability to serve if called before placing their names in the box. By appeal to their sense of duty many respond and we have found these highly competent and reliable.

This kind of exercise of judgment by our Commissioners is, I believe, not only proper by commendable, and I would not think a blanket draft from the census or voting lists would improve the administration of justice in any way. Perhaps we do need a clearer, more specific guide-line for Commissioners but I would not think there is any real substitute for conscientious exercise of judgment in designating jurors.

The only forms we use here which might be considered responsive to your requests are enclosed.

I would be quite content to leave to your judgment whether my comments here be made part of the record.

Respectfully,

G. HARROLD CARSWELL,
Chief Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF WYOMING,
Cheyenne, Wyo. July 12, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your letter of July 1, 1966, enclosing copies of S. 3296 and you ask that I make comments concerning the desirability of the proposed legislation and the changes it will require in our present operation.

First, let me state that Wyoming is a single judge, single district court, comprising twenty-three counties and 97,000 square miles, with a total population of 330,000.

Section 1864(e) provides that the master jury wheel shall contain the names of persons residing in all counties within the judicial district. According to Section 1865(a) the jurors shall appear before the Clerk to fill out the juror qualification form, which will mean that the jurors residing in Teton, Park, Crook, Campbell, Big Horn and Sheridan counties will have to travel a distance of 500 miles to the seat of the court, or a round trip of 1,000 miles. Are these prospective jurors who have to travel this distance to fill out the form to be paid mileage and per diem, or must they do so at their own expense? For your information I am enclosing a copy of Form AO 112 (Rev.), Summons for Petit Juror, which is sent to the jurors when their names are drawn and they are required to complete the form on the back and bring it with them when they report for jury service.

We use approximately 120 petit and grand jurors every two years. Section 1864(b) provides that the jury commission shall in no event place the names of fewer than 2,000 persons in the master wheel. This will mean that in Wyoming every two years we will have drawn the names of approximately 120 persons and emptied the wheel of the balance.

At the present time we have on our jury panel members of all nationalities and races, including colored, Japanese and Spanish Americans, which in my opinion, is a complete cross-section of all the citizens of this state. We draw the jurors who attend the sessions held at Cheyenne, the seat of the court, from four counties and within 100 miles of the seat of the court. We also hold court once a year at Casper, in the central part of the state, and in Sheridan, in the northern part of the state, and draw jurors from within 100 miles of the place where the court is being held. The proposed legislation would be expensive and, in my opinion, would not improve the jury panels in Wyoming.

The Wyoming docket is up to date and litigants can have their cases tried in as short a time as thirty or sixty days after filing. Our present jury system has worked well for the 76 years of statehood and I trust it will not be disrupted.

Sincerely yours,

EWING T. KERR,
U.S. District Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 27, 1966.

Re S. 3296, a bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection service, etc., to be known as "Civil Rights Act of 1966."

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: In answer to your letter of July 1 to Chief Judge Clary, and at his request, I am forwarding the following documents to describe the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in our District and the problems which Title I of the above Bill would create for our court:

1. Letter of July 21, 1966, from our Clerk, John J. Harding, Esq., with Exhibits A and B attached (the juror qualification questionnaire mentioned in your letter is attached to Exhibit B).

2. Sheet entitled "Method of Selecting Jurors, United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania," prepared by our Jury Commissioner, Hon. E. J. Carroll.

3. Sheet entitled "Proposed Jury Selections vs. Present Practice," also prepared by our Jury Commissioner.

The sponsors who recommend jurors to the above-mentioned officials of our court are leading citizens from all walks of life and of all races and creeds (labor union leaders, religious leaders, civic leaders, academic leaders, business leaders, fraternal organization leaders, etc.), so that we feel our juries now comprise an accurate cross-section of our community.

At present, we use approximately 2,500 jurors per year, whereas § 1864(6) of the proposed Bill would require us to secure 23,679 potential jurors a year. As you will note from page 2 of the letter of July 21, it is estimated that this would require 10 full-time employees in our Clerk's office, as opposed to the 2 part-time employees who are able to handle the work under our present procedures. I would suggest that the Bill should contain a clause providing that, if the Chief Judge of any District Court and the Judicial Council of the Circuit found that the plan in operation in such District Court achieved the objectives described in §§ 1861 and 1862, it would not be necessary for that court to comply with the elaborate provisions of §§ 1864–1868, which would involve a great deal of additional work for already overworked Federal Courts in the metropolitan area and considerable additional expense for the taxpayers. I believe we get a higher and more representative type juror from the recommendations of our sponsors than we would get from the use of voter lists as required by the proposed Bill.

There are certain changes which would seem desirable in the Bill, such as extending the period of six months in § 1869(a)(1) to at least one year, elimination of the requirement that jurors appear before the Clerk to fill out the juror qualification form as stated in § 1865(a)—line 22 of page 5—since it is a long trip for many of our jurors to Philadelphia and they can send in the form just as satisfactorily as appearing in person (if necessary, they could appear before the Commissioner who was nearest to their home), etc.

I would certainly agree that it would be most desirable if Title I could be deleted from the Bill if it is to be passed before the Judicial Conference of the United States has a chance to comment upon it, since that Conference is in the best position to submit the considered views of the Federal judiciary. I would also agree with page 3 of your opening statement of June 6, 1966, where you point out that the Judicial Conference of the United States has suggested that questions as to the race or religion of jurors are unnecessary and quite possibly "constitutionally objectionable."

Copies of this letter are being sent to all the judges of our court and any additional comments submitted by them will be forwarded to you.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS L. VAN DUSEN,
Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS,
Houston, Tex., July 25, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 1st, together with copy of S. 3296, and note that you request my observations and comments with respect to the desirability of this legislation.

From seventeen years experience on this bench, I have found the present method of selecting juries in this Court to be simple, efficient and practical. Certainly it is true in this District, and I believe equally so in the United States Courts throughout Texas and throughout the Nation, there has been no effort at any time to exclude qualified jurors by reason of race, religion or on any such basis. The procedures followed are designed to give a fair cross-section of the citizenship of this District, and in my judgment it has uniformly accomplished that purpose. For that reason, I am very dubious about any overall revision of the present method. Unless there be clear examples of some deficiency in the present system, I should be inclined to go with the present method which has proved its worth over a long period of time.

Addressing myself more specifically to the provisions of S. 3296, I will say that the use of voter registration list is an entirely proper source from which to select jurors' names. In this District we use this as a primary source, although we do from time to time have resort to membership rolls in labor unions, Chambers of Commerce, Rotary Club and other civic or fraternal organizations. I would doubt the wisdom of restricting the choice to that single source.

The provision of paragraph (b), page 4, line 4, providing that at least one per cent of the total number of registered voters shall be placed in the jury wheel will cause a great and unnecessary burden upon the commissioner and the clerk. I would estimate that in the Houston Division of this District there are perhaps 700,000 registered voters. I see no benefit to be derived by having some 7,000 to 8,000 names in the jury wheel, which is to be emptied and refilled every second year. If a jury panel of some 60 to 70 jurors is to be drawn, which is about average, if there are perhaps 500 names in the wheel there is ample opportunity for the element of chance to play its part in the drawing of the names.

The sentence beginning on line 18 of page 5 provides that each person whose name is drawn "*shall appear before the clerk* and fill out a juror qualification form". I see little advantage, and great trouble and expense in requiring this be done in the presence of the clerk. A great many of our jurors must drive 75 or 100 miles to attend court. It is enough of an imposition upon them without requiring a preliminary trip to fill out a simple form in the presence of the clerk. I see no reason why this might not be done by the juror at home and mailed in to the clerk.

The sentence beginning on the last line of page 5, and continuing on page 6, provides that the form shall elicit the "name, address, age, sex, education, race, religion, occupation and citizenship * * *" of the juror. I think it very unwise that the question of the race or the religion, and perhaps the education of a juror should be injected into the manner of his selection. It simply invites questions as to whether a particular minority may or may not have been adequately represented in the selection of a jury. In the years I have been on this bench, there has seldom, if ever, been a panel without a very significant number of negroes. Usually there are several on the panel of twelve ultimately chosen to try a case. There is no distinction between the way they are processed and every other juror is processed. The same is true as between Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, and all other religions. Where that practice is followed, I think it unwise to inquire into matters of that nature which serve no part in qualification of jurors. Nor do I think it particularly appropriate for the lawyers who are selecting a jury to have before them the fact that certain named jurors belong to a particular religious faith. The result would be that the attorneys would make every effort to secure as many members of the jury of the same religion as the defendant; and would lead to efforts on their part to inject questions of religious bias or prejudice in the case. These things have no part in the administration of justice.

Section 1867 (page 8, line 20) provides that the defendant may question or challenge the selection procedures "prior to the introduction of evidence at the trial" and a similar provision is made with respect to civil cases in paragraph (b), beginning at page 9, line 11. In my judgment any challenge to the method in which the jury is selected should be made much earlier than "prior to the introduction of evidence at the trial". You may understand that in many criminal cases (and, to a lesser extent, in some civil cases) the defendant will utilize every possible delaying tactic to prevent the trial from going forward in an orderly fashion. If objection is made to the way that a jury panel has been selected, a defendant should not be permitted to wait until the government is ready to go forward with its evidence to raise the point. This will cause delay and confusion, require the taking of evidence outside of the jury's presence, and is a matter which could and should be resolved long prior to trial.

Section 1869, page 11, line 11, in my judgment is too restrictive in its provisions with regard to excusing jurors. A judge should be allowed wide discretion in this area. Mothers with small children frequently are excused; law enforcement officers, who obviously will not be chosen to serve on a criminal jury, frequently are excused, and other such situations frequently present themselves. I see no advantage in restricting the judge's discretion in this fashion.

I approve the increase in the fees provided in Section 102 (page 13, line 11).

Before such wholesale revision of our present system, I think inquiry should be made as to any instances wherein our system has not worked well. I am unaware of any cases where there have been miscarriages of justice attributable to the method of selecting juries and that is the purpose which the jury is designed to serve.

Sincerely,

BEN C. CONNALLY,
Chief Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, July 20, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 1, 1966, regarding jury selection procedure in our district. Pursuant thereto, I enclose the following, prepared by our Clerk of Court:

1. Analysis of S. 3296, Title I, and its effect on the jury selection system in the Northern District of Iowa, if passed.
2. The Jury System of the United States District Court, Northern District of Iowa, with Exhibits A, B and C attached thereto.

At the present time, the Clerk advises me that he does not prepare annual reports containing statistical information on the jury selection process.

I trust this information may be of some assistance, and you have my permission to include the same as a part of the record of the hearings on this legislation.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. MCMANUS.

Enclosures.

ANALYSIS OF S. 3296, TITLE I, AND ITS EFFECT ON THE JURY SELECTION SYSTEM IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA IF PASSED

The present method of selecting petit and grand juries in the Northern District of Iowa is very satisfactory. Both the Chief Judge, Edward J. McManus and Judge William C. Hanson have expressed approval of the method and of the quality of jurors. By observation the juries for the Federal Court in the Northern District of Iowa appear to be of a high caliber and no change should be necessary at this time.

Should S. 3296, Title I, become law we would have no objections to Sections 1861, 1862, 1863, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870 or Section 102(a) and (b) or Section 103(a) or Section 104. However, Sections 1864 and 1865 would change considerably our present method of jury selection and would present some problem for the Northern District of Iowa.

Section 1864 would require that the names for possible jury service be selected at random from voter registration lists, supplemented if necessary by other methods prescribed by the judicial council. In addition, Section 1864 would provide that in no event should the master wheel contain fewer than 2000 names of persons for possible jury service. It is our feeling that voter registration lists would not provide the quality of juries that the key men system presently used in this district is now furnishing for our trials. Placing of a minimum of 2000 names in a master wheel would create some difficulty in the Northern District of Iowa because at the present time we draw our juries in compliance with proposed Section 1864, which calls for a minimum of not less than 300 qualified names of persons to be placed in the jury wheel for each jury panel to be drawn. We think 2000 names for each court point is excessive. (We have petit jurors to draw for six court points plus at least two grand juries and at 2000 names per panel, this would amount to at least 16,000 names.)

In proposed Section 1865, names would be drawn from the master wheel and the persons drawn would be summoned to appear at the Clerk's office to fill out a questionnaire and from those persons qualified, juries would be selected. We feel that by receiving the names from key men in the Northern District and mailing questionnaires the same result can be maintained with a minimum amount of office work and expense to both the prospective juror and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

In conclusion it would be our recommendation that the present method of selecting juries be continued or that each district be allowed to establish its own method following guide lines similar to those set out in the present Rules of Federal Procedure.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS,
Fort Smith, Ark., July 29, 1966.

Re S. 3296.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman Committee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: In further response to your letter of July 1, 1966 relative to the above numbered bill. I have been furnished with a copy of a letter written by Hon. J. Smith Henley, Chief Judge U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, dated July 22, 1966 and addressed to Senator MCCLELLAN. In the letter Judge Henley analyzes Title 1 and 2 of the Bill. I have read with care the analysis of said Title and concur whole heartily in his statement of objection to the enactment of Title 1 and 2.

I assume that Judge Henley sent you a copy of his letter to Senator MCCLELLAN above referred to, but in order that the Committee may have the benefit of Judge Henley's comments I am enclosing herewith a copy of said letter.

Frankly, I do not think it is necessary for me to submit any additional argument against the enactment of Title 1 and 2 and I shall appreciate it if you will accept the comments of Judge Henley and I shall refrain from so doing.

I might add however that I have been a United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas for a period of almost 26 years (since April 1, 1941) and I have been Chief Judge of the District for several years. I am certain that the minority group in Arkansas have received equal and exact justice at the hands of Federal Court Juries. I cannot refrain from stating that Title 1 and 2 of the Bill are the most uncalled for and unjust legislative proposals that I have ever encountered and that applies not only to my service as Judge but also to my services as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1930 to November 15, 1937, and as a Member of the United States Senate from November 15, 1937 to April 1, 1941.

Nothing but confusion and endless trouble will result from the enactment of Title 1 and 2 and I earnestly hope that the Committee and the Congress as a whole will avoid the debacle that will be created by the enactment of such title.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. MILLER.

cc: Judge J. Smith Henley, U.S. District Judge, P. O. Box 429, Little Rock, Ark.; Judge Oren Harris, U. S. District Judge, El Dorado, Ark.; Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U. S. Senator, Washington, D.C.; Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, U. S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS,
EASTERN AND WESTERN
DISTRICTS OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, Ark., July 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senator,
3241 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Some days ago I received a letter from Senator ERVIN of North Carolina with which he enclosed a copy of Senate Bill No. 3296 which he describes as the Administration's version of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. The Senator also enclosed a copy of the statement which he made at the opening of his sub-committee's hearings on the bill. I was requested to supply certain information, and to comment on Titles I and II of the bill dealing with jury selection in both the State and federal courts. I supplied that information and without going into detail advised Senator ERVIN that in general I was opposed to the provisions of both titles. Since I wrote to Senator ERVIN, I have been supplied by Congressman MILLS with a copy of House Bill No. 14765. That copy shows the bill as originally written, and also shows the present text of the bill as reported out by the House Judiciary Committee.

The importance of the jury system to our form of government and way of life and the impact which the adoption of Title I or Title II of either the Senate or the House bill would have upon that system prompt me to write you this letter for the purpose of stating my views in some detail. Primarily what I have to say will be directed to the Senate bill, but from time to time I will make some comment on the House bill.

First, I will say that the House bill as reported out of the Committee seems to me to be a better bill from an administrative or mechanical standpoint than the Senate bill, and the House bill, as reported, meets some of the objections that I have to the system envisioned by the Senate bill. However, the differences between the two bills are differences in degree only. Both bills contemplate a method of selecting grand and petit jurors to which I am opposed in principle.

With specific reference to S. 3296, Title I of that bill relates to the method of selecting federal grand and petit jurors and is doubtless within the constitutional power of Congress to enact. Title II prohibits discrimination in the selection of jurors in the State courts, and then goes on to vest the federal courts with jurisdiction to take action at the suit of the Attorney General of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in the State courts. The jurisdiction which Title II would proceed to confer on the federal courts with respect to State court jury selection is, I think, of doubtful constitutionality and is definitely undesirable even if such jurisdiction can be conferred.

TITLE I

Section 101 of Title I of the bill is a drastic revision of Chapter 121 of the Judicial Code of the United States, U.S.C., Title 28, which deals with federal juries and the right to trial by jury in the federal courts. References herein to Code sections are to the sections appearing in the bill unless otherwise indicated.

Section 1861 declares it to be the policy of the United States that "all qualified persons shall have the opportunity to serve on grand and petit juries in the district courts of the United States and shall have an obligation to serve as jurors when summoned for that purpose." Section 1862 prohibits discrimination in jury selection on account of "race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status." The same statement of policy and the same prohibition appear in the House bill.

Section 1863 provides for a jury commission for each judicial district or for separate divisions of the same district. The commission or commissions are to consist of the Clerk of the Court and of an individual appointed by the Court. Each commission is to act under the direction and supervision of the chief judge of the district. The Senate bill eliminates the present requirement that the jury commissioner be a member of the principal political party opposed to that of which the Clerk is a member; the House bill retains the present requirement.

I have no difficulty with section 1862 which effects no change in present law. As to 1863 I prefer the present arrangement under which if the Clerk is a Democrat, the jury commissioner is to be a Republican, and vice versa, but I have no strong feeling on that subject. If the more important provisions of the bill which in effect eliminate discretion on the part of the members of the jury commission in selecting jurors become law, it probably makes no difference what the respective political affiliations of the members of the commission are.

The provision in section 1863 that the work of each commission shall be under the supervision of the chief judge of the district can create a problem in a multi-division district in which the chief judge does not customarily handle jury trials in all divisions. Both the Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas are such districts, and I am sure that there are similar districts in other States. In Arkansas the work of the jury commission in a particular division is supervised by the judge who actually hears cases in that division. For example, I am the chief judge of the Eastern District but do not customarily handle jury cases in the Jonesboro or Helena Divisions of that district. Judge Gordon E. Young handles jury work at Jonesboro, and Judge Oren Harris handles jury work at Helena. I am not the chief judge of the Western District but do have charge of jury work in the Harrison Division of that District. Under the present arrangement Judge Young supervises the jury commission at Jonesboro, Judge Harris supervises it at Helena, and I supervise it at Harrison. I think that the present arrangement is a good and workable one, and I would not like to see it changed.

With regard to section 1861, I disagree with the idea that it should be the "policy of the United States" to give "all qualified persons" an "opportunity" for jury service. I have not been aware that there has been or should be any such affirmative policy. My real trouble, though, goes to the concept of who are "qualified persons," which concept is spelled out in section 1866, which section I shall reach presently.

The real heart of Title I is to be found in sections 1864, 1865 and 1866, read together and taken in connection with the policy expressed in section 1861. The scheme of jury selection which those sections contemplate may be summarized as follows:

Subject to an exception upon which I find it unnecessary to comment at this time, names of persons appearing on voter registration lists of all counties or parishes within the jurisdiction of a jury commission are to be selected at random and placed in a so-called "master jury wheel." From time to time persons whose names are drawn at random from that wheel will be examined to determine whether they are qualified jurors. A person found to be qualified and who is not exempt or excused from jury service will have his name placed in a "qualified juror wheel," and actual grand and petit jurors will be drawn from that wheel.

The question of whether a person is qualified is in general to be determined solely by reference to information furnished by the prospective juror and solely by reference to certain disqualifications set forth in section 1866, which disqualifications are negative statements of the qualifications appearing in section 1861 of Title 28, U.S.C. as presently written. Under section 1866 a person is considered "qualified" unless he:

"(1) is not a citizen of the United States twenty-one years old (or older) who has resided for a period of one year within the judicial district;

"(2) is unable to read, write, speak, and understand the English language;

"(3) is incapable, by reason of mental or physical infirmity, to render efficient jury service; or

"(4) has been convicted in a State or Federal court of record of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year and his civil rights have not been restored by pardon or amnesty."

My basic objection to Title I relates to section 1866, read in context, but before I discuss that basic objection there are some more or less technical objections which I desire to mention.

Section 1864(b) provides that the master wheel is to be filled with the names of at least one per cent of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists for the district or division, but that in no event shall the commissioners place in the wheel the names of less than 2,000 persons. The same requirement appears in the House bill. I think that a minimum of 2,000 names in the master wheel is excessive for small divisions and even for divisions of moderate populations. In Arkansas we have maintained jury boxes for the respective divisions, each containing not less than 300 names, and we have not had any difficulty in getting sufficient jurors to handle the business.

Section 1864(d) requires custodians of voter registration lists to make the same available to the jury commissions, and authorizes the district courts, "upon application of the Attorney General," to compel compliance with that requirement. I do not see why the exercise by a district court of its jurisdiction to require that voter lists be made available should depend upon any application of the Attorney General or the Department of Justice. It would seem to me that if custodians of records refuse to make them available to a jury commission, the court might act on the application of the commission although, of course, enforcement of the court's order might depend upon the cooperation of the Department of Justice.

That portion of section 1865 which requires persons whose names are drawn from the master wheel to appear personally before the Clerk to fill out a juror qualification form seems unnecessary, burdensome, and expensive, to say nothing of the extra work which it would place on the shoulders of personnel in the offices of the respective clerks. In view of the minimum qualifications set up by section 1866, it would appear that information as to whether a person is qualified under that section could be obtained easily by means other than a personal interview. The House bill recognizes that fact and provides that as an alternative the chief judge of a district, with the consent of the judicial council of the circuit, may direct that the necessary information be obtained by mail.

This brings us back to section 1866 and to my basic objection to Title I. The qualifications or disqualifications set forth in section 1866 are generally unexceptional if considered as minimum qualifications. Few would argue that federal juries should be made up of minors, illiterates, the physically and mentally infirm, or convicted felons. But it certainly does not follow that every adult who can speak, read and write English, who is not a cripple or an insane person, and who has not been convicted of a felony, or, if convicted, who has been pardoned, is qualified to render just and efficient jury service. But under section 1866 every person fitting that description is declared to be qualified, and under section 1861 he must be extended the "opportunity" to serve on the jury. This is the feature of Title I to which I am unalterably opposed. In my opinion the adoption of the Title could seriously weaken the effectiveness of the jury system.

Granting that qualified jurors can be found and are found among all races of people and in all walks and stations of life, not every person of all races and in all walks and stations of life who meets the minimum qualifications of section 1866 possesses the mental and psychological capabilities or the moral character which would qualify him to sit in judgment on his fellow men.

Regardless of race or wealth, and regardless of the causes of disparities in human capabilities and character, all of us know that those disparities exist. Whether we like it or not, it is an inescapable fact that some of us are wiser than others, some of us are more experienced than others, some of us are more fair minded than others, some of us are more practical than others, and some of us are more honest and responsible than others. Those disparities the bill and its underlying policy or philosophy completely ignore.

In the fairly recent case of United States v. Henderson, 7 Cir., 298 F. 2d 522, 526, the Court took occasion to say that no litigant has any constitutional or statutory right to have "ignorance represented in the jury box." I do not think that any such right should be created today, or that any litigant should be exposed to a verdict rendered by people who may possess no more than the minimum qualifications of the bill.

I am sure that you will remember that when Judge Medina was called upon to try the Communist conspirators in New York a number of years ago, the defendants made a vigorous attack on the composition of juries in the Southern District of New York. In rejecting that attack on appeal the Court of Appeals, speaking through Judge Learned Hand, said in United States v. Dennis, 2 Cir., 183 F. 2d 201, 221, citing the 1821 English decision of Rex v. Edmonds, 4 Barn. & Ald. 471, 474:

"The first ground (for attack on the jury panel), was that the officer selected the names and did not take them by some mode of chance or hazard. Now such a mode would be contrary to all precept and example. Jurymen have always been named by the discretion of some person; of the sheriff, the coroners, or elizors."

The reason why jurors have always been selected by the exercise of someone's discretion is obvious and is as valid today as it was when *Edmonds* was decided.

Jury service may be and frequently is a valuable lesson in citizenship to a juror, or it may give him a sense of status or security, or a sense of "belonging" to the community in which he resides. But, it is not the primary function of a jury to educate its members or to improve their social morale. Juries sit to try lawsuits, and the right to trial by jury extends to many broad areas of human controversy, some simple, some highly complex.

The verdicts of juries are not abstractions. They operate directly upon the liberty, fortunes, or the very lives of the litigants involved. The rights, the fortunes, the lives of litigants should not be determined by jury panels chosen indiscriminately from voter lists which is what S. 3296 contemplates.

This was recognized as recently as 1960 by the Committee on the Operation of the Jury System set up in 1941 by the Judicial Conference of the United States. In its 1960 report the Committee stated that while a jury should be representative of the community from which it is drawn, and that the sources from which jurors are selected should include all social and economic groups in the community, nevertheless, "the jury list should represent as high a degree of morality, integrity, intelligence and commonsense as the jury commission can find in each social and economic group by the use of impartial methods of selection." The Jury System In The Federal Courts, 26 FRD 409, 419.

The standards for grand and petit jurors which have prevailed from the earliest times in Arkansas are not without interest here. Ark. Stats., Ann., § 39–101, provides that no person shall serve as a grand juror unless he is a qualified elector, a citizen of the county in which he may be called to serve, "temperate and of good behavior." Other standards, applicable to both grand and petit jurors, are to be found in Ark. Stats., Ann., §§ 39–206 and 39–208. Grand and petit jurors must be "persons of good character, of approved integrity, sound judgment and reasonable information."

Does a person meet those standards merely because he is literate and has not been convicted of a felony? To ask that question is to answer it. We all know that some of the most dishonest people in the country and some of the most immoral and irresponsible have never been convicted of a felony. But, if they meet the other qualifications of section 1866 and have not been so convicted, their names must be put in the box even though their true character is known to everyone concerned. More than that, conviction does not disqualify if there has been a pardon. Pardons may restore certain civil or political rights; they do not of themselves create or restore character or discretion.

Federal jury trials are becoming not only more numerous but also more complicated. That is to be expected in view of the fact that our population is increasing and our civilization becoming more complex. With the work of jurors becoming more difficult it would be expected normally that we would be interested in improving the quality of our jurors rather than in reducing qualifications to a bare minimum. The Judicial Conference's Committee which has been mentioned was evidently of that opinion because in its 1960 Report, 26 FRD at 418, we find the statement that although much has been done to improve the quality of jurors serving in the courts and to increase the efficiency of the jury system, "much remains to be done."

This brings me to comment on that portion of Senator Ervin's preliminary statement to the effect that Title I of S. 3296 has never been referred to the Judicial Conference, whereas H.R. 5460, passed by the House, and endorsed by the Administration as a partial alternative to Title I, had been "the subject of careful consideration by the Judicial Conference . . . and has the Conference's backing." I am glad to note that the Senator's sub-committee "will consider the provisions of H.R. 5640, as well as those of Title I."

Assuming for purposes of argument that in instances federal juries have been too narrowly based and have not included representatives from certain callings or economic groups, I think that those defects have been due largely to the comparatively low compensation of jurors. Section 102 of S. 3296 provides for substantial increases in compensation, and I think that those increases, which I favor, will go far toward making our jury panels more representative. Even if the other features of Title I fail of passage, as I hope that they will, I would like to see Section 102 adopted as a separate measure or as a part of some other measure.

I have examined the remaining sections of Title I and find that I have no specific comment to make on them at this time.

TITLE II

Section 201 of the bill states that no person "shall be denied the right to serve on grand and petite juries in any State court on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status."

Sections 202(a) and 202(b) authorize suits in the federal courts by the Attorney General whenever "there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which would deny or abridge any right secured by section 201 . . ." The Attorney General may seek "preventive relief," including injunctions and temporary restraining orders. Suits may be filed without regard to whether any "aggrieved party" has exhausted existing remedies, and the federal courts are required to "expedite" such suits "in every way."

Under section 203 if a federal district court finds that any right secured by section 201 has been denied or abridged, the court may grant either prohibitory or mandatory relief, perhaps both.

The court may prohibit or suspend the use of any qualification for jury service or basis for excuse, exemption or exclusion which: (1) violates or has been applied in violation of section 201, or (2) is susceptible to being applied in violation of section 201 because it vests in jury officials "undue discretion to determine whether any person has satisfied such qualification or whether a basis exists for excusing, exempting, or excluding any person from jury service."

The district court may require the use of "objective criteria to determine whether any person has satisfied any qualification for jury service or whether a basis exists for excusing, exempting or excluding any person from jury service." The court may also make requirements in connection with record keeping and preservation of records relating to State jury selection. And, finally, the district court may appoint a master "to perform such duties of the jury officials as may be necessary to assure that the rights secured by section 201 . . . are not denied or abridged."

Section 204 provides for detailed discovery of evidence about State jury selections in any suit brought by the Attorney General under section 202 or by any person under 42 USCA § 1983. Section 205 requires record preservation by State jury officials and provides for inspection of such records. The remaining sections of the Title need not be abstracted.

Unlike Title I, Title II presents a serious constitutional question, as I think has been recognized by the Chief Justice of the United States. Section 201 is designed to go much further than the protection of litigants in the State courts from discriminatorily selected juries; it asserts some supposed "right" on the part of everybody to serve on State court juries, and then vests the federal courts with the power to enforce that asserted "right."

There is no doubt that the Fourteenth Amendment protects a *litigant* in the State courts against juries in the selection of which invidious discrimination tending to his prejudice has been practiced. But it does not necessarily follow from the constitutional prohibition against discrimination that Congress by legislation can affirmatively require the States to include specific classes of persons as jurors or can affirmatively fix qualifications for State jurors or can declare and enforce some supposed right of the general public to sit on State court juries.

Apart from any question of constitutionality, however, I consider it an unwarranted interference with the rights and affairs of the States for the federal courts to undertake to sit in general judgment, at the suit of the Attorney General, on the make-up of State court juries, or, in instances, to appoint masters to perform the functions of State jury officials.

But, even if the rights of the States and the sensibilities of State officials, including judges, are to be ignored altogether, which certainly should not be done, I would still be opposed to Title II since I see in it an attempt to accomplish indirectly with respect to State court juries what Title I would do directly with respect to federal court juries, namely to eliminate any significant or meaningful discretion in the selection of jurors.

CONCLUSION

Since Titles I and II appear as part of a civil rights measure, it would seem inferable that the proponents of those Titles are primarily concerned with the rights of minorities. I am not at all sure that such concern is sufficiently warranted as to justify the sweeping legislation incorporated in the bill.

From my own observation from the federal bench in Arkansas, extending over a period of nearly eight years, I have not observed that minority groups in this State have received less than justice at the hands of federal court juries as presently selected. And I have no reason to believe that any real injustices are practiced upon them in the Arkansas State courts, except perhaps in unusual and isolated instances.

Nor is it clear that minority groups in Arkansas or elsewhere would really fare any better in the courts, whether State or federal, if present methods of jury selection were abandoned in favor of the method contemplated by the bill.

U.S. District Court,
Eastern District of Missouri,
St. Louis, Mo., July 6, 1966.

Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Constitutional Rights, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: Your letter of July 1st to Chief Judge Roy W. Harper was received on July 5th. Judge Harper left on that date for a Sentencing Institute in Denver, Colorado, and asked me to respond to your letter. Judge Harper will return to the city on July 25th and may desire to make some additional comments.

I enclose a short statement of the manner in which our jurors are now selected in this district, along with a questionnaire which is sent to each juror prior to his selection. We do not require the Clerk or the Commissioners to make an annual report and have no statistical information available concerning our jurors.

The following sections of R.S. Mo. 1959 are the pertinent sections of the Missouri law dealing with registration of voters: 113.010, 113.500, 116.010, 117.010 and 118.010. These sections generally provide for mandatory registration of voters in order to vote in the City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, and Jackson County (which is in the Western District of Missouri), and in cities containing a population of ten thousand or more. In all other counties within our district, registration of voters is optional and may be had by fifteen percent of the voters petitioning the county court to place it on a ballot to be voted on by the people. Registration has not been adopted in many of the counties in the Eastern District of Missouri.

S3296, if it became law, would require us to have a greater number of persons that we now have on the list of qualified jurors in all divisions, since the minimum number would be two thousand for each division or one percent of the persons of voting age, whichever is the larger, if supplemental lists are used.

S3296 also provides that at least one percent of the total number of persons on the registered voters list shall be placed in the master wheel. The City of St. Louis has approximately 306,000 registered voters, the County of St. Louis has approximately 381,000 registered voters. Accordingly, from these two counties alone it would be necessary that we maintain in the master list of the Eastern Division of this District 6,870 persons plus an appropriate additional list of persons from the other counties in this Division. Our present master list in the Eastern Division contains approximately 850 names and each of the other two divisions have approximately 500 names. To process the greater number of persons required by the Act would probably require additional personnel in the Office of the Clerk. In my personal opinion if S3296 became law, it would not result insofar as this District is concerned, in a more qualified jury or a different type jury than we presently have, but only greater numbers.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

James H. Meredith.

U.S. District Court,
District of North Dakota,
Bismarck, July 5, 1966.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of July 1, 1966, in which copies of S. 3296 were enclosed.

Briefly, a short statement describing the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in this district is as follows: The clerk of this district at Fargo maintains a jury box containing approximately two thousand names of prospective qualified jurors. Whenever the Court considers that, due to depletion of the number of names, it is advisable to draw more names, the clerk and jury commissioner send out requests to various prominent citizens of this state to submit to them names of representative qualified citizens for jury service. The number of names requested of course varies with the number of names to be added to the list in the box pursuant to the Court order. The inquiries from the clerk are usually directed to county officials—superintendents of schools, county judges, and state district court judges, etc., and to prominent businessmen, including bank officials. When the summons is sent to the prospective juror, he is requested to fill in the questions on the reverse side of the form and bring it with him to the clerk's office at the time of registration for jury service. When he appears, that form is completed and signed before the clerk. The only substantial minority group in this state consists of members of the Indian population. We have very frequently had Indians on our jury panels and petit juries, and to the best of my knowledge there has been little, if any, criticism of jurors being representative citizens.

Enclosed kindly find two copies of the summons to serve as petit juror (being Form AO 112) and two copies of the form used for summoning grand jurors (being Form AO 111). When the clerk is ordered to call special jurors, she has added one question, which has been typed on one of the forms enclosed, namely: "Have you resided in the State of North Dakota longer than one year?" In order that the answers to the questions establish qualifications for jury service, this question was included.

You have invited comments about S. 3296. I am concerned about certain provisions:

1. Reference is made to Sec. 1864(d) and (f). It is my understanding from these provisions that the members of the jury commission would be required to personally go to the county seat of each county in this state at least one time every two years for the purpose of inspecting, reproducing or copying voter registration lists or other appropriate records. In this state there are 53 counties covering a vast area. It would seem that this would involve not only a substantial amount of time, but a great deal of traveling and expense.

2. Reference is made to Sec. 1865. Apparently this provision would require "each person whose name is drawn * * * shall appear before the clerk and fill out a juror qualification form * * *." There are two locations in North Dakota in which the clerk has a permanent office—Fargo and Bismarck. If this provision means that when a prospective juror receives his summons by certified mail he must appear before the clerk for the purpose of filling out this form, it would involve a substantial amount of expense. In each of the four divisions of this state, jurors serve who reside more than 200 miles from the place where court is held. It would seem to me that bringing this form with them at the time of registering for jury service, as is now the custom, should be adequate.

3. Reference is made to Sec. 1867. Under these provisions, the action which may be taken by the defendant in a criminal trial or by any party in a civil case may be taken at any time "prior to the introduction of evidence at trial." Of course I realize that questions may arise on voir dire which go to the qualifications for jury service, as provided in Sec. 1866. I wonder, however, if action challenging compliance with Sections 1864 or 1865 should await this stage in the proceedings. I have this in mind: The action required by the jury commission in this state would be taken in Fargo. The clerk would be one of the members. If a term of court was in progress in Bismarck at which the resident deputy clerk was clerking the court, and the clerk was acting in her official capacity at a term in Grand Forks, and such a challenge was made in Bismarck, it would certainly disrupt and delay proceedings in both Grand Forks and Bismarck if such a challenge could be made as herein provided. I can see where this provision could delay and interfere with the efficient functioning of the Court.

4. Reference is made to Sec. 1869. Under this provision, apparently the only basis for being excused by the Court is a showing of "unusually severe hardship." I realize that this is a general term. However, in my judgment it would be much more realistic to provide that a prospective juror could be excused by the Court upon a showing of good cause, and leave that determination within the discretion of the trial court. It is not at all uncommon for elderly persons in this district, particularly farmers and ranchers,

to arrange to take winter vacations to visit children and relatives in more moderate climates during the winter months when they can be away from their farming or ranching business. This is the very time that the courts are almost continually in session, trying jury cases. Whether interference with business or personal convenience and wishes could be construed as "unusually severe hardship" might be questionable.

I will be interested in learning of any proposed changes in, and the progress of, this proposed legislation.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE S. REGISTER,
Chief Judge.

SUMMONS FOR GRAND JUROR
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE ______________.

To

You are hereby summoned to appear in the United States District Court for the __________ district of __________ at room __________ in the United States courthouse, at __________, in the city of __________ on __________, 19__, at __________ o'clock _______, to serve as a grand juror during a term of the court to commence on that day.

By Order of the Court:

____
Clerk.

By ____________________
Deputy.

Dated ______________, 19__

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. Jurors are entitled to receive for their service the fees and mileage allowed by law, unless they fail to notify the court, on receipt of the notice, that they have a valid reason for being excused, as required in paragraph number 4.

2. Failure to attend in accordance with this summons is punishable by fine or imprisonment.

3. The marshal has no control over the jury lists, and cannot excuse any person from jury duty.

4. If you have moved out of this judicial district, or if you are physically unable to attend court at the time and place specified, or if you believe you have a valid reason for being excused, you should immediately notify the court by mail, giving a full statement of the facts. Failure to give such notice will prevent you from receiving fees and mileage for the day on which you are excused, unless the reason for being excused arose too late to permit prior notification to the court.

5. Unless you receive a communication from the court excusing you from service, you must attend as directed in this summons.

[Questions on back of this form must be answered]

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Greensboro, N.C., July 7, 1966.
Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Thank you for your letter of July 1, 1966, and enclosures, soliciting my suggestions with respect to the changes proposed in jury selection methods for Federal courts.

There can be no question that every court has the clear duty to zealously guard the integrity and impartiality of the jury system. We are doing everything possible to achieve this result in our district. No suggestion has ever been made that our jury boxes do not contain a true cross-section of the law-abiding, intelligent citizens of our district. Our objective has always been to include representative citizens of all races and creeds, and not to exclude anyone by reason of race, religion, sex, or economic status. We have approached the problem in this manner because we believe it is required by the present statutes, is fair and just, and an indispensable aid in the quest for truth.

We reconstitute our jury boxes, by divisions, at least once every five years. One time a name is drawn, it is not returned to the jury box until the entire box is reconstituted, thereby insuring that no citizen will be called upon for jury service more often than once every five years. We, of course, follow the statute with respect to the Jury Commission. The Jury Commission uses the sponsor method in obtaining the names of prospective jurors. Every effort is made to insure that sponsors, both white and Negro, are highly respected citizens of their communities. Typical sponsors are business executives, laborers, mayors, housewives, officials of chambers of commerce and junior chambers of commerce, Y.M.C.A. executives, farm leaders, postmasters, school officials, and the like. When a sponsor has been selected, he is written a letter (Exhibit 1) to solicit his cooperation. When jurors have been nominated, they are sent a letter (Exhibit 2) and a questionnaire (Exhibit 3). When names have been drawn for jury service, jurors are written a letter (Exhibit 4) giving them a brief outline with respect to their duties and period of service.

If district courts faithfully adhere to the provisions of the present statutes, I see no reason whatever for Title I of S. 3296. On the other hand, if a district court is not complying with the present statutes, it appears that ample machinery is already provided to enforce compliance. If, however, new legislation is to be enacted in this field, I would like to point out what is considered to be some of the more glaring deficiencies in the pending bill:

1. I seriously doubt if the 45-day-period provided in § 1854(f) is sufficient time to "empty and refill the master wheel." We have six divisions in the Middle District, and I anticipate it will take the Commission the entire 45 days, working full time, to empty and refill the master wheels in each of the divisions. Additionally because of the heavy schedules of most courts during the late fall, I believe some other season of the year would be a more convenient time to reconstitute the jury boxes.

2. The provisions of § 1865(a), which prohibits a disclosure of the jury list, is somewhat disturbing. We have followed the practice of making jury lists available to interested counsel at least 15 days in advance of the trial, and the occasion has never arisen when I felt that any injustice or impropriety resulted from the disclosure.

3. As I understand § 1869(a), the court would no longer be empowered to exclude from jury service individuals engaged in certain professions or callings. We now systematically exclude from jury service all doctors, lawyers, nurses, and public school teachers. As I interpret the proposed legislation, these individuals could only be excused by the court on a peremptory challenge or a finding that they were unable to render impartial jury service. It is difficult to conceive of a situation where an attorney would require, or even want, active practitioners of law or medicine to serve on the jury, and it seems inherently unfair to require them to use one of their peremptory challenges in order to excuse a person engaged in one of these professions.

4. The proposed bill seems to delete the provision of the present statute which permits the United States Marshal to summon talesmen from bystanders. This could greatly increase the cost of administering the jury system. We normally call about 17 jurors to try a civil case, and about 20 to try a criminal case. Experience has taught that these numbers are usually sufficient. However, if we were placed in the position of having to delay a trial until additional jurors could be drawn from the jury box and summoned by the marshal, we would feel compelled to have a greater number present when the case is called.

If new legislation is to be enacted, it is my hope that many objectionable features, some of which are mentioned above, will be eliminated. As earlier stated, it is my feeling that the present legislation in this field is adequate, particularly when the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 243 are considered.

You are at liberty to use this letter in any manner as you see fit.

With sincere best wishes and kindest personal regards.

Cordially yours,

EDWIN M. STANLEY,
U.S. District Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, Ind., August 1, 1966.
Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Your letter of July 1, 1966, arrived while I was away from the court on vacation. I am sorry for the delay in responding to your letter and I fear this response may be too late for your use.

I have confined my comments to Title I of S. 3296 in the attached memorandum. You will note the memorandum has attached to it a memorandum from the Clerk of this court together with attached exhibits setting forth the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in this district.

Since there is a difference in view among judges concerning the requirement of drawing jurors' names by lot from "beginning to end" for assignment to trial work, I have included herewith a short tract I wrote for one of our seminars for newly appointed district judges. While it deals with the mechanics of drawing names for assignment to trial work after they have been taken from the "master wheel," and thus would not relate to the main thrust of S. 3296, it gives some insight to a few of the problems which confront trial judges in the matter of handling the selection of jurors for trial work.

With sincere regrets for my tardiness in responding to your letter, and with kindest regards, I remain

Respectfully,

WILLIAM E. STECKLER.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING S. 3296, TITLE I

The attached memorandum from the Clerk of this Court together with the attached exhibits sets forth the jury selection machinery as it actually operates in this district.

It will be noted that the Clerk states in the third paragraph of his letter:

"From these lists a questionnaire (Exhibit C) is mailed to the prospective juror. Upon receipt the questionnaires are screened by the Commission for acceptability. If the person is determined to be acceptable, the name is then transferred to a 3 x 5 card (Exhibit D) and placed in the jury box by the Commission as provided by statute (28 U.S.C. 1864)."

Upon receipt of the memorandum from the Clerk, I queried him as to the standards, or guides, that he and the Jury Commissioner follow in making their determination of the prospective juror's "acceptability." He stated that their consideration is confined solely to the answers stated in the questionnaire.

A reading of the provisions of Title I of S. 3296 and the attached memorandum of our Clerk discloses significant changes that would be required in the jury selection machinery presently employed in the district. Most significant is the very substantial additional man hours that would be required on the part of the Jury Commision. Whereas at present the duties of the Jury Commission require only part-time attention of the Clerk or a deputy, the proposed legislation would require at least the full time of one deputy clerk and much of the time of the Chief Clerk, and substantially more time of the other member of the Commission. In this district the other member of the Commission has usually been an outstanding businessman.

It is apparent from S. 3296 that the selection of the prospective jurors' names "at random from the voter registration lists of persons residing in the judicial district or division . . ." in its implementation would require a great amount of trust to be placed in the local voter registration officials on the one hand, no matter what procedure the Chief Judge of the district might prescribe to be followed by the Commission in making the "random" selection of names from the voter registration lists; or on the other hand, a personal appearance on the part of a deputy clerk at the voter registration office *in each of the counties* of the district or division to make the random selection.

In the Southern District of Indiana, one per centum of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists of the district or division, or one per centum of the total number of persons of voting age, would seem to be excessive in view of the number of persons called for jury duty. The thought of the amount of mail that would be received by the Chief Judge of the district is staggering.

While the provision in S. 3296 of requiring the person summoned to appear before the Clerk to fill out the questionnaire would appear to be an improvement over present requirements, after enactment it would present the obvious need for additional personnel in all of the Clerk's offices.

I cannot fully agree with the views expressed that the religion of any juror is none of the business of the Jury Commissioner; that it is none of the business of the courts; and none of the business of the Justice Department. Unless this mark of identification is known, there will be no way of establishing that there has been a systematic exclusion of persons by reason of religion—if such should ever occur. While I would favor including this information in the questionnaire, my feelings on the matter are not vehement. I can see no harm in asking a prospective juror to state his religion; it can be asked on voir dire examination anyway, though at that stage of a jury proceeding the number of peremptory challenges a litigant has remaining to exercise for that reason may not be sufficient to overcome the bias of the panel. The point I make is that the names placed in the "qualified juror wheel" should not be a biased group from the standpoint of *race or religion*—and this can be known only if their race and religion are made a matter of record. I realize that race and religion are not grounds for challenge for cause in the selection of a jury in the jury trial—quite to the contrary, but the very force behind the efforts to secure the passage of Title I, I am sure, stems in part from abuse in that regard. Seating a jury in a trial is quite a different matter than furnishing names on a cross-section basis to provide a pool from which to draw names by lot for jury work in the case. I repeat, the reason I would favor recording prospective jurors' race and religion is to provide a basis for determining whether solely by reason of race or religion persons had been *denied* the right to perform jury service, and not to require it to establish race or religion as a basis for *qualifying* for jury service. This I believe is the bill's objective.

The provision in Title I of S. 3296 that the Jury Commission, among other things, shall deem any person qualified to serve on grand and petit juries in the district court unless he has not resided for a period of one year within the judicial district is, in my opinion, constitutionally suspect. A person is no less a citizen of a judicial district by reason of not having resided in the district for one year than the person who has resided there for a year or more.

Other features of Title I, particularly § 1867, are, in my opinion, objectionable. Section 1867 will be the source of abusive delay, especially in criminal trials.

In sum, I would oppose Title I of S. 3296 in its present form.

As to the other two titles of the bill, I have no comment.

Statement of Richard C. Peck, Clerk, U.S. District Court, District of Nebraska, in Connection With Scheduled Appearance Before the Subcommittee on July 27, 1966, at Hearings on S. 3296

To the Honorable Chairman and Members, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate:

The District of Nebraska encompasses an area of approximately 77,227 square miles with a population of approximately 1,430,000 people. 592,673 of them voted in the last general election. Of a total of 93 counties in the district only 12 are required to have voter registration. There are 2169 voting precincts in the state. From Omaha, the headquarters of the District and situated in the easternmost part of the state, the distance to Scottsbluff, a city near the western boundary, is 446 miles.

With these statistics in mind I am overwhelmed at the thought of the enormous increase in expenditure of funds, the staggering volume of clerical work, and the aggravating inconvenience to jurors which would of necessity be generated if the provisions of Title I of this bill, S. 3296, are implemented.

Using the total vote cast at the last general election as a reference figure, at least 5926 names would have to be gleaned biannually from the registration rolls of the 12 counties in Nebraska requiring voter registration and from the separate poll books of approximately 1600 voting precincts existent in the remaining 81 counties which do not have registration and require only the signature of the voter on a poll book on the day of voting. Contrast this with our present annual need for jurors names, which is something less than 1000, and it becomes quite obvious that the cost of increasing my staff by the number of personnel necessary for such an undertaking, and the mileage and subsistence payments required for their travel to all of the points where these records would be available for copying would alone be something to behold.

Moreover, to complete the task in the short period of November 15 to December 31 would indeed require the application of magical administrative effort; and in Nebraska an added complication is the fact that by state law all poll books are sealed for 6 months immediately after the canvass of the votes is completed and they cannot be opened except upon order of a court having jurisdiction thereof.

I note that the bill contains provisions directing that a master wheel contain names from all counties in the District and that when drawn from that wheel jurors must appear before the clerk for execution of a qualification questionnaire. For a juror to travel to Omaha from Scottsbluff and return would require a minimum of 2 days time with attendance fees of $20.00 per day, plus subsistence at $16.00 per day, plus mileage at 10 cents per mile on a roundtrip of 446 miles, making the grand total of expense incurred for the execution of that questionnaire a minimum of $161.20! But if consideration of cost is not enough to discourage such a procedure, the discomfiture inflicted upon the prospective jurors should. What conscientious individual who is busily occupied in the daily affairs of making a living would appreciate the inconvenience and loss of time imposed upon him in the making of such a lengthy trip for the sole purpose of completing such a form?

This bill also eliminates the provisions of present Section 1863 of Title 18 which permit the Court by order to exclude from service such groups of persons as doctors, nurses, pharmacists, clergymen, morticians, etc. It ought not be difficult for anyone to imagine the inconvenience and complications which would arise if the courts attempt to compel such groups of people to serve as jurors. The public interest simply compels their exclusion.

A casual reading of the bill is sufficient to reveal the tremendous volume of record keeping which this legislation would impose upon administrative machinery which in some districts is already burdened to the point of frustration. Consider the man-hours and the record flow required to collect and list the thousands of names required for the master wheel, to list again the names drawn therefrom, to summons them in for execution of the questionnaire, to assist in the filling in of the information to be requested on the form, to voucher the payment of fees, to note the failures to appear, to note the grounds of disqualification, to make a listing of names inserted in the qualification wheel, to make a drawing from the qualification wheel, to list again the names so drawn, to summon them for duty, to keep the records for the detailed challenging procedure provided for, to keep track of those persons excused for up to 6 months time, to note the reasons for excuse or exclusion from service,—there seems no end to the morass of records which this legislation would either compel or encourage to be accumulated and preserved.

It is apparent that Title I of S. 3296 seeks to assure nondiscrimination in selection of individuals for service on federal juries. But, certainly no one can deny that the law of the land already unmistakably forbids purposeful discrimination in the selection of persons for duty upon federal juries. We are not aware of any present lack of machinery to enforce that law or accomplish its purpose. It is even suggested that existing civil rights legislation probably subjects the clerk and the jury commissioner to liability in damages if they practice discrimination in the performance of their duties. Therefore it would seem that the present machinery ought not to be tampered with unless some more cogent reason can be established which demonstrates a need for change.

One thought is important, I think, in considering the ultimate effect of this proposed legislation. The right to trial by jury does not mean the right to have ignorance, stupidity, mediocrity, or indecision predominate in the make-up of the jury. This bill, in its obsession to provide minute rules to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, etc., takes no account of the need of our judicial system to have serving upon its juries citizens, selected to be sure without discrimination, but who are also known to be honest, fair-minded, of good reputation, and of sufficient capability to enable them to make decisions and thus render creditable jury service. I submit that a lesser standard can not foster the integrity of the courts nor command reliance upon the operation of the adversary system of jurisprudence as we presently know it.

Additionally, the courts in this 20th century have the same need for simplification of procedure, streamlining of administrative machinery, and utilization of modern technics as is required of any other activity. The ever increasing load of work must be discharged, and I know of no other circumstance that can contribute more directly to paralysis in judicial administration than the temptation to become involved in excessive and useless record keeping.

When I was prevailed upon to leave the active practice of law and accept appointment to my present position we embarked upon a program of modernization which has enabled us to reduce the size of the staff by 20% and yet handle a 50% larger volume of litigation. Our experience convinces us that there is a need constantly to pursue a course of positive and imaginative action in the administration of the courts' record keeping processes. Time and personnel limitations and the necessity for efficiency compels the elimination of all record making which fails to accomplish a purpose commensurate with the effort expended in its creation. This proposed legislation defeats that goal and I find it difficult to be restrained in my opposition to it.

Finally, for your consideration, but with no advocacy to impose our system on any other district, I attach hereto as a separate document a description of the jury selection machinery now in use in the District of Nebraska.

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD C. PECK,
Clerk, U.S. District Court,
District of Nebraska.

STATEMENT BY MICHAEL KELLER, JR., CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY WITH RESPECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE I OF SENATE BILL 3296, JULY 27, 1966

Senator ERVIN forwarded the Bill to Chief Judge Madden and requested his comments. He referred it to me for comment on those portions which would affect the office of the clerk. Among my comments, which were transmitted by Judge Madden to Senator ERVIN, was a suggestion that it might be helpful to the Committee to obtain the viewpoints of a number of clerks. As a result, I was invited to appear before the Committee.

Although some of my remarks may apply to other clerks, I can only speak for my own office. From conversations with many clerks at annual conferences of the Federal Court Clerks Association, I know there are many different systems in use. I think we shall all welcome a proposal which will provide a degree of uniformity. However, I believe some of the provisions of the Bill may substantially increase the duties of many clerks who are already over-extended with available personnel and we hope it may be possible to suggest changes which will lessen the workload without any substantive change in the purposes of the Bill.

It may be helpful to describe the system presently in use in New Jersey, where we have used voting registration lists as our primary source for many years. New Jersey is one District without divisions and with three places of holding court: Camden, Newark and Trenton. Judges are permanently stationed in each city. Separate jury boxes are maintained at each place and we have two Jury Commissioners. Each of the three places uses the seven most contiguous counties of the twenty-one in the state. Initially, it was determined that we should draw from each county in the same proportion as that country bore to the total number of registered voters in the seven counties. With the consent of the Court and the Jury Commissioners, the clerk performs all the preliminary ministerial duties. Each tenth name is taken from various lists—there are usually dozens for each county. A standard questionnaire furnished by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is mailed to each person so selected. Upon the return of the completed questionnaire, it is examined by personnel of the clerk's office to determine whether the prospective juror is *legally qualified.* If he is found to be, a 2″ x 4″ card is prepared with his name, address, occupation; and, in the case of a married woman, the occupation of her husband. These cards are filed by county, not alphabetical, in special small file cabinets and become what we call our Jury Pool of legally qualified jurors. In the three offices, there is usually a total of at least 6,000 names in the pool. When the Court directs that a grand jury be drawn or the clerk determines petit jurors are needed, the clerk and Jury Commissioner remove from our jury pool, by county on a percentage basis, as many cards as will be required and place them in a drum or wheel from which jurors are drawn as provided by statute. A smaller number are drawn for a grand jury as only 23 will be selected. For petit jury service, we usually draw 300–500 at Camden and Trenton, and 2,000–3,000 at Newark. The names are placed on mimeographed lists *in the order drawn* and the other information from the 2″ x 4″ cards added. Jurors are summoned from the list as needed. The lists usually last at least a year. Those portions of the list which contain the jurors of a particular trial panel are furnished to counsel *at the time of trial* for use on the voir dire.

Section 1864(b) requires that there be a master jury wheel which shall contain at least 1% of the total number of persons on voter registration lists for the district or division. Although I shall later point out that I believe a "master wheel" is not necessary at this point in the jury selection procedures, I shall discuss its effect. As of November, 1965, there were 3,151,599 registered voters in our district. We would be required to place a total of 31,516 names in our three wheels. Since "names" must be "placed" to be later drawn publicly, (Section 1865(a)), for purposes of personal appearance to complete a questionnaire, it follows that individual cards, capsules, etc., must be prepared for each name. This imposes a new and heavy burden on a clerk's office. Assuming this procedure remains in the Bill, it is believed the purposes of it could be served with a reduced number. There were less than 2200 jurors used in New Jersey in fiscal year 1966. On the basis of a two-year life of a master wheel, (Section 1864(f)), we would require about 4400 jurors from it. It is suggested that it would be ample if the master wheel be required to contain double the number of jurors who were *summoned* for service during the previous two fiscal years, with the proviso that the wheel could be supplemented from the same source of registration lists if required. In addition, I would eliminate any minimum requirement such as 2,000, (Section 1864(b)). There are some places of holding court with their own jury boxes where a very small number of jurors are used. I would also eliminate the requirement that the master wheel contain 1% of the total number of persons *of voting age* if sources in addition to registration lists are used, as permitted in Par. (a) of this section. This would be applicable if a Jury Commissioner furnished one name. In lieu thereof, there could be a requirement that the master wheel must at all times have deposited therein at least 90% of its total from registration lists.

As indicated above, though the framers of the Bill may have had some purpose which is not clear to me, I do not see the necessity of having a master wheel into which the jury commission must place the 1% of names and from which the jury commission shall draw names for possible later qualification. I assume "jury commission" includes the Jury Commissioner. In most instances, they are civic leaders and others with some standing in the community. It seems to me that it is reducing the stature of a Jury Commissioner to a pretty low level to ask him to sit down to check off over 30,000 names, or even 15,000 if the clerk selects half, only for the purpose of preparing a list from which some qualified jurors will be found. Under present 28 USC 1864, the only "drawing" by a Jury Commissioner is from qualified jurors for the purpose of obtaining panels of grand or petit jurors for actual service. It is suggested that the similar proposal in Section 1866(c) of the Bill be the only drawing in which he is required to participate.

In lieu of the "master jury wheel", I believe it would be sufficient for the clerk to work from the registration lists—striking names in whatever random method is authorized. In lieu of any percentage figures, such as 1%, in using the lists, I suggest that he use the lists as and when required and that a percentage figure be applied to the jury pool or wheel which will contain those found to be qualified. It could be required that 90% of those shall have been obtained from the voting registration lists.

In my original comments to Chief Judge Madden, which were transmitted to Senator ERVIN, I misinterpreted Section 1865(a) in connection with the appearance of each prospective juror before the clerk to complete a questionnaire. I had erroneously thought that each person in the master wheel must so appear. At the thought of 31,516 interviews, I had started checking the retirement statutes to determine my eligibility. Actually, only those drawn from the wheel must appear. However, considering the fact that we use about 2,200 jurors a year and a certain number interviewed will be found not qualified, this provision still presents a formidable task. I know that some districts have used this procedure for years; notably, the Southern District of New York. I assume that such districts have obtained the personnel to do this. I believe most of the districts which have not followed such a procedure would require additional deputy clerks. I can see some advantages of a personal interview; particularly, where the jury commission may base its acceptance of a juror on more than legal qualifications. However, if a questionnaire is to be used to determine only *legal* qualifications, as is done in New Jersey and many other districts, in most cases this can be determined from the questionnaire received by mail. It is true that the response to mail requests is less than to a summons to appear with sanctions for failure to appear. But, with over 3,000,000 registered voters, we do not expect to exhaust the supply. If the Declaration of Policy, (Section 1861), is to give all persons "the opportunity to serve", such opportunity is given when we mail a questionnaire. It is a question of balance between the possible advantages of personal interview and the time and added personnel which it requires. I would prefer that it be made optional.

Although it has no bearing on the effect of the Bill on the operation of a clerk's office, I wish to add a comment on the requirement that a prospective juror appear at the clerk's office. There is now no statutory provision for any payment to such persons where the system is in use. I see none in the proposed Bill. It is suggested that a person so summoned should be compensated with the same per diem and mileage as one summoned for jury service.

The present Title 28 USC 1867 requires the clerk to prepare the summons when a juror is directed to appear for jury duty and deliver it to the U.S. Marshal for service—personally or by certified mail. I do not recall when any such service was made "personally", though it may be required in an emergency. Unless I have over-looked it in the Bill, I see no reference to the summoning of jurors for service. From personal experience, we receive reports of non-delivery, etc., from the Marshal at a time so late that it is difficult for us to anticipate what the total appearances of jurors may be, so that we may determine whether more should be summoned. It is suggested that any provision for the issuance of summons should provide that they be mailed by the clerk by certified mail; and, when required, personal service be made by the Marshal.

Another reference to the Bill which does not concern the operation of the clerk's office is the fee to be paid to a Jury Commissioner. Neither of our two Jury Commissioners reside in any of the three cities where they have performed their duties. The present $5.00 per diem has often not even covered train fare. Although the Bill has raised the per diem to $16.00, I suggest that they be placed on the same level as jurors and be allowed 10¢ per mile for travel when their duties are performed in cities in which they neither reside nor have their place of business.

Another such reference relates to the frequency of service. The present 28 USC 1869 provides that a petit juror may be *challenged* if he served within one year prior to the challenge. The proposed Section 1869(b) limits service within the two-year life of the "master jury wheel". In New Jersey, unless by accident, we do not call a juror for service if he has already served in our court. Both the Court and attorneys have expressed the opinion that repeated service by a juror often removes him from his fact-finding function and he becomes a lawyer. There would be less likelihood of having repeaters if the two year period of selection was extended—whatever method of selection is finally adopted.

In Section 104 of Title I, the Bill provides that Sections 101 and 103 become effective 120 days after enactment. In the past, it has taken a few weeks just to obtain the registration lists from our 21 counties—and many clerks will have far more counties. State clerks request time to assemble the lists; and because of the usual weight and bulk, require that they be picked up. All clerks will be required to "start from scratch". The amount of time required will vary, depending on the size of the district and whether this will be an entirely new or partially new system. It is suggested that a six month period be allowed. Depending on when the Bill is enacted, it may be possible to fix a six month period after the next General Election, thus giving clerks an opportunity to obtain the latest registration lists.

Chief Judge Madden has requested that I include the following matter in this statement to supplement comments he previously furnished to Senator Ervin.

Section 1869 relates to exclusion from jury service. In (a) (1) and (2), the only exclusion permitted is for one peremptorily challenged by law and one found to be unable to render impartial jury service or that his jury service would disrupt the proceedings. The present 28 USC 1863(b) is as follows:

"(b) Any class or group of persons may, for the public interest, be excluded from the jury panel or excused from service as jurors by order of the district judge based on a finding that such jury service would entail undue hardship, extreme inconvenience or serious obstruction or delay in the fair and impartial administration of justice."

Over the years, we found that many jurors far removed by distance from the place of holding court did not have personal or expeditious common carrier facilities to attend. It did entail undue hardship and extreme inconvenience to such jurors. Invariably, such jurors sought and received an excuse from service. After making certain that it would not interfere with the requirement that jurors represent every economic and social group without regard to sex, race, color or religion, the Court adopted a Standing Order limiting the distance from which jurors should be summoned. Chief Judge Madden has suggested that a similar provision be incorporated in the Bill to permit a Court to take care of situations which may exist in a district or division.

Respectfully submitted.

Michael Keller, Jr.

Statement of Gilbert C. Earl, Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, Prepared for Presentation on July 27, 1966, Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights

I am pleased to be honored by your kind invitation to comment on the technical aspects of Title I of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, S. 3296.

As a result of my many years of experience with the jury selection process in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, I am greatly encouraged to know that the Congress of the United States is considering proposed legislation to strengthen the federal laws pertaining to this vital part of our American system of justice. Many of the federal court clerks have been hopeful that the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States for enactment of new laws to make the jury system more effective would meet with success in Congress.

Before directing my observations to the proposed legislation, which is the subject of this hearing, I consider it germane to the problems here involved to make a brief statement as to the difficulties encountered by federal jury commissions under present law. Faced with the lack of statutory guidelines as to an acceptable system of jury selection, and cognizant of the many directives arising out of decisions of the courts affecting jury selection generally, the federal jury commissioners are faced with an extremely difficult task in order to perform their duties and fulfill the responsibilities of their office. For example, the commissioners must operate without the aid of direct subpoena authority or investigative assistance. Furthermore, they must look to the overworked staff of the clerks' offices for assistance since they do not have any clerical assistants of their own. Any jury selection system which is adopted is highly vulnerable to challenge through legal procedures available to competent counsel; hence, it is necessary for the commissioners to perform their time-consuming function with extreme caution.

A careful examination of Title I of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 leads me to the conclusion that this legislation, as drafted, has many virtues. However, I consider there are serious problems in the present draft of the proposed legislation. Should S. 3296 be enacted into law in its present form, it will require the services of a full-time jury commission, adequately staffed, in almost every district in order to make the provisions of the Act operative. In my opinion, criminal cases would move to disposition much more slowly than at present. And it would impede progress substantially in disposing of the large volume of civil litigation confronting the courts. Much of the time of the judges would be required to hear the endless motions brought on to challenge the jury selection procedures in effect, litigation instituted to compel compliance with subsection (d) of Section 1864, special proceedings brought by counsel in behalf of jurors under summons in an attempt to prove by evidentiary hearing that their service would result in an "unusually severe hardship" [Section 1869], and proceedings instituted pursuant to the provisions of the other Titles of the Act.

In the absence of certain safeguards, this proposed legislation offers momentous problems for the clerks' offices. Unless salaried jury commissioners are provided who are able to devote full time to the duties of their office, armed with the necessary clerical assistance, or unless provisions are made for a sizeable increase in the staff of the clerks' offices, the other services rendered by the latter offices will be impaired severely. It will mean that *every* non-statutory function will have to be dispensed with until sufficient relief is obtained.

For the sake of making my testimony more specific, I wish to call your attention to certain sections of Title I. Section 1864, subsection (b), provides that "The jury commission shall place in the master wheel the names of at least 1 per centum of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists for the district or division . . ." In Connecticut, we have upwards of 1,500,000 registered voters [1,347,206 on the registration lists on August 31, 1965]. This would mean that this number of people would have to be considered by the jury commission in making its random selection of names in accordance with the guidelines established by the chief judge of the district as provided in subsection (c). As a result, approximately 15,000 names, selected at random, would then be required to be placed in the master jury wheel. Before commencing the arduous task of handling this phase of the selection process, however, the jury commission would be compelled to negotiate with 169 officials of the various municipalities in order to obtain access to the voter registration lists. Incidentally, these completed lists would not be available until after election day on the even-numbered years; hence, it would be impracticable to attempt to obtain copies of such lists [or makes copies thereof, if required] and thereafter complete the process of emptying and refilling the master jury wheel between November 15 and December 31 of the same year.

If this section is to remain in the proposed Act, I would strongly urge that subsection (d) be amended to provide that all State, local, and Federal officials having custody, possession, or control of voter registration lists or other appropriate records be required to certify and transmit a copy of such completed lists to the district court in that jurisdiction on or before December 15th of each even-numbered year or at such other appropriate time as may be determined. [It might be well to consider further whether or not a nominal fee should be paid to the appropriate agency or official for services rendered in performing this statutory service.] Subsection (f) could then be amended to provide for emptying and refilling the master jury wheel during the first three months of the succeeding calendar year. This should provide adequate time within which to complete the mechanical operation involved.

I propose an amendment to one part of subsection (b) of this section which reads as follows:

"(b) The jury commission shall place in the master wheel the names of at least 1 per centum of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists for the district or division. . . ."

My suggestion would be to reduce the minimum percentage of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists whose names go into the master jury wheel from 1 per centum to one-half of 1 per centum. The final number of persons available for jury duty under this arrangement should serve the needs of the courts and at the same time lessen the burden placed on the jury commission. The smaller number of names in the master jury wheel would be representative of the qualified citizenry residing in the geographical areas comprising the district or division.

Referring next to Section 1865 (Drawing of names from the master wheel), I propose that consideration be given to amending a portion of the second sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Each person whose name is drawn, . . . shall appear before the Clerk and fill out a juror qualification form to be prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States".

You will observe that this suggestion contemplates substitution of the "Judicial Conference of the United States" for the "Attorney General". This recommendation is made on the theory that the sole authority for prescribing the juror qualification form should rest with the Judicial Branch of the Government.

In passing, I should like to make this limited comment on Section 1866 (Qualifications for jury service), as proposed. Inasmuch as the voter registration lists are to be the principal source for obtaining the names of prospective jurors, it occurs to me that consideration should be given to amending this section to require that only those persons who have become voters are qualified for jury service. Otherwise, the very system of jury selection proposed in this Act would be discriminatory against non-voters. As you know, the Courts have held generally that any system of jury selection in effect which systematically excludes any group or class of citizens is invalid.

Turning next to Section 1867 (Challenging compliance with selection procedures), I would respectfully suggest that it be amended to require a movant to make a showing of *probable cause* by affidavit or otherwise before being entitled to present, in support of his motion to dismiss an indictment or stay his proceedings, the testimony of the jury commission. Since it is contemplated that such motions may be filed in any case, prior to the introduction of evidence at trial, there will be a large volume of matters of this nature brought on for hearing. Unless the jury commissioners are insulated to some extent against the routine motions, they will spend a substantial portion of their time on the witness stand in Court while counsel conduct a "fishing expedition" into their methods and practices of jury selection. [Needless to say, these types of motions will require a large amount of the time of the courts to hear and decide them.] I can assure you that unless some safeguards are provided in this area the Court will never find a competent jury commissioner who will accept appointment for the allowable compensation of $16.00 per day.

Lastly, I wish to call attention to a practical problem which will result if Section 1869 (Exclusion from jury service) is enacted in its present form. Since old Section 1863 (Exclusion or excuse from service) is to be repealed, the Court is left with very little discretion to excuse a juror for good cause shown. The judges will be engaged for hours on many Court days adjudicating claims of jurors demanding that they be excused on the ground of "unusually severe hardship". It seems to me that in many instances the Court will be required to take evidence and make findings before deciding whether the prospective juror has met the statutory test. Questions such as these will be presented:

(1) Should a doctor be excused from jury duty unless it is demonstrated affirmatively that his absence will work an unusually severe hardship on his patients?

(2) Should a school teacher be excused from jury duty unless a showing is made that her absence from the schoolroom will work an unusually severe hardship on her pupils?

(3) Should a lawyer be excused from jury duty unless a showing is made that his inability to meet his Court assignments will result in an unusually severe hardship on his clients and the Courts involved?

(4) Should a mother of small children be excused from jury duty unless it is demonstrated affirmatively that her absence from home would result in an unusually severe hardship upon the children?

(5) Should a clergyman be excused from jury duty unless it is demonstrated affirmatively that his absence would result in an unusually severe hardship on the members of his parish?

(6) Should a mortician with a one-man establishment be excused from jury duty upon the showing that he does not have anyone to substitute for him in his absence and that it would work an unusually severe hardship on the families of the deceased?

(7) Should an owner of a one-man business be excused from jury duty on the ground of unusually severe hardship unless he demonstrates affirmatively that the closing of his business establishment will result in his financial ruin?

In view of these practical problems, I would recommend that Section 1869 be amended to give the Court discretion to excuse a juror for *good cause* rather than upon a *showing of unusually severe hardship.*

Respectfully submitted.

GILBERT EARL.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD W. ANDERSON, CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, TO THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman, I am Harold W. Anderson and serve as Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington, which position I have held since April 1959. I also serve as a U.S. Commissioner and am Vice-President of the Federal Court Clerks' Association. I am an attorney and have been a member of the Washington State Bar since 1928.

As requested in your invitation to me to testify before this Subcommittee, my comments are directed to the technical aspects of Title I of S. 3296, relating to jury selection and other purposes.

§ 1863—I believe the proposed change in compensation for the jury commissioner from $5.00 to $16.00 per day is a step in the right direction. In my District the two jury commissioners who serve in the two Divisions of our court, are and their predecessors have been prominent business or professional men. The $16.00 proposed, of course, would not be compensatory. Such compensation is not adequate unless the work of a jury commissioner is considered to be a public service. I recommend a jury commissioner be paid $25.00 per day together with mileage at 10 cents per mile and subsistence of $16.00 per day, when transacting official business away from his official station.

§ 1864(b)—The proposal that the jury commission place in the master wheel the names of at least 1 per centum of the total number of persons listed on the voter registration lists for the district or division, would be extremely burdensome, time consuming, expensive and unnecessary. The registered voters in the Northern Division of our court, which comprises six counties, totalled 756,272 persons in 1964. In the Southern Division of our court, which comprises 10 counties, there were 343,705 registered voters in 1964. This would mean that the jury commission would have to obtain the names and addresses of 7,562 persons in the Northern Division and 3,437 in the Southern Division. Considering the fact that in a two-year period we would only use up 900 names in the Northern Division and 650 names in the Southern Division for jury service, it is readily apparent that we would needlessly be obtaining thousands of names.

If in addition to the selection of names from the voter registration lists, it should be required that we obtain the names of 1 per centum of the total number of persons of voting age residing in the district or division according to the most recent decennial census, this would mean that we would have to obtain the names and addresses of 7,638 persons in the Northern Division (based on the 1960 census of voting age persons of 763,820); in the Southern Division of our court we would have to obtain the names and addresses of 4,009 persons (based on the 1960 census of voting age persons of 400,928). In our District we obtain most of the names from the voter registration lists, however, we always obtain some names from other sources such as key men and public officials in outlying communities, together with a few names selected at random from telephone books and city directories.

I do not agree that the jury commission should place in the master wheel the names of a least 2,000 persons. This figure would certainly vary by districts throughout the country. In the Northern Division of our District, our experience has proven that 1,800 names will last on an average of three years; in the Southern Division of our District, a list of 1,300 names will also last on an average of three years. I would recommend that no minimum number be required and the following portion of the present §1864 be retained:

"The names of grand and petit jurors shall be publicly drawn from a box containing the names of not less than three hundred qualified persons at the time of each drawing.

"The jury box shall from time to time be refilled by the clerk of court, or his deputy, and a jury commissioner, appointed by the court."

This would leave it up to the discretion and the requirements of each district court.

§1864(f)—I fail to see the necessity of requiring the master wheel to be emptied and refilled every two years, and to do this between November 15 and December 31 of each even-numbered year. I would recommend that the portion of the existing statute, as above quoted, be retained and leave the time of refilling the box within the discretion and requirements of each district court.

§1865(a)—After the master jury wheel has been filled with the number of names directed by the court, I see no necessity of having the jury commissioner participate in the ministerial act of drawing the names of persons to whom jury qualification forms or questionnaires are to be sent. Nor, do I see why it is necessary to have the prospective jurors appear before the clerk and fill out the juror qualification forms. This is presently done in our court by mail. Why bother a citizen to come into the clerk's office perhaps a distance of 200 miles to fill out this form where it could just as well be done in his home and be returned by mail. I do not believe the form should elicit the race or religion of the person, both of which are certainly immaterial to his serving as a juror.

§ 1866(c)—I agree that the jury commission should place the names of persons determined to be qualified as jurors in the qualified juror wheel, however, I would recommend that the clerk maintain and have custody of the wheel. Also, to meet the requirement that the drawing of names be done publicly, I would recommend that the drawing be made in a court room in the presence of a judge and a court reporter, so that a record would be made of the number and names and addresses of the persons drawn for jury duty. The preparation of lists of the names of persons assigned to each grand and petit jury panel should be prepared by the clerk, and I would recommend that the words, "Jury commission or the," be stricken from the last sentence of this subsection.

§ 1867(a)—In my opinion this subsection invites an additional defense tactic that has nothing to do in defense of the crime for which the defendant is on trial, and would be used in many cases merely for purposes of delay. Even though the jury commission had properly complied with sections 1864, 1865, and 1866, the commission would be put on trial by the defense.

§ 1867(b)—In my opinion this subsection would penalize the litigants for the possible misfeasance or malfeasance of the jury commission. I would recommend that in lieu of subsections (a) and (b) the clerk and/or the jury commissioner be held penally liable for failure to comply with sections 1864, 1865, or 1866 of this title, and upon conviction thereof, may be fined not more than $500.00 for misfeasance in office; or upon conviction of malfeasance in office, may be fined not more than $2,000.00 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

§ 1867(c)—Consistent with my comments as to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, I would recommend that the first sentence of subsection (c) be stricken.

§ 1867(d)—Consistent with my comments as to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, I would recommend that this subsection be changed to permit examination of records or papers only in connection with possible investigation and prosecution of the clerk and/or jury commissioner for misfeasance or malfeasance in office.

§ 1869—If a peremptory challenge is exercised against any juror in a particular case, I fail to see the necessity of requiring that challenge being noted on the juror's qualification form. In a jury term, a juror might possibly be peremptorily challenged several times. Is it contemplated that each one of these challenges be noted, and for what reason? All members of this Subcommittee who are attorneys know that no reason has to be given for a peremptory challenge. Also, any record keeping in connection with this subsection in my opinion, should be done by the clerk and not by the jury commissioner. The jury commissioner does not usually office in the same building as the clerk, and in many instances maintains his office a considerable distance away, and it would prove extremely burdensome upon the jury commissioner to have to come to the clerk's office on almost a daily basis.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD W. ANDERSON.

HOW THE SUPREME COURT IS CHANGING THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the very popular and dependable publication, U.S. News & World Report, in its June 20, 1966, issue, presented an article titled "In the 13th Year of the 'Warren Revolution'—How Supreme Court Is Changing United States."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD, together with a related article which appeared in the same issue, titled "Some Criticisms of the Court."

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IN THE 13TH YEAR OF THE "WARREN REVOLUTION"—HOW SUPREME COURT IS CHANGING UNITED STATES

(Sweeping changes in the habits and customs of the nation have been brought about by "judicial activism" of the Warren Court in recent years.

(Federal judges have ventured into controversial areas affecting millions. Examples: education, religion, race relations, morals, politics, subversion, States' rights, and law enforcement.

(However, many issues remain unsettled, such as de facto segregation in schools and housing. Now, with crime and lawlessness mounting in the country, questions are being asked.

(Is it time to moderate the trend of judicial change in America? Here is the dramatic story of what has occurred in the "Warren Revolution.")

In the thirteenth year of what is being called the "Warren Revolution," it now appears that Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, and the Supreme Court over which he presides may be inclined to slow the rapid tempo of court-directed changes in America.

On May 18, speaking to the American Law Institute in Washington, the Chief Justice exhibited misgivings about the growth of "federalism" in the country, and a withering of State and local responsibility in the field of law enforcement.

Referring to new civil-rights bills pending in Congress to change the manner of selecting juries—mostly aimed at considerations of race, sex, or color—Mr. Warren expressed concern lest some "ill advised" legislation might be enacted.

Some of these bills, he said, "go a long way, and would radically change the relationship between our federal and State governments."

There are other indications that the Supreme Court may be pausing to consider the consequences of some of its edicts, in particular a series of recent decisions striking blows at law-enforcement procedures.

At the same time, the Court has ventured into broad new fields, where many questions remain unsettled, including race relations; *de facto* segregation in the schools, in homes, in jobs, and at social events; censorship of allegedly obscene books, magazines, and movies; the rights of suspected criminals against the police, and the role of television in the courts of the nation.

The upheaval in America that started in 1954 under the Warren Court has been characterized by legal scholars as the most "daring and revolutionary" period of "judicial activism" in constitutional history.

The judiciary has intervened in the most controversial areas, dealing with such things as education, religion, morals, politics, citizenship, suffrage, passports, the postal power, sedition and subversion, communications, labor-management relations, and local law and order.

A record of dissent: With exception of the decisions in the school-segregation cases, which were unanimous, most of the major decisions of the Warren Court have been with sharply dissenting opinions, often in 5-to-4 or 6-to-3 divisions among the nine Justices.

Never in any year has the degree of unanimity among the Justices reached as high as half the cases decided by the Court with written opinions.

The number of unanimous opinions on the bench has ranged from a low of 23 per cent of all full-opinion decisions in 1959–60, to a high of 42 per cent in 1963–64, according to an annual compilation by "The Harvard Law Review."

Yet the actions of the Court have influenced the daily lives of almost all Americans including more than 50 million schoolchildren and their parents; 20 million Negroes; millions of businessmen and union members; millions of churchgoers; members of Congress and State legislatures; thousands of federal, State and local-government employes; the apparatus of the Communist Party, and an untold legion of the criminal underworld.

The Supreme Court has waited until the closing day of its term each year to hand down decisions in some of the most difficult and controversial cases.

Here are some the most significant areas of judicial activity by the Warren Court:

RACE RELATIONS

Starting with the epochal school-desegregation decree of 1954, the "Warren Revolution" began in the universal field of race relations, aimed at bringing about equality among the races.

Subsequently, in one case after another, the Court knocked down racial barriers in transportation, "peaceful demonstrations," registration and voting, boxing matches as well as other athletic or entertainment events, and access to public accommodations such as hotels, motels, bars, restaurants, parks, playgrounds, theaters, swimming pools, beaches and golf courses.

Meanwhile, new federal laws advancing and protecting Negro rights were passed by Congress in 1957, 1960, 1964 and 1965, with additional legislation now being considered.

Last year the Supreme Court quickly upheld the 1964 Civil Rights Act as a valid exercise of congressional power to regulate interstate commerce; knocked down Virginia's poll tax under the new 24th Amendment; and threw out, by a 5-to-4 decision, trespass convictions of Negro "sit-in" demonstrators which had occurred before the 1964 Civil Rights Act became law.

Where Court is silent: The Court has never ruled, however, on the fundamental question of whether State and local government is required not only to abstain from segregation, but to promote affirmatively racial integration in schools, housing, hospitals, employment and other areas.

Nor was the Court willing to hear an appeal by Negroes who claimed that they were discriminated against by a labor union in employment and seniority.

Schools remain largely segregated in Northern suburbs, and many areas of the South. Integration, so called, is token. The flight of white populations to the suburbs in the North has, in fact, increased *de facto* segregation in the central cities.

The big question now: Will the Court, using judicial power, try to force "integration"—balancing schools by racial quotas, forcing children to be bused long distances to mix the races in schools, breaking up suburban neighborhoods, knocking down the lines of political jurisdiction that separate the suburbs from the central cities?

SUBVERSION

In a series of split decisions in 1956 and 1957, the Court curbed federal and State action aimed at Communist subversive activities.

Sedition laws of 42 States were invalidated on the ground that the Federal Government had "pre-empted" this field with the 1940 Smith Act, making it a crime to advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Federal convictions of alleged Communists were overturned; investigating powers of Congress and State legislatures were restricted; an act of Congress to bar "security risks" from Government jobs was held not to apply to "nonsensitive" positions.

The Court in 1951, under Fred M. Vinson as Chief Justice, upheld Smith Act convictions of 10 top Communists. The Warren Court in 1957 revoked convictions of 14 "second string" Communists under the same law. Recently, the Warren Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, held unconstitutional as a "bill of attainder" a section of the 1959 Labor-Management Act prohibiting any person from serving as a union official who had been a member of the Communist Party at any time during five preceding years.

The Vinson Court in 1950 sustained against a bill-of-attainder attack a section of the 1947 Taft-Hartley law, denying access to the National Labor Relations Board for unions whose officers refused to sign non-Communist affidavits.

Communist mail freed: Last year, in another 5-to-4 decision, the Supreme Court overruled a section of the 1962 Postal Act authorizing the Postmaster General to detain and destroy mail determined to be "Communist propaganda."

The Post Office Department had argued that it should not have to subsidize distribution of mail from Communist countries which refuse to sign reciprocal agreements to deliver American political literature.

More than 70 bills were introduced in Congress between 1956 and 1958 to undo various Court decisions. These bills included House bill HR 3, aimed at ending the "judge-made" doctrine of "pre-emptive federalism."

The latter measure was endorsed in principle by the American Bar Association, the Governors' Conference, and the National Association of Attorneys General. The chief justices of the 48 States in 1958 adopted, 36 to 8, a resolution condemning the U.S. Supreme Court for making hasty decisions "without proper judicial restraint," and with acting as a "policy maker" in national affairs.

PASSPORTS

Asserting jurisdiction over the passport authority of the executive branch, the Court held, 5 to 4, in 1958 that the State Department could not withhold passports from suspected Communists because of their "beliefs or associations."

By a 6-to-3 vote in 1964, a section of the Subversive Activities Control Act was held unconstitutional because it might prevent "innocent members" of the Communist Party from going abroad for "innocent purposes."

In 1965, however, the Court upheld, 6 to 3, a ban on travel to Castro's Cuba under the 1952 Immigration and Nationality law. This case was distinguished from previous rulings on the ground that it did not inhibit "freedom of expression or associations."

Government security agencies contend they have been hampered in the investigation, control, and restriction of movement of subversive agents by various Court rulings.

RELIGION

The Supreme Court closed its term in 1962 by holding that recitation of an optional, nondenominational devotional known as the "Regents' Prayer" was unconstitutional in New York public schools under the "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment. The next year, the Court banned reading of Bible passages and the Lord's Prayer as devotionals in public schools of Pennsylvania and Maryland.

More than 150 resolutions were introduced in Congress to reverse the edicts, Governors, mayors, and State legislatures sent petitions calling for a constitutional amendment.

Belief-in-God ruling: In 1961 the Court held that a public official cannot be required to take an oath affirming his belief in God. The same year, the tribunal upheld "Sunday closing laws" in various States.

Last year, in three separate cases, the jurists gave a lenient interpretation to a section of the Selective Service Act exempting "conscientious objectors" from military duty where they profess a belief in a Supreme Being.

"The Harvard Law Review" commented:

"The Court has now so broadly construed the test for conscientious objectors that the 'establishment' issue will probably remain dormant until a party who flatly declares that he does not believe in a Supreme Being seeks conscientious-objector classification."

For years the Court avoided coming to grips with Connecticut's 1879 law prohibiting use of birth-control devices. Last year, by a 7-to-2 decision, the Justices found the statute in violation of at least six provisions of the Constitution.

APPORTIONMENT

After 175 years of government, the Supreme Court held in 1962 for the first time—by a 6-to-2 decision in the landmark case of Baker v. Carr—that federal courts have a right and duty to oversee political apportionment of seats in the 50 State legislatures.

Two years later, by 6 to 3, the Court extended its decree to cover apportionment of the House of Representatives in Congress—a co-ordinate branch of the Federal Government.

At the same time, in another 6-to-3 decision, the Justices held that both houses of a State legislature must be based solely on population—"one person, one vote."

The Baker v. Carr edict was widely regarded as overturning a 1946 ruling in which the late Justice Felix Frankfurter said a dispute over congressional districts in Illinois was too political to be "justiciable."

Senate seeks reversal: A majority of the U.S. Senate voted on two occasions—in 1965 and 1966—to reverse the Court, but the resolution failed to muster the two-thirds majority needed for a constitutional amendment.

By mid-May of 1966, according to the Council of State Governments, 37 States had reapportioned one or more houses of their legislatures under court orders.

Twelve other States were in litigation, or awaiting approval, or operating under temporary plans. Minnesota was listed as the only State which had not adopted any "effective plan."

Twenty-seven States, with a total of 258 House seats, had reapportioned congressional districts. No action was expected in other States until after the 1970 census.

In these and other areas, many officials claim States' rights have been eroded by federal-court decisions to a point where State governments are largely pawns and administrative agencies for federal programs such as for schools, hospitals, highways, agriculture and relief.

CENSORSHIP

For some time, the Court has been trying to write a self-executing definition of "obscenity"—which could be applied by State and local censors—to get around "free speech" provisions of the Constitution.

By a 6-to-3 opinion in 1957, the jurists held material dealing with sex is not protected if it is "without redeeming social importance," and "appeals to the prurient interest," or what Justice Potter Stewart later termed "hard-core pornography."

In three cases this year, by 5-to-4 decisions that aroused the ire of "liberals," Chief Justice Warren said that material not otherwise objectionable could be banned if it is advertised and promoted in a lewd way, or in a way that amounts to what he called "pandering."

Justice John M. Harlan pointed out that "no stable approach to the obscenity problem has yet been devised by this Court. . . . I do not see how the Court can escape the task of reviewing obscenity decisions on a case-by-case basis."

"The Wall Street Journal" commented:

"The Supreme Court . . . may be ready for a great new crusade—protecting the nation's morals from corruption by books and magazines and movies."

CRIME

The judiciary today seems inclined to be on the defensive in trying to assure the public that court protection of the "rights" of suspected criminals has not been carried so far as to tip the scales of justice against society as a whole.

Crime on the streets and subways of big cities, public parks unsafe after dark, attacks on women in the business districts or downtown apartment areas—these are symptoms of a national problem, recognized by the White House in a special message to Congress.

Chief Justice Warren told the American Law Institute:

"One matter above all others which we face as a profession, which is of most concern to the American people today, is the problem of crime."

Some critics "take the easy approach of placing the blame for our high rate of crime on our courts and our system of law enforcement," he noted.

Crime, Mr. Warren said, is a problem whose root causes "go deep into the whole fabric of our civilization, and into our moral, social, and economic systems."

Fears arise: Many public officials, nevertheless, are disturbed by the trend of recent Supreme Court decisions which, they think, make it harder for police to make arrests, and easier for criminals to go free on technicalities.

Vincent L. Broderick, former New York police commissioner, told a Northwestern University conference April 29:

"We in law enforcement, and many others throughout the land, are concerned—greatly concerned—with a rising pattern of violent crimes—crime which has grown at a rate far greater than our population. Those in law enforcement are concerned that they retain the means to cope with it. And they see, in recent Supreme Court decisions, inroads or potential inroads upon their capacity."

The Warren Court has expanded its domain over the State judiciary, requiring it to comply with federal rules of procedure, and applying to the States most of the strictures of the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution.

Many authorities feel that the Bill of Rights—the first 10 Amendments—was drafted as a protection against the abuse of autocratic power by the Federal Government, and was not intended by the founders of the Republic to apply to the several States.

Various rulings: In recent years—usually with dissenting opinions—the Supreme Court has held:

States must provide legal counsel and free trial records for all indigent defendants in criminal felony cases. The Court has not yet made it clear at what point in a police inquiry the "right to counsel" obtains, or whether the principle will be extended to misdemeanors.

Suspicion alone is no ground for arresting anyone—even though a suspect may be caught red-handed with incriminating evidence.

A prisoner must be arraigned "without unnecessary delay" in a federal case; any confession obtained in the meanwhile, whether voluntary or not, is inadmissible in court.

The Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination is now applicable to State, as well as federal, criminal proceedings.

In the landmark case of Mapp v. Ohio, in 1961, by a 5-to-4 opinion, the Supreme Court ruled that evidence of a crime obtained contrary to federal standards under the Fourth Amendment's provisions against illegal search and seizure is "inadmissible in a State court."

When it appeared that hundreds of convicts, already serving time, would seek reviews of their cases, the Court in 1965 announced that its Mapp rule would apply "for prospective operation only."

In another 5-to-4 decision, Escobedo v. Illinois, in 1964, the Court held that a confession obtained from a suspect during police interrogation—before he had been accused of a crime—could not be used as evidence, unless the suspect had been warned of his rights and permitted to see his lawyer.

At the Northwestern University conference April 29, Chief Judge Charles S. Desmond of New York State cited Justice White's dissent in the Escobedo case, that the decision appeared to be another step in the goal of barring from evidence "all admissions obtained from an individual suspected of crime, whether involuntarily made or not."

Judge Desmond said the Mapp rule "does not provide any protection for the ordinary average citizen who never needs it. What the rule does is to immure and safeguard the professional criminal, especially the narcotic dealer and gambler.

"It has the everyday practical effect—just as the new rules on confessions—of depriving the public, not just the prosecutors and the police, of reliable, convincing real evidence."

Growth of crime: FBI reports show 2.75 million "serious crimes" occurred in the United States last year, or a 58 per cent increase in the last seven years.

Most of these crimes were committed by "repeaters"—criminals previously arrested for other serious offenses. The great majority are offenses under State laws or municipal ordinances—not the Federal Code. Lawyers say 10 or 15 times as many criminal cases arise in State courts as in federal courts.

Police claim that statements obtained during interrogation of witnesses or suspects are vital to the solution of a majority of all criminal cases.

Michael Murphy, former New York City police commissioner, told the New York District Attorneys Association:

"To arrive at the truth, it is incumbent upon the police to question the suspect in order to obtain necessary evidence, and sometimes—even more importantly—to exonerate him, if the evidence so warrants."

Mr. Broderick said: "The stark fact will always remain that the municipal police officer is called upon to take action alone, on the street, in the face of violently developing situations, without law books, without ready authorities, without legal advice, and quite often in an atmosphere of latent or overt hostility, in which his own life, and that of others, may be in danger."

How taxpayer is affected: Under new Supreme Court rules, the taxpayers are going to have to pay for the legal defense of all indigent defendants in felony cases in both federal and State courts. Court records indicate that 60 per cent of the defendants in criminal cases cannot afford to provide their own lawyers. Many plead guilty, and are sentenced without a jury trial, hoping to obtain clemency from the judge.

The Criminal Justice Act of 1964 provided compensation for court-appointed lawyers in federal cases.

Chief Justice Warren said 12,383 lawyers have been appointed so far by the federal courts. He estimated the total would not exceed 20,000 a year, "unless the statute is amended to cover postconviction proceedings and other cases not now included."

What is the practical effect of all this? A federal judge observed:

"I'm a strong believer in everyone having at least one appeal, a review to make sure there has been no substantial error. But that doesn't mean unlimited reviews of the same case. It's these postconviction jobs that are causing trouble.

"A case goes through all of the appellate procedures. Then the defendant files a habeas corpus, and it starts all over again. He gets another court-appointed counsel, and another free copy of the trial record. Some of these cases come back six or seven times.

"Now we're getting a rash of these State cases. Some of these defendants are guilty as can be. They admit it. But they claim error in the trial, or some other technicality, as a means of getting off. There's no end to it."

That's the record of the "Warren Revolution" affecting race relations, religion, education, crime, morals, politics, citizenship and the Communist conspiracy in America.

Where will it all end? Who knows? But there are indications that the High Court is taking another look at Federal-State relations in the field of law enforcement. Perhaps the new note of caution will extend to other areas as well.

RECORD OF DISSENT

In a 12-year period, 1953 to 1965, the Supreme Court handed down full-opinion decisions in 1,264 major cases.

Of these decisions: 432, or 34.2 per cent, were by unanimous opinion of the Court—832, or 65.8 per cent, were with dissenting opinions by one or more of the nine Justices.

This means: The Warren Court has differed in judgment on nearly two-thirds of all major cases.

Source: "The Harvard Law Review."

WHO'S WHO ON SUPREME COURT

Usually on "liberal" side:

Earl Warren, 75, Chief Justice since 1953; Republican nominee for Vice President in 1948 and candidate for presidential nomination in 1952; former Governor and State attorney general of California, onetime district attorney of Alameda County (Oakland).

Hugo Lafayette Black, 80, Associate Justice since 1937; former "New Deal" Democratic U.S. Senator from Alabama and onetime police-court judge.

William Orville Douglas, 67, Associate Justice since 1939; former Yale law professor and member of Securities and Exchange Commission under President Roosevelt; Democrat; from Washington State.

William Joseph Brennan, Jr., 60, Associate Justice since 1956; former Newark lawyer and judge of the New Jersey State supreme court; Democrat.

Usually on "conservative" side:

Tom C. Clark, 66, Associate Justice since 1949; former U.S. Attorney General under President Truman and Justice Department lawyer during the Roosevelt Administration; Democrat; from Texas.

John Marshall Harlan, 67, Associate Justice since 1955; former Manhattan lawyer and judge of U.S. court of appeals in New York; Republican.

Potter Stewart, 51, Associate Justice since 1958; former Cincinnati lawyer and judge of U.S. court of appeals in Ohio; Republican.

Byron Raymond White, 49, Associate Justice since 1962; Deputy Attorney General under Kennedy; all-American football player at University of Colorado; Democrat.

Newcomer, not yet on record in enough decisions to be identified with either side:

Abe Fortas, 55, Associate Justice since 1965; former Washington lawyer and Under Secretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt "New Deal" regime; Democrat.

SOME CRITICISMS OF THE COURT

Prof. Philip B. Kurland of the University of Chicago law school, 1964:

"The Justices have wrought more fundamental changes in the political and legal structure of the United States than during any similar span of time since the Marshall Court [early in the history of the Republic] . . . .

"First and foremost . . . has been the emerging primacy of equality as a guide to constitutional action. . . . The egalitarian revolution in judicial doctrine has made dominant the principles to be read into the 'equal-protection clause' rather than those that have been read into the 'due-process clause' of the Fourteenth Amendment.

"The second major theme has been the effective subordination, if not the destruction, of the federal system. The two are not disparate, but related notions, for each is a drive toward uniformity and away from diversity. Uniformity cannot exist if there are multiple rulemakers. Therefore, the objective of equality can be achieved only by elimination of authorities not subordinate to central power.

"The third theme . . . is enhancement of judicial dominion at the expense of the power of the other branches of government, national as well as State.

"A fourth element courses through the opinions of the Court . . . the absence of workmanlike product, the absence of right quality."

Prof. Henry M. Hart, Jr., of Harvard law school, 1959:

"It has to be said that too many of the Court's opinions are about what one would expect could be written in 24 hours . . . Few of the Court's opinions—far too few—genuinely illuminate the area of the law with which they deal."

Prof. Alfred H. Kelly of Wayne State University, Detroit, 1965:

"Much of the history that the recent Court has produced is of the law-office variety. It fails to stand up under the most superficial scrutiny by a scholar possessing some knowledge of American constitutional development.

"The present use of history by the Court is a Marxist-type perversion of the relationship between truth and utility. It assumes that history can be rewritten to serve the interests of libertarian idealism."

Prof. Robert G. McCloskey of Harvard University, 1966:

"In some notable cases, the Warren Court has, with more or less frankness, created constitutional rules out of whole cloth. Whether they were 'good' constitutional rules is not here in question. The point is that they were patently judge-made, and modern awareness of this fact may detract from the priestly authority that clothed the Court in the past. . . ."

During the last four terms, "the remarkable extent of the Warren Court's will-to-govern becomes fully manifest. . . . The Justices chipped away at doctrinal roadblocks to a judicially defined good society."

Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard law school, 1960:

"When decisions are too much result-oriented, the law and the public are not well served."

Prof. Robert Braucher of Harvard, 1955:

"The judicial power extends to cases and controversies; it is for Congress and the President to make laws, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and otherwise to administer the Government. . . . Judges are supposed to focus on the case, rather than lawmaking or public administration."

Every Chief Justice in recent years, from Charles Evans Hughes through Harlan Fiske Stone to Fred M. Vinson, has espoused a philosophy of "judicial restraint."

Chief Justice Warren, however, during his years on the Court, has pursued a doctrine of "judicial activism."

Justice Felix Frankfurter commented in 1958:

"It is not the business of this Court to pronounce policy. . . . Self-restraint is of the essence of the judicial oath, for the Constitution has not authorized the judges to sit in judgment on the wisdom of what Congress and the executive branch do."

Justice John M. Harlan, in Mapp v. Ohio, 1961:.

"The Court, in my opinion, has forgotten the sense of judicial restraint which . . . is one element that should enter into deciding whether a past decision of this Court should be overruled."

Justice Frankfurter, in Baker v. Carr, 1962:

"The Court today reverses a uniform course of decisions established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only five years ago.

"Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme."

Justice Harlan, in Reynolds v. Sims, 1964:

". . . No thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases . . . will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the federal judiciary. . . .

"Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional functions of this Court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional 'principle,' and that this Court should 'take the lead' in promoting reform when other branches of government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements."

Justice Hugo Black, in Jackson v. Denno, 1964:

There is no constitutional provision which gives this Court such lawmaking power. . . . I think the New York law here held invalid is in full accord with all guarantees of the Federal Constitution, and that it should not be held invalid by this Court because of a belief that the Court can improve on the Constitution."

Justice Frankfurter, Harlan, and Tom C. Clark, in Konigsberg v. California, 1957:

"What the Court has really done is to simply impose on California its own notions of public policy and judgment. . . .

"Today's decision represents an unacceptable intrusion into a matter of State concern."

Justice Byron White, in Escobedo v. Illinois, 1964:

"The decision is another major step in the direction of the goal which the Court seemingly has in mind—to bar from evidence all admissions obtained from an individual suspected of crime, whether involuntarily made or not.

"Today's decision cannot be squared with other provisions of the Constitution which define the system of criminal justice which this Court is empowered to administer."

Justices Black and Potter Stewart, in Griswold v. Connecticut, 1965, a birth-control case:

"There is no provision of the Constitution which either expressly or implicitly vests power in this Court to sit as a supervisory agency over acts of duly constituted legislative bodies. * * *

"The adoption of such a loose * * * standard for holding laws unconstitutional will amount to a great unconstitutional shift of power to the courts, which * * * will be bad for the courts, and worse for the country."

Justice Harlan, in Hamm v. Rock Hill, 1964:

"The Court holds that these State trespass convictions, occurring before passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, must be set aside by virtue of the federal doctrine of criminal abatement. This remarkable conclusion finds no support in reason or authority. * * *"

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gore in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the pending legislation affecting the airlines strike.

I have participated from the beginning in the deliberations of the Labor Committee on the intricate issues of the dispute and the broad ramifications of congressional intervention.

I am mindful of the fact that the whole American power structure and opinion leadership is almost unanimous in its insistence that Congress "pass a law." It would seem from available evidence that the general public is of the same view.

Nevertheless, I am unable to support this measure. I think the price we will pay for the damage to our collective bargaining system will be far greater than any temporary gain from a politically forced settlement at this juncture.

This is a dramatic dispute. It has caught public attention. It has inconvenienced many people and it has caused many others to suffer economic hardship. This is certainly a matter of genuine concern and we deplore it. Yet, put in perspective the struck airlines account for 3.6 percent of the total intercity passenger miles traveled via the Nation's transportation system and about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total freight movements. Part of this 3.6 percent is being carried now by other airlines, buses, trains, and automobiles. The Secretary of Labor testified last week, and on Monday of this week, that there was not a national crisis in our transportation system.

This is not to say that there is not great public inconvenience and frustration as well as economic damage. The Secretary estimated that the "gross revenues of the entire transportation industry are probably being reduced by about $1 million a day, and the indirect effects we estimate as of about the same order of magnitude." Though important, these direct losses are much smaller than those involved in the New York transit strike, the longshoremen's strike or any major steel or auto strike.

If strikes of this magnitude demand governmental intervention at this stage, where then do we draw the line and what are the implications for the whole system of free collective bargaining? This dispute has not run its full natural course; the opportunities for a negotiated settlement have not been exhausted. When the employees voted down the settlement agreed to by their national leadership, they acted as freemen expressing their honest conviction that the settlement was not fair to them. Honorable men may differ on the question of whether or not it was fair "under all the circumstances"; that is, the status of the economy, the problem of inflation, and many other peripheral implications unrelated to the question of whether he is getting paid a fair return for his labor. If there were no Vietnam and if the economy were not running too hot already, the merits of the employee's position would be viewed more objectively and fairly than it has been.

I oppose congressional intervention now because, as I indicated, the possibilities of settlement have not been exhausted. When it is clear they have been, then Congress may appropriately intervene. Philosophically, it has always been agreed that this kind of intervention should be a matter of last resort.

At our Monday hearing and executive session, I urged a further exploration of settlement possibilities and an early report to the Labor Committee. The main reasons for rejection of the agreement by the employees should be explored and negotiations to resolve the problem should be further pursued. If the cost of resolution is not reasonable, or the parties come to a stalemate, then they should report to the committee. Congress may then act in its discretion. It would be unfortunate to take this step if, in fact, their differences were moderate and reconcilable.

Every time there is a strike of any consequence, there is a wide clamor for someone to "pass a law." If there were any laws that would preserve the free enterprise system, protect individual rights and prevent strikes, they would have been passed long ago. I am sure there is ample room for improvement in our present laws respecting employer-employee relations. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that our system of collective bargaining is superior to any other system in the world. Whatever its cost from time to time, it is a small price to pay to avoid government domination of employer-employee relations. Collective bargaining, for all its faults, tends to reflect the realities. Mutually arrived at agreements are accepted and respected by the parties, while imposed agreements erode sound relationships.

After days of intensive hearings and committee discussions, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the heart of the problem is not really the transportation interruption, nor the genuine merits of the contract dispute but rather the much broader questions of inflation, wage-price guidelines and other contract disputes that will follow this one. This strike is simply the victim of other broad policy considerations. Those "other considerations" are important and had better receive more intensive and creative attention than they have this far. But it must be conceded, I think, that it is somewhat easier for the unaffected observer to view it all with equanimity than it is for the fellow who is appointed to make the sacrifice.

The hard reality is that we are engaged in a major war and are now experiencing the inflationary pressures, dislocations, and inequities that logically follow. This is the first time any country has been rich enough to attempt the production of a major war out of one pocket and a Great Society out of the other.

The result of it all is that prices are going up, profits are soaring to new heights, and the rising cost of living is biting deeply into real wages and fixed incomes. Wage guidelines have worked with considerable effectiveness, but price guidelines have all too often been only an invitation to raise prices to enhance profits. Examples of shameless profiteering throughout the economy are multitudinous. I think it cannot be expected that one portion of our Nation will stand quietly by to sacrifice while another portion profiteers.

Effective wage, price, and profit measures that spread the burden equally will have to be adopted for the duration of this problem if we are to avoid a major crisis in the foreseeable future.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the analysis which he has made of this labor-management dispute. I think he is right in saying that once the established procedures for negotiation and mediation had all been tried, the dispute should have been left to the two principal contestants; namely, the airlines and the machinists.

The difficulty was that the playing field in which this contest should have been fought out was so cluttered up by referees, field referees, time officials, and other kinds of officials who were trying to run the game, that the contest was never joined. I do not think Congress should at this time be involved in the act. It is my judgment that if we gave them assurances that the contestants could meet in their own hall and discuss their differences, an agreement would be reached.

The recent proposal was accepted by some local unions, including one in my area, involving Northwest Airlines. The same is true of some other parts of the country. It is my judgment that if the political, sociological, and psychological issues could be removed, I believe settlement would follow quickly. I hope this advice would be followed. If for another week or so we stopped what we are doing, and let the airlines and the machinists get together, they would come to their own settlement, I believe.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would be interested in ascertaining if there is any deadline beyond which the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin would agree that an impasse such as the one we have now had passed the reasonable stage. Negotiations between the airlines and the union have been going on since August 9, 1965, and no mutually acceptable agreement has yet been reached. What would be a reasonable time for these parties to resolve their differences? When it is clear that neither side is going to give in, and that the public is the victim of such a deadlock, what would be considered a reasonable time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the Senator from Florida listened to what I said.

Mr. SMATHERS. I heard every word the Senator said.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I thought we should let these parties get together, that the contestants had not had a free field, that the field was overrun by field referees and other officials, and that they, the principals, had not had a free run at settlement.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator knows that negotiations between the parties started on August 9, 1965. Almost 1 year has gone by since then. The first time the provisions of the Railway Labor Act were brought into play was on April 21 of this year, when an Emergency Board was created by the President. Before that, the union and management had negotiated for 2 months in 1965 and had then jointly applied to the National Mediation Board for its assistance. Would the Senator say there should be no time limit?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I said after we had exhausted the legal processes. We should give these contestants an opportunity to settle these questions.

Mr. SMATHERS. And then what?

Mr. McCARTHY. And then we take action. I said that we should take the field judges off the playing field and let the contestants fight over the ball.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I think everyone will admit is fair and impartial in matters of labor relations, listened to nearly 2,000 pages of testimony regarding the contested issues. The board which he chaired made recommendations, which were flatly turned down by the machinists. After the President called union and management together, they finally reached an agreement subject to ratification by the union membership. The leadership recommended the settlement to the members of the union, and the members of the union flatly turned down the proposed settlement.

What I am trying to get from both Senators, the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota, is a statement as to when we move to protect the rights of innocent citizens in this matter, if ever.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to respond to that.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well.

Mr. NELSON. On Wednesday of last week we were advised that there was not the slightest chance of an agreement being reached. Some members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee would have liked to have sent a bill to the Senate on Wednesday. Several of us on the committee argued that the bill should not be sent out and that we ought to wait for a report from the Secretary of Labor on Friday on the status of negotiations. That viewpoint prevailed, although most people thought there would be no result from it. On Friday night a settlement was reached, although it was rejected over the weekend. I know the Senator from Florida knows this, but I state for the RECORD that here is a case which does not involve bad union bosses telling their members what to do. Here is a clear-cut case of free union members acting independently of a great union. The machinists have made great contributions to our economy. They looked at the agreement reached between their representatives and management and exercised their right to reject it.

Mr. SMATHERS. So the man who said there was not the slightest chance was right.

Mr. NELSON. As far as reaching an agreement between the employers and representatives of the union is concerned, he was wrong, but the members did not accept the agreement. They rejected it. The cost of the contract proposed was $73 million over a 3-year period. It was rejected at the local union level. I and others suggested they should continue to negotiate and ascertain the reasons why they were not in favor of the proposed agreement. The Emergency Board recommendation had a cost-of-living provision in it. The later one did not. Many people think that the lack of a cost-of-living provision was one key factor in rejecting the proposed contract. In any event, my point is that if collective-bargaining process were allowed to go its full natural course the parties would explore the reasons for rejecting the agreement and attempt to negotiate the differences. Perhaps a cost-of-living provision and one or two other changes would make it possible to reach agreement. When all possibilities are exhausted, then is the time for Congress to act. But at least the natural course for negotiation should be allowed to run its full natural course.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is it not true that the proposed Board settlement provided for a cost-of-living provision of $76 million, spread over 42 months, while the settlement reached last Friday involved a cost-of-living increase of $73 million spread over a 36-month period? In gross number of dollars, the settlement was $3 million less than the one proposed by the Board.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, and the interesting thing about it is that the recommendation of the Emergency Board would have cost $66 million or $67 million over a 36-month period. But if the cost of living went up to trigger that provision, it would cost more than the agreement rejected by the union members.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not want to debate whether it should be $76 million,

$75 million, or $73 million. I agree that there ought to be a natural bargaining process, but I want to ask the Senator, How long does the unrepresented public have to be inconvenienced and the economy harmed while this type of argument goes on? The public is inconvenienced. There are great losses to the economy of the Nation. How long must we stand idly by, when nothing actually is being achieved; when one side says, "We are not going to talk about anything unless you meet our demand"; and the other side says, "We cannot meet your demand?" How long does the Senator from Wisconsin think this situation should continue before Congress moves in and acts? These particular negotiations and discussions were initiated in August 1965.

Mr. NELSON. At no inconvenience to the public until 26 days ago.

Mr. SMATHERS. But at great inconvenience to the public within the last 26 days.

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Enormous inconvenience.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Actually, the economic lives of many people outside the airline business or airline industry are being slowly strangled. Much damage is being done. How long shall that be allowed to continue? Does not Congress have any responsibility whatever?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, we have a responsibility. I will answer the Senator's question. I answered it in my speech, and I answered it a couple of minutes ago. I will answer it again.

I think that free collective bargaining ought to run its natural course before the drastic action of congressional interference is taken. This is absolutely a clear-cut case of a failure to let both sides continue their negotiations on the additional points concerning which the membership rejected the agreement.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that there should be bargaining when it is honest, reasonable, sensible bargaining. But when the point is reached that ultimatums are given, when each side becomes intransigent, when one side says, "We won't take what you offer," and the other side says, "We won't meet your demands"—at that point, what are we to do?

Mr. NELSON. That point has not been reached. I have said several times that when in the natural course of collective bargaining has run its course and there is no chance of a settlement at all, that is time enough for Congress to exercise its discretion to act; but that point has not been reached.

The Senator from Florida talks about the cost. There is no question in the world that the strike is expensive; but I point out that the Secretary of Labor said that the direct cost losses to the whole transportation industry are about $1 million a day—about $1 million a day to the whole transportation industry—with another million dollars of peripheral losses.

Mr. SMATHERS. No; $7 million.

Mr. NELSON. I stated it correctly. Seven million dollars loss to the struck airlines; but the rest of the transportation industry—buses, railroads, and the other airlines—is picking up the other $6 million.

So the direct loss to the transportation industry, nationwide, is $1 million, with another $1 million of estimated peripheral losses. That is $2 million a day. That is far less than the daily cost of the New York City transit strike or the longshoremen's strike, or any similar strike, including the steel strike.

Now, is Congress, every single time there is a dispute that is an inconvenience to the public—and they all are—to intervene and put the men back to work?

Our system of collective bargaining is far and away the best system of collective bargaining of any country in the world. We can stop the inconvenience to the public of any strike; but all that means is that we would have compulsory arbitration, we would get rid of the private enterprise system and the working man's freedom. The public would be comfortable, but we would have destroyed something a great deal more important than the temporary inconvenience to the people who cannot get a ride on the airlines today.

The airlines which are struck today involve 3.6 percent of the total intercity miles traveled in this country, and one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total freight hauled in this country. Of that 3.6 percent of the intercity travel, a substantial portion is being picked up by the running airlines, another portion by the buses, and another portion by the railroads; and so what we are probably down to is a total reduction of 1 percent of the intercity miles traveled in this country as a result of the strike.

Of course, that is an inconvenience. Of course, that is an expense. But freedom does cost money; and that is what this is all about.

If every strike that causes this much inconvenience calls for the intervention of Congress, before the natural course is run, we are going to be handling every single strike in the United States. Because this is not a big one, in comparative terms with the others we have had in the past, in which we have not intervened.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am certain Congress will continue to permit and should continue to permit a reasonable time during which parties who are in dispute can work out their problems.

However, there comes a time, it seems to me, when it is evident that the parties are not going to resolve their particular problems. It may be that one or the other actually wants the Government to move in.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me finish, and then I will yield back to the Senator.

They go on for what is obviously more than a reasonable time, and the public begins to suffer. As to what the Senator has said with respect to the cost, the Secretary of Labor has stated that there is an increasing rate of loss. Possibly the Senator is correct, that the net loss to the transportation industry is a million dollars a day right now. But the cost is increasing. It is becoming greater. The Secretary of Labor so testified, that the cost of this strike will begin to affect more and more people, and will do greater and greater damage.

My question is, How long do we have to let the public bleed? How long must they bleed, how long must they continue to suffer, before we concede that the time has come to get this strike settled one way or another, in the interests of the general public? Because I do not think it does our economy, collective bargaining, or labor any good; it does not do anybody any good for the two disputants to continue to argue while the public is without a vital service. And I really believe that the general public expects the people whom they elect and send to Congress to represent them to finally do something about it.

The Senator says the time has not arrived for that. I say that it has. That is the only area in which we are in disagreement.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to make one observation with respect to the remarks of the Senator. I believe that today, given some more opportunity to bargain over the issues which caused the rejection of the settlement, there is a thousand times better chance of settlement by negotiations now than there was last Wednesday. Last Wednesday everybody agreed there was no chance at all. Friday night they agreed. Now——

Mr. SMATHERS. What has brought that on? Has it been the pressure of Congress talking about the matter? Has it been the righteous indignation of those people who have not been able to obtain the type and character of service to which they think they are entitled? Has it been the letters which have poured in, by which the Secretary of Labor stated when he testified, that mayors and representatives of the people throughout the country have been protesting the continuation of this strike? Has that brought it nearer to a solution?

But this strike has gone on for nearly 4 weeks now, and I repeat, what I am asking is, How long must the public bleed before we put a stop to it? That is my question to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I believe I have answered that question for the RECORD several times.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. First, I should like to point out that the Senator is being consistent in his position, because, as I remember, he voted against reporting any resolution.

I, too, would like to see negotiations continue. But I call the Senator's attention to a question which I addressed to Mr. Siemiller, who is the president of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

This was my question:

> If no legislation is recommended by this committee, would the union consider enter-

> ing into an agreement with the carriers to return to work while negotiations continue? Such an agreement, of course, should provide for retroactivity of contract terms and reserve to the union the right to strike at any time it saw fit.

This was Mr. Siemiller's answer:

> I don't believe in all sincerity we could get our membership to agree to that.

If that proposal were acceptable, the union would send its members back to work, the union would retain the right to strike, and the employees would be guaranteed retroactivity with respect to any wage increases granted under any subsequently negotiated collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Siemiller, however, stated that the union would not consider this course of action, although he personally would like to be able to give me an affirmative answer. It seems to me, therefore, that that is a clear indication that the union leadership was not in a position at that time to make any contract concessions.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interpret the question or the answer in that way. As I am sure the Senator will agree in retrospect, Mr. Siemiller was giving an honest and accurate answer. Because the fact of the matter is that the contract was rejected by a large margin.

I think his guess is correct, that they would not go back to work without the contract settled, because of course they would lose their bargaining position, then, to go back and bargain while working, and then go out on another strike——

Mr. PROUTY. They would not lose their bargaining position, because they would retain the right to strike again at any time, a right which they shall lose by our passing a resolution regardless of its final form.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, but to have two strikes in a row is something I do not believe that the union membership or leaders would want to get engaged in.

But my point here is, I think there may well be a time when Congress should act. But as of last Wednesday—and the distinguished Senator from Vermont was on the committee, and made a fine contribution to the discussion and the questioning at all stages—I think the Senator will agree we thought there was hardly any chance; and when I was urging that we wait until Friday for a reply from the Secretary, many people there thought the chances were almost nil, and that perhaps we ought to send out a bill immediately. I, too, felt they were almost nil; but bam, on Friday they reached an agreement.

I say that as of this moment, today, there is a better chance of their getting back together and negotiating the relatively small points which I think now separate the membership's willingness to accept and the employers' position; and if in fact they could in the next 3, 4, or 5 days reach an agreement that was reasonable and not too costly, one that could be met, I think that would be a much better solution, to delay action for these 4 or 5 days, than for Congress to move in, for the first time in 40 years, in this kind of a situation.

Mr. PROUTY. If we had any assurance that would take place, I am sure we would all agree. However, I cannot see it in the same light as the Senator, particularly in view of the Secretary of Labor's testimony on Monday to the effect that he did not anticipate a voluntary settlement in the immediate future.

Mr. NELSON. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Labor could give us no assurance on last Wednesday, and yet dramatically they reached an agreement. If they can do it once, they can do it again.

Mr. PROUTY. Last Wednesday, the Secretary asked us to delay reporting a bill in order to permit certain avenues to be explored. Day before yesterday, however, he testified that these avenues had been exhausted and that he was no longer hopeful of an early settlement. The agreement reached Friday also troubles me, or rather, the failure of the union membership to ratify its terms troubles me. I believe the union's national negotiating committee was under extreme governmental pressure to settle, and that it was also under pressure to reach an agreement from a public relations standpoint.

However, when the officers and leaders of most of the IAM locals involved recommended to their respective memberships that the contract terms be rejected, I do not think that many of us were surprised at the outcome of the vote. This might be a case where the union's national leaders acted responsibly, but one where the leaders of the various local unions did not. I think the ratification vote might have shown quite a different result if the local leaders had urged approval of the new contract.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICE INCREASES ON MILK, BREAD, AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning unanimously approved a resolution which I presented to the committee.

This resolution would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake an immediate investigation and survey of price increases for milk, bread, and other commodities.

The purpose of the investigation is to provide the committee and the Congress and the American people with information that will give us an understanding of what is behind sharp food price increases, particularly the price increases for bread and milk, that have taken place in recent days.

There has been an unfortunate effort on the part of some industry spokesmen to attribute increases of as much as 3 cents a quart in the price of milk entirely to the milk producers, because of modest increases in farm price supports on April 1, and again on July 1.

There has also been an implication that increases of as much as 2 cents a loaf in the price of bread can be explained entirely by modest advances in wheat prices.

I think that investigation will demonstrate very quickly that the farmer's return represents a very small part of the increase in milk and bread prices.

The purpose of the investigation which our committee has instructed the Secretary to undertake immediately is not to make anyone a scapegoat, but simply to demonstrate the facts, and to show that when there is an increase of 2 cents on a loaf of bread or 3 cents on a quart of milk—as we have had in a number of market areas around the country—many factors go into such an increase other than the amount the farmer receives. The farmers' share is actually a minor part of the total.

The Metropolitan Milk Institute of New York wired me this morning that the figures on milk price increases in a New York Times story of last Friday were in error. It may very well be that there is some error or conflict in various statistics that have been cited. If this is true, then it further points up the need for a reliable and fully publicized investigation, and statement of the true facts by the Department of Agriculture.

When the investigation is completed—and I hope that it will begin immediately and be completed within the next 2 or 3 weeks—the Secretary will then report his information to our committee. At that time, if hearings seem to be in order, I hope our committee will take that into consideration.

I do think that this investigation is in the interest of not only farm producers, but also consumers. Consumers have a right to know the facts and to understand what is behind these very marked increases in food prices which have occurred during the last few weeks. I know that farmers are not to blame and I am determined that this be demonstrated to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution as unanimously approved by the committee this morning be printed at this point in the Record along with a press statement which I released this noon.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Agriculture Committee Approves McGovern Food Price Resolution

> The Senate Agriculture Committee today unanimously approved a resolution proposed by Senator George McGovern directing the Department of Agriculture to survey and report to the Committee on the extent to which farmers are being improperly blamed for milk, bread and other food price increases.
>
> The resolution directs the Department to make a survey, community-by-community, of the amount of farm price increases, the amount of consumer price increases, and the extent to which increases in excess of the farm return were blamed on increased farm prices.
>
> In presenting the resolution, McGovern read newspaper articles which he said falsely blamed farmers for milk price increases that were actually double and triple what the farmers get. "Bread prices have been raised in many places several times more than is

justified by increases in wheat prices," he said.

"The investigation I have requested as approved by the Committee is not an effort to make a scapegoat of anyone," Senator McGovern said.

"It is an effort to be sure that consumers clearly understand that farm prices are only a minor factor in most of the current round of food price increases."

The resolution, which will go directly from the Committee to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, asks him to report back to the Committee on the price increases as early as possible. The Committee will then consider the need for hearings.

The Committee agreed to amend the resolution to cover several food commodities, including butter, cheese and eggs, and increases in meat costs resulting from specification buying.

The resolution approved by the Committee, as originally submitted by Senator McGovern, follows:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas members of the Senate Agriculture Committee are receiving protests against milk price support increases indicating public misunderstanding of the extent of April 1 and July 1 rises in supports to farmers, and,

"Whereas numerous bread price increases are being attributed entirely to higher farm prices for wheat, and

"Whereas some newspaper accounts indicate retail price increases of as much as 5 times price increases to farmers have been attributed entirely to the increase in farm return; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to make a survey through the field offices of his Department of the amount of retail milk price increases since April 1 in towns and cities of the Nation, their relationship to increases in farm price support in each instance, and the extent to which the public was clearly advised, or misinformed, as to the reason for such increase; and that the Secretary similarly survey bread price increases and their relationship to farm returns for wheat, reporting to this Committee as early as possible."

THE "CREDIBILITY GAP" WIDENS IN OUR WAR IN VIETNAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it should not be news to my colleagues in the Senate and the House that the American people are not getting the facts about what is going on in Vietnam. Indeed, they have never gotten the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about our involvement in southeast Asia.

Actually, the whole basis alleged for our military intervention is false. It is not true, as the official pronouncements have stated again and again, that we were invited in by a friendly government to help it repel aggression. The official record, found in the State Department's publication: "Why Vietnam," issued August 20, 1965, with the foreword by President Lyndon B. Johnson, is bare of any such commitment. It is not found in the crucial letter of President Eisenhower to President Diem of October 1, 1954, in which President Eisenhower proffered aid but coupled his offer with conditions of reform and good performance which were never carried out. The only request for aid by Diem had been one to assist in the transportation of several hundred thousand North Vietnamese to South Vietnam.

The lack of such a request by Diem—to help repel aggression—and the evidence that it was we, the United States, who asked ourselves in, is further confirmed in the White House statement of November 3, 1954, which states that President Eisenhower had instructed Gen. J. Lawton Collins, as his special representative, to explore with President Diem and his government how to help them with their critical problems and to supplement measures adopted by the Vietnamese themselves. The initiative for intervention came from the United States. At no time under President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, and not until after the inception of the Johnson administration, were any U.S. troops sent into combat. Previous to 1964, they had only been military advisers. Therefore, the official allegations repeatedly made that three Presidents have made this commitment, and that it has thereby become a national pledge, are without foundation. The fact is, we asked ourselves in and, by our subsequent actions, we have become the aggressors.

Equally unfounded is the subsequently dredged up assertion that the SEATO Treaty, in article 4, justifies our military intervention. That likewise is a deception. This article of the SEATO Treaty makes clear that in the case of aggression all the parties to the treaty shall consult and come to a conclusion by unanimous agreement. There never was any consultation, and, of course, there was, and could be, no unanimous agreement because at least two of the signers of the SEATO Treaty—France and Pakistan—are completely out of sympathy with our attitude and actions in southeast Asia.

The stark and unpalatable fact, which the official propaganda has never been willing to face, is that we went half way around the world to inject ourselves into a civil war and, in doing so, violated every pertinent treaty commitment—the United Nations Charter, the SEATO Treaty—which, in article 1, refers to the United Nations requirement not to resort to force but only to peaceful means, as further enumerated in article 33—and we likewise violated the unilateral commitment made for the United States by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith that we would respect the Geneva agreements and its pledge of all-Vietnam elections. All these we violated, and treaties, under our Constitution, are of the highest class of commitments.

We might add that there was a further commitment which the American people understood, or thought they understood, that President Johnson made in his campaign not to follow the Goldwater policies, but to find a peaceable solution to our presence in Vietnam, which, at the time of his campaign, had not escalated into sending our troops into combat.

President Johnson, in the course of his campaign, said:

> There are those who say I ought to go North and drop bombs to wipe out the supply lines. . . . But we don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia.

And President Johnson also said:

> We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves.

When he made these statements in the fall of 1964, he did make a commitment to the American people.

That commitment has been totally breached. We are going farther and farther north. We are getting bogged down in a land war. And we are sending more and more American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away from home.

No wonder there is a "credibility gap." It is ever widening.

The allegation that we are fighting aggression and that North Vietnam—Hanoi—is the aggressor, is also a distortion of the truth. There has been infiltration from the north, but it followed U.S. violation of our agreements and was far less in quantity than ours. Moreover, we are expected to be the law-abiding, treaty-respecting nation.

So much for the past, with its awesome present and future consequences.

We now find four veteran reporters, newspaper men of integrity and repute, now in Vietnam, assailing the United States' news policies in Saigon. They are Dean Brelis, of the National Broadcasting Co.; Malcolm Browne, formerly of the Associated Press and a Pulitzer Prize winner, who has been in Vietnam for years; Charles Mohr, of the New York Times, likewise there for considerable time; and Jack Foisie, a star correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, also an old Asia hand.

In an article published in the New York Times under a three-column headline reading: "Four Reporters Assail U.S. News Policies in Saigon," Mr. Browne points out that the Pentagon's news policies prevent reporters from getting first-hand information about military activity in Laos and Thailand. "As far as the command is concerned publicly," Mr. Browne averred, "Laos doesn't exist. Neither does Thailand." Surely, the American people are entitled to know of our steady widening of the war and that American troops are operating outside of South and North Vietnam in both of these other countries.

Mr. Browne also referred to Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, as "one of the great practitioners of the 'art' of news management."

I ask unanimous consent that the news article from the New York Times of August 2, 1966, headed: "Four Reporters Assail U.S. News Policies in Saigon," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. A more detailed commentary on Assistant Secretary Sylvester and his performance is published in the August issue of the Progressive magazine, published at Madison, Wis. In it is an account about Mr. Sylvester which appeared in Dateline 1966, a publication of the Overseas Press Club, which revealed that Sylvester made no secret of the fact that he expected American newsmen to disseminate only information "that made the United States look good."

At this point, a network television correspondent said:

> Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the American press to be the handmaidens of government?

Sylvester, he recalled, replied:

> That's exactly what I expect.

That is what an official in a totalitarian country would and could expect. It is shocking to hear that from an American official.

Considering the widening "credibility gap," which is a euphemism for what actually goes on—namely, that the American people are being misled by their Government officials—when this matter was brought up, Sylvester replied:

> Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?

There is much else in this revealing résumé as to the lack of concern on the part of some Pentagon officials, and especially Assistant Secretary Sylvester, about getting the truth to the American people; and I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The 'Bull Session,'" from the August issue of the Progressive, be printed also at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

FOUR REPORTERS ASSAIL U.S. NEWS POLICIES IN SAIGON—ON TV, THEY SAY BRIEFINGS BY MILITARY ARE OFTEN LATE, INACCURATE, AND COLORLESS

Defense Department information policies and press briefings in Vietnam were sharply criticized by four American correspondents there in a television program last night.

The correspondents, whose remarks were taped in Saigon, said briefings by United States military spokesmen were often colorless, late and inaccurate. The daily briefings are called "The 5 o'clock follies" by many correspondents, Dean Brelis of the National Broadcasting Company said.

Malcolm Browne, a former Associated Press reporter and a Pulitzer Prize-winner now doing free lance work in Vietnam, said on the National Educational Television program on WNDT that the briefing officers often lie.

Charles Mohr, a New York Times correspondent, said the information officers in Saigon were "more interested in policy than facts" and in "the effect of a story—rather than its accuracy."

A SANITARY WAR

He said the Administration was reluctant for correspondents to write about napalm or antipersonnel bombs. "They want to make it a sanitary war," he said.

Mr. Browne criticized the Pentagon's news policies, which, he said prevented reporters from getting first-hand information about American military activity in Laos and Thailand. "As far as the command is concerned publicly," said the writer, "Laos doesn't exist. Neither does Thailand."

He said Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was "one of the great practitioners" of the "art" of news management.

He said the Administration, and "particularly Secretary [of Defense Robert S.] McNamara, have deliberately misled American public opinion." An example of this, he said, is "the continual harping on the North Vietnamese aggression." Mr. Browne said the war in Vietnam was basically a civil war. The three other correspondents agreed.

Jack Foisie, a reporter for The Los Angeles Times, said he would prefer "formal censorship" to news management "that squashes information at the roots."

There was sympathy for the briefing officers, though, Mr. Mohr said they often "give a distorted picture, not out of either bad motive or viciousness, but simply because they themselves don't have a clear idea of what happened."

The correspondents agreed with a statement by Mr. Brelis that no one could cover the war adequately from Saigon. "You've got to go out there," he said.

EXHIBIT 2

THE "BULL SESSION"

As Assistant Secretary for Public Defense, Arthur Sylvester, a former newspaperman, is charged with the top responsibility for the official release of war news from Vietnam. This most sensitive task demands, among other qualities, an appreciation of the people's right to know a great deal more than they now do about the war they are paying for with their taxes and the lives of their sons.

If an account written by Morley Safer, a respected Columbia Broadcasting System newsman in Vietnam, is essentially correct—Sylvester has attacked it without effectively refuting it—then the Assistant Secretary holds views on the handling of war news that should horrify the press and public, and justify his removal by President Johnson.

Safer's account, which appeared in *Dateline 1966*, a publication of the Overseas Press Club, revealed that in July, 1965, a meeting was held in Saigon between Sylvester and a group of American newsmen to discuss some of the problems involved in covering the war. Sylvester, wrote Safer afterwards, "seemed anxious to take a stand to say something that would jar us. He did."

The first jolt, as Safer told the story, came when Sylvester said, "I can't understand how you fellows can write what you do while American boys are dying out here." Then he went on, as Safer described it, "to the effect that American correspondents had a patriotic duty to disseminate only information that made the United States look good."

A network television correspondent said, "Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the American press to be the handmaidens of government?" Sylvester, Safer recalled, replied, "That's exactly what I expect."

When the problems of the credibility of American officials was brought up, Sylvester responded: "Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?"

One of the newsmen suggested that Sylvester "was being deliberately provocative." The Assistant Secretary, according to Safer, replied: "Look, I don't even have to talk to you people. I know how to deal with you through your editors and publishers back in the States."

Safer's account of what immediately followed this threat is astounding: "At this point, the Hon. Arthur Sylvester put his thumbs in his ears, bulged his eyes, stuck out his tongue, and wiggled his fingers."

At one point Sylvester asked: "Do you guys want to be spoon-fed? Why don't you get out and cover the war?" The effect, as described by Safer: "It was a jarring and insulting remark. Most of the people in that room had spent as much time on actual operations as most GIs. Two television correspondents walked out, saying they had enough. A few minutes later, two more correspondents left."

If Sylvester made a single one of the remarks attributed to him he merits dismissal. When the Overseas Press Club published the Safer article, Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Missouri Republican, entered it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and told the House that "if Mr. Safer's reporting of this meeting is accurate—and based on my own experience I have no doubt that it is—then Mr. Sylvester should either resign, or be fired."

Sylvester later wrote to Representative HALL, attaching a copy of his correspondence with Victor Riesel, president of the Overseas Press Club. The Congressman inserted Sylvester's response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—where it has been greeted with the same press silence that was accorded the original incident for a whole year.

In his letter to Riesel, the Assistant Secretary referred to Safer's account as a "gem of misrepresentation," and charged him with distortions and "self-created quotations attributed to me." Sylvester said that Safer was correct on only one point—that in opening the session Barry Zorthian, minister-counselor of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, said it was not the usual briefing for information, but a "bull session." Otherwise, wrote Sylvester, "his (Safer's) recollection of the evening was 'bull.'" He made specific denials of only one of the comments attributed to him by Safer, and then concluded with an attack on Safer's reputation as a newsman.

The indifference of Congress and the press to this incident is shockingly callous. If Safer still stands by his story, as we understand he does, his description of the official Pentagon position on the handling of news in Vietnam, especially the Sylvester notion that the people are entitled to only that news which makes the United States look good, should be the subject of a comprehensive Congressional investigation—and the sooner the better.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority leader has in mind suggesting a unanimous-consent agreement to apply to the Lausche amendment only. I think that perhaps the staff on both sides of the aisle will wish to notify Senators, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. CLARK. I withhold it.

Mr. KUCHEL. My understanding is that the limitation would go into effect about half an hour from now.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have a brief statement of 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 1:30, there be an hour of debate on the Lausche amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] for 30 minutes, and the other 30 minutes by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

Mr. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object—and I approve it—I have been informed by a staff member that one Senator here said he had some objections.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. KUCHEL. For 2 minutes; then the Senator will be here.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with the airline strike now in its 27th day, I am prepared to support vigorously and vote for any equitable measure that will assure prompt restoration of air service for the benefit of the general public.

There is no further need to recite statistics to demonstrate how serious an effect this impasse between labor and managment has had on the American economy. We have heard numerous statements in this Chamber that have recounted the hardships suffered by everyone from the stranded tourist to the merchant who has watched his business dwindle away to a trickle.

There is strong evidence that, if allowed to drag on much longer, this walkout could set off a general economic downturn that would be highly resistant to any corrective action.

I am convinced that not more than one or two Senators doubt the words of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in Senate Joint Resolution 186, that "emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers."

I am convinced that nearly every Senator is aware of the urgent necessity for steps to protect the welfare of the general public.

Yet, I am also convinced that many Senators are reluctant—for whatever reason—to associate themselves with those steps.

It is ironic that some of these Members of Congress who frequently proclaim the abject surrender of the legislative branch of this Government to the executive branch are the ones who are now hesitant to move in this field. They chide the President and other members of his administration for attempting to bypass or ignore the Congress. In their flights of wrath, they proclaim that Congress has become an "errand boy" to the President—that his wish is our command.

But now, faced with a road heavily mined with political explosives, they would turn back and have the President lead the way for them.

Mr. President, Congress has clear authority in this matter. This is our road to walk, and article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution is our guide. It provides that Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce.

Should we fail to assume our responsibility, should we attempt to shunt it to the President, Congress would be gravely imperiling the concept of separate and coequal branches of government.

We would be setting an ominous precedent for future generations to place in Presidential hands sweeping discretionary powers that should rightly be exercised by the Senate and the House.

As the directly elected representatives of the people of our various States, it is we who must move to protect their interests in this current crisis. We cannot look downtown for direction. The initiative and the responsibility are ours.

Mr. President, at one point in the show "My Fair Lady," Eliza Doolittle cries out in anger at "words, words, words."

It is my hope that the American public will not have to rise up in anger and shout for action instead of words from the Congress.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority leader unfortunately cannot be present in the Chamber at this time, but I propose, with his approval, the approval of the minority leader, the minority whip, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the following:

I ask unanimous consent that commencing at 1:30 p.m. the Lausche amendment be called up; that 1 hour be allotted to its consideration, 30 minutes to be allotted to each side, the proponents' time to be controlled by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the opponents' time to be controlled by me, as floor manager of the bill; that the vote shall be had at the expiration of 1 hour; and that any quorum calls which may be had in the meanwhile shall not be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Gruening in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] that there be included in the unanimous-consent request that at the end of 40 minutes—20 minutes used by the opponents and 20 minutes by me—there shall be a live quorum call, leaving 20 minutes to be used after the quorum call is completed.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection to that, but I do not think it is necessary to write it into the unanimous-consent agreement because we have agreed that the quorum call shall not be charged to either side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I am satisfied.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon, when only the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and I were on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], with the concurrence and approval of the Senator from Oregon introduced into the Record a letter from the Attorney General, which is printed at page 17973 of the Record and which I shall read in full. It is addressed to Senator Long, who stated yesterday that it was written at his request. The letter reads:

> Office of the Attorney General,
> *Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.*
>
> Hon. Russell B. Long,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Senator: I am writing in response to your inquiry regarding any constitutional or other legal problems involved in S.J. Res. 181 as reported by the Senate Labor Committee yesterday.
>
> While I do not wish to comment on either the need or merits of this legislation I would like to call your attention to Section 2 which delegates the broadest possible authority to the President to order people back to work pending settlement of a labor dispute. No standards are expressed in the resolution by which to guide the President in this extraordinary delegation of power.
>
> Section 5 provides for enforcement through injunctive relief. In any judicial proceedings a court would have to find that the power had been exercised properly. Thus the absence of express standards would invite attack in such proceedings. The unnecessarily broad nature of the delegation is underscored by the fact that Congress would already have made the finding expressed in the Railway Labor Act without stating what further findings, if any, the President should make before exercising his discretion.
>
> Sincerely,
> Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
> *Attorney General.*

Mr. President, I wish to point out with regard to the Attorney General's letter that there is either a typographical error or the Attorney General was reading the wrong resolution before he wrote the letter to the Senator from Louisiana, because he refers to "S.J. Res. 181" which is not the pending measure or the committee resolution. The committee resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 186.

Senate Joint Resolution 186 does contain the finding of the Congress in accordance with the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, that this labor dispute "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services."

That finding having been made by the Congress in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 186, the President is then given discretion as to whether or not to order the men back to work.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, as many other Senators have stated, and as is abundantly clear in the committee report, this resolution uses not only the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, but follows exactly the procedure set forth in the Railway Labor Act, with respect to the exercise of discretion by the President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield in a few moments.

Under the Railway Labor Act, section 10, it is the National Mediation Board which makes the finding that the dispute threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce. That finding having been made, the President decides whether or not to create a dispute board.

I wish to quote from the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act:

> SEC. 10. If a dispute between a carrier and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing provisions of this Act and should, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon—

Mr. President, I call attention to the words—"who may thereupon"—

> in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute.

Note the words "in his discretion"—

> Such board shall be composed of such number of persons as to the President may seem desirable: *Provided, however,* That no member appointed shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any carrier. The compensation of the members of any such board shall be fixed by the President. Such board shall be created separately in each instance and it shall investigate promptly the facts as to the dispute and make a report thereon to the President within thirty days from the date of its creation.

I will skip the less relevant part of section 10 and continue:

> After the creation of such board, and for thirty days after such board has made its report to the President, no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

That is section 10.

I stress that in this act, a great deal of discretion is left to the permanent National Mediation Board. After it has notified the President, the President does not have to act. He is not mandated by the board's action. He may—I emphasize "may"—in his discretion create an emrgency board, such as the Morse board, to investigate and report respecting such dispute.

In my judgment, Senate Joint Resolution 186 is, procedurally, legally and constitutionally no different from section 10 of the Railway Labor Act.

If Senate Joint Resolution 186 is unconstitutional, as the Attorney General hints, but does not say, then the Railway Labor Act on the same grounds is unconstitutional.

Now, note well that the Attorney General's letter raises as a smokescreen the possible illegality of a Presidential determination to send men back to work under the terms of the committee resolution. If Senate Joint Resolution 186 is unconstitutional—and clearly it is not—then there can be no doubt that section 10 of the Railway Labor Act is, likewise, and for the same reasons, unconstitutional. Thus, each of the 167 boards appointed thereunder were illegally appointed, their conclusions are invalid, and the act is null and void.

Mr. President, I would hope the Attorney General would think better of his letter, so that we might have a more carefully considered and better thought out view from him with respect to this constitutional question.

Senators will remember that for the period from January 1961 until September 1964, the Attorney General of the United States was the now junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

I ask the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] if he would care to respond to what I have just stated.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, an able lawyer himself who, in his long experience, has dealt with problems of this kind before.

I have a few words I should like to say, in support of the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I also have the greatest respect for Mr. Katzenbach.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt there, so do I. I think he is an excellent—indeed, a first-class—Attorney General, with whom I have had many occasions to work in a friendly and cooperative manner.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I can understand how reasonable men might differ on these matters. On this particular matter, I happen to support the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania. As he knows, I have deep reservations about having any legislation in this field at all, but I have a few remarks I should like to make, to add to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has just said.

First, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says, section 10 of the Railway Labor Act is structured in exactly the same way as the committee bill. The National Mediation Board makes a finding that essential transportation services are threatened, and then the President has discretion, just as he does under the committee resolution, to decide whether or not the men will work.

Section 10 does not tell the President that he has to appoint an Emergency Board, or that the men must work, if the National Mediation Board makes the finding about disruption of essential transportation services. It says he may do so, in his discretion. The committee resolution does the same thing. Congress makes the finding, and the President has discretion, based on his day-to-day knowledge of the situation. The resolution is really, in effect, a special extension of section 10 for this dispute. Under section 10, if the President appoints a board after the Mediation Board makes its finding, the workers are stopped from striking for an additional 60 days. If he does not, the strike can occur. All of that is left to the President's discretion by the explicit language of section 10. That is the same as the committee resolution. I cannot see, therefore, that the discretionary aspect of the committee resolution raises any problem.

Second, even if there were some problem, the fact is that the committee report does give the President some guidelines.

It does make clear an intent that there are certain standards which are to govern the President's exercise of discretion.

I should like to read into the RECORD at this point that part of the report:

> The committee believes that it is the President, rather than the Congress, who should judge whether requiring the employees in this case to return to work would be in the best interest of achieving a fair and just settlement of this dispute. The President, directly and through the Secretary of Labor and other members of the executive branch, has been in day-to-day touch with the events which have transpired in this dispute.

Thus, the President is to judge the severity of the economic situation throughout the country and the gravity of the collective bargaining problem, and act accordingly.

The Senator from Pennsylvania knows the reasons why this approach was taken by the committee. One, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, stated, when he appeared before the committee last week, and again this week, that there was no national emergency. Two, he stressed the fact that this was having no effect on the defense posture or the movement of defense goods. Three, in his testimony 2 days ago before the committee, he did not suggest that Congress pass any legislation to deal with this problem.

Therefore, although the majority of the committee felt some action was needed, they did not think that a mandatory back-to-work order was warranted under those circumstances. It felt it was premature for the Senate, and for Congress in general, to order employees back to work where there was no great national emergency and where the President of the United States and the executive branch of the Government had not requested any legislation at all.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield at that point——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator agree that one reason which motivated a majority of the committee to give the President the same discretion under Senate Joint Resolution 186 as he had under the Railway Labor Act was to give him more time to make up his mind whether he thought action should be taken to end the strike?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is absolutely correct. We asked the Secretary of Labor, when he appeared before the committee, whether he would like to come before the committee later, but he responded by saying that there was no specific time when he would be able to return with a conclusion that such action would be necessary. Therefore, it was felt that by writing this discretion into the legislation, the President, at his discretion, could take the kind of action that we have outlined, at whatever time he thought was appropriate.

Third, let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, there is a long line of cases which indicate that Congress can delegate to the President broad discretion to act, particularly in emergency situations. And, in my judgment, there is a considerable question as to whether a court would allow the defendant in an injunction suit under this resolution to challenge the President's exercise of discretion. The courts have been reluctant in the past even to hear a challenge to an exercise of Presidential discretion.

Thus, for all these reasons, for the first one particularly, but supported by the second and the third, I think it is quite clear that there would be no legal problem associated with the committee resolution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his clear and concise statement of what seemed to me a case to refute the suggestion made by the Attorney General that the committee bill raises grave constitutional questions.

I commend the Senator from New York for what he has just said and I find myself in complete agreement with it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 721

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The hour of 1:30 having arrived, the Senate, pursuant to the previous order, will proceed to the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I point out that under the agreement the time taken for quorum calls is not to be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 721).

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that the amendment (No. 721) be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 721 is as follows:

On page 4, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) If agreement has not been reached prior to the date of expiration of the final period of time which the President has ordered pursuant to section 2 and a written request is made by either party to the dispute within fifteen days after such date, the Mediation Board shall immediately notify the President.

"(b) On receipt of a notice referred to in subsection (a), the President shall create a Presidential Board to investigate and decide such dispute. The Presidential Board shall consist of not less than five members, a majority of whom shall be public members appointed by the President (one of whom shall be designated Chairman), with the remaining members divided equally between and designated by the carrier or carriers involved and the representative or representatives of the employees involved. No member appointed by the President shall be financially or otherwise interested in any carrier or any organization of employees. If either party to the dispute shall fail or refuse to designate its members within one week following the appointment of the public members, the President shall appoint such members in the same manner as the public members were appointed. In the event any member of the Presidential Board is unable or unwilling to serve, his successor shall be appointed in the same manner in which he was appointed. Each member of the Presidential Board named by the parties to the dispute shall be compensated by the party naming him. Any member appointed by the President shall be paid reasonable compensation for his services in an amount to be fixed by the President, and shall be reimbursed for his necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred while serving as a member.

"(c) The Presidential Board shall have power to conduct investigations and take testimony at any place within or without the United States. For the purpose of any hearing conducted by such Board, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such Board.

"(d) Upon the appointment of the Presidential Board, such Board shall promptly hold a public hearing of the parties with reference to the dispute and shall make and publish a report in writing with respect to the dispute which shall state the findings, conclusions, and decision of the Board on each of the issues involved on which the parties have not reached agreement. Such report shall be made within sixty days after appointment of the Board, except that the President, on good cause shown, may extend such period.

"(e) The decision of the Board shall be by a majority of the whole Board. The rates of pay or working conditions prescribed or approved by the Board in its report shall be just and reasonable and, unless set aside in judicial proceedings as hereinafter provided or changed by voluntary agreement of the parties, continue in effect until changed in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. Such decision shall provide that the wage provisions thereof shall be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

"(f) The report of the Presidential Board and the transcript of the proceedings before it, including the evidence, shall be filed with the President and with the National Mediation Board. A copy of such report shall be furnished each party to the proceeding.

"(g) In the event of disagreement between the parties as to the meaning of the findings, conclusions, or decisions, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may apply to the Presidential Board for a clarification of its report, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall, with or without a further hearing, promptly issue a further report setting forth its decision on each of the issues involved in such disagreement.

"(h) A report filed as herein provided shall, unless set aside in judicial proceedings as hereinafter provided, be conclusive and binding on the parties and enforcible by appropriate proceedings in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for any district in which proceedings of the Presidential Board were held, or the United States district court for any district in which any party is doing business.

"(i) Within thirty days after the filing of the report a petition to impeach the report may be filed in any United States district court mentioned in the next preceding paragraph by any party to said proceeding on any one or more of the following grounds of invalidity:

"(1) That the report clearly does not conform to the requirements laid down by this Act for such reports, or that the proceedings were not substantially in conformity with the Act, but no such report shall be subject to review on the ground that rates of pay or working conditions prescribed therein, if any, are not just and reasonable;

"(2) That the report does not conform to the issues in the controversy submitted to such Board;

"(3) That a member of such Board rendering the report was guilty of fraud or corruption in connection therewith, or that a party to such proceeding practiced fraud or corruption which fraud or corruption affected the report; or

"(4) That the report violates rights secured by the Constitution of the United States to any of the parties to the dispute or to any employees bound by the report therein.

"(j) No court shall entertain any such petition to impeach a report on the ground that such report is invalid for uncertainty; but such report may be submitted to the reconvened Presidential Board for interpretation as provided by this Act. A report contested as herein provided shall be construed liberally by the court, with a view to favoring its validity, and no report shall be set aside for trivial irregularity or clerical error, going only to form and not to substance.

"(k) If the court shall determine that the entire report is invalid on some ground or grounds designated in this section as a ground of invalidity, the court shall set aside the entire report; but if the court shall find that only a part of the report is invalid and if such invalid part is separable from the valid part the court may in its discretion set aside the entire report or set aside only the invalid part.

"(l) At the expiration of twenty days from the decision of the district court upon the petition filed as aforesaid, the judgment of the court shall be final unless during said twenty days either party shall appeal therefrom to the United States court of appeals. The decision of the court of appeals shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(m) Upon the appointment of a Presidential Board under subsection (b), the period of time provided for in section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, during which no change except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose, shall be reinstated and shall continue in effect until the Presidential Board shall have made its report and such report shall have become final and binding on the parties. During said period of time none of the parties to the controversy, or affiliates of said parties shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout."

On page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5" and insert "SEC. 6".

On page 4, line 10, after "section 2" insert "or section 5(m)".

On page 4, line 24, strike out "SEC. 6" and insert "SEC. 7".

On page 5, line 9, strike out "and 5" and insert "5, and 6".

On page 5, line 12, after "section 3" insert "and any decision under section 5(e)".

On page 5, line 15, strike out "SEC. 7" and insert "SEC. 8".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on the basis of the discussion that has taken place in the last 3 days, it is thoroughly apparent——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him how much time he yields himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is thoroughtly apparent that there is a necessity for Congress to take action that will bring to an end the stoppage of service by the five airlines that are now idle. Before us is pending the question, Shall Congress act? Should the President act?

Perhaps I am somewhat impulsive and not adequately considerate of the arguments made by the opponents of any action. I nevertheless have come to the conclusion that, in the interest of the citizens of the country and of the economy, Congress should take action.

The taxpayers of the United States—without full knowledge, I believe, by the people—are subsidizing to a tremendous degree the operations of the airlines. The amount of the subsidies, of course, is increasing each year. We subsidize in three fields: One, directly the operation of the airlines; two, indirectly the building of airports; and three, again indirectly, the provision of multiple services, through our radar and other communications systems, in providing aid for the commercial airlines in the operation of their business.

The subsidies which I have just identified inure not only to the benefit of the operators of the commercial airlines, but also to their employees. The query then naturally arises, Do we not have an interest far beyond that which would otherwise exist in stoppages which occur in private industry or governmentally regulated industries?

The Federal Aviation Agency has thus far expended $700 million in aiding the construction of airports. We have spent $840 million in subsidizing the operations of the airlines; and we have further expended approximately $750 million in the financing of the communications system. The total of these figures is nearly $2,300 million. We have a right, Mr. President, to intervene in this dispute. We have a right to intervene, and I must say an obligation to intervene, first, because we are a part of the financiers of this operation; and second, because we are representatives of the public, the group most vitally interested in what is being done.

It is a simple matter for the labor leaders and the commercial airlines to engage in this struggle, and not to pay heed to the interests of the public. It is an indefensible matter for this important service to be paralyzed by labor leaders who, because of their inordinate power, possess the capacity to paralyze the service completely.

The Senator from Oregon has made arguments on this subject two or three times, and I quote his statement that it is because of naked power on the part of the labor leaders and the labor unions that this stoppage has continued. Power distorts judgment. The statement has frequently been made that "power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Here we have a situation, my fellow Senators, where the labor leaders and the union members know that they can paralyze the airline industry by refusing to work. Yet, Mr. President, there is hesitancy on the part of the White House and on the part of the Senate to act.

I shall support the Morse amendment when it comes before the Senate. I shall not support the measure which was reported by the committee. But, Mr. President, I come now to the substance of my amendment. What I have thus far said, in a measure, is a premise for what I propose.

The committee amendment provides that the men, upon certain action taken by the President under the Railway Labor Act, shall by compulsion go back to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The President can extend the period in which they, by compulsion, are required to work; but the outer limit of the time of extension is 180 days. That is, after they have negotiated for 180 days, if stubbornness prevents an agreement at the end of the 180 days, we are back where we started from.

How much time has thus far been spent in negotiations? The Railway Labor Act provides for an undetermined period of negotiation prior to putting into effect the specific provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

The proof shows that, under the negotiations that were in progress for at least 4 months before specific and affirmative action was taken under the Railway Labor Act, the Mediation Board, at the beginning of about the fifth month, proffered arbitration. It said to both parties: "You can have arbitration."

The Mediation Board waited for 30 days, and no acceptance was received of the proffer of arbitration. Subsequently, an Emergency Board was created by the President, of which Board the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was Chairman.

The union wanted $130 million in increased pay. The Arbitration Board allowed $76 million. The Senator from Oregon has made the argument on the floor of the Senate that the grant made by the Board was liberal and that to go beyond that amount would feed the fires of inflation.

The union rejected the Board's recommendation, and the strike has been in progress now for 24 days.

Stubbornness prevails, and it will prevail so long as pressure is not applied by the people of the United States. There must be a reasonable approach in trying to adjust this dispute.

My amendment contemplates that after 180 days of negotiation, unless a settlement is reached, the President of the United States shall appoint a Presidential Board vested with the power to arbitrate the dispute.

The Board shall consist of not less than five members, the majority of whom shall be representatives of the public. The remaining membership shall be equally assigned to the union and to management respectively.

The Board is empowered to take testimony, conduct investigations, subpena witnesses, and to make a report and render a decision at the end of 60 days. That decision shall be final and conclusive. There shall be no further dillydallying after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the difference between the proposal of the committee and my amendment is that at the end of 180 days under the committee proposal, unless a settlement is reached, we will be back where we started.

I suggest that that is not sound. We should lay down now the rule as to what the procedure shall be. We will find that, if we place arbitration before the parties to the dispute, the arbitration will act as a powerful inducement toward bringing about a settlement as contemplated in the committee bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I ask my friend, the Senator from Ohio, whether his amendment does not call for compulsory arbitration at the end of the 180-day period?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. I have so stated.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senate is not ready for compulsory arbitration, either under this bill or under any other bill in the foreseeable future.

I am certainly not ready for compulsory arbitration in a case which has as many gray areas as this one and in which there is no conclusive evidence of a national emergency.

There may well be a need for permanent emergency strike legislation. I regret that the President has not sent down such a proposal, as he promised in his state of the Union message.

When we come to consider permanent legislation dealing with strikes, I think we shall want to give very careful consideration to whether, under some circumstances, we desire some form of compulsory arbitration.

As I said a moment ago, I am not ready for it yet, certainly not in this case, and

I doubt if a majority of the Senators are ready for it.

Mr. President, I will be glad to yield time to any Senator who wants to speak.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 minutes to me?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since we have only one-half hour, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I oppose the Lausche amendment. I rise to speak, not to be redundant in terms of the arguments of the Senator from Pennsylvania, which I think are entirely correct, but to deal with what I think is endemic in this situation and which is very frequently recognized, especially in labor circles.

I have, naturally, as have other Senators, received a great many telegrams and other communications from very fine people, people whom I know very well and for whom I have the highest regard.

Some of these people are leaders of the American labor movement, the heads of unions, and generally people who are considered as directing the strategy and policy of the trade union movement in the United States.

Reiterated constantly in these telegrams is one fundamental theme. I quote from one of these telegrams:

> Public inconvenience is a small price to pay for freedom.

Mr. President, I agree with that statement. Public inconvenience is a small price to pay for freedom, and we would not endeavor to legislate in this field if all that was at stake was public inconvenience. However, I believe that what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] was trying to reach and what we are trying to reach in the measure which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is managing and what we tried to reach in the committee is not public inconvenience. I thoroughly agree that is no criterion in this dispute.

We are trying to reach immobilization of air transportation in our country.

Mr. President, when immobilization of our country's air transportation is threatened and when any part of it is jeopardized, we then have not only a right but also a duty to act. This is especially true in regulated industries, and this is a regulated industry, an industry in which we have the power to regulate routes and charges. We also have the power to regulate everything else in the industry, including wages.

It would be very unwise to do that, because we believe in this country that the play of the marketplace is the best way in which to handle our economy. We do that as a matter of policy. We do that with respect to prices. We do it with respect to antitrust laws, and we do it even in respect of the pricing which is regulated, because it depends very heavily upon the demand as conditioned by the cost and as conditioned by the existence of an adequate demand to create a reasonable cost which will entitle the Government to license the use of facilities—in this case, airways and airports.

Mr. President, we legalize, as far as we can, this interference with the give and take of the economic process because none of us is smart enough to have a better substitute. We believe that the Communist system, in which this is done by bureaucratic planning, is much less satisfactory than our system. The Communist system greatly inhibits freedom and imposes compulsory arbitration so that it leads in the direction which substitutes planning by somebody for the give and take of the marketplace, as represented by collective bargaining.

For that reason, I think the general sentiment is against it, unless we go to a system such as we had in the war, when the War Labor Board, in effect, did it, and unless we go to a system where this is part of the system.

In short, nothing is wrong, morally or legally, with compulsory arbitration. Indeed, in 1963 we did it in desperation, for all practical purposes, in the threatened Railway Labor Strike. What is wrong with it is that it belongs only as part of a system; and as an act of desperation it may have to be done, but it cannot be justified. If we are to make it a permanent piece of the machinery of America, it can only be done as part of a system, and it antithetical to our system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to get the yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. We need something permanent, because we are in a flap in Congress. We were in the railway labor dispute; we are in the airlines dispute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. The proposition that this is not as deep an emergency as we found in the railroad situation is unquestioned. It is not. But it does qualify, under the Railway Labor Act, as a stoppage of essential transportation.

The question, is, therefore: Do we act or do we withhold action? What we have chosen to do is to act. All these plans of Senator CLARK, Senator MORSE, and mine are designed to act and to still leave collective bargaining open. We are still attempting to safeguard the public interest by bringing these lines into operation, resolving the doubt as to whether it will or will not tend to create a national emergency if allowed to continue.

We need permanent legislation; and, as Senator CLARK has said, undoubtedly compulsory arbitration will be considered. I am against it. I believe that the essential function of government can best be served with the receivership-seizure technique, and I am the author of such a bill—S. 2797—and have long stood for that principle.

Be that as it may, we should not endeavor to anticipate in this way, at this time, on this bill, what will necessarily be the final resolution of this question; because to do so would be to defeat the purpose of the bill and to prejudice the ultimate full consideration of what we should do. Compulsory arbitration really does not belong, except as a measure of desperation or as a part of a general national planning operation, in which we certainly do not wish to be committed right now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wonder whether the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield me a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield time?

Mr. CLARK. I yield the time requested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the end of 180 days, if the dispute is not settled, what will Congress do?

Mr. JAVITS. Congress will then consider the recommendation of a board and the President on two points: one, what ought to be the terms of a settlement; and, two, what the Congress ought to do, whether it ought to proceed along the compulsory arbitration or the seizure line, et cetera.

For that reason, Senator MORSE and I have joined in an amendment to this measure—amendment No. 718—demanding of the administration its plan, its pattern, for dealing with matters of this character on a permanent basis. But I do not feel that we ought to be committed to one or the other of these courses at this time, when the virtue of what we are doing is that we are taking only an interim step and that we cannot be accused of ending collective bargaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, at the end of 180 days, we will consider compulsory arbitration and other factors, but we should not do it now?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator think that there will not be the same argument raised 180 days from now that is raised today about this subject?

Mr. JAVITS. If we are where we are, and the administration has not sent us the permanent plan and the dispute has not been settled, then I am sure the same arguments will be raised. But I think the chances are pretty good on both scores.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not be fair to the Senator from Ohio, in view of the remarks that he has made in speaking in favor of the Morse resolution, if I sat in silence and did not give my notice that I shall not vote for his amendment.

My record against compulsory arbitration as a means of settling labor disputes when a strike is concerned is well known. I was one of two Senators who voted against the bill that the Senate passed in 1963, which provided for the compulsory arbitration procedure in the settlement of that threatened railroad strike. I set those reasons out in detail in 1963. I hold just as firm to those arguments today as I did in 1963, and

10 years from today I will be holding firm to them, too.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement of 1963, in opposition to compulsory arbitration in the 1963 railroad case, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTE IN THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY—SHUTDOWN OF NATIONAL RAILROAD SYSTEM WOULD BE DISASTROUS TO THE NATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the labor dispute in the railroad industry involves not two, but three parties. We are apt to think of this issue in terms of the Nation's railroads and the railroad brotherhoods which represent the railroad employees. However, there is a third party, and in my opinion, that is the most important party—the American public. To the carriers and the brotherhoods I say today, there are considerations that rise above individual or group selfish economic interests; namely, the good of our country and the public interest.

I have pointed this out to the brotherhoods in the past weeks, as I have pleaded with them not to make the mistaken judgment of attempting to settle on the picket lines a set of issues which are not susceptible of being settled on the picket lines, unless they want to defend going back to jungle law in economic disputes. We ought to settle this dispute by the application of rules of reason, by taking the economic evidence involved in connection with this substantive issue and in connection with the jobs that are involved in the dispute. A good many substantive work rules are involved.

If there ever was a case, in my work in the field of labor relations, that calls for settlement, first around the collective bargaining table, and then around the voluntary arbitration table, this is it.

If some equitable agreement is not reached between the carriers and the railroad brotherhoods, with the help of congressional legislation if necessary, we are still confronted with the fact that the Nation cannot tolerate a general shutdown of our most vital artery of national commerce. This artery carries the life blood of our Nation. It must remain open.

We in the Congress serve here with the primary responsibility of representing the public interest of all the people of the Nation. Whenever any economic segment of that citizenry follows a course of action which may develop a fact situation in which its course of action sacrifices the general public interest, then it will become the responsibility of the Congress to proceed to protect the public interest for the right to strike is not an absolute right, and never has been. Most rights we have must be exercised in connection with their relationship to other rights. It is very easy for us to say we have a right to do such and such. We may have the right, it is true, but it may not be used in a manner which will destroy other rights with which it must be reconciled.

Mr. President, in connection with these great national disputes which involve so directly the national welfare, including the health, safety, and security of the country, I say most respectfully to labor, as I have said so many times in the past: Never forget that the greatest value of the right to strike is to be found in the threat to strike. All too often, when labor goes beyond the threat to strike and pulls the plug, so to speak, it loses the strike, because in most national emergency disputes which involve the health and safety and welfare of the Nation, public interest must come first.

Labor ought to recognize that the public interest will always be placed first.

That is why the Senator from Oregon has urged in recent weeks that the parties agree to voluntary arbitration of the issues in this dispute on which they could not reach agreement.

Having mentioned the procedure of voluntary arbitration, I wish to pay my respects and my compliments to a great industrial statesman within the field of railroad labor. He is the head of one of the so-called nonoperating unions. I refer to the incomparable George Harrison, who has demonstrated time and time again that he recognizes the point the senior Senator from Oregon has made. It is very interesting to note that in recent weeks Mr. Harrison entered into an arbitration agreement in regard to one part of the transportation industry in the country, and I commend him for it. It is with great regret that I note that the chiefs of the five operating brotherhoods did not exercise the same degree of industrial statesmanship.

The President of the United States has alluded clearly to the unthinkable results of a nationwide stoppage of our railroad systems. In his message of July 22, 1963, he told the Congress:

"In the event a strike occurs it will bring widespread and growing distress.

"Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment—including coal and other mining which is dependent on rails leading directly to the mine, steel mills that ship by rail, certain chemical plants which load liquids directly into tank cars, and synthetic fiber mills dependent on chemicals which for safety reasons can be carried only in rail tank cars—all of these and others would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail services would be disrupted. The delay, cost, and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.

"The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.

"As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components—including those engaged in the production of automobiles, metal products, lumber, paper, glass, and others—the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic. Construction projects dependent on heavy materials—exports and waterway shipping depending on rail connections—community water supplies dependent on chlorine which also moves only by rail—slaughterhouses and stockyards, iron ore, rubber and machinery, magazine publishers, and transformer manufacturers—all would be hard hit by a strike. The August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.

"The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15 percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of gross national product would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.

"At the same time, shortages and bottlenecks would increase prices—not only for fruits and vegetables, but for many industrial materials and finished products as well—thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive posture in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold."

The parties to this dispute knew that. The President did not tell the parties anything they did not know when he recited to the American people what the economic effects of the strike would be. Yet the record of the case is clear. Time and time again, the carriers agreed to cooperate with the Government in the adoption of peaceful procedures for the determination of the issues on the merits; and the brotherhoods adamantly, time and time again, refused. Who put the public interest first? Not the brotherhoods. I am sorry to find it necessary to say these things on the floor of the Senate.

I propose to put the blame where it belongs—right on the backs of the chiefs of the brotherhoods involved in this dispute. They have made a sad and sorry record of noncooperation with the Government in the attempt to seek voluntary, peaceful procedures for the settlement of this dispute.

A stoppage of general railroad service would be particularly disastrous to the small business segment of our economy. Thousands of such firms would close in bankruptcy after a few days. Their losses would be reflected many times over in related and dependent areas of the national economy. We cannot afford so great a sacrifice. We cannot afford it because I believe reasonable men, with their minds uppermost on the general public interest, can resolve the railroad dispute.

LEADERS OF THE RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS' SERIOUS MISTAKE—REJECTION OF VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

If there was ever a labor-management dispute that called for a solution through the procedures of voluntary arbitration, it is the railroad dispute with which we are now confronted.

President Kennedy deserves the highest praise for having offered the voluntary arbitration procedures to the parties and the carriers are to be commended for having agreed to accept this procedure under the specific plan offered by the President.

The President offered to the parties the services of one of the most able and highly respected labor arbitrators in our Nation—Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg. Mr. Justice Goldberg is recognized as one of the greatest leaders of our generation in the field of labor relations. His record is one of impartiality. He has brought his great judicial temperament to every labor dispute he has ever mediated or arbitrated.

Mr. Justice Goldberg was willing to devote his time this summer to an arbitration of the railway labor controversy dispute. Both sides to the dispute should have wasted no time in accepting the President's suggestion. The proposal was for voluntary arbitration. I believe that management and the railroad brotherhoods also had a patriotic obligation—I use the term "patriotic" advisedly—to retain voluntary arbitration in the field of labor relations as a tool, a vehicle, and a procedure for the settlement of labor disputes.

It is perfectly clear, as one studies the issues involved in this dispute, that the American public has come to the conclusion that there should be an equitable settlement of this dispute without a costly strike.

I need yield to no one as a friend of the legitimate rights of management and of the legitimate rights of labor. I say to the railroad brotherhoods, "In my judgment you had a clear responsibility, owed to your membership, owed to the families of your membership, and owed to the American public, to accept the principle of voluntary arbitration and to accept as the arbitrator a truly great man recommended by the President who, in my judgment, has no peer in the field of labor arbitration."

Mr. President, everyone in the dispute knows that a shutdown of the railroads would finally end with a settlement on just about the same terms as would be awarded by such an impartial judicial arbitration award, based upon all the evidence, as Mr. Justice Goldberg would have handed down.

Why the leaders of the railroad brotherhoods rejected the voluntary arbitration services of Mr. Justice Goldberg, I shall never understand. They lost a golden opportunity for a fair and equitable ruling. They know that Justice Goldberg is without a parallel as a mediator of labor disputes. With his great ability in this field he would have mediated—and successfully—the majority of the issues in dispute. His arbitration functions would have been called for on only a small number of issues. Above all, he would have placed his reputation as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court at stake. This would have assured absolute fairness and justice on any decision he might have rendered by way of arbitration.

But all this is "water over the dam," so to speak. The leadership of the brotherhoods rejected the President's voluntary arbitration offer, and thereby lost a great opportunity.

In the 11th hour of the negotiations the brotherhood finally agreed tentatively to proposals by Secretary Wirtz to arbitrate two basic issues involving the engine crew and the train crew. Unfortunately, it was too late. The brotherhood and railroads could not get together on the terms of the arbitration and the matter was thrown back to Congress.

But with respect to the offer of arbitration on the part of the brotherhoods, in my judgment, it does not meet the test of a good-faith offer, because the brotherhoods so entwined their offers with restrictions and reservations, as I said earlier in the debate today, that in one breath they offered arbitration, and in another breath they effectively took arbitration away. The terms, conditions, and restrictions they sought to impose killed their offer at the very time they submitted it.

It now remains for the Congress to exercise its jurisdiction toward a fair solution of the dispute.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102—THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

On July 22, in implementation of a plan for settlement of the railroad dispute, as offered by the President, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate joined in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 102.

The objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 102 as introduced, were explained by the President in this language:

"Ineffective measures which would not halt an injurious nationwide rail strike have been rejected as inconsistent with the public interest.

"Punitive antilabor measures which would destroy railway labor's rights to collective bargaining and reasonable job security have been rejected as harmful to the Nation and insensitive to the very real issues posed by the proposed work rule changes.

"Seizure of the railroads has been rejected as unjustified in the circumstances of this case, as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and has merely postponed the day of reckoning on more efficient work rules and their acceptance by the brotherhoods.

"Compulsory arbitration of this dispute by a special or congressional panel has been rejected as inconsistent with the principle that solutions reached through free collective bargaining should always be permitted and preferred.

"Indefinite extension of the status quo for one or both parties has been rejected as on evasion of a serious public, as well as labor-management, issue that must be squarely faced.

"Our objective instead was to find a solution which—

"(1) Is sufficiently familiar to the Congress, in terms of the procedures and principles involved, to facilitate its prompt enactment;

"(2) Encourages the parties to achieve their own solutions through collective bargaining;

"(3) Confronts the parties, on issues where voluntary agreement is not possible, with methods and standards of solution which are comparable to those both sides have previously experienced and found acceptable;

"(4) Recognizes both the public interest in promoting railroad efficiency and preventing a disastrous strike and the public's concern for those adversely affected by a settlement; and

"(5) Provides for an interim remedy while awaiting the results of further bargaining by the parties.

"RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

"As noted above, the railroad 8-hour law of 1916 provides a precedent for congressional intervention of this type; and the Interstate Commerce Act provides a pattern to which both Congress and the parties are accustomed. Recognizing that both railroad mergers and their effect on railroad employment are deeply affected with the public interest, section 5 of that act wisely supplements the results of private decisionmaking and collective bargaining in this area with the quasi-judicial regulatory powers of the independent Interstate Commerce Commission. Proposed mergers must be passed upon by the Commission after due regard to their effect on public service and safety, the rights of employees, and other considerations. In its order of approval the Commission includes specific terms and conditions to protect the job security of the employees involved. The carriers and brotherhoods remain free to supersede these employee security provisions with their own collective bargaining agreement. The value which railroad and other unions attribute to this section was reflected in their urging that comparable provisions be included in this year's mass transportation bill; and there are such provisions in this bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported in the House."

Mr. President, I digress from reading the President's message to say that I have a sense of humor when I am confronted with a little irony; and perhaps in this instance it is best explained as a paradox, for early this year representatives of the railroad brotherhoods and representatives of the mass transit workers came to me and urged me to help write into the mass transportation bill what amounts to the Washington amendment. It became known as the Morse amendment. I fought hard for that amendment, against what many Senators said were insurmountable odds. We had a meeting of the Democratic conference; and there it was perfectly clear that at that time the Morse amendment was not favored. But as Senators came to understand the fairness and the soundness of the position taken by the railroad brotherhoods and the mass transit workers, my amendment was adopted by the Senate by a good-sized majority, and it is now pending in the House; and the President adopted, as part of his program for the handling of this dispute, the principle of the very amendment that the brotherhoods and the mass transit workers earlier this year urged be added to the mass transportation bill. That is a bit ironical, and also is a bit humorous, Mr. President, when we consider the position the brotherhoods have taken in opposition to the President's proposal.

I read further from the President's message:

"There is no reason why these principles and procedures, if they are applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad mergers and mass transit modernization, are not equally applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad modernization and mechanization. An expert body should pass on these proposed rule changes in the light of public service and safety; and it should also make provision to prevent the employees from bearing the full cost of technical or economic progress, so long as priority is given to agreements privately reached by the parties themselves.

"I recommend, therefore, that—for a 2-year period during which both the parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval, or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission being directed to use to advantage the word of the two previous panels which received the evidence on these matters."

To digress again, Mr. President, let me say it was the brotherhoods who strongly endorsed the inclusion of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act in the first instance.

I read further from the President's message:

"At its discretion the Commission may also appoint a special advisory panel to assist it in the discharge of its functions. The Commission shall judge the effect of each proposed rule on the adequacy and safety of transportation service to the public and on the interests of both parties; and it shall, with the advice of the Secretary of Labor, require fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of the affected employees, giving proper weight to the protection provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act and those recommended by the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board reports. Emerging from the recommendations of these boards was the principle that, while many jobs would not be filled following the death, retirement, or voluntary transfer of the present occupants, every present employee with a significant attachment to the railroad industry would retain the right to his present employment or to comparable railroad employment at comparable pay. Provisions would also be made for rehiring priority, relocation expenses, displacement allowances, education and retraining grants, supplemental severance and retirement benefits, and other features. In short, no one would be thrown out in the street; and, while the railroads gradually modernize their operations, there would be little, if any, loss to individual employees.

"Unlike compulsory arbitration, this method would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions. But any strike or lockout designed to impose a rules change which has not been approved by the Commission or the parties, or to oppose one which has been approved, would be subject to the remedies of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"This procedure is most appropriate to the disposition of those rule changes involving the manning of train or engine crews—the "automation" issues, in a sense. It would build on the progress made to date in defining and refining those issues through the various panel studies and subsequent bargaining efforts.

"While the disposal of those issues should be sufficient to remove the barriers to a peaceful solution of all other issues by collective bargaining between the parties, many of them are closely interrelated to the work rules changes—and I recommend that the same joint resolution of the Congress provide that either party may submit such issues to the Commission to be settled by procedures deemed appropriate by the Commission.

"I stress the fact that, unlike compulsory arbitration, these procedures would provide only interim changes and only for those situations and for such length of time as the parties are unable to agree to collective bargaining."

Mr. President, I think the message the President of the United States sent to Congress on July 22, accompanying his proposal, was a sound one. I still think so today. Not one syllable uttered by any Senator during this debate has, in my judgment, to the slightest degree called for a qualification of the President's statement.

A few days ago, after considerable discussion with a group of Senators in the office of the majority leader—and the meeting was attended by spokesmen from the White House and by the Secretary of Labor—it was suggested by the Secretary of Labor that there be added to the President's proposal an amendment which would provide for a seven-man board, on the basis of the organization and procedures which I presented to the Senate earlier today.

That amendment was sent to me by the administration yesterday. I offered it to the Senate today. I am proud that I offered it, and I am proud that I voted for it. I am satisfied that in due course of time there will be general recognition of the fact that that is the joint resolution that ought to have been passed by the Congress.

The legislative problem which the administration faced in drafting Senate Joint Resolution 102 was to provide a procedure which would preserve collective bargaining but which at the same time would provide the assurance that there would be a resolution of the dispute through voluntary action of the parties without resort to a work stoppage.

Senate Joint Resolution 102 as originally introduced in the Senate, attempted to do this by identifying the engine crew and train crew issues as matters which are closely comparable to railroad mergers, amalgamations and coordinations, as well as mass transit modernization, with respect to their impact upon employment security. It was pointed out that not only are job security problems identical in these regulated areas, but that the proposed rule-changes with respect to the manning of the engine and train involve matters generally subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission with specialized knowledge of the railroad industry, including factors such as public service and safety which are so intimately involved in the current dispute. These were the considerations which prompted the administration to develop an ad hoc procedure designed to remove the case which had been blocking the channels of bargaining.

The second key to the administration proposal was to develop a system within the ICC framework for the development of interim rules governing the engine and train crew issues for the time being.

It is in the light of these interim rules that Senate Joint Resolution 102 would encourage and stimulate the parties to continue to bargain in order to develop final solutions of these and of all other remaining issues.

This is what the Secretary of Labor meant when he stated that the procedures contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 102 did not consitute compulsory arbitration, but, on the contrary, were designed to preserve collective bargaining within the limitation established by the background of these long overdrawn negotiations.

Thus, section 1 of the original Senate Joint Resoution 102 provides that changes in the work rules involving the manning of train or engine crews shall become effective only upon application to and approval on modification by the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act. It appears to be the intention in this section, read in the light of the scheme of the resolution and of the legislative background, that these rules will provide a basis for the manning of the trains for the interim period only.

Stated conversely, the resolution does not authorize the Commission to approve rules which are dispositive of the entire manning issue for the indefinite future. The emphasis is on interim work rule procedures to be effective only until such time as the parties reach agreement regarding the entire matter or 2 years following the date the interim rule goes into effect, whichever occurs sooner.

Section 3 of the original Senate Joint Resolution 102 emphasizes that the Commission in acting upon application to approve the proposed work rule changes within the limitations already developed, shall take into account considerations of safety and public interest and shall give due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Emergency Board and to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement developed in the negotiations following the Emergency Board report.

No matter what the Commission does in this connection, it is required to provide fair and equitable job security arrangements provided by section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act—the so-called Washington agreement procedures—protecting the jobs of employees and providing for the insurance against any worsening of the position of employees in consequence of the interim rule change.

Secretary Wirtz suggested that the decisions of the Commission would be subject to review in the same manner as are the orders of the Commission under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The parties are enjoined to bargain collectively with respect to the unresolved issues covered by the notices, other than the manning issues governed by section 1. However, if the parties fail to agree on any such issue within 60 days following the effective date of Senate Joint Resolution 102, either party may submit the proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission for disposition by special procedures adopted by the Commission after consultation with the parties, including, but not limited, such procedures as were recommended by the Emergency Board.

Thus, the resolution is designed to avoid compulsory arbitration as the term is generally understood and to provide in its place for the development of some interim basis for creating an atmosphere conducive to collective bargaining without the crisis pressures which have been built up as of this time. This is accomplished by the device of the so-called interim procedures.

WASHINGTON AGREEMENT SUPPORTED IN PAST BY BROTHERHOODS

Mr. President, basic in the procedures and principles adopted by the President in the administration in regard to the railroad tion is the Washington job protection agreement in the Mass Transportation Act. Those of us who have been consulting with the administration in regard to the railroad dispute crisis were not parties to the drafting of Senate Joint Resolution 102. It was presented to us for consultation after the officers of the executive branch of the Government had prepared it and believed that it warranted favorable consideration. We talked about its pros and cons. Many suggestions were considered. Finally the administration decided that it ought to be considered in the form which it sent to Congress. The record should be made clear that under those circumstances we said we would support the resolution. Neither the consultants nor those who drafted the proposal—and although I cannot speak for him, I can express the opinion that it also applies to the President of the United States himself—took the position that under no circumstances should Senate Joint Resolution 102 be modified by amendment or by substitution unless a better program could be proposed, first, to protect the public interest; and, second, to protect the legitimate interests of the carriers and the brotherhoods.

The Senate Commerce Committee considered the President's proposal as originally introduced under Senate Joint Resolution 102. What did the Commerce Committee produce?

A compulsory arbitration resolution, under the substitute Senate Joint Resolution 102, which was reported to the Senate on August 23.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION—A DISSERVICE TO EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

I have said time and again that I will not vote for any legislation providing the perennial bromide of compulsory arbitration as the means for settling the railroad dispute. Regrettably, the joint resolution reported by the Senate Commerce Committee offers precisely that kind of remedy.

Each time throughout recent history that the statutory procedures fail to settle a dispute involving the national economy, at some point someone reaches into the cabinet for the timeworn proposal of compulsory settlement as the basis for curing the headache. Some have called compulsory arbitration an excessively harsh remedy, but it is more than that. Let us not delude ourselves. It is a form of economic capital punishment. As a practical matter, it means that there will be no more collective bargaining where it prevails. Some may prefer decapitation as a cure for this headache, but I urge more realistic measures which are designed to maintain a true balance between the rights of labor to engage in collective bargaining and to strike and the rights of the public to be safeguarded against paralyzing and destructive consequences of a total strike affecting the national health and safety.

The committee measure favors decapitation of collective bargaining, and it is with sadness and regret that I must at this point part company with my distinguished friends who have joined in reporting out a measure of this kind.

The significance of compulsory arbitration as a form of economic capital punishment is well understood by the administration, by the railroad brotherhoods, by the carriers, by the house of labor and by all of the professional members of the labor-management relations community. Indeed, it was only a few weeks ago, as I mentioned earlier, that the President of the United States in his special message to the Congress on the railroad dispute told us that the administration had given careful consideration to the various kinds of legislation which Congress might enact to solve the present railroad situation and had specifically rejected compulsory arbitration as inconsistent with the principles of free collective bargaining.

The report of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy issued in May of 1962 emphasized its rejection of "the idea that there should be any legal requirement that disputes should be resolved through compulsory arbitration." This has been the consistent position of all of the Secretaries of Labor, including Secretary Wirtz, and represents the honest and sound judgment of those who are most familiar with the process of collective bargaining and settlement of emergency disputes.

Since I will be referring rather extensively in the next few minutes to the work of the Committee for Economic Development and the special panel appointed by the committee to make a study group report on national labor policy, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a list of the members of the independent study group, because I do not know how there could have been brought together a better qualified group of recognized authorities on the subject of labor economics, labor law, mediation, and arbitration than this group.

It consists of the following:

Dr. Clark Kerr, chairman of the group, president of the University of California and one of the distinguished mediators and arbitrators in our country.

Douglas V. Brown, professor of industrial management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

David L. Cole, practicing attorney and arbitrator, Paterson, N.J.; one of the most able men we had on the staff of the National War Labor Board during the war.

John T. Dunlop, professor of economics, Harvard University. When the members of the board and the staff of the National War Labor Board get together for a reunion now, we refer to men such as Dr. Dunlop as graduates of the War Labor Board. He was one of our distinguished staff members.

William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University.

Albert Rees, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Robert M. Solow, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Philip Taft, professor of economics, Brown University.

George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Taylor was vice chairman of the War Labor Board. He has settled, as an arbitrator in the past 20 years, many of the major labor disputes of this country.

Members of the staff were:

George P. Schultz, director of the staff, professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago.

Abraham Siegel, associate director, associate professor of industrial relations, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

David Burke, staff associate, University of Chicago.

The report they have prepared is a classic. It should be required reading, not only in undergraduate courses, but also in graduate seminars which deal with the subject of labor relations.

I extend my congratulations to the Committee for Economic Development for the great contribution it has made to knowledge in this field through the appointment of this independent study group and the report which has been filed. I particularly congratulate Donald K. David, chairman of the board, Committee for Economic Development.

I ask unanimous consent that the foreword which he wrote for this report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FOREWORD

"The research project which terminates with the publication of this study was, in the words of the Committee for Economic Development Trustees' resolution of authorization 'a carefully, extensively and soberly considered step.' For the trustees, and their committees recommending the study, were fully aware that they were 'approaching one of the most explosive policy areas in this country.'

"But, characteristically, Committee for Economic Development authorized and arranged the financing of this independent study because its trustees were convinced that national policy toward labor organizations was a subject urgently in need of impartial inquiry. And the trustees launched the project conscious of the fact that Committee for Economic Development would once again 'live dangerously in pursuit of the national interest.' Their decision to proceed followed discussion of the project at two meetings of the executive committee, the first in November 1958, and at a meeting of the program committee before it was approved by the research and policy committee for referral to the board of trustees in January 1959.

"In order to assure a detached environment for the study group's work, the trustees wisely called for no public announcement of the group's composition and the nature of its task. The group was thus able to work over a period of about a year and a half, meeting occasionally at sessions lasting a full week, without 'fanfare, the excitement of expectations, or the diversion of advance public debate.'

"I believe that the results of the study, to be found in the following pages, will prove ample justification for the decision of CED's trustees—and for their precautions. Also, readers will note that the group stayed strictly within the scope of their assignment as defined by the resolution of the trustees, adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"'The study is to evaluate policies in terms of their effects upon the general public interest, rather than in terms of effects upon the interests of any particular sector of the society. The study is to deal with policies toward "labor organizations" as instinct from "labor"—i.e., such matters as full employment policy, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, etc. National policy is understood to cover Federal, State, and local government policies, but to exclude matters that are primarily within the purview of management and labor, such as personnel policies, except insofar as these internal matters condition, or are conditioned by, public policy.'

"As also prescribed by the trustees, publication of this report by CED 'does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the recommendations therein by the Committee for Economic Development, the research and policy committee, the research advisory board, the research staff, or any board or committee or any officer of the Committee for Economic Development.'

"In the spirit of objectivity with which CED authorized this study, it even sought its financing from outside philanthropic sources, and I wish here to thank those who joined in this effort to assure the independence of the study group. I wish also to offer my personal congratulations to members of the study group for adhering studiously to their mandate, and for the diligence and dedication they brought to their task."

Mr. MORSE. In the foreword Chairman David had this to say about the work of the independent study group:

"I believe that the results of the study, to be found in the following pages, will prove ample justification for the decision of CED's trustees—and for their precautions. Also, readers will note that the group stayed strictly within the scope of their assignment as defined by the resolution of the trustees, adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"'The study is to evaluate policies in terms of their effects upon the general public interest, rather than in terms of effects upon the interests of any particular sector of the society. The study is to deal with policies toward "labor organizations" as distinct from "labor"; i.e., such matters as full employment policy, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, etc. National policy is understood to cover Federal, State, and local government policies, but to exclude matters that are primarily within the purview of management and labor, such as personnel policies, except insofar as these internal matters condition, or are conditioned by, public policy.'"

The independent study group appointed by the Committee on Economic Development in its report of December 1961 warned against the use of "meat ax solutions, such as compulsory arbitration, which are offered as one-shot and one-blow solutions to any problem which appears to be too difficult for other solutions." The report of the Livernash Committee to Secretary of Labor Mitchell in January 1961 on collective bargaining in basic steel makes precisely the same point. It tells us that—

"The fundamental handicap of compulsory arbitration is that it operates without either standards or consent. In the absence of participation in determining their own economic future, the parties will demand to know the basis for the decision. Unfortunately, there are few, if any, generally accepted standards which both labor and management will accept in setting wages and working conditions. In the area of wages alone there are over a half-dozen criteria that can be and have been used in determining rates and most of these are very general and controversial in application. The great advantage of free collective bargaining is that the economic decisions involved in a settlement are self-justifying, at least so far as the parties are concerned. Compulsory arbitration lacks this essential element."

The report warns that experience with compulsory arbitration in a number of the American States and in Australia and New Zealand establishes that compulsory arbitration has always corroded free collective bargaining.

The fact is that compulsory arbitration is repugnant to our entire tradition of economic freedom in America. Not only is it repugnant, but it does not work. Years ago we were told by my old friend, Will Davis, who served as Chairman of the National War Labor Board and later Director of Economic Stabilization during World War II days, that—

"The determination of a controversy between free citizens by the edict of Government is not a peaceful thing, and it is not a settlement. It is an enforced termination of warfare, and it settles nothing."

On this subject, I speak from experience. I have spent many years in the area of collective bargaining and arbitration, and I have served in all kinds of the most difficult disputes, which appeared at the time to be hopelessly deadlocked and hopelessly entangled. I have seen these before the war, during the war, and in the long period since. A review of my record will show that my judgment on this issue has never varied. In 1941, in an article appearing in the March issue of the "Commonwealth Review," published by the University of Oregon, I wrote about the growing agitation of that period for legislation to provide compulsory arbitration. I said then, and I say now, that compulsory arbitration is opposed generally by both unions and employers—and rightly so. A realistic approach to labor problems forces the conclusion that the most powerful argument against compulsory arbitration is that it obviously will not work. I said then, as I say now, that any employer group conscious of its own self-interest must recognize that the application of compulsory arbitration to their disputes is bound to threaten their managerial rights. I said, further, that compulsory arbitration will always be opposed by labor because labor recognizes that compulsory arbitration places in the hands of the arbitrator the power to determine the very existence of the union itself.

Compulsory arbitration, no matter how plausible it may be made to sound in any case such as the one before the Congress today, does, in fact, place in the hands of the arbitrator the power to destroy the employer or the union.

The railroad brotherhoods have always been opposed to the use of compulsory arbitration. They have told me this time and again. They have fought over the past 4 year to avoid the very thing that is threatening them today. If any of them have finally yielded to the terms laid down by the Commerce Committee in its reported bill, or in a modified form with 6(b) out of the bill, it is only because they feel that there are no other courses left open to them. They must feel that they have been driven to the very edge of the cliff and that they must either surrender or perish.

An analysis of the record in this case demonstrates all of the evils which compulsory arbitration would bring upon this industry. No assurances that its effects can be stopped here can satisfy me. The policy of this bill, if it becomes law, will be spread throughout all of labor relations and will mark a great turning point in the history of collective bargaining in the United States. In reviewing this history, one must underscore the point that the carriers have for a number of years been steadily and persistently following the policy of attempting to get a compulsory arbitration bill before the Congress. And their long and patient efforts have now been marked by success.

The threat of compulsory arbitration has been ever present in the negotiations relative to this dispute. This factor, alone, perhaps more than any other, has chilled the bargaining to a degree where resolution of the issues has become, as a practical matter, impossible.

The Rosenman report and the President's report to the Congress each has emphasized in various ways the inadequacy of the bargaining which has taken place. We have been told in these reports that progress throughout the past few years has been small and that only in the most recent period following the Rosenman report has there been any encouraging signs that the parties might warm up to their task of developing a basis for an agreement.

The brotherhoods have been understandably hesitant to develop positions in bargaining because of their fear that any offer they might make would eventually become the standard for the compulsory arbitration which was constantly casting its shadow over the parties. Perhaps if at some point the brotherhoods had offered to compromise a figure on the reduction in the size of the engine crew or of the train crew and if their effort had aborted, they must have felt that their figure would have become the floor in the deliberations of the panel on compulsory arbitration to achieve an enforced resolution of the issue. I cannot believe otherwise.

Let me digress here to say that when I arbitrate a case, the offers of the parties in collective bargaining are not admissible in evidence. Why should they be? In collective bargaining the parties are trying to arrive at a conscionable compromise, and make give-and-take adjustments. They may make an offer on issue "X" in the hope that they will get from the other side a better offer on issue "Y." It is the view of the senior Senator from Oregon that when the parties enter into arbitration, in effect, they are in court.

I have always been proud of the fact that time and again lawyers trying their cases before me in my arbitration courtroom expressed appreciation of the fact that judicial procedures and the rules of evidence were followed to a reasonable degree. So I have always ruled that the bargaining which took place in the collective bargaining room has no place in the arbitration courtroom.

Yet I know there are many employers and many negotiators for labor who fear arbitration because they fear they may not get such a ruling, and they fear that some offer they made might rise to plague them in the arbitration courtroom.

I have been trying to find some basis for explanation of the adamancy so characteristic of the brotherhoods' handling of their side of this case. I express this view not knowing whether it is borne out by the facts or not, but I assume it may have had some bearing. It does not justify their adamancy.

The threat of compulsory arbitration had a very real and pernicious effect on the bargaining in this case. It has been charged that the carriers lacked genuine enthusiasm for developing a basis for a negotiation because they hoped and apparently knew that a deadlock would mean the end of collective bargaining in railroading. But as I have studied the record of the case that has been made available to me, I do not find that that charge against the carriers stands up.

If we demonstrate to the parties now that there will be no compulsory arbitration, and we tell the carriers that they can put aside their plans and hopes of the past 2 years, and we tell the unions that they can put aside their fears, I think we can all safely assume that the parties will begin to bargain in earnest for the first time. The resolution pending before the Senate carries with it all of the vices and the evils which I and which all other commentaries on compulsory arbitration proposals have identified throughout the past three decades. The arbitration board contemplated by the resolution will not only resolve in binding and final arbitration the issues relating to the firemen-helpers and crew consist issues, but it will also resolve all of the other issues in the dispute.

I must qualify that statement now in view of the amendment that was adopted this afternoon. I am still not sure that I know what all the effects of the amendment will be, and I am inclined to think that the authors of it do not, either. But it would appear, from the confused explanations given about the amendment this afternoon, that there is no assurance now, as the joint resolution has gone this far through the Senate, that there will be a final determination of all the issues. If not, it is not worth passing. Unless there is to be a procedure that will result in the determination of the issues, we are postponing the so-called evil day, and we shall have the headache back with us in 6 months.

Section 6(b) of the joint resolution, which has been changed in the resolution since I dictated this speech, provides that if the parties fail to resolve any of the other issues within the short time of 30 days after the issuance of the manning issues, the National Mediation Board shall certify to the arbitration board the remaining issues. We all know that all the carriers have to do under such a provision is to drag their feet for a few days and the entire matter will be very easily dumped into the compulsory arbitration procedures. This is bald, unadulterated compulsory arbitration of one of the most critical disputes affecting the entire labor relations structure of the railroad industry.

On the basis of the modification of subsection 6(b), which was adopted on the floor of the Senate, all the brotherhoods will have to do is to drag their feet after there has been a decision on the two main issues. Eventually the whole problem will be dumped back on the floor of the Senate. That is why I believe it is incomprehensible that the Senate should adopt any such legslation.

If this measure passes, it most assuredly will become a precedent for the settlement of any other issue in any future negotiation, and it will mean an end to the long history of collective bargaining in this great industry.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL

The railroad brotherhoods have objected strenuously to President Kennedy's proposal for the use of the good offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission in reaching a settlement of the railroad dispute. Possibly at the root of this is the fact that they fear a lack of impartiality on the part of the I.C.C. membership. I do not share this fear.

I think the brotherhoods are unduly alarmed and unjustifiably disturbed about the consideration the case would receive if the President's proposal were to be enacted.

In my opinion the Interstate Commerce Commission would be bound by the evidence. I have a great deal of difficulty in accepting the contention of the brotherhoods that they would have no chance of getting a so-called square deal from the Interstate Commerce Commission because the representatives of the workers in the industry themselves negotiated the Washington agreement. The Washington agreement is carried out under section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which places the determination of job security issues that are involved in connection with mergers and dislocations in industry within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Therefore, I think the President of the United States was quite logical and quite fair when he suggested in his recommendation that the agency of the Government that has jurisdiction over the railroads should be the agency to hand down, not final determinations, but interim determinations, covering a 2-year period, until the parties to the dispute themselves work out modifications and agreements in respect thereto.

To show his fairness, the President, through his Secretary of Labor, had a modification of the original proposal introduced in the Senate last night by the senior Senator from Oregon and presented in argument today. That modification calls for the appointment of a seven-man tripartite board which would do the arbitrating and would submit its arbitration recommendation to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would either promulgate it or modify it prior to promulgation.

I will not spend more time on this point now; but, as I said earlier in the debate, there is practically no possibility of a decision of an arbitration board being modified by the Interstate Commerce Commission unless an arbitration board should go hog wild and render an arbitration decision which obviously could not be squared with the evidence.

So as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the presumption is in favor of the President's proposal. Anyone who seeks to modify that proposal has the burden of proof to show that his modification would better protect the public interest than the draft of the President's proposal which was introduced in the Congress.

I say most respectfully, that in my judgment the Commerce Committee did not sustain its burden of proof. It did not overcome, in its committee report or in any arguments or speeches made by its members on the floor of the Senate during the course of the debate, this presumption in the President's proposal.

I am confident that that point of view would likewise be shared by the President, in that if anyone could show that the public interest would be better protected by a modification of the President's proposal, he would be the first to favor such a modification.

On August 14 in discussing the railroad dispute in the Senate, I referred to a letter addressed to me by a number of Oregon constituents. The very sincere views they expressed prompted me to offer the suggestion that a panel of seven, two from the carriers, two from the brotherhoods, and three from the public, might be appointed to consider the issues on their merits and weigh the evidence supporting the contentions of the two sides to the dispute. I know of no more rational way of handling it.

Because of the situation that has developed, I feel that the Senate should have the opportunity to consider another proposal as a step toward an equitable solution of this vexing problem.

The problem is and always has been to develop a statutory procedure which would achieve a balance between the policy of the Federal Government which recognizes the precious hard-won right of employees to organize and to strike and the policy of protecting the national interest from the destructive effects of a national strike endangering the public health and safety.

The basic idea implicit in my substitute is not new. It has in one sense or another been debated and explored by those elements in the labor-management community who are concerned with problems of national emergency strikes. In fact the basic idea was advocated by the eminent counsel to the United Steelworkers of America in the litigation in 1959 in the basic dispute of that period. The name of that counsel is well known to all of us. He later became a most distinguished and successful Secretary of Labor and is now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I refer, of course, to Mr. Justice Goldberg, who in 1959 was the counsel to the Steelworkers in the litigation culminating in the United Steelworkers against United States, reported in 361 U.S. 39. The main thrust of Mr. Goldberg's argument in that case was that the public interest in maintaining national safety and security could be served by enjoining only that part of the steel strike which interfered with the national defense production. It was his contention that partial operation of the steel industry would amply satisfy all of the essential steel requirements involved in maintaining national health and safety. The Supreme Court did not disagree with this conclusion. However, it sustained the position of the Government in that case, holding that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act authorized the issuance of a broad injunction enjoining the entire steel industry.

In a study on the basic steel industry completed in early January 1961 for former Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the point is made that partial operation of the steel industry might well take care of the essential needs of the country.

In its report on the national labor policy by a study group designated by the Committee for Economic Development, to which I have referred, it was noted that "partial operation of a struck industry or facility may be all that is necessary to protect the public interest in continued availability of the goods or services involved." It was stated by the group consisting of some of the most eminent scholars and specialists in the labor field, whose names I mentioned previously, that partial operation offers hope in many industries, including the transportation industry, "of protecting the public interest while allowing private pressures on parties to bring about a voluntary settlement." This group stressed that "the President is entitled to have this possibility explicitly recognized" in any law dealing generally with the subject of emergency strikes.

Of course, what we have here is a need for a special, ad hoc legislative remedy to fit the situation confronting the United States because of the hopeless deadlock in the railroad negotiations. We do not need a general law at this point such as this group had in mind. What we need is a special procedure to fit this single case. The bill which I have developed will do this. It is based upon the concept that the public interest must be protected from the consequences of a total strike by providing for a plan to maintain essential rail services during the strike. At the same time it respects the principles of free collective bargaining by encouraging the parties to settle the dispute voluntary procedures and by preserving the right of the employees to strike. However, because of the competing interests of the national community, the strike must necessarily be related to that part of the rail system which is not required to be maintained in the interests of the national health and safety.

The analogy is, of course, to the difference between a total atomic war and a limited war. Just as a total war would be destructive of our entire civilization, a total strike would imperil and threaten our national health and security. To avoid the total consequences of this kind of total action, we have developed a concept of limited war in order to isolate international disputes to a point at which they will not endanger the security of the world. Similarly, in my amendment, we would isolate the economic war between labor and management, if it should break out, in such a way that the national health would be protected.

The amendment thus requires the President to develop a plan by which the area of allowable economic conflict can be clearly marked out and separated from the area in which continued rail service is required in the public interest.

It would authorize the President to appoint a Special Railroad Work Rules Disputes Board composed of seven members. Three of the members will be selected by the President from a panel designated by the carriers, and three of the members will be selected from a panel designated by the brotherhoods. The seventh man shall be the Chairman, who shall be appointed by the President directly.

I am perfectly willing to modify my proposal so as to provide for two members to be designated by the carriers, two by the brotherhoods, and three to represent the public. What is important is to have a tripartite Board. I shall not press the matter of detail, for I have no illusions about what will happen to this amendment in a few minutes. The overwhelming majority of Senators will vote against it, because the die has been cast. They are for compulsory arbitration. They are for setting the saddest, sorriest precedent in the history of labor-management relations in the history of this Republic and of Congress.

But it is important, in carrying out one's trust in the Senate, to make the record for future reference. So I offer the amendment and make this explanation of it and engage in these comments today for future reference.

I am satisfied that the leaders of labor and of management will come back for the very procedures that I suggest today, after they have suffered the sad experiences that will be imposed upon them by what I consider—and I express my own opinion—the surrender by Congress to the powerful pressure that has resulted in the passage of a measure that never should have been passed.

Congress should have told those pressure groups: "We are going to put the public interest first."

But the public interest is not put first by the passage of the kind of legislation that is being proposed here today.

The Work Rules Disputes Board will have the responsibility of issuing a decision with recommendations on the two basic issues involved in this case. I refer, of course, to the issue involving the engine crew and the train crew.

The recommendations issued by the Board will, however, not be binding on the parties. Either may accept it, or either may reject it. Upon the request of any party who has demonstrated that he has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a settlement of any of the issues covered by the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, the National Mediation Board may refer any such issue to the Disputes Board for decision and recommendation in the manner already described.

During this entire period in which these issues are either made the subject of decision and recommendation of the Board or are otherwise settled by the parties, the status quo is maintained. The carriers may not make changes in their work rules, nor may the unions strike.

Once the issues have been settled in the manner described or have been included in the decision by the Board, the parties will then be free to take whatever action they desire. The carriers and the unions may accept the recommendations and conclude the matter. The carriers may put the recommendations into effect, and the union may strike in protest thereof.

The carrier may put some other rule into effect and the union may strike to enforce the recommendations.

All of these courses are open.

However, if the carriers should put into effect some rule other than those recommended, a strike by the union will result in a seizure of that part of the rail system which is necessary to maintain national defense and safety. On the other hand, if the union should strike in protest of the carriers' putting these recommendations into effect, the President may direct the Attorney General to enjoin that part of the strike which interferes with the national health and safety.

In either case, the essential national transportation will be maintained giving due consideration to all other available means of transport, and at the same time the parties will be able to resort to economic force in support of their own positions.

Under this system we avoid the vice of compulsory arbitration. However, we develop effective recommendations which the parties may follow. The parties nonetheless are free to follow other courses, but if they do so, the President has full authority to take action to maintain essential transportation either by seizure or by injunction.

Mr. President, I have offered my amendment and urge its serious consideration by the Senate because I believe it offers a sensible and practical procedure for the solution of this most difficult case.

Mr. President, last night I read to the Senate a section-by-section analysis of the amendment I have offered. I shall not take the time to repeat the reading of that analysis. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed again at this point in my remarks.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"ANALYSES OF THE WORK RULES DISPUTES SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE

"I. Purpose

"The object of this bill is to provide for a system which will encourage the parties to adhere to collective bargaining procedures in the settlement of the issues invloved in the work rules dispute and at the same time to protect the economy from the paralyzing effect of a total railroad strike. It accomplishes this objective by (1) providing for an effective mediatory and conciliatory system to handle the basic issues and (2) authorizing the President to take all necessary steps to maintain essential rail transportation during a strike. It has twin objectives to develop procedures to assist the parties in finally resolving the issues and, at the same time, to give the President the means by which he can safeguard the public interest in the event of a strike. Is is based upon the proposition that during a rail strike, the national interest may be best served by requiring the continued operation of only that part of the rail system which is necessary to move essential commodities.

"The general plan of the bill is based upon a concept of limiting the area of economic conflict to that part of the economy which cannot be said to involve the national health and safety. This concept may be analogized to the political theories of total war and limited war. Total war threatens the security and health of the entire world. A strike shutting down the entire rail system or in other words a total economic war, threatens the security of the country. Just as we must limit wars in order to preserve our world civilization, the bill would limit the rail strike to protect the health and security of the country.

"Partial operation of the rail system during a strike emergency provides the necesary balance between the right of labor to bargain and the obligation of the Government to protect the public interest from the devastating effects of a total strike. The plan of developing legislation to provide for partial operation of the transportation services in the situation now confronting the country is not new. It was recommended in the report of an independent study group designated by the Committee for Economic Development in December of 1961. The study group consisted of such eminent scholars and labor exports as Clark Kerr, George W. Taylor, David L. Cole, and John T. Dunlop. Its recommendations parallel the basic ideas expressed in the Morse bill.

"II. Mainenance of the status quo

"The bill requires the maintenance of the status quo until all issues are resolved through collective bargaining or are made the subject of recommendations by a special railroad Work Rules Disputes Board.

"III. Factfinding and recommendations by the Work Rules Disputes Board

"A. The President will appoint a Board consisting of seven members (three drawn from management and three drawn from labor with a Chairman designated by the President).

"B. The Board will first consider the basic issue involving engine crew and train crew. The remaining issues must be negotiated by the parties.

"C. The Board will issue its decision and recommendations on the two basic issues within 90 days.

"D. The remaining issues are to be resolved by the parties in collective bargaining. However, the National Mediation Board may refer any of the remaining issues to the Work Rules Disputes Board for determination upon request of any party if it finds that the party making the request has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach agreement on such issue in collective bargaining.

"IV. Termination of the Statutory Status quo period

"The parties are free to take such action as they may determine to be in their own interests whenever all issues in the dispute have either been resolved through collective bargaining or have been made the subject of the Work Rules Disputes Board's decision and recommendation.

"V. Partial operation of the rail system in the event of a strike

"A. If the carrier should reject the recommendations of the Board and should put into effect work rules of a different nature, the unions may strike. In this event, the President is authorized to seize such part of the railroad system as may be necessary to maintain essential services in the public interest. The facilities which have not been seized will remain subject to the strike.

"B. If the carrier should put into effect the recommendations of the Board, the unions may strike in protest thereof. In this event, the President is authorized to enjoin that part of the strike which interferes with the maintenance of essential rail transport.

"C. In determining what part of the rail system must be maintained in order to provide essential services, the President must give due consideration to the availability of other means of transport for the shipment of essential commodities.

VI. Compensation in the event of seizure

"In the case of seizure the bill provides that just compensation shall be made for the operation of the railroads, giving due consideration to the fact that the United States took possession of the rail system when its operations had been interrupted by a strike.

"VIII. Strike risks

"The bill provides that the Work Rules Disputes Board, in its recommendations, may provide that employees who strike in protest of the recommendation may be denied any part of the job protection provisions contained in its decision."

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I close with this final statement about what I believe is really involved in the crisis that has been created by this case. We in this country must make up our minds whether we shall preserve economic freedom by preserving the precious right to bargain collectively; the precious right on the part of management to resort to economic force by way of a lockout, if it wants to follow that course of action; the precious right of workers to band together and refuse to offer their services in concern and engage in a strike.

Many persons like to dismiss these abstract rights. But I would have Congress and the people of the country reflect on the kind of country we would have if those rights were lost to free employers and to free workers.

It may be said, "Oh, you are whistling while walking by a graveyard. There is no danger of that. Stop deluding yourself."

But there are people in other countries and in other civilizations who took the same position, the position that they could not lose their freedom. But it happened.

There are many ugly dangers in this country today that are attacking our freedoms from many angles. There are in this country extremists who want to invest in the police of the country, including the police of the District of Columbia, police-state powers that would destroy the basic rights of freedom. They want to take away the protection of the Supreme Court in such fact situations as the Mallory case. Another group of extremists seeks to vest more and more unchecked power in the American military.

I have heard it said—and I repeat today, and it is apropos the subject matter of the protection of freedom which is so basically involved in this proposed legislation—"Be on guard, for it can happen in the United States that a military power can become so strong that free institutions and constitutional procedures become endangered."

Mr. President, those of us who have been battling on the floor of the Senate for the past few years against the unchecked power of the CIA are really fighting to preserve for the people the precious principle of our system of checks and balances, for in a democracy there is no room for unchecked power by any agency of government or any group within our citizenry.

Some may ask, "What does this have to do with this joint resolution?" The answer is, "Everything"—as Senators will realize if they reflect upon the major premise of my argument. I am arguing against the unchecked exercise of compulsory power on economic freedom. If the wall of protection which Americans have enjoyed all these years in the field of management-labor relations is broken through by a compulsory-arbitration hammer drive such as this joint resolution can, in my judgment, properly be said to constitute, we shall start to tear down the wall of economic freedom for management and labor which has been built up to protect them from the exercise of arbitrary power by the Government—in this instance, by a compulsory arbitration board representing the Government.

Mr. President, the preservation of these abstract principles of government will determine whether Americans remain free. When we read history, we find that the first step taken by police states is destruction of the economic freedom of the workers and managers; and usually they do it with unchecked military power.

So, Mr. President, as a constitutional liberal, I offer this amendment to the committee amendment. I know it has been argued that this is a rather complex amendment. Of course it is. But freedom is complex, too; and freedom is worth whatever price we have to pay to protect it. I will not vote today for such a precedent, even though an attempt is made to limit it to this case, for it cannot be limited to this case. Although Senator after Senator has gone through the verbal form of trying to assure himself that the proposal now confronting us will not establish a precedent, no Senator can assure himself or anyone else that it will not establish a precedent. Of course it will establish a precedent, Mr. President—and an exceedingly dangerous one. Who knows where it will lead? It should not be established, because it never should be followed. But precedents are followed; that is one of the ugly things about bad precedents.

So I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by saying that I care not whether I am the only Senator who will vote against this joint resolution or whether I am the only one who will vote for this amendment to the committee amendment. I will stand on the record I am making today for future reference in support of the preservation of economic freedom for management and labor, and in opposition to a precedent of compulsory arbitration set by this very unwise and shocking joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to summarize the matter in capsule form by saying that I refuse to believe that we cannot make democracy work in this country and that we have to resort to compulsory arbitration, even in a national emergency case.

I am a great believer in the passage of time in the settlement of labor disputes. The therapeutic effect of the passage of time upon the thinking of people is remarkable in settling a labor dispute. I am pleading this afternoon for a passage of time in connection with the airlines strike, for the men to be sent back to work, to be assured by the resolution that we pass that their rights will be protected retroactively as far as an economic settlement is concerned, and for them to try again to work out the matter within the framework of collective bargaining and also within the framework of the public interest. That includes, may I say respectfully—although labor does not like to hear it said—a wage settlement that will not disrupt the stability of the economy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. May I say, lastly, that I do not think that compulsory arbitration should be added to this resolution, even by those who believe in compulsory arbitration. I think we have a responsibility, after legislation is passed in respect to this dispute—I have no doubt that it will be passed in one form or another—to then pass so-called permanent legislation by way of amendment to both the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley law and section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. That is the time, it seems to me, to consider the various alternatives, procedurally, for the settlement of disputes by way of permanent legislation. Therefore, I think it is a mistake to raise compulsory arbitration in connection with this legislation. I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. Also I shall continue to vote against compulsory arbitration in connection with any bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall take 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon has said that he is a great believer in the therapeutic effect of the passing of time. I am, also. But a lot of time has passed in negotiations between the contestants in this labor dispute. There has been practically 1 year of negotiation, direction by the Mediation Board, direction by the Emergency Board, intervention by the Secretary of Labor, proffer of arbitration. But the 1 year has produced no settlement.

It was finally determined to paralyze the air service of the country, and that paralysis, Mr. President, has been quite severe. The five struck airlines account for 62 percent of all U.S. passenger traffic and 70 percent of air mail service. Service is affected to 231 cities in the United States and 23 foreign countries. Mr. President, each day 150,000 passengers and 4,100 flights are affected. Seventy cities have been totally denied air service. One year has passed, and at the end of 1 year we have this paralysis of the airline service in our country.

The question comes to my mind, and I think it should come to the minds of other Senators, with this tremendous impact on the various communities of the United States in the knowledge of the unions, why do they persist in the strike? They do so, Mr. President, because they know that they will not only bring the commercial carriers, but the Government to its knees.

I understand the argument about the preservation of democracy. But, Mr. President, what about my rights of freedom? What about my liberties? What about the rights of the 150,000 passengers a day? Do they have any right to complain? Of course, the answer is that they do.

We are here speaking of providing liberty and freedom and the exercise of browbeating power to a small segment of the economy at the expense of the people of the Nation. I do not know how many persons are in the galleries who have been denied the ability to move. What about their freedom?

Yes, I am a believer in freedom. I am a believer in democracy. But I do not want anyone else to use his freedom so as to impair my freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in Latin there is a maxim:

> Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas.

That means: 'So use your own power so as not to injure others."

I say to Senators: So let the union members and the airlines use their powers as not to injure others. They are not doing that.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

My understanding is that in due course the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] desires to request a call for a live quorum. There is nobody on our side who desires to speak, but since a brief rebuttal may be necessary after the live quorum, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Fifteen minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since this will be a live quorum, I suggest that attendants on both sides advise Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is this quorum call charged to neither side?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order the quorum call is charged to neither side.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 166 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who were not in the Chamber earlier while my amendment was being discussed, let me briefly outline what the amendment hopes to achieve.

Its purpose is to give 180 days to the disputants in an effort to negotiate a settlement. If a settlement is not negotiated within the 180 days, exercising the powers and rights of collective bargaining, then at the end of the 180 days the amendment would provide for the creation of an arbitration board. That arbitration board would take testimony, investigate the matter, and render final judgment as to what the settlement should be.

We say to the disputants, "If you do not settle your dispute in 180 days of negotiation, then it will be done by compulsory arbitration."

That, in brief, is the purpose of my amendment. I am now prepared to submit it to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. CLARK. For the benefit of all Senators, and in reply to the Senator from Ohio, the amendment calls for compulsory arbitration at the end of 180 days.

I am not ready for it. I do not believe that the Senate is ready for it. I am convinced that the country is not ready for it.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] states, correctly, I think, the position of a majority of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee at this time, with respect to our approach to a reasonable and realistic effort toward a solution of the serious problems resulting from the airlines strike.

It seems to me, however, that the Senate would be ill-advised to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. He is, of course, sincerely concerned, as are other Members of this body, with the impact of this present labor dispute on an essential transportation service, but I believe it would be unwise to adopt such a far-reaching amendment, establishing grave precedents, in a time of crisis and heated debate.

If it seems appropriate at some later time for the committee, or the Subcommittee on Labor, to conduct hearings on legislation dealing with arbitration; or, the administration, which is now studying labor legislation with a view to offering suitable remedial proposals, should send us a specific measure with a request for action, then at such time, the gentleman from Ohio could well share with us his views, comments, and suggestions—and I, for one, would certainly give the gentleman's testimony every serious consideration.

But I repeat, a measure setting such grave precedents in the arbitration area could, if enacted in the midst of controversy, be completely misinterpreted for years to come and could have serious long-term consequences.

Our report, Senate Report No. 1424, which accompanied this joint resolution to the floor was written very carefully, and it shows the efforts of a majority of the Members to keep this resolution confined within quite narrow limits. I know that I, for one, while wanting to see this dispute reach an equitable settlement as soon as possible, feel quite strongly that the Senate should, at this time, remain within the limits set by our findings, and confine itself only to the problem of resumption of essential air service in our Nation.

The Senator now speaking is one of the few Members of this body who voted for the National Labor Relations Act which became law in 1935. Indeed, this Senator worked to draft that hallmark legislation, and he gave his support not only by vote but also by voice, when he spoke strongly in favor of enactment of this important law.

I believed in collective bargaining then.

I believe in collective bargaining now.

For many years, the labor force in our Nation has demonstrated that our faith in collective bargaining, our faith in a responsible labor force, was not misplaced.

For many years, labor has, by and large, adjusted differences in points of view with management within the framework of that 1935 act.

And labor can, I am sure, continue to bargain in a responsible manner—reflecting credit on the Nation's workers.

Senator LAUSCHE's proposal would do violence to the philosophy of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and would negate the fine record of a vast majority of our working force. I oppose this amendment, Mr. President, and urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is bad enough that we have to take any action at all, but by adopting the pending amendment this afternoon we will be turning back the clock 30 years.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

In this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 81, as follows:

[No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—6

Fannin
Holland
Lausche
McClellan
Smathers
Williams, Del.

NAYS—81

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Bennett
Brewster
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Hayden
Hill
Miller
Pearson
Ribicoff
Scott
Symington

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendments were rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] proposes to strike section 2 of the joint resolution and substitute therefor the following:

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to reinstate and extend, by Executive Order, for such period or periods of time as determined by him, the period of time provided for in section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, paragraph 3, during which no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose: *Provided, however*, That such period or periods of time shall not exceed in the aggregate one hundred eighty days. During the period or periods of time referred to in this section none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it will take only a minute or two to explain this amendment. I discussed the matter at some length yesterday afternoon.

I wish to say at the outset it is regrettable that Congress has to take any action at all. It is regrettable that the rank and file of the members of the Machinists' Union could not see fit to abide by the recommendation and the agreement that was achieved by their representative under the auspices of the President of the United States.

I find no fault with their action, for the simple reason that for years we have been trying to democratize the unions in America, and finally we have achieved that result. We have proved now definitely that the rank and file of the members of this union are not being led around by their noses by their leadership, and they have a perfect right to disagree with their leadership if they so see fit.

But the fact still remains that the public interest is involved in this situation at this time, which fact has brought Congress, or particularly the Senate, to this point of involvement.

When the resolution was reported by the committee yesterday, I found some fault with the language used in section 2. It said, "The President may"—may do this or may not do it, as he saw fit.

In other words, I felt that the language was wishy-washy. I suggested then and I propose now to change that language by saying that Congress authorizes the President, in his discretion, to extend the time for a period of 180 days.

I think we would come closer, by the language that I have suggested, to creating a state of partnership between Congress and the President, and I hope that the committee will consider this language as a modification, and accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my opinion the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island makes a semantic improvement in the language of the resolution as reported by the committee. I think the words "is authorized" are better than the word "may"; but I do not think that they fundamentally change the meaning of section 2. I have conferred with the committee members who were responsible for reporting the committee resolution and they have agreed. Therefore, I accept the Senator's amendment; and ask that it be approved by a voice vote.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has a perfect right to accept the amendment for any reason that he likes. But I do not think that I am indulging in semantics. I have a very deliberate reason for introducing this amendment. As I said yesterday, the President has already become a party to the controversy and has exhausted his powers in vain. An issue has been raised in the Senate as to whether or not Congress, without action of the President, should assume the responsibility and order these people back to work. I think that is properly an executive action, and should not be assumed by Congress without the support or without the action of the President.

There is a precedent for authorizing the President. We have done that time and time again. Senators will recall that not too long ago, a question arose in this body as to whether or not we should do business and conduct trade with people or governments behind the Iron Curtain; and we amended the legislation at that time by saying it can be done only if the President of the United States says it is in the national interest.

The one man in the country who can best understand and answer for the national interest in any case of emergency or crisis is the President of the United States. I think it would be wrong to exclude him entirely. If we give him the authority to do this in his discretion, he can do it, when and if he believes that the interest of the country is being endangered because of this prolonged strike.

I think it would be considered an act of passing the buck to the President if we said he may or may not do it, as he sees fit. In view of the fact that the President of the United States has already been involved in this crisis, and has already been a party to the settlement that was made by the leadership and rejected by the members of the union our choice of expression is important. I am using language which has been used before. The language proposed by the committee is not language of art, when it comes to drawing legislation. The word ordinarily used, when you grant or delegate any authority to the President of the United States, is to say "we hereby authorize the President" to do this or that; and I feel that language would be more direct. It would show that Congress has used language which involves us in the situation; and, as I said before, it creates a sense of partnership. This, I feel, will dispel once and for all this bugaboo or this bogey about who is passing the buck to whom.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not construe the response of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] to be in anywise minimizing the thrust of the basic argument of the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator from Rhode Island has just said.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to add that this was a matter of real concern, not an exercise in semantics, within the committee. We discussed this point for perhaps an hour.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is giving substance to what we said. In that respect, it is an improvement.

May it be said for the committee that we used the words of the Railway Labor Act which we thought were words of art.

The Senator has made a worthwhile contribution and I hope the Senate will approve of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should say it is my understanding that negotiations are going forward for the purpose of attempting to arrive at some substitute for the committee amendment.

I am not a party to those negotiations, although the majority leader has kindly kept me advised as to what is going on. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I know of no negotiations which are going on.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if that is the case, I suggest that we have third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is what we call timing. I should like to acquaint the Senate with an amendment which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I propose. The amendment is printed as amendment No. 718.

When we are ready to vote on a definitive plan in this legislation, the senior Senator from Oregon and I hope very much that the Senate will look upon it favorably.

The amendment endeavors to deal with the problem which I think is quite properly raised by the Senator from Ohio. That concerns the fact that there is no legislation on the books under which the President can act in such a situation. Congress and the President are attempting to deal with, at the very least, a very trying work stoppage in a very critical industry, a regulated industry.

It is high time that we get some idea from the administration as to what it would like to do about this subject, so that we are not caught again, as we were in 1963—and as we are now in 1966—without remedies, and face the need of developing ad hoc remedies on the spur of the moment.

For that purpose, we have prepared an amendment which directs the Secretary of Labor to commence a study of the operations and the adequacy of the emergency labor dispute provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act, with instructions to report to us by January 15, 1967, his findings of such study, together with appropriate recommendations for amendments—and this is the important part—so that we may provide permanent procedures to make unnecessary in the future such special legislation as is embodied in this joint resolution.

Mr. President, I think most of us are very uncomfortable in these circumstances. Many of us have devoted our lives to seeking to develop collective bargaining procedures and internal union democracy to back them up. We are very deeply mortified in a situation in which the public interest finds itself powerless. Hence, there is grave danger that unwittingly, without any design to do so, our collective bargaining process may be seriously interfered with as a pattern for the country's economy.

I think that the reactions of most of the labor union leaders right now are very strongly against this legislation. Nevertheless, one must understand that the feelings of these men are mixed. These are men who have devoted a lifetime to the collective bargaining process. They see it being jeopardized by a piece of legislation, the fundamental thrust of which will bring men back to work, men who have just voted to reject a settlement.

This is a very awkward position for Congress to be in. No Senator will fail to face up to his responsibility and vote yea or nay on the measure the Senate presents as the way in which it thinks the dispute ought to be settled. However, none of us will be very happy about it.

The senior Senator from Oregon and I think this is a very opportune moment to bring Congress into a position in which it really, at long last, demands the assistance of the administration and requests the administration to assist Congress in forming a permanent pattern which would represent an ultimate guarantee to safeguard the public interest.

This would apply in a case such as this, or in the railway case, or in the event of a general strike, which is what it would amount to if the Teamsters Union were to call the men out. The country would face a general strike, as it did in the case of the longshoremen strike, in the case of the transit strike in New York, the seamen strike, and other strikes.

If the President does not choose to follow through on his state of the Union message, in which he assured us that he recognized the existence of this problem, at the very least the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from New York would give us an expertise, not merely on the basis of the reading of a paper or testimony, but also on the basis of a considered study, with 6 months' time in which to do it, by the Secretary of Labor.

I feel that now, somehow or other, the mainspring has been touched in respect to this matter.

It is strange that this did not occur in 1963, but I think that it is occurring now. I believe that Congress is acutely conscious of the fact that we have not been deliberate enough in advance to have law on the books to deal with the situation in which we now find ourselves.

I think the moment is very propitious to have labor legislation with some permanent plan to deal with this problem of national or sectional emergencies, particularly in regulated industries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Senator would clarify a little more what he means by "operations" in line 4 of the amendment. I understand the other part, but I am not clear as to what the Senator means by the word "operations."

Mr. JAVITS. The "operations" would include the manner in which the 80-day injunction operates under the Taft-Hartley law—what actually happens when injunctions have been obtained in the labor disputes and what disputes have been settled before the expiration of the 80 days.

I have no doubt that somehow or other we will get over this problem. However, we need provision on the books so that this situation may be dealt with.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator refers to a history of how the acts have worked out?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. In that way, we will have an opportunity to learn from our experience under those acts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is a cosponsor of the proposal. I think it is a good proposal. I do have doubts as to whether it ought to be considered as an amendment to this resolution. I would consider it as a separate proposal.

I also have doubts as to whether we ought to take it up at this time in the debate, because we have to proceed, in my judgment, to the consideration of a substitute amendment for the pending Clark proposal.

I do not want my friend, the Senator from New York, to think that in any way I qualify my position on the substance of the proposal that he is now talking about.

I think it really ought to come up, and I think we ought to proceed to take care of it at a very early date, following the disposition of the pending legislation. It really ought to come up when the Senate decides whether or not it wishes to proceed with the consideration of various proposals of amendments to the emergency dispute section of both the Taft-Hartley law and the Railway Labor Act. I would prefer to have it laid aside at this time, at least temporarily, and we should proceed with a discussion of a substitute to the Clark proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. When I say to the Senator from Oregon that that was precisely my purpose, I do not think the Senator was listening to me.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear that.

Mr. JAVITS. I explained that. I said that I would not bring it up and that it should not be brought up until we determined exactly what would be the pattern.

Mr. MORSE. I did not understand that.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree thoroughly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today, my colleague, Senator NELSON, spoke on the airline strike. What he said made sense. I agree with him. I say this although I have heard eloquent and moving statements in the Senate, pleading for congressional action to require the airline strikers to go back to work.

I think any step of this kind should only be taken with the most convincing evidence that such action to require, to force, to compel, to dictate to workers that they go back to work against their will—that such action is justified by a clear national emergency.

The right to strike is organized labor's most vital right.

Mr. President, does this Nation face a true national emergency? How about it? Is the Nation's health or safety really endangered?

It is my understanding that some 60 percent of the Nation's effective airline service has been stopped because of the strike.

But only some 5.9 percent of the travelers in this country use the airlines. Another 2.6 percent travel by bus, and 2 percent by train. The overwhelming majority rely on the automobile—some 89.5 percent. This means that less than 4 percent of available travel facilities are not available. Ninety-six percent are available for those who cannot use the 4 percent. Now, under these circumstances do we have a situation that warrants requiring, compelling, forcing American workers to give up their basic right to strike, to force them back to work?

Recognize that far less than 1 percent of the country's nonpassenger cargo travels by air.

Members of Congress are seriously inconvenienced. So are business leaders. But does this honestly require such drastic action as Federal dictation to require workers to break a strike? That is the question.

There has been much talk about lobbying on this measure. This Senator just does not believe it. I have not been approached or lobbied by any labor official, in spite of the fact that I talked at some length yesterday with a top man from the AFL–CIO. He was interested in unemployment compensation. He said not a word about this strike. Yesterday, I talked with a top man in the AFL–CIO in the State of Wisconsin, and he said nothing about the airline strike.

As far as I am concerned, there has been no pressure. Organized labor certainly has not exerted any undue pressure.

I think it is clear to anyone who looks at this matter objectively and tries to get perspective on it that this country is not in an emergency that would require this kind of emergency legislation.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to express my commendation to the Senator from Wisconsin for his statement.

Most of us have sat here this week, honestly seeking information as a basic for judgment. We may all come in with our prejudices, whatever they may be, and I have waited to hear somebody lay it on the line about the doom of the Republic hanging in the balance if we do not act. I have been surprised at the eagerness of Congress to rush into this breach, and this is what bothers me.

It is not just this simple instance of the airline strike right now, it seems to me. It is the precedent that we would be establishing, and deepening. We will have a great deal more labor-management disputes; and I think it is not too extreme a judgment to conclude that if we take the action that is requested here today, the next time there is a strike, it will be a little bit easier to nudge into the conclusion that that is of national importance, that the public interest is jeopardized by it.

I think we ought to look ahead down the road about what we are discussing today, and we should not jeopardize what is already a major part of a deep reservoir of good, constructive, and balanced labor-management practice, in the fundamental principle of the right of collective bargaining. I do not think we ought to be so prone to sell it out quite so fast, or to threaten to sell it out, because that surely will be the consequence if we take one of the actions posed before us.

What I fear that really is carrying us is our sense of national inconvenience, and I suppose the Members of the Senate have been as inconvenienced as much as anybody. I had to fly four different airlines in order to get home the other day, and that is just a plain nuisance. But I do not think this body has any business trying to legislate itself out of a nuisance.

I, likewise, think that there is some sense of pique, a kind of letdown, a kind of psychological backwash, after everybody thought that this matter had been settled over the weekend. I think that legislation responding to that kind of psychological dip would be poor legislation.

It seems to me that we have to ask ourselves the central question: Is this the kind of impending national disaster that requires the substantive action of this body? So far, nobody has been willing to say that it is. Therefore, because of that, it seems to me that we would do well to abide our sense of pique for the moment, to let our sense of being inconvenienced take its place in proper perspective to our sense of a much larger national obligation, and that is in the retention of the fundamental principle of collective bargaining.

No matter who we are in this body, I think we must concede that there might even be two sides to the dispute that is going on. In any case, the principle to which most Senators have always subcribed is to let both sides hammer it out around their own bargaining table, in their own collective bargaining procedures, unless national disaster impends, unless the economy is about to be brought down, unless the war in Vietnam were being jeopardized because of it. Whatever it may be, no one has set up a standard that suggests that that kind of disaster is staring us in the face.

For that reason, whatever our personal emotions may be, whatever our personal inconvenience may have been, I hope that we take the long view on this, rather than the short one, and think twice before we inject this body into a dispute that is clearly—up until now, at least—within the bounds of normal management-labor differences of opinion. The matter ought to be settled voluntarily at the conference table of their own choosing, rather than on a mandatory basis by a premature act on the part of this body.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator has made a splendid point in opposition to the so-called proposed Morse substitute, because the Morse substitute would summarily command these workers back to their jobs.

The time may come—perhaps in the very near future—when a situation approaching disaster dimensions might arise. But I think that decision as to the time and danger should be left to the President of the United States. As this committee amendment now reads, as I understand it, the workers will not be ordered back summarily. The discretion and authority is left to the President. If he feels that the national interest is involved, in his discretion, he can extend the number of days and ask everybody to go back to work. But I think it would be a terrible mistake on the part of Congress summarily to order these people back to work.

Mr. McGEE. May I say to the Senator that I think it is only one step removed from the unfortunate attributes of such a step to take the next step—of intruding Congress in any way into a situation in which it is not willing to say that a national disaster impends. That is the whole point. Because once we take that action, this will be used as another excuse to be an inch closer to intruding into the next circumstance that may be even further removed than this one from the national interest.

For that reason, I say let us draw the line now and vote against the Morse amendment, vote against the Clark amendment, vote "no"—unless someone can give us a more constructive and positive demonstration that the national well-being hangs in the balance.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am likewise inclined to vote "no" on both of these proposals, for a variety of reasons.

I was particularly struck yesterday when the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] informed us that 96 percent of the people moving between cities are moving as they always have moved, and that 99.9 percent of intercity freight is still moving.

I believe it would be a tragic mistake for us to intervene in this situation. If the strikers are forced back to work, nothing will be solved. They will go back grudgingly and unwillingly. They will not be happy and management will not be happy. Another crisis may soon confront us.

As the Senator stated, our present situation could well tend to repeat itself.

Whenever a situation such as this occurred Congress would be asked to intervene. This would be totally destructive of the process of collective bargaining.

It seems to me that, despite the duration of this strike, there has not been an adequate opportunity for management and labor to sit down and negotiate across the table. There have been too many interventions. There have been too many interruptions. We have no guarantees at all that if the Congress does not act that this strike will be settled, but I am confident that every effort will be made to settle it in the same manner as other strikes have been resolved.

Of course, we are put to great personal inconvenience. One hundred fifty thousand people a day or thereabouts are inconvenienced. Speaking personally, upon leaving Alaska the day after the strike started, I was obliged to return to Washington via Los Angeles. I propose to go back to Alaska this weekend and I shall have to go through Los Angeles. But I do not think that that is sufficient reason for me to vote for the Government to intervene at a time when, in my opinion, adequate negotiations have not taken place. That is not sufficient grounds for forcing free Americans to do that which they say they do not want to do.

Adequate testimony has been given on this matter. I merely wish to record why I am prone to vote as I intend to vote, and to indicate that I share the belief and concur in the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

To make the Record straight, if I had been voting over the weekend in the union, I probably would have voted to accept. That would be my "druthers." However, others do not always vote as I do. How I feel is irrelevant. What is not irrelevant is what I think is at stake if this body interjects itself at this level, at this time, in the matter of collective bargaining.

What bargaining power does a workingman have if Congress is going to jump in and tip the scales every time there is a dispute? All that management has to do is sit still. They do not have to wiggle, offer, or do anything. It is made to appear that these are the good guys. The only means that the workingman has to get his case heard and discussed is to take the only action he has, to strike. That puts him in the doghouse with a lot of people quickly. But what other bargaining power does he have to protect his job and his rights to a decent living?

Therefore, we should be very slow to contribute in any way to eroding a collective bargaining system that has really arrived at a considerable measure of respectability and contributed to national balance. We have come to this point the hard way in this country. Blood has been shed over this principle. Lives have been lost. Many laws have been written, but we are arriving at a sophisticated and mature management-labor relationship in ethics and conduct, and among them a right to disagree and bargain collectively around the table.

Unless we can demonstrate a national catastrophe, unless there is some mitigating circumstance that needs to be called to the attention of the country, we should not inject this body into the dispute. Instead of being participants, we should be referees to guarantee that those rights are not eroded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand the Senator, he is making the argument that there is no national emergency.

Mr. McGEE. I am making the argument that nobody in a position of responsibility is willing to say so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has not been established that there is a national emergency.

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to have that restated. That is the point; is it not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Frankly, if I have to vote for one of the two measures, I shall vote for the Morse resolution. It is constitutional and it sets the standards.

Mr. McGEE. Why would the Senator vote for either measure if there is no emergency present?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not going to vote for a bill.

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. But as to what he would vote for, let us not talk academically.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As far as I am concerned there is no national emergency. Who said that there is?

Mr. McGEE. My point is that we do have a business injecting ourselves into a labor dispute if it can be demonstrated that there is indeed a national emergency that requires some kind of mandatory action. But the Senator tells me that there is no such emergency. Nearly everybody else says that there is not an emergency. Why are we considering any measure? We are sore—some of us—because they did not accept the agreement. The pride of some people has been stung. Some people have been inconvenienced because they scheduled a trip for Monday. But that is no basis to intervene in the dispute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If there is anybody from Louisiana who cannot get on an airplane, call my office. Many persons have called my office. We have not yet failed to get a single person on an airplane. Eastern Airlines is not operating, but Delta Airlines is. As long as Delta Airlines stays open, we can put anybody on an airplane. Instead of Delta flying 60-percent filled, they are flying 100-percent filled. So Eastern Airlines is not making money but Delta is. There is no national emergency. The President will not say that there is a national emergency, nor the Secretary of Labor, nor the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As a practical matter, the Senator is correct that people are getting outraged and angry. The leaders of the union thought, as a matter of responsibility, they should sign the agreement. Their people said no. They said, "We do not think you should sign."

Congress has passed all of these laws benefiting labor. I voted for many of those, as did the Senator from Wyoming.

We are experiencing a labor dispute and it is an inconvenience for some people.

If the Senator has difficulty getting on an airplane, let me know. Where does the Senator want to go?

Mr. McGEE. I can think of no greater ride than to go any place by way of New Orleans.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to say to the Senator that if we are going to pass anything, the Morse proposal sets standards and tells the President what he can and cannot do. As a practical proposition, I cannot see why we should pass anything.

Mr. McGEE. I suggest that that is a hypothesis. The Senator should not say that he would choose between the two alternatives. We have a duty and that is to get out of this business unless there is a national emergency.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McGEE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator from Louisiana entertain a call from me for a more direct route to Alaska than through Los Angeles?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If that is all we are talking about, making 35,000 men go back to work against their will, so that the Senator can avoid going to Los Angeles on his way to Alaska, I say no.

How many hours is it to Los Angeles? It is about 4 hours. The flight then goes from Los Angeles to Anchorage. How many hours am I going to save the Senator by making 35,000 men go back to work against their will?

Mr. BARTLETT. Then I shall not call the Senator's office, but I shall agree with him altogether. I am not discommoded too greatly by having to go in a roundabout way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One can go around the Horn before he gets there, within 1 hour, and pay a few dollars to do so, but while these giants are fighting it out, big management and big labor, let them fight it out.

Mr. BARTLETT. Where is the process of breaking down this wonderful system of collective bargaining?

Mr. McGEE. I want to thank my friend from Louisiana for his comments. I do not want the Senate to kill collective bargaining. That is the reason I am speaking now. I did not intend to make a speech, but I gather it is necessary to try to get someone to do something. If there is no other comment, I will yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I disagree with the views of the Senator from Wyoming that we should not have any bill, but I certainly commend him as a stanch administration supporter for the sort of quasi-filibustering he has been carrying on until we can see what the administration really wants done.

Mr. McGEE. Shall I say, Mr. President, that my vote would have been the same? I could have, I suppose, won some marbles by shutting up. Shall we call it a declaration of conscience instead of a filibuster?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield to me further.

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Since the administration and our Republican friends have been unable to develop a bipartisan agreement which is necessary to beat the committee resolution, I suggest we get on to third reading and passage.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I was elected by the Senate to be majority whip, and I thought that meant I had some responsibility to try to be a liaison between the White House and the Senate. I cannot detect any effort by the executive branch to have this resolution passed. About all I can detect is that if we want to do something, it is within our power to do so. It certainly is. If the President wants to veto it, we still have the power to override him. But this is entirely our idea, as I understand it. If that is what it is, then I believe that every Senator should be the guardian of his own conscience.

In Louisiana, we have no problem. If any Senator needs to fly anywhere, let me know, and I will get him on an airplane.

Mr. McGEE. That is why I made my comments in the Senate. That is why I did not go down to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, or talk to the labor unions, or the airlines. I did not want to be bugged. That is why it is a complete mystery to me why the Senate itself is trying to get mixed up in this affair.

Why do we not leave it alone? Otherwise, we will make ourselves look ridiculous. It will be the undoing of what we have been able to accomplish in a balanced and fair way in labor-management relations for the past 50 or 60 years.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I completely concur with what the Senator from Wyoming has said. There has been no showing in this Chamber, or in the record, that there is a national emergency. If Congress is going to be involved every time a segment of an industry or a segment of our population is inconvenienced, this will be a very busy Senate and a very busy Congress just passing that kind of legislation.

I think that the Senator from Wyoming has made a very worthwhile contribution. Let us not worry about the merits of the Morse resolution or the committee resolution. Let us vote down both the resolutions, and when someone comes in to show that there is a national emergency, and there is danger to the health and welfare of the citizens of this country, then we can consider this other legislation.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been listening to this colloquy with some interest. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming some questions. I presume he feels that the airline service in this country is essential to transportation?

Mr. McGEE. I believe that we have come to find it necessary just as automobiles have come to be necessary, and television sets, and so forth. I go back—the Senator does not, I am sure—to the time when we did not have airplanes. I managed to make it whenever I had to travel. Thus, these are relative terms when we talk about necessity.

Mr. DOMINICK. Fine. I would also assume that the Senator would not contradict the fact that 60 percent of airline traffic is at present not moving.

Mr. McGEE. I would not contradict that at all.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator would not contradict the President's finding that there has been a breakdown in essential transportation services in many sections of this country?

Mr. McGEE. For those segments which are using the airlines. In addition, there are automobiles, trucks, buses, and railroads.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is interesting that when the President makes that finding, then the people who are disputing the question of what their wages and hours are, have to stay at work under the Railway Labor Act. This has already happened. All this resolution is designed to do is to say, "Stay at work while you continue negotiating." I cannot see that this is related to some of the eloquent terms which the Senator has ascribed to this situation.

It strikes me that what we must say is, "Let us keep the essential services going for the benefit of the public while negotiations continue." I cannot see any problem on that. Perhaps the Senator can outline his views.

Mr. McGEE. There is a difference in the problem, for example, of those affected by the Railway Labor Act and the airlines separated from that.

Mr. DOMINICK. No. The airlines come under the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. McGEE. I am talking about those affected by the airlines. That is quite a different factor, in my judgment, both in terms of scope, in terms of impact nationwide, and in terms of economic impact within. There is a difference between the dispute in 1963, and now. This is a current strike against the airlines. Here, we are talking about something else which is a modern phenomenon, really jazzy, really sensational, really newsworthy, and real inconvenience. Suppose we got stuck with DC-3's and had to fly them all the time instead of jets, we would be complaining that somehow our interests were being impinged upon by the strikers. Thus, these are relative terms. We should take a look at the big picture, not the specifics of a particular industry at this time, unless someone is willing to demonstrate that this is a national disaster.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have not been complaining so much, but the telegrams, letters, general information, and the many telephone calls that I have received indicate to be a far-reaching problem exists. The number of letters and calls I have received from employees of the airlines on strike, asking us please to get the strike settled so that they can get back to work, have been phenomenal. It is a 90-to-10 percentage in my own office in favor of settlement. I would also say that the general letters and information coming in from all over the country would clearly indicate that this is a serious situation and not just a labor-management dispute. There are many other people involved in this dispute.

Mr. McGEE. We have all kinds of groups involved. That would be true in any strike, whether a plumbers strike, an auto workers strike, or whatever kind of strike it may be. There will always be people that will be economically set back by it. That is part of the price to be paid in the collective bargaining process. That is part of the price we have demonstrated historically that this country is willing to risk, and will pay for if necessary, in order to achieve balanced labor-management relations. I do not believe that we should impinge upon that balance with this kind of action in the Senate at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator does not believe that the airlines have more specific effect on the national interest than the plumbing industry?

Mr. McGEE. Well, that is open to question. An Italian innkeeper once told me that he thought perhaps the greatest contribution the United States made to modern civilization was the American bathroom. I suspect that there would be a great deal of interest if there were to be a plumbers strike.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would disagree with my friend from Wyoming that we have not reached a critical situation in this dispute.

An important segment of the transportation system is badly disrupted. It is a service used by businessmen and other people for important trips—not a high percentage are pleasure trips. The most important phase of this problem has not been mentioned, that of the President calling the unions and the airlines together to negotiate a settlement. I believe that this is the first time, in my memory at least, that a union's members have refused to abide by what its leaders have agreed to. This presents a critical situation. They may sit down again, reach another agreement, and the members may disagree again with what their leaders approve. This is a critical situation which calls for action by Congress.

Mr. McGEE. It is a critical situation, but I have heard Senators on this floor say that union leaders dictate to their members and state that members should have freedom to vote as they will. Now when the members of the union have stood up and said they do not want to accept what their leaders recommend, we should applaud that action and not play on the other side of the street.

If I had been a member of the union, I think I would have voted for that settlement, because I think it was a good one. But that is irrelevant. It is why we have votes. The members of the union chose not to take the recommendation of their leaders. I think we should respect them for it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think it is healthy for members of the union to disagree with their leaders, but I wish it had been done on some other question.

Mr. McGEE. I think it would have been better to have had it done in a local union somewhere. There was no intention that the members of the union had to accept the proposal because the President had called their representatives together. The President was an individual. He was trying to bring them around to do some hard thinking to reach an agreement, but that was not the end of the story. The President did not tell the union what it had to do. He did not intend to do that. He did not mean to make his suggestion final. It would have been well to have had the proposed agreement ratified.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, some time ago the Senator from Louisiana wanted to get acquainted with some of the union presidents who were in his State of Louisiana, and he arranged to have lunch with them. I proceeded to find fault with organized labor. I said, "Why don't you do this? This is wrong. You ought to correct it."

Those international union presidents said, "We would like to do it, but you passed the Landrum-Griffin bill and you stripped us of our power. You voted for so-called union democracy, and you felt that we should not be able to do anything. If you want us to exercise any responsibility, then you should change the law to give us this power."

Mr. President, I voted for that bill on final passage. The bill started out labeled as the Kennedy-Ervin bill. It wound up being called the Landrum-Griffin bill, which was regarded as being an antilabor bill. But we voted for union democracy. We wanted the union member to make up his own mind. Now we are living with it. If Members of Congress do not like it, change the law.

As far as being angry with labor because the union members voted not to take the recommendations of their leaders, is concerned, let us remember that we voted for that law, and we have to live with it. We have no right to be outraged at labor. Congress voted for that bill. It subscribed to that principle.

I see no particular need for voting on this strike. It is just one more strike. As far as Louisiana is concerned, it is an inconvenience.

Is it more than that in Wyoming?

Mr. McGEE. It is more than an inconvenience in Wyoming. We have some economic hardship there because we have a thriving tourist industry and the airlines bring in thousands of tourists to see Wyoming. But a higher principle at stake is the principle that Congress is not to deal with a strike unless it can be demonstrated that it is a national emergency, and thus far the Government has been unwilling to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as the Senate meets to consider legislative action to end the massive airlines strike, there are at least 100,000 wage earners out of work as a direct result of the strike. Thousands of others are either out of work or suffering a diminution of their wages as an indirect result of this strike. The airlines involved are continuing to lose some $7 to $8 million a day. Approximately 150,000 passengers are either stranded far from home, unable to travel from their homes, or being forced to seek other less suitable transportation.

I share the sentiment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] when he introduced his original resolution to end the strike. It is regrettable in this Nation of free and collective bargaining that lawmakers must do through legislation what responsible Americans should be doing through discussion.

It is unconscionable that we would allow this strike to continue. Regardless of how Labor Secretary Wirtz might define a crisis, I feel, as did the New York Times in a recent editorial, that "a strike against the airlines, which are regulated as a public service, is in effect a strike against the public." I feel that if the President of the United States had been more concerned with results than with publicity in his much heralded "settlement" of this airlines strike, there might have been an agreement that could have been ratified by the rank and file of the powerful and respected machinists union.

The publicity photos showing President Johnson's "settlement" had hardly dried when the proofs for an ad thanking the President "on behalf of 6 million Floridians" for "the personal leadership that has now settled the crippling strike of five major airlines" were rushed to U.S. newspapers, The ad was an open letter to the President.

Signed by Florida Gov. Haydon Burns, the full-page ad made this rather startling observation in regard to the President's role in the strike:

> Your action has demonstrated your understanding of the devastating effects of this stoppage upon millions of wage earners and businessmen who were innocent victims of this dispute.

The fulsome praise came a little early. From what Mr. Wirtz told the press Monday, there seems to be a dichotomy in the "understanding of the devastating effects" within the administration because the White House has still not endorsed legislation to end this dispute.

I am prepared today on behalf of the American people to support any reasonable proposal that would get the striking union back to work. Regardless of whether the union members care to publicly acknowledge it, they are being hurt badly by the strike.

A friend of one of my staff members belongs to a San Francisco local of the struck union. In place of a $650-per-month paycheck, he is getting $25 a week, and his plight differs little from that of other union members.

What makes a work stoppage of this magnitude particularly illogical is that the work could continue even as negotiations are continuing. There need not necessarily be a strike. I see no justification, particularly when a crisis situation exists, for reasonable men to require a strike atmosphere for the conduct of their negotiations.

Reasonable men discussing sensible solutions to important issues should not need to conduct their discussions in the atmosphere of an escalating crisis. And, if work were continuing, the struck union members would continue to draw their wages, the bank accounts now being wiped out would be preserved, the credit ratings that are now being clouded could be maintained, and the commerce of this Nation would not be interrupted.

I am positive that if the struck union members would take pencil and paper to the problem, they would find it inconceivable that they would ever regain what they are losing in this work stoppage.

If nothing else, the airlines strike points out at least two important considerations. The first is that the strike, which was intended to become the ultimate weapon of the union, has now become the first attacking salvo. There had been no serious discussion of the issues until the strike started.

The second consideration is that there is a great need in this country for legislation to deal permanently with strikes that seriously affect the national welfare, interest, and security. The web of interdependence spun by an increasingly complex social and governmental structure has made a strike of virtually any magnitude a strike of national importance. There is hardly a union worthy of the name which cannot cast into one segment of our economic system a stone large enough to send ripples through the entire system.

I know not what form permanent legislation would take, but I imagine it would incorporate some principle of binding arbitration. In any event, I stand ready to support any reasonable effort to get the 60 percent of the Nation's aircraft, which are now idled, back in the air while negotiations to settle the dispute are underway.

In the same context, Mr. President, I would like to point out the ingenuity displayed by Frontier Airlines, which services Wyoming and other States.

Faced with a massive economic backlash from the strike, Frontier called together its top officials under the direction of President Lew Dymond and rescheduled the complete Frontier system so that connections could be made at major terminals.

After an all-night meeting, Frontier added 36 new flights, including nonstop service to Salt Lake City, Omaha, and Chicago, none of which had been served by Frontier before the strike.

I ask, Mr. President, that the political advertisement to which I alluded, and a news dispatch, telling how Frontier Airlines met the strike-triggered disruption of regular air traffic, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and advertisement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, July 19, 1966]

FAL Official Reveals How Firm Whipped Strike Backlash

(By Wanda Banta)

A vice president of Frontier Airlines revealed here yesterday how this firm saved itself from an economic backlash and massive layoffs in the 12-day-old airline strike.

The strike against five airlines was called July 8. Frontier, one of two lines serving Wyoming, was not struck, but faced the possibility of losing its business through lack of connections at major terminals.

Frontier, based in Denver, serves 11 Western states making transcontinental connections for its passengers at major terminals.

William Mitchell, vice president of sales and service, told the Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce in a meeting at the Plains Hotel that Frontier was alerted July 7 of the strike certainty and an all night planning meeting was called by Lewis Dymond, president, in Denver with 20 high level officials.

By 4 a.m., Mitchell said, the officials had rescheduled the complete Frontier system and at 6:30 a.m., July 8, the day of the strike, special sections of planes were ready in 30 minutes to help process 45 per cent of the connections through major terminals.

Since the strike began, Frontier has added 36 new flights in an effort to serve the public he said, and to avert layoffs. He said the line was running into many areas previously not served by Frontier.

Some of the added flights were new nonstop flights going into Salt Lake City, Omaha and Chicago. These flights absorbed the loss of connections ordinarily served by United and TWA.

Three new sections were run into Las Vegas, Nev., for the first time in Frontier's history, he said.

"In less than 24 hours we had installed phones in Las Vegas, borrowed a ticket counter from another airline, sent in our advanced party and were in business."

He said that as soon as each phone was connected, it was ringing.

"Had we not adopted the plan, Frontier would have run out of pilot time, which is federally controlled and our equipment would have lain idle," he said.

Mitchell said that airlines failing to adopt an alternate system of operation during the strike face serious economic and operational problems.

He said he feels Frontier was saved from making massive layoffs and when the strike is over there may be a slight profit.

On an average day, Frontier processes 4,200 phone calls call in the Denver terminal but since the strike the number has increased to 7,800 a day, he said.

Mitchell also announced that Frontier's new schedule, originally planned for release July 15, will be held in abeyance until after the strike is settled. At this time, however, 12 arrivals and 12 departures are scheduled for the Cheyenne terminal.

He said that Frontier's business has increased in Cheyenne this year over last including a 37 per cent increase in passengers, a 336 per cent increase in air freight, an 85 per cent increase in air express and a 148 per cent increase in airmail.

[From the Washington Star, July 31, 1966]

Thank You, Mr. President

Six million Floridians join with me in congratulating you on the personal leadership that has now settled the crippling strike of five major airlines.

Of all the issues at stake in this tragic stike, none was greater than the public welfare. Your action has demonstrated your understanding of the devastating effects of this stoppage upon millions of wage-earners and businessmen who were innocent victims of this dispute.

A continuation of this strike would have inflicted even greater damage on the already severely affected economy of Florida and the many other areas of the nation that were deprived of vital air transportation facilities. Your own "VISIT USA" program to which so much effort has been devoted would have suffered a still more serious setback as additional numbers of Americans would have vacationed abroad while our visitors from overseas would have cancelled their plans to visit our country. This was a situation that urgently called for the national leadership that only the President can provide.

As America's leading resort state, Florida now looks forward to welcoming a midsummer floodtide of family vacationers who will come from all parts of the nation and from Latin America and Europe as well.

We are taking this means of publicly expressing our gratitude to you for your leadership in ending this strike. All Florida thanks you.

Respectfully,

Haydon Burns,
Governor of Florida.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, some of the eloquent speeches made on this floor, including those made by my colleague Bob Bartlett, to the effect that the Congress should not inject itself into the labor-management relationship, have much merit. Yet I believe that action to end the strike should be forthcoming as quickly as possible. My State, Alaska, being at the outer fringes and depending greatly on air transportation, is suffering, and I am hopeful and confident that in a very few days the President, who felt he had arrived at a solution last Saturday, will be able to use his great persuasive power to get management and labor to agree.

The fact is, however, that the rank and file of the Machinists Union, by the overwhelming vote of three to one, have rejected the settlement arrived at by their officials, and feel that certain aspects of the proposed settlement are unfair. I happen to know that the President of one of the airlines that is struck feels definitely that it is unfair to the rank and file—to the strikers—to wait 6 months for the increase in wages that under the present proposal will be postponed until that time, and he assured me that his company was willing to settle for these increases immediately.

The 3-to-1 rejection of the contract by the rank and file of the strikers emphasizes that there is an ever-increasing number of rejections of collective bargaining recommended by the leadership and yet not accepted by the membership. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, in a report rendered 4 years ago, emphasized that one of the upsetting factors in the contract negotiations of that year was the increasing number of rejections by the membership, some of them attributed to the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Before the New York University 16th Annual Conference on Labor, David Previant, a nationally known expert in labor law, stated, and I quote:

> The broad power of investigation and its use by the government, some of which is merely to satisfy administrative curiosity, continues to impair the image and efficiency of labor unions.

He pointed out that title 1 of the Landrum-Griffin Act forces union leadership to negotiate contracts on the basis of political considerations within the labor movement, stating:

> Thereafter, with the passage of Landrum-Griffin, the local union leadership itself became more acutely aware of membership reactions. While this leadership was not opposed to the concept of democracy in the affairs of labor unions, it recognized the encouragement implicit in the so-called Bill of Rights to the growth of dissident groups, and the overt invitation to attacks upon incumbent leadership. It had its choice, then, of overcompensating with extreme militancy in order to maintain its official position, or to permit the fullest exercise of the concept of town-hall democracy by letting the membership make all of the decisions. The leadership which adopted the negative policy merely submitted contracts to the members without, or with only faint, recommendation. Thus, in either case, the rejection rate increased as a direct result, I believe, of government activity and regulation of labor unions. * * *
>
> Thus contracts may also be rejected by irresponsibles who have been encouraged by law to become more active solely to satisfy some personal urge of their own. They may use opposition to the contract as a political platform. If such opposition or a two-party system is essential to trade-union democracy, then it can be a dangerous luxury for the institution of collective bargaining.

He concluded:

> Many unions believe that the purpose of most of the more vigorous sponsors of the Landrum-Griffin Act, as well as the demonstrable effect of the law, was to create a breach between the individual member on the one hand and his union on the other. The accomplishment of this purpose will, of course, weaken the unions. The obvious result has been the creation of mistrust and suspicion and the installation of fear and caution among the officers of labor unions in the handling of grievances as well as in the negotiation of contracts.

I am hopeful that the President, with his great skill and influence, and his deep concern for the public interest so repeatedly demonstrated on every level of government, will bring about an early settlement of this costly strike, of which many innocent people not directly concerned with the issue are the victims.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 725

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 186, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for himself and other Senators, proposes an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 186, as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike out all after the resolution clause and insert the following:

"That (a) the Congress does hereby find and declare that a labor dispute between Eastern Airlines, Incorporated, National Airlines, Incorporated, Northwest Airlines, Incorporated, Trans World Airlines, Incorporated, and United Airlines, Incorporated, and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, a labor organization, threatens substantially to interrup interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services; that such essential transportation services must be maintained; that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute, including a report and recommendations of the Emergency Board Numbered 166, a proffer of arbitration and mediation with the parties by the National Mediation Board; further, that the efforts of the National Mediation Board and the Secretary of Labor to settle this dispute have been unsuccessful; and that it is desirable to achieve a settlement of this dispute in a manner which serves the public interest and economic stabilization and which preserves the free collective bargaining method.

"(b) The Congress therefore finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

"SEC. 2. For a period of 60 days effecive from the date of enactment the provisions of Section 10, Paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply and no change, except by agreement of the parties shall be made by the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose. At the expiration of said 60 day period, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in Section 1 of this Joint Resolution, and if the special Airline Dispute Board provided for in Section 3 finds that the provisions of said Section 1 continue to exist and recommends to the President that the 60 day period be extended, to extend the provisions of Section 10, Paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act for an additional period or periods of time not to exceed 120 days upon issuance by the President of an Executive Order so providing. During the period or periods of time referred to in this section, none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike of lockout.

"SEC. 3. The President shall appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board which shall consider the background and circumstances of this dispute and endeavor to promote agreement between the parties. Any such agreement shall provide that the wage settlement provisions be retroactive to January 1, 1966. Nowithstanding any other provision of law, each member of the Board shall be compensated at a rate prescribed by the President for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"SEC. 4. The Board shall report to the President upon his request and as required by Sec. 2; and, if an agreement has not been reached thirty days prior to the expiration of the final period of time provided in section 2 the Board shall make a final report with recommendations to the President which shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President, along with a full and complete report of the dispute and his recommendations regarding terms or procedures which will assist in the final settlement of this dispute in the public interest and without further interruption of the continuity of transportation services by these carriers.

"SEC. 5. (a) Upon suit by any of the parties to the aforesaid dispute or by the Attorney General the several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain any violations of section 2 of this joint resolution. Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under this section may be pending, that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not; and subpoenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

"(b) In granting an injunction or relief under this section, the jurisdiction of such court sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

"SEC. 6. If, prior to the settlement of the dispute referred to in section 1, a dispute between any other air carrier and its employees shall in the judgment of the President, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service after all procedures of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in a settlement of such dispute, the President shall issue an Executive order reciting such findings; whereupon the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 shall become applicable to such dispute and to the parties thereto as though originally included in such provisions: *Provided*, That any such agreement referred to in section 3 shall provide that the wage settlement provision shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the prior collective bargaining agreement.

"SEC. 7. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if we may have order, I should like to make a few announcements concerning the procedural problem that confronts us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment by way of a substitute, but I may very well, at least within the next hour—and I hope earlier than the next hour—withdraw it and offer an additional substitute. That is what I wanted to explain to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, can the Senator give us some idea about how long he intends to speak?

Mr. MORSE. It will take me quite a bit of time to explain this substitute and the next substitute. I shall spend whatever period of time that is required until the people now in conference come forward with what I hope will replace my substitute.

If they do, I will withdraw my substitute and offer that one.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield after I finish this thought.

This is the culmination, may I say, of conversations that have been going on all day long in regard to working out a bipartisan substitute.

I think we are on the verge of working it out, but in the event that it cannot be worked out, my substitute will be offered as I have offered it, and it will receive considerable bipartisan voting support.

I prefer to offer it as a measure that will have bipartisan sponsorship. My proposal has the sponsorship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senators be reasonably safe in assuming that there would be no vote this afternoon?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think so at all. To the contrary, I think it is highly desirable that we stay in session until we dispose of the measure tonight one way or the other. My own view is—and I know that others share it, but not all—that the country is entitled to our taking that course of action today.

Mr. CLARK. Would Senators be reasonably safe in assuming that there would be no vote before 5 o'clock?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there is any doubt about their safety regarding that. I hope they do not follow a course of action which would deny them the information they ought to have before voting.

Mr. CLARK. I honor the Senator for his dedication to this legislation and for his determination to get it passed. I think it interesting that the bipartisan leadership, which obviously includes representatives of the executive branch, has been unable to agree on a substitute which they could bring before the Senate.

I wish my friend, the Senator from Oregon, well. The Senators know of my desire to get this matter behind us and to have a vote on whatever amendment the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from New York might propose, so that we might have third reading on the committee's joint resolution.

I hope that when we complete our business here, the President will have the authority to send the men back to work.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to modify one part of the statement of the Senator. I would not want the RECORD to show that I remained silent when the Senator said that the so-called bipartisan effort today involved representatives of the administration as parties to the bill which I hope will soon come to the floor of the Senate, or to the bill that I already have at the desk.

I want to make it clear that a letter from the Attorney General—which I hope will eventually come into the RECORD today—makes it perfectly clear that his involvement was in his capacity as a lawyer, advising the group only in regard to the legal problems involved in all of the resolutions that are being considered.

We are not offering a substitute that the administration recommends, but a substitute that the minority leader, the majority leader, and Senators on each side working with them have been engaged in trying to work out.

The administration, as I shall point out, continues to say that it is recommending no legislation. I want to make that very clear. I think that they are making a mistake in taking that position, which I shall also set out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly so that I may make an inquiry of the minority leader?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I will not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I say to my friend, the minority leader, that the Washington Post of today carried the following statement:

> DIRKSEN told reporters Mr. Johnson definitely wants legislation.

Was the Senator correctly quoted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator was correctly quoted, and the Senator was abysmally wrong.

I must amplify that and say that I got that impression from the conversation with the President at 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. A.M.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was in the afternoon, after our policy meeting. He made it emphatically clear, and I seldom impute words to the President, but he said: "I told you I didn't want a bill." I said "But, in all the discussion, I got the distinct impression that you did and, besides, what are you going to do without a bill?"

We left it at that.

Mr. CLARK. Was there any answer to the question of the Senator?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Wait a moment. This is a serial movie. [Laughter.]

I finished over in the TV gallery, and then it all hit the TV screen about 6 o'clock or 6:15 p.m. I had another call. He thought it was a pretty good conference except for that one thing, and there we left it.

Last night I received another call after I got home, about half past 8, and we had another discussion with sundry people. This morning the Attorney General was in my office.

We have been trying to put together and rationalize various points of view. I used the phrase yesterday: "Sharing the responsibility." I think we all have a responsibility here.

I talked a good deal today with the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Some agree and some do not.

Mr. CLARK. That is typical of minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, that shows rare independence.

Mr. CLARK. It applies to the majority members as well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are not of the consensus type. So, obviously, trying to get a major agreement here is no easy undertaking.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the President of the United States has advised him that he did not want legislation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say that the President of the United States said he did not ask for legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Oh.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He may change his mind somewhere along the line, and the request will become modified. A want will develop.

Mr. CLARK. A need?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say need. I said a want, because want is one thing in the political idiom, and need is quite another. I hate to be quite so semantic about it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has been crystal clear. I thank him for his response.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that later he would read a letter from the Attorney General.

Mr. MORSE. I did not say I would read it.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator said that a letter from the Attorney General would be read.

Mr. MORSE. I said that I thought probably a letter from the Attorney General would be referred to or put in the

RECORD. However, I do not have possession of it. I am not in a position to read it, but I did refer to his letter in order to make clear, because of the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania concerning the participation of the administration leaders in this bipartisan effort that has been going on today, that they were not participating in that bipartisan effort by way of requesting that legislation be passed, but that the Attorney General was advising the bipartisan group as to the legal problems that the Attorney General, as a legal adviser to the group, thought would be involved in the various proposed pieces of legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At their request.

Mr. MORSE. And he appeared at the request of the group for that advice.

Mr. PROUTY. Has the Attorney General had an opportunity to pass on the legal aspect of the new amendment, the most recent Morse amendment?

Mr. MORSE. He most certainly has had the opportunity, and he has exercised the opportunity of passing on each and every word of it.

Mr. PROUTY. I will not ask the Senator's comment as to whether or not he helped draft it.

Mr. MORSE. At our request, he gave us assistance in drafting it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question I wish to address to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the negotiations which apparently have taken place during the past 24 hours, was the Senator from Pennsylvania included?

Mr. CLARK. I was not. I will say, though, in justice to the majority leader, that he would come back every so often and report to me what the result was. But I have not been invited to any meeting by the majority leader, by the minority leader, by the President of the United States, by the Attorney General, by the Postmaster General, or by anybody on the White House staff or on the Senate staff. I have been in the position where my sole responsibility was to do what I could to get the committee bill passed.

May I say that I do not resent the fact that I was not called to any of these meetings. I welcomed it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the Senator from Pennsylvania is the floor manager of the bill that was reported by the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. That is my understanding, but sometimes I am not sure.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Can the Senator from Pennsylvania enlighten us as to whether any of the members who composed the majority of the committee that voted to report this legislation to the Senate floor included in any of these negotiations?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Massachusetts can speak for himself; as can the junior Senator from New York; the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator from West Virginia. I believe that the senior Senator from New York has been included, but he was not really in favor of the committee bill. The junior Senator from Michigan is not on the floor. I doubt that he was included. Was the Senator from Vermont included?

Mr. PROUTY. The minority leader invited all Members on the minority side to convene in the cloak room.

Mr. CLARK. To explain what had been done, but not to participate in the negotiations?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There should be no overtones or implications of anybody being included or excluded. The Senators are well over 21, and whatever is produced on the floor will be considered, and considered for as many days as the Senate wishes to consider it.

As far as I know, the vote of no one and the support of no one is pledged to anything. We have tried honestly to bring to the Senate something which would bring a majority of the Senate into agreement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Not quite yet.

We may be successful and we may not, but I do not think it is right to have any implications. Everybody confers around here. The Senator has just been in a conference inside about something. It does not matter to us what it is. I have been in 16 conferences today about this and other matters. To give some impression that there is something clandestine or that people are being included or excluded is juvenile, I say with all respect, and I do not think we ought to have it on the floor of the Senate.

I am not pledged to anything except the interests of the country. I will work all night, if necessary, to come to agreement with a majority of my colleagues as to what is best.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is not suggesting, is he, that those who voted to report this bill to the floor are any less interested and dedicated as he?

Mr. JAVITS. I am suggesting, also, that they can have as many conferences as they please.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is not suggesting, is he, that the majority should not also have a voice in working out the matter, that their interests should not be expressed?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly not. And their interests will be expressed here.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. This is the only point the Senator from Massachusetts was trying to ascertain. The point of interest was to find out from the senior Senator from Pennsylvania as the manager of this particular legislation and as the spokesman for the group that reported it out, whether his interest and the interest of those who participated in that discussion were being represented.

On the contrary, I think that is a very legitimate question. I know we can evaluate what comes out on the floor. So I quite disagree with the Senator from New York, and I think the floor manager should have been included in these new discussions. I think that those views that predominated in committee could have been expressed and should have been presented.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator would allow me one more minute, I should like to say this: I did not say that the question is illegitimate. Any question is legitimate and should be honestly answered, as it has been. But I see nothing clandestine or improper in people with an identity of view, having a conference, to see whether they can come to some consensus as to identity of view, and not invite one who has a different view, who is working upon a different line. I see nothing wrong or improper or suspicious about it, and all I am speaking to is to allay any suspicion of the matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the boys engaged in contests on the Danang front in Vietnam under the circumstances do not always have a chance to confer, and particularly to confer with whom they wish.

When a heavy piece of legislation is involved in a strike bound country, as here, one must work as best he can.

I believe in reciting the chronology, because that must speak for itself. I wheeled myself—I should say I crutched myself—into the office of the gentle majority leader yesterday morning, about 11 o'clock, and a little conference was going on. They had tried to get me and I was not available for the moment. We had there a preliminary discussion, and there was a preliminary draft.

I said:

> It comes on a good day, because this is the day that the minority policy committee meets. I will present it in full. I will telephone every minority member of the committee, to make certain that he will be on hand.

Every one of them was on hand. We had a full and free discussion for quite some time before we came here. Everyone had a full opportunity to speak his piece.

At roughly 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon there was a meeting in my office. The majority leader was there, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was there, the Attorney General was there, and I was there. We were there mainly for a kind of roundtable discussion and to explore an idea that had come to us, because we had had a cloakroom conference at roughly, I should think, about 2 o'clock or 2:15. That conference was wholly exploratory. It broke up.

Subsequently, I arrived home in the country about 8:15 in the evening. I like to put in all the gory details. When I got there, twilight was upon us. Day was fading. I could not even see the beauty of my marigolds, my cannas, and my nasturtiums. I had a great time of it.

I had hardly set my briefcase down when the telephone rang. It was the White House. The Attorney General came on the line. We had some discussion. I saw there was a general tendency to forbear a little. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] knows, I am the forbearing and tolerant type. I think there is no problem too difficult to solve.

I then made arrangements to see the Attorney General again in my office at 10 o'clock. I called all the members of the committee and asked them to stand by in the cloakroom at 11 o'clock this morning. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] appeared in my office with the Attorney General. I had invited him; I did not invite anybody else. We had a further discussion of this idea.

As a result, we then came here and reported it to all of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who were in town; and all were in town save one, who got here at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Since then, the exploration, the explanations, the discussions have been going on seriatim in the cloakroom, in my office, and elsewhere for only one reason, and that is to find a point of common understanding and to find a common denominator. We had nothing else in mind. I do not think it is my duty to invite you on that side to come over, except for the majority leader. I have a responsibility to invite him, but other than that, my first and primary duty and responsibility is to the Members on my side. I wanted to be sure that all of the six Republicans on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were kept fully informed of every step of these proceedings; and whatever eventuates this afternoon will be the result of all these discussions and all of this exploration.

So, in consequence, I trust that we will stay here. Maybe we will get a job done because, when you stop to consider it, here is a damage imposed on this country running into millions of dollars.

I received a call from Europe this morning. There was a fellow stranded there without money, and he cannot get back. I have talked to the presidents of two airlines this morning. I did not call them. They called me. They told me about the hundreds and hundreds of people who are stranded in countries all over, and mind you, 23 countries are involved in this matter, in addition to the 50 States.

We have a responsibility and we cannot duck it. Try to go home and explain to the people, regardless of your point of view, that this was involved, this technicality, this question of who goes first, whether you share the responsibility, whether one side loaded upon the other, and they will have no time for your explanation.

They will be like Napoleon when Marshal Ney came back from Russia and his troops had been cut down by the cavalry in the snow. Napoleon said: "I will have plenty of time to tell you; I will have no time to have you tell me how you lost."

They will have no time for those things. This thing is upon us and the damage is heavy. As a citizen of the country I would like to find out what we can do and I am willing to forbear in that undertaking.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has worked harder on this legislation than any Member of this body. He has been in the frontline trenches for months. His Board prepared an excellent report which, unfortunately, was rejected by the union.

He has indicated to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that he has been in constant communication with the White House with respect to the proposed legislation.

I realize that the Senator from Oregon may not be in a position to answer this question, but I hope he can.

Can he tell us whether the President of the United States supports the amendment of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. The President does not request the legislation being offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Would the President be content with it?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion, speaking for myself, I am satisfied if it is passed the President will sign it. But I am not authorized to say, in behalf of the President, that he will sign it. If he did not sign it I would be the most perplexed, confounded man in America on the basis of the participation that I have had in the case.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. In the opinion of the Senator from Oregon would the President of the United States veto the committee bill if passed by the Congress and placed before him for signature?

Mr. MORSE. I have no opinion on what he would do, but in view of the legal advice that the Attorney General has given in an advisory capacity, I would be a little surprised if he signed it.

Mr. CLARK. May I say that I would be a little surprised if he did not sign it in view of the legal arguments which I am sure would be brought to bear on him and which were summarized in the colloquy between the former Attorney General of the United States, Mr. KENNEDY, and myself this morning.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] knows, I was not able to be a student in that legal seminar this morning. I wish I had participated in the seminar because of my great admiration for the legal ability of the former Attorney General and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], but I have had it summarized for me, and I hope accurately.

If the summary is accurate, I think this is one time when the former Attorney General [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are wrong in their legal conclusion.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. In connection with all of this colloquy, I think that one of the significant statements was made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], when he said quite properly that it was perfectly all right for the leadership and the members of the committee to confer and try to thrash out these problems. But, he said—and in view of the fact that he is neither the majority leader nor the minority leader, I think we ought to know how we stand—that when the time comes, and this new compromise plan or substitute is revealed to the rest of us, we will have ample opportunity to consider it and ample time to discuss it.

The reason that the Senator from New Hampshire is interested in a full discussion of any new proposal is that in 1963 the Committee on Commerce had this task in relation to the threatened railway tieup. We sat for 10 days, and we sat far into the night, night after night, listening to evidence, and considering the problem of what Congress can do and should do in dealing with settling or arbitrating strikes that imperil public health and safety.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for an interruption at that point?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is true that that happened, but there was no strike at the time the Senator was sitting on that committee and there was no stoppage of work, and there is now.

Mr. COTTON. I know, but that is not the point that the Senator from New Hampshire is trying to make.

Some of us came out of that experience with rather definite ideas of certain things that need to be avoided by the Congress in acting with respect to this type of situation. At some time in the debate, I would like to have the opportunity to express those ideas and discuss what we learned from experience.

I have been a Member of this body for a good many years, and very rarely have I intruded on discussion or debate of measures that came from any committee except my own. It is highly proper that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should deal with this matter and come in with whatever compromise they see fit. However, I can visualize killing time here for the next couple of hours, then having this new plan revealed to us in all of its glory, followed by a request for a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate in considering a plan that I assume was not considered in the committee, and yet is of vital interest to everybody in this body.

Let me say this, that all this talk about putting a monkey on the President's back, or putting a monkey on the back of Congress is good window dressing. It is all right for cloakroom discussions. It is all right for backdoor politics. But that is not the question. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in trying to put the President of the United States at a disadvantage, any time, anywhere, particularly when the public safety is involved. But once Congress falls into the trap of passing a measure, a self-executing measure triggered off by Congress, which calls for sending men back to work, we might as well hang a sign outside the Senate door reading, "Capitol Hill Labor Relations Board."

It will mean that we will have every two-for-a-cent strike in this country dropped into the lap of Congress to be arbitrated or taken care of every time anyone thinks or alleges the public health and safety is involved. That is what we will be up against. If my distinguished colleagues are worried about the mail they are receiving from those constituents and others who have not been able to get on an airplane, let them wait until we have established the precedent of a self-executing act of Congress which sends men back to work, and we will be reading and answering mail that will come into our offices, from all kinds of people in all kinds of labor disputes and strikes, from now until the end of time.

So far as I am concerned, there are certain guidelines that we must follow and certain things that we must avoid. I simply want to make sure—I do not care if the powers that be, confer from now until next weekend—that when they finally decide to take us into their confidence and give us the result, we will have ample opportunity to consider and discuss it. This is particularly true in view of the fact that it could not have been thoroughly considered and discussed in committee and the public has had no opportunity to be heard upon it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to my good friend from New Hampshire that if applause were permissible in the Senate Chamber, we would certainly hear a great deal of it at this moment from a great many Senators who are now in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont made that statement.

I was about to say that I had made clear I would not advocate a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the resolution so long as it is evident there is a good-faith debate going on in this Chamber, and so long as it is not a debate that could be characterized as being prolonged debate for the sole purpose of prolongation, or as other Senators call it, a form of filibuster.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that no one would be more insistant in having this matter debated on its merits than I.

Let me also say that when the substitute for my substitute is ready to be offered, it will not vary much from the substitute now before the Senate. There is nothing in the substitute for the substitute, so far as its general framework is concerned, which was not well known to every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, before a majority of that committee brought the resolution to the floor of the Senate.

The differences are mainly two: procedural and time. All this has been known from the beginning in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Now let me say, if the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me to finish—I really feel that I should say it, rather than the majority leader. I know how easy it is to make remarks on the floor of the Senate, and have them given interpretations that were not even intended by the speakers, but even if intended by anyone, the majority leader is entitled to have me say this—that there has been no disposition on the part of the majority leader, myself, or anyone else in the Senate who has participated in these conversations, to keep anyone out of them. We just had not reached the point in our discussions where we had anything to offer anyone if he were brought into the discussion to consult with us.

Also, let me say that I do not believe there is anyone in the Senate, who has been in the Chamber for the last few days, working in a vacuum. I believe that everyone in the Senate knows what has been going on, what the alternatives have been, and what has been the general conversation among us out of the so-called conferences.

I think we all know that the choice before us is whether we should follow the committee resolution which provides that the authorization shall be given to the President to send the men back to work; or the authorization as set forth in the substitute resolution by which both Congress and the President, when the resolution is signed, send the men back to work under a time schedule set forth in the resolution. There is nothing complex about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I want to say that the majority leader has done nothing in these conferences, by any stretch of the imagination, which could be interpreted as closing anyone out of a settlement. When we met with representatives of the administration, sometimes at our request, for legal advice, and sometimes at their request, for briefings in regard to the parliamentary situation, we had no reason to believe that those same representatives had not been talking to others in the Senate besides those in the room. However, we were not in a position where we could say, "Now, we are ready for principal consultation."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is on his feet, and I should like to have his attention for a moment, because I want to be sure that my statement is absolutely accurate from the standpoint of his understanding.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if I may interrupt at that point, the distinguished Senator from Oregon was addressing the first part of his remarks to me and, I believe, misinterpreting what I intended to say. I therefore think that he should allow me to correct any misunderstanding which may exist.

Mr. MORSE. By all means.

Mr. COTTON. I want it distinctly understood that what I said was not intended in the slightest degree as a criticism of any conferences which have taken place by anyone. Of course, we are not legislating here without the leadership, or without the committees involved, conferring and trying to smooth out differences. I was not even suggesting that the majority leader or the minority leader would try to bring something in and force it down our throats without giving us time to be heard.

However, 2 days' debate on this situation are almost over. There is pressure for the Congress to act. I was simply concerned about the possibility that, late in the day, in would come some kind of compromise plan; and that, by force of circumstances and in the performance of their duty, the leadership might try to expedite consideration unduly.

In short, I wanted to make sure ample notice was given. There must be an opportunity for certain observations to be made, but there were no other implications in what I had to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks and for his lucid statement. Senators can be sure there will be no unanimous consent presented tonight, certainly not at the last hour; that there will be sufficient time for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to be at our desks, and at the clerk's desk at the same time.

I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that there ought to be plenty of time to study it, despite the fact that this is considered by some to be emergency legislation.

I feel, furthermore, the floor manager of the bill should be, insofar as humanly possible, kept fully informed of what takes place at conferences or caucuses, so he can meet with members of the committee and confer as to what has transpired. Up to this afternoon nothing had transpired. I felt it was my responsibility to keep the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] informed. I have done so to the best of my ability, as I would do it for any Member on either side of the aisle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been listening to the colloquy about this meeting. There was some suggestion that there was something secret about it. The Senator from Washington was there. I was not a part of the leadership——

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly am not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I guess I was invited because our committee had the railroad strike to consider and had that experience in the Commerce Committee 2 years ago. Some members of our committee thought we should have had jurisdiction over this strike. I did not encourage it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator had.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All we did was discuss what was on the floor and what we might do about it. The Attorney General did not represent anybody from the administration except the Attorney General. We asked him several legal questions and asked him to see if he could bring back his legal interpretations of these matters. I do not think there was any contact with the President or the White House or the administration at the meetings I was in. There was nothing more about it.

I discussed these ideas with many Senators. As a matter of fact, I read in the morning's newspaper all about it. There was nothing secret about it. I read a long story in the Washington Post about it this morning.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I should like to refer to the words of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and commend him on them. I think his point is, that if we get involved in a strike which involves only 4 percent of the people who travel between cities and one-tenth of 1 percent of intercity freight, we are in effect putting up a sign inviting Congress to take action when other strikes are taking place. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for bringing out that point.

I would hope his words would stir Congress to take action carrying out the words of the President, in his state of the Union message, asking that we enact general legislation to take care of national interest situations such as this.

With the legislative skill the Senator from Oregon has, he could move very helpfully to develop such general legislation. However, I have many doubts about our moving into this dispute, and inviting many more calls for one-time action in this field.

I would like to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has a great fund of knowledge in this field a question. As I understand it, if we pass the committee resolution, or any other resolution relating to this dispute, it will mean that men will be forced to go back to work, something which has not been done for some time. What would be the actual penalty if the workers refused to go back? And is there any danger that the mechanics may not do the work as well as they usually do, if they are forced back to work?

Mr. MORSE. If they were any part of a conspiracy, the same penalty would apply to them as has always applied. It does not mean that they will keep their jobs, but if they are ordered to go back to work and they engage in a conspiracy, and the court orders them back, and they act in violation of the court order, the court will act on the contempt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, I do not think it has been mentioned, but there is another factor involved, which must be considered in the proposed legislation or any other that is put into law ordering the mechanics back to work. All of the mechanics are certified by the FAA, and they must have a Government license to work. Whether a penalty would be to take away their Government license or whether they would be more susceptible to Government action because they are licensed by the Government is a point we must consider very seriously.

Before one obtains a certificate, he must have 18 months' experience. The mechanic must pass both an oral and written examination before he is certified to be an aerial mechanic.

So this is a point we must consider in the legislation. The mechanics have that tie to the Government that licenses them.

I wish to add another point about the meeting which has been referred to. It was a meeting which combined a great many ideas. While I was there, I did not agree to vote for any amendment. I do not know whether or not I will. Like the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I want to read it first.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. To answer the point the Senator from Washington has just made, in the first place, I hope we include this, and I shall do my utmost to see that it is done, paragraph 8 of section 9 of the Railway Labor Act reads:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this Act be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

That absolutely is a "must." I shall do my utmost to see that it is kept in. An injunction provides it customarily even without this provision, but we should be sure that it does not run against counseling or guiding workers to do otherwise, so it would not run against every employee and it would not compel involuntary service.

On the second point, and it is a very important point, raised, while I am not trying to be a Pollyanna, I feel if the workers go back, their compensation will not go down. I think the money compensation part of the contract will be adjusted back to what was offered. That is generally done, and I think it will be done in this case.

Next, again without being a Pollyanna, I do not believe that an American worker, when he goes back, will jeopardize anybody's safety by the character of work which he does. I do not think it is being a Pollyanna, but I cannot believe that any American worker would not do his job in any sensitive spot such as this as well as he could.

Mr. PELL. Perhaps my question was not clear. If the rank and file of the unions should say, "We are going to stay out," what would be the sanctions employed to force them back to work? For let us remember that this same rank and file just exercised its democratic right and disobeyed its leadership 3 to 1.

Mr. MORSE. To raise the issue as to whether or not there is a conspiracy. The doctrine of conspiracy would apply.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pages are distributing copies of the latest proposed substitute for the substitute; but there are too many other substitutes on the desks. I wonder if there is not some way in which the various amendments could be identified, so that Senators may be aware of what will be proposed and what is pending. I understand that the amendment offered a short time ago by the Senator from Oregon will shortly be withdrawn.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one instant further?

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Montana making a request of me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want Senators to know what amendment is the new one.

Mr. MORSE. The only one I have is the one on the desks; the one I offered as a substitute for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] as cosponsors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am referring to the new amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I did not know we had a new one. I have not been privileged to see it.

Mr. JAVITS. No; the one now before the Senate is the one offered by the Senator from Oregon; it is not a new one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am referring to the new one.

Mr. MORSE. To my new one?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is that the amendment which is pending now?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Pennsylvania participated in any of the discussions relating to the substitute for the substitute.

Mr. CLARK. The answer is "No."

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "No"; but I want to go back to where I was before I started to yield, including when I yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire.

In the office of the majority leader today, when we reached a point where it looked as though we had some language that we should submit to the Senate, I said to the majority leader—and he not only agreed but stated he had been thinking along the same line—that we should proceed to confer with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Do you know what the majority leader said? He said—and the Senator from Hawaii was there—"I will go and talk to him right away."

The majority leader left us, came immediately to the floor of the Senate, and, I understand, did tell the Senator from Pennsylvania that there was a desire to consult with him. I do not know what the exact language was.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Montana was most kind and courteous to me. He did not indicate any desire to confer with me, but he did tell me what had been going on in the conferences to which I was not a party.

I wish to say further to the Senator from Oregon that when he had in his hand the amendment he sent to the desk not very long ago—perhaps an hour or so—he came to me and said, "I want you to know what I am doing, and this is what I now intend to propose. I wish you would take a look at it."

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator also agree that I further said, "I want to talk to you about it," and he said, "There is about to be a vote on the Lausche amendment; we will do that as soon as the vote is over."

I said that would be fine. In fact, we started to go to the cloak room, and the Senator from Pennsylvania said he thought that would put him in a somewhat rude position with respect to the Senator from Ohio, because he was offering the compulsory arbitration amendment, and I said, "Fine, we will do it after the vote."

Then later, when I was working on an emergency matter here, the Senator from Pennsylvania came to my desk and wanted to know if we could talk then.

I said, "Joe, we will do it as soon as I get through with this."

Mr. CLARK. And here we are.

Mr. MORSE. In fact, we have all been working at that sort of pace. But I do not wish the Record to stand with any indication that the Senator from Oregon, the majority leader, or anyone else has been discussing these matters without including the floor leader of the joint resolution.

In fact, the Senator from Pennsylvania asked for a third reading, and I rose, since that meant I would take the floor, and the two of us had a little jovial conversation about that.

I have been in that sort of position all afternoon, while they have been trying to prepare a final draft. I still do not have it. I thought awhile ago perhaps the majority leader had the new one. That is why I said "I still have not received it" and then I found out he was talking about the one I have introduced. It will be here shortly. There will be copies for each Senator and there will be plenty of time in which to read and consider it.

But I do not think the impression should be left in the Record that anyone in the Senator from Pennsylvania's group has been unaware of what the framework of the substitute would be. They have all known that we seek to put in it language that is mandatory along the lines of the Morse resolution that was defeated in the committee.

That is all we have before us now, as far as the basic principle is concerned, with, as I said, some differences in the time bracket. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think everything the Senator from Oregon has said is absolutely accurate. I should like to summarize it and make my view clear for the Senator from Massachusetts.

In the first place, I have not asked to sit in on any of these conferences with either the leadership or the representatives of the executive branch. I did not wish to be called in, and I have not been called in.

Both the majority leader and the Senator from Oregon have been very courteous in telling me, after the fact, what the results—and often there were no results—of those conferences have been.

I am pleased with the situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been very cooperative, very courteous, and I think very understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had thought that the new proposed substitute was at the desk. It is my understanding now that what is at the desk is the——

Mr. MORSE. Sixty-day proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Amendment which is pending.

Later in the afternoon, it is anticipated that another substitute will be brought out, at which time the Senator from Oregon will withdraw his present substitute and introduce the substitute to the substitute.

I should like at this time, if I may, to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the majority leader anticipate a vote on this amendment tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not expect one, but I would not guarantee there would not be one.

Mr. PASTORE. Then what about this substitute to the substitute to the substitute we are talking about?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is coming in later, and Senators should stay here and study that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President I think we ought to take it home.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator wish to take it home?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Fine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that we make our record tonight on what I think will be the final draft of the proposal. When we proceed to do that, it may empty the Chamber; that is up to the Senators. I think an understanding would be in order that we not take any vote tonight. I would recommend that we come in at an early hour tomorrow morning, proceed with the debate, and hope for a vote tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Reserving the right to object, let me say to my friend the majority leader—and I shall be guided by his wishes—that for some time now, the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration have been trying to obtain a quorum in order to determine what, if anything, to do about the fair elections bill. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] has one version, I have another, and the President has sent down a third.

The procedures in the Committee on Rules and Administration are such that it is very difficult to obtain a quorum. We finally arranged to meet tomorrow at 9:30, in order to endeavor to dispose of that matter. As the floor manager of the joint resolution, it will be impossible for me to be there. I should like for Senator Jordan, Senator Cannon, and the other members of the Rules Committee to know that in my opinion, the pending measure has a higher priority. However, from where I sit, I do not believe we will gain a thing by coming in before 11 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would respectfully disagree. I would suggest that the Committee on Rules and Administration meet at 8:30 rather than 9:30, that we have a morning hour——

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator know about the customs and habits of the members of the Rules Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I used to. But in view of the fact that the Senator has said that this is more important, I repeat my request that we come in at 10 o'clock, though I make that request with great regret.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, why do we have to meet so early in the morning, when we do not do anything all day long?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a good question. I wish I knew the answer.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the Senator said anything about the likelihood of any votes tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The possibility is very, very slim.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think, in view of the discussion that has taken place here, there should not be any votes tonight. We are down to the point where we are voting on the major issues. However, I do disagree with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] with regard to the convening time on tomorrow.

I think we ought to come in at 10 o'clock. After all, those of us who feel that legislation should be passed, feel that such an important public interest is involved that we should not postpone it one single minute because of some committee meeting.

I think that committee meetings ought to be waived until we take care of this issue, and let Senators decide how they want to vote on it.

There is no principle involved in the choices between these pieces of legislation that has not been discussed and discussed and discussed both in committee and on the floor of the Senate. I do not think anyone would be at all taken by surprise as to the major principles of this legislative proposal.

The difference concerns the details, whether it is 60 days plus 120 days, or whether it is 30 days, and then 90 days, and then another period. Those are the differences between the various proposed pieces of legislation. It is either the mandatory congressional action or the action that would give discretion to the President that reflects the major difference.

It is my opinion, Mr. Majority Leader, that we ought to get the final draft at the desk. It can then be photocopied so that each Senator, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] said, can take it home with him, and we will then be in here tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock ready to proceed with the debate and the vote.

I will not speak at any great length, but I have a responsibility not only to myself, but also to my colleagues who have been working with me on this, to make a statement in support of the substitute corresponding to the statement that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] has made in support of the committee proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to confirm fully what the Senator from Oregon has said. Nothing is being considered by anybody here, that I know of, which does not involve the basic principles of law and facts that have been discussed for days in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have personally briefed the Senator from Pennsylvania on everything that has occurred. I say it advisedly as a Senator, that nothing has occurred that I have not told him about. I believe the same is true of the majority leader.

Mr. President, I still hope—and I think we are entitled to this—to learn from the administration what it wants. I think this business of telling us that they do not want any legislation, but telling us at the same time that this would be better than that, really leaves Congress in a position in which it must deal with the Presidency in this matter, with executive authority. It is a very difficult and trying position. To my mind, it is what is causing us most of this difficulty on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I can call the majority leader as my witness to say that I have taken that position and so advised the administration. However, that does not in any way release us from our responsibility to get the legislation passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope that the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senator from Montana will be agreed to. I believe that we want to indicate tonight—I agree that we cannot vote tonight—that we will take action on this measure tomorrow and either fish or cut bait. We want to indicate to a great many people throughout this country and in other parts of the world that we will not let this situation last indefinitely.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon in what he says, and with other Senators, that we should act on this matter tonight as indicated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest very seriously—and I do not mean to be impertinent or facetious about this—why do we not reach a unanimous-consent agreement on a time certain to vote tomorrow? I do not care whether it be 3 o'clock, 4 o'clock, or 10 o'clock tomorrow night. Everybody seems to be anxious to vote. Let us have an agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, and reserving the right to object, I think the answer to the Senator from Rhode Island is that the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont have made it very clear that they want assurance of adequate time within which to discuss the matter.

As the proponent of the substitute, I am not going to be placed in the position of going along with a unanimous-consent agreement that could be interpreted as denying them what would be considered adequate time to debate the measure.

I say to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] that I think we will be surprised to see the time that will be saved in the debate on tomorrow after the Senators have had an opportunity to study the resolutions. I think they will be ready to vote at a much earlier hour than is now contemplated.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I do not feel as the floor manager of the bill that I can agree tonight to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a certain time tomorrow.

I would hope that tomorrow we would be able to proceed in an orderly manner for perhaps an hour or so and then could consider a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I hope so, too.

Mr. CLARK. I do not think we can do it now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to put the Senate on notice that I may or may not want to participate tomorrow.

On tomorrow afternoon we have a markup of the independent offices bill. I would not like to see my unanimous-consent agreement entered into while I was absent from the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator can be assured that we will do our very best to see that his rights are protected.

ORDERS FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

I change my unanimous-consent request and ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, there will be no morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does the majority leader anticipate any more votes tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. None whatever?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, sir—reluctantly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I ought to serve notice that I shall object to any subcommittee and committee meetings tomorrow morning, regardless, because I think it will be the duty of Senators to be here at 10:30 and to labor with this matter until we have completed it. It is one of the most important things that confronts the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator returned to the Chamber, the majority leader postponed our session until 10:30 a.m. in order to permit the Committee on Rules and Administration to have a very important meeting on the fair elections matter. I take it the Senator means while the Senate is in session?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. That will start at 10:30.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say that, because of what I consider to be a most unsound precedent put into effect in the early part of this session, this rule does not apply to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, some 19 Members, all of whom are very important senior Senators and who should participate in this debate.

There is nothing that the Senator from Illinois can do to prevent the Committee on Appropriations from meeting. We are thus deprived of the wisdom of those senior Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a dispensation that was secured when the Senate began.

My very distinguished and lovable friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, should have been on hand on the first day of the session when the resolution was offered, and he should have said, "I object."

It would have then been done on motion, and the Senator could have started a filibuster on the matter.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. He will recall that 2 years ago I did that, much to the fury of my friends on the Committee on Appropriations. However, last year I was neglectful; I missed the boat. However, I will not miss it next January.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct, but he was not afraid of the fury. We are so accustomed to fury.

Mr. CLARK. Hell hath no fury like a Senator scorned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, early this afternoon there was some discussion in the Senate as to the position of the President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is about to make a speech with respect to the pending amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator would be offended if, because of other pressing engagements, I did not wait to hear him.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania is a rapid reader and that he can read what I say tomorrow morning. Because much of what I have to say relates to his resolution, I have no doubt that he will read what I say.

Mr. CLARK. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is delivered at my door. I assure the Senator that by the time I come here, I will have read his words.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, early this afternoon there was a discussion on the floor as to what the President desired, if anything, and what the President would do about legislation passed. Questions were presented as to whether he would sign the committee's resolution or whether he would sign a substitute resolution. I am satisfied that the administration, which includes the President, would be very concerned about the legal implications, the enforcibility, and the constitutionality of the committee resolution. I am satisfied that it has no concern in regard to the enforcibility, the legality, and the constitutionality of the substitute that I have offered and of any modification of it that will be included in the resolution which is now being mimeographed, which will be made available to the Senate in a matter of a few minutes.

When it is made available—if I may have the attention of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]—we can do one of two things. We can substitute it for the Morse-Mansfield-Hill-Smathers amendment by way of a substitute to which I am now addressing my remarks, or the Senators can offer amendments to the present amendment by striking certain language and inserting other language and offering to add—I hope they will—whatever cosponsors they wish to add.

I think I should make this statement at the beginning of my remarks, because of all the discussion that has gone before. I think that leaves no room for doubt as to what is planned by those of us who are offering the substitute, which will be our course of action.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield

Mr. JAVITS. My judgment would be to let the situation stand just as it is at the close of business tonight, with the Senator having offered a substitute, and we should cause to be printed in the RECORD the new document. Tomorrow, if the Senator is satisfied that he wishes to use the new one instead of the one he has, all Senators will have been apprised of what is in it, and that can be done.

My judgment is that it would not be wise to change the pending measure tonight, until the Senator has read carefully what it is and is satisfied.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

The minority leader was not in the Chamber when I addressed myself to the Senator from New York, and I should like to have the attention of the minority leader at this time.

I say to the minority leader that he was not in the Chamber when I addressed my remarks to the Senator from New York, as acting minority leader at the time. The Senator from New York has made a suggestion, and I wish to present it to the minority leader. I am sure that the minority leader will be inclined to agree with the suggestion.

The Senator from New York suggests that I continue my discussion of the substitute that is now at the desk, and if it meets with the agreement of the minority leader, the last thing I will do after finishing my discussion will be not to offer but to have printed in the RECORD the resolution that I have been advised by legal counsel for the staff is now being mimeographed, so that it will be in the RECORD.

I also hope that the staff will be able to deliver to the office of each Senator tonight a copy of that resolution, and that it will be printed in the RECORD. With that understanding, Mr. President, I shall proceed.

The difference between the substitute now at the desk and any modification of it that will be offered tomorrow along the lines of what has been referred to as the bipartisan resolution is not a difference in basic principle at all. The two resolutions are in complete agreement on what I consider to be the controlling principle—namely, that Congress takes joint responsibility with the President, which will come into existence when the President signs the resolution, if he signs the resolution—and I fully expect him to sign the resolution— that will bring the strike to an end, send the men back to work by whatever legal process is necessary to send them back to work, and make retroactive any wage settlement that is finally agreed upon for the settlement of the case.

As I said this morning—and as I say now—I hope it will be possible for the carriers to do what I think is the right thing for them to do—to make clear that when the men go back to work, they will go back to work on the basis of the financial arrangement that the negotiating committee for the union and for the carriers agreed upon last Friday night. When they came to an agreement on a final proposal for the settlement of the dispute, it was rejected by the vote of the membership of the union. I think that is the only fair and decent thing to do. I think that the workers are entitled to that. I think they are entitled to that increase in wages now, and they should not be expected to wait for that increase in wages on a retroactive basis.

Furthermore, as one who has had much to do with retroactivity over the years, I wish to point out that the workers in fact gain a greater financial advantage if the increase in wages is made available at the earliest possible date. Too often, a lump-sum payment in retroactivity does not help the workers financially as much as one would think. If the increase comes into being at the earliest possible date, the workers have it to meet their bills, where they may have bills. They do not suffer the losses that are incurred in various financing programs on the installment plan which result from carrying the cost of the debt, and paying it after they receive a lump-sum payment. For the men and for their wives and for their families, I think a fair and equitable thing for the carriers to do—I think they will want to do it—would be to indicate clearly that they are willing to start making the payments immediately, in case the resolution that I shall offer passes.

Mr. President, I was interested in some of the discussion here this afternoon, that we should not take any action in this case, that we should really have no legislation at all.

I am at a loss to understand that, because the administration spokesman, Mr. Wirtz, left no room for doubt in both of his appearances before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that this strike is resulting in serious interruption of essential transportation in various sections of the country, not only in Alaska and Hawaii, but in other sections of the country, as well. That testimony is in the record and points out the essential areas of the country that are dependent on transcontinental air transportation on one or more of the struck airlines. The testimony of the Secretary of Labor also points out a group of major cities, including some of our larger cities, that are suffering great losses as a result of a denial to them of adequate air transportation services.

The testimony of the Secretary of Labor leaves no room for doubt either as to the great consumer loss, the business loss, the tax loss, the loss of pay, and the millions of dollars that are being lost to the economy of this country as a result of the strike.

It has been my position, Mr. President, and the position of those who have been supporting my proposal for bringing the strike to an end by way of a congressional mandate signed by the President, that the situation is so serious that Congress would be walking out on its responsibility if it did not pass the legislation. Why? Because in my judgment the public interest calls for it. It calls for a balancing of interest. It is impossible to understand the position of the senior Senator from Oregon in this case unless you understand that three interests are involved: The interest of the union, the interest of the carriers, and the interest of the public.

As I have said over and over again in this debate, the paramount interest has now become the public interest. Of course, the union has a great interest, and the carriers have a great interest. But when the transportation service is shut down, when essential service is denied to large segments of this country, the public interest outweighs the other two interests combined, as far as the responsibility of Congress to pass legislation is concerned.

Furthermore, I wish to stress again that we are dealing with a regulated industry. We are not dealing with a strike between a group of contractors and a union that has a collective-bargaining agreement with them on an industrywide basis. We are not dealing with a strike between a private entrepreneur and a group of workers represented by a union. We are dealing with a strike that now has become a strike not only against the carriers, but has become a strike against the public and against the public interest. As I have said, a trust rests upon Congress to pass whatever legislation is necesary to protect that public interest, and when we are doing that we are not taking away any right from the union in the sense that it has a right greater than the public interest.

Mr. President, we know these union members; and I wish to say, in spite of whatever their feelings may be, that these union members are fine citizens. They are patriotic citizens. They are typical Americans, along with the rest of us. They go to the same churches. They send their children to the same schools. They belong to the same lodges with us.

The senior Senator from Oregon has never taken the position, and does not take the position now, that in some way, somehow, these union workers are less American than the rest of us. But I am taking the position that because they are Americans, they, too, have the same responsibility as the rest of us to place the public interest first and their own interests second—and that goes for the carriers, too—for this system of government by law cannot be maintained if the public interest is to be subordinated to the economic interest of any particular group in the country.

In order to understand that, we must understand what is meant by a regulated industry vested with the public interest. As will be seen from some of the court quotations I shall cite later in my speech, the courts, over and over again, have said to all economic groups in the country that their rights are subordinated to the rights of the public. We cannot maintain a system of self-government or of government by law and have any other doctrine prevail.

What do we mean by a regulated industry vested with public interest? We mean that we have an industry the operation of which is so vital to the welfare of the people that the Government must maintain some control by way of regulation over that industry as to the prices it can charge, as to the conduct of the workers working within the industry, and as to whatever else is necessary to maintain and regulate that industry in the public interest.

The court leaves no doubt about the fact that anyone who works in that industry, or any entrepreneur who seeks to operate a business within that industry, has no rights that are superior to the public interest, but by the very nature of the regulatory powers of the Government they are subordinated to the public interest.

There does not seem to be much recognition of that basic principle in the discussion that has taken place thus far in this debate. On the contrary, those who think no action should be taken seem to think the right to strike means an unlimited right in a regulated industry to follow any course of action that the workers want to follow, the public be damned. That does not happen to be the law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, as the courts have pointed out, the Constitution itself has vested in Congress certain regulatory powers, if you want to put it that way. It has vested in Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. That power was not put into the Constitution as empty language. Read article I, section 8, Mr. President. It carries with it the duty of Congress to regulate commerce in the public interest. That is the legal basis of my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution. That is the legal principle that the Senate must not overlook. We cannot justifiably escape that responsibility. We can evade it. As Senators, we can walk away from it.

When a showing has been made—and that showing has been made by the Secretary of Labor, and is so clear that every Senator can take judicial notice of it—that this strike is denying essential transportation to sections of the country, the Senate, under the Constitution, has a duty to regulate commerce in such a manner as to stop that interruption of essential transportation.

The Senator from Oregon knows very well that he has been living with, shall I say, a great deal of misrepresentation as to what his position is in this case. I am not talking now about the emotional attacks that are being made upon me by certain labor leaders and certain lobbyists. I am covered with scars from such attacks that have occurred for 32 years. This is not the first time that the senior Senator from Oregon has been in a position where he has reached a conclusion contrary to the wishes of labor.

I wrote some of the major opinions during the War Labor Board days, many of which were not pleasing to some of the unions in this country, because I thought the unions were wrong. But I say to the everlasting credit of the labor representatives on that Board that once the opinions I wrote became the majority decisions of the Board, there was never a time when those labor representatives did not recognize that the opinions had to be carried out.

I am not going to stand on the floor of the Senate or in committee and say, either by inference or innuendo, that once a legal decision is made in this case by way of a congressional act there will be a single member of the IAM Union who will not respect that decision, no matter how much he may disagree with it, grumble about it, protest it, and express his displeasure with it.

In my judgment, there is no group in labor, industry, or among the public, that will defend more stanchly the system of government by law than the members of this union. All this talk a few minutes ago on the basis of what I consider to be a purely hypothetical situation—suppose they defy it? By that very statement, it would be an unjustifiable reflection upon the members of the union.

I do not quote them, but at least I state what I think is a fair interpretation of the news stories which have been published in regard to some of the statements made by members of the union, including its international president, that they do not think the strike can end short of the passage of a law.

Mr. President, because I am always so careful in trying to avoid misquoting anyone, or giving an inaccurate interpretation of anyone's position on a given matter, I should like counsel on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to take note of and make it his responsibility to obtain out of the transcript of the hearings, the statements which Mr. Siemiller, international president of the IAM, made in regard to this subject matter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF P. L. SIEMILLER, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS

Mr. SIEMILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We, like the two participants preceding us, are here upon an invitation from this committee, limited to present a statement on one subject alone and state our position on that subject and were requested to do so within a period of 30 minutes. We shall not need the 30 minutes for the presentation.

We have furnished the committee with copies of the presentation and rather than to attempt to summarize, I believe I can best do it by reading the statement verbatim.

My name is Roy Siemiller. I am international president of the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, affiliated with the AFL–CIO. I welcome your invitation to appear before you to present the viewpoint of the strikers who are, in part, responsible for the grounding of the five airlines. In great part, of course, the responsibility rests with management.

May I start by saying that this is a legal strike for legitimate economic objectives. It is also a peaceful and orderly strike. We are proud of the trade union discipline of our members.

Perhaps this is the first time there has been such a strike where there has not been any police arrests for any reason. This has been a peaceful strike.

It is our understanding that this hearing is for the sole purpose of determining whether in fact a national emergency exists.

The joint resolution states, and I am referring to the original one, that this labor dispute threatens "essential transportation services of the Nation; that it is essential to the national interest, including the national health, safety, and defense, that essential transportation service be maintained."

The truth is that in some instances air transportation to certain cities has been curtailed. But the fact remains that no city has been cut off from air transportation.

Further, the newspapers report that there are "no shows" and empty seats on the carriers that are presently servicing the public in this country.

In the United States today there are 11 trunk carriers of which only 5 are on strike; 6 are still operating.

There are 13 local or feeder lines which service every city in the United States which the struck carriers normally service.

In addition to the airlines still flying, there are three all-cargo domestic carriers still operating as well as four helicopter carriers, seven intra-Alaskan carriers and two intra-Hawaiian carriers, and one intra-California carrier.

Finally, general aviation including the huge fleet of corporate executive planes has not been hampered by the strike.

In discussing the obstacles to travel, I think it important that we understand the magnitude of air transportation today in proportion to other modes of transportation. According to the best Government and non-Government figures Americans logged a total of 878,400 million passenger-miles in 1965. Of this total, 89.5 percent was by automobile; 2.6 percent by bus; 2 percent by railroad, and only 5.9 percent by domestic air carriers.

With regard to freight, the Statistical Abstract published by the Department of Commerce notes that in 1963, the latest data available, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all domestic intercity freight traveled by air.

This particular dispute has grounded 61 percent of the Nation's major airline service. Putting things into perspective nearly 97 percent of all intercity passenger travel is not affected by this dispute. Conversely, only 3 percent of all intercity passenger travel has been affected by the strike.

Some major carriers not involved in this dispute have advertised publicly that seats are available on flights to cities which they service. I have attached hereto three of these advertisements—one involving Braniff which was taken from the July 20 issue of the Kansas City Times, another involving Delta which was taken from the July 23 St. Louis Dispatch, the third involves American Airlines taken from the New York Times dated July 26, 1966. Other advertisements have appeared in other newspapers and on the radio, notifying the public that seats are available on other airlines.

We know of no situation where the health of this Nation or any single community in it has been endangered by this strike.

Nor is national defense imperiled by this strike. Contracts between the struck carriers and the Military Airlift Command are still in effect. All Military Airlift Command flights are still being serviced. In addition, 177 charter flights carrying more than 15,000 military personnel were serviced between July 9 and July 25. These flights are chartered by the Department of Defense under its civil air movement program.

I am offering an example of the notice which the Department of Defense submits to the Department of Labor which, in turn, refers it to our union. This notice sets forth the time of departure and arrival of these flights, and accordingly, we supply the necessary mechanics and service personnel to handle and service these aircraft.

Notwithstanding our willingness to cooperate in the servicing of all military flights it is important to note that Northwest Airlines has not requested its employees to service these aircraft.

We do not believe that the facts warrant any finding that this strike has imperiled the national health or safety. On the contrary, we are fearful that if this resolution should be enacted, the welfare of the United States and its heritage of freedom will, in fact, be impaired.

We do not believe that the right to strike can be recognized only in cases where a strike is ineffective or where no one will be inconvenienced.

We sincerely regret the fact that this strike has intruded into the lives of some of our fellow Americans. We ask their understanding and their patience. Freedom is never as orderly as other systems. Under other circumstances it might be possible for the Government to suppress this strike and to force airlines employees back to work against their will. In another age, a great dictator became famous for making the Italian railroads run on time. I doubt that is a system many Americans would care to live under.

Yet, this resolution, in my opinion, is symptomatic of an unhealthy concept of freedom. We believe that the right to strike is basic to Western freedom. The right to withhold one's services in support of what a man considers to be a fair and equitable settlement is a right inherent to our position in the entire Western World.

In my mind, this is the right we are hoping the people of Asia some day will enjoy. We think the basic issues here in this airline strike and the basic issues in southeast Asia are identical.

In closing, may I say that I understand the responsibility which rests on your shoulders for the strength and welfare of our Nation. We share your concern.

If and when conditions require drastic action for economic stability, we stand ready and eager to cooperate—as we have in three earlier wars. However, I plead with you to realize that any stabilization plan which seeks to control personal income must be fair; it must apply equally to all forms of personal income—including salaries, commissions, bonuses and dividends as well as wage rates. To single out wage rates for control when other forms of personal income are uncontrolled is discriminatory.

I am confident that if this resolution is rejected, these five air carriers will return to the bargaining table and a settlement will be possible.

(The attachments referred to previously follow:)

"FLIGHT INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM PASSENGER TRAFFIC DIRECTORATE, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, JULY 14, 1966

"CAM–7489, 95 passengers: Eastern Air Lines.

"Louisville, Kentucky to Washington, D.C., 16 July.

"Lv 1930 hrs. Arr 2227 hrs.

"CAM–7490, 95 passengers: Eastern Air Lines.

"Louisville, Kentucky to Washington, D.C. National Airport, 16 July.

"Lv 2000 hrs. Arr 2247 hrs.

"CAM–7491, 95 passengers: Eastern Air Lines.

"Louisville, Kentucky to Washington, D.C., 16 July.

"Lv 2030 hrs. Arr 2327 hrs.

"CAM–7500, 59 passengers: United Air Lines.

"Atlanta, Georgia to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 16.

"Lv 1100 hrs. Arr 1419 hrs.

"CAM–7567, 54 passengers: United.

"St. Louis to Philadelphia (McGuire Air Force Base), July 15.

"CAM–7501, 146 passengers: TWA—July 16.

"Baltimore to St. Louis (16 deplaning for 624 Engineer Platoon) then to Albuquerque (130 deplaning for Albuquerque Reserve Training Center).

"CAM–7502, 18 passengers: TWA.

"Kansas City to Chicago (Great Lakes Naval Station), July 16.

"July 17: 56 passengers to Indianapolis where an additional 81 will be for continuation of flight to Philadelphia (Toby Hanna Army Depot)."

"[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 26, 1966]

"IS THERE ANY CHANCE OF GETTING A SEAT ON AMERICAN AIRLINES?

"Yes.

"But there's one problem: since American Airlines is still flying, our telephone lines are completely jammed. So you might not be able to reach us to find out which flights have empty seats. Or which cities have additional American flights during the strike.

"We do have empty seats on our planes, though.

"We've even sent some flights out with fewer people aboard than normally.

"Even our coast-to-coast flights—which were all sold out right after the strike began—now have few passengers standing by.

"All this is because lots of people have put off their vacation and business trips. And those with reservations can't even get through to us to cancel them.

"So we suggest this:

"If you can't reach us by telephone, go to the nearest American Airlines ticket office. They'll give you the information you need.

"Or, come out to the American terminal at the airport.

"If the flight you want is all booked up, there's a pretty good chance we'll get you on a later flight.

"We'll help you in every way we can.

"AMERICAN AIRLINES."

"[From the Kansas City Times, July 20, 1966]

"A LOT OF SEATS ON OUR AIRPLANES ARE GOING TO WASTE

"Braniff International is flying.

"But a lot of people figure that we haven't got a seat to spare. Without bothering to check with us.

"Check with us.

"In most cases, we'll have something for you.

"You may have trouble getting through on the phone. If so, ask your travel agent for the information you want. Or come to the airport in person.

"We have people working overtime to put you on an airplane.

"We'd hate to see an empty seat go where you wanted to go."

"[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, July 23, 1966]

"IMPORTANT NOTICE FROM DELTA FOR ST. LOUIS AIR TRAVELERS

"Delta Air Lines is not on strike. All Delta flights are operating normally. However, because of the interrupted service on 5 other U.S. air carriers, hundreds of travellers are calling Delta who would not normally do so.

"This has imposed an unprecedented load on our telephones. As a result, many of our good friends can't reach us to obtain space and information. Yet many of our flights are departing with empty seats! For example, since the strike started, Delta has averaged the following numbers of empty seats daily to these destinations alone:

"Average number of empty seats flown daily since July 8, 1966

From St. Louis to—	
Chicago	266
Memphis	87
New Orleans	65
Houston	33
Average empty seats daily	451

"Please be assured that we are doing the very best we can under difficult circumstances * * * and that we sincerely appreciate your patience.

"If you are unable to reach us by telephone, come out to the airport and stand by. Chances are excellent that we can accommodate you within a reasonable time. Remember * * * many Delta flights are leaving with empty seats to most destinations.

"DELTA."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there questions?

Senator PROUTY. Mr. Siemiller, I want to assure you that all of us on this committee, most Members of Congress and representatives of labor and business do not want compulsory arbitration in this country if it can possibly be avoided, but I think as Members of Congress we have to measure up to our responsibilities to the public welfare.

I had hoped that you and representatives of the airlines would have been able to come here today and say that this hearing was unnecessary because you were about to reach agreement. Unfortunately that is not the case.

I did ask Mr. Curtin certain questions with respect to the increase in wages and fringe benefits and in fairness to you I think I should submit the same questions so that you can express a different point of view if you so desire.

I understood Mr. Curtin to say that the President's Emergency Board recommended an increase of 3.6 percent over a period, I believe, of 42 months. Is that your understanding?

Mr. Siemiller. Senator Prouty, I imagine that figure is as good as any other figure that you could latch on to. There are so many different variables in connection with a recommendation of this kind as to what it will cost that, in my judgment, it is impossible to put a percentage figure on it.

As an example, how many employees are the carriers going to have? How much overtime are they going to work? There are so many. I could go on and on. That is just to give you an example, but I would say when we start throwing figures around in percentage points or in millions of dollars of cost that it is just something to talk about and it possibly is somewhere within the ball park, but it is not very accurate.

Senator Prouty. It seems to me there must have been experts available to the Emergency Board, to your people and to management so that at least an approximate figure could be determined. I do not want to belabor the questions, however, but I do consider it of major importance.

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, I think that is an approximation.

Senator Prouty. I think they are using the administration's wage-price guidelines or so I am told.

Mr. Curtin also suggested that the carriers had agreed to increase this to 3.85 percent. There, again, you may disagree with it. I merely wish to give you an opportunity to disagree if you have an objective basis for believing otherwise.

Mr. Siemiller. Again, let me state it this way: The carriers have agreed to some changes since that time. Their cost is very debatable, again for the variables I have pointed out and again based on some other features that are involved in it.

Naturally, when you are sitting on the carriers' side of the table they will put forward the very best figures they can justify by any means whatsoever and naturally from the other side of the table, very frankly, we are going to do the same thing.

So there is a big difference of opinion in regard to these figures which I don't think is helpful in this particular case, because there are just too many issues involved.

Senator Prouty. Mr. Curtin also suggested, if I remember correctly, that the demands of the union at the time of the strike were roughly 75 percent above the Emergency Board recommendation.

Now, you must have some idea as to whether these figures are right or wrong. Let us consider the 3.6 percent increase first and then the $20 million variable which has been mentioned.

Mr. Siemiller. We do not have a cost figure to put on that. In our judgment, it is impossible to get an exact cost figure.

Secondly, on the second question that you would have as to the difference in the offer or the difference that was discussed at the time of this strike and the recommendations of the Emergency Board that you might have, again, there is one large $20 million variable, in excess of $20 million, which is roughly the cost of pensions that is involved.

This is the last industry left, just about, where employees are asked to contribute toward a pension and that is involved in this, and that is an issue which is still subject to negotiations and I feel we can find some answers on that issue.

Senator Prouty. Do you feel you are making any progress with the airlines in this dispute?

Mr. Siemiller. We have not made much progress. My honest judgment is that the carriers are not going to move with an offer sufficient to cause our membership to accept it as long as there is legislation pending before the Senate.

I strongly feel they would rather have legislation than to work out an agreement and they are going to hide behind the Senate. That is my personal feelings in this.

Senator Prouty, I must tell you that we are not a dictatorial union in any way. We have a constitution that we have to live up to. There are 35,400 people who will have to vote to accept or reject any offer that we take to them. The offers that we have now, it is our judgment that they would not be acceptable.

Senator Prouty. Do you believe the benefits already agreed to by the carriers are inflationary in respect to the President's guidelines?

Mr. Siemiller. To start with, I do not want to dodge your question, but we do not buy the President's guidelines.

We think it is directed to only one sector of our society. It was grabbed out of thin air and they changed the formula to get the 3.2. We do not think it is inflationary.

What is the difference? The airlines are going to have to pay their employees some of their profits or cut their rates. If the customers flying airlines keep the money in their pockets or if the employees have the money to spend, we think it is still within the economy. We do not think our demands are inflationary.

The Chairman. We have a rollcall vote on the final passage of the military assistance bill.

Senator Prouty. I have just one more question.

Do you believe that the country is faced with inflationary pressures which if not controlled may well jeopardize the welfare of the Nation as a whole?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, we feel that the country is faced with inflationary pressures. We think whoever let the interest rate get away from them has caused the inflationary pressures.

The Chairman. The committee will stand in recess until we can vote and return.

(Whereupon, at 6:05 p.m. the committee recessed for a rollcall vote.)

(Whereupon, at 6:18 p.m., the committee reconvened after rollcall vote.)

The Chairman. The committee will kindly come to order.

Senator Fannin?

Senator Fannin. I would like to ask you a question regarding your prepared statement. Mr. Siemiller, in response to the statement, "A joint resolution states that this labor dispute threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; that it is essential to the national interest including the national health, safety, and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained."

Do you disagree with that statement?

Mr. Siemiller. It is essential that transportation services be maintained. We want it to be maintained.

Senator Fannin. I asked you whether you disagreed with that statement.

Mr. Siemiller. Which statement?

Senator Fannin. The statement I just read. The prepared statement you presented to us.

Mr. Siemiller. Yes; I disagree with the statement in the joint resolution that this does threaten the national health, safety, or defense of this Nation.

Senator Fannin. What part of this statement do you disagree with?

Mr. Siemiller. I agree that it is essential that transportation services be maintained, taken in that context.

Senator Fannin. Don't you agree that defense is very important and if it is in any way interfering with our defense program that it is detrimental to our Nation?

Mr. Siemiller. I don't agree it has interfered with defense so it becomes a national emergency.

Senator Fannin. Then you would permit interference with our defense program unless, in fact, a national emergency?

Mr. Siemiller. There will always be some interference with a defense program. That is inherent in our way of life, in our free democracy that we have.

Senator Fannin. It certainly is not the intent, I do not think, of the union organizations or of the business organizations to interfere with our defense program?

Mr. Siemiller. It is not the intent, no; but it is one of the byproducts of freedom.

Senator Fannin. I certainly do not follow you to the extent that you are willing to have this right affect the defense of our country when we are in a war in southeast Asia and the lives of our men are at stake. I assume you were here when I read the telegram from the different defense industries that are in my home State. Were you here at that time?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes; I was here.

Senator Fannin. I think it is very evident that these firms are critically affected. They are concerned about this strike and feel that it is something that should have serious consideration. From what you have said I do not believe that you are giving it serious consideration.

Mr. Siemiller. Your assumption is entirely incorrect.

Incidentally, we represent the employees of some of the concerns that you read, and I do not doubt that there are interruptions. I find interruptions myself in traveling across the country even though I went to California, up to the coast to Seattle and back during the strike. I know you can do things. It is harder to do it with this kind of interruption that we have.

What is the alternative that you have? We want the strike settled. However, we can't settle the strike on what has been put on the table at this time. A majority of 35,000 workers, some of which are in your State, refuse to buy it, to accept it.

So the alternative is that we have a dictatorship—put them in the army, put a uniform on them and they will be back to work.

Senator Fannin. No one is asking you to do that and that is not the consideration we have in front of us today. That is just as improper for you to make that statement as it is for you to use these absurd figures you have presented trying to mislead the people that only 3 percent of all the passengers traveling are affected by this dispute.

Mr. Siemiller. These are not our figures, sir. They are the Government's figures and the airlines' figures.

Senator Fannin. You are using them in a misleading way.

Mr. Siemiller. That is your conception of it, not ours.

Senator Fannin. You answered my question. If you will just look at your prepared statement and compare that with the answer you gave me, I think you will observe the same considerations.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Dominick?

Senator Dominick. Mr. Siemiller, I want to start out by saying I know many of the people in your union are very fine and able people and ably represented.

Mr. Siemiller. Thank you.

Senator Dominick. I want to ask just a couple of questions. Am I correct in my understanding that the union as well as the airlines is now ready to go into bargaining at any time they should be called?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, sir. We are ready. We will meet the carriers at the bargaining table any time, any place, right here in front of this committee or any place else.

Senator Dominick. In other words, the calling of this hearing and the introduction of legislation has not created any breakdown in negotiations?

Mr. Siemiller. I think your assumption is correct. It has not created a breakdown. I firmly believe it has delayed them.

Senator Dominick. If, for example, the Secretary should call the parties in to bargaining sessions 30 minutes from now, you would have no objection to going?

Mr. Siemiller. We would be there. The full committee is right here in this room. We would have no problem.

Senator Dominick. The next thing, the Secretary of Labor gave quite a few figures in the process of his presentation, amongst which there are 150,000 passengers per day which are not moving, $1 million a week loss of payments; that the entire transportation revenue system is down $1 million per day and the airline revenue is down $7 million a day.

Are there any figures there which you would dispute?

Mr. Siemiller. I would have no grounds for disputing those figures.

Senator Dominick. Would you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement that mail delays of 24 to 48 hours are occurring with first-class mail delayed 4 to 5 days.

Mr. Siemiller. We would have no figures on that. I would say the Post Office Department figures would be the best you can get.

Senator Dominick. Do you have any knowledge on the statement that was made in his presentation about the drug shipments being impossible to fulfill?

Mr. Siemiller. This is the first we had heard of that.

Senator Dominick. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Javits?

Senator Javits. Mr. Siemiller, I wish to make it clear I for one do not assume this hearing is intended to evaluate the equity of the position of the union and the position of management. I can assure you I shall do my best, and I think it is the general feeling, to keep that out of the question.

I am very gratified at what you have said about your readiness to bargain promptly just as management has indicated through its witnesses.

You indicated, however, that you thought that our proceedings had "delayed" the progress of collective bargaining. Could you tell me for how long it is delayed?

Mr. Siemiller. It would be hard to say for how long a delay. I said earlier, and perhaps you were not all here——

Senator Javits. We have all been voting and doing a few other things.

Mr. Siemiller. Thank God for that. I know what you are voting on.

I do not feel that the carriers are going to make an offer that will be satisfactory to the membership that they will vote for by a majority vote. We will never have anything satisfactory for all of them, but a majority of them will not vote for it as long as there is pending legislation.

As long as something is pending here, I do not believe the carriers are going to make an offer that we can get our people to accept. This is my firm personal belief.

Senator Javits. You heard the Secretary of Labor suggest to us that we put the matter over for a few days. Do you think that would make any difference in your answer?

Mr. Siemiller. We would try to do our best to reach a settlement. Each time we convinced someone that we have something our members would accept. We will try our best for that. I do not know what was in the Secretary's mind. He does not always confide in us so I could not tell you what he had in mind.

Senator Javits. What is the reason for your statement that the management and carriers cannot agree to a settlement that would be acceptable to a majority of the members of the union so long as this legislation is pending? What is there in that situation that would induce the carriers to take that position?

Mr. Siemiller. My judgment tells me the carriers would much rather see this legislation passed and put the people back to work than to have to meet what we consider just demands for the membership, their employees. As you said, Senator, if you want to get into the merits and debate these issues, we are prepared to, but I don't think it would serve a useful purpose.

Senator Javits. I don't think we should. May I ask you this: There are two bills pending before us, Senate Joint Resolution 180, a seizure resolution, and a second one has replaced it, Senate Joint Resolution 181 to which I am a party and that is why I am so interested in your view which is really continuing the standstill, the traditional framework within which bargaining has taken place in the airlines industry and also has a provision for retroactivity.

Why, therefore, should the carriers in your opinion, not the members, but the carriers, in your opinion, derive any excess comfort from that?

Mr. Siemiller. Except that they have 180 days under that bill to continue hoping that they will get a settlement for less than which we consider their employees are entitled to.

Senator Javits. Do you think it would in any way really weaken the position of the union with that retroactivity provision in there as big as life?

Mr. Siemiller. I think the retroactivity strengthens the union as far as retroactivity is concerned. That has to do with the amortization of vacations and other things which are not retroactive as I understand under the terms of this. The time already has passed for all holidays and so on but for money issues it is my understanding that it would be retroactive on it.

The whole package clearly is across the board, and again it is hard to discuss this without getting into the merits of the individual issues. I think Senator Morse, who knows more about this than possibly anyone—he sat on that committee—he would say it is pretty hard to discuss this issue without getting into the merits of each and every one of the issues involved.

Senator Javits. But your conclusion is the pendency of this legislation, in your judgment, will be a depressing influence on management really doing all that it would otherwise do?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes.

Senator Javits. In your judgment?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes.

Senator Javits. Do you prefer looking at the legislation, the seizure or partial seizure to the standstill?

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, I do not prefer either.

Senator Javits. Suppose you had to have one or the other? Suppose this thing really gets to the point where it does really develop a very basic national emergency?

Mr. Siemiller. I would rather meet that question at the time. I am not evading the question. It is a question to me, would I rather be shot or hung.

Senator Javits. Do you agree with the Secretary who says he thinks there is enough substance to the idea that you can get together so that we ought to hold off for a modest period of time?

Mr. Siemiller. We will cooperate and try our very best to reach an agreement. I don't know what the Secretary has in mind.

Senator Javits. Is it also the disposition of the union just as it loosened up as it were on military problems to do the same with respect to other problems as, for example, Senator Dominick mentioned drugs and whatever else might really be a bracing point?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, sir. We would do that. If there were a life involved or something, we would send our people in to service the flight.

The Chairman. Senator Randolph.

Senator Randolph. Mr. Siemiller, if there are members on this committee who would feel compelled, by certain circumstances, or constrained to vote for Senate Joint Resolution 181 in this committee, and those members felt that in so doing they were in no way taking sides between the carriers and the union in question, would you understand the feeling of any members who would support such a resolution?

Mr. Siemiller. I think I could understand their feelings. Let me say this: We would not question the motives of any Senator for voing what he considered was his best judgment after looking at the total picture. He has that right.

In our judgment, you were sent here by the people of West Virginia to serve their interests and we would expect you to use your best judgment, and we have a lot of members now in West Virginia which we did not have very long ago. We would hope our members would want you to do that.

Senator Randolph. I will not discuss your membership because my record is too well known.

Mr. Siemiller. It is a good one.

Senator Randolph. I want, Mr. Siemiller, you to tell the Senator from West Virginia how, in your thinking the passage of the proposed Senate Joint Resolution 181 would prejudice the union position.

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, I believe we would be working at a complete disadvantage. We would be in the position where the carriers knew they did not have to agree to anything and they were protected for a period of 180 days. I just cannot see where we would have an equal advantage with the carriers with a status quo involved even though there was a retroactivity on some of the issues involved. This is not money alone, but it evolves around cost items.

Senator Dominick. Would the Senator yield at that point?

Senator Randolph. Yes, I yield.

Senator Dominick. Would you prefer the establishment of a board that would hold hearings for 30 days and then come out with the final decision?

Mr. Siemiller. That would be compulsory arbitration and we would be completely and unalterably opposed to it.

Senator Dominick. Even though you do not have to go to work?

Mr. Siemiller. Even though we would not have to go to work it would be a gross mistake.

Senator Randolph. I do not want to be gratuitous in any way, Mr. Chairman, but I believe in the importance of collective bargaining. I am not sure whether there is more than one member at this table who voted for the National Labor Relations Act as I did, when I was a Member of the House. This was the Magna Carta of the labor movement, and brought collective bargaining to a respectable—and responsible—position in equity in our Nation. I voted also for the Fair Labor Standards Act, which increased wages and provided for better working conditions—including a workweek of reasonable length. These votes were in those early, difficult days, and that record has been continued.

I have problems here in my own thinking, not because of members of any segment of labor, or any segment of society; but I have certain situations that concern me as they do you.

I commend the labor movement as it has helped to build our economy.

I say that over and over again, and I say it here this afternoon. This is a situation however that bothers me. I know a man who is trying to fly from Kansas City to Pittsburgh on Saturday. He tells me, Mr. Siemiller, that he can't make that trip and it is important that he make that trip. Now, Braniff International has canceled its flight from Kansas City into Chicago on Saturday, if I am correctly informed. You understand the running out of town and you know all of this in the airlines language, flight time and so on. I am not going into it today, but they canceled the flight he had. Also he finds there is no service, if I am correctly informed, and I have not had the opportunity as of now to check this, that there is no flight that he can take from Chicago to Pittsburgh on Saturday.

Now, I am not certain of this fact, but I am trying to check it. In other words, he is unable to fly on a necessary trip from Kansas City to Chiacgo and Chicago to Pittsburgh. He might go around via Detroit using Mohawk, and I am not sure yet. He is trying all of these. But many people are not familiar with all of these other airlines, and other possibilities.

So, these are problems which I think concern us—not only the individual movements which include persons and products—but the deeper problems, perhaps about which my constituents are writing to me, as they are writing to other Senators.

This has been going on not just for the past few days, but certainly for the past few months. They express their concerns about the financial problems of the Nation.

We had the homebuilders in today, calling on all of the Senators here—and they are unable to build a home because the money has dried up. This is a serious problem. There are many problems that have to do with our financial structure: to make money available for the homebuilder, and the home buyer, who is concerned with the threat of inflation, the balance of payments—all of these are matters of concern.

So, I share this concern and I know that you share this concern. I am certain of that.

Secretary Wirtz, Mr. Siemiller, in this testimony today, if I read it correctly, indicated this strike is having an adverse effect on our balance-of-payments deficit of a magnitude, as I recall, of about $1 million a week. Is that correct? Did I hear that correctly?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Senator RANDOLPH. As Members of the Senate, I think we view that sort of situation seriously. I wonder if you would care to comment on the viewpoint of your union in regard to this serious matter?

Mr. SIEMILLER. Senator, we recognize it is very serious. We recognize it is a great inconvenience and a costly inconvenience to a segment of our society, a segment of America. It is costly in many ways to different people.

I have often wondered when people put statistics together where they place the work force of this Nation.

Senator RANDOLPH. All statistics should be clothed with figures, not the figures per se, but the personalities, the men and women, the human element.

Mr. SIEMILLER. I would agree with you as to the seriousness of it and I would agree with you as regards the inconvenience of it. Some people are not as well informed as others as to the circuitous route that you can take to get to where you have to get with the air carriers that are still operating. Some you still can't. There are some of these, and I am not here indicating that these situations do not exist. The position of our union is this is not a national emergency that should cause legislation.

We want to find an answer to this problem. We have scattered across from Gander, Newfoundland, to Tokyo, 35,400 people involved in this work stoppage. To them it is a great hardship, also. To the pilots, to the other employees of the airlines it is a great hardship.

We need to find the answer and find it as expeditiously as possible.

We have been in negotiations trying to since last October. I could not say so, but I am firmly convinced that the administration's guideline policy has been a real deterent to finding the answer to the problem to get this situation settled.

Again, as I said to Senator JAVITS, to get into the equities of it would be wrong, but just let me drop one thing in. You take an airline mechanic who is going to have to certify to the safety of the airworthiness of a Boeing 707 taking to the air with 100 lives including the crew in it. He is drawing $3.52.

You take a longshoreman in the same city in San Francisco, and he is getting $14 an hour. These are some of the equities that are involved in this particular situation that we are involved in, and why it is difficult for us to convince our members that they are not just as valuable and why they should not get and why the equity should not be involved in this settlement.

I only picked that one. Obviously, I could get more. I do not want to get into that unless you want me to do so. But we want to get a settlement for it.

Again, and as I believe I said to Senator FANNIN, we have to convince a membership, the Senate of the United States passes laws that say we live up to our Constitution. I cannot sign an agreement on behalf of our members. They have to agree to it. We have to take it out and they have to agree before we have an agreement.

I think it is right, and I believe in democracy and I want to practice it but this is a problem that we have. If we do not have the ingredients in a settlement that these people will vote for, we do not have a settlement.

Senator RANDOLPH. I want to thank you for your responses to my questions. They were asked with a certain feeling on the part of the Senator from West Virginia that he is not just groping but he is attempting to find the best answers he can from all parties concerned in this very serious situation.

It might not be an emergency to use that term, but certainly I think it is a blow which is injurious to the economic well-being of the Nation.

Mr. SIEMILLER. Senator, let me say we appreciate your statements, your thinking, and we welcome your help in helping us find an answer to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MURPHY.

Senator MURPHY. Has there been any expression on the part of your rank and file membership at this late date as to whether they would as soon go back to work and let you negotiate or whether they insist on staying out on strike? I ask this from long experience. As you may know, I have been 40 years in the labor movement, I have been through several strikes, I know about the mechanics and the personalities.

I know public positions once taken are difficult, but there also comes a consideration of the general welfare of the general public which in my consideration always supersedes all the rest.

Secondly, I am concerned about the welfare of the good reputation of the labor movement which at this point I think is in jeopardy. I have been around it 40 years and believe in it and have stood up on the line on several occasions. What is the feeling or what would you guess is the feeling of your rank and file? Would they object to going back and performing services? In the meantime, you go ahead and continue your negotiations in free, complete liberty, just as you do it now.

In the old days as you know, we used to say a strike that was not won in 21 days was lost and that you get a better deal while you are out on the bricks. I would have hoped by now we would have advanced from there. I think in these enlightened times this has changed. I know most of the gentlemen on this committee and I know their feelings in this matter. They are friendly, they are absolutely friendly. They want to see this solved properly, but they are under the gun because the administration has not provided the leadership in this we hoped it would and now apparently it has been put on the back of this committee and Congress.

Something has to be done and we want to get it done and I would like your expression as to how the rank and file would feel about a request of this kind.

Mr. SIEMILLER. Senator MURPHY, we have not taken that specific issue to the membership and asked for an expression.

However, there has been——

Senator MURPHY. What would your guess be? You have represented them very well.

Mr. SIEMILLER. Thank you. I was in San Francisco the week before last. I attended a meeting of that local union at the large overhaul base in San Francisco where there are some 6,000 or 7,000. The indication there expressed was they would not go back to work unless they were ordered to do so by a Federal court or a law enacted. They want to get a settlement.

You have had a lot of experience and I know and I appreciate that. You have had strikes that you have been involved in where you had a membership that you had to hide. You could not expose them or you had lost your position. We have one now that is so militant that they do not leave us much room to move around in.

My honest judgment is if that were presented to the people, their vote would be "No, we don't return to work until we get a settlement."

My second thought on the subject is, and you did not ask me this question, but unless relief is forthcoming for these highly skilled mechanics, they are going to be moving out of the air transportation industry and taking jobs in San Francisco as dock workers or go to work for Greyhound Bus where the rate of pay is in excess of $5 an hour for a mechanic repairing a bus.

There are some real equities involved in this but in honest answer to your question, I don't think we could get them to agree to it, and I believe if I ordered them to, they would tell me where I could go.

Senator MURPHY. May I ask one other question? Assuming that there is a settlement, it has been said that it would take another 5 or 6 days before you could get the settlement agreed to by all of the locals involved. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. SIEMILLER. No; it is not today. It was at the time the statement was made. We have beefed up our communications to such an extent that if we get a settlement, we can take it out for ratification in 24 to 30 hours.

We have changed procedures and all. When Mr. Ramsey said, "Look, Eastern Air Lines has letters out to their employees berating the union for not giving the membership an opportunity to say if they wanted this offer or not"; when he says they would take any offer on the table back to the membership for their expression, at that moment all offers were withdrawn so we had nothing to take to the membership.

At that time our procedure was such it would have taken 4 or 5 days. Today we could do it under any circumstances in 48 hours and I believe quicker than that.

Senator MURPHY. Do you feel that the insistence on the guidelines is becoming one of the great obstacles in the settlement of this strike?

Mr. SIEMILLER. Yes, sir.

Senator MURPHY. In other words, do you feel that the opposite side of the negotiation table, the carriers, might be inclined to come to the terms which you could agree on if it were not for guidelines that have been set down by those who are concerned with inflation, shall we say?

Mr. SIEMILLER. Yes, I honestly do. I think I would put myself in their position. Here I am operating an air transportation industry. My rates are regulated by the Government. I have been very, very successful and exceeded anything they said was justifiable. If I do something to anger the Government or something, there could be some retaliation.

I think I would be very careful also if I was the carriers.

Senator Murphy. I have no other questions.

The Chairman. Are there further questions?

Senator Williams.

Senator Williams. There is a phrase we use from time to time around here, Mr. Siemiller, and it is a position when we are advancing an idea, a hope therein, and the phrase is, "fair advantage." It seems to me that what you are suggesting, a resolution of this nature would put the management side of the equation in this dispute in more than fair advantage. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Siemiller. That is my judgment. We would not be on equal footing or status. We would be prohibited by law from taking any action for working for these 6 months.

Frankly, there is another thing, Senator Williams, which should be of concern to everybody. Every one of us is a human being. Every one of us has certain prejudices and feelings. You take 35,000 people and send them to work against their will, what kind of performance are they going to give? This concerns me greatly. What kind of morale are we going to have in this very essential industry and essential work force? I fly these planes. I want to be just like the pilot on TWA, who wrote the president of TWA and said when he took off in his bomber in World War II he wanted to be sure that the guy who checked it out knew what he was doing. He feels the same way when he takes over one of TWA's planes. I feel the same way. I want to feel that that plane is airworthy.

Senator Williams. This strike in progress is a legal strike, is it not?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, sir.

Senator Williams. What is management's counterpart to a strike when labor-management discussions are not bearing fruit and coming to an agreement? What do you call that?

Mr. Siemiller. I don't know what you would call that, what terminology.

Senator Williams. Do they still call them lockouts, when management uses an economic weapon comparable to a strike?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, if that is your question.

Senator Williams. So that is management's expression? When you have these problems, it is a strike?

Mr. Siemiller. That is right.

Senator Williams. Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts used the word "extraordinary" a few times this afternoon with respect to what we are doing today and described the extraordinary activity of the White House in the steel strike. We had the railroad strike, not before this committee but another committee. The steel strike was brought to the President's desk. I just wonder, has any lockout been brought to the President's desk or the President personally or has any lockout been brought directly to this committee or the Commerce Committee?

Mr. Siemiller. I do not know of a lockout where management just shut down their plant and created a situation where it came to the attention of the President or the Congress.

Senator Williams. I cannot recall any.

Yet, what we are doing here is an analogy to the lockout situation from what we are considering here.

Mr. Siemiller. It is the opposite. We have some lockouts going where management shuts their plant down around the country when involved in labor disputes that we have, but it is a small concern and it would never become of the magnitude that this is.

Senator Williams. Would this not be an analogy of precedent to consider a lockout?

Mr. Siemiller. There is precedent. If there was a lockout and if the President involved himself in it, my judgment tells me it would be the first time he did that.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. I want to join with my colleagues in welcoming you to the committee, Mr. Siemiller. I would like to, if I could, just review some of the points that were asked of an earlier witness who appeared here today. I imagine the Bureau is concerned about the problem of inflation as certainly the carriers are, are you not?

Mr. Siemiller. Very much so, because inflation erodes wages and real wages faster than any other section of our society and we represent wage earners.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. We heard earlier from the Secretary of Labor who stated in this testimony that he feels that both parties should go back to the woodshed, so to speak, and continue their bargaining efforts. I am just wondering whether you feel that there can truly be meaningful bargaining atmosphere when you are bargaining under the umbrella of statements which have suggested that only an agreement which comes within the wage-price guidelines would be accepted.

Mr. Siemiller. I would answer that this way: The Emergency Board's recommendation is well within what we understand the wage-price guidelines to be. Our membership would not vote for that. They would not accept that as it is.

If there is going to have to be some additional ingredients involved before the membership will accept a negotiated settlement, again, when we get into the so-called wage-cost guidelines that you are involved in, we are getting in a sea that is pretty hard to swim in because there are so many situations involved.

If we are talking about direct wage increases to the employees, then we would be well within it. If we are talking about the cost—and as an example, this is the last industry left in the country where the employees or four of these carriers contribute to the cost of insurance for their dependents. This is about the last industry where you contribute to the cost of pensions that they have. The employer in the major industry makes the contribution. This is a major industry that does not have a cost-of-living escalator clause.

All of these are subjects that are in this package and are part of it. So it is pretty hard to say how you want to apply these so-called guidelines. What are you going to put in them? What are you going to put on the outside of them?

We had an announcement of a wage increase. I mentioned longshoremen earlier. They settled for 25.6 percent. It was just settled for a 5-year agreement spread over 5 years.

I think that is still within the guidelines that they have. I do not think it was inflationary. Again, the administration's interpretation of that or Gardner Ackley's might be entirely different. I might say I know it would be different from my interpretation.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. Is it your interpretation that the wage-price guidelines actually as they were established and as I read them, the increase to the 3.2 percent is not necessarily to apply to every situation across the board; is that correct?

Mr. Siemiller. That is correct, Senator Kennedy. The 3.2 is as phony as a $3 bill with my picture on it. They had a formula for arriving at this over a 5-year period, if the formula used would provide 3.6. They decided to discard the formula and stick to the old one and 3.2.

With the 3.2 for these so-called guidelines that we have, the formula in the first place is one that is hard to justify.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. Nonetheless, in response to an earlier question I think you commented if this 3.2 or the wage-price guidelines were not applicable, to state that as a hypothetical, you feel you can reach a settlement of this dispute; is that right?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, sir. I would say if the carriers were told to go reach an agreement with the union, we would probably get one before daylight. They may disagree with me wholeheartedly. That is my feeling.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. Therefore, actually the equities of your particular dispute are really becoming decided by our national objectives of wage-price guidelines in this particular instance and there has been stated national policy in such a way that at least as far as you are concerned and the membership of the union make it extremely difficult to bargain collectively?

Mr. Siemiller. That is correct. If we were required to stay within the administration's interpretations of the guidelines, we could not reach an agreement that our members would ratify.

The Chairman. Are there further questions?

Senator Kennedy of New York. I was very impressed with your testimony before the committee and also the frankness and the candid way in which you answered the questions which I think would be very helpful to the committee and were very helpful to me.

The Secretary appeared here earlier on behalf of the administration. He came out in opposition to the resolution that we are discussing. He said what their proposal was that both carriers and the unions would go back to begin negotiating again.

I want to ask you if you think those negotiations can arrive at a solution, in your judgment, over the period of the next few days?

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, I would rather not say what my judgment tells me. I would rather tell you we will try our best to reach an agreement.

Senator Kennedy of New York. Do you think it is possible?

Mr. Siemiller. There would have to be a change on the part of the carriers.

Senator Kennedy of New York. Would there also have to be a change on the part of the carriers as Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts mentioned?

Mr. Siemiller. I have no idea.

Senator Kennedy of New York. Is it possible to reach a settlement if the Government maintains its present position, and the carriers follow the advice of the Government?

Mr. Siemiller. The answer to that is just as I gave it to the Senator from Massachusetts a moment ago. The answer is, "No," that nothing is in that guideline. As I said, the recommendation of the Emergency Board is well within this guideline. It is not satisfactory to the members at all in this case. They would not vote for it.

I could not convince them. I would be less than honest if I told you there was a chance.

Senator Kennedy of New York. It appeared when the Secretary came in and suggested not to accept this resolution and give it a few more days. In fact I gather they are stating—because they must know your position as you stated it to us—is that they will follow the guidelines.

Mr. Siemiller. I would hope your assumption would be correct.

Senator Kennedy of New York. It seems quite clearly from your testimony that they must know it. The carriers know it and yet it is being suggested that you go back in and start negotiating. Unless the Government is willing to obviate the guidelines, then you are not going to reach an agreement.

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, let me say it this way: As was pointed out earlier, with the guidelines, a portion of the wage guideline policy provides for inequities in certain situations. We think that there are great inequities in this situation. There has to be some retreat on a firm position so far.

Senator Kennedy of New York. From the public statements made within the last week or so, it is the administration feeling that what has been offered to the union so far is within the guidelines but anything above that would be outside the guidelines and therefore, inflationary?

Mr. Siemiller. You could take that from the statements I have read also. We have not been told that by the administration.

Senator Kennedy of New York. I am somewhat puzzled and I listened to that testimony this afternoon, in listening to their position, and their failure really to make any concrete suggestions to the committee as to what should be done or even state that the Government is really going to do anything beyond what has already been done except for the fact that everybody is going to go back and talk some more not only in opposition to this resolution and this legislation but also without suggesting any other legislation which would deal with these union problems.

Mr. Siemiller. I cannot tell you what is on the mind of the Secretary of Labor and I have not seen the President of the United States for 4 months.

Senator Kennedy of New York. We have our own responsibility, but it would seem also the ones who would know the most about the situation and the effect around the country would be the administration, so I have some reluctance about taking any action myself or voting for any action in view of the position of the administration.

Mr. Siemiller. It would be my observation, because I find Secretary Wirtz extremely honest that he has something up his sleeve or he would not have come here and said what he said.

Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. The provisions of the wage-price guidelines that you referred to in talking to the Senator from New York, these are advanced as general guideposts. They are referring to the noninflationary wage behavior, and I am reading from the economic report of the President, transmitted to the Congress in 1962:

"To reconcile them with objectives of equity and efficiency, specific modifications must be made to adapt them to the circumstances of particular industries. If all of these modifications are made, each in the specific circumstances to which it applies, they are consistent with stability of the general price level."

I imagine it is your position, Mr. Siemiller, that you feel the objectives of equity and efficiency are certainly of sufficient importance in this case to provide some elasticity in the position of wage-price guidelines?

Mr. Siemiller. Yes, sir; very definitely so.

Senator Prouty. If no legislation is recommended by this committee, would the union consider entering into an agreement with the carriers to return to work while negotiations continue? Such an agreement of course, should provide for retroactivity of contract terms and reserve to the union the right to strike at any time it saw fit.

Mr. Siemiller. I don't believe in all sincerity we could get our membership to agree to that.

Senator Prouty. What weight do you feel your membership would give to the recommendations of the negotiations committee? I would think they would give great weight to them.

Mr. Siemiller. They would give some weight to it in some locations more than others. I must tell you that we have a very militant—I am repeating myself—membership involved in this.

As an example, the group in New York, where a large contingent is, were so unhappy with the legislation that had been proposed they wanted to have a march on the Congress. They had hired buses to come down here. I had stopped them. They had circularized the rest of the country and they wanted to have 35,000 strikers come here and tell you what they think.

So far I have persuaded them not to, so this is the feeling of these people. They are very militant and very adamant.

Senator Prouty. If there were no legislation, with the union retaining the right to strike at any time and all benefits becoming effective retroactively, do you still feel your members would refuse to go back to work while negotiations continued?

Mr. Siemiller. I would personally rather tell you yes, we would do that but I do not think I could say that.

Senator Murphy. Mr. Siemiller, you have obviously, from the background of the facts of this particular discussion, a special case. In my experience, there have been special cases in an industry with which I am familiar and there are reasons why this special case in your industry has occurred. Has it been pointed out to the representatives of the administration that this has worked a hardship on your people; that possibly the wage scale is below the norm for the same type of work? Has it been pointed out that in the case of the people affected, the so-called 35,000, that this might not have any great effect on inflation; that you are merely trying to rectify a condition that possibly never should have existed? Has that been pointed out to the representatives of the administration?

Mr. Siemiller. We have attempted to. We did our very best. I am sure that both Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary Reynolds are very, very conversant with our opinions and statement on this. Incidentally, let me say they are both very fine gentlemen and they have both been helpful as Assistant Secretary Reynolds has been all the way. He has more facts and figures at his fingertips in this dispute than I have actually and he has been in it to that extent from both sides and he has both sides' figures on it.

We have attempted to point this out, that there are some inequities involved here that should be settled.

Let me give you just as an example, we have room to bargain as I told the carriers the other day on certain items. You had the references here a moment ago to the Emergency Board recommending a 42-month agreement as an example, a 42-month period.

We acquiesced to the carriers' request for 36 months in the first place. Now the settlement does not provide for the carrier to pick up the cost of the dependents' insurance for its employees which is now contributory.

It does not provide for the carrier to pick up the part that the employee is contributing in the pension plan. They do not want and are not willing to wait 3 more years to get another shot at this, and these are some of the issues that are involved.

There are some other issues about the requirement of an employee to work compulsory overtime, not having the right to refuse overtime. This has been blown out of proportion in my judgment, but it is involved in the issues.

We have a lot of issues to overcome, but in answer to your question, there are a lot of inequities compared with other industries—the aerospace industry, the automobile industry, some of the busline industry, and others.

There is certainly room in our judgment for special consideration to be given.

As I answered a question a moment ago, Senator Murphy, the carriers are pretty fat in profits, the greatest amount of profits of any industry that we know of, that they have now. They have exceeded that which was said to be desirable. The Government is going to tell them to cut their rates if they stay in this same situation. We asked the Government not to do it until we got this wage agreement settled. I wrote them a letter and asked them not to do it.

Well, inflation, what is the difference? If money is in circulation, if it is left in the pockets of the travelers by the airlines or if the employees who render the service have it. It is still in circulation and that is what causes inflation or at least one of the causes is money in circulation to buy hard goods that are not available or getting more scarce.

So this is part of the situation.

Senator Javits. Would the Senator yield for one question?

Is it the contention of the union that its demands are within the guidelines because its demands are intended to receive increases within the guidelines and to right inequities which the guidelines allow to be righted?

Mr. Siemiller. That is a byproduct but that would be our contention. As George Meany so stated, the American labor movement does not buy the concept of wage-price guidelines unless it is put on all segments of our economy, but you have stated it. We do believe sincerely that we would not be out of the ball park if we were successful in negotiating an agreement that our membership would buy.

Senator Javits. I am glad, Mr. Siemiller, that I do not have to—for the purposes of this question—agree with your economic theory about money in the pocket of the travelers versus the inflationary impact of the wage increase, but I do think it is important that we understand that the union itself does not feel that it is asking the Government to materially, as you say in the ball park, violate the guideposts, but what you seek and demand you believe can be covered by the inequities section.

Mr. Siemiller, I am not so sure I am very happy about your denying me the opportunity to meet how many thousands of my constituents.

Mr. Siemiller. They rented 18 buses.

Senator Javits. It is rare Senator Kennedy and I see somebody coming to us.

Mr. Siemiller. I felt the situation would be best served if they stayed home and did some thinking constructively.

The Chairman. If there are no further questions, thank you very much.

Senator Griffin. I would like to say, Mr. Siemiller, that your testimony has been excellent and you make a very persuasive witness and are very candid for which we are appreciative.

It would seem if your statements are to be taken at face value, the administration either has to abandon its guidelines or it has to reinterpret its guidelines in such a way as to make some exception or it has to call for compulsory arbitration because you make the flat statement that there is no settlement within the guidelines as the administration is now interpreting that your membership will ratify. That is a very disturbing and awkward dilemma that the administration is faced with. Is that about the situation?

Mr. Siemiller. Would you let me qualify that statement—as to what I understand the administration's interpretations of the guidelines, but the answer is "Yes" to your question with that qualification.

Senator Griffin. Let me go on and suggest something else. I am sure I don't have to tell you that in the public mind, at least, collective bargaining, its processes and to some extent the good name of labor is in jeopardy. And we would have difficulty where the public is clamoring for no compulsory arbitration but I can tell you there is a great deal of sentiment building up in the country, particularly as it might apply to regulated industry.

What about the possibility of the unions and the carriers agreeing to voluntary arbitration to resolve this situation?

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, under the climate, the atmosphere, and the guidelines, we do not think that any professional arbitrator could render a fair and just decision on this.

Senator Griffin. Why would you say that?

Mr. Siemiller. He would be restricted by the so-called guidelines. He makes a living by doing this. He is not going to get out on a limb to where he would not be used in another case. He is a human being, too.

Senator Griffin. Your arbitration agreement voluntarily entered into need not make any reference to the guideline. You would make your case and be willing to abide by it?

Mr. Siemiller. There is no arbitration when a climate exists with a set of wage-price guidelines that labor is supposed to stay within. Our judgment tells us that no arbitrator that we know of would be free to use his own judgment.

Senator Griffin. I think you weaken your case a good deal when you say there is no arbitrator anyplace who would judge your case fairly.

Mr. Siemiller. I think he is restricted. I don't think he is free to do it. He would do the very best he could, but I don't think he is free to render the judgment that his judgment would tell him should happen in the case. I just cannot see it.

I am just a normal human being, I think, a machinist working in a machine shop and I react like other human beings do and I react to pressures back and forth.

Senator Griffin. All I can do is persuade you, and I think that would be a good way out for everybody if the union and the carriers could do that.

Mr. Siemiller. I wish we could, but I don't see it in the picture.

Senator Murphy. You must understand our position.

Mr. Siemiller. Very definitely.

Senator Murphy. You represent 35,000. I am supposed to come here to represent about 19 million people in the State of California. The pressure is building up, the mail is piling up and they are saying as a public servant somebody must do something.

Now, it is obvious that you have negotiated, you bargained to no avail. If I understand your statement correctly, unless the administration withdraws its insistence on the guidelines, there can be no solution. Is that a fair statement, sir?

Mr. Siemiller. No, I did not say that exactly. I said if the carriers still stick to that position that they are not going to exceed or stay within that, I don't think we can get an agreement.

In answer to your other statement, I certainly recognize your responsibility.

Senator Murphy. We now are faced with a dilemma where people have said "We don't understand this. We don't know the details. We don't know the different characteristics involved, but we do know one thing, that the public peace of mind, the public welfare, the transportations system, is being seriously disrupted and, of course, it is being disrupted by a labor union."

They have fresh in their memory the transit strike in New York where illegally in the face of injunction this strike went forward. This was not popular. This on top of it has to suffer from the former.

The reason I am pressing on this is because it is my hope, and I have the greatest faith and hope and belief in collective bargaining, with full knowledge of the accomplishments, but I would think that the greatest thing possible that could happen at this point would be for the labor leaders and the unions involved to say, "Look, on behalf of the public welfare, we will put our trust in the administration or in the committee of Congress and we will go back to work for a period of 100 days or 90 days or whatever."

Certainly nothing is being accomplished when negotiations have ceased. Certainly, when you get to a deadlock there must be some other method. If this does not happen, there falls upon this committee the obligation to consider first the public welfare; second, the consideration of the union.

I am in complete sympathy. I know the facts very well, but I make this plea because I also have lived for a long time in this great country. I have dealt with people and I think the feeling and the general spirit of the general public now is becoming very difficult and I think they are going to insist on a settlement and they are going to insist on one statement that you made which I wish you would rephrase, where you suggest if you put men back to work and they were not in complete agreement that it might not be completely safe, that they might not do their job properly.

I would hate to think anywhere in the labor movement that this weakness exists, and I am sure it was just an implication and not a statement of fact on your part.

Mr. Siemiller. Senator, there is one part of your statement, labor leaders can agree with anything. If their members do not follow them, then you are just whistling in the dark.

Senator Murphy. Then you are a bad leader.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I always try to quote statements accurately, especially the statement to which I am now referring, which is in the transcript of record, involving officers of the union, statements to the effect that they did not think the strike could end unless there was an agreement acceptable to the membership, short of legislation.

I have just asked to have put into the Record at this point the colloquy between Mr. Siemiller and the Senator who asked him about this, in the transcript of the record.

I want to do that, Mr. President, because I think the union is entitled to have it done. I think that members of the union are entitled to have this statement made in the Record, that any impression being given that the union will defy the law is an unjustifiable reflection upon the members of the union.

Mr. President, I was speaking about this being a regulated industry. If anyone thinks that not acting on this problem in connection with the strike will put them in the position that they will be relieved of any responsibility to act on the same problem in the near future, they could not be more wrong.

I had made this point before, but not in exactly this context. No one in Congress will evade the issue which is being raised by the alternative resolutions in regard to which they will have to choose by seeking to evade assuming their responsibilities in connection with this dispute.

The problem will only grow and get worse, and the public interest will suffer more and more irreparable damage, because there are employee demands in other regulated industries just waiting in the wings. They will come out. They will make their demands, if this union is allowed, by the use of its naked economic power, to force upon the carriers a highly inflationary rate settlement. They are demanding a 7- to 8-percent settlement which would be inflationary, and then all these other cases will involve at least that much, if not more.

Are we going to sit by and try to evade that responsibility by making the kind of argument we have heard in the Senate for the last few days that we do not want to send men back to work because that would violate their right to strike?

Not a word has been mentioned by those who so argue concerning the right of the public to be protected in a regulated industry and to have a strike against the public interest prevented.

I repeat, the rights of this union are not being jeopardized by the resolution. This is not a case in which there is any refusal on the part of the employer to bargain. This is not a case in which an employer is trying to get rid of a union.

This is a strong union. The issue of the security of the union is not involved. When we talk, in a situation such as this, about the right to strike, it is a horse of a different color from a situation in which the existence of a union is involved. I would yield to no one if there were an attempt to deny the right of a union to exist. I would be in here with another type of resolution. I would be in with a request for legislative action that would leave no room for doubt that a resolution invoking an unfair labor practice—if existing law did not protect the union—should be immediately enacted.

Mr. President, in my political career I have fought, and shall continue to fight, for the basic rights of unionism. Mr. President, you and I will not remain free if the time ever comes when restrictions are placed on the right of freemen to become part of a union and have the right to bargain collectively. But that does not mean a union can use whatever economic weapons it chooses in those instances when the use of those economic weapons results in great damage to the public interest. Then the representatives of the people have the duty of looking after the public interest.

That is what the Senator from Oregon was trying to accomplish by this resolution, along with those Senators who are supporting it.

There are rights of a union, but there are the greater rights of the public. The Government not only is vested with the public interest, but the public is entitled to be protected from the inflationary tornado that will be started if the union is allowed to use its naked economic power to exact from the employers in this case a settlement that violates the public interest.

We should also recall that the public has a great financial investment in the industry. Therefore, the public is entitled to a fair consideration for a fair share of the distribution of the profits of this industry.

There is no question of the fact that the last 2 years have been very profitable for the industry, but they were not profitable in all of the last 10 years. During the last 10 years, as I have placed in the Record, and I shall only summarize it tonight, some of these companies have lost money. In some of those years some of the airlines have broken even, but in none of those last 10 years except the last 2 have the companies made profits that came anywhere near what the unions would like the American people to believe has been the case.

I have put an analysis into the RECORD to show that for the five companies concerned, during the last 8 or 10 years the return on the investment has averaged 5.1 percent.

One can make that return on his money by taking almost no chances at all, by investing it in savings banks in some places, or in places where there is no question as to the security of his money.

How in the world do my colleagues in the Senate think this industry can expand unless it can make money? It must expand from the standpoint of rendering to the public the service which it needs. In the next 3 to 5 years, how is it going to reequip large segments of the industry with airplanes that will cost $9 million to $10 million each if it does not make money? In the not too distant future, how is it going to buy the super-super planes that are designed to carry, not 100 passengers, but several hundred for transcontinental trips, when these planes will cost a minimum of $20 million each, unless the industry can make money?

So we have a problem of a balance of interest and a matter of a balance in determining what is a fair share of the profits that shall go to the union, to the companies, and to the public.

A question was raised earlier this afternoon in a colloquy on the floor of the Senate. I recall it was with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He and I had a colloquy about whether or not the Civil Aeronautics Board has an obligation to look at the profit situation and make a determination as to whether or not rates paid by the traveling public should be reduced. I completely agree. I also pointed out that is what the CAB has done and will continue to do. It has done it thus far in providing reduced rates for certain types of service.

It is also true that there will be a consideration, in due course of time, or in connection with other petitions filed with the CAB for general rate reductions. The public is entitled to the general rate reductions if the financial condition of the companies warrant. That is why I say that the profit should be shared by the public, the workers, and the airlines after they get a fair return on their investment. That is what they are entitled to under law in an industry vested with the public interest.

Lastly, I should like to talk on the economic point, and I would not talk about the substantive economic issue if it had not been raised by my colleagues. I put material in the RECORD last night dealing with wages paid in this industry in comparison with other industries and answered the argument made here about a settlement of a wage dispute involving mechanics of a bus company on the west coast, where there was a 6-week bus strike by the mechanics. It was pointed out that the mechanics in that settlement received more than what is proposed for the settlement in this case.

Do not forget that there are many aspects involved. The union asked only for $4.04. That was the union's top figure for the mechanics. They asked for it on a 36-month basis. My board, after it granted retroactivity for 6 months, decided on a 42-month basis, so that the mechanics at the end of that period would be getting $3.98 or $4, depending on certain computations—within 4 to 6 cents of what the union originally demanded.

Is any Member of the Senate unaware of the fact that the demands of the workers in a labor dispute are always and invariably more than they will be willing to settle for? The wage settlement proposed in the emergency board report, then upped somewhat by the carriers after the emergency board's report was rejected, then upped further by the wage agreement that was entered into between the parties last Friday, and subsequently rejected by the union, represents, in each case, including the additional money allowed by the carriers under the collective bargaining agreement of last Friday, a tremendous victory for this union.

Mr. President, I have never experienced a settlement of an individual wage case in which someone could not examine the thousands of collective bargaining agreements existing in this country and not find one or a few collective bargaining agreements for similar work in which the workers were getting more money. But it does not follow that because such an agreement can be found, the workers in a case under consideration should automatically get the top wage that is being offered somewhere else, because what an arbitrator or what a quasi-judicial officer who is asked to make recommendations on wage issues has to take into account are all the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement, not only the wage provision. It is necessary to take into account the whole history of wage progression in any industry. It is necessary to take into account every other section of an agreement that involves certain other benefits.

For example, consider the health, welfare, and pension benefits of this industry, one of the blue ribbon industries, one of the industries in which the workers are getting benefits far in excess of what generally prevails in American industry.

It is an industry in which four of the operators involved in this case, may I say, when it comes to the pension matter, contribute all but 12.5 percent of the cost of carrying the pension. You will not find that in very many contracts when you take into account, Mr. President, the higher pensions. I have put the information in the RECORD, right out of the transcript and the exhibits before the Emergency Board, that there are many companies in this country, smaller companies, which pay all the cost of the pensions, but the pensions are much less than the pensions in this industry. That must be taken into account.

I have said before and repeat tonight, if I were a mediator in this case, and not one who had the obligation of joining in the handing down of recommendations based upon the evidence that the parties submitted, I should regard this matter of health, welfare, and pensions highly negotiable, and subject to compromise and mediation. As I have said before, the reason for that is that 10 years from today, we will look a long time to find an agreement on health, welfare, and pensions in which the employer is not paying the full cost, as part of the wage cost. That is clearly the trend.

But, Mr. President, the union did not justify any such recommendation on the part of this emergency board, on the evidence that it submitted. In fact, it left no room for doubt that its major concern was in regard to other issues, not this issue. For its members know they have a good pension system. They know they are a blue ribbon industry in regard to pensions.

I did not mean to spend this much time on the substantive issues, Mr. President, but I have spent it because there keeps creeping into this debate some question as to whether or not this union should have received more on this item or some other item.

But the people who make those suggestions, Mr. President, do not have the evidence before them that we had before us. Those who stand on the floor of the Senate and make such statements did not have the responsibility of sitting as judicial officers to weigh the evidence. When they make those statements, Mr. President, I say respectfully they simply do not have the information before them that they ought to have before they start raising questions as to whether or not this union has in any way failed to receive full consideration of all of its rights under the procedure that has been applied, through the President of the United States, in connection with this case.

I turn now, Mr. President, to another phase of the problem. I take the Senators back to 1963, when we adopted the same order as I have proposed in my resolution—the mandatory decision by Congress in the famous railway dispute of 1963.

Congress in 1963 voted mandatory legislation. That is what I am requesting now. Congress in 1963 went even further, and ordered, in that legislation, compulsory arbitration. That is where I parted company with the majority. Only two of us, in 1963, refused to vote for compulsory arbitration in connection, not with a strike—for the men were not yet even out on strike—but with a threatened strike.

I think that is a very interesting fact, in view of some of the discussion that has taken place here on the floor of the Senate about the 1963 case. In fact, I get a little lost in the befuddlement that has been involved in the discussion of the 1963 case, because Senators say, "Oh, well, that is not the same situation."

Here was a case in which the President referred to a serious national emergency. That was true, as you will see in a moment as I discuss it. But the President of the United States did not ask for the action that the Senate took in 1963. The

Senate did not take the action that President Kennedy sought. President Kennedy did not ask for the bill that the Senate passed. President Kennedy did not ask for compulsory arbitration. He recommended something quite different.

But in 1963, with fewer men threatening to strike than are out on strike now, the Senate passed mandatory legislation in the form of compulsory arbitration. And I shall always be proud to have my descendants read that I voted against it because of its compulsory arbitration feature.

But I proposed mandatory legislation, and I proposed mandatory legislation at the request of President Kennedy. For, as I said yesterday, he called me down to the White House the morning of the day that the Senate rejected his proposal, and talked to me about it. I had been in frequent conference with him over the railroad case for days before it reached the climactic stage here in the Senate. I had been in consultation with him because he knew of my chairmanship of the Railway Emergency Board of 1941, when there was also a threatened nationwide railroad strike. In that case, after 6 weeks of hearing in Chicago, with a record made by the parties that would almost reach from the floor where I stand to the top of this desk, including the hundreds of exhibits that were introduced, we issued an emergency board report which was rejected.

This was followed by a request of the parties after our recommendations were made—not before.

The interesting thing is that in this case, upon the suggestion of the union, the request was made that the Board agree in advance, before we ever wrote our report, that we should serve as mediators in case the union rejected the recommendations and we were told by counsel for the union that the probabilities were they would reject it. We had not even written the report yet. That is very interesting, to say the least.

In the 1941 case, after the report had been filed, the union rejected it and asked for a rehearing so that it could introduce some additional evidence. I gave them that rehearing, and their evidence in no way justified any modification of our report. The Board unanimously affirmed its previous report. While that hearing was closing, I gave the decision from the bench, and I did not wait to put it in writing because the argument obviously did not justify any modification of our recommendations. Both sides then asked the Board to mediate a settlement between them.

In view of the fact that both sides asked for it and the President of the United States urged us to accept the invitation to serve as mediators, we proceeded to settle the case by mediation.

Mr. President, I assume it was on the basis of that experience that President Kennedy called me in at the very beginning of the controversy on the railroad situation in 1963 to advise with him in regard to the handling of that case.

President Kennedy made a proposal which I discussed on the floor of the Senate at the time. I put that part of the 1963 Record of April 27, 1963, in the Record earlier this afternoon. He made a proposal for the entire matter to be handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission which, under the law, has very definite jurisdiction over a situation such as this if it is submitted to it.

On the morning of the day that Congress voted its compulsory arbitration resolution, President Kennedy said to me in his Office:

> If you and the majority leader, Mike Mansfield, are the only two to vote for it, I want you to introduce it as a substitute. How many votes do you think we will get for it?

I said:

> I do not think more than 10, Mr. President.

I said that because what had happened here under the drive to have the type of legislation that was passed was very interesting. I missed it by, I think, five votes. I think we got 15 votes.

I give this little background in regard to this matter before I proceed with the rest of the discussion of the application of the 1963 case to the case that is pending.

Mr. President, everyone has been very cooperative with me in connection with the procedural matters that confront me in presenting the resolutions by way of a substitute to the floor of the Senate.

The message has just been sent to me that the leadership would like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum for the purpose, may I say for the Record, of giving me the 3 or 4 minutes that I need to scan the resolution that is being sent to me to be offered at the desk.

The leadership wants to be certain that the resolution carries out my intent also. I am sure that I will receive that cooperation, and I shall then, as soon as I scan the resolution, ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

With that understanding, unless the presiding officer indicates either by facial expression or words that he prefers I not do so. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, prior to the call of the quorum, I was discussing the 1963 railway case, including its historical background. In that case no issue was raised as to whether the task of staying the strike was to be handed to President Kennedy. The legislation that was passed did not indicate to President Kennedy, "You can follow this course of action if you decide to follow it." By the legislation in 1963, Congress laid down a mandatory prohibition against a strike occurring, which was only threatened and had not yet occurred. There was no condition of national emergency in existence when we acted in 1963. There was a statement from the President that if the strike occurred, there would be a national emergency. But the men were at work, and therefore, at the time Congress passed the legislation, no national emergency in fact existed. There was not even a cessation of essential transportation to any section of the country, in terms of the Railway Labor Act. It was all "threatened." A national emergency did not exist, as a cessation of essential transportation exists today in various sections of our country.

In 1963, however, Congress directed the rail carriers to withhold changes in the work rules, and it directed the carriers and the workers not to engage in any strike or lockout.

The duration of the resolution was 6 months, or 180 days, except that the no-strike, no-lockout provision was to last for the duration of the arbitration award, which was 2 years.

Mr. President, the 180-day provision of the substitute resolution, or of the Clark resolution, was not just pulled out of the thin air. This 180-day, or 6-month, period is quite common. We had it in the act of 1963.

Today, we know that the interruption in essential transportation is a condition, a condition that the Railway Labor Act was designed to avoid. The interruption is not imminent or threatened; it is here and has been going on for 26 days.

Mr. President, all I seek by this substitute legislation is that Congress mandatorily declare that the interruption must stop and that Congress provide the common procedure—well-recognized in precedent after precedent in the law—for stopping it.

The national emergency which the 1963 act averted was not a condition then, and it is not a condition now. But it is threatened. What is the degree of threat?

On Monday, Secretary Wirtz testified before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the lengthening strike is bringing us closer to a national emergency.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] asked Secretary Wirtz:

> It is also my understanding that you have said that you would not contradict a finding by this committee that there is a developing threat to the national health and safety?
>
> Secretary Wirtz: That is correct. The answer to which you are referring is mine to Senator Javits in which I pointed out that over a period of time that may become prolonged, those factors could well materialize.

Mr. President, the object of the pending version of the resolution is to authorize the President to issue a back-to-work order, presumably whenever he thinks—not Congress, but when the President thinks—the national emergency has arrived and has become a condition rather than a threat.

That is not what we did as recently as 1963. We acted in anticipation of an emergency. Congress acted; the President was given no discretionary power in that legislation. He did not even get the legislation he wanted. He got compulsory arbitration.

It is true—but it has no bearing upon the legal nature and effect of the legislation passed by the Congress—that the President sent up a message in which he set out the statistical information as quoted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] today and that because of the facts that he set out in his message to the Congress if a strike did occur, it would result in a national emergency.

But a national emergency did not exist when President Kennedy sent up the message. The Congress took its action on the basis of a threatened national emergency. I wish to say on this point, Mr. President, that I disagreed with the administration in its finding that no national emergency exists, but I am well aware of the fact that under the so-called national emergency doctrine of health and safety that is set out in the Taft-Hartley law, that that particular law leaves it up to the President to determine a national emergency.

Therefore, I think, the courts would be prone, but not necessarily bound, to rule that in the absence of a showing of a national emergency by the administration the President would be without any discretionary power under the committee's resolution to send the employees back to work, because under the committee's resolution the Congress is not exercising its constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce.

It is not regulating interstate commerce to authorize a President to exercise discretion as to whether or not he wants to attempt to order men back to work.

The Constitution does not give the President any authority over interstate commerce. The Constitution does not give the President the authority to regulate commerce. It gives that authority to the Congress.

This legal distinction, in my legal judgment, is being lost sight of in discussion of the legal problems connected with the legislation, and I say that most respectfully in view of the comments that have been made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by lawyers in the Senate who do not agree with me on my statement of the law, and do not agree with the Attorney General, whose legal conclusions are exactly the same as mine.

I made these statements in the committee the other afternoon before they voted to send this resolution to the floor of the Senate. The next day the Attorney General was called in and, as he said, at the time he came to advise us in conference, that he did not know of the position I had taken the day before in committee on the legal aspects of this matter, and he gave to those of us in conference with him the same legal holdings and conclusions that I had previously stated in committee.

I believe that the Attorney General is right. I think it should be made very clear in the Record tonight that if we pass the Clark resolution the Congress is not in any way, as a matter of law, regulating commerce; the Congress is simply seeking to delegate to the President the authority to regulate commerce, if in his discretion he decides to regulate commerce. He does not have a scintilla of right to do it and we cannot give him a right which he does not possess under the Constitution. The Congress cannot delegate a constitutional right to the President that he does not have under the Constitution. That is why I said in committee, I said yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and I say tonight that the Clark resolution, in my judgment, if it is passed, will buy not only one lawsuit, but a series of lawsuits for the President and his administration.

In my judgment, the Clark resolution will be thrown out in any legal test.

There is no question about what the courts will hold if there is passed the substitute resolution that those of us urging it to pass have pending at the desk at the present time. Under our resolution Congress is regulating commerce by a mandatory order in the form of the resolution that interruption of essential transportation to any section of the country caused by this strike must stop now. It sets forth the legal procedure for the enforcement of that mandate and, when the President signs it, it becomes the law. When the President signs it there is no question at all as to what a court will hold, and certainly no question as to what the Supreme Court will hold on the basis of its existing precedents—that it falls within the clear constitutional and legislative prerogatives of the Congress.

If there is eliminated every other phase of this debate, I see no sense in the Congress passing a resolution such as the Clark resolution that is subject to as much legal doubt as surrounds that resolution.

But there is no doubt as to the legality and constitutionality of the resolution we have offered as a substitute for the Clark resolution.

The public is entitled to have Congress pass legislation about which there can be no legal complaint.

In 1963, the "stay at work" order contained in the legislation that was passed by the Congress came from the Congress. I find nothing in the proceedings of that debate which suggests that anything else was contemplated. I have read and reread that entire debate in the last few days. I had printed a large segment of it in the Congessional Record today.

When the arbitrator's award came under court test, the District Court for the District of Columbia reviewed the situation in the following words:

> A strike was imminent. The country was confronted with a serious emergency. A nation-wide railroad strike would have been a calamity. Congress alone could avert the catastrophe. The national legislature was not found wanting. It expeditiously fashioned and invoked a drastic measure. . . . It promptly passed a Joint Resolution, which was approved by the President on August 28, 1963, Public Law 88–108, 77 Stat. 132.
>
> This enactment expressly prohibited any strike.

In considering the commerce power as vested in Congress, the district court went back to the common law, and then to the early cases under the U.S. Constitution in which the power and authority of Congress to regulate commerce was tested.

I quote from the court's decision:

> The power of the government to regulate persons engaged in a public calling or in a calling coupled with a public interest has its roots in the common law. If a business of this type enters interstate commerce, the legislative power is lodged in Congress as a result of authority conferred on it to regulate commerce between the States.

Later the court continued:

> Originally, such regulation was directed principally to rates and charges exacted from the public and to services rendered to patrons and consumers. It has been expanded to include such matters as safety requirements, hours of labor and similar subjects. The Supreme Court has gone as far as to sustain a statute regulating minimum wages paid to employees in any business affecting interstate commerce, irrespective of whether it is in the category of a public calling.

In other words, I recognize that even in industries not vested with public interest—that is, in nonregulated industries—Congress has the power, where the business affects interstate commerce, to pass statutes regulating minimum wages paid to employees. In fact, it has the power to pass legislation dealing with anything relevant to the necessary implementation of the authority of Congress, under the Constitution, to regulate interstate commerce.

Mr. President, that just happens to be the law. No speech, no series of speeches on the floor of the Senate can change it. That is why, I repeat, I have offered a substitute which protects the public interest in many ways, but one of the ways it protects the public interest is that it permits of no doubt as to its legality. If we start with the major premise laid down by Secretary Wirtz twice in his testimony before the committee, that the strike is causing an interruption of essential transportation—and those are words of art in the Railway Act, too, Mr. President—an interruption of essential transportation in various sections of the country, Congress has the power, and—I respectfully submit—the duty, to pass legislation which will not be successfully questioned as to its legality but will make it possible for the law enforcement officers of this country, under a court order, to bring the strike to an immediate end. The public interest is entitled to that. It has already been too long delayed. The public has already been subjected to unfair losses as a result of what, I say most respectfully, has been a delay too long on the part of Congress to take action.

The Court then went on to cite the 1916 railroad strike and the action Congress took then to arbitrate the case itself:

> The decision in Wilson v. New related to a situation very similar to that presented in the instant case. . . . . The constitutionality of this statute was challenged in the same manner as is being done in the case at bar. The Supreme Court upheld the validity of the Act as within the regulatory power of Congress.

I discussed Wilson against New the other night on the floor of the Senate. I pointed out that in that case, Congress not only agreed to send men back to work but also fixed their wages and hours of employment, and other working regulations, for a period of 90 days.

What was said about that case, in an attempt to rebut my position in debate on the floor of the Senate? It was said that it was decided 40 years ago, as though that in some way weakened the case as a precedent. On the contrary, it makes it a much stronger case because for 40 years it has stood and has been cited over and over again as one of the leading cases setting forth the definitive language as to what the Constitution means by the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

My reply to those who would like to push Wilson against New aside as though it had never been decided is that the passage of 40 years makes it a much stronger case so far as a great precedential landmark in American constitutional law, and in the law as it deals with the prerogatives of Congress, is concerned.

So I point out to the Senators that the pending issue is not one we have to go back to 1916 to find precedents for. We need go back only 3 years, to the railroad work rules case, and the legislation which passed this body with only two "no" votes. That legislation was adopted in anticipation not only of a national emergency but in anticipation of an interruption in essential transportation service. The statute forbade a strike or lockout by order of Congress, in which the regulatory power over commerce is vested by the Constitution.

There was no delegation of that authority to the President, to be used if, as, and when the President decided the national emergency was in existence.

Although I believe Congress and the President made a mistake in 1963 by prescribing and accepting compulsory arbitration the President did not ask for it, but when he signed the bill, he got it. Therefore, his signature must be considered as an after-the-fact approval—that is, after the fact in respect to what he recommended to the Senate. He did not recommend compulsory arbitration. As the means of disposing of the issues, they did not try to pass the responsibility back and forth over who should forbid the strike to take place.

The Congress imposed a means of settlement which the President did not seek. But he signed the law, and it provided for compulsory arbitration of the issues in a dispute where no strike had taken place, but where emergency conditions threatened.

If Senators do not believe that there is any threat sufficient to call for governmental action, then they should vote against legislation for that purpose. If they think the threat is sufficient, and the interruption of essential transportation to many sections of the country which everyone acknowledges exists, call for remedy, then they should vote a remedy.

The should not attempt to pass that remedy to the President of the United States who, under the Constitution, does not have any authority to regulate interstate commerce.

They will not vote any remedy under the Clark resolution, for they do not know whether the President will in fact issue any back-to-work order under it.

Suppose he does not, and the strike continues. Will that satisfy Senators? It surely will not satisfy the mandate of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which vests in Congress the regulatory power over interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I think we can also take judicial notice, not only of the legality of the substitute resolution, but of what will be the reaction of millions of Americans if the Congress of the United States seeks to pass its responsibility to the President of the United States and nothing comes of it because the President does not sign that type of measure.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I am not in a position to speak for the President, but I said then, and I repeat now, there is not the slightest justification for doubt that if a substitute resolution is passed calling for a congressional mandatory end of the strike, the President will sign it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the expectation that I shall ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall conclude shortly.

The Washington Post in an editorial today comments on the legislation before the Senate to end the airline dispute. It is stated that Senator MORSE now wants Congress to take upon itself full responsibility for ending the strike. This is not my position. I have made it clear in prior statements on the floor that the resolution I introduced on July 25 and subsequent amendments to that resolution, including the substitute amendment offered yesterday, provide for the Congress making a finding which, upon enactment of the legislation, will return the employees to work.

The Congress is proposing this legislation under the interstate commerce clause, and the President must sign the legislation before it becomes law. Congress is exercising its proper responsibility, and the President is exercising his responsibility under the Constitution in signing this legislation.

The editorial goes on to state that my original bill, Senate Joint Resolution 180, providing for a return to work and seizure of the struck airlines by the Government required a finding of emergency conditions by the President. The procedure under that resolution included a finding of Congress that a national emergency existed requiring a threat to the health and safety of the Nation under the language of title II of the National Labor Relations Act. The President, if he concurred, would initiate a suit in the Federal District Court to enjoin the strike and create a receivership of the struck airlines.

This procedure is entirely different from the procedure of subsequent resolution now being considered by the Senate. The resolutions I have introduced that are presently being considered are based upon the interstate commerce clause which empower the Congress to pass return-to-work legislation. Yesterday, I read on the floor of the Senate the legal and constitutional basis for this resolution. It would not be advisable at this time to require a finding of emergency conditions by the President. Secretary Wirtz has stated such an emergency does not exist. Although I personally believe such an emergency does exist, the administration does not. However, my resolution does not provide for such a finding but a finding of interruption of interstate commerce so as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services.

The writer of the editorial in the Washington Post did not see an important distinction between the resolution I have been pressing since Monday and the resolution I introduced in the first instance.

It would not be legally possible or politically proper to adopt the suggestions contained in the Washington Post editorial to require the executive and judiciary to find a national emergency in this return-to-work legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Washington Post on which I have just commented be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 3, 1966]

GET DOWN TO THE MERITS

Politics rather than the national interest appears to be the dominant factor in the debate over emergency strike legislation. The Administration has refused to ask Congress for any legislation at all, and Secretary Wirtz has let Congress know that if it should act on its own the President would prefer the Morse resolution which would keep the responsibility entirely on Capitol Hill. Some members of Congress, on the other hand, are deliberately trying to pass the buck to the White House. It is not an edifying spectacle.

In an emergency of this kind the two branches should be pulling together instead of scrambling to avoid an exposed position. The same can be said for the two major political parties. The issue is in no sense a partisan one. Leaders and legislators of both parties should be working together to find the most effective formula for ending the airline strike with a minimum impact on the national economy and on the principle of collective bargaining.

We do not share the feeling of some critics that Senator CLARK's resolution is an abdication of congressional responsibility. It would authorize the President to order an end of the strike for 180 days (or shorter periods) during which mediation would continue. But Congress itself would make a finding that the 26-day-old strike "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce." This mild legislative declaration could well be strengthened; yet the very fact that Congress acted at all would be indicative of a belief that the emergency should be met without further delay.

It is interesting to note that Senator MORSE, who now wants Congress to take upon itself full responsibility for ending the strike, provided in his original bill for a finding of emergency conditions by the President. He would also have brought the courts into the picture to enjoin the strike if they sustained the President's findings. That original Morse resolution is now outmoded in its language and general approach, but it does suggest a sound policy of involving the executive and the judiciary and the legislature, when a delicate task of this kind has to be done in the national interest.

The chief defect of the Clark resolution, as we see it, is its failure to offer any solution if the 180-day period should expire without a settlement. Senator Lausche would bring in compulsory arbitration at that point. But the bad taste of the compulsory arbitration ordered by Congress in the railway strike in 1963 still lingers. It would be more reasonable, we think, to let the President extend the no-strike period, if necessary. He could also be authorized, in the event of an extension, to name a new fact-finding board and to put its recommendations into effect temporarily until an agreement could be reached.

It is important that the action of Congress in this case be carefully worked out despite the need for haste. The formula that emerges from the present debate may well become a precedent for ending other emergencies resulting from the tie-up of essential industries. What a pity that the fear of political repercussions has diverted the Administration as well as many Congressmen from addressing themselves to this vital issue solely on its merits.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President I can well understand how the writer of the editorial would very likely come to the conclusion I have read in view of the myriad resolutions and proposals that have been discussed in this body in the past few days. Also I can well understand it because the legal distinction is a fine one, but exceedingly important. However, it is a distinction that is as different as black midnight and the high sun of noon.

Having said that, I think the Washington Post editorial staff is deserving of high commendation for what I consider to be a high order of fulfilling the educational function that a newspaper ought to fulfill in the editorials it has been writing on this subject matter.

Mr. President, the last point I want to raise deals with my view as to what I think the position of the administration should be. The President has made very clear that he has not asked for, and is not asking for, legislation. The Attorney General of the United States, in his conferences with us, has made very clear that he sat with us to give us legal advice at our request, but that he did not sit with us to present the administration's point of view in regard to any issue that is involved, or to make any request for action or no action on the part of Congress.

That leads me to emphasize this point, which seems to have been omitted from the comments of a good many Senators: Although the President has not asked for legislation, neither has he asked that Congress not pass legislation. I wish to repeat that, for it seems to me that in some of the statements made by some of my fellow Senators, they wish to give the impression that the President has committed himself as in favor of no legislation.

He has neither committed himself for legislation nor against legislation. He has neither asked Congress to pass legislation, nor has he asked Congress not to pass legislation. The position of the administration has been, "That is up to Congress." The position of the administration has been that when it comes to the regulation of interstate commerce, that is the business of Congress and not of the President. That is a mighty important distinction for the administration to draw, and I highly praise it for it.

But, Mr. President, the situation has developed, in the course of this debate, where a group of Senators have pressed upon the majority leader and the majority whip, upon myself, and upon other Senators the rather insistent demand that, although the President has not asked for legislation nor has he asked that Congress not pass legislation, those Senators feel that we have reached the point in this debate where the President at least should give some indication to the majority leader, for transmittal to the Senate, as to what his position would be if Congress, in its wisdom, should pass the substitute legislation that is being offered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain editorials with reference to the airlines dispute, which give some concept of the state of opinion upon this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1966]

AIR STRIKE TURNDOWN

The overwhelming rejection by striking airlines mechanics of the excessively generous settlement they obtained through President Johnson's personal intervention is conclusive evidence of the folly of a national labor policy built on ever higher rewards for union irresponsibility. The shabby scenario that unfolded at the White House last Friday was bound to convince the union rank and file that the more recklessly they exercised their stranglehold over a vital transportation industry, the more certainly appeasement would be followed by more appeasement until they got everything they wanted.

The Administration had given its blessing to an agreement that exceeded by at least 25 per cent the fair and socially responsible increases recommended by a Presidential emergency board. The original proposals were themselves in excess of the nationwide standard of 3.2 per cent fixed by the Council of Economic Advisers as a safeguard against wage-price inflation. The President initially committed his full prestige to support of the panel report. But when the union turned thumbs down and Congress prepared legislation to get the planes back in the air, Mr. Johnson made it plain to the airlines—all of which need Federal approval for rates, routes and airmail subsidies—that he wanted them to give more. The resulting compact, with its gains of 4.3 to 4.5 per cent a year, was promptly hailed by the President as non-inflationary because it would not mean higher airline fares. Yet everyone at the White House knew that the carriers' high profits and productivity had always made it certain that they could absorb an above-ceiling pay increase without raising fares.

Under the guidepost philosophy, industries in this position are supposed to consider sharing the fruits of the efficiency with the consumer through lower prices instead of giving them all to their stockholders in higher profits or to their workers in pay increases that will intensify union presssure on companies with smaller profit margins and thus touch off a new inflationary spiral. No suggestion for cutting plane fares was made at the White House.

The leadership of the International Association of Machinists has for many years been among the most respected in labor for its stand on union ethics, automation and other social issues. But it has rarely shown much strength in facing its own membership. Indeed, much of its insistence on upsetting the emergency board report stemmed from fear that James R. Hoffa's Teamsters Union would muscle in on its rank and file in the airlines.

This endeavor to prove that the machinists could out-Hoffa Hoffa has now resulted in a repudiation of the union high command that also represents a repudiation of the Johnson Administration and its policy of seeking to appease labor by interminable recourse to expediency, double standards and double talk.

The White House, having helped to undercut its own standards of economic sanity, must now turn to Congress with firm proposals for ending the airlines strike and providing dependable protection against future shutdowns in vital industries.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1966]

STRUGGLE BEHIND THE STRIKE

As Congress wrestles with the airline strike, a fourth dimension has come into clearer focus. Senator Morse, author of the most hopeful congressional maneuver to end the walkout, told his colleagues that "there is practically no hope of a settlement unless that settlement goes far beyond inflationary bounds." Secretary Wirtz had previously indicated that the underlying collision is between the union's demand for higher pay and the Administration's stabilization policy.

Here are the Secretary's precise words to the Senate Labor Committee:

"President Johnson has insisted publicly, and the Government mediators have urged publicly and privately, that this case be settled within the framework of the recommendation of the Presidential Emergency Board."

The five struck airlines agreed not only to the emergency board's $76 million proposal; they also offered to go above the Administration's "guidelines" with an $81 million settlement. The union clings to its inflationary demand for a 53-cents-an-hour increase and other benefits, and P. L. Seimiller of the striking machinists repeatedly told the Labor Committee that his union would not accept any settlement within the Administration's stabilization guidelines.

The walkout assumes the posture, therefore, of a revolt against a White House policy. In effect the country is suffering an acute dislocation of its air transportation (Mr. Wirtz estimated that 150,000 passengers a day are grounded) because the union is continuing a struggle that the Government will not permit it to win.

This situation gives a strange twist to Secretary Wirtz's plea that the freedom of the union to strike be left unimpaired. The freedom to strike readily becomes an empty shell if the chance of winning the strike has in fact been denied. And the hardships that have been imposed on the public become especially indefensible if they are the result of an exercise in futility.

Contrary to Mr. Wirtz's view, this would seem to be a point at which Congress ought to be intervening. It can properly halt the strike and put another presidential emergency board to work trying to devise a non-inflationary settlement that will satisfy the parties. If no such formula is to be found, it is far better to keep essential public services operating, with wages and working conditions that a presidential board deems to be fair, than to allow the present disruptions to continue or to force a settlement on the union by "woodshed" methods. It appears from the action of the Senate Labor Committee yesterday that Congress is determined to act on the problem.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have stated, we have reached that point in the consideration of this legislation where there are Senators who feel that the President should give some indication to the majority leader, for transmittal to the Senate, as to what his position would be if Congress should pass the substitute legislation.

Mr. President, no one wishes to protect the prerogatives of the President more than I do; and if I have not, in connection with this case as well as other matters—but let us limit ourselves for the time being to this case—performed the function of doing everything I could to protect the prerogatives of the President, I do not know what could be done that I have failed to do. Everyone here knows that I have completely agreed that the administration should not be asked to assume a responsibility that, under the law, is the responsibility of Congress, in respect to interstate commerce. I have worked long and hard against suggestions that sought to pass that responsibility to the President of the United States.

I can well remember when the President was majority leader of the Senate, and parliamentary situations such as that in which we now find ourselves were faced by him, as majority leader, in quite a number of similar situations. In those cases it would have been most helpful to him, as majority leader, and to his supporters in the Senate, if at least the amount of information that it has been suggested be obtained from the President in this case had been obtained, so that the majority leader could so advise the Senate. On quite a number of occasions, Mr. President, such information was obtained by the then majority leader from the President.

I happen to believe, Mr. President, that the public understands pretty well the procedural and parliamentary differences that have developed in the course of this debate on the basic issue as to whether or not Congress should act, with full responsibility, to pass legislation containing a mandatory provision ending this strike, or should pass legislation such as the committee resolution, that would seek to pass that responsibility to the President.

We should not forget that when the President signs a resolution, if such a resolution is presented to him, in the nature of the substitute that I am offering, he joins with us as a partner in approving legislation to order men back to work. Together, Congress and the President will then have ordered the men back to work, and should. And I happen to believe that if we pass such legislation, that is exactly what will happen, unless, by some bargaining miracle, this matter is settled before that 11th hour.

Therefore, I want the Record to show, as I advised a representative of the White House today, that it would be very helpful if we could have a statement from the White House that would leave no doubt about the fact that, if the substitute legislation is passed, the American people can have assurance that it will be signed. I do not think that that in any way infringes upon or violates any of the rights, privileges, or prerogatives of the President of the United States. If I thought it did, Mr. President, I would not suggest it, and I would not join with those who are recommending it.

I think the position I have taken over the years in complete defense of the separation of powers doctrine should leave no room for doubt in the minds of anyone that I would not be joining in any recommendation that I think in any way violates the separation of powers doctrine. And this suggestion does not.

This suggestion is very similar to, and in fact it is identical with, similar suggestions that have been made to other Presidents when the present President was majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

It would be very helpful, in my judgment, to the leadership of the Senate if we could have this information made available to us tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now introduce, for printing in the Record only, an additional joint resolution which, in all probability, will be used as the basis for a modification of the substitute amendment that is now the pending business of the Senate, and which I have been discussing for the past hour or more.

There being no objection, the text of the proposed joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 186

Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress does hereby find and declare that a labor dispute between Eastern Airlines, Incorporated, National Airlines, Incorporated, Northwest Airlines, Incorporated, Trans World Airlines, Incorporated, and United Air Lines Incorporated, and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, a labor organization, threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive every section of the country of essential transportation services; that such essential transportation services must be maintained; that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute, including a report and recommendation of the Emergency Board No. 166, a proffer of arbitration and mediation with the parties by the National Mediation Board; further, that the efforts of the National Mediation Board and the Secretary of Labor to settle this dispute have been unsuccessful; and that it is desirable to achieve a settlement of this dispute in a manner which serves the public interest and economic stabilization and which preserves the free collective bargaining method.

(b) The Congress therefore finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

Sec. 2. For a period of 30 days effective from the date of enactment of this joint resolution the provisions of Section 10, paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply and no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose. During such period of time none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

Sec. 3. (a) Within the period of time specified in section 2, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in Section 1 of this Joint Resolution, to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board which shall thereafter engage in mediatory action directed to promoting agreement among the parties. The provisions of section 2 shall continue to apply during a period of 60 days following the appointment of the Board. At the expiration of said 60-day period, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in Section 1 of this Joint Resolution, and if the Special Airline Dispute Board provided for in this Section finds that the provisions of said Section 1 continue to exist and recommends to the President that the 60-day period be extended, to extend the provisions of Section 10, Paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act for an additional 90 days upon issuance by the President of an Executive Order so providing. During the period or periods of time referred to in this section, none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

(b) Any agreement among the parties shall provide that the wage settlement provisions be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such service and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this Joint Resolution.

Sec. 4. If an agreement has not been reached thirty days prior to the expiration of the final period of time provided in section 3, the Board shall make a final report with recommendations to the President which shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President, along with a full and complete report of the dispute and his recommendations regarding terms or procedures which will assist in the final settlement of this dispute in the public interest and without further interruption of the continuity of transportation services by these carriers.

Sec. 5. (a) Upon suit by any of the parties to the aforesaid dispute or by the Attorney General the several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain any violations of sections 2 and 3 of this joint resolution. Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under this section may be pending, that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not; and subpenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(b) In granting an injunction or relief under this section, the jurisdiction of such court sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

Sec. 6. If, prior to the settlement of the dispute referred to in section 1, a dispute between any other air carrier and its employees shall in the judgment of the President, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service after all procedures of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in a settlement of such dispute, the President is authorized to issue an Executive Order reciting such findings; whereupon the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 shall become applicable to such dispute and to the parties thereto as though originally included in such provisions: *Provided*, That any such agreement referred to in section 3 shall provide that the wage settlement provisions shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the prior collective bargaining agreement.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Joint Resolution shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this Joint Resolution be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by January 15, 1967, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this Joint Resolution shall not be affected thereby.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the prayer at the beginning of the session of the Senate tomorrow, the senior Senator from Oregon be recognized by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, August 4, 1966, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 3, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

A. John Cope, Jr., of Washington.
Grant G. Hilliker, of Virginia.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph W. Stephan, Jr., of Ohio.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Fernando E. Rondon, of California.

For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 7 to class 6:

John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Edward P. Allen, of Massachusetts.
Samuel B. Bartlett, of Massachusetts.
Don E. Bean, of Virginia.
Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas.
Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois.
Marion V. Creekmore, Jr., of Tennessee.
Hilary J. Cunningham, of Michigan.
Edmund T. Dejarnette, Jr., of Virginia.
Frank Ralph Golino, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Gussman, of New York.
Richard J. Harrington, of California.
Edwin Ho, of California.
Leon M. Johnson, Jr., of Colorado.
D. Lowell Jones, of Mississippi.
Norman C. LaBrie, of Massachusetts.
Denis Lamb, of New York.
James W. Lamont, of Maryland.
John R. Lampe, of Minnesota.
George H. Lane, of Illinois.
Mark Lore, of New Jersey.
Michael J. Mercurio, of Ohio.
Geoffrey Ogden, of California.
Donald K. Parsons, of California.
Harry W. Quillian, of Virginia.
Alan D. Romberg, of New York.
Charles B. Salmon, Jr., of New York.
Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.
Peter O. Suchman, of New York.
Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.
David S. Wilson, of California.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 8 to class 7 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

Edward James Alexander, of Colorado.
David E. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
G. Gardiner Brown, of Ohio.
Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.
Gordon J. DuGan, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Walter J. Kearns, of Montana.
Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey.
John H. Kelly, of Virginia.
Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.
Thomas E. Macklin, Jr., of California.
Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York.
Miss Eleanor Wallace Savage, of California.
Miss Elizabeth R. Thurston, of Indiana.
James E. Thyden, of California.
Miss Judy Anne Uhle, of Illinois.
William D. Wade, of Massachusetts.
Anthony H. Wallace, of New York.
Miss Carol A. Westenhoefer, of Michigan.
Paul R. Wisgerhof, of Colorado.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

John H. Adams, of California.
John W. Bligh, Jr., of New York.
Norman R. Buchsbaum, of New York.
Timothy J. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Michael B. Cook, of New York.
Bruce Cossaboom, of New Jersey.
James F. Creagan, of Ohio.
Carl C. Cundiff, of Oklahoma.
John H. Curry, of Michigan.
Lawrence A. Dash, of Pennsylvania.
Edward S. Dubel, of New Jersey.
Bernard Engel, of Ohio.
Albert E. Fairchild, of North Carolina.
Daniel Figgins, of Iowa.
Robert M. Fresco, of New York.
Richard J. Higgins, of Missouri.
Dell J. Hood, of Texas.
Duane L. King, of Washington.
James O. Knowles, Jr., of Washington.
Miss Barbara M. Kugel, of Michigan.
Lawrence B. Lesser, of New York.
Philip Thomas Lincoln, Jr., of Michigan.
James B. Magnor, Jr., of New York.
James P. Nach, of New York.
Gene R. Preston, of California.
Jerry Lincoln Prillaman, of Virginia.
Denis R. Regan, of New York.
James L. Robb, of Colorado.
Erik S. Ronhovde, of Montana.
C. Michael Schneider, of Ohio.
James T. Schollaert, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Spencer, Jr., of Tennessee.
Thomas E. E. Spooner, of New York.
Willis J. Sutter, of New Jersey.
Miss Caroline Marr Turtle, of Arizona.
Phillip J. Walls, of Michigan.
Stephen H. Whilder, of Virginia.
Howard S. Witmer II, of Michigan.
Kenneth Yalowitz, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Miss Juliet C. Antunes, of New York.
William S. Butcher, of Ohio.
Robert K. Carr, of California.
Robert J. Carroll, of Connecticut.
Thomas H. Carter, of Florida.
Herbert A. Cochran, of North Carolina.
Preston M. Corn, of Illinois.
James P. Dodd, of Kentucky.
David J. Dunford, of California.
Miss Katherine M. Durkin, of New York.
Robert C. Felder, of New York.
Thomas Austin Forbord, of California.
William L. Gallagher, of California.
Miss Patricia J. Howell, of Indiana.
Robert D. Johnson, of Missouri.
Philip A. King, of Florida.
Miss Isabel D. Lamy, of Missouri.
Edward Gibson Lanpher, of Virginia.
Alexander O. Lehner, of New Jersey.
James N. May, of North Carolina.
Norman D. McLennan, of Michigan.
Jonathan C. Menes, of California.
Ralph R. Mooney, of Virginia.
Robert J. Palmeri, of Massachusetts.
Raymond J. Pardon, of New York.
David D. Passage, of Colorado.
Robert Stephen Pastorino, of California.
Gerald D. Ramsey, of the District of Columbia.
Arnold L. Raphel, of New York.
James J. Reid, of Texas.
Lange Schermerhorn, of New Jersey.
Edric Sherman, of California.
Thomas H. Shugart, Jr., of North Carolina.
Steven E. Steiner, of Pennsylvania.
Byron R. Stephenson, of Kansas.
Miss Carol K. Stocker, of Illinois.
Terrence P. Tiffany, of Oregon.
Kenneth H. Torp, of New York.
Miss Ruth L. Willow, of Michigan.
Ralph Winstanley II, of Indiana.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consular officer of the United States of America:

Thomas A. Twetten, of Iowa.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

James D. Baldwin, of New Jersey.
Edmund F. Becker, of Virginia.
Edward B. Beidleman, of Virginia.
Paul H. Brent, of California.
Mrs. Ruth L. Brooks, of Michigan.

Eugen F. Burgstaller, of Maryland.
Stewart D. Burton, of Utah.
Will J. Carter, of Texas.
R. Dabney Chapman, of Maryland.
Gordon A. Martin, of Maryland.
Robert N. Chipperfield, of Illinois.
John D. Clayton, of Virginia.
Walter R. Cox, of Texas.
Robert E. Day, Jr., of Virginia.
Eddie Deerfield, of Illinois.
Cloyce I. Dixon, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard L. Doerschuk, of Maryland.
William W. Douglass, of Kentucky.
James H. Feldman, of Ohio.
Alan Fisher, of the District of Columbia.
James M. Flint, of Maryland.
C. M. Fry, of Missouri.
Allen Fuehrer, of Virginia.
Burton L. Gerber, of Missouri.
Robert S. Hewett, of Virginia.
Neil Hinckley, of Utah.
Paul W. Hodges, of Virginia.
John T. Kirby, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph Yoshio Kiyonaga, of Maryland.
John F. Kordek, of Illinois.
Arthur R. Lee, of Idaho.
George H. McLain, of Virginia.
Samuel Duncan Miller, of the District of Columbia.
John S. Morgan, of Florida.
Peter Cary Muncie, of Maryland.
Edmund R. Murphy, of California.
Miss Kathleen O'Malley, of the District of Columbia.
Herschel F. Peak, of California.
John P. Presby, of Texas.
Metro Romankiw, of Virginia.
Richard E. Scutt, of Pennsylvania.
George Sekel, Jr., of Ohio.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.
Jerome J. Stenger, Jr., of Maryland.
John McH. Stuart, of New York.
John M. Taylor, of Virginia.
Robert Allen Thomas, of Pennsylvania.
Joel D. Ticknor, of California.
Eugene W. Trone, of Pennsylvania.
Donald C. Weaver, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Wheeler, of Pennsylvania.
Robert E. Winter, of Ohio.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Donald J. Bouchard, of Maine.
Richard A. Calfee, of Michigan.
Allen Cooper, of Florida.
Henry P. Daymont, of California.
Lloyd M. Duffe, of Iowa.
Charles E. Gates, of California.
Miss Mildred J. Hall, of West Virginia.
George M. Hiraga, of California.
Miss Catherine M. Hurley, of Connecticut.
Miss Lucy H. Little, of Florida.
Robert A. MacCallum, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph P. Malone, of Massachusetts.
Joseph L. Martinez, of Pennsylvania.
F. Coleman Parrott, of Alabama.
George J. Peterson, of California.
Chester F. Polley, Jr. of Illinois.
Charles T. Pooley, of New York.
David A. Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Rodman, of North Carolina.
Danny B. Root, of California.
Miss Mary J. Singhouse, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Dorothy M. Weaver, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Frances Lee Weinman, of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.—Hebrews 13: 6.

Eternal God, our Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we are children of Thine—creatures of Thy hands, sustained by Thy spirit, redeemed by Thy love and guided by Thy wisdom. Steady us, we pray Thee, and give us strength to do what we ought to do. Save us from accepting too easy answers to the problems that confront us. Save us from yielding to the temptation to accept the second best when the best can be ours. By the power of an inner spiritual triumph may we conquer all pettiness, all narrowness, and all unworthy desires. May we put first that which is first, second that which is second, and last that which is last. May Thy spirit rule our hearts, and together may we serve our Nation to the limit of our faith and our ability, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13298. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3080. An act to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 170, 74th Congress, appointed Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Scott, Mr. Fong, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Simpson (alternate) to be delegates on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Teheran, Iran, September 27 to October 4, 1966.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, with House amendments thereto, and insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Hays, Jones of Missouri, and Corbett.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings, with a House amendment thereto, and insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Hays, Jones of Missouri, and Corbett.

AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO ACCEPT TITLE TO THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY LIBRARY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 1207) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman from Texas would assist the Members of the House if he would explain the precedents that are involved, and the purpose of this proposed legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased to answer the query of our distinguished minority leader and say that this is in accordance with the General Services Administration responsibilities to administer Presidential libraries as a part of the National Archives.

Mr. Speaker, this would implement the immediate acceptance of the very kind and generous offer by the late President's estate of his papers, documents, and other materials of his office, which will be placed in the library. The library will be built by the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., and then given to the U.S. Government for operation under the Archives system, as a place of research for the people of the United States. This follows the pattern set in the other Presidential libraries—the Hoover Library, the Truman Library, the Roosevelt Library, the Eisenhower Library, and the Johnson Library.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the land and the building are being donated to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And that through the transfer of title from the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., to the Federal Government, there is no cost involved to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. However, as I further understand the matter, once the transfer is consummated, then the Federal Government does have in this case, as it has in the others, the maintenance responsibilities for the future?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. The actual maintenance and operation of Government libraries and museums is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $225,000 a year.

The estimate for the expenses of the Johnson Library is $190,000 to $225,000. The actual expenses of the Truman Library at present are $230,000; of the Hoover Library are $150,000; of the Roosevelt Library are $210,000; and of the Eisenhower Library are $175,000.

So, Mr. Speaker, the range is from about $150,000 to $230,000 for maintenance and operation, which would be the responsibility of the Government, as we make these materials available to the American people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall not oppose the consideration of this joint resolution, but I would hope that in the future there would be some way to bring these libraries and these papers into one central place.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to understand why the Congressional Library would not be a good repository for the papers of the various Presidents.

It seems to me that if this library construction program is going to be continued, and upon the basis that it has grown in recent years, there are going to be libraries for the Federal taxpayers to maintain all over the United States of America at various and distant places.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that somehow or other something could be worked out whereby these papers could be brought to a central point for the purpose of those who care to scrutinize them.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, to further clarify for the Members exactly what is proposed, this resolution would authorize the transfer of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library to the United States without further delay.

The public papers and other historical documents of President Kennedy were given to the people of the United States in February of last year by the executors and trustees of his estate. It was the wish of President Kennedy that these documents and other materials of his administration be permanently placed in a Presidential archival depository in his home State of Massachusetts.

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., a private, nonprofit corporation, has received contributions from millions of admirers of President Kennedy and has indicated it is now ready to construct the library and museum facilities needed to house these documents and other materials. The corporation has submitted an offer to the Administrator of GSA to transfer the facilities to the United States upon completion.

The basic authority for accepting title to such facilities as these is found in section 507(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. It authorizes the Administrator of GSA to accept gifts of library facilities to be used as Presidential archival depositories. There is a provision within the statute which requires the Administrator to submit a report on the proposal to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. The Administrator may not accept the offer until the expiration of 60 days of continuous session of Congress following the submission of his report.

On June 27, 1966, the Administrator transmitted a report to the Speaker outlining the nature of the proposal and recommending that the Kennedy Library be accepted and designated as a Presidential archival depository. I introduced House Joint Resolution 1207 indicating the affirmative approval of Congress that this library be accepted.

Hearings were held on the Administrator's report and on the resolution on July 26 by the Government Activities Subcommittee. The library facilities will be constructed in Cambridge, Mass., on a site to be donated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The proposal submitted provides for some 90,000 square feet of floor space. This is approximately the size of the other Presidential libraries. As in the case of the other five Presidential libraries, there will be a museum operated along with the archives building.

These facilities will be constructed and furnished entirely at the expense of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., and will be transferred to the United States at no cost. The United States will then become responsible for operating and maintaining the facilities. It is estimated that this cost will be around $225,000 annually. This figure compares favorably with the present cost figures incurred in operating the Presidential libraries now in existence. The present range is from $150,000 to $230,000.

The subcommittee and the Government Operations Committee voted unanimously to report the resolution. The primary purpose of the resolution is to permit the Congress to affirmatively express its approval of the project and its gratitude to the thousands of people who have made it possible.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I do wish to say a word in behalf of the minority in connection with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 1207. I would note that it has been reported out of the committee unanimously. I think the records and papers of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy are clearly important historical resources. The study of the history and the meaning of his administration will clearly be advanced by this depository.

The materials given to the United States for this library now consist of a total of 14,902,000 pages of manuscripts, 2,575,000 pages of microfilm, and 513 oral history interviews. In addition, there are 12,000 books, 73,150 still pictures, 900,000 feet of motion picture film, 560 sound recording tapes, and 520 sound recording disks. Some 10,690 museum objects relating to the life of President Kennedy have also been contributed, and it is expected that the number of items contributed to the library will continue to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas if he plans to comment a little bit further on this resolution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to revise and extend my remarks and to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this resolution because there are many Members who may wish to make some comments on this and may want to avail themselves of that opportunity.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would merely add that the committee acted pursuant both to the request of the Administrator of the General Services Administration and to a letter from Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, who is the president of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc.

The statute under which the General Services Administration is authorized to accept title to Presidential archival depositories—the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—stipulates in section 507(f) that before accepting such facilities the GSA Administrator must submit a report to the Speaker of the House and the Secretary of the Senate and that a period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress must elapse before the offer may be accepted. This resolution would authorize the Administrator to accept title to the John F. Kennedy Library without waiting for the required 60 days to elapse. It is an appropriate tribute to our late President that the Congress should take this expressly affirmative action rather than merely indicate its acquiescence by the absence of negative action during the 60-day period.

It is only within the last 25 years that this Nation has come to realize the importance of a systematic collection of the papers of our Chief Executives. The papers authored and received by a President during his term in office have long been recognized as valuable basic source material of the history of this country. In fact, the late President Kennedy himself said:

> Documents are the primary sources of history; they are the means by which later generations draw close to historical events and enter into the thoughts, fears, and hopes of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Presidential archival depository will clearly serve an important purpose in maintaining these historical records for students, scholars, and all the American people.

It is clear that the cost of the design, construction, and furnishings will be entirely undertaken by the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts in December 1963, specifically to construct and equip facilities in Massachusetts to house and preserve the papers and other historical materials of John F. Kennedy. The funds for the construction of the library were in part raised through a fundraising campaign in 1964 to which more than 8 million people contributed.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas has clearly indicated that the costs, as estimated, will amount to $225,000 a year in terms of maintenance and operation and for the protection of the depository. There is no cost to the United States other than this estimated maintenance figure which, I understand, is in line with operating costs of existing Presidential libraries housing the papers of Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that acceptance of the title to the John F. Kennedy Library is a step in the national interest and it will preserve and maintain a valuable cultural and historical resource for generations yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in announcing my support for House Joint Resolution 1207 to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

During the fundraising campaign of 1964 more than 8 million people contributed to the Kennedy Library. This was a wonderful expression of public admiration for our beloved late President.

The Library Corporation has offered to give the Library to the United States. Section 507(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act authorizes the Administrator of General Services to accept gifts of library facilities to be operated as Presidential archival depositories. Pursuant to the act the Administrator submitted a report to the Congress explaining the nature of the proposal and recommending that the Library be accepted by the United States and designated as a Presidential archival depository. Before a binding acceptance can be extended to this offer, however, it is necessary that Congress remain in session for 60 continuous days following the Administrator's report.

House Joint Resolution 1207 would express immediate congressional approval of the acceptance of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Library. It would no longer be necessary to wait for 60 days of congressional inaction.

Today President John F. Kennedy is close to the hearts and minds of all Americans. None who saw the man can forget his style, his dignity, his intelligence, or his warmth. No one who heard him speak could forget his eloquence. No one who saw him act could forget his decisiveness and his courage. President Kennedy had been and is one of the most admired and loved of American Presidents.

President Kennedy was, in addition to his other virtues, a historian. Had he never been President he would have been remembered for his contribution to our understanding of the march of history. As a historian he appreciated the immeasurable value of documents and the source material of history. He realized that great men were immortalized by the documents and source material handed down from generation to generation.

The documents of President Kennedy which will reside in his library are of great cultural value. They reflect the values of a cultured man. But they are much more than that.

Years from now, when the people who saw and knew President Kennedy are gone, when the regret surrounding his tragic death has subsided—when the objective eyes of history cast a detached view upon his Presidency—the true measure of his greatness will be immortalized for the American heritage.

The people of the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, and particularly the citizens of Cambridge, are proud and pleased that the library is to be located in their city. It was at Cambridge where he received his education—Harvard—and his talents were first recognized, for this was the area he represented as a Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1207

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to accept title to the structure or structures to be erected and equipped at Cambridge, Massachusetts, by the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Incorporated, to be transferred to the United States Government, without reimbursement, for use as a Presidential archival depository to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and to maintain, operate, and protect such depository as a part of the National Archives system. The Administrator may enter into such agreements with the officers of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Incorporated, as are necessary to complete the transfer of title to the United States and may do so without regard to the provision of section 507(f)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397(f)(1)), that the Administrator shall not enter into any such agreement until the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which a report in writing of any such proposed Presidential archival depository is transmitted by the Administrator to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REASON, NOT PREJUDICE, IS NEEDED ON ANTIGUN LEGISLATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the horror of Monday's mass murders in Texas has been succeeded by a hysteria of demand for strict antigun legislation. Most of this, of course centers around the Dodd bill—the gun registration bill. It is the one the Communists want, too. Gun registration is part of their program for eventual world control. Coincidentally or not, the far-left publications are rallying to the support of the bill.

Does anyone not realize that the killer could have purchased weapons, even under the Dodd bill, until the day his crimes were committed? The Dodd bill will not stop crime but it will make gun ownership so difficult that the average law-abiding citizen will not subject himself to the redtape necessary to acquire a weapon. That will leave the field of gun ownership substantially to the criminal. It appears to me that the criminal is having a field day in this country already. America leads the world in crime. I do not like to see the criminal have a near monopoly on weapons.

If this shrill outcry for antigun laws will abate sufficiently for Americans to look with reason upon the problem, it will be found that the National Rifle Association, which has become the favorite whipping boy for the far-leftists, is not opposing weapons-control legislation. This organization is suporting legislalation which would make it difficult for criminals, deliquents, unsupervised juveniles, and irresponsible persons to acquire weapons. There are several of these measures pending. I support some of them. I know of no organized effort to prevent their passage. Like the Dodd bill, none of these would have prevented Monday's horrible crime. But they would provide more police supervision over the question of who could buy weapons.

Crime is not limited to those who possess weapons. Automobiles—some of them in the hands of irresponsible motorists—kill more people than guns. To single out guns for restrictive legislation would be to ignore the fact that the majority of crimes are committed with other devices. Knives, clubs, stones, and so forth, can be and frequently are lethal weapons. The danger is in the Dodd bill which would simply open the door wider for crime and make it exceedingly difficult for law-abiding citizens to own a weapon, either for protection or for sport. Better listen to reason before we fall into a trap.

TIGHT MONEY MARKET KILLING HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GRIDER**. Mr. Speaker, the tight money market in Memphis, Tenn., is killing the homebuilding industry, squeezing out home buyers, and making it impossible for homeowners to sell their homes.

In July of 1965, 699 building permits were granted in Memphis, Tenn. This July there were only 488; an alarming decrease of 39 percent.

During the last 4 months there has been a drop of 260 housing units, or a 21-percent decrease.

This situation, in my opinion, calls for immediate and drastic temporary action.

Last week a group of homebuilders visited my office here in Washington. These are able and distinguished men, who put the welfare of their community and their Nation above their own personal gain. They are deeply concerned for our community and for our Nation unless this most important segment of our economy gets real assistance in a real hurry.

The legislation which would increase the borrowing power of the Federal National Mortgage Association by $2.2 billion is needed immediately. We further need legislation which includes a provision to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to purchase FNMA and Federal Home Loan Bank Board debentures and other obligations. We probably need a temporary ceiling on consumer-type certificates of deposit and such legislation will receive my support. I urge the support of all Members of this body and ask that the legislation be placed on the calendar at an early date.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, the increase in food prices in the large cities has become a difficult problem for all people, especially for wage earners. I read in the daily press that the Secretary of Agriculture agreed to lend the full weight of the Department of Agriculture to an investigation of food prices that are rising in New York at such a disturbing rate, and I agree that an investigation is essential. But can we afford to meet this crisis with nothing but an investigation? It is possible that months will pass before anything conclusive is determined. Meanwhile, the inflation which now threatens us may turn to outright disaster.

I personally favor temporarily freezing all prices on food staples. I think this should be done at once lest the matter get out of control. City dwellers find life difficult enough without having to face deadly pressures on their personal budgets because of inflation in the price of foodstuffs.

I believe a bill to freeze food prices for 90 days, pending further recommendations from the Secretary of Agriculture or the President, would receive substantial support in Congress, especially from the Representatives of the major cities, and unless I receive persuasive reasons to the contrary, I plan to introduce such a bill early next week. I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture to this effect, and I hope that he will give attention to the letter that I sent to him last night.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker, recently the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared an analysis of the provisions of title IV, the so-called housing section of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, as amended in the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. I will include this analysis in the remarks I will make in the Committee of the Whole today.

FLOWERS FOR THE WEDDING OF MISS LUCI JOHNSON

Mr. **YOUNGER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **YOUNGER**. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read into the RECORD a telegram received from Mr. William Enomoto to the effect that the flowers for Miss Luci's wedding were being shipped from the San Francisco International Airport by Government plane. After the House adjourned last evening, I called Mr. Enomoto, who told me that he had been told that a Government plane was being used but after he sent me the telegram, he found out that prior arrangements had been made to ship the flowers by private carrier and he asked me to make this correction, which I am happy to do.

ACT NOW ON INFLATION

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued to hear the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], as I have been intrigued with the other remarks by my Democratic colleagues on the impact of inflation on our economy and our society.

I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], is now ready to concede that inflation is not a Republican shibboleth. I believe it is about time that the administration should wake up to the fact that inflation indeed is serious and that it requires action on the part of the Executive to cut expenditures, which it has the power to do right now—not next week, not a month from now. It can do it right now, and it is necessary for it to proceed along this line.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION STALLS FHA GRAB

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, on July 28 in the House of Representatives, I charged the administration proposed invading again the sphere of private industry and called upon Veterans' Administrator William J. Driver to withhold a proposed announcement that the VA's fee-appraisal-panel functions would be relinquished to the Federal Housing Administration.

I pointed out that it was not the intent of Congress in establishing the FHA that the agency should compete with small businessmen in providing appraisal services to the public; and that if FHA has too large a staff of appraisers, the proper action at this time is to reduce its staff and not seek employment for them in competition with independent appraisers through the proposal being considered in connection with the VA's own operations—the VA fee-appraisal panel.

It is a pleasure to inform my colleagues that the Veterans' Administration has stalled this FHA grab.

I commend Administrator Driver for his understanding of the problem involved and for his decision to retain the fee-appraisal-panel functions under the VA.

At this point in the RECORD, I am inserting Administrator Driver's letter to me announcing this determination.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: Technical staff personnel of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have discussed possible use by VA of the temporary excess staff appraisal capacity in the FHA. These discussions have resulted in a conclusion that use of FHA staff appraisers as VA designated fee personnel, pending increases in the FHA appraisal workload, is not feasible.

I appreciate your inquiry of July 27 on this matter.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF BREAD

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, for the last several days there have been several speeches made in this body by our city friends expressing deep concern over the increased cost of bread and other foods. I share their concern. I agree these increased costs are absolutely unjustified.

I am very happy to state to the House that the gentleman from Texas, Congressman PURCELL, of the Committee on Agriculture, the chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee, is going into this subject next week. It is the intention of the subcommittee to determine why this high rise is placed on bread and other foods.

Mr. Speaker, we know these increases cannot be attributed to the few people in this country who are still willing to work in the hot sun on the American farms.

The work of our farm people is as hard and more difficult than that of any other segment of our economy. Farmers rise early in the morning and work until very late in the day. Their income per dollar of investment and per hour of labor is indeed lower than that of any other segment of our society.

I sympathize with those who live in the cities over the high costs, but I wish to say again that these high costs cannot be attributed to the income of our American farmers which, as of now, as has been true in the past, is still substandard.

I can confidentially tell you now that the high costs are attributable to those who handle the food crops after they leave the farms—transporters, handlers, brokers, packers, wholesalers, processors, and retailers, including the labor of these off-the-farm sources.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 196]

Bray
Celler
Clevenger
Conable
Dingell
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Foley
Hansen, Wash.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
King, N.Y.
Machen
Morrison
Murray
Pool
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Shriver
Sickles
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REQUEST TO MEET AT 10 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do object, Mr. Speaker. I am constrained to object. I do not want to hasten the execution.

The SPEAKER. The objection is heard.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765), with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before rising on yesterday, the Committee had agreed that all debate on title III of the committee substitute and all amendments thereto would terminate within 1 hour.

Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendments offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 60, lines 10 and 11, strike out "about to engage or continue to engage" and insert "engaging".
>
> And on page 60, lines 23 and 24, strike out "about to engage or continue to engage" and insert "engaging".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, the two amendments, Members will note, refer to the language, as now written, which says:

> Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would—

And so forth. The amendments would merely substitute the word "engaging" for the other language.

The first amendment should refer to page 60, and the second to line 23 of page 60.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I always yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman has changed the amendment in its reference to line 23?

Mr. WHITENER. May I state what my two amendments would do.

If Members will look at page 60, lines 10 and 11, they will see the words "about to engage or continue to engage."

If Members will look at line 23 of the same page they will see those same words.

Those words would be stricken, and there would be substituted in lieu thereof the word "engaging," so that if the bill should become law title III would read:

> Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is engaged in any act—

And so forth. I believe there is good reason for this. As I said yesterday, I do not believe we should require that the Attorney General of the United States or any other person exercise clairvoyant powers and try to anticipate what someone may do next week or a year from now.

If Members really are interested in preventing the deprivation of rights, privileges, and immunities granted and secured by the Constitution they will have served that purpose if they limit it to those who are engaging in that type of conduct.

So my two amendments would merely limit the Attorney General or any other person to bringing an action where someone is actually engaging in the prohibited acts.

I cannot imagine any more difficult situation for either counsel or litigant than to be hauled into court by some individual or by some government and being charged that they are about to engage in some type of conduct in the future. So this amendment would not do any violence to what I understand to be the intent of the proponents of this legislation. It would merely bring a little bit of reason and logic into the language of the statute.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I will be glad to yield again.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that by substituting the words "engaging in" that your definition would say that before the Attorney General may proceed he must have reasonable grounds to believe that the individual has engaged in an act or practice which denies——

Mr. WHITENER. No. The gentleman knows that is not what I said. What I said was he must have reasonable grounds to believe that a person is engaging in it at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Now, the gentleman knows that you may believe that some civil rights group or the Ku Klux Klan or some individual citizen may engage in some unlawful conduct in the future. I could take many of my acquaintances in my area where I could almost guarantee you that at some time in the next few months they are going to sell a pint of liquor, but I do not know of any law that would give me the right to go in and bring them into court and try them for unlawful acts now because I have reasonable grounds to believe that they are going to sell some whisky at some time next year. So this is what my amendment would prevent. This is all it does. It says that if it is unlawful to engage in something or to do something and, if you are doing it, then the Attorney General or a private person may come in and bring an action in court and stop you from engaging in this unlawful conduct, but cannot do so in anticipation of some suspected action.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the gentleman from North Carolina is sincerely trying to perfect this section, because I am sure he wants language in the bill which would make this bill an effective one. However, I must very respectfully disagree with him as to what actually will take place if we were to adopt his amendment. First of all, what would happen would be that we would seriously limit the right of the Attorney General to institute an action at a time when irreparable harm was about to take place. The Attorney General's authority to bring such a suit is allowed when there are reasonable grounds to believe irreparable damage can take place. This is a basic equity right today. This amendment would curtail the right in equity to step in and, based on sufficient proof, to enjoin the irreparable damage from taking place. I believe that the gentleman certainly would not want irreparable injury to be done first before permitting injunctive relief to be granted. I am also sure that the gentleman will agree we are not speculating as to whether or not an action will take place 6 months from now but there are reasonable grounds to believe under this language that an individual is engaging in or is about to engage in a denial of a Federal right because of discrimination. The language speaks for itself, and I do not believe that there should be any real difficulty in comprehending what it intends to do.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Is there any language elsewhere in this title to indicate the criteria or the formula upon which the Attorney General may make a decision as to whether or not a person is about to engage in such an action?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, we leave it to the discretion of the Attorney General to have reasonable grounds to believe that a violation of a Federal right has occurred or is about to occur, and leave it for the court to take the necessary action.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, then this matter is left entirely, again, in the hands of the Attorney General?

Mr. RODINO. The final determination, as the gentleman knows, is always up to the court.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Yes; but the Attorney General will have the power to institute the proceedings on any such grounds as he may see fit. In fact, he will have unlimited power, should he so choose, to embarrass innocent citizens.

Mr. RODINO. Provided there are reasonable grounds to believe that a person has engaged in or is about to engage in such activities.

I do not believe that language, really, is difficult to understand, and for this reason I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman is not putting this issue as it really is.

The gentleman says that you leave it to the Attorney General. But that is not what you do in this section.

As the gentleman mentioned, at line 15, it says: "Such other person in his own right or the Attorney General."

So, it is not limited to the exercise of the discretion by the Attorney General. Any man walking down the street could walk into a Federal court building and institute an action against any other man who walked down that street the day before, and subject him to the embarrassment and the expense of litigation. It is not limited to the Attorney General.

Mr. RODINO. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that that might happen today, or it might happen on any other day. I do not believe there is any reason why we should now restrict actions of this nature that an individual may be able to bring which seeks injunctive relief.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SENNER. I believe we are rehashing old ground here. I believe further that this amendment was already fully discussed in title II, and I further believe that in title II, this amendment was ably explained by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] to the effect that when we use the language "about to engage or to continue to engage," this is an equity proceeding for injunctive relief.

Mr. Chairman, this is a well-known term, and it is commonly used in the law of equity today, is that not correct?

Mr. RODINO. This is correct. It would actually restrict the authority of court of equity to award injunctive relief.

Mr. SENNER. In other words, it is as simple as that? We rehashed this yesterday, did we not?

Mr. RODINO. That is right.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman who said that we are rehashing something that has been gone over numerous times heretofore, and even yesterday, but I would remind my friends that what we are rehashing is something that this very Congress, this very House of Representatives, has defeated on numerous occasions in years gone by.

Mr. Chairman, I see no more reason why this power—this most unusual and unheard of power and authority—should be given to the Attorney General now than when this House of Representatives defeated the request for such power the last time it came up for consideration.

This is an amendment which has a great deal of merit. As now written this bill is stronger than when it was defeated by the House of Representatives the first time, the second time, and the third time.

Mr. Chairman, it now gives the same power and authority to other persons in general. Read line 15 on page 60 of the bill. It gives not only the Attorney General of this country this power, and this right, but, "such other person in his own right, or the Attorney General for and in the name of the United States."

This great United States of America can bring such an action against any individual citizen, based upon what one person, even a crackpot or chronic complainer might believe is going to happen.

Now, my friends, how far are we going? We can go just so far and be reasonable. How can this, the Congress of the United States, pass an act giving people authority to do such a thing as this, based entirely upon speculation and guesswork?

What the Attorney General might believe to be, or the other citizen might believe to be "about to take place," is pure speculation. Of course, it is speculation, and nothing more or less.

Now then what are you going to do? If the Attorney General has speculated or if the other citizen, the normal citizen, one of your fellow men, has guessed wrong and speculated at the wrong time, about the wrong person, as to what he was "about to engage in." Are you going to award damages to the man who has been mistreated; who has been unjustly accused; who is forced to come into court and answer to a charge brought by the Attorney General of this land, or by a crackpot troublemaking citizen?

There is not one single word, not one phrase, not one section in the proposed law that would protect that innocent citizen who was unjustly accused, unjustly sued, and dragged into court.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from South Carolina made that particular point because I had intended to inquire into that.

Is there any provision under which the person who is harassed by another person, not the Attorney General of the United States, any individual in the

United States, can proceed under this title?

Mr. ASHMORE. None whatsoever.

Mr. JONAS. What if he arrests an innocent person and subjects him not only to embarrassment but to the expense of going to court, leaving his business to defend himself? What redress, if any, is available to him?

Mr. ASHMORE. None in this bill at any point whatsoever, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. There is no provision which would require him to put up a bond to indemnify a person unjustly harassed?

Mr. ASHMORE. None whatsoever.

Mr. JONAS. This goes far beyond giving the discretion to the Attorney General. We can assume that he would not be vindictive but you cannot assume that every individual in the United States is motivated by these high principles. It is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. ASHMORE. On the contrary, I think we might assume under present day conditions that some people are going to be vindictive, from the way they are acting on the streets and highways of this country today.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I might point out in line with what my friend from North Carolina has just said that if title IV of this bill becomes the law of the land, then any fellow walking down the street might well bring a real estate man into court and get an injunction against him because he assumes that that real estate man is not going to sell his property to a member of another race.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the proponents of the legislation, and in conjunction with this amendment, just exactly how title III is going to operate in its present form particularly unless there are some clarifying amendments adopted?

For instance, I read on line 11, page 60, when "any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right."

Then the Attorney General or an individual can bring an action.

Yet, when we talk about open housing, in title IV on page 68, line 17, "whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice."

Now, as it is drafted, it would seem to me that the right secured—the right secured, not the power of the Attorney General to bring an action—but the right secured is defined in title IV.

Mr. Chairman, the right protected in title III is any right so defined in the laws or the Constitution. Thus the Attorney General can bring an action under title IV without a pattern or practice but with a single act. There is not any question about that, is there? Is there any question about that? I ask the gentlemen sponsoring the legislation, who are speaking on behalf of the legislation—the gentleman from New Jersey or the gentleman from Colorado or somebody—to answer that question?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the gentleman from Florida that title III provides broader authority in some instances.

Mr. CRAMER. Exactly. That is the point I am making.

Mr. Chairman, now when we got to title V having to do with desegregation of public education and other facilities, we took care of that situation. We specifically provide in title VI that that would be the sole remedy, did we not? I ask the gentleman from Colorado, did we not in title VI say on page 80:

> *Provided*, that this title shall be the exclusive means whereby the Attorney General may bring suits for the desegregation of public education.

Specifically for the purpose of not permitting him to use title III?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The objective being——

Mr. CRAMER. Is that right or wrong?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You are wrong to this degree——

Mr. CRAMER. Maybe the gentleman from New Jersey would care to answer the question. I refuse to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I comment?

Mr. CRAMER. I refuse to yield to the gentleman from Colorado. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if that is not what it specifically says? The gentleman from Colorado will not admit it says what it says.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CRAMER. I would like the gentleman from New Jersey to say whether it means what it says or whether it means something else. Title VI specifically says it shall be the exclusive remedy for school integration. Therefore, title III is not available under title VI, but it is available under the open housing provision, title IV.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the deafening silence on the part of the gentleman from New Jersey, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CRAMER. During the period of silence I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Would the gentleman agree that unless this amendment is adopted, under section 403(a)(3) of title IV on page 63 of the bill, every newspaper, every radio station, and every television station in the country might well be the victim of an unwarranted lawsuit by some individual, not just the Attorney General, because he thought they were about to engage in printing and publishing a written notice, statement, or advertisement with respect to the sale of a dwelling house?

Mr. CRAMER. That or any other proscription, under title IV, and all laws, where we have used "pattern or practice" consistently as the test for the Attorney General's action, is amended by title III so that action can thus be brought by an individual or the Attorney General for any single act under any present law.

I will carry it one step further. Let us take interference of rights by force or threats of force in title V.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Title V creates a civil right to be protected against threats and intimidation relating to all the described specific acts, such as voting, enrolling, and attending public school, applying for employment, selling, purchasing, renting, using a vehicle in interstate commerce, motel, hotel, and so forth.

I wish to caution the Members of the House—and if you will look at the majority report you will see that this is confirmed—that title III, the right of the Attorney General or individual with respect to any act, includes acts that are not only accomplished but that are about to be engaged in relating to every single one of those described acts in title V—interference with rights without any exceptions.

I hope that sinks in.

There is not one single exemption written in relating to Mrs. Murphy, or relating to the 100 employees in the FEPC provision—now reduced down to 8 by the latest proposal—and not including any other exclusions written into the law or proposed in title V. It is broad and covers everything without any exemptions whatsoever. Therefore, under title III, the Attorney General or an individual can bring a court case to enforce a right protected under title V, that is nowhere else in the law. The exceptions thus overruled would include Mrs. Murphy, clubs, and fraternal organizations, and would include every exemption written into title IV, such as religious schools, and so forth. I hope that is understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. WHITENER, there were—ayes, 28, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 197]

Brown, Calif.
Celler
Conable
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Ford, William D.
Green, Oreg.
Hansen, Wash.
Hosmer
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Long, Md.
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Ottinger
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Shriver
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Vigorito
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 404 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which I ask to be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the two amendments will be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 60, line 15, after "or" insert ", in the case of a pattern or practice of resistance to full enjoyment of such rights,".

On line 16, after "States" insert a comma (",").

On Page 61, line 5, after the word "or" insert ", in the case of a pattern or practice to full enjoyment of such rights,".

On page 61, line 6, after "States" insert a comma (",").

On page 61, line 12, after "SEC. 303" insert "Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit any remedy available under any other law of the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in complete good faith, although I frankly admit that I am not in favor of title III.

The point has been brought out in colloquy on the floor, and it has disturbed me since reading the bill and trying to figure out what is attempted in title III. There is a serious question as to whether the test for bringing suit by the Attorney General—in those instances where it presently requires a pattern or practice to be in existence or threatened before the Attorney General would bring an action—whether or not that present statute would be modified by this new title III so that the Attorney General could inject himself in any act or practice. I think that is obviously the effect of title III as written and why it needs this amendment.

No. 1, my amendment would insert the words "pattern or practice" relating to the implementation by the Attorney General of title III as a new alternative remedy in those instances where there is a remedy now available.

What we have also done in the amendment with the second provision is to make certain that in those instances where there is a remedy available by law, where the Attorney General or a person can bring suit for relief, get relief where there is only an act or a practice, that is preserved by the language that is added as a new section:

Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit any remedy available under any other law.

The right to bring an action based on any act or practice where provided under present law is thus preserved.

Let me point out what is going to happen if this amendment is not adopted. A good part of what Congress has done in the past relating to the actions of the Attorney General will be undone. In every instance where there is a pattern or practice limitation presently provided for in the law that exception goes through the window. Refer to FEPC, for instance, in title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The FEPC law does provide in section 707 that whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to full employment he may bring a suit. That limitation would be nullified by the right of the Attorney General to bring an action relating to any act or practice under title III.

The significance should be clear, particularly under the fair employment situation. A single individual, a single instance, without instruction of the employer, without any intention on his part whatsoever to discriminate, and the Attorney General could bring an action for that single act, rather than for a pattern or practice of acts that the employer was guilty of—or his designee was guilty of.

In the bill before us, if we look at the open housing title on page 68, we will see that the Attorney General can only bring an action when there is "a pattern or practice of resistance."

Title III was not intended to so operate because of the manner in which title III got into the bill. The administration did not even ask for title III. The Attorney General stated he would have to have a national police force if it was enacted. The administration resisted title III. It got into the bill in the subcommittee. It was offered on the basis of having been considered in previous Congresses and that, therefore, hearings are not necessary. So therefore it was put in the bill, even though it was not requested.

The least we can do is to try to clean it up a little because now we have it before us. I believe the amendment I have offered would go to great lengths to do that.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman in the well would explain to the Committee whether or not the amendments he has proposed would in any way limit the existing powers of the Attorney General under any law that may now be in force?

Mr. CRAMER. The objective of the proviso of the new section is to prevent this from providing a lesser remedy than is provided under present law.

Mr. MATHIAS. Does the gentleman view this as an alternative remedy which would be available?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. It would be an alternative remedy in those instances when there is a pattern or practice involved.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand it, the gentleman proposes the words "pattern or practice" on line 15 after the word "or," and he proposes the words "pattern or practice" on line 5, page 61, after the word "or." Is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I inquire: Would it be necessary for the Attorney General, before he could institute an action, to prove a pattern or practice?

Mr. CRAMER. It would be the same situation as under the present title III, where he would have the same duty he has relating to any act or practice. The same duty would remain. I am not changing the necessity for proving the case at all. I am changing the definition of what must be proved from "any act or practice" to a "pattern or practice."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer is that any act may be enjoined, even with the gentleman's amendment; is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. If it is part of a pattern or practice, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would it have to be a part of a pattern or practice before the Attorney General could institute the action?

Mr. CRAMER. The Attorney General must allege a pattern or practice. We have previously provided that the Attorney General must in fact be convinced a pattern or practice exists and must so certify and must so prove before a cause of action will lie. That is not the case here. He alleges a pattern or practice, which might be a single act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And he would not have to allege the pattern or practice in order to state a cause of action?

Mr. CRAMER. If he can do so under other existing law.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. He could use this title as an auxiliary remedy?

Mr. CRAMER. As an alternative remedy; that is correct.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. In view of the explanation and the colloquy which has developed, we can accept the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida if I heard correctly an answer to a question. Would the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida lessen the authority of the Attorney General in any law now on the statute books?

Mr. CRAMER. It specifically excludes such effect.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I believe the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida whether his amendment changes in any way the provision providing that a single person or citizen may bring an action?

Mr. CRAMER. This relates to action by the Attorney General.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. So that an individual does not have to show a pattern or practice?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 60, line 15, strike out "such other person in his own right, or" and on page 61, line 5, strike out "such other person in his own right, or"

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this amendment did not occur to me until the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina was being debated, immediately preceding the last amendment.

The gentleman from North Carolina, in his debate opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, indicated and showed that he did not even know there was a provision in this title that any person other than the Attorney General could bring a lawsuit under this title.

He further indicated in his opposition to the amendment that his construction of this title was it provides that the Attorney General can take action against something that might happen. Now, there are at least two good reasons why my amendment should be adopted. One is the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey that the Attorney General would use good judgment as to whether or not he would file one of these lawsuits. However, he did not attribute the good judgment to any person or to any other person in the United States who might want to bring such a lawsuit. This bill is so wide open in its explicit wording that I believe it should be limited only to the Attorney General. That is my first reason for the amendment.

The other reason for my amendment is that under the provisions of this bill there are going to have to be mindreaders employed to determine whether a person is thinking about engaging in one of the prohibited activities. I do not believe that just an ordinary person would have the funds with which to employ the necessary number of mindreaders to decide what is in the mind of some person who might say, if he is going to say it, that such person is thinking of engaging in some act that would deprive the complainant of his rights and privileges. Now, we must assume that the committee feels or at least the majority of the committee feel that the Attorney General will have such mindreaders available to him.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As I understand it, your amendment would merely provide that the Attorney General would be the only one who could bring this action where "reasonable grounds to believe" existed in his mind. For example, it would not permit some individual in the city of Chicago or the city of New York or your home town or my home town to bring an action against the mayor of the city because he thinks that next week when they are going to try to sit in the city hall the mayor is going to try to throw them out.

Mr. DOWDY. Or that the mayor is thinking maybe he will try to throw them out. That is right.

Mr. WHITENER. It will prevent these arbitrary lawsuits by irresponsible people and limit the bringing of them to the Attorney General.

Mr. DOWDY. That is right. We do not have enough judges in the U.S. courts to handle cases arising under this title as it is now written. The danger of a multiplicity of suits is bad enough if it is just left in the hands of the Attorney General. For that reason, having listened to the debate about this bill and what the proponents say it is supposed to do, I feel this amendment of mine should be adopted, because it bears out what the gentleman from New Jersey said he understood the title to provide in the first place. This title is bad enough in giving the Attorney General the authority to bring a man into court for what the Attorney General thinks the man is thinking about doing. That authority should not be conferred on everybody in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, an analysis of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas indicates that it would deny to an individual a right to carry out his constitutional rights in instituting a lawsuit. The objective of title III is really to expand the authority given by title 42, United States Code, section 1893. Under that particular section, any person may institute an action to secure and protect his constitutional rights against deprivation under color of law. All we are doing here is expanding that rights to make sure if any Federal right denied because of race, color, religion, or national origin, he may institute the action himself without having to go to the Attorney General of the United States. What the gentleman's amendment does is to take that right away from the individual and require that the Attorney General institute the suit for him. I hope that the amendment is defeated. And I hope that you defeat the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. But in order that I may understand what we are talking about, that paragraph opens with these words—

> Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe—

Then it says—

> such other person in his own right may bring suit—

Well, now, who makes that determination as to whether or not there are reasonable grounds? Presumably, under this language the individual who institutes the proceedings would make that determination.

If that is the case, it would seem to me——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman, and I am sure that the gentleman will agree, that in order to get anything before court, and especially in a court of equity where you have to file a complaint, and allege at least some reasonable grounds to support his claim of a violation of a particular right.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman show me where in this section it says anything about filing a complaint, other than based upon his own decision that there are reasonable grounds to do so?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, here it is down on line 16—"may institute a civil action or other proper proceeding for temporary or permanent preventive or mandatory relief."

Mr. HARDY. All right. He may institute a civil action.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Now, he can bring a civil action purely upon his own contention?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. That there is a reasonable ground to suppose that someone is about to discriminate against him?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. He may now institute such an action, but whatever relief is granted is up to the court to determine.

Mr. HARDY. I understand that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I understand that. The court would have to make an adjudication, but the action could be brought even though it were capricious if the individual chose to bring it. Let me just place before the gentleman a little illustration to see if I understand the situation correctly.

Suppose the gentleman from Colorado was about to employ someone, and I thought I was qualified, and I applied for the job. Then I decided that there was reason to believe that the gentleman was not going to employ me because of my religion? Could I then bring suit against you under this language?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, sir, if discrimination in such employment is prohibited by Federal law.

Mr. HARDY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is going too far.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But if there is Federal protection against such discrimination then there is a remedy provided under title III.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Just 1 minute.

Mr. HARDY. But, if the gentleman will yield further, my point is that I could just out of capriciousness bring an action into court against the gentleman just because I thought he was going to discriminate against me, because I happen to be a Methodist and he was something else?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, you can do that now.

Mr. HARDY. I do not know about what kind of law you could do it under, but under this thing——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But if the gentleman will permit, I will read to the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are mixing up the right to bring a suit, and the result that might occur therefrom.

The gentleman from Colorado has correctly said that the suit probably could be brought without this language. But the bringing of suit does not mean that the allegations of the complainant are proven. And until they are proven there is no relief to be given to the person who files the suit.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it is elementary that unless the allegations of the complaint are proven, the costs will fall upon the complainant, particularly with respect to his attorney fees, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, anyone in this Chamber can be sued on an alleged promisory note but the person who brings this suit must prove there was such a note and it was signed by the person to be charged. We are going far afield in opposing some of the proposals in this legislation that are not going to happen in accordance with some of the statements of some of our Members.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has stated that a private party who is wrongfully brought into court could recover attorney's fees. Under what provision of the Federal law could he do that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I did not say that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, will the gentleman say that it could not be done?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for that question. I do not think it has any part in this discussion. What I did say, if the gentleman will listen, is that if the person brings the suit and fails to maintain the allegation, he is, of course, liable for the costs and the expenses that are incurred thereby which in the past has been a sufficient deterrent against groundless suits in almost every instance known to man.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of curiosity, what is to protect the average citizen from harassment in a situation like that if he has to defend himself and pay the costs of an action which may be totally invalid?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is that the burden of a groundless suit, which is the same thing that protects a citizen from harassment, falls on the person who brings such a suit.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to try to adhere somewhat to the law and the facts as we know them to be. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will listen to what I am about to say.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I usually listen to what the gentleman from North Carolina has to say because he is a very able person. But the gentleman might listen to what I have been saying.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I did listen to the gentleman. That is why I am amazed. I know the gentleman is an excellent lawyer.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stood here and told you there be a deterrent to the individual's bringing lawsuits on a groundless proposition against some other citizen because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] says that the party bringing the suit would be liable for costs.

But if you will look at the clear language of this title, you will find that the gentleman from Ohio is entirely in error. On lines 16, 17, and 18, on page 61, it says:

> The United States shall be liable as would be a private person for costs in such proceedings.

If you will look at the earlier parts of the title, you will find that any person walking up and down the street can bring a lawsuit. How? He can bring it in the name of the United States. So the United States would then be the party.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio please answer this question? We all know that in this situation fees of attorneys could not be recovered by a successful litigant defendant in one of these actions, do we not?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; I did not make any statement that they would nor did I intend to leave any inference that they would.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman did not because I know he is too good a lawyer to make such a statement.

But may I ask the gentleman from Ohio this question. Does the gentleman know what the minimum fee schedule in his State by the State bar association is for an appearance in the Federal district court for filing an answer or for 1 day?

Mr. McCULLOCH. No, I do not know what the fee schedule is but it would be the same whether it was in this kind of a case or whether it was another groundless case.

Mr. WHITENER. Precisely.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Or any other kind of case that might be filed against a defendant.

Mr. WHITENER. Precisely. Personally——

Mr. McCULLOCH. The deterrent, therefore, remains the same in this case as it would in any other case.

Mr. WHITENER. If the minimum fee in the gentleman's State is the same as it is in my State under our bar association regulations, then this falsely accused defendant who prevails in court would at least have to pay $50 for the preparing of an answer and $200 for 1 day, if they got rid of it in 1 day, for attorney's fees.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like again to answer that statement by a fundamental concept of law recognized by all lawyers and most all laymen. That is exactly the kind of liability that would be incurred by any defendant who is wrongly accused or wrongly sued by anyone. That is the established law of the land.

Mr. WHITENER. Surely the gentleman is not suggesting that this Congress ought to create environments in which that type of litigatory misconduct would be permitted rather than deterred?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that statement, of course, this proposed legislation does not promote that kind of environment. I am sure that the good lawyers in this committee would agree with that statement.

Mr. WHITENER. Will the gentleman answer this question: Does the gentleman not think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would deter the bringing of any such baseless or groundless lawsuit?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do not think that question has any material bearing on the matter before us. Let me answer the question——

Mr. WHITENER. I would appreciate it if you would.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have answered that one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Dowdy) there were—ayes 42, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would merely like to recall to the Committee a colloquy which took place a minute ago, and which is sufficiently important that I think we ought to correct the legislative history. The gentleman from Ohio made the statement that under circumstances in which an individual might be exonerated after a proceeding of this sort, he could recover his costs. This is challenged and contradicted by the gentleman from North Carolina, who referred on page 61 to lines 15, 16, 17, and 18.

I do not believe that in those lines he will find anything which contradicts what the gentleman from Ohio said. This merely provides that when the United States is a party, it shall be liable as would a private person. That is all it says, and I do not think it affects what the gentleman from Ohio has said.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 61, lines 13, 14, 15, and 16, after "title", strike out "and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party bringing the action shall have exhausted administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law".

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for the 4 remaining minutes of the hour.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with my amendment, let me say there is nothing that I said that will be at variance with what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] said, except that the gentleman from Maryland failed to point out that under this provision, in lines 16, 17, and 18, on page 61, it would not be the private litigant who paid those costs. It would be the U.S. taxpayer who would pay those costs, because the only way that the action could be brought, either by a private person or by the Attorney General, would be for and in the name of the United States, according to the clear language of the title.

To get to the amendment which we have now before us, if the Members will note section 303, it in effect says that even though a litigant comes to the Federal district court, after he has brought lawsuits and been through boards and commissions and State courts, and all around the merry-go-round, that Federal court must still go through the foolishness of hearing it again.

If this language we have in the bill now is adopted, it says this, that the U.S. court "shall exercise the same" jurisdiction "without regard to whether the party bringing the action shall have exhausted administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law."

Since I have been here, for the past 10 years, we have had quite a running battle in the Judiciary Committee about the problem which the Federal courts have complained about, that persons come running into the Federal courts with habeas corpus and other proceedings without first having exhausted their remedies under the State law or under administrative bodies.

We have on one occasion in the House of Representatives passed a bill relating to habeas corpus which would require that before a criminal defendant could start meddling around in the Federal jurisdiction, that he must have exhausted his remedies in the State courts or administrative bodies, as the case may be.

My amendment is very simple. It would merely say that the district courts would not be under any obligation to retry something that may have been already tried several times.

Since there may be others who would like to comment upon this, I will yield back the balance of my time in order that they might do so.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from North Carolina yields back 1 minute.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to state that the amendment should be defeated.

This is a customary provision. For example, the same language is included in section 207 of title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I believe it is necessary language, and for that reason the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week when the House was considering title I of the President's 1966 civil rights bill, I listened carefully and at length to the debate on the provision which would establish a new system of Federal court jury selection to guard against racial and other discrimination.

I voted against striking out this section because I am sure in certain Southern States there has been such discrimination in making up a panel from which jurors are selected. I think our system of allowing attorneys for both defendant and plaintiff to challenge jurors is sufficient assurance of obtaining a fair, impartial jury and a fair trial.

As to the consideration of the civil rights bill, I find it very difficult not to be influenced in my voting by the race riots and violence which has broken out so frequently of late. These disorders seem to indicate that minority groups are pressing too hard and too fast. They use illegal means to obtain legal rights—civil rights do not mean civil riots. This is inexcusable and tends to prejudice my thinking.

Title IV, to eliminate discrimination in the sale and rental of housing, causes me special concern. The people of my congressional district voted almost 3 to 1 against open housing, and it is not easy to disassociate my views from this expression of public opinion in that election.

However, I have sought to limit the weighing of my views on this issue to a State of Washington court decision under which the State supreme court ruled open housing illegal. The court declared unconstitutional a 1957 statute declaring it an unfair practice and a misdemeanor to discriminate against anyone in the sale or rental of publicly assisted housing on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In addition, Justice Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court has stated:

> Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden, in the name of equality, if the strictures of the [fourteenth] amendment were applied to governmental and private action without distinction.

Justice Douglas, concurring in Lombard against Louisiana, in 1963 said:

> The principle that a man's home is his castle is basic to our system of jurisprudence.

On the basis of these decisions, I am voting to strike down title IV.

As a constant supporter of civil rights legislation, I have felt especially comfortable voting this way because with title IV in the bill, it is frankly stated by most Members of Congress that the bill will never become law. In fact, with title IV in the bill it may not even be considered by the Senate. So, in my decision to vote against the open housing section, I feel I am lending support to passage of this legislation.

On the other hand, if title IV remains in the bill, I shall be forced in all conscience to cast the first vote since I have been in Congress against a civil rights bill.

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Chairman, for more than a week now this House has been engaged in debate on the latest or 1966 version of the civil rights, or, if you prefer, the "civil wrongs" bill. I have listened with much interest but have refrained up to this point from engaging in the discussion myself. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I do so now with the serious reservation whether I, as a Representative in this House from the so-called South, can make a worthwhile contribution to defeating the bill under consideration. The propagandists apparently have succeeded in downgrading my section of our great common country to such an extent that any voice from the South raised in protest against what is being done to the Constitution of the United States and the liberties of the vast majority of our people is either ignored or treated with contempt. Yet, Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of my people and as one who deplores the assaults being made upon the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, I feel it my duty to again raise my feeble voice in protest.

When the history of this period through which we are now passing and the life of the young Republic is written, it will undoubtedly reflect the fact that the country is being governed not in the democratic way of government by the majority, but government by the organized minorities.

Mr. Chairman, in the past several years under the pressure of the misguided liberals, the do-gooders, the power of the Federal dollar and the threat of political reprisal, the Congress has enacted into law the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965, and is now in process of writing into the law of the land another, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, of even more far-reaching effect than the others.

And I ask you, my colleagues, what has been the result? In spite of the passage of all of these laws which we were told were to bestow equal rights on all of our citizens, we are faced with new and more far-reaching demands by those who loosely advocate equal rights. Yes, today the great metropolitan centers, whose leaders have been the most active in the advocacy of civil rights, are face to face with virtual anarchy. Racial riots in our metropolitan centers, both East and West, seem to be the order of the day. The destruction by fire of whole segments of these cities, the looting and destruction of private property, and, yes, even maiming and murder seemingly are regarded by a large segment of those who advocate Federal legislation in civil rights as of no great moment. It is all glossed over as a result of these perpetrators being forced to live in so-called ghettos and by the familiar Communist reference to "police brutality." A disregard for the law is being advocated by many of our Negro leaders, headed by the advocate of nonviolent civil disobedience, King Martin Luther himself. It is indeed a sad day, Mr. Chairman, when we have arrived at the point where a citizen whether he be black or white can determine for himself or his followers which laws should be obeyed and which should not. Surely, King Martin Luther and his followers are under the same compulsion to obey and respect the law as the Imperial Wizard Shelton of the Ku Klux Klan. I hold no brief for either of them.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are told that if we do not enact this bill that there will be further riots and demonstrations, that this will be another long, hot summer. Speaking to this point, in the 1964 version of the civil rights bill among other things, I posed this question:

> I ask, Mr. Speaker, is all of this done out of fear? Is the Congress of the United States to yield to threats of further demonstrations by minority group leaders—blackmail if you please?
>
> I ask you in all candor, to what end will this bring us? Is the Congress to comply by legislation with the demands and even riots of every organized minority group in the country?

Well, Mr. Chairman, we passed that bill and we also passed another one in 1965, and now in 1966 we are confronted with the same threats and if this one is passed and no doubt it will be in some form, then one is prone to question what form the 1967 Civil Rights Act will take and for that matter the 1968, 1969, and 1970 acts. For it would appear that now in order to appease the clamor we must have a new civil rights act each year.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be pardoned if I quote from another prophecy that I made on the floor of the House, this time in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when I prophesied what would happen if that bill passed and I quote:

> The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:
>
> 1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.
>
> 2. A step-up in more and more demands by Negro agitators.
>
> 3. More regimentation of the American by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.
>
> 4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death-knell of State sovereignty.

I submit to you in all candor whether it is not true now that we have had a "tragic breakdown of good relations between the races"?

Whether the demands made by the agitators haven't been stepped up?

Is it not a fact that more regimentation of all of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government with the resultant deprivation of the liberties of all American citizens has not resulted?

And, lastly, is it not true that a significant if not fatal assault upon the free enterprise system and State sovereignty has been made?

Title 4 of the bill would deprive all of our citizens of the right to lease and dispose of their real property as they see fit.

And that, Mr. Chairman, brings me to a brief discussion of title 4 of this bill which seems to be the focal point of the debate. This is without question the most controversial of all of the six titles of the proposals contained in the bill under consideration.

After careful consideration and study of the whole bill, I find it difficult to reason in a logical manner why this is true. The other titles of the bill including the assaults made upon the jury system, particularly in State courts, the extraordinary and far-reaching powers granted the Attorney General, and the general and further centralization of power in the executive department at the expense of the States and the liberties of the people, are all repugnant and obnoxious. But, of course, there must be an explanation for such widespread objection to title 4, which would prohibit the historical, constitutional, and traditional American right of one to lease and dispose of his real property as he saw fit. The answer is obviously because all other civil rights bills considered by the Congress in recent years have been aimed at one section of the country; namely, the South. But here for the first time apparently title 4 of this bill would bring home to all sections of the country the racial problem. Under this title of the bill, the people of the North, East, and West, as well as the South, would no longer have the right to dispose of their property as they saw fit. The prospect of this curtailment of their rights has created a great furor all over the country and many Members of the Congress who have found it so easy to embrace all civil rights legislation heretofore proposed, now find it difficult if not impossible to vote for a bill which as a practical matter would adversely affect their own constituents. This proposal, unlike its predecessors, is not a pistol pointed at one section of the country. Rather, it is a scatter gun aimed at all sections.

When the original proposal for title 4 was prepared and sponsored by the administration it created such consternation all over the country that the liberal element and its advocates both in the administration and in the committee were constrained to moderate its harsh effect. And so, we now have in the bill a provision which the proponents of this legislation claim is more moderate than the first version. But the opposition to the Federal Government interfering with the traditional right of a man to dispose of his property to whom he pleases is so strong, that I seriously doubt that this provision will remain in the bill. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that in order to get the bill enacted into law and further appease the agitators, a further revision, with a watered-down version of the present provision, will be written into the bill before final passage, if in fact the title is not entirely stricken from the bill.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues not as a southerner but as an American who loves America and its institutions, who believes in constitutional government, that we are legislating here on our responsibility as Members of the Congress not for this year, not for the next decade, not for any particular minority group, but that it is our duty and obligation to legislate for the benefit of all of the people in our beloved Republic in perpetuity. You and I, permit me to say, as Members of the Congress are expendable. I beseech you in all sincerity not to legislate in an atmosphere of hysteria and fear. We are here today, tomorrow we are gone, and these seats which we are so often constrained to prize so highly will be occupied by others. But what we do here today and the laws that we pass will determine whether the concept of America as conceived by the Founding Fathers will endure.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the hour has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITENER) there were—ayes 42, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

Policy

SEC. 401. It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

Definitions

SEC. 402. For purposes of this title—

(a) "person" includes one or more individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint-stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and fiduciaries.

(b) "dwelling" includes any building or structure, or portion thereof, whether in existence or under construction, which is in, or is designed, intended, or arranged for, residential use by one or more individuals or families.

Mr. RODINO (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this title be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and open for amendment at any point.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) "discriminatory housing practice" means an act that is unlawful under section 403 or 404.

(d) A person shall be deemed to be in the business of buildings, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings if he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as either principal or agent in three or more transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest therein.

Prevention of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing

SEC. 403. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person who is a real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or employee or agent of any real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or any other person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, or any employee or agent of any such person—

(1) To refuse to sell, rent, or lease, to refuse to negotiate for the sale, rental, or lease of, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(2) To discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(3) To make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination.

(4) To fail or refuse to show any dwelling which he is authorized to show to prospective buyers, rentors, or lessors, because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or to fail to submit promptly to his principal any offer to buy, rent, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental, or lease.

(5) To represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that any dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, rental, or lease when such dwelling is in fact so available.

(6) To deny to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of the person he represents or may represent, access to or participation in any multiple-listing service or other service or facilities related to the business of selling or renting dwellings.

(7) To engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner with respect to the sale, lease, or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

(c) Nothing in this section shall bar any religious or denominational institution, or any charitable or educational institution or organization which is operated, supervised or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, or any bona fide private or fraternal organization, from giving preference to persons of the same religion or denomination, or to members of such private or fraternal organization, or from making such selection as is calculated by such organization to promote the religious principles or the aims, purposes, or fraternal principles for which it is established or maintained.

(d) Nothing in this section shall affect, or be construed to affect, any liability for payment of a real estate or other commission by any person with respect to the sale, lease, or rental of a dwelling.

Prevention of discrimination in the financing of housing

SEC. 404. It shall be unlawful for any bank, savings and loan institutions, credit union, insurance company, or other person that makes mortgage or other loans for the purchase, construction, improvement, or repair or maintenance of dwellings to deny such a loan to a person applying therefor, or discriminate against him in the fixing of the downpayment, interest rate, duration, or other terms or conditions of such a loan, because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such person, or of any member, stockholder, director, officer, or employee of such person, or of the prospective occupants, lessees, or tenants of the dwelling or dwellings in relation to which the application for a loan is made.

Interference, coercion, or intimidation

SEC. 405. No person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the excise or enjoyment of any right granted by sections 403 or 404.

Enforcement by private persons

SEC. 406. (a) The rights granted by sections 403, 404, and 405 may be enforced by civil actions in appropriate United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and in appropriate State or local courts of general jurisdiction. A civil action shall be commenced within six months after the alleged discriminatory housing practice or violation of section 405 occurred.

(b) Upon application by any party and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, a court of the United States in which a civil action under this section has been brought may appoint an attorney for such party or parties and may authorize the commencement of a civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security. A court of a State or subdivision thereof may do likewise to the extent not inconsistent with the law or procedures of the State or subdivision.

(c) The court may grant such relief as it deems appropriate, including a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, and may award actual damages to the plaintiff, or, in the alternative, if the defendant has received or agreed to receive compensation for services during the course of which the discriminatory housing practice occurred, the court may award as liquidated damages an amount not exceeding the amount of such compensation.

(d) In the case of a civil action brought under subsection (a) alleging a discriminatory housing practice which occurs in a State, or political subdivision of a State, which has a State or local law prohibiting such practice and establishing or authorizing a State or local authority to grant or seek relief from such practice, the court, upon issuance of a temporary injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order preserving the complainant's right to obtain all relief, including the opportunity to buy or rent the specific dwelling with respect to which the alleged practice occurred, may stay proceedings in such civil action for a period not exceeding 30 days pending referral by the court or the complainant, as appropriate, to such State or local authority: *Provided*, That, at the expiration of such thirty-day period, the court may further stay proceedings for an additional period or pending the termination of then pending State or local enforcement proceedings, if it believes that such proceedings will proceed expeditiously and that such further stay will serve the interests of justice; in the event of such further stay, the court may continue or withdraw any orders it has previously entered in the case as the interests of justice may require. The issuance or withdrawal of any temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order entered by the court pursuant to this subsection may be conditioned upon the posting of reasonable bond or other security as may be just. If, after direction by the court, a complainant fails to make reasonable efforts to initiate appropriate proceedings under applicable State or local law, the court may, in its discretion, and in the absence of a showing of good cause for such failure, dismiss the action.

Enforcement by the Attorney General

SEC. 407. (a) Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights granted by this title, he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court by filing with it a complaint setting forth the facts pertaining to such pattern or practice and requesting such preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order against the person or persons responsible for such pattern or practice, as he deems necessary to insure the full enjoyment of the rights granted by this title.

(b) Whenever an action under section 406 has been commenced in any court of the United States, the Attorney General may intervene for or in the name of the United States if he certifies that the action is of general public importance. In such action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

Enforcement by the Fair Housing Board

SEC. 408. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Fair Housing Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board). The Board shall consist of five members, appointed by the President with the advise and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one member as Chairman. No more than three members of the Board may be of the same political party.

(2) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be five years, beginning with the effective date of this Act, except of those members first appointed, one shall serve for five years, one for four years, one for three years, one for two years, and one for one year. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(3) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate of $25,500 per annum and the other members at the rate of $25,000 per annum.

(4) Three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(b) The Board may, in accordance with civil service law, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees, and make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

(c)(1) The Board shall make such rules and regulations as shall be necessary and proper to carry out its functions, including the conduct of hearings hereinafter authorized.

(2) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers it may itself exercise. It is further authorized to delegate to any member or members, or to any agent or agency the authority to conduct hearings.

(d) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is hereby authorized to direct and supervise, under such rules and regulations as he shall establish, investigations of violations of sections 403, 404 and 405 of this title, either upon the receipt of a written statement of a person alleging to be agrieved or his representative, or on the basis of information available to the Secretary indicating that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a violation may have occurred.

(e) For purposes of investigation the Secretary shall have, and for purposes of hearing the Board shall have, the same powers and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under section 161 of title 29, United States Code.

(f)(1) If, upon basis of an investigation, the Secretary shall determine that a violation has occurred he shall file with the Board a written complaint indicating that such violation has taken place and stating the facts upon which his determination is founded.

(2) A copy of such written complaint shall be served upon the person or persons charged with the violation.

(g)(1) Upon receipt of a complaint, the Board shall set a hearing thereon, provided no such hearing shall be conducted prior to ten days after service of the complaint upon the person charged.

(2) In any such hearing the Secretary shall designate a person or persons to present evidence in support of the complaint.

(h) Except as provided in subsection (f) and (g) of this section, the Board shall conduct hearings and shall issue and enforce orders in the same manner and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations and appellate procedures as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under section 160 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i) and (j) of title 29, United States Code, and all parties to the hearing shall have the same rights as are therein provided: Provided, the provisions of section 160(c) of title 29, United States Code relative to reinstatement of employees and to complaints under section 158 (a)(1) or (a)(2) of title 29 United States Code shall be inapplicable; And provided further a violation hereunder shall be treated in the same manner as an unfair labor practice under said provisions of section 160 of title 29, United States Code.

(i) The Secretary may delegate any power or duty herein granted or imposed to a duly designated representative.

Assistance by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

SEC. 409. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(a) make studies with respect to the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices in representative communities, urban, suburban, and rural, throughout the United States;

(b) publish and disseminate reports, recommendations, and information derived from such studies;

(c) cooperate with and render technical assistance to Federal, State, local, and other public or private agencies, organizations, and institutions which are formulating or carrying on programs to prevent or eliminate discriminatory housing practices;

(d) cooperate with and render such technical and other assistance to the Community Relations Service as may be appropriate to further its activities in preventing or eliminating discriminatory housing practices; and

(e) administer the programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further the policies of this title.

Effect on State laws

SEC. 410. Nothing in this title shall be construed to invalidate or limit any law of a State or political subdivision of a State, or of any other jurisdiction in which this title shall be effective, that grants, guarantees, or protects the same rights as are granted by this title; but any law that purports to require or permit any action that would be a discriminatory housing practice under this title shall to that extent be invalid.

Contempt of court

SEC. 411. All cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this title shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

Existing authority

SEC. 412. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the United States or any agency or officer thereof under existing law to institute or intervene in any civil action or to bring any criminal prosecution.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: On page 61, strike line 19 and all that follows down through page 74, line 6, and renumber the following titles and sections accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia in support of his amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered, in effect, will strike the language contained in title IV of the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965. Indeed, it was in 1963 when the House Committee on the Judiciary was considering civil rights legislation that I pointed out the urgent need for stronger legislation to safeguard the voting rights of every American, a need I might say that became increasingly apparent and was finally met in the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The history of civil rights in the last few years has amply demonstrated, I believe, the need for new legislation to reform our jury system, to strengthen our criminal laws relating to civil rights offenses, and to improve the civil and judicial machinery concerned with suits to desegregate public schools and public facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported and I do support those titles to this bill.

These objectives as proposed in this legislation I support and have supported wholeheartedly. But I cannot support title IV as proposed in the bill before us. It is, I believe, inconsistent. I believe it would create discrimination and confusion with its conflicting exemptions. I believe it is unrealistic, ignoring the experience and the consequences of State fair housing laws. Its promised benefits, I believe, are illusory and impossible of realization. I believe it would be disruptive and depressive in its economic consequences.

To me it has created grave constitutional doubts. I realize that it would be foolish, in the face of recent Supreme Court decisions, to be categorical about the unconstitutionality of any proposed legislation, suffice it to say that the constitutionality of title IV does present a great constitutional question.

Mr. Chairman, inherent in our consideration of property rights—and that is exactly what title IV touches upon—there is the fundamental concept that every individual under the protection of the Constitution has the right to own property, both real and personal, and to use it as he sees fit, so long as he does not interfere with the lawful right of his neighbors or endanger the health, safety, or welfare of the community in which he lives.

So strong was this feeling and so important was this question of property rights at the time of the adoption of our Constitution that the Bill of Rights was designed to protect not only personal liberties and personal rights but, as well, property rights.

Antidiscrimination housing legislation unavoidably raises a conflict between reserved private rights such as freedom of association and nonassociation and nondiscrimination.

Legal measures taken to assure equality of housing opportunity necessarily, I believe, constitute an interference with individual property rights.

The issue appears to me, then, to be one of balancing those respective rights. People in this Nation in general do not buy, sell, or rent residential property, especially their own home, with a great appreciation of governmental attempts to tell them who their neighbor must be or to whom they must sell or not sell their property. The average American tends to look upon his right to sell realty as being absolute, and I believe that attitude is steeped deep in the traditions of this Nation.

I strongly and sincerely believe that the ultimate achievement of equality in housing would be hindered and not helped by the enactment of title IV. Title IV as reported by the Judiciary Committee is in a form that eliminates from its coverage the vast bulk of housing in this Nation, leaving such a small portion affected as to make it largely a meaningless gesture.

These are proposals, I understand, to be considered for further compromise. I say the original proponents of this bill, who favor open housing, are unhappy with the present form of title IV. The Attorney General has expressed doubts as to its interpretation. Other vital segments of this Nation have expressed concern over its vague, contradictory, and confused provisions.

The opponents of open housing are, of course, unhappy with title IV.

Many respected constitutional lawyers have seriously questioned the constitutionality of title IV. It is in this area, Mr. Chairman, that I have grave concern for title IV of this bill. Of course, the advocates of State rights have opposed title IV, contending that the States rightfully and logically should be allowed to resolve the problem.

The American people, I believe, have made it clear that they are not now ready for title IV. I suggest that each Member of this Committee refer to the correspondence he has received from his district on this title of the bill.

No matter, Mr. Chairman, how praiseworthy the objectives to end discrimination in all forms may be, no matter how valiantly the members of the Judiciary Committee have labored to bring out an acceptable and workable bill, the fact is that title IV as it is now before us satisfies no one, fails to achieve its objectives, and creates more problems than it solves.

At least, under present conditions and circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to all that we in the committee were unable to reach an agreement upon constructive and effective legislation regarding open housing.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the essence of my amendment will be to strike out title IV of the bill, and I respectfully request the support of the Members of this Committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIAS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, when will it be in order for me to seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Mathias perfecting amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in order for the gentleman from Minnesota to offer such an amendment after the gentleman from Maryland has concluded his remarks on his amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, assuming that the gentleman is recognized for that purpose and offers his substitute, then is it correct to say that no other amendments or substitutes will be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Then at what point would additional amendments be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the Mathias amendment would be in order. An amendment to the substitute, if it is offered—the substitute for the Mathias amendment, if it is offered—would be in order.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. At that point, those would have to be disposed of before other amendments could be offered.

Mr. CRAMER. If I understand correctly, an amendment to the substitute, if offered, would be in order, and an amendment to the Mathias amendment would also be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Under what conditions can a perfecting amendment to title IV be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] was to strike out all of title IV. What does it perfect? Or what would it then perfect?

The CHAIRMAN. Under our rules—the rules of the House, and ordinary parliamentary procedure—the basic legislation is perfected before there is a vote on an amendment to strike.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the Chair has correctly stated the rules of the House—and I do not at this moment accept that he has—would the vote then occur in this manner: if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr MacGregor] offers substitute language, would there first be a vote on the substitute language which is intended to be offered by Mr. MacGregor to the perfecting amendment?

Then, if that substitute language is rejected, would the so-called perfecting amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] be voted on? And, if that amendment or that so-called perfecting amendment is rejected, would the vote then occur on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] to strike all of title IV?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's assumptions are correct, unless there intervened after the defeat of the substitute amendment which may be offered and the perfecting amendment which has been offered another amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Am I correct in assuming from the ruling of the Chair that a vote on the amendment to strike title IV, by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] can only occur if the substitute amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] is defeated, and if the so-called perfecting amendment by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] is defeated?

The CHAIRMAN. Eventually, the Chair will have to say to the gentleman, the Moore motion to strike will be voted on. The Chair cannot guess how many perfecting amendments will be offered before that event takes place.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Under the rules of the House, how many more perfecting amendments can be offered? Is there a limit?

The CHAIRMAN. As many more perfecting amendments as are in order at the time they are offered and as are allowed by the Committee.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the Chair cite the specific rule of the House which would allow the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] to offer this amendment as a perfecting amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule is No. XIX and the precedents contained thereunder.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the Chair cite those precedents?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be delighted to, if the gentleman will give him a little time.

The Chair will read from "Cannon's Precedents," volume 8, page 448, section 2,860:

> A perfecting amendment has precedence of a motion to strike out and must be first voted on when both are pending, but a member recognized on a motion to strike out may not be deprived of the floor by another member proposing a perfecting amendment.

This is the situation at present.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the Mathias perfecting amendment is adopted, will additional amendments then be in order before a vote on the Moore amendment can be taken?

The CHAIRMAN. They would be, under the precedents.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is the gentleman on his feet?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana is as much on his feet as the gentleman from Illinois who raised the question now is.

A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have one more parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I should like to know: Must every additional amendment that follows to title IV be in the form of a perfecting amendment?

The **CHAIRMAN.** No, that is not necessarily true; but they could be.

Mr. **MATHIAS.** Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Maryland will state it.

Mr. **MATHIAS.** Was I not recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk has not yet reported the amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. **WHITENER.** Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Will the gentlemen who desire to make parliamentary inquiries allow the Clerk to report the amendment?

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS: On page 65, after line 14, insert the following:

"(e) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, or be construed to prohibit, a real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or employee or agent of any real estate broker, agent, or salesman from complying with the express written instruction of any person not in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, or otherwise not subject to the prohibitions of this section pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) hereof, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling owned by such person, if such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman, or any employee or agent thereof."

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, is a moving of the previous question on the Moore amendment in order at this time?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The motion is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **MATHIAS.** Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I am seeking to keep faith with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. It merely restates what has already been stated. The language we have employed has been said by some to be obscure. Those who objectively sought the meaning have, however, been able to find it.

But as I said in general debate, I do not seek to write a legal brief. I do seek to help enact an equitable bill. Thus I am offering this amendment to remove any lingering doubts about what I meant then and about what I mean now. The amendment neither strengthens nor weakens the bill. It simply repeats in the active, permissive tense what is already passively implicit.

With this amendment, I believe this title will pass the House and the other body, and a great opportunity will be open to all Americans. But I remind you that we are now making legislative history. If you reject this amendment, which is clear and unequivocal in its terms, you will be just as clearly and unequivocally adopting the interpretation of those who have sought to becloud this whole issue, and will be denying the right of the homeowner to make an exempted sale through the normal channels of business.

If you defeat this amendment, you will have defeated the purpose and spirit of the compromise which broke the deadlock in the Judiciary Committee. If you defeat this amendment, then, by all the rules of legislative interpretation, what has been called the "Mathias compromise" will no longer be before the House.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACGREGOR

Mr. **MACGREGOR.** Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk and have submitted to the Parliamentarian an amendment in the nature of a supplement to the perfecting amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACGREGOR: On page 62, strike out lines 15 through 20.

On page 62, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through page 63, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 403. (a) It shall be unlawful for the owner, lessee, sublessee, assignee, or manager of, or other person having the authority to sell, rent, lease, or manage, a dwelling, or for any person who is a real estate broker or salesman, or employee or agent of a real estate broker or salesman—".

On page 64, strike out lines 19 through 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner (or to an agent acting under the instructions of the owner) with respect to the rental of a dwelling which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families, whether or not living independently of each other, if such owner actually occupies such dwelling as his residence."

Mr. **MACGREGOR.** Mr. Chairman, let me take the first portion of my time to describe what this substitute, if adopted, would do.

First, Mr. Chairman, my proposal would leave us with an antidiscrimination-in-housing section that would cover all sales, as indeed the original bill recommended by the administration would have done and as provided in H.R. 14765 in the form in which it was approved by the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to rentals, it would provide three exceptions:

First, it would except charitable or fraternal or religious homes from the antidiscrimination ban.

Second, it would except Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse, or, if you will, the social security widow who rents some rooms in her house. She would not be covered by the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the third exception is the four-plex exception, which covers multiunit dwellings of up to four units where the owner occupies one of those four units.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer these rental exceptions in this substitute in a desire to conform insofar as is possible with existing State laws.

The first exception, the religious and fraternal exception, is present in the laws of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and others.

The second exception, rooms in an owner-occupied dwelling, is the same as the law of Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

The third exception, which is the duplex or "four-plex" exemption, is found in the laws of Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, people have said to me, "Do you really mean by your proposal to provide for Federal antidiscrimination laws that reach to all sales, including owner-occupied, single-family dwellings?"

Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is "Yes."

Yes, Mr. Chairman, a man's home is his castle, but when he leaves it and sells it, how can it be contended that in his absence it continues to be his castle?

Mr. Chairman, I speak to those in this Chamber who believe deeply in equality of opportunity for all American citizens, and I speak to those who voted in such overwhelming numbers in 1957, 1960, and in my time in this body, 1964 and 1965, in support of civil rights legislation.

I ask you to consider—and if you can find the time, to reread the testimony given before Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 by the highest ranking legal officer of our Government, Attorney General Katzenbach, and the testimony of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Weaver.

I seek your support for this proposal of mine if you believe deeply as I do in the goal of equal opportunity in housing for as many Americans as is reasonably possible and constitutionally proper.

Mr. **RODINO.** Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the Mathias amendment and in opposition to the MacGregor amendment and the Moore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a critical and crucial issue which faces us. It is a challenge to each of us. The question is, Shall we or shall we not do that which we believe necessary to help end the practice of discrimination in the area of housing?

While I would want to do everything necessary to end all discrimination in this area, I have learned while here to be realistic enough to recognize that one must of necessity be practical in order to achieve the realization of a good objective without forsaking basic principles.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason I believe a compromise in support of the Mathias amendment at this time is not a compromise of principles but rather a compromise based on reality and practicality.

Further, having heard all of the debate in the committee and in the subcommittee and knowing the sentiment of this House, I urge that we recognize the need here to support the Mathias amendment and to oppose the MacGregor amendment and the Moore amendment in order to establish the principle of nondiscrimination in the housing area.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], our chairman, who has conducted these deliberations unfortunately cannot be here today because of illness. And he has asked me to read this statement to the committee. This is Mr. CELLER's statement:

STATEMENT BY MR. CELLER

Mr. Chairman, I support the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland. What this amendment does is clarify the intent of the committee when it considered and accepted the Mathias amendment to title IV.

For 43 years I have watched the give and take on the floor of the House and I have learned that the all-or-nothing attitude produces nothing except a slogan. We have always the vision of human perfectability before us, and mankind has taken faltering step after faltering step towards it. Since we have not reached that horizon, we can only hope that flexibility, reason and understanding will move us much closer to that vision than would rigidity, self-righteousness, intolerance, and/or cunning.

If we are to exempt the owner, as we do in the bill before us, then it needs must follow that in allowing him to pursue his preference, we do the same for the agent of his choice. We cannot treat the principal in one manner and the agent in another, when he is the agent following the express written directions of his principal. If we exempt the owner, as we do in this bill before us, then in all fairness we should not hobble him by refusing him the services of an agent who can act upon his, the owner's, instructions. It is clear that if the owner issues no instructions, then the broker comes fully within the provisions of this title.

Certainly the people of the United States are no strangers to open-housing mandates. Seventeen States have enacted fair housing laws which prohibit discrimination in the private housing sector. They include: Alaska, California, Colorado, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin, in addition to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

All these States provide criminal penalties for violations. All these States except Alaska and Michigan cover real estate brokers.

Moreover, 25 municipalities have fair housing ordinances prohibiting discrimination in the private housing sector; 40 municipalities have adopted resolutions or ordinances opposing discrimination in public housing. Hence, the ground we tread today is not completely uncharted territory.

I ask my colleagues to join realism to idealism and in so joining reach a workable and acceptable conclusion. I ask my colleagues to stay with me in support of this perfecting amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS, of Maryland, and oppose the amendments offered by Mr. MOORE and Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the MacGregor and Mathias amendments. We have heard a great deal of philosophy about open housing, but we have heard very little said about the rights of individuals who own property. And as I speak here today in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], and support the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], I hope that my remarks will be interpreted to be remarks made in the interest of preserving the constitutional rights of people who, by dint of their own energies and by their zeal, have moved ahead economically, and I express the hope that they will not have their rights trampled down in the interests of this great dream that some have expressed here today.

If you have any doubt about how far reaching this rather inexplicable title goes, I invite your attention to an analysis written in an objective manner by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The analysis is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE OPEN HOUSING PROVISIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED "CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966" AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (H. REPT NO. 1678, 89TH CONG., 2D SESS.

(By Raymond J. Celada, legislative attorney, American Law Division, Library of Congress, Legislature Reference Services, July 21, 1966)

INTRODUCTION

On April 28, 1966, President Johnson sent Congress a message proposing an omnibus civil rights bill entitled the "Civil Rights Act of 1966." The legislation introduced on May 2, 1966, as H.R. 14765, provided among other things, for judicial relief from discrimination in housing.

The bill prohibited discrimination in the sale, rental, or financing of all housing. Builders, realtors, banks, homeowners, or any persons engaging in the sale, rental or financing of housing were subject to the provisions of the bill. It provided that any individual discriminated against could seek redress in the federal or state courts. Also, it authorized the Justice Department to institute suits where it found "prevailing patterns" of discrimination.

A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on this and various other civil rights measures on May 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24 and 25, 1966. (Civil Rights, 1966. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, Serial No. 16.)

Upon conclusion of the public hearings, the subcommittee spent six days in executive session considering the bill. The subcommittee struck out everything after the enacting clause and approved an amendment in the nature of a substitute which it recommended to the full Judiciary Committee. No change was made in the open housing title (IV), and the subcommittee withheld its recommendation with respect to these provisions.

Thereafter, following nine sessions devoted to consideration of the bill, the full committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute bill made a number of major changes in the fair housing title, principally in the areas of coverage and enforcement. Generally, the committee-amended version limits Title IV's prohibitions to real estate brokers, lending institutions, and others engaged in the business of building, developing, buying, selling, renting, leasing or financing residential housing.

The second major change approved by the committee was the adoption of an administrative enforcement remedy. This amendment establishes an enforcement agency with power to issue cease and desist orders.

ANALYSIS

1. Policy. Section 401 of the revised bill declares that it is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation. The original version of the policy statement made an additional point, specifically, the right of every person to be protected against discrimination in residential housing. The omission of the latter provision goes hand in hand with the reduced coverage approved by the committee. Thus, whereas the original bill protected the right of every person to be free from all housing discrimination, the committee substitute—despite the adoption of an additional remedy—protects the right of every person with respect to *some* housing discrimination. In short, although the object of the bill remains unaltered, the number of subjects covered by its provisions have been considerably reduced.

2. Definitions. Section 402 contains the definition of various key terms used in Title IV of the bill.

The term "person" remains unchanged and includes one or more individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and fiduciaries.

The term "dwelling" has undergone a significant change in the committee reported version. Under the terms of the original bill, "dwelling" was defined to include not only "any building or structure, or portion thereof, whether in existence or under construction, which is in, or is designed, intended, or arranged for residential use by one or more individuals or families," but also any vacant land that was offered for the construction of residential housing. Although it is difficult to assess the import of the omission of vacant land in terms of actual market transactions, it would not appear to be insubstantial. More significant, perhaps, is the opportunity it may present large tract developers to circumvent the bill's prohibitions by passing title to the lot in advance of actual development thereof by tacit agreement of the parties.

The Phrase "discriminatory housing practices" remains unchanged and means any act prohibited by sections 403 or 404.

The committee added a new paragraph to the definitions section, providing that a person shall be deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, renting or leasing dwellings if he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as either principal or agent in three or more transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest in a dwelling. This provision indicates what section 403 makes obvious, namely, that Title IV's prohibitions are limited to persons, both natural persons and legal entities, that are in the business of building, developing, buying, selling, renting or leasing residential housing. Stated differently, it exempts a homeowner from charges of discrimination when he sells or rents his property. On the other hand, a homeowner may bring himself within the provisions of Title IV by engaging in more than two transactions during a twelve month period. In effect, the bill presumes that three transactions constitute business dealings in the narrower sense.

The word "business" qualifies the word "transactions" so as to suggest that the dealings that convert the owner to a dealer are those in which he acts as a vendor or lessor or the agent of either. In other words, it appears that the sale and simultaneous or subsequent purchase of a new or larger house by an owner do not constitute two transactions, thus exhausting his exemption for any twelve month period. Briefly, then, an owner is free to discriminate in two sales, rentals or leases a year.

The committee reported text uses the plural buildings—e.g., "business of buildings"—when the singular building is clearly indicated.

3. Prohibited Discrimination. Section 403 outlaws discrimination with regard to enumerated classes of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The vari-

ous classes of persons coming under the title are real estate brokers, agents, or salesmen, or employees or agents of real estate brokers, agents, or salesmen, or any persons in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings.

The committee bill's section 403 makes it unlawful for any of the several classes of covered persons—(1) to refuse to sell, rent, or lease, or negotiate for the sale, rental, or lease of, or otherwise deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin; (2) to discriminate in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale, rental, or lease or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith because of race, color, religion, or national origin; (3) to make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed or published, any oral or written notice or advertisement with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling that indicates any discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination; (4) to refuse or fail to show a dwelling, which he is authorized to show because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or to fail to submit promptly to his principal any offer to buy, rent, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin or to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental, or lease; (5) to represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that a dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, rental, or lease when it is in fact so available; (6) to deny to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of the person he represents or may represent, access to or participation in any multiple-listing service or facilities related to the business of selling or renting dwellings; or (7) to engage in any act or practice the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

As already noted, this section underwent significant change in committee. The kinds of discrimination covered continue to be the same—i.e., race, color, religion, and national origin. Similarly, five of the seven specified acts made unlawful appeared in substantially the same form in the original version of the bill. In virtually all other respects the section approved by the committee represents a major departure from the introduced text.

The most significant change, of course, is the classes of persons coming under the bill. The text accompanying the President's message applied to any person capable of passing any interest in a dwelling. Thus, the original bill's enumeration of covered categories of persons included not only real estate brokers or salesmen, or employees or agents of real estate brokers or salesmen, but also owners, lessees, sublessees, assignees, or managers of, or other persons having the authority to sell, rent, lease, or manage a dwelling. This all inclusive list and the bill's broad definition of "dwelling" plus the absence of even a single express exemption implied the total elimination of discrimination in housing. The committee substitute, as previously noted, limits the bill's prohibitions to persons in the business of building, developing, buying, selling, renting or leasing residential housing. Under the committee's revision, the only way an owner may be affected is to engage in more than two transactions a year.

Both the original and the committee texts declared the following discriminatory acts to be unlawful:

(1) Discrimination with regard to the sale, rental, or lease of residential housing or refusing to negotiate the same.

(2) Discrimination with regard to terms, conditions, or privileges of such sale, rental, or lease, or in the provision of services or facilities connected therewith.

(3) Printing or publishing any notice, statement or advertisement that indicates discrimination or any intention to discriminate with regard to the sale, rental, or lease of residential housing.

(4) Misrepresenting the availability for inspection, sale, rental, or lease of residential housing.

(5) Discrimination with regard to access to or participation in any multiple listing service or other services or facilities related to the business of selling or renting residential housing.

The committee bill lists two additional kinds of unlawful activities. The first makes it unlawful for anyone of the covered classes of persons to refuse or fail to show a dwelling which he is authorized to show, because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or to fail to promptly submit to his principal any offer to buy, rent, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin, or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental, or lease. The second makes it unlawful for any person in the business of housing to engage in any act or practice the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The activities prohibited by the bill raise a number of significant questions. Many more will doubtless come to light during the course of Title IV's administration if and when enacted into law. Perhaps one of the most vexing questions concerns the application of the title to the sale or rental of property by an owner who lists such property with a real estate broker. In other words, while it is evident that Title IV does not prohibit discrimination by an owner if he personally sells or rents his home, is the owner prohibited if he employs a broker? The bill is not altogether clear on this point and the committee report does little more than set forth the bill's basic provisions. According to published accounts of the reported bill, Congressman MATHIAS, a Member of the House Judiciary Committee, is reported as having stated that the homeowner exemption would also apply when he lists his property with a broker. See the New York Times, Thursday, June 30, 1966, pp. 1, 23.

It is clear that if the broker on his own initiative chooses to discriminate he is liable under Title IV. The question arises where the exempt owner gives a broker a restricted listing requiring the property to be shown whites only. Assuming the accuracy of the remarks attributed to Congressman MATHIAS, what supports the purported exemption? It would appear that such a result must be gleaned, if at all, from the language of either of the two new prohibitions added in committee since the others, while now applicable to a narrower class of persons, are virtually identical to those in the original version of the bill. The latter, as noted elsewhere, banned all forms of discrimination by both homeowners and brokers. The only apparent language capable of sustaining this view is found in the initial clause of the first of the two committee additions which makes it unlawful for a broker "to fail or refuse to show any dwelling which he is authorized to show to prospective buyers, rentors, or lessors . . ." By emphasizing the word "authorized", it may be argued that a broker commits a violation only when he fails to show a property to a person of a particular race despite the fact that he has been "authorized" to show it to all comers. Conversely, when he is not "authorized" to show it to all comers, the act, however discriminatory, is not unlawful. Such a construction is at best cumbersome and, assuming the desirability of the contemplated exemption, it might be advisable to set it out with more clarity.

The section banning discriminatory advertising raises another important question. That section speaks in terms of advertisements connoting "any preference, limitation, or discrimination". What exactly is contemplated by the quoted language? Not infrequently, notices for the sale of residential housing include reference to the property's proximity to a particular church and/or a parochial school. Does such a reference betray an intention to make a "preference, limitation, or discrimination" because of "religion"? The insertion of such a reference, unlike that of proximity to public transportation, is equivocal. However, like the other, it may represent nothing more than a desire to stimulate buyer interest.

In addition to the homeowner exemption, section 403 of the committee bill carves out two other new exemptions. Generally, most apartment rentals are covered. Paragraph (b), however, exempts from coverage the sale, rental, or lease of a portion of a building containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if the owner occupies one of such living quarters. In short, the committee amendment exempts buildings of four units or less when the owner lives on the premises. This is the so-called Mrs. Murphy's boarding house exemption.

The second exemption permits any religious or denominational institution, or any charitable or educational institution or organization which is operated, supervised, or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, or any bona fide private or fraternal organization, to give preference to persons of the same religion or denomination, or to members of such private or fraternal organization, or to make such selection as is calculated to promote the religious principles or the aims, purposes for which it is established or maintained. Similar exemptions are found in many state open occupancy laws and presumably this experience may be relied upon in borderline cases.

The final provision in section 403 makes clear that nothing in Title IV is intended to affect any liability for payment of a real estate or other commission.

4. Financial Institutions. Section 404 of the bill prohibits discrimination in the financing of housing. The section which is unchanged from the original, makes it unlawful for any bank, savings and loan institution, credit union, insurance company, or other lender of money for the purchase, construction, repair, or maintenance of dwellings to refuse to make such loans, or to discriminate in the terms or conditions thereof, because of the race, color, religion or national origin of the borrower or of the prospective occupants of the dwellings involved. It should be noted that this prohibition is applicable to any transaction involving all residential housing. In brief, no exemption is, expressly or impliedly, authorized.

5. Intimidation. Section 405 of the committee bill, a carryover from the original, prohibits any persons from intimidating, threatening, coercing, or interfering with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or because he has exercised or enjoyed, or aided or encouraged another in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right safeguarded by section 403 or 404. This section is intended to protect Negroes and others from threats, etc., not only by parties to any negotiation or prospective transaction but from any third parties who seek to forestall the same. It reaches similar conduct in retaliation for having negotiated the purchase or rental of a dwelling and/or for having consummated the same. Finally, it reaches similar

activities directed at persons who aid or encourage others in the enjoyment of these rights.

Although section 405 contains no express criminal penalties, the conduct proscribed therein may be prosecuted under Title V of the bill which deals with interference with rights. Section 501(a)(5) of that title makes it a crime for any person, by force or threat of force, to injure, intimidate or otherwise interfere with, or to attempt to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin while he is lawfully engaged or seeking to engage in selling, purchasing, renting, leasing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, rental, lease, or occupation of any dwelling.

Section 501(b) makes it a crime for any person, by force or threat of force, to injure, intimidate, or otherwise interfere with, or attempt to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person to discourage lawful participation by such person in any of the benefits or activities described in paragraph (a) or because any such person has participated or sought to participate in such activities or urged or aided others to so participate. In addition, it makes it a crime to use force or the threat of force against any person because he has engaged in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity to so participate.

These provisions of Title V, surpassing in breadth section 405, authorize a graduated scheme of penalties depending upon the seriousness of the injury inflicted upon the victim. The general maximum penalty prescribed in the absence of bodily harm is a $1,000 fine or 1 year imprisonment or both. In the case of bodily harm, the maximum penalty is a $10,000 fine or 10 years imprisonment or both. Where the victim is deprived of his life, the maximum penalty authorized by Title V is "any term of years or for life."

As will be seen shortly, section 406 authorizes a civil remedy for violations of section 405.

Although the language of section 405 as supplemented by section 501 appears to reach many forms of retaliatory action against persons because they have opposed discriminatory housing practices forbidden by Title IV, there is some doubt whether these sections protect persons against retaliation because they have filed a complaint, testified or assisted in any proceeding under this title. The rights protected by section 405 are the rights to be free from discrimination by brokers, etc. under 503 and by financial institutions under 404. Nothing in these sections specifically relates to enforcement. The rights protected by section 501 are the rights to be free from injury, intimidation, or interference by various persons relative to the sale, purchase, rental, lease, occupancy, or contract or negotiation of sale, rental, etc. of any dwelling. Although it may be argued that freedom from retaliation for bringing a proceeding to enforce the right goes hand in hand with the basic rights protected, Congress on other occasions has expressly provided a safeguard.*

6. Enforcement—Private Persons. Although the revised bill retains the private legal remedy proposed by the original bill's section 406, the committee has made a number of signficant changes. The language of subsection (a) containing the general authority for private suits, is identical with that found in the bill as introduced. Briefly, it authorizes civil actions in appropriate federal district courts and state courts to enforce the rights granted in sections 403, 404 and 405. The action must be initiated within six months of the alleged violation.

Paragraph (b) provides that upon application of any party the federal court may waive the payment of fees, costs or security in any civil action brought under section 406(a). Also upon petition, the court may appoint an attorney for any party or parties under such circumstances as it considers just. Similar authority is given state and local courts to the extent their laws and procedure allow. The committee made only one change with respect to paragraph (b), but that change is an important one. The original version used the word "complainant" rather than "party or parties in a civil action under section 406(a)". The net effect of this change is to extend the benefits of the paragraph to respondents as well as complainants.

Section 406(c) authorizes the court to grant appropriate relief, including injunctive relief, and to award actual damages, or in the alternative, if the defendant has received or agreed to receive compensation for services during the courses of which the discriminatory housing practice occurred, to award as liquidated damages an amount not exceeding such compensation. As originally proposed, paragraph (c) authorized injunctive relief and monetary damages, including damages for humiliation and mental pain and suffering, and up to $500 punitive damages. Despite the rather substantial language change adopted by the committee, it may be that the only really new matter is the provision authorizing in the alternative the award of liquidated (meaning fixed) damages—i.e., defendant's commission. The deletion of the specific reference to damages for humiliation and mental pain and suffering would not necessarily bar their recovery. The section's authorization of actual damages would generally permit recovery of all damages proved by complainant, including, in many jurisdictions, humiliation and mental pain and suffering. The measure of damages is ordinarily governed by the law of the state where the tort is committed. Consequently, if state law permits recovery for these factors, they may be awarded in an action under section 406. Likewise, the deletion of punitive damages does not necessarily affect the award of so-called smart money—save, of course, to remove the original bill's $500 ceiling—if complainant can prove actual damages and malice on the part of defendant. While the states differ with respect to recovery of punitive damages in the absence of statute, the majority seem to allow it. See 22 Am. Jur. 2d 238 (1965).

Paragraph (d) of the original bill simply provided that the prevailing party in a civil action authorized by section 406(a) could recover reasonable attorney's fees as an element of court costs. Generally, an amount for reasonable attorney's fees is not part of a judgment unless expressly authorized by statute. The committee revision omits any reference to attorney's fees and in its place inserts a new subsection authorizing the court to give states and localities with appropriate laws the initial opportunity to remedy a charge of housing discrimination. Thus, section 406(d) provides that when a case is brought under section 406(a) alleging a discriminatory housing practice prohibited by an applicable state or local law and from which relief can be obtained under state or local law, the court may, upon issuance of a temporary injunction or other appropriate order preserving the complainant's right to obtain all relief, including the opportunity to buy or rent the specific dwelling with respect to which the alleged housing practice occurred, stay the action up to 30 days pending referral by the court or by the complainant, as appropriate, to relevant state or local authorities. At the end of the stay, the court may order a further stay for such additional period as it deems appropriate or pending termination of state or local proceedings, if it believes the state or local proceeding will be conducted expeditiously and that a stay will serve the interests of justice. In the event of such a further stay, the court may continue or withdraw any orders it has previously issued, as justice requires. Issuance or withdrawal of any temporary injunction or other order may be conditioned upon the posting of reasonable bond or other security. If the court directs the complainant to make reasonable efforts to initiate appropriate proceedings under applicable state or local law and the complainant fails to do so and does not show good cause for such failure, the court may, in its discretion, dismiss the action.

The practice of acceding initially to applicable state authorities, follows the precedent established in the public accommodations and equal employment opportunity provision of the 1964 Act, and is doubtless, intended to encourage enactment and more effective enforcement of relevant state and local laws.

7. Enforcement—Attorney General. The committee bill adopts without modification the original bill's section providing for enforcement by the Attorney General.

Section 407(a) authorizes the Attorney General to bring a civil action for injunctive relief whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of his rights granted by Title IV.

Section 407(b) authorizes the Attorney General to intervene in a civil action brought by a private person in a federal court under this title, if he certifies that the action is of general public importance. In such cases, the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it were a party complainant.

Again, both these subsections are reminiscent of provisions applicable to other situations in the 1964 Act. During the debate on the earlier measure, then Senator HUMPHREY gave the following explanation of "pattern or practice" of discrimination as it applied to public accommodations and fair housing: ". . . is meant to exclude action in sporadic instances of violation of rights, which will be left to correction by individual complainants under other sections of these titles. It would be clear that an establishment or employer that consistently or avowedly denies rights under these titles is engaged in a 'pattern or practice of resistance.'

"The Attorney General may obtain relief in public accommodations and employment cases only where a pattern or practice has been shown to exist. Such a pattern or practice would be present only when the denial of rights consists of something more than an isolated, sporadic incident, but is repeated, routine, or of a generalized nature. There would be a pattern or practice if, for example, a number of companies or persons in the same industry or line of business discriminated, if a chain of motels or restaurants practiced racial discrimination throughout all or a significant part of its system, or if a company repeatedly and regularly engaged in acts prohibited by the statute.

---

* The National Labor Relations Act, for example, expressly provides that similar conduct with respect to an unfair labor charge shall be considered an unfair labor practice. 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(4). See also 42 U.S.C. 2000 e-3(a) dealing with retaliation in connection with an unlawful employment practice charge. State fair housing laws frequently protect against this kind of activity. Thus, section 296(7) of the New York Act provides:

"It shall be an unlawful discriminatory practice for any person engaged in any activity to which this section applies to retaliate or discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden under this article or because he has filed a complaint, testified or assisted in any proceeding under this article." New York Executive Law.

"As a further safeguard, the bill requires a showing that those engaged in the pattern or practice had the intention to deprive others of their rights under Title II or Title VII. That is, where several companies are involved, the Attorney General could not show a pattern or practice by proving that one company refused to serve a Negro because of his race and several other companies also refused service but for legitimate reasons. That kind of a showing would not satisfy the requirement of intent; what is required is a showing of intentional discrimination. Intention could, of course, be proved by, or inferred from, words, conduct, or both. The issue would then be whether, as a matter of fact, there was a refusal of service or employment amounting to a pattern or practice, or whether the companies acted in concert or in a conspiracy. And the bill would authorize the Attorney General to join all or some of several defendants in the same action.

"The point is that single, insignificant, isolated acts of discrimination by a single business would not justify a finding of a pattern or practice, and thus the fears which have been expressed in this regard are totally groundless. (110 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13745, 13776 (daily ed., June 17, 1964).)

Briefly, then, the Attorney General's suit is limited to situations where there is concerted or persistent interference with rights protected by sections 403 and 404 of this title.

8. Enforcement—Fair Housing Board. As noted at the outset, the committee has supplemented the enforcement provisions of Title IV by authorizing an administrative remedy. Section 408(a) establishes a Fair Housing Board of five members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than three members may belong to the same political party. Members will have staggered five year terms and shall be paid at the yearly rates of $25,000, except for the chairman, who shall be paid $25,500. The chairman will be designated by the President. Three members shall constitute a quorum.

Section 408(b) authorizes the Board, in accordance with civil service laws, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

Section 408(c) authorizes the Board to issue necessary and proper rules and regulations, to delegate any or all of its powers to any three or more of its members, and to delegate its authority to conduct hearings to any member, agent, or agency.

Section 408(d) authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to investigate violations of sections 403, 404, and 405 of this title, either on the basis of information giving reasonable grounds for the belief that a violation has occurred or upon receipt of a written statement from a person who alleges that he is aggrieved by such violation.

Section 408(e) provides that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for purposes of investigation, and the Board, for purposes of hearing, shall have the same powers and be subject to the same conditions and limitations as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under 29 U.S.C. 161. That section confers upon the N.L.R.B. diverse investigatory powers. For purposes of all hearings and investigations which in the opinion of the N.L.R.B. are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by sections 159 and 160, dealing with investigations of questions concerning the representation of employees and unfair labor practices, respectively, the Board is empowered to subpoena witnesses and documentary evidence. Any member of the N.L.R.B. is empowered to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to matters under investigation or in question. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena, the N.L.R.B. may make application to the appropriate district court, which is empowered to issue orders requiring obedience, and to punish for contempt if necessary. Witnesses may not be excused from testifying or producing evidence on grounds of self-incrimination; however, they are immune from any prosecution, penalty, or forfeiture—except perjury—for or on account of anything on which they are compelled to testify or produce in evidence. Process of the N.L.R.B. may be served personally or by registered mail or telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. Witnesses and deponents are entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States. Court process may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found. All federal boards and agencies are required, when ordered by the President, to answer the N.L.R.B.'s request for all records, papers and information relative to any matter before the Board.

Although the incorporation by reference of the N.L.R.B.'s investigatory power is probably sufficient to indicate generally the Fair Housing Board's power in this area, it would seem preferable to rewrite similar provisions into Title IV. It should be noted that section 161 grants no roving commission, but is limited to the exercise of powers and functions embodied in sections 159 and 160 of the National Labor Relations Act. These conditions are totally unrelated to fair housing. Consequently, a question arises as to what delimiting factors, if any, apply. In view of the provisions of section 408(e) of the bill, it is obvious that the authors intended that these powers should be exercised for purposes of investigation by the Secretary of H.U.D. and for purposes of a hearing by the Board. However, this still leaves the occasion for much argument (and uncertainty) concerning the application of the introductory prepositional phrase to fair housing. These and other issues could be obviated by including an investigatory power section in Title IV tailored to the specific functions and purposes of the Secretary of H.U.D. and another to the quasi-judicial power and procedures of the Board as authorized by section 408.

Section 408(f) provides that if the Secretary finds, after investigation, that a violation has occurred, he shall file a written complaint with the Board stating his findings as well as the facts. The Secretary is required to serve a copy of the complaint on the person or persons charged with the violation. There is no requirement that he notify the complainant and no requirement of formal notice to anyone should he determine that no violation has occurred and apparently no way for the complainant to get a hearing before the Board should the Secretary make such determination.

Section 408(g) provides that the Board shall set a hearing after it receives a complaint from the Secretary but not before the passage of 10 days following service of the complaint on the respondent. The Secretary is directed to designate a person to present evidence in support of the complaint. There is no indication that the complainant may have his own attorney.

Section 408(h) provides that except as provided in sections 408(f) and 408(g), the Board shall conduct its hearings and issue and enforce its orders in the same manner, and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations and appellate procedures as are provided for the N.L.R.B. under 29 U.S.C. 160 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i) and (j), and that all parties to the hearing shall have the same rights as are provided therein. The exceptions provided in the initial clause of section 408(h) subordinate the N.L.R.A's provisions incorporated therein to the division of functions authorized by section 408(f) and the ten day limitation between service of complaint and hearing in section 408(g). The N.L.R.A. separates prosecution and enforcement between the General Counsel and the N.L.R.B., whereas Title IV separates these functions between the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Fair Housing Board. Moreover, the N.L.R.A. allows only five days between service of the complaint and hearing. (In actual practice, however, ten days are the rule.) These two differences between the N.L.R.A. and Title IV are reflected in the exception provided by section 408(h).

The subsections of section 160 of the N.L.R.A. adopted by section 408(h) relate to the power of the Board to prevent unfair labor practices. Paragraph (b) requires the Board to serve respondent with a copy of the complaint and notice of hearing. The hearing may not be held until at least five days after the respondent has been served with the complaint. No complaint shall be issued based upon an unfair labor practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of a charge with the Board. A complaint may be amended by any person conducting the hearing or the Board any time prior to the issuance of an order. Respondent is entitled to file an answer to the original or amended complaint and appear in person or otherwise and give testimony. Regional directors and trial examiners may grant intervention in person or by counsel or other representative to the extent and upon terms they deem proper. Hearings are to be conducted "so far as practicable" in accordance with the rules of evidence which apply in the federal courts.

Paragraph (c) of section 160 of the N.L.R.A. provides that all testimony shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. The Board, upon notice, may take additional testimony or hear additional arguments. If the Board is of the opinion, based on a preponderance of the testimony, that respondent has engaged or is engaging in an unlawful practice, it shall state its findings of fact and issue an order requiring respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful practice. In addition, the Board may order respondent to take other affirmative action including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay. Back pay may be required of either the employer or the labor organization, depending upon which is responsible for the discrimination suffered by the employee. The Board is required to apply the same policy to both affiliated and independent labor organizations in issuing complaints and in framing its remedies for unfair labor practices. If no sufficient case is made out, the Board shall issue an order dismissing the complaint. Neither reinstatement nor back pay shall be ordered where the employee was suspended or discharged for cause.

Upon the conclusion of a hearing on an unfair labor practice complaint, the trial examiner files an intermediate report in which he makes certain findings of facts and recommendations. If no exceptions are filed within 20 days after receipt of a copy of the intermediate report, the trial examiner's findings and recommendations automatically become those of the Board.

Paragraph (d) provides that the N.L.R.B. can change findings made and orders issued in a case any time prior to the filing of a transcript of the record with a court seeking enforcement or review of the orders.

Orders issued by the N.L.R.B. are subject both to enforcement and review in the courts. Enforcement proceedings are set forth in paragraph (e). Virtually the same procedural provisions are applicable in petitions by employers, unions or aggrieved parties, seeking review of Board orders pursuant to paragraph (f). It should be noted, however, that the review proceeding is a review of the Board's action rather than a trial de novo.

Sections 160 (e) and (f) of the N.L.R.A. give jurisdiction to the U.S. Court of Appeals to enforce, review or set aside Board orders seeking to remedy unfair labor practices. Petitions for review or enforcement may be filed in the circuit in which the unfair labor practice occurred or in which the party resides or does business. The U.S. District Courts may take jurisdiction to review Board proceedings where the appropriate Court of Appeals is on vacation. After the N.L.R.B. files a petition for enforcement of its order, it must certify and file with the court the record of the Board proceedings. Notice of the Board's action must also be served upon the party or parties against whom the order is entered. Full jurisdiction of the case is then acquired. A court is not limited to denying or granting enforcement of the Board's order as a whole. A decree may be entered "enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board." In enforcement or review proceedings, the court may not entertain or consider any objection which was not raised before the Board unless the failure or neglect to urge the objection is excusable because of extraordinary circumstances. Findings of fact by the Board "if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as whole" are conclusive and binding on the court. Leave to adduce additional evidence before the Board may be sought of the court by either party to the proceeding. It must be shown to the satisfaction of the court that the additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to present the evidence before the Board in the original hearing. If the leave is granted, the Board, after hearing the additional evidence, may modify its findings or make new findings and file recommendations for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The court's decree is final, subject to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Paragraph (g) of section 160 of the N.L.R.A. provides that proceedings for enforcement and review shall not stay the Board's order unless specifically directed by the court.

Paragraph (i) provides that petitions for enforcement and review are to be heard by the courts "expeditiously and if possible within ten days after they have been docketed."

Paragraph (j) authorizes the Board, after it has issued a complaint alleging the commission of unfair labor practices, to petition the appropriate district court for temporary relief or restraining order without waiting until it is ready to petition for enforcement of its order in an unfair labor practice case.

In order to obviate some of the more pronounced irrelevancies caused by the incorporation by reference of a distinctly labor statute, section 408(h) of Title IV provides that 29 U.S.C. 160(c) (N.L.R.A.) relative to reinstatement of employees and complaints under 29 U.S.C. 158 (a)(1) or (a)(2) are expressly made inapplicable. However, violations under this title shall be treated in the same manner as unfair labor practices under 29 U.S.C. 160, which is to say that the Board may bring a contempt action to secure compliance.

The incorporation of selected N.L.R.A. enforcement and review procedures which procedures have been heavily litigated raises a number of questions. Perhaps, the most obvious, is whether the decisional law is incorporated into Title IV along with the language of the relevant provisions of sections 160 and 161. This and other issues that may arise in the wake of the enactment of Title IV thus constituted would appear to militate in favor of adopting review and enforcement procedures specifically tailored to unfair housing rather than unfair labor practices.

9. Miscellaneous. The committee bill prescribes additional functions for the Secretary of H.U.D. including broad powers to study the problems of discrimination. Thus section 409 directs the Secretary to make studies and publish reports on discriminatory housing practices, cooperate with and render technical assistance to private or public agencies, including the Community Relations Service, and administer his Department's programs in a manner affirmatively to further policies of Title IV. However, pursuant to section 408(i), the Secretary may delegate any of his powers and duties under this title.

Section 410 is identical to section 409 of the bill as introduced which provided that no state or local law granting or protecting the same rights as are granted or protected by Title IV shall be invalidated or limited by Title IV. However, any state or local law that purports to require or permit a discriminatory housing practice shall to that extent be invalid.

Section 411, numbered 410 in the original, makes the jury trial provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, 42 U.S.C. 1995, available in voting rights suits, applicable to contempts arising under the bill. As a result, jury trials are required in any proceedings for criminal contempt where the aggregate fine exceeds $300 or the cumulative imprisonment exceeds 45 days. In other cases of criminal contempt the accused may be tried with or without a jury at the discretion of the judge. In any case of criminal contempt involving a natural person, the fine is not to exceed $1,000 nor imprisonment exceed the term of six months.

Section 412, numbered 411 in the introduced version, contains a separability clause. It provides that nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the authority of the federal government and its agencies or officers, to institute or intervene in any civil action or to bring any criminal prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, this title is shocking to most Americans—and let us not delude ourselves or anyone else. Most of you here on the floor of the House have expressed at one time or another your violent opposition to this unwarranted encroachment upon the rights of individual property owners in this country. You may stand up here and rave and talk about how we love everyone and be hypocritical if you desire. But when you get back into the quiet of your own room at your home, you will know whether or not you are being honest with yourself.

This is a terrible piece of legislation. This particular title has so many defects. When the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], who now tells you that he is perfecting it, undertook to perfect it in the committee, it almost brought national chaos. All over the Nation interpretations sprung up about what the gentleman had done. And what does he say now? He says, "I am going to perfect a clear amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], which is just as clear as crystal." The gentleman from West Virginia says, "Let us strike the whole title and be done with it."

But the great perfecter comes in. After having already engaged in an effort of great imperfection, he is going to try to make the clear language of the gentleman from West Virginia a little more perfect. How silly can we get? How ridiculous can we get? Why, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is going to perfect a title, and yet he did not say a word to you about striking out the language of section 403(a)(3), which is as unconstitutional as anything that I can imagine.

I wish the gentleman would perfect that. It says that "It shall be unlawful for any person who is a real estate broker," and so forth, "or any other person in the business" of real estate or in connection with it, "to make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination."

The gentleman ought to be concerned about perfecting that. Have we reached a point in America that a citizen cannot say to a newspaper man that he will do or not do a particular act?

I hope we will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and forget about these imperfections that are called perfecting amendments.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland and in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, the 26th of July, during general debate, I made a statement which I shall now repeat. It serves the purpose again. My position has been constant since that time, because it goes to the logic and to the heart of the question before us.

> The bill which is presently before us represents a compromise of the original title IV. The compromise has been a subject of some criticism, due to certain ambiguities which were born of the haste and the pressures with which it was presented and acted upon in the Committee on the Judiciary.
>
> At an appropriate time, under the 5-minute rule, an amendment will be offered to conform the language of the bill to the intentions of the supporters of the Mathias compromise in committee, of which I was one. The amendment, which I will support, will make it unmistakably clear that a real estate agent may act under the instructions of an exempted principal in promoting and completing an exempted sale.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the bill thus amended and perfected will represent measured and moderate balancing of the rights of the individual homeowner on the one hand and the rights of a prospective purchaser to fair access to the housing market on the other hand. As modified by the Mathias amendment, which is now before us, we will do that which was intended by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there has long been a cherished statement that, "A man's home is his castle." It comes down to us from Old England, when William Pitt, the elder said:

> The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of Eng-

> land can not enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

The Mathias amendment will insure that a man's home is his castle now and for as long as the Mathias amendment is effective.

I hope the Mathias amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mathias amendment, in opposition to the Moore amendment and to the MacGregor amendment.

First, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. MacGregor] has said that we are returning to title IV of the bill which was sent up by the administration.

This bill contains a policy statement as he indicated, that there should not be any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in residential housing.

May I state to the House that we considered this proposal for many days in the subcommittee. The subcommittee heard the testimony in connection with this particular title. But it postponed consideration of title IV until the end of its executive sessions. The subcommittee sent title IV as it is printed, beginning on page 25 of the bill print on to the full committee. That was reported to the full committee without recommendation.

The full committee, then, acting upon an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] took its action. It was explained to the committee that certain exemptions would be made.

One of those exemptions is that an individual homeowner can have at least two sales in a 12-month period before he is deemed to be in the housing business. That was an exemption.

There was also an exemption for the so-called Mrs. Murphy boarding house and four-family unit dwellings.

There was some misunderstanding as to the real intent and purpose of the gentleman from Maryland—at least as he stated it to the committee—to exempt the real estate agent who might be selling a home for an exempt homeowner. The result was that the exemption did not extend to a real estate agent under the terms and conditions of the bill as reported and now before the House. The individual homeowner has the right to sell, or not sell, to whomever he pleases, but he cannot, by specifically instructing his agent, lift the agent out of the coverage of the bill.

It was then, as pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio, that the Mathias amendment was offered to perfect the language.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentioned my name, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will yield to the gentleman when I finish, if I have time.

The intention of the Mathias amendment is to permit the real estate agent if he complies with the written instructions of the homeowner to be outside the prohibitions of title IV.

Now, the MacGregor amendment would not permit that. It would not exclude an individual homeowner. That is the reason why the MacGregor amendment is not acceptable under the provisions of the bill which has been reported by the committee. It would conform to many of the State laws that do not permit discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I believe we should defeat the MacGregor amendment, adopt the Mathias amendment, and defeat the Moore amendment.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Does the gentleman agree with Attorney General Katzenbach when he testified before Subcommittee No. 5 and he said:

> If it is a question of exempting single-family dwellings, I think it would have a very major impact in terms of destroying the effectiveness of the bill.

Does the gentleman agree with the Attorney General that by exempting single-family dwelling sales we would be gutting the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the MacGregor amendment and the Mathias amendment. I support the Moore motion to strike this title. The basic objections to this title are the lack of constitutionality and so forth. They have been discussed in great detail during the debate here. I want to limit myself for the moment to the Mathias amendment.

I would hope that each and every one of you before you assume that there is something magic about the Mathias amendment—and apparently there is something to the Mathias amendment—I hope you examine what the Mathias amendment does and what is to come hereafter.

Now, what does the Mathias amendment do? Does it take the real estate man out of the basic problem he has under the Mathias amendment that initially passed the committee? That amendment tried to get the real estate man in a position to represent the owner when there is a two-family transaction or a so-called Mrs. Murphy transaction. It tried to get him out from under the bill, but it does not do it at all. If you read this, it reads him out in the first clauses and reads him right back in the last clause.

This is typical of this whole title IV operation. It is obvious that what the proponents want to do is to give an exemption which is not really an exemption at all, if they can get away with it. That is what the Mathias amendment to the amendment does. It says, "if such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman or any employee or agent thereof."

So the party has an absolute right to bring the suit on every selective transaction. The real estate man then has to defend himself on the basis that he did not suggest to the property owner that he had a right to selectivity because if he had done so, he would have induced that party—in the language of the bill—to take advantage of that exclusion. Now, what kind of sense does that make? It reads the real estate man right back into the picture in that the real estate man cannot even suggest that the party is entitled to the exclusion. I thought the exclusion was to be absolute. This does not look absolute to me. The real estate man is written right back into the middle of the fight as to whether or not "such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman or any employee or agent thereof." Maybe the gentleman does not intend that. But I was in the committee when the gentleman told me he did not intend to do that and his amendment then did not in fact do what his amendment now tries to correct.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wonder what the gentleman does intend to do.

Mr. Chairman, I know what his amendment says. I knew in the committee what his amendment did, and I tried to interrogate him, along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] and others.

Is it not true that the real estate man will be exempt, even though the proponent thereof said, "That is my intention."

I said "That is what it says." He said "That is not my intention."

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General says that these are the facts, regardless of what his intention is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he is coming in with yet another amendment that says he will do what he intended to do.

I have never seen an argument for an amendment designed to do nothing since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I do not believe.

Yet, here it is: The gentleman says that the amendment, "neither strengthens nor weakens the bill." The amendment does not do anything. But at the same time, this is the crucial amendment on which this bill is going to rise or fall. This is the amendment on which the merit or lack of merit is being debated in this great deliberative body, as to whether this title is going to win or lose, and that is on the basis of "it neither strengthens nor weakens the bill."

Mr. Chairman, what kind of foolishness are we involved in?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. CRAMER. I shall yield to the gentleman from Maryland in a moment.

There is nothing personal in what I am saying. There is nothing personal in my remarks about mentioning the gentleman's name. As the gentleman says, there are many who have so referred to it, and I do not know how else to refer to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post lets the cat out of the bag. We are now engaged in the same procedure in which we were engaged in 1964. The Washington Post says, "Please make these exceptions, make these exemptions, and protect 'States rights' a little bit in this bill, and we will be happy."

Then, Mr. Chairman, the test comes later when it becomes imperative to strengthen our Civil Rights Act of 1964, by doing away with the exemption.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post states:

> The House ought to support the Mathias compromise—with regret, perhaps, but with a clear conscience. If the principle of fair housing can be established this year for the apartments and new developments, it can be broadened, and the pattern of all the other civil rights legislation, in the years to come.

So, Mr. Chairman, hearken you this: The first message, Mr. Chairman, next year on civil rights will be to strike out the exemptions contained in title IV.

I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this additional time in order to maintain good faith with the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentleman from Florida is accurate in calling attention to the wide national interest in this particular subject.

Mr. Chairman, I say that it does not either strengthen or weaken the bill, because as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]—who unfortunately cannot be with us today—has clearly stated that what we are doing now is what you and the members of the committee——

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman from Maryland tell me why the gentleman did not exempt my "social security" widow in his amendment? The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] did in his amendment, but you do not in yours. Why do you not?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has further said that the perfecting amendment will not exempt the real estate agent. It will take out the real estate agent who complies with express, written instructions of the property owner.

Mr. CRAMER. Why does not the gentleman take my social security widow out?

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentleman has raised an interesting and important point. It will take out the real estate agent for housing occupied by the property owner who is exempt. So the bill——

Mr. CRAMER. If he does not "induce" or if he does not "suggest," he has that right. But if he does "induce" or "suggest," only the owner has that right.

Mr. MATHIAS. Precisely.

Mr. CRAMER. Why did not the gentleman take the "social security widow" out?

Mr. CONTE. Who is she?

Mr. CRAMER. Mrs. Murphy.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in support of the Moore amendment and against the Mathias amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one of those who has castigated the Supreme Court although I have not agreed with every decision that they have made. It is one of the three separate and distinct branches of the Government. I do not happen to be educated in the law. I am not an attorney. But I think I can read what this bill says and I think I can predict what the Supreme Court will do.

Mr. Chairman, the very first sentence of title IV says:

> It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

The gentleman from Maryland comes in with an amendment and says, "Well, that is our policy but you can discriminate a little bit. You can discriminate if you do not discriminate over four times in an owner-occupied apartment unit."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. No, not at the moment. You have had a lot of time. Just be patient.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to wait for the gentleman to yield.

Mr. HAYS. But you cannot discriminate if you own five apartments and live in one of them. You can if you own four.

Now we have had a lot of 5-to-4 decisions from the Supreme Court. They are only human and I suppose they react on every given day according to how they feel. If one of them happened to be engaged in civil litigation the day before—and this is possible, maybe even probably a divorce case or something, he might be in a mood to vote any old way.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think for the life of me that the Supreme Court is going to say a little bit of discrimination is all right but a lot is all wrong. I have talked to a good many learned lawyers in this House and I have not found a single one be he for the amendment or be he against it who does not think that this is a snare and a delusion and that the ultimate thing will be that the Supreme Court will say, You cannot discriminate in any case if you only have one apartment in your house and you are taking in somebody to live in part of it. Because you just cannot have a constitutional amendment of that kind when the very title says you cannot do it at all.

The McGregor amendment goes even further than that. Why, the courts have held and we have passed laws saying that if you are charged with murder or if you are charged with some other felony, you have the right to advice of counsel but if you are a homeowner and want to rent your home, according to the MacGregor amendment, you do not even have the right to the advice of the real estate agent to tell you what you can do or you cannot do.

Now I think I know what the temper of the people of this country is. I, like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], with whom I share a common boundary on the Ohio River for about 100 miles, have voted for every civil rights bill that has been before this Congress in the last 18 years. I did so because I believed in them and I believe in the first three titles we have worked on in this bill. But I think in this housing section in title IV we are asking for trouble. We are exacerbating trouble which already exists in this country.

If you want to write a law that will do the things that need to be done, we ought not to buy any delusions such as has been offered to us by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and we ought to adopt Mr. MOORE's amendment that strikes the title out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, now I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all are aware of his very fine record of service in the House and the many kinds of important measures that he has supported and voted for over the years. I am sure, although I have not checked his record and the gentleman can advise us if I am wrong, that he has for instance supported the wage and hour legislation which has been before the House in various forms from time to time.

Am I right?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct. But do not filibuster, let us get to the point.

Mr. MATHIAS. We are getting right to the point. Because you raised the question on whether the bill discriminates a little. This is important to the philosophy of what we are doing here. Under the wage-hour legislation, for instance, we say that it is our national goal and our national purpose that the minimum wage in this country should be fixed at a certain amount.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I know the argument you want to make and I do not yield any further. What you are going to say is that we discriminated a little there and we ought to discriminate a little here.

The point is that a little bad does not make it right if you have a little bad somewhere else.

Mr. Chairman, possibly in the wage-hour laws, if you want to be factual about it, if you want my opinion, we should not have any exemptions whatsoever, but the fact is that we do have some and the fact that they might be bad does not cast any spell of legitimacy upon your attempt to say that a man can discriminate with four apartments but he cannot discriminate with five.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thought the gentleman told me he was at least going to be at least a little bit generous with his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, it is true that there is a great deal of confusion among the Members of this House. But there is also more confusion among our constituents. I have received letters indicating that some of my constituents thought they did not have the right to sell their house now to whomever they chose and that their neighbors did not have the right to sell their homes to whomever they chose.

The Supreme Court long ago knocked out the old deed restrictions and covenants with the land that were prevalent in the southern parts of this country and in some of the northern sections with reference to race and national origin. The executive department has now said, "If you are going to sell a housing project under the Veterans' Administration housing program, there can be no discrimination. It must be open housing." The executive department has also said, "If you are going to put on a housing project and sell housing under FHA, it must be open housing." And I daresay that if we do not enact this title IV, the executive department will probably tell them, "If you are going to have guaranteed deposits, you are going to have to show wide lack of discrimination in the financing of housing."

The thing that is going to make what you call housing available to all segments of our country is more income to those people that you are trying to help.

The real estate developer, the man who has a house to sell, if you get enough money, he is going to turn loose of it. This section will not, in my opinion, obliterate the ghettos that we have been concerned about, but in an effort to try to do good, you will take away one of the most cherished rights of this country—the individual's right to control his property.

Whether you agree with him or not, whether you think he is the most bigoted individual in the world, that individual property owner should have the right to dispose of his property in any manner that he sees fit as long as it is not to the detriment of the health of the community or not for illegal purposes.

Think seriously about this. This is a further erosion or an attempt at erosion of the individual freedoms and rights that have made this country great. If we continue to chip away at those individual rights, we may be headed for the ultimate end that some of the pessimistic people in this country keep chanting—the gloom sellers. I, for one, do not subscribe to that. But I have faith in this House. I have faith in the individual Members, that they will do the right thing in this regard and vote for the Moore amendment and knock out the title.

On page 75 of the bill, under title V, there is paragraph 5 which will protect those people who desire to sell their property without discrimination, or who wish to rent under open housing; and I commend the committee for having this section in the bill.

This section protects that individual property owner from threats or intimidation should he desire to practice open housing. This is as it should be because I believe it is the individual's right to use his property in any manner he sees fit with freedom of choice of tenant or purchaser.

Although I question the wisdom of some of the other sections of the bill, if title IV is stricken from the bill, I will vote for final passage. I feel that the mechanics of the jury section can be worked out administratively.

And again I appeal to the individual Members of this House to preserve one of the basic rights of the American citizen, and support the Moore motion to strike title IV.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moore amendment. I hoped to make a few comments during general debate. Since it turned out that no time was available, I saved my comments until consideration of title IV, inasmuch as my comments deal more directly with that title than with any of the other titles.

As has been the case with other civil rights measures in previous years, this civil rights bill is subject to many objections. It has been well pointed out during this debate that perhaps the most drastic invasion of constitutional rights ever to be embodied in a bill reported out of a committee of this House is contained in title IV of the legislation now before this Committee.

> The right of private property is a natural, inherent and inalienable right. Such right antedates all constitutions, but to insure its continuance it is guaranteed by the Federal and the various state constitutions. The right to property is also included within the constitutional guaranties of due process of law.

Let me ask a question: Was the paragraph the Members just heard delivered composed by a Member of this House who comes from the Deep South and who thought up a self-serving declaration? Or could it conceivably have come from another source? I am here to tell the Members that I did not compose that. It is a verbatim transcript of language that is contained in the encyclopedia of American jurisprudence, a copy of which can be found in the anteroom off to my right, known as "Corpus Juris Secundum." I did not make that up. That is the law of every State in this Union, all of our 50 States. I ask your indulgence while I read it one more time:

> The right of private property is a natural, inherent and inalienable right. Such right antedates all constitutions, but to insure its continuance it is guaranteed by the Federal and the various state constitutions. The right to property is also included within the constitutional guaranties of the process of law.

I say that the right of private property is so fundamental that it extends further than the gentleman from West Virginia said it extended. He said it extended to all Americans. I will say that it extends to all human beings. As a matter of fact, it does not even stop with human beings. It extends into the animal kingdom. It is a right, I believe, we could even get Mr. Gunnar Myrdal to go along with, as to its existence.

This right of property is one of the most sacred attributes of American citizenship and this right, along with another equally sacred prerogative—the right of freedom to contract with another person—is now in grave jeopardy and may well be on the threshold of a ruthless and unconstitutional curtailment.

I beg of you to think on this question and see if you do not agree that I am speaking the truth. The other titles of this bill are unnecessary in some instances and in other instances carefully contrived to make a play for the support of civil rights groups by giving an illusion of providing rights where in fact they already exist.

For example, any person who can show that he was convicted or rendered liable to a money judgment by the verdict of a jury in the selection of which discrimination was exercised can find a ready remedy in the appellate courts.

Mr. Chairman, the reasons why this hastily written piece of legislation should be enacted can be attributed, in my judgment, to a desire on the part of the proponents of this bill to appear to be doing something about civil rights this year. This is a flimsy reason indeed when measured against the harm that is being done, chief of which is the curtailment of that most basic of human rights, the right to acquire, possess and dispose of property according to the dictates of one's own individual judgment.

(On request of Mr. WHITENER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, in line with the gentleman's quotation from the "Corpus Juris Secundum." I point out that as late as 1963 Justice Harlan, a Justice of the Supreme Court, in the case of Peterson against Greenville, said:

> Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference.

That coincides with what the gentleman was saying.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman. I point out that we freely engage in discrimination among members of the same race, and will no doubt continue to do so if this bill should pass. The only time we will not be able to do so is when our races or our religions do not happen to coincide.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 14765, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. While I endorse all of the provisions of this vitally needed bill, I want to address my remarks particularly in support of title IV of the bill which is designed to ban discrimination in housing.

In all my long years in the Congress, I have never risen to support a more desirable and long overdue provision in our Nation's laws. This great democracy of ours has flowered to become the all-time wonder of world civilization because it was based on the simple principle of justice, that all men are created equal, and that all are entitled to equal rights, equal opportunity, and equal treatment. This simple principle of elementary justice is the bedrock on which our entire democratic society rests.

For generations—indeed, centuries—all the blessings of liberty and freedom were enjoyed by the great majority of our people. As successive waves of immigrants of different ethnic origin flooded the shores of our country, they were absorbed into our democratic lifestream. They furnished the hard work and the skills which built our great country and, in turn, they enjoyed the blessings of liberty and equal opportunity which our forefathers envisaged when they forged our Constitution.

But all of us with any conscience have always been concerned that a minority in our country, through poverty and through inadequate education, is deprived of the right to enjoy the fruits of freedom which are the very essence of America. In recent years, as America has grown increasingly affluent in the aggregate, the disparity between the great majority of Americans and the disadvantaged and deprived minority has become more shockingly apparent. In typical American fashion, we have taken steps to try to eliminate this disparity and to give equal opportunity and freedom to all. In recent years, we have overcome one of the shames of American society by assuring the right of every American citizen to vote without fear or hindrance; we have launched a compassionate antipoverty program to give jobs and better opportunities to our lowest income groups, particularly our minority groups. We have stepped up our program of Federal aid to education in an attempt to extend to every American child access to the decent education which is essential for a person to achieve his or her true fulfillment.

We have done many splendid things to bring freedom of opportunity and equality to all our citizens, but there is one area where our efforts have been lacking, and that is to make available decent housing to all American citizens regardless of ethnic origin, regardless of race, color, creed, or religion.

We have learned that bad housing in bad neighborhoods is bad for the unfortunate people who have to live there. Too many of our children are born in slums and are forced to live in housing which does not meet minimum standards and in neighborhoods which are blighted.

It is true that we have set in motion programs over recent years which are designed to eliminate slums, to improve neighborhoods and to make available more decent housing at prices and rents which low-income families can afford. We have many programs in operation which offer considerable promise in achieving these ends.

But everyone knows that housing is one of the few—if not the only remaining area—where true freedom of access is denied to large numbers of people. This lack of freedom to purchase and to rent whatever housing they can afford wherever it may be available has condemned too many of our unfortunate minority groups to a life of perpetual misery in our worst ghettos and slums.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I urge with all my heart and being that my colleagues vote for this historic bill before the House, particularly title IV, the fair housing title. Our devotion to the principles of American democracy and equal justice and fairplay for all demands that we pass this urgently needed legislation by an overwhelming vote. By this action, we can strike a mighty blow to burst the bonds of prejudice and to bring our great country closer to the objective we all seek—an America with freedom, justice, and equal opportunity for all.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation which will be facing the House, a vote will occur first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota in the nature of a substitute for the Mathias amendment. A vote will then occur upon the Mathias amendment. After the Mathias amendment has been disposed of, it will then be in order to offer additional amendments to perfect title IV. After the conclusion of consideration of and action upon all such amendments, a vote will then occur upon the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the MacGregor amendment. I oppose the Mathias amendment. I shall support the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

I believe it is fair to say that the MacGregor amendment would result in a tougher open housing title IV.

It is fair to say that the Mathias amendment would moderate title IV as it was reported by the House Judiciary Committee.

Notwithstanding the fact that the author of the amendment said that it would neither strengthen nor weaken title IV, I believe it is further fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that any liberal who votes for the Mathias amendment will be indicted by liberals for having "gutted" title IV, and any conservative who votes for the Mathias amendment inevitably and ultimately wil be indicted by conservatives for having made it possible for title IV to carry.

Every person on the floor within the sound of my voice who has dealt with political realities knows that this is so.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to deal definitively with title IV—what it covers, who it covers, or what the consequences of coverage may be. I believe that all concerned are adequately advised of the issue at stake and I suggest that we proceed as promptly as possible to a vote on this issue.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Does the gentleman agree with me that if the Mathias amendment is included, the language "if such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman, or any employee or agent thereof" means that the real estate agent or his salesman could not even have a form available for the owner to fill out to get the exemption, because he would be inducing the owner to do so under this language?

Mr. POFF. Specifically I must say I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, and I will further say I fear that the gentleman from Maryland has failed again to translate into language what his true intent is.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORMAN. The gentleman from Virginia recited, when he first stood up, what would happen after the vote on the MacGregor substitute.

Let us assume for the moment that the MacGregor substitute carries. Then what will be the next vote after that? I did not quite catch the gentleman's statement or the statement by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote would occur on the Mathias amendment as modified by the MacGregor substitute.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] asks permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the MacGregor amendment and in opposition to the Mathias amendment and in opposition to the Moore amendment. I think that the best argument made in favor of the MacGregor amendment was made in one sentence earlier this afternoon by a member of the Judiciary Committee who, in opposing it, said, and I quote him:

> The MacGregor amendment would not permit the home owner to discriminate.

In other words, the MacGregor amendment returns to the original purpose of the administration bill, the prohibition of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. Earlier we heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], in making the familiar argument about the sacredness of private property say that he did see one limitation that could be put upon the right to dispose of private property and that was if the health of the community might be impaired. I ask the members of this committee what could be more of an impairment and danger to the health of a community than the virus of discrimination and segregation? What is more essential to a healthy community than the elimination of all discrimination in housing? A healthy community is an integrated community, one in which segregated housing patterns and the resulting de facto segregation in schools no longer exist.

Let us search our conscience as we face this proposition this afternoon. The administration bill would have outlawed discrimination in any housing, built, rented, leased, or sold in the United States. I support that approach, and I introduced similar legislation—H.R. 14971.

The Judiciary Committee itself carved out large exemptions in the original bill. It now exempts the landlord who lives in one of the four apartments in his building. It exempts private clubs, an exemption which I fear will encourage ingenious stratagems for evasion. It contains no provision to prevent discrimination in the sale of vacant land and exempts individuals who engage in less than three transactions during a year. In short, this title was already riddled full of holes and its potential coverage was reduced from 60 to 23 million units.

The MacGregor amendment plugs these holes and should be supported.

Now, as for the Mathias amendment. I view that, with all due respect to the good faith of the gentleman from Maryland, as an amendment which has been conceived in fear and written on the parchment of racism. It is an amendment which reacts to the voices of darkness. It is an amendment which is now being urged upon liberal Members of the House as a necessary compromise in order to pass any bill. If the amendment fails, it is argued, the bill will be too strong for northern moderates to vote for it. That is a familiar argument, but I say it is a disservice to any Member of the House to make that argument here today. We should vote against the Mathias amendment because it is right to vote against it as a matter of principle.

Those who urge liberals to abandon principle in the name of expediency do not base their pleadings on facts or statistics. They have no head count. They are acting on an assessement of a mood. Theirs is a hunch resting on a guess standing on the shoulders of an assumption. We should not forsake principle so easily.

The Mathias amendment is really no compromise. It is a capitulation, a codification of prejudice rather than a clarification of language.

Let me reply to those who have argued that the Mathias amendment is really a clarifying amendment. It is no such thing. It does not clarify any language in the bill. Instead it changes the plain language of the bill and threatens, if adopted, to codify a new form of discrimination.

There is no question that, without the Mathias amendment, brokers would be forbidden to discriminate. That is what the bill before the House says and that is what it means.

Section 402(d), the definition section, says:

> A person shall be deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings if he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as either the principal or agent in three or more transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest therein.

Moreover, section 403 specifically says:

> It shall be unlawful for any person who is a real estate broker . . . to refuse to sell, rent, or lease . . a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This amendment would completely distort the purpose of the title. It would exempt a whole new category of businesses and encourage the creation of a new class of real estate brokers.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that anyone in this Chamber would question the national impact of the 83,000 realtors throughout the country.

If we defeat the MacGregor amendment and adopt the Mathias amendment, the once-tight fabric of the administration's original bill will be turned to cheesecloth.

The bill was originally intended to prevent discrimination in the sale of any of the 60 million housing units in the country.

The exemptions already written into this title mean that it will apply to only 23 million out of 60 million housing units. The exempt units are principally located away from the central city. If suburban housing is afforded an additional loophole through the Mathias amendment, then how is title IV ever going to help break down the walls of the ghetto which seal Negroes in our urban centers into a world of hopelessness and immobility? Mr. Chairman, in my opinion title IV will not do much to make it easier for Negroes to move out of the ghetto. But with the additional restrictions imposed by this amendment, it would do very little indeed.

Let us look at one practical effect which the amendment would have. It would, in effect, reward certain forms of discrimination by housing brokers. It seems likely that certain firms would become known as the place to go when you want to buy a house in a segregated neighborhood, or when you want to be sure that no Catholics, or Jews, or Puerto Ricans, or Mexicans, or Negroes will try to buy your house. In short, I think that the effect of this amendment would be to create a whole new class of brokers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is concerned with public transactions. Real estate brokers set themselves up to do business with the public. They advertise in the newspapers and elsewhere. Anyone may come to them to try to find a house or to put his house on the market. They are a public business, a public agency.

The root question raised by this amendment, then, is not whether a private individual can sell his house to a friend. Instead, the question is whether this Congress is going to pass a bill which allows a business which holds itself out to the public to refuse to do business with some members of the public because of their race, religion, or nationality.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion the Mathias amendment would perpetuate in our society the virus of discrimination which, if we take seriously the words of the gentleman from Texas as I used them, is the reason for voting for the MacGregor amendment, and against the Mathias amendment.

Let us reject the arguments of those who would permit public brokers to pass on private prejudices to the world at large.

Let us move forward to create a world of freedom, equal opportunity, and human dignity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the MacGregor amendment. I can also support the Mathias amendment. I am opposed to the Moore amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Not at this point. When I have completed I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, the MacGregor amendment is virtually the law of New York at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] for his "Henry Clay" stance, although I know he would rather be right. But I want to reduce this entire question to one simple, common denominator: When we get to the end of this debate and vote on title IV, the question should be and will be: "Are you for or against discrimination?"

Mr. Chairman, I was shocked by the so-called Republican policy declaration, opposing title IV in full, without regard to the possibility of amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln would have turned over in his grave if he could have seen this "emancipation proclamation."

Mr. Chairman, I have a picture of Abraham Lincoln on my wall. I say to those on the Democratic side that I know that many of you have pictures of President Johnson and the late President Kennedy on your walls. I have Abe Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt—so when I make a determination, I have them in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the problems of individual Members of Congress, but the great Republican Party cannot possibly support a policy of discrimination. I unequivocally repudiate any such policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support title IV, but for those of you who have any qualms about it, you have the opportunity to clear the way now by your vote for either the MacGregor amendment or the Mathias amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Mathias amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 4:30—the Mathias amendment and all amendments to the MacGregor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Mathias amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, if this unanimous-consent request is granted, do I correctly understand that further debate would be permitted after the vote on the Moore amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Further debate will be permitted on the title and the Moore amendment and any other amendments offered which are in order.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observed standing at the time of the agreement, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Roberts], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tenzer], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias], the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, how much time will each Member have?

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member will be recognized for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] because he will need the time to explain his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Georgia talk about the sacred right to acquire property and I agree that it is an important right. That is why we ought to have title IV. We are trying to give every American citizen the right to hold and to acquire property. I have heard it urged that we should vote against title IV because we might lose an election. I do not want to pose as a saint or a hero, but I for one do not submit my morality to computers. I believe this is the dominant moral issue of our time. Those of us who come from the North have been pointing the finger at the South. Now we have got to put our own house in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time may be yielded to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. I wish to make a few points regarding the fair housing provisions of this bill, based on our experience in Minnesota with a fair housing law. As a State senator, I was the chief author of the bill that put the law into effect in 1962. The law is administered by the State commission against discrimination, which also administers the fair employment practices law adopted in Minnesota in 1955.

In connection with the proposed Federal law, we hear fears expressed of litigation that might arise over alleged discrimination in housing. I think these fears are groundless, Mr. Chairman. My fellow attorneys in this Chamber share my knowledge that nearly everyone avoids going to the time-consuming expense of starting a legal proceeding unless it is absolutely necessary. I do not think title IV of H.R. 14765 would cause a flurry of needless litigation. Most actions would, I am sure, be filed in good faith.

My conclusion is tied to Minnesota's experience. Since the fair housing law went into effect there, more than 270 formal complaints have been filed alleging discrimination in the rental, lease, or sale of housing. The law spells out procedures for conciliation. If conciliation by the commission is unsuccessful, there are procedures for a public hearing, with a cease-and-desist order reviewable by a State district court.

Of the more than 270 complaints filed with the commission, only 1—I repeat, only 1—has gone beyond the point of conciliation. Local human relations councils have been organized by the dozens around Minnesota. They are one measure of the effectiveness of the conciliation technique.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, why the experience of the fair housing board created by title IV would differ much from the experience of the Minnesota commission. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized under title IV to "direct and supervise, under such rules and regulations as he shall establish, investigations of alleged violations" of the open housing provision. He would, I am sure, be able to resolve most disputes before they went to a hearing before the board.

One of the weaknesses of the Minnesota law, as well as the proposed Federal law, is the exemptions it allows. There are three exemptions under the Minnesota law: first, rental of a portion of a two-family dwelling, where one unit is occupied by the owner; second, rental of rooms in a one-family dwelling which is occupied by the owner; and third, rental, lease, or sale of a one-family dwelling, occupied by the owner, not defined as a publicly assisted housing accommodation.

We have learned this lesson in Minnesota: conciliation is effective only where discrimination is legally banned. Conciliation is ineffective where there are exceptions.

Minnesota, like all other States that have adopted fair housing legislation, had many fears before its law was passed—fears of panic selling, fears of mass flight of white tenants, fears of violence. The 1964 annual report of the Minnesota commission spoke out emphatically on this subject:

> The Commission has continued its policy of checking back with owners of apartment buildings where it has given assistance to complainants and the conciliation required acceptance of a minority-group family or individual as a tenant. It has been found that the fears of the owners are false and unfounded, that there is no exodus of white tenants or other kinds of problems as were often predicted.

Our experience in Minnesota has shown us that a person's right to live where he wants to live, without discrimination, is a important to him as his right to work where he wants to work, without discrimination. I emphatically recommend a strong housing provision in the bill we are considering.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be granted to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise to urge you to vote for the MacGregor amendment. This amendment would seem to be, by far, the best fair housing proposal to be offered for a vote by this Committee. The MacGregor amendment would restore the original administration bill with all of its most important features and with only the most minimal and reasonable exemptions. The amendment would prohibit racial discrimination in the entire housing market: suburbia as well as the inner city, individual sellers as well as those in the real estate business, and single dwellings as well as multiple units. I strongly support the MacGregor amendment since I feel it would be a significant start in eliminating racial ghettos.

I have heard the very honest and nonpolitical statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman], who have outlined what the amendment would do. Mr. Chairman, as a lifelong member of the Democratic Party, I am embarrassed to see that the only comprehensive fair housing proposal to be offered to this Committee of the Whole House of Representatives comes from the Republican side of the aisle. It is even more embarrassing to note that the MacGregor amendment is much closer to the original Democratic administration's proposal than that form of the bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I very honestly and humbly feel that I would be defaulting on my repeated pledges and my duty to not only my constituents but to all of the American people, who, after all, we all serve as Members of this National House of Representatives, if I did not support this kind of fair housing legislation. It is time not just for a first step but it is time for a significant step in eliminating racial ghettos from America.

I know that most of my colleagues have received an avalanche of mail in recent weeks regarding the fair housing section of this 1966 civil rights bill. Most of these letters seem to have been either sent or stimulated by real estate brokers. I am sure that many of my colleagues must feel that all those involved in the real estate business are opposed to this bill.

I, too, have received much mail on this issue, but I have also received mail from people in the real estate business who very strongly favor the fair housing bill in its original and comprehensive form. These communications show that many people in the real estate business are convinced that a fair housing law which would have broad coverage and effective enforcement is not only necessary for our society but would also be in the interest of their industry.

I would like to read some of these communications. The first one is by the Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association, a large organization of real estate brokers in the Detroit area.

[A Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association Inc., press release, June 24, 1966]

The Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association believes in "Democracy in Housing." That equal access to housing is a fundamental right of every American citizen. We further believe that every American citizen should have the same right and the same privilege to rent, lease, mortgage, buy and sell the home of his choice in the neighborhood of his choice based only upon his economic ability.

Artificial restrictions upon the rights of certain Americans, and particularly Negroes, and other members of minority groups, have no bases of right, under any fundamental law of man or God.

The Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association wholeheartedly supports the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 and especially Section 4 thereof, in respect to equal housing opportunities.

Our Association deems it most regrettable that all persons and organizations in our Country do not believe these rights extend to all Americans. That legislation is still needed to implement the basic law and one of the fundamental propositions upon which our Country was founded that "All men are created equal" is a sad commentary, indeed, while America is assuming a position of world leadership, and is endeavoring to instill in the world community of nations the principle that basic human rights are to be enjoyed by all men in a free society.

Detroit Real Estate
Brokers Association,
Clarence Hudson,
President.
John S. Humphrey,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to read a letter I have received from a real estate broker whom I am honored to have as a constituent, Mr. Lewis S. Grossman. Mr. Grossman has an outstanding reputation in Detroit as a very successful real estate broker and businessman and as head of the Grossman Development Co. Based on his long experience in the real estate business, Mr. Grossman states what I feel sure is the true significance of this bill for those who make their living from real estate transactions when he declares that the bill is necessary because the legitimate real estate man needs the backing of the law to permit him to act in a moral, ethical manner.

I would like to read in full Mr. Grossman's succinct but very pertinent letter.

Grossman Development Co.,
Wayne, Mich., June 13, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: With reference to Title IV of the current civil rights proposal involving housing, this is to alert you that as a real estate broker I heartily *concur* with the purposes and aims of the above act. The legitimate real estate man needs the backing of the law to permit him to act in a moral, ethical manner. The above legislation, in my view, is absolutely vital to the breakdown in the evils of segregated housing with its pronounced unfortunate effects in the areas of education, crime and employment.

You have already probably received much correspondence organized by real estate brokers and other such organizations, but I can assure you they do not represent all real estate brokers any more than the A.M.A. represents the thinking of all doctors.

Sincerely yours,
Lewis S. Grossman.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I support comprehensive housing legislation like the MacGregor amendment because of my commitment to legislation which will not just make a start but a significant effort in dealing with housing discrimination and all the various economic and social problems that brings to not just minority groups but to all of society.

I support comprehensive housing legislation knowing that it will not result in economic disaster for either individual American homeowners or those who are in the real estate business.

I support comprehensive housing legislation because it is both a moral and social imperative for our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley].

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be granted to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Roberts].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moore amendment which would strike out title IV.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in these few seconds that I have a predicament. As a Member of this body I try to keep my constituents informed as best I can on what is taking place. I also happen to be a partner in a small real estate concern in my area. What is my situation? As a Member of this body how am I going to tell my citizens about the provisions of the Mathias amendment without violating the law as proposed by the gentleman from Maryland? It cannot be done. It is clearly unconstitutional on the face of it. I hope you will knock all of section 4 out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, there is simply no right more basic or fundamental to Americans than the right to live where one wants to live. Yet in the United States today we know that millions of our citizens are locked out of whole sections of the country and are denied the opportunity to buy homes and rent housing where they desire. The result is the ghettos of our large cities. If we are concerned with the conditions which exist in the major cities of America today, then let us support the MacGregor amendment and let us break once and for all the hold the segregationists have on the real estate market.

Mr. Chairman, we are not discussing private property or the sanctity of the home. We are discussing the right of citizens to bid for housing in the public marketplace. We are discussing the right of Americans to live where they chose.

We should not defeat that objective with the Mathias amendment which would legalize discrimination by the very public businesses which link those seeking housing with the houses which are for sale.

Mr. Chairman, our forebearers came to the United States in search of a world where there would be no ghetto and where opportunities would be equal for all. Today we can help to implement that goal for all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Committee recognizes that every legal system in the world is based upon the work of the greatest lawgiver the world has ever known—Moses. I would call to the attention of the Committee the fact that he did not say, "Thou shalt not kill more than two or three times a year. Thou shalt not steal as many as four times a year," or use like language on any of the other commandments with which the Committee is familiar. He said, "Thou shalt not"—period. Such should still be the language of the law.

I would call the Committee's attention further to the fact that the 10th Commandment states, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house." In this commandment and in the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," there was recognized at this ancient time and by this great lawgiver the property rights of persons. I believe these basic rights to be violated by this title, and therefore urge the Committee to support the Moore amendment to strike title IV of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be allotted to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first let me pay especial tribute to the outstanding manner in which this bill has been handled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff]. They have been courteous and cooperative. Each has fought zealously for the principles in which he believes, and each has been thoroughgoing but gentlemanly throughout. The House can well be proud, as indeed it is, of both of them.

Section 4 is not one which should be amended. Section 4 should be eliminated from the bill. Regardless of what may be done in an effort to soften the bill and make it more acceptable, this section will create the machinery and the precedent for the future regulation of all real property, including those units which are now or may be excluded by the bill. Once this monstrosity is enacted into law, the precedent will have been created. The bill's scope can be and will be expanded and tightened in the future. I find it strange that there is anyone who fails to grasp the importance of maintaining the right of complete property ownership. I find it strange that anyone would not understand and abhor the inequities created by this bill. I find it strange that anyone would fail to realize that in the zeal to protect the purchaser's rights, there is an equal responsibility for protecting the right and stability of the real property owner or his agents.

These inequities are apparent on the face of the section. The alleged violator would not have a chance. Defendants in suits under the open housing title must bear all the expense of their defense while the plaintiffs may use tax money and never spend a dime of their own. Even if the defendant can beat the U.S. Government in court, which is pretty hard to do, the property owner would lose under such conditions. During the course of such a trial, the owner would not be able to contract to sell or otherwise dispose of his property. He would have to bear all tax costs and suffer the loss of unpaid interest and increased financing costs. This would go on for years. The Supreme Court has by its rulings, given protection to criminals from such treatment, but the law-abiding property owning citizen would find himself in an entirely different category. He would have no protection under the law.

Few sections have been written which are more completely one-sided, more destructive to property rights, or which inject the Federal Government more squarely into the control of the lives, habits, and property of the people. The Federal Government would be looking down your throat from the day you become or seek to become a homeowner.

There simply is no way to make this section palatable. In whatever way it may be written, more harm than good will have been done. Again let me say there are no magic formulas which will solve civil rights problems. It takes work and cooperation and understanding; not bills in Congress or riots in the streets.

All amendments to the section and the section itself should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Rodino yielded his time to Mr. Corman.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Multer yielded his time to Mr. Corman.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tenzer].

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the MacGregor amendment, consistent with the laws of my State, and in opposition to the Mathias amendment, and in opposition to the Moore amendment.

A policy statement issued the other day by the Republican policy committee declared that title IV of the bill "has divided the country and fostered discord and animosity." It is not title IV which fosters discord—it is the absence of State laws against discrimination in housing which divides the country.

Seventeen States with a total population of approximately 100 million of our citizens now have laws against discrimination in publicly assisted and private housing. Eight of the States provide coverage in the sale of single family homes. Fifteen of the States cover realtors and thirteen of the States cover financial institutions.

I am guided by only one policy statement—and that statement is called the Constitution of the United States.

I suggest that title IV rather than "dividing the country" will unite the country by providing protection against discrimination in housing for the remainder of our citizens.

I will support the MacGregor amendment, more consistent with the laws of my State of New York—I will vote against the Mathias amendment and will vote against the Moore amendment to strike title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind that on principle this section should not be amended to provide for any exemptions from the application of the fair housing concept. However, we are faced with a practical legislative problem which according to the best evidence I have seen thus far will not produce enough affirmative votes unless the Mathias modification carries. In the interest, therefore, of some legislative accomplishment on this extremely important subject, I hope the pending Mathias amendment prevails. This tactical concession is not unprecedented. We included certain exemptions in the civil rights bill on public accommodations and fair employment in the minimum wage bill and in other matters. As a matter of fact it is a time-tested procedure in the legislative process. Surely no one can deny that it has produced dramatic progress. It is a frustrating decision to make for those of us who have a moral commitment to full and equal rights for all American citizens as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights, but as I see it we have little or at best very risky choices if we do not follow this procedure. I confidently predict that the negative votes on the pending Mathias amendment will represent a strange alliance: a small minority of Members who sincerely view any exemptions as prima facie evidence of discrimination, despite the fact that 40 percent of the present housing in the United States will be subject to this act plus the over 1 million new units entering the market each year and another much larger group of conservative Members who know that a fair housing title without exemptions will undoubtedly cause the whole subject to be stricken from the bill. Although I sympathize and respect the position of my liberal colleagues I cannot in good conscience be a party to such an entrapment by the conservative coalition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mathias amendment and to the Moore amendment, and reluctantly I support the MacGregor amendment. May I say that in the State of New York our statutes go much further than the provisions under the present bill. In the State of New York, there is no impediment to the sale of real estate. I believe in the State of New York we probably sell more real estate in any given day than probably in any other State of the Union. I believe that in the State of New York not only is our antihousing statutes constitutional, but also it is implicit that we believe there is human dignity involved in the sale of real estate. We believe in human rights as well as property rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado yielded his time to Mr. CORMAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, let us not lose sight of the fact that we are here debating a bill entitled in part "a bill to assure nondiscrimination—to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices." I remind the Members that if you vote against my amendment here, and if you vote for the Mathias amendment, you will be voting to exempt the sale of single-family dwellings from the coverage of title IV. What we will be doing in the opinion of the Attorney General is taking a step which has "a gutting effect"; we will be acting to cause a "very major impact in terms of destroying the effectiveness of the bill."

Mr. Chairman, during Judiciary Committee deliberation of title IV, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] repeatedly voiced his support for the original draft. I feel sure that his announced change of position, and that of certain others, is a change based on judgment and judgment only. I must respectfully disagree with that judgment. I have greater optimism as to what this House will pass.

Existing law in 11 States—Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, and Rhode Island—makes no exception for the sale of owner-occupied dwellings. In my own State of Minnesota the Republican Party at its 1966 convention adopted a platform urging that our existing State law outlawing discrimination in housing be extended to include sales of all housing, whether publicly or privately financed. After an open and lengthy debate, this plank was adopted on a rollcall vote by a solid majority of more than 1,000 delegates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee worked long and hard on an extremely difficult issue.

To correct the RECORD, the subcommittee did not make recommendation on this matter at the time we reported the bill to the full committee. We were still unable to resolve this very difficult balance between property rights and rights against discrimination.

The final agreement was reached when 21 members supported the bill as we bring it to you today. I participated in the drafting, and I know the gentleman from Maryland intended that whatever rights we spelled out for the homeowner he was to retain when acting through an agent. There was no question about that at the time the committee discussed this compromise.

So all that the Mathias amendment will do today is to spell out explicitly what was agreed to by the 21 Members who voted in support of this bill.

For those who question whether or not we are doing anything significant to eliminate racial discrimination in housing, I would suggest we would be doing a great deal.

Admittedly, we say to the individual homeowner, "This law does not cover you. You retain unrestricted freedom of choice to sell to whomever you wish, whether you act independently or through an agent."

But we say to all of the people in the business of selling or leasing residential property, we say to those in the business of lending money for the purchase of such property, that they may not be the source of discrimination. This covers the bankers and the apartment operators and the realtors.

The bankers have not objected.

I have heard no objection from the apartment operators.

There has been some question about why we excluded four units or less if the dwelling is owner-occupied. We did decide, since we wanted to leave out of this coverage the people who are homeowners, that we ought to recognize the fact that many homeowners live in small apartments and that their business is only secondary to the establishment of the home. We looked at what the States have done and followed the most liberal interpretation. We said, "If it is four units or less we will not cover you." That is the law in my State.

Then we got to the realtors, and said that they may not be the source of racial discrimination. And that is when the great debate started. The realtors have done everything they could to confuse and becloud this issue.

I watched the campaign on proposition 14 in California in 1964. I did not see any billboards that said, "Protect the realtor's right to perpetuate discrimination in this Nation." The billboards said, "Protect the homeowner's right to free choice." And that is precisely what this bill does.

I urge support of the Mathias amendment, and defeat of the MacGregor and Moore amendments.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, title IV of H.R. 14765 should be stricken from the pending bill. It has no place in the laws of a democratic, representative government.

This proposal strikes at the very heart of a free enterprise system in which the fee simple ownership of real property is a vital part.

The right of private ownership of property in fee simple has been a privilege and right of the American people. Until this legislation was proposed, we had believed that as long as a property owner paid the taxes on his property, and as long as he did not use it for illegal or immoral purposes, that he could do what he pleased with it, occupy it or leave it unoccupied, and rent it or sell it as he saw fit and to whom he saw fit.

If a member of any group, a majority or a minority group, wants to buy or rent a particular piece of property, he has always had that right, provided the owner would be equally willing to sell it or rent it to him. A contract for the purchase and sale of real property has historically required a meeting of the minds between a willing buyer and a willing seller. The only exceptions to this rule have been when the right of eminent domain has been exercised and when property has been sold under court order.

If the language of title IV of H.R. 14765 is enacted into law, it could set off a chain reaction which could eventually result in legislation, Executive orders, or judicial decrees that a property owner could be required to sell or rent property even though he might prefer to retain it and even to occupy it personally.

The right of private ownership of property is an integral part of a free enterprise system. If the Congress of the United States undertakes to destroy the basic rights and concepts of private ownership of property, then it will, at the same time, begin to wipe out the free enterprise system in this country and on this planet.

Human rights cannot exist without property rights, and a healthy respect for both. Any attempt to destroy or weaken the right of private ownership of property is an attempt to destroy a system of private capital, and to substitute a totalitarian form of government in its place, whether it is called socialism, state socialism, or communism.

Any government which has the power to give all of its citizens everything can be the same government which can subsequently take away all rights of all citizens of majority and minority groups alike, reduce them to the status of slaves and subjugate them absolutely to the tyranny of an all-powerful bureaucracy, autocracy, or dictatorship.

The pages of history are replete with instances in which exactly this has taken place. I wish that the sponsors of this legislation would carefully read and reread "Mein Kampf" and "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich" because a man named Adolph Hitler promised to do, and did, exactly the same kind of things that are encompassed in this legislation. With persuasive language and forceful oratory, he persuaded the German Reichstag to give him absolute powers of government. He was able to persuade them to do just that because he said:

> If you will give me these powers, I shall never abuse them. I will use them only to strengthen the German Government and to perpetuate the place of the German people in the sun for a thousand years.

He even described his government as the "Thousand Year Reich," and said that it would stand for a thousand years.

The old saying that "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely" was never more forcefully demonstrated than in the case of Hitler. He became so maddened with this absolute power which was his, that he led his people and his country into a precipitate headlong rush into a holocaust of war which resulted in the moral and physical destruction of the Government and the people of Germany.

God forbid that the United States of America and its people should ever suffer the same fate because of the gross folly, to be charitable, or the deliberate design, to be perhaps more accurate, of those who advocate and sponsor legislation such as is being considered by this House today.

Much of the foregoing was included in the remarks which I made during general debate on Thursday, July 28, 1966, but it is equally applicable during the debate under the 5-minute rule during the consideration of the MacGregor amendment, the Mathias amendment, and the Moore amendment.

I shall vote for the Moore amendment which will strike title IV. I shall oppose the MacGregor amendment because in my opinion, it is even worse than the language contained in the committee bill. I shall oppose the Mathias amendment because, even though it may be couched in weaker language than the committee bill, the results could be comparable or equal to the results of the language of both the MacGregor amendment and the committee bill.

I urge the rejection of the MacGregor amendment and the Mathias amendment. I urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express strong opposition to title IV because it would deprive every and any, actual and potential property owner within the United States, of a right of private property ownership. It would destroy a basic human right that belongs to all persons.

I am deeply concerned that the proponents of title IV are trying to "railroad" the civil rights movement at the expense of a basic and inherent human right of all Americans, the right of private property ownership. Even the minority ethnic groups which will receive the limited rights offered in this title, will themselves suffer the loss of a basic individual freedom. Mr. Chairman, title IV is definitely unconstitutional in my opinion, and I call for its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCULLOCH yielded his time to Mr. MATHIAS.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my thanks to the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding their time to me.

It is interesting that in this debate constitutional objections to title IV, as amended by the Mathias amendment, are heard from the same Members who raised constitutional objections to the act of 1964 and the act of 1965, both of which acts have been overwhelmingly sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States.

But today, in the case of title IV, we do not have to look as to what the Court will do, because that is a question that was settled one century ago. This House passed a national fair housing title in April 1866, and one century ago the Supreme Court of the United States, with not a single member of the Court then sitting who is now sitting, sustained and upheld the constitutional authority of this Congress to act in the legislative area in which we are acting today.

Now, those of you who say that the Mathias amendment does not go far enough, let us be fair. As the gentleman from Ohio said in debate:

> It would be a grudging and in most instances a meaningless concession to allow the home owner an exemption from the law and in the next breath to withhold the means of fully exercising it.

We should be fair to everybody here.

To those who say it does not go far enough, consider this: We have in this country some 60 million housing units and the very minimum, according to the Department of HUD, the very minimum of those 60 million, is 40 percent or approximately 23 million units, that would become open housing under the Mathias compromise. We are talking about alleviating conditions for the 21 million American Negroes. If the average family is about 4 members, we need about 5 million housing units or a little more than 5 million housing units for them. We are immediately going to put 23 million units here on the open housing market. And I urge you not to forget that there will be 1½ million units built annually in the suburbs and center cities all over this country.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, certainly the most publicized provision of the current bill has been the so-called fair housing title—more widely described as "forced-housing." A cursory glance at title IV, both before and after the amendments, shows us the reason for so much publicity. For even as amended, title IV represents an hitherto unprecedented extension of Federal power into the most intimate of the individual's remaining spheres of privacy—his home.

In its original form title IV is contemplated asserting Federal power over the individual homeowner's decision to sell or not to sell on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. Such a drastic step found little committee support—even from the so-called "liberal" bloc. As overwhelming adverse opinion flowed in, the northern committeemen, faced with the Burkean dilemma of conscience versus constituency, chose the latter as their standard and deleted the controversial section that would have included the individual homeowner. Still a bit leery of a civil rights title that threatened areas outside the South, the committee amended section 402(b) so as to exclude from coverage the "vacant lot." The significance of this will be elaborated below.

A primary question which has historically concerned Congress has been the constitutionality of a proposed bill. Perhaps it is still not too presumptious, notwithstanding recent Supreme Court decisions, to bring this question again to the attention of Congress. The administration argues for the title's constitutionality by way of, first, the interstate commerce clause; and second, the 14th amendment.

A review of Supreme Court decisions indicates that Congress, under its commerce clause, may prohibit racial discrimination, for example, as to public accommodations. Indeed, under the commerce clause, the Congress can reach a single farmer who grows wheat on his own farm for his own consumption even though the amount grown may be trivial—317 U.S. 111 (1942).

Is there really any activity which can be considered so local that Congress cannot regulate it, or is it true, as a cynic might suggest, that whenever money changes hands the transaction affects the GNP, therefore that's commerce, and Congress can reach it? Are the limitations on the commerce power real or only theoretical? The answer to these questions lies, by and large, not with the Court, but with Congress itself. As Chief Justice Marshall said in Gibbons against Ogden:

> The wisdom and discretion of Congress, their identity with the people, and the influence which their constituents possess at elections are * * * the sole restraints on which they have relied to secure them from abuse. They are the restraints on which the people must often rely in all representative government.

Marshall's words apply today and their meaning is clear. If there have been abuses of the commerce clause it is the Congress, not the Court, that is culpable. It is time for Congress to accept this mantle of responsibility and exercise its "wisdom and discretion" to limit the so-far limitless commerce clause.

Nevertheless, there are certain areas immune to even the reach of the commerce clause. Congress partially acquiesced in this view by making exceptions to the fair employment and public accommodation provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today it is contended that similar "exceptions," for example, the individual homeowner, have made title IV palatable to the Supreme Court. Perhaps this is so. The ability of the Supreme Court to find past enactments of this Congress constitutional makes the position of prognosticator most uncertain. But even if title IV as amended is upheld, it must be obvious that such legislation is only the first step. This follows since the emasculated title IV simply will not accomplish what its

White House sponsors have set out to accomplish.

The original—and we may assume continuing—administration intent was to end racial discrimination in the buying and selling of homes. The bill in current form, however, will apply primarily only to, first, large apartment landlords; second, mortgages; and third, those "in the business of developing." It is the inclusion of this third category—essentially the real estate developer—which might have constituted a real step toward the administration's aforementioned goal. However, by excluding the "vacant lot" from coverage, the committee has effectively provided a loophole which may well frustrate the entire administration intent. Suppose developer X owns 100 acres of vacant land. In complete compliance with title IV, developer X may sell off these 100 acres in small vacant lots designed for residential purposes to Mr. A, B, C, D, and so forth, solely on the grounds of race. Mr. A, B, C, D, now holding the land in fee simple, may contract with a construction company—indeed with developer X—for the construction of a home and thus perpetuate northern segregated housing. Such shenanigans would have been clearly covered by title IV before it was amended. For section 402(b)(2) originally forbade any discrimination in the selling of "any vacant land." What does this mean? Simply this. Another impossible promise has been fulfilled by an impotent piece of legislation. This was well expressed in hearings before the Senate by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing which called title IV "totally inadequate to meet today's critical national problem of the explosive racial ghetto; even if it could be strengthened, such a proposal at this strategic moment may raise false hope among the Negro masses which cannot possibly be fulfilled by this proposal." To the promisees, however, the way is clear. The way is the street—first the demonstration, then, that failing, the riot. Such tactics have borne fruit in the past. We would be naive not to expect that they will be tried again. But what will—indeed, what can—be our answer "the next time?" Neither this Congress nor the Supreme Court seems inclined to support the extension of Federal power over the individual homeowner. Our answer, not "the next time" but now, must be that there are, after all, other rights besides those of the intended beneficiaries of title IV—that the scales have finally tipped in favor of the rights of the former—the right of the homeowner to sell his home to the buyer of his choice.

We have seen thus far that it might be possible for this present Supreme Court to find title IV constitutional on the basis of the commerce clause. But we have seen that the title in its present emasculated form cannot accomplish its goals. Finally we have seen—as graphically evidenced by the committee handling of title IV—that Congress and the American people are not willing to sacrifice those few remaining rights to accomplish those goals, not even in the name of interstate commerce.

Does the 14th amendment offer anything better? Certainly, in terms of the attitudes and desires of the people and their representatives in this Republic, such a question is purely academic. For they and we have concluded this far and no further. Nor does the 14th amendment provide a sounder constitutional base.

Continuing with our hypothesis that the present title IV is only the first step, and assuming that the ultimate demand will be identical with the original, that is, extension of Federal power over the individual homeowner, can it possibly be said that such individual discrimination by a homeowner constitutes "state action" within the meaning of the 14th amendment? The answer given by the Supreme Court is a decisive "no." The Court has not even been able to muster a majority to hold that the 14th amendment prohibits the owner of a restaurant or other place of public accommodation from discriminating among customers on account of race, which would be a much easier conclusion for them to support. See *Bell* v. *Maryland,* 378 U.S. 226 (1964). Rather reliance has been on the commerce clause.

The administration, however, argues on the basis of dicta in *United States* v. *Guest,* 383 U.S. ——, that section 5 of the 14th amendment "empowers the Congress to enact all laws punishing all conspiracies—with or without state action—that interfere with 14th amendment rights." The opinion of the Court in Guest was delivered by Mr. Justice Stewart. In addition there were three separate opinions, in which a total of seven Justices joined. The specific dicta relied upon by the Justice Department is found in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Clark, joined in by Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Fortas. Justice Clark said:

> There can be no doubt that the specific language of section 5 empowers the Congress to enact laws punishing all conspiracies—with or without State action—that interfere with 14th amendment rights.

Before taking this sentence as the final pronouncement, let us consider: First, the sentence is only one sentence in a lengthy concurring opinion. It has been taken out of context and quoted by the administration for ulterior purposes. Second, the sentence is not found in the majority opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart, but in the concurring opinion of three Justices. Third, the all important facts of Guest differ drastically from anything envisioned by title IV. In Guest the acts with which the Court was concerned were conspiracies carried out in part "by shooting Negroes; by beating Negroes; by killing Negroes." They were acts clearly criminal and the only question was whether the United States had made them punishable or had the power to make them punishable by Federal law. But to view the decision of an individual homeowner to refuse to sell his home as in any way similar to a "conspiracy" to "shoot Negroes, beat Negroes, and kill Negroes" constitutes a gigantic leap beyond the dicta in Guest. Certainly a person has a right not to be beaten and killed. But nothing in the 14th amendment makes the discriminatory act of the homeowner in refusing to sell or rent on account of race unlawful. Nothing in the 14th amendment, as it has been construed until now, requires the State to make such discriminatory acts unlawful. What 14th amendment "right" would Congress be enforcing?

Perhaps Mr. Justice Harlan, in his concurring opinion in *Peterson* v. *Greenville,* 373 U.S. 244, 250 (1963), has given the most eloquent answer to the administration's original and—we may be assured—eventual goal:

> Underlying the cases involving the alleged denial of equal protection by ostensibly private action is a clash of competing constitutional claims of a high order: liberty and equality. Freedom of the individual to choose his neighbors or associates, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden, in the name of equality, if the strictures of the 14th amendment were applied to governmental and private action without distinction. Also inherent in the concept of state action are values of federalism, a recognition that there are areas of private rights upon which Federal power should not lay a heavy hand and which should more properly be left to the more precise instruments of local authority.

Thus title IV not only finds scant constitutional foundation per se, but also seems directly offensive to other provisions of the Constitution. Indeed title IV may well be prohibited first, by the first amendment prohibition against denials of the right of freedom of association; second, the fifth amendment guarantee against deprivations of property without due process of law or against the taking of property for public use without just compensation; third, by the ninth amendment's recognition of the existence of rights retained by the people, with the classical expression of one such right being that "a man's home is his castle"; or fourth, by the 10th amendment, which is more than a State's rights amendment, reserving as it does those "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, to the States respectively or to the people." If the financing of housing can be so regulated, notwithstanding the above constitutional provisions, then truly there seems to be no limitation on the Federal power to intervene on the basis of the commerce clause. Of course, the reported bill represents a compromise, and consequently does not appear as harsh as what was originally demanded. But the bill represents only a compromise in degree, not in principle. Hence the principles of free association and unrestricted disposition of one's own property remain jeopardized in principle, if not in immediate effect. It is time we recognized that such circuitous erosion of constitutional principles amounts to a threat—to reverse the familiar phrase—more real than apparent. More specifically, this seemingly "disarmed" housing provision really opens the door to and whets the appetite for eventual governmental supervision of the individual seller's choice of buyer.

We should not, however, concern ourselves with the future predictable threats of this title to the exclusion of the real and present danger created by it. Section 404, relating to the prevention of discrimination in the financing of housing, deserves careful examination. Here we must learn from the recent past, specifically from the undreamed assumption of power by HEW with regard to the 1964 act. Because of the HEW precedent, it seems quite possible for a regulatory agency to require a financial institution to maintain a financing portfolio in terms of race, color, religion, or national origin. In other words, the X bank would have to keep records showing how many Negroes, whites, Irish, Poles, Jews, et cetera, obtained loans for the purpose of building homes. If the percentage of loans, say, for Chinese, was less than the percentage of Chinese who lived in the community, there might be "reasonable grounds" for the instituting of a civil suit by way of section 406. Such percentage discrepancies have given HEW cause to intervene in education. We would be naive not to expect the same assumption of power by another agency.

Much has been said of the so-called exemption of the individual homeowner. Proponents argue that the bill is now palatable. In the first place, the so-called "exemption" may be more apparent than real. Here is why: It is evident that title IV does not prohibit discrimination by an owner if he personally sells or rents his home. But it is not at all clear whether the owner may discriminate if he hires a broker. If not, then the "exemption" is virtually meaningless; for today the great majority of Americans sell their homes through brokers. It does seem to be the intent of the committee, however, for the exemption to allow the owner to discriminate though he sells through a broker. According to published accounts of the reported bill, Congressman Mathias stated that the homeowner exemption would also apply when the homeowner lists his property with a broker—New York Times, June 30, 1966, pages 1, 23. The important fact, however, is that the committee's intent is not made clear by the language of the bill. This ambiguity should certainly be clarified. For if Congress allows the present language to stand, it will be a simple matter for a plaintiff, for the Attorney General, or for the fair housing board to contend that by omitting clarification Congress gave tacit approval to the theory that the single individual homeowner is covered when he sells through his broker.

A further example of the hollowness of the "exemption" of the individual homeowner may be illustrated upon careful scrutiny of section 402(d). That section defines "in the business" of housing by way of the number of transactions involving housing that a person engages in during a year. Thus any person who participates in as principal or agent more than two "transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling" during 1 year is covered. Here is how this will affect the average individual—the typical American homeowner: Suppose one who is employed by the Government or by an insurance company, or by a large business, is transferred from Detroit to Seattle. He sells, rents, or leases his home in Detroit. This constitutes one transaction. Upon arrival in Seattle he rents a furnished apartment so he and his family will have a place to live while they look for a new home. He has now engaged in a second transaction. Perhaps a month or two later he finds a suitable home and buys or rents it. He is now "in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings" according to section 402(d). Apart from the logical absurdity of so describing this typical homeowner, important legal consequences attach to his new status. Suppose instead of selling the home back in Detroit, he merely rented it. If the Detroit lessee terminates his lease within the year, our man in Seattle is precluded from selling or renting his Detroit house to whomever he pleases. Suppose he does put the Detroit house up for sale. If his first offer is from a Negro or from a member of some other minority group, he had best be very careful in accepting any subsequent offer. Suppose our man in Seattle prefers to retain ownership of the Detroit house himself rather than either, first, sell to the first offeror, or second, risk prosecution for selling to a subsequent offeror. This preference too may well be denied him. For by refusing to sell at all on such grounds, he has clearly "discriminated" by reason of race, color, national origin, or religion.

A much more important area of danger within amended title IV lies in section 408 providing for enforcement by a "Fair Housing Board." Clause (2)(d) explains that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to direct investigations whenever "information" indicates that there are "reasonable grounds" to believe that a violation has occurred. The Secretary may then file a complaint before the Board. The Secretary's investigatory powers and the Board's hearing powers are the same as those of the National Labor Relations Board—clause (2)(e).

What does this broad, general grant of power mean? There is considerable evidence that even the House Judiciary Committee members are uncertain as to what they have reported. As noted by the New York Times in reference to the Fair Housing Board amendment:

> There were indications that some Members were not aware of how strong it was. (N.Y. Times, June 30, 1966, p. 1.)

Probably none of us will know how strong it is until this new enforcement agency has had time to become firmly entrenched, to make its own interpretations of these sweeping clauses. Fortunately the committee does not have the final word. There is still time for this body to examine section 408.

As a starting point let us examine the Board's membership. There are to be five members; however, the Board may delegate to any three members all of the powers the Board itself may exercise. And since three members constitute a quorum, three might delegate to themselves all of the Board's powers, as I read the language. Then since only two of these three would constitute a quorum, these two could carry on all of the Board's business. But this is only the beginning of the Board's powers of delegation.

Section 408(c)(2) authorizes the Board to delegate its power to conduct hearings to "any agent or agency." Since the Board can select the "agent or agency" and since they are not limited to Board employees, the NAACP, CORE, SNCC, the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Muslims, or any other individual, group, or organization qualify to conduct hearings. As we know, the NLRB's power to conduct hearings is not a token grant. As best we can then, let us examine the powers held by the NLRB and then, by juxtaposition, learn what powers this Board or its agent would be granted.

The law relating to the NLRB is found in title 29, section 161, of the United States Code. By reference to subsection 160(b) of title 29, the new Board or its agent would have the power to issue a complaint of alleged housing discrimination against any person, the trigger to this power being a mere charge, unsupported by evidence that there had been discrimination. Five days after service of the complaint the Board or its agent may order the person charged to appear at a hearing in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere, in effect to stand trial. It should be noted that there is no jury at this "trial"—kangaroo court—nor may any witnesses be excused from testifying or producing evidence on the grounds of self-incrimination.

By reference to subsection 160(c) of title 29 the Board would have the power, if it decided that upon the preponderance of the testing taken the person charged had engaged in housing discrimination, to issue a cease and desist order. The person aggrieved by this finding and order could resort to the court of appeals. It should be noted, however, that the review proceeding is a review of the Board's action rather than a trial de novo. Thus the Board's—not a jury's—findings of fact would be considered conclusive if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole.

By importation from subsection 160(g) of title 29, the filing of an appeal by the aggrieved will not operate to stay the Board's order. This order remains in effect until modified. Since it is very unlikely that a court would modify such an order without first hearing substantial testimony, the aggrieved will remain subject to the Board's order through a considerable portion of the appeal proceedings.

In addition the Board is authorized to commence proceedings on its own. Thus the Board, following the issuance of a complaint based only upon an unsupported charge, may petition any U.S. district court where the alleged discrimination occurred, or in which the person charged resides or transacts business. As to the meaning of "transacts business" one can only conclude that the same broad reading will be given to the phrase as has been in past civil rights cases.

Further powers of the Board include power of access to evidence, subpena powers, and, with Presidential assent, access to all records, papers, and information in the possession of all the departments and agencies of the Government.

From this once over lightly approach, it must already be apparent that this Fair Housing Board is destined to be a pretty powerful, free-wheeling outfit. Even in times of national emergency where no other speedy solution appeared available, Congress has been reluctant to issue such a carte blanc as is envisioned by the proponents of section 408. And here the all important and hitherto enabling "national emergency" situation is absent.

Furthermore there are clearly adequate channels of relief for any aggrieved person. He may take his own case by way of section 406—"Enforcement by Private Persons"—or he may be aided by the Government by way of section 407—"Enforcement by the Attorney General." Thus there is not even a need—much less a "national emergency"—to justify creation of this overbearing legal hydra—octopus—empowered with the attributes of administrator, enforcer, prosecutor, adjudicator, and litigant.

In summary, we have seen that title IV finds no real support from either the interstate commerce clause or the 14th amendment. We have further seen that its enactment would quite likely be forbidden by other constitutional guarantees. As Justice Douglas said in *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, 484 (1965):

> The foregoing cases suggest that specific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras, formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance. The right of association contained in the penumbra of the first amendment is one.

And certainly the 5th, 9th, and 10th amendments apply in equal force to prohibit the enactment of title IV.

Secondly, we have seen that even if enacted, title IV will not accomplish its goals. This was made clear in the statement of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing quoted above. Empirical evidence compels the same conclusion: since 20 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and some 26 municipalities have "fair housing laws." Yet the largest slums and ghettos are found in those "fair housing" areas.

Finally—and perhaps most importantly—American public opinion seems clearly opposed to housing measures of this nature. Let us rephrase section 401 so as to place it in the interrogative: "Is it the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation?"

The answer to that question is simply, "No, not if 'policy of the United States' still bears any relation to 'will of the majority'." For in every single instance in which such a proposition has been put to the people it has been overwhelmingly rejected. For instance, the people of the State of California, and of the cities of Seattle, Tacoma, Akron, Omaha, Detroit, and Berkeley have defeated decisively by referendum such proposals.

And as was stated by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights in a memo:

> There is a scarcity of mail in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. It is running 100 to 1 against making freedom of residence a national policy. (N.Y. Times, June 9, 1966, p. 1.)

It seems extraordinary—to put it mildly—for the Federal Government to define as "policy of the United States" that which is clearly not the policy of the people of the United States.

Indeed to an impartial observer it might well seem contradictory to a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Mathias amendment, to vote against the MacGregor amendment, and to vote against the amendment to strike the entire title IV.

Many people would prefer that all discrimination—even that by individual homeowners—be eliminated and support the MacGregor amendment because it in fact would do this. They argue that if discrimination in housing is bad, a little bit of discrimination cannot be good. And I suppose an agreement can be so made. Others would say there should be no limitation on either the homeowner or the seller and that either or both should have untrammeled right to decide to whom he will sell and for what reason. As usual, we seek an amendment that will go down the middle, which will save the bill from defeat and which will give reasonable protection to the legitimate rights of both groups.

Today, this country is faced with a refusal by a minority group to any longer tolerate what has amounted to a refusal by the majority to accord them rights all other Americans have enjoyed for years. This refusal by the minority has assumed the proportions of a revolution. America should have long since recognized these inequities, and, thereby the deaths and injuries to Negroes and whites alike, and the destruction of property might have been averted. We did not.

Over the past few years this Congress has moved to eliminate the injustice and the segregation that has exemplified the injustice. Many who would have accepted the Negro on an individual basis as an American, ignoring the racial differences, and judging him as we judge all others on quality of character, personality, cleanliness, honesty, and all of the other attributes by which we choose our associates, now have in most instances the law behind them and are not objects of discrimination themselves because they refuse to discriminate.

So it has been in employment, in public accommodations, in public facilities, in schools, and many other areas.

Only yesterday a Negro driving from one section of the country to another could not know in advance that when he was tired, he could find rest and when he was hungry he could find food for himself and his family. Today it is different.

Still, today a Negro, for that reason and for that reason alone, cannot choose where he will live as a white fellow American can. The result has been their concentration in substandard areas regardless of character, personality, cleanliness, and honesty, and so forth. I have traveled through these areas at night in a police car. I wonder how any child living there can be expected to grow up as a decent, law-abiding citizen. They have not. Today violence reigns in many ghettos. This violence I do not condone. It results in anarchy and vigorous steps ought to be taken immediately upon its outbreak to protect the lives and property of Negro and white alike.

But they petition their Government thusly. We respond, not out of fear but because we should have long since responded.

Title IV has been the crux of the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1966. I have had letters from real estate people in Oregon opposing this section of the bill. With the Mathias amendment this law does no more than the laws passed in Oregon in 1957 and 1959 would and do. Indeed, as is so often the case, if other States met their responsibilities as well as does Oregon, many Federal laws would be unnecessary.

This law adds to the Oregon law only a definition of who is "engaged in the business" of dealing in real property and eliminates the words "solely" in the prohibition of discrimination in "selling, renting, or leasing real property" because of race, color, religion, or national origin. It is a distinction without a difference and the owner or his agent still retains the right to refuse to sell for any reason save this.

The Oregon law reads as follows:

> 659.031 Definitions for ORS 659.033. As used in ORS 659.033, unless the context requires otherwise:
>
> (1) "Person engaged in the business of selling real property" includes:
>
> (a) A person who, as a business enterprise, sells, leases or rents real property.
>
> (b) A person who sells, leases or rents real property in connection with or as an incident to his business enterprise.
>
> (2) "Purchaser" includes an occupant, prospective occupant, lessee, prospective lessee, buyer or prospective buyer.
>
> [1959 c.584 § 2]
>
> 659.032 [1957 c.725 § 2; repealed by 1959 c.584 § 4]
>
> 659.033 Discrimination in selling, renting or leasing real property prohibited. (1) No person engaged in the business of selling real

property shall, solely because of race, color, religion or national origin of any person:

(a) Refuse to sell, lease or rent any real property to a purchaser.

(b) Expel a purchaser from any real property.

(c) Make any distinction, discrimination or restriction against a purchaser in the price, terms, conditions or privileges relating to the sale, rental, lease or occupancy of real property or in the furnishing of any facilities or services in connection therewith.

(d) Attempt to discourage the sale, rental or lease of any real property to a purchaser.

(2) No person shall publish, circulate, issue or display, or cause to be published, circulated, issued or displayed, any communication, notice, advertisement or sign of any kind relating to the sale, rental or leasing of real property which indicates any preference, limitation, specification or discrimination based on race, color, religion or national origin.

(3) No real estate broker or salesman shall accept or retain a listing of real property for sale, lease or rental with an understanding that a purchaser may be discriminated against with respect to the sale, rental or lease thereof solely because of race, color, religion or national origin.

(4) No person shall assist, induce, incite or coerce another person to commit an act or engage in a practice that violates this section. [1957 c. 725 § 3; 1959 c. 584 § 3]

Mr. Chairman, once again, the United States has caught up with Oregon.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I stand for human rights.

I support H.R. 14765 only because it represents another timid step toward justice. I take this stand because no people or government has the right to withhold from anyone rights to which all men are entitled.

When we speak of enacting any civil rights bill, we should be saying that at long last we admit our crime against our black brothers.

We reject the theory of paternalism and superiority.

We accept the truths of justice and equality.

We acknowledge that the rights of some are the heritage of all.

The right to vote, to select the public officials and public servants of his or her choice.

The right to practice any trade or profession that he or she is qualified to practice.

The right to shop where he or she pleases within the framework of their own economic boundaries.

The right to play where he pleases, whether it be the golf course, the public beach, the public pool, the movie house, the theater, or any public place of amusement.

The right to enjoy whatever is a part of the culture and heritage of our country.

The right to defend our country from all of its enemies and to maintain the rule of law at home.

The right to live in any neighborhood and in any type of home that he or she can afford.

In essence, I demand that every man, woman, and child fortunate enough to live in America be accorded and assured the right to the safeguards and priceless promise of the Constitution of the United States—without restriction and without limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. All time has expired.

The question occurs on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Mathias amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MacGregor) there were—ayes 67, noes 186.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Mathias) there were—ayes 138, noes 150.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Mathias and Mr. Whitener.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 179, noes 179.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'CLORY

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McClory: On page 61, strike out lines 20 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 401. It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to implement this policy by encouraging and promoting appropriate fair housing programs at the State and local levels. It is not the purpose of this title to invalidate or supersede State and local laws designed to prevent such discrimination and thereby relieve State and local governments of their responsibility in this area. The standards of conduct required, the procedures established, and the remedies provided by this title will serve to prevent such discrimination where State or local law or the enforcement of such law remains inadequate and will serve to encourage and promote the enactment and enforcement of State and local laws providing effective remedies for such discrimination substantially equivalent to or greater than those provided by this title."

On page 74, immediately after line 6, insert the following new section:

"APPLICATION OF TITLE

"Sec. 413. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, none of the rights and remedies under this title shall apply with respect to any State or political subdivision which has in effect laws which make unlawful discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental, and financing of housing.

"(b) Whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable cause to believe that there exists in any State or political subdivision referred to in Section 413(a) of this title a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights enumerated in sections 403, 404, and 405 of this title he may bring a civil action against the State or political subdivision in any appropriate United States district court by filing a complaint setting forth the facts pertaining to such pattern or practice, the State or local law concerned, the provisions of this title which are necessary to insure the full enjoyment of such rights and requesting that such provisions be made applicable with respect to the State or political subdivision. If the Attorney General shall establish to the satisfaction of the court that such pattern or practice of resistance does exist in the State or political subdivision and that the State or local law does not effectively insure the full enjoyment of the rights enumerated in sections 403, 404, and 405, the court may enter an order setting forth the provisions of this title determined by it to be necessary to insure the full enjoyment of such rights. Any civil action under this subsection shall be heard by a three-judge district court in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

"(c) Whenever a district court enters an order under subsection (b), the provisions of this title set forth in such order shall apply with respect to the State or political subdivision concerned from and after the date on which such order becomes effective until such order is modified, terminated, superseded, or set aside by any court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of law.

"(d) In the case of any State or political subdivision with respect to which the provisions of this title are applicable, the chief executive officer of such State or political subdivision may bring a civil action against the United States in any appropriate United States district court by filing a complaint alleging that existing State or local law effectively insures the full enjoyment of the rights enumerated in sections 403, 404, and 405 of this title, which complaint shall set forth the State or local law concerned, and request that the provisions of this title be made inapplicable with respect to the State or political subdivision. If it shall be established to the satisfaction of the court that the State or local law effectively insures the full enjoyment of the rights enumerated in sections 403, 404, and 405 the court may enter an order providing that the provisions of this title shall not apply with respect to such State or political subdivision. Whenever a district court enters an order under this subsection, the provision of this title shall not apply with respect to such State or political subdivision from and after the date on which such order becomes effective until such order is modified, terminated, superseded, or set aside by any court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of law. Any civil action under this subsection shall be heard by a three-judge district court, and any appeal therefrom shall lie, in the same manner as in the case of any civil action under subsection (b) of this section.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State or political subdivision' shall include any other jurisdiction with respect to which the provisions of this title may apply."

Mr. McCLORY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Because of the confusion at the time that the gentleman from Illinois was recognized, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if anyone heard what the gentleman's amendment provided. Was it an amendment of one sort or another? Was it a perfecting amendment?

Mr. McCLORY. It was a perfecting amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Was it a substitute? I believe it would be helpful for the membership if the gentleman will repeat what he said, so we will know precisely what he is seeking to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will repeat what he said.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering a perfecting amendment to title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is offering a perfecting amendment to the text of title IV.

The Clerk concluded the reading.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is discussed in the additional views of my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH], beginning on page 40 of part 2 of the committee report.

The purpose of this amendment is to encourage fair housing programs at the State and local level. It must be recognized by all that while the direction and policy statement regarding fair housing may be appropriately developed by the National Congress, the solutions must occur in the 50 States of our Nation and in the individual communities and rural areas within the States.

The amendment does not change the requirements with regard to the sale, rental, or financing of residential property; it merely changes the order in which the Federal law shall preempt or dominate these subjects. Under the title IV provision as presented, the Federal law would take precedence and, indeed, would be invoked initially in connection with any controversy involving the fair housing subjects covered in title IV. Under section 406 the jurisdiction of the Federal court would be paramount and a defendant would be without recourse to assert rights and protections afforded by State or local law unless the court should be willing, in its absolute discretion, to permit such rights to be asserted.

There is a provision for a 30-day stay of the Federal proceedings, again in the discretion of the court, where the effectiveness of a State statute or local ordinance is asserted by the defendant. It is true that the court may—and I emphasize may—divorce itself of jurisdiction if it decides in its discretion that a State or local enforcement proceeding will proceed expeditiously and that it will, in its opinion, serve the interests of justice.

However, this is hardly the way for the Federal Government to acknowledge and express respect for States and municipalities which are endeavoring to provide effective fair housing laws and to apply their provisions. It would seem far preferable to adopt the procedure set forth in the amendment which would require the Attorney General to initiate a civil action in a three-judge Federal court when he has reasonable cause to believe that a pattern or practice of resistance to the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in sections 403, 404, and 405 is taking place.

At least in such a proceeding it could be determined whether the State or local or Federal law should be applied. Parties would not find themselves involved in two proceedings at the same time and the threat of repetition of the conflict between State and local regulation would be avoided since once the three-judge Federal court had made a determination as to the application of the State or the local or Federal law, that determination would continue until modified, terminated or superseded by a subsequent order of the court.

Let me point out further with respect to section 407—which authorizes the Attorney General to initiate a suit where he believes that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the rights granted in title IV—that the Attorney General is under no obligation or restraint whatever to give effect or regard to the existence of State or local laws. The section contains no provision for a stay of proceedings no matter how strong the State or local law may be and no matter how conscientiously it may be applied.

The amendment which I have offered would reverse this situation and would require the Attorney General to establish the ineffectiveness of the State statute or local ordinance before undertaking to invoke the full provisions of title IV.

This amendment contains a statement of policy which I believe coincides with the views of the Members of the House. In addition to the policy statement aimed at preventing discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation, the statement declares that the purpose of this title is to implement that policy by encouraging and promoting appropriate fair housing programs at the State and local levels, and that it is not the purpose to invalidate or supersede State and local laws in this area.

As the Attorney General recognized and as has been pointed out previously on the floor of this House, a large number of States—20 in all—have provided fair housing statutes, all except 3 of which apply to private housing, as does title IV. Some of the State ordinances are more restrictive than the provisions of title IV; others are not as restrictive. At least 25 of our major municipalities, including Chicago, New York, Indianapolis, Des Moines, St. Louis, Washington, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other large cities have ordinances aimed at ending discrimination in housing. These should not be swept aside, nor should the Federal law be superimposed on top of these local ordinances. It is my feeling that the problems of fair housing in Chicago are different from those in New York. St. Louis may have its own individual problem. Washington appears to have made substantial progress under the regulations adopted by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

We are all aware that fair housing legislation is a controversial issue. We are aware, too, that solutions must be found to provide greater opportunity for those who seek and deserve better private housing. I am sure that much of the civil rights legislation that we have enacted in the past has had a salutary result. Other parts of the program have done little more than hold forth promises which neither this Congress nor the Executive have been able to fulfill.

This amendment gives balance and perspective to the action which I hope we will take with regard to title IV. At the same time, it will not involve the assumption of greater responsibility than we should be required to assume or mislead anyone in believing that the Federal Government is assuming a role beyond that which it has any right to assume.

I urge a favorable vote on the amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 5:30.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if this agreement is agreed to, it would not preclude the offering of amendments to any portion of title IV at any time later tomorrow, would it?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the request of the gentleman from New Jersey, it was to the pending amendment and any amendment thereto.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHITENER. Is it correct to state that any amendments that any Member will offer to any portion of title IV must first be disposed of before the Committee reaches a vote upon the motion or amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the Chairman, and, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], but it occurs to me that during the consideration of this bill for now 8 days the Committee might want to consider an orderly procedure in the possibility, if not probability, that this amendment and perhaps others might be more readily concluded by granting time to those who wish to be heard rather than seeking to invoke, either by unanimous consent or motion, what amounts to cloture on this extremely important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, with that statement I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from New Jersey—is it the gentleman's intention that the Committee rise at the termination of the 5:30 time period?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is the intention of the gentleman from New Jersey to move that the Committee rise at that time.

Mr. CRAMER. That is what I understood.

Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Did I understand the Chair to say that all amendments have to be disposed of to this title before the Moore motion to strike is taken up?

The CHAIRMAN. As it has been indicated, the title will be open to perfecting amendments before the vote on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I had made a previous inquiry, and I had understood that the answer was to the effect that the MacGregor substitute and the Mathias amendment, as well as the Moore motion, could be disposed of and amendments would still be in order on the title; is that incorrect, assuming the Moore amendment did not carry, of course?

The CHAIRMAN. Based upon that assumption, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. All right.

Then, Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. It is my understanding that action could be taken on the Moore amendment to strike and if that did not prevail, then further amendments to the title would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observed standing the following Members: Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rogers of Colorado, Mr. Whitener, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Cramer, Mr. McClory, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Smith of Virginia, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Colmer, Mr. Watts, Mr. Fountain, Mr. Corman, Mr. Celler, Mr. Moore, Mr. St. Onge, and Mr. Dowdy.

Each Member will be recognized for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate], and I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy], would like to do likewise?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate], and I would like to add that I cannot support his amendment, but I yield to the gentleman my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Senner].

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. St. Onge].

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be granted to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the unclear amendment and undefined amendment that has been offered here.

First of all, any State law prohibiting housing discrimination that is in force and effect is covered by section 410 of the bill.

This proposal is unprecedented, and as I view it cannot be successfully operated because it confers on the Federal court legislative powers. It asks the courts to render advisory opinions. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I just could not let the opportunity pass to announce publicly that for once I agree with the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I should first like to thank my colleagues for yielding their time to me. Basically, I suppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith], and myself could be described as a home rule amendment. It is an amendment which would permit the local States and municipalities who have already acted on this very troublesome problem to continue to handle their own local problems at the local level until such time as the Federal Government might come in, and if such action on their part was a subterfuge, then the remedy would be in a court of law to establish that fact.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado that this proposal may be unprecedented. I think it will not be the first part of this legislation that may be unprecedented.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory]. Do the other parts of this bill have effective dates? I see none in this particular section 401 of the bill, therefore I presume it would become effective upon signature. I would ask if the State or municipality should pass a law in compliance with the spirit of this bill, thereafter would that law be effective in your opinion?

Mr. McCLORY. That is my opinion. That is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the support of this amendment by all Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McClory-Hungate-Smith amendment.

In the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965, we acted to promote, stimulate, and encourage State and local action to make a reality of our pledges of equal opportunity. If we do not adopt this amendment we will be taking an opposite course now.

When Attorney General Katzenbach testified before our subcommittee we discussed with him the preemptive effect of title IV. He made it clear that any exceptions to coverage existing in State and local laws not mirrored in the coverage of title IV would be rendered invalid.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, before the debate on this unwise and unreasonable bill is concluded, I expect to express at some length my views concerning a number of its proposals, and the capricious, unconscionable, and illegal manner in which certain provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is being administered in certain sections of the country.

In the meantime, however, I wish to speak briefly concerning title IV of the bill—the so-called fair housing section.

I must vigorously oppose title IV and therefore support the Moore amendment to strike it from the bill.

In my humble judgment, the enactment of title IV would constitute a serious threat to the concept of individual property rights which has been a fundamental basis of our system of government.

On the basis of past decisions of the Supreme Court, the constitutionality of title IV is extremely doubtful. There is, of course, a very real possibility that the present Supreme Court will ignore previous decisions. It has in the past. And this possibility makes it all the more important that the Congress act to prevent the far-reaching erosion of individual rights which could take place if title IV is enacted.

While the dangers of title IV are clearly apparent, there is little evidence that it would result in any substantial progress toward its stated objective of eliminating racial discrimination in housing. In fact, some of the worst minority housing problems are in communities which have had State or local fair housing laws for years.

Although it would have little effect on housing conditions of minority groups, title IV would undoubtedly open a Pandora's box of controversy and litigation. Because of the haste with which title IV was considered and drafted, members of the Judiciary Committee do not even agree among themselves as to what is intended by some of its provisions. This was made clear by the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. Moreover, anyone accused of failing to comply with the ambiguous requirements of title IV might be forced to defend himself against three separate kinds of punitive action. Title IV would authorize private suits against property owners—with the Federal Government providing attorneys and underwriting court costs. Title IV would also authorize the Attorney General to bring suit against property owners. Still another provision of title IV would authorize punitive action against property owners by a "Fair Housing Board."

I want to emphasize that, as a matter of personal conviction, I do not approve nor do I support racial, religious, or ethnic discrimination. I believe that every American should be treated as an individual—and that no one should be penalized because of his race, religion, or national origin. I also believe that the personal freedom of individuals should be subject only to those limitations which are required in the best interests of society or are necessary to protect the rights of others.

In any truly civilized society, it is the recognized obligation of government to protect—on an equal basis—the legitimate personal and property rights of all its citizens. But no government can carry out this responsibility properly if, in attempting to advance the interests of some of its citizens, it takes away or seriously jeopardizes the rights of others.

The enactment of title IV would do little or nothing to improve housing opportunities for minority groups. It would do much to create confusion, turmoil, and bitterness. Has not this Congress already created enough of that? Surely it is time for us to stop, look, and listen and start thinking and acting in the best interests of all our people.

I urge you not to approve title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN].

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the three sponsors of this amendment. I think that it is a very good amendment and I am happy to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the principal sponsor, Is it true that under the present bill without this amendment, if one were found guilty of discrimination pursuant to this title IV in a State that already has similar legislation that he could then be found guilty likewise under the State law since the guarantee against being prosecuted more than once does not apply as between State and Federal offenses?

Mr. McCLORY. I believe the gentleman is eminently correct. Section 410 provides no protection against being prosecuted in both places at the same time, one after another. There would be a duplication of fair housing legislation unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The prohibition against double jeopardy would not apply in this situation, and the person could be held guilty under both State and Federal law, except with your amendment only one or the other would apply. If the State has sufficient law, then the person would be prosecuted only under State law. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLORY. That is correct. The Federal law would have to be established before this could be effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a subterfuge and a farce. It is an effort to deny to some Americans the protection which is guaranteed to other Americans. When we legislate in this body, we legislate to give rights to every American citizen. We set a minimum standard. If we adopt this amendment, we will take away from the people who need it the most the protection of this law. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. In what way would it be farcical if the Attorney General thought these laws were being used for purposes of subterfuge and went into a three-judge Federal court and asked for relief; where would the damage be?

Mr. CORMAN. Because you would give the right to people in some States without the Attorney General taking action, and in other States you place on the Attorney General unprecedented and unwarranted burden to establish discrimination before an individual may seek his remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I believe it is obvious to a great many of us here on this floor that the enforcement of open housing and fair housing rests mostly with the States and localities where these discriminations may occur. It is for this reason that I urge the adoption of this amendment as one which will protect the rights of the States and the localities in doing away with this discrimination.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that unless this amendment is adopted, we are going to mislead the American people as to what it is the Congress of the United States is doing. Certainly we are not suggesting in this Federal legislation that we are going to move into every community of every State of the United States and undertake to enforce their housing laws. It seems to me our job should be only to fill gaps where the local and State governments have not undertaken to do the job they should.

We talked yesterday about rights and responsibilities. Certainly we should not assume any responsibilities which the local and State governments have. Instead of this proving a subterfuge and a farce, what we would be doing, unless this amendment is adopted, is to mislead the American people, to kid them that we are doing something more than we are doing.

I believe a great deal of the trouble has been created by speeches and pronouncements made in this Nation's Capital with respect to what our policy is, without providing implementation and a means of enforcement for carrying out these rights.

What we should be doing is to lay down broad guidelines, setting forth policy, and then let the established units of government, which have the responsibility, carry out that responsibility. This legislation should encourage States and municipalities to provide their own fair housing legislation. The Federal Government should not move in unless it first establishes in a Federal court that the municipality in the State is not doing the job. The burden should not be on the municipality to disprove or to undertake to disprove its guilt, which is the way the legislation is written now.

This is a very important amendment. Certainly it coincides with the broad principles embraced on this side of the aisle.

It seems to me that we should act only within our delegated constitutional powers and we should not undertake in the Federal Government those rights and privileges which belong to the States and the people themselves as described in the 10th amendment to the Federal Constitution. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the best way to accomplish the point raised by Mr. McCLORY would be to establish a policy, by the legislative record alone, simply to the effect that the

Federal Government should not take action when the State or local government is doing its job.

This is precisely the way Mr. GOODELL, of New York, handled the very same situation for the Equal Opportunity Act of 1965. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1966, pages 9149–9150.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], to close this debate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is an unprecedented provision. It is terribly complicated.

What this amendment would do is make title IV inapplicable in a State or locality which has a fair housing law of any kind, unless the Attorney General took all these steps and asked the courts for an advisory opinion. The courts are required to take legislative action, which is the responsibility of the Congress. This amendment would remove from the coverage of title IV any State or locality which has any kind of fair housing law, no matter what its substance.

The existence of any law, any fair housing law, no matter how limited, or regardless of whether it reaches the same transactions reached by title IV, would be enough to trigger the exemption. This would include every one of those States which has laws covering only public or publicly-assisted housing.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, the amendment would encourage subterfuge by permitting the State or locality to enact a weak fair housing law.

It will vest in the courts legislative authority. The amendment, in my opinion, probably is unconstitutional because it would delegate to the courts the legislative powers to pick and choose among the provisions of title IV those which would be applicable and those which could be enforced. It is the business of the Congress to decide in the first instance what laws should be in effect and where.

In all, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a self-defeating amendment, and I oppose it and urge its rejection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCCLORY) there were—ayes 48, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765), to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENSELESS DESTRUCTION OF 54 LOVELY ANIMALS DESTINED FOR AMERICAN ZOOS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have asked Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to intervene to save the lives of 54 wild animals from Kenya destined for 13 zoos in the United States.

The animals, including gazelles, hartebeests, and giraffes, will be dumped overboard at the United States 12-mile limit, I am informed, unless the Department of Agriculture takes action. The animals are aboard the ship *Masslloyd*, but will not be permitted to enter the United States because the transport ship stopped at unauthorized ports contrary to USDA regulations. Zoo officials do not believe the animals were contaminated by the stopovers and feel that USDA officials could at least quarantine the animals until such time as this can be proven.

Dr. Warren D. Thomas, director of the Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo, said:

> If there were any possibility that these animals would carry disease into this country, I would be the first person to argue that they should not be allowed to enter. But for the past dozen years the exact same procedure has been followed with regard to the importation of thousands of animals in the exact same situation as exists now.

Dr. Thomas said the Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo has a rare type of antelope, called a dibitag, in the shipment. It is one of the rarest animals in captivity, according to zoo officials.

The animals are destined for zoos in Columbus and Cincinnati, Ohio, Milwaukee, Portland, Denver, San Francisco, Omaha, Boston, Jacksonville and Tampa, Fla., and Washington, D.C., San Antonio, Tex., and Chicago.

The problem concerns the unauthorized stops by the ship and that 7 of the 54 wild animals aboard do not have the necessary papers. I have asked for immediate intervention by the Department of Agriculture to prevent the senseless deaths of these animals.

The animal importers went through the usual channels at the Department of Agriculture to obtain permits to import the animals. Permits, according to zoo officials, were issued for 47 of the animals and they were quarantined for the required 60 days in Mombasa, Kenya. The other seven animals were also quarantined for the required time, but the necessary paperwork was not completed.

Dr. Thomas maintains that the stand of the USDA is absurd because this same ship has made the same stops en route for the past dozen years and the USDA has never before taken the position that such layovers would prevent animals from being imported. Dr. Thomas said:

> All we are asking is that the USDA give these animals a chance to prove that they have not been contaminated. If the USDA would make arrangements for the animals to be held in quarantine for the required period of time, the tragic dumping of the animals could be avoided.

The *Masslloyd* is scheduled to arrive outside of New York on Friday, August 5, 1966.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 14765, and in so doing wish to express my congratulations to Chairman CELLER and the members of his committee for the hard work evident in this fine bill.

America is the haven of people who came from every corner of the populated world. Men of all beliefs, all religions, all colors, endured numerous hardships as they crossed the oceans. Some were fleeing persecutions, some were fleeing the cries of children hungry too often, some forsook security in quest of adventure, but all came seeking a new life of liberty.

Out of our revolution came a nation founded upon a belief in the individual endowed with inalienable rights by nature, and a belief that human rights are always superior to property rights.

It is not our purpose to point our fingers at a section of our country and blame it for the mistakes of the past. Such mistakes were not geographical but national. As a nation we can feel shame for them and as a nation we can make amends for them. This is the task of the Congress; this is the purpose of this bill. This is why we are here today.

Some have referred to H.R. 14765 as "compromise legislation," and they have done so with an arching of eyebrows and a smug sense of self-righteousness. Since when is "compromise" a dirty word in the American legislative process? Democracy gets its authority from the people and the people are all different. Compromise has enabled us to fuse the different ideas of different people into a whole which has always gone forward, and compromise has enabled us to do so without the bloody purges which have stained so many other nations. We are here to serve the public interest, and if to do so demands compromise, then compromise we shall. Let us stop talking of what the bill does not do; let us look rather at what it does do.

Alexis de Tocqueville, the noted 17th century French historian, wrote:

> He who punishes the criminal is the real master of society. The institution of the jury raises the people itself to the bench of Judges. The institution of the jury consequently invests the people . . . with the direction of society. The jury cannot fail to exercise a powerful influence upon the national character. . . . The jury contributes powerfully to form the judgement and to increase the natural intelligence of a people; and this, in my opinion is its greatest advantage.

Trial by peers is a respected institution in American society, but can we truly speak of trial by peers if many millions of our people are systematically excluded from jury duty? There is no such thing as a second-class human being in our society. We maintain that man is worthy to judge his fellow man, not that better men are qualified to judge lesser men, nor first-class citizens to judge second-class citizens.

Let us face it, discrimination has and does exist in our selection of juries and such discrimination eats away at the very foundation of our judicial system. Local governments have not met their responsibility in remedying this situation. Thus, the responsibility falls upon Congress, and I am assured that my colleagues recognize this and will act accordingly.

It has been implied on the floor of this House that the major right of American citizens is the right to own property. Very true, it is a right, just as freedom of speech is a right, but freedom of speech gives no man the liberty to yell "fire" in a crowded theater. Neither does the right to own property give any man the power to exploit the very foundations of our democratic society in expressing that right. We must place our values in proper order, and in so doing we must not hesitate to place human values above property values, as have the great Americans of the past. I think we all know what this means.

We cannot tolerate violence, neither by the majority nor by the minority. If citizens are lawfully, and I emphasize "lawfully," demonstrating for the rights that are due to them by nature of their being American citizens, then no man can obstruct such actions. If our local governments cannot adequately protect our citizens, then the Federal Government must step into the vacuum left when the States abdicated.

In 1951, while director of labor for the State of Illinois, I issued directory order No. 2091. It provided that the Illinois State Employment Service would not accept job orders which were in any way discriminatory. After 15 years, I am no Johnny-come-lately to the struggle for civil rights. I recognized then, as I do today, that in order to have a dynamic democracy, all the citizens must be assets to that democracy. If its citizens are liabilities, it tears at the very fabric of our free institutions.

The 1966 civil rights bill will go a long way toward establishing our democracy as a vital force against despotism and tyranny wherever they exist. President Johnson recommended the early enactment of this legislation a few months ago when he declared:

> This administration has pledged that as long as racial discrimination denies opportunity and equal rights in America, we will honor our constitutional and moral responsibility to restore the balance of justice.

History has been patient with us for 100 years, but her patience is growing thin. Let us not obstruct America, let us push her forward. The eyes of all the freedom-loving people of the world are upon us. Let us not disappoint them. Let us keep faith with them. I urge unanimous passage of H.R. 14765 to achieve that end.

OPEN HOUSING SECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this so-called civil rights legislation now being considered by the House of Representatives. Title IV, the open housing section of the bill, has received more publicity than any other section. In my opinion, the open housing provision of the legislation is the most vicious, sinister, liberty-destroying proposal that has been presented to the Congress since I have been a Member, which covers a period of approximately 18 years. It is intended to have the long arm of the Federal Government extend to every facet of the private lives of all Americans. At one stroke, it wipes out all property rights and destroys private initiative. It breaches the fundamental principles established by our Founding Fathers. It is the long start of the police state and welfarism that so many people are trying to foist upon America.

One of the great principles of the American way of life has been the right to own and dispose of property by the individual as he might desire and as his capabilities might permit him to possess. The legislation is clearly unconstitutional and runs counter to every principle laid down by the framers of our Bill of Rights. Whether or not the present so-called Supreme Court of the United States would call it unconstitutional is another thing. We have no way of knowing from day to day or from hour to hour what is or what is not constitutional. It depends simply upon the political philosophy of the Court that day as to whether or not the law would be upheld.

For the first time we see real opposition to this type of legislation on the part of people throughout the United States. Many of them have remained silent when proposals heretofore were offered but not so now. This proposal strikes at the very heart and the foundation stone of our democracy.

I realize that the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has substituted the so-called compromise proposal for title IV, the open housing section. In all seriousness, I say that the compromise is worse than the original bill itself. The intent and purpose of the compromise is to get open housing legislation on the books this year and then year by year it will be enlarged until the law will cover every dwelling from the smallest cottage on the seashore to the largest high-rise apartment building in the metropolitan areas.

I call upon the Members of this House to defeat and turn down this legislation that is intended to deprive our people of the human right to own property and do with it as they choose so long as it does not infringe upon the rights of others. The constitutional right to own property carries with it the constitutional right to dispose of it as one sees fit. To restrict the right to dispose of this property to the person of the owner's choice is a rank infringement of the constitutional privilege of the vast majority of the American people. Too long have our majorities been discriminated against and I hope now they will let their representatives know their feelings and demand equal treatment under the law.

"IS CRIME DEMOCRATIC?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks today an article from today's Washington Daily News by Bruce Biossat entitled "Is Crime Democratic?"

He points out among other things:

> Some of those brilliant young fools at Berkeley and other campuses argue that they are bound by no law or rule they had no part in making. They accept no authority but their own constantly shifting opinion.

Then he goes on and quotes from Stokely Carmichael in a speech he made in Chicago in which he quotes Carmichael as saying the following:

> We've got to let them (the white community) know that when they arrest one of us in our community, we're going to move to disrupt this whole country.

If that is not communistic propaganda and anarchism, I do not know what it is. The sooner this country decides that its laws will be obeyed and that anyone, white or black, who disobeys them will be arrested, the sooner the rest of us are going to believe that this country is not going to be destroyed by a bunch of Communists and anarchists.

Mr. Biossat winds up by saying:

> And it is time to stop whistling past the graveyard and saying "This can't happen to me."

I commend this article to the reading of all the membership.

Mr. Speaker, the article which I have quoted from is as follows:

IS CRIME DEMOCRATIC?

(By Bruce Biossat)

A good proportion of the American people are hiding from some very unpleasant truths about themselves.

Far too often, their public behavior is appalling. Many are openly and aggressively lawless. Others are basically lawless in spirit and, tho they would not acknowledge it, have devolped an incredibly high tolerance of crime and violence. Evidently they can feel neither shame nor shock.

Short of the grosser offenses against their fellow Americans, many have made trespass and other invasions of privacy virtually a way of life. They are arrogantly ill-mannered on the highway and in every public place. They are uncaring and indifferent toward the rights and needs of other human beings.

The courts of this country are currently embarked on a process of reinforcing shaky individual freedoms. But while they are about it, countless Americans are turning freedom into license.

They exhibit a contempt for authority which is destructive of freedom. They really do not think that any kind of hampering, uncomfortable, disagreeable law ought to apply to them personally.

In an age that is probing deep into the mysteries of human conduct, they have begun to convert explanations of misbehavior into excuses for it—as Chicago's scholarly police chief, O. W. Wilson, points out.

In a nation whose political system is founded on the will of the electorate, some Americans are pretty close to saying that there is no individual will and no personal responsibility. The offender is always the creature of forces:

"He came from a broken home . . . He was a deprived person . . . He was unloved . . . He blacked out."

Some probers into conduct seem to stop just short of arguing that crime is human and, hence, democratic.

Indeed, the ennobling cloak of the word "democratic" is today being thrown over all manner of licentious behavior. The word is being defined to mean:

"I am to be left alone to do or say anything I please, regardless of the consequences to others."

Any interference with such unbridled behavior is being promptly labeled in some circles as "undemocratic" and even "fascistic."

Some of those brilliant young fools at Berkeley and other campuses argue that they are bound by no law or rule they had no part in making. They accept no authority but their own constantly shifting opinion.

Some Negro leaders frankly justify lawlessness and violence done in the name of their rights. A few appear to contend they are above the law.

The most startling comment made recently in Chicago by Stokely Carmichael, hot-headed "black power" advocate and chairman of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, was this:

"We've got to let them (the white community) know that when they arrest one of us in our community, we're going to move to disrupt this whole country."

The consequences of turning freedom into anarchy are written large across the face of this country—in shattering, death-dealing riots, in a rising crime rate that the most unemotional public authorities think spells crisis.

If it is the crisis they say it is, then the hiding from ugly truths cannot continue much longer.

The reassuring words "only a minority does these things" will no longer suffice. Misbehavior, up to and including the breaking of the law, is a commonplace in 1966 for many millions of Americans.

The numbers involved are frightening. There is almost no place to escape the degradations. He who says the peril to a sane society is exaggerated is whistling past a graveyard loaded with people who thought "it can't happen to me."

OUR DOMINICAN ACTION JUSTIFIED

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a syndicated column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as one American who viewed with disgust the spectacle of leftwingers and peaceniks beating their breasts and crying in anguish over the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic revolt, I was more than pleased to read the report of the findings of the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University.

This report officially confirms, by a panel of completely impartial experts, what intelligent men knew from the beginning, that the President's firm and immediate action prevented a Communist takeover of that country. Though this report will do nothing to erase the sorry spectacle created by the lunatic fringe who sniped at the President, wept crocodile tears all over the Senate floor, and blackened our name in the world press, it at least sets the story straight for today and for future historians.

The column of William S. White in the Washington Post of August 2 summarizes the report, and I would like to make it a part of the permanent RECORD:

INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES UPHELD

(By William S. White)

Hard to believe though at times this is, the plain truth does have a way of cutting at last through all the doctrinaire fogs thrown out by lefties and peaceniks whose essential creed is that the United States is always wrong.

A case in point is the American intervention last year in the Dominican Republic to prevent, first, a civil war blood bath and, second, a possible takeover by Castro communism.

A distinguished and independent panel of private experts which cannot possibly be waved off as stooges of current American foreign policy has now returned a unanimous verdict supporting the integrity and the success of the American action.

It will evoke no apologies from those unappeasable Senators who saw in their Government's emergency measures only some nasty old Yankee interference with "democracy" in Latin America. These Senators—the Fulbrights and their like— are long since eagerly off on yet other efforts to find something wrong with this country's efforts in other parts of the world.

Still, the findings of the first absolutely qualified and absolutely impartial inquest into the Dominican affair will have some interest for history at any rate.

The Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University asked five people of unimpeachable credentials to look into the intervention in their own way and to seek simply the facts.

Chosen were Willard L. Beaulac, a former career Ambassador with long service in Latin America; Karl Cerny, chairman of the Department of Government at Georgetown; Jules Davids, a professor and once a valued associate of President Kennedy; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, a former State Department official and a sister of the late Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Joseph S. Farland, who has served as Ambassador in both the Dominican Republic and Panama.

Here are their conclusions—and all of their conclusions, unabridged:

"1. There was a serious threat to lives of foreign nationals from April 27 on. That threat justified the first stage landings on April 28 which had as their purpose the evacuation of Americans and other foreigners.

"2. The situation became more and more chaotic and the number of persons seeking evacuation increased rapidly, requiring a second stage action, the landing of reinforcing troops on the 29th. At the request of the United States, two meetings of the Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) were convened on the same day. The Council adopted resolutions calling for a cease-fire, appealed for the establishment of an International Safety Zone (ISZ) and sent a five-man commission to the Dominican Republic.

"3. A coup had been planned for a later date, but was precipitated by a series of unforeseen events. Communists were linked with the earlier planning. Although surprised by the timing of the rebellion they quickly assumed a leading role in the disorders that broke out. Progress in the Communist effort to dominate the revolt became increasingly evident. The third stage of U.S. action which followed, involving additional troop landings, was predicated upon this situation and upon the ISZ resolution of the OAS. Pursuant to this resolution, the United States military established an international neutral zone which separated the fighting forces and made possible the cessation of hostilities.

"4. There was no widespread popular rebellion in the Dominican Republic. Disorder was almost exclusively confined to the city of Santo Domingo.

"5. American troops had four objectives. These were (1) the protection of American and other foreign lives. (2) the halting of violence. (3) the prevention of a Communist seizure of power, and (4) the opening of an option to the Dominican people to choose their leaders in a free election. All these objectives were attained.

"6. The United States should have attempted to make earlier use of the machinery available to the OAS for collective action. Such efforts would have reduced the possibility of suspicion and misunderstanding of U.S. action.

"7. The reasons for U.S. landings were ineptly explained to the public. The failure to communicate effectively the rationale for its actions had damaging effects in the United States and throughout Latin America."

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution adopted by the International Executive Board of the United Steelworkers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United Steelworkers of America have been in many fights for right and justice. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, any time when they have been motivated by anything other than a sincere desire to contribute to the welfare and best interest of all the American people. I have enjoyed their support for the many years that I have been in the Congress, and in return they have never asked my support of anything that was not in the interest of our country and of all our people.

I am happy to say Mr. Speaker, that I am standing with the steelworkers at this time as I have on past occasions. I hope the friends of labor will realize as do the steelworkers that any time we accept compulsory arbitration, we have started to dig the grave for organized labor and the blessings it has brought for the men and women of toil.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks at this point to include the entire text of the resolution adopted by the International Executive Board of the United Steelworkers of America, dated July 25, 1966:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT FOR IAM STRIKERS

The International Executive Board of the United Steelworkers of America wholeheartedly supports the present struggle of striking members of the International Association of Machinists (IAM) to obtain an equitable settlement from Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans World and United.

At the same time, this Board unanimously opposes any governmental action that would force the workers back to work under conditions and wages they are legally seeking to change through the exercise of our free collective bargaining system. Such action would constitute a one-sided step favorable to management since it would freeze workers to old conditions and terms while encouraging management to refrain from realistic collective bargaining.

Members of the Machinists' union are merely attempting to obtain a reasonable and fair share of the unprecedented profits enjoyed by the airlines. Last year, it should be noted, the five airlines netted $200 million, doubling their profits of the previous year. This year their profit is running at a rate 30 percent ahead of last year. The proposals of the union would add less than 2 percent to the cost of operations of the airlines and would not necessitate a fare increase. From the profit figures of the airlines it is obvious that the issues blocking settlement are not questions that involve the airlines' ability to pay but are questions of their willingness to share prosperity with their workers.

The union, it should also be noted, has complied with every provision of the Railway Labor Act. The strike is a legal strike, and it is an orderly strike. The workers are to be complimented for their display of good trade union discipline as they march on picket lines in 231 cities across the nation.

The airlines lag sadly behind prevailing and accepted practices in other labor-management agreements. For example, the airlines do not have a company-financed pension plan but require their employees to contribute to it. In addition, the airlines' hospitalization plan does not extend coverage to dependents of the workers.

The workers involved in the strike against the airlines are entitled to their fair share of the companies' record-breaking profits as a simple matter of economic justice.

The International Executive Board of the United Steelworkers of America not only supports the workers in their strike but extends its encouragement to the workers to maintain a united and determined front in their effort to obtain a fair contract.

PRACTICE OF MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS IN ANNOUNCING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS ON FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, on June 2, 1965, I testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. As one of the sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 169, which created the joint committee, I was—and still am—enthusiastic about the committee's opportunities.

Today I wish to reiterate a point I made during my appearance before the joint committee a year ago.

Modern-day government in the United States is complicated. There are some 91,000 governing units at all levels of government which are guided by over 520,000 elected officials and 10 million full-time employees. Our Government is so large and so complex that few understand it well and many barely understand it at all. Yet, government touches the lives of all our citizens. It seems clear, therefore, that the lines of responsibility and authority in government must be as clear as possible. It would seem too that our citizens have a right to expect and demand that their tax dollars be spent economically and fairly.

I strongly believe that the policy of encouraging or assisting Members of Congress in the announcement of Federal grants, contracts, or projects in their States or districts should be terminated. If, in fact, a Member of Congress has successfully secured Federal support for a legitimate activity in his State or district, this fact will surely become known. We need not worry about that.

However, to encourage or assist Members of Congress in making initial announcements of Federal grants, projects, and—particularly—Federal contracts, leaves at least a shadow of doubt as to whether or not the contract or project was awarded solely, as it should have been, on factors such as cost, performance, merit, and national interest. And yet, the executive branch actually notifies elected Members of Congress in advance of such announcements, sometimes with prepared press releases, so that the Member can make his announcement first.

I believe there is a danger that Members who become publicly known for taking credit for such Federal activities may soon become recognized as "brokers" in the business of the Federal Government. Soon constituents, potential campaign contributors, educators seeking grants, businessmen, lobbyists, or others may conclude that the accepted way to deal with the Federal departments, bureaus, or agencies is through the office of a Member of Congress. Not only would this condition greatly overtax a Member's resources, but, of far greater concern, it would undermine the established means for conducting business with the Federal Government and place improper emphasis on the role of a Member of Congress. A Member of Congress is supposed to be a legislator—not an errand boy for special interests or a press release outlet for the executive branch.

Currently the Atomic Energy Commission is considering a site for the location for the proposed 200-Bev proton accelerator. Some individuals have been widely publicizing what they feel they have done to promote various sites and boasting about the roles they are allegedly playing in working to win favorable approval for a specific site. I hope that overstatements and interferences will not result in any good site being dropped from consideration. Further, when the AEC does choose a site, I would hope it will do so on the basis of merit, cost, and ability to perform the assigned tasks, rather than on the basis of how much political influence, real or imagined, is being thrown around.

I recall having received a telephone call earlier this year from a representative of a major Midwestern university who was anxious to learn whether or not his university had been awarded a $133,000 grant by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This individual had learned the day before that other Members of Congress had announced the awarding of similar grants to other Midwestern universities; thus, he was led to believe that Members of Congress were playing key roles in the awarding of these grants and that the thing for him to do was to telephone me. I assured the caller that I did not, in fact, have any responsibility in this area, and that the decision was one to be made solely by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is unfortunate that an educator was misled by the practice of Members of Congress announcing grants and other Federal awards. He should not have been so deceived.

I also recall an editorial in the New York Times which criticized candidates for public office who campaign on the theme that they can "get more" out of the Federal Government for their State, district, or city than can their opponents. The editorial of October 27, 1965, cited a mayoral candidate's advertising that he could "get more" from Washington, D.C., and therefore he was the man to support. The Times stated:

> This is a remarkable indictment of the Johnson administration. It suggests, for example, that Sargent Shriver, the head of the antipoverty program and a Democrat, would be less sympathetic and helpful to New York if its Mayor were a Republican. It makes the same inneundo about the officials who run the housing, education, mass transit, anti-pollution, and other programs in which New York has a vital interest. It suggests that President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY and Senator KENNEDY himself would not be so helpful to the Mayor of the Nation's largest city if he were of political faith different from theirs. We reject these Democratic-inspired innuendoes about the fairness of Federal agency officials. We prefer to believe that they place their sworn duty to administer Federal programs impartially ahead of partisan loyalties.

I agree with the Times that this kind of action is insulting to the Federal Government and to the people who make the decisions on Federal grants, projects, and contracts. Further, it should be insulting to the intelligence of the American people. A man does not deserve to be elected to public office because he contends he can "get more" from the Federal Government or from other levels of government than the facts would warrant. A man does not deserve to be elected to public trust because he has been able to outpromise his opponent as to what undeserved rewards he can secure regardless of the merit.

I would like to think that a procurement officer or Corps of Engineers official, or, for that matter, a panel of educators serving the National Science

Foundation, who based decisions on need, cost, merit, and performance, would not be pleased to note announcements by Members of Congress of contracts, grants, or projects, in that such announcements clearly leave the impression that congressional influence had something to do with the matter, when in truth, hopefully, it did not.

It is unwise to have a Member of Congress announce the awarding of a contract with which he very likely had nothing to do. Putting it another way, it is not sound public policy to have a Member of Congress announce projects, grants, or contracts because it will inevitably appear that the award was due to the Member's diligent efforts, influence, or contacts in the department concerned or in the White House, overlooking the fact that very likely the only diligent effort was in preparing the press release to announce the award and overlooking the fact that the Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, committees of Congress, and others were actually responsible for preparing the way for the project's approval.

In this day of discussion of ethics on the part of legislators, I must confess that I am deeply concerned that all officials of government conduct themselves in a way that is above criticism, for what affects the reputation of one directly affects the reputation of, and, in turn, the effectiveness of Congress as an instrument of government.

BIRTHDAY OF LATE GLOBAL AVIATRIX—JOAN MERRIAM SMITH

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today, August 3, 1966, the late aviatrix, Joan Merriam Smith of Long Beach, Calif., would have been 30 years old. As sponsor of House Joint Resolution 464, a memorial resolution in her honor, I call attention to this courageous young pilot, who in 1964 flew the 1937 Amelia Earhart route around the globe. She is deserving of the recognition requested in my resolution, namely that the 12th day of May each year be designated "Joan Merriam Smith-Amelia Earhart Aviation Day." Amelia Earhart blazed the frontier of aviation for women, and Joan Merriam Smith dreamed, lived, and fulfilled the achievement of flying solo the uncompleted 1937 Amelia Earhart route around the Equator in 1964.

The memorial resolution also requests an airmal stamp in honor of Joan Merriam Smith. A suggested theme, "World Friendship, via Aviation," was demonstrated by Joan Merriam Smith when she requested thousands of global friends, at each stop of her 1964 flight, to autograph her plane, *The City of Long Beach*. This was her own unique idea for sharing this historic flight and contributing to world friendship and understanding. It would be most appropriate for this commemorative airmal stamp to be issued on May 13, 1968, the 50th anniversary of airmail postage.

The city of Long Beach, Calif., through its mayor and city council, has endorsed this memorial to Joan Merriam Smith through a formal resolution.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the folowing letter from Miss Kay A. Brick, chairman, All-Woman Transcontinental Air Race, Inc., Teterboro, N.J., which is dated May 13, 1966:

Members of the Congress of the United States:

As a member of the Citizens Committee for Recognition for Late Global Aviatrix, Joan Merriam Smith, I should like to state my endorsement to Congress of the memorial resolutions (H.J. Res. 461–5 and S.J. Res. 114).

The 1964 global flight of Joan Merriam Smith was one of courage, patriotism and pioneer spirit—as was the life and flights of Amelia Earhart, Joan's inspiration for her life and 1964 flight which completed the 1937 Earhart Equator route. It is appropriate that these two aero pioneers be honored by a joint Aviation Day.

An airmail stamp with the theme, "World Friendship, via Aviation" is deserved because Joan Merriam Smith's flight illustrated this theme since thousands autographed her plane, at various stops. This theme would be inspirational to the aviation industry and peace.

Joan Merriam Smith flew in the 1960, 1961 and 1962 Powder Puff Derby and in 1964 served as Honorary Starter for the race.

She was courageous and inspirational to know, dedicated to her profession of flying & ATR highest skilled pilot-rating.

Sincerely yours,

KAY A. BRICK,
Chairman-AWTAR Board.

FIGHTING LIVESTOCK DISEASES

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, since this country was first settled we have been engaged in a continuing battle to keep from our shores the devastating diseases of livestock which ravaged most other countries of the world. Within recent years this task has become even more difficult because of our modern means of international transportation and the greatly increased volume of people, animals, and products moving in international commerce. One reason we enjoy the standard of living that we do today is because our livestock industry has been able to develop and operate free of the tremendous burden placed upon similar operations in other countries due to the drain on their productivity from disease.

One of the greatest of these menaces to our livestock and wildlife populations is foot-and-mouth disease which is perhaps the most dreaded of all the plagues exotic to the United States. This disease affects all cloven-hoofed animals and when introduced into the susceptible population can cause losses in meat and milk production which bring the livestock economy to a standstill. Another is a disease known as rinderpest, a disease of cattle in which death losses from the acute form approach 100 percent. Rinderpest is widespread in Asia and Africa and has periodically appeared in Eastern and Western Europe. We have been able to prevent the introduction of rinderpest into the United States but in the case of foot-and-mouth disease there have been six instances since 1900 when this plague has entered this country. The first of these was in 1902 and the last in 1929. By vigorous action to find and eradicate all animals affected or exposed to the disease, in each instance it was eliminated, but not without great cost. The direct cost of fighting this disease during these outbreaks was about $23 million and the indirect losses are conservatively estimated to be 10 times that amount.

The most persistent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease suffered by a North American country occurred in our neighbor to the south, Mexico, starting in late 1946. Recognizing the extreme danger this posed to the United States our Department of Agriculture joined with the Mexican Government in a joint campaign, on a tremendous scale, to eliminate the infection through inspection and vaccination of livestock over thousands of square miles of Mexico combined with the destruction of those animals known to be infected or exposed. This effort was carried out over a period of years and was successful. The last outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico occurred in 1953. The cost of this effort to the United States reached $137 million with expenditures by the Mexican Government also very high for their scientific and military personnel working in the campaign and their contribution to the indemnity payments.

As far as the U.S. internal defense was concerned, Congress recognized in 1930, the following heavy losses that had been incurred in previous years, our safeguards against the entry of exotic diseases needed strengthening. Legislation enacted in that year placed an absolute prohibition on the importation of domestic ruminants and swine from countries where foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest exist. This prohibition was applied to fresh chilled or frozen meat from such countries. The legislation also included an exception providing for the importation of wild ruminants and swine from infected countries provided that certain rigid safeguards were carried out by the Department of Agriculture. Since the enactment of the 1930 legislation, no outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred in the United States. The Department of Agriculture is now confronted with a situation involving a shipment of a group of wild animals from Africa destined for certain zoos in this country. This particular shipment has not met the requirements established by the Department for the importation of this class of animals in order to carry out its responsibilities under the legislation to safeguard our domestic livestock and wildlife. The importers of this particular group of animals were informed, while the vessel was still at sea, that this shipment would not meet the requirements laid down before the shipment left Africa. The importers were given possible alternatives under which this particular group of animals might still qualify for entry. These included placing the shipment in quarantine at established and approved facilities in Hamburg, Germany, or Naples, Italy, or locating at some other point outside the United States a satisfactory arrangement for quarantining the group for a sufficient period of time to assure their freedom from illness prior to completion of shipment to this country. They also, of course, have the alternative of returning the animals permanently to some other country where they might be accepted. Apparently, at least for the present, such alternative arrangements have not been completed.

If there is an issue here it is whether or not the rigid safeguards are necessary which have successfully prevented for over 30 years the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest into the United States. These safeguards are in existence only to protect livestock and wildlife in this country against the introduction of these devastating diseases. Our livestock industry has a value estimated at $17 billion. Modern rapid marketing practices in this country are such that should foot-and-mouth disease or any other communicable disease gain entry it could spread like wildfire across the Nation. Serious losses to our livestock and related industries would inevitably occur and it can be predicted, based on experience in infected countries, that there would be great interference with general commerce and a severe adverse effect on the total economy.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RIGHT AND WRONG

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the August 1 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, John Edgar Hoover wrote a message that should come through to the American people "loud and clear."

With the turbulence, violence, and chaos developing in the major cities around the country, it is high time the American people make a close self-analysis and a final determination on whether they are going to pursue a course that is right or wrong. The article follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

In its day-to-day operations, law enforcement deals primarily with one of the most elemental concepts of mankind—the difference between right and wrong. Over the years the citizens of this country, through their representatives in Congress and State legislatures, have written our Nation's concept of this difference into our laws and statutes.

Unfortunately, the concept of right over wrong is not as clear and strong in the hearts and minds of present-day Americans as it was in the hearts and minds of our forefathers. Acts that are wrong, illegal, and immoral are condoned or ignored by much of our society. Many persons have no compunction about committing illegal acts because they feel secure in the knowledge that if detected, they stand an excellent chance of "beating the rap." To their way of thinking, even though guilty, "justice is served" if they can escape punishment through legal loopholes or technicalities.

The increasing number of youthful criminals on our streets leads to the inescapable conclusion that many of our young people are not being taught, by word or example, the simple difference between right and wrong. Permissive parents who pamper their children are in fact failing their children. In many homes, weak alibis and excuses are replacing the teachings of the Ten Commandments, and the Golden Rule is obsolete. Some young people who should be receiving moral training, discipline, and guidance in their homes, schools, and churches instead are left to the guiles of false leaders. The distinction between right and wrong becomes distorted and seemingly unimportant to these impressionable youth.

Our birthright of freedom and liberty would not have been gained had the men of Valley Forge and Bunker Hill let their convictions lie listless in the bottom of their hearts. Neither will these precious rights be preserved unless we do more to uphold Lincoln's strong belief that "right makes might."

All citizens must earnestly rededicate their thoughts and actions to the principles on the Stone Tablets. Let every person, young and old, in his personal, business, and social life, proudly stand for what he believes to be morally right, lawabiding, and honorable. We live in a republic famed for its freedoms, including the freedom of choice. When it comes to choosing between right and wrong, let us be certain we perpetuate this freedom by making the right choice.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

THE REPUBLICAN SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the supplemental views of Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, and myself to the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. CURTIS, HALL, AND CLEVELAND

We support the committee report and feel it is a constructive, forward step in strengthening Congress.

These supplemental views contain further recommendations for needed reforms in the procedures of Congress. They are not intended to detract from the work that has been accomplished but are offered as constructive additional steps to be taken.

The Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress, established by the unanimous votes of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, was given the mandate of studying "the organization and operation of the Congress" and recommending "improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution."

The impetus for this study of the Congress may have originated from differing views of the role of Congress, but the phraseology of the mandate compels the conclusion that Congress itself believes—

1. That it is weak; otherwise it would not need strengthening;
2. That its operations are complex; otherwise they would not need simplifying;
3. That its relationships with the executive and judicial branches are not as good as they should be; otherwise they would not need improving; and
4. That it is not meeting its responsibilities under the Constitution satisfactorily; otherwise, it would not be necessary to alter it.

Thus, there would appear to be unanimity of opinion that Congress can and should be strengthened. In our opinion, an important key to a more effective Congress is a better understanding of the role of the minority, and permitting it to perform its historic function. Too often overlooked by students of government is the important role that the two party system performs in the United States. We submit that perhaps the most overlooked congressional reform and one that might do the most in the final analysis to redress the weaknesses enumerated above would be to permit the minority to better perform its historic role.

Therefore, we are pleased that the joint committee report includes a significant number of important measures designed to protect minority rights. Such recommendations as those for improving committee procedures, providing more adequate professional staffing for the minority, strengthening of legislative review procedures, and improving the availablity of budget information are all reforms of particular value to the minority party as well as to the entire Congress.

For these reasons, we feel that our first recommendation is especially important, and we particularly invite students of government and the media to carry forward a constructive dialog addressed to its potential.

1. COMMITTEES ON PROCEDURES AND POLICIES

We strongly urge the creation of new committees in the House and Senate to be known in each body as the Committee on Procedures and Policies. Such committees would have the power to examine into and report back to the Congress on the expenditure of Federal funds by the executive branch to insure that they are spent efficiently and in accordance with law. The chairmen of these committees shall be members of the minority party.

During the past few years, the legislative branch has been increasingly subordinated in the lawmaking process. Power has been increasingly concentrated in the executive branch. By allowing this development, the Congress has strayed from the mandate of the Constitution by which it is established as a coequal branch of Government.

The appropriations process, the right to raise and maintain armies, and the right to declare war are outstanding examples of authorities granted exclusively to the Congress which are more and more being absorbed by the executive branch.

In addition, there are other ways by which the power and authority of the legislative branch have been diminished. It is not our object to enumerate these abuses here but, recognizing their existence, to propose means for correcting them.

We believe the best means would be creation of the Committees of Procedures and Policies in the House and Senate, headed by members of the minority party.

In both Houses of Congress are Committees on Government Operations having jurisdiction to conduct comprehensive investigations. It is difficult for them to do so effectively when the results appear likely to reflect unfavorably on their own party's administration. This is the purpose of giving control of these committees to the minority.

This is not an original idea in representative government either here or abroad. The House of Commons in Great Britain has a committee known as the Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is by convention a leading member of the opposition, usually a person who has been Financial Secretary of the Treasury. The committee is charged with responsibility for insuring that all public money is spent in the manner intended by Parliament. It also promotes economy and efficiency and helps to maintain high standards of morality in all public financial matters.

In our own history also, there are examples of minority control of committee investigations. Perhaps the most famous occurred in 1923 when the Teapot Dome oil-reserve investigation was conducted by a Democratic Senator at a time when both Houses of Congress and the executive branch were controlled by the Republican Party. This Senator, Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, accepted the responsibility of conducting the investigation at the urgent request of Republican Senator Robert La Follette.

These committees would infringe in no way upon the majority's power to conduct its own investigations. The new committees would help only to reveal areas in which Government was not serving the American people as well as it should.

Indeed, the mere existence of such committees would tend strongly to encourage self-improvement in any administration, obviating the need for investigations, and would help to eliminate public impressions of poor government by strengthening the operations of good government.

We propose that, in the Senate, the Committee on Procedures and Policies be composed of eight Senators, in addition to the chairman, divided equally between the majority and minority parties. In the House of Representatives, there shall be 14 members in addition to the chairman, likewise divided equally between the two parties. To repeat, the chairman of each would be a member of the minority.

For the purpose of performing its duties, each committee, or any subcommittees thereof, when authorized by the committee, would be authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not Congress is in session, is in recess, or is adjourned; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas would be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittees, or by any member designated by the chairman, and could be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

Under the scope of authority which would be granted to these committees, it would be possible not only to review and correct executive activities which go beyond the boundaries of constitutional power or transcend the intent of Congress, but it would be possible also to insure the public that the full truth would be told in matters which involve allegations of corruption.

From the outset of our investigation into congressional reform, we Republicans have stressed the importance of having minority-controlled investigatory committees for reasons which should be obvious to even the most casual observer of the current political scene.

At the present time, for example, the public is rightly concerned about ethics in Government. We submit that if the heavily outnumbered minority in the Senate and House had control of a committee such as the one we have suggested, the public confidence in our processes of government—and in the honesty of all our officials—would be far stronger than it is.

If the minority had control of an investigatory committee, the "credibility gap" could not have gained the serious proportions which it has today when an immense majority of the American public literally does not believe the pronouncements of its own Government.

The genius of American Government has been its response to the will of the majority while protecting minority rights. Our proposal is based squarely on a reaffirmation of this important principle. We do not propose that the minority be given control of an investigatory committee for the sake of frustrating, thwarting, or obstructing the will of the majority. We do so because of our conviction that the control of an investigatory committee would redress the serious imbalance that occurs when the White House and both branches of Congress are locked tightly under the control of a majority party that enjoys enormous majorities in Congress and ever-proliferating power in the Executive.

"Powers tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely." This important pronouncement of Lord Acton's is reflected in Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice in its opening paragraph:

"Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say, 'It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced Members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority, against the attempts of power.' So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities."

Certainly a role of the minority is to serve as a check against the wantonness of power. We submit that this, our first and foremost recommendation, would give us the necessary means to do so.

2. LOBBYING BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Title 18 of the United States Code specifically prohibits the use of appropriated moneys for the purpose of influencing Members of Congress "to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress." The statute reads as follows:

"§ 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys.

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment." (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 792.)

The joint committee has made excellent recommendations to tighten up the procedures governing lobbying by private organizations and interests. A complete job calls for enforcement of the above-cited criminal statute with respect to lobbying by the executive branch. We urge the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations to study this matter and report to the Congress its recommendations for insuring enforcement of title 18.

3. CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The House Administration Committee presently has under consideration recommendations by the President for improving the laws covering campaign financing and is developing legislation in this area. It is our opinion, however, that the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress should have made recommendations in this field, particularly to provide for complete disclosure of all campaign donations, whether in money or in kind, and complete disclosure of all expenditures, whether by the individual candidate or by a committee in his behalf.

4. ETHICS

We are pleased that the joint committee has recommended that the House establish a Committee on Standards and Conduct similar to the existing Committee on Standards and Conduct in the Senate. We urge that the membership of the House committee, as of the Senate committee, be evenly divided between the two political parties.

5. CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members * * *." The existing machinery for contesting an election to the House of Representatives is antiquated and complex. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has made an exhaustive study of this subject. We urge that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations review this study and report a comprehensive set of recommendations for improving the contested election machinery in the House.

6. RIGHTS OF WITNESSES

In addition to the right to counsel, a witness before a committee of the Congress should be extended the right to cross-examine other witnesses and to review the record, in particular any material which might tend to defame him. He also should have the right to bring in rebuttal witnesses.

7. CONTEMPT CITATIONS

We recommend that all citations of contempt be referred to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations before they are reported to the floor of the House for further proceedings.

One of the necessary powers of any legislative body is to protect itself against acts designed to undermine and contravene its functions. The means employed by the Congress is through the contempt procedure, a procedure which calls to the attention of the Congress the act which threatens it and provides for punishment of the offender, either through the courts or through the bar of the House against which the contempt has been directed.

Most contempts today arise from actions of those called before committees of the Congress as witnesses. There is no need to call attention to the importance of our committee structure but the point that concerns us is the manner in which contempt citations are handled.

At present, it is the practice for the committee which has been the subject of the act of contempt to serve as first judge of the matter. It is the committee itself which reports the matter to the parent body, acting as both victim and prosecutor.

We question both the soundness and the justice of such a procedure and for that reason we recommend that contempt citations be referred in each case to an impartial committee—the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. This committee would screen the evidence and report its findings and recommendations to its parent body.

8. DECLARATIONS OF WAR

On June 2, 1965, Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, testified before the joint committee as follows:

"Finally, I am of the opinion that it might be appropriate at this point in history for a study of the nature of the constitutional authority granted the Congress with respect to foreign and military affairs. For example, at the time the Constitution was drafted, the meaning of the word "war" was reasonably well understood. The United States position with respect to World War I and World War II was clear. However, more recently, and particularly in Korea, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the United States has pursued military actions which by any reasonable definition constitute warfare. These actions were at the direction of the President and without any official declaration of war by the Congress.

"Our Constitution created separate branches of the Federal Government and attempted to establish checks and balances between these branches. Undoubtedly, the Congress was given the power to declare war for a reason. Today the United States is engaged in an undeclared war in Vietnam. This, I believe, raises a number of questions:

"Does the concept of declaring of war need updating?

"What was the original constitutional intent?

"Should Congress hold additional hearings on such matters, or merely let the 'teach-ins' serve as a platform for debate on foreign policy?

"If hearings should be held, which committees should be involved?

"What is Congress' proper role today in these areas of foreign policy and undeclared war, in view of the advent of nuclear weaponry and the modern technology of warfare and the need for centralized control and decisionmaking?

"Is the normal authorization and appropriation process sufficient and/or is it being utilized adequately, to fill the desirable congressional role in this area?

"Is Congress effectively exercising its power of appropriation to involve sufficiently the representative branch of the Federal Government in the basic issues underlying our foreign commitments—and a declaration of war is only one point on the spectrum in this regard?

"Is there congressional check on Executive action in the increasingly important area of intelligence, counterinsurgency, and covert military operations adequate?

"With the improbability of wars on the scale of the 19th and early 20th century conflicts and the increasing likelihood of so-called cold-war wars, and the resulting use of programs of counterinsurgency, do we need to define the various war situations that we are likely to face and evaluate the desirable congressional role—which might vary considerably—in each?"

One year later, these questions remain unanswered. We urge that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations be charged with the responsibility of undertaking a thorough study of the role of Congress in the foreign and military activities of the Federal Government.

9. THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

We are well pleased with the recommendations contained in the final report for improving the fiscal machinery of Congress. They are a major step forward in strengthening Congress vis-a-vis the executive branch. In view of the failure to provide for a legislative budget committee, however, we recommend that the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which is composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the appropriate fiscal committees of the House and Senate and has experienced professional staff, be given the responsibility of overseeing the legislative budget.

10. INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE AND THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

We recommend that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations understake a review and analysis of the growing advantages of incumbent Members of Congress over candidates to the House and Senate. We believe that efforts to strengthen Congress would become self-defeating if incumbents were to become virtually impregnable in office as a result of the benefits conferred by these reforms.

Congress is unique among the national parliaments of the free world and even among the legislatures of our 50 States in following a rigid practice of selecting committee chairmen by seniority. While it is true that the Rules of the House provide for election of committee chairmen by the full House and that the practice of seniority could be ended any time there is sufficient will in either party to do so, we regret that the joint committee did not see fit to recommend one of a number of alternatives to this system. The experience of the 1946 Reorganization Act shows that reforms aimed at curtailing the powers of a committee chairman, however meritorious on other grounds, provide no real solution to the problem of seniority. We strongly recommend that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations face this problem in a forthright manner and take action to at least modify the seniority system.

11. EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

Although the Congress recently passed Freedom of Information Act, we recommend that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations devote further study to problems of access by Congress and the public to information within the executive branch. Part 15 of the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress contains an excellent study of executive privilege, but there is still much that needs to be clarified in this area.

12. TERM OF OFFICE

The joint committee received extensive testimony relating to the term of office for Members of the House of Representatives. It was determined that the committee should make no recommendation in this area.

In the opinion of two of the undersigned,[1] the present system, even though it is not perfect, and despite the fact that it places the additional workload of a congressional campaign upon the shoulders of the incumbent, still comes closest to achieving the ideals and principles of representative government. Let us keep in mind the basic American principle that the will of the people shall be the supreme law. If we are to fulfill this principle, our actions must reflect the best interests of the people. We must give them ample opportunity to "turn out to pasture" every 2 years those representatives whose policies and actions no longer meet with the approval of those they represent. Biennial elections of the people's personal representatives in the House have not failed to yield responsible progress and stability over the past two centuries.

13. BIPARTISANSHIP OF NEW JOINT COMMITTEE

We recommend that the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations be equally divided between the parties. To accomplish this, the membership of the proposed committee should be increased to 12 in number, with the appointment of 3 Democratic and 3 Republican Senators, 3 Democratic and 3 Republican Congressmen, following the pattern of the Joint Committees of 1945–46 and 1965–66 on the Organization of the Congress.

14. PROGRAMING AND SCHEDULING

We recommend, not only consideration of the minority but for all Members of Congress, that the work of the House be more fairly programed and scheduled than is presently the case. The legislative calendar should be arranged so that individual Members would be advised of its makeup at least 2 or 3 weeks in advance. All Representatives bear an important obligation to make appearances in their own districts. Proper programing and scheduling of legislation would permit this and enable Congress to complete its work by its legal adjournment date.

15. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

It is standard procedure for organizations to have provisions in their bylaws allowing less than a majority to call meetings. In light of this fact, we recommend that in the event a chairman cancels a scheduled committee meeting, two-fifths of the membership of the committee should be empowered to call that meeting despite the notice of cancellation.

A rule in both the Republican conference and the Democratic caucus provides that the chairman shall call a meeting upon the written request of 50 Members. Section 52 of Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, states that, "It is the duty of the chairman to call the committee together, but, if he is absent, or neglects or declines to call a meeting of the committee, it is the duty of the committee to meet on the call of any two of its members. . . ."

THOMAS B. CURTIS.
DURWARD G. HALL.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND.

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES J. V. MURPHY AS WASHINGTON EDITOR OF FORTUNE MAGAZINE

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

---

[1] Representative CLEVELAND has taken a position favoring a 4-year term, provided only that House elections are held in years when there is no presidential election and that there is a limitation on the number of consecutive terms a Congressman can serve.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a very courageous outspoken journalist is retiring from Fortune magazine after contributing to the public welfare in a very unique manner. Charles J. V. Murphy has served the interests of the citizens of this Nation for many years as the Washington editor of Fortune magazine. I have made several Congressional Record statements about him, volume 111, part 14, pages 18665–18669, "Traveler to the Pacific Wars"—and January 30, 1963, daily Record, pages A394–395, "Cuban Invasion".

I am delighted to see that he will be writing for Life magazine from time to time in the future and that with our country so short of competent journalists well grounded in military, diplomatic, and economic matters, Mr. Murphy is not being put out to pasture at the age of 61. I know the present climate of opinion may not lend itself to hard-hitting, courageous reporting about the difficult problems of Vietnam, Europe, the economic situation, and the political turmoil in the world today but this country needs honest, blunt reporting and I hope it will have it for many years from Charles Murphy in Life magazine and other publications.

IS FREEDOM DEAD?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published excerpts from a series of addresses by Richard G. Capen, Jr., director of public affairs, Copley Newspapers, La Jolla, Calif. His series of excerpts is entitled "Is Freedom Dead?" The compilation follows:

Is Freedom Dead?

(Excerpts from a series of addresses by Richard G. Capen, Jr., director of public affairs)

In just a few months, we will enter the last third of the Twentieth Century. Unquestionably, it will be one of the most challenging and critical periods in our nation's history.

Many current trends—both at home and abroad—are of deep concern to millions of Americans. The problems raised by these developments, and the solutions required, are indeed complex. Despite today's relative prosperity and a rising standard of living, there is an uneasiness in America.

First, our country's military and economic strength is being tapped around the globe as we attempt to meet threats to Freedom.

Domestically, there is an increased reliance on centralized government to provide personal security and solutions to local problems.

Thirdly, there are signs of declining morality at home, which has resulted in a sharp increase in crime rates and more than 300,000 illegitimate births per year. Established authority is scorned, whether it be the policeman on the corner, the written law of our constitution, or the teachings of our spiritual leaders.

We find that "Is God Dead?" has become the dialogue of our time. While some 97 percent of our citizens affirm their belief in God, only 44 percent attend church services weekly, only 27 percent consider themselves to be deeply religious.

Perhaps a parallel can be drawn when discussing patriotism in America today. How many would ask, "Is Freedom Dead?" How many Americans fulfilll their obligations to Freedom daily or even weekly? How many citizens believe in the American Way of Life, but practice their faith only on the Fourth of July or on Election Day?

The "Is God Dead?" controversy has served a useful purpose, because it has generated constructive debate on the very meaning of existence. Such a critique of our Heritage could be equally beneficial.

From the outset, I would state that Freedom is NOT dead, but I would suggest that it is in danger. Just look around!

DEMANDS OF DEMONSTRATORS

What about the demonstrators?

It used to be that when a person wanted something, he worked to earn it. Today he stages a riot, insisting that it be given at someone else's expense.

It used to take a lifetime of plain hard work to provide a family with a little surplus and sense of security. Today mobs of demonstrators demand that they be given it out of your earnings and with little effort on their part!

Bearded pickets protest against capitalism and yet are first in the line to demand their share of the American Way of Life. They burn their draft cards but would never hesitate to accept an unemployment check or social security benefit. They see no evil in Castro, and yet condemn our President as a threat to peace.

Some so-called minority groups seem to think the world owes them a comfortable living. They forget that society's obligation is to guarantee opportunity, not handouts.

They forget that the Great Society was not born in the 1960's. The concept of improving our standards of living has existed in America for more than 200 years but our Founding Fathers wanted a society in which individual liberty was paramount.

They rejected the notion that the State could be author of utopia and searched for the freedom to succeed, even at the risk of failure.

Let's look at education.

While our nation has made great strides in the intellectual development of our youth, there is an inclination to assume that one is educated once he has received his diploma or degree. Self-education, following graduation, is often an insignificant part of daily living. One 1963 study, for example, showed that nearly two-thirds of all U.S. adults had not read one book all the way through during the previous year.

This same lack of interest in current affairs is reflected in another survey which showed that only one-third of a college graduate sampling could guess the population of Russia within 25 percent. Only slightly more than half had an accurate idea of the population of the United States.

Two-thirds could not cite a single advantage of our economic system over that of Russia. One in ten could not name a single country behind the Iron Curtain!

Today professors themselves are appalled at the number of youngsters overloading college campuses—without any intellectual basis for being there. College for everybody appears to be a national goal. If this fetish is accepted as federal policy, we should ask where our responsibility ends for educating those who look upon college as just a means of postponing work.

What about centralized government?

The public is concerned about the continued expansion at the Federal level. In fact, one Gallup Poll showed that fear of big government has trebled in the past five years.

Today Congress is writing into law the concept that every American is entitled, through government help, to a job, a reasonably good living, comfortable housing, medicare, federal college scholarships, a beautiful neighborhood, pollution-free air and water, urban renewal and job retraining, etc.

There are 42 separate federal agencies involved in education programs. There are 57 job retraining programs, 65 federal programs to improve health, and some 2,400 federal agencies issuing guidelines to regulate our national economy.

With these costly programs has come a concurrent increase in the size of government. Today, one dollar out of every five, and one job out of every eight, flow from the federal level.

In the past decade, federal aid to states and cities has been expanded fourfold through more than 125 separate programs. More and more state and local governments are merely becoming agencies for the administration of federal programs rather than autonomous, policy-shaping bodies.

It is my opinion that many of these urban crises will require local leadership to develop local solutions, tailored to the unique needs of each community.

What about the cost of these federal efforts?

Today Washington is spending ten times as much on welfare as it did during the darkest days of the depression. This year, such costs will account for 53 percent of all federal outlays, with about eight million Americans receiving some form of public assistance. Currently there are more than 250 welfare programs, including 52 separate economic aid programs.

Too often our citizens do not appreciate the ultimate cost of federal spending. The increased taxes, to underwrite medicare and other expanded social security benefits, exemplify the problem. If a 21-year-old employee were to regularly deposit his and his employer's social security payments in a 4% savings account until retirement, he would have more than $75,000 in that account at the age of 65! That is hardly a "something for nothing" program!

DEFINING POVERTY

What about the so-called war on poverty?

Often poverty has been defined to merely suit political expediency. For example, we have been told that one-fourth of our citizens still live in poverty. No doubt some do and we have an obligation to care for those who are truly needy. But if we applied the same yardstick for defining poverty in England, three-fourths of the British would be classified as "poor."

Our critical domestic needs are sometimes clouded by catch-phrases and generated crises. In the process we amplify our shortcomings so loudly that our nation's accomplishments are drowned out by government's quick, and too often extravagant, remedial action.

The Job Corps is a case in point. One out of every ten job corps staff members makes over $19,000 a year and many are politically appointed. While a patriotic young American GI is paid $78 a month fighting in Viet Nam, it is possible for a high school drop-out to earn $200 in a job corps center. The cost of operating this program has run as high as $10,000 a year per participant.

At best, the anti-poverty programs have been ill-conceived, half-formed and riddled with political overtones.

LEGISLATING MORALITY

Let's look at law enforcement.

In my judgment, one of the most serious—and tragic—domestic problems of our time has centered on general disrespect for law, sometimes encouraged under the banner of civil rights. Such downgrading of authority has contributed to our major crime rate which has increased 58 percent in the last seven years.

The theory of obeying only those laws which a person likes is a dangerous doctrine in a civilized society.

While it is ironic that the recent violence has come in the wake of the most sweeping civil rights legislation in the nation's history, it is perhaps understandable.

Too many believe that morality can be legislated. Too many believe that racial problems can be settled in the streets, that they have a "right to riot." Too many expect, from someone else, that which they must earn for themselves.

Equitable civil rights must ultimately be achieved in the hearts of men, through responsible citizenship, and proven accomplishment. We should recall that this nation was built by immigrants—yes, the minority groups of their time—who struggled for opportunity and who scorned the false idea of "something for nothing."

What about the future?

Can we develop constructive solutions to the problems we face? I think so if we are willing to realistically face up to our responsibilities.

Historically, we have always looked to the next generation to provide the continuity and respect for our heritage.

This "passing of the torch" is particularly challenging at this time in our nation's history because significant changes in our population are occurring.

OUR LEADERS OF TOMORROW

Current statistics dramatize the fact that an entirely new power group is emerging. For example, the average age of our citizens will drop from 33 in 1960 to 25 by 1968. In 1970 our nation will be the youngest in the Free World, with 50 percent of our population under 26 years of age.

At that time there will be 40 percent more teenagers than today. In fact, in the next ten years, 80 percent of our population increase will be among persons under age 35.

In this same decade Man's total knowledge will double. Thus, we may soon learn more about the surface of the moon than we know about five-sixths of the peoples of our own planet who are not Americans. Why? Because 90 percent of all scientists who ever lived are alive and working today.

At the 1939 World's Fair, it was predicted that intercontinental rocketry and atomic power would become realities in one or two generations. Five years later, America had both.

Today we hear incredible predictions of planes carrying 1,000 people, medical checkups and diagnoses made by computers, 100-year life expectancies, and homes on the ocean's bottom. All are quite possible in the lifetime of millions of Americans.

Ten years ago educators' textbooks remained up-to-date for eight to ten years. Today they become obsolete in three to five years. One-third of the products manufactured today did not even exist ten years ago. Other forecasts indicate that, by 1985, a total of 88 million U.S. adults will be college graduates as against 47 million in 1960.

In short, our leaders of tomorrow will be young, affluent, used to great job security and highly educated. They will know the depression, and even World War II, only out of history books. They also will be faced with an incredible number of alternatives as they plot their futures.

At the same time, these young people will be looking for a greater meaning to life—something more than a home in the suburbs, two cars in the garage and a color television set. Some will want to "save the world."

They may be justifiably exasperated with present conditions at home and abroad. However, such impatience should not lead to a repudiation of the past, for there can be no future without a past on which our American success is based.

These young people should not accept the theory that the best way to build a better world is by tearing down every institution now in it.

They should recall the terrible times of war and depression that preceded them, and take pride in the fact that their ancestors had enough confidence and resilience to move ahead in spite of such personal hardships.

As patriotic citizens, we must ask how we can best pass to this generation the responsibilities of our American Way of Life. How can we encourage young Americans to set their sights on the challenge of opportunity rather than the false hopes of security? It is to these questions that I would like to direct several specific suggestions.

We must challenge public apathy and the acceptance of deliberate violations of law in the name of so-called civil rights. Such attitudes turn demonstrations into violent riots and free speech movements into filthy speech tirades.

Unfortunately, we have allowed the thin radical fringe of the college campus to steal the spotlight from the responsible majority without a battle. Our conscientious campus leaders should speak out in defense of their country. Let's hear more of their patriotism. Let's hear more of their respect for law and order, of their desire to prepare for responsible community leadership.

Let's hear more of their willingness to serve our country if called to duty. Perhaps then the peaceniks, beatniks and smutniks would be removed from the limelight.

There also is a critical need to build an informed and active citizenry. In no major Republic of the world does so small a proportion of eligible voters take the trouble to vote as in the United States. Of those who do, many do not know the issues or candidates.

In Los Angeles, for example, 86,000 votes were cast recently for an admitted Communist leader. Added to this are the results of a recent poll which found that 57 percent of those questioned did not know their Congressman's name. More than 40 percent could not name the party to which he belonged, and 86 percent did not know how their representative voted on any major bill in the past year.

Only half knew that elections for seats in the House of Representatives are held every two years. Only one in ten adults had ever engaged in any type of political activity.

As another specific recommendation, we should increase support to individual candidates, both in time and money. Young people should be encouraged to seek politics as a professional career. This includes giving dignity and adequate compensation to all those in office.

ENDLESS WELFARE?

We should realize that welfare does not automatically give birth to hope. Frequently, it breeds only despair and degradation.

While it may provide a few necessities of life, it adds nothing to a man's stature nor does it relieve his frustrations. Such relief usually takes away the drive to work and contributes little to a person's self-respect.

At some point we must ask ourselves whether there is to be a limit to massive welfare spending programs. Do we have a moral obligation to subsidize a man who would rather take relief than work? Must we support, without limit, families that refuse to abide by even minimal standards of behavior?

When government makes it more profitable not to work than to work, it's time for a reappraisal of our welfare programs! I do not believe that government has a responsibility to help those who continually refuse to help themselves.

If we are to be truly effective in solving these local, social and political problems, we must devise ways of making volunteer service more attractive. One survey indicated that there may be as many as 61 million Americans who would be willing to contribute time and effort to problems that beset their communities, if they knew how.

Thus, we are faced with the challenge of how to best tap and organize this reservoir of volunteer manpower.

ECONOMIC EDUCATION

In addition, business and industry must be prepared to defend the principles of our economic system, as persuasive arguments against those who would substitute government for personal responsibility. This is particularly significant when realizing that only 15 percent of all high school students, and 20 percent of all college students, have ever studied economics.

Our citizens must fully appreciate our Heritage and Free Enterprise, a system which has made our nation the wealthiest and most productive in all recorded history.

The task will not be easy if recent studies of youth attitudes are any indication. One such poll revealed that 84 percent did not think patriotism was important. Some 56 percent voted for government regulation of business.

Nearly half would do away with freedom of the press, 62 percent that government had the responsibility to provide jobs, and 43 percent guessed that the average net profit for industry, after taxes, was between 10 and 25 percent. More than 61 percent did not believe there was a need for profit at all.

I do not wish to suggest that these results typify the thinking of our young people. However, we have learned what a minority group of contemptuous students can accomplish—from throwing themselves in front of troop trains to electing an admitted Communist to an important study body position on California's largest campus.

Business should be more aggressive in publicizing its accomplishments. For example, how many realize that American industry spends more than $40 billion a year for the social welfare of its employees? How many know that private industry has fought its own war on poverty by providing six million new jobs in the past five years?

How many realize that industry will contribute more than $5 billion to its own employee training programs? And I might add that, unlike some federal programs, this training and retraining is in jobs for which there is a demand, not just make-work assignments.

In the future, business leadership will be essential to solving metropolitan problems including transportation, air and water pollution, urban renewal and industrial growth. This is particularly critical when one considers that today two-thirds of our people live in cities, and in the near future, one-half of our citizens will live in three super cities: Buffalo-Chicago, Boston-Washington, and San Diego-San Francisco.

Overshadowing even our most serious domestic problems, are the mounting threats to Freedom around the world. In the past four decades, a billion people were freed from colonialism and other forms of servitude. At the same time, however, a billion others were swept behind rigid curtains into economic and political slavery.

LEADERSHIP FROM AMERICA

World unrest has seemingly become a way of life as shown by the fact that there have been 164 violent outbreaks around the globe since 1945.

Today the entire Free World is looking to the United States for leadership in this struggle—not so much because of our economic and military strength, but more so because of our spiritual strength.

For the most part, the Communists are fed, housed and clothed. However, look at the spiritual starvation reflected in their taut faces. Observe the hopeless resignation as they are forced to accept drab mediocrity and regimentation. Are these the signs of a civilization about to bury free men? I think not.

I am concerned, however, with the number of Americans who believe that the cold war struggle is coming to an end, that we can curtail the maintenance of our defenses and that the enemy will soon become mellowed and compromising.

In actuality, we are likely to live within the cold war atmosphere for many years to come. Today, the United States is saying "no" to the Communist threat for the twelfth time since the end of World War II. Each time in the past, the enemy ultimately drew back saying, in effect, they only wanted to see if they could get away with it.

Our ideological war must be fought as intelligently and as vigorously as the shooting war in Southeast Asia. Prime Minister Nehru once said, "The United States was inclined to think solely in terms of military might or in terms of money." In his opinion, we had neglected to give other nations a better understanding of our own point of view.

The Peace Corps and the Voice of America represent a hopeful beginning, but they are no match for the world-wide propaganda machinery of the Communist Party.

We must reach more people, more often and with a more effective message. Propaganda based upon truth, in the long run will be more effective than that based upon lies.

The history of Christianity is an outstanding example of such a positive approach, for no other faith—political or religious—has won so many converts. As we defend the world's freedom with our guns, we will have to educate the Free World with an understanding of democratic principles and the successes of capitalism.

However, as the United States faces these challenges abroad, we will have to decide which war will have top priority—that against communism or that to conquer domestic "poverty." Can we afford to pour billions into both efforts indefinitely? I do not believe so.

Certainly, our nation's healthy economy can withstand the financial burden of the war. But, it is not at all clear that it should be required to underwrite a host of costly, and often ill-conceived, domestic programs. If it develops that such efforts are financed through inflation, the ultimate cost will be substantial indeed, for inflation is the cruelest tax of all!

In conclusion, it is my belief that America is resolved to remain strong morally, economically and militarily. We have the deep and abiding faith in our Way of Life to meet any recognized challenge that may confront us.

Those who criticize our system should recognize that Capitalism will always have its deficiencies, for it is the product of free men. However, since when is it necessary to tear down the temple of our forefathers just to get rid of a few termites in the basement?

The demographic changes which I cited earlier can produce unlimited opportunities for the future.

The pace of this change is dramatized when recorded history is condensed down to fifty years. On that abbreviated scale, man stopped living in caves ten years ago.

Five years ago picture writing was started. Two years ago Christianity came into being. Just five months ago, the printing press was invented and ten days ago electricity discovered. Yesterday, the Wright Brothers flew their first plane, television was discovered this morning, and jets came into being ten minutes ago.

Are we prepared for the next ten seconds of time on this condensed scale of mankind?

IS FREEDOM DEAD?

There have been 25 civilizations before ours and all have been destroyed—not from without, but from within. If our American Way of Life vanishes, it is my belief that it will not be because of atheistic communism. It will be because of our own apathy, our own unwillingness to assume our individual obligations to society.

Americans, with their religious and constitutional heritage, can no more afford to be part-time citizens than they can afford to be part-time church goers.

They should recognize that the battle for Freedom is never over, for each generation will find new ideals to seek, new tyrannies to overcome. History has shown that our liberty can never be taken for granted as it must be constantly deserved and preserved.

So we must ask whether we can pass our own Freedom test. How many are concerned about their rights but are ducking their responsibilities? How many demand respect for the law but fail to set an example by obeying it themselves?

How many look beyond their daily bread for a greater meaning to life? How many enjoy the blessings of this life but are unwilling to earn their own way?

A thousand years from now, civilization may believe that Freedom passed through its most critical test in the last third of the Twentieth Century. If so, the opportunities for success—or, more seriously, the ultimate responsibilities for failure—rest with America today.

We are fortunate to have the opportunity of assisting in that challenge, so let's get on with the task of writing that history, a history which will show that neither God nor Freedom Is Dead!

RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution declares unequivocally:

> The right of the people to bear arms shall not be infringed.

This is article II of the Bill of Rights.

This constitutional right has never been more important than now when this administration shows signs of being unable to maintain law and order which, incidentally, is a basis of any civilization. In fact, in the District of Columbia where the example for the Nation should be set, major crimes rose three times as fast in the past year as in other cities over 250,000. We have nightly violence in our cities and in two cases in the past several weeks police power broke down and troops had to be called in.

No one has suggested that everyone's hands be cut off because a madman recently strangled eight nurses in Chicago. Yet when a mad sniper shoots people from a campus tower in Texas, it is suggested that the constitutional right to bear arms be compromised.

To erode the constitutional right to bear arms at this time is to abrogate the citizen's right to protect his home and family against violent intruders in an emergency.

IS THE SIERRA CLUB ABOVE THE LAW?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a number of our colleagues are badgering the Internal Revenue Service because it has warned the Sierra Club that contributions to it as a nonprofit nature group may not be tax deductible. This is because the Sierra Club is using the money for a big lobbying campaign against the Colorado River Basin project.

The Sierra Club is complaining that the warning that contributions to its legislative campaign may be nondeductible are costing it $5,000 a week in lost contributions to influence the outcome of this legislation. If that is the amount it is losing per week just think of the staggering amount of money it has been collecting every week before the warning, and the staggering amount it is probably still collecting. That kind of money means the campaign it is carrying on must be the biggest, or at least one of the biggest, lobbying operations ever to hit the Nation's Capitol.

But the Sierra Club has not even bothered to register under the Lobby Act, or had not done so by a couple weeks ago. Neither had its president, David Brower, who signed the two $10,000 ads in the New York Times and the one in the Washington Post.

Are the tax laws and the lobby registration laws only for the rest of us? Is the Sierra Club sacrosanct and above the law?

Is the proposition being urged on IRS that this once-respected organization should now be free from our tax laws and our lobbying laws so as to carry on, unfettered by any regulation or code of ethics, its reckless campaign against western water resource development?

If some one, or some organization, says its in favor of conservation do they automatically have the right to say anything and do anything, legal or illegal, that comes to their madcap caprice thereafter?

I know there are still some sincere, conscientious Sierra Club members who believe the law should be obeyed. I would advise them to act immediately to halt the barrage of misinformation being leveled at this Congress by the club's leadership. Unless they do so quickly it may be too late. The result is as inevitable as tomorrow's dawn: Never again will any Member of Congress be able to treat seriously the Sierra Club or its entreaties.

We have heard the phony "wolf cry" once too often. Informed people know the Grand Canyon is in no danger of being flooded, inundated, or ruined. They know the issue here is not conservation, but water. They know what is at stake is not a place for the Sierra Club's rugged members to play shoot-the-rapids, but a place for the West's teeming millions to live. Without life-giving water this vital region of our Nation cannot possibly support its burgeoning population.

Even though the Sierra Club leadership seems to be above and beyond reason and responsibility, it certainly should not be held to be above the law.

THE FORGOTTEN LITTLE MAN—A CASE STUDY OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have often had occasion to protest the Great Society emphasis on the big guy—big business, big labor, big politics, big States, and big regions—to the serious detriment of the little man. This, of course, is the way that the almighty "consensus" is built on which everything seems to depend these days. Consensus politics, however, become intolerable when they can trample the little guy solely because he is a little guy, unaffiliated with any of the big blocs or special interests. This is the point at which tyranny sets in. When the little guy can be trampled on with impunity, the turn of the bigger guy is not far away.

Today's Wall Street Journal carries an editorial exactly illustrating this point. It describes and deplores the difficulties being endured by a Mr. Jones, of Atlanta, Ga., who received a small business loan from one Government agency while another agency was denying him the authority he needed to go into business.

The situation of Mr. Jones is becoming a typical pattern for the small guy. This country is full of Mr. Joneses. They make a majority even though they are not part of the hallowed "consensus" and are not consulted or thought much of by the consensus takers. The unfortunate Mr. Joneses are unorganized; all they want is just to get ahead in the world. Yet, they are the backbone and the sinews and brains of this country. They have the power, collectively, to turn the bureaucrats, the autocrats, and all the other "crats" out of power and I believe they will.

I offer the Journal's editorial at this point in the Record on behalf of Mr. Jones and the millions of other "little guys" who are taking a beating from the Great Society.

Mr. Jones Goes to Washington

By now Joe Jones, Jr., must be a bit skeptical of all the talk about the Federal Government's devotion to the small businessman. At any rate, he has reason to be.

When Mr. Jones, an Atlanta truck driver, first journeyed to Washington for help, things went swimmingly. The Small Business Administration lent him $25,000 to start his own trucking business.

Now, a trucking business isn't worth much without something to haul, so Mr. Jones got a chemical company and a candy manufacturer to agree to let him help transport their freight. Since some of their cargoes moved across state lines, he then had to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to operate as an interstate contract carrier.

The ICC, however, turned him down. In fact, the agency so far has rejected the trucker's applications seven times. In the latest instance the ICC examiner explained that Mr. Jones isn't offering services not available elsewhere: "There are already enough carriers in the Atlanta area to do the job."

These developments naturally leave Mr. Jones both sad and puzzled. "I've got two companies that want me to haul their stuff, and I don't see why I can't make a contract with them," he noted. "That's just free enterprise."

Unfortunately, free enterprise and free competition aren't always what Federal regulators worry about. Too often, as in this case, their prime aim seems to be merely to protect competitors from new competition.

It won't be any consolation to Mr. Jones, but the regulators at least are fairly impartial in their approach. From time to time they damage not only small business but big business and consumers as well.

U.S. COMMITMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carter] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be selected as one of the group of Representatives recently chosen to journey to southeast Asia to investigate the U.S. military, economic, and political commitments.

On the 2d of July, we enplaned for the southeast Pacific. There were intermediate stops in California, Hawaii, and the Philippines. In the absence of Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharp, commander in chief of our Pacific forces in Hawaii, we were briefed by Gen. John K. Waters, commander in chief of the U.S. Army, South Pacific, Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., commander in chief, U.S. Air Force, Pacific; and Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force, members of his staff.

We were briefed by the different headquarters groups in Hawaii, such briefings being similar to others we received throughout southeast Asia. It seemed that the officers there and in other Army Corps headquarters approved of pinpoint bombing of military objectives in Hanoi and Haiphong. It was pointed out that massive infiltration was being attempted from Cambodia through the central highlands and in the areas of Pleiku, An Khe and Nha Trang. Bombing was necessary to cut petroleum supplies, and to render massive infiltration too costly.

After an informative meeting with these gentlemen, we continued our journey, stopping at Clark Field in the Philippines, where we were met by Lt. Gen. James W. Wilson of the U.S. Air Force.

We toured the airbase at Clark Field and noted the size and extent of our forces there. We visited the Air Force hospital where our sick and wounded from all southeast Asia are received, some for definitive treatment and others to be dispatched to hospitals in Guam, Hawaii, and the United States, depending upon the particular type of care and treatment they need.

It was evident that the hospital was efficiently run and staffed by physicians of high caliber. It was quite clear that our men are receiving better treatment than in any previous war and that this treatment is being given more quickly. It is reassuring to know that they are receiving the highest quality of treatment.

After our visit there, we traveled on to Saigon, where we were received by Ambassador Lodge and by members of the staff of General Westmoreland. On the 6th of July, we were briefed by members of the State Department, including Ambassador Lodge, and members of the U.S. Agency for International Development. We learned there that of the $643 million spent last year in South Vietnam, over $400 million was used to stabilize South Vietnamese currency.

It was rewarding to learn that the new medical school and hospital built with U.S. AID funds will soon be staffed through a contract with the American Medical Association. This medical complex was practically completed in November 1965.

After lunch with Ambassador Lodge, we were briefed by General Westmoreland and his staff. In the afternoon, we met General Ky and later had dinner with Lieutenant General Chieu, his second in command.

It was realized by some of us who had been there before that visits by large groups to military installations in the field yield little information about the men and their combat actions. So, a smaller group, composed of the gentleman from California, the Honorable Jim Corman, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable Ed Gurney, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable Basil Whitener, and myself, made arrangements to visit the 1st Corps, commanded by Gen. Lew Walt.

This distinguished soldier is a marine's marine. It seems he had a thorough comprehension of how the war in Vietnam can be won. He envisions the whole picture—military, economic, and political—and after pacifying an area, he, in cooperation with AID, assists in redevelopment.

General Walt has integrated his marines with platoons of the popular forces, composed of local Vietnamese, to build up the morale and loyalty of such forces. It was gratifying indeed to see the spirit of the American marine transfused into the South Vietnamese. General Walt has a unique way of finding the Vietcong; it is called the county fair system.

After surrounding a belligerent village, all the inhabitants are marched out and a census is taken. The loyal popular forces then go in and carefully search the village for Vietcong. Many times these enemy groups are found and are removed.

It is noted that areas pacified by the forces of this general remain relatively peaceful and his efforts have met with a high degree of success. The loyalty of the Vietnamese in the areas he has pacified is unquestioned. Fifty-two platoons of integrated marines and Vietnamese are now in training. Such platoons will form the nucleus of a popular force for defense of villages and isolated areas. It seems that this policy could well be used in other parts of South Vietnam.

The enthusiasm of the men and officers of General Walt's command is outstanding, discipline is excellent, morale is high. The conduct of these men reflects honor upon the Marine Corps and upon the United States.

We visited practically every regimental and battalion headquarters in the area, including the well-organized and efficient Marine Air Wing installation at Chu Lai, commanded by Col. Leslie E. Brown.

In company with General Walt, we visited the naval hospital in Da Nang. It was seen that General Walt, though strong as steel with the enemy, is soft as silk with his men. As he viewed the wounded men, the great feeling he had for them was apparent.

After spending the night in their area, we journeyed on to An Khe in the 2d Corps area.

In An Khe, the headquarters of the 1st Cavalry Division, we were briefed while their artillery and rockets within this area boomed out harassing fire. Villages in the surrounding area were not visited as in November of 1965—perhaps because of increased Vietcong and North Vietnamese action. By helicopter, we visited an artillery unit at the Mang Yang Pass. There the lonely road was seen where 5,000 of the flower of the French Army were annihilated by the Vietminh. Nineteen hundred graves mark this battleground.

Conversations with the officers indicated increased infiltration into the 2d Corps area from Cambodia. The possibility of massive infiltration was discussed and was considered probable.

The situation in this area does not—to this observer—appear to have greatly improved since November 1965.

Again, in and around Saigon, the presence of the Vietcong is evident. Some method of identifying and capturing these dangerous underground elements must be found. Gen. Lew Walt's "county fair system" might well be used.

Port facilities in Saigon are not yet adequate. It seems clear that much pilferage occurs and that much of our supplies finds its way to the Vietcong or into illicit markets to encourage corruption and further undermine the local economy.

Our military buildup in this country of 14 million is tremendous. In adjoining countries, military construction is enormous. Never has so much been necessary to pacify so few. Our ring of bases extends from Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, through the Philippines, and South Vietnam to Thailand. It seems that the American people should know of the enormity of our total military commitment, and that they should also know of the actions of our leaders and agencies. Regretfully, it is acknowledged that our people are not so informed.

It is easily seen that southeast Asia is an immense powder keg, the explosion of which might well involve all of Asia and the entire world.

The size of our commitment in this area is no doubt frightening to our allies and disturbing to our enemies. Would the United States stand idly by and see Mexico or South America invaded by a foreign power? No, it would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Then by what right can we be in countries of southeast Asia? Is it because of the SEATO and Geneva Conference commitments? No, we were bound by them only if the majority of the signatory powers voted to intervene. The fact is, a majority of the signatory powers voted not to intervene.

Rather than become more deeply involved in a land war in Asia, it would be more economical in lives and wealth and more conducive to truly good international relations, to limit our present deployment in areas surrounding South Vietnam to forces sufficient to secure pacification of that country.

We have the best trained, best equipped, finest military men in the world. When they fight, let us be absolutely certain they fight for the right and for the principles and ideals our country has always stood for.

I am firmly convinced that the people of this country will not continue their support of the administration if, as General Ky has stated, it will take 10 to 15 years to win this war.

A BILL TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN THE TAX LAWS ON REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman frfom New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from taxable income certain reimbursed moving expenses.

Earlier in this session, this House passed a bill permitting the Federal Government to reimburse its employees for some basic expenses of moving. This has been a standard practice in private industry for years. Now that the Congress has recognized that we live in an age of mobility, it is time to correct the inequities in our tax laws that penalize and inhibit this mobility.

An example of the mobility of our population can be seen in statistics from New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District, which I represent. In 1960, only 57 percent of the residents of my district lived where they had lived in 1955. The other 43 percent were new to their residences, and over 65,000 of the residents of my district had come from other States or from abroad during those 5 years.

This national migration is not the result of chance, but is closely related to employment and labor mobility. The Department of Labor reports that fully one-half of all these migrants moved for work-related purposes—to take new positions, to seek work, or to transfer jobs.

Under the present Internal Revenue Code, as interpreted by recent court decisions, reimbursement of an employee by a firm for moving expenses other than for actual transportation costs and sustenance while en route, results in the realization of taxable income by an employee.

The inequity of taxing an employee on reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses is evident. These are legitimate outlays by employers for moves which benefit them, yet we presently regard such reimbursements as net taxable income. When one realizes that up to 38 percent of all migrants could fall under the provisions of this ruling, the need for corrective measures becomes apparent.

It is for these reasons that I am today introducing legislation which, when enacted, would exclude from income those reimbursements by employers of reasonable employee transportation and moving expenses, including the moving of personal effects and household goods, storage costs when the move is of indefinite duration, and family travel expenses from the old to the new residence. It would also cover reimbursement for a house-hunting trip at the new location, for meals and lodging at the new place of residence while occupying temporary quarters for a limited time, and for expenses incurred in disposing of the old residence, or canceling a lease, together with the expenses of acquiring a new residence.

I believe that, in the interests of establishing equity in our tax structure and of encouraging the mobility of workers throughout our society to alleviate geographic imbalances in the labor market, this bill should be speedily considered and adopted by the Congress.

CHARLIE POWELL'S PLIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HARD MONEY HITS HOME

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a fellow named Charlie Powell. He is a friend of mine who just discovered the other day that he has been robbed of $1,200.

He did not report it to the police because he knows they cannot do anything about it. Strange as it may seem, there is no law against the type of robbery committed against Charlie Powell, even though there certainly ought to be. It is important that all of us in Congress understand exactly what has happened to Charlie, because in a sense we are the ones who let it happen, and apparently we are the only ones who can help him.

Actually, Charlie is a kind of average guy and what has happened to him is happening to many hundreds of thousands of other Americans.

Fourteen years ago Charlie got a GI loan and bought a modest three-bedroom house in my hometown of Fort Worth. It was not always easy for him to keep up his mortgage payments, particularly when one of the kids would come down with a bug and there were big doctor and medicine bills to pay.

Even so, Charlie managed somehow to scrape up enough money to send in his house payment faithfully each month. Not only did this spare him the embarrassment of getting a nasty form letter from the mortgage company, but it gave him the satisfaction of knowing that he was gradually building up an equity in his home. To Charlie, these monthly house payments represented his basic security, sort of a savings account—not a huge one, it is true, but the only one he had.

Then, suddenly, Charlie's company transferred him to a job in another city. He and his wife sat on the edge of the bed for several nights and talked over what they should do. They finally decided to sell their home and buy another they had located in the city to which they were moving.

Charlie needed the money from the old house to make a downpayment on the new house, and he did not figure there would be any problem. After all, his home in Fort Worth was valued at approximately $12,000, and after all these years of payments he only owed about $4,000 on the remainder of the note.

DISCOUNT FEE, $1,200

You can imagine his surprise when a lending firm told him that in order to sell his house, he would have to give the loan company $1,200 of his hard-earned equity under the existing "discount rate."

The discount rate, Charlie discovered to his amazement, is a fee assessed by mortgage companies to handle a loan. The law forbids charging it to either the buyer or the builder of a house, so it is pushed off on the seller—in this case, Charlie Powell. The discount rate, Charlie was told, varies according to the availability of mortgage money. Right now, mortgage money is scarce, so the discount rate in Fort Worth is way up—12½ percent.

Charlie was still stunned when he emerged from his talk with the mortgage company. "Twelve hundred dollars. It is going to cost me $1,200 just for the privilege of selling the house that I have scrimped and saved to pay for," Charlie thought.

"It is not fair," he muttered bitterly. "I have been robbed." And so he has.

What is more, Charlie has lots of company. Hundreds of thousands of hard-working families across the Nation are facing exactly the same dilemma. Through no fault of their own, the toil and sweat they have poured into building up an equity in their homes is being inexorably drained away by the tight money market.

EQUITY DEVOURED

Many others, in fact, find themselves in far more desperate straits than Charlie. Some who find it necessary to sell their homes after paying regularly on their notes for as long as 6 years, discover to their deep chagrin that the high discount rate now required to sell the dwelling has absolutely eaten up every single penny of equity which they have sacrificed to build up over the years.

Others, still less fortunate, have discovered that, instead of having anything at all accumulated as result of their steady payments, they actually must pay a discount rate even higher than their total equity. In order to sell their homes, these unfortunate Americans in addition to giving up all their equity are forced to supplement it with extra cash in order to satisfy the higher discount rate.

In other words, in addition to what they have paid out over the years, they have to pay still more simply to turn the house. They end up not only without one red cent to show for their years of payments, but they have a rather sizable bill to pay simply to get someone to take over the note. This is truly tragic. It is, in fact, little short of criminal in its effect upon these families.

BUYERS HURT, TOO

The hard money policy thus has devoured the total savings of many a person who must sell his home. Let us look now at the other side of the coin and see what has happened to the family that wants to buy a home. This family also is brutally victimized by the recent monetary policy. Its interest rates have gone up unconscionably as a result.

Let us make a brief comparison. In 1950, a person could purchase a $10,000 home on a 25-year amortization schedule at a 4-percent rate of annual interest. Many American families did so at that time. Today, however, to purchase a $10,000 home and pay it out over a 25-year period, a family in most cases would be required to fork over interest payments at the rate of 7 percent annually.

If this seems superficially like a relatively small difference, let us consider exactly what it means in dollars and cents to that family. The same $10,000 house, on the same period of payout, today will cost the purchaser an additional $3,750 before he gets it paid for—just because of the increase in the interest rate.

In other words, while it may appear relatively insignificant to speak in terms of a 3-percent increase in the rate, it comes to a staggering sum when we calculate it in actual dollars. Because of the artificially high interest rates, the American family which buys such a house today is paying over the years almost as much in interest as it pays in principal.

If the amortization is stretched to 30 years, the family pays actually more money in interest charges than it pays for the house itself. Multiply the burdensome effect upon each such family by the 4½ million individual housing transactions which take place in this country every year, and you can see the chain reactive drag upon the economy.

Since just last December, interest rates are up 37½ percent above their former level. This is, of course, more than 10 times the increase in general wages and prices which the President has certified as conducive to sound economic health in his wage-price guidelines.

A HAND IN THE POCKET

High interest is a hidden hand in the pocket of almost every American consumer. Few people realize how costly it is to the families of our country. Let us think for a minute about the size of consumer credit in this Nation. Family debt, particularly installment debt, has skyrocketed. Where American families owed a total of $56 billion as recently as 1960, they owe $86 billion today. Unnaturally high interest rates are sapping away more and more of the average family's paycheck every month.

Let me give you just one example. The other day a friend of mine showed me a bill from one of the country's mail-order department stores. He had been running a charge account there and receiving bills like this for years, but he openly confessed that he never before had bothered to take a pencil and figure out the carrying charges he was paying to this store in return for the privilege of buying its wares on a time-payment plan. He did calculate these charges for the first time a week or so ago. Do you know what these carrying charges amounted to? On an annual basis, they added nearly 20 percent to his bill. In other words, for every $4 purchase he made, he was paying $5. For every $100 worth of goods he bought, he actually could be paying $120.

From the standpoint of its impact upon the cost of living, rising interest rates have constituted the most inflationary element in our total economy.

THE GOVERNMENT VICTIMIZED

Our Government itself is one of the chief victims of the hard money policy. This fact was brought forcefully home to the Treasury Department within the past week. During the past few days, our Treasury Department has been in the process of refinancing some $14.9 billion worth of long-term Government bonds. Most of these bonds which are now maturing were sold originally at a 4-percent rate of return. Some of them were sold for 3 percent. But now, caught in its own web of deliberately induced high interest rates, the Government is having to pay 5¼ percent in order to resell these bonds.

This increase in interest on these bonds which our Government has put on the market just in the past week, will cost the taxpayers of this Nation approximately $223 million extra each year.

Let me make that point clear: The additional interest—the increase in interest which the Government must pay to be competitive in the hard money market—means that our taxpayers must cough up $223 million more every year just to pay the extra interest on these same bonds. For this, of course, they get no extra service. They do not get a mile of paved road, or a single brick for a schoolhouse, or a single penny in matching grants to our States. They get nothing.

Still, this added amount which has been levied upon the Government by bond investors, as result of the Government's own policy, is costing the Government more than the total upstream soil conservation program, more than the water pollution abatement program, more than any productive program of the Government save for a very few.

BIGGER THAN THE BUDGET

The amount of money that is being drained away from the American public in excessive interest rates through all types of debts is truly astronomical. It is, in fact, almost unbelievable. It is calculated that in this year alone interest charges of all types will come to approximately $125 billion. This, of course, is more than the entire national budget.

Total debt, both public and private, throughout America, comes to approximately $1.3 trillion. Each time the interest rate goes up 1 percent, another $13 billion a year is tacked on to the cost of living and doing business in this country.

Just what does this mean to the average family? While there is no precise way to make a completely accurate assessment of what each family pays annually in interest charges, we can make some judgments based on national averages.

SOAKING AMERICA'S FAMILIES

For example, the average American owning a $10,000 home has lived in it for a little better than 4 years. His interest payments on the home note come to about $45 a month. This typical American owns about $3,000 worth of automobiles, on which the interest charges soak him an additional $15 monthly. In addition, he has installment payments on major home appliances, charge accounts, credit cards, loans from the bank, all bearing interest. It has been estimated that this typical American family probably is paying close to $100 a month in interest charges of various types.

For a typical breadwinner with this type of obligations, his salary would be in the neighborhood of $6,500 annually, or about $550 a month. If he is paying out $100 of this every month in interest charges, for which he does not get a thing in return, it means that we have allowed to develop an unseen 18-percent drag on his earning power.

HOW IT HAPPENED?

How did all of this come about? How, with the American economy thriving, did some ghostly economic bandit reach into Charlie Powell's pocket and steal $1,200 without his even knowing it? How did it reach so surreptitiously and so deeply into the pockets of so many millions of Americans?

The answer is not altogether simple, but it can be explained.

Last December, the Federal Reserve Board deliberately increased the interest rate on the money which the board lends to banks. The rate had been 4 percent, and the board raised it to 4½.

This action was intended to halt inflation. The board was under the delusion that by raising the interest rate and making it more costly to borrow money, it would help force down the cost of living by discouraging people from buying so much and thus bidding up the price of goods. This, apparently, was the rationale.

Some people undoubtedly thought this would work, but it did not. It backfired. People continued to borrow and buy things on time, but it just cost them more money to do so. The result was that the cost of doing business went up, and not down.

CRISIS IN HOUSING

The most immediate and dramatic result of this ill-timed policy is that it has precipitated a major crisis in the housing industry.

The Federal Reserve Board, at the same time it raised its interest rate, allowed the banks to increase the interest they pay on what the financial community calls "certificates of deposit." These are documents which the banks give to people who lend money to the bank.

It did not take long for news of this bank bonanza to reach the people who had their nest eggs socked away in savings and loan associations. These institutions, of course, were not able to meet the dazzling new interest rates being paid by the banks.

As a result, untold numbers of longtime depositors descended on their savings and loan companies, snatched up their money and gleefully trotted to the nearest bank. Here, actually, is where the American housing interests really began getting out of kilter, since savings and loan associations traditionally have been the main sources of mortgage money for people buying homes.

MORTGAGE MONEY DRIES UP

With the higher bank interest rates draining deposits out of the savings and loan associations, it began to get tougher and tougher to get a loan to buy a house. The savings and loans simply no longer had the available cash. Consequently, the bottom started to drop out of the housing market. Mortgage cash became virtually nonexistent in some cities. Demand for home loan money very shortly was far ahead of supply.

This, naturally, jacked up the home loan discount rate, which essentially is the extra, unofficial price a fellow has to pay to a mortgage company to get a loan at the officially fixed interest rate. It is a bit like the "bonus" which certain automobile dealers charged new car buyers, under the counter, when autos were so scarce following World War II.

As the discount rate zoomed up like a rocket from Cape Kennedy, it automatically erased a large part of the equity which people like Charlie Powell had built up in their houses through steady payments over the years, robbing them as surely as a bandit in a darkened street.

The homebuilding industry has suffered a particularly heavy blow, and this alone has sent waves of economic distress rolling across the Nation like ripples across a pond.

Before this money crisis arose, the homebuilding industry had expected to construct 1.6 million housing units this year. This certainly was not unreasonable, since there are 1 million new family units formed in this country every year at the present rate, and some 600,000 housing units are taken out of the national inventory annually by fire and by public displacements such as new highways, urban renewal projects, and so forth. So it takes about 1.6 million new houses to stay even.

But now—as a direct result of the deliberate hard money policy—the annual rate of building starts and permits has dropped to the lowest point in 6 years—a low point unequaled except for the two recessions during the 1950's.

Building permits—indicators of future construction activity—are down 25 percent from a year ago. Housing starts are down 20 percent for the same period. Mortgage commitments from banks have plunged 63 percent and those from savings and loan associations 51 percent.

WHO GETS HURT?

Who is hurt by all this? Just the homebuilders? Not by a long shot.

If things keeep going the way they are, the next 12 months could see a drop of 400,000 housing units from the anticipated total. This would mean the loss of 800,000 man-years of employment. Let us think about that for a minute. It takes all kinds of people to build a house—carpenters, brickmasons, electricians, painters and many other types of craftsmen. Also, it takes the employees of all the firms that run lumber mills, build plumbing fixtures, operate brick plants and construct all of the commodities and materials that must go into a house. All of these people are severely affected when the normal level of homebuilding is artificially stymied.

To allow this crisis to continue would be to put out of work for an entire year a number of these workmen greater than the total population of the State of Idaho.

I am proud of our country. I am proud of its people, and I am proud of the system of capitalism which has allowed us to become the wealthiest Nation the earth has ever known. Part of our great growth is due to the very fact that we have deliberately, purposely encouraged widespread homeownership. We have made this country a nation of grassroots capitalists.

CURBING INFLATION?

The defenders of tight money and high interest invariably try to excuse it on the ground that it is supposed to be a weapon against inflation, as we mentioned before. It would be hard to imagine a more ridiculous notion. What is inflation, to the average American, but the high cost of living? Increased interest charges only add to that cost.

Surely by now the advocates of tight money should see the error of their reasoning. Far from curbing inflation, tight money and high interest have done nothing more than increase the cost of living while siphoning off great chunks from the buying power of America's families. And it is the buying power of America's families which lubricates the machinery of American business.

The more money our families have to spend, the more they can purchase from the retailer, and the more he can order from the wholesaler, and the more things that can be profitably produced by our manufacturing enterprises which employ millions of Americans. Thus, both by soaking up buying power from the markets and by making it harder for small business to finance growth, this contrived policy of high interest rates has stifled and retarded the entire economy.

I am convinced that available long-term financing at reasonable rates of interest is one of the truly key factors behind the astounding success of the American economy. Look at our own country, and then look at some of the impoverished nations of Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE

The most significant difference between our economic systems is that here in America the average fellow has been able to get money to build a house, open a business, start a family. In the backward nations, he has not. The average citizen of the so-called underdeveloped world lives in grinding poverty simply because he has never been able to get the first leg up on the economic ladder. Credit is simply not available at all to the average person, and going rates of interest are the highest in the world in the poorest nations of the world.

History is replete with examples of this central lesson: High interest rates and tight money bring recession and perpetuate depression. It is as simple as that. It has always been so. That policy has invariably induced recessionary reactions in our own country.

TIME FOR ACTION

Clearly the time has come for action. Congress simply must not stand by, wringing its hands in dismay, while the current crisis develops into a full-blown economic disaster.

Part of the answer, I believe, lies in the prompt enactment of two bills sponsored by my respected Texas colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. These two pieces of legislation, H.R. 14026 and H.R. 15639, have been favorably reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Let us take a look first at H.R. 14026. This bill would place a temporary 4½ percent ceiling on rates which banks can offer on certificates of deposit. Some banks currently offer certificates of deposit to investors at rates of up to 5½ percent. This bill, by limiting interest to 4½ percent until August 1, 1967, would end the intense competition which has drained away a large part of the country's home mortgage money.

Additionally, this bill would authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the first time, to set ceilings on dividend rates paid by federally insured savings and loan associations.

It would allow the Federal Reserve Board to purchase in the open market obligations issued by the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal National Mortgage Association when requested to do so by the Secretaries of the Treasury and of Housing and Urban Development. This provision is designed to pump money directly back into the mortgage market.

It would require consultation between the Treasury Secretary and officials of the Federal Reserve Board, the Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation before any of the financial agencies change the rules governing savings rates that institutions can pay.

A STARTING PLACE

These actions, at least, would constitute a starting place. Ultimately, the level of prevailing interest rates must be rolled back if the country is to enjoy continued economic health. High interest has never successfully lowered the cost of living. It invariably has brought on recession. It always retards the economic growth. And the long range policy of this country, with its growing population, must be in the upward direction of full employment and continued economic expansion.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for action. These bills are not the whole answer to the evils of high interest and tight money, but I think they constitute a good starting point. And I am sure that Charlie Powell and millions of other Americans just like him will agree with me.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. I thank my dear and distinguished friend from Texas for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I am sure it typifies the experience of so many Americans in all parts of this country. I, as has the gentleman in the well, have met with some of our homebuilders only recently. It is a grave situation with which we are confronted in the money market. As I recall, when the gentlemen met with us, they pointed out that one of the difficulties in the money market is trying to compete with all the big Government expenditures we have.

I am sure that you, as I, would like to see all of us, including the Members of Congress and others in the Government, try to join in this fight to combat inflation. The Commerce Department has just mentioned that the cost of living rose to its highest level in the first 6 months of this year since 1958. So I appreciate personally your bringing this matter to our attention, and I share your concern as I am sure does every Member of this House.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I do agree with him that we definitely must do some things to halt the spiral of inflation. I submit that raising the cost of doing business for the American family is not the way to do it. I have heard comments to the effect that the way to halt inflation is to increase taxes. This has exactly the same effect. I do not believe you can convince the average American that you are assisting in lowering his cost of living when you raise his taxes. I do not think you can convince him that you are lowering his cost of living when you raise the interest that he has to pay, because both of those things are part and parcel of the high cost of living today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas for bringing to the attention of the House a matter that is certainly of growing concern, not only among the families of America but, I might also point out, among the farmers that are in forest products industry producing areas, such as I represent on the north coast of California. I am hopeful that other Members of the Congress will rally to his leadership as expressed so eloquently in his comments.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from California. Undoubtedly the present policy, and the rapid decline in housing starts, have exercised a severe chain reaction among many segments of the economy. Unquestionably, one of the first to feel the blow would be the forest products industry. When fewer houses are built, less lumber is bought, and ultimately there results unemployment among lumberjacks and lumber mill employees. Those who grow the trees, then, are adversely affected. Finally, every business in an entire area which depends upon the patronage of those employed in the forest industries begins to feel the pinch.

My distinguished friend from California, who has discussed these matters with me on other occasions as well, and who always devotes himself with such industrious application to the needs of his area, is right to be concerned.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from Texas yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my valued friend from Texas, a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and one who has demonstrated both a constructive interest and a keen insight in these matters.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I rise to compliment my colleague from Texas, one of our ranking and distinguished Members, and to express my gratitude for his interest. I happen to be a member of the Banking and Currency Committee where, for some time now, we have been examining into some aspects of this problem. It has been my measured view that with some of the problems we have faced in our individual States, where the high-interest interests have actually ruled the roost, some of the very disturbing forces have actually reached the point where they have legitimatized what used to be usury. I have come to the conclusion sadly that on the national level we have reached the point at which we are beginning to nationalize the loan shark. You are absolutely correct when you state that this is a hidden hand in the pocket of every American citizen. But some of the ancillary or contributory factors are complex. I do not think we can go to one particular place and blame it for all our woes.

But I do think that the interest that you are revealing here in the remarks you have made is most appropriate and will be most helpful in concentrating the attention not only of the Congress but of all our citizens on this very nettlesome problem.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful to my colleague and friend for his comments, as I am grateful for the many months of arduous labor and study that he and his colleagues on the House Committee on Banking and Currency have devoted in an attempt to find a resolution of this problem. I think the gentleman from Texas will agree with me that a review of the history of nations rather well supports the proposition that those nations become great, those nations have achieved high levels of family income, those nations have attained high standards of living where the opportunity is given to the average citizen to build something and to own something of his own.

I believe we can draw a definite comparison between the growth in the United States, which has been founded on the availability of credit to the average citizen at rates of interest that he can pay on the one hand, and the lack of growth in many of the underdeveloped countries of the world—in Asia, Latin America, North Africa, and elsewhere all over the globe—where credit simply has not been available to the average citizen, or, where interest rates, where credit is available, have been extortionately high on the other hand. I believe almost as a general proposition we can in inverse ratio draw a comparison between the going rate of interest, and the size of the average family income and its standard of living. I do not want to see us follow the counsel of those who have held down the economic growth of their countries through exorbitant interest rates.

I do not believe our future as a nation will be well served by soaking up the buying power of our people and draining it away in excessive interest charges, because over the long pull, with our growing population the economy is going to have to continue to grow, the economic growth rate is going to have to continue to expand, if we are to have productive jobs for the new Americans coming on the market every year.

EVOLUTION OF A FOOD BUYER—UNCLE SAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the biggest buyer of food is the Federal Government. Its agencies go into the market every day to secure enormous quantities of foods of all kinds to supply Government personnel, Armed Forces, and other requirements.

So Uncle Sam has something in common with the city housewife. When food prices go up—as they have been doing and may well continue to do—Uncle Sam's buyers should shop around just as the careful consumer does.

This year, the farm surplus situation has shown signs of turning the other way. Surplus stocks are down. Stocks of butter and cheese, for example, are nil. The Department of Agriculture has had to shop around, too, to supply its "consumers."

For over a year, it has been buying margarine instead of butter. This margarine has been bought on a bid basis, not as a price support or surplus program. It is just as nutritious as the other spread. On the average, it has cost the Department 44 cents a pound less, and no long-term storage charges.

Some 70 million pounds have been purchased for use in relief and institutions donations since December 1964. The saving has been over $30 million.

Since a majority of Americans probably are using margarine today, this would seem to be a common sense solution to one phase of the problem of Government food buying.

Under these circumstances, American margarine is a suitable product for the school lunch program. It can fulfill all the nutritional requirements for its type of food and at lower cost and with supplies readily available. In turning to it, the Department is a wise shopper.

Similarly, the Department of Defense is to be commended for securing margarine in larger quantities for its personnel food needs. Its program, begun last May, has been successful. Undoubtedly it has saved taxpayers millions of dollars.

In both these cases, Uncle Sam has done just what a prudent housewife would do—turned to an alternate product that was available, that could do the same job, and that, happily, cost a good deal less.

GREAT IDEAS WORLD YOUTH FORUM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and difficult jobs facing us today is preparing the youth of today to be the leaders of tomorrow.

Father Edward John Wilson, teacher of philosophy and theology at Archbishop Stepinac High School, White Plains, N.Y., has developed a stimulating program to help accomplish this.

He is organizing a world forum to expose the deprived and disadvantaged youth to great ideas that have moved society. The program is known as the International Student Forum, Inc.

In an excellent news report the aims and purposes of this new effort are explained.

I commend it to my colleagues:

[From the White Plains (N.Y.) Reporter Dispatch, July 15, 1966]

GREAT IDEAS WORLD YOUTH FORUM BORN HERE

(By Louise N. Jones)

A program to train the world's dispossessed and delinquent youth for leadership is being organized by a young Negro priest here. Prominent educators have endorsed the plan.

International Student Forum Inc. is the brain-child of the Rev. Edward John Wilson, teacher of philosophy and theology at Archbishop Stepinac High School in White Plains. The forum would give a cross-section of young men in many countries an eight-year study program devoted to great ideas that have shaped the thinking of mankind.

The study groups would come from all economic and cultural situations but chiefly "the poor, dispossessed, dropouts and those who are classified as delinquents," Father Wilson says.

The main thrust, the priest explained, will be made toward high school and college-age men from such areas as Negro and Spanish Harlem in this country; some will be reform-school inmates, school dropouts and delinquents.

Many of these young men, Father Wilson added, have leadership potential that has been turned in the wrong direction.

"Our hope," he said, "is to turn them in the right direction and enable them to lead their peers toward positive action."

Father Wilson said his proposal has been commended by Dr. Mortimer Adler of the Institute of Philosophical Studies in Chicago, and Dr. Robert M. Hutchins of Santa Barbara, Calif., former president and chancellor of the University of Chicago.

Community leaders have offered support. Roland W. Mahood of White Plains, vice president of Hanover Insurance Co., is president of the forum's board of directors. Barrett G. Kreisberg of Worthington, a New York City attorney is vice president; Israel H. Moss of Stamford, regional director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, is secretary; and Father Wilson is treasurer. Directors are Mrs. Richard Schwarz of Briarcliff Manor, Westchester regional director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; Owen Peagler of Hartsdale, coordinator of the State Office of Economic Opportunity; Arthur O'Keefe of Scarsdale, manager of corporate accounting for Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., Dr. Kenneth Clark of Hastings, a member of the New York State Board of Regents and head of the psychology department of City College of New York; and Mrs. Irving Meshberg of White Plains, past president of the Westchester Mental Health Association.

Much of the study material will be drawn from the Great Ideas series published by the Encyclopedia Britannica. It will be prepared by Father Wilson with the advice of educators.

All trainees will study one or two of the ideas chosen from a basic eight: authority, freedom, God, beauty, communication, education, love, government.

They will consider each idea, Father Wilson said, "in the light of its use over the last 3,000 years, in the rise and fall of nations, war and peace, strife and harmony among men. They will also see how these ideas are being used today in their own countries and around the world."

After nine months of considering an idea, the young people will be brought together to live out that idea.

"Most important, they will strive to find ways and means to make it serve as a bond of unity, friendship and peace," Father Wilson said.

On returning home, each student will be responsible for organizing young people of his community to combat the misuse of such ideas there and to recognize the international importance of their own actions.

The young men will study a new idea each year over the eight years of high school and college.

Father Wilson envisions leaders emerging soon around the world who have "reached a rapport with other leaders, all of whom must assume the responsibility of the destiny of history."

"They will," he concluded, "form the nucleus of a world leadership that will assure mankind of a world at peace in a community of understanding."

The first step in launching the program is a fund-raising campaign to obtain $8,000. Eight young men from Father Wilson's high school classes expect to leave July 27 for a 21-day tour of Madrid, Paris, London, Geneva, Munich and Rome. Accompanied by Father Wilson and others, they will meet with government and education leaders to explain the forum's central ideas and to lay the groundwork for its European phase.

All of them are Westchester residents and as members of Delta Chi Rho, a study-service club led by Father Wilson, familiar with the International Student Forum almost from its inception. The members of this pilot group are Alfred Fenzel of Eastchester; Bertrand Herbert of Greenburgh, John Giovanetti of Harrison; Peter Consula of Yonkers; and Thomas Minck, Vincent Cartelli, Thomas Ficaretta and Rocco Martello, all of White Plains.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the last few years the Metropolitan New Orleans area has become one of the brightest spots in the Nation for the homebuilding industry. The area has been experiencing the most tremendous boom in its history. The homebuilding industry has contributed most substantially to this economic growth and prosperity.

To emphasize this fact of prosperity for the Metropolitan New Orleans homebuilders, there were less than 8,000 new units started in 1963, but by the next year, this volume of housing starts had jumped to 9,500, and in 1965, to 11,300 units.

But, Mr. Speaker, in my area alone, not to mention the rest of the Nation, the outlook for 1966, if present tight money and high-interest-rate conditions prevail, is that the volume of new starts this year will drop back to about 9,200—that is, 5,000 single family units, and 4,200 multifamily dwellings. The biggest decline will be in the multifamily group, it is predicted. The multifamily units had reached a total of 5,500 in 1965.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in the second quarter of this year, the number of multifamily units in Metropolitan New Orleans has increased over the number of such starts in the second quarter of 1965—that is, the multifamily units are up to 1,278 from 1,036. However, the single family units have declined in number in this same period from 1,637 to 1,397 starts. The reason for the climb in the mutilfamily starts is a continuing backlog of work in the New Orleans area as a result of the devastation brought by Hurricane Betsy in September 1965. However, the drop in single-family units is the first real sign in my area of the harm which is being done to the homebuilding industry from the hike in discount rates by the Federal Reserve System Board last December, and the Federal Reserve's boost in permissible interest rates for certificates of deposit issued by commercial banks.

There is no doubt that these actions by the FED have resulted in an interest rate "war" with the interest rates for homebuilding industry mortgages now at 6.5 percent and higher. Mr. Morgan G. Earnest, a distinguished homebuilder in New Orleans, and a board member of the House Builders Association of Greater New Orleans, and also its past president, has told me that these actions will cause the homebuilding market in our area to drop substantially by the end of this year, unless action is taken to free the flow of money for his industry.

"The famine of money" is now being felt in the New Orleans area, as it is all over the Nation. There is little doubt that tight money and high interest rates are putting a decided dampener on building. If this interest rate "war" continues over a longer period, and rates are not reduced, and other positive relief action taken, we could experience a real recession in the homebuilding industry.

In the Nation as a whole, a $15,000 home now costs about $1,725 more than it did last December when the discount rate was raised by the Federal Reserve System. All this has occurred because of a hike of one-half of 1 percent on mortgage rates, and a six-point climb in FHA and VA financing for homes. Today, new housing starts in the Nation are at a 5-year low, and homebuilders are forecasting that, under present conditions, there will be a 35-percent loss to the industry by the end of the year. In June 1966, the number of housing starts in the Nation was down more than 20 percent over June 1965. Building permits are down by 25 percent from last June to this one. FHA-financed starts have dropped by 25 percent, and VA-financed starts have declined by 22 percent.

Also very hard hit by high interest rates and tight money are the savings and loans associations which lend most of the money used in home construction and home financing. This, in turn, hurts the family man who needs to borrow money in order to build a home. In other words, the average citizen throughout our country is now feeling the pinch of tight money and high rates; they are not building either because they cannot afford to, or they cannot get the necessary money from a savings and loan association.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board announced earlier this week that savings accounts at the Nation's 6,230 savings and loan associations has declined by an estimated $1.1 billion in July of this year. This is the largest outflow of savings ever seen in a single month in the history of savings and loan associations of our Nation.

The inflow of new money to the associations, in the first 7 months of this year, is estimated to be about $1 billion, which is a drop of 73 percent over the first 7 months of 1965. Furthermore, in 1964, the first 7 months saw a gain in the savings and loan industry of $5.4 billion; in 1963, the gain in the same period was $6.1 billion.

There is no doubt that the scarcity of money flow into the associations which are the largest single provider of funds for home mortgages, has been the principal factor in the large decline in residential construction thus far this year.

In a speech last Saturday, to the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Builders Association, Mr. John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, stated that he is more optimistic than a month ago that there will be a loosening of the money available for mortgage lending purposes. He said this because, among other things, he "hoped Congress will take legislative action that will afford relief," for the savings and loan associations, as well as the homebuilders.

All of these adverse conditions require action by the Congress, Mr. Speaker. The House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported two vital bills which help a great deal to alleviate these conditions. The first of these bills would increase by $2 billion the present limits on borrowing by the Federal National Mortgage Association to finance its secondary market operations by authorizing borrowing up to 15 times, instead of the present 10 times, of FNMA's capital and surplus. This legislation would effect a 50 percent increase in the borrowing authority under the secondary market operations by increasing the ratio from the present 10 to 15 times the total of the Corporations' capital and surplus.

The second important bill favorably reported by the Banking and Currency Committee will ease the current interest "war" on savings deposits. Briefly, the bill provides a 4.5 percent interest ceiling on "consumer" certificates of deposit of under $100,000 issued by all commercial banks.

The fact is that the National Association of Home Builders supports both of these measures, and I support them, too.

The homebuilding industry of our Nation is a vital part of the growth and prosperity we are enjoying today in the United States. Any adverse blow to this industry has a direct effect on the continuance of the development and prosperity of our economy. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the Congress must take constructive action to ease the flow of money in the open market and give the homebuilders the opportunity to return their volume of business to its normal status again.

A LETTER CONCERNING THE EFFORTS OF THE SUMMIT CLUB AND DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the process of a day we are all called upon to read a great number of letters and, once in a while, our voluminous mail contains a letter that stands out because of its human warmth.

I received such a letter from the executive secretary of the Summit Club of Rhode Island, Mrs. Frances W. Taylor.

The unselfish efforts of an organization such as the Summit Club and people like the chief of the division of vocational rehabilitation in Rhode Island, Mr. George F. Moore, Jr., as cited in this letter are worthy of much attention and admiration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have Mrs. Taylor's letter inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SUMMIT CLUB OF RHODE ISLAND,
Rumford, R.I., June 1, 1966.

Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST GERMAIN: Do you really know what the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is doing in Rhode Island? Let me tell you through the eyes of The Summit Club who recognize deeds and care less for statistics.

Patricia Hogan, club treasurer and past president is a cerebral palsied young lady in her early thirty's who has a constant shake and walks scissor fashion, a combination affliction which quickly exhausts her energies and places a hardship upon her in many ways. She has wanted to walk so badly that she has undergone four operations within the past several years which almost cost her life last year. Cutting of tendons in strategic places is involved. She has just left the hospital this year with two disabilities she didn't go in with—a mouth infection and a sprained ankle in the leg not operated upon. The Summit Club members help one another endure their frequent trips to the hospitals but this was almost too much to bear even with the supportative shoulder of Mrs. Donahue, club advisor, who helps so many of the club members ride the storms and emotional stresses which the handicapped are under.

And then the news came! DVR, who paid for her most recent hospitalization, phoned Pat and informed her that they would send her to New York to a famous brain surgeon, Dr. Cooper of the Rusk Institute to see if there is any possibility of doing a delicate brain operation heretofore considered too dangerous for Pat by the doctors. She is there now. DVR will cover all expenses. Well, I can tell you that the news hit the club like an electric shock. My poor pen cannot begin to tell you how we feel about this except by the very flat word of gratitude that we have a public service in existence like the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation headed by George F. Moore, Jr., Chief, who is not so involved with the mechanics of administration that he fails to remember the people he is serving—that they are people.

Margaret Heineman is our most well-known club member to Rhode Island as her story was carried for three days in the newspaper. She is the one who was a research scientist before she was operated upon for an aneurism which caused brain damage. DVR sought to save what talents and training this lady had left and spared no expense doing so.

Kathy Leonard is on a scholarship to Rhode Island College from DVR.

Others, like Barbara Messier, have learned safer and more efficient homemaking skill thanks to DVR.

During their formative years a goodly portion of our club members had passed through whatever testing DVR (then under a different administration) had to offer—and they are the ones who failed to make the grade which required competing with normal people economically. Now over half of our members have been retested by DVR and are being helped both individually and through group therapy of the club milieu thanks to the very warm and genuine interest of Mr. Moore in the welfare and adjustment of all handicapped. He feels that they should be given more than one chance and during the interim of administrators new methods and opportunities have developed so chances for rehabilitation for gainful employment are much greater now.

Another young man may soon have the opportunity of going to Rusk Institute also. He is a severely handicapped cerebral palsied young man whom the world completely by-passed when he was growing up. DVR is now going to try to improve his speech so that when his mother dies he will at least be able to make himself understood. He has not had therapy in other ways so that now he does not even sit correctly in a correct wheelchair. He does have a very keen mind which is difficult to hide in spite of his deformity and other problems. Because his arms are atrophied he thought he could do nothing to help carry the operating costs of The Summit Club as do all other club members who make articles to sell each year for this purpose until he was reminded that we knew he gardened with his feet. Our garden booth at the bazaar draws many people each year as Laddie Holt raises hundreds of interesting plants for our sale. Through the channel of the club he has taken on new meaning and purpose for him but think what new horizons lie before this young man now that his physical plight has come to the attention of DVR.

Mr. Moore was the first person I consulted when I was asked by the handicapped to help them form a club. Recreation, part of the rehabilitative team elsewhere, especially in hospitals, is not one of the powers delegated to DVR in Rhode Island. Mr. Moore did say at that time that he would do whatever he could to help the individual handicapped person and he has along the lines of retesting and retraining where possible. He could see the value of such a club as ours but survival, in his mind, was another matter and a problem he could not entertain and he certainly was skeptical of our methods. Mr. Moore and Mrs. O'Leary closely watched the club grow and develop and now that we have proven ourselves, we have earned the very real and tangible endorsement of our efforts from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

With far-sightedness, not even found in California, DVR, through registered club members in their files, has brought major retraining to the handicapped on a group basis through The Summit Club. This includes sewing and office equipment for activity the club could not possible have swung by themselves. Margaret Heineman is ample proof of the value of recreation as an ancillary therapeutic tool of rehabilitation. She now uses her pampered hand at the fine new sewing machine wheel under the watchful eye of Mrs. Felts, a most devoted instructor from DVR. Also her cane is always close by—a cane which DVR had long hoped she would use instead of her wheelchair. Finally motivated by her great desire to attend the club or not be allowed to go by her family, she tearfully left the wheelchair at home. Only later did she abandon the wheelchair part of the time at the R.I. Medical Rehab Center at Howard where she is being retrained.

This club makes the hardship of being handicapped endurable. We have another member sent to us from R.I. Hospital who is a severe arthritic case undergoing constant and painful therapy for hours there every day. The Summit Club is her only relief. Interestingly enough, she is learning to knit with fingers that will hardly close. She is most proud of her efforts.

Mrs. Donahue's daughter, Gail, was thoroughly tried out at Goodwill Industries and she failed to make the grade for competing with normal people on a competitive basis. The sewing project was the first time she displayed stick-to-itiveness and whole-hearted interest.

We had another club member motivated enough to leave his wheelchair at home. We have had quite a few handicapped come to us tied in emotional knots and almost mute resulting from their isolation and frustration. Currently we have a blind girl who was referred to us by R.I. Medical Center who was motivated enough by our educational recreation program enough to accept psychotherapy at the hospital. With us they can unbend and relax, be accepted and understood, each one feeling the other is much worse off. Our members come from as far as Tiverton and Taunton for the kind of program we have.

We are now acting as an unofficial ancillary service to the many health agencies in Rhode Island who are just beginning to recognize that after childhood is over, the treatment and therapies are past or arrested, maximum job training reached if possible at all, there is one more important step if the individual is to reach and maintain his maximum potential and that is to remove the social isolation a disability places upon the individual, the lack of which may affect his physical and mental health. It is no economy of energy, time, cost, or of human resource to allow these people to sit on the fringe of society for the rest of their lives. Referral is only as far as these agencies go.

We hope they appreciate the importance of DVR as the extended arm of their services. To promote its own best interests the community must function as a unified whole—right down to the involvement of the handicapped themselves within a structure of their own which is The Summit Club. The partnership of the non-handicapped volunteers and the handicapped in this club have been meeting this rather specialized form of recreation for the past three years with largely unsolicited donations from those in the community who have become acquainted with us, and by their own efforts. Somehow we've met the three basic costs ourselves—program expense, maintenance and operating costs, and in a limited way, transportation.

The Veterans Hospital, Meeting Street School, individual doctors, nurses, therapists, other health and welfare agencies and hospitals are now making referrals to The Summit Club as they can see the benefit of our efforts of bringing recreation to all handicapped as we give them a reason for being and a place to belong. We motivate and activate.

DVR recognizes that recreation is helpful for diagnosis by the degree of cooperative response of the handicapped to a variety of activities offered in an informal group setting which are educational in character and often untouchable by formal testing methods.

Recreation is supportative therapy whereby the handicapped are helped to make meaningful social contacts with others in the community in which they live.

As re-educative therapy, recreation provides compensatory substitutes for recognized ineptitudes or inferiorities.

Recreation is remedial medicine in character as play neutralizes conflicts and frustrations resulting from their disabilities and play provides a "neutral" area where the client and rehabilitation can start a relationship.

The role of recreation as preventative medicine is untapped according to authorities in their field. Only those who work closely with the handicapped can appreciate the tensions so many of these people are under, not only from their own inadequacies imposed upon them by their disabilities, but also from their families and from an uneducated community who view them with mixed feelings of pity, alarm, or indifference.

If the use of leisure time for recreation has become "both an individual and a social obligation" as stated one day in the newspaper, and therefore a basic human need and a right for normal people, how much more so does this apply to the handicapped.

Without the vision and backing of Mr. Moore, our scope of activity would be seriously limited. We deeply appreciate what is being done for the handicapped.

Yours most sincerely,
FRANCES W. TAYLOR (Mrs. R. H.),
Voluntary Executive Secretary, the Summit Club of Rhode Island.

THE HONORABLE WILBUR J. COHEN

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1966, the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed the National Convention of the American Association of Workers for the Blind in Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Cohen was appointed Under Secretary on June 1, 1965. Previously, he was Assistant Secretary for Legislation, where he represented the administration and worked closely with the Congress on 65 major legislative proposals which became law during the 4½ years he was Assistant Secretary for Legislation. He has been intimately connected with all of the legislative developments in the social security and public assistance programs since 1934 and has been closely associated with the recent medicare, medical school, and education legislation.

Mr. Cohen is known throughout the country as the expert on social security, including the new medicare program. Perhaps less well known for his tireless efforts on behalf of new programs involving health and education, he nevertheless was responsible for guiding such worthwhile programs as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Older Americans Act, the Health Professions Act, the Clean Air Act, the heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments, the vocational rehabilitation amendments, and many others through Congress in recent years.

Mr. Cohen is an extraordinary public servant giving unselfishly of his knowledge, his experience, and himself. The following address with respect to the problems of blindness, the progress being made, and the plans for the future is indicative of his desire to make it possible for all persons, handicapped as well as those reasonably sound of mind and body, to have equal opportunity for employment and for living at the height of his capacities.

The speech and biographical information follow:

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION—WILBUR J. COHEN

Wilbur J. Cohen was appointed Under Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare on June 1, 1965. He was previously Assistant Secretary for Legislation, having been appointed to this post by President Kennedy in 1961. He was responsible for handling some 65 major legislative proposals which became law during the 4½ years he was Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

He is on leave as Professor of Public Welfare Administration at the University of Michigan where he taught from 1956 to 1961. He was Chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Health and Social Security in 1960 which recommended Medicare and other health and social security proposals.

He was the research assistant to the Executive Director of President Roosevelt's Cabinet Committee on Economic Security from 1934 to 1935 which drafted the original Social Security Act. He has been intimately connected with all of the legislative developments in the social security and public assistance programs since 1934 and has been closely associated with the recent medicare, medical school, and education legislation.

Mr. Cohen was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1913. He is married to Eloise Bittel of Ingram, Texas, and is the father of three sons.

He graduated from the University of Wisconsin in economics in 1934 and also received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1966.

He is the author of several books and many articles in the social security, health and welfare field and is a recipient of a number of awards for distinguished service in health, education, and welfare.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE BLIND

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is a pleasure to be here today to participate in your National Convention. Your organization has done so very much to open up new opportunities for those who are afflicted with blindness. Through your understanding of the problems of blindness and your initiative in applying remedial services, many a blind person's life has been made much brighter.

Our Nation is making continued progress in raising the quality of all of our citizens' lives—the children, the aged, the sick, the handicapped, the uneducated, and the deprived, and we are extending their ability to choose how to make the most of their lives. I think this is particularly significant for the blind and disabled. They are being provided more opportunities to be productive and creative through opportunities for employment and other satisfactions of life—but we believe that more must be done to really provide them with equal opportunity.

Today, I would like to discuss with you some of the problems of blindness, the progress that has been made and what still can be done to alleviate, and hopefully, to eventually eradicate this disabling condition.

EXTENT OF PROBLEM

Unfortunately, the incidence of blindness is increasing in this country. Between 1940 and 1960, the percentage of blind persons in this Nation increased much more rapidly than the population in general. In contrast to a general population increase of 36 percent, the blind population increased some 67 percent. In just one year alone, 1964, 31,800 people first became afflicted with blindness.

Today, in the United States, there are about 400,000 blind persons and 3,500,000 persons with only partial vision. About one million people have a visual impairment severe enough to prevent them from reading a newspaper. Cataracts, glaucoma and diabetes account for about one-half of the blindness in this country—and the sad thing is that much of this blindness could be prevented through early detection and treatment.

There are about 70 million persons over age 40 with a visual problem; it is estimated that this number may rise to 80 million by 1980. There are about 56 million children under age 15 with visual problems and it is estimated that this number may increase to 75 million by 1980. Thus, it is important that we mobilize all of our resources to cope with this growing incidence of visual defects.

RESEARCH

In the face of this rising tide, one of our great hopes is research. The job has really just begun. In 1951, the year that the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness was established, less than $500,000 per year was being spent on eye research.

The most serious problem, then and now, was and still is, the shortage of scientific manpower in the field. For this reason, strong emphasis was given to research training.

In spite of the serious deficiencies in scientific manpower in this field, the growth of ophthalmic research supported by NINDB has been substantially growing, from a little more than $500,000 per year in 1955 to $12.5 million in 1966. In 1965, of a total of $16.7 million available from all sources for eye research, 65 percent—nearly $10.8 million—was from the NINDB, 24 percent from other Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sources (including NIH), 5 percent from other Federal sources, and 6 percent from private sources.

Another problem, in addition to the shortage of trained manpower stems from the multidisciplined nature of modern research related to the problems of blindness. Only recently have the special talents of the physiologist, biochemist, immunologist and anatomist been brought to bear on the problems of blindness.

We know, for example, that glaucoma and cataracts are associated with the aging process, while many of the children's eye disorders are related to neurological disorders. The development of an effective rubella vaccine (german measles) will prevent thousands of cases of blindness. The discovery that another infective, toxoplasmosis, afflicts hundreds of infants causing uveitis, paves the way to finding the cure or an effective preventive.

There are additional steps which we believe are necessary in the immediate future to further strengthen the national eye research effort:

1) *Training*—we propose to establish, through the NINDB a program of career teacher-investigator awards in ophthalmology. These awards will be for the support of full-time academicians in selected medical schools. At the present time, many of our university medical centers are lacking the necessary full-time staff required to develop

strong research and training programs in ophthalmology.

2) *Program Leadership*—we will establish within the NINDB a special national advisory committee with a subcommittee on vision research and training. This subcommittee will be the focal point for leadership in the national eye research program.

3) *Research Centers*—we will provide the means for the early establishment of 3 or 4 national eye care research centers which will be built into existing eye research programs. The funding for these programs will come from the NINDB and other programs of the Public Health Service which support clinical services and community demonstration projects. The concern of these centers will extend beyond the usual basic and clinical research to include studies of the extent and distribution of eye disorders; the standardization of methods of screening and evaluation; and the early recognition of eye defects. They will serve as focal points not only for research and training but for innovation and demonstrating the most effective means of preventing, curing or treating eye disorders. Once effective measures are found, we will bend every effort to expedite their widespread application by ophthalmologists, optometrists, and others concerned with eye care.

There are numerous other exciting developments in the field of medical research dealing with the eyes that I could discuss with you if there were more time.

MEDICAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

If we are going to conquer the problems of blindness, however, we must step up our efforts to close the gap between the discovery of modern medical miracles and their availability to the public. Through improved health services the knowledge gained from research can be gainfully applied. Periodic eye examinations and screening programs would detect visual problems in the early stages and with early treatment cut the chances of the development of a serious eye condition. The promotion of safety measures would help prevent many of the accidental eye injuries that occur unnecessarily each year.

The use of TV, radio and other kinds of mass communications media in a lively campaign to educate the public about the importance of eye care would help us gain on the growing seriousness of the problem.

As in other fields of health and medicine, we need more trained health personnel—ophthalmologists, optometrists, and allied health personnel. And we need more conveniently located medical facilities and services.

Although we are making some progress through new Federal programs to increase the number of medical personnel, we must do even more to increase the number of trained health workers and to upgrade the skills of those presently at work. To deliver the services that are needed we must make more efficient use of the manpower we already have and through group practice, to use our medical and paramedical personnel more effectively. Within these group practice clinics and neighborhood health centers, we need conveniently located community eye clinics and many of them. We could use mobile eye clinic units to reach the people who for some reason or another cannot get to the community facilities. And we need more eye pathology laboratories. We must have services available for the people who need them, where they need them and when they need them. We must take all possible steps to see to it that the modern medical discoveries are available to people throughout the country.

The reorganization of the Public Health Service which is now taking place under the Surgeon General is explicit in its recognition of the need to more rapidly apply our knowledge. Two Bureaus—the Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control and the Bureau of Health Services will be actively engaged in this effort.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

One of the most encouraging developments in our society has been an increased awareness and understanding of the problems of blindness and of the handicapped, in general. And concerted efforts are being made to deal with these problems more effectively.

There was a time, not too many years ago when the general attitude was pity and rejection for the blind or disabled; when people thought they should be taken care of, but it was the general view there was not much more you could do for them. They were left alone and isolated from the community. Helen Keller's often quoted remark, "Not blindness, but the attitude of the seeing to the blind is the hardest burden to bear.", illustrates the general attitude of the past.

We have come a long way in our thinking. Now, the idea that a handicapped individual can be helped and restored to an active, productive and satisfying life has caught hold. It is the individual's capacity and motivation not the handicap that counts. Just last year this concern was demonstrated in the enactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments which were an important step forward for the millions of disabled persons who can be restored to useful lives through modern rehabilitation methods.

Many more disabled persons now are being given the opportunity to return to productive lives—as breadwinners or in family pursuits. A year ago, the number of blind persons rehabilitated into employment through the vocational rehabilitation program was 5,450. This year the number will be substantially more; and the continued effort will be relentless until we rehabilitate every blind person who wishes to be rehabilitated.

Last year these people were rehabilitated into a number of different kinds of jobs. More than 1,400—over 25 percent—went into homemaking or family work. Three hundred and twenty seven went into professional occupations; twice that many into managerial work. More than 700 found employment in service occupations—the fastest growing category. About 350 became skilled workers. The clerical and sales field took some 600. The remainder went into less skilled jobs, agriculture and sheltered workshops.

More is being done, also, to develop and widen job opportunities for blind persons. Take, for example, the specific action sponsored by your Association and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to give the highly useful program for home teaching of the blind added impetus. This program will greatly help newly-blinded housewives to meet their home duties and responsibilities.

In September 1963, Western Michigan University admitted the first eight students to a training course for home teachers of the blind. The course was developed from a joint project undertaken by the Department and your Association to study practices in home teaching and make recommendations for such training at the college level.

This coming September, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration's Division of Training will support a new short-term training endeavor at Western Michigan. Qualified home teachers of the blind, rehabilitation counselors, and newly-added home demonstration agents from the Department of Agriculture, will enlarge methods of giving direct help and guidance to newly blinded housewives. They will also explore ways of organizing a community—its churches, schools, family service organizations, visiting nurses, and other groups able to assist and counsel housewives when blindness strikes.

Blind persons, too, are penetrating the professional labor market. Last year well over 300 blind persons were rehabilitated into professional employment through the public program.

Today, more than 2,000 blind persons are enrolled in some 400 colleges and universities, training for various professions. About 95 percent of them are getting Federal support, which is a substantive indication of the combined efforts of all of us to raise the sights on employment.

For the last two years, the University of Cincinnati Medical School has conducted classes in computer operations for blind persons. These students are so well trained that they have had job offers before completion of their courses.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration is negotiating with a trade-technical school in Virginia for the training of blind people in the operation of equipment used in the manufacture of cotton and wool products. The endeavor now has the cooperation of one of our larger cotton mills. It is believed that procedures will be worked out whereby large numbers of blind persons can be placed, after proper training, in textile plants throughout the country. The project principles are based on the fine results of a similar program in Israel, developed through a VRA-supported grant in its international research program. Through this domestic effort, the VRA is moving into widespread activities to train blind people in the operation of modern industrial machinery.

Another interesting endeavor along this line is that of the North Dakota School of Science, which is training and placing blind machinists. It is an operation that has excited national interest. In several states there is new activity in creating or expanding trade-technical schools. Georgia is moving strongly, as is Alabama, and other states.

Federal help is available, too, for construction of workshops and other facilities by public or voluntary agencies. There is help for existing workshops to improve their business and plant operations, and there are other grants for aiding workships to improve their self-image.

A competent workshop will help us determine also how a blind person, perhaps with emotional problems or other handicaps, will respond to job situations, to closed and competitive situations with other people and how he can be taught individually to adapt to the world of work. We hope that the hundred or more workshops now serving the blind will be increased.

All of us realize that the success of rehabilitation of blind people is directly related to their adjustment and their ability to move about. It was through the VRA that the mobility program got its start at Boston University and Western Michigan. The concept of training instructors in mobility has been highly successful as far as it has gone. But, there is a critical need for at least a doubling of this progam as well as increased facilities in the Office of Education for mobility measures for blind children.

We should also note the advancements in the nationwide vending stand operation for blind people. There are now some 2,600 stands in operation with gross sales of more than $60 million. They provide employment for thousands of blind people. The number of blind operators may be tripled in a few years, with a commensurate increase in gross sales.

To do a good job in vocational rehabilitation, though, we must meet the critical need for trained instructors and teachers. In this area, as well as in the field of health and education generally, we must step up our efforts to recruit and train personnel if we are to attain our goals.

EDUCATION

In addition to the need for health services and vocational rehabilitation there is the basic problem of providing an adequate education for blind people so they can become self-supporting citizens. In the past, we have neglected basic education, as well as vocational education. This problem has been particularly critical in the rural areas.

We must explore new teaching methods and devices that will help the blind to compete on an equal footing with the rest of us. We need to print more books for the blind—interesting and stimulating books. There are many areas of the country that just do not have adequate teaching materials of any kind for the blind.

One of the most seriously neglected groups in our nation has been the multiple handicapped child. Being blind is a serious enough handicap by itself but when this is combined with another serious impairment—mental retardation, deafness or epilepsy—the situation has been considered almost hopeless. Somehow we must provide more effective help and opportunities for these children. It may take a team of experts but we must face this problem.

INCOME MAINTENANCE

Significant progress has been made in providing income to the blind under the major public income maintenance programs. There are about 175,000 blind persons receiving aid under the public assistance programs. There are approximately 60,000 blind persons receiving disability insurance benefits under the Social Security program.

The 1965 Amendments to the Social Security Act made a number of changes that will directly benefit the blind. The eligibility requirements for payment of disability insurance benefits under the Social Security program were liberalized, and even more important were the establishment of the Medicare program (Title XVIII) and the new medical assistance program (Title XIX), and major improvements in maternal and child health and welfare services (Title V).

The new medicare program will help finance the major costs of medical care for all of our nation's elderly people, including elderly blind and disabled citizens. This new program will help to remove the financial barriers to high quality medical care for our older citizens.

The new medical assistance program under Title XIX will also serve as a major vehicle for bringing better health care to many of our citizens. This new Federal-State program will provide comprehensive health care for the needy and the medically needy—including the blind, the disabled, the aged and particularly, children. States may now receive Federal aid for an improved medical care program which will replace the medical assistance that has been provided under the five separate public assistance programs. By 1975 the program should provide comprehensive care for virtually every person who cannot afford to pay for the medical care he needs.

The new Medical Assistance program will help to bridge the gap between the need for medical care and the availability of such care. States must provide comprehensive care—including diagnosis, treatment and restorative care to people who are already receiving public assistance as well as to those people who are medically needy. States may also make services available to children in low income families up to the age of 21 and to a mother with a dependent child whose father is dead, disabled, absent from the home or unemployed. There is a tremendous opportunity to improve the medical programs under public assistance that in the past have been fragmented and uncoordinated.

Thirteen states have already been approved for medical assistance programs under Title XIX and other state programs are in the process of development.

Children will also serve to benefit from the important changes that were made in maternal and child health and crippled childrens services (Title V). The 1965 amendments set up a five year grant program to improve the health care of school age and pre-school children, especially those children in low income areas. A whole range of services can be provided—screening, diagnosis, preventive services, dental care, remedial care and treatment. Vast opportunities will be provided for the screening and diagnosis of eye conditions of young children, and for the treatment and correction that is needed.

For the first time, many children who have had eye examinations in school who were found to have visual problems, but who could not afford glasses or preventive treatment will have a chance to get them.

CONCLUSION

All programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare constitute a united front against the encroachment of adversity; the effects of deprivation; and the misfortunes of ill health, and injury. The President has called the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "The Department of the People". For in most of our programs, we deal directly with people—those who need help in material things, those who need counsel and advice, those for whom the products of research will prevent, alleviate, or cure illness, and those who need health and rehabilitation services.

But we are not content with our present efforts and solutions. We know that many handicapping conditions that cause people to fail in later life could be detected and corrected at an early age. Bold and innovative measures which would bring the resources of the schools and community to bear on these problems at early stages would serve to benefit the child as well as the entire community and Nation. President Johnson has stressed the need for an expansion and improvement of comprehensive health, education, and related programs for children whose growth is impeded. Recently, the President asked Secretary Gardner to set up a Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development to study the Department's goals and policies that affect handicapped children. The task force, under the chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services, Lisle C. Carter, Jr., will review all the existing programs—and consider action to assure that they are serving the interest of these children with special needs. The task force will be particularly concerned that these programs are being implemented with the best and newest techniques that are available for helping the handicapped.

Yet, to get the greatest effect from our programs, we work with groups such as yours. Without you we could not reach those who need help. We have an intense interest in involving citizens and institutions in the work of government; in what President Johnson calls "Creative Federalism" by which he means a creative partnership between the Federal government and state, local, and nongovernmental institutions and agencies.

This is where your people are so important, to provide the grass roots vitality where it is needed.

I believe that the time will come when each of our citizens will have ready access to the blessings of the latest medical services, as well as to all the education and training his needs to develop his talents and capabilities. I believe the time will come, and soon, when each person, whether he be reasonably sound in mind and body, or blind, deaf, sick, injured, malformed, retarded, emotionally ill, or otherwise handicapped, will have equal opportunity for employment and for living at the height of his capacities.

Those are the purposes of the legislation that has been recently enacted for better educational opportunities; for Medicare; for Regional Medical Programs; for improved social security and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; for amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; and the Older Americans Act. All of them are rather specific, but all of them have implications for our joint effort to help people. And I promise you that President Johnson, Secretary Gardner and I shall do our utmost to support your efforts to help the blind citizens of our nation.

MAKING COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions since coming to the Congress I have sponsored measures to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. However, since action on this legislation does not appear imminent at this time, I am today introducing a bill that would make Columbus Day an official holiday for Federal employees in those States where October 12 is presently celebrated, and it is my hope that this measure will receive immediate consideration by the House.

As a matter of experience, in those States where Columbus Day is presently observed, Federal employees are inclined to take vacation or sick leave in order to have the holiday, with the result that Federal offices are frequently understaffed.

Most Federal agency business in those areas is conducted through State and local officials which means that on that date each year the Federal Government has employees in its offices who are unable to carry out their duties through no fault of their own.

In view of the fact that employees of private organizations and business firms also celebrate Columbus Day in 34 of the 50 States, it would seem both prudent and practical to recognize that the only persons not participating in such community activities are the Federal "cinderella" people who are left in their offices while all others are paying their annual and laudable tribute to the great navigator.

Mr. Speaker, it was on this date in 1492 that Christopher Columbus set sail from Palos, Spain, on his historic voyage that led to the discovery of the New World.

I think it is appropriate and long overdue that we began paying proper tribute to the great explorer who played so important a role in the beginning of our country, and the bill I am introducing today represents a step toward that goal.

INVESTIGATION OF RISING FOOD PRICES

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago I called to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and others in the administration the dangers of skyrocketing food costs, pointing out that those who must commit the major portion of their incomes to the market basket are the ones most severely affected by the food price spiral.

Over the past 12 months I have become increasingly concerned that adequate steps were not being taken to reverse this trend. The situation now is such that I believe an investigation by a committee of the Congress is warranted.

The dangers which I recognized and identified a year ago were the basis for my opposition to and vote against the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. The conditions that were responsible for the overall increase in food prices at that time have not only persisted but have worsened during the past year.

As a Representative from New York I am particularly disturbed at rising food prices in our city, which tends to lead the rest of the Nation into new price levels. I welcome the announcement that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to testify before the New York City Council tomorrow in an investigation of food prices there.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that immediate action be taken to check this dangerous trend and to determine what can be done to keep the price levels of basic foods within the reach of those in lower income brackets.

I am, therefore, introducing today a resolution to create a Select Committee of the House to conduct a complete investigation into the market prices of food and dairy products.

I insert the text of my correspondence last year with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs under date of July 30, 1965, at this point in the RECORD:

> Those of us who supported the recent Federal excise tax cut hoped that this would be reflected in a lower consumer price index at this time. I am sorely disappointed to note that in June we had the largest increase in consumer prices for any month in the past two years. Our expectation of lower prices fortunately was fulfilled in the decreased lists for automobiles and air conditioners. However, this in no way compensated for the grave and intolerable new levels in food basket items. A 6% rise in meat prices over the May level accompanied by an overall increase of 2% on food items simply puts the fat in the fire.
>
> I have been involved with others in Congress in trying to lift the standard of living of our most needy Americans through various measures ranging from the Poverty Program through Appalachia. All these moves will be in some measure frustrated by the soaring costs at the market place. Shortly we will be considering the Administration's agricultural program for this year. I urge and insist that before that day comes that you investigate and report just what is being done to determine the reasons and remedies for runaway prices of meat and other items contributing to this condition.
>
> In studying commodity future reports I take particular note that almost without exception these reports mention the effect of our Vietnamese situation on such future trading. I ask that the compass of your investigation be sufficient to determine whether any prospects of profiteering on Vietnam may be detected in the food industry.
>
> Finally, as a Representative from New York City I am especially concerned with food costs in my City leading the Nation into new high levels at a rate of 2% over the rest of the country with meat and poultry and fish prices up nearly 6% and fruits and vegetables 3.5% over the previous highs of last May. This is at a time when the plain fact is that we have more people with lower incomes living in our City than we had five or ten years ago. This must mean either unhealthy scarcities in the basic diet or an increase in an already deplorable cost of welfare.
>
> I am calling this request for an investigation to the attention of my colleagues in New York as well as to the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture with a similar request that his Committee on consumer needs undertake prompt and parallel inquiries.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> HUGH L. CAREY,
> *Member of Congress.*

POLAND CONTINUES ITS FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week in Syracuse, N.Y., I participated in a ceremony that was both heartwarming and at the same time somewhat saddening. The occasion was the public display of the new U.S. postage stamp commemorating the millennium of Polish Christianity. The ceremony was heartwarming in that it paid tribute to the courageous history of the Polish people; it was saddening, in the knowledge that the homeland of these valiant people is presently under the iron yoke of Communist tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has formally recognized the millennium of Polish Christianity not only through the issuance of a commemorative stamp but also through a proclamation signed by President Johnson on May 3. I was privileged to be present at the White House when the President signed the proclamation. The President presented me with one of the pens used in the signing. Last week, it was my pleasure, in turn, to present that same pen to Msgr. Casimir Piejda, the pastor of Sacred Heart Church in Syracuse.

Monsignor Piejda and Msgr. John Kociela, pastor of Transfiguration Church, are the spiritual guardians of Syracuse's wonderful Polish community. They enjoy the respect and the admiration of all who know them, and even many who only know about them. It was thus most fitting that Monsignor Piejda and a representative of Monsignor Kociela were major participants in the millennium ceremonies in Syracuse.

Mr. Speaker, the courage and quiet dignity of the Polish people were written on the faces of those who attended the gathering last week. As Monsignor Piejda addressed the audience, the whole colorful history of Poland ran through one's mind. It is a history of struggles, victories, defeats, partitions, and tragedies.

Hundreds of nations have risen and fallen since Prince Mieszko first united the ancient tribes of Poland and embraced Christianity in 966—yet, Poland, ever true to her religion and her culture, has endured.

The same qualities of patience and courage which have placed such a significant role in the lives of the Poles through the centuries now propel many Americans of Polish descent into positions of prominence and influence in every facet of our society. They have excelled in the fields of science, government, business, and religion, and their contributions to the world are incalculable.

As we join with Poles the world over in commemorating the millennium—the indissoluble link between Poland and Western civilization—let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of Poland's liberty. I join with the people of my congressional district in praying that justice and freedom will soon be restored in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I want to include in my remarks an excellent article which appeared in a recent edition of the Catholic Sun, the Catholic diocesan newspaper in Syracuse. It contains a vivid portrayal of the valor and distinction of the Polish people:

[From the Catholic Sun, June 30, 1966]

POLAND CONTINUES ITS FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

CHICAGO.—The 1,000 years of Poland's history being celebrated this year were marked by a continuous military struggle for freedom. This resulted in part from Poland's geographic location at the very center of Europe on a plain forming a corridor between the Baltic Sea and the Carpathian Mountains. With no natural boundaries on the east and west, Poland was a prey to inroads of Mongols, Tartars, Turks, and Russians, as well as Germans, Danes, and Swedes.

The first major invasion occurred in 1241 when the brilliant chief Subutai led his Mongols into Poland after conquering most of Russia. The Poles met the horde at Lignica (Liegnitz), but went down to defeat when their commander, Prince Henry the Pious, was slain. Over the next four centuries Poland was to serve as a shield protecting Western Europe from repeated Asiatic invasions.

The Popes also called on Poland to fight aggression of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. Two centuries after Lignica, the Polish King Wladyslaw III gave his life at Varna in Bulgaria when combined Hungarian-Polish armies sought vainly to stem Moslem conquest of the Balkans.

Ironically, Wladyslaw's father, Jagiello, had been called a "Saracen" for leading Poles and Lithuanians in a smashing victory over German Knights of the Cross at Grunwald in 1410. In one of the colossal political blunders of history, a Polish ruler had invited these Teutonic Knights to check marauding pagan Prussians. The knights exterminated these original Prussians and colonized the Baltic Region with German settlers. Their attempt to conquer the pagan Lithuanians was frustrated when Lithuania's Grand Duke Jagiello embraced Christianity and accepted the Polish crown, thereby forming a union of Poland and Lithuania.

This united republic, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, suffered constant invasion. Consequently, the nation's ablest men were often in the field. One such was John Zamoyski, who, besides being Grand Hetman, or army commander, was also the republic's Chancellor and a distinguished patron of the arts.

There was John Karol Chodkiewicz, who in 1605 astounded Europe by leading 4,000 Polish troops and "winged hussars" in a devastating victory at Kirchholm (Latvia) over 14,000 Swedes under the personal command of King Charles IX. Ten years later Chodkiewicz routed an army of 300,000 Turks at Khotin (Chocim) near the Polish border.

This Turkish threat followed the shocking defeat of the Poles near the Rumanian town of Cecora in 1620, when the venerable grand hetman, Stanislaus Zolkiewicz, was slain after vainly attempting a strategic retreat with greatly outnumbered forces. In 1610, Zolkiewicz, with only 6,000 soldiers had won a crushing victory over 34,000 Swedes and Russians at Klushino. His triumphant entry into Moscow was hailed by the Russian Boyars, then divided by loyalties to several claimants of the throne. Zolkiewski's suggestion that the son of Polish king Sigismund Vasa be made tsar was welcomed, but when the hetman brought Tsar Vasily Shuisky back to Warsaw as prisoner, Sigismund announced that he would take over the Russian throne himself. This enraged the Muscovites, who then united in support of Michael Romanov.

The famous Gustavus Adolphus, leading a new Swedish invasion, was defeated in a series of battles (1627–29) by Hetman Stanislaus Koniecpolski. Later—in mid-17th century—only a national uprising after the miraculous victory at Czestochowa and the brilliant guerrilla warfare of Stefan Czarniecki finally ended the Swedish occupation that followed the disastrous Cossack rebellion and Tartar invasion.

Hetman John Sobieski—Zolkiewski's grandson—gained another magnificent victory over the Turks at Khotin in 1673. Ten years later, as King John III, Sobieski ended the Turkish threat to Christendom when he decisively defeated a huge Islamic army besieging Vienna.

Devotion to liberty brought Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko to America to serve with distinction under Washington. Pulaski gave his life. Kosciuszko later led an unsuccessful Polish uprising against Russia. Veterans of that war served in "Polish Legions" that fought for Napoleon under banners inscribed with "All Men Are Brothers" and "For Your Freedom and Ours."

Polish generals who led the illfated Uprising of 1831 commanded in many wars for freedom in western Europe. General John Skrzynecki organized armed forces of the Belgian state. General Joseph Bem led the Hungarian insurrection against Austria in 1848. General Chrzanowski organized the Sardinian army and the Polish volunteers that served under Garibaldi. Ludwil Mieroslawski, between leading uprisings in 1848 and 1863, directed revolutionary forces in Sicily and the German duchy of Baden. General W. Krzyzanowski and more than 4,000 Poles fought in the Union army during the American Civil War.

In 1920 a Soviet invasion that was timed to coincide with Bolshevik seizure of power in German cities was smashed by the Poles under Marshal Joseph Pilsudski on the outskirts of Warsaw.

During World War II, after Poland made the first but futile stand against the powerful modern armies of Adolph Hitler, Poles continued to fight the Germans on many fronts: In France, in North Africa, in Norway, at Monte Cassino, in the air battle of Britain and in the underground Home Army (A.K.) of occupied Poland.

HOMEBUILDING SUFFERING—HIGH INTEREST IMPOSED BY FEDERAL RESERVE THE CAUSE—TWO GOVERNORS IN WASHINGTON—ONE UNELECTED, THE BANKERS GOVERNOR, AND THE OTHER, THE ELECTED GOVERNOR

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I have had several discussions on the floor of the House concerning the independence of the Federal Reserve System.

It is now operated illegally as a fourth branch of the Government. Really the system is created by law just like any other law is passed. Money talks and is more powerful than ever. If our Nation ever falls, conflict of interest will be the principal contributing cause.

To say that the Federal Reserve is independent of the other agencies of Government or of the President of the United States is untrue. Such an argument is strictly propaganda on the side of the few who have seized monetary powers.

Congress is given the right to pass a number of laws specified in section 8 of article I of the Constitution including the monetary powers; however, that part of the Constitution makes it very plain that the Congress is not to execute a law that is passed in pursuance thereof.

Section 8 concludes with the significant paragraph:

> To make all laws which will be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers * * *.

This includes the monetary powers. In other words, the law creating the Federal Reserve System was passed as any other law was passed. It is to be executed by the President of the United States just the same as any other law is executed, as provided in the Constitution.

There is not anything in the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, or any amendment thereto, that even infers or implies in any way that the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal Reserve banks shall be independent of the President or that the law is any different from the passage of any law that is passed by both Houses, signed by the President of the United States, and executed by the President of the United States, as provided by the Constitution of the United States.

This claim of independence is a fallacy and a fake.

The fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is unable to cite or refer to just one statement that was made by any person in the Congress when the Federal Reserve Act and amendments thereto were passed, or to cite any reference to independence in any congressional report which would indicate that it was the intention of Congress to make the Federal Reserve independent, is evidence that no such proof exists or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], an outstanding student as well as an outstanding Congressman, would be able to refer to it.

The Federal Reserve System is not independent by law or by the Constitution. The Federal Reserve has seized independence by getting away from the constitutional requirement that requires agencies of the Government to get their operating funds from Congress or with the approval of Congress.

The Federal Reserve has traded paper money, Federal Reserve notes, good as any money, guaranteed by the Government 100 percent, printed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing here in Washington, for U.S. Government bonds, which provide for the payment of interest.

The Federal Reserve being the fiscal agent of the Government is under obligation to give the Government a honest, square deal and make sure that no advantage is taken of the Government or the people in its operations. Let us see if the people have been protected by the Federal Reserve.

When the Federal Reserve traded non-interest-bearing Government obligations—currency—for interest-bearing obligations—U.S. Government bonds—it has stored the bonds in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the taxpayers are required to continue to pay interest on them as if the bonds had never been paid for once. In addition, when the bonds actually become due, they are paid for again.

FORTY-TWO BILLION DOLLARS OF BONDS IN NEW YORK FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York has $42 billion of these bonds now. The taxpayers are being forced to pay between $1½ and $2 billion interest annually on these bonds. In that way, the Federal Reserve takes this interest, spends as much as it desires for any purpose in the world that it desires to spend it for without any independent audit of any kind and without the approval of the General Accounting Office and all that is left is turned over to the U.S. Treasury. The point is that the Federal Reserve in this way has unlimited funds at its disposal and these funds can be used by the Federal Reserve in any way it chooses. Our national debt is $42 billion higher than it really should be because of this procedure.

FEDERAL RESERVE DUES PAYING MEMBERS OF LOBBYIST GROUP

As an instance of how foolish some of the expenditures are, one outstanding example is the expenditure of $90,000 a year by the Federal Reserve for memberships from the different Federal Reserve banks in the American Bankers Asociation, the outstanding lobbying organization in Washington, D.C., and in the United States of America.

In other words, the Federal Reserve is a dues-paying, card-carrying member of this lobbying organization. If this $90,000 were not paid for these dues, it would go into the U.S. Treasury and save the taxpayers that much money. Hundreds of other illustrations could be given that are just as shocking as this one. It shows that the Federal Reserve demonstrates no proper regard for the taxpayers.

NO ARGUMENT CAN BE PRESENTED THAT FEDERAL RESERVE IS INDEPENDENT

If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], or any other Member of the House or Senate, has any logical argument to present that the Federal Reserve is independent of the executive branch of the Government, I hope the argument will soon be presented.

It is true that the Republican Members of Congress since 1913 have supported the American Bankers Association in its efforts to have an independent Federal Reserve. The following comments are worth consideration:

First. When the Federal Reserve Act passed Congress in 1913—the original act—only a very few Republican Members in either body supported it; just a handful, but they commenced immediately to get the law changed to put everything in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Second. In 1935, when the American Bankers Association was lowering the boom on the Congress at an appropriate time—in the depths of a depression—for amendments to the Federal Reserve Act that were claimed to be for the purpose of getting us out of the depression, but really for banker control in the New York Federal Reserve Bank, some interesting things happened:

First. When the House passed the bill, it was provided that the Open Market Committee would be the Federal Reserve Board, the appointed and confirmed members, to represent the public interest, and there would be no private bankers represented on any committee that had to do with fixing interest rates or determining the volume of money. This bill was not supported on the floor of House by the Republicans.

Second. The bill went to the Senate where it was changed up in the Senate committee so that the big bankers of the country could be in secret meetings with the Federal Reserve Board to fix interest rates and the volume of money. Then the bill was supported by the Republicans in the Senate. That was commencement of our present trouble.

Third. When the bill returned to the House after the Senate amendments, the Republicans then voted for the bill.

REPUBLICAN PARTY THE HIGH-INTEREST PARTY

It should be understood that the Republicans always voted on the side of the big banks because obviously the Republican Party has always been the high interest party and the party has consistently voted for high interest.

HIGH VERSUS LOW INTEREST

The Congress will very soon have an opportunity to determine by voting on H.R. 14026 whether we will have higher and higher interest rates or whether or not an effort will be made to commence in the direction of lower and lower rates as provided in the bill recently reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee. High interest has almost stopped homebuilding.

It should be remembered that in countries where interest rates are very high—like South America—the people are very, very poor and suffer miserably from poverty, ignorance and disease although there is tremendous wealth among a few. In countries like the United States and particularly in the Scandanavian counties, where interest rates have been comparatively reasonable over a long period of time, the masses have a better standard of living and although there is too much concentration of wealth, it is not to the immoral extent of the high interest countries.

The test in the House will be whether low interest will be favored by the House supporting the 4½-percent proposal in the Banking and Currency Committee bill, H.R. 14026 which was reported favorably by a vote of 19 for to 9 against July 25, 1966, or will the Republicans be able to get enough support from Democratic members to carry a higher rate.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL CHILDREN

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week delegates of the Citizens for Educational Freedom assembled in Buffalo, N.Y.—City of Good Neighbors—for their seventh national convention. This group seeks, among other objectives, to obtain the right to equal educational opportunity for all children.

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Hugh Carey, was the main speaker at the convention's closing. A very able legislator and an effective member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman Carey serves on the national board of trustees of the Citizens for Educational Freedom.

It gives me great pleasure to include his excellent address at this point in the Record:

Address of Representative Hugh L. Carey Before the Seventh Annual National Convention, Citizens for Educational Freedom, Buffalo, N.Y., July 30, 1966

I am inspired and I am grateful to again be among my friends of Citizens for Educational Freedom at our Seventh Annual National Convention today in Buffalo, New York.

I well remember my first opportunity to address C.E.F. in Missouri. There were a lot of people from Missouri in those days—A lot of people who said, "Show Me"—When C.E.F. set out to achieve equality in educational opportunity for all our children.

You were a mere but a mighty handful then—but in six short years you've shown the skeptics and the cynics, and, oh yes—the secularists that you just won't settle for second class status in education for anyone. I know you never will.

You never can because this organization had founding fathers and founding mothers of indomitable spirit. I am thrilled to see the "Spirit of St. Louis" (the birthplace of C.E.F.) is not only alive but more vital and vigorous than ever.

We owe that spirit to the old St. Louis "Gashouse Gang" Judge Daley, the Corley's, the Duggan's, Glen Andreas, Tom Dooley's mother, the Hubbel's, Father Blum and all the rest of our hierarchy of heroes too numerous to mention.

Along the way in our travels when we have met in Detroit and New York and Philadelphia we have picked up some terrific new members of the "Gashouse Gang" like Rabbi Morris Sherer and Dr. Edwin Palmer, but the "Spirit of St. Louis" still pervades and must persevere. For although we have "come a long way from St. Louis," we still have a long way to go.

This has been a great year of exciting progress for the children of our schools and significantly for the children who are preparing to enter our schools. From Headstart to Upward Bound we are doing new things with Federal aid and these new developments are in no small way the result of support we are receiving in the Congress from organizations such as CEF.

These innovative and fundamental ground gainers are all centered on the key concept of aid to the individual. It is this concept which should always be our polar star in legislation for our schoolchildren. It is so basic, so simple and yet so practical that I think we tend to understress it in the educational dialog.

I sometimes think we need some signs in large letters over the doorway of the Office of Education and the committees of Congress with this inscription: "Federal aid available, only individuals need apply—institutions use side or rear entrance."

I feel strongly on this point because we can never stray from the path of equality if we require that every Federal program must aid every American individual according to his needs without difference or distinction, race, creed, origin or school of attendance.

If a bill seeks to do this it is a sound bill, a fair bill and a workable bill. This is why the venerable and memorable GI bill was the best education bill in our history in 1948, and it is with great satisfaction that we reflect that the GI bill is now the permanent law of this land. Through the action of this 89th Congress in enacting a program of benefits, every one of our servicemen can now look forward to entering any school of his choice after his military obligation is discharged. We can now say that our veterans not only fight for freedom, they also enjoy freedom, true freedom of choice in education when they return home.

Here is the classic case of aid to the individual and this is chief among the reasons why this law has such basic support in Congress.

Other evidence of this support is apparent in the entire education program enacted by the 88th and 89th Congresses. These Congresses addressed themselves to two questions: (1) What are the educational needs of the children in the United States, and (2) what are the needs of the Nation? The answers to these questions were agreed to be mutually inclusive and beneficial: The need of every child is an equal opportunity to quality education to attain the fullest development of his mental capabilities; the need of the Nation is to attain and maintain a well-educated citizenry.

But for years Congresses previous to the 88th and 89th were lost in debate over education legislation revolving around questions of Federal control of education and separation of church and state: Would Federal support of education mean Federal control; would Federal support to nonprivate schools violate the tenet of separation of church and state. The real "loss" in this congressional debate, however, was the loss to future generations of the best-educated school-age children throughout our entire Nation and especially in economically disadvantaged areas. The Commissioner of Education put it succinctly and correctly when he said: "These are not issues to be debated but problems to be solved."

And Congress has faced and emphatically sought to resolve these problems in education by marshalling the resources of the Federal Government to help all children, in all schools, to attain the promise of a useful and fruitful adult life by providing as the basis the opportunity for the best education possible.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided for educational programs which existed only in the imaginative minds of some of you through the years at these conventions. These programs benefit disadvantaged children as individuals, whether economically, socially, or culturally, in both public and private schools. Titles I, II, and III of the ESEA provide financial assistance to educate children as individuals in the poorer communities in the United States, to provide library resources and textbooks, and to provide supplementary educational centers and services to enrich school programs. These provisions are in addition to federally assisted programs and services already in operation which are shared by public and private school children, such as school lunch and milk programs.

In testifying on the ESEA in February of 1965, Dr. Edwin Palmer, member of the Executive Committee of the Citizens for Educational Freedom stated: "We of CEF . . . believe that it is imperative for the welfare of our Nation that all children in all schools receive the finest education available." I hope that from results of the first year of its operation, neither Dr. Palmer nor any of you here today are disappointed in the attempts made to attain this imperative and the sincerity of the Congress in making them possible. For children in nonpublic schools have shared in the benefits of this act, based on their needs, and not on their particular religious affiliation.

Programs possible under title I, "Improved education for children in poverty areas," in which private school children have participated include shared facilities and services, loans of materials and equipment, usage of educational radio and TV, and special services rendered by public school teachers in the private schools. Under title II, "Library books, textbooks and audiovisual materials," children and teachers in both public and private schools have been provided with books, texts, documents, maps, films, and other printed, published and audiovisual materials. And the "supplementary educational centers and services" provided under title III offer the most imaginative means of meeting the educational needs of a community—private as well as public.

Parenthetically, I might note that explaining the provisions of this bill even briefly to members of this organization is akin to telling Aunt Jemima how to make pancakes.

In a sense, more significant than the provisions of this bill is the climate it has created in the promise of a new private-public school partnership.

This promised new relationship of cooperation between private and public schools is being realized. In the process of implementing the provisions I have mentioned, private and public school educators have had to sit down together and plan programs, and on a regular basis. What they have agreed upon in most instances is an arrangement whereby the public schools make available their personnel for special instruction and services, largely remedial or consular, in the private schools. Examples of ESEA public-private school cooperation are:

In Chicago, private school children go to the public schools for special afterschool programs with public school children.

In Rochester, private school children will participate in theater productions at public facilities outside public school systems and in field trips.

In Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Litchfield, Minnesota, private school pupils spend part of their regular school day in reading and speech projects in the public school.

I have indicated some of the initial gains made in guaranteeing an education of high quality to all children, especially children of poverty. But in view of these gains, we must realize that long-range, comprehensive efforts must be made and continued. Congress now has under consideration amendments to the ESEA which recommend the inclusion of an increasing number of children: Indian children in BIA schools, children of migratory agricultural workers, and orphans and delinquent children in State-supported and operated schools.

You, as members of the CEF, and as private citizens and parents, must continue to support equality of opportunity for a good education for every boy and girl in our Nation. It is your responsibility as well as mine as a Congressman, to be vigilant in overseeing the implementation and expansion of provisions of the ESEA.

I am well aware that we have a whole kennel of constitutional watchdogs carefully observing the operation of this act to detect any incursions in the area of church-state relationship. You know these organizations all to well—the POAU, ACLU, etc.

Vigilantly in a negative way they watch for any stray teacher or pupil who might trespass over the imaginary line they visualize in every school bill.

Just as vigilantly and even more diligently in a positive way I would hope that organizations like C.E.F.—sometimes called the "Parents Educational Liberties Union," would strive for uniformity of comparability, of equal treatment for all children in the administration of this act.

Because this is a local option, local control child benefit system it is vital that a standard of comparability of benefits at the local level be required. Among public and nonpublic school beneficiaries of this act there should be no long and short system of services. What is good for the children of New Mexico is good for the children of New York and what is available for the public school child in any new federally-aided program must be made available to non-public school children.

Let me emphasize that just as much as this is a child benefit act it is an innovation act—it is an act to do things for children that have never been done before.

While impressing upon you the need to continue the strides made under the ESEA in the past year, I would like to turn now to an area of education in which I hope to see great strides made this year: the education of physically and mentally handicapped children. This is an area of great concern to me and to many of my colleagues in Congress.

Little noted but I hope long remembered was the bill I sponsored and which passed in September of last year as Public Law 89–313. This amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in such a way that it became in this provision a "little G.I. bill for the handicapped."

Recognizing that the Act of April 11, 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act did not make specific provision for handicapped children. Public Law 89–313 provided that every child in a State-operated or State supported school, public or private would be entitled to a grant allocation of one-half the per pupil cost in the State. Schools like St. Mary's School for the Deaf here in Buffalo, throughout our State and the other States received a total of nearly $17,000,000 in assistance in the 10 months the program has been in operation. I hope to broaden the system of benefits in the G.I. bill for the handicapped in the near future.

As you may be aware, I have been holding hearings, as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Education of the Handicapped, on the adequacy and efficiency of the various federally supported programs for the handicapped. I have had as witnesses before this committee representatives from the Office of Education, the Welfare Administration, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Public Health Service, and from several schools and universities and interested private organizations. And I am convinced that if this Nation can truly claim that it is responsive to the educational needs of all children and youth, it must reassess its programs for educating the handicapped. We must determine whether our educational programs are responsive to and effective for meeting the needs of the handicapped. If our programs are not meeting their educational needs, we have to determine how much, what kind, and under what type of administration new legislation should be enacted.

On June 8 of last year when President Johnson signed into law the act which I introduced establishing a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, he said:

"Human talent is our most precious national resource. Strong and successful as America is, we cannot allow any of our human potential to be wasted or neglected. This conviction motivates us now in all that we do in the field of education."

We cannot afford to neglect and waste any of our human talent; we must give truth to the President's conviction.

There are over 1 million children in the United States who have physical, emotional or mental handicaps to the degree that their educational development is hindered. However, of this number, only about 30 percent are receiving special educational attention in our schools. What happens to the remaining 70 percent? How are they being helped to prepare for a self-supporting, independent life as well-educated citizens in an increasingly complex economic and technological society?

Congress has taken some steps to help remedy the problems existing in the education of the handicapped: Legislation providing for teacher-training programs and special research programs, for example, has been enacted. As I said, by my bill 89–313, title I of the ESEA has even been especially amended to include the handicapped. But programs for educating the handicapped remain glaringly inadequate in many states. Many states are reluctant to use the general funds for education provided under ESEA for the specific benefit of a few handicapped children.

The problem before Congress now, therefore, is to decide whether existing legislation, if reinforced by increasing funding, is adequate to meet the requirements of educating our handicapped children or whether new legislation is needed to meet these requirements. If the states hesitate to use the general funds they are allowed now, should not specific funds be allocated so that the handicapped may be guaranteed their fair share in the "substance" as well as the spirit of equal, quality educational opportunity endorsed by the Congress and organizations such as the C.E.F.? The economically and culturally disadvantaged are being guaranteed this right under ESEA: The veterans are being guaranteed this right under the GI bill of rights. What is now needed is an expansion of 89–313, to extend its benefits to all children including those in schools which are not state supported.

Let me mention some of the problems existing in the field of educating the handicapped as revealed during the subcommittee hearings:

Within the next decade approximately 300,000 specially trained teachers of the physically and mentally handicapped will be needed. Under the present level of teacher-training authorization, it will be impossible to meet this need, but I am of the opinion that with increased funds to provide more personnel and facilities, this number can be trained.

I am concerned with the lack of non-college preparatory education for handicapped youth. The newly authorized national technical institute for the deaf, for example, will provide technical training to only one-third of those deaf youth capable of advanced occupational training.

Without meaningful vocational training, these already handicapped youth will be further handicapped, economically, in our increasingly technological and scientific world of work.

I am concerned with the lack of teachers and facilities facing the victims of the recent Rubella epidemic when they are ready to enter school. My fear is based, of course, on the already very evident shortage of teachers of the handicapped. The Rubella victims will make more critical this shortage.

I am bothered by the fact that approximately 48,000 mentally retarded children are not eligible for benefits under office of education programs for the handicapped because they are in privately operated and supported schools.

I am concerned that many handicapped children in rural areas are not being reached by the diagnostic and treatment services that are available. In fact, we do not even know how many handicapped children there are, so we do not know how many we may be overlooking in terms of health and education services.

I am afraid that there is not adequate coordination of programs for the handicapped:

Between the various Federal agencies and between the Federal, State, and local agencies.

I am concerned with the quality of day school education for the handicapped. I have observed, for example, that the quality of education for deaf children in Maryland's day schools is below the level of education provided in residential schools for the deaf.

These are a few of the problems that concern me and that concern many Members of Congress and that, I am sure, concern members of the C.E.F.

Congress has enacted legislation—the ESEA—for the economically disadvantaged, now let us concern ourselves with legislation for the physically and mentally disadvantaged.

I would propose that a basic, minimum support grant be provided to each physically and mentally handicapped child in the U.S.

The economically deprived as well as the children in publicly supported and operated schools for the handicapped, as well as those in privately operated and supported schools—to guarantee that every handicapped child is enabled to receive an education commensurate with his abilities.

In addition, I would propose guaranteed Federal funds for construction of housing and classroom facilities to meet the educational needs of the handicapped.

In the coming week I shall introduce an omnibus bill for the handicapped to reach these objectives.

In closing, I would like to relate a story to illustrate my appeal to you to support this and other federal legislation for equal treatment.

According to this story in Alistair Cooke's "One Man's America," on May 19, 1780, in Hartford, Connecticut, the skies turned from blue to gray at noon. By mid-afternoon the skies had blackened so densely that, being a religious age, men fell on their knees and begged a final blessing before the end came.

As some men fell down and others clamored for immediate adjournment in the darkened chamber of the Connecticut House of Representatives, the speaker of the house, Colonel Davenport, got to his feet and silenced the din with these words:

"The day of judgment is either approaching or it is not. If it is not, there is no cause for adjournment. If it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish, therefore, that candles be brought."

Today, I ask each of you to continue to bring lighted candles. I ask each of you to bring to the support of a "Magna Charta" for the education of the handicapped that same spark of enthusiasm you brought to the support of equal educational opportunities for all children contained in ESEA. I hope that candles will continue to be brought to light the way for the educaton of all children, including the physically and mentally handicapped, in the years ahead.

All of us have the right and the duty to concern ouresIves with how our education legislation is being implemented. The ESEA and legislation affecting the handicapped need the active support of all groups to guarantee their equitable operation.

In our "interest-group democracy" groups such as the C.E.F. must articulate their interests and must cooperate with one another so that the best interests of our society may be realized.

For when reduced, the common denominator of these interests has been and must continue to be the guarantee of equal educational opportunity for a good education to all of the children in our Nation.

OUR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a field trip to Camp Pickett, Va., where I observed the training of the 3d Medium Tank Battalion of the 103d Armor, Pennsylvania Army National Guard. I want to bring to your attention, and to the attention of my colleagues, the outstanding reception which was afforded me by the officers and men of this fine National Guard unit.

I was privileged to observe these men as they engaged in maneuvers against an "aggressor forces" during 4 days of intensive field operations which will conclude today.

I was tremendously impressed by the men and their enthusiasm as they carried out each phase of their training program. Although some of their equipment was slightly outdated, I am told by the battalion officers that they were able to draw more modern combat gear for this 2-week training exercise than ever before, and the men expressed their gratitude by putting their full energy into the training activities.

The opporunity to visit with the 3d Medium Tank Battalion of the Pennsylvania National Guard gave me a first-hand opportunity to observe what our Reserve Forces are doing across the country to maintain this Nation's preparedness. It was indeed gratifying to me to go into the field with these men to see how a group of individuals from all walks of life, and from a broad range of civilian trades and professions can be molded into an efficient and ready combat force through this program of periodic active duty training. A great deal of credit is due the battalion commander, Lieutenant Colonel Washco, and his aide, Major Stefanik, for their leadership of this unit.

It was a particularly distinct pleasure to have participated in a simulated air rescue by helicopter and to have taken command of an M48 medium tank during a mock attack problem. While visiting tank range No. 4, I might add, it was my good fortune to score two bulleyes in four firings of the tank's 90-millimeter gun.

WASHINGTON REVISITED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of a visit from Mr. Jack Kassewitz and his lovely wife, Ruth, when they visited this Nation's Capital during their vacation. Jack is a noted editorial writer for one of the South's outstanding newspapers—the Miami News. Mr. Kassewitz is not a stranger to the Washington area as he was one of the editors for the Times-Herald during the war years. In his role as a tourist, however, he made some very interesting reflections on what he saw at Arlington National Cemetery and upon the work of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore include these two articles by Mr. Kassewitz, entitled "The Sights of Arlington" and "Our Busy Congressman," at this point in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention:

THE SIGHTS OF ARLINGTON

(By Jack Kassewitz)

WASHINGTON.—It was 9 in the morning and already the heat and humidity were stifling on the Virginia hillside, just across the Potomac from the nation's capital.

Rifle shots echoed and reechoed through the stately oak trees, an early reminder to the tourists that they were standing in the sacred burial ground of America's military men and women. At Arlington National Cemetery, thousands of service personnel have found their solemn final rest, some of them known but to God.

At the gates of Arlington a funeral cortege waited for a signal from an Army officer. Then began a long climb to a tiny chapel half a mile away. Here services were conducted for a victim of the war in Viet Nam. Within the hour, the tourists would hear the rifles fire on three occasions and they were told the salutes would be heard many times that day.

KENNEDY GRAVE THERE

On a steep hillside, approaching the Tomb of the Unknown (military men from three wars) a mechanical grave digger was busy uncovering new ground, while several rows of graves waited in earth skinned of grass.

And on another Arlington hillside rests temporarily the 35th President of these United States, John F. Kennedy. An eternal flame and millions upon millions of Americans keep the quiet vigil. On the third November anniversary of his death, the President's body will be moved a few yards east to a simple white marble memorial, where a $2 million gravesite today is two-thirds complete.

The closer the tourists neared the Kennedy gravesite, the more solemn the air. Men doffed their hats when they stood outside the small picket fence which enclosed the present grave and those of two Kennedy children. Ladies, for the most, quietly looked on, and occasionally one would brush away a tear.

But it was disturbing and aggravating, and some times insulting, to see some fellow Americans as they walked through the cemetery as if they were on a casual holiday. Some women wore shorts and thong shoes, others tight fitting slacks and floppy blouses. Their menfolk were equally casual, carelessly tossing cigarets to the ground and/or depositing chewing gum wrappers wherever they happened to be. The sights would be repeated at the Unknown's tomb, as well.

Occasionally one of the Washington newspapers will editorially chastise these tourists who plod their way up the 45-degree incline because of their manner of dress (some have been seen with hair in curlers) and their mode of approach. Obviously, few of them read the papers during their Washington visit.

SIGHTSEERS BUSY

Washington is an unofficial mecca for all American tourists, and it should be, as the seat of this nation's government. The public buildings are filled with sightseers, the Washington Monument constantly ringed by those who wish to make the 555-ft. journey to the top. The tourists dress casually, as they have a right, particularly in hot weather.

But Arlington National Cemetery deserves more than just a holiday air. All Americans should accord its heroes the dignity they deserve.

OUR BUSY CONGRESSMEN

(By Jack Kassewitz)

WASHINGTON.—This is the most exciting city in the nation—when Congress is in session. Of course, tourists have a bit of trouble finding out what is going on at Capitol Hill, but that's part of the game.

Recent visitors were particularly interested in a new report of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which does little to modernize the horse-and-buggy procedures indulged by the House and Senate. Microphones are still forbidden in the latter chamber and the acoustics make it impossible to hear the Senators in their deliberations. Galleries can only stare.

The Joint Committee did suggest Congress can improve its order of business by scheduling committee and floor meetings on a five-day workweek; and by ending each session on July 31 unless a majority votes otherwise.

HARD WORKERS

The visitors would find it difficult to believe such a rule would vastly change the lives of South Florida's Congressmen and its two Senators. These are among the hardest workers in official Washington and certainly among the most productive. Their Constituents in Miami never really understand the immensity of the task which confronts DANTE FASCELL, CLAUDE PEPPER, GEORGE SMATHERS and SPESSARD HOLLAND.

Their day frequently begins at 7 a.m. with committee meetings. Then a brief time is spent in staff conferences and answering mail before the sessions of the House and Senate which convene at noon daily. Most of the time the elected officials meet their visitors from Florida after adjournment, which comes anywhere between 4 and 7 in the evening. Believe us, it's a long day.

Even during the Fourth of July holiday week, when many Congressman went home, Rep. DANTE FASCELL was at his desk by 8 every morning in the new Rayburn House Office Building. Administrative assistant John Buckley estimated FASCELL would clear up 1,000 pieces of mail on the holiday. Rep. FASCELL sees every letter that comes to his office and every answer in reply.

Rep. CLAUDE PEPPER (whom everyone in Washington calls Senator), is squeezed into narrow quarters in the Cannon Building, oldest of the House offices. He has a youthful staff but a productive one and they were busy answering problems about Medicare. The Senator suggested his constituents let him know how they felt about Medicare and the answers were not long in coming.

Just because a Senator fails to answer his name at a roll call doesn't mean he's idle. GEORGE SMATHERS was in Geneva, Switzerland, at the direction of the White House and the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is the ranking Democrat.

TRADE MISSION

His mission was GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Conference, with representatives of nations all over the world who do business with the United States. The objective: To lower tariff barriers and lower the barriers of misunderstanding between nations.

Sen. SPESSARD HOLLAND was engrossed much of a morning marking up an Agriculture Bill, but not too busy to show visitors his offices which are lined with photographs and mementos of nearly 50 years of public service.

NEW YORK TIMES ENDORSES HUDSON RIVER COMPACT BILL OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the really impressive conservation and development efforts of the 89th Congress has been the battle of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] to spur the restoration and development of the majestic Hudson River. This great river, which Baedecker once called "more beautiful than the Rhine" has been allowed to slip into a deplorable state of pollution and blight. Congressman OTTINGER has fought against tremendous odds to shape legislation that would provide for a cooperative effort between New Jersey, New York, and the Federal Government. This effort has now won support from 58 Congressmen, 2 Senators, the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Army have won an unusually forceful endorsement from the executive office of the President, Bureau of the Budget.

On August 2, the New York Times ran an editorial strongly endorsing the Ottinger compact bill and explaining why it should be enacted quickly without any weakening amendments. I commend this excellent study to my colleagues, who, I believe, will soon have an opportunity to vote on the measure. I am sure that they will be persuaded as I was by its compelling logic and urgency.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1966]

PROTECTING THE HUDSON VALLEY

Now that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has heard from all the chief disputants in the long controversy over how to protect the Hudson Valley, it should move for effective legislation before Congress adjourns.

The best hope for enhancing and preserving this majestic but defiled river still lies in the Ottinger bill, even though it has been weakened by the amendments Secretary of the Interior Udall demanded as the price of Administration support. Governor Rockefeller made it plain in his testimony before the committee that the softening of the measure has done nothing to diminish the opposition to it that he expressed in a letter to President Johnson last spring.

We think the Governor is wrong in believing that the protection task can be performed better through a Hudson Valley compact of the type enacted by the New York Legislature. One defect of the commission that compact would create is that it would be dominated by this state, with nine votes as against three each for New Jersey and the Federal Government. The other principal shortcoming is that the commission would have few enforcement powers. It would rely in large part on education and persuasion to save the magnificent resources of the valley.

The Ottinger bill, even as amended, would provide the stronger legal safeguards required if the spoliation of the Hudson is to be halted. It would authorize Federal officials to negotiate a much more realistic compact with New York and New Jersey, thus giving it a vastly greater chance of acceptance in Washington and Trenton. The one unfortunate development is that Secretary Udall's objections caused the watering down of a provision under which he could have banned Federal licensing of projects that might interfere with the valley's natural treasures.

Our hope that the Ottinger bill will be passed this year is made more urgent by the plan recently put forward in the final report of the temporary Hudson River Valley Commission, headed by Laurance S. Rockefeller. Its design for keeping the lordly Hudson from becoming the world's broadest sewer, washing vast expanses of treeless subdivisions and factories on graded hills, is bold; and its implementation would be costly. There is no chance whatever of carrying it through without the push of a strong enforcement agency. Adoption of the Ottinger bill will create such an agency and thus help preserve the river's grandeur against the depredations of the communities and industrial enterprises along its banks.

HELP FOR KENTUCKY PLANS TO BECOME U.S. PLAYGROUND

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson took good news to Kentucky last weekend.

Among other things he announced during his Midwestern swing was that the Economic Development Administration had approved a $3.9-million grant to help Kentucky develop a State park and recreational area at western Kentucky's new Barkley Lake.

The Louisville Courier-Journal welcomes this Federal assistance as a boon to the State's recreational potential and to the regional economy. Its editorial on the grant is submitted now for the RECORD.

[From the Courier-Journal, July 26, 1966]

HELP FOR KENTUCKY PLANS TO BECOME U.S. PLAYGROUND

Whatever its other results, the best thing about President Johnson's Saturday visit from a local viewpoint was his announcement of a $3,900,000 federal grant to help Kentucky develop a state park and recreational area on the eastern shore of Western Kentucky's new Barkley Lake. This project, scheduled to begin this summer, will be another major step toward making the lakes region of Western Kentucky one of the great recreational complexes of the Eastern United States.

The state already has a tremendous investment in park and recreation facilities along Kentucky Lake—Kentucky Dam Village, Kenlake and Cherokee state parks—but demand consistently outstrips available facilities. Barkley Lake Park will help ease the pressure. With more than four million dollars in state funds, plus the federal grant, the park will offer the state's biggest recreational outlay of lodge, golf course, boat docks, beach, picnic area, and hiking and bridle trails.

In addition, the region will be able to offer one of the nation's biggest wilderness recreational areas in the 170,000-acre Land-Between-The-Lakes now being developed by TVA.

WELCOME ECONOMIC LIFT

It will be an almost totally rustic area, with only a few access roads and trails and widely-scattered camping sites. The more sophisticated developments will be offered by the state's recreational parks and the increasing number of private camps and motels along bordering Kentucky and Barkley lakes.

Western Kentucky can use the economic help that the parks are sure to provide. A former agricultural section, it suffered considerable unemployment even before Lake Barkley and Land-Between-The-Lakes took great chunks of land off local tax rolls, and it was this economic pinch that prompted the grant by the Economic Development Administration. This is the third such grant made to Kentucky park developments by EDA, $1,100,000 having been granted for Greenbo State Park, and $346,000 for Jenny Wiley State Park earlier. Thanks to passage of last year's bond issue, the state will be able to match these and similar grants which it hopes to receive for other state parks located in regions needing an economic lift.

BISHOP RICHARD C. RAINES, OF INDIANA AREA OF METHODIST CHURCH, URGES CONGRESS TO APPROVE HOUSING TITLE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading churchmen of my home State of Indiana and, indeed, of the Nation is the Reverend Richard C. Raines, bishop of the Indiana area of the Methodist Church.

Bishop Raines and I are both Methodists, although, as a Democrat, I must confess that Bishop Raines is Republican by political persuasion.

A few days ago I received a telegram from Bishop Raines concerning the civil rights bill which the House is now considering, with particular reference to titles IV and V of the bill. As we are today debating title IV, the housing title of the bill, I think it appropriate that I call to the attention of my colleagues Bishop Raines' telegram, the text of which follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
July 26, 1966.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I write to seek your strong support for title 4 and title 5 1966 Civil Rights Act (H.R. 14765). It is imperative I believe that Federal legislation be adopted which would prohibit real estate brokers from discriminating on the bases of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or lease of residences. The 1964 general conference at Pittsburgh, which speaks officially for the Methodist Church, adopted the following statement: "Christians must insist that all people have the freedom to reside wherever their economics means and personal wishes permit. The local church should prepare its members to live in integrated neighborhoods and challenge them to help in creating fully inclusive community." (1964 discipline—par. 1824 C. 6). Much of the violence we have witnessed in Watts, Harlem, and other areas around the Nation results from the pent-up frustration of Negroes who have been confined to ghettos partially because of the discriminatory practices of realtors in the sale and rental of housing. We are storing up for ourselves a devastating whirlwind if we do not soon eliminate the fences which bind our Negro brethren in poverty, disease, and wretched living conditions. Similarly I favor strong legislation which would protect Negroes and civil rights workers by imposing stiffer penalties against those who deny other's constitutional rights. We must make it clear that those who tamper with the basic constitutional freedoms of any Americans are infringing on sacred rights and are going to receive much harsher punishment than a mere lecture or slap on the wrist. I hope you will use your influence to obtain favorable action for these two significant pieces of legislation.

Most cordially yours,
Bishop RICHARD C. RAINES,
Indiana Area the Methodist Church.

FLORIDA'S "POCAHONTAS" AND GEORGIA'S "JOHN SMITH"

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, among the considerable accomplishments of my friend and colleague from Georgia, the Honorable MASTON O'NEAL, is an ability to spin a set of historical facts into most interesting stories.

I would like to have the above captioned article which he has written printed in the pages of the RECORD, for it is a most interesting story about a fascinating period in American history.

FLORIDA'S "POCAHONTAS" AND GEORGIA'S "JOHN SMITH"

(By MASTON O'NEAL)

Few Americans ever heard of the Indian princess, Malee, or of the young Georgia soldier from Milledgeville named Duncan McKrimmon, yet their story was one to parallel that of Pocahontas and Captain John Smith. During the First Seminole War it was the subject of many newspaper articles and later on in the early 1800's a number of historians devoted a page or two to the now forgotten pair.

Pocahontas is well known to every modern school boy and girl. Why the difference? Did she have a press agent, or, to borrow a phrase much used by the Supreme Court, did she "pre-empt the field" of that type of heroism?

Malee, whose name became Milly Francis, was belatedly recognized by the Congress of the United States. She was the first woman ever awarded a Congressional medal and a pension, only to have the slowly moving wheels of official Washington delay the award until three days before she died a pitiful and consumptive pauper. This was twenty-four years after she had saved the white man from execution at the stake.

The Milly Francis-Duncan McKrimmon story is offered as fact—not fiction. Tracing it out while thumbing through old books listed on the last page herein has provided fine entertainment. These books were made available by Florida State Library, Georgia Extension Library Service, the University of Georgia's rare book section, and Library of Congress, and obtained through the Decatur-Seminole Regional Library.

Duncan McKrimmon was a young Milledgeville lad caught up in the excitement of events leading to the First Seminole War. This war of the winter of 1817–1818 was not much of a war. It was too one-sided. The Indians had been rampaging the border between American Georgia and Spanish Florida while being spurred on by the British in that area who still had not gotten over the loss of the War of 1812.

General Andrew Jackson made one of his characteristically impetuous marches from Tennessee through Georgia to the trouble spot and in doing so went by Fort Hawkins (now Macon). Hartford (just across the Ocmulgee from present day Hawkinsville). Fort Early (on the Flint south of Cordele), the friendly Indian village of Chehaw (just above Albany), and the principal American bastion of Fort Scott (16 miles below present day Bainbridge and in the Jim Woodruff Dam Reservoir near the Georgia-Florida border).

A few overwhelming defeats administered to greatly inferior Indian forces and the questionable executions of two Englishmen (Arbuthnot and Ambrister) just outside the Spanish fort at St. Marks, Florida completed the war.

As Old Hickory hurried through Georgia he was joined by Georgia militiamen. Among these was young McKrimmon, a private in Captain Joseph Watters' company of the 2nd Regiment.

The trip into the wilderness led to Fort Gadsden on the Apalachicola River which had been re-built by one of Jackson's favorite lieutenants. The general named the fort for this highly respected officer who later gained greater fame when, as Ambassador to Mexico, he negotiated the Gadsden Purchase.

The troops did not remain at Fort Gadsden many days, but it was long enough for the

Georgia boy to slip off and go fishing. Unfortunately he lost his way in the surrounding forest and was captured by a roving band of Indians who bound him and carried him to Francistown, an Indian village between St. Marks and the now famous Waukulla Springs.

Francistown was the village of a most influential Creek Indian chief called by the Britishers in the area, "Francis, The Prophet". His Indian name was Hillis Hadjo, which has been phonetically spelled Hillisajo many times. The "Hadjo" was a title which Welbourne Kelley says in his recent novel Alabama Empire can best be freely translated "unreasonably courageous".

Francis, or Hillis Hadjo was highly respected by the British, and especially by Colonel Edwin Nichols, a hard loser, who had suffered part of Pakenham's defeat at the hands of Andrew Jackson in the historic battle of New Orleans.

Nichols had now recently taken Francis to London with him and had created quite a stir. The savage was lionized by London Society. He was granted an audience with the Prince Regent (later King George IV). He was given a gold mounted tomahawk, a diamond studded snuffbox and a large sum of money. As an example of the reception given him a London Newspaper reported of a Ball given on board a Russian Frigate lying off Woolwich (near London) on the anniversity of the emperor's birth "The double sound of the trumpet announced the arrival of the patriot Francis, who fought so gloriously in our cause in America". The item, with further description, was reprinted in Niles Weekly Register of Baltimore, on March 15, 1817.

Francis was now back home in Francistown doing quite a bit of strutting in a grey frock coat which seemed to be his daily uniform.

When the warriors brought in the panicky young white soldier Francis ordered him tied to a stake on the edge of the town. He was stripped of all clothing. Whether he was to have been burned at the stake (as contemporary newspapers reported), or whether he was to have been shot (as Milly herself said many years later) will probably not be definitely established at this late date, but an execution of some sort was about to take place when Milly, the youngest of the chief's daughters broke down and desperately begged her father to spare the lad.

The Milledgeville Journal later (Nov. 3, 1818) outdid itself in reporting the matter. With melodrama characteristic of that day's journalism it gushed: "the ruthless savages, having shaved his head and reduced his body to a state of nudity, formed themselves into a circle, and danced around him some hours, yelling all the while most horribly. The youngest daughter of the Prophet (who is about fifteen years of age and represented by officers of the army we have conversed with to be a woman very superior to her associates) was sad and silent the whole time—she participated not in the general joy, but was evidently, even to the affrighted prisoner, much pained at the savage scene she was compelled to witness. When the fatal tomahawk was raised to terminate forever the mortal existence of the unfortunate McKrimmon—at that critical, that awful moment, Milly Francis, like an angel of mercy, placed herself between it and death, resolutely bidding the astonished executioner, if he thirsted for human blood, to shed hers . . .".

The daughter's tears prevailed on the father as they have on countless other fathers. The chief spared the boy and took him seven miles away to Fort St. Marks where he sold him to the Spanish governor for seven and a half gallons of rum.

In the meantime General Jackson's army swung in a wide circle to invade the Mickasucky Towns near Tallahassee before descending on St. Marks. While this was happening American ships were proceeding to the port of St. Marks which they entered shortly before the general and his men arrived by land.

Lest you think that Americans have ever been honorable in warfare the ships were flying the British flag.

Although McKrimmon was a prisoner of the Spanish governor he sought and obtained permission to visit the "British" ship.

Hillis Hadjo (Francis) and a particularly ruthless Indian chief named Himolle Micco also went out in a canoe, but received a different sort of reception from McKrimmon. They were invited to the captain's cabin for a drink, and upon signal were captured there by the American jack tars. The next day, on Jackson's orders, they were hung from the yardarm—Hillis Hadjo still wearing the grey frock coat.

The "war" was soon over with Jackson chasing the Seminoles across the Suwannee River, hanging Old Man Arbuthnot, and subjecting the handsome dashing, but tactless Ambrister to the firing squad.

Private McKrimmon returned to Georgia with his unit.

Milly was destitute.

The Milledgeville Journal reported, "Now, the fortune of war has placed her in the power of the white people—she arrived at Fort Gadsden not long since, with a number of others that had surrendered, in a starving condition. We are gratified to learn that a proper respect for her virtues induced the commanding officer, Colonel Arbuckle, to relieve her immediate wants. McKrimmon appears to have a due sense of the obligation he owes the woman who saved his life at the hazard of her own—he left town last week to seek her, and as far as may be in his power to alleviate her misfortunes. It is also his firm determination, we understand, if she will consent, to make her his wife, and reside, provided he can prevail upon her to do so, within the settled parts of Georgia."

McKrimmon's hometown paper later reported receiving a letter from Colonel Arbuckle dated Fort Gadsden, December 1, 1818 which said:

"Duncan McKrimmon is her—Milly, the Prophet Francis's daughter, says she saved his life, or used such influence as she possessed to that effect, from feelings of humanity alone, and that she would have rendered the same service to any other white man similarly circumstanced—she is, therefore, not disposed to accept his offer of matrimony, which has been made as an acknowledgment of gratitude. The donation presented through me by the citizens of Milledgeville to Milly, has been delivered, and she manifested a considerable degree of thankfulness for their kindness."

Historian James Parton reported in Volumn II (page 483) of his "Life of Andrew Jackson" (published 1860) that "—she yielded at last and became his wife. They settled on a plantation south of Suwanee Old Town, where they lived very happily till 1836, when McKrimmon died, leaving Milly a widow with eight children."

Parton was unquestionably wrong.

Although historical oblivion soon came to McKrimmon, Milly was moved to Arkansas (now Oklahoma) with thousands of other Seminoles. She appears to have been forgotten for nearly a quarter of a century, but again became a figure of national interest when discovered by Lt. Col. Ethan Allen Hitchcock (later a major general) whom the War Department had sent to observe the treatment accorded the removed Indians.

Hitchcock's diary, later made the basis of two books ("Fifty Years in Camp and Field" by W. A. Groffut, 1909, and "A Traveler in Indian Territory" by Grant Foreman, 1930) reports finding her, the widow of an Indian, with three children, two sons and a daughter.

After transacting other business with her, the diarist said, "I spoke of the story of her having saved the life of a white man and she at once told me the whole story. During the war (1817–18) it was "given out" that if any Indian caught a white man he had the life of the white man in his power (no chief even could save him). Milly heard a war whoop and going to the place found that two Indians had a young white man tied and perfectly naked: other Indians came around and Milly described the white man doubling himself to screen himself from the gaze of those that were looking at him and at the same time looking anxiously around as if there was no one to speak for him and save his life.

"Milly's eyes were very animated as she gave this account. She is a good looking woman now and must have been a beautiful girl. She was a little girl, she said, the size of her daughter now. Seeing the young man and thinking it a 'pity' he should be killed she went to her father and urged that it was a pity, etc. The father said go to the men who have right over the young man's life. She went to them and began to plead. One of them said he should die for that, he had two sisters killed. She told him that to kill a white man would not bring back his sisters and that he was but a boy and had no 'head' to guide him—(the meaning of this was that he was not old enough to have engaged in the war on his own judgment). Milly prevailed on conditions that the lad should have his head shaved and live with the Indians. She then went up to him and told him his life should be spared if he would permit his hair to be cut off and live as they did. She said he thrust his head out saying Yes, Yes, cut it all off if you choose. His head was then shaved, all but the scalp lock on the top and he was loosed and dressed."

Later, Milly told Hitchcock, he was carried to St. Marks and sold for a barrel of whishey (sic) to some Spaniards.

The diary continues, "Milly says they were not preparing to burn him, as we have the story published, but were about to shoot him. She says that he came back among them sometime afterwards and offered her marriage, but that she refused him, saying, she did not save his life to marry him. Milly said that on her way to this country everybody appeared to know the story and gave her a great many presents, but that now she is very poor and has to work hard to get a living."

Colonel Hitchcock pushed a bill through Congress which was approved on June 17, 1844 granting her a pension of $96 per annum "as a testament of the gratitude and bounty of the United States, for the humanity displayed by her in saving the life of an American citizen, who was a prisoner in the hands of her people and about to be put to death by them: —"

Section 2 of the bill authorized the Secretary of War "to procure and transmit to the said Milly, a medal with appropriate devices impressed thereon, of the value of not exceeding twenty dollars, as an additional testimonial of the gratitude of the United States."

The bumbling and exasperating delays of official Washington brought about a sad result. On june 1, 1948 James Logan, Creek Agent, wrote a letter to Hon. William Medill, Commissioner of Indian Affairs: "I had the honor to receive on the 7th Ulto. your communication, with enclosure—relating to the Act of Congress, granting to Milly—a pension. The same day I received information that she was laying dangerously ill. I immediately visited her, and found her as I was informed, in dying circumstances, and I regret to say in a most wretched condition. I immediately procured medical aid, and done all that was possible to alleviate her sufferings. I read your letter to her, (she comprehending English perfectly) at which she was so highly elated, that I flattered myself she was recovering, but my hopes were fallacious, her disease was consumption. She died on the 19th Ulto—a Christian, a devout member of the Baptist Church—. She informed me, that at the time the act was rendered which saved the life of Capt. (sic) McKrimmon, she never expected any pecuniary reward, her family was rich, she did not require it. She had become very poor—& she was very grateful for the notice taken of her by the Govt. &c."

PART II

Milly's story contains another romance that did not quite blossom and which ended in tragedy. To understand both we need to go back to the execution of Robert Ambrister at St. Marks.

This dashing adventurer was the second son of wealthy London parents. Although educated for a liberal profession his father secured for him a commission in the British Marines. This soon got him wounded at Waterloo with an artillary regiment. After spending a short time on St. Helena with Napoleon, Ambrister was sent to the East Indies. He had a difficulty there with another officer and wounded his antagonist in a duel, only to be suspended from his command for one year.

Returning to London to wait the end of the suspension Ambrister fell in love with a banker's daughter. He proposed, she accepted, but the wedding was postponed until his restoration to service.

Ambrister decided to kill time in the interim by visiting his uncle, the Governor of New Providence in the Bahamas where he met the old scottish trader, Alexander Arbuthnot, and Milly's father, Francis, The Prophet. The result of these acquaintanceships was an adventurous trip to St. Marks.

The historian, James Parton, who reports all of this interlude in Milly's life, got it first hand from J. B. Rodgers, a soldier of Andrew Jackson's army, who was detailed to guard Ambrister during the court martial, and who later was a respected citizen of Rock Island, Tennessee.

He described the Britisher as "tall and of fine prepossessing appearance. Engaging in manner, he displayed natural abilities of a high order and a thorough education in the frequent conversations which his free and confiding nature prompted him to indulge in. Genial and whole-souled, he engaged the warmest sympathies of those who saw him during his imprisonment."

Speaking of the executions of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, Rodgers said:

"Among the spectators was a girl of seventeen who seemed to be in deep distress, and to have no one to comfort her. It was none other than Milly, the daughter of the Prophet Francis, who had been summarily hanged twenty days before. There was white blood in the veins of this beautiful maiden, as there was in those of her father. She was a brunette, with long flowing hair, keen black eyes, and finely formed person. She was dressed in the manner of white women.

"The poor girl had been extremely, though chastely intimate with Ambrister. Ambrister told me, while he was awaiting trial, that when Francis was in England, presents of dresses and other articles of female attire were given him for his daughter. When these arrived in St. Marks, Ambrister accompanied Francis to his town and remained domiciled in his house for a considerable time. There Ambrister said he had found a most interesting daughter of the Prophet, a most exquisitely handsome girl of about seventeen summers, modest and coy, not bashful but natively diffident. When the father unpacked the presents for Milly and gave them to her, she was at a loss to know how to use them. The dresses were not such fits as could have been made in Paris and London.

"In the last extremity Milly applied to Ambrister for help, and to his utter astonishment, he was quite as much at a loss as the girl, but by pinning and tucking on so beautiful a person, it was not long before Milly lost the appearance of a 'maid of the forest'. Ambrister claimed some credit for his suggestions and said that he believed that with proper practice he could become adept.

"After which it was not long before he became a decided favorite with the family and the town. Francis gave intimation that he should be pleased to give his daughter in marriage to Ambrister along with three hundred Negroes. Ambrister knew he dared not refuse to treat this offer with becoming consideration and respect.

"Soon he had to escort Milly (I think the name Malee in Indian) to visit the daughters of the Spanish Commandant at St. Marks—two handsome ladies.

Milly was not long in taking steps to apply and fit dresses. When properly adjusted, with native modesty, she made rapid strides to his esteem.

"She was most beautiful, he said: he loved her for her virtue and modesty. She could talk enough English to make herself understood, and she understood the Spanish and Indian.

"Ambrister, in all his visits to the young ladies in the fort, was accompanied by Malee as his interpreter, and she often played off her little pranks on him, telling the young ladies at one time that they were married, at another time that he was in love with her but that she had discarded him, and like pranks.

"Among the presents was a velvet riding hat, with feathers, fine bridle and saddle, too large for a pony, and but for her admirable skill in equestrianism would often have brought her down. With the aid of it, however, she often outrode him, even when he was best mounted on a black pony whose spirit could only at times be conquered by the application of the Spanish curb and rowel.

"In this way Ambrister passed some time. Malee could stand on the ground and bound into the saddle and ride off with her black hair flowing in the wind before he could climb on his grey headed black. Malee's favorite gait was a gallop, hard for him to perform, but which he had to do to keep company with her.

"Ambrister declared that, except at the time he pinned Malee's dress, he was never permitted to put his hands on her. She rallied him for his leaving her and the pretty Spanish girls in the fort. All taken, Malee's appearance was unique and handsome in the extreme on horseback, particularly during the sojourn of Ambrister.

"The writer saw Malee at St. Marks on the 8th of April, the day her father was executed; but he has no knowledge of her having been there again until the 29th, the day Ambrister was shot. General Jackson's army was camped between her father's town and the fort. The army marched in the morning about four o'clock; which was known to the town; and possibly curiosity brought Malee to St. Marks with the others. As she was about to cross the bridge over the ditch surrounding the fort, she, with the others, met the platoon in charge of Ambrister, and not being able to divine the cause of the cortege, stood and witnessed the execution of Ambrister. At this, it was said, she was much distressed, possibly more than at the death of her father. It was said by the commandant's family, that Malee went to their house and there gave full vent to her feelings."

In retrospect one can easily understand how she declined the proffered hand of Duncan McKrimmon a short while later.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Life of Andrew Jackson," by James Parton (1860) Vol. II.

"Fifty Years in Camp and Field," W. A. Croffut (1909).

"A Traveler in Indian Territory," Grant Foreman (1930).

"Two Fighters and Two Fines," Tom W. Campbell (1941).

"A View of West Florida," John Lee Williams (1827).

"History of the Indian Wars," Henry Trumbull (1844).

"Life of Jackson," John Frost (1847).

"Milly Francis and Duncan McKrimmon," T. Frederick Davis, in the Florida Historical Quarterly, Vol. XXI. No. 3 January, 1943.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—AMENDMENT TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the signs of progress which I personally find extremely encouraging in the struggle for full equality in this society is the increase in the numbers of minority group persons entering our professions. We in Congress cannot properly take all the credit for this development, but there is no doubt in my mind that the civil rights legislation passed by this House in the last few years has had much to do with the encouragement given young Negro men and women to better themselves educationally and professionally. Yet, 2 full years after passage of the equal employment opportunity title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, there exists a situation so insidious and so malignant as to make a mockery of both the spirit and the letter of that legislation. Many of these same young Negroes whom we have encouraged to enter the professions, find when they have completed their long and expensive training that they cannot become members of the professional groups which govern nearly all aspects of practice.

In many of the professions—law, engineering, teaching, and others—Negroes find full equality difficult if not impossible to achieve. But perhaps the best example of discrimination in professional societies—because of its critical nature—is the medical profession, and specifically the medical profession in the South.

In its 1963 report, the Civil Rights Commission found that the number of Negro physicians in many areas of the South was declining. A definite pattern, among young Negro doctors, involved early education in the South, higher education in the South or elsewhere, and internship and practice in the North. Today, nearly 4 years later, although the number of Negro doctors nationally is increasing, in the South the decline continues. Why is it that Negroes from the South do not practice there? Why is it that a woefully inadequate level of health care in the South affects Negroes and not whites? I would like to mention a few statistics on the subject.

In Mississippi, the maternal mortality rate for whites was identical with the rate for whites in the Nation as a whole.

The Mississippi Negro rate was six times higher than the white rate, and half again as high as the national Negro rate.

The infant mortality rate in Mississippi was twice as high for Negroes as whites, and again the Negro rate was substantially higher in the State than in the Nation as a whole.

I need not cite just Mississippi. Throughout much of the South medical care for Negroes lags far, far behind care for whites. In a number of southern counties, every 10th Negro baby died during the 1st year of life, and higher infant mortality rates are not unknown.

If all the new Negro doctors returned to the South to practice we could change these awful figures. But they do not. And the reason they do not is because they know that practice without membership in the county and State chapters of the American Medical Association is impossible. And they know that they cannot become members of these chapters.

To be a doctor today is difficult enough without having to fight against discrimination from one's fellow doctors. In the field of medicine new drugs, methods, and operation techniques emerge every day. A doctor cannot isolate himself, but must communicate with the rest of his profession if he is to keep abreast. And the chief medium for this communication in this country is the AMA.

The AMA is no longer a strictly private professional guild dedicated to the furtherance of its members' interests. The AMA has permeated every phase of medicine. Its list of accredited medical schools has acquired the force of law. Through their reliance on the AMA to inspect such schools, the States tacitly confer upon it the power to set standards and grant approval. Seven Southern States have, by law, given their State medical societies an official role in selecting members for the State medical examining boards. And this when a number of these same States have virtually no Negroes in State or county societies.

AMA members have access to the numerous publications of the organization, and State and local societies offer other services such as maintenance of bill collection agencies, legal advice service, and inexpensive malpractice insurance. Also staff hospital appointments, teaching positions, and specialty ratings are often determined with the local AMA's approval.

I do not charge that the AMA is segregated nationally. Negro doctors do belong to the AMA and Negroes have served in its house of delegates. However, there is a clear pattern of discrimination in a number of its State and county chapters. The American Medical Association, as a national organization, has consistently failed to do anything about this. Its spokesmen hide behind the claim that they do not have the power to act, pointing out that each county society has complete control over its own membership policy. There is no basis in fact for this assertion. Nowhere in the constitution or bylaws of the AMA is there any provision limiting its power to place sanctions on those State and local societies that practice racial discrimination. That the AMA does in fact have the power to assert control over membership policies is manifested by the fact that, on at least three separate occasions, resolutions have been introduced in the house of delegates which would have imposed sanctions on any State or local society which practiced racial discrimination in the selection of its members. These attempts failed. But the important point here is not that the resolutions failed, but that they were voted on in the first place. There was no claim made that these resolutions were beyond the power of the national association. On the contrary, the fact that the votes were taken was an admission that the AMA does indeed have this power. Thus the AMA contention of lack of control is little more than a subterfuge for its traditional unwillingness to exercise the power it does in fact possess.

The AMA with its more than 150,000 members purports to represent the medical profession. It has presented itself to the American public as the spokesman for all doctors, all physicians, all races, and all parts of the country. But so long as the southern Negro doctor is denied membership this is a lie, and the AMA's deliberate unwillingness to counter this lie and admit Negroes by forcing its constituent chapters to stop discriminating makes it entirely proper for us to lay the same of southern medical care right on the doorstep of the AMA's national headquarters in Chicago. The Negro mothers who have never given birth to a child in a hospital, whose children contract diseases unknown among whites for a hundred years, and whose husbands die of undetected tuberculosis will never be able to receive the care they need until Negro doctors can practice on a completely equal basis with their white counterparts.

In Montgomery County, Ala., where the ratio of white doctors to total population is 1 to 850, and that of Negro doctors to total population is 1 to 25,000 the AMA can tell 50,000 Negroes that it is sorry but it cannot make the Montgomery County Medical Association accept Negro members. And the Negro doctors in Montgomery County will wait another 5 years and then, perhaps, someone in the county association will finally answer the membership applications which have been unanswered for the past 5 years. Or in Mobile County, or in Jefferson County or in any one of the hundreds of other counties across the South where new Negro doctors are unknown and membership applications get mysteriously lost and forgotten.

Well over a year ago I called upon the AMA to heed the words of the ancient injunction, "Physician, heal thyself." And in that time, as in the previous 200 years, the AMA chose to ignore the injunction. But the time is rapidly passing when we can allow the AMA the opportunity to heal itself. The thousands of lives lost to needless disease each year, and the frustration of the new Negro physicians who are not allowed to save those lives make immediate action now, on our part, a necessity. To this end I plan to offer an amendment to the civil rights bill now before us, which would bring the AMA—and all other professional groups—under the equal employment opportunity title of the 1964 act, and make discrimination in membership practices an unlawful employment practice. I hope you will all join with me in supporting this amendment. If we act together now, we can end this affront to human dignity and life.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, for August 4 and 5, on account of Tennessee Democratic primary.

Mr. CONABLE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. WATSON), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. WATSON), for 30 minutes, on August 4; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 15 minutes, today; and to include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER to include extraneous matter with the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include an analysis from the Legislative Reference Services.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) during general debate on the bill H.R. 14765, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. GOODELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. REES.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3080. An act to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2611. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a tort claim paid during fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 2673, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 3467. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; with amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.J. Res. 1217. Joint Resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 902. An act to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture: S. 2104. An act for the relief of Harriet C. Chambers (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 16791. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increases shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16792. A bill to amend the law providing for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products so it will apply to lamb; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 16793. A bill to provide that no further sales may be made under the Participation Sales Act of 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 16794. A bill to amend section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to require the Secretary of Agriculture in certain cases to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 16795. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increases shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 16796. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 16797. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 16798. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 16799. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 16800. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 16801. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 16802. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 16803. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 16804. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 16805. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 16806. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 16807. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 16808. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 16809. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 16810. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 16811. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 16812. A bill to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 16813. A bill to transfer to the AEC complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi section near Los Alamos County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 16814. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 16815. A bill to provide that no further sales may be made under the Participation Sales Act of 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16816. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices in the competitive civil service without term; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 16817. A bill to avoid unintended discrimination among individuals who are pursuing a course of education at Florida State University and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University who, except for certain administrative action, would be eligible to receive an educational assistance allowance under provisions of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 16818. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide notice, hearing, and judicial review with respect to any prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 16819. A bill to transfer to the AEC complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi section near Los Alamos County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 16821. A bill to provide that Columbus Day shall be a legal holiday for officers and employees of the United States in each State in which such day is designated as a legal State holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16822. A bill for the relief of the town of Natick, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 1258. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.J. Res. 1259. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H. Con. Res. 947. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Con. Res. 948. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. Con. Res. 949. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 950. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CABELL:

H. Con. Res. 951. Concurret resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASEY:

H. Con. Res. 952. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H. Con. Res. 953. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 954. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 955. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.Con. Res. 956. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 957. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Con. Res. 958. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 959. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 960. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H. Con. Res. 961. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H. Con. Res. 962. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 963. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 964. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H. Con. Res. 965. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the imposition of export controls on cattle hides, calf and kip skins, and bovine leather should be rescinded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 955. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Res. 956. Resolution providing for a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation to ascertain the reasons for the rapid rise in the prices of food, including dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 957. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the development and maintenance of a strong merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 16823. A bill for the relief of Kalatu Nair Gopalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16824. A bill for the relief of Robert N. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 16825. A bill for the relief of James D. Stephens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16826. A bill for the relief of Rina Dellapina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 16827. A bill for the relief of Ng Chong Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 16828. A bill for the relief of Farida Safiehzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 16829. A bill for the relief of Serapio de Anda-Villarreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

421. **Mr. MOORE** presented a petition from the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, urging the naming of the Veterans' Administration hospital located in Clarksburg, W. Va., the Louis A. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Miami SBA Office Wins National Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to tell my colleagues in this Chamber that the Miami regional office of the Small Business Administration, under the direction of Mr. Thomas A. Butler, has been presented a unit achievement award for its outstanding service to Florida hurricane victims.

The award was presented by SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin at the agency's special honor awards ceremonies here in Washington on Friday, July 29.

The official citation reads:

> For exceptional valuable service and assistance in disaster areas on an agencywide basis in furtherance of Small Business Administration's program goals and mission.

I would like to add my personal congratulations to the five persons receiving the award—Douglas E. McAllister, Robert W. Norene, William H. Merrill, Richard J. Green, and Ruth A. Donaldson.

These are the people who comprised SBA's Miami regional office's disaster unit. They are to be commended for long hours of truly dedicated service, particularly for their assistance to victims of Hurricane Betsy, the central Florida tornadoes of last April and, more recently, Hurricane Alma.

The people of Florida know only too well the damages and heartbreaks that follow in the wake of such storms. Because of this unit's expertise, hundreds of homeowner's and businessmen were able to get help quickly to rebuild their property. The fact that this type of assistance is so readily available is reassuring. This unit, in particular, deserves our heartfelt thanks.

A Patriotic American, Joan Merriam Smith—August 3, 1936, to February 17, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today the daily press tells of the draft dodgers, the lack of civilian involvement in crime prevention and community life, the anti-American youth on the college campuses but too often the positive patriotic deed of an individual is taken for granted and unrewarded.

A young American aviatrix was an example of late President Kennedy's credo of "Ask what you can do for your country." I refer to the late Joan Merriam Smith who in 1964—March 17 to May 12—wrote American aviation history by flying the 1937 Earhart Equator route and was honored by the 1965 Harmon International Trophy posthumously. This is aviation's highest award.

When asked the reason for her flight, the late Joan Merriam had replied:

> My flight was made to complete a page of aviation history for the United States.

Today, the United States needs more patriotic citizens like her.

I have introduced a memorial resolution, House Joint Resolution 462, as has four of my colleagues in this House, House Joint Resolution 461 to 465, which is still pending before Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 under Chairman BYRON ROGERS, of Colorado, and Members might note their interest in this, especially the several Congressmen who are pilots and all women Members of the House.

A Joint Aviation Day for May 12 as proposed in the resolution is a deserved honor for Joan Merriam and Amelia Earhart. A second request is for a world flight stamp honoring Joan Merriam and carrying the suggested theme of "World Friendship, Via Aviation." Too many recent U.S. postage stamps did not bear a theme or design of positive value. This proposed airmail stamp would be an appropriate issue for May 13, 1968—the date of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. airmail stamp. Mr. Postmaster General, let us tell the world of Americans and American achievement, and American heritage in our future stamp issues and thusly stamp collecting and global correspondence will contribute to patriotism and world peace.

Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, July 29, 46 Members of the House of Representatives sponsored a statement on Vietnam in response to the recent pronouncement by Premier Ky suggesting an invasion of North Vietnam and eventual war with Red China. As one of the signatory Members, I would like to introduce this statement in the RECORD as I believe it will be of great interest to my colleagues:

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

> Recent statements by Premier Ky suggesting an invasion of North Vietnam, and eventual war with Red China, indicate he and other South Vietnamese generals have ambitions that extend far beyond and contradict the limited aims stated by President Johnson in seeking self-determination for the Vietnamese people. The danger that the war will spread is increasing daily. Extension of the conflict may embroil the major powers of the world in a destructive and brutal confrontation that would shatter all hopes of world peace.
>
> Premier Ky's statements dramatize the necessity for the American government to redirect its energies more forcefully in pursuit of a peaceful political settlement of the war. The spiral of escalation now being advocated by General Ky must be opposed and new initiatives attempted for negotiated settlement. The United States should use its great influence to assure that fair and free elections open to all parties will be held in the South so that a truly representative civilian government may be established. The granting of political rights to all would offer a peaceful alternative to those who now pursue the path of armed rebellion.

DEMOCRATS

JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, JOHN A. BLATNIK, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, JEFFERY COHELAN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN DOW,

KEN W. DYAL, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD FRASER, JACOB H. GILBERT, BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, ROBERT LEGGETT, JOHN C. MACKIE, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, PATSY T. MINK, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, ROBERT N. C. NIX, BARRATT O'HARA, EDWARD J. PATTEN,

THOMAS REES, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, HENRY S. REUSS, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, HERBERT TENZER.

LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, WESTON VIVIAN, JEROME R. WALDIE, LESTER WOLFF, SIDNEY R. YATES.

REPUBLICANS

SEYMOUR HALPERN, THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN.

House Resolution 728

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this February, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 728, to express the sense of this House that the President should begin withdrawing, to the extent possible, some American troops from Europe.

Back in February my resolution created a minor stir. But since then, many persons, including the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, have become convinced that we have to pull troops out from Europe. Why should be protect Europe—when Europeans can protect themselves—at the cost of straining our balance of payments and our military resources? I believe that the administration is at this very minute pulling troops out from Europe, even though they deny it.

Why should this administration deny doing what is commonsense when they are so often so proud of doing the senseless and mistaken? Look at our great European allies. In thanks for the troops that we keep in Germany, the Germans build a steel mill for Red China. Then there are the French, who are kicking us out of France. This is their gratitude for the aid dollars by the billions we poured into France after the war. Last we have the British, who trade with North Vietnam because if Britannia no longer rules the waves, Britannia still waives the rules.

We have no obligation to protect these people any longer. They are rich enough to defend themselves, and they know it. Quite recently, Franz Josef Strauss, former German Defense Minister, said that we were foolish not to make Europe bear more of the burdens of European defense. "Foolish" is the right word.

I think this House ought to commend this administration for starting to pull troops out from Europe. But I think that this House ought to also tell the administration to admit what it is doing, and to be proud of it. Someone might think that the administration was only pulling troops out from Europe because they had mismanaged the Vietnamese war, and needed to drag specialists to Vietnam from all over the world, to make up for lack of foresight.

I am introducing a resolution today stating the sense of the House as support of administration policy of troop withdrawal from Europe. I think that this House ought to be on record as supporting troop withdrawal from Europe.

I would also like to say at this time that I have no sympathy with this administration's little game of calling Britain's Socialist Prime Minister a "second Churchill" to get him to keep his mouth shut about American policy in Vietnam. I was discouraged to see that we are going to bribe Britain with a $100 million aircraft engine order. Do we not have American plants that need work? I know we have American shipyards that need work, and the administration has placed an order for $14 million worth of ships from a British shipyard that can not operate at a profit. As far as I am concerned, this is bribery. It is an attempt to prop up a Socialist government that can not run an economy any better than this administration can.

This administration is giving away production orders that ought to produce jobs for American workers just to keep the Socialist government of Britain from condemning American Vietnam policy. I object to foreign aid being used as a tool of international bribery.

Some people may say that our bribe to Britain is just support for the pound sterling in its hour of crisis. I do not agree. Our Government and the British Government are partners in funny money economics, and they are going to pay the piper quite soon. Until then, I do not want to see American defense production orders farmed out to Britain while Britain will not help in Vietnam. I do not like to see the President of the United States call a Socialist Prime Minister of Britain a "second Churchill" or some such name, and hold out bribes to boot, just to get the British government to keep mum on Vietnam.

If world opinion sees our Vietnam policy as such a dumb and blundering policy that they refuse to join in and can only be kept quiet with bribery, then the American people ought to know about it. This is another example of the perennial Johnson credibility gap.

A Reminder, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] put his finger on the real problem behind the current airline strike and many other strikes in a notable statement he issued yesterday.

The New York Daily News, in its lead editorial today entitled "A Reminder, Mr. President," found occasion to comment on Mr. LAIRD's remarks. In his statement, the gentleman pointed out that the basic problem behind these strikes is inflation. This is the core problem which, in Mr. LAIRD's words, "the administration has not shown the courage to attack."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that the lead editorial in today's New York Daily News be included in the RECORD along with the complete statement issued yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The material referred to follows:

A REMINDER, MR. PRESIDENT

In the midst of all the confusion and buck-passing about how to end our nation's 27-day airline strike, one comment by Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD stands out as clear, candid and commendable.

Moaned MIKE, while lesser upper-House legislators stood mute: "This (the labor-touchy airline strike) is back in our laps. And if there is anything we don't like in our laps, it is this kind of matter."

In the House of Representatives, however, Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD (R-Wis.) did speak up loud and plain.

The basic problem behind the airlines and many other strikes, he declared, is inflation—"which the Administration has not shown the courage to attack . . . It is understandable that workers will balk at accepting a wage increase of 3.2 or 3.5% when the cost of living is increasing at an annual rate of 4.1%."

Then LAIRD aimed square at his target. He noted that President Johnson, in his State of the Union message last January, said he would ask Congress for new and stiff legislation to deal with strikes that harm the national interest. "I find it hard to believe that the President had nothing specific in mind when he made this pledge to Congress and the nation. Yet here it is 6½ months later . . . he should make good on his promise . . . instead of drifting from crisis to crisis in labor-management relations."

That's probably as blunt a demand for Presidential courage as has been recorded in recent months. The next voice we hear should be that of Lyndon B. Johnson.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AUGUST 2, 1966

In his State of the Union message, President Johnson said:

"I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

I find it hard to believe that the President had nothing specific in mind when he made this pledge to the Congress and the nation.

Yet here it is 6½ months later. The country is in the midst of an airlines strike, and the Executive Branch has not yet produced the bill which it promised last January.

There is no reason why the President and his advisers should have neglected this issue. This isn't the first strike of 1966. The Wall Street Journal pointed out last week that time lost because of strikes in May was the highest May figure in seven years.

The problem which lies behind the strike is one which the Administration has not shown the courage to attack. The problem is inflation.

The President has been seeking to impose his guidelines as a ceiling on wage increases at a time when the cost of living is rising at a rate exceeding the limits set by the guidelines. It is understandable that workers will balk at accepting a wage increase of 3.2 or 3.5 per cent when the cost of living is increasing at an annual rate of 4.1 per cent. It is particularly understandable when they see wage settlements concluded in other industries which shatter the guidelines without any objection from the White House.

Whatever the outcome of the present strike, the Administration should not think that the real problem has been dealt with properly.

To get at the root of the problem, the President should begin to interest himself in efforts to achieve price stability and thus remove the major stimulus to the kind of impasse between labor and management which has crippled air transportation.

He should make good on his promise to propose legislation to deal with serious strikes instead of drifting from crisis to crisis in labor-management relations. Legislation drafted in haste to meet an immediate crisis such as we are now going through may prescribe a cure that is as bad as the disease. In the current crisis, some had proposed government seizure of the airlines. So drastic a remedy would have been a regrettable departure from the historic relationship of government and private enterprise—a departure that Congress, business, and labor would regret in future years.

Proposal for Minimizing the Public Hardship in Transportation Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it must be clear to those involved—the machinists, the airline operators, the public, and the Government—that a protracted strike of five major airlines, or the discontinuance of air transportation service, is no longer tolerable.

Regardless of the efficacy, even need, of the strike device in ordinary labor-management disputes, it is no longer an appropriate weapon in labor disputes when public hardship or a national emergency is involved.

The public has a majority interest in the transportation business. Transportation—air, water, land, or rail—is a service, a public service, whether passenger, mail, or freight.

The taxpayer has a large stake in all transportation businesses.

Profits are essential to the airlines and important to the public. The wages should be fair for the work done. The profits should be fair for the risk, investment, and service rendered. Neither excessive wages nor excessive profits should be taken at the expense of the user of the transportation or at the expense of the taxpayer who contributes to the subsidies and governmental services to the industry.

Any excessive profits or wages which are not returned to the public in reduced fares are just as inflationary and unacceptable as increased prices that are required by excessive wage or profit demands. The fare-paying traveler is just as entitled to a slice of the extra profits as are the employers and employees. The taxpayer is just as much entitled to a slice of the extraordinary profits as they were obligated to subsidize when profits were impossible.

In many places public transportation is an absolute necessity. Interruptions of transportation can quickly and easily become a public inconvenience or hardship or a national emergency.

Presently it must be clear that a political solution is usually wrong or often impossible. It would appear as though President Johnson has refused to intervene in either the airline or the New York City transport strikes for political reasons. Politics has no place in labor disputes when the national interest or public inconvenience is involved.

President Johnson is quick to use his office to control steel, aluminum, and other industries, but laggardly when unions exceed the administration economic guidelines allegedly designed to forestall inflation. Perhaps another President would be similarly encumbered and shackled by the feared political consequences.

Through press-agentry, President Johnson attempted to milk as much political advantage as possible out of the negotiation proceedings. His curious outward detachment from the negotiations until settlement appeared imminent, then the nighttime summons of the parties to the White House woodshed, the mandatory closeting of the negotiators in the Executive offices, the grand TV announcement of the "noninflationary" settlement, the devious childish withholding of the terms of the agreement from the public, the taxpayers, and the families of the machinists until the time of the election must have demonstrated that this President and his labor advisers do not understand labor, do not care about management, and have little concern for the public or the taxpayer. Neither crass politics nor cheap press-agentry have any legitimate or helpful place in labor-management. The President has mishandled the airline strike.

The President cannot be blamed entirely because there is no prescribed plan or procedure for solution.

A new procedure for settling strikes of this nature is desperately needed to resume air transportation service now and to preclude such a public inconvenience and hardship in the future.

The present law permits Congress and the President to weasel out of their responsibility. Congress leaves the problem to the President; the President defers to the Congress. Generally, President Johnson likes to intrude on the prerogatives of the legislature—but not in distasteful strike situations. Congress must enact clear enabling legislation.

Compulsory arbitration is a distasteful method for settling an ordinary labor-management dispute. Compulsory arbitration brings together representatives of both contending parties with a neutral third party acceptable to both contenders. While compulsion in any form in a free society is objectionable, the inhumanitarian hardships of unabated use of economic power by either labor or management are also objectionable. Heretofore, Congress has refused to invoke compulsory arbitration for many good reasons. The enormity of the public detriment now overwhelms the reasons against compulsory arbitration.

Seeing no better solution, I suggest the addition of this tool to present labor-mangement relations law.

I propose that compulsory arbitration machinery be set in operation when the President or, and I repeat "or," the Congress makes the determination that a strike has become a national emergency or an intolerable public nuisance. No more deferring of the Congress or the President to the other; no more fiddling; no more "dilly dallying" or charging one another of failure to act. Secondly, I propose the representation of the public on the Board of Arbitration. I suggest a three-member Board with full authority to settle all issues. One representative selected by labor, one by management and one member of the American Arbitration Association or the American Bar Association to represent the public, user, and taxpayer interests. All other procedures of the present law could be retained.

These new but simple suggestions would insure more nearly fair settlements without the enormous losses, hardships and inconveniences of discontinued service.

My plan, when known and understood by the parties, would encourage, if not impel, quicker settlements of labor disputes. It would insure more stability and productivity in public transportation industries.

I believe scholars and students of labor-management relations know what is necessary. We do not need a study commission. We do not need protracted hearings in both the House and Senate. We need courage. We need to eliminate politics. We need to consider the public. We need new enabling legislation. We need it now.

These proposals are intended to, and do, protect the basic right of labor to organize, bargain, and strike. They also protect the necessary right of investors to earn a profit, and of management to manage its business.

Reckless, irresponsible, callous, or greedy action by either party must be minimized. The public rights must have primacy and must be protected now and in the future.

I urge members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to consider my proposals which are included in my bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For thus saith the Lord God, in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.—Isaiah 30: 15.

O God our Father, eternal source of wisdom, power, and love, whose mercy is over all Thy works and whose will is ever directed to Thy children's good—in quietness and in confidence we lift our hearts unto Thee. In the assurance of Thy presence we face the responsibilities of this day. May the brightness and the glory of good will dwell in our hearts and may all ill will die. Fill us with kindness, compassion, and understanding—with all those moral qualities which make our life together a happy and enduring experience. May we lead our people away from the treacherous road of deceit, hypocrisy, and pretense along the pathway of justice, freedom, and peace. Thus, may we follow Thee all the days of our lives. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF SECTION 7043, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7327) to repeal section 7043 of title 10, United States

Code, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 7043(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting the following, 'prescribes, but not more than $13,500 a year.' and substituting in lieu thereof the following: 'prescribes, but not more than the rate of compensation provided for grade 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House this legislation and what the Senate has done?

Mr. HÉBERT. I shall be happy to.

This legislation sets the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, the language school, at grade 18. The House set no limitation on the salary. The Senate set a salary limit. That is the only change in the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1035 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE SAVINGS DEPOSITS WITH A UNIFORMED SERVICE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14875) to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "President" and insert "President, not to exceed 10 per centum a year,".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2858) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARMATZ, ASHLEY, DOWNING, MAILLIARD, and PELLY.

HIGHER AND HIGHER INTEREST RATES VERSUS LOWER AND LOWER INTEREST RATES WILL BE DECIDED BY H.R. 14026

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the Rules Committee of the House grants a rule on H.R. 14026, the Members of the House will have an opportunity to express themselves on a very important question. The question is, Does Congress want to instruct the Federal Reserve and the U.S. Treasury to work in the direction of lower and lower interest rates or will it instruct these agencies to work in the direction of higher and higher interest rates?

The question is just that simple.

H.R. 14026 fixes a rate of 4½ percent on certificates of deposit or regulation Q for the next year. This is to give us time to look into the question more extensively and have a more permanent program within the year.

If you are in accord with this question being passed on—really as a sense of congressional mandate—please ask the Rules Committee to grant a rule on this bill as quickly as possible.

Please read in another part of this record the Democratic Party platforms of 1960 and 1964.

CREDIT SHORTAGE IN HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], just said, the committee last week favorably reported H.R. 14026 by a vote of 19 to 9.

That bill is designed to come to grips with the current credit shortage in our great housing industry. The bill, very briefly, would—

First, permit the Federal Reserve to buy FNMA and Home Loan Board paper, and thus reallocate credit, to a degree, in favor of the housing industry.

Second, it would raise the permissive reserve requirement of certificates of deposit by the banking system from a 6-percent ceiling to 10 percent.

Third, it would permit the Home Loan Bank Board to set ceilings on what savings and loans can pay, in order to prevent cutthroat competition.

Fourth, it would require coordination between all the monetary agencies when ceilings are set.

And fifth, Mr. Speaker, it would set, for the period of a year, a 4½-percent ceiling on certificates of deposit in an amount under $100,000 held by any bank.

Mr. Speaker, the package, taken together, would remove a very inequitable situation in the present housing market, and I believe enable our Nation to get the economy moving forward, without inflation.

I hope that the House Committee on Rules will view favorably the request of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for a rule, and that this body may shortly consider H.R. 14026.

HOW REPULSIVE NEED POLITICAL DISAGREEMENTS BECOME?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the less edifying stories that has appeared in the public press in a long time appeared on the front page of the New York Times this morning when our distinguished colleague from New York was quoted as inviting "everybody in Harlem to spit on one of his political opponents."

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, is in some sort of controversy with a leader up there by the name of "Jones." He invited everyone to spit on Mr. Jones on sight.

Mr. Speaker, I hope he does not bring that to the floor of the House against his adversaries here, because some of us who come to this Chamber every day would be at a disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant to point out that Mr. POWELL has been absent all week, on what business I do not know. He was not here to vote to bring the civil rights bill up, and when the civil rights bill was substantially weakened by the Mathias amendment on a tie vote broken by the Chair, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was again conspicuous by his absence.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I realize that I should not be speaking with reference to my fellow colleague when he is not present.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] took me to task for reproaching Mr. POWELL in his absence. But I pointed out then and I point out now the fact that it is difficult to criticize the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his presence because Mr. POWELL so seldom honors this Chamber with his presence.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a basic tenet of our free enterprise economic system, the right of employees to join together and bargain collectively in an effort to obtain their just rewards from our abundant industrialized economy. The International Association of Machinists in striking against five airlines are acting within the accepted framework of our economic system and within the law. Their goal is a proper one: to share in the unprecedented prosperity currently being enjoyed by this Nation's airlines. The airlines are no longer struggling to find their place under the transportation sun. Indeed, last year, profits of these five airlines increased by approximately 100 percent. And again this year, their profits have been rising at a rate over 30 percent above last year's record income.

It is obvious that the machinists have every right to share in this prosperity.

I most strongly oppose any attempts on the part of the Congress which will thwart the functioning of free collective bargaining procedures. This strike has been conducted in an orderly fashion and has followed the wishes of the membership as expressed in a democratically conducted vote. The short delay a traveler may encounter can by no stretch of the imagination be extended into labeling this strike as a national emergency.

Any Government action conceived in emotional haste to force these men to return to work can only have harmful effects for the future. It will set a precedent which will cause irreparable damage to the collective bargaining system under which both worker and employer have been able to prosper from the amazing vitality and productivity of the American economic system. Let us refrain from tampering with this basic mechanism of American economic life.

REPRESENTATIVE JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., COMMENDS THREE COLLEAGUES FROM LOUISIANA

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment of the House's time here, if I may, to commend three colleagues from Louisiana who, in spite of having reelection campaigns facing them in their districts, have stayed on the job here every day in an effort to defeat this vindictive bill. They are Representative HÉBERT, the dean of the Louisiana delegation, Representative PASSMAN, and Representative LONG.

There is, in the end, no more praiseworthy an act that a Member can do than stay here on the job, doing his duty as he sees it, struggling for the principles he believes in, in the face of sniping from political opponents back home. They are to be commended for remaining on the job and I would like the RECORD to show that those of us who are trying to defeat this measure appreciate their staying on the firing line.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 30, newspapers throughout the Nation carried articles which indicated that the airline strike was over and that L.B.J. had negotiated the settlement. Everyone seemed to forget that the workers still had to vote before the settlement could become official. But on Sunday, when the votes were counted, they began to realize that the President does not always get his way. Union members voted against the Presidential proposal 3 to 1.

As Congress legislates an end to the strike, as apparently it must now do, we should not overlook the significance of past experience. It has been clearly shown that the President and his proposals do not meet the desires of the workers. We are now returning to the people's branch of government, the Congress, the proper place for settling such matters. In doing so, we avoid the possibility of another failure and, at the same time, restore the role of Congress in the check and balance system.

The airline strike has now been in effect for over 4 weeks. It has crippled the transportation industry both domestically and overseas, and thousands of Americans have felt the effects physically and financially. Free collective bargaining has had ample time to settle the disagreements which led to the strike. It has failed to do so. We must preserve the right to bargain and the rights of investors and a mobile public. The President has tried his hand and failed. Congress, then, has allowed all possible means of settlement to take their course. Each has failed to bring about satisfactory results. The time has now come for Congress to act. Missouri has a so-called King Thompson law which prevents public utilities from striking when the public health and welfare is adversely affected. This law would be a good guideline for the Federal Government to follow.

AUTHORIZE STATE JURISDICTION ON UNIFORM TIME

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow each State of the Union an opportunity in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases.

Some States are divided by two or more time zones in populated areas in certain States that are adjacent or across the State line from metropolitan areas are completely out of harmony on uniform time. It promotes turmoil, misunderstanding, and confusion both to private and public business.

There are approximately 13 States divided into various time designations and are constantly in the state of confusion. The boundary line between central time and eastern time runs almost through the center of the States of Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee. It also separates Michigan's Upper Peninsula from the rest of the State, and goes through the western tip of Florida. This situation exists in other parts of the country—an example: where mountain and central and Pacific bisects certain States.

The bill which I am introducing today will make it much more feasible for bisected States to operate under the new Time Act. Under present provisions of the Time Act of 1966, and the decision to adopt daylight savings time or to remain on standard time must be made for the entire State. This will in some cases result in great hardship and confusion, especially in those sections of a State which are part of a large metropolitan area centered in an adjoining State. Under my amendment, that decision could be made separately for each portion of a State bisected by a time line.

Let me emphasize that other States would not be affected and that bisected States would not be exempted from any other provision of the Time Act. It would require bisected State to commence and end daylight time on the same dates as all other States. It would not authorize any form of local political option for a city, a county, or any other such subdivision. To the contrary, the phrase "including all political subdivisions thereof," which makes the Time Act applicable to an entire State, would remain in the act.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 198]

Anderson, Tenn.
Brock
Celler
Dickinson
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Grider
Hansen, Iowa
Karth
King, N.Y.
Long, Md.
Miller
Moeller
Morrison
Morse
O'Brien
Olson, Minn.
Powell
Quillen
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Toll
Ullman
Whalley
Willis

The **SPEAKER**. On this roll call 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14765, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: On page 61, strike out line 19 and all that follows down through page 74, line 6, and renumber the following titles and sections accordingly.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, I offer two technical amendments to title IV of H.R. 14765, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman made the amendments available to this side?

Mr. **RODINO**. Yes, they have been so made available.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 62, line 16, strike "buildings" and insert in lieu thereof "building";

On page 63, line 21, strike "rentors" and insert in lieu thereof "renters";

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, the amendments speak for themselves. They are just technical amendments. In one case we singularize the word "buildings" to make it "building."

In the other case we correct the spelling of the word "rentors", and make it "renters."

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 64, immediately following line 18, insert the following:

"(8) To induce or attempt to induce any person to sell, rent, or lease any dwelling by representations regarding the present or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, religion, national origin, or economic status, or by representations to the effect that such present or prospective entry will or may result in—

"(A) the lowering of real estate values in the area concerned;

"(B) a deterioration in the character of the area concerned;

"(C) an increase in criminal or antisocial behavior in the area concerned; or

"(D) a decline in the quality of the schools or other public facilities serving the area."

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose is to add a provision in title IV of this bill aimed at the so-called practice of "blockbusting."

What is blockbusting? Blockbusting is the practice of some unscrupulous real state agents to scare property owners in a neighborhood into selling their property below its value by telling them that members of a minority group—for example, Negroes—are moving in.

This practice has two evil results: it permits these real estate agents to make windfall profits by reselling the properties, often to members of minority groups—at unconscionable markups; it also often has the result of creating in the end a new black ghetto.

How would this amendment stop the practice of blockbusting? It would do so by adding to the list of prohibited discriminatory acts a paragraph prohibiting any person from inducing the sale or lease of property by making representations with regard to the entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, or religion, or economic status. Those representations might include predictions of reduced real estate values, an increase in criminal or antisocial behavior, a decline in the quality of the schools, and the like.

This proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, is based on laws that have been adopted in several States and cities. It is particularly close to the law existing in the State of Ohio and to a law enacted this year in the State of Maryland—a border State, it should be noted. This is a type of law which, at the State level, at least, is favored by the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The decent realtors are in favor of eliminating this nefarious practice and they have indicated their support of State laws on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the committee that if title IV is to become a Federal law—and I sincerely hope it will—it should include a prohibition against this vicious practice of "blockbusting" on the part of real estate agents. This will make more comprehensive the protection provided by title IV. It will assist decent realtors to police their own colleagues, and it will help to make the act work as intended.

The purpose of this bill, and of title IV in particular, is to eliminate black ghettos, and not to foster new ones. I think that, with the adoption of my amendment, this purpose would be furthered.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BINGHAM**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the question comes up, Is this amendment a complete blanket prohibition of oral or written statements by sellers or their agents? Second, if this amendment is adopted as a provision, is there a penalty for violation—if so, what type?

Mr. **BINGHAM**. There would not be a blanket prohibition against oral or written remarks but only against remarks of the character specified in the section. That is, no person may induce a sale by making representations concerning the entry into the neighborhood of certain minority groups. The penalties would be the same, and the treatment would be the same, as for other practices that are prohibited under the same section of the bill.

Mr. **ROBISON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BINGHAM**. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. **ROBISON**. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to my colleague from New York about this amendment. I understand that in intent, if not in form, it is very similar to a law that we already have on our statute books in New York.

I think this is a necessary and a very desirable amendment to title IV if it should become law. I intend to support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to do so also.

Mr. **BINGHAM**. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as copies of the amendment are not available, I ask that it be reread prior to further consideration.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. **CORMAN**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have absolutely no objection to the objective of this amendment, but I think it is superfluous. The classic blockbusting case is clearly an act or practice for the purpose of restricting the availability of housing to a racial group, and it is clearly in violation of section 403(a)(7).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I possibly have not used the right parliamentary procedure, for I do not know that I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment. I merely wanted to get time to submit a couple of questions.

First, if I understood correctly the reading of the amendment, it would apply only to representations about people of certain races. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York if it would apply to all people, regardless of race, as to such representations? In other words, why confine it? I think the idea is good, but why confine it to just one group?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to say to the gentleman that the amendment is not limited to representations with regard to persons of any particular race, color, or religion. It includes persons of a particular economic status. In other words, it would be broad enough to cover the moving into an area, let us say, of people of an indigent character, whether or not they were of a particular race.

Mr. COLMER. I am not sure I understand what "economic status" means. What I am trying to say is I think the weakness in the gentleman's amendment is that it is not all inclusive. For example, in his statement, if I recall correctly, the gentleman said something about gangsters, et cetera. My point is that the amendment should be broad enough to cover a gangster, regardless of his race. If I understand the amendment correctly, I do not think it does that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question. The purpose of the provisions would be to prevent those who are trying to induce someone to sell their property below its proper value by making representations about people of an undesirable character moving into the neighborhood.

Mr. COLMER. My point is, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, he did not say that in the amendment. My point is simply this: Does the gentleman's amendment cover people of undesirable character, such as gangsters and so on, regardless of their race, and previous origin, and religion, et cetera? In other words, would it cover a white Caucasian gangster?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not sure it would, in the sense that the gentleman intends. I do not know that that is a problem. I might say to the gentleman, the problem which has arisen in many States—and which this amendment is trying to meet—has been brought about by representations made by real estate agents regarding persons moving into the neighborhood who are of a different race.

Mr. COLMER. Very well. I wanted to point out what I regard as a weakness in the gentleman's amendment.

I want to ask the gentleman this further question: As I understand it, there are a number of State laws, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York—New York being among those States—that cover this subject already. Is that correct?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman know how many States have similar laws?

Mr. BINGHAM. Two States—Maryland and Ohio—have laws similar to this amendment. The State of California and the State of New York have provisions covering licensing of real estate brokers, which go into the same thing. There are a number of cities also, I might say, which have anti-block-busting ordinances.

Mr. COLMER. Has the gentleman considered what might happen here if we have under this section such a provision, with the Supreme Court under the doctrine of preemption deciding as they have recently? Would not this act take precedence?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COLMER. Would not this action take precedence over and repeal and nullify the State laws?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe it would do so. I believe the question would be the same as that presented by the rest of title IV, which prohibits discriminatory actions that may also be covered by State laws.

I know the gentleman is against title IV, but if title IV is enacted—and I believe it should be—then this antiblockbusting provision should go along with it.

Mr. COLMER. I repeat, I am for the intent of the gentleman's amendment—but I wanted to again emphasize this erroneous practice of the Supreme Court. Under the Cloverleaf, Ala., case, and under the Steve Nelsen case in Pennsylvania, and a number of other cases, the court has held that where Congress had enacted legislation in the particular field, that the State laws were void. I wanted to point that out to the gentleman so that he would realize that he might be losing his State law on the subject.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that the members of the committee have not wholeheartedly endorsed the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. We have a committee that has brought to the floor of the House one of the most controversial pieces of legislation, whose avowed purpose is to eliminate discrimination in housing and segregation in housing. While the members of the committee do not rush forward wholeheartedly to endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, let me point out, one of the most evil situations accompanying, and causing and flowing from segregation in housing is the so-called practice of blockbusting. That is the practice at which this amendment is aimed.

I believe the lack of preparedness of this committee to discuss the purposes and objectives of this amendment and to discuss whether or not this amendment is included in the bill is pretty good evidence of a lack of proper preparation on the part of that committee.

I took the trouble to inquire of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and also of the Attorney General about this amendment. I have received replies from both of those two agencies, along with a comment from the attorney general from the State of Michigan, precisely on the point of this amendment.

I am going to read first an excerpt from the letter received by me from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a letter signed by Robert C. Weaver, the Secretary.

He says as follows:

> This is in response to your letter requesting advice as to whether section 403(a) (7) of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, prohibits the practice commonly known as "blockbusting."

Then he states as follows:

> Our chief law officer advises me that in his opinion the present language of section 403 (a) (7) does not prohibit the activities commonly referred to as "blockbusting."

He goes on to define what constitutes blockbusting in the following language:

> The general practice in blockbusting situations is for a person to include a homeowner to sell his house because of the existing or potential proximity of other houses owned or occupied by persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin.

He goes on, in another section of his letter, as follows:

> Of course, it is the purpose of Title IV of the proposed Civil Rights Act to help make housing accommodations available on a nondiscriminatory basis so that the exclusionary pressures giving rise to blockbusting, and its attendant evils, will be eliminated.

I would point out that this practice of "blockbusting" is perhaps the most pernicious device used by realtors and by others today to frighten people. Certainly, if we seek to eliminate the racial hatreds attendant upon a change of neighborhood, and if we intend to try to have stabilized neighborhoods, the acceptance of this amendment is one of the most important devices to achieve that end.

I want to read a comment from the attorney general of the State of Michigan. In a letter sent to me he says:

> I note the absence of an "anti-blockbusting" (fair neighborhood practices) section, and urge the inclusion of such provisions. We refer you to the proposed model of Chapter 5 of the Second Tentative Draft of the Uniform Civil Rights Act, issued for discussion purposes only by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

This is what the the Attorney General of the United States speaking through Mr. Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, says:

> Because section 403(a) (7) was added to the bill by the House Judiciary Committee, I cannot speak authoritatively as to its full intent.

> However, I have been informed that some members of the Committee believed that it could be used to reach blockbusting. It can be argued that the language of the section is broad enough to ban at least some kinds of blockbusting tactics. Nonetheless, without the benefit of at least substantially more legislative history than is now available, it is doubtful whether a court would interpret the provision broadly enough to make it a fully effective prohibition of blockbusting.

This is in addition to an earlier paragraph, which the Attorney General says, as follows:

> You have asked whether section 403(a)(7) of H.R. 14765, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, would effectively prohibit "blockbusting." "Blockbusting" is the practice, engaged in by unscrupulous real estate agents, of deliberately attempting to unsettle an all white or nearly all white neighborhood by telling residents that it is soon to be overwhelmed by Negroes, or that a Negro family is about to move in, and that property values are therefore certain to go down, with the intention of causing irrational selling at low prices by white homeowners.

I would point out to my colleagues, if we want to eliminate racial hatred in this country, if we want to eliminate the vicious profiteering that helps to create hatred, panic, distrust, and outrageous economic profits and benefits to unscrupulous persons that causes segregated housing in this country, this legislation presently before us cannot fail to include the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Both as cause and effect and as a creator of racial hatred, there is nothing worse in this country today than this rotten practice of blockbusting.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend from Chicago.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan and the author of this amendment. We have an ordinance similar to this amendment in Chicago, which has driven out the speculators and those who would engage in making excess profits out of scare tactics—and blockbusting—I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that there is nothing more cruel than to move a member of a minority group out of one ghetto only to see another ghetto created very shortly because of the very tactics that this amendment would bar. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House adopts this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. And the practice creates unfair and improper enrichments and racial hatred while stimulating to the *n*th degree.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that with this amendment you will support title IV?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be happy to see what is in title IV when the committee has concluded its consideration of it. I will be happy to give my opinion at that time, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You reserve your opinion in that regard?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. I am like the rest of the Members of this body.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did the Attorney General in his letter point out that this was not necessary?

Mr. DINGELL. No, the Attorney General did not point it out. He said he thought it was the intent of the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. But he said he could not clearly determine whether the intent of the committee on this point would be carried out. I read the letter to the gentleman from Colorado and I am sure he was listening closely and must have heard it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman that it was the intent of the committee under section 403(a)(7) to cover the question of blockbusting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman may be correct in what the intention of the committee was and the gentleman may very well interpret this bill to accomplish that end, but I will point out to him that the Secretary of HUD does not so interpret that section. I will point out to him further that the Attorney General of the United States points out that there is great doubt as to whether the language of this section as drawn does reach the problem in the way that the gentleman and the committee hope it will do so. This is another very good reason why this amendment should be adopted, I will say to my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be very happy to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. When you set forth in this amendment down to the 4th or the 5th line——

Mr. DINGELL. This is the amendment of the gentleman from New York, I may say. You have an amendment which I had intended to offer, also, I will say to my good friend, which was substantially an identical amendment as that offered by the gentleman from New York, but he was recognized before I was.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The difficulty with the amendment is that after referring to the present or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person of a particular race, color, religion, national origin, or economic status—and we understand that language—but when we come to this other language "or by representations to the effect that such present or prospective entry will or may result in" four different items, then that is uncertain and indefinite——

Mr. DINGELL. I would rather yield, I would say, to my good friend from New York to answer that, but before I do I will say that the gentleman from Colorado is a distinguished lawyer and respected by his colleagues. If he has an amendment which would perfect any defect in this amendment, I am sure that the gentleman from New York would be happy to support it. I would certainly support such a reasonable amendment, but I will say if the gentleman is not prepared to do that, then he should not oppose this language and the matter should be cleared up in conference.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I may state first of all that the gentleman from New York and I have discussed this matter for some time. He presented this amendment to us 2 days ago and gave us an opportunity for us to examine it. Until today when we began to take a look at it we had understood that section 403(a)(7) would cover the objective that the gentleman had in mind, that is to say, the so-called anti-block-busting practice, because in paragraph 403(a)(7) we provide:

> To engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Wait until I finish my statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York runs into this difficulty: When you have the additional words "or by the representation to the effect that such present or prospective entry will or may result in"—that is not any more definite than the language that we have, because that is prospective also.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

First of all, with respect to the point that the specification or addition in the second part of my amendment is redundant and unnecessary, if the gentleman from Colorado would like to offer an amendment to strike out that part, I would have no objection to it. I included the specification only because it was included in the State laws on this subject that have been adopted to date, but the specification merely spells out the intent of the first part in more detail, and it would therefore do no harm to leave it out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If we did that, then you are going back to section 403(a)(7), and that is all you would have.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I certainly do not understand the gentleman's position that section 403(a)(7) includes coverage of this blockbusting matter. That section reads as follows:

> To engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the statements that are made by real estate agents under the "blockbusting" procedures are not for the purpose of limiting or restricting the availability of housing to any particular group. They are simply made to induce sales, usually sales below value, and the result of that may be that a "black ghetto" is created. But they do not, in the first instance, serve to limit housing to any particular group.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] we take his amendment, down from lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and down on line 5, after "economic status," and then strike the comma, and add a period, and strike the balance of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MODIFIED AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 64, immediately following line 18, insert the following: "to induce or attempt to induce any person to sell, rent, or lease any dwelling by representations regarding the present or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, religion, national origin, or economic status."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAGEN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 62, lines 9 and 10, strike out "whether in existence or under construction," and insert in lieu thereof "the construction of which is commenced on or after the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this act and."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry is: When will the vote come on the Moore amendment to strike the entire title IV?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the vote will come on the Moore amendment when Members cease offering perfecting amendments to title IV.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, a further inquiry of a parliamentary nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, if the Moore amendment is defeated, of course, that would leave title IV in the bill. Could Members then offer and debate additional amendments to title IV?

The CHAIRMAN. Title IV would still be open to amendment.

Mr. ASHMORE. Would it still be open to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It would still be open to debate, yes, unless the Committee had fixed the time.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple amendment.

First, I would like to comment on the current provisions of the legislation that is before us. I refer specifically to the subject of exemptions. Certain exemptions were included in this legislation to make it more palatable to some Members of this body who might have defeated the whole title if the exemptions were not in there.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to some of these exemptions, let us first take section 402(d) which defines who is a professional realtor. This exemption is designed to eliminate the householder not in the business and dealing with his own property but it does not. It gives anyone who owns a house or two houses, we will say, two bites. Under this amendment, say there was an old lady who owned two houses. She rented her second house three times in the course of 12 months. She would then become a professional realtor and could not deal as she wanted to with either house without complying with the proposed law even though she lived in one of them.

The second exemption is a little bit broader and covers the case of a rental apartment up to four units.

Under this legislation a realtor himself who admittedly is a professional under no circumstances could deal with his own house, except within the scope of this law. He could, however, deal with a four-unit apartment house in which he lived.

Mr. Chairman, one more comment, there is a further section dealing with financing and it refers to mortgagees. I submit that there are very few single householders who when they sell their house do not become mortgagees and regardless of other exemptions in this bill, I think they would be covered by virtue of the provisions of section 404 of this law.

So all I am saying to you is that those of you who are relying on some small householder exemption as a justification for voting for this bill should look very closely at these sections as they are put together.

Mr. Chairman, I think they are poorly drawn. When you get back home, if you vote for it on the basis of these exemptions, you are going to find the flak hitting you at election time.

The amendment I propose would make this act prospective in its application. That is to say, the only coverage would be with regard to a house that was started to be constructed within 60 days after the enactment of this bill into law. It would not cover any existing house.

As this bill stands, it is an ex post facto law because many people have bought homes, they have invested in homes and chose neighbors on the basis of understanding a factual situation, including the law at the time of their purchase or construction. We are adding a new element to the law. We will disturb their neighborhoods. We will possibly jeopardize their financial investment.

If this title is made prospective as I propose, then they will know the rules, they will make their investment or they will buy their house in a neighborhood with the understanding that this Federal law governs their ownership. We will not be penalizing past actions but rather regulating future actions.

My amendment is as simple as that. It makes title IV entirely prospective in its operation. It does not jeopardize anyone's home presently in existence or anyone's investment in a home based on a state of facts and the law that existed at the time he made his investment or bought his home.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, there are several elements to be considered in this legislation. One is its constitutionality. I shall not comment on that. I think the Supreme Court would probably hold it constitutional.

Second, the propriety and value of this legislation. I do not think it is proper because at least 17 States have acted in this area, many cities, and so forth. I do not think it is needed in that respect. But I question its value, because if the measure is used as a vehicle to upset long-established relationships, it can only cause racial dissension and strife such as occurred in Brooklyn, where there has been a clash between Negro people and Italian people in an area which was being desegregated, so to speak.

If this legislation is labeled—and I think Stokely Carmichael was right in this one respect—as an effective effort to destroy the ghetto, it is a fraud and anyone who votes for it on that basis according to his statement is a hypocrite, because it will not destroy the ghetto. The fact that New York has had a tough law on the subject demonstrates the point. New York's law has not destroyed the ghetto of Harlem. That is the best evidence of that fact. So, if you think you are doing anything about the problem of the ghetto in passing title IV of the bill, you are wrong, and you may well injure the people you are seeking to help.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Suppose I am a developer in the process of developing an area, and I am constructing homes now. Would the amendment exclude me from those homes that are now in the development?

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is correct with respect to those dwellings on which construction has begun.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And if I had 160 acres in development and had one house built on it and your amendment became effective, I could build 300 houses on the 160 acres?

Mr. HAGEN of California. No, only the one house would be exempt.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Only the one. What about the developer who may be in the process of constructing these homes? Is it the intention of your amendment to exempt him?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I am exempting this one house.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What one house are you exempting?

Mr. HAGEN of California. The one that was under construction before the 60 days after enacting this bill into law. Finally, I would like to restate the reasons for my amendment.

The Mrs. Murphy and/or small householder exemption presently in the bill is too uncertain and limited to give adequate exemption to a noncommercial householder or property owner dealing with his own property and I would point out that the Judiciary Committee has already stipulated by its actions that he should be exempt.

The Judiciary Committee started out to cover all sales or renting of dwellings by all householders, agents acting on their behalf, and by all professional builders, developers, and real estate agents. This was so unpalatable to so many influential people that they sought to exempt a small, nonprofessional dwelling owner dealing with his own property.

Their first effort at exemption is the language of section 402(d) defining a professional realtor, manager, builder, or developer and exempts from that description only those persons, who within the preceding 12 months, did not participate as either principal or agent in more than two sales or rentals of dwellings.

It is apparent from the language of the subsection that a true professional would never qualify for this exemption with respect to the sale or rental of his own home because his professional acts would totally deprive him of the exemption for all purposes.

A widow with one house would not be able to rent it more than twice in 12 months without suffering the prohibitions of the statute.

A widow with two houses, standing side by side, one of which she rents and one of which she lives in could not have more than two different tenants in the rented house in any 12-month period without becoming subject to the statute with respect to both her houses. Query, further, could she stand more than two lease or rental term changes or renewals with the same tenant without the same loss of exemption?

I am certain that other examples of the operation of this exemption to cut down the privilege could be developed to point up its illusory and uncertain value.

The second Judiciary Committee effort to achieve an exemption is in section 403(b) and on its face it is confined to exempting sales or rental of apartments in a building in which the owner lives and which contains a total of no more than four apartments.

The exemption would not obtain if the building had more than four apartments nor, regardless of size, would it obtain unless he personally occupied one of them at the time of each rental or at the time of sale. The residence of his aged father or mother in one of the units in his stead would be insufficient occupancy.

Since this exemption is not tied to the definition exemption contained in the preceding section 402(d), I would assume that even a professional realtor could get this exemption as an apartment house owner although he could not get it as the renter or seller of his own single family house. Peculiarly he could discriminate as an apartment house owner but not in his realty business or with respect to a single family dwelling which he might own for his own use.

A member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman], has attempted to persuade me that the apartment house exemption would operate to exclude the widow I mentioned dealing with her own property even though her sales and/or rental of such property exceeded two transactions in any 12-month period and placed her in the category of a professional. I am not convinced by his argument. The language of section 403(b) as an apartment house exemption is too explicit to permit such interpretation and the two exemption sections bear no relationship to each other.

The aforementioned exemptions, uncertain and limited as they are, are eliminated for many, if not most exemptees insofar as sales of realty are concerned by the provisions of section 404 of this title. This seection attempts to regulate professional lenders of money on real estate but it goes beyond that. It describes as unlawful discriminatory lending activities of clearly identifiable professional lending institutions but it also proscribes discriminatory activities of "other person that makes mortgage or other loans" with respect to realty. It has been my observation as a lawyer in California that a substantial number—and perhaps a majority—of sales of single family dwellings are consummated directly between seller and buyer with a downpayment, with the buyer being the obligor on a promissory note payable to the seller for the balance due, and with the seller assuming the role of a mortgagee. A literal reading of section 404 would strip all such sellers of any exemption they might have had by virtue of either section 402(d) or 403(b).

Finally I would like to again comment on the value of this legislation to society and the assumed beneficiaries of the ending of discrimination in housing.

It is an unnecessary and dangerous intrusion of Federal authority on the police power of the States and units of local government—many of which have acted in this field with no showing of demonstrable benefit to those most in need of improved housing.

It will have small impact on housing above the level of the lower middle class. At this point of time, economic considerations dictate against disadvantaged persons claiming housing in middle and upper economic class areas. It will have its major impact, if any, in the housing areas occupied by blue-collar workers and persons of low income of all races and faiths. I advisedly say, "if any," because it would appear that presently there are no real barriers in such areas of housing to racial intermixing except the creation of personal antagonisms or the flight of the original residents of the area. One of these areas is in Brooklyn and was the scene recently of a bitter race riot.

The so-called ghetto is only remotely the product of racial discrimination in housing. Rather, it is the product of commonality of low income or the decision of people to live near other people with whom they can easily identify.

In my judgment we could do more to eliminate the ghetto by job and business acceptance first. Then neighborhood mixing would occur naturally with the removal of economic barriers and would occur in a climate of preconditioned acceptance less likely to add to real or stimulated hate.

I have supported civil rights bills in the past and will continue to support sound civil rights bills. I cannot, in good conscience, support unwise and counterproductive civil rights legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 199]

Anderson, Tenn.
Blatnik
Brock
Burke
Celler
Cleveland
de la Garza
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Grider
Hansen, Iowa
Herlong
Karth
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Mackie
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Pickle
Pike
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Smith, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Ullman
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Albert) having assumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 14765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 394 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with title IV there are certain basic propositions that I think we should consider at some time and perhaps this is a good a time as any to consider them.

During the consideration of the bill by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a very distinguished legal scholar, Prof. Bartel M. Sparks, of New York University Law School, testified before the committee under the chairmanship of Senator ERVIN.

I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues, regardless of their motivation in the consideration of this bill and how they will vote on it, the brief conclusions which Professor Sparks arrived at. They are as follows:

> If Title IV becomes law, it will have two significant effects: One, it will discourage building; and, two, it will deprive members of minority groups of opportunity to compete for what housing remains.

The professor concluded by saying that the entire title should be rejected.

Members of the Committee, we are dealing here with a very serious right of human beings. I am afraid that in the consideration of this title we have overlooked the real area in which we should be concerned. Lord Blackstone had this to say:

> There is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination and engages the attentions of mankind as the right of property, or that sole dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe.

Another statement has been made by a latter day savant, is the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, who had this to say:

> It has been the fashion to speak of the conflict between human rights and property rights, and from this it has come to be widely believed that the cause of private property is tainted with evil and should not be espoused by rational and civilized men. Insofar as these items refer to great impersonal corporate properties they make sense, but the issue between the giant corporation and the public should not be allowed to obscure the truth that the only dependable foundation of personal liberty is the personal economic security of private property.

Now, I think that those are well-settled propositions and ones which we should be aware of here today as we consider title IV of the bill.

From the very foundation of our republic, and in the English jurisprudence before that, our legal system has considered the right to sell as an essential feature of free society. Some of our State constitutions contain provisions declaring the right of property to be "before and higher than any other constitutional sanction."

More recently it has been declared:

> In organized society the degree of liberty among human beings is measured by the right to own and manage property, to buy, and sell it, to contract.

So when we consider these basic propositions, I think they reveal to each of us that the right to sell, to give away, or even to dissipate one's interest in property is the thing which has brought about freedom and marks us from countries who do not enjoy it.

Therefore, I suggest that the House should strike down title IV.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire from some knowledgeable person on the committee who favors this bill, what has become of the fate of the poor old widow, Mrs. Murphy, and her rooming house? I cannot find anything in here that would give her the relief that was given her in a former bill on the subject of civil rights. I am just wondering whether this committee, in its consideration of this bill, has deliberately drafted it in such a way that a person living in her own private home and having a room or two to spare is to be limited in the selection of her paying guests for those spare rooms she has?

Does the gentleman from California wish to answer that question?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will try to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to page 64, section 403(b), line 19.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman give me that page again, please? I looked very carefully and could not find anything on this.

Mr. CORMAN. It is page 64, line 19:

> (b) Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner with respect to the sale, lease, or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

At the time the committee composed that language, we were very concerned about Mrs. Murphy, and about anyone else, in the sanctity of her home.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Obviously that does not help Mrs. Murphy, because it specifically provides for four living quarters for families. Mrs. Murphy wants to rent her rooms to two or three young men or young ladies, who will not be in family status. I want to know what becomes of her situation, when she is dependent on this for a living?

The gentleman should know—I am sure he is a good lawyer—that the language which he quoted does not cover Mrs. Murphy.

Mr. CORMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the compliment. I can say there is no one in the House from whom I would rather have a compliment.

In determining the exemptions under 403(b) we have to start with the assumption that one is no more than four. I believe we could get a court to take judicial notice of that. Once over that hurdle, we can see that Mrs. Murphy is covered by this bill unless she lives in a five-unit apartment. Mrs. Murphy—and everybody else in the land—is untouched by this bill if she lives in an apartment of less than five units. If she lives in a four-unit or three-unit or a one-unit dwelling, she can rent to whomever she wants.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. She does not live in an apartment. She—like thousands of other widow ladies who have a home which is larger than they can use—wants to have a few paying guests, single people, to come to her home. This bill does not cover her nor protect her. Everybody who knows the English language ought to be able to understand that.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, suppose Mrs. Murphy has a 10-bedroom house, which her late husband had bought for her, and she has 10 roomers in the house. Every bedroom is occupied. I wonder if the gentleman from California would say that Mrs. Murphy is provided for, that that takes care of that situation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Under that theory of misconstruction of this language—somebody might shed some light on that. But if she does not rent any but one room, and if she changes tenants over four times in a year, she is caught in this trap.

Mr. CORMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. The answer is, she would be excluded if she had 10 or 20 or 30 rooms and the house is intended to be occupied by one or two or three or four families living separately and she lives in the structure.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman from California may believe it is unequivocal, but the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] did not think it was unequivocal when he offered his substitute yesterday. A very specific part of that substitute was to take care of the social security widow and others who do not have four or less units where the families live independently. His amendment specifically said "whether or not living independently."

That is the problem, and the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from Florida has been deeply engaged in the consideration of this bill in the Committee on the Judiciary, on which he is a distinguished member. Does the gentleman from Florida believe that this touches in any way the right of Mrs. Murphy to rent her rooms in a private home?

Mr. CRAMER. In our minority views, I, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], on page 26, touched on this specific subject.

Our conclusion is just as unequivocal that because of the rules the gentleman speaks of—that one owns a home and has two or three rooms to rent out and that those persons renting those rooms live "independently"—since they use the same dining room and whatever there is and do not live "independently," they are not excluded, in our opinion.

I am not the only one who believes that. As further evidence, the gentleman from Minnesota included that in his amendment, to try to clarify it, yesterday.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was not aware of the discussions which took place in the Judiciary Committee when this bill was framed. Will the gentleman tell me whether, in the consideration of that matter in the committee, when the majority drafted this bill, he believes they deliberately excluded Mrs. Murphy from protection; or, if not, whether they just cannot read the English language?

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the distinguished gentleman, I do not know what their intention was. I can only judge by what the bill says. Perhaps that is the wrong way to approach it, but that is what the courts are going to have to do when they interpret it, and that is what the people will have to live by.

We saw yesterday a performance in which a person who offered a substitute to title IV—a nine-page substitute, which had 10 minutes of discussion in the committee—clearly had not done what he intended to do. I say in this instance, if it were intended to exclude that social security widow, in my opinion, they did not do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They could have done it in a very few words, could they not?

Mr. CRAMER. Certainly.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia and to the gentleman from Florida and to all Members that the hearings disclose the Attorney General of the United States did not favor a Mrs. Murphy rental exclusion in the coverage of title IV.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is evidently the reason why they did not exclude her. I do not see why we could not get a frank statement as to what has gone on.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for an answer on this.

Mr. RODINO. At the time we were discussing this matter with the Attorney General in the hearings, no exemptions were in the bill. However, just as the gentleman from California stated—and he stated it explicitly—we were unequivocal in our determination to exclude Mrs. Murphy. The exclusion or the exemption is incorporated in section 403(b).

There may be a difference of understanding on the part of the gentleman from Florida and on the part of those of us on the majority, but this is what we intended. I am sure we all recognize the problem.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Florida was one who expressed an interest in making certain that social security widows with two or three rooms to rent out to supplement their income should have a right to choose with whom they were going to live. That is how simple it is.

When this amendment was written, the gentleman from Florida was not consulted in any way with regard to what the wording should be. If I had been consulted, I would have cautioned the proponents that in my opinion "living independently" would not exclude Mrs. Murphy or a social security widow who was renting three or four rooms, when the people shared the dining room, the bath facilities, or anything else. Then they do not live "independently."

In my opinion, the manner in which it was drafted was to provide just as little exclusion as possible, in view of the Attorney General's opinion and otherwise, and that is exactly what we did. It is unfortunate that this exclusion was not considered at length in the committee when the total substitute was under consideration.

I think it is clear that the social security widow is not excluded.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. If a woman in a college town has a home and is taking in college students and she takes in more than four students, she comes under the act. Is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. If she leases more than twice a year and those units "or the building itself is not to be occupied by more than four families living independently of each other." How can you express more clearly that you want a limited exemption than to say you are exempted only if there are four separate units or possibly less, living independently?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who offered this amendment indicated that he thought the Supreme Court would hold title IV constitutional, and I agree. That is one good test as to whether or not it is. His amendment, which we may have lost sight of but which we are supposed to be talking about, would completely gut this bill. This bill would have no real effect for 50 years because it would have no effect until all of the houses which are presently in existence pass on to the great beyond and we would rebuild our cities and countryside. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge its defeat.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I believe there were many Members who were not on the floor at the time the amendment was presented. Will the gentleman please tell the House what this amendment seeks to do?

Mr. CORMAN. The gentleman who offered the amendment is on the floor now, and I do not want to misstate it, but as I understand it, it would limit coverage of this bill to houses constructed more than 60 days after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is correct. It would be prospective rather than ex post facto as the present proposal.

Mr. YATES. Then, it would not cover any of the buildings in existence at the present time, would it?

Mr. CORMAN. No, it would not. But now I would like to get back to coverage and exclusions, because it seems to me the opponents of this bill have very cleverly mixed two different sections and made an effort to confuse Members of the House as to what the committee is doing. We set out some limitations on what people who are in the real estate business can do. They cannot be the source of discrimination which leads to segregation in housing. To define what we mean by "people in the business" we have said that they must engage in more than two transactions in a 12-month period. That is the only purpose of the two-transaction definition. It is to ascertain who comes under the prohibitions in section 403(a) of the bill. We made a very broad homeowner exclusion in section 403(b) and we did it intentionally and we did it clearly. We wanted to go well beyond the exclusion for "Mrs. Murphy" in the public accommodations section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. We said that we do not want to legislate as to the rights of homeowners in this country. We want them to have a free choice as to whom they may sell their property. Then, in examining what was reasonable in defining a person's home as distinguished from his business, we said that if the building is four apartments or less, then it is his home and this law does not touch it. That is the interpretation of the Attorney General, and that was the intention of the majority of the committee. I submit to you that no other reasonable interpretation can be placed on title IV.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Amplifying what the gentleman from California has said, the Department of Justice in its analysis of title IV after it had been approved by the full committee made this statement:

> Title IV as amended by the House Committee on the Judiciary also contains a "Mrs. Murphy" exemption for sale or lease of residential quarters in owner occupied one, two, three, or four family buildings. Subsection 403(b)—

The one that the gentleman from California cited to the gentleman from Virginia—

> exempts an owner with respect to the sale, rent, or lease of a part of a building which he occupies as his own residence. Providing that it contains living accommodations for no more than four families living independently of one another.

Mr. Chairman, the intended beneficiary of this exemption includes ordinary home occupants, boarding and rooming houses, which will come within its terms, because the typically one-family dwelling, regardless of how many roomers they may accommodate——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, now, this is the opinion of the Attorney General and his interpretation of the facts to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the contrary notwithstanding, and the interpretation that he places upon the provisions of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I respect the opinion of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] but on the interpretation of these sections I agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Now, Mr. Chairman, another thought occurs to me: What about the situation of the farmer who, one way or another, provides housing for workers? What is his exemption, and what is his coverage?

Mr. CORMAN. I would assume that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] is talking about housing in which he does not live?

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is correct.

Mr. CORMAN. And I would further assume that he is in the market of leasing houses, then he would be in the bill if he leases more than two.

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is correct.

Mr. CORMAN. I also want to make it clear on this "two or more units." If he engages in three transactions within the period of a year he comes under this law as to all three. He does not get two chances to discriminate. He has to engage in the business, and that means that he has more than two transactions within the preceding 12-month period.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if he has more than two transactions, he is automatically covered, and that is whether it is a little old lady or a little old getleman, or whomever it is?

Mr. CORMAN. That is right, with the exception of anything in his home. But in his home he is excluded from coverage under section 403(b).

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if your intention was to do as you say for Mrs. Murphy what was done in 1964, what I cannot understand is why in the world do you change the language?

Mr. CORMAN. Because we wanted to make a broader exemption than "Mrs. Murphy" in 1964. And that is precisely what we do.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am talking about a woman who has a few rooms to rent in her house.

Mr. CORMAN. I am also.

Mr. CRAMER. Such house contains not more than five rooms for rent, or hire, which are actually occupied by the proprietor. It says nothing about "living independently." Who put "living independently" in there, and why?

Mr. CORMAN. Because it refers to the four units in all so that one may ascertain whether or not the structure comes within the exemption.

Mr. CRAMER. Exactly; and it does not come within that definition.

Mr. CORMAN. If the gentleman cannot convince the court that "one" is less than "four," he is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I can convince the gentleman from California that "living independently" is renting a room, although it may be used the same as a dining room.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my response to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and say that we did carefully consider how broad we wanted to make the exemption. We did not like the exemption as provided in the 1964 civil rights bill, because we thought this one should be much broader than that provision providing for "Mrs. Murphy." It ought to exempt every homeowner who might have three additional separate apartments, as well as his individual residence.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very broad exemption. It may be objectionable to the Attorney General. I do not care. I think it is good law; I think it is fair, and I think it is clear.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I am opposed to the gentleman's intention. I also understand the hostility toward the established language in the previous acts.

The Attorney General when he testified—and you will find this on page 1201 of the hearings, said:

> I do not think it would greatly affect or impede what is attempted to be accomplished in this act if Mrs. Murphy's type exemption were inserted into this act.

Then he goes on to say:

> I would have no problems with exemptions of that kind as the committee and this Congress might wish to direct.

Mr. CORMAN. The Attorney General might not have a problem but I think I would have had a problem in legislating as to how a man can sell his home. I did not want to do that and the majority of the committee did not want to do that. That is why we drafted the bill the way we did. The individual homeowner is excluded from this bill.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman does not come from one of the farming areas so probably he is not concerned about the farming areas. But what would be the gentleman's position as far as this bill is concerned where a farmer in order to carry on his farming operations has found it necessary to have 10 houses on his farm and has entered into annual agreements with the people. He built this farm house to make it possible to carry on his farming operations by having these houses available, would you say that this bill would prevent the farmer from saying, "I am not going to have anybody except my own farm people on my place?"

Mr. CORMAN. He would not unless he comes within the definition of section 402(d), then he would.

Mr. WHITENER. How does he get into that?

Mr. CORMAN. If this house is a portion of pay for work done, I think he is not in the real estate business.

Mr. WHITENER. Where does that appear in the bill?

Mr. CORMAN. If he is selling or renting property so that he has two or more transactions in a 12-month period, then he is covered.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of the gentleman from North Carolina and to the same question of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], I agree with my colleague in the well as to the interpretation of the language in this bill.

In other words, a farmer could say, "I am renting or leasing these dwellings only to my employees." Is that correct?

Mr. CORMAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise in opposition to the Hagen amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are losing sight of the fact that the amendment that is before us by the gentleman from California has nothing to do with Mrs. Murphy. First of all, may I point out that I think the discussion has clearly established that all of us are friends of Mrs. Murphy. I think the majority has shown it by writing into the legislation the exemption concerning Mrs. Murphy. But I would like to point out that the amendment before us would defeat the objective we are trying to accomplish in this bill, and that is to prevent discrimination in housing. It would defeat it by postponing the effective date of this legislation. It would mean, in effect, that the bill would not be effective until at least 60 days after the date of enactment. It would mean then that there would be an exemption, and the gentleman says it very clearly, for all housing in existence up to 60 days following the enactment of the act. It would mean that one could discriminate in that area.

Mr. Chairman, further than that, if there are any proponents of this bill, and I am sure there are many who want to insure that there will be no discrimination, they will vote down this amendment. I am sure all of us realize that this act applies as to sales and transactions which take place after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite obvious that there must be a reason for changing the wording between the 1964 act relating to Mrs. Murphy and the 1966 bill which we have before us as it relates to a home occupied by the owner in which there are additional rooms for rental. I do not know exactly what the reason is, but they had some reason for putting in the words "living independently." They did not put "living independently" in the 1964 act. It seems to me the reason is obviously to prevent someone who has a dormitory-type of situation—for example, five or six rooms in a home which are rented to students on a campus—from claiming an exemption under the act.

A further comment that was interesting to me related to what the "three transactions in a year" limitation. The gentleman from California made the statement—and I was shocked when I heard it—that anyone who had three transactions in a year would be covered for all of those transactions that year.

That is not correct. Otherwise a homeowner would be included in every instance where the homeowner that year exceeded two transactions. If all he wanted to do was to sell his home in the coming year, he has a right to do so. If he rents or sells another residence—such as a summer home—he has an absolute right to do that. But if he goes into a third transaction, it was my understanding he would then—and only then—become a real estate agent. He would then come in interstate commerce, and would be subject to the act.

I was shocked to hear the gentleman say that a homeowner making his first sale or that second rental would retroactively come under coverage of the act.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I would like to make my own comments before I yield further.

It seems to me the confusion which exists as to "Mrs. Murphy" results from the fact that the word "dwelling," which is defined in title IV, is not used in connection with the exemption which is claimed to be provided for Mrs. Murphy. It seems that everyone here is interested in the "Mrs. Murphy" exemption, but we do not seem to be setting forth this exemption clearly and unequivocally. It would seem that if the word "dwelling" were included in the exemption on page 64, it would then clearly cover an individual in his or her own residence.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. We purposely changed the language there because we are referring in section 403(b) to a portion of a building or a structure. A "dwelling" is defined in the bill to include a portion.

Mr. McCLORY. I understand that, but we have made no reference to a dwelling in section 403(b). If we would follow the definition of dwelling which states that a dwelling is a place occupied as a residence by one or more individuals or families—and I think that is what we are attempting to exempt by that exclusion—it seems to me it would be preferable and we would remove the doubt concerning the exemption of an owner occupied boarding house or rooming house—the Mrs. Murphy exemption. By failing to use the word "dwelling" section 403(b) clearly exempts a 4-unit apartment building where one apartment is occupied by an owner but does not set forth in clear language a Mrs. Murphy exemption.

I want to assure the Members of the House of this: If I vote for title IV, I will be voting only on the basis that Mrs. Murphy is covered in section 403(b), and I think that other Members who vote for title IV will be doing likewise. On the other hand, I think it is incumbent upon the Committee to clarify the language of the bill and not merely rely on the history we are making now on the floor of the House.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Although we know that "Mrs. Murphy" is a very prominent person and needs a great deal of attention, I think we should be sure of what we are giving or taking away from Mrs. Murphy.

The bill provides that the person excluded is the one whose rooms are occupied by no more than four families living independently. The separate rooms that might be occupied by four college students—are they families or not?

Mr. McCLORY. I think the gentleman poses a question which indicates that we need some clarification. It seems to me that the exclusion refers to four apartments or four apartment units, not four rooms in a building. I think if we would use the word "dwelling," then we would be talking about rooms in a dwelling or in a residence as defined in that title.

Mr. ASHMORE. Let us not tell Mrs. Murphy that we are excluding her if we are not excluding her where she is renting a room to a college student, another room to another college student, a third room to a grade school teacher, and a fourth room to a clerk who works uptown. Would she be excluded?

Mr. McCLORY. I would intend that she would be exempt.

Mr. ASHMORE. But this amendment would not exclude her.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be completed in 10 minutes.

Mr. LENNON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the amendments thereto—that is on the Hagen amendment—conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

The Chair observed standing at the time of the agreement: The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley]; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jennings]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Todd]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Lennon]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy]; the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen]; the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Senner]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory]; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards]; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing]; the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Roncalio]; the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers]; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Craley yielded his time to the other Members.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will each be recognized for approximately 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Todd yielded his time to Mr. Rodino.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Senner yielded his time to Mr. Rodino.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Whitener yielded his time to Mr. Hagen of California.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Roncalio yielded his time to Mr. Rodino.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Lennon yielded his time to Mr. Hagen of California.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy yielded his time to Mr. Hagen of California.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Downing yielded his time to Mr. Hagen of California.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Jennings].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct two questions to the members of the committee.

The first pertains to Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse. If there is no objection and we feel that the language does cover Mrs. Murphy, would there be any objection to accepting the language as it appeared and which excluded Mrs. Murphy in previous bills?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to continue, but I would like to have the gentleman answer that question on his time.

The second question I would like to direct to the gentleman from California. It appears to me that what he is asking for in his amendment—and I support the amendment—is merely what has been asked for and has been passed in many bills, which this Congress has passed, and that is the "grandfather clause." I would like to ask the gentleman if this is anything other than the grandfather clause which is in the other bills we have passed?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely correct. This is purely and simply a grandfather clause. It will make this bill prospective rather than retroactive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for approximately 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDWARDS yielded his time to Mr. DICKINSON.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that title IV of the measure before the House should not be included in a bill at all but offered as a constitutional amendment. As a matter of fact article V of the Bill of Rights was incorporated to protect private property. It is clear that the controlled sale of private property for anything but public use was never even contemplated.

For private property is no longer private property if an owner cannot sell it at the price he wishes, to whom he wishes. The United States has been predicated upon the right freely to acquire, use and sell private property.

Moreover there is no way to distinguish legally between various kinds of private property. An apartment house or an office building, owned by private individuals, is just as much private property—when it comes to purchase and sale—as is Mrs. Murphy's boarding house, Bill Jones' $10,000 house, the Kennedy's estate on Cape Cod, or a house in de facto segregated Georgetown.

Now I would note that over 58 million Americans live in the suburbs today—a gain of 50 percent in the last decade. Various reasons have been given by various grades of experts for this rush from the city centers. One of the chief ones is the deterioration of schools in the cities themselves because of recent developments. It is very clear that if we force these 58 million in the suburbs, when they want to move for one purpose or another, to sell to people they do not want to sell to, the Congress almost certainly will be faced with unprecedented legislation. It will have to let those who have moved to the nearby suburbs move farther out or pass another law to chain them to their present homes so they will be forced to live next to neighbors they do not desire.

I would further note that the preamble of the Constitution declares that a principal objective of our Government is "to ensure domestic tranquillity."

The purpose of article IV is clearly to "block bust" the suburbs. Can anyone in this House reading about, hearing about, and seeing pictures of the rioting and looting in our cities, as a result in part of laws Congress already has passed, honestly believe that enactment of title IV will "ensure domestic tranquillity"?

The city originated so that people could gather within it at night for common safety. Today people are fleeing the cities into the suburbs at night to find safety.

As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Representative JAMES UTT, stated on the floor only yesterday:

> This administration shows signs of being unable to maintain law and order which, incidentally, is the basis of any civilization.

He spoke principally of spiraling crime in the cities. Title IV would have the practical effect of extending the cities' current lawlessness and rioting into the suburbs to which people have fled.

My California colleague noted that in this fully integrated Federal Capital—in the District of Columbia—major crime has increased three times as fast in the past year as in any other city of 250,000 or over. And crime in the other cities has, overall, gone up shockingly fast. This has happened despite the fact our Capital has far more police per capita than the national average.

Personal safety has been one reason why people have left the District of Columbia for the nearby Virginia and Maryland suburbs. Now title IV would extend the same sort of violence to these and other suburbs. Let us not forget that police power has broken down under racial attack in the past few days in Cleveland and Chicago and troops had to be brought in. Do we really want to create this situation in the suburbs?

I think every Member must face the fact that this is what title IV will clearly do. I think every Member should keep in mind that this is what he is voting for if he votes for title IV.

We are being asked to forget the Constitution of the United States, to destroy the private property system upon which our Nation has been built, and to further endanger the life and limb of our citizenry, young and old, to grant special privileges to a 10-percent group.

No longer will a man be able to move into a congenial neighborhood. A natural law will be broken, for no longer will birds of a feather be allowed to flock together. No longer will a man and his family be able to live near people of similar interests—among "good neighbors." He will be forced to live among people he may not like nor enjoy. For this proposed measure transcends race. Under title IV, you have to sell your house to anybody, which means that your former neighbors and friends will have to live next to anybody.

This is the most preposterous proposal that has been put before Congress in a long time—perhaps ever. It deserves to be roundly and flatly defeated on legal grounds, on human grounds, and on commonsense grounds. I think it no exaggeration to say: Its passage will mark the end of the United States as we have known it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] for 1 minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, heretofore I have spoken against the Hagen amendment for the simple reason that if we examine what the amendment does, it is clear that it would exclude from the operation of this act any structures that may be started within 60 days after this act becomes effective.

That means if I were a developer and I started the construction by surveying out for 160 acres to build 300 houses, I would be exempt.

I suppose I started to build an apartment building within the 60 days, and that building would contain 1,000 units. Then I would be exempt from the operation of this act.

Hence the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I should like to ask some member of the committee; it is this: In my hometown and all over this country there are boarding and rooming houses operated by widows—by many Mrs. Murphys—if you please, there are some Miss Murphys too. Some of them have big homes with many rooms. They take a few roomers in many. Such facility are available in large numbers in college communities. Are these operators exempted from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I ask the gentleman: Does she live there?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. She lives there.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then she is exempt.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Then you are telling this House that it is the committee intent and that the language of this bill exempts such operators?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Regardless of how many people she may be feeding and providing rooms for?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right. We expanded the "Mrs. Murphy" exemption here, and it was our intention to do so. If she can rent to 10, or has a house big enough to rent to 20, she is still exempt so long as she is an occupant in her home.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY]

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a lengthy discussion here about Mrs. Murphy. I know we intend that she shall be excluded.

We are confronted now with a grandfather clause. We want to take care of grandfather, too.

It seems to me that the legislation in its present form does not cover a great deal. If we make it only prospective we would cover much less. It is my opinion that 70 to 80 percent of the dwelling units of this country are excluded under the present provisions of the bill, as amended by the Mathias amendment.

I believe we should determine what, if anything, we intend to do. If we want to exclude all dwelling units as of today, then the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] should be adopted.

However, I am sure it is the intent of Congress to act with respect to the dwelling units of the country as they are today and provide exclusions with regard to what we have.

I will vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I may say that this amendment of mine was drafted by some of the same people who worked with the committee in drafting this bill.

One of the reasons why I offer the amendment is these very real differences of opinion about the effect of the present language with respect to exemptions.

I agree with the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] as to their interpretation of the language as it is presently in the bill.

Those Members who believe they are giving Mrs. Murphy any substantial exemption are propagating an illusion, as this bill is presently written.

As the bill is presently written, with all of its inadequacies—and I believe they are very real—it covers housing that was built and transactions that were entered into before there was any thought of a law of this character. It is an ex post facto law.

My amendment would make this purely prospective in its operation. builders and homebuyers would know it was the law and could act accordingly.

Why penalize someone who has acted in the past on the basis of a state of facts and a state of the law as it existed then? That would be unfair.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] pointed out, we have many grandfather clauses in law, for precisely that reason of equity.

With respect to the amount of housing uncovered, I believe these gentlemen have overlooked the fact that we have a Presidential Executive order in effect, which has been in effect for some time, governing housing built with FHA, GI, or other similar Government assistance. We are really talking about housing built purely with private capital, under no Government guarantees—mortgage guarantees or otherwise—in a purely private transaction.

With respect to present housing that is all my amendment would exempt. I would say that there was no showing made of any great need for 23 or 25 million units or any certain figure to satisfy the problem of minority groups. I suspect under the President's Executive order and the laws which obtain in some 17 States and several municipalities that there is plenty of housing available to a member of any minority group who can afford it. If this bill is entitled a bill to eliminate the ghetto, we are again dealing in an illusion, because it will not do so. It will just not eliminate the ghetto. They have fair housing laws in New York and other States at present, and they have not worked in eliminating the ghettos there. All I am attempting to do with my amendment is to make it prospective in its operation and to do equity to those people in this country—and there are millions of them—who have made property arrangements on the basis of an assumption of what the law was at the time they made their property arrangement.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, first you will agree that the Mrs. Murphy concept has nothing to do with your amendment?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I will not agree to that, because I do not think you have really done much for Mrs. Murphy and I am giving her an across-the-board exemption.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, what does the Mrs. Murphy provision have to do with your amendment? Where is the Mrs. Murphy section, which is 403(b), in your amendment? What has that to do with your amendment?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I would say that if Mrs. Murphy owns two houses and she made the mistake of renting one of them twice in the course of a year, she is a professional real estate agent and cannot deal with either one of the houses outside this law as you have presently written her exemption.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What has that to do with your amendment?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I say the future Mrs. Murphy will be governed by your exemption, but mine will leave the present Mrs. Murphy alone beyond a shadow of a doubt. In the future she will presumably know the state of the law and act accordingly in her property arrangements.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. We can agree, then, it has nothing to do with the present but it may at sometime in the future.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Of course, my amendment is for the present Mrs. Murphy, because it would clearly exempt her.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would clearly exempt her.

Under your concept here and the reason I am objecting to this amendment is that you leave it wide open for a period of 60 days after the act is put into force and effect. You cannot pass an ex post facto law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It would serve no useful purpose in the bill. It will restrict in substantial amount the coverage by this bill. Those who are interested in the theory and the concept of the bill as it was introduced, as it was studied in the committee, and as it came out of the committee, should oppose the amendment.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the absurdity of this proposal to exempt Mrs. Murphy's grandfather in the so-called grandfather clause is patent.

If this amendment called for the exemption of housing erected prior to the War Between the States, there might be a point to it.

You might just as well say that only people born after the enactment of this bill can take advantage of it and make as much sense.

I trust this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] to close the debate for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hagen amendment and I urge it be defeated. First, because it restricts the application of the title, and actually guts the bill. It would prevent title IV from prohibiting or preventing discrimination insofar as existing housing is concerned. In answer to the gentleman from Virginia, might I say that Mrs. Murphy is not only excluded in this bill, but we have gone further than existing law in that regard. We have a broader exemption here in that we also exclude multifamily units. We want to make it clear that this amendment, the Hagen amendment, has nothing at all to do with Mrs. Murphy. I urge that we defeat the Hagen amendment, because the Hagen amendment will definitely defeat the objectives and the purposes of this bill. For that reason I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HAGEN of California and Mr. RODINO.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 96, noes 139.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions I would like to ask the committee or direct to the committee in an effort to clarify some of the words in my own mind at least.

In section 402(d) it states, and I am paraphrasing by leaving out some of the additional language:

> A person shall be deemed to be in the business if he has participated * * *

I am no attorney but from the standpoint of English, this would mean to me if he has "completed three or more transactions." I have heard discussions concerning "two" transactions. My question is: Are you allowed to complete three transactions before you are considered to be in the business or two transactions?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, only two. Once you have your third transaction completed, you are covered.

Mr. CRALEY. Does this mean after the third transaction is completed?

Mr. **RODINO.** It means the third transaction is covered. You can only complete two transactions and be exempt.

Mr. **CRALEY.** Then the language would have this meaning—when you are participating in your third transaction?

Mr. **RODINO.** That is correct.

Mr. **HARDY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRALEY.** I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **HARDY.** I would like to have the gentleman clear that point up if I might because this is directly contrary to the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], if I understood him correctly. He said that you did not get two free rides. The gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California are obviously in disagreement and the question ought to be resolved on the floor.

Mr. **RODINO.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRALEY.** I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **RODINO.** There are no "free rides" if there were three or more transactions in the preceding 12 months.

Mr. **CRALEY.** I am stating within the preceding 12-month period. My question applies to either two or three transactions. You have answered the question: When the third transaction has begun, the person involved comes under the provision.

Mr. **RODINO.** That is correct.

Mr. **CRALEY.** My next question refers to that same section where you use the word "business." Does the word "business" qualify the word "transactions" so as to suggest that dealings shall convert the individual into "a person in the business," or those in which he acts as vendor or lessor and not those in which he acts as the buyer or lessee?

Mr. **RODINO.** That is correct. It refers to the vendor, lessor, or renter. It does not refer to the buyer or the lessee.

Mr. **CRALEY.** I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for an inquiry of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. **CRALEY.** I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Do I understand the gentleman from New Jersey to say that if in one year a person has three transactions—say two leases and a sale—the following year and the years thereafter that party is a real estate broker, in effect, and is covered? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. **RODINO.** No, we are measuring by the standard of the immediately preceding 12 months—the transactions he has had in the preceding 12 months.

Mr. **CRAMER.** As I understood, the gentleman said that if you had three sales, then the following year you would be a real estate broker.

Mr. **RODINO.** I did not say that. If the gentleman understood that, he is incorrect in his understanding.

Mr. **CRAMER.** It is correct, is it not, that if you have two rentals and in that same year you want to sell your home you can not do it without being subject to the act. Is that correct?

Mr. **RODINO.** You are subject to the act in the third transaction, yes.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Right.

Mr. **CRALEY.** Mr. Chairman, may I direct one more question to the committee: In section 403(3) you use the words, "preference, limitation, or discrimination." I am concerned about the word "preference" because it has come to my attention that such language might impede justifiable advertisements by individuals wishing to indicate the proximity of their property to churches or to schools. Is it the committee's interpretation that the word "preference" in subsection (3) would prejudice such advertisements?

Mr. **RODINO.** No, it definitely would not. The geographic location vis-a-vis, churches and schools could be referred to.

Mr. **CRALEY.** Such advertisements could appear.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **WHITTEN.** Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bill will be defeated, and I would like to tell you why. However you may feel on a number of things, there are sound reasons for all of you to vote against this bill.

Organized society is built on two primary factors—the ability of a man to work and earn and save, which provides capital, and to enjoy the fruits of that labor.

Early in our history or in the history of mankind it was learned that to enjoy the fruits of that labor it was necessary to have rules for the protection of the majority in their property and personal rights from individuals who took into themselves the right to rob, to ravage, to steal and to murder.

In this bill we strike at both of those fundamental bases on which society is built. Let me show why. Today, with crime rampant as it is all over the country, instead of trying to bring the guilty to justice this bill would give, as a matter of right the privilege of serving on a jury to the irresponsible in this country, which certainly would not have any beneficial effect on convicting the guilty.

This measure would set up a great mass of detail with regard to juries, which gives to lawyers in the courtroom more and more opportunities to raise technicalities, which will slow down the judicial process and will, in turn, make it harder to convict, and more time consuming to see that a man is punished for his crime even when convicted.

In that area, certainly we will not do anything to improve the situation that exists. This bill will not do anything to protect the individual, the property owner, or society from the criminal.

Let us look at the other side, the Housing section. It is agreed that additional housing is badly needed now. Yet it is acknowledged that in 34 years we will have 340 million people and twice as great a need for housing. It is acknowledged that in every city in our country there is a tremendous need for housing. Now, much less for the future. So what would this bill do?

It will limit the use that a man may make of the housing he puts his money into. Will that cause an increase in housing or will it cause the investor to put his money or capital elsewhere?

Let us look at another thing. It is acknowledged that for one reason or another minority races in many instances in this country have a low income. Thus, is a man going to build housing exclusively for minority groups where he feels he will not be able to fill up his housing built under present high costs?

But many say this bill will require that housing be integrated so the builder can look to all races to keep his apartments rented. What if the average renter prefers segregation and therefore looks for four-unit apartments. Under those conditions, will the possessor of capital invest it in large apartments? Will they then build high-rise apartments that will help take care of the 340 million people we will have in 34 years or will they build 4-unit apartments or something else entirely?

I say that good intentions are not enough. This may be a political year and the proponents hold this bill out as doing some good. A careful analysis, however, shows it will not. I repeat, by giving the irresponsible the right to serve on juries and giving the lawyers a right to raise all these questions in a trial, and on appeal, we lessen the certainty of punishment, and we slow down the infliction of punishment, where guilt is proven. If we tie strings on what a man can do with housing in which his money is invested, we are forcing him to put it in something else; but, if he puts his money in housing, we are forcing him to build units of four instead of the high-rise apartments which will house thousands of people, apartments that this country so badly needs.

Good intentions are not enough, I repeat. However good the intentions of the proponents may be, if we pass this bill we are hurting the very causes they espouse. If passed, punishment for crime will be lessened, and housing will become more scarce.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, how many amendments do we have at the desk?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will state that there are at the desk five amendments.

Mr. **WHITENER.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. **WHITENER.** I have four at this desk.

The **CHAIRMAN.** There is only one amendment pending before the Committee, however, and that is the Moore amendment.

Mr. **DOWDY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. **DOWDY.** Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting. I want to know on the matter now pending, the move to strike, I have been waiting until some of this stuff is out of the way.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, that is what I am trying to get at. I would suggest, as an orderly procedure, if we can get all the people who have amendments to bring them to the desk, so we know about how soon we can get around this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, last week—and that seems a long time ago—when this bill was under general debate, I referred to the "seven commandments" to be found on pages 63 and 64—the "seven commandments" promulgated by the Moseses of the Judicial Committee.

I asked at that time why the word "sex" as a qualifying condition was omitted. My purpose in taking this time today is to determine whether I ought to offer an amendment to the "seven commandments" to insert the word "sex," in the numerous places where it has been omitted.

When I asked the question the other day as to why the word "sex" had been left out, all I got was deafening silence.

I should be glad to have someone explain to me why you deliberately dropped the word "sex" in this title although you use it in practically every other similar situation in the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman to explain.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question arises as to section 403, which the gentleman is talking about, and that relates to the prevention of discrimination in the sale of rental of housing.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It refers to real estate agents, salesmen, and employees. Of course, that is the application of the same.

The question is: Could and do you intend——

Mr. GROSS. Could what?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Wait a minute.

Mr. GROSS. I could not hear the gentleman. Would the gentleman speak more directly into the microphone?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The real reason is that if Mrs. Murphy is renting her boarding house it will not be required of her, if she has a bunch of women there, to rent it to you, if you come along and want to rent it.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think that is discrimination? Would that not be discrimination against me?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is not unreasonable discrimination.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that.

After asking the question last week, I got the report privately, from proponents of this bill, that you carefully omitted the word "sex" for the reason that it might have something to do with the operation of a "bawdy" house.

Can this be true? If so, in what way would the provisions of the proposed bill be applied?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield. I am looking for information and not getting it.

Mr. CORMAN. It is not true.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from California now give me his explanation as to why "sex" is omitted from all these conditions?

Mr. CORMAN. Our committee has always been very careful only in those areas where there was a demonstrated need to correct inequity. There was no evidence before our committee that such inequity existed as to housing in relation to discrimination on account of sex.

I would say further that we have now twice been quoted to from the Old Testament. I suggest there was an 11th commandment in the new one which might stand us in good stead in respect to this legislation.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for I seek information.

Mr. DOWDY. I was not on the subcommittee, but it occurred to me that the Mattachine Society might object to the mixing of sexes inside those houses.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman: Does this not apply to advertising and everything else?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, it does; to all statements, too, to the spoken word.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. There has been a suggestion about the advertising of "bawdy" houses. I would suggest that would more properly be covered by the Iowa State Legislature.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, you are writing legislation here today that will govern what takes place in the State of Iowa, and you know it. Let us not get off on that kind of tangent for under this proposal there would be all kinds of preemption of State rights.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Certainly we are not writing it as it relates to "bawdy" houses the gentleman is talking about in Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I did not refer to either Iowa or Colorado.

Is there any reason why a man should not live among women in a rooming house?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On the assumption that perhaps they are married, they probably would be permitted to. We are trying to keep that at a local level.

Mr. GROSS. Do men and women not live together in nursing homes?

Do they not live together, in some instances, in YMCA's?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If they have that practice in Iowa, it has not spread to Colorado.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODINO: On page 63, line 22, delete "lessors" and insert in lieu thereof "lessees."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address a couple of clarifying questions to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], in order to clarify the meaning ing of two parts of title IV.

First, section 403(a)(6) forbids "access to or participation in" multiple listings, on discriminatory grounds. Some of my constituents have been concerned that this might mean that members of a multiple listing service might, under this language, be forced to make their listings available to people who were not members of the service, and who did not pay the required fees. Am I correct in interpreting the language to mean that membership in and the benefits of a multiple listing service cannot be denied on discriminatory grounds, but that certainly individuals who do not qualify for membership, or who are delinquent in their dues, are not entitled to access to the listings?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman in response to the question that we prohibit discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin and would not open up any additional rights.

Mr. TODD. I thank the gentleman. The impact of this section, then, as I understand it, is simply that race cannot be used as a criteria of membership in a multiple listing service. It would not open up the multiple listing service to unqualified persons.

I would appreciate clarification of another section—403(a)(4), where it says the realtor must "use his best efforts to consummate any sale." Am I correct in believing that the word "best" does not imply that a realtor must satisfy every unreasonable whim of a prospective buyer, or to work evenings, or weekends, or to drop a large sale and work on a small one, in order to meet the criteria of nondiscrimination? Is the word "best" included simply to discourage a realtor from discriminating through noncooperation and inaction? Does it not simply imply that the realtor should use the effort he usually makes in connection with a sale, regardless of the race of the potential customer?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. My answer to that would be "Yes." He would not be compelled to do any more than his best efforts.

Mr. TODD. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, one of the reasons for supporting the adoption of the new Michigan constitution—and I was one of them—was the civil rights section which it contained. This section has established the principle that discrimination is banned in real estate transactions, as well as other transactions within the jurisdiction of the State.

If I understand the gentleman correctly, title IV would do no more on a national basis than is already done under the Michigan constitution—and in fact, it would do less because it is less stringent. Am I correct in this interpretation?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I believe the answer is yes, because we specifically provide in section 410 that nothing should be construed to invalidate or limit any law of a State that grants, guarantees, or protects the same rights as are granted by this title.

Mr. TODD. I thank the gentleman. This means that I represent my constituency as well as the entire State of Michigan in voting for this title, since the civil rights section of the Constitution was supported in an overwhelming manner. I am pleased that my personal views on this issue are the same as those expressed in the Michigan constitution, and as implemented by this bill, and I support the bill on final passage. To vote against this title would repudiate the objectives of the Michigan constitution, and would further repudiate the adoption of that constitution by vote of Michigan's citizens, as well as my constituents.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELTNER

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELTNER: On page 73, line 21, insert a new section 411 to read as follows and redesignate the remaining sections accordingly:

"SEC. 411. Nothing herein shall affect the title or any other interest in a dwelling of any person who is not in violation of this title and who has not acquired such title or other interest in whole or in part for the purpose of assisting in a violation of this title."

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a long amendment, but I believe it is an important one. I am certain that it is not the purpose or the intent or the desire of the Committee on the Judiciary to offer any bill, and seek its passage, which would becloud title or raise questions concerning title or generate new and unusual title problems.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to make that intent clear, and so that the bill, as it is finally written and passed, will contain within its pages this simple statement:

That nothing herein shall affect the title or any other interest in the dwelling of any person who is not in violation of the title, and who has not acquired such title or other interest, in whole or in part, for the purpose of assisting in the violation of this title.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment proposes to do, is simply to assure those whose job it is to examine titles and to raise questions, that the bona fide purchaser or the bona fide lessee may purchase land in the usual course of business, provided that those transactions are not in violation of the specific provisions of this bill.

I offer this amendment in the spirit of one who hopes to see legislation generate opportunities for all people, and not to generate litigation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] in the sponsorship of this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that it would permanently spell out in the statute what seems to me inherent or implicit in the law. In fact, I believe it would be very important in making affirmative the language which is now contained in the present body of law concerning the bona fide purchaser.

I further believe that it would ease the burden of title lawyers, as well as the burden of insurance lawyers, with respect to the closing of real estate transactions, particularly in those States where abstracts of title are used.

Mr. WELTNER. My experience as a lawyer leads me to believe that this would be quite helpful.

Mr. Chairman, I know that title lawyers are quite diligent, and sometimes they are overzealous. I believe that this clear language—printed in the bill itself—would be most helpful in this respect.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The latter part of the gentleman's amendment says, "and who has not acquired such title or other interest in whole or in part for the purpose of assisting in the violation of this title."

Now, when and where is that ascertained? Do you determine that he has not participated in the violation of this title, when you examine the title?

In other words, my point is, I do not see the value of this amendment. It really clutters things up. One cannot arrive at a definite conclusion in the examination of a title in order to determine that "X" who is purchasing has participated in discrimination?

Mr. WELTNER. Surely the gentleman from Colorado does not want us to bring a bill to the floor of the House which is going to raise a great many questions of title, which is going to becloud questions of title, and which is going to raise difficult rent problems.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact the language to which the gentleman from Colorado refers, and the language which he raises can be raised with respect to the language of the entire bill, and that is why the affirmative terms and language of the amendment are so important.

Mr. WELTNER. Most assuredly. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman managing this debate may see fit to embrace this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered in the spirit of good will, and I think it will make a substantial improvement and contribution to this legislation.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no one in this Committee who is more desirous of maintaining firmness in real property law than the Member of the House from the Fourth Congressional District in Ohio. This amendment like many proposals has every element that appeals to the quick reaction of a Member.

But I regret to say, this amendment is not very carefully drawn.

If there is uncertainty as to the meaning of the "Mrs. Murphy" language in this bill, this amendment is more confusing than the wording of that amendment.

Let me read to you the first two or three lines of this amendment. It says: "Nothing herein."

What is being referred to by the word "herein"? In the referring to the whole law—title 42, United States Code, which contains nearly the entire body of the civil rights legislation?

Title 42 includes many pages of the United States Code.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the word "dwelling" is used. I ask the lawyers of the House: in deeds of trust or deeds of mortgage or in warranty deeds, What property is conveyed by the word dwelling"?

That is only one of the many uncertainties in the amendment.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, at this late date in this debate I hope we are not going to confuse the situation by attempting to do something that is already provided for in the law.

Mr. Chairman, I call upon my good friends, the lawyers across the aisle to express their opinion about the way this amendment is drawn and what it could do if it becomes a part of this bill?

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if this legislation passes the House, it must pass the Senate. If there is a gaping hole in this legislation, it may be remedied in the Senate. If it is not remedied there, we will have another chance at it in the conference committee.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the trust of this type of title or paragraph was considered in the committee and was rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see that this amendment has any effect one way or the other. There is nothing in this bill that is intended as a cloud on the title of bona fide purchasers, but I would underline and emphasize every word that was said by the gentleman from Ohio when he called to our attention the danger of attempting to write a very complex law on the floor of this House when none of us have an opportunity to research the potential effects of such an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the dangers may well be that if we specify that there is no cloud created as a result of some action, it might be implied that there could very well be a cloud as to other actions.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Committee would support the Committee on the Judiciary and vote down this amendment not because of what it intends to accomplish but because of a real threat that we will be writing law on this floor that none of us completely understands.

Every word and every sentence that went into this bill was difficult to arrive at. I think we did a good job. We did what we intended to do. I would not like to see us undo it at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated that in his opinion the amendment neither does anything or that it does nothing. If that be the case and, if it bespeaks the clear intent of this legislation, why not adopt it so that someone who is seeking to discern that intent need not read through 10 days of debate?

Further, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield once again, there was a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, that nowhere in the bill was the term "dwelling" used. As I read this bill, the entire thrust of it is as to dwellings.

The term "dwelling" is used over and over again. Section 403(a) refers to persons dealing with dwellings. Each subparagraph thereof has the word "dwelling" in it.

The term "dwelling" has the interpretation given to it in this entire bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman from Georgia misinterpreted my remarks. I did not say that "dwelling" was not used in this act. I said the word "dwelling," when you are talking about title to real property, has a mighty different meaning than the proper description of real estate. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to know what he means by "herein." Why did he not limit his amendment to the title in question? I repeat, it refers to this whole body or law in 42 United States Code. What does he mean by the word "effect"? And what does he mean by the words "in person"?

Finally, is this not going to complicate the questions of title rather than clarify or solve the questions of title?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to call attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, who objects to the use of the word "dwelling" in this amendment. He says that it does not mean anything. He does not understand the meaning of it. I did not draw the amendment, you understand, but I expect that the person who did read the title he is amending before he wrote the amendment. The title defines "dwellings." In section 402 it starts out by defining "dwelling." It states:

> (b) "dwelling" includes any building or structure, or portion thereof—

And so on. That is subdivision (b) of section 402. Subdivision (d) of the same section states:

> (d) A person shall be deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing "dwelling"—

Then we come to the seven commandments that are contained in section 403. It starts off by saying:

> It shall be unlawful for any person—

Now, there is objection to the use of the words "any person" in this amendment. "Any person" is used all throughout the title which it would amend. Any person other than a person who is—"any person or any of his agents who is engaged in building or selling, renting or leasing dwellings."

In the first subsection it states:

> To refuse to sell, rent, or lease—real estate or a dwelling.

The third subsection states:

> To make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice—

With respect to the sale, rental or lease of a dwelling.

The fourth subsection covers failure to show any dwelling or to refuse to use his best efforts to consummate a sale.

The fifth subsection states:

> To represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that any dwelling is not available—

The sixth subsection states:

> To deny to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin of the person he represents or may represent, access to or participation in any multiple-listing service or other service or facilities related to the business of selling or renting dwellings.

It is all the way through. Objection is made to the term "any person"; "any person" seems to me to be as plain in this amendment as it is in any part of the bill that we are talking about. Just as any dwelling is used throughout the title.

Objection was made by the gentleman from Ohio that this section of the amendment does not say what it covers. It does. It says:

> Nothing herein shall affect the title, or any person who has acquired such title or other interest, in whole or in part, for the purpose of assisting in the violation of this title.

It is limited to the title that is being amended. The objections that have been made are superficial, and evidently without reading the proposed amendment any more than I have. I have just now seen it.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain it is the intent of this legislation that it extend opportunity, and not that it raise questions of the title, of the validity of transactions handled in the normal course of affairs. If that is not the intent of the title, I would like some response from the members handling this bill on the floor. I believe my amendment goes toward making that crystal clear.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Weltner amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The objections are heard.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Weltner amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. When the time was fixed, the Chair observed these gentlemen standing: The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY], the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. JOELSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The gentlemen will each be recognized for slightly more than 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCULLOCH yielded his time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLLIER yielded his time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].)

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of what I understand the purpose of this amendment to be, but I am afraid it does not accomplish the purpose that the gentleman from Georgia has in mind. I am afraid this amendment will cause more questions to be raised about titles than it will settle.

I invite attention to the fact that in the first clause of the amendment he says:

> Nothing herein shall affect the title or other interest in the dwelling of any person who is not in violation of this title.

By indirection that means every person who violates this title in any degree whatsoever will have the title to his property placed in jeopardy. That worries me, because it seems to me what is proposed here will open a real can of worms. This will bring into question the validity of the title of thousands of home and property owners all over the United States.

That is a sound reason to oppose this entire title.

If an amendment of this sort is required to preserve the titles of real property—people who own real property anywhere in the United States will be directly involved and should be concerned. This title in such case should be more properly labeled a bill for the relief of the lawyers of the United States. I can visualize thousands of lawsuits arising all over the country involving titles to real property, on allegations that someone has violated the provisions of this title.

What title insurance company will guarantee the title of a man against whom an allegation has been made that he is in violation of this bill, until that issue has been settled in the courts?

This will open more trouble than it will settle if this title is susceptible to the interpretation which the gentleman from Georgia places on it, which causes him to offer what appears to be a perfecting amendment but which opens up the very question of the validity of title to real property.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JONAS**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **FASCELL**. The inference the gentleman has made as to the interpretation of the amendment I do not concur with at all. However, one could ask the same questions which the gentleman has asked concerning a dwelling as it is defined in this bill, because I do not know where anyone could put a dwelling except upon real estate.

Mr. **JONAS**. That is right. It is the title to the land that would be brought into question.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis].

Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I have the highest regard for Charlie Weltner as a lawyer.

I rise as a lawyer in opposition to this amendment for this reason: I believe the entire civil rights bill of 1966 imposes remedies for violations of the act which in every instance are in personam, that is, against a person; and which in no instance are in rem, that is, against things, property being an "in rem" quantity so far as the law is concerned.

I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], is entirely correct, that the addition of the last part of the amendment brings into doubt whether there are in rem remedies in this act.

If we leave that out, any lawyer in the land would say no real estate title could possibly be involved. If a person should violate the provisions of this bill, he would find himself civilly in contempt of court or, if it is criminal, he would subject himself to a fine or imprisonment. It would not, however, in any instance, operate to create an encumbrance or a cloud upon the title to real estate.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. **JOELSON**. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should pass and I were a title searcher I do not believe I could ever absolutely certify a title without a proviso that the title was only good if there had been no violation of the law and if there were no allegation of violation of the law.

I agree with the previous gentleman that this would becloud title rather than clear title. For that reason I oppose the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hungate].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy yielded his time to Mr. Weltner.)

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the opinion expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

I point out that if this amendment is adopted no title searcher could ever pass on the title until he had made an investigation to determine whether there had been any violation of this act. How would he prove that? He probably would have to go into court himself and institute a separate action.

The law we hope will be enacted will provide that if a sale is made it will go on through as it has in the past.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. **McCLORY**. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner].

Mr. **WELTNER**. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a plain statement that should prevent lawsuits. It should prevent unreasonable objections to title; it should protect innocent purchasers. What happens when a man buys a house in a subdivision? The buyer may not know that the seller is acting in violation of title IV. Yet this bill specifically gives to the court the power to grant such relief as it deems appropriate. That could include an injunction or a restraining order or a direction for specific performance. So let us suppose that he pays his money and takes the deed not knowing that the owner himself has been in violation of this statute. What is there here to indicate that the court cannot come along and say, "Notwithstanding the fact that you are innocent, the sale was in violation of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 and you are accordingly ordered to be divested of your property and directed to transfer it to some third party?" This amendment is designed to prevent that very occurrence; to make that clear right in the body of the law—that a man who is not a party to an effort to avoid or evade this law may take his title with assurance that some event beyond his control and beyond his participation will not later becloud his title. This is a worthy aim, Mr. Chairman, and I urge the Members of this body to support this amendment.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WELTNER**. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia. Does not the gentleman agree that if there were a pending lawsuit that might affect the title, that would be reflected on the lis pendens docket?

Mr. **WELTNER**. That is exactly what it is designed to do. To restrict the occurrences which would affect title, such as a notice of lis pendens, or an application for injunction. It is designed to avoid the necessity of taking affidavits from everybody in town as to the manner in which the property was sold.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia. Does the gentleman not agree that there is no suggestion—that a title examiner would have any trouble learning of pending litigation?

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] to close the debate.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the amendment because it raises more clouds and actually beclouds the issue more than many can imagine. Title IV actually protects all bona fide purchasers and does not affect title to real property or upset completed real estate transactions. It would not compel a court to convey or reconvey title in any such cases. I think there is no necessity whatsoever for this amendment. The case has been well stated by the gentleman from Ohio and others, and for that reason I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Weltner) there were—ayes 31, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

Mr. Chairman, having reference to page 62, section 402(d), the definition of a person who is deemed to be in the business of building, developing, and selling—and the words go on to say, "he has within the preceding 12 months participated as either principal or agent in three or more transactions involving the sale, rental, lease," and so forth.

I believe it is clear that an attorney representing a party is his agent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, an attorney with a real estate practice who represents parties in two or more real estate transactions, would he then come under the provisions of this act in the sale of his own home, even though he acts as a principal only once within a 12-month period, when he has acted as attorney-agent for people who are selling or buying real estate in the course of his law practice?

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, if he is in the business of selling housing, he is covered.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. Do you intend to mean that an attorney representing parties to real estate transactions is in the business of buying and selling, even though he is not acting as principal?

Mr. **RODINO**. If he is acting as an agent.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. As an agent.

Mr. **RODINO**. Therefore, he is covered.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. So, every lawyer, with a real estate practice would automatically be covered in the sale of his own home, even though he sells his home only once in a 12-month period—he would come under the purview of this law?

Mr. **RODINO**. The question is how many transactions he completed during the preceding 12 months.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. In other words, if he sells his own home only once, and if he represents other parties to real estate transactions in the course of his business as an attorney, he then comes under the law?

Mr. **RODINO**. Is he an agent, or is he merely the attorney?

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. The attorney is an agent.

Mr. **RODINO**. No; if he is representing him as an attorney, I understand it is quite different than if he is representing him as an agent in the sale or the transaction of the sale or handling of that transaction. Then he is covered in that transaction.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. I understand what the gentleman probably would like this language to say, and what the committee meant for it to say. However, I believe it is quite clear that in principal-agent law—fiduciary law—an attorney is always acting as an agent when he acts as an attorney for a party——

Mr. **RODINO**. No, not in this——

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Not as a real estate agent.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. Then a real estate agent is the only sort of an agent, who is meant to be covered by this law?

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let us make it clear that if he is acting as an agent and if there are more than two transactions in the preceding 12-month period, he is covered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment and opinion, if he is acting merely as an attorney, and if he has nothing to do as an agent with that transaction, he is not covered.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. But, Mr. Chairman, an attorney is an agent for a party. He does not act as the principal. An attorney representing a party in a real estate transaction is an agent of the party.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. I would suggest that the gentleman read section 403, which states as follows:

> It shall be unlawful for any person who is a real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or employee or agent of any real estate broker, agent or salesman, or any other person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, or any employee or any agent of any such person—

Now, in order to come under this title he must meet this definition, regardless of the questions that the gentleman may ask. If he is acting as an agent, as a real estate broker, that is one thing. If he is acting as an attorney, that is another thing. One question is whether he is acting in an agent-broker capacity.

Now if he as an attorney accepts—and most States require before you can engage in business as a real estate agent or a broker that you must obtain a license; now if he as an attorney has a broker's license to sell real estate, then he will be covered in every transaction and he has no exemption.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. Then if I understand the gentleman correctly, in developing the legislative history of this law, the word "agent" is meant to mean "real estate agent"? Not an agent in the general sense of one acting for a principal.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. **ERLENBORN**. So if a person is not a real estate agent, then he does not come under the purview of this law. He would be exempt?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. That is correct. In addition, a person may be covered if he is in the business of selling or renting housing.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments which I offer and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendments offered by Mr. CASEY: On page 63, line 7, after "origin" strike out the period and insert "or number of children or the age of such children."
>
> On page 63, line 12, after "origin" strike out the period and insert "or number of children or the age of such children."
>
> On page 63, line 18, after "origin," insert "or number of children or the age of such children".
>
> On page 64, line 18, after "origin" strike out the period and insert "or number of children or the age of such children."

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Chairman, since the purpose of this bill is to take from the control of a landowner the privilege of whom he shall rent to and the purpose is to make housing available to those who need it, I think the Committee has overlooked a very important segment.

We have tried to look after Mrs. Murphy in the operation of her boarding house, but have ignored Mrs. Murphy's kids.

Mr. Chairman, all you have to do is to look in the newspaper ads and see "no children" or "no children under 18."

The gentleman from New York and I know what it means to try to find housing when you have quite a few children. They immediately think not to rent when someone wants to rent a house and you have more than a couple of children—especially if you have so many like the gentleman from New York—what is it, 14 now? I am running a poor third in the House of Representatives with only 10 children.

But that is one segment of society that does have trouble in finding housing.

Mr. Chairman, if you honestly want to help those who find housing closed to them, you will accept this amendment. Because throughout this land, we who are continuing to propagate the race in this Nation have a little difficulty in finding housing open to us where we would like to be able to rent.

Seriously, I challenge you to look in the newspapers right now and I am sure that without question you will find restrictions as to children. They will take pets sometimes but not take children.

Mr. Chairman, if you really want to help out the segment who needs some housing open to them, then we should have this provision.

Mind you, I will put the children of the gentleman from New York up against any family I have ever known as being well behaved. When you have that many children, you have to have them well behaved because otherwise they will run over you.

Mr. **CAREY**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CASEY**. I yield to the gentleman. I have had to concede to you for a long time. You are the champ around here.

Mr. **CAREY**. I was about to state to my colleague from Texas that you began yielding to me back in 1960 and you have not stopped since.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my colleague from Texas that I do not regard this amendment as frivolous or mischievious.

Mr. **CASEY**. Mr. Chairman, I did not offer the amendment as a frivolous amendment at all. It is a serious matter having as many children as we have.

Mr. **CAREY**. Yes, it is, of course. You and I do not jest lightly about these matters.

Mr. **CASEY**. That is correct.

Mr. **CAREY**. I want to indicate to you that this gets to the very real point and the significance of this bill. Those of us who have been engaged in the war on poverty have looked at the family complexes in the poverty sector of our society and we know that among the poor we have the large families.

It would be a devious thing and, indeed, a very artful device if, in order to achieve discrimination, one who did not want a minority group or family in his neighborhood would seize upon the notion that this is a large family or, being a small family, might become a large family with low income.

Mr. **CASEY**. We both started with small families.

Mr. **CAREY**. Everything starts small in this country. I think the gentleman's amendment speaks to posterity. I think it looks in this bill to a very real problem that we do not intend that discrimination and laws against discrimination should be based on a matter of age, and we should not have discrimination against children while we are outlawing discrimination against all other individuals in society. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendments and support them en bloc, no matter how many amendments he may have.

Mr. **CASEY**. I thank the gentleman for his support.

The **CHAIRMAN** pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Rodino) there were—ayes 99, noes 50.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask the managers of the bill some questions about subsection (b) of section 406 on page 66, line 19, of the bill. The section is entitled "Enforcement by Private Persons."

This provision provides:

> (b) Upon application by any party and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, a court of the United States in which a civil action under this section has been brought may appoint an attorney for such party or parties and may authorize the commencement of a civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security.

I am unable to find any clarification of this point in the report. About the only hint there is as to what the committee means here is the title of this particular section, "Enforcement by Private Persons."

I would like to know from the managers of this bill if I am reading this section correctly, that if a property owner in my district is involved as a defendant in some legal action arising out of this bill, he may petition the court for the appointment of attorneys and the waiver of fees, costs and security, or is this for the plaintiff only? In other words, does this go to the defendant as well as the plaintiff?

Mr. CORMAN. The court may in its discretion appoint an attorney for either party. The original language of the bill provided that the court could appoint—and I read to you from page 28, line 16, the stricken line here: "Upon application by the plaintiff and in such circumstances," and so forth. The committee in discussing it felt there may be occasions when the defendant would be hard put to defend the action, and felt we ought to give the court discretion to appoint an attorney for either party.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman be good enough to answer further about the language "in such circumstances as the court may deem just." Would the gentleman be good enough to elaborate on what was the committee's thinking on that language?

Mr. CORMAN. We thought we could leave it to the discretion of the court.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There are absolutely no guidelines. Would the person have to be indigent before he could seek relief from the court; or could the person who has bought a piece of property and who has an equity in that property and who is involved in an action but who is not necessarily indigent, but for whom the legal cost would create a hardship, seek this kind of relief as a defendant in this suit?

Mr. CORMAN. I would think he might, although I would not want to limit the discretion of the court in the legislative history at this point. I think the court is perfectly capable of ascertaining when justice demands that an attorney be appointed for either party. I would assume that the indigency of one of the two parties would be a consideration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Therefore, the words in the title of this section, "Enforcement by Private Persons," would not indicate to the court that these legal fees and legal services are available only to plaintiffs, but rather they are available to defendants if they petition the court for such assistance? Is this correct?

Mr. CORMAN. That is perfectly correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then further, the language on line 23, "may authorize the commencement of a civil action," would not be construed by the courts to mean again that these lawyers or attorneys and the waiver of fees applies only to plaintiffs, since normally a plaintiff would be the moving party?

The word "commencement" does not in any way alter the gentleman's statement that this provision would apply to a property owner defendant as well as to a plaintiff?

Mr. CORMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRALEY

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Craley: On page 62, strike out line 15 through line 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A person shall be deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings if he has participated, within the preceding twelve months, as either principal or agent, in more than two transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest therein."

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a perfecting amendment on language. A few moments ago we heard the floor manager, the gentleman from New Jersey use precisely this language in his definition of involvement when he said and I quote, "More than two transactions." We have had a great deal of discussion on the floor as to how many transactions are involved. The committee has indicated that "two" is the magic word. All I am attempting to do is to have this written in the legislation itself, so that it will not be subject to further questioning but become a permanent part of the bill.

I have merely specified that a person shall be deemed to be in the business if he has participated, within the preceding months, in "more than two transactions." To me this is clarifying. It clearly specifies the number of transactions. It in no way changes the intent of the committee or of the legislation.

I would hope that the committee would accept the amendment.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I do not believe this changes the intent of the committee. However, the present wording is the wording the committee report refers to.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Could the gentleman indicate what change he would make, by his amendment, to accomplish what he suggests? It is hard to follow it as it was read without being compared to the language in the bill.

Could the gentleman tell the Committee what language he is striking out and what he is adding?

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRALEY. On page 62, line 17, after the word "has" I put in the word "participated."

At the conclusion of line 17 and at the beginning of line 18, I have stricken the word "participated" and crossed out on line 18 "three or more" and written in "more than two."

I did so because I feel that this specifically identifies the exact number of transactions. In fact, the manager on the floor used the expression not more than 5 minutes ago, in defining the number of transactions, when he said, and I quote, "More than two transactions."

The gentleman from California has indicated that this does not change the intent. I believe that it qualifies it and makes it a matter of legislation, rather than going back to a hearing to establish the intent or the purpose.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it the gentleman's effort to try to clarify line 18, which refers to the terms "principal or agent" with relation to sale and as to whether the term "principal" includes both sellers and the buyers involved in a transaction?

Mr. CRALEY. No. I am not attempting to clarify anything more than the number of transactions. The wording in the present bill is "three or more." We have identified that "two" is the magic number. The leader on the Democratic side has indicated "more than two transactions."

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman's amendment would mean two rentals, sales, or any other types of transaction?

Mr. CRALEY. Whatever is presently intended.

Mr. CRAMER. Or a combination of two such transactions within a year?

Mr. CRALEY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. The third transaction, be it rental or sale, would cause the party to be included?

Mr. CRALEY. This is the present intent of the legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. This means whether a person is buying a house or selling a house?

Mr. CRALEY. No. We have established by previous colloquy that a person buying is not covered. This would in no way affect that. That has already been determined by previous questioning.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman's amendment does not prevent that interpretation, which some have made of this section, does it?

Mr. CRALEY. No, not this part of my amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. It also does not exempt the homeowner from the operation of the title if that individual has participated in the rental of two rooms or the rental of the same room to two different people within a 1-year period. Is that correct?

Mr. CRALEY. My amendment has one purpose behind it; that is, to clarify the number of transactions.

Mr. CRAMER. It does not guarantee the homeowner the right to sell to anybody he wants to if he has leased twice the same room during the year or leased two rooms to two different people during the year. Is that correct?

Mr. CRALEY. I make no further guarantee than "the number."

Mr. CRAMER. The homeowner would still could be subject to the title if he had had two such transactions?

Mr. CRALEY. That is the interpretation of the gentleman from Florida, and not mine or the committee's.

Mr. CRAMER. I do not agree with the gentleman. The committee said in its report that if there were two transactions the third transaction would be covered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate rather intently for 2 days, and if I am not mistaken, I have heard two different statements about who is covered and who is not. You know, it is just too bad that Gilbert and Sullivan are dead, because if they were to take these debates, they could write a light opera that would outshine any they have ever written. I think I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] say—and I would like to hear him say it again so we can get things clear—in the first two transactions you are not covered but in the third one you are. Now I have a specific question.

Mr. CORMAN. Will the gentleman let me answer that first, please?

Mr. HAYS. Let me first ask the question. If you have the third transaction, are you then liable for the first two you made under the law?

Mr. CORMAN. There are no exemptions for one who is in the business under the definitions stated.

Mr. HAYS. I understand that, but a homeowner——

Mr. CORMAN. So a homeowner dealing with his home is not covered by that section. He is excluded by section 403 (b).

Mr. HAYS. If he is renting another piece of property that is not his home?

Mr. CORMAN. If he deals in anything other than his home and has three or more transactions in a year, he is in the business. All of the transactions are covered by this legislation then. I did not say that the first two are exempt, but I said as soon as he is in the business, and the test of that is if he had three transactions in 12 months. Then he is in business and all of his transactions are covered by this legislation. That limits what a person in business can do. This must be differentiated from what a man can do with his own home.

Mr. HAYS. Then, in other words, a man who owns a house and has a second house for rental and rents that three times in a year because somebody moves out, is covered on the first two even though he did not realize he was going to have this thing come up because he was hoping they would stay, but they did not. Is that right?

Mr. CORMAN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. At least it is a little more clear than it was, but I heard the gentleman say earlier that he hoped some amendment or another would be defeated because it was very confusing to try to write legislation like this on the floor. I will leave it up to the membership that have been here if they ever saw anybody more confused than the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary. You can hardly get any two of them to agree to anything in this bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I must object. I was on my feet.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems clear from the debate of the last 2 hours that a serious error was made by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary in not holding hearings on the Mathias substitute. Let me make it clear that no hearings were held on the form and content of title IV now under consideration. We had no expert testimony from people who are charged with the administration of State laws in this field as to the impact of the two-or-less-transaction or the three-or-more-transaction exemption which was tentatively approved by this committee yesterday. However, a Senate subcommittee this morning heard expert testimony as to the effect of the action taken in the House yesterday. I have before me from the wire services a UPI story dated today at 1:36 p.m. I quote from that story:

> The chairman of the New York City Commission on Human Rights told Congress today the pending controversial open housing provision of the House civil rights bill was a mandate for discrimination.
>
> "It will serve to further perpetuate the black ghetto, isolated from the power structure of the white community," William H. Booth said in testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. Booth further testified:

> "The caste system will be upheld," he said, speaking of the Mathias amendment adopted tentatively in the House yesterday.
>
> "We can envisage a nation of black cities and white suburbs.
>
> "The cities will grow darker, more dank, and hungrier, while the suburbs will evolve as the white haven of self-contained euphoria."

Mr. Chairman, UPI comments further:

> The House yesterday approved 180–179 an amendment designed to weaken the housing provision to make the civil rights bill more palatable to opponents. It would extend immunity to the ban on discrimination in housing sales or rentals to real estate agents working for, and instructed to discriminate by, the owners of exempt housing.

Mr. Booth continued his remarks before the other body today as follows, as quoted by UPI:

> In effect, this section of Title IV is stating that all private home owners and those who reside in two, three or four-family homes are hereby granted the privilege of discriminating in the sale, lease or rental of their buildings under the aegis of the United States Government.

And, Mr. Chairman, this distinguished New York official concluded, and I quote:

> How can the ghettoized Negro of the northern city break out into the ruralized suburb unless he can purchase a private dwelling?

Ladies and gentlemen of this Committee, the debate in the last 2 hours has clearly demonstrated the necessity of holding hearings upon complex and difficult legislation of this kind.

The Mathias substitute amendment to title IV was approved tentatively on a 180–179 vote in this Chamber yesterday. I cannot believe that we would have made this decision if the House Judiciary Committee had heard the views of William H. Booth.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, listening to the debate on title IV, I cannot help but wonder how many Members and how many lawyers in the Justice Department realize what the real problem is among the Negro community so far as housing is concerned. I shall vote for this section, but I am thoroughly convinced it is not the answer to the problem of adequate housing. There are laws, some more stringent than this, in effect in several States and large communities, but we still have slum conditions, rioting, and all of the other ills which we read about daily.

I feel I can speak with some knowledge of this problem, having been born and raised in an integrated neighborhood in the packinghouse district of South Omaha, Nebr. Negro families lived within a block of our home and I grew up with youngsters of all races, creeds, and colors, because where I was born and raised was a sort of melting pot area. I played with these people, I went to school with them and got to know them, and we got along very well. As a matter of fact, there was never any thought in any of our minds about any prejudice between us.

Later on I became mayor of the city of Omaha, a city of approximately 300,000 at that time, and I served for 6 years in that position. It was not until I became mayor that I ever heard of the problem of prejudice, because, as I said, it never was raised through all of the years that I grew up and associated with those in my neighborhood of various races, creeds, and colors.

When I became mayor I became even better acquainted with the Negroes in the community and they respected me because I treated them as I would treat any other person of any other race. There just was no prejudice in my mind because of the color of a man's skin.

And so, as I said above, I think I know something about the concerns and the needs of the Negro community. I am personally acquainted with hundreds of fine Negro families. They are some of our leading citizens, and I point out that those among the Negro community who own their homes take good care of them and raise lovely families who enter the adult world with the same training and abilities as those of any other race.

The Negro people, I feel—and this is based on my almost lifetime experience with them—do not, for the most part, want to leave their friends and neighbors and move to another neighborhood where they will be separated from their previous environment. However—and this is the important point of my remarks—they do want decent housing and they deserve it.

I noted in about 1950, after I had been mayor for only a year and a half, that a problem existed so far as decent housing was concerned in the Negro community. This became evident with the eventual separation from the service of men following World War II and men involved in the Korean conflict, who returned to their former places of residence. I had many of these men, with their wives and children, come to my office with tears in their eyes, saying they were unable to secure decent housing. They did not want to live in a ghetto or in substandard housing, and I certainly agreed they should not. Therefore, I made application to the Federal Government for 1,200 low-cost public housing units for Omaha. This not only would have taken care of the need then existing but would have taken care of the need for approximately another 10 years.

Low-cost public housing is a good program. It is not a Federal handout and the investment is eventually returned to the Government. However, I ran into great obstacles when I made application for these 1,200 low-cost housing units.

The local real estate board and the local newspaper were violently opposed to this, and I might say I was almost "run out of town on a rail" for asking for these units. But I knew it was the only answer to this problem and I knew further that a fellow member of the Republican Party, known for his down-to-earth philosophy, the Honorable Robert A. Taft, had originally cosponsored the low-cost public housing legislation. But there was a big furor and when the day came that our city council was to take up my application for 1,200 of these low-cost housing units the special interest groups had done their work, our city council chamber was jammed beyond capacity, 95½ percent of those in attendance were opposed to the units, my city council became jittery and afraid, but I am happy to say that the council did approve 700 of these units.

These 700 would take care of the immediate need, although the 1,200 units I originally requested would have taken care of the need for 10 to 15 years in the future, and this was sacrificed in favor of the 700 units because my city council would not back me up.

At that time only a simple vote of the mayor and members of the city council was required in order to have these units constructed in Omaha. But the real estate interests were extremely angry because I had made this request and immediately thereafter they went to the State legislature, urging that legislation be placed on the books stating that no further public housing units could be erected in the State of Nebraska without a vote of the people. Since that time no further units of low-cost Federal housing have been built in Omaha.

There has been a modest program of housing for the elderly, but nothing that really gets at the root of the problem of housing, which can only be solved by the erection of more low-cost public housing units. This is too bad because as a result of the lack of additional low-cost housing units there has been a greatly expanded slum landlord development. These slum landlords are an insult to every American regardless of the color of his skin or his station in life. They prey upon the Negro who cannot afford to purchase his own home. They gouge these Negro families, charging excessive rates and they will not keep the housing in decent repair.

I recall one instance I ran across when I was mayor of Omaha, and I know hundreds of other exist. This instance involved an old, dilapidated house of approximately 12 rooms, adjacent to the Negro community. This property was bought by an absentee landlord at public sale because of nonpayment of taxes for around $1,200. The owner of the premises put approximately $1,800 into the property, bringing his total investment to approximately $3,000. He chopped this 12-room dilapidated structure into 1-room apartments on 3 floors and a basement. Some of these rooms had a sink with running water and others did not.

None of these one-room apartments had bathroom facilities. All of the persons living on each floor used a common bathroom. We tried desperately to condemn this property because we were convinced it did not meet building code requirements and it was a fire hazard. But when this case and others of a similar nature would come before the council for condemnation, these slum landlords would hire the cleverest and smartest attorneys and they would get postponement after postponement, and in the majority of the cases I never had enough support from the city council to actually get the condemnation accomplished.

In the case of the one house I mention, which the landlord purchased for $1,200 and spent approximately $1,800 chopping up the structure into one-room apartments, we found out—and it was a matter of record—that he was receiving $700 a month rent from the tenants. Simple arithmetic can prove that within 5 months he was taking in enough money to entirely recoup his investment and leave enough over to pay the relatively low taxes involved. All the rest was pure gravy, and that situation exists to this very day all over the country.

Ofttimes I see pictures of ghettos in which the housing units, whether it be a whole house or a tenement type structure, appears to be dilapidated, with no paint, with garbage, et cetera, in the yard. The first thought of many people is why do these people not use a little elbow grease and paint the structure and clean up the premises. I cannot speak for every such unit, but I will tell you why this condition exists. The people who live in these tenements and old houses owned by slum landlords are angry. They pay exorbitant rents and they cannot get the absentee landlord to fix up the units. That is why you see holes in the ceiling and other conditions, including rats running rampant, and the renter cannot help but say to himself—"I am paying high rent, I can get nothing fixed, my landlord doesn't care about rats, broken plumbing, and so forth. Why should I be called upon to keep his premises clean and painted?"

So, Mr. Chairman, these slum conditions which exist are due primarily to the slum landlord, and it is a certainty that a mother and father with a family living in one room cannot possibly maintain a good home and family environment. Children cannot help but gain the very worst impression when forced to live under such conditions. This causes a tragic breakdown in family life and leads in so many instances to problems as the children reach school age and eventually go out into the world to make their own living. This is a major cause of school dropouts. This is why youngsters and young adults participate in the disturbances which we have read so much about. They are frustrated. They have been brought up to hate conditions which have existed from the time they were born until the time they became young adults.

So adequate and decent housing, in my opinion, is the one most important cause of the problems we have today as they concern the Negro community. Others may argue that jobs are not available and other things are troublesome to these people. I could not disagree with them. But I will say if these children lived in decent quarters where love and affection could abound and they could be raised in the same healthy environment as we want for ourselves, the problem of school dropouts, which leads to unskilled persons seeking jobs, and all of the other problems surely would be almost eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I say that frustration is the major cause of the friction we have, and I say again it is due mainly to the slum landlord who provides slum housing and who maintains in most instances the ghetto in the Negro community. Riots are rooted in these frustrations, not in the race of the people involved.

I might add that from the experience I have had the worst slums in this country are paid for by the taxpayers. These people who are forced to live in these slums pay half or more of their welfare payments to these slum landlords and so in effect the taxpayers of this country are subsidizing and making rich the absentee slum landlord. I say this is outrageous and we must design and take advantage of programs at every level of government to work against it. Mr. Chairman, the crying need so far as adequate housing is concerned is a crash program wherein the various communities around the country will make application and the Congress must provide all of the low-cost public housing that is needed to provide these people with decent housing within their means, and the elimination of the slum landlord.

I hope the real estate boards throughout the country will take an interest in this approach and will withdraw any opposition to the low-cost public housing program. If they had done that long ago, and if they will do it now, it would be helpful, because certainly they have been negligent in this field and have a responsibility in solving this problem. They have fallen down on the job in the past, and I hope and I urge that they will meet their responsibilities so far as this problem is concerned along the lines which I am suggesting.

Mr. Chairman, as I said originally, I think I am qualified to speak out on this problem. It was stated that some young attorney approximately 30 years old in the Justice Department wrote this housing section. He was not identified and I would not know his background. As I stated, I shall vote for this section. But it will in nowise solve the problem. As I stated, the Negro people have no desire to move out of their neighborhoods into white neighborhoods where they will be strangers. But they do want decent housing within their means.

I repeat that there are so-called open occupancy statutes on the books of many States and communities, but this has not solved a thing. Where are the people who are supposed to understand the problems of our minorities and, in this instance, our Negro friends?

How many of them have been born and raised in an integrated neighborhood as I have? Yes, Mr. Chairman, we must take profit out of poverty through a program of low-cost public housing and in so doing we will provide decent housing which these people can afford and in which they can maintain a healthy family environment. This in turn will solve many of the other problems which exist and about which we hear so much.

In conclusion I might say that I do not feel that the rent supplement program is any answer to this problem. It is the wrong approach. I know in my own mind that a rent subsidy program will simply pour more millions of tax dollars into the pockets of the slum landlord, and this we cannot tolerate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes had it.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. When the motion was agreed to, the Chair noted the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], and the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser], standing.

The gentlemen will be recognized for approximately 2 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to try to clarify in my own mind the meaning of subsection or subdivision (d) of section 402.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can obtain the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman], or whether I can obtain the attention of anyone else, but I want to say that there is a provision in this section that has been discussed here which provides that a person shall be deemed to be in the real estate business, building, and so on, in the event he participates in three or more transactions.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman can hear me or not.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be no further debate until the Committee is in order.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, my question involves subsection (d) of section 402 in which it states:

> A person shall be deemed to be in business if he has participated in three or more transactions within the preceding twelve months.

Once he is in business is that forever?

Mr. CORMAN. No, sir. You would look for each transaction back 12 months.

Two transactions within the prior 12 months would bring the person within the definition of 402(d) at the time of the third transaction. Whether there was or was not discrimination in the first two transactions, they would count in ascertaining that fact. Any discrimination in those two transactions would not create liability under 403(a) unless at the time of the discrimination the party fell within 402(d).

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have gone into that.

You say he is not forever, that is for the rest of his life, in business. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] claims you have a different opinion because this is subject to two constructions, and I would like to hear the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the first part of the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee would like to know the answer. The language of the bill is not clear, and is subject to at least two constructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I crossed the aisle to discuss with my colleague on the committee the question of whether the third sale or disposition by an owner within a 12-month period would make the seller guilty under this legislation on the first two sales.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, the first two sales would count only in defining whether he is in the business. Any discrimination as to the first two would not subject him to guilt or violation of the law but only to ascertain whether he falls within the definition of being in business. He does not have to engage in discrimination to ascertain whether he comes within the definition. That is totally on the number of transactions involved.

Mr. McCULLOCH. So that we completely understand each other, the first two sales of real estate by an owner or leasor do not become unlawful even if within the 12-month period there is a third such transaction?

Mr. CORMAN. That is correct. They would be effective only to bring him within the definition of the three transactions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened for the last 5 to 10 minutes since I introduced my amendment and all I hear in the debate is the word "two." "Two" seems to be the magic word.

I have talked to Members on both sides of the aisle and somewhat begrudgingly they indicate they have no major objection to it except it is a late time to bring it up. I do not think there is any better time to bring it up than now. I say that we have agreed to the fact that "two" is the magic number. The amendment specifies "no more than two transactions."

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee accept the amendment which I feel clarifies in writing and in the legislation itself the intent of the committee and of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the language that the gentleman tries to bring before us in this amendment is redundant. It merely rewrites in something that is already clear. We have made it specific in that we talk about the "three or more" transactions. Therefore, I see no need for this amendment. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Smith of Virginia moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back

to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the motion, not with the expectation that it will be adopted at this time—although I think it should—but in order to seek to have this matter that we are now discussing clarified. We have gotten into such a confused state here I do not think anyone knows where we are at or what anything means. As someone has suggested before, the committee that drafted this monstrosity does not seem to be able to agree on what it means. I do not wish to discuss it because I do not know enough about it to have any opinion on it. I do not know whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, because people who are supposed to advise us about it do not seem to be able to agree.

I am here simply to try to get the matter clarified, and in the 2 or 3 minutes I have left, I will be glad to yield to anyone who wishes to ask anyone a question. Do not ask me a question because I do not know.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **CRAMER**. This is the question I intended to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he had yielded. We are told that the Mathias amendment that we voted on tentatively yesterday in Committee, regardless of the amendment before us, conforms the bill to some State statutes and their exemptions. I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] or anyone else who wishes to answer the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] included, who State statutes exempt the third sale? What State statutes let you have two dogbites? What State statutes let you say, "The third sale is not exempt"?

There is no such State statute, and how anyone can suggest that this conforms to existing State statutes in those 19 States that have fair housing laws is not telling this House the whole truth. There are no State statutes that are on the basis of a three-transaction approach for exemptions.

Can the gentleman from New Jersey cite me a State statute that has a two-transaction exemption?

Mr. **RODINO**. No, I cannot; but we as a committee of the Congress can write our own definition, and that is what we have before us.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Exactly. So you come to the conclusion that a single homeowner who rents two rooms cannot sell his house because the committee says he is in the real estate business and is in interstate commerce. There is not a single State statute that takes the approach that with three transactions, you are in the business. With the third transaction you are in; with two you are out. I think that is extremely important when you come to preemption. The gentleman from Virginia is an authority on the subject of Federal preemption of State statutes, and he knows as this is drafted that there is no "similar State statute." Therefore, would not all State statutes fail? Would they not? I ask the gentleman as an authority.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I do not know that I am an authority on anything any more, but I agree with the gentleman. It would not.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **RODINO**. I merely wish to reply to the gentleman from Florida. The State of Oregon has a statute which prohibits discrimination by persons engaged in the business of selling, leasing, or renting real property.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Real estate people, period. It does not make a homeowner a realtor.

Mr. **RODINO**. We do not attempt to comport with each and every State statute.

Mr. **CRAMER**. If the gentleman from Virginia will yield further, the Oregon statute also deals only with licensed real estate brokers. The Oregon statute does not try to make a homeowner a real estate man to force him into this nonexemption.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS**. Some of us have been in the practice of law in the years gone by, and we know that from time to time a lawyer finds it necessary to sell property for a client, either in a direct deal with the client or to settle an estate. I would like to know if this bill covers lawyers who, in the general practice of the law, sell real estate.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. To whom are you directing the question? I do not know.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS**. I would like to get an answer from the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I said I did not know, and I am not answering any questions.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **CRAMER**. The gentleman can find the answers on page 62, where we define the persons included. It includes "fiduciaries," which means lawyers.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODINO) there were—ayes 118, noes 127.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. RODINO.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 177.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The vote recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAGGONNER

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAGGONNER: On page 65, line 17, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 404."

On page 66, immediately after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) In any case in which, as a result of subsection (a) of this section, any bank, savings and loan institution, credit union, insurance company, or other person makes a mortgage or other loan of the type referred to in such subsection (a), such mortgage or other loan shall, in case of default by the borrower and after all reasonable efforts to collect have been exhausted, be held and considered to be an obligation of the United States backed by the full faith and credit of the United States."

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes, when the Committee is in order.

The Chair will state to the Members of the Committee of the Whole that the consideration of this matter will be expedited if Members of the Committee will be in order. Those who must converse will please retire. Those Members in the aisle will please clear the aisles and take their seats. The business of the House must proceed in order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], for 5 minutes.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. Section 404 plows new ground.

Mr. Chairman, section 404 of title IV is entitled "Prevention of Discrimination in the Financing of Housing," and it reads as follows:

HOUSING

SEC. 404. It shall be unlawful for any bank, savings and loan institution, credit union, insurance company, or other person that makes mortgage or other loans for the purchase, construction, improvement, or repair or maintenance of dwellings to deny such a loan to a person applying therefor, or discriminate against him in the fixing of the downpayment, interest rate, duration, or other terms or conditions of such a loan, because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such person, or of any member, stockholder, director, officer, or employee of such person, or of the prospective occupants, lessees, or tenants of the dwelling or dwellings in relation to which the application for a loan is made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the practical effect of the language in this section of this legislation is devastating. In effect, what this section of this legislation does is to first give to the Secretary of HUD, then to the Fair Housing Commission to be created by this bill, or to the courts, both State and Federal, the authority upon the receipt of a complaint, or without the receipt of a complaint, if they feel that in their opinion there has been discrimination in the granting of a loan, to require and order, an individual who is a lender, or any lending institution making a loan for the purchase or for the repair or for the rental of housing the power to make them grant such a loan.

Mr. Chairman, we have never gone this far before. We should not do so now. This section 404 actually is far beyond help by amendment, but we have to try. I hope the Moore amendment to strike prevails.

Mr. Chairman, the exemptions about which you have heard so much here this afternoon do not apply to any of these lenders or lending institutions. The bankers do not have the two exemptions about which we have been arguing for 2 hours.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Government has, under the Federal Housing Authority, granted insurance to these institutions or individuals who make voluntary loans for the purchase of housing. The effect of course is where there is default. The lender is insured against loss by the Federal Government.

But here, now, under this new concept of nondiscrimination in financing, we find the executive branch of the Federal Government, through the executive agencies of the Federal Government, with new-found authority which will allow them to make lenders lend money to purchase, rent, repair, or build housing. The enforcers of this legislation will transcend a board of directors for a bank. The enforcers of this legislation will in fact then become the banker. This section does not deal with open occupancy or nondiscrimination in occupancy but in nondiscrimination in financing. There is a great difference.

It simply means this to me, that if the Federal Government in its wisdom can insure voluntary loans on housing purchased, then the Federal Government in its wisdom if they are going to force lenders to make loans they do not want to make under the language of this legislation can do no less than they have done with the FHA and ought to put the faith and full credit of the Federal Government behind such unwarranted action. Simply stated my amendment simply says that where there is default after reasonable efforts to collect a delinquent loan, the Federal Government having forced through one of its agents or some of its agents an individual or an institution to make loans, the Federal Government should insure and reimburse that lender against loss in instances of default.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any of you can argue with that premise. The banker should remain the banker. There is no legitimate place for this Federal board of directors. The emotions of today will not allow for equal treatment. Here, too, preferential treatment will be demanded.

Mr. **WATSON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **WATSON**. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made and for his amendment.

We are interested in equity and we are interested in fairness, and I believe this Committee should adopt the gentleman's amendment. I am disturbed about one thing—it makes too much sense to be adopted in the particular frame of mind that we have had here over the past several hours.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any reasonable man would argue with this amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **WATSON**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WATSON**. Mr. Chairman, with alarming regularity we are witnessing every year another bill allegedly aimed at protecting the rights of all Americans. Under the guise of civil rights Congress appears to be willing to pass a law—any law—to satisfy the demands and appetites of howling mobs and demonstrators who are storming the streets of America.

I have been greatly relieved by a developing tendency on the part of an increasing number of my colleagues to view the bill before us with great alarm.

Nevertheless, I have been alarmed by most arguments advanced this week by my colleagues who are supporters of this bill. They are using the timeworn cliche to defend the measure against efforts to amend it. I have been amazed by their classic retort before we would vote on amendments to delete or modify a particular section of this bill. It goes something like this: "We must retain this provision because it strikes at the heart of the bill, and to knock out the provision would gut the entire bill."

This is illogical reasoning and, it reflects an inability on the part of those making such an argument to really defend the bill. Their arguments should be reversed to point out that if we don't strike at the heart of the bill, this body will go on record as gutting the Constitution.

It was only a matter of time before Congress would be called upon to pass a measure designed to destroy such basic institutions of a free society as property rights and tampering with juries.

With the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I must confess that I was convinced that the Justice Department could not possibly conceive of another measure termed "civil rights" to thrust upon us. But, here we are again during the long hot summer months, considering another civil rights proposal while the great cities of this country are being subjected to militant civil rights groups who have no regard for anyone's rights.

Only recently a leader of one civil rights group scoffed at the 1964 Civil Rights Act by asserting that it was not worth the paper it was written on. In addition, rabble-rousers advocating so-called "black power" have publically stated that the legislation before us today is completely useless.

I submit that now is not the proper time to consider the type of legislation contained in H.R. 14765. With virtual anarchy existing in our cities, it is time for Congress to consider proposals to strengthen our overburdened police departments and to put teeth into our criminal statutes.

It is shocking to me that anyone could believe that this bill will curb violence. In my opinion it will lend support to acts of destruction and racial dissension which is already threatening the social fabric of this Nation.

Who can possibly be so naive as to think that by destroying personal property rights we are going to bring about racial harmony and peace? This is completely fallacious thinking on the part of supporters of this bill. I am, of course, referring to title IV of the bill, which purports that when so-called human rights are in conflict with property rights, human rights are to take precedence.

We have been led to believe by the administration that in our society today a conflict does exist between human rights and property rights. I certainly would not deny that we are all endowed with human rights by heritage and law, but a basic premise of our constitutional system is the right to enjoy and hold property. It is inconceivable to me that we are being forced under this title to bring human rights into conflict with property rights when under our system of government it is possible to enjoy both. If we destroy one we certainly destroy the other, because how can civil rights possibly exist when property rights are dissipated?

This is the salient point of the entire fair housing section of this bill. Everyone has the right to enjoy his property. Property itself contains no rights, but when that property is owned by an individual, his personal or human right is to hold or dispense with the property as he sees fit.

The renowned jurist, Blackstone, once observed in his "Commentaries" that:

> There is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination and engages the affection of mankind, as the right of property; as that sale . . . dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe.

I think we are all aware of the tremendous impact that Blackstone had on the framers of our Constitution, and his views on property are clearly indicated in the third, fourth, and fifth amendments to the Constitution. In addition, the 14th amendment prohibits each State from depriving any person of property without due process of law.

But, now we are faced with a section in this bill that is in direct violation of the very letter and spirit of the Constitution.

Despite the "clarifying vote" to water down this section of the bill to remove 60 percent of the Nation's housing from coverage, the door is now open for future legislation that could include provisions designed to curb an individual's right to own and dispose of his own property.

Just recently the Attorney General implied that a person leasing a room in his home on a month-to-month basis is considered to have made 12 separate transactions during a given year, and consequently he is covered under the forced-housing provisions.

In reality, the Attorney General, or no one else for that matter, is certain just what we can expect if title IV becomes law; but I can tell you this—we are sitting on a powder keg. If we allow the Pandora's box of nebulous definitions of this title to be opened, we can expect the right to hold and enjoy property to be forever destroyed.

There will be no protection for anyone from a flagrant intrusion by the Federal Government into their private homes. It is incomprehensible to me that we stand on the threshold of being completely engulfed by the encircling arm of the Federal Government which would be able to tell us how to dispose of our property. If we allow such a widespread provision as this to escape us and become law, we will have destroyed a basic right of the American people with one swoop of the Damoclean sword.

But, we are not being asked to end at this point. There is no satisfying the executive appetite for more power. To enforce the housing provision, Congress is being called upon to create a Fair Housing Board. As if the American people were not already burdened with Government bureaucracy, along comes another Federal enforcing agency to dictate to them how to dispense with their property. It goes without saying that this will result in increased burdens on the American taxpayer, but the taxpayer will be paying the salaries of bureaucrats who are armed with weapons to destroy his right to hold taxable property.

It would appear that cautious and reasonable men would be satisfied with one unconstitutional provision at a time, but the fair-housing section is not the only title before us that seeks to break down the foundation of our system of government. We are also advised that present methods of jury selection in the various States are offensive to some minority groups.

In our delicate system of federalism, a basic principle underlying the entire structure of Federal-State relationships is the constitutional right of a State to prescribe its system of jury selection. If we pass title II of this bill, we are saying to the States, "We have no faith in you and your present methods of picking a jury. Therefore, the time has come for the Federal Government to dictate binding rules of jury selection for you."

I maintain that this is a valid interpretation of title II. There have been no substantial changes in this title, and as it now stands the Attorney General would be given the power to oversee the various methods of jury selection in all State courts. If our States lose their prerogatives to set forth rules for jury selection, they can just as easily lose their rights to prescribe selection of judges and rules regarding courtroom procedure.

Although titles II and IV of this bill have aroused the most attention, other sections have been proposed in haste and would fail to attain their avowed end without further racial discord. For instance, title III would have the effect of giving anyone the ridiculous right to claim that he was about to be denied some right, and as a result could initiate immediate action for relief. Not only is the wording of this section totally incomprehensible, but the Federal Government would bear the brunt of paying the costs of actions brought into court.

But, this is by no means the end of the arbitrary and capricious rules dictated by this bill. As if the Attorney General's office is not going to be busy enforcing the other sections, under title VI it can also enforce the illegal guidelines for desegregation of public schools handed down last March by the U.S. Office of Education. At a time when local school districts are going under in an attempt to carry out and facilitate the desegregation guidelines, they are to be further harassed by another arm of the Federal Government, the Attorney General's office, in bringing about a so-called racial balance in public schools. Rather than solving problems, this further interference by a Federal agency into the affairs of local school districts will complicate racial strife that already threatens the entire country.

I can only plead with my colleagues to realistically approach this bill in terms of what it will not accomplish rather than the insignificant good that could possibly emanate from it. We are being called upon to create special rights and privileges while at the same time destroying basic rights for all citizens. No right is ever created when another's right is destroyed. I could not in good conscience with an abiding faith in the Constitution vote for this legislation. To do so would be to destroy the confidence that voters have placed in me to uphold and defend that sacred document.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman has some merit. The only quarrel that I would have with the amendment is that it seems to me that the gentleman is trying to clean up a section of this bill, to wit, section 404—which is beyond such an operation. I do not think you can make it acceptable by amendment unless you just strike everything and start over.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you some of the reasons I feel that way.

You will note on line 18 that among the types of institutions referred to are credit unions.

As I understand it, a credit union is a voluntary organization where people are not looked upon as stockholders but as members of an organization or a club.

In my hometown of Gastonia, N.C., we have a credit union known as the Excelsior Credit Union, which is the largest Negro credit union in America. It is operated, controlled—its membership, everything about it—by members of the Negro race. It is one of the things that our community is so proud of, because here is another example among many in my State of the accomplishment by members of a race that some would have you believe have no capacity to make a contribution or to develop any economy on their own.

In North Carolina we have found that this is not true.

We have the North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., which is owned, operated, controlled in every respect by members of the Negro race and which just a few months ago dedicated a new 27-story office building in the city of Durham, N.C., with the Vice President of the United States making the principal speech.

Mr. Chairman, we have in North Carolina the largest transportation company, owned, operated, and managed exclusively by the members of the Negro race.

So I am wondering if the proponents of this legislation are trying to say to the Excelsior Credit Union in Gastonia, N.C., that even though members of the Negro race have established this fine organization that that credit union and the members of it have to make their hard earned money available to some low grade credit risk among the white race. Is that what the proponents are saying? Because if you will look at page 65, line 25, and page 66, line 1, of this bill, after referring to discrimination against a person, it goes on and says: "or of any member, stockholder, director, officer, or employee of such person,".

Now something has been said about careless draftsmanship. What person? An officer or a stockholder? If they mean the savings and loan institutions, why did they not say "institution" instead of "person"? Are they talking about the person who has been discriminated against when they use the word on line 1, page 66, or are they talking about a building and loan institution? As I said on the first day of debate, probably the most inglorious hour of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives was when the committee reported this bill out.

It is so poorly drafted that many who are acting as proponents will tell you privately that they do not know what is in it. They are ashamed of it. I can think of no more classic example of this than section 404. While I admire the purpose and will support the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, I think he is engaging in a vain act when he attempts to make something out of nothing, and that is exactly what he is doing in relation to section 404.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care throughout the debate, which has been extensive and illuminating, and I have heard many efforts directed at obfuscating the facts and the language clearly printed in the text of the legislation. At this moment the pending amendment has nothing to do with the remarks of the very distinguished gentleman who preceded me here in the well. The language in the bill before us is very clear. It says, "You shall not discriminate in the granting of a loan because of race, religion, or national origin." It does not say, "You shall not deny a loan to a deadbeat, to a person who has a history of nonpayment of his obligations." It does not say that. It would be most imprudent and impractical to put the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind the guaranteeing of what could prove the most irresponsible type of loans—and that is precisely the effect of the amendment pending before us.

I know that there are those who in deep dedication oppose this legislation, every word of it, and I respect fully their right to do so. Attack it directly, deal with the facts. But let us not come in here and assume that we are dealing with persons who are naive.

There is nothing in section 404 that would enforce an imprudent loan, and I am not speaking in an area in which I am lacking in knowledge or interest.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I would be most pleased to yield to my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. The gentleman has talked about the extreme cases, and those determinations are easy to make. But who is to make a determination in borderline cases? The gentleman argues there will be such cases. Who is going to say in borderline cases a loan should or should not be made?

Mr. MOSS. The prudent manager, and I do not read anything in this act which would deny him the exercise of logical, reasonable, rational judgment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I am pleased to yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Would the gentleman agree today that the emotions which sweep this country have removed prudence from the actions of the Government in race relations?

Mr. MOSS. No, the gentleman would not agree that prudence has been removed. The gentleman will agree that there are unfortunate and emotional binges going on in this country, and he regrets them as much as any other American. But the gentleman does not believe that we contribute here in the Congress of the United States by attempting to obfuscate and confuse the facts of important legislation aimed at lessening the pressures which have created regrettable conditions in this Nation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to advance a real example and ask the gentleman's views and ask the advice of the committee. In the city of Los Angeles we had some unfortunate racial disturbances in an area known as the Watts area. Before that occurred, various savings and loan associations and banks loaned mortgages in that particular area. After this racial disturbance occurred and a great deal of property—some $30 to $40 million—was burned or damaged in different ways, all of the savings and loan associations and all of the banks drew a line around that district. They call it the curfew district. They are not making any loans in that district to anyone, as far as I know. If they are, it is unknown to me. But I know that is the general policy in that area.

Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this language in section 404 would place the making of loans in that area on an individual basis, if it is an area in which the financial institutions are not making any loans? Would they be forced to make loans to an individual who applies from that area and who might be a colored person?

Mr. MOSS. I cannot speak for the intent of the committee, but I can tell the gentleman how I read this language and how I feel a properly managed institution would apply it. As long as they are refusing in that area the application for loans of white, of colored, of orientals, I do not feel this would in any way impair their right to exercise judgment. I know there are areas in my own district where, because of the fact of future planned developments, no loans are being made of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. But the reason for it is not because of the race of the applicant and the condition described, where a breakdown in effect of law enforcement has made an undue risk, an unreasonable risk, whether it be an applicant of white or black or whatever color, or national origin, or religion. I do not believe the institution would be denied that right of judgment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purely economic impact of the legislation we are considering is a subject that has not been discussed a great deal. I would like to address myself to that narrow question now.

Of the 17 States in our country that have nondiscrimination legislation covering public housing and publicly assisted private housing, 13 of those States cover lending institutions of all kinds. There is absolutely not a shred of evidence on the record that lending institutions in these States have been prejudicing in their lending operations, in the safety and security of their loans. It has not placed the integrity of their loan portfolio in the slightest jeopardy.

Mr. Earl Schwulst, chairman of the Bowery Savings Bank—which has in its portfolio over $3 billion of loans on open occupancy housing projects—has testified time and time again as to the excellence of those loans and as to the positive comparability of those loans to loans on lily-white housing. The vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Frank C. Lowe, has stated publicly that the Met has been lending on a nondiscriminatory basis, and the company operates 150,000 dwelling units in the United States that are operated on a nondiscriminatory basis. He has testified their occupancy is high, their turnover is low, and that the nondiscrimination requirement has no impact whatsoever on the economics of their operation.

The Chase Manhattan Bank did a survey at the end of 1965, in which they queried literally thousands of realtors and appraisers across the country. Eighty-five percent of them said that nondiscrimination legislation has negligible impact on the volume of housing starts.

In New York City and Washington, D.C., where the nondiscrimination legislation now in effect does cover lending institutions, we have seen in recent years since the coverage, the most extraordinary explosion of housing activity.

We have had this legislation in effect in New York State in progressive stages since 1950. During these years of coverage 650,000 housing units have been built to meet the demand of a voracious housing market. We have built $3 billion worth of urban renewal, which has been rented on a nondiscriminatory basis. That housing has met every single test of financial feasibility to the developers, the owners, and the lending institutions, and the Federal Government, acting as insurer.

In Washington, D.C., a decade ago, when the Redevelopment Land Agency was attempting to find developers for the 650-acre tract in southwest Washington, they beat the bushes and could not find a substantial member of the real estate and building fraternity in Washington to develop that land. They had to go to a young inexperienced developer in New York to develop that land. Why? Because the development builders and investors in Washington did not feel there was a market for housing in that location.

There was no nondiscrimination requirement of any kind, Federal, State, or local, in 1955.

Now, a decade later, when the market for housing in southwest Washington has been proved beyond question, and the area has been established, developers by the dozens are competing in a frantic effort to obtain sponsorship of the last 1 or 2 acres. And this in the face of broad nondiscrimination requirements contained in the 1963 ordinance. Why has there been a continuing buildup of interest and competition? Because the market has proved to be sound.

The entire experience, both in building and lending under the prevailing nondiscrimination requirements, virtually all of which are stronger and more comprehensive than the legislation we are considering, proves beyond an iota of doubt where there is a strong market for housing the builders will build, and the lenders will lend, the lessors will lease, and the purchasers will buy, regardless of the presence or absence of nondiscrimination legislation.

The existence or absence of nondiscrimination legislation has no discernible causal impact whatever on the health, vitality, and integrity of the housing market.

In 1960 the FHA did a study of 17 SMSA's—17 standard metropolitan statistical areas—in which they proved that if housing had been sold to Negroes on the same basis as to whites in comparable economic circumstances there would have been in this country in 1960 approximately a market for an additional 230,000 housing units which could have been sold to the nonwhite population.

Today current estimates are that if housing were rented or sold to Negroes on a nondiscriminatory basis there would be an additional annual demand for 500,000 dwelling units in this country for a period of 3 to 5 years, in order to satisfy that demand, so much has the economic capability and effective purchasing power of the growing nonwhite middle class increased.

I suggest to my colleagues in this House if they will take a long, hard look at the lagging sales and rentals in recently completed real estate developments across the country, the evidence will suggest to them that passage of this legislation could well give a stimulus not only to the private construction sector of our economy, but to the rental market as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Scheuer was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion and debate on the question of whether nondiscrimination legislation is good morals, of whether it is good sociology, of whether it is good politics. Those questions each Member will have to answer for himself, for the community he represents, and for his country. But there is one clear issue of fact which I do not think any Member can challenge or question; namely, that nondiscrimination in housing is good business.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that section 404 in no wise requires that a loan be granted. All section 404 states—and it states it rather clearly—is that there be no discrimination in the granting of a loan on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Now, in answer to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], I might say that his colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], stated explicitly and clearly and made it abundantly clear that it was the intention of the committee when it wrote this language to insure that there be no discrimination in the granting of a loan on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. This in no wise, however, precludes a lending institution from inquiring into the responsibility of the individual fiscally. All we say here is that there be no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Could the gentleman speak specifically to the question raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield]? Suppose you have a potential borrower who is fiscally sound and he wants to build in this area which is off limits because the property there has been destroyed. How would this law apply then?

Mr. RODINO. It is still a judgment that the bank must make based on the credit or the financial responsibility of the individual.

Mr. HAYS. But suppose they are not lending to anybody there, but an individual who is fiscally responsible requests a loan?

Mr. RODINO. As long as they are not going to discriminate against him on account of race, color, religion, or national origin there is no question. That is the crux of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But would that savings and loan association or bank be charged with discrimination because they would not go into an area where they felt that the risk was too great? That is the point I want to know about. If they have publicized that they will not loan in an area bounded by such and such streets, north, south, east, and west, would they be forced to make a loan in that area?

Mr. RODINO. I think the gentleman answered the question himself when he asked it, because he said if they would not go into the area because the risk was too great. Does he mean financial risk?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the individual, but the fiscal risk that may be attached because of previous loans.

Mr. RODINO. In my opinion, they do not have to go in.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. I merely rise to say that I was interested in hearing the gentleman from North Carolina take up the battle for this loan company owned by Negroes. Now I will not be surprised to hear him attack title IV on the ground that it discriminates against Negroes who might want to bar whites from moving into Harlem and getting into a slum there.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. As I understand the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], there is nothing intended by the proponents to prevent a lending agency declaring a certain area of a certain city, county, or any other territorial area as an area in which they will not extend credit for housing.

Mr. RODINO. Not on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. WHITENER. So if the X Insurance Company decided that they would not lend money in Washington, D.C., or in a precinct of Washington, D.C., it is not contemplated that this legislation would be brought into play?

Mr. RODINO. Would you be basing this on race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mr. WHITENER. No. Geographical area.

Mr. RODINO. What would be the reason? Just geographical area. I do not know what you mean.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], gave us that example as one. I will say to the gentleman that if we go back a little into history, we had actually to pass a special act here in the Congress to get the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans in rural areas and in small towns because the lending institutions refused to do it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], participated in and was the author of that legislation back in the late 1950's. So lending institutions do make decisions about areas for many reasons. In the case of the veterans we saw that happen, and the Government had to move in to assist in those areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the basic question here is whether or not there is a fiscal feasibility; whether or not the person is financially responsible.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the question of the gentleman from California is concerned, I believe that the gentleman alluded to certain restrictions against investing in certain areas.

I assume that there, too, the question is whether or not it is financially feasible to make a loan, and this is the question that I feel is now pending before us.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the question that we are attempting to get answered is this: Does the gentleman from New Jersey say that it is not the authors' or the proponents of the bill intent to preclude the lending institution from blocking out areas in which they will not do business?

Mr. RODINO. There is no intention to ban discrimination on account of geography.

Mr. WHITENER. And, if the gentleman will yield further, so if an insurance company decided that it would not extend credit in Ward 1 of Hackensack, N.J., that is their business?

Mr. RODINO. So long as there is no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I believe it is common knowledge to everyone present here today that the circumstances which have developed in the Watts section of Los Angeles referred to previously by the gentleman from California [Mr.

HOLIFIELD] have come about because of racial disturbances. Therefore these lending institutions to which he refers have said that because of this racial disturbance and this civil disobedience they will make no more loans there. The risk is too great.

How can it then be said that this does not or would not involve racial discrimination on the part of these lending institutions when they make a firm judgment that because of this racial disturbance they will make no more loans? It is purely a matter of race.

Mr. RODINO. The question, I believe, that the gentleman must answer, is whether this is discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Thus the reason for the loan not having been extended, is because that an individual is of a particular race, a certain color, a certain national origin, or a certain religion.

This is the question before us, and I believe it is simple. But what the gentleman does with his amendment, is to make the United States a guarantor and insurer for all loans made.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RODINO. I yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. What my amendment proposes to do is when ordered to do so, is to let the banker lend the money, and then let the Federal Government insure loans they ordered made which are defaulted on. In borderline cases in just such instances as will be raised because of circumstances similar to "Watts," the Federal agent who enforces this legislation is going to become the banker. The banker must be guided by sound economics and not social desire.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so to ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]. I do not intend to take the entire 5 minutes which have been allotted to me. However, the manner in which this section 404 is drafted disturbs me, particularly in view of the many State statutes on the same subject matter having control over business and the lending of money.

In most instances, those State statutes as to nondiscrimination apply to persons in the business of loaning money. In reading section 404, it says:

> It shall be unlawful for any bank, savings and loan institution, credit union, insurance company, or other person that makes mortgage or other loans—

It does not say he must be in business. It does not say that an individual must be licensed As a precedent I cite to the gentleman the nondiscrimination lending section.

The gentleman cannot listen to me and to his counsel at the same time.

Mr. RODINO. I would say to the gentleman, I am reading the section and I am listening intently to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. The Ohio law provides, for the information also of the gentleman from Ohio, as follows:

> It shall cover an individual, corporation or association of any type that lends money as one of the principal aspects of his business or incidental to his principal business.

Second, Mr. Chairman, for instance in the State of New York it says:

> If the party, the insurance company, mortgage company, institution or lender is doing business in the State—

In other words, the thrust of practically all the State statutes is a prohibition against someone doing business as a lender.

Mr. Chairman, as I read the draftsmanship of the section before us, any single individual does not have to be in the business of making loans. He can be making, as many people do where I come from, loans for mortgage purposes for additional income, second mortgage loans, first mortgage loans—one or two a year. He is not in the business. He is not licensed. But even if he makes a loan as a friend to another friend, he would be covered by the language as written.

Why in the world did not the committee provide that he should be covered if he is in the business of making loans or is licensed to make loans? There should be some restriction; should there not?

Mr. RODINO. I believe that the language is clearly written. I believe if the gentleman wants to understand it he can understand it. I do. The rest of the House does. Those of us who feel that this bill is necessary understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I realize also that the gentleman from time to time has offered what he has considered to be clarifying amendments. We have disagreed and we disagree again.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman disagree with an amendment consistent with the Ohio law that says:

> For a person to be covered, lending institution or individual, that he shall be in the business of making loans.

In the State of Ohio the law says:

> One who lends money as the principal aspect of his business.

Would the gentleman object to such an amendment as that?

Mr. RODINO. I would object to such an amendment because we happen to be writing a law for every State in the Union. We are responsible for the writing of the law. We have written that law. I think it is clearly understood. If the gentleman intends to support it, fine. If he does not intend to support it, why then he makes his position known.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is the responsibility of everybody to try to take as many bugs out of the legislation as we see apparently exist.

If I am expected to go back to my constituents and try to explain to them if this is enacted whether they are covered or not covered or if somebody comes to me and says, "I have a friend who wants me to make a loan to him under the language of this section 404, do I have to observe nondiscrimination," as I would have to read it? It says very clearly a person who makes mortgages or who loans money to any person would be included.

Mr. RODINO. I would like to assure the gentleman if my assurances count for anything, that certainly we do not intend to cover transactions between friends or families.

Mr. CRAMER. Why would you object to clarifying it?

Mr. RODINO. But we cannot write a law that covers everybody.

Mr. CRAMER. I do not wish to cover everybody. I just wish to make sure that we cover only those who are in the business.

Mr. RODINO. There is a definition of the word "person" in section 402 on page 62. If the gentleman will refer to that section.

Mr. CRAMER. That is some definition. Let me read it.

> "Person" includes one or more individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint-stock companies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and fiduciaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAGGONNER) there were—ayes 105, noes 85.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RODINO and Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 145, noes 107.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the motion was made, the Chair observed standing the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

The Chair will recognize the Members listed for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to state to the gentleman that it is not in order at this time. There has been no change in the bill since the last such motion was offered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Virginia yielded his time to Mr. WAGGONNER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief statement and then ask the members of the committee if they disagree with me.

There are certain savings and loan organizations in California which I personally know have a policy against making loans to the Negro race. They have various reasons. They are not familiar with the appraisal problem down in the Watts area or with the collection problem. They are able to place their money in the area in which they prefer to loan, the $24,000 or $30,000 homes.

As I read this language, if they have that policy, which is established by the board of directors and the management, if in the future a member of the Negro race were to go to one of these associations and they were simply to say, "Our policy is not to take your application or not to make a loan to you," they would be in violation of this section.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If it were denied on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, the answer would be "Yes."

Mr. SMITH of California. Then by this section those who have been in business for many years and have built it up—because we now pass a law—would thus be placed under the penalties of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point up one thing which has not been mentioned, which I believe is highly significant.

As most of the Members know, depending upon the charter organization of a financial institution, the board of directors really are "custodians of the private funds of the investor." They are custodians.

If a savings and loan or a financial institution approved a sizable number of so-called borderline loans under the provisions of this bill, using it in reverse, would they then discard whatever responsibility they have for their judgment, in the event that such loans were defaulted? May they hide behind this section of the bill in order to justify such bad judgment?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman that this section does not in any manner attack the judgment and responsibility of the person making the loan, unless it involves discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. COLLIER. On the gentleman's time, may I say, I could not disagree with you more.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, first let us get the perspective in the right position.

This section says that they shall not deny a loan or discriminate because of race, color, religion, or national origin. That is the only thing it does.

Having announced that as a policy, there is nothing in here that would require anybody to make any loan, nor can the Federal Government itself come in to make them make a loan.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana is completely off base, because there is no provision here that would make anybody make any loan under any circumstances. Why should they do a useless act of trying to make us guarantee? It is that simple.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS yielded his time to Mr. WAGGONNER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the annual administration so-called civil rights bill is before us and we are implored by its advocates to adopt its provisions as submitted lest further damaging riots ensue as a result of any indication of inaction or other alleged lack of concern on the part of Members of this House.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, resent being blackmailed in this fashion, or otherwise stampeded, into voting for any legislation—including this particular measure.

Until legislative due process becomes an outworn, obsolescent concept, I want to debate bills on their merits—without regard to the pressures or threats which may emanate from any quarter.

If this House be the last bulwark of the rule of law in our land, I suggest that we play our constitutional and parliamentary role—for the very freedom of ourselves and of our countrymen may be at stake. Only through objective and temperate consideration of the legal ramifications of our proposed actions will we succeed in forging laws which contribute to the greatness of our Nation and the benefit of the individual citizen.

Mr. Chairman, despite the remarks which were attributed to you early this week, no group or political party has exceeded the Republican Party in its vital, abiding concern for the basic human rights of all of our citizens.

The Republican Party was founded out of concern for the rights of a minority group. Its history is a symphony of efforts to preserve and strengthen human rights. Our fundamental appeal today is our concern for the legitimate interests of the individual in an age when his identity is being blurred in a complex society.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the overwhelming majority of my Republican colleagues are not prepared to forsake their bedrock principles. Consistent with our basic philosophy, we do not now propose to abrogate legitimate individual human rights in a misguided attempt to garner the votes of a minority group, or to cow to threats of violence.

Outside the pale of political philosophy, simple logic dictates that we cannot strengthen the rights of any minority group by curtailing the rights of all citizens.

These and other considerations, Mr. Chairman, form the basis for the controversy now swirling about the provisions of title IV of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Most other sections of the bill, although poorly drafted, are almost universally accepted as reasonable and necessary. Title I would modify the Federal jury selection system—a welcome reform. Title II covers the selection of jurors at the State level—needed in some places without harm to others. Title III restates certain powers previously granted to the Attorney General in the area of the enforcement of constitutional rights. Title V would strengthen Federal authority in dealing with crimes against persons engaged in lawful civil rights activities—also a desirable improvement.

Title IV, however, is an entirely different matter. It would place the Federal Government in the position of policing and regulating the sale or rental of private homes. Thus, the basic right of all citizens to dispose of real property in any manner they may see fit would be annulled.

Impinging on the private rights of all citizens is not the way to strengthen the civil rights of minority groups.

In previous civil rights laws, we have sought to guarantee equal public education for all, equal voting rights for all, equal access to public accommodations for all, among others. In achieving these worthy goals, each of which I supported, I believe we gave dramatic implementation to individual public rights without compromising the inalienable private rights of all citizens. Adoption of title IV would move us from the lofty realm of guaranteeing public rights into the dangerous quicksands of restricting private rights.

An important objection to title IV is its curtailment of the right of contract. The basic requirement for a legal contract is mutual agreement—voluntarily reached without undue strictures. "Freedom to buy" cannot exist without "freedom to sell."

Title IV would seriously circumscribe the fundamental private right of the seller to enter into a contract for the sale or rental of his property. The time limitation provision, far from being an ameliorating feature, would cast a 6-month cloud over many sales and rentals which would bring chaos to the real estate market.

A monster Federal bureacracy would be required to enforce title IV—thus flying in the face of our efforts in previous civil rights bills to encourage State and local leadership in the attainment of civil rights objectives. Of course, no law should be enacted if it is not to be enforced.

The Mathias amendment adopted yesterday, Mr. Chairman, simply and in effect permits some realtors, but not all, to discriminate on behalf of their seller clients. If the seller is exempt—permitted to discriminate—the realtor can discriminate without penalty—if the seller, but not the realtor, suggests it.

I believe that the Mathias amendment—which failed by both voice and standing votes before passing by one vote in a count by tellers—is a cheap political compromise which plays both ends against the middle—an attempt to convey an impression of "rightness" by seeking to strike a balance between two wrongs. Many of the moderate Negro leaders, including Mr. Roy Wilkins, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, strenuously opposed the Mathias amendment. Realtors opposed the amendment for three reasons: Frst, it was wrong; second, probably unconstitutional; and third, its only objective was to make a bad title IV palatable to more Members.

Proponents claim that title IV permits "a little discrimination." This is a misrepresentation because title IV, especially since being amended by the Mathias amendment, permits more discrimination in housing than it prohibits. Less than 40 percent of the 60 million housing units in the United States would be affected; at least 60 percent would be exempted.

Of course, even "a little discrimination" is just as morally wrong and reprehensible as much discrimination. I wish someone would explain to me how those who favored the Mathias amendment, or support title IV, are less bigoted than those who opposed the Mathias amendment, or who question title IV.

I am convinced that even the present Supreme Court—which we may be sure will search out every possible precedent to uphold this Civil Rights Act of 1966—cannot hold title IV to be constitutional—although some members of the Court disclosed their prejudgment of the open housing section by publicly applauding the reference to it in the 1966 state of the Union address by the President.

Title IV is contradictory to the title of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 itself. Title IV permits discrimination; yet, the first sentence of the bill reads:

> It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion.

Even a Supreme Court that is famous for 5-to-4 decisions could not with good grace hold that: "If you discriminate three times you are right, but if you discriminate four times you are wrong."

The right of private property is a natural, inherent right. This right antedates our Constitutions; in fact, it predates all written constitutions. It is only guaranteed by written constitutions, not endowed by them. It should not be abrogated under the transparent guise of trying to eliminate racial or religious discrimination. To adopt title IV would be to open a Pandora's box of problems and create more social discord without realizing appreciable social benefits.

However, if we in Congress had intended to retain title IV in this so-called civil rights bill, and if we are sincerely opposed to hypocrisy and demagoguery, we should have been forthright enough to vote for the MacGregor amendment which would have precluded all discrimination on account of race, color, or religion in the housing field. The MacGregor amendment, the true test of those who want to eliminate discrimination in housing, failed—and failed decisively—with administration House leaders in the vanguard of the opponents.

Mr. Chairman, it seems evident that title IV of this bill—both in its original and amended forms—was not carefully drawn. I suggest that its authors were thinking more in terms of winning future elections than in the betterment of future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time and the time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] be allotted to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] of the committee. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] has previously stated that this is a very simple matter and then has gone on with rambling language to invoke the fifth amendment and add further confusion without giving any specific answers to the questions which have been asked of him. It is impossible to get a direct answer from him. Would the gentleman tell me, with a yes or no answer, whether or not a lending institution that is asked to make a housing loan in a racially changing neighborhood wherein they have already made a sound financial judgment in view of past history that this neighborhood, changing by race, is going to reduce property values and says no with a pointed statement that, "We are not going to make this loan because it is for housing in a racially changing neighborhood, changing from white to Negro, and we believe from past experience that property values will decrease"—will they have discriminated because of race? I only want one single yes or no answer. Is this discrimination under the language of this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, first of all, the question is: Have you quit beating your wife?

Mr. WAGGONNER. When did you start?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. You go around in a circle and then accuse me of running around the clock. First of all, I point out to you——

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would this be racial discrimination? Yes or no?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is a matter that must be determined.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Who is going to make that determination? What factors will influence the determination?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That becomes the duty and responsibility of the loaning agency, for them to determine whether or not in their judgment this is a good loan once they exercise their judgment and if in that neighborhood they should loan to an individual who happens to be white and deny it to one who happens to be black, then they are in violation of this section.

There is nothing here—and I want to point this out to you and the fallacy of your amendment—there is nothing here that would require you or the agency or anybody else that is loaning the money, to make any loan of any nature. The only thing it says is, whenever you do make a loan, do not discriminate against those whom you loan it to on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Will the gentleman please, and I know it is hard, try to answer my question yes or no as to whether or not the case I have cited constitutes discrimination? I know it is hard for him to answer specifically. He never does.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The only way I can answer you is, "Maybe."

Mr. WAGGONNER. All right. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, you do not want an answer.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse for the moment to yield further because the gentleman has, with his answer, "Maybe" admitted that this might constitute racial discrimination. Therefore, the executive branch of the Government can and does come in, he believes legally, and review this and make a determination and possibly force these people to make a loan.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WAGGONNER. So, with his "dodging" answer, the gentleman has admitted that it would be racial discrimination. He has opened the door for the Government to barge in.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Where in this section is there any authorization to compel anyone to loan anything to anybody?

Now, the gentleman from Louisiana just read this section which the gentleman is attempting to amend.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I have read it over and over again, perhaps more times than has the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman may have, but if the gentleman will read it again the gentleman will not find that any one from the Government or any other place can compel any association or any lending agency to make any kind of loan.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Unless racial discrimination is involved in the opinion of the Government as in the case which I cited as an example, and to which the gentleman replied "Maybe."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. All right. If there is racial discrimination that does not compel them to make the loan, and the gentleman's amendment goes ahead to say——

Mr. WAGGONNER. Oh, the gentleman is contradicting himself. The section specifically say that it shall be unlawful not to make a loan where there is discrimination, so in effect, they must make the loan.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Where in this section does it say that?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Read section 404.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It does not compel them to make the loan.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Why, certainly it does; because it says it shall be unlawful to deny such a loan. Therefore, they must or suffer the consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call particular attention to those of my colleagues who feel that this is not an effective bill, and to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], who told us very candidly that lending institutions in the State of California practice racial discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would stop that practice. This would mean that a man could walk into a bank and establish his credit without carrying an undue burden because of the color of his skin.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is highly important that we pass such a law.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this is an effective bill, and that this is precisely why we ought to pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] to close the debate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The case has been stated. The section does just what it says it does, and that is not to require a lending institution to make any specific loan, but to prohibit a lending institution from denying a person a loan on account of his race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Waggonner and Mr. Rodino.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 89, noes 155.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee resumes consideration of the bill H.R. 14765 after it rises tonight, that the first order of business shall be a vote on the Moore amendment to strike out title IV, and that in the event that amendment is defeated, the Committee shall then continue the consideration of title IV for amendments.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader two questions:

First, if the unanimous-consent request is approved, how long would we continue tonight in the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, one of the reasons for making the request is to try to expedite consideration of the business this evening. I understand that there are two amendments at the desk, and at least two Members hope to make 5-minute speeches on the Moore amendment. I would hope we might finish by 6:30 this evening. Members understand that if the Moore amendment is defeated, we will resume consideration of title IV, including the offering of amendments and debate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. What I would like to know is when we might expect to adjourn tomorrow. We have been patient. We have been a couple of weeks on this bill. A lot of us have commitments for Saturday. With the airline strike still on and train reservations almost impossible to get, I think it would be helpful if the Membership could know what we could plan on.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the leadership cannot answer that question or the leadership would be putting itself in the position, I will say to my friend, of trying to impose advance limitations on debate. We have tried to be liberal and considerate with respect to Members who have amendments to offer. If the gentleman would yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, I am sure he would say we hope to expedite consideration of this matter. We hope to finish it tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think it would be at all unreasonable to suggest that if we obviously could not conclude consideration of the bill by 4 or 4:30 tomorrow afternoon, with the situation being what it is, we might know then that the bill would go over to Monday. I do not believe that is an unreasonable request.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to take these matters one step at a time. I am not in a position to make a request that we rise at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon at this time. I do want to proceed to the conclusion of this matter, and to do so in a manner that would be convenient to all the Members of the House if at all possible. If we could come in early, we might have an opportunity to adjourn early.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of my friend from Indiana, I hope the membership of the House will realize that the leadership on the Democratic side has been very understanding, and I am sure that my friend from Indiana realizes the difficulty of putting oneself into a frozen position by answering questions of the kind he has addressed. But I would think that the gentleman from Indiana, knowing the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] and myself would have confidence in our understanding judgment.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if by chance there could be a slight change made in the unanimous-consent request that he has asked, that is, to permit, we will say, a total of 20 minutes debate on the Moore amendment, 10 minutes on each side before the vote is put tomorrow at the opening of the Committee of the Whole House?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to accept that amendment. That would mean we would vote within 20 minutes after we go into the Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. With 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should understand that the time will be controlled equally by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] and by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request as modified?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I yield to my friend from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that the Committee will operate until 6:20 this evening and that we will recess then until tomorrow when the first order of business will be what?

Mr. ALBERT. There will be 20 minutes of debate and then the vote.

Mr. RODINO. Half to be controlled by this side and half to be controlled by the other side?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask this question, if it be proper—and I intend to be properly respectful—is there an intention to ask a unanimous-consent request to convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. ALBERT. I should like to make that request, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am very pleased.

Mr. ALBERT. That is within control of the entire assembly.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I understand that that request will be made. I hope it will be granted. Some of us are very tired, Mr. Chairman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, in the allotment of 20 minutes tomorrow, will the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Ohio fix this time, so that it will be 10 minutes granted to those for, and 10 minutes granted to those against? That has not been done.

Mr. RODINO. I have 10 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has 10 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Will this time be allotted 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I have 10 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] will have 10 minutes. I do not know how it will be disposed of.

Mr. ARENDS. That is the point.

Mr. RODINO. I will allot 5 minutes of my 10 minutes to whomever wishes to speak in opposition.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, it will be my purpose—and it has always been my practice—to allot time in a fair and just and equitable manner. That I shall do.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire as a matter of slight interest, as of the time we vote on the motion to strike, what assurance would the mover get that he can be heard on his amendment? If the gentleman from New Jersey will permit me to share his time, I would be appreciative.

Mr. RODINO. I have already explained that I will give 5 minutes of the time allotted me to an opponent on this side.

Mr. MOORE. May I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio what I may expect on this side?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia can expect the same just and equitable treatment from this side.

Mr. MOORE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I feel no reasonable assurance that all the equities which may prevail will give me an opportunity to speak.

Again, with the understanding that what the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, proposes, is involved, could we extend this for more than 20 minutes, and ask for a half hour?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If it were not for the fact that I have implicit faith in the fairness of the gentleman from Ohio and of the gentleman from New Jersey I would name four individuals and include the gentleman from West Virginia among those who would have time. They have given assurances. The gentleman knows that their assurances are their bond.

Mr. MOORE. May I say I appreciate very much the observation of the majority leader. I am, pretty soon, going to have the record for having the longest pending amendment in the Committee of the Whole, so I am not interested in extending this. We have sat here listening to those amendments which have been proposed, perfecting in nature, so as apparently to qualify. I believe it is fair for all the Members to see how much interest I have in my pending amendment. I have not clouded the debate at all. I have let it go on. I would certainly like to be heard.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman believe we should have 30 minutes of debate?

Mr. MOORE. I should like to have 30 minutes, with some assurance that we would be heard.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman want that?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my request to provide that 30 minutes of debate shall be in order tomorrow prior to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished majority leader: why do we not work for 40 minutes, and close out debate, and take the teller vote and quit for the day? Why put the vote over until tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I will let the distinguished minority leader answer the question. I believe it was his suggestion that we vote tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It was the strong feeling of a number of people on our side that we ought to vote on the Moore motion to strike tomorrow, and that we ought to conclude all business up to that point. Then, after the motion to strike is voted on, if it loses, we can continue and conclude the consideration of title IV tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know why we should not vote tonight.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, is my understanding correct that the unanimous consent request propounded by the distinguished majority leader would preclude a quorum call prior to the first order of business and the 30 minutes before the vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will reply to the gentleman that if there is no quorum present any Member at any time can make a point of order. In other words, it will not preclude a quorum call.

Mr. HALL. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Would that time come out of the 30 minutes allotted for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, for a further parliamentary inquiry, may we determine what further perfecting amendments there are to the Moore amendment at the clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will tell the gentleman from Missouri that there are no perfecting amendments to the Moore amendment. There are two perfecting amendments at the desk that are to the title.

Mr. HALL. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

In the event there are further perfecting amendments submitted during the debate tomorrow on the Moore amendment, what would be the parliamentary situation at that time as far as a limitation of debate is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. The best way the Chair can explain the situation to the gentleman from Missouri is to say that in the event the Moore amendment is defeated title IV will still be open to perfecting and other amendments.

Mr. HALL. I understand this thoroughly, Mr. Chairman, but the Chair repeatedly ruled in the last 2 weeks of debate, if you will recall, that perfecting amendments must be heard to the Moore amendment before you called for a vote and then thereafter there will be additional votes on title IV. This was thoroughly understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must have misheard the Chair, because there have been and there are and there could be no perfecting amendments to the Moore motion to strike. The perfecting amendments are to the title, and the title must be perfected prior to a vote on the Moore amendment unless this unanimous consent agreement is entered into. This is merely a method of disposing of the motion to strike.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could we have the unanimous consent request restated?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be restated.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. The unanimous-consent request is that when the Committee resumes consideration of the bill, H.R. 14765, after the recess tonight the first order of business shall be after 30 minutes of debate a vote on the Moore amendment to strike out title IV and, in the event that amendment is defeated, the Committee shall then continue the consideration of title IV.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Do I understand that the gentleman dropped that portion in which he provided for a division of time equally between the proponents and opponents?

Mr. **ALBERT**. No. That is included. Fifteen minutes shall be under the control of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and 15 minutes under the control of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH]. I think it is well understood that they will yield the time to both proponents and opponents of the Moore amendment.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. By gentleman's agreement?

Mr. **ALBERT**. Yes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAGGONNER

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WAGGONNER: On page 61, line 22, after "discrimination" insert the following: "except by individual homeowners."

Mr. **FUQUA**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **FUQUA**. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the debate we are engaged in today is basic to the future of this Nation. I speak in behalf of the Moore amendment to strike out title IV of this proposed bill as an unwarranted and dangerous infringement on the rights of all Americans—without regard to their race, color, creed, or national origin.

It seems to me that it is a basic premise of the system of government that we enjoy, that a man has the right to enjoy private property. Under dictatorial or communistic rule, the state owns private property, and dictates its disposal.

I want to point out in the strongest possible terms that the Supreme Court of the United States in Shelley against Kraemer—1948—rendered racially restrictive covenants unenforcible. This made it impossible to prevent by state action or private contract, a property owner from selling or renting to anyone he wished.

In our free society, I think that we should retain this freedom. While this decision of the Court made it impossible to enforce restrictions which disallowed the sale of private property or its rental by racially restrictive covenants, this proposed law would force property owners under certain conditions to sell their property to persons they personally found objectionable.

Just as those who wish to have freedom of religion, must give to another the basic right not to have any religion at all, so must we allow a person to dispose of his property as he sees fit.

Such actions may be unreasonable, arbitrary, and even unjust at times, but an infringement of this freedom, will be a loss of basic freedoms for all.

Passage of this bill will not eliminate the slums. Some feel that passage of this measure will in some way provide a magical avenue to better living conditions. The truth is that better living conditions come with increased incomes.

We are all somewhat restricted in the home that we can buy by our income level.

This bill provides a restriction on a person who owns private property from disposing of that property as he sees fit. It seems to me the fifth amendment is applicable, in that a person cannot be denied his right of liberty and property without due process of law.

We are creating a new and overlapping board to enforce this section. We simply cannot give a so-called right to one, without taking away a right from another.

This title takes away basic rights. Its passage will react in having taken from the American people a basic and sacred right.

Government control, Federal intervention, new boards, new laws, will not solve all of the problems that face this Nation.

This bill with this section constitutes a basic and flagrant violation of the right of private ownership as I understand it. I believe that its passage will not be a forward step for this Nation, but a very decided step backwards.

I urge that this amendment, which would strike title IV from this bill, be adopted.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Chairman, we have come to the end of another long day in the debate on this civil rights bill of 1966. Few debates have ever lasted this long in the House. I think after many arduous days there is something that needs to be said here and now. I simply want to say to the Members of the House that I, as one Member of this House, feel that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has done a magnificent job in chairing this debate. No matter what your opinion might be as to the merits of the legislation, certainly we can all agree that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has been eminently fair and totally proficient in every instance. For this I am appreciative. I am sure the entire House is.

Mr. Chairman, section 401 of title IV is the policy section and reads:

> SEC. 401. It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

My amendment would make a simple change in that policy and as amended it would read as follows:

> It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination except by individual home owners on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this simple change simply makes the policy of title IV, as stated, conform to the language of the title itself, because this House in adopting the weakened, watered-down Mathias amendment in an effort to pass some sort of bill has provided exactly for that discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that we should be honest with ourselves and make the policy language conform with the actual language of the title itself, and that we should say as a matter of policy, as we say in the language of the title itself, we will allow discrimination by the homeowner himself. If you are sincere about the exemptions of the Mathias amendment you will adopt this amendment.

Mr. **LATTA**. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported every civil rights bill to become law since I have been privileged to be a Member of this great body. I believe deeply that the legislation for which I voted was necessary to make certain that all of our citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin, were properly accorded their constitutional rights. It was my hope that this Congress would consider additional civil rights legislation in these or other areas necessary to further protect the constitutional rights of our Negroes and other minority groups. The thought never crossed by mind, Mr. Chairman, that during the process of protecting the rights of our minorities, this Congress would ever seriously consider taking basic constitutional rights away from all people in the name of civil rights. Yet, Mr. Chairman, this is precisely what the housing title of this bill is proposing to do. For this reason I will be compelled to vote against this entire bill if title IV is not stricken or drastically amended.

I have wondered more than once during this debate if we really knew we were about to destroy one of our basic freedoms, cherished by all Americans for so long—the right to own, enjoy and dispose of private property. Yet, this question is being considered by this House and referred to by the press as another civil rights bill. This is not just another civil rights bill, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is past time that we stop considering it as such. This bill takes private property rights—which antedate the Constitution itself—away from all Americans.

One of our foremost legal texts, "Corpus Juris Secundum," sums up this right in volume 16, pages 606–607, when it says:

> The right of private property is a natural, inherent and inalienable right.

To further protect this right, we have written a guarantee into our Constitution. This is the same Constitution, incidentally, which every Member of this House swore to uphold and support when he took his oath of office. Yet, this bill proposes to limit and abridge this right by Government edict.

As this bill now reads, as amended yesterday:

> It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

This policy will apply to the sale or rental of private housing with but few exceptions: First, a person selling his own home without the assistance of a real estate agent would be included. However, if he has within the preceding 12 months participated as either principal or agent in more than two transactions involving sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest therein, he would be included. Second, this same person could be excluded from the provisions of this bill and have a real estate broker, agent or salesman also excluded from the provisions of this bill providing he gives express written instruction that he wishes to discriminate and provided such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman or any employee or agent thereof.

Now, let us examine these so-called exemptions and see how meaningful they really are. First of all, practically all people selling real estate today must some time during the course of selling the same enlist the services of a real estate office. Therefore, the outright exemption provided the individual selling his own home—providing he has not participated in more than two real estate transactions during the preceding 12 months—is for all practical purposes meaningless.

Before going on to a less meaningful exemption designed to include real estate agents, let me pause to say that the "two transactions a year exemption" to which I have just referred completely lays waste to any argument that there is a matter of "morals" involved in this bill. Certainly, if there is a moral obligation for a person to sell or to rent his property to anyone, there cannot be any exemption whatsoever. If I believed, which I do not, that there was a moral issue involved here, I could not possibly approve of a person's sinning even once, let alone twice in the preceding 12 months.

Now, let us turn our attention to the so-called clarifying amendment dealing with real estate agents which was adopted on yesterday. Many Members really thought they were voting for a meaningful amendment. Actually, it was a meaningless thing that neither helped nor hindered the bill's effectiveness.

The author of the amendment—my good friend from Maryland—stated honestly in presenting it to the House—"it merely restates what has already been stated." I refer to the gentleman's remarks which appear on page 18115 of the Record. He further honestly stated "the amendment neither strengthens nor weakens the bill." Two things, however, did become abundantly clear in the colloquy between the author of the amendment and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer]. No. 1, it places a duty on the property owner—a person not usually schooled in the law and not familiar with his rights—to perform an act that he doesn't know he must perform. The property owner must give written instructions to the real estate agent to discriminate in the sale or rental of his property for the exclusion to be operative. No. 2, the real estate agent could not encourage, solicit, induce, or even "suggest" to the homeowner that he has the right to discriminate. The colloquy covering these two points appears on pages 18121–18122 of the Record.

So, what do we have in the way of exemptions when all is said and done—nothing of any consequence. However, the consequences of the actions of this House will be the start of the eroding away of private property rights long enjoyed and cherished by a free people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, how many amendments are pending at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are three pending amendments. The Chair understands from inquiry that each of the Members offering the amendments is content for the amendment to be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. After the vote on the Moore amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the Chair state what the pending amendment is?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. HALL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman object to 10 minutes? I was going to move to rise at 6:20, but I do not want to cut off the time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude at 6:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that some time during action on this bill I would be able to agree with the gentleman from Louisiana, and I am pleased to say that that time is now. I share his view of the conduct of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

I am vigorously opposed to his amendment. I think it is perfectly clear that it is the purpose of this bill to end discrimination in housing. We do not legislate as to individual homeowners, but we legislate as to transactions. We are attempting to tear down the artificial barriers that have been impeding the free flow of commerce in housing. We have already done this in a number of areas. Over 100 years ago we said one could not buy and sell people any more. Two years ago we said one could not discriminate in the sale of meals in public restaurants and in many other things. Now we are saying, "If you are in the business of selling real estate, you are under the same proscription as the other businessmen in the community."

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I think the offering of this amendment and debate on it clearly shows one simple thing. All the statements we have heard want to exempt the homeowner. Here is an opportunity to do so with very clear and simple language: "It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination except by the individual homeowner on account of race or color."

It is quite obvious that there is no intention to exempt the homeowner. If there were the intention to exempt him, why would not they accept the amendment? Is or is not the homeowner exempt? I say he is not, if you oppose this amendment. If you mean what you say, go ahead and adopt the amendment. If you do not mean what you say, vote against the amendment. If you want the homeowner in, vote against this amendment. It is very simple.

Let me say to you that as this bill is drafted, if an owner sells other property or rents even his own rooms in his own home and then decides to sell it, the homeowner is in because there have been more than two transactions.

They want the homeowner in. They do not want the homeowner exempted. That is the coloration of this whole approach to this bill—to make it appear there are exemptions on the one hand, to give exemptions, but to take away on the other. The simple thing is, if you want the homeowner out, say so. That is what the amendment does. I believe this is quite obvious.

Someone just asked me, "I am a lawyer, I have a client. He has property he wants to sell or rent. I have two or three clients. I am in a partnership. This bill says no person shall discriminate except for two sales. I represent those clients, and I sell or rent the property in their behalf. The third time I engage in such a transaction, if I want to sell my own home, I cannot do it. I cannot sell my own home after representing those clients in two instances."

There is not any question about that, because the definition of a person on page 62, lines 3 and 4, includes "one or more individuals, corporations, partnerships," so there is not any question.

If you want to clarify it, this is the way to do it.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana has served not one, but two useful purposes in offering the amendment. First, he has given all of us an opportunity to compliment the Chairman.

Second, he has also brought into clear focus the exact nature of the policy behind the exemptions that have been recommended by the Judiciary Committee. The exemptions are clearly to remove coverage of the individual, casual transactions, which will tend to have lesser impact upon the national housing market than frequent and repetitive commercial transactions, which may have a greater impact on the national housing market.

This is, as I have said before, analogous to our exemptions under the wage-and-hour laws, where we establish a national standard and apply it to the larger interstate businesses which do a million dollars or more gross a year, which have a greater impact on the national economy, but we leave out the intrastate businesses which do less than a million dollars, and which have a lesser impact on the national economy.

In exempting the casual, individual sales, we are in 99$\frac{99}{100}$ percent of the cases going to exempt the individual American homeowner. We are, furthermore, under the four-apartment exemption, the so-called four-plex exemption, going to give an absolute exemption to the homeowner who occupies his home and who rents out dwelling space. I believe that, therefore, what the gentleman has done is to give us an opportunity to discuss what these exemptions are and what they mean. Having performed that useful function, I hope his amendment will now be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] to close the debate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hate to trespass on the gentleman's time, for I had intended to do this at the end of the debate. But since the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has brought up the subject, I desire also to comment upon the outstanding job which the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has done.

The gentleman has presided over this historic debate, one of the longest in the history of the House, with firmness, fairness, and extraordinary competence. The gentleman is a fine presiding officer and has performed outstanding service for the Committee and the House during this debate. I know I speak for all Members when I say we are grateful to him and everyone of us joins in congratulating him.

I want also to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] who has had to take over in the middle of the debate and has done an outstanding job. I cannot say that, without saying also that we all regret that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. Celler], whose name is probably on more important civil rights acts than that of any other individual in the history of the country, was not able to continue with the management of this bill.

We wish him Godspeed and full recovery. Our great dean is a bulwark of strength among us. We love him and we miss him.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I merely wish to say that I, and I believe all on our side, share the feelings expressed in the comments made concerning the gentleman from Missouri, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

We certainly wish the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, the very best in a quick and full recovery.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I too join in the sentiments expressed about the manner in which the distinguished Member who is now chairing these deliberations has presided over this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment which has been presented. I believe the gentleman from Florida should know that the amendment, if it were to be adopted, would of necessity require including other exemptions. The policy which is stated here in section 401 is a declaration which covers a broad area. We do not go into exceptions.

There are exceptions as to religious institutions, fraternal organizations, individual homeowners and others. The individual homeowner is exempted, as we provide in this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I did not mention the name of my good friend, Bill McCulloch, who is not sick, thank God. He has not had to take over, but he has managed the other side of this bill with his usual competence and fairness.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Since this debate has taken the form of a series of testimonials to the gentleman from Missouri, and since we have a number of key votes coming up again, which might result in ties, does this mean that the gentleman from Missouri might break a tie in a different fashion the next time around?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will always try to assume his responsibilities.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

CONGRESS MUST DECIDE WHO FIXES INTEREST RATES AND WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE LOW OR HIGH

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has always been the low-interest party. On the other hand, the Republican Party has alway been the high-interest party.

We are now suffering from high interest caused by 8 years of Republican rule from 1953 to 1961, which was the first administration in the history of our Nation to advise the Federal Reserve Board that it was independent of the Government and the Board could fix interest rates at any level it desired.

If the Board had given up its claimed independence at the end of 8 years, it would not have been near so bad, but the Board has adamantly kept this power that was temporarily given it by the Eisenhower administration. Furthermore, the Board even defied the President of the United States in his efforts to keep them from raising interest rates 37½ percent in December, 1965. Eventually, if the increase in interest is not stopped the Federal Government will not have enough money for anything after paying interest on national debt and for national defense.

The President is elected by the people—all the people in the 50 States; the Federal Reserve Board is composed of unelected officials of the Federal Reserve Board appointed for 14-year terms and cannot be reappointed. If the Federal Reserve Board makes a terrible mistake and it costs the people billions of dollars a year, there is not anything—according to the Board's view—that the President can do about it or that the people can do about it. In other words, they cannot be punished in any way or even reprimanded for the great harm they have inflicted upon the people.

On the other hand, if the Constitution of the United States prevails, elected officials of our country are responsible. If a Member of Congress tried to do what the Federal Reserve Board does—which is so harmful to the country—the Member of Congress would be accountable to the people who elected him.

In other words, we have unelected people running our country; that is one of the most important parts—the part that determines whether interest rates are low or high and the part that determines whether money is plentiful or scarce, both of which determine whether our country is prosperous or in a depressed condition.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—THE LOW INTEREST PARTY

Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest heritages of the Democratic Party is its long and consistent record of support for low interest rates.

Through the years, the Democratic Party has represented the views of the great majority of the American people on this issue. Our party has represented the people and has not accepted the special pleadings of the handful of big banks which seek to control all monetary policy.

The Democratic Party, time and again, has reiterated its support of low interest rates.

The platforms adopted at the national conventions of the Democratic Party in 1960 and 1964 plainly spell out the Democrats' steadfast opposition to high interest rates and tight money. I place the platform planks relating to this question in the RECORD:

EXCERPT FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1960

SECTION III—AN END TO TIGHT MONEY

As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight-money policy.

This policy has failed in its stated purpose—to keep prices down. It has given us two recessions within 5 years, bankrupted many of our farmers, produced a record number of business failures, and added billions of dollars in unnecessary higher interest charges to government budgets and the cost of living.

A new Democratic administration will reject this philosophy of economic slowdown. We are committed to maximum employment, at decent wages and with fair profits, in a far more productive, expanding economy.

The Republican high-interest policy has extracted a costly toll from every American who has financed a home, an automobile, a refrigerator, or a television set.

It has foisted added burdens on taxpayers of State and local governments which must borrow for schools and other public services.

It has added to the cost of many goods and services, and hence has been itself a factor in inflation.

It has created windfalls for many financial institutions.

The $9 billion of added interest charges on the national debt would have been even higher but for the prudent insistence of the Democratic Congress that the ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government bonds be maintained.

EXCERPT FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1964

AN END TO TIGHT MONEY

In 1960, we proposed:

As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight money policy.

This policy has failed in its stated purpose—to keep prices down. It has given us two recessions within 5 years, bankrupted many of our farmers, produced a record number of business failures, and added billions of dollars in unnecessary higher interest charges to Government budgets and the cost of living.

Since 1961, we have maintained the free flow of credit so vital to industry, home buyers, and State and local governments.

Immediately, in February 1961, the Federal Housing Agency interest rate was cut from 5¾% to 5½ percent. It is now down to 5¼ percent.

Today's home buyer will pay about $1,700 less for FHA-insured financing of a 30-year $15,000 home mortgage than he would have had he taken the mortgage in 1960.

Today after 42 months of expansion, conventional home mortgage rates are lower than they were in January 1961, in the midst of a recession. So are borrowing costs for our States and municipalities, and for long-term corporate issues.

Short-term interest rates have been brought into reasonable balance with interest rates abroad, reducing or eliminating incentives to place short-term funds abroad and thus reducing gold outflow.

We have prudently lengthened the average maturity of the Federal debt, in contrast to the steady shortening that characterized the 1950's.

THE TRUCK CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the city of Allentown, Pa., has opened an ambitious crusade to become better known as "the truck capital of the world."

This is a worthy undertaking and deserves the support of Americans everywhere. As the birthplace of our Nation's great heavy-duty truck industry, Allentown is an authentic historical landmark in our country. Since 1905, Allentown has been the home of Mack Trucks, Inc., currently the city's largest heavy industry, and the Nation's oldest producer of motortrucks.

Mack motortrucks have been built continuously in Allentown since 1905—a record which cannot be matched anywhere in America or anywhere else in the world. Mack still remains today as our country's largest independent manufacturer of heavy-duty trucks, and is the only truck manufacturer in the Nation whose sole business is truck building.

In addition to being the authentic "truck capital of the world," Allentown is one of America's most progressive communities. It has a great heritage, being one of the oldest established cities in the Northeast and was first populated by the thrifty, progressive, and ambitious "Pennsylvania Dutch" pioneers. It has twice been selected by sister cities as a truly "All America" community, and its growth rate over the years has been unparalleled. Today, Allentown is able to boast some $475 million annually in manufactured products; $252 million in retail sales; $300 million in wholesale volume, and bank debits in excess of $2.5 billion. Its system of public parks and other municipal facilities are among the most elaborate and advanced in the Nation. Nowhere have religious denominations, business groups, and civic and service groups combined their energies and facilities more cooperatively to assist the betterment of the city.

Special credit is due also the Mack Truck Co. whose high quality production standards consistently over the years have been in the finest American tradition, and which have enabled the Mack truck to become, as the Allentown Evening Chronicle has said so aptly in a recent editorial, "a legend in our language." The phrase "Built like a Mack truck" is used everywhere today to denote ruggedness, quality, and sheer strength. As a matter of fact, the phrase has even been known to have been used to compliment a pretty girl.

Mack motor vehicles have served America and her allies in both world wars, and doughboys of World War I from many allied nations still refer affectionately to the Mack military vehicles of that conflict as "Bulldog Macks" because of their dependability and familiar blunted radiator design.

Under the leadership of Zenon C. R. Hansen, Mack's growth in the past 2 years has proceeded at a rapid rate. Sales climbed more than $50 million in 1965, rising to $368 million, and this year promise to exceed well over $400 million. Mack last year climbed from the 200th position among America's 500 largest companies, up to 184th in size, a jump of 16 notches.

Mack has also demonstrated its confidence in our Nation's future by undertaking one of the most extensive building expansion programs in its history. In Allentown, Mack Trucks has added a $3 million addition to its main assembly plant, has opened a separate product development center, and plans to break ground shortly on a big, new executive office building which will house all of the company's domestic and worldwide staff officers. Earlier this year, Mack trucks dedicated its new west coast manufacturing and assembly plant at Hayward, Calif., and last month broke ground for a new plant in Toronto, Canada. All of these actions demonstrate vividly that Mack is living up to its slogan, "Mack's on the grow."

President Hansen has also pledged full support to Allentown's efforts to become better known as "the truck capital of the world." After a recent national sales meeting of Mack executives in Allentown, Mack officials from scores of communities across the Nation took back to their hometown mayors keys to the city of Allentown, along with personal letters from Allentown Mayor Ray B. Bracy urging his fellow mayors to think of Allentown henceforth as the world truck capital.

It is fitting and proper that all Americans join in assisting Allentown in its mission to become universally known as "the truck capital of the world."

THE ENRICO FERMI PLANT—A $120 MILLION DREAM THAT MAY NEVER COME TRUE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House know of my strong interest in the problems raised by the construction of atomic powerplants in or near our large cities. The many facets of these dilemmas are matched only by the high hopes that many entertain for these plants as the eventual source of most of our power.

When the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York proposed building the Ravenswood plant in Long Island City, David Lilienthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, joined Detlov Bronk, the President of the National Academy of Science and of the Rockefeller University, as well as some leaders of community, labor and social organizations, in opposition to building the largest atomic powerplant in the world in the middle of the largest city in the world.

I have consistently urged that a careful investigation be made before the Atomic Energy Commission approves the construction of any nuclear powerplant. An important part of such an investigation should be hearings held at or near the proposed construction site. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 10831, which would amend section 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require that local hearings be held.

Mr. Speaker, the dilemmas involved in metropolitan nuclear powerplants have again been raised in an excellent study by Saul Friedman, entitled "The Enrico Fermi Plant—A $120 Million Dream That May Never Come True," which appeared in the July 17 issue of the Detroit Free Press. I know that many of my colleagues will find the article both informative and interesting.

The article follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, July 17, 1966]

A $120-MILLION DREAM THAT MAY NEVER COME TRUE

(By Saul Friedman)

Ten years ago this summer and a decade after Hiroshima, the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant began to rise on the shores of Lake Erie south of Detroit to herald the age of the peaceful atom.

Designed on daring theories and the confidence that technology would catch up quickly enough, the Fermi plant was the prototype of a dream. It was to be a pilot plant to supply electric power from nuclear energy and, at the same time, produce a valuable fuel, plutonium.

The hopes for its success—both commercial and scientific—were limitless.

Now, 10 years and $120 million later, the answers are emerging, and, though the dream may not be shattered, the cracks are growing.

Fermi's founders tenaciously insist that the final answer hasn't been written, that the plant can still live up to some of the hope.

But there is a growing array of scientific and engineering opinion that Fermi has become little more than a gigantic radioactive white elephant.

In interviews with the Free Press, physicists from the Argonne Laboratories, and experts from the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, have written Fermi off as unworkable.

It has produced only a trickle of electricity and not a single gram of plutonium. And there is a chance that it will be closed within another two years.

Milton Shaw, director of the Atomic Energy Commission's division of reactor development and technology, recently told the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy that the AEC has no commitments with the Fermi plant after 1968.

"The Fermi project was originally undertaken as a demonstration of the sodium-cooled fast breeder reactor concept and its economics for combined power production and plutonium breeding on a commercial scale," he testified. "Obviously, this objective has not been achieved."

To this, Walker Lee Cisler, chairman of the board of Detroit Edison Co., and the man for whom Fermi has been a great dream, adds bluntly: "Up to this time."

The Fermi plant was designed to produce virtually costless electricity and at the same time produce plutonium it did not use.

By 1970 the plant was was to have earned $43.4 million from the sale of steam to Detroit Edison's turbines and $48.6 million from the sale of plutonium—at $46 a gram—to the government.

But it has produced only $303,000 worth of electricity for the $120 million invested. Even if it had prouced the plutonium, there is no longer a profitable market for it.

The plant, named for the famed pioneer in atomic research, was largely built and is controlled by Detroit Edison, which has spent $67 million on it.

But directly and indirectly, taxpayers throughout the nation and users of electricity, mostly in the Detroit area, have put up this money.

Why has the plant been unable to fulfill the dream or meet the goals set for it 10 years ago?

Some critics of Fermi venture to say that the undertaking was too enormous for private industry to tackle and that only the government has the resources to commit to such a project. They say the venture should have been—like the atomic bomb, intercontinental missiles, and supersonic aircraft—part of the national purpose.

Still others feel that Fermi has been a step—if an unproductive one—toward vast sources of power never dreamed of before.

Essentially, the trouble with Fermi is that, like so many dreams, it was ahead of its time. As a result, it is now six years behind schedule with little hope of ever catching up. And even if it did, by the end of this decade, the reactor would probably be obsolete.

There is nothing wrong with the theory on which Fermi is based. Small, experimental, government-operated plants here and abroad have proven that.

But a scientist at Argonne National Laboratories, which operates one plant itself, put it this way: "When something is done earlier than it should be, it does not have the technology to match the theory. If the technology doesn't catch up with you, it's a bust. Fermi is that kind of a bust."

If the practical know-how to make it work did not exist, how then did Fermi come to be built?

The idea to build the plant came from Edison board chairman, Cisler. The first privately-owned nuclear power reactor of its kind, it was to be a living monument to Fermi and to the enterprise of industry.

And it was also the realization of the ancient dream to create energy, in this case electricity, and produce more new fuel than was consumed.

This was possible because Fermi was to be more advanced than other reactors, which merely boiled water to create steam and drive turbines. Fermi was to be a "fast neutron breeder reactor," which meant it was to produce electricity using as fuel uranium-235, which is rare, and uranium-238, which is plentiful.

As the reactor produced electricity, it was to create or "breed" plutonium, which can be used as fuel to produce energy and thereby produce more plutonium. It was this plutonium Fermi hoped to sell.

From its beginnings in 1947 and through each of the 20 years of labor and ambition that followed, a series of legal, technical and political obstacles have blocked Fermi's road to success.

In the early, planning years, Fermi's organizers were confronted by a maze of laws, the politicians that created them and the government agencies that administered them. While Fermi's architects fought to convert their blueprints into an atomic reality, cost estimates for the plant rose from an original $40 million to $50 million to more than $100 million.

Today, about $112 million has been spent, plus another $8 million worth of nuclear materials contributed by the Federal government. Last year, final cost estimates rose another $5 million and it takes about $2.5 million to operate Fermi for a year.

From the beginning, about 60 percent of the cost has been financed by Detroit Edison through two companies which Cisler created to build and operate the Fermi plant—Power Reactor Development Co. and Atomic Power Development Associates. The rest of the money, excluding government funds, has come from a combine of about 35 other utilities and industrial firms. Several of these firms stopped contributing after their original investment was made in the early 1950's.

When contributions finally began in 1956, a new set of technical problems greeted Fermi's engineers. The plant was originally designed to generate some 430,000 kilowatts of electricity-producing steam heat. For safety reasons the Atomic Energy Commission cut that figure by more than half; the plant is licensed to produce a maximum of 200,000 kilowatts.

Even so, and even when the plant is not shut down for costly repairs, Fermi can produce a maximum of only 67,000 kilowatts. This is the most heat power produced by any breeder reactor—but it is only one-seventh the power originally planned and one-third of the power permitted by its license. A conventional boiler nearby can make 10 times the amount of electricity at a fraction of the cost.

At 67,000 kilowatts, Fermi is unable to produce the plutonium which the plant's designers hoped to sell to reduce the plant's operating costs. Finally, the present core of expensive uranium-235 fuel is expected to burn out sometime in 1968. A new core would cost another $4 million.

If Fermi's builders are unwilling to invest in a new, nuclear core, and they appear reluctant to do so, the reactor will be shut down, perhaps for good. Its radioactive elements will be buried, for safety's sake, in a remote nuclear grave.

Such a strange Nuclear Age grave would also be the resting place for Walker Cisler's dream.

For more than 20 years this dream has preoccupied Cisler. And one cannot understand the remarkable story of the Fermi Project without some knowledge of this man who is the apotheosis of the American corporate giant. Without Cisler, Fermi would not have been built.

In the power industry for most of his 68 years, he is, in his field, one of the most knowledgeable men in the world. He is a man easily at home in important board rooms, often at the head of the table; or at civic banquets as the guest of honor; or behind the speaker's rostrum.

Three inches in "Who's Who" do not begin to tell of the business and professional boards and civic and political campaigns on which he has served. He is, in the corporate adjective, "dynamic." A world-traveler, a sought-after speaker, a name of influence, a man of contacts, a peripatetic organizer and doer, he is superbly aware of himself and his powers.

His distinguished white hair, the restraint of his office, his tailored clothes, all exude his solidity, his sense of caution and business conservatism. All of which is a reflection of his industry, where growth is based on predictables.

But Cisler is a pioneer, too. And under his leadership, Detroit Edison launched into its adventure with the atom.

It all began when Cisler served the government and Allied armies as a power consultant during World War II. There he got his first glimpse of the nuclear future.

And he met some important people, among them, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, a member of the first AEC, former partner in Kuhn-Loeb, a banking house which often financed utility companies; and Gen. K. D. Nichols, an engineer who served on the project that built the first atomic bomb.

Cisler was serving as a consultant to the AEC when a committee of electric utilities officials began investigating nuclear energy's role in the future of their companies.

Detroit Edison, one of the interested utilities, hired Cisler as chief engineer in 1945. The president of Edison was the late James W. Parker.

In October, 1947, the AEC created an Industrial Advisory Group" to "speed up industrial activities in the atomic energy field, including the development of atomic-electric power plants."

Cisler recalls the AEC announcement. The then AEC chairman, David Lilienthal, made it in Detroit, after a luncheon of the Economic Club. Lilienthal named Parker chairman of the advisory group, and Parker soon appointed Cisler as executive secretary.

A year later, in 1948, the advisory group asked the AEC to give private industry a piece of the atomic action. In 1949, the AEC asked industry for some preliminary proposals. In 1950, five utility—industrial combines proposed nuclear power plants. Only one, a combine of Detroit Edison and the Dow Chemical Co., chose to study the possibilities of a breeder reactor.

The others decided to build water reactors, which produced steam to spin conventional turbines. Although this was to be a costly and pioneering effort, the water reactor was relatively simple and feasible.

But evidently, as Fortune magazine concluded, the Dow-Edison combine decided upon the breeder reactor because they wanted a reactor that might be profitable as well. On March 23, 1951, the AEC agreed to allow Dow-Edison, and other companies, to explore the possibilities.

At a special conference in 1952, soon after the contract signing, Cisler explained his reasons for beginning work on the unconventional breeder reactor:

"Power system supply . . . to their customers at rates which must be justified before and approved by public service commissions. These kilowatt hours contain the same amount of energy whether they are produced using conventional fuels . . . or by the envisioned generation stations using heat from nuclear fission. It is obvious, therefore, that power systems cannot justify the adoption of fissionable fuels, on a wide scale, until costs are competitive with those of conventional methods."

"A breeder reactor," he went on, "would continuously produce amounts of fissionable material in excess of that consumed. Thus, breeder reactors would augment rather than consume the word's supply of fissionable materials."

The "fissionable material" Cisler spoke of was plutonium, which only can be made synthetically. Cisler had written to his friend, Commissioner Strauss to explain the breeder reactor's unique ability to produce high-grade plutonium, which is used in nuclear weapons.

And Cisler told the conference:

"It is recognized that the sale of by-products (plutonium) is important, and even may be the controlling factor in a nuclear power plant.

"It is expected that not only will there be a possible market for weapons purposes, but that there will be a market for the excess fuel to meet the requirements for mobile reactors and . . . of an expanding nuclear power industry.

"For the future, if we can achieve a flourishing private enterprise in the atomic energy development, there should be a most important result. Our country's strength will be measured . . . by the production capability of a great free enterprise whose atomic products can be turned from civilian to military requirements at very short notice."

* * *

An April, 1952, the AEC formally approved Dow-Edison's plan for designing a breeder reactor.

Rep. Chet Holifield (D., Calif.), cochairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Sen. Clinton Anderson (D., N.M.), former co-chairman, and other nuclear research experts in Washington, believe Fermi was conceived and built on the political sands of the 1950s, sands that have now shifted.

The world was then caught up in the Cold War and nuclear weapons were urgently being stockpiled. American industry saw nuclear power as a potential source of cheap energy, not only for bombs but for manufacturing. The peaceful uses of the atom were then believed to be limitless and big business wanted to try its own hand at nuclear development.

"In the days when it was built," Holifield says, "it (Fermi) was an attempt by Lewis Strauss to show that private industry could do it without the help of government. Strauss wanted to keep the government out of industrial atomic development.

"It's obvious the plant has not done what it was supposed to do, and for all practical purposes it has failed."

A former nuclear research and development expert with the Joint Committee, now a top official in private industry, said he thought the Fermi attempt was doomed from the start.

"Such an undertaking . . . has enormous costs," he said. "You've got to figure $1 billion. No one has such resources to commit, except the government. The development of breeder reactors should have been part of the national purpose.

"It should, therefore, have been done by the government, operating through private industry, and not by a single industry trying to go it alone. Now that Fermi has failed, we must begin all over again."

Similar arguments were heard in Congress in 1954. Before the Dow-Edison group could go ahead with its plans, it needed a change in the atomic energy laws which, in 1946, had given government a monopoly on nuclear secrets and materials.

At the urging of Strauss, the utilities, and powerful lobbies, Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which permitted the construction and ownership of atomic facilities by private companies.

Late in 1954, Dow Chemical pulled out of the project because, Cisler said, Fermi was more relevant to the power industry than to chemistry.

Cisler then organized the 35 other utilities and industrial firms that had joined the group into Atomic Power Development Associates (APDA), a nonprofit organization chartered in New York, to design the reactor Cisler envisioned. Cisler is chairman and president of APDA, and Detroit Edison is the largest single contributor (about $750,000 a year since 1955).

On Aug. 30, 1955, Cisler organized the company that was to build, own, and operate the reactor—Power Reactor Development Co. (PRDC).

It was chartered in Michigan as a "nonprofit . . . business league of 10 members of industries in the United States interested in the conservation of natural resources and the economical production of electric energy, and to study, develop, design, fabricate, construct, and operate one or more experimental nuclear power reactors . . ."

Although some of them since have become inactive in PRDC, the original sponsors were among the most powerful and influential companies in the nation:

Alabama Power Co., Allis-Chalmers Co., the Babcock & Wilcox Co., Burroughs Corp., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Co., the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus and Southern Ohio Electric Co., Combustion Engineering, Inc., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Georgia Power Co., Holley Carburetor Co., Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Mississippi Power Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Rochester Gas and Electric Corp., the Toledo Edison Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., and Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Cisler was PRDC's first and only president. Its offices are at 1911 First across the street from Detroit Edison headquarters. In the same two-story building, which is owned by Detroit Edison, are the offices of APDA.

That year, 1955—when PRDC was formed—was crucial for the project. Congress had opened the door to private industry, the new chairman of the AEC, Lewis Strauss, was friendly to the project, and plans for the reactor were coming along. If construction was to get underway, big money was needed.

The problem was how to convince cost-minded boards of utilities to contribute to APDA and PRDC the millions it would take to build Fermi.

Detroit Edison supplied an incentive when it got permision from the Michigan Public Service Commission to write off as "operating expenses" the money it contributed. This set a precedent which was followed by other states.

In February, 1955, Cisler appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He was asked how he charged off the money spent on the Fermi project thus far.

"In our case of our own company," Cisler replied, "it is charged to operating expenses."

"This is a research and development operating expense allowed by the utility commission?"

"Yes," replied Cisler. "We have a communication to that effect telling us where to charge it by the Michigan Public Service Commission."

"Have they placed any limit on such an amount that you can spend?"

"No," Cisler answered.

On March 23, 1955, the Michigan Public Service Commission issued its first formal order on the Fermi plant to Detroit Edison. The PSC chairman at the time was John H. McCarthy, who explained his thinking in 1956 to a conference co-sponsored by the Atomic Industrial Forum, of which Cisler was president.

McCarthy said the PSC had come to the conclusion that the breeder reactor "possessed the great longterm possibilities of producing electrical energy at the lowest cost," and that it was "completely safe in operation."

As a result of McCarthy's ruling, Detroit Edison has charged off to "miscellaneous operating expenses" and "nuclear power research expenses" every dollar it has spent on Fermi. Originally the PSC authorization set a limit of $8.5 million, but that has been exceeded.

In addition to charging off the expenditures at Fermi, Detroit Edison writes off the work of its Nuclear Power Development Department, the cost of materials used for publicity and appearances before official groups and civic bodies, and the cost of the Atomic Information Center it has set up at the Fermi site.

Also, Detroit Edison charges off depreciation on the part of the Fermi complex it owns, and the value of those installations (about $25 million) are included in the "capital account" with the PSC.

All this money is taken into account by the PSC when it figures the rate of return Detroit Edison ought to get on its investment. Hence, indirectly, consumers of electricity pay for Fermi. PSC staff men, who have questioned the extent of these write-offs among themselves, note that Detroit Edison has one of the highest rates of return (seven percent) in the nation.

When he explained his ruling, McCarthy said such authorizations may cease "if upon competent evidence it (the PSC) concludes that such research and development bears no evidence of eventual success . . .

"When the regulatory agency is satisfied that in designing, constructing, and operating a reactor of a particular type further research is not only fruitless but also impracticable . . . the utility should not be permitted to reflect further expenditure in its capital or operating expense accounts."

The PSC has not withdrawn authorization. And from 1961 through 1965, Detroit Edison charged off an average of $3.75 million a year and about $600,000 in depreciation.

McCarthy has since left the PSC. Now president of the Detroit Water Board, he is a consultant for Detroit Edison. His son works for Detroit Edison as an engineer.

Cisler also won a ruling from the Internal Revenue Service which made deductible all Detroit Edison contributions to PRDC and APDA. And the IRS ruled further that the two groups, being nonprofit corporations, were exempted from paying taxes on the money they receive.

During the same period Cisler tried to get the Public Utilities Holding Act changed to allow utility companies to combine to build Fermi. Failing that, Cisler got assurance from the Justice Department that they would not be prosecuted under anti-trust laws.

New utilities joined PRDC, and so did industrial firms that later did construction work at the plant site, Allis Chalmers, Babcock & Wilcox, Holley Carburetor, Combustion Engineering.

A most important item that also concerned Cisler at the time was the price Fermi was to get for plutonium. Cisler was constantly and informally in contact with AEC Chairman Strauss, and Gen. K. D. Nichols, general manager of the commission from 1953 to 1955.

Plutonium prices were top secret, apparently because the government did not want to even hint how much plutonium it had for fear of giving away the size of its bomb stockpile.

Cisler had a "Q" clearance, which gave him access to top secret material, including the price of plutonium. During December, 1954, he discussed with AEC officials the price the commission would pay for plutonium produced by Fermi.

Cisler acknowledges these conversations, but says he cannot reveal whom these talks were with, claiming the information is "classified."

Although the going price for plutonium was obviously of crucial importance to the financing of Fermi, Cisler insists today that "we didn't investigate the price the government was paying. It wasn't our business."

It is now known that the AEC was paying $12 a gram for low-grade plutonium, most of it imported. High, weapons-grade plutonium was probably being purchased for three times that amount.

Piecing together testimony Cisler has given to the Joint Committe and the PSC, after conversations with AEC representatives, including Gen. Nichols, it appears that Cisler was assured that Fermi would get $90 a gram for its high-grade plutonium.

All these prices were secret then, but there are signs now that there was some serious, internal criticism of the price promised to Cisler. For in early 1955 Cisler reported that the price finally fixed was half of what he expected, or $46 a gram.

Gen. Nichols left the AEC late in 1955 and became a consulting engineer and a director of the Atomic Industrial Forum. In 1958, he joined the board of directors of Detroit Edison, and in 1964 was named to the board of the Fruehauf Corp., the chairman of which is Cisler.

Since the economy of the plant had been based first on a $90 price, Cisler was forced to turn to a banking group for a $15 million loan for plant construction.

Detroit Edison guaranteed 58 percent of the loan, plus interest (and is paying it), and other PRDC members spread the rest of the loan among themselves.

Cisler's accountants were compelled to revise downward their figures for the plant's earning prospects. Even so, the prospects looked good.

With an AEC subsidy of $3 million for the uranium-235 fuel, the plant was to begin full operations in 1961. By 1970, the plant was to have earned $43.4 million from the sale of steam to Detroit Edison's turbines, and $48.6 million from the sale of plutonium—at $46 a gram—to the government.

With revenues estimated at $92 million for the first decade, the future of the reactor semed assured as plans were made for the ceremonial groundbreaking on Aug. 8, 1956.

But even before the scheduled Fermi groundbreaking, a nuclear accident 1,500 miles away set in motion a crippling dose of political fallout that eventually spread to the Fermi site on the marshlands near Monroe.

In an isolated area near Arco, Idaho, the Federal Government operated its "experimental breeder reaction I," a much smaller version of what Fermi was to be.

Despite dozens of safety devices and all the computerized calculations, someone at EBR–1 failed to push a button exactly on time. There was a "meltdown" of the uranium–235 fuel. The fuel core was destroyed; but more important, had the "meltdown" caused the uranium to form into a certain shape, it could have become a "critical mass." If that happened, the reactor could have exploded like a small atom bomb and radioactive elements would have been launched into the atmosphere.

At the time—late 1955—PRDC had its application in with the AEC for a construction permit, which it expected in time for the groundbreaking. But the incident at Arco intruded.

Arco's reactor was not located in a populated area; Fermi was to be placed in the heart of one of the nation's most populous metropolitan areas.

Fermi, its scientists and engineers said, was safe. But they would have said EBR–1 was safe. Fermi was to have safety devices; but EBR–1 had them, too.

The fact was, human beings ran reactors. And although something is known about human frailties, less is known about the capricious atom, especially in a breeder reactor.

Just last August, an eminent physicist, Dr. Hans Bethe, of Cornell, a consultant to the Fermi project, told a committee of the AEC he was confident the reactor will be fully stable. But he had to add: "We still do not know how the reactor will behave under power."

The incident at EBR–1, and the unknowns of breeder reactor, were on the minds of key people in the spring and summer of 1956 when the PRDC construction application was pending.

On June 28, before a House subcommittee, Strauss goofed. Even though the permit had not been formally approved, the AEC chairman happened to mention that he was going to speak at the groundbreaking ceremony.

On the following day, Thomas E. Murray, a member of the AEC opposed to issuing the permit, came to the same subcommittee and dropped a small bomb.

He revealed that Strauss had overruled and marked secret a report from the commission's own Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, dated June 6.

This suppressed report said in part: "Even though there are no facts or calculations available to the committee that clearly indicate that the proposed reactor is not safe for this site, the committee believes there is insufficient information available at this time to give assurance that the PRDC reactor can be operated as this site without public hazard."

The committee proposed that further study be made before the permit was issued because "the committee does not feel that the steps (to advance the breeder reactor program) should be so bold as to risk the health and safety of the public."

The late Senator Patrick V. McNamara and then Gov. G. Mennen Williams strongly questioned the safety of the reactor.

Nevertheless, on Aug. 4—four days before the groundbreaking—the AEC approved the construction permit. Murray dissented.

Rep. HOLIFIELD, then a member of the Joint Committee, called the action "reckless and arrogant." He pointed out that PRDC could not get insurance coverage for the proposed plant.

(With help from the AEC, which requires nuclear plants to have liability insurance to protect residents around plants, PRDC eventually got insurance. A number of companies shared the risk so none would have to pay more than four percent of the principal. The principal amount PRDC must now carry is $12.5 million, and $19 million when the reactor operates at maximum authorized power. The premiums, which are higher than for any other plant, cost Fermi about $250,000 a year.)

Senator ANDERSON, then chairman of the Joint Committee, called the AEC a "star chamber" proceeding, and he quietly suggested to United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther that unions should intervene in court to stop the construction.

The UAW, joined by other unions, had argued that a permit to construct is, in effect, a permit to operate. Operation, the unions claimed, would endanger 3 million people in a 30-mile radius of the plant. The Circuit Court of Appeals ruled for the unions, but the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the decision.

Dissenting from the majority, Justices Hugo Black and William Douglas agreed with the union position. They said:

"The time when the issue of safety must be resolved is before the (Atomic Engergy) Commission issues a construction permit. The construction given the (Atomic Energy) Act (of 1954) by the Commission is, with all deference, a light-hearted approach to the most awesome, the most deadly, the most dangerous process that man has ever conceived."

While the legal hassle had gone on, the groundbreaking took place as scheduled. Strauss charged that Fermi's critics were "aiding the attack which is being directed against the free enterprise development of nuclear power in this country."

"The attack," he added, "would, if successful, have the effect of weakening, if not eliminating, such free competition and of returning atomic energy to its former condition of government monopoly and operation."

After the groundbreaking, nothing went according to plan.

Fermi engineers had figured the 30-inch-long pins of uranium fuel could last until three percent of each pin had burned up. They soon discovered that at one percent, they swelled. If they swell enough, the liquid sodium that cools them cannot flow through the spaces between the pins. If the pins cannot be cooled, they melt down, as did EBR–1.

If there was a meltdown in Fermi, the reactor could explode; and while the blast itself would be small, the explosion could send into the air 300 times more radioactive material than came from the Hiroshima bomb.

Now engineers have discovered they need a new fuel core after a burn-up of only four-tenths of a percent. Each fuel core costs more than $4 million.

After more than a year's delay in inserting the fuel, it was found that the liquid sodium had clogged some crucial parts and had eroded some of the graphite protection against radiation. New graphite was installed.

The steel dome over the reactor vessel had to be redesigned to prevent the giant plug that bottled up the reactor from shooting through the roof in the event of explosion.

The mechanism to move the fuel elements in the reactor failed, and men were sent into the vessel to fix it. Their protective suits tore. The giant cask car, which transports radioactive elements, failed, and it is still not working properly. The giant sodium steam generators constantly caused trouble, and one nearly exploded. They leaked sodium, which when combined with air or water, can explode or catch fire.

After having paid half the cost of the $4.9-million steam generators, Detroit Edison helped PRDC out in 1962 by buying them for $4.9 million. They still leak and cannot yet be used safely.

When the plant was planned, PRDC was to own the reactor and sodium steam generators, and Detroit Edison was to own the turbines and buy steam from PRDC. Now that Edison has purchased the generators, it is theoretically supposed to buy heat.

Edison has always been careful to say the two plants were separate, since PRDC is chartered as a nonprofit corporation. A wall has even been built between the two parts of the plant.

However, the main control room for the reactor has always been in the turbine building owned by Edison. And although the PRDC charter says its assets are to go to educational institutions if it is dissolved, Edison purchased the generators.

Cisler had told the Michigan Public Service Commission: "It would be reasonable to expect at some future time that the reactor facility might well be under the entire ownership of Detroit Edison."

On top of all the technical difficulties, the price of plutonium dropped to $9 a gram. With the relaxation of the cold war, the American stockpile of nuclear weapons had grown to "overkill" proportions, and the demand for plutonium dropped.

President Johnson has ordered a two-thirds reduction in the plutonium stockpile, and regulations requiring government purchase of the metal are due to expire in 1971.

So, instead of the $92 million Fermi was expected to earn, it has produced not a gram of plutonium, and electricity worth only $303,000.

Now time is running out on the expensive uranium fuel core.

Cisler, seeking at least to break even each year (last year's construction and operating expenses were $5.5 million), has sought help from the AEC and foreign nuclear researchers.

Recently, the AEC granted Fermi a contract on which it will earn only $450,000. A source with the Joint Committee told the Free Press that the contract was given just so Fermi could be in a better position to bargain for foreign contracts.

The contract will run out May 10, 1968. After that the AEC has no commitments with Fermi.

The AEC, which operates EBR–II at Arco, is stepping up its program to build other breeder reactors under contract with private industry. The British, who have been successful with their Dounreay reactor, on Scotland's deserted moors, are planning a new one.

"Fermi has been written off," said an expert in private industry. "But it prevented government from playing its rightful role in financing and developing our breeder program. As a result, our country is behind the British, and probably the Russians, because our breeder development program has been set back 20 years."

"I can't agree wtih that," said Cisler. "I'm proud we have Fermi. It is the largest of its kind in the western world. Let us not forget that. As a research facility, it is the best."

An AEC official told the Joint Committee, however, that Fermi does not quite come up to the over-all level of competence the AEC gets in its testing at EBR–II. Fermi is simply larger.

Cisler is hoping that by 1968, when the uranium core is burned up, a plutonium core, which would last longer and produce even more plutonium, might be perfected.

"That is what our goal is," he told the Joint Committee in April, "to get to the point where we can fuel that reactor with plutonium. This is really what is behind our purpose . . . I am just hopeful that we can mobilize all of the know-how that exists anywhere in the world to enable us to put a plutonium loading in that reactor at the earliest possible time."

But this is a rather forlorn hope, the experts agree. A workable, safe plutonium core is not considered possible, said the AEC, until about 1980.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, present AEC chairman, is a co-discoverer of plutonium. He calls it "the ornery element," the AEC said, because of "its tricky chemistry, the prolific radiation from fission products that accompanies its birth, the need to process it remotely, and the requirement that it be handled in small quantities to insure against spontaneous chain reaction."

Both Government and industrial experts believe the design of Fermi will be obsolete by the time that a plutonium core becomes workable. Time and technology will pass by the Fermi plant, these men believe, and it will be left to others to complete the work that it began.

Already more cautious power companies, like Commonwealth in Chicago and Consolidated Edison in New York, are planning less sophisticated water reactors that will generate many times the amount of electricity that Fermi can produce, even if it worked.

It can be said quite simply that Fermi was ahead of its time, an idea dying for lack of nuts and bolts to make it work. Some say already that Fermi is a noble, and an expensive, failure.

Even if Fermi's cost can be computed in bricks and dollars, there is still no price tag on dreams. Fermi's true cost will be known only to one man, whose dream it was.

During the long court controversy over the Fermi project, one judge speculated that it might well turn out to be a "white elephant."

"Should that be the case," he said philosophically, "it will simply be one of the unproductive steps in what promises to be a program to open to mankind sources of power undreamed of only a few years ago."

EFFORTS OF WISCONSIN FARM GROUPS TO GET TOGETHER AT COUNTY LEVEL NOW RECEIVING WIDE ATTENTION

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the efforts of Wisconsin farm groups to get together at the county level is now receiving wide attention.

This morning's Washington Post carried an article by Loren H. Osman, describing these activities in Sheboygan and Rock Counties. I have followed with particular interest this development in Rock County, which is in my congressional district.

That the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the NFO, along with our largest dairy cooperative, Pure Milk Association, would ever find common ground on which to meet seemed doubtful. Yet, these groups have done this. In so doing, they recognized the differences that exist among them, but have found other areas of common interest. On July 22, for example, this Rock County federation—officially named the Federated Farm Organization of Rock County—sponsored an appearance by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. The auditorium at Delavan-Darien High School was filled for this program.

For those who might be interested in seeing this type of development in their own rural areas, I am pleased to quote in part from an article which appeared in the June 13 Janesville, Wis., Gazette, which succinctly reports the intent of the group:

> Rock County farm leaders reviewed local agricultural problems and came up with one answer to help solve them—a county-wide congress of representatives from major farm organizations.
>
> The group would:
>
> 1. Develop policy decisions on problems at the local level.
> 2. Compromise differences of opinion among members.
> 3. Present a united front for agriculture.
>
> Leaders and farmers at a preliminary meeting held recently at Turtle Town Hall recommended that the presidents and two delegates from each large organization—Farm Bureau, Grange, and National Farmers Organization (NFO) meet every three months.
>
> In addition, an annual meeting for all members would inform the memberships of progress to date, it was decided.

I congratulate the farm groups in Rock County and hope that what they have started will be emulated throughout the country.

TWO PRESIDENTS EXCHANGE TOASTS: SHALOM—PEACE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an exchange of toasts between President Johnson and the President of Israel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 2, 1966, our good President and Mrs. Johnson tendered a dinner at the White House to a very distinguished gathering in honor of His Excellency, the President of Israel, Zalman Shazar and Mrs. Shazar.

I would like to share with those of our colleagues who did not have an opportunity to attend that dinner, the very beautiful toasts exchanged on that occasion.

They are as follows:

President JOHNSON. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the traditional Hebrew greeting we welcome our esteemed guest: Boruch ha-ba . . . blessed is he who comes to our shores as the leader of a people for whom we hold the greatest admiration.

Mr. President, as a renowned scholar and educator, and as a pioneer in the new Israel, you are deeply versed in the teachings of the Bible.

And you know that our Republic, like yours, was nurtured by the philosophy of the ancient Hebrew teachers who taught mankind the principles of morality, of social justice, and of universal peace.

This is our heritage, and it is yours.

The message inscribed on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is the clarion call of Leviticus:

"Proclaim ye liberty in the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

It is a message not only for America, or for Israel, but for the whole world.

We cannot proclaim tonight that all men have liberty, that all men are moral, that all men are just. We do not have universal peace.

But those of good will continue their work to liberate the human spirit from the degradation of poverty and pestilence, of hunger and oppression. As spiritual heirs of the Biblical tradition we recognize that no society anywhere can be more secure unless it is also just.

Israel today carries forward its pursuit of spiritual values. It is sharing those values and those experiences with other countries in the world.

We in America, as we meet here with all of our blessings tonight, are keenly aware that God has showered our land with abundance. The sharing of our blessings with others is a value we hold in common with Israel.

Above all, Mr. President, we share in common the vision of peace you call shalom.

The Prophet Micah described it in this way: That every man sit under his vine and fig tree and "none shall make him afraid."

As our beloved, great, late President, John F. Kennedy, said on May 8, 1963, as a declaration of the leader of this country and as spokesman for this land: "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors . . . We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. . ."

We subscribe to that policy.

This I say in friendship for all the peoples of that region. We extend to all the hand of friendship, and offer to help all in meeting the challenges of fear and pestilence and poverty.

We look toward the happy and peaceful pursuits that can bring tranquility and the blessings of knowledge and understanding to all peoples, without fear of war.

We welcome you tonight, Mr. President, in friendship and in deep respect for you and the people of your country.

I should like to ask all gathered here to join me in the traditional Hebrew toast in honor of our distinguished guest . . . to life, to peace, to blessing for all mankind.

President SHAZAR. Dear Mr. President and Mrs. Johnson:

Before I respond to your gracious toast of friendship, Mr. President, may I, on behalf of Mrs. Shazar and myself, express to you and to Mrs. Johnson our heartfelt congratulation on the occasion of the marriage of your daughter four days from now.

May she and her husband enjoy a long life of happiness. Let me tell them the same words in an old Jewish expression as we used to say "Mazal tov". It means good luck.

I would like to give voice tonight to the deep appreciation which I feel and which I believe is shared by men and women in many lands for your leadership in the effort to achieve a world in which every nation would be left alone to lead its life in accordance with its own free choice in which its independence and integrity are respected.

Your name, Mr. President, will always be associated with the concept that the only real enemies of men are ignorance, poverty, disease, racial discrimination and the degradation of man by his fellow man. They are the enemies of mankind.

Under your leadership, the American people have been foremost not only in projecting this vision, but in helping to realize it—many of the countries which have reason to be grateful to the United States for the help they have received in tackling these enemies in maintaining their freedom.

Mr. President, I bring you a cordial message of greeting from our Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and from all the people of my country in Israel. On behalf of the Government and people of my country, I wish to record our appreciation of the understanding which has marked your approach to our problems and the satisfaction in the continued growth of the friendship between our two countries.

It is a great honor for me to ask this distinguished gathering to join me in wishing you a long life and considerable success in moving mankind towards the goals of peace and greatness with the greetings of "L'chayim tovim u-shalom", to life, to good life, and to peace, I toast the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson.

ADVICE RECIPROCATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, careful note should be taken by everyone of the fact that the Communist Party U.S.A. has ordered its members and followers to organize political action "in and around the orbit of the Democratic Party."

Since no one else has done so, I feel compelled to call this to the attention of my loyal and patriotic Democrat colleagues. They must be alert against infiltration. They must watch that the policies of the Communist Party are not foisted upon them.

Having issued this warning, I want to be the first to say that the Democrat Party is not working in tandem with the Communist Party.

But Democrats have been kind enough to warn the Republicans and the public of the dangers of what some of them term "right wing" infiltration; so I think it only fair and reasonable to return the compliment and warn them that they have the most dangerous organization in the country trying to infiltrate and influence the Democrat Party. I am glad the Republican Party is not so threatened.

I do not think there is any doubt that the Communist Party is an organ of the Soviet Union. It has behind it, moreover, all those hidden espionage, propaganda, and infiltration organizations which have become so powerful in the days after the party went underground in 1948 after exposure. In that year membership lists were destroyed and, in fact, the party threw off a large part of its membership to get down to a trusted hard core of dedicated revolutionaries. The Communists realize, if their opponents do not, that organization and dedication are more important than size. After all, 4,000 well-organized and dedicated Communists seized dictatorial power in Russia in 1917—and they are still in control of that sprawling nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for the Congress to give serious consideration to legislation similar to H.R. 6005 submitted March 9, 1965—and in two prior Congresses—by our colleague from Missouri [Mr. HALL]; to be cited as "The Russian Organization Control Act of 1965—U.S.A." Perhaps now requests for departmental reports would be more favorable, and action by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, more prompt.

I think Members will agree it is not by any stretch of the imagination McCarthyism to cite the official line of the Communist Party U.S.A. and to issue a warning about its intent to work in and through the Democratic Party. Why this choice was made, I do not know. I am only truly thankful they did not choose my party.

FREE ELECTIONS—A CONDITION OF PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I foresee no simple means of ending the conflict in Vietnam. But there are many things we can do to bring about a climate in which the conditions of peace can develop.

By itself, the fighting will not achieve peace, unless it forces the insurgents to the conference table—which it surely has not done so far. Indeed, we appear to be as far from negotiations today as we were a year ago, and although it is clear that North Vietnam now cannot conquer South Vietnam, we must realize that soldiers alone cannot rid the south of insurgency. This, in my opinion, is because some political solution will be required before insurgency ceases.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge once again that we consider further actions leading to the establishment of a political climate which can foster a constructive South Vietnamese Government, expressive of the popular will and dedicated to improving the lot of its citizens.

I said this in a resolution introduced in the House on June 30 and later in a speech on July 21. I also said that if the United Nations could not send observers to oversee the elections set for this fall, Premier Ky should request observers from independent Asian nations. They could help assure the world, as well as ourselves, of the honesty and therefore the credibility of the elections. The Organization of American States has recently performed admirably in this capacity in the Dominican Republic.

If it is impractical or impossible to organize an observer group from independent Asian nations, another option suggests itself. Remember that the central problem of the planned elections in South Vietnam is one of the honesty and, therefore, of the credibility of the elections as an expression of popular will. Determining the honesty of elections depends on getting facts—facts about who is permitted to vote and where, about how the ballots are distributed and counted, and so on. What group of people—already on the scene—is more qualified to get the facts than the international press corps?

This suggests that the press can play an important role in assessing the credibility of the elections in Vietnam. For the press, the central problem is getting access to the facts, particularly in a war zone where military security is understandably tight. But if the members of the press corps in Vietnam were to have full access to any voting place in the country, if they were to have access to all records of the elections, if they were to have access to the ballots after counting—then they would have access to the facts necessary to determine the honesty of the election. The stories written by the press under such conditions would make up an independent evaluation of the honesty of the election.

Indeed, it might be appropriate for the Ky government, or for any other agency, to ask the press corps in Saigon to nominate a committee of reporters, to write a final report assessing the honesty of the elections. Obviously, there might be differences of opinion between independent reporters, but there is no reason why minority reports could not be attached to the final report. Such a report would offer an authoritative assessment of the honesty of the elections, without forcing us all to read 200 or 300 newspapers.

What I am suggesting is, in fact, no more than that the press fulfills its traditional function: Independent reporting and evaluation. But in a theater of war, the press is inhibited from access to facts and even to sectors of the countryside. My suggestion is merely that these restrictions be removed with respect to all facts pertaining to the election and, indeed, that the Ky government actively support the efforts of the press to get the facts. For example, planes could be provided to take newsmen to various voting places around the country, or ballot count records could be provided. Active cooperation with the press, rather than grudging acceptance, could do more to insure a credible election than any other single course of action open to the Saigon Government.

It is in everyone's interest that this be done. If the election is fair and honest, and therefore credible, we want everyone to know it. If it is fraudulent, we want to know that, too. For we cannot allow ourselves to be bamboozled by inaccurate reports about an election and thereby to build an erroneous policy. I hope the Secretary of State will vigorously push for the adoption of these suggestions.

In any event, the Department of State must take vigorous steps to encourage the establishment of some sort of observer teams. It has produced many reasons why unbiased observers cannot be found. This negative attitude is simply not acceptable. Unbiased observers must be found. Reticence on the part of international or national groups cannot deter us. We cannot lose this opportunity. For to lose it will increase the political turmoil, the instability and the duration of the conflict. If the elections fail, we will tend to rely increasingly on military solutions alone. Power may break men's bodies, but it does not necessarily bend their minds or reduce their determination. Infatuation with power leads down a blind alley.

Open-ended military escalation—the big bang theory of settling differences—can never resolve the conflict into anything but a stalemate. I say this, in part, because of my own experience in China during World War II. A guerrilla war does not require vast amounts of material—it requires only a few rounds of ammunition and a grenade here or there. Sufficient ammunition to keep harassing civilians and troops can be brought along jungle trails on the backs of coolies. A guerrilla war does not require a lot of food—this can be taken from the countryside. But it does require a population not hostile to the guerrillas, and indifferent to or out of touch with, the central government. The guerrillas will disappear when the villagers cease to harbor them. This will occur when substantive political form and effective action develop in the South Vietnamese Government. Military forces, where they provide order and security, can contribute to the conditions under which this political development can take place. But armed forces themselves should not be mistaken for such governmental structure.

We should recognize, at the same time, that the establishment of a popular government in Saigon does not depend upon the immediate elimination of all guerrilla activity in the mountains and jungles. Complete territorial control is not a prerequisite to improvement of political structure.

We should not allow our concern with areas we do not hold to blind us to the needs of the areas which are subject to the central government. It is the people already on the side of establishing a popular government who will make it possible for this conflict to end.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, the Department of State must encourage action which will make the elections credible. It cannot lose this chance. This is an important step toward ending the conflict and toward preventing its enlargement. And it is a precondition of the establishment of a viable government in South Vietnam.

SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS TAKE HOLD IN HAWAII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note the passing of a milestone in the conservation and development of Hawaii's vital soil and water resources. That milestone is the recent completion of construction on the Naalehu watershed project in Hawaii County.

Three other small watershed projects are being built in the State under Public Law 566, one in Hawaii County and two in Honolulu County. Applications for three more projects have been submitted by local sponsors to the Department of Agriculture for approval, and two of these have been approved for planning assistance.

In Hawaii we have demanding water management problems. Flash rains and seasonal storms have caused many damaging floods in the Islands. As much as 6 inches of topsoil have been washed from an entire field during one storm. We now have an effective means of preventing much of this loss and further developing these areas for the benefit of the Hawaiian economy.

Hawaiian farmers are intensely interested in soil and water conservation and are cooperating wholeheartedly with the Soil Conservation Service in establishing sound conservation practices on their land. Nearly 1,800 rural landowners and operators are cooperating with 15 soil conservation districts that virtually blanket the State. More than 1,140 farm conservation plans have been prepared with the help of the Soil Conservation Service.

The magnificent natural beauty of Hawaii exacts its toll in the limited amount of land that can be devoted to agriculture, in the difficulty of water control on the steep slopes, in the few perennial streams because the porous mountains absorb so much of the rainfall. Some coastal areas receive less than 10 inches of average annual rainfall, while others record more than 100 inches in a single year. Sometimes the winds shift and normally dry areas receive heavy rainfall. Then floods often occur along the coastal plain.

Few sites are suitable for the location of impounding reservoirs because of the porous rock, the steep and narrow valleys, and the wash of rocks and debris down steep stream beds.

So we do have exceptional water control problems in Hawaii. But we are planning and building watershed protection and development projects because we have problems to overcome. We are meeting these problems according to the conditions that exist. A valuable feature of a Public Law 566 project is that it is planned for a particular area to meet the needs of that area.

We want not only to prevent damaging floods; we want also to assure an adequate supply of water where it is needed, and to put the available water resource to good use. We have sound promise of doing this in the small watershed projects we have undertaken. I am confident that this program will continue to grow in Hawaii and benefit Hawaii, for it has proved its value throughout the United States.

CONGRATULATIONS TO U.S. COAST GUARD ON ITS 176TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, my heartiest congratulations are extended to U.S. coast guardsmen all over the world as they observe today the 176th birthday of their organization. The coast guardsmen who are stationed on the island of Oahu in Hawaii and members of their families are celebrating the occasion with a picnic at the beach. They have much to celebrate, for the Coast Guard has come a long way from its beginnings in 1790, when it was organized by the then Secretary of Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, as a small revenue fleet to intercept smugglers. The Coast Guard's duties have since been increased and enlarged.

Commonly thought of as a peacetime, humanitarian watchdog of our shores, the Coast Guard today also patrols the waters off Vietnam. Twenty-six Coast Guard cutters are now in service off the Vietnam coasts to intercept the smuggling of Communist supplies into South Vietnam.

My island State of Hawaii is the proud home of 2,349 coast guardsmen of the 14th Coast Guard District. Commanded by Rear Adm. George D. Synon, the district extends from Hawaii to Japan.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin on August 1, 1966, ran an article on the 176th birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard. I am pleased to submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COAST GUARD WILL BECOME 176 YEARS OLD THURSDAY

The U.S. Coast Guard, ordinarily a humanitarian organization, will reach its 176th birthday Thursday at war.

The non-military branch of the U.S. Treasury Department has 26 cutters working Viet Nam coasts trying to stop the smuggling of Communist supplies from north to south.

In Hawaii things are more peaceful and Oahu-based Coast Guardsmen and their families will hold a picnic Thursday at 11 a.m. at Bellows Beach.

There are 2,349 Coast Guardsmen in the 14th Coast Guard District which spreads from here to Japan and has headquarters on Kapiolani Boulevard.

The district has 16 cutters, including 12 in Honolulu and others in Hilo, Maalea, Maui; Pago Pago, American Samoa, and Sangley Point, Philippines.

Rear Admiral George D. Synon, the commander, also, heads an operation of 22 loran stations in such isolated places as Yap.

He also has jurisdiction over many lighthouses including a one-man station on Maui.

VIET NAM ACTION

The Coast Guard has been in Viet Nam a year.

Coast Guardsmen killed, wounded or captured 75 Viet Cong and destroyed or captured 16 junks.

In the past year the Coast Guard service has responded to 27,000 emergency calls and saved nearly $2 billion worth of ships and cargoes.

The service also was busy checking on the flow of Cuban refugees heading for Florida and helping Mississippi River flood survivors.

The Coast Guard was started in 1790 by Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury, who wanted a small revenue fleet to intercept smugglers.

FREEMAN AND FARM PRICES

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman are devoting much time, effort, and personal attention to the farm areas these days, obviously seeking to rebuild the rural fences which they themselves knocked down with their own words and actions.

This new-found concern for farmers comes a little late. Farmers have calendars, too. They know, as well as anybody else, that November 8 is election day. Maybe better than almost anybody else.

The current administration pitch to farmers is that "you never had it so good." For musical background, a quartet which sounds suspiciously like it might include Johnson, HUMPHREY, Freeman, and McNamara, sings, "I Love You Truly."

It's a rather seductive number but the cool reaction of farmers seems to run something like this: "Why should we believe that you will love us in November when you spurned us and denounced us 'til July?"

This attitude is sharply pointed up in a New York Times article of July 31, 1966, captioned "We Farmers Feel Let Down." At this point I include this report by Donald Janson in my remarks:

"WE FARMERS FEEL LET DOWN"

(By Donald Janson)

KANSAS CITY, MO., July 30.—"Like most farmers around here, I feel we've been let down. Farm support here was strong for the Johnson Administration, but the President has not lived up to expectations."

Marion H. Mahnken, grain and livestock farmer at Salisbury, Mo., made the statement more in sorrow than in anger. He has been a consistent Democratic voter, but intends to be an "independent" one henceforth.

"The farmer has been made the whipping boy for inflation caused by the Vietnamese War," he said in an interview this week. "The biggest jolt was when the Administration took steps to deflate farm prices. This was discrimination against the farmer."

ANGRY FARMERS

Last spring President Johnson urged consumers to boycott high-priced cuts of meat to help throttle the prospect of inflation. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced soon afterward that he was "pleased" to report that "farm prices in certain key items have moderated."

These performances proved to be dynamite in the Farm Belt. It was the first time in memory that a farmer's advocate in the Cabinet had expressed please at a decline in farm prices.

No amount of explaining has succeeded in reversing the impression upon farmers that they are being unjustly blamed for inflationary trends that are hurting them at least as much as other segments of the population.

"At least he could have said 'I regret to report,' corn-grower Harold Loyd commented when the Secretary was in Columbus, Ind., last weekend.

"I voted for Johnson," farmer Floyd Struthers of Ayrshire, Iowa, said in an interview earlier this month, "but I'm returning to the Republican column. The Administration thinks farmers are making too much money. Did they ever come out and try to pay the farmers' expenses?"

"Costs are up terrifically," Mr. Mahnken said. "New equipment is almost prohibitive. We can't farm without it and we can't afford it with the prices we're getting for our products."

Rural voters fume because the Administration has acted to hold down prices of products they market, while prices of things they buy continue to creep up. In the last few months the farmer's costs have been rising more rapidly than his income.

Until this spring the Johnson Administration enjoyed considerable support in the Farm Belt. Then came the statements on inflation. They were accompanied by a series of steps by the Administration that cemented the mushrooming view among farmers that the Government was unfairly penalizing them.

Military purchases of pork and butter were cut back early this year when prices of these items rose. Heavy sales of Government-held corn were made from surplus stocks when corn prices rose. The same thing happened with high protein wheat. Quotas on cheese imports were lifted to force prices down. Hide exports were limited for the same reason.

Since then the President has announced a 15 percent increase in wheat acreage for next year, a move that appeases wheat growers and promises increased income. The other actions that aggravated farmers have been halted. But the farmers' confidence in the Administration has not been restored and Democratic Congressmen in farm states fear they may suffer at the polls in November.

A recent survey by the Iowa Poll showed that Iowa farmers disapproved of Secretary Freeman's performance in office by a margin of 2-to-1. Representative JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, freshman Democrat of Iowa, who is seeking re-election, declined an invitation to fly to Iowa with the President this month, saying he had made plans to go by commercial plane. Iowa's Democratic Governor, Harold E. Hughes, suggested last month that

> the White House keep Mr. Freeman out of the state. Concern among Democratic office seekers has been equally strong in other farm states.
>
> As election time grows nearer, the Administration is anxiously trying to recoup. Mr. Freeman spent last weekend in Indiana, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Nebraska and Iowa. The Administration, he assured rural audiences at every stop, has the interests of farmers at heart.
>
> He cited gains in farm income, increasing exports and disposal of price-depressing surpluses. He stressed repeatedly that the Administration's goal remained the elusive one of income levels for farmers at a par with those of other segments of the economy.
>
> SWING TO GOP
>
> "The actions taken by the Administration to improve farm income are getting across to farmers," he said afterward, "and I think they will have this very much in mind when they vote in Congressional elections this fall."
>
> But talks with farmers disclose continuing discontent and widespread skepticism. Many farmers expressed displeasure as well with the protracted Vietnamese War and domestic programs they see as tax drains.
>
> "If the election was now," said Clifford Graham, Democratic committeeman for the swing township of Silver Lake in Iowa's Palo Alto County, "Silver Lake would go Republican."
>
> Two years ago this microcosm of rural sentiment, which has always been on the side of the winner in Presidential elections, supported President Johnson 2-to-1.

The administration contention that farmers are wallowing in prosperity has about as much validity as the White House announcement that the airline strike was settled. The real truth is that about 100,000 of the Nation's 3.2 million farm units are being squeezed out of business each year, while the remaining operators find they must struggle harder and harder to remain afloat in a sea of constantly rising production costs.

According to published statistics of the Department of Agriculture itself, average prices received by farmers for the commodities they sell are 14.7 percent lower today than they were at the height of the Korean war in 1951. Over that very same period, prices paid by farmers for goods and services—farm production costs, to put it another way—are up 18 percent.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that it takes $11.24 today to buy the same food items at retail which cost $9.54 in 1951. That is an increase of nearly 18 percent.

To summarize: farm prices are down; farm production costs are up; retail food prices are up.

It should be added that the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar is constantly shrinking. It is about 39 cents now, as against 43 cents a dozen years ago. In other words, 61 percent of the cost of the food items in the housewife's shopping basket is added after these commodities leave the farm.

The Johnson administration's own inflationary policies are generating the production, transportation and distribution cost increases which are added all along the way from the farm to the supermarket. Yet the New York Times of August 2 front-paged the word that—

> Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman will come to New York this week to help look into the cause of the rise in food prices here.

The answer, of course, is to be found right here in Washington and no one knows it better than the President and Mr. Freeman.

A headline in the same edition of the Times says:

> Soaring Food Prices Bewilder and Confuse City Housewives—Where Will It End? What's the Cause? and To Whom Do you Complain? Are Some of the Questions They Ask.

The kind of answers inquiring New York housewives are likely to receive were neatly summed up by Mr. Freeman himself just a few days ago. At a briefing of Democratic congressional candidates in Washington on July 28, the Secretary was asked for advice on how to handle questions about rising living costs. Here is his recommendation, as reported in the Chicago Tribune of July 29:

> "I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for six years," Freeman replied. "Slip, slide, and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can.
>
> "Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers," he cautioned. "If you do, and have to choose a side, take the farmers' side. It's the right side, and, besides, housewives aren't nearly as well organized."

These are the words of the man President Johnson is sending to New York City to answer housewives' questions about rising food prices. His "slip, slide, and duck" formula tells you even more than you need to know about Mr. Freeman's credentials as an analyst of soaring living costs.

His counsel to harassed housewives may be reserved for later discussion. His current "farmers never had it so good" line, which he has been peddling in rural areas, deserves some comment now.

He told a recent press conference, July 26, that net realized farm income for 1966 is now estimated at $15.7 billion—$1.5 billion more than 1965.

What he did not mention is that about $500 million—one-third of this increase—is accounted for by inflation. The 1966 dollar is now worth about 3 percent less than its 1965 counterpart and, if inflation continues at the current rate, it may be worth 4 or 5 percent less by the end of the year.

The other billion dollars can be accounted for in one sentence: Direct Government payments to farmers in 1966 will reach $3.5 billion as against $2.5 billion in 1965. In passing, it might be noted that direct Federal payments to farmers in 1960 totaled $693 million—less than one-fifth as much as in the current year.

What this points up is that diluted dollars and sharply increased Federal farm payments give an illusion of farm prosperity which really is not there. Farmers know this, even if Mr. Freeman does not.

Farm operating costs reach alltime highs month after month and the end is nowhere in sight. Farm units go under at the rate of 100,000 a year and farmers are told by no less an authority than the President himself that "1 million farmers could produce all of the Nation's farm needs, including our large commercial exports"—which is another way of saying that about 2.2 million farm operators are surplus.

Strangely enough, while the number of farms declines, the number of U.S. Department of Agriculture employees keeps going up. In 1955, there was only 1 USDA employee for every 54 farms. In 1965, the ratio was 1 employee for every 30 farms.

Farm debt is skyrocketing under the Johnson administration while interest rates paid by farmers hit the highest levels in half a century. Total farm debt was $16.9 billion in 1956. Now, just 10 years later, it is $39.4 billion. Farmers paid interest charges of $902 million in 1956. This year the total will be near $2.5 billion.

The parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, averaged 84½ under the Eisenhower administration. It has averaged 78 since 1960.

The Johnson-Freeman gimmick of citing increased income per farm is statistical manipulation. It is obvious that income per farm will go up as the number of farms goes down. When you cut a pie into fewer pieces, each slice is sure to be larger. This leaves little comfort, however, for the displaced farmer who is no longer getting any slice of the pie at all.

In all fairness, it should be pointed out that market prices for some farm products have improved sharply in the last 2 months. Unprecedented worldwide demand for food has cut deeply into U.S. stocks of wheat and feed grains that were counted surplus only a short time ago. Both wheat and feed grain production in 1966 will be well below U.S. output last year. Record market demand at home and abroad has pushed soybeans to an unusually high price level. With milk production trending down for the last 2 years while the population increased, milk, butter, and cheese prices have also moved higher.

All of these factors have brought added income to farmers in recent months. They have been earning those extra dollars in the marketplace—in the supply and demand marketplace. Wheat, corn, soybeans, and milk are all selling well above the Government-supported prices. It is a tight supply situation which is holding those prices up—not Government supports.

This may puzzle economists of the Freeman-Cochrane school who argue that only Government supply-management programs can create farm income. Nevertheless, the administration is taking credit for farm price increases brought about by heavy foreign and domestic food demands. Except in the cities, of course.

It will be interesting to watch this unfolding drama as more and more administration spokesmen hit the campaign trail between now and November—slipping, sliding, ducking, and perhaps, praying.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES STAMP TO BE ISSUED TO COMMEMORATE CONSTRUCTION OF ERIE CANAL

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of New York has requested that the Postmaster General issue in 1967 a stamp commemorating the sesquicentennial of the Erie Canal's construction. In calling for this stamp, the legislators have acted with a true sense of history, and I fully support their proposal.

Begun in 1817, the Erie Canal stimulated national expansion and economic development: people and goods moved swiftly and at low cost between east and west. The canal encouraged growth not only in the west where it ended, but in the east where it began. New York City prospered, and the towns along its banks boomed.

The expansion of Rochester during the mid-19th century resulted directly from the traffic the canal brought and the markets it opened. In evaluating its role, Arch Merrill, one of the foremost scholars of the canal has written:

> When the Erie Canal was done and a mighty column of traffic began to parade its shallow, narrow waters, it was truly said: "They have built the longest canal in the world in the least time, with the least experience, for the least money and for the greatest public benefit."

Mr. Merrill continued:

> The building of the Canal was the most significant single event in the early history of the state and of this region. It also had far-reaching national import. It forged an economic bond between the East and West that insured a Union victory when the Civil War came. It built great cities, peopled great states, loosed a flood tide of immigration westward. It gave a rich frontier an outlet to the sea. It made New York State an economic unit . . . It brought prosperity to the stunted backwoods of Western New York. It boosted the value of land . . . It reduced the time of travel between Buffalo and New York from six weeks to ten days.
>
> And beyond question, the Canal made the cities of Rochester, Buffalo, and Syracuse, as well as most of the smaller towns on its banks.

The Erie Canal was significant in our Nation's history and growth, for it represents not only a major individual development, but the first link in the chain of transportation that unites America. The Erie Canal made possible the beginning of an era.

I urge my colleagues to join me in endorsing the efforts of those who are working to secure Post Office approval for an Erie Canal commemorative stamp. I believe that issuance of such a stamp would be most fitting and proper.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like at this point to have included in the RECORD the resolution which was passed by the New York State Legislature. I think that the resolution will serve to demonstrate to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives the merit of this proposal:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, June 22, 1966.

RESOLUTION 124

Concurrent resolution of the State of New York, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a stamp commemorating the start of construction of the Erie Canal

Whereas, on the fourth day of July, nineteen hundred sixty-seven, there will be commemorated the sesquicentennial anniversary of start of construction of the Erie Canal on July fourth, eighteen hundred seventeen, in Rome New York; and

Whereas, the construction of the three hundred mile long Erie Canal was one of the greatest internal improvement projects ever undertaken by the nation; and

Whereas, the construction of the Erie Canal provided a main route for the opening of the west and the resulting growth and expansion of the nation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), that the Postmaster General of the United States be, and he hereby is respectfully requested to issue on an appropriate date in 1967, a stamp commemorating the start of construction of the Erie Canal on July fourth, eighteen hundred seventeen; and be it further

Resolved (if the Assembly concur), that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Postmaster General of the United States and to each member of Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the Senate,

ALBERT J. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

In assembly, June 22, 1966, concurred in without amendment.

By order of Assembly:

JOHN T. MCKENNAN.

URBAN RENEWAL HAS FORGOTTEN THE GHETTO

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disturbing lack of effort and success in renewing the ghetto areas of our cities by way of the present urban renewal program has led me, in light of the situation the country faces this summer, to file suplemental views on the housing and urban renewal legislation recently voted out of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Earlier this year, Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, took issue with the suggestion that residential urban renewal was in any way suffering as a result of a trend toward commercial urban renewal. He indicated to our Housing Subcommittee that whatever the problems of urban renewal in the 1950's, since 1961 urban renewal had changed its course for the better.

In February of this year I asked the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress to prepare a study on residential urban renewal using figures from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I believe the Library's study, plus a chart prepared by my office from the figures supplied by HUD, indicates that in the case of at least eight key cities in the United States, residential urban renewal has taken a back seat in terms of urban renewal projects most recently approved by the present administration. The neglect of our true housing needs would undoubtedly be even more startling if figures were available to compare low-income versus high-income housing built or contemplated even in the few residential urban renewal projects.

My supplemental views in House Report No. 1699, part I, 89th Congress, 2d session, the chart prepared by my office, and the study by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service follow:

[From H. Rept. No. 1699; pt. 1, 89th Cong., 2d sess., July 15, 1966]

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

We are told that the proposed Demonstration Cities Act would help the poor and disadvantaged in our restless cities. For the past 17 years we have been told that slum clearance and urban renewal would do likewise. Now we are told, by Secretary Weaver himself, that urban renewal has never lived up to its promise. And yet, instead of improving upon the multibillion-dollar program already in existence—urban renewal—and regearing it to meet the true housing needs of our urban populations, we are handed still another huge program.

My efforts over the past several years to change this deplorable situation with respect to the urban renewal program have more often than not been met with the statement by HUD that urban renewal cannot be tampered with for fear of losing flexibility. Flexibility for what? Do they mean the kind of flexibility that has constructed luxury high rise apartments and promoted commercial downtown renewal at the expense of the low- and moderate-income citizens left behind in the ghettoes? Do they mean the kind of flexibility that has fostered the explosive situations in city after city that we face this summer?

We are told that, whatever the problems or urban renewal in the past, since 1961 residential renewal has been emphasized. Yet a Library of Congress study using HUD data shows that the following major cities have had the following high percentages of funds approved for nonresidential, commercial projects in the last 5 years: Atlanta, 97 percent; Baltimore, 77 percent; Boston, 62 percent; Chicago, 60 percent; Cleveland, 49 percent; New York, 56 percent; Philadelphia, 75 percent.

Speaking for myself, my patience with the present trends in urban renewal has about come to an end. If a city qualifies for demonstration city assistance, then why should it be permitted to continue at the same time with residential urban renewal projects completely inconsistent with the goals set forth for the new program? And why should only demonstration projects in demonstration cities be required to produce "a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost and result in marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas"? Do we need a 6-year demonstration program to prove that in both the few demonstration cities and the thousand other urban centers not so designated there is a need for improvements in the quantity and quality of housing in low- and moderate-income residential areas?

During the executive committee session on this bill, I offered an amendment to the urban renewal laws—an amendment that in no way would have affected the demonstration cities program. Instead, it would have set a priority in the existing multibillion-dollar urban renewal program emphasizing the needs of those with low and moderate means, using the language quoted above from the demonstration cities bill itself. It was rejected on a straight party line vote. The reason? Flexibility!

I shall offer this same amendment when the bill reaches the floor. For my part, I view the proposed Demonstration Cities Act as a unique opportunity for the Congress. It can provide a test of the sincerity of those who desire its enactment. If they want demonstration cities, then let them first put their urban renewal house in order. Let them restrict urban renewal grants to those cities who are interested in housing the poor instead of accommodating the rich. Had we kept our urban renewal program on the right track all these years, possibly millions of our citizens of all races and backgrounds would not be living in fear for their very lives and properties this summer.

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

Urban renewal (in selected cities)

Cities	Redevelopment grants approved[1] (total January 1960 to June 30, 1965)		Residential grants[1]			Nonresidential grants[1]		
	Projects	Amount (in thousands)	Projects	Amount (in thousands)	Percent of total	Projects	Amount (in thousands)	Percent of total
Atlanta	3	$7,049	1	$240	3.0	2	$6,809	97.0
Baltimore	8	45,982	4	14,992	23.0	4	30,990	77.0
Boston	5	71,778	3	27,086	38.0	2	44,692	62.0
Chicago	7	53,787	3	21,340	40.0	4	32,447	60.0
Cleveland	3	31,818	1	16,166	51.0	2	15,652	49.0
New York	5	57,496	3	25,376	44.0	2	32,120	56.0
Philadelphia	15	53,572	4	13,177	25.0	11	40,395	75.0
Pittsburgh	3	59,874	2	45,201	76.0	1	14,462	24.0
San Francisco	1	35,201	1	35,201	100.0			
Washington, D.C	2	13,881	2	13,881	100.0			
Total	52	430,438	24	212,871	49.5	28	217,567	50.5

[1] The projects figuring in the computation are those where a judgment can be made as to whether the reuse will be predominately residential or nonresidential. Therefore, projects in early planning stages prior to formal approval are not included. Certain other projects subject to modification of reuse are not reflected where that reuse cannot be determined at this time.

Source: Chart prepared by the office of Hon. William B. Widnall from information supplied by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, March 1966.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1966.

To: The Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: Housing conditions and urban renewal expenditures.

Enclosed are the following:

(1) Table 1 "Conditions of Housing in Selected Cities, 1960" taken from the 1960 Census of Housing.

(2) Table 2 "Housing Conditions of the Elderly for the United States, 1960". In this table the percentages as well as the number of deteriorating and dilapidated units are given.

(3) Table 3 "Housing of the Elderly in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1960". No figures are provided by the Census Bureau on the housing conditions of the elderly in specific cities.

In order to approximate the number of deteriorating or dilapidated units occupied by elderly persons in specific cities, however, one may apply the percentages for those types of units listed in Table 2. Within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas 8% of the owner-occupied units were deteriorating; 1.9% were dilapidated. Of the renter occupied units 15.3% were deteriorating; 5% were dilapidated.

(4) Table 4, "Children under 18 in Housing Units, for SMSA's". Again, no census figures show the number of children in deteriorating or dilapidated housing. In order to make some estimation of the relation of children to bad housing, it may be helpful to apply the following percentages to the figures in Table 4. In 1960, for the United States as a whole inside SMSA's, 5.5% of all owner-occupied units were deteriorating; 1.3% were dilapidated. 15.8% of all rent-occupied units were deteriorating; 4.9% were dilapidated. Of course, there is no way to calculate the variation in deterioration or dilapidation among units occupied by one child or 6 children.

(5) A copy of basic urban renewal statistics as of June 30, 1965 for the total program.

(6) Tables prepared by the Urban Renewal Administration showing:

(a) Numbers of dwelling units and commercial structures started during 1964 and 1965. URA informs us that statistics for the years 1960–1963 would require some time to compile since it would be necessary to receive reports from local agencies. If your office wants to pursue this aspect further, a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would receive prompt attention to this project.

(b) Number of dwelling units planned for rehabilitation in the selected cities.

(c) Monetary figures on urban renewal projects in selected cities, by division of residential and non-residential projects. The projects figuring in the computation are those where a judgment can be made whether the re-use will be predominantly residential or non-residential. Therefore, most projects in early planning stages are not included, since reuse patterns are subject to modification.

TOM F. LORD,
Analyst in Housing.

TABLE 1.—*Conditions of housing in selected cities, 1960*

City	Owner occupied units	Sound	Deteriorating	Dilapidated	Renter occupied units	Sound	Deteriorating	Dilapidated
New York	577,012	543,740	29,080	4,192	2,077,890	1,720,559	286,514	70,817
San Francisco	102,141	98,572	3,113	456	189,834	169,841	16,236	3,757
Pittsburgh	91,831	79,178	11,056	1,597	96,505	68,686	22,050	5,769
Philadelphia	381,339	316,062	18,563	1,714	234,425	187,082	38,868	8,475
Los Angeles	404,962	388,570	14,495	1,897	471,806	419,706	43,590	8,510
Baltimore	149,668	140,977	7,777	914	125,929	94,799	24,245	6,885
Boston	61,291	54,850	5,675	766	163,396	129,022	28,293	6,081
Chicago	396,727	369,539	24,084	3,104	760,682	625,030	112,104	23,548
Atlanta	66,504	59,378	5,745	1,381	79,449	55,722	14,691	9,036
Washington, D.C	75,532	71,502	3,737	293	176,534	157,754	15,860	2,920
Cleveland	121,173	111,127	8,723	1,323	148,718	114,344	27,969	6,045

Source: U.S. Census of Housing, 1960.

TABLE 2.—*Housing conditions of the elderly for the United States, 1960*

	Total	Sound	Deteriorating		Dilapidated	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
United States as a whole:						
Owner occupied	11,104,549	9,366,748	1,363,639	12.3	374,162	3.37
Renter occupied	4,868,074	3,546,333	936,539	19.2	385,202	7.9
United States—Nonfarm inside SMSA's:						
Owner occupied	6,163,897	5,558,216	490,550	8.7	115,131	1.9
Renter occupied	3,427,886	2,734,669	523,314	15.3	169,903	5.0

Source: U.S. Census of Housing 1960.

TABLE 3.—*Housing of elderly (60 years and over) in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas, 1960*

City	Total	Owner occupied	Renter occupied	City	Total	Owner occupied	Renter occupied
New York	1, 492, 557	571, 462	921, 095	Boston	373, 535	217, 160	156, 375
San Francisco	891, 895	524, 627	367, 268	Chicago	756, 603	452, 399	304, 204
Pittsburgh	693, 419	456, 736	236, 683	Atlanta	94, 648	64, 944	29, 704
Philadelphia	545, 524	419, 811	125, 713	Washington, D.C	95, 683	45, 785	49, 898
Los Angeles	819, 311	515, 434	303, 877	Cleveland	222, 032	159, 291	62, 471
Baltimore	182, 011	132, 814	49, 197				

Source: U.S. Census of Housing, 1960.

TABLE 4.—*Children under 18 years old in housing units, in standard metropolitan statistical areas, 1960*

	New York	Pittsburgh	Philadelphia	Los Angeles	Baltimore	Boston	Chicago	Atlanta	San Francisco	Washington, D.C.	Cleveland
All occupied units	4, 683, 787	693, 419	1, 258, 988	2, 193, 879	480, 555	737, 437	2, 054, 743	295, 683	891, 895	572, 949	532, 403
No children	2, 547, 675	365, 590	679, 337	1, 160, 075	244, 543	402, 953	1, 078, 054	141, 769	487, 543	294, 485	258, 854
1 child	731, 554	115, 940	195, 942	322, 482	76, 351	105, 172	328, 068	47, 751	124, 702	96, 116	86, 820
2 children	814, 989	104, 323	184, 907	369, 714	68, 924	108, 772	316, 340	56, 767	136, 975	75, 378	90, 509
3 children	403, 384	66, 478	104, 434	220, 787	43, 513	67, 916	174, 698	77, 765	82, 347	55, 097	58, 978
4 children	116, 456	25, 917	51, 327	70, 328	24, 692	30, 386	76, 038	12, 006	30, 281	30, 152	21, 233
5 children	44, 191	11, 515	24, 456	30, 138	12, 655	12, 764	48, 832	4, 262	17, 477	14, 211	9, 667
6 children or more	25, 538	3, 656	18, 585	20, 355	9, 877	9, 474	32, 668	5, 363	10, 570	7, 510	6, 342
Owner occupied	1, 923, 451	456, 736	894, 128	1, 324, 373	307, 442	398, 522	1, 137, 394	183, 725	524, 627	298, 074	332, 833
No children	861, 782	245, 499	463, 702	590, 423	155. 340	203, 628	558, 206	84, 579	253, 144	135, 262	152, 007
1 child	321, 950	69, 521	135, 054	201, 479	52, 681	52, 525	174, 737	29, 783	79, 827	50, 920	51, 475
2 children	427, 235	68, 067	148, 971	286, 923	46, 582	65, 900	196, 932	41, 143	102, 166	39, 406	63, 999
3 children	721, 696	48, 031	81, 750	161, 729	27, 829	44, 685	112, 857	16, 749	55, 257	35, 864	39, 816
4 children or more	90, 788	75, 618	65, 151	83, 819	25, 010	31, 784	94, 662	11, 471	34, 233	36, 622	25, 536
Renter occupied	2, 760, 336	236, 683	364, 860	869, 506	173, 113	338, 915	917, 349	111, 958	367, 268	274, 875	199, 570
No children	1, 685, 893	120, 091	216, 135	569, 652	89, 203	199, 325	519, 848	57, 190	234, 399	159, 223	106, 847
1 child	409, 604	46, 419	60, 888	121, 003	23, 670	52, 647	153, 331	17, 968	44, 875	45, 196	35, 345
2 children	387, 754	36, 256	35, 936	82, 791	22, 342	42, 872	119, 408	15, 624	36, 809	35, 972	26, 510
3 children	181, 688	18, 447	22, 684	59, 058	15, 684	23, 231	61, 841	11, 016	27, 090	19, 233	19, 162
4 children or more	95, 397	15, 470	29, 217	37, 020	22, 214	20, 840	62, 921	10, 016	24, 095	15, 251	11, 706

Source: U.S. Census of Housing, 1960.

LOCALITIES IN PROGRAM

(June 1965)

1. Localities with urban renewal projects (including GNRP's reservations)	770
2. Population under 100,000	658
3. Population 100,000 and over	112

PROGRAM STATUS

4. Urban renewal projects (including GNRP's with grant reservations)	1, 592
5. In planning	546
6. In execution	837
7. Completed	209

8. Grant reservation, $4,502,987,000.

RELOCATION (LPA ACQUISITION)

9. Families relocated	193, 705
10. Families whose housing condition is known	167, 958
11. Percent relocated to standard housing	93. 0
12. Percent to public housing	23. 9
13. Percent to standard private rental housing	46. 3
14. Percent to standard sales housing	22. 8
15. Percent self-relocated to substandard housing	7. 0

LAND ACQUISITION—DISPOSITION—REDEVELOPMENT

(1,046 projects completed or in execution)

16. Total project area ......acres	71, 793
17. Land acquired or to be acquired ......acres	38, 686
18. Land acquired (included in line 17) ......acres	29, 037
19. Land ready for disposition redeveloper not yet selected ......acres	3, 155
20. Total land with redeveloper selected ......acres	18, 098
21. Not yet committed to redeveloper ......acres	1, 956
22. Committed to redeveloper ......acres	16, 142
23. Redevelopment not started ......acres	5, 615
24. Redevelopment started, not completed ......acres	2, 832
25. Redevelopment completed ......do	7, 695
26. Dwelling units completed	77, 096
27. Private	70, 713
28. Public	6, 383

REHABILITATION (DWELLING UNITS)

29. Dwelling units scheduled for rehabilitation in projects in execution	138, 927
30. Dwelling units completed or in process	74, 530
31. Percent of total completed or in process	53. 6

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal Administration—Selected redevelopment projects, construction started during fiscal year 1964 and 1965—Selected cities

City	Number of dwelling units	Number of commercial, industrial, institutional structures
Total, selected cities	12, 290	416
Atlanta	122	11
Baltimore	15	12
Boston	950	9
Chicago	665	311
Cleveland	----------	7
Los Angeles	----------	1
New York	5, 866	8
Philadelphia	717	13
Pittsburgh	300	22
San Francisco	1, 071	6
Washington, D.C	2, 584	16

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal Administration—Rehabilitation of dwelling units planned, in urban renewal projects approved for execution, as of Dec. 31, 1959, and June 30, 1965—Selected cities

City	Number of dwelling units planned for rehabilitation		
	As of June 30, 1965	As of Dec. 31, 1959	For the period Jan 1, 1960 to June 30, 1965 [1]
Total	62, 276	20, 684	41, 592
Atlanta	2, 131	177	1, 954
Baltimore	6, 967	----------	6, 967
Boston	4, 292	----------	4, 292
Chicago	28, 925	19, 550	9, 375
Cleveland	4, 500	580	3, 920
Los Angeles	----------	----------	----------
New York	7, 158	----------	7, 158
Philadelphia	7, 261	377	6, 884
Pittsburgh	963	----------	963
San Francisco	----------	----------	----------
Washington, D.C	349	----------	349

[1] Computed by net changing the June 30, 1965, and Dec. 31, 1959, columns.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal Administration—Urban renewal project approvals, principal reuse of projects,[1] Jan. 1, 1960, through June 30, 1965—Selected cities

[Dollars in thousands]

City	Residential		Nonresidential	
	Number of projects	Federal grants	Number of projects	Federal grants
Total, selected cities	24	$212, 871	28	$217, 567
Atlanta	1	240	2	6, 809
Baltimore	4	14, 992	4	30, 990
Boston	3	27, 086	2	44, 692
Chicago	3	21, 340	4	32, 447
Cleveland	1	16, 166	2	15, 652

Footnote at end of table.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Renewal Administration—Urban renewal project approvals, principal reuse of projects,[1] *Jan. 1, 1960, through June 30, 1965—Selected cities*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

City	Residential		Nonresidential	
	Number of projects	Federal grants	Number of projects	Federal grants
Totals, selected cities—Con.				
Los Angeles	--------	--------	--------	--------
New York	3	$25,376	2	$32,120
Philadelphia	4	13,177	11	40,395
Pittsburgh	2	45,212	1	14,462
San Francisco	1	35,201	--------	--------
Washington, D.C.	2	13,881	--------	--------

[1] The principal reuse for the entire project for those projects in advance planning or in execution where a determination can be made. The ultimate classification as to residential or nonresidential uses of certain of the projects approved during the 5-year period cannot be determined at this time, and these projects are not reflected in the listing.

THE 1966 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. **DUNCAN** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the nationwide reports that have flowed in this past week, it is evident that our observance of Captive Nations Week this year has exceeded in depth and scope the observance of any previous year. In terms of sheer noise about the week, the celebrations were at a respectable minimum; in terms of citizen concern about the still enslaved captive nations, they attained to a new high. And this is all to the good because the captive nations movement itself counteracts present Red potitical warfare strategy, which employs the principle of lullification with reference to us and the western industrial nations to stir up old rivalries and to distract our attention from both the captivity of peoples and Red subversion and infiltration in the underdeveloped world. Also, the growing movement represents a widening base for inevitable operations once Moscow shifts gears and reemploys its cold war principle of frontal attack against our posture and institutions; in short, once it has taken full advantage of the "breather" obtained in the present phase.

This is our opportunity, too, for a "breather" in the sense of learning more about the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union, and preparing legislation that would lead to genuine bridges of understanding with the captive peoples themselves. The means for this is the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This is the opportune time for such a committee in order to demonstrate our responsible obligation to the captive nations, our awareness of current Red strategy, and our determination to work for the freedom of close to a billion still-enslaved people. Responsible and forward-looking leadership clearly demands such a course of action in this period and will enable us to avoid the pitfalls of calculated Red lullification.

The nationwide observance of the 1966 week underscored this theme. The selected items below amply show the scope and depth of the week's observances. With permission granted, Mr. Speaker, I place the following as part of my remarks: First, an article by John Chamberlain, "Why No Noise About Captive Nations?" in the Washington Post, August 1, 1966; second, an advertisement in the July 21 issue of the Wanderer, "Our 'Secret' Allies—Our Key to Victory"; third, a proclamation by Gov. Paul B. Johnson of the State of Mississippi; fourth, the July 22 News From China release on "President Chiang Addresses 'Captive Nations Week' Rally"; fifth, also the July 23 News From China release on "You Speak at 'Captive Nations Week Rally"; sixth, the city of Chicago observance, including an official June 27 release, a July 16 Chicago Captive Nations Committee release, a short report on "Captive Nations Week in Chicago", the program for Captive Nations Day, the adopted resolution of July 16, the statement by the Honorable Frank T. T. Sia, a statement by the Honorable Petras P. Dauzvardis, the captive nations parade lineup, the Chicago Tribune's July 17 report on "10,000 Parade Here for Captive Nations" the Southwest Messenger Press report on the Vets participation in the Chicago observance, July 14, and a read message from the Honorable Dan Rostenkowski; seventh, two Manion Forum texts on the captive nations, featuring Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, and titled "Communism Can Be Defeated" and "The Captive Nations—A Major Deterrant Against Global War"; eighth, a July 14 editorial "Captive Nations" in the Tablet, a New York Catholic Weekly; ninth, a letter to the Washington Daily News editor, written by Miss Vera A. Dowhan on "Captive Nation's Week" and published on July 21; tenth, a July 15 release by the National Captive Nations Committee. "President Johnson Lauded on Timely Captive Nations Proclamation"; and eleventh, the program and resolution of the American Committee of California for Freedoms of Enslaved Nations:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 1, 1966]

WHY NO NOISE ABOUT CAPTIVE NATIONS?

(By John Chamberlain)

Captive Nations Week has come and gone with July, and one wonders why so little noise was made about it. The likely answer is that our State Department is so busy trying to "build bridges" to the Marxist governments of Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, and Bucharest that it is trying to forget the very existence of Public Law 86–90. This law, it may vaguely be recalled, was unanimously adopted by Congress in 1959 to proclaim once a year every July the desirability of extending the provisions of the UN Declaration of Human Rights to East-Central Europe.

The UN Declaration upholds a number of "universal" principles, including the right of individuals to take part in governmental processes and to have equal access to public service. But where, in the captive nations of Eastern Europe, does not Communist Party permit multiple-slate ballots, or minority party organizations? "Public service" is so obviously reserved for candidates who meet with official Party approval that it is almost banal to mention it.

Another UN-proclaimed human right is freedom of opinion, expression and information. But the Assembly of Captive Nations in New York City seems to be talking into a vacuum when it lists recent violations of this right in Poland and other East European states. When 34 leading Polish intellectuals protested the curtailment of free discussion, the authorities replied by reducing the newsprint allotment for a prominent Catholic newspaper, Tygodnik Powszechny. And when a Polish writer, Melchior Wankowicz wrote an article about this for publication abroad, he was tried and sentenced to three years in jail, with a subsequent "humane" reduction of the sentence to 18 months.

Wankowicz got off easy at that. For, in 1965, Stanislaw Wawrecky was tried and executed for the crime of stealing meat—a crime judged to be "especially dangerous at the time of rebuilding the country." Horrified by the Wawrecky sentence, the Polish Writers Union has asked for abolition of the death penalty, except for the crime of genocide. But nobody in the Warsaw government listens to the demands of the Writers Union, whose members stand in daily peril whenever they put pen to paper. Witness the recent jailing of the Polish writer Miller for allowing his critical articles to be published in England. "There is no freedom of speech, of thought, or of the press in Poland," said Miller during a recess of his trial.

Miller might have said the same thing of neighboring Czechoslovakia, where Ivan Svitak, a writer on philosophy, was thrown out of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences a couple of years ago for criticism of Czech culture. Since his expulsion from the Academy, Svitak has been totally unemployed and forbidden to publish or lecture or work for any cultural institution.

Recently the Czech Communist Party has been pursuing Svitak with charges of "parasitism," which is ironical when the poor man is forbidden to take a job within his competence. No doubt they might shut up if Svitak went to work as a garbage collector.

Freedom of Movement, another "universal" right, is restricted in the East-Central European states and almost totally denied in the Baltic states. Hence it is quite understandable when a few East Europeans, bound southward for a tour of Yugoslavia, get off the bus in Vienna and ask for political refuge.

The Right to Work implies the right to quit one job for another, and it is covered by several articles in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. But in Bulgaria work contracts can be broken at will for "disciplinary reasons" by management. The workers have no such recourse: if they quit they are likely to be left without employment or means of subsistence, or, in many instances, hired for only the heaviest sort of labor.

Freedom of conscience and religion is, of course, denied every day in Poland and Hungary, where Catholics are less and less able to recruit students for their seminaries and religious orders. And, as always, there is the continued enslavement of Poles and Hungarians in Soviet Russia.

"Bridge building" is a commendable ideal. But for every concession made by our State Department in terms of trade with Communist East Europe, we should demand a "human rights" concession at the other end of the "bridge." Strangely, during Captive Nations Week, no such demands were heard emanating from Washington's Foggy Bottom.

[From the Wanderer, July 21, 1966]

OUR "SECRET" ALLIES—OUR KEY TO VICTORY

"Is true freedom but to break fetters for our own dear sake, and, with leathern hearts forget that we owe mankind a debt? They are slaves who fear to speak for the fallen and weak. No. True freedom is to share all the chains our brothers wear, and, with heart and hand, to be earnest to make others free."—JAMES R. LOWELL.

If ours were an enlightened self-interest, what would be the normal position to take on the captive nations? *We would work continuously to promote their freedom and to publicize their present enslavement.*

Why?

The captive nations are testimony to the fact that we cannot do business with Communists. Americans should remember that there is not a single nation or territory under Communism which did not have relations with the Soviets. Moreover, the more high-sounding the treaties and agreements made with the Soviet empire, the quicker and more absolute was the enslavement. By exploiting the captive nations for the lessons they can teach, we learn that:

1. *Red Russia cannot be contained by disarmament pacts, cultural exchanges, windy debates, give-and-take agreements, appeasement.*

Rather, the seed of Communism's destruction lies within itself. The conquered are longing and planning for their freedom. To shake hands with Khrushchev—or with the one who may soon replace him and start the cycle over again with friendly smiles and lofty proposals—is to snuff out the captive's spark of resistance, a weapon against our own enslavement. Even for *our own sake*, therefore, we should work to keep Americans aware of the present state of the captive nations and of the best natural hope for our victory which comes from them.

2. *The strongest advantages of the enemy are not military, but political and psychological.*

It was not armed might that locked the galling chains about the necks of the captive nations. Although Russia's greatest conquests occurred in times of war, the armies came second. First there came subversion in government, education, and communications. In government, the puppets of appeasement, assured the people that peace, friendship, and freedom were to be the gifts of cooperation with the Reds. In education, traditional moral standards and partiotism were held up for examination as curiosities, and then suppressed. In communications, what the people could not know was not reported and what they could know was subtly distorted. The string about each nation's throat became a cord, the cord became a rope and the rope eventually became an iron chain. The captive nations are watching the thread around America's throat. If we but listen to their cries, perhaps we shall snap the string before it becomes a chain. Certainly, we must be totally prepared militarily, but no amount of armed might will protect us if we rot from within.

If all we know is what is in the refrigerator, what is on TV, how much gas is in the car, and which cigarette pleases most; if all we have time for is luxury, then we should hoard well our comforts, for we have not long to enjoy them. We must take time, in the name of enlightened self-interest, to learn and teach the lessons of the captive nations, to win this Soviet-declared war of politics and psychology.

3. *To work for our own preservation, we must work toward the liberation of the captive nations.*

Communism is a cancer. A man who is told that he has lung cancer would be a fool to take steps to protect his heart with never a thought about curing the cancer. It is foolish to talk about keeping ourselves and the rest of the Free World from Communist domination without planning the liberation of the enslaved nine hundred million Freedom Fighters. Declaring military war is not the way to free them. Waging ideological, political, and psychological war is the way. The Free World must become absorbed, in international dealings, with the subject of the captive nations. Every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice. Every reliable report of Red suppression of the enslaved must become subject to investigation by the Free World.

Next time one of the captive nations breaks the slavery chains, we should be ready to recognize the new government and to send in American representatives and real "foreign aid." It is our obligation to elect representatives who will do this. It is our obligation to make the present representatives of the Free World aware of the need for nonviolent aggression on behalf of the captive nations.

War is what will result from appeasement; war when we can only lose. A strong, unyielding stand today will make war unnecessary. From within and without their prisons, the people will rise to drive back to hell the father of lies with his false philosophy.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond comprehension. Justice and charity demand that we preface any evaluation of "peaceful co-existence" with consideration of the plight of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Caucasus, China, Cossackia, Croatia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, North Vietnam, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, White Ruthenia—and Cuba.

It is not practical, it is not just, it is not Christian to negotiate on other matters without insisting on freedom for the enslaved; for by doing so we write off the millions who look to us for help, we invite further Communist aggression, we become slowly reconciled to surrender by default.

There is only one standard for America: if a policy advances the cause of freedom, let us pursue it vigorously; if it injures the cause of freedom, let us reject it vehemently. In the words of John Donne:

"No man is an island unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent * * * a part of the main.

"Every man's death diminishes me because I am involved in all mankind.

"Therefore, send not to learn for whom the bell tolls . . . it tolls for thee."

(NOTE.—Above statement is reprinted, in part, from a leaflet issued by the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main P.O., Yonkers, N.Y.)

THE EXHIBIT OF THE MARTYR CHURCH AND ATHEISM—MARXISM: A TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITY TO LIFT WHAT HIS HOLINESS PIUS XI NAMED "THE CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE"

An English translation of the original "Exhibit of the Martyr Church" is being prepared for a USA tour of all principal cities. The value of such an exhibit lies in that it will circumvent the apathy of the clergy and lay people as well as "the conspiracy of silence" of the communications media and its failure to present the truth as to the tyrannical nature of even "modern" communism.

Americans will learn from this Exhibit and the accompanying program that if this nation is to survive, our citizens must realize that the same political school of thought responsible for Communist enslavement of more than 20 nations—and during the life of the "United Nations"—is still in control of our nation and preparing to surrender U.S. citizens to the control of a U.N. world government of Socialist states where we will be out-voted, out-gunned, a Christian minority amongst atheists and other non-believers in the gospel of Jesus Christ. To those who doubt that any group of American politicians or church leaders would consider such an act of treason, the Captive Nations are visible proof as to how the "one worlders" feel towards Christianity and freedom in general.

The sum of $100,000 is required to make this U.S.A. Exhibit and tour a reality. Are there 100 Christian patriots who will make a sacrificial gift of $1,000 for this campaign to bring Americans the facts that they must have soon if our nation is to survive and the captives to be freed? Or are there 200 patriots to make a sacrifice of $500 each?

Will you do your part to bring to American communities a program that will publicize the plight of our brothers and sisters in Christ whose "civil rights" are being violated a thousand times more outrageously than those of any of us in America—but for whom no one seems to be demonstrating, campaigning, lobbying, or even praying.

Every Community Displaying This Exhibit Will Also Feature:

For Speakers: The best of the world's freedom fighters, some of whom have lived in the nations that fell to communism and saw first-hand how religious liberty and all personal freedoms were taken away.

A Parade of over 500 men and women dressed in the native dress of the Red-enslaved nations and carrying miniature placards of the Exhibit.

The Rosary of the Enslaved: During the entire parade the public will hear over the PA systems the actual voices of Bishops, priests, and ministers who have suffered or are still suffering under the Communists. Their prayers will be heard in the native tongues of all the Red-enslaved nations.

The Litany of the Enslaved: To be recited publicly by the marchers in the parade.

The Captive Nations Dancers: A 2-hour show in the auditorium where the Exhibit will be displayed.

Presentation of the Flags of the Captive Nations: This colorful ceremony will be at the Exhibit Hall and part of the show with the Captive Nations Dancers.

Full-page newspaper ads, radio and TV spots, and circulars blanketing every home in the community with the story of the betrayal of the Captive Nations and the world government and disarmament plans of our "surrender salesmen."

The community will learn that WW III has been a war for the minds of men and all will be informed as to what they must do to win this battle against anti-Christ.

No other educational program can possibly match the impact that this Exhibit with its parades and shows will have on a community. No other anti-Communist activity can reach in time a sufficient number of people with the message as to the need of personal involvement in the required spiritual and educational programs to stop the one-world government and disarmament planners. We will be working not just one week of the year but continuously to publicize the enslavement of more than twenty once free nations and to expose the disarmament and world government plans.

Many of us "conservatives" like to talk about our forefathers who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in a total commitment to the battle for freedom. But too many of us are content to live and play as though the threat to our freedom will disappear because of someone elses' sacrifices. Too many of us are apparently willing to wait until our savings or debts are counted in rubles.

Many Americans do not hesitate to go into debt to purchase a $3,000 car that depreciates in value one thousand dollars the first year! Americans should not hesitate to use their savings or to borrow in order to provide funds to bring The Exhibit of the Martyr Church and Atheism—Marxism to our communities as a visible warning of where our nation is being led.

It is futile to save assets for a hypothetical future which may never come because those assets were hoarded and not spent for the preservation of freedom. The crisis of this hour challenges each one of us donate completely our assets of intellect, energy, time, and finances to execute quickly the type of educational programs that will break through the power of the "liberal" television and newspaper media's ability to brainwash Americans to accept disarmament and surrender to world government "in the name of peace."

We are living in a crisis even greater than that faced by the men who suffered and sacrificed at Valley Forge. We will retain our own freedom and restore it to the Captive Nations only if we can match the spirit of James Otis, who said in 1761, "I am determined to sacrifice estate, ease, health, applause, and even life, to the sacred calls of my country . . "

What is your answer?

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatica, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Paul B. Johnson, Governor of the State of Mississippi, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Mississippi, and call upon the citizens of Mississippi to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Mississippi to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol in the City of Jackson this fifteenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred ninety-first.

PAUL B. JOHNSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

[From News From China, July 22, 1966]

PRESIDENT CHIANG ADDRESSES "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" RALLY

TAIPEI, July 22.—In a message released today to the last-day "Captive Nations Week" rally to be held in Taipei tomorrow, President Chiang Kai-shek said the expanding purge on the Chinese mainland is a sure sign of the deepening of the internal crisis there.

The purge, he said, is a countermeasure against the widespread struggle among the people on the mainland, particularly in intellectual circles, against Mao Tse-tung and his tyrannical rule of the past 17 years.

Praising the U.S.-initiated "Captive Nations Week" movement as a collective undertaking to support struggles for freedom in captive countries, President Chiang called on all freedom-loving people to unite in the common struggle against communism. "With unyielding faith and with a pragmatic program of action, we shall be able to provide support for the people in all captive nations and enable them to cast off their shackles and regain their freedom," he said.

The following is the full text of the message:

Our people in all walks of life have responded enthusiastically to the U.S.-initiated Captive Nations Week movement for the purpose of supporting our compatriots' anti-Communist revolution on the Chinese mainland as well as the struggle for freedom on the part of people in other captive countries. The movement not only seeks to rescue those now being enslaved and enable them to be free again, but also promotes collective undertakings to prevent enslaving of others.

As we observe the Captive Nations Week of 1966, the Communists on the Chinese mainland are carrying out bloody purges to counter a struggle of unprecedented proportions—a struggle directed against Mao Tse-tung and communism. Participating in the struggle are intellectuals and the masses of the people on the Chinese mainland who are taking this opportunity to get even with the Chinese Reds for their 17 years of tyrannical rule. This struggle will deal a fatal blow to the Chinese Communist regime. The expanding purge and the spreading anti-Communist struggle are sure signs that the internal crisis of the Peiping regime has been aggravated. The more repressive the regime becomes, the more powerful will be the anti-Communist movement of the intellectuals as well as all the people on the mainland. Thus, Mao's despotic rule is bound to be shaken to its foundations and to disintegrate as a result.

Since they seized the mainland, the Chinese Communists have been engaged in widespread infiltration and subversion which account for most of the chaos in our world today. Communism is the source of all aggressive wars, and the Mao regime is the arch-culprit. In order to save the enslaved people shut behind the iron curtain, we must first eliminate the nefarious Communists from the mainland. To this end we must do our utmost to launch our offensive at an early date in response to the anti-Mao, anti-Communist struggle now spreading on the mainland and put an end to the misery of our compatriots there. All those on the Chinese mainland, who oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought and tyranny, and who refuse to remain enslaved, will be our allies in the national revolution as well as our comrades under the San Min Chu I (Three Principles of the People). They are expected to continue and expand their life-or-death struggle in an undaunted spirit against the Communist regime, wait for our assistance and join forces with us. By coordinated attacks from both within and without against the Peiping regime, we shall accomplish our sacred mission of national recovery and deliverance of our people from Communist rule.

It is our conviction that to combat slavery in the name of freedom conforms to the most basic requirement of humanity and the strongest aspiration of mankind. In observing the Captive Nations Week, all freedom-loving people throughout the world must unite for this common struggle. With unyielding faith and with a pragmatic program of action we shall be able to provide support for the people in all captive nations and enable them to cast off their shackles and regain their freedom. Only thus can the world have security and peace and can mankind enjoy freedom and prosperity in perpetuity.

[From News From China, July 23, 1966]

YEN SPEAKS AT "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" RALLY

TAIPEI, July 23.—Vice President C. K. Yen said today the current purge on the Chinese mainland clearly shows that the intellectuals, the students and even the Communist Party cadres "are fed up with communism."

'This constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of the Chinese Communists, and has forced the Chinese Communists to resort to terroristic measures," he said.

In a speech to a "Captive Nations Week" mass rally, the Vice President said as the first step to "shatter the chains on their enslaved brethren entrapped in the captive nations," the free peoples must join hands immediately on the battleground of Vietnam.

He said the war in Vietnam is being waged "for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom and liberty of the whole world."

"Any assistance to the people of Vietnam is a direct help to the cause of liberty," he stressed.

President Chiang Kai-shek in his message to the rally said the current purge on the Chinese mainland "is a sure sign of the deepening internal crisis there."

He called on all freedom-loving peoples of the world to unite in the struggle against communism, "the source of all aggressive wars." He also appealed for support for the Republic of China's return to the mainland to overthrow the Communist regime which, he said, "accounts for most of the chaos in our world today."

The mass rally, held at the Taipei City Hall, was attended by some 2,000 representatives from all walks of life of the nation and foreign dignitaries. It was presided over by Ku Cheng-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League (APACL), China Chapter.

Kim Chung Yul, chairman of APACL league council, and former defense minister of the Republic of Korea, and Dr. Anthony Kubek, chairman of the department of history of the University of Dallas, Texas, were among foreign dignitaries who attended the meeting.

Dr. Kubek, in his speech at the rally said the intellectuals in the United States who advocate appeasing the Peiping regime "do not represent the rank and file of the American people."

The American scholar, who has fought against communism for more than 20 years, accused these appeasers of seeing only what they would like to see and not what the world actually is.

He questioned why they advocated a strong stand against nazism and fascism in World War II but want to appease communism now. "Both communism and nazism are totalitarian—they both deny freedom to the individual," he said.

The mass rally adopted a declaration in support of all enslaved people behind the iron curtain.

It said that freedom is indivisible and the world could not remain half free and half enslaved forever.

Also adopted at the rally were messages to President Chiang, U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, the government and people of South Vietnam, the allied forces in Vietnam, all captive nations and the suffering people on the Chinese mainland.

Following is the full text of Vice President C. K. Yen's speech:

"In response to the Captive Nations Week of 1966, as proclaimed by the President of the United States of America, the civil organizations of the Republic of China organized today this mass meeting. The purpose of our rally is to reemphasize our determination to emancipate all peoples in captive nations and our faith in the final victory of freedom for mankind. I wish therefore to solemnly declare, on behalf of my government and my people, our firm standing on this most important issue of human rights.

"To struggle for men's liberty is one of the noble ideals which inspired the American people to declare independence. The history of the past one hundred and ninety years has unmistakably testified that for realizing this ideal, the American people have never failed once to pay the price, when necessary, in sweat, tears, and even blood. Because of this historical heritage, it is of unusual significance to both the federal government and the people of the United States to have their President issue a proclamation every year since 1959, inviting them to observe the Captive Nations Week, which falls on the third week of July, with appropriate ceremonies and activities in order to manifest their sympathy and support to the enslaved peoples of the world. Again, because of this historical heritage on the part of such a great champion of liberty, the idea of captive nations week has kindled the hope of mankind and a dynamic global movement has been set in motion.

"We, the people of the Republic of China, in our dedication to bring about the abovementioned noble ideal, are more than willing to offer our utmost efforts. The arch enemy to men's liberty today is the Chinese Communists: They are trampling on our territory, they are enslaving our compatriots, and they are threatening the liberty of men everywhere. It is our indomitable determination to wipe out the puppet regime of the Chinese Communists on the mainland in order to free our fellow men in fetters and secure this important human right on a permanent basis. On this common ground, there is a completely identical purpose between the Chinese people and other peoples who cherish their ideal in their hearts.

"The will to set men free and the evil power to enslave them are heading for inevitable collision. As a matter of fact, they are already engaged in open hostilities in Vietnam. Hence, any assistance to the people of Vietnam is a direct help to the cause of liberty. Only last June, President Johnson of the United States declared in a very forthright manner, "we are not just fighting for 14 million. We are fighting for almost 3 billion people who also want freedom and liberty." This very fact clearly shows that the war in Vietnam is being waged for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom and liberty of the whole mankind. It further indicates that any attempt to appease the Chinese Communists is as useless as daydreams. It behooves the free peoples to join hands immediately on the battleground of Vietnam, as the first step to shatter the chains on their enslaved brethren in the captive nations.

"I wish to point out that during the past year the Chinese Communists have been increasingly rejected and repudiated both within and outside the bamboo curtain. As a result of their ruthless suppression of the people and their subversive activities against other nations, their evil nature has been completely exposed for every one to see. Especially, they have exhausted their resources to develop nuclear weaponry, consequently the people under their domination have been denied the minimum standard of living. Also, in utter defiance of the public opinion of the world, they have recently detonated a nuclear device for the third time in a row, attempting to further blackmail the peaceloving nations. However, they have evidently failed in this attempt of intimidation by showing their military might. On the other hand, they have only earned the intensified anger and hatred of the people on the mainland. We need only follow the progress of their recent purge to understand that all the pillars of the puppet regime, namely, the party organization, political apparatus, and military establishment, are beginning to crumble down.

"That the Chinese Communists have to start the purge proves that their internal struggle for power has become very serious. The purge also bears witness to the fact that on the mainland the intellectuals, the students, and even the party cadres are fed up with communism. In many ways, they have also manifested their profound interest in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People as well as the traditional Chinese civilization and culture. Such a change of loyalty constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of the Chinese Communists, and, in a sense, forces the Chinese Communists to resort to terroristic measures. However, as it is always futile to suppress the people's revolutionary resistance, the downfall of the Chinese Communists is not far away.

"Therefore, this is the right moment for us, the people of the Republic of China, to free our fellow citizens on the mainland. This is also the right moment for all the freedom-loving peoples to destroy the common enemy.

"President Chiang has reminded us about such a moment in his inaugural speech last May, by saying: 'Hereafter, as long as we resolutely make more positive efforts, speed up our preparations, work in harmony and unity, and taking advantage of our own strength and the enemy's weakness, seize the opportunity for our counteroffensive when the moment arrives, we can, by engaging in struggles and by shedding our own blood, quicken the anti-Communist armed resistance and revolution on the mainland.'

"We have full confidence in the bright future of free men. On the basis of this faith of ours, we offer cooperation to all peoples for freedom. Let us join together in this noble task, and make all possible efforts to secure for all men their inalienable right of liberty."

CITY OF CHICAGO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
June 27, 1966.

From: Jack Reilly.

The Captive Nations Day programs will take place on Saturday, July 16, with a parade on State Street at 12:00 P.M., followed by an assembly at Grant Park. These events will be participated in by the many national groups of the city who trace their ancestry to the Captive Nations.

Mayor Daley has named a Captive Nations Day Committee to coordinate the programs which will be held to mark the event.

COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY—1966

Mr. Viktor Viksnins, General Chairman.

Albania: Mr. Hafizi Yousuff Azem.

Armenia: Mr. Art Kushdilian, Mrs. Arpine Cnaderjian.

Bulgaria: Dr. George Paprikoff, Mr. Jordan Georgiev, Mr. George Marinov, Mr. Hristo Gelov.

Byelorussia: Mr. Anthony Bielenis, Mr. William Puntus, Mrs. Vera Romuk, Mr. Nick Zyznieuski.

China: Mr. Albert K. Leong, Mr. Pack H. Wong.

Cossackia: Mr. K. Mandzula, Mr. Andrej Mazanow.

Croatia: Mr. Eli Saravanja, Mr. Joe Simatic, Mrs. Ivanka Simatic, Mrs. Sandra Szabo.

Cuba: Mr. Antonio Perez, Mr. Alberto Palomares.

Czechoslovakia: Alderman Otto Janousek, Mr. Vaclav Kubicek, Miss Vlasta Vraz.

Estonia: Mr. Kalju Kaldalu, Mr. Alexander Koepp, Mr. Oscar Kookla, Mr. Johannes Randruut, Professor Arthur Voobus.

Georgia: Mr. Dimitri Gunia.

Germany: Mr. Bernhard Averbeck, Mr. Joe Gies, Mr. George Iberle, Mrs. Isabella Erbe, Mr. Kurt M. Klessig, Mr. Fred Lindner, Mr. John A. Meiszner, Mr. Dieter K. Schroeder.

Hungary: Mr. Ernest Czike, Mr. Coloman S. Fiedler, Mr. Julius Hovany, Mr. Frank Imre, Mr. Leslie de Perczel, Dr. Frederick Nagy, Mr. Jeno Petrokovits, Mr. Paul Quirico.

Korea: Mr. Edward I. Kim, Mr. Ki Young Shim, Rev. G. K. Un.

Latvia: Mr. Voldemars Lagzdins, Mr. V. Landmanis, Mr. Leonids Neimanis.

Lithuania: Mr. Karolis Avizienis, Mr. Albert J. Kerelis, Mr. Leonas Prapuolenis, Mr. Vincent Samaska, Mr. Anthony Santaras, Mr. Frank D. Savickas.

Poland: Mr. Boleslaw Bilogan, Mrs. Francis Dymek, Miss Adele Lagodzinski, Mr. Kazimierz Lukomski, Mr. Stan Kus, Mr. Stanley O. Stawski.

Serbia: Mr. Gragisha Kashikovich, Mrs. Roksanda Panish, Alderman Samuel Yaksic.

Slovakia: Mr. Rudolf Bado, Mr. Milan Blazek, Mrs. Julia Krajcovic, Mr. Anton Ondrush, Mrs. Anna Vizza.

Slovenia: Mrs. Gizella Iozian, Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, Father Vendelin Spendow, O.F.M.

Ukraine: Very Rev. Theodore Bilecky, Mr. Bohdan Bilynskyj, Mr. Ernst Dziubynsky, Mr. Theodosij Nosiewych, Mr. Walter K. Nychay, Dr. Vladimirus Pomirko, Mr. Taras Shpikula.

HONORARY COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY

Senator Paul H. Douglas.
Senator Everett M. Dirksen.
Governor Otto Kerner.
Mayor Richard J. Daley.
His Excellency Most Rev. Vincentas Brizgys.
Mrs. Ulana Celewych.
The Honorable Paul Chung.
The Honorable Petras P. Dauzvardis.
Dr. Jose J. de Alvarez.
The Honorable Edward J. Derwinski.
Dr. L. B. Dzinich.
Mr. Alfred Engler.
His Excellency Most Rev. Jaroslav Gabro.
Dr. Peter Hletko.
The Honorable John C. Kluczynski.
Mr. Walter A. Kollacks.
Rev. Valdis Landmanis.
Mr. Clyde Miller.
Mr. William Moran.
Mr. Joseph C. Murphy.
Rev. Oleh Myronowych.
Mr. Harold H. Pax.
Dr. Chester Piekarczyk.
The Honorable Roman Pucinski.
Mr. Paul Quirico.
Dr. V. Romuk.
The Honorable Daniel Rostenkowski.
The Honorable Frank Tze-tnu Sia.
Mr. Ray Soden.
Mr. Ray Spano.

[From the Captive Nations Committee, July 16, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY IN CHICAGO

The third week in July, according to Public Law No. 86-90 is designated as Captive Nations Week; the following are the honorary chairmen: Senator Paul H. Douglas, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Governor Otto Kerner, Honorable Richard J. Daley.

Twenty national groups representing the enslaved nations behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains, will parade on Saturday, July 16, 1966. Starting at 12 noon, at Wacker Drive and State Street, the marchers will go down State Street to Congress, ending at Grant Park, where a special program will take place. The Seventh Annual Captive Nations Committee anticipates 10,000 participants, many significant and colorful floats, bands, open cars, many marchers in native costumes carrying American and National flags.

Over the past few years the observance of Captive Nations Week in Chicago has developed into a very impressive demonstration for the freedom of captive nations and a show of appreciation to the United States Government for its unceasing efforts on behalf of these unfortunate peoples.

During this special observance in Chicago, thousands of different national groups will manifest their support to the administration for the firm stand against Communist aggression in South Viet Nam.

The Captive Nations Day Program will be held in Grant Park. As the main speaker, has been invited Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. Joseph C. Murphy, American Legion State Commander, will be the speaker. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, National Captive Nations Committee Chairman, will deliver an address on behalf of all enslaved nations.

The Captive Nations Day recalls us not to forget those who are still under the Communist grip, and especially those who sacrifice their lives in the battle for freedom.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN CHICAGO

The seventh annual observance of Captive Nations Week in Chicago was held on Saturday, July 16, 1966, starting with a parade on State Street, led by Mayor Richard J. Daley, assisted by general chairman, Viktors Viksnins, and the representative of U.S. soldiers in Viet-Nam action.

Appearing on the reviewing stand were Sen. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, American Commander Joseph C. Murphy, Consul Generals of China, Korea and Lithuania, Msgr. P. Leskiw—representing His Excellency Most Rev. Jaroslaw Gabro—Very Rev. F. Bileckyj, and other members of the clergy, as well as the members of the Captive Nations Committee, with Sig Sakowicz acting as moderator.

Ten thousand people of eighteen national groups paraded down State Street with U.S. soldiers wounded in Viet Nam and who are recovering in Great Lakes Naval Hospital. They served as honorary parade marshals. Two hundred thousand spectators lined the sidewalks to watch the parade pass.

Besides many floats, bands, open cars and marchers dressed in their native costumes, many participants carried signs and banners saluting the American soldiers fighting for freedom in Viet-Nam and supporting President Johnson's policy there. They also saluted their Freedom Fighters and the national resistance movement in their homeland.

Following the parade on State St., was an Assembly at the Grant Park Band Shell where 5,000 attended. Sen. PAUL H. DOUGLAS and American Legion Comm. Joseph Murphy were the speakers. The audience adopted the Resolutions, paid tribute to the heroes fighting for freedom. Program closed with the band playing the "Captive Nations Hymn" and "God Bless America".

PROGRAM FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1966

Presiding: Mr. Frank D. Savickas.

Procession of Flags and National Groups.

Posting of United States and State Flags: by Honor Guard of the Chicago Fire Department.

National Anthem: Band of the Ukrainian-American Youth Ass'n., Inc. /SUMA/. Conducted by: Michael Holian.

Invocation: Bishop Dionisije, Serbian Orthodox Church.

Pledge of Allegiance: Col. Jack Reilly.

Address: Prof. Lev Dobriansky, National Chairman of Captive Nations Committee, Washington. Joseph C. Murphy, American Legion Department Commander. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Benediction: Rev. G. K. Un, Korean Methodist Church.

Finale: "Captive Nations Hymn," "God Bless America," by Band of the Ukrainian-American Youth Ass'n., Inc. Conducted by: Michael Holian.

THE CHICAGO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMITTEE RESOLUTION, JULY 16, 1966

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States of America to proclaim a Captive Nations Week, and the same has been done for the past seven years; and

Whereas the political settlement which followed the holocaust of World War II established the division of Europe into the Western and Soviet zones of influence, thus contradicting the principles of democracy, freedom and self-determination of nations proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter to be goals of the Western Allies; and

Whereas this division of Europe exposed nations of Central and Eastern Europe to direct and ruthless Soviet domination, at the same time encouraging Russia's aggressiveness towards the Free World and providing it with enlarged base to support its aggressive policies; and

Whereas Communism continues to threaten the peace, security and independence of the Free World, having succeeded in a complete take-over of Cuba, encouraging subversive conspiracies in Latin America and Africa and conducting open, aggressive warfare in South Viet-Nam and neighboring countries of Laos and Cambodia; and

Whereas the people of the United States of America share with all the nations subjugated by the twentieth century communist colonialism their just aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and sovereignty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, That it urges the adoption by the United States of a national policy, which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of all peoples enslaved by the communist imperialism, by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom; be it further

Resolved, That convinced of the indivisibility of freedom and peace, we consider the reestablishment of political stability of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as of other communist dominated nations, based on principles of democracy, self-determination of all nations and sovereignty within their respective ethnic and historical boundaries, as of paramount importance for freedom and security of the entire world; be it further

Resolved, That we support unreservedly the determined United States resistance of communist aggression in South Viet-Nam, and that we salute members of the U.S. and Allied Armed Forces, escapees from the Captive Nations and their sons among them, fighting for man's freedom. At the same time we regret that the same resolute firmness and farsighted policy was lacking at the time freedom of the now Captive Nations was being sacrificed in the doomed attempt to appease communist imperialism at the close of World War II; be it further

Resolved, That the Ambassador of the United States of America to the United Nations puts on the agenda of the United Nations following problems:

1. abolishment of all concentration camps, slave labor and mass deportations.

2. free elections in all the enslaved nations under the supervision of the United Nations Organizations; be it further

Resolved, That we oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations Organization because it has engaged in aggression and subversive activities in Southeast Asia, namely Viet-Nam, Africa, and Latin America, seriously threatening the freedom of mankind and world peace; be it further

Resolved, That this Committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy, which would demonstrate to the communist rulers that the United States of America will not cease in its efforts until all the Captive Nations are able to enjoy the God given rights to freedom and independence by all the peoples of the world.

Viktors Viksnins, General Chairman.
Eli Saravanja, Chairman of Resolution Sub-Committee.
Ulana Celewych, Secretary.
Alexander Koepp, Estonia Representative.
Roksanda Panich, Serbia Representative.
H. Jeusuf Azem, Albania Representative.
Dr. Chester A. Piekarczyk, Poland Representative.
Konstantin Manschula, Cossack Representative.
Leonids Neimais, Latvia Representative.
Ki Young Shim, Korea Representative.
Dimitry Gunia, Georgia Representative.
Taras Shpikula, Ukraine Representative.
Whalther A. Kollacks, Germany Representative.
L. Prapuolonis, Lithuania Representative.
Eli Saravanja, Croatia Representative.
Anton Ondrus, Slovak Representative.
Vaclav Kubicek, Czechoslovakia Representative.
Albert K. Leong, China Representative.
Vera Romuk, Byelorussia Representative.

STATEMENT ON THE OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Frank T. T. Sia, Consul General of the Republic of China, July 6, 1966, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago)

In July, 1959, the 86th Congress of the United States of America passed a joint resolution, known as Public Law 86–90, instituting the observance of Captive Nations. This is a historical document of a great nation and its people expressing warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and, in particular, sharing with the peoples under Communist enslavement their desire and longing for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Through direct and indirect aggression, Communist imperialism has taken over a very substantial part of the world's population and territory. We see today, of a total world population of 3,218,000,000, 1,010,290,000 are enslaved, that is, almost one third of the people in this world. The world's area totals 52,398,178 square miles and 15,237,400 square miles are fenced in by Communist curtains, that is, more than one third of the world's area. But the peoples behind the curtains never acquiesced in Communism. They manifested their hatred against Communist tyranny by sabotage and uprisings and, whenever possible, by escaping to the Free World.

How desperate and driven a man must be to become a refugee can be measured only in terms of what he risks and gives up to escape. He not only gives up home, possessions, job, friends and relatives, and sometimes his own family; he also risks imprisonment or death if he is caught trying to escape. He puts his friends and family in jeopardy for having helped him, or for not having informed on him or stopped him. To escape, the refugee must run a gauntlet of natural obstacles—mountains, rivers, deserts, jungles, seas—plus man-made border barriers: Communist minefields and barbed wire, searchlights and machinegun towers, the hunting dogs, border patrols and observation planes.

Nevertheless, Communist tyranny and persecution have made more than 12 million human beings willing to make the sacrifices and take the risks. Since the end of World War II, more than 3,350,000 refugees escaped from Communist China, 3,500,000 from Communist East Germany, 2,600,000 from North Korea, 1,000,000 from North Vietnam and hundreds of thousands from each of the other captive nations.

In Asia, the Chinese Communists are the principal perpetrators of troubles, subversions and aggressions. Ever since the Chinese Communists took control of the mainland of China, they have used it as a base of operation against the Free World to further the Communist aim of world domination. The Chinese people on the mainland suffered greater persecution and deprivation by the Chinese Communists' venture in North Korea, exploitation of nuclear explosions and instigation of North Vietnamese aggression against the Republic of Vietnam.

We must always keep in mind that in this worldwide struggle between freedom and democracy of the Free World and Communist imperialism and totalitarianism the real and most reliable allies of the Free World are the Captive Nations. The love of freedom in the hearts of these voiceless millions of captive peoples and their desire for liberty and independence constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace and must be kept alive. In sympathy with these voiceless millions, Free World nations should refrain from acts that enhance the status and prestige or strengthen the position of their Communist overlords. And let no one in the Free World entertain the illusive thought that Communists are softening and can be pacified and changed by conciliation and accommodation. There are differences and rifts among the Communists but their subjugation of the captive peoples and their aim of world domination will never change.

So no recognition and admission to the United Nations should be given to the Chinese Communist regime, which would only give it more opportunity to subvert and wreck the Free World and exercise a stronger stranglehold on the Chinese people. And such an act would also be a disastrous letdown to all the Captive Nations signifying to them that their struggle for freedom and independence would be prolonged and seemingly hopeless. But such an act is contrary to the spirit of Public Law 86–90.

Public Law 86–90 supports and anticipates the achievement of freedom and independ- In the spirit of this Law and by the Proclaence for all the Captive Nations of the world. mations issued by the President of the United States of America, the Governor of Illinois and the Mayor of Chicago, we are gathered here for this year's observance of the Captive Nations Week.

Statement in Behalf of the European Nations Held Captive by the Soviet Union

(By Petras P. Dauzvardis, Consul General of Lithuania, July 6, 1966 (7 P.M.), Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago)

The Soviet Russian empire and its allies are attempting to present themselves to the world as "peace-lovers" and defenders of the rights of colonial peoples to freedom and independence.

This "face," of course, is plain hypocrisy. Soviet Russia is the biggest and almost the sole colonial power in the present-day world.

"Since 1939 the Soviet Union has incorporated the whole or part of six countries, with a population of 22 million—they include *the world's three newest colonies: Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia*. In addition the Soviet Union exercises economic, political and military domination over millions of other men and women in neighborly countries. Countless efforts have been made by national movements in countries under Russian control to gain independence. All have been suppressed." This is what the Rt. Hon. David Ormsby Core, British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, stated in a speech before the United Nations.

"The Soviet colonial system is most cruel and oppressive"—said Adlai E. Stevenson.

Officially recognized as such, and so declared (by the United States Congress, Public Law 86–90), the Soviet-captive nations are: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossackia, Turkestan, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Albania. In addition to these nations there are the Croats, the Serbs, the Slovenes and the Slovaks in the center of Europe, who are deprived of their independence and are captive nations.

All these nations or states have long and heterogeneous histories, Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary were independent before World War I. Most of the other nations had reestablished their independence and became sovereign states after World War I; regrettably, a few others remained captive or were incorporated into multi-national states.

1. The independence and statehood of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Byelorussia and Ukraine were nipped in the bud by imperialistic Russia within five years after World War I. This group of nations could be called "Soviet-swallowed states." Some writers have said that the initials USSR mean "Union of Silently Swallowed Republics."

2. The same calamity befell Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in 1940–1944. They were seized by and forcibly "incorporated" into the USSR pursuant to the secret Hitler-Stalin agreements of August 23 and September 28, 1939.

The seizure and incorporation of these states by the Soviet Union is not recognized by the United States and many other countries. The diplomatic consular representatives of the independent Baltic States are duty recognized and functioning in the United States and elsewhere. Consequently, these countries are *Soviet-occupied states*.

3. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria are Moscow-violated, forcibly "communized" and dominated states—*"satellites"* of the Soviet Union. Their Communist minority regimes are recognized by other states, but not by their own peoples. The factual evidence: the Lithuanian, Polish, East German and Hungarian revolts which were brutally crushed by the Soviet army.

Eastern Germany lingers between the agony of the Baltic and the Balkan States.

In the net result, all of the above-named nations and states are subjugated and exploited by the Soviet Union. Their peoples are deprived of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Telling illustrations are now taking place in Poland: the Catholic nation is being hindered in every way imaginable from celebrating the millennium of Christianity in their homeland. Similar anti-religious acts and suppressions go on in every country subjugated by the Soviet Union. And the same thing goes on in all other fields: economy, education, literature, arts, and social and cultural life. Everywhere you look, there is only dictatorship, terrorization and exploitation, both physical and spiritual.

The Soviet-subjugated countries and their oppressed and terrorized peoples demand freedom and independence. That demand flows from their inherent right, from international law, the right of self-determination, and even from the double talk by Soviet leaders regarding sovereign rights, national and political independence, territorial integrity, and the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other states.

The subjugated and colonial peoples of the Russian empire demand freedom and independence, in addition to the above prerogatives, by virtue of the same right under which many colonies and occupied states have acquired their freedom and independence, and which the Soviet leaders advocate for the remaining colonies.

Captive Nations Day Parade, Saturday, July 16, 1966

LINE OF MARCH

1. Motorcycle Escort.
2. Massed Flags: Darius Girenas American Legion, Post #271.
3. U.S. Navy Band.
4. Cossacks: Mounted Troop.
5. Latvia: 6 open cars.
6. Latvia: Float.
7. Latvia Drum & Bugle Corps: Golden Grenadiers.
8. Latvia: Marching Unit.
9. Slovakia: 3 open cars.
10. Slovakia: Marching Unit.
11. Cuba: Marching Unit.
12. Germany: 3 open cars.
13. Germany: Float.
14. Germany: Drum & Bugle Corps.
15. Germany: Marching Unit.
16. Hornets Drum & Bugle Corps.
17. Serbia: Marching Unit.
18. Armenia: Marching Unit.
19. Estonia: Marching Unit.
20. Byelorussia: open car.
21. Byelorussia: Marching Unit.
22. P. J. Cullerton Drum & Bugle Corps.
23. Hungaria: Marching Unit.
24. Bulgaria: open car.
25. Bulgaria: Marching Unit.
26. Chinese Drum & Bugle Corps.
27. Poland: open cars.
28. Poland: Float.
29. Poland: Float.
30. Poland: Band.
31. Poland: Marching Unit.
32. Lithuania: 15 open cars.
33. Lithuania: Float.
34. Lithuania Drum & Bugle Corps: Chicago Lawn Moose Post.
35. Lithuania: Marching Unit.
36. Korea: 2 open cars.
37. Korea: Marching Unit.
38. Chicago Fire Department Band.
39. Croatia: Marching Unit.
40. Georgia: Marching Unit.
41. Shannon Rovers Pipe Band.
42. Albania: Marching Unit.
43. Ukraine: 4 open cars.
44. Ukraine: Float.
45. Ukraine: Band.
46. Ukraine: Marching Unit.
47. Czechoslavakia: 3 open cars.
48. Czechoslavakia: Marching Unit.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 17, 1966]

10,000 Parade Here for Captive Nations

Chicagoans descended from people in captive nations throughout the world proclaimed their hopes for the freedom of their homelands yesterday.

Ten thousand persons whose ancestry stem from captive countries marched down State street to the sound of drums and bugles, then gathered in Grant park for a mass meeting.

Soldiers wounded in Viet Nam who are recovering in Great Lakes naval hospital served as honorary parade marshals for the procession, which was led by Mayor Daley and Senator Douglas, Democrat of Illinois.

Chicago's observance of Captive Nations days was reported to be one of the largest in the nation. Thousands of onlookers lined the sidewalks to watch the marchers pass.

The marchers carried dozens of signs and banners saluting the American soldiers fighting for freedom in Viet Nam. Others proclaimed support of United States policy in Viet Nam.

The marchers, many in colorful costumes of their homelands, represented Latvia, Slovakia, Cuba, Germany, Serbia, Armenia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Hungary, Bulgaria, China, Poland, Lithuania, Korea, Croatia, Albania, Ukrainia, and Czechoslovakia.

[A Southwest Messenger Press, Inc., Publication, July 14, 1966]

Members of Vets Press (American Veterans Press Association of Chicago) are taking part in the 7th Annual Captive Nations Week observation which will culminate with a parade and program on Saturday, July 16th in Chicago.

In the photo are (L to R):

Frank T. T. Sia, Consul General of the Republic of China, a five year honorary member of Vets Press.

Joe Martin, Executive-Secretary and Public Information Coordinator who is also on the staff of the Messenger Press Newspapers.

Sigmund Sakowicz, a disc jockey on Radio Stations WGN and WTAQ and a philanthropist with his time in promoting programs benefiting veterans and patriotic organizations.

Col. John Reilly, Director of Special Events in the City of Chicago and Mayor Richard J. Daley's representative.

The photo was taken at a Press Conference in the Conrad Hilton Hotel on July 6th at which time the Captive Nations Committee disclosed their plans for Captive Nations Week.

Not shown in the photo is another Vets Press member, Joseph C. Murphy, State Commander of the Illinois American Legion who will be the principal speaker on Captive Nations Day, July 16th in Grant Park, Chicago.

A colorful parade, starting at 12 noon will course down State St. from Wacker Drive to Congress Street and then to Grant Park.

Mayor Daley urges every American citizen to attend the parade and the Grant Park program to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the Captive Nations.

He also encourages all churches, educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the Captive Nations.

Members of the American Legion are asked to attend in full uniform or wearing uniform caps. Other veterans' organizations are also invited to take part appropriately uniformed.

Speakers will salute the American GIs fighting for freedom.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 15, 1966.

Mr. VICTOR VIKSNIN,
General Chairman, Committee for Captive Nations Day 1966, Room 610, City Hall, Chicago:

It is with sincere regret that I cannot take part in the Captive Nations Day parade and program. Important sudden business prevents me from being in Chicago. The plight of the captive nations has always been of great concern to me. I am a cosponsor of legislation resolving that the Congress of the United States call for the respect of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nations.

If we ever hope to see a world of free people we must continue our efforts to release the enslaved people in the captive nations so they can live under governments of their own choice. This Captive Nations Day brings us closer to that goal.

Sincerely,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Member of Congress.

[From the Manion Forum, South Bend (Ind.), May 8, 1966]

COMMUNISM CAN BE DEFEATED BY "WARS OF LIBERATION" IN THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Dean MANION. My friends, a few weeks ago I invited Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, in Washington, to talk to us about the possibilities for peace through international trade and through a proper understanding of the many captive nations now enslaved by the Communists all over the world. Dr. Dobriansky's broadcast was so popular with all of you that I have asked him to come back. He is here today to explore this subject further.

Doctor, when you were here a few weeks ago, you were talking about the possibilities for peace through the liberation of the captive nations. Now, the Communists are always promoting what they call "wars of liberation" in Viet Nam and elsewhere; is this what you are talking about in reverse, or not?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. In a sense we're talking about the same thing in terms of the process, but our objective, of course, is entirely different. Our objective is toward the expansion of world freedom and the liberation of this huge mass of humanity that is now in a state of Communist captivity.

As you will recall, Dean Manion, when I was here with you before, I stressed the deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence that is being waged by Moscow. We mustn't forget that Moscow is the chief center of the entire Red Empire, the whole empire, including mainland China, depends on the strength and the power of the center, namely Moscow and the Soviet Union itself.

Behind this facade, this shield of peaceful coexistence, Moscow, with its various puppets and satellites, has proceeded to wage these wars of so-called "national liberation." Actually, any war of national liberation of the Communist type is a war of the few against the many. Anyone that is familiar with the history of how nations have become captive, whether during wartime or peacetime or in some state of unsettlement, will find in every instance that it is always a well-trained group that comes into power, that seizes the main media, the means of control within the state.

Usually the department of interior comes first, the police, that is, the armed forces, and then the group proceeds to take over completely. Now, one can say there is a war of liberation, an unfinished one, a genuine war of liberation behind the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain, even the Sugar Curtain, namely, a war for the liberation of all these captive nations.

Does it mean war in the sense of military foray? No, on the contrary, we can have an enormous advantage here through many para-military means to influence the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, to let them know that we are with them, that we haven't forgotten them, that we don't intend to build bridges of understanding that end up with toll gates of the various Communist regimes you have in these captive states.

Dean MANION. A few weeks ago, Doctor, Mr. Jules DuBois, the Latin America correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune*, was on this program. He pointed out that the Soviet Government makes huge financial outlays for the promotion of these wars of liberation that you have described. Tell us more about that. Does Moscow actually have schools and that sort of thing conducted around the world to promote these wars of liberation and to prepare people to wage them?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. They certainly do, and this, I'm afraid, is one of the tragic gaps in the understanding of the American people with regard to political warfare as waged by the Communists. Most Americans are unaware of the fact that even before Lenin seized control in Russia, about 15 years before 1917, he started a political warfare school. There is one on the Island of Capri, there is another in Italy and a third outside of Paris.

Once the Bolsheviks came into power they proceeded in a very formal and methodical way to set up schools, and that has continued right down to the present date. We estimate there are about six thousand schools behind the Iron Curtain or in the Red Empire, and also among the various Communist cells in the free world. The Moscow government, we estimate, spends roughly *more than five billion dollars a year* for this type of political warfare to take place in various parts of the world, primarily in the underdeveloped areas.

We estimate, too, a revolving fund of about 150 thousand professional revolutionaries that make up the cadres. These are people that are dedicating their lives to Communist revolutions, the fomentation of such revolutions wherever possible, and they feel that it's possible in every part of the world, including the United States.

Dean MANION. This is certainly a very frightening story that you're telling here. I know, of course, and most people, I think, recognize that these so-called wars of liberation, these Communist cadres, are working in underdeveloped countries—Asia, Latin America, and so on. Now is it conceivable that this softening-up process is being carried on here in the United States as well?

U.S.—CHIEF COMMUNIST TARGET

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Not only conceivable, but it's actually being done. I don't wish to go back into past history but there was even a measure of it back in the Thirties, and we are getting, of course, a massive repetition of it now. This is all in black and white, there's no mystery about it, I'm not concocting it. The fact is, the Communist Party and numerous functionaries, through the united front or the popular front means, is aiming at the youth of this Nation, and thus you have the hyper-activity of Reds on various college campuses. They have also infiltrated many of the civil rights areas.

In other words, they are doing precisely what has been done in the past on a larger scale. In view of the enormous amount of resources that they have now as against the past, I think, without being an alarmist, it is important for Americans to understand that, after all, the United States is the chief target, or, in Communists' eyes, the chief enemy. You can see, if the United States were to collapse there would be no other part of the free world that could possibly cope with the Communists. By the same token, if the Soviet Union were to collapse, you would have also the collapse of the Red Empire.

Moscow has denounced the Captive Nations Week Resolution most vehemently all of these years, precisely because Moscow has recognized that the Resolution strikes at one of the greatest weaknesses within the Soviet Union itself, namely, its multi-national character and the existence of about twelve captive nations within the U.S.S.R.

Dean MANION. Doctor, do you think this Consular Treaty that is being proposed for Soviet Russian diplomats is a part of this softening-up process?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. No question about it. It's a unique treaty in the sense that for the first time we're submitting to a provision that will give diplomatic immunity, which is usually reserved to members of the embassy, to consular offices. Now the Soviet Union, as Mr. Hoover has so well pointed out, is most anxious to set up consulates in New York, Chicago, San Francisco and perhaps, as they have in the past, a sub-consulate in Los Angeles. All across the country then you'd have the establishment of these spy nests. We would not get a benefit in return by setting up consulates in the Soviet Union.

There are other aspects to this. It's a current issue and I think it will be brought up in due course in Congress. Not only would we be exposing ourselves to the espionage and the spy element here but we would be putting a diplomatic stamp of approval upon the Soviet Union as a state similar to ours, which it is not. It is really an empire within an empire. The Soviet Union is the very basis, if you will, an imperial basis, of the entire Red Empire, economically, scientifically, militarily and politically.

We have a great deal to fear from the Soviet Union. More so, contrary to what Mr. Rusk has said, than we have to fear from Red China. It is the Soviet Union that has the resources, and not only that, it is more skillful, more adept and more deceptive in its peaceful coexistence policy.

Dean **Manion**. Doctor, this audience already knows, at least I've told them frequently, that you are the author of the famous Captive Nations Resolution which was passed unanimously by Congress in 1959. Now what can be done to implement the force and effectiveness of this famous resolution?

Dr. **Dobriansky**. Very concretely, the first thing we must do and which we have been striving to do, is to set up a special House Committee on the captive nations. Why in the House? Mainly because it's a more responsive chamber to the will and to the feelings of the American people than is the Senate. We have been striving to do that. But there has been one obstacle in the sense that the House leadership has not provided us with the opportunity.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT WORLD STRIFE SOURCE

The curious thing is that the majority of the House Rules Committee which has to report this out either favorably or unfavorably, is for such a committee. Why have a committee of this sort? Well, it would be a working symbol of the dedication of the American people toward the eventual liberation and freedom of all the captive nations. Its work would spotlight or focus the attention not only of the American people alone on this whole area of the Red Empire, particularly Soviet Russian imperial colonialism, but also call the attention of the world at large to the slavery of the captive nations.

The fact is if you pick up a daily paper, time and time again, whether out of the mouths of Kosygin, Brezhnev or others, you will find that they are constantly talking about American imperialism. To use the old Goebbels trick, the more it's repeated the more people throughout the free world will think that Americans really are imperialists. In fact, we even have a venerable historian such as Arnold Toynbee saying that America is the last imperialist power in the free world except for the Portuguese, and that is going some.

Now with a committee of this sort we can really show the last source, fundamental source, of imperialism, colonialism, and really the source of our major troubles in the world at large, namely, the Soviet Government.

A second concrete proposal is the passage of the U.S. Freedom Academy Bill. Now this has been bottled up, again in the Rules Committee, in the House of Representatives. It is urgent that the Rules Committee report this out favorably. Why? So that we may train people in political warfare. We now send nothing but amateurs—whether out of the USIS, the State Department or any other agency—to cope with these professionals in South Viet Nam and British Guiana and Colombia, Venezuela or anywhere else in the free world.

We have to have people who know the techniques and methods employed by the Communists who use the few to conquer the many. Behind the Iron Curtain it is we who have the many that can really make their Communist rulers very insecure and, in time, will be able to overcome the few that are represented in their totalitarian governments.

Dean **Manion**. Thank you, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you do not have a copy of this Captive Nations Resolution, the Manion Forum will send you one free of charge along with the address of the National Committee for the Captive Nations, of which Dr. Dobriansky is Chairman. We want to have a record-breaking series of Captive Nations observances next July when the week will be proclaimed by President Johnson.

Get on the "band wagon" now and be sure that we exploit this great potential for peace, namely, the ultimate liberation of the one billion people now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. The Communist threat to world peace will be liquidated once and for all when the historic freedom and independence of the captive nations is restored.

[From the Manion Forum, South Bend, Ind., Feb. 6, 1966]

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: A MAJOR DETERRENT AGAINST GLOBAL WAR—OPPRESSED PEOPLES COULD ALTER AGGRESSIVE DESIGNS OF RED REGIMES

(By Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Dean **Manion**. With me here at the microphone today is Doctor Lev Dobriansky, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, in Washington. Doctor Dobriansky is a frequent witness before committees of Congress and is a recognized authority on the subject of international trade and commerce. He is also chairman of a distinguished group of prominent, patriotic people known as the National Captive Nations Committee. (Suite 514, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.) Doctor Dobriansky, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Dr. **Dobriansky**. It's grand to be back with you, Dean Manion.

Dean **Manion**. Doctor, the fear of war and the hope for international peace is undoubtedly the overriding concern of all people today. At the same time, it is a confusing concern—we hear it spoken of as peaceful coexistence and other palliatives. What, in your observation and your judgment, is the possibilities of obtaining peace?

Dr. **Dobriansky**. The possibility of obtaining peace is a very real and promising one. However, we must distinguish carefully between what we in a free world regard as a genuine peace and what the various Red totalitarian regimes talk about, namely, peaceful coexistence.

As it has turned out, and as it will continue in the future, when the Red regimes speak of peaceful coexistence, they mean, actually, coexisting momentarily with the Western world, particularly the United States, and while doing so, carrying on wars of national liberation. These so-called wars of liberation are, in effect, infiltrations—subversion into many of the continents of the world, particularly Asia, Africa and Latin America. In light of this, what we are really engaged in, fundamentally, is a political warfare on many of these continents.

So, although we do pray for peace in the sense of a concourse of peoples, an intercourse economically, politically, culturally in every measure—all the marks of what we consider peaceful coexistence. Actually, we have a peaceful coexistence that has been fomented primarily by Moscow, and which serves as a shield for its political subversion in other parts of the world. This in turn foments revolutions and turnovers. As a consequence, in the final analysis it brings American military power into play as a kind of last minute resort or reaction. We see this in South Viet Nam. We saw it for a time in the Dominican Republic. We are very likely to see it in many areas on these three continents.

Dean **Manion**. We hear the division made between the free world and the Communist world, Doctor Dobriansky, who are the captive nations?

Dr. **Dobriansky**. Well, the captive nations concept includes many nations in Eastern Europe, in Asia, and also in Latin America. When we talk about the captive nations, we must bear in mind that any appeal we make for the captive nations in the aggregate could be a great contribution to the possibility of peace. I have continually maintained that the captive nations, in the aggregate, *in toto*, constitute one of our major deterrents against a hot global war. Not only that, I would even go so far as to say that it's a major deterrent against some of these wars of national liberation.

The captive nations in Europe include not only those in Central Europe with which most Americans are familiar, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, but also many nations—in fact, the majority of them—within the Soviet Union itself. Most Americans, unfortunately, have forgotten the three Baltic nations—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—who were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 1940s. Yet, they are part of the family of captive nations.

But over and beyond the Baltic nations, there are numerous other captive nations within the U.S.S.R., such as Baku and Ukraine, which is, incidentally, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, with a population of forty-five million. Then we have Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia in the Soviet Union. There is the large nation of Turkistan in Central Asia, and Idel-Ural.

In the Asiatic sphere, there is North Korea, Tibet, North Viet Nam, and the huge area, mainland China. The Peking regime is a junior partner, perhaps a very irascible one to Moscow—but the fact is, the underlying population, roughly six-hundred, fifty to seven hundred million Chinese, constitute a captive nation. Of course, we have our own captive nation in the Western Hemisphere, namely, Cuba.

So the list of captive nations is a long one. It is a list that began back in 1920 when the first family was brought into captivity as a result of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. It was expanded during World War II, and also at the end of World War II, so that we have, roughly, about twenty-seven distinct captive nations. The big question is, will this list be extended? The road that we are following, I am convinced, will lead to an extension of it. It may be South Viet Nam, Thailand, Columbia, British Guiana, Ghana, or any place where there is Communist political warfare underway.

Dean **Manion**. We started off to explore the possibilities of peace. How can these captive peoples be instrumental in achieving international peace?

POPULAR MYTHS ABOUT RED EMPIRE

Dr. **Dobriansky**. I would say first that we have to become instrumental ourselves by revising some of our notions with regard to the captive nations and with regard to what I call the entire Red Empire. We're given to a number of myths that today circulate about. Let me just cite some of these notions or myths. One is that the captive nations are represented by their various Red regimes. Meaning, for example, the Gomulka regime in Warsaw.

The way some of our Americans think and talk, it would seem that the Gomulka regime is a popular regime, one that had been put into office through a national election on the part of the Polish people. This is grossly untrue. The plain fact, and a very crucial fact, is that all these regimes—the totalitarian regimes—have been imposed, and they work against the interest of the people.

It is important for us to maintain this distinction, to make the constant appeal to the freedom aspirations of the underlying populaces—the Polish people, the Hungarian people, the Ukrainian people, even to the Russian and Chinese people in their fight for additional freedoms within their areas against their respective governments.

To the extent that we do this, to that extent we intensify the insecurity of each of these regimes. To the extent that we are successful in intensifying this insecurity, to that extent will we be able to cope with any aggressive designs on a scale of political warfare, or even direct, armed aggression by any of these regimes.

Dean **MANION**. Is this what the President means when he talks about "bridges of understanding" with Eastern Europe and the so-called Communist nations?

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. Not at all. The general notion of the bridges of understanding seems to rest on this myth and additional myths. The myth, first, of captive nations and the Red regimes being identical, and secondly, the nationalism that you have in the various satellite countries, and even within the U.S.S.R. The President, for example, speaks of a sweeping nationalism in Eastern Europe. This is true, but it's not new. Nationalism has always been there and the Red regimes use it, just as the Moscow regime within the U.S.S.R. has always used it, as a weapon against the people.

The point that I think should be stressed is that it is fine to build up bridges of understanding. I'm not against it and any friend of the captive nations is not against it, but we want to know what is at the other end of the bridge. Is it, as the President thinks, the totalitarian government—the Red government say, in Bucharest or in Budapest, or in Warsaw—or is it the people? I think the failure here of the entire policy is that the bridge leads to the government, to its entrenchment against the underlying populace.

Dean **MANION**. Doctor, I know from your testimony and from your writings that you believe in international trade in general—you believe that we should trade with the Communist people, those of Eastern Europe and the other captive nations. What are the conditions of this trade, in your estimation, that would be proper?

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. I'm glad you brought this up, because if the Communists can use trade as an instrument in their political warfare—as they have continually—there is no reason for the United States not to use trade as a weapon. However, many persons advocate unconditional trade. Meaning they think that on a commercial basis all we have to do is to trade with the various Red governments and that will contribute to amity and peace and a peaceful intercourse with the peoples involved. The fact is that such unconditional trade would lead to a buttressing of the economy of these various Red regimes, and very little in the way of a benefit would redound to the underlying populace.

There is a great danger here in connection with unconditional trade. We advocate instead a pol-trade policy. Namely, trade on a basis of political concessions. Meaning, that if the Bucharest Government is interested in a chemical plant, we will consider it, provided we also will be able to realize certain freedom concessions—not only on the part of the Rumanians but from East Germans and others. It can be worked out in the sense of political bids against their commercial bids.

Dean **MANION**. And this would be the true way to edge toward the ultimate liberation of the people behind the Iron Curtain?

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. It would certainly be one of the ways. There are many others—in the sphere of diplomacy, in propaganda, as connected with the Voice of America and numerous other media that we can use. But this requires a general psycho-political warfare context, for which, unfortunately, I would say, we are totally unprepared.

Dean **MANION**. The Soviets and the Communists are constantly promoting revolutions on this side of the Iron Curtain. Do you think we should turn the trick and encourage liberation on their side of it?

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. Yes, and again I stress the paramilitary, the psycho-political. Many persons think that when you speak of liberation it will mean a hot war or involvement, if you will, in a nuclear war. On the contrary, the appeal is made on political grounds and can sway and influence the various peoples throughout the entire Red Empire. We have allies there—approximately one billion people—to whom we are making no appeal.

Dean **MANION**. We're making the mistake of appealing to governments instead of to the people who are oppressed by those regimes?

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. That is correct, and that is one great fallacy underlying our present policy I was very dismayed that in the state of the Union message the President made no reference to the captivity of the various people in the entire Red Empire.

Dean **MANION**. Thank you, Doctor Dobriansky. I hope we will have an early opportunity to continue and further explore this most interesting subject of the captive nations.

Dr. **DOBRIANSKY**. I look forward to it, Dean Manion.

[From the Manion Forum, South Bend (Ind.), Feb. 6, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognized the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Viet Nam and others; and

Whereas, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, July 14, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

We are a nation founded by immigrants, but no longer a nation of immigrants. And, with the passage of time, our roots, nourished in so many foreign soils, have slowly been lost to sight beneath the cultural accretions of our own brief history as a nation. Thus it is that for many Americans, perhaps the majority, the heritage of their blood, the history and culture of their immigrant ancestors and the lands from which they came, retains little or no meaning.

Sporadically, however, and often tragically, we have been reminded of our cultural legacies. The Irish Rebellion, the Great War, the Spanish Civil War, the Second World War and, presently, the hydra-like manifestations of the Cold War, such as the Slovak Uprising. the Hungarian Revolt and the Berlin Wall, have all thrown their spotlight on the seedbeds of American democracy.

But the Cold War, the advent of Soviet Russian and Communist Chinese imperialism, has introduced a new term into the language with which we describe this multiple heritage—"Captive Nations." And the very nature of this kind of national slavery is such as to cloak that heritage even more in the shrouds of ignorance. So much so that relatively few Americans are prepared even to recite the names of those nations in slavery.

To many, "Captive Nations" will suggest Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Serbia, Tibet and Ukraine.

Does that sound complete? Can you name others? Do you know that it covers less than half the list?

There are also Armenia, Azerberjian, Byelorussia, Cossakia, Crimea, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Georgia, North Caucasus, Mongolia, Ruthenia, Rumania, Idel-Ural, Karelia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkestan.

Thirty-two.

And these are only those whose claim to
Thirty-two.
nationhood is most distinct and who possess a measurable representation in the population of the United States.

An impressive list of nations. Especially when thought of in terms of the millions upon millions of men, women and children whom they represent.

An unanswerable indictment.

This coming week, across the country, those who know the meaning of that indictment will commemorate Captive Nations Week. There will be proclamations and declarations, speeches and songs, demonstrations and marches; and all with one purpose: to remind.

To remind tyrants that their tyranny is neither forgotten nor condoned. To remind those in bondage that their desire for freedom is encouraged by free men. And to remind free men that their freedoms are imperiled and can only be maintained while the God-given rights of all men are demanded and insured.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 21, 1966]

Letters to the Editor: Captive Nations Week

In the course of our Nation's history, perhaps no congressional resolution has shown more substantive proof of this country's position as a vanguard of freedom than the Captive Nation's Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) passed by Congress in 1959. And, perhaps too, no resolution has been more grievously attacked by anti-freedom governmental systems.

But quite possibly the greatest pain in freedom's side is the one inflicted by some confused Americans who thru lack of knowledge as pertains to these peoples—historic, geographic, ethnographic, linguistic—fail or refuse to recognize the great value potential of the resolution's context. To them, the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains are more an ocult phenomena than a hope of eventual reality.

To speak in behalf of these millions of beleaguered political slaves is to be type-cast as "political," "partisan" or even "radical." Since when has the pursuit of freedom become synonymous with any of these?

This week, July 17–23 marks the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week. Adding impetus to this yearly celebration is the date on which the 1966 proclamation was signed, July 8, the date of the ringing of the Liberty Bell when the Declaration of Independence was made public in 1776. Additional import augmenting both the proclamation and the date, was the President's signing of the Congressional measure creating the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission at the same time.

Vera A. Dowhan.

[A news release from the National Captive Nations Committee, Washington, D.C.]

President Johnson Lauded on Timely Captive Nations Proclamation

The National Captive Nations Committee has praised President Johnson for the unique timing of his 1966 Captive Nations Week proclamation. The committee's chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, declared: "The proclamation's release on July 8, the historic date of the ringing of the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia and the public release of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, is powerfully symbolic."

Led by the committee, citizens across the nation will observe Captive Nations Week during July 17–23. In pursuance of Public Law 86–90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, the event has been observed annually since 1959. Each year communist regimes denounce the week during which Americans join in supporting the just aspirations of all captive peoples for national independence and individual freedom.

In praising the President's action, Dr. Dobriansky pointed out that the proclamation's "further association with the signing of the Congressional measure creating the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will not be lost on all the captive nations."

Captive Nations Week will be observed by Congress on Wednesday, July 20.

Captive Nations Rally, Ukrainian Culture Center, Los Angeles, Calif., July 17, 1966

(Sponsored by the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy, President; Dr. William Rethy, Secretary; Mr. Wolodymyr Siyak, Treasurer)

REPRESENTATIVES

Armenia: Art Bachoian.

Estonia: Bernard Nurmsen, Walfried Gutman.

Hungary: Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy, Dr. William Rethy, Dr. Miklos Verbovszky.

Latvia: Arnis Tubelis, Artis Lejins.

Lithuania: Stasys J. Paltus, Mrs. Alena Devenis, Albinas Markevicius.

Poland: Carol M. Blaze, Mrs. Helen Blaze, A. Dutkiewicz.

Romania: Dr. Emil Onaca, Mrs. Ileana Petrescu, Ironim Petrescu.

Ukraine: Wolodymyr Siyak, Mycola Novak, Alex Wesely.

"I have sworn upon the Altar of God, Eternal Hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."—Thomas Jefferson

"We will never surrender positions which are essential to the defense of freedom nor will we abandon people who are now behind the iron curtain through any formal approval of the status quo."—John F. Kennedy

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies, *Carol Blaze*.

Presentation of colors.

The National Anthem.

Invocation, *Rev. E. Caune*.

Welcome, *Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy*.

The spirit of Ukraine, the Ukrainian Choir.

"Our Loss Is the Enemy's Gain," *Arnis Tubelis*.

Latvian colours, Southern California Latvian Mixed Choir.

Introduction of representatives.

Songs of Hungary, piano solo.

"Burning Issues of Our Times," guest speaker.

"Estonians' Will To Live," vocal solo.

Adoption of a resolution, Laszlo Kecskemethy.

Lithuanian voice, two vocal solos.

"United We Win," Steve Szabo.

Romanian Future, orchestra Romanasu.

Polish Strength, a trio.

Thanks, *Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy*.

The benediction, *Right Rev. M. Dowhal*.

We are grateful that you came and support our aims with your presence and with your donations.

What We Lost . . . the Enemy Gained

Armenia—in 1921—3 million lives lost in their struggle against the Russian-Turkish Imperialists. Five-sixth of Armenia is occupied by the Turks and one-sixth by the Soviet Union. A splendid, industrious people who are better able to govern themselves than their Communist overlords and they *will never be satisfied with anything less than complete independence.* They have just as much right to exist than the Turks or the Russians!—With Armenian independence our enemy is going to be that much weaker.

Estonia—a nation with unique culture, akin to the Finns and Hungarians, with a pre-war population of 1,200,000, of which 25% was exterminated by the Russian Imperialists. Since 1940, 89,730 persons were deported; two Lutheran pastors and six Greek Orthodox priests were murdered.—They have just as much right for freedom as any other nation. *It is the duty of all free nations to nullify the pact made between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia in regards of this nation!* Our State Department never recognized it as valid and the time is here that we openly say so!

Hungary—population 11 million—where Cardinal Mindszenti is still in exile at the American Legation—a defense bastion of the Christian West against the pagan East (Tartars, Turks, Russians). It is systematically looted by the economically starved Russian Imperialists with phony trade agreements and imported stooges. A very rich uranium mine at Pecs is utilized exclusively by the Russians and a rich bauxite deposit from the Transdanubian region is being carried to Russia. Secret underground laboratories furnish parts for Russian space program.—*All this is a great aid to the Russian war potential?*—How much good the Communist system can do and how much blessing the presence of a huge Russian army means in Hungary was exemplified by the 1956 uprising of "young people and children". Children whom they indoctrinated against Christianity and Capitalism in favor of Bolshevic Paradise turned against their masters and destroyed them. Only well trained Russian army was able to crush this glorious revolt. *The thirst for freedom, however can never be quenched in the souls of decent people! This spells the doom of all types of Dictatorships!*

Latvia—a nation of two million freedom-loving, prosperous and enterprising farmers and aspiring intellectuals. A buffer state between Germany and Russia. Since 1945 she is under Russian domination. Thousands of her best men: professors, statesmen, lawyers, farmers, etc. were deported to Siberia. Of their religious leaders numerous pastors, Baptist ministers, Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox priests were deported. Only 80 Lutheran pasters remained of a former 279.—*Freedom made this nation prosperous but slavery brought misery on her children. But, that which is good must prevail!*

Lithuania—After its occupation and forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1940, a shockingly large segment of her population—most of the intellectuals have been deported to Siberia or put to death. The Communists murdered 15 Catholic priests and exiled hundreds more. Today only some 340 of a former 1,600 remains. *No one dares to say that these people were war criminals! Our State Department agrees that they should be free.* Even their worst enemy, the Russian Dictator, must admit *that such a small nation* (population 3 million) *can hardly be a "menace" to the freedom and independence of the Soviet Union!* Why is then the Big Bear so reluctant to give Lithuania back its freedom?

Poland—a thousand year old Christian nation with 30 million population. In 1918 became a republic under the leadership of Joseph Pilsudsky and Ignacy Padarewski, the world famous pianist. *Between the two wars it achieved a splendid progress in the fields of economic and social life,* like her neighbor, Hungary, *without the aid of Communist system.* In 1939 Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany divided her territory among themselves. A countless number of Poles perished in concentration camps in Germany at Katyin forest, and in the slave labor camps of Siberia. After the war the Russian troops "forgot" to go home and helped to establish a Communist regime, loyal to Soviet Russia.—Thus, since 1939 these freedom loving people made several attempts to regain their independence, but in vain.—*They were not "war mongers" but war victims, therefore their fate loudly proclaims the shameful, ruthless and unjust decisions made at the so called "peace conferences". This is one more reason why these treaties may be revised and justice be done! The United States cannot be part of such barbaric acts against any nation!*

Romania—The 11th Russian invasion in her long history transformed Romania into a large prison camp, called People's Republic. Of her 20 million people some live under constant fear, some in dark and humid prison cells and some in concentration camps in Romania and Siberia. Since 1947, more than 30 per cent of the Orthodox priests have been dismissed and replaced by Red collaborators. "People's Metropolitans" have been elected, and a Communist partisan, Patriarch Justinian Marina, has been in command since 1948.—Although, Romania is the world's fourth producer of oil, has fertile agricultural areas, large forests and many kinds of minerals, the Romanian people live in poverty and on the point of starvation because the Russians take most of their produce for an unjustly low rate of pay.—*Romanians want to be free and lords of their own destiny just the same as any other free nation! Their economy should not be forced to support the Russian war machinery!*

The Ukraine—Some consider these 45 million people as Russians but the Ukrainians object to that. This nation was formed more than a thousand years ago with the capital city of Kiev. They have their own history, traditions and culture distinct from that of the Russians. Their homeland, about the size of France, contains the richest farmland and mining resources in the Soviet Union. Imagine the war making potential of Russia without the Ukraine!—They were forcibly absorbed by the Russian Empire in the 17th century. Regained their independence in 1917. Fought the Red Army for 3 years without any Western support. After their defeat the first Russian satellite state was created of them. But their will to resist the dictator remained intact. To punish them, in 1932 Moscow confiscated their whole harvest. Seven million Ukrainians died of starvation! Russians killed or tortured to death about all Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox clergymen and destroyed their churches.—During World War II the Ukrainians fought both Hitler and Stalin.—*How many members of the victorious American Armed Forces knew that 45 million Ukrainian "allies" also wanted to be free of the Soviet Union?* How many American citizens want to help them to regain their freedom now?—*It is easy to see where the "strength" of the Russian Bear comes from!*

A dreadful statistics—Mr. Aleksander Kutt, an economist found that, according to the Soviet's own figures, *Moscow has wrung some 12 billion dollars in illegitimate profits out of these satellites* in the 1955–64 period. Observe how the "clever" Russian trade works: The overcharges on Soviet exports to these countries have amounted to 7.3 billion dollars; the underpayments for Soviet imports from the satellites reach 5.5 billion dollars, reckoned by the differences between the prices charged on the two sides of the Iron Curtain for comparable goods. "To get a proper perspective of what Moscow has wrung out of the hides of its captive East European peoples, the 12 billion dollar almost equals the 13 billion dollars which the United States has distributed among the have-not nations of the world in economic aid that will never be repaid: Thus the "spread" in what might be called the comparative decencies of East and West is 25 billion dollars!" (John Chamberlain, Coexistence: For the Birds.)—*How long can we wage such a losing battle?*

[From the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, Los Angeles, Calif.]

A RESOLUTION TO FREE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The President of these United States:
Members of Congress:

Whereas we are in complete agreement with the aims and objectives of the struggle in Viet Nam, as it was defined by the President of these United States of America, that every nation has a right to be free from both internal and external pressures to establish the kind of government her people want, to adopt an economic system of her own choosing, and to exercise her political freedom without fear or intimidation;

Whereas our State Department never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union as a just and permanent solution of any dispute that may have existed between those states;

Whereas it is a well known fact that Poland suffered the most from both the German and Russian occupational forces and that Hungary was forced into World War II by the manipulations of Hitler's politics, and that Romania was also occupied first by the Nazi Armies;

Whereas none of these Eastern European nations can be labeled by anyone as war mongers, in fact they were victims of both wars by virtue of their location as buffer states between the warring powers of the West and the East;

Whereas the economic wealth that is being extracted from these nations, the scientific know-how and the skilled manpower obviously are very important contributions to the strength and power of the Soviet Union and, consequently a suspected reason of occupation;

Whereas it is in the best interest of the survival of the free economic and political systems of the world and, with it, in the best interest of the survival of these United States that these Captive Nations be freed and made independent of the Soviet Union and their people be allowed to live a life that is best suited to their historical aspirations and present ambitions;

Whereas the responsible leaders of these United States repeatedly announced that we do not want to be instrumental in the perpetuation of an unjust and dangerous international arrangement and that we are fighting and are willing to help the fight for a just and durable peace, our words should be supplemented by actions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That

1. our Government officially declare the end and termination of the agreements made at the end of World War II in regard of the fate of these East European nations;

2. our Government initiate steps either for an European Conference of Nations or for a special program in the United Nations Organization to re-shape the map of Europe: to re-arrange the borders and re-establish the independence of all peace-loving people and insure the possibility of their voluntary economic and cultural cooperation with the family of nations;

3. our Government take upon itself the role of genuine peace maker by insisting on the rights and freedom of all nations without showing favor to anyone at the expense of others;

4. our Government implement these efforts by attaching "conditions" and "requirements" to our trade and cultural negotiations with the Soviet Union and all other Communist governments as to the gradual and systematic changes expected of them on their way towards a free and democratic society.

Knowing that the liberation of the Captive Nations is long overdue and that there cannot be any disarmament without first establishing a just relationship among the nations we respectfully renew and emphasize our plea for the above outlined actions.

Captive Nations Rally, July 17, 1966, Ukrainian Culture Center, Los Angeles Calif.

By unanimous consent this resolution was adopted by the Captive Nations Rally.

LASZLO KECSKEMETHY, *President.*
DR. GEZA WM. RETHY, *Secretary.*

AUTOMATIC INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, no single group in the United States has contributed more to the well-being of this Nation, the prosperity of our people, and the substance of the American way of life than those distinguished citizens who are now retired. It is upon the foundations they have built that the modern world will exist. Our debt to them is enormous.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is all the more unfortunate that we must acknowledge that no other group suffers more than these people from the outrages of the inflation that is upon us. Many of whom I speak are on fixed incomes and must endure even further sacrifice as the cost of living spirals higher and higher with the passing of each quarter.

In an effort to ease the burden of these people who have given so much, I am today introducing legislation to provide automatic increases in Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits whenever the consumer price index climbs 3 percent or more since the last increase.

My bills are similar to the automatic increases allowed under civil service pensions, various labor-management agreements, and the military retirement system.

My bills would establish the 3 months beginning July 1, 1965, as the first base period. If the consumer price index has increased 3 percent or more over the base period, the social security and railroad retirement benefits are increased by a corresponding amount.

It should be noted that the increases in the cost of living result in proportionately more revenue going into the social security trust fund through increased jobs and higher salaries. Thus an increase in the tax rate is not needed to meet the costs of increased benefits. Revenue into the fund and increased benefits under this escalator clause would advance together.

As I have indicated, no group suffers more from the increased cost of living than our older citizens. Between 1958 until 1965, the consumer price index jumped by over 8 percentage points. The cost of services climbed 16 percentage points. Sad to say, the social security benefits did not increase at all during the same period.

We require a better way of maintaining stable benefits for both our social security and our railroad retirement beneficiaries.

The Republican coordinating committee has recognized this need and carefully noted the impact of this inflation on our older people.

We have the means to remedy this situation through the two bills I am introducing today.

NOISE ABATEMENT AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1966, at pages 12191 to 12206, I reported to the Members of the House on the considerable and widespread response to the legislation I have introduced to deal with the general problem of noise abatement and control.

My original statement and explanation of my "noise pollution" bill, H.R. 14602, is found in the Congressional Record of April 21, 1966, at pages 8745 to 8767. See also in this general area my additional detail on May 2 at page 9470, May 3 at page 9679, daily Congressional Records of May 16 at page A2629, and August 1 at page A4048.

I would now like to bring my report up to date by including in the Record some additional responses to my noise pollution bill, which have come from industry and Government and editorials and letters from those who are interested in hearing and seeing that something be done about excessive noise. I am also including articles of interest in this field.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

Will Noise Drive Us Off the Deep End? It's Increasing All the Time—Progressive Deafness Indicated

(By Robert K. Sanford)

Sonic booms are being produced on a regular schedule these days in the area near Edwards Air Force Base north of Los Angeles. They possess a peculiarly ominous quality for residents of the Midwest.

As supersonic airplanes streak above the Antelope valley, teams of observers wait in three "typically Midwestern" houses down below and record the shakes that result, physical and psychological. This is research to attempt to determine how people will react to the repeated booms that will be produced when supersonic airliners go into service in about eight years.

The houses were built specially for the tests and were constructed of materials commonly used in the Midwest—because the Midwest is the area that will experience most of the booms.

For the Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the agencies conducting the tests, the boom noise is a touchy problem. The aircraft industry has developed the technical ability to produce fantastically sophisticated machines for flight, planes that will carry 300 people and fly at 1800 miles an hour, yet an irritated public on the ground could restrict the supersonic use of the planes to flights over water or areas that are sparsely populated. The sonic boom remains the biggest problem ahead for supersonic airliners.

This specific example illustrates a dilemma of a more general nature, the buildup of noise that has accompanied man's mechanical progress. We produce and use so many machines that the noise of their operation has begun to reach undesirable levels. Noise has become a serious pollutant of our environment.

It has been estimated that the general noise level in major cities in the United States has been rising at a rate of one decibel a year for the last 30 years. And prospects are that noise will continue to increase.

"If our society continues to move more and more people in more cars and continues to use more and more machines then our environment will keep getting noisier," says Ira J. Hirsh, director of research at Central Institute for the Deaf.

The tests at Edwards Air Force Base comprise the twelfth government research project on sonic booms since 1958. There have been numerous government studies regarding jet aircraft noise near airports. Studies have been made of traffic noise, construction noise, household noise and industrial manufacturing noise. New York State last year enacted legislation which defines (by electronic measurement) and prohibits excessive noise on public highways. It was estimated that in New York City 40 per cent of the excessive noise was caused by trucks with defective exhaust systems.

The trouble is, no one has gathered this information together with an idea of doing something about noise, Representative Theodore R. Kupferman (Rep.), New York, told the House of Representatives recently. He introduced a bill to establish an Office of Noise Control within the framework of the Surgeon General's Office. His bill would provide grants to state and local governments to find ways of preventing and reducing noise. It would centralize federal research projects about aircraft noise, and it would finance an educational campaign to alert the public to the evils of noise and the advantages of a more quiet environment.

Congressman Kupferman advocates that residents near airports be compensated for part of the cost of soundproofing their homes. He pointed out that construction noises can be reduced. A silencer for an air compressor unit can be bought for about $200, he said.

With Representative John W. Wydler (Rep.) New York, Kupferman pushed for an amendment of NASA appropriations this year to provide $20,000,000 for research on the reduction of aircraft noise. The amendment went down to noisy defeat, 271 to 90, in the House, but Kupferman has been quietly gathering information to support his bill to establish an Office of Noise Control. He has cited the following studies and views as some of those that are relevant to the problem:

Dr. Lee E. Farr of the University of Texas spoke to the American Medical Association in 1963 about noise in the home. In a test kitchen, he said, a vent fan above the stove operated to produce a sound level of 84 decibels. When the dishwasher was operated simultaneously, the level rose to 88 decibels, and when the sink garbage disposal unit was turned on the noise level rose to 91 decibels, with peak noise at times of more than 100 decibels.

"Thus we see," Dr. Farr said, "that in the kitchen we can produce sound at such a level of intensity that if one were exposed to it for a full working day over an interval of time acoustic damage would result. I point this out merely to emphasize how increments, each perhaps acceptable in itself, can reach a sum which is unacceptable."

At a hearing this year before a New York State mental hygiene committee, Dr. Julius Buchwald, a psychiatrist, said psychotic symptoms can develop among persons who are disturbed while they are asleep and dreaming. He said residents near jet airports are exposed to such disturbance.

Everybody dreams at least five times a night, D. Buchwald said. When a dream is disturbed a person can suffer paranoidal delusions, psychoses, hallucinations, suicidal and homicidal impulses, and nightmarish memories, he said.

At the hearing a resident near Kennedy International Airport told of two occasions when neighbors threatened armed violence because of the noise. "It's a peculiar thing why my neighborhood should have a distressing amount of nuts," the man said.

Belgian companies engaged in constructing factories in the Congo found that they had to put special noise-muffling devices on construction machinery. The native workers, not used to such noise, simply walked away from their jobs when loud machines were operated.

The primitive Mabaan Tribe in the jungle of southeast Sudan lives in relative quiet that is disturbed only now and then by the bleat of a goat or some other sound from nature. A number of comparative studies have been done with the Mabaans as subjects. They were found to have better hearing ability than people of the same age in industrial areas of the United States. Generally, hearing loss and increase in blood pressure occur with aging in healthy persons in the United States. On the other hand, the Mabaans showed constant blood pressure levels from age 15 to 75.

Coronary heart disease is unknown among the Mabaans and it is thought they retain the elasticity of the smaller arteries. But occasionally when Mabaans leave their area to live in a big city such as Khartoum they become prone to hypertension and coronary heart disease.

Dr. Zhivko D. Angeluscheff, a New York physician, has reported that the blood capillaries of workers in noisy surroundings (at noise levels near 110 decibels) show an increase of peripheral resistance. This offers a clue for understanding the incidence of high blood pressure in our mechanized society, he said.

Dr. Angeluscheff says that we do not understand completely how a man hears and why he ceases to hear. But he believes that a sonic sickness—the progressive deafness of man—is in the making in our machine society.

From such testimony as this, and from other studies, Congressman Kupferman has argued that there is evidence that excessive noise can cause hypertension, short tempers, flushed skin, stimulation of the adrenal glands and stomach upset. "Excessive noise destroys efficiency and is extremely costly," he said. "It can cause deafness, interrupts minimum requirements of sleep, severely strains the nervous system, inhibits the normal developments of infants, is the cause of accidents, and interferes with school programs."

Questions arise: "Are people in our modern civilization quietly going crazy because of the noise? Is noise a factor in heart disease? Certainly it is a manifestation of the quickened tempo of modern life, a tempo that the relatively healthy and primitive Mabaans don't have to meet.

Anyone who has experienced a noise barrage from massed motorbikes, had his ears pierced by the stabbing sounds of rock 'n' roll guitars or felt his nerves wearing short in an ambush by neighbors' power mowers needs no statistics to know that noise is growing and galling. However, if he seeks solace in statistics he can find that his decibel disgust is warranted, as the following comparison of figures shows:

Acoustics engineers have listed general values of acceptable levels of noise. Thirty-five decibels is acceptable for a courtroom or schoolroom, 55 decibels is acceptable for a restaurant, 60 decibels is an acceptable level for a sports coliseum, 60 decibels makes use of the telephone difficult, 80 decibels is considered intolerable noise for satisfactory use of the telephone, 90 decibels is tolerable only when for a short duration, and 100 decibels causes actual physical discomfort.

Generally, research director Hirsh says, acoustics experts advise industry that noise levels to which workers are exposed should be kept below 85 decibels (per octave of frequency cycles). This figure applies to steady noise for an eight-hour working day. Above that level, serious loss of hearing can result.

When one compares these general levels to the amounts of noise that are experienced in everyday pursuits the reasoning behind the expressed alarm at the growth of noise becomes apparent.

Noise 80 feet from the tail of a jet fighter has been measured at 135 decibels. Jet airliners with several engines produced noise in the 160 decibel range. A siren 100 feet away measures more than 130 decibles. Traffic noise on main avenues in New York measures 140 decibels at times. The noise level in New York subways has been measured at 100 decibles, a level that can be produced by the appliances in a kitchen.

Human reactions to noise are deep-seated. Sharp, explosive sounds can cause a "startle pattern," Hirsh says, in which the person jumps and the arms go up in a defensive attitude. Tests of people under conditions of steady noise and conditions of relative quiet have indicated that noise made the subjects think that time was passing more quickly. The noise changed their conception of the passage of time. People who have been forced to shout in conversation for several hours have shown obvious physical and nervous strain. Districtions due to noise reduce the efficiency of workers and are a major cost factor in business and industry.

One of the objects of the sonic boom tests is to determine what flight patterns, speeds and altitudes would be best to reduce the magnitude of the booms heard on the ground. But the improvement (reduction of noise) from flight variations would be only fractional.

Studies of ways to reduce noise from subsonic airliners around airoprts have not revealed any new methods of much promise. If planes climb out at a steep rate on takeoff they take their noise away faster. But this is tied directly to the economics of the operation of the plane. A heavily loaded plane cannot climb out steeply. If the load is reduced, the revenue to the operator of the airliner is reduced.

A federal study group reported this year that initiative for the solution of jet noise problems can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests. This conflicts with the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operations and local governments.

Some measures can be effective against ground noise. Efficient mufflers can be installed on power lawn mowers. They would increase the cost of the mower. The New York State legislation that prohibits excessive noise from trucks sets a noise limit of 90 decibels at a distance of 50 feet from a truck. The noise is measured at roadside near toll stations while trucks are traveling at a speed less than 35 miles an hour. Truck manufacturers testified in legislative hearings that mufflers on new trucks kept noise at a level near 80 decibels or below. But with use the mufflers become damaged and less efficient.

Zoning and urban planning can be used to limit the bad effects of the general growth of noise. Federal attempts to encourage local bodies to keep housing developments away from airports have had little success to date. But, by necessity, noise will become increasingly important in zoning and planning, Hirsh believes. Some of the more modern zoning ordinances include measured decibel noise limits at property lines as legal protection against noise producing industries, power plants or air conditioning machinery.

In all, the control of noise has become complex. Technical progress has taken us to a point where for many people complicated effort is required just to find some peace and quiet. We cannot afford to take the attitude that excessive and uncontrolled noise is the price we must pay for growth, says Representative KUPFERMAN.

Man has been hoodwinked by the cult of veneration to machines, says Dr. Angeluscheff, and our nerves are undergoing slow degeneration as a result. Put another way, if silence is golden, man has succeeded at alchemy in reverse.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.), Democrat and Chronicle, July 3, 1966]

NOISE! NOISE! NOISE! THERE'S NO ESCAPE . . . AND IT GETS WORSE

(Cities have always been noisy but now Suburbia, once a haven of quiet, is bedeviled by the noise of power mowers, dogs, hotrodders, radios and—king of them all—jet airplanes. Noise is ever with us. And it's taking an increasing toll of nerves and viscera. The world screams: "Quiet!" . . . but there is none.)

(By Arthur Edson)

ALEXANDRIA, VA.—This is a nice backyard, on a dead end street 12 miles south of the White House in what used to be known as a quiet neighborhood.

Lovely, giant oaks hem in the yard on all sides. Ferns and rambling roses and Virginia crepers give it grace. It's pleasant to loll and watch as a catbird bathes daintily and a bullying bluejay muscles aside a cardinal so it can gobble the sunflower seed.

Only one thing is wrong with this yard, and what is wrong with it is wrong with almost every yard in urban and suburban America.

Shrubs or fences can ensure visual privacy, but there's no way to shut out the unceasing noise from heaven and earth, an inescapable fact in these summer months of outdoor living and open windows.

In nearby yards three power lawnmowers—so useful, but so annoying—angrily splutter. Chief, the white German shepherd dog who lives next door, barks excitedly. A teen-ager proves his virility, or something, by heavy-footing the accelerator of his sports car in a mad dash to the intersection, 300 feet away, and then squealing his tires on the sharp turn. A radio rock 'n' rolls monotonously.

Suddenly these assorted nuisances are overwhelmed by that prince of peace-disturbers, the jet airplane, whining in to land at the nearby airport.

A day in the city is a day spent with noise (sometimes called music) in elevators and restaurants; with police and fire sirens screaming; with dynamite blasts shaking the earth as new buildings go up; with auto horns dinning away in traffic jams; with the ubiquitous transistor radio blaring through walls.

Cities have always been noisy, but there was a time you could move away from it all. Now traffic surges into and around cities by beltways, throughways, freeways, railways and airways. In a nation becoming increasingly citified, there is no escape.

Minds are so used to the eternal clatter that it requires a conscious effort to sort out individual sounds (possibly nothing would shock a great city as much as unexpected, complete silence). But experts say ears keep on listening, and that the din demands a heavy toll, in irritability, in fatigue, in damaged hearing—and that it may affect hearts and sanity.

IT WILL GET WORSE . . .

If today is bad, tomorrow will be worse.

People are squeezed in more tightly. Automobiles and airplanes grow more powerful and more numerous. And, finally, there's that supersonic plane with its sonic boom that may cut a reverberating swath 70 miles wide along each flight from coast to coast.

Bo Lundberg, since 1948 director general of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, claims the global supersonic racket will be catastrophic.

"We have arrived at one of the most important crossroads in history," Lundberg says, "not merely for the aviation people but for all mankind."

Representative JOHN W. WYDLER, whose district is in the traffic pattern for New York's Kennedy Airport, sadly says: "At this time of year noise is the No. 1 issue, even greater than Viet Nam."

THERE IS LITTLE CONTROL

Noise is defined as unwanted sound, which helps explain why it is so difficult to control.

Tolerances to sounds vary enormously—what's music to a 16-year-old daughter may be unbearable to her square father—and when and where the sounds occur will influence judgments.

Measures of sound use incredibly complex equations.

Even an attempt to define terms isn't easy, as you'll see from this, by Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, a New York Republican straight from Noiseville, downtown Manhattan:

"The decibel—known as db—is a dimensionless unit used to describe levels of acoustic pressure, power and intensity. It is a logarithmic ratio between two sound pressures. In other words, a difference between two sound-pressure levels of 10 decibels means a relative increase of sound energy of 10 times the lower level, not an arithmetic increase of 10 points. A doubling of the apparent noise level means the sound energy has been multiplied by 10."

But nevertheless let's take an unscientific look at familiar sounds on a decibel chart:

35 decibels—all right for a schoolroom.
55—acceptable in a restaurant.
60—difficult to talk on a telephone.
80—impossible to talk on a phone.
84—noise made by the average truck.
90—tolerable if of short duration.
100—physical discomfort, or the amount of racket that can be created in a kitchen with all gadgets running at once.
110—loss of hearing, if prolonged.
130—about what a jet airliner makes in an airport, and the maximum for human ears.

JUST WHAT IS NOISE?

The New York Noise Abatement Commission has been in business since 1929, and Rep. KUPFERMAN says:

"Evidence from the commission's studies supported findings that excessive noise destroys efficiency, interrupts minimum requirements of sleep, can cause deafness, severely strains the nervous system, is extremely costly, inhibits the normal development of infants, is the cause of accidents, and interferes with school programs."

Other studies have suggested that noise can cause sterility, or temporary color blindness, or inflammation of the stomach.

Why should noise affect health so adversely?

Well, the life of primitive man depended on his hearing; he had to respond immediately and purposefully to unexpected noises.

An English physician, Dr. John Anthony Parr, explains it:

"A sudden loud noise spells danger and we react. In fact, we automatically get ready either to defend ourselves or for flight. Our muscles tense and we jerk, our abdominal blood vessels contract to drive extra blood to our muscles and this produces that feeling of the stomach turning over, and in an instant the liver releases stores of glucose to provide fuel for the muscles which may have to fight or run.

"This internal upheaval, if repeated again and again, is exhausting physically and mentally, and ultimately can cause a nervous breakdown."

EFFECTS ON HEALTH, SANITY

Despite the debilitative effects of noise, little has been done to prevent it. Few cities have meaningful or even rudimentary regulations.

Possibly there are three major reasons for this:

—Regulations are hard to write. New York, one of the cities that tries, prohibits "the use of any automobile, motorcycle, street car or vehicle so out of repair, or loaded in such a manner as to create loud and unnecessary grating, grinding, rattling or other noise."

But policemen aren't sound engineers, and at what point does sound become loud and unnecessary?

—Quiet is often expensive to come by.

At the end of 1965, for example, the aircraft industry had on order 538 jets and 122 turboprops, valued at over $3 billion. Any drastic overhaul job, in an effort to make them quiet, would run into fantastic sums.

Or take trucks. Lewis C. Kibbee, engineering director for the American Trucking Association, reports some tires may increase their noise level by 150 per cent as they become worn. Since plenty of tread is left, it is not economically feasible to throw them away.

A simple way to control truck noise: Cut down excessive speed on throughways in heavily populated areas, especially at night. A truck at 60 miles an hour is two decibels louder than when it's doing 50.

—Often rebellious in other fields, Americans seem resigned to their noise fate. In nearly every account of the sonic boom, for example, this line usually appears: "People must learn to live with it."

BIGGEST QUESTION: WHY?

But increasingly the question is being asked, why?

Representative KUPFERMAN wants a U.S. director of noise control, in the Surgeon General's Office. Appropriately for a congressman from a district that is eternally being torn down and rebuilt, KUPFERMAN is keen on toning down the construction business.

Representative WYDLER got 89 other congressmen to join him in his demand—unsuccessful—to set aside $20 million of the Space Agency's money for a crash program on how to curtail jet noise.

"It's a danger to health, mental and physical," WYDLER says. "You can't talk. You can't hear the radio. A priest told me that you can't conduct Mass. But we've stimulated enough fear in the administration so that they will include it in the budget next year."

In any discussion of ways to curtail or minimize air noise—quieter engines, better zoning laws around airports, insulation of homes in the direct flight patterns—the talk eventually gets around to the supersonic transport.

The French and the English are building a supersonic airplane, the Concorde, which they hope to have ready for the airlines by 1971. Eastern Airlines have made a down payment on two American-built super-planes for delivery in 1974.

What then?

One side of the argument is stated by the Swedish expert, Bo Lundberg, who says:

"Never before in history will so many have been disturbed so much by so few. Is it justifiable that millions of passengers on our spacecraft Tellus"—he means the earth—"should be disturbed in this way to enable 100 passengers flying from New York to Los Angeles to gain a couple of hours in flight? My answer to this question is 'no.' "

Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Group, answers the same question with a "yes."

"Who wants to fly at speeds of 2,000 miles an hour? Who needs it? I think we all need it. Man has always turned a technological advance to his advantage. The advance here it speed and speed in transport is good in itself."

. . . THE JETS WHINE ON

It's the impersonality of modern sound that is most infuriating. When friends give a party and it gets too loud, neighbors can summon the police. But most noises have no such simple solutions.

Washington's National Airport illustrates the difficulties.

It was opened to jets in April, and the protests, many from the most fashionable parts of the city, rolled in. Federal Aviation Administration officials counted the complaints, and that was that. The jets whined on.

Loretta Hirsch, in a letter to the Washington Post, said:

"I cannot understand why the entire communities of Southwest Foggy Bottom and Georgetown haven't risen in a body to bring down these thundering horrors—with slingshots if necessary."

Occasionally a nerve-shattered listener resorts to a more powerful weapon than a slingshot.

Oldtimers in the Midwest still recall, with pleasure, the exploits of the late Dr. Logan Clendening, who wrote a nationally syndicated medical column.

During WPA days a sewer line was being put in in Kansas City, and the air hammer banged away seven and a half hours a day under the doctor's study. He made the usual complaints with the usual lack of results.

Finally Clendening donned a dress suit, a homburg hat, kid gloves, put a carnation in his button hole and strolled over to chat with the foreman.

Suddenly an axe appeared, and with the battle cry—"I'm not going to have any damn sewer beating all day long!"—Clendening started swinging at the air hammer.

Walt Bumgarner, the foreman, said later: "There wasn't much damage. When I think it over, though, it's a wonder Dr. Clendening didn't cut off his leg. You can tell he's never done much chopping. He doesn't let the axe swing itself."

In the end it illustrated perfectly the odds against those who rebel against noise. Damage to the doctor: Four hours in jail and a $50 fine for destroying public property and for of all things, disturbing the peace. Damage to the air hammer: $2.

[From the Goshen (Ind.) News, July 11, 1966]

THAT OTHERS SAY—SHHH!

Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, Republican, of New York, one of the newest men in the Congress of the United States (he won the seat vacated by New York City's Mayor John V. Lindsay) has taken up a cause dear to our heart, but which we were beginning to think nobody would ever get around to championing.

The congressman calls his target "noise pollution" and we salute him for hauling it out of the limbo of unwanted crusades and mounting his charger.

"We are at long last," the congressman explains, "giving some hard thought in this country to the conservation of two of our natural resources, namely water and air, while we continue to ignore another environmental problem which should be of equal concern to us, that is, excessive noise . . . My own long-term interest in this field has led me to discover that in addition to interrupting sleep. noise destroys efficiency at work and is extremely costly, severely strains the nervous system, and can cause deafness and coronary thrombosis."

Noise pollution, adds Representative KUPFERMAN, causes "internal upheaval" of the body. Coming from New York City, where a great many bodies are in eternal as well as internal upheaval, it is no surprise that the congressman is bugged by noise. But New York has no corner on noise.

Ask any mother, on a rainy spring day with a houseful of young children; she knows what noise really is. Ask any driver in a traffic jam when some nut back in the line of cars leans on the horn; the urge to retaliate is probably due to "internal upheaval" of the body. Ask the spouse of a hi-fi fanatic, the parent of a teen-ager watching television or listening to the radio; the neighbor of a motorcycle-owner; anybody living on a highway used by diesel trucks—these people can tell you about noise.

They will join us in cheering Representative KUPFERMAN on. But we can't think offhand what he can possibly do about the problem.

[Vol. 20, No. 6, June 1966]

NOISE: AN OCCUPATIONAL HAZARD AND PUBLIC NUISANCE

(*Man's sense of hearing is nowadays being subjected to increasing strains that may well lead both to deafness and to neurotic disorders. The effect of noise is insidious because the human nervous system is very adaptable and high noise levels can apparently be accepted without demur, although hearing is in fact being progressively impaired. Some factories are now instituting noise-control procedures, and the creation of noise-abatement societies in a number of countries reflects a growing public concern with a problem that shows no sign of diminishing with time.*)

Noise—as forthcoming volume in the WHO *Public Health Papers* series[1] points out—is not a new feature of the industrial scene. The deafness of coppersmiths was mentioned by Ramazzini in his *De Morbis Artificium* in 1713. Before the Industrial Revolution, however, comparatively few persons were occupationally exposed to noise; but in the modern world machinery and vehicles make it ubiquitous. Many workers are subjected to noise, not only in heavy industry, transport, building, and the armed services, where it would be expected, but also in farming and in offices, traditionally regarded as being quiet. In the USA alone it has been estimated that some 170,000 males in the 50–59 age group may be eligible for workmen's compensation because of hearing impairment, though many do not claim for fear of jeopardizing their employment. The problem is almost certainly increasing, and many exposed workers develop hearing losses that may be severe; yet little attention is paid to this hazard in many countries. This is because the onset of hearing loss is insidious and because it may be difficult to distinguish impairment due to occupation from that due to advancing age. In addition, many employers may fear litigation or legislation if they agree to investigation of the problem. Lack of interest in the past was partly due to the fact that accurate means of measuring noise and hearing loss were not then available.

The potential cost of noise-induced hearing loss probably exceeds that of any other occupational disease, when assessed in terms of compensation and increased accident rates. Doctors, factory inspectors, and insurance companies need to co-operate in the reduction of the risks. It is as important to protect workers against hearing loss as against any other occupational disease or injury.

Noise-control departments in particular industries and public noise-abatement societies have been established in many countries. Many national standards organizations are trying to standardize terminology and specifications for sound-measuring instruments and hearing-aids, and an increasing number of manufacturers are designing their products to meet these requirements. Since national specifications vary, the work of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) is of great importance. An increasing number of countries are promoting control legislation, establishing criteria for assessing the risks involved, and compensating sufferers from hearing loss.

THE PATHOLOGY OF HEARING IMPAIRMENT

The ears of healthy young adults are sensitive to frequencies ranging from 20 to 20,000 Hz.[2] Certain frequencies are heard at lower intensities than others, and the greatest sensitivity is in the range of 1000–4000 Hz. Sound begins to be uncomfortably loud at an intensity of 100–200 dB (decibels) and painful at 130–140 dB (see Fig. 1). The mechanism of damage to the cochlea of the inner ear—for a diagram of the ear, see Fig. 2—is not altogether clear. Exposure to excessive noise initially produces a reversible auditory fatigue known as temporary threshold shift. On prolonged exposure, the changes become irreversible. The histopathological lesions in experimental animals begin with swelling and altered staining of the hair cells of the organ of Corti, followed by the destruction of occasional cells in the cochlear area corresponding to 4000 Hz; and this may proceed to involve the entire cochlea, leaving a bare basilar membrane. There are no detectable changes in the corresponding nerve bundles.

---

[1] Bell, A. (1966) *Noise: an occupational hazard and public nuisance,* Geneva, World Health Organization (*Publ. Hlth Pap.,* No. 30).

[2] Hz is the abbreviation of Hertz, a unit of frequency equal to one cycle per second.

The ear exposed to high sound levels is protected by the acoustic reflex, a contraction of the small muscles tending to fix the ossicles of the middle ear and minimize the disturbance. This reflex is ineffective against violent impulse sounds, such as gunfire, unless it is stimulated by a previous noise.

Deafness may be of two kinds—conduction deafness due to interference with transmission of sound to the inner ear, and true inner-ear deafness caused mainly by exposure to excessive noise. There are also mixed forms and functional losses due to psychological factors. Deafness is very far from being always of occupational origin. It may be due to trauma, diseases such as otosclerosis, toxins, tumors, or old age. It may also be hereditary. The diagnosis of occupational deafness is often complex and may call for repeated examination. It may be noted that occupational deafness is occasionally due to factors other than noise, such as blows on the head or blasts near the ear that rupture the eardrum or damage the organ of Corti, but these are numerically of minor importance. There is also the barotrauma suffered by aviators, tunnel workers, and divers, caused by sudden changes in atmospheric pressure.

Short exposure to high-intensity noise may rupture the eardrum. Prolonged exposure to noise may cause hearing loss, though this rarely amounts to total deafness.

The sufferer may be quite unaware of the early stages of impairment, even when this amounts to as much as 40%, or he may be aware of deafness in one ear only, even though testing shows that both are affected. The hearing of speech is affected first, particularly for high-pitched voices and for words containing many consonants. In hearing loss of cochlear origin, the subjective appreciation of loudness may be out of proportion to the increase in physical intensity of the stimulus, a phenomenon known as loudness recruitment. Tinnitus may be present. As the hearing loss increases, the victim hears his own voice less clearly and may speak in a loud unmodulated fashion. The appearance of the drum is usually normal.

Any loss from which the ear eventually recovers is called a temporary threshold shift. Transient deafness of this kind used to be common after aeroplane flights. The loss resulting from a day's exposure to noise usually disappears by the following morning, most recovery occurring within an hour or two of the end of exposure; but complete recovery may take as long as 10 days. The extent of the threshold shift depends on the type of noise responsible and is, for any individual, a more or less consistently repeatable phenomenon. Significant shift is not produced by continuous steady noise below 78 dB. For noise of greater intensity, the amount of shift produced is generally speaking, greater for the higher frequencies. Recovery from a temporary threshold shift is usually complete 16 hours after a two-hour exposure, unless the shift exceeds 60 dB, when complete recovery may take several days. It follows that, for workers in some industries, even a week-end may be insufficient for recovery.

Intermittent noise is frequently a feature of the industrial environment. A noise heard only during alternate minutes produces about half the threshold shift that it would produce if continuous. Losses from intermittent and continuous noise have been compared in soldiers exposed to gunfire and to tank noise; for the first hour or two losses due to both types of noise were similar, but thereafter they were higher for continuous noise. Men working with jet aircraft do not develop hearing loss as rapidly as might be expected because the intermittence of the exposure is partially protective. It follows that rest periods and task rotation may help to limit auditor damage in factories.

Permanent hearing loss begins for frequencies around 4000 Hz, and an early dip at this pitch is characteristic of occupational deafness. Lower frequencies are progressively involved. Impairment tends to reach a maximum after 10 years' exposure and then to remain constant, but it is unsafe to conclude that anyone who has worked in a noisy environment for 10 years need expect no further loss. The precise relation between temporary thereshold shift and permanent loss is not clear. Noise that does not cause temporary loss rarely, if ever, causes permanent impairment, and temporary shift and permanent impairment run parallel on their differing time-scales. Thus, for a given noise, the shift in dB after an 8-hour exposure closely parallels the permanent loss after 10 years' exposure. A reasonably accurate prediction is that the ultimate hearing level at 4000 Hz will equal the temporary level found two minutes after the cessation of 5 hours' continuous exposure to the noise in question.

Susceptible persons develop impairment comparatively quickly and are often aware that noise disturbs them unduly. They may experience head noises, nausea, or vertigo after a day's work. Susceptibility probably represents one end of the scale of sensitivity rather than an innate fragility of the auditory mechanism, and it may be transient or persist throughout life. It is important to consider whether the criteria for noise levels should be set low enough to protect this minority, but routine tests to detect susceptible persons are not yet practicable.

THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF NOISE

Interference with speech communication is one of the best understood effects of noise. The importance of this in industry is obvious. In general, noises that are hazardous to hearing also interfere with speech, though the converse may not be true. The frequency range 200–6000 Hz is the important range for speech perception, with the vowel frequencies mainly below 1500 Hz and the consonant frequencies above. The latter carry most of the information content of speech; they are weaker in intensity and are more readily masked. Interference due to noise is essentially a masking process and occurs at relatively low levels of background noise. Speech only partly masked by discontinuous noise may be complemented by gesture, a factor contributing as much as a third to total intelligibility. The extent to which the hearing threshold, in decibels, is increased is known as the speech interference level.

It is often asserted that noise adversely affects output, efficiency, and morale. These effects are difficult to assess quantitatively, and it is not always easy to distinguish the effects of noise from those of emotional and environmental factors. The behavioural effects of noise are probably not a major health problem. Noise may be defined as any sound regarded as a nuisance. But the degree of annoyance depends not only on the intensity of the sound but also on subjective factors; that is to say, annoyance is a very individual response, and even very weak sounds can be distracting. In general, however, the nuisance increases with loudness and pitch. Industrial experience does not point to any major or prolonged effect of noise on efficiency since human adaptability tends to nullify any changes. The initial effects rapidly wear off with concentration on the task. Short performance tests are of dubious value. It is difficult to prove that workers become more tired in a noisy environment, and morale, as such, seems to depend more on satisfactory identification with the work done than on noise levels or other disturbance.

Noise may cause certain physiological effects—changes in the electrical resistance of the skin, gastric activity, or muscle tension—but it does not follow that responses in laboratory animals are duplicated in man. Some studies have failed to show any such disturbances; on the other hand, Russian workers have reported precordial distress and electrocardiographic changes in persons exposed to continuous noise of 85–120 dB. In animals, the stress of noise may cause transient adrenocortical activity and local labyrinthine damage, which may correspond to the vertigo experienced by some well-drillers.

Excessive noise may influence occupational accident rates by impairing accuracy of movement, perception of auditory signals, or clarity of vision. Nevertheless, many employees work under very noisy conditions for many years without any damage to health that can be causally related to such exposure.

OCCUPATIONAL DEAFNESS

A knowledge of the extent of hearing loss in the general population is essential to the study of noise-induced hearing loss, for hearing loss is far from being always of occupational origin. The problem of differentiation is not a simple one, because increasing industrialization and urbanization make it difficult to find any population that has not been subjected to noise.

It is not easy to assess the prevalence of deafness in a community. On a conservative estimate, 8–10 million persons in the USA need hearing-aids. The actual hearing-aid rate in the urban areas is said to be around 6.8 per 1000 population, rising from 1.3 per 1000 for persons under 45 years of age to 72.6 per 1000 for those aged 75 and over. A national sample survey of 2,500,500 persons was carried out in the USA in 1935–36. Among employed males impairment was most prevalent in skilled and semi-skilled workers and least in professional and business groups; in other words, there was evidence that better hearing goes with higher economic status. There was an even greater prevalence among the unemployed of each occupational class, their reduced employability probably being caused by their hearing impairment.

There are differences in auditory acuity in the two sexes. In general, men have poorer and more variable hearing than women of the same age. Both sexes show increasing impairment with age—the process of presbycousis, whose pathology is obscure. Aging is known to be accompanied by cochlear degeneration, but it is possible that the decrement is primarily due to changes in the middle-ear mechanism. It is often difficult to decide whether hearing loss is due to age or occupation. The major break in the audibility curves for men occurs around the age of 32, while the critical point for women is at about 37 years of age. Losses from external noise and from presbycousis are thought to be additive.

Occupational deafness, though only a small part of total industrial morbidity (medical and traumatic), is largely preventable, and in some cases prevention is easy. Occupations well known to be associated with hearing loss include aircraft crewing and maintenance, boilermaking, forging, weaving, punch-press operating, tunnelling, foundry work, blasting, shipbuilding, timber-milling and papermaking. Less obvious hazards are bell-ringing, combine-harvester driving, well-drilling, shooting, and the use of certain automated office equipment.

Various factors must be considered in ascertaining whether exposure to a particular noise level has produced, or will produce, hearing loss. These include the overall noise level, together with its composition, duration, and distribution through the working day and working life, the age and sensitivity of the individual, the presence or absence of ear disease, and the efficiency of protective measures. The evaluation of exposure by noise dosimeters indicates a linear relation between hearing losses in the test population and the cumulative noise dose for all frequencies of 2000 Hz and over; but it is impossible to use this to predict individual impairment, since observed losses vary widely about the mean.

The maximum intensity to which an unprotected person should be subjected is probably around 135 dB. There is no direct relationship between hearing loss and the energy content of the noise. Other things being equal, high-frequency sounds are more damaging than low-frequency sounds, so that the spectrum of a noise must be evaluated before its potential effect can be assessed. Aircraft mechanics suffer less impairment than factory employees, though working at a far higher noise level, because their exposure is not constant. For this reason, frequent change of employment may be of protective value.

HEARING-CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

The aim of hearing conservation, ideally, is to ensure that hearing is not affected during working life more than it normally would be with aging. No programme is likely to succeed unless its aims are discussed with employers and employees on the same basis as accident prevention measures.

On any site the need for action is manifest if speech communication is difficult, or if workers experience head noises or persistent hearing loss after exposure. But the absence of such gross indications should not militate against any decision. It is difficult to define a safe exposure to noise for general application, because types of noise and exposure timings vary widely. It has been tentatively stated that if the sound energy of a noise is distributed fairly evenly and regular exposure occurs for many hours each day and week by week for years, and if the intensity at 300–600 Hz or 600–1200 Hz is 85 dB, then noise-control measures including hearing testing and ear-protectors are advisable. Several approximate critria have been suggested, such as difficulty in hearing a loud voice at a distance of one foot—a test that any factory inspector of normal hearing can use without recourse of instruments.

A person with an average loss of 15 dB is just beginning to notice difficulty in speech perception, and this is the minimum loss that is usually accepted legally as a handicap. A conservation programme aimed at detecting loss at 4000 Hz and preventing this from exceeding 45 dB will usually ensure that the average overall loss is less than 15 dB.

MEASUREMENT AND CONTROL OF NOISE

To determine whether a noise is a potential hazard calls for accurate and appropriate instruments. In the United Kingdom the instruments necessary to measure sound levels and determine octave bands cost some £700 (US$1960).

The sound-survey meter is a small cheap instrument used in preliminary surveys, as when screening sites for possible hazards. The sound-level meter is more sensitive and can be used in conjunction with an analyser. Both instruments measure the overall noise level. Since neither can simulate the total response of the human ear, to approximate to this response they usually contain electrical weightings or filter networks. Their range is usually from 24 to 140 dB.

With many impact noises, the needle of an ordinary meter cannot move fast enough to measure the peak sound pressure. An impact-noise analyser is then used. The cathode-ray oscilloscope usefully presents the wave form of a noise, and is particularly indicated for the study of impact noises.

The octave-band analyser is important because deafness is better correlated with frequencies than with overall intensity. It consists of band-pass filters dividing the audible range into frequency groupings with middle values of 125, 250, 500 Hz and so on, and the actual analysis is performed in the laboratory from a calibrated tape-recording.

In the assessment of continuous traffic noise, graphic recorders may be used in conjunction with a meter to record sound-pressure levels on a paper strip.

Finally, a noise cumulator—a meter recording the total amount of time a worker is exposed at or above a selected level—may be helpful. If necessary, employees can carry a small radio transmitter, the information being recorded at a distance.

If sound levels fluctuate markedly, different observers may obtain differing results using the same meters. Readings must be taken at several areas on the site, as near to the ears of the workers concerned as practicable.

The control of noise should aim at ensuring that the worker is inherently safe, whatever his own attitude or actions. Modern techniques often permit economical and effective noise reduction, but noise control in factories may still be costly and given a lower priority than protection against hazards more obvious and more immediately dangerous. As the risks are often greatest in small factories that cannot afford private consultants, the services of a government department should be freely available. Where the reduction of the noise to a safe level is not simple, the problem must be tackled in stages: an initial sound survey to delineate the problem, then engineering modifications, followed by further measurements. The cycle may need to be repeated until the overall noise and frequency composition have fallen to an acceptable level.

By administrative measures managements can reduce exposure through task rotation, or reducing hours of work, or sitting noisy machinery in remote sections.

Engineering measures ideally begin with the design and location of premises, and with planning for the acquisition of quiet machinery of a reasonably predictable noise level. It is important for machine manufacturers to appreciate the noise problem, and to design their products accordingly. Economy and noise-reduction go hand in hand, since noise is a waste of energy and badly maintained machines become noisier with wear. The source of a noise must be pinpointed, together with its path of escape to the exterior. It may be possible to reduce noise by changing a machine, process, or material—for example, by substituting welding for riveting, rubber for metal, or slow-acting pressures for high-velocity impact.

Noise may be reduced at source in many ways: by lubrication, for instance, by the use of dampers or insulators to prevent the transmission of vibration, or by the insertion of sound-peak limiters in telephone circuits. Noisy machines can be enclosed, preferably completely, with operation by remote control. It is possible to treat rooms with suitable sound-absorbing materials; this is particularly effective if the spectrum of the noise is known, thus permitting a correct choice of material. However, in most industrial situations such methods alone will not reduce sound to a safe level; they are most applicable when the desired attenuation is not great, when the room is reverberant, and when the employee is not too close to the origin of the noise. Sound insulation is not identical with absorption. It connotes the interposition of a barrier between the source and the point to be protected; however, its effectivenes may be increased by the use of material with a high absorption coefficient. Partitions should be heavy and form an air-tight seal across the noise pathway. Sound may also be reduced by resonators and mufflers, some of which attenuate noise by reflecting it back to its source.

Safety can be ensured only with the co-operation of the workers, and it is a managerial responsibility to educate them. Yet it is notoriously difficult to persuade workers to wear ear-protectors even in industries known for a high incidence of occupational deafness, and in some places where protectors are issued they are never used. This further emphasizes the importance of the control of noise at source, wherever possible. However, in some factories personal protective devices are the only practicable way of reducing risk. The purpose of an ear-protector is to limit the amount of sound reaching the drum, and there are four main types: plugs, semi-insert plugs, muffs, and helmets. More than one type can be worn simultaneously, as when aircraft mechanics use both plugs and muffs for fullest protection. It is unlikely that the total attenuation achievable by any of these methods exceeds 50 dB, and generally it is much less.

Plastic or rubber earplugs are cheap, but the indiscriminate issue of ill-fitting plugs courts failure, because a good fit in the external meatus is important. Individually moulded plugs are more comfortable and effective, but dearer. Semi-insert plugs are moulded to the shape of the external ear; but since they do not penetrate the canal their attenuation is poor. The ear-muff consists of a pair of cups covering the external ears and connected by a head-band. They often afford better protection than plugs and may include built-in telephone receivers for use in very noisy areas. Helmets are designed to cover most of the bony portion of the head, so reducing bone conduction.

If ear-protectors have to be worn continuously, factors such as comfort, ease of communication, and absence of irritation are of great importance. The efficiency of any device may roughly be assessed by comparing the temporary threshold shift on working days when it has and has not been worn. The mean attenuation over the four octaves from 250 to 4000 Hz is called the noise protection figure. Approximate attenuation values are 8–25 dB for various types of earplug and 25–40 dB for muffs. Satisfactory attenuation depends on the tightness of the seal and, as it may become loosened with movement, its effectiveness should be periodically checked by audiometry. The better the seal the better the protection, but the greater the possibility of discomfort; there must be a balance between efficiency and discomfort.

It is not difficult to persuade workers to wear protectors when exposed to noise levels so high as to be painful, but reluctance is met at lower levels. Users should be able to choose from several types, and they should be made aware of the fact that deafness may develop without their knowledge. Disciplinary action may be required, if only to protect managements against compensation claims. In some countries legislation requires not only that employers should provide protectors but that employees wear them.

AUDIOMETRY

An audiometer is used to measure hearing acuity, and audiometry forms an essential part of any hearing-conservation programme. It enables losses to be detected long before the victim notices any difficulty in conversation, identifies susceptible persons, and evaluates the efficiency of protectors and control measures. Audiometric schemes can hardly be considered expensive when the cost of a single compensation case may exceed that of the necessary equipment. If the number of workers does not warrant the installation of an audiometric room, arrangements can be made with local medical services.

Audiometers must be calibrated regularly; the operator can do this himself if he knows the exact status of his own hearing. Testers must be well trained because an audiogram is a potential legal document. Owing to the phenomenon of auditory fatigue, the audiogram of a person working in a noisy environment may vary with the time of day, and at least 16 hours should elapse between testing and the last exposure to noise; Monday-morning testing is particularly suitable. It is almost always possible to eliminate the effect of background noise by testing in sound-proofed rooms. Owing to the existence of various sources of error, repeat audiograms may differ by 10 dB or more; and no one should be transferred to other work unless testing has been done on different days with consistent results. The greater the hearing loss, the easier it is to obtain accurate repeatable results.

Pre-placement audiometry may permit the apportionment of responsibility for hearing loss between employers. Its purpose is to obtain a baseline audiogram to check against any subsequent changes in hearing, and it should be applied to all employees working in very noisy conditions. Applicants with binaural loss of 20%–70% should not be employed in noisy areas, although in fact severe loss may be an advantage in some situations since the damage has already been done. Follow-up testing is desirable to detect early signs of impairment. Except when the overall noise exceeds 120 dB, yearly examination might suffice, were it not for the existence of susceptible persons. Some authorities recommend testing at 7, 30, and 90 days after placement, others are content to wait for 90 days; but in general, if the change at the first follow-up test is less than 15 dB, yearly intervals should suffice.

Because audiometery is time-consuming, rapid screening tests have been evolved. Single-frequency screening at 4000 Hz is easy, as it is not masked by ordinary environmental noise and can often be performed in rooms that have not been acoustically treated. Most noise-induced loss occurs initially at this level and, if the threshold at this frequency is within normal limits, hearing for speech will be normal in at least 98% of subjects. In large plants a number of men can be tested simultaneously by using automatic audiometers with a single supervisory technician; the results are recorded graphically.

ASSESSMENT OF DISABILITY

Hearing disability may be measured in terms of earning power or of difficulty in hearing everyday sounds and speech. Impairment may affect one or both ears, and it is often difficult to assess the social handicap since audiometric conditions are artificial. An approach may be made by allocating standard levels of speech loss to correspond to audiometrically estimated losses in decibels at known frequencies.

The assessment of binaural loss is complex. Even total deafness in one ear does not constitute a 50% handicap; if the other ear is normal the currently accepted figure is around 20%. There is no agreed method for assessing the binaural handicap for different degrees of loss in both ears. When the hearing loss at 2000 Hz is greater than at 500 or 1000 Hz, a man may hear but be unable to understand because of poor consonant discrimination. The point when disability is first noticed depends on many subjective and objective factors. What matters always is the ability to hear ordinary speech under ordinary conditions. Losses below 15 dB are not usually considered a handicap. At 30 dB loss, the handicap becomes evident to the individual; above 45 dB he needs help to carry on without serious inefficiency; and at 85 dB he is totally incapacitated for speech communication.

It should be possible to reduce the prevalence of occupational deafness by audiometric testing, but it is undesirable that candidates for employment should automatically be rejected or that employees should lose their jobs because of hearing impairments. It is preferable to reduce the noise to a safe level by engineering measures or by the use of protectors. In some cases, the hearing loss may be so great that little additional impairment is possible. For certain types of noise, a man may continue to work in noise up to the intensity that caused his original permanent loss, but he should not be transferred to a noisier environment. A man who has already sustained noise-induced hearing loss is not necessarily more susceptible to subsequent exposure; indeed, in some circumstances, the existing loss may be protective.

There is, as yet, no satisfactory treatment for persistent noise-induced hearing loss. Nevertheless some deaf persons are helped by hearing-aids—though there are not as useful for inner-ear deafness as for conduction losses—or by lip-reading and auditory training. Rehabilitation is important and not the concern of employer and doctor alone; the State has a legislative interest in protecting those disabled by hearing impairment, and particular attention should be paid to deaf juveniles entering industry.

DAMAGE-RISK CRITERIA

A damage-risk criterion specifies the maximum sound-pressure level of a noise to which persons may be exposed without risk of significant hearing loss. There is some analogy with the maximum allowable concentration of toxic agents familiar to industrial hygienists; but noise is more complicated since no single limit applies to all its effects. Limits can protect only the majority, and it is impracticable to allow for susceptible individuals—universal protection would necessitate noise levels too low for many industries to achieve or afford. Many suggested criteria relate to long-term exposure and are inapplicable to impact noise, and there is no agreement on precise acceptable degres of risk. The prevention of loss over the entire range of hearing may be economically impossible. Expert opinion is therefore not unanimous, and the difficulties of incorporating risk criteria into the legislation are many. However, it is rarely difficult for an investigator to give a useful opinion on specific hazards. Intensity is not the sole factor governing risk. There is no safe intensity level without relation to frequency, and damaging levels cannot be defined in terms of sound-level readings alone. Nevertheless, exposure to 150 dB or above should not be allowed. Audiometry is important as a monitor of the particular criterion finally adopted in any factory. All frequencies may not be equally damaging, and criteria must allow for this factor.

LEGISLATION

In some countries, compensation legislation originally provided for accidental injuries only. Consequently noise-induced hearing loss may not always be accepted as eligible. Where it is eligible, it may be difficult to state when it occurred. The law may specify that the disability shall be deemed to have occurred at the time of the claim or when the worker first become aware of it; in some countries, the employee must be absent from work for a certain period before he can claim. Sometimes compensation is not payable unless there has been an occupational exposure of a specified duration. The lack of reliable records of hearing status at the start of employment is a frequent cause of dispute.

Although some industrialized countries have no legislation in this field, most of them are becoming increasingly aware of the problem. In California, only four hearing-loss claims were processed under compensation law in 1952, whereas 352 were filed ten years later. In 1961, compensation could be claimed for occupational hearing loss in 22 States of the USA, and for traumatic hearing loss in almost all of them. In Norway, hearing impairment caused by noise from machines or tools is classified as an accident entitling the victim to insurance benefit. In Japan, compensation is paid when, at the time of retirement, losses due to industrial noise exceed 60 dB in the speech-frequency range.

In 1948, the New York State Court of Appeals held that compensation for partial noise-induced hearing loss was allowable even though there had been no loss of wages—an important divergence from the traditional principle that compensation is payable for loss of earnings and medical costs only. Some Canadian Provinces will not compensate unless there has been a loss of earning capacity. Within any one country there may be considerable local differences in the maximum amounts payable. Sometimes a fixed sum is allowed for certain scheduled degrees of impairment regardless of absence from work; and in such cases a reduced scale of benefits has been proposed to keep industrial liability within bounds. Hearing loss seldom produces industrial disability in the legal sense, and industry cannot reasonably be expected to assume sole responsibility for loss when hearing defects are so common in the general population. If non-occupational loss is not distinguished from that due to working conditions, the potential liabilities of industrialists could be enormous. If compensation were paid for any loss deviation from the audiometric zero, many workers would be entitled to it although their hearing was still within normal range. Therefore legislation sometimes provides that compensation is not payable unless the average loss exceeds 15–17 dB.

Occupational loss is usually the outcome of many years of exposure, often in different jobs, and so pre-placement examination is important in apportioning disability. If audiometry is to be more widely used for this purpose, legislation should specify the conditions of testing. It should also encourage, or require, employers to take on a proportion of sufferers from noise-induced loss, and it should stimulate employers to reduce noise in their factories.

In each country, the legislation is influenced by the degree of industrialization and the social and political structure. In some countries, such as India, there is no statutory control. In Austria, very noisy industrial processes must be carried out in separate places of work. In Czechoslovakia, low noise levels are considered an index of quality in factory operation, and the advice of acoustic experts must be taken into account in factory construction. In Finland, if a harmful noise cannot be otherwise dealt with, the process must be intermittently reduced or interrupted.

Detailed regulations in the USSR cover matters such as the design and operation of machines, the replacement of percussive operations, the use of sound-absorbing materials, methods of measuring permissible noise levels, and standards of medical examination and protection. The technical impossibility of reducing a noise level must be established before a commission.

In the Netherlands, the hearing ability of ships' officers and crews must be established in terms of their ability to understand spoken orders. Italy and Japan specify that workers in certain industries must undergo annual hearing tests. In a number of countries, including New Zealand, Denmark, and France, it is compulsory for doctors to notify cases of occupational deafness. Brazilian legislation classifies any noise above 80 dB as hazardous enough to justify higher rates of pay; and other countries also incorporate noise limits in legislation, for example, for offices in Czechoslovakia and for ships of the German Federal Republic. Some national legislation requires the provision of ear protectors and hearing aids. Recent legislation in California stipulates the exposure levels at which earplugs must be worn and the need to instruct their users. In some countries, for example Australia, organizations have been established by legislation to investigate noise problems.

On the international level, the ILO recommends measures to reduce office noise.

COMMUNITY NOISE

Cities are steadily becoming noisier, and the causes are many: transport, construction work, domestic radio and television, and industry. Though there is an increased awareness of the problems of community noise, the difficulties of assessing individual annoyances are manifold, and motivations may be difficult to measure. What is acceptable to one group may be unpleasant to another; the noise of building work may be considered either as a nuisance or as a symbol of prosperity. Complaints are conditioned by many factors—whether the area is residential or industrial, the standards of house construction, the location of schools and hospitals, the times when noise occurs, local topography, and effects on property values.

The relations between industry and the community are involved, and local residents will be more sympathetic if industry is seen to be doing its best to reduce the nuisance. Since the intensity of propagated sound diminishes in proportion to the square of the distance from its source, the space between factories and houses is important. Other factors include sound absorption by the air (which is affected by temperatures and humidity), atmospheric turbulence, and other weather conditions.

Some industries are bound to be noisy, and the problem of arranging for them to function economically without infringing the community's reasonable requirements calls for general co-operation. There is, of course, the risk that well-organized minorities may succeed in imposing unreasonable restrictions. It is helpful if nearby residents are given information on a factory's aims and methods and if the operation of machines is limited to certain times of day. The materials used in factory construction may affect the noise levels of the neighborhood. Noise may be reduced in many ways: transmitted vibration can be lessened by suitable mounting; the source of noise can be enclosed; and rail-junctions can be welded.

Zoning is an important part of town planning and is just as applicable to noise as to other environmental noxae such as air pollution. Many planners originally postulated two types of industrial district—light and heavy—but the distinction is often an impracticable one, and the idea of performance standards in zoning has been adopted as a more scientific approach to city planning for reduced noise. Industry can, within limits, be established anywhere provided that it does not create a nuisance or transgress agreed performance standards. These should be neither too liberal nor too strict. Ideally, it should be possible to predict the noise a factory will produce when in operation and to ensure that it will not be a source of annoyance to the community. Legal enforcement must be reasonable and realistic. Steps can be taken to discourage the building of private houses near such noise foci as airports. In Czechoslovakia, factories whose noise level exceeds 100 dB must have a protective belt of 500 metres, and the external noise level at the point nearest any residential area must not exceed 50 dB by day or 40 dB at night. Regulations in the USSR require that plants with equipment causing a noise level over 90 dB should be sited on the leeward side of the nearest residential area and separated from it by an acoustic buffer zone, landscaped and planted with trees, beyond which the level of emerging sound must not exceed a specified level.

The evaluation of residential noise presents many difficulties, and universally satisfactory limits cannot be formulated. The ISO has suggested ranges of maximum noise-rating numbers for certain indoor non-residential spaces and has estimated probable public reactions to excessive residential noise. Situations vary, and a heavily industrialized area might be rated at N55 without complaint and a residential area as low as N30. The composite rating must allow for background noise conditions, which vary from time to time in suburban communities. In many cases it is possible to predict complaints about particular sources of noise. The study of reactions to aircraft noise has produced the concept of perceived noise level, which takes into account the greater annoyance caused by higher frequencies of sound; in the United Kingdom, a limit of 100 perceived noise decibels is laid down for the take-off paths at airports.

Other legislative controls exist. Thus, in the United Kingdom, it is possible under common law for any individual to take action against the perpetrator of a nuisance, although noise, as a nuisance, is often incapable of objective definition. Also in the United Kingdom, if a noise can be established as a public health hazard, local authorities possess enforcement powers and property owners may complain to the magistrates. In some countries, local city ordinances and bylaws apply to automobile noise and building work, as regards both actual noise levels and the time of day when they are produced.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION AND RESEARCH

Noise is only one aspect of occupational health, and occupational health but one aspect of public health; the difficulties in allotting priorities are enormous. In highly industrialized countries, preventive measures have so reduced the incidence of occupational diseases that more attention can be paid to conditions causing discomfort rather than disease, and to general working and living standards. In developing countries, the control of fatal or incapacitating diseases must take first place in public health measures. Nevertheless, once an occupational health service is established, noise should be given due consideration and attention paid to special groups of exposed employees such as airline workers. The international approaches include conferences and educational programmes for architects, factory inspectors, industrial medical officers, machine designers, engineers, measuring equipment makers, trade-union officials, and factory managers. Although hearing conservation is basically a medical problem, with obvious implications for WHO, collaboration is needed from such bodies as ILO and ISO. In each country a body of experts capable of stimulating and directing control activities should be established. Although several international meetings have been devoted to noise, none has been planned specifically for public health and labour officials; and it is as well to bear in mind that too broad a representation (e.g., including lawyers, industrialists, engineers, audiologists, insurance executives, and factory inspectors) may result in discussions restricted to generalities.

Any detailed model legislation for noise control must provide for a general survey of the problem, including methods, instrumentation, and standards; the definition of harmful levels by intensity, frequency, and duration; specification of persons to whom, and places where, the law applies; details of enforcement and penalties; methods of medical examination, and qualifications of control staff; and the use of ear-protectors. Noise levels should be classified in relation to particular industries.

There is also need for a freer international interchange of information. The International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre of ILO has done useful work in this field. A detailed up-to-date bibliography would be most useful; the volume of published material on acoustics is prodigious, and there is a need for some correlation and the dissemination of abstracts via a central clearing-house.

Although many countries are paying increasing attention to the health problems of noise, only a few have attempted any systematic assessment on a national scale. It is difficult to obtain comprehensive data. Statistics from compensation authorities are insufficient to define the magnitude of the problem, and the notification of occupational deafness may remain a theoretical obligation. Many countries have no large-scale audiometric and screening programmes. Surveys often demand a great deal of time and effort. However, the nature of a number of industries varies little from country to country, and it might be valuable to carry out simultaneous programmes on noise-induced hearing loss in a particular industry in several countries. Valid comparisons cannot be achieved without standardizing techniques for assessing hearing and recording the results.

Any international sponsorship of research on noise should concentrate on those problems whose solution is likely to benefit the greatest number of workers. Until the mechanisms involved in normal hearing and occupational deafness are fully understood, many problems will remain obscure. What is of paramount importance is the prevention of noise-induced hearing loss, which may be more widespread than is generally supposed. Other aspects—noise as a nuisance, effects on efficiency, the development of prediction tests—would, in some countries, be accorded a much lower priority. It is essential to be able to distinguish between occupational hearing loss and loss from other causes, such as presbycousis, and to agree on pre-employment hearing standards and on work placement in relation to varying degrees of deafness. A test is needed that can be performed at any time of day with the minimum difficulty, irrespective of the preceding exposure.

A major problem still insufficiently explored is that of the effects of impact or impulse noises and of noise fluctuating in intensity and spectrum. An acoustic dosimeter, analogous to the personal film badge measuring exposure to radiation, would be very helpful. It is in the engineering field, however, that the need for research is greatest. In many industrial processes few, if any, efforts have been made to control noise at its point of origin. The purchaser of machinery should be able easily to ascertain its noise level under operating conditions. Damage-risk criteria are essential in any control programme, but none has yet found general acceptance. In many industries and countries, workers must continue to rely mainly on personal protective devices, and the necessary technical advice must be made available to developing countries if this equipment is to be cheap and effective.

Finally, studies of ethnic groups not exposed to the noise of civilization might help to clarify the degrees of hearing loss attributable to social and occupational causes. Such groups are becoming rarer every year, and the remaining opportunities for research should be seized before it is too late.

[From Rodale's Health Bulletin, July 9, 1966]

THE NOISE WILL GET WORSE

Peace and quiet have always been recognized as essential to good health. People can stand only so much noise before their bodies demand a period of quiet to relax and release tensions. In this mechanized and noisy modern world, quiet is becoming an ever more precious commodity—both because relaxation is needed to counter the pressure of life and because noise is infringing on our quiet places of refuge. The phrase "noise pollution" has been coined to describe the growth of unwanted sounds into a force as degrading of the quality of life as dirty air and foul water.

It may be more difficult to quiet our environment than to clean up our air and water, however. For it appears certain that the United States government will soon announce officially that it is starting construction of the greatest noise-making device in the history of mankind—the supersonic air transport. That advanced type of airplane will have the advantage of traveling as fast as 1,800 miles an hour, but in achieving that speed it will trail a path of audible shock waves 100 miles wide in its wake. A supersonic plane flying from New York to Los Angeles will disturb the meditations of millions of people all across the country. It will rattle pictures on walls, start dogs barking, stampede flocks of turkeys and generally create a bigger disturbance than any force short of a hurricane or tornado.

For years the government has been testing public reaction to continual sonic booms. There have been 11 different studies and field trials. Reaction has been almost unanimous that explosions "out of the blue" are an unwarranted infringement on a person's right to have some quiet time to himself. There have also been numerous reports of physical damage to homes and property by sonic booms. Yet there has been no sign that the government is even considering stopping the supersonic transport project because of the noise disturbance it will create. The official view was expressed not long ago by Brig. Gen. Jewell C. Maxwell, director of supersonic transport for the Federal Aviation Agency. "People in time will come to accept the sonic boom as they have the rather unpleasant side effects which have accompanied other advances in transportation," he said in an interview published in *Science Digest*.

The government is bound and determined to push ahead with the supersonic transport project because of the conviction that "If we don't build it, someone else will." Taking second place in the air to Russia, France or Britain would be unthinkable, even if every American who happens to be sleeping under an air route must be awakened every time 250 people want to travel from one place to another faster than sound. Because it is technically possible to build a supersonic transport, it will be built, though such a plane can corrupt the quality of life without filling a real transportation need. What difference does it make if people can save an hour or two in a trip from downtown New York to downtown San Francisco by making the air portion of the trip supersonically? While the Federal Aviation Agency is spending billions to achieve that time saving, another branch of the government will be spending money to help people figure out what to do with their growing amount of spare time.

It doesn't seem likely that our public servants will wake up to the foolishness of supersonic passenger flight unless people with their feet on the ground let them know how much they value quiet. Unless we make noise about this issue now that is loud enough to be heard in Washington, we are likely to be living with sonic boom noise for many years to come.

[From P.I. Newsletter, March–April 1966]

MENTAL POLLUTION: A PHRASE IS COINED TO WARN OF CITY ILL

In describing the array of social ills that beleaguer man in the city the World Health Organization has turned phrase-maker. According to Dr. M. G. Candau, WHO director-general, the urbanite all too often is a victim of "mental pollution."

The phrase describes the pressures of city life, as over-crowding, noise, and long commuting distances, that beset man.

U.S. CONGRESSMAN CITES WHO IN PROPOSING NOISE CURBS

Director-General M. G. Candau's statement on the health hazards of city living has been cited in full to support legislation recently introduced into the U.S. Congress to curb noise.

Issued for World Health Day, the statement reads thusly in part: "Psychosomatic and neurotic disorders are undoubtedly largely associated with the congestion and noise, the hectic rhythm of city life . . ."

The legislation seeks establishment of an office for noise control under the Surgeon General to administer Federal grants for anti-noise programs.

Representative THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, Republican, of New York, who quoted the WHO chief, introduced the bill. A double-edged comment:

"We must no longer turn a deaf ear to the problems of excessive noise. We must open our eyes to the serious problem of noise today."

[From the Chelsea Clinton (N.Y.) News]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: ASKS QUIET AFTER DARK

DEAR SIR: Rita Bird's timely article, "The Infernal Racket," deserves the thanks of all Chelsea. She rightly points out that the narrow canyons of our streets magnify sounds intolerably. Confined between two close walls of buildings the high-pitched shrieks of children on the sidewalks assail the ear drums with unbearable shrillness.

These sidewalk voices can be heard from a 15-story roof. They penetrate closed windows. They are the chief cause of the flight of many tenants from Chelsea. They are the reason why many Chelsea-ites regard the arrival of warm weather with dread.

No one objects to the baseball games, no matter how boisterous, which go on in the streets. They end, reasonably, at dark. It is the interminable childish screaming and caterwauling that continues until late at night which exhausts people. Even tiny tots, ever unsupervised, and ever piercingly vocal, are seen about, playing before strange doorways until midnight or later. We know their apartments must be hot, and sympathize with them, but hot, too, are the apartments of their captive audience who must forgo the relief of open windows, as the lesser or two evils.

VICTIMS OF THE DIN

Scientific studies have proven that noise contributes largely to the rise in mental health cases. People returning from work cannot look forward to the evening of quiet recuperative relaxation which they require. The sick and the old, babes in their cribs, are deprived of their rest. The conscientious pupil, indoors at his homework, is unable to concentrate in the din from outside.

The victims of this bombardment of noise are many, but the heaviest sufferers are the offenders themselves. Deprived of a normal bedtime they are too sleepy the next morning to get to school on time and fall behind in their studies. They become truants and eventually dropouts. Even more alarming are the habits of late prowling inculcated in the preschoolers. Early familiarity with the night life of the streets makes it easy for them later, as adolescents, to drift into delinquency.

NOT MALICIOUS

In most cases the noise, though ill-advised, is not malicious. Few people except the unfortunate sufferers, are aware of the acoustical vagaries of New York architecture. However, the parental insouciance that permits young children to be abroad and disturbing late at night must be held blameworthy.

Miss Bird closed on a note of hope. Let us go further with a constructive plan. Let this newspaper assume leadership in a "Quiet After Dark" campaign. Let this become a community slogan, with printed banners tied to posts all over Chelsea. The chore of hanging them might be entrusted to those civic-minded youngsters, the school crossing guards. In exploring the resources of the community there is none that may more appropriately be tapped than the schools. What topic could be more pertinent for a social studies class, a home room period, an assembly program, or a Parents Meeting than how best to serve one's community and promote neighborhood goodwill? The sense of responsibility this will develop will make for good citizenship later.

Regardless of race or creed, children when properly motivated will work with wholehearted enthusiasm for a cause. It is up to adults to supply them with a worthy one. Quiet after dark is just that.

L. SYLVESTER.

[From the Miami Herald, June 2, 1966]

STOP THE NOISE, AUSTRIANS SAY

VIENNA.—The Medical Association of Vienna proposed Tuesday that excessive noise be declared unlawful in Austria and that special noise-fighting police be established to enforce the law.

In a letter to the Austrian ministry of the interior, the association noted that excessive noise, especially in cities, can impair health.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 23, 1963]

NOISE—SOMETHING MORE TO WORRY ABOUT

(Latest official worry: noise, and its effect on people. Medical experts say "noise pollution" is serious, increasing. Governments seek ways to dampen the growing din of modern life. Jets, lawn mowers, TV sets, autos, other things create a racket day and night. It can drive people crazy and have other effects, now under study.)

[Reported from Washington and London]

Noise is taking its place alongside air and water pollution as a major and growing concern of governments.

Particularly in cities, noises of all kinds are found to be rising to an unprecedented pitch. Some experts say the din is capable of driving people crazy.

Right now, it is the noises of modern jet aircraft that are getting a major share of attention. But the scream and roar of the jets is only part of the problem. Both health authorities and sound engineers say that over-all noise is intensifying so rapidly that it is threatening to get completely out of control. It is this accumulation of sounds that is causing official worry.

UNHOLY CACOPHONY

Noise investigators are running into complaints about TV sets and hi-fi record players blaring into the night. Car radios, and transistor sets carried along the streets, add their part. The cacophony is increased by police, fire and ambulance sirens, auto horns, power lawn mowers, outboard motors, cement mixers, air hammers, and roaring trucks and buses.

In Great Britain, it got so bad that Parliament passed a Noise Abatement Act. Now a Government committee has reported on the whole problem of noise in England, with suggestions on what to do about it.

The British committee suggested that the Government help defray the cost of insulating houses against noise near London's jet airport. The Government, however, turned down this proposal.

"There is no doubt that noise affects health," the British committee said, but it went on to observe that the "general effect" is "more psychological than physical." U.S. medical researchers have gone further in suggesting that noise can damage hearing, general health, and the nerves.

One medical expert wrote: "It is not an exaggeration to say that quite a few cases of insanity are caused by nervous systems that cannot adjust to the constant bombardment of noise." Another medical study suggested that long exposure to intense sound levels may even affect virility.

MILLIONS IN COST

In civilized countries all over the world, authorities say that noise has become a serious economic as well as social problem.

In the U.S. alone, more than 60 million dollars a year is spent on sound-deadening materials for residential, commercial and industrial buildings. This estimate is made by Cyril M. Harris, president-elect of the Acoustical Society of America and editor of the "Handbook of Noise Control."

In aviation, industry and Government have invested nearly 175 million dollars on anti-noise research and equipment. The automotive industry also has a huge investment in noise-suppression research and devices.

Currently, municipalities and federal agencies—including the military—admit they are fearful of costly lawsuits based on noise nuisances near airports. And, according to an authoritative source, workmen's-compensation claims for hearing loss due to din in factories threatens to tax industry with a bill that could run into billions.

140 DECIBELS: DEAFNESS

Noise—defined as "unwanted sound"—is measured by engineers in units known as decibles. Experts agree that prolonged exposure to noise of 95 to 100 decibels is hazardous. They say that 100 to 120 decibels "for even a minute or so" can cause temporary deafness, and that a "shock wave" or a "blast wave" of 130 to 140 decibels can damage people's hearing permanently.

A cannon blast can produce a "shock wave." If you stood on the ground close to a jet plane that was "all fired up and ready to move," your ears could receive the same intensity of sound.

In planning jetliners and jet airports, many things have been done to mitigate the noise nuisance. At the new, ultra-modern jet airport, Dulles International, near Washington, runways are set half a mile from the terminal. Extra land, extending a mile and a half beyond the runway limits, was purchased to isolate the airport further. An existing timber belt, extending 1,000 feet inward from the airport boundary, was left, and 1.5 million new seedlings were planted to form a sound barrier 1,000 feet wide around the airport perimeter.

"Yet, with all these precautions and expenses," a Federal Aviation Agency official said, "the 100-decibel noise level still penetrates about a mile beyond the boundaries."

Supersonic aircraft create an effect known as the "sonic boom." This is the explosive noise created when a plane exceeds the speed of sound. It hurts the ears and has been known to break windows, crack plaster, shake buildings. People sometimes even mistake the shattering noise for an earthquake. In France recently, it was revealed that historic Strasbourg Cathedral, located near an air base, is in danger of being damaged by sonic booms.

Now the Kennedy Administration has called for development of a supersonic jet airliner for civilian use in this country. It is expected to cost at least a billion dollars, and the Federal Government is expected to foot three-fourths of the bill.

UNPARALLELED BLAST

Some outstanding aviation engineers have said that the sonic-boom problem can be minimized by careful planning in development of supersonic planes. But one industry expert warned that the supersonic airliner is capable of creating "a blast wave unparalleled in human experience."

"The potential noise can be a thing of sheer horror," he said. "The plane will fly at altitudes and speeds that can set up a gigantic sound boom.

"Such a boom is capable of cutting straight across the country—or wherever the craft flies—in a swath 30 miles wide.

"Imagine the havoc that can be spread by a blast path 2,500 miles long and 30 miles across! The magnitude of it makes it absolutely imperative that industry and Government harness every research effort—regardless of the cost—to devise a suppressor. This Frankenstein's monster must be curbed before it ever is created."

A statement in a similar vein was made to Congress on August 15 by Representative ROMAN G. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois. Declaring that "indescribable violence will be done to millions of Americans once the full fury of the supersonic age descends upon us," he introduced a bill proposing curbs on supersonic development. It is one of several bills on this subject before Congress.

Industry and Government say they are well aware of the problem of aircraft noise, existing and future. These things have been done:

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has sent subcommittees to cities all over the country to hear citizens' complaints and investigate conditions at airports. It piled up a record bulging with horror stories of what it's like to live near a big airport.

The House Committee concluded that "airport noise (is) a scientific problem which cannot be resolved by legislative action." Nevertheless, Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York, representing the district in which Idlewild International Airport is located, has introduced a bill demanding that the FAA take responsibility for curbing airport noise. He proposed an initial appropriation of 20 million dollars to create an Aircraft Noise Abatement Service within the Agency.

The FAA and airport-management groups already have established sound-abatement centers at big-city airports. But an FAA spokesman admits: "This is something which is going to get worse, not better. The public will have to learn to live with it—or move away from the vicinity of airports."

A National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, backed by five major aviation associations, has been set up.

Throughout the aviation industry engineers are working hard on new, improved noise suppressors for present jet and piston engines. The drive already is under way to assure that the new supersonic jet engine, when it comes into being, will be a quiet one.

AIRPORTS LIABLE

The push to do something about the airport-noise problem before it gets any worse was given impetus in 1962. In that year, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the Griggs case, ruled that airport operators are potentially liable for damages to householders from aircraft noises. There have been similar decisions since, and some 1,200 lawsuits are said to be pending.

WORKMEN DEAFENED

The howl of jet engines is not the only noise currently causing concern. In industry, noise is regarded as a serious problem. Noises generated by punch presses, drop hammers, drills and other heavy machinery produce sounds with a decibel count said to be equal to explosions and jet roars. Workmen, exposed for long periods, become deaf.

Some years ago, high courts in New York and Wisconsin handed down precedent-shattering decisions in workmen's-compensation cases. They ruled that employes could collect for occupational deafness, even though they had not lost their jobs or even any working time because of the disability.

Immediately, hundreds of claims were filed in these and many other States. Industry faced the possibility of paying out literally hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation claims.

In recent years, the situation has changed. In some States where claims mushroomed, the law was modified to require that a worker lose six months' employment before he could collect. "We can live with the situation now," said a spokesman for an employers' association.

Meanwhile, industry itself did much to reduce the noise hazard. Soundproofing of factories were undertaken—increasing efficiency, many employers say. Workers were issued protective devices, such as ear plugs. Noise of the machinery itself was cut down. Gradually the problem was abated, though experts say it is by no means cured.

Certain trends in modern apartment building add another headache to the noise problem. In the old days, apartment houses generally were soundproof. There were 10 to 15 inches between floors; walls were thicker and well insulated; ceilings were higher.

Today, many apartments—an even private homes—use building techniques which offer little protection against noise. They go in for lightweight construction. Sound waves bounce around inside the apartments, often making it impossible for the occupants to hear themselves talk. Conversation also travels through the thin walls and air ducts, so the neighbors often get an earful of what's going on.

"After unwillingly being made a privy party to everything that goes on in my neighbors' living room and bedroom," said a resident of a typical jerry-built apartment, "I've adopted the habit of conducting all of my own private discussions with my wife in a whisper!"

What's to be done about it? Experts say that apartment noise can be controlled with "proper acoustical engineering." The FHA, with assistance of the National Bureau of Standards and private acoustical firms, has issued a "guide" for "impact noise control" in multifamily dwellings.

"But it's just that—a 'guide' rather than a regulation," an official said.

Richard K. Cook, chief of the sound section of the National Bureau of Standards, recommends a number of ways in which the householder himself can cut down noise in modern homes. He advocates liberal use of insulating materials, carpets, drapes and upholstered furniture to absorb noise. Much can be done in choosing models of home machinery and fixtures, such as air-conditioners, vacuum cleaners, toilets, etc., for quietness characteristics.

TV and radio commercials are under official investigation as noisemakers. The Federal Communications Commission is inquiring into "numerous complaints concerning the broadcasting of annoyingly loud commercial announcements." It says:

"The Commission is of the opinion that the practice of broadcasting such irritatingly loud commercials is not in the public interest. . . ."

The National Association of Broadcasters takes issue with the FCC. It denies that "the problem of annoyingly loud commercials exists to such an extent that any action by the Commission is warranted."

Traffic noise also is the subject of much study and some lawmaking. The noise of average city traffic measures about 80 decibels. A police-car or fire-engine siren will send it soaring above the level that the human ear can tolerate comfortably. Some cities now restrict use of emergency sirens.

WORN-OUT MUFFLERS

On highways, there are periodic crackdowns by State troopers on trucks with faulty mufflers. One unmuffled truck, experts say, can produce as much noise as 90 to 100 passenger cars. Scientific organizations, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and State highway organizations have given attention to the problem. Highway noise has been abated somewhat by planting of "buffer strips" of trees and shrubs and scientific placements of earth embankments. But the problem remains.

RACKETS PEOPLE MAKE

Perhaps the most difficult problem of all is "people noises." This covers a broad gamut. It includes the noises made by little children at play on lawns and sidewalks from early morning till dark. It includes the staccato click of women's steel-tipped spike heels on city pavements. It includes the shouts of taxi and truck drivers; policemen's and doormen's whistles—and the noises people make late at night in leaving night clubs.

The British report despaired most of ever curing people noises—and American experts agree.

"We doubt," the British investigators said, "whether technical advances will contribute much to the solution of the problem, which is fundamentally one of human behavior." It suggested:

"Ultimately, the best remedy . . . is sympathy and consideration between the people concerned.

"We recommend that local authorities . . . direct some of their publicity activities, both in schools and generally, towards teaching that the creation of unnecessary noise is inconsiderate and ill-mannered."

In the U.S., with a substantial body of medical opinion now agreeing that too much noise is not good for people, many communities and some States are going a step beyond "sympathy and understanding."

In California, administrative rules, described as "the first comprehensive noise-control orders in the U.S.," went into effect last March 15. They are administered by the State industrial safety board, and are designed to reduce damage through control measures at places of employment.

JAIL TERMS FOR SOME

New York—regarded by many as one of the noisiest cities in the world—has battled the problem for years.

An ordinance in New York City provides fines and even jail terms for those who play radios, phonographs and such machines too loudly between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m.

The laws are broad enough to take in unnecessary blowing of auto horns and almost every type of excessive noise. A police-department official said it has "helped some," but "we try to enforce it with discretion."

Memphis, Tenn., once plagued by auto-horn blowers, adopted an antinoise ordinance more than 20 years ago. It has won more than a dozen "quietest city" awards from the now-defunct National Noise Abatement Council. "People all over the world consider us a model," Memphis' police commissioner commented. A veteran newspaper editor added: "You hear a horn blow in Memphis and everybody asks: 'Is that guy crazy?' "

WE'VE GOT TO DO SOMETHING

In other cities, other countries, antinoise ordinances are proposed, argued, sometimes adopted and enforced. But for every little gain on the antinoise front, it seems that modern civilization produces a new quiet-shattering menace.

As one expert, viewing the situation, commented: "One thing is certain—we've got to do something before the mounting crescendo of noises drives us all crazy!"

[From Harper's Bazaar, August 1966]

NOISE POLLUTION—A GROWING SCANDAL

(By Natalie Gittelson)

Only a little more than a half century ago, Dr. Robert Koch, winner of the Nobel Prize for Medicine, predicted: "The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the *worst enemy of his health,* as he did long ago with cholera and plague." It was no mad scientist nightmare. Already the Koch prophecy is on the brink of total, terrifying fulfillment. Now, in 1966, the World Health Organization of the United Nations pinpoints 'mental pollution' as the newest menace of city life. It is "rapidly becoming more pernicious than air or water pollution," WHO warns, adding that the resultant "psychosomatic and neurotic disorders are undoubtedly largely associated with the . . . noise and hectic rhythm" of urban living, "its vast anonymity and its many strident appeals."

In the jungle of the city, each of the afflicted has his favorite (or, more accurately, unfavorite) noise pest: the belch of jet planes, the screech of horns, the thunder of pneumatic drills as they tear up the terrain, the blast and crash of construction jobs, the whine of fire sirens, the 'double crossing of a pair of heels' whose love has (raucously) congealed in the next apartment in the middle of the night. At cocktail parties, the din is deafening. (*Literally* deafening, according to some of the best medical authorities, from whom we shall hear in a moment.) In taxis, the blare of rock and roll all but triggers instant nervous breakdowns among the sensitive. On busses and trains and beaches and even lately in restaurants, transistor radios roar out the news of cosmic doom—insuring, surely, the death of conversation. At the movies, candy wrappers rustle, popcorn crunches . . . and one's closest neighbor calls the plot turns in sibilant stage whispers. Depending on personal temperament, the munchers, crunchers and rustlers may wreck life's pleasure and shatter its peace even more effectively than the more impersonal (although perhaps more organically dangerous) sonic boom.

Dr. Howard M. Bogard, chief psychologist in the department of psychiatry at the Queens Hospital Center, one of New York's largest municipal hospitals, testified recently at a hearing on jet noise nuisance, held by the New York State Assembly's mental hygiene committee. "The tolerance threshold of each human being to noise is a subjective and individual matter," he says. "What only mildly annoys many well-adjusted can acutely threaten the emotional stability of those who are making borderline psychological adjustments and barely holding onto reality."

We have become entirely too accustomed to accepting outer chaos as a necessary condition of urbanity or, as more than one civic official has put it complacently, "the price of progress." But even to the best balanced of city creatures, the death of silence frequently seems absolute. "In their personal lives, people are hung up on the idea that noise nuisance, like other unpleasantness, will somehow take care of itself. Men feel psychologically impotent in the face of small and large disasters and therefore fail to take action," Dr. Bogard laments.

However, not only the World Health Organization, but also some of the most distinguished experts in the medical profession believe that noise by no means falls in the minor nuisance category. It is not simply pestiferous, it is pernicious—potentially a deadly crippler, even a killer, of the human race. Dr. Zhivko D. Angeluscheff, member of the International Association Against Noise and Fellow of the Academy of Medicine and Sciences (who was, by the way, the first scientist to warn the United Nations of noise as a hazardous threat to health), points out that our mechanized civilization "disregards completely the biological limits of the human ear and the human nervous system." While the United States leads all other nations in producing noise, it has done less than any other country in systematically controlling it. (In West Germany, recently the scene of the Fourth International Congress for Noise Abatement, laws prohibiting excessive construction noise have been in effect for some time.)

Progressive deafness due to otosclerosis, Dr. Angeluscheff insists, is a *sonic disease*. "The primary causative factor," he says, "is vibratory energy (*i.e.*, noise), in which the intensity itself is not of primary importance. Even unperceived ultrasonic waves (those beyond audibility) can damage the nervous system by penetrating the nerve cell of the ear. Man doesn't even hear all the sounds by which he is surrounded daily. But in time they can destroy his auditory nervous system."

There is mounting scientific evidence that destruction of the auditory nervous system is not the worst havoc that noise can wreak. According to Dr. Angeluscheff, supersonic sound can also destroy the submolecular life of living cells, both animal and vegetable. Ocean plankton, exposed to it, undergoes profound changes in five to ten seconds; in five minutes, chloroplasts lose color and die. In Oklahoma City, ten thousand chickens forced into captivity to undergo the boom of supersonic testing twice a day for a period of six months sustained some or all of these effects: the rupture of reproductive organs, the stoppage of egg-laying, loss of feathers, internal bleeding, hernia and death. Following the testing, only four thousand of the original ten thousand remained alive.

Another of medicine's anti-noise crusaders says, " . . . The danger to *humans* is striking home. When the human chicken begins to lose his hair and his wife experiences unwanted abortions and sterility, we will see headlines on supersonics."

Dr. Samuel Rosen, consulting ear surgeon at Mt. Sinai Hospital and the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary and a professor at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, several years ago traveled to the Sudan to study the Maban, "a tribe which lives in an area with the *lowest background noise level* recorded in an inhabited place." Possessing neither drums nor guns, they know only the sound of their own muted voices and the hush of the White Nile jungle. Not only is their hearing the keenest ever tested by Dr. Rosen, but almost no coronary heart disease exists among them. Accordingly, Rosen believes he can establish a relationship between keen hearing and longevity. He has now joined a team of Russian doctors in a study of long-lived Caucasian mountaineers, some of whom may be one hundred and eighty years old. This team of medical men will explore the ways that loss of hearing (thus noise) may influence coronary heart disease and the span of life.

The organic threat to life and health that noise pollution poses for our time is indisputable. But to many, even the hazards of abortion and progressive nerve deafness, with the dullness and apathy of response it breeds, seem somehow less terrifying than the psychotic symptoms that an unremitting onslaught of contemporary noise can cause. Dr. Julius Buchwald, a psychiatrist who teaches at the New York Medical Center and who was also a witness at the aforementioned jet noise hearing, lists paranoidal delusions, hallucinations and suicidal homicidal impulses as some of the consequences of chronically noise-interrupted sleep. Both Dr. Bogard and Dr. Buchwald accept the new scientific theory that 'dream privation' can result in far worse disorders than simple anxiety and agitation. "If you relentlessly don't let people dream, they go crazy," Dr. Bogard says.

"Moreover a person subjected to continuous noise of unvarying intensity will perceive it progressively, as having *greater* intensity. Tolerance to noise decreases rather than increases with time." Thus, to talk about 'getting used to' jet noise borders on absurdity.

But even the less dramatic noise of street repairs and housing construction (and in the country, power lawn mowers and outboard motors), besides being dangerously "detrimental to productivity, especially when verbal communication is affected," may result in nerves frayed during the day to such a point that during the night, sleep is at best fitful and fretful. According to Dr. Bogard, people who fail to sleep sufficiently are not only deprived of dreaming, but also experience "marked changes in reaction time. They drive erratically, cross the street as though they were half blind, cut themselves while shaving and burn themselves while smoking."

Beyond describing it and deploring it, what can we do about the growing menace of noise pollution in America? Robert Alex Baron, who lives in New York City, was plagued by the roar of the five air compressors, the whine of chain saws, the rat-a-tat of rock drills and the racket of diesels under his window, where the city was building a subway spur. When a thirty-three story building also started up across the street "to the tone of high-pitched riveting guns and the rattle of cement trucks," he implored his neighbors to join with him in forming the Upper Sixth Avenue Noise Abatement Association. Its primary aim was to cause the enactment of 'noise statutes,' making it a violation to operate any machinery in or over any street, unless equipped with mufflers which prevent noise in excess of ninety decibels at the source. (Any noise above sixty decibels is harmful to human beings, most doctors agree. The World Health Organization puts the figure even lower.)

In some countries of Europe, pneumatic drills which can be hardly heard are available and in use! Oddly enough, not only does American industry resist conversion but frequently the American laborer himself looks askance at the idea of change. Some psychiatrists speculate that, just as truck drivers tamper with their mufflers so that they can roar aggressively down the roads, so has the noise of the drill become a personal virility symbol to the men who use it. (But Dr. Angeluscheff insists that these "unhappy men" are just plain hard of hearing.)

"Acoustic technology has the solutions to most of the urban noise sources," Mr. Baron wrote recently in a letter to *Newsweek* magazine. "Silenced jack hammers, rock drills and pile drivers are already on the market. But they lose out to their unmuffled competitors by lack of demand in the form of noise specifications and restrictive legislation." (Editor's note: As we go to press, the *New York Times* hails the construction of a fifty-two story office tower from which "the loudest noise has been the warning beeps that precede blasting for the foundation. The actual foundation blasting, by the Diesel Construction Company, was muffled by noise-absorbing wire mesh blankets. Joints were welded quietly rather than riveted.)

Clearly it is the public and the public alone who must protect the public interest. Mr. Baron and his committee succeeded in persuading New York Congressman THEODORE KUPFERMAN to introduce and sponsor a national noise control program in Congress: The Noise Control Act of 1966. Another legislator, Assemblyman Leonard Yoswein, who conducted the jet noise inquiry in which Drs. Bogard and Buchwald appeared as witnesses, recently introduced a bill that would require the New York State Commissioner of Mental Health to study the effects of noise on health and well-being. Mr. Yoswein lives near Kennedy International Airport where jet noise is so aggravating that residents have more than once blocked the runways in protest, and one woman threatened to blow up the Kennedy control tower to free herself and her family from the plague of intolerable noise. To lengthen the runway at Kennedy Airport and fly planes over Jamaica Bay instead of the roofs of homeowners would cost about a million and a half dollars. "The powers-that-be, however, wish only to maintain the status quo," says Mr. Yoswein. Their position is—if the people don't like it, let them move elsewhere. Nevertheless, inch by inch, he and his committee are edging stubbornly toward effective local noise-abatement legislation.

Another even more recent citizens' protest has caused the cessation of night and Sunday flights to and from the heliport on top of the Pan Am building. Seven articulate and well-dressed women politely picketed the Pan Am Building on Forty-Second Street, winning almost instant recognition from Mayor John Lindsay.

Mr. Baron, who has taken time off from a flourishing career in the theatre to devote himself to the onerous task of noise abatement (he was the only American delegate at this year's International Congress for Noise Abatement) speculates, tongue not altogether in cheek, that so few men have so far joined the anti-noise fight because unconsciously they welcome hearing loss as a protection from shrill and nagging wives!

Quite seriously, he believes that, as in the instance of the successful Pan Am picketing, it is American women who will finally take the initiative in supporting and making operative the burgeoning noise abatement movement. He has a few practical suggestions. Ask your Congressman to support H.R. 14602. Demand, individually and through women's organizations, he says, that manufacturers of kitchen appliances and air-conditioners adopt standard noise ratings. When it comes to personal noise-making, practice personal good manners. "Acoustic consideration," Mr. Baron calls it. Resolve that your family will not contaminate the atmosphere with excessive noise, whether from two A.M. television, vacuum cleaning while the windows are wide open, or from too exuberant children racketing on the lawn. In time, although the major problems of sonic boom and so on will not take care of themselves, an awakened and eloquent people will insure that they do find humane and rational resolutions. The more eloquent the public, the shorter the time it will take.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 7, 1965]

Fight Noise, Specialist Warns Cities—Din May Impair Hearing, Says Speech Association Head

(By John Street)

Cities should start figuring out ways to be quieter, a New York City hearing specialist said here today.

Continued exposure to relatively high noise levels in cities may have the cumulative and "insidious" effect of impairing hearing, according to Dr. Thomas H. Fay Jr., president of the New York State Speech and Hearing Association.

"Noise pollutants" should be considered along with water and air pollutants, he said.

"Noise is a problem. It's absolutely essential that we turn our attention to it, and the sooner the better."

Dr. Fay was here for his association's annual convention today and tomorrow at the Manger Hotel. He is an assistant professor and chief of the communicative disorders service, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, New York Medical College, and also serves as a "consultant in communications" for industries and the New York and Los Angeles fire departments.

Fay acknowledged that it is often difficult to convince people of the urgency of noise abatement programs.

Damage to the tiny nerve endings in the inner ear may occur gradually, over a long period of exposure to high noise levels. The victim may be hardly aware of it.

Also, some persons downgrade the importance of a hearing loss, he said. "People think they can live with a hearing problem, until they learn how difficult it is from experience."

Fay said much research must be done to determine what noise levels are harmful to what persons. Noise intensity, frequency, time of exposure and the nature of the individual ear must all be considered, he said.

Many industries would do well to analyze their noise conditions, he said. A boiler factory is the "classic example" of a noisy industry, "but far less intense levels of sound are dangerous."

Where possible, noise sources should be "sound-treated." Actual "sound-proofing" rarely if ever exists, he says.

Other solutions are to isolate the worker from the noise source, or to "sound-treat" the worker himself with some type of ear muff or ear plug. Fay said airport ground crews often wear such devices.

One of Fay's concerns as consultant to the New York City Fire Department is the new $875,000 "super pumper" the department plans to put into use. "The monster," as he calls it, designed for fighting fires of "holocaust" proportions in downtown areas, can pump a stream of water powerful enough to "blast down a brick wall."

Firemen will have to wear ear muffs with tiny speakers, both for ear protection and to be able to communicate above the monster's din, he said.

Fay also is working on development of new types of "apparatus warning signal" which he thinks will replace the old-fashioned fire engine siren.

Sirens, especially those which make a continuous howl, are often lost in normal traffic noise, and don't identify the type of emergency vehicle. You don't know whether it's "an ambulance, a fire engine or a mad politician," he said.

Devices with more distinctive sounds, perhaps interrupted sounds, might be a more effective warning and also be less offensive to persons nearby.

[From Diners Club magazine, June 1966]

What Noise Annoys You?

(By Leslie R. Jones)

With advancing age, many members of society experience a pronounced loss of hearing. Isn't this just one of the many symptoms that plague us as we grow older? Some people think so. Yet, not long ago a study was made of a tribe of American Indians who lived out their lives under primitive conditions in an unusually quiet area. The study revealed the amazing fact that there was no loss of hearing among them as they passed into old age.

Is it possible, then, that in urbanized America we have created a society permeated by ear-assaulting, unpleasant noises and that these have become so intolerable to us that we have solved the problem of handling them by unconsciously attempting to shut out all the zooming jets, screaming fire engines and noisy garbage trucks? In many cases, this seems to be true.

There are, first of all, two types of noise: (a) loud and sustained, and (b) low, sustained and equally irritating. Noise, as it is generally understood, is the phenomenon of loud, harsh, unharmonious sounds or vibrations that strike the ear in an unpleasant or irritating way. The trouble with this definition is that it leaves the question of "unpleasant and irritating to whom?" unanswered.

Consider the city dweller who must endure a radio turned up high from early morning until late at night. To the lady playing the radio, the sound is probably delightful. Perhaps it even shields her from loneliness.

But to the occupant of the apartment below it can become as irritating as a dentist's drill. And what about the man whose air-conditioner vibrates? In his air-cooled comfort, the sounds of the motor may actually soothe him. To nearby neighbors, the vibration may be such a disturbing noise that it prevents them from getting a good night's sleep.

Clearly, "loud, harsh, unharmonious" attributes are matter of subjective judgment. As a psychiatrist has pointed out, the voices of Friday night revelers in New York's Greenwich Village may represent a nuisance to the apartment dweller who must arise early to go to work, while the same sounds may have a pleasant ring for the pizza parlor operator whose profits are linked to the revelers.

What, then, constitutes a "noise problem"? Some authorities have suggested that if two persons experience difficulty in making themselves heard at arm's length, a noise problem exists. Even this minimal definition has to be qualified. It is probably a valid measurement if the environment is an industrial plant. Yet, few patrons frugging in the boiler-room atmosphere of a discothèque would accept such a definition.

Furthermore, low, sustained noise constitutes almost as much of a problem as the more common variety. Sound consists of auditory sensations caused by changes of pressure in matter and is transmitted in waves through water, metals and, most often, air. It is measured in decibel units at frequencies of 1,000 cycles per second. When it reaches two decibels, it can be distinguished by most adults. Merely to distinguish it late at night can have a negative effect not only upon your sleep but upon your mental health as well. Most people can endure noise briefly, but few are able to tolerate it day after day. In fact, *Today's Health*, the official journal of the American Medical Association, claims that it is likely that many emotional collapses have been precipitated or made more severe by exposure to continuing irritating noise.

Aside from the mental health aspects, it has been established that the ears of a person who works under extremely noisy conditions over a long period of time can be physically affected. In some cases tinnitus, or a ringing in the ears, occurs. In others, there is a loss of hearing. Presently, industry is conducting research to discover which noises are dangerous and the minimum noise level that may cause physical damage to the hearing mechanism. One hundred and twenty decibels has been established as the danger mark. Now inquiries are being made to determine how long a man can be exposed to noises of that or lesser intensity before experiencing injury.

Although results are still inconclusive, it would seem that three factors are involved: the intensity of the sounds; the length of time during which a person is confined in a noisy environment; and the individual's own tolerance level for noise. This last category can vary widely.

How, then, should we go about eliminating unnecessary noises around us? Obviously, it will be impossible for you to eliminate all noise unless, like Thoreau, you retire to some isolated pond. And even then, the outside world with its jet planes, automobiles and transistor radios will undoubtedly penetrate your splendid isolation. However, the farther you live from areas of high population density, the fewer irritating noises you will have to endure.

If you must live in a congested area, there are several steps that you can take to make your apartment or home quieter. Acoustical tile, sound-absorbing building materials and porous surfaces cut down on the reflection of sound even if they don't shut it out. To do that, airtight barriers are needed. Since these require brick, plaster, stone or thick plastic, such barriers are sometimes impractical.

In addition to the above-mentioned materials, drapes, bookcases, carpets and other sound-catchers can also provide some relief from reverberations. If your dwelling faces a busy street on which buses, automobiles and foot traffic prove irritating, you can cut down on the noise and the annoyance by keeping the windows facing the street tightly closed, while opening those in the back of the house or apartment. Remember, though, if you leave even a small crack between the window frame and the moving portion of the window, you will be defeating your purpose. Effective sound blockage depends upon acoustically tight windows and doors.

If, having done all these things, you are still annoyed by unwelcome noises, *your last resort is earplugs*, or protectors. These can be purchased at most surgical supply houses and drugstores. They vary in style and design—some are made of plastic, others of rubber and still others of pliable compounds. Initially you may experience some discomfort at feeling something in your ear, but most people are able to acclimate themselves to the plugs. Especially if they block out noise effectively—and help the wearer enjoy a good night's sleep.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, June 17, 1966]

Opinions Long, Hot, Noisy Summer

(By Carl A. Jones)

Freshman Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman of New York is getting quite a bit of response to his bill designed to produce less noise in America.

Mr. Kupferman feels there is far too much noise in the land from dawn until dark—and far into the wee hours—and we agree. He takes the position that the federal government is undertaking to control just about everything else, so why not noise? His bill would set up a federal Office of Noise Control.

We do not know just how the office would work—or how it would enforce its directives. Mr. Kupferman suggests that perhaps special grants could be ladled out to states and cities willing to put some kind of muffler on all the racket. (Maybe Johnson City would be eligible, since it has an anti-noise ordinance.)

There is no question that noise is much with us, whether it's the pneumatic tube outside the window or the chatterbox at the next desk. And there are horns, whistles, toots and roars above, below and on the ground.

Mr. Kupferman says noise produces physical illness, drives many stout men to the psychiatrist's couch, and causes many free-swinging domestic squabbles. We have no reason to doubt him, though we frankly do not have much faith in his federal Office of Control. We are afraid it would just proliferate the bureaucratic babble and thus raise the noise level yet a few more decibels.

A fellow can still escape to a mountaintop once in a while, as one of our good friends does, but he must come back and when he does the noise always sounds worse than it did before.

Another thing:

We doubt that the congressman's bill could become law in time to affect the cacophony of campaigning up and down the country, especially in Tennessee, during the next few weeks.

It looks like a long, hot, noisy summer.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, May 9, 1966]

He Could Be Serious

Stand by, citizens, for a real eye-opener. Representative Theodore R. Kupferman of New York has discovered a new subject to champion. Representative Kupferman is sponsoring legislation to provide federal grants for research into the control, prevention and abatement of excessive noise.

"The effects of 'noise pollution'," states Representative Kupferman, "are largely unknown to the layman. My own long-term interest in this field has led me to discover that in addition to interrupting sleep, noise destroys efficiency at work and is extremely costly (it is estimated that businesses lose two million dollars a day because of it), severely strains the nervous system, and can cause deafness and coronary thrombosis."

Now, there are a few things we bet you never knew before. How in the world have we gotten along all these years without knowing the ill effects of "noise pollution." On the other hand, if we haven't known of it, we are inclined to wonder about its importance.

And then, there is that $2 million a day estimate. It is a good bet that a breakdown of that estimate would show you a few more things of which you were never aware. It is downright amazing to see from time to time the things with which we are advised to be concerned but which have never entered our minds before.

The Kupferman bill would establish an Office of Noise Control under the Surgeon General's Office. It looks like all you shouting people and barking dogs have finally had your day. The quiet people are to inherit the world. If Representative Kupferman is serious, he still has a sense of humor. He concludes his explanation of the situation with this statement: "We can ill afford to continue to turn a deaf ear to this problem." Hear, hear!

[From the Architectural & Engineering News, June 1966]

Kupferman Introduces Bill To Fight Noise Pollution

An Office of Noise Control to administer Federal grants to state and local governments for noise control research would be established by a bill introduced by Representative Theodore R. Kupferman, Republican, New York. The proposed office would be under the office of the surgeon general.

Other provisions of the bill would include research projects to reduce aircraft noise.

Kupferman occupies New York Mayor John V. Lindsay's former congressional seat.

[From the Kansas City Kansan, July 22, 1966]

Editorials: U.S. Office of Noise Control

This is the reason of the Cicada. He is abroad on the land and giving forth volcanic waves of rasping, whirring sounds, noon to night.

Cicada's racket we can't do much about. The rackets men and youths make for themselves and for the calculated torture of sensitive fellow men is something we could do something about, if we tried hard enough. Arresting drivers of cars and trucks equipped with hideously loud engines would be one measure toward abatement of needless irritating noise. Arresting operators of vehicles with faulty mufflers or tampered with mufflers would be another. Arresting operators of vehicles who howl their tires with excessive acceleration and in making sharp turns is a third way of abating the needless noises inflicted upon suffering humanity.

Our city also could do with a few less howling dogs.

It's just possible needless noise some day may become a federal offense. The forces of action in abatement have begun to stir. Representative Theodore R. Kupferman, Congressman from the 17th New York district, is sponsoring legislation to provide federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments for research into the control, prevention and abatement of excessive noise. One of the first tasks of the Office of Noise Control, which his bill would set up in the Surgeon

General's office, would be to conduct an educational campaign to alert people to the dangers of excessive noise.

Comments Representative KUPFERMAN:

"We are at long last giving some hard thought in this country to the conservation of two of our natural resources, water and air, while we continue to ignore another environmental problem which should be of equal concern to us, that is, excessive noise, or 'noise pollution.'

"The effects of 'noise pollution' are largely unknown to the layman. My own long-term interest in this field has led me to discover that in addition to interrupting sleep, noise destroys efficiency at work, and is extremely costly. It severely strains the nervous system and can cause deafness and coronary thrombosis.

"I do not agree with those who profess that compensation for the injuries caused by excessive noise is to be found in the overall benefits of progress," concludes Congressman KUPFERMAN.

May his kind and his power increase. Progress is not measured in decibels of sound.

THE "LOW DOWN" FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—WIFE BEATING DURING DAY WAS PERMITTED

(By Joe Crump)

Representative T. R. KUPFERMAN, New York, ". . . We are at long last giving some hard thought in this country to the conservation of two of our natural resources, namely, water and air, while we contine to ignore another environmental problem which should be of equal concern to us, that is excessive noise or noise pollution. . . .

"My bill—H.R. 14602 . . . would provide Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments for research into the control, prevention, and abatement of excessive noise. . . .

"My bill . . . under the Surgeon General's Office would be to act as a central clearinghouse for the compilation and coordination of present studies in the field of noise abatement. . .

"I am happy to report that there has been, to date, considerable and wide-spread response to the legislation which I have proposed" . . . Following is a condensed speech before Queens School Health Council by Z. D. Angeluscheff, MD.)

In the department stores at counters, "mikes" and loudspeakers are used to address customers who are standing two to three yards away. There are two explanations: First, that in this great noisy city we have become somewhat hard of hearing. Second, today's market advertises and sells radios, TV, amplifiers and speakers, and the people buy them.

Modern life with its wailing sirens, screeching cars, blaring radios and TV, roaring planes is potentially dangerous. The impact of this life of noise upon the human organ of hearing results in his progressive deafness. Now you know how Hearing Centers and Hearing Aids are born.

The ear of man is conditioned by evolution to receive and interpret as sound vibrations up to 32,000 vibrations per second (Helmhotz). The dog receives up to 35,000, the cat up 50,000, the mouse up to 95,000, and the bat up to 120,000 cycles per second.

The exposure is not always acute, but mostly slow, chronic, painless. The people are not aware of the slow degeneration of their nerves. They come to seek help when it is too late, the process being irreversible and progressive.

During the rule of Elizabeth the First of England, there was a strict law, beating of wives during the night was prohibited. This judicial milestone was not the starting point of the emancipation to come. The beating of wives during the day was permitted. Medieval society was concerned with the noise. Noise is our concern too, but we are in a less fortunate position. There is not such a law today to silence noise and acoustic outbursts.

The ear, a most precious organ of man, is in danger!

A GRASSROOTS COMMENT

Representative KUPFERMAN also refers to the Biblical story familiar to all when the walls of Jericho were caused to fall by the blasts of many hundreds of trumpets and shouts from many people.

No doubt the walls would have been reduced much quicker if they could have used the noise generated by power mowers, air hammers, outboard motors, jet planes, helicopters, public address systems, transistor radio, motorcycles, motor scooters, etc., etc.

The leading cause of loss of hearing may not be old age after all.

CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIF.,
June 9, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE KUPFERMAN,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: On behalf of my colleagues on the City Council and all of the citizens of the City of Inglewood, may I extend to you our deep-felt thanks for the introduction of a bill setting up a federal Office of Noise Control and authorizing grants to local governments to find ways to abate noise pollution from jet aircraft and other sources.

The City of Inglewood is the gateway to the Los Angeles International Airport and all aircraft landing at this large complex fly directly over the homes of our citizens. We have worked long and hard trying to find some equitable solutions and understandings of this problem and it is heart-warming to realize that someone has come up at the federal level with a positive program that may lead to the eventual solution of this national problem.

You have the support of our 90,000 citizens and the elected officials of our City. If we can assist you in this cause and help to bring this bill to fruition, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GOEDIKE,
Mayor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS M. D. ANDERSON HOSPITAL AND TUMOR INSTITUTE,
Houston, June 8, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
Representative in Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: I indeed appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of your bill and the statement which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1966, on pages 8339 to 8362.

Certainly the problem of penetrating and invasive environmental sound is one in which we must come to grips. I hope that we may be able to devise some meaningful studies which would be useful in establishing criteria for excessive invasion of sound, which in turn could become extremely annoying to those who are not concerned with its generation.

I must congratulate you on your awareness of this most troublesome component of our most present day urban life and your willingness to do something about it.

I hope that upon some occasion we would have an opportunity to meet and to discuss our mutual interest in this field.

Best wishes for the success of your bill, I am,

Most sincerely,

LEE E. FARR, M.D.,
Professor of Nuclear and Environmental Medicine.

INDUSTRIAL ACOUSTICS CO., INC.,
Bronx, N.Y., June 30, 1966.

Representative KUPFERMAN,
30 West 44th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your attempts to make the problem of noise pollution a matter of Federal concern.

As one who has been working exclusively in noise control for the last twenty years I want to go on record that, with the exception of Aviation Noise, there is hardly any man-made noise for which immediate practical, proven and economical noise control devices cannot be provided. Aviation noise control is a separate and special field involving basic engine and aircraft design apart from considerations affecting our whole modern transport and defense systems. Nevertheless, even in this area, there is much that can be done now to reduce the noise of aircraft and engines being tested on the ground.

The question as to what noise levels are acceptable has been researched extensively. There is actually good agreement on a scale of noise levels which are considered disturbing, uncomfortable, unbearable and deafening; in fact, acceptable levels for factories, offices, homes, city streets and industrial areas have been established. Several manufacturing firms, and some States including New York and California, have already adopted measures designed to limit or prevent hearing loss of factory employed workers; also New York City, Chicago and other cities have adopted ordinances to limit permissible noise levels in manufacturing districts. Nevertheless, the majority of citizens living in metropolitan areas or working in factories either have no or only limited protection against the intrusion of undesirable and unwanted noise.

There is no reason why the large body of work on noise control already available could not form the basis for a general code of acceptable noise level standards for all areas of our daily lives.

I appreciate the strong argument for allowing the States to handle such matters on their own, but believe that progress will be very slow without the Federal Government strongly supporting noise control efforts throughout the nation. The adoption of your bill would form an excellent basis for this.

Though research must be a continuous effort I want to stress that the engineering, medical and sociological knowledge for effective noise control is available now.

I am enclosing some articles on Noise Control for distribution to colleagues supporting your endeavor. Good luck.

Sincerely,

MARTIN HIRSCHORN,
President.

[From the IAC Bulletin, No. 1413]

INDUSTRIAL NOISE: ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS, LEGAL TRENDS, AND ABATEMENT TECHNIQUES

(By Martin Hirschorn, President, Industrial Acoustics Co.)

Occupational loss of hearing is accepted as a compensable hazard under workmen's compensation laws throughout the United States. Every state recognizes deafness claims due to accident or trauma, and more than half of the states recognize hearing loss caused gradually by disease over a period of time (Table 1).

TABLE 1.—*Hearing loss compensation benefits*

Jurisdiction	Is occupational hearing loss compensable?		Compensation schedule in weeks		Maximum medical benefits (dollars)	Maximum weekly benefits (dollars)	Maximum amount payable (dollars)		Must employee leave work to file claim?	
	Noise induced	Traumatic	1 ear	Both ears			1 ear	Both ears	Noise induced	Traumatic
Alabama	No	Yes	50	150	1,800	33	1,650.00	4,950.00		No.
Alaska	Yes	Yes	52	200	No limit	81	1,800.00	7,000.00	No	No.
Arizona	No	Yes	85	255	Indefinite	[1] 145	11,000.00	33,000.00		No.
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	40	150	No limit	35	1,400.00	5,250.00	No	No.
California	Yes	Yes	(2)	(2)	do	(3)			No	No.
Colorado	No	Yes	35	139	3,500	[1] 44	1,408.75	5,594.75		No.
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	52	156	No limit	(3)	2,860.00	8,580.00	No	No.
Delaware	Yes	Yes	75	175	do	50	3,750.00	8,750.00	No	No.
District of Columbia	Yes	Yes	52	200	do	(3)	3,640.00	14,000.00	No	No.
Florida	Yes	Yes	40	150	do	42	1,680.00	6,300.00	No	No.
Georgia	Yes [4]	Yes	60	150	2,500	37	2,220.00	5,550.00	No	No.
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	52	200	No limit	[1] 113	5,850.00	22,500.00	No	No.
Idaho	Yes	Yes	35	150	do	[1] 30	1,050.00	4,500.00	No	No.
Illinois	Yes	Yes	50	125	do	61	(5)	(5)	No	No.
Indiana	No	Yes	75	200	do	42	3,150.00	8,400.00		No.
Iowa	Yes	Yes	50	175	do	50	1,850.00	6,500.00	No	No.
Kansas	Yes	Yes	30	110	6,000	42	1,140.00	4,180.00	No	No.
Kentucky	No	Yes	(6)		3,500	33	2,080.00			
Louisiana	No	Yes			2,500	35	(7)	(7)		Yes.
Maine	No	Yes	50	100	No limit	39	1,950.00	3,900.00		No.
Maryland	No	Yes	75	175	No limit	25	1,875.00	4,375.00	No	No.
Massachusetts	No	Yes	150	400	do	(8 9)	3,000.00	8,000.00		No.
Michigan	Yes	Yes			do	57			Yes	Yes.
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	55	170	do	45	2,475.00	7,650.00	No	No.
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	40	150	do	(9)	1,400.00	5,250.00	No	No.
Missouri	Yes	Yes	[10] 17	[10] 100	do	[1] 43	[10] 765.00	[10] 4,500.00	Yes [11]	No.
			[12] 44	[12] 168			[12] 1,980.00	[12] 7,530.00		
Montana	No	Yes	40	200	2,500	50	2,000.00	10,600.00		No.
Nebraska	No	Yes	50	100	No limit	37	1,850.00	3,700.00		No.
Nevada	Yes	Yes	85	255	Indefinite	[1] 22	2,000.00	6,000.00	No	No.
New Hampshire	No	Yes	52	114	No limit	42	2,184.00	4,788.00		No.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	60	200	do	40	2,400.00	8,000.00	No	No.
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	40	150	15,000	40	1,520.00	5,700.00	No	No.
New York	Yes	Yes	60	150	No limit	55	3,300.00	8,250.00	Yes [11]	No.
North Carolina	No	Yes	70	150	do	[1] 38	2,450.00	5,250.00		No.
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	50	200	do	[1] 32	1,575.00	6,300.00	No	No.
Ohio	Yes	Yes	(13)	(13)	do	(3)	1,225.00	6,125.00	No	No.
Oklahoma	No	Yes	100	200	do	30	3,000.00	6,000.00		No.
Oregon	Yes	Yes	60	192	do	(3)	2,790.00	8,928.00	No	No.
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		180	do	[1] 48				
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	60	150	Indefinite	30	1,620.00	4,050.00		
South Carolina	No	Yes	70	150	No limit	35	2,450.00	5,250.00		No.
South Dakota	No	No			2,900	38				
Tennessee	No	Yes	75	150	2,500	36	2,700.00	5,400.00		No.
Texas	No	Yes		150	No limit	35	(7)	(7)		No.
Utah	Yes	Yes	50	100	do	54	2,100.00	4,200.00	No	No.
Vermont	No	Yes		215	Indefinite	30		7,740.00		No.
Virginia	Yes	Yes	50	100	do	37	1,850.00	3,700.00	No	No.
Washington	Yes	Yes			No limit	(3)	1,950.00	6,825.00	No	No.
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	60	180	3,200	38	2,280.00	6,840.00	No	No.
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	[10] 36	[10] 216	No limit	(3)	[10] 1,539.00	[10] 9,234.00	Yes [11]	No.
			[12] 50	[12] 333⅓			[12] 2,137.00	[12] 4,250.00		
Wyoming	No	Yes	(3)	(3)	Indefinite	(3)	2,500.00	5,000.00		No.
Canada	Yes	Yes					(14)	(15)	Yes	No.

[1] Approximate figure.

[2] Special formula.

[3] Variable figure based on formula set by State law.

[4] Georgia: Hearing loss due to noise compensated by recent court decision, not by statute.

[5] Illinois: Must be total hearing loss in one or both ears. Amount of compensation depends on average wage, marital status, and number of children 18 years of age or under.

[6] Kentucky: Based on percentage of weekly earnings for total of 75 weeks.

[7] Depends on wages.

[8] Wages.

[9] Benefits based solely on actual wage loss.

[10] Noise induced.

[11] 6 months.

[12] Traumatic.

[13] Ohio: Compensated only for total loss of hearing in 1 or both ears.

[14] $11.25 per month for life.

[15] $112.50 per month for life.

In New York State, for instance, there is no limit on maximum medical benefits, while maximum weekly benefits amount to $55. Maximum compensation payable is $3,300 for one ear and $8,250 for binaural hearing loss.

Monetary considerations are not the sole incentive for more effective noise control, of course. High noise levels may cause serious accidents because warning signals are not heard. Quality and quantity of work may be reduced because of inability to understand verbal instructions. Productivity may be affected because of fatigue, absenteeism, and low morale. However, compensation favorable to the workman claiming hearing loss is a trend that should be closely examined.

Estimates of the total value of all claims filed for occupational deafness in all states have been put as high as $3 billion or more. This total may climb as compensation payments are raised and more states recognize gradual loss due to disease. The trend in this direction is illustrated by a court ruling in Georgia, a state that does not recognize gradual hearing loss as an occupational hazard. The court ruled that loss of hearing does not have to result from a single accident but could have developed over a period of time (Lockheed vs. Shipman).[1]

Another estimate on the cost of noise (*Time* magazine, Jan. 2, 1961) placed it at $2 million a day in workmen's compensation for noise-related injuries, lost manhours, and decreased efficiency.

In a recent paper Floyd Frazier, director of noise research, American Mutual Insurance Alliance, reported total awards in closed cases since 1950 in all states might be in the order of $15 million. It has been suggested, by another source, that this total would be considerably higher if claims cases settled out of court were included.

Frazier's paper goes on to say that "The potential seriousness of the problem cannot . . . be judged by past limited claims experience. As workers accumulate more hearing loss, an accrued liability is being built up and may be called upon at any time, even years in the future."

In this context it should also be noted that in one year alone the Veterans Administration spent $60 million for 90,000 veterans with service-connected hearing loss claims.

A review of the regulatory, legal, and claims activity in the various states emphasizes why industrial noise control is essential.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATION

In 1962 California adopted Noise Control Safety Orders that are undoubtedly indicative of a trend towards stricter noise control.

These safety orders decree that no employee can be exposed to noise levels in excess of 95 decibels (at 300 cycles/second and upwards) for more than five hours per day without corrective measures being taken.

Claims activity in California has increased from 4 in 1952 to 140 in 1961. In 1963 there were 373 claims.[1] It has been estimated that the claims potential in California may amount to $600 million.[2]

---

[1] "Noise—State Activity Increases." *Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers,* April 1964.

[2] "California Industry Confronts the Noise Problem." *Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers,* August 1962.

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATION

An often-quoted precedent-setting case was decided in New York in July 1948. The New York State Court of Appeals made an award in the amount of $1,661.25 for a hearing loss caused by industrial noise while the employee was still working for the company. Not only did the court recognize occupational loss of hearing, but it also allowed that there may be a compensable disability without any loss of earnings.[3]

The New York State 1958 legislative session passed an important statutory enactment dealing specifically with occupational loss of hearing. This was the first time in the then 44-year history of the state's workmen's compensation law that legislative action was taken in this area.

An important feature of this enactment was the "freezing" into the statute of a six-month waiting period before a claim for occupational loss of hearing can be compensated. This provision has also been adopted by Missouri and Wisconsin. During times of relatively full employment it can be expected to have the effect of limiting the number of claims being filed.

The statute also defined the liability of the employer, stating that the "last employer in whose employment the employee was exposed to harmful noise shall be liable for the payment of the total compensation due the employee."

This means that the only way in which an employer can protect himself against unjust hearing loss claims is to conduct pre-employment hearing tests.

In October 1961 the New York Workmen's Compensation Board issued *Rules on Occupational Loss of Hearing and Noise Control*, which have far-reaching significance.

These rules answered the question "what industrial noise levels may cause loss of hearing" in the following manner:

If the sound energy of the noise is distributed more or less evenly throughout the eight octave bands, and if a person is to be exposed to this noise regularly for many hours a day, five days a week for many years, then: if the noise level in either the 300–600 cycle band or the 600–1200 cycle band is 85 db, the initiation of noise exposure control and tests of hearing is advisable. The more the octave band levels exceed 85 db the more urgent is the need for hearing conservation.

The New York Workmen's Compensation Board reports the number of closed occupational hearing loss cases as follows: 1955, 53; 1956, 56; 1957, 61; 1958, 57; 1959, 70. No figures are available after 1959.[1]

DIFFERENT APPROACHES

There is a difference of 10 db, i.e., 95 vs. 85, between the California orders and New York rule. This can perhaps best be explained by saying that the orders are based on economic and medical considerations whereas the rule has an essentially medical foundation.

The orders apparently took account of certain economic considerations involved. Obviously the lower the noise level above which corrective action is mandatory, the higher will be the cost to industry, because a larger segment of industry will be affected. On the other hand the New York rule is based on a criterion set by the Subcommittee on Noise of the Committee on Conservation of Hearing, American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, headed by Dr. Aram Glorig.

This medical criterion emphasizes safety rather than accepting a risk of danger. The high level of 95 db undoubtedly exposes industry to considerable danger, since occupational hearing loss and resulting claims can be incurred at lower noise levels.

WISCONSIN LED THE WAY

This state had the nation's first effective state compensation law in May 1911. "Schedules covering accidental injuries were adopted in 1913 at which time loss of hearing was compensated on the basis of 40 weeks disability for total loss in one ear and 160 weeks for total loss in both ears." [4]

More recently, in 1951, Albert Wojcik filed a hearing loss claim against the Green Bay Forge Co. The industrial commission decided on an award of $1,575.46 even though Wojcik had not lost any wages or time from work. This set off a substantial number of similar claims.

Under the present statute, claims may not be filed until after six consecutive months absenteeism from employment in a noisy environment, subsequent to date of injury. This date would be established on the basis of transfer of an employee from a noisy to a quieter area because of hearing loss, termination of employment, retirement, or one year continuous layoff.

NEW JERSEY AND CONNECTICUT

One New Jersey company had forty hearing loss claims within 12 months. Each claim took between $500 and $4,000 in benefits. Apparently each can still be reopened if the claimant's[1] hearing depreciates further. Another New Jersey company moved its plant to Maryland and left behind a series of claims for hearing loss filed after the move had been made. These claims might not have been instituted, or would have been postponed, if the plant had not moved.

No total figures are apparently available for Connecticut. However, when a drop-forge plant closed down recently, 64 claims were paid for hearing loss through an insurance carrier. The total amount of money received by way of settlement of the 64 cases was $146,488 or an average of $2,288 each. Additional cases are now pending in another drop-forge plant which has gone out of business.

ACTIVITY IN OTHER STATES

Missouri has very comprehensive provisions for the determination of occupational hearing loss, including a six-month waiting period.

Other states with regulations or activity in industrial noise control include Minnesota, Utah, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, and Washington. Oregon, where 12 claims were filed in 1963, is in the process of preparing a code similar to that of California. Legal actions on occupational deafness claims have been reported from Arizona and Louisiana. North Carolina and Idaho apparently are also studying noise regulations. Hearing loss bills were introduced to legislatures in 1963 in Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, though apparently none have been acted upon as yet.[5]

Another indication as to how the courts feel about noise is evident from the $12,500 Supreme Court award to a Pittsburgh property owner. This amount was awarded because the value of his property had decreased due to the noise produced by airplanes taking off from Pittsburgh Airport.

After that ruling, 3,000 law suits were filed in the City of Los Angeles alone, in addition to numerous suits in New York City.

FOUNDRY NOISE MANUAL

In 1958 the American Foundrymen's Association issued the *Foundry Noise Manual*. It discusses among other questions the problem of accrued liability and points out that insurance carriers have collected no premiums for hearing loss compensation. They therefore argue that a sudden imposition of a possible tremendous accrued liability cost could make it impossible for insurance carriers to insure many types of industrial concerns unless some relief is provided through legislation.

This situation still largely prevails today because total awards to date have been relatively low; however, there is always the danger of an event or circumstance triggering a claims explosion.

The manual points out that the situation then could be similar to the one that existed in New York in the 1930's due to silicosis. Since many businesses could not withstand the financial burden and could not secure insurance to relieve them of the liabilities, some were threatened with bankruptcy. It is estimated that from 35,000 to 50,000 workers became unemployed.

As a result, the New York state legislature at that time passed emergency legislation that drastically limited liability and gave industry and insurance carriers time to accumulate reserves before claims could develop substantial costs.

MACHINE NOISE LEVELS

Table 2 gives foundry machinery noise levels on an over-all basis as published in *Foundry Noise Manual*. The noise levels in the fourth and fifth octave bands, for the majority of these operations, exceed the maximum 85 db prescribed by the New York Workmen's Compensation Board. This maximum is also the suggested tentative environmental design base of the *Foundry Noise Manual*.

TABLE 2.—*Foundry hearing zone noise levels**

Type of machine	*Overall noise level*†
Core blower	116
Shakeout (½- to 4-cubic foot castings)	98–114
Pneumatic air hoist (2,000 pounds)	112
Pneumatic chipper, 100 p.s.i. (4- to 6-foot castings)	112
Pneumatic chipper, 100 p.s.i. (1- to 3-cubic-foot castings)	110
Electric furnace, 30 ton, early in run	105
Push-up machine (sand molding)	103
Sand slinger, air rush and sand noise	102
Jolt squeeze machine (sand molding)	100
Tumbler (small castings)	100
Stand grinder (small castings)	96
Premix burner with 2-inch outlet	94
Scarfing, acetylene weld	91

*Measured 2 to 5 feet from a machine and in the vicinity of the operator.

†The overall noise level (db) is that attained as a combination of the levels in all frequencies of the noise spectrum.

Table 3 gives a more general picture of typical noise levels for comparison, and includes various industrial machines, offices, factories, and others.

TABLE 3.—*Noise from industrial machines* *

Type of machine	*Decibels*
Cannon (12-inch) 12 feet in front and below muzzle	225
Jet engine test cell	150
Pneumatic rock drill	130
Hydraulic press	130
Wing bar drop press	128
Diesel engine room	125
Threshold of pain	120
Noisy electric power substation	120
Swagers	108–118
Shell presses	98–112

Footnote at end of table.

---

[3] "The Problem of Noise in Industry," by Dr. Aram Glorig. *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 51, No. 9.

[4] "The Wisconsin Story of the Industrial Noise Problem," by Meyer S. Fox, *Noise Control*, January 1955.

[5] "Noise Measurement and Noise Control," by Stanley E. Pihl. *Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers*, April 1964.

TABLE 3.—*Noise from industrial machines* *—Continued

Type of machine	*Decibels*
Punch presses (various types)	96–110
Wood planers	98–110
Wire stranding machines	108
Shredding machines	108
Boiler factory	107
Subway station, express train passing	105
Riveter	105
Potato chip frying machines	95–105
Headers	101–105
Airplane propeller grinding	100–105
Drophammers	99–101
Looms	94–101
Wood saw	100
Bumping hammers	100
Automatic screw machines	93–100
Ball mills	99
Sewing machines	93–96
Electric power station	95
Noisy factory	90
Cotton spinning	84–87
Lathes (average)	80
Printing press	80
Stenographic room	75
Quiet typewriter	65
Conversation	60
Average office	50
Quiet office	40
Broadcasting studio	30
Average threshold of hearing	15
Acute threshold of hearing	0

*At operator's ear level or a distance of 3 feet from the machine, and other comparative locations.

Surveys have shown that more than 50 per cent of machinery in industry produce 90 db and 100 db of noise, and 50 per cent of all areas show noise levels of between 85 db and 95 db.

It is apparent that there can be only very few manufacturing concerns without a noise problem in one form or another.

CORRECTING THE NOISE PROBLEM

Three basic steps are required in protecting hearing and in protecting industry against financially injurious claims:

1. Audiometric preplacement testing of all employees and periodic retesting.
2. Noise measurement surveys to establish where excessive noise is present.
3. Corrective measures controlling noise at its source and its transmission, or protecting the individual by means of earplugs, earmuffs, or the creation of quiet areas.

Preplacement audiometric testing protects industry against unjust claims when an employee already has a previous hearing loss history. Audiometric examinations after employment enable management to detect whether an employee is developing a gradual hearing loss and to take corrective measures.

For audiometric testing to be accurate, pure tone air conduction audiometry should be performed in a soundproof room. Modular prefabricated medical testing rooms are available for this purpose.

The maximum permissible ambient noise level has been determined by the Subcommittee on Noise in Industry of the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology. It must not exceed 40 db in fourth and fifth octave bands, with the assumption that no frequencies below 500 cps will be measured, and well-fitted earphones will be worn.

Each organization should determine noise levels in various areas and establish safe, critical, and danger zones. A safe zone would in general have noise levels below 85 db; critical zone levels would fall between 85 and 95 db. Above 95 db should be classified as dangerous. Corrective measures should be taken whenever the noise levels exceed 85 db, particularly in fourth and fifth octave bands. Table 4 shows weekly permitted average noise exposure as published by the Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 4.—*Weekly average exposure permitted* [1]

Octave band (cycles per second)	Hours per week						
	0.1	0.3	1	3	10	25	40
20 to 75	135	135	125	115	110	110	105
75 to 150	135	130	120	110	105	105	100
150 to 300	135	125	115	105	95	95	95
300 to 600	130	125	110	100	95	95	90
600 to 1,200	125	120	110	100	90	90	85
1,200 to 2,400	120	115	105	100	90	90	85
2,400 to 4,800	120	115	105	100	90	90	85
4,800 to 9,600	120	115	105	100	90	90	85

[1] These figures were published by the Bureau of Labor Standards as part of a model code for adoption by the States.

Example: If octave band is 600 to 1,200 cycles per second and the sound level is 100 decibels, then weekly exposure should not exceed 3 hours.

There are two basic approaches to noise control: 1) elimination or reduction of source, and 2) control of noise transmission. Personal protective devices are not considered an effective long-term control method since they do not in any way control the hazard itself. "They should be used only when control measures fail to reduce the levels." [6]

REDUCTION AT SOURCE

Reduction of driving force. This may involve slowing down of rotations, pressure reduction, increase of fluid flow cross-section, impact force reduction.

Substitution. Welding instead of riveting. Squeezing instead of impact tools. Grinding instead of chipping. Quieter materials.

Reduction of response of vibrating member. This can be accomplished by the application of damping materials, bracing, stiffeners, increase of mass, and resonance shifts.

CONTROL OF NOISE TRANSMISSION

Control of noise transmission is accomplished by the use of soundproof rooms, enclosures, sound screens, air and gas silencers, and absorptive treatment. A few typical installations of this type are illustrated in the photos.

PERSONNEL PROTECTION

In addition to the use of earplugs, earmuffs, and helmets, personnel protection can also be accomplished by providing quiet rooms to control time of exposure to high noise levels.

Though many people find earplugs uncomfortable, this can largely be overcome by individually-fitted plugs. Other objections are that earplugs may be difficult to keep clean and are easy to lose. It is also often impossible to be sure that they are always worn or that they are properly inserted. The use of personal protective devices has been compared with the use of respiratory protective equipment against airborne contaminants. The safest approach is, of course, one that makes noise control independent of the employee.

[From National Safety News, Industrial Acoustics Co., Inc., Bronx, N.Y.]

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT NOISE?

(By Martin Hirschorn, president Industrial Acoustics Co.)

New industrial processes make more noise than many of the older ones and modern ears have become more sensitive to noise. There is no cure-all for noise but many methods help.

(*The article has been condensed slightly from a paper presented at the 22nd Annual Convention, Greater New York Safety Council.*)

Noise, or unwanted sound, is a by-product of our mechanized civilization to which man has been exposed since the dawn of the industrial revolution. If the problem has become more acute in recent years, it is undoubtedly due to the fact that new processes are noisier than older ones. Possibly, too, man of today is more sensitive to noise, for a complex set of reasons, than his forebears. However, it is undoubtedly a tendency of modern engineering design to build for more power, higher speeds and less weight, all factors contributing toward noisier machinery.

Industrial management is becoming increasingly aware of the adverse effects on health and morale, of persons exposed to excessive noise levels. Unfortunately, standard solutions for the many problems that arise are not available in many cases but require specially engineered equipment.

The most pronounced physical effect of noise is damage to the ear. Exposure to intense noise from machinery causes partial and temporary hearing losses which may last from a few minutes to several hours. Continued and repeated exposures can result in partial but permanent deafness. Douglas E. Wheeler [1] reports that "of a sample containing 175 men daily exposed to very high level noise, 45 per cent retained normal hearing, in some instances after ten years of exposure; on the other hand, 23 per cent displayed severe bi-lateral losses, in some instances after only a few months exposure."

Dr. Karl Kryter [2] states that "the maximum safe intensity at which no deafening effect will occur is probably in the neighborhood of 85 db above 0.0002 microbar for 'critical bands' of noise."

It must be emphasized in this connection that the over-all intensity noise level as indicated in decibels on a sound level meter will not correctly indicate its deafening effect. In studying the effect of noise, it is important to know the intensity of the various frequency bands present. Apart from deafness, no other physiological effects have been observed in noise levels extending to about 120 db. However, the effects on man due to turbo-jet engine noise and siren generated sounds of the order of 150 db are summarized by Dr. Kryter [3] as follows:

"1. Severe but temporary hearing loss.

"2. Heating of the skin (Rats and Guinea Pigs died of increased body temperatures).

---

[6] "Noise—Guide Lines for Control." *Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers,* April 1964.

[1] Noise Abatement in Connection with Hearing, by Douglas E. Wheeler, Proceedings of the National Noise Abatement Symposium, Oct. 20, 1950, Vol. 1, p 15.

[2] The Effects of Noise on Man, by Dr. Karl D. Kryter, The Journal of Speech & Hearing Disorders, Monograph Supplement 1, p 45, Sept., 1950.

[3] Ibid., p. 21.

"3. Vibration of cranial bones and air movement in the nasal passages and sinuses; also, blurred vision at frequencies between 700 cps and 1500 cps.

"4. An apparent weakening of the muscular structure."

Paul E. Sabine[4] states that "there is a wealth of reliable data from medical sources in support of the statement that sustained exposure to noise is a contributing factor in impaired hearing, chronic fatigue that lowers bodily resistance, neurasthenia, increased blood pressure and decreased working and mental efficiency and that noise should rightfully be classified as an occupational hazard along with gases, fumes, dust toxic liquids and bacteria."

Apart from the physiological and adverse morale effects of noise, most serious effects may occur where continuous or sudden noises pervent communication between operators of equipment. It is obvious that such an inability to communicate where necessary will result in inefficiency and may also contribute to the causation of accidents.

DEAFNESS COMPENSATION

In recent years, precedents have established particularly in New York State where court decisions have held that deafness is an occupational disease. The maximum award possible in New York State is $4300.[5] The amount that might be involved in such claims is illustrated by a recent action in New Jersey where 263 men are suing for $5,000,000 in deafness compensation.[6] Awards of such magnitude would obviously have a serious financial effect.

The above indicates both the medical and the economic consequences inherent in the noise problem. Industry undoubtedly will have to reduce noise to "normal" levels. The question as to what constitutes a "normal" level, or how to accomplish such a reduction, cannot be answered at present by referring to any standard codes or methods. However, general objectives can be established by studying a specific noise problem where it exists and working out a solution using such acoustic (or related) data which, though scattered, are available at the present time. The final solution may be complex.

METHOD OF NOISE CONTROL

A. Sources of noise: The purpose of noise control work is either to prevent the creation of a noise, or, if the noise cannot be eliminated, to confine its radiation within certain defined limits.

From a point of view of noise control, sources of noise can be classified in a very general way as follows:

1. Impact noises through forge or bumping hammers, riveters, punch presses, swagging machines, cutting machines, etc.
2. Gear noises through engines, machines, drive gears, etc.
3. Fluid flow noises, through fans, blowers, compressors, pumps, turbines, jet engines, valves, etc.
4. Combustion noises through furnaces, engines, etc.
5. Magnetic noises through transformers, motors, etc.

Typical noise levels of industrial and other processes are shown in table I.

For effective noise control, it is necessary to reduce both the transmission of airborne and structurally transmitted noises. The comparatively widespread use of vibration control equipment can be attributed to the necessity of protecting machines and buildings from the damaging effects of shock and vibration rather than to purposes of noise control.

Nevertheless, shock and vibration control forms an important aspect of noise control work. Means available for the control of airborne noises, where creation of noise cannot be prevented, can be classified in a general way as follows:

1. Imposition of a sound-barrier or silencing enclosure for isolating impact, gear, magnetic noise sources, etc.
2. Provision of fluid flow silencers where airborne noises are transmitted in the same confined channel as the line fluid such as air, gas, oil, water, etc.
3. Use of permanent or suspended sound-absorbing surfaces for reduction of reverberation times and over-all noise levels.
4. Earplugs for individual protection.

B. Silencing enclosures: During the lecture, a demonstration illustrated the principle of a silencing enclosure for airborne noise control in conjunction with vibration-control equipment for isolation of structurally-transmitted sound. The demonstration was made with a small eccentrically loaded motor where vibrations were transmitted through the base and sound radiated directly into the air. Application of the soundproof enclosure alone or vibration isolating mounts without the silencing enclosure did not result in any significant noise reduction; however, simultaneous application of both methods reduced the noise to a satisfactory degree.

Unfortunately, in practice the solution is never quite that simple. A silencing enclosure must be constructed in such a manner that any production machine can be efficiently operated; there must be adequate accessibility for maintenance work and also special provisions for ventilation. For some types of machines, these requirements make it practically impossible to solve the problem by such means.

On the other hand, there are a large number of machines—in fact, nearly all automatic or semiautomatic operated machines—which can be silenced by means of enclosures. An important point to consider in the design of silencing enclosures is that any open surfaces in excess of 10 per cent of the total surface will not result in any noise reduction. Special silencing devices, such as acoustic filters[7] and resonators, have been used in the treatment of necessary openings.

C. Fluid flow silencers: The problem of silencing noises transmitted in conjunction with the movement of air, gases, or liquids is more clearly defined because the sound usually travels along a confined pipe or channel which transmits the fluid and it is generally possible to install silencing devices in these channels. Standard equipment is available for the solution of many problems of this type.

In the aircraft industry, the noise produced by the testing of jet engines presents a particularly serious problem. There, noise levels in excess of 150 db are produced and the silencing equipment required is very costly. It usually consists of a reinforced concrete tunnel, some being as much as 900 sq. ft. in cross-section, and the inside is equipped with suitably arranged sound-absorbing panels and resonator devices.

D. Suspended sound-absorbing materials: In many cases, where the overall noise level is not too high, perhaps up to about 100 db, the installation of acoustic ceiling tile or suspended sound-absorbing materials can be useful.

Though the actual reduction in terms of decibels can never be very high for this type of installation, it can have an important psychological effect insofar as it tends to isolate the operator from the noise of other machines. In many instances, the use of acoustic tile or suspended sound-absorbing materials can be very effective and desirable; particularly, if used in conjunction with other methods such as silencing enclosures and fluid flow silencers.

E. Use of earplugs: Earplugs giving as much as 20 db reduction are available. Cotton-wool, though widely used, is actually quite ineffective, particularly in the lower frequencies. Many people find earplugs uncomfortable, though this objection could perhaps be overcome by individually fitted plugs. Other objections are that earplugs are difficult to keep clean, easy to lose, and sometimes make communication by speech difficult.

Where noise levels exceed 125 db, helmets are sometimes employed in order to protect against noise transmission through the bone structure. In this connection, the advisability of conducting hearing tests by means of an audiometer on prospective employees in noisy locations might be mentioned. This would afford a certain amount of protection to industry in cases where deafness compensation claims arise.

F. Isolation of machines: In some cases it is possible to reduce the effects of noisy machinery appreciably by locating the machines in separate soundproof rooms or locations away from the majority of workers. Though measures may still have to be taken in order to protect the operators of such machines, steps of this nature can reduce the magnitude of the problem.

G. Residential Districts: The effects of location of noisy industries in residential areas represent another aspect of the problem. In such instances, action by residents has caused the concerns involved either to silence the machines or move them to another location.

The most serious problem faced by industry from the point of view of public relationships in residential areas is due to transformer and jet engine noise. Engineering solutions are available for both problems and progress is being made towards developing more economical methods and equipment.

H. Redesign of machinery: A certain amount of experimentation has lately been carried out in the use of metals such as copper manganese which has good damping characteristics and reasonable mechanical strength.[8] Impact noises can be reduced to some extent by the employment of softer metals where conditions permit. Mild steel, for instance, is quieter to work with than stainless steel. Copper, brass and aluminum can be expected to produce less impact noise than steel. Some time in the future it is conceivable that certain types of metal shaping and forming machines which, at the present time, work metal by exerting powerful impact blows can be replaced by hydraulically operated pressure devices.

Another possibility lies in the fact that the human ear is sensitive to a definite range of frequencies; that is, generally speaking, from 16 to 20,000 cps. If machinery can be designed where the periodic pressure fluctuations lie in the ultrasonic range, this would perhaps be a solution for certain types of machines. A dog whistle is one example of what is possible; the higher hearing limit of a dog is higher than that of a human being and the dog can therefore hear sounds which a human being cannot hear. However, R. O. Fehr[9] points out that in some operations it may probably never be possible to silence a machine by redesign. An aircraft jet engine is an outstanding example.

---

[4] American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 34, No. 3, March, 1944.

[5] A Lawyer Looks at the Industrial Noise Problem, by Noel S. Symons, Proceedings of the Second Annual National Noise Abatement Symposium, p. 45.

[6] The New York Times, Dec. 6, 1951.

[7] Design of an Equipment Silencer, by Martin Hirschorn, Chemical Engineering, Sept., 1949.

[8] The Damping Capacity of Copper Manganese Alloys, by R. S. Dean and others, Transactions of the A.S.M., Vol. 40, p. 35.

[9] The Reduction of Industrial Machine Noise, by R. O. Fehr, Proceedings of the Second Annual National Noise Abatement Symposium, Vol. 2, p. 95.

The noise problem is complicated by the fact that no comprehensive studies are available concerning the particular nature of each problem in the many industries affected. Studies of noise conditions in interested industries are essential before standard solutions or codes can be drawn up. This is obviously going to be a long-term program but some industries are already spending millions of dollars annually on noise-control equipment. Plant or machinery designers have so far not been too conscious of noise factors and this is reflected in the present high industrial noise levels. The average engineer or plant manager is often quite unfamiliar with basic noise control principles.

However, all the signs indicate that a considerable interest in this subject matter is developing. Consideration of the principles of acoustical engineering in the design of factories and machinery is essential for the long-term solution of the problem.

TABLE I.—*Noise levels of various industrial machines (at operator's ear level or a distance of 3 feet from the machine) and other comparative locations*

Type of machine	*Decibels*
12-inch Cannon, 12 feet in front and below muzzle	225
Jet engine test cell	*150*
Pneumatic rock drill	130
Hydraulic press	130
Wing bar drop press	128
Diesel engine room	125
Threshold of pain	120
Noisy electric power substation	120
Swagers	108–118
Shell presses	98–112
Punch presses (various types)	96–110
Wood planers	98–110
Wire stranding machines	108
Shredding machines	108
Boiler factory	107
Subway station, express train passing	105
Riveter	105
Potato chip frying machines	95–105
Headers	101–105
Airplane propeller grinding	100–105
Drop hammers	99–101
Looms	94–101
Wood saw	100
Bumping hammers	100
Automatic screw machines	93–100
Ball mills	99
Sewing machines	93–96
Electric power station	95
Noisy factory	90
Cotton spinning	84–87
Lathes (average)	80
Printing press	80
Stenographic room	75
Quiet typewriter	65
Conversation	60
Average office	50
Quiet office	40
Broadcasting studio	30
Average threshold of hearing	15
Acute threshold of hearing	0

The above values have been obtained from various sources including: Sabine, H. J. and Wilson, R. A., The Application of Sound-Absorption to Factory Noise Problems, Journal of The Acoustical Society of America, 1943, 15, 27–31, and authors' own observation.

The decibel is a ratio and does not have any dimensions. It compares two sound pressures. The generally accepted reference norm is 0.0002 dynes per square centimeter or zero db, which corresponds approximately to the minimum audibility of the human ear (or the threshold of audibility).

Noise levels recorded here are merely intended to represent typical readings obtained and may vary in different situations.

[Reprint from Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning, March 1952]

ELIMINATING NOISE TRANSMISSION IN LIQUID PIPE LINES

(By Martin Hirschorn)

Most liquid pipe noise problems can be solved by the installation of commercially available noise attenuating couplings; however, occasionally pump system noise problems may arise, due to high pump speeds or other complex conditions, which cannot be solved by available commercial equipment. In such cases, an acoustical analysis of the problem will indicate the correct method of solution and may involve the use of special pressure release wall couplings.

The problem of pipe line noise transmission is frequently encountered, and resulting complaints have often proved very troublesome to consulting engineers and contractors.

Simple methods for eliminating this problem in the majority of cases are available. The use of commercially available noise attenuating couplings and a new design for the solution of unusual noise transmission problems are described here.

DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

In industrial practice, the problem of pipe line noise is generally regarded as one of preventing noise transmission along the pipe wall itself. This means that noise transmission through the water or liquid column is considered to be negligible. It is well known that inserting a material of small acoustical impedance in a pipe line will result in a satisfactory degree of noise attenuation. The material frequently used is a tube constructed of rubber and canvas composition with a steel wire reinforcement embedded within the rubber or on the outside of the tube. The measurement of actual noise reductions obtainable by means of such pipe line inserts has been studied by a number of investigators.

Constable (Reference No. 1) reports that canvas reinforced rubber tubes, 1 in. and 1½ in. in diameter, 3/16 in. thick and of various lengths, gave attenuations of 17 decibels per ft at 200 cycles per sec and 30 db per ft at 1000 cps. He obtained the same attenuation through a water filled tube as through an empty tube. Ganitta (Reference No. 2) reports an attenuation of 7.5 db per meter (2.3 db per ft) at 200 cps and of 18 db per meter (5.5 db per ft) at 1000 cps in a similar water filled tube, 5 cm (1.97 in.) internal diameter, 0.7 cm (0.276 in.) thick and 9.4 meters long. He obtained an attenuation approximately 5 db per meter higher with the same empty rubber tube but strengthened with wire.

The difference in values obtained by the two investigators can probably be attributed to the different conditions of the experiments, but both investigations reveal a relatively high attenuation in the rubber tube, both in the pipe wall path and the liquid column path.

The effect of pressure, or increased internal stress, on rubber and other couplings has been investigated to some extent (Reference No. 3) and it would appear that the use of a large amount of rubber is desirable for good attenuation characteristics at high pressures. The alloy copper-manganese is of particular interest in this connection, since it is reported (Reference No. 4) that it has very high damping characteristics which improve with increasing stress.

In commercial and industrial practice, water column noise transmission as distance from pipe wall noise transmission has hitherto been no real problem. This is no doubt due to the fact that most of the pumps currenty in use are of comparatively low speed, 1800 rpm being a common value. A pump speed of 3600 rpm or higher will probably introduce water column noise transmission, and in such a case the use of a rubber coupling alone will be comparatively ineffective. The wave motion transmitted along the water column in such an instance will be a function of the pump speed and the number of impellers on the rotor. Accordingly, if the pump speed is N rpm and the number of impeller blades is n, then the fundamental frequency f will be:

$$f = [(N \times n)/60] \text{ cycles per sec} \text{ ---------------- } [1]$$

Preliminary experimental investigation has indicated that water column noise transmission can be eliminated by the use of pressure release wall materials, which will be discussed later.

PIPE WALL ATTENUATION

Each material has a definite acoustic resistance, measured in acoustical ohms, which is derived from an analogy with Ohm's Law for electrical waves. This acoustic resistance z, is a function of the density of the material and the velocity of sound through the material.

$$z = \rho c \text{ ---------------------------- } [2]$$

where ρ = density, grams per cu cm; c = velocity of sound through material, cm per sec.

Typical values for z are given in Table 1. Rubber has a very low and steel a very high acoustic resistance.

The following formula gives the attenuation of sound transmission along the walls of a metal pipe by means of a rubber insert (Reference No. 5):

$$Pr = (\text{Power transmission through insert})/(\text{Power transmission without insert}) = 4r/(r+1)^2 \text{ ------------------ } [3]$$

where Pr = power ratio; $r = z_1/z_2$ = ratio of specific acoustic resistances of metal pipe and rubber insert.

The acoustic resistance z for copper, for example, is 3.20×10^6 g/cm² sec and for rubber 0.003×10^6 g/cm² sec. Therefore, $r = (3.20 \times 10^6) / (0.003 \times 10^6) = 10.66 \times 10^2$

On substituting in Equation 3, we get $Pr = 0.375 \times 10^2$. From this, the attenuation R can be calculated:

$$R = 10 \log Pr = -44.3 \text{ db} \text{ --------- } [4]$$

The above equation and calculation does not take into consideration the effect on attenuation of pipe length, diameter or frequency. However, Constable concluded the following from his experiments:

1) The attenuation for a given length of rubber insert increases with the test frequency up to about 7000 cps and then decreases.

2) The attenuation for a given frequency increases with the length of rubber insert.

3) Canvas reinforced rubber is not as effective as plain rubber.

4) No change in attenuation was observed for the various cross-sections which were tested; that is, ¾ in. to 1½ in. diameter.

5) For insulation of low frequency sound, a long length (i. e., several feet) of rubber tube is required, whereas high frequencies can be eliminated by a comparatively short length of rubber hose.

PRESSURE RELEASE WALL ATTENTION

The compressibility of a liquid is comparable to that of a solid and is very much less than that of a gas. Consequently, at a node in a liquid where the pressure fluctuation is a maximum there will be a swelling of the tube, whereas no such effect will occur at the anti-node. This swelling of the tube results in a corresponding drop in pressure and a lowering of the velocity of wave propagation in the liquid column. This reduced velocity can be calculated from Korteweg's formula:

$$c_0^2/c_R^3 = 1 + \{2 E R/[a E_1 (1 - 5a/6 R)]\} \text{ ------------------ } [5]$$

where c_0 = velocity of sound in free fluid; c_R = velocity of sound in fluid of pipe;

E = elasticity of fluid $= \rho c\hat{o}$; E_1 = elasticity of walls of pipe; R = radius of tube; a = thickness of wall; ρ = density of fluid

Ganitta derived from Korteweg's formula the following expression for the damping coefficient:

$$\beta_R = 2\pi \times \epsilon \times c_R \times N \times \eta \times f \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots [6]$$

where β_R = attenuation, nepers per cm; $N = R/a\ E_1$; $\epsilon = \rho/(1 - 5a/6R)$; η = a friction coefficient (typical values for η are as follows: Steel, 5×10^{-1}; brass, 1×10^{-3}; glass, 2×10^{-3}; rubber 1×10^{-1}); f = frequency.

TABLE 1.—*Typical acoustic resistances of various materials*

Material	Sound velocity (c), centimeters per second $\times 10^5$	Density (ρ) grams per cubic centimeter ^{3}	Acoustic resistance ($z=\rho c$), $\times 10^5$
Aluminum	5.25	2.65	1.39
Copper	3.58	8.93	3.20
Cast iron	3.85	7.7	2.96
Steel	5.05	7.8	3.93
Lead	1.2	11.4	1.37
Nickel	4.76	8.9	4.23
Silver	2.74	10.5	2.88
Tin	2.72	7.3	1.96
Brass	3.42	8.5	2.90
Ivory	2.2	1.85	.41
Pitch	.68	1.1	.075
Paraffin wax	1.46	.9	.13
Rubber	.03	.95	.003
Oak	4.05	.8	.32
Ice	3.2	.92	.29
Concrete	3.1	2.6	.81
Cork	.50	.24	.012
Water (fresh)	1.48	.998	.148
Water (sea)	1.50	1.0234	.1535
Air	.3316	[1] 1.293	.0000428

[1] Times 10^{-3}.

Source: Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning, March 1952.

The above equation indicates that a small modulus of elasticity and a high friction coefficient are essential properties for a material used in connection with a liquid column noise attenuator.

The theoretical attenuations for three types of pressure release materials are calculated below.

Sponge rubber

If: $R = 1$ in., $a = 0.485$ in., $E_1 = 15$ lb per sq. in. $= 1.03 \times 10^6$ dynes per sq. cm.

Substituting these values, the following is obtained: $N = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\epsilon = 1.68$.

Substituting in Equation 5 the appropriate values for water, $c_o = 1.43 \times 10^5$ cm per sec and $\rho = 1$ gm per cm^3, $c_o/c_R = 372$ is obtained. That is, $c_R = 385$ cm per sec.

Now substituting in Equation 6, $\beta_R = 2\pi \times 1.68 \times 2 \times 10^{-6} \times 385 \times 0.1 \times f = 0.815 \times 10^{-3} \times f$ nepers per cm $= 0.214 \times f$ db per ft.

This gives, at 100 cps, $\beta_R = 21.4$ db per ft, and at 1000 cps, $\beta_R = 214$ db per ft. *Thin Metal Tube* (*Copper*)

If: $R = 1$ in., $a = 0.01$ in., $E_1 = 11.5 \times 10^{11}$, $\eta = 1 \times 10^{-3}$.

Substituting these values, the following is obtained: $N = 0.87 \times 10^{-10}$ and $\epsilon = 1$.

Again, substituting in Equation 5 the appropriate values, then $c_o/c_R = 2.15$ and $c_R = 0.67 \times 10^5$ cm per sec.

Now, substituting in Equation 6, $\beta_R = 2\pi \times 1 \times 0.87 \times 10^{-10} \times 0.67 \times 10^5 \times 10^{-3} \times f = 3.65 \times 10^{-8} \times f$ nepers per cm $= 0.96 \times 10^{-5} \times f$ db per ft.

This gives, at 100 cps, $\beta_R = 0.00096$ db per ft, and at 1000 cps, $\beta_R = 0.0096$ db per ft, and at 10,000 cps, $\beta_R = 0.096$ db.

Soft rubber tube

If: $R = 1$ in., $a = 0.485$ in., $E_1 = 150$ lb. per sq. in. $= 1.03 \times 10^7$ dynes per sq cm, $\eta = 10^{-1}$.

Substituting these values, the following is obtained: $N = 2 \times 10^{-7}$ and $\epsilon = 1.68$.

Again, substituting in Equation 5 the appropriate values then $c_o/c_R = 82$ and $c_R = 1750$ cm per sec.

Now, substituting in Equation 6, $\beta_R = 2_\pi \times 1.68 \times 1750 \times 2 \times 10^{-7} \times 10^{-1} \times f = 0.366 \times 10^{-3} \times f$ nepers per cm $= 96.6 \times 10^{-3} \times f$ db per ft.

This gives, at 100 cps, $\beta_R = 9.6$ db per ft and at 1000 cps, $\beta_R = 96$ db per ft.

The results of the above three calculations are shown in the accompanying graph and indicate the attenuation obtainable through a thin metal tube is negligible. On the other hand, the attenuation through the sponge rubber and soft rubber is theoretically very high. The effect of pressure on attenuation has not yet been adequately studied; however, it can be anticipated that the subjection of sponge rubber to a relatively high presure will destroy most of its pressure release characteristics. The problem then is how to retain the pressure release characteristics of sponge rubber, or soft rubber, under high pressure.

One way in which it appears this could possibly be done is to protect the sponge rubber by means of a stronger tube, though the attenuation characteristics of this combination would necessarily be reduced. Nevertheless, it would seem worthwhile to investigate this method further on an experimental basis by using different materials for such a protective tube, both perforated and solid. Further, various types of rubber compositions should be tested with and without a protective tube.

REFERENCES CITED

1) The Prevention of the Transmission of Sound along Water Pipes, by J. E. R. Constable, *Proc. Phys. Society,* London, 1938, pp. 360–7.

2) Untersuchungen uber die Schalleitung in wassergefullten Rohren, by Eugen Ganitta, *Akustische Zeitschrift,* V. 5, pp. 87–102, September 1940.

3) Reduction of Noise in Piping Systems (Liquid), Report No. 11, April, 1951, Project No. 90–874, Navy Dept., Bureau of Ships.

4) The Damping Capacity of Copper Manganese Alloys, by R. S. Dean and others. *Transactions* of the A. S. M., Vol. 40, p. 355.

5) *Acoustics,* by Stewart and Lindsay, p. 95.

[From Audecibel, September 1955]

INDUSTRIAL NOISE AND HUMAN HEARING

(By Martin Hirschorn)

Noisy operations in industry have undoubtedly been a problem since the beginning of industrial manufacturing operations. "Boilermaker's deafness" for instance is a term which probably can be traced back to the middle of the last century. However, industrial noise as an important problem requiring an immediate solution is of only very recent origin. There are a number of general reasons for the recent emergence of this problem; amongst them being the strong possibility that modern man is more sensitive to noise than his ancestors. Another is the tendency for some types of industrial operations to use machines designed for more power, higher speeds and less weight. All these are factors which, in combination, are likely to result in noisier machinery.

The major immediate reason for the nationwide attention to this problem must be attributed to the increasing number of claims for compensation awards on the grounds of deafness incurred while working in a noisy environment. The situation became more acute as a result of several court decisions favoring the claimant. Mr. Noel S. Symons, a lawyer specializing in the legal aspects of industrial noise, reports that: "In 1948 the court of Appeals, the highest court in New York State, ruled that an employee in a drop forge shop was entitled to a schedule award for occupational loss of hearing though he had lost no time from work and had not suffered any loss of wages because of his hearing impairment. On October 6, 1953 the Supreme Court of Wisconsin upheld a similar award for impaired hearing to a drop forge worker under the act of that state." (Ref. 1).

Statutory regulations for deafness compensation schedules vary from state to state, but the nationwide scope of the problem will be evident from Table I as presented by Dr. Meyer S. Fox (Ref. 2).

TABLE I

Analysis of provisions of workmen's compensation laws for hearing loss—maximum amounts which could be paid in dollars—for scheduled injuries—January 1, 1952. In this group of states compensation for temporary disability is allowed in addition to allowance for permanent partial disability.

Jurisdiction	Hearing, 1 ear	Hearing, both ears
Arizona	$1,100	$3,300
Arkansas	1,000	3,750
Colorado	980	3,892
Connecticut	1,872	5,616
Delaware	1,560	3,120
District of Columbia	1,820	7,000
Federal Employees Compensation Act	6,300	24,000
Idaho	875	3,750
Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Act	1,820	7,000
Maine	600	1,560
Maryland	1,250	3,750
Massachusetts	2,000	4,000
Mississippi	1,000	3,750
Nevada	1,700	5,100
New Jersey	1,800	6,000
New Mexico	1,050	4,050
North Carolina	2,100	4,500
North Dakota	1,100	3,740
Ohio	805	4,025
Oregon	2,700	8,640
Rhode Island	1,200	3,000
South Dakota	(1)	(1)
Tennessee	(1)	3,750
Utah	----------	----------
Washington	1,140	4,100
Wisconsin	1,850	12,333
Wyoming	1,525	3,000

[1] No set amount provided.

In this group of states compensation for temporary disability is allowed in addition to permanent partial disability with certain limitations as to period:

Jurisdiction	Hearing, 1 ear	Hearing, both ears
California	$1,200	$6,000
Florida	1,400	5,250
Georgia	(1)	3,600
Illinois	1,700	4,250
Indiana	2,025	5,400
Kansas	625	2,500
Kentucky	1,575	(1)
Minnesota	1,760	5,440
Montana	687	4,125
Nebraska	1,300	2,600
New Hampshire	1,260	5,100
New York	1,920	4,800
Vermont	1,063	4,750

[1] No set amount provided.

In this group of states compensation for temporary disability is deducted from the allowance for permanent partial disability.

Jurisdiction	Hearing, 1 ear	Hearing, both ears
Alabama	$1,150	$3,450
Iowa	1,400	4,900
Louisiana	----------	----------
Michigan	(1)	(1)
Missouri	1,320	5,040
Oklahoma	----------	----------
Pennsylvania	(1)	4,500
South Carolina	1,750	3,750
Texas	(1)	3,000
Virginia	1,000	(1)
West Virginia	1,200	3,600

[1] No set amount provided.

1. Commission may provide benefits up to maximum of 200 weeks. ($6260).

2. Commission may provide benefits up to maximum of 100 weeks. ($3000).

3. To be fixed by commission but not to exceed $3000.

4. During 1952, compensation for loss of hearing on one ear was raised in the schedule in the states of Kentucky to $1800, and in Virginia to $1250. (Supplement to 1952 Analysis).

The reason that there has not been an avalanche of such compensation claims is due to the differentiation between temporary and permanent deafness. In order to establish permanent deafness the worker must have been away from the noisy environment for a minimum of six months.

Nevertheless, the cost potential to industry inherent in deafness compensation awards runs into astronomical figures. Mr. Symons has suggested that: "On a nationwide basis, the cost might well run into billions of dollars and it might easily threaten the financial stability and security of many industries and insurance carriers." (Ref. 2).

The most pronounced physical effect of noise is damage to the ear. Exposure to intense noise from machinery causes partial and temporary hearing losses which may last from a few minutes to several hours. Continued and repeated exposures can result in partial but permanent deafness. Douglas E. Wheeler reports that "of a sample containing 175 men daily exposed to very high level noise, 45 per cent retained normal hearing, in some instances after ten years of exposure; on the other hand, 23 per cent displayed severe bi-lateral losses, in some instances after only a few months exposure."

Apart from deafness, no other physiological effects have been observed in noise levels extending to about 120 db. The effects on man due to turbo-jet engine noise and siren-generated sounds of the order of 150 db are summarized by Dr. Karl D. Kryter as follows:

(1) Severe but temporary hearing loss.

(2) Heating of the skin (rats and guinea pigs died of increased body temperatures).

(3) Vibration of cranial bones and air movement in the nasal passages and sinuses; also, blurred vision at frequencies between 700 cps and 1500 cps.

(4) An apparent weakening of the muscular structure.

Paul E. Sabine states that "there is a wealth of reliable data from medical sources in support of the statement that sustained exposure to noise is a contributing factor in impaired hearing, chronic fatigue that lowers bodily resistance, neurasthenia, increased blood pressure and decreased working and mental efficiency and that noise should rightfully be classified as an occupational hazard along with gases, fumes, dust, toxic liquids and bacteria."

Apart from the physiological and adverse morale effects of noise, most serious effects may occur where continuous or sudden noises prevent communication between operators or equipment. It is obvious that such an inability to communicate where necessary will result in inefficiency and may also contribute to the causation of accidents. (Ref. 3).

The problem of setting up deafness risk criteria for industry is a very critical one. It is probably safe to say that not enough information is presently available in order to specify exposure noise levels for the ear which must not be exceeded in order to prevent deafness. Quite a lot of work is being done along these lines but no definite medical findings can be expected in the immediate future. Moreover, in the event that definite medical findings are announced, which might at some time form the basis for industrial legislation on maximum permissible noise levels, many industries are likely to find themselves in a very serious situation, because noise control can in some instances be very costly. A difference of a few decibels in the risk criterion may mean a saving of or the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in industrial noise control measures. For this reason, and because of the medical complexities involved, all proposed hearing risk criteria are presently regarded as tentative.

Dr. Kryter states that "the maximum safe intensity at which no deafening effect will occur is probably in the neighborhood of 85 db above 0.0002 microbar of 'critical bands' of noise." (Ref. 4).

Dr. H. C. Hardy of the Armour Research Foundation has proposed tentative hearing risk criteria which are presented in three zones: (Ref. 5).

(1) A normally safe noise level zone where there is negligible risk.

(2) A critical noise level zone where a hearing loss risk is more likely to exist.

(3) A "danger zone" where a hearing loss risk can be expected in many instances. This curve is shown in figure 1.

Dr. Leo L. Beranek, of M.I.T., quotes the following damage risk criteria (Ref. 6).

Octave bands in cycles per second	Octave band levels of continuous noise in decibels
37.5 to 75	110
75 to 150	102
150 to 300	97
300 to 600	95
600 to 1,200	95
1,200 to 2,400	95
2,400 to 4,800	95
4,800 to 9,600	95

These tentative criteria can be regarded as a general guide in order to determine whether noise levels exist which can be regarded as critical from a deafness compensation point of view.

One of the best means available to industry to protect itself against unjustifiable hearing loss claims, apart from reducing noise as such, is a program of audiometric testing. Preemployment audiometric tests will determine whether an employee already suffers a hearing loss or not. Periodic audiometric tests will check an employee's susceptibility to hearing loss. If he is susceptible he could be relocated in a less noisy environment. In order for such tests to have any value it is important to have a room quiet enough for test-tones at the O-db setting of the hearing loss dial to be audible at 500 cps and higher. According to Dr. Jerome R. Cox, of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., therefore, (Ref. 7) the noise level indicated by spectrum #1 should not be exceeded. Dr. Aram Glorig, Director of Research, American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, in recent talk tentatively suggested spectrum #2 as the maximum background noise for reliable industrial hearing tests.

Octave bands in cycles per second	Sound level in decibels	
	Spectrum No. 1	Spectrum No. 2
20 to 75	----------	65
75 to 150	----------	45
150 to 300	----------	35
300 to 600	38	35
600 to 1,200	40	35
1,200 to 2,400	48	40
2,400 to 4,800	60	50
4,800 to 9,600	----------	60

In the majority of cases it will be necessary to provide special soundproofed structures in order to obtain such low noise levels. Fortunately standard prefabricated audiometric testing rooms are commercially available designed to reduce the acoustical spectrum to these levels.

REFERENCES

[1] Symons, Noel S. Insurance Aspects of Industrial Noise.

[2] Fox, Meyer S., M.D. "The Otologist Looks at the Industrial Noise Problem." The Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Monthly (August, 1953), 32:433–440.

[3] Hirschorn, Martin. "What Can We Do About Noise?" National Safety News (September, 1952).

[4] Kryter, Dr. Karl D. "The Effects of Noise on Man." The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Monograph Supplement 1 (September, 1950), 45.

[5] Hardy, Dr. H. E. "Tentative Estimate of a Hearing Damage Risk Criterion for Steady State Noise." Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, XXIV (November, 1952), 756.

[6] Beranek, Leo L. Acoustics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

[7] Cox, Jerome R. "How Quiet Must It Be To Measure Normal Hearing?" Noise Control (January, 1955).

[From Noise Control, vol. 3, No. 1, 40–46, 54, January 1957]

SOME CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN THE SILENCING OF AIR-CONDITIONING AND VENTILATING AIR INTAKES, ROOF EXHAUSTERS, AND COOLING TOWERS

(By Martin Hirschorn, Industrial Acoustics Co., Inc.)

The noise problem caused by cooling towers and by ventilating and air-conditioning air intake and exhaust systems is one that is well known to occupants and residential neighbors of large office buildings as well as to travelers who are familiar with the larger hotels throughout the country.

In the past, noise has not been a problem unless somebody complained and possibly threatened legal action; such a development might obviously create a serious public relations problem. When strong public resentment has already developed, and is perhaps accompanied by court injunctions, soundproofing measures alone may not satisfy the complainants. The following example is offered to illustrate the advisability of taking noise control measures in the original installation rather than permitting the development of public complaints.

A few years ago the writer was consulted on a problem in the suburbs of New York where a cooling tower on the roof of a low building had occasioned serious complaints from occupants of the surrounding garden apartments. The owner of the cooling tower promised to make the cooling tower more or less inaudible and showed the complainants sketches of a fairly elaborate silencing installation which was being planned.

This installation involved a complete enclosure as well as air intake and discharge silencers, which added to the over-all dimensions of the proposed installation. After inspecting the design the complainants stated that in addition to the noise the appearance of the cooling tower was also objectionable and that along with the soundproofing job they wanted the tower moved out of sight. As a result, the company involved decided to dismantle the brand-new cooling tower, drill water wells, and install a pumping installation. As a cooling tower silencing effort, this measure turned out to be quite effective, though the total cost was almost prohibitive.

A few case histories will be presented here in the hope that the corrective techniques outlined, if applied to jobs in the planning stage, will assist others in avoiding similar tedious, drawn-out, and costly experiences.

Some of the various steps involved in the solution of three actual noise problems will be discussed:

1. The design of an air-conditioning air intake silencer.
2. The design of a roof exhaust silencer.
3. Silencing equipment for an air-conditioning cooling tower.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BASIC DATA

One approach in correcting problems of the type under discussion, regardless of whether an intake or exhaust system is involved, is to establish the following information:

ACOUSTIC DATA

A. If an existing installation is involved, the noise level and spectrum created by the noise maker at the complainant's location nearest the source should be measured. If the installation is in the design stage, this noise level will have to be calculated or estimated depending on the availability of information.

B. The noise level spectrum existing at the same location when the noise maker is shut off should be determined. This is often referred to as the *ambient noise level.* In most cases this can easily be established by measurement.

C. Determining the difference between the noise spectra in A and B is one method of establishing the degree of noise reduction required. It can be assumed that if the noise-generating equipment cannot be heard above the ambient noise there is no legal justification for the complaint.

AIR FLOW AND PRESSURE DROP DATA

Air-conditioning and ventilating noise problems always involve the flow of air; therefore, the aerodynamic design of this equipment is as important as the acoustical design. After all, a silencing installation cannot be called very successful if the air flow has been restricted to the point that the operating efficiency of the equipment involved is affected. In some instances, when pressure drop is critical, the cost of the silencing equipment may be determined by pressure drop requirements rather than by acoustical considerations. If space is at a premium too, then a difficult engineering problem may be involved.

In addition to the acoustical data the following information must then be established:

A. Design air flow, usually stated in cubic feet per minute.

B. Maximum permissible pressure drop through silencing system.

C. Space layout and accessibility requirements.

Since most of these installations are in the open and are sometimes exposed to corrosive vapors, selection of materials from a corrosion point of view must also be borne in mind. It might be best to illustrate at least some of these problems by following the analysis, design, and subsequent performance check-out of actual silencing installations in the case histories below.

1. LEVER HOUSE AIR-CONDITIONING INTAKE SILENCER PROBLEM

Seven high-pressure blowers located behind a louvre measuring approximately 70 x 15 ft in cross section caused enough noise to disturb the neighbors at a distance of about 60 ft directly across the street. The louvre was located on the second floor of Lever House on 54th Street at the corner of Park Avenue in Manhattan. The purpose of the blowers was to circulate fresh air through the building for air-conditioning purposes. Since the building, though provided with ample transparent glass surfaces, has no windows which can be opened, the operation of the blowers was obviously vital to the occupancy of the building. The owners of the building, therefore, were seeking a solution which would satisfy the complaining neighbors, at the same time not interfering with the operation and maintenance of the blowers.

The latter condition seemed at first to pose a problem, since a space of only 6 ft was available between the louvres and the blower inlets for installation of any silencing equipment. The amount of air induced through the louvre amounted to 200,000 cu ft per min, or a velocity of approximately 400 ft per min through a louvre with a free area of 50 percent. This can be considered as a relatively low velocity, and in this case it was apparent that pressure drop considerations would not constitute a problem.

Acoustical survey

The first step before attempting any design of equipment was to make an acoustical survey. The results of this survey are shown in Fig. 4. (Figures not printed in RECORD.) Curves 2 and 3 are of most interest.

Curve 2 shows the noise level at a window location directly opposite the intake louvre. Curve 3 shows the lowest nighttime ambient on 54th Street, which occurred in this particular street at 7 a.m. The difference between these two curves, shown in curve 5, established the design criterion for this job.

Selection of acoustical splitter system

In order to meet these attenuation requirements a splitter system 4 ft long and 6 in. thick on 16-in. centers was selected. This allowed an access space to the blowers of about 4 ft for maintenance purposes. The splitters were placed at an angle to prevent straight-through line-of-sight radiation. It had been established in previous installations that such an arrangement would add 5 to 6 db attenuation, especially in the higher frequencies.

Figure 2 shows a cutaway view of the silencing system seen through the louvre. Figures 1 and 3 show the intake louvre and Lever House respectively.

Results

The results of the installation were satisfactory because it was impossible to measure any sound emanating from the louvre in excess of the ambient level. Curve 4 of Fig. 4 shows the estimated noise level at the chief complainants' window after installation of silencing equipment; this level presumably could have been measured had there been no ambient interference.[1]

2. THE DESIGN OF A ROOF EXHAUST SILENCER

The problem here was a rather interesting one. A manufacturer located on Third Avenue in New York had installed three roof exhaust blowers. These were discharging vertically, and the resulting noise was found to be disturbing to the residents in the apartments located to the east of the factory, less than 100 ft away.

During the acoustical survey an interesting observation was made: each time the elevated trains (part of the New York subway system) passed by, an over-all noise level of about 100 db was obtained; this was approximately 15 db higher than the over-all noise level of all three blowers at the same measurement location. In other words, the transient noise created by intermittent train service was much higher than the continuous noise created by the three blowers. The residents had lived in this high transient noise level for many years, but upon installation of the new roof exhausters they joined together in complaining. This practical experience demonstrates the well-known fact that transient intermittent noises at a higher intensity level are usually less disturbing than a continuous noise at a lower level of intensity.

The acoustical survey produced curves 1 and 3 in Fig. 5 showing blower noise spectrum and daytime and nighttime ambients respectively. Accordingly, it was decided to design a silencer having an attenuation corresponding approximately to the difference between curves 1 and 3. The attenuation which was finally measured is shown in curve 4.

Practical problems

The blower housing rose approximately 5 ft above the roof and was equipped with a motor projecting to one side. The problem was to design a combination low-cost enclosure and exhaust silencer for three 36-in.-diameter blowers having a capacity of 18,000 cfm each. The unit, of course, had to be weatherproof, which meant that the silencing unit could not exhaust vertically unless a special weather cover were provided. The silencer unit was sized adequately for minimum pressure drop. The resulting design is shown in Fig. 6. It will be noted that this design solved the problems of weather protection and equipment accessibility in one continuous structure without the use of a door or removable panel. This design was influenced by a paper by Dr. H. C. Hardy[2] and consists essentially of one 180° lined bend. The attenuation obtained was fairly closely predicted by using the following expression:

$$\text{db} = 10 \log \frac{4\alpha N + 1}{1 - \alpha}$$

where

db=attenuation in decibels for one 180° lined bend

α=sound absorption coefficient of liner

N=number of diameters, or $\frac{L}{D}$

where

L=length of treatment in inches

D=diameter of treatment in inches

Using the sound absorption coefficient for a 4-in. lined panel and substituting in the above equation, it was found that attenuations in excess of requirements could be obtained by the design shown in Fig. 6. In addition, the exhaust opening was diverted from a vertical position to a horizontal position, which meant that further attenuation could be expected because of a change in the directivity pattern of the exhaust noise. The result was a very conservative though inexpensive design, as proved by the final check-out. (See curve 2 of Fig. 5.)

Figure 7 shows a close-up of the roof exhauster silencer, and in Fig. 8 the top portions of all three silencers are visible. In the background can be seen the apartment buildings where the complaints originated.

3. SILENCING EQUIPMENT FOR AN AIR-CONDITIONING COOLING TOWER

General considerations involved in the design of cooling tower silencing equipment have been described previously.[3] Before proceeding with a case history it might, however, be appropriate to discuss briefly cooling tower noise in general.

Cooling tower noise control has developed in the last few years into a problem of increasing importance. Objectionable noises created by air-conditioning cooling towers installed in confined spaces close to hotel rooms, residential apartments, or offices have led to threats of law suits and have caused considerable inconvenience to their owners and to others.

An important aspect of the noise control problem is that for a small cooling tower the *acoustical correction* may exceed in cost that of the cooling tower itself; for large cooling towers the silencer cost is likely to amount to a very substantial fraction of the total cost. The cost of such cooling tower silencing can be reduced by planning for it when the tower installation is being designed.

---

[1] Martin Hirschorn, "How air intake was silenced," Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning 25, 92 (August 1953).

[2] Howard C. Hardy, "Design characteristics for noise control of jet engine test cells," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 24, 185 (March 1952).

[3] Martin Hirschorn, "Silencing cooling towers," Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning 24, 95 (August 1952).

Sources of noise and its transmission

Cooling tower noise is caused principally by the following factors:

1. Periodic pulsations imparted by the fan rotation to the air; also, air turbulence caused by fans with high tip speeds.
2. Splashing of water into the basin.
3. Motor and gear box or fan drive.

The fan noise is a function of the fan speed and the number of blades on the rotor; this noise, therefore, is likely to have low-frequency characteristics, whereas air turbulence will contribute noise in the higher-frequency bands. The fan noise is usually predominant, though in some types of cooling towers the dripping water will produce more noise than will the fan.

In a large cooling tower installation, occupants in rooms located over the fans may complain about fan noise and occupants of lower rooms may complain about water noise. Nevertheless, whichever noise is predominant, it will usually be necessary to silence both the air intake and discharge ends of the cooling tower.

Noise from the cooling tower can be transmitted along the following paths:

1. The air intake louvre (water noise usually predominant).
2. The air discharge louvre (fan noise usually predominant).
3. The walls of the cooling tower (fan and water noise).
4. The circulating water pipe lines (due to circulating pump in basement or transmission from cooling tower).
5. Vibration transmission from motor and fan base (structurally transmitted noise).

All of these five avenues of noise transmission can cause a great deal of trouble and must be considered carefully when planning the tower installation. An otherwise effective installation of air intake and discharge silencers can be rendered ineffective if the attenuation through the wall structure does not at least equal that through the silencers. The problem of water-pipe noise has been dealt with in a previous paper.[4] Vibration transmission through the foundation due to the fan and motor can be prevented by mounting the complete fan and motor base on suitably loaded vibration isolation mounts.

Intake cooling tower silencer for hotel

The installation described here is located on the roof of a single-story hotel annex in New York City. A cooling tower, which caused noise complaints in adjacent garden apartments less than 30 ft away, had already been treated with an air discharge silencer of egg-crate type construction. This silencer was fairly effective insofar as apartments above the cooling tower were concerned. However, the residents in the garden apartments below and adjacent to the annex were still disturbed by the noise emanating from the cooling tower inlet opening. Figure 9 shows the cooling tower with the intake silencer under construction. The apartments affected are to the left of the parapet.

The acoustical considerations applying to this installation will be apparent from Fig. 10.

Without taking into account the short-distance factors involved, the attenuation requirements were established by considering the differences between curves 1 and 3. The system selected to accomplish this job is shown in Fig. 11. Curve 2 of Fig 10 shows the actual measured level after installation of the silencer. This silencer can be expected to give more attenuation, especially in the higher frequencies; however, the measurements shown by curve 2 were affected by ambient interference. The intake silencer had to be sized for an air flow of 30 000 cfm. Again, the unit was sized amply for minimum pressure drop. A complete enclosure for the lower portion of the cooling tower was constructed, and adequate space and an access door had to be allowed for maintenance purposes. An outside view indicating how the intake had to be completely housed in is shown in Fig. 12.

Figures 13 and 14 show cooling tower silencing installations at the New York Stock Exchange and the Hotel Plaza. Figure 15 is a schematic flow diagram of the Hotel Plaza silencing system. The New York Stock Exchange installation is one of the more recent installations actually contracted for simultaneously with the cooling tower.

Conclusion

In conclusion it can be said that intake and exhaust noise problems of almost any description lend themselves to successful engineering solutions provided that all the pertinent factors summarized below are taken into account:

1. Acoustics.
2. Air flow.
3. Space limitations.
4. Maintenance.
5. Accessibility.
6. Durability.
7. Cost.

Actually, all of these considerations are of equal importance, since no silencing installation can be considered adequate unless they have all been included in the silencer design.

As a final comment it should be mentioned that although all the structures described above were specially developed designs for each application, today there is available a large selection of standard duct silencers with predetermined acoustical and pressure drop characteristics which could undoubtedly be adapted to some problems similar to those described above. However, though standardized silencing is highly desirable, there are, unfortunately, still too many situations where specially designed or adapted equipment constitutes the only solution. This is particularly true where existing installations are involved. Standardized silencing could be used more extensively if architects and engineers were to plan for noise control equipment on the drawing boards. This is already being done at an increasing rate, and we can perhaps look forward to the time in the near future when this will be standard procedure.

MAY 31, 1966.

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
Member of Congress,
17th District of New York,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUPFERMAN: I wish to commend you heartily for your letter highlighting the problem of noise pollution which appeared in the May 5 edition of the San Francisco Chronicle. Such efforts to bring this matter to the public's attention are badly needed, and I warmly support your sponsorship of legislation creating an Office of Noise Control under the Surgeon General.

During years of research in the public health field I have increasingly become aware of noise as a public health problem. (Though I am employed by the California State Department of Public Health, in the remarks which follow I do not speak for the department in any official capacity.) Unfortunately, to date it is a grossly neglected one; there has been some research effort, but community action is conspicuously absent. What is needed is public awareness of noise as a pollutant which is irritating at best, and probably dangerous to mental and physical health when exposure is over many years, as it is for the city dweller. Once there is an aroused public, then police will enforce noise control laws already on the books (they don't now), and legislative bodies will pass more effective, up-to-date ones.

I'm aware that this is a very complex problem (but so is air pollution and communities are doing something about that). It might be advantageous to zero-in on one source of noise at a time, to simplify matters and to more easily enlist the public's attention and support. I propose as the first target motorcycle, truck, and sport-car exhaust noise. In my area at least this is the most obvious source of disturbing noise.

From a comparative rarity, motorcycles and sport-cars have become very popular since the last war. These machines and their exhaust-rapping drivers are notorious noise-makers. I believe enthusiasts and the industry claim there are a number of engineering or technical excuses for not muffling these motors adequately. Paradoxically, these tiny engines (even those of motor scooters) produce many times the noise that the much-maligned 300 horse-power Detroit cars produce. The latter are adequately muffled, and I believe that if public pressure were great enough the sports vehicle industry could and would solve the technical problems of muffling their engines properly.

I think it logical to first aim at these vehicles because their excessive noise is totally unnecessary. We probably simply have to bear the mechanical noises of large trucks (though I'm sure more could be done to muffle their exhausts), since they seem necessary to our commerce and are to a certain degree inherently noisy due to their size and construction. But the public does not have to put up with the Hellish rapping of motorcycles and sportcars just because enthusiasts enjoy buzzing about in them.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. MIELKE,
Associate Social Research Analyst, Bureau of Chronic Diseases, State of California, Department of Public Health, Berkeley, Calif.

PRICHARD, ALA.,
June 7, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I am very interested in and enjoyed reading your floor statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21 on the problem of noise pollution.

I posted your statement on the bulletin board at the plant where I work and you would be amazed at the response from my fellow workers as a result of this I have been asked to write you and ask for your help in acquiring any agency (government or civilian) to check the noise level in the factory in which we work as it is very high.

I have written to my Representative urging his support of your bill.

Any help you can give us would be greatly appreciated by the members of Local 940, United Papermarkers & Paperworkers, Mobile, Ala.

Thanking you very much.

JIMMY C. MARTIN.

AMERICAN TRUCKING
ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: Thank you very much for your courtesy in sending me the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, containing your presentation on "Noise Pollution."

---

[4] Martin Hirschorn, "Eliminating noise transmission in liquid pipe lines," Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning 24, 100 (March 1952).

We appreciate being kept up to date on developments as they occur concerning this subject in the deliberations of the Congress.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS C. KIBBEE,
Director, Engineering Department.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
June 3, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. Representative,
17th District, New York,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was with considerable interest that I read your article in Letters from the People, in the May 5th issue of the St. Louis Post Dispatch, with reference to "Noise Pollution," and I endorse your article 100%, and something should be done to eliminate unnecessary noise.

In my opinion, one of the greatest contributing factors to noise pollution as well as Air Pollution are the Diesel Powered Vehicles with open exhausts, if the exhaust noises of the Diesel-Powered Equipment was, shall we say, consistent, it possibly would not be so disturbing, but they have what I consider a vibrating exhaust that can be heard for miles.

Attached you will find an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat, in which the last paragraph of this article deals with this condition, and more or less verifies my thinking.

Apparently, it would require Federal Legislation to correct a situation of Open Exhausts, as Diesel Powered Equipment is mostly Interstate, and possibly could not be controlled by reciprocal State Laws, such as the Trucking Industry enjoys.

Another contributing factor are Motorcycles and small Foreign Cars, but again it is a case of Open Exhausts.

Yours very truly,

O. E. REINHARDT.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat]

TWO SIDES TO COIN

To the EDITOR:

The people of the Plaza Square Apartments would not have to urge a law to keep noisy trucks from their area if the lawyers had enforced the law requiring mufflers when the truckers first took them off to reduce the cost of operation.

ROBERT E. MELLING.

GODFREY, ILL.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.,
June 3, 1966.

Mr. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
Member of the U.S. Congress, 17th Congressional District, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: I sincerely appreciate your letter concerning the ill effects from excessive noise, which was printed a few weeks ago in one of the San Francisco papers, the S.F. Chronicle. Please tell me to whom I might write to endorse your efforts for legislation for research into the control of this great nuisance to peaceful living. I shall write to the California Congressmen and would like to know others who might be influential.

With increasing populations and people living in closer and closer proximity to one another, the necessary steps should be taken now to guarantee sufficient quiet in home and living areas.

I would like to emphasize the need for soundproofing requirements in apartment buildings. Neighbors, of course, all live on varying schedules, and it is very disturbing (as anyone who have lived in apartment houses knows) to try to sleep or relax with excessive noise from neighbors next door. Insulation against sound should be mandatory in apartment buildings. I understand that in Sweden, Great Britain and Germany, there are such laws for control of sound in apartment buildings.

I interpret your interest in "noise pollution" as being on a larger scale than just apartment houses and local noises; perhaps you refer more to industrial noise, or even sonic booms. May I, in this regard, comment that my personal feeling about military needs, such as sonic booms caused by military aircraft, are far more important than a personal complaint by an individual. If an airborne jet of the U.S. Air Force causes a sonic boom, then we can tolerate this—it must be vital to the defense of the country.

It is good to know of your active interest.

Sincerely,

MRS. ELISABETH A. PFORR.

INSULATION SALES CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 26, 1966.

Representative KUPFERMAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in regard to the Noise Abatement Program which our Government is proposing. I speak relative of the pending bill set up by the Federal Office of Noise Control which is to provide grants for research in noise control and prevention.

Naturally, we, being in the acoustics field, are very interested in this project as we have been dealing with it since the inception of our business. Back in 1950 to 1954 we were members of the National Noise Abatement Society which had its offices at 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. But due to insufficient funds, they had to dissolve, and we felt it was one of the saddest annual meetings ever attended. The necessity of noise control, similar to water pollution, we feel is one of our foremost needs, not because we are in this type of business, but because of its effect on the public in general.

One of the current organizations whom we feel have been doing a very fine job is the American Industrial Hygiene Association, 14125 Prevost, Detroit 27, Michigan. Perhaps you are aware of this organization, but I submit the address in case you would be interested in their noise manual. In the notice we received, it indicated that you might have some information available to us on present proceedings, and I would appreciate it very much if you would forward this information to us.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN GILBERTSON.

ROCK WOOL INSULATING DIVISION
OF AMERICAN GYPSUM CO.,
Pueblo, Colo., July 7, 1966.

Hon. T. KUPFERMAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to my attention that you are sponsoring legislation to set up an Office of Noise Control to research methods and techniques of improving sound conditions in homes, offices, plants and machinery.

We are most interested in such a program and would be interested in learning more on your proposal. If we can be of any assistance to you in your efforts to get legislation on this subject or in providing you with any information, please feel free to call upon us.

Yours very truly,

S. L. MATTHEWS,
General Manager.

YORK CORP.,
SUBSIDIARY OF BORG-WARNER CORP.,
York, Pa., June 28, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUPFERMAN: My company is very much interested in the pending Bill on "Anti-noise Pollution", and we would appreciate any information you can forward us at this time, plus, a copy of the proposed Bill if it is available.

Yours sincerely,

J. W. CHANDLER,
Manager, Government Relations.

ROBIN M. TOWNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., July 7, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: It has come to our attention that you have prepared a bill proposed to establish an Office of Noise Control.

As the only full-time acoustical consulting firm in the Pacific Northwest, we are continually working on a variety of noise problems for both Government and industry and are very much interested in your proposed bill.

We would appreciate receiving a draft of the bill and also the names of the acoustical consultants who assisted you in its preparation.

Sincerely yours,

ROY L. RICHARDS.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,
CULLEN COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING,
Houston, Tex., July 7, 1966.

Representative KUPFERMAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUPFERMAN: Please send me information on the pending bill which would start a study on the effects of noise and how to eliminate it, set up a Federal Office of Noise Control, and provide grants for research in noise control and prevention.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. LOIS MONROE,
Secretary.

THE JERSEY JOURNAL,
Jersey City, N.J., June 17, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for the tearsheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you included your Visiting Editorial from The Jersey Journal in your discussion of noise pollution before Congress.

I see from your other exhibits that you have struck a sensitive spot in the American public.

It looks as though quite a lot of us would like relief.

I hope you will keep me informed of your progress from time to time.

Sincerely,

EUGENE FARRELL,
Editor.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF AIRPORT
EXECUTIVES,
Torrance, Calif., May 26, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUPFERMAN: On April 21st you spoke in the House, introducing a bill for the establishment of the Office of Noise Control.

Please advise the number of this bill and the committee to which it was assigned.

When you answer, please send a copy to: Mr. Jack R. Egan, A.A.E., Airport Manager, Torrance Municipal Airport, 3201 Pacific Coast Highway, Torrance, Calif.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

F. R. HOYT, A.A.E.,
Executive Director.

New York, N.Y.,
May 31, 1966.

Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Kupferman: As your constituent, I wish to congratulate you on your "Noise Pollution" Bill. I was under the impression that noise abatement regulations exist in New York City, but since the days of Mayor LaGuardia no enforcement of any kind is in evidence. I remember the days when trucks with open exhaust were immediately stopped and summonses issued. Today it is a common occurrence to have overland trucks-trailers go through the streets of New York without any attempt to muffle the roar of their exhaust.

Another matter, often overlooked, is the continued blowing of police whistles by doormen. You can well imagine what goes on in an area which consists of apartment houses while every doorman tries to out-blow the other for a taxicab. This is a completely uncalled for, nerve-racking custom, established by the doormen themselves, who labor under the impression that they will collect larger tips by making noise. It is quite obvious that a vacant taxicab will not bypass a wave of hand and, in addition, traffic accidents are known to have resulted from these whistle blasts when a driver mistakingly thought that a police officer was signaling him for some infraction of traffic rules.

I sincerely trust that my appeal, shared by many, many citizens, will be understood, and perhaps you can influence Mayor Lindsay to pass regulations which will simply make whistle blowing a punishable offense.

May I again congratulate you on your Bill, as it is obvious that small groups or individuals are a menace to the health of the majority of citizens for imagined personal gain.

Respectfully yours,
Paul de Samelson,
Mechanical Engineer.

Walker Manufacturing Co.,
Racine, Wis., June 6, 1966.

Representative Kupferman,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Kupferman: As manufacturers of devices to control noise (automobile exhaust systems) we are very much interested in your pending bill to study the effects of noise and how to eliminate it.

Could you please send us further details?

Yours truly,
R. E. Arndt.

B & K Instruments, Inc.,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 26, 1966.

House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Representative Kupferman.

Dear Mr. Kupferman: In one of the recent "Executive Reports" from Prentice-Hall I noted that you have a bill pending about noise abatement.

As a company that sells instrumentation for the measurement and analysis of noise and vibration, we are especially interested in your proposed program and would appreciate learning more about it. Please send us whatever information you have readily available.

The enclosed literature describes B & K instrumentation that will be most useful in measuring sound levels for evaluation and possible correction.

Very truly yours,
J. W. Day, Jr.,
President.

THE UNITED STATES IN ITS LONELY NEW ROLE AS WORLD POLICEMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, continuing the Atlantic studies being conducted by the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic community, I invite attention to penetrating commentary prepared for our committee by the eminent foreign-policy expert, Dr. Eugene V. Rostow, dean of Yale Law School.

Dean Rostow's statement deals in a practical way with the crux of the NATO problem and the discomfort of the United States in its lonely new role as world policeman.

Here is his statement:

Prospects for the Alliance

(By Eugene V. Rostow, Dean of the Yale Law School)

My topic is the prospects of the Atlantic Alliance. By way of preparation, I have been peering into a particularly opaque crystal ball. I shall try to concentrate on a few of the more obvious patterns of light and shadow that glow beneath the surface. For I was taught once by an English colleague of genius that the most important facts in any problem were the super-obvious ones—the facts so manifest, and so close to us, that they defy perspective, and become almost invisible.

In talking about the future of the Alliance, I should make it clear at once that I shall not attempt a neutral and bloodless exercise in pseudo-scientific prediction. I shall consider choices of policy, and talking about these choices from the point of view of the American national interest.

Some decry the concept of national interest in foreign policy as "philosophical nihilism", and preach the need for larger and more generous premises as guides to action. I strongly favor a comprehensive definition of the national interests of the United States, as a great power, necessarily obliged to assume great responsibilities in the world community. And in my pride as a citizen I hope that we shall always discharge those responsibilities with spirit, and in the grand manner.

But I regard it as self-deception, and rather dangerous self-deception, to pretend that the nation-state has been superseded by larger groupings as the unit of action in world politics, or that the idea of nationality has ceased to stir men's loyalties, however responsive they may also be to supra-national ideas like those of the United Nations, the Commonwealth of Nations, the concept of a united Europe, or that of the Atlantic Community.

The question with which *I start*, therefore, is that of the national security interest of the United States in its relationships with the other leading industrial nations of the free world. Let me make a few preliminary qualifications. First, I shall be talking primarily about American links to those nations which take an active part in the military and political programs of the Cold War, and of development assistance to the Third World. That is, I shall not be talking directly about our historic connections with neutral countries, important as they are, and important as they should continue to be. Secondly, my definition raises a problem in semantics. Should the Atlantic Alliance include Japan, and the other advanced nations of the Pacific? We tend to think of the Alliance as a group concerned only with the defense of Europe against the Soviet Union. However adequate this view might have been in the immediate post-war period, it has become obsolete, and is becoming more and more obsolete with every passing day. As I view the future, the Alliance should expand geographically around the nucleus of the relationship between Europe and North America, the heart of the security problem in every perspective.

In its broader sense, the Atlantic idea has two aspects.

Through one window, the Atlantic Community is a cobweb of relationships defining the common culture of the European peoples—their shared personal ties, and family connections; their heritage of ideas and of ideals; their habits of life, and work, and social organization. The Atlantic Community, in this sense, is a single civilization, embracing New Zealand and Switzerland, Russia, Poland and Sweden, and exercising a powerful influence on the culture of many non-European countries. This fact is a dynamic force of the utmost importance in world politics.

That is not, however, the meaning of the term I shall be discussing. What I shall be talking about here is the Atlantic grouping as an Alliance, not as a civilization, and about the role of that alliance in American foreign policy since the end of the War, and during the next twenty-five years.

Since the War, Europe has been at least partially protected by the military power of the United States. I say "partially" protected because, save in the case of Yugoslavia, we have protected only those parts of Europe which were West of the Armistice lines of 1945. We did not invoke force to carry out the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, nor to prevent the coup d'etats of 1948 in Czechoslovakia, or of 1956 in Hungary. Western Europe, disorganized and dispirited by the War, could not have defended itself against the tides of Communism. The American shield, rather tardily interposed, gave Western Europe time to recover.

The United States undertook this burden for a basic and abiding reason of American national security—to prevent the balance of power in the world from being transformed to our fatal disadvantage. We intervened in Europe after the War for the same reasons which led us to remain protectively in Japan: to keep Europe from falling into Soviet hands, and, correlatively, to bring the weight of Europe's population, military potential and political influence as much as possible into the scales of world politics on our side. Such, at least, was our long-run hope.

These two primordial features of the American interest in Europe will remain operative indefinitely as motives of American foreign policy. But the problem of Europe in American foreign policy is altogether different from what it was in 1948 or 1956. European recovery is now a powerful fact in every realm. European self-confidence, badly shaken by the experience of Fascism and War, is being restored by the success of its bold political and economic programs, and by the resurgence, and the visible assertion, of its influence.

The strongest political force in the relationship between Europe and North America is the European desire to end the American protectorate in Europe. I should define that goal, which both Europeans and Americans profess to share, as the desire to transform the protectorate into a relationship of equal responsibility within an Alliance of broad scope. The Alliance is recognized as indispensable both in Europe and in the United States. It should become not merely an arrangement for the defense of Europe, but a body concerting the influence of its members over the whole range of the world's political problems, in the interest of assuring the safety of the free world, and promoting its development.

For other great and super-obvious changes in the world have altered our relationship to Europe, and to Japan. The break-up of the old imperial system, and the revolution of rising hopes throughout the Southern Hemisphere, have created new problems of political instability—new demands for protection, and for subsidies to replace those formerly provided by the imperial powers. The pressures implicit in these processes are made especially acute by the availability of the Communist alternative, and by the efforts of the Communist movement to seize power in various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Even the differences between China and the Soviet Union do not necessarily nor uniformly aid us in this regard. Chinese pressure has certainly helped make the Soviet Union more cautious in Europe. But some men in the Soviet Union must be tempted to encourage small wars between us and the Chinese in Asia. And some also are led by Chinese rivalry to compete with the Chinese for leadership in the world Communist movement by seeking to outdo them in pouring oil on the fires of so-called "anti-colonial wars of national liberation."

These developments have escalated the costs and complexities of American foreign policy at a geometrical rate. It is a cliché to observe that the world is going through processes of revolutionary change. In many parts of the world, it is nip and tuck whether those . . . (the) processes (of change) shouldn't more accurately be called those of disintegration . . . rather than of change. As a result, a genuine pooling of Allied talents and energies is now indispensable, if we hope to keep these turbulent forces within channels of order. The Alliance is a necessity to the United States from the point of view of our national interest—a necessity, in all probability, for the first time since the War. Until now, NATO has been a politically desirable way of expressing a hope, and of organizing a political process. It expressed the hope that Europe would ultimately take a larger share in the task of keeping the peace, and in assisting the development of the Third World. And it set into motion the political evolution that could transform the post-war protectorate into an alliance of equality.

These trends and tendencies have ripened to a point of maturity. The time has come for their promise to be realized. "[The job of being the free world's policeman is becoming more and more onerous for us. And with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, . . . and the emergence of polycentric and assertively independent foreign policies, the risks of world politics have become more rather than less acute.] It is commonly thought that the danger of a general nuclear war has receded. But it is barely two years since the Cuban missile crisis. And the possibilities of new explosions which could have unpredictable consequences cannot be dismissed as illusory in South East Asia, in the Middle East, or in other troubled places of the world.

I should say, therefore, that [. . . both the evolution of European institutions, and the pattern of Communist action give a higher and more urgent . . . priority than ever among the aims of United States foreign policy . . . to the assurance of political solidarity with our European allies, and with Japan, and to the development of institutional arrangements designed to achieve it.]" Europe, North America and Japan are and will remain the indispensable source of the capital, the skills, the military power and the nerve on which the safety and progress of the free world depend. As presently organized, the task is becoming both expensive, and politically difficult, for the United States. It is inequitable, and politically risk, for the United States to continue to carry so large a share of the burden indefinitely.

At every point in the landscape—from Vietnam and the future of Berlin and East Germany to the annual battle over Foreign Aid funds in Congress—it is apparent that the struggle for order and progress in the free world would be far more likely to succeed than is the case at present if it were conducted by an Alliance working in close cooperation, according to agreed plans. It is equally obvious that continued friction between Europe and the United States would give the Soviets some ground to hope that someday, at the right moment, they might deal separately with each. Thus, in the pattern of Rappallo, they can dream of achieving a neutral Third Force policy in Europe, and a withdrawal into isolationism here.

These are risks of the utmost gravity, which it should be the first aim of American prudence to eliminate.

Yet our relationship with Europe, the central feature of any system of political cohesion for the Alliance, is carried on today pretty much as it was in 1956, when the disaster of the Suez crisis occurred. Several movements for change in the architecture of the Alliance are gaining momentum. The confluence of these movements offers President Johnson a striking opportunity to make a fresh start.

What is the deepening conflict between the United States and Europe about?

In part, it is a conflict over strategic policy. We advise Europe to leave nuclear weapons to us, and to concentrate on conventional forces. This advice strikes Europe as politically naive, since it presupposes either backing down before a Soviet threat the United States might refuse to oppose, or, even worse, a conventional war fought in Europe, while both the Soviet Union and the United States were not bombed. Speculation along these lines hurts American feelings. But it is widely shared in Europe. In view of our failure to insist upon the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and our decision not to act in regard to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, we are in no position to say that such thoughts are inadmissible. This kind of analysis lies behind the British and French programs of nuclear weapons production. In turn, those programs are denounced in Washington as militarily naive, since the British and the French won't have large stockpiles of weapons for a long time. They understand this, but want to be in a position to start a war, or at least to threaten to do so, if they believe vital national interests to be in peril, even though Washington does not agree. The possibility of such developments naturally disturbs our Government.

A second subject matter of conflict is the future organization of the Alliance. Here the conflict is a paradoxial one, since both President DeGaulle and many spokesmen for our government use exactly the same ideas, and profess to want exactly the same thing, often in almost identical language. Each says that the Atlantic Alliance is and will continue to be the indispensable basis for European and American security, so long as the Communist movement remains what it is. Each says that the present pattern of the Alliance is unfortunate, since the United States is so much stronger than its partners. Each professes to favor the formation of a political Europe—whether federal or confederal, integrated or merely cooperative. Such a Europe, concerting and coordinating the foreign policies of its members, could deal with the United States as an equal—the famous "dumbbell" of President Kennedy's Atlantic partnership. Under those circumstances, Europe would take full responsibility with us for maintaining the peace, and assisting the orderly development of the Third World.

One can find these themes, with insignificant variations, in the speeches and press conferences of President de Gaulle and of Jean Monnet, of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and in dozens of other official and semiofficial pronouncements.

Clearly, the incantation of these formulae cannot have meant the same thing to President de Gaulle and to President Kennedy, and to all the other men who have recited them so eloquently during the past decade. Some European observers think that we engage in what they enjoy calling Anglo-Saxon vagueness or hypocrisy when we talk of forming a true Europe—that we supported British membership in the Common Market because we thought Britain would be an American agent in Europe, so that we could keep control; and that when France and Germany sought to advance the Fouchet plan, and now the Erhard plan, for organizing a political Europe, we countered with M.L.F., in order to prevent Europe from becoming genuinely independent.

For our part, the atmosphere of Washington on these subjects is equally heated, and equally colored by passionate fantasy.

Some French and American enthusiasts carry the battle a step further. They contend that a form of supra-national European unity is a pre-condition which must be met before a true Atlantic partnership could be realized. Confusing ends and means, these men urge that nothing be done to improve the Atlantic relationship until a supra-national Europe has been organized and started on its way. Often these are the same men who most strongly support British membership in a supra-national Europe, although they never explain how Britain could be expected to adhere to supra-national organizations in the political field.

One might examine the conflict among the Allies in other areas: in trade, agriculture and finance for example, or in the even more delicate sphere of nuclear science and technology. But there is no need to do so. From the point of view of our national interest, the important fact is that the habit of conflict is spreading, and that its atmosphere is becoming more embittered. Such habits, and that atmosphere, are in themselves a danger to unity. They should be examined and cured before they lead to irreparable damage.

The political atmosphere will not be altered until the political problem is faced directly. We have learned, to our cost, that political unity is not a by-product of collaborative efforts on projects in other fields, however useful and desirable such projects may be in themselves.

For some years, we have been urging our allies to bear a larger share of the costs of our common defense—but not the costs of nuclear science and technology—and of the costs, too, of aiding the underdeveloped countries. Our allies in reply have requested more direct and responsible participation in the processes of political decision which determine our indivisible fates. This proposal has been put forward in many forms, and by many spokesmen. It has thus far been steadily resisted by the American government. Behind the welter of words and arguments, the essence of our attitude, I have concluded, is an unwillingness to qualify our independence of political and military action. We have continued and expanded the practice of unilateral negotiation with the Soviet Union, and of unilateral action in the Far East. While we reserve the right to veto independent action by our allies, as the case of Suez demonstrates, we have avoided every commitment, whether of usage or of agreement, that would seem to bind our own hands in advance.

I suggest that this is the nub of our quarrel with Europe, and most conspicuously, of our quarrel with President de Gaulle.

It is in my view a serious quarrel, and it should be an urgent goal of our foreign policy that it be faced, negotiated, and cleared away by agreement. The policy of doing nothing until President de Gaulle retires has been self-defeating, and has helped to make the quarrel worse. It has led to our flirtation with the danger of seeming to favor Germany over France and Britain, a course which could only weaken the fabric of the Alliance.

No single step, and no single subject, offers any hope in itself of eliminating the malaise of the Alliance. Before progress can be made on any particular front, the air has to be cleared between Britain, France, Germany and the United States, and above all, between France and the United States, because the conflict has been most acute there. Our goal should be the concord of the Entente Cordiale, the most successful of modern alliances. That goal can only be accomplished through the achievement of understanding, and if possible of agreement, on political fundamentals. If, as I should contend, the division of the Allies over Suez exemplifies the path to catastrophe, it follows that procedures to minimize the chance of such divisions deserve a place high on the agenda. The long silence between the President of France and the President of the United States has been unhealthy.

From every point of view, the strengthening of the Alliance should not be delayed. The primitive safety of all the Allies, and of the entire free world, depends upon the cohesion and coherence of the Alliance. It is an illusion to think that even the United States could long protect its national security unaided by its Allies. The nations of the West are interdependent. Their arrangements for cooperation should reflect the realities of that fact. Unless strong institutions are soon developed to keep Europe and the United States in political harness, the West will speak with at least two voices, which could easily cancel each other as an influence in world politics.

In the context of this conclusion, the insufficiency of a plan such as the Multilateral Nuclear Force stands out sharply. That plan contemplates a jointly controlled and jointly financed allied naval force, supplied with American nuclear weapons. It would supplement the principal strategic and tactical defense forces of the Alliance. Since transfers of the nuclear weapons would be a discretionary act on the part of the United States, the program would leave the M.L.F. as dependent on American supplies as the British were on Skybolt. This would remain the case unless at some point a most unlikely decision were made, against our will, that the M.L.F. should obtain the necessary weapons abroad.

As part of a broader program to coordinate the political, economic and military policies of the Alliance, proposals such as the M.L.F. could play a useful, if subordinate role. In the absence of a broad program such proposals cannot meet the political needs they are intended to satisfy, for it would leave Europe quite as dependent as it is now on our nuclear establishment, without gaining a responsible voice in the process of political decision.

In Germany, of course, proposals such as the M.L.F. are attractive to the spirit of nationalism, as a first step towards freedom from post-war restrictions on her nuclear armament. In other parts of Europe, they are regarded at best as a symbol of the need for strong Atlantic institutions, at worst as a device to divert attention from the real problems of the Alliance.

It is difficult to understand the vigor with which we pressed the plan, save as an expression of a natural desire to win a political victory. But diplomacy is not tennis. And some victories can be bought at too high a price. M.L.F. achieved by deadline, and by the threat to go ahead bilaterally with Germany, could only reinforce the determination of many to create an independent Europe as a genuinely autonomous political and nuclear power.

The continuation of that trend would be contrary to our interests, and to those of Europe's. In the world of tomorrow, security and progress cannot be achieved by "separate but equal" political and military arrangements. In this realm, as in others, a coming together in equality, through appropriate forms of integration and unity, is our best hope of safety and of progress. As Franklin remarked a long time ago, under circumstances which are not without pertinence today, "Join or Die."

Mr. Speaker, our committee is indebted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER] for reviewing Dean Rostow's statement. Mr. MOSHER is third-ranking minority member of the Committee on Science ar Astronautics. I now yield to Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Alliance is in uneasy disarray and decline. There is confusion, conflict, suspicion, skepticism in the political relationships between the United States and its European allies.

Rostow asserts as obvious the immediate, imperative necessity to end that confusion and conflict, to make a new start with a strengthened and expanded Alliance, including Japan. America's national interests require it, and the "primitive safety" of the free world requires it.

I find convincing Rostow's definition of the problem and the need. I am glad that he argues from the viewpoint of American national interest. But his paper is very limited; he hardly touches his announced subject, "The Prospects of the Atlantic Alliance," if by prospects is meant that which can be anticipated, expected, or hoped for. He does not attempt specific recommendations.

Rostow implies that the initiative must come from the United States, if the required new "cohesion and coherence" of the Alliance is to be achieved, and he suggests we should not wait until after De Gaulle retires. There is a critical lag in the attitudes and conduct of the United States in its relations with Europe; they are today essentially of the same nature as 10 years ago—at the time of the Suez affair—they are increasingly out-of-phase with the political realities of Europe's new strength and independence. And he says this "offers President Johnson a striking opportunity to make a fresh start."

It is more than an opportunity, it is an absolute necessity that President Johnson should take that initiative. But will he? Can he? Mr. Johnson, the State Department, the Pentagon, the Congress, the American people—all of us are bogged down in Vietnam and seemingly sinking deeper every day, lucky if we are not strangled there completely.

It may prove to be one of the most unfortunate ironies of history that the United States at the height of its power, became so completely absorbed in a vicious, major war in southeast Asia—to stop the spread of communism—that it simply neglected, or lacked the resources and will, to meet its more significant obligations in other parts of the world, and thus actually left Europe—to say nothing of Africa and Latin America—increasingly vulnerable to Soviet influences.

Certainly, Rostow is right, that Soviet Russia has much to gain from every divisive influence which may disrupt the Atlantic Alliance. He suggests Ben Franklin's words are pertinent, "Join or die." A genuine pooling of allied talents and energies is indispensible, if there is to be a balance of power sufficient to sustain the free world. If Europe and the United States increasingly speak with several voices, they will drown each other out. Continuing friction between the United States and its European allies gives the Soviets reason to be confident they can deal with each separately. Recent unilateral approaches to Moscow by Britain, France, and the United States tend to confirm that.

So, it is today a most crucial question—terribly important for our national interests and for the life of the whole free world—whether or not President Johnson has the wisdom, will, and courage, or can find the time and energy, to initiate the diplomatic offensive which is long overdue and now imperative, to achieve the political understandings and agreements for a significantly new, expanded alliance.

Above, I expressed the fear that Vietnam might keep the President from giving adequate attention to that task. On the other hand, conceivably it may be our Vietnam dilemma which will itself force the President to act to strengthen the alliance. Does not our unilateral action in Vietnam and the troubles it now is bringing down upon us, demonstrate dramatically our need for strong and ready partners? And does not Vietnam demonstrate the need for a free world alliance, as Rostow suggests which should apply to more than the Atlantic region? For certainly the whole free world is interdependent. The troubled puzzlement, lack of sympathy and suspicion with which our European allies look upon our present course in Asia, reemphasizes the imperative need for fresh, fundamental, realistic political understandings and agreements, or the alliance will crumble completely.

I have emphasized that the President must take the initiative to begin very soon the hard negotiations which will be required with our allies. Under our system he alone has the necessary authority to do that. But many others, certainly Congressmen, should be encouraging the President to act, should be calling forcefully for the building of a new, stronger free world alliance. And among the most insistent should be Republican voices.

These further comments occur to me—but none are original with me—as being pertinent:

First. Any military alliance—such as NATO—will come under stress when an individual member nation, acting in its own national interest, takes some independent action which its allies do not support. Thus, France withdrew some of its NATO forces to fight in Algeria; Britain and France took independent action in Suez; and the U.S. action in Vietnam now has little or no support from NATO Allies. Other allies expect such divergencies occasionally, and a sound alliance can survive such stresses; the long-term goals and broader community ties that bind the alliance together are stronger than the temporary differences.

But an alliance will not long survive when one nation attempts to dictate a course for the whole which is not recognized by the others as absolutely necessary in its own national interest, and which is contrary to the interests of one or more of the other members. Has not the United States created a crisis in NATO by doing exactly that? Witness the agreement we required of Britain at Nassau; the attempts by Secretary McNamara to dictate a NATO strategic policy to the rest of the Allies; U.S. efforts to impose our formula for a multilateral nuclear force—MLF—on Europe. This dominant posture of one ally goes far beyond the occasional differences which can be tolerated within an alliance. France also is recently guilty of attempting to dictate the future of NATO.

Second. NATO is no longer the necessity for the Western European nations that it once was. NATO has achieved its original goal of shielding Europe until it could become self-reliant and self-confident. Our allies there have grown out of their hopelessness of 20 years ago, to become a vigorous, industrial complex which competes with the United States for world markets and challenges our world political leadership. De Gaulle's independent leadership, divergent from ours on occasion, symbolizes the new strength of the Western World, and should be recognized as that, rather than as any indication of imminent division and collapse.

I repeat, NATO is no longer such a necessity for the new, strong Europe; but a new, stronger, broader alliance with our European and other free world allies is more than ever a necessity for the United States. The vastly enlarged, manifold economic and political problems which beset us because of our position of world leadership responsibility, vigorously challenged everywhere by the thrust of communism, require that we find strong partners willing to share the load.

Third. Western Europe is no longer an American protectorate, and to the extent that we think or treat is as such, we court disaster. Have the Kennedy and Johnson administrations really recognized that truth? The U.S. stubborn insistence on forcing MLF upon NATO is a distressing symbol of our failure to understand the new relationships. MLF seemed a poor idea from the start, deficient as a technical solution, because of its reliance on mixed manning, and much more deficient for its lack of political reality—it infuriated our allies.

Any new alliance arrangements, to be viable, must recognize the European nations as equal partners of the United States, carrying an increased share of the load. but also sharing more in making the decisions.

Fourth. Perhaps MLF is now dead, following the recent Erhard-Johnson talks. But it is more than ever apparent that Europe's nuclear dilemma will remain the most divisive force in the Atlantic alliance. It will be impossible to build the stronger, broader, deeper alliance our U.S. national interests so urgently require, until that dilemma can be resolved. Obviously, many Europeans doubt the ultimate strength of the U.S. commitment to use our nuclear weapons—presumably against Soviet Russia—in defense of Western Europe. Many believe the nuclear stockpiles of Russia and the United States would merely serve to counter each other, in stalemate, while Europe could again be devastated as the main battlefield of a "conventional" war initiated by Russia. Therefore, the determination of France to provide her own credible nuclear deterrent. Therefore, also, Germany's preoccupation with acquiring some share and say in nuclear armament; and the fear of neighboring peoples that Germany may gain nuclear power.

The terrifying, complex problem of nuclear proliferation—how many fingers on that trigger—is much more than merely a European problem, but there is no better place to begin to solve it than within the Atlantic alliance. It demands some kind of American initiative.

Fifth. Certainly the in-depth consultations which the United States should initiate now with its allies—to agree on the evolution of the Atlantic alliance—should be in sharp contrast to the grandstanding, headline style which has characterized President Johnson's recent "peace offensive." Here is where lengthy, difficult diplomacy must be off the record until significant results have been achieved.

Sixth. Rostow's belief that Japan must be a party to the new alliance raises interesting questions. It would seem to me that the United States and its European allies must first solve their nuclear dilemma—as discussed above—before the alliance can be enlarged to include Japan.

Perhaps another necessary preliminary step should be a new SEATO alliance, including Japan.

There also is an obvious question of compatibility, if Japan is to become part of an enlarged Atlantic alliance. Rostow emphasizes that the Western peoples who are now participating in the Atlantic alliance all share much the same history and traditions, "a single civilization." That has contributed much to the strength and durability of NATO. The inclusion of Japan or the SEATO powers in a single free world alliance—for collective security—would not have the benefit of that same "single civilization" factor.

Eventually, will it be argued that Russia also must become part of the alliance? If Red China is to become the most dangerous, aggressive threat to the free world, conceivably Soviet Russia's evolving attitudes and interests might bring it within the framework of a defensive arc reaching from Norway's Arctic Circle to Japan, also including India, aimed at containing China. Russia, India, Japan, and the United States obviously have many mutual interests in that area.

Or, could these worldwide interests and frictions be better resolved in a strengthened United Nations, rather than by more and more immense, complicated military alliances?

THE REVEREND WURMBRAND RECOUNTS COMMUNIST TORTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, Rumanian Lutheran minister, should be read by every American. Especially, it should be required reading for those who countenance an appeasement of the Communist tyrants or suggest that they are maturing. It should also be read by those well-meaning clerics who wrote that they had tears in their eyes as the Russian Communist clergymen joined them in the World Council of Churches sessions a few years ago. It is a shocker but it presents an incisive portrayal of how our Judeo-Christian brothers fare at the hands of their Red tormentors.

Reverend Wurmbrand was imprisoned from 1948 to 1956 and again from 1959 to 1964 in his native land. He was exiled from there and is now in America where he was a most cooperative witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee which is the partner of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the other side of the Capitol. There could be no mistake in Reverend Wurmbrand's concern for communism. He had suffered first hand. The record is replete with other instances where Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen have recounted the same tortures, the same antireligious attitudes, the same hostility to the basic human rights that we Americans consider to be the very minimum standards that governments should foster.

As Reverend Wurmbrand put it, there is no real church behind the Iron Curtain since it is infiltrated but at the same time "there exists the underground church which works as the first Christians worked."

In other words, there is no free exercise of religion by these unfortunate men and women of the captive nations. The church above the surface is an instrumentality of the state. There is a great body of evidence to substantiate these contentions. It is well known that few if any of the so-called clerygmen who represent the U.S.S.R. at the World Council of Churches are anything other than representatives of the Communist state—in many cases they are directly under the discipline of the secret police.

To the extent that the captive people are exposed to religion in the Iron Curtain countries it is a political-economic brand of socialism and not a theological-scriptural testimony. Reverend Wurmbrand testified:

> To the Orthodox Church of Rumania foreigners come and see the liturgy and see everything so beautiful. The Church is open. They do not understand the language, they do not know what is preached. I will give you the text of the sermon. It was a sermon about an epistle of St. Paul where it was written that Christ is our peace and so the

priest explained. "Christ is our peace. Who is against peace? American imperialists. And who is on the side of the peace? We the socialist countries. So you see that Christ identifies himself with socialists and so on. Such sermons they have. They have used the religion for their own purposes in the country. Then they have used the religion for getting political positions in the West. They are not fools to send in the West representatives of the Communist Party. They sends bishops with great beards and beards are always very impressive here in the West and through these beards they influence the West.

COMMUNISTS INFLICT TORTURE

Reverend Wurmbrand adds his articulate testimony to the hundreds of other exiled clergymen who tell what happens to those who do not preach in the Communist style. Tortures so inhumane that they cannot be printed are recorded in our hearings. In his own words:

Reverend WURMBRAND. There were different cells. In solitary confinement I was the first 2½, nearly 3 years. It was in the most beautiful building of Bucharest in the building of the Secretariat of State for Internal Affairs. It is a building before which all foreigners stand and admire it. I can tell you that your White House is a very little building in comparison with ours. And there beneath the earth, 10 meters beneath the earth are the cells. There are no windows in the cells. Air enters through a tube. And there were a few desks, with a mattress, with a straw mattress. You had but three steps for a walk. Never were we taken out from these cells except for interrogations when prisoners were beaten and tortured.

For years I have never seen sun, moon, flowers, snow, stars, no man except the interrogator who beat, but I can say I have seen heaven open, I have seen Jesus Christ, I have seen the angels and we were very happy there.

But the treatment was very bad. The purpose was to make us mad. You didn't hear a noise. A whisper you didn't hear in this cell. The guard had felt shoes. For years, not to hear anything. In all these years of prison we never had a book, we never had a bit of paper, we never had a newspaper, nothing to distract our mind except that from time to time tape recorders were put on the corridor. I didn't know what a tape recorder is. I had not seen such a thing. But at once we heard beautiful Rumanian music, and then we enjoyed it. We didn't know what has happened with the Communists that they make us enjoy, and after 10 or 15 minutes at once you heard, "Ha, ha, ha, don't beat," the torturing of a woman. This lasted for half an hour, the torturing of a woman. And of 100 prisoners who had been in that cell, in that corridor, everybody recognized that it is his wife or that it is his girl. I myself thought also that it is my wife.

Never will a Westerner understand, if I would not have the marks on my body, which are my credentials.

He tells of Communist brainwashing, he tells of the Communist humiliation of religious symbols such as crosses. An example he gave is as follows:

One Sunday morning in the prison of Pitesti a young Christian was already the fourth day, day and night, tied to the cross. Twice a day the cross was put on the floor and 100 other cell inmates by beating, by tortures, were obliged to fulfill their necessities upon his face and upon his body. Then the cross was erected again and the Communists swearing and mocking "Look your Christ, look your Christ, how beautiful he is, adore him, kneel before him, how fine he smells, your Christ." And then the Sunday morning came and a Catholic priest, an acquaintance of mine, has been put to the belt, in the dirt of a cell with 100 prisoners, a plate with excrements, and one with urine was given to him and he was obliged to say the holy mass upon these elements, and he did it. And I asked him afterward, "Father, but how could you make this?" He was half mad. He answered to me: "Brother, I have suffered more than Christ. Don't reproach to me what I have done." And the other prisoners beaten to take holy communion in this form, and the Communists around, "Look, your sacraments, look, your church, what a holy church you have, what fine is your church, what holy ordinance God has given you."

CORRUPTION OF RELIGION

Reverend Wurmbrand testified that the persecution had made "Christians to be of steel. The worst thing has been the corruption of religion. They have put as religious leaders their man."

The Communists are committed to a doctrine which calls for the state to minister to the total needs of man. The family, his God, is personal desires are all placed in an unimportant position. Everything must yield to the state. Children inform on parents and evil men pose as father confessors to gain information. There can be no separation of church and state in the Communist world and those foolhardy Americans who believe otherwise are the greatest aiders and abettors of the Communists. The testimony of Reverend Wurmbrand details the total domination of religion by the state—except, of course, the religion that is practiced in the catacombs.

He also gives some prophetic warnings regarding peaceful coexistence with the Communist world. His thoughts should be weighed by every one in the free world who hears the incessant plea of the State Department apologists who measure their victories in the degree to which we can coexist with evil. Reverend Wurmbrand said:

I am a man who does not understand politics. I have not read newspapers for 14 years.

It may be right for a state to have peaceful existence with communism. I do not know. That is a question for Johnson and Goldwater to decide. But the church can never have peaceful coexistence with atheism. Everybody would laugh if I would say that health can peacefully exist with the microbe of tuberculosis, that the FBI can coexist peacefully with gangsters, that the church can peacefully exist with drunkenness, but communism and atheism is much worse than drug addiction and drunkenness. You drink a little wine and the next day it passes, but communism poisons youth and our children since 50 years. How can there be peaceful existence with this on the side of churchmen and the church leadership I cannot understand.

I must say I have been very sad. I have read in your periodicals that, I do not know why, church bodies here ask the admission of Red China in the organization of allied nations. It may be right. I do not know politics. I do not know what this organization of allied nations is, but I ask myself, "You, a church periodical, why don't you write about the tortures inflicted to Chinese Christians by the Communists? That is your business and leave the business of politics to the Senate and like this."

I express here the grief and the great pain of a suffering country and of a suffering church, and I apologize if I am a little unpolite.

AMERICANS AID TO OPPRESSORS

Reverend Wurmbrand further tells of American assistance to the oppressors of the Rumanian people. He gives a graphic commentary on our foreign aid efforts to Communist countries. Whether it be in the form of sales of wheat, building rubber plants or increased trade, what we do to help the Communist states behind the Iron Curtain helps solidify the grasp of the tyrant over the people. Note this part of his testimony:

The Rumanian people, as well as the other peoples behind the Iron Curtain, are desperate. They have abandoned hope that they will ever be released. For years we have heard a broadcast station: "Rebel against communism, rebel against communism," and when we rebelled we were abandoned.

And we see how our oppressors are helped. I will tell you a scene. Believe me, God is here. I tell you the scene just as it happened. It was in the years of brainwashing, the 14th year of prison. We are gathered to a meeting, and Major Alexandrescu, the commandant of the prison of Gherla, delivered us a speech and said:

"You fools, you set for 15 or 20 years in prison and expected the Americans to come. You expected the Americans will come and release you. Now I will give you the news. The Americans come but not to release you. They come to help us, to help us, to make business with us, to make trade with us. You fools have not known. The Americans if you beg them, they give you nothing. If you insult them, if you mock them, they give you money. We have been more clever than you."

There are words which I have heard myself. Such things have happened in our country.

Unfortunately, Reverend Wurmbrand is all too accurate in this account. At this very time, American investments are being used to help Rumanians acquire a pork processing plant which will eventually breed and process more than 300,000 pigs a year. The pork products, in turn, would be shipped over here and sold in the United States. As a result of a policy laid down by President Johnson, the Export-Import Bank stands ready to support American industrial development of Communist Rumania even though that Red nation is actively aiding Hanoi wage war against American troops in South Vietnam. The Export-Import Bank will probably extend credits of as much as 70 percent to this undertaking, Mr. Speaker, and you know where they get most of their money—from the U.S. taxpayers.

While on the subject of Vietnam, Reverend Wurmbrand told how he handled a group of peaceniks who were protesting American actions there. He listened to a group which was venting their wrath against the United States. He stripped to the waist showing his scars and said:

"This have Communists done to me. Do you think that American Christians should fight against communism?" So they surrounded me and asked me, "Why have Communists done to you this?" I said to them, "Suppose that I am a murderer. Do you agree that a murderer should be tortured? Has Oswald been tortured? Has Ruby been tortured with you?" They all said, "No; murderers have not been tortured." I continued: "Then know that I have not been charged with murder. I am a clergyman."

They stopped the demonstration. In Philadelphia there was again such a demonstration. I am not a man of politics. I can't speak for the war of Vietnam or against the war in Vietnam. I speak this general principle that Christians must be on the side of righteousness. They must never be on the side of the inquisitors of Christians. They must be on the side of the victims of the inquisitors, they must be on the side of the Christians.

TWENTIETH CENTURY MARTYRS

Mr. Speaker, the American people must become aware of the nature of world communism. Nothing in our religious heritage, nothing in the Bible requires us to be stupid, to close our eyes. Love thy neighbor still applies and we certainly must love those poor oppressed peoples. Yet we must not love evil and communism is evil. Reverend Wurmbrand joins the many great Christians who have stood up to communism, persevered and now bring their message to the rest of the world. I am personally glad that there are men in this world like Rev. Richard Wurmbrand and they will always be our brothers in this battle against the insidious agents of the Devil, the Communists. They are the 20th century martyrs. They may well be 20th century prophets. We should listen and we should take heed.

Because of the potent nature of Reverend Wurmbrand's testimony, Mr. Speaker, I include it in its entirety at this point.

COMMUNIST EXPLOITATION OF RELIGION

U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1966.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:20 a.m., in room 318, Old Senate Office Building, Senator THOMAS J. DODD presiding.

Also present: Jay G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator; and Robert C. McManus, investigations analyst.

Senator DODD. I will call this hearing to order. We have as our witness today Pastor Richard Wurmbrand, who is a refugee from Rumania. Mr. Sourwine will introduce and read a copy of Dr. Wurmbrand's credentials.

I must say, before you do so, that we are grateful for your appearing here. I am familiar with the nature of your testimony—I think I am—to an extent. I feel that you are rendering a real service to the cause of the free world.

Go ahead, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, this letter of credentials, which I shall read pursuant to your instructions, was given to Dr. Wurmbrand by Dr. Hedenquist, who is the mission director of the Svenska Israelsmissionen. The reason is explained in the text. It reads:

"Pastor Richard Wurmbrand is a refugee from Rumania, a country which he had to leave because of the antireligious persecution. Fleeing from there, he has not the usual credentials, which have been taken from him at his arrestation by the secret police of the Communists.

"Our mission, knowing him since 26 years, certify hereby that he is an Evangelical Minister who has had until now the following functions:

"From April 1939, to January 1940, he was secretary of the church's mission to the Jews which had to retire from Rumania at the last date because of the war.

"During the whole war he has been pastor of our mission in Rumania.

"Since our mission retired from Rumania in 1945, from that year to 1948 he has been a pastor of the Norwegian mission to the Jews.

"In the same time he has worked also in the representation of the World Council of Churches for Rumania.

"He was also a professor of the Old Testament in the Seminary of Bucharest.

"From 1948 to 1956, he was in prison for religious motives.

"Released in 1956, he was no more authorized by the Communist authorities to fulfill his duties. From 1956 to 1959 he preached and exercised his other pastoral functions illegally.

"Rearrested for this in 1959, he was again in prison until July 1964, when he was released on the basis of a general amnesty.

"Since 1964, he was pastor of the Evangelical Church in Orshova, a Rumanian town.

"Continuing to be the object of persecution and being in great danger, our Scandinavian missions to the Jews succeeded to make him escape from there.

"We recommend him as a most reliable person, a fine Christian who has published several books against atheism and communism and who has got a burning heart for Christ and for all people in need."

This is signed by Dr. Hedenquist, doctor of theology, mission director in Sweden for Svenska Israelsmissionen.

Reverend WURMBRAND. He is the former secretary of the World Council of Missions.

Senator DODD. Without objection, this letter will be included in the record. Since it has been read, it will not be reprinted.

Mr. Sourwine, you may proceed. I have some questions which I might as well ask to begin with, rather than wait until later.

Pastor, how many languages do you speak?

Reverend WURMBRAND. There are legends about me that I speak very many languages. Something like 14.

Senator DODD. Forty?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Fourteen.

Senator DODD. Obviously, you speak English.

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes; English, French, German, Hungarian, and so on.

Senator DODD. Did you come directly from Rumania?

Reverend WURMBRAND. No, no; from Rumania I went to Italy, from Italy to Oslo, and then from Europe I came to the States.

Senator DODD. From where?

Reverend WURMBRAND. From Paris.

Senator DODD. When was that?

Reverend WURMBRAND. I came to the States 3 weeks ago.

Senator DODD. Were you required by the secret police to make any commitments before you could leave Rumania?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Before I left Rumania I was called twice to the secret police. The first time they said that they don't know yet if they will allow me to leave the country with my family. They said: "Dollars have been received for you. You will have to leave the country, but perhaps we will let some time to pass, because your remembrances of prison are too fresh and you have too good a pen."

Senator DODD. What?

Reverend WURMBRAND. A pen. "You can too well write. Perhaps we will keep somebody here of your family as hostage."

The second time they called me again and they said: "Now you will leave the country, but be very cautious when you come out. You may preach Christ as much as you like. We know that you are a preacher, but don't touch us. Don't speak against Communists. If you will speak against communism, for $1,000 we can find a gangster who will liquidate you. We play with you with open cards. You come from prison. You have met in prison men whom we have brought back from the West."

And that is the truth. I have been in prison with a Rumanian Orthodox priest, Vasile Leul, who has been kidnaped from Austria. I have seen his nails torn out and broken, and so they reminded me of that. "You know how our prisons are and that you can come back in prison."

And the third thing which they said: "We have also another possibility with you. We can destroy you morally outside. We will find a story with a girl or a money story or something else and people will be stupid enough to believe it. We will destroy you if you touch us."

And under these conditions I was allowed to come out. And very sorrowfully in the West I found people in the West, even religious leaders, who told me the same thing: "Preach Christ as much as you like but don't touch Communists."

Senator DODD. As I understand it, you said you came to this country 3 weeks ago.

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes, sir; just today it is 1 month.

Senator DODD. Three weeks?

Reverend WURMBRAND. One month today.

Senator DODD. Were you in prison from 1948 to 1956?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes, and then imprisoned again in January 1959 to 1964.

Senator DODD. Were you in the same prison all of that time?

Reverend WURMBRAND. No, no; we were transferred from one prison to the others.

Senator DODD. From 1956 to 1959 as I understand it, you exercised your religious function in spite of the law against such activity, did you not?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes, yes.

Senator DODD. How did you do this?

Reverend WURMBRAND. When I came out from prison in 1956, I was licensed to preach—of course, nobody can preach in our country except he has a license from the Government—and in the beginning I got a license, but which was withdrawn from me after the first week of preaching.

The motives are so comical you would say. In a sermon I said that Christians must keep hope, because the wheel of history turns, and the wheel of life.

"You meant us, that communism will change, that communism will fall. Never will it fall." It has been reproached to me that in a sermon I have said Christians must practice patience, patience, and again patience. "Ah, you meant that the Americans will come and we must be patient until they come."

Everything was misinterpreted, and so the license has been withdrawn from me. And then generally in the Soviet countries there exists the underground church which works as the first Christians worked. Only now we understand texts of the Bible which we had not understood before. I did not know why it is written in the Bible that a man named Simon was called Peter. Simon was called Niger and so on. Everyone is called otherwise than his mother called him. So it is with us now. In every village I was called by another name. I was called Valentin, Georgescu, Ruben. In every village I had another name, and so I could preach.

I did not understand in earlier times why Jesus, when He wishes to have the last supper, and: "Go in town and you will see a man with a pitcher and go after him and where he enters prepare the supper."

Why does he not give an address, a number, and a street? Now we know it when we make secret prayer meetings. We never give the address. We don't know if that man is not the informer of the secret police. We tell to the man to wait in a public garden or somewhere, and when one with a flower here, or with a necktie passes, go after him. We don't introduce ourselves to each other, and if somebody asks the name of the other one, we know that he is the informer of the secret police. And so we have developed a technique of secret church work, and so I could work.

Senator Dodd. How did you keep alive? How did you sustain yourself?

Reverend Wurmbrand. The Christians sustained me everywhere. I had no salary, I had no regular salary but the Christians everywhere sustained me. In Rumania the first question asked about a pastor or a priest of any denomination, is: Has he been in prison? If he has been in prison he is all right. All the Christians sustain him.

Senator Dodd. You were rearrested in 1959, as I understand it.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes.

Senator Dodd. Were you kept in the same prison until your release in 1964?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No. Then, also, I was in several prisons.

Senator Dodd. Could you describe for us the cell in which you were kept in solitary confinement?

Reverend Wurmbrand. There were different cells. In solitary confinement I was the first 2½, nearly 3 years. It was in the most beautiful building of Bucharest in the building of the Secretariat of State for Internal Affairs. It is a building before which all foreigners stand and admire it. I can tell you that your White House is a very little building in comparison with ours. And there beneath the earth, 10 meters beneath the earth are the cells. There are no windows in the cells. Air enters through a tube. And there were a few desks, with a mattress, with a straw mattress. You had but three steps for a walk. Never were we taken out from these cells except for interrogations when prisoners were beaten and tortured.

For years I have never seen sun, moon, flowers, snow, stars, no man except the interrogator who beat, but I can say I have seen heaven open, I have seen Jesus Christ, I have seen the angels and we were very happy there.

But the treatment was very bad. The purpose was to make us mad. You didn't hear a noise. A whisper you didn't hear in this cell. The guard had felt shoes. For years, not to hear anything. In all these years of prison we never had a book, we never had a bit of paper, we never had a newspaper, nothing to distract our mind except that from time to time tape recorders were put on the corridor. I didn't know what a tape recorder is. I had not seen such a thing. But at once we heard beautiful Rumanian music, and then we enjoyed it. We didn't know what has happened with the Communists that they make us enjoy, and after 10 or 15 minutes at once you heard, "Ha, ha, ha, don't beat," the torturing of a woman. This lasted for half an hour, the torturing of a woman. And of 100 prisoners who had been in that cell, in that corridor, everybody recognized that it is his wife or that it is his girl. I myself thought also that it is my wife.

Never will a Westerner understand, if I would not have the marks on my body, which are my credentials.

Senator Dodd. Excuse me, never will who understand?

Reverend Wurmbrand. A Westerner can't understand.

Senator Dodd. A Westerner?

Reverend Wurmbrand. A Westerner can't understand God is here and knows that I will not tell you the whole truth because if I will tell you the whole truth, you will faint and rush out of this room, not bearing to hear what things have happened. But I will tell you that in a prison they crucified a cat before ourselves. They beat nails in the feet of the cat and the cat was hanging with the head down, and now you can imagine how this cat screamed and the prisoners, mad, beat on the door, "Free the cat, free the cat, free the cat," and the Communists very polite, "Oh, surely we will free the cat, but give the statements which we ask from you and then the cat will be freed," and I have known men who have given statements against their wives, against their children, against their parents to free the cat. They did it out of madness, and then the parents and the wives have been tortured like the cat. Such things have happened with us.

Senator Dodd. Did you have any fellow Christian like you imprisoned?

Reverend Wurmbrand. We had hundreds of bishops, priests, monks in prisons; my wife who is near me, she has been with Catholic nuns. My wife tells that they were angels; such have been put in prisons. Nearly all Catholic bishops died in prison. Innumerable Orthodox and Protestants have been in prison, too.

Senator Dodd. The point I was getting at—and I guess I did not make it clear—were the Christians treated any differently or mistreated any differently?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Everybody in prison was very badly treated. And I cannot be contradicted on this question, because I have been with physicians, I have much more broken bones than anybody, so either I broke my bones or somebody else broke them. And if I would not have been a clergyman but a murderer—it is a crime to torture a murderer, too. The Christian prisoners were tortured in a form which should mock their religion. I tell you again in the prison of Pitesti one scene I will describe you about torturing and mocking Christians, and believe me I would renounce to eternal life to paradise after which I long, if I tell you one word of exaggeration. God is here and knows that I do not say everything. It cannot be said. There are ladies here. There are other people hearing it.

One Sunday morning in the prison of Pitesti a young Christian was already the fourth day, day and night, tied to the cross. Twice a day the cross was put on the floor and 100 other cell inmates by beating, by tortures, were obliged to fulfill their necessities upon his face and upon his body. Then the cross was erected again and the Communists swearing and mocking "Look your Christ, look your Christ, how beautiful he is, adore him, kneel before him, how fine he smells, your Christ." And then the Sunday morning came and a Catholic priest, an acquaintance of mine, has been put to the belt, in the dirt of a cell with 100 prisoners, a plate with excrements, and one with urine was given to him and he was obliged to say the holy mass upon these elements, and he did it. And I asked him afterward, "Father, but how could you make this?" He was half mad. He answered to me: "Brother, I have suffered more than Christ. Don't reproach to me what I have done." And the other prisoners beaten to take holy communion in this form, and the Communists around, "Look, your sacraments, look, your church, what a holy church you have, what fine is your church, what holy ordinance God has given you."

I am a very insignificant and a very little man. I have been in prison among the weak ones and the little ones, but I speak for a suffering country and for a suffering church and for the heroes and the saints of the 20th century; we have had such saints in our prison to which I did not dare to lift my eyes.

I am a Protestant, but we have had near us Catholic bishops and monks and nuns about whom we felt that the touching of their garments heals. We were not worthy to untie their shoelaces. Such men have been mocked and tortured in our country. And even if it would mean to go back to a Rumanian prison, to be kidnaped by the Communists and going back and tortured again, I cannot be quiet. I owe it to those who have suffered there.

Senator Dodd. Now, did the Rumanian secret police employ brainwashing techniques?

Reverend Wurmbrand. The worst thing has been the brainwashing. All the tortures of times before were nothing in comparison with brainwashing.

To describe very shortly brainwashing: First of all we were doped. The dope was put in our food. I did not know about this dope. But we saw only the results, a dope which gave two results. First of all, what the physician calls aleulia which means lack of power of will. The power of will was completely broken. If we were told, "Lift your hand," I lifted it. If I was not told to let the hand down, I would never have left it down. We were at the same time very much undernourished. We had times when we received 100 grams, one slice of bread, a week. It was told to us, "We give you as many calories as you need to be able to breathe only," and so our power of will has been broken.

Second, this drug or perhaps it is another drug, produces the delirium of self-accusation. I have seen prisoners knocking during the night on the door and saying, "Take me to the interrogator, I have new things to say against me." Prisoners quarreled with their interrogators to say against themselves more than the interrogators asked from them. And then we have had in prisons the curious phenomenon that we as priests received confessions from other prisoners. Now everybody is a sinner, but not everybody is a criminal. Men who have never murdered confessed that they have murdered, that they have committed adultery, and that they have stolen. They felt they had to accuse themselves. This has also been the result of this doping. And after we were doped like that—that is the secret of all the Soviet show trials, in which the prisoners accuse themselves—then the time of brainwashing came. For 17 hours a day from 5 in the morning to 10 in the evening we had to sit like this. We were not allowed to learn. We were not allowed to rest a little bit our weary heads upon our hands. To close your eyes was a crime. Seventeen hours a day we had to sit like that and hear from the morning to the evening: "Communism is good, communism is good, communism is good, communism is good," until you heard one who was already 20 years in prison under the Communists shouting, "Communism is good, communism is good, communism is good, I give my life for communism."

It was after the technique of Professor Pavlov, a scientifical suggestion.

In prison there were not only priests and pastors. We have had hundreds of peasants and young boys and girls who were put in prison for their Christian faith. These were separated and for them there was a special brainwashing, not only that "communism is good," but "Christianity is dead, Christianity is dead, Christianity is dead. Nobody more believes in Christ, nobody more believes in Christ, you are the only fools."

And so on. And I must tell you that you may know how far this brainwashing went. I do not like to pose here like a hero. I believed that Christianity is dead under this influence. I believed——

Senator Dodd. I did not hear that.

Reverend Wurmbrand. I believed that Christianity is dead under this suggestion. Nobody goes more to church. They gave us post cards. I have not seen my wife for 10 years. They gave me post cards, they gave to all of us post cards: "Write to your children and wife; they may come and on that day see you and bring your parcels," so on that day we were shaved; we expected and expected until the evening and nobody came. They had not sent the post cards, but we did not know. Then came the brainwashings. "Your wives are laying in bed with men," obscene words, "Your children hate you. You have nobody to love in the world. You are the only fools. Give up faith. Nobody is more Christians. Christianity is dead."

I believed also that nobody is more a Christian. I had read in the Bible that there will be in the last time the great apostasy, that people will leave the faith and I believe that I lived now this time. But I said to myself if Christianity is dead, I will sit at its tomb and will weep until it arises again, just as Mary Magdalene sat at the tomb of Jesus and wept until Jesus showed himself. Then when I came out of prison I saw Christianity is not dead. The number of practicing Christians in Rumania according to the figures given by the Communists themselves in 20 years of Communist dictatorship has grown 300 percent.

Senator Dodd. How do the Communists use religion for their own purposes if they do?

Reverend Wurmbrand. That is a very tragic side. The worse thing in Rumania has not been the persecution of Christians. The persecution has made the Christians to be of steel. The worst thing has been the corruption of religion. They have put as religious leaders their man. A bishop, a pastor, a preacher, just a man like other man and can commit sins. Now if they found a preacher or somebody else in adultery or in some money irregularity or I do not know what sin, they called him and blackmailed him and said, "Now you must become our man. Otherwise we publish what we have found." Or they found others who were weak ones, whom they promised I do not know what. They never keep their promises. And these men, they put at the leadership of religion everywhere.

They have their bishops, their bishop vicar, their professors of theology, their presidents of the Baptists and Pentacostals and so on. I could give names. I know this from firsthand. Because many of these, when we came out of prison, out of remorse confessed to us what they have done. And now they use these men. With us in Rumania religion is a very great thing. You do not find much religious difference in Rumania. By these weak Christians, the Communists used religion for their propaganda. When the Communists came to power in Rumania, they convoked in the building of our parliament a congress of all the cults. There were 4,000 priests; pastors, rabbis of all religions were there. Our Prime Minister Groza, said the same things which you hear now in the West. This was in 1945 when they came to power with us. "You know Rumanian communism will not be like Russian communism. We are a democratic communism. We will not persecute the church. We are on the side of monarchy. We will never collectivate agriculture. We are something entirely else and you should be on our side and then we will protect religion and we will give salaries to the priests."

And the priests, good men, simply believed him and cheered him. Priests and bishops one after the other stood up and said, "Well, if your communism is otherwise than the Russian communism, if it will be a good communism, we do not object against communism in principle." And one after the other stood up and praised this form of communism. There was only one in that congress who protested and said that communism can never change, that terror is an essential part of communism, because communism is contrary to human nature.

What would you say if I would take the purse out of your pocket? Everyone wishes to have something. A dog wishes to have a bone, and communism is against human nature because it does not allow you to have anything of yours and so communism must use terror. At that congress there was only one who said these things. This one is now before you.

But what has happened? I went to prison, this was one of the charges against me. I met in prison all those who had praised communism, all those who have collaborated with communism, and they were treated just like me. They had been the fools. There was only one difference that I was in prison with a good conscience and they were with a bad conscience. In prison they had remorse. Religion was used for Communist propaganda in our counrty.

Just to give you one example: To the Orthodox Church of Rumania foreigners come and see the liturgy and see everything so beautiful. The church is open. They do not understand the language, they do not know what is preached. I will give you the text of the sermon. It was a sermon about an epistile of St. Paul where it was written that Christ is our peace, and so the priest explained, "Christ is our peace. Who is against peace? American imperialists. And who is on the side of the peace? We, the Socialist countries."

So you see that Christ identifies himself with socialism and so on. Such sermons they have. They have used the religion for their own purposes in the country. Then they have used the religion for getting political positions in the West. They are not fools to send in the West representatives of the Communist Party. They send bishops with great beards and beards are always very impressive here in the West, and through these beards they influence the West.

Senator Dodd. I have many more questions, but would you show your wounds and scars, if you have some?

Reverend Wurmbrand. I apologize here before the ladies.

Senator Dodd. Take your time. If ever a man was entitled to time, I think you are.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Look here, look here, look here. Look here, look here. And so the whole body.

Senator Dodd. What is the scar behind your ear?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Here they put the knife and said, "Give accusatory statements against your bishops and against the other pastors. Do you give or not?" And they cut. It is true that they did not cut very deeply.

Senator Dodd. These are all knife wounds?

Reverend Wurmbrand. They tortured by all means. They beat until they broke the bones. They used red-hot irons, they used knives, they used everything. And what was the first thing is not that they beat, not what they did, but how they did it. They interrogated you very politely, and if you did not wish to say what they asked they said, "Well, we have the first. On the 15th you will be beaten and tortured at 10 o'clock in the evening."

Imagine what 14 days were after this. We have had prisoners who during this time, which has been given to them, knocked at the door, "I can't bear it. I will say everything," before they have been tortured.

Senator Dodd. I wish you would turn around before you put your shirt on.

Reverend Wurmbrand. And that it may be very clear, it is not that I boast with these marks. I show to you the tortured body of my country, of my fatherland, and of my church, and they appeal to the American Christians and to all freemen of America to think about our tortured body, and we do not ask you to help us. We ask you only one thing. Do not help our oppressors and do not praise them. You cannot be a Christian and praise the inquisitors of Christians. That is what I have to say.

Senator Dodd. All right. You may put on your clothes. That scar on your right breast, do you remember how that was inflicted?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; by knife.

Senator Dodd. By knife?

Reverend Wurmbrand. By knife. I have been in Oslo. I went to a hospital. There were several physicians. I can give their names. I spoke with them about religion. In the beginning they said, "We are atheists," and then they saw my body and I asked them what treatment do I need. They said: "About treatment, do not ask us. Ask only the one in whom we don't believe, but who has kept you alive, because according to our medical books, you are dead. A man who has what you have, with four vertebras broken, cannot live. According to our medical books, you are dead. If you are alive, then the one in who we don't believe has kept you alive."

Senator Dodd. I think it is important for our purposes to understand this completely. As I take it, they cut you, but they must have been asking you questions.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Surely, surely. I had worked in the representation of the World Council of Churches in Rumania, and after the war this World Council of Churches made a great relief work and I myself had relationship with the Rumanian patriarchs and with the bishops and with the Baptists and with the Pentacostals and Lutherans and so on, and we worked with all these. And now they wish to make with us in Rumania a great show process, a great show trial as they have made in Hungary with Cardinal Mindszenty and so on, and they wished from me accusatory statements against all these with whom I have had connections, and because I did not wish to give these accusatory statements, I and others have been tortured. This has been the usual thing. Nobody enters in the Rumanian secret police without being beaten, without being tortured. I have been not the worst tortured. The proof is that I am alive. So many died. Nearly all our Catholic bishops have been so handled that they have died, and in that time the Russians were in our country, they decided that the Catholic bishops should be killed. One of the members of the Government has been Gromyko, one of the murderers of Christians. Perhaps you will understand why I call his name.

Senator Dodd. Yes; I do.

Reverend Wurmbrand. I have seen Catholic priests, heroes, dying not only for Christ and confessing Christ to the end, but dying for the Pope.

I have heard the word of a Catholic priest, I will not tell his name. He was asked, "Do you still believe in the Pope?" and he said, "Since St. Peter there has always been a Pope, and until Christ will come again there will always be a Pope. And the actual Pope, Pius the 12th, has not made peace with you and never will a Pope shake hands with you." He was trampled under the feet and tortured to death. Under our eyes he was killed. At that time a member of the government who killed this Catholic priest has been Gromyko, and the priest died with the hope that never will a Pope shake hands with his murderers.

Senator Dodd. You saw and heard this yourself.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes, surely; and it is not only one case. I could never finish if I would tell you what I have seen. I must just pour out before you my heart. I speak for a country and I speak for a church. We are very, very sad there about all these compromises. I must tell you I have been in England before I came to the States, and I have spoken with high Christian officials from England. The Archbishop of Canterbury and many canons and so on have been in our country recently, last year. So I asked Christian leaders—I will not tell names—"Why have you sat at banquets with our inquisitors? I am a little pastor, I cannot interrogate you, but I speak for the others who cannot speak for themselves. Why have you sat at banquets with our inquisitors?"

I was answered, "We are Christians and must have friendship and fellowship with everybody, with the Communists, too. Don't you agree?"

I said, "I can't polemicize with you. I have not read the Bible for 14 years. You must know Christianity better than I. Faintly I remember in the Bible it is written that friendship with the world is hatred toward God. But supposing you must have friendship and fellowship with everybody. How is it that you have had friendship and fellowship only with our inquisitors, and with us never?"

Never have these great men of the West been in the houses of Christian martyrs. I have an only son and I love him. I cannot look to him. He looks like a skeleton. He has hungered. He will never be healthy. And so many of our children died. All these great prelates from the West are great men. I am very little in comparison with them. But I always asked myself, "Well, all right, make friendship with the Communists. But only with the Communists?" They never inquired about us.

I asked them, "Why did you go to see the Pope, who is all right, who does not need your visit? When you have been in Rumania why have you not visited the tombs of the Catholic bishops killed in tortures? Why have you not shed there a tear? Why have you not put there a flower? That is what we expected. Why have you not left 10 pounds? Ten pounds would have been the salvation of a Catholic family there. You go to see the Pope. The Pope is all right. He has to eat and to drink." But I must say we are very sad there about these compromises with communism. We do not understand. I am a man who does not understand politics. I have not read newspapers for 14 years.

It may be right for a state to have peaceful existence with communism. I do not know. That is a question for Johnson and Goldwater to decide. But the church can never have peaceful coexistence with atheism. Everybody would laugh if I would say that health can peacefully exist with the microbe of tuberculosis, that the FBI can coexist peacefully with gangsters, that the church can peacefully exist with drunkenness, but communism and atheism is much worse than drug addiction and drunkenness. You drink a little wine and the next day it passes, but communism poisons youth and our children since 50 years. How can there be peaceful existence with this on the side of churchmen and the church leadership I cannot understand.

I must say I have been very sad. I have read in your periodicals that, I do not know why, church bodies here ask the admission of Red China in the organization of allied nations. It may be right. I do not know politics. I do not know what this organization of allied nations is, but I ask myself, "You, a church periodical, why don't you write about the tortures inflicted to Chinese Christians by the Communists? That is your business and leave the business of politics to the Senate and like this."

I express here the grief and the great pain of a suffering country and of a suffering church, and I apologize if I am a little unpolite.

Senator DODD. You were the representative of the World Council of Christian Churches?

Reverend WURMBRAND. I was one of the workers of the office of the World Council of Churches. This man who gives me a certificate, this Pastor Hedenquist, was at that time one of the leaders of the Council of Churches who came to Rumania.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were responding to the chairman's question about what had been asked of you under interrogation. Did you complete that answer?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Well, it is a very interesting thing. Jesus says that the children of this world are wiser than the children of light. You are a political body. You interrogate me about what I have been asked about the World Council of Churches. The World Council of Churches never put to me this question.

Senator DODD. Never what?

Reverend WURMBRAND. They have never put to me the question, "You have been arrested. One of the main subjects of your interrogation was that you represented us in Rumania. Please tell us what have you been interrogated about?"

I was never asked by them. The secret police wished to know everybody with whom they worked and with whom we had connections and so on. One of the great purposes of their interrogation was to know how they could win the World Council of Churches for their position.

Mr. SOURWINE. How they could win?

Reverend WURMBRAND. The Council of Churches to defend their position.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you answer that one?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Well, I hoped—I must say that I was mistaken in the answers which I gave—I hoped that the World Council of Churches will never be won to their position.

Senator DODD. Will never be what?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Won for their position.

Senator DODD. Work for their position?

Reverend WURMBRAND. That they will never, so I had hoped. And now when I came out I read last month there was a sitting of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, in which they took the following decision, a very nice decision: "We ask America to stop its fight against communism, and we ask also the Commiunist governments to stop their fight to overthrow the social regime everywhere," which was a very nice decision. "We ask both parts to keep peace."

But in the East nobody published this decision of theirs. Nobody in the East has the slightest idea of this decision. So this disarms only the West. Such decisions are taken. They look very fine. The purpose has been accomplished.

Mr. SOURWINE. In effect, the sole accomplishment has been to ask the West to stop its fight?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mentioned questions about the World Council of Churches. Was there more than one, or was there just the single question of how they could win it for their purposes?

Reverend WURMBRAND. No; there were also other questions; what relief they sent and to whom they gave this relief and what was the political purpose of this relief, and so on. They considered then the World Council of Churches—that was in 1948—they considered the World Council of Churches as an American spy organization. They do not consider it any more like that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were being questioned by the Rumanian secret police were you not?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you say they wanted to know how they could win the World Council of Churches for their purposes, did you mean for the purposes of Rumania?

Reverend WURMBRAND. No, no, no; for the purposes of communism, for the purposes of the whole Communist world.

Mr. SOURWINE. In other words, the Rumanian secret police are, in your opinion at least, just like any other Communist secret police?

Reverend WURMBRAND. Sure, there is no difference at all, and our interrogations, if they were important ones as mine, they went to Moscow. I know it from the Orthodox priest, Vasile Leon, who has been kidnaped from Austria and he has been brought to Moscow. In Moscow he has been interrogated about me. In Moscow they knew everything about Rumania. They worked hand in hand. At that time the secret Rumanian police had Soviet advisers.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think you have touched on this, but can you perhaps give us a little more on the subject? What has been the policy and practice of the Communists with respect to religion in countries where they have come into power?

Reverend WURMBRAND. They used three great instruments. First of all, the persecution, to make everybody afraid. They never accepted that they have put anybody in prison for religious motives. They found always political motives. Now I will give you the political motives.

A Unitarian pastor, a friend of mine, has been put in prison and sentenced to 7 years under the charge that on a Christmas Eve he has said that Jesus being a baby Herod wished to kill him but his holy mother fled with him to Egypt. That was the charge. "Aha, you meant us under Herod, and you hope Nasser will be on the side of the imperialists and therefore you mentioned Egypt."

Another friend of mine, a pastor, was sentenced to 15 years in prison. He was one of the greatest saints whom I have ever seen in life. The charge against him was he preached on a Sunday morning in a village about John 21 where it is said that the Lord walked on the seashore and he saw the apostles and asked them, "Have you something to eat?" They said, "We have not," and then Jesus said, "Throw your nets on the right side."

So the pastor preached from the pulpit. He asked, 'Have you something to eat?" and when he asked, "Have you something to eat?" everybody began to weep, because with us, peasants have nothing to eat. After the collectivization of agriculture our peasants have nothing to eat. Peasant children do not see milk and fruit. Everything goes to the collective and from the collective perhaps to Vietnam. Nobody knows where it goes. Our population does not see. They began to weep because they had nothing to eat and then the pastor, not knowing in what world he is, said, "Dear children, you have nothing to eat because you throw your nets on the left side. You must throw them on the right side." He meant the side of the clemency and of the goodness of God.

The next day there was the secret police, "Aha, you have said not to go to the leftwing with the Communists but with the right side, the imperialists."

The man got 15 years of prison.

So there has been, first of all, this method of persecution. There has been, secondly, the method of corruption. We live in the times of the abomination of the desolation of the holy places. There have always been bad Popes and good Popes and bad priests and good priests. For the first time in church history the leadership of churches is dominated by the central committee of an avowed atheistic power. The central committee of the party decides who must be patriarch, who must be Baptist preacher, Pentacostal preacher, and so on. Everywhere they have found weak men or men with some sin. Those they have put in the leadership of churches and so you could hear in our theological seminary in Bucharest the theology that God has given three revelations—once through Moses, second through Jesus, the third through Karl Marx, and so on.

Religion is corrupted from within. Religion has been widely used and is still as the tools of Communist politics. The priests everywhere had to propagate the collectivization of agriculture and everywhere when Communists have something important to do, knowing the influence of religion, priests and pastors are put to preach these things.

Mr. Sourwine. Have the Communists shown themselves to be opposed only to Christianity, or to all religions?

Reverend Wurmbrand. To all the religions. The Jewish religion has been persecuted just as the Christian religion. In the prison of Gherla we had a whole room with rabbis who were in prisons. We had in prison the Moslem priests and so on.

Mr. Sourwine. Did they segregate the rabbis in one room——

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine. The Christians in another, and——

Reverend Wurmbrand. No, no, they were at a time kept with us, but the rabbis, because they had to respect certain dietary laws and the Sabbath and so on, they separated them in order not to provoke collision with other prisoners.

Mr. Sourwine. Did the prison authorities permit the Jews to follow their dietary requirements?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine. To practice their religion?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; under one form. They could follow the dietary rules, not eating everything which has been given to them. That is all. They did not give them any special food.

Senator Dodd. They did not give them any special diet?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No; no special diet for Jews. Neither do the Moslems eat pork and so they did not get anything special.

Senator Dodd. Were the rabbis subjected to the same kind of torture that you suffered?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; sure, sure. There was no difference in this. I must say it may look anecdotic for you. I had a discussion once with the commandant of the prison of Targulacna, and he said, "We are not like the Fascists who made the racial differences and persecuted the Jews and Hungarians. We are not so. Look around you. We keep in prison Rumanians, Hungarians, and Jews all alike. Wc don't make racial differences."

Mr. Sourwine. That could be interpreted to mean that he was saying people of the Jewish faith were being persecuted for their religious activity, but not for their race.

Is it true that there is no anti-Semitism in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. There is anti-Semitism. Just before we left the country, everywhere where Jews were in high positions as chief engineers or directors in ministry and so on, they were silenced and put to lower functions.

Mr. Sourwine. Would you expand on that?

Senator Dodd. Just repeat it.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes, yes. Just before we left Rumania, a few weeks before we left Rumania, all kinds of Jews who were chief engineers or directors or something great in different institutions have been put to lower positions just because they were Jews.

Senator Dodd. To lower positions?

Reverend Wurmbrand. To lower positions.

Mr. Sourwine. Not because of religion?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No, no.

Mr. Sourwine. Just as a matter of racial prejudice?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Sure They could have been atheists. They were even members of the Communist Party, but if they were of Jewish origin, they were put to lower positions. From the secret police all the Jews have been driven out.

Mr. Sourwine. Are there any Buddhists in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Buddhists? No; we have none. Perhaps a few intellectuals, just a few.

Mr. Sourwine. Have the Communists done anything, to your knowledge, to try to win position and influence for Communist agents in the religious community of the free world?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Sure. We had a professor, Justin Moisescu.

Mr. Sourwine. Moisescu?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Moisescu, yes. He was a professor. He had never been a priest. Truly a very clever and a very cultured man. He was professor of church history, but a layman. With us there has been a law that you can't be professor in a theological institute unless you are a priest. So he resigned. He didn't wish to be a priest.

And then, what discussions he had with the secret police he knows, he was known in the whole country as a whoremonger, as a drunkard, nobody appreciated him. At once we heard that in a few weeks he had become priest, bishop, metropolitan of Yasi. That is the highest function with us after the patriarch.

Mr. Sourwine. That is the Rumanian Orthodox Church?

Reverend Wurmbrand. In the Rumanian Orthodox Church. Whatever will be the consequences for me, I have told you how I have been threatened, and these threatenings are not simple words.

Recently from Italy two Rumanians have been kidnaped. We have their names. And I know what can happen to me. But I will tell you this Justin Moisescu personally has denounced a group of 400 Christian peasants from his own bishopric. I have been imprisoned with them. He has denounced the priests whom he ordained when he knew that they said some counterrevolutionary word.

He has a very impressive beard and he has come out to the free world and was accepted as a bishop, and those in the West believe that they speak with the Orthodox Church of Rumania and they speak with the secret police of Rumania. And now the interesting thing is I would not mind accepting men like him and like Gromatca, this arch traitor and others. I don't mind that they are accepted in the West. But I ask myself in every bargain, in every business, both parts must win. I give you the product but you must give me the dollars for it. We accept your traitors. What does the East accept from us? If we had posed to Rumania this question, "We will accept Justin Moisescu, you must accept a Bible society in Rumania," we would have it. But we accept without asking for it. Justin Moisescu is a member of the secret police. They sent to America the priest Liviu Stan. Everybody knows Liviu Stan is a man of the Communists. When the Communists came to power he was among the first ones who put posters on our walls that Christians must vote and go with the Communists. These posters were signed and the others by this Liviu Stan. The Communists in Rumania are not so stupid to send here a man who will say, "I come from the side of the Communist Party." Liviu Stan came as a representative of the Orthodox Church of Rumania. And so they have many men. They have sent recently a priest, Ananaia.

Now that is a very interesting thing about this priest, Ananaia. This priest, Ananaia, has been with me in prison. He has been 10 years in prison. He has been beaten. He has passed through brainwashing. And they have such confidence in brainwashing that they had the confidence to send him to the West and he does their work.

Senator Dodd. He is a priest in good standing, and of what church?

Reverend Wurmbrand. In the Orthodox church.

I speak out of the pain of a heart. I can't polemicize. I am a very little pastor. I can't polemicize with great religious bodies, but I am a man who has read nothing for 14 years. And now I came out to the West. I had always been very interested in missions and I wished to know what happens in missions. I took in hand the International Review of Missions, edited by the World Council of Churches, and I read there in the issue of January that in Rumania, orthodoxism and protestantism grow in an atmosphere of full religious liberty.

If the man who wrote this has not taken thousands of dollars from the Rumanian secret police, he deserves to be hanged for stupidity. He could have taken money for this. I believe he has not taken money. And then I wrote to them a letter, and said, "Either you lie or I lie. If I lie, I promise that never more will I be a pastor. If you lie you have to withdraw. Now to see if I lie or you lie I ask you to answer the following 20 questions, if you say there is full religious liberty in Rumania.

"Where is the office of the World Council of Churches of Religion in Rumania? It has offices everywhere. In the Communist countries it has none.

"Where is the Bible Society? We have no Bible Society. Show me one Bible printed in 20 years. We have no such thing. Tell me the name of one Christian who for 20 years could publish a book. Give me the name of one Christian professor of humanistic sciences in our country. Tell me one Sunday school in Bucharest where it can be attended.

"Tell me where is the YMCA in Rumania. Where are the pastors Ghelbegeanu, Vacareanu, and so on? They are in prison.

"Please answer to me these questions. If you have received answers, I have received answers."

There is no possible answers. It is not right for Christians to mock our sufferings. The Communists have mocked us enough. Don't praise our inquisitors. That is the only thing which we ask.

I apologize before these great Christian bodies. I am really a very little man but I speak for the great saints who suffer in prison. It is not right to praise our inquisitors or to think that now they have become better.

Mr. Sourwine. Are the restrictive measures imposed upon the exercise of religion in Rumania today as stringent as they were 10 or 15 years ago?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No; they are no more stringent and I will explain to you why. I have been in a very poor family, a family with five children. Generally our men are very poor with us, unbelievably poor.

My salary when I left Rumania was $28. You say it is little, $28 a week. It was $28 a month. My son was not allowed to finish his studies because of my condemnation. He worked as a building worker and had $30 a month. Our bishop has $70 a month. And now our population is very, very poor.

Senator Dodd. When you say dollars, you mean the equivalent?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; the equivalent of $70. Now I was in a very poor family with five little children, and I carassed a child and the mother said to me, "This child is so good, it doesn't weep even when it is hungry." It had given up weeping because the child knew it is useless to weep. You can't get food. And so this child was not beaten, because it didn't weep any more. The Rumanian people does not weep any more. And, therefore, it must not be beaten any more.

The Rumanian people, as well as the other peoples behind the Iron Curtain, are desperate. They have abandoned hope that they will ever be released. For years we have heard a broadcast station: "Rebel against communism, rebel against communism," and when we rebelled we were abandoned.

And we see how our oppressors are helped. I will tell you a scene. Believe me, God is here. I tell you the scene just as it happened. It was in the years of brainwashing, the 14th year of prison. We are gathered to a meeting, and Major Alexandrescu, the commandant of the prison of Gherla, delivered us a speech and said:

"You fools, you set for 15 or 20 years in prison and expected the Americans to come. You expected the Americans will come and release you. Now I will give you the news. The Americans come but not to release you. They come to help us, to help us, to make business with us, to make trade with us. You fools have not known. The Americans if you beg them, they give you nothing. If you insult them, if you mock them, they give you money. We have been more clever than you."

These are words which I have heard myself. Such things have happened in our country.

Mr. Sourwine. Are there any open churches in Rumania today, which anyone may attend?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Just I didn't finish this question. So there is a relaxation in what sense? Our people has given up the fight. Political underground movements don't exist any more with us. They have no such. And so everything has quieted down in the country, and so they don't need any more of the same terror. I have been for years in prison with thieves and murderers. Even before having been put in prison I have been chaplain of a prison. A thief after he has stolen is a gentleman. He gives to the waiters the greatest tips and he invites girls and he invites you and he orders the best wines. He has not worked for his money. And such thieves are the Communists. They have stolen half of Europe, they have stolen Russia, too. They have stolen a great part of Asia. And now they have what they have stolen and they are gentlemen and they expect the next occasion to steal again.

In this sense there is a relaxation with us, but it is not an essential one. We continue to have the avowed dictatorship of an atheistic party. We have one party. There can be no religious freedom where there is one party. We have elections. Now a joke is made with us that when God created Adam, He created only one woman, Eve, and He said to Adam, "You are free to choose for wife whomsoever you wish." But there was only Eve. And so are the elections with us.

Our Government doesn't mind old women coming to church but our childhood, our youth is poisoned with atheism. We are not allowed to counteract, and what bitter fruits will come out of this seed nobody can know.

Now you have asked another question, do we have open churches in Rumania? If somebody comes to Rumania—it is another situation in Russia—if somebody comes to Rumania, he is really impressed.

The Orthodox liturgy is something very beautiful. It is grand. And if you come in Rumania you see thousands of churches open, liturgies, sermons, many people in the church. And I have spoken with Americans who have been there and have told me, "I was very impressed." And now there is really a certain religious liberty. In Rumania you are allowed to say as much as you like that God is good. You are not allowed to say that the devil is bad. St. John the Baptist could have saved his life if he had said: "Repent because the kingdom of heaven is near." Nobody would have touched him. He was touched when he said, "You, Herod, are bad."

If Christ would have delivered a thousand "Sermons on the Mount" they would not have crucified Him. They crucified Him when He said, "You vipers," then He was crucified.

In Rumania you can say God is good but you can't say "communism is cruel, they commit atrocities, it is a crime to poison children with atheism." If you do this you go to prison. There are many priests, rabbis, and pastors who compromise and don't put the dot on the "i." There exists the real church and the real religion and that which compromises.

Mr. Sourwine. Are there churchmen in Rumania today who willingly cooperate with the Communist authorities?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Surely. The Orthodox hierarchy nearly entirely. Of the Catholic hierarchy, not one. The Catholic bishops died in prison, all except four. These four have house arrest. At the Vatican council no Catholic bishop was allowed to come. Came a Catholic priest, a well-known traitor, Augustine, who is the real leader of the Catholic Church; the leadership of the Baptists, for example, is entirely in the hands of the Communists.

I have here a document which I present to the Senate, a list of 150 Russian Baptist pastors recently deported to Siberia. Not all arrived in Siberia. Many died of tortures.

Senator Dodd. Can you talk a little more slowly? I could get your pronunciation better.

Reverend Wurmbrand. This is a list of 150 Baptist pastors of Russia who have been recently deported to Siberia. I have the names, the addresses, the names of their wives, of their children. They have not all arrived to Siberia, because of the tortures many died.

Senator Dodd. These were Rumanians?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No, no, Russians. And I give it to the Senate.

Mr. Sourwine. Mr. Chairman, do you wish this list and the document of transmittal to go into the record? There is an English translation to be made.

Senator Dodd. Yes; I believe it should be in the record.

Mr. Sourwine. Will you hand that list to the reporter?

(The list and the document appear in the appendix of this volume.)

Senator Dodd. I don't quite understand this. These are 400 Russian Baptists?

Reverend Wurmbrand. 150.

Senator Dodd. Were they in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. No, no, they are Russians. We got it from Russia. Here I have another very interesting document.

Mr. Sourwine. If you would excuse me, please, I believe the Senator's question raises a point you should clear up. How do you have this information about Russia? Have you been in Russia?

Reverend Wurmbrand. I have worked for years secret missionary work among the Russian soldiers who occupied our country. I speak Russian fluently, and we brought many Russian soldiers to Christ. To preach Christ to the Russians means Heaven on earth. They seek the Gospel as the thirsty soil seeks water. They have not known Him. The beauty of the Gospel you know it when you preach it to Russians; how they live it and how they enjoy it, and so I have made some connections.

In a public sitting I can't say how I have arrived to have these lists.

Mr. Sourwine. You know it to be authentic?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Personally I can tell you from where I have this list, but it is absolutely authentic. It can be controlled. Surely in a public sitting I can't say how I have received it.

I present to the Senate also a very interesting document, the most interesting I have ever known in this matter, the document, "Li Wei Han." It is a letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba. Now recently they have quarreled but this letter is an older one in which they teach how to win the leadership of the churches for communism, how to make that the Communists should be leaders of the churches. It is an unequaled document of Machiavelianism.

We have lived these things but never have I seen it put on paper as this.

Mr. Sourwine. May I suggest this be printed as an appendix to the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator Dodd. Yes.

(The letter referred to will be found in the appendix.)

Senator Dodd. I take it what you have been telling us must be more or less common knowledge in Rumania, is it?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; surely.

Senator Dodd. Would it be accurate to deduce that the embassy officials of the several countries must have heard it too?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes, surely. Everybody knows, but there are many here in the West who don't wish to know.

Senator Dodd. Why not?

Reverend Wurmbrand. They don't wish to be troubled in their quietness. They close their eyes before this menace. I have met men who simply close their eyes when I told them about these things. They know that they are true. But they have a certain policy of friendly relationship with the Communist countries, and they are very honest men, but they are duped exactly as we were duped in Rumania.

Wherever the Communists came in the beginning, they said the same thing which I read here in newspapers and in periodicals. "You know Stalin's communism has been very bad, but Yugoslavian communism or another kind of communism, this is very good."

A little lion in its first days you can play with him just like with a puppy. When he becomes great, only then he is a lion. Yugoslavian communism is this little communism. And American communism is a very little one and English communism is a very little one. When they grow, when they can do whatever they will to do, then only we can see them. With us, in the beginning, we also had a very nice communism. I have seen in Rumanian Communist demonstrations signs with the slogan, "God Save the King." I have seen the Communist Secretaries of State making great crosses, showing themselves as being on the side of religion and making compliments to religion and bowing to religion and saying they are Democrats. In the beginning, they have put in prison party members who said that the agriculture must be collectivized. And they have gone together with the bourgeois party, with the Liberal Party of Tatorescu and with other Democrats.

I have seen in the West Social Democrats collaborate with them. In Rumania, I have seen dying Social Democrats in the same cell with me; they died. Communists in Rumania, too, were nice until they had the whole power in hand. When they had the whole power in hand, they have done things exactly as in Russia, and so they will do everywhere. There is no difference.

Mr. Sourwine. You mentioned demonstrations by the Communists. Does Rumania have anything like the demonstrations that are so prevalent in this country, demonstrations against the Government's activities or against its policies?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Nobody can say a word of criticism. Such a thing doesn't even enter in the mind of somebody. I will tell you something which may be laughable for you. It is very tragical with us. But the story is just as I tell you. I know the man. A man was in a barbershop in a little town, Sibiu. While the barber shaved him, he said to the barber: "What should I do? My hair falls." The barber said, "Very well, I will make you a friction but you must not be anxious about this. The most intelligent people of the world have been bald." On the other seat there was an officer of the secret police and he said to the barber, "What have you said now?"

"I have said that the most intelligent people of the world are bald."

"So, you assert that Stalin has not been intelligent." It is a question of laughter for you but it is tragical with us. Nobody dares to say a word.

I stopped in Newark, and in Philadelphia, a demonstration against the war in Vietnam. I had not this clerical suit on. I stopped the demonstrators and I undressed myself to the belt. Afterwards I heard that it is illegal here in the States, and that I could have gone to prison for this. I undressed myself.

Senator Dodd. It would have been all right on the bathing beach.

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; it was not on the beach. And I told them, "This have Communists done to me. Do you think that American Christians should fight against communism?" So they surrounded me and asked me, "Why have Communists done to you this?" I said to them, "Suppose that I am a murderer. Do you agree that a murderer should be tortured? Has Oswald been tortured? Has Ruby been tortured with you?" They all said, "No; murderers have not been tortured." I continued: "Then know that I have not be charged with murder. I am a clergyman." They stopped the demonstration. In Philadelphia there was again such a demonstration. I am not a man of politics. I can't speak for the war of Vietnam or against the war in Vietnam. I speak this general principle that Christians must be on the side of righteousness. They must never be on the side of the inquisitors of Christians. They must be on the side of the victims of the inquisitors, they must be on the side of the Christians.

In Philadelphia there was a great meeting. A pastor with clerical suit, a Presbyterian pastor, delivered a speech in which he praised Communists and said that Communists are all right and it is stupid to fight against them. I have learned something from the Communists. In a minute—after—the pastor was no more in the pulpit, I was in the pulpit. I said: "Now I will speak about communism. What do you know about communism? And I will show you my credentials, how I have studied communism." I undressed myself to the belt. I did not know that all these bad reporters are there and took pictures. And I showed them my body. "That is what Communists do to Christians, and you, Pastor, why don't you make demonstrations, if you are a Christian and if you have youth in your vigor, why don't you demonstrate before the Soviet and Rumanian Embassies and the other embassies against torturing Christians?" And then the public, which has been there booed him and shouted to him "Judas."

These are Judases. They may be all right innerly, I don't know their hearts, but I think that Christians, if they wish to demonstrate, they should demonstrate against those who have recently deported 150 Baptist pastors.

Mr. Sourwine. The subcommittee has received substantial information to the effect that the Rumanian Communist Government has infiltrated into this country Communist-trained clergy with other missions than those of a spiritual nature. Do you have any information about that?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Rumanian Communists are very interested in the fact that you have here, in the States, something like 300,000 Americans of Rumanian origin who speak the Rumanian language and are Orthodox.

The Rumanians have a bishop, Bishop Viorel Trifa, who is anti-Communist and the Communists wish to win these 300,000 on their side. They can't very well win them for communism, but they can win them for a leftwing Christianity which supports communism. They have sent here several men, Moisecu, Liviu Stan, and so on. These don't come with Communist slogans but with the words: "You must love your Rumanian fatherland. * * * You must have connections with the Rumanian patriarchy." When I came out from Rumania I saw for the first time a Rumanian newspaper which appears in Bucharest, and which nobody in Bucharest has ever seen. The Voice of the Fatherland it is called, and in the fatherland nobody sees this newspaper. Only your American Rumanians see it and in France. I have never seen it. My son looked at it, and we have never seen it. In this newspaper you read about priests and churches. In our newspapers you will never have a word about the church. There you have pictures of priests and monasteries and how fine it is and so on. They make this propaganda, surely.

Senator Dodd. You mean this paper is only distributed in the free world?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Only in the free world. They have at midnight, which corresponds to I don't know what hour here in the United States, it is noon or I don't know what, they have religious services which are jammed in Rumania, but they are emitted from Rumania. We have no religious services on the broadcasts. These are broadcast religious services only that the Americans should know how fine the Communists are and that they have religious services.

Mr. Sourwine. Are you saying that the religious services of the Rumanian Orthodox Church——

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine (continuing). Are broadcast in Rumania at a time which is midnight in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine. Beamed to the Western World?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; sure.

Mr. Sourwine. To the free world?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Sure.

Mr. Sourwine. And not broadcast in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Sure. In Rumania, nobody hears them.

Mr. Sourwine. Of course, a broadcast beamed from Rumania to the United States necessarily will have enough power to be picked up in Rumania if anyone wanted to tune in.

Reverend Wurmbrand. First of all, it is a very inconvenient hour. It is midnight for us. Secondly, in Rumania it is jammed.

Mf. Sourwine. It is what?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Jammed.

Mr. Sourwine. They jam it in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. They jam it in Rumania.

Mr. Sourwine. So that even those who know about it, who might try to pick it up——

Reverend Wurmbrand. It is jammed. You can't hear it in Rumania.

Mr. Sourwine. Suppose a group of persons were called together trying to tune in that broadcast above the jamming. Would there be reprisals against them? Is it an illegal thing?

Reverend Wurmbrand. In this moment, no reprisals would be taken. No reprisals are taken today if somebody hears foreign broadcasts. But everything is noted. What happens with us? We have waves of terror. We have had a great wave of terror from 1948 and 1949 which lasted until 1955. We had the relax until 1958 when nobody was arrested but everything was noted.

Then in 1959 came again a wave of terror, and all those who were noted for years before were taken in. And now the whole spy work continues with us. You are not arrested. But everybody knows that he is spied out and that everything is noted. How far this inner spy net goes is unimagined. In a little townlet of ours there is a little Baptist church with only 22 members. The pastor of that church told me that he is the informer of the secret police and that he knows three members of his church who give information against him. So it was in the church in which I was. The servant of the church had the order to inform who comes to me. I had no salary. So, usually men who came to me brought a little parcel with food and clothes and so on. The servant had to spy out who comes with parcels. In the smallest churches you have five or six who have to spy out what the others do. One neighbor spies the other. Children spy on their father and so on. It is without end so nobody dares to do a thing.

Senator Dodd. I am somewhat interested in these interrogations to which you were subjected. If I understand you correctly, they lasted for hours; is that right?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; surely.

Senator Dodd. Without going into a lengthy explanation, what did they ask you?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Well, they asked many things. First of all they wished to know who has said counterrevolutionary things of all the bishops and priests and pastors and laymen whom I knew. Who has spoken against the Government. Who has something against the Government. How we organized and so on, without end. And now at a certain moment I was tired with being beaten. They told me at a certain moment, "Mr. Wurmbrand, supposing that you are not a counterrevolutionary, you are a well-known pastor in the whole country and everybody had confidence in you and you spoke with bishops and all kinds of men and you have been in so many villages and towns and everybody confessed to you and so forth. Tell us who are the counterrevolutionaries. Don't speak about your activity. You are all right. You are not a counterrevolutionary. But then show your loyalty toward our Government, tell us who the counterrevolutionaries are. Are you disposed to do so?" So, I said, "Yes; I am disposed."

When they heard that I am disposed, they asked me: "Do you smoke, do you wish liquors?" Everything I could have at that moment. And he knew, the officer, that he will receive another star there if he gets from me this information. And then he asked me now, "Who are the counterrevolutionaries?" I said, "As you know I have worked on an international scale, so I can tell you the counterrevolutionaries not only in Rumania but even in Russia."

Oh, he was so glad. I said: "In Russia, you have had as Secretary of State for Internal Affairs, Yagoda. Yagoda has killed thousands of people as counterrevolutionaries. Then you have discovered who has been the counterrevolutionary: Yagoda has been. Yagoda has been shot as counterrevolutionary.

"Then you have had as Secretary of State for Internal Affairs, Beria, and Beria has killed other thousands of people as counterrevolutionaries. Then you have found out who has been the counterrevolutionary: Beria. Why do you seek the counterrevolutionaries in the church? Seek them in your own party. And in Rumania it has been the same thing."

Communists are not only anti-Christian. They are anti everything. They are anti their own comrades.

I have been in prison. I have been there with Lucretiu Patrascanu, the great Communist leader, who has brought communism to power in our country. He was put in prison and tortured until he became mad.

My wife has been in prison with Gheorghe Cristescu. Everybody in Rumania knows the founder of communism in Rumania, who has been in prison for communism under the bourgeois. He has been with my wife together, and he said to my wife, "Forty years ago I fought for the 8-hour labor day and now my Communist Party has come to power and I have to work 14 hours a day."

They are anti absolutely everything. It is not only anti-Christian.

Senator Dodd. What was the name of the prominent woman Communist in Rumania?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Ana Pauker, and she was also in prison.

Senator Dodd. Do you know her?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes, yes, surely; she has also been in prison, and she has been kept a short time and then afterward she died of cancer.

Mr. Sourwine. I have no more questions, sir.

Senator Dodd. We don't have any more questions. Do you have anything more you want to say, Pastor?

Reverend Wurmbrand. I want to say something. I owe it to those with whom I have been in prison. I have told you so many sad things. I don't wish to end with this note. I must tell you that in these great tortures and this great suffering, Christians have shown themselves as saints and as heroes, and if I am allowed to conclude with just one scene which I have seen myself.

It was at the canal. With us, 150,000 men and women have been arrested to build a canal. Beaten, tortured, hungry, without anything, they had to build a canal.

Senator Dodd. Build a canal?

Reverend Wurmbrand. Yes; a canal, the Danube Canal. My wife has worked and shoveled the earth. At this canal, there was a religious brigade of 400 men, bishops, priests, peasants who loved Christ, sectarians and so on, all who were for religious motives in prison.

Over this brigade criminals have been put, and to the criminals it has been promised that they will be released if they torture these Christians. This promise has never been kept. But imagine a criminal who is sentenced for life, if he knows that he has such a hope. If they saw you in this brigade making a cross as it is a habit with us in Rumania, or folding your hands or saying a word about God you were beaten to death.

And now a Sunday morning the political officer of the prison comes, the whole brigade is gathered, and just at random he sees a young man. He calls him, "What is your name?" He says the name. "What are you by profession?" He said, "A priest." And then mocking the Communist said, "Do you still believe in God?"

This priest knew that if he says yes, this is the last day of his life. We all looked to him. For a few seconds he was silent. Then his face began to shine and then he opened his mouth and with a very humble but with a very decided voice he said: "Mr. Lieutenant, when I became a priest I knew that during church history thousands of Christians and priests have been killed for their faith, and notwithstanding I became a Christian and I became a priest. I knew what I became. And as often as I entered the altar clad in this beautiful ornate which priests wear I promised to God, 'If I will wear the uniform of a prisoner, then also I will serve Him.' Mr. Lieutenant, prison is not an argument against religion. I love Christ from all my heart."

I am sad that I can't give the intonation with which he said these words. I think that Juliet when she spoke about Romeo, she spoke like that. We were ashamed because we—we believed in Christ. This man loved Christ as a bride loves the bridegroom. This man has been beaten and tortured to death. But this is Rumania. Rumania is a country which is mocked, which is oppressed, but deep in the hearts of the people is a great esteem and a great praise for those who have suffered. The love to God, the love to Christ, the love to fatherland has never ceased. My country will live. With this I finish.

Senator Dodd. Your testimony has certainly been very impressing.

(At this point, a member of the audience later identified as L. D. O'Flaherty, addressed the Chair).

Mr. O'Flaherty. Mr. Chairman, we have pretty substantial reason to believe that our brother is in danger of his life, and I don't know what steps we could take to have him claim asylum here. He has asylum in France, but we fear for his life because as he has told you, they have told him they will bump him off, get a gangster to bump him off. What arrangements if any—I am not a politician or a political science scholar—what arrangements could be made for his asylum in this country? Can he make a declaration to secure asylum here for his protection?

We know individuals have followed him from city to city unknown to him, and I ask this openly here.

Senator Dodd. Would you identify yourself? I didn't get your name.

Mr. O'Flaherty. O'Flaherty. L. D. O'Flaherty.

Senator Dodd. O'Flaherty?

Mr. O'Flaherty. I am a businessman, a Christian businessman. I am a director in a certain organization here that is given him support, Friends of Israel. On that basis I make this request. I don't think he understands the danger.

Reverend Wurmbrand. We have a God who protects us. We have the angels around us.

Senator Dodd. I think we had better discuss this matter privately with the pastor after the public hearing. I don't think it is a matter which should be discussed publicly.

Mr. O'Flaherty. Thank you.

Senator Dodd. We will adjourn this hearing now subject to further call.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)

GHETTOS, PROPERTY RIGHTS, AND MYTHS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in some parts of our country combined segregationist and right wing forces have completely distorted the truth with regard to property rights and civil rights. A national fair housing law is needed now, and I would like to insert in the Record some supporting evidence. "Ghettos, Property Rights, and Myths," by Joseph B. Robison, demonstrates this need dramatically:

Ghettos, Property Rights, and Myths—Right-Wing Forces That Seek To Repeal the Rumford Act Have Made California the First Battleground in Their New War Against Fair Housing Laws

(By Joseph B. Robison)

(Joseph B. Robison is General Counsel to the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing and Director of the Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress. He is a member of the New York State and United States Supreme Court bars.)

There you are living in your suburban home which you bought five years ago. Then a man buys the vacant lot next door and, the first thing you know, he is putting up a glue factory. When you protest, he gives you a cold stare, fishes a little pamphlet out of his pocket and, reading from it, says, "This is my property. I have the right to enjoy it according to my own dictates. I may occupy and dispose of it without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of my conscience. I have the right to maintain the stability and security of my income."

Finding this hard to believe, you go to a lawyer who assures you that no one has an absolute right to do what he wants—with property or anything else. Within a matter of days, you are able to invoke "governmental interference," with the man's scheme. The police and the courts tell your neighbor that there are laws against any kind of factory in that neighborhood. The laws also bar apartment houses, require that all residences be at least twenty-five feet from the street, and prohibit occupancy by more than one family.

The existence of these and hundreds of other laws curbing the use of property should come as no surprise. No matter how strongly Americans object to legal restraints in general, their first reaction to any specific annoyance is usually, "There ought to be a law." The natural result is that we have in fact a lot of laws. We may sigh for the good old days when a man could go about his business or personal affairs without constant instructions from the government, but in a society as large and complex as ours, we always find in the end that there really ought to be a law. Without laws, we would still have child labor, poisonous drugs, unsafe buildings, unreliable airplanes and putrid food.

Among the recent entries in the "There-ought-to-be-a-law" derby are the statutes against housing bias, now in effect in twelve states and the District of Columbia. The command of these laws is simple: When the owner of an apartment or house puts it up for sale or rent, he may not exclude applicants on the basis of race, religion or national origin.

Somehow, this is regarded in some quarters as a peculiarly outrageous, un-American and totally unheard-of attack on the rights of private property. Why?

The theory seems to be that it is immoral to use laws to regulate the use of property. Yet, that theory has carried very little weight with the American people when they have seen that legislation was needed. Even in the touchy area of race relations, they have used legislation for more than a century to regulate the use of property so that it does not work evil.

As early as 1865, Massachusetts prohibited discrimination based on race or color in "any licensed inn, in any public place of amusement, public conveyance or public meeting." By the turn of the century, no less than fifteen states had such laws, as well as parts of the District of Columbia. (The United States Congress also passed a civil rights law in 1875 but it was invalidated by the Supreme Court eight years later.)

These statutes struck directly at the use of private property. No doubt, they shocked many of our ancestors of a century ago. Yet the American people accepted them as necessary to curb an existing evil. Over the years, their range and scope have been steadily expanded. Today, thirty-one states and the District of Columbia have such laws. They are no longer limited to enterprises that are traditionally open to the entire public, like railroads and inns. They also apply to retail stores, barber shops, swimming pools, skating rinks and even elevators in apartment houses.

In the two decades since World War II, anti-bias legislation has spread to other areas. New York and New Jersey adopted the first fair employment laws in 1945. Twenty-five states now have them. Six states prohibit bias at colleges and universities.

No one believes these laws have achieved miraculous cures. It is equally clear that they have not wrought the disasters that were freely predicted. Employers have not been driven out of business. No omnipresent police force has appeared. There has been no flood of false and malicious charges against innocent parties. What has happened is that the American people have accepted the laws and have complied with them about as much as they comply with laws in general. And discrimination in jobs, schools and public places has been reduced.

Now we have the fair housing statutes. First, there were a number of state and local laws barring discrimination in housing with public funds or other governmental assistance. Then, in 1957, New York City adopted the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Law, the first to apply to housing built without government assistance. Such laws are now in effect in Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oregon and Pennsylvania, as well as the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia and fourteen cities.

Among the most recent of the state laws is the Rumford Act, adopted in California in 1963. Not surprisingly, that state that has become the arena for an all-out, no-holds-barred effort to reverse the trend toward more and broader fair housing laws. For the citizens of California will be voting, in November, on a proposed amendment to their state constitution that would nullify the Rumford Act and bar all such legislation in the future.

MYTHOLOGY OBSCURES THE ISSUE

The proponents of the amendment insist there is something special about real estate that puts it beyond the law—that the America we know and love will be destroyed if landowners are limited in the way they may dispose of their property. They tend to talk of "sacred" property rights as something beyond the reach of the legislative process. (The pro-amendment propaganda also talks a great deal about "forced housing." This is one of those gimmicky phrases that mean nothing. Under fair housing laws, no one is forced to live anywhere—or not to live anywhere. No one has to live with anyone.)

Actually, there is nothing "sacred" or untouchable about property. Rights in property—even real property—were originally created by law and they have always been subject to legal regulation to protect the health, lives and morals of the people. England adopted sanitary codes in the 14th Century and building codes in the 17th. When zoning laws were first proposed 100 years ago, they were called unprecedented invasions of property rights. Yet, now they are taken for granted. They regulate urban and suburban land use in fantastic detail. They have even spread to rural areas where they keep property owners from cutting down timber and overgrazing pastures. Our own century has contributed the rent control laws of the two world wars. Those laws tell property owners how much rent they may charge. They even keep owners from ousting unwanted tenants.

Professor Richard R. B. Powell, reporter for the American Law Institute's Restatement of the Law of Property, explains that all these limitations have been placed on property rights because it is necessary "that the liberty of a landowner be curtailed so as to assure the larger liberties of other human beings." Talking specifically about fair housing laws, he says, ". . . there is no property right to be asserted for the defeat of these civil rights."

The fact is that almost every law regulates property in some way. For centuries, Anglo-American law has required that innkeepers and common carriers give equal treatment to all members of the general public seeking the use of their facilities. Minimum wage laws curb both employers and employees. Mortmain statutes limit the amount of money a dying man can leave to charity. Labor relations laws tell the employer he may not keep union members off his payroll, while right-to-work laws tell the unions they may not exclude non-members. All these laws regulate the use of property. It makes no difference that, in some cases, it is real property.

REPEATED FAILURE IN THE COURTS

The "sacred rights of property" theory has failed with the courts as well as with the people. Fair housing laws have been challenged in a number of legal proceedings. They have been upheld by courts in Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Ohio, New Jersey and New York. Not one state has gone the other way.

In one of these cases, the Colorado Supreme Court took note of the fact that the briefs filed in opposition to the law placed "heavy reliance on expressions such as 'inalienable rights,' 'human right to own property,' 'essential attributable of property,' 'freedom of choice,' etc." The court held, however, that "the constitutionally protected rights in property, for which respondents contend, are subject to regulation by a proper exercise of the police power of the state."

Laws that curb our freedom can be justified only by some need of society. The need for fair housing laws is evident. No one seriously denies that housing discrimination exists. It is so widespread that almost every house or apartment put on the market bears an invisible label. It is marked as available to either white or colored, but not both.

The evil effects of the ghetto are also clear. There is, first, the spreading effect of segregation in housing—its strong tendency to produce segregation in education, playgrounds, and all other aspects of our daily lives. It is primarily responsible for the segregation in Northern public schools that has become such a bitter and seemingly insoluble issue in our great cities. Second, there is the severe intergroup tension (a polite phrase for racial violence) growing out of housing problems. Names like Cicero, Levittown and Folcroft remind us that almost all of the riots and other race disturbances outside the South in the last two decades have sprung from disputes as to where the ghetto walls should be located. Third, there are harmful effects and high costs of housing segregation for everyone. Negroes regularly pay more than whites for equivalent housing. Hence, they are forced into doubling up and other expedients that breed slums. The result is increased delinquency, disease, fire losses and a host of other evils.

The opponents of fair housing laws do not really deny that the problem exists. They argue instead that it should not be dealt with by legislation because that would interfere with "sacred" property rights. This credo is expressed in all its glory in a "Property Owners Bill of Rights," promulgated in June, 1963, by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, familiarly known as NAREB. It would guarantee the following ten "rights" to "the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed."

"1. The right of privacy." This is a red herring. There is nothing in any fair housing law that impairs privacy. No such law or regulation that has ever been adopted or even proposed would permit anyone to invade your home.

"2. The right to choose his own friends." Of course you can choose your own friends. No fair housing law keeps you from doing so. (Note that NAREB does not say "the right to choose his own *neighbors.*" That formulation is not used because NAREB knows there is no such right. Apartment house tenants cannot select their neighbors by dictating to the landlord. The home owner has no control over the sale of the house next door.)"

LAWS OF SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

"3. The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates," and "4, the right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience." These rights do not and never did exist. Put such a "right" into law and out go zoning standards, rent control, building codes and dozens of other restrictions on property necessary in an orderly society. "Governmental interference" with the way we "occupy and dispose of property" has been with us for centuries and is obviously here to stay.

"5. The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference by laws giving special privilege to any group or groups." In a sense, all laws give special privileges. The Wagner Act gave labor unions privileges they did not have before. The Taft-Hartley Act did the same for employers. The restaurant licensing laws give special privileges to the lucky few who get licenses. Except in that sense, fair housing laws confer no special privilege. They apply to all and they benefit the entire community. They do away with the special privilege now enjoyed by property owners to put race labels on the commodity they sell.

"6. The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants." This is an interesting point. Whose "right" is it? Certainly not the tenant's. A tenant does not have any control over the congeniality of his surroundings.

This was disarmingly revealed in a leaflet, distributed in 1957 by five New York City real estate boards, urging their tenants to write to the City Council opposing a fair housing bill (which the Council adopted later that year). The leaflet warned, "The proposed law would destroy the right to select your neighbors." It did not say "your right to select your neighbors." That would have been inaccurate. Neither did it say "our right to select your neighbors." That would have been too frank.

"7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions." Of course, your broker should act according to your instructions, but not if they are illegal. You cannot instruct your broker to rent your house to a dope peddler or to someone who will operate an illegal still. Sacred property rights are not impaired when the legislature prohibits dope peddling or moonshining—or when it prohibits discrimination in housing. (We might also add that the law does not permit an owner to pick any "other representative of his choice." For most purposes, he must pick a real estate broker licensed by the state.)

"8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property." This is a variation on the same theme. Even without fair housing laws, the government looks over the property owner's shoulder pretty closely when a decision is made about the "acceptability and desirability" of a future occupant. But if there had been no laws up to now, that does not mean that there may not be in the future. The employer had the unlimited right to hire and fire until the '30's, when he was told not to discriminate against union members. A decade later, fair employment laws further prohibited discrimination on the basis of race. Today, in thirty-eight states, the property owner has the right to discriminate in selling or renting a house or apartment. In twelve states, he does not. NAREB has every right to say that the owner should be allowed to discriminate—that the twelve states are wrong and the thirty-eight states are right, but the proposition that property rights are "sacred" has nothing to do with the case.

"9. The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns—to maintain the stability and security of his income." This means the owner's right to choose "congenial" neighbors for someone else. The notion that a building company is concerned about "congeniality" when selling a 15,000-home development is absurd. The point about maintaining the owner's income is a different matter. That is a legitimate objective. Yet it cannot be pursued without regard to all other considerations. Even without fair housing laws, the owner is limited in the way he obtains income from property. The owner of a half-acre in the middle of a residential area could assure his financial security for life by opening up a discount house, but the law tells him he cannot. For even better reasons, the law can also tell an owner he may not ensure his financial security by exploiting the ghetto system. If fair housing laws really did cause substantial financial damage, a telling argument could be made against them. Can NAREB produce the names of owners who have been put out of business by the laws now in effect in twelve states? It has not done so so far. Back in 1957, when the first of these laws was pending in the New York City Council, the Real Estate Board of New York ran an advertisement warning that the law, if enacted, "Would depress real estate values, would affect the basis of the City's taxation and its credit, and would undo much of the success we've had in amicable living." New Yorkers are still waiting for these evils to descend upon them.

"10. The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others." This too is illusory. There is no such right. Anti-trust laws, labor laws and any number of other regulations govern these matters.

THE BASIC ISSUE HAS LONG BEEN CLEAR

The real estate industry's arguments would carry more weight if the industry had any alternatives to offer. What has it done about racial discrimination except to exploit it? How does it propose to deal with the horrors of slum ghettos? How would it end the shame of a country that forces minority group families to read the hidden labels before they dare to apply for shelter?

As in the case of all welfare legislation, the fair housing laws have been passed only because shocking abuses exist and because these abuses have not been checked by those in a position to do so. Discrimination in housing is a disgrace to the nation. The legislatures that have adopted laws to eliminate it have acted within the oldest and best traditions of our country.

California's anti-Rumford amendment, which would not only repeal the Rumford Act but bar similar legislation in the future, and the NAREB code would preserve property rights at the cost of continuing the ghetto system that causes turmoil at home and disfigures our image abroad. Are we prepared to pay the price?

OPERATION HEADSTART PROGRAM IN NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend the great good sense shown by the Office of Economic Opportunity in utilizing local volunteers in its successful Headstart program. Children from impoverished, restricted families need to be given a greater awareness of what they can do and be, and the help of generous, interested volunteers from the child's own community immediately expands his vision of the world in his own neighborhood and his own town. This summer the Orleans Parish School Board in cooperation with total community action will begin its third project Headstart. About 3,500 children will receive their first introduction to a new world.

The Times-Picayune on June 5, 1966, printed an article which I think gets across the nature of the job Headstart is doing so well, and shows the good sense of using community volunteers. The article quotes one of the New Orleans directors of Headstart, Dr. Juliana L. Boudreaux, on the important role played by volunteers. Dr. Boudreaux states:

> One of the biggest factors that contributes to the slow development of culturally deprived children is their concept of what life has in store for them. Many come to us feeling that already they are failures, that they can do nothing well. . . . One of Head Start's most important goals is to change that attitude. Unless we can build their self-esteem, it is doubtful that we can teach them.

The article cites the use of mothers of children registered in the program as teacher aids, and as neighborhood recruiters bringing more families into the Headstart program. Mr. Speaker, I insert this informative article in the Record at this point:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, June 5, 1966]

Two Thousand Enrolled for Headstart—Registration To Continue Through Friday

Some 2,000 preschool children have been registered for this summer's Project Head Start, to begin in 48 area public schools June 20.

Registration will continue from Monday through Friday this week.

The program is being financed under a $495,514 grant to Total Community Action Inc. and is administered by the Orleans Parish School Board.

Parents may register their children this week from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. Registration is being conducted at participating schools.

Project officials added that 60 recruiters are at work in each school neighborhood informing parents about the program. The recruiters, parents whose own children were part of either Head Start or Project Pre-Kindergarten last year, have completed a two-day training course.

Classroom activities and special learning experiences for the children will highlight this year's program.

Also featured will be a more extensive medical and dental program.

Head Start, intended primarily for children of lower income families, is designed to increase learning ability and general intelligence levels of the students.

Toward this goal, classes in the program are limited to 20 students and are open to children without restriction as to race, creed or national origin.

Each group will have a teacher, assistant teacher and teacher aid. The teacher aid must be the mother of a child registered in the program.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, June 5, 1966]

Headstart Opens Door to Future

When a child opens the door to Head Start, he enters a wonderful new world.

He goes wild over the toys and books and play things. He never saw so many things at one time in all his life that he could actually play with.

These are some of the things he can see and feel and touch. There are many more in this new world, intangible things that he can't see, that are just as exciting—and important.

He meets a teacher who will lead him to all sorts of adventures in learning—and he meets volunteers who do all manner of things to give the teacher more time to devote to him.

He is thrilled at having grownups about who actually have time to pay attention to him, to listen to what he has to say, to tell him stories and read to him, to take him on field trips to help build his knowledge of special talents, to share these with him.

Last year one of the Head Start volunteers was a flute player. She visited all the classrooms and got a big hand wherever she went. Volunteers do a fabulous job in Head Start, according to Mrs. Patricia R. Bayle, school-community coordinator, department of kindergarten-primary education, for the Orleans Parish School Board.

These are things, too, the youngsters can see. But one of Head Start's biggest contributions again is something they can't see, she points out. Volunteers take time to talk to each one, to share his little jokes, to answer questions, to stimulate wonder and curiosity. This way they help to build his self-image, to make him feel as if he is somebody special, that someone really cares.

Ideally, a child of pre-school age would receive attention, affection and guidance in his home environment. But for many, unfortunately, this is not the case, Dr. Juliana L. Boudreaux, director of kindergarten-primary education, division of instruction, relates.

One of the biggest factors that contributes to the slow development of culturally deprived children is their concept of what life has in store for them.

"Many come to us feeling that already they are failures, that they can do nothing well," she says. "One of Head Start's most important goals is to change that attitude. Unless we can build their self-esteem, it is doubtful that we can teach them.

"This warm classroom atmosphere to which the volunteers contribute so much goes far to dispel fear and to enable these children to develop feelings of belongingness, self-confidence, adequacy and security—in other words, to develop a positive self-image," Dr. Boudreaux points out.

Head Start opens a new door for the volunteers, too, it seems. They become so wrapped up in this new world they bend over backwards to do all sorts of extra-curricular things, Mrs. Julia F. Floyd, supervisor, points out.

One day she entered a Head Start classroom and found all the small fry proudly wearing colorful smocks made of dish cloths—and each one had his or her name hand-embroidered across the front. A volunteer had made them.

Another volunteer created oil cloth animals for the tots' Easter baskets. Volunteers come up with ideas the children go for in a big way, too. One class embarked upon a new adventure to make egg shell bunnies from eggs they cooked in the classroom.

This was a volunteer's exciting idea they followed. Another volunteer made new curtains for the classrooms. Others brought in collections of interesting things, materials, pictures, books, potted plants, flowers—everything they could think of that would add richness to the lives of the little ones.

Being able to speak well and to listen attentively are two of the big lessons in this new world, Dr. Boudreaux points out. In Head Start opportunities are provided for first-hand experiences so the small fry will have something to say. But even before they can learn to speak well, these youngsters must be able to hear correctly. Important to all learning is the ability to listen attentively. This emphasis on the importance of listening and speaking skills is the best foundation for building readiness for the next steps, she relates.

In both these fields the volunteers play a big role. The children begin to look up to them—to take them as models for speech patterns and the like, she adds.

That door into Head Start is not only a door to a new world for the present, it's the door to the future for these little ones. It's the start of a new life. It sets the pattern for their whole lives.

Research indicates rather forcefully, says Dr. Boudreaux, that all later learning is likely to be influenced by the very basic learning that takes place by the age of five or six. Education, to be effective, must begin with the very young.

"Head Start's goal is to improve the educational possibilities of these children," she points out. "In this new world they will learn to do, to explore, to discover, to create. Thus, they will be more ready for regular school learning—for a brighter and more fulfilling future."

A throng of 3500 Orleans children are about to enter this new world on June 20. The Orleans Parish School Board in cooperation with Total Community Action will begin its third Project Head Start.

There will be 175 classes in 48 schools for eight weeks—two four week periods.

"We need 800 volunteers in this new world. Each is asked to serve two or three consecutive days, hopefully, for the entire eight weeks, but at least for one of the four-week periods," says Mrs. Floyd.

"We're looking for college students, graduating high school seniors, club women—people who love to work with children."

The first four-week period will run from June 20 to July 15. The second will be from July 18 to August 21.

Volunteers who would like to be a part of Head Start are being interviewed now at Project Pre-Kindergarten headquarters in the old post office building at 600 Camp, Room 100. There will be an orientation program on June 21 from 9 a.m. to noon at the Edward Hynes School, 990 Harrison, for Head Start volunteers.

Heading the Head Start staff is Dr. Malcolm F. Rosenberg, assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. Mrs. A. J. Waechter Jr., is chairman of the advisory volunteer committee.

ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN DEFEAT OF POVERTY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Moeller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, off and on again over the past 2 years in this Chamber and in the various news media across the country, there has been periodic dialog about the role of private enterprise in the bold experiment which is this affluent Nation's attempt to defeat poverty.

To borrow a phrase from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, "We all know in our hearts that this Nation's antipoverty program is right." And this is so whether you are Republican or Democrat. Yes, this great endeavor is right and the team that has been assembled under the leadership of the director of the OEO, Sergent Shriver, is by and large, a group of dedicated individuals attempting to fight the problems to which some of our citizens are subjected.

We may sometimes, in our zeal to win this struggle, tend to forget that it is our magnificent private enterprise system which has produced the affluence which affords our Nation the great opportunity to fight poverty.

This continuing indirect role of our private enterprise system is brought to mind on those occasions when one of our Nation's great companies takes its time and resources to involve itself. Such a situation developed just last week in my district.

While attending the Jackson County Fair at Wellston, Ohio, I took the opportunity to visit several schools in the area to see, at first hand, how our Headstart programs were going.

The teachers and the little children involved in Headstart are truly exciting. One can almost see the cloud of a dim future being lifted from the eyes of the children involved. The glum expressions of children with futures dimmed by lack of opportunity is being literally replaced by the bright and eager eyes of youngsters who have a future and will make a contribution.

One aspect of my visit, however, was disturbing. I happened to ask one little boy if he had brushed his teeth that morning. He shook his head, and with a shy smile, and a shrug of the shoulders indicated that he did not know what I was talking about. It later developed that a great number of the children in the Headstart programs, within the 10th Congressional District, had never visited a dentist and did not know what toothpaste and toothbrushes were. Faced with this situation I went to the phone and placed two long-distance calls. One to the Lever Bros. Co., in New York and the other to the Procter & Gamble Co., in Cincinnati. I frankly explained the situation to the executives, contacted on the phone, and was totally gratified with the reactions I received.

Mr. Speaker, within the hour, I received a confirmation from Mr. Warren Gerz of the Lever Bros. Co., that 80 dozen large-size tubes of Pepsodent toothpaste and 80 dozen junior-size Pepsodent toothbrushes were on their way to the Headstart programs in Jackson County. Subsequently, I received word from Mr. C. C. Uhling of Procter & Gamble that this fine organization was dispatching 200 toothbrushes to my district office for ultimate distribution within the 10th Congressional District.

It goes without saying that I take this occasion to commend, in the highest terms, the individuals and the two great companies, Procter & Gamble and Lever Bros., for their splendid response. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of all my colleagues, the great good will and spirit of cooperation which exists in our profitmaking system. It is there, gentlemen, and believe me, from this experience, it stands ready to aid Government at all levels, in the noble efforts to combat disadvantage.

NORTH VIETNAMESE PRISONERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times wonders whether the captured North Vietnamese seamen will give us a bargaining lever with Hanoi.

The United States possesses strong military and political levers, the newspaper says in an editorial. It remarks, however, on the unpredictability of the Communists.

At any rate, the Watertown newspaper points out, the captured seamen prove that North Vietnam is actively engaged in combat with the United States. It adds that they might be used in exchange for American servicemen held in North Vietnam. And it further adds that our holding of these men might persuade North Vietnam to comply with the Geneva Convention on treatment of war prisoners.

This is certainly a hope to be kept alive, and I offer the editorial stating that hope for the Record:

Prisoners, a Bargaining Lever?

Announcement that the United States is holding 19 North Vietnamese seamen as prisoners of war has a number of important meanings—and possibilities. These hostages serve both military and political purposes.

First, the positive identification of these sailors as being from North Viet Nam establishes a fact we had known all along, but which had not been definitely proved to some doubting nations: North Viet Nam, contrary to its protestations, is actively engaged in combat against the United States.

Second, there is speculation these 19 sailors might be used in an exchange for some of the 63 American servicemen held by Communist forces in Viet Nam.

Third, the fact the United States has the these hostages might possibly persuade North Viet Nam to comply with the 1949 Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war.

Holding of these 19 North Vietnamese is a departure from the U.S. policy of turning prisoners over to South Vietnamese authorities. But it is done with good reason.

In the past, North Viet Nam, in denying it was actively engaged in the war, always accepted men sent back to Hanoi by the South Vietnamese not as repatriated prisoners, but as refugees from the South. But now the U.S. and South Viet Nam have a lever of proof.

In contrast to the North Vietnamese soldiers, who normally are captured without any identifying insignia or uniform of the North Vietnamese army, the 19 sailors were captured in uniform and taken from two motor torpedo boats that clearly came from North Viet Nam and made an unsuccessful attack on a U.S. naval vessel June 30 in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Hanoi has announced it considers captured American airmen as war criminals; may try them as such; and would not hesitate to execute them—unless the U.S. succumbs to such blackmail by pulling out of Viet Nam.

So now the questions arise: Will Hanoi concede its troops are in combat against the United States? Will North Viet Nam, which like the U.S. was a signatory to the Geneva treaty, decide to abide by it? And will it cooperate in a prisoner-of-war exchange? The United States possesses strong military and political levers. But Communists are unpredictable.

REIMBURSEMENT OF MEDICARE PATIENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital or rehabilitation center to receive the care of a physical therapist.

The bill quite simply, would strike out language in the Medicare Act (title XVIII, sec. 1861, m, 7), which states that expenses can be paid "but not including transportation of the individual in connection with any such item or service."

This bill was initially introduced by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] and deserves the careful attention of all Members.

The present wording of the statute made it necessary for therapists to travel to patients' homes or to distant extended care facilities. The effect of this is to dissipate the time of the qualified practitioners, and hence to reduce their availability for these crucial services. Our principal purpose in medicare, of course, was to maximize the efficiency of medical aid for the elderly.

As presently written, the travel provisions are reducing that efficiency and limiting the amount of available service for our needy. The short supply of our therapists requires that we preserve their energies and utilize their skill most effectively. We can do this by giving patients the resources to travel to care centers and hospitals. I would hope that the Congress might act favorably on the legislation introduced by my colleague from Minnesota, and cosponsored today, by me.

REFLECTION ON COAST GUARD'S DEDICATED SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we honor an organization which has a long and distinguished record of service to our Nation and to humanity.

In celebrating the 176th birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard, I think we should reflect just a moment on the outstanding service which this small, but dedicated branch of Government has established. Since its inception in 1790, the Coast Guard has fought Napoleon's navy, cleared the Gulf of Mexico of pirates, and now is helping to defend freedom in Vietnam.

We in Florida are particularly aware of the gigantic task the Coast Guard does. Since it established a patrol in the Florida Straits in 1958 the Coast Guard has rescued or assisted more than 12,500 Cuban refugees from small boats and islands between Florida and Cuba. During the Cuban exodus in October and November 1965, more than 4,000 refugees were assisted.

For the tiny fleet which Alexander Hamilton envisioned, the Coast Guard has grown into a worldwide service with operations extending around the globe. While being on constant military readiness, its duties include ocean research, maintaining an extensive program of maritime safety and promoter and keeper of national security. That is quite a bit of work for a service with approximately 33,000 officers and men.

We owe a great debt to the Coast Guard. For its effort now and for the American heritage which it helped build.

CONTROL OF MOSQUITOES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would provide for the control of mosquitoes through research and technical assistance.

This is not a new subject to come before the House; however, it is a subject which certainly merits more attention than it has received in the past.

Legislation has come before this body many times in recent Congresses which would deal with the dangers of disease outbreak from mosquitoes and mosquito vectors. There has been, in fact, no bill enacted; it has been nearly a decade since hearings were held on the subject.

My bill is similar to that which was introduced by the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] a year ago January. I am hopeful that the response of the House will be more favorable now.

We in Middlesex County, N.J., have feared being plagued by the presence of a large number of mosquitoes in the Raritan Arsenal area. Leaders in county government, in industry, in civic affairs, and in the health professions have warned repeatedly that such a situation could be a breeding ground for an encephalitis epidemic.

The president of a local trucking firm has written to tell me that his 12 workmen on the night shift "are kept so busy fighting off the hungry monsters that we are finding it difficult to keep abreast of our work." "I've never seen any mosquitoes as large or as vicious as those that breed here," his day dispatcher also reported.

These mosquitoes are worse than a nuisance—they are clearly a health hazard. We know all too well the histories of past epidemics which have resulted from unchecked mosquito expansion.

I have written to Surgeon General Dr. William Stewart in reference to this problem and have received a reply from Dr. David J. Sencer, Assistant Surgeon General and Chief, Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta.

Dr. Sencer reported:

> The Public Health Service does not have funds available for direct aid to States, counties or communities for the control of pestiferous mosquitoes, except in emergencies such as floods or epidemics of vector-transmitted diseases.

In other words, until the tragedy strikes, our hands are tied. It certainly would appear that the old cliche an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure would be directly applicable here. We are faced with a menace which we do not have the proper means to combat. Our local mosquito control commission has spent over $60,000 in 6 months in an effort to lessen the danger of an outbreak but this has not proven to be sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I also know from past experience that our case is not isolated. Other Congressmen have attempted to battle mosquitoes in past Congresses and they have met with little success. My distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] have worked incessantly for a mosquito control project such as the one I am introducing today. They could recite to you chapter and verse the difficulties which they have had and with which they have suffered as a result of the lack of effective mosquito control.

Under this bill, Congress would establish a program of aiding technical study and research for mosquito control, of providing Federal facilities for the execution of State and local programs and of making matching grants to assist States and localities.

Hopefully, this act will alleviate the present injurious effect on agricultural activities, urban use activities, the development of recreational facilities and community development in general occasioned by the existence of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease.

We have already waited too long to mobilize our forces against this common enemy. We must turn over attention to the mosquito problem and we must organize for its control.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a publication of the American Mosquito Control Association entitled "Why Organize for Mosquito Control." I believe that it succinctly summarizes the problems involved with the various species of mosquitoes and the different diseases which they carry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate and positive consideration of my bill.

The article follows:

Why Organize for Mosquito Control

In the United States, almost 150 species of mosquitoes are recognized. Many of these have certain requirements of temperature, altitude, type of water, and other basic factors in their environments which tend to limit their occurence. We call some species "house" mosquitoes, "field" mosquitoes, "snow" mosquitoes, "salt marsh" mosquitoes, and other names which identify their normal production areas. Although these names generally apply, we often find them "away from home" or outside their usual habitat. Many kinds of mosquitoes are so well fitted for survival that they can live under very adverse conditions. While only about 150 different species of mosquitoes may live in an area the size of the United States, they may be found in many thousand types of habitats. Consequently, mosquitoes occur nearly everywhere.

They maintain a continuous attack upon us with little warning. They pump blood from our cattle and horses under our very eyes. They are well equipped to occupy this earth, since they have been on earth some 50 million years; the human race is but 500,000 years old.

In the mosquitoes' developing life, water is required. Before the eggs can hatch into active wrigglers and before these can develop into a less active pupal stage, water or sufficient moisture is an absolute necessity. However, when they are fully grown they are two-winged vigorous insects which may be capable of flights to areas many miles from the water. The mosquitoes which are most annoying may be growing in the vase on the living room table or in the fish pond in our yard. On the other hand, they might very well come to us from distant rivers, lakes, ponds, swamps, or other natural waters. Floods, rains, melting snow or high tides create places for young mosquitoes to grow. We build reservoirs, dams, ditches, sewage ponds and numerous other water areas which provide additional larval habitats. We irrigate our lawns, golf courses, fields, crops, and pastures and produce varieties of water resources for enterprising mosquitoes. It seems that man and nature together multiply the number of mosquito sources.

In recent years, the importance of malaria has been reduced in many parts of the world by mosquito control or eradication. Yellow fever and dengue, both important mosquito-borne diseases, are rare now because we have learned how to reduce the mosquito populations where these diseases were once common. In some areas *Aedes aegypti*, the vector of urban yellow fever, has been eradicated. Suppression of encephalitis, also a mosquito transmitted disease, is being approached through mosquito control. Many communities now exist where mosquitoes once claimed the land. Crops are being produced in swampy localities which we once feared to enter because of the vast mosquito menace. We work, vacation, and live in many places because mosquito control has made it possible to do so. We hear the names of a few great men associated with these outstanding mosquito control projects; but we know that those capable persons did not accomplish these programs alone. They were the leaders, scientists, and more important, the believers in the possibility of effective mosquito control through organization. No individual could have controlled the mosquito problem which spread in Brazil following the introduction of a malaria mosquito from Africa. Many hundreds of men, trained and organized, required several years to accomplish this result. In our local communities, we must plan mosquito control through organization. A united defense against mosquitoes on a continuing basis is our only hope for success.

VIETNAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a remarkable statement about the conflict in Vietnam which was made recently by Michael Monroney, the vigorous young candidate for Congress, who is seeking the Democratic nomination in the Eighth District of Maryland.

The statement is remarkable because it shows clear evidence of calm and courageous thinking on a subject that has been clouded over in many campaigns by hysteria and demagoguery. I consider it one of the most thoughtful endorsements of the principles behind our involvement in Vietnam that I have ever come across.

Unfortunately, this statement did not receive as widespread attention from the press as it deserved. I feel it should be read carefully by every intelligent American citizen:

Let's Talk Sense About Viet-Nam

(Text of speech by Michael Monroney
Saturday, July 30, 1966)

The issue of America's military involvement in Viet-Nam has implications far beyond the security from oppression of one small Southeast Asian nation.

Upon the results of this conflict rests the future security and peace of all men and women who desire freedom and the right to direct their own destiny.

Upon the results of this conflict could well rest the fate of our liberty here at home in years ahead.

Every aspect of our present policy—and, most importantly, the acceptable alternatives—must be weighed in any debate of this vital problem as an issue in this Congressional race.

I find it bitterly ironic and distasteful that two of my opponents—in an apparent attempt to make political capital from this desperate struggle—have either naively or dishonestly ignored so many of the facts which have generated our increased involvement in this conflict.

I find it disheartening that they have failed to provide one single acceptable alternative.

Every American abhors the thought of people killing other people. Every American shares the grief of families who have lost sons in this far-off, war-weary land. Every American shudders at the thought of escalation into nuclear holocaust.

Any American policy—short of withdrawing every American soldier from Viet-Nam or blatantly ignoring any avenue to a peaceful settlement—involves this abhorrence, this grief, this fear.

My two opponents do not have a monopoly on these emotions, but these very emotions, so it appears, have motivated their statements on Viet-Nam. They would indeed be less naive—or, at least, more intellectually honest—to have the courage to call for immediate withdrawal of every American soldier from Viet-Nam.

This course of action—however inconsistent with the realities of what is happening in Viet-Nam—would at least be consistent with their abhorrence, their grief and their fears.

Instead—without reviewing the facts, without examining the record—they have implied that this Administration has failed to pursue every possible means of negotiating a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam.

Instead—without regard for the consequences—they have suggested alternatives which would only prolong the agony of Viet-Nam and which would only intensify the efforts of our enemies.

For the sake of honest political debate and in the interest of intelligent public dialogue, let us talk sense about Viet-Nam. Let us review the record.

The gallant efforts of the United Nations brought to an abrupt halt an outright Communist attempt at armed aggression in Korea. As a result, Peking came up with a different strategy to spread the Communist sphere of influence.

We are facing this strategy in Viet-Nam today. It is a cleverly designed effort to conceal the spread of Communist control over nations by representing, in this instance, the Viet Cong and the National Liberation Front as a strong indigenous movement, more nationalist than Communist and with the genuine support of the people of South Viet-Nam.

We must not be duped into accepting this idea.

This so-called "war of national liberation" was and is nothing more than a shabbily disguised experiment—now openly admitted as such in Peking to test the Free World's alertness and determination to preventing the spread of Communism.

There is ample evidence that the Viet Cong—who kidnapped, maimed or murdered once every fifteen minutes during our 37-day peace offensive earlier this year—are nothing more than grisly gangsters working the wicked will of Hanoi and Peking.

And now we face North Vietnamese regulars, invaders, filtered into South Viet-Nam in increasing numbers as a desperate attempt to save the Communist experiment from failure.

Fortunately or unfortunately, the determination of the Free World to break the back of this evil experiment is dependent upon the patience and courage of the American people and the fortitude of our fighting men in Southeast Asia.

The President has said, "We did not ask to be the guardian of the gate, but there is no one else."

In fact, there are others. Korean, Australian and New Zealand troops are fighting in South Viet-Nam. The Philippine government, for example, will soon dispatch to South Viet-Nam 2,000 military engineers with sufficient troops to protect them. Every member-nation of SEATO is providing some form of military or non-military aid to support South Viet-Nam.

These nations—and others—recognize the dangers to them if this deadly experiment is successful. The Prime Minister of the new State of Singapore supports us, saying our presence in Viet-Nam is "buying time" for a stable Communist-resistant Southeast Asia.

Don't fall victim to cries that we have no friends who support us in South Viet-Nam. We do!

One of my opponents has called for a halt to the bombings, a halt to the build-up of American forces in South Viet-Nam. He says we should seek a de facto cease-fire, ordering American troops not to fire unless fired upon.

We cannot have a unilateral peace, my friend. Your suggestion—however well-intended—will serve only to intensify the "fight-fight-fight" policy as stated by Ho Chi Minh.

It would only, I fear, be interpreted as a sign of appeasement by Hanoi and Peking. It would only, I fear, lose whatever initiative we may have gained since the last peace offensive six months ago.

It would only, I fear, increase our casualties. A dead man can't shoot back!

This particular candidate has provided other "answers" to the problems, one of them being that we request a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Secretary Rusk has made it clear he would agree to just such a proposal, including one made recently by the Prime Minister of India.

It would contribute to intelligent debate if this particular candidate would read the newspapers!

It would contribute to intelligent debate if this particular candidate would not represent as his own thinking proposals which he has plagiarized from offers already made by our State Department . . . assuming, of course, that his unilateral peace might work!

It would contribute to intelligent debate if we could get something more than armchair dipolmacy from this particular candidate!

I have another opponent who has offered as his solution a halt to the escalation and redoubled efforts to obtain peace talks.

He says his position is—and I quote—"somewhere between the President and Senator FULBRIGHT." I submit to you that this particular candidate is afraid to agree with the President and afraid to disagree with him.

True to form, this particular candidate has his feet planted firmly on both sides of the fence.

His halt to the escalation would, I assume, entail a halt to the bombings of North Viet-Nam and a halt to the build-up of American troops in South Viet-Nam.

Such action would have the same effect as I have already described with regard to a similar position taken by his fellow expert.

As a result, let us take a look at his proposal for redoubling our efforts for a negotiated settlement.

Quite honestly, I do not know what this Administration can do—short of the President crawling down the streets of Hanoi on his hands and knees—to convince Hanoi and Peking and Moscow that the United States Government wants to sit down around a table and discuss a way to end this war.

It is my understanding that we have—in addition to repeated and direct appeals from our own diplomatic sources—utilized the dipolmatic channels of more than 70 other nations to convey to Hanoi and Peking and Moscow our desire for peace talks.

Other nations have undertaken unilateral diplomatic action repeatedly to bring this conflict to a halt.

Every attempt to bring about peace talks, even preliminary discussions, has been turned down flatly, and I would suggest to my two opponents that for each such attempt which has received news coverage it is just possible that others have not.

Furthermore, I have read the "14 points" which our government has established as the element for an honorable peace. These "14 points" provide a reasonable basis for bringing a halt to the fighting.

Take a look at the 13th point.

"The President has said, 'The Viet Cong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an unsurmountable problem.' "

And let us take a look at Hanoi's reply. They insist that the Viet Cong be accepted as the sole bargaining representative for the people of South Viet-Nam at any negotiations.

Their terms, in effect, state that we must turn over South Viet-Nam to the agents of Hanoi's war of national liberation before we even sit down to discuss the fate of the people of South Viet-Nam.

Let us take a look at our 14th point.

"We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Viet-Nam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped."

On this point, I could only suggest the following re-wording:

"We will halt all aerial and ground attacks if the other side will reciprocate in order to begin preliminary discussions for a peaceful settlement."

This is at best a practical and concrete suggestion based on the record, rather than a grandstand play for political gain.

As another possibility for dramatizing our desire for peace, I might suggest that the United States unilaterally call for a conclave of representatives from the more than 40 nations with which we have formal mutual security agreements.

Such a meeting would be designed to launch a coordinated effort through the diplomatic channels of each of these nations for a negotiated settlement to the war in Viet-Nam.

Such a meeting would—if practicable—add one more effort for peace to those which have already been made, including the tireless attempts by U Thant through the available machinery of the United Nations.

Our President has said he would go anywhere, any place, at any time to discuss peace.

On this basis and as another constructive proposal, I would suggest that the President make himself available with his chief foreign adviser in Tokyo in September. The suggestion would include an invitation to the heads of state and their foreign ministers of not only those nations with which we have mutual security agreements, but also comparable representatives from Hanoi, Peking, Moscow and the Communist bloc nations.

A meeting of this kind—with no preconditions other than a mutual desire for peace—would at least bring the participants together for discussion.

I cannot hold out personal hope that such additional efforts would succeed, but it would provide additional evidence for all the world to witness of our nation's intense desire to end this increasingly dangerous conflict. Such efforts would be consistent with the hope and faith which has made our nation great.

I am not, however, personally convinced that Hanoi, Peking or even Moscow want peace in Southeast Asia short of Communist control of that entire segment of the world.

Every attempt we have made—every attempt made by hundreds of diplomatic missions and messages by more than 70 other nations—has been met by a brick wall.

There are several things you can do with a brick wall. You can ignore it. You can penetrate it. You can flatten it. But you cannot negotiate with it. We do not want to ignore, penetrate or flatten this brick wall, but we do want to negotiate with it.

All avenues to peace failing while all avenues to peace are being tried, I take the position that the United States must continue its military efforts in Viet-Nam. We must continue until one of the avenues to peace is opened.

I take the position that—until one of these avenues is opened—our air strikes against military targets in North Viet-Nam are justified. I would, however, not condone the bombing of any non-military targets.

As for the elections in South Viet-Nam on September 11, I would adopt a wait-and-see attitude. I do not feel it is appropriate to condone or condemn in advance this attempt on the part of the people of South Viet-Nam to establish a constituent assembly for the purpose of self-determination.

In summary, I urge the armchair quarterbacks—and I myself qualify in this category—to exercise understanding and tolerance of the risks which our nation is taking in Southeast Asia.

At no time in the history of mankind—because at no time has mankind been armed with such weapons of devastation—has any one people been entrusted with so great a responsibility.

There is no question that we are treading on the brink of grave dangers by our policy in that far-away land.

We are fighting a fight which—several years ago—it might have been possible to keep clear of, if only to delay the time and the place when we must make our stand.

But, my friends, the die is now cast.

Proceeding with great caution, we must see this conflict through. We must insure that this Communist-inspired experiment fails—knowing full well the risks involved—if we are to assure freedom-loving people around the world and our children and their children any guarantees of peace and security and any rights of self-determination.

We owe at least this—and nothing less than this—to the responsibility of world leadership which we have so unwillingly inherited.

We owe at least this—and nothing less than this—to future generations of Americans who must have the peace tomorrow which we must sacrifice today.

Thank you.

HANDICAPPED CHILD BENEFIT AND EDUCATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Act."

As chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Education and Labor, it has been my responsibility, with my distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee, to review Government programs currently enacted in this field. In addition, our subcommittee has been made keenly aware of the shortcomings of these programs and the existence of unmet needs in this area. It has been clearly demonstrated to our Subcommittee that we lack any semblance of a national policy in the education and training of the handicapped. Further, many of the States in turn are without a well-defined public policy to this date.

If this were a passing problem, Federal action might be questioned; however, all signs and indications clearly demonstrate that in the years and decades ahead, we will have an ever increasing number of children who will suffer from deafness, blindness, mental illness and retardation, and multiple handicaps of all kinds. Unless we begin at once to plan and prepare the facilities and personnel required to serve these children, parents will experience a tragic futility in meeting their responsibilities. The handicapped child must not be a burden to the family alone. That burden must be shared by a humanitarian society. Unless something is done without delay, unfortunately we will not have teachers, programs, classrooms and all the special facilities required in this field of special education. It has been lucidly displayed to our Subcommittee that great possibilities for prevention, therapy and improved instruction are possible in special education. All that is lacking is the commitment of adequate resources by the Federal Government to provide the funds necessary to get programs underway.

In the 1,000 days of the administration of our late President John F. Kennedy, we made up our minds to do something about the neglect of the mentally retarded. Due to President Kennedy's leadership and the support of a determined Congress, we have made dynamic advances in the field of mental retardation in the space of a very few months. Hope has displaced despair in the minds and hearts of thousands of parents of retarded children because of our actions. Because we have accomplished this, we must not be content to rest on our record in this field alone; rather, our progress here is a lesson that Federal leadership is required in other types of affliction just as severe as mental retardation.

I do not want to convey the impression that the Federal Government is now exerting a minimal effort in assistance to handicapped persons. Our examination of Federal programs reveals that we are currently expending in excess of $800 million in a great variety of Federal assistance grant legislation. Such agencies as the Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Bureau of Crippled Children's Services, the Welfare Administration and a score of others are conducting these manifold programs. Even the Library of Congress manages the distribution of publications for the blind. Unfortunately until now, there has been very little coordination and inter-communication among these agencies. This has been brought to the attention of the administration by our subcommittee in the conduct of its hearings. Possessed with this knowledge, I am pleased that President Johnson has already begun to take action to effect better management of these efforts in the executive branch. On July 4, 1966, he directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to organize a Task Force to study all phases of the Federal Government's operations affecting the handicapped. The Honorable Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been named Chairman of this Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development, and following is a list of its membership:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation: Mr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs: Dr. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination: Mr. Wayne Kimmel, program analysis officer.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education: Mr. Philip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education Projects.

Office of Field Coordination: Mr. William A. Crunk, field representative.

Office of the Surgeon General: Dr. Paul Pearson, Assistant Director, mental retardation program, NICHD.

Welfare Administration: Dr. Arthur J. Lesser, Deputy Chief, Children's Bureau; Mrs. Pauline Rogers, family and child welfare specialist, Bureau of Family Services.

Office of Education: Dr. Morvin A. Wirtz, Deputy Assistant Commissioner.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration: Mr. Joseph Hunt, Assistant Commissioner.

Social Security Administration: Mrs. Ruth White, social insurance specialist.

Administration on Aging: Mr. Harvey Glommen, Director, foster grandparent program.

While this study is underway, I feel that it is incumbent on the Congress to do more than sit and await the outcome. In the bill I introduced today, I proposed that we begin to chart our own legislative path to work with this study group in the evolution of a comprehensive effort in this field for the first time in our Nation's history. It is with this in mind that the bill I have introduced has been drawn as an omnibus vehicle. This bill in great measure responds to the very practical and sound recommendations of the many organizations in the field who have already testified before our subcommittee. In form, it would function very much as does the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The eminent success of this legislation for the education of the disadvantaged child, as well as quality education for all children, makes it an ideal model for legislation in the field of the handicapped.

Following is a section-by-section analysis of my bill as introduced today:

Section-by-Section Analysis of the "Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Act"

DECLARATION OF POLICY

This section declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide comprehensive support for the education and training of the handicapped. Although there are a number of Federal programs benefiting the handicapped, investigations by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped have pointed out the lack of a national policy for the handicapped and a need for coordinated effort.

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE HANDICAPPED

Sec. 101—*Appropriations Authorized:*

Authorizes for Fiscal Year 1967 such sums as may be deemed necessary by the Congress for providing financial assistance to states for education and training of the handicapped. For Fiscal Year 1968 and succeeding Fiscal Years, such sums may be appropriated as may be authorized by law.

Sec. 102—*Allotments to States:*

Expands the provisions of Section 203 (a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides funds to states for each child in a state-supported non-school district school or institution for the handicapped. A grant of one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that state was made for each child enrolled in such a school. This section was the result of my bill, PL 89–313, which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last September. I am pleased that a great number of state and other school superintendents have written me to express their gratitude for the assistance received under this section.

While this legislation has been very beneficial, no similar funds have been available for children enrolled in classes for the handicapped in their local schools or for private schools serving handicapped children. In many sections of the country, public schools are not able to provide education for handicapped children, and the Office of Education estimates that only 25 percent of handicapped children are currently receiving the educational services they need. Number of privately operated programs for the handicapped are encountering severe financial difficulty. One example, the Fickling School in Dallas, Texas, offering services not provided in local schools, is currently losing $3,000 per month, and the Director, Mrs. Fickling, has already loaned the school $150,000.

Aid to local school districts through the state agencies will enable communities to begin or expand programs for children now receiving no help. Dr. Ernest Willenberg, President of the Council for Exceptional Children, has commented that as residential schools are now being supported and their programs improved, parents are faced with the choice of sending the youngsters away or keeping them in a program in the local school without benefit of such support.

The cost of educating a handicapped child is recognized to be much higher than for a normal child. Assistant Commissioner of Education Arthur Harris has called this cost the major deterrent to educating the handicapped child in the schools.

Section 102 will provide a grant to the states of one-half (the Federal percentage) the "average per pupil expenditure" in that state for each handicapped child. If the sums appropriated are not sufficient to pay the full amounts, the sums for each state will be reduced ratably. The language of the bill is explicit that if a state agency should desire to make direct grants to individuals on a tuition or scholarship basis, this could be done. The system would be similar to that employed in the payment of veterans benefits under the G. I. Bill.

Sec. 108—*Repealer:*

This section repeals Section 203(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

TITLE II—INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE HANDICAPPED

Sec. 201—*Duration of Program:*

This section authorizes to be appropriated for Fiscal Year 1967 such funds as may be necessary and calls for separate authorizations for each subsequent year. A program of grants to states is established for acquisition and distribution of instructional materials and equipment suitable for education and training of the handicapped. The amount to each state is proportionate to the children aged three to seventeen in each state.

Instructional materials for the handicapped are generally not available. The relatively small number of handicapped and the expensive nature of special materials has resulted in commercial publishers offering little in this area, so that teenage children, for example, who are slow learners have to read books designed for five-year old interests.

SEC. 203—*State Plans:*

This section calls for state plans for the purchase and distribution of library resources, textbooks and other materials for the handicapped. It also provides for special equipment for such educational services as audiological and psychological evaluation of deaf and other handicapped children.

SEC. 208—*Development of Training Materials for the Handicapped:*

This section expands the Captioned Films for the Deaf Program to include instructional films and materials for other handicapped persons. It also provides for distribution centers in each region served a Regional Office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

TITLE III—EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED

This Title establishes a program for making grants for exemplary programs for education of the handicapped, to serve as models for regular programs.

SEC. 301—*Appropriations Authorized:*

This section authorizes for Fiscal Year 1967 to be appropriated such funds as shall be necessary and calls for such sums as may be authorized by the Congress in Fiscal Year 1968 and thereafter.

SEC. 302—*Apportionment Among States:*

This section provides for a basic grant of $20,000 to each state, with the remainder of sums appropriated distributed among the states as the population of children aged three to seventeen in that state is related to the population of such ages in all states.

SEC. 303—*Uses of Federal Fund:*

This section describes kinds of projects designed to enrich and improve programs for education and training of the handicapped and aim at developing area where the unmet needs are greatest. Particular emphasis is given to projects for early identification and enumeration of the handicapped, coordinated programs of education, training and other services, programs for the multiple handicapped and handicapped children in rural areas, etc.

SEC. 304—*Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval:*

This section provides that each project within a state is to be awarded for not less than $5,000 to insure projects of sufficient magnitude and quality as to be exemplary.

SEC. 307—*Regional Programs:*

This section earmarks funds for the development of regional programs where the interests of the handicapped children can be best served on a regional basis rather than within state or local programs.

TITLE IV—TRAINING AND RESEARCH

This Title provides for future expansion of programs for training professional personnel to serve the handicapped, and for development of new educational methods and technology for educating the handicapped.

SEC. 401—*Training:*

Section 7 of the Act of September 6, 1948, is amended by striking out the authorizations for the Fiscal Years ending 1968 and 1969, and allowing such funds as the Congress may authorize.

SEC. 402—*Grants for Recruiting Personnel:*

This section authorizes such funds to be appropriated as may be deemed necessary to allow the Commissioner of Education to make grants to professional organizations, universities and colleges, state education agencies and other groups he deems advisable for recruiting personnel into fields of teaching or offering allied services to the handicapped. This will provide educators of the handicapped with resources similar to those available for recruiting scientists and engineers.

SEC. 403—*Research and Demonstrations:*

This section amends Section 302(a) of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to allow the Commissioner of Education to make contracts with private corporations and institutions for research and demonstration projects, developing educational methodology and equipment for the handicapped. Under the present law, only non-profit agencies can apply. Much emphasis is being given by industry in such areas as computerized programmed instruction which could be applied to the handicapped under the provisions of this amendment.

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS FOR THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 501—*Appropriations Authorized:*

This section authorizes to be appropriated such funds as may be deemed necessary to assist state education agencies in developing expanding and maintaining administrative and supervisory units having responsibility for educating and training the handicapped. This program will allow state education agencies to establish special administrative units for handicapped children at the state, and where indicated, local levels, to assist in identifying handicapped children and providing services for them.

SEC. 505—*Special Project Grants:*

Provides for 15 percent of the amounts appropriated to be used by the Commissioner for special projects developing state leadership and for such purposes as recruiting and retaining personnel for educating and training the handicapped.

SEC. 509—*Bureau for Education and Training of the Handicapped:*

This section calls on the Commissioner to establish and maintain within the Office of Education a Bureau for carrying out programs relating to education and training of the handicapped.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 604—*National Advisory Commission:*

This section establishes a National Advisory Commission for advising and assisting the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare with respect to education and training of the handicapped. This Commission will make recommendations to the Secretary for gathering information on the actual numbers of handicapped children, emerging needs of the handicapped, coordination of Federal programs for the handicapped and other such recommendations as may be appropriate.

RULES COMMITTEE ACTION ON H.R. 14026 NEEDED NOW TO END INTEREST RATE WAR, SAVE HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, last December 6, the Federal Reserve Board made a dreadful mistake in hiking interest rates across-the-board and increasing the maximum interest rates payable on certain commercial bank time deposits by 37½ percent.

Not only has this ill-advised action created inflationary pressures by contributing to over-expansion of plant and equipment facilities, but this move by the Fed touched off a high interest rate war which has drained dry our thrift institutions of funds for home financing.

As a direct result, the homebuilding industry is sick, as predicted housing starts for 1966 are off 25 percent. In hundreds of communities from coast-to-coast, thrift institutions, normally the primary source of mortgage financing, are out of the market entirely. Mortgage brokers, real estate agents, insurance agents, and people in the many other building-related industries are virtually out of business. Construction workers and other members of the building trades unions are anxious about their future livelihood. The situation, now very bad, is bound to get much worse as present loan commitments are fulfilled but without new funds entering the housing pipeline. The homebuilders—as every Member of this House knows—are up in arms, and properly so.

One week ago today, July 28, Chairman PATMAN filed the Banking and Currency Committee report on H.R. 14026, a bill which would not only end this destructive and senseless rate war, but would offer relief to the home-buying public and the building industry.

The homebuilders, the thrifty industry, the smaller banks, and representatives of consumer groups and working people such as President Meany of the AFL–CIO, all agree that a 4½-percent temporary ceiling on small denomination bank time deposits is the only sure solution to this terrible problem. H.R. 14026 contains such a provision, and the Rules Committee must grant a rule on this bill so that the House can act immediately to provide the necessary emergency relief before it is too late.

THE 176TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today the U.S. Coast Guard was born. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the officers and men of the Coast Guard and the service they have performed through the years and which continues today on an even larger scale.

The Coast Guard was originally established to patrol our coast to prevent smuggling into the United States which was in its infancy at the time. Today its functions and services have expanded and its duties now include service in

South Vietnam, the Mediterranean, and from the Arctic to the Antarctic.

The Coast Guard has a record of service in wartime of which it can well be proud. During national emergencies it operates as a mission of the Navy; during peacetime it operates under the Treasury Department. The Coast Guard is the Nation's oldest continuous, seagoing service.

The Coast Guard has an outstanding record of rescuing ships and cargoes, the value of which runs to many times the yearly budget of the agency.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, it has been a pleasure to work with the officers and men of the Coast Guard. I respect their ability and devotion to duty and country.

I am pleased to have had a part in providing an excellent base of operations for the Coast Guard's eastern area office and its third district office--I refer to the quarters at Governor's Island, N.Y., where we will soon have 6,000 employees and supporting activities.

On this 176th anniversary, I say to the officers and men of the Coast Guard, "Congratulations, you have a distinguished background and a long and, I know, distinguished future ahead."

THE MIAMI GATEWAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. John D. Barfield, Director of the Miami Gateway Reception Center of the Department of State, made a most informative address to the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas meeting in Montego Bay, Jamaica. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues his remarks on the functions of the Department of State reception centers in Miami and five other great U.S. ports of entry and also his comments upon the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center which we are developing in the Miami area. The text of his remarks during the chamber of commerce annual convention of June 9–11 is as follows:

Speech of John D. Barfield, Director, Miami Gateway Reception Center, Department of State, Washington, D.C., to the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, Annual Convention, Montego Bay, Jamaica, June 9–11, 1966

Having participated in several conferences in beautiful Jamaica in the past several years and having a high regard for the basic importance of free enterprise in the mutual development of our respective nations, I accepted with alacrity the gracious invitation to speak to this distinguished group extended to me by Mr. Frank Gatteri. In passing, I would like to record my admiration for the truly dedicated job your International Coordinator has done during the past years I have known him and, I am told, for the entire sixteen years he has been one of the principal sparkplugs of this increasingly important organization.

I would like to discuss with you briefly several points relating to private and official facilities for making visits to the United States by distinguished foreign guests on serious purposes more profitable. I feel there is much that is not generally understood concerning the availability and usefulness of such facilities and this is most unfortunate in a period when the maximum benefit should be derived from such visits in order that commercial and industrial progress, so greatly needed, may be expedited. As this conference is dedicated primarily to private initiative, I am pleased to comment on this aspect first, as it pertains to Miami. Though I am an official of the U.S. State Department, I am also an ex-officio member of the board of a non-profit organization in Dade County known as the Council for International Visitors of Greater Miami. This group which includes many of the most prominent people of the area dedicates itself to optimum programing of VIPs and students visiting the area for serious purposes who are referred to it through any of a number of prestigious programing agencies. Last year this organization programed completely or in part some 1900 international visitors to the Greater Miami area.

When you or your professional friends wish to visit the United States for professional reasons involving contact with your colleagues here it might be quite worthwhile to write to the Chamber of Commerce in cities you intend to visit asking them to refer the letters to the local volunteer organization for rendering services to international visitors. These local private organizations are associated with a national organization known as COSERV—that is, Community Services for International Visitors. Services including arranging appointments with local persons, home hospitality such as dinner and lunches, sightseeing, etc. If a letter is sent within one month of arrival it would normally be possible to arrange a program along the lines desired or, if done by telephone, less notice would be necessary. Of course, something can usually be arranged almost on the spur of the moment but for a dependably optimum program a month's notice should be given.

As an officer of the U.S. State Department I am naturally concerned primarily with programs of official visitors to the United States. Before turning to visitors who arrive on the various programs of the Department of State, I would like to say a few words about a sort of semiofficial program designed for the businessman from other countries visiting the U.S. I refer to the program administered in the U.S. by the Department of Commerce. Businessmen in other countries wishing to visit the U.S. for business purposes are invited to visit the various embassies, legations, consulates general and consulates of the United States in their respective countries to inform the appropriate commercial officers of their intentions. Such missions then notify the Department of Commerce in Washington which in turn informs the field offices of the Department of Commerce in the various cities to be visited by the businessman. The field officers then make the desired appointments so that upon arrival no time is lost in logistics.

The department of Commerce publishes a magazine monthly called International Commerce which circulates extensively among U.S. businessmen interested in International Commerce. The itineraries of visiting businessmen can be published in this magazine so that U.S. businessmen interested in contacting them can contact the field office of the Department of Commerce in the city concerned to make arrangements for the visiting businessman to be informed of this interest so that it can be exploited if there is mutual interest. At the present time, unfortunately, this service is not being used to the degree which would appear useful. That is one reason I wish to bring it to your attention and suggest that you visit or call the commercial section of the U.S. mission where you live when you visit the U.S. on business. One caution is neecssary, however, in the past, business visitors have announced their intentions to visit particular cities and on occasion fail to notify the Department of Commerce that their plans were changed—with unfortunate consequences. Therefore, it is hoped businessmen will remember to notify the Department of Commerce of changes of plans when arrangements have been made.

Now a few words about the official U.S. State Department programs with which I am in charge in Miami. My office is one of six Departments of State Reception Centres in the United States. The others are at New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, Seattle and Honolulu. Their function is to meet in coming official visitors of the U.S. to assist them with entry formalities and extend an official welcome. Additionally, they program a smaller number of official visitors who spend periods averaging five days in their respective locations. Last year, for example, the Miami Reception Centre met some three thousand visitors and programed 1021. Some of these visitors were businessmen.

I would like to tell you some thing of what is meant by programing. Perhaps the best way to do this is to describe a typical Miami program but before doing so I would like to adduce for your consideration the fact that since 1949 some 53,000 official visitors have arrived in the U.S. for programing which should give you some idea of the magnitude of this operation. Another purpose of giving you the details of a typical Miami program is to give you an idea of some of the important attractions of Miami where the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas has a chapter.

Let us assume our visitor is an Engineer who is in charge of planning for the government of country X. He might be interested to see the University of Miami which has an enrollment exceeding 14,000, making it the largest private university in the Southeastern part of the United States. He will note the new computer centre with its superb equipment unexcelled in this part of the U.S. He will learn there is a short six or eight week course designed for professors in computer techniques and operations which might be useful for some of the members of the faculty at some of the universities in country X. Perhaps what will interest him most is the new industrial engineering course designed for graduate students seeking masters degrees. In this course students are taught all aspects of the problem of installing a given industry in a given country where it does not exist.

The student himself works in the Industry in the Miami area to learn first hand its operational and administrative problems and technique. His thesis is designed to serve also as a basis for financing. Thus, the student finds himself in a position to act as the Agent for the various individuals, as well as private and public financial organizations, which may be interested in sponsoring the installation of the particular industry in a given country. This month the first student to complete this program was awarded his degree at the universary of Miami. Two other students from Colombia are presently enrolled and applications are being accepted for a considerably larger number of students. I consider this program as having an enormous significance particularly in light of the next item on the programme of our hypothetical visitor.

Next, our engineer visitor might well wish to consult the officials of "Interama"—the Inter-American Centre Authority. This is a semiautonomous entity of the State of Florida designed to create a permanent $500,000,000 cultural, educational and trade centre of the Americas. It will be located on a 1700 acre plot of prime land in Greater Miami between Miami and Miami Beach. The land has been cleared and construction will begin almost immediately with opening date set for July, 1968. Already more than half of the Latin American nations have formally or informally pledged their participation in this momentous enterprise. The most interesting aspect of this project, in my opinion, will be the inter-national exchange of persons opportunities created. As many as a thousand or more top university students from the various Latin American countries will come each year to serve as guides for the exhibits of their countries. This function will occupy only half of the time of the students, the other half being free for study at one of the numerous institutions of higher education in the Dade County (Greater Miami) area. The implications of this opportunity are simply breathtaking. One can easily see how this ties in with industrial engineering courses at the University of Miami. Additionally, there are very fine courses of nearly every sort at the various other educational institutions in the area such as Dade County Junior, Barry College and Lindsay Hopkins Institute. U.S. and foreign industry will also have a chance to exhibit their wares. The U.S. exhibits will be in the industrial area and the foreign exhibits will be a part of the pavilions of the international area (there will be four areas, i.e., cultural industrial, inter-national and recreational). These exhibits will not be product displays but comprehensive stories of industries showing the evolution of given industries within the U.S. For example, the transportation story will be told by any U.S. automotive company or companies interested in doing this without reference to the specific product. However, there will be a separate trade center where specific products may be displayed. It is contemplated that businessmen from all over the hemisphere will find this a convenient meeting place to discuss mutual needs and plans.

With respect to commerce, our visitor might well wish to visit the new port of Dade County at Dodge Island, built largely on land dredged up from Biscayne Bay at a cost exceeding $23,000,000. An interview with one or more of the officers of the very active Chamber of Commerce would be quite rewarding. It should be pointed out that within the past year the Chamber has been instrumental in securing a VIP room adjacent to the U.S. Customs area at the Miami International Airport, primarily for use of the consular corps and VIPs who have free entry. The various publicity media also will use this facility which will significantly expedite and dignify reception of our distinguished visitors. Also, a committee has been created to assist in investigating and rectifying trade complaints received from persons in other countries and the various consuls have been advised of this service which is designed to guarantee, to the extent possible that unethical businessmen will not prosper.

The above contacts might well represent the extent of the professional contacts desired by our visitor if he is on a typical visit. The rest of his time he might wish to leave free for sightseeing, home hospitality and last minute purchases before returning home. "Miami is often the last stop for VIPs and student groups from Latin America". It is here that the aforementioned Consul for International Visitors of Greater Miami's most interesting and influential citizens cooperate to provide home hospitality and sightseeing for distinguished international visitors are dis-abused of some of the misconceptions and stereotypes of which those who have never seen for themselves understandably are possessed. The visitor perceives that diversity is the order of the day in American homes and that valid generalizations are difficult to draw in light of this.

In closing, in addition to reiterating my sincere gratitude for your gracious invitation, I would like to state my personal conviction that the future of inter-American relations of all types looms bright on the horizon. Though there will doubtlessly be contretemps and set-backs from time to time, the ineluctable course of developments will be favourable. Clearly; the required attitudes and educational achievements are rapidly being acquired by our citizenry, so that the tremendous potential of our hemisphere will be realized in a climate of freedom to the benefit of all. The role of free enterprise, the theme of this conference, is vital.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN PRESIDENT'S CABINET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Schisler], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to create a new Cabinet-level agency—the Department of Education. This measure, although introduced no less than 50 times since 1900, is more important now than ever before.

Today there are well over 50 million elementary and secondary school students in the United States; millions of other young people are now in our colleges and universities. The Nation spends literally tens of billions of dollars annually on education.

Because State and local governments have traditionally supported their own educational systems, the Federal Government has been slow to enter this field. However, the ever-increasing number of students has convinced Congress to aid State and local educational agencies.

In fiscal 1965 the Federal Government spent $5 billion in education and training programs. The comparable figure for fiscal 1966 is estimated at $7.077 billion. One year later it will reach $8.371 billion. A total of 42 different Federal agencies are involved in these educational and training programs.

A look at fiscal 1966 expenditure estimates illustrates the multiplicity in the Federal educational effort. For fiscal year 1966 total expenditures will be around $7 billion. Of this total, the Office of Education will administer only $1.5 billion. Forty-one other agencies will have distributed billions of dollars. A table below lists some of them and the amount they distribute:

[In millions]

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (excluding Office of Education)	$930
Office of Economic Opportunity	637
National Science Foundation	365
Department of Labor	291
Department of Housing and Urban Development	240
Department of Interior	180
Department of Agriculture	180
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	144
Atomic Energy Commission	94

The fact that so many Federal agencies are spending so much on education is the main reason for the creation of a separate Department of Education. To avoid duplicity and waste, all these programs must be coordinated. Millions of dollars could be saved or put to more effective use if one Federal department could guide all others in their educational programs.

The bill I have introduced will provide greater coordination and more direction for the Federal educational effort. This legislation gives the President authority to transfer any educational programs to the new Department of Education.

The bill also forbids Federal control of education. It provides for a Secretary, Under Secretary, and three Assistant Secretaries to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. A Special Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Development will be in charge of all long-range planning. He will be appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President.

Mr. Speaker, it was almost 100 years ago that President Andrew Johnson issued an Executive order creating an Independent Office of Education. Seventy-two years later, the Office was transferred to the Federal Security Agency. In 1953, it became part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Today as we approach the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Office, it is time, in view of its mammoth growth and increased importance, to make it a Cabinet-level department.

THE HANDICAPPED CHILD BENEFIT AND EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill entitled "The Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Act."

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare I have become increasingly concerned about the Federal programs to provide assistance for the education and training of the handicapped. In 1955 after addressing a group of parents of mentally retarded children I returned to Washington to chair my subcommittee and to ask many witnesses from various departments in the Government what was being done in the field of mental retardation and learned that nothing was being done. That year my committee appropriated $750,000 earmarked for programs in mental retardation. This year the committee approved the amount of $334 million for this purpose.

In 1958 I was successful in having legislation enacted to provide for programs to train teachers for the mentally retarded, and in 1961 inaugurating the same kind of programs to train teachers of the deaf. I still am of the opinion that we are not doing enough in these areas. I believe that many of the programs which have been set up to assist the blind, the deaf, and the mentally retarded should be expanded to help all handicapped persons. Research is showing us that new techniques and new equipment can contribute measureably to the education of children with other kinds of handicaps. Certain kinds of programed instruction or computer based instructional techniques are proving successful with emotionally disturbed youngsters, but the equipment and materials involved are of sophisticated design and are financially beyond the reach of most schools.

I am convinced that the time has come when we need a national policy and Federal help and leadership in dealing with the educational and training needs of all handicapped children who need special help. For too long, we have dealt with these problems on a piecemeal basis, without bringing the total problem into sharp focus. We have not done nearly enough in even measuring the size of the problem and identifying the children who need and would benefit from special help.

As in the case of mental retardation, if we are to move forward, we must turn the spotlight directly on the group of children who are so often dealt with on a hit or miss basis today. In my judgment, this means special legislation on a broad base, special appropriations for this purpose only, and separate administrative units within our educational structure whose exclusive concern is for the handicapped child who needs special educational help. These are the real purposes of the bill I am introducing.

The bill I am introducing today would provide financial assistance to States for education and training of the handicapped. It would expand the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which now provides funds to States for each child in a State-supported nonschool district school or institution for the handicapped. It would provide for instructional materials for education and training of the handicapped and would expand the captioned films for the deaf program to include instructional films and materials for other handicapped persons, a provision which I urged be included when this bill passed the House this year.

The bill would provide for exemplary programs for education of the handicapped which would establish a program for making grants for exemplary programs for education of the handicapped to serve as models for continuing programs. Particular emphasis would be given to projects for early indentification of the handicapped since this is the time when progress can be made if the handicap is recognized and identified.

The bill provides that the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education would establish and maintain within the Office of Education a bureau for carrying out programs relating to education and training of the handicapped and it would set up a National Advisory Commission to advise and assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to education and training of the handicapped.

I am certainly hopeful that this much needed legislation will receive early favorable consideration in the House.

STATEMENT OF ORVILLE FREEMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor and pleasure of accompanying the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture to New York City where he testified before the city council on the rising cost of food, especially bread and milk. In my opinon, Secretary Freeman did a masterful job and is to be commended for his outstanding statement and testimony.

I think that all of my colleagues here in the House, indeed all Americans, should read his statement, for it contains facts that we all need to know. With this in mind I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD.

However, I feel that the Secretary did not go far enough in stating the dangers that face every American consumer, especially of dairy products. Based on the statistics that I have been studying, I have reached the conclusion that in the months to come it will no longer be a question of high prices for milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream; it will be a question of the availability of these products at any price. Unless we take immediate action, we will face the very real possibility of rationing of dairy products, which is without precedent in this country in peacetime.

While the production of other crops, such as cereals, beef, pork, and poultry, can be increased in a relatively short time, it takes 2 to 3 years to increase milk production for this is the time that it takes for a calf to be put into production. As of today our dairy herds are still being slaughtered for use as meat because the price of meat is so high and the return to dairy farmers from his milk so low.

In the year 1900 we had more dairy cows than we have today. Summer is the traditional time of high milk production. Yet this June production was off 3 percent from June of 1965 and virtually the same as in January of 1965. For many years we have been living off of our accumulated surpluses of dried milk, butter, and cheese. These are long since gone and so our requirements must be met by our day-to-day production which is increasingly becoming inadequate. I fear that in the months ahead producers will continue to slaughter off their herds and our production will continue to slip even though we are facing ever-increasing domestic and foreign demands.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that it will be in the best interests of both the consumer and the farmer that a system of direct production payments be made to milk producers. I feel that production payments will be the fastest and most economical way to stimulate this much-needed production. What has happened in New York City is happening all over. The farmer is getting a penny a quart more for his milk but the consumer is paying 3 cents more. The consumer is outraged at this increase, while in fact the bulk of the increase is going to those organizations who handle and distribute dairy products. With direct production payments the farmer would receive enough additional income to permit him to continue farming and to expand his herds. Just as important the consumer would not be subjected to unwarranted and unconscionable increases. The cost to the taxpayer would be far less than the continuous drift toward inflation.

The dairy farmer in America today is earning about 60 cents an hour. I do not think very many of us would be interested in investing our time, energy, and money in an enterprise with a return like this. I strongly urge both my colleagues and the administration to examine these facts and act upon them quickly.

STATEMENT OF ORVILLE FREEMAN

Mr. President, Members of the New York City Council:

I should like to begin these remarks by commending the leadership and the members of this Council for your concern and interest in food and food costs.

New York is a great city. Its millions of people consume enormous quantities of food. Even a small change in the cost of that food affects their standard of living. This is especially true of large families, and particularly so of those in the low income groups.

Therefore, it is wise, timely, and responsive that you propose to investigate recent food price changes. I applaud your initiative. And I thank you for this invitation to take part in your hearings—an invitation which I accepted with alacrity.

My philosophy of food and people recognizes the basic unity of interest between the farmer and the consumer—and with the food marketing system, too. The farmer earns his livelihood by producing food abundantly for consumers, and he expects to receive a fair price for his product. The consumer depends upon the farmer for that abundance of food, and knows that he must pay an adequate price in order to receive it. There is no conflict in these viewpoints . . . or in the concept that what is good for the farmer and consumer is in the long run good for the middleman as well.

In addition, each farmer is himself a consumer. Most farmers today buy their food at the supermarket like the city consumer. All of us recognize that nutritious food in adequate supply is necessary to our well-being.

We know that food, like other things, must be paid for. However, because we must have food to live, and because food is an important item in our family budget, and because we buy it more frequently than any other item or service, we are likely to be very sensitive about food costs—and vocal about them, too.

This is as it should be. The focus of public attention is the most effective instrument for fair play that we have in a free society. Therefore, your investigation is a useful one, and I am pleased to do my best to contribute to it.

Let me repeat that both farmers and consumers benefit from fair and stable farm and food prices. Violent upswings and downswings disrupt markets and supplies, damaging producers and consumers alike.

Sometimes we tend to see only one side of the equation. It is easy to see how prices that are too high penalize consumers. But it is equally true, though less immediately apparent, that in the long run prices that are too low also hurt consumers.

A fair price must be paid. If it is not paid, consumers eventually will not be able to command the resources and the services to get the food quality and abundance they desire at prices that are equitable. If the farmer and those who manufacture his production tools, supplies, and equipment—and if those who process and distribute what the farmer produces and bring it to the consumer in an attractive, sanitary, and nutritious way—if all these do not get a fair return, their labor and their capital will go elsewhere.

Obvious as this is, it bears restating.

It is well to note that over the past year, dairy farmers have left the farm at twice the usual rate, and the number of dairy cows has dropped to the lowest level since 1900. With alternative kinds of employment available, many dairy farmers are putting both their capital and labor elsewhere.

Dairy farmers have been the lowest paid of the generally underpaid farm segment. In New York last year, dairy farmers earned only 40 cents an hour after costs and a 5¾ percent (prevailing rate) return on capital. In Wisconsin, where the prevailing interest rate was 5½ percent, the hourly return in 1965 was 60 cents.

Is it any wonder that thousands of them are taking the better paid jobs available today in our booming economy with a 40-hour work week and no cows that must be milked morning and night? The clearly predictable result of this movement out of dairying has been a sharp cut in the supply of milk with higher prices to the consumer.

The issue, then, becomes clearly: What is a fair price? What should the farmer receive? Are unreasonable profits being made? What is the true story? Is the American consumer getting good food at a fair price, or is he being exploited in the marketplace?

As I have said, I am here to be of service to you in your important investigation. But I also come to you—and through you to the consumers of this great city and other cities throughout the United States—with a simple plea, "Don't make the farmer the scapegoat for increases in the cost of living and for the inflationary pressures that may now exist."

I respectfully submit that recent modest farm price increases have been too long delayed. They are fair to the farmer. They are needed by the farmer. They are not unfair to the consumer. In a broad sense, they are in the national interest.

Farm price increases have occasioned only a small part of the rise in food prices that we have witnessed recently. Permit me to illustrate my point by an analysis of price increases in certain of the more important food items to which attention has been called repeatedly in the press and on the air in New York City.

Most prominently mentioned have been milk and bread. According to newspaper accounts, the retail price for a 1-pound loaf of white bread rose 3 cents from July 1965 to July 1966. In that same period, the farmer's return for the farm ingredients in that 1-pound loaf—the wheat, skim milk, and other farm products—rose from 3.4 cents to 3.9 cents.

The price rise to the farmer was only half a cent—compared with a reported 3 cents rise in the retail cost. Clearly, 2.5 cents of the 3 cent rise in the loaf of bread was *not* caused by the farmer.

A little history emphasizes this point. In 1950 the farmer received about 2½ cents for the wheat that went into a 1-pound loaf of bread. That loaf retailed for about 14 cents then. Today the farmer receives 3.2 cents. But the price of bread around the nation now averages 22 cents. The farmer is receiving less than a penny more for the wheat in a loaf of bread for which the retail price has increased 8 cents.

The situation for milk is comparable. Increases of 2 to 3 cents a quart have been reported in New York City at the retail level. During 1966 the average price paid to farmers for Class I fluid milk will increase between 40 and 45 cents per 100 pounds over last year. With 46 quarts of milk in each 100 pounds, a retail price increase of about 1 cent a quart would be justified. Anything more than this must be accounted for by other factors.

The question thus becomes, "What about the *farm* price increases for milk and bread?" Were farmers adequately rewarded before these increases occurred? Or are the increases justified? Are they fair? Are they in the national interest?

The period 1947 to 1949 is customarily used as a base for comparison of price changes in the various items we buy as consumers . . . and if we use it as a base to measure recent trends in farm prices, marketing charges, and retail food prices, some interesting facts emerge.

1. Farm prices in 1965 were 8 percent below the 1947–49 base period. In first-half 1966 they were 2 percent below, and last month they were 1½ percent below the base period.

2. Retail food prices in 1965 were 28 percent higher than in the 1947–49 period. In June 1966, they were up 34 percent from the base period.

Last year the cost to consumers of farm-produced food totaled $77.6 billion, up $34.2 billion, or 79 percent, from the 1947–49 average of $43.4 billion. Of this $34.2 billion increase in the cost of farm-produced food, $27.6 billion, or 80.7 percent, was received by the marketing agencies, processors, and other components—in other words, the middleman. Only $6.6 billion, or 19.3 percent, trickled down to the farmer for the much larger volume of products he delivered to the distribution system.

The point these figures dramatize is that farm prices and farm income have lagged far behind the return to other sectors of our economy. May I call your attention to certain charts (appended to this statement) which I think will clarify some of the points at issue? [Charts do not appear in RECORD.]

Chart 1 shows the widening gap between retail food prices and the prices received by farmers.

Charts 2, 3, and 4 compare prices for wheat, dairy, and meat at the farm with retail prices of bread and other bakery, meat, and cereal products.

These objective facts establish, I think, beyond controversy that farm prices are not the major cause of increased food prices that we are now experiencing. On the contrary, farm prices lag far behind the increased prices of other items which make up the cost of living.

Do you know of any other major item—whether it be taxes, transportation, professional services, housing, or whatever—whose price is less today than it was two decades ago? I'm sure the manswer is "no." There are no other items making up a considerable part of our cost of living that have actually decreased in price.

We are all concerned with rising prices—the farmer no less than the city dweller. Since 1960, the things the farmer has to buy have gone up by 11 percent. If he had not increased his productivity during these years, his financial position would be very bleak indeed. But since 1960 farm productivity per man hour is up by nearly one-third, compared with an increase in productivity in the non-farm sector of only about 18 percent.

And since 1947, farm output per man hour has risen 185 percent as against an increase of 65 percent in the non-farm sector.

This sizable increase in farm productivity didn't "just happen". The farmer has invested millions upon millions of his own dollars to improve his agricultural plant. Government programs—research, economic stabilization, credit—have aided and encouraged the farmer to increase his productivity. And the results have been worth the effort.

Today, the American consumer—despite recent price rises—is eating better food, at a lower real cost, than he ever has before. As chart 5 shows, the average family today spends about 18 percent of its after-tax pay on food—the lowest average in the world, and by far the lowest in our entire history. In 1947 this same family spent 26 percent of its take-home pay for food, and as recently as 1960 spent 20 percent. If the percent of take-home pay spent for food remained the same as it was in 1947, $35 billion would be added to the nation's food bill, and about $750 a year to a family of four.

Let's compare 1960 with today to see how much more we can buy now than we could then: One hour of factory labor earnings in 1965 bought: 12.5 pounds of white bread . . . compared with 11.1 pounds in 1960. 2.4 pounds of round steak . . . compared with 2.1 pounds. 3.2 pounds of sliced bacon . . . compared with 3.5 pounds. 3.5 pounds of butter . . . compared with 3 pounds. 9.9 quarts of milk . . . compared with 8.7 quarts. 5 dozen eggs . . . compared with 3.9 dozen. 27.8 pounds of potatoes . . . compared with 31.4 pounds. 16.2 cans of tomatoes . . . compared with 14.2 cans.

American farmers not only have provided a plentiful supply of food for their own country; they have also given the United States a valuable instrument for other uses. This year agriculture will earn more than $5 billion of precious foreign exchange, thus setting a new export record. Each year food assumes a more important role in American foreign policy.

This year we are shipping about one quarter of our total wheat crop to one nation, India . . . and this wheat is the only thing standing between that sub-continent and widespread famine. Since 1954, 145 million tons of American food, at a cost of more than $15 billion, have gone to hundreds of millions of hungry, needy people all over the world. This magnificent humanitarian record is a tribute to the generosity of our people and the productivity of our farmers.

But even if we are persuaded, now, that the farmer is entitled to some price increases as a matter of fairness and in the nation's interest, the question still remains: Why have recent jumps in certain food prices *exceeded* farm price increases?

Why have bread prices jumped a reported 3 cents a pound, rather than the ½ cent that farm price increases would justify . . . and why has milk gone up 3 cents a quart, instead of 1 cent?

This very important question deserves a prompt and factual answer.

So far, to my knowledge, consumers have not received such an answer. But I am sure that the members of this Council and many New York City consumers read with interest, as did the Secretary of Agriculture, a comparison of the second quarters of 1965 and 1966 in the July 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal which showed that profits for 12 unmanned grocery chains are up 21 percent over a year ago, and profits of food products companies are up 16.5 percent.

And now, as you pursue the answer to the food price question, I promise you the wholehearted cooperation, support and assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Permit me to make a few additional points which I am sure you will want to keep in mind as your investigation goes forward.

These facts are too often overlooked:

1. Farm prices and food prices may be, and usually are, two different things.

2. Americans are choosing more expensive types of food than formerly, and are eating a smaller volume of the lower-price foods. Over the past 20 years, consumption of meat is up about 20 pounds per person, and most of the increase has come in the higher priced cuts of meat. Conversely, consumption of

cereal products, an inexpensive item, is *down* about 25 pounds per person per year over the same period.

3. Today's consumers are receiving more services with their food purchases. For instance:

The typical American supermarket today stocks from six to ten thousand items on its shelves, double the number it did 20 years ago. It is not unusual to find as many as 85 different cuts of meat and poultry and 70 different varieties of canned vegetables in one market. An estimated 70 percent of sales today are for products that did not even exist 10 years ago. All of these innovations cost money, and all must be paid for by the consumer.

Other non-food services—parking lots, check cashiers, trading stamps, advertising and promotion—also cost money.

4. Convenience foods, to the extent they are purchased by a housewife, also add to her food bill. A good example is the TV dinner, selling for 60 cents. Prepared at home, it would cost 20 cents. In this case the housewife pays about 40 cents for built-in services. These convenience foods free the housewife for other activities and give her more time to spend with her family, but they are an item in increased food costs which cannot be charged to the farmer. For a TV dinner, for instance, the farmer receives only about 8 cents for his products out of the 60 cents retail cost.

5. The shopper in the supermarket often buys many items in addition to food. Cigarettes, cosmetics, hardware, and even wearing apparel go through many a supermarket check-out counter. Certainly, these items cannot properly be considered a part of the family *food* budget.

Finally, let me point out once again that:

1. Only a small portion of the increased cost of food at the retail level can be traced to increased farm prices.

2. Recent modest farm price increases are badly needed and have been earned. Both consumers and farmers benefit when the farmer is fairly rewarded for his labor. The farmer has not been fairly rewarded in the past, and if this situation is allowed to persist, food supplies will diminish as farmers leave agriculture. Prices will then increase sharply and the consumer ultimately will pay much more.

3. Many factors—convenience items, services, etc.—go into the retail price of food. All of us as consumers must decide whether we wish to buy such convenience and such service along with our daily bread.

4. The real cost of food—measured as a percentage of income and in the number of hours of work necessary to buy it—has been going steadily down.

5. Food price increases beyond the modest farm price increases so far experienced call for vigorous investigation. Food is a necessity. The food middleman is entitled to a fair return for his capital and labor, but more than a fair return is *not* in the interest of the consumer, the farmer, *or* the businessman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Grider (at the request of Mr. Albert), for August 4, 1966, on account of primary elections in Tennessee.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, for August 4, 1966, on account of primary elections in Tennessee.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa (at the request of Mr. Albert), for August 4 and 5, 1966, on account of official business.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington, for August 5, 1966, August 8, 1966, and August 9, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schisler (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Resnick (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Joelson to revise and extend his remarks.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 5, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2612. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and to the authority transferred to the Department by Executive Order 10958, effective August 14, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2613. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense, and the provisions of Public Law 88–390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2614. A letter from the Chairman, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the annual report covering operations of the bank system, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Federal savings and loan system, for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2615. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 7, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of explosive anchorages, coastal waters of Hawaii, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1950; it is also in response to an item in the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2616. A letter from the Chairman, United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, transmitting the report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–271, and Law No. 9, April 13, 1964, of the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 16407. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the Danville Junior College, Danville, Ill. (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 16330. A bill to provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 16367. A bill to extend the benefits of the War Orphans' Educational Assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the Soviets and the Seas (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 16706. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14831. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; with amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 16830. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16831. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to assist in providing means for portability of credits under certain private pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 16833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 16834. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital located in Clarksburg, W. Va., the Louis A. Johnson Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 16836. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow each State an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 16837. A bill to amend section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to require the Secretary of Agriculture in certain cases to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 16838. A bill to establish the former home of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the American national symbol "Uncle Sam," as an historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 16839. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16840. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be required in an individual's disability insurance benefits on account of his entitlement to workmen's compensation benefits where the disability is blindness caused by an industrial accident; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16841. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16842. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16843. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with certain structures and facilities in the city of Bethlehem, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward an urban renewal project in that city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 16844. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 16845. A bill to establish a Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 16846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 16847. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 16848. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 16849. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 16851. A bill to clarify the tax status of American Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16852. A bill to provide that the historic San Francisco Mint shall be made a national monument; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 16853. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 16855. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 1 year to 6 months the period for which a woman not otherwise qualified must have been married to an insured individual in order to qualify as his "widow" for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16856. A bill to incorporate American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 16858. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 16859. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide an alternative method for making protective payments in behalf of recipients of such assistance who present a problem of chronic and serious mismanagement of funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 16860. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16861. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide for arbitration of emergency disputes where no other mode of settlement is effective; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.J. Res. 1260. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit law enforcement officers to question a suspect outside the presence of counsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 966. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 967. Concurrent resolution favoring establishment of a branch of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace open to students of all Middle Eastern countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Res. 958. Resolution providing for a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation to ascertain the reasons for the rapid rise in the prices of food, including dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 16862. A bill for the relief of Pietro Liotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 16863. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16864. A bill for the relief of Marge Eastlyn Savery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16865. A bill for the relief of Calogero Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16866. A bill for the relief of Antonio Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16867. A bill for the relief of Ninfa Gemma Sinagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16868. A bill for the relief of Miss Ngam Fei Mo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1966

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. William Thompson, Calvary Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the true Sovereign of history, rule and overrule our human frailties in order that this council chamber may echo with voices of understanding and justice this day. As we debate crucial issues of war and peace, of plenty and poverty, of labor and management, of the realm of the Nation and the rights of the States, keep us aware that we represent, and are commissioned to serve, people. Therefore, let us never be satisfied with being personally enslaved to the power of impassioned politics alone. Free us from being bound to the errors of the past; guide us in our present perplexities; and enable us to plan for an honorable and just future. To Thy gracious guidance we commend our labors this day, and in Thy name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 186.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the majority leader.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, that I may yield to the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] for a statement. What I shall seek to do after that, after consultation with the leadership, is to ask for a live quorum, including a unanimous-consent request that I may be recognized after the quorum call, because the proposal for the parliamentary procedure at the beginning of the session today is as follows: After the quorum call I shall ask consent to offer a modified amendment for the substitute that is now the pending business of the Senate, which the Parliamentarian says I have a right to do. We shall be able to have that modification ready with the cosponsors immediately following a live quorum.

So I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE VOICE FOR AMERICA IN VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, lately, there has been criticism of intensified U.S. air activity over North Vietnam on Soviet efforts to bring about peace through negotiation. For my own part, I question whether the Soviet Union has ever had any intention of bringing this conflict to the bargaining table.

The Soviet Union has endorsed so-called "wars of national liberation" and is supplying war material to North Vietnam. The New York Daily News recently reported the arrival of new shipments of Soviet-built aircraft to North Vietnam to counter American attacks. And, on July 6, Leonid Brezhnev announced that Soviet aid to the Communist north would grow.

In the same speech, Mr. Brezhnev charged that American acts have produced "a storm of indignation among all honest people of the world. Even the close allies of the United States," he argued, "are disassociating themselves from the crime committed by the American imperialists. Never before has the prestige of the United States fallen to such depths as now."

If the Soviet Union finds it so shameful for the United States to fight in Vietnam, why has she been so anxious to provide missiles and aircraft and military instruction to the north, and to urge aggression against the south, under the counterfeit cry of "war of liberation"?

If the world is outraged, let the U.S.S.R. show leadership, let her show that she will pave the way for the reconvening of a conference at Geneva. It was at Geneva that the agreement giving South Vietnam autonomy was reached, and the Soviet Union approved the agreement. As cochairman of the earlier conference, she has the authority, if not the duty, to act.

If the Soviet Union regards the Vietnam situation as a grave danger to peace, she should be prepared to persuade her North Vietnamese friends of the wisdom of such a course, even if it means incurring the wrath of the paranoids in Peking.

But this is a kind of leadership rarely found among totalitarians. While Brezhnev talks, Red infiltration, terror, and savagery continue.

It is clear that no meaningful effort at negotiation will succeed until the Communist side finally recognizes that it cannot succeed through force of arms and violence; but that, on the contrary, the United States, South Vietnam, and their allies are capable of putting an end to aggression and insurrection in the south.

There is a major communications problem in getting this idea across.

As usual, the Communist camp is counting on its double standard of morality in world affairs, which dictates that violence is permitted in the name of Lenin, Marx, and Mao, but not in defense of human freedom. Because Americans believe in human values, many of our citizens accept the argument that it is wrong forcefully to resist violence in whatever cause.

Sometimes, alas, it appears that America speaks with two voices. The Communists, judging others by a mirror of themselves, delude themselves into thinking we are playing a reverse of their own double game. For the American people are overwhelmingly united to see this ugly affair through. The Communists continue to misgage the firmness of our national will. They intensify their own military activity, believing that America is deeply divided and will give up, and that they are on the edge of victory.

I quote Ho Chi Minh on July 19:

> Of late the U.S. aggressors hysterically took a very serious step further in the escalation of the war: they launched air attacks on the suburbs of Hanoi and Haiphong. That was an act of desperation comparable to the agony convulsions of a grievously wounded beast.

What kind of self-hypnosis is this? This war has become far too deadly to tolerate further shadow shows. The oriental aggressors should look behind the screen to see that the tiger is real.

It is highly important that America's voice come through, loud and clear and officially. There is no second American voice. However, hard some may try to mount one, it is a false voice.

If the Soviet Union wants to promote a just peace, it should seek it through diplomatic negotiations rather than propaganda. Those Americans who vocally demand some kind of abrupt ending to this war, and most of us wish we could be spared all of it, must recognize that amateur attempts at political action are only convincing to the other side, and that in fact they are a cause of intensified war efforts because they deceive the other side.

The point America must emphasize is that her people are united in a determination to see the conflict grimly through. It is time the message got through, too.

THOUGHTLESS EXTINCTION OF BIRDS AND MAMMALS SQUANDERS THE NATION'S TREASURE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my friend, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in sponsoring legislation that will shortly be before the Senate to protect certain vanishing species of our wildlife. It is a shame, Mr. President, that many of the species of birds and mammals indigenous to this North American land mass have been exterminated. The proposed legislation would provide the means, I think, to halt this process of extermination, and to protect those species whose remnants yet remain.

The California grizzly bear proudly stands in the center of the flag of my State of California. This powerful animal once roamed our Sierra Nevada Mountains, but is now extinct.

Over the last century and a half, 24 species or subspecies of birds, and 12 species of mammals, have been driven to extinction in America, often because of man's thoughtless slaughter of the birds and animals themselves or the destruction of their environment. This elimination of a living part of our American heritage represents a permanent loss to our Nation of one of its spectacular ties with the past, and the sad truth is that it did not have to be.

Among the famous animals which now live only in our folklore are the passenger pigeon, the Carolina and Louisiana parakeets—the only members of the parrot family native to the continental United States—the eastern elk, the Badlands bighorn sheep, and both the California and the Texas grizzly bear.

To allow needless and thoughtless extinction of a species is to squander the Nation's treasure and to repeat the mistakes of the past. To accept indifferently the prospect of extermination for many of our native species today shows a wantonness of mind. Yet, the list of animals facing oblivion grows as our Nation's population and industry expand.

I recognize and commend the devotion with which special efforts to save endangered species have been made by Federal, State, and local governments and by private conservation groups. Without such vigorous efforts the whooping crane, the trumpeter swan, the Kodiak bear, the American buffalo, the fur seal, and a host of other valuable animals would have vanished long ago. But such an approach, however effective in isolated situations, is not the most effective or efficient solution to a problem as diverse as this.

There are 124 animals identified as "endangered with extinction" or "rare" by the U.S. Department of the Interior. This situation demands a program of wider scope than is possible under existing law. Some of the more prominent of the species needing protection are the timber wolf, the grizzly bear, itself a separate species, the key deer, the Sonoran pronghorn, the Tule elk, the California bighorn, the bald eagle, the burrowing owl, the California condor, the white heron, the blue pike, the Atlantic salmon, eight varieties of trout, and the list goes on and on. I ask unanimous consent that a list of rare and endangered fish and wildlife of the United States be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. It is clear, from this list of endangered wildlife, that every section of our country would benefit if the Secretary of the Interior were enabled to protect these endangered species, much as he is able to protect migratory birds.

Given adequate safeguards and consideration for State and local interests in the administration of their fish and wildlife resources, S. 2217 surely is legislation which is in the interest of the Nation.

I thank my able friend, the Senator from Oregon, for yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

PRELIMINARY LIST OF RARE AND ENDANGERED FISH AND WILDLIFE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Compiled by the Committee on Rare and Endangered Wildlife Species, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.)

MAMMALS

Endangered

Indiana Bat—*Myptis sodalis.*

Delmarva Peninsula Fox Squirrel—*Sciurus niger cinereus.*

Blue Whale—*Sibbaldus musculus.*

Humpback Whale—*Megaetpra novaeangliae.*

Atlantic Right Whale—*Eubalaena glacialis.*

Pacific Right Whale—*Eubalaena sieboldi.*

Timber Wolf—*Canis lupus lycaon.*

Red Wolf—*Canis niger.*

San Joaquin Kit Fox—*Vulpes macrotis mutica.*

Do—*Vulpas macrotic nevadensis.*

Grizzly Bear—*Ursus horribilis.*

Black-footed Ferret—*Mustela nigripes.*

Florida Panther—*Felis concolor coryi.*

Guadalupe Fur Seal—*Arctocephalus philippi townsendi.*

Caribbean Monk Seal—*Monachus tropicalis.*

Florida Manatee or Sea Cow—*Trichechus manatus latirostris.*

Key Deer—*Odocoilsus virginianus clavium.*

Sonoran Pronghorn—*Antilocapra americana sonoriensia.*

Rare

Spotted Bat—*Eudorma maculatum.*

Black-tailed Prairie Dog—*Cynomys ludovicianus.*

Utah Prairie Dog—*Cynomys pervidens.*

Kaibab Squirrel—*Sciurus kaibabensis.*

Block Island Meadow Vole—*Microtus pennsylvanicus provectus.*

Beach Meadow Vole—*Microtus braveri.*

Glacier Bear—*Ursus americanus cumonsii.*

Southern Sea Otter—*Enhydra lutris nereis.*

Ribbon Seal—*Histriophoca fasciata.*

Tule or Dwarf Elk—*Cervus nannodes.*

Columbia White-tailed Deer—*Odocoilsus virginianus leucurus.*

California Bighorn—*Ovis canadensis californiana.*

Peningular Bighorn—*Ovis canadensis creamobates.*

Depleted

Gray Whale—*Eschrichtius glaucus.*

Bowhead Whale—*Balaena mysticetus.*

Hawaiian Monk Seal—*Monachus schauinslandi.*

Status undetermined

Alberto's Squirrel—*Sciurus aberti navajo.*

Eastern Fox Squirrel—*Sciurus niger vulpinus.*

Texas Kangaroo Rat—*Dipodomys slator.*

Big-eared Kangaroo Rat—*Dipodomys elephantinus.*

Salt-marsh Harvest Mouse—*Reithrodontomys raviventris.*

Guadalupe Mountain Vole—*Microtus mexicanus guadalupensis.*

Louisiana Vole—*Microtus ludovicianus.*

Florida Water Rat or Round-tailed Muskrat—*Neofiber alleni.*

Polar Bear—*Thalarctos maritinus.*

Pine Marten—*Martes americana.*

Fisher—*Martes pennanti.*

Everglades Mink—*Mustela vison evergladensia.*

Wolverine—*Gulo luscus.*

Prairie Spotted Skunk—*Spilogalo putorius interrupta.*

Canada Lynx—*Lynx canadensia.*

Elephant Seal—*Mirounga angustirostria.*

Peripheral

Coatimundi or Chula—*Naqua narica molaris.*

Jaguar—*Felis onca vernacrucis.*

Ocelot—*Felis wiedil albescens.*

Margay—*Felis wiedil cooperi.*

Jaguarundi—*Felis yaguarunii caconitli.*

Mountain Caribou—*Rangifer tarandua montanus.*

Woodland Carbou—*Rangifer tarandua caribou.*

Musk Ox—*Ovibos moachatus moschatus.*

BIRDS

Endangered

Hawaiian Dark-rumped Petrel—*Pterodroma phaespydia sandwichensis.*

Mene (Hawaiian Goose)—*Branta sandvicensis.*

Aleutian Canada Goose—*Branta canadensis leucopareia.*

Tule White-fronted Goose—*Anser albifrons gambelli.*

Laysan Duck—*Anas laysenensis.*

Hawaiian Duck (Koloa)—*Anas wyvilliana.*

Mexican Duck—*Anas diasi.*

California Condor—*Gymnogyps californianua.*

Florida Everglades Kite (Snail Kite)—*Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbaus.*

Hawaiian Hawk (Io)—*Buteo solitarius.*

Southern Bald Eagle—*Maliaoetus l. leucocephalus.*

Attwater a Greater Prairie Chicken—*Tympanuchus cupido attwateri.*

Masked Bobwhite—*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi.*

Whooping Crane—*Grus americanas.*

Yuma Clapper Rail—*Rallus longirostris yumanensis.*

Hawaiian Common Gallinule—*Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis.*

Eskimo Curlew—*Numenius borealis.*

Puerto Rican Parrot—*Amazona vittata.*

American Ivory-billed Woodpecker—*Campephilus p. principalis.*

Hawaiian Crow (Alala)—*Corvus tropicus.*

Small Kauai Thrush (Puaiohi)—*Phaeornis palmeri.*

Nihoa Millerbird—*Acrocephalus kingi.*

Kauai Oo (Oo Aa)—*Moho braccatus.*

Crested Honey-creeper (Akohekohe)—*Palmeria dolei.*

Akiapolaau—*Hemignathus wilsoni.*

Kauai Akialoa—*Hemignathus procerus.*

Kauai Nukupuu—*Hemignathus lucidus hanapepe.*

Laysan Finchbill (Laysan Finch)—*Paittirostra c. cantans.*

Nihosa Finchbill (Nihoa Finch)—*Psittirostra cantans ultima.*

Ou—*Psittirostra psittacea.*

Palila—*Psittirostra bailleui.*

Maui Parrotbill—*Pseudonestor xanthophrys.*

Bachman's Warbler—*Vermivora bachmanii.*

Kirtland's Warbler—*Dendroica kirtlandii.*

Dusky Seaside Sparrow—*Ammospiza nigrescens.*

Cape Sable Sparrow—*Ammospiza mirabilic.*

Rare

Newell's Manx Shearwater—*Puffinus puffinus newelli.*

Hawaiian Harcourt's Petrel—Oceanodroma *castro crytoleucura.*

Florida Great White Heron—*Ardea o. occidentalis.*

Trumpeter Swan—*Olor buccinator.*

American Peregrine Falcon—*Falco Peregrinus anatum.*

Northern Greater Prairie Chicken—*Tympanuchus cupido pinnatus.*

Lesser Prairie Chicken—*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus.*

Greater Sandhill Crane—*Grus canadensis tabida.*

Florida Sandhill Crane—*Grus canadensis pratensis.*

Hawaiian Stilt—*Himantopus himantopus knudseni.*

Western Burrowing Owl—*Speotyto cunicularia hypugasa.*

Puerto Rican Whip-Poor-Will—*Caprimulgus noctitherus.*

Golden-checked Warbler—*Dendroica chrysoparia.*

Ipswich Sparrow—*Passerculus princeps.*

Status undetermined

Eastern Brown Pelican—*Pelecanus occidentalis carolinesis.*

Anthony's Green Heron—*Butorides virescens anthony.*

Steller's Eider—*Polystista stelleri.*

Spectacled Eider—*Lampronetta fischeri.*

Ferruginous Hawk—*Buteo regalis.*

American Osprey—*Pandion haliaetus carolinensis.*

Prairie Falcon—*Falco mexicanus.*

Evermann's Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus evermanni*

Townsend's Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus townsendi.*

Turner's Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus atkhensis.*

Yunaska Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus yunaskensis.*

Chamberlain's Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus chamberlaini.*

Sanford's Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus sanfordi.*

Amchitka Rock Ptarmigan—*Lagopus mutus gabrielsoni.*

Dixon's Rock Ptarmigan—*Legopus mutus dixoni.*

Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse—*Pedioecetes phasianellus columbianus.*

Prairie Sharp-tailed Grouse—*Pedioecetes phasianellus campestris.*

Texas Gambel's Quail—*Lophortyx gambelii ignoscens.*

Mountain Plover—*Eupoda montana.*

Bristle-thighed Curlew—*Numenius tahitiensis.*

Alaskan Short-billed Dowitcher—*Limnodromus griseus curinus.*

Hudsonian Godwit—*Limosa haemasticta.*

Pacific Bar-tailed Godwit—*Limosa lapponica baueri.*

Red-legged Kittiwake—*Rissa brevirostris.*

Aleutian Tern—*Sterna aleutica.*

St. Thomas Screech Owl—*Otus nudipes newtoni.*

Hawaiian Short-eared Owl—*Asio flammeus sandwichensis.*

Puerto Rican Short-eared Owl—*Asio flemmenus portoricensis.*

Florida Scrub Jay—*Aphelocoma c. coerulescens.*

Attu Winter Wren—*Troglodytes troglodytes meligerus.*

Pribilof Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. alascensis.*

Stevenson's Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. stevensoni.*

Semidi Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. semidiensis.*

Unalaska Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. petrophilus.*

Kiska Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. kiskensis.*

Tamago Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. tanagensis.*

Seguam Winter Wren—*Troglodytes t. seguamensis.*

Black-capped Vireo—*Vireo stricapilla.*

Puerto Rican Bullfinch—*Loxigillia p. porttoricensis.*

Aleutian Gray-crowned Rosy Finch—*Leucosticte tephrocotis umbrina.*

Wallowa Gray-crowned Rosy Finch—*Leucosticte tephroctis wallowa.*

Sennett's Seaside Sparrow—*Ammospiza maritime sennetti.*

Fisher's Seaside Sparrow—*Ammospiza maritima fisheri.*

Yakutat Fox Sparrow—*Passerella iliaca annectens.*

Samuel's Song Sparrow—*Malospiza melodia samuelis.*

San Francisco Song Sparrow—*Melospiza melodia pusillula.*

Suisum Song Sparrow—*Melospiza melodia maxillaris.*

Giant Song Sparrow—*Melospiza melodia maxima.*

Amak Song Sparrow—*Melospiza melodia amaka.*

McKay's Snow Bunting—*Plectrophenax hyperboreus.*

Peripheral

Green-throated Arctic Loon—*Gavia arctics viridigularis.*

Northwestern Least Grebe—*Podiceps dominicus bangai.*

Northeastern Least Grebe—*Podicepa dominicus brachypterus.*

Red-faced Cormorant—*Phalacrocorax urile.*

Eastern Reddish Egret—*Dischromanassa r. rufescens.*

Wood Ibis—*Mycteria americana.*

Roseate Spoonbill—*Ajaia ajaja.*

Northern Black-bellied Tree Duck—*Dendrocygna autumnalia fulgens.*

Masked Duck—*Oxyura dominica.*

Northern Gray Hawk—*Buteo nitidus maximus.*

Northern Black Hawk—*Buteogallus a. anthracinus.*

Northern Aplomado Falcon—*Palco femoralis septentrionalis.*

Northern Chachalaca—*Ortalis vetula mccalli.*

Richardson's Blue Grouse—*Dendragapus obscurus richardsonii.*

Northern White-tailed Ptarmigan—*Lagopus l. leucurus.*

San Quentin California Quail—*Lophortyx californicus plumbeus.*

Gould's Turkey—*Meleagris gallopavo mexicana.*

Northern Jacana—*Jacana s. spinosa.*

Rufous-necked Sandpiper—*Erolin ruficollis.*

Atlantic Sooty Tern—*Sterna f. fuscate.*

Atlantic Noddy Tern—*Anous stolidus atolidus.*

Northern Xantus' Murrelet—*Endomychura hypoleuca scrippsi.*

Whiskered Auklet—*Aethia pygmaea.*

Northern Red-billed Pigeon—*Columba f. flavirostris.*

Northern White-fronted Dove—*Leptotila verreauxi angelica.*

Florida Mangrove Cuckoo—*Coccyzus minor maynardi.*

Northern Groove-billed Ani—*Crotophaga s. sulcirostris.*

Merrill's Pauraque—*Nyctidromus albicollis merrilli.*

West Indian Nighthawk—*Choreiles minor vicinus.*

Northern Buff-bellied Hummingbird—*Amazilia yucatanensis chalconata.*

Northern Violet-crowned Hummingbird—*Amazilia verticalis elliotі.*

Coppery-tailed Elegant Trogon—*Trogon elegans canescens.*

Northeastern Elegant Trogon—*Trogon elegans ambiguus.*

Northeastern Green Kingfisher—*Chloroceryle americana septentrionalia.*

Northwestern Green Kingfisher—*Chloroceryle americana hachisukai.*

Northwestern Rose-throated Becard—*Piatypsaris aglaise richmondi.*

Northeastern Rose-throated Becard—*Piatypsaris aglaise gravis.*

Northeastern Tropical Kingbird—*Tyrannus melancholicus couchii.*

Northwestern Tropical Kingbird—*Tyrannus melancholicus occidentalis.*

Northern Kiskadee Flycatcher—*Pitangus sulphuratus texanus.*

Northern Buff-breasted Flycatcher—*Empidonax fulvifrons pygmaeus.*

Northeastern Beardless Flycatcher—*Camptostomi i. imberbe.*

Northwestern Cave Swallow—*Petrochelidon fulva pallida.*

Couch's Mexican Jay—*Aphelocoma ultramarina couchii.*

Northern Green Jay—*Cyanocorax yncas luxuosus.*

Cascade Boreal Chickadee—*Parus hudsonicus cascadensis.*

Northern Mexican Chickadee—*Parus sclateri eidos.*

Sennett's Long-billed Thrasher—*Toxostoma longirostre sennetti.*

Red-spotted Bluethroat—*Luscinia s. svecica.*

Cuban Black-whiskered Vireo—*Vireo altiloquus barbatulus.*

Colima Warbler—*Vermivora crissalia.*

Cuban Yellow Warbler—*Dendroica petechia gundlachi.*

Northern Olive-backed Warbler—*Parula pitiayumi nigrilora.*

Alta Hira Lichtenstein's Oriole—*Icterus gularis tamaulipensia.*

Audubon's Black-headed Oriole—*Icterus graduacauda audubonii.*

Dickey's Varied Bunting—*Passerina versicolor dickeyae.*

Northern White-collared Seedeater—*Sporophia torquecla sharpei.*

Southeastern Pine Grosbeak—*Pinicola enucleator eschatosus.*

Northern Olive Sparrow—*Arremonops r. rufivirgata.*

Noreastern Botteri's Sparrow—*Aimophila botterii texana.*

FISH

Endangered

Shortnose Sturgeon—*Acipenser brevirostrum.*

Longjaw Cisco—*Coregonus alpenae.*

Lahonten Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki henshawi.*

Piute Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki seleniris.*

Greenback Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki stomias.*

Montana Westslope Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki asp.*

Gila Trout—*Salmo gilae.*

Arizona (Apache) Trout—*Salmo sp.*

Atlantic Sálmon—*Salmo salar.*

Desert Bace—*Eremichthya acros.*

Humpback Chub—*Gila cypha.*

Little Colorado Spinedace—*Lepidomeda vittata.*

Moapa Dace—*Moapa coriacea.*

Colorado River Squawfish—*Ptychoceilus lucius.*

CuiUi—*Chasmistes cuus.*

Devils Hole Pupfish—*Cyprinodon diabolis.*

Comanche Springs Pupfish—*Cyprinodon elegans.*

Owens Valley Pupfish—*Cyprinodon radiosus.*

Pahrump Killifish—*Empetrichythys latos.*

Big Bend Gambusia—*Gambusia gaigei.*

Clear Creek Gambusia—*Gambusia heterochir.*

Gila Topminnow—*Poeciliopsis occidentalis.*

Maryland Darter—*Etheostoma gellare.*

Blue Pike—*Stizostedion vitreum glaucum.*

Rare

Lake Sturgeon—*Acipenser fulvescens.*

Atlantic Sturgeon—*Acipenser oxyrhynchus.*

Deepwater Cisco—*Coregonus johannae.*

Blackfin Cisco—*Coregonus n. nigripinnis.*

Arctic Grayling—*Thymallus arcticus.*

Sunapoe Trout—*Salvelinus aureolus.*

Blueback Trout—*Salvelinus oquassa.*

Olympic Mudminnow—*Novumbra hubbsi.*

Ozark Cavefish—*Amblyopsis rosae.*

Suwannee Bass—*Micropterus notius.*

Sharphead Darter—*Etheostoma acuticeps.*

Niangua Darter—*Etheostoma nianguae.*

Trispot Darter—*Etheostoma trisella.*

Tuscumbia Darter—*Etheostoma tuscumbia.*

Status undetermined

White Sturgeon—*Acipenser transmontanus.*

Pallid Sturgeon—*Scaphirhynchus albus.*

Shortnose Cisco—*Coregonus reighardi.*

Colorado Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki pleuriticus.*

Utah Cutthroat Trout—*Salmo clarki utah.*

Eagle Lake Rainbow Trout—*Salmo gairdnerii aquilarum.*

Thicktail Chub—*Gila crassicauda.*

Yuaqui Chub—*Gila prupurea.*

White River Spinedace—*Lepidomeda albivallis.*

Kanawha Minnow—*Phenacobius teretulus.*

Mohave Chub—*Siphateles mohavensis.*

Lost River Sucker—*Catostomus luxatus.*

Modoc Sucker—*Castostomus microps.*

Shortnose Sucker—*Chasmistes brevirostris.*

June Sucker—*Chasmistes liorus.*

Rustyside Sucker—*Moxostoma hamiltoni.*

Humpback Sucker—*Xyrauchen texanus.*

Widemouth Blindcat—*Satan eurystomus.*

Toothless Blindcat—*Trogloglanis pattersoni.*

Nevada Pupfish—*Cyrinodon nevadensis.*

Salt Creek Pupfish—*Cyprinodon salimus.*

Waccamew Killifish—*Fundulus waccamensis.*

Pecos Gambusia—*Gambusia nobilis.*

Unarmored Threespine Stickleback—*Gasterosteus aculestus williamsoni.*

Roanoke Bass—*Ambloplites cavifrons.*

Sacramento Perch—*Archoplites interruptus.*

Guadalupe Bass—*Micropterus treculi.*

Blenny Darter—*Etheostoma blennius.*

Fountain Darter—*Etheostoma fonticola.*

Tuckasegee Darter—*Etheostoma gutselli.*

Waccamaw Darter—*Etheostoma perlongum.*

Backwater Darter—*Etheostoma zoniferum.*

Yellow Darter—*Percina aurantiaca.*

Bluestripe Darter—*Percina cymatotaenia.*

Freckled Darter—*Percina lenticula.*

Longnose Darter—*Percina nasuta.*

Sharpnose Darter—*Percina oxyrhyncha.*

Leopard Darter—*Percina pantherina.*

Slenderhead Darter—*Percina phoxocephala.*

Olive Darter—*Percina squamata.*

Tidewater Goby—*Eucyclogobius newberri.*

Rough Sculpin—*Cottus asperimus.*

Tidewater Silverside—*Menidia beryllina.*

Waccemaw Silverside—*Menidia extensa.*

Peripheral

Mexican Stoneroller—*Campostoma ornatum.*

Sonora Chub—*Gila ditaenia.*

Chihuahua Shiner—*Notropis chihuahua.*

Rio Grande Darter—*Etheostoma grahami.*

REPTILES

Endangered

American Alligator—*Alligator mississippiensis.*

Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard—*Crotaphytus wislizenii silus.*

San Francisco Garter Snake—*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia.*

Rare

Bog Turtle—*Clemmys muhlenbergi.*

Status undetermined

Desert Tortoise—*Gopherus agassizi.*

Gila Monster—*Heloderma suspectum.*

Black Legless Lizard—*Anniella pulchra nigra.*

Lake Erie Water Snake—*Natrix sipedon insularum.*

Two-striped Garter Snake—*Thamnophis elegans hammondi.*

Giant Garter Snake—*Thamnophis elegans gigas.*

Key Blacksnake—*Coluber constrictor haasti.*

Arizona Ridge-nosed Rattlesnake—*Crotalus willardi willardi.*

Peripheral

Green Turtle—*Chelonia mydas mydas.*

American Crocodile—*Crocodylus acutus.*

AMPHIBIANS

Endangered

Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander—*Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum.*

Texas Blind Salamander—*Typhlomolge rathbuni.*

Black Toad, Inyo County Toad—*Bufo exsul.*

Rare

Pine Barrens Tree Frog—*Hyla andersoni.*

Vegas Valley Leopard Frog—*Rana pipiens fisheri.*

Status undetermined

Larch Mountain Salamander—*Plethoden larselli.*

Cheat Mountain Salamander—*Plethoden nettingi.*

Georgia Blind Salamander—*Haideotriton wallacei.*

Grotto Salamander—*Typhlotriton spelaeus.*

Shasta Salamander—*Hydromantes shastae.*

Amargosa Toad—*Bufo boreas nelsoni.*

Houston Toad—*Bufo houstonensis.*

Illinois Chorus Frog—*Pseudacris streckeri illinoensis.*

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to ask for a quorum call, but first I ask unanimous consent that, following the quorum call, I may be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask that it be a live quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 168 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Talmadge in the chair). A quorum is present.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is a proposed modification of the resolution that is now pending at the desk. The resolution pending at the desk, a copy of which was supplied to each Senator yesterday, was introduced by me and cosponsored by the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

I shall ask to modify that amendment shortly, by way of a substitute, and I shall explain the modification. But I ask Senators to read the copy of the modification which is on their desks, so that any Senators who wish to notify me of a desire to cosponsor the modification can notify me before I send it to the desk.

I wish to say that the minority leader has been very helpful and cooperative in regard to this matter. In fact, a good many of the modifications were first proposed by him as a possible compromise. He has advised me that a list of names of cosponsors on the Republican side is now being prepared, which will be handed to me shortly; and I prefer to have that list—may I say to the minority leader—before I send up the proposed modification.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like very much to welcome cosponsors from my side of the aisle. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has asked that I add his name to the list of cosponsors.

Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon this question: In the mimeographed sheets containing apparently the present resolution as of 6 o'clock last night, the sixth and seventh lines formerly read "threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive every section of the country." The last few words have apparently now been changed to "any section of the country," is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. It was a typographical error. It is correctly stated in the resolution pending at the desk.

I detected that after it had been distributed. I called counsel immediately, and asked that the word "every" be changed to "any," because that was a clear typographical error. And it has been changed, I am advised by the staff member. It has been changed, supposedly, on the copy that is on the desk of each Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that the thrust of his present proposal is that if any section of the country is deprived of essential transportation services, men can be required to return to work against their will? It does not have to be a general national deprivation, but merely if any section is deprived?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. That is the language of the Railway Labor Act. It is a direct quote from the Railway Labor Act, and the resolution itself is bottomed completely, in regard to the jurisdiction of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, on the exact language of the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Railway Labor Act require the return of men to work if means of conciliation, mediation, and the rest have broken down? Does the basic Railway Labor Act require compulsory arbitration? I had never supposed it did.

Mr. MORSE. That is not what the Senator from Oregon has said, and that is not the position that the sponsors of the legislation have taken.

What we say is that this strike has interrupted essential transportation in various sections of this country, to the degree that the public interest requires that Congress pass legislation that will send the men back to work and provide for the men who are involved the safeguards which are set forth in other portions of this resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true therefore that this language prescribes a requirement which is not contained in the basic Railway Labor Act?

Mr. MORSE. There is no requirement in the basic Railway Labor Act that if men strike, they should be sent back to work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. MORSE. That matter rests with the wisdom of Congress. The Senator from Illinois exercised his wisdom in regard to that matter in 1963, by preventing men from even going out on strike, and voting for a law that put them into compulsory arbitration. The Senator from Oregon voted against it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that perhaps the Senator from Oregon was wiser at that time than he is today. We are not in as grave a situation as in 1963 or 1946.

Mr. MORSE. He was right then, and he thinks he is right today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Oregon thinks so. The question is whether he is.

Mr. MORSE. That will be for events to determine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. On page 18098 of yesterday's RECORD, in column 1, the Senator commented at some length on the desirability of having an indication from the President of the United States as to whether he would sign the Senator's substitute if it were passed. I wonder if the Senator has had any response to that from the White House.

Mr. MORSE. The White House is not asking for legislation. It is not asking that we not pass legislation, either. It has made clear to the Senator from Oregon that if we pass legislation, the White House hopes that it will be fair, reasonable, and constitutional.

Mr. CLARK. I do not want to press the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I have told the Senator from Pennsylvania what I know. That is all I know about it.

Mr. CLARK. But the Senator from Oregon went further in the comment to which I referred. He said he had talked with a representative of the White House and had advised him that it would be helpful if today the President advised the Congress that if the Senator's substitute joint resolution were passed, the President would sign it. My inquiry is: Has the Senator had any reply to his suggestion?

Mr. MORSE. I have received no information that such a letter will be forthcoming. I still hope that such a letter will be forthcoming. But I owe it to my own record and I owe it to those who have worked so diligently on this matter to say that I do not have the slightest doubt that if the substitute joint resolution that we are now offering is passed by Congress, the President will sign it. But I am in no position to say that I have been told by the President that he will sign it. I cannot speak for the President, I can make my own interpretations as to what I think the President's position is on this matter. I think the President should advise us of his position, or that at least he should indicate his position on the substitute resolution. But he has the Presidential right to do otherwise.

I am satisfied that the President's position is that he is not going to tell Congress in any way what it should or should not do. He is going to leave the legislative process completely in the hands of Congress. As the President, he will exercise the Presidential prerogatives after the legislation is passed.

All I can say is that I am satisfied that if we pass the joint resolution, it will be signed. I cannot possibly say anything more and be within the realm of fact. I do not intend to go, as I never knowingly go, outside the realm of fact.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me. I think there are a good many Senators, including the Senator from Pennsylvania, who agrees with the Senator from Oregon that it would be most helpful if, before we passed either the present substitute or any other substitute, we were advised whether or not the President would sign it.

I can understand the President's reluctance in advising us to that effect, since I understand he does not want to take any part in putting the men back to work.

Mr. MORSE. He does automatically become a party to it if, as, and when he puts his signature on any bill we pass. I have made that clear over and over again on the floor of the Senate, and I have made it clear in my representations at the White House.

There is no question about the fact that the President shares the view of the Attorney General in regard to the legality of my legislation. There is no question as to the legality and constitutionality of my legislation. I think that bears upon the information I gave when I told the Senate that the President hopes that if the Congress passes legislation it will be fair, reasonable, and constitutional legislation.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

(At this point, Mr. MUSKIE assumed the chair.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wish to say at the outset that I do not mean any impertinence at all in the question that I am going to ask. There has been extensive and intensive discussion here as to whose responsibility it is to act at this moment; and we have raised this bugaboo about passing the buck to the President.

As the Senator from Rhode Island understands this joint resolution, it cannot take force and effect until the President signs it. If he refused to sign it, I suppose it would come back here for an overriding of the veto.

By the substitute we are putting the President on the spot without any exercise of choice, no chance of other solution. His is a dilemma without discretion. If he refuses to sign it he is saying that the Congress is wrong in ordering these people back to work. On the other hand, if he does sign it he does become a party in ordering these people back to work.

The point that the Senator from Rhode Island is making is this:

Does not the Senator think that because of the divergence of point of view that now exists, even within this body, we should leave the discretion to the President as to whether or not a crisis has arisen in which collective bargaining should be brought to a stop, and that action must be taken to break a strike? Surely no matter how we look at it, by the action of the substitute, if we enact the substitute today, are we not actually breaking the strike? There is no question about it. We are telling those people, "You have to go back to work for 30 days." Then, we set about providing machinery to bring about an ultimate settlement.

I do not intend to quarrel with the Senator. He is an expert in this field and I know that he is sincere in what he is trying to do.

I think that the drastic mistake we are making today is depriving the President of the discretion to watch this matter closely; and to act if and when the point of national emergency is reached. We would be setting the trigger for compliance on the part of workers who may be inconveniencing people in these long-haul airplane rides. What we are actually arguing today is to cataclysmically bring this matter to a halt without having had anybody say an emergency or crisis exists and mandating without the exercise of discretion by the President. I think that that is all wrong.

Mr. MORSE. I say respectfully that I do not reach the same conclusion as the Senator from Rhode Island because I think under our separation of power doctrine Congress finds itself in a position where it has a responsibility to determine whether or not it wants to pass legislation, irrespective of whether or not it gets the kind of commitment from the President that some seek. In my judgment, we fail in our duty to the American people, whose interests are sorely affected by the strike, if we refuse to pass legislation today. We cannot justify not voting in favor of the substitute resolution simply because we have not received a recommendation from the President as to what he would favor.

The President has exhausted the law. When we talk about breaking a strike, the Railway Labor Act has already been used to break a strike. The application of that law prevented them from going on strike for 60 days. The decision was made to apply the terms of the law. The union had reached the decision to go on strike and the Railway Labor Act was applied and prevented the strike.

Now, the Railway Labor Act has exhausted itself. The resolution, if passed by Congress, would extend the time and order them back to work, when signed by the President.

Mr. PASTORE. The action here today is tantamount to changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator mean; in the middle of the strike?

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely.

Mr. MORSE. Not only against the carriers, but against the public interest.

Mr. PASTORE. The right to strike is inherent in the labor movement.

Mr. MORSE. But not absolute.

Mr. PASTORE. Not absolute, and that is what I am discussing. What right do we have here, today, to take absolute action? That is what we are doing. The word "absolute" is being used here.

Is there any Senator in this Chamber, if he were sitting in a judicial capacity, who could say, "I have heard everything that needs to be heard on the issue before I can make judgment conclusively and absolutely to cut off the rights of persons"? That is what disturbs me.

I submit that the public has not been heard on this. We had several hearings. I understand there was called in one representative of these people. I do not know if Mr. Meany has been heard, or whether Mr. Reuther has been heard. The Senator from Rhode Island has not heard anybody of authority and responsibility who declares definitely, conclusively, and absolutely that we have reached a point so critical that we must break off the existing law and philosophy, and command, "You go back to work whether you like it or not."

I do not think that we have had proof of the efficiency of this legislation by a preponderance of the evidence or beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. MORSE. I think that many Senators have heard from Mr. Meany and from the representatives of labor. Before we start to talk about the courts, there is no question what the courts would do. If Congress passes this substitute resolution, exercising its power to regulate interstate commerce, it will be sustained. Cases are perfectly clear that this falls within the unquestioned power of Congress when it becomes law, which means when it is signed by the President. We might as well face the fact. We have under consideration a question of fact.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, we are interested in facts.

Mr. MORSE. If we do not believe that the public interest is entitled to be protected by sending the men back to work under a resolution which protects their legitimate rights, then vote against the resolution. But the public, let me say, is entitled to be protected.

Wages are no longer an issue in this case. There was an issue about wages but that is not involved in this case any more. The machinists union was getting $3.52 an hour. We offered them $3.98. They asked for only $4.04; their official demand as served upon the carriers was $4.04. They settled for $4.08 the other night.

The wage issue is therefore out the window. There is no wage issue existing between the carriers and the union. That was settled by a collective-bargaining agreement. They got more than they asked for in the beginning. On the other points which are in issue, let me tell the Senator, we cannot possibly justify a strike against the public. There is no question, if they get their demands, that they will receive a 7- to 8-percent increase. In my judgment, any group of reliable economists will say that that would go far beyond a noninflationary increase. That is where in my view we owe a duty to the public to come in and adopt the substitute resolution which we are about to offer.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not questioning our duty to the public. I think we can dress this thing up and embellish it with fancy words which have an attractive connotation. But we are not getting to the central point. What the Senator and I are discussing now is the corpus delicti, the national emergency. The Senator is assuming that it exists. I am saying that it has not been proved. Before we prove it, let us not find the defendant guilty. That is my argument today.

I am not satisfied that at this very point any drastic action has to be taken. But I am willing to say that we should enact legislation to give standby authority to the President that if we do get to a critical point, then he can act as the Chief Executive. That is the only fault I find. I am not saying that we should not apply ourselves to this issue. I think the time has come for the Senate to be concerned and to be involved. The only question is: What action do we take?

Do we take cataclysmic action, or pass standby legislation, if this thing does become critical, if the public interest is further injured? Let us not assume it at this point. Let us wait until it has been proved. Then the President, who speaks for all the people of the country and is just as much concerned with the national interest as I am, or the Senator from Oregon can act in that interest at least he will have law under which he can protect that public interest, which he cannot do today without this further authority.

That is the argument I am making.

Mr. MORSE. I want to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island by saying that he does not agree that the proof is in the RECORD. I believe that the RECORD is saturated with proof that the public interest is being irreparably damaged by the strike; that Congress must come to the aid of the public. The strike now is more against the public than it is against the carriers. If the Senator does not believe that, then, of course, he will not vote for the substitute resolution.

In regard to the matter of law, I am not going to vote for a resolution which, in my judgment, runs the great legal danger that the Clark resolution runs. I know the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from New York, that they believe it is constitutional.

I do not think it is constitutional. The Attorney General does not think it is constitutional. All we would be doing, if the Clark resolution were to be adopted, would be to buy a lawsuit for the administration and get into litigation.

What we need to do is to pass legislation, and if the President signs it—and I am satisfied that he will—we then join him as partners in proceeding to work out, under the terms of this substitute resolution, a settlement of the case.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator feel that the President will not sign the Clark resolution?

Mr. MORSE. I make no comment as to what the President will do.

Mr. PASTORE. I wonder what the authority is for assuming that he will not sign?

Mr. MORSE. Because I believe it is illegal. I have little difficulty thinking that if the President is going to sign something which the Attorney General tells him is illegal that he will sign it; but, of course, I cannot and do not speak for the President.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield once more, I do not wish to delay him further from his presentation, but I want to say that we are all talking about the public interest. I realize that a serious situation exists. Every major strike is serious. I am sure there are people who are inconvenienced, but I say in all honesty that I have not received over 50 letters from Rhode Island on the matter. It might well be that the people of my State are not so much affected by these large trunklines which run great distances. It may be our Rhode Island people are not that much interested—but the fact remains that we are talking about a serious situation and an even more serious solution. We are talking about a cataclysmic action which could destroy the philosophy of the right to strike and employ collective bargaining. There is no question about that. I am saying that we must give the President some kind of standby authority to watch the matter closely and to move swiftly if he feels he must. I do not think it is fair, without the President's choice to make a determination, for the Senate, on its own, to say, "We are at the end of the line." That is what I am talking about today. I do not know whether we are at the end of the line. But, if we are, why can we not leave the determination to the discretion of the President?

That is the argument I make today.

The Senator says that the Record is saturated.

Who saturated it?

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary of Labor, in his entire testimony——

Mr. PASTORE. He and the Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. It is all in the record, setting forth the sources of information in the Federal Government, that there is an interruption of essential transportation in various sections of the country that calls for the application of the Railway Labor Act.

But, let me say, in 1963, the Senator from Rhode Island and other Senators voted for the compulsory arbitration bill without even a strike occurring. They passed legislation that put the workers in the position where they were subjected to compulsory arbitration.

Mr. PASTORE. I was just waiting for the Senator from Oregon to make that statement. Will he yield on that point?

Mr. MORSE. And I want to reply to what I know the Senator is going to say. Go ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh?

Mr. MORSE. Go ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Sure. Because that was suggested by the President of the United States. That is that point I make. President Kennedy sent it up here.

Mr. MORSE. The President of the United States never proposed compulsory arbitration in that case. The President never sent to us the bill which the Senator brought out of committee. He sent to us quite a different bill, as I said yesterday. The morning of the day that the Senator voted for the compulsory arbitration bill I was called down to the White House by the President, after he had talked to the majority leader over the telephone, and asked me to offer a bill as a substitute bill. He said he wanted it offered, even if only the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Montana would vote for it. I did not want to be any party, at that stage, to the bill which the Senator from Rhode Island brought out of committee. The Senator is one of the fellows that imposed compulsory arbitration on labor in 1963 by his bill. The men were not even out on strike yet. They only threatened to strike.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield further? Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, surely.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I cannot hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I want to say that the implication on President Kennedy is based on the message which he sent to Congress on the emergency which existed at that time.

The Senator is wrong if he is trying to implicate the President with compulsory arbitration. He finally signed it, but with great reluctance, let me say.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that.

Mr. MORSE. I do.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that.

Mr. MORSE. I do.

Mr. PASTORE. I was the manager of that bill. I daresay there is no man in the Senate who knows more about the background of the bill and what transpired in that case than I.

I talked with President Kennedy. I do not care who else did or did not. I know that President Kennedy was behind the bill that was passed without the hesitancy or this reluctance which is being mentioned here today.

We had a serious situation that involved the economy of this country. President Kennedy said this strike could not take place without doing irreparable harm to the national interest. We passed that bill. I managed the bill. The President signed it. After he signed it he called me up and thanked me for the part I played in it.

Mr. MORSE. Nobody questions the sincerity of the Senator from Rhode Island, but if the Senator stands on the floor and states that the President wanted that bill, I tell him that he did not want that bill. He wanted a different bill. That is why I offered it. He did not want the Senator's bill. He asked me to offer a substitute, which I did offer. He asked me how many votes I would get. I said 10. We got 15.

Mr. PASTORE. I stand on what I said.

Mr. MORSE. And I stand absolutely on what I have said. The Record shows what the President said. I offered the President's bill at his request. Read the Record.

Mr. PASTORE. I read the Record. In fact, I made the Record.

Mr. MORSE. Now Senators want to give the President discretionary power without living up to Congress' responsibility.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator from Oregon think we are passing the buck unless we pass the proposal he is talking about, which does not go into effect unless he signs it? If we say, "Take it or leave it," we are passing the buck?

Mr. MORSE. Congress has the responsibility under the interstate commerce clause to do its duty.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us not act absolutely, unequivocally, and without recourse, without the participation of the President of the United States. That is what we are trying to to do. We are trying to exclude him from it. We are trying to reach a decision that is irrevocable, without any choice or discussion on the part of the President of the United States, the one man who is elected by all the people. That is absolutely wrong. I do not know if President Johnson wants it this way. He has not said yes or no, but the President is out of it. We are deliberately excluding a determination by the President of the United States under any circumstances, and that is absolutely wrong. We are taking executive action without participation or choice on the part of the Executive himself, and that is absolutely wrong.

Mr. MORSE. I only want to say, in reply to the Senator, that we are giving the President discretion under my proposal to sign or not sign. That is the discretion, and that is the only discretion, we have the right as Members of Congress to pass to him. We have not any right to pass to the President what I consider to be an illegal attempt to regulate interstate commerce by his issuing such order as he wants to make them go back to work, after the evidence is clear that there is an interruption to essential transportation in many parts of the country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not repeat the arguments which have been made, but assuming the arguments which have been made with respect to the President's signing the resolution, which makes him a party to this legislation, and the fact that we are following a pattern of the law which inhibits a strike in this area, and which has inhibited it for 8 months, I think the public has a right to have determined whether that strike should be further inhibited under the pattern of the law that is in existence, rather than imposing a new obligation.

This is not a measure for compulsory arbitration which deals with terminal settlement. It only continues for a longer period of time the cooling off period already provided for in the law.

I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it would have been preferable, and I felt it was preferable in the committee—and I have had something to do with this legislation—to give the President authority; but, generally speaking, Congress gives authority only to one who asks for it, who gives an indication that he wants it.

I think that is the greatest defect here. I do not criticize the Senator from Oregon. I am as deeply concerned as he is about this dispute. The biggest trouble and the reason why Congress may have to go this route, which the Senator from Oregon believes is in the public interest—and I had a great deal to do with drafting this measure—is that the President has failed to tell us what he wants.

He has failed to tell us what authority he would like to exercise. He has left us absolutely rudderless and adrift.

I am not trying to criticize what the Senator has said. At the worst, he is 49 percent right. But what the President has done, if we are men and Members of Congress, is leave it up to us without any recommendation. He has said, "You act."

The only indication the President has given us is the preference of Secretary Wirtz, which is against the Clark resolution. He does not want that authority, if we can put any credence in what Secretary Wirtz has said in his statement. He personally thinks, if they are going to do something that is best under the circumstances, they want the Morse formula, if there is any substance in Secretary Wirtz' words.

We are following the pattern in the law which does inhibit the strike. We are extending the pattern for a given period of time. We are not trying to make a definitive conclusion. Whether we exercise the power or give it to the President is tweedledee-tweedledum, because if he signs the resolution, the responsibility is with the President. He then receives the authority, if he intends to use it, and if he intends to use it, he has to do it now. The provisions of the Railway Labor Act are in effect in the definition, not that there is a national emergency, but that there is a stoppage of essential transportation in given sections of the country.

On balance, in view of the compromise and the 30-day period of time, during which there is a period for the President to exercise that authority, and if that is the best way to get a consensus, that is the way to go.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may answer the statement of the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield. I shall continue to be accommodating, but I hope that sooner or later—I hope sooner than later—I may send my joint resolution to the desk.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator prefers that I not speak now, I shall wait.

Mr. MORSE. No. I think the discussion is pertinent now and is in the interest of continuity.

Mr. PASTORE. The first point that the Senator from Rhode Island makes with respect to the substitute joint resolution concerns the language in subsection (b):

> The Congress therefore finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

Nothing in the joint resolution declares that the national interest is involved. I am questioning why that has not been included in the joint resolution. If the corpus delicti in this instance is the national interest, and if it is being irrevocably harmed, why is that not stated in the joint resolution?

In answer to the question, "Why has not President Johnson spoken out?" I simply say that President Johnson has been immediately involved in the dispute. We are people of experience. We are practical minded. We are realistic people. We do not just go ahead and recommend that Congress take drastic action when we are trying to get the parties to come together. The President did make an effort to get them together. As a matter of fact, he brought them under his own roof. He was involved in the problem to the extent that any man could become involved in it. We do not start pushing people around and threatening them with drastic legislation while they are in the process of meeting to negotiate a settlement.

That may be why the President did not make a recommendation to Congress. But over and above that, what obligation is there on the part of the President to tell us what he thinks we should do or should not do, if in his own mind the time has not come for him to speak out?

Has he not the authority, has not the privilege, to say, "I must weigh the facts. I would prefer at this time to let the parties resolve their own dispute before I recommend to Congress that legislation be passed which in effect would break the strike"?

There is no question at all what Congress will do if the substitute joint resolution is passed. We will be breaking a strike. Senators talk about inhibition. This is not inhibition; it is the breaking of a strike that is already in progress.

I say again that it grieves me that the airlines mechanics should have struck. It grieves me that they did not accept the recommendation made by their own leaders. But that is another question. I say that the Senate will become the instrumentality of strikebreaking if we pass the substitute joint resolution. We pretend to justify our action on the ground that the national interest is being irreparably harmed, yet no reference is made in the joint resolution to the harming of the national interest.

We say we need an emergency measure. But it not to meet an emergency, not to end a national emergency or to promote the national interest. It is only so that the strategic transportation service of certain carriers shall continue. I will admit that as a legal proposition we have the authority to do that. Under the Constitution, Congress has the right to pass legislation that has to do with transportation. I do not question that for a single moment.

It is not a matter of right—but of reasoning. Reason tells us that this is a very, very serious action. What we will do here, if we pass this substitute, would repudiate the philosophy of collective bargaining and the rights of people to work or not to work when there is a dispute. Before we take that action, without consultation with the President, without giving him some authority to exercise the powers of his high office, I say we had better beware, or this will come back to haunt us.

Today we are weighing everything else. We are weighing the national interest as against the breaking of this great philosophy, which is a hallmark of our country. We have held up as a flag unfurled to the entire world the right of the American worker to be democratic and to be free.

I say that we must take action. That action, in all probability, will be drastic, and no question about it. But let us not arrive at the moment that, on the strength of evidence before us thus far, we must go as far as to break a strike.

Mr. MORSE. All I can say is that I am at a loss to understand his argument, when the Senator from Rhode Island was one of those who, in 1963, voted to prevent men from even striking.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is very interesting to hear this remastication of history, and to see this threshing of old straw.

But while we do it, there are people sitting in airports, or at the end of a telephone line, wondering how they can get to the home or the place where there has been a bereavement in the family.

While we are sitting here threshing old straw, there are business people chomping their teeth and biting their nails, wondering how to get sensitive and delicate replacement parts to industry in all parts of the country, in order to prevent further layoffs of people.

While we sit here threshing old straw, there are perishables—whether they are young poults in California, or baby chickens of Illinois, or flowers or fruits or vegetables in Florida—that are seeking a market, and are probably being destroyed right now through the processes of heat and of age.

While we are here threshing old straw—and I cannot prove this, except by a memorandum that was handed me yesterday morning—there are bodies from Vietnam out in San Francisco that cannot get to the homes where they belong for a decent and proper interment. There are people trying to obtain seats on airplanes to go to the bedsides of loved ones who are dying, and we sit here frittering away a lot of time, to see on whose back the monkey is going to be.

There are no winners in an earthquake, and there will be no winners in this situation. I have been prepared from the outset to accept a share of this responsibility by Congress as well as by the President. Right now, Mr. President, I hand to the distinguished Senator from Oregon—and it is easier for him to walk than it is for me—a list of the names of 10 minority members, with my own name at the top, as sponsors for the substitute that he proposes to offer; and if there are others who wish to associate themselves in this common endeavor, the way and the time are still open.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a comment to the Senator from New York about what he said a while ago?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, with the understanding that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from New York, inadvertently, overstated the position of Secretary Wirtz with respect to his feeling about the Morse resolution and the committee resolution. I read from his testimony at page 103 of the hearings on August 1:

> Senator CLARK. But you are also in accord, are you not, Mr. Secretary, that if the bill which the committee agreed to by a vote of 11-to-5 is amended to eliminate the three 60-day periods—

And it was—

> you think it relatively unimportant whether or not the trigger is made by the President or by the Congress?
>
> Secretary WIRTZ. Yes. And again I can put it, the answer to that question is yes, and I can completely answer you only by saying that it, in my mind, was relatively unimportant. There seem to me reasons which commend its being done in a single act, as long as the findings go as far as the findings in the resolution bill, in terms of an immediate situation. But you are correct that I do not attach controlling importance to that.

I think we are arguing about how many angels can dance on the end of a pin. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it is far better law; it is far better political judgment; it is far wiser to leave this decision to the President.

I cannot understand how people at the White House can get so insistent that Congress take the responsibility to perform, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said, an executive action.

What we should do is give the President the authority to move in this situation—if in his discretion he thinks it is wise to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may reply to that statement?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, with the understanding that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. It is entirely true, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, that that is entirely consistent with my statement. They did prefer the Morse plan, but the Secretary did not consider that of overriding importance.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from New York consider it of overriding importance?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not, and I think that point is the nubbin of this whole controversy. With all due respect to the Senator from Rhode Island, if we give the President the power, he would have to act immediately, because, after all, it is a 30-day provision. It would take a week or several days for the men to get back to work physically and for the planes to be rolling.

I say to the Senate, as one of the people who architected this compromise, that if the President signs the bill, he is ordering these men back to work as much as we. Let us have no nonsense about that. He is exercising his discretion and using his judgment. He knows very well that if he did not want to do that, he could send the bill back to us with a short message saying, "I am vetoing this measure." He knows there will not be a two-thirds vote to override the veto. There is no such feeling of unanimity in Congress about it.

If he does not wish to veto it, then he, as much as we, is ordering these men back to work. Let us understand that very clearly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we are assuming here that the President of the United States has no concern over bringing people to the bedsides of their beloved sick and that sympathy abounds only in the Senate.

President Johnson has as much concern about that as does the Senator from Illinois. He is as much worried about the bodies we are talking about.

We are talking here about the President of the United States. We are suggesting that he is incompetent to do this, that he has no concern about it.

We all know President Johnson cares about the people and problems listed in the very dramatic, graphic, and pathetic presentation made by the Senator from Illinois. All of us are concerned with the sorrows of our fellow man. But transportation is not for tragedy alone. There are those who travel for pleasure and profit.

Let me say something about these people who are sitting down. Some of them are wearied by their wealth. Some of them, of course, have voted themselves some very fat pensions. They have themselves stocked up with a lot of stock options. Maybe they cannot get to Los Angeles. Maybe some actor cannot go to New York for a little performance and make $5,000 or $10,000. It takes all kinds of people to make up a planeload. And I am saying that the planes should fly—for everyone's cargo and for everyone's convenience. It is a matter of dramatics. It is a matter of devising the most sensible way.

What I am saying here is: Why in the name of commonsense do we exclude the President? Why?

Can someone answer that question?

Mr. MORSE. It has been answered over and over again.

Mr. JAVITS. It has been answered over and over again that we do not exclude him. We include him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island knows very well that, not by the remotest illusion, have I ever intimated in the Senate that the President is lacking in the milk of human kindness.

I was pointing out the condition that is growing in the country. It will continue to grow unless there is a solution. But we seem here to be more concerned about who is going to exercise a little authority and who is going to exercise it first. That is the sole proposition that is involved here.

I think, as this is set up, there is a sharing of responsibility, and the President, when he appoints the Board, makes the first move. If he fails to appoint the Board, this whole matter falls. It falls to the ground, and that is the end of it. Therein lies the President's initial responsibility.

Mr. PASTORE. But in the meantime, are the strikers not mandated back at work?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. The President cannot leave this whole thing in limbo. The Senator knows that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not want him to.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, we do not. If we pass the committee measure, the President of the United States can put them back to work tomorrow if he finds it in the national interest to do so.

It is only a question of how we should do it. But this idea that "I am all right, and the other fellow is all wrong," is something to which I cannot subscribe. The idea that one does not believe in helping the country, in helping the suffering, the poor, and the sick, if he does not do it this way, or that way, is something to which I do not subscribe.

We all have compassion. We all want the planes to fly.

I say that we should leave the judgment to the President of the United States. That is all I am saying.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What a discussion in futility.

Mr. PASTORE. It all depends on how one looks at it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Somehow, there is no power in this tremendous Government to get this machinery started one way or the other. We have labored earnestly and long to bring in here a compromise that I think will work. Both sides share responsibility. Yet, we continue this futile argument.

The time has come to get on with the business of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has pointed out in the RECORD that under article I, section 1, of the Constitution, all legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I have talked from the very beginning of this debate about the legislative responsibility of Congress under the Constitution. This raises the issue as to whether we will meet our legislative responsibilities, and whether the President shall exercise whatever discretion he wants to exercise in relation thereto by signing or vetoing the legislation, as the Senator from New York said.

There is where the President comes in, and that is in keeping with our separation-of-powers doctrine. But what is proposed by those who want to pass the responsibility to the President of the United States is that we should not exercise our power under the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce, that we should somehow, some way, delegate that to the President of the United States.

We cannot do it. The Attorney General of the United States has told the President, "You can't do it." In my judgment, the Attorney General is quite right. That is why I think we ought to play it safe, so to speak, by passing a substitute resolution, the legality of which, in my judgment, is not subject to reasonable question.

So, Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of the joint resolution already pending at the desk, and I offer this modification on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I shall be glad to add during the course of the debate the names of any other Senators who wish to have their names added.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification of the wording?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that on line 8 of paragraph (a) the word "any" should be changed.

Mr. MORSE. That has already been corrected from "every" to "any."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The distinguished Senator from New York in describing this a few moments ago used the word "certain," which is better than "any."

I suggest that, instead of the words "any section," we use the words "given section," "some section," or "certain section." That would make it more clear.

This question does not exist with relation to four of the major airlines in Texas. Delta, Braniff, and American are not struck. Only Eastern Air Lines is struck. Also, we have the Continental Air Lines to California. That airline is not struck.

I suggest that it would be more exact language if we were to change the word "any" to "given," "some," or "certain."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot accept the suggestion of the Senator from Texas. The language is a direct quote from the Railway Labor Act. It was included in the text so that we will have the exact language for the consideration of the court if there should be any court consideration. That is very important from the standpoint of legislative history.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the word "any" has court interpretation, I withdraw the recommendation. However, if it were new or initial legislation, I think any of the other three words would be more exact than the word "any."

Mr. MORSE. We have it this way because that is the language of the statute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 186, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the proposed amendment to the joint resolution be dispensed with, unless Senators want to have it read. A copy is on the desk of each Senator. I do this in the interest of saving time. I ask that the modification be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The proposed amendment to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186), as amended, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) the Congress does hereby find and declare that a labor dispute between Eastern Airlines, Incorporated, National Airlines, Incorporated, Northwest Airlines, Incorporated, Trans World Airlines, Incorporated, and United Air Lines, Incorporated, and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, a labor organization, threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services; that such essential transportation services must be maintained; that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute, including a report and recommendation of the Emergency Board No. 166, a proffer of arbitration and mediation with the parties by the National Mediation Board; further, that the efforts of the National Mediation Board and the Secretary of Labor to settle this dispute have been unsuccessful; and that it is desirable to achieve a settlement of this dispute in a manner which serves the public interest and economic stabilization and which preserves the free collective bargaining method.

"(b) The Congress therefore finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation by such carriers.

"SEC. 2. For a period of thirty days effective from the date of enactment of this joint resolution the provisions of section 10, paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply and no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose. During such period of time none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

"SEC. 3. (a) Within the period of time specified in section 2, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in section 1 of this joint resolution, to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board which shall thereafter engage in mediatory action directed to promoting agreement among the parties. The provisions of section 2 shall continue to apply during a period of sixty days following the appointment of the Board. At the expiration of said sixty-day period, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in section 1 of this joint resolution, and if the Special Airline Dispute Board provided for in this section finds that the provisions of said section 1 continue to exist and recommends to the President that the sixty-day period be extended, to extend the provisions of section 10, paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act for an additional ninety days upon issuance by the President of an Executive order so providing. During the period or periods of time referred to in this section, none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

"(b) Any agreement among the parties shall provide that the wage settlement provisions be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such service and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this Joint Resolution.

"SEC. 4. If an agreement has not been reached thirty days prior to the expiration of the final period of time provided in section 3, the Board shall make a final report with recommendations to the President which shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President, along with a full and complete report of the dispute and his recommendations regarding terms or procedures which will assist in the final settlement of this dispute in the public interest and without further interruption of the continuity of transportation services by these carriers.

"SEC. 5. (a) Upon suit by any of the parties to the aforesaid dispute or by the Attorney General the several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain any violations of sections 2 and 3 of this joint resolution. Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under this section may be pending, that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not; and subpenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

"(b) In granting in injunction or relief under this section, the jurisdiction of such court sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

"SEC. 6. If, prior to the settlement of the dispute referred to in section 1, a dispute between any other air carrier and its employees shall in the judgment of the President, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service after all procedures of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in a settlement of such dispute, the President is authorized to issue an Executive order reciting such findings; whereupon the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 shall become applicable to such dispute and to the parties thereto as though originally included in such provisions: *Provided,* That any such agreement referred to in section 3 shall provide that the wage settlement provision shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the prior collective bargaining agreement.

"Sec. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this joint resolution be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by January 15, 1967, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

"Sec. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very brief in my explanation of the resolution which is on the desk of each Senator. I believe it is clearly stated, and it speaks for itself.

Mr. President, the substitute amendment I offered last night, which is dated August 3, 6 p.m., contains only one basic change from Senate Joint Resolution 186, reported by a majority of the committee—one basic change in principle. However, that difference was the major issue before the committee during its 5 days of executive consideration of this dispute. That issue is whether Congress, after making the same finding and declaration provided in section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 186 and my substitute amendment of today, should reinstate a period of time in which there can be no strike or lockout under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, as provided in paragraph 2 of my substitute; or, should the President be authorized, in his discretion, by Executive order, to require the strikers to return to work.

The issue is simple. However, it involves the question of jurisdiction of Congress under the interstate commerce clause and the general powers of the Executive under the Constitution, where the health and safety of the Nation are at stake. It involves article I, section 1, of the Constitution, as called to my attention this morning by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], and that is that the legislative power is vested in Congress and not in the executive branch of Government.

Since Senate Joint Resolution 186 has been before the Senate, some Senators, including members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, have taken the position that no legislation is needed to return these employees to work.

Mr. President, without reiterating all the evidence that is already in the Record in regard to the interruption of essential transportation in many sections of the country, I think it is crystal clear that Congress, in carrying out its legislative responsibility, should proceed to act under article I, section 1, of the Constitution.

The strike has become a strike not only against the carriers, but also against the public interest. We are dealing here with a regulated industry.

In 1963, Congress exercised its legislative prerogatives in the railroad dispute, and prevented a strike from even occurring—it was only threatened—stopped the men from striking, and imposed compulsory arbitration on them. I put all the important quotations from the decision into the Record yesterday. The Federal court not only held that that was within the power of Congress, but also pointed out that workers in a regulated industry are subject to such impositions being placed upon them when their strike or threatened strike involves such a danger to the public interest. That is the situation in this case.

It is easy to argue about a right to strike; but, as I said earlier this morning, it is not an absolute right, and it is a qualified right in a regulated industry when the public interest becomes involved.

I yield to no one in fighting for the rights of labor for collective bargaining and for obtaining fair settlements. But these workers, through their own negotiators, have a fair settlement in this dispute. These workers—in a regulated industry—insist that they ought to be allowed the right to continue to strike, in spite of the fair settlement that their own negotiating committee has negotiated.

As I said earlier, there is no wage issue left in this case. By the settlement that their negotiators obtained for them last Friday night, they got more in wages than they had asked for in the beginning; for their high figure was $4.04, and they have ended up with $4.08.

Mr. President, there has been talk about underpaid workers. This is a blue-ribbon industry, as far as its pay is concerned, in relation to other pay in this country. It is above the average. It is a well-paid industry, and it should be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. The skills of these workers call for that kind of pay. But these workers, in a regulated industry, with a great public investment in that industry, I say most respectfully, have no right to injure the public as they are injuring the public. They should not be allowed to use their naked economic power to force out of the carriers—and, not so indirectly, out of the taxpayers, in the long run—a settlement in this case that will be highly inflationary in nature. Their action can be used as the bellwether for additional inflationary settlements from the major industries that are waiting in the wings to have their disputes settled.

If ever there was a time in my 21 years in the Senate when the Senate had an obligation to say "No," by way of legislation, to a union that seeks to use its naked economic power to force that kind of settlement, that time is now.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I joined in sponsoring this substitute resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. However, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon to clarify one question which is on my mind.

I see nothing in the substitute resolution to inform us as to the wages which the airline employees will receive during the first 30 days when they return to work. I believe I know, but I should like the Senator to tell me.

Mr. MORSE. The retroactivity clause is in there and the workers would go back to work on the basis of the wages under the old agreement, unless the parties agree to a different wage.

May I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I commented on this matter yesterday. I had expected that the announcement would be at my desk by now, but it is not—but I think it will be—that if the members go back to work, they will go back to work, by agreement with the carriers, on the basis of the wage settlement that was negotiated last Friday night.

I said in my speech yesterday that I thought this was only fair and reasonable, because we can take judicial notice of the fact that the final settlement will not be for less. I wish the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] were on the floor, for I think he might have some information that would buttress the statement I am now making. After the carriers have entered into that agreement, I think it only fair under the law, if it is passed and signed—as I hope it will be—that the men go back to work on the basis of the wage settlement included in their collective bargaining agreement of last Friday night. I know it can be argued that the union has rejected it, but we would not be very realistic if we thought they would ever get less.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was my understanding. However, it is not in the resolution. I thought it should be brought out for clarification.

Mr. MORSE. It is very important.

I have pointed out many times that we are not seeking to take advantage of this union in regard to wages. We have retroactivity back to January 1, 1966. The retroactivity clause was laid down by the Emergency Board. They are entitled to retroactivity. There is no question that they will get it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I have said, Mr. President, that the wage issue no longer is an issue in this case, and the other issues certainly do not justify the union continuing this strike against the public interest and thus doing the great damage I feel it is doing to the public interest.

I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is right, and his argument is unanswerable. He has pointed out the damage that is being done to essential transportation—that is the language of the Railway Labor Act—by a continuation of this strike.

It is on the basis of that legislative power and duty that the senior Senator from Oregon urges the passage of this substitute.

With regard to the major issue before the Senate, which is clearly presented by the substitute amendment we will vote on today, sections 2 and 3 of the substitute amendment set forth the procedure for returning these employees to work. Section 2 provides that for a period of 30 days from the date of enactment, the said employees must return and continue to work. During this period of time, as provided under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, no change except by agreement shall be made by the parties to the dispute in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

That bears on the question of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in regard to the terms and conditions under which they go back to work. They go back to work under the old agreement subject to whatever modification the parties themselves are willing to agree to. They have already agreed, although it was rejected by the members, to many modifications in the old agreement.

Section 3 provides that within said 30-day period, the President is authorized to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board to engage in mediatory action. For 60 days from the date the Board is appointed, the provisions of section 2 continue.

I wish to stress when the 60 days start running. Suppose the President does not appoint a Board for 10 days the 60 days will run from the 10th day. Whatever the date is that he appoints the Board, then the 60-day period starts to run.

Section 3 provides that within said 30-day period, the President is authorized to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board to engage in mediatory action. For 60 days from the date the Board is appointed, the provisions of section 2 continue; neither the carrier nor the union can engage in a strike or lockout. As provided under the Railway Labor Act, the appointment of the Board by the President results in the no-strike, no-lockout period of time.

Section 3 further provides that at the expiration of said 60-day period, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in section 1, and if the Special Airline Dispute Board recommends that the said 60-day period be extended, to extend the no-strike no-lockout period of time for an additional 90 days by Executive order of the President.

Discretion? We are giving the President great discretion in this matter. But he has to act on the basis of congressional authority to regulate commerce and all of those actions thereafter will be ministerial. Congress has sent the men back to work and delegates only ministerial functions to the President thereafter. The President joins in sending them back to work when he signs the resolution.

The provisions of sections 2 and 3 represent a compromise between the position of those who favor returning the employees to work solely on the basis of a Presidential order—which, as I have said, will be subject to great legal attack, and my position which has been that the Congress is making the finding and declaration which should require the employees to return to work automatically.

The initial 30-day period in my substitute amendment returns the employees to work automatically for a 30-day period on the finding and declaration of the Congress contained in section 1. Thereafter, the 60-day period is triggered by the President appointing a Special Airline Dispute Board following the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

Finally, a 90-day period is triggered by the President on the basis of the findings of Congress and the recommendations of the Board extending the period of time for 90 days by Executive order.

The remainder of the resolution is essentially the same as the resolution reported by the committee. Section 3(b) provides that the wage settlement provisions be retroactive to January 1, 1966, when any agreement is reached by the parties.

Section 4 provides that the Board shall make a final report with recommendations to the President, which shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President, along with his report and recommendations.

Section 5 provides for enforcement of sections 2 and 3 by the Attorney General.

Section 6 provides that if prior to the settlement of this dispute, a dispute between other air carriers and their employees may be made subject to the Executive order of the President, as provided in section 3. The substitute amendment contains new sections 7 and 8.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] talked to me about this. He was the first person to make this recommendation to me and he deserves the credit for it. I saw immediately that we should follow the suggestion. Again, it is language taken from the Railway Labor Act. It removes the doubt as to whether there is going to be any involuntary servitude, insofar as individuals are concerned.

Section 7 protects the right of the individual employee to voluntarily terminate his employment without being subject to the penalties of this joint resolution. Section 7 is the same language as contained in the Railway Labor Act, section 9, paragraph 8. It is consistent with the purposes of the Railway Labor Act and this joint resolution. The guarantees contained in section 7 are already available under the due process clause of the fifth amendment. Similar involuntary servitude provisions are contained in the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Let me say that I do not know what the concern is about sending these men back to work through the court action provided in this measure. That is nothing new, Mr. President.

What I do not like is what I think is an implied reflection on the members of this union, as I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday. The record of this union is a record that recognizes we have to maintain a system of government by law. Who are the union men? They are our neighbors; they are our associates; they go to the same churches; they send their children to the same schools; they are fellow Americans. I wish to disassociate myself from any implication that once this measure becomes law and the law works its course in accordance with the terms of the resolution, that this union membership will defy government by law.

I say in behalf of the international president of this union that he left no room for doubt in statements he made when he said, in effect, that he does not think the men will go back to work unless legislation is passed. Other spokesmen for the union in other parts of the country have taken the position, with some irritation and feeling, that they were not going back to work unless ordered back to work under the terms of the law.

I do not think that there is any problem about these men carrying out their legal responsibilities. I join with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I think he is right in proposing this language from the act that leaves no room for doubt about whether or not an individual worker, acting in his individual capacity, is going to be compelled to go back to work.

It is true that if a worker does not want to go back to work, he may suffer some consequences of his own making, but not under the operation of the statute.

But whether or not he goes back to work and keeps his job if he does not go back to work—whether he is not going to lose a great many benefits that will flow to him under the agreement, including health, welfare, and pension benefits, is a question that is not involved in the operation of the statute.

The important thing that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is making clear here is that this law is not going to have an effect on the individual which could be interpreted as involuntary servitude.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York for further comment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator is saying. I would like to make this substantive point.

When the men go back to work, and I hope they will be going back to work, they have to get wages, hours, and conditions of work, and so forth. Is it the intention of the drafter of this substitute, the Senator from Oregon, that where the Airline Dispute Board is referred to in section 3, and the statement is made "a special Airline Dispute Board which shall thereafter engage in mediatory action directed to promoting agreement among the parties," that that will include mediatory action while this law that we are talking about remains operative as to interim wages, hours, and conditions of work under which the employee will be working?

For example, we have heard it said that the workers will receive the salary and the compensation specified in the settlement that they turned down rather than the old wage rate. It seems to me that we should——

Mr. MORSE. That is the agreement between the parties.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. Of course, the provisions of the bill would allow an agreement between the parties, and I should like to make that clear. In section 2 we find that there will be no change in the previous conditions, that is, in the contract that has expired, except by agreement. That is contained in line 4, section 2 of the substitute. But is it not also a fact that we will expect a Special Airline Dispute Board to mediate as between management and labor while they are at work under this resolution?

Mr. MORSE. That is part of their responsibility.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

May I ask the Senator if he would have any objection to this: The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is desirous of speaking at an hour which would be suitable to him, and I should like to ask unanimous consent for the Senator to have the floor at 2 o'clock p.m., or as soon thereafter as anyone who has the floor at that time has finished speaking.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] may be recognized at 2 o'clock p.m. today, or as soon thereafter as the Senator who has the floor at that time has surrendered the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is to ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, although the record has been made, I want to bring it together in one point.

Mr. President, as long ago as July 27, Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified that an interruption in essential transportation service had occurred. This, of course, is a finding the executive branch makes when it appoints an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act, and invokes a 60-day, no-strike period. It must be determined at that time an interruption in essential transportation to a section of the country will ensue if the work stoppage proceeds.

To quote from the summary of the Secretary's testimony on July 27:

> The transportation services involved here are clearly "essential" in any ordinary sense of the term.
>
> The "national interest" is plainly involved—but hardly in the usual sense of "national health, safety and defense." Yet if there should be one accident on an airline during this strike period—with the overload it places on the lines that are operating—the recriminations would be levelled without regard to any proven facts of relationship or non-relationship to the strike. This possibility haunts this testimony—and I assume no responsibility regarding it.
>
> Neither do I mean by what are necessarily broad generalizations to disregard the hundreds of thousands of small and individual inconveniences a public service stoppage creates. We are entitled to measure the national interest to some extent by what happens to each of us.
>
> Finally, and more significantly, I have tried to give the Committee today's picture. Tomorrow's will be different, and worse by at least a little; and more so the next day. If the question is whether the public deserves an end to this situation, the answer is clearly that it does.
>
> We are confronted with a serious, substantial, adverse impact on the national interest, an impact which, however, has not yet brought the country to an emergency stage. However, any prolongation of the current strike, by increasing the strain on existing services, and by multiplying the current delays and inconveniences may well bring the nation to that crisis, emergency stage.

Yes, Senators can point, as Secretary Wirtz did, to the fact that by greatly overloading their facilities, some other airlines have picked up part of the loss of service caused by the strike. But are Senators prepared to answer to the public outrage that Secretary Wirtz also mentioned, if an accident occurs on these overstrained airlines that are operating under abnormal, emergency conditions?

I submit to Senators that we are not here, holding the national authority over interstate commerce in our hands, to wait for disaster, for dramatic loss of life, for catastrophe to befall the public before we act. We are supposed to be here to prevent national emergency conditions from arising.

That is what we did in 1963. We did not wait for the disaster to be visited. We acted in anticipation of it.

And I say to Senators that every day this strike continues, the burden upon the airlines continuing to operate under these conditions increases the chances of air accident.

Of course, Senators may point to statistics and say that at least in part the loss of service from the five lines has been made good by others. But they ignore the dangers of such emergency operations over a prolonged period of time.

Just so can Senators point to the military picture, and say that the National Guard and the U.S. Air Force are seeing to it that no emergency is allowed to develop. But they must at the same time ignore the cost to the taxpayers of such added service by the Air Force and the National Guard, and the unknown cost to the public in the diversion of their planes, men, and services from the military activities they are designed to perform.

Secretary Wirtz told us that the possibility of air accident on the overstrained airlines still operating haunted his testimony on July 27. That was his answer to the issue of whether this strike affected the national safety, health, and welfare. Many can say that it does not affect it yet because nothing disastrous has occurred. Are we waiting for it to happen before we act?

Are we waiting for the first plane to crash so we can be assured then that there is a real emergency in terms of national safety and health? When that happens, are we then going to continue sitting here blaming the President for not having acted first?

It is our duty to regulate commerce, not his, and that will be a burden we will not succeed in shifting.

WILL FAILURE TO ACT GET RID OF LABOR DISPUTES?

I have also been a little bemused by the contentions made here on the floor that we should certainly not interfere with the collective bargaining process by enacting legislation to protect the public interest. Senators seem to be laboring under the great illusion that if we merely refrain from acting on this one problem, the issue will not come before us again.

I submit that if we refrain from acting, this will only be the beginning. Far from having every labor dispute dumped in our laps if we do act, we will have far more labor disputes carried to the point of becoming national issues if we do not act.

Wage contract after wage contract is being negotiated. Union after union has its eyes glued on Congress to see what we will do when the Nation is confronted with a stoppage of essential transportation. This dispute is the bellwether one for many unions, some of them also of critical importance to regulated industries.

Telephone service, for example; also the ground transportation workers around airports, including National Airport.

Gentlemen, if Congress fails to act in this case, it will be only a matter of weeks before there will be another, and another, work stoppage in a vital industry. If you think you can postpone facing this issue until next year, or at least until after the November election, I think you are mistaken. I do not think we will even get to the end of the current session without having another dispute on our hands, brought about at least in some degree by the thought on the part of the workers that if Congress did not act in a clear-cut case like the Machinists' strike, anything goes.

Certainly we should have general, permanent legislation. I have introduced it in every Congress since 1947. I have not heard Senators flock around to get action on it. I have not heard Senators plead and appeal for general emergency dispute legislation until they are faced with a specific dispute such as this, whereupon they promptly complain that disputes should not be dealt with one at a time but only on a general basis.

The trouble with that argument is that it only means not dealing at all with emergency disputes. When there is no urgency, Senators are not interested in general legislation. When there is urgency, Senators say we need general and not specific legislation.

Mr. President, I have also gathered information in regard to the relative status of workers in comparison to workers elsewhere in the country. This point keeps constantly popping up in debate, seeking to give the impression that a settlement is sought to be imposed upon the workers which is somehow unfair to them.

The Emergency Board raised the rate to $4 per hour. We are talking about the pace-setting rate or the key rate, which is what is referred to in discussing wage settlements in collective bargaining agreements.

In this case, for the mechanics, the present rate is $3.52. We got it up to $4.

They only asked for $4.04. The $4 was for the period extending over 42 months. They asked for 36 months. They asked for $4.04 for 36 months. The other night, in the agreement, they got $4.08 for 36 months which eliminates the wage issue.

I want to put some tables in the RECORD. One table shows the median hourly earnings of automotive mechanics, 1964–65, to which reference has been made by some Senators in debate, giving the impression that somehow the machinists are not doing so well as the automotive mechanics.

That is not the case.

There is a Greyhound settlement out on the west coast that goes over $4. We can always find an exceptional settlement, but they do not have the same continuity of employment, nor the benefits. But yet, we are here dealing with a regulated industry which has cost the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in the building of airports, and the subsidization of the airlines during their lean years in order to develop their business. There are work opportunities in the sense that they are guaranteed this large number of union members in the industry. When we look at the percentage points, a large bulk of the workers never have to worry about job opportunities being made available to them, whereas in many other industries there is a great turnover and large layoffs. Contrast the construction or the automobile industry—in the latter we know that plants shut down periodically for some period of time.

Mr. President, let me quickly say, in regard to the median hourly earnings for automotive mechanics—look at how the figures run:

All metropolitan areas, $3.21 per hour. Northeastern, $3.82; South, $2.94; North Central, $3.29; West, $3.39; Pittsburgh, Pa., $3.31; Charleston, W. Va., $3.13; Chicago, $3.51; San Francisco, $3.71.

Then we come to automobile repair shops, and we see the same statistical information showing that the employees are considerably below the employees we are talking about today. This is statistical material which the Bureau of Labor Statistics made available to me, dealing with this issue. I mention it because I know that irrelevant arguments can sometimes seem to influence votes on the floor of the Senate. I have heard some Senators argue as though the machinists were not getting a reasonable settlement, when they are in the upper group in this country in regard to wages and their benefits.

I ask unanimous consent to have these tables printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Median hourly earnings of automotive mechanics, 1964–65

All metropolitan areas	$3.21
Northeast	3.12
South	2.94
North Central	3.29
West	3.39
Highest metropolitan area:	
Pittsburgh, Pa	3.31
Charleston, W. Va	3.13
Chicago, Ill	3.51
San Francisco, Calif	3.71

AUTO REPAIR SHOPS, AUGUST–OCTOBER 1964

Auto mechanics, class A—Highest metropolitan area:	
Northeast, New York	3.58
South, Houston, Tex	3.53
North Central, Cleveland, Ohio	3.78
West, Los Angeles, Calif	3.79

Attached are recent wage determinations issued under the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act.

Those selected show rates for aircraft mechanics and in some cases aircraft and auto mechanics.

NOTE.—Laredo Air Force Base rate $2.86 minimum for both aircraft mechanic and automotive mechanic.

Airplane mechanics: "Mechanics employed by the scheduled domestic airlines earned, on the average, $580 a month in late 1962."—Employment Outlook in Civil Aviation

REGISTER OF WAGE DETERMINATIONS AND FRINGE BENEFITS UNDER THE MCNAMARA-O'HARA SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965

Laredo Air Force Base, Webb County, Tex.

[Wage determination No. 66-4. Date: Feb. 3, 1966]

Title and class of service employees	Minimum monetary wage (per hour)	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
Boiler fireman	$2.38	--------	--------	--------	--------
Carpenter, maintenance	2.70	--------	--------	--------	--------
Electrician, maintenance	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Forklift operator	2.06	--------	--------	--------	--------
Helper (trades)	2.06	--------	--------	--------	--------
Janitor, heavy	1.75	--------	--------	--------	--------
Janitor, light	1.65	--------	--------	--------	--------
Laborer	1.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Machine operator	2.54	--------	--------	--------	--------
Machinist (single machine)	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Machinist (more than 1 machine)	3.01	--------	--------	--------	--------
Mechanic, aircraft	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Mechanic, automotive	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Packer, shipping	1.96	--------	--------	--------	--------
Painter, maintenance	2.70	--------	--------	--------	--------
Pipefitter	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Plumber, maintenance	2.70	--------	--------	--------	--------
Sheetmetal worker	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------
Truckdriver, heavy (over 4 tons)	2.38	--------	--------	--------	--------
Truckdriver, medium (1½ to 4 tons)	2.22	--------	--------	--------	--------
Warehouseman	1.96	--------	--------	--------	--------
Welder	2.86	--------	--------	--------	--------

Fort Rucker, Ala.

PART I—CONTRACT FOR MAINTAINING AIRCRAFT

[Wage determination No. 66-64. Date: May 4, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage [1]		Fringe benefits payments			
	Minimum	Maximum	Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
CLERICAL						
1. Accounting clerk	$1.88	$2.68	--------	------	------	------
2. Aircraft records clerk	1.48	2.28	--------	------	------	------
3. Aircraft records clerk, senior	1.88	2.68	--------	------	------	------
4. Aircraft records specialist	2.23	2.98	--------	------	------	------
5. Clerk-stenographer	1.48	2.28	--------	------	------	------
6. EIR technician	$2.23	$2.98	--------	------	------	------
7. Maintenance clerk	1.88	2.68	--------	------	------	------
8. Motor pool maintenance clerk	1.88	2.68	--------	------	------	------
9. Motor pool records clerk	1.43	2.08	--------	------	------	------
10. Production control clerk	1.48	2.28	--------	------	------	------
11. Production control clerk, senior	1.88	2.68	--------	------	------	------
12. Procurement clerk	2.23	2.98	--------	------	------	------
13. Research clerk	2.13	2.78	--------	------	------	------
14. Supply clerk	1.43	2.08	--------	------	------	------
15. Supply clerk, senior	1.88	2.68	--------	------	------	------
16. Technical publications technician	2.23	2.98	--------	------	------	------
17. Technician, aircraft scheduler	2.23	2.98	--------	------	------	------
18. Technician, weight and balance	2.23	2.98	--------	------	------	------
19. Technician, X-ray	2.58	3.28	--------	------	------	------
20. Transcriber	1.43	2.08	--------	------	------	------
PRODUCTION AND MAINTENANCE						
1. Aircraft cleaner	1.60	2.46	--------	------	------	------
2. Aircraft inspector, fixed wing	2.57	3.28	--------	------	------	------
3. Aircraft inspector, rotary wing	2.57	3.28	--------	------	------	------
4. Aircraft painter	1.70	2.58	--------	------	------	------
5. Aircraft welder	2.02	2.68	--------	------	------	------
6. Aircraft welder, master	2.42	3.08	--------	------	------	------
7. Automotive serviceman	1.60	2.26	--------	------	------	------
8. Auxiliary ground and hangar equipment mechanic	1.70	2.58	--------	------	------	------
9. Avionics technician	2.57	3.28	--------	------	------	------
10. Battery mechanic	1.70	2.58	--------	------	------	------
11. Carburetor mechanic	2.02	2.88	--------	------	------	------
12. Fabric and upholstery mechanic	1.70	2.58	--------	------	------	------
13. Fixed wing mechanic	2.02	2.58	--------	------	------	------
14. Fixed wing mechanic, master	2.32	2.88	--------	------	------	------
15. General storekeeper	2.02	2.68	--------	------	------	------
16. Helper, general	1.40	2.01	--------	------	------	------
17. Inspector, supply	2.32	2.88	--------	------	------	------
18. Janitor	1.40	2.01	--------	------	------	------
19. Machinist	2.02	3.08	--------	------	------	------
20. Parts expediter	1.60	2.26	--------	------	------	------
21. Plant utility repairman	2.02	2.68	--------	------	------	------
22. Production stock expediter	1.70	2.58	--------	------	------	------
23. Propeller mechanic	2.02	2.88	--------	------	------	------
24. Radio and electronic mechanic	2.02	3.08	--------	------	------	------
25. Rotary wing mechanic	2.02	2.58	--------	------	------	------
26. Rotary wing mechanic, master	2.32	2.88	--------	------	------	------
27. Sandblast operator	1.60	2.26	--------	------	------	------
28. Sheetmetal mechanic	2.02	2.88	--------	------	------	------
29. Storekeeper	2.02	2.58	--------	------	------	------
30. Utility man	1.60	2.26	--------	------	------	------

Footnotes at end of table.

Fort Rucker, Ala.—Continued

[Wage determination No. 66-64. Date: May 4, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage[1]		Fringe benefits payments			
	Minimum	Maximum	Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
TEST BOARD						
1. Aircraft accessory mechanic	$2.02	$2.88				
2. Janitor	1.40	2.01				
3. Machinist	2.02	3.08				
4. Radio and electronic mechanic	2.02	2.88				
5. Sheetmetal mechanic	2.02	2.88				
6. Storekeeper	2.02	2.58				
TEST PILOTS	Per month[2]					
1. Rotary wing test pilot	$700.00	$950.00				
2. Fixed wing test pilot	700.00	950.00				
Applies to all classes of service employees			(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

[1] Clerical, production and maintenance, and test board employees are to receive step increases of 10 cents per hour after each 16 weeks of employment until the maximum rate for the grade is reached.

[2] Test pilots are to receive step increases of $50 per month after each 6 months of employment until the maximum salary range has been reached; except that new employees are to receive the first $50 per month increase after 3 months of employment and each 6 months thereafter until the maximum salary range has been reached.

[3] Sick pay: Four hours per month from date of hire credited after 60 days of employment. Group life, accidental death and dismemberment, and accident and health insurance plan: To be provided at employer's expense, and at the benefit level currently provided incumbent employees.

[4] Vacation: 6.6667 hours per month for employees with less than 10 years of service with an employer; 10 hours per month for employees with 10 years but less than 20 years of service with an employer; and 13.3 hours per month for employees with 20 or more years of service with an employer.

[5] Holidays: 9 paid holidays per year (New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, the day before Christmas, Christmas Day, Washington's Birthday, Veteran's Day).

[6] Bonus: Rotary wing troubleshooters to receive $20 per week in lieu of all other flight pay while in pay status. Other employees to receive flight pay of $3 per hour for propeller driven aircraft and $5 per hour for jet propelled aircraft. $0.20 per hour to be received by each employee who possesses an FAA "A" or "P" licenses and $0.35 per hour by employees possessing both "A" and "P" licenses.

PART II—CONTRACT FOR ROTARY WING INSTRUMENT FLIGHT TRAINING

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage (per month)[1]		Fringe benefits payments			
	Minimum	Maximum	Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Academic instructor	$400	$525				
2. Academic instructor, senior	550	550				
3. Flight instructor	475	700				
4. Link instructor	400	450				
5. Link maintenance	400	450				
6. Meteorologist	450	500				
7. P. T. instructor	400	515				
8. Tower operator	400	450	(2)	(3)	(4)	

[1] All employees, other than flight instructors, are to receive merit step increases of 5 percent per month every 6 months until the maximum of the salary range has been reached. Flight instructors are to receive merit step increases of $25 per month every 6 months until they reach $650 per month and may receive $25 merit increase each 12 months thereafter until the maximum of the salary range is reached.

[2] Sick leave: 1 day per month from date of hire credited after 60 days of employment.

[3] Vacation: 5/16 of the working day per month of service, but not to exceed a maximum of 2 weeks per year.

[4] Holidays: 8 paid holidays per year (New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, Washington's Birthday, Veterans Day).

Craig Air Force Base, Ala.

[Wage determination No.: 66-14. Date: Mar. 16, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
AIRCRAFT REFUELING					
1. Refueler	$1.89				
2. Refueling manager	3.18				
3. Refueling operator	2.48				
4. Refueling supervisor	3.01				

Craig Air Force Base, Ala.—Continued

[Wage determination No.: 66-14. Date: Mar. 16, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
CONTRACTOR SUPPLY OPERATION					
5. Parts expediter	$2.31				
6. Purchasing agent	2.23				
7. Stockroom attendant	2.14				
8. Supervisor, general supply	2.49				
9. Supervisor, laundry and dry cleaning	1.99				
CUSTODIAL SERVICES					
10. Foreman	2.48				
11. Working leader	1.71				
DINING HALL OPERATION					
12. Baker	2.48				
13. Busboy	1.55				
14. Cashier	1.69				
15. Cook	2.48				
16. Cook's helper	1.97				
17. Dishwasher	1.55				
18. Manager	3.01				
19. Pot and pan washer	1.55				
20. Salad man	1.78				
21. Serving line attendant	1.66				
22. Shift leader	2.73				
23. Storeroom clerk	2.14				
GENERAL					
24. Administrative clerk	1.99				
25. Bookkeeper	2.49				
26. Clerk-typist	1.99				
27. Desk clerk	1.99				
28. Janitor	1.55				
29. Laborer, general	1.55				
30. Night watchman	1.83				
31. Resident manager	4.31				
32. Secretary	2.23				
33. Supply clerk	1.99				
34. Truck driver (up to 2½ tons)	2.14				
35. Typist	1.99				
GROUNDS MAINTENANCE					
36. Foreman, general	3.51				
37. Greenskeeper (golf course supervisor)	2.81				
38. Working leader	2.67				
HOUSING ADMINISTRATION					
39. Housing manager	2.49				
40. Supply man and driver	2.14				
41. Supply supervisor	2.23				
42. Warehouseman	2.14				
INSECT AND RODENT CONTROL					
43. Laborer (skilled in pest control)	1.97				
44. Working leader (certified pest controller)	2.64				
LIGHT PLANE (T-41). TRAINING					
45. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	3.24				
46. Aircraft mechanic	2.81				
47. Flight supervisor	3.93				
48. Instructor pilot	3.60				
MOTOR POOL OPERATION					
49. Bus operator	2.14				
50. Chief dispatcher	2.23				
51. Driver school instructor	2.49				
52. Heavy equipment operator	2.48				
53. Light equipment operator	2.14				
54. Light vehicle operator	1.89				
55. Motor vehicle transportation supervisor	3.01				
56. Vehicle dispatcher	1.99				
MOTOR VEHICLE MAINTENANCE					
57. Automotive body man	2.64				
58. Automotive body shop helper	1.97				
59. Automotive painter	2.64				
60. Battery shop attendant	1.97				
61. Construction and heavy equipment mechanic	2.81				
62. Filling station attendant	1.89				
63. General purpose mechanic	2.81				
64. Lubrication man	1.97				
65. Maintenance controller	2.23				
66. Maintenance scheduler	3.01				
67. Maintenance superintendent	3.60				
68. Maintenance supervisor	3.69				

Craig Air Force Base, Ala.—Continued

[Wage determination No. 66-14. Date: Mar. 16, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
MOTOR VEHICLE MAINTENANCE					
69. Motor vehicle inspector	$2.95				
70. Service station manager	2.14				
71. Service station mechanic and inspector	2.64				
72. Special purpose mechanic	2.95				
73. Tire repairman	1.97				
PAVEMENT AND RAILROAD MAINTENANCE					
74. Working leader	3.34				
WATERPLANT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
75. Waterplant (well) operator, skilled	2.64				

Laredo Air Force Base, Tex.

[Wage determination No.: 66-23. Date: Mar. 26, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	$3.42				
2. Aircraft mechanic	2.86				
3. Flight supervisor	3.93				
4. Instructor pilot	3.60				
5. Janitor	1.75				
6. Night watchman	1.83				
7. Refueler	2.22				
8. Resident manager	4.31				
9. Secretary	2.23				
10. Supply clerk	1.99				

Webb Air Force Base, Tex.

[Wage determination No. 66-22. Date: Mar. 25, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	$3.78				
2. Aircraft mechanic	3.12				
3. Flight supervisor	3.93				
4. Instructor pilot	3.60				
5. Janitor	2.34				
6. Light vehicle operator	2.47				
7. Night watchman	1.83				
8. Resident manager	4.31				
9. Secretary	2.23				
10. Supply clerk	1.99				

Moody Air Force Base, Ga.

[Wage determination No. 66-14. Date: Mar. 16, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	$3.37				
2. Aircraft mechanic	2.90				
3. Flight supervisor	3.93				
4. Instructor pilot	3.60				
5. Night watchman	2.02				
6. Resident manager	4.31				
7. Secretary	2.23				

Reese Air Force Base, Tex.

[Wage determination No. 66-25. Date: Mar. 26, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	$3.47				
2. Aircraft mechanic	2.88				
3. Flight supervisor	3.93				
4. Instructor pilot	3.60				
5. Janitor	1.97				
6. Night watchman	1.83				
7. Refuelers	2.36				
8. Resident manager	4.31				
9. Secretary	1.99				
10. Supply clerk	1.99				

Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.

[Wage determination No. 66-26. Date Mar. 26, 1966]

Class of service employee	Minimum hourly wage	Fringe benefits payments			
		Health and welfare	Vacation	Holiday	Other
1. Aircraft maintenance supervisor	$3.42				
2. Aircraft mechanic	2.86				
3. Flight supervisor	3.93				
4. Instructor pilot	3.60				
5. Janitor	1.75				
6. Night watchman	1.83				
7. Refueler	2.22				
8. Resident manager	4.31				
9. Secretary	2.23				
10. Supply clerk	1.99				

SPECIAL COMPARISON OF AIRLINE WAGE RATES TO WAGES IN COMPARABLE INDUSTRIES AND OCCUPATIONS

During a public hearing before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate on July 27, 1966, suggestions were made by a spokesman for the IAM that wages currently being paid to the employees they represent are inequitably low when compared to certain other industries and contract settlements. Particular reference was made to comparable wages in bus line repair, auto and truck repair, defense industries, etc. Actually, these allegations amount to an attempt at relitigating the questions of fact which had been fully heard and decided by Presidential Emergency Board No. 166. A discussion of selected rates in this context is inappropriate. The following comments are offered, however, to assist interested persons in analyzing the accuracy and credibility of the allegations made in the Hearing:

I. TYPICAL GREYHOUND BUS RATES

There is a wide variation between the rates of pay for Greyhound bus mechanics around the country and for such mechanics in certain west coast locations. The IAM cited a recent IAM-Greyhound settlement which gave a basic hourly wage to west coast bus repair mechanics in excess of $4.00 an hour. That is true. The reference to this figure overlooks, however, the fact that the pay for bus repair mechanics working for this and related companies elsewhere in the United States is as follows:

Miami	$3.32
Chicago	3.38
Washington-Baltimore	3.39
New York City	3.32
Boston	3.32
Atlanta	$3.32
Pittsburgh	3.32
Minneapolis-St. Paul	3.38

To the best of our knowledge, the foregoing rates include cost of living factors where such factors are an element in the contract. When comparing the current $3.52 mechanics rate, which would be subject to an immediate 18¢ increase to $3.70 according to the PEB No. 166 recommendation, it should be evident that the recommendation continues to keep airline mechanics far ahead of the large majority of their colleagues working on bus repair around the nation. In this brief analysis, it is also impossible to completely tell how the bus companies place a limited number of employees in the maximum rates which are described above. Early reports indicate a tendency to restrict the number of mechanics occupying the maximum rate and to expand the number of lesser skilled employees in lower labor grades working on bus repair.

II. TYPICAL TRUCK REPAIR RATES

The Industrial Relations Department of the American Trucking Association published on June 1, 1966 a compilation of journeymen mechanics hourly wage rates in effect in selected cities throughout the United States. The rates were drawn from trucking labor agreements, primarily negotiated with the IAM. A copy of that compilation is attached. It should be evident from a comparison of the $3.70 airlines mechanics rate (the result of $3.52 plus 18¢ per PEB recommendation) with the typical rates in effect in 1966 that the airline mechanics are far ahead of the majority of their colleagues working in truck repair around the United States. Again, a small number of west coast locations enjoy a higher wage. Significantly, the PEB recommendation for wage increases of 18¢, 15¢ and 15¢ over the life of the agreement will bring the airline mechanics rates very close to even these, most extreme west coast rates. On the whole, however, the airlines mechanics rate is far ahead and will continue to be far ahead of the majority of truck repair mechanics rates.

III. TYPICAL AEROSPACE WAGE RATES

Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc. and IAM District Lodge 1578 are under a contract from August 2, 1965 through July 15, 1968 for aerospace work by my machinists in Santa Monica, California. Wages paid to some representative job categories as of July 18, 1966 are set forth below. These figures show not only the basic wage rate but also a cost of living factor which is being included in the rate beginning in August 1966:

Building and equipment mechanic A	$3.57
Carpenter maintenance A	3.63
Machinists maintenance	3.89
Mechanic, auto A	3.49
Mechanic maintenance A	3.63
Sheetmetal workers, maintenance A	$3.57
Storekeeper	3.07

The airlines employ so called "mechanics" to perform comparable functions for these job titles (with the exception of storekeeper whom the airlines entitle a "store's clerk"). Comparing the $3.70 airline mechanics rate for all of these jobs categories to the rates stated above, it should be evident that the airlines are ahead of the wages paid in most of the representative mechanical categories drawn from the Douglas-Lodge 1578 agreement. Under the PEB recommendation, a typical airline storekeeper would be paid $3.07, the same wage being paid at Douglas for the same function. Obviously, a more detailed analysis is necessary if this subject is going to be seriously pursued. A brief study shows, however, that there is no pattern of inequity when comparing airlines mechanics rates to a typical aerospace company under contract with the IAM in a west coast location. We have not even discussed the lengthy progression steps through which the Douglas-Lodge 1958 contract compels workers to move as they go toward the top of the rate. Again, just as in the bus line situation, there is a great tendency to subdivide categories into lesser skilled levels and lesser pay rates.

IV. UPDATING OF CARRIER EXHIBIT NO. 27 BEFORE PRESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY BOARD NO. 166 COMPARING GROSS HOURLY EARNINGS OF A TYPICAL AIRLINE EMPLOYEE WITH THOSE OF TYPICAL EMPLOYEES IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Before the Presidential Emergency Board #166, the carriers introduced Exhibit #27, copy of which is attached. When all of the published categories and rate levels in this airline bargaining unit are considered, from messenger to technician, including mechanics, and when overtime and various forms of premium pay are included in the computation, the weighted average gross hourly wage for a typical employee in this airline bargaining unit turned out to be $3.42 per hour (this is a statistical figure and there is not necessarily any employee receiving this particular sum). Exhibit #27 showed that when this airline figure was compared to an identically computed figure in other American industries, the airline employees ranked first and have ranked first for many years. We have reviewed the U.S. Department of Labor's booklet "Employment and Earnings and Monthly Report on the Labor Force" Volume 12 No. 12 for June 1966, to update the earnings rankings shown in Exhibit #27.

A copy of that United States Department of Labor release is enclosed. Based on the data available in May 1966, the airline employees ranking in first place continues to be true. We refer interested parties to data on pages 60, 62, 64, 66 and 68 of the most recent BLS study, for confirmation of this fact. The weighted average used in Exhibit 27 was $3.42. We conservatively estimate that the Presidential Emergency Board's recommendation would add 18¢ to that figure, resulting in a new $3.60 weighted average. That keeps the airline employees substantially ahead of their counterparts in a broad representative sample of other American industries.

[CARRIERS EXHIBIT 27]

RANKING OF AVERAGE GROSS HOURLY EARNINGS OF PRODUCTION WORKERS BY INDUSTRY, MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, AND STORES EMPLOYEES OF THE RAILROADS AND IAM-REPRESENTED EMPLOYEES OF THE FIVE CARRIERS

This exhibit shows the relationship of the average gross hourly earnings of the IAM-represented employees of the five carriers with the gross hourly earnings of production workers by industry groups and railroad maintenance of equipment and stores employees throughout the past 10 years.

The IAM-represented employees progressed from a ranking of fifth place among the groups in 1956 to the top position in 1962, a position which has been retained to date.

Ranking of average gross hourly earnings of production workers by industry, maintenance of equipment, and stores employees of the railroad and IAM-represented employees of the 5 carriers, January of each year 1956–66

	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
5 carriers	$3.42 (1)	$3.41 (1)	$3.32 (1)	$3.18 (1)	$3.09 (1)	$2.94 (2)	$2.86 (2)	$2.78 (1)	$2.48 (3)	$2.35 (4)	$2.19 (5)
Petroleum refining and related industries	3.37 (2)	3.24 (2)	3.20 (2)	3.14 (2)	3.08 (2)	3.00 (1)	2.89 (1)	2.77 (2)	2.73 (1)	2.60 (1)	2.43 (1)
Transportation equipment	3.29 (3)	3.19 (3)	3.08 (3)	2.97 (4)	2.87 (4)	2.76 (4)	2.74 (4)	2.60 (4)	2.44 (5)	2.36 (3)	2.23 (4)
Primary metals industries	3.23 (4)	3.15 (4)	3.06 (4)	2.99 (3)	3.01 (3)	2.82 (3)	2.86 (2)	2.76 (3)	2.56 (2)	2.47 (2)	2.33 (2)
Ordnance and accessories	3.16 (5)	3.07 (5)	2.97 (5)	2.89 (5)	2.80 (5)	2.74 (5)	2.64 (5)	2.58 (5)	2.46 (4)	2.30 (6)	2.14 (7)
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	3.09 (6)	3.00 (6)	2.93 (6)	2.83 (6)	2.78 (6)	2.71 (6)	2.63 (6)	2.54 (6)	2.44 (5)	2.35 (4)	2.28 (3)
Machinery	3.03 (7)	2.92 (7)	2.84 (7)	2.75 (7)	2.67 (7)	2.58 (8)	2.53 (8)	2.43 (8)	2.33 (8)	2.26 (7)	2.16 (6)
Railroad, maintenance of equipment and stores	[1]2.96 (8)	2.88 (8)	2.74 (9)	2.73 (8)	2.62 (9)	2.62 (7)	2.55 (7)	2.51 (7)	2.36 (7)	2.21 (8)	2.09 (8)
Chemicals and allied products	2.93 (9)	2.84 (9)	2.77 (8)	2.69 (9)	2.63 (8)	2.54 (9)	2.46 (9)	2.35 (9)	2.25 (9)	2.14 (9)	2.03 (9)
Fabricated metal products	2.81 (10)	2.72 (10)	2.65 (10)	2.58 (10)	2.53 (10)	2.45 (10)	2.42 (10)	2.31 (10)	2.20 (10)	2.11 (10)	2.00 (11)
Paper and allied products	2.70 (11)	2.61 (11)	2.52 (11)	2.44 (13)	2.38 (14)	2.29 (15)	2.22 (15)	2.15 (15)	2.06 (15)	1.97 (15)	1.87 (15)
Stone, clay, and glass products	2.67 (12)	2.56 (14)	2.50 (13)	2.44 (13)	2.39 (13)	2.30 (14)	2.26 (13)	2.17 (14)	2.10 (13)	2.02 (13)	1.91 (13)
Instruments and related products	2.66 (13)	2.59 (12)	2.51 (12)	2.46 (11)	2.42 (11)	2.36 (11)	2.27 (12)	2.20 (12)	2.11 (12)	2.04 (12)	1.93 (11)
Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products	2.64 (14)	2.59 (12)	2.50 (13)	2.46 (11)	2.42 (11)	2.34 (12)	2.32 (11)	2.26 (11)	2.14 (11)	2.08 (11)	2.01 (10)
Electrical equipment and supplies	2.61 (15)	2.56 (14)	2.50 (13)	2.43 (15)	2.38 (14)	2.33 (13)	2.25 (14)	2.18 (13)	2.09 (14)	2.02 (13)	1.90 (14)
Food and kindred products	2.48 (16)	2.44 (16)	2.38 (16)	2.30 (16)	2.24 (16)	2.16 (16)	2.10 (16)	2.01 (16)	1.93 (16)	1.84 (16)	1.75 (16)
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	2.20 (17)	2.14 (17)	2.09 (17)	2.03 (17)	1.98 (17)	1.93 (17)	1.89 (17)	1.83 (17)	1.79 (17)	1.75 (17)	1.66 (17)
Lumber and wood products	2.16 (18)	2.08 (18)	2.08 (18)	1.97 (18)	1.97 (18)	1.84 (19)	1.83 (19)	1.80 (19)	1.74 (19)	1.65 (19)	1.60 (19)
Furniture and fixtures	2.15 (19)	2.07 (19)	2.02 (19)	1.97 (18)	1.94 (19)	1.89 (18)	1.86 (18)	1.81 (18)	1.76 (18)	1.72 (18)	1.65 (18)
Tobacco manufacturers	2.15 (19)	2.05 (20)	1.97 (20)	1.90 (20)	1.81 (20)	1.74 (20)	1.69 (20)	1.63 (20)	1.55 (20)	1.50 (21)	1.41 (21)
Leather and leather products	1.91 (21)	1.86 (21)	1.79 (21)	1.74 (21)	1.71 (21)	1.65 (21)	1.62 (21)	1.58 (21)	1.54 (21)	1.50 (21)	1.43 (20)
Textile-mill products	1.91 (21)	1.83 (22)	1.76 (23)	1.69 (23)	1.65 (23)	1.61 (23)	1.59 (22)	1.51 (23)	1.49 (23)	1.49 (23)	1.41 (21)
Apparel and related products	1.85 (23)	1.81 (23)	1.78 (22)	1.70 (22)	1.69 (22)	1.62 (22)	1.58 (23)	1.57 (22)	1.53 (22)	1.51 (20)	1.41 (21)

[1] As of November 1965.

NOTE.—Figure in parenthesis indicates ranking of earnings.

Source: "Employment and Earnings," U.S. Department of Labor, "Wage Statistics for Class I Carriers," Interstate Commerce Commission, Company Records.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina. I have finished my statement on the resolution, Mr. President, and I am about to yield the floor. However, the Senator from North Carolina wants to ask me a few questions.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon certain questions.

Is it not true that both the committee resolution and the substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon declare this:

> The Congress, therefore, finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not one of the advantages of the substitute over the committee resolution that, while both of them declare emergency measures to be necessary under the circumstances which confront the Nation at this hour, the substitute resolution provides for such emergency measures and the committee resolution provides that there shall be no emergency measures unless the President elects to put them in operation?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly so. That is why I have said so many times that the committee resolution is an attempt on the part of Congress to delegate legislative power, and that cannot be done under the Constitution. The Attorney General has told us that it cannot be done. He has told the President that the President cannot assume it. Therefore, I think we would be unwise to proceed to pass the committee joint resolution, when the legal adviser to the President says that it is an unconstitutional measure.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the substitute joint resolution does not in any way alter the relationship which existed between the carriers and the members of the union at the time the strike began?

Mr. MORSE. Not one iota.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the substitute measure is based upon a recognition of the desirability of having the entire controversy settled by collective bargaining, and does nothing whatever to interfere with collective bargaining, but, on the contrary, attempts to encourage a settlement of the controversy by collective bargaining?

Mr. MORSE. That is completely true. It is the argument I have made over and over again.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the most desirable way to settle controversies between labor and management is by the processes of collective bargaining?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true also that the substitute joint resolution recognizes that every man as an individual has the right to quit work at any time, for any reason satisfactory to him, and expressly spells out in section 7 of the substitute measure that nothing contained therein shall interfere with the right of an individual to quit work?

Mr. MORSE. Absolutely. I discussed that point this morning. It is a very important point. I took it for granted that every Senator recognizes that this is a basic right anyway and that such language was not necessary in the joint resolution; but I joined with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in taking the language right out of existing law and inserting it in this measure.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from North Carolina that perhaps the overriding desirability of the substitute measure compared with the committee measure lies in the fact that the substitute recognizes that the legislative power of the Federal Government resides in Congress, and that Congress ought to stand up and exercise that legislative power instead of trying to delegate its responsibility to the President?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. He had stepped out of the Chamber momentarily when I told the Senate that the Senator from North Carolina had invited my attention to article I, section 1, of the Constitution, which vests the sole legislative power in Congress, and vests no legislative power in the President—only the executive power—and that, in my judgment, what is being attempted by the committee joint resolution is to have Congress delegate that power. Clearly we cannot delegate our legislative power to the President.

Mr. ERVIN. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Oregon shares the regret of the Senator from North Carolina that we are confronted with a situation which demands that emergency measures be taken by the Congress. After consideration of what has been said on both sides of the subject, and as a result of giving much thought to this question, I am of the belief that the substitute offers the most desirable approach. While I regret that it must be done, I realize that Congress must act.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another section of the bill to which I do not think the Senator from Oregon alluded with great specificity, and that is section 8 of the resolution, which, to my mind, is one of the critically important sections of the substitute. This section, which I originated as Amendment No. 718 several days ago, requires that the administration make a complete study and give us recommendations for improved permanent emergency strike legislation. It puts us on the road which we should have traveled at least 3 years ago, and that is to resolve an open question, because the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act do not answer what happens afterward. Under the Railway Labor Act we are up against the puzzling proposition of a statute which sets forth procedures by which it was supposed that strikes would be unnecessary in transportation which is of an essential national character. Yet the procedure at that point falls down, and we have no answer.

Notwithstanding the promise of the administration to Congress—and I do not say that invidiously—in which the President said in his state of the Union message that he would send recommendations to Congress, he never has, and we are left in the situation which occurred in 1963 when we were under the imminent threat of a railroad strike. We find ourselves under the double embarrassment of this strike going on and leaving people who, like myself, have spent a lifetime of devotion to the cause of labor, being put in the position of breaking a strike in an industry in which there should not have been a strike—not because the workers are not entitled to justice, but because the public exigencies call for procedures under which it would not be necessary to strike. They are similar to Federal employees. Employees who come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Labor Act are somewhat equivalent to them.

Also, an 80-day injunction may be imposed under the Taft-Hartley Act when the President feels it is justified. The 80 days expire. Then what happens? What is the recourse for the U.S. Government?

We saw it in the transit strike in New York City. This question applies not only to national strikes, involving longshoremen and aircraft and railroads, but also to local situations. In New York City, there was a tieup in local transportation for 2 weeks. The whole country suffered. Banking, brokerage houses, essential services, insurance, the direction of great enterprises in the United States which have offices in New York, all suffered very seriously though one might make an argument very persuasively that people must endure inconveniences during strikes in the interest of the principle of collective bargaining. I think it was much more of the character of a national emergency than one which involved only the inconvenience of the people of New York.

For all these reasons, and again without disrespect, I say that the argument is one of tweedledee tweedledum on the floor. A period of 30 days is most impractical from the point of view of a return to work. The President could wait 10 days to sign the resolution. It would take about a week for the people to get back on the job. Therefore, much of the 30 days would be gone. But I think it would be immaterial because, when the President signs the bill, he is signing a direction for a return to work. A period of 30 days, and then 60 days, is provided for. There is no direction in the resolution as to the settlement of the dispute.

I think it would be difficult for the workers, management, and the riding public to know that at the end of 30 days, or 60 days, or another 90 days, the transportation could be cut off, and that Congress would then have to be faced with a need for a resolution of the dispute, tantamount to compulsory arbitration such as occurred in the railroad dispute.

Whether we argue it should be done in this way or in the way proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and, as I did in committee, I shall support the substitute and, if it fails, I shall with ardor and strength, support the Clark resolution, as I did in committee; we must do something, and have something which is a consensus and which Congress will produce.

I have done my utmost, within the limits of statesmanship, to architect something which would command the support of the majority of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to take a moment to publicly express my deep appreciation to the Senator from New York for the great assistance which he has given. As everybody knows, it has been a difficult task, but I would not have accepted the assignment unless I believed in it.

I am satisfied that in due time what we are doing will be of great service to American labor, although they may not appreciate it now. In my judgment, if American labor should be allowed now to use this as a pacesetter for future action, I do not see how they could avert—if we do not bring this strike to an end—irreparable damage which will flow to American labor and the great cause for which it stands. We would then be in Congress trying to save labor from public reaction which they would suffer as a result of the action they had taken.

But I wish to say to the Senator from New York, the cosponsor with me of my original resolution—who then, for reasons that he has fully explained, decided for a time to vote with those in the committee who favored the Clark resolution. Subsequently the Senator from New York has been very helpful to me in working out a compromise that I think meets many of the objections raised in the committee. The substitute resolution would not be at the desk this morning were it not for the legislative architectural ability of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is very kind. Frankly, I take no great satisfaction in this effort. I feel it is a very profound duty.

I think the preponderate view of the Senate is very strongly in favor of trade unions. Many of us have shown that on occasion. But also, I think, when we talk as often as we do about the public interest being paramount, at least occasionally we have to vote that way. I think this is such an occasion.

Mr. President, I would also beg my close friends, with whom I have worked for years, who are leaders in the trade union movement, to understand that we understand their attitude. I would not expect them to do anything else but to protest vigorously, and to assure me and everybody else in my position of the utmost recrimination and retaliation by American labor. That is their duty and their job. They are protagonists. They have a position and a point of view that it is their job to fight for, just as management would fight for its position. That is the open market in ideas, considerations, et cetera.

It is our job to undertake the arduous responsibility of the ruler or the judge, as the case may be, and to vote what we think is in the very best interests of the whole country, including labor. On occasion, that task is not easy; and this situation shows up its difficulties in their most glaring and regrettable form. Most of us will not—and certainly not Senator Morse nor I—approach this vote with any degree of joy and gladness. But it is a duty which must be performed. We are not sent here to do only the easy things that will get the applause of one group of the community or the other. We wish that were the case. We try very hard to do it; but sometimes we just cannot.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator for yielding. I thought I might make one or two comments that would be worthwhile to add to what has been said.

First of all, we have heard much talk about the proposed legislation being strikebreaking. That is what the Senator from New York was referring to in some of his comments.

But as I have listened to the debate, I have been thinking about that. I believe that the term "strikebreaking," in the minds of the people, usually means that workers cannot strike, and therefore they will lose what they are seeking.

In the proposed legislation, what we are doing is saying, "You go back to work, you continue being paid, and you continue free collective bargaining in the negotiation period." If the unions wish to stick on their position, or if the airline companies wish to stick on theirs, all they have to do is to stand absolutely solid, is that not true, until the end of all these periods, and then they can go out on strike again?

Mr. JAVITS. That is perfectly true; and in addition, I might point out that by including in the resolution what is already manifest in the Constitution, if an individual feels so strongly about it that he just will not work under these conditions, he can quit his job and refrain from working.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think that was a very helpful amendment which the Senator from New York had added.

Mr. JAVITS. Senator Morse has pointed out that perhaps such an employee would feel he would lose his job, or lose some of his perquisites. He may very well; but I do not know necessarily that he will lose anything.

In addition, I believe that, by and large, the men feel they should return to work when Congress asks them. Mr. Siemiller said that himself, that they will come back to work because they are honest, patriotic Americans, and if Congress asks it or if a court asks it, they will do their job.

I am absolutely confident of that. I will ride in airplanes with the greatest feeling of security and peace of mind, confident that every mechanic and machinist is doing his job to the best of his ability, and will not take out his grievances on the plane or on safety.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. There are two comments on that point I should like to make. One is that I have received informal assurances from the airlines that the first item of business, if the airlines are put back to work, would be for the negotiators to work out the pay and wage rate scale during the interim period, which I was assured would be higher than what the pay was when the contracts terminated on December 31, 1965.

The second point I wish to make is that although this is the machinists' union, it is not just mechanics who are involved, as I think the Senator from New York is aware. There are janitors, floor cleaners, finishers, painters—there are all kinds of different work classifications included within the designation of machinists represented by this union. So that, although the actual mechanics on the airplanes are involved, and I have the highest respect for them, having been active in the aviation field for more than 30 years; I am positive that we need have no concern about safety from the point of view of what those people would or would not do. They will exercise their highest duty and their highest prerogative, even if the joint resolution should pass.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I should like to close by again calling the attention of Senators—who will be voting shortly—to section 8 of the substitute resolution, which, as I said, starts in motion what should result in at least enabling the public interest and the interest of the United States to safeguard themselves as working entities. It is in the highest public interest, in terms of the people of the United States, that the Government should at no time be immobilized from operating. I am very hopeful that this provision, which calls upon the Secretary of Labor to immediately study the question and bring us recommendations by the 15th of January, 1967, for permanent emergency strike legislation will be part of the measure which the President signs. However this matter may be worked out in conference with the House of Representatives, I hope that we will all recognize that this is perhaps the most important part of the effort which has here been touched off.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Though I did not dwell on that point when I gave the explanation of my joint resolution, I did not do so because I think it speaks for itself. May I say that I am a cosponsor of the resolution the Senator from New York introduced, calling for such a study by the Secretary of Labor. I think we have the right to his advice; and furthermore, it would only carry out what the President said in his state of the Union message was his intention. He at that time said—I am paraphrasing, but fairly accurately—that such legislation would be forthcoming. I believe, with all the storm clouds in the economic skies as far as management-labor relations are concerned, we had better get on with the business of having some permanent legislation. In fact, I have already expressed some doubt as to whether we ought to wait until January for consideration of such legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much. He did join with me, and I will state to the Senate, it would have been impossible even to get the proposal into this substitute resolution, and make as much progress as we have, unless Senator Morse had joined in the effort and it had had reasonably good support in our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I close by pointing out that no one is going to cheer and applaud the result of this vote. None of us regards it with anything but the deepest concern and the deepest sense of responsibility. I realize that some Senators who have supported the Clark resolution may vote against this one. I regret that very much, because I see no difference whatever in principle, or, indeed, in substance, between the two. I deeply believe that the point which has been made and reiterated constantly—that the President needs to sign the measure in order to make it operative even for the very short period of time which is called for, the 30 days for a return to work, requires on the part of the President the exercise of the same authority, when he signs the joint resolution, as he would exercise under the Clark plan—and he would then be called upon to issue the Executive order which would mean nothing but signing another piece of paper.

Mr. President, I believe it is important to act in this matter in order to give the President the authority which he now does not have. It seems to me that this substitute is the only measure upon which a real majority can be built in the Senate. I believe the measure needs to be supported on that ground.

I repeat what I said in committee and what I said here. If this measure should fail, I intend, with vigor and enthusiasm, to support the bill reported by the committee.

I am deeply convinced that the intent and purpose of the Railway Labor Act is to avoid, if humanly possible, strikes in just such situations as this.

The act does not work because the act is imperfect. Therefore, facing a serious situation nationally, we are doing our utmost to buttress and shore up the Railway Labor Act. It is not good to have to do so. We ought to have permanent legislation. However, this is the best we can do under the circumstances. Whether we shore it up in this way or by the use of the Clark plan, it amounts to the same thing.

The President will either sign this or he will not.

I pledge myself not to vote to override his veto. If he does not favor this, I will stand with him. This is a partnership between the President and the Congress.

If he does want it to take effect, I will support him. It is tweedledum and tweedledee whether he does this or does what is called for in the Clark resolution.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2858) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PELLY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14875) to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7327) to repeal section 7043 of title 10, United States Code.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1207) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1207) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and the distinguished senior Senator from New York on what to me is the best compromise under the circumstances.

I think it is quite obvious that this strike is doing great and serious harm to all citizens of the country. There is no question that some sections are hurt more directly than are others. But ultimately, there is no question that people and businesses everywhere, whether the business be big or small, the people from North or South, rely in some manner on a fully functioning commercial airline system. Businessman and farmer, rich and poor, housewife and student—all are required to suffer to some extent because of this strike.

Mr. President, I think everyone must recognize the fact that the continuation of this strike up to this point has been very dangerous to our economy and the public interest.

Our economy is not in as good a shape today as it was 6 months ago. Nearly everyone admits that fact. More of the economic indicators for the first time in more than 5 years have begun to indicate that we could be in for considerable trouble in the months ahead.

In the second quarter of 1966, the gross national product registered the smallest increase since the fall of 1964.

Second quarter retail sales for this year are off 2.6 percent from the preceding quarter.

Personal income gained less in the second quarter than in any quarter since the spring of 1963.

These conditions, combined with rising interest rates, rising prices, and a protracted stalemate in this current strike could set off a general downturn of large proportions.

The strike is causing loss to those people who are members of the International Association of Machinists, even though they may recover it at a later date.

The Secretary of Labor, when he testified before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, stated that the situation already was bad. He did not think that it constituted a national emergency at the moment. However, he did testify that, if the strike continued much longer, it would constitute a national emergency. He made that statement on July 27, 8 days ago. It is obvious that the strike cannot be permitted to continue any longer without actually resulting in very serious damage to the economy.

The strike causes great inconvenience to the people of the Nation. As the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has said, the public interest is now involved in this deadlock. This is no longer merely a dispute between the machinists on the one hand and the airlines involved on the other.

Since July 8, millions of innocent citizens with no direct interest in the contested issues have been unwillingly drawn in.

One year of negotiations between the International Association of Machinists and the five affected airlines failed to produce a mutually acceptable pact. The efforts of the National Mediation Board failed to produce such an agreement, as did the Emergency Board created by the President on April 21 of this year. The personal intervention of the Secretary of Labor, and finally, the President of the United States, could not bring about a settlement. There is nothing else to do now but to have the Congress act.

I think that calling on Congress to act was the only thing that could be done.

When the senior Senator from Oregon first asked that we move, there were those who—while they agreed that legislation was needed—did not agree with his approach to the matter.

It has been out of that disagreement on the part of people who thought something should be done, but did not agree on the details of how to do it, that we now have this compromise.

There are those who say that we should do nothing. I say we cannot let the patient, in effect, bleed to death. That is what is happening in Florida, in Alaska, in Hawaii, and in other States whose economies are greatly dependent upon airline service. The people in some of these States depend on airline service for nearly all their movements to and from other States.

This strike not only drastically affects the people in those States, but it has also begun to affect everyone.

With respect to the question of having the President assume responsibility, I would point out that the President must either sign or veto legislation passed by Congress. In signing a bill into law, he assumes a measure of responsibility for it.

As the senior Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out, the Constitution gives us the primary responsibility in this matter. It is our responsibility and our duty.

We must now meet that responsibility and duty. However, the President will be participating with us should he sign this particular measure.

I hope this legislation will be overwhelmingly adopted this afternoon.

We need to move. We need to act before there is more suffering and more economic dislocation.

However, like the Senator from New York, if this particular compromise is not passed, I will then be one of those who will vote for the so-called Clark resolution, even though I do not think it is nearly as satisfactory or desirable as is the measure now proposed by the distinguished Senators from Oregon and New York.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, but not until later than 1:30, at which time, I also ask unanimous consent, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be recognized, and that at 2 o'clock the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would it be in order to bring up the unemployment compensation bill after the pending business is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on the results of the ratification vote last Sunday whereby the membership of the IAM rejected the terms of the collective bargaining agreement which their president and their national committee had negotiated with the carriers.

Also, I should like to point out why I am opposed to the pending resolution.

According to the figures available to me—and I think this is important—17,251 voted against the contract, while 6,587 voted to accept it. There were 35,400 members eligible to vote, however, which means that 11,562 members did not vote either way.

Accordingly, if we combine the number of votes cast to accept the contract with the number of members who did not vote, we have a total of 18,149. To put it another way, 48.7 percent of the union members eligible to vote voted against the contract while 32.6 percent of the eligible voters did not vote.

It is clear, therefore, that a majority of the union's members affected by the proposed contract did not vote to reject it.

I am concerned over the manner in which last Sunday's ratification vote was conducted. I am advised that the telegrams sent to the local unions by Mr. Siemiller and the negotiating committee were quite complicated and that it was difficult to fully understand the proposed terms of settlement on the basis of the contents of these telegrams.

Another complicating factor is the speed with which the ratification vote was held. I am convinced that the membership of the union was not adequately informed and did not completely understand the contract proposals on which they were called to pass judgment.

I am, also, informed and it appears entirely reasonable to me that the rank and file members of the union and their local leaders were quite irked at the manner in which the President flatly announced to the Nation on Friday evening that the airlines strike has been settled. This was done at a time when the membership had no knowledge of the terms of the settlement but knew only too well that the strike was not settled unless these terms were approved in a ratification vote.

I might also point out that I have been informed that the union members who are carrying out the negotiations specifically requested the President not to make that announcement on Friday evening. We know the President has refused to assume any responsibility with respect to pending legislation, but he certainly had no hesitancy in rushing to television and radio to announce the settlement for which he thought he would receive the credit.

Much has been said here about the union democracy involved in the membership's rejection of the contract negotiated by their president. I would like to point out, however, that the officers and leadership of most of the local unions strongly recommended that the membership of their respective locals reject the proposed settlement. In my opinion, the ratification vote would have shown an entirely different result if the leaders of the local unions had supported their international president and recommended to their members that the contract be approved. I think it is clear that the manner in which the administration announced that the strike had been settled created a tremendous amount of resentment among the rank and file members of the union and had a significant influence upon the action of the officers of the local unions in recommending that the settlement be rejected.

I have given this problem my utmost consideration in trying to determine what is the proper course of action for me to take with respect to the pending resolution and the various substitutes which have been proposed. In this regard I have been in contact with many members of the other body, and I am convinced that a resolution designed to terminate the current strike cannot pass the House unless the administration is prepared to state that the national interest is involved and the President affirmatively states that he desires Congress to enact some form of emergency legislation.

I have now concluded that the best thing for the Senate to do in the present circumstances is to lay this legislation aside for a short period of time and to permit the parties to return to the bargaining table. It is entirely possible that the carriers are in a position to make further relatively minor concessions which would justify the machinists again submitting the proposed contract terms to their membership for another ratification vote.

If this situation materializes, I suggest two things: first, that any announcement of another settlement make clear that the union's membership will make the final decision. Secondly, I strongly urge that a sufficient period of time be allowed before the ratification vote to insure that the local union leaders and the rank and file membership of the union fully understand the proposals on which they are voting. In this connection, I believe that it is foolish to schedule a ratification vote on a Saturday or Sunday when so many members of the union, like all the rest of our citizens, are engaged in other activities during the summer.

I believe that if what I think will occur actually happens, another ratification vote could be conducted by the union during the early part of next week. In my opinion, the process of free collective bargaining should be given this additional opportunity to function and to discharge its responsibility to the Nation. I am fully cognizant, however, of the fact that this cannot occur unless the administration relaxes its pressure on the airlines and permits them to make further relatively minor concessions which would justify the holdings of another ratification vote by the union.

I trust that a majority of the Senate will agree with my conclusions. I inform the Senate now that in the present circumstances I shall not vote for any resolution today or tomorrow which will require the union to terminate its strike unless the authority and responsibility for such action is vested in the President to exercise when and if he deems necessary. As I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, I know of no instance where any administration failed and refused to take a position either for or against any piece of pending major legislation. I am convinced that it is not up to Congress to break this strike at a time when the administration takes the position that there is no national emergency, that the national interest is not involved, that such legislation is not needed to protect the national health, welfare, or safety, and when the President refuses to take the position that he desires enactment of emergency powers.

For these reasons, I shall vote against the pending substitute resolution offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and others and against any other proposal offered today which would result in the Congress ordering the striking employees back to work.

Perhaps, Mr. President, my proposal is too simple to be worthy of consideration. But it seems to me that it does offer at least some hope of settling this very serious and difficult strike without congressional action.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in elaborating very briefly on what I had to say last night, I should like to address the Senate for a few minutes. The main reason I ask that privilege is because of the long days and hours in 1963 that some of us on the Committee on Commerce put in, under the leadership—because the distinguished chairman of the committee was necessarily out of town for a portion of that time—of the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. It is because of that experience that I venture to make a few suggestions to the Senate at this time.

In the first place, I again say I think it is not only most unfortunate from the standpoint of the dignity and the deliberations of the Senate, but also from the standpoint of the effectiveness of any action which we may take at this time on the strike situation, that there has been so much open talk on the floor and quiet talk in the cloakrooms, and so many rumors in the press, to the effect that this is simply a contest to see whether the President shall assume the burden of taking drastic steps in regard to this airline strike, or whether Congress shall assume that burden, and that it is a contest to put the blame on the President or on the Congress for purposes of political ends.

Mr. President, when we allow ourselves to think on that basis, we are forgetting the primary object of this legislation—if there is legislation—which is to put the planes in the air and effectively stop the strike, for the time being at least, and restore transportation.

On that point, let me suggest to the Senate that unilateral action on the part of Congress, at least at the beginning, simply will not do the job.

If Congress furnishes the tools to the President, whether he asks for them or not—and he might very well be justified in not using them—I think we are a little premature when we start criticizing. If Congress simply furnishes the tools to the President to help him take steps to end this strike, get the planes in the air, the people back to work, and communications resumed, then, if the President, acting with that authority, declares that there is a national emergency, or that interstate commerce is disrupted to the point that it may constitute something approaching an emergency, and take affirmative action, I cannot conceive that the men who are members of the striking union will not honor his decision and request, go back to work, and give this a fair trial.

Mr. President, let us look at the other side of the picture. These men can read. They will understand what transpired if the Congress of the United States, after bickering and fighting and debating and compromising and conferring for 2 or 3 days—it being perfectly obvious that the President at least is not very enthusiastic about action by Congress, whatever he may do—takes action. Certainly there has been no indication that the President is asking for legislation, and one could well assume from the course of events that he has grave doubts as to whether the time has come for such action. If the Congress then passes an act sending the men back to work for the first 30 days by action of Congress, what is the situation? They are being sent back to work not by the President, not by the man who sits in the White House, who all through the years traditionally has decided when action is necessary and when situations exist which involve the public interest, the public health, and the public safety, but they are being actually sent back to work, in their opinion, by action of the Congress.

That would be far from a united action, with no suggestion or call from the President. In my humble opinion, that is neither good nor effective. In my humble opinion, Congress in such a situation does not command—and this is no reflection on Congress—the respect and the prestige to send back to work the striking union men, who are so imbued and who believe so intensely in their cause that they have repudiated the agreement and refused to return to work and thus fulfill an agreement agreed upon by their officers.

So, unilateral action, in attempting to send them back to work by action of Congress, is not only setting a new precedent, a precedent that will rise up to haunt us in the years ahead, but it also has a very strong possibility, if not probability, of not doing the job.

Mr. President, when a railway tieup was threatened in 1963, although the strike had not actually started throughout the country, President Kennedy had the leaders of Congress and the members of the Commerce Committee down to the White House.

Strictly speaking, that problem should have gone to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare but, through some agreement at that time of which the Senator from New Hampshire does not have the details, it was decided that such request as the President decided to make would go into the hands of the Committee on Commerce.

I well remember, as does the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—and as do other Senators, I daresay—the day we went to the White House and the late President Kennedy said to us that he had exhausted every effort that he could exert to avert the railway strike, which clearly was coming because of the dispute relating to the crew concept and the locomotive firemen.

He reviewed the fact that there had already been two—yes, three, I believe—Presidential commissions going back several years, that had taken evidence, considered the problem, and come to a conclusion; that in each case the discontented firemen and other employees affected by the order of the carriers had refused to accept the decisions; that they were then ready to strike if the order were issued by the carriers that would discharge the firemen who were claimed not to be needed; and that the country was under the gun.

The President unhesitatingly said at that time that a national railway strike—and I am sure that he was correct—would tie up the economy of the country and would be a national disaster that the people of the country and its economy could not afford. Therefore, he presented to us a plan of action.

In the colloquy this morning between the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], to which I listened intently, there was much talk about what President Kennedy's plan was and whether Congress changed it. I well remember that President Kennedy said to us at the White House at that time that he was extremely reluctant to invoke any process which could be termed compulsory arbitration.

But he also said that the situation was so serious that something akin to compulsory arbitration, in his opinion, must be resorted to. However, he had a plan which could be executed, he believed, without setting a precedent in the future for compulsory arbitration. The plan, in essence, called for an act of Congress that would authorize another board, that would stop the strike or forbid the strike; that would accept all the points in dispute that had been tacitly agreed on and were not being questioned by the carriers or the unions; that would leave to the board of arbitration only those questions that had been rather narrowed down—the crew concept, the firemen, and others—for adjudication by the board; and that the period should be only temporary, in that the act would expire in 2 years.

It was contemplated that arbitration and collective bargaining should go on during that time, and at the end of 2 years the right to strike would then be restored automatically.

It is true that the bill which came from the committee went somewhat further than what the President had suggested, in that it was more plainer and bolder in its provision for what could be termed temporary compulsory arbitration. But at all times, the President knew exactly what he wanted. He was convinced that action was imperative. He was leading Congress and urging Congress to take whatever action was necessary to avert a national disaster.

Acting on that basis, we held public hearings, as I am sure the Senator from Rhode Island will corroborate, because he presided over them. We held hearings day after day and night after night, far into the night, for 10 days, if not 2 weeks. We listened to the evidence of those representing the carriers and those representing the various railway unions. We heard evidence from the public. All the argument and conflict about what we should do was carefully sifted.

There was strongly divergent views. Many Senators will remember that our late, beloved colleague from California, Senator Clair Engle, led a strong fight against any action by Congress which would even smell of compulsory arbitration. Finally, we arrived at a conclusion, and the President put it into execution.

Now, mark this: That was not the end of it. Again and again, during the intervening time, since the Board of Arbitration or the Presidential Board that was created at that time rendered its decisions, after long deliberation and hearings, the parties have been back to the Committee on Commerce. They have asked for hearings and hearings have been held. Even to this very day—I informed myself on the point only this morning—unresolved matters are in dispute. While it is generally agreed that a strike has been averted and is not likely to occur, I was told by a negotiator for the carriers that it is still possible, after all this time, for us to be confronted with a railway strike, growing out of the 1963 situation that occupied the attention of the Senate and of the House for such an extended period.

Mr. President, I emphasize this because it bears out the main point I am attempting to make. We find ourselves in a situation—and one that is nobody's fault—where hastily a problem has arisen and hastily the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, composed of extremely able men with good minds—has brought in a bill for immediate debate on the floor of the Senate. I may add that the limited opportunity members of the committee have had to review and weigh all the factors does not compare with the long days and weeks of study that took place in 1963.

Since then, another bill was brought in as a substitute. Now we have a third version, also as a substitute. And Senators disagree.

So far as this Senator knows, there has not been one word from the White House to indicate that the President wants any legislation, and only some intimation as to what specific legislation would be more palatable to him as opposed to other forms of legislation. That is not what one would call a very affirmative endorsement.

I am not criticizing the President of the United States, because he may very well be correct. If he feels that the time has not come to reach out the long arm of the Federal Government and put these men back to work and the planes in the air, or that the situation with which we are confronted does not justify such action, I am not here to say that he is wrong. But I am here to say this: If we willy-nilly send out of Congress an arbitrary measure that attempts to force men back to work without any Presidential action necessary except the usual signing of a bill that is passed by Congress, the first danger is that the bill will not accomplish its purpose. We all know that we cannot make an individual work by law. We can only bar improper union activities and collusion. The bill will not have force, it will not command respect, and it will not appeal to the patriotism or the public spirit of the men who are on strike.

So far as this Senator is concerned, if Congress does anything more with this delicate subject—which can be accepted as a precedent for the future—than offer, or place in the hands and at the disposal of the President of the United States, the tools with which to work, we will be rendering a great disservice to this country and, in my opinion, we are unlikely to be successful.

The President alone knows. The President is the only one in a position to determine really how much of an emergency exists. I have not been impressed with all of the argument on the floor of the Senate about the inconvenience or even the hardship to the public. The fact remains that probably less than 4 percent of travel, and about one-tenth of freight movement in this country is affected by the present strike.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the figure is one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct. The figure is one-tenth of 1 percent. I thank the Senator.

Does the present tieup in any way affect our war effort? We do not know. Possibly members of the Armed Services Committee may have information on this point. But it is only the President who really knows. It is only the President who is going to be believed, if the time comes to say that the continuance of this strike is affecting our military prosecution of the war.

When I say that it is only the President who will be believed, I am not impugning the confidence of the people in their representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives. Everybody knows that only the President has access to all of the information. It is the President who knows what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have to report. It is only the President who knows what the CIA has to report. It is the President who knows what Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence have to report. If this blossoms into a situation that really impairs the war effort, it is the President who will know.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from New Hampshire. He knows that I am not passionate on this course, but it seems to me the only course upon which we have left to embark.

However, as a matter of information, I should like to read to the Senator from the testimony of Secretary Wirtz because of the view which the Senator has just stated in which he interprets the President's attitude to be that he does not want legislation now.

I wish to read to the Senator from New Hampshire, because it influenced us in the committee, this exchange between Secretary Wirtz and myself. It could have been any other Senator, but it happened to be the Senator from New York. These statements appear on page 15 of the transcript of the hearing.

> Senator JAVITS. Is it fair to say you are not telling us not to do it and you are not telling us to do it, but you are here to give us whatever information you can that will help us do it if we wish to do so?
>
> Secretary WIRTZ. I think that is fair and would like to share between the Administration and the Congress the responsibility for trying to meet a situation which has been precipitated quite rapidly, literally overnight, and we assure this committee the fullest cooperation in an attempt to meet that joint responsibility.

I would respectfully ask the Senator from New Hampshire, who is a very fair man, if he could tell from that whether the President does or does not want legislation, or whether it would, as I said before, leave us rudderless and adrift?

Mr. COTTON. In the first place, I think what I started to say was that the President did not want legislation. Then, I corrected myself and said the President certainly did not appear enthusiastic about any legislation; and if he wanted it, he certainly had not so indicated to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest to my colleagues that he did less than that. I think that the Senator, in a quite typical New England judicious manner, is giving him the best of it.

I have rarely seen a situation as important as this situation, in which a President, noted for his decisiveness, has failed to indicate any definite policy. If he had said, "Gentlemen, I do not want a bill," we would not back it and neither would the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. COTTON. I do not argue with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on that point. The Senator from New Hampshire is trying to lean over backwards to avoid the pitfall of giving the impression to the people of the country that we are engaged in a scrap as to who is going to be blamed and who is going to get the glory. I do not think that there will be any glory coming out of the situation for anybody.

As a matter of fact, I have not been one who goes around saying that the President wanted all of the credit, that he did not consult the Congress when he called the leaders in, that he announced it to the country with great glee, and now things have gone sour and he wants to put it on our back. I do not think that statement is justified.

The President truly tried to settle the strike by getting the carriers and the representatives of the union to sit down, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] knows—he himself has done it many times—and try to come up with an agreement. That is what the President did. Up to that point, I have not the slightest criticism of the President. If Congress thinks for a single minute that it is going to derive any advantage in the public mind by trying now to carry the ball and get credit for doing what the President was unable to do, there are going to be some sadly disillusioned men in the Congress before we are finished, because 500 men in the House of Representatives and the Senate cannot settle a strike. Mr. President, you might as well try to settle the strike in Madison Square Garden. If that is doubted, just remember what has been going on in this Chamber for the last 2 days.

The President may be in doubt now; certainly he has left us in doubt. I agree with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as to that. He may be in doubt as to whether the time has come to apply the necessary pressure to force at least temporary cessation of the strike. But unless he comes to the conclusion that there is an emergency—and I do not mean a technical national emergency, but that there is an actual crisis—there is nothing involved to justify action. Unless he takes the lead in that action, my contention is that whatever is done will not amount to anything.

When Senators, for whom I have great respect, say that this is the difference between Tweedledee and Tweedledum, whether Congress calls a moratorium on the strike and orders them back to work for 30 days, and whether we give him the power to do it, I contend it is not a trivial matter. I contend we are embarking on a venture that cannot succeed unless the President acts.

Why should we write into this substitute an ironclad provision putting the men back to work for 30 days? As a matter of fact, if the President does sign it after his silence, and after his obvious lack of affirmative enthusiasm for any kind of legislation, what right do we have to expect that the striking machinists are going to be so awed and so impressed by an act of Congress, after it has bickered, debated, and disagreed about that action for days, that they are then going to go back to work.

Not only will we run the risk of attempting something and then failing, and failing far worse than the President has failed thus far, but we will also be taking an unprecedented action which will open up wide vistas of trouble for the future.

Let me reiterate what I said last night when only a few Senators were in the Chamber. In the first place, Congress is exceeding its function when it affirmatively passes an act to send men back to work. It is our job to provide the tools. It is our job to provide the basic law. We are not the executive branch. We resent it—and I have resented it constantly—when we feel that the executive branch is infringing upon the legislative branch. It is not our prerogative to take an individual strike between "A" and "B", or "X" and "Y," and try to judge its merits in a few hours in committee and a few hours on the floor of the Senate, and then put into action a self-executing measure.

I have listened to speeches about constituents writing to their Senators and Representatives. All of us have received those letters, although I have not received as many on this subject as I have on the subject of dogs and cats. I have not received as many letters on the subject of this strike as I have on whether flying saucers carry little green men visiting us from Mars. But I have had letters on the subject, of course, and I know that there has been hardship.

But, the moment we open the door and take unilateral action to settle, or at least send men back to work and temporarily terminate one single strike, then every time there is a labor dispute all across this broad land, every time there is a strike anywhere—and there are no strikes that do not cause hardship, there are no strikes that affect only a few people—every time that happens—mark my words—Senators and Representatives will be flooded with letters. What we have received to date on this problem will not be a patch on the accumulation of letters through the years that will come to the Capitol from every antilabor person, from everyone aggrieved on the subject, from everyone who feels strongly about a particular dispute and writes, "You did it in the case of the airlines strike. You can do it again. Why don't you get busy?"

As I said last night, if this substitute is passed with section 2 in it, which actually sends the men back to work, we may as well put a sign outside the Senate door, "Capitol Hill Labor Relations Board," because the Senate will be in that business.

Let me say this before I close: The President told us last January that he intended to send us proposed legislation providing for means to avert or prevent strikes which endanger the public health and safety. I do not reproach him for not having sent it up, although he has not been reticent about sending up other recommendations. But, I can understand the difficulty. It would seem to me, however, that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the leadership in the Senate, might well begin right now to consider—and not leave it for another crisis to develop—what, if any, machinery can be set up for this general purpose.

Let me remind all Senators that I came to Congress and was sworn in in January 1947—20 years ago—and I served as a Member of the House when the Taft-Hartley law was passed. I voted for it, and I was present and voted to override President Truman's veto of that law. Senators will remember that we were charged with every kind of heinous crime because the President of the United States was dead against that law. But, before the ink was dry on it, President Truman made use of its provisions in order to stay and delay strikes.

During the years since, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law to delay strikes have been resorted to 24 times. Of course, that does not include the times that the provisions of the Railway Labor Act were employed, as they have been in this case.

If Congress is eager to do something to preserve the health and safety of this country, to avert strikes endangering the health and safety, and perhaps even the defense of America, there is no reason why it could not begin now and not wait for the President.

But, no. It is an entirely different situation when we are going to select one strike and act upon it. That is when we should be careful to provide the President with the means of acting upon it.

So far as I am concerned, my only criticism of the President is that he has the duty to guide us to the extent of indicating whether he wants legislation or does not want legislation; and if he does want legislation, then what kind of legislation is it that he desires.

If he does not so indicate to us, then, so far as I am concerned, until I am convinced that there is some damage being done to the economy of this country, and its health and safety are being endangered, which has yet to be proved, I am not about to vote for any bill, or any resolution, which is self-executing and steps in and orders men back to work by action of Congress.

I have decided that I am willing to support the resolution which the committee reported. If I get the opportunity, I shall vote for it, because it does exactly what I believe should be done, can be done, and the only thing we should do without hazard; namely, to leave to the President, whether in his discretion he is ready to use them or not, the tools that he may use tomorrow, the next day, the next week, or whenever he decides that the public welfare is involved to the extent that he should take action.

In closing, let me summarize to this extent: What I have just said I believe in thoroughly—that that is all we should do and all we ought to do. I also reiterate that if we do more, I, for one, doubt very much if it will prove effective unless the President picks up the ball, affirmatively goes to the country, states the Congress has done the right thing, says he approves the measure putting men back to work, and then appoints a board for action. Unless he does that, the men will not go back to work, because the measure will not bear the respect or prestige to accomplish that end without some real affirmative action on the part of the President of the United States.

That is the reason why I shall not vote for the pending proposals, regardless of my respect for the Members who have supported it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, shortly I shall move that action on the question be postponed until Wednesday, August 10. I should like to speak very briefly to give my reasons why I think that would be constructive action, but before I do, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and it will be a live quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the motion been made?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When does the Senator intend to make the motion?

Mr. PROUTY. After we have a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 169 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senators who are present that my remarks will be very brief. I shall then ask for a rollcall vote on a motion which I shall subsequently make.

Mr. President, while only a few Senators were on the floor, I pointed out that of the 35,400 members in the Machinists Union, 11,562 did not vote on the question of whether the union should ratify the agreement reached by their negotiators and the air carriers. To put it another way, only 48.7 percent of the union members voted against the contract; 32.6 percent of the eligible voters did not vote.

I noted earlier that the union negotiators requested the President of the United States not to announce a settlement on Friday night. They wanted a chance to contact the leaders of the local unions and explain what was involved in the agreement. The President did not see fit to go along with their request, and he announced the settlement on radio and television around 11 o'clock, I believe. The union members knew that no settlement could be reached without ratification of its terms by them. They did not know what was actually in the agreement, and they were highly incensed. I think a great many of them voted against it because of a certain pique with the President, for the action that he had taken in announcing an agreement on Friday night.

It seems to me, Mr. President, and I have been so informed by union leaders, that a weekend is the worst possible time in which to hold elections, particularly during the summer months, when the membership is enjoying the great out-of-doors. As I have said, 11,562 of the members did not even vote, and that amounts to 32.6 percent of the members involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad that the Senator is putting his statistics into the RECORD. However, I do not know what might have been the motivations of those who did not vote. But even if all those who did not vote had voted to approve the agreement, the agreement still would have been rejected, would it not?

Mr. PROUTY. No. No; that is not the case.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator would add it up.

Mr. PROUTY. Forty-eight percent voted against the contract.

Mr. MORSE. How many voted to reject it?

Mr. PROUTY. Some 6,587 voted to accept it. If we combine the number of votes cast to accept the contract with the number of members who did not vote, we have a total of 18,149, which is more than 50 percent of the union membership involved in the dispute.

Mr. MORSE. It is my point of view that when the Senator added those who voted to approve the contract to those who did not vote, he had to assume mathematically that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the Senator speak a little louder, please?

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator took the total number of those who voted to approve the contract, and added to that figure the number of those who did not vote at all, and the Senator made the assumption that those who did not vote at all would have voted to approve it—which would be an unwarranted assumption—would not the Senator still fall short of equaling the number who voted to reject the contract

Mr. PROUTY. I would have to add up the figures: 17,251 voted to reject the settlement, 6,587 voted to approve it, and 11,562 members did not vote. So if we assume that all nonvoters would have voted to approve the settlement, we must add the 11,562 nonvoters to the 6,587 who voted to approve. Under such an assumption this would result in 18,149 votes in favor of the settlement and 17,251 votes to reject the settlement. So I conclude that the assumption of the Senator is not correct.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I think the percentage of those who voted to reject the contract is in the area of 48.5 percent of the total membership of the union.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. My figures show 48.7 percent, but it is in that vicinity.

Now, Mr. President, I have been in touch with quite a number of Members of the House of Representatives, including members of both the minority and the majority parties. They have informed me that they do not believe that the House will not vote for any measure which can be construed as strike-breaking on the part of Congress—in other words, forcing these men to go back to work—unless the President affirmatively requests such legislation and asserts that it is needed in the national interest. They appear perfectly willing to leave it to the discretion of the President in the present circumstances.

The motion that I shall presently make will not mean, in my judgment, that the Senate is shirking its responsibility. It will mean, I think, that we believe that the union and the carriers are close enough together so that, given a few more days in which to negotiate, they may get together and resolve the strike without any action on the part of either Congress or the President. I believe the carriers can make some relatively minor concessions which will enable the union negotiators to send the settlement proposals back to their membership for ratification. I think it will be ratified. I do not make this as a casual statement. I think there is good reason to believe that the union membership will ratify a subsequent proposal which may be made by the carriers.

It seems to me that, rather than have Congress say to the 35,400 IAM members, "You are going back to work, regardless of whether you like it or not," Congress might very well say, "We are granting you a few more days in which to try to get together with the carriers and reach a voluntary settlement through free collective bargaining."

If the parties are unable to do that by Wednesday, I am sure that Congress will then move with expedition to settle the matter, one way or the other. This is the only way, it seems to me, in which we can save ourselves a great headache. Other major negotiations are coming up. The IUE has announced that it will strike GE on October 3, absent an agreement. What effect will this have on national defense and the war in Vietnam? We can keep Congress out of union negotiations, but we will not do this obviously, if we make it mandatory that the machinists return to work in the present context of this labor dispute.

I feel confident that come next Tuesday or Wednesday night, the strike can be settled without any action taken by Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the important things about this motion which the Senator has not mentioned is that the President must now have been impressed with the feeling on the floor of the Senate, at least as to our feeling that he has not affirmatively told us that he does or does not want anything.

It seems to me that normally one would assume that this motion is a means of laying things over and not facing the issue.

I do not think that is so in this case. We should add to the reasons stated by the Senator from Vermont, which can be argued over as they relate to the figures—and they undoubtedly will be argued—the fact that the President has not told us what he wants, and we are entitled to know what he wants.

I think that a vote such as the Senator from Vermont will call for will definitely tell the President that we are looking to him. We have a right to look to him for recommendations. He has not made any recommendations. He has not even told us whether he backs the Attorney General who says that the committee bill is unconstitutional. The President has not confirmed that statement or anything else.

It seems to me that this has gone on long enough. It is a serious matter. It seriously concerns and inconveniences many people in all parts of the country.

Big things are involved here. The Senator from Vermont may very well be offering us the only way in which we can protest the fact that we have been left alone in this matter—notwithstanding executive responsibility—without any opinion from the President.

The President is the man who mediated and authorized the attempted settlement. It failed to settle the strike.

I think that the Senator from Vermont may be giving us a touchstone to let the President know how we feel about this.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. He made an extremely important point, with which I am in complete agreement. I have emphasized that point in my earlier remarks. If the President had sent recommendations of any kind to Congress concerning whether we should or should not legislate, I am sure Congress would have pursued the matter. I believe Congress would have supported the President, and we would not find ourselves divided as we are this afternoon.

We have not heard from the President. The committee invited representatives from the Defense Department, the Post Office Department, the Commerce Department, and of course, the Labor Department. However, at the discretion of the administration, it was determined that Secretary Wirtz was to be the only administration witness and act as its spokesman.

I am certain that Senators who have taken the time to read the transcript of our hearings, or who sat in on the committee hearings, have become just as frustrated as did every member of the committee, including members of both the majority and minority parties.

There is, in my judgment, an opportunity to settle this strike without congressional action.

If such is not the case, then certainly we can start next Wednesday, perhaps with a Presidential recommendation, and work with all deliberate speed to take care of this situation.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I now move that all action on the pending resolutions be postponed until Wednesday, August 10.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the motion because I am happy that the Senator has come around to the viewpoint of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the other members of the committee who have argued, last week and on Monday, that a settlement could be negotiated and that collective bargaining had not run its full course.

I am very happy to have the Senator endorse the position that a group of us in the committee took last week and on Monday. I think it is the proper approach toward a solution of this issue.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I have been sympathetic to his position at all times.

I assume that the majority leader will move to table my motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sorry that the majority leader will take that course of action because, in my judgment, my motion would have wide appeal on a vote on the merits which will not be reflected on a procedural motion to table it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me address myself——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may there be order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask the attachés to proceed to the rear of the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chamber be cleared. It is getting so that one cannot walk across the aisle without running into attachés.

I ask that the Chamber be cleared of all except those who have necessary business here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the Chamber of all attachés.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust the motion to postpone will not prevail.

The President has run out of authority under the Railway Labor Act. He has exhausted his authority.

Both sides to the controversy have confessed that further bargaining at this time is just a fruitless and an abortive endeavor.

What do we do now? Do we sit here rather supinely and permit this condition to prevail and try to shift the onus to another branch of the Government?

I thought the legislative branch had some responsibility. The state-of-the Union clause in the Constitution says that the President shall make recommendations to Congress from time to time. It does not say that Congress has no authority to initiate legislation on its own.

It was not by accident that the legislative branch was incorporated in article I of the Constitution, because it is the central power of the Government on which everything rests.

Are we going to do as has been done in other days? Eighteen years ago, I served in the 80th Congress. What did Mr. Truman have to say about us? He put a tag upon that Congress. He said it was a do-nothing Congress. And it stuck.

What do we want them to say about us now in the country—that we have no guts? Do we want them to say that we have no courage, that all we do is to show the white feather when there is a controversy and some votes are involved? Is that what we are going to do? Does that improve the image of Congress in the country?

Mr. President, I will not go back and make that kind of confession to the people in the State of Abraham Lincoln. He stood up to whatever the controversy was.

Now, the Mediation Service was asked to act 7 months ago. Both sides applied for mediatory service.

This is not something that transpired overnight. The issue has been before the country. It has been before the Board. It has been before Congress. It continues on and on and on.

As I said this morning, perishables perish, whether they are chickens, little turkey poults, or whatever they may be.

For all I know—and I get it on pretty good authority—bodies are in San Francisco. These bodies cannot be shipped back to their families for interment because transportation is not available.

Replacement parts of sensitive items cannot be delivered to the industrial plants of the country because there are not vehicles or transportation to properly do the job.

In the face of that situation, are we going to quibble semantically as to whether it is an emergency situation or a national emergency, or whether one side or the other has dubbed it so? Everybody can see for himself.

This morning, a food purveyor to the airlines—he happens to be a good Republican—said that it is costing him $10,000 every day. We do not know how to measure the damage done by this situation right now. So the damage rolls on and on, like a cyclonic wave, and we would sit here and say, "Postpone, postpone; let's drift; let's dawdle," when we have a responsibility? No; not I. I am not going to make that confession to the country.

I shall lament the day when the Senate will say, "Oh, we will take our time, another 6 days, and then maybe it will all juxtapose itself, everything will be sweetness and light, discord will become harmony, and so the problem will solve itself." The problems in a complex society do not solve themselves, and there must be something more than that.

So much, Mr. President, for the motion to postpone. But what about the substitute? I hope the substitute will be accepted by the Senate—I mean the first one on which we shall vote. Some say this is breaking a strike. Well, bless you all, the Railway Labor Act has been on the books since 1926, and the format for sending them back to work has been on the books that long. All we would do here is to reinstate it because it has run out. The time period has run out. We do not add anything to it.

Some talk about strikebreaking. I think it is sheer nonsense to talk to the Senate in that fashion, when that formula was developed 40 years ago and it is here before us today, and successive Senates have worked their will upon it and added to it from session to session. Every time it was amended and approved, that meant that just another Congress, just another Senate had approved the format under which we have lived and which has been so generally accepted.

I have said that the power of the President has been exhausted under that act. All that is left is mediation. If they will not go back, if they say it is fruitless, if the President has no further power, what do we do—sit here and fold our hands and twiddle our thumbs? That is the impression that would be given to the country. I will not do that.

No; not for me. I will not demean the image of the U.S. Senate.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] said: "Just give him the tools." What are we doing here, except to give the President the tools? First, we reinstate the labor act provision in the first section of the substitute. It sends them back to work. But in the second section, it puts upon the President the affirmative power, a duty or authorization, to appoint a disputes board. We do not say he shall. I suggest that Senators look at the language before them. It says that he is authorized.

Suppose he does not do so? The whole business falls. That is the end of it. Then let them pick up the broken pieces, if they will. That is what we meant by sharing the responsibility. Then, after the 30 days, they have 60 days more. Before it can be made effective for a second extension, we say that the President has to issue an Executive order to make it good. Part of the responsibility for him, and part of it for us.

One would think that we were not a coordinate branch of government, the way we have been talking here about putting the monkey upon somebody's back. One does not talk that way in an hour of pain and agony for the country, and there is plenty of it.

I can think of States where the impact of this strike is not felt. But what about Los Angeles, San Francisco, Indianapolis, Columbus, O'Hare Field in Chicago, La Guardia Airport and Kennedy Airport in New York? Think of the people who sit there, who call up, who hope that they can get someplace to calm the brow of a sick person or to be at the last rites for somebody where the spirit has been spent. Oh, think of all the things that enter into it.

So, we have to get the machines into the air and get the men back to work. We provided for it 40 years ago. We only reinstate it now and say, "All right, the President thinks the Board should not be appointed. That will be the end of it. And then we can worry about the rest of it." But those are the tools that we provide here. So let nobody say that we have not put in the tools.

It has been said that we are aiming at one strike. What did we do when the railroaders were prepared to strike? Six hours before the strike deadline, the late, beloved President John F. Kennedy signed that bill into law. What did we call it? We raced up and down the hall and we said, "It is an ad hoc bill."

I do not care about these strange phrases that creep into our language. What does "ad hoc" mean? For this only. You Latin students know what it is. For this dispute only. It was not to make a precedent. So we said, "It is ad hoc." That is a good way to get off the hook, when you get on the platform and say, "Oh, ladies and gentlemen, this was just ad hoc." That was ad hoc, too. We got over it very safely and very nicely; and as a matter of fact, I do not think that we set a precedent.

This is ad hoc, too. Do not fall for the argument that it is an attempt to break a single strike. We are attempting to get an essential segment of the transportation of this country back in order again, so that the economy can thrive and so that people can be served. That is the whole story.

I trust, therefore, that the motion to postpone, which will convey anything but a proper Senate image to the people of the country, will fail. I believe that the Morse substitute is a good piece of work. It has on it the two leaders. Four out of our six members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are on it, and I do not think one could sell them that kind of goods, with all the experience they have had, unless they felt that the substitute was pretty good. Ten of my own members are on that substitute, and that is enough for me.

So, may the motion to postpone be roundly defeated, to establish to the country that we have not lost our guts, we have not lost our drive, we have not lost our sense of perspective and our place in the governmental scheme. And then let us vote up the substitute and accept our share of the responsibility.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it is hard to compete with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] oratorically. I would remind him, however, that only last Tuesday, a general consensus of Republican Senators reflected the feeling that the President should assume responsibility for this matter unless and until he was ready to advise Congress that a national emergency exists or that legislation is essential to protect the public interest. I believe that the Senator from Illinois will have to agree with me that this statement is correct.

I think we should recall that the late President Kennedy, when confronted with the railroad strike, asked for legislation. He did not say that there was no need for it and that Congress should take action with a recommendation from the President. At that time, President Kennedy sent a message to Congress, and said he must have legislation to avoid a national emergency.

We can talk about the business concerns affected by the strike. Unfortunately, they are. But so are 35,400 labor men and their families involved in the strike as well as the issue of breaking a strike not involving the public interest. I think that these should be considerations as well.

I am disappointed in this union. I think it has been wrong in taking such an adamant position. I have said so publicly and repeatedly. I think that its judgment in this matter leaves much to be desired.

But I also think that this motion which I have made will hasten and bring about an end to the strike. I think that will be the end result.

I cannot understand my leader defending the President for not making recommendations, or for not sending recommendations to the Congress. I think that that is his responsibility and not the responsibility of any Member of Congress. I am disappointed and shocked. I do not like it at all.

The President has had ample opportunity to make his views known through the Secretary of Labor and other officials of the administration.

The President has refused to take the position that he wants Congress to assume the burden. I am as convinced as anyone could be that, should the Senate adopt the substitute amendment, the House of Representatives will never adopt it.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DOMINICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have the floor. I desire to make a motion to table the pending motion to postpone. I do not mind yielding once or twice more for very short periods of time, but I do not intend to yield to the entire Senate and thus frustrate the purpose of my motion.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. DOMINICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as the floor manager of this measure, I wish to say that I feel the Senate has the responsibility to pass on the two measures before it. I hope that the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] will be defeated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to say for the Record that the Senator from Vermont referred to 35,400 machinists.

There are, according to the testimony, between 36,000 and 37,000 other employees who have been put out of work, at a time when they want to continue in operation. They are just as important as others.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that the Senate would defeat the motion made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

I agree with my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, that there is such a thing as prestige and dignity attached to this body. I do not want to see the Senate march up the hill, and march down the hill, only to march up the hill again next Wednesday.

We have had 3 days of debate on this matter. It has become so repetitious that some of us could give the various speeches by heart.

I have heard Members say that they know what the labor union would do if we wait until Wednesday; what the carriers would do if we wait until Wednesday; what the other body would do if we wait until Wednesday. I think we have waited too long already to know what the Senate will do.

I have no pipelines, but I do have a sense of responsibility to this body. I hope the Senate will face up to its responsibility and vote down this motion to postpone; it has no business in this body after the debate we have gone through. If we do not vote it down the Senate will look ridiculous and I think it will look so deservedly.

Mr. President, I move to table the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] to table the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the vote on the motion to table, or on the Prouty motion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The vote is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] to table the Prouty motion.

(At this point, Mr. Tydings assumed the chair.)

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present, and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 170 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—21

Aiken
Bartlett
Burdick
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Douglas
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Mondale
Morton
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Bennett
Brewster
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Scott

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to lay on the table Mr. Prouty's motion to postpone was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request which I hope will meet with this body's approval.

I ask unanimous consent that on the Morse substitute, there be a time allocation of 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], or whomever he may designate, and the other half to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], or by whomever he may designate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senate has now made it clear that it does not wish to defer this matter and await a recommendation from the President—which, unhappily, unfortunately, and I think tragically for the proposed legislation, the Senate does not have.

Under those circumstances, I think that the greatest common denominator—and this is the only thing which I have tried to architect—as between the President and Congress, from everything we can divine and glean from the administration's position, is the Morse substitute.

I say that because the substitute parallels in every aspect of the Railway Labor Act, which itself prevents a strike. The Morse substitute is drafted as closely as humanly possible to continue exactly what is in the Railway Labor Act in every detail.

With all due respect to those who have so passionately argued approaching it through the method of the Senator from Oregon—that is, by Congress acting in the first instance—or through the method of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], to wit, giving the President full authority, I think we have really come now to the point that lawyers call de minimis. I think I represent this to the Senate as my honest judgment, that now it really does not matter at all, and whatever may be the prides involved on the various sides, they certainly are not substantive, when we provide for a return of only 30 days, operative when the President signs the measure. Having brought the period down to 30 days—which we have done—it certainly indicates that when the President signs it, he will be ordering the return as much as Congress when it passed the resolution.

The idea that the President, in some secret chamber of his mind, may think it is one thing to sign a bill and another thing to sign an Executive order for 30 days, is not sound. He could keep it on his desk for a week, and it could take the workers another week to return to work.

So it seems ridiculous to argue that the President when he signs the resolution is not as operative a factor as is the Congress when it passes the resolution.

In my vote for the substitute, this is how I feel about it.

This is not a victory for the Morse theory, with all respect to my colleague from Oregon. His original theory was that we needed a big block of time. As a matter of fact, under the Morse substitute, the President has a brief amount of time. We have come now to providing a 30-day period. I do not see how it could be said that he has much time to act within that 30-day period. The President has to perform two acts. First, he must sign the resolution. Then he must issue an Executive order to make it operative for beyond 30 days. So I do not understand the argument which has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, with the approval of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I think we have gotten down to the point of whether we do anything in this matter or do not, and whether we do something—and this is strange coming from me on the minority side—which accords the President's views dignity and respect.

Again evaluating the record that we have before us and what Secretary Wirtz has had to say, it seems irrefutable that the so-called Morse approach, which we have in effect cut down to de minimis, is preferable to the Clark approach, which gives him, the President, the authority to use it immediately.

For whatever reason, whether the President is worried about a national emergency or whether he does not want to offend the union, it is immaterial at this point. The fundamental point is this. It is my distinct judgment on the record, on what Secretary Wirtz has said, on the opinion of the Attorney General on the constitutionality of the Clark approach, that the President prefers the Morse trigger. So in an effort to meet that desire, by providing that the President may extend the period which, after 30 days, expires unless the President acts, and then in 60 or 90 days it again expires unless the President acts, it gives the President complete discretion.

I understand the argument of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] in seeking to pin on anyone who backs the substitute the label of strikebreaker. I have been through that before. It was charged against me in the medicare bill, when I teamed up with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. I was charged at that time with voting against a liberal measure. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] will confirm, the label on a package is not conclusive as to its contents.

The measure before us is not a strikebreaking measure. It is a resolution to prevent a strike, and provides a time limit within which that prevention may take place. It does not inhibit the employees in their right of collective bargaining. Under the substitute we are coming to a point, completely compatible with safeguarding the public interest, of proposing a measure which is designed, so far as we can divine the views of the administration, to protect the public interest.

To me it is a fair solution in a case where the Senate has said we must act. It has passed the constitutional point the Attorney General raised. It reaches, to some degree at least, so far as we can divine, what the President desires.

Therefore I hope that the proposal prevails.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield some time to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, concerning the gravity of the stoppage in airline service, I want to repeat what I said yesterday; namely, that the strike affects 62 percent of U.S. airline passengers and 70 percent of the airmail service.

The stoppage of the airline service has affected 231 cities in the United States and 23 foreign countries.

Each day 150,000 passengers and 4,100 flights are affected.

Seventy cities have been denied all airline service.

In my judgment, the stoppage of the air transportation service does affect the national interest and calls upon the U.S. Congress to act to bring the stoppage to an end.

There has been considerable discussion about the fulfillment of official responsibility. In my thinking, the President has a responsibility. The Congress likewise has its obligation.

It would have pleased me much more if the President had communicated to the Congress what he wanted us to do. For one reason or another, he failed to do it. That brings us to the question whether his failure should operate as an inducement for Congress to likewise fail in our responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes of the Senator from Ohio have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator from Ohio 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion, performing our responsibility is the principle that should apply in the disposition of the resolution before the Senate. Flee not from thy obligation. Perform it. Not to act at this time would be a cowardly flight from the responsibility which we owe to the people of our country.

In my judgment, the President has hurt himself. If we fail to act, we will hurt ourselves and definitely despoil the image of the Senate and of the Congress.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to vote against the Morse amendment, because while I regard the present airlines strike of the mechanics to be a grave inconvenience to that section of the public which travels by air, it is not a sufficient emergency to justify interfering with collective bargaining and the right to strike.

The testimony is pretty clear that travel by air comprises only 5 to 6 percent of the passenger traffic moving between cities, and that 40 percent of the air traffic is still moving. American Airlines, fortunately, is still moving; certain other national lines are moving; and the feeder lines are moving. So I think we can say that, at most, around 4 percent of intercity traffic is being prevented by the strike.

The railways are still moving. The buses are still moving. The truck lines are still moving, and the vast volume of intercity traffic is still moving. It is a very different situation from that of 20 years ago, when the railways were virtually the sole means of intercity communication, and when a strike was threatened which would have tied up every railway in the United States. I think it is abundantly clear that while this present strike is both a nuisance and an inconvenience, and certainly is such to those of us who have to travel back and forth a considerable distance, it is not yet of such a sufficiently grave nature as to justify interference with the right to work or not to work.

There has been very little discussion of the substantive issues which now separate the parties. As I understand it, the representative of the lines, now admits that the airlines are able to meet the present added demands of the rank and file. Mr. Curtin was reported by the press as having said on Monday that the question of ability to pay was not involved. This will be shown in the tables and materials on profits which I am submitting at the end of my address. What he said was involved was the question of national policy. Let me discuss that briefly, if I may.

I have been studying through the financial manuals what has been happening to the net income, after taxes, of the various companies; and I should like to state some of the figures. In 1960, the net income after taxes of United Air Lines was $8,487,000. In 1965, it was $38,827,000. The figure for TWA was minus $321,000 in 1960. It is up, in 1965, to a plus of $22,820,000. Northwest Airlines had earnings of $1,230,000 in 1960—this is net income after taxes—and in 1965, of $24,830,000. National had a deficit of $5 million in 1960. Its earnings were up to $18,419,000 in 1965.

Eastern, which has had the poorest earnings record of any of the so-called big five perhaps partially because of a previous strike, lost $3,700,000 in 1960; but in 1965 it made $21,348,000.

Let me read the percentage earnings on investment of the five lines in 1965: Eastern, 11.1 percent; National, 19 percent; Northwest, 19 perecnt; TWA, 10.3 percent; United, 9.4 percent.

In the first 6 months of this year, there has been a tremendous increase in the volume of traffic. Revenue passenger miles for the first 5 months of this year, for Eastern, were 15 percent above last year's corresponding period; for National, 23.6 percent above; for Northwest, 27.4 percent above; for TWA, 22.2 percent above; and for United, 30.3 percent above. These figures are all taken from the records of the CAB.

The net income figures, except for TWA for the first 6 months of this year have not been filed, and will not be filed, I think, until the 10th of August. But we telephoned to the CAB this morning, and the net earnings figures for TWA, for the first 6 months were up 22 percent. I predict that the other lines will show similar increases.

Mr. **CLARK**. Over what year, sir?

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. Over the first 6 months of last year. And we have witnessed, of course, a tremendous increase in the price of the stocks of these airlines. I will supply the figures for the RECORD. I can say that the increases in stock prices have really been great. For Eastern, on August 4, 1964, the price was 30 and a fraction. On the 4th of August 1966, the price was 99. For National, the price in 1964, on the 4th of August, was 51. Then the stock was split 2 for 1 on the 9th of November 1965, but it is still selling today for 80.5, or an equivalent of 161 on the old basis.

For Northwest, the price was 56.5 in 1964 and 111.75 on the 4th of August 1966.

TWA has gone up from 41 to 85.

United has gone up from 48 to 62 and a fraction, but once again, there has been a 2-for-1 split, so that, on the old basis, that would be 125.5, or almost three times the price on the corresponding date in 1964.

In other words, the airline business is now a very profitable venture. It is true then, prior to 1964, the profits were low and in some cases nonexistent. This was particularly true of Eastern. In table 1, I give the whole story from 1960 on. I shall not go into the question as to whether or not the rank and file of the union membership were wise in turning down the proposal that was made to them. As I understand it, the chief point of difference now is the cost-of-living clause, as to whether that should be included in the base as a so-called escalation clause. There is no doubt that the companies would be able to meet not only the increased wages of labor, but also the pension demands of labor. And so far as the cost-of-living clause is concerned, there is every indication that they would be able to meet that.

I should like to point out, if I may, that the so-called guideline for wage increases being limited to 3.2 percent a year is based on physical productivity and constant price levels. It is said that if we can keep the labor cost per unit produced constant, and increase labor costs per hour only in correspondence with the increase in output per hour, then we can keep prices constant. In general, I approve of that standard. But the point is that the cost of living has to be constant.

The increase in the productivity of wage labor per man-hour, in manufacturing, at least, has averaged somewhat above 3.2 percent. It was 1.4 percent for 1960 over 1959; 4.6 percent for 1961 over 1960; 3.2 percent for 1962 over 1961; 4.4 percent for 1963 over 1962; 4 percent for 1964 over 1963; and 5.1 percent for 1965 over 1964. I show this in tables.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks, an article from Fortune magazine and also tables showing the operating profits of five airlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **CLARK**. Does the Senator wish more time?

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. I ask that I might have 2 or 3 more minutes.

Mr. **CLARK**. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. I thank the Senator.

In short, as far as manufacturing is concerned, labor productivity per man-hour has gone up recently more than the 3.2 percent provided in the guideline. If we take society as a whole, and deflate the gross national product by the total number of employees the increase is less. But on the whole, labor in manufacturing has performed by a high standard of increase.

The cost of living has gone up somewhat—not as much as many of our Republican friends say, but it has increased.

Let me put this question before the Senate: Suppose productivity per man-hour goes up by 3.2 percent, and wages are increased, in money terms, 3.2 percent, but the cost of living goes up 3.2 percent. That means there is no increase in real earnings for the workers during this period that their productivity has advanced, and the result, of course, inevitably, is no increase in real earnings despite the increase in output. The result is a great increase in corporate profits and this is shown in the recent annual current corporate figures. The corporate profits after taxes increased from $26.7 billion in 1960 to $44.5 billion in 1965 and to an annual rate of $48.7 billion in the first quarter of 1966. This would be an increase of $22 billion or approximately 80 percent. This is the most serious source of imbalance in the economy.

I think this has produced a very dangerous imbalance in our society. It has also been fed by the 7-percent investment credit which is really a 14-percent reduction in taxes. While I will not pass judgment as to whether or not the rank and file of the airplane maintenance branch of the Machinists Union should have rejected the offer, I can say that I think they had good, sound reasons which they might use to justify their position.

The right to strike and to leave work should be a very important value in American life. It is not something to be trifled with. If we make an exception in this case, we will be led to make exceptions in many other cases. If the broad language of these provisions is approved, they will be called upon again and again. We would be opening Pandora's box.

This would not only be unjust, but it would also lead to further dangerous precedents. We cannot regulate wages by prohibiting strikes, in all fairness, unless we go on and then regulate prices and profits. For by prohibiting strikes, we take away one of the chief weapons of labor and tilt the balance of power in favor of the employers.

This would inevitably lead to a control of American industry by Government that in the long run would be extremely dangerous. In an allout war we would have to do this. But we are not yet in this situation.

I will therefore vote against the Morse amendment or against any amendment which would take away the right to strike, a right which I regard as a basic right to be denied only in the gravest national emergency. Such a grave national emergency, in my judgment, does not present itself at the present time. And in its absence it would be a grave error to force large numbers of men to work against their will.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 1A.—*Operating profits of 5 airlines (operating profits equal operating revenues minus operating expenses—CAB records)*

[In thousands of dollars]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1960	−5, 866	−6, 881	1, 985	−883	9, 429
1961	−25, 195	−456	1, 119	−24, 187	6, 560
1962	−17, 203	14, 004	8, 239	−7, 390	14, 846
1963	−30, 888	9, 407	12, 436	17, 521	27, 282
1964	4, 580	22, 048	28, 906	50, 892	45, 037
1965	30, 838	37, 085	46, 383	49, 781	72, 305

TABLE 1B.—*Net income before taxes (includes operating profit plus capital gains or loss minus interest and other nonoperating revenues or expense)*

[In thousands of dollars]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1960	−7, 846	−4, 950	1, 906	−1, 167	11, 076
1961	−28, 530	−2, 133	−639	−37, 858	40
1962	−19, 060	11, 626	4, 822	−21, 790	5, 626
1963	−37, 946	7, 790	10, 443	661	19, 393
1964	−3, 880	18, 484	28, 338	36, 008	37, 371
1965	21, 348	34, 568	46, 730	37, 369	64, 196

Table 1C.—*Net income after taxes not including special taxes*

[In thousands of dollars]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1960	−3, 701	−5, 007	1, 230	−321	8, 487
1961	−14, 971	−2, 109	83	24, 996	703
1962	−14, 425	7, 498	2, 520	−12, 499	3, 348
1963	−37, 392	4, 729	5, 057	576	10, 451
1964	3, 880	11, 130	14, 616	19, 419	22, 963
1965	21, 348	18, 419	24, 830	22, 820	38, 827

Table 2A.—*Return on investment*

[Percent]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1960	+0. 69	−3. 34	+4. 51	1. 78	+5. 12
1961	−1. 21	+. 40	+3. 39	−3. 82	+2. 90
1962	−2. 61	+14. 17	+6. 19	+1. 61	+3. 54
1963	−13. 43	+9. 45	+8. 78	+6. 28	+4. 91
1964	+2. 69	+15. 57	+15. 86	+11. 03	+7. 40
1965	+11. 1	+19. 2	+19. 3	+10. 3	+9. 4

Table 2B.—*Actual total investment*

[In thousands c. dollars]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1960	245, 918	28, 072	75, 652	162, 606	329, 933
1961	251, 219	63, 816	92, 876	280, 302	425, 238
1962	253, 776	73, 213	98, 923	299, 792	466, 249
1963	218, 554	82, 547	92, 325	295, 743	428, 826
1964	256, 379	89, 446	105, 481	327, 777	465, 423
1965	293, 592	110, 839	139, 485	372, 366	562, 048

Table 3A.—*Revenue passenger-miles for domestic scheduled service*

[In thousands of miles]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1966: 1st 5 months	3, 208, 278	1, 337, 580	1, 185, 297	3, 363, 717	5, 037, 170
1965: 1st 5 months	2, 785, 689	1, 082, 239	930, 091	2, 753, 215	3, 866, 210
Increase of 1st 5 months of this year over 1st 5 months of last year	422, 589	255, 341	255, 206	610, 502	1, 170, 960
Percent increase	15. 1	23. 6	27. 4	22. 2	30. 3

Table 3B.—*Revenue ton-miles for domestic scheduled service*

[In thousands of miles]

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1966: 1st 5 months	358, 175	14, 525	141, 158	413, 569	626, 987
1965: 1st 5 months	298, 736	18, 579	110, 616	336, 528	475, 873
Increase of 1st 5 months of this year over 1st 5 months of last year	59, 439		30, 542	77, 041	151, 114
Percent increase	19. 9	27	27	22. 9	31. 8

Note.—CAB records: There may be a slight error in the 1965 figures for National.

Table 4.—*Closing stock prices on Aug. 4*

	Eastern	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1964	30⅜	51	56½	41⅜	48½
1965	56	[1] 83	83½	43	71
1966	99	80½	111¾	85¼	[2] 62¾
1966 (June 30)	104⅛	84¼	113½	89⅝	64

[1] National stock was split 2 for 1 on Nov. 9, 1965.

[2] United stock was split 2 for 1 on Apr. 29, 1966.

Table 5.—*Net income after taxes, percent increase from 1963 to 1964 and 1963 to 1965*

	National	Northwest	TWA	United
1963 to 1964	135. 4	189	3, 271	119. 7
1963 to 1965	289. 5	391	3, 861	271. 5

Note.—Eastern, 450.2 percent increase from 1964 to 1965.

Table 6.—*United Airlines payments to workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics)*

Average payment per hour	Percentage increase over 1959	Top hourly rate for mechanics	Percentage increase over 1959
Dec. 1, 1959: $2.66		$2. 98	
Dec. 1, 1960: $2.80	5	3. 13	5
June 1, 1962: $2.93	10	3. 25	10
June 1, 1963: $3.04	14	3. 33	12
June 1, 1964: $3.16	19	3. 43	15
Jan. 1, 1965: $3.25	22	3. 52	19

Average fringe payments per hour to workers on United Airlines (fringe payments equal vacation pay, holiday pay, health and welfare fund, pension, and all social security payments)

Average payment per hour	Percentage increase over 1959–60	Top hourly fringe payments	Percentage increase over 1959–60
1959 to 1960: 64 to 67.5 cents		72 to 75 cents	
1960 to 1962: 67.5 to 75 cents	12	75 to 83 cents	12
1962 to 1965: 75 to 90 cents	20	83 to 97 cents	20

Table 7.—*Increases per man-hour of wage-workers in manufacturing, 1959–65*

Year	Index of production, manufacturing industry (1959=100) (1)	Production workers, manufacturing industry (2)	Average hours per week, manufacturing industry (3)	Man-hours per week [1] (4)	Index of man-hours (1959=100) (5)	Index of man-hour productivity [2] (6)	Percentage change from preceding year (7)
		Millions		*Millions*			
1959	100. 0	12. 237	40. 3	493. 15	100. 0	100. 0	
1960	102. 7	12. 586	39. 7	499. 66	101. 3	101. 4	1. 4
1961	103. 4	12. 083	39. 8	480. 90	97. 5	106. 0	4. 6
1962	112. 0	12. 488	40. 4	504. 41	102. 3	109. 5	3. 2
1963	117. 8	12. 558	40. 5	508. 60	103. 1	114. 3	4. 4
1964	125. 6	12. 808	40. 7	521. 29	105. 7	118. 8	4. 0
1965	136. 7	13. 108	41. 2	540. 05	109. 5	124. 8	5. 1

[1] Col. (2) × col. 3.

[2] Col. (1) + col. (5) × 100.

Sources: (1) Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. An index of physical quantity of output, based on the 1957 Standard Industrial Classification, published on base 1957–59=100, changed proportionately to base 1959=100. (2) Bureau of Labor Statistics. Production workers comprise working foremen and all nonsupervisory workers (including trainees). (3) Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 8.—*Consumer price indexes, the United States and other industrial countries, 1958–65*

[1958=100]

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Austria	101	103	107	111	114	119	125
Belgium [1]	101	102	103	104	106	111	115
Canada	101	102	103	104	106	108	111
Denmark [1]	102	103	107	115	122	126	134
France	106	110	114	119	[2] 105	108	111
Germany (West)	101	102	105	[3] 108	111	114	118
Italy	100	102	104	109	117	124	129
Japan	101	105	110	118	127	132	142
Netherlands [4]	102	103	105	108	113	119	126
Norway	102	102	105	111	114	120	125
Sweden	101	105	107	112	115	119	125
Switzerland	99	101	103	107	111	114	[5] 119
United Kingdom	101	102	105	110	112	115	121
United States [6]	101	102	103	105	106	[6] 107	109

[1] Excluding rent.

[2] 1962=100 for years 1963–65.

[3] Including the Saar for years 1962–65.

[4] Excluding compulsory social insurance and wage tax.

[5] Provisional.

[6] Including Alaska and Hawaii for years 1964–65.

Source: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics.

EXHIBIT 2

[From Fortune magazine, February 1966]

QUESTIONS ABOUT AIRLINES

The airline stocks, which in recent years have been one of those "turnaround situations" Wall Streeters dream about, are now enveloped in large uncertainties. The airlines are uncertain about the profits the Civil Aeronautics Board will allow them to earn. They are uncertain about the direction of their own costs (including their taxes). Most of all, they are uncertain about their ability to generate enough new traffic so that operating rates in their expanding fleets remain profitable.

Meanwhile, their stockholders have nothing to compain about. Eastern Air Lines, which had lost $72 million in 1960 through 1963, and whose stock was below 30 during much of that period, recently got as high as 98. The stocks of most other trunk lines, i.e., big carriers that have long routes and serve the major cities, have also soared since the 1962 low: American stock has increased 350 percent in value, United 540 percent, Western 670 percent, T.W.A. 850 percent, Delta 930 percent, Continental and Braniff 1,000 percent, Northwest, 1,150 percent, National 1,300 percent. Northeast Airlines, which was near bankruptcy early in 1965, and selling for around 4, was close to 40 later in the year, after control had been purchased by Storer Broadcasting Co.

These fantastic price rises reflect the new high level of earnings, of course. In 1962 three of the eleven trunk lines, T.W.A., Eastern, and Northeast, lost money on domestic operations, and the trunks as a group made only $8 million. In the twelve months ended last June 30 (the latest year for which figures are available), the trunks earned $180 million on domestic operations. The only trunk line losing money today is Northeast, and even its deficits are narrowing sharply. Its price rise reflects not only the narrowing, but Storer's obvious willingness to spend money on it.

The airlines' growth has been an expression of the extraordinary leverage in their situation. Their operating costs are not decisively affected by the volume of business they do; it costs almost as much to fly a half-empty plane as to fly a full one. When an airline is at the breakeven point, incremental revenues come down to profits very easily, but any reduction in revenues brings on sharp losses. The story of the airlines in the past three years has been essentially about their ability to add incremental revenues. In 1962, when the trunks as a group were just barely in the black, their over-all operating revenues were $2.25 billion; their over-all operating expenses plus interest charges came to $2,247 billion. In the year ended last June 30, their revenues had risen by $750 million, their expenses and interest only by $470 million—even though they were now flying many more seat-miles. In some cases, airlines are taking as much as three-quarters of incremental revenues down to pre-tax profits. One spectacularly leveraged airline has been Northwest, whose revenues in the first eleven months of 1965 rose by 23 percent over the comparable 1964 period; net profits *after* taxes rose by 74 percent.

Because the incremental revenues are so profitable, the airlines work hard and experiment endlessly to fill the empty seats. The airlines have introduced jet economy fares in many markets, lowered family fares, let servicemen fly at half price on a "space available" basis, extended coach service to the entire nation (three out of every four seats are now offered at coach rates), and eliminated most excess-baggage charges.

FALLING BREAKEVENS

Meanwhile, the industry still has plenty of empty seats. The great rise in revenues and profits did not come from any appreciable increase in the proportion of seats filled: now, as in the early 1960's, most of the trunks fly with only 50 to 55 percent of their seats filled. What has changed is the number of seats, and the number of miles they are being flown, both of which are greatly expanded; and the breakeven point, which has been sharply reduced by the jets.

The number of sea-miles flown has increased by 65 percent, to 81 billion, since 1960. At the end of 1965, furthermore, over $2.4 billion worth of jets were still on order for domestic trunk operations, enough to add 48 billion sea-miles. The expansion of capacity has vastly magnified the effects of the leverage. At T.W.A. last year, a rise or fall of one percentage point in the "load factor" (proportion of passenger-miles to sea-miles) represented about $10 million in revenues and $5,600,000 in net profits—64 cents a share.

The breakeven point for most piston planes came when around 60 percent of seats were filled. For most jets it is 40 percent or even less. Most airlines still fly a mixture of the two, and so their passenger breakevens tend to cluster around 50 percent: the range in the year ended last June was from 39 percent for Northwest Airlines to 59.6 percent for Northeast. With the continuing reduction in the number of piston planes in use, it seems likely that breakevens will fall still further. Additional reductions in breakeven load factors seem possible as the airlines find ways to step up their utilization of planes. Delta, for example, has begun operating its DC–8 aircraft ten and a half hours a day on the average, up from eight hours in 1964; the effect will be to reduce fixed overhead charges per flight hour by some 20 percent. In the year ending last June 30, most of the domestic trunks had passenger breakevens 3 or 4 percentage points below the figures for the previous year; Eastern's, for example, fell from 57 to 52 percent (while its passenger load factor rose from 52.5 to 55.8 percent). On the whole, then, the trunks will do very well if they can continue to get load factors in the area of 55 percent.

Figures on the new jets ordered by each airline are generally available, and it is often possible to make some important inferences about future earnings from these figures. There is a rule of thumb that a big new jet can return somewhat more in annual revenues than it cost the airline originally. The Series 61 DC–8, for example, has 200 seats and sells for $8 million. Douglas Aircraft estimates that each seat has a revenue capability of $85,500 a year, assuming nine hours of daily utilization. This means that at capacity the plane would generate annual passenger revenues of $17,100,000; at 55 percent it would generate $9,400,000. An airline that was able to operate the plane at a 45 percent breakeven point and attain 55 percent load factors would thus have an operating profit before taxes of at least $1,700,000 (i.e., 10 percent of the revenues at full capacity); cargo revenues might bring this figure even higher. When airlines order the medium-range jets, like Boeing's 727, the calculation begins with a presumption of about $5 million of annual revenues at a 55 percent load factor and ten hours' daily use; the plane costs $4,300,000. With a short-range jet like the Series 10 Douglas DC–9, the cost would be $3,200,000, the revenues $2,900,000 on seven hours' daily use.

The industry's enormous new capital-equipment program has made accounting procedures increasingly significant. In general, the small trunk lines have somewhat more conservative accounting practices than the so-called "big four" (American, United, T.W.A., and Eastern). Most of the smaller companies depreciate their jets over ten years; the big four use eleven through sixteen years. Most of the smaller companies also amortize the 7 percent investment tax credit over the life of the equipment, while the bigger companies take the entire benefit in the year in which it first becomes available.

If the smaller trunk lines used the same accounting practices, their reported incomes would rise appreciably. Continental, for example, would have added 15 cents a share to its 1964 net if it had depreciated equipment over twelve years instead of ten. Taking the entire investment credit at once would have added 30 cents more. Still another option available to airline financial men is to set up a reserve fund for maintenance and overhaul expenses. Airlines with such funds, and Continental is one of them, often accrue more money than is actually spent. (They can do this in reports to stockholders but not for tax purposes; Internal Revenue allows deductions for maintenance only when the money is actually spent.) Had Continental been expensing these costs, still another 17 cents a share would have been added to net. The total reported earnings, had all three liberal accounting procedures been used, would have been $2.44 a share instead of $1.82.

The uncertainties confronting airlines begin with CAB policy. How much profit will the board allow them? In 1960, after a five-year study of airline economics, the board ruled that the big four should be allowed to earn 10¼ percent on their capital and the other trunk lines 11⅛ percent, the trunk average being 10½ percent. (Earnings are stated before interest charges; capital includes long-term debt. The figures apply only to domestic earnings.) As things turned out, of course, there were scarcely any profits at all in the next few years. In the five years 1960–64 the trunk lines as a group had only a 4.7 return; their earnings for the period were about $1 billion short of what the board's standard would have allowed. In 1965, however, the trunks earned just about 10½ percent. The industry has persistently argued that the present healthy levels should be averaged in with the sicklier figures of recent years, that it is really still "catching up."

The board seems not to agree. Charles S. Murphy, the new chairman, recently said that the industry's "prosperity has made it necessary for the CAB to take a fresh look at some of its responsibilities." He added that there was "no reason why we should ever try to reduce earnings just for the sake of reducing them"—but some members of the industry nevertheless suspect they are in for an era of government-imposed price reduction. One special source of concern has been the board's recent refusal to allow surcharges for jet service in markets being converted from pistons. Previously, higher rates for jet service were taken for granted in the industry. *Aviation Week* estimates that the industry would forgo some $200 million a year in revenues if all jet rates were held or brought down to the levels now in effect on piston service; the CAB's own estimate of the difference is $146,500,000. At present traffic levels, American would forgo some $30 million in revenues if jet fares were brought to piston rates. The effect on earnings would be about $1.70 a share.

The industry's uncertainties about costs pertain partly to labor relations, of course but also to the possibility of new taxes—which have been mentioned more frequently since the airlines became prosperous. There is recurrent talk about a federal tax on jet fuel for example, of perhaps 2 cents a gallon. The 2 cents would probably cost the industry more than $60 million a year; United, the heaviest consumer of jet fuel, would pay about $20 million of that and the effect on earnings would be something like $1.80 a share.

Any such costs would put a crimp in profits, and if they were imposed the industry might not be able to show gains in profitability unless it were also able to raise its load factors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself not more than 10 minutes. I may not use the entire 10 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just had a call from Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who has followed some of the discussion on the floor of the Senate as to what he did or did not say in the hearings.

Secretary Wirtz instructed me to make very clear to the Senate that he favors the Morse bill, if legislation is to be passed. He thought he had made clear when he was before the committee that, although the administration is not taking any position one way or the other with regard to the passage of legislation, if the Senate is to pass legislation, the Secretary of Labor would favor the Morse bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield on the time of the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Secretary of Labor has changed the view he expressed several times before the committee, to the effect that he was strongly opposed to a three-bite determination.

I was going to read what he said in my own remarks. I wanted to be sure that he had told the Senator he had changed his mind.

Mr. MORSE. He did not say he had changed his mind. He stated what his mind is as of now. His mind is that, although the administration is not asking for legislation, and is not asking that there not be legislation passed, the Secretary of Labor advised me that it is the policy of the President—and he asked me to advise the Senate of this—that, if Congress passes legislation, the Secretary of Labor favors the Morse bill.

I said to the Secretary:

> I want to make it very clear that you are not speaking in your personal capacity, Mr. Secretary, but are speaking as an administrative witness.

He said:

> That is true.

I asked him again if I could make that perfectly clear. He said that I could make it perfectly clear.

Let the RECORD show that the Secretary of Labor, within the last 15 minutes, has advised the senior Senator from Oregon that if we pass legislation, he favors, as the administration witness, the Morse bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor did not have reference to the first Morse bill, but to the Morse compromise measure.

Mr. MORSE. He referred to the substitute bill that is the pending measure before the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been little discussion of it, but we are at war. And this is no neighborhood war. This is a major war. It has all the prospects of becoming more and more major in its consequences.

The record of the senior Senator from Oregon is clear. I do not favor the war. I do not think we should be in the war. We are in it. We have already killed more than 4,200 American boys. We have wounded several times that number. There is every indication that the war will continue for quite some time and that more boys will be lost and wounded.

Mr. President, involved in this situation is the inevitable result of a war on the economy of a country.

I would have the Senate take into account this afternoon what we did in World War II when the argument of the labor leaders sitting on the War Labor Board with me was that we had to carry out a no-strike, no-lockout agreement. They argued that we had to maintain economic stabilization in this country in order to protect the economy while our boys were dying in Europe.

They are dying in Asia today. That is the only difference.

I agree that something has to be done about prices. Something has to be done to see to it that management does not break the barriers and engage in a contribution to inflation.

I want to say that the demand of this union for a 7- to 8-percent increase is an inflationary demand. No one can deny these statistics. That is what this union is on strike for.

In my judgment, that is against the best interest of labor, as well as against the best interest of the American people.

It has been argued here this afternoon that we should not break a strike. We are not breaking a strike. We are applying a law that has been on the books for years, and it has been applied time and time again to stop strikes for a 60-day period under its application. The resolution proposes to extend that period of time to another 180 days. That is the essence of time involved.

The American people are entitled to have the Railway Labor Act extended for another 180 days.

The American people in regard to the public interest are entitled to have these workers go back to work for this period as they proceed to try under collective bargaining to settle the dispute.

I have not the slightest doubt that if they are sent back to work, the controversy will be settled.

I happen to believe that the best service we can perform for this union is to put these men back to work.

Some of their leaders have said, both at the local and national level, that they will not go back to work unless Congress passes a law.

In my judgment, thousands of the men in this industry would welcome a law. It would get them off the hook. It would lead to a fair settlement.

There is no longer any wage issue involved in this case. They asked for $4.04, and they have already gotten $4.08 by the collective bargaining agreement.

A question has been raised again in regard to an escalator clause. It is generally recognized that escalator clauses are on the way out, not on the way in, because escalator clauses are themselves inflationary. But the other night the union through its negotiators agreed to eliminate an escalator clause. Even as to the escalator clause in the Emergency Board report—we gave them an escalator clause—the original demand was for a one-way street. There was to be an escalator clause only if the cost of living went up; but if it went down, there would not be a wage decrease. This is not the typical, traditional escalator clause, by the way.

What we have provided is that if it can be shown after a year that the cost of living has gone up 1 percent or more, based on the average of the last 5 years, an arbitration board would be appointed to determine what the facts are, and the union would be given the benefit of the escalation, taking into account the factors that are set forth in the report. That is all the union is entitled to, in my judgment, after its members have been given the good wages designated by both the Board report and the general agreement. That is all they are entitled to in the midst of a war.

In the public interest, the steps necessary to prevent inflation should be taken, so long as we can make a valiant effort to do so, and the union has as much public responsibility as do the employers and everyone else in the country to cooperate in protecting the economy.

In regard to the profits of the companies, no consideration has been given on the floor of the Senate in the last several days to what the companies have made during the past 10 years.

The record shows 5.1 percent return on the investment. Only in the last 2 years have there been good profits in this industry. Of course, the employers have the ability to pay, if one wishes to put the burden on them and deny to the public the rights that it has for a distribution of some share of this profit for the public benefit. The public is entitled to a share of the profits because it has spent millions and millions of dollars for the subsidization of the carriers and then for the building of the airports that provide the facilities that give the work opportunity to the workers and provide the facilities that give to the carriers an opportunity to engage in a private enterprise system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. When I get through, if I have time, I shall yield. I am not only answering the Senator from Illinois, but also others who have made similar arguments.

From the standpoint of the earnings of a company, three parties have a right to share in the earnings. One of the parties is the workers, and they are sharing by a wage settlement—a financial settlement—in this case that continues to keep them in the blue-ribbon class of the workers of this country. This is not an underpaid group of workers. This is a group of workers far above the average.

Because it is in a regulated industry this group of workers has a remarkable work guarantee program, too. That does not mean that they are all assured of continuity of employment, but it means that the nature of this business results in a large percentage of these employees not having to worry about whether they will continue to be employed. That is not true in some other industries, where there is seasonal fluctuation. It is not even true in the automobile industry, where from time to time there are seasonal layoffs.

In my judgment, the inflation issue is not being given the weight and the consideration it deserves by those who do not wish to pass legislation or by those who wish to pass the responsibility to the President of the United States. We, the Congress, owe it to the American people to see that we do what we can to stop this inflationary tornado from breaking forth.

As I have said many times—but it must be repeated in the closing minutes of this debate—look at the other groups waiting to come in to get an increase in their wages far beyond what would be an inflation control wage. They would use this as the bellwether case.

There is no justification in asserting the argument that has been made here this afternoon that because there have been profits in this industry during the last few years, we ought to take the position that the carriers should have the burden put upon them. What is the ability-to-pay criterion in connection with wage settlements? Of course, the profits are taken into account in deciding what the wages ought to be. But one does not take the position that a union that demands an exorbitant wage increase should get it because the carriers could pay it, in a regulated industry in which a public interest ought to be protected.

Furthermore, not a word has been said here about the tremendous requirement costs of this industry during the next 5 or 6 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. They will have to buy a large number of planes, each of which will cost $9 million to $12 million; and within 10 years, if they go on with the superplane, they will have to spend $20 million. Where will they get the investment for that kind of reequipment program, if we say we will give an undue share of the profit to the workers in the industry?

I yield to no one in desiring these workers to receive a very good wage. They are receiving a very good wage. But in the midst of a war, when crisis faces this country and they know that their economic power is great, they apparently insist on getting what they want or continuing a strike.

There is no question as to what is in the record with regard to the national interest. There is no question about what is in the record in regard to an interruption of essential transportation service in section after section in this country.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we have a clear duty, under the Constitution, to regulate commerce by taking the necessary steps to provide the public with the transportation that, in the midst of a war, this union does not have a scintilla of right to take away from the public by a strike it is now conducting. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the settlement already agreed upon by its own negotiator is an exceptionally good one.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon has said that the consumers or users of the airlines should—and, in his judgment, would—receive a reduction in rates. Does the Senator have any guarantee of that? To what degree has the CAB ever reduced rates domestically?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot give any guarantee of it, but I have no doubt, as a result of my discussions with administration leaders, that the CAB knows very well that it has to proceed, without delay, to give consideration to the rate problem. It has already been trying to do so indirectly in regard to the type of service and the reduced rates given to students and other groups. I believe that the CAB should proceed with a full-fledged rate hearing seeking to distribute these profits among the public. But I am at a loss to understand the theory of the Senator from Illinois that because it has not done so to date, we ought to go along with what is obviously an exorbitant demand on the part of this union, and that this will really prevent inflation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have a little time and will be glad to yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I should merely like to point out that the theory behind the wage-price guidelines was that the real wages of the workers should not increase by more than the increase of the physical productivity per hour. The physical productivity per hour in manufacturing has been going up at something more than 3.2 percent. I do not stress that fact. But I should like to point out that any increase in the cost of living diminishes to that degree the increase in real earnings, and that a 3.2-percent increase in money wages in a period of advancing prices should not be mistaken for a 3.2-percent increase in real earnings.

Without going into the question as to whether or not the rank and file were correct, I can say that I do not believe that they should be open to the castigation which has been meted out to them and that they had at least an arguable point.

I predict that this same weakness in the wage-price guidelines will rise up to haunt us, and that trying to keep the money wages per hour down to 3.2 percent in a period of advancing living costs will ultimately prove to be one sided, as it already has been; and, to my mind, it is the chief reason for the extraordinary increase in corporate profits.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 minute, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The 3.2-percent guideline has never been involved in this case. It was not an issue before the emergency board. The settlement that the parties negotiated is a settlement in the neighborhood of 4.4-percent increase. Guidelines is a dead issue, as far as this case is concerned.

The live, vibrant issue is whether or not Congress will stand by and let a union conduct a strike, which is a strike now against the public interest, setting a precedent that will mean that an inflationary tornado will be let loose on this country; and I do not like to see labor be the cause of starting it.

I wish to say, also, that it is the responsibility of Congress to take some action—which it has not taken—with regard to inflation-control legislation. The argument has been made that there is control in other areas. That is partly our fault, too. I believe we should get busy and pass some general inflation control legislation.

When I think of what happened in World War I and what is happening today with regard to labor-management relationship in respect to wages and prices, I am at a loss to understand how we can justify permitting this union to proceed with these unreasonable demands and to use its naked economic power to force those demands upon a suffering public.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, first, I should like to quote a statement made by the distinguished and able senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] yesterday afternoon:

> But once Congress falls into the trap of passing a measure, a self-executing measure triggered off by Congress, which calls for sending men back to work, we might as well hang a sign outside the Senate door reading, "Capitol Hill Labor Relations Board."

It seems to me that this is so true. I believe that the full responsibility in this instance must rest in the hands of the President. That is the only way in which a measure of flexibility can be maintained. The President has access to all of the facts. He knows what is going on. He knows the views of the carriers and the leaders of the union. If they cannot get together, then I think he must make the final decision as to whether it is necessary to exercise emergency powers.

Certainly the President has had no difficulty or hesitancy in expressing his point of view on a great variety of other issues. Only today, the newspapers indicate that he is very much concerned about the increase in steel prices, and apparently he is going to assume some responsibility in that respect.

I do not want to get into the question of Vietnam, but certainly the President did not consult Congress with respect to escalating the war in that country.

He has not had any hesitancy in making recommendations to the Congress in support of Great Society legislation and other legislation.

I cannot understand why he is unwilling to assume the responsibility in this instance of advising us whether or not he desires emergency legislation. I think this is a serious strike. Because it is, I think the President should come forward to Congress and say that he needs legislation to take corrective action, if he believes that he does. He has failed to do that. He apparently has no intention to do it. We are advised that he is not requesting Congress to act, and also that he is not requesting Congress not to act.

I believe that if we support the substitute resolution, we are going to postpone any settlement for a long time. I am convinced that the House of Representatives will not accept any legislative proposal which does not require the President to say that an emergency exists if this strike is to be broken solely by congressional mandate.

I hope very much that the resolution approved and reported by the committee will be adopted, and that the substitute resolution will be defeated overwhelmingly.

I thank my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. On balance, the bill which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported, of which I am the floor manager, is about the best that we can do. Mr. President, I would like to make six points in that regard.

First, there has been a lot of irrelevant talk about legality. There is no constitutional issue involved here. If the committee measure is unconstitutional, then the Railway Labor Act has been unconstitutional since it was passed in 1926, and since discretion is granted to the President under the Morse amendment, it too is unconstitutional.

There is question about the power of Congress under the interstate commerce clause. That is irrelevant. Both the committee resolution and the Morse amendment utilize interstate commerce as a constitutional basis for action.

Both sides also admit that the public needs protection.

My second point is that the issue between the Morse amendment and the committee resolution is the extent to which Congress should act, and the extent to which Congress should delegate power to the President.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] pointed out that the President takes the responsibility for his measure, when he signs it. The proposal now before the Senate sponsored by the Senator from Oregon also gives the President discretion to appoint or not appoint an airlines board.

If the committee resolution is approved he is given greater discretion and there are those of us who support it because we think that it is wise to give him that discretion. Why do we think it is wise to give him that discretion? Because the situation is not clear. There are many Members of this body who do not think there should be any legislation because a national emergency has not been established while there are others who think we should act because there is sufficient emergency.

I believe the interruption of interstate commerce is sufficient to require Congress to act to give the President, who is in touch with the day-to-day operations, the authority to send the men back to work.

My third point is, that while we have the power in Congress to send these men back to work, it is not wise to exercise that power, which is really executive and not a legislative power.

My fourth point is that the Morse amendment is a bad precedent which puts the Senate in the executive business and takes us away from legislative business. It also puts us in the labor relations business to a much greater degree than is wise.

My fifth point is that the Secretary of Labor has apparently changed his mind. In his very forthright testimony given before the Labor Committee he stated he was strongly opposed to breaking the time up into three 60-day periods.

I would think he would be clearly opposed to slicing up the period in this case as well. The Secretary spoke strongly. I will not take the time to read what he said, other than to quote the following:

> There has been general discussion of the single 180-day period or three 60-day periods and I will be glad to answer in terms of that understanding.

Then, he continues:

> While I would not count that difference a basic or vital difference, I would have a very, very strong preference or judgment to express in terms of the single 180-day period for the following reasons:

He then gives his reasons. Now according to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who I have no doubt is accurately reporting what the Secretary said, he has changed his mind and is willing to have a divided period. I wish I had information as to what prompted this change.

In dealing with this change of position on the part of the administration spokesman, I find it unfortunate they cannot develop a firm position on what they want and do not communicate it to us.

My sixth point is the one made so ably by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. Every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House of Representatives who votes for the Morse amendment is going to be charged in his home State and district with being a strikebreaker. There is no way to get around it. The committee amendment under which the President is given discretion to act will help remove the onus from many fine men who will be seeking election.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

How much time do I have remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Four minutes remain to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

I agree completely with the points the Senator has made in summarizing the situation.

So far as the committee resolution is concerned, I intend to vote against the substitute and to vote for the committee resolution. I believe that it is the wise and proper thing for the legislative branch to do.

If I am left with no alternative, of course, I will vote for the substitute on final passage, in the event that it should be adopted—which I hope will not be the judgment of the Senate.

Again, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining to him. I believe that I have 3, and I will waive 1 minute of it——

Mr. CLARK. If I could interrupt the Senator, I understand that both of us have 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. All right. The understanding is that we will call for a live quorum. After the live quorum, the Senator will use his 3 minutes, I will use my 3 minutes, and then we will vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is with the understanding that the time will not be charged against either side.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the call of the quorum being suggested by myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the time not be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 171 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A quorum is present.

Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time. As between the committee resolution and the Morse amendment—the fourth Morse amendment—I support the committee resolution. I think it is wiser on the whole to vest in the President the authority to determine whether or not these men should be sent back to work after the Senate and the House of Representatives has found that there has been a sufficient interruption of interstate commerce to justify the extending of the terms of the Railway Labor Act.

There is no constitutional issue involved here. The question is whether each individual Senator wants to vote for any legislation. If a Senator does not want to vote for legislation, he will vote against the Morse substitute. He will then have an opportunity to vote for the moderate compromise resolution brought out by a majority of the committee, which calls for Congress exercising its responsibility to extend the Railway Labor Act and then for the President of the United States determining whether or not to use that tool—that authority—which has been given to him.

The Morse substitute, on the other hand, calls for Congress acting in what I think is essentially an executive capacity. In my judgment, such action is not advisable and, therefore, I prefer the other approach.

Finally, let me say to Members of the Senate, if they vote for the Morse substitute and take the position that, as Members of Congress, they are going to exercise what is fundamentally an executive responsibility, when the 100 Senators, and when the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, every one of whom is up for election, go back to their homes, they are going to be charged with being strikebreakers. That may be unjust; that may be unkind; but it is a fact of political life.

I think the Senate should vote for what a majority of the committee brought before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I announced a few minutes ago, when some Members of the Senate were not present, the Secretary of Labor talked to me within the hour and authorized me to make the following statement to the Senate in his public capacity as the administration's official witness in this case. He authorized me to make this statement——

Mr. LAUSCHE. To whom does the Senator refer?

Mr. MORSE. Secretary Wirtz.

He said the position of the administration continues to be that it neither asks Congress to pass legislation nor does it ask Congress not to pass legislation. If the Congress in its wisdom decides to pass legislation, I am authorized to inform the Senate that it prefers the Morse resolution, which is the bipartisan resolution pending.

Next, I am asking for a resolution that joins the Congress and the President in a partnership, if Congress continues to believe that the Railway Labor Act, which is the prevailing point in the pending resolution, should be used, in the public interest, because the strike must stop. It then has an orderly procedure, becoming effective when the President signs it. At that time the President and Congress become partners in making effective a law that, in the public interest, sends the men back to work.

Next, let me state that we are in the midst of a war. Senators know my position with respect to that war, but we are in it. The airline strike raises a great economic crisis in respect to the war. So that raises the second facet of the emergency question. We are in a national emergency in that there is a substantial interruption of air transportation in many sections of the country. The public is entitled to have that transportation, not only in its economic interest, but in other interests.

Another facet of the emergency is that if the strike is continued, this union, in the exercise of its naked economic power, will force its demand for a highly inflationary wage increase of 7 to 8 percent. The members of the union are getting under the proposed settlement, 4.4 percent. So the wage question is not in dispute. The union asked for $4.04. It received $4.08 on the key classification. Therefore, this resolution joins Congress with the President, when he signs it, as a partner by acting in the public interest to bring an end to the strike.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If he were voting, he would vote "yea." I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Bartlett
Boggs
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Douglas
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Bennett
Brewster
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Hayden
Hill
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Scott

So Mr. MORSE's amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, when the Labor and Public Welfare Committee began consideration of the airline strike last week, my initial position was in favor of congressional intervention. The strike has unquestionably disrupted and inconvenienced many people and a part of the business and commercial sector. It therefore appeared that special measures might be needed.

During the hearings, however, the Secretary of Labor twice testified that there is no national emergency. And twice he told the committee that the administration requests no legislation, and makes no recommendations for legislation.

In these circumstances, the committee adopted and reported the resolution in the form which is now before the Senate. A majority of the committee felt that some legislation might well be necessary, but they also felt, in view of the testimony of Secretary Wirtz, that any mandatory back-to-work order would be unwarranted. Therefore, they proposed to give the President full power to act at such time he finds that action is needed in the national interest.

Along with other Senators on the committee, I voiced doubts as to the need for any legislation at this time. Nevertheless, because Senator MORSE made it clear that he would bring a proposal to the floor regardless of what action the committee took, I voted to report the resolution.

It is now over a week since the committee began its consideration of the strike; it is over 3 weeks since the strike began. The Senate has been discussing it for 3 days. Yet we have still had no request from the administration for legislation. We have had no finding by the President, or by his economic advisers, that the strike is a danger to the economy—such as the statement made by Mr. Ackley just today relating to the steel price rise. There has been no indication from the Secretary of Defense that the national defense is in any way adversely affected. No major administration official—not one—has suggested that the Congress should enact legislation. Indeed, it has been indicated in today's debate that the President might not even sign such a bill if we were to pass it. I am, therefore, opposed to legislation at this time.

We have, of course, our own responsibility to examine the facts of this dispute. But the facts do not support congressional action now.

First, there is no national emergency, as that has been defined traditionally. Although some particular communities have been hit hard by the strike, transportation in the Nation as a whole has not been seriously affected. Airlines carry only 6 percent of intercity travel, and nearly 40 percent of the usual volume of airline flights are still in operation. Therefore, about 96 percent of all intercity travel has been unaffected; 99.9 percent of intercity freight is moving normally. And our Nation's defense efforts have not been impaired by the strike; men and materiel are moving without difficulty.

Second, this legislation would be unprecedented. Never before, in nearly 200 years, has Congress ordered striking men back to work. Only twice has Congress prevented men from striking—in 1916 and 1963. And the contrast between those cases and this is one demonstration why action now is inappropriate.

In 1963, for example, the President specifically requested legislation in a special message to the Congress. He said a work stoppage would seriously interfere with the national defense. The Council on Economic Advisers predicted that by the 30th day of the strike then threatened, 6 million nonrailroad workers would be laid off, in addition to 700,000 railroad employees; unemployment would have reached 15 percent nationally, the worst rate since 1940. None—not one—of those factors is present today.

Third, this legislation would be a far-reaching precedent for intervention by the Congress into dozens, perhaps hundreds, of major labor disputes: intervention on an emergency basis, in the midst of bargaining, without the sober and considered judgment of expert and experienced opinion in or out of the Congress.

In the last 30 years—in the last 5 years, or even just in the life of this Congress—there have been hundreds of labor disputes more serious in their effects than this one. There have been longshore strikes that cut off all ocean commerce from the east and gulf coast ports. There have been maritime strikes with similar effects on our foreign commerce and the balance of payments. There have been strikes in the aerospace industries which hampered our space programs. There have been public service strikes, such as the New York subway strike, which crippled millions of people in our greatest cities. And there have been strikes—some within the last 5 years—in which men have fought and engaged in armed violence and died.

In none of those cases did Congress even seriously consider the possibility of intervention.

I submit that those earlier judgments of the Congress not to intervene were completely sound and correct. Whatever the shortrun effects of congressional intervention in particular labor disputes, Congress knew that the longrun effect could only be injurious to a free economy and a free collective-bargaining system. We have stood firmly behind that principle in far more serious situations than the present. There is nothing—in the facts or in the position of the administration—which compels us to be the first Congress in the history of the United States to thus intervene in a labor dispute.

This is not to say that our present collective-bargaining system is perfect.

I favor new legislation to deal with strikes that affect the public interest. I believe our laws are inadequate to handle the problems which have emerged in this area in the last few years. Too frequently the public interest is not sufficiently taken into account as the parties bargain. This is an ingredient which cannot be overlooked, and I believe we should act expeditiously to assure more effective assertion of the public interest in labor disputes. I would urge that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee undertake to hold hearings at an early date on this problem and on the form which new legislation should take.

That is the proper approach to new emergency strike legislation—on mature consideration by all Members of Congress, with administration recommendations, and on a basis that deals with the entire range of problems.

But the problem does not end there. The airline problem is really just one example of the problems which confront our economy in this time of war and increasing inflation. In the labor area, the increasing complexity of our economic problems only means that there will be more disputes like this one, a fact which only emphasizes further the need for an overall examination. The questions are numerous. How are we, for example, to develop wage guidelines which help chart the direction of development in an expanding economy without unduly constricting the bargaining process in particular disputes? How are we to make sure that unforeseen cost of living increases do not make a mockery of our guidelines?

More broadly, with the increasing inflation and the increasing profits being generated by the war, should we now be considering a tax increase to help maintain economic stability? And, too, if we are going to pay for programs to deal with the problems of our cities, with poverty, with the plight of our elderly, and with a dozen other domestic problems, should we not begin considering a tax increase for that reason as well?

These are all complicated matters which must be examined seriously and in depth. They require—as this very labor dispute has shown—the most urgent attention of the executive branch and of the Congress and its various committees. This strike has revealed most serious problems—not only in our labor policy, but in the economy as a whole. We should not now ignore those broader problems by contenting ourselves with considering a single dispute. Rather this case should be an impetus to the administration and the Congress to face and deal with the true emergency—the pressing public problems of the day.

I repeat, however, that I do not believe the present situation justifies the truly extraordinary act of congressional intervention. I shall, therefore, oppose the legislation which is before the Senate today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I intend to support reluctantly the compromise measure we are now considering.

I use the word "reluctantly" because this is not the approach I would have preferred. It is not the forthright approach that would have required the Congress to fully assume the responsibility that is ours in this moment of crisis. It is not the approach that would have said unequivocally—beyond all shadow of a doubt—that we, the Congress of the United States, find emergency action to end this deadlocked dispute absolutely essential, and that we, the Congress of the United States, direct that such action be taken.

Instead, Congress is retreating. In the face of a politically dangerous and difficult task, we are seeking to transfer the burden of our clearly defined duty to the shoulders of the President. Like the small boy who breaks his neighbor's window with a baseball and then denies it, we are trying to say: "I didn't do it, he did."

Yet, Mr. President, I will vote for this compromise. I will vote for it because, with the passing of every day and every hour, tens of millions of Americans suffer more intensely painful inconvenience and economic dislocation as a result of the grounding of 60 percent of our domestic commercial air service. I will vote for it as the only politically practical solution to an impasse that is seriously threatening the welfare of the general public.

The time has passed when additional debate on the need for airline strike legislation could prove fruitful. The arguments on all sides have been stated and restated. They have been answered and then answered again. And, from it all, a factually simple case has emerged.

One year of negotiations between the International Association of Machinists and the five affected airlines failed to produce a mutually acceptable pact. The efforts of the National Mediation Board failed to produce such an agreement, as did the Emergency Board created by the President on April 21 of this year. The personal intervention of the Secretary of Labor, and finally, the President of the United States, could not bring about a settlement.

On July 8, a third party to this dispute, the general public, was dragged in unwillingly, when the failure to resolve the outstanding issues between union and management resulted in the present strike.

Mr. President, it is the interest of that forgotten and abused third party that we must now protect. It is the air traveler, the hotel desk clerk, the taxicab driver, none of whom are represented at the bargaining table, that we must here represent by acting to restore full air service to our Nation's cities.

I would hope, then, that even this compromise can be adopted so that interests of all Americans, unionists as well as farmers, might be served.

While the planes fly, the carriers and the IAM can continue their negotiations in an atmosphere free from the pressures that now make the chances for a pact acceptable to both sides extremely remote.

I am not presuming to side with one or the other of the contestants and say that the case of one has more merit than the case of the other.

Rather, I am urging that we allow these parties, the airlines and the union, to work out solutions to their problems in a manner that will do no further harm to the average citizen.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to first draw a parallel, and then, from that parallel, make a prediction.

On the 16th of May of this year, Great Britain's maritime unions went out on a strike that completely closed down that island nation's ports. The strike lasted 45 days while England's Labor government agonized over whether or not to take steps to end it.

On the 30th of June, the workers returned to their jobs. Statistical evidence compiled at that time suggested that the strike's effects were not really as devastating as had been expected. Most of Britain's exports, the mainstay of the British economy, had been shipped by air freight. A few small exporters suffered greatly, but an independent survey indicated that only 15 percent of British manufacturers interviewed felt they had suffered any long-term damage.

Yet, there is little doubt that England's maritime strike was the trigger for the harsh deflationary policies the Wilson government has been forced to adopt. It was the economic straw that broke the camel's back.

By failing to take firm action at the outset of the walkout to get the workers back on the docks, the British Government was later forced to the adoption of far more drastic and unpopular measures.

By failing to treat one diseased limb when it first became infected, England allowed the patient to become so ill that now even emergency surgery may not save the patient.

Mr. President, Congress has lessons to learn from this example. If we are too timid and too fearful to move decisively to end this airline strike now, we may later be faced with the necessity of enacting painfully stringent economic measures of wide scope.

Already, the indicators by which we judge the health of the national economy have given us cause for concern.

In the second quarter of 1966, the gross national product registered the smallest increase since the fall of 1964.

Second quarter retail sales for this year are off 2.6 percent from the preceding quarter.

Personal income gained less in the second quarter than in any quarter since the spring of 1963.

And, added on to these signs is the news that steel prices are again climbing.

These conditions, combined with the daily losses caused by the airline strike, could set off the downturn so many economists have been predicting.

Should that happen, Mr. President, I predict that Congress will be sitting long hours and wrangling with far more difficult issues than the one now before us. In an effort to restore a badly damaged economy to full health, we will be faced with much tougher decisions than the one we are now considering.

I would hope, then, that even this compromise can be adopted so that the interests of all Americans, unionist and managers, as well as farmers and housewives, might be served.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I remain inalterably opposed to dictated Federal compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes. Therefore, I am glad we were able to defeat overwhelmingly yesterday the compulsory abritration amendment.

I support the compromise resolution because it allows continuing free collective bargaining during the 30-day cooling-off period authorized by Congress. Both workers and management retain during this time their full rights and responsibilities to negotiate, and the public interest is recognized and served by a return to work.

I am hopeful the parties will reach settlement during this time. If not, it will be up to the President to authorize an extended cooling-off period under the discretion given him by the compromise bill.

It is incumbent on Congress to make the public interest clear and to provide for continued free bargaining during a restoration of service.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I shall vote against this resolution. Congressional intrusion into employer-employee relations in this drastic manner is not justified unless a national emergency is present. The President of the United States has not requested legislation. The Secretary of Labor and the Senate Labor Committee have stated to the contrary that no such emergency exists. This debate has developed no evidence of a national emergency, there has been no interruption in the movement of military supplies, 99 percent of all the freight in the Nation is moving and overall transportation has been affected less than 4 percent.

The affirmative case for this legislation rests on inconvenience to a portion of the traveling public who have been accustomed to using the airlines. Citizens are unhappy because of the failure of the parties to reach an accord. Frankly, I am too, but, inconvenience and unhappiness do not provide a basis for this extraordinary action or a reason for interference with free collective bargaining.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Chamber is in a state of confusion. There are aids on the floor who do not seem to have any work to do. I request that the aisles be cleared, and that persons having no business in the Chamber be ordered to withdraw.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Ohio will be honored. Senators and other persons in the Chamber will either take seats and be in order, or withdraw.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The vote was announced—yeas 54, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Allott
Anderson
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Burdick
Case
Cotton
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Bennett
Brewster
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Hayden
Hill
Miller
Moss
Scott

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) was passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 186

Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress does hereby find and declare that a labor dispute between Eastern Airlines, Incorporated, National Airlines, Incorporated, Northwest Airlines Incorporated, Trans World Airlines, Incorporated, and United Air Lines, Incorporated, and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, a labor organization, threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services; that such essential transportation services must be maintained; that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute, including a report and recommendations of the Emergency Board No. 166, a proffer of arbitration and mediation with the parties by the National Mediation Board; further, that the efforts of the National Mediation Board and the Secretary of Labor to settle this dispute have been unsuccessful; and that it is desirable to achieve a settlement of this dispute in a manner which serves the public interest and economic stabilization and which preserves the free collective bargaining method.

(b) The Congress therefore finds and declares that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers.

Sec. 2. For a period of thirty days effective from the date of enactment of this joint resolution the provisions of section 10, paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply and no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy, or affiliates of said parties, in the conditions out of which the dispute arose. During such period of time none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

Sec. 3. (a) Within the period of time specified in section 2, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in section 1 of this joint resolution, to appoint a Special Airline Dispute Board which shall thereafter engage in mediatory action directed to promoting agreement among the parties. The provisions of section 2 shall continue to apply during a period of sixty days following the appointment of the Board. At the expiration of said sixty-day period, the President is authorized, on the basis of the findings of Congress in section 1 of this joint resolution, and if the Special Airline Dispute Board provided for in this section finds that the provisions of said section 1 continue to exist and recommends to the President that the sixty-day period be extended, to extend the provisions of section 10, paragraph 3 of the Railway Labor Act for an additional 90 days upon issuance by the President of an Executive order so providing. During the period or periods of time referred to in this section, none of the parties to the dispute, or affiliates of said parties, shall engage in or continue any strike or lockout.

(b) Any agreement among the parties shall provide that the wage settlement provisions be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such service and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

Sec. 4. If an agreement has not been reached thirty days prior to the expiration of the final period of time provided in section 3, the Board shall make a final report with recommendations to the President which shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President, along with a full and complete report of the dispute and his recommendations regarding terms or procedures which will assist in the final settlement of this dispute in the public interest and without further interruption of the continuity of transportation services by these carriers.

Sec. 5. (a) Upon suit by any of the parties to the aforesaid dispute or by the Attorney General the several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain any violations of sections 2 and 3 of this joint resolution. Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under this section may be pending, that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not; and subpoenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(b) In granting an injunction or relief under this section, the jurisdiction of such court sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).

Sec. 6. If, prior to the settlement of the dispute referred to in section 1, a dispute between any other air carrier and its employees shall in the judgment of the President, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service after all procedures of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in a settlement of such dispute, the President is authorized to issue an Executive order reciting such findings; whereupon the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 shall become applicable to such dispute and to the parties thereto as though originally included in such provisions: *Provided,* That any such agreement referred to in section 3 shall provide that the wage settlement provision shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the prior collective bargaining agreement.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this joint resolution be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by January 15, 1967, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

Sec. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1390, H.R. 15119. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I urge all Senators to be present tomorrow morning so that we may proceed with the consideration of the bill as soon as possible after 10 o'clock. This is a most important bill. I am sure that all Senators have received a great deal of correspondence on it as I have.

It will be appreciated if Senators stay in town and attend to this matter of business, so that we may proceed with the bill tomorrow.

Mr. President, the Senate need not proceed further with the consideration of the bill tonight, unless the Senator from Louisiana wants to make an introductory statement.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would prefer to make the introductory statement tomorrow. I hope that we can vote on the big issue tomorrow, which is whether we will pass the Senate bill or the House bill. I hope that we reach a vote on this bill tomorrow.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana and I have discussed that subject. I also hope that we reach a vote on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, I ask the majority leader now whether he hopes we can complete action on the unemployment compensation bill tomorrow.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Well, I hope so, and I think the prospects are fairly good.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the concurrence of the minority leader, that all committees of the Senate be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 3, 1966, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since there was no period for the transaction of routine morning business today, that it be in order to lay before the Senate a Presidential message and communications, receive bills for introduction and refer them, and to print various routine matters in the RECORD.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **VICE PRESIDENT** announced that on today, August 4, 1966, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT ON STATUS OF PUERTO RICO (H. DOC. NO. 464)

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, U.S. Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated August 1966 which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **ANDERSON**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 11671. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1429).

By Mr. **CHURCH**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1684. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala. (Rept. No. 1432).

By Mr. **SYMINGTON**, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 1431); and

H.R. 15485. An act to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles (Rept. No. 1430).

By Mr. **MAGNUSON**, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1433).

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print individual views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in the report on H.R. 14921, filed earlier today by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. **McINTYRE.** Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 47 officers for promotion to the grade of temporary major general and 44 officers for promotion to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Army. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. John MacNair Wright, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Brig. Gen. Horace Greeley Davisson, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. **McINTYRE.** Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably the nominations of 142 officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy in the grade of lieutenant commander and below and the nominations of 600 officers for appointment in the Marine Corps in the grade of second lieutenant. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Peter J. Leniart, midshipman (Navad Academy), for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Donald L. Darnell (Navy enlisted scientific education program), for permanent assignment in the Navy);

Norvelle Curry, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers, for assignment in the Navy;

James R. Moore (U.S. Navy retired officer), to be a chief warrant officer in the Navy, for temporary service;

Lt. (junior grade) Lloyd A. Huck, U.S. Navy, for promotion in the Navy;

Chief Warrant Officer Charles W. Bickel, for promotion in the Navy;

Joseph L. Renzetti, for transfer and appointment in the Navy;

Rodney A. Arena, and sundry other meritorious noncommissioned officers, for appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

Michael L. Layson (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps), for appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

Richard J. Tipton (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps), for appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps; and

William E. Abbs, and sundry other staff noncommissioned officers, for appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York:

S. 3689. A bill to amend chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the grounds of insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **LONG** of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 3690. A bill for the relief of Albert Jelenic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **LAUSCHE**:

S. 3691. A bill for the relief of Viktor Detschmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **ANDERSON**:

S. 3692. A bill to transfer to the AEC complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi Section near Los Alamos County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax the interest on certain obligations of volunteer fire departments; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR COMMITMENT FOR TREATMENT OF PERSONS ACQUITTED IN FEDERAL COURTS ON THE GROUND OF INSANITY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the commitment for treatment of persons who are acquitted of crimes in the Federal courts on the ground of insanity.

The senseless tragedy at the University of Texas earlier this week has once more brought to the public's attention a serious gap in the law of many of our States and in Federal law as well. Psychiatrists have pointed out that Mr. Whitman would undoubtedly have been acquitted of this terrible crime because he was so clearly insane. Yet, in many States and in the Federal courts, too, acquittal on the ground of insanity not only fails to result in care and treatment for the acquitted person, but also can result in a potentially dangerous person going free.

The law in our States ought to insure that sick men like Whitman will be treated for their illnesses and that the public will be protected. The bill I introduce today would insure that this problem is met insofar as trials occur in the Federal courts. I believe it can serve as a model for new legislation at the State level as well.

Because this gap in the law exists at the Federal level, I have been working on this matter for some time. It was brought to my attention earlier this year, when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which covers New York, Connecticut, and Vermont, adopted a new and broader standards of criminal responsibility to apply in criminal trials in the Federal district courts located in those States, and thereby increased the potential number of acquittals on the grounds of insanity. Rejecting the M'Naghten rules, which have governed the determination of insanity in most Anglo-American courts for over a century, the court in the case of United States against Freeman adopted the American Law Institute's suggested definition, which was proposed in 1962 as section 4.01 of its Model Penal Code. Under the M'Naghten rules, a finding of insanity occurred only if the defendant was unable to distinguish right from wrong at the time of his act. Insanity acquittals were, understandably, relatively rare under this narrow test. As a result of the Freeman decision, the courts in the second circuit will now apply a broader and far more realistic yardstick—whether at the time of his act the defendant—

> As a result of mental disease or defect . . . lack[ed] substantial capacity either to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law.

The second circuit is not the first court to adopt a standard of criminal responsibility more enlightened than the M'Naghten rules. The erosion of the M'Naghten rules began in 1954 with Judge Bazelon's opinion for the District of Columbia circuit in Durham against United States. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 3d and 10th Circuits, as well as many State courts and legislatures—including New York, Connecticut, and Vermont—have since departed from M'Naghten, too.

All of these rulings reflects a judgment that those whose crimes occur because of mental illness should be treated for their illness rather than punished for their conduct. Based on the application of modern psychiatry to the law, these decisions reflect a retreat from the archaic practice of just imprisoning the mentally ill, which was the effect of the M'Naghten rules. But in the Federal area, this change has occurred without accompanying assurances to the acquitted defendant that he will receive the medical attention he needs, and to the public that it will be protected from unwise release of dangerous individuals. Federal law—apart from a special provision applicable in the District of Columbia—contains no provision for the commitment and treatment of those acquitted in the Federal courts on the ground of insanity. As a result, we have up to now relied on the States to step in and handle these federally acquitted defendants as they would persons acquitted on the same ground in their own courts. When the States have not done so, "not guilty on the ground of insanity" has turned out to be the same as "not guilty," and the defendant has gone free without receiving treatment for her illness.

The bill which I introduce today would remedy this situation by creating a procedure for commitment and treatment of those who are federally absolved of criminal responsibility for their actions. The major importance of this problem, in my judgment, is not a matter of numbers, although anyone acquitted could, of course, create danger to the public. But even in jurisdictions which have adopted more enlightened tests of criminal responsibility, the rate of acquittal on the ground of insanity runs only 2 to 3 percent of all criminal defendants each year. The basic point is that each of those acquitted on the ground of insanity may need care and treatment. It was for this reason that Judge Kaufman, speaking for the second circuit in the Freeman case, called on Congress to "explore its power to authorize commitment of those acquitted on grounds of insanity." My bill would authorize that commitment, and thereby provide the care and treatment that is the implied promise of an enlightened test of criminal responsibility. And in doing so it will provide a model code to guide any State which is considering action in this area.

Mr. President, this bill is based on three existing statutes:

First, the District of Columbia statute—enacted in response to the Durham case in 1955—which provides for the mandatory commitment of persons acquitted on the ground of insanity in the District (D.C. Code secs. 24–301 (d) and (e));

Second, the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act, enacted just last year to modernize the law governing the civil commitment of the mentally ill in the District (D.C. Code sec. 21–501 et seq.); and,

Third, the Federal statute (18 U.S.C. 4247 and 4248) which governs the disposition of persons who are insane or incompetent at the time they complete a Federal criminal sentence.

I shall explain the extent of my reliance upon and conscious divergence from each of these three statutes as I proceed to explain the provisions of my bill.

The bill would add a new section 4249 to title 18 of the United States Code.

Subsection (a) provides that any person acquitted on the grounds of insanity in the Federal courts is to be held thereafter for up to 60 days for a psychiatric examination and a hearing on commitment for care and treatment, unless the court determines that there is no basis for believing that he is mentally ill in a dangerous way. He is to be held in "a suitable hospital or other treatment facility designated by the court." The phrase "suitable hospital or treatment facility" is used throughout the bill. Besides implying a right to treatment, it is intended to suggest that a person acquitted on the ground of insanity is under no circumstances to be confined in a jail-like institution. He has been acquitted, absolved of criminal responsibility. From that point on, his contact with governmental authority is solely medical in nature—to determine whether he needs institutional care and treatment, and to afford him the care and treatment itself if it is decided that he should have it. The bill therefore contemplates that all confinement following acquittal is to be in "a suitable hospital or other treatment facility."

Subsection (a) also provides the procedure for the psychiatric examination. There are to be two qualified psychiatrists, and the acquitted person is to be informed that he may pick one of them. The language on the latter point is based on comparable provisions in the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act. The psychiatrists are to report their conclusions within 30 days after their appointment. The bill specifically directs that their findings and conclusions be accompanied by a full statement of their reasoning in support thereof. The court will need to know all the facts which the psychiatrists have considered relevant about the acquitted person and all the reasoning of the psychiatrists in arriving at their findings and conclusions—hence the bill's specificity on that point.

Subsection (b) governs the hearing which is to occur once the psychiatric reports are filed. In providing for a hearing, the bill is significantly different from District of Columbia Code section 24–301(d), which provides for the mandatory commitment of every person acquitted in the District of Columbia on the grounds of insanity.

Although the acquittal on the grounds of insanity is, in my judgment, a sufficient basis for holding the acquitted person for a psychiatric examination, there will be some instances in which commitment for any longer period is unwarranted insofar as the acquitted person is concerned and unneeded insofar as protection of the public is concerned.

The bill, therefore, does not provide for mandatory commitment, but rather makes commitment depend on a hearing as to the acquitted person's present mental condition. He was acquitted because of his mental condition at the time of the crime—or, more precisely, because the jury had a reasonable doubt concerning his mental condition at the time of the crime. His mental condition may have improved significantly by the time of acquittal. Or he may still be mentally ill, but not in a dangerous way.

The bill contemplates that the hearing will be held and the final decision ordinarily made within 30 days following receipt of the psychiatric reports. This is not an explicit requirement. However, since the bill provides that the acquitted person may be held for only 60 days, and since the psychiatrists have 30 days in which to report, it is the evident intention of the bill that the matter be concluded before the 60-day detention of the acquitted person ends, if that is at all possible.

Subsection (b) also requires that the acquitted person be represented by counsel at the hearing. This procedural safeguard is not contained in District of Columbia Code section 24–301(c). However, last year's District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act does contain this safeguard, and in my judgment, it is necessary to insure that only those who are no longer ill or do not endanger the public because of their illness will not be institutionalized.

The acquittal on the ground of insanity is the basis for the 60-day detention after acquittal. Beyond that, I do not believe the proceedings should really be much different from the usual civil commitment proceeding. The bill, therefore, contains the procedural safeguards which I have described, and provides further that the United States shall have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the acquitted person should be institutionalized.

The standard which governs the court's determination under subsection (b) is twofold. To be committed for treatment, the acquitted person must be both mentally ill and, because of his illness, must constitute a danger either to himself or others, or to the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. This standard is different from those set forth in each of the three statutes on which the bill is based, for a number of reasons.

First, both section 24–301 of the District of Columbia Cole and 18 United States Code 4247 talk in terms of "sanity" and "insanity." My bill talks in terms of mental illness. This is the operative term in the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act, and it is defined in the act to mean "a psychosis or other disease which substantially impairs the mental health of a person." I believe mental illness will be an easier and more realistic concept for courts, juries, and psychiatrists to deal with under this bill.

Second, the other part of the standard is a combination of section 24–301 of the District of Columbia Code and 18 United States Code 4247. The Federal Government has no generalized police power. Therefore, it probably has no power to hold someone whose release, because of a mental illness, "would constitute a danger to himself or others." The courts have held, however, that the United States does have the power to hold someone whose release, because of a mental illness, would "endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States."

Subsection (b) therefore contemplates that if the acquitted person's release is found to constitute a danger to himself or to others, but not to the safety to the officers, property or other interests of the United States, he will be turned over to State authorities. If his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States, he will be turned over to the Surgeon General of the United States, who will provide him with medical and psychiatric care and treatment in a suitable hospital or other treatment facility.

As a practical matter, it is unlikely that there will be many cases in which a person will be found to be dangerous to himself or others, but not to the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. In the leading case of Royal against United States, the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in 1960 held that a person would be dangerous to the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States if it was probable that he would violate laws which the United States has "primary responsibility for enforcing," or that he would interfere with the rights which the United States has a "direct duty to protect." In the 10th circuit's view, the only interests which are not among the "other interests of the United States" to which 18 United States Code 4247 applies are those which are "general and indirect"—"promotion of the general welfare, protection of the peace and quiet of the community, or the observance of local or State laws."

Theoretically, therefore, there will be instances in which an acquitted person may be dangerous to himself or to others while not being dangerous to the interests of the United States. However, it is evident from the Royal case that the interests of the United States which are protected under 18 United States Code. 4247 are quite broad. Hence, it should not be necessary too often to turn over to a State a person who should be committed for treatment.

The requirement in the last sentence of subsection (b) that a person confined under this bill "shall receive medical and psychiatric care and treatment" is based upon the language in section 21–562 of the District of Columbia Code, which is the part of the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act that expressly creates a right to care and treatment. This bill therefore contemplates that the adequacy of the treatment which a confined person is receiving will be relevant in later inquiries as to whether his commitment for treatment should be continued.

Subsection (c) provides that anyone committed to the custody of the Surgeon General under this bill will be released when he is no longer mentally ill, or when, even though he is still mentally ill, he is no longer mentally ill to the extent that his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. The release, under the bill, can be either unconditional or conditional—that is, under supervision—as the circumstances warrant.

Subsection (c) also provides for the unlikely possibility that a person would still be mentally ill and would be dangerous to himself or to others, but no longer dangerous to the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. In this unlikely event, subsection (c) directs that he be transferred to the custody of State authorities.

Subsection (d) provides that the superintendent of the hospital or other treatment facility where the acquitted person is confined may at any time certify to the court that the person should be either unconditionally released or conditionally released under supervision, or transferred to a State authority. The court can simply do as the superintendent of the treatment facility recommends or it can hold a hearing. If the United States objects, the court must hold a hearing. At any such hearing, the confined person has a right to counsel and a right to call a psychiatrist on his behalf. The United States is given the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the confined person's continued confinement is warranted.

Subsection (e) directs that the superintendent of the treatment facility file a report not less frequently than every 6 months about the confined person's mental condition. If the report amounts to one of the recommendations contemplated in subsection (d), the bill then provides that the provisions of subsection (d) will come into play. If the report is less than a recommendation for a conditional release or an unconditional release or transfer, subsection (e) provides that the court shall have the confined person's lawyer go interview him, or if he has no lawyer, shall appoint a lawyer to go interview him. Subsection (e) then provides for further action by the court based upon the advice it receives from counsel and upon its own examination of the superintendent's periodic report. Finally, subsection (e) provides that where the periodic report is submitted at a time when the acquitted person has been institutionalized for a period equivalent to the maximum sentence that he could have received, he will receive a hearing as a matter of right on the question of his continued confinement. And he is also entitled to a hearing as a matter of right on that question at least every 2 years, if one has not been held under the provisions of subsections (d) or (e).

Mr. President, this is a carefully drawn bill in an area where legislation is needed. It will protect the public and at the same time bring medical treatment to persons who need it. Its guarantees of procedural due process, both at the time of commitment and in connection with release proceedings, are not only fair in themselves, but will also assure that assertion of the insanity defense will not be improperly discouraged. We in Congress should be grateful to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals for creating an impetus to overdue reform in our procedures for handling the criminally insane. That court has joined those who have recognized that primitive sanctions are not the answer to mental illness. Now Congress must act to provide the commitment for care and treatment that is the answer in this type of case. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, so that other Senators may have the chance to examine it in full.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3689) to amend chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the grounds of insanity, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3689

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4249. Commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States on the ground of insanity

"(a) Whenever any person charged with an offense against the United States is acquitted solely on the ground that he was insane at the time of its commission, that fact shall be set forth by the jury in their verdict, and the trial court in which the proceedings which resulted in his acquittal were conducted shall order such person to be committed for a period of not to exceed sixty days to a suitable hospital or other treatment facility designated by the court for an examination to determine his mental condition; except that, if the court determines, on the basis of the record of the trial or other available evidence or data, that such person is not mentally ill to the extent that his release would constitute a danger to himself or others, or would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States, the court may order his immediate release. Upon such commitment, the court shall cause such person to be examined as to his mental condition by two qualified psychiatrists. Such psychiatrists shall be designated by the court, except that the person to be examined shall be informed that he has the right to select one of the two psychiatrists to be so designated. The participation of such a psychiatrist shall be at the expense of the allegedly mentally ill person, unless he is indigent, in which case the Surgeon General shall, upon the written request of such person, assist him in obtaining a qualified psychiatrist to participate in the examination in his behalf. The psychiatrists so designated shall, within thirty days after their designation, file their reports with the court setting forth their findings and supportive reasoning with respect to such examination, including their conclusions and supportive reasoning as to whether such person is mentally ill, and whether, because of such illness, his release would constitute a danger to himself or others, or would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. During the period of his commitment for an examination under this subsection, such person shall also, upon giving his written consent, receive medical and psychiatric care and treatment.

"(b) Upon receipt of the reports referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the court shall promptly schedule a hearing to determine whether the person with respect to whom such reports were filed is mentally ill, and whether, because of such illness, his release would constitute a danger to himself or others, or endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. The alleged mentally ill person shall be represented by counsel at that hearing, and if he fails or refuses to obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent him. The court shall cause a written notice of the time and place of the hearing to be served personally upon the person with respect to whom the report was made and his attorney. The court shall determine the person's mental condition on the basis of the reports of the psychiatrists, and on such further evidence in addition to the report as the court requires. At such hearing, the examining psychiatrists may be called as witnesses, and be available for further questioning by the court and cross examination by such person or on behalf of the Government. The court may, in its discretion, call any other witness for the acquitted person, except that the court shall call any witnesses requested by the parties. If, after the hearing, the court shall determine, on the basis of a preponderance of the evidence, that the person is mentally ill, and that, because of such illness, his release would constitute a danger to himself or to others, the court shall notify the proper authorities of the State (including the District of Columbia), territory, or possession where such person has his legal residence, or, if this cannot be ascertained, the proper authorities of the State, territory, or possession wherein he was charged with the offense for which he was acquitted, of the determination of the court, and shall cause such person to be delivered into the custody of the proper authorities thereof. If the court determines that the person is mentally ill, and that, because of such illness, his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States, the court shall commit the person so acquitted to the custody of the Surgeon General or his authorized representative, who shall confine such person in a suitable hospital or other treatment facility where he shall receive medical and psychiatric care and treatment; except that, if the court determines on the basis of the record of the trial or other available evidence or data that such person is in a condition to be conditionally released, the court may order his release under such conditions as it may require.

"(c) Whenever a person shall be committed to the custody of the Surgeon General or his representative for confinement by him pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, such person's commitment shall run until he is no longer mentally ill, or if mentally ill, is no longer mentally ill to the extent that his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States. In either of these events he shall be released, unless he is still mentally ill to the extent that his release would constitute a danger to himself or to others, in which case he shall be delivered into the custody of the proper authorities of the State (including the District of Columbia), territory, or possession where he has his legal residence, or, if this cannot be ascertained, of the State, territory, or possession wherein he was charged with the offense for which he was acquitted.

"(d) Where any person has been confined by the Surgeon General in a hospital or other treatment facility pursuant to subsection (b) of this section and the superintendent of any such hospital or the head of any such treatment facility certificates that, in his opinion, such person is no longer mentally ill to the extent that his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States and that the person is entitled to his unconditional release or transfer from such hospital or treatment facility in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c), and such certificate is filed with the clerk of the court in which the person was tried, and a copy thereof served on the United States Attorney, such certificate shall be sufficient to authorize the court to order the unconditional release or transfer of the person so confined at the expiration of fifteen days from the time such certificate was filed and served as above; but the court may, or upon objection of the United States shall, after due notice, hold a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of the person so confined may be submitted. Such person shall be represented by counsel at that hearing, and if he fails or refuses to obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent him. Such person may call a qualified psychiatrist to examine him and testify in his behalf at the hearing. The participation of such psychiatrist will be at the confined person's expense, unless he is indigent, in which case the Surgeon General shall, upon the written request of such person, assist him in obtaining a qualified psychiatrist to testify in his behalf. In any such hearing, the United States shall have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that such person's continued confinement is warranted. The court shall weigh the evidence and, if the court finds that the person is no longer mentally ill to the extent that his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States, the court shall order such person unconditionally released from further confinement or transferred in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). If the court does not so find, the court shall order the continued confinement of such person in the hospital or other treatment facility to which he was previously committed. Where, in the judgment of the superintendent of such hospital or the head of any such treatment facility, a person confined by the Surgeon General or his representative pursuant to subsection (b) of this section is not in such condition as to warrant his unconditional release or transfer, but is in a condition to be conditionally released under supervision, and such certificate is filed and served as hereinabove provided, such certificate shall be sufficient to authorize the court to order the release of such person under such conditions as the court shall see fit at the expiration of fifteen days from the time such certificate is filed and served pursuant to this section. The provisions as to hearing prior to unconditional release or transfer shall also apply to conditional releases, and, if, after a hearing and weighing the evidence, the court shall find that the condition of such person warrants his conditional release, the court shall order his release under such conditions as the court shall see fit, or, if the court does not so find, the court shall order the continued confinement of such person in the hospital or other facility to which he was previously committed.

"(e) The superintendent of any hospital or the head of any treatment facility in which any person is confined by the Surgeon General or his representative pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall, upon the expiration of 90 days following such commitment, and not less frequently than every six months thereafter during the confinement of any such person, submit to the court a written report with respect to the mental condition of such person, together with the recommendations of such superintendent or head concerning the continued confinement of such person. Upon the recipt thereof, the court shall examine it to see if it is substantially the same as a certificate under subsection (d), in which case such report and recommendations shall be deemed to be a certificate within the purview of subsection (d) and the provisions of that subsection shall be applicable. If it is not, the court shall order the confined person's counsel to interview him, or if the confined person no longer has counsel, shall appoint counsel to interview him. Counselor shall, on the basis of such interview, recommend to the court whether he believes such person's further confinement is warranted under the standard set forth in subsection (c). Based on counsel's recommendation and on its own examination of the periodic report and recommendation, the court may order (1) such person's unconditional release, conditional release, or transfer, (2) the continued confinement of such person in the hospital or other treatment facility to which he was previously committed, or (3) a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of the person so confined may be submitted. The court, upon objection of the United States to any such proposed order of release or transfer under clause (1) of this subsection, shall, after due notice, hold a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of the person so confined may be submitted. In any case in which the court intends to order the continued confinement of such person under clause (2) of this subsection, the court shall, at the request of such person and prior to entering such order, hold such a hearing if, at the time of the submission of the periodic report with respect to such person, his period of confinement pursuant to subsection (b) of this section has exceeded the maximum period to which he could have been sentenced upon conviction of the count or counts contained in the indictment charging him with the offense or offenses of which he was acquitted by reason of insanity. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in any case in which the court intends to enter an order continuing the confinement pursuant to clause (2) of a person with respect to whom a periodic report has been submitted, the court shall, at the request of such person and prior to entering such order, hold a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of such person may be submitted, if, for the two-year period immediately prior to the submission of such report, such person was confined for such period pursuant to subsection (b) and did not, during such period, have a hearing under this section with respect to his mental condition. Such person shall be represented by counsel at any such hearing and may call a qualified psychiatrist to examine him and testify in his behalf. The participation of such psychiatrist will be at the confined person's expense, unless he is indigent, in which case the Surgeon General shall, upon the written request of such person, assist him in obtaining a qualified psychiatrist to testify in his behalf. In any such hearing the United States shall have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that such person's continued confinement is warranted. The court shall weigh the evidence and, if the court finds that the person is no longer mentally ill to the extent that his release would endanger the safety of the officers, property, or other interests of the United States, the court shall order such persons unconditionally released from further confinement or transferred in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c) or conditionally released. If the court does not so find, the court shall order the continued confinement of such person in the hospital or other treatment facility to which he was previously committed.

"(f) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude a person committed under the authority of subsection (b) of this section from establishing his eligibility for release by a writ of habeas corpus. The Surgeon General or his authorized representative shall have authority at any time to transfer a person committed to his custody under this section to the proper authorities of the State (including the District of Columbia), territory, or possession of such person's residence.

"(g) Whenever counsel is appointed in accordance with the provisions of this section, he shall be awarded compensation by the court for his services in an amount which accords with section 3006A(d) of this title. The compensation shall be charged against the estate of the individual for whom the counsel was appointed, or, if such individual is indigent, against funds appropriated under section 3006A(h) of this title. Whenever a psychiatrist is obtained to participate in the examination of an indigent person in accordance with the provisions of this section, he shall be awarded compensation for his services in an amount which accords with section 3006A(e) of this title. Such compensation shall be charged against funds appropriated under section 3006(A)(h) of this title.

"(h) The provisions of this section, except to the extent otherwise specifically provided therein, shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia."

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"4249. Commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States on the ground of insanity."

STIMULATION OF FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 726

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the names of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 2191) to provide for the civil commitment of certain persons addicted to the use of narcotic drugs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3514) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health, the names of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELEASE OF HEARINGS IN CLOSED SESSION ON GENEVA TRADE NEGOTIATIONS HELD BY THE COMMITTEES ON SMALL BUSINESS AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on September 9, 1965, a joint session was convened by the Senate Committees on Small Business and Agriculture and Forestry to review U.S. offers to negotiate on agricultural commodities in the Kennedy round trade discussions at Geneva. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Senator Ellender, and I feel that it is now appropriate to release the record of these hearings. The volumes will be distributed through the regular channels of the two committees and subsequently will be available at both committee offices.

Articles appearing in the press indicate that certain agreements have been reached on farm issues by the nations of the European Economic Community. It was gratifying to note that the EEC nations had arrived at a "common agricultural policy" at Brussels last month.

Members of this body, and the American people as a whole, I believe, have consistently wished the nations of the Common Market well in their efforts to agree upon a common policy that will help all of their people.

It is a fair observation that officials in this country have restrained themselves from public debate as to the conduct of these discussions, and the specific policies decided upon. It should be clear, however, that members of this body and its cognizant committees are aware of the consequences of these arrangements as they are described in public reports, a sampling of which I shall ask to be included at the conclusion of my statement. Knowledgeable people have commented that certain countries stand to benefit from these EEC agricultural policies and others would be disadvantaged.

There should be no mistaking the fact that the Members of this body are conscious of their responsibilities as they relate to the possible adverse impact of the Geneva negotiations in agricultural and other commodities upon the United States.

We applaud the progress which has been made by the EEC nations in resolving their intramural differences so that international negotiations can now proceed. At Geneva, we expect hard bargaining. However, we also expect, and the people who elected us expect, that

American producers will be able to compete for the share of EEC markets to which their efficiency entitles them.

I feel that it is timely to advise our friends in Western Europe of our sincere feelings in these important matters.

It is pertinent to note, for instance, that the Committee for Economic Development pointed out in 1964 that nearly all Europeans would stand to suffer from political restrictions on trade in agricultural products in the following ways: Consumers would pay higher prices; internal resources would become committed to uneconomic uses; labor shortages would be intensified; and the higher prices of food would be reflected in increased costs of manufactured goods and services across their whole economy.

This observation is confirmed by the recent remarks of the secretary-general of the European Free Trade Association, Sir John Coulson, who has also pointed out in a recent copy of the EFTA Reporter that nations such as Denmark have experienced injury in the course of applying the new EEC agricultural policy.

Our September joint hearing produced graphic evidence of how the restrictive tariff and nontariff barriers of the EEC have already injured exporters of American agricultural products. It was also shown how our industry and balance of payments can suffer in the future by placing barriers in the way of our establishing a "historical share" of the rapidly developing European market in meat products. Those who read the hearings will find expressed a deep concern, as well as suggestions that action be taken along lines previously legislated by the Congress.

For the present, our committees are withholding their judgments on these issues. We hope that, by doing so, we may give the Geneva round of negotiations increased prospects of success. However, the patience of the Members of this body is not inexhaustible; just as the patience of the millions of businessmen, ranchers, and farm families whom we serve is not inexhaustible.

In the interim report of the Small Business Committee on livestock exports, filed with the Senate on October 22, 1965, the committee had this to say:

> The Kennedy round negotiations will provide unparalleled opportunities to strengthen the bonds of trade, friendship, and alliance.
>
> However, based upon existing and recently announced potential restrictions in beef and the curtailment of the trade in poultry which American exporters have experienced since 1962, a real and ugly possibility exists that political barriers may be used as a device for the exclusion of American (meat and livestock products) from the Common Market.
>
> Such political decisions would foreclose possibilities of expanding long-term U.S. export markets, regardless of the relative efficiency of our production, transportation, and efforts at market development.
>
> The responsibility for evaluating these possibilities falls upon the governments involved, for this is entirely a governmental matter.
>
> This committee takes a very serious view of these matters and is presently looking into them further.

As was recently pointed out by Mr. Fred Borch, the chief executive officer of the General Electric Co., in the spring issue of Forum magazine:

> The nations of Western Europe and North America have shared in the last 20 years a common progress, based largely on the expansion of international trade and for the future, we need to be partners in the fullest sense.

It is our hope that this partnership will develop and flourish out of a recognition of the mutual possibilities and political problems which elected officials in all our countries face. None of us wish to face the consequences of the nonrecognition of these problems and possibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the material to which I have referred be included in the RECORD at this point for the information and consideration of those who are concerned with this important matter.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1966]

COMMON MARKET MEMBERS AGREE TO POLICY OF INFLATIONARY, PROTECTIONIST FARM PRICES

BRUSSELS.—A protectionist and inflationary agricultural-price package was agreed upon by the Common Market.

It is a package which affects 10 million farmers and 180 million consumers in France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg. The net effect will be that these consumers ultimately will be paying more money for such farm products as meat, milk, cheese, rice, fruits and vegetables and related products.

Most Common Market sources say prices have been set at too high a level. Maurice Couve de Murville, French foreign minister, protested as the program took shape. But France went along with the package since the only way to achieve agreement seemed to be by setting high prices on the various commodities up for consideration in the unified farm policy.

In a marathon meeting which ended at 5 a.m. Sunday, the Common Market Council of Ministers finally solved many of the key pricing problems of the six-nation community's single farm policy.

That agreement paves the way for completion of the Common Market position for negotiating farm-trade liberalization under the Kennedy Round of tariff cuts, so called because authority for U.S. participation was concluded under the Kennedy Administration. The council is scheduled to meet again here tomorrow to complete its position in this round, which is being conducted in Geneva by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

But a review of the farm-commodity-prices level from which the Common Market will negotiate may not please American Government negotiators.

COMMON MARKET FARM TRADE

The U.S. has a sizable stake in Common Market farm trade, which has been rising steadily ever since formation of the European Economic Community. In 1965, U.S. exports of farm products to the Common Market amounted to $1.5 billion, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. EEC sources say the total is currently running at a $1.6 billion annual rate.

But, prices within the EEC are of vital importance to that U.S. farm trade. The Common Market, on most agricultural products, has a variable-levy import system. The duty assessed is the difference between lower world market prices and the higher EEC internal prices. The higher the EEC sets its internal prices, the higher the duty for American exporters to surmount. Moreover, the higher EEC prices go, the more will EEC farmers be stimulated to produce the products which American farmers might want to supply.

Thus on a product with a world market price of $1, an EEC price of $1.25 would result in a 25 cent duty on American or other imported products. And the high $1.25 price might stimulate many EEC farmers to produce more of that item than they would if faced by prices closer to the world level.

The marathon meeting of EEC's Council of Ministers debated the issue of prices through most of the sessions. The package finally agreed upon setting the following price levels within the community: Beef on the hoof, $662.50 a metric ton (2,200 pounds); milk, 9.5 cents a quart; sugar beets, $170 a metric ton; and soft wheat, $106.25 a metric ton, with a scale of prices on other grains geared to the soft wheat price.

A complicated crisis price system has been established for fruits and vegetables. Under this system, prices will be supported when they fall to the crisis level, with the support fund amounting to about $60 million a year. Estimates are that two-thirds of this fund will go to Italy, the biggest producer of fruits and vegetables in the Common Market.

Prior to the opening of the pricing debate, the EEC Executive Commission had submitted its suggested scale of prices on commodities. In its report the commission said: "Prices at farm will increase in every country except Italy and West Germany under this proposal."

After the meeting, one EEC source said: "The agreed price list was higher in every case than the schedules suggested by the commission. So you can draw your own conclusions about their inflationary effects."

INFLATION FEARED

One official of the Dutch delegation said: "We are having an inflationary spiral in the Netherlands now. The new milk price will only add to that inflation." The Netherlands is a leading milk producer on the Continent. While Dutch farmers may appreciate the high prices for their products, Dutch consumers certainly won't. Some sources fear that demands for higher wages may mount, once trade union members begin to feel the effects of the higher farm prices, not only in the Netherlands but throughout the Six.

The Council of Ministers also set production quotas for sugar totaling 6,480,000 metric tons annually of refined sugar. The total included 1,750,000 tons for West Germany, 2,400,000 tons for France, 1,230,000 tons for Italy, 550,000 tons for the Netherlands and 550,000 tons for Belgium-Luxemburg.

The high quotas, plus a price level that is considered extremely generous, probably mean that the Common Market will become a surplus sugar producer, sources here concede. Expectations are that the beef price also will encourage farmers in the group to expand cattle output.

Yesterday's agreement means that the Six have established a farm-marketing system with price schedules for 86 percent of Common Market farm production. These cover grain, pork, poultry, eggs, beef and veal, rice, sugar, and fruits and vegetables. Prices for fats and oils are to be established this fall. No policy has been established yet for wines and tobacco, so these products remain outside Common Market regulation.

Kennedy-Round negotiators have been waiting for months for the Common Market to organize its agricultural markets. Until the EEC had set its prices for sugar or beef, for instance, it couldn't negotiate any tariff reductions on these items. The new agreements will allow the Common Market to develop a Kennedy-Round position in agriculture.

Earlier, the Executive Commission estimated that the Common Market's system of levies plus farm payments by individual nations will result in creation of a fund amounting to about $1.6 billion annually. "Since ministers were so generous in establishing the price levels on various commodities, it appears that the estimate of the fund's size may be very conservative," one commission spokesman said.

A total of $285 million annually of that fund is to go to modernize agriculture in the Common Market.

The remainder will go to subsidize exports through payments of the higher domestic prices to EEC farmers when products must be exported at lower world market prices. In contributions to the fund the following percentages will apply: Italy, 20.3 percent; France, 32 percent; West Germany, 31.2 percent; the Netherlands, 8.2 percent; Belgium, 8.1 percent and Luxemburg, 0.2 percent.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 12, 1966]

Common Market Agrees on Farm Financing and an End to Internal Industrial Tariffs

Brussels.—Common Market foreign ministers, after a year of haggling that was marked by a seven-month French boycott, have finally come to terms on agricultural financing and internal tariffs on industrial goods.

The representatives of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg agreed to establish a $1.6 billion fund for switching farm control by mid-1968 from national governments to the European Economic Community, or EEC, as the Common Market is formally known.

The ministers further agreed that all tariffs on industrial goods moving within the six-nation trading bloc will be eliminated by July 1, 1968. That would be a year later than had been anticipated, but still 18 months ahead of the goal laid down in 1957 by the Treaty of Rome.

Internal tariffs within the EEC currently stand at 20% of their original levels at the time the Common Market was created by that Rome accord nine years ago. Of the remainder, five percentage points will come off July 1, 1967, and the rest a year later.

The ministers also agreed to erect a common tariff wall against goods from outside the EEC by that July 1, 1968 deadline.

OUTSIDERS LOOKING IN

For traders outside the Common Market, including the U.S., the multipronged agreement will likely mean some major changes in trade patterns. The latest accords will push EEC members to rely more heavily on their partners for the goods they need, to the possible exclusion of exporters from nonmember lands. Especially hurt may be the U.S. current $1.2 billion of annual farm-product sales to the Common Market.

The elusive agreement took some 13 months to tie down. When an agreement on farm financing wasn't reached by last June 30—despite persistent proding by French President de Gaulle—France huffed out of Common Market meetings and refused to participate in many EEC affairs.

At one point in the deadlock, some observers were predicting that the crisis would pull the Common Market apart. Early this year, however, the partners managed a compromise that got them talking again.

Under the agreement finally worked out, the EEC's nine-man executive commission will gradually take control of the community's farm policies over the next two-year period.

The commission will have at its disposal an EEC fund of about $1.6 billion. Half of the money will come from Common Market levies on food imported from nonmember countries, and the rest will come directly from the treasuries of the member governments. France will put up 32 percent of the total national contributions, West Germany 31.2 percent, Italy 20.3 percent, the Netherlands 8.2 percent, Belgium 8.1 percent and Luxemburg 0.2 percent.

The fund will be expended for two main ends. Part of it will go to support EEC farm-product exports to nonmember lands, while the rest will be spent on modernizing farming within the community.

France will get about 40 percent of the export funds to make its cereal grains and other products competitive in world markets. Holland will get help for its dairy products, Italy for its fruits and vegetables and Belgium for beet sugar.

As part of the community-wide farm control, the EEC will start imposing uniform marketing and quality standards for olive oil starting this November, for fruits and vegetables starting November 1967, for grains, pork, fats and oils in July 1967, for rice in September 1967, for dairy produce and beef in April 1968 and for sugar in July 1968.

FRANCE SEEN AS CHIEF GAINER

The marketing programs will establish community-wide prices for each farm commodity, but these prices, except for grains, have still to be set and could be a continuing source of friction within the EEC. France, with its highly productive farm community, wants low prices; the less efficient, highly subsidized West German farmers would prefer high price supports.

To French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, the farm agreement represents a "satisfactory solution for all." To others, however, France is clearly the chief beneficiary. And France, itself, would argue that this was just, as West Germany was the principal gainer when France dismantled her industrial tariffs and permitted German sales to soar on French soil.

West Germany, even while agreeing to the new farm and internal-tariff regulations, made it clear the package still could be pulled back if certain conditions aren't met.

West Germany, for one, is insistent that France and the other partners get down to work on a Common Market stance for the world tariff-cutting negotiations being sponsored by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The U.S. went into these talks calling for a 50 percent cut in tariffs.

West Germany, too, may take another look at the package in June or July, after ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization members meet on the crisis that French plans to withdraw from the defense group have caused.

EEC Council Achieves Major Breakthrough—Decisions Taken on Farm Financing and Customs Union

The EEC Council of Ministers reached the most important Community agreement in the past two years when at 5 a.m. on May 11 it decided on the financial regulation for the common agricultural policy and set a firm date for full establishment of the customs union.

The Council marathon followed a tradition for making some of the most important decisions in the development of the EEC. The first steps toward the May 11 decisions were taken on March 31, 1965, when the Commission presented its farm financing proposals to the Council. But talks were interrupted for seven months, from July, 1965 to February, 1966, by a crisis resulting from French absence from the Council.

The decisons taken after Council meetings on May 4–5 and 9–11 will permit the Council to devote its full attention to the Kennedy Round trade negotiations in Geneva and to the remaining aspects of the common farm policy. The German and Dutch delegations made it clear that the May 11 decisions were conditional on early progress in Geneva as well as on a common approach to commercial credit policy toward Communist countries.

INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMS UNION TARGET DATE: JULY 1, 1968

The Council set the date for the complete free movement of industrial products within the Community on July 1, 1968, one and a half years ahead of the schedule foreseen in the Treaty of Rome. The common external tariff will also be fully applied from that date.

In the industrial sector, tariffs among the member states are 80 per cent below their original January 1, 1957 level; the latest 10 per cent reduction was on January 1, 1966. The Council decided that an additional five per cent cut will be made on July 1, 1967, and the remaining 15 per cent will be eliminated a year later.

National tariffs on industrial goods from non-member countries are being adjusted to the common external tariff level, a process which is already 60 per cent completed. The final move will take place on July 1, 1968.

COMPLETION OF AGRICULTURAL POLICY

The Council is to decide by July 1, 1966 on remaining regulations and common prices necessary for achieving the agricultural customs union. It also set a timetable for applying those decisions (see box).

The six Community countries already apply a common policy to agricultural products amounting to 85 per cent of their total output. EEC market organizations which have been in force since mid-1962 cover wheat and feed grains, pork, eggs and poultry, fruit and vegetables and wine. Since autumn 1964, rice, beef and veal, and dairy products have been under a Community policy, and other market organizations will be established according to the Council timetable.

COMMON PRICES TO BE SET

Commensurate with setting up market organizations to buy up surpluses, to grant export subsidies for selling them on the world market, and to protect Community farmers against outside competition, EEC farm policy calls for establishment of common prices throughout the Community.

Until these common prices come into effect, member countries apply different prices with preferences for Community products over imports from non-members. Common prices for grains were determined by the Council in December 1964 and will be applied on July 1, 1967. Other common prices will be applied as foreseen in the Council timetable.

The Commission will also make proposals by the end of 1966 for the market organization for tobacco, including changes in state monopolies and the removel of tax discrimination. Successful completion of work on these measures would lead to application of the market organization on July 1, 1968. Proposals will also be made for ordinary wines by March 1, 1967, and the market organization would go into effect no later than October 31, 1969.

AGRICULTURAL FINANCING DETERMINED

The European Agriculural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) was created in July, 1962 to finance the various measures of the common agricultural policy including market interventions, export rebates, and farm improvements. The provisions concerning the Fund's operations, which were decided by the Council in January 1962, expired on June 30, 1965.

The new regulation passed by the Council on May 11 applies to the time from June 30, 1965 to the end of the EEC's transition period on December 31, 1969. However, separate provisions governing the Fund have been decided for two periods, one going from June 30, 1965 to June 30, 1967, and the other from July 1, 1967 to December 31, 1969. (The Fund makes payments retroactively and can therefore reimburse for expenditures in a previous year.)

Full Community responsibility for financing farm policy expenditures will begin on July 1, 1967 where a market organization exists for a product and will, for other products, begin on the same date that later market organizations come into force.

EAGGF OPERATIONS IN 1965–67

In 1964–65, the EAGGF reimbursed half of eligible agricultural policy expenditures, member states' governments directly paying the other half themselves. For the period from 1965 to 1967, two alternatives were left open by the Council for the gradual assumption of full Community responsibility for agricultural financing.

Under the first alternative, four-sixths of all farm policy spending would come from the Fund in 1965–66 and five-sixths in 1966–67. This progression depends on a number of decisions on market organizations and common prices being adopted by the Council before July 1 of this year. If this deadline is not met, the progression will be six-tenths and seven-tenths for the two seasons, with the move to full financing still to take place on July 1, 1967 for products subject to a common market organization.

TIMETABLE FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The EEC Council on May 11 accepted the following timetable for the entry into force of remaining elements of the common agricultural policy:

November 1, 1966: Common market organization and common price for olive oil.

January 1, 1967: Completion of market organization for fruits and vegetables and application of quality standards for fruits and vegetables sold within the producing country.

July 1, 1967: Common prices for grains. Free movement of poultry, pork, and eggs. Common market organization for sugar, fats and oils. Common price for oil seeds. Application of basic criteria of policy on state aids to agriculture.

September 1, 1967: Common price for rice.

April 1, 1968: Common prices for milk, dairy products, beef and veal.

July 1, 1968 (at the latest): Common price for sugar.

For the two seasons, 1965–66 and 1966–67, the Fund's resources will come from member states' contributions according to the following key:

[In percent]

	1965–66	1966–67
Belgium	7.95	7.95
France	32.58	29.26
Germany	31.67	30.83
Italy	18.00	22.00
Luxembourg	.22	.22
The Netherlands	9.58	9.74

FINANCING FROM 1967–69

From July 1, 1967 to the end of the transition period, the EAGGF will obtain its resources in two ways, variable levies on agricultural imports and contributions of the member states. Ninety per cent of levies on agricultural imports will go to the Fund, covering about 45 per cent of its expenditure. The rest of the cost will be shared by member states according to the following scale:

	Percent
Belgium	8.1
France	32.0
Germany	31.2
Italy	20.3
Luxembourg	.2
The Netherlands	8.2

The expenditures of the Fund will continue to cover eligible market interventions and export rebates as well as structural modernization programs. It was earlier determined that the expenditure on these modernization programs would equal one-third of total expenditures on market interventions and export rebates. The Council, however, decided to change the method of calculating export rebates, figuring the subsidies on the basis of gross exports rather than net exports (exports minus imports) as originally planned.

The possibly higher amounts which would have to be spent on modernization programs to retain the one-third ratio led the Council to place a ceiling on this part of the Fund's expenditures. The ceiling was set at $285 million a year with the provision that the Fund, under certain circumstances, may cover 45 per cent of the total cost of each modernization project instead of the earlier limit of 25 per cent.

FUND TO RECEIVE ALL LEVIES AFTER 1969

After the end of the transition period on December 31, 1969, the EAGGF is to cover all agricultural expenditures, and all levies on agricultural imports are to go to the Fund. The Council agreed to take the necessary steps to assure this development on schedule. Five delegations went on record as calling for examination of increased powers for the European Parliament at the same time as these steps are taken.

The Council decided on certain lump sum payments to compensate for the failure to establish some market organizations as agreed earlier. Italy will receive $45 million for structural improvements in the fruits and vegetables and olive oil sectors for 1965–66 and $15 million for the tobacco sector for 1967–68. Belguim will receive up to $4 million a year for the marketing of sugar during three seasons beginning with 1965–66.

DIVERSION OF CUSTOMS RECEIPTS

The Council also discussed the redistribution of customs duties receipts after the industrial customs union goes into effect on July 1, 1968. There will be no duties between member states, and the common external tariff will be in effect after that date. A problem will arise when the port of entry of imported goods is not in the same country for which the goods are destined—thus a diversion of customs receipts could occur. The Council agreed that a decision on redistribution of customs duties would be needed if diversion occurred in spite of preventive administrative procedures it adopted.

The Soviet zone of occupation in Germany was declared not to be a "third country" according to the agricultural financing regulation; therefore agricultural exports to it are not eligible for Community rebates.

A resolution was also agreed upon by the Council on the balanced development of the Community, calling for early action on proposals for tax harmonization, commercial policy, social policy, regional policy, and European companies law, and a European patents law.

A NOTE ON EEC AGRICULTURAL POLICY

The Treaty of Rome prescribes that the Common Market will extend to agricultural products. On January 14, 1962, the Council of Ministers took the first major decisions concerning a common agricultural policy for the Community which went into effect on July 1, 1962. It was decided that the seperate national agricultural policies would be replaced by a single EEC policy including common financing, common responsibility, and a Community-wide market without national barriers or restrictions.

The objectives of the EEC agricultural policy, as set out in the Rome Treaty, are:

1. To increase agricultural productivity.
2. To ensure a fair standard of living for farmers.
3. To stabilize markets.
4. To guarantee regular supplies.
5. To ensure reasonable prices to consumers.

Within the common agricultural policy there are various provisions for each product; however, market organizations have been set up for the major products. A market organization is the system by which the Community carries out the necessary operations for buying surpluses to maintain prices, for granting export rebates, and for providing protection against low-cost imports.

The common agricultural policy also establishes common price levels throughout the Community, assuring free movement of goods. For many products, these levels are used to guarantee farmers a fair return from sales of their goods. Common prices are also the basis for calculating the amount of import protection given farmers by a system of variable levies which have replaced national tariffs.

[From the EFTA Reporter, June 6, 1966]

AGRICULTURE IMPORTANT TO KENNEDY ROUND

(NOTE.—The agricultural objectives of the European Free Trade Association were stressed by Sir John Coulson, EFTA's Secretary-General, in a speech to the Federation of Agricultural Journalists, at The Hague on May 19, 1966. His general statement on EFTA's agriculture will be found on pages 3 and 4, and on pages 5 and 6, his special references to the agricultural policies of Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and Denmark. Below we give Sir John Coulson's observations on the effect on the Kennedy Round of recent developments in the Common Market.)

Protectionist policies in certain European countries have been constructed—and are still being reinforced—during the years in which the Kennedy Round negotiations should have been forging ahead. The great objective of these negotiations was to reduce the tariffs by the main trading countries of the world by 50% across the board, with a bare minimum of exceptions. The idea was welcomed by all the industrialized countries, including all the members of EFTA and of the EEC, as a really bold attempt to free the channels of world trade and to spread in a global fashion the benefits which both the Six and the Seven had experienced inside their own groupings from the reductions they had made in trade barriers. The same countries also unanimously accepted that balance and reciprocity could only be achieved in the Kennedy Round if those countries with important exports of agricultural goods also received trade advantages in the agricultural sector. To some extent therefore, results in terms of industrial tariffs are dependent on results in the agricultural sector.

The picture of what has happened since then is disappointingly short of these great objectives. I shall not speak here of the industrial side of the Kennedy Round negotiations, although that has not been nearly as rapid or effective as it might have been. But the record on the agricultural side has been very poor. The long struggle to implement the common agricultural policy in the EEC fortunately took a long step forward recently, but in the meantime the absence of decision has meant that the agricultural sector of the Kennedy Round has hardly even begun. This is a serious situation, three years after the beginning of negotiations and only one year away from the expiration of the United States legislation which gives the President power to take part in the Kennedy Round.

To make things even more serious, one cannot help fearing that the need for unanimity among the Six tends to mean accepting the pace of the slowest, setting prices for agricultural products in the Community which can be profitable to the less efficient producers. Through the operation of the levy system, these prices must also be paid by consumers in the Six even for the products imported at much lower prices from outside the Community. This means that encouragement is now being given to farmers in the EEC to produce more and more food at a cost far above the world market price.

Surely what is needed for a sensible organization of the agricultural sector everywhere in Western Europe is to set production limits within which these higher prices would apply, and not to leave prices as the only regulator. As things are, it looks as if any agricultural results of the Kennedy Round will be meager; the low cost producers outside the EEC will find themselves increasingly shut out of traditional markets in favor of high cost domestic production.

You must forgive me if I find this situation difficult to understand. After all, the same economic facts are operating in the Six as in other countries. To set agricultural prices so high that they are still profitable to farmers of low productivity means channeling into the agricultural sector large resources which are badly needed to finance general economic growth. In these circumstances it is interesting to note the increasing disquiet being expressed in the more fertile countries of the EEC at the prospect of financing and disposing of the large surpluses which will be stimulated by the present price policies. Clearly it is reasonable to expect interesting developments to arise as this situation continues.

It is not, of course, my intention to claim that some EFTA countries have a monopoly of wisdom in regard to agricultural policies and that all other countries fall short of our standards. That would be a caricature of the situation. But I do believe that the search for solutions which is going on in EFTA is a healthy development. To this I would add one further thought. Agriculture is not only a serious stumbling block in the context of the Kennedy Round. It is probably also, in present circumstances, the *main economic obstacle to a wider European market solution, which would be of great benefit to all the people of Western Europe.*

So, for all these reasons and others which I have not mentioned, we cannot escape from the fact that agriculture in Western Europe must be supported by Governments and by international action, at least in the foreseeable future.

To say that, however, is merely to describe the problem, not to solve it. The difficulty still remains in deciding how much support should be given, what share can be allocated to agriculture of the total national income. If, for example, we pitch our support or our prices so high as to make production profitable even for the marginal farmers, we encourage the production of large surpluses in the more fertile areas and these may seriously unbalance the entire economic structure, national and international. In addition, there are the difficult technical problems of how the support shall be contrived so as to achieve the best possible results on the national plane and on international trade.

UNIQUE DANISH SITUATION

In the case of Denmark, this country still competes effectively in the export field with low-cost overseas producers of temperate zone agricultural products. For this reason, most of the world thinks of Denmark as a predominantly agricultural country, but the appearances belie the reality. Although Danish agricultural exports are 40% of her total exports, agricultural production is only 13% of the Danish national product. In fact, Denmark in the years since the War has been experiencing a rapid industrial revolution, and her industrial exports already exceed her exports of food.

In Denmark, therefore, we have a situation unique in Europe, whereby the agricultural sector, although small in relation to the national economy, is a major exporter, operating on the basis of efficiency and not of government protection. The effort has come from the farmers themselves and such moves as the Government has made in recent years to provide support for agriculture have been forced on Denmark by the high protection policies increasingly being followed in her main export markets.

It must be admitted that the domestic price guarantees now in force in Denmark may in time come to undermine the present competitiveness of Danish farmers. However, Danish agriculture still continues to hold its own in terms of competitive power. In the last fifteen years more than half of the labor force has left the farms to enter Denmark's new industries, but the growth of agricultural productivity has fully kept pace with this loss. There are now many more large farms which can be cultivated economically by modern means, and the farmers continue to concentrate on livestock products to the extent of 80% of production. It is worth noting that the proportion exported in several lines is also 80%.

But the Danes have also brought to their agricultural exports the same ability to please the customer as is so well displayed by other Danish exporters, notably of furniture and other household goods. The Danish farmers long ago made cooperative arrangements whereby the foodstuffs they sell abroad are of uniformly high quality, year in, year out, and are attractively packaged and presented to their export customers. This, in fact, has been the solid basis for their export achievement. The Danes also use cooperation in every other step of agricultural production, from the buying of seed to the marketing of the product. It is also interesting to note that the agricultural labor force is probably the most highly educated in Europe.

The main threat to the livelihood of the Danish farmer is, of course, the action by the governments of most othern Western European countries in refusing—some in the name of European integration—to allow their peoples to buy Danish produce at relatively low prices and forcing their consumers instead to pay much more for their food than is really necessary.

Nor is this the only consequence for Denmark. High support prices for agricultural products in other European countries inevitably mean much greater production, with the temptation to create new international systems to finance the dumping abroad of the surpluses. Denmark has suffered increasingly from this kind of thing in recent years. She has not only lost important markets in the EEC because of the high levels of production of the common agricultural policy, but she has also been faced with the fact that subsidized exports from the Six have damaged Danish markets inside EFTA itself.

COMMON CAUSE IN WORLD ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Fred J. Borch, president and chief executive, General Electric Co.)

(NOTE. Mr. Borch is the fifth Chief Executive Officer in General Electric's 74-year history. In his 35 years with the Company, he has served as Vice President and Group Executive for the Consumer Products Group, Vice President for Marketing Services, and once worked as an auditor for $78 per month early in his career. A member of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development and a member of the Business Council, Mr. Borch is also a member of the Commerce Department's Balance of Payments Advisory Committee. He is also on the Board of Governors of Western Reserve University.)

The nations of Western Europe and North America, says General Electric's Chief Executive, have shared in the last 20 years a common progress, based largely on the expansion of international trade. For the future, he stresses the need to be "partners in the fullest sense: in investment, in technology, in research and development."

By most economic measurements, the past 20 years have been years of remarkable progress for the people of North America and Western Europe.

The combined output of goods and services, in total gross national products in the Free World, reached more than $1.5 trillion in 1965. Since 1960, per capita income in the U.S. and Industrial Europe has increased by more than 15 per cent. Unemployment rates have now dropped to less than 4 per cent in the U.S., and are even lower in the other North Atlantic nations.

Translating these economic indicators into real benefits: More people are living better; they have more money to spend on a growing range of products and services, and more leisure time in which to enjoy these things.

In response to the common needs of people and nations, we have witnessed the emergence of common markets; common agreements and provisions for defense; organizations for economic cooperation and development; and cooperation in meeting the growing capital needs of the nations of the Free World—with development of such institutions as the World Bank.

These tremendous, forward-looking moves have been accompanied by steadily expanding world trade—from $95 billion in 1958 to $148 billion in 1964—with strongly rising investment, productivity, and consumption in Western Europe, Canada, and the U.S.

All of our recent experience and the lessons of history demonstrate that international trade on the broadest possible basis, with the fewest possible restrictions, is one of the greatest contributors to the progress of nations. For people who trade with one another, who have contracts with each other that are honored, who couple their technologies and provide a basis for international investment—these people are forging working alliances and relationships built not upon the fear of a common enemy but rather on the sharing of a common objective: Economic growth built upon a mutuality of purpose, a partnership in operation, a partnership in progress.

But often the lessons of history go largely ignored, even by the advanced nations who have profited most by this partnership in progress. There is still an almost ineradicable tendency to think of economic growth as being exclusively a national matter—or for that matter, to think of economics exclusive of politics.

Thus, after several years in which the trend has been mostly in the right direction, we see worldwide a slowing—if not yet a reversal—in the movement toward international cooperation which has carried the Free World through many perils since World War II, and which has resulted in so much economic and social progress. We are beginning to see, instead, a multitude of the type of inward-looking restraints and restrictions that were more characteristic of the 1930's than appropriate to the needs of the 1960's.

AN ESCALATION OF PROTECTIONISM?

Businessmen on both sides of the Atlantic and all over the world cannot fail to be greatly concerned about today's mushrooming restrictions on international trade and investment. These restraints speak the language of heightened national self-absorption. And once set in motion, they will be difficult to turn back, leading to an escalation of protectionism.

We must assume that this disturbing trend has not been created intentionally. Rather, it reflects an accumulation of actions and reactions taken by nations in response to: (1) the pressures of internal demand and the dangers of inflation; (2) stubbornly continuing trade imbalances; and (3) necessity of preserving the integrity of their currency, as well as that of the British pound and the U.S. dollar, as the media of international exchange.

The very rapidity of our economic advance is a primary source of many of the strains and pressures we are experiencing. In any long-term expansion, such as that of Western Europe, Canada, and the U.S. during the past several years, the dangers of "overheating" of the economy on the one hand, and of overreacting in controlling and restraining it on the other are omnipresent.

These forces are at work today, not intended deliberately to interfere with the expansion of international trade and investment, but in order to protect nationalistic interests. It is the political-economic judgment of the countries involved, soberly made, that their national interests and national security are best served by each of these individual actions—and who is to say they are wrong?

But the fact is that if you add them all up, the end result is lesser world productivity and a poorer world civilization—not good long-term for the industrialized nations, not good for the developing nations, not good for world progress and peace.

CONTINUING BUSINESS DIALOG NEEDED

If the causes are obvious, the cures—at least in broad outline—are likewise simple, though terribly difficult to achieve in detail, of course. They lie in *continued frank discussion* by businessmen with each other, and with their governments, on points of economic friction; and in *continued negotiation* by governments on different economic interests.

These discussions and negotiations, if they are to be effective, should and must include not only formal trade restrictions (such as tariffs) and formal trade agreements, but the informal ones as well—those things which may not be deliberately designed to dry up the free flow of trade but have the effect of distorting open market trading conditions appreciably. These include such things as: (1) border taxes, which purport to equalize competitive advantages resulting from indirect taxation, but actually put nations that rely on direct taxation at a great disadvantage; (2) intervention by governments in licensing agreements; (3) restrictions on direct investment; (4) restrictions on remittances; (5) subsidized export prices; (6) prohibitive tariffs—and so on and on.

For if greater freedom is to prevail, then freedom itself must be protected. Competition should be encouraged, but there must be safeguards against unfair competition from nationally subsidized industries. The orderly expansion of world trade should be promoted, but dumping must be prevented. There must be respect—somehow guaranteed—for private investment if the much-needed capital markets are to develop as they should.

Business enterprises operating world-wide have a responsibility to participate in this "continuing dialogue" on international business problems—either directly or by providing to governments the hardcore facts on which sound negotiations can proceed and fair trade arrangements may be reached. International and multinational companies are not new, but their motives are still misunderstood at home and abroad. Large corporations have a particular responsibility to communicate their contributions to the attaining of national economic objectives.

SETTING MORE AMBITIOUS GOALS

All multinational businesses must learn to act as good corporate citizens of the countries in which they operate—everywhere standing willing to enter into the dialogue with government in the interests of the national economy—while recognizing in this the overriding need for the right kind of world economy. The experience of the past decade has demonstrated what broad economic partnerships can achieve. It is now within our several national capabilities to set more ambitious goals and to set about the task of fulfilling them.

The needs of the world's people exceed all the world's productive capacity—and will for years to come. During the 1960's, the expansion of money and credit in the U.S. has been at twice the rate prevailing in the late 1950's, and capital expenditures are now running at a $60 billion annual rate. It has been estimated that in the next decade, private industry in the U.S. will need to invest some $600 billion to meet the needs and demands of its customers. Western Europe may need to spend almost as much on capital expenditures. That amounts to more than a trillion dollars of new investment in 10 years, in just two major areas. The needs of the remainder of the Free World can only be guessed at—perhaps another trillion dollars.

PARTNERS IN THE FULLEST SENSE

If these needs are to be met, we will need—and need to be—partners in the fullest sense: in investment, in technology, in research and development. Everywhere the aim must be to provide the resources and facilities needed by the engineer-entrepreneurs and managers, who are the "growth catalysts" of every modern industrial society.

We share with one another, and indeed, with the rest of the world, a vast fund of compatible beliefs, common principles, and shared ideals. In the 21st century, people may well look back on this period of challenge and trial and wonder at some of the obstacles that we seem so intent on placing in our own path.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PRAISES PAUL DOUGLAS AS "GREAT SENATOR—IN THE TRADITION OF LINCOLN"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during President Johnson's very successful tour of the Midwest on Saturday, July 23, he came to the great State of Illinois late that afternoon. The President and his party were greeted by Governor Kerner, of Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, one of our colleagues, and a group of Illinois Congressmen, and other Members of the Congress from other States were there. The enthusiastic crowd that greeted the party had more homemade original placards per person than I have ever seen before.

President Johnson, speaking at the Lawrence, Ill., Airport, paid a great tribute to our colleague, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, part of which is in this advance release of the text of that speech.

Speaking of the great Illinois Senator, PAUL DOUGLAS, President Johnson said:

> Your great Senator PAUL DOUGLAS is a tower of strength to us. I am very happy to say that today you have standing in the United States Senate a man who carries on in the tradition of Lincoln, a man named PAUL DOUGLAS, who fights to see that all men are free and equal and live together as brothers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Lyndon Johnson's remarks at the airport at Lawrenceville, Ill., on Saturday, July 23, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON ARRIVAL AT LAWRENCEVILLE, ILL., AIRPORT, JULY 23, 1966

Mr. Mayor, Governor Kerner, Senator DOUGLAS, Congressman SHIPLEY, Congressman GRAY, ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, Mrs. Johnson and I want to thank you very much for coming out here and giving us this warm welcome.

We always just love to come to the great State of Illinois. We admire and respect your Governor. Your great Senator PAUL DOUGLAS is a tower of strength to us. Your Congressman SHIPLEY and Congressman GRAY and the other Members of Congress, who have accompanied us here today, have gone through the heartland of this country with us and we find it strong. We find it prosperous, we find it happy and we are glad.

I will never forget this long afternoon that I have spent in Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

The greatness in your eyes and in your friendly hands and in your abundant spirit is a greatness that only free people can have.

We have so much to be thankful for. All of this country was once the land of Abraham Lincoln. He belonged to the whole nation, of course, but he belonged especially to Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois.

I was reminded many times today that when Lincoln walked this land he too drew the strength from the proud and the independent people that he knew as neighbors. These were the wellsprings and they helped him face the terrible decisions upon which depended the fate of the young American nation.

No President, either before or since, was so bitterly fought by his enemies. But he never wavered from the conviction that all men deserve to be free and to live together as brothers.

I am very happy to say that today you have standing in the United States Senate a man who carries on in the tradition of Lincoln, a man named PAUL DOUGLAS, who fights to see that all men are free and equal and live together as brothers.

So the American faith today is built from that conviction. I believe that it is an unwavering faith. I don't think the day will come when Americans are ever afraid to fight for freedom. I don't think the day will come when America will refuse to be true to its word and keep its commitments. I don't think the day will ever come when the American people will desert those who stand for them on far-off battlefields in the fight for freedom.

We Americans have never run from danger. We will never run from responsibility. We have built the greatest country that mankind has ever known and we are going to work today and tonight to make it better all the time.

We have given our blood and our treasure so that others may have the same opportunities. We are not going to say that all of these sacrifices have been in vain.

The United States was born in strife—it was nurtured in hardship. We grew and we prospered because we weren't afraid of frontiers. But we always looked toward those far-away horizons. We have not come this long distance in history because we were a weak or a frightened or a fearful or a timid people.

When America grows afraid and loses its commitment to freedom, that is the day that America will begin to die. The faces that I have seen and the States that I have visited today have told me that this will never be.

Mrs. Johnson, Luci and I, the distinguished Governors, the many able, patriotic Members of Congress from both parties, are grateful for your warmth, for your generosity, for your hospitality. We want to thank you for helping make this a wonderful and a rewarding day for us.

We in America have much to be thankful for, much to be grateful for. I want to thank each of you for the contributions you are making to helping all of us make this the greatest nation in all the world.

Goodbye and God bless each of you.

TRIBUTE TO WORLD PRESS INSTITUTE AT MACALESTER COLLEGE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate, on the completion of its 5 years of operation, the World Press Institute at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn. The institute under the direction of James V. Toscano has been doing a very effective job of winning friends for our country by bringing to the United States those young men who are and will be the opinionmakers in their respective nations.

Recently, I had the good fortune to meet with a group of foreign reporters brought to Washington by the institute and I found them both interesting and interested. These young men were intelligent and articulate and knew what questions were worth asking. They were not selected on the basis of their favorable views toward the United States, but rather because of their ability, maturity, and openmindedness. In fact, Harry Morgan, the young founder of the institute, has expressed the opinion that if the reporters' prejudices are against the United States, so much the better: as he put it, we have no need to convert our friend—it is our critics whom we should try to win to our side.

The World Press Institute continues to do important work for our country and all of us owe it and the men behind it a vote of thanks for the friends they have won for America.

THE PROPOSED BRIDGE AND MARBLE CANYON DAMS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, again I am moved to protest against statements which mislead the public as to the location of the proposed bridge and Marble Canyon Dams on the Colorado River in Arizona.

In this instance the distortion appeared in the lead paragraph of an analysis of the controversy which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 31.

The article, written by William V. Shannon, begins this way:

> After years of maneuvering and tense negotiations, the plan to build two dams in the Grand Canyon is now nearing a showdown in the Congress.

To most people in the United States the Grand Canyon means only one thing—the spectacular gorge in northern Arizona which comprises the Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, and which is one of the scenic wonders of the West. The idea of having two dams built in this gorge is naturally abhorrent to all who love and enjoy our great out of doors, and who particularly revere the awesome slash in the earth which has been seen and enjoyed by millions either from Bright Angels Point on the northern rim of the canyon or from El Tovar on the southern rim. The idea of flooding out this magnificent area raises hackles all the way from Phoenix to New York City.

However, the dams are not going to be built in the Grand Canyon National Park, or in the Grand Canyon National Monument, and it is a distortion of the facts to write a sentence, or make a statement, which will lead anyone to believe that this is the case.

Both dams will be located well outside the boundaries of either the monument or the park, and only the waters from the lower dam, Bridge Canyon—or Hualapai, as it has been renamed—will impinge on any area of the park at all. Bridge Canyon Dam will be located some 90 miles below the park, and some of the water it would back up would flow into a 13-mile stretch of the river bordering the park. This stretch of the river is now completely inaccessible, except to the very hardy, and all the dam would do would be to provide a river surface upon which thousands of people who otherwise would never have seen this part of the canyon can ride up in boats and enjoy it.

I realize that far down in the article Mr. Shannon discusses the specific location of the two dams, and that for the careful reader who pursues the article to the end, it would become clear that the dams actually would not be located directly under Angel's Point—but for the casual reader it is definitely misleading.

It is reprehensible enough when dedicated conservationists, who are paid executives of conservation organizations, overstate the case on the Colorado River dams and mislead the public, but it is even less understandable when a great newspaper like the New York Times sheds its objectivity.

I sincerely hope, as the Colorado River Basin bill proceeds through the Congress, we can keep the facts straight, and prevent misrepresentation and distortion of what the measure will and will not do.

COMMISSION ON OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the most carefully considered articles on S. 309, a bill to create a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 26. It was written by James J. Kilpatrick. I think that Mr. Kilpatrick has analyzed the many problems facing any group which undertakes an inquiry of this kind. I believe that all fair-minded people will be interested in his conclusion:

> It is likely that the problem has no satisfactory answer. In the end, the whole business may have to be left where it is now, in the rough and imperfect hands of jurors who may not know dirt, but who know what offends them. Anyhow, it would do no harm to attempt a comprehensive study that might throw congressional light on a bunch of slugs who thrive in the dark.

This, of course, is the aim of the legislation: to clear out the cobwebs in local and State laws, to attempt a clear definition which judges can use for a standard, and to bring uniformity in the laws by suggesting what changes ought to be made. Some things are obscene; some are only offensive or in poor taste. Where should the line be drawn and how tightly? These problems will not be solved under present conditions. We ought to let experts sit down together to discuss the whole gamut of problems surrounding the sale of filth, and come up with recommendations which will be meaningful.

I ask unanimous consent to have the column, "Conservative, Liberal Seek Pornography Study," printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 26, 1966]

CONSERVATIVE, LIBERAL SEEK PORNOGRAPHY STUDY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A Republican conservative from South Dakota and a Democratic liberal from New Jersey, poles apart on most issues, have taken the leadership jointly in urging a serious congressional inquiry into the whole murky field of pornography. It seems unlikely, but they may just possibly bring a measure of order to a problem that is in total confusion now.

Senator Karl Mundt's bill to create a study commission on "noxious and obscene matters and materials" passed the Senate on July 11. Representative Dominick Daniels' almost identical bill is now pending before the full House Labor and Education Committee, after receiving unanimous endorsement from a select subcommittee April 29.

This is the third time in the last seven years that the Senate has passed such a bill. The House never has gone along. This time, Committee Chairman Adam Clayton Powell has promised Daniels that hearings will be held. If enough public support can be generated, Powell may yet be persuaded to push the proposal along.

Several reservations have to be voiced about the Mundt-Daniels bill itself; and those who have serious apprehensions about government censorship will be a little wary about endorsing even a congressional study that seeks to define something as undefinable as "obscenity." Yet both sides to this controversy—those who despise commercially peddled filth, and those who defend absolute freedom of press—include decent men and women. Neither side has a monopoly on virtue or on fanaticism either. And it is conceivable that both sides could benefit if a genuinely searching and thoughtful investigation were undertaken.

The commission envisioned under the pending bills, unfortunately, may be so elaborately concocted that it will bog down in its own individual ruts. The idea is for the President to appoint three members from the clergy, two from the Department of Justice, and two from the Post Office, plus one Senator, one Representative, one educator (secondary), one educator (higher), one librarian, one publisher (books), one publisher (magazines) one State attorney general, one city prosecutor, one local police chief, one man from the movies, one man from radio-TV and one from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This earnest foolishness stems from the thinking of men who imagine that if only you put together three potatoes, two onions, two carrots, and a pound of cubed beef, you will have a palatable stew. Something more is required; and in this case, it is mainly the labor of a few intelligent men able to see this complex problem whole and entire, and not through little labeled windows. If the President should appoint 20 pre-frozen members with neatly packaged attitudes, the foes of smut will consistently outvote the defenders of freedom by 13–7 or 12–8, and nothing useful will have been accomplished.

That reservation to one side, the Mundt-Daniels proposal in itself is sound. All that is asked under the pending legislation is a study. The idea is to look into the "origin, scope, and effects" of the traffic in pornographic materials. The commission would examine the conflicting and overlapping local, state, and federal laws in the field. In the end, it would formulate recommendations "for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic."

Now, if such an investigation were undertaken by broad-gauged men—men who understand enough of freedom to know that freedom can indeed be abused—a legislative foundation might be laid on which some sensible new obscenity laws could be erected. The present laws, by and large, are a mish-mash, partly derived from the late Inspector Comstock and partly derived from Mr. Justice Brennan. Nobody really knows what pornography is, or what the effects of pornography are, but everybody knows this traffic is a dirty and lucrative racket. The question is: How do you combat the racket without jeopardizing the right of sophisticated adults, in a free society, to obtain reading matter that would shock three clergymen, two postal inspectors, one congressman, and one cop?

The answer does not lie in permitting an honest, God-fearing Nashville officer, acting on his own Bible-belt convictions, to close up "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" It doesn't lie in harassing Hugh Hefner's "Playboy" or in prosecuting the nudist magazines. But by the same token, neither is a problem of deep public concern to be resolved through the absolutism of the American Civil Liberties Union, which scoffs at the notion that pornography could have a bad effect on anyone.

It is likely that the problem has no satisfactory answer. In the end, the whole business may have to be left where it is now, in the rough and imperfect hands of jurors who may not know dirt, but who know what offends them. Anyhow, it would do no harm to attempt a comprehensive study that might throw congressional light on a bunch of slugs who thrive in the dark.

BLEEDING THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Carl T. Rowan is a distinguished journalist, who has held high position in the administration. His columns, appearing throughout the country, are often filled with a high degree of understanding and based on facts which are equally authoritative.

In a recent column appearing in the Indianapolis Star, Mr. Rowan comments on the attitude of Moscow concerning the war in Vietnam. In his view, which he finds supported by both evidence and the opinion of persons within the administration, the Soviets "are playing a shrewd game of letting this Asian war bleed the United States of money and manpower while the Soviet Union toys around the edges, risking little and hoping to gain a lot."

Russia, as he points out, is supplying modern planes and the equipment for missile sites in North Vietnam. Soviet propagandists are keeping busy in spreading anti-American portrayals of us. In short, he sees the Soviet attitude hardening toward the United States, as we become ever more deeply involved, "bleeding" in money and manpower.

The Soviet Union is convinced that we are rapidly becoming isolated in terms of world opinion. This, Mr. President, can only benefit world communism, not ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE PROPOSALS SCORNED—RUSSIANS PLAY SLY GAME TO BLEED UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Among the last words uttered by former Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri before his fatal heart attack last January in Tashkent were some spoken by Soviet Prime Minister Alexie Kosygin. He confided that he was sending Alexander Shelepin to Hanoi to arrange a peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam war.

Shastri's aides passed the word along and for months the few top officials in the Johnson administration who were privy to this information believed that the Russians were working for peace.

Nobody in top circles of the Johnson administration really believes that today—despite Peking's fulminations about Moscow's "collusion."

The view is growing (and evidence to support it mounts) that the Soviets are playing a shrewd game of letting this Asian war bleed the United States of money and manpower while the Soviet Union toys around the edges, risking little and hoping to gain a lot.

UN Sec. Gen. U Thant has just gone to Moscow with a peace proposal that Soviet leaders ought to push out of a simple concern for humanity. But, like Charles de Gaulle, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and Harold Wilson, U Thant got nowhere.

What is not generally known is that the United States has secretly put before both the Soviet Union and North Viet Nam peace proposals that would seem to leave no doubt as to the U.S. desire to end the war. The proposals have been rejected arrogantly.

When Chester Ronning, the Canadian diplomat, was in Hanoi recently he was authorized to say that the United States would halt all bombings, unconditionally, and cease all military activities if Hanoi would quietly pledge to end the infiltration of troops into South Viet Nam and the Viet Cong would halt its terrorist activities.

Under this plan, the United States would then be pledged to sit at a conference table until all parties, including the Viet Cong, could negotiate an election scheme that everyone agreed would be a fair expression of the will of the people of South Viet Nam.

The Johnson administration would further agree that if, in such a genuine free election, the Vietnamese people chose the Viet Cong Communists or union with North Viet Nam, the United States would respect that choice.

The North Vietnamese greeted Ronning with contempt and literally threw him out of the country.

The clue to Hanoi's renewed intransigence would appear to lie in Peking, where Liu Sho-chi told a rally of a million people last weekend, "U.S. imperialist aggression against Viet Nam is aggression against China."

Liu and Vice Premier Tao Chu not only denounced the "Peace-talk swindle" but accused Russia and India of "catering to the needs of the U.S. imperialist policy of blackmail" when they issued a joint communique calling for "all governments to renounce the use of force."

Yet, the Soviet Union, by word and action, may be doing more to keep Hanoi away from the peace table than Communist China. There is ample evidence that Hanoi still fears domination by China and that Ho Chi Minh probably would choose negotiation to total reliance on Peking.

But it is Russia that is providing the sophisticated aircraft machinery including modern planes and missiles sites. Soviet propagandists are every bit as busy as the Chinese, trying to portray President Johnson as the new Hitler and Americans as the new Nazis.

The Soviet Union seems to have convinced itself, if not others, that the United States is rapidly becoming isolated in terms of world opinion—a development which, if true, would redound to the benefit of world communism.

In any event, Soviet leaders seem to have concluded that they have a world to gain and virtually nothing to lose if the war just rocks along and does not really get so far out of hand that Soviet cities are threatened.

Kosygin went to Tashkent to tell Pakistan's Ayub Khan and the late Mr. Shastri what a dangerous game they were playing—and how they owed it to mankind to stop fighting. I wonder if Mr. Shastri, alive today, would be able to convince Kosygin that the Russians are now playing with fire.

THE INNOCENT VICTIMS OF THE TEXAS SNIPER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, much attention has been given in the time since the horrible shootings by the sniper at the University of Texas in Austin to the question of immediate passage of legislation to regulate the sale of guns. I think that it may well be that in our attention to questions of interstate commerce and the sale of guns, we have paid too little attention to the innocent victims of the sniper. We have, as usual, spent our time talking about the criminal without attending to the victims. And yet there are in this instance many more victims than the one criminal; the toll he caused is very high.

We ought to turn our attention, instead, to the question of compensating the victims of this violent crime. Last year I introduced a bill, S. 2155, to provide for compensation to victims of crimes of violence in the District of Columbia and in other Federal jurisdictions. In a few days, I will introduce a substitute amendment to my bill, embodying a number of revisions suggested by the legal community. When I first introduced S. 2155, I recommended that the States enact similar laws, and I said I hoped they would do so. While one State, California, does have a limited law in this area, and while the matter is being actively considered in other States, no real action has been taken. The horror of the Texas shootings tells us that such action is needed, and is needed promptly. Each State should have a law providing that such innocent victims of violence be compensated for injuries, or that, in case of death, their families be compensated.

Mr. President, let us turn our attention where it is most needed, and where it will really do some good.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 7, 1966, Gen. Bruce Clarke, made an outstanding address before the convention of Lions International at Madison Square Garden in New York City.

I understand 22,000 people gave General Clarke a standing ovation. His observations on vital Vietnam questions are so pertinent to these troubled times that I feel they need a much wider audience.

General Clarke has a long and distinguished record in the service of his country and in order that my colleagues may also have the benefit of his perceptive answers to these most often asked questions, I ask unanimous consent to have his speech entitled "Some Answers to Vietnam Questions" printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Talk by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, Retired, Before the Lions International Convention, Madison Square Garden, New York City

Dr. Campbell, distinguished guests, members of Lions International and friends.

It is an honor to appear before such a large and important audience.

I have observed your organization in many lands and am very favorably impressed with the way in which you are carrying out your Lions Club Objectives in 135 countries and geographical locations with 800,000 members. You are a great force in the "People to People" program and hence for world peace and understanding.

I am also very much aware of the great support the Lions Clubs are giving to the Boy Scout movement. As of 1 January this year you were sponsoring about 5,200 units. Thus your fine influence is extended to more than 150,000 boys at this time. I bring you the appreciation of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America and its President, Thomas J. Watson, Jr.

Lions and Scouting have been a great partnership. Thirty years ago Lions Clubs sponsored only 11 Boy Scout Units. Now they sponsor 5,200. Forty-seven percent of all U.S. Lions Clubs now sponsor units. This is indeed a great record.

Your Lions leadership has now set its sights on 10,000 Scout units. This is great news in our "Breakthrough for Youth" program. I hope your support of Scouting will continue to grow. Our boys never needed more the influence such as you and Scouting can give them.

I would like also to bring to you greetings from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge and its Honorary Chairman, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, and its President, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells.

I am sure you are aware that your Society won the George Washington Honor Medal in 1962, and five other awards have been won by Lions Clubs since 1954; all for outstanding programs in furthering the American Way of Life.

SOME ANSWERS TO VIETNAM QUESTIONS

Because of my long military background in command of troops overseas and your timely interest in the situation in Vietnam, I have been encouraged to speak about that. I realize that you are from many countries, but I believe you are all interested in the situation in Southeast Asia.

I realize that I could not do justice to such a subject in the short time at my disposal by a usual talk, so I have decided to state to you my answers to about 20 questions which have been asked, many of them several times, in recent months.

I hope by so doing I can bring the basic facts into focus as I see them.

Because of your interest in Boy Scouts I'll answer first the question which is on:

BOY SCOUTS

We see pictures and read reports of Boy Scouts participating in anti-American Buddhist riots in Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. What about this?

General Westmoreland, in a letter to me of 9 June, said: "Unfortunately there are a number of youth groups in Vietnam who wear uniforms resembling the standard Boy Scout uniform—the boys referred to in your letter are not Vietnamese Boy Scouts but were members of a Buddhist youth group."

WHAT IS OUR NATIONAL PURPOSE?

According to my definition

It is the National Purpose of the United States to continue to work to fully secure for our people for the future those objectives of the Constitution of the United States set forth in its Preamble: to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, and to support the purposes of the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations; and by aid and assistance to other peoples of the world as is in the national interest.

It is my firm belief that the assistance we are giving to the oppressed people of South Vietnam is in furtherance of our national purpose as I understand it.

Of the six purposes in the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution the one "to insure domestic tranquility" is greatly needed today.

WHAT IS OUR OBJECTIVE IN THE FAR EAST?

"Our objective in the Far East is simple. There, as throughout the world, we wish to see independent nations developing as they see fit in accordance with their own traditions."—Hon. William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State, Far Eastern Affairs.

"In the first half of this century we learned that there can be no peace if might makes right—if force used by one nation against a weaker nation is permitted to succeed. We have learned that the time to stop aggression is when it first begins. And that is one reason we are in South Vietnam today.

"Modern weapons and means of communications, even more than common aspirations, have created a single world community.

"There is no going back. This is the way it will be as far ahead as any of us can see.

"We can only go forward to help make that community one in which nations respect the rights of others and live at peace with one another.

"For the American interest will be well served if our children grow up in a world of independent nations capable of assuming collective responsibility for the peace. Our interest—and that of world peace—will not be served if nations continue to violate the independence of other nations.

"So as our men and our allies fight in Southeast Asia, we are working on many fronts to build a mosaic of peace and human progress."—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

". . . The United States seeks no territorial aggrandizement in South Vietnam or anywhere in Southeast Asia. We do not wish to maintain our troops in that area any longer than is necessary to secure the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. We want no permanent military bases, no trade advantages. We are not asking that the Government of South Vietnam ally itself with us or be in any way beholden to us . . . We do not seek to destroy the Hanoi regime or to force the people of North Vietnam to accept any other form of government . . . We wish only that the people of South Vietnam should have the right and the opportunity to determine their future in freedom without coercion or threat . . ."—Gen Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

WHEN YOU SAY "WIN" IN VIETNAM, WHAT DO YOU MEAN?

I mean the attaining of our objectives as I have stated it. I do not mean the destruction of North Vietnam or its government. We must, however, defeat the enemy operating in South Vietnam in order to change his attitude so that he seeks an effective, peaceful settlement.

While I am sure we will win a military victory against the Communists operating in South Vietnam, the military can only restore order. The task for a stable political settlement is for politicians and diplomats.

WHY DO MANY AMERICANS SAY THEY ARE CONFUSED ABOUT VIETNAM?

There are several stated reasons. I'll list them:

1. It is a long way away from Washington and the bulk of our people are oriented toward Europe and its problems.
2. Some think that the dangers of aggressive, international Communism have been overplayed.
3. The long birth struggles of a newly emerging nation under long and constant terror, subversion, and armed attack.
4. The tendency to measure an oriental country by ourselves.
5. The impatience to get to a solution quickly.
6. Antipathy toward the present administration on the part of some.
7. The urge in some, created by the great advances in information media, to want to know detailed future plans and predictions from our top responsible leaders which cannot be disclosed without danger to our war effort.
8. The terror, subversion and acts of the Viet Cong are not adequately pictured and reported.
9. The great many generous, helpful, humanitarian acts of our servicemen and our assistance programs are not fully reported.
10. The understanding, devotion and sympathy for our purposes in Vietnam by our servicemen there are not fully appreciated by our people.
11. The extent of the allied support in Vietnam is not fully appreciated. For instance, Korea will soon have two divisions there. In proportion to the strength of Korea, that is a real contribution. There are several other nations that are making important contributions also such as Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines.
12. Failure to understand the good reasons why war has not been declared, and why the Reserves have not been called up as yet.
13. "Business as usual" attitudes.
14. The clinging to false hopes for "Peaceful Coexistence" with aggressive, world Communistic programs.
15. Why do not more of our allies, whom we have assisted so much, give us help in Vietnam now?

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM HAS BEEN CALLED A "DIRTY LITTLE WAR". WHY DO WE LET OURSELVES BECOME INVOLVED IN SUCH THINGS SO FAR AWAY?

No one likes war—especially those who have seen and experienced its ravages at first hand. But as the British Philosopher and Economist, John Stuart Mill, pointed out in the mid-1800's, there are worse things than war:

"War is any ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things: the decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing worth a war is worse . . . A man who has nothing which he cares about more than his personal safety is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

"What makes this a particularly 'dirty' war is the terrorism of the Viet Cong. In 1964, 11,000 village chiefs and local government officials were killed or kidnapped by the Viet Cong. They were not soldiers but civilians carrying out their official duties on the local level. On a proportional basis in the United States, this would have meant that 143,000 of our citizens were slain or kidnapped in one year."—Cyrus Vance, Under Secretary of Defense.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DO YOU CONSIDER WE AS A NATION SHOULD USE MILITARY FORCE?

I have always considered the use of military force or the threat to use military force by our country to be for one of three basic purposes: To restore order; to maintain order; or to establish order so that the orderly, peaceful processes of governmental and international relations can function. Human progress can only advance in a climate of order.

HOW DO YOU SUGGEST WE GO ABOUT UNDERSTANDING OUR MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

I use three steps in such a study: 1. What is our present situation? Where are we now? 2. What do we want to accomplish? Where do we want to go? 3. How do we do it? or how do we get there?

An evening spent on this by a study group should produce a good understanding.

When you make such a study, you should remember that "uneasy lies the head that wears the crown", for we wear the crown of Western World leadership.

Carrying out our world commitments as the Western World Leader is like wearing a hair shirt. It is more irritating when it gets hot, but we dare not take it off lest the world be thrown into chaos and World War III.

Also, turn the question around; Will the loss of South Vietnam to subversive Communist attack affect our position in the world? What if it leads to the loss of Thailand? then Malaysia? Singapore? and Indonesia? What would be its impact on Japan, Korea, NATO, Africa, and South America?

Is there a better time and place to "draw the line"?

HOW IS THE MORALE OF U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM?

I hear often from my friends in the Army in Vietnam, and we hear from our two sons there often. I get much evidence of high morale.

During last Easter week Bishop Reuben H. Mueller, President of the National Council of Churches, visited the combat zone in Vietnam. He brought back high praise of the U.S. servicemen there when he said: "It is a fearsome war but I saw no fear evidenced by our soldiers. Their morale is ace-high. They are not bothered about why the United States is in Vietnam. They just know they are there and what they have to do, and they act accordingly. Some of them don't want to leave when their combat time is up."

"The morale of a man in a military organization comes from many factors. It may well be summed up in one word: 'Confidence.' Confidence in his training, equipment, leadership, in himself, in his unit, and in the support from home. The military commanders play a big part in it but so do civilian officials, Members of Congress, the press, radio and TV commentators, and the general public at home. Together they must insure that the soldier does well an important job and receives recognition for it. So long as this is accomplished there is a general feeling of confidence, well-being, and progress in a military unit; and the report which states that the 'morale is excellent' will be sound."—From *Soldier Morale*. Written by Lt. General Bruce C. Clarke in Korea in 1954.

In war much artillery is fired on harassing missions to affect morale. The bombing of North Vietnam is a great booster to our morale and affects adversely the Communist morale.

WE HAVE BEEN A NATION WHICH HAS FOSTERED TEAMWORK AS A NATIONAL TRAIT. IS THAT STILL IMPORTANT?

I think even more so. We are in a great ideological struggle between our way of life and aggressive world Communism. This struggle is now focused in Vietnam. It requires teamwork to win that struggle—teamwork in our forces in Vietnam and teamwork in the whole American team from Maine to Saigon.

In this struggle our President is the elected, constitutional captain of our team. He and our men in Vietnam have the right to expect the degree of loyalty we have learned to give to our football captains and teams in high school and college.

The cement that holds a "team" together is loyalty—loyalty to those above, to those below, and to those at our sides; and, above all, loyalty to ourselves.

When an American steps beyond the bounds of team loyalty he hurts our effort and helps to prolong the war.

"I must frankly tell you that our intelligence indicates that the aggressor presently bases his hopes more on political differences in Saigon and Washington than on his military capacity in South Vietnam."—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

ARE WE WINNING MILITARILY IN VIETNAM?

I think there is no doubt of it now. It is easy to think in battle or war that we have all the problems and that the other side has none. It just isn't so. We have the cream of our professional armed forces there. No force was ever better equipped or led. Our military victories for some time have been consistent and impressive. Our First Team is now scoring.

It will take time and we must not get impatient. The great oriental virtue is patience. We need to acquire some of this too.

We must never think that the end we seek in Vietnam is not worth the cost and the effort. The communists world-wide are trying to convince our people and our allies of this so we will quit.

We have seized and held the initiative for some time now. That is the best indicator we are winning.

I AM DISTURBED BY POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM. WHY?

"We should not despair of the political developments in Vietnam. They have not seriously affected the war effort. We need to recollect our own perilous, protracted effort to implant the torch of liberty in America. American Colonists began their resistance to harsh British colonial laws in 1763: 12 years later the shot rang out at Concord Bridge; 8 more years of bitter struggle followed before the Treaty of Paris was signed ending the Revolutionary War; 6 more years were consumed in our endeavor to design a document of government which has stood the test of time, including a civil war. It took 26 years to forge our nation, yet the South Vietnamese have been building one just 12 years. Freedom worth fighting for is worth the time, sweat and tears required to build it."—General HAROLD K. JOHNSON, *Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.*

WHEN WILL THE WAR BE OVER IN VIETNAM?

I cannot guess a date, but I can set forth the conditions that I think will end the fighting. It will end when the Viet Cong and the invaders from North Vietnam abandon their efforts to take over South Vietnam by subversion, terror, and armed aggression. The aggressors will abandon their project when it is no longer worth the cost to carry on—when they are convinced they cannot win on the battlefield. Peace on a meaningful basis will start then.

Our object in winning is not to destroy North Vietnam but to accomplish this change in attitude in the enemy.

We can speed it up by an increase in national loyalty, in unity, and in national teamwork and by stopping to feed the Communists a hope that we here in the United States will get tired and quit.

Our final military victory in South Vietnam may well come without much notice. The enemy may just fade away. This very likely will come when we are getting set for a "second half" push and the Communists know it.

The Communists consider it a victory when they take two steps forward even if forced later to take one step backward. We must be aware of this lest we lose a lot we have fought for at the conference table.

WE HAVE HEARD IT CHARGED THAT THE UNITED STATES USES AN "ARROGANCE OF POWER" IN WORLD AFFAIRS. DO YOU THINK THIS IS SO?

In the last twenty years I have held seven large U.S. troop commands in Europe, in Korea, and in the Pacific. Several times there were allied troops under my command. I was always proud of my country's purpose in supporting such forces overseas. I have detected no arrogance of purpose but quite the contrary in every case.

Arrogance in any form is distasteful, be it financial, economic, political, intellectual or personal. We may have arrogant individuals, but we are not an arrogant nation in our foreign policy as I have seen it at the receiving end.

IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT WE HAVE ALIENATED OUR FRIENDS OVERSEAS AND HAVE LOST PRESTIGE. IS THIS SO?

I probably have been in 35 countries of the world in an official capacity over the past 25 years. I have always found among the bulk of the people a great backlog of friendship for America. We must always remember that we live in a competitive world. Sometimes the competition is keen, as it is now in the political life of our country. Friends on the international front come from mutual self-interest. There is a lot of that in the Western World today holding friends together.

The quickest way to really lose friends and prestige with our many allies would be to accept a defeat in Vietnam.

I believe we should always remember that: "The minority is always noisier than the majority" when a negative attitude is being exposed.

In recent elections in NATO countries there were a total of 13,000,000 Communist votes cast. Hence, it is not difficult to organize demonstrations when we are fighting Communists in South Vietnam.

ASSUMING THERE WILL BE WARS IN THE FUTURE, WHAT PATTERN DO YOU THINK THEY WILL FOLLOW?

I think there will be so-called "Wars of National Liberation" aided and abetted by the two focal points of aggressive Communist expansion: Moscow and Peking. These wars will increase in number if we do not bring the Vietnamese war to a successful conclusion.

Vietnam is the Korea of the 60's. In Korea, we joined the issue then to determine whether the Communists could expand by overt aggression. In South Vietnam, we have moved to defend the proposition that no country shall be undermined and taken over by subversive outside aggression.

Since Korea, the Communists have put aside overt aggression as a tactic. Our success in South Vietnam will cause them to reconsider also so-called "Wars of National Liberation."

This success can only be brought about by our demonstrated strength and determination.

WE HEAR A LOT ABOUT "ESCALATION". WHY IS IT SO DANGEROUS?

The word "escalation" came from the word "escalator"—a device used to move people between floors in a building. This device goes down as well as up, as you know. As applied to warfare, it has come to connote an action that can get out of control. This is a narrow concept.

While the tempo of war and even battle increases and diminishes as the circumstances and the enemy's actions and reactions are brought to bear, I am sure we are doing everything possible in Vietnam, consistent with our objectives, to prevent escalation not in our interest.

Escalation is not a unilateral action; it takes two to escalate. We should remember that the United States is not completely free to move the military action in any direction it chooses. If the North Vietnamese decide to infiltrate additional regular forces into South Vietnam, that calls for a different response by the United States than if the North Vietnamese decided to withdraw forces from South Vietnam.

We should remember that in the conduct of battle or war it is often better to take a measurable step forward to reduce the possibility of uncontrolled escalation later.

WE HAVE HEARD A LOT ABOUT THE RIGHT TO DISSENT. HAVE YOU ANY COMMENTS ON THIS?

"Public debate is, of course, at the heart of the American political process, and as long as such debate serves not to confuse but to isolate and define the issues at stake as a basic for informed, responsible policy-making, then debate serves a constructive and very necessary purposes. As long as debate serves not to convey to other peoples the impression of a nation irresolute and deeply divided, but to reflect an open-minded public responsibly participating in the democratic process, then debate distinguishes our open society where freedom is a fact, from closed societies where freedom is merely a fiction."—General Harold K. Johnson.

When the dissent becomes obstructive in a democracy, it infringes on the rights of the majority and tends to erode national teamwork and national effort. Both the majority and the minority in a democracy have rights the other is bound to respect.

(See my answer to the previous question on "teamwork".)

ARE OUR TROOPS IN VIETNAM WELL TRAINED, ORIENTED, AND INDOCTRINATED?

Our commander in Vietnam is a fine, outstanding, competent American soldier who has a long record of setting the highest standards in management, training, conduct, morality and ethics wherever he has served. I am proud to say he has served in one of my commands.

He was an Eagle Scout.

He has received in recent years the Silver Beaver and Silver Buffalo award from the Boy Scouts of America for his outstanding services to American Boyhood.

He has been Superintendent of West Point.

* * * * *

He has written and published a card for all troops in Vietnam to carry in their billfolds to guide them in their conduct. He lives by these nine rules and expects others in his command to do so:

Nine rules

1. Remember we are guests here. We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people! Understand their life, use phrases from their language, and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right of way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else, you are members of the U.S. Military Forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

In the past few months I have visited four of our largest troop training posts. I have seen the training and the indoctrination. I can state positively, from experience in such things in three wars, that our troops being sent to Vietnam in units or as individuals were never better selected, trained or prepared for combat.

CONCLUSIONS

We have drawn the line

I would like to quote from a letter of an Army captain in South Vietnam to his wife just before he was killed:

"We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. This cannot be done if America loses heart . . . Please don't let them back where you are sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and of victory—for we must and we can win here. There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go. We have drawn the line here and the America we all know and love best is not one to back away."—Captain James P. Spruill.

The line is drawn—we either hold on this line in stopping aggressive world Communism or we will leave the world in chaos and contribute to the possibility of World War III.

Fifty years ago the French at Verdun rose to a cry: "Ils Ne Passerent Pas!" and the Germans did not pass.

The whole world is watching to see if we and our allies will repeat that feat in Vietnam in the 1960's. I have no doubt that we will.

I hope you will take that message home with you and use it to help dispel confusion and to creat unity of effort in order to hasten a successful solution in South Vietnam.

Thank you.

THE NATIONAL JAYCEE TEENAGE SAFE DRIVING ROADEO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, beginning this Sunday, August 7, the final trials of the National Jaycee Teenage Safe Driving Roadeo will take place here in Washington.

The Roadeo was established in 1952 by the U.S. Jaycees and is sponsored by the Jaycees and the Ford Motor Co. Nearly 3 million youngsters have participated in the Roadeo at city, State, and national levels. This year more than 250,000 teenagers from over 2,000 communities will take part in the safe driving competition.

The Roadeo provides youngsters of driving age with an opportunity to improve their driving skills and to demonstrate to their communities their interest in increasing their knowledge of traffic laws. Another beneficial effect of the Roadeo is the stimulation of community interest in high school driver education programs.

The tests given Roadeo contestants are thorough and stiff. They are examined on the rules of the road; undergo a behind-the-wheel test in traffic, and a psychophysical test in a specially devised machine to determine their reaction time.

Local awards range from plaques to U.S. savings bonds. State awards vary, but include cash grants, merchandise awards, and plaques. Each State winner also receives a trip to Washington to compete in the finals. The three top national prizes are a $2,000 college scholarship and a 1966 Comet Cyclone convertible for the first place winner; a $1,500 scholarship for the second place winner; and a $1,000 college scholarship for the third place winner.

Mr. President, I commend the sponsors of the Roadeo for supporting a program valuable to the participants and to the country at large. Programs such as this do a great deal to publicize the need for safe driving, as well as materially improving safety on the roads. I congratulate the administrators of the Roadeo for its great success, and the finalists, who have demonstrated their skill behind the wheel.

ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS REGARDING THE PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, being from a State where agriculture is the cornerstone of the economy, I have been more than a little concerned in recent months about certain erroneous actions taken and statements made by high public officials about the prices of farm products.

I want to carry this concern one step further today and look ahead a year or two or more, with some words of warning about a serious international situation that could develop if mistakes are made by those same officials now.

Particularly I want to call attention to the world wheat situation and its relationship both to production in the United States and to this Nation's position as a world power.

As many of the distinguished Members of this body know, Mr. President, our wheat and feed grain surpluses of a few years ago have dropped to extremely low levels this year. This reduction has occurred despite the oft-stated aims of certain political and governmental leaders in the past to maintain emergency reserves large enough to carry the Nation through an extended period of drought or a severe disaster such as a war which might cripple production for a time.

The reduction of these surpluses or reserves resulted largely from governmental action, first from acreage controls and more recently from the dumping or selling of Government stocks of grain in large quantities on the open market when the price reaches a certain level.

It is my position, Mr. President, that too much of this grain has been dumped and that this drove prices down at a time when the prices being received by the producer—the farmer—were still far below full parity. I maintain this was wrong especially in that it occurred by Government decree when the purpose of all of our Government farm programs should not be to impose price ceilings, but should be to raise prices received by farmers to full parity in the marketplace.

I believe this was a mistake which cost farmers millions of dollars, Mr. President. Like so many decisions and actions of the past, however, it is a mistake that cannot be corrected, but can only serve as a warning against similar mistakes in the future. Furthermore, it has created a new situation with international ramifications now threatening to do still greater harm not only to farmers but to our entire Nation, and there is still time to head off this threat.

The basis for my concern, Mr. President, is a recent report that the Soviet Union's huge purchases of Canadian wheat will be used for export purposes and to prevent Communist China from getting the grain, as well as for protection against crop failures in Russia itself.

Is this all the Soviet Union has in mind?

No; it is not, Mr. President, and this is the point that prompts me to sound an alarm here today. The information is documented in a Wall Street Journal article written from Munich, Germany, recently by William S. Rukeyser.

This is the point that should disturb every American:

If the Soviet Union has a good year with its own grain crops, and if wheat surpluses in the major exporting nations of the world continue to drop, the Kremlin could achieve a "corner" in free world wheat markets. A "corner" on the market, Mr. President, is when a trader gets control of enough of the available supply of a commodity to allow manipulation of the price.

According to the best information now available, Mr. President, the U.S. wheat crop this year will fall 250 to 300 million bushels short of meeting domestic and export needs totaling about 1.5 billion bushels for the year ahead. This will leave a critically low carryover reserve of only 250 to 300 million bushels next July 1. If this year's drought conditions continue into 1967, our Nation would have no choice except to reduce our food-for-peace wheat exports or ration wheat at home.

Even more startling, Mr. President, is the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation today has only 80 million bushels of corn and 230 million bushels of wheat in its uncommitted inventories. The corn, I am told, is only 1 week's supply for the Nation's domestic and export needs.

A Republican task force of the House of Representatives recently studied this problem, Mr. President, and I believe both the Congress and the administration should heed its warning.

The task force concluded:

> A world food crisis is upon us. The threat of a domestic grain shortage is present. Time is running out for the Administration to take bold action aimed at sharply increasing United States farm production.

I am sounding the further warning, Mr. President, that it will be a sad and costly day for the United States if the Soviet Union through its manipulations and our errors is permitted to control the world wheat market and thus the price of wheat. I hate to think what would happen if the United States had to buy wheat from a Communist nation.

Immediate steps should be taken by the Department of Agriculture, or by Congress if necessary, to increase acreage allotments for wheat and feed grains. This must be done for the national security. Time is of the essence.

At the same time these steps for the national security are taken, steps should be taken to protect our farmers against the improper use of our national security food reserves for price-depressing or price-control purposes to the detriment of our farmers. We can and should provide this protection by setting fixed mandatory amounts for the reserves of the various commodities. The Department of Agriculture could not tamper with the reserves or use or "dump" them in such a way as to affect the price in the marketplace. The fixed amounts would distinguish the "reserves" from the "surpluses" which were accused of depressing farm prices in years past.

As the population of our nation increases, it becomes more necessary almost by the year for us to establish national security reserves of farm products to feed our own people and maintain our food-for-peace distribution program abroad on a stable basis. We owe it to the agricultural community which cooperates in enabling us to achieve these national goals to provide safeguards so that the reserves cannot be used as an economic whip against the producers in the future.

BOB STRAUB OFFERS WILLAMETTE RIVER PLAN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Members of Congress know how proud we from Oregon are of the beauty and the variety of spectacular scenery in our State. One of our chief assets is the Willamette River, the great tributary that runs between the Cascades and the coast range to join the Columbia at Portland.

But the Willamette has not been mainly a wild, scenic river for fishermen and white-water boating, like the Rogue or the Umpqua or the Deschutes. The hospitable Willamette Valley, mecca for generations of early settlers, now is home to the great majority of Oregon's people—more than a million now, surely 2 million in the next 20 years or so. That means more industrialization, more urbanization of the riverbank, more pollution, less opportunity to preserve the river as the irreplaceable natural feature it is.

Now we have a proposal to do something about it.

Oregon's State treasurer, Mr. Robert W. Straub, has proposed a plan to take public control of the banks along most of the length of the Willamette, from above Springfield to Portland, for development as a primary recreational resource for the 2 million people who will soon live along this stretch of the river. The distance is 220 miles. Most of this land is now in private ownership. But much of it is agricultural or undeveloped—though it will not remain so for long.

Bob Straub suggests using a combination of methods to preserve the banks for hiking, riding, or bicycle trails, for intermittent picnic grounds and campsites, for boating and for fishing and swimming, if and when the tide of pollution is driven back. These methods would include cooperation between the State government, counties, and cities to obtain easements, voluntary donations of presently unproductive land, zoning, and, where necessary, public acquisition of title to the riverbank, except where industry and urban development has already gone too far.

We have a precedent in Oregon for Mr. Straub's plan. Long ago a very farsighted Governor of Oregon, the last Oswald West, saw to it that Oregon's magnificent beaches, the length of the State's Pacific shore, were placed in perpetual public ownership for all of the people to enjoy as their common birthright. It is this great principle that Bob Straub now proposes to extend to the banks of Oregon's great river, to the extent that this can still be accomplished.

FEDERAL FUNDS SHOULD HELP

One of the ways it can be accomplished may be with the help of Federal funds under the open spaces program and perhaps other programs. I am confident that such funds will be available for a project of this kind. For we here in the Capital know, from the efforts that have now begun to reclaim the Potomac as a living part of our landscape, how vital it is to save a river while there is still time.

Bob Straub's plan is a conservation measure in its truest sense. It was recognized as such at once by many voices, including one of Oregon's leading newspapers, the Eugene Register-Guard.

The Register-Guard commends Mr. Straub for his "vision" and declares that his idea is "more than just commendable; it's great." I agree.

Bob Straub is also the Democratic candidate for Governor of Oregon this years. The Willamette River rediscovery plan is a part of his program for Oregon. The Register-Guard points out that this is no reason to question the plan as just politics. Even Mr. Straub's Republican opponent, Secretary of State Tom McCall, commended the idea. But as elected officials ourselves, we in the Congress may perhaps go a step further. We know that politics, however much the word is used distrustfully, remains the name for the democratic way of deciding on a great public policy—such as the conservation of a great river.

If Oregon moves forward to turn the Willamette River into a foremost recreational showplace of the whole Nation, as Bob Straub has proposed to do, that vision will not have become reality by itself. It will be the result of a political decision of Oregon's people to make it come true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the editorial of the Eugene Register-Guard supporting Mr. Straub's proposal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DREAM TOO THRILLING FOR POLITICS

One thing about State Treasurer Robert W. Straub: He's got imagination. Or, if you prefer, vision. His newest idea—getting as much Willamette River frontage into public hands as possible—is more than just commendable; it's great. And it shows that he's thinking about Oregon not so much as it is today as the way it's going to be 20 and more years hence. He knows that within 20 years close to 2 million people may live within 20 miles of the Willamette River.

Few Oregonians know much about the river. They see it from bridges and that's about it. Few even understand how it runs from Eugene to Portland, meandering along as if it were going out of its way to touch Corvallis, Albany and Independence instead of following the freeway as people do. Yet, what a magnificent recreational resource it could be.

Quite independently of Mr. Straub's brain storm, the Upper Willamette Resource Conservation and Development Project last week sent invitations to civic leaders in Lane, Linn and Benton counties for a boat trip from Dexter Dam to Albany. Chances are that many of the civic leaders, if they go on this three-day excursion, will see country they have never seen before.

Oregon already has two magnificent north-south recreational strips, the Cascade Skyline and the Oregon Coast. Both are accessible to the public over much of their length. But to get to the shore of the Willamette in many places the visitor has to trespass over private property.

The Eugene-Springfield area is far ahead of the rest of the state in recognizing the true, long-range value of the river. Small chunks in Albany, Corvallis and Salem are in public hands. The state owns a 300-foot right-of-way, once acquired for a highway, near Champoeg State Park. But in between, which should be no-man's land, the shore is somebody's.

It's 220 miles from Springfield to the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia. That means a potential of 440 miles of priceless public recreation land. Some, of course, is already pre-empted for industry or, in Portland's area, for the sluicing of traffic. But much remains. And some private uses, such as irrigation, are not incompatible with what Mr. Straub has in mind.

He's the first to grant that it is unlikely all 440 miles could ever be acquired by the public. "But if we get only a quarter of it. . . ." he says. It's more than we have now.

As a candidate for governor, Mr. Straub may be excused for relating his great dream to his own candidacy. If he's elected (actually, as a politician, Mr. Straub says "when," not "if"), he says, he'll appoint a Willamette River Recreation Commission. That group could encourage municipalities and counties to acquire river frontage. And it could serve as a vehicle for accepting donations of land along the river, perhaps as memorial corridors. That's how much of the coast's state park land was obtained, by donation. No great outlay of public money should be called for.

Mr. Straub's dream should not be rejected out-of-hand because he is a candidate and because this is an election year. Republicans as well as Democrats can welcome his idea. Mr. Straub's Republican opponent, Tom McCall, in a speech in Eugene Thursday, called the idea "magnificent" in "scope and sweep." Politics should not get in the way of the truth that future generations will thank this one for saving something, as we thank our grandparents for preserving so much of the Oregon Coast.

SECRETARY FREEMAN DEFENDS FAIR FARM PRICES—CALLS FOR VIGOROUS FOOD PRICE INVESTIGATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a few moments ago I was handed the text of remarks which Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman made in an appearance this morning before the New York City Council at city hall in New York, on food price increases.

In his statement, the Secretary has very properly emphasized the rather small proportion of the food price increases which is going to the farmers of the Nation. He has contrasted the earnings of farm people—their disposable income—with the higher disposable income of others in the economy. He has emphasized that food has cost a declining portion of the disposable income of our citizens for a good many years.

The Secretary outlined the following five points.

1. Only a small portion of the increased cost of food at the retail level can be traced to increased farm prices.

2. Recent modest farm price increases are badly needed and have been earned. Both consumers and farmers benefit when the farmer is fairly rewarded for his labor. The farmer has not been fairly rewarded in the past, and if this situation is allowed to persist, food supplies will diminish as farmers leave agriculture. Prices will then increase sharply and the consumer ultimately will pay much more.

3. Many factors—convenience items, services, etc.—go into the retail price of food. All of us as consumers must decide whether we wish to buy such convenience and such service along with our daily bread.

4. The real cost of food—measured as a percentage of income and in the number of hours of work necessary to buy it—has been going steadily down.

5. Food price increases beyond the modest farm price increases so far experienced call for vigorous investigation. Food is a necessity. The food middleman is entitled to a fair return for his capital and labor, but more than a fair return is not in the interest of the consumer, the farmer, or the businessman.

As the author of a resolution which passed the Senate Agriculture Committee unanimously calling for a study of current food price increases, I want to commend the Secretary for his statement, and for going to New York City to help create understanding of the food price situation.

I especially endorse his point 5. Food price increases should be thoroughly investigated, not to create a scapegoat, but to give the consuming public a clear understanding of where their food money is going; to prevent efforts to unjustly blame it all on farmers; and to assure an equitable food price level for the benefit of farmers, consumers, and those in between—the middlemen.

I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL, CITY HALL, NEW YORK, N.Y., AUGUST 4, 1966

Mr. President, Members of the New York City Council, I should like to begin these remarks by commending the leadership and the members of this Council for your concern and interest in food and food costs.

New York is a great city. Its millions of people consume enormous quantities of food. Even a small change in the cost of that food affects their standard of living. This is especially true of large families, and particularly so of those in the low income groups.

Therefore, it is wise, timely, and responsive that you propose to investigate recent food price changes. I applaud your initiative. And I thank you for this invitation to take part in your hearings—an invitation which I accepted with alacrity.

My philosophy of food and people recognizes the basic unity of interest between the farmer and the consumer—and with the food marketing system, too. The farmer earns his livelihood by producing food abundantly for consumers, and he expects to receive a fair price for his product. The consumer depends upon the farmer for that abundance of food, and knows that he must pay an adequate price in order to receive it. There is no conflict in these viewpoints . . . or in the concept that what is good for the farmer and consumer is in the long run good for the middleman as well.

In addition, each farmer is himself a consumer. Most farmers today buy their food at the supermarket like the city consumer. All of us recognize that nutritious food in adequate supply is necessary to our well-being.

We know that food, like other things, must be paid for. However, because we must have food to live, and because food is an important item in our family budget, and because we buy it more frequently than any other item or service, we are likely to be very sensitive about food costs—and vocal about them, too.

This is as it should be. The focus of public attention is the most effective instrument for fair play that we have in a free society. Therefore, your investigation is a useful one, and I am pleased to do my best to contribute to it.

Let me repeat that both farmers and consumers benefit from fair and stable farm and food prices. Violent upswings and downswings disrupt markets and supplies, damaging producers and consumers alike.

Sometimes we tend to see only one side of the equation. It is easy to see how prices that are too high penalize consumers. But it is equally true, though less immediately apparent, that in the long run prices that are too low also hurt consumers.

A fair price must be paid. If it is not paid, consumers eventually will not be able to command the resources and the services to get the food quality and abundance they desire at prices that are equitable. If the farmer and those who manufacture his production tools, supplies, and equipment—and if those who process and distribute what the farmer produces and bring it to the consumer in an attractive, sanitary, and nutritious way—if all these do not get a fair return, their labor and their capital will go elsewhere.

Obvious as this is, it bears restating.

It is well to note that over the past year, dairy farmers have left the farm at twice the usual rate, and the number of dairy cows has dropped to the lowest level since 1900.

With alternative kinds of employment available, many dairy farmers are putting both their capital and labor elsewhere.

Dairy farmers have been the lowest paid of the generally underpaid farm segment. In New York last year, dairy farmers earned only 40 cents an hour after costs and a 5¾ percent (prevailing rate) return on capital. In Wisconsin, where the prevailing interest rate was 5½ percent, the hourly return in 1965 was 60 cents.

Is it any wonder that thousands of them are taking the better paid jobs available today in our booming economy with a 40-hour work week and no cows that must be milked morning and night? The clearly predictable result of this movement out of dairying has been a sharp cut in the supply of milk with higher prices to the consumer.

The issue, then, becomes clearly: What is a fair price? What should the farmer receive? Are unreasonable profits being made? What is the true story? Is the American consumer getting good food at a fair price? or is he being exploited in the marketplace?

As I have said, I am here to be of service to you in your important investigation. But I also come to you—and through you to the consumers of this great city and other cities throughout the United States—with a simple plea, "Don't make the farmer the scapegoat for increases in the cost of living and for the inflationary pressures that may now exist."

I respectfully submit that recent modest farm price increases have been too long delayed.

They are fair to the farmer.

They are needed by the farmer.

They are not unfair to the consumer.

In a broad sense, they are in the national interest.

Farm price increases have occasioned only a small part of the rise in food prices that we have witnessed recently. Permit me to illustrate my point by an analysis of price increases in certain of the more important food items to which attention has been called repeatedly in the press and on the air in New York City

Most prominently mentioned have been milk and bread. According to newspaper accounts, the retail price for a 1-pound loaf of white bread rose 3 cents from July 1965 to July 1966. In that same period, the farmer's return for the farm ingredients in that 1-pound loaf—the wheat, skim milk, and other farm products—rose from 3.4 cents to 3.9 cents.

The price rise to the farmer was only half a cent—compared with a reported 3 cent rise in the retail cost. Clearly, 2.5 cents of the 3 cent rise in the loaf of bread was not caused by the farmer.

A little history emphasizes this point. In 1950 the farmer received about 2½ cents for the wheat that went into a 1-pound loaf of bread. That loaf retailed for about 14 cents then. Today the farmer receives 3.2 cents. But the price of bread around the nation now averages 22 cents. The farmer is receiving less than a penny more for the wheat in a loaf of bread for which the retail price has increased 8 cents.

The situation for milk is comparable. Increases of 2 to 3 cents a quart have been reported in New York City at the retail level. During 1966 the average price paid to farmers for Class I fluid milk will increase between 40 and 45 cents per 100 pounds over last year. With 46 quarts of milk in each 100 pounds, a retail price increase of about 1 cent a quart would be justified. Anything more than this must be accounted for by other factors.

The question thus becomes, "What about the farm price increases for milk and bread?" Were farmers adequately rewarded before these increases occurred? Or are the increases justified? Are they fair? Are they in the national interest?

The period 1947 to 1949 is customarily used as a base for comparison of price changes in the various items we buy as consumers—and if we use it as a base to measure recent trends in farm prices, marketing charges, and retail food prices, some interesting facts emerge.

1. Farm prices in 1965 were 8 percent below the 1947–49 base period. In first-half 1966 they were 2 percent below, and last month they were 1½ percent below the base period.

2. Retail food prices in 1965 were 28 percent higher than in the 1947–49 period. In June 1966, they were up 34 percent from the base period.

Last year the cost to consumers of farm-produced food totaled $77.6 billion, up $34.2 billion, or 79 percent, from the 1947–49 average of $43.4 billion. Of this $34.2 billion increase in the cost of farm-produced food, $27.6 billion, or 80.7 percent, was received by the marketing agencies, processors, and other components—in other words, the middleman. Only $6.6 billion, or 19.3 percent, trickled down to the farmer for the much larger volume of products he delivered to the distribution system.

The point these figures dramatize is that farm prices and farm income have lagged far behind the return to other sectors of our economy. May I call your attention to certain charts (appended to this statement) which I think will clarify some of the points at issue?

Chart 1 (not printed in RECORD) shows the widening gap between retail food prices and the prices received by farmers.

Charts 2, 3, and 4 (not printed in RECORD) compare prices for wheat, dairy, and meat at the farm with retail prices of bread and other bakery, meat, and cereal products.

These objective facts establish, I think, beyond controversy that farm prices are not the major cause of increased food prices that we are now experiencing. On the contrary, farm prices lag far behind the increased prices of other items which make up the cost of living.

Do you know of any other major item—whether it be taxes, transportation, professional services, housing or whatever—whose price is less today than it was two decades ago? I'm sure the answer is "no." There are no other items making up a considerable part of our cost of living that have actually decreased in price.

We are all concerned with rising prices—the farmer no less than the city dweller. Since 1960, the things the farmer has to buy have gone up by 11 percent. If he had not increased his productivity during these years, his financial position would be very bleak indeed. But since 1960 farm productivity per man hour is up by nearly one-third, compared with an increase in productivity in the non-farm sector of only about 18 percent.

And since 1947, farm output per man hour has risen 185 percent as against an increase of 65 percent in the non-farm sector.

This sizable increase in farm productivity didn't "just happen." The farmer has invested millions upon millions of his own dollars to improve his agricultural plant. Government programs—research, economic stabilization, credit—have aided and encouraged the farmer to increase his productivity. And the results have been worth the effort.

Today, the American consumer—despite recent price rises—is eating better food, at a lower real cost, than he ever has before. As chart 5 shows, the average family today spends about 18 percent of its after-tax pay on food—the lowest average in the world, and by far the lowest in our entire history. In 1947, this same family spent 26 percent of its take-home pay for food, and as recently as 1960 spent 20 percent. If the percent of take-home pay spent for food remained the same as it was in 1947, $35 billion would be added to the nation's food bill and about $750 a year to a family of four.

Let's compare 1960 with today to see how much more we can buy now than we could then: One hour of factory labor earnings in 1965 bought:

12.5 pounds of white bread—compared with 11.1 pounds in 1960.

2.4 pounds of round steak—compared with 2.1 pounds.

3.2 pounds of sliced bacon—compared with 3.5 pounds.

3.5 pounds of butter—compared with 3 pounds.

9.9 quarts of milk—compared with 8.7 quarts.

5 dozen eggs—compared with 3.9 dozen.

27.8 pounds of potatoes—compared with 31.4 pounds.

16.2 cans of tomatoes—compared with 14.2 cans.

American farmers not only have provided a plentiful supply of food for their own country; they have also given the United States a valuable instrument for other uses. This year agriculture will earn more than $5 billion of precious foreign exchange, thus setting a new export record. Each year food assumes a more important role in American foreign policy.

This year we are shipping about one-quarter of our total wheat crop to one nation, India . . . and this wheat is the only thing standing between that sub-continent and widespread famine. Since 1954, 145 million tons of American food, at a cost of more than $15 billion, have gone to hundreds of millions of hungry, needy people all over the world. This magnificent humanitarian record is a tribute to the generosity of our people and the productivity of our farmers.

But even if we are persuaded, now, that the farmer is entitled to some price increases as a matter of fairness and in the nation's interest, the question still remains: Why have recent jumps in certain food prices exceeded farm price increases?

Why have bread prices jumped a reported 3 cents a pound, rather than the ½ cent that farm price increases would justify . . . and why has milk gone up 3 cents a quart, instead of 1 cent?

This very important question deserves a prompt and factual answer.

So far, to my knowledge, consumers have not received such an answer. But I am sure that the members of this Council and many New York City consumers read with interest, as did the Secretary of Agriculture, a comparison of the second quarters of 1965 and 1966 in the July 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal which showed that profits for 12 unnamed grocery chains are up 21 percent over a year ago, and profits of food products companies are up 16.5 percent.

And now, as you pursue the answer to the food price question, I promise you the wholehearted cooperation, support and assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Permit me to make a few additional points which I am sure you will want to keep in mind as your investigation goes forward.

These facts are too often overlooked:

1. Farm prices and food prices may be, and usually are, two different things.

2. Americans are choosing more expensive types of food than formerly, and are eating a smaller volume of the lower-price foods. Over the past 20 years, consumption of meat is up about 20 pounds per person, and most of the increase has come in the higher priced cuts of meat. Conversely, consumption of cereal products, an inexpensive item, is down about 25 pounds per person per year over the same period.

3. Today's consumers are receiving more services with their food purchases. For instance:

The typical American supermarket today stocks from six to ten thousand items on its shelves, double the number it did 20 years ago. It is not unusual to find as many as 85 different cuts of meat and poultry and 70 different varieties of canned vegetables in one market. An estimated 70 percent of sales today are for products that did not even exist 10 years ago. All of these innovations cost money, and all must be paid for by the consumer.

Other non-food services—parking lots, check cashiers, trading stamps, advertising and promotion—also cost money.

4. Convenience foods, to the extent they are purchased by a housewife, also add to her food bill. A good example is the TV dinner, selling for 60 cents. Prepared at home, it would cost 20 cents. In this case the housewife pays about 40 cents for built-in services. These convenience foods free the housewife for other activities and give her more time to spend with her family, but they are an item in increased food costs which cannot be charged to the farmer. For a TV dinner, for instance, the farmer receives only about 8 cents for his products out of the 60 cents retail cost.

5. The shopper in the supermarket often buys many times in addition to food. Cigarettes, cosmetics, hardware, and even wearing apparel go through many a supermarket check-out counter. Certainly, these items cannot properly be considered a part of the family food budget.

Finally, let me point out once again that:

1. Only a small portion of the increased cost of food at the retail level can be traced to increased farm prices.

2. Recent modest farm price increases are badly needed and have been earned. Both consumers and farmers benefit when the farmer is fairly rewarded for his labor. The farmer has not been fairly rewarded in the past, and if this situation is allowed to persist, food supplies will diminish as farmers leave agriculture. Prices will then increase sharply and the consumer ultimately will pay much more.

3. Many factors—convenience items, services, etc.—go into the retail price of food. All of us as consumers must decide whether we wish to buy such convenience and such service along with our daily bread.

4. The real cost of food—measured as a percentage of income and in the number of hours of work necessary to buy it—has been going steadily down.

5. Food price increases beyond the modest farm price increases so far experienced call for vigorous investigation. Food is a necessity. The food middleman is entitled to a fair return for his capital and labor, but more than a fair return is not in the interest of the consumer, the farmer, or the businessman.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, too often we in this Nation think of a man or a woman as retired or elderly only because he or she has lived 65 years or thereabouts. But our older Americans are getting younger all the time, both in terms of outlook and in terms of capacity for new experiences.

At least they should be. We are trying, in legislation and in community organization, to pay more effective attention to the health needs and other needs of those near or past age 65.

But no matter how tolerable we make idleness, many older Americans feel that there should be some way in which they can make use of their knowledge and energies. Some may want additional income. Others may want to give service to others. Many simply feel excluded from society if they do not work in some way.

Columnist Sylvia Porter, in her usual illuminating and hard-hitting way, has summarized the problems now facing older Americans who want work. Her syndicated articles—which appeared on June 28, 29, 30, and July 1—also described the several attempts by Federal agencies to break through barriers now facing the older worker. The Office of Economic Opportunity, for example, has sponsored limited but promising programs enlisting the elderly. The Department of Labor is increasing its technical services to the elderly and would add more service under legislation now under consideration by Congress. The Administration on Aging, created by Congress last year, must work with other agencies to reduce age discrimination and encourage work opportunities.

The articles also note that proposals for a Senior Service Corps, now before Congress, could be an imaginative answer to many older worker problems. As the sponsor of one such proposal I would like to suggest that a Senior Corps could serve at least three purposes:

It would show more dramatically than ever before that older Americans are able and willing to serve in worthwhile community service programs.

It would encourage responsible private and public sponsors to develop programs to deal with long-standing community needs.

It would serve as a referral agency to those older workers who might be more adequately served by other programs now contemplated by the Department of Labor.

Thus, the Corps would be a spearhead and a focal point in employment and service programs for older Americans.

Mr. President, Mrs. Porter's articles give a valuable summary of a problem that should be of concern to each one of us. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINDING JOBS FOR THE ELDERLY—I

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Let us repay our older Americans for their sustained creative participation in our national and community life by providing them with a wide range of meaningful opportunities . . . let us find ways to employ the skill and wisdom that so many of our older Americans possess and long to share. . . ." President Johnson, March 26, 1964.

It was a ringing challenge indeed. But more than two years later not much has been done.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 calls for the "opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age." But job discrimination because of age remains widespread in the U.S.

In August of 1965 an Office of Economic Opportunity Task Force on Programs for Older Persons recommended 10 concrete programs to increase the incomes of the elderly, all providing paying job opportunities. To date, only token action has been taken to implement them and only one in 100 poverty dollars is earmarked for the elderly.

Nearly two years ago the President's Council on Aging recommended a new part-time employment service under the U.S. Employment Service to help find more part-time jobs for elderly Americans and provide more education and training opportunities for elderly workers. But only baby steps have been taken in this direction. Only one in 10 job trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act is 45 years or older and only an insignificant fraction are as old as 65.

The slogan for "Senior Citizens' Month" in May promised a "new day for older Americans." The new day is far from dawning and, in the words of Charles Odell, assistant to the director of the U.S. Employment Service, "there is no great cause for optimism."

It is a fact that the often desperate financial plight of elderly citizens has been almost ignored by government, business, welfare agencies and poverty warriors. We have created a retirement income foundation through Social Security but we make it dreadfully difficult for the estimated two-thirds of those reaching age 65 who would like to continue working to supplement this income through paying jobs.

Corporations have expanded and improved pension plans for retired workers. But they still insist on arbitrary retirement policies which force older workers out of their jobs. Corporate hiring practices have steadily reduced the age of the "older worker" to age 40–50 today.

As for "the Great Society," the elderly have been barred from helping the nation with its problems, says William R. Hutton, executive director of the National Council of Senior Citizens. "Many of those who tried to help have met the prevailing attitude of mere tolerance or condescension toward people over 65. Our so-called 'welfare' policies have been calculated to make the aged think poorly of themselves, sapping their self-respect," Hutton says.

In summary, none of the countless committees, study groups, task forces, gerontological seminars, Federal do-good agencies, etc., etc. has managed to provide meaningful numbers of jobs for the elderly who are willing, able and in need of work.

President Johnson is calling for yet another "special study" to find out "what we can do in the twilight period of people's lives."

They need another study? No! What they need are jobs.

JOBS FOR THE ELDERLY—II

(By Sylvia Porter)

Question: "I am 63, healthy, and not afraid to work. But nobody wants me because I am too old. I don't want any financial help, but please advise me where I can go to get a job to supplement my Social Security check."

Answer: Almost nowhere.

This plea underlines the problem facing many older Americans today: widespread rejection by employers. The answer underlines the failure to tackle the problem.

As Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, executive director of the National Council on the Aging, recently testified before a Senate Special Committee, today's elderly "walk a taut tightrope between a lengthening longevity and a shrinking bank balance." A man now reaching the official retirement age of 65 can expect to live 13 additional years and a woman aged 65 lives an average of 16 more years.

Yet for many this milestone means automatic retirement and poverty: while citizens aged 65 and over now are nearly 10 percent of the population, they are at least 20 percent of the poor.

Officially, the unemployment rate for the elderly is below the national jobless rate of 4 percent. But this is misleading. The reason that rate is so low is that the elderly know there are no jobs for them and they stop looking. It's called "retirement," but as Mrs. Mathiasen says, it's "no more than a polite word for unemployment."

Nine of 10 large U.S. corporations have mandatory retirement policies. While at least 20 states now have laws barring job discrimination on the basis of age, one-half of the job openings in the U.S. still are closed to anybody aged 55 or over, and one in four job openings is closed to workers as young as 45.

Today, the Labor Department classifies a worker aged 45 or older as an "older worker" and this age group now makes up nearly one-half of the nation's long-term unemployed. Three out of four of the unemployed aged 65 or over are out of work for at least 15 weeks.

The cost to the U.S. economy of these facts, in unemployment compensation and lost production, is estimated at more than $4 billion a year.

Yet study after study of the job performance of older workers has shown that absenteeism actually is lower than among younger workers; that the older worker is at least as productive as his younger counterpart; that the average 55-year-old man remains on a new job longer than the average 25-year-old.

Admittedly, a key obstacle to providing jobs for the elderly is their relative lack of education and skills. More than three-fourths of the aged poor family heads have had less than eight years of schooling.

Another obstacle is the isolation of the elderly. As one observer put it: "They are to be found in the rooms of rundown hotels of the central city, in old homes and apartments, in mining and railroad towns, in rural shacks."

But the vital "but" is that millions do have sufficient education, skills and know-how to perform many needed services today. The heart of the matter is that neither the economy nor the "Great Society" should perpetuate today's policies concerning the elderly. The economy needs the skills of all the experienced workers it can get.

PILOT JOB PROJECTS MAY HELP ELDERLY

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Across the land," declared antipoverty chief Sargent Shriver at a recent hearing by the special Senate committee on aging, "the American people are thinking about the problems of aging. America cares, America is concerned, America is dedicated to improving the lot of its senior citizens."

Are we? If so, exactly what are we doing to relieve the poverty that now hits one in five of the elderly, the forced unemployment through mandatory retirement, the massive job discrimination because of age?

A new administration on aging has been created under the Older Americans Act of 1965. It is supposed to be working up a coordinated program of services and opportunities for our older citizens.

The Small Business Administration is trying to draw up a national roster of retired business and professional men and women to provide faltering small businesses with specialized counseling in a variety of different fields.

WORK FOR FARMERS

The roster still is not truly nationwide, but it is a service thousands of small businesses badly need and it could give rewarding part-time work to hundreds of semiretired businessmen and women.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has launched a Foster Grandparents project which employs older Americans to provide desperately needed tender loving care to abandoned and underprivileged children in orphanages and other institutions. As one worker remarked: "It gives me something to get up for in the morning."

The O. E. O. also is helping to finance Operation Green Thumb, employing retired farmers to help beautify our rural roadsides and countryside.

Says an O. E. O. spokesman: "Communities all over the country are just beginning to draw up plans to help the elderly poor—and to request antipoverty funds."

The National Council on the Aging has been developing and distributing models for a variety of part-time and full-time job opportunities and employment services in communities where the elderly are concentrated. The work is mostly in community and household services. And the O. E. O. has approved plans for several comprehensive senior-citizen service centers which offer counseling, job-referral, health and legal services, and educational and recreational opportunities.

The United States Employment Service has trained and hired 75 older-worker specialists in six major cities who will interview and counsel elderly job applicants and attempt to develop new local job opportunities tailored to the specific needs and abilities of the elderly. This effort is due to be extended soon to 20 cities.

The U. S. E. S. has, in addition, launched two experimental projects to organize special part-time employment services primarily for elderly workers—and to tap the services of volunteers who can help pinpoint suitable part-time jobs.

We have made a good beginning, in the words of the just-released report of the Senate committee on aging. But it's painfully obvious that every single effort to develop jobs for older Americans now underway is on an extremely limited scale. It is a good—but token—start.

FINDING JOBS FOR THE ELDERLY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Many Americans, officially retired, are able and willing to work—at least part-time—and to perform badly-needed services.

Yet the efforts to provide jobs for the elderly are pitifully limited and half-hearted.

What should be done?

There are pages and pages of evidence, testimony and recommendations on jobs for the elderly. Here are the highlights that stand out:

1. The Office of Economic Opportunity, which recently launched a limited number of highly successful projects employing elderly Americans, should greatly expand such projects. For example, this spring's short-lived "Medicare Alert" campaign, in which 14,500 older workers tracked down many other elderly citizens to inform them about Medicare doctor insurance, might be continued to perform many other services.

EXPANSION URGED

2. The OEO's "Foster Grandparents," which employs older Americans to work with underprivileged children in institutions, should be greatly expanded. There are more than 20,000 abandoned institutionalized children, but to date there are only about 1,100 "Foster Grandparents." The elderly could also help relieve the nationwide shortages of tutors and other school helpers.

3. In August, 1965, President Johnson announced a massive project to train elderly Americans as "home health aides" to perform a variety of tasks to help fill the gap of an anticipated 50,000 workers because of Medicare. Today Medicare is in effect but not a single home health aide has been trained. Thousands of additional orderlies, kitchen assistants, nurse aides, etc. will be needed in hospital clinics and nursing homes under Medicare. Again, older Americans obviously could help fill this need with only a minimum of training.

TWO BILLS CITED

4. Older workers also could serve as "handymen" in rural areas: making regular visits in pick-up trucks to other elderly citizens; performing such services as repairing broken window panes, patching roofs, helping plant small gardens; transporting those in need to the doctor or local anti-poverty agencies.

As evidence of this need, an estimated 2.5 million homes occupied by elderly citizens are classified as "dilapidated" or in otherwise seriously deficient condition.

5. Two bills moving through Congress call for a new "Senior Service Corps" providing elderly citizens across the nation with a wide variety of paying jobs in all these areas and in a wide variety of other community services. Such a Corps could be an imaginative answer to many of the employment-income problems.

6. An imperative is greatly expanded opportunities for short-term training, basic education, special employment and job counseling services. A key point is that two-thirds of the retirees who wish to continue working want part-time jobs.

And perhaps most fundamental of all is the need for an overhaul of all attitudes toward arbitrary retirement. The National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress reported recently to the President: "The idea of a fixed retirement age makes little sense in a society so diverse in its work and skills."

In the words of Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz, we must break away "from the sterile view of man that fixes a time to learn, a time to earn and a time to die."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOREFATHERS CAME FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 23, President Johnson made an impressive tour of Indiana and Kentucky and parts of Illinois, and Tennessee. It was my privilege to be with the party and to see the great welcome extended the President on that trip.

In his brief remarks at the airport at Louisville, Ky., to an enthusiastic crowd gathered there at 8:10 p.m., on Saturday, July 23, President Johnson gave some history of his family in Kentucky, the DeSheas and the Huffmans of Kentucky. The DeSheas are one of the alltime leading great families of Kentucky, and I believe the Members of the Congress would like to know this background in President Johnson's life.

In his remarks, the President announced an Economic Development Administration grant for a national outdoor facility at Lake Barkley State Park. This facility and others developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the general area will provide recreational opportunities for many Americans. Our servicemen at Fort Campbell will profit from the location of the facility, and the project will help the economic situation of the area. This project is a fine example of the results of our new Great Society programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point President Lyndon Johnson's remarks at the Louisville, Ky., airport upon his arrival there.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON ARRIVAL AT LOUISVILLE, KY., AIRPORT

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Young, Senator COOPER, Senator MORTON, Mr. Barnsley, Mr. Bingham, Distinguished Members of the House and Senate who are traveling with us, My Friends of Kentucky.

Mrs. Johnson and I want to express our deepest and sincerest thanks to you for coming out here this late in the evening, bringing your signs and giving us this warm welcome to the great City of Louisville in the great State of Kentucky.

I always get a peculiar pleasure when I set my foot on Kentucky soil. I am sorry that I can't be here longer tonight—at least not this trip. But I am coming back.

The Johnsons will always come back to Kentucky, because—and I hope this won't get me in trouble down home—Kentucky is where we really started out.

My father's mother was born in Russellville. My great great grandmother was a sister of a Governor of Kentucky, Joseph Deshea, and a sister of a major general of Kentucky in the War of 1812, and a sister of a Congressman from Kentucky, and a sister of a Congressman from Tennessee, all of them happened to be Desheas.

My great grandfather, John Huffman, was a Kentucky farmer until the middle of the last century. He did move to Texas, but I hope that you won't hold that against him.

He was really seeking new horizons. He thought that that was in the best Kentucky tradition. That Kentucky tradition gave us men like Daniel Boone and Casey Jones. It also gave us great institutions like the TVA.

Thirty years ago the people of Kentucky, in this whole region, faced an uphill climb. The hill was long, and it was steep. But while the rest of the country was debating, Kentucky was marching.

You may, with my economists, keep calling the Upper South an exciting new frontier of progress. But you took Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal—you converted it into the beginning of a great new society, for I was still just a Junior Congressman.

This is a good place, I think, and a good time tonight for the Governor to announce another step forward.

The Governor and the delegation and my associates in Washington, who all are interested in Kentucky, have been working on a plan that we think would be helpful to this great state.

Tonight we can tell you that we have approved the request of the State of Kentucky, through its Governor, for a grant from the Economic Development Administration for the development of a great new natural outdoor facility at Lake Barkley State Park. The amount of the Federal grant is approximately $4 million. It will be matched equally by the funds provided by the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The public facility which will be constructed with these funds will add to and complete the other facilities planned for the Kentucky Lake and Lake Barkley and the natural recreation areas that are now being developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority at your lakes. All of these facilities will provide recreational opportunities for more than 70 million Americans, who will be located within a day's drive of this beautiful recreational area. It will also be available to our fine fighting servicemen and their families who have served this country so well and who are now stationed at Fort Campbell, which we visited earlier this afternoon.

The immediate area adjacent to the city of this project is an area of economic need. It meets all the tests outlined in the Economic Development Act of 1965.

So we are convinced that the development will make a material contribution to the economic well-being of this area. It is going to save me some time that I have been spending, because I think it is easier to make the grant than it is to take the calls from the Governor and the Senators from Kentucky and the Congressional delegation.

This area, which is jointly being developed by Federal and State and private enterprise is destined to become one of this nation's most attractive and best outdoor recreational areas.

So I am very proud of my Kentucky heritage. I try to live up to it.

I want to thank you again for your welcome. I want to thank you for the contribution that this great State has made in the Halls of Congress, in the outstanding leaders that you have provided us in this nation, in the field of public service, in the field of journalism, in the field of the development of the TVA, and many other worthwhile projects.

I particularly want to thank you for furnishing us the most able executive, I think, that we have in the White House, Mrs. Bess Clements Abel, a Kentucky girl, who walks with Kings and Prime Ministers and never loses the common touch to the extent but what she can lecture the President.

So I thank you again for all the contributions of Kentucky. I hope that you will go right on doing what you have been doing since the Johnson family moved away to Texas and just keep on setting the standards for the rest of us to follow.

Thank you and good night.

SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS ON THE HANOI-HAIPHONG RAIDS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a recent article by the noted writer on Vietnam, Prof. Bernard Fall of Howard University, raises some very curious questions concerning our raids on the oil storage depots at Haiphong and Hanoi.

Why did not Hanoi deploy its jetplanes—Mig–17's and Mig–21's—to protect the oil depots?

Why was our June 29 raid carried out in daylight, as though we were confident there would be no fighter plane interception?

Why was the timing of the first raid taken when it was?

Finally, and perhaps of first importance, is there a vital effect upon Hanoi from our bombing raids?

Mr. Fall does not give us answers, but there is some utility in raising questions. In doing so, he also gives us a considerable number of background facts which have not been presented publicly, at least for the most part, otherwise.

Mr. President, I ask that the article in the New Republic of July 16, "The Air Raids—Leftover Puzzles" may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Republic, July 16, 1966]

The Air Raids—Leftover Puzzles

". . . On June 26 the Far Eastern Air Force [FEAF] Target Committee nevertheless proposed that FEAF combat-operations policy ought at least be rewritten sufficiently . . . to maintain air pressure through destruction operations rather than to continue with the old policies of delay, disruption, and dislocation. . . . This modification is not a major change in policy, but rather a shift in emphasis from delay and disruption operations to destruction."

The above lines deal with the June 26, 1952 decision to bomb North *Korean* electrical power plants. [Robert Frank Futrell, of the USAF Historical Division, *et al.*, *The United States Air Force in Korea 1950-1953*, New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1961, p. 457.] Almost 14 years later to the day, President Johnson and his key advisers also explained that the bombing of the oil storage targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area did not constitute a change in policy, even though it marked a shift from attempting to delay North Vietnamese supply and troop reinforcements to a policy of attempting to destroy them at their source. These raids raise some intriguing questions, which require a short recapitulation of the targets and forces involved.

North Vietnam's known petroleum storage capacity is estimated at about 155,000 to 180,000 metric tons. The greater Haiphong area, with its sub-depots at Do-Son, accounts for 40 percent of the storage capacity; Hanoi for 20; Dong-Nham for 9; Bac-Giang for 4; and Nguyen Khé and Viet-Tri together for perhaps 12. They were all hit during the past week and, according to official reports, heavily damaged, if not altogether destroyed. If the official accounts are correct, the North Vietnamese lost 86 percent, or close to 130,000 tons of their total storage capacity. That indeed would be a crippling blow to anyone's *conventional* transport system and, above all, air power. A German 1963 study for example, showed that the superb Nazi jet fighters (we had no combat-worthy jets until 1946) were kept from being effective simply because they lacked fuel.

The same would hold true for Ho Chi Minh's precious 70-odd jets, the bulk of which are obsolescent MIG–17's, though perhaps a dozen are contemporary MIG–21 fighters fully able to take on American planes in combat. (Two American jets were shot down by them last year, and just recently, on June 22, a North Vietnamese MIG–17 shot down an American F–8 Crusader 40 miles north of Haiphong.) It is clear, then, that under certain circumstances the small North Vietnamese Air Force *will* engage American airplanes in combat—but rather surprisingly, the defense of the allegedly "vital" oil storage tanks was apparently not one of them! Thus far, not a single of the many American attacks against the oil storage areas has brought about any reaction on the part of the MIGs, although all other means of air defense, from light and heavy flak to SAM antiaircraft missiles, were committed without a shred of hesitation.

This is the more remarkable, since the first major American raid on Hanoi and Haiphong comprised at least 46 aircraft which came both from carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin and from American airbases in Thailand. They were surely picked up by North Vietnamese radar at least 100, if not 200, miles before reaching their targets: plenty of time for North Vitnamese jets to "scramble" to combat and intercept altitude; and, after all, what more "vital" targets would there be for them to defend than the Hanoi-Haiphong "envelope"? A similarly puzzling situation must have confronted the American pilots flying the mission. Fighter-bombers loaded down with bombs are sitting ducks for fast interceptors. Hence, to fly against Hanoi and Haiphong in the face of 70 undestroyed MIGs willing to defend their country's vitals could have developed into a major disaster. Even the approach of the MIGs would have compelled the American bombers to take such defensive measures as to abort part of the mission. Or sound aerial warfare practice would have compelled the US to neutralize (*i.e.*, attack and destroy) the jet airfields at Phuc-Yen and Cat-Bi (see map on page 8) prior to attacking Hanoi and Haiphong, since both airfields are within minutes of both cities. Neither Hanoi nor Washington claim that such airfield attacks have occurred.

In other words, the North Vietnamese reacted to the air raids on their petroleum storage areas (a) as if they knew that they were going to be hit; and (b) as if they didn't think they were worth defending anyway. And the American aircraft attacking them also acted, to say the least, curiously: (a) they attacked a perfectly fixed target in broad daylight, which could just as well have been attacked under the cover of darkness when all but radar-directed flak would have been badly hampered; and (b) they attacked SAM sites in the vicinity of the target areas—destroying, according to Secretary McNamara's statement, a MIG–17 defending *them!*—but felt sufficiently confident about noninterference by enemy interceptors with this primary mission as to leave their bases unattacked. There must be logical answers for all the unanswered questions; for example, timing. De Gaulle was in Moscow, and both the Russians and the French—all personality clashes aside—do not think too highly of American policy in Vietnam as it was. The fact that de Gaulle's personal envoy, M. Jean Sainteny, was about to arrive in Hanoi with a private message from the French leader to Ho Chi Minh—known in Washington—made the timing even poorer. As it turned out, Sainteny's plane to Hanoi was grounded in neighboring Laos by the American raid on the Hanoi storage area, located near Hanoi's Gia-Lam airport. And a high-level Hanoi mission, perhaps Ho Chi Minh, was in Peking. If somebody wanted to make sure that the Sainteny mission to Hanoi would fail, this was the way.

Just two weeks earlier, both French and Rumanian diplomats had been informed separately by high-ranking Chinese officials that, while Peking did not particularly relish the idea of negotiations between Hanoi and Washington, it would do nothing to block them. It was confirmed to me in Europe at that time that this information had been passed on Washington as soon as it became available. That again puts the mission of a high-level Canadian diplomat, Chester Ronning, to Hanoi in a different light. Ronning's mission to Hanoi was rapidly touted as a "total failure," even though, according to unimpeachable reports, Ronning himself did not see it that way. In fact, Hanoi's relenting from last year's prenegotiating position (which included both the unconditional cessation of bombing and the departure of U.S. troops) to one in which there no longer was any mention of the departure of American troops, could have been considered a significant step toward a new middle ground. But these were not the only interesting straws flying in the wind.

There was the extremely strong statement by UN Secretary General U Thant and an interesting proposal put forward in March, 1966 by the leading younger theoretician of the French Communist Party, Jean-Maurice Hermann, in the party's highest-level magazine *Démocratie Nouvelle:* ". . . What would happen if a certain number of [important] persons or powers which desire peace in Vietnam—and there are many of them—met and attempted, on the basis of the texts of all sides [*des uns et des autres*], to elaborate the project of a compromise which would then be submitted to both the Americans and the Liberation Front, saying: 'After all, you said you were ready to accept this. And you [the other partner] said it also. However, it is difficult to get the negotiations going because you do not wish to. Would you, separately, accept this as the basis of a settlement?' . . . Face to face with honest and acceptable proposals, a refusal would completely unmask those who are against peace."

It would be hard to say whether this proposal represents a French Communist position or a Russian "feeler," or simply the kind of flexible thinking now prevalent in France; but before anyone cries "impossible," it should be remembered how Ralph Bunche won his Nobel Peace Prize running up and down the corridors of a hotel in Rhodes where Arabic and Israeli delegations were hammering out a cease-fire, with the Arabs refusing to sit down at the same table with their enemies.

On the roller-coaster that is Vietnam, we have gone from a period in early 1965 where negotiations were deemed impossible because we were losing the war to one where "premature" negotiations might in the eyes of the "Hawks" conceivably *spoil* the chances of a political rebirth in Saigon or even of military victory in the field. During the Korean war, 34,211 enemy vehicles were destroyed (as against 1,500 thus far in North Vietnam) in a more massive interdiction offensive than the one now in force in Vietnam. But as Vice Admiral J. J. Clark, commander of the Seventh Fleet, later stated: "It did *not* interdict. The Communists got their supplies through; and for the kind of war they were fighting, they not only kept their battle line supplied, but they had surplus to spare so that by the end of the war they could even launch an offensive."

Yet, as in Korea, the Vietnam war is now likely to ride the upswing of the blood-drenched roller-coaster into the annihilation of industries, flood control and irrigation dams, and cities and villages—for, after all, when all of North Vietnam will supply the Viet Cong and the infiltrated divisions with the help of massive coolie labor, *people* must become a strategic target. And they will. Never fear they will.

BERNARD B. FALL.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD PRESS INSTITUTE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the World Press Institute has observed its fifth anniversary, and I believe its work of providing successive groups of foreign journalists with an opportunity to spend a year of study and travel in the United States deserves special attention and commendation.

The World Press Institute has its headquarters at Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., and Dr. Harvey M. Rice, president of Macalester, is a member of the board of directors of the institute. The institute has the financial support of several corporations and foundations, including American Motors Corp., the Coca-Cola Export Corp., General Foods Fund, General Mills, Hammond Organ Corp., Hilton Hotels Corp., the Johnson Foundation, National Cash Register Corp., Pan American World Airways, the Procter & Gamble Fund, the Reader's Digest Foundation, Signode Corp., Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, and Whitney Communications Corp.

Each year since 1961, 15 professional journalists, between 21 and 35 years of age, from different countries have participated in the year-long program. Initial screening of the applicants is handled by selection panels of editors and publishers in each country. The 1965–66 program included young journalists from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, Germany, Ghana, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, The Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, United Arab Republic, and the United Kingdom.

The World Press Institute fellows study for one academic semester at Macalester College in a special course in American studies. They are housed in student dormitories on the campus and live as a part of the regular student body of the college and participate in the social and cultural life of the school as well as of the St. Paul-Minneapolis community.

Following their studies, the fellows travel around the United States for several weeks and then during February, March, and April they work as interns on an American newspaper, magazine, or television station. The program concludes with further travel, workshops, conferences and investigation and research on special phases of American life. The fellows, of course, are free to travel and observe and free to write without restriction.

I have had an opportunity to meet with the fellows and to discuss American Government and issues with them, and have enjoyed the exchange of ideas. I believe this special program undertaken by a Minnesota college and various groups in the Nation represents one of the many commendable efforts made to advance understanding among citizens of different nations, a process in which they learn about our way of life and we of theirs. It is particularly important when it involves journalists who have the special responsibility of reporting and interpreting events and for helping citizens to form a reasoned judgment on issues and policies which cross national boundaries.

THE TRAGEDY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Senate, to recognize, and to extend thanks to the many persons in Austin who performed in an exemplary manner during and after the recent tragedy in which 13 citizens were killed and 31 others wounded at the hands of a sniper on the University of Texas campus.

All of us deeply appreciate the heroic deeds and accomplishments of students, university officials, newsmen, ambulance drivers, medical personnel, police, safety officials, and individual Austin residents.

I especially wish to convey the heartfelt gratitude that all Texans and all other Americans feel for the bravery of the Austin policemen, among them Ramero Martinez, who though off duty, joined other members of his force in ending the terror. Martinez was joined in the assault by Austin officers Houston McCoy and Jerry Day. I laud also the bravery of Allen Crum, a bookstore employee and retired Air Force noncommissioned officer, who aided the Austin policemen in their final encounter with the sniper.

Many Austin residents and students are to be especially commended for their acts of courage in aiding the wounded and in pulling them to safety while under fire themselves. These included student body president, Cliff Drummond, newsman John Thawley, Vietnam veteran and student Brehan Ellison, student James McKinney, construction worker Bill Davis, and dozens of others.

I know all of us in the Senate extend our sympathy to those who mourn personal losses in this tragedy and offer our prayers that such an event may never again occur.

MORE WHEAT AND FOOD RESERVES NEEDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we have been worried about grain surpluses for years, but now it is the specter of grain shortages that looms on the horizon. Five years ago we had a surplus of 1.4 billion bushels of wheat. Today that has dwindled to 536 million bushels—only enough to meet our normal needs for 3 or 4 months. Yet, India is calling for unprecedented quantities of American wheat. The Soviets and the Chinese are buying large quantities of wheat for cash from our allies, principally Canada. These countries could one day soon be in the market for American wheat if we have it to sell.

What are we to say to the hungry abroad if we cannot assist them in a time of cruel famine? How are we to rationalize decisions that could leave us with no wheat for hard cash markets while we pay farmers not to produce? I am deeply concerned lest the United States soon be placed in the position of having exhausted our wheat stocks while paying farmers to leave their land idle in the face of widespread human starvation. What a tragic image of our country that would present to the world. We are devoting the lives of our soldiers and $2 billion a month to a questionable effort in Vietnam designed to save America's face in Asia.

But the face of America cannot be saved by armaments if we sacrifice an even greater instrument of influence and power in the world—the power of food—the greatest source of material strength in the American arsenal. Our policies in southeast Asia—regardless of what one personally might think of them—have subjected us to doubt, suspicion, fear and resentment all around the globe. But our capacity to produce food is admired the world around.

That is why I am disturbed by our fast diminishing food reserves. That is why I am shocked by information that has come to my attention that the administration has sent the word to our embassies around the world that we do not have enough wheat to maintain our food-for-peace program at its present level.

U.S. Embassies have been notified that we will have only 11.2 million tons of wheat for food for peace in the present marketing year—25 percent less than we provided in the 1965–66 marketing year. There can be some substitution of corn and grain sorghum, but with minor exceptions, these substitutions are unsatisfactory. Furthermore, they do not contribute to long-range market development for American wheat, which is an important part of the function of our food-for-peace program.

Our embassies will also soon learn that we will have no significant amount of high-protein, nonfat milk except for the voluntary agencies—and they face drastic cuts. Our Government stocks of this urgently needed food were 24½ million pounds on May 31, a tiny fraction of our nearly 2½-billion-pound annual production.

On May 31 we did not have a single pound of cheese and less than one-half million pounds of butter in Government stocks which could be diverted to food for peace or any other use.

Our feed-grain stocks, while not critical, were down from 2 billion bushels to 1.5 billion. They, of course, are little used in food for peace, since their principal use is for livestock feed.

Except for cotton and tobacco, our surpluses are all but gone. And so we are forced to cut back on food for peace.

Why do we hobble and tie our strongest single weapon in today's world—nourishing, abundant food?

The House has passed a greatly expanded authorization of our food-for-peace program—a program which I was privileged to direct for the late President Kennedy—a program that was dear to his heart—a program for which Vice President HUMPHREY valiantly worked during all his brilliant service in the U.S. Senate. It is perhaps the finest and most important oversea program ever provided by the American people. Yet, it is now being cut back by Executive order. Even if the Senate acts on the House-passed expanded authorization—and I hope we will act on a bill approximately like the House version—what good will we have accomplished if there is no food to send abroad and only increasing Executive restrictions on the present program? Food for peace, or food for freedom, will contribute little to either peace or freedom if the American granary is empty and the restrictions are increased.

So, Mr. President, I call on our Secretary of Agriculture to announce a substantial increase in wheat-acreage allotments for next year beyond the 15-percent increase he has already announced. We need more wheat and more dairy products and more edible oils if food for peace is to move abroad in step with the growing demands of this hungry planet. I call on the Secretary not only to authorize more wheat acreage, but also to safeguard the farmer's return for his added production.

Several knowledgeable newspaper columnists have written articles in the last 2 weeks about the administration's dilemma in regard to wheat acreage allotments. Mr. Eric Wentworth authored such a piece in the Washington Post last week, and Mr. Nick Kotz has written on the same subject in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 26.

Both articles indicate that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are confronted with a difficult decision on wheat acreage. If they do not increase wheat acreage allotments, they may later be accused of withholding production which might have prevented disastrous famine in India or elsewhere in the world. If they do increase wheat acreage allotments, they may later be accused of bringing on price-depressing surpluses to the economic injury of American farmers, according to the newspapermen.

In reality, however, the President and the Secretary are not, as they have been described, "between a rock and a hard place." There is a third alternative which would assure abundant wheat stocks and a fair return to the farmers of the United States.

Early this year the administration proposed a commodity reserve bill to authorize the maintenance of wheat reserves against the very sort of contingency which the newspaper writers are describing—poor world crops and the danger of famine. Producers were fearful of this proposal lest the so-called emergency reserve be used to depress wheat markets. The resulting opposition to the reserve bill has meant that it is not now scheduled for consideration in either the House or the Senate. I intend, however, to push hard for the passage of such legislation early next year.

It was my belief when the bill was introduced that the concept of the bill was excellent. It was also my belief that farmers should be given assurance that the maintenance of such a reserve would not be permitted to depress market prices and result in producers receiving inequitable returns for their whole crop.

On April 1, 1966, I introduced an amendment to the reserve bill, S. 2932, which I believe contains a formula for a solution of the supposed dilemma. The amendment provides that when our wheat stocks are low and the Secretary of Agriculture finds that it is desirable to build them up he should offer farmers a price support loan at 115 percent of the normal loan rate. This would fill up the reserve with wheat in excess of anticipated, normal requirements. The amendment also provides that sales from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks should be at not less than 115 percent of the normal loan rate, plus carrying charges.

The loan rate or basic price support level for wheat is now $1.25 per bushel. The market is substantially higher than that. The effect of my amendment would have been to have the Government say to farmers: "We will guarantee you $1.44 per bushel to produce wheat to go into a reserve against emergencies, and we shall not release any wheat from Government stocks into the market at less than that price."

If the Secretary of Agriculture, for example, determined that there was a need to produce 200 million bushels of wheat in excess of anticipated domestic and export requirements as insurance against famine, he would set an acreage allotment to obtain that production. Farmers would be given domestic-use wheat certificates and loans on the approximate 500 million bushels of the crop destined for domestic consumption to bring their return up to parity on that portion of their crop—a return of $2.50 per bushel. They would be given loans on an additional 200 million bushels destined for the reserve at 115 percent of the normal loan rate, a return of $1.44 per bushel, and they would receive loans on the balance of their production, just as they do today, at the $1.25 rate.

The $1.44 market-price level at which my amendment attempts to protect the producers for reserve wheat is little enough reward to farmers for providing a necessary reserve. I think it ought to be considerably more. In all candor, I chose 115 percent of price support as the level of my amendment because I believed it was all that Congress and the administration could be persuaded to allow.

It is unthinkable that the United States of America, with at least 60 million acres of idle farmland, should even consider running the risk of a famine that might cost tens and hundreds of thousands of human lives. We have a responsibility to use the resources with which God endowed this Nation for the welfare of mankind. We can do it under arrangements which will add to the prosperity of our farmers while strengthening our entire economy. I would like to urge our food and agricultural policymakers today to give consideration to the suggestion contained in my amendment No. 509 offered to Senate bill 2932.

Beyond urging our officials to consider arrangements for replenishment of our reserves without injury to producers, I would like to suggest to producers that they consider the production and retention of some reserve wheat stocks in their own hands.

Under existing wheat legislation, wheat producers may overplant their farm allotments by as much as 50 percent and yet qualify for domestic marketing certificates if they store the excess wheat in bonded storage.

In view of the larger wheat allotments already announced for 1967, few producers will have additional land on which to grow wheat in excess of the announced allotments. For those who do, however, this provision in the legislation permits them to overplant their allotment by as much as 50 percent without incurring any penalty—except that they must store the extra wheat.

Wheat yields are highly variable in most areas. With surplus stocks exhausted and market prices substantially above the Government loan level, it will be good business for many producers to overplant their allotments for the 1967 crop if they have the land available.

The excess wheat grown on this land may be taken out of storage in a future year when adverse weather results in a partial crop failure. Or, if the weather continues favorable for a series of years and the market price of wheat declines, the excess wheat can be released without penalty by underplanting the current allotment that year.

From a national standpoint it is desirable that individual producers hold a small secondary reserve of wheat which can be released in case of partial crop failures. From the standpoint of the individual producer—with wheat prices at current and prospective levels—a little excess wheat, stored under bond available to be marketed if the current crop fails, is an excellent investment.

This flexibility in the wheat program was provided as a protection especially for the producers in the high weather-risk areas. Many producers have profited by utilizing these provisions in the past. To the extent there is extra land available and weather permits, the economic incentives should be strong for the utilization of these provisions this coming year.

One can indeed be happy that the current wheat program provides this degree of flexibility. It is to the advantage of both U.S. wheat producers and consumers throughout the world that it be utilized in producing the 1967 crop.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an article from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 26, by Mr. Nick Kotz, which appeared under the heading "Freeman, L.B.J. Ponder Wheat Acreage Boost."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Freeman, L.B.J. Ponder Wheat Acreage Boost

(By Nick Kotz, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent)

Washington, D.C.—Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has endured a grim nightmare in recent weeks. In his recurring dream, he is held responsible for world starvation. He had failed to authorize enough production of American wheat.

In the next few weeks, Freeman and President Johnson must make the crucial decision whether to increase wheat acreage under the farm program. This is wheat to be planted this fall and harvested next summer.

Why is this decision such a difficult and important one?

On the one hand, insufficient production of U.S. wheat could leave countries like India in perilous condition if their own crops fail as India's did last year. The world could run out of wheat early in 1968.

However, if Freeman authorizes too much wheat acreage, the price could become depressed for the American farmers.

The actual increased supplies could cause price reductions. Worse yet, the mere announcement of an acreage increase could cause an immediate price drop in the highly speculative U.S. commodity market.

A drop in wheat prices today would hurt the American farmer financially at a time when he has prospects for his best earnings in years.

And a price drop could be most harmful in November elections for Democratic, farm-state congressmen. Farmers already are riled because they are accused by some of causing inflation. A drop in wheat prices surely would result in widespread farmer discontent.

There is a further political danger for the Johnson administration. An increase in bread prices is imminent. If wheat acreage is increased following this bread price hike, some Republicans surely will charge that acreage was increased to knock down wheat and bread prices.

Such a charge would not be true. Wheat from the soon-to-be-planted 1967 crop has nothing to do with the cost of bread being produced now. But the charge still could be politically effective, because of its apparent logic.

Freeman's dilemma today is exactly the reverse of what it was several years ago. At that time, the farmer and taxpayer were, in his words, "suffocating" under the burden of a 1.4 billion bushel wheat surplus.

Storage costs were scandalously high, wheat prices were low. The government struggled to unload surpluses and to raise wheat prices.

This was a difficult job because sales of surpluses tended to push down prices.

The situation is far different today. The surpluses have disappeared—sold in growing cash markets and given to the world's hungry poor through the Food for Peace Program. U.S. exports this year were an astronomic 865 million bushels.

What are the simple mathematics of the present wheat planting dilemma? U.S. wheat reserves are now down to 550 million bushels. Wheat needed to fill expected U.S. commitments next year amounts to 1.4 billion bushels. But the U.S. crop now being harvested is expected to total only 1.2 billion bushels.

On the basis of these estimates, U.S. wheat reserves next June will be only 300 million bushels—a mighty slim reserve to ward off unexpected calamities here or abroad.

To avert such a possibility, Freeman already has increased the forthcoming wheat acreage 15 per cent—from 51 to 59 million acres.

He is considering authorizing another four to eight million acres for farmers participating in the government program.

This decision is so crucial that it was discussed at length last week by the National Security Council.

Freeman, the President, and U.S. government employees throughout the world are counting the U.S. harvest, measuring the Indian monsoons and gathering reports on crops in friendly nations such as Canada.

With difficulty, they also are peering behind the bamboo and iron curtains to estimate harvests in China, Russia, and eastern Europe.

In the final analysis, the President must make a judgment decision based partly on best estimates of future food production and food requirements. The possible consequences of his decision range from short-range politics to long-range hunger.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to include in the Record at this point the text of amendment No. 509 offered to S. 2932, the proposed Commodity Reserve Act of 1966.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment to S. 2932

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 107(1)(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as effective with respect to the 1966 through 1969 crops, and section 107(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as effective for the 1970 and subsequent crops, are each amended by inserting before the punctuation mark at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That price support for wheat within the farm reserve allocation shall be at a level equal to 115 per centum of the level of price support for other wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates. For any marketing year the farm reserve allocation shall be the number of bushels which bears the same relation to the farm wheat marketing allocation as the national reserve allocation bears to the national wheat marketing allocation. The national reserve allocation for any marketing year shall be the projected yield of that part of the national acreage allotment which results from action taken by the Secretary under the first proviso of section 332(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or section 4 of the Commodity Reserve Act of 1966. The national reserve allocation for any marketing year shall be proclaimed at the same time that the national acreage allotment is proclaimed for the crop of wheat to be marketed in such marketing year. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the farm reserve allocation shall not exceed an amount which, when added to the farm wheat marketing allocation, would equal (i) the actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest in the calendar year in which the marketing year begins multiplied by the normal yield of wheat for the farm, plus (ii) the amount of wheat stored under section 379c(b) or to avoid or postpone a marketing quota penalty, which is released from storage during the marketing year on account of underplanting or underproduction. The farm reserve allocation shall be shared among the producers on the farm in the same proportion as wheat marketing certificates'.

"(b) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end of the third sentence to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any sales of wheat at less than 115 per centum of the current support price for wheat, plus reasonable carrying charges.'

"SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the Commodity Reserve Act of 1966."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his continuing study and interest in the matter of wheat prices and agricultural problems generally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON and Mr. METCALF addressed the Chair.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and then I shall yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] for calling the attention of the Senate and the Nation to the rapidly depleting surplus of foods that have been so helpful in keeping our Nation in the world market, as well as taking care of millions of hungry and needy people.

I am concerned, with him, that we are getting ourselves in a position in this Nation—and I speak particularly of wheat—whereby we will be practically taken out of the world market if we do not begin to expand our production.

I think it is essential that the Secretary increase the use of these 15-percent allotment acreages by additional acreage if we are to have a supply of wheat that will not result in consumers complaining about the price of wheat, and second, so that we will have sufficient wheat to keep our country in the world market.

After all, we are a great wheat-producing nation and those of us familiar with it realize that Canada is increasing its acreage for the production of wheat. Australia also is doing the same thing, I have been advised, by as much as 60 percent this coming year. Argentina, too.

I sincerely hope that the Senator's suggestion will be read not only by the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary but that they will also act on it favorably.

I would urge strongly that we keep our Nation in a position to stay in the world wheat market. The only way we can is to increase our wheat acreage.

As the Senator knows, we concluded the fiscal year 1966 with 550 million bushels of wheat. Based on the crop prospects for this year, we will probably end up on June 30, 1967, with a crop as low as 300 million bushels of wheat. That is not in the interests of the economy of this Nation; neither is it in the interest of agriculture nor in the interests of the world wheat market. I therefore sincerely hope that the Senator's suggestion will be adopted by the Department.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the Senator's comments, because he is a recognized authority all over the Nation on the subject of wheat and its use, both in terms of the needs of our own people and those who depend upon us in many parts of the world.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. The Senator from South Dakota, of course, is an expert on food for peace. Because of his experience in the administrative agencies of the executive department, he knows more about it, probably, than any other Senator.

He has made a significant statement today, calling upon the administration to increase the acreage for wheat, feed grains, and dairy products.

I voted against some of the foreign aid programs. I voted with the Senator from South Dakota, for example, in cutting military expenditures. I also voted to cut other foreign aid and, yet, the most important aid of which I can conceive, the food-for-peace program, is to provide food for other countries. As the Senator from South Dakota has said, it is unthinkable that here, where we have this tremendous productive capacity for food, we would allow famine to exist in other parts of the world.

Thus, the purpose for which we provided the diverted acreage, and the acreage conservation reserves, has now to be utilized. We said that we would set aside these acres until such time as it was necessary to feed the people of America or to feed the people of the world. Now the time has arrived when we should plant these acres to take care of the necessary famine situations abroad, and to take care of our own reserves which we will need in America.

As the Senator from Kansas has said, we have dropped alarmingly in our reserves in America, from 550 million bushels to probably 400 million bushels or 300 million bushels next year. The time has arrived for the administration not only to allow the additional 15 percent in acreage which they called for before, but, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, to allow for additional acreage for wheat and wheat production. At the same time, however, we should be concerned, with the Secretary of Agriculture and the President, to consider the fact that we must not allow the price of wheat to drop.

While we need to increase wheat production, we must not allow the increase to result in a fall in the price of wheat.

I think that we have a fair market price. The price of wheat is increasing. The farmers of America, if they were allowed to produce more on their conservation reserve acreage and on their diverted acres and were allowed a higher quota, could begin to get the kind of price which they deserve and merit.

I heartily concur with the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Kansas that the administration should come up with an increased acreage production program, but at the same time, it should be careful to preserve the present market price.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator. His remarks are well taken. He has expressed his concern to me on many occasions about our dwindling wheat reserves. He has talked to me at various times, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, about the need for those of us on the committee to take a careful look at this matter.

I especially appreciate his speaking out as he has today. The Senator, as has been true with the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and other Senators, have voted, in previous years, for acreage restrictions which were designed to cut back on production at a time when we had surpluses beyond any need.

Now, however, we no longer have that situation. We have stocks on hand which are only a little above what we need for our own reserve requirements. At the same time there is a massive famine in India, the Russians and the Chinese are in the world markets buying up all the wheat they can secure, the situation is entirely different. Now we have to begin to consider production patterns at home which are geared not to the situation in 1960, 1961, or 1964, but to the growing demands for wheat in the world today. Every indication is that we need a substantially larger wheat acreage for next year than the acreage now contemplated. So I hope that the Senator's request will be heeded, and that we will get an announcement shortly of increased acreage which will go beyond what has yet been indicated.

Mr. METCALF. The whole point of a wise farm program, which has been adopted over the years, was to set aside these acreages so that when the time arrived that we had an emergency situation, such as arises at the present time, we would be able to take care of the diverted acres and the acreage conservation reserves and put them back into production.

The time has certainly arrived that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture should order that some of these acres be put back into production for wheat, for America and for the world.

Mr. McGOVERN. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I, too, should like to commend the Senator from South Dakota for making this very important speech today. I associate myself generally with the comments made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Let me say, first, that the Senator from Montana raises a very important point, that the shipment of foodstuffs to the needy people of the world is, perhaps, our best foreign policy.

I am sure that the Senator will agree with me that wheat and foodstuffs which we ship to India and Pakistan have a far more beneficial effect and are far more important than guns and bullets; would not the Senator agree?

Mr. McGOVERN. I fully agree with the Senator. Like the Senator from North Dakota, I have had the opportunity in recent years to look into all the various kinds of American overseas aid. Some of that aid, I think, has done more harm than good.

Some of our expensive military equipment has been used to finance wars between two or more of our friends abroad. The classic example of that was the Pakistan-India conflict of last year. How much better it would have been if those resources had gone into the production of more food to meet the urgent problems of countries like India and Pakistan.

I do not think there is any program in which the United States participates overseas that has returned as large dividends as has the food-for-peace program.

Mr. BURDICK. I know the excellent job the Senator did as Food for Peace administrator. It is that kind of program that we should support.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BURDICK. This increase in wheat acreage is not only needed for humanitarian purposes, but it is needed to bolster our agriculture at home. I hope the tools the Senator has provided in his legislation, or in mine, where I asked for a 25-cent certificate for wheat shipped overseas, will be considered by the administration, because I do not think the farmers should bear the full brunt of that policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree. I think we are going to have to adopt the proposal the Senator from North Dakota has made or some other similar formula. I do not think farmers expect to be rewarded at the same price for the products they ship overseas under the food-for-peace program that they receive in the U.S. market, but neither do they expect to produce wheat on a large scale to be moved abroad at $1.25 a bushel. So either the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota for an export certificate of 25 cents a bushel or some other proposal designed to protect the wheat producer will have to be given serious consideration if we are to treat the farmer fairly.

Mr. BURDICK. Does not the Senator think we ought to aim for a minimum of $1.90 blend price for all wheat?

Mr. McGOVERN. As a blend price, I think that would be a fair level. Since food is so essential not only to our people but to people abroad, we should provide our farmers with an adequate price for producing it.

As the Senator has indicated, this is not a humanitarian program by any means. It will be of great benefit to our own economy if we can turn idle acres into productive acres. It will mean not only greater farm income, but also greater sales of farm implements and all the things that farmers utilize in the production of additional wheat.

Beyond that, we have historical proof that when we have sent our food products abroad under a food program, we have always been able to produce dollar markets. One of the outstanding examples of that is Japan, where food-for-peace shipments on a grant or concessional basis for a number of years resulted in Japanese children learning to drink or eat American milk, dairy products, and bread, and today the Japanese are the biggest cash customer of American farm products in the world.

There is no reason why the same kind of market development cannot take place in other areas of the world such as India, Pakistan, and Brazil.

Mr. BURDICK. And at the same time we would be stimulating our own economy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. I have talked with the Secretary several times and have urged on him to increase the wheat acreage. I know that the Senator from South Dakota and others from the Midwest have done likewise. I hope he will lend a kindly ear to our requests to increase wheat production. The world needs it, and we at home need it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his leadership in that regard.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Once again the Senate is witnessing an example of the creative and vigorous leadership of the Senator from South Dakota in the field of food for peace—the program by which this Nation meets its moral responsibility to use some of its agricultural abundance to help meet the frightful and heartrending problems of world hunger.

I think our Nation does not fully perceive the radically different commodity situation we face today as we consider the food-for-freedom legislation. For our food surpluses are gone. The Senator from South Dakota has cited statistics showing what we have on hand in wheat, feed grains, dairy products, and the rest. And the reserve stocks of other nations are down as well.

I saw some figures the other day, made available by the Department of Agriculture, showing that in 1961 world reserves were sufficient to meet world needs for almost 4 months, but that by June 1967 it is estimated that these reserves will be down to 36 days' supply.

So any serious world conflagration or drought could easily create disastrous shortages.

Surely, these threatening shortages require us to face our responsibilities with clear eyes.

In past years, the food-for-peace program was easy to administer because it did not involve questions of acreage expansion. It did not involve the impact of Government purchases in the open market for supplies needed to meet our responsibilities overseas. It simply meant emptying surpluses out of the Federal bins or other bins under contract with the Federal Government. It was not exactly surplus dumping; yet it was aimed at removing surpluses.

Mr. McGOVERN. It was frequently referred to as "the surplus disposal program." I was always bothered by that name, because I did not consider a program to feed the hungry people of the world as a disposal program, as though it were some kind of a garbage can operation.

But, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, there are two significant changes in our food-for-peace program. No. 1, we are going to have to increase acreage for cereal grain production and deliberately produce more cereals to use abroad.

The other new aspect is that we must give our Secretary of Agriculture authority to go into the open market and deliberately purchase products, when they are not in Government stocks, to meet the needs of hungry people. I think we can do more to advance the cause of peace and freedom by an imaginative food-for-peace program than by any other effort we can make abroad. I think the Senator shares that view.

Mr. MONDALE. I do not think there is any doubt about it. But, as the Senator's speech here today reflects, the disappearance of surpluses has ramifications of major proportions, and it is Congress, and the committee on which we both serve—the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—which must deal with it.

Among the basic problems we face as a nation with no surpluses, is: Do we really mean business in meeting our responsibility to help feed the world's hungry? That is the first question.

If we do, then are we willing to make the commitment necessary to increase production, and at the same time—and I think this is a fundamental part of the program—see to it that the American farmer receives a decent return for his efforts?

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. MONDALE. I do not think the family farmer, who is now receiving about 79 percent of parity, who has contributed so enormously to the prosperity of this Nation, who has made us a unique nation which cannot only feed itself, but also produce enough in addition to prevent the actual starvation of millions of people in the world—I do not think that the family farmer should be asked to produce more unless we are prepared to pay him a fair price for his output. And I fear that unless we couple our plea for expanded acreage with provision for a decent return, we may not obtain the increased production that we need.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree wholeheartedly with what the Senator has said. I think simply authorizing additional acreage is not enough. It will require incentives to obtain the needed production; and I hope that some formula can be worked out, as the Senator has suggested, that will provide the protection and the security that our producers need to provide this urgently needed production.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota not only for the contribution he has made here today, but for the successful effort on his part to have incorporated, in the recently passed Foreign Assistance Act, a provision designed to encourage greater attention to agriculture in our aid program, and to encourage greater efforts on the part of underdeveloped countries to concentrate on food production. We are talking here about American food aid abroad, but we all know that the long-range answer to the problem of chronic food deficits in the world is for the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to do more on their own in producing their food needs.

So I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his successful effort in persuading the Senate to agree to his amendment, which will gear our foreign assistance program, more than it has been in the past, in the direction of increased food production all over the world.

Mr. MONDALE. I might add here another essential change that is required in our food aid program. During the 12 years that our food-for-peace program has been in effect, the main emphasis has been first of all on providing food for the world's hungry, and, secondly, ridding ourselves of our surpluses. Not enough emphasis was placed upon the vital problem of improving agricultural yields in the nations which were asking for our help.

I do not think we have emphasized that enough. And I believe that, now that we have to pay hard dollars in the open market to procure, not surpluses, but increased production by the American farmer, we should see more clearly than before the necessity, at the same time, to do more in helping the underdeveloped countries get their own agricultural houses in order, so they can take those steps necessary to move closer to self-sufficiency.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the important issue at home in the United States during the next decade is, as President Johnson has so well termed it, the "war against poverty." It is a war that even the most peace-loving man cannot object to. It is a war in which no one is hurt, everyone is helped. It is a war into which every weapon of our vast arsenal of economic armaments must be thrown. It is a war that we can afford to wage, but we cannot afford to lose.

The war will be fought on many fronts. We have heard some of them—manpower development and training, regional planning, medicare, aid to education, economic development. But there are other places where it is just as important to fight the war against poverty although the spotlight of public attention may not be as bright. One such battlesite is the desert of unemployment where persons who can work and who are workers are without work, due almost entirely to factors beyond their control.

To cope with the sad plight of the worker who is without a job, the tragic depression of the 1930's saw the creation of a system of unemployment compensation founded on cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. That program helped millions of men and women in the United States to survive the hardship of involuntary unemployment. The idea of paying a part of a worker's wage to him when he is put out of work to tide him over until he is able to get another such job worked marvelously well right at the start. But this Federal-State system geared to a depression economy, and left largely in the hands of the States, has not kept pace with the changing times. As a result, unemployment benefits have lagged behind rising prices and rising wages. Inflation has sharply cut the purchasing power of the dollar yet these unemployed workers find their benefits limited by State standards set years ago. And Congress has hardly dared to intrude on its original creation.

To correct this imbalance and to bring unemployment benefits back into line with wages, the President decided to make revision of the unemployment program an important part of his legislative recommendations to the 89th Congress. It was the subject of a message from the President dated May 18, 1965, urging Congress to modernize the system so that it will assure adequate payments of unemployment benefits for an appropriate period for most regular workers.

Mr. President, the bill before us is the response of the Senate Committee on Finance to the President's request. It is the most comprehensive revision of the Federal unemployment compensation statute since the inauguration of the program in 1935 as part of the Social Security Act.

The changes in the Federal-State unemployment compensation program which would be made by H.R. 15119 would, among other things, extend coverage to additional jobs, establish a permanent program of extended benefits to exhaustees during periods of high unemployment, furnish the States a procedure for obtaining judicial review of certain determinations of the Secretary of Labor and improve the financing of the program, and provide additional States' requirements as to benefit amount, duration, eligibility, and disqualification.

The amendments made by the Committee on Finance in the House-passed version of H.R. 15119 are substantial. I particularly want to mention four areas in which the committee made important changes in the House bill. Those areas are: First, the imposition of certain benefit requirements; second, the full Federal financing of extended benefits; third, the increase in the taxable wage base; and, fourth, the definition of small firm employers to be included in coverage under the unemployment insurance program.

The question will surely arise as to why did the committee make such drastic changes in the House proposal when most witnesses who testified before the committee supported the House bill, as is, intact, without amendment. The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that these witnesses represented employer and business groups. These groups are for the House bill because they know it does little or nothing to upset the operation of current unemployment compensation programs. Its tax rise will be little felt by the employers and its impetus to increase benefits for the unemployed is next to nothing.

Labor does not support the House bill. Labor repudiates the House bill. That is right—the labor groups during 2 weeks of hearings on this bill were unanimous in urging the passage of no bill rather than passage of the House bill. Labor said that if the House bill were approved without change they would urge the President to veto it. Now, why would labor urge the President to veto a bill designed to benefit the workingman? The answer to this question is simple. It just does not do the job.

This unemployment compensation legislation was recommended by the President to improve the plight of the workingman when he loses his job. It is a bill which should benefit the workingman. But there was nothing in the House bill for that workingman to applaud. For example, the President had urged Congress to enact minimum standards governing the adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits paid in the States, but the House did not include standards in its bill. Without adequate benefits, the bill means little to the workingman.

The Committee on Finance was not willing to approve a bill for the workingman which would not benefit the workingman. While our bill may not meet in every particular the standards urged by the administration, it does go a long way in providing a mechanism to upgrade State unemployment compensation programs. Of most importance under the committee bill, minimum standards would be set governing the amount of benefits which would be paid each week to an unemployed worker, the period over which it would be paid, and the conditions of eligibility for these benefits. The setting of these standards is the single greatest departure from the House bill and the greatest single hope to the unemployed. Under the committee bill the benefit an eligible unemployed person would receive would be 50 percent of his average wage or 50 percent of the average wage paid in the State, whichever was the lesser. Thus, if the average wage in a State is $100 per week, workers paid less than this would receive 50 percent of their actual wage if they became unemployed, while workers earning more than $100 per week would be limited to an unemployment compensation benefit of only $50.

Mr. President, this benefit standard which would be fixed by the committee bill is not onerous. To the contrary, at least 18 States already have unemployment compensation programs which provide a level of benefits equal to, or greater than, those required under the committee bill. Another 18 States provide benefits of between 40 and 50 percent of the State average wage and to upgrade their benefits to comply with the committee bill would impose no serious burden on these States. The remaining 14 States provide benefits of less than 40 percent.

To a considerable extent, low benefits come about because of a fear that higher benefits will increase State unemployment taxes and these higher taxes will discourage new businesses from coming into the State. Regrettably, under the unemployment compensation system we have in effect today, States are able to, and do, compete with one another to see which can do the least for their unemployed workers.

When the unemployment program was set up in 1935, a Federal tax was imposed on employers against which a credit of 90 percent was given providing that the States would set up their own unemployment compensation programs. This 90-percent credit was designed to eliminate fear of interstate tax competition. It worked in 1935, but over the years some States have ingeniously worked around the tax credit in order to outbid their sisters for business. The problem is that competition to attract commercial enterprise may be so intense among States that a decisive factor may be the size of the unemployment tax that a State levies. The cost-conscious State in order to land industry may determine the extent of its benefits, the duration of its benefits, the persons eligible to receive benefits, and the standards for disqualifying would-be benefit recipients so as to require a low tax from its business constituents. Or, the State may set a scale of taxes geared to the employer's unemployment experience or to other criteria which in effect will produce a low percentage of payrolls in the State subject to the tax.

The result is that while the State may attract business from other States on the basis of a low unemployment tax cost to the business, the workers in that State bear the burden of that incentive to business. Pity the poor person who despite the luring of new industry to the State is without a job. His unemployment benefits, if any, will be meager.

By requiring all States to have a benefit at least equal to 50 percent of a worker's wage up to 50 percent of the State average wage, the committee's bill counteracts interstate competition for low benefits and low taxes. It protects the States from each other.

Besides the benefit level, the committee bill would require that a State must pay benefits for at least 26 weeks to each individual who had 20 weeks of employment or its equivalent and that to be eligible for benefits under the unemployment compensation program, a State could require no worker to have more than 20 weeks of employment or its equivalent.

Actually, at present, in all but 2 States and Puerto Rico, some claimants may receive 26 weeks of unemployment benefits and 30 States qualify for benefits for all claimants who are employed for at least 2 weeks, with only 2 States not paying benefits to at least some claimants with 20 weeks of employment.

Under the bill, if the State did not adopt these standards, its employers would not receive the full Federal tax credit of 2.7 percent but would have their credit limited to the 4-year average cost of benefits in that State. For the country as a whole, the 4-year average cost currently is about 2 percent at a $3,000 wage base.

The next important amendment relates to extended benefits payable in periods of high unemployment or recession. The Committee on Finance accepted the House formula and its "trigger" mechanism virtually without change. However, we did modify the financing provisions to relieve the States from having to pay for any part of these extended benefits.

The House bill would have divided the cost of these benefits equally between the Federal Government and the States. That would be an admirable arrangement—if at the same time the States are not being called upon to increase their regular benefits. Since they are being required to upgrade their regular benefits—and this will increase their costs—it seemed appropriate to the committee that the Federal unemployment tax receipts collected from all over the country should be used to cover the expenses of this extended benefit program. This is precisely the approach taken by Congress when it enacted temporary extended benefits during the 1961 recession.

The third important change made by the Committee on Finance enlarges the wage base subject to the unemployment tax, but retains the tax rate of 3.3 percent as provided in the House bill. Under present law—and it has been that way since 1939—the Federal unemployment tax is levied on the first $3,000 of wages. The House increased the wage base to $3,900, effective in 1969, and raised it still further, to $4,200, beginning in 1972. The committee amendment to the House bill would make the $3,900 wage base effective a year earlier, in 1968, and would raise the base in 1972 to $4,800. This higher wage base is necessary to assure revenues sufficient to cover Federal costs—principally those of administering the State-Federal unemployment compensation program and of paying the entire costs of the extended benefits.

Raising the wage base against which the unemployment tax is levied to even a last-stage level of $4,800 hardly seems out of place. When the wage base of $3,000 was put into the law in 1939, that represented 98 percent of all wages in covered employment that was subject to the unemployment tax. With the rise in wages since 1939, only 52 percent of all wages in covered employment is taxable under the $3,000 wage base. The burden of the tax is, therefore, disproportionately carried by the low-wage industries. A raising of the taxable wage base even to $4,800 will not produce a tax on the 98 percent of wages in covered employment as in 1939, but it will certainly bring about a much more equitable situation than is prevalent today.

The fourth major amendment applied to the House bill by the committee was to continue the relief provided by present law to small firms of less than four employees. The law now extends unemployment insurance coverage to employers of four or more workers during each of 20 weeks in a calendar year. The House bill would have substituted a test of coverage extending the program to employers of one or more workers during each of 20 weeks in a calendar year or to employers with payrolls of $1,500 in a calendar quarter.

During the committee's hearings on the bill, testimony was given stating that the House provision extending coverage to employers of one or more in 20 weeks or of payrolls of $1,500 per calendar quarter would particularly harm small retail merchants. With a view toward helping these very small retailers in an era of consolidation and concentration in such enterprises, it was decided that the present provision of the law was preferable and protected the really small merchant from the additional administrative and recordkeeping as well as financial burden of paying an unemployment tax on his one, two, or three employees whose full-time attachment to the labor market might be questionable at best.

Of course, the States are left perfectly free to extend coverage under their own laws to employers of less than 4 and presently 25 States do cover such employers, extending coverage to 1.4 million workers of the 3 million employed in these small firms all over the country.

With the inclusion of these major amendments plus other amendments providing unemployment benefits to certain individuals engaged in multistate employment and assuring uniform duration for extended benefits triggered by a national "on" indicator, the Finance Committee believes that H.R. 15119 is an infinitely better bill, a bill that will actually mean something to the Nation's unemployed, a bill that will not exact from the States nor from the employers of the country anything more than their fair share of the moral responsibility to see that the affliction of unemployment is made as bearable and livable as possible. The committee feels that this bill as amended is one that the greatest Nation on earth can feel no pangs of conscience about and can point to with pardonable pride. It is a good bill that the committee urges to the favorable attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have had prepared a tabulation showing what the cost of the additional benefits under H.R. 15119 would be on a State-by-State basis and what the interest credited to each State in the unemployment trust fund was at the end of 1965.

The interest income available is more than adequate in most States. In fact, in 30 States the interest income available to the States would exceed the cost of the increased benefits. Therefore, it would not be necessary for the States to raise any additional revenue from tax sources in order to provide the additional benefits provided in the bill.

In States in which it would be necessary to raise additional revenue to meet the cost of the additional benefits, the burden would not be great, particularly if the taxable wage base of those States were brought into conformity with the wage base for the Federal tax provided in the pending bill.

I believe that Senators who examine this tabulation will be able to see that the matter of complying with the minimum benefits which we believe to be desirable is not necessarily difficult for any State.

If we were to find that it were a serious problem, we would seek to work it out in such a fashion that any hardship would be reduced or eliminated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of 1965 interest earned on reserves and estimated increases in benefit payments resulting from proposed benefit requirements [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Estimated 1965 increases in benefit payments due to benefit and duration requirements	Actual 1965 interest credited to unemployment trust fund	Excess of interest over increases in benefit payments	Unemployment trust fund, Dec. 31, 1965
Total	249, 410	[2] 264, 842	+15, 432	8, 357, 356
Alabama	1, 942	3, 053	+1, 111	91, 146
Alaska	3, 974	163	−3, 811	16, 168
Arizona	3, 884	2, 296	−1, 588	65, 308
Arkansas	601	1, 038	+437	33, 097
California	48, 030	22, 530	−25, 500	659, 689
Colorado	5, 269	2, 058	−3, 211	62, 794
Connecticut	3, 866	6, 691	+2, 825	205, 115
Delaware	404	765	+361	24, 454
District of Columbia	0	2, 243	+2, 243	65, 072
Florida	6, 044	6, 015	−29	182, 184
Georgia	4, 209	6, 540	+2, 331	197, 894
Guam	----------	----------	----------	----------
Hawaii	0	725	+725	23, 188
Idaho	964	1, 033	+69	32, 447
Illinois	21, 479	17, 997	−3, 482	545, 090
Indiana	9, 828	6, 173	−3, 655	186, 016
Iowa	1, 150	3, 999	+2, 849	118, 120
Kansas	742	2, 196	+1, 454	65, 333
Kentucky	1, 395	4, 077	+2, 682	123, 986
Louisiana	3, 964	4, 231	+267	128, 402
Maine	2, 405	1, 132	−1, 273	35, 255
Maryland	0	5, 728	+5, 728	177, 062
Massachusetts	3, 158	7, 253	+4, 095	229, 688
Michigan	4, 718	13, 725	+9, 007	515, 258
Minnesota	2, 194	755	−1, 439	27, 781
Mississippi	612	1, 963	+1, 351	63, 591
Missouri	6, 533	8, 066	+1, 533	241, 074
Montana	1, 351	666	−685	20, 087
Nebraska	1, 205	1, 452	+247	42, 305
Nevada	3, 161	1, 023	−2, 138	29, 369
New Hampshire	(3)	976	----------	30, 830
New Jersey	14, 900	10, 368	−4, 532	316, 758
New Mexico	1, 516	1, 234	−282	35, 882
New York	3, 657	43, 240	+39, 581	1, 305, 870
North Carolina	5, 429	8, 066	+2, 237	245, 069
North Dakota	0	234	+634	7, 716
Ohio	11, 006	10, 281	−725	366, 882
Oklahoma	2, 683	1, 628	−1, 055	49, 676
Oregon	4, 485	3, 156	−1, 329	98, 481
Pennsylvania	4, 753	8, 057	+3, 303	394, 465
Puerto Rico	11, 490	1, 900	−9, 590	55, 189
Rhode Island	1, 409	1, 782	+373	55, 737
South Carolina	2, 266	3, 233	+967	97, 933
South Dakota	830	517	−313	15, 284
Tennessee	3, 202	3, 404	+202	110, 270
Texas	14, 981	8, 596	−6, 385	255, 817
Utah	1, 238	1, 301	+63	37, 406
Vermont	0	248	+248	8, 734
Virginia	3, 536	5, 034	+1, 498	151, 910
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------	----------
Washington	12, 522	7, 270	−5, 252	216, 498
West Virginia	3, 750	2, 130	−1, 620	63, 818
Wisconsin	2, 446	7, 259	+4, 813	219, 777
Wyoming	227	318	+91	10, 383

[1] As contained in bill reported on by Senate Finance Committee.

[2] Total includes New Hampshire.

[3] Not available.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, first let me say, while the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance is present, that it will be my purpose tomorrow to ask for consideration of the amendments individually and not en bloc. As we are all interested in expediting this matter, and as the Senator well knows, the key vote will come on sections 151 and 152, the so-called Federal standards. That will be the key vote. As far as I can ascertain from our side, we will expedite matters.

We know that many Senators on both sides have commitments over the weekend. We will be coming in at 10 o'clock in the morning, and we will try to get to the key vote as soon as possible. It will be determined one way or the other, and that is the crux of the matter which will be debated tomorrow.

Mr. President, in the consideration of this bill (H.R. 15119) the committee by a majority of one vote adopted an amendment to the bill, as reported, which would provide Federal standards relating to the eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits payable to unemployed workers of State programs. No justification exists for this radical departure in the basic concept of the Federal-State unemployment insurance program. On the contrary, a review of the 30-year history of this legislation conclusively demonstrates that without the heavy hand of Federal intervention, the individual States have adopted, modified, improved, and expanded their unemployment insurance programs to meet the peculiar conditions of each State so as to produce a better program than would have resulted if the States had been held to rigid Federal benefit standards.

The average weekly benefit payable to workers has increased significantly over the years. In 1939, the average weekly benefit was $10.66, and in 1964 it was $35.96—an increase of 237 percent. After allowance is made for cost-of-living increases, the average weekly benefit in 1964 would buy 50 percent more than in 1939.

State maximum benefit limitations have also increased appreciably over the years. All but two States, following the draft bills recommended by the Social Security Administration, originally established their maximums at $15 per week. Maximum benefit limitations have increased on the average of 200 percent. In the larger industrial States where the greatest number of covered workers reside, the increases have been even greater with maximum weekly benefits currently at $65 in California, $72 in Michigan, $55 in New York, $53 in Ohio, and $50 in New Jersey. These benefits are free of Federal and State income tax, social security and hospital insurance taxes, and the unemployed worker does not incur transportation and uniform expenses, union dues, and similar costs.

In 1939, the waiting period before benefits were payable was from 2 to 4 weeks. Today, three States have no waiting period, and the rest have a 1-week waiting period for which benefits are often payable when an individual has been unemployed a specified length of time. For an individual who is unemployed for 12 weeks, a reduction in the waiting period from 4 weeks to 1 week means a 25-percent increase in benefits payable, even with no increase in the weekly benefit amount.

In 1939, the average maximum duration over which benefits were payable was approximately 15 weeks. At present, all States except three have a maximum benefit period of 26 weeks, and nine States have maximum periods ranging from 28 to 39 weeks. Again, an individual who collects benefits for 25 weeks rather than for 15 weeks realizes a 67-percent increase in benefits payable, even with no increase in the weekly benefit amount.

When the increase in benefit amounts, the shortening of the waiting period, and the extension of the benefit period are considered together, the record of the States in improving benefits is impressive, particularly in the large industrial States where the greater majority of covered workers reside. If rigid Federal benefit standards were imposed early in the program's history, there is reason to assume the improvements in the program would have been less favorable. Father

Joseph Becker, a noted scholar in this field, has stated:

> It is difficult to say whether the total protection of the system would have been greater if it had been completely federal. Provisions established by Congress would have been the result of compromises reached between the interests of the different sections of the country and might well have represented a lower standard of benefits than is currently paid by the major industrial states, where the great majority of covered workers live.

The adoption of the Federal benefit standard is not progressive, but regressive. The standard will reverse the progress the program has experienced, to the detriment of the great majority of covered workers. If the recommendations of the Johnson administration on unemployment compensation are an indication of the kind of Federal regulation we may expect, the capacity of the unemployment insurance program to meet the needs of our workers will experience a steady decline.

The committee's amendment could require extensive revisions in the unemployment insurance programs in all of the 50 States, in order to conform to one or more of the new Federal standards relating to eligibility, benefit amount, or duration periods.

In order to meet the Federal benefit eligibility standards imposed by the Senate amendment, 22 States would be required to amend their laws. Thirty-three States will be required to amend their laws to increase the maximum weekly benefit amounts payable. Additionally, 46 States will be required to increase the duration of their benefits payable for individuals who have 20 or more weeks base-period employment—or the equivalent. The States are required to make these amendments in order to secure the benefits of the tax credit provisions of Federal law.

There are many other changes in State law that will be required as a practical matter because the new Federal requirements will completely unbalance the present framework of State benefit provisions. The resources at the States' disposal in meeting the problems of the unemployed are not unlimited. The States, in allocating the available resources to most adequately meet the needs of the unemployed, have often followed benefit principles developed by Congress in the social security insurance program. Three of these principles involve providing minimum unemployment compensation benefits, replacing a greater proportion of the wages of lower-income groups, and providing dependency benefits in recognition of the increased burdens unemployment imposes on large families due to the high level of their nondeferrable expenditures.

Thirteen States replace a higher percentage of an individual's wages in the lower income groups. Since there is a greater difference between gross and net wages and a greater percentage of deferrable expenditures in the higher income groups, this practice is reasonable. Indeed, it is analogous to "loading the benefit schedules" at the lower benefit levels in the social security law. This practice of providing a larger benefit in proportion to contributions for the lower income groups has been consistently adopted by the Congress, most recently in the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

All of the States provide minimum unemployment compensation benefits. Minimum benefits for social security recipients have been consistently provided by the Congress, and they were increased by 10 percent last year when benefits were generally increased by only 7 percent.

Eleven States provide benefits that increase with the number of dependents an unemployed worker has. By the standards of present Federal law, providing dependent benefits would seem to be a reasonable allocation of resources. Social security benefits are increased when dependents are involved, and our income tax laws reflect similar thinking.

The Senate amendment will force the States to use their resources to provide increased benefits for individuals now receiving the largest benefit amounts, at the expense of poorer workers and families with dependents—those with the fewest deferrable expenditures.

Particularly serious is the impact the new benefit standard will have on the following 11 jurisdictions that provide dependents' benefits: Alaska, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio, and Rhode Island. The bill reported by the committee completely disregards the dependency benefit formulas used by these 11 States. In some instances, an individual may not be receiving a basic benefit equal to 50 percent of the average weekly wage in covered employment, but may be receiving substantially more than that amount when dependency allowances are included. If dependency benefits are not included in determining whether a State meets the new Federal standard, the benefits a State will be required to pay may be so high that they frustrate the basic philosophy of the program. Although dependency benefits could be reduced in such a case, it would narrow the difference in benefits payable to individuals without dependents and those with large families, thus defeating the principle of dependents' allowances.

If dependency benefits are included in determining compliance with the new standard, the committee's amendment will increase the benefits payable to the general worker, while leaving the worker with dependents at the same level. Some of these States may even find it necessary to curtail or eliminate dependency allowances to finance these benefit increases. Providing increases for the highest paid workers at the expense of large families with many dependents violates the philosophy prevailing in these 11 States.

The committee bill, by making no attempt to deal with these problems, completely unsettles the law in these 11 States by leaving the question of dependency allowances up in the air. The problem may have been avoided because the majority knows that any realistic solution virtually spells the end for the present system of dependents' allowances in these States.

The State's freedom to prescribe the periods over which beneficiaries will draw benefits has been an integral part of our Federal-State system for the last 30 years. The trend in State legislation has been to adopt a "variable duration period," correlating the length of the benefit period to the amount of base-period employment of the claimant. While in 1941, 32 States had variable benefit periods, today 43 States—all but 7—have them.

The committee's bill will require all States to provide 26 weeks of benefits to any individual who has 20 weeks of base-period employment—or an equivalent where other formulas are applicable.

The imposition of a Federal standard relating to the "duration period" over which benefits are payable will also have a disruptive effect on State laws.

In order to fit this requirement into the present benefit schedules, such drastic amendments of State duration periods will be required that the practical effect will be to force the States to abandon variable benefit periods. To illustrate, Wisconsin now provides a maximum duration period of 34 weeks to individuals with 42 weeks of base-period employment. In order to leave its benefit schedule proportionate after providing 26 weeks of benefits to individuals with 20 weeks of base-period employment, Wisconsin would have to provide over 50 weeks of benefits for an individual with 42 weeks of base-period employment. Many other States providing benefits in excess of 26 weeks to claimants with strong labor force attachments would also be confronted with similar problems.

Additionally, many States provide benefits to individuals with less than 20 weeks of base-period employment. Similar amendments in these provisions would be required to maintain a proportionate and an equitable benefit schedule.

The argument for a uniform benefit period is based on the theory that individuals with a smaller amount of base-period employment have just as much need for unemployment compensation benefits as individuals with a higher degree of base-period employment. If this is the objective of requiring 26 weeks of benefits for 20 weeks of base-period employment, the means are not adapted to the ends. Resources now being used to provide shorter benefit periods for workers with less than 20 weeks of base-period employment may be needed to meet the new standard. When the cost of maintaining a proportionate benefit schedule after adoption of the new standard is added, many States may be forced to eliminate benefits to workers who have less than 20 weeks of base-period employment. Ironically, a Federal standard will ultimately reduce benefits for those with smaller base-period employment—the very group it is ostensibly designed to help.

These problems, resulting from the precipitous action taken by the Democrat majority, will disrupt the unemployment compensation laws in all of the 50 States. It will impair the program's ability to meet the needs of our unemployed workers, for whom the program, as managed by the States, has been a bulwark during the past 30 years. For the reasons we have stated, the Republicans on the committee strongly recommend that the Senate delete the provisions providing Federal benefit standards relating to amount and duration.

WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES STILL ESSENTIAL, BUT NEED REVISION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the back of the minds of most Senators as this debate on the airline strike progressed was the crucial economic question of what a higher settlement than the 4.2 percent annual increase turned down by the machinists over the weekend will do to the wage-price guidelines.

Many Senators undoubtedly felt that whatever the labor-management issues involved here, it was desirable that the Congress act to prevent an airline wage settlement that could serve as a wage-price guideline buster, an inflationary cataclysm that might set off a wage-price spiral that could be disastrous for our economy.

Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge no one has tried to answer those fears, and I think they should, because those fears may well be groundless.

I say this as one who has taken a vigorous and active interest in this whole guideline matter over the years. I also speak as one who has spoken on the floor of the Senate and around the country in defense of President Johnson's wage-price guidelines, and the intelligent way both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have used the guidelines to keep the cost of living down.

Mr. President, the machinists had a point in rejecting that 4.2-percent offer. The cost of living has already increased 1.9 percent this year. If in the remainder of 1966 we have the same experience we had in the first 6 months, we can expect the cost of living to go up to 2.8 percent over the full year.

Now what happens to that 4.2 percent wage increase if the cost of living goes up 2.8 percent?

It means the machinists' real wages would go up not 4.2 percent, but only 1.4 percent. Now, Mr. President, average productivity in American industry has increased 3.2 percent. This after all is just what the guideline means.

The result is that the machinists would be receiving less than half—in fact, only about 40 percent—of the average increase in productivity, and far less than their own productivity increase, which I understand in the airline industry is well above average.

Mr. President, what will happen if the airline pay increase becomes universal throughout the country? What will happen if workers generally receive a pay increase of 4.2 percent, which because of the increase in the cost of living will give them only a 1.4 percent increase in their real income? What will happen in view of the fact that these workers are really producing, this year, 3.2 percent more than they had been producing?

The result will be that their employers will enjoy a profit increment from the price increase of 1.8 percent on their labor costs and, of course, a 6 percent profit increase—a productivity increase of 3.2 percent and a price increase of 2.8 percent—on their nonlabor costs.

If the administration should modify the guideposts to allow for a 2.8 percent increase in the cost of living—that is, to give workers their full productivity increase plus a full allowance for a rise in the cost of living of the size I have discussed—it would mean that the guidelines would permit a wage increase of 6 percent, not the 4.2 percent which the machinists rank and file turned down.

Mr. President, I have checked out the arithmetic I am using in this speech with the economists of the Joint Economic Committee, and they agree that I am correct.

The fact is that the guidelines that prevent a workingman from receiving a full productivity increment plus a full allowance for the rise in the cost of living will keep his real wages—not his money wages, but his real wages—lower than the productivity he and other American workers taken together are contributing to the economy. In so doing, they would increase profits inequitably in relation to wage increases. Thus, the reason why wages are significant is that productivity is in real terms. Productivity is measured in real terms, not in money terms.

Finally, I challenge Senators to compare what has happened to wages, on the one hand, with profits on the other hand, in the past 3 years. In 1963, corporate profits after taxes were $33.1 billion. For the first quarter of this year, they were coming in at an annual rate of $48.7 billion, a more than 40 percent increase in only about 3 years. I doubt whether there has been a period in American history that has seen such a rapid escalation of productivity as we have seen in recent years—and it did not start from a depressed base.

Meanwhile, wages have gone up far, far less. There is little question that real wages—that is, wages allowing for the increase in the cost of living—have gone up far less than productivity has gone up in this country. That is why I said in the Senate last March 14, and repeat now:

> The administration should either greatly increase its flexibility in handling the wage-price guideposts to take this into account, or it should, from time to time in the course of the year, adjust the wage productivity measure upward from 3.2 percent with a cost-of-living adjustment to take actual price behavior into account.
>
> In general, however, it would be a tragic mistake to abandon wage-price guideposts. Under skillful administration handling they have served the Nation well. Of course, they cannot do the whole job. But monetary and fiscal policy cannot do the whole job either without provoking a needless recession.

Mr. President, I believe we need wage-price guidelines more urgently now than ever. I say that because we now have a situation in which there is some evidence that demand may be moderating in terms of supply. The gross national product grew only one-half of 1 percent in the second quarter of this year, between the beginning of April and the beginning of June. Unemployment increased from 3.7 to 4 percent between April and June. With the enormous increase in our work force of 1½ million a year and the great expansion of our productive facilities—because most of the increasing acceleration in our economy has been going into plant equipment—we will rapidly approach a point where our productive facilities, our productive capacity, will exceed the total amount.

Meanwhile, prices will go up if we become discouraged because of the airlines strike and if others misunderstand the wage-price guidelines, and if we do not provide the practicable, workable, and effective kind of wage-price guidelines which I believe can still serve the great purpose of keeping the rise in the cost of living under good control.

THREE AMERICAN WOMEN FIGHT DISEASE IN VIETNAM WITH FEW SUPPLIES, LESS MONEY, AND GREAT DEDICATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the efforts of three dedicated American women who live in Kontum, the heart of the Central Vietnamese Highlands: Patricia Smith, a doctor from Seattle; and two nurses, Joan Blonien and Jean Platz, both from Milwaukee. Dr. Smith went to Vietnam to help treat lepers among the Montagnard tribes in 1959. However, she soon found herself confronted by an overwhelming number of sick tribesmen and sent out a call for help to the United States. Joan Blonien answered immediately. A graduate of Marquette University in Milwaukee and a registered nurse, Joan has been in Vietnam, with only one short leave of absence, since 1960. The two were joined by Jean Platz, also a registered nurse and a graduate of Alverno College in Milwaukee, in 1961. Since that time the three have operated as a team, inseparable and invaluable since they have brought modern medicine to a people long ignored by society.

Dr. Smith started out in 1959 with only a truck. Soon she found a room she could use in Kontum as a small dispensary. Gradually, with the help and dedication of the 2 Milwaukee nurses, she opened a 10-bed clinic. Then people began to hear of the three brave Americans who lived near the southern terminus of the Ho Chi Minh trail. The war grew crueler and hotter around them. Many of their patients had been wounded by the fighting, but they stood their ground. A German bishop heard of their efforts and their need for a bigger hospital and more supplies. He raised enough money to provide them with a 40-bed hospital which now treats an average of over 100 patients at a time. The German gift was partially out of gratitude for aid given Germany under the Marshall aid program.

At the same time, Joan's mother, Mrs. Clem Blonien, and others in the Milwaukee suburb of Wauwatosa began to organize fundraising projects to help support the three Americans and their small staff of unskilled Montagnard assistants. The parish of the church of St. Jude the Apostle founded a Joan Blonien Club which helps buy much-needed food and medical supplies for the hospital. The ladies' auxiliary of the Knights of Columbus Council in Wauwatosa began to send medical supplies to Kontum.

These women face conditions often more primitive than those on our own frontiers over a century ago. The life expectancy of the Montagnard is under 30 and three-fourths of the children die before they reach maturity. Dr. Smith and her assistants have only the most rudimentary equipment—no X-ray machines and a chronic lack of medicine, even vitamins. They desperately need help.

The hospital is completely nonsectarian. Dr. Smith said on a CBS "Twentieth Century" program recently:

> We're not here to convert anyone to a political system or even a religious faith.

Their job is dangerous, but they are saving lives and winning hundreds of new friends for America. They deserve all the help the American Government and people can give them. I am sure I speak for my State, Mr. President, when I say Wisconsin is proud of them.

These nurses need the kind of help the AID program in Vietnam and our massive military program should be able to provide; and I intend to do all I can to help them get it.

I am telling the Senate today of what these three remarkable women have done because I hope other Members of Congress and Americans throughout the country will also help these three American women in their great mission of mercy.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM NEEDS RAPID ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the House Rules Committee received a request from the House Agriculture Committee for an early hearing on H.R. 13361, a bill which, among other things, extends the special milk program for schoolchildren for an additional 4 years.

This legislation may be scheduled for action on the floor of the House in the near future. Its passage is essential if school administrators around the Nation are to have any firm assurance that the school milk program will continue to operate after June 30, 1967.

The school milk program provides mid-morning and mid-afternoon milk breaks to the Nation's schoolchildren with the help of Federal funds. By providing an inexpensive supply of "nature's perfect food," it greatly aids the child from poorer families to receive the nourishment which is so essential if he is to perform adequately both in and out of school.

There is no disagreement on the value of this program. The administration has abandoned its earlier suggestion that the program be cut by 80 percent. Sixty-seven of my colleagues in the Senate have endorsed my bill to extend the program. Now all that remains is for Congress to speak by giving final approval to legislation extending the program. I hope we will do this in the very near future.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until Friday, August 5, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of Aug. 3), 1966:

FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from the class of career minister to the class of career ambassador:

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.

Douglas MacArthur II, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Richard H. Davis, of the District of Columbia.

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia.

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia.

William Leonhart, of West Virginia.

Henry J. Tasca, of the District of Columbia.

Leonard Unger, of Maryland.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Peter G. Berkhout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of deep regret and loss that I inform the House of the recent death of a man who, to many people in my State and throughout the country, was a source of inspiration and leadership.

Dr. Peter G. Berkhout, of Paterson, N.J., was the epitome of a well-founded, scholarly man. Educated first to be a minister, then to be a doctor of medicine, Dr. Berkhout maintained a consistent and ever-increasing interest in astronomy, music, education, theology, and many other fields.

Dr. Berkhout was not only a doctor of medicine, administering to the needs of the body; he was also interested in the mind and spirit of his fellow man. He was a member of the board of trustees of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Mich., a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Christian School Association—the largest private school system in the State of New Jersey—and a leading member of the Paterson Rotary Club.

To his wife and family I offer my deepest expression of sympathy and consolation, and I share with our community in the great loss that we all have experienced.

The memory of Dr. Peter G. Berkhout will always remain as that of a man who, steadfast to his beliefs, selflessly and unfailingly served his community to the full measure of his ability.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 3, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Denis Patrick Wall, pastor, St. Bede's Catholic Church, Clapham Park, London, United Kingdom, offered the following prayer:

We give thanks to God that He has given us this day. We ask Him that we may use it as He would have us use it.

Help us, Lord, to think and to speak and to act as You would have us to think and to speak and to act.

Help us to see ourselves as You see us. Help us to love others as You love us. Help us to understand others as You understand us. Help us to understand even those who oppose us.

Help us to act as You would have us act—help us to know that when we act, we act for You. Help us to know that all we have, that all we are, is from You, and not for us, but for those whom You have given us.

We pledge to You that, with Your help, we will act as You would have us act; we will be as You would have us be; we will seek to be as You are. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PROXMIRE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 4, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AUTHORIZATION TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS AND IMPROVEMENTS THEREON TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1391, S. 3421.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3421) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3421

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to determine and to convey by quitclaim deed and without consideration to the University of Alaska for public purposes all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station, including improvements thereon, and such personal property as may be designated, located at Palmer and Matanuska, Alaska.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1426), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for the transfer of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station to the University of Alaska. As part of the transition to statehood, the experiment station should become the responsibility of the State and be operated in the same manner as other State experiment stations.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 15119.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119), to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations in the Marine Corps and in the Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps and in the Navy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTIONS OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. MORTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7327) to amend a limitation on the salary of the Academic Dean of the Naval Postgraduate School, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1434).

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 3694. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands at Acadia National Park, Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 727

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 728 THROUGH 731

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 28, 1966, the names of Mr. BURDICK, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3662) to establish a price support level for milk, introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and other Senators) on July 28, 1966.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3641) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL MILK AUTHORIZATION, APPROPRIATION ESSENTIAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, milk, in addition to being nature's perfect food, is a highly perishable commodity. For this reason milk production must provide a certain amount of surplus above anticipated needs if we are to be sure that fluid milk will be available to meet any excessive demand that may develop. This is simply because we cannot use fluid milk produced last week or last month to meet current demand. We cannot store fluid milk as we can so many other commodities such as wheat and beef.

This surplus milk naturally tends to drive down the price received by the dairy farmer for the supply always exceeds estimated demand. The Congress has attempted to alleviate this problem in several ways. One is the milk price support program. A second is the milk marketing order program which permits the creation of controlled-price markets. A third is the special milk program for schoolchildren which was originally conceived of as a way to utilize surplus milk production although it is now considered primarily as a child nutrition program.

Today we are seeing an increasing exodus from the dairy farm because the farmer is receiving insufficient prices for his milk. The administration has attempted to remedy this by increasing the support price under the price support program to $4. In addition the controlled price for fluid milk in milk marketing orders has been increased in many instances. However a third important step is to adequately fund the school milk program and insure the continuance of the program past June 30, 1967.

Both the House and the Senate have acted to provide funds for the program for fiscal 1967. I hope that House-Senate conferees will meet soon to resolve differences between the House and Senate figures. In addition the Senate has passed legislation extending the program for 4 years. Two House committees have reported similar legislation, but it has not yet been considered on the floor of the House. Here again I am very hopeful that early action will be forthcoming. Both these measures are essential if we are to make sure that all possible steps have been taken to provide our dairy farmers with an adequate income and, as a result, our Nation with an adequate supply of milk.

VOLUNTEERS HONORED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Americans have long paid public homage to outstanding citizens, both for excellence of service and for exceptional bravery. We hear of scores of honors being rendered daily to men and women in the military services, to career civil servants, to other men and women who are consistently in the public eye. It is right that we do honor those who serve well.

It is for this reason that I am particularly pleased and especially proud that this week 2 Idaho men, together with 28 other men and women selected from all parts of the country, have been honored for a little known, but vitally needed, service to the country.

The two Idahoans, Frank O. Refield, of Burley, and E. A. Finkelnburg, of Hazelton, between them have given nearly a century of volunteer service as weather observers. Mr. Refield has kept continuous and accurate weather observations at Burley, Idaho, since 1917. Mr. Finkelnburg has rendered more than 45 years' outstanding service as a weather observer at Hazelton, Idaho.

It is upon the daily observations of these men, along with the 12,000 other volunteer observers throughout the Nation, that all of us are better able to adjust to the changes in our natural environment, are able to live more prosperous and predictable lives.

These men and women have asked for no compensation, sought no honors, have been satisfied in knowing that they are serving their fellow Americans. This week the Weather Bureau has recognized the service of 30 of these volunteers, including our 2 Idaho men. Mr. Refield has been awarded the Thomas Jefferson Plaque for his work and Mr. Finkelnburg has received the John Campanius Holm Award for his service.

Both deserve well the recognition that has come to them.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if this country is to obtain a solution to the great air and water pollution problems which face it, we must have the interest and aid of industry. It has come to my attention that the Baytown, Tex., refinery of the Humble Oil & Refining Co., has received the Honor Roll Award from the Izaak Walton League of America on June 29 of this year. This award was presented in recognition of Humble's efforts to reduce waste discharges substantially below the levels set by public regulations.

The award cites the Baytown refinery for "foresighted leadership in the installation and operation of a three-stage system of water purification before discharge." I have an article on Humble's effluent control efforts, printed in the March 28, 1966, issue of the Oil & Gas Journal, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW HUMBLE COMBATS WATER AND AIR POLLUTION—COMPANY DOESN'T STOP WITH PUBLIC-REGULATIONS COMPLIANCE, BUT AIMS AT REDUCING WASTE DISCHARGE TO THE LOWEST PRACTICAL LEVEL—HERE'S AN OUTLINE OF METHODS IN USE AT BAYTOWN

Policy of Humble Oil & Refining Co. for controlling effluent quality is to reduce all waste discharges to air and water to the lowest practical level, not just to the level required by public regulations. This also includes controlling the physical conditions of the effluent so that natural functions of the receiving media are not impaired.

The approach of Humble's Baytown refinery toward implementing this policy involves four basic avenues of attack:

1. Attack at the source. This is considered the best approach but not always the easiest or most practical. When feasible, modifications or additions have been made to equipment and processes to eliminate the production or release of contaminants.

2. Improved processes. This actualy ties in with attack at the source since a new process can retire an existing unit which by its nature is a source of contamination.

3. Installation of special equipment. In some cases where similar wastes are produced at many locations, economics dictates that common treating facilities be installed.

4. Assign responsibility. Pollution control is the responsibility of each process unit operating supervisor; however, in addition, conservation coordinators are assigned full-time to monitor the overall effectiveness of control, assist in identifying possible sources of contamination, and assure that immediate steps are taken when necessary.

Program started. To meet its goal for controlling effluent quality, the Baytown refinery began a program as soon after World War II as technical manpower became available. From that time to the present, a period of less than 20 years, the Baytown refinery has spent more than $10 million to improve the quality of its air and water effluent. This is in addition to the $1.5 million required annually to operate and maintain the facilities installed for this purpose.

This program has resulted in producing an effluent usually of better quality than that of the receiving body and in reducing the amount of contaminants in emissions to the air by 98½% of the levels present prior to the start of the program.

1. WASTE-WATER TREATMENT

Some of the steps that the Baytown refinery has taken to reduce waste-water discharges to the lowest practical level include the installation of:

Oil-water separators (Fig. 2) and an expanded industrial sewer system, which included rebuilding the master separator and installing effective oil-recovery facilities. The total investment in these facilities is about $5 million.

A separate sanitary-sewer system designed to serve a population of 5,000 persons.

Gathering systems of several miles of pipelines to collect waste chemical streams at a central location for further treatment and disposal through sales outlets.

A sewer system to gather special chemical wastes and transport them to a treating facility where these streams are treated and neutralized before they are discharged into the main sewer system.

An effluent filtration unit, built at a cost of $1.4 million. Originally, the unit was designed as a filtering unit for removing undesirable components of waste water and recovering usable slop oils. The unit now primarily recovers by filtration the slop oils from emulsions.

Facilities to strip hydrogen sulfide from sour condensate streams. Installed in 1952, improvements made in 1957 and again in 1964 have resulted in facilities capable of receiving sour water containing as much as 2,000 to 3,000 ppm of sulfides and releasing an effluent normally containing less than 10 ppm. Further treatment of the effluent removes all remaining traces of hydrogen sulfide.

Modern cooling towers to increase the number of times water can be reused and to reduce the volume of water required for process cooling.

Coalescing equipment to remove and recover oils from waste-water streams at the process units.

Surface condenser equipment at the pipe stills to remove oils from the waste-water streams prior to their entry into the main sewer system.

A 20,000-gpm pump near the outfall to permit dilution of final waste waters with twice the volume of bay water and furnish additional oxygen to the effluent before discharge into the Houston Ship Channel.

Effluent improvement: Upon the completion of these and other improvements carried out between 1949 and 1960, the quality of the effluent at that time showed more than a 90% improvement when compared to the effluent quality prior to the start of the water-pollution-control program. Because of these improvements, the effluent quality at this point was generally of better quality than that of its receiving body, the Houston Ship Channel.

In August 1964, facilities were completed which provide further treatment of refinery waste water before its discharge into the channel.

The new facility consists of three lagoons totaling about 380 acres (Figs. 3 and 4) into which refinery effluent is pumped and impounded an additional 45 days. The extended retention time permits oxidation and bacteriological treatment of a nature expected to reduce volumes of pollutants in the effluent by an additional 70% upon completion of auxiliary aeration equipment. The lagoon project is still in the experimental stage, and much needs to be learned about the effect of the many variables.

During 1965, facilities were installed to receive and treat ballast waters from ships docking at Baytown to prevent oil from escaping into the ship channel during ballast-unloading operations.

Monitoring, testing: To insure that effluent of a continuous high quality is discharged into the ship channel and Scott Bay, an extensive monitoring and testing program is carried out where in samples of effluent are analyzed regularly (Fig. 5). Results of these tests are used to improve in-plant controls and to provide data for immediate corrective steps whenever necessary.

The testing and monitoring program includes the determining of the characteristic components of waste water. Reports of these tests, exactly as found by the laboratory, are furnished to the Texas Park and Wildlife Commission each week. A target goal has been established for each characteristic component. In each case, the target goal set is more severe than required by the refinery's permit. As these goals are regularly attained, they are changed to more rigid goals.

2. AIR-POLLUTION CONTROL

As a result of an appraisal made by an outside consulting firm in 1952 and Humble's own investigations, it was determined that the refinery's most pressing air-pollution problem was the discharge of sulfur gases to the atmosphere. This problem resulted from treating processes used during and after World War II to remove the sulfur contained in crude.

The discharge of significant quantities of sulfur dioxide to the atmosphere was caused by (1) the concentration of acid recovered from treating processes, (2) the combustion of waste acid sludge burned at the broiler houses, and (3) burning fuel gas containing large amounts of hydrogen sulfide produced by conversion units.

Sulfur gases discharged to the atmosphere were reduced 95% by (1) the installation of hydrofining and other treating units which eliminated acid treating by converting the sulfur compounds in the hydrocarbon streams to hydrogen sulfide; (2) the disposal of recovered hydrogen sulfide by means of a contract entered into with another chemical company, wherein that company purchases recovered hydrogen sulfide from the refinery to make elemental sulfur; and (3) the sale of the remaining spent sulfuric acid streams to a chemical company which operates a highly efficient plant adjacent to Baytown refinery. Refortification of the spent streams is accomplished with substantially no air pollution.

Regenerator discharges: The second most pressing problem was the discharge of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and particulate matter from the regenerators of the catalytic-cracking units installed in 1942 and succeeding years.

An effective method of treating regenerator gases was provided by equipping the refinery's second catalytic-cracking unit (constructed in 1944) with a furnace, and the third unit (constructed in 1958) with a CO boiler. This equipment, in each case, burns the carbon monoxide and waste gases produced from catalyst regeneration at the respective units to produce steam. The original catalytic-cracking unit, constructed in 1942, has been shut down and dismantled.

Although the present units are equipped with cyclone separators, the refinery has still experienced difficulty at times in controlling the emission of particulate matter (catalyst). It is expected that this problem will be solved next year, when the present catalytic-cracking units are retired and a single, large new unit is placed in operation. It will be equipped with cyclone separators having ultrahigh efficiency which are expected to reduce the emission of particulate matter to a desirable level. The unit will incorporate a CO boiler which will utilize regenerator gases.

Other steps: Humble has also taken these steps to reduce atmospheric contamination:

Installation of floating-roof tanks, thereby reducing the vapor space and controlling the evaporative liquid surface. All highly volatile hydrocarbons are stored either in floating-roof tanks or special tanks that will stand the pressure necessary to control evaporation or in tanks which have connections to a vapor-recovery system which will permit full recovery of vapors created by gasoline blending and by filling and emptying operations.

An additional compressor was installed in 1964 to recover gases from the emergency release system. The compressor provides the capacity necessary to recover large quantities of hydrocarbons formerly vented to air or burned at ground torches.

Two major improvements have been made to the refinery's emergency release system (safety flares) which have resulted in reducing smoke emission from these units.

A smokeless ground flare was installed in 1955 to replace a conventional flare serving the propane lube plant. This system is designed to receive an inventory of 5,000 bbl/hr of liquid propane from the unit in case of emergency. In the present system, a large quantity of primary air is injected with secondary air, produces complete combustion and a smokeless flame.

A smokeless burner was installed on top of each of the 250-ft. flare stacks serving the west side of the refinery early in 1965. Steam is used to assist in supplying adequate air to assure complete combustion of gases supplied to the burners when it becomes necessary to release gas because of an emergency. The smokeless burners eliminate smoke from these flares.

The air-pollution problem caused by incineration has been greatly reduced by burning trash in small, controlled amounts. The refinery is now examining a new type of incinerator recently designed for solids waste burning. If this new incinerator proves effective, its use will essentially eliminate this problem.

Program effective: An indication of the effectiveness of the refinery's air-pollution-control program is that it has received relatively fewer complaints from neighbors during the last several years. The refinery has an established procedure for following up on each complaint received to determine whether it is in fact responsible for contaminating the atmosphere and, if so, to take immediate action to correct the situation.

The Baytown refinery also has taken steps to prevent future units from contributing to the pollution problem. Before management will permit any new installation to be built, project engineers must indicate, as part of the appropriation request, that the unit is so designed that it will meet requirements for acceptable noise and effluent quality and air-pollution control.

THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE DEMOCRAT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, upon coming on the floor of the Senate, I learned there had been an extended colloquy about a letter written by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to the St. Louis Globe Democrat, obtained a copy of the letter, and stated my regret that it had been sent.

It was not until later that I learned the Senator from Arkansas had criticized the Globe Democrat and that apparently some people thought I was on the floor when he made his remarks.

For the record, I do not agree with the Senator's characterization of the Globe Democrat as a "rather radical newspaper." I believe it could be more accurately termed "a rather conservative paper."

Nor do I believe the Globe Democrat "takes a radical position on foreign policy." Its position on South Vietnam has been close to my own—"move forward or move out."

I believe Richard Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe Democrat is a man of high character, and an able and patriotic American, and had I been on the floor at the time the Senator from Arkansas made his remarks, I would have so stated.

Some 11 years ago Mr. Amberg came to St. Louis to take over this newspaper. Since then he has worked at least as hard as anyone in Missouri to make our town a finer place in which to live. The worthy causes he has supported are legion; and the area is a better area because of the many fields of civic progress in which he has been a leader. I would not want any record to imply otherwise.

COMPLETING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM IS NOT ENOUGH

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 1973 is the target date for completion of what is without doubt "the largest public project in history," the Federal Interstate Highway System.

An article discussing its background and its future appeared in the Indianapolis Star for Sunday, July 10, under a Washington dateline. Among the observations made are those which quote Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton, who says:

> Personally, I can see no end to the need for improved roads, particularly when we are killing 50,000 persons each year on our highways.

This, Mr. President, is a belief I have frequently stated myself, and which I have sought to put into action by my bill, S. 1272, calling for an extension of the Interstate System from its scheduled 41,000 to 60,000 miles. I am pleased to note that the Federal Highway Administrator also sees well-engineered, modern highways as a necessity in order to reduce the tragic toll of traffic fatalities and injuries. The article continues:

> The greatest contributions to safety on the highway, he added, are controlled access and dividers between lanes. These make a road twice and perhaps even three times as safe as ordinary highways, he said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Joseph R. Coyne and distributed by the Associated Press, may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 10, 1966]

INTERSTATE SYSTEM UNDERWAY—COMING BY 1973: COAST-TO-COAST CAR TRIP WITH NO TRAFFIC LIGHT

(By Joseph R. Coyne)

WASHINGTON.—In 1925 two adventuresome young men drove nonstop from Los Angeles to New York in a Packard touring car. It was a dusty, muddy journey which lasted 167 hours and 50 minutes.

That things are better today is due, in good part, to the Federal-aid highway program, which celebrates its 50th birthday on July 11.

Since President Woodrow Wilson signed the first Federal aid highway law, the Federal government alone has spent $45.7 billion helping states build roads. More than $30 billion has been spent during the last decade.

And today, the nation has under construction the most modern system of superhighways yet conceived—the 41,000-mile Interstate System, which is expected to cost more than $50 billion.

But it was a different story in 1925 when Lynton Wells, now director of the Storer Broadcasting Company in Washington, and Leigh Wade, now a retired major general living in Washington, made their much publicized trip in just under seven days.

"I wouldn't want to do it again," Wells says in recalling the trip, "and I don't think anybody else is crazy enough to try it."

He called it the first—last—nonstop automobile trip from coast to coast. While one of the team drove the other slept and they even loaded gasoline from cans while driving around a block.

The roads?

Wells said they saw virtually no paved roads west of the Mississippi River, and in Missouri "the mud was about as bad as I've ever seen in my life."

Wells said it was because of this trip that the government later credited the pair with convincing the Missouri legislature it should approve a $100 million bond issue to build a road between Kansas City and St. Louis.

The Federal government is paying 90 per cent of the cost of the interstate system, and when it's finished in 1973, motorists will be able to travel coast to coast without a traffic light. On other types of non-local highways, the Federal government normally pays half the cost.

But the officials aren't stopping there. Planning has already begun on highways of the future.

Rex M. Whitton, the Federal highway administrator who has spent a lifetime in highway work, said future emphasis will be on safer and more modern facilities, not on simply adding more miles of highway.

"Personally, I can see no end to the need for improved roads, particularly when we are killing 50,000 persons each year on our highways," Whitton said in an interview.

The greatest contributions to safety on the highway, he added, are controlled access and dividers between lanes. These make a road twice and perhaps even three times as safe as ordinary highways, he said.

The interstate system, which officials say will save 8,000 lives yearly when completed, incorporates these features.

Whitton said he sees the need for wider lanes and paved shoulders on highways not a part of the interstate system.

"We now have more than 3.5 million miles of highways and the demand won't be so much for more mileage in the future but for better mileage," he said.

As highways go, Whitton is an expert among experts. The Federal aid highway program was less than four years old when Whitton, on May 1, 1920, took his first job. It was with the Missouri highway department as a levelman on a survey team. He worked for 40 years with that department rising to chief engineer. In 1961 he was named Federal highway administrator by President John F. Kennedy.

Whitton noted a tremendous change in highway construction during his 46 years in the business, and said it's not just in switching from horses to high-powered construction equipment.

Human factors, he said, are important in today's highway planning. Highways must be built to serve people, and social, esthetic, historical and conservation factors must be taken into account in planning.

The first major Federal attempt at highway construction began long before President Wilson signed the first Federal Aid Highway Act.

That was in 1803 when Congress provided for construction of the National Pike of Cumberland Road to ease the movement of westward-bound pioneers. Between 1806 and 1838 Congress appropriated $7 million for this work. But little was done after that as the railroad came into prominence.

There were two major developments in 1893, however—the introduction of the gasoline automobile in the United States and the creation in the Agriculture Department of the Office of Road Inquiry. This was an office with three employes and a $10,000 annual appropriation which was dropped to $8,000 three years later.

Its function was to investigate, educate and disseminate information on road building. It was a far cry from today's Bureau of Public Roads—part of the Commerce Department—with its 5,500 employes and a Federal aid program which will total $4 billion during the year which began July 1.

The pattern for future road building was fixed with the 1916 Federal Aid Highway Act which required states to organize a highway department as a condition for Federal aid. By the end of 1917 every state had done this.

The law provided only $5 million the first year for construction of post roads in rural areas but it was a start.

It also fixed three factors for apportionment of aid—population, area of a state and mileage of its rural delivery and star post routes. The same factors are used in apportioning aid today.

From that beginning—there were 3.6 million motor vehicles registered in 1916—the Federal aid program has grown into one of the government's most important services. Motor vehicles registrations have reached 93 million and are expected to be 120 million by 1975.

In 1916, total road and street mileage was about 2.5 million. Only 10 per cent was surfaced and that mostly with gravel. In 1956—when the Interstate System was begun—there were 3.4 million miles of highway in the nation. Today about 75 per cent of all roads are surfaced.

The Federal aid program hasn't done the entire job, of course. States and localities have done most of the work. Even on a Federally aided road project it's the state which must plan and build the road, not the Federal government.

Only about 880,000 miles of highway have been built since 1916 with Federal aid but that mileage represents the nation's major road network.

And the interstate system when completed will carry more than 20 per cent of all traffic although it will comprise less than 1 per cent of the nation's total mileage. It is the largest public project in history.

EFFECT ON THE RESIDENTS OF SALINA, KANS., OF THE CLOSING OF SCHILLING AIR FORCE BASE, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we all remember the closing of 90 military bases as directed by the Secretary of Defense 2 years ago. In Kansas, Schilling Air Force Base was closed by the Secretary's decree in November of 1964.

When Schilling was closed, nearly 40,000 people were affected economically in the community. Yet this severe shock to business did not dampen the enthusiasm of the city to rebound from their setback.

During the past 18 months, the residents of Salina, Kans., have made an outstanding economic changeover as they injected private enterprise into the abandoned Air Force base.

Probably one of the most complete documentary stories on the changeover at Schilling and the efforts of the Salina people was reported in the July 25 issue of the National Observer.

I ask Mr. President that this article be inserted in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, July 25, 1966]

First Aid for a Wounded Town—How a City and Its Citizens Gained New Life After "Mac's Ax" Closed a Big Air Force Base

Salina, Kans.—On Nov. 19, 1964, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara gave the orders of execution. In the name of economy in Government and military redeployment, the Defense Department was closing 95 air bases, naval yards, and other military installations in 33 states. The impact would be felt from Portsmouth, N.H., to Lompoc, Calif.

The citizens of the affected communities reacted with shock and hysteria. By the planeload, delegations of them poured into Washington to argue for reconsideration. Irate and embarrassed senators and congressmen pleaded with the Pentagon and called the White House on behalf of constituents who found themselves about to lose the basis for 10 to 70 per cent of their local economies.

Now, 1½ years later, what actually has happened? Have the affected communities suffered the economic depression they feared, with the dispiriting consequences they predicted?

Many of the military installations still are only in the process of being phased out, and so no conclusive survey is yet possible. But in some communities the question admits of an answer—an answer that involves an incredible and complex mixture of community pride, Chamber of Commerce fervor, and sweeping, multifaceted, Government largess.

The Defense Department has put out a bright, colorful, profusely illustrated booklet about the changeover called *The Challenge of Change*. One of three communities featured therein is this central Kansas farm center whose 41,293 people on Nov. 19, 1964, had no inkling that in so short a time their city was going to be a prime example of any kind of challenge *or* change.

In fact, the dawn of that day in Salina revealed nothing but good news—an inch of new snow on the ground, a blessing for the drought-stricken wheat farmers of the region and hence for the townspeople who did business with them.

THE DAY OF DECISION

Of course, Salinans, like everyone else, also knew that this was the day on which Secretary McNamara would make public his new list of condemned military installations. And they knew quite well that if Schilling Air Force Base, a huge Strategic Air Command bomber base at the city's edge, were on this list, it would be an economic blow to Salina for which no amount of moisture for the wheat could compensate.

According to Air Force analyses, since the reactivation of the base in 1951, the city's population had jumped 60 per cent to make it the fourth largest in the state. One-third of all residents of Saline County, including the city, derived income directly from Schilling payrolls. Spending from those payrolls accounted for more that one-fourth of the sales in Salina stores. In addition, the base as an institution made purchases in the Salina economy "running at $1,116,200 per fiscal year."

But on Nov. 19, there was little cause for worry. Rep. Robert Dole of the Congressional district that includes Salina had assured Salinans that Schilling was not likely to be affected by Secretary McNamara's new list of closures.

Indeed, Rep. Garner Shriver of an adjoining Congressional district had declared that he had information indicating that *no* Kansas base would be affected. The runways at Schilling had been improved for B–52s that were scheduled to replace the old B–47s there. And at that very time Col. Roy Crompton, commander of Schilling's 310th Aerospace Wing, was at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona to receive an award for the best cost-reduction program in the entire 15th Air Force.

Then, out of the clear blue euphoria, the switchboard of the city's daily newspaper, the Salina Journal, received a long-distance call from Sen. James Pearson in Washington for editor Whitley Austin. Mr. Austin, long a leader in the community's successful efforts to build good relations with the base, and long an editorial defender of the need for manned bombers, picked up his phone and heard the Kansas Republican senator say, "Whit—sit down. . . ."

That afternoon, the Journal's story about the needed snow still made page one. But it sank into obscurity beneath the thick, black, inch-high letters of the nine-column banner headline that announced: "Mac's Ax On Schilling."

At City Hall, several blocks away, City Manager Norris Olson got the news from his wife, who had been listening to the radio.

The next day, reminisces Mr. Olson, "we had meetings—nobody knew much what we were meeting about but we had meetings." Businessmen such as E. G. Anderson, vice president of a plumbing and heating company, simply got together for coffee: "We just sat looking down our noses into our cups. We kept asking each other, 'What are we going to do?' "

The feeling throughout the community quickly came through to a Government official who arrived in Salina not long after: "It was like it was in Washington after Pearl Harbor," he declares. "Everyone you saw you knew was thinking about it, you could feel it, it was like a magnet drawing filings together on a piece of paper. In Salina, it was something of the same thing, only on a lesser scale. You would see people on the street and you knew that everyone you saw had the same thing on his mind—Schilling."

"SAVE OUR SCHILLING"

At a "town-hall" meeting about what editor Austin termed "the rape of Schilling," there were many, as in most other similarly affected communities, who wanted to declare war on the Pentagon and get the decision reversed. The Salinans decided to send a delegation of seven community leaders—accompanied by Congressman Dole, U.S. Sen. Frank Carlson, and Kansas Gov. William Avery—to argue for the excellence of Schilling as a base. This was Salina's "SOS Squad"—"Save Our Schilling."

But unlike many such delegations, this one had made another decision. Explains one member: "We went to Washington to argue, to make the strongest case we could. But should that fail, we also went prepared to do business."

The thing Salinans were most anxious to argue about was that of all the major military installations on the list, Schilling was to go the soonest: June 30. On Nov. 19, it was calculated, Schilling had 5,364 military and civilian employes with 8,000 dependents and an annual payroll in excess of $20,000,000—all to be lost to this relatively small city within seven months.

But at the Pentagon, where the Salinans were given a four-course luncheon in a dining room normally reserved for four-star generals, Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance had all the answers. There would be no change; B–47 bombers were being scrapped; the B–52s were being redeployed; Schilling did not figure in the redeployment; it therefore had no "follow-on mission"; therefore it would be closed. Says an SOS Squad member: "It took him about one hour to convince us."

At that point the Salinans, as one Defense Department official admiringly puts it, "rolled up their sleeves" and told Mr. Vance: "You've said you can help us; now tell us how." The deputy Secretary was ready for that too. Already he had phoned a white-haired, loquacious civilian in the Pentagon who in the next few months was to be one of the most important persons in Salinans' lives. "I've got a delegation from Salina and I want to send them over to see you. Can you clear your schedule this afternoon?" Grins Don Bradford, director of the little-known Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) of the Defense Department, "the deputy Secretary says, 'Can you clear your books?' and I cleared my books."

In the modest suite of offices occupied by the tiny staff of the OEA (Director Bradford, five field men, one economist, and two secretaries), the Salinans found what Mr. Bradford fondly describes as "the Defense Department's heart—no, its conscience."

When Mr. McNamara began juggling and cutting military installations in 1961, he created the OEA because "if these decisions are made in the national interest, everybody should share the burden." It is the OEA's job to "be the Washington advocate" for the injured communities in getting compensatory aid and advice from Federal agencies.

"We had no ground rules," says Mr. Bradford, "except to do what made sense to carry out this responsibility." Salinans—and praise for Mr. Bradford's office is heard not infrequently in Salina—put it less delicately: "Bradford—he's a real red-tape-cutter."

After the Washington talk, says Mr. Bradford, "Salina invited us to come out, and we came out fast—we had a three-year's job to do in six months." And with him he brought both regional and Washington representatives of an array of Government agencies that Salinans would have spent months trying to approach and deal with individually.

Together, the OEA men and the Salinans considered the situation: Salina could not fall back on the area's "declining agricultural population." Too, lower freight costs for wheat than for flour were forcing Salina's mills to relocate elsewhere. Salina needed industry to get new population and payrolls. But so far, Salina's brave talk about getting new industry had amounted to little more than "yackity-yackity," as one OEA man put it. What did Salina have to offer industry? It had become a crossroads for two new, major interstate highways: 1–70, running from the East to the West Coasts, and I–35W, which eventually will reach south to the Gulf of Mexico. What else could Salina develop to offer? Industrial skills. Therefore one of the most profitable uses that could be made of Schilling facilities would be for technical training institutions.

So the thinking went. Then, Salinans remember, Mr. Bradford would tell Federal representatives of such agencies as the Office of Education, "This is what they need here; what can you do to help?" Under Federal surplus-property laws, much of the base could be turned over to Salina free, in effect, if used for activities consistent "with national goals."

The community had been planning an "area vocational-technical training school"; this could go in at Schilling. By this alone, the community was saved a prospective $750,000 bond issue. And explains Mr. Bradford: "It showed things could happen. It provided some payroll and it showed some activity."

But out of those early coffee sessions, Salinans had decided on something else they could do to make the community attractive to newcomers. Economic decline or no, they could carry out previously dragging plans to replace the old, out-grown City Hall, County Courthouse, and Public Library buildings with a big, new, jointly occupied government complex.

It seemed crazy to be thinking about a new bond issue when the economic bottom was dropping out of everything. But when community leaders approached E. G. Anderson about heading the bond drive, he thought it over and decided, "It intrigues me—I'll do it." He discovered that it intrigued nearly everyone else, too. Chamber of Commerce manager Les Matthews proudly describes the situation even now: "You want to get something done? You make some phone calls for help and you get it!"

On Feb. 23, barely more than three months from the closure announcement, and without a Presidential election or even a City Commission contest to attract voters, some 50 per cent of the 14,073 Salina registered voters turned out in a blinding snowstorm that snarled traffic and closed schools. They approved the library and government-building bonds by margins of nearly two to one.

Where at one time hard-nose opposition within the City Commission had all but killed the joint-government-building plan, the community now is cited in the state as a model of city-county co-operation. And to secure the land for the new complex, an application for Federal urban-renewal money that previously had gotten nowhere suddenly came off the bottom of the application stack in Washington. Then Salina put in for another urban-renewal grant that would clear a slum area to open the way for expansion plans of certain Salina industrial and educational plants. Where will the slum residents go? The expectation is that they'll move to low-cost houses vacated by Schilling servicemen—houses that the Federal Housing Agency angelically refused to dump at depressed market prices that would have blackjacked Salina realtors.

As Salinans see it, miracle followed miracle. For the first time in years, the Community Chest fund campaign exceeded its annual goal. A fretful Chamber of Commerce, fearing the worst about attracting new members in 1965, found itself getting 113, only 6 fewer than in 1964. And the $10,000 that these new members brought in Chamber financial subscriptions was more than double the 1964 total.

A MATTER OF PURE PRIDE

Part of the decision to go ahead with the government complex, at least, involved simply a desire to provide public works, "to keep some breadwinners in here." But chamber manager Matthews talks also of pure community pride. "I hate to use a cliche," he says, "but the people just got together and refused to be beaten." Agrees editor Austin: "It's like in any catastrophe—and this was a catastrophe: It unites the community."

Everybody in Salina wants to tell you about somebody else who "put in 14 hours a day" or "hasn't sold a car in his car dealership for months" or "has spent only half-days in his law office" in order to give time to what now has become a Save Our Salina effort. The city is annexing 3,033 acres at the base to increase Salina's geographical size by some 50 percent. The municipal airport is moving to the better facilities at Schilling this month, and a Salina Airport Authority was created. To get power to create the airport authority, Salinans had to lobby for special legislation in the Legislature at Topeka. The necessary bill, capital observers say, went through the Legislature in near-record time.

A co-ordinator is needed for all the activity at Schilling, recommended the OEA. Wilson and Co., a large engineering concern based in Salina, donated one—Bob McAuliffe, who served the first three months at Wilson's expense.

It's a weary Mr. McAuliffe who, with his phone ringing or somebody coming in his office to see him every few minutes, tries to enumerate all the things Salina is getting at the base.

Beech Aircraft of Wichita is leasing five big Schilling buildings for aircraft-modification and missile work; eventually Beech will have an estimated 1,200 employes there. Funk Aviation of Salina, a manufacturer of crop-dusting aircraft, leased a hangar. A seed company is establishing a district warehouse at Schilling. A company will build mobile-home components there. A local developer will establish a plant for making artificial marble. There will be a humidifier-manufacturing plant and a frozen-food distribution center. Says Mr. McAuliffe wryly, "If you stick around another quarter-hour, something else probably will be announced."

The State Highway Patrol not only is basing its aircraft at Schilling but has turned the old bomber-crew ready-room into a police academy. The Government is turning over the base hospital intact for a new state vocational-rehabilitation center.

Perhaps most important of all, Schilling Institute is to open this fall. A state school offering degrees in various kinds of technological training, it is establishing a 185-acre campus at Schilling to serve, in three to five years, an estimated 2,500 students. State legislation was needed for it, also, and because of screams from competition-fearful state junior colleges, this took longer than the airport-authority bill. But Salina got it.

The speed with which the Air Force left Salina, once considered a blow that other communities were spared, now is hailed as an advantage the others didn't have. A Salinan explains: "Many people said that industry didn't want to locate where there was a base, and there was some truth to this. Now, because the Air Force left so soon, we not only have facilities to offer but industry can get into them right away."

Even so, Salina at first was so anxious to get something to replace the base that it made the common mistake of making offers to industry without being sure what would be available, and on what terms, at Schilling. The city frightened away at least one industrial prospect this way before it heeded OEA's warning to "slow down."

One of the city's largest plums, however, seems simply to have dropped out of the sky. Over a period of time, the chamber kept getting calls from someone asking questions about Salina. Finally the chamber manager made a credit check on the caller, who had given only his name, to find out whom he represented. The answer sent the chamber into high gear to provide any information requested and more. The man represented Westinghouse, and in an industrial area south of Salina you now can see the framework for a huge new Westinghouse fluorescent light-bulb plant estimated to cost $4,000,000 and expected to employ 500 people to start.

Through the not-immediately authorized efforts of base commander Col. John F. "Sundown" Scanlan (so nicknamed because Schilling was not the first base closed out from under him), Capehart housing units vacated at the base now are the home of the "waiting wives" of servicemen fighting in Vietnam. The wives' 1,800 children will necessitate the reopening of the Salina school board's Schilling elementary school. But having so many Schilling homes occupied is a relief to the local real-estate market, and the wives spend money in Salina stores.

HUNTING FOR FUNDS

"An air base can become a cancer on a community, destroying its initiative," observes Mr. Bradford. And City Manager Olson admits of Salina: "We had just taken the base for granted." But on the other hand, little seems to have so stimulated the initiative of Salinans as opportunities for Federal assistance that now are available. In addition to achievements already enumerated, the city is seeking Federal aid for two new parks, one of them totaling 98 acres, and for a golf course to go on the old airport grounds. Says Mr. Olson: "I never saw so many people go into action so fast."

Nor in this politically conservative community does one hear much noise about "Federal control." Salinans who are mad at the Government at all are mad because the urban-renewal project's "final-final" approval seems slow in coming through. Says one lifelong Democrat, "This bureaucracy is enough to make a conservative out of me!" Where Government operations were concerned, grimaces another Salinan, "We were babes in the woods."

But Mr. Bradford's logic generally seems accepted so far: "If you want to buy a base for $50,000,000, that's fine. But if you want it on surplus terms, then—for good reasons—there are going to be some hookers."

Has political pull been a factor in all this Federal assistance? Hardly, since the entire Kansas Congressional delegation is stanchly Republican. "That's one of the fascinating things about it," says editor Austin: "Partisan politics have in no way been involved." Says an OEA official: "We were in town for a solid month before we knew whether the mayor was Republican or Democrat or what." The truth is that communities who try to exert political pull may only create delays caused by the necessity to release all developments through the offices of senators and congressman trying to exert pressure. It's also true that some Federal agencies that might have come into Salina—the Job Corps, the Bureau of Prisons—were deliberately discouraged because it was decided that in the long run other uses of Schilling facilities would be more beneficial to Salina. The OEA says two major factors are making Salina's comeback possible. One is the prosperity of America's economy as a whole: "Salina isn't stealing industry; industry is expanding." The other, in Mr. Bradford's words, is that "Salina has broad-based leadership, talent in depth."

PADLOCKING POCKETBOOKS

Not everything has gone well in Salina, of course. Some fund campaigns, for example, unlike Community Chest, did find after the base closed that, as one campaigner puts it, "people put a padlock on their pocketbooks." But community spirit ran high enough, and things went well enough, so that the Chamber of Commerce replaced its slogan for 1965, "Response to our Challenge," with the more confident sign that now graces innumerable Salina business fronts: "Ask us about Salina—City on the Move." And delegations from communities losing military installations in Oklahoma, Washington State, Nebraska, and New Mexico have been into Salina to see how Salina did it.

When the base closed, 60 to 80 percent of Salina's skilled tradesmen left, seeking work elsewhere. But now, says Clem Blangers, president of the Salina Building and Trades Council, they are coming back. At one time some 3,750 homes stood vacant. Now the Chamber estimates there are but 1,000 to 1,100 vacancies. In the first five months of this year, more new-dwelling buildings permits were issued than in all of 1965. And the valuation of new business buildings for which permits have been issued already exceeds the valuation recorded for business-building permits in 1965.

"I don't know how much longer the spirit will last," says Mr. Austin. "A tide of emotion can't keep up forever. It's dwindling some now. And we're still going along mainly on hopes and expectations.

"But by next spring [and in this estimate he gets agreement from the OEA] we should be back where we were economically, if not in population, before the base closed." Throughout town, you hear the declaration, "It's the best thing that ever happened."

Indeed, with something of the same patriotic sentiment that inspired Betsy Ross, a contest is under way for still another new thing in this community—an official City of Salina flag.

GERALD GEORGE.

THE MAKING OF A SENATOR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the July 25 San Francisco Chronicle carries an eloquent tribute to our colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, written by the distinguished columnist, Arthur Hoppe. It is one of the most sensitive and moving tributes that I have seen offered to a Member of the U.S. Senate.

No one familiar with the record of the Senator from Idaho will dispute Mr. Hoppe's verdict:

> Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, is a politician and a good one.

Neither will those of us who have been impressed by his service to his State, to the Nation, and to the cause of world peace be surprised to read Mr. Hoppe's words:

> He holds firm to what he believes. You may, if you will, question his stand. But you can question neither his independence, his integrity nor his courage.

Mr. President, the easiest course for a politician to take is to go along with prevailing opinion or administration pressure on major issues. The harder course is the one which Senator CHURCH has chosen—that is the course of independence and absolute personal loyalty to his intellect and his conscience.

In my judgment, Senator CHURCH has authored several of the most penetrating articles and addresses on the need for new foreign policy initiatives ever to come from the pen or the lips of a U.S. Senator. I am firmly convinced that if we are to know lasting peace in our time, we must begin to move more quickly along the lines spelled out by the Senator from Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent that the well-deserved tribute by Mr. Hoppe be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 25, 1966]

THE MAKING OF A SENATOR

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—It is hot in Washington. And cynical. And, I think, a trifle weary and uncaring.

You hear little talk of Vietnam any more, other than its effect on the November elections and whether the President can pull a rabbit out of the hat to save the Democrats. "What else," a lady at a cocktail party said with a shrug, "is there to say about it?"

And after a week here the cynical feeling grows that we have evolved a political system that produces political leaders who think only in political terms. Politics is all here and all are politicians. And politically it's always safest to go along with the crowd.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, is a politician and a good one. He came to the Senate in 1957 at the age of 33—handsome, dapper, an American Legion oratory contest winner, a Junior Chamber of Commerce "Outstanding Young Man," the model for an Arrow Collar ad of the thirties, a boy wonder. You would have pegged him as one predestined to go along with the crowd.

Today, Senator CHURCH is one of the leaders of what Doves there are left—a score in the Senate, a handful in the House, none publicly in the Administration. Each day the pressures of an ever-escalating war tighten on him. He knows that the vast majority of his constituents are Hawks. He knows that the President's irritation with dissenters grows. Worst of all, he knows, as he puts it, "that at any moment an incident could so inflame American opinion that past opposition to the war would be equated with treason."

He smiled wryly. "You feel a little like a Volkswagen sitting on a railroad track not knowing when the train is coming around the bend."

He frowned. "I think it's not so much the present political consequences, but the potential ones that keep most men from coming over to our side."

Yet, despite all this, he holds firm to what he believes. You may, if you will, question his stand. But you can question neither his independence, his integrity nor his courage. The one-time shallow-seeming boy wonder hasn't gone along.

"I would hope I've changed," he said with a smile as he lit a cigar in a quiet office off the Senate floor. "Partly of course, it's because this job is a tremendous post-graduate course in what the world's all about."

He talked for a while of a recent trip he had made to Europe as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And you could picture the one-time boy wonder from Idaho, conferring with Adenauer and De Gaulle.

"And partly," he said, with a wave of his hand that included all the mystique of the Senate, "it's this place itself."

As I left his office and walked up the marble steps where Webster and Calhoun, Taft and Borah had walked, I think I understood a little of what he meant. I thought of the pride these men had taken in the duty of the Senate to advise as well as to consent—to refrain from listlessly "going along."

It is the heart of our system. And the system, while it produces hacks, also produces in some mysterious way, those who are essential to it. And I felt better.

But then, out in the sticky sunlight, the headlines were crying about the possible execution of American flyers by North Vietnam. And for a chilling moment, I thought I could hear a train whistle around the bend.

THE DOSSIER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure first started looking into electronic eavesdropping equipment, there were many who called us "dreamers." They said we would not find anything, that the privacy of the American citizen was being protected. The record that the subcommittee has made speaks for itself.

Monday's New York Times carried an article about a computer plan for personal dossiers in Santa Clara, Calif. It is reported that a Mr. Carl Sheel, sometimes known as "the father of the Santa Clara system" has said that persons who were concerned about an invasion of privacy were "the higher educated people—you might call them the dreamers."

Mr. President, only time will tell whether we are dreamers or not. Nevertheless, we are concerned with proposals at all levels of government, and in the private sphere, which would incorporate in a single file basic information about an individual from the cradle to the grave. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will soon send a questionnaire to all Federal departments and agencies asking them to list the type of information which they maintain in their files. The results should be very interesting. Only then will we be able to determine whether we are, in fact, dreamers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the article from the August 1 New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1966]

COMPUTER PLAN FOR PERSONAL DOSSIERS IN SANTA CLARA STIRS FEARS OF INVASION OF PRIVACY

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN JOSE, CALIF., July 31.—Many residents of the big, rapidly growing Santa Clara

County will find their names indexed within the next year in a centralized computer system, which will provide at least sketchy information in personal "dossiers" to authorized inquirers in seconds or minutes.

As the county of nearly one million residents goes into "computer government" to save paper work, manpower and dollars, some officials themselves have raised questions about "invasion of privacy" and the concept of a close watch on activities of individuals "by big brother."

These doubts have been dissolved in some instances by assurances of county spokesmen that confidential information would continue to be protected. Nevertheless there remains concern in some quarters over the system's potential misuse despite safeguards.

These fears were reflected last week at hearings conducted in Washington by a special subcommittee of the House Operations Committee on invasion of privacy.

One of the proposals under attack was that of the Budget Bureau for a National Data Center. Under the plan 20 Federal departments and agencies now guarding their own data would make this available to a centralized computer for use by those agencies.

Representative CORNELIUS F. GALLAGHER, Democrat of New Jersey, the subcommittee chairman, said the pooled information could include data on a person's education, grades, credit rating, income, military services, employment and almost anything else, all wrapped in one package.

The alphabetical persons index record in the Santa Clara system, dubbed LOGIC for Local Government Information Control will include the following data: name, alias, Social Security number, address, birth record, driver's license data, vehicle license number, position if a county employe, and other data if the subject has been involved with the Welfare or Health Departments, the District Attorney, adult or juvenile probation, sheriff, court and so on.

Also included would be his voter and jury status and property holdings.

Howard W. Campen, the County Executive, has made a number of speeches in which he referred to the personal "dossiers" and the speed with which they could be made available to persons entitled to the information.

After one such talk Clarence Wadleigh, of Palo Alto, a graduate student in education at Stanford University, who has familiarized himself with some aspects of the computer program, wrote to The Palo Alto Times of his fears about the system's potential.

"Unlimited capacity for information storage combined with instantaneous retrieval," Mr. Wadleigh stated, "would seem almost irresistible temptation to 'record' more than is warranted and 'retrieve' for unethical and/or illegal purposes. The toy could easily become a monster."

Mr. Wadleigh said yesterday that he was still concerned that "many people out there are saying, 'We're going to have to build a case against somebody in the future, let's start building his history now.' "

He called for "some kind of reviewing system to be set up to see what kind of information is programmed."

Newton R. Holcomb, Assistant County Executive, Robert R. Sorensen, director of the county's General Services Agency, and Thomas Johnson, data processing systems programmer, all have asserted in interviews that the computer would be programmed for limited access.

During the Washington subcommittee hearing, witnesses suggested that records covering a juvenile misdemeanor might be fed into a computer and then follow the offender for the rest of his life, interfering with ability to get and hold a job.

Mr. Johnson said this would be impossible under California law, which requires eradication from the records of details about rehabilitated juvenile offenders after a specific period.

"Whatever rules are maintained now in this connection will be maintained under the new system," Mr. Johnson said. "If it were decided to put the information into the computer it could only be entered and retrieved by those directly concerned."

"If you ask, " he went on, " 'would it remain there forever?,' the answer is 'absolutely not.' It would in many respects be harder to get at, while it was there, than it is now, for it would require technical knowledge of how to get at the computer records."

"Juvenile records," he stressed, "are completely confidential and only used in line of correctional and preventive police work. California law takes the position that anybody can make a mistake."

Mr. Johnson said that there remained questions about whether such data as venereal disease records would be added to the personal dossiers.

If the decision were yes, he asserted, "complete confidentiality" would be the rule as in juvenile matters. "There won't be a dossier of every little fact about a Santa Clara resident," he said.

"This is no big brother system," Mr. Sorensen said. "It is a way of maintaining more efficient records. You can distort and misuse information but you can do it now."

This is the way the computer would work: Confidential information protected by law would be fed into it along with open, public data. But the only access to the data would be through any one of about 100 teleprocessing units manned by trained operators.

When a county department asks for data to which it was not legally entitled, the computer, according to the officials, would say the data were not available.

"Welfare Department information," Mr. Sorensen related, "is protected by law, as are juvenile records, and records of the Health Department, especially in the venereal disease category."

"Suppose a sheriff's deputy arrests a man he is pretty sure is a relief recipient," Mr. Sorensen continued. He wants full data. The teleprocessor at the sheriff's office sits down at the unit and asks for the information. But the computer slaps the sheriff down. He is told it is not available."

Social workers in Santa Clara County were among those who had reservations about "the availability of broad access to the names of clients."

"These fears have somewhat abated," Frederick B. Gillette, County Welfare Director, reported.

Karl Sheel of the data processing division, who is sometimes called "the father of the Santa Clara system," said that persons who were concerned about an "invasion of privacy" were "the higher educated people—you might call them dreamers."

Mr. Sheel said there was no reason to fear anything "if you have no arrests, no outstanding warrants against you or if you're not on welfare or if you've stayed out of the clutches of adult probation."

SBA, JUSTICE AGREE ON PLAN TO GET SBIC LITIGATION MOVING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, recently held hearings to review the Small Business Investment Company program.

On July 19, 1966, the subcommittee received the testimony of Mr. Richard E. Kelley, the former Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration in charge of the SBIC program. In his testimony Mr. Kelley recommended that SBA be permitted to conduct its own SBIC litigation in civil cases rather than the Department of Justice. He pointed out that he felt that there had been an unreasonable delay in the prosecution of SBIC litigation by the Department of Justice. Mr. Kelley stated:

> No single matter was more frustrating to all of us at the agency than our relations with the Department. (Meaning the Department of Justice.)

He testified that several SBIC cases had been referred to the Department of Justice and had remained there for as long as 2 years.

As a result of this testimony, I invited representatives of SBA and the Department of Justice to my office to discuss this matter with me. Mr. Philip Zeidman, General Counsel of SBA, and Mr. John Douglas, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division, Department of Justice, represented their two agencies. In our discussion, the substance of Mr. Kelley's complaint was affirmed and there was indication that there had been a considerable amount of delay in the handling of SBIC litigation.

I think we all recognize clearly the responsibility that the Department of Justice has for all Federal litigation. It must have sole authority to control the litigation because a diffusion of authority would result in conflicting policies. The resulting confusion would not be in the best interest of the Government.

There has been some discussion of this problem of SBIC litigation between the two agencies in the past. In 1963 the Department of Justice and SBA entered into an agreement regarding SBIC litigation. This agreement recognizes at the beginning that:

> The Department of Justice has supervisory control over all litigation.

However, it goes on to say:

> None of the above is to qualify the right of SBA attorneys to go into court and conduct litigation arising under the Small Business Investment Act, although Justice believes that there may be a few very unusual cases which it will desire to handle itself.

I think that this agreement was a very sensible and logical one. It placed the authority for litigation where it should be, that is, the Department of Justice. It also would permit SBA to handle most of their own civil SBIC cases in court. Somehow there has been some trouble in implementing this agreement.

As a result of my conference with Mr. Zeidman and Mr. Douglas, I sent a letter to the Administrator of SBA, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, and to the Attorney General, Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. In my letter I reviewed the allegations of delay made by Mr. Kelley. I also pointed out that there were differences in opinion between the two agencies as to the exact limits of the agreement reached in 1963. I urged the two agencies to resolve their differences and to reaffirm and to adhere to the agreement. I also requested a report on the status of SBIC litigation every 6 months.

On July 27, 1966, I received a reply to my letter from Attorney General Katzenbach in which he says that the SBA and the Department of Justice "have agreed to work out the specific methods by which the 1963 agreement can be carried out in a manner satisfactory to both agencies." I have also received a reply from SBA Administrator Boutin expressing a willingness to cooperate in this matter. The agencies both agreed to report to the Small Business Subcommittee every 6 months on this litigation.

Mr. President, I intend to follow this matter very carefully. I am well pleased with the response I have received to my efforts to improve the progress and effectiveness of SBIC litigation. This is an important matter affecting the regulatory and enforcement powers of the SBA. The delays in the handling of this litigation must not be permitted to continue.

I think that if SBA conducts more of its civil SBIC cases they will be handled promptly and efficiently. I am convinced that this can be done without eroding the ultimate responsibility that the Department of Justice has over Federal litigation.

Mr. President, I want to stress that this agreement dates from 1963 when the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration exchanged letters affirming the agreement.

However, it has been a dead letter. It has not been honored.

Now, Mr. President, how are we to see that this logical agreement will be honored, not dishonored, from now on?

The answer is that the Department of Justice and the SBA will report every 6 months beginning in January 1967 to the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking Committee on the status of SBIC litigation.

We will have the facts. We will know whether or not SBA attorneys have in fact been able "to go into court and conduct litigation arising under the Small Business Investment Act," and to do so except "in a few very unusual cases."

We will not be reluctant to make these reports available to the Senate, and if this agreement is not honored, we will recommend legislation to the Congress to assure that these cases are handled expeditiously and competently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD a copy of the 1963 agreement between SBA and the Department of Justice; a copy of a letter dated October 18, 1963, from Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of SBA, to Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General; a letter from me to Mr. Katzenbach dated July 22, 1966; a copy of Mr. Katzenbach's reply to my letter dated July 27, 1966; and a copy of a reply dated July 28, 1966, of Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of SBA, to my letter to him dated July 22, 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 AGREEMENT BETWEEN SBA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Department of Justice has supervisory control over all litigation in courts, including SBA litigation. Therefore, prior to initiating any litigation, SBA is to receive clearance from the Department of Justice. The most important reason for such clearance is to determine that the proposed litigation will not adversely affect criminal prosecutions, civil fraud litigation, or other litigation in which Justice is or may become involved. Further, SBA attorneys during the course of litigation will receive clearance from the appropriate U. S. Attorney prior to taking any steps which will significantly affect the outcome of the case. Again, the most important reason for such clearance would be the same as above. Nor will SBA knowingly take any action out of court which will affect pending litigation.

None of the above is to qualify the right of SBA attorneys to go into court and conduct litigation arising under the Small Business Investment Act, although Justice believes that there may be a few very unusual cases which it will desire to handle itself. Nor does any of the above imply any desire on the part of Justice to control investigations or administrative matters conducted by SBA unless such matters directly affect litigation being conducted or to be conducted by Justice.

In all documents filed in court proceedings, the name of the U. S. Attorney will be of equal rank with the first-listed SBA attorney.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1963.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: As you know, members of our staffs have met to discuss the respective functions of the Department of Justice and of this Agency with regard to litigation arising out of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. They have not been able to reach complete agreement on all particulars. We have, however, been reassured by your staff that, when we have determined that a particular course of action best serves the needs of the small business investment company program, the Department does not contemplate frequent instances of either delay or serious questioning of the proposed action.

I recognize that instances in which our proposed action might have an adverse effect on pending or proposed litigation within your exclusive jurisdiction, such as criminal prosecutions, must represent an exception to this understanding. I further recognize that it is impossible to lay down rules to govern every possible contingency; to a considerable extent we must each rely upon the good faith of the other, and upon our mutual desire to protect the interests of the United States as effectively as possible.

You will appreciate, I am sure, that I have statutory duties to discharge. In the light of the reassurances noted above, I believe that I can discharge those duties within the framework of your staff's proposed arrangement, a copy of which is enclosed. I have therefore instructed my staff to work out the details of such an arrangement, and I have been informed by them that they contemplate no great difficulty in doing so.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator,
Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOLEY: Thank you for your letter of October 18, 1963, expressing the willingness of your agency to recognize the authority of the Department of Justice to control SBA litigation, within the framework of a statement you attached which had been prepared by your staff. I am confident that if the mutual assurances set forth in your letter and statement are adhered to generously and in good faith we will encounter no further difficulties in carrying out our respective statutory responsibilities.

Your letter speaks only in terms of litigation under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I assume that your agency will continue to recognize the authority of the Department of Justice to control all other SBA litigation, as you have in the past (see, for example, your general counsel's letters to Assistant Attorney General Douglas, March 25, 1963, and to Acting Assistant Attorney General Guilfoyle, January 29, 1963).

I should also note that references to the United States Attorneys in the statement attached to your letter should be considered as comprehending Assistant Attorneys General and other attorneys of the Department of Justice, where appropriate. Many actions in relation to litigation are not within the delegated authority of the United States Attorneys and must be cleared at the departmental level. The recent discussions and correspondence between your agency and the Department cannot, of course, be construed as any enlargement of the authority of United States Attorneys with respect to SBA litigation.

I am pleased that this problem has been resolved amicably and to the mutual satisfaction of our respective agencies. We look forward to working with you on a fully cooperative basis in the future.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

JULY 22, 1966.

Hon. BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator,
Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOUTIN: On July 19, 1966, Mr. Richard E. Kelley, former Deputy Administrator for Investment, Small Business Administration, testified before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee of which I am chairman. In his testimony Mr. Kelley complained about the delay in the handling of SBIC cases by the Department of Justice. Mr. Kelley said, "No single matter was more frustrating to all of us at the agency than our relations with the Department."

As a result of this testimony, I invited representatives of the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration to discuss this matter with me. On the afternoon of July 21, 1966, Mr. John Douglas, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, and Mr. Philip Zeidman, General Counsel, SBA, came to my office to talk to me.

During the course of our meeting it was brought out that in October, 1963, an agreement had been entered into by the Department of Justice and SBA regarding the handling of litigation arising out of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

This agreement recognizes the need for Justice Department control of the litigation when it states, "The Department of Justice has supervisory control over all litigation in courts, including SBA litigation." However, it recognizes that SBA should play an important role in the handling of court cases except in rare instances as follows:

"None of the above is to qualify the right of SBA attorneys to go into court and conduct litigation arising under the Small Business Investment Act, although Justice believes that there may be a few unusual cases which it will desire to handle itself."

There was some question regarding the interpretation of the agreement. Mr. Douglas indicated that he would need time to study the agreement and its background.

It appears to me that this agreement meets the legitimate responsibilities of both the

Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration in the conduct of SBIC litigation. I would like to urge both the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration to reaffirm and to adhere to this agreement so that SBIC litigation will not suffer the delays to which it has been subjected in the past.

I would like to receive a periodic report on the status of SBIC litigation. It seems to me that a report every six months would be sufficient to keep the Small Business Subcommittee informed on the progress of this litigation.

Please let me know as soon as possible the conclusions that the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration reach on this very important matter. This delay must not be allowed to continue.

I am sending an identical letter to Attorney General Katzenbach.

Sincerely yours,
William Proxmire,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Small Business.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: I welcome your suggestion of July 22 that the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration reaffirm and adhere to the agreement reached in 1963 between the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration regarding the handling of litigation arising out of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. While we do not, of course, accept Mr. Kelley's statements, I share your view that the 1963 agreement meets the legitimate responsibilities of the Department and the Small Business Administration in the conduct of SBIC litigation.

I have spoken to Mr. Boutin, the present Administrator of the Small Business Administration and we have agreed to work out specific methods by which the 1963 agreement can be carried out in a manner satisfactory to both agencies. Staff members of the respective agencies will confer on this matter in the near future and should be able to reach common ground. We in the Department of Justice pledge every effort to reach an accommodation in a way which will permit SBA attorneys to get into court in civil cases more frequently than in the past.

Pursuant to your request, we are preparing a report on the present status of all SBIC litigation and will provide your committee with such a report every six months. We appreciate your constructive interest in this matter.

Sincerely,
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General.

Small Business Administration,
Office of the Administrator,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. William Proxmire,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Small Business, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: Thank you for your letter of July 22, 1966, summarizing the meeting of July 21, attended by Mr. Philip Zeidman, General Counsel of this Agency, at which you explored the relationship between the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration. I am grateful for your interest in the speedy and effective enforcement of the Small Business Investment Act and regulations. I want to assure you that this is an interest which I share. I am determined to achieve that objective.

We will be pleased to comply with your request for a semi-annual report on the status of SBIC litigation. If agreeable with you, we will make our first report in January of 1967, effective as of December 31, 1966.

Sincerely yours,
Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

NEGROES AND THE OPEN SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 2, the Honorable Edward W. Brooke, the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, issued a statement entitled "Negroes and the Open Society." In this paper, Attorney General Brooke surveys the plight of Negroes in this country and offers his suggestions for State and Federal action in the areas of education, housing, employment, health, and equal justice.

Mr. Brooke, himself an eminent Negro, has outlined a constructive, comprehensive program which should be of interest to the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of his statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Negroes and the Open Society

(By Edward W. Brooke, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Republican candidate for U.S. Senator)

Racial discrimination has struck at the heart of the American dream—the promise of freedom and equality of opportunity—for over two hundred years. It has gnawed at the political and social fabric of America, at times threatening to overwhelm us. It has exacted high costs—in human suffering, economic loss (a loss that approached $27 billion in 1966), inferior education, blighted neighborhoods, and infant mortality to mention only a few. Radical discrimination has been a serious handicap to our foreign policy, especially in our relations with the peoples of the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I advocate a broadly-based, massive assault against all remaining forms of discrimination in American life.

I call for an Open Society—a society which extends to *all* Americans the freedom and opportunity to have equal justice under law, to obtain quality education, to enjoy decent housing and good health, and to gain equal access to the economic benefits available in a free enterprise system. In order to achieve an Open Society, the thinking and approach to the problem of civil rights must be redirected. There must be a major shift in emphasis in current programs. I suggest three guidelines.

1. *A Coordinated, Comprehensive, Strategic Attack.*

The problems of racial discrimination are interrelated. They occur in discernible patterns. Patterns of segregation in housing are reflected in *de facto* segregation in schools. Substandard education is correlated with high rates of unemployment. Limitations on employment and the opportunity for vocational advancement, in turn, restrict income and economic mobility.

Discrimination is a *system* that will yield only to a coordinated, comprehensive, strategic attack. In recent years, other than civil rights groups, the Federal Government has borne the brunt of this attack. But state and local governments and the private sector of our nation—our universities, churches, our labor unions, businesses and civic associations—must be allies. An excellent example has been Massachusetts, whilch has actually moved in a direction that is well in advance of the Federal Government.

If this nation is to deal with more than the individual symptoms, a constructive partnership will be needed between the public and the private sectors at all levels.

2. *Metropolitan Planning.*

The problem of discrimination against the Negro is no longer a regional problem. The experiences of depression, war, and population migration have made it a problem of national scope, increasingly focused in our metropolitan centers of population. Negroes who have moved to the nation's cities, have been excluded by economic and racial barriers from the predominantly white residential suburbs. The growing ghettos of our central cities, with their deteriorating housing, inferior schools and generally inadequate public facilities now stand as the greatest challenge to the achievement of an Open Society.

If the nation is to resolve the problems stemming from racial concentration in our cities it will need metropolitan-wide planning. It cannot be bound by local prejudice or by the inertia of poorly conceived governmental programs. Too many Federal programs stop with the central city when the basic problems of discrimination are much wider. Here must be a willingness to experiment with enlarged governmental districts, intergovernmental compacts, new site locations for housing, schools, and other public facilities, and programs that link two or more communities in the metropolitan area.

In substance, a new metropolitan perspective must be applied to virtually all facets of discrimination in our urban society. Without such planning, the problems of the ghetto will become insurmountable.

3. *Vigorous Enforcement of the Law.*—Another guideline of any effective civil rights program is vigorous enforcement of the law. The national Administration's failure to enforce civil rights laws has caused great disappointment.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 bans discrimination in all Federally assisted programs. But not until May of 1966 did the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare announce that Federal funds would be withheld from school districts that practice discrimination. One year after passage of the Civil Rights Act, the United States Commission on Civil Rights found that there were discernible patterns of noncompliance in nearly two-thirds of the hospitals surveyed—despite the fact that each hospital had received financial assistance from the Federal Government. And to date, the Justice Department has failed to appoint any Federal registrars to Georgia under provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, even though that state has the largest number of unregistered Negroes of voting age. These are only the most blatant examples of executive inaction.

Weak enforcement can be traced in other areas to inadequate planning and staffing. Moreover, some enforcement procedures have proved to be ineffective tools in rooting out discrimination. The complaint system, for example, has generally proved useless because the burden of filing court suits has been placed on the victims of discrimination.

Existing civil rights law must be a more potent weapon in the war against segregation and discrimination. Legislation must be vigorously enforced. Enforcement agencies must be provided with adequate staffs to provide the necessary leadership. And those laws which contain inadequate enforcement procedures must be amended.

These principles should guide our attack in the following major areas of discrimination in American society.

I. EDUCATION

Twelve years after the Supreme Court decision on school segregation, virtually no progress has been made in desegregating our schools. Only about 6 percent of Southern Negro children attend school with white children.

In both the North and South Negro schools are almost always inferior in quality to white schools; and both Negro and white school children now receive an inferior education to the extent that they are not being prepared to live in a pluralistic society. The elimination of segregation from the schools is the most critical issue facing American education today.

The United States Office of Education sets the guidelines under which school systems must desegregate. The most recent guidelines of March 1966 are considerably stronger than those issued in the past. However, despite the May deadline for filing compliance agreements for the 1966-1967 school year, by mid July, 78 school systems in the South had failed to submit plans for desegregation as a first step for meeting government demands. Close to 90 more schools districts had submitted agreements but attached conditions that may prove unacceptable upon review.

In the face of this open defiance of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no Federal funds were withdrawn from school districts that discriminate until May of this year and only 12 districts were affected at the time.

Whereas segregation in the South has traditionally been supported by law, Northern style segregation, commonly referred to as *de facto* segregation, has risen primarily from community custom and indifference, segregated patterns of housing and gerrymandered school districts.

In Philadelphia, 58 percent of the pupils enrolled in public schools are Negro; in Manhattan, 75 percent of the children are nonwhite in Washington, D.C., 89 percent of the pupils in public schools are Negro. And the percentages are increasing.

The tragedy of the ghetto, however, involves more than the racial concentration of our schools. As psychologist Dr. Kenneth Clark states, "segregation and inferior education reinforce each other." The quality of education invariably suffers.

The Federal Government has taken no action in the North in the mistaken belief that the mere *threat* of withholding funds would force school districts to take steps toward ending *de facto* segregation. But even this threat has been removed with the recent announcement by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not apply to *de facto* segregation.

Recommendations

To meet the crisis in education faced in the North and South alike, I strongly urge that the following steps be taken:

1. *Action on School Desegregation.*

Prompt and vigorous enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (banning discrimination in all Federally assisted programs) is required. The Federal Government must not hesitate to cut off funds from school districts which fail to meet the Government's standard. To assure this end:

Congress should provide adequate staff and funding for the enforcement operation of the Office of Education and should increase its initial appropriation of $3 million to desegregating school districts.

Congress should enact Title II of the Administration's Civil Rights Bill of 1966 which would strengthen the Office of the Attorney General in desegregation suits. This section would allow the Attorney General to file desegregation suits, even if he did not have a written complaint and local residents were financially able to sue on their own behalf.

2. *Reducing Racial Concentration.*

Short-term measures such as the pairing of schools, busing (for example, the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunities—better known as METCO—in Massachusetts) and open enrollment while quite useful, should not be regarded as permanent solutions to the problem of racial imbalance. An adequate solution will require metropolitan area planning.

Congress should move to clarify the ambiguities contained in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by enacting legislation which makes *de facto* segregation of schools illegal and provides for the withholding of funds from school districts which practice *de facto* segregation. The Federal courts should be given the authority to enforce the provisions of the law. At present, Massachusetts is faced with an anomalous situation in which state funds have been withheld because of *de facto* segregation in the Boston school system, while millions of dollars are poured into the City by the Federal Government.

Federal grants issued under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act should be used as incentives to metropolitan planning. Federal funds issued for school construction should be used to break up, rather than strengthen, the patterns of segregation.

The states, in cooperation with the Federal government, localities, and private sector, should implement effective metropolitan planning in education. Such planning should include the enlargement of school districts, new transportation patterns, and the construction of new schools aimed at reducing racial concentration.

Educational parks, in particular represent a promising, bold approach to the problem of achieving quality education and more racially balanced schools. These school complexes would assemble on a single large campus children from an attendance area broad enough to include both majority and minority children. The concentration of students, teachers and resources would result in richer programs and more services than any individual school could provide. Their strategic location would help alleviate the problem of racial imbalance as well.

3. *Teachers and Curriculum*

Teachers can play a vital role in upgrading the quality of education and in school integration.

Where practice teaching is done on a segregated basis, the Federal Government should take action under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

State Departments of Education and local Boards of Education should actively recruit and train qualified teachers who are Negro.

Congress should provide adequate funding for the National Teacher Corps, an imaginative effort aimed at breaking down the vicious cycle of poverty and ignorance in rural and urban slums.

A comprehensive system of pre-school centers for underprivileged children operating both during the school year and during the summer months is required. The highly successful Operation Headstart program should be expanded, systemized, and imaginatively administered.

Finally, new methods of curriculum should be devised. Textbooks should reflect a more realistic view of the role of minority groups in our history.

II. HOUSING

For millions of Negroes, housing means the lack of free choice in selecting a place to live, and congested ghettos that breed broken homes, delinquency, illegitimacy, drug addiction and crime. Since World War II, the pattern in housing has been new homes in the suburbs for white families with rising incomes and old homes in central cities for Negroes. Indeed, the trend in recent years has been accelerating.

Because I believe the situation in housing has reached crisis proportions, I strongly urge that the following steps be taken:

1. *Banning Housing Discrimination.*

The Administration's housing bill banning racial discrimination in the sale, rental or financing of all types of housing, represents a potentially important advance in assuring freedom of choice in the open market. This legislation is a significant step toward achieving the promise and spirit of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Nevertheless, the Administration's method of attacking discrimination in housing ignores a more potent instrument.

The President could deal with the problem of discrimination in housing more effectively by issuing an appropriate executive order. President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 11063 banning discrimination in FHA and VA-financed housing, covered 20 per cent of the total housing supply. By extending the Executive Order to all housing financed through banks and savings and loan institutions whose deposits are guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC), more than 80 per cent of the housing supply could be covered.

In the absence of an executive order, the Administration's Bill should be supported. However, it should be strengthened in its proposed methods of enforcement. The concept of a Federal Fair Housing Board with effective enforcement powers—adopted as an amendment in the House Judiciary Committee—has sound precedent in numerous state open housing laws.

States and local governments should also take the initiative in ensuring open housing. Massachusetts has strong fair housing laws. They have been widely accepted by the citizens of the Commonwealth. Eighteen states now have similar housing laws on the books. These laws should be strengthened and vigorously enforced. The Massachusetts Republican Platform of 1966 calling for increased funds and authority for the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination should be implemented.

2. *Housing Low and Moderate Income Families.*

Our present Federal and state housing programs have been hampered by inadequate funds, poor planning and the power of suburban areas to veto housing plans, thus confining subsidized housing to the core city ghetto.

A coordinated effort between our public and private sectors is urgently needed to increase the rate of housing production for low and moderate income families. The present rate of housing production is only 1.4 million units per year. Most of this housing is priced beyond the reach of families below the median income level. Housing production must be increased to at least 2 million units per year—at least half of which should be made available to low and moderate-income families. Both Federal and state governments and private sources as well should contribute toward filling this gap.

Congress should provide funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to conduct research in such areas as the amount of sub-standard housing and the need for low-income housing in the nation so that Federal programs may be directed to the areas of greatest need.

The rent supplement program recently approved by Congress should be made metropolitan wide in scope by elimination of the amendment allowing local governments to veto rent supplement projects. As originally introduced, the rent supplement bill was designed to encourage the development of housing throughout the metropolitan region and to rent a portion of these new units to low income families under a supplement program. The local veto amendment minimizes the possibility of locating units outside of congested city cores.

3. *Metropolitan Planning.*

Any attempt to reduce racial concentration in housing must necessarily involve the dispersal of low-income families through metropolitan planning. The various governmental units must undertake joint ventures to meet the problems of both desegregation and increasing the supply of low and moderate income housing on a metropolitan area-wide basis.

Districts within the metropolitan area should be rezoned and provisions made for low and moderate income housing programs. These programs should be comprehensive enough to provide for community services and transportation networks to other areas.

Federal and state housing funds going to local governments should be used as incentives for the development of metropolitan-wide plans for low and moderate income housing.

4. *Revitalization of the Ghetto.*

On a long-term basis, the plight of the ghetto can and will be relieved by an open market in housing and meaningful planning of low and moderate income housing outside of the central city. In the meantime, we must utilize our present resources to rehabilitate the ghetto.

It is not enough to tear down and renovate our slums. Equally important is the need to link the physical rehabilitation of the slum to the social rehabilitation of its inhabitants.

The Administration's Demonstration Cities Bill represents a new approach to the problem which deserves to be tested. However, the program is deficient in its failure to embrace the entire urban community. The program should provide incentives for planning on a broader scale, for those areas in which the problem of segregation transcends the boundaries of the central city.

Community Action Programs provide people living within the ghetto the opportunity to improve their situation through cooperative effort. They also serve to call the public's attention to the substandard living conditions of the "invisible poor." To be effective, these programs will require imaginative approaches by governmental agencies at the local, state, and national levels.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Millions of Negroes remain untouched by the wealth of our affluent society. The unemployment rate among Negroes is 7 percent, more than twice the average for whites. Often, Negroes can only find employment in low-skilled, low-wage occupations and industries with the lowest growth rates and the most limited opportunities for advancement. Moreover, these jobs are most vulnerable to the rapid pace of automation. Joblessness among Negro youths is a particularly acute problem. As of April 1966, 19 percent of out-of-school Negro youths between 16 and 21 were unemployed, twice the rate for white youths in the same category. These unemployed figures are reflected in the mounting welfare budgets of our major cities.

Recommendations

No single, simple, quick measure can eliminate these critical problems. I strongly urge the adoption of a broadly based action program which includes the following points:

1. *New enforcement powers for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.*

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination by employers, unions, and employment agencies should be strengthened. At present, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, created by the Act to carry out Title VII, can only investigate complaints of discrimination and then seek conciliation. If no redress is possible, the individual must take the initiative in seeking redress in the courts. Because of the complaint system, the EEOC has had only negligible impact on employment discrimination. In addition, the EEOC has been hampered by insufficient investigative powers and resources, limited enforcement powers which are complicated and ineffective, and a lack of administrative authority to undertake or coordinate manpower development or economic opportunity programs in support of its enforcement activities.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be amended to authorize the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue cease-and-desist orders against individuals engaged in unlawful employment practices and to order back pay to those who have suffered financial loss through the denial of equal employment opportunity.

2. *State fair employment practices commissions.*

A number of states have made important advances in establishing state antidiscrimination commissions. However, the effectiveness of these state agencies has often been limited by inadequate financial support and excessive restraint in enforcement.

States should take the initiative in strengthening state fair employment practices commissions. In this regard, I urge implementation of the 1966 Massachusetts Platform plank which calls for strengthening the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (MCAD).

3. *Eliminating discrimination in trade unions.*

In spite of the progress made by labor unions to promote equal employment practices, a number of unions continue to discriminate against Negroes. Unions have a special obligation to make a place for those against whom they and employers have too long discriminated. I urge, therefore, that:

Government contracting authority, in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and an executive order banning discrimination on work done by Federal contract, be used to insure equal employment practices and expanded training opportunities on all Federal projects. It is regrettable that the Departments of Labor and Justice did not initiate action against trade unions to enforce nondiscrimination on government contracts until February, 1966.

Unions on all levels evaluate and revise all programs and practices that discriminate unfairly in job placement, job training or advancement. National union leadership should take affirmative action against unions that continue discriminatory practices.

Unions increase job opportunities in the skilled crafts and building trades by a) actively recruiting Negroes and others into craft unions; b) establishing pre-apprenticeship training to help Negro youths qualify for apprenticeship programs.

4. *Metropolitan Job Councils.*

Metropolitan Job Councils should be established by private sources in all major urban areas to plan, coordinate, and implement local programs to increase job opportunities for Negroes. Membership should include representatives of business, organized labor, education, and other appropriate community organizations. These councils would accumulate up-to-date information on the Negro labor force and job opportunities in the area, and would help coordinate and improve existing programs. Technical assistance would be offered by the Councils to help employers and unions make positive efforts to recruit Negro workers, and eliminate unnecessarily rigid hiring specifications.

5. *Rural employment programs.*

Many marginal farmers have become victims of mechanization, shrinking acreage allotments, and racial prejudice. The migration of unskilled rural Negroes to urban areas has created additional problems. Between 1960 and 1964, the number of Negro farmers decreased by 35 percent. To meet these problems I recommend that:

The Secretary of Agriculture move immediately to implement the recommendations of the United States Civil Rights Commission aimed at the elimination of segregation in Department of Agriculture programs. The Secretary has made little progress in implementing the report which is now over a year old.

The Department of Agriculture extend to Negro farmers the necessary assistance, information, and encouragement to give them the equal opportunity to diversify their farm enterprises.

Federal, state, and local agencies and private groups as well cooperate in the development of comprehensive programs to facilitate the adjustment of rural families moving to urban areas. Centers should be created in rural surplus labor areas to help potential migrants make arrangements for jobs and housing and should provide vocational and personal counselling.

6. *Employment Programs for Negro Youth.*

Programs for intensive counselling of Negro youth, the sector of our population with the highest incidence of unemployment, are grossly inadequate. The need exists for year-round youth job placement services.

Counselling services for in-school youths should be improved and expanded with the aid of skilled vocation advisers acquainted with requirements of industry. Expanded high school vocational education programs are also needed in urban and rural areas to train youths effectively for occupations in which employment opportunities are available.

Business and industry should work closely with schools and labor unions through Metropolitan Job Councils where possible to gear in-school training realistically to job requirements and to broaden in-service training opportunities.

V. HEALTH

Negroes are subject to more illnesses and disabilities than white people; they lose between one and one-third times as many days of work from disease or disability, and have a higher infant mortality rate and a seven years shorter life expectancy. The figures are integrally related to poor living conditions and inadequate health care.

The effects of inadequate health care are compounded by discrimination—especially in the South. Despite the fact that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 bans discrimination from health facilities receiving Federal funds, wide-spread discrimination against Negroes still exists. Negro doctors, dentists and technicians are all too often refused staff privileges and excluded from professional societies; Negro nurses are excluded from training programs, paid lower wages and forced to eat in segregated cafeterias; and, Negro patients continue to be placed in segregated wards.

The persistence of this discrimination can be traced in large part to the failure of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to take steps necessary to achieve compliance with the law. Effective enforcement action has not been taken. Except in cases where complaints have been filed, field inspections have not even been made to ascertain the extent of noncompliance.

To remedy these abuses in medical care, I strongly urge that the following steps be taken:

1. *Enforcing compliance in health care.*

HEW should conduct surveys and thorough field examinations to determine the extent of discrimination in federally assisted health programs. Funds should be withheld from those hospitals which continue to discriminate against Negroes in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Finally, HEW should take steps to ensure that hospitals participating in the Medicare program comply with Federal laws against discrimination.

2. *Improved Health Services.*

While the new programs of Medicare and medical aid for the indigent represent increased provision of medical services to low income families (many of whom are Negroes), they should be supplemented by:

Additional experimentation in the concept of neighborhood health centers which provide a range of health services on a coordinated basis to all members of the family in a single location. The neighborhood health center sponsored by Tufts University in the Columbia Point housing development is an excellent example of how health services can be more effectively delivered to low income families that would not otherwise receive them.

Comprehensive study and evaluation of ways of improving the quality and availability of medical services to low income families in both urban and rural areas.

3. *Medical Research.*

Organizations, both private and public, should undertake thorough studies to examine the causes of the Negro's high infant mortality rate and lower life expectancy and should develop a comprehensive plan of attack on these problems. The continued disparity between the Negro and white population in these vital statistics is cause for deep national concern.

VI. JUSTICE

1. *Protecting Negroes and civil rights workers.*

The tragic shooting of James Meredith in Mississippi is the latest in a series of violent acts committed against civil rights workers. Since 1960, an estimated thirty Negro and white civil rights workers have been murdered in the South, while countless others have been the victims of beatings, bombings, maimings, and shootings.

The continuing failure of all-white juries to convict assailants has, in addition, focused the nation's attention on the gross inequities in the jury system in the South. We can no longer tolerate a system of justice in which Negroes and civil rights workers are not free to exercise their constitutional rights. We can no longer postpone fulfillment of our national pledge to liberty and justice for all. It is time to guarantee that justice will be done throughout the nation.

A number of bills pending before Congress and sponsored by Republicans and Democrats alike are designed to remedy these flagrant abuses. I urge that Congress enact a strong civil rights bill during this session—one that includes, in this area, the following:

Provision for a representative cross-section of the population on jury lists, thereby eliminating discrimination on the grounds of race or color in jury selection.

Removal of certain criminal cases to the Federal courts where state jury selection procedures are not in accordance with Federal procedures.

Greater Federal protection against intimidation of Negroes and civil rights workers, including stronger Federal criminal penalties for those who deprive individuals of their federally protected rights.

Amendment of the United States Code so that local, county and city governments are held *jointly* liable with officials employed by the government who deprive persons of rights protected by the Code.

Establishment of an Indemnification Board within the Federal Government with authority to grant money damages to the person(s) whose federally protected rights have been violated.

2. *Voting Rights.*

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 largely removed the legal barriers to voting. However, apathy, fear and ignorance continue to impede Negro registration and voting. While Congressional action in the area of voting is not now needed, the Administration must take the lead in enforcement. It has not yet enforced the law in large areas of the South, notably Georgia. Beyond enforcement, the Administration must provide more imaginative and innovative voter registration education where it has sent Federal examiners. Pamphlets and posters in all Federal facilities advertising voter registration might be used. Finally, voter registration hours should be better advertised in Southern communities.

3. *"Home Rule" for the District of Columbia.*

Since 1874 the people of Washington, D.C. have been under the jurisdiction of the Congress—their pleas for self-government largely ignored. The situation is made more intolerable by the fact that 62 percent of the population is Negro, while ten members of the powerful House District Committee are from the South. That this situation should exist in a nation which prides itself on its democratic principles is deplorable enough. But that such a situation be permitted to continue in our nation's capital is reprehensible. Attempts to get a "home rule" bill through Congress this year have once again failed. But this issue must not be allowed to die. I strongly urge Congress to act and to restore democracy to our nation's capitol once more.

* * * * *

The challenge of a "Great Society" cannot be fulfilled until we have achieved an Open Society, with equal opportunity for all Americans to obtain quality education, enjoy the minimum comforts of decent housing, sustain a potentially healthful existence, and gain access to the material benefits of our abundant, free economy.

This challenge is a particularly fitting one for the Republican Party, as the party of Lincoln, to undertake. It is a challenge underlined by the noble purpose and inspiration of a uniquely American dream. For, over the course of more than three centuries, we have dared to seek strength for our society by giving freedom to its members. We have liberated common men and women and have discovered uncommon faith and power. We have dedicated ourselves to the importance of the individual and have achieved unparalleled greatness as a nation.

As a people, we must now fulfill the promise of that dream. We must build a truly Open Society where all men have the right to achieve their individuality, where every man has the right to participate in the American dream.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, since I have been on the floor this morning, several Senators have asked me when we will bring up the independent offices appropriations bill, which is a long and complex bill, with many items and involving many departments, in which Senators have, in some cases, a general interest, but in some cases a more specific interest.

I have just conferred with the majority leader. There will be several votes on the independent offices appropriations bill since we have notice of certain amendments on different items. The majority leader advises me that the bill will be brought up on Monday if we complete action on the pending bill, the unemployment compensation bill, today. I was hopeful we could guarantee no action until Tuesday, but the leadership apparently wishes to begin with it upon the completion of the pending bill. There will be some votes on the independent offices appropriations bill when it is called up. I make that announcement because several Senators have asked about the scheduling of the bill.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, after line 6, strike out:

DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER

Sec. 101. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Employer. For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employer' means, with respect to any calendar year, any person who—

"(1) during any calendar quarter in the calendar year paid wages of $1,500 or more, or

"(2) on each of some 20 days during the calendar year, each day being in a different calendar week, employed at least one individual in employment for some portion of the day."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1968.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 14, after the word "Sec." to strike out "102" and insert "101."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, would the Senator tell me——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are only changing the section numbers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 7, after the word "Sec." to strike out "103" and insert "102."; on page 4, line 7, after the word "Sec." to strike out "104" and insert "103."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 9, line 15, after the word "Sec." to strike out "105" and insert "104."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 11, line 6, after the word "unemployment" to strike out "compensation;" and insert "compensation;" after line 7 to insert:

(B) the State shall participate in arrangements, approved by the Secretary of Labor, for combining employment in, and wages paid in, more than one State; and the eligibility of any individual for unemployment compensation, his weekly benefit amount and the maximum benefits payable to him, under any such arrangement, shall be based on the individual's employment or wages paid, or both, in (i) the paying State and (ii) any transferring State as if such employment or wages were in the base period of the paying State: *Provided, however*, that employment or wages that have been used in the computation of any individual's eligibility for unemployment compensation in a transferring State shall not thereafter be transferred to a paying State, nor shall employment or wages that have been transferred to a paying State and used under any such wage combining arrangement be thereafter available for use in the transferring State;

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that we have a voice vote on that amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (putting the question).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 15, line 24, after the word "Section" to strike out "3303(b) or" and insert "3303(b),".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. In line 25, after "Section 3304(c)", to insert "or Section 3309(a)."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, may I ask what this does?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is a conforming amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. It does not have to do with imposing Federal standards?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is the House section regarding judicial review. It contains a conforming amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does not involve that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 17, line 6, after the word "section", to strike out "3303(b) or" and insert "3303(b),"; in line 7, after "section 3304(c)", to insert "or section 3309(a)".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 19, after line 8, to strike out:

Sec. 141. (a) Section 901(c)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "the net receipts" each place it appears in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five-sixths of the net receipts"; and

(2) by striking "0.4 percent" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "0.6 percent".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 141. Section 901(c)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(a) by striking paragraphs (A) and (B) and substituting therefor the following new paragraphs:

"(A) in the case of fiscal year 1967, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the Budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act;

"(B) in the case of fiscal year 1968, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the Budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as five-sixths of the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act;

"(C) in the case of any fiscal year after fiscal year 1968, and before fiscal year 1973, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the Budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as three-fourths of the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; and

"(D) in the case of any fiscal year after fiscal year 1972, an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the Budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as two-thirds of the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act."; and

(b) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence thereof the following: "in the case of any fiscal year prior to 1968, and of 0.6 percent in the case of fiscal year 1968 or any fiscal year thereafter".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 22, line 6, after "(b)," to strike out "To assist in the establishment and provide for the continuation of the comprehensive research program relating to the unemployment compensation system, there" and insert "There"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "such"; in the same line, after the word "research", to insert "authorized by this section".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 27, after line 5, to insert:

PART E—BENEFIT REQUIREMENTS

Certification and requirements

Sec. 151. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by renumbering present section 3309 as section 3312 and inserting after section 3308 of such Code a new section 3309 as follows:

"Sec. 3309. (a) Certification.—On October 31, 1968, and October 31 of each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary each State whose law he finds is in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) and has been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the 12-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the 4-month period ending on October 31) and that there has been substantial compliance with such State law requirements during such period. The Secretary of Labor shall not withhold his certification to the Secretary unless, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, he finds that the State law is not in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) or has not been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the 12-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the 4-month period ending on October 31) or that there has been a failure to comply substantially with such State law requirements during such period. For any State which is not certified under this subsection on any October 31, the Secretary of Labor shall within 10 days thereafter notify the Secretary of the reduction in the credit allowable to taxpayers subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State pursuant to section 3302(c)(4).

"(b) Notice to Governor of Noncertification.—

"If at any time the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that a State may not be certified under subsection (a) he shall promptly notify the Governor of such State.

"(c) Requirements.—

"(1) With respect to benefit years beginning on or after July 1, 1968.—

"(A) the State law shall not require that an individual have more than 20 weeks of employment (or the equivalent as provided in subsection (4)) in the base period to qualify for unemployment compensation;

"(B) the State law shall provide that the weekly benefit amount of any eligible individual for a week of total unemployment shall be (i) an amount equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, or (ii) the State maximum weekly benefit amount (exclusive of allowances with respect to dependents) payable with respect to such week under such law, whichever is the lesser;

"(C) the State law shall provide for an individual with 20 weeks of employment (or the equivalent) in the base period, benefits in a benefit year equal to at least 26 times his weekly benefit amount.

Any weekly benefit amount payable under a State law may be rounded to an even dollar amount in accordance with such State law.

"(2) The State maximum weekly benefit amount (exclusive of allowances with respect to dependents) shall be no less than 50 percent of the Statewide average weekly wage most recently computed before the beginning of any benefit year which begins after June 30, 1968.

"(3) In determining whether an individual has 20 weeks of employment, there must be counted as a week, any week in which the individual earned at least 25 percent of the Statewide average weekly wage.

"(4) For the purpose of subsections (c)(1)(A) and (C), the equivalent of 20 weeks of employment in a State which uses high-quarter wages is total base period wages equal to five times the Statewide average weekly wage, and either one and one-half times the individual's high-quarter earnings or forty times his weekly benefit amount, whichever is appropriate under State law.

"(d) Definitions.—

"(1) 'benefit year' means a period as defined in State law except that it shall not exceed one year beginning subsequent to the end of an individual's base period.

"(2) 'base period' means a period as defined in State law but it shall be fifty-two consecutive weeks, one year, or four consecutive calendar quarters ending not earlier than six months prior to the beginning of an individual's benefit year.

"(3) 'high-quarter wages' means the amount of wages for services performed in employment covered under the State law paid to an individual in that quarter of his base period in which such wages were highest, irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law.

"(4) 'individual's average weekly wage' means an amount computed equal to (A) one-thirteenth of an individual's high-quarter wages, in a State which bases eligibility on high-quarter wages paid in the base period or (B) in any other State, the amount obtained by dividing the total amount of wages (irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under the State law) paid to such individual during his base period by the number of weeks in which he performed services in employment covered under such law during such period.

"(5) 'statewide average weekly wage' means the amount computed by the State agency at least once each year on the basis of the aggregate amount of wages, irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law, reported by employers as paid for services covered under such State law during the first four of the last six completed calendar quarters prior to the effective date of the computation, divided by a figure representing fifty-two times the twelve-month average of the number of employees in the pay period which includes the twelfth day of each month during the same four calendar quarters, as reported by such employers."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 23 of such Code (as amended by sections 103(b)(2) and 131(b)(3) of this Act) is further amended—

(1) by striking out
"Sec. 3309. Short title."
and inserting in lieu thereof
"Sec. 3309. Benefit requirements."
and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:
"Sec. 3312. Short title.".

On page 32, after line 7, to insert:

Limitation on credit against tax

Sec. 152. (a) Section 3302(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) If the unemployment compensation law of a State has not been certified for a twelve-month period ending on October 31 pursuant to section 3309(a), then the total credits (after applying subsections (a) and (b) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection) otherwise allowable under this section for the taxable year in which such October 31 occurs in the case of a taxpayer subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State shall be reduced by the amount by which 2.7 percent exceeds the four-year benefit cost rate applicable to such State for such taxable year in accordance with the notification of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 3309(a)."

(b) Subsection (c)(3)(C)(i) of section 3302 of such Code is amended by substituting the term "4-year" for the term "5-year."

(c) Section 3302(d)(5) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(5) 4-YEAR BENEFIT COST RATE.—For purposes of subsection (c)(4) and subparagraph (C) of subsection (c)(3), the 4-year benefit cost rate applicable to any State for any taxable year is that percentage obtained by dividing—

"(A) One-fourth of the total compensation paid under the State unemployment compensation law during the four-year period ending at the close of the first calendar year preceding such taxable year, by

"(B) The total of the remuneration subject to contributions under the State unemployment compensation law with respect to the first calendar year preceding such taxable year. 'Remuneration' for the purpose of this subparagraph shall include the amount of wages for services covered under the State law irrespective of the limitation of the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law paid to an individual by an employer during any calendar year beginning with 1968 up to $3,900, and beginning with 1972, up to $4,800; for States for which it is necessary, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate the remuneration with respect to the calendar year preceding the taxable year."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the amendment beginning on page 27, line 6, down to and including line 7, on page 34, with the exception of the language beginning on page 28, line 19 down to and including line 20, page 29, and on that I shall ask for a division into four parts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We have four Federal standards on benefits. I am asking to vote on each one separately. That is all that I am asking.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator withhold that request until we have time to examine it further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall withhold that for a moment. I believe that under the rules I am entitled to a division.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All that I am asking is that each of these four Federal standards be voted on individually.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am seeking information. We have here a 51-page bill, copies of which have only recently been made available to Members of the Senate. I am trying to find out the request of the Senator from Louisiana or what his proposal is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There are four Federal standards in the bill. I am asking that the Senate vote on each one separately, rather than on all four together. Some Senators favor one standard and some Senators favor another. I am simply considering the rights of every Senator in this matter, so that each Senator can vote for what he wants to vote for, and vote against what he wants to vote againt.

The first vote will come on whether workers are entitled to benefits after 20 weeks of work. There are 48 States in the Union which provide that if one has worked for 20 weeks, or roughly 5 months, the worker is entitled to some benefits. Forty-eight States conform. Only two States do not—Virginia, which requires 23 weeks, and Wyoming, which requires 26 weeks.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, all I am asking for is some information so that I can make an intelligent appraisal of the bill, which has only just been made available to me. If I construe the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana correctly, the first one of these requirements is that which is set forth on page 28, lines 16 through 23.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I want a vote on those lines beginning with line 19 through line 23, on page 28. All we are saying is that 2 States will conform to what 48 States are doing right now. What we are saying in effect is that Virginia and Wyoming should conform to what the State of North Carolina is doing now—and 47 other States.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Louisiana wants to vote first on lines 19 through 23 on page 28?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. And then would it be agreeable to the Senator, after we have disposed of that issue—incidentally, Puerto Rico is involved in this too, I believe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think not.

Mr. MORTON. After we have completed that issue, then we go to the remainder of sections 151 and 152 en bloc?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What I want is a vote, first, on subparagraph (A). That presents the issue of eligibility. Then I propose that we vote on subparagraph (B). That is the issue of an individual being entitled to 50 percent of his weekly benefits. Then I propose that we vote on subparagraph (C) as to whether a worker gets 26 weeks of benefits or not. Then I propose that we vote on paragraph (2), which says that 50 percent is the highest limit of the benefits a man can draw.

That presents four separate issues and I think that each one is very important and worth voting on individually. That is how we voted in committee; just that way.

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the committee voted on it just that way, and we lost by a vote of 9 to 8. But I am not about to agree to anything which will cause us to lose 9 to 8 again.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator loses by a larger vote than that. But, at the same time, my feeling is that each one of these issues presents something that a Senator might want to vote for, or he might want to vote against. Each one of them is worthy of being voted on individually, on its merits. It would be unfair to ask a Senator to vote on these points en bloc, because he may want to vote against one and vote for another. At least, we know that one Senator in the committee favored one over another. As the Senator knows so well, he would favor some parts of the committee amendments and would not favor others.

Mr. MORTON. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me, in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. We are now voting on the committee amendments individually. Should not section 151 be voted on as a committee amendment, without segmenting it or breaking it down?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no unanimous-consent agreement and no demand for a division, the Senate would vote on the section beginning on page 27, line 6 down through and including page 34, line 7. However, if there is a request for a division—and there has been—then the Senate would vote on a different basis.

As the Chair understands the Senator from Louisiana, he is requesting that the Senate vote on the section on page 27, line 7 down through page 34, line 7, except for line 19 on page 28 down through line 20 on page 29. On those, the Senator will ask for a division, which he has a right to do—it is in four parts. It does not take unanimous consent. The Senator has the right to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the division which has been asked for would mean six record votes on this section instead of one; is that not correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has a perfect right to request that, but the Senator from Louisiana is asking that there be——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not requesting. I would prefer to vote on the whole section at one time because it is all one plan involving four Federal standards. If the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Louisiana is not granted, in asking for a division, he would then automatically be asking for six rollcall votes; is that not correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct, except that the Senator from Louisiana is going further. He is asking for a division. He is asking for unanimous consent that the first part and the last part, which refer to indicating a change, be handled together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that it could be done by unanimous consent.

We could have one vote or two votes whichever way is wished.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the question I am asking is that in the absence of any unanimous consent being granted, we could either vote on the entire sections 151–152 en bloc, or if some Senator asks for a division it would then take six rollcall votes to achieve the same answer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, until we can find out just what the situation is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, what we are talking about is simple. If the Senate does not grant unanimous consent, I will just have to insist on a division. That means that we will vote on subparagraph (A) first——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The reason I want to suggest the absence of a quorum is that this is the first I have heard of the Senator's request, and I want to be sure that I fully understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee, I am happy to vote en bloc, but there are other Senators who have different views on parts of this issue. For example, in the committee, there were two Senators who, I believe, voted for subparagraph (A) because they felt that the States have no problem. They were voting to make two States come into line with the other 48 States, which includes theirs. But other Senators might feel differently about subparagraph (B). That being the case, I propose that we have a vote on each one of these important issues.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought we were going to vote en bloc. I may agree to what the Senator is requesting, but I want to understand it first.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that it is a lot easier to have these votes one by one because then the Senate can understand all four at one time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the event there is a division asked and granted, would the Chair advise as to how the votes would come under such a description? Then we could decide.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have some concern about this——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If unanimous consent is not granted, and a division is requested, the first vote will be on the language found on page 27, line 6, down to page 28, line 18.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, has that amendment already been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No, it has not been agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask that we vote on it. Let us vote on it, if there is no objection.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the bill is brought up on such short notice. The bill was not available to us who are not on the committee until yesterday. We had to remain all day yesterday on the Senate floor considering the proposed legislation growing out of the strike of the machinists against the airlines. The proposed section 151 would make most drastic alterations in the unemployment compensation laws in the United States.

Frankly, I do not think the Senate ought to be rushed into acting on a bill of this major significance when the Members of the Senate other than those who happen to be on the Finance Committee have had no opportunity to study the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ERVIN. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This amendment changes the date for certifying whether a State is eligible for tax credit under the law.

While the committee divided 9 to 7 on some votes, the certification date change from December 1 to October 31 was agreed to unanimously. It is not a controversial change.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, Mr. President, we are now considering the amendment from page 27, line 6 down to page 28, line 15, which is for the most part a conforming amendment. It changes the date of the act by 31 days.

Mr. MORTON. Fifteen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is on page 27, line 6, to page 28, line 18.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I thought it was line 15.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Eighteen.

Mr. MORTON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the next amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How far does the Senator from Louisiana wish to divide it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask for a division from line 19 to line 23 on page 28.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Since the Senate has agreed to lines 17 and 18, what effect does that have on lines 19 through 23, which are a part of the same amendment? Where we have agreed to part of the amendment what is the effect? Is a division now in order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Chair cannot interpret legislation. The Chair was informed that this is the way the manager of the bill asked that it be divided, and the Parliamentarian informs the Chair that he had a right to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We voted on the language of the amendment down to line 18, and there was no objection to that. Lines 19 through 23 were set apart. What do they mean? They cannot stand by themselves. Lines 17 and 18 were only a part of other sections; would the other sections not have to be offered as a part of this amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The answer as to whether lines 17 and 18 are sensible and necessary in the absence of what follows is something for the Senate to determine.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there seems to be some misunderstanding. We agreed to lines 17 and 18, did we not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So the next vote will be on lines 19 through 23. That is the first Federal standard in the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I say, I want a division on that.

This provision requires that every worker be entitled to some unemployment insurance benefits after he has worked for 20 weeks. Forty-eight of the States provide some benefits at that point. There are two States which do not. Virginia requires 23 weeks instead of 20, and Wyoming requires 26.

This amendment would put Virginia and Wyoming in line with the other 48 States, and would mean that Virginia would pay benefits after 20 weeks of work instead of 23, as the other 48 States do, and would mean that Wyoming would pay benefits after 20 weeks instead of 26.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Would not the effect of the amendment be to put Federal compulsion on those two States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. It would mean that.

Mr. ERVIN. In that respect, would it not alter the whole scheme of the unemployment compensation law?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, it does not alter the whole scheme because 50 out of 52 jurisdictions already have this standard. But it would require 2 to come in line with 50.

Mr. ERVIN. Do not those other two States have those standards by virtue of acts of their State legislatures, rather than by acts of Congress?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Then this amendment would seek to impose a Federal standard upon all of the States of the Union, in violation of the provisions of existing law and in violation of the policy which has been pursued ever since unemployment compensation was established; and therefore, while the change seems harmless in its consequences, it is not harmless in its consequences because it amounts to putting Federal compulsion on the States, instead of having the State legislatures exercise the powers they have under existing law, to prescribe the standards governing the program within their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we cannot put any Federal compulsion on North Carolina to do what North Carolina is already doing, nor can we put Federal compulsion on Louisiana to do what Louisiana is doing. It is beyond our power to make a State do something it is doing already.

Mr. ERVIN. The answer to that is very simple. We are putting a requirement upon North Carolina and upon Louisiana which they cannot hereafter vary by acts of their legislatures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But, Mr. President, with this amendment, we conform the Federal law to the practices in 50 jurisdictions and the practices in 48 States, including North Carolina and Louisiana. We provide here Federal recognition of what 48 States have done. It does require Virginia and Wyoming to come into line with the other 48 States, that is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would require Virginia and Wyoming to come into line with the other 48 States, but it also precludes any of the other 48 States from changing their standards in the future; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They can change it to make it more generous, but they cannot change it to make it more onerous; that is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So in effect we are imposing standards on all 50 States when we do this.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. One would say that here the Federal Government is conforming to a standard that 48 States have adopted. If those 48 States would like, hereafter, to be more generous with the workingman, they can. But in this respect, we have adopted their standard, and if the States decide they wish to be less generous toward the workingman, they would not be able to do that. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Once this amendment has been adopted the principle will have been established that the Federal Government can tell the respective 50 States what they may or may not do, and the very next amendment, the one to be offered following this, starts to dictate to the 50 States what they must do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, it does not dictate to all of them. About 44 States are already doing what we are urging them to do by that next amendment. But there are a number of States that would have to comply.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is supporting the bill, may not want this comment to be stated as a question. Nevertheless, the fact remains that what is involved is the transfer of power over these decisions from the State legislatures to Congress. That power, once transferred, will be asserted year after year by Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Nebraska did not ask a question; but assuming that it was posed as a question, the answer is that the Federal Government first provided for such benefits in 1939, when it enacted a law to impose a tax for unemployment insurance and left it to the States to set benefits.

I may say that the performance of the States in that area was exemplary. For the most part, the States merely asked the Federal Government, "What would be considered a good law?" They asked the Federal Government how such a law should read and to send a model of one to them. Most of the States adopted the model of the Federal statute and submitted it to Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the amendment, in effect, require the States of the Union, to come into line with the law that exists at present in the State of Vermont?.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This particular amendment would require two States to come into line with what Vermont and 47 other States are doing now, so far as eligibility is concerned. In 48 States the workingman is entitled to some unemployment benefits after 20 weeks of work. There are two States where that is not so. In Virginia, a workingman is entitled to benefits after 23 weeks; in Wyoming, he is entitled to benefits after 26 weeks. So the amendment would require Virginia and Wyoming to come into line with the practice of 48 States.

Mr. AIKEN. However, they would not even then come up to the present provisions of Vermont law, because Vermont provides for 39 weeks of benefits, liberal payments, and other services which are favorable to the employer, provided he is a Vermont employer only, and favorable to Vermont employees.

I have received protests against the Senate amendment; but I find that they are from employers who have plants in other States also, where the benefits are less than they are in Vermont.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is exactly correct. This would require those two States to start paying something after 20 weeks. It would make those 2 States come in line with the other 48 States.

Mr. AIKEN. We have a provision for 39 weeks of benefits—26 weeks, and another 13 weeks providing the unemployment exceeds a certain percentage of the total working force.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This would not make any State do what the State of Vermont is doing. It would not go that far in any respect.

It does provide certain minimum Federal standards. One of these standards is to make each State pay something after 20 weeks.

Some States start making payments after 10 weeks work. Some States start paying some benefits with less than that.

This standard would say that after 5 months of work a man is entitled to draw some benefits when he loses his job.

Mr. AIKEN. The pending bill sets minimum standards. It does not set the exact standards on payment or length of unemployment period that each State must observe. It would not require them all to have the same period.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is exactly correct.

I would be very disappointed to find that States do not provide more than is required here. Most States do.

Vermont, as the Senator indicates, goes far beyond what we are asking in this respect. The different States provide for all sorts of benefits extending beyond this. We hope that they will continue to do so.

This would provide that a man is entitled to draw some unemployment insurance benefits after 20 weeks.

Mr. President, the Federal Government has an interest in this. We have a tax. There is presently a 3.1-percent

Federal tax. The Federal Government keeps 0.4 percent to spend on its part of the program and the States are entitled to a tax rate of 2.7 percent, if the State wishes to have a program.

Mr. President, one thing that amuses me is that when we talk about standards and providing for an experience rating, the employers love that.

Some employers associations appeared to testify for just one thing—the experience rating. That is a Federal standard. They love and adore that experience rating. In some States it decreases the tax from 2.7 percent to zero. They love it with all their hearts. It is a Federal standard, but it favors them.

When a Federal standard favors a workingman, that is a different proposition.

This would just provide that, as between the States, 2 States would do what 48 States are doing now.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let me understand the parliamentary situation. Under the request of the Senator that a division take place, will the Senate pass judgment one by one on specific provisions, starting on line 19 of page 28?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The first part that would be pending would be lines 19 through 23 on page 28.

Mr. KUCHEL. What would the next one be? Would it be the balance of that page?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The next would be subparagraph (B)—line 24 on page 28 through line 7 on page 29.

Mr. KUCHEL. The next would be subparagraph (C) on page 29.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. What would the next one be?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The next one would be paragraph (2).

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator mentioned a moment ago this experience rating being of benefit to the employer. Do we pass judgment on that in the pending bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. We do not change that at all, not in the least bit.

Mr. KUCHEL. What does the Federal law provide with respect to that experience rating?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The States are given a credit of 2.7 percent against a Federal tax of 3.1 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. By Federal law?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. The States in turn give employers a more favorable rating in the event that those employers have stable employment and very little unemployment. They are therefore entitled to reduce the tax from the 2.7 percent down to zero.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is an excellent provision. It is an incentive to an employer to stabilize his employment.

I want to make this clear to help me answer the other questions that will arise in the Senate.

This provision in Federal law with respect to an experience factor favoring employers is mandatory upon the States. The States cannot change the provision.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The pending bill does not change it. It has been mandatory since 1939 on the States, that the States would have experience rating. The employers came in and testified, asking that this not be made optional on the States, but that it continue to be mandatory.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think that is most important. It is not an option. That is the statement of the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator answered a question posed by the Senator from Vermont. Can the Senator from Louisiana indicate, perhaps with the help of his staff, what if any provisions of the law of California are below any of the separate recommended amendments of the committee in the pending bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. California has a requirement that a low-paid worker earn at least $720 in order to qualify for some benefits.

The pending bill would say that if he had been working for 20 weeks in a covered establishment, even though he might not have made $720, he would be entitled to some benefits.

That $720 figure would have to be reduced to $673.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not quite understand. It would have to be reduced in order to accomplish what?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under California law, a worker must presently have $720 in earnings in order to qualify. At present wage scales in California, the bill would require that benefits be paid to a worker who earned $673.35. Actually, nearly every employee in California makes more than $673.35. Any worker who makes that much is probably also making $720.

So the change in this law would really pose no problem of consequence to California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The $673 of earnings would take place under what period of time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Twenty weeks. So that about the only change that would affect California would be that a low-paid worker might have some small benefit that might not exist presently. But that would apply to very few people in California, because, as the Senator knows, people are making more money than that in California.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much would it be a week under this Senate amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. A difference of $2 a week.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not understand that any gainfully employed person in California is making that kind of substandard wage.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is the point I was attempting to make, that practically nobody in California makes that little money for his effort. The kind of people who would be making such a pitiful wage are not covered, anyhow. So this could not benefit them. We must bear in mind that this applies to a covered industry and that the industry must have at least four employees.

My guess is that fewer than one-quarter of 1 percent of the workers in covered employment in California would benefit from this.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have one more question. I do not wish to take a great deal of time. We are passing judgment now on a Federal standard, that the State law shall not require that an individual have more than 20 weeks of employment in order to qualify, and so forth. How does that provision apply to a State law which says that one must make $720 before he is covered? I do not quite understand that.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question that is germane to his colloquy with the Senator from California?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe I can answer that question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This happens because California has a law which requires that to be eligible, a worker must earn $720. That is a peculiarity of California law.

About 99.9 percent of all workers in covered employment in California qualify for that. For the very small number who do not qualify because of this peculiarity of California law, a man could become eligible after he earned $673.75, instead of having to earn $720.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nothing in this bill has anything to do with the amount of money a man must or must not earn in order to become eligible. We refer to 20 weeks of work in covered employment. The consequence of this is, as we relate it to the California law, that it makes a slight change with reference to the monetary provisions. The practical effects are almost nil. There may be some other States which have these monetary provisions as a result of which a few more people will be covered.

It is only the type of action in the California law, with reference to how much a person must earn in order to become eligible, which might be affected by the imposition of 20 weeks. The committee bill provides that with 20 weeks in covered employment a man would become eligible for benefits. The California law provides that one must make a particular amount of earnings. As far as we know, the practical consequence so far as California is concerned is that nobody who is not now covered will be brought within the provisions of this law.

Mr. KUCHEL. There is no provision for 20 weeks of employment in California law. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under California law, a man must have earned $720, without regard to weeks of work, in order to qualify. This would provide he could qualify when he has made $673.35.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In answer to the question of the Senator from California, the adoption of this proposal would mean the automatic repeal of that portion of the California law.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The State would have to change the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And to that extent, it does set that standard for the State of California. The Senator will find that the same is true with respect to many other States.

In addition, it would prohibit any 1 of the 50 States from acting through its legislature and changing the law, as has been done heretofore, except as the State would have to come to Congress to get approval. The States could expand it, but they could not reduce it.

Let us face it—the question here is, do we or do we not want Federal standards imposed on the States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is possible that no one in California, in covered employment, is earning such a pitiful wage. It is conceivable that there would be no effect on California because there might not be anybody working in covered employment who earns that little money. So the Senator might be spared all that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator wishes to be hypothetical, it is conceivable that nobody would be covered by reducing the coverage from 26 to 20, but we know that it will. That is the reason the 20-week provision has been put in. Likewise, they will be affected by the other change, and if they are not, why have this section in the bill? Let us be realistic.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We have better facts on that aspect. It would affect a few people.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question that it would affect only a few people. Changes would have to be made in the laws of few States. We are proposing national standards.

If a man has worked 20 weeks in employment in any State, he ought to be eligible for unemployment compensation benefits. If there are States where this is not provided, they would have to conform to the provision. If States have worked out a "Rube Goldberg" sort of formula which comes out in 20 weeks, they might have to change the formula, but it will not increase the number who are eligible.

The practical result of this provision would affect only two States in the Union. The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out the two States involved. The proposition is simple.

Do we want to lay down a national standard which says that every man who is in a covered employment under the unemployment compensation system, if he works for 20 weeks, should be eligible for some benefit?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator say that in providing a Federal standard of eligibility of 20 weeks, it would not affect the laws of any of the 50 States except 3, but it would affect hereafter the power of all 50 States to pass any laws which were inconsistent with the Federal standards?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is exactly correct. I thought that that was clear.

Mr. ERVIN. No, sir.

Mr. McCARTHY. Unless we amend the committee bill, no State could raise the eligibility requirement above 20 weeks. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the first amendment, which is section (A), seems to be an amendment to which most of us could agree, for, indeed, it affects only two States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. But once we start adopting Federal standards, where do we stop? This program has probably contributed more to the economic stability of this country than any other program inaugurated during the 1930's. It has made that contribution because each State has been able to pattern the program to the needs of the State.

In my State of Kentucky unemployment is at its worst, and it hurts most in the rural sections and in the mountains of Kentucky. There are no big cities there. The coal miners are out of work. We do not have a serious unemployment problem in Louisville, Lexington, Bowling Green, Paducah, or Ashland, but we do have it in the rural areas of our State, particularly in the Appalachian area.

Each State has its own problem. Here is a program that has been successful. Most States followed the pattern of the great State of the Senator who is now presiding, the Wisconsin pattern, when this bill was originally passed 30 years ago. We have today such States as Massachusetts, Michigan, and others that give weight to the number of dependents that a man has.

In other words, in Detroit or Flint there may be two men working on the assembly line. One is a 20-year-old fellow who is just out of school, who has gotten his first job, and who is living with his family. On the other side of the line is a 43-year-old man with five children, who has been working for the Pontiac company for 18 years. They are both laid off. They are both getting the same wage. They do not get the same unemployment compensation under the laws of the State of Michigan. The man with five children gets more compensation than the man who is just out of high school still living with his family. The duly elected Legislature of Michigan and the people of Michigan, through their elected representatives, have set up this plan.

There are those who argue that this is a welfare program and not an unemployment program, and, therefore, Michigan should get no credit whatsoever because they want to treat a man with five children in a different way than the man who has just entered the labor market and has been employed for perhaps 20 weeks.

Once we begin setting Federal standards, all of this ultimately goes out the window. One might say that it does not in this bill, but if we start, it goes out the window.

Section (A), the matter now before us, on which a rollcall vote has been ordered, is something that all of us could be for, except perhaps, the Senators from Wyoming and Virginia. This is a minor matter. But the principle is there.

As has been pointed out, this even affects the law in California. I do not know how many it might affect. True, it might affect one-tenth of 1 percent of the labor force of California, but nevertheless, we are starting to put the Federal Government into a position of setting standards in the several States, and I am not talking from the standpoint of States rights. I am talking from the standpoint of a successful program, the most successful program of all the programs that emanated from the 1930's, the most successful program in taking out the valleys and leveling off the hills in the socioeconomic complex we have in this country today.

I would prefer that we consider this entire section 151, en bloc. The chairman of the committee has asked not to do that and I will, of course, abide by his wishes. But I trust that we will, as long as we have to handle these matters separately, vote down each and every one of the portions of this section that inject the Federal Government into a program which has been so successfully managed by the several States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This amendment would affect about three States, but in substance it affects every State, because it establishes a principle of Federal standards. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct. It affects Wyoming and Virginia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But if we adopt the amendment of the Committee on Finance, we establish the principle that the Federal standards should prevail in all States of the Union, if they are to get the benefits of the bill.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This question came up when I was the Governor of Massachusetts. We are proud of the way our unemployment insurance program is carried on in Massachusetts. It is more generous than the program in many States. If the amendment is adopted, we are imposing Federal standards in all of these several States to conform to whatever the Federal requirement may be.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct, and it is not a question of only conforming to what happens to be in this bill. Once this principle is adopted, and we say the Federal Government is going to take this program over and set Federal standards, we do not know where it will end. We do know that it will go far beyond what is here.

The committee did strike from the administration proposal the escalation portion of going to 60 percent and 66⅔ percent. They had to strike it. They would not have gotten the bill passed if it were included. But next year, or the year after they will be back.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Department of Commerce of Massachusetts is opposed to the bill in its present form because in many ways the standards of Massachusetts fit our needs. I will not say they fit our needs better or less, but they fit our needs, and our State government, represented by our department of commerce, is opposed to the bill.

Mr. MORTON. Massachusetts has one of the best laws in the country. It does give weight to need. It considers dependents. Every unemployed worker is not treated the same in Massachusetts, and I think this is a good thing. We do not have it in Kentucky. I wish we did. Our people do not want it apparently. Massachusetts does. I say that we should have it and not be penalized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think our State was one of the very first States to adopt the principle of unemployment compensation, although I am not sure, but I think it was. We gradually broadened it and made it meet the needs of the State. What we want to do is cooperate and go along, but we do not want to be standardized, because that may not fit our needs as they develop with the State.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was going to ask the Senator, but the Senator from Massachusetts developed the point in his discussion with the Senator from Kentucky that I was going to ask. It seems to me that this is just the camel getting its head further under the tent of Federal invasion of the areas which should properly be left to the States. It seems to me that the States, generally, have taken care of the situation as it befits their needs. We are entirely satisfied in our State with the State's administration. I think it is not only a dangerous innovation but also, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, is only the first step. Next year there will be more control. The year after that, there will be still more control and more administration by the Central Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that if we adopt the so-called Federal standards which the Finance Committee has already adopted by a vote of 9 to 8, every State with the exception of two, will have to change their present law?

Mr. MORTON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. SMATHERS. The only States which would not have to change the law would be Vermont and Hawaii. Is it not a fact that the State commissioners, when they met from all over the Union, stated that they would like to have adopted the House bill as it came to the Finance Committee? They thought that was a reasonably fair bill. They thought that it extended coverage sufficiently. They thought that it would raise taxes sufficiently and, therefore, they wanted that bill. Is that not a fact?

Mr. MORTON. That is a fact.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the House bill, in point of extending coverage and increasing taxes, made substantial improvement in the program?

Mr. MORTON. That is true.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that if some of the State legislatures did not act so quickly as did other States, adoption of Federal standards would serve to punish certain employers in certain States where the legislatures had refused to act?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, more than 15 months ago, the administration's proposals were introduced into the House of Representatives. Great controversy resulted from the inclusion in that bill of a package of so-called Federal standards. Those Federal standards included requirements that: First, a State be forbidden to require more than 20 weeks of employment in a year in order to qualify for benefits; that, second, a State be forbidden to provide less than 26 weeks' worth of benefits for an individual with 20 weeks of employment; and that, third, a State be forbidden to provide a weekly benefit amount less than one-half the beneficiary's average wage, up to a minimum maximum to be calculated in accordance with a formula specified in the bill. This minimum maximum would have to be recalculated in every State every year. It might go up—it might go down.

Some of these Federal standards were already law in many States. Other elements would force changes in almost all State laws. I say "force" because the employers in any dissenting State would be substantially penalized if the State's legislature or Governor refused or delayed acceptance of any one of these changes in their own laws.

You know what happened then. After careful consideration an overwhelming bipartisan approval was registered for an unemployment insurance bill without these guns at the heads of the States.

Only 1 of the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee refused to register strong support for the bill. Only 10 Representatives voted "nay" on final passage—as against 374 in favor.

What happened on this side of Capitol Hill? Essentially the same provisions so thoroughly and carefully rejected on the other side were returned to the bill in the Finance Committee. Was the vote overwhelming? No; the vote was 9 to 8. Did the bill with these provisions draw bipartisan support? No; all of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle felt obliged to refuse to accept the bill with those provisions in it.

Most States presently do provide unemployment benefits of at least half the beneficiary's weekly wage up to the State maximum. Most States refuse to give 26 weeks' worth of benefits for 20 weeks of work in a year. The Federal standards require all to conform absolutely to the generally rejected standard as well as to the generally accepted standard. Good-faith efforts, substantial compliance, even a benefit package on balance more generous than the Federal standards package—all alike are insufficient. All alike result in substantial penalties to employers in States which do not fall in line quickly enough.

On both sides of the aisle, throughout the spectrum of responsible political viewpoints, voices have risen to urge the States to assume responsibilities, to cease being collectively the silent element in our State-Federal governmental partnership. In the unemployment assistance field, where the partnership concept has been practical, fruitful operation for almost three decades, we cannot now fulfill our responsibilities by making the States into mere administrative agencies for programs determined in detail by the Central Government.

As a practical matter, adoption of this Federal package may well kill any efforts to obtain a bill that can be approved by a conference committee. The House has been clear on this point—the Federal standards package has been rejected.

Any Member who wants to preserve a viable State-Federal partnership, who is concerned with really enacting this bill, who gives heed to the viewpoints of those charged with enforcing these laws—any such Member will, I am confident, join me in opposition to the so-called Federal standards package in H.R. 15119.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Kentucky stated, in reply to an inquiry propounded to him by the Senator from Florida, that only 2 States in the Union now have laws which would comply with the Federal standards which the bill would impose upon 50 States. The Senator answered in the affirmative, as I understand it; is that not correct?

Mr. MORTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky, if this bill is passed with the Federal standards in it, it would deprive even those two States of the power hereafter to make their own laws relating to many of the aspects of unemployment compensation, would it not?

Mr. MORTON. It would, indeed, put those States in a straitjacket so that they would have to pass laws within certain narrow confines.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Kentucky share my view that if we embark upon a program of substituting Federal standards for State standards in the field of unemployment compensation, the ultimate result will be that the Federal Government will control all the taxes which are levied for purposes of unemployment compensation?

Mr. MORTON. If we go down that road, that will be the inevitable end. The Federal Government will take over the whole program, lock, stock, and barrel, before too many years have passed.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky if many of the States which have administered their programs in a prudent manner, according to

State standards, now have accumulated substantial surpluses in their unemployment compensation funds?

Mr. MORTON. Yes. The figures were placed in the RECORD by the chairman of the committee last night. Many of them are substantial, indeed.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Kentucky agree with me that those States which have accumulated substantial surpluses in their unemployment compensation funds have managed their fiscal affairs with a wisdom and an intelligence which the Federal Government itself has not manifested in relation to the management of its own fiscal affairs?

Mr. MORTON. That certainly is an obvious truth.

Mr. ERVIN. Now, what are the taxes which are levied for unemployment compensation? Are they not collected in 90 percent of the cases by the State administering the unemployment compensation funds in the State?

Mr. MORTON. Approximately 90 percent, yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, and only approximately 10 percent of the taxes are collected by the Federal Government itself?

Mr. MORTON. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. The Federal Government taxes go only, under existing law, for the payment of the costs of administering the program?

Mr. MORTON. It goes beyond the cost of administering the program, because it pays for the business that defines people's jobs, and other things of that kind get into the act. But primarily, yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the unemployment compensation benefits come out of State taxes—the money collected by the States?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, that is true.

Mr. ERVIN. So, this is not a question——

Mr. MORTON. That is true with the exception of emergencies. There have been times when we have extended it in times of emergency. It has been the Federal Government that has advanced the money.

Mr. ERVIN. That has happened where some States have exhausted their unemployment compensation funds, because of severe depression in those States or because of the fact that they have put the standards so high that their unemployment compensation funds were insufficient to pay the benefits established by their standards.

Mr. MORTON. In any event, in emergency situations, money has been advanced.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the contention that is sometimes made by those who want to federalize the unemployment compensation law, that it is a Federal grant-in-aid program, is totally without support in fact, insofar as the funds used for the payment of benefits to a person unemployed are concerned.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When this question first arose this morning, I suggested that the question of Federal standards should be voted on en bloc, that there was no way in which they could be separated successfully and voted on individually. I was right.

I have since checked with the Parliamentarian and want to point out that what we shall be doing in voting on the pending amendment is voting on the repeal of the laws as they exist, not just in two States but in practically all the States because this amendment states:

> The State law shall not require that an individual have more than twenty weeks of employment (or the equivalent as provided in subsection (4)) in the base period to qualify for unemployment compensation.

Subsection (4) is part of another committee amendment that comes later in the same section and as yet has not been approved. Therefore, this pending amendment has no meaning whatsoever. The Parliamentarian has so ruled. It is plain that should we defeat the rest of the amendments this one is meaningless.

What we will be doing is saying that State law shall not require that an individual have more than 20 weeks of employment during a base period to qualify for unemployment.

I have checked with the staff of the committee, and I have been advised that under this rule if adopted a person could have been earning as little as $1 a week for 20 weeks and then get the full 36 or 52 weeks' benefits under the bill.

Even if subsection (4) is later adopted we would be changing the laws not of two States, as is claimed, but we would be changing the law in California, because California has a higher minimum—$720—than is provided in subsection (4), which has not been adopted. The law of Connecticut would be repealed. The Illinois law provides a minimum of $800, and that would be repealed. Maine has a requirement for a $600 minimum, and that law would be repealed.

I repeat, even if all the committee amendments were adopted here today the laws of those States would be repealed or changed.

The laws of Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Washington, and West Virginia relating to minimums would automatically be nullified. Perhaps their legislatures would have to be called back into session to repeal them.

The laws of Florida, Oregon, and Wisconsin would likewise be affected. Wisconsin provides for 18 weeks and a $16 average. That law would have to be changed or repealed. The provision for the $16 average could be changed.

All of the 50 States would be affected, because we provide that a State to qualify must provide for 20 weeks with no minimum on earnings; that is, assuming we adopt this amendment and do not adopt the other committee amendments.

What should have been done was to vote on the whole package of eligibility standards and either approve or disapprove all of them. If the committee amendments are adopted Congress will be approving Federal standards for all 50 States. That is the issue. Let us face it and make the decision accordingly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought that the chairman of the committee and the Parliamentarian had conferred earlier and had worked out this problem satisfactorily.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought so too, but apparently not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not know that. The provision beginning on line 1, page 30, could, I think, be incorporated in the amendment with which we are dealing, because it is in simple language, and should meet the objection the Senator is now raising.

I am quite satisfied the Senate would adopt the lines on page 30 along with what we are voting on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate may or may not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to ask unanimous consent——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Minnesota will agree with the statement I have just made—that the adoption of the amendment now pending before the Senate would in itself nullify the minimum requirements of the 50 States, and if a worker had a minimum of 20 weeks at 75 cents a week cutting grass, for example, and then were to get out of work, he could qualify for the full unemployment benefits. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree that it affects only 20 weeks——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But in any of the 50 States, if a worker has 20 weeks' employment, and then were out of work, he would collect the full benefits regardless of his earning record.

That points out how ridiculous it is to vote on language without putting the whole package together.

I again ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider voting on the language beginning on page 28, line 19, down to and including line 7 on page 34. The whole package of Federal standards would thus be put together.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. The chairman of the committee is not here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we follow that procedure that should take care of subsection (4) as well as the other provisions. We would then be voting on the entire package. Then we would be voting for or against the Federal standards.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota reserves the right to object.

Mr. McCARTHY. The chairman's right to ask for a division on the amendment continues to run. He may ask unanimous consent to modify it by including the amendment now under consideration, line 21 on page 29 to line 8 on page 30, which would take care of the issue which has been raised by the Senator from Delaware, with respect to this particular provision in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not take care of the full problem even if we adopted the unanimous-consent agreement to modify the amendment as suggested by the Senator from Minnesota; it would still affect the States of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Washington, West Virginia, Florida, Oregon, and Wisconsin. They would be affected even if we adopted the package just proposed by the Senator from Minnesota. It may be easy to say that only two States are affected; it may be easy to say that we will impose this provision on only two States but the Congress would be affecting all the States. The committee's proposal affects the States I have just named.

I think we should have a vote with respect to this whole package.

I understand the Senator from Minnesota reserved the right to object, but I intend to get a ruling on my unanimous-consent request that the whole package be acted on, beginning on page 28, line 19, down to and including line 7 on page 34.

That is the unanimous-consent request I presented in order to put the whole package in the proper perspective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That we vote en bloc on the whole package of Federal standards. We should be voting on it in one amendment. It would be more intelligent than to vote on the cockeyed proposal before us now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not say that it would be more intelligent. As a matter of fact, it might be more appropriate for us to vote on it piece by piece. It would, of course, simplify the procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not simplify it to vote as the chairman of the committee suggests in the pending amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the simple question is whether we are for the Federal standards and whether the Senate is prepared to take what the committee has brought out in the bill, that is a fair proposition. If the Senator wanted a vote on changes in the Federal standards which we are recommending, I think in that case the proposal made by the Senator from Louisiana is somewhat more orderly. We are going to have some loose threads which will have to be tied down. I do not think the Senator's objection is particularly well taken. I think we could get action on that particular unanimous-consent request, and go on to the financing and duration of the periods.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think a serious question is raised here. I point out to the chairman of the committee that if we vote on the package as a whole it would make more sense. I will wait for him to decide. I conferred with the Parliamentarian and find that what we were acting on are a lot of words, but in reality we are doing nothing.

Mr. McCARTHY. That would not be quite true. Even if we acted on the amendment before us, if we had the modification at line 9 on page 30, we would have an adequately defined proposition before the Senate. I do not say we would not have some loose edges.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will admit that this amendment covers someone who may make as little as $1 a week, and that is affected by the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The unanimous-consent agreement which would eliminate the matter referred to on page 29 and page 30 will be before the Senate.

While we are waiting for the chairman, I suggest that the allegation that it will permit further intrusion is unfounded. This is an old program, under which federally imposed taxes are made available for the States. The law has been amended only once in 35 years, in order to add an amendment which would be helpful to the States. We do not have the situation, as was stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that once the camel's head is under the tent it will continue to go under. There has been no action on this law since 1939, and here it is 1966.

So to suggest that this is a program which, if we change it now, will be meddled with and modified every year, does not stand the test of examination of the history of the program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think it is true that the unemployment compensation law, now approximately 30 years of age, should have some upgrading. Both the House bill and the Senate bill would do that. I cite as an example the raising of the base pay which will be taxed. The base was established 30 years ago. The House bill, as well as the Senate bill, would increase that amount in steps. I believe some legislation is in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. This would be a Federal standard, would it not?

Mr. CURTIS. It would be the tax standard. But I wish to come to that later.

The House bill was passed by an overwhelming vote. If we are to have legislation this year, I would hope that what the Senate does is not too much at variance with the action of the House.

Coming back to the distinguished Senator's observation that this has been a Federal program, in a sense that might be true. But basically, as I see it, it has not been. A Federal act was passed which compelled the States to inaugurate an unemployment compensation system.

Now, what are the real basics to be decided in an unemployment compensation system? I say they are two: How long do you have to work to get it, and how much shall you receive?

On these two issues, the States have had complete determining authority up to this time; and that is the basic issue before us today: whether or not the Federal Government shall assert the power over the States to determine the length of time a man must work, and how much the State must pay.

On those two basic issues, it has always been a State program. It has worked well. It has enabled the States to adapt the program to their own particular problems of employment, their economies, and so forth. Obviously, rural States have different problems than highly industrial States.

I hope that we can have a clear-cut vote on the whole issue of the Federal Government taking over the two important functions now reserved by the States, to wit, how long do you have to work to get benefits, and what shall your benefits be? I think those functions should remain in the hands of the States.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I deeply regret that the Senate must today consider this bill, which would make major alterations in the law and affect every State in the Union, when the proposed amendments to the bill and the committee report on the bill were not made available to Members of the Senate until yesterday. That means that those Senators who do not serve upon the Finance Committee have been unable to study the bill, because all of us were compelled to remain upon the Senate floor yesterday in connection with the joint resolution growing out of the strike of the machinists against the airlines.

As has been pointed out by several Senators, this bill undertakes to make drastic changes in the laws relating to unemployment compensation. Under the present law, the legislatures of the respective States have the power to prescribe the standards which govern the administration of the law in this area in the respective States. I think that provision is very wise for two reasons.

The first reason is that I have not yet fallen victim to what is facetiously called Potomac fever. I believe that the people who sent me here are far more capable and far more qualified to determine what should be done with respect to the standards of eligibility for unemployment insurance and with respect to how they should spend their own money in the payment of benefits for unemployment compensation than Senators or Representatives from distant States.

It has always been passing strange to me that when men get elected to Congress, they speedily fall victim to Potomac fever, the main symptom of which is an exhibition of their conviction that the people who elected them do not have sense enough or judgment enough to manage their own affairs. I believe that the State legislatures can manage this question with far more wisdom than the Congress of the United States. And that brings me to the reason for my second objection to the bill.

In North Carolina today, we do not have unemployment in our industrial sections. Such unemployment as exists occurs in such industries like fishing, canning, and the like. I believe that the Legislature of North Carolina, which is familiar with the situation in respect to employment and unemployment in North Carolina, is far better qualified than Congress to act wisely with respect to setting up standards for eligibility for unemployment compensation and with respect to the amounts of unemployment compensation.

I think one of the tragedies of our generation, and perhaps the chief tragedy insofar as Government is concerned, is the continual effort which is being made to concentrate all of the powers of government in one centralized government in Washington, D.C., and to reduce the States of the Union to meaningless ciphers upon the Nation's map. I think there is too much power and too much authority concentrated now in the hands of our Federal Government here in Washington. Yet there are those who are now asking and reaching out for more power and authority in a completely new area, an area which, since the inception of the unemployment compensation program, has been left entirely to the respective States and their respective legislatures.

My second reason for opposing the committee amendments is that it is unwise to attempt to govern by uniform Federal standards employment and unemployment conditions which are quite diverse throughout the 50 States constituting the Union. It represents, in short, an attempt to make States having diverse situations fit into the same Procrustean bed.

I am speaking specifically with reference to committee amendments agreed to by a majority of one vote in the committee, to provide Federal standards relating to the eligibility, the amount, and the duration of State unemployment compensation benefits to be paid to unemployed workers who are covered by the various State statutes.

What is the justification for such action by our Congress? It can be shown that my State of North Carolina and other States have continually improved and updated their compensation laws through actions of their respective general assemblies.

These bodies have been and are very aware of the needs of their States in this area and have acted practically at every session to meet the changing needs of unemployment. For example, it has not been too many years since North Carolina paid a maximum benefit of only $20 per week for 16 weeks. The State of North Carolina now pays a maximum benefit of $42 per week for 26 weeks. This is a 241-percent increase in benefits over a period of approximately 15 years.

North Carolina has administered its unemployment compensation fund in a wise and prudent manner. As a result, it has accumulated a surplus of approximately $250 million in its unemployment compensation fund.

Those who advocate the centralization of power in Washington in this area of our life sometimes yield to the temptation to say that if a State accumulates a surplus in its unemployment compensation fund, it is guilty of some kind of a crime against society.

Mr. President, we hope that no depression will ever come again to this Nation, but the practice of wisdom requires the accumulation of surpluses in unemployment compensation funds in times of prosperity in order to have funds available for that purpose in times of depression.

I venture the assertion that if Congress yields to the importuning of those who try to concentrate power to prescribe standards and eligibility for and duration of benefits in unemployment programs in the Congress, we will reach a day when there will be no surplus in any unemployment compensation fund anywhere in the United States.

As I observed in a colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky, this program does not represent in any true sense a Federal grant-in-aid program.

Under the existing law, as administered in my State, the State of North Carolina collects 90 percent of all the unemployment compensation tax. This 90 percent belongs to the State of North Carolina and is deposited in a trust fund as the property of the State of North Carolina. Under the existing law, all benefits arising out of unemployment in my State are paid out of North Carolina's funds.

I am unwilling to give to the Federal Government the power to prescribe standards to govern benefits in this area. This is so because I think North Carolina manages its financial affairs far better than does the Federal Government.

When we look back at the fiscal record of the Federal Government for 36 years, we find that we have had 30 deficits in the last 36 years.

Federal taxes have increased from $4.1 billion to $93 billion. Federal expenditures have risen from $3.4 billion to $96.5 billion yearly. The national debt has ascended from $16 billion to $317.8 billion. The annual interest on such debt has grown from $659 million to $11.4 billion. These facts augur ill for Federal control of the expenditure of State taxes levied and collected to pay benefits to the unemployed.

That is one reason I oppose this measure.

The benefit requirements or standards which are proposed for imposition on all the States by the amendments to the pending bill are:

First. Benefit amount. Individual weekly benefit amount must be at least 50 percent of the individual's average weekly wage, but limited to 50 percent of the statewide average wage.

Second. Duration. Any worker who has 20 weeks of employment—or equivalent—shall be entitled to not less than 26 times his weekly benefit amount—compulsory entitlement of 26 weeks, benefits for those working only as much as 20 weeks.

Third. Eligibility. No worker may be required to have more than 20 weeks of employment—or equivalent—in his base period to qualify for benefits.

I do not think that Congress should undertake to tell the States of this Union how they shall expend moneys which belong to those States. Yet, that is precisely what section 151 of the bill as reported by the committee undertakes to do.

We are told in the very beguiling language of our good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that the Federal requirement embodied in subsection (a) will affect only three States—or two States and Puerto Rico.

I change that statement to make it a little more accurate. I would say it would not change the provisions of State laws prescribing the weeks of work required by existing State laws as a condition precedent to eligibility for employment benefits except in the case of three States—or rather two States and Puerto Rico. However, it would rob all 50 States of the Union of the power they now enjoy to adopt laws on this subject inconsistent with the Federal standards which subsection (a) would impose upon all 50 States.

What would be the impact of these compulsory benefits standards on my State of North Carolina and the other States? North Carolina is an annual-wage State, meaning that the weekly benefits are based on the claimant's annual total earnings. This type of benefit formula is outlawed by the proposed standards in H.R. 15119, as amended by the committee.

North Carolina and other States with such provision have found that it meets their needs. Despite the fact that the experience has been most favorable under this law as it now exists, this would nullify the laws of North Carolina and the laws of every other State which has an annual-wage standard.

Under this proposal, we would force the General Assembly of North Carolina to completely rewrite its benefit law. Then, in my opinion, once we legislate at the Federal level on a 50-percent benefit, we will be requested at each future session to keep moving this percentage upward, and thus rob those drawing unemployment compensation benefits of any incentive to seek work until their eligibility ceases.

The Senate, which is confronted with so many legislative proposals now that it has to stay in session virtually the entire year, will have another burden of legislation imposed upon it by the adoption of Federal standards of eligibility and benefits, as the committee amendment undertakes to propose. This is so because demands to change Federal standards will be increasing until the sound program now existing is virtually wrecked.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I begin by saying that I do not mean any impertinence by the comparisons I may cite. We are up against the proposition that we have created here, to use a term for lack of a better term, a situation which is more or less amorphous—shapeless—no common form among the several States.

In my State of Rhode Island we are 96-percent manufacturing. So we are a consuming State in a large respect—buying the agricultural products of our sister States.

The Senator took occasion—and I do not dispute this at all—to recite what a wonderful fiscal situation exists in his beloved State of North Carolina. I think the people of North Carolina ought to be congratulated for it. But I do not believe it is because there is anything mysterious or anything peculiar about the people of North Carolina as individuals as distinguished from the people of Illinois or the people of Rhode Island.

It so happens that North Carolina has a mixed economy. North Carolina is both agricultural and manufacturing. We, in Rhode Island, who must buy the food we consume, pay taxes in order to support the farmers of North Carolina. Because of the preponderance of manufacturing in our State, we find that the workers in Rhode Island are in a less favorable situation. Our tax must always be kept at a maximum, for the simple reason that when we have unemployment, it affects many more people.

We do not have the mixed complex that exists to that State's advantage in North Carolina. The Rhode Island situation concerned me so much when I was Governor of my State, that I thought that the only solution to the whole problem was to nationalize unemployment compensation, because unemployed workers in Rhode Island or in California have a damaging effect on the national economy. Unemployment anywhere is the common peril and problem of us all.

I realize that we are legislating national standards with reference to benefits, but we are not legislating national standards with reference to the tax. I know that this is a difficult thing to do, but I would hope that one day we would do with the unemployment compensation what we have done with old-age pensions. They are levied on a national level; it is considered a national concern, a national problem; and I would hope that we would do the same with unemployment compensation.

I would hope that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina would remember one thing—that, fortunately, his State is a manufacturing and an agricultural State, and much of the problems of the agricultural people in that State are being supported by the taxpayers all over the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not mean to be critical about this matter, but it so happens that the people of North Carolina are fortunate in that respect.

Mr. ERVIN. I would like to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island.

As I understand, the Senator from Rhode Island believes the whole setup should be changed so as to conform to conditions in Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. No. Unemployment anywhere is our common misfortune. Our country prospers by interstate commerce between prosperous States.

Mr. ERVIN. I believe that the people in Rhode Island can handle those conditions far more effectively than can the people in North Carolina. That is why I am opposed to federalizing unemployment compensation for Rhode Island or the rest of the country. It would be prescribing uniform standards to govern diverse conditions.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator feel the same about the subsidies we pay for tobacco? Why does not North Carolina subsidize the tobacco farmer in North Carolina?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not believe we are discussing tobacco.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the problem. We are discussing State economies and how employment and unemployment in those economies can best be handled.

Mr. ERVIN. We are discussing unemployment compensation, and I refuse to allow my good friend, the fisherman from Rhode Island, to drag that red herring across the trail.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not a fisherman, and have no red herring. Mine is a manufacturing State—and we know employment and unemployment problems.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a large part of the manufacturing in North Carolina is in the cigarette industry, cigarettes consumed over the rest of the country; that the demand for cigarettes is steady throughout the year; that during periods of depression, people still continue to smoke cigarettes; that as a result of this, there is relatively steady employment in North Carolina, and that is one reason why payment rates are low? In other words, it is not the virtue of North Carolina but the good fortune created by the nature of its product and the demand for the product, which is more steady than in the heavy-industry States, where the economy goes up and down like a roller coaster?

Mr. ERVIN. I say to the Senator from Illinois that the principal industry of North Carolina is textiles. While we manufacture a considerable amount of tobacco, that is not our principal industry.

But I would say to the Senator from Illinois that his State has much more industry than does North Carolina, and that Illinois is much more capable of paying taxes for unemployment compensation than is North Carolina, and I believe that the taxes the employers of Illinois pay for that purpose ought to be used for the benefit of their unemployed employees rather than for the benefit of those who are unemployed in North Carolina and elsewhere.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Inasmuch as tobacco has been injected, the burley tobacco program has not been subsidized and has not cost the taxpayers any money—speaking of the burley tobacco program. But apart from that, in North Carolina, a State with which I have some familiarity, does not the furniture industry give more employment than the cigarette industry?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. And certainly that industry goes up and down.

Mr. ERVIN. Furthermore, the tobacco manufacturer pays more into the Federal Treasury for general purposes than does any other manufacturer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do they pay more or do the consumers pay more?

Mr. ERVIN. The manufacturers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They advance it, but the consumers pay for it.

Mr. ERVIN. The consumer, in the last analysis, always pays the freight.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They do, with cigarettes.

Mr. PASTORE. I repeat that I do not wish to take the position here that we should all pick on and criticize tobacco. I did not mean that point. I do not mean any impertinence about this.

The Senator from North Carolina took occasion to recite a wonderful fiscal record, and all I am saying is that there is no magic about the people in North Carolina as opposed to the people in Kentucky or in Rhode Island. A complex is involved here that changes from State to State and which creates certain problems that, in my view, sometimes become a national concern.

Mr. ERVIN. That is the very reason why, when the unemployment compensation program was set up, it was provided that the decisions in reference to the matters that are covered by the committee amendment should be left to the States, because there are differences from State to State.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, but the point is that perhaps we made a mistake at that time. I am not saying that we will wave a magic wand here and change that. I know how difficult that will be in Congress.

I was Governor of my State, and I had definite problems. My State always has had the maximum tax. It is not because the people in Rhode Island do not know how to administer as well as the people in North Carolina. It so happens that we in Rhode Island do a lot of buying. We do a lot of buying of food that is being subsidized by the agricultural price support, whether it be wheat or cotton or tobacco.

The point I am making is that some States are in a very advantageous position because they have a mixed economy, which other States do not have. So the problem exists.

For anyone to say that an unemployed man in Rhode Island or an unemployed man in North Carolina is of no concern to a citizen in California, I believe is a serious mistake. That is all I am saying.

Mr. ERVIN. I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that North Carolina probably supports Rhode Island as much as Rhode Island supports North Carolina, because the people of North Carolina buy many of the products of Rhode Island's manufacturing plants.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course.

Mr. ERVIN. Are we desirous of going into the business of rewriting the unemployment compensation laws of the 50 States in every detail in each session?

This seems to me to be the beginning. We get bogged down now. Do we not have enough to do without opening up this area as a new duty and responsibility? This area has, from the inception, been solely a State responsibility and one which the States have well met in keeping with their own peculiar States' unemployment problems.

There are those who argue to the contrary. However, if one looks hard enough he will see that those are the individuals and organizations who would like to federalize completely the unemployment compensation program; but not having been able to accomplish federalization, they have over the years been seeking Federal unemployment compensation standards of all kinds.

In order that no one may be confused by the many justifications offered by the proponents of Federal benefits standards, I wish to single out one simple fact for Senators to consider before they determine their position on the benefit standard proposal. Do Senators realize that we are proposing to tell each State in the Nation just how much, for how long, and under what condition each respective State must spend its own tax-collected dollars? The funds from which State benefits are paid to the eligible unemployed are funds derived solely from State-collected tax money, and are solely owned by each State. These funds are not grant-in-aid funds in respect to which Congress has always exercised its right with respect to fixing standards. We have never, to my knowledge, placed—and I hope we shall never place—Federal standards on 100-percent State-collected-and-owned tax dollars. If we do, just what will we be starting?

If we adopt the amendments recommended by the committee, we are starting to do just that. We will be authorizing the Federal Government to control the States in the expenditure of State-owned funds. Such action is inconsistent with sound or wise Federal-State relations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before we vote on this issue I would like to express my views on the committee amendments and the amendment pending at the desk. I understand that we are voting on one section of the proposal which deals with Federal standards.

Having served as the Governor of a State for 4 years, I am somewhat familiar with the bill. I would say very honestly and frankly that this federally created agency of unemployment compensation administered by the States has been one of the most successful operations that we had in the State of Kansas. Our State never hesitated to give working periods that took care of these people, in addition to payments each week. We had no difficulty with the Federal Government.

I would sincerely regret to see the Senate today vote to establish Federal standards and take this fine program away from the management of the States. In my opinion, that is what is going to happen if we vote for the committee amendment.

There has been some discussion, and one might be led to believe, that the States have not been taking care of this situation. I have gathered some information that should be in the RECORD which indicates how well the States have been taking care of the matter with this program.

In 1939, keeping in mind that the program was established in 1935, the average weekly benefit payment was $10.60. By 1965, the average weekly benefit payment had risen to $37.19. Since 1939, the cost of living has gone up 126 percent. But the average benefits paid by these States, which have been under criticism this morning, have increased 250 percent.

When we look at the total amount of benefits that a worker can receive today, as compared with 1939, the States' cases are even stronger. In 1939, the typical State paid a maximum of 16 weeks of benefits at a maximum weekly rate of $15, thus entitling a worker to a maximum total benefit of $240. A few States paid somewhat less and a few States paid a little more. But if one will look at the overall record today, it will be found that 42 States have total maximum benefits in excess of $1,000, 25 of them over $1,200, and 7 States pay more than $1,500.

In 1939, the most liberal State paid $300 and most States paid a maximum of $240. Compared with any index which might be used, this increase of four, five, or six times in the total maximum benefits is satisfactorily "keeping pace" with the cost-of-living index and the present price-wages under which we are living.

It occurs to me that the States have demonstrated that this is one program that they are not only handling properly, but they are taking care of unemployment.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the committee amendments will not be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the language on page 28, lines 19 to 23 inclusive. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe the States must retain their participation in the unemployment compensation program so that it can be more effectively administered. Interference by the Federal Government can only be harmful to the State unemployment compensation systems, thereby adversely affecting both the employer and employee.

In considering this bill the Senate committee—by only one vote—adopted an amendment providing Federal standards relating to the eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits payable to unemployed workers of the various States. In so doing, the committee rejected the wisdom of the House of Representatives, which passed overwhelmingly a bill void of these Federal controls.

As the House knew well, no justification exists for a radical departure from a joint cooperative system to a federally controlled and dictated system. To make this change would be to destroy the basic concept of unemployment compensation.

A careful review of the 30-year history of this legislation conclusively demonstrates that without the heavy hand of Federal intervention, the individual States have adopted, modified, improved, and expanded their unemployment insurance programs to meet the peculiar conditions of each State. This has resulted in a better system than would have come about if the States had been held to rigid Federal benefit standards.

I feel that adoption of Federal standards would not be progressive, but regressive, reversing the progress the program has experienced and acting detrimentally to the covered workers, employers, and State taxpayers.

It should be noted that the committee's bill would require extensive revisions in the unemployment insurance programs in all of the 50 States, in order to conform to one or more of the newly dictated Federal standards.

In order to meet the Federal benefit eligibility standards suggested by the Senate committee, 22 States would be required to amend their laws. Thirty-three States would be required to amend their laws to increase the maximum weekly benefit amounts payable. And 46 States would be required to increase the duration of their benefits.

In addition, the committee's bill would force the States to use their resources to provide increased benefits for individuals now receiving the largest benefit amounts, at the expense of poorer workers and families with dependents—a fine example of Federal control at its worst.

We all know that the State's freedom to prescribe periods over which beneficiaries will draw benefits has been an integral part of our Federal-State system for the last 30 years. The trend in State legislation has been to adopt a variable duration period, correlating the length of the benefit to the amount of base-period employment of the claimant.

The committee's bill would require all States to provide 26 weeks of benefits to any individual who has 20 weeks of base-period employment. It is a flat figure provided by so-called Federal wisdom with no room for compromise or consultation from the States, who we are to believe have learned nothing from 30 years of experience in this field.

Increased benefits ordered by this Federal unemployment bill could totally disrupt the budgets of many States. Let me point out that under the Federal dictation bill the required Texas tax increase of some $47 million between this year and next would be larger than the $36 million increase in all other Texas State taxes planned for the same period.

Mr. President, my State has a number of needs, all of which cannot be handled at the same time. Last year Texans decided that the improvement of education would receive top priority. Accordingly, the legislature increased appropriations for higher education by about $40 million a year over the coming 2 years—an amount less than the tax burden this committee bill would place on Texas in those same years.

To improve elementary and secondary education, the legislature financed an increase of about $80 million a year over the next 2 years to provide for enrollment growth and higher teacher salaries. But this step would be jeopardized by the federally forced tax increase the committee's bill would bring.

And, despite the demonstrated fiscal insanities of this bill, the basic question remains one of where the decision should be made on priorities in the raising and spending of revenues to support State and local needs.

My objections to this bill go beyond the purely financial impact and go directly to this bill's impact on the Federal system of government. Under the committee's bill the Federal Government will take over more and more of the responsibility for deciding how the resources of a State shall be used to meet the needs of its citizens.

We all recognize, of course, that under our federal system certain functions rightly lie within the Central Government's responsibility. We also recall a coequal principle of our federal system—that the Central Government must abstain from getting unnecessarily involved in State and local activities.

Unemployment quite clearly presents a gray area between these two principles. Its problems and impact are neither exclusively national nor exclusively local. Thus Congress originally framed the unemployment insurance program as a joint, coordinate program of shared responsibility, vesting in National Government certain overall functions and leaving to the States the final decisions on financing and benefits.

That system, Mr. President, has worked. It has provided ever-improving benefits for the unemployed without bankrupting the States in the process and while allowing local priorities to be treated in order of their importance.

Under the cooperative system, benefits have increased regularly in both amount and duration. The antirecession purposes of the system also have been well served by transferring to the unemployed during recessions vast sums of money from reserves carefully built up during prosperous times.

State autonomy has permitted rapid adjustment to changing local conditions. There has been active participation in the program by the employers and employees directly affected, generating a sense of responsibility for local affairs.

Throughout its 30 years of successful operation this program has been subjected to guerrilla warfare attacks from those faint-hearted bureaucrats who do not believe there is any use for State and local governments. These attacks have sought to undermine the cooperation between Federal and State administrators and to distract from State accomplishments.

The House of Representatives rejected this year's manifestation of this continuing attack by those who would remove the people from control of the people's affairs. The Senate should exhibit similar sagacity.

Let us reject this notion that all the country's wisdom resides in Washington. Let us continue to honor and utilize local knowledge, local experience and local participation in the governing of our citizens.

This bill, Mr. President, would disrupt the unemployment compensation laws in all of the 50 States. It would impair the program's ability to meet the needs of our unemployed workers, for whom the program, as managed by the States, has been a bulwark during the past 30 years.

I strongly recommend that the Senate delete from this committee bill the unwise provisions dictating Federal standards and Federal controls, preserving instead the joint Federal-State system which has served, and is serving, our Nation well.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee's proposed amendments to H.R. 15119 raise the issue of the most fundamental concept of Federal-State relations. The committee amendment in question would provide national standards relating to the eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits payable to unemployed workers under State programs. I favor the retention of the basic philosophy which has guided this cooperative program since its inception—that is, that each State retains the authority and responsibility for establishing its own guidelines as to eligibility, amount, and duraton of benefits payable under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

This, in my judgment, is the issue. The issue is not, as some would have us believe, whether the amount payable should be greater than it is in some States, whether the duration of the benefits should extend for a greater period of time than it does in some States, or whether eligibility standards should be more lax than they are in some States. The basic issue which faces the Senate today is whether this criteria will remain the responsibility of the indivdual States or whether the National Government in Washington will dictate the terms and conditions to the States. If the latter view prevails, the future of existing cooperative programs of this nature is in jeopardy. Also, it is predictable that the States will view future proposals of a cooperative nature with a great amount of scepticism and will be reluctant to lend their support to them for the very simple reason that the authority granted to them in the original program may well be wiped away in the future by amendments of the nature which are here proposed.

There is absolutely no justification for this radical departure from the basic concept which has undergirded the unemployment insurance program from the time of its original enactment. Conditions of employment and unemployment and the opportunity to find new employment differ from State to State. So also does the overall cost of living. These factors were taken into consideration and were determinative in the original drafting of the unemployment compensation insurance program. While there have been many changes in our country since this bill was originally enacted into law by the Congress, differences from State to State still exist and will continue to exist. The question is whether Congress will show enough wisdom to recognize that there are differences between the States and allow for them, or whether Congress will attempt to legislate uniformity to the detriment of many of the States and the workers of those States.

The amendments added by the Senate Finance Committee, by only a one-vote margin, will require almost all of the 50 States to substantially revise their existing unemployment insurance programs. According to the minority views contained in the Finance Committee report on the bill, 22 States would be required to amend their law in order to comply with the Federal benefit eligibility standards imposed by the committee amendment. Thirty-three States will be required to amend their laws relating to the maximum weekly benefit in order to conform to the Federal standards. Forty-six of the 50 States will be forced to change the law now on the books specifying the duration of benefits payable to individuals who have 20 or more weeks base-period employment. In my view, this is not Federal-State cooperation. This is Federal dictation to the States in its rawest form.

In its attempt to legislate uniformity among the States, the Congress should be aware that uniformity can be ultimately achieved only at the lowest common denominator. Great strides have been made by those States which were least industrialized when this law was originally put on the books. The industrial base of those particular States has expanded tremendously in recent years, and the prospects for a further and even greater expansion are tremendous. New and expanded industry creates employment, and not unemployment. The legislation now pending before the Senate, however, will unquestionably hamper and slow down industrial expansion and will to that extent be self-defeating.

I urge the Senate not to be shortsighted enough to adopt the Senate Finance Committee's proposed amendments to H.R. 15119. A long range view of this whole situation is convincing on the point that federalization of the unemployment insurance program is not in the best interests of this Nation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, over the years Michigan has developed what I believe is an excellent unemployment compensation law, attuned to the needs of our State. Indeed, ours is one of the best in the Nation.

Unlike most other States, Michigan does not have a single maximum benefit. Here is the way our law works.

In the first place, each qualified applicant receives weekly benefits amounting, not to half, but to 55 percent of his prior weekly wage, up to the prescribed maximum.

The schedule of maximum benefits is as follows:

The maximum for a single person is $43.

The maximum for a person with one adult dependent—for example, man and wife—is $47.

The maximum for a person with one dependent child is $52.

The maximum for a person with an adult dependent and children is—

With one child, $59.

With two children, $66.

With three or more children, $72.

The benefit provision in the Senate committee amendment gives no recognition to the variable maximum system of benefits in effect in Michigan.

The statewide average wage in Michigan in 1965 was approximately $134. By 1967, if current trends continue, the average wage will be about $140.

This means that if the proposed maximum requirement were adopted, the maximum benefit for a single person in Michigan would have to be raised from the present $43 to $70 by 1967.

Then the State of Michigan would either have to abandon its variable maximum system—or if it should decide to maintain the system with the present spread, the maximum for a family man with three or more children would have to be raised to $99.

This system of variable maximums was originally designed in 1954 by an advisory council comprised of representatives of labor and management, appointed by our Governor.

This council meets every biennium and has over the years made recommendations which have resulted in the constant improvement of the Michigan law.

Some of the amendments offered here today could seriously interfere with the benefit schedule and the unemployment compensation program that is operating so well in my State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the Senate might as well proceed to vote on the committee amendment.

The issue is clear. The adoption of the committee amendment would eliminate the minimum earning requirements in any State. Its adoption would have the effect of providing that in any State where a man had worked for 20 weeks, even if he earned only $1 per week, he could draw—assuming the unemployment was high enough to trigger the benefits—a full year's unemployment benefits. As one member of the staff said, a man could be working cutting the grass at 75 cents per week, and he still would be eligible for a full year's benefits.

I ask for a vote on the amendment. It should be defeated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on lines 19 through 23, page 28 of the bill, as follows:

> (A) the State law shall not require that an individual have more than 20 weeks of employment (or the equivalent as provided in subsection (4)) in the base period to qualify for unemployment compensation;

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 174 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Allott
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Montoya
Moss
Prouty
Ribicoff
Scott
Stennis

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the language on page 28, lines 24 and 25, and continuing to page 29, lines 1 to 7, inclusive, as follows:

> (B) the State law shall provide that the weekly benefit amount of any eligible individual for a week of total unemployment shall be (i) an amount equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, or (ii) the State maximum weekly benefit amount (exclusive of allowances with respect to dependents) payable with respect to such week under such law, whichever is the lesser;

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORTON. What was the language? I did not hear it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the language on page 28, lines 24 and 25, continuing to page 29, lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, and I would like to explain it. There are a number of States that operate on an annual wage basis. They judge the benefits by the annual wage. There are six States that judge benefits by the annual wage rather than by the weekly wage.

The amendment which I send to the desk would solve their problem and put them in conformity with the bill we have before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are amendments to the committee amendment in order prior to the adoption of the committee amendment as a whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentarian advises the Chair that is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer this amendment at the request of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington, whose States operate on an annual wage basis. This amendment is designed to insure that the bill's minimum benefit standards shall not be misapplied in situations where the results anticipated by the standards are already being met. It means that these six States would not have to abandon their annual wage system to come in conformity with the intention of the bill. This amendment would affect Alaska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, and West Virginia.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is my understanding correct that if this amendment is adopted it will not be necessary for the legislatures in those States to change their existing laws?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to advise the Senator from Louisiana that the Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator's amendment is not in order, the way it is drafted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Chair advise me why it is not in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the Senate has already agreed to the language the Senator proposes to strike out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I modify my amendment to simply make that amendment come at another place. The amendment we are getting ready to vote on ends at line 23, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It ends at line 24.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It begins at line 24. Where does it end?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Line 7, page 29.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I may modify my amendment to make it come at the end of the same line, line 7, would it not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. It will be easier for me to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 29, at the end of line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 3309(a) CERTIFICATION.—

"(1) On October 31, 1968, and October 31 of each calendar year thereafter the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary each State whose law he finds

"(A) is in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) and has been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the four-month period ending on October 31) and that there has been substantial compliance with such State law requirements during such period;

"(B) contains a benefit formula with respect to which the State agency has established as of July 1 of the applicable calendar year accords with the conditions of subsection (d).

"(2) The Secretary of Labor shall not withhold his certification to the Secretary unless, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, he finds

"(A) that the State law is not in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) or has not been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the four-month period ending on October 31) or that there has been a failure to comply substantially with such State law requirements during such period; or

"(B) that the State agency has not established as of July 1 of the calendar year that the benefit formula in its State law is in accord with the conditions of subsection (d). For any State which is not certified under this subsection on any October 31, the Secretary of Labor shall within ten days thereafter notify the Secretary of the reduction in the credit allowable to taxpayers subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State pursuant to section 3302(c)(4).

"(d) ALTERNATIVE CONDITIONS.—

"The State agency shall establish on July 1 of each calendar year after 1967, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor, that the benefit formula contained in the State law as of such July 1 and for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on the immediately preceding June 30, would have had the result, for the immediately preceding calendar year (had such calendar year been their base period), of providing at least 65 percent of all individuals in covered employment in the State with a weekly benefit amount of at least 50 percent of each such individual's average weekly wage and at least 80 percent of all such individuals with a total benefit amount of at least 26 times each such individual's weekly benefit amount."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to insure that the bill's minimum benefit standards will not be misapplied in situations where the results anticipated by the standards are being met. The objective of the standards section is to assure that the greater majority of covered workers could, if unemployed, receive a benefit of 50 percent of their average wage, and that not more than 20 percent of the covered workers would have protection for less than 26 weeks. Under the alternative requirement proposed by the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] and other Senators, the State formula, no matter what it was, would be applied to the wages and employment experience of covered workers during the prior calendar year. If at least 65 percent of the workers would have received a benefit equal to one-half their wages and at least 80 percent would have had a potential duration of 26 weeks or more, the State law would be certifiable under this section for the following taxable year. That is, if in 1968 the benefit formula in effect during the period of July 1 to October 31 would have produced the specified results when applied to the wages of covered workers in 1967, the State law would be certifiable under section 3309(A) for the taxable year 1968 and employees in that State would qualify for the 2.7 percent Federal tax credit.

The amendment also has the effect of giving States credit for family benefits. In some States, benefits are provided to the dependents of workers. The amendment would have effect in that case, as well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the State of Washington and other States compute unemployment compensation on an annual wage basis.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the amendment allow such States to continue to pay unemployment benefits based on such computation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The legislature of the State of Washington would not have to make any changes in order to conform with the Federal law?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would not—so far as your method is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what my junior colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I were concerned about.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know of no objection to my floor amendment, and I hope we might dispose of it without a rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I explain the amendment that is now before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The committee amendment would provide that workers receive 50 percent of their——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will interrupt for a moment to state the question that is before the Senate. It is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, which begins on line 24, page 28, and continues through line 7 on page 29.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, what this amendment provides is that when a worker is unemployed, he would receive a benefit, after 20 weeks, amounting to at least 50 percent of what his average weekly wage has been.

Forty-four States already have such a provision. As to most of the States that do not so provide, the amendment which I offered would take care of their problem, because they achieve the same result, but they do it on an annual wage basis; therefore the amendment which I offered, and which the Senate has agreed to, would largely solve their problem.

The pending amendment would require two States, California and Massachusetts, to come into line with the other States. It creates no real problem as far as those two States are concerned; so this is a rather limited adjustment, to simply say that in 50 States, instead of 48, when a man is out of work, his benefit would equal 50 percent of what his average weekly wage has been.

Now, that is subject to a further limitation, later in the bill, providing that that amount should not exceed 50 percent of the average wage paid in the State. But all we are to vote on in connection with this amendment is whether the man would be entitled to receive 50 percent of what his average wage has been, after he has worked 20 weeks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The adjustment required in the two States the Senator has mentioned would be less than one-fourth of 1 percent. It is minimal. In effect, one could say all States are really unaffected, in practice, with the exception of these two, which would have to make an adjustment of one-fourth of 1 percent or less in order to comply.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In other words, Mr. President, as the Senator has so well stated, this would require 2 States to adjust their benefits by about one-fourth of 1 percent, to fall in line with the other 48 States.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. If it is only going to require two States to adjust by one-fourth of 1 percent, why are we bothering with it? We had a vote on this question of Federal standards, and the position of the Senator from Louisiana prevailed. We have these other Federal standards; let us go ahead and get through with them. I assume the votes will be the same as they were. The Senator apparently has the votes.

I shall then offer a substitute for the entire bill. I cannot do it when we are considering these committee amendments, under parliamentary procedure. I shall offer as a substitute for the bill as passed by the House. Everybody knows the issues; we can go ahead and have a rollcall on that, and that would wind this thing up.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, that is perfectly all right. I am not trying to delay the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennesse [Mr. GORE] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—38

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Montoya
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

The next committee amendment to be voted on is on page 29, lines 8 through 14.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thought I was recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was making an announcement as to the next committee amendment. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the announcement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment to be voted on is on page 29, lines 8 through 14.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate would require that an individual who has 20 weeks of work must be provided with 26 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits.

This requirement probably puts less of a burden on the States than do any of the other committee amendments. Eighty-four percent of our unemployed workers today are eligible for 26 weeks or more of unemployment compensation if they lose their jobs.

The average potential duration for all persons who become unemployed today is 24 weeks. When it is considered that the average spell of unemployment for a typical worker is only about 6 weeks, this requirement that workers be provided with only 26 weeks of benefits becomes rather insignificant.

Seven States today satisfy this requirement completely by providing uniform duration for all their unemployed. New Mexico provides 26 weeks of benefits for every individual who has 22 weeks of work. Three other States, California, the District of Columbia, and Pennsylvania, provide 26 weeks of benefits for a worker who has been unemployed for 26 weeks.

In Massachusetts, the average potential duration is 25.7 weeks; Utah, the average potential duration of unemployed workers is 25.6 weeks; in Oregon, it is 25.3 weeks. A great number of States already have average potential duration of 23 or more weeks. Only 14 percent of our unemployed workers would be affected by this requirement, and of them, only those who remain unemployed far longer than the 6-week average spell of unemployment would actually get benefits for a longer period than they do today.

As in the case of the eligibility requirement and the 50-percent individual benefit amount requirement, this duration requirement is more a reflection by the Federal Government of the actual practices within the States than it is a new high standard, which States would be required to move up to. The upgrading of State plans by reason of this requirement is slight.

I urge that the committee amendment described as subparagraph (C) beginning on page 29, line 8 be agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if it be agreeable to the chairman of the committee—I understand that we are now down to line 7, page 29—I ask that the amendment which is now pending be coupled with the committee amendment going through that part of the bill, which would bring it down through line 7 on page 34; in other words, that the committee amendments be considered en bloc from now on, through title I of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know that some Senators have made plans and have made commitments to be away, and in order to save time, I would be willing to make that request, in the hope that we might agree to the remainder of the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe that I should explain the remainder of this committee amendment. The remainder of it would provide that the State benefit would be no less than 50 percent of the statewide average weekly wage.

This amendment, taken in conjunction with the requirement that an individual's benefits shall be equal to 50 percent of his average wage, provides the standards on the weekly benefit amount.

A number of States today which do provide their unemployed workers with 50 percent of their average weekly wage, have a limit generally stated in dollars on the maximum amount that may be paid to any unemployed worker. In my own State of Louisiana, for example, the maximum today is $45 a week. This works out to about 45 percent of the State average wage in Louisiana. Thus, our maximum would have to be increased by an additional $5. I might point out here that our State legislature, just last month, increased the weekly benefit amount from $40 to $45.

In 18 of the States the maximum benefit amount is already set at 50 percent or more of the State average wage and in these States no further action would be needed to comply with this standard. A number of other States, however, fall short of meeting this 50-percent requirement.

Nineteen of our States have benefits ranging between 40 percent and 49 percent; the remaining 15 States have maximum limitation which is less than 40 percent of an individual's weekly wage. Thus, while low-paid workers in the State already get 50 percent of their average weekly wage, the higher paid workers in the State bump up against the maximum limitation and find their unemployment benefits are less than one-half their wage.

Under this committee amendment, higher paid workers in a State would get an increased unemployment benefit beginning in 1968. If this committee amendment were not agreed to, there would be no maximum limitation on the State benefits and a highly paid movie star in California, the corporate executive in New York, or bank president in Chicago, would get one-half of his fantastic salary if he became unemployed. We have to have a limitation on the amount the States will have to pay out.

I urge that the committee amendment described as paragraph (2) beginning on page 29, line 15, be agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of line 11, on page 29, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "But this paragraph shall not preclude a State law from limiting the payment of benefits based on base period seasonal employment or wages to seasonal workers (as defined in the State law) to the seasonal period specified in such law, nor shall this paragraph preclude the apportionment of benefits during a benefit year on the basis of seasonal and nonseasonal base period employment or wages."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment provides that seasonal workers would be paid unemployment benefits only during that season.

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This amendment conforms to existing law in the States. I have studied the amendment and I have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment. If I am correct in my understanding, the States are now being taken up one by one to pick up enough support for Federal standards. If Hawaii wants Federal standards why exempt them?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is an amendment which I am sure the committee would have agreed to. The Senator from Hawaii is not a member of the committee but he certainly had every right to offer an amendment to make the bill conform to a practice that exists in the States. As I understand the situation, this is what the existing law provides.

Mr. INOUYE. The amendment would clarify the present intent of the law. I want to assure that seasonal workers would not be covered by this law. We have about 10,000 seasonal workers in canneries. If this provision passes without this clarifying language we may find that seasonal workers can work 20 weeks and get 26 weeks of payments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is a clarifying amendment. There is no Federal requirement on the subject. The Senator from Hawaii wishes to make it clear. I have no objection to the amendment. I do not understand why anybody objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 29, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "but this paragraph shall not preclude a State law from limiting the payment of benefits based on base period seasonal employment or wages to seasonal workers (as defined in the State law) to the seasonal period specified in such law, nor shall this paragraph preclude the apportionment of benefits during a benefit year on the basis of seasonal and nonseasonal base period employment or wages."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Neither existing law nor the bill which is before us requires anybody to pay unemployment benefits to seasonal workers. Some States do it. I applaud them for doing it. The State of Hawaii is one State that does. The Senator from Hawaii wants to make it clear that no one would misconstrue the bill to do something that was not intended.

I am happy to accept the amendment that this does not tell a State what it will or will not do in connection with seasonal employees.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator say in the case of seasonal workers that they may, during a particular season, earn as much money as others do in the entire year and that they would not be covered by the present law?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are saying that if seasonal workers do qualify under the 20 weeks of employment, the State could not be required to pay them unemployment benefits beyond the season. In other words, if the seasonal employee works enough to achieve the 20 weeks of employment, the State would not be required to pay his unemployment benefits for 26 weeks.

Mr. MILLER. So that 26 weeks would come to 20 weeks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For seasonal workers.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana who determines the length of the season.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State administrator determines that. We are trying to conform to the State law. I have no objection to doing that. If a State provides benefits beyond what the Federal Government insists upon, we do not want to interfere.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am not saying that I object. I am trying to get a clear picture. Suppose that a State does decide to do this. Does that mean that the State will receive some Federal money to carry out that provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That comes later in the bill; to get the Federal money.

If the Senator will yield——

Mr. MILLER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This provision makes clear that the State does not have to pay a seasonal worker for 26 weeks, which would be required if he were not a seasonal worker.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Hawaii?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Why is the amendment only worded in the "may" fashion? Why not prohibit it throughout the country?

Mr. INOUYE. Some States may desire to be more generous than Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER. Would the money be Federal money?

Mr. McCARTHY. They have the money.

Mr. INOUYE. The only money they receive will be administrative funds.

Mr. McCARTHY. But most of the money would come from State funds.

Mr. MILLER. There would be no Federal money involved if a State is in or out of it, so far as seasonal workers are concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can explain it. This is an example of another State pinched by the proposed Federal standards, which have been approved by the earlier amendments, and they now are trying to get from under the yoke.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The entire amendment is rather simple. Federal law does not require coverage of seasonal workers and this bill does not require coverage of seasonal workers.

We voted to say that if a worker earns unemployment compensation benefits and is out of work he would be entitled to draw 6 months of benefits, or 26 weeks.

The State of Hawaii does something that most States do not do. I think it is a fine thing to do.

All that the Senator wants to provide is that if this is a seasonal worker who works during the summer or winter season, as the case may be, he cannot be regarded as unemployed except during this season.

If he is a harvest worker he is only unemployed during the harvest season, because that is the only time for which he is hired. So, really, if he is a seasonal worker, the Federal Government does not propose to make States pay benefits beyond the season, because that is the only period during which we can regard him as being unemployed. We in the committee did not study it. We did not think about the problem. It never came up. The Senator from Hawaii is not on the committee. He is a very fine Senator, taking very good care of Hawaii. He said to us, "We have a problem peculiar to Hawaii. You do not intend us to take 26 weeks for our workers who work only in the summertime or only in the wintertime, do you?"

We said, "No, we never intended to do that."

He said, "How about taking this amendment, to eliminate that intent, that notion?"

We said, "Fine."

There is the amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Could the Senator from Louisiana interpret for me what the word "seasonal" means?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State administrator determines it. This is something that the State does by its law, which is not a requirement of the Federal Government at all. We simply do not want to bring about unintended results, and this is what the amendment would do.

Mr. MORTON. The amendment of the Senator from Hawaii brings out some interesting points. For instance, many college boys and girls go to the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and the other New England States, for summer work—I suppose that is seasonal—in the hotels and resorts up there. I do not know whether under Vermont or New Hampshire law they are covered.

It strikes me that when we try to pass Federal standards, then we offer this amendment, that amendment, and the other amendment to take care of some unique situation.

For instance, we have many fellows at work in Churchill Downs in Kentucky for 3 weeks, and they sell tickets to anyone who wants to bet 2 bucks on a bangtail. I guess that is seasonal work. The racetrack is open for only 5 weeks of the year. So I guess I will have to go into the cloakroom and draw up some kind of amendment to take care of racetracks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What this amendment provides is that Kentucky can do about its bangtails whatever it blessed well pleases.

Mr. MORTON. Kentucky wants to do what is best for its citizens in this bill. That is why we do not want any Federal standards.

Under the committee amendment, apart from the amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from Hawaii the Senate is now considering, it means that we have to pay 26 weeks of benefits for 20 weeks of work; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the worker is covered.

Mr. MORTON. I wanted that point made clear.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, under Hawaii's unemployment law, a person is paid 26 weeks' benefits for 20 weeks of work, or its monetary equivalent in his base period.

The monetary equivalent is defined in our State law as five times the State average weekly wage, which is a maximum of $500 in Hawaii.

What we in Hawaii are worried about is that seasonal workers in Hawaii probably would not qualify for 20 weeks of work, but they could easily qualify by earning $500 during a season. This committee provision, therefore, could effectively eliminate our seasonality provision and entitle most seasonal workers to qualify for the 20 weeks' benefits.

I have studied the measure proposed by the Finance Committee very carefully, and I have analyzed its provisions with great care to determine their applicability to Hawaii's very forward looking unemployment insurance law—particularly as it applies to our pineapple workers. Hawaii is unique among the States of the Union in that its unemployment law is the only one which extends coverage to agricultural workers. The State law deals with the problem of seasonality in agricultural labor by a carefully conceived formula.

It is this seasonality provision in my State's law which I thought might well be required to be nullified if the Senate adopts the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee.

I discussed this situation in great detail with the staff of the Finance Committee and with the Department of Labor. It was my understanding that, as neither the existing Federal unemployment compensation law nor the Finance Committee proposal cover agricultural workers, the pending committee measure would not have any bearing on the Hawaii law's provisions dealing with seasonality of agricultural workers. I was given firm assurance of this by the Labor Department and the Finance Committee.

Nevertheless, to make this absolutely clear, I had planned to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], to establish legislative history and intent that the pending measure was not applicable to the seasonality provisions of Hawaii's law.

However, since my colleague, Mr. Inouye, has now introduced his amendment, which I think is a good one because it accomplishes the same thing as my planned colloquy would have, I should like to point out the merits of this amendment to the Senate and to clarify its purport and intent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is exactly right. We do not think that the bill creates the problem the Senator fears. Our true feeling is that the amendment is unnecessary, but if out of an abundance of caution you want it enacted, I have no objection.

Mr. FONG. I am certain that the law does not cover our situation, but to be sure about it, the amendment was introduced. It is, indeed, a clarifying amendment.

I should like to join my colleague, Mr. Inouye, in sponsoring the amendment to the committee amendment if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. INOUYE. I would be most happy to have my colleague join me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, Mr. Fong, be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye].

The amendment to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. As I understand one part of the amendment, an employee may work for 20 weeks, and as a consequence he would be considered for entitlement of 26 weeks benefits; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Is there any State in the Nation now which pays unemployment compensation in excess of the number of weeks worked by the employee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, quite a few. Quite a few States have what we call uniform duration, which could exceed the period during which a man is out of work.

Mr. NELSON. Is there any State in the Nation—as I am not sure that I exactly understand what the Senator has just said—which now provides 26 weeks' unemployment compensation based upon 20 weeks of work?

Mr. MORTON. If the Senator will yield to me, in response to his question, my understanding is—and staff will find it—that there are 4 States in the 50 States which pay a longer period of compensation than the base period of employment. I mean, that is subject to correction, of course, but that is my memory of the situation.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. New York, Vermont, Maryland, and Hawaii presently provide that there would be 26 weeks of unemployment for 20 weeks of employment. Will the Senator please keep in mind that this particular provision is the most inexpensive one in the bill, because most working people have already found another job by the time they have had 6 weeks of unemployment. In other words, contrary to what some folks might think, most working people are looking for another job. A man must work at least 5 months to be covered, and when he is out of a job, he is certainly going to look for another one. Thus, it costs very little to extend the benefit period to 26 weeks.

This particular requirement is the one where more States are out of conformity than any other. But this is the one thing that costs the least money. Therefore, no one is particularly upset about the provision for the 26 weeks because the cost is small.

The other provision, for example, would require that the maximum benefits be as high as 50 percent of the average State wage, and that does cost a substantial amount for the States to put out.

Mr. NELSON. Does the committee have any testimony on how much they anticipate the provision would cost?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will get that cost for the Senator shortly, but the answer is that if they go from 20 weeks to 26 weeks, the cost will be relatively insignificant.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is hardly measurable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Costwise, it is not a material item.

Mr. McCARTHY. It just looks good.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For example, in the Senator's State of Wisconsin, it already provides for 28.6 weeks—almost 29 weeks.

Mr. NELSON. Wisconsin has very liberal provisions. In a number of provisions it is among the first in the country. For example, in terms of total weekly benefits, Wisconsin ranks in first place, with California and Hawaii. In some other benefits, such as the length of the period of payment of benefits, we also rank near the top, including what Pennsylvania provides.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Wisconsin is the grandfather in this field. When we passed this law in 1935 Wisconsin was the only State that had such a program.

Mr. NELSON. Wisconsin pays maximum benefits, but in order to accumulate those benefits, based on 20 weeks worked. Wisconsin pays 16 weeks of unemployment compensation. Based on 43 weeks worked, it pays benefits of 34 weeks of unemployment compensation. So it ranks among the highest in the Nation, if my statistics are accurate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In Wisconsin it takes 33 weeks of work to get 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. Wisconsin is what we call a variable-duration State.

Mr. NELSON. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana another question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State of Wisconsin has been leading the way in this field since the early 1930's. For 30 years it has been leading the way and blazing the trail. It seems to me that eventually somebody might be able to show the State of Wisconsin how to improve the program.

Mr. NELSON. I am just raising the question as to how many States provide more weeks of compensation than weeks of work. The Senator has said four States——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Seven States.

Mr. NELSON. Seven States provided more weeks of compensation than weeks worked.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But keep in mind that a workingman must have worked 5 months, must be available to work, ready and able to do a day's work, and he must have been out of work for 2 weeks before he applies for benefits. The record is that the average workingman is back on some other job by the time he draws 6 weeks of benefits.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The fact remains that 43 States have laws or practices which will have to be changed. In other words, 43 States require that a person has to work for as long as the period for which he will receive unemployment compensation. So if we adopt the committee amendment, and it passes through Congress, it means that 43 States will have to get their State legislatures together, change the law, upset the applecart, and do it this way rather than their way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not be very happy about bringing out a bill asking other States to do something if I did not ask my own State to do likewise. The State of Louisiana has just increased its benefits by $5. This bill will require that State to raise its benefits by $5 more. But we will not have to raise any more revenues, because the interest Louisiana is drawing on its trust fund balance brings in enough money to cover the cost. I think that is true of most of the States.

I would be happy to go back to my people of Louisiana and say, "Yes, I voted to pay a workingman $50 instead of $40 when he is out of work. It will not cost Louisiana any tax increase. There is enough money coming in now to take care of it."

With reference to the question of this measure affecting a legislative decision, I would be happy to ask the Louisiana Legislature to raise the standard to treat the working people who are out of employment temporarily a little better. We would probably do it without this law, but I really know of no one who will be upset by providing this increase in Louisiana. They may be in some other State, but not in my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on line 8, page 29, to page 34, line 7, inclusive.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(The VICE PRESIDENT assumed the chair at this point.)

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 176 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—44

Allott
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Montoya
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment the lines of the committee amendment which appear on page 29, lines 8 through 14.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment before he does that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. President, all this particular amendment would do would be to provide that with 20 weeks of work, there would be 26 weeks of benefit. Most States do not provide that amount of benefits, but the cost is very, very small. Our advice is that the cost of this matter is rather insignificant, because most workingmen are back at work by the time they have drawn 6 weeks of benefits. That is the average period of unemployment.

Most States will have to conform to it, but it really will not cost them much money. The cost is very small, and no State would be required to increase the tax in order to pay it.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, beginning with line 8, insert as subsection (3) the language ending on line 14.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have just voted on that proposal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, we did not vote on that. We voted on the committee amendments en bloc. I am offering a part of what we voted on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If I recall correctly, we voted on the language beginning on page 29, line 8, down to and including the language on page 34, line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it, the Senator from Louisiana is moving to put back a part of the language which has already been rejected by the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct, but the amendment is in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not offering the same amendment that was voted down. I am offering a part of it, lines 8 through 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is offering a part of the language which was rejected, as a new amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would it be in order to offer piecemeal the remainder of the language which has just been rejected?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senators wish to offer it piece by piece and line by line, as long as it is offered not in toto, it is in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the ruling, even though the Senate has rejected the amendment and reconsidered the vote by which it was rejected, the identical language can again be offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate did not reject the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senate rejected the amendment from line 8 on page 29, through line 7 on page 34.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand what the Senate did. I understand the ruling of the Chair, but I just want to get it straight because there may be a time when I, too, want to use the same procedure.

I understand that when the amendment has been rejected in toto, by bringing it back piece by piece, in separate parts, one can, in effect, put the whole thing back in again. I wanted to get it clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is right. He is fully respected and protected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wanted to get that noted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, section (c) on page 29, lines 8 through 14.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Allott
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Montoya
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. LONG of Louisiana was rejected.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Adjourn until when?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to adjourn is not debatable and takes precedence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What was the motion?

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask for a record vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When do we adjourn to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Until noon Monday.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Symington
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Cannon
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Montoya
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Williams, N.J.

So the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 8, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 5 (legislative day of August 3), 1966:

U.S. ATTORNEY

James P. Alger, of Guam, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be major

Wilkins, Arthur L., O37438.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Armstrong, Henry J. (Inf), OF101874.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288:

To be majors

Davis, Donzelle, O1932303.
Jarvis, John R., O945672.
Jurling, Darrell D., O2021743.
Lewis, Wrightson, O2265511.
Moreau, Donald M., O1932321.
Nelson, Lennart N., O2201763.
Palmer, Thomas C., O1924823.
Parlas, Joseph L., O1935283.
Stecher, William F., Jr., O1873575.
Vivaldi, Joseph R., O1872715.

To be captains

Alhouse, Robert D., O5405282.
Allen, Frank C., O5308574.
Beaty, William E., O1937941.
Berestecky, Boreslow P., O5203000.
Bishop, Noyes S., Jr., O5405456.
Cain, Moses A., O5204966.
Cary, Jack R., O5307444
Casey, Andrew M., O5304186.
Donohue, Edward J., Jr., O5201202.
Easom, Earnest E., O5310869.
Ervin, Clarence H., O5404111.
Glover, Leo M., O5405052.
Hannon, James D., O4031144.
Kidd, James L., O5304226.
LaFon, Leslie C., Jr., O4026686.
Lamb, Thomas L., O1942369.
Lewis, John H., Jr., O5204982.
Logan, Abraham T., O5307932.
Manbeck, Jackie L., O5401450.
Maxwell, John C., O4026942.
Mayhew, William B., O4045273.
Moeller, Gene L., O4013173.
Murkison, Eugene C., O5306238.
Pettit, Ernest G., O4031172.
Pimental, Rodney A., O5304499.
Rasmussen, Richard K., O5509792.
Rybat, Edward S., O4031013.
Sinclair, Bobby H., O5402539.
Smith, Patrick O., O4010960.
Snoddy, George R., O5404112.
Spencer, Charles A., O4012427.
Taranto, Monroe J., O5507836.
Taylor, Willie M., O4026390.
Tetreault, Raymond J., O5405499.
Vemity, Charles G., O4046472.
Youree, James F., O5303943.

To be first lieutenants

Arnette, Ben S., Jr., O5313415.
Baldwin, Larry D., O5709587.
Barber, John T., O5308980.
Barnes, Michael V., O5412782.
Benning, Robert M., O5318313.
Bradford, Robert F., O5014024.
Branch, William A., O5319113.
Byrne, Alan H., O5511065.
Carter, Lewis L., O5309852.
Christoffer, Fred, Jr., O5017360.
Church, Douglas R., O5317648.
Ebersole, Richard A., O5318163.
Floody, Harold V., Jr., O5010888.
Foster, Nathaniel W., O5221959.
Gregory, Wilbur T., O5017780.
Hamilton, Thomas R., O5412332.
Hanke, James S., O5514165.
Hern, Jay R., O5011404.
Hocking, John W., O5514940.
Hood, Harvey R., II, O5406146.
Johnson, Raiman K., O5015623.
Kaiser, Jan L., O5317587.
Kallam, Luther P., Jr., O5315225.
Knox, Allen N., O5007562.
Kostoff, John T., O5212130.
London, Leroy, Jr., O5318529.
Morales, Angel L., O5826265.
Nugent, John H., O5011311.
Patin, Jude W. P., O5413784.
Patriquin, Redmond L., O5314493.
Poindexter, Alonzo J., O5414190.
Richter, William D., O5312193.
Ridick, John A. V., O5012070.
Sherburn, John H., O2308580.
Stanfield, Howard S., O5413472.
Taylor, Donald R., O5530256.
Van Orden, James T., Jr., O5008475.
Vollrath, Frederick E., O5317316.
Warner, Westford D., O5319233.
Wells, William L., O5708074.
Wilson, Ronald D., O5405963.
Wylie, Edgar L., O5317688.

To be second lieutenants

Bachman, James H., O5530590.
Barrett, Robert E., O5406534.
Benge, Holmes D., O5416209.
Carawan, Larry B., O5318994.
Chandler, Nicholas L., O5019528.
Ciarlo, Fred H., O5419604.
Cole, Robert G., Jr., O5417947.
Daugherty, Joseph P., O5417001.
Falkenrath, James H., O5531493.
Fiebig, Heinz, O5325405.
Fuks, Joseph A., O5532580.
Giroux, Ronald V., O53326227.
Haerter, Frederick A., O5534286.
Hill, Augustyne V., Jr., O5419773.
McCaslin, James P., O5418978.
McNaughton, Peter J., O5533292.
Michael, Charles B., O5325136.
Mooneyham, John D., O5417029.
Myers, Carl W., O5221583.
Nunemaker, John E., O5213057.
Peters, Stephen F., O5419654.
Reilly, Timothy B., O5225489.
Rhinehart, Harry J., O5322313.
Robisson, Arthur C., O5223401.
Schmidt, Ernest R., O5406695.
Sheehan, Richard F., O5014385.
Taylor, Herbie R., O5416212.
Trimble, William L., O5019664.
Van Steenburg, Robert, III, O5321081.
Walker, Richard B., O5532660.
Zana, Donald D., O5226817.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps

Santos, George C., O1928268.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Rossi, Lorraine A., L1010641.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Pavlakovic, Dorothy D., N3008479.
Rasmussen, Doris S., N2297648.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bole, Charles T., II, O2300469.
Griswold, William H., O5223837.
Hobaugh, Don C., O5220045.
Leslie, Donald B., O5518981.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Benson, Daniel H., O2305931.
Davies, David C., O2304961.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Barbier, Arthur G., O5525227.
Burkebile, David L., O5711466.
Colwell, Edward J., O5220243.
Cottingham, Andrew J., Jr., O5315616.
Crews, Richard L., O5711572.
Crosier, Joseph L., O5227618.
Dunker, Richard B., O2309378.
Harding, Roger F., O5708783.
Hunt, Keith K., Jr., O5205096.
Knapp, Stanley C., Jr., O5708896.
Leazure, Jerry A., O5400390.
McPhail, Schubert D., O5307620.
Morgan, Daniel D., Jr., O5021670.
Pozelnik, Louis S., O2309263.
Schatzman, Ronald C., O3041438.
Schuchmann, George F., O2313073.
Shaver, Glyndon B., Jr., O5319610.
Sutton, Charles A., O5315738.
Young, John G., O5227890.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Ehrhart, Marjorie K., N2320797.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Devlin, Terrence E., O2316283.
Murphy, Eugene W., Jr., O2322214.
Van Meter, George E., O4074339.
Zimmerman, Park T., O5535133.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Barlow, Matthew J., Jr., O2320685.
Bobbitt, Ralph C., O2320687.
Bunn, Simon M., Jr., O2316915.
Burton, Francis C., Jr., O2316755.
Carmichael, Benjamin M., O2320723.
Farnsworth, Lynn S., O2316825.
Glick, Benjamin, O2316823.
Howard, William B., O2316831.
Jacobson, Eric S.
Kennedy, Charles W., Jr., O5412604.
Kromash, Marvin H., O5212888.
Latham, George, H., O5408740.
Master, Franklin D.
McCracken, Joseph D., O2316767.
Nelson, Kenneth E., O2316957.
Raque, Carl J., O2320789.
Spritzer, Harlan W., O2320680.
Stroud, Michael B., O2316741.
Whitelaw, John M., Jr., O2316834.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Palmer, William W., Jr., O5412347.
Stutz, Douglas R., O5510467.
Williams, Charles, O5313950.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Coats, Max E., Jr., O2312738.
Polk, Harry H., O2320984.

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Green, Priscilla A., M2317310.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Abelite, Mara, N5519529.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Camden, Harry C., O2316530.
Cook, Richard E., O5531621.
Parmer, Bert E., O2317420.
Ressdorf, Horst, O2320370.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Clark, Doris M., II, L2316303.
Roberts, Janice I., L5322596.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Jones, Walter H., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Coppin, David F.
Crawford, John L., III
Gorsky, Rudolph J., Jr.
Herndon, Michael E.
Lavigne, Jeffrey E.
Rasmussen, Lynn W.
Tuttle, Josef E.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Ahlum, William J.
Ames, Orrin K., III
Ammon, Richard W.
Aronow, William F.
Ashcraft, Jack G.
Auger, John D.
Barczak, Robert A.
Battles, James E.
Baylor, Ross G.
Bement, Danny B.
Beshore, David F.
Bigbie, Samuel H., Jr. O5332503.
Binau, Otto J.
Braudaway, Jessie A.
Briggs, Chester E., III
Brown, David J.
Brummer, William J.
Bullock, Howard R.
Burnett, Ira S.
Burns, Kennith R.
Burns, Terry L.
Bush, Joseph K., Jr.
Calmes, James G.
Castro, Albert C.
Chase, Charles C., Jr.
Clirehugh, Robert W., Jr.
Cloud, Stephen J.
Cooper, Wayne D. O5332707
Cornutt, Howard L., Jr.
Corrigan, Edward T., Jr.
Crocker, Larry D.
Curl, Terry W.
Denney, Michael E.
Devlin, Edward T., Jr.
Dionne, Wayne C.
Drummond, William T.
Duell, Norbert C.
Dunton, John T., Jr.
Eckelman, Arnold J.
English, Ronald W.
Epps, Joseph E.
Fincke, Dale E.
Fletcher, Jeffrey D.
Flores, Thomas V., Jr.
Fors, Carl E.
Friesner, Wayne L.
Galanti, David M.
Geraghty, John J.
Gillespie, Richard E.
Goggans, Milton E.
Goto, Victor M.
Gray, Thomas W.
Gregg, Maurice R.
Gross, Waymon G.
Haas, Allen J.
Hamner, George F., Jr.
Hancock, Thomas E.
Handberg, Roger B., Jr.
Harding, Michael J.
Hare, Anthony J.
Hargraves, Walter A., Jr.
Harinck, Allen V.
Harrison, Klien S.
Hedgpeth, Dale L.
Henderson, David L., II
Hilt, Robert J.
Hostrawser, William B.
Hughes, John R., Jr.
James, John C.
Janecek, Paul W.
Johnson, Gerard V.
Jones, Francis E.
Jones, Jerry L.
Kennedy, Robert J., III
Kennemer, Larry C.
King, Kasey K.
Kirk, James W.
Komar, Robert T.
Lane, Roderick L., III
Lauer, Ronald A.
Levine, Alan B.
Link, Robert J., Jr.
Long, Robert K.
Malanowski, Richard J.
Malloy, Michael
Matthews, Warren T.
May, Roy L.
Mayo, Charles E.
McArthur, James L.
McCarthy, Jeffrey C.
McClure, James M.
McDermott, Michael A.
McDonald, Allen K.
McLenahan, Thomas G., Jr.
Meier, Jimmy A.
Metzger, Michael J.
Miller, William G.
Minser, William G., III
Moerls, John M., O5421702
Moormann, Joseph C.
Niedermeyer, Glenn J.
Nowak, Norbert
O'Donnell, William T.
Park, David J.
Parkes, James J.
Pelton, James O.
Penland, Robert T.
Peters, LeRoy R.
Phillip, Joseph P.
Pollock, Frederick K.
Prather, William W.
Pursley, Charles N., Jr.
Rainbolt, Michael T.
Reese, David G.
Sanderson, Robert W.
Sanz, Donald L.
Sarlin, Raymond W.
Scherer, Robert J.
Schimpf, Roger L.
Segesman, Ben R.
Shelton, Donald E.
Sherman, Stephen A.
Sherrill, James E.
Smith, Cyril J.
Smith, Kent M.
Stackrow. Robert J.
Stacy, Aubrey B.
Stephens, L. Dale
Strange, Robert G.
Strye, James W.
Stryker, Thomas E.
Sullivan, Dennis M.
Sumera, Ronald R.
Sutton, James C.
Takahashi, Daniel T.
Tanner, John S.
Tatum, Howard R.
Taylor, David G.
Taylor, George L., Jr.
Toepel, John A., Jr.
Trzupek, Eugene W.
Van Denburgh, Roy W.
Vasilion, Pete G.
Waltman, Owen L., Jr.
Way, Richard E.
Webb, George A., Jr.
Witt, Kay B.
Wojciechowski, Henry J.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Ruth O. Ware, Emerson, Ark., in place of W. P. Nash, Jr., resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Edythe E. Gollar, Greenview, Calif., in place of Mabel Whipple, retired.

E. Eugene Henry, Huntington Park, Calif., in place of G. J. Nevin, deceased.

Jimalou J. Wyman, Lakeview, Calif., in place of J. A. Marsh, retired.

Harry V. Wiley, La Mesa, Calif., in place of C. J. Lehew, retired.

Arthur C. Stuart, Mount Laguna, Calif., in place of R. M. Stuart, retired.

John F. Sheehy, South Gate, Calif., in place of H. B. Lull, retired.

Carl A. Tice, Yorba Linda, Calif., in place of D. W. Cromwell, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Robert S. Sinkowitz, Voluntown, Conn., in place of W. L. Liberty, retired.

FLORIDA

A. Gerald Cayson, Blountstown, Fla., in place of C. E. Yon, resigned.

Thomas H. Brown, Jupiter, Fla., in place of G. E. Southard, retired.

Willie A. Perry, Tallevast, Fla., in place of F. S. Perry, retired.

GEORGIA

J. Derrell Weaver, Norman Park, Ga., in place of A. C. Curtis, Jr., deceased.

Bradwell H. Floyd, Plainville, Ga., in place of C. A. Bennett, retired.

Rubie R. Raulerson, St. George, Ga., in place of V. M. Roberts, retired.

HAWAII

Gunichi Takahashi, Waialua, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Oumi, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lois A. Woods, Dahinda, Ill., in place of K. M. Mosher, transferred.

William Lippert, Washington, Ill., in place of J. W. Norris, retired.

INDIANA

Harry S. Young, Bloomfield, Ind., in place of C. F. Henderson, retired.

IOWA

Arne W. Eriksen, Alta, Iowa, in place of D. E. Castle, retired.

Paul W. Gannon, Colfax, Iowa, in place of R. O. Woods, retired.

Gerald R. Brummer, Crescent, Iowa, in place of G. E. McMullen, retired.

Donald C. Logue, Cumberland, Iowa, in place of LeVerne Riggs, retired.

William A. Hartgenbush, Schaller, Iowa, in place of W. A. Keenan, retired.

KANSAS

George W. Kohls, Herrington, Kans., in place of J. B. Doyle, retired.

KENTUCKY

Carl R. Lair, Monticello, Ky., in place of T. C. Powell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Geneva S. Mims, Garden City, La., in place of C. C. Badeaux, retired.

Katheryn L. King, Greenwood, La., in place of M. V. Bryson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert R. DeForge, Agawam, Mass., in place of M. E. Brady, retired.

Arnold D. Hall, East Otis, Mass., in place of I. E. Hall, retired.

John V. Joyce, Holden, Mass., in place of D. F. McAuliffe, retired.

William P. Callahan, North Dighton, Mass., in place of J. E. Williams, retired.

Joseph G. Moitozo, Rehoboth, Mass., in place of C. O. Swanson, retired.

Robert D. Rudden, South Dennis, Mass., in place of C. W. Bayles, retired.

MICHIGAN

Pauline L. Coon, Alba, Mich., in place of A. L. Shepard, retired.

Leo R. Buckler, Glen Arbor, Mich., in place of E. L. Grady, retired.

MINNESOTA

Odell L. Agre, Sacred Heart, Minn., in place of A. O. Skalbeck, retired.

Alexander J. Winkels, Stewartville, Minn., in place of M. R. Tysseling, retired.

Marion A. Kennedy, Walker, Minn., in place of M. J. McGarry, retired.

MISSOURI

James E. Sewell, Everton, Mo., in place of M. L. Newkirk, transferred.

MONTANA

Roy C. Hogenson, Wilsall, Mont., in place of G. H. Gregg, resigned.

NEVADA

Geraldine E. Cooper, Weed Heights, Nev., in place of M. M. Curtis, retired.

NEW YORK

Mary J. Donato, Dewittville, N.Y., in place of I. R. Chapman, retired.

Aloys V. Smith, Garnedville, N.Y., in place of C. J. Jones, retired.

Mary C. Berger, Grafton, N.Y., in place of H. P. Cooper, retired.

Marwood S. Myer, Haines Falls, N.Y., in place of W. M. Lowerre, retired.

C. Ross McCluskey, Hopewell Junction, N.Y., in place of Catherine Whalen, deceased.

Marian G. Flugel, Morton, N.Y., in place of T. G. Spring, retired.

Ethel W. Andrus, Silver Bay, N.Y., in place of E. G. Watts, removed.

Anthony Maiorano, West Haverstraw, N.Y., in place of Napoleon Ponessa, retired.

Paul J. Ennis, West Henrietta, N.Y., in place of Margaret Ely, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mary M. Harris, New London, N.C., in place of James Napier, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Dale E. Brayton, Hunter, N. Dak., in place of Elmer Knorr, retired.

Dorothy E. Stringer, Tower City, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Griffin, retired.

OHIO

Leonard B. Alt, Genoa, Ohio, in place of H. R. Sherk, Sr., deceased.

Robert C. Chapman, Mount Gilead, Ohio, in place of C. S. Gladden, retired.

Norbert J. Huber, North Star, Ohio, in place of E. M. Gavitt, retired.

Raynor V. Burcham, Proctorville, Ohio, in place of L. M. Collins, retired.

T. Faye Kughler, Stone Creek, Ohio, in place of C. C. Schumacher, retired.

Donald R. Deem, Tuscarawas, Ohio, in place of R. M. Crites, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Doris E. Steverson, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of D. L. Ratliff, removed.

Clarence D. Niblett, Hastings, Okla., in place of H. B. Melton, retired.

OREGON

Edward I. Taylor, North Powder, Oreg., in place of R. E. Smith, transferred.

Vergie M. Magnuson, Warrenton, Oreg., in place of R. G. Magnuson, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Florence M. Hannan, Bradfordwoods, Pa., in place of N. D. Mashey, retired.

Alvin C. Brady, East McKeesport, Pa., in place of S. H. Ward, retired.

Clifford P. Wenhold, Milford Square, Pa., in place of R. S. Weiss, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Cesar A. Perales, St. Just, P.R., in place of B. A. Ramos, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

John C. Talbot, West Warwick, R.I., in place of C. W. Lambert, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hortense W. Cole, Cross Hill, S.C., in place of J. A. Richardson, retired.

John J. Ward, Darlington, S.C., in place of F. B. Bynum, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Frederick B. Vaske, Elkton, S. Dak., in place of Jane Dunn, retired.

Alyce A. Schroeder, Wentworth, S. Dak., in place of J. D. Ulmer, retired.

TENNESSEE

Joe M. Fondren, Arlington, Tenn., in place of M. A. Moore, retired.

Elaine L. Bush, Cedar Grove, Tenn., in place of J. T. Coffman, transferred.

Thomas A. Henson, Cowan, Tenn., in place of O. B. Sloan, retired.

Fred R. Lockett, Jr., Johnson City, Tenn., in place of C. M. Guffey, retired.

Frank W. Greer, Pegram, Tenn., in place of H. B. Payne, deceased.

TEXAS

Bennie R. Vick, Conroe, Tex., in place of O. G. Williams, retired.

Bobby J. Bonner, Palmer, Tex., in place of H. B. Copeland, retired.

VERMONT

Ralph G. Aulis, Norwich, Vt., in place of H. F. McKenna, retired.

VIRGINIA

Dorothy C. Lewis, Mappsville, Va., in place of N. B. Chase, retired.

WASHINGTON

Genevieve F. Tapscott, Packwood, Wash., in place of S. T. Combs, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert L. Pullen, Sutton, W. Va., in place of B. F. Randolph, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 5 (legislative day of August 3), 1966:

U.S. ARMY

1. The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 30, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Francis Smith, O33169, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Melvin Zais, O33471, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank George White, O21378, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Knowles, O35418, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24228, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Dale McCown, O23532, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Carroll Case, O43824, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, U.S. Army.

Brig, Gen. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Osmund Alfred Leahy, O23106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

2. The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Carroll Case, O43824, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Livingston Nelson Taylor, O21853, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21960, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Merle Fondren, O32481, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Milton Hightower, O23531, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Dale McCown, O23532, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Richard J. Tipton, to be second lieutenant, and ending Earl K. Ziegler, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 25, 1966.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Peter J. Leniart, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Michael L. Layson, to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 25, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

You are the light of the world.—Matthew 5: 14.

Eternal God, our Father, spirit of light and life, in this day of distress, in this world of suffering and sorrow we would purify our own hearts as we face the high responsibilities and great demands committed to our care and to our attention this day. Let our littleness be swallowed up in Thy greatness, our pettiness in Thy pursuing presence, and our trite criticisms in Thy triumphant spirit.

Before the altar of prayer we bow, confessing our faults, asking Thy forgiveness, and praying that Thou will give us strength and wisdom that in these days we fail not man nor Thee. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TO AMEND THE REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS TO PROVIDE FOR THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, O'BRIEN, ROGERS of Texas, SAYLOR, and MORTON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY].

EYES OF THE NATION WILL BE FOCUSED ON A HISTORIC WEDDING IN OUR CAPITAL CITY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, August 6, 1966, the eyes of the Nation will be focused on a historic wedding being celebrated here in our Capital City of Washington, when Luci Baines Johnson, younger daughter of President and Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson, becomes the bride of Patrick J. Nugent, younger son of Mr. and Mrs. Gerard Nugent, of Waukegan, Ill. May I add that it is also a historic day for the 12th District of Illinois, wherein Waukegan is the largest metropolitan center.

Many people are saying or thinking that Pat Nugent is a lucky young man to be marrying the attractive daughter of the President and Mrs. Johnson—and indeed he is. I would suggest also that Luci is a fortunate young lady to become the bride of Pat Nugent, this tall, handsome, and serious-minded young man from Waukegan.

Pat Nugent comes from a family and background that characterize the very best that is American. Strong family ties, reliance upon spiritual values, longtime and loyal friendships, unwavering devotion to decency and to honorable goals attainable in a free society—these and other qualities constitute the real makeup of Pat Nugent and his family.

More than 100 close relatives and friends of the Nugent family, mostly from Waukegan and other nearby points, are in Washington for the wedding and prenuptial events. Speaking on behalf of Mrs. McClory and myself, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the membership of this House, I extend a warm and cordial welcome to all of them. Many will join Mrs. McClory and me this evening in our home at a 12th District open house.

Let me add my praise of the dignified and appropriate demeanor of Luci Johnson and Pat Nugent and their families during this prenuptial period, culminating in the ceremony and reception tomorrow. The modesty, simplicity, and absence of fanfare that has prevailed is most commendable.

I congratulate the bride- and groom-to-be, and all of the others who have contributed to make their wedding day the happy beginning of a long and successful marriage.

CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN CELEBRATES BIRTHDAY, AUGUST 6

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and extend best wishes to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who will celebrate his 73d birthday tomorrow.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas was elected to the 71st Congress in 1928, and it is eloquent testimony to his public service that he has been elected to every succeeding Congress. Over the span of years, with courage and vigilance, with honesty and dedication, he has protected the best interests of the people of America.

It has been a privilege as well as an honor for me to serve, as I have for the past 19 months, on the Banking and

Currency Committee under such an outstanding chairman. Mr. PATMAN is an acknowledged authority in the money and banking field and his accomplishments in this area are admirable.

To my knowledge, no man has done more to advocate the cause of reasonable interest rates for the American people than Chairman PATMAN.

He has fought tirelessly throughout his years in Congress on behalf of credit unions and has succeeded in strengthening the credit union system in America.

I feel he has done more for small business than any other man in this country. He has consistently supported antitrust laws and thus has enabled small business to survive and compete effectively with big business.

Chairman PATMAN spearheaded the drive that led to endorsement of credit unions on all military bases and the end of loan-shark and sharp-practice finance company abuses directed against our servicemen.

Mr. PATMAN's goal has always been a monetary system with an adequate money supply designed to meet the needs of the economy and of our people. The little people of America look to WRIGHT PATMAN to protect their interests, and he has never let them down. He has been the champion of their cause, and I have been privileged to follow his lead in advocating this just cause.

His wise counsel and guidance have been inspirational to me, and I know that WRIGHT PATMAN will rank in history as one of the greatest legislative leaders of all times.

May he have good health and many more happy birthdays so that he can continue in the service of the people for many, many years to come.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 14765.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 200]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Battin
Celler
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Dow
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Griffiths
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hungate
Karth
Keogh
King, N.Y.
McEwen
Martin, Mass.
Morrison
Murray
Olson, Minn.
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Watkins
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONGRESS HAS FAILED TO DO ITS DUTY IN PROTECTING THE PEOPLE AGAINST EXORBITANT INTEREST RATES AND COST; IT HAS PERMITTED FEDERAL DEBTS TO ACCUMULATE AT ROBBERY INTEREST RATES THAT ARE TREMENDOUSLY BURDENSOME TO THE PEOPLE; IT HAS PERMITTED FEDERAL RESERVE TO CONTINUE ITS SEIZED INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the proceedings today I have a statement in this issue of the RECORD concerning the interest burden that is being forced upon the people, the Federal Government, and other governments by the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve's claimed independence is a fake. It is resulting in unmercifully robbing the people and placing burdens upon them which they cannot bear and, at the same time, enjoy a proper standard of living.

If the interest rates had not been increased to astronomical proportions in recent years and had been held to the 20-year level preceding 1953, we would have saved $60 billion during this time in existing interest charges that have been collected on the national debt. Our national debt would be $60 billion less today. In addition, if the Federal Reserve had canceled the Government obligations, which it holds when they were paid for, our national debt would be $42 billion less today.

So, here is $102 billion that the American people are being compelled to pay interest on that is not justly due.

The mystery is why would the Congress of the United States permit such outrageous swindles?

THE FARMER IS GETTING NOTHING FOR SOMETHING

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to laud the action being taken by Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, to find out "where the money went." We all know that the price of consumer foodstuff items, such as milk and bread, is continuing to rise. It is evident that the consumer is paying more and the farmer is getting less, so where did the money go? Has it just disappeared? Has it gone to trading stamps, to free gifts to lure the public into large chainstores? I think it is high time we found out. The fact of the matter is the public is paying more and the farmer is getting less. The public is being told you can get something for nothing if you just trade at this store or that one. Well, there never was something for nothing and the way it is ending up is that the farmer is getting nothing for something.

LEGISLATIVE AIDS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 89th Congress various proposals were submitted in Congress seeking to provide non-Federal assistance to the field of education. For instance, H.R. 5785, which I submitted in March of 1965, would provide an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer, his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education and an additional credit for gifts or contributions made to any such institution. Previous to that, on February 1, 1965, I had introduced H.R. 3914, which would provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only. The latter measure is a modification of the tax-sharing idea, or more properly, a tax retention plan in which 2 percent of all individual income taxes collected under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or territory within which all of it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

Needless to say, those educational institutions which are striving to pay their own way without Federal help would profit immensely from legislation of the types proposed above. The case of Hanover College in Hanover, Ind., is a fine illustration of private initiative in education and should be financially encouraged without the danger of Federal control and dictation.

I request that the article entitled "Hanover Finds Funds Without U.S. Handouts," from the Chicago Tribune of July 31, 1966, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

HANOVER FINDS FUNDS WITHOUT U.S. HANDOUTS

(By Chesly Manly)

HANOVER, IND., July 30.—Hanover college, the oldest four-year private college in Indiana [founded in 1827], is upholding its tradition of independence and self-reliance by refusing to accept federal aid of any kind.

Dr. John E. Horner, Hanover's 44-year-old president, said the college raised $1,147,425.99 from private contributors, an all-time record, in its last fiscal year, which ended June 30. He mentioned this as evidence that the private colleges can get the support they need from private sources and remain truly private if they work for it and refuse to be "seduced by federal aid."

TERMS OTHERS INCONSISTENT

"Some of our sister institutions are really inconsistent when they say they want federal support but not federal control," Dr. Horner said. "As a citizen and a taxpayer I expect the federal government to control the money it spends. As president of a private college I want it to remain private.

"Another objection to federal aid is that it tends toward a monolithic system of higher education. The great strength of American higher education comes from the dual system of public and private institutions. Something will go out of it if we all get our feet in the federal trough. As a private college we regard ourselves as an educational arm of the free enterprise system."

Hanover, a co-educational college with an enrollment of 1,000, is related to the Presbyterian church.

"We have a liberal arts tradition and a Christian tradition, and we believe it is important to American culture that young people should be exposed to both of them," Dr. Horner said.

COLLEGE RAISES $5,300,000

He said the college has raised $5,300,000 of a $5,500,000 development program that began five years ago and ends next December. About $2,000,000 of this will be added to the endowment, which will have a total market value of about $7,000,000. Two new residence halls and a $500,000 administration building have been completed and the college hospital has been renovated. A new campus center, to cost $1,500,000, is under construction.

Hanover has an operating budget of about $1,700,000, of which the students pay only 67 per cent. The other 33 per cent consists of voluntary contributions. Like Wabash college, at Crawfordsville, Ind., Hanover has refused to accept federal aid for student loans and scholarships, as well as for dormitories and other facilities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that I am present and missed this last quorum call by 3 seconds, being necessarily held up in my office.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know that the inconvenience being caused by the airlines strike is of paramount interest to every Member of the House. I would like for the Members to have their office staffs, if they have not seen it, show them the August 4 edition of the official publication of the machinists. This publication is locked up at 6:30 on Saturday evening. The headline states, "Airline Settlement Won Despite the Politicians." It goes on to say just exactly what happened in this unusual operation at the White House last Friday evening.

Of course, this settlement announcement was as premature as the President's announcement. I do hope that the carriers will be able to submit another proposal so that the machinists will have an opportunity to vote between now and this Monday evening so that their next edition can say, "Airlines Settlement Really Settled With Help of the President."

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14765, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had been agreed that the first order of business would be the vote on the Moore amendment to strike out title IV, that debate thereon would be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], and that in the event the amendment to strike out title IV is defeated, the Committee shall then continue the consideration of title IV for amendment.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago, about now, the motion which we are about to vote on to strike title IV was read to the House, and since then there has been a great deal of debate involving title IV and concerning amendments, which has pointed up the fact that title IV is very shoddily written, given no consideration in the committee, and even the proponents of title IV do not know what it means. When words are read, various proponents will say that they mean one thing and others will say that they mean something else. Even from minute to minute a proponent will say that a certain phrase means one thing, and then, asked a little bit later about something else in the same sentence, the same proponent will say the same phrase means something else.

Obviously title IV is not in shape for sensible people to vote to put it into law, since even the proponents do not know what it means.

Actually, I believe some of the proponents have not read title IV, judging from the statements they have made in debate thus far. I have read it several times. Quite frankly, it is so ambiguous I would not attempt to tell anyone it means one thing and have any certainty that any court would agree with me about it.

But I want to talk about the reasons to strike title IV. This will apply to all those who feel that the Government should control the sale of property, and it applies to those people, among them myself, who believe a person should control his property as he sees fit.

The first thing I mention is the policy declaration, that there should be no discrimination. But immediately the bill goes on and discriminates. If we are going to have discrimination, then it ought to go all the way. If we are not going to have any discrimination, we ought not to have any at all. For that reason, the Members can see I am talking to both sides.

Here is an item I know the committee proponents have not thought of or they would not have put title IV in the bill. This bill would be much stronger and would be much more restrictive of the disposition of property without title IV, because title IV does attempt to put some exceptions in. If we read title V and title III, they have housing provisions that have no exceptions at all, and they make it a penal offense and people can be put in jail and fined, even if a homeowner wants to sell his house and choose the purchaser. If Mrs. Murphy, whom we talked about, wants to rent a room in her house, she faces a penal provision in title V. So we would have much stronger legislation, as far as housing, if we only talk about title V and particularly title III. She cannot only be sent to jail, but she can be fined $1,000 for renting her room and choosing a renter to suit herself. Also, the Attorney General can enjoin her and make her rent a room in her home to whomever he pleases.

If the Members will follow me, they will see what I am talking about. Turn to pages 74 and 75 of the bill. It says:

> Whoever * * * injures, intimidates, or interferes with * * * any person * * * selling, purchasing, renting, leasing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, rental, lease or occupation of any dwelling.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order and the gentleman will not proceed until the Committee is in order.

The gentleman from Texas may proceed.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, but I doubt that there are many who want to hear anything about this bill. Their minds are closed. Some of the actions that have taken place here during consideration of this bill remind me of the dog and pony shows I used to see when I was lad. Whenever the ringmaster would come in and pop his whip, they all jumped through the hoop or stood up on their hindlegs, or whatever it was he wanted them to do.

As I was saying, this bill makes it a penal offense and a person can be sent to jail or fined if he interferes with or intimidates anybody with respect to "selling, purchasing, renting, leasing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, rental, lease, or occupation of any dwelling." It provides he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both.

The Members must see that there is a stronger provision in this bill, which will be weakened somewhat if title IV is left in. All those of my colleagues who believe that people should not have a right to control their property ought to strike title IV, because it weakens the provisions of titles III and V.

Certainly all who believe, as I, in the traditional right of private ownership of property, will vote to strike title IV, because it is not legislation that should even be considered by Representatives of a free people.

Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia to strike title IV ought to be unanimously adopted.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I shall address my remarks to a section of title IV which has not been the subject of debate heretofore. I might suggest that those who are concerned about the strength or the weakness of title IV would do well to examine section 408, which would, for the first time, undertake to establish what is called a Fair Housing Board.

Under the language of the bill, the Fair Housing Board would not be, as some have contended, a mediation and conciliation service. On the contrary, it would take upon itself many of the characteristics of investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

I believe it is important that we summarize a few of the powers which this Board would enjoy. Those are the powers which would be transported by reference from the National Labor Relations Act.

By way of example, the new Fair Housing Board would have the power to issue a complaint against any person on the basis of a naked charge, unsupported by any evidence whatsoever, filed by a single individual.

The Fair Housing Board would have the power to order a person charged to appear at a hearing within 5 days, which hearing could be scheduled in Washington or anywhere else in the United States the Board might decide.

The Board would have the power to amend the complaint, whenever the Board chose to do so, even after the person charged had presented a complete defense to the original charge.

The Board would have the power to permit any other person or persons to intervene in the proceedings and to present testimony.

The Board would have the power to issue a cease and desist order and an order requiring the person charged to do whatever the Board might decide was necessary to be done to implement the policies of title IV. Time will not permit me to itemize all of the other powers involved.

I believe it is vitally important to understand that while the act would permit an appeal from the Board's order to the circuit court of appeals, that appeal would not give the homeowner his day in court. Findings of fact made by the Board would be conclusive. No court of law would ever hear witnesses or take evidence.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in this debate about the constitutionality of title IV.

It should be abundantly clear that every civil rights proposal which has been before the Congress—in 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965—has been attacked on the ground that it was unconstitutional.

Fortunately, we are in the possession of at least three separate Supreme Court decisions recently rendered which should forever place at an end such attacks upon the constitutionality of legislation which implements the 14th amendment.

May I point out that one part of the basis for this reasoning is set forth in Katzenbach against Morgan, which upheld the authority of the Congress to prescribe rules and regulations as they relate to voting.

In this decision the Court pointed out that under section 5 of the 14th amendment Congress is empowered to pass appropriate legislation that would implement and carry out the provisions of the 14th amendment. The Court went on to cite McCulloch against Maryland, which is an old decision, and discuss the standard or measure of what constitutes "appropriate legislation" under section 5 of the 14th amendment. The Court said:

> Correctly viewed, section 5 is a positive grant of legislative power authorizing Congress to exercise its discretion in determining whether and what legislation is needed to secure the guarantees of the 14th amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore]. The asserted objectives of title IV are to provide additional means of enforcing the constitutional provisions of equal protection of the laws and to give Negroes and possibly others a better opportunity to secure more desirable housing. These are worthy goals, and I am sure none of us would disagree with them. In spite of good intentions I think we should make inquiry as to the actual results of title IV and the results which will probably follow. I believe Daniel Webster was absolutely correct when he made the statement:

> The Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions.

This title attempts to provide a willing seller by denying to every property owner the right to consider race, color, religion, or national origin as influencing factors in the selection of a tenant or a customer. But that provision raises two further questions which I believe are of primary importance. First, what personal right does this take from every property owner in the United States of America? Second, what effect will this have on the ability of Negroes and other groups to obtain better housing?

I submit to my colleagues that if this title is enacted into law, its principal effects will be first to reduce the total amount of housing available by discouraging building and, secondly, to put Negroes and other groups, which the legislation is intended to help, at an increasing disadvantage in their efforts to buy what housing is available.

If title IV becomes the law of the land, it will, in my opinion, have two significant effects. First it will discourage building. Secondly, it will deprive the members of minority groups of the opportunity to compete for what housing remains. Therefore I think this title should be voted down, and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia is entitled to our support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I would first address myself to my fellow Republicans. I say to my fellow Republicans today that it would be one of the tragic ironies of history if the congressional Republicans of 1966 repudiate the congressional Republicans of 1866 who passed the Nation's first fair housing law. A century ago our predecessors, who had known the personal leadership of Abraham Lincoln and were the immediate inheritors of his tradition, established this important precedent for us.

If we seek to assume the leadership of this Nation in this stormy present, and in the tradition of Lincoln, we cannot shirk our duty today.

To those who say "never" to every necessary change, I would remind them that one of the great lessons of history is that when men who say "never," using as their excuse that they are saving the ancient landmarks of a people, attempt to build a dam or a dike across the channel where history flows, inevitably all they dam up behind it is a sense of injustice and of inequity. Sooner or later, in every case, the pressures behind that dam break through and sweep away the very ancient landmarks that the dam was built to save.

And, Mr. Chairman, in this great country of ours the history of the Republic should teach us that the saving of ancient landmarks has been the work of men who in a positive manner have constructed appropriate channels through which history finds its course, past the ancient landmarks, enhancing and preserving them as it goes. That is the manner in which we must move and adjust ourselves to conditions of our time.

To those who raise a constitutional question, I remind you of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States a century ago in passing upon and approving the Fair Housing Act of 1866, establishing beyond a doubt the authority of Congress to act on this subject.

To those who raise the question of the rights of the individual in his home, I would repeat to you the words of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who said in this House on Wednesday that title IV, as we have amended it—and I quote the gentleman, who is an eminent authority that as we have amended this section, "it will insure that a man's home is his castle, now and as long as" the work we have done here "is effective."

To those who say that this bill will in some way depress the building industry, I recall the advice of the gentleman from New York, who has had great personal experience, that in fact this will stimulate the building industry. This judgment is supported by the testimony of numerous industry witnesses which appears in the record of the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Finally, to those who say that they are going to vote against this title because it does too little or because it fails to do what it is advertised to do, let me recall once more a brief summary of the figures which outline both the need, the demand and the solutions that we will be providing under title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 21 million Negroes in America. Title IV as we have presented it will immediately cover a very minimum of 40 percent of American housing or at least 23 million housing units. It will further cover completely most of the new housing units that are being erected in the new suburbs and the new center cities. It will cover new apartment houses, which are being built approximately 45 percent in central cities and 55 percent in suburban areas. It will meet the immediate demand.

Mr. Chairman, I think this title promises tremendous progress toward the solution of one of the great social problems of our day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we defeat the Moore amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Moore amendment to strike title IV from this bill. There was overwhelming evidence before the Judiciary Committee that there exists in this country racial discrimination in the rental and sale of dwellings. This discrimination is inconsistent with the protections of the 14th amendment, and clearly impedes the free flow of interstate commerce.

I would hope that the lengthy debate we are about to conclude would have clarified the reasons for this legislation—its objectives, how it expects to obtain those objectives and the limitations of the legislation.

Addressing ourselves to the last point first, it is abundantly clear that this legislation does not interfere with the free choice of the homeowner in selecting either a tenant to share his home or a purchaser to buy it. The proposal by the President to restrict that free choice was rejected by the Judiciary Committee. Any reasonable interpretation of title IV can reach no other conclusion. Once we reached the determination that we would leave untouched the free choice of the homeowner, we then had to consider whether there were other causes of segregated housing with which we might properly deal and which would be effective in eliminating all of the evils which have been imposed upon our society by forced racial segregation.

There was evidence before the Judiciary Committee and it is my firm conclusion that the principle cause of racial segregation in housing has nothing to do with the free choice of individual homeowners. Rather, it is the method of doing business on the part of banks and realtors that has developed during the past 30 years. During these past 30 years, we have seen tremendous progress toward making every American family a homeowner. The principle ingredient in this accomplishment has been the availability of long-term, low-interest mortgage money coupled with a booming residential building industry and vigorous real estate sales. Regrettably, one of the prices demanded of an American citizen to participate in private home ownership has too often been a white skin. For a wide variety of reasons, I suggest to you illogical and unjust reasons, bankers, property developers, realtors, have refused to transact business with Negroes in the same manner that they transact business with whites.

So late as yesterday, the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] called to our attention the fact that some savings and loan associations just adopt a policy that they do not lend to Negroes. Many of our colleagues during the past 4 days have from the well of this House implied that you can tell that a man is irresponsible by the color of his skin. The tactics of the business community in keeping the Negro out of the housing market are subtle, but they are manifold and they are effective. The California Real Estate Board has stated that 99 percent of the listings for sale or rental of property are made by the property owner on an unrestricted basis. Yet California suffers in many areas from segregated housing. If it is not demanded by 99 percent of the homeowners, then I suggest to you that it is perpetuated by the business community which does not own the property but which is an essential factor in its exchange.

When President Johnson proposed that this Congress outlaw all discrimination in all housing, the National Association of Real Estate Boards attacked that bill with great vigor. Their opposition, so they claim, was principally that it constituted an evasion of the homeowners free choice in dealing with his property. But when your committee protected that free choice, the National Association of Real Estate Boards renewed their attack with considerably greater vigor. Now contending that the Mathias compromise was worse than the original bill. Being perfectly candid about it, I suppose from their point of view, that is a correct analysis because now the attention of this Congress and of the Nation is focused on their role in perpetuating segregated housing. They no longer fight for the principle of a man's home being his castle, they no longer fight for free choice for individual property owners—those issues have already been resolved by the Mathias compromise—they now fight for the right to conduct their business in a manner discriminating against their customers because of the color of their skin. This practice is immoral, and when this bill becomes the law, as I hope it will, it will become illegal and abandoned. I urge defeat of the Moore amendment and adoption of title IV and H.R. 14765.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would not divide this House with respect to the observations that I make. I would only choose to speak to my fellow Americans.

My basic concern, Mr. Chairman, has been and still is the fundamental doubt I have about title IV of this legislation and its constitutionality.

I recall quite well that we have had presented during the debate on this title many different references to decisions of the Supreme Court as to how it might be suggested that they would act if given the opportunity to judge the constitutionality of title IV.

With due regard and sincere appreciation for those suggestions that have been advanced, I still have firm in my mind the question of whether or not title IV squares itself with the Constitution of the United States. There are those who say that the Court has spoken on a number of occasions clearly on this issue either on cases of recent date or of some 100 years ago. I would say to my colleagues that such is not the case, for if you delve more deeply into these decisions that have been given to you as the basis of explaining the constitutionality of this title, there is a grave absence of words. True, the Court has spoken, but it has only spoken through the route of the 14th amendment, where the States have deprived individuals in this country of rights which are secured to them under the Constitution of the United States. If you go deeply into the decisions—and not too many years back—as a matter of fact very recently—you will find that the Court has spoken firmly, and questioned firmly, the constitutionality of anything that suggests that the 14th amendment shall be used as the legal vehicle to protect individuals from the capricious acts of other individuals.

The firm scintilla that runs through all the decisions of the Court with respect to the 14th amendment does—and I firmly state it—protect the right of an individual against the acts of State government. But it does not lend itself to the interpretation that the 14th amendment shall be used to protect individuals in the handling of their individual rights and property rights as opposed to other individuals.

This has been said many times and in many ways. Recent cases confirm this constitutional thesis. It is for this reason that I had, and still have, the question in my mind that title IV does not square itself with the Constitution of the United States. Certainly to attempt to create the legal fiction that the powers of Congress under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution can be stretched to apply to individual homeowners, in my opinion, stretches that clause beyond all present legal recognition.

But if I were to leave that constitutional plateau and suggest that this is a matter which can be decided at some future time, I would then ask myself the question as an individual in this House who has been a militant civil rights legislative supporter, what does title IV propose to do? Does it really touch the problem at hand?

It seems to me that there are others, who feel, as some in this House feel, that it does not. I have suggested that it will encourage discrimination, and no less an authority than the chairman of the New York Commission on Human Rights yesterday indicated that title IV will serve to further perpetuate the ghetto, isolated from the power structure of the community.

Going on, Mr. Boothe said, "the caste system will be upheld"—and he was speaking of the Mathias amendment, which has been adopted. He said:

> We can envision, if this title IV is enacted, a nation of black cities and white suburbs.

But if that does not bother us, let us go to section 404 of title IV, which deals with institutions in the field of finance, which must support financially real estate undertakings in any city, town, or State in this country. The point that has been raised I think is real, but one thing they overlooked is the test of discrimination. It would be the condition that is in the mind of the person who seeks the loan and is refused that would be determinating factors. If he feels he has been turned down under this title IV by reason of his race, he could institute an action against the officials of the financial institution, and under this title, my colleagues, the U.S. Government would hire him an attorney and provide the money to pay that attorney. This could lend itself to pressure and harassment of these institutions.

Again, I simply say that it is the condition that is in the mind of the person who wants to borrow, and however wrong the credit credentials may be, and however sincere the financial officer may be in wanting not to discriminate, the mere fact that the individual who has been refused the loan feels that he has been discriminated against is enough to put this title in all its ramifications into operation.

For these and many other reasons I urge your support of my amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. We have been building up to the climax of this vote through 2 weeks of debate. This vote on the Moore motion to strike title IV involves 14 pages of a 60- or 70-page bill.

Those who listened to the debate yesterday and the days before know there is great uncertainty as to the construction of the various provisions in title IV. There have been many, many interpretations of the several provisions. There are many ambiguities involved in this very controversial area. We know there is some doubt—I say some doubt—in the minds of good lawyers as to the constitutionality of this title.

When we add up all of the problems, it seems to me that we would be far wiser to send this title back to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration. I so urge such action.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of my amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I woke long before the usual hour this morning. I could not sleep as I thought of the fateful consequences that will attend our vote in this Chamber today. There is not a man in this body whom I do not credit with the most sincere desire to achieve a legislative solution that will serve to bank not fuel the fires of racial tension that not just figuratively but tragically enough are literally burning in the streets of our great cities across the land. We sing that beautiful hymn of our land:

America, America, God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.

But this bill is no crown of brotherhood; rather we drive the first nail into a cross of injustice. There may be money in open occupancy housing as the gentleman from New York says, and the cry in America has become, "business is business"; but my question is this: At this critical moment and juncture in our history when we desperately need unity among our people will this bill advance that end? The answer is "No."

It will frustrate and disappoint those who come quickly to realize that it will not solve the ghetto problem. Everyone admits that. It will embitter those who see in it the dragon's teeth of a system of government where "Big Brother" decrees that war is peace and hate is love, and let no one under penalty of punishment by law dissent from the egalitarian doctrine which has become the religion of the state.

Oh, but the proponents say—in this great moral crusade we are leading—in what the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], with his voice quivering with emotion describes as "this really tough law," we provide an exemption for the individual homeowner and his realtor. We place in reality the imprimatur of the Federal Government—the stamp and seal of approval on the ugly stain of prejudice in the all-white suburbs. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland is not a perfecting amendment; it is not a softening amendment; it is not that strangest of all descriptions—the amendment that neither weakens nor strengthens—it is the old "sweetener" amendment. It is like the line from Julie Andrews' song: "A little bit of sugar makes the medicine go down."

We hear of the virus of discrimination. It is a dread scourge indeed, but it is not the only virus that has attacked the body politic in America. Today we suffer as never before from the virus—yes, an epidemic and scourge of violence and lawlessness. Three sheets of my daily press summary one day this week were filled with new stories of burnings, lootings, pillage, and rape, and all committed in the name of civil rights demonstrations.

We need an antidote for the poison that has been poured forth from vials of racial hatred. Even more we need an antibiotic to combat the virus. But this bill is no antibiotic. Rather as a history professor once described the French Revolution as a giant political cathartic. That happens to be the wrong remedy for many human ills just as this bill is the wrong remedy.

Oh, the proponents seek to drive us into yet another corner. They have unfurled and raised high the banner inscribed "Human Rights." They raise the standard of human rights, and they employ a dichotomy of human rights as opposed to property rights and never the twain shall meet. There is no such airtight compartmentalization or fragmentation of rights. One of Shakespeare's characters said in Henry IV, "the first thing let us do is kill all the lawyers." I heard someone in this Chamber yesterday muttering, "The first thing let us do is get all the lawyers off the Judiciary Committee." As a lawyer myself I could not, of course, agree. But lawyers sometimes are dry as dust in defining terms like property rights. They present them as a skeleton and never quite manage to flesh that skeleton out with all of the meaning that it has for the average homeowner or holder of property. Our legal rights are often compared to a bundle of sticks when they are discussed in the classroom, but they are far more than that. What is it that provides the great and basic distinction between our society and that of the U.S.S.R.? They have an egalitarian society—or so they say—but for us it would have a cloying taste indeed. Why? Because they do not by and large respect the institution of private property. The average Soviet citizen has a few square feet of space in the state-owned apartment. He does not even aspire to homeownership. The state will provide him with shelter, but he cannot be entrusted with the responsibility of owning his own property. He might make the wrong decisions with respect to the enjoyment and use of that property if he did. No, the state plan must prevail over the individual wishes and desires of the Soviet citizen.

I hope—yes, I pray—that the day will come when we can in large measure eliminate the specter of prejudice and racism from our midst. I think we will see the dawn of that day. This bill will not create the climate, however, that will hasten its coming. If it stirs up more hatred and violence, as I feel that it will, we will by its passage have retarded—not advanced—the cause of civil rights.

We laughed in this Chamber on yesterday or the day before when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] quoted to us the 10th Commandment from the Old Testament. That commandment reads, "Thou shalt not covet." But it is true, as he said. There is a spirit of covetousness sweeping over America. I listened a Sunday or two ago to the Attorney General of the United States as he addressed a nationwide television audience. Oh, no, said he, with great aplomb.

> It would be a tragedy to assume that a conspiracy is responsible for riots in our streets. It is because these young people are living in a time of great prosperity. They see other people with TV sets and fine motor cars. They do not have these things or the means to acquire them, so in bitterness and frustration they riot, pillage, loot and burn.

And voices from even higher up say, "If I had to live in a ghetto I would have enough spirit to lead a pretty good revolt myself." The cry is changing. Instead of "freedom now," it is becoming a cry that as the line in the Broadway play of a few seasons ago went, "I'm depraved because I'm deprived." It is not freedom anymore that is the bright and shining and holy grail, it is rather television sets and motor cars.

I applaud Rev. P. H. Jackson, of the National Baptist Convention, for saying that civil disobedience must not be allowed to become a way of life in America. I applaud him for having the courage and infinite good sense, to observe that the current riots and disorders are the biggest single threat to the peace and security of the United States.

It was the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, whose name and memory have been invoked so many times during this debate who said:

> Let reverence for the law become the political religion of the Nation.

Let us pass this bill without title IV and seek to cool rather than heat up the passions and the prejudices that threaten to divide us to the great delight of our enemies and the enemies of our free system. Then let us direct our attention to the great task that lies before us of building a society where men can walk together in decency and dignity toward the goal of a better life.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Moore amendment, which proposes to strike title IV from the civil rights bill of 1966.

The debates on this bill, and especially on title IV, have extended over 2 weeks; indeed, it has raged for months in the press, and the arguments really do not change, although this time the source of some of the protests to the passage of this legislation may have shifted from South to North. There has not been much change, however, even though this bill and especially title IV, is sometimes referred to as the first northern civil rights bill, because for the first time the impact of this legislation will be felt in our northern cities as well as in our southern hamlets. Still, the lines of support and opposition have changed remarkably little.

The support for this bill comes principally from the Democratic side of the aisle, from Members representing Northern and Western States; and the opposition still is concentrated among our Democratic colleagues from the South and—with some notable and noble exceptions—on the Republican side of the aisle.

The arguments have changed remarkably little too. Whatever the subject matter—whether it be jobs, or public accommodation, or housing, or schooling—we hear the same refrain over and over again—the Federal Government is intruding into fields where it has no competence, no authority, and no jurisdiction. We hear that the rights of our white citizens are being infringed upon, or eroded away, in order to give a privileged position to the Negro. I often feel that we get so wound up in our arguments and in our overblown rhetoric that we lose sight of the facts of everyday life.

To those who say that the use of Federal law and Federal law enforcement is not the proper way to solve the problem, I can only ask what is the right way? Of those who oppose this legislation, I can only ask what has our society accomplished in the direction of solving this problem of interracial injustice without the use of Federal law and Federal authority? Indeed, it seems only fair to me to ask of each individual who opposes the passage of this bill what his personal contribution has been towards the solution of the Negro problem in America.

In 1958 the Catholic bishops of America issued a joint statement in which they asked a rhetorical question: Can enforced segregation of the races be reconciled with the Christian conscience? Their reply: "In our judgment, it cannot." That same judgment has been echoed by the moral leaders of this country, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, to the point that I do not believe that anybody can really contest the issue any longer.

When we then attempt to apply this moral principle to the day to day existence of our society we find the evil of enforced segregation—legal or illegal—poisons every phase and facet of our community and national life. The critical term is the word "enforced." In the Old South, this enforcement had the respectable color of law, but those laws have been now struck down by the Supreme Court, and the South has been changing many of its patterns very rapidly.

In the North, however, it has long been illegal to segregate the races and yet this segregation has continued, and has been enforced by all sorts of extra-legal devices, by unwritten laws, by unspoken covenants, by custom, by arrangement, by unspoken policy decisions, by gentlemen's agreements made in school boards, real estate boards, the boards of directors of banks and savings and loan institutions, and other large and small companies.

Racial segregation and injustice in the North has been prevalent in every field of human activity; in jobs, in schooling, in housing, in social affairs, in every type of economic activity. To pretend that it has not, to protest that it is the result of natural forces, or the result of the inherent deficiencies of the individual Negro, is to deny the reality of one's own life and experience. These patterns of injustice, based upon the accident of race and color, have been enforced in such a way that the individual Negro, whatever his talents and abilities, found himself pitted against all of the forces of organized society, arrayed against him in a manner untouched by existing law.

Last summer, during the debate on the voting rights bill of 1965, our distinguished majority whip, the very wise and very brave gentlemen from Louisiana, Mr. HALE BOGGS, gave a very courageous, candid statement in the well of the House in which he said that the day had arrived when the people of the South could no longer attempt to delude themselves or deceive others about the manner in which they had systematically deprived their Negro fellow citizens of the right to participate in government through the ballot box. He called upon all Americans to recognize and acknowledge what they had been doing for decades and centuries, and to take the first steps toward rectifying that situation, and to take that step immediately by voting for the passage of the bill under discussion.

Precisely the same statement can and should be made today to the people of our Northern States: the day is at hand when we must face reality, when we must acknowledge the true state of our society, and when we must take the steps necessary to eliminate the very evident evils which afflict us.

We need to do this, not only because we want to help the Negroes to a full and free life, but because we want to assist our white fellow citizens to free their lives of the curse of racial bigotry and injustice which has cost—and will continue to cost—all who live in our society untold millions of dollars in economic waste, in unnecessary government expenditures at every level, and incalculable suffering for whites and Negroes alike.

We cannot temporize, or evade, or pretend. The evil exists, and we have at hand today, in the form of this legislation, a tool which will not by any means solve all of the problems, but which will mark at least a beginning toward this solution. If we turn away now from our clear responsibility, we simply are acting to permit this evil in our society to fester and to further poison every phase of our society. Sooner or later we, or better men who come after us, will have to deal straightforwardly with this problem. I submit that today is the time, the tools are at hand, the responsibility is ours and therefore—by keeping even this imperfect title IV in the bill, and by voting this legislaiton into law—let us begin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a minute to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT.]

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, on one particular I agree with the distinguished minority leader: We are reaching the climax in a historic debate which has been on a high plane and of high quality. It seems to me the vote we make here today is going to be, as much as any vote we have made during the last 19 months, a test of the ability of the 89th Congress to meet its responsibilities to the American people.

If we fail here, we will have failed in a major area of our responsibility. What we are going to be voting on in the next 5 minutes is the very heart of this bill. If we strike out title IV, the record of the 89th Congress in its 2d session in the field of human rights will be damned.

I urge the defeat of the Moore amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are not only considering civil rights legislation, but we are considering American rights legislation. More transcendent, we are considering moral rights legislation.

The elimination of this title from the bill would be inconsistent not only for civil rights legislation, but, on a higher plane, with legislation consistent with American rights, and the traditions of our country. And, greater still, there is the moral question that we should recognize, and we can do it by defeating the Moore amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I vigorously urge defeat of this amendment.

With title IV, we do not end, and we know that we are not ending, the ghettoes that exist in America. But with title IV the ghetto may find some end. With title IV we can break the last links in the chain of racial discrimination which exists today.

We can live up to the pledge and to the commitment which the Congress made in 1949 in its National Housing Act, when it made an even broader commitment by pledging the Nation to the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment, which would undoubtedly gut the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MOORE and Mr. RODINO.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 179, noes 198.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title IV and all amendments thereto conclude at 3:30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we agree to limit the debate to 3:30, is it the intention of the leadership to rise at that time?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield, after the reading of title V it is the intention of the Committee to rise.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, if we agree to limit debate on title IV and all amendments thereto to 3:30, then it will be the plan to read title V, but then rise, without any consideration of amendments thereto?

Mr. RODINO. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And there will be no business tomorrow, and we will take up the civil rights bill again on Monday?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished minority leader that the leadership will have to answer that question.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, we hope to go over from this evening until Monday, and in any event there will be no legislative business tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intention to continue the consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey will yield further, the gentleman from Michigan is correct. We shall continue with the consideration of this bill until we have finished it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I apprehend there will be a vote on this question. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know—and I believe the membership would like to have at least some idea—how many amendments are now pending. I do not believe we should cut off the time for debate until we know, or at least have an idea, how many amendments we have pending for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to reply to the gentleman from South Carolina that the Chair can tell the gentleman how many amendments there are pending at the desk. But the Chair cannot tell the gentleman how many amendments are in the pockets of the various Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that; how many are pending at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are four amendments pending at the desk.

Mr. ASHMORE. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have at least four here, or five over there, and perhaps more.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have three amendments which I believe are meritorious.

Mr. ASHMORE. And, Mr. Chairman, there are two more here, and three more there. There are some 10 or 12—12 or 15, it would appear, yet to be considered.

Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me we should not set a time limitation now when there are 12 to 15 pertinent amendments pending to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, because of the fact that every time we cut off debate we have had numerous people standing, and every Member of the Committee has only about a minute to speak, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] if he would agree to amend his request insofar as to allow each proponent of an amendment his 5 minutes during which to explain his amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, if there are no more than the 12 amendments that have been suggested, then I think that would be reasonable but I cannot possibly agree if there are going to be more amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I feel if there are no more than 12 amendments, certainly 2 hours from now is a reasonable time for debate.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I think that the House is not able to work its will when gentlemen and ladies are required to explain their amendments in a minute or two or even less than a minute. I think it is entirely reasonable to request that anyone who has a legitimate amendment be allowed 5 minutes within which to explain the amendment. How else can we vote on it if we do not know what is in it?

So, Mr. Chairman, I would again renew my request to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I have no method of determining the legitimacy of the amendments that will be presented.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I think we have to assume that any Member who is offering an amendment is offering a legitimate amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the action on title IV today that title V will be read? We will adjourn over the weekend and reconvene at noon on Monday and then all amendments to title V will then be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think the House should bear in mind on this unanimous-consent request that has been made here that we have a 17- or 18-page title. All the debate so far has been on a motion to strike it. There are a number of amendments that are very important, that need to be considered by the House and debated.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on the motion to strike has certainly shown that there is a lot of ambiguity in this title that should be straightened out. I certainly think that since we have the civil rights bill before us that the House should not be hurried unnecessarily in its action on it as did the Committee on the Judiciary in only considering this for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey this question. As I understand, if this agreement is reached, then title V would be subject to amendment as the first order of business on Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. RODINO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I have an antiriot and and an anti-Ku Klux Klan amendment that I want considered in that title. There has been considerable talk of riots and civil disturbance, and the extent to which the various provisions of the bill cope with this very important problem. I trust the gentleman is not going to try to cut off debate on that title before we have had a reasonable opportunity to consider my antiriot amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from New Jersey has attempted to cut off debate unreasonably. I think under the circumstances that we have tried to be as reasonable as possible. I dislike to appear to be disagreeable but I must insist upon my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions during the debate on the Moore amendment, parliamentary inquiries were addressed by members of the Committee on the Judiciary as to whether amendments would be in order after the Committee had acted upon the Moore amendment. We were assured on a number of occasions that would be done. Yesterday afternoon the distinguished majority leader made a unanimous-consent request, the last few words of which, in effect, said that we would vote within 30 minutes—or in other words after 30 minutes of debate today and then title IV would be open for amendment and debate.

Mr. Chairman, some of us have very serious amendments which ought to be considered in a serious way with adequate debate. While I do not like to suggest that my friend from New Jersey would be a party to it, I think that those of us who have held back in an effort to cooperate and to get to a vote on the Moore amendment are being taken advantage of by reason of our having been cooperative. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his unanimous-consent request.

I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to how the time would be divided. Would it be divided among those who are now standing, apparently seeking time, or would it be divided in the discretion of the Chair as to whom he wishes to recognize.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make a list, but primarily the time will be allotted to those, first, who have amendments and those who oppose amendments. The Chair will attempt to see to it that all who have amendments will be heard first.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. POOL. I object.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on title IV and all amendments thereto conclude at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POOL) there were—ayes 116, noes 82.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize those gentlemen who desire to offer amendments; first members of the committee. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk four amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to have them considered en bloc?

Mr. WHITENER. No.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 63, lines 13 through 19, strike out all of subsection 403(a)(3) and renumber the following subsections of section 403(a).

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the action by my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] has, in effect, precluded adequate deliberation on this title. I regret that in our desire to be cooperative we were unable to anticipate that the situation would develop where we would not be able to engage in the type of debate a serious matter of this kind merits.

As I have said earlier, since title IV was reached by the committee, we have on several occasions addressed inquiries as to whether there would be opportunity for the presentation and the debating of amendments to title IV in the event that the Moore amendment failed. We were led to believe that there would be. And yet, before we even commence considering these amendments, we are drastically limited in our opportunity to present them.

This amendment, which I now offer, is a serious amendment that I would believe should appeal to all of the Members of the House. It would merely strike section 403(a)(3), which is on page 63, lines 13 through 19. I am not alone in expressing the view that this provision is clearly in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. In testimony before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the representative of the American Civil Liberties Union had this to say:

> I think there is a free speech problem. We have in the past, as we did here in the District of Columbia when considering the Fair Housing ordinance here, opposed a prohibition on publication or advertisement, and it would seem to me that we would be opposed to a prohibition like this on free press grounds.

The question was asked:

> So you would be opposed to that subsection?

The answer was: "Yes."

In testimony before the same committee, by the Attorney General, which I will not read in detail, some hesitancy about this provision was also expressed.

Let us see what the language does. It would make it unlawful "to make, print, or cause to be made, printed, or published any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any preference, limitation, or discrimination."

In other words, if, as I understand it, I am in the real estate business, or selling a piece of property, and I say to a newspaper reporter that I am not going to sell this property to a member of the Chinese race, or to a member of the Methodist Church, then I have committed an unlawful act and he will have committed one too if he prints it in his paper.

The same thing would be true if an individual advertised.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Now that the provision against discrimination against those persons with children is in the title, would this also come under the purview of what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes. I believe that under the Casey amendment, if someone said to a newspaper reporter, "I am not going to rent my house to people with children; even though I have a 30-room house, I am not going to let anybody with children in it," that would be an unlawful act, and it would be unlawful to print it or publish it.

This might be a job printer, a newspaper man, or any other person running a mimeograph machine, such as in the office of my good friend from Virginia on Capitol Hill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, this section is very important if we want to get at the kind of discrimination real estate brokers have been imposing on the community and on the sellers.

There is no first amendment obstacle to section 403(a)(3) which forbids brokers and others in the housing business to "make, print, or publish any oral or written notice, statement, or advertisement" with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination. To be sure, such a ban would restrict the kind of "speech" which the broker may engage in. But since the speech is part and parcel of conduct which the Congress validly has decided to ban—discrimination by the broker on his own initiative—the speech also may be regulated. As the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, has said:

> It rarely has been suggested that the constitutional freedom for speech and press extends its immunity to speech or writing used as an integral part of conduct in violation of a valid . . . statute. We reject the contention now . . . it has never been deemed an abridgement of freedom of speech or press to make a course of conduct illegal merely because the conduct was in part . . . carried out by means of language, either spoken, written, or printed. (*Giboney* v. *Empire Storage & Ice Co.*, 336 U.S. 490, 498.)

There is no lack of precedent for this kind of prohibition. Thus, section 704 (b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it an unlawful employment practice for employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies to publish notices or advertising indicating any preference or other discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. So, too, the Federal Trade Commission Act prohibits false or misleading advertising, title 15, United States Code, sections 52 to 55, and the Securities Act of 1933 prohibits offers to sell or to buy securities through the use of a prospectus or otherwise unless the registration requirements of the act are complied with, title 15, United States Code, section 77e.

Further, the Attorney General of the United States was asked his opinion of Mr. Speiser's statement before the Senate. He was asked, "Do you see any free speech problems with that?" referring to this section. Mr. Katzenbach replied, "No, I do not see any free speech problems with that."

The adoption of this amendment would seriously cripple the efforts to stop discrimination. I urge its defeat.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. In the analysis by the Library of Congress impartial experts, they asked this question:

> That section speaks in terms of advertisements connoting "any preference, limitation, or discrimination." What exactly is contemplated by the quoted language? Not infrequently, notices for the sale of residential housing include reference to the property's proximity to a particular church and/or a parochial school. Does such a reference betray an intention to make a "preference, limitation, or discrimination" because of "religion"?

Mr. CORMAN. The test would be whether the purpose and intent and effect of the language used would be to encourage, induce, or solicit discrimination because of those factors.

Mr. WHITENER. And the property owner would find out the answer after somebody had taken him to court and he had spent $500 or $1,000?

Mr. CORMAN. The property owner is not involved here. It is the real estate broker.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. May I make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman?

I inquire whether, if I use all my 5 minutes on this amendment, I will be recognized in opposition to other amendments, in view of the limitation of time?

The CHAIRMAN. The limitation of time is 4 o'clock.

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The word that worries me in this particular section more than any other is the word "preference." That does not apply only on the basis of race but would apply also on the basis of religion. As I started to comment to my colleague from North Carolina, we have members of religious denominations in my State who have erected dwelling units around "camp meeting" grounds. These units are owner-occupied, occasionally rented and occasionally sold.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], who very carefully wrote into this law protection against this thing you are suggesting.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that paragraph (c), beginning at the bottom of page 64 and the first paragraph at the top of page 65 would authorize discrimination under the conditions mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I cannot agree, because that section deals with an institution. I am talking about a group of individuals who belong to the same denomination and associate together because they have the same religious views and desire to worship together.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to the gentleman, if it falls outside of the exclusion mentioned by the bill, and this is purely and simply an effort to discriminate against people because of the sale or rental of property prohibited here, then it would be prohibited under this section.

Mr. JONAS. May I make this comment? This goes far beyond discrimination and makes it unlawful to express a "preference" for members of the same religious denomination to become neighbors and associates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'CLORY

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MCCLORY: On page 69, starting at line 10, strike all the language down to and including line 13 on page 72.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate from title IV the provisions relative to establishment of a Fair Housing Board and all of the broad authority granted to this administrative agency for investigation and enforcement.

First of all, I might say that the revisions relative to a Fair Housing Board were not recommended by the administration and there were no hearings by the House Judiciary Committee with regard to these provisions. Actually, the authority granted to a Fair Housing Board duplicates substantially that which is granted to the Attorney General and to the courts with regard to enforcement of the fair housing standards and policies set forth in title IV.

The provisions for a Fair Housing Board were added as the final amendment by the full committee just at about the time the executive session was to adjourn, and I may say quite candidly that there was not even a full discussion or debate on the part of the full committee relative to this part of title IV.

I think there was a feeling on the part of some at the time this proposal was accepted by the full committee that the Fair Housing Board was a sort of human relations commission or community relations council that would undertake to conciliate and work out problems of discrimination in housing without either authority to compel attendance at hearings or to enforce its orders or recommendations. But that is not what the provisions establishing a Fair Housing Board accomplish.

What these provisions do accomplish is to create an entirely new Federal agency comparable to the National Labor Relations Board with a five-member board, including a chairman, to receive $25,000 per year and with authority to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees and make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the Board's functions. In addition, the Board is authorized to make such rules and regulations as shall be necessary to carry out its functions, including the conduct of hearings. The Board is also authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it might exercise and for them to conduct hearings.

The broad powers of the proposed Fair Housing Board should not be minimized, as the section itself specifies that for purposes of investigation the Secretary shall have and for purposes of hearings the Board shall have the same powers as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board. Now anyone who has had any knowledge of or experience with the National Labor Relations Board recognizes that these powers are broad and generally final and conclusive. Penalties for violation of its orders may result in fines and also imprisonment as in the case of a failure to pay a fine or for being in contempt of court.

Of course, there was no need to establish the procedure for adjudication of fair housing problems by the court if it was the intent to establish an administrative agency with plenary powers such as are granted to the Fair Housing Board. Even in the case of an appeal from the Fair Housing Board, the court would be required to base its appeal on the record made before the Fair Housing Board and not on the basis of a trial before the court as contemplated in sections 406 and 407 of the bill.

The court procedures which are provided in section 406 authorize a party to file a complaint and to be represented by an attorney. No such corresponding authority is afforded with regard to the Fair Housing Board provisions. Indeed, the Secretary may initiate a proceeding on his own behalf without the benefit of any complaining party.

The legal proceedings which are authorized in section 406 are required to be brought within a period of 6 months after the alleged discriminatory act complained of. But enforcement by the Fair Housing Board of any alleged discrimination could be brought at any time as the provisions of that section are drafted. Presumably a 6-month statute of limitations would apply also by reason of the reference to the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Chairman, in seeking the objectives of title IV it seems clear that we should do at the national level only what is required to be done. That, in essence, was the purpose of the earlier amendment which I offered to the Committee. Clearly the authorization for a Fair Housing Board duplicates the existing provisions for judicial determination. It also duplicates—indeed, supersedes—the authority of all State courts and administrative agencies concerned with assuring fair housing without discrimination due to race, color, religion, or national origin.

I urge the adoption of the amendment which I have offered for the striking of the provisions to create a Fair Housing Board in title IV of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge earnestly the adoption of this amendment which I have offered for the striking of the provision to create a Federal Housing Board in title IV of this legislation.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield, if he has any time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, with whom I serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, has made a number of statements about the Fair Housing Board, which for the benefit of all the Members present require some comment.

First of all Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert at this point in the Record a series of questions and answers which I have prepared regarding section 408.

Questions and Answers Concerning the Fair Housing Board Established by Section 408

(Prepared by Congressman John Conyers, Jr.)

Just what does section 408 provide?

It establishes an administrative process to handle complaints of housing discrimination, modeled after the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board in resolving labor disputes. The functions of investigating and conciliating complaints would be given to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development instead of being handled by the Board itself.

Why do we need such an administrative process?

Experience with comparable State and local agencies repeatedly has shown that the administrative process is quicker and fairer. It more quickly implements the rights of the person discriminated against and also quickly resolves frivolous and otherwise invalid complaints. Concilation is easier in an informal administrative procedure than in the formal judicial process. Also individual court suits would place a greater burden of expense, time and effort on not only the plaintiff but on all other parties involved, including the seller, broker and mortgage financier, and on the judicial system itself.

How would someone bring a complaint before the Fair Housing Board?

All complaints would have to be filed with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. He would investigate complaints, dismiss those without merit and attempt conciliation of valid complaints. Only after all attempts at conciliation had failed, would the Secretary file an official complaint with the Fair Housing Board.

Is there a time limit on filing complaints?

Yes. Six months. The bill provides a six-month limit for initiating court suits alleging housing discrimination. The same limit applies to complaints filed with the Secretary of HUD since the incorporated procedures of the NLRB include a six-month limitation.

Could someone gain double relief by both initiating a court suit and filing a complaint with the Secretary of HUD?

No. The courts can stay any court suit pending disposition of any case by the Federal administrative process which would be the normal and expected procedure. The courts could keep jurisdiction as protection against slowness on the part of either the Secretary or the Fair Housing Board. Delay might work against the interests of either the person alleging or accused of discrimination. Though the Board could provide injunctive relief, only the courts, with the required participation of a jury, could award monetary damages.

What provision is there for conciliation?

Following the practice of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, the Secretary of HUD would attempt to settle all cases through conciliation. The Secretary would attempt to resolve valid complaints both through his own representatives and, under section 409, with the cooperation of all the various private and local, State and Federal agencies involved in programs to prevent and eliminate discriminatory housing practices.

Will most cases be resolved without recourse to the Fair Housing Board?

More than 90% of all complaints filed with the NLRB annually are either dismissed, withdrawn or resolved through conciliation. Only 6.2% of all NLRB cases ever go to the Board. Experience with State agencies comparable to the Federal Fair Housing Board is quite similar.

How would the Board handle complaints and what are its powers?

After a hearing in which the rights of all parties would be protected by the usual procedures of a quasi-judicial agency, the Board can issue cease and desist orders which are reviewed and enforced by the Federal Circuit Courts of Appeal. Following the practice of the National Labor Relations Board, monetary damages would not be awarded by the Fair Housing Board.

What precedents are there for such an administrative process?

Sixteen out of the seventeen States with fair housing laws relating to private housing have administrative agencies with comparable powers. The Equal Employment Act of 1966 gives the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission the same authority and procedures regarding job discrimination that this section provides the Fair Housing Board regarding housing discrimination. Just three months ago the House of Representatives passed that bill by the overwhelming vote of 299 to 94, with wide bipartisan support.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [The Chair counting.]

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, before yielding I would like to reply to some of the statements which the gentleman from Illinois has already made.

Mr. Chairman, first of all this Fair Housing Board provision was extensively considered during the public hearings held on this bill. The hearings were held before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee. Though I am not a member of that subcommittee, I was privileged to attend some of those hearings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the fact that the administration wanted——

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I have searched the records and I have not been able to find any hearings on that subject.

Mr. CONYERS. I did not say that there were hearings held on just this particular proposal. What I said was that this proposal, incorporated in exactly the language I offered as an amendment during the executive session of the Judiciary Committee, was supported and discussed by a great many of the witnesses who testified before Subcommittee No. 5. At this point I would like to insert in the Record a list of the more than 35 groups which specifically supported inclusion of a fair housing board provision in title IV in their testimony before Subcommittee No. 5:

Groups Specifically Supporting Inclusion of Fair Housing Board Provision in Title IV of 1966 Civil Rights Bill in Their Testimony Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee

(Hearings held on May 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 1966)

I. U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

II. CATHOLIC GROUPS

The National Catholic Welfare Conference (including): The Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Catholic Men, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Catholic Youth, the National Federation of Catholic College Students, the National Newman Apostolate, the National CYO Federation.

The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.

The National Catholic Social Action Conference.

The Catholic Interracial Council of Waterbury.

The Christian Family Movement.

III. PROTESTANT GROUPS

The National Council of Churches representing 30 major religious bodies.

Coordinating Committee on Moral and Civil Rights of the International Convention of Christian Churches.

National Student Christian Federation.

Protestant Episcopal Church Division of Christian Citizenship.

United Church of Christ, Committee for Racial Justice Now.

United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action.

Young Women's Christian Association.

General Board of Christian Social Concern of the Methodist Church.

IV. JEWISH GROUPS

The Synagogue Council of America representing the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the United Synagogue of America.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

B'nai B'rith Women.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

V. LABOR GROUPS

AFL–CIO.

Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO.

United Auto Workers.

VI. CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS

Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

NAACP.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Neighbors, Inc.

VII. OTHER GROUPS

American Newspaper Guild.

American Veterans' Committee.

Japanese-American Citizen's League.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American Civil Liberties Union.

Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there were no hearings held on this subject.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat again that this proposal was extensively considered during the Judiciary Committee's hearings and discussions of the entire 1966 civil rights bill. But certainly there were no hearings held on just this proposal alone.

I believe that the gentleman from Illinois should know that the Attorney General of the United States has spoken publicly about this Fair Housing Board provision. Attorney General Katzenbach testified before the Senate Judiciary subcommittee during hearings specifically devoted to the changes in the 1966 civil rights bill approved by the House Judiciary Committee. He specifically indicated the administration's support for the Fair Housing Board.

At this point I would like to insert in the Record the colloquy between Senator Ervin and Attorney General Katzenbach regarding the Fair Housing Board.

Colloquy Before Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Regarding Fair Housing Board

Senator Ervin. Does the administration favor part of the amendment that establishes a Federal so-called Fair Housing Commission?

Mr. Katzenbach. Yes, I think it is a useful amendment, particularly since part of the other act was changed.

I think we should understand clearly exactly what section 408, providing for the Fair Housing Board, would do for the administration of complaints that might arise under title IV, the fair housing section.

Mr. Chairman, all we are doing is following a very well established pattern in this House. Indeed, I might refer to a bill this House passed just 3 months ago, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1966, which gained the widest margin of approval, 299 to 94, that this House has given to any civil rights bill. That bill, H.R. 10065, known as the Hawkins bill, gives the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the very same authority and procedures regarding job discrimination that section 408 would give the Fair Housing Board regarding housing discrimination.

You might recall that in the Hawkins bill we gave the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which was established by title VII of the 1964 civil rights bill, the authority to issue cease-and-desist orders, enforceable by the Federal Circuit Courts of Appeals, regarding job discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or national origin. That is exactly what we are trying to do regarding housing discrimination by establishing this Federal Fair Housing Board. In addition the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, with whom all complaints of housing discrimination would be filed, would first attempt to settle all housing discrimination cases by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Only after all attempts at conciliation had failed would he file a formal complaint with the Fair Housing Board.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have inserted at this point some of the correspondence I have received in support of the establishment of a Fair Housing Board such as that in my amendment. These individuals and groups concur with me in the belief that the best way to deal with complaints of housing discrimination is to provide administrative relief rather than to rely on the slow and burdensome process of litigation.

Unitarian Universalist Association of Churches and Fellowships in North America,
Boston, Mass., June 24, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conyers: The Unitarian Universalist Association of Churches and Fellowships is deeply concerned over the prospects for the fair housing title in the Civil Rights Act of 1966, currently under consideration in the House Committee on the Judiciary.

We wish to urge upon you the necessity for supporting the strongest possible housing title in terms of breadth of coverage and in enforcement procedures.

We are disturbed by reports that efforts will be made to exempt one-family and two-family homes from coverage of the Act. This would constitute a severe blow to the aspirations of those Negro families who are seeking better living conditions, better schools, and more wholesome environments for their children outside the slum ghettoes in which they are now forced to live. Arguments of the real estate interests that open-occupancy housing legislation is "forced" housing are patently absurd. The forced housing comes when Negroes and other minority groups are *forced* to live in segregated neighborhoods in the decaying core of our cities, as you well know!

As a member of the influential House Judiciary Committee your vote is important to save the housing title of this bill from emasculation. We therefore urge you to resist all weakening amendments and to support an amendment which would strengthen enforcement by providing an administrative remedy to avoid long, expensive court proceedings, as many of the states have so provided.

Sincerely,
Robert Edwards Jones,
Director, Washington Office.

P.S.—Many thanks for your strong efforts in this regard.

The Methodist Church,
June 16, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: Today the Detroit Annual Conference of the Methodist Church passed the following resolution:

"We the delegates at the Detroit Annual Conference, coming from over 500 Methodist Churches in Michigan, urge you to support the civil rights legislation as found in SB 3296 and HR 14765. This would assist in protecting citizens right to trial by jury of their peers, their right to vote, attend any public school, use governmental facilities, have free access to the right to own or rent property, and several other matters without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status.

"We would urge you to strengthen the provision regarding the right to rent or own property to provide for the initiation of administrative enforcement by a federal agency."

Sincerely,
Harold A. Nessel,
Conference Secretary.

COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN YWCAs,
Detroit, Mich., June 16, 1966.
Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: The Council of Michigan YWCAs wishes to express to you its support of H.R. 14765, the new Civil Rights bill, now before the Congress. We urge you to act favorably on this essential legislation during the present session. We believe all of the following features should be included in the Act:

1. The prevention of discrimination in the selection of state and federal juries.
2. The means for facilitating the desegregation of public school and other facilities.
3. The protections for Negroes and civil rights workers against violence when exercising their constitutional rights.
4. The prohibition of all racial and religious discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. This provision we consider of special importance at the present time.

The Council of Michigan YWCAs also urges you to consider the recommendations of the White House Conference, which is urging a strengthening of H.R. 14765 in a number of ways. Experience has shown that successful administration of civil rights legislation requires strong administrative agencies, as suggested by the Conference.

Very truly yours,
FRANCES E. COBURN,
Chairman, State Public Affairs Committee, Council of Michigan YWCAs.
ELOISE E. SPENCER,
Executive Secretary, Council of Michigan YWCAs.

TRANSPORT WORKERS
UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., July 21, 1966.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, representing 150,000 workers in subways, buses, airlines, railroads, utilities and in the missile space industry, strongly urge the immediate passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 (H.R. 14765) without weakening amendments.

We urge the creation of a Fair Housing Board to enforce prohibitions against housing discrimination, more potent federal jury reform including an "automatic trigger" and the tightening of the rights protection clause preventing harassment arrests of civil rights workers. We also call on you to toughen the penalties against bigots who deny Americans their constitutional rights.

Respectfully,
MATTHEW GUINAN,
International President.
DOUGLAS L. MACMAHON,
International Secretary Treasurer.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 21, 1966.
Hon. JOHN L. CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: The Civil Rights Bill currently before your Committee is legislation devised to respond to pressing problems in the movement to overcome racial discrimination. The titles covering the selection of jury members, protection of civil rights workers and more effective enforcement of the public education and public facilities sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the Attorney General are most necessary. The recent shooting of James Meredith certainly dramatizes the need for such federal protection.

I wish, however, to particularly emphasize the fair housing section. The elimination of the ghetto is at the heart of any sensible attempt to alleviate the growing pressures in our urban complexes. Residential segregation provides the rationalization for all forms of subsequent Defacto Segregation in schools, playgrounds, health facilities and other aspects of communal living. Even the possibility of obtaining better job opportunities is seriously curtailed by these residential patterns whereby plants and service facilities are located in one section of a large metropolitan area and minority groups in another without adequate means of public transportation.

As a Union we have always supported the enactment of state and local Fair Housing Ordinances. We are now urging the enactment of a national public policy on the matter. Prejudice in housing is a national problem which our large northern urban and suburban areas must face. The ghetto itself proves to be the boiling pot of civil unrest and violence for the people trapped in its environs and, at the same time, an impenetrable wall due to housing discrimination against escape and individual improvement. Urban redevelopment will be meaningless unless there is freedom of choice in housing.

I, furthermore, suggest the strengthening of legislation in the following manner:

1. A more automatic trigger for the application of Federal standards to jury selection.
2. An administrative agency to enforce the fair housing section.
3. Indemnification of citizens who have been injured in the exercise of their civil rights.
4. Extend Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to cover state and local government employment.

In terms of legislative activity for this Congress time is running out. I, therefore, suggest fast action by your Committee.

Sincerely,
I. W. ABEL,
President.

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
July 14, 1966.
Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed please find a copy of Councilman Thomas Bradley's Report to the People on the Housing Title of the proposed 1966 Civil Rights Act.

This column has been published locally and has been distributed to local civil rights organizations and individuals who have indicated interest in such matters.

We are concerned at the relative lack of national activity on behalf of passage of the Housing Title and have been trying to think of some device for spurring interest and action. Hence this letter and enclosure to you.

Warmest regards.
Sincerely yours,
THOMAS BRADLEY,
Councilman, Tenth District.
By: MAURICE WEINER,
Field Deputy.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE—LXI

(By Councilman Thomas Bradley)

On Friday, June 24, I urged the President of the United States to use the full weight of his office and influence to assure the passage of Title IV of his proposed 1966 Civil Rights Act. Title IV would try to achieve non-discrimination in housing.

Following is the text of the letter I sent to President Lyndon Johnson. Copies have gone to Los Angeles area Congressmen and both U.S. Senators from California THOMAS KUCHEL and GEORGE MURPHY.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Residents and organizations in the Los Angeles community share my deep concern that the House Judiciary sub-committee recently failed to recommend Title IV of your proposed Civil Rights legislation for 1966. Since Title IV represents a significant and substantive portion of your proposal, we know that any prospective failure to enact this Title would cause you great concern also.

"We therefore urge that you use all the facilities and influence at your command to assure that nothing short of Title IV, as included in H.R. 14765, introduced by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, is passed by this Congress.

"Rather than removing or weakening the non-discrimination in housing sections, there is need to supplement and strengthen them. The White House Conference, 'To Fulfill These Rights,' which you called early in June, endorsed the broad outlines of your legislative proposals, but urged strengthening of its enforcement provisions. It is, of course, important that the Federal government establish policies to prevent racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, and in financing housing purchases, sales, construction, improvement and repair. Your proposed legislation goes a long way towards establishing these policies.

"However, it is equally vital that the various Federal agencies have adequate and sufficient authority and facilities to implement desired policies. I share the White House Conference views that remedies for housing discrimination should include civil litigation, administrative actions, cease and desist orders and, if necessary, termination of assistance from the Federal government. And as stated in the recommendations of the Conference, 'Those parts of the housing industry benefiting from government mortgage insurance and guarantees should be required to demonstrate that they are merchandising and otherwise encouraging the rental and sale of housing to all without regard to race.'

"Mr. President, segregation in housing is a root cause of many of the evils which beset our society. It results in a terrible isolation of human beings from each other, thus depriving us of valuable insights and experiences, and breeding debilitating ghettos of fear and hostility. It is largely responsible for the recent Office of Education statistics indicating little real progress in school integration. It helps to explain the continued proportionate increase in the Negro unemployment rate, both by sterile association and a deprivation of means and goals which is the consequence of isolated living.

"I therefore cannot urge too strongly that every effort be directed towards passage of a meaningful non-discrimination housing bill and effective enforcement provision. I have asked my friends to urge their Congressional representatives to vigorously support this measure.

"Thank you for your help in this urgent struggle to achieve human dignity for all—now.

"Sincerely yours,
"THOMAS BRADLEY,
"City Councilman, Los Angeles."

I urge each of you to likewise write your Congressman or Senator and the President, expressing your viewpoint. This is part of the democratic tradition of citizen participation. By your letters, and even telephone calls to Congressional offices in the area, you will let your elected representatives know how vital is this issue to you and the entire community.

That this matter is one of the highest urgency is indicated by the failure of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to recommend the key housing portion of the bill. Let us act vigorously now.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that we have provided for machinery to apply to the courts to rectify any alleged discrimination. Therefore, there is not the need for a Fair Housing Board such as there is with regard to the Fair Employment Practices Act or as to the National Labor Relations Board Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that under the existing provisions of title IV we might be burdening not only the complainant but the person who is being complained against, the party who may be accused of discriminatory practices, with inordinate and unjustified delay. The property might be tied up for a much longer period by going into court than it would if we have this board. I would again point out that before any board hearing is established, there is an investigation conducted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to determine whether there is validity or merit in the complaint. Up until that time the person complained against or the agency or perhaps the broker would not be subjected to any penalties or difficulties whatsoever. The investigations by the Secretary would eliminate a great many of the complaints in expeditious fashion because he would be able, on his own authority, to dismiss all invalid complaints. Through this the procedure established in section 408 frivolous complaints of housing discrimination would not result in any unjustified burden on property owners, real estate brokers, or mortgage financiers. But in addition it would provide expeditious relief for those who are actually being discriminated against. I would like you to discuss a point that has not been made clear so far.

Section 408 very specifically and carefully separates the judicial function of enforcement, exercised by the Board, from the investigatory functions exercised by the Secretary.

Under the same implicit powers exercised by the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in conciliating labor disputes, and exercised by every other investigatory agency, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would investigate and conciliate housing discrimination cases. I would particularly point out that those statements made by any party during the Secretary's attempts at conciliation could not be used in any hearing before the Fair Housing Board. That is only one of many reasons why we separate investigation and conciliation from the more judicial function of holding hearings and providing injunctive-type relief.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, might I say that the gentleman from Michigan has effectively answered the gentleman from Illinois. He has cited the reasons for the establishment of this administrative procedure and has explained just what section 408 provides.

Mr. Chairman, this section establishes an administrative process to handle complaints on housing discrimination. It is modeled after the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board in resolving labor disputes.

There are precedents for this kind of action, Mr. Chairman. The precedents are that 16 out of 17 States which have fair housing laws relating to private housing have administrative agencies with comparable powers. This is nothing new. This is something that has been considered by the committee. It is an effective way to deal with complaints of this sort. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Judiciary Committee whether under section 408(f)(1) it is intended that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, after an investigation, shall file a complaint with the Fair Housing Board if there are reasonable grounds to believe a violation has occurred?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, and only then. I might add that no one can file a complaint with the Fair Housing Board, I might say to the gentleman from New York, but the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, am I correct then in assuming that the Secretary is not required to perform a quasi-judicial function?

Mr. CONYERS. That is correct. He has no judicial powers, quasi or otherwise. The judicial function of holding hearings and issuing orders is strictly reserved to the Board.

Mr. RYAN. Purely investigatory.

Mr. CONYERS. That is true; in addition, there is a 6-month statute of limitations on any complaints filed with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, the Secretary is not a judicial body but the Board would be a judicial body, and more than just a quasi-judicial body, because the determination they would make would constitute the record in the case you would appeal from that, and the appeal would be on the record that they make.

With regard to those States which have administrative agencies, they also have a court proceeding. Here we have a duplicate matter of enforcement. It seems to me one or the other ought to be removed. I think the Fair Housing Board should be removed since we have given validity to the court procedures in sections 406 and 407. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I should like to clarify what our distinguished colleague from Illinois has pointed out. The Board cannot enforce any of its orders without first going to the circuit courts of appeals, as is customary with the orders of almost all quasi-judicial independent agencies. The Board in and of itself would be powerless to enforce any of the orders that it might issue.

Mr. HICKS. I wish to make this one point. I have had at the desk since yesterday such an amendment as the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee, has offered. To me the bad part of this particular bill is not necessarily the Housing Board, but the authority that is being given to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. It seems to me, as was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina, that we are making one more administrative agency which will burgeon as did the NLRB. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, true, would have an investigatory duty only under such rules and regulations as he shall establish, and under these rules and regulations, as stated in (i)—

> The Secretary may delegate any power or duty herein granted or imposed to a duly designated representative.

He will delegate it. He will set up a department or a branch in his office. The people manning this new department will be very diligent. They will go out and not only tell the real estate people how to run their business, but they will also tell the banking people how to run their business. You are going to have notices posted around, "We aren't going to be unfair any more," just as the NLRB does, and that is really the bad portion of this bill, regardless of the very great motives that I am sure the gentleman from Michigan has in offering this portion of the bill.

In the city of Tacoma, where the real estate board has developed a standard of practice, which I included in the RECORD the other day, that is outstanding, that would do as much as if the MacGregor amendment had been adopted, they feel very strongly about this matter. I can do no more than concur with them that there is every possibility of harassment if this Fair Housing Board section is continued in the bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am very glad that the statement has been made by our colleague, because it helps to clarify maybe a misunderstanding on the floor here. I refer to paragraph (h) on page 71 of the bill, and I quote it:

> Except as provided in subsections (f) and (g) of this section, the Board shall conduct hearings and shall issue and enforce—

I repeat, "shall issue and enforce"—

> orders in the same manner and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations and appellate procedures as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under section 160 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), and (j) of title 29, United States Code.

I think that we are granting powers here by this provision of the bill as to which many of us are not fully informed. I join with the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is that I am in support of the gentleman's amendment. There has been misunderstanding about this title of this section of the bill as it existed since it was first mentioned in the committee. For example, my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] said it was considered by the committee. I want this Committee to understand that the Judiciary Committee probably gave 2 minutes to its consideration on this matter. It was not even read.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that under the procedure provided under this section, there would be an opportunity for conciliation procedures to be carried out by the Secretary of the Department?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is my understanding.

I will yield to the author to answer it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say that this was considered in the committee. As a matter of fact, the distinguished gentleman on the other side, who raised the question, questioned us during our consideration of this Fair Housing Board.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development wrote to me, I would like to say, concerning his deep interest in the conciliation procedure that is inherent in all investigatory agencies and boards, as follows:

> It would be my firm policy, in my enforcement activities under that authority, to use conciliation to the fullest extent possible. I would not contemplate filing a complaint against any person alleged to be in violation of Title IV unless unsuccessful efforts had first been made to obtain a satisfactory solution through discussion and conciliation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like to insert the full text of Secretary Weaver's letter concerning section 408.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.
Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: I wish to emphasize one very important matter in connection with the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the proposed Fair Housing Board provisions of Title IV of the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966.

It would be my firm policy, in my enforcement activities under that authority, to use conciliation to the fullest extent possible. I would not contemplate filing a complaint against any person alleged to be in violation of Title IV unless unsuccessful efforts had first been made to obtain a satisfactory solution through discussion and conciliation.

This would be consistent with all actions we have heretofore taken in similar enforcement activities and would, I am sure, be consistent with the general policy of the Administration.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. WEAVER.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had a chance to get started yet.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The authority given by section 408 to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Fair Housing Board is essential to the enforcement of title IV.

Many of us supported the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] to reduce the coverage of the bill in order to make it acceptable to the majority of the Members of the House. We hope that the House will not now make unenforceable the antidiscrimination principles in the area in which the bill still applies.

When the administration sent its bill to Congress, it relied for enforcement primarily upon suits by individuals. Under the original administration bill, an individual who has been the subject of discrimination could recover damages for humiliation, pain, and suffering and up to $500 punitive damages. His attorney could obtain reasonable attorney's fees from the discriminator. All this is now removed from the bill and all that is left is the right of the man discriminated against to recover actual damages—if he can afford a lawyer to bring the suit at all.

So title IV as it is written today, relies on the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Fair Housing Board for its enforcement. The Secretary will investigate—and conciliate while he is investigating—and the Board will act in cases presented to it by the Secretary. This method of administrative enforcement has been used by most of the States and municipalities that have fair housing ordinances. This administrative procedure is necessary if title IV is to be enforced. I cannot believe that anyone wants to set up a rule against discrimination and then not provide adequate enforcement.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Michigan with regard to this section.

In the gentleman's opinion, would most of the cases be resolved without recourse to the Fair Housing Board?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I should like to answer that question based not just on personal experience but based on the official report of the National Labor Relations Board for fiscal year 1965, the latest available report.

I was surprised to find out that more than 90 percent of the cases filed with the NLRB were resolved either through dismissal, conciliation, or withdrawal of the complaint.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Did the gentleman also find in his investigation of the NLRB that something approximating 6 percent of the cases actually did go to the Board for disposition?

Mr. CONYERS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have listened to the debate on this important amendment, offered by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY].

Frankly, I am utterly and completely appalled that the House this afternoon, with this kind of attendance on the floor, would accept—by voting down this amendment, which undoubtedly will be done—a provision such as this, which was adopted literally at the last moment by the committee without any hearings whatsoever.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in the record before this House today as to what is involved in setting up a monstrosity of this kind.

It is said that 23 million housing units will be covered by this legislation, even in its "watered down" form, and that there will be literally millions of transactions every year. We do not have any idea how many functionaries are going to be required to administer this section of the law.

So far as the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan is concerned, that this Fair Housing Board is going to be without power, apparently he has not read the language of his own section, the section which he offered as an amendment to this bill, because as I read it the very clear language of that section says that that Board will have the power to issue cease and desist orders and it will have the power to enforce these orders against private citizens in this country.

Frankly, it is shocking that the record of this House on this point has been so poorly made as it has been this afternoon.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to reject completely the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey, who stated that there was no opportunity to receive damages under this legislation as presently before the House.

Not only can there be relief under the Fair Housing Board, whatever that might amount to, including specific performance, but also, as we read section 406(c), we see that the Federal court in the other available proceedings, in duplicating proceeding, can award actual damages to the plaintiff and enter such other orders including the actual damages.

What we are doing here is setting up a duplicate enforcement authority. The person can go into court to get relief of a kind, and he can go before the Board and get some other kind of relief.

There is not one word in this section which says anything about conciliation. If they are to have any conciliation or adjustment, that will be dependent upon rules and regulations which this Board may or may not make.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, to carry forward the point the gentleman from Illinois just made, there is a specific section of the bill, starting at line 14, page 72, which says just exactly what assistance by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall offer, but when we read the language of that section, we do not find one word about conciliation. The intent of this section is very clear; it is to bring the violators of the language of this section before a so-called Fair Housing Board for the issuance of cease-and-desist orders. That is not my idea of conciliation.

This is a provision which I believe a lot of people in this country are going to find shocking. They are not going to like it when they find that this kind of language has been written into this bill.

I urge support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I strongly support the inclusion in this bill of the Fair Housing Board as proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers]. I want to commend him for his leadership on this important proposal.

The history of fair housing laws in virtually all of the States makes it clear that the laws have no effect if they are not supported by an enforcement agency.

In New York, for example, the State commission for human rights acts as the Fair Housing Board would under this title. I would be the last to argue that the fair housing law has completely ended discrimination in New York, but I can state emphatically that what effect it has had has been due to the work of the administrative agency.

I am convinced that the Fair Housing Board is vital to the success of title IV. In my testimony before the Judiciary Committee on May 10, 1966, I urged that such a board be created under this title. In the 87th and 88th Congress the legislation which I introduced to prohibit discrimination in housing would have used the Civil Rights Commission as an enforcement agency.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and to support the creation of a Fair Housing Board, which would serve as a strong force in the Government's effort to eliminate discrimination in housing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

I would like to comment about the extent of the Judiciary Committee's consideration of this section that has been alluded to by many of those supporting the motion to strike the Fair Housing Board, the only provision for enforcement without going into court that exists in title IV. It just so happens that I happen to be the freshman member on the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not customary in this committee that junior members introduce amendments before other members of the committee. This amendment came up in the closing hours of the discussion, because I brought it up after the other members had offered their amendments to title IV.

I think that there should be some comment made here about the parallel forms of relief that are available in court and before the Commission. I think that all of the attorneys involved in working on the language of this bill, and certainly those on the Committee on the Judiciary, took this into very full consideration, Mr. Chairman, when we made it perfectly clear that there would be a staying order issued. This is standard and customary procedure in any court. When an agency or a board has jurisdiction of a matter, the court would stay any action or hearing on the case until it had been disposed of by the Board or the Secretary. I do not think that is subject to a lot of debate.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? Because that is not just plain fact. It is up to the full discretion of the court.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this amendment, but I take this time because it points up the need for the concern in the motives and the long-range program that we are faced with in title IV of this bill. In the 10 years I have been a Member of this Congress I have not experienced any bill or any provision in any bill with more ambiguities or a greater inability to get any factual information on the enforcement and administrative provisions of this one.

Mr. Chairman, I would like any member of this committee to answer a question or two for me at this point so that I might determine their motives and how this particular amendment would apply at some time in the future. I direct these questions to any member of this committee that reported this bill.

First, as I understand it, title IV as it was originally introduced covered individual real estate sales which subsequently was removed by the amended title IV before the bill was brought to the Committee on Rules. Is that correct?

Mr. CONYERS. I think that is correct.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Title IV as recommended by the administration and as introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. Celler], was not considered by the subcommittee. It was forwarded by the subcommittee to the full committee without any recommendation. So that title IV came to the full committee in the form in which it was originally introduced without recommendation or consideration by the subcommittee.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman. Now may I ask—and I presume this action was taken because in the judgment of the committee it was an improvement over the original bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be delighted to yield if you will answer my question.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. If you will take the bill, H.R. 14765, and turn to page 25 and follow down to page 36, you will find the original title IV that was introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and which was reported in that form by the subcommittee without recommendation to the full committee. Then if you will turn to page 61 under title IV——

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I can see where I am not going to get an answer here, and you will use up all my time. May I simplify my question by asking this: Was title IV as it was brought to the floor of this House an improvement, in the opinion of anybody on either side?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLIER. It was an improvement?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Everybody agrees to that.

Mr. COLLIER. Fine. Then, that leads to my next question. If it was an improvement, am I then to believe that in the next session of this Congress, if a new title IV is brought to the floor which will cover every individual real estate transaction, that the gentleman will oppose it?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. COLLIER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, this part of title IV did not in my opinion have the approval of all members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, in accordance with long-accepted practice, bills are sometimes reported to the House with parts thereof opposed by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that is the case with respect to the amendment in question. It came at the last moment in consideration of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory], that little or no debate in the full committee of the House Committee on the Judiciary was had, and, finally, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me further, this part of the title was not a part of the original administration bill.

Mr. COLLIER. It was not?

Therefore am I to assume that the committee tried to get an amendment to this bill as reported to this House, which was an improvement over the administration bill?

Mr. Chairman, if the bill as amended is an improvement, as stated is an improvement I would like to place in the Record the fact that if a bill is introduced in the next session of Congress which reverts to coverage of individual real estate sales those who support it in the face of saying title IV of the 1966 act is an improvement over the original H.R. 14765, they will be ridiculously inconsistent. And that may be the understatement of the year.

The general public is not as naive as this Congress may think. In fact, I feel sure that many of my colleagues will find this to be an accurate statement before the inevitable passage of this bill.

On the other hand, perhaps I am giving many of my distinguished fellow Members of this House every benefit of doubt. Or maybe it is they who are naive. I make these prefacing remarks because I have witnessed quite a display of legislative maneuvering on certain amendments offered to this bill and, particularly, the one which was adopted by a slim margin of 190 to 189 Wednesday. The amendment further weakened title IV of the bill, which had already undergone surgery at the last minute in committee, in order to make it politically palatable. Yet, I cannot believe that there are very many Members of this House, particularly those who have been in the Congress for several years such as I, who are not entirely aware of the fact that the forced housing provision of this bill is merely a forerunner to leglislation that will be brought before us in the next session of Congress.

For just as sure as we indulged in legislative calisthenics for political consumption back home, we are going to have another bill in the next session of Congress which will nullify title IV in any amended form to provide for coverage of every real estate transaction, whether by an individual or his agent and regardless of what instructions may be provided under this very temporary provision.

Refute if you like this conclusion, but the history of civil rights legislation in this Congress defies such refutation. I cite the changes that have been made in the basic Civil Rights Act of 1964, which I supported, and which came about before the ink was even dry on the original document, to use an expression. Specifically, we included in the 1964 Civil Rights Act a fair employment practice provision, which law everyone extolled as the answer to discriminatory hiring practices. It went into effect July 1 of 1965, yet before we had even 10 months' experience with the law, this Congress completely revised it to bring its application down to cover places of business with only eight employees and changed completely the basic procedure of determining guilt under the law.

How can a law be regarded as a good and necessary piece of legislation one year, yet totally inadequate less than 10 months after its effective date? It just does not make sense. The fact of the matter is that the authors of this legislation and its ardent proponents are merely employing cagey tactics, knowing full well that they can draw into their fold a number of their colleagues with their camel's nose under the tent approach. There is no doubt that they realize also that they soften the blow by establishing a legislative precedent which appears to be reasonably inoffensive to start. It is sort of a one-two punch attack, with the second one often landing in the solar plexus.

Not that my words will do any more than fall upon deaf ears at this point of predetermination in this debate, but I do want the record to show that this legislation and all of the legislative calisthenics in which we have been engaged thus far will culminate in the ultimate adoption of title IV as originally presented in this bill, which has not only raised very serious constitutional questions, but which would have been so politically unpalatable to Members of this body this year that it could not have passed.

There is another aspect of this very serious problem of civil rights upon which I feel disposed to comment for I cannot believe that any Member of this body can be unaware of it. It is a sad fact that emotionalism, which surrounds any issue involving civil rights, makes it virtually impossible to deal with on a strictly constitutional, rather than racial, basis. Perhaps the best example of the situation to which I am presently addressing my remarks lies in the statement on this floor yesterday by one of my respected colleagues from New York and a member of my own political party who said, "But I want to reduce this entire question to one common denominator: When we get to the end of the debate on title IV the question should and will be, Are you for or against discrimination?"

Responding to this conclusion, I am reminded of the words of the great contemporary statesman, Bernard Baruch, who said:

> Every man has the right to his opinion, but no man has the right to be wrong in his facts.

Certainly, if the question involved in title IV of this bill, no matter how it may be camouflaged in amendments and exalted verbiage, were as simple as that, one would hardly need the hours of debate and legal expertise that has gone into the writing of this bill. Unfortunately, the idea of slapping an unfair label upon those who do not believe in discrimination, but are willing to pursue the courage of their convictions on any other basic aspect of the law is a rather sad commentary these days.

If ever there was a time when tolerance must be extended beyond the political aspects of any issue, it is today. I do not believe that the words "civil rights" are so sacred in the light that they are projected today that we should attempt to achieve by legislation civil rights which invade the fundamental civil rights of someone else. In my own case, I have supported many civil rights measures, both in the form of completed bills and amendments in the 10 years I have been a Member of Congress, but I shall continue to reserve the right to exercise my own judgment on each and every bill of this nature as long as I am a Member of Congress.

I would again be remiss if I did not point out that merely disagreeing with the prejudice of others—and indeed I do, does not give me the right to impose through legislation my personal moral attitudes upon my fellow man. Instead, though I may personally disagree with him, I feel that I must evaluate my judgment on many fundamental and legal concepts which certainly embrace the traditional rights of private property and private ownership.

Recently a prominent judge in rendering an opinion with regard to the constitutionality of forced housing in my home State of Illinois said:

> The whole effect of such a law would be to divest title or leasehold interest in one person and transfer it to another. Thus the ultimate goal of such action is to enable a private individual to acquire property of another without the consent of and contrary to the wishes of the owner of the property.

Again I repeat that it is not a question of whether I feel that the owner of any property is exercising prejudice or intolerance in the rights that go with his private ownership. It is, instead, a fundamental constitutional question.

In conclusion, I laud my colleague from West Virginia, Representative Arch M. Moore, distinguished member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for his summary of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, and I recommend its reading to everyone understandably concerned with and interested in this difficult and pressing issue. It will indeed be interesting to reread his comments 4, 5, or 10 years from now. I believe that his evaluation and conclusions will be established as the most accurate appraisal of this problem when the full chapter of civil rights legislation is written into history.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I see on page 71, line 4, that this board shall have the same powers and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as provided for in the National Labor Relations Board, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, if this Board is going to have any powers like the NLRB, and if it going to have a record like that Board has, then I say that this proposal ought to be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey who spoke earlier in support of this amendment has requested the sum of $50,000 from the House Committee on Administration this year for the purpose of investigating the NLRB.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall yield to the gentleman from New Jersey when I have finished my statement.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois used my name.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is true that I made that request, and that the Committee on House Administration has not yet given to me the money for the purpose of this investigation.

But I might point out, however, that I have investigated very thoroughly the recent activities and operations of the NLRB, and in my opinion they are to be commended.

Mr. PUCINSKI. All right; that is the gentleman's opinion. And, apparently, they do not need the $50,000 for this investigation, because they already have the judgment on it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I say that we already have in this bill adequate provisions whereby the Attorney General can bring action in a district court, wherever there is any evidence of discrimination, and I further believe that those provisions are sufficient under title IV.

Mr. Chairman, the administration is not asking for this Board. Neither President Johnson nor the Attorney General have requested establishment of such a Board. It is obvious to me that this proposal is just another effort by an agency to grab more power. I believe that there is great merit in the statement that there have been no hearings held on the question of the establishment of this Board.

Mr. Chairman, if this agency is to have the same power as the NLRB, this is the best argument I can think of to defeat this proposal. I urge you to support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois if you don't want some Government employee harassing every homeowner in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the constitution of my State of Michigan and the ordinances of my own city of Ann Arbor contain provisions assuring uniform opportunity to acquire housing to all, provisions generally similar to or stronger than those in the bill before us. Until recently, however, when an action occurred which violated these laws, the persons offended found that a delay of many, many months occurred before legal steps taken which benefited them could be consummated.

The result was, that few complainants who initiate and persist in legal action have been individuals who received strong support from civil rights organizations.

Mr. Chairman, very few individual families benefited under these laws until recently when administrative proceedings by local commissions became more effective.

Therefore, it would seem to me that the handful of you on the opposite side of the aisle here who desire this law, who want it to go into effect, who have encouraged its consideration, and who have had the courage to support it, and who I am convinced would like it to aid the single family—"little people," as well as aid organizations—that you should help keep in this section.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. I would like to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation itself, sections 406 and 407, authorizes the granting of an immediate injunction including a permanent or temporary injunction, or restraining order. A person is entitled to get immediate relief under sections 406 and 407 but there is no assurance he can get immediate relief from the Fair Housing Board any more than from the National Labor Relations Board. It could drag on for years.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to that.

In my State of Michigan we have had civil rights laws without commission enforcement for many years. But it has been only through initiative recently shown by local and State boards that we have begun to make some progress.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN].

And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify something that seems to be a source of concern to many of the Members. This amendment was heard and deliberated on by the Judiciary Committee in the same manner as was every other part of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

I apologize for not being a more senior member of the Judiciary Committee so that I could have introduced the amendment at an earlier stage. It was discussed. It was debated. And it was overwhelmingly passed in the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should not penalize a portion of a bill that has been reported by a committee just because it happens to be the last substantive amendment that succeeded in passing.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the fact that there is a Federal court remedy in the bill, I should like to point out that we are trying to cut down the number of court cases by means of this Fair Housing Board. We are trying to provide the little homeowner, the small broker, if you please, with a forum that will not involve expensive litigation and court procedures. The one way that we can do it—and it is already in use by 16 of the States having civil rights commissions—is to provide for administrative relief.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a memorandum from the Legislative Reference Service listing the 16 States which have administrative boards with similar powers to the Federal Fair Housing Board established by section 408:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C. August 2, 1966.

To: Hon. JOHN J. CONYERS, JR., Attention: Larry Horwitz.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: State Fair Housing Commissions.

Reference is made to your conversation of above date with Mr. Vincent A. Doyle during which you requested information concerning fair housing commissions. Specifically, you requested a tabulation of states which have administrative bodies authorized to issue cease and desist orders along the lines of the proposed federal Fair Housing Board, Title IV, H.R. 14765, H. Rept. 1678, 89th Congress, 2nd Session.

As of May 20, 1966, twenty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, had laws banning discrimination in one or more kinds of housing (Public Housing, Urban Renewal Housing, Other Publicly Assisted Housing—FHA, etc.—or Private Housing.) Of this number, 17 states had fair housing laws relating to private housing. Sixteen states provide for enforcement of their private fair housing law by an administrative body empowered to issue cease and desist orders analogous to the proposed Federal Fair Housing Board.

1. *Alaska:* State Commission for Human Rights. Creation, Alaska Stat. § 18.80.010; power to issue orders, Alaska. Stat. § 18.80.130.

2. *California:* Fair Employment Commission. Creation, California Labor Code § 1414; power to issue orders, California Health and Safety Code § 35738.

3. *Colorado:* Civil Rights Commission. Creation, Colorado Rev. Stat. Ann. § 80-21-4; power to issue orders, Colorado Rev. Stat. Ann. § 69-7-6(d)(12).

4. *Connecticut:* Commission on Civil Rights. Creation, Conn. Gen. Stat. Rev. § 41-123; power to issue orders, Conn. Gen. Stat. Rev. § 31-127.

5. *Indiana:* Civil Rights Commission. Creation, Indiana Ann. Stat., § 40-2310; power to issue orders, Indiana Ann. Stat. § 40-2312.

6. *Massachusetts:* Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. Creation, Mass. Ann. Laws, ch. 6, § 56; power to issue orders, Mass. Ann. Laws ch. 151B, § 5.

7. *Michigan:* Civil Rights Commission. Creation, Mich. Const. Art. V, § 29; power to issue orders, Mich. Stat. Ann. § 17.458(7)(h).

8. *Minnesota:* State Commission Against Discrimination. Creation, Minn. Stat. Ann. § 363.04; power to issue orders, Minn. Stat. Ann. § 363.07(4).

9. *New Hampshire:* State Commission Against Discrimination. Creation, N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. §354-A: 4; power to issue orders, N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 354-A:9.

10. *New Jersey:* Division on Civil Rights. Creation, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 18:25-6; power to issue orders, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 18:25-17.

11. *New York:* State Commission for Human Rights. Creation, N.Y. Executive Law § 293; power to issue orders, N.Y. Executive Law § 297(e).

12. *Ohio:* Ohio Civil Rights Commission. Creation, Page's Ohio. Rev. Code § 4112.02; power to issue orders, Page's Ohio. Rev. Code § 4112.05(G).

13. *Oregon:* Bureau of Labor. Authority to deal with housing discrimination, Ore. Rev. Stat. § 659.054; power to issue orders, Ore. Rev. Stat. § 659.060.

14. *Pennsylvania:* Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission. Creation, Pa. Stat.

Ann. § 956; power to issue orders, Pa. Stat. Ann. § 959.

15. *Rhode Island:* Rhode Island Commission Against Discrimination. Creation, R. I. Gen. Laws Ann. §§ 28–5–1 to 28–5–39; power to issue orders, R. I. Gen. Laws Ann. §34–37–5 (14).

16. *Wisconsin:* Equal Opportunities Division of the Industrial Commission. Authority to administer, Wis. Stat. Ann. § 101.60(d) (3); power to issue orders, Wis. Stat. Ann. § 101.60 (d) (c).

RAYMOND J. CELADA,
Legislative Attorney,
American Law Division.

AUGUST 2, 1966.

The best way that we can do it is to set up a commonsense procedure. Investigations are conducted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. He cannot issue any order. If there is no merit in the complaint, it is dismissed. If there is merit to the complaint, he attempts to conciliate it. If he cannot conciliate it then and only then does he refer it to the Board. In no other way can a complaint reach the Fair Housing Board. I think that should be made very, very clear.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, those of you on the other side who have shown courage in supporting this bill so far, and who I am sure desire to help "little people," should keep this section in the bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I understood when we started on this limited time that the Chair had stated that the time of the Members who had amendments would be heard. It seems to me all this time is being consumed by people who voted to limit the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must tell the gentleman from Texas that he has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOWDY. Is it the Chairman's intention to carry out his promise at the beginning that Members who had amendments at the desk would be given time to be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated that he would do his best to hear Members for and against amendments and that he would give preference to those who had amendments. The Chair made no commitments.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to the Members of the Committee that the Congress of the United States created the Community Relations Service in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It exists today. Only a few weeks ago we considered a reorganization plan in the Government Operations Committee which transferred the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice. That plan was approved by this House.

One of the things that were brought out in the debate was the fact that the Community Relations Service did not have a heavy workload, because the expected number of cases arising from public accommodations legislation in 1964 did not materialize.

The gentleman from Michigan, the author of this section of title IV of the bill, has said that the purpose of the Fair Housing Board would be to act to avoid court cases through conciliation. He talked about the fact that the States have conciliation services. But I have not heard anyone admit that the U.S. Government already has a general-purpose conciliatory body in the Community Relations Service, that it is presently equipped, functioning, and can do exactly the same job the gentleman is trying to put forward for his Fair Housing Board to do.

It seems to me that in the absence of any discussion of this subject, the admission on the part of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], to the effect that the States have conciliation boards in many cases, points up the fact, as has been stated by the proponents of the amendment, that this is duplicatory; it is unnecessary, and this Committee would be well advised to recognize that the Judiciary Committee did not give full thought to this question. I think we should support the amendment and strike that provision from the bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I just wanted to point out that in the Judiciary Committee we undertook, in the provision relating to court procedures, to take care of the little fellow. We authorized the appointment of an attorney and the payment of attorney's fees and the court costs. We have made provision for the little fellow in this legislation already. To authorize now a great Federal bureaucracy, a great Federal agency, would not be consistent with trying to take care of the little fellow but would burden him with all kinds of things with which he should not be burdened.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I should like to propound a question of the gentleman from New Jersey or the gentleman from Colorado, who are the managers of this bill. The leadership of the bill has consistently upheld the infallibility of the Judiciary Committee by opposing amendments. Have the gentlemen spoken on this issue? Would the gentlemen indicate what the position of the leadership on this bill will be relating to this amendment? Do they want it in or out?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. I support the provision that is included in the bill, and I oppose the amendment that would strike that provision.

I would like to state further that we have accepted some amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman from New Jersey is correct. There have been some amendments accepted. The point is not whether they are accepted. The point is, what are we acting on? We are acting on the creation of a Fair Housing Board, which, in view of the very existence of the Community Relations Service, is not necessary. There cannot be a Member in this Chamber who could give one valid reason why the Federal Government should establish a completely duplicative Fair Housing Board. I am sure that is why the Attorney General of the United States did not ask for it, did not testify in favor of it, and why the administration is not seeking it. It is unnecessary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman. I think the first thing that should be cleared up in this discussion is the reference that has been made to the Community Relations Service. As has been suggested, that is a very appropriate remedy for conciliation purposes. I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman that the Community Relations Service is going to be involved since the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, under section 409(d), can call upon the Service for assistance and cooperation. However, the Community Relations Service is completely unprepared to assume, sir, the full responsibility of acting as arbiter in housing disputes that might arise under this provision.

Because of the Housing and Urban Development Department's intimate involvement with all aspects of the housing and financing field it has the expertise which is necessary to be helpful in conciliating housing discrimination problems.

It would seem incredible to ask a newly founded agency, with no expertise at all in the housing field, to mediate these disputes when we already have an agency in the Government which is well-equipped and prepared to fulfill this function.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The point I wanted to make is that when we transferred the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice a few weeks ago, they specifically said they were planning to enlarge the Community Relations Service. I do not know what your idea of large or small is, but it seems to me this is clearly the agency to do the job you are describing.

I do hope that the membership will support the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question or two if I may. Do I understand under the procedures authorized for the Fair Housing Board, that implicit in its operation is the opportunity to utilize conciliation procedures?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, I will be glad to attempt to answer my distinguished colleague. As I mentioned earlier, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has sent me a letter in which he has committed himself to emphasize the conciliation process in the course of his investigation.

We have found further that conciliation works. Regardless of the opinion that any of the Members might hold of the NLRB, over 90 percent of the cases filed with it are settled through either dismissal, conciliation, or withdrawal of the complaint. There is no language in the NLRA—and it has been working for 31 years—about conciliation, because conciliation is inherent in all investigatory agencies.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman. I want to emphasize what has been said by others, which is, Mr. Chairman, that if this Fair Housing Board is taken out, it destroys the only effective means of bringing conciliatory procedures to bear on the enforcement of the fair housing provisions.

I believe it would be an enormous mistake to take this out. Our experience in the State of Minnesota has been that conciliation is by all odds the most effective means for both education and action in the field of fair housing.

I strongly urge the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we were assured there would be an opportunity to offer amendments and debate them, and in view of the fact that the Members of the House, who have spoken at such length, voted to cut off debate, would it be in order to ask that debate on this amendment be closed off at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed. Does the gentleman so request?

Mr. WHITENER. I so request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. It is so ordered.

The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. McClory.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McClory) there were—ayes 51, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy: In the so-called Mathias perfecting amendment, strike the words "If such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman, or any employee or agent thereof."

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KREBS. That is an amendment to the Mathias amendment, which has been disposed of by this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, the agreement we had was that after the motion to strike was disposed of we would take up amendments to title IV. This amendment is an amendment to title IV, to a perfecting amendment that was adopted pending the motion to strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard?

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that this amendment was not offered in a timely manner, since the Mathias amendment has already been disposed of by this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard further?

Mr. DOWDY. I believe I have made my point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order is sustained because of the fact that this matter has already been acted upon and this is, in effect, an effort to amend an amendment that has been agreed to.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I disagree.

I move to strike the requisite number of words.

When agreement was made yesterday that the Moore amendment debate would be limited, it was also understood that title IV would afterward be open for debate and amendment. Yet today, the very first thing we have is an unconscionable limitation and cloture placed on the debate of a most important and highly controversial title, which is ambiguous to a great extent. Under the terms of the agreement entered into yesterday, many of us held up our amendments, expecting to debate them today. We feel betrayed.

Now, I want to talk about the Mathias amendment. We are going to have to vote on this, presumably after the Committee finally rises on this bill.

The gentleman from Maryland said that his amendment did not do anything one way or the other. He was in part correct, but that does not apply to the last part of his amendment, the part to which I attempted to offer an amendment to strike; that is, to the language:

> If such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman, or any employee or agent thereof.

Those words place a greater burden upon the real estate dealers and the brokers and the builders and so on, as covered by the bill. Consequently, this amendment is bad. It is more restrictive. It will hurt anybody who is in business concerning dwellings.

I use the word "dwellings" because that is what is used in the bill.

The Mathias amendment makes the bill worse rather than better. The gentleman from Maryland was incorrect when he said it did not do anything at all.

The language of his amendment, which has been adopted by the committee, would make it impossible for a person who wanted to sell his home to get any advice from a realtor, builder, or their agents, salesmen or representatives, who are under the restrictions of this bill. The seller, be it a recent widow, or anyone else, might well find that her attorney would be forbidden under this title to advise her.

This is undue and unconscionable restriction on the professions involved, and on the right of individuals to advice of counsel. The Mathias amendment is so restrictive as to call for its defeat when the proper time comes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Whitener: On page 63, line 25, insert a period in lieu of the comma after the word "origin," and strike the words: "or to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental, or lease."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I shall be appreciative if the gentleman will clarify language of the bill.

Specifically on page 62, line 3, it says that the term "person" includes one or more individuals, and so on. I wish to inquire as to whether or not the term "person" or "individual" includes women?

Mr. WHITENER. I suppose I am not a very good one to try to explain this. Yesterday I pointed out this type of thing, and I was accused of—what was it?—obfuscating the issues, or something.

Mrs. BOLTON. I certainly am not attempting to obfuscate the issues.

Mr. WHITENER. Whatever "obfuscating" is, I do not believe the lady or I would do that.

Mrs. BOLTON. Might the gentleman give me an answer as to whether or not the term "person" or "individual" includes women?

Mr. WHITENER. I will ask my friend, Mr. Rodino of New Jersey, if he will answer the gentlewoman's question.

Mr. RODINO. Well, cannot an "individual" include a woman? I ask that question. I think the question answers itself.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think the gentleman has the point but just the wrong side. My question is whether a woman is to be considered as a "person" or "individual" under this title of the bill?

Mr. RODINO. Is not a woman a "person"?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes. I certainly see this to be the case, although sometimes we are not considered so. I was wondering if this bill so considers women?

Mr. RODINO. The gentleman from New Jersey has not only always considered them as persons but very fine persons.

Mrs. BOLTON. But as legally defined in the bill what does the term "persons" mean?

Mr. RODINO. Well, I am sure that the term "person" as defined in the bill includes women, it includes men, and it includes individuals, both men and women. Therefore, I am sure that a "person" would include women. I do not know how much clearer we can make it.

Mr. WHITENER. Now, if we can get back to home plate for just a minute, I think what the gentlewoman wants to know is whether or not under this bill members of her sex are protected from the type of discrimination which is alleged to exist on the basis of race, color, national origin, economic status, and a few others.

Mrs. BOLTON. But the bill has left out the women in several instances. We have found ourselves left out so many times, may I say, that I had hoped I might have a very clear answer, a yes or no answer, to my question as to the status of women under title IV. If it is no, then I would offer an amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], has stated that women are included in the definition of "persons." Accordingly I have not offered my amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia who I know the gentlewoman will remember, when we had another civil rights bill up, was very considerate of this point.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes. I had a very nice time with the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I can very easily hand in the amendment which I have in my hand, which would include ladies and those who are excepted and take care of the situation all right.

Mr. WHITENER. Perhaps we can get together, the three of us, and form a triangle and get this amendment considered later. If I may get back to the amendment I offered, this is a rather unusual piece of legislation in that it says it shall be unlawful for a realtor, his agent, servant, salesman, employee, or any other person to fail or to refuse to use his "best efforts" to consummate a sale. All my amendment would do would be to strike out that language, because it is a rather nonsensical thing to say that a professional man has to use his best efforts. Who is going to determine that? As I pointed out on the first day of the debate, as a member of the legal profession, I do not think I have ever tried a lawsuit and I know I have never tried one which I lost when after it was all over I did not wonder why did I not do something more. Sometimes in retrospect I felt that I had not given my best efforts to it and thought that if I had spent another hour in the library the previous night perhaps I would have won it. Would anybody in this room say that we ought to enact a statute which requires, let us say, an architect, a doctor, a barber, a plumber, a beautician, or a member of any other profession to use their "best efforts" or otherwise be subject to being brought into court? Why, I heard on the radio last night in connection with this airline strike that we are so concerned about now that the head of the machinists union said if we pass legislation here which would stop the strike, his men would probably be much more careful in the repair work they do on the planes. When he was asked if that meant a slowdown, he said no, just the time necessary to "protect the public safety."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina lost part of his time in a meritorious cause, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman for that, but we have some other amendments, and I think this is clear already and I would like for us to get to a vote on it.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all that we require in this section is that the person who is a real estate agent, broker, or salesman, uses the same efforts when he is involved in this kind of transaction, irrespective of race, color, religion, or national origin, of any party to the transaction.

Mr. Chairman, this is all that these words mean.

Mr. Chairman, when we use the words "fail or refuse to use his best efforts," we mean that the person who is involved in this kind of transaction should not discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Am I not correct, and may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] that this language "to use his best efforts" is taken from the realtors' code in many States, a part of which contains the realtors' code for the State of Washington which was injected into the RECORD by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS], I believe.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of the fact that this language is taken from the realtors' code.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, might I say that it is the same wording and essentially the same phraseology, in many instances?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Who is going to determine when a lawyer has used his best efforts?

Mr. RODINO. We are talking about real estate brokers or others engaged in the business of selling housing.

Mr. ASHMORE. Well, a real estate man.

Mr. RODINO. It is always a question of fact.

Mr. ASHMORE. Who is going to determine the question of fact?

Mr. RODINO. A court determines the question of fact.

Mr. ASHMORE. There it is again. It has to be brought into court again.

Mr. RODINO. If he does not discriminate, then a suit will not be sustained.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if you furnish a lawyer and then they get the Attorney General to come in, he can sue him, also, is that not right?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 65, line 19, strike out "that makes mortgage" and insert "regularly engaged in the business of making mortgages."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this involves the question that was discussed yesterday, pretty much at length, relating to lending institutions and individuals or persons who are engaged in that business.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the debate has been cut off. As I stated yesterday, there were about four amendments relating to trial by jury, and to the "Mrs. Murphy" situation, and there was no answer to these proposed amendments.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only way in my opinion to obtain an answer, and that is to do it on the floor of the House.

Yesterday, I agreed, as one, to not offer any amendments until after the motion was disposed of, the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. At that time I was given to understand that we would have an unlimited opportunity for debate today. Now that has been cut off.

Mr. Chairman, we have only 1 hour left. We have, perhaps, 10 or 12 amendments still pending for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This is one amendment that I believe deserves serious consideration, in that the prohibition relating to preventing discrimination in the financing of housing as it relates to our finnancing institutions, trade unions or insurance companies, or any other person, it does not say he has to be in the business of financing at all.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, you look at the definition of what we are talking about—"or any other person"—and observe who is included. Every single lawyer in America is included. Every single trustee in bankruptcy is included.

Every single person who is the administrator of an estate is included, and every single executor of an estate is included.

Mr. Chairman, every trustee is included, and these are not people doing the business of making loans.

As a matter of fact, this is so broad that an individual making a loan to a friend would be included. There is no question about it.

Mr. Chairman, the other day I questioned the gentleman from New Jersey on this and he replied, "It is our intention to include only those doing business." So my reply to him today is, "Well, if that is your intention, why do you not write it into the legislation."

With the adoption of my amendment, the legislation will read as follows:

> Or other person regularly engaged in the business of making mortgages or other loans * * *

What I am saying is if they intend to do what they say they will do, this is a simple way of doing it without any subterfuge, without any question. I cite as an example the Ohio law which deals with exactly the same subject matter. The Ohio law says:

> Any person who lends money as one of the principal aspects of his business.

Also in the State of New York it defines an individual or person—relating to a person doing business of lending money.

Now, if they mean what they say, they should accept the amendment. If they mean to include every single individual who wants to make a loan to his friend or build an addition to his house, paint his house or build his house—and many people are not in the business of buying up second mortgages, but they invest their money in this way. If you want to include every individual, then vote against my amendment. But if you want to make sure that it applies only to those doing business, then vote for it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the amendment by the gentleman from Florida is a good amendment. It will authorize the widow Murphy to loan the $10,000, that she receives by reason of the wrongful death of her husband, on a mortgage. In my opinion, she is prohibited from doing so under the language of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 62, after line 20, insert "But nothing contained in this bill shall be construed to prohibit or affect the right of any person, or his authorized agent, to rent or refuse to rent, a room or rooms in his home for any reason, or for no reason; or to change his tenants as often as he may desire."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this brings us back to poor Mrs. Murphy and her roominghouse that we discussed yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as it is written does not take care of her and that was shown clearly yesterday. But everybody said they were sympathetic to a lady who wanted to rent one of her rooms or two of her rooms or six of her rooms. But nobody has offered any way to do it.

Now why not make this thing perfectly clear if that is what you mean, make it perfectly clear by saying what you mean. That is what I have done in this amendment. So after this provision about three or more transactions, I have clarified it by saying—nothing contained in this bill shall be construed to prohibit or affect the right of any person or his authorized agent to rent or to refuse to rent a room or rooms in his home for any reason or for no reason or to change his tenants as often as he may desire.

That is all there is to it. If you mean to protect these widow ladies in these college towns who make their living by renting spare rooms in their homes, if you wish to protect them as you have said you did and as the gentleman from Colorado said we did in another section of the bill—but which does not do it—and anybody can see that simply reading it, then just adopt this little amendment and it will take care of that one situation real handily.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk here about other things and I have another amendment that I would like to offer also, and to give the House the opportunity to vote on it. That is the sex amendment. I propose in an amendment which I will offer later, if I get the opportunity, that after the word "religion" on page 60, line 14, and subsequent pages, we insert the word "sex."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's other amendment be read. We can vote on them separately but this way he can explain them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODINO. What was the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas requested that the other amendment referred to by the gentleman from Virgina be reported, that we vote on them separately, but presumably one right after the other. The Chair is not familiar with what the second amendment is.

Mr. RODINO. That is what I was going to ask the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the first part of the request of the gentleman from Texas, as I understood it. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SENNER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I will get an opportunity to take care of the ladies a little later, if time permits. I have in my hand an amendment that I hope to have an opportunity to offer. It is similar to the one that we put in the civil rights bill, and would include women along with others.

Suppose a lady has one room to rent and two people appear at her door at the same time. One is a Chinaman and the other is a white boy or a white girl. If she rents to the white boy or the white girl, she is in trouble because she has discriminated against the Chinaman. But she can rent to the Chinaman and the white man or woman would have no complaint whatever. She would have complied with the law.

It seems to me that we have so many things in this bill that make it so bad, if we could do a little good to protect people who are not protected, it might be a good thing to do in these closing minutes.

I deplore very much the procedure of beginning debate on the amendments to this title today and at the same time, simultaneously, the gentleman from New Jersey moves—and the motion is adopted—that we shall cease all consideration of it this afternoon.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I most respectfully oppose the amendment of the gentleman. I believe he alludes to the poor Mrs. Murphy type of boardinghouse. I would like to state that we have gone over this ground. I addressed an inquiry to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, on August 4, addressed a letter to me which I would like to read:

AUGUST 4, 1966.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the effect of section 403(b) of Title IV of the pending "Civil Rights Act of 1966" on "Mrs. Murphy"-type boarding houses.

Section 403(b) definitely exempts "Mrs. Murphy", who is the owner-occupant of a boarding or rooming house, from the coverage of Title IV. That section provides:

"Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner with respect to the sale, lease, or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence."

The exemption applies without regard to the number of rooms available for rent, so long as the building is a 1, 2, 3, or 4-family house. The one-family house used as a rooming house or boarding house and occupied by the owner, "Mrs. Murphy", would be exempted in the rental of rooms whether or not she made more than three rentals a year.

This is what seems to me to be the clear reading of the section and is consistent with my understanding of the intent of the Committee.

I trust that my explanation will allay any remaining doubts about the scope of this exemption.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that should put to rest the question as to whether or not we did provide for an exemption for Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse or the individual homeowner. I do not believe that we should continue to talk about a doubt regarding this position when the chief enforcement officer, the one who will interpret this legislation, states to us explicitly, as he has done in this letter, that Mrs. Murphy or any person who has a boardinghouse is exempt under this provision.

For this reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **RODINO**. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows perfectly well that that provision, and he must realize that that provision he has just read, which is on page 64, under subtitle (b), line 19, applies to "four families living independently of each other." That is not talking about a roominghouse. That is talking about a situation where four families are living in one house, that has been temporarily or otherwise arranged so that they may live independently. It does not say anything else.

If the gentleman wants to do it, why does he not do it honestly and clarify the question so that there can be no further question about that? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. **RODINO**. Yes. May I say that on line 22, page 64, it does not say four families. It says "by no more than four families."

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Well, one family.

Mr. **RODINO**. That means there may be one or two or three or four families, which means there may be less than four families in that structure.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. The gentleman is not talking about the same thing I am talking about. This provision is clearly confined to families independent of each other, living independently. I am talking about the college student that is renting a room in the widow's home in Charlottesville, for example.

Mr. **RODINO**. That widow is exempt.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. That is what the gentleman says, but the language does not say so.

Mr. **RODINO**. We believe that the language says so. That is the intent of this Committee, and we hope that this history we are writing here will be so reported. I am sure it will be so construed.

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take this time, but this is a subject in which I have been deeply interested. I have had an amendment prepared to try to do something about it. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey, since he says it is his intention to exempt the Mrs. Murphy situation—why in the world would the gentleman object to the clarifying language the gentleman from Virginia has offered to accomplish that? I just do not understand.

Mr. **RODINO**. May I answer the gentleman, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. **CRAMER**. Yes, I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. **RODINO**. Unfortunately, I must disagree with the gentleman when he says the language would clarify. Although I know the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is one who certainly is an artist with words, nonetheless, I must say that in this situation the language only helps to confuse an issue which I believe is clearly stated.

Mr. **CRAMER**. I get the gentleman's point, but I cannot understand how the gentleman could possibly come to the conclusion that there is not a mountain of confusion relating to how this is to be interpreted, as the result of the discussions that took place yesterday alone, in which it was clearly indicated, regardless of what the Attorney General says he thinks it says. It clearly says on page 64, line 23, that the persons that are exempted are those that are in homes occupied by the owner and by no more than four families living independently of each other.

When one reads those two in conjunction, it is obvious that someone who has a home, with a couple of rooms in it, and is renting to people, is not "living independently."

If the Committee does not adopt the amendment, as the gentleman suggests, this will be open to questions ad infinitum.

This is an opportunity to answer the questions clearly and unequivocally. It will not do any damage if the gentleman wants to do what he says he wants to do, so why does the gentleman not accept it?

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRAMER**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **RODINO**. The language states: "by no more than four families".

Surely one is less than four.

Mr. **CRAMER**. "Living independently."

If the gentleman has any doubt that the legislation accomplishes what he says he wants to do—and there certainly is a basis for doubt—the simple way to handle it is to spell it out, as the gentleman from Virginia is trying to do.

I do not want there to be a question raised when a social security widow in my district wants to rent two of three rooms in her home to earn a little extra money and wants to choose with whom she will live. I want her out of this. That amendment will take her out of it, and leave her out of it, unquestionably.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRAMER**. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **RODINO**. If there is a doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Florida,——

Mr. **CRAMER**. There surely is.

Mr. **RODINO**. I want to assure the committee that doubt does not exist in my mind, nor did it exist in the minds of the members of the committee who supported this, nor does it exist in the mind of the Attorney General, who surely knows how to interpret these provisions.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRAMER**. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. **WHITENER**. I point out that the language in the bill is so imprecise, and the language of the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia is quite precise.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Would the gentleman read the language again?

Mr. **WHITENER**. It says "to rent or refuse to rent a room or rooms in his home for any reason".

Mr. **CRAMER**. I suppose the trouble with that language is it is too simple. It spells it out too clearly.

Mr. **WHITENER**. And it says "or to change his tenants as often as he may desire".

Someone said to me a moment ago, "I could support the amendment if it said, 'in his place of residence,' ", and I replied, "These folks would say that might include a high rise apartment."

The gentleman from Virginia has brought it down to what is intended.

Mr. **CRAMER**. The weakness of the amendment is that it is simple enough so that everybody can understand it. It does not take a lawyer to figure it out, so everybody is unhappy about it. My social security widow can understand that language, and we ought to pass it.

Mr. **ASHMORE**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CRAMER**. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. **ASHMORE**. I believe it should be made clear that the letter which my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], read, sent by the Attorney General to him, refers to four-family dwellings.

Mr. **CRAMER**. I appreciate that.

Mr. **ASHMORE**. What we are talking about is four individual people living in different rooms.

Mr. **CRAMER**. That is correct. It is subject to a different interpretation. Let us clarify it. Let us adopt the amendment.

Mr. **MATHIAS**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has offered this amendment in the hope, as he has expressed it, that it will reduce confusion.

I suggest that in the House, in the press, and the country at large it might increase confusion, because as the result of the adoption of the Smith amendment Mrs. Murphy might no longer be Mrs. Murphy; she would probably become Mrs. Smith or at least be joined by Mrs. Smith. We would not know then to whom we were referring when we had a Mrs. Smith boardinghouse or a Mrs. Murphy boardinghouse.

But there is an even greater reason for defeating the amendment. The amendment says that a person may rent a room or rooms in his home. The gentleman does not make it clear that his "home" is a dwelling which he or she occupies.

The amendment refers to the authorized agent or person who is doing the renting. I am not sure that the widow in Charlottesville, Va., or the widow in Lexington, Va., who is renting rooms to a college student is going to have an authorized agent, and I do not know what kind of agent she would have under any circumstances who is not already contemplated by the amendment already adopted.

I believe it is perfectly clear from the language of the bill as it is before us that there is an absolute and total exemption for the owner who occupies a structure which has not more than four independent dwelling units in it.

The owner who occupies such a limited structure may rent out any number of rooms he or she desires to college students or anyone else, on any kind of terms, and change the terms of tenancy or the tenant as often as he or she desires, because it is an absolute exemption to such owner who occupies a structure with four or less independent dwelling units in it. I think that is perfectly clear from the language, so that the gentleman from Virginia's amendment is unnecessary and should be defeated.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think we must be careful and precise about our language. I heard the language of the gentleman from Florida just a few minutes ago. I call his attention to it. He made reference to "my widow." I suggest to him he has no widow and I hope he does not have one for many, many years. The purpose of 403(b) is to give exemption to Mrs. Murphy but also to lots of other people. The other people are people who do not keep roomers but who have duplex, triplex, or four-unit apartment houses and live in them. They are to be excluded, too. This amendment would be mischievous because it would confuse the intent of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODINO), there were—ayes 71, noes 62.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RODINO and Mr. SMITH of Virigina.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to all the debate that has transpired on the so-called civil rights bill now being debated on the floor of the House. I, of course, am not a member of the Judiciary Committee; however, I find it difficult to understand how this bill received a favorable vote by the majority of the members of that great committee. Every section of the bill is certainly obnoxious to me, as we people in this country will be completely without any freedom if we continue to pass legislation of this nature.

I am very much in favor of the Government assisting in building all the necessary low-cost housing in the thickly populated areas of this country so that every person could have an opportunity to own or at least live in a decent home. However, I cannot vote for any proposed legislation that would tie the hands of the property owner to the extent we would be in the same position the people of Russia are existing under today.

The suggested penalties to be imposed upon our free citizens when they even talk to a demonstrator, which is absolutely foreign to our way of life in this country, is entirely out of line. I personally would like to vote for legislation to outlaw demonstrations and picketing which was foreign to our country up until the last few years when it seems we imported this idea from South America and some of the other foreign countries.

I hope the Congress will not close their eyes to what is going on in this country at the present time and get on with passing legislation which would curb the growing crime situation which is existing in the entire United States at the present time. We should not be wasting our time with a so-called civil rights bill when we are actually taking rights away from the people who this proposed legislation purports to assist. I do hope the entire bill will be sent back to the Judiciary Committee and if this is impossible, I hope we will be able to completely delete the housing section from the bill on final passage.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, my conscience compels me to rise in vociferous opposition to title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, both in its reported form and as amended by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. In the guise of civil rights, this bill is truly a form of harassment to an outstanding profession—to the thousands of realtors in our Nation. The bill purports to give freedom of choice to all. Yet in reality it removes the freedom of the individual to dispose of his real property as he sees fit. Social change cannot be legislated; it can only evolve. The Congress on this occasion is proposing to invade the holy domain of individual rights, the tenets on which our great Nation was founded.

The great metropolitan areas of the United States are in part a result of the efforts of real estate developers across the land. Their work has made it possible for persons to come to the city to study, to work, to contribute their skills and talents for the improvement of our society. When we seek to legislate the human element of free choice out of our society, then we reduce our Government to the free association of robots. Our country is a melting pot of ethnic groups. Mutual respect and admiration among them has been developed through their actions rather than by legislation. It would be far preferable if we continue the time-honored traditions of our forefathers by permitting the individual personality to exercise his capacity for choice and decision in this very personal matter.

I should like to share with you here the very well chosen words of one of my constituents of Dallas, Tex., who expressed his opposition to this legislation in the following letter to me:

> This legislation is premised on the mistaken belief that the exercise of freedom of choice by a real property owner is an act of racial discrimination. This assumption is a gross oversimplification which apparently rejects a traditional and fundamental right, both of which have their roots in the English common law—a tradition and right of freedom of contract and freedom of choice in the disposition of one's own property.
>
> Personal choice in the disposition of one's property apparently stands to thwart the dreams of the planners of the society of tomorrow. Freedom of choice and freedom of contract have apparently become anachronisms in the scheme of those who would determine for us the choice of our neighbors and our tenants.
>
> The American people are striving toward the solution of this problem, and the solution is attainable. Yet in every instance where state legislation comparable to that of the pending bill was submitted to a referendum of the people, it has been rejected by overwhelming majorities. Voluntary efforts are achieving this objective. The use of force—the employment of the police system, the destruction of the human right of real property ownership, the suppression of freedom of contract—are all destructive of the objective of biracial understanding. I urge the Congress to choose the traditional American way of voluntary effort, and to reject the alien way of the police expedient.

My obligation as a Representative of the people of the State of Texas is crystal clear to me today. I was sent to Congress to protect the rights of the individual citizen, not to legislate them out of existence. I shall therefore vote against title IV in any form.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, the real issues involved in fair housing legislation have been buried under a barrage of emotions and slogans. People have tried to convince us that title IV of the Civil Rights Act protects one person's rights at the expense of another person's. This is simply not rue. The question is not whether the right of a person to sell his property to whomever he wishes is greater than the right of a person to buy any home he can afford. Rather, the question is: may one person infringe upon the rights of another? The answer is an emphatic no.

Obviously, if a person refuses to rent or sell his property to minority groups, he is doing more than just infringing upon the rights of the minority group. He is also denying them the right to attend well-staffed schools, he is denying them the right to equal job opportunities, and he is condemning them to a life of poverty, neglect, and deprivation. We must not be deceived. Being denied the right to live in a certain house does not mean living in another equally desirable house. It usually means living in the slums and poverty-stricken areas of our society.

Some of my colleagues seem reluctant to take steps to abolish ghettos. I do not say that title IV will wipe all slums off the map. But it will allow people to move out of their ghettos, if they have the means and the desire. It is, therefore, a bill that should and must be passed.

There are those, however, who say that any American with initiative can "get ahead" and can move out of his home in the slums. But they do not say where the underprivileged and oppressed may go when they are prepared to leave and abandon their slum existence. Perhaps they do not say because they know what barriers a person faces when he tries to move out of the ghetto. I urge passage of title IV so that these barriers may be abolished and so that we may assure the rights of first-class citizenship to every American citizen.

The racial troubles of our country cannot be solved by one law, or even by many laws. But I believe that segregated housing is the root of America's gravest social problem, and we—as lawmakers—must pass this bill and do everything else in our power to kill this root so that someday the tree of bigotry will wither and die.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 73, strike out all after "section" on line 23 and all of 24 and insert "1101 of Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000 (h))".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think a brief explanation will very clearly indicate to the gentleman what I am attempting to do.

Mr. Chairman, all this does is take the 1964 Civil Rights Act rule for contempt and the right of trial by jury rather than the 1957 Civil Rights Act rule. This indicates a preference what we did in 1964. The basic issue involved is whether a man is entitled to a trial by jury before he is subjected to a criminal penalty for contempt.

The proposal I make is to use exactly the same language as we did in 1964. The identical language of that bill is keyed into the language of the bill before you.

Mr. Chairman, we have had this issue of trial by jury before us for year after year. Let us get it out of the way. In 1964 we got it out of the way. We said in writing the civil rights proposal of 1964 that this rule shall apply that a man is entitled to a trial by jury if he is going to be put in jail for contempt. Now they want to change the rule and go back to 1957.

The 1964 act provides that he shall be entitled to a trial by jury but shall conform as nearly as may be to the practice in criminal cases pending convictions that he shall be fined no more than $5,000 or imprisoned for no more than 6 months.

All this does is to take to the latest position of Congress and say that is our position now.

A man is entitled to a trial by jury if he is going to jail for contempt of court. What they want to do is to go back to 1957, which is old hat. That was amended in 1964. They want to go back to a limited trial by jury solely in the instance where there is a 45-day penalty. If it is in excess of a 45-day penalty, he is entitled to a trial by jury or a fine of not over $300 as I recall—and I will put the exact wording in—then he is entitled to a trial but not otherwise.

Why do you want to limit a man's right to a trial by jury. Let us use the 1964 act which was enacted a year and one-half ago and let us not change the rules of the game particularly as it relates to a broad title such as this in housing. I would hope the leadership of the Committee would accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it does not do any harm to the bill but it does protect the right of a trial by jury. It gets that issue out of the way. If you do not, it will be an issue as in 1964. What they are writing into the bill by referring to 1957 is this provision:

> In cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of the Act, the accused upon conviction shall be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both provided in the case of a fine, it shall not exceed $1,000.

Then in the event the proceeding of contempt before a judge without a jury results in a sentence which exceeds $300 or 45 days, the accused is entitled to a trial by jury, but not otherwise.

In 1964 we adopted the principle that regardless of whether the penalty was 45 days or $300, the accused would be entitled to trial by jury. He would be entitled to trial by jury in every instance.

If you want to limit the right to jury trial, vote with the committee. If you want not to limit that right, but do what we did in 1964, then vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are a number of us who are not members of the committee and who have a couple of pocketfuls of amendments apiece to offer to this bill. Thus far the limited time has been completely dominated, and understandably so, because they are entitled to priority of recognition, by members of the committee and, to a large extent, by those who voted to close off debate.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, if we can ascertain the information, how many more amendments there are to be offered by members of the committee so as to preclude anyone else from getting recognition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Nine amendments that have not yet been reported are pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the Chair advise me how many of those are being offered by members of the committee, thus precluding others from having an opportunity to offer their amendments?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will see if he can ascertain the information.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not the situation that all amendments will be considered and voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer the first parliamentary inquiry. There are four or five pending amendments to be offered by members of the committee, as far as the Clerk can estimate.

This time is coming out of the limited time for debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I do have a legitimate parliamentary inquiry if the other was not. Would it be in order to make a unanimous-consent request at this time that the action of the House in voting to limit debate be vacated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a unanimous consent is in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If such a request is in order, I make the request.

Mr. RODINO. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly, we were granted 2 hours in which to submit amendments. One hour and 45 minutes has been used up. We have 15 minutes remaining. Did the Chair just rule that it would be inappropriate, and this Committee would be unable to reconsider, the fixing of this time? Was that the ruling of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to reconsider is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DICKINSON. In that event, Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers a preferential motion, which the Clerk will report.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DICKINSON

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. DICKINSON moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, this is the only method available to me to be heard on the amendment which I have been waiting for some 2 weeks to offer. The amendment will be read by title as required, but it is quite obvious, having only reached three amendments in an hour and 45 minutes and with nine more pending, that I will not be heard on my amendment.

My amendment, which is at the desk and which will be heard, says:

> That notwithstanding any foregoing provisions of this title—

And I am dealing specifically with title IV—

> this title shall not apply to any attorney-at-law with respect to any act taken by him in the course of his practice as an attorney.

We had colloquy yesterday, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 18193, where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] asked of the committee, "was an attorney-at-law, practicing his profession, covered under this title, and, if so, to what extent?" As I read the colloquy and as I read the report, there seems to be a difference of opinion. First, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] says no, and then the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] says that if he is acting as an agent, he would be.

I submit there is no way an attorney can act except as an agent or as an attorney in fact. My point is this. The law says that any organization which is an association or a partnership is a person which is covered. I simply want to make it clear—and there is some misunderstanding—that an attorney acting as an attorney is not covered by this, so that he cannot sell his own home if he has engaged in two discriminatory acts acting as an attorney.

I have another inquiry I would like to direct to the manager of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], if I might get his attention: The word "partnership" is used here as meaning "person," as defined by this act. Let me pose a hypothetical question:

I am assuming that a partnership can be any number, such as a large law firm with, say, 25 members, and that a section of this law firm is devoted to real estate practice. If this partnership is covered under title IV, I would like to know, if the gentleman will inform me, whether that means every individual member also is covered and cannot then sell his own home after there have been two transactions of discrimination by someone in his firm acting as an agent? Would every individual member of the law firm be covered?

Mr. RODINO. As long as he is a member of the partnership, since the partnership is covered, he would be covered.

Mr. DICKINSON. You mean, if we have a large firm, one section handling real estate trusts, and so forth, and I am a member of it, although I have nothing to do with this transaction, say I practice criminal law, I cannot sell my own personal home if a partner of my law firm is covered?

Mr. RODINO. We are not directing our attention to him as an individual in that case. We are directing our attention to that individual as a member of the firm.

Mr. DICKINSON. Yes. Well, that is the point.

Mr. RODINO. And we look to the transaction that takes place by the firm.

Mr. DICKINSON. And not as an individual member, is that correct?

Mr. RODINO. That is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. I believe it is only fair to admit, and all Members of the House would be only fair if they admitted, there is some area of ambiguity, some area that needs to be cleaned up other than by you and me making legislative history. I hope the Committee would see fit to accept my amendment, which is very simple:

> Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this title, this title shall not apply to any attorney-at-law with respect to any act taken by him in the course of his practice as an attorney.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked the Committee to accept an amendment. If I understand, he submitted an amendment to strike the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was recognized to speak on a preferential amendment to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. DICKINSON. If the gentleman would like to have me clear up the parliamentary situation, I took this method to be able to tell the Members that I have an amendment which will be reported, on which they can vote later.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, as the gentleman from New Jersey indicated as well, if a lawyer is practicing in a partnership and has nothing to do with the sales involved, but there is a partner in the firm and that partner makes sales and deals with clients, and this can involve rentals or sales for the client, then the other partner, who is in the criminal business, will be excluded from selling his own home by virtue of the fact that his partner is selling property or renting property for a client? Is that not clearly expressed in the wording of this proposal?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

We have had such a preferential motion before, to strike the enacting clause, but since then there have been some perfecting amendments. Therefore, the motion is in order.

In essence, this motion would kill the bill, rather than provide any clarification.

May I point out, on the question of an attorney, his relationship to his client is altogether different from that of a real estate agent, or one engaged in the business of selling or renting housing, as we have set forth in section 403.

If an attorney is practicing law, as such, then his relationship is no different from that of anyone else in connection with any sale of his own property. If he is conducting a business of a real estate agents, or of selling houses as we provide in section 403, then he would be covered.

If there is a partnership which is engaged in the real estate business, then that partnership would be covered.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the amendment which I propose to offer, if and when time allows, will do nothing to the bill that is not now covered, except to clear up this one ambiguity. Why can the gentleman not accept the amendment, if he says it does not do anything?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. There is no reason for the amendment. It will only lead to confusion.

Certainly the gentleman and I recognize that an attorney at law has a confidential relationship with his client.

But he will not become an agent, necessarily, within the meaning of the title, merely because he happens to be employed as an attorney.

Mr. DICKINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, is he saying that my amendment confuses rather than clarifies this one point?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 67, noes 103.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 64, lines 15 through 18, strike all of subsection 403(a)(7).

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time is about to expire, and I will try not to use the total 5 minutes, but I think that what has developed here, in that we have not had an opportunity fairly and adequately to present our amendments, shows two things: The first thing I think it shows is that the wisdom of cutting off debate is to be questioned. Secondly, I think it affirmatively shows that some of us were unwise yesterday to agree to cooperate by withholding our amendments in order that the Moore amendment might be voted upon as early as possible under the assurance that we would have an opportunity to present our amendments and have them debated. I take full responsibility for my error.

I would hope that as we go forward in the debate on other titles of the bill, if we are not going to deal fairly, that we say so ahead of time or the proponents should just use the power and have everybody understand they are using it. Please do not try to mislead us any more.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out subsection (7) on page 64 under section 403(a). That language is:

> (7) To engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Now, what sort of language is that? "any act or practice." Is it an act to talk to a neighbor? Is it an act to put a sign in front of your house that this house is for sale to Negroes only or Chinese only or Baptists only? What does this mean? This is another example, and I am not going to take any more time here because I do have other amendments and other Members do, also. I hope you will support the amendment, not because of anything I said but because I have been denied the right and the opportunity to say what should be said.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, since the amendment would limit title IV of the bill. For that reason this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Whitener) there were—ayes 64, noes 107.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement all time on title IV has been consumed.

Are there further amendments to title IV?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments at the desk, and I am sure that others also have such amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to offer them without debate?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes; I shall have to offer them without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Whitener: On page 65 strike out all language on lines 15 through 25, and on page 66 strike out all language in lines 1 through 3, and renumber the following sections of title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Whitener and Mr. Rodino.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 122.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TALCOTT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Talcott: On page 63, line 7, line 12, and line 18, and page 64, line 18, after "religion'" insert "inability to enter into a lease agreement of more than 60 days by reason of his status as a migrant agricultural worker,".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott].

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Talcott and Mr. Rodino as tellers.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Williams: On page 69, line 4, insert "(1)" immediately after the "(b)", and on page 69, after line 9, insert the following:

"(2) Whenever the Attorney General initiates an action under subsection (a) of this section, or intervenes in an action under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and the court fails to grant the relief called for in the complaint filed in the action, the court may, under such circumstances as the court may deem just, award the defendant his costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee, to be paid by the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams) there were—ayes 54, noes 88.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Williams of Mississippi and Mr. Rodino of New Jersey.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKINSON

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dickinson: On page 74, immediately following line 6, insert the following:

"Sec. 413. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this title, this title shall not apply to an attorney-at-law with respect to any act taken by him in the course of his practice as an attorney."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Rodino.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 61, line 22, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 63, line 7, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 63, line 11, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 63, line 18, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 63, line 22, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 63, line 25, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 64, line 2, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 64, line 6, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 64, line 10, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 64, line 11, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

On page 64, line 18, after the word "religion", insert the word "sex".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 48, noes 88.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parlimentary inquiry.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the proponents of this bill whether the word "sex" coming after "religion" is supposed to have any significance?

The CHAIRMAN. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. Rodino.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRALEY

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Craley: On page 66, strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 405. No person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or in the enforcement or attempted enforcement under section 406 of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or the enforcement or attempted enforcement under section 406 of, any right granted by section 403 or 404."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams), there were—ayes 16, noes 88.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 65, line 15, strike all of section 404 down to and through page 66, line 3.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODINO. The amendment has already been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will check.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to inject myself into the controversy, but I had an amendment to that effect, which was voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's recollection, too. The point of order is sustained.

Are there further amendments? If there are no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V

Interference with rights

SEC. 501. Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force—

(a) injures, intimidates, or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin while he is lawfully engaging or seeking to engage in—

(1) voting or qualifying to vote, qualifying or campaigning as a candidate for elective office, in any primary, special, or general election;

(2) enrolling in or attending any public school or public college;

(3) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States or by any State or subdivision thereof;

(4) applying for or enjoying employment, or any perquisites thereof, by any private employer or agency of the United States or an State or subdivision thereof, or of joining or using the services or advantages of any labor organization or using the services of any employment agency;

(5) selling, purchasing, renting, leasing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, rental, lease or occupation of any dwelling;

(6) serving, or attending upon any court in connection with possible service, as a grand or petit juror in any court of the United States or of any State;

(7) using any vehicle, terminal, or facility of any common carrier by motor, rail, water or air;

(8) participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance; or

(9) enjoying the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any inn, hotel, motel, or other establishment which provides lodging to transient guests, or of any restaurant, cafeteria, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other facility principally engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, or of any gasoline station, or of any motion picture house, theater, concert hall, sports arena, stadium, or any other place of exhibition or entertainment, or of any other establishment which serves the public and which is located within the premises of any of the aforesaid establishments or within the premises of which is physically located any of the aforesaid establishments; or

(b) injuries, intimidates, or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person (1) to discourage such person or any other person or any class of persons from lawfully participating or seeking to participate in any such benefits or activities without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or (2) because he has so participated or sought to so participate, or urged or aided others to so participate, or engaged in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity to so participate; or to so participate, or urged or aided others to so participate, or engaged in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity to so participate; or

(c) injures, intimidates, interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any public official or other person to discourage him from affording another person or any class of persons equal treatment in participating or seeking to participate in any of such benefits or activities without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or because he has afforded another person or class of persons equal treatment in so participating or seeking to so participate—

shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

Amendments

SEC. 502. (a) Section 241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the final paragraph thereof and substituting the following:

"They shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results, they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

(b) Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

Mr. RODINO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the title be dispensed with, that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD and open for amendment at any point.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read title V.

Mr. McCULLOCH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Was it not agreed earlier today in the Committee that we would proceed with the disposition of title IV, read title V, and then the Committee would rise?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that as a gentleman's agreement. That is the Chair's understanding.

The Clerk concluded the reading of title V.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the following is an amendment which I will offer to title V of the bill. I submit it here for the information of the Committee:

Page 77, immediately following line 24, insert the following:

"Civil Rights Indemnification Board

"SEC. 503. A board is hereby created and established, within the Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') to be known as the Civil Rights Indemnification Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed of five members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Commissioner not later than the close of the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act. The first members appointed shall continue in office for terms of one, two, three, four, and five years, respectively, from the date of appointment, the term of each to be designated by the Commission, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed: *Provided, however,* That upon the expiration of his term of office, a member shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have been qualified. The Commission shall choose a chairman from the Board's membership. No member shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any member may be removed by the Commission for neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board. The Board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"SEC. 504. The Board shall, in accordance with the civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary, and such attorneys, hearing examiners, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court.

"SEC. 505. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 506. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

"SEC. 507. All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid out of the fund established in section 517 of this title upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"SEC. 508. (a) Whenever any person suffers grave bodily injury, or damage to his property by bombing or burning, or is deprived of his life, and the action producing such injury, death, or damage would constitute a violation of section 501 of this title, the injured party, or his legal representative, may file a claim seeking indemnification for such injury, death, or damage with the Board.

"(b) Every claim shall be made on forms to be furnished by the Board and shall contain all the information required by the Board. Each claim shall be sworn to by the person seeking compensation, or by his legal representative, and, except in the case of death, shall be accompanied by a certificate of the injured person's physician, stating the nature of the injury and the nature and probable extent, if any, of disability.

"(c) All claims for indemnification herein must be filed with the Board within six months of the injury or damage for which an award is sought, except that where the injury results in death, the claim may be filed within twelve months of death.

'Sec. 509. Whoever makes, in any affidavit, report, or supporting document required under section 508(b) of this title or in any claim for compensation herein, any willfully false statement, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 510. The Board, upon consideration of any claim presented to it, and after the completion of any hearing or investigation as it may deem necessary, shall determine and make an award for or against payment of compensation for such injury, death, or damage. Such award may include a reasonable attorney's fee, but shall not exceed $25,000, exclusive of such fees, or, if death occurs, shall not exceed $50,000, exclusive of such fees.

"Sec. 511. The Board shall have power to issue subpenas for and compel the attendance of witnesses, to require the production of books, papers, documents, and other evidence, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses upon any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board.

"Sec. 512. Any assignment of a claim for compensation under any section of this title shall be void, and all compensation and claims therefor shall be exempt from all claims of creditors.

"Sec. 513. The decision of the Board shall be final unless it is fraudulent, or arbitrary, or capricious, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

"Sec. 514. The United States Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to review any final decision of the Board and render judgment thereon, subject to the monetary limitations contained in section 510.

"Sec. 515. (a) Any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Board may obtain a review of such decision in the United States Court of Claims, by filing in such court, within ninety days after the date of such decision, a written petition naming the Board as defendant, specifying with particularity the reasons why such decision is not entitled to finality under section 513 of this title or that the decision is clearly erroneous as a matter of law.

"(b) A copy of such petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Board and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, as provided for United States Court of Appeal, in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"Sec. 516. (a) When it appears, after a claim has been filed with the Board, that the person or persons responsible for the injury, death, or damage for which an award is sought is or are known, such person or persons shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in any proceedings instituted before the Board and to be fully heard.

"(b) In the event that such proceedings before the Board indicates that the injury, death, or damage resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the city, county, or other political subdivision under whose authority such action was taken shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the proceedings and to be fully heard.

"(c) Notice under this section may be by personal service or by registered or certified mail. Notice to a city, county, or other political subdivision may be given to the chief executive or principal legal officer of such political subdivision.

"(d) The Board may, if necessary to secure a full hearing for any intervenor, continue the proceedings from time to time.

"Sec. 517. (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the 'Indemnification Compensation Fund' which shall consist of such sums as Congress may, from time to time, appropriate therefor or transfer thereto and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this Act or any other Act of Congress. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the awards, judgments, and expenses authorized by this Act. The Board shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates of appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the 'Indemnification Compensation Fund'.

"(b) The Board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the disposition of any cases after judicial review for the immediately preceding fiscal year, including a detailed statement of appropriations and expenditures.

"Sec. 518. (a) Upon payment by the United States of any award made under this title, the Attorney General may institute, for or in the name of the United States, a civil action against the person or persons responsible for the injury for which the award is made and, upon proof of the facts upon which such award was based, shall recover, for the United States, an amount not exceeding the amount of such award. Any recovery so obtained shall be deposited in the fund established in section 517 of this title.

"(b) If the injury for which an award is made resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the city, county, or other political subdivision under whose authority such action was taken may be joined as a defendant in any action brought by the Attorney General under this section and shall be jointly and severally liable with the person or persons responsible for such injury.

"(c) In any case brought under this section against anyone notified under section 516, the findings of fact made or adopted by the Board, and, if judicially reviewed, sustained by the court, shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts determined by the findings, and the award of indemnification shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the damages suffered by the complainant.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted pursuant to this section.

"Sec. 519. Nothing herein shall deny to any person the right to pursue any action or remedy granted him under any other law of the United States or any city, county, or other political subdivision: *Provided,* That in the event that any person receives in any other action an award of damages for which an award of indemnification has been made under this title, the United States shall have a lien against such award in the amount of the award of indemnification. In the event such other award is made prior to the award of indemnification, the amount of such other award shall be considered by the Board in determining whether to make an award and, if so, the amount of the award."

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CRITICAL SITUATION DUE TO NICKEL SHORTAGE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of telegrams that I have received from a company back home that is about to face a complete shutdown because of the fact that again we are exercising a so-called trade policy that is injurious to American industry.

Mr. Speaker, we are shipping out of the country so much nickel that the situation has arisen where nickel is not available to American manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, this message says that unless they receive immediate relief in the matter of getting a supply of nickel, the Duraloy Co., located in a community which it is my honor to represent back home, will be completely shut down. The metal that they make and the products that they produce with nickel are absolutely essential to such industries as the petrochemical industry, the petroleum industry, the cement industry, the steel industry, the automotive industry, and the industrial finance builders.

While the immediate cause of the company's dilemma is caused by a strike at the source of its nickel supply, the export practices of our Nation make it impossible to find a new source of supply. This is true because we export beyond the point of safety emergency supplies.

Unless some of the short supply material is diverted from export the only alternative is to again pry open our strategic stockpiles.

In any case, any delay in meeting the needs of the Duroloy Co., will mean unemployment and a loss of markets for the company which will of course add to the economic troubles of this community and its workers.

We are in a situation where so much of our raw materials are being exported that we are fast becoming a nation of producers of raw materials and importers of finished materials, thereby reverting to the old colonial status.

Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a bill calling upon the Congress to immediately open the stockpile on nickel to give this particular company enough nickel to meet their demands or otherwise face a shutdown and probably the elimination of this industry from this community that has been a depressed community for the better part of the past 40 years.

The latest telegram received by my office follows:

SCOTTDALE, PA.,
August 3, 1966.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference our telegram July 25 relative our critical situation due to nickel shortage caused by strike at International Nickel Co. Our situation becoming more acute and will face complete shutdown unless immediate relief can be achieved. Our high alloy products are essential to process equipment used by other manufacturers in making war material and our industry has been supplied with adequate nickel in past emergencies by special consideration. Further thought should be given to the impact our shutdown will have not only on our community but industries such as petro-chemical, petroleum, cement, steel, automotive, industrial, finance, builders, to name a few. Therefore, seriously need your assistance in directing adequate nickel supply to us.

THOS. R. HEYWARD III,
President.

OHIO LAW IS NOT AS STRICT AS TITLE IV

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it has been alleged on several occasions that title IV of the pending civil rights bill is not as strong as various State laws on the subject. It has been specifically averred that the Ohio law is more stringent. On the face of it, this is an incorrect statement. There is nothing in the Ohio law that would bring the hordes of the Justice Department and the various bureaucratic agencies down your back. There is nothing in the Ohio law that would result in an investigation by the FBI or the various police agencies of the Federal Government. Such a claim is specious on its face when one looks at the insurmountable burden which the Federal Government can place on your back. Consider just one item: the proposed agency to be set up by this bill would have the power to order you to Washington to answer their complaints. It could also provide legal services for those who claim to be aggrieved.

The Ohio Association of Real Estate Boards has answered one of my colleagues and I feel that their letter deserves a place in the legislative history on this bill. I include it with these remarks:

OHIO ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS

I appreciate very much your letter of July 28th in regard to Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

In regard to the Bonding Provision—we feel there is a great difference between the word "shall" in the Ohio Statute and "may" which is presently in the Federal Bill.

This problem is further compounded when section 406(d) is read in conjunction with 406(b) which provides for the appointment of an attorney for the complainant and commencement of suit without fees or security. In the event the court, in its discretion, finds a bond to be desirable how can such a bond be made without cost?

We have read your statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, 1966 and cannot agree that the Ohio Statute is "substantially stricter" than the Federal Bill. We anticipate that if the Federal Bill were to become law that the Ohio Statute would become ineffective as a practical matter, and the intentions expressed in 406(d) for the Federal Court to defer to state or local authority will come to naught.

I would like to further call your attention to various sections of the Ohio Statute beginning with Section 4112.05(b). This has language which prohibits testers from making surveys and causing complaints to be filed where no genuine intention or williness or ability to purchase or rent is involved. The Ohio Civil Rights Commission is required to find, before it permits the filing of any formal complaint, that the complainant acted with the intention of fulfilling any contracts or agreements which he was seeking. This prevents harassment by groups who are more interested in agitation and surveys then they are in housing.

Section 4112.05(e) contains language which requires that the Civil Rights Commission make its findings on the basis of reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

Section 4112.05(f) requires that notice be given to the complainant and to the respondent in any hearing affording them an opportunity to be present. It also provides that no person and this would include all realtors, owners, or other people shall be compelled to be a witness against himself at any hearing before the Commission or a Hearing Examiner. This we feel is a legal safeguard against harassment by any complainant and is in accord with all of our principles of due process of law which has been our heritage for some time.

Section 4112.05(g): The Commission is required to make its conclusion of law as well as findings of fact. Another safeguard against harassment. The chapter elsewhere provides for appeals to the Common Pleas Court from a finding of the Commission. Appeals, therefore, are as in other legal cases, limited to questions of law.

Under the Federal bill, two cases of which we have specific knowledge, would continue in litigation at great expense to the respondent and no ultimate remedial action in favor of the complainant for the simple reason that no complaint was actually stated under the law. In our state procedures this was quickly and effectively dealt with at a minimum expense. And even so the respondents were not happy at having to defend an invalid charge. In both cases they not only were not in violation but were in actual compliance with the law.

In conclusion, Bill, we feel that legislation is not the answer; education and understanding among people is the only way this problem can be solved.

Again, I appreciate your interest and concern for trying to solve a very delicate problem.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT L. MCALLISTER,
Director, Realtors' Ohio Committee.

SALUTE TO REPUBLIC OF IVORY COAST

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the sixth anniversary of the independence of the young, vibrantly dynamic, and proud Republic of the Ivory Coast in Africa. As chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for myself and the members of the subcommittee, and I am sure all my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle, I extend congratulations and every good wish to the Honorable Felix Houphouet-Borginy, the able President of the Ivory Coast, to the popular Ambassador Konon Bédié, and to all the people of this happy and thriving African nation.

Potentially the most economically self-sufficient state in former French West Africa, Ivory Coast is a rectangular-shaped country of 127,520 square miles facing the coast on the south side of the African bulge. It is bounded on the north by Upper Volta and Mali, on the east by Ghana, and on the west by Liberia and Guinea. The southern boundary is a 340-mile coastline on the Gulf of Guinea.

The population of Ivory Coast was estimated in 1962 at 3,340,000, of whom about 12,000 are Europeans concentrated mainly in Abidjan, which now has a population of about 250,000. Ivory Coast contains perhaps 60 distinct tribal groups. The rate of population increase is about 2.5 percent per year.

The early history of Ivory Coast is virtually unknown, although it is thought that a neolithic civilization existed there. Early contacts were limited to a few missionaries. In the 18th century, the country was invaded by two related ethnic groups. Ivory Coast officially became a colony of France in 1839. From 1904 to 1958, Ivory Coast was a constituent unit of the Federation of French West Africa. It was a colony under the Third Republic and overseas territory under the Fourth Republic. Ivory Coast became independent August 7, 1960, and thereafter permitted its community membership to lapse. It was admitted to the United Nations on September 20, 1960.

The contemporary political history of Ivory Coast is closely associated with the career of Félix Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Republic and leader of the Parti Démocratique de la Cote d'Ivoire (PDCI), the only political party in Ivory Coast. Houphouet-Boigny first came to national political prominence in 1944 as founder of the Syndicat Agricole Africain, an organization that won improved labor conditions for African farmers and formed a nucleus for the PDCI.

Stability has prevailed in Ivory Coast since independence in 1960.

The Constitution of Ivory Coast provides for a strong President within the framework of a separation of powers. The 70-member National Assembly is elected by direct universal suffrage for a 5-year term. The judicial system culminates in a Supreme Court composed of four chambers: constitutional, judicial, administrative, and auditing.

Ivory Coast's economy is based almost exclusively on exports of tropical products: 90 percent of the people are engaged in agricultural pursuits, and 75 percent of the total production is accounted for by the agricultural sector. The four major agricultural products, in terms of value received from exports, are coffee, cocoa, tropical woods, and bananas.

The Ivory Coast is the world's third leading producer of coffee and its fourth producer of cocoa. These two crops accounted for 73 percent of the country's export revenues in 1960. Ivory Coast traditionally has had a favorable balance of trade.

Ivory Coast's foremost need today is rapid exploitation of its economic potential. With an economy already more diversified than any other in West Africa, Ivory Coast has undertaken to increase public expenditure and to induce increased private investment in the industrial sector, with the hope of overcoming the need for foreign aid by 1970.

United States-Ivoirien relations are friendly and close. The United States is sympathetic to Ivory Coast's program of rapid, orderly economic development and to Ivory Coast's moderate stance on international issues.

Mr. Speaker, in the late months of 1965, when I was engaged as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations, four members of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, visited Africa under the direction of Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa. I am extending my remarks to include the following account of the study group's visit to the Ivory Coast as reported on pages 39–41 of House Report No. 1565:

> IVORY COAST
>
> The members of the study mission met with President Houphouet-Boigny who led the struggle for independence in French-speaking Africa and whose prestige extends beyond the boundaries of his own country.
>
> The President was a Member of the French Parliament prior to independence. The experience he acquired as a parliamentarian in Europe adds to his ability to govern his nation effectively.
>
> Although the Ivory Coast has 60 tribal groups, none is dominant, thus lessening the risk of political problems.
>
> The President is very conscious of the Red Chinese threat and ambition to colonize Africa. His Government and those of several like-minded countries have taken a strong stand against Peiping in African and international meetings. He advocates a unified policy among African states to counter Red Chinese activity in Africa.
>
> It is to be noted that this nation does not yet have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union nor any of the Soviet bloc countries, including Yugoslavia, although last fall the Government announced its willingness to consider establishing such relations.
>
> The Ivory Coast has no dazzling natural assets, but its land area is extensive and it has one of the lowest population density percentages on the continent.
>
> The Ivory Coast is the only country which has announced the goal to be completely independent of foreign assistance by 1970. It is the President's strong belief that independence will not be complete until the nation is economically independent. Although certain economic problems may make the attainment of such an objective in so short a period appear overly ambitious, it is a point to be noted and encouraged.
>
> A visit was made to the National Assembly and discussions were held with the President of the Assembly and parliamentarians.
>
> A meeting with American business representatives produced encouraging discussion on the potentialities of more U.S. private investments in the country.
>
> ECONOMY
>
> The Ivory Coast is one of the few African countries today that has become steadily more prosperous since independence. Both gross net product growth and per capita income have increased about 10 percent per year since the nation became independent. Inflation, however, is very much in evidence.
>
> The country is the third largest coffee-producing nation in the world. Last year, the United States purchased approximately $47 million worth of Ivoirien coffee. The sale of coffee has been a major factor in building the nation's large reserve account. In the current year and in the years to come, declining coffee sales are expected to reduce the nation's large reserve holdings. The Ivory Coast's current production of coffee considerably exceeds its quota under the International Coffee Agreement, to which it is signatory.
>
> Since coffee and cocoa are the chief cash crops and a decline in their sales is anticipated, the nation is making great plans for diversification of crops for export. One project contemplated would raise a rice crop for local consumption and export. Serious consideration is being given to the establishment of a fishing industry. A fisheries training vessel, the *President Kennedy,* is under construction in the United States and is due for delivery to the Ivory Coast in the next few months. The country is particularly eager for the United States to share with it its knowledge relative to the tuna industry.
>
> U.S. ASSISTANCE
>
> The U.S. economic aid programs for the Ivory Coast have been relatively modest. The total development grants, development loans, and food-for-peace assistance for fiscal years 1961–65 is $18.8 million. Of this total, $6.7 million represents two development loans and $6.6 million represents proceeds from commodities under titles I and IV of Public Law 480. As an example of economic viability and constructive economic planning, an airport is to be built in the south-central section of the nation in a pilot demonstration area around which it is planned to center a number of development projects. The project will cost $1 million, with the equivalent of $500,000 from food-for-peace sales proceeds.
>
> AMERICAN WEEK
>
> Later in 1966, in the city of Abidjan, the capital, an exhibition called American Week is to be held. American representatives of U.S. firms will display manufactured products from this country in order to promote better business associations with the local populace. The Department of Commerce and USIS will assist in the exhibition.
>
> AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK
>
> The African Development Bank was inaugurated on November 4, 1964. The Bank is the first institution of its kind to be established by African governments, financed by African capital, and directed by Africans. It has the objective of playing a vital role in the development of Africa.
>
> The headquarters of the Bank is located in Abidjan, Ivory Coast. At the time the study mission was in Abidjan no fewer than 27 independent African nations had already joined the Bank and paid their initial subscription toward the authorized capital stock. Others are expected to join in the near future.
>
> The Bank is not asking the United States to subscribe to the capital stock. An offer to provide technical assistance to the Bank has been made by our Government.

AROUND-THE-WORLD CONCERT TOUR OF WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY CHOIR

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, the choir of Wittenberg University of Springfield, Ohio, in my congressional district, is now in the homestretch of a 24,000-mile, 49-day, around-the-world concert tour. The Wittenberg Choir, conducted by Dr. L. David Miller, dean of the Wittenberg School of Music, is believed to be the first coeducational music organization ever to make an around-the-world concert tour. The 1966 tour is the third overseas trip for the choir, which made tours in Europe during the summers of 1961 and 1964.

One unique feature of the Wittenberg Choir tour is that the trip was financed entirely by the choir, with the largest portion of the expenses coming from the private enterprise of the choir members. Each member was required to contribute $1,000 toward the expenses. Baking pizzas, nursing, sandblasting, sorting silver, waiting tables at a dude ranch, taking photos of Santa Claus, and laboring in a steel plant were some of the methods used by the young people. This willingness to work and to pay their own way was one of the factors that helped to create considerable respect for Wittenberg students on the two previous tours abroad.

The choir embarked on the tour with many wishes for success and Godspeed. Among these was a proclamation issued by Ohio's Gov. James A. Rhodes commending the choir for the efforts to be made in furthering amity and good will on its tour and stating that the choir will be conveying greetings to hosts around the world from the more than 10 million citizens of Ohio.

Wittenberg University's president, Dr. John N. Stauffer, appraised the choir's role in a threefold fashion:

> You will be, it seems to me, witnesses to the Christian Gospel, envoys for Wittenberg, and ambassadors of American freedom and of American responsibility in the world.

The choir prepared three repertoires for its world tour—sacred, secular, and folk. The tour includes concerts in Hawaii, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaya, Thailand, India, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Greece, and Italy.

Wittenberg University, affiliated with the Lutheran Church in America, has an enrollment of 5,268. It is a fully accredited small university which emphasizes the liberal arts. The Wittenberg Choir has 77 members representing 18 of the 50 U.S. States.

The July 14 Washington Post carried an article about the praise the Wittenberg Choir received for its performance in Hong Kong. In view of the fine job done by this outstanding group of American students, I am today introducing a House resolution congratulating the Wittenberg Choir on its success and acknowledging its members' contribution as ambassadors of song and good will for the United States.

The story in the Washington Post is as follows:

HONG KONG TRIUMPH—CHINESE APPLAUD WITTENBERG CHOIR

HONG KONG, July 13.—The Wittenberg University Choir drew praise from the music critic of a leading newspaper today for its first performance here.

"A large group of attractive and very talented young Americans last night gave a widely varied and excellently presented program of vocal music," said the South China Morning Post.

More than 1000 persons attended the concert at the City Hall Auditorium. The crowd, mostly Chinese, gave the student choir from Springfield, Ohio, enthusiastic applause throughout the two-hour performance.

The choirs' second and final performance was scheduled at the City Hall tonight.

The Morning Post critic said director Dr. David Miller "has achieved an extremely high standard of singing from this versatile group.

"Part singing," the critic wrote of last night's performance, "was carefully balanced and diction and enunciation were good throughout. Dr. Miller achieves a lovely pianissimo tone, all the more effective because the range of dynamics was wide and built up to strong and powerful climaxes."

The critic commented on some of the songs which were best received and said the most appreciated, perhaps, was "Evening Bell," a Chinese song which was sung in the Mandarin Chinese dialect.

It was written by David Chao, a Chinese who studied music at Wittenberg and now is in Taiwan.

All in all, the critic said, the 80 member choir presented "an enjoyable and entertaining and impressive evening of vocal music."

The choir was presented with a flag by the Music Society of Hong Kong following the performance. A large part of the audience also went backstage to congratulate the student singers.

The group, which arrived here Monday from Taiwan, leaves Thursday for Kuala Lumpur. It also is scheduled to visit Bangkok, Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, Cairo, Jerusalem, Beirut, Athens and Rome.

I also include a list of the choir members:

WITTENBERG CHOIR PERSONNEL 1966 AROUND-THE-WORLD TOUR

OHIO

Harriet Alexander, Worthington.
Janet Barnes, New Carlisle.
Bruce Baunach, Toledo.
Barbara Bowman, Wooster.
Robert Boyce, Shelby.
James Chadbourne, Bryan.
Gary Cook, Cleveland Heights.
Gary Crist, Urbana.
William Downing, Akron.
Larry Drotleff, East Cleveland.
John Geib, Canton.
Mary Gramly, Mansfield.
Thomas Heil, Columbus.
Mary Henkle, Lebanon.
Stephen Hiltebrant, N. Ridgeville.
Thomas Hudson, Ashland.
Sarah Hunt, Lima.
Jeanette Inbody, Findlay.
Robert Lantz, Mansfield.
Rudolf Medicus, Dayton.
George Meese, Lyndhurst.
Marsha Meyers, Cleveland.
Margaret Mowery, Springfield.
Randall Myers, Bucyrus.
Thomas Orvis, Columbus.
Robert Pohowsky, Cincinnati.
Margaret Pyle, Granville.
Gloria Reed, Lyndhurst.
Pamela Rhoads, Washington C.H.
John Schuder, Dayton.
Randall Simon, Lorain.
Jeannine Smith, Marion.
Stanley Sneeringer, Lancaster.
Betty Staley, Ashland.
Howard Stephan, Lakewood.
Elizabeth Syverson, Columbus.
A. Dale Truscott, Dayton.
Ruth Updegraff, Dayton.
Mary Walborn, Columbus.
Linda Waltonen, Fairport Harbor.

COLORADO

Jo Ann Soker, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Richard Carlson, Branford.

FLORIDA

Carol Feiser, Boca Raton.

GEORGIA

Ann Billings, Atlanta.

ILLINOIS

Mary Alice Kmet, Oak Park.

INDIANA

Mary Bean, Indianapolis.
Cheryl Boringer, Indianapolis.
Ellen Derra, Indianapolis.
Richard Heasley, Fort Wayne.
Rebecca Schuette, Auburn.

MARYLAND

Thomas Folkemer, Linthicum.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ted Randall, Boxford.

MICHIGAN

George Arends, Wayne.
Maureen Sanders, Birmingham.

MINNESOTA

Janice Hoaglund, Bloomington.
Karen Hoaglund, Bloomington.

MISSOURI

Marsha Young, St. Louis.

NEBRASKA

Susan Gosker, Hooper.

NEW JERSEY

Beth Bricker, Glen Rock.
June Forsberg, Westfield.
Richard Greten, West Caldwell.
Edythe Humphries, West Englewood.
Krysia Olszewski, Glen Ridge.

NEW YORK

Allan Grubert, White Plans.
Judith Sutcliffe, Massapequa.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jerry Cobb, Raleigh.

PENNSYLVANIA

Judith Adams, Prospect.
William Bean, Pittsburgh.
George Blind, Lafayette Hill.
Mary Everhart, Gibsonia.
John Haer, Warren.
Stephen Hurnyak, Charleroi.
Judith Skelly, Erie.
Stephen Tener, Erie.
Rebecca Thompson, Pittsburgh.

WEST VIRGINIA

Martha Beneke, Wheeling.
Kitty Woods, Huntington.
Dr. L. David Miller, conductor.
Mrs. L. David Miller.
Elmer F. Blackmer, manager.
Tracy H. Norris, publicity.
James L. Varis, photographer.

The resolution is as follows:

H. RES. —

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its congratulations to the Wittenberg University Choir of Springfield, Ohio, composed of young people from 18 of the 50 States, on the occasion of its around-the-world concert tour, between June 25 and August 12, 1966. The House recognizes the initiative and ingenuity of the members of the choir in financing the tour themselves. The House extends its congratulations to the choir, secure in the knowledge that the members of the choir are ambassadors of song and good will to the world for the United States.

THE CONTROVERSIAL TFX PROGRAM

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star on Thursday, August 4, 1966, carried an Associated Press story on the controversial TFX program. I believe this article should be read by every Member of this House. For this reason I submit it below:

DELAY IN BUILDING TFX ACCEPTABLE TO NAVY CREATES STIR

NEW YORK.—The bitter controversy over whether Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara forced a second best warplane on the nation's military to save $1 billion is heating up again.

This latest outbreak centers around development of the Navy version of the TFX—tactical fighter experimental—now known as the F111B.

As a weapons system—aircraft wedded to missile—the program is 12 to 18 months behind schedule.

BADLY OVERWEIGHT

The first three prototypes were so badly overweight they were useless for carrier operations.

Further, the research and development costs for the weapons system are soaring although this is not uncommon in projects involving new weaponry.

The F111—and there are two versions to date—may not turn out to be the all-weather, all purpose air superiority aircraft originally envisioned by McNamara.

The Marine Corps already has told Congress it does not intend to buy the F111 in either the Air Force or Navy versions for close air support of troops.

REPORTS OF NEW HEARINGS

There have been published reports out of Washington indicating that the Senate Investigations subcommittee, headed by Sen. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, D-Ark., may reopen its still unconcluded hearings.

In 1963 the McClellan subcommittee heard testimony covering over 2,700 pages and collected in 10 volumes, but it never issued a finding.

To date the controversy over the F111B has swirled around the first three prototypes.

A slimmed down fourth prototype, identified as No. 4 F111B, was rolled off the assembly line in July and its builders contend it will meet the Navy's operating requirements although it, too, is still somewhat overweight. The No. 4 has been flown for 80 minutes.

"WE MUST MAKE WORK"

A Navy decision of whether to buy the F111B is not expected until December after full evaluation of a fifth prototype, which is due for production this month.

Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze said on July 27 that the F111B was a weapons system "we must make work."

The controversy over the TFX, or F111, began in 1962 when McNamara overrode the recommendations of a 235-man panel of aircraft experts four times.

The panel had recommended acceptance of a design submitted by the Boeing Co., of Seattle.

"COMMONALITY" STRESSED

McNamara selected the General Dynamics design on the grounds that it offered the best chance of producing an aircraft with a high degree of what he called "commonality;" that is, identical parts.

The defense chief characterized the Boeing cost estimates as unrealistic although Boeing had been working on a design for a variable sweep wing aircraft, such as the TFX, since 1959.

In the original competition Boeing proposed to build 23 research and development aircraft for $466 million. General Dynamics' proposal was $543 million.

McNamara told the McClellan hearing the purchase of a single warplane for use by the Air Force, Navy and Marines would save at least $1 billion.

"ROUGH JUDGMENTS"

Subsequently, when the subcommittee asked the then comptroller general, Joseph Campbell, to check McNamara's savings claim, Campbell reported he could find no figures and quoted McNamara as saying: "He had made rough judgments of the kind he had made for many year with the Ford Motor C." McNamara is a former Ford president.

During the course of the hearings there were assorted charges of favoritism, conflict of interest and lack of Defense Department cooperation, but McNamara refused to budge.

At the time of the contract award, there was congressional testimony that to buy 1,704 TFX warplanes with spare parts and spare engines would cost around $7.8 billion.

As matters now stand, Rear Admiral W. E. Sweeney told a House Appropriations subcommittee last March the Navy F111B research program was running about 30 percent higher than estimated.

MISSILE CREATES DELAY

Further, Sweeney said, overall research, development and engineering costs had climbed from $84 million to around $210 million.

One of the major delays encountered in the program has been development of the Phoenix missile. Research costs reportedly have climbed from $137 million to around $240 million.

The TFX, or F111, comes in two versions—the "A" for the Air Force and the "B" for the Navy. General Dynamics claims the two versions have 85 percent commonality. The F11B is being built for General Dynamics by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., on Long Island, N.Y.

Both versions employ a wing which will sweep from 16 degrees off a right angle extension, or nearly straight out, to 72.5 degrees for high speed operations.

The Air Force version has a wingspan of 63 feet and is 73 feet long. The Navy version has a 60-foot wing span and length of 66.8 feet.

MISSIONS DIFFER

The Air Force has bought the F111 as a fighter-bomber, while the Navy plans to use it as a long-range interceptor.

Since their missions differ, the electronic equipment, or "black boxes," differ radically.

The Air Force version is designed to travel at two and a half times the speed of sound at its service ceiling of 60,000 feet, while the Navy version is supposed to reach 2.2 times the speed of sound at 55,000 feet. The speed of sound at these altitudes is 660 miles an hour.

Air Force and industry sources say the F111A had exceeded its speed requirements, has carried a full load of 48 bombs each weighing 813 pounds, and has reached its service ceiling.

General Dynamics had produced 14 of the proposed 18 F111As at its Fort Worth plant. There is no weight problem with the F111A.

WEIGHT IS CARRIER PROBLEM

As for the Navy versions, the No. 3 had a 78,000-pound gross weight, a fact which set off the current controversy when the information became public.

Since the Forrestal class carriers have an elevator capacity of only 79,000 pounds, this meant the No. 3, if used by the Navy, would have to be fueled and armed on deck, thus reducing some of the carrier commander's operating flexibility.

After an intensive weight-reduction program, Grumman turned out a slimmed down F11B in July with a gross weight of 64,778 pounds, according to one source. This was still higher than the maximum of 55,000 pounds set by the Navy.

On the basis of information gleaned from assorted sources in Congress, among the military and in industry, here is the way the No. 4 F11B compares with the original specifications.

The Navy asked for an empty weight of 39,000 pounds, No. 4 weights 43,000 pounds.

REQUIREMENT CHANGED

The Navy specified an aircraft which could land on a carrier anchored in a dead calm. This requirement was changed by McNamara to an arresting wind-over-deck of 10 knots, or 11.6 miles per hour.

With its new high lift wings, No. 4 can land at 105 knots with an arresting wind of between 15 and 18 knots. The Navy's current fleet jet, the Phantom II (F4) lands at about 132 knots and has an arresting wind requirement of 32 knots.

The Navy originally asked for an aircraft which could "loiter" for more than three hours at a distance of 750 miles from the fleet. This was reduced by the Pentagon to a range of around 500 miles and a loiter time under three hours. No. 4 is expected by Grumman to meet the compromised loiter and range requirements.

The service ceiling of 55,000 feet has yet to be met by the F111B. A Grumman spokesman said the No. 3 was never taken to its ceiling because Grumman knew it was overweight and unacceptable. The No. 4 is expected to meet the Navy specifications, he said.

CONTROVERSY ON COSTS

One of the chief sources of the controversy concerns costs and in this area there is a welter of often confusing and conflicting figures.

The Pentagon has announced a plan to buy 431 F111s, 24 of which will be for the Navy. This figures out to a unit cost of $2.3 million. General Dynamics' original unit cost estimates, based on an order of 1,704 aircraft, with spare parts and spare engines, came to $2.9 million each.

What makes the Pentagon purchase order unusual is that it was announced before a final decision on the F111B had been made and even before the No. 4 improved model had been turned out.

A congressional source said in an interview he understood the unit cost had soared to around $9 million but efforts to check this figure have been rebuffed. If the congressional source turns out to be right, this would mean a "buy" based on the original 1,704 proposal of $15 billion—roughly twice the original cost estimates.

BILL TO ESTABLISH ARBITRARY 4½ PERCENT INTEREST CEILING AND TO SET DIVIDEND CEILING REQUESTED

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on the bill we are considering, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, many of us thought that the 21-day rule was grossly abused. The Committee on Rules had hardly a few hours to consider the confusing and misleading committee report before a 21-day rule resolution was put in the hopper.

Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency took the floor of the House and pleaded with Members of the House to ask the Committee on Rules to grant a rule on H.R. 14026. Among other things, this bill would place an arbitrary 4½-percent interest rate ceiling on certain types of time deposits in commercial banks, as well as grant standby authority for the Home Loan Bank Board to set dividend ceilings on savings and loan share accounts.

This bill was reported from our committee on July 28. Barely a few hours later that afternoon the chairman of our committee introduced House Resolution 941, a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules after 21 days. After having reported the bill, it turns out that the Johnson administration itself is unalterably opposed to setting statutory interest rate ceilings. Yesterday the Treasury Department told a Senate committee that enactment of the House bill could have catastrophic results on the homebuilding industry.

Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing a reckless abuse of the 21-day rule. By the request for its invocation, the responsibility for calling this measure before the House no longer rests with the Committee on Rules but squarely on the shoulders of our beloved Speaker. For the sake of accuracy, if the Members of the House want to risk a financial crisis of monumental proportions by enacting this measure, they should address their appeal for quick action to the House leadership—not the Committee on Rules.

Students of House parliamentary procedure should study this embarrassing predicament in order better to comprehend the dangers of hasty consideration inherent in the 21-day rule.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of more irresponsible action than if the Committee on Rules heeded the pleas of Chairman PATMAN and reported a rule on H.R. 14026 prior to expiration of the required 21-day rule. Rather they might reappraise the minority's request for hearing from Treasury officials, especially in light of their recent opposition, and send the bill back to committee for more judicious and responsible consideration.

TAXPAYERS SHOULD BE ADVISED OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recent days much publicity has been given to the decisions of the Supreme Court regarding the rights of persons accused of crime to have counsel at all stages of the proceedings. Equal publicity ought to be given to the recent decision in *Kohatsu* v. *United States*, 351 Federal 2d, 898, which held that a taxpayer does not have to be told of his constitutional rights during a criminal tax investigation.

This decision was reached although the Internal Revenue Service investigations affect more people and is responsible for more criminal prosecutions than any other Federal administrative agency. The Ninth Circuit specifically held that the rule of the Supreme Court of the United States enunciated in *Escovedo* v. *U.S.*, 378 U.S. 478, which requires the assistance of counsel, was inapplicable to the situation where a routine civil tax audit conducted by a revenue agent changed into a criminal investigation conducted by a special agent of the Intelligence Division. The court held that the special agent was under no duty when he first entered the case and began seeking incriminating information to advise the taxpayer of his constitutional rights.

In the Kohatsu case the taxpayer's personal income tax return for 1958 had been assigned to a revenue agent for a routine audit. The audit continued for about a year during which time the taxpayer allowed the revenue agent full access to his books and records. Subsequently a special agent was assigned to the case and the criminal investigation began. The taxpayer was not advised relative thereto. A year and a half after the special agent was assigned to the case the taxpayer was requested to appear at the Intelligence Division for a formal interview. He appeared without counsel. At this point he was advised as to his constitutional rights. It was some 3 months after this interview that the taxpayer realized he was subject to criminal investigation. It was the Government's contention that the stage at which the taxpayer was entitled to learn that he was involved in a possible criminal charge was at the time of arrest or indictment. With this contention the Ninth Circuit agreed.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE'S FOOT DRAGGING ON PROMISED "RIGHTS" FOR EMPLOYEES AGGRAVATES NAIRE

Its patience at an end, NAIRE today vigorously chided the Internal Revenue Service for its failure to follow through on a bargain struck in principle 1 year ago, which would give IRS workers a right to counsel when they are in trouble.

Shortly before its 1965 convention NAIRE began consulting in earnest with top IRS officials on the employee organization's proposal for a right-to-counsel regulation covering IRS employees undergoing investigation by IRS inspection teams, where the investigations might result in either administrative discipline or criminal prosecution. NAIRE spokesmen conferred repeatedly with IRS management, and even furnished drafts and revised drafts of the desired regulation.

The parties achieved an agreement in principle during late August of 1965, and refined the specifics of the regulation by the end of the year.

Before actually promulgating the regulation—which was to take the form of a "Commissioner's letter" from Commissioner Sheldon Cohen—IRS said it had to get clearance from the inside.

The clearance operation must have required a lot of steps, since the regulation has not been released to this day, in spite of repeated queries and other efforts by NAIRE to pry it loose.

Said NAIRE Executive Secretary-Treasurer George Bursach today:

> This is a story NAIRE tried hard not to break, but we are absolutely at the end of our rope. What both sides agreed to in good faith at least a year ago has still not been implemented. In spite of what IRS management says for the record, we don't know the true reasons for the delay. We only know that the delay itself is inexcusable, and undermines the whole theory of collective bargaining as "equals" between employee organizations and Federal agencies.

Bursach went on:

> If this is an example of democratic collective bargaining within the IRS, we might as well revert to a monarchy, where we at least don't have our hopes aroused by an agreement, then see them destroyed by inaction on the part of our so-called bargaining partners.

NAIRE and IRS even went so far as to take ceremonial pictures of Commissioner Cohen and NAIRE President Thomas Ravielli back in March of this year for release "within a few days," as IRS officials then put it, according to Bursach.

The official reason assigned by IRS for the long delay is that the proposed regulation has not yet been cleared by its Office of Chief Counsel.

COULD WE RUN A RAILROAD LIKE CONGRESS PERMITS ITS MONETARY AFFAIRS TO BE OPERATED? WHY SHOULD INTEREST ON $42 BILLION BE PAID ON U.S. GOVERNMENT BONDS THAT HAVE BEEN PAID FOR ONCE? WHY SHOULD CONGRESS PERMIT THE TREASURY TO REFINANCE U.S. BONDS THAT HAVE BEEN PAID FOR ONCE?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department announced last week the refunding of bonds maturing August 12 and November 15, 1966. The Treasury Department will pay 5¼ percent on these new issues.

The alarming thing is that the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee holds in the New York Federal Reserve Bank $5,851 million of these bonds and these bonds have been paid for once.

Now, the Federal Reserve is getting new bonds for these $5,851 million that are being refinanced. The added interest will increase the income of the Federal Reserve by $80 million per year.

Why should new bonds be given for bonds that have already been paid?

If Congress does not give more attention to what is being done in this field, our interest rate burden will be so great that the people will be unable to bear it and, at the same time, enjoy a proper standard of living.

Remember, interest owed by the Government comes first when taxes are paid. It is the first item that must be taken care of; other programs must take a back seat.

Now, our annual interest payment of $13 billion on the national debt is the second largest item in our budget, second only to national defense expenditures.

If interest increases in the foreseeable future as it has in the past few years, it will not be long until the Federal Government will be unable to finance necessary programs because of high interest.

We are paying twice as much interest on the national debt as we would be paying if the Roosevelt-Truman rates had remained in effect. Because of the high interest imposed by the Federal Reserve with the consent and approval of the Eisenhower administration, we are annually paying $6½ billion more than we would have been paying under the rates effective when the Republicans came in in 1953. The fact is, we have paid since that time in interest $60 billion more than would have been necessary under the old rates. Remember too that the old rates remained effective for 20 years, through the period of World War II and the Korean conflict and also through the worst depression in our history. So if the old rates could have been maintained under these conditions for 20 years, they certainly could be maintained now.

SEIZED INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The Federal Reserve under its seized independence has doubled the long-term interest rate the last 15 years.

Short-term rates have been affected drastically. What it cost the Federal Government during World War II to borrow a certain sum of money for a definite period of time should be compared to what is being paid by the Federal Government today. A cost of $100 on such short-term securities then costs the Federal Government $3,000 today; that is inflation at its worst in addition to the 100 percent on long-term Government obligations.

These interest rates are not only exorbitant; they are unnecessary and certainly unearned.

The 37½-percent Federal Reserve increase in interest rates in December 1965 is imposed on top of then already exorbitant rates.

Congress is responsible for this condition. Congress has not been doing its job in this area. The Federal Reserve has $42 billion in U.S. Government bonds in the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. If anyone is under bond for the safekeeping of these bonds, the information is not available. The Federal Reserve is collecting between $1½ and $2 billion a year interest on these bonds that have been paid for once. The $5,851 million that are now being refinanced are a part of this $42 billion.

How can anyone justify the Government's monetary matters being operated in such a way as the Federal Reserve is allowed to operate on the Government's credit?

NO AUDITS

The Federal Reserve has never been audited by an independent auditor or by the General Accounting Office. The Federal Reserve has never been audited by an independent auditor or the General Accounting Office since it became a central bank in 1935. Practically all other Government agencies are audited by the Comptroller General, but not the Federal Reserve.

It would be a good time to see an audit that has been conducted by the General Acounting Office of the Federal Reserve System. However, the Federal Reserve has refused to permit the Comptroller General to audit the system.

In December 1965, the Federal Reserve in defiance of the President arbitrarily increased interest rates 37½ percent by an amendment to regulation Q.

The Federal Reserve, as claimed, is not independent of the Government under the Constitution. Its only independence has been seized. It only has "squatter's" rights to its title to independence. I would not say its independence has been seized like Castro seized Cuba because Castro did run a risk of his life and the lives of other people in order to take over Cuba. The Federal Reserve has just as effectively taken over the monetary system in this country by infiltration and a seizure of power without firing a shot or spilling a drop of blood. Castro's conquest is insignificant in value in comparison to the wealth of the commercial banks of the country who are in on this scheme and device.

Congress should give more consideration to what is going on in the financial area involving interest rates, fair allocation of credit, and related matters affecting the public interest.

A commercial bank has lots of power. I am not against commercial banks; I am for them as long as they do not operate against the public interest. I do not want to be a party as a public official to the banks operating through the Federal Reserve System and their tremendously powerful American Bankers Association in taking advantage of the people and of our own Government.

The Federal Reserve has been so bold in its actions that when terrible things—like the $42 billion in bonds being held in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York that should be canceled and the national debt reduced that much—are called to the attention of Congress and the people of the Nation, the exposure is so terribly bad it is considered incredible and many people interrogated about it will reply, "I just do not believe Congress will let anything like that go on." It is difficult to believe that Congress would let things like this go on, but they are going on; they are happening every day. The people are being robbed and coming generations penalized through the payment of unearned interest.

When Abraham Lincoln was President, he made a statement that was often repeated and similar to one attributed to Horace Greeley. A quotation from President Lincoln's statement is as follows:

> The money power has established a more vicious form of universal slavery over the American people than ever was established over the American Negro.

This was over 100 years ago.

The American Bankers Association has been operating for the last hundred years. This association is always on the job here in Washington with plenty of high-paid representatives, most of whom have occupied important positions in the three branches of our Government. They are ever on the alert to make sure that no law is passed that would be detrimental to the profits of the banks and to make sure that every privilege that it is possible to be obtained for the banks is obtained for them.

When you consider that this lobby has been on the job a hundred years with the benefit of all the experience that it has had under capable management, it is in a powerful position to deal with Members of Congress who spend 2, 4, or 6 years, or longer, in the Congress. In addition to the powerful lobby of the American Bankers Association itself, which reaches into every community in our Nation, there is an interlocking relationship between the banks and the big businesses of the Nation. These big businesses also have lobbies in Washington and when the bankers need their help, it is available because they have a mutual interest brought about by interlocking relationships of the different businesses.

When these facts are considered and we realize what has happened here in the United States the last few decades, we cannot help but wonder how long the working people, the plain people, and the average people can stand up under such burdens which are unfairly taken and unlawfully seized.

The question is, When will Congress commence to give attention to these many major problems that are robbing the people in broad daylight and putting our country in bondage for generations?

TWO GOVERNMENTS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The truth is we have two governments in Washington—one run by elected representatives of the people, the Congress, and the President; the other run by unelected officials of the Federal Reserve, along with private bankers, who happen to be the biggest bankers in the United States who profit most from high interest and tight money.

CURRENT TREASURY REFUNDING OF EXISTING ISSUES FOR NEW 5½ PERCENT BONDS COSTING TAXPAYERS AN EXTRA $200 MILLION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department recently announced a refunding of bonds maturing August 15 and November 15, 1966. The Treasury Department, in order to meet the present tight money, high interest rates, will pay 5¼ percent on these new issues. This high 5¼-percent rate is caused by the Federal Reserve increasing rates 37½ percent last December.

Assuming that the holders of the $9.136 billion of August 15 issue, with coupon rates of 3 and 4 percent, exchange all their holdings for the new 5¼-percent issue, the extra annual interest costs to the taxpayers will be approximately $121 million. Of this $9.136 billion, the Federal Reserve System holds $5.851 billion. So of the $121 million per year extra interest, the Federal Reserve System will receive almost two-thirds of this amount, or about $80 million per year. Here we see a fine example of the Fed profiting from its own high interest, tight money policy.

If the holders of the $5.757 billion of November 15 maturity, with coupon rates ranging from 3⅞ to 4¾ percent, exchange their holdings for the 5¼-percent new issue, the total annual interest costs amount to a little more than $71 million. The Federal Reserve System owns 15 percent of these issues and, if it exchanges these for the new 5¼-percent bonds, its cut of this extra interest rate will be about $10 million a year.

So the total extra interest charges on these refunding operations will cost the taxpayer almost $200 million more a year than he must presently pay. The Federal Reserve System will gain a profit from this escapade of over $90 million. All these high rates are caused by the Federal Reserve.

We all recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this country is at war. It is not the munitions makers who profit now from war, but the Federal Reserve and its big banking community. Secretary Fowler might take a lesson from the actions of Secretary Henry Morgenthau and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board Marriner Eccles, when they held the Government bond rates at par throughout World War II and continued doing so right up to 1951. World War II was financed at the lowest possible rate, but now we are financing this war in Vietnam at rates determined by the big banks and the Fed—rates which I consider much too exorbitant. Mr. Speaker, I do hope in the future that Secretary Fowler considers the American public over the demands of the high-interest-rate gang. The bankers who profit the most from high interest and tight money should not be in on these policymaking decisions, but they are. It is like presidents of railroads being on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight rates.

ANALYSIS OF POLL CONDUCTED IN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the analysis has just been completed of the poll conducted by me in my congressional district.

I sent the questionnaire to every family, without regard to political party affiliation. I am told by colleagues and professional pollsters that the response was higher than average.

My staff and I spent many long hours in drafting the form of the questions. My aim was to solicit the opinions of my constituents without indicating to them my views. At the same time I tried to be certain that the questions were presented fairly and factually and covered the important issues of the times.

I am particularly pleased with the fact that so very many took advantage of the opportunity to send me their comments about matters not included within the questions, while others made appropriate remarks enlarging upon their "yes" or "no" answers.

The results are as follows:

Results of survey by percentage of answers

Question	Yes	No	No answer
Do you favor—			
1. Defending Israel from attack by the Arabs?	80. 74	15. 31	3. 95
2. Supplying arms to Israel to offset the Soviet arms buildup by the Arab nations in the Middle East?	86. 88	9. 88	3. 24
3. Honoring our commitment to resist outside aggression in South Vietnam to prevent a Communist takeover?	75. 89	18. 23	5. 88
4. Continuing to offer to negotiate peace in Vietnam with anyone, any time, anywhere, without any conditions?	77. 88	17. 67	4. 45
5. Establishing United Nations armed forces to maintain world peace?	83. 22	12. 40	4. 38
6. Admitting Red China to the United Nations without a commitment not to attack her neighbors?	29. 42	65. 30	6. 38
7. Selling food to—			
(a) Russia?	44. 68	49. 30	6. 02
(b) Red China?	31. 30	62. 20	6. 50
(c) The United Arab Republic?	30. 93	61. 60	7. 47
8. Restricting the sale of rifles, shotguns, and pistols?	83. 58	13. 14	3. 28
9. Granting more Federal funds for—			
(a) Education?	82. 15	13. 43	4. 42
(b) Transit?	69. 48	25. 78	4. 74
(c) Rent subsidies for the elderly, handicapped, and displaced?	73. 86	20. 97	5. 17
10. Establishing Federal standards for highway and auto safety?	90. 36	6. 40	3. 24
11. Increasing the minimum wage of $1.25 per hour?	77. 93	17. 69	4. 38
12. Increasing the term of office of Congressman from 2 to 4 years?	58. 84	36. 97	4. 19

INCREASING PROBLEMS OF AUTO THEFTS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1966, I introduced H.R. 16657 to deal with the increasing problems of auto theft in this country. My statement with respect to this is to be found at pages 17550 to 17552 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Among the problems in the field is the fact that there is no check as to ownership of motor vehicles at the time and place of export. My bill would require, among other things, that customs officials check car ownership and registration before permitting export.

This could go a long way toward reducing car thefts by making export of stolen cars difficult and, therefore, unprofitable.

In the course of my statement, I pointed out that neither statistics nor even estimates were available of the number of stolen automobiles transported outside the United States and I stated:

> Unfortunately, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has no figures or even estimates as to the number of stolen automobiles which are being exported each year. This is so, notwithstanding the fact that the FBI and Justice Department have been aware of the increasing problem of stolen vehicles being transported in interstate and foreign commerce for the past several years.

In connection therewith, I have received the following communication of August 3, 1966, from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1966.

Hon. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The "News Release" dated July 28, 1966, concerning legislation introduced by you proposing proof of ownership of vehicles to be exported has been received.

In connection with your comments in this article that the FBI does not compile statistics of the number of stolen automobiles exported from the United States, I would like to bring the following information to your attention.

In 1954, the United States Bureau of Customs indicated to the FBI it had no specific regulations regarding documents which must be filed with that agency by a shipper of automobiles in foreign commerce. It was also learned it was not the practice of Customs to physically check vehicles being shipped to see if any declaration filed corresponded with the automobile. Customs advised it would not be feasible from a budget or personnel standpoint for it to physically check automobiles being exported to determine whether they were stolen.

In 1962, the FBI was advised by the United States Department of Commerce that its regulations did not require the shipper to present documents of ownership for automobiles being shipped out of the United States.

We made inquiries in 1963, at major United States seaports of Customs officials and steamship lines engaged in carrying automobiles to foreign countries to determine procedures being followed for the detection of stolen automobiles being exported. It was determined from these sources that automobile title papers need not be presented by a shipper and no physical inspection of automobiles is made by Customs.

Based upon the above information, regulations for the exportation of automobiles and the acceptance of documents governing the motor vehicle being exported are not the responsibility of the FBI. It is the function of the United States Department of Commerce to set up regulations for the exportation of automobiles. Unless a check of each vehicle being exported is made to determine whether the documentation is in proper order, a determination cannot be made as to whether a vehicle is stolen. Consequently, no information is available as to the number of stolen automobiles exported in foreign commerce.

The jurisdiction of the FBI in stolen automobile matters is found in Section 2312, Title 18, United States Code, dealing with the interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles. An investigation under this statute is initiated upon the receipt of an allegation that a motor vehicle has been stolen and has moved in interstate or foreign commerce.

I trust this will clarify our position in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
J. EDGAR HOOVER.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from New York, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday, and as long thereafter as required, there will be a continuation of consideration of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Following that, S. 3105, the military construction authorization, open rule, 3 hours of debate;

H.R. 15639, increase in FNMA borrowing authority, open rule, 3 hours of debate;

H.R. 14359, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, open rule, 2 hours of debate;

H.R. 15963, establish a Department of Transportation, open rule, 4 hours of debate, waiving points of order; and

H.R. 483, relating to marital deductions for estate tax purposes, which the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, has advised me he will call up under a unanimous-consent agreement.

May I advise, Mr. Speaker, that upon the conclusion of the civil rights bill we will seek to agree on a date for the consideration of District bills, which we cannot take up on Monday on account of the civil rights bill. We hope to take up District bills immediately upon the disposition of the civil rights bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FASHION & ACCESSORY DESIGNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that my home city of Cleveland was chosen as the location for the 17th annual convention of the National Association of Fashion & Accessory Designers. This group, known as NAFAD, was founded in 1949 by Jeanetta Welch Brown and Ada Fisher Jones, and is composed of designers of men's, women's, and children's wear, millinery, and accessories.

This year this fine organization is being very capably guided by its national president, Mrs. Henriene H. Vincent of St. Louis, Mo.

Delegates from 30 States and the District of Columbia met at the Statler Hilton Hotel July 5 through 11, to exchange ideas and to hear a number of distinguished speakers, including Mr. Francis Coy, president of the May Co. of Cleveland, and Mrs. Margurite Belafonte, a program director for the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The association is active throughout the year publishing information on fashion trends and standards in its own magazine, Fashion Cue; acquainting its members with fashion markets; making scholarships available to promising high-school and college designers and conducting career clinics and job opportunity seminars on college campuses.

Although NAFAD is doing a remarkable and outstanding job of educating, teaching, and channeling the artistic talents of the Negro community, it has, in the best tradition of American democratic heritage, awarded its annual scholarships equally to deserving Negro and white students.

There is a demand for designers with new ideas in the garment industry, as there is a demand for imagination in so many fields, and an organization such as the National Association of Fashion & Accessory Designers deserves our attention and praise for the part it plays in encouraging creativity.

ARNOLD HOFFMANN

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Arnold Hoffmann lived in the heart of my congressional district at 144 East 58th Street.

He was typical of the district in his interest in art and culture, but he was outstanding in his ability as an artist to convey the meaning of freedom in the anti-Nazi themes of some of his best known paintings.

His death at the age 80 is mourned because of his great contribution to society.

His obituary from the New York Times follows:

Arnold Hoffman Is Dead at 80—A Painter of Anti-Nazi Themes—Russian-Born Artist Turned From Landscapes to Topical Commentary

Arnold Hoffmann, an artist best-known for his anti-Nazi paintings, died Sunday night in Lenox Hill Hospital after a long illness. He was 80 years old and lived at 144 East 58th Street.

Mr. Hoffman came to critical attention in the nineteen-twenties, in his period of mysticism and symbolism, when Edward Alden Jewell, art critic of The New York Times, saw in his work "a fusion of music and painting" and quoted the artist as saying that "music has never been far from my brush."

By 1938, Mr. Hoffmann, conscious of the bloodshed in Ethiopia, Spain and China, turned from landscapes and abstractions to white-faced women and children running from the brilliant reds of burst aerial bombs, and to trenches filled with corpses.

FREEDOM HOUSE EXHIBITION

"An artist must reflect the era he is in," Mr. Hoffmann wrote, "though some claim that art must be pure, untouched by any religious or political conflicts."

Mr. Hoffmann had at first been known as a painter of flowers, then of portraits. But of his absorption in topical commentary, he said in an interview: "I love flowers. I want to paint them, but I am ashamed to."

His war poster, "Slave World—or Free World," was bought by the Office of War Information and distributed among workers in arms factories.

In 1942, his five large anti-Nazi paintings were shown and then hung in Freedom House, because, Herbert Agar, president of Freedom House said, "these pictures can contribute as much to the fullest awakening of America as a major bombing of our cities by the enemy."

One of his paintings, "Civilization, 1940," depicted Jews—young and old, women and children—being disgorged from cattle cars at the entrance to a concentration camp. It was hung in the University of Palestine in Israel.

He commemorated the 1942 destruction of Lidice by the Nazis in a painting acquired by the National Museum of Prague. His "Defense of Stalingrad" was accepted for the Soviet Government collection. His "D-Day" took an Allied Artists prize.

A NATIVE OF ODESSA

In recent years he traveled to and painted in Israel, Greece and Spain. In 1956, Mr. Hoffmann was elected to the International Institute of Arts and Letters and in 1957 to the Royal Society of Arts in London.

A native of Odessa, Russia, he studied at the School of Beaux Arts Ostromensky, where he became a teacher before he was 20. He went on to study in Munich, Germany, and arrived in the United States in 1910.

In recent years Mr. Hoffmann turned to the rocks of the coast of Maine, where he had a summer home for subject matter. His work is in many museums and private collections.

Mr. Hoffmann was a member of the American Water Color Society, the Audubon Association and the Allied Artists of America.

Surviving are his widow, the former Laura Schwartz; two sons, Arnold Hoffmann Jr., art director of the Magazine and Book sections of The New York Times, and Dr. Arthur Hoffmann, a research chemist of New Canaan, Conn.; and four grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held tomorrow at 2:30 P.M. at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

NEW IRS RULING DISCOURAGES CONTINUING EDUCATION

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and disturbed to learn of the IRS's proposed ruling to limit income tax deductions for educational purposes. The announced changes narrow considerably the IRS's previous interpretation of the law which states that educational expenses are deductible if they are incurred in order to maintain or improve skills required by the individual in his present employment or to meet the express requirements of the individual's employer.

In its announcement the IRS proposed two substantive changes in the regulations for educational expense deductions. First, the proposed rules state:

> If the minimum educational requirements for a trade or business, position, or specialty are changed, the fact that an individual has met the old requirements is immaterial in determining whether the expenditures for additional education undertaken to meet the new requirements are deductible.

This regulation applies even if the individual was hired on the condition of meeting these minimum educational requirements.

The second substantive addition to the present regulation is that the educational expenses which lead to the attainment of a degree are generally not deductible. The IRS takes this position on the ground that such academic achievement will either meet minimum requirements for a taxpayer to keep a job he has obtained without fully meeting its requirements or qualify him for a better job even if he did not originally have that in mind.

This narrow construction of the law seems to me entirely contrary to well established national policies of encouraging education and self-improvement. The trends in the past decade have been toward more and more financial aid from the Federal Government to those who are seeking an education. For example, the GI bill provides funds for ex-servicemen who wish to further their educations, and the Higher Education Act and National Defense Education Act provide billions of dollars for the higher education of individuals and for the development of the educational facilities of our Nation.

In light of these and other governmental acts and policies, I feel that the Government has clearly stated its position to encourage and assist Americans in the pursuit of education. My feeling is that the use of incentives, such as income tax deductions, is a better way to achieve this purpose than is the use of direct doles. Instead of interpreting the law concerning tax deductions for educational expenses more narrowly as the IRS has done, it would seem to be time for a broader interpretation.

Surely the IRS cannot be so shortsighted as to forget that in addition to the desirability of raising the standards of our country, education brings better jobs, higher wages, and hence more tax revenue in the long run.

It is especially important that our teachers be given every incentive available to advance their educations. However the IRS's proposed changes seem to be designed to discourage the development of the teaching profession. The Wall Street Journal gives the following examples of situations that might arise:

> A teacher hired during a teacher shortage without the minimum educational background couldn't write off the cost of bringing himself up to the minimum, the Service says. On the other hand, the revenuers add, teachers required to take further courses periodically to retain their status in a school system will still be able to deduct the expense.

In addition to these examples, two examples given by the IRS in its statement on proposed rule changes substantiate my point:

> I, who holds a bachelor of arts degree from an accredited college, applies for a certificate authorizing him to teach in the secondary schools in State X. Because I does not have the number of credits in professional education required by laws and regulations of State X, he is issued an emergency teaching certificate. I obtains employment as a teacher and, while so employed, obtains the additional credits in professional education necessary to obtain a continuing certificate in his position. Its expenditures in obtaining the additional credits in professional education are not deductible under paragraph (b) (2) of this section.

The second example seems to me to be even more unjust to teachers:

> J, who holds a bachelor of arts degree, obtains a permanent teaching certificate to teach, in the secondary schools in State X. Subsequent to the issuance of the permanent certificate, the regulations of State X are changed to require as a condition to the issuance (or retention) of a permanent teaching certificate for the secondary schools, in addition to a bachelor's degree, a specified number of hours of graduate courses. J's expenditures for the additional graduate courses are not deductible under paragraph (b) (2) of this section.

The inequities of these proposed rule changes are not limited to teachers. It seems wholly unfair that the man who pays much of the cost of Government programs distributing tax dollars to provide schooling to improve the skills of dropouts, is denied a tax deduction for the cost of improving his own and his family's education.

If we are to continue to provide incentives for Americans to further their educations, policies of income tax exemptions and deductions for educational expenses must be continued and developed, not diminished. In addition, new programs helping students to help themselves must be instituted.

I have joined, earlier in this session, with a large number of my colleagues in introducing legislation providing a tax credit for certain expenses of higher education. I think the recent proposal of the Internal Revenue Service only serves to underline the need for such legislation to ease the tax burden on those who are striving to continue their education.

The IRS has requested comment on their proposed change. I have written to the IRS stating my position and I hope that my colleagues who share my feeling that this is a time, if anything, for broader construction of educational deductions, will join me in contacting the IRS.

BOXCARS IN THE HARVEST AREAS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today reminded the Interstate Commerce Commission that the Midwest harvest season is now in full swing and that the peak need for boxcars is almost at hand. It is hoped that every effort is currently being made to keep an adequate supply of boxcars on hand in areas such as the Red River Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota. As the harvest begins to move into the elevators and other storage facilities, it is imperative that whatever steps are necessary to move cars into the area be taken now.

I am hopeful that legislation passed by the Congress this year, designed to provide the ICC with additional rate-setting authority, will eventually lead to a greater supply of boxcars on the Nation's railroads. However, this legislation does not go into effect until September, and, therefore, will not contribute to a larger fleet of cars at this time. Therefore, every effort must be made now to make sure the boxcars on hand are in the harvest areas of greatest need.

INFLATION AND THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has developed over possible congressional intervention in the airlines strike involves the entire economy of the Nation and casts an accusing finger at the root of the trouble, inflation. The American public, now inconvenienced and hampered by costly transportation delays, is suffering from a serious work stoppage that is a direct result of unwise Federal fiscal policies.

The Machinist Union's rejection of the administration proposals for settlement of the strike reflects a growing fear among the U.S. population that goes well beyond a labor union asking for increased benefits. American labor is well aware that their contractual gains will go up in smoke in the path of the flaming fires of inflation.

The uncontrolled and growing cost of government has triggered the current labor-management difficulties. The cost of government has increased faster than any other segment of the economy. If Federal guidelines are to be applied anywhere, they must be applied to Federal spending first. To do otherwise is worthless and futile.

REPUBLICAN STATEMENT ON SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday seven Republican Members of the House issued a statement calling on the administration to take the initiative in seeking an end to racial discrimination in South-West Africa. We believe that such leadership is particularly important in light of the recent decision of the International Court of Justice. Signing the statement with me were Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts, and Mr. HORTON, Mr. REID, and Mr. KUPFERMAN, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent to include the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT ON SOUTH WEST AFRICA

It has traditionally been the faith of the United States that disputes between nations can and should be resolved through the rule of law. But broad acceptance of the rule of law requires that it afford justice to those appealing to it. Perhaps the most significant result of the decision by the International Court of Justice on July 18, 1966 in the South West Africa case is that it may make the concept of peaceful settlement of disputes more difficult to accept by nations anxious for change.

The decision was an unfortunate setback for those who have counseled restraint and moderation in dealing with apartheid in South West Africa. Strong United States leadership is needed now to encourage African leaders to continue the search for a peaceful settlement of the controversy. Overwrought aggressiveness would result in needless human suffering and loss of life—and would diminish the chances for constructive change.

In dismissing the suit of Ethiopia and Liberia, the International Court of Justice made what Judge Mbanefo of Nigeria, in his dissenting opinion, termed two "impermissible" distinctions; first, between the right to bring a case and the right to have that case decided, and secondly, between the "conduct provisions" and the "special interests provisions" of the Mandate agreement. These distinctions are legally dubious and historically myopic. But they form the basis of the decision, and that decision will stand, despite American Judge Phillip C. Jessup's brilliant dissenting opinion that it is "completely unfounded in law." The Africans will not let the matter rest there—nor should the United States.

The Court stated that it had to "apply the law as it finds it, not to make it." In fact, the Court majority appears to have ignored the law as it found it in the 1962 Judgement, by which the Court accepted jurisdiction, which was then considered to be final and without appeal. Instead the Court made law by giving the sanction of silence to de facto annexation and racial discrimination. Thus, the decision seems to be an unfortunate example of legal politics and judicial avoidance. Because it appears to be a political determination, the decision could cast doubt in the minds of many Africans about the efficacy of the rule of law.

In addition, the decision of the all-white members of the Court majority could severely curtail the influence of their countries in Black Africa. If the United States fails to take the initiative in seeking an end to racial discrimination in South West Africa, the western countries may be increasingly precluded from any effective influence in this issue. Thanks to the learned dissent of Judge Jessup, the United States is in a unique position to take such an initiative.

The painful silence of the Administration since the decision has been punctured only by the belated and limp State Department release of July 27th. The release contents itself with a recounting of past Court opinions while failing to acknowledge the serious political implications of this Court decision, the wisdom of the Jessup dissent, or the need for United States leadership, Only U.S. leadership now will convince the African States of the sincerity of U.S. concern for the future of non-discriminatory development and non-violent transition in Africa. Only U.S. leadership now can assure that we will be welcome in Africa when prudent leadership is most critical.

Therefore, we strongly recommend that the President:

1. Initiate a resolution at the forthcoming Session of the United Nations General Assembly, convening in September, to call an immediate Charter Amendment Convention to review Chapters XI and XII of the Charter, relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories and the International Trusteeship System, respectively. In such a Convention, the United States should support Charter amendments providing for:

(a) the automatic inclusion of former mandated territories under the League of Nations (such as South West Africa) as United Nations Trust Territories;

(b) the explicit prohibition of racial discrimination in any Trust Territory;

(c) the establishment of the right of the Secretary-General to bring action in the International Court of Justice upon a finding that racial discrimination is practiced by the administering power in the Trust Territory.

The Convention should be required to recommend any Charter amendments to the 21st Session of the General Assembly by January 1, 1967.

2. Appoint a high-level official delegation, headed by the Secretary of State, to visit African states and the Organization of African Unity in Addis Ababa, and to confer with African Foreign Ministers. This would demonstrate American concern and facilitate the development of a responsible United States policy for the resolution of the South West Africa crisis.

3. Call a White House Conference of American businessmen and bankers with economic interests in South Africa to examine in detail all proposals for a unified private and public economic policy of the United States to encourage the Government of South Africa to abandon its abhorrent policy of apartheid.

THE JUNIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS RECEPTION

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last month several of my colleagues and I lunched here in the Capitol with the International Junior Diplomats in Washington. This is a group composed of junior Foreign Service officers in our State Department and their counterparts in the local embassies. I was most impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the effort our own young diplomats make to give young diplomats from other lands some sense of what American life is all about.

I was not surprised, therefore, to read in the press how successful the Junior Foreign Service Officers' sixth annual Fourth of July reception had been. More than 1,500 people attended this event, which was held on the eighth floor of the Department of State. The honored guests were, as always, the young representatives of more than 110 diplomatic missions here in Washington.

To add a cultural dimension to the celebration, the National Collection of Fine Arts of the Smithsonian Institution loaned an exhibit of modern American art. The exhibit provided a vivid contrast to the 18th century antiques with which the State Department's eighth floor is furnished.

This particular celebration of our national holiday was one of which we can be truly proud. It yields significant dividends of good will, international understanding, and it also promotes appreciation of American products. The junior Foreign Service officers' reception—which does so much good for our Government—costs the Government nothing. The complete cost of the reception is defrayed by contributions from junior Foreign Service officers themselves, and by contributions from patriotic individuals and corporations from every part of the Nation in the form of funds, food, and wines. Mr. Speaker, I include a list of these public-spirited individuals and institutions with my remarks:

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

American Export Isbrandtsen Lines.
American Security and Trust Company.
Mr. Luigi Appareti.
The Bourbon Institute.
California Cling Peach Advisory Board.
California Wine Institute.
Chrysler Corporation.
Corning Glass International.
Deere and Company.
Delta Air Lines.
Eastern Airlines.
Farrell Lines.
Florida Citrus Commission.
Ford International Group.
General Electronics.
General Motors Overseas Operations.
Ceasar Giolito Associates.
Grace Line.
International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.
Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.
Lykes Brothers Steamship Company.
The Mayflower Hotel.
Moore-McCormack Lines.
National Association of Manufacturers.
Natureripe Berry Growers.
Northwest Airlines.
Ocean Spray Cranberry Company.
Oregon Filbert Commission.
Portland, Oregon, Chamber of Commerce.
Schenley Industries.
Security National Bank of Falls Church.
Security Storage Company of Washington.
State Department Federal Credit Union.
Sterling Turkeys.
United States Lines.
Utah Turkey Marketing Board.
The Washington Hilton.
Westinghouse Electric International Co.
Whitman Chocolates.

DEMISE OF THE GUIDEPOSTS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an inflationary atmosphere now exists in this country. I believe the Johnson administration is responsible for generating it.

The lid is off the wage-price guidelines. The guidelines are dead. The administration has made a sham of the guidelines by pursuing inflationary policies while inflationary pressures continue to build up in the economy.

The airline strike crisis and the industrywide hike in steel prices together tell the story of how the White House has shirked its responsibilities in the current economic situation.

The best exposition of this I have read is contained in the New York Times editorial of August 5, 1966, in which the Times declares:

> The White House undercut its own stabilization efforts by maintaining an expansive spending policy, failing to use tax weapons to check demand and applying the guideposts in a spasmodic and discriminatory fashion.

I have long felt a tax increase could be avoided if nondefense spending were cut substantially. With that qualifier, I commend this New York Times editorial to all my colleagues in the House.

I herewith include the editorial in my statement:

Demise of the Guideposts

> The steel industry's decision to raise prices on some of its most basic products is likely to provide the coup de grace for the Administration's sagging wage-price guideposts.
>
> Few economists ever believed "jawbone" methods of combating inflation could work indefinitely in a period of soaring economic demand, skyrocketing profits and tight labor supply. Skepticism turned into certainty of collapse when the White House undercut its own stabilization efforts by maintaining an expansive spending policy, failing to use tax weapons to check demand and applying the guideposts in a spasmodic and discriminatory fashion.
>
> Whatever their inherent weaknesses, the guideposts represented a creative device for sharing productivity gains and protecting the purchasing power of the dollar through voluntary restraint. They helped achieve the remarkable stability of living costs the country enjoyed for the last five years. The dents put in the formula in recent months have played a significant part in pushing the Consumer Price Index up at an annual rate of 3.5 per cent; and a much faster leapfrog of prices and wages seems probable in the rest of this year. The whole economy will suffer from such a development.
>
> * * *
>
> The White House is right in rebuking the major steel producers for putting their price increases into effect without discussing them with the Government first. An industry that occupies such a strategic national position ought not deprive the President or his Council of Economic Advisers of an advance opportunity to comment on the implications of higher prices—and certainly not in a period of war and incipient inflation.
>
> It is hard, however, to escape the conclusion that the steelmakers were emboldened to act unilaterally by the Administration's pathetic performance in the current airlines strike. It flagrantly conspired to undermine its own anti-inflation standards on the wage front. Then, after the strikers had contemptuously rejected a settlement endorsed by the country's President and their own, the Administration has not advice to give Congress on whether or not to enact a back-to-work law.
>
> The Senate finally ended this unedifying exhibition of buck-passing yesterday by passing a bill under which Congress will order the machinists back for 30 days and empower Mr. Johnson to keep them at work for another 150 days if there is still no settlement. Assuming that the House goes along, the planes will fly and the machinery will begin rolling for an eventual wage agreement, under Government pressure, at a level substantially above the 4.3 per cent figure the unionists already have spurned.
>
> The direct impact of the steel price increase will be relatively slight but its psychological effect will be great. Many other industries are likely to take their cue from Pittsburgh's giants. These will include many that have a far weaker case and perhaps even some that should be cutting prices, instead of raising them. Steel, which has long complained that its profit margins are lower than those of most other basic industries, has been selling more metal this year but making less money than it did in 1965.
>
> The industry complains that all its costs have been going up faster than its productivity, and it cites the higher labor bill it assumed under a contract personally negotiated by Mr. Johnson last year as one key factor. The pact strained the outer limits of the guideposts but on its own, probably would not have pushed prices up without the cumulative weight of other cost increases.
>
> The crucial consideration, unquestionably, was the sense steel has had since its jarring price confrontation with President Kennedy in 1962 that it alone in the American economy is expected to set a pattern of restraint. When the White House ignores its own hold-the-line admonitions, the chances for stability evaporate.

AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that this House is not attempting to expedite the passage of legislation passed by the Senate to end the crippling airlines strike. Thousands and thousands of Americans throughout the United States and the world are awaiting action by this House and the end of this strike—already extended too long by politics and politicians unwilling to take any action which might in any way even momentarily displease a few union bosses.

It is past time for action, Mr. Speaker, and it is the responsibility of the Democratic leadership of this House to take that action now. Committee hearings should not proceed in a leisurely, routine fashion—they should be expedited and a bill brought to this floor for action without further delay.

To delay action until the end of next week is unthinkable.

PROPOSAL FOR STUDYING THE USES OF COMPUTERS AND AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT IN THE FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I have written Chairman Celler, of the Committee on the Judiciary, the following letter requesting that the committee undertake a study of the potential uses of computers and automatic data processing equipment for the Federal court system:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
The Chairman, The Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: We are living in an age of computer technology, computers that guide rocket ships, predict voting behavior, diagnose illnesses, audit income tax returns, forecast weather, analyze the economy, report the stock market, and operate entire factories—to only mention a sampling of their usage.

Recognizing the potentials of automation for the Federal Court System, I requested in early March, 1966 that the minority staff of the Committee on the Judiciary commence preliminary studies of the problems and potentials in using computers in the Federal Judiciary. I also requested that the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepare a memorandum on the applications of automatic data processing in legal information handling. Similarly, studies and experiments have been undertaken by a number of individuals, groups and institutions which have focused on practical and theoretical applications of computers for the handling of legal information.

The results and findings of these studies and experiments are impressive, not only because they evidence a saving of time and money in judicial administration and law practice, but because they also demonstrate a reduction in the possibility of errors in administering justice.

It has been shown that computers can be effectively employed for such tasks as jury selection, organization and control of dockets, comprehensive legal research, classification and analysis of evidence, and law enforcement. Computers are being so employed in State and municipal courts throughout the country. Federal agencies, such as the Department of Justice, have likewise assigned similar functions to computers.

Computers are today performing work that heretofore has involved innumerable man-hours. My State of Ohio early recognized the potentials of computers as a means of saving man-hours in judicial administration. Your State of New York, Mr. Chairman, is another excellent example. In New York County, IBM machines are used to process thousands of jury cards, select over 1300 jurors and count off a certain number of jurors for the Supreme, City, Municipal and General Sessions Courts; then list the names of those drawn for each court; and then type, address, stuff, seal and stamp the appropriate summonses—all in less than twenty-five minutes.

I believe the last few weeks of debate on Title I of the Civil Rights Bill of 1966 clearly demonstrates that the Federal courts could use such machines to effectively and economically comply with the strictures of the jury selection procedures defined by that Title should it become law. However, I certainly do not believe this is the only use that the Federal courts might make of automation.

The use of computers by courts does not mean an abandoning of traditional legal duties and functions. To the contrary, it is the addition of improved legal skills and tools, less susceptible to error and capable of high speed efficiency. The implications for the future are obvious. The computer

> will some day be considered as essential—and commonplace—to the courthouse as typewriters, telephones and stenographic reporting.
>
> I believe that it is time that the Congress inquire into the potentials of automation for the Federal Judiciary and ascertain if legislation is in order. Accordingly, I am requesting that the Committee on the Judiciary undertake this important study at the earliest convenient date.
>
> If there exists a way to more efficiently operate our Federal courts, its potentials should be fully explored. If there is a means of improving the administration of justice in the Federal courts, it is encumbent upon the Congress to fully explore this possibility. If automation is the answer, then the Congress must give the Federal Judiciary the benefits of the age of computers.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> William M. McCulloch,
> *Representative to Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, I should like to briefly develop the reasons I am urging such a study.

This is an era of the population explosion and the information explosion. In less than 30 years the population of the United States will be in excess of 310 million persons. Each year 25,000 new opinions are published by the courts in the United States and 29,000 new statutes are placed in the statute books of our States. Added to the some 300 million reported cases now scattered through several reporter systems and the 2 million State and Federal statutes that are similarly spread throughout the statute books, the totals are staggering. In addition to these official publications there are, of course, thousands of trade journals, legal periodicals, treatises, and texts which form a part of the working tools of the courts.

The implications of this population and information explosion for the courts is self-evident. Merely adding more courts and more judges will not solve the delays and administrative problems that plague our Federal courts. It is inevitable that as the population increases so will the information increase and so will the need for more available courts increase. It is submitted that the use of automatic data processing may be a first step toward breaking the cycle of more judges and more courts, a remedy which really has not solved the problems of delayed justice, resulting from clogged courts and already overworked judges.

Mr. Speaker, when this body was considering S. 1666 on March 2, 1966, to create additional Federal judgeships, I had occasion to state:

> I believe we can act on the measure [S. 1666] before us in greater confidence, in view of the promising prospect that before we are again called upon to create a large number of additional judgeships, we will have acted on proposals to solve the problems of our escalating caseloads and burgeoning dockets by means other than merely pyramiding new numbers of judgeships every few years.

The use of automatic data processing by the courts is just such a proposal. It is not a new idea, but the use of such machinery in the Federal court system has never before been explored. It is because the "state of the art" in computer technology has sufficiently developed and the problem of clogged Federal courts has become sufficiently acute that the proposal to make use of automatic data processing equipment is particularly timely.

The potential uses of computers and the handling of legal information has the support of many distinguished members of the bar as well as the leading legal professional associations. For example, Chief Justice Warren has expressed an interest in this area and, in fact, made some preliminary inquiries as to the potential uses of such machinery by the Supreme Court. The American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the Association of American Bar Libraries, as well as local bar associations have special committees which are concerned with computers and law. To list the representative groups and entities involved in automatic data processing with legal projects I submit the following:

> Federal Government: Department of Defense (Project LITE); Department of Justice (LEX) Antitrust Division.
>
> State Governments—Courts: New York (Project EMPIRE); Pennsylvania; Ohio; New Jersey.
>
> Universities: University of Pittsburgh; George Washington University; Western Reserve University; University of Oklahoma; University of Iowa; University of Nebraska.
>
> Foundations: Southwestern Legal Foundation; American Bar Foundation (with IBM Corporation); Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Project Lawsearch).
>
> Industry: Jonkers Business Machine; Datatrol Corporation; Systems Development Corporation.
>
> Commercial Law Services; Automated Law Searching; Law Research Service, Inc.
>
> Other Nations: Soviet Union; Canada; Belgium; Italy.

Among the more obvious examples of potential uses are those found in the applications that have heretofore been made of automatic data processing systems in handling legal data. For example, automatic data processing machinery is used in jury selection and docket control by a number of State and municipal courts, as well as for other administrative court details. Aside from the administrative uses of such machines, actual "judicial" uses have primarily involved comprehensive and rapid legal research. However, numerous other uses have been suggested. Chief Justice Warren at one time suggested they be used to study consistencies and inconsistencies of prior Supreme Court decisions. Other judges have expressed an interest in using this equipment for the taking of evidence in big cases—as these machines can actually read, sort out the evidence, and index a case.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time is at hand when the Committee on the Judiciary, acting for this body, should exercise leadership in exploring this vital area of government. I know the distinguished chairman of the committee will agree with me that we must have no possibility untried to secure an expeditious and exacting application of our judicial machinery. I am sure he will expedite initiation of my proposal.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], and to associate myself with his request to the chairman of the committee.

This is a timely and forward-looking proposal. It speaks to a responsibility of which we should not delay recognition. We live in an age when we can send men into space to execute complicated maneuvers while in orbit, and return to earth with certainty, safety, and precision. Yet the earthbound journey of a lawsuit through our courts is in no way comparable. Frustrating delays, excessive costs, and the uncertainties of the availability of evidence work to erode rights and equities with the passage of time. If the precision and rapidity of the computer which has come of age in the age of space and made orbital travel possible, could be harnessed to the task of solving the mounting problems of congestion and complications in our courts, the cause of more enlightened justice would well be served.

I join with my colleague in urging the earliest consideration of this request by the chairman of the committee, and the earliest possible undertaking of this pioneering effort to assure equal justice to all the people.

THE NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS—THE 1966 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK CALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, it is now. This point was well emphasized in the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week this past July. From Vermont to California and Hawaii, from Florida to Washington and Alaska, the 1966 week was observed by Governors' and mayors' proclamations and also by citizen committees that planned and executed the festivities of the week.

This expanding captive nations movement clearly signifies the fact that our people refuse to be hoodwinked into any false "peaceful coexistence" while nearly a billion people remain in Red captivity. In addition, they well perceive the continued Red totalitarian control exercised in every state of the Red empire. The changes that have transpired in the Red empire have not spelled any real and genuine increases in freedom among the captive nations, whether in Central-South Europe, the U.S.S.R., Red Asia, or Cuba. They are contributing, however, to the entrenched power and rule of the Communist Parties controlling these Red states.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when imperialist Moscow and its syndicated associates are striving through deceptive "peaceful coexistence" to obtain our acquiescence and indifference toward the captive nations, the need for a Special Committee on the

Captive Nations is more urgent than ever before. Only such a committee could truly build bridges of understanding with the captive nations, the peoples themselves, as opposed to the unrepresentative, totalitarian regimes that rule over them. The longer we delay on this basic issue and forgo the wonderful opportunity we now possess to increase and intensify our understanding of the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union, the greater will be the costs and sacrifices our people will inevitably suffer as the collective power of the Red empire increases. And this is a heavy moral burden for anyone to bear for the rest of his life.

Some preliminary data on the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance have already come to light, and to show its scope and variety in different parts of the country, I request that the following items be appended to my remarks today:

First, a proclamation by Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio, of the city of Newark, N.J.; second, the proclamation by Mayor James H. Tate, of Philadelphia and the program, resolution, and a principal address at the Philadelphia observance; third, a message by our colleague, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, to the highly successful Chicago observance led by Mayor Daley; fourth, the statement on the week by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY; fifth, a letter published in the July 19 issue of the Pittsburgh Press on "Captive Nations Week: A Time of Sorrow"; sixth, a release on "Captive Nations: A Force for Peace," by the National Captive Nations Committee; seventh, the committee's invitation to a Captive Nations Week reception in the Capitol, which was attended by many of our Members; eighth, a July 8 editorial in the New York Daily News and a clarifying reply by Miss Vera A. Dowhan, of Washington, to "Captive Nations Week"; ninth, the "Manifesto for Captive Nations Week, 1966," issued by the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent in New York; tenth, a letter to the editor in the Hartford Courant in Connecticut on the theme "Toward Freedom of the Captive Nations"; eleventh, the programs, parade formation, worship service, and appeal by the League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples sponsored by the Free Friends of the Captive Nations in St. Louis, Mo.; twelfth, an address prior to the week delivered by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Youth, America, and the Future," and given at St. Basil Academy in Philadelphia; and, thirteenth, the text of a sermon delivered by Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., which appeared in the Catholic News on July 28, entitled "Formula for Freedom":

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas: the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Odel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas: the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas: the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas: the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Hugh J. Addonizio, Mayor of The City of Newark, New Jersey, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17 through July 23, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Newark, New Jersey, and I do call upon the citizens of Newark to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of The City of Newark, New Jersey, this seventeenth day of July, 1966.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Mayor.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–23, 1966

Whereas The Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by Resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the third Sunday of July as the beginning of Captive Nations Week; and

The City of Philadelphia is linked to these Captive Nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Philadelphia are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

The roll of nations held captive by Russian Communist colonialism is one of appalling length and we now find the Red tide has come to within ninety miles of our shores;

The principles of self-government and human freedom are Universal ideas and the common heritage of mankind; and

The people of Philadelphia, in common with all the peoples of the United States, want for the peoples of Captive Nations the same freedom and justice which is theirs;

Now therefore, I, James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week and urge the people of Philadelphia to arrange for observance of the occasion in appropriate ceremonies and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the Captive Nations for freedom and National independence.

JAMES H. J. TATE, *Mayor.*

Given under my hand and the Seal of the City of Philadelphia this eighteenth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

PROGRAM: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK CEREMONIES, INDEPENDENCE MALL, PHILADELPHIA, 3–4 P.M., SUNDAY, JULY 24, 1966

National anthem: By the Assembly.

Invocation: The Rev. John Fatalik, representing His Excellency Archbishop Krol. Father Fatalik is pastor of St. Agnes Slovak Church.

Welcome: Ignatius M. Billinsky, Executive Vice Chairman, Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee and Master of Ceremonies.

Opening address: Dr. Austin J. App, LaSalle College, Chairman Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee: "The Captive Nations, Urgency of Their Liberation."

Philadelphia Captive Nations proclamation and remarks: The Honorable James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia.

Pennsylvania Captive Nations proclamation by Governor William W. Scranton: To be read wth remarks by Governor Scranton's representative, Mr. John Acton, Esq., President of the Youth Advisory Board to Governor Scranton.

Presentation of guests of honor: Master of Ceremonies, Mr. Billinsky.

Presentation of captive nations girls in costume: Mrs. Rima Mironas.

Main address: Judge E. Leroy Van Roden, President Judge, Orphan's Court, Media, Pa. "The Spirit of Captive Nations Week."

Resolutions: Presented for approval by acclamation by Mrs. Margit Rohtla, Captive Nations Committee Secretary.

Benediction: The Rev. Giragos H. Chopourian, Armenian Martyr Congregational Church.

PROCLAMATION

President Lyndon B. Johnson proclaimed the week beginning July 17th as Captive Nations Week on July 8th. On July 14th Governor Scranton issued a proclamation for the same week, and on July 18th, Mayor James H. J. Tate did so for Philadelphia. On July 17, 1959, Congress requested the President annually to proclaim the third week of July Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The committee sincerely thanks the Mayor's Office, the Philadelphia Park Commission and the Philadelphia Police Department for their services, advice and cooperation.

GREATER PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTIONS

(Adopted by acclamation at the mass rally at Independence Mall, Philadelphia, July 24, 1966.)

Whereas, the U.S. Congress on July 17, 1959, requested the President annually to proclaim the third week of July Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for the captive nations of the world"; and

Whereas, President Johnson on July 8 proclaimed the week beginning July 17 Captive Nations Week nationally, and Governor William W. Scranton on July 14 for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Mayor James H. J. Tate on July 18 for Philadelphia; and

Whereas, 1966 marks the tenth tragic anniversary of the Soviet-Russian suppression of the Hungarian fight for freedom, the thirteenth since that of East Berlin, and the twenty-fifth since the mass deportations by the Soviet Russians of Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians from their homelands; and

Whereas, Sino-Russian imperio-colonialism continues to enslave Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Mainland China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Eastern Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, White Ruthenia; and

Whereas, in an age of enlightenment and self-determination any imperialism and colonialism but especially the brutally totalitarian one of Soviet Russia is irreconcilable with human rights and the United Nations Charter: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia and this assemblage gathered at historic Independence Mall this July 24, 1966,

That the United States should proclaim and pursue a policy most likely to assure the liquidation of Soviet-Russian colonialism and Communist tyranny, and promote the speedy liberation and independence of all the captive nations; and

That to this end, recognizing the power of conscience, right, and justice, when resolutely applied, for undermining colonialism, the U.S. should apply unremittingly every possible moral, economic, and diplomatic means; and

That all cultural and economic intercourse with Communist governments should be on the basis of concessions and considerations conducive to the eventual liberation of the enslaved peoples; and

That where and when Communist aggression or subversion becomes acute, as at present in South Vietnam, the United States should intervene with whatever armed forces and modern weapons needed so as not only to repel such aggression but to assure the independence and self-determination of the involved countries; and

That, in as much as American armed forces are fighting against Communist armies in Vietnam, all trade with Communist bloc countries which send arms and munitions to North Vietnam should be banned; and

That, the American delegates to the United Nations and to other councils should at every opportunity expose the Sino-Russian imperialism and colonialism, including that over not only the Satellite nations but also the captive nations within the Soviet Union, such as Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, etc.; and

That, to implement American dedication to the eventual independence of all the Captive Nations effectively, the House of Representatives should establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; and

That a Captive Nations Freedom Stamp series should be inaugurated and a Freedom Academy established; and finally

That copies of these RESOLUTIONS be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, both senators from Pennsylvania, all the congressmen of the Greater Philadelphia area, and to the newspapers, radio and television stations of the area.

(Presented by the Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia.)

The Captive Nations: Why and How To Liberate Them

(Address by Austin J. App., Ph. D., Phila. Pa., chairman, Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia; associate professor of English, LaSalle College; honorary president, Federation of American Citizens of German Descent; at Captive Nations Week observance, Independence Mall, Philadelphia, July 24, 1966)

Honorable Judge van Roden, Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia and I as chairman welcome all of you here at the site of the Liberty Bell to this Captive Nations Observance which implements the noble Congressional Resolution of July 17, 1959, that there be such annual observances "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. That Resolution seven years ago specified twenty-one such nations under Communist colonialism.

We are also grateful for and try to implement President Johnson's proclamation of July 8 for the nation, which is presently fighting the extension of Red tyranny in South Vietnam, Governor Scranton's of July 14 for Pennsylvania, and our own Mayor Tate's of July 18 for Philadelphia. And we are elated that the Honorable Judge E. Leroy van Roden is our main speaker.

Since World War I, largely under the impact of American public opinion and moral and diplomatic pressure, Western colonialism in Africa and Asia has almost disappeared. This Western Colonialism was often benevolent; it certainly never needed a barbed wire entanglement and a Berlin-type wall to reduce its colonies to virtual concentration camps.

But a monstrous colonialism, which tragic U.S. policies at Yalta and Potsdam and for a decade thereafter like Frankenstein helped to expand, if not to create, is the totalitarian Soviet-Russian colonialism. It stretches from the middle of Europe to the ends of Asia. It inflicts an atheistic barbarism on one billion people. And it subjects to colonialism 115,000,000 once independent Christian people in such captive satellite nations as the Baltic, Poland, Hungary, Eastern Germany, and it cruelly deprives of freedom and self-determination another 133,000,000 peoples of captive races inside the USSR: Ukrainians, Armenians, Byelo-Russians, Mongolians and others. Soviet Russia also plotted and accomplished the Red enslavement of Yugoslavia, China, North Korea, Cuba, and North Vietnam.

Finally in 1950 Washington checked the extension of this Red colonialism to South Korea with 37,133 American lives; it is now belatedly but rightly doing so in South Vietnam. But these tragic wars fought in what is left of the Free World merely demonstrate the fallacy of containment. It is both immoral and inexpedient. It is wrong to consign unchallenged to Soviet Russian slavery the 250,000,000 captive peoples. It is inexpedient and foolish to keep Soviet Russia secure behind its Iron Curtain from where it plots and directs aggression against alternating parts of the Free World costing the lives of our soldiers to stalemate.

The defeatist policy of appeasement and containment must be converted to one of conscious and determined liberation of the Captive Nations. Just as all other colonialisms were finally ended, the Soviet Russian one must end, too. A policy of liberation is not the way to a world war: it is rather the most likely, perhaps only way to prevent it. Only a Russia reduced to its proper size, with its captive peoples free and independent, will no longer be a threat to world peace or to American security. The dissolution of the Soviet Russian colonialism is the wave of the future, the obligation of progress and civilization. If the benevolent colonialisms of Africa and Southeast Asia had to go, then a hundred times more urgently must the totalitarian colonialism of Soviet Russia in Europe and Asia go.

The way to destroy this brutal colonialism without a world war is for the Free World to support the yearnings of the captive peoples with all possible moral, diplomatic, and economic means. The governments of the Free World, the press, and the religious leaders must realize the following and act accordingly:

First, The Soviet Russian empire is not a force for law and order in Europe and Asia but a totalitarian tyranny within and an agent of subversion and aggression without.

Second, It is the most ruthless in history, the only one that ever needed an Iron Curtain and a wall around it, and the most godless, the only one confessedly atheistic, dedicated to the systematic eradication of religion and God.

Thirdly, Its puppet regimes do not represent the people of the captive nations who pine for liberation and with the right encouragement would heroically fight for their independence.

Fourthly, America has a responsibility to them—one in justice to all those who were betrayed into Soviet colonialism at Yalta, and in charity and humanity to all the others for whom America failed to secure the rights pledged in the Atlantic Charter.

Fifthly, The first thing America—the President, the Congress, the press—must do is to say and keep repeating clearly that Soviet Russian colonialism is an anachronism and a barbarism, that it must be dissolved, that the captive peoples have every right to expect their complete liberation and independence.

Finally, America and the Free World must repeatedly assure the captive peoples that they are encouraged themselves to display ingenuity and heroism for achieving their independence, and that in the future any uprising such as those of East Berlin and Hungary will be given all the material, moral, and diplomatic support possible under international law.

And let us stop saying and thinking that the only way the captive nations can be liberated is through a world war. The Roman, the British, the French empires were all dissolved without world wars. Let us not think or say the Soviet Russian empire cannot in the same manner be destroyed—until we have courageously told it to dissolve and thrown the full spotlight of publicity on its brutality and all the moral conscience of mankind on its inhumanity. Thank you.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 14, 1966.

Regret that my participation in Captive Nations Week observances in Delaware and New Jersey prevent me from joining you this afternoon. The restoration of freedom to all the captive peoples is a prerequisite to true world peace. My best wishes to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of our nationwide observances.

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Statement by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, for 1966 Captive Nations Week

The American people reaffirm their deep interest in all peoples' right to freedom.

By Joint Resolution of the Congress, approved July 17, 1959, the President is authorized to issue a Proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week."

President Johnson has asked all of us "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Our President has thus reminded us that our heritage is part of a universal ideal.

On July 4, 1966, we celebrated the 190th Anniversary of our independence. Throughout these almost 2 centuries, the concept of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness has been central to our form of government.

Regrettably, these precious values are still not enjoyed by many peoples throughout the globe.

Our hearts go out to these peoples. We are mindful of their plight. We know how they yearn to be free. Each people's right to work out its own destiny—in liberty—is as deeply meaningful to us—as it was to our Founding Fathers.

May God grant that the prayers of mankind for a world of freedom and peace shall be fulfilled.

To these goals, we repledge ourselves. We express anew our faith in the triumph of these principles. We shall work—we shall strive—we shall persist—for these great international values.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 19, 1966]

Captive Nations Week: A Time of Sorrow

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PITTSBURGH PRESS:

Captive Nations Week this year is July 17-23. Let's make it the beginning of the end of Communist captivity for all nations.

The Captive Nations are the national group that (against their will) are now existing under Communist domination.

They include (1) those incorporated within the boundaries of the Soviet Union and Red China; (2) the "satellites," the supposedly independent countries that have their own Communist governments.

The Captive Nations, together with the dates of the Communist takeovers, are (among others):

1920—Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Iedl-Ural, North Caucasia, Democratic Republic of the Far East (Siberyaks), Ukraine.

1922—Turkistan.

1940—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

1946—Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia.

1947—Poland, Romania.

1948—Czechoslovakia, North Korea.

1949—Hungary, East Germany, China (Mainland).

1951—Tibet.

1954—North Vietnam.

1960—Cuba.

1964—Zanzibar (Tanzania).

The people of the Captive Nations can offer no opposition to the Communist rule. Any attempt to protest or insurrection is ruthlessly suppressed by the Communist police and the Red Army.

Examples: revolts in various Russian slave camps, the rising in East Germany and the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

ANNE BURDICK.

SQUIRREL HILL.

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

CAPTIVE NATIONS: A FORCE FOR PEACE

The chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee stated today that, "if we fail to revise our foreign policy of patched-up containment, we can look forward to innumerable years of guerrilla warfare and more Vietnams, with the possibility of maintaining global peace becoming progressively slimmer." Addressing a luncheon meeting of the Lions Club of Washington at the Mayflower Hotel, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also professor of economics at Georgetown University, held that "only by concentrating on the captive nations in the Red Empire and prudently helping them in their cold war against the Red totalitarian regimes can we successfully curb Red cold and hot war aggressions in the Free World."

Captive Nations Week is being observed now in all sections of the country. The President issued his proclamation of the Week on July 8. Over half of the governors and mayors of every major city have similarly proclaimed the Week. Congress also is observing the Week.

The professor also pointed to "the nonsensical inconsistencies" of our present policy toward the Red Empire. "While the USSR, Romania, Poland and other totalitarian Red states are heavily supplying Hanoi to continue its aggression in South Vietnam," he said, "pressures have been building up in this country to supply the Red regimes of Eastern Europe with capital and technology to strengthen our indirect enemies in Vietnam." He added, "Beefing up the cold war economies of Eastern Europe helps not the captive nations but the totalitarian Red Syndicate of Communist Parties in control of the various captive nations' states." "The Great Illusion of our day, for which we'll pay dearly later," he said, "is the naive notion that the Communist-dominated states of Central Europe can or want to be divorced from Moscow."

Vehement Communist opposition to Captive Nations Week was cited in detail by Dobriansky. "The Week," he said, "is a major obstacle to Moscow's calculated strategy of peaceful coexistence." The chairman of the committee, which conducts the annual national observance, stressed "The present world-wide struggle can be won by us if and when we strike by all paramilitary means at the basic source of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism within the USSR itself." He called for a special Congressional committee on the captive nations to explore this area.

Mr. DONALD L. MILLER,
Executive Director.

COMMITTEE INVITATION

The National Captive Nations Committee requests the honor of your presence at a reception in honor of National Captive Nations Week, Tuesday, July 19, 1966, 5:30–7:30 p.m., at the residence of Elizabeth Wyatt Bell, 2509 Foxhall Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.

[From the New York Daily News, July 8, 1966]

Captive Nations Week will be with us July 17 through 23. Chief credit for keeping the plight of Soviet-enslaved East-Central Europe in the world spotlight goes to the New York-based Assembly of Captive European Nations, which the then-campaigning Lyndon Johnson hailed two years ago for reminding "the world that freedom is not only an issue in Asia and Africa but in many countries of Europe as well."

We hope that he will now vigorously underline that statement in his expected proclamation and during the week's observance.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: Your editorial of July 8, "Captive Nations Week," was gravely inaccurate and misleading. The conduct of the annual Captive Nations Week observances has been almost entirely undertaken by the National Captive Nations Committee, headquartered in Washington, D.C. If you would but consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in July and August of every year, you would find all the necessary data substantiating this fact. As for the Assembly of Captive European Nations demonstrating any real sympathy for the numerous captive non-Rusisan nations in the USSR, this is virtually nil. The few captive nations in Central Europe for which ACEN exclusively speaks, and this in an emigré rather than an American voice, constitutes just a small segment of the entire family of captive nations. Those in the Soviet Union, in Asia and in Cuba, far exceed the few in Central Europe.

Sincerely,

VERA A. DOWHAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MANIFESTO FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

The Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED) is an organization of American citizens of Central and Eastern European descent. The countries of their origin, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Ukraine are presently under Communist domination.

CACEED fully supports Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in July, 1959, by the Congress of the United States, whereby the third week of July of each year was designated Captive Nations Week as a public demonstration of American support for the aspirations of the captive nations everywhere to restore their freedom and national independence.

Public Law 86–90 refers to the captive nations as follows:

". . . The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others . . ."

In July 1966 Americans will mark the 8th annual observance of Captive Nations Week in nation-wide ceremonies, manifestations and public gatherings.

Captive Nations Week will provide an occasion for reflections on the present state of world affairs. We recall that President Johnson, in his State of the Union Message to Congress on January 12, 1966 declared the most important principle of U.S. foreign policy was "*. . . support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions,*" because "*. . . the insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world.*"

Despite this official statement and annual Captive Nations Week observances, we regret to note an increasing trend towards political accommodation of the Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe.

U.S. foreign policy in that part of Europe has been predicated on the assumption that the satellite regimes are well on the road to independence from Russian Communist control. In this respect CACEED believes that the concept of "building bridges of understanding" to Central and Eastern Europe, as expressed by President Johnson, is largely being misunderstood by some policy-makers who believe that by unilaterally increasing trade and cultural exchanges with Communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe we would be helping the captive nations to achieve gradual independence from Moscow.

CACEED fully supports U.S. policy in Vietnam and elsewhere in resisting Communist aggression and Communist attempts of world domination. We believe that a similarly firm policy towards Communism in Central and Eastern Europe is in the best interest of the United States.

In commemorating Captive Nations Week, 1966:

We accuse the Soviet Government of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nations made captive during and after World War II—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania;

We further accuse the Soviet Government of forcibly depriving the nations within its own borders of the promised right of self-determination, and of destroying the formerly free and independent states of Ukraine and of the other non-Russian nations inside the Soviet Union;

We condemn the Communist enslavement of mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet and Cuba.

In accordance with the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960:

We urge the United States to declare its support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist regimes and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

And to recognize the fact that Soviet Russian imperialism is a threat to the peace and security of the world, which threat would be greatly diminished by the liberation of the captive nations.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1966, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet-subjugated lands of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia in the world-wide conflict betwen the forces of freedom and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help these allies in their struggle for freedom and national independence.

Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED).

July 1, 1966.

[From the Hartford Courant]

Toward Freedom of the Captive Nations

To the Editor of the Courant:

In 1959, the Congress of the United States adopted unanimously what has become known as the Captive Nations Resolution, in the form of Public Law 86–90, providing for the designation of a week in July as Captive Nations Week. In addition, the law authorizes the President of the United States to issue a proclamation on the week "each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

In keeping with the spirit of the law, the National Captive Nations Committee, headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, has worked out a program for this year's nationwide observance, urging the widest possible support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam and other areas of the globe threatened by Communist aggression.

These observances are also designed to demonstrate public support for the aspirations of captive peoples, to restore their freedom and national independence, and to spotlight the plight of captives who are prevented from voicing their true desires by regimes not of their choice.

What is happening today in Vietnam is but a repetition of what once took place in the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, and other countries now confined to the Russian-Communist prison of nations.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire.

Despite the official pronouncements in support of national independence as the "strongest force of today's world," our Government's hands somehow seem to be tied when it comes to direct action in response to frequent pleas by the captive voices at the risk of persecution and arrest.

While this voice grows louder behind the Iron Curtain, it should reverberate even stronger here, until such a time when they are allowed to have their way, to shape their institutions, and to chart their own course—free of external pressure and control.

Alexander Pryshlak,
President, Connecticut Captive Nations Committee.

Hartford.

Free Friends of the Captive Nations,
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Citizen: "Captive Nations Week"—by law of U.S. Congress, proclaimed by each President since 1959 and by Governor Hearnes of Missouri and Mayor Cervantes of St. Louis—to remember the nations taken over by Communism.

As citizens of this wonderful United States—grateful for the privileges and mindful of our responsibilities—we feel deeply for our relatives and friends living in Communist-controlled countries. We parade today to remind you that one-third of the world's population is under Communist control.

Do you ask, "Why don't the captive nations rise up and fight?"

(1) All weapons have been confiscated.

(2) The people have been infiltrated with spies, making it impossible to organize for fear of detection.

(3) Most important—their will to resist has been discouraged because they cannot depend on the Free World to stand by or assist them. Only a token protest of Soviet action from the Free World followed the brave attempt of the Hungarians to free themselves—resorting to rocks against tanks! The Free World leaders shake hands and enter negotiations with those who have enslaved these people. How disheartening.

One of the best weapons the U.S. has against Communist conquest is the hatred of these Captive Nations people for their slavemasters. YET the U.S. has failed to take advantage of their burning desire to be free from Communist tyranny.

Lenin taught: *First* we will take Eastern Europe, *then* the masses of Asia. We will isolate the United States, the last bastion of Capitalism. We will not have to attack; it will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands. (By encirclement, plus fear of nuclear attack, they plan to force our progressive surrender.)

Communism depends on public apathy and ignorance concerning their goals and strategy.

Communists believe (1) There is no God. Man has no soul. A conscience does not exist. (2) Man's sins are explained by his profit-making way of life. (3) Government controlled economy minus individual freedom equals a better man. (4) Murder, lying, etc. are righteous acts if they further Communism.

Communist tactics (1) Work into influential jobs in government and communications—TV, press, books, magazines—to focus on everything BUT the tyranny of Communism. (2) Condition American minds to Communism through Socialism. Increase government control. (3) Discredit the anti-Communists. Associate Patriotism with extremism. (4) Dedicated, disciplined few to control the masses. (Only 6 percent of the Russians are Communists—a handful of Communists took over Cuba.)

Strategy: Peaceful co-existence to *us* means willingness to cooperate. Peaceful co-existence to them means world conquest without war.

Please write us for speakers, films, literature.

Parade Formation

1. Police Escort.
2. American Flag.
3. Drummers.
4. Hearse and Casket ("Victims of Communism" on casket; "Freedom of the Captive Nations on both sides of the hearse.)
5. Skeletal Arm Banner.
6. "We Are the Free Friends" . . banner.
7. Individual C.N. Flag, groups in alphabetical order Interspersed with other banners.
8. American groups with identifying signs.
9. End of C.N. procession sign.

Commemorative Worship Service, Soldiers' Memorial, July 16, 1966, at 2:45 p.m.

Prelude: Organ: Mrs. Harriet Howard Lee, Director—Organist, Cote Brilliante, United Presbyterian Church.

Invocation: The Rev. Alphonse Skerl, St. Mary's of Victories Church, Representing The Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Message: The Rev. Dr. Wesley H. Hager, Grace Methodist Church Representing The Metropolitan Church Federation.

Prayer: The Very Rev. John Lazar, Dean, Southwest Deanery, St. Nicholas Diocese.

Message: The Rev. Rabbi Benson Skoff, Brith Sholom Kneseth Israel Congregation, President, St. Louis Rabbinical Association.

Captive Nations Hymn by Frederick Nagy, Quartet: The Rev. Arpad de Kallos, Hungarian American; Anton Beler, Croatian American; Carl Landis, American; Mike Stefanyszyn, Ukrainian American.

Message: The Rev. Alphonse Skerl.

Interlude, Organ: Mrs. Harriet Howard Lee.

Message: The Very Rev. John Lazar.

Benediction: The Rev. Dr. Wesley H. Hager.

Laying of Wreath.

Taps: Andred Sgroy, National Bugler for AMVETS, State Bugler for American Legion.

(Sponsored by the Free Friends of Captive Nations.)

Captive Nations Hymn

(Words: The Reverend Norbert J. Trepsa; music and arrangements: Frederick Nagy.)

Almighty God, Creator of all nations,
Thou givest law to all of thy creations,
It is thy will, as we thy faithful see,
That every man and every land be free.

It is godless might, against thy will it raves,
Holds captive lands and man it chains as slaves;
With lies, deceit, with pain and godless word;
It threatens us—the free—with deadly sword.
Almighty God, Creator of all nations,
Give us the strength and charity and patience;
See that our freedom undisturbed remains:
Free captive brethren from their heavy chains!
Amen.

Appeal by the League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples

THE NEED

Behind the Iron Curtain there are 65,000,000—or Saints. It depends on the point of view.

From the Communist point of view, the 65,000,000 are figures, numbers—without individuality, *without identity.*

But Christ was not crucified by Statistics—He endured crucifixion for Souls, individual Souls.

From God's point of view, the sixty-five million Catholics suffering under Atheistic Tyranny, denied the Mass and Sacraments, are Souls, Martyrs, Saints.

Is your point of view Communist? or Christian?

If Christian, can you comprehend suffering on so vast a scale? Sixty-five million Catholics suffering? There are only forty-five million in the United States!

THE PLAN

For parishes and organizations

The League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples has a plan: a Free Parish adopts *spiritually* a Captive Parish and prays for it by *name,* restoring its identity and the identity of its people. No longer are they statistics: they are people, living in a certain town, belonging to a certain Church, devoted to a certain patron. We restore their name, their identity, *in our prayers,* asking God's Grace for them . . .

To adopt a parish? All that is necessary is for one dedicated person in a free parish to become a league representative. The league representative will work with groups of fellow parishioners who, in spiritual communion with the Captive peoples, will attend Mass and receive Holy Communion once a month, preferably a definite day and hour. The enrollment fee is $5 per parish.

For individuals

Individuals may also become members of the League. The requirements are to attend one extra Mass per month and to receive Holy Communion for the captives. The enrollment fee for individual membership is one dollar.

THE PATRONESS

Our Lady of Guadalupe: Empress of the Americas, who appeared as the Immaculate Conception, the Enemy of Evil—the Woman clothed with the Sun, the Moon at her feet, "terrible as an army in battle array"—who appeared to an oppressed and helpless people as the "Mother of All" and gave them hope.

O Lady of Guadalupe, patroness and advocate of the humble and oppressed, we commend to thee today the people of the captive nations, suffering under the heel of Godless communism. Be with them and comfort them in their hour of desolation. Grant them courage to remain faithful to thy Divine Son and His Church in the face of persecution, threats, and even death. We pray particularly for the priests and people of our adopted captive parish (name of parish) in (City and Country). Immaculate Heart of Mary, be the refuge, hope, and victory for these and all our persecuted brothers in Christ behind the iron curtain. Holy army of God, saints, martyrs, angels and archangels, hasten to their assistance and bring them safely through the dark night of persecution. Amen.

YOUTH, AMERICA, AND THE FUTURE

(Commencement Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, at St. Basil Academy, Philadelphia, Pa., June 9, 1966)

Reverend Mother Daria, Distinguished Faculty, Honored Guests and Parents, and Members of the 1966 Graduating Class, I am deeply honored to participate in this glorious Commencement of St. Basil Academy. It is a treasured privilege to pay tribute to the high and excellent standards of your institution and to you graduates who have admirably upheld its ideals and purpose. In these times all of us are indeed fortunate to be the benefactors of the illustrious care, spiritual guidance, and wise leadership of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn.

In the usual Commencement address graduates are bombarded with the proverbial utterances about the stern realities of life, the challenges of the future, the opportunities of chosen fields of endeavor, and the prospects of success and sometimes failure. The captive audience in the meantime cannot wait for the address to come to a quick and resounding end. Many have endured this final travail before you, and I can assure you that many will have to persevere after you, but I shall endeavor to bring as much relief to you now as is possible.

My message concerning youth, America, and the future is simple and succinct. It is designed for you as youth, living in this country of ours, the United States of America, and facing your inevitable future with high hopes, aspiration, and perhaps some apprehension. The message is made easy because of the content of your instruction, the background of your heritage, and the imposing fact that as youth you are, for better or for worse, the present foundation of both your future and that of America and the world at large.

LOVE GOD AND DO WHAT YOU WILL

A generation ago, when I had the inestimable, intellectual pleasure of studying formal philosophy at both Fordham and New York University, deep and indelible impressions were made, but to this day I have never forgotten the words of St. Augustine, "Love God and do what you will." It is this insight into human existence that I wish to convey to you as you depart from these halls into whatever sphere of your future endeavor.

"Love God and do what you will" is not a message of license to indulge in whatever you please or desire, regardless of consequences both to yourself and those about you. Positively, it is a message of personal, moral freedom and liberty, aimed toward a rational and volitional order within yourself and thus, by automatic contribution, to the society in which you live. To love God means to love His creation and daily to do all that is necessary for the wholesome and ordered fulfillment of both His creatures and works. It is a rule, born not of arbitrary dictation but of pragmatic experiences upon experiences over centuries, for your self-improvement, the actualization of your potentialities, and the full development of your talents.

Today, we are told, there is a new ferment and restiveness among youth, not only here but throughout the world, that change has engulfed mankind, and that we are confronted by uncertainties and challenges of unprecedented proportions. Youth, as the present foundation of the future, needs a firmer perspective than this. Essentially, youth today is no different from that of 30 years ago, or 50 or a 100 years ago. Indeed students are more civilized today than they were in medieval times when many a professor was catapulted through a window. Those of the past also had their problems, their pressures, anxieties, and frustrations, and their periods of restiveness and rebellion. The historical setting was of course different, but the condition of problem-solving and emotional stress were the same.

Also, the way some talk about change in the present, you would think the world stood changeless and static in preceding generations. Technologic, social, cultural, economic, religious and other changes were as real then as now. The quantities and masses involved, the pace and rapidity are, of course, different now, but real change by way of transformation and becoming was present in yesteryear, too. True, there were no TV transmitters, space shots, automotive miracles, horrendous missiles, LSD drugs and so forth, but these are only the accidents of change, not its essence. For the comforts they provide, the labor costs they reduce, the pain they relieve, and the new horizons they open, the means of change are important and determinative. But in the years to come, what we consider stupendous today will be viewed with the same attitude as we do the innovations of the past.

The 20th Century, a period of massive change, is in fundamental respects strikingly similar to the 14th Century, a turbulent period of transition from the medieval world to the modern. Institutions were subjected to critical change and revision then, as the minds and souls of men, formed by the rational and spiritual disciplines of the Church, charted new avenues of existence in the dominant spirit of "Love God and do what you will."

Today, even some theologians teach "God is dead," but this thesis, philosophically repugnant on the surface, is both indicative of our period and, in my judgment, explosive for the long-run good. It indicates not that God is dead, for this is philosophically self-contradictory, but that God as a self-subsisting Reality is dead in the minds and souls of modern men who have lost their love of God and seek to do what they will, often without moral principle, charity, and justice. Is it any wonder that amidst the marvelous changes of this century, our history is tragically marred by bigger and fiercer wars, by Nazi and Russian genocide condemning millions to gas chambers and slave labor camps, and by the growth of a totalitarian Soviet Russian Empire which, behind the facade of Communism, is unprecedented in the annals of history.

YOUR UNIQUE AMERICA

Merely to provide economically better plumbing systems, more jobs, and even more education of certain types does not insure moral rectitude and purpose, the development of a rich and balanced personality, and a happy and engaging life. Nazi Germany was not inadept in such provision, and yet the soul and mind of a nation were twisted and distorted. The Russian imperio-colonialists are trying to become equally adept, but at the frightful costs in life and treasure to the millions who make up the captive nations in the Soviet Union and beyond.

With the sterling advantages of your moral training here, you will embark upon your respective careers and courses of life, seeking maximum opportunity for the fulfilment of your hopes and dreams in the unique environment of your America. Relatively too few of our people grasp with total perception and value the uniqueness of this nation that affords the broadest scope and opportunity for personal freedom, individual choice, and the perennial correction of injustices and maladjustments.

Without appearing to be super-patriotic and self-inflating, it is important today to recognize the invaluable uniqueness of our nation. This precious quality is not derived from the fact that we are the materially richest nation in the world or that we are the most powerful militarily. On the contrary, these and other dominant facts are themselves derived from the basic physical and moral nature of our nation. We are unique in that our people are ancestrally related to almost every nation and people in the world. We are also unique in our democratic institutions and our fundamental idealism, based upon the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, which in turn are founded on religious principles of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Today, more than ever, these truths must be taught and re-taught as many in our society have lost their sense of heritage and are easy pawns for enemy manipulators. Plans are being made for a bicentennial celebration of the American Revolution in 1976. You will be astounded to know that in almost all the resolutions submitted in Congress for the preparation of this glorious event, hardly any emphasis is placed on the Declaration of Independence. And yet it is this event which conspicuously differentiates the American Revolution from the French, English, or Russian. When next year the Russian imperio-colonialists will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of their morally fraudulent Bolshevik Revolution, you can rest assured that there will be some fools among us paralleling our revolution and the totalitarian Russian one.

By virtue of your heritage and your training here, you are remarkably equipped to understand and to convey to others the unique significance of the American Revolution and its enduring impact upon all colonial nations in the world, particularly those in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The American Revolution was a revolution for national independence and freedom to insure the opportunities for personal freedom. It is this kind of revolution that every captive non-Russian nation in the Red Empire thirsts for and strives to achieve.

The world is beset by many problems—problems of hunger, disease, economic underdevelopment, regional differences and conflicts. These are not new problems; they have always been and will continue to be for sometime. To mix these problems with the predominant problem of our time, that of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, is to display a mixed-up mind, and we have many such minds expressing themselves today. You wouldn't know from this why we are spending over $50 billion annually for military hardware and our men and women are dying in Viet Nam.

Clearly, the chief source of this problem of problems is imperio-colonialist Moscow. The USSR is the power center of so-called world communism. As you well know, it has become so because of early Soviet Russian conquests of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia and other formerly independent states. On the scale of power politics, no part of the present Red Empire—whether Red China, Poland, Yugoslavia, or Cuba—would long survive if, for one reason or another, the USSR were to collapse. As an empire within an empire, the USSR is greatly vulnerable because of the rampant Russian imperio-colonialism among the captive non-Russian nations in that empire-state. The nature of the conflict today is not between socialism or communism and capitalism, nor between peoples in one sector of the world and another, but between democratic freedom and totalitarian Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

As graduates of this Academy, and whether you now realize it fully or not, you bear a moral responsibility both to yourself and your America to share your growing knowledge about Eastern Europe, about Ukraine, with your fellow citizens. You might not believe it but people like Senator **FULBRIGHT** still think that the population of the USSR consists of "over 200 million Russians." One of the most powerful weapons Moscow possesses is the gratuitous protracted ignorance of many of our fellow citizens regarding the basic, multi-national weakness of the USSR. Love God and do what you will means broadening your knowledge in this all-crucial area and constantly applying it to inform our fellow citizens as to the nature and tactics of the enemy.

A FUTURE WITH PURPOSE AND FREEDOM

It should now be obvious that the freedom you cherish in your hearts and minds to pursue your personally chosen goals and vocation, to develop your talents and to enrich your personality, is inextricably tied up with your moral dedication to preserve this personal freedom by contributing to the freedom of your country and thus to the eventual freedom of the now captive nations. It is a politico-moral tragedy when many an American whose career has been interrupted by the conflict of the world, admits he does not know what he is fighting for or against. What you give of yourself to the higher ideals and to others less privileged, you will reap in the consciousness of your own fruitful development.

Life, whether in the past, present or future, is always challenging. It becomes more so when it is wholesomely oriented to a future with moral purpose and freedom. That is the future I hope and pray for you. Even at this stage you possess assets of moral and intellectual training that pricelessly equip you to cultivate and enjoy a bountiful future. To know right from wrong, to attest with firm conviction to truth as against falsehood, to become self-reliant rather than reliant, to work for moral and civil order, to advance freedom for the billion of unfree, and to further the goal of peace with freedom and justice—all this and more will be richly realized when you "Love God and do what you will."

[From the Catholic News, July 28, 1966]

FORMULA FOR FREEDOM

(NOTE.—*The Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., recently delivered the sermon at the Mass for Captive Nations at St. Patrick's Cathedral. Father Hill, a staff member of the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola, is executive secretary of "Operation Yorkville," an interfaith organization working to help protect children from the dangerous effects of the widespread dissemination of obscene materials. The full text of Father Hill's sermon is as follows:*)

A captive nation is a nation that is not free. A captive nation is not free to choose its rulers and its form of government. A captive nation is not characterized by freedom of thought and action. A captive nation has no freedom of worship. In none of these nations could there be a public Mass in a church with the people of God gathered together in prayer to ask for freedom. For each of these 32 nations is under the strict control of a Communist leader, who in turn is under strict orders from Moscow.

Yet our Blessed Lord spoke of His mission to captives. At the beginning of His public life, He came to Nazareth where He had been brought up. According to His custom He entered the Synagogue on the Sabbath day and rose to read. The volume of the Prophet Isaiah was handed to Him. He opened it and found the place where it was written, "The Spirit of The Lord is upon me. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives."

As He rolled up the volume and returned it to the attendant He sat down. The eyes of all in the Synagogue were upon Him. At that moment He said to them, "This day is fulfilled the scripture in your ears."

In this incident, Christ applied the words of Isaiah's prophecy to Himself. He made it plain that His own personal mission was to proclaim release to captives. It is good for you to hear these words from His lips this morning, for Christ and Christ alone can release the nations from captivity.

It is important for you on this day, the first day of Captive Nations Week, to hear these words of Christ. "The Father has sent me to proclaim release to the captives." It is important for you to understand them. It is most important however, that you listen to them and follow the directives of our Blessed Lord. Only if you hear, understand and obey can you be completely convinced that Christ and Christ alone can lead the captive nations out of captivity. How then can you come to an understanding of His words?

Premier Kosygin and General Secretary Brezhnev are the men who rule the Soviet Union. Behind these two men of action are thinkers, Marx, Engels, Suslov. The thought of these men pervades and dominates the Soviet Union and its ruling minority. Their ideology is simple; "Spirit does not exist. There is only matter. Christ is a lie. Religion is the opiate of the people." As one stands before the globe of the earth and examines the Soviet Union and the captive nations subject to this Marx, Engels, Suslov ideology, one can see clearly that there is one word that describes the thought controlled Union and the thought controlled captive nations functioning within the outer structure of the Union. That word is "Prayerlessness." Soviet leaders do not believe in God. Soviet thinkers do not believe in prayer. As a result, "Prayerlessness" has been imprinted upon the minds and hearts of millions, especially upon youth. This atheistic concept of a nation without prayer has reached millions of Russians through Marx, Engels, Suslov and their ideology of dialectical materialism. But as Premier Kosygin stands in Red Square in Moscow with his fist clenched before a microphone, backed by the ideology of Marx, Engels, and Suslov so Paul VI kneels in Rome with his arms extended in prayer, backed by men who are also trained ideologists. Premier Kosygin looks to the earth. Paul VI looks to heaven. Kosygin thinks and speaks. Paul, too, thinks and speaks—but Paul also prays. As behind Russian thought there is hate, so behind Christian thought there is love. As behind Kosygin there is Marx, Engels, Suslov, so behind Paul VI there is Carl Rahner, the German; John Courtney Murray, the American; Hans Kung, the Swiss; Peter Howard, the Englishman, world leader of Moral Rearmament (to mention but one Protestant). And behind Paul VI there is also Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, the Frenchman. It is extremely important that every Communist master Communist thought and ideology. It is important that every member of the Assembly of the Captive Nations master the ideology of love and prayer, even though this ideology be a theology.

I emphasize today one of these great thinkers, one of the greatest of our time—the last, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, for his thought is having a profound effect in all the nations of the world. A great scientific mind, a great heart, a great love led him to call upon all mankind to unite in building the earth—in making the world a home for all peoples. Chardin more than adequately explained the words of Christ, "The Father has anointed me to proclaim release to the captives," when he spoke to all mankind of the "totalization" of the world in Christ. "The age of nations is past," wrote Chardin, "The task before us now, if we would not perish, is to build the earth." This statement may seem alarming to you who are working for the release, the sovereignty, the identity of the Captive Nations. Yet his words should not alarm you. The age of nations may not be completely passed. It may be centuries before the age of nations is completely passed. Meantime, how can freedom, sovereignty, identity be regained, if mankind is not to work toward unification, toward "totalization"? In Chardin's view, the constant goal of the individual and national development should be the unity of mankind. Individuals and nations must achieve this unity, he wrote, if we are ever to have any fullness of life on the earth.

And how are we to work for this unity? It is for each of us to do it, we of the free nations of the world, together with those in the Captive Nations who will not have the Spirit of Christ driven out of them. For as Chardin said, "In our hands, the hands of all of us, our world, our life, are placed like a Host, ready to be charged with the divine influence, the real Presence of the Incarnate World." A man of great vision, Chardin believed that despite the crushing burdens which revolutions have placed on mankind, the substance of a new world is being born in the very flesh of peoples all over the earth. It is up to us, in every country to help prepare men who, at first in themselves, then in the circle around them and then at the head of nations, will preside over the true destiny of mankind. So thought Teilhard de Chardin.

We must listen to this man. We must take the entire developing world into our gaze. We must see, with Chardin, how it is that Christ and Christ alone can bring release to the Captive Nations, how Christ and Christ alone can unify all nations in love.

It is good that you are here today to hear of this intense all embracing love of Christ with its unifying effect on all mankind. It is good to hear words of love at a time when hearts are bleeding, are tempted to hate, when we are tempted to see hate as the answer to hate. But we must see love as the answer to hate. We must see Christ as the great unifying force of tomorrow's world. We must have our "hands ready to be charged with the divine influence."

If we are to master this vision, we must master the thought of men like Teilhard de Chardin. We must read his books, "The Divine Milieu," "The Future of Man," "The Phenomenon of Man," "The Hymn to the Universe," "Building the Earth." But most important of all, his thought must bring us to our knees before our Maker. We must pray with a passionate commitment to him: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." This is the prayer of Paul VI as he kneels in his chapel in Rome. This is not the prayer, much less the thought of Premier Kosygin whose words are, "My will be done."

THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY AND ONE NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST'S WAR AGAINST THE TRUTH

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, a nationally syndicated columnist wrote a series of unsubstantiated allegations concerning the legislative development of the antipoverty amendments of 1966 and my role as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in rewriting of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

In an effort to refute, point by point and fact by fact, the untruthfulness of the columnist's allegations, I called a press conference and issued a statement, quoting facts, dates and statistics.

Unlike the columnist's original assertions, my rebuttal failed to receive the same coverage, exposure or amount of space.

This is an ancient problem, I recognize, and the press never accords a refutation, denial or rebuttal the same space it does to the initial charges. This is because the press hates to admit it is wrong.

Nevertheless, the Members of this House may be interested in the true facts and I am doing what the newspapers which carried this columnist's column on the antipoverty bill refuse to do—I am placing in the Record not only my refutations, but the columnist's original charges. Even though certain newspapers rarely—and this columnist never—accede to the spirit of fair play, I am happy to do so.

Statement by Representative Adam C. Powell on a Columnist's Charges That He "Delayed" the Antipoverty Bill

A columnist whose daily column is the only one in America to appear on the comic strip pages recently made several charges about the anti-poverty bill and my alleged role in delaying this important legislation.

Let me discuss each allegation—not for the columnist's hopeless enlightenment because he is beyond redemption—but to set the record straight for millions of people.

1. "Southern Congressmen cannot enthuse publicly over the anti-poverty bill aimed chiefly at helping Negroes. . . ."

Of the 9.7 million families below the poverty line ($3,000) in America, 7.6 million or 79% are white. White people need this anti-poverty bill more than Negroes.

2. "It had been agreed between Northern big-city Democrats and Southern Democrats that the anti-poverty bill should be voted ahead of the Civil Rights bill."

What "big-city Democrats" made such a deal? Who authorized them to enter into such an unconscionable deal—the House leadership? The Administration? I'm the Committee Chairman and I knew nothing about any such private "deal".

3. "During this time (my trip to Geneva to attend the International Labor *Organization* Conference), Powell's Committee Colleagues were working feverishly to draft and report out the bill."

An elegantly fashioned falsehood symbolic of the first-class inaccuracy and second-class reporting that characterizes Drew Pearson's daily forays into journalism by innuendo.

The indisputable facts are—and facts are something this muckraking columnist rarely has—*the bill was drafted, completely finished and reported out of the full Committee on May 18th. I did not leave for Geneva until June 2nd.*

My Colleagues indeed had worked "feverishly". A Democratic caucus within my Ad Hoc Subcommittee had reported out a total of only $217 million in unrestricted Community Action funds. But I personally offered an amendment for an additional $150 million and it was accepted by the full Committee.

4. "And when he came back to find that other Members of his Committee had done his work for him and whipped the anti-poverty bill in final shape."

As I stated before, I not only participated in the shaping of this bill, but of 43 amendments to this year's bill, I offered *11* and *all* of them were adopted. That's 25% of all 1966 amendments from the full Committee.

5. "Powell claimed privately that these probes were too ineffectual and incompetent to merit Committee attention."

I have never made any such claim—privately or publicly. The probes were highly successful and the reports proved it. The referred-to "conscientious Representative Sam Gibbons" saw all of these reports. He never made any complaints to me about their inadequacy.

6. Powell pleaded "that he had to be in New York at a board meeting for his Church on Wednesday, the day the $1.7 billion measure was to be brought up for action."

Even though the Speaker never informed me as a mere gesture of courtesy that he intended to schedule the bill the week of July 18th, I nonetheless informed him personally of the important annual corporate meeting of my Church that Wednesday evening. I have been associated with my Church for 36 years. We Baptists just can't seem to get the same recognition other religious groups do. And it's even worse when we're black.

7. "Powell also demanded that civil rights be voted on first. . . ."

I will pay $1,000 to any person who produces one scintilla of evidence that I personally spoke to or met with any person to demand, urge, suggest or even hint that the civil rights bill be voted on first. Will this irresponsible columnist match my confidence by resigning if he can find no such evidence?

8. "Finally he tried to pressure Sargent Shriver. . . . into giving him more funds for specialized relief projects in his home area, Harlem."

What so-called "relief projects"? We have no "relief projects" in Harlem. I have pressured Sargent Shriver for my Congressional district no more than any other Congressman. But Harlem needs anti-poverty more than most Congressional districts because the median family income of my district is the 370th lowest of all 435 Congressional districts.

9. "With Cleveland torn by race riots and Chicago, New York and Washington sitting on powder kegs . . . the anti-poverty program (is) aimed at alleviating Negro slum areas, the chief cause of race riots."

What ridiculous nonsense! Riots are caused because the black people are hungry—hungry for jobs, fair treatment by the police, adequate recreational facilities, decent housing and good schools. The anti-poverty bill alone cannot "alleviate" these conditions. Two years of existence of the anti-poverty bill did not prevent Chicago, Cleveland and Omaha from exploding into violence this year.

Black people have been reduced to violence as a last resort because they are not eating. While unemployment for whites has declined from 4.1% in June of 1965 to 3.5% in June of 1966, unemployment for black people has escalated from 8.3% in June of 1965 to 9.0% in June of 1966. The employment situation for black people in the ghettoes is getting worse instead of better.

Nevertheless, the anti-poverty bill is not a "Negro bill" and to treat it as such is indicative of the most vicious racism imaginable.

What I have sought and what I shall continue to seek is at least $10 billion for the anti-poverty bill.

TAXI WALKOUT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the airport drivers strike, which began today, has again focused a spotlight on the pressing need for additional and more adequate transportation to Washington area airports.

Last Monday, many of you flew in helicopters from Capitol Hill to Dulles and Friendship Airports. This demonstration pointed out the speed and ease travelers might enjoy with the establishment of regularly scheduled helicopter service.

Because of the walkout of taxicab, limousine and busdrivers, the public is faced with either a long trek in a private automobile or the inconvenience of hastily scheduled, makeshift service.

A helicopter shuttle service could have and could now guard against this kind of dilemma. It could now insure swift and convenient travel.

This "minor" strike is dwarfed by the mechanic's walkout which has grounded five major airlines and reduced Washington air travel by some 30 percent.

Many people, therefore, may pay little attention to today's strike since it is likely to appear as simply another restriction to what is already drastically cutback air service.

However, the driver walkout is nevertheless an emphatic reminder that the public deserves effective and dependable transportation to the city's airports.

I am sponsoring legislation which would direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to hold investigations and begin studies into the need for a helicopter transportation system.

I believe that the need is clear and the demand is apparent.

The Congress should direct its attention to this legislation now. We should urge the CAB to move swiftly in its studies and to submit concrete recommendations that can be translated into a course of action.

If the driver strike persists, I shall recommend that we call upon the CAB to issue a temporary certification for regularly scheduled helicopter service to fill the void created by the walkout.

Pressing needs demand clear thought and bold action. It is time for the Congress to exercise its traditional role of protecting the public and leading in the path of progress.

RULES COMMITTEE ACTION NOW ON H.R. 14026—THE "CD" BILL—IS VITAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 19 the chairman of the committee in the other body to which is referred banking legislation announced that he was introducing a bill dealing with the current interest rate war between financial institutions. He also stated that it would nevertheless be the privilege of the House to act first on such legislation since our Banking and Currency Committee has held extensive hearings on this very serious question. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, your committee held 15 sessions of open hearings extending over a period of 6 weeks. On July 25, your committee overwhelmingly voiced its approval of Chairman Patman's bill, H.R. 14026, ordered it reported to the House and requested the chairman to seek a rule from the Rules Committee.

Now I see where the committee of the other body has seen fit to abandon the principle of legislative courtesy by proceeding on interest rate regulation. My understanding is that after 1 day of hearings, the bill will be voted upon today in executive session. In the meantime, our own bill which contains a temporary 4½-percent rate ceiling, endorsed by the Independent Bankers Association, the thrift industry, the National Association of Home Builders, and consumer and labor groups, lies dormant in the Rules Committee.

This state of affairs is disturbing because of the likelihood of hasty approval by the other body of a bill without the vital temporary rate ceiling. This confused situation, Mr. Speaker, can only serve to delay and becloud the issues which demand an immediate and effective solution. Perhaps had the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, not been so vacillating on this subject, legislation would have already been enacted by now in time to save the housing industry and our housing programs from destruction. At present, the issue is in doubt at best.

I am hopeful that our Rules Committee will promptly grant a rule on H.R. 14026 so that the House can work its will and avoid getting into a legislative snarl with the other body. I believe the great majority of Members will strongly support the bill as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. I was quite pleased to note in yesterday's Congressional Record that the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, stated his unqualified support for H.R. 14026. Speedy action is necessary and any delay will be very harmful.

Tomorrow, Hon. Wright Patman, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, celebrates his 73d birthday. One of the best gifts he can receive from his colleagues in the House is passage of H.R. 14026. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to get it out of the Rules Committee, and to get it to the floor where we may all have an opportunity to cast our votes. Passage of H.R. 14026 would be an appropriate birthday present for that champion of reasonable interest rates, Chairman Wright Patman.

GOOD JOB, GOOD CHOICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the mountain of praise grows taller for the job Edwin O. Reischauer performed as Ambassador to Japan and for President Johnson's choice of U. Alexis Johnson to succeed Ambassador Reischauer.

Numerous tributes to the outgoing and to the incoming Ambassadors already have been entered into the Record, but I would like to add one more. It is from the Louisville Courier-Journal of July 31, 1966. The editorial follows:

An Envoy Choice That's a Sound One

Few men are better suited to their jobs than Edwin O. Reischauer has been to his as U.S. Ambassador to Japan. His personal popularity in that island nation and the respect for his opinions among officials in this country made his service extremely valuable at a critical time between the two Pacific powers. But he is a scholar, and not a career diplomat. The time finally came, after five years of service, when he had to return to his faculty post at Harvard University.

If he leaves his successor some major problems—mounting demands for return of Japanese sovereignty over Okinawa, criticism of U.S. policies in Viet Nam and a reexamination of Japan's defense posture—Ambassador Reischauer also leaves a diplomatic climate in which these can be approached in the mutual interests of both nations and in the long-range interests of all Asian nations.

Since he must be replaced, U. Alexis Johnson is a sound choice to succeed him. Much of his career has been in Japan and the Far East. It was his long negotiation with the Red Chinese in the early 1950s that led to the eventual repatriation of Americans.

Mr. Johnson is respected for the important role he played in negotiating the Japanese-American peace treaty, the basis for the solid growth of mutual interests and for the outstanding economic development of Japan, now fourth among the world's industrial powers. Mr. Johnson will be charged with the responsibility of working with Japanese leaders to see how effectively this revived power can be used to work for peaceful development of Asia.

THE NEW OHIO RIVER DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the six Ohio River States—Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia and Pennsylvania—recently established the Ohio River Development Commission to promote recreation, tourism, and industrial growth in the Ohio Valley region.

I would like to include in the Record an article that appeared in the Courier-Journal of August 2 regarding this new commission:

Boating Governors Plan New Era for Ohio River

(By Martin K. Pedigo)

A floating log and an empty gas tank caused the governors' tour of the Ohio River to sputter occasionally yesterday but did nothing to dim the bright hopes the governors expressed for a cooperative effort at boosting the Ohio Valley region.

Indiana Governor Roger D. Branigan was named chairman of the new Ohio River Development Commission, which will promote recreation, tourism and industrial growth. He will serve with the governors of the five other Ohio River states—Kentucky, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia and Pennsylvania and three top aides from each state in the group.

The commission came out of a conference between Branigin, Kentucky Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, Ohio Gov. James A. Rhodes, and West Virginia Gov. Hulett Smith on one of the four boats that carried about 100 officials and newsmen part of the way from Cincinnati to Louisville.

The idea was announced at a stop at Madison Ind., where Branigin also dedicated a $750,000, 39-room expansion of facilities at Clifty Falls State Park. The expansion consists of a three-room addition to the inn, two new two-story motel units, each with 18 rooms, and a central building containing two dining rooms and a lounge.

The tour went after breakfast by boat from a marina restaurant east of Cincinnati to the Cincinnati municipal wharf, then by bus to Markland Lock and Dam, where the U.S. Corps of Engineers gave the officials a brief rundown on the Engineers' plans for the Ohio's modernization.

Three private pleasure boats and an engineers' cruiser then took the party through the locks and on down river. There was a brief stop at Vevay, Ind., and then the tour stopped at Madison and Clifty Falls Park for lunch.

One of the boats limped into Madison on one propeller after the other was damaged by a floating log.

AN HOUR BEHIND SCHEDULE

After lunch the boats headed toward Louisville, leaving Madison about one hour behind schedule. Most of the time had been made up when the boat carrying the four governors and their fellow commission members ran out of gas just off Twelve Mile Island. After she took on five gallons of gas, the tour continued down river to Louisville, where the press and some officials toured the Belle of Louisville before heading for a dinner at a downtown motel.

Gov. Breathitt named Natural Resources Commissioner J. O. Matlick, Fish and Wildlife Commissioner Minor Clark and Public Information Commissioner Cattie Lou Miller, who will serve alternately with Parks Commissioner Robert Bell, to the development commission.

Branigin said the commission will attempt to encourage both recreational and industrial development of the Ohio River Valley.

He added with a smile. "This is a dream for all of us, and if it is accomplished, those responsible will be called blessed."

The Hoosier governor said the commission will start promptly to seek federal assistance and to form a master recreation and tourism plan for the river.

Branigin said Rhodes originally suggested the idea at a Midwest Governor's conference.

Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois and Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania were unable to make the tour although aides represented Kerner at the Conferences.

Breathitt said that even with the cooperation of the new commission, there will be healthy and friendly competition for the tourist dollar. The Kentucky governor said, "We have not yet adequately developed . . . this greatest potential tourist attraction in the United States."

He predicted that the cooperative effort should help all six states to double their tourist income in a very few years.

"A MODEST PROPOSAL," BY JOSEPH ALSOP

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARNSLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of three articles by Joseph Alsop, on the problem of the cities, that appeared in the Washington Post on August 1, 3, and 5, 1966:

A MODEST PROPOSAL—I

(By Joseph Alsop)

The problem of the cities, in the form that it is now assuming, is the most urgent, the most difficult and the most frightening American domestic problem that has emerged in all the years of this country's history since the Civil War.

As a sort of farewell before a month's vacation, an attempt will therefore be made to sum up the problem, as it now stands, in a series of three reports. The only way to begin is with the terrible words of the general confession:

"We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done."

This include, first of all, the almost complete failure to find out and to face the hard facts of the modern urban problem. The heart of the problem of the cities is the problem of the Negro ghettos, which have been flaming into riot in recent weeks.

As an illustration of the near-total lack of realism in most discussion of ghetto matters, it is only necessary to analyze the common school slogan, "End de facto segregation."

To begin with, you cannot "End de facto segregation" in an urban school system, when the entire school system is already de facto segregated. Yet some people are still mouthing this slogan here in the District of Columbia, whose public elementary schools are now 91 per cent Negro!

To go on with, short of a Constitutional Amendment, you could not even end de facto segregation by forcibly homogenizing all the schools in an urban school system that was only 30 per cent Negro. The careful research behind the Watts report shows that any school which is forced to accept as much as 25 per cent of disadvantaged children virtually ceases to be a school; and almost all the children of the ghettos are very seriously disadvantaged.

Race has nothing to do with the effect on the school. The school becomes worthless because the teachers are unable to carry the huge extra burden of helping their disadvantaged pupils—whether they are Negro, or Mexican-American, or poor white. And when the neighborhood school goes to hell in a hack, all the middle and lower-middle income families in the neighborhood simply pick up and move to the suburbs, thereby creating another wholly segregated school.

Since an amendment forbidding such movement is unlikely, the important thing is not to "end de facto segregation." The important thing is to provide many more teachers, and much better teachers, for all schools carrying a serious burden of disadvantaged pupils. But there is no money to do that. Nothing for schools, and billions upon billions for freeways and expressways that promote the white emigration to the suburbs! That has been our rule for many years, again recalling the terrible sentence from the general confession.

The result is the present situation. This situation is not generally understood, yet the new SNCC leader, Stokely Carmichael, clearly understood it well enough when he boasted to a recent Washington rally that "We'd have black power" in most of the big American cities "within six years."

Six years is too short an interval, but school figures and population figures unanswerably indicate that most of the really major American cities are likely to have Negro majorities within the next decade, if not sooner. This is partly because of the growth of the ghettos, but the main cause is the flight to the suburbs of virtually all white families with children of school age.

Unless present trends are reversed, in short, most of our great cities are due to become huge Negro reservations—a series of super-Watts! When and if that happens, "black power" will no doubt be installed in City Hall. But when and if that happens, as any practical-minded man can foresee, there will be other consequences, too.

The change in the cities will not only accelerate the white movement to the suburbs, until the city centers truly are reservations in the grimmest sense of that grim word. This change will also, and above all, accelerate another movement that has already begun without anyone paying much attention.

Finance and business, industry and commerce will follow the flight into the suburbs; all the vast national investment in the centers will quite suddenly be almost worthless. And far worse still, these city-sized super-Watts of the future will have hardly more resources of their own to solve their problems than the Watts District of Los Angeles has today.

If we do not change the trend, there will be no hope of integration, no hope of equality for the Negro Americans. There will be an immense increase of the ugly race feeling that the riots have already begun to promote. There could even be, one day, a President Verwoerd in the White House. Any effort, any expenditure, any personal or national sacrifice, will be better than the thing we are threatened with, whites and Negroes together.

A MODEST PROPOSAL—II

(By Joseph Alsop)

Why are most of the American great cities likely to be transformed into super-Watts? Why, in other words, do more and more of the cities have heavy Negro majorities in their school systems, predicting virtually segregated Negro cities of the future?

The first answer is the schools. Here in Washington, for instance, we have elementary schools that are over 90 per cent Negro; we have a city-wide population that is two-thirds Negro; and we have a voting population that is still only about one-half Negro. (These differences appear in all major cities, although other cities' figures are down in the scale as yet.)

But although Washington has already become a predominantly Negro city, the District of Columbia retains a white population of about 250,000. There should, therefore, be a great many tens of thousands of white children of school age in the District. And in reality, there are almost none!

To be precise, Washington had 26,000 white children of elementary school age five years ago. It has lost half that number since then. And of the 13,000 white children of school age still in the District of Columbia, far more than a third attend private schools.

Those figures mean only one thing: That nowadays, white families with children almost automatically emigrate to the suburbs. That conclusion can be cross-checked, too, in half a dozen ways.

The Southwest redevelopment, for instance, has caused many white people to return to live in the District of Columbia. But of these returners, almost none are families with children.

Again, there are two or three Catholic parishes in Washington with particularly strong parochial schools. As the Negro people moved into these neighborhoods, virtually all white Protestant families with children moved out, leaving the public schools almost solidly Negro.

But many of the white Catholic families have stayed, although the parochial schools, too, now have very high Negro percentages. This is because the parochial schools, being strongly led, have remained as good as ever, and the Catholic families therefore saw no reason to move.

It would be unrealistic to deny that the cruel fact of race prejudice has played a role in the white emigration to the suburbs. But the truly dominant role has been played, and is still being played, by the schools themselves.

If the admission of large numbers of disadvantaged children causes a school to go to hell in a hack, almost all families who are able to do so rather promptly move to a neighborhood with better schools—which nowadays means a suburban neighborhood. And as the Watts Report shows the racial origin of the disadvantaged children has little to do with this emigration. The children's effect on the school, because of the extra burden they inevitably impose on the teachers, is the heart of the matter.

The truth of the matter is that the Justices of the Supreme Court left a needed job only one-half done, when they outlawed segregated schools. Because of this country's shameful history of economic and other injustices to its Negro people, the great majority of Negro children are disadvantaged. Desegregation of the schools should therefore have been accompanied by legislation sharply increasing outlays on the school systems, and particularly on the great urban school systems.

That can still be done. The question is whether it can be done in a way to halt the white movement to the suburbs, and even to bring a lot of white families back into the city centers—thereby making a reasonable population balance in both cities and school systems, and thus preventing the growth of the city-sized super-Watts that now threaten us.

The answer is not just good urban schools, which we do not now have. Merely good schools are no longer good enough to reverse the sinister population trend that may soon make our cities into vast Negro reservations. The answer, I fervently hope and strongly believe, is immensely superior urban schools, fine enough to hold and even to attract all families that want the best schooling for their children.

If New York spent $1700 per child per year, or a bit more than Scarsdale does; if St. Louis did the same—in short if present urban school outlays were just about doubled in every great city—the cities would soon enough have the superior schools that are so desperately needed for social-political reasons as well as educational reasons.

That would leave the problem of safe streets, which has played a lesser, yet discernible, role in the white emigrations to the suburbs. For safe streets, more money must be poured out, not only on better police departments, but also on parks and playgrounds and other recreational facilities and all the other things that make a city a good place to live.

The total bill, as anyone can see, will be astronomically larger than the cities can hope to pay. But what if the Federal Government pays the whole cost of giving superior schools to the great cities, and further lets the cities use their present school budgets to make themselves habitable once again? That question will be examined in the last report in this series.

A Modest Proposal—III

(By Joseph Alsop)

The right way for all Americans to look at the desperate American urban problem is simply to think of our great cities as very important patients in a very expensive hospital.

In a healthy family, the father and children do not complain about being on short commons for a while, in order to pay for the mother's medical expenses. And if one may be cynical, this tends to be especially true if the father, the bread-winner, the source of the family's income and prosperity, is the person whose recovery from a dire disease is going to cost a small fortune.

In our almost wholly urbanized America, the great cities are the major sources of the general prosperity, and they are indeed direly diseased. They grow less and less fit for human habitation, year by year. They are afflicted with the open ulcers that are the Negro Ghettoes, which should fill every single American, be he Rocky Mountain sheepherder or Wall Street banker, with inextinguishable shame.

Furthermore, because of the population trends already examined in this series, most of the great cities are threatened with early transformation into vast, impoverished Negro reservations—city-sized super-Watts, in fact. Unless something is done, and done soon, to reverse the white emigration to the suburbs, that will be the end of the road, not just in one great American city, but in the majority.

For the reasons set forth in two previous reports, there is only one expedient that offers much hope of reversing the present urban trend. The great cities must be given superior schools—not just good schools, mind you, but immensely superior schools, with a strong attractive power—and along with superior schools, the great cities must be given the resources to achieve safe streets again.

That means an astronomical expenditure. A good guess is that all the great cities' present levels of spending per child in school should be at least doubled. In many cases, further funds should also be provided for root and branch rebuilding of antiquated, jail-like urban schools. And in most cities, sums just about equal to the present school budgets are needed to get safe streets, by more spending on police, parks, recreational facilities and other neighborhood-builders.

Now, then, is the job to be done? There is no use talking about increasing the cities' tax rates. High urban taxes are another influence behind the white emigration to the suburbs. Only the Federal Government can do the job.

Yet, if the Federal Government is to spend many billions per year to cure the disease of the cities, this necessarily means discrimination in favor of the great cities, and against the suburbs, the small towns and the countryside. Nothing could be more politically difficult, yet the job must be done.

Suggesting remedies is not usually the reporter's task, but the aim of this series is nontheless to offer a modest proposal for a remedy. We should begin, I think, by recognizing that the great cities are not merely a major source of the national wealth; they are also the sole source of the wealth of the metropolitan areas that extend for hundreds, even thousands of square miles beyond each city's limits.

The cities, therefore, may be regarded as engines which generate the whole flow of Federal revenue from each metropolitan area. And the cities are deeply diseased, endangering the revenue. Why not, then, take the three following steps:

First, let the President appoint a distinguished Federal commission, or even a series of commissions, to trace the true limits of the metropolitan areas of each of the great cities.

Second, let the Federal revenues from each metropolitan area be ascertained, and let the Congress recognize that the revenues from each area are in fact mainly generated in the diseased city center.

Third, let the Congress therefore provide that of these revenues from each metropolitan area, a generous percentage will be returned to each city-center, in order to pay for the superior schools that offer the main hope of cure for the urban disease.

In this manner, the subsidies to the cities that are so desperately needed will at least be placed on a rational basis. If the whole school bill is footed by the Federal Government (while the schools, of course, continue to be managed by the municipal school boards), the cities will then have enough financial elbow room to do all the things needed for safe streets.

There are other advantages in the plan. The newly traced metropolitan areas could later be used as a basis for metropolitan authorities, on the pattern of the TVA, to handle such urban-suburban problems as transportation—problems which are also urgent and grave. The superior schools should not merely cure the urban disease; they should also open the door out of the poverty trap for the children of the urban ghettoes.

But enough has been said, except for one thing. If you once grasp what this urban problem is going to do to the American future, you will automatically agree that any effort, any outlay, any sacrifice is justified to achieve a cure.

THE SEA AT NIGHT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when a lot of people wonder about the young men and women of America, and particularly are curious about the quality of the men in our armed services, I hope I am not presumptuous in calling attention to some beautiful lines written by a nephew of mine, Branson H. Willis, Jr., who is in his third year in the U.S. Air Force, having recently returned from service in the far Pacific. I believe it shows the sensitivity and the fine spiritual qualities which are to be found in so many of the young men and women of our day, and especially in those young men who, today, in our armed services are the gallant defenders of our way of life which puts so much emphasis on spiritual and moral values.

I ask that the brief essay, "The Sea at Night," appear following my remarks.

The Sea At Night

(By Branson H. Willis, Jr.)

The sea at night—Can there be any one thing in all of our nature to equal its majestic qualities? Often I have walked along the beaches in the faintly luminous twilight, many times thinking various thoughts, more often enveloped in its somewhat erie setting. As the breeze sings softly on my ears, and as the waves beat angrily at the cool, sandy shores, the fresh, clean smell touches my senses, as if . . . yes! I am a part of it. For a single moment the world of reality is a distant memory. A sudden realization of myself as tiny as the single grain of sand, and I, too, am dwarfed by the bigness of it all. It is a feeling I treasure. Maybe I think of a girl I used to love only yesterday, yet that brief yesterday is years gone by. The street lights are out, the horns are silenced, the problems of man seem tiny in comparison to the realm of space and water. It is a wonderful sense of security and fear together. For a brief instant a flash of fear touches my mind, but only for a brief instant. Reassurance is all around me. I realize the eternities of mankind can never be reached or even delved upon. Then, as quickly as the moment came, it is gone. Regret floods my thoughts for I know I must again enter the streetlights, the horns, the problems, reality. Somehow, the reluctance eases for I realize I cannot escape. I am content to know that for a moment—ever so brief—I was free!

INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there is great interest in the Interstate Taxation Act, H.R. 16491. The director of revenues for my State of Florida has sent me a resolution adopted by the Florida Revenue Commission opposing this legislation. Their main belief, in opposition to this bill, is that if it cannot be amended or defeated, Florida's present $18 million annual revenue from the use tax on interstate transactions will be reduced approximately 70 percent or $12,600,000.

I would like, at this time, to offer this resolution adopted by the Florida Revenue Commission on July 29, 1966, so that my colleagues may have the benefit of their feelings on this bill:

Resolution of the Revenue Commission of the State of Florida

Whereas, Haydon Burns, Governor, Tom Adams, Secretary of State, Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., State Comptroller, Broward Williams, State Treasurer, Earl Faircloth, Attorney General, Doyle Conner, Commissioner of Agriculture, and Floyd T. Christian, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, as and constituting the Revenue Commission of the State of Florida, have been apprised of the recent introduction in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on

July 25, 1966, of H.R. 16491, entitled "A Bill to Regulate and Foster Commerce among the States by Providing a System for the Taxation of Interstate Commerce," and

Whereas, said Revenue Commission has determined that said bill constitutes a grave threat to (1) the revenues of the State of Florida, (2) the flexibility and discretion of the State of Florida in maintaining its own tax administrative procedures, and (3) the efficiency of the administration of the Florida sales and use tax laws and would increase the cost thereof, and

Whereas, enactment of H.R. 16491 would abrogate the authority of Florida and other states to require multistate vendors to collect and remit use tax, which authority has been sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in the General Trading and Scripto cases, and

Whereas, the enactment of H.R. 16491 would result in a loss to Florida of a substantial portion of Eighteen Million Dollars annually collected and remitted to Florida by approximately Six Thousand multistate vendors, and

Whereas, the administrative effort necessary to fight off pressures for the states to submit to federal restriction of the states' tax policy and administration and would render it increasingly difficult as time passed for any state to remain sovereign and independent, and

Whereas, the several states are now taking positive action to simplify compliance problems by enactment and adoption of uniform statutory provisions and regulations.

Now therefore, the Revenue Commission of the State of Florida, on this 29th day of July 1966, hereby expresses its strong opposition to the enactment of H.R. 16491 and urges that the several states be given a reasonable opportunity to enact and adopt uniform statutes and regulations which would reduce the burdens of tax compliance by multistate vendors and eliminate any suggested necessity for federal intervention in the area of taxation historically reserved to the states and sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Haydon Burns,
Governor.
Tom Adams,
Secretary of State.
Fred O. Dickinson, Jr.
State Comptroller.
Earl Faircloth,
Attorney General.
Doyle Conner,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
Floyd T. Christian,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

MRS. LYNDON JOHNSON SUPPORTS FORTHRIGHT CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES BEFORE MARRING THE GRAND CANYON

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to find that Mrs. Lyndon Johnson is among those who believe that thorough consideration should be given to alternative means of supplying water to Arizona and the Southwest before the Grand Canyon is irrevocably altered and damaged by the construction of huge power dams.

In a letter to Mr. Walter G. Wight of Greenbelt, Md., who wrote in protest against the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, Bess Abell, social secretary to Mrs. Johnson, wrote:

> It is Mrs. Johnson's hope that forthright consideration will be given to alternate means for meeting the water and power needs of the thirsty Southwest, before any actions are undertaken that would mar the Grand Canyon.

If such a policy were to be adopted by Congress, it would mean refusing authorization of the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams at this time.

It would mean prompt authorization of the Central Arizona project for the diversion of 1.2 million acre-feet of Colorado River water into Arizona. This diversion could be carried out without either of the proposed new dams by using revenues from existing Colorado River hydro-dams.

It would mean study and consideration of whether the national interest would best be served by the clumsy device of stretching the reclamation program into a means of financing a vast and enormously expensive program of inter-regional water transfer.

It would lead, I believe, to a conclusion that the Southwest can have needed water and America can continue to have the Grand Canyon as nature made it.

H.R. 4671, as ordered reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, would authorize the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams as profitmaking enterprises able to pay a part of the huge cost of water importation into the Colorado River Basin. These dams, which would damage the unique and irreplaceable Grand Canyon, have virtually no more relationship to the importation of water for the Southwest than would a steel mill in Pittsburgh or a gold mine in Alaska with comparable profits which were used to defray part of the cost of the necessary waterworks. This reality contrasts strangely with language in H.R. 4671 which speaks of the generation and sale of electric power as incidental to other purposes of the bill.

Expert studies indicate strongly that nuclear and coal powerplants are attractive alternatives to the hydrodams. Interest free Government loans, perhaps no larger than the nonreimbursable portion of the Government funds for the hydrodams, are another possibility.

But as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] has said, the main impediment to full consideration of such alternatives is "political." The law would have to be changed and controversy would result, he said.

However, Congress should not shrink from new laws and new departures in policy to meet the emerging need for a national water policy. Let us approach the problem carefully, weighing the possible alternatives and their impact on the national welfare. Let us reject a selfish grab for the Grand Canyon and a sacrifice of one of the world's great natural wonders because political expediency has us hemmed in.

Let us make the key decisions on interregional water transfers and water importation schemes after, not before, a national water study.

Because of Mrs. Johnson's great contributions and longstanding interest in conservation of our natural resources her views are highly significant. I include the text of the aforementioned letter to Mr. Wight:

The White House,
Washington, July 20, 1966.

Mr. Walter G. Wight,
Greenbelt, Md.

Dear Mr. Wight: Mrs. Johnson has asked me to thank you for your recent message to her and tell you how much she appreciates your support of efforts to preserve and enhance the natural beauties of America.

She appreciates your comments about Grand Canyon and current proposals for installing further dams along the Colorado River. As you may know, these measures are before the Congress at the present time. It may interest you to know that because of interest from all over the world in this great natural wonder, the Administration did not recommend construction of Bridge Canyon Dam to the Congress.

It is Mrs. Johnson's hope that forthright consideration will be given to alternate means for meeting the water and power needs of the thirsty Southwest, before any actions are taken that would mar the Grand Canyon.

Sincerely,

Bess Abell,
Social Secretary.

KEEP DEFENSE FACTS FROM ENEMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1966, the Columbus Dispatch printed an excellent column by Alice Widener concerning the injustice of some recent criticism directed against Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester.

In her column, Mrs. Widener makes the very apt observation that:

> Nothing is harder to correct than a publicized untruth; nothing is harder to repair than a vendetta-type injustice.

I would add the corollary that nothing is more unfortunate and inexcusable than irresponsible reporting which blatantly violates the bond of trust between the administration and the press.

I find it inconceivable that anyone, and particularly a Member of this body, should see fit to question the integrity of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Certainly never before in the history of our Nation has a position such as his been so involved with the question of instantaneous communications, the need to properly inform the American public, and the responsibility to protect the lives of the fighting men involved. Never before has the American press been so excellently equipped and so intricately committed to providing the most complete news coverage of any war, as it is in Vietnam.

At the same time, modern communications systems have presented a tremendous challenge to the members of the press to join with the Nation's leaders in formulating guidelines which will guarantee accurate coverage of the war in Vietnam and still protect the necessary secrecy of vital information about our military action there.

Certainly Secretary Sylvester has set an outstanding example in charting new policies which will serve the best interests of the American public and also protect the lives of the Armed Forces in Vietnam. Contrary to several isolated, but well-publicized, reports, Secretary Sylvester has never advocated a deliberate misrepresentation of factual data in news reporting, and most certainly he has never sought to impose upon the press the subterfuge role of propaganda spokesman for the American Government.

Arthur Sylvester, as a former correspondent, does ask, and with justification, for responsibility. The Secretary has stated his position very clearly:

> When any nation is faced with nuclear disaster, with the life or death of your nation, you do not tell all the facts to your enemy.

Therefore, it seems clear to me that there is no question of Secretary Sylvester's purpose. He has merely restated a position any responsible reporter would himself advocate. I compliment the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs for the wisdom he has shown in this very difficult area of public concern, and I call special attention to Mrs. Widener's closing words:

> Discretion—meaning prudent silence or a discerning good judgment—still is sometimes the better part of valor.

I believe very strongly that Secretary Sylvester has shown the highest measure of valor in the manner in which he is carrying out an extremely difficult job.

I therefore respectfully submit Mrs. Widener's article for insertion in the Record, in order that all may have the opportunity to read it:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, July 28, 1966]

Sylvester Is Right To Keep Defense Facts From Enemy

(By Alice Widener)

Nothing is harder to correct than a much publicized untruth; nothing is harder to repair than a vendetta-type injustice.

I don't like untruths, half-truths or injustice, and so I believe it is time to try to correct some unfair propaganda against Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Arthur Sylvester.

Recently I sought an exclusive interview with him to find out facts about his alleged opinion. "It's the inherent right of the government to lie to save itself."

Also I wanted to find out some facts about the problem of press reporting on the Viet Nam War.

Actually the headline-getting statement of Secretary Sylvester about the right of government to lie to save itself was only a part of his response to a questioner during the Cuban missile crisis in 1962.

In reply to my recent direct question, Secretary Sylvester said, "I can only tell you what I told two congressional committees under oath. Obviously no government information program can be based on lies; it must always be based on truthful facts. But when any nation is faced with nuclear disaster, with the life or death of your nation, you do not tell all the facts to your enemy. That, and that alone, is what I am talking about.

"Moreover, in the Viet Nam War, no reporter has a right to divulge information endangering the lives of our fighting men, and none has a right to divulge information about troop movements or planned military maneuvers that would so endanger them.

"I believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I do not make an arbitrary separation between government and the people.

"When the Government is taking life or death emergency measures to protect all the people as was being done over the weekend prior to President Kennedy's address to the nation in the Cuban missile crisis—it is essential not to give the enemy an advantage by letting him know exactly what you are doing.

"That is essential to the people's right to survival in a nuclear era. In such event, the interests of the people and the government are one, and I am confident that is the way we want it to be."

I personally am in full agreement. Also, I believe it to be entirely right that President Johnson has asked the FBI to investigate who leaked to a newspaperman advance information about our recent air attacks on the Hanoi and Haiphong oil installations.

Our pilots are human beings with a right to maximum survival chances.

No reporter or government employee has a right to leak vital information about our military action in Viet Nam in defiance of press ground rules laid down by the military, regulations faithfully observed by most reporters.

I am no respecter of persons and don't believe anyone is perfect—me first. But I think it is about time that my colleagues in the press and the American people give Secretary Sylvester a decent break. I believe he is a patriotic American trying hard to perform an extremely difficult task in time of undeclared war that is not of his own making.

Secretary Sylvester doesn't believe in lying to the people and neither do I. But nobody need always tell every single thing he or she knows—not in a private family or public community or a nation.

Even in our times of instant worldwide communications, discretion—meaning prudent silence or a discerning good judgment—still is sometimes the better part of valor.

OUR HISTORIC CAPITOL

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, with plans having been formulated to extend and alter the historic west front of our Capitol, I wonder how many of us are familiar with the fascinating architectural history behind that building. Reading of the struggles of Latrobe, Walter, and the other contributors to this great building inclines one, I believe, to more strongly support preservation of this cultural and historic heritage.

The history of the Capitol and an evaluation of the attempts to change it are compellingly set forth in an article by the eminent Washington Post critic, Wolf Von Eckardt. In his concluding paragraph, Mr. Eckardt reminds us of the real cost of extending the west front: "an estimated $34 million and the certain loss of a building that for a century and a half has in Thomas Jefferson's words 'captivated the eyes and judgment of all.'" Mr. Von Eckardt's article follows:

Lesser Minds Fiddle With What Fathers Fussed Over

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

Although busy enough making independence and self-government work, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson worried and fussed a great deal about the National Capitol.

The original building—the last remaining portions of which lesser minds would now entomb in a new, vastly extended marble front—is as much their work as that of architects William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe and Charles Bulfinch.

As Washington and Jefferson saw it, the Nation's first building was to be the symbol for generations of the dignity and permanence of the new republic.

Two generations later, President Millard Fillmore decided against tampering with the original building when Congress demanded more space. Instead, in 1851, he appointed architect Thomas U. Walter to add new wings to either side of the old building. They are connected with it by narrow corridors. To give harmony to this ensemble, Walter capped it with his magnificent dome.

To Abraham Lincoln, too, the Capitol was a symbol of the permanency of the Union. Despite the demands which the Civil War made on manpower and finance, he ordered the work rushed to completion. His judgment of the country's sentiment was soon proven correct:

"How is the Capitol? Is it finished?" were among the first questions the representative of the Confederacy asked the representative of the Union when South and North first met to negotiate the end of hostilities on Feb. 3, 1865, aboard a ship in Hampton Roads.

It was essentially finished. Two years earlier—not long after Gettysburg—the bronze statue of Freedom was, precisely at noon on Dec. 2, 1863, slowly hoisted atop the great cast iron dome. A flag was unfurled and a salute of 35 guns was fired from Capitol Hill.

All that remained to be done now was Frederick Law Olmsted's magnificent west terrace and landscaping and, obviously, continuing interior improvements of plumbing, lighting, heating and cooling. But for this the building and the symbol were complete, or should be considered so. Who would dream of extending St. Peter's in Rome, Monticello, Mount Vernon or even the Houses of Parliament in London?

BICKERING GOES ON

But the unending bickering—a curious mixture of political and architectural ambition, of genius and pettiness, parsimony and extravagance, respect for history and disrespectful vainglory—that had accompanied the work from the very beginning has persisted to this day. In a way this bickering helped create our Capitol. Now it threatens it.

President Fillmore had ended the long debate in Congress about enlarging and changing the original Capitol because he would not "mar the harmony and beauty of the present building which, as a specimen of architecture, is so universally admired." Yet only ten years later scheme after hideous extension scheme was proposed.

For nearly a hundred years, Congress, supported by the vast majority of the country's architects, has resisted all of them. Rather than change and disfigure its glorious home, Congress decided to accommodate the ever-growing need for additional space and facilities by constructing new buildings on Capitol Hill. The results are the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court Building, the old and new Senate Office Buildings, three huge House Office Buildings and now the proposed Madison Memorial Library which will serve as a third building for the Library of Congress.

The old, vainglorious and long rejected enlargement proposals of the 1870s and '80s have, however, intrigued the present Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is not an architect but a builder and former Republican Congressman from Delaware.

With the emphatic backing of the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D-Tex.), he puffed out the east facade of the original, central portion of the building by 32½ feet with a new, slick marble replica. The work was completed in 1961.

ON THE WESTERN FRONT

Last month Stewart and his powerful Commission for the Extension of the Capitol suddenly announced that they had decided to similarly extend the west front, but this time by up to 88 feet and not with a replica but a somewhat changed design. The members of this Commission, in addition to Stewart, are Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, House Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK (D-Mass.), Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (R-Ill.) and House Minority Leader GERALD F. FORD (R-Mich.).

This second extension would, of course, spell the final obliteration of the splendid building that Fillmore saved and Washington and Jefferson worried so much about.

Of all the politicians who fussed with the work of the Capitol's architects, Washington and Jefferson were surely the most qualified. An informed appreciation of architecture was, in their day, considered an essential part of the education of a Virginia gentleman.

True, Washington thought it best to let the design of buildings "be governed by the rules which are laid down by the professors of the art. But his active part in the enlargement of his home at Mount Vernon belies this modesty.

And for Jefferson, of course, architecture was a passionate avocation. He had, he confessed, in uncharacteristic ecstasy, "stood for whole hours gazing at the Maison Carré like a lover at this mistress." It was not that this exceptionally well preserved Roman temple at Nimes, in southern France, seemed more perfect to him than other buildings he had seen.

It was because, in the words of one scholar, this temple's almost austere simplicity—in contrast to the still predominant Georgian style which accompanied British colonization—"was the speaking symbol of all that America could and should stand for, proclaiming the strength of republican virtue, the beauty of discipline, the wisdom of rule by laws rather than men, in a language he wanted all the United States to learn."

In quest of such architecture, Washington and Jefferson called a competition for the design of the Capitol. Its disappointing results may justify the slight hanky-panky which helped Thornton to win it. The fact that he had been introduced to President Washington by the famous painter John Trumbull may also have helped.

At any rate, Thornton was given permission to enter three months after the competition was officially closed and after the French architect Stephen Hallet had been given reason to believe that he had won. But surely Hallet's drawing of what looked like the fairy tale palace of a minor Renaissance prince was hardly the simple, classic building both Washington and Jefferson had in mind.

William Thornton was born in 1759 at Tortola in the Virgin Islands. He studied medicine in Edinburgh, traveled extensively in Europe and in Parisian society, settled for a while in Philadelphia where he knew Benjamin Franklin, gave up the practice of medicine and married a 15-year-old girl. He eventually became a Commissioner for the District of Columbia and later head of the United States Patent Office which he saved from destruction by the British in 1814 by stepping in front of their cannon and cussing them out.

At Philadelphia he had learned of a competition for the design of a public library. "When I traveled," he wrote, "I never thought of architecture, but I got some books and worked a few days, then gave a plan in the ancient Ionic order, which carried the day."

He carried the day again in the Capitol competition, his second architectural effort.

"Grandeur, simplicity and convenience appear so well combined in this plan of Dr. Thornton's," wrote George Washington on Jan. 31, 1793, to the District Commissioners who were officially in charge, that he was certain of their instant approval.

And Jefferson let it be known that Thornton's design "had captivated the eyes and judgment of all. It is simple, noble, beautiful, excellently arranged and moderate in size. . . . Among its admirers none is more decided than he whose decision is most important."

But Hallet's eyes and judgment, understandably perhaps, were captivated not at all. He, after all, was a professional architect and Thornton was not. And the District Commissioners, it turned out, made a bad mistake when, to appease the cantankerous Frenchman, they awarded him the same prize as Thornton ($500 and a building lot in Washington), invited him to examine Thornton's plans (which he promptly ripped to pieces in a lengthy report), and gave him the $400-a-year job of supervising the construction of the building (which he proceeded to change in accordance with his own ideas).

When it was discovered that Hallet had laid foundations for a square court, instead of the Rotunda Thornton had planned, President Washington, according to the long harassed Thornton, "expressed his disapproval in a style of such warmth as his dignity seldom permitted."

Hallet was fired. But since he refused to surrender the original plans, it is difficult to judge precisely how much influence he had on the design. Some historians have accepted Hallet's assertion that Thornton stole it from him in the first place. Glenn Brown, in his two heavy volumes on the history of the Capitol, defends Thornton's originality and competence with passionate eloquence.

The truth is probably, as Latrobe has written, that Thornton's design was one of the most brilliant and modern of his time, but that the amateur lacked the practical skill to properly execute and articulate it. His, regardless of details, is no doubt the chaste, classic simplicity of the building that pleased Jefferson so well and that Walter's House and Senate wings lack. As any discerning art historian knows, it is impossible to recreate this spirit, the "Zeitgeist," as the Germans call it, of a work of art. And although George Stewart's East Front now appears as an exact replica, future generations will, no doubt, instantly recognize it for what it is—a mid-20th century imitation.

Even Latrobe, aside from his jealous ambition, rebelled against Jefferson's and Thornton's pure classicism, though in the end he, like Bulfinch, faithfully executed Thornton's design. Besides he created the marvelous interiors of the original building.

Another difficulty was lack of skilled craftsmen. It proved hard to recruit carpenters and stone cutters who could build anything higher than thresholds.

Money, furthermore, was short. Washington's public buildings were to be financed from the sale of lots. But in the trackless wasteland where few streets were even marked, the real estate business was slow. The Government had to borrow money.

Under the circumstances, President Washington would not hear doing the building in marble as Thornton urged. There was none about at the time and it would have had to be imported at tremendous expense. Instead the original Capitol was built of sandstone from the nearby Acquia quarry and painted white.

CORRODED AND PAINT-BAKED

Sandstone is porous and has, as the incumbent Architect of the Capitol keeps pointing out with much alarm, corroded in spots and is caked with the innumerable coats of paint. But Washington's sandstone is part of our history, too. And although it must, of course, be repaired, and although marble is unquestionably the most suitable building material, it should no more be changed for the sake of prettiness than we should put up plastic cherry trees around the Tidal Basin.

On Nov. 22, 1800, President John Adams welcomed Congress in the completed north wing of the building, congratulating the gentlemen "on the prospect of a residence not to be changed." Seven years later, built under the direction of Latrobe, the identical south wing was completed. The two were joined by a wooden arcade where the Rotunda now stands.

Latrobe was appointed by Jefferson in 1803. He was a most accomplished architect and engineer but just as arrogant and troublesome as Hallet had been—at least for poor Thornton. The two kept harpooning each other with bitter accusations and acid sarcasm.

Latrobe was born in England and trained partly in Germany. On a visit to Philadelphia, in 1798, he met the president of the Bank of Pennsylvania and in the course of a casual conversation made a sketch of what a bank ought to look like. Nine months later, to his great surprise, he had the commission.

Latrobe was almost unique among the architects of his time in believing in function as well as form. This led him to his many quibbles, not only with Thornton but with Jefferson as well, who would not have his conceptions of classic design altered for the sake of a more workable building.

Latrobe and Jefferson, for instance, disagreed violently over roofing the House of Representatives. Latrobe, for functional reasons, wanted a hemispheric dome lighted by a lantern with vertical glass panes that could be easily waterproofed. Jefferson wanted something like the dome over the new Halle aux Bles he had seen in Paris with long ribs springing from a drum and horizontal glass strips between them. It seemed to him more like the Pantheon in Rome.

The President had his way. Latrobe was sarcastic. "Presidents and Vice Presidents are the only architects and poets," he wrote his assistant. ". . . Therefore let us fall down and worship them . . ." The leaks Latrobe had predicted were fixed with some extra putty.

But Jefferson, like everyone else to this day, much admired Latrobe's handsome "corncob" capitals on the ornamental columns in the original Senate wing. It was a patriotic deed of much daring to replace the 2000-year-old acanthus leaf of antiquity with a motive as lowly—and American!—as carved ears of Indian corn.

BRITISH SET FIRES

"The Cossacks spared Paris," as one English newspaper remarked, but the British did not spare Washington and the fire damage they did to the Capitol in 1814 was extensive. The District Commissioner promised Congress, which had retreated to Sam

Blodget's nearby hotel, to have the building restored by 1816. It took 14 years longer.

Latrobe now did over much of the formerly wooden interiors in marble and metal, but was out of town a lot on other business and an increasing irritant to the growing bureaucracy. In 1817 he stiffly informed President James Monroe that he had "no choice between resignation and the sacrifice of all self-respect." He was spared the sacrifice. Bulfinch took over and to him goes the credit for completing the Capitol much as Thornton had envisioned it.

That job completed in 1830, there seemed no more need for an Architect of the Capitol and the position was abolished for many years.

In 1850 the country's population exceeded 23 million and even distant California had become a state. The 62 Senators and 232 Representatives who assembled that year felt crowded.

Again, following precedent, a competition was called. Again the munificent sum of $500 was offered as first prize. And again the entries proved most unsatisfactory.

Robert Mills, the official government architect and engineer at the time, was asked to combine the various ideas the competition had brought out into a new scheme. Mills had designed the Washington Monument, the Treasury and the Patent Office (now the National Portrait Gallery), among other handsome buildings, but failed to please Congress on this job. After much hassle, President Fillmore appointed Thomas U. Walter to build the Capitol as we know it today.

Walter's design reflects a different America than Thornton's. The age of elegance and almost aristocratic refinement had yielded to a new sense of power—in fact, to a certain arrogance, and to the esthetic confusion of the beginning industrial revolution. Walter's idea of "classic" architecture was different from that of Thornton and Jefferson. He would, he once lectured, have architects think as the Greeks thought, not do as they did. And what he thought the Greeks thought was really what most Americans thought of—the manifest destiny of a new industrial empire.

Walter's nine million pound, cast-iron dome reflects this spirit. Besides, it was a great engineering feat. People often wonder how Walter got the 16-foot figure of Freedom way up there. It's quite simple. He merely built scaffolding straight up the middle of the rotunda, through the eye of the dome. From there he swung a derrick by means of which the ironwork could be hoisted up on the outside.

He left the interior of the original rotunda unchanged up to the top of the cornice. From there a new and higher inner dome was constructed.

The last constructive and truly handsome work on Capitol Hill was performed by Frederick Law Olmsted, America's greatest landscape architect, who, beginning with Central Park in New York, gave us fine city parks all over the country. Olmsted, in 1874, spruced up the Capitol grounds. He created the handsome plaza on the east of the building which has now been turned into a dismal parking lot. And he designed the marble terraces and grand stairs on the west which Stewart's extension scheme would also destroy, along with the architecture. They were, according to Olmsted, "to support, sustain and augment."

By the time all this was finished, Ulysses S. Grant was President, the flag had 38 stars and Congress again felt crowded.

Though long retired as Architect of the Capitol, Walter offered two remedies. His plans showed the Capitol enlarged like a blown-up balloon. Then the busy architectural firm of Smythmeyer & Pelz came along with a real lulu. Extending the Capitol east and west, they wanted to adorn it with towers and turrets in all directions. It was filed away.

In 1903, however, these ideas were again resurrected and a Joint Commission of Congress appointed architects Carrere & Hastings to study the possibility of extending the east front.

They recommended an extension of no more than 12½ feet to give Walter's dome better visual support. They called this Scheme A. In addition, they complied with the request of the Commission for more space but recommended against it. This plan, called Scheme B, was to extend the east front by 32½ feet. With some slight amendments, the Commission approved Scheme B, despite the architects' recommendation to the contrary. But *the Congress as a whole voted it down in 1905 and built the first House and Senate Office Buildings instead.*

Nothing was ever said about the west front. *Scheme B was brought up and voted down three times more—in 1935, 1937 and 1949.* In 1955, a year after J. George Stewart was appointed Architect of the Capitol, legislation to extend the east front in substantial accordance with *Scheme B was passed as a rider to the Legislative Appropriations Act. There were no public hearings or public debate.* But the measure had the emphatic backing of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Many Congressmen apparently took any criticism of the scheme as a criticism of this popular leader. The deed was done.

A PROMISE BY RAYBURN

Again, nothing was ever said about the west front. On the contrary, Rayburn assured the Congress in 1958 that "we are not going to do anything with the west end."

Yet the present Commission for the Extension of the Capitol says that it derives its authority from the 1955 Scheme B legislation.

It proposes to bring out Thornton's portico by 44 feet and change its design by adding a pediment, widening it and adding more columns. Thornton's wings are to be brought out 88 feet. And Walter's corridors that connect the original building with his wings is to be extended by 65 feet. Olmsted's terrace and stairs are to be redesigned.

The yield: 4½ acres of space—a 25 per cent increase in the size of the present Capitol—to be used for two visitors' auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms, several conference rooms and 109 "hideaway" offices for Members of Congress.

The cost: an estimated $34 million and the certain loss of a building that for a century-and-a-half has in Thomas Jefferson's words "captivated the eyes and judgment of all."

OUR INADEQUATE HOSPITALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are making great strides forward in medical care for the aged in this country, we cannot overlook the shockingly inadequate state of our hospitals across the Nation. Although July 1966 marked the historic beginning of the medicare program, it was also the month when hospital care in my own city of New York was crippled by strikes of nurses and orderlies, when Dr. Howard J. Brown, New York City's health services administrator, suggested closing one of the major hospitals in the city, for lack of adequate personnel, and when news media were filled with harsh denunciations of the quality of medical care in America.

Facts vital to the American public which had not previously been brought to its attention revealed the urgent need for upgrading the standards and facilities for medical care. According to a study made in 1964 by Columbia University for the Teamsters' Union, 43 percent of the patients in New York City's hospitals received fair to poor care. Another more recent study made by the Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York, showed that 47 of New York's 130 general hospitals need to be completely replaced; properly to renovate the others, $324 million would be necessary.

This appalling situation was graphically presented to the American public by a series of television programs which recently appeared on WCBS–TV, entititled "Are You Safe in Your Hospital?" Some of the significant portions of these television broadcasts follow:

Earl Ubell, one of America's most distinguished science and medical reporters, questioned Dr. Samuel Standard, professor of clinical surgery at New York Hospital, one expert who checked the surgeon's performance:

Dr. STANDARD. The total rate of optimum surgery for the entire group was close to 60 per cent. It was 57 per cent for the total group.

UBELL. In other words, the chances of a patient getting optimum surgery, in this city . . . is six to four.

Dr. STANDARD. That's right; that's right.

UBELL. And four times out of ten he will get less than optimum surgery?

Dr. STANDARD. That's right.

DUNN. The city's Bureau of Laboratories checks on their skills by giving them various samples of blood, urine and cultures to identify. Dr. Morris Schaeffer, the Director of the Bureau, keeps an accurate score of the results.

Dr. SCHAEFFER. Well, they will vary with the different institutions. Some are good in one area but may be weak in another. One of the poorest areas is bacteriology. This seems to have become a lost art. Only a few of the large laboratories can do bacteriological determination accurately. Many of the others, however, seem to be falling down in this area.

UBELL. In other words, they fail to identify the infectious germs which a patient might have?

Dr. SCHAEFFER. Yes, that's correct.

UBELL. Out of a hundred cases, how many are in error?

Dr. SCHAEFFER. Well, it depends upon the rating. If we ask for perfect ratings, we might find fifty per cent of the laboratories not able to do perfectly although they are able to do well. On the other hand if we say—allow them one error out of three we might find 25 per cent of the laboratories still making that amount of errors.

UBELL. Taking a look at the facilities within hospitals, how many of our hospitals have adequate surgical facilities, adequate physical therapy departments, and adequate clinical laboratories?

Mr. PETERS. We looked at all of these departments in depth. We found that of the surgical suites, the operating rooms, 22 percent, or one out of five, were adequate. In the X-ray departments, ten percent, one out of ten, were adequate. In physical therapy departments we're running about 27 percent adequate. In other words, about three out of ten were adequate. But there are 130 hospitals in New York City that we're concerned with, and out of these, 47 need to be replaced and another 24 require extensive modernization.

UBELL. Well, what's the bill for all this going to be?

Mr. PETERS. Well, we estimate the bill will be at least $750 million.

William C. Wilkins, one of the nurses in Bellevue Hospital, works in a ward with dozens of patients.

UBELL. How many nurses are there who work in this ward?

Mr. WILKINS. I am the nurse.

UBELL. You're the nurse? The only one?

Mr. WILKINS. I'm the only one. We have one practical nurse who relieves on three different other wards on our days off. There is one practical nurse who covers four wards on relief shifts and there's one to two nurses for the whole building, the whole twelve wards on the night-to-day shift.

UBELL. How many patients is that?

Mr. WILKINS. Well, there are 26 patients to the ward now. This is just a recent innovation. There had been 32 patients on the ward and they removed six beds at our request.

UBELL. Is that a normal nurse's load, 26 patients per nurse?

Mr. WILKINS. No, it's not. The normal nurse's load in modern hospitals, in the voluntary hospitals, will run two, maybe three patients.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate WCBS-TV for this fine documentary film dealing with a matter of vital concern to the public.

THE DOCTOR SHORTAGE IN INDIANA'S NINTH DISTRICT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Indiana needs doctors.

Indiana is the 11th largest State in the Nation, and over the last 40 years has experienced a steady decline in the number of doctors available to serve its health needs. While in 1940, we had 150 doctors for every 100,000 people, today we have only 97. But the national average is 143. Although the doctor-patient ratio is not the only standard by which we measure the doctor shortage, it nonetheless makes apparent the gravity of the Indiana problem.

In the past 2 years, I have had informal talks with many Ninth District residents. On almost every occasion, and especially in meetings with women and young mothers, the question arose, "What can you do about getting more doctors?" These women speak from a deep concern. It is these women, and our elderly, who are most acutely aware of the shortage of doctors.

There are several reasons for this shortage. First, doctors are part of a general migration from the Midwest. Second, residency training is crucial in determining where a doctor will choose to practice. Unfortunately, in Indiana, there is a statewide shortage of opportunities for internships, residencies, and continuing medical education. Third, the State of Indiana and local communities have not made Indiana an attractive place to practice medicine. Fourth, all across the country, an insufficient number of our young people are choosing the medical professions. Fifth, doctors generally find it more convenient and profitable to locate near large hospital complexes and near large population centers.

The Ninth District, being predominantly rural, is especially hard hit by the doctor shortage. The 17 counties in the Ninth District need 176 new doctors. If we consider that many of the doctors in the Ninth District are specialized, and not in general practice, the need is even greater.

By the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare guideline, a community should have at least 1 doctor for every 1,000 potential patients. Using this standard, every Ninth District county is faced with a shortage. Here are the totals:

County	Number of physicians required	Number of physicians now practicing	Number of physicians short
Bartholomew	52	46	6
Clark	68	44	24
Dearborn	30	18	12
Decatur	21	11	10
Fayette	24	12	12
Franklin	17	4	13
Jackson	31	17	14
Jefferson	24	19	5
Jennings	18	7	11
Lawrence	37	26	11
Ohio	4	3	1
Orange	17	9	8
Ripley	22	10	12
Scott	15	7	8
Shelby	35	22	13
Switzerland	7	2	5
Washington	18	7	11
Total	440	264	176

Every citizen should have access to a physician—not only when an emergency arises—but for the regular care essential to good health. But we are not going to get doctors merely by wishing for it or by asking them to come in to the Ninth District. We are not going to get the doctors who are so desperately needed, unless there is planning. This means getting our community leaders around a table, enlisting public support and setting up a coherent and well-structured program. The formulation and initiative must come from local people. Private organizations, and the State and Federal Governments can lend a hand, but the strength of the program rests with local control and community interest.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

In the short run, there is very little that local citizens can do about the exodus from the Midwest. This is a regional problem which demands community action of far-reaching significance. I spoke on this subject several weeks ago on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The shortage of residency positions must be solved on the State level, and it is encouraging to see our State officials and the medical profession moving to meet this shortage. Our local citizens, however, can do a great deal to make the Ninth District communities attractive for the practice of medicine. This means that the communities in the Ninth District must provide doctors with modern facilities for practicing medicine, assure doctors a reasonable income, and show that our communities are desirable places in which to live and to raise a family. And we can help alleviate the general doctor shortage by encouraging Hoosiers to go into the medical professions.

WHERE DO WE BEGIN?

Communities in the Ninth District must determine their needs and their capabilities. How many doctors do they need? How many can they support? If assistance is desired, the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, through a preliminary survey of the area, will provide a factual evaluation of the community's medical needs. For further information write the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, Director Medical Program, D/703, 3333 Arthington, Chicago, Ill.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

If the survey shows that there is a need for a doctor and that the community has the financial resources to support his entry, a nonprofit corporation can be established. Of course there are other ways to formally organize.

Whichever way the community chooses to organize, the core group, with officers from the community, must take charge of the health improvement drive and must direct the resources of the community in the proper directions.

Raising money, however, will probably be the group's most difficult task. Support must be solicited from every member of the community. Farmers and merchants, businessmen and laborers, must be shown that their interests are best served by recruiting a doctor for the community. Though it means hard work, the corporation has the advantage of a keenly felt need.

A hard core of supporters must contact these members of the community to enlist their support. The PTA, the Boy Scouts, the chamber of commerce, service clubs, and other important civic groups must join in the drive. The support of local newspaper and radio stations will be crucial.

In short, the community health improvement drive, though directed by the corporation, is a community project. Without community support the most aggressive and enterprising corporation will fail.

A SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN PROGRAM

A community may want to look around in its own area to find potential doctors. It can provide a scholarship or low interest loan to a local youth graduating from college who wants to pursue a career in medicine. If the community wants to guarantee a return, it can provide loans whose payment is reduced a certain percentage for each year the individual chooses to practice in the area.

The corporation may want to contact the dean of the Indiana University Medical School who can arrange for a meeting between a student and the community leaders. If the meeting proves successful, the corporation can make arrangements to help finance the student's medical education. At least one Ninth District community has tried this approach and succeeded in getting a doctor for their community.

The President, in his January 25, 1966, message on rural poverty, recommended increased loan forgiveness for graduating physicians whose medical education has been financed in part by the Federal Government and who choose to practice in rural areas. The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966, which passed the House, authorizes forgiveness on loans at a rate of 15 percent a year up to 100 percent. This proposal, if enacted, will be helpful to rural communities in attracting doctors.

HOSPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Almost one-half of Ninth District hospitals have bed-occupancy rates above 90 percent. In fact, three of our hospitals have occupancy rates above 100 percent. These facilities simply cannot handle the demand placed on them by Ninth District residents.

Good hospitals, however, are a great inducement to a doctor when he must choose between alternative locations for a medical practice. They not only encourage doctors to enter the area, but also to remain. The corporation can provide funds to our overcrowded hospitals for increased bed capacity or for technical improvements.

Federal aid is available, often through the State government, if the community wishes to use this source of funds. The community should not forget, however, that financing is primarily a local responsibility. Federal financial aid can only be used to supplement local efforts.

The Hill-Burton program provides grants and long-term, low-interest loans to States in constructing and improving hospitals and other medical facilities. Five hospitals in the Ninth District have received a total of more than $2 million under this program. The Administration on Aging offers grants that States can make available to nonprofit, voluntary organization to plan, develop, and coordinate the providing of health services for older people.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Community Facilities Administration, provides long-term loans to communities to help build hospitals and to finance the local share of the cost of a project partially financed by another Federal agency.

The Federal Housing Administration will insure mortgage loans to corporations or associations to help build or improve nursing homes of at least 20-bed capacity.

If financing is not otherwise available, the Small Business Bureau may offer loans on reasonable terms.

MEDICAL CENTER

If the survey conducted by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation shows that your community needs a doctor and that your community can provide him with a $25,000 a year practice—which is not unreasonable considering his expenses and his training—the foundation will help you plan a medical center. An attractive medical center with sufficient outpatient facilities and modern equipment can act as a strong inducement to a beginning doctor.

The foundation will provide an architect and the plans for a two-doctor building and larger buildings that are adaptable to local conditions. Complete plans and specifications will be provided for cooperating communities which wish to follow these plans without deviation.

Some aid is available from the Federal Government, but again cannot be used to supplant local programs for financing. The Public Health Service provides matching funds to States to help construct comprehensive community health centers. The Small Business Administration makes loans to small, privately owned hospitals and clinics when private financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. See "Hospital Improvement" above for other Federal programs.

A WELL-ROUNDED COMMUNITY

A doctor, like the rest of us, wants to live in a community where he can raise a family. This means a nice home, good roads, good schools, recreational and cultural facilities, and a healthy religious atmosphere. Of course, the corporation cannot work on a program of overall community development, but it should not ignore the impact of these factors on any individual's decision to move into a community.

FINDING A DOCTOR

Once the community has established that it wants and needs a doctor, and has taken steps to provide the facilities necessary to the practice of medicine, the community must begin making contacts. If the community is working through the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, they will use the foundation's close-working relationship with the American Medical Association and the State medical societies to obtain a doctor. If the community is working independent of the foundation, it can go directly to the placement service of the Indiana Medical Association. It also can contact the dean of the Indiana University Medical School.

The Journal of the American Medical Association, the Journal of the Student American Medical Association, and some local medical association publications, accept advertisements listing openings for medical practice. The community may want to post brochures in all nearby hospitals or send them directly to medical schools around the country.

A CONCLUSION

A Congressman can offer valuable assistance in the community's effort to attract doctors.

First. He can suggest methods for attacking the problem. Hopefully, this paper offers useful guidelines in approaching this problem.

Second. He can support legislation in the Congress which will help alleviate the doctor shortage.

Third. When communities are seeking Federal grants and loans for the improvement of hospitals and other health facilities, he can help facilitate the application and funding processes.

Fourth. He can aid communities in contacting the proper governmental and private officials.

Fifth. He can work with local officials in making the Ninth District a more attractive place in which to live.

Sixth. He can cooperate with State officials and medical personnel in attempting to improve Indiana's medical opportunities.

Seventh. In his contacts with undergraduate and graduate students, he can encourage them to pursue a career in medicine.

The shortage of medical personnel is one of Indiana's most pressing problems. It is especially acute in the Ninth District. It is my responsibility, as the Congressman representing the Ninth District of Indiana, to do all these things.

The solution, however, does not lie in a Congressman's office. He can only aid local citizens who are determined to improve the quality of health care in their community.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUPFERMAN, for 30 minutes, August 9, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. KUPFERMAN), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PIRNIE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUPFERMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. RANDALL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7327. An act to amend a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School; and

H.R. 14875. An act to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 8, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2617. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the fourth report of the actions taken by Federal agencies, during the period January 1, 1966, through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–451; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2618. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82–554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2619. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 8, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Owls Head Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 19, 1960; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provision of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

2620. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the number of individuals in each general service grade employed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as of June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 65 Stat. 736, 758; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2366. An act to repeal certain provisions of the act of January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091), as amended (Rept. No. 1812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13161. A bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools; with amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6143. A bill to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15706. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8205. A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and references to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8699. A bill for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16608. A bill to amend the charter of Southeastern University of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 16869. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to landlords and tenants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 16870. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation on the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits, and to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16871. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increases shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16872. A bill to provide for the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month period, from the national stockpile of nickel to meet needs of certain firms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16873. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 16874. A bill to amend section 201 of the Agricutural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to require the Secretary of Agriculture in certain cases to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 16875. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 16876. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs, make the use of appropriations under the act more more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year, extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 16877. A bill to establish a price support level for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 16878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16879. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 16880. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 16881. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16882. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 1261. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.J. Res. 1262. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 1263. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 7-day period beginning on the second Sunday in August of each year as Willing Water Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 968. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 969. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 959. Resolution authorizing expenditures incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures to be paid from the contingent fund of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Res. 960. Resolution providing for a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation to ascertain the reasons for the rapid rise in the prices of food, including dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 16883. A bill for the relief of William J. Hurley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 16884. A bill for the relief of Laurence Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 16885. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary Louise Nozet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 16886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teodozja Stochmal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

422. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Good Citizens Life Insurance Co., New Orleans, La., relative to opposition to any amendments exempting real estate brokers under title 4 of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cal Poly and the Tournament of Roses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago on June 13, it was my pleasure to join in the discussion on the floor of the House of Representatives about one of this Nation's most famous and enduring festivals, the annual Tournament of Roses, which is held on New Year's Day in Pasadena, Calif. One of the highlights of the tournament is of course the renowned Rose Parade. Each year the competition for outstanding float is an occasion for great activity and excitement. This aspect of the tournament alone represents many wonderfully interesting stories. One of these each year takes places on the Kellogg-Voorhis campus of California State Polytechnic College, at Pomona, Calif., in the congressional district it is my privilege to represent.

California State Polytechnic College has successfully competed in the Rose Parade for 18 years and has won a first prize in its class many times. This outstanding record is due to the energy, initiative, and ingenuity of the students at Cal Poly. Every aspect of the work is undertaken by the students, including the selection of the theme, the design and construction of the float, the growing of the flowers, and the placing of them on the float. Faculty advisers to the float committee do just that—they merely advise. All the planning and work is done by the students. The students contribute their time and it is estimated that over 3,500 man-hours of work are necessary to assemble a float each year.

The most elaborate part of the float is the placing of the flowers and this starts around December 29 and continues until early morning on New Year's Day. This year the students of Cal Poly had to place nearly 150,000 blooms of chrysanthemum, silver leaves, croton leaves, and carnations, and over 1,500 red roses on the float in the short period allowed.

Mr. Speaker, the students of California State Polytechnic College are to be commended for their industry and achievement, which has greatly contributed to the success of the entire Tournament of Roses each year and I would like to pay tribute to the students and their fine school.

National Drum and Bugle Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 20–27 is National Drum Corps Week. All over the Nation, in the cities and towns where members of drum and bugle corps live, hundreds of thousands of Americans will join together in celebration.

Drum and bugle corps are for the young people of America; young men and women who eagerly support the motto: "Pageantry and Patriotism on the March." Their enthusiasm and high spirits are truly admirable as they combine their individual talents to bring pleasure to their State and local communities.

The art of the drum corps is an expression of order, color, symmetry, and beauty. It is an art which demands the highest measure of discipline; it is rigid and exacting. At the same time, its emotional impact is unequalled, with its brilliant color, pulsating rhythm, and brassy blare of syncopated jazz.

The group spirit of the young men and women who participate in drum and bugle corps all over America is truly admirable. They willingly devote many hours of their spare time in order that each appearance by their group meet the high standards they set for themselves. In their loyalty to their corps, and in their pride in the performance of their marching routines, these young people exhibit the finest qualities of American youth.

Participation in drum and bugle corps instills a sense of patriotism, responsibility, and maturity in America's young people. Therefore, I am sure that my colleagues join with me today in offering our commendation and full support to National Drum Corps Week.

Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I have received dozens of letters and telegrams urging congressional action to bring the airline strike to an end. Notwithstanding my conviction that labor and management require a maximum of freedom in which to engage in collective bargaining, I am likewise concerned about strikes which adversely affect the national interest such as the current strike of the machinists' union against United, TWA, Eastern, Northwest, and National Airlines.

Representing as I do a congressional district located near the great O'Hare Airport near Chicago, I have received communications from many airline employees who are thrown out of work as a result of the walkout by the machinists. These other employees are far greater in number than the machinists involved. In addition, of course, there are millions of Americans who are inconvenienced and whose economic welfare is impaired by the strike.

In dealing with the airlines, we are concerned with a regulated industry. Its rates, schedules, profits, indebtedness, and other aspects of its business and service are controlled by Federal and State regulatory agencies.

I am not advocating any specific legislative action. However, I am asserting that some appropriate and immediate action must be taken. Whether the Congress or the President is to act should not concern us as much as the interest of getting the airlines in operation again. We must submerge political considerations in promoting the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have communicated my support of appropriate legislation to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I indicate here publicly my support of appropriate and early action by this House. Every day of delay involves the loss of many millions of dollars in business profits and in wages, as well as in great individual inconvenience and economic detriment to the American public.

In addition to some immediate congressional action to effect assumption of airline service, I am hopeful that steps will be taken to provide effective machinery for avoiding similar strikes in this and other industries which, in my opinion, impair the entire system of free collective bargaining—and the great and overriding interest of the American public.

Tribute of Col. Emily C. Gorman, Retiring Director, Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 1966, Col. Emily C. Gorman retired from the U.S. Army, ending a most distinguished military career, climaxed by outstanding performance as Director of the Women's Army Corps. It has been my privilege to know this most capable officer throughout her life since we were born in the same little village of Pulaski, N.Y. Therefore, I have followed with deep interest the accomplishments which have marked her steady rise in responsible leadership.

Colonel Gorman graduated from Pulaski Academy and then received her A.B. from Cornell University in 1931. Later she did graduate work in Syracuse University and Rochester University. After several years of teaching, she volunteered for military service soon after the attack on Pearl Harbor. She was accepted for officer's training at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in October of 1942. Early recognition of her administrative ability caused her to be assigned as chief of the administration school of the first WAAC training center. Subsequent assignments in planning and organization prepared her for duty as a general staff officer.

Some of her major assignments have included service as Assistant Chief of Standards Branch in the Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, D.C., in 1944; operations and training staff officer, Training Division of the U.S. Continental Army Command, Fort Monroe, Va., from 1957 to 1960; and as Assistant Chief of Foreign Military Training Division, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, Department of the Army, from 1960 until her appointment as Director, WAC.

During her 24 years of outstanding service, Colonel Gorman received significant military awards including the Army Commendation Medal, Women's Army Corps Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal, the National Defense Medal, and the General Staff Identification Badge, and upon her retirement the Distinguished Service Medal in recognition for her eminently meritorious service in leading the Women's Army Corps to its present position of prestige and outstanding effectiveness. As the citation so well stated:

> Through her integrity, sound judgment, and gracious demeanor, she constantly projected a favorable image of the Women's Army Corps throughout both the civilian complex and the military community. Her professional ability and steadfast devotion to duty contributed materially to the defense effort of her country. Colonel Gorman's distinguished performance of duty represents outstanding achievement in the most honored traditions of the United States Army and reflects great credit upon herself and the military service.

Colonel Gorman retires from the service with the appreciation and respect of those who have observed her splendid performance. She has demonstrated in a very effective manner the role of women in defense efforts and has provided inspiration for those of her sex who undertake administrative or executive responsibilities.

The fine people of her hometown and of this entire area have watched her career with pride and affection. They join with all of us in congratulating this most capable officer on her distinguished service. We are confident that her great talents will continue to be used in some service to the Nation, in either public or private fields. She has our good wishes for health and happiness in all she undertakes.

It is also a great satisfaction to note that Colonel Gorman has been succeeded as Director of the Women's Army Corps by a truly outstanding officer, Col. Elizabeth P. Hoisington, whose family has a military record of unparalleled distinction. The colonel's father, now deceased, served as a colonel, her brother Perry M. Hoisington recently retired as a major general in the U.S. Air Force, her brother, Lt. Col. Robert H. Hoisington, and two brothers-in-law, Lt. Col. James E. Maertens and Lt. Col. Charles R. Smith, are presently on duty with the Army. We are fortunate indeed to maintain such leadership in this most important military activity.

U.S. Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 5, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard has just celebrated its 176th anniversary. I would like to take this opportunity to salute the officers and men of this fine organization, our oldest continuous seagoing service.

Originally established by Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton as the Revenue Cutter Service, the Coast Guard started its meritorious duties in 1790 with 10 light, fast 50-foot schooners with the main purpose of protecting our coastal shores from smuggling. Activities have historically included wartime duties under the Department of the Navy and peacetime services under the Secretary of the Treasury. Both of these functions have been exemplified in the past year. July 20 marked the first anniversary of the initial arrival in Vietnam of the Coast Guard's "Market Time Patrol." In their function of detecting the infiltration of supplies to the south from the north the 26 Coast Guard vessels there cruised a half-million miles, and boarded 35,000 junks, intercepting many tons of ammunition, arms, food, and medicine, from delivery to the Vietcong.

In the past year they aided victims of Hurricane Betsy, the springtime Mississippi River floods, and the Cuban exodus—amounting to a saving of 15,000 lives and $1.9 billion in cargoes, or more than 4 times its annual budget.

As a member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am proud of this outstanding service and happy to note this impressive anniversary. Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard deserves our sincere congratulations.

Awards for Creative Salesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, salesmen play a most important role in our booming national economy.

On August 16, I had the pleasure of meeting three of the top salesmen of the United States. They were the charter members in the newly established Academy of Creative Salesmanship, one of whom—Otis Clift, of the M. S. White Candy & Tobacco Co., of Independence, Mo.—is a constituent. The principal owner of this company is Mike Zupanec, a resident of my home city of Independence and a lifelong friend. The other two men were John Cacciatore, of the Peter P. Dennis Co., of Phillipsburg, N.J., and B. A. Ravn, of the Seeman Co., in San Francisco.

These three salesmen were selected to be the very first members in the Academy of Creative Salesmanship after a grueling 6 months' competition among 7,286 salesmen representing the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Each of the three salesmen's performances during this period was audited by a committee of judges, with especial attention being paid to such aspects of a salesman's day as territorial coverage, fulfillment of quotas, securing of new accounts, and sales resourcefulness.

The Academy of Creative Salesmanship has been established under the aegis of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, a trade association whose wholesaler membership services 1,522,000 retail outlets from coast to coast. Some of the products involved are tobacco products and accessories, razors and shaving supplies, candy and confection items, paper goods, timepieces, dietetic foods, writing instruments, and photographic equipment.

Joseph Kolodny, managing director of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, and Mr. W. B. Bennett, a staff assistant, accompanied these three top-place salesmen to Washington, where their induction into the academy took place.

They explained to me that the academy has been established to champion the cause of salesmen everywhere in the Nation, and to enhance the profession of the salesman as an honorable and a dignified one. The association is convinced that selling is accountable for the rapid growth and achievement of some 50 gigantic consumer product industries and that the heartbeat of our flourishing national economy is rooted in the record of accomplishment of the country's salesmen.

Mr. Kolodny, long a spokesman of the tobacco and allied products industries, stated recently:

> The sales and movement of merchandise are basic and inherent in the American industrial system. As distributors, sales managers, and salesmen, our role in the scheme of things is that of selling, marketing, and merchandising. When these fundamental functions are belittled or misunderstood, our significance in the industrial spectrum, encounters similar circumstances. When the status of a profession is denigrated, it fails to attract the necessary new and qualified recruits. Creative salemanship has built this nation into the greatest and most powerful in the entire world. Creative salesmanship has paved the way for countless aspirants in the commercial, artistic, academic, and entertainment fields to achieve the pinnacle of fame, pre-eminence, and world renown. Creative salesmanship has provided and continues to provide maximum earning power and unlimited opportunity for growth in every sphere of legitimate endeavor. Throughout the entire course of American history, scarcely any recital of praiseworthy achievement omits reference to the names of individuals who have risen to the top by virtue of dogged determination and creative salemanship.

Following a presentation of $7,000 in scholarship funds for the higher education of the three salesmen's children, I asked Otis Clift of Independence, Mo., point blank: "Otis, what is a salesman?" Gentlemen, I found his answer both eloquent and enlightening.

> Being a salesman today—

He said—

> no matter what you are selling, means keeping your thumb on the pulse of trends in marketing. It is keeping up on changes in display techniques and learning how to make thoughtful and dignified sales presentations to prospective merchants. In many cases, it is a question of the salesman's having to educate the storekeeper. It is a lot of work, but it is good work. New accounts are extremely important to a salesman. Lose an account for any reason, you search for two new ones. I love my work. I have an intense interest in my customers and my company's welfare. If there are any other reasons for trying to be a good salesman I am not aware of them.

Gentlemen, I do not believe any of us should forget the importance of the country's corps of salesmen and their vital role in making this wonderful economy go. Accordingly, I would like to salute Mr. Clift of Missouri, Mr. Cacciatore of New Jersey, Mr. Ravn of California, and their thousands of fellow salesmen. I believe the Academy of Creative Salesmanship has taken a healthy and firm step to enhancing the stature of all of them and I hope the idea does not stop with the 30 consumer product industries associated with the National Association of Tobacco Distributors—but that it spreads.

The Nation's salesmen have long needed a rallying point and a reminder as to their importance, and I believe the association's Academy of Creative Salesmanship will serve these needs admirably.

Horton Cites Potential Privacy Invasion by Proposed Central Data System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking and only minority member of the Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy of the Government Operations Committee, I am acutely aware of the concern which has been created by the proposal for a computer data center, the subject of our subcommittee's hearings on July 26 to 28. I was particularly impressed with the editorial "Too Personal by Far" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning. This article accurately accounts the concern of our subcommittee's capable chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], and of a Congressman ROSENTHAL, and myself.

Because of the precautionary value of the editor's comments, I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. The text of the editorial follows:

TOO PERSONAL BY FAR

"Monster," "octopus," "a great, expensive electronic garbage pail"—these are among the choicer epithets members of Congress are hurling at the Federal Government's plan to set up a central "data bank" containing lots of information on each and every one of us. In this newspaper's view, the scheme deserves the abuse.

The proposed National Data Center is being pushed by the Budget Bureau ostensibly for the sake of efficiency; centralizing, coordinating and expanding information in the files of various Federal agencies would make the stuff easier to handle and get at. Which, according to a good many opinions expressed at the recent hearings of a House subcommittee, is a large part of the trouble.

The group's chairman, Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey, noted that the pooled information could include a man's schooling, grades, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and "practically any other aspect of his life." Such a wealth of information in Federal hands is frightening enough, Mr. GALLAGHER thinks, but to make it worse computers are untrustworthy guardians for it.

As a couple of witnesses explained it, the machines lack judgment; they can't take account of changes in people or their motivations or extenuating circumstances in their behavior. Yale Professor Charles Reich observed that information gets less reliable the further it gets from its source in time and distance and is ultimately "petrified" in computers.

The more fundamental objection, of course, is that a central data bank would be a flagrant invasion of privacy and hence an affront to individual liberties. Both Congressmen and several witnesses cited the danger of its getting out of hand and being used for evil purposes.

Federal spokesmen naturally are concerned to change the unfavorable image of their pet project; a Budget Bureau consultant, for example, insisted that the public's idea of the data center computers as some kind of all-seeing Orwellian Big Brothers is nonsense. The rebuttals, though, are anything but reassuring.

Thus the consultant argued that the machines could be told not to blurt out confidential information and could be taught to disguise identities with a special code and sort out trick questions that pose as statistical inquiries but are actually intended to elicit information about individuals.

The disturbing thing about the explanation is that if the machines can be taught all those lessons, somebody has to do the teaching—namely, Government officials would be programing the computers. In other words, if the officials were so inclined they could reverse the safeguards allegedly built in. Depending on who was in control, the machines could indeed become Big Brothers.

We do not suggest that many officials would attempt to abuse the power. Yet the fact is that even as it is, Federal agencies have been known to harass individuals or businesses, just as some of them have not been above electronic prying and other violations of privacy.

In any event, it is a cardinal requirement of a free society that the people do not entrust their liberties to the whims of men in power but rely rather on wise laws to protect them from oppression. Unfortunately, this principle has been much eroded in recent years, and its degeneration tells a good deal about what is wrong in the relationship between individual and Government today.

What is chiefly wrong is that the people have permitted their Government to grow so excessive in size and power that it can hardly help being a threat to them even if it doesn't want to. A Government that taxes so hugely and harshly must acquire a vast amount of information about the citizens. A Government that seeks to subsidize practically every segment of the population must acquire still more. No one can safely assume the information will not be harmfully employed.

Bigness being the trend, we see little likelihood that the Federal obsession with accumulating personal information will be curbed in any near future. But at least it need not be further encouraged. Congress should promptly and emphatically dispatch the Budget Bureau's incipient octopus.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to let my colleagues know my personal expression of concern about this proposal. I am extending my remarks to include the statement I made at the opening of our subcommittee's hearings on the computer data center:

STATEMENT AT THE OPENING OF HEARINGS BY THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVASION OF PRIVACY OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman the mission of this Subcommittee, investigating instances of individual privacy invasion caused by or contributed to as the result of Federal Government action, is important and timely. Clearly, our experiences and endeavors of the past year, have proved this point. And, I feel your exposition of the Subcommittee's work sets forth with special significance the wisdom of Chairman Dawson in chartering this Subcommittee.

Privacy, as a fundamental freedom of the American citizen, is an unquestioned Constitutional right. That this Subcommittee, through examination and exposure, has curbed a brand of overzealousness on the part of certain Government agencies to overlook this right in personality testing is a notable example of the inherent protections to be found in our Federal system of checks and balances.

As significant as those earlier hearings were, I have become convinced that the magnitude of the problem we now confront is akin to the changes wrought in our national life with the dawning of the nuclear age. Proposals to gather in one central location or in one giant data bank all the information which Federal agencies amass on the citizens of this country are sufficiently filled with possibilities for privacy invasion that I believe it is eminently proper for our Subcommittee to conduct this investigation.

These data bank concepts are a product of modern technology. Today, the computer is a central figure in our society. The increasing rate at which it will change our lives exceeds the imagination, exceeds even the imagination of the computermen who foster it. Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Dean of Science at MIT and former science advisor to President Kennedy, has said:

"The computer, with its promise of a million-fold increase in man's capacity to handle information, will undoubtedly have the most far-reaching social consequences of any contemporary technical development. The potential for good in the computer, and the danger inherent in its misuse, exceed our ability to imagine . . . We have actually entered a new era of evolutionary history, one in which rapid change is a dominant consequence. Our only hope is to understand the forces at work and to take advantage of the knowledge we find to guide the evolutionary process."

We will be fortunate if we are able to keep these processes "evolutionary" and not "revolutionary."

Assuming the best for a moment, let us regard our computer systems as good and fair and the computerman behind the console as honest and capable. Even in these circumstances, there is danger that computers, because they are machines, will treat us as machines. They can supply the facts and, in effect, direct us from birth to death.

They can "pigeon hole" us as their tapes decree, selecting, within a narrow range, the schooling we get, the jobs we work at, the money we can earn and even the girl we marry.

It is not enough to say "It can't happen here"; our grandfathers said that about television.

Now, let us compound the concern. Assuming a computerman who was dishonest, unscrupulous or bent on injury, there would be nothing sacred. We could be destroyed!

Admiral Hyman Rickover has expressed a fundamental concept concerning these problems; he states that we must realize that the power of these computers is *technology*, and technology must serve man; man must never blindly accept technology, he must take up the challenge and control it. It is a force he has to master and use to his benefit.

The Admiral exhorts us to be faithful to individual basic values, to preserve our right of privacy and independence and to bend this fantastic new technology to our principles. It is the function of law givers, in Admiral Rickover's view, to set the limits within which computermen can operate. He makes it clear that this is not a limit on science or knowledge but only on our use of knowledge and technology.

The concept of such control is ancient. Fire controlled is our friend; uncontrolled it is devastating. The wheel is man's servant and yet his greatest exterminator. The computer is another two-edged sword. It will take more than the controls of the "horse-and-buggy" days to use computers for our benefit and yet keep them from making shreds of human dignity, privacy, and freedom.

To provide an example, despite the flood of technical language some government consultants use to camouflage their recommendations, the fact remains that a central data service bank would require:

One, that confidential information now in government files would be forwarded to a new group and use for other purposes than it was originally given; and

Two, that a new group would have the code and would know the names, addresses and background of the people submitted the confidential information.

Tying the two together would be an easy matter.

It is held that personal dossiers are not intended, but no thoughtful computerman can deny that they are a logical extension of present plans. I am pleased to say that computermen as a group are deeply concerned with the problem of controlling information storage and retrieval so that no one ever will be able to take away our basic freedoms through these means.

One last point: the argument is made that a central data bank would use only the type of information that now exists and since no new principle is involved, existing types of safeguards will be adequate. This is fallacious. Good computermen know that one of the most practical of our present safeguards of privacy is the fragmented nature of present information. It is scattered in little bits and pieces across the geography and years of our life. Retrieval is impractical and often impossible. A central data bank removes completely this safeguard.

I have every confidence that ways will be found for all of us to benefit from the great advances of the computermen, but those benefits must never be purchased at the price of our freedom to live as individuals with private lives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.—1 Corinthians 13: 7.

O God, fount of all that is good and true and beautiful, whose love endures forever, we thank Thee for the reverence which lifts our hearts to what is real, and for the love of home that reflects Thy gracious spirit. Bless, we pray Thee, those whom Thou hast joined together. May their consecration be beautiful and everlasting.

We invoke Thy blessing upon our labors this day that we may help to build a better world in which men and women can live together in peace and good will and in which their children may grow into fuller manhood and finer womanhood. Teach us that only through love can we begin to perceive the divine mysteries of life and the true glory of man's relationship to man.

Blest be the tie that binds our hearts in steadfast love; the fellowship of kindred minds is like to that above. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 5, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 26, 1966:

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

On July 27, 1966:

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

On August 1, 1966:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On August 4, 1966:

H.R. 1407. An act for the relief of Leonardo Russo;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jacobo Temel;

H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa;

H.R. 4437. An act for the relief of Bryan George Simpson;

H.R. 4458. An act for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel;

H.R. 4584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski);

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7508. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio;

H.R. 8317. An act to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8865. An act for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; and

H.R. 11718. An act for the relief of Jack L. Philippot.

On August 5, 1966:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; and

H.R. 14324. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3421. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-2.

LARRY BLACKMON WRITES THAT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS STRONGLY SUPPORT H.R. 14026

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, your Committee on Banking and Currency overwhelmingly voiced its approval of my bill H.R. 14026. This flexible proposal would not only end the high interest rate war among our financial institutions, but would also make adequate funds available to the seriously ailing building industry.

On July 27, more than 700 homebuilders from all over the country met in Washington to demand Government action to save housing. I am sure that virtually all my colleagues were visited by builders from their home districts. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters from homebuilders from every section of the country. To a man, the homebuilders who have written to me and to whom I have spoken support your Banking and Currency Committee recommendations in H.R. 14026.

With unanimous consent, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a letter I just received from Larry Blackmon, president of the National Association of Home Builders:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1966.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Association of Home Builders strongly supports H.R. 14026, recently reported favorably by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The home building industry urgently needs the legislative relief which would be provided by this legislation.

As you know, more than 700 home builders from across the Nation attended our "Call to Action" meeting July 27 in order to meet their Representatives and Senators concerning the shortage of available funds for home building. Our members strongly support the provisions of H.R. 14026, and will urge all House Members to support the bill when it reaches the floor.

We previously indicated to you our support for H.R. 15639, which would increase FNMA's borrowing authority by approximately $2 billion. Our members overwhelmingly support this bill and will similarly work for its passage on the floor.

It is our hope that both H.R. 15639 and H.R. 14026 will be acted on by the House of Representatives as soon as possible. Such legislation is urgently needed in order to provide immediate relief to our industry.

Sincerely,

LARRY BLACKMON,
President.

NATO NEEDS SPAIN

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Richard Mowrer has reported in the Christian Science Monitor that Spain has closed its airspace to British military aircraft. Previously Spain had banned flights over Spanish territory of military aircraft of all NATO powers other than Britain, flying to and from Gibraltar.

The January ban on overflights related to Spain's exclusion from NATO. The Spanish Government stated that:

> Spain is not disposed to tolerate any longer risks or consequences deriving from a base (Gibraltar) included in an international military organization to which Spain herself does not belong.

The same pattern is followed in a speech last March by the Spanish Foreign Minister who said:

> It would be a mistake for any country to assume that because we belong to the West European community it can demand of us facilities of a military nature which are outside the scope of our present obligations.

Spain obviously feels no obligation to an organization in which she has not been invited to participate. I have on previous occasions pointed to the desirability of Spanish participation in NATO. Spain would bring into the NATO organization a strong and effective military force at a time when nearly all nations, with the exception of the United States and West Germany, have reduced their NATO commitments. The close ties which the United States has enjoyed with Spain since bilateral defense and aid agreements were signed in 1953 clearly point to the wisdom of continuing base rights for the United States in Spain and to the need for broader involvement in the European defense program by Spain. The French pullout from the NATO Military Command further emphasizes this need.

The principal stumbling blocks appear to have been interposed from Socialist and Labor governments in the north of Europe. It should be increasingly apparent to these governments and to their people that their safety is in the balance and that it makes little sense to deny membership in NATO to Spain, which has the strongest anti-Communist government in Europe.

DELAY IN ACTION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that if he expects the Department of Justice to take immediate action on anything he is bound to be disappointed. I called them this morning on a very routine matter and they told me it would take 6 weeks before they could possibly arrive at a decision on it.

INFLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just asked for a special order for 1 hour today in which I hope I will be able to discuss to some degree the economic situation in our society, particularly with reference to inflation which does exist; the problems involved in whether or not we might at this point increase taxes; also the Federal expenditure policy.

Whether or not we get around to the point where that is feasible after our work today, I do not know. However, I have prepared remarks which I will put in the RECORD on this subject, but I am hopeful that I will be able to discuss this in detail.

Frankly, I am shocked that the President of the United States continues to temporize in this area and that the Congress under the control of the same political party refuses to use its committee structure—namely, the Joint Economic Committee, among others—to zero in on this very serious question. I shall do the best I can today to move the dialog forward.

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]. The city of Cleveland has my profound sympathy, as I come from a city that has suffered at the hands of the advocates of civil disobedience. We understand a little of what Cleveland has undergone in these recent weeks.

I have asked for a special order today to call once again for what I believe to be a mandatory investigation into the area of Communist subversion in the civil rights movement.

Stokely Carmichael is one symptom of a disease that is afflicting this country at the present in the militant new approach of certain elements within the civil rights movement. I think this approach is typical of Marxists, that it plays into the hands of world communism, that it is un-American, and out of step with our free society and our whole system in which individuals and groups seek relief and redress through due process of law.

It is high time that the Congress should look into this militant new challenge to our whole American system of government.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with illustrations, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the pleasure of submitting to you the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

Last month marked two important milestones in the railroad retirement system. It rounded out 30 years of benefits paid under the original acts of 1934 and 1935. And it saw the inauguration of a historic new benefit for railroad workers: medicare.

In three decades, the railroad retirement system has grown from a controversial child of Franklin Roosevelt's first administration into a vital element of our national economy.

It has broadened the horizons of millions of retired workers and their families.

It has given them security and dignity in place of charity and dole.

During fiscal year 1965—the period covered by this report—$1,118 million was paid in benefits to 980,000 retired workers and survivors. This was nearly as much as was paid out during the first 10 years of the program, and it brings the cumulative total of benefits paid to more than $13 billion.

The report of Chairman Howard W. Habermeyer, of the Railroad Retirement Board, is comprehensive and detailed. I commend it to the Congress for review and study.

The report is, I believe, testimony to the vision and compassion of a great President and a great Congress of more than 30 years past.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 8, 1966.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 201]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Bates
Blatnik
Brock
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Celler
Cohelan
Conte
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, La.
Fino
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kupferman
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCarthy
McCulloch
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
Powell
Randall
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Scott
Sisk
Stephens
Toll
Tuten
Ullman
Whalley
Willis
Wydler

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 14765, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, August 5, 1966, the Clerk had read through title V of the committee substitute, ending on line 24, page 77, of the bill.

Are there any amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODINO: On page 76, strike lines 19 through 21.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would merely correct a technical error. It is a printer's error. There is a repetition of the language on page 76, lines 17 through 19. To strike lines 19 through 21 would correct the repetition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 77, immediately following line 12, insert the following:

"VIOLENCE IN CONNECTION WITH CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

"SEC. 501A. Whoever, participating with one or more persons in any public demonstration, march, parade, or other public activity the purpose of which is to assert the free exercise by any ethnic group of the rights, privileges, and immunities under the Constitution and laws of the United States, knowingly and willfully—

"(1) injures, intimidates, or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate, or interfere with, any other person conducting himself in a lawful manner, or

"(2) damages, destroys, or steals, or attempts to damage, destroy, or steal, any real or personal property,

shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and, if bodily injury results, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more ten years, or both; and, if death results, shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple but is one that I think is vital to those of us who desire law enforcement in this country, and would give equal protection to all people. It is based on the right of all citizens, under the 14th amendment of the Constitution, to equal protection.

As you will notice, it simply provides that if a person is demonstrating or marching lawfully to assert his civil rights, but while so doing participates in an act that destroys or damages the property of another—for example, sets fire to a building, steals, loots, or commits other violence, attacks the person of a citizen or injures a citizen—he would be punished in the same manner as a person who does violence to one of the demonstrators. The penalty is exactly the same as is provided for one who injures, or interferes with, or intimidates a demonstrator or a marcher asserting his rights as a constitutional privilege and right under the civil rights laws of this country.

It says that both sides shall receive the same punishment if they damage the property of another or injure another person or kill another person. The same words are used in the penal clause for this additional section as are used in title V for the activities of those who interfere or intimidate those who are marching or participating in a demonstration.

It seems to me this is clearly what the people of this country want, and clearly within the purview of Congress to make a violation of law by either side subject to the same penalty. That is exactly what my amendment does, and nothing more.

I will be glad to answer any question that anyone might have on the point.

I think my friend from New Jersey should accept this amendment if he believes in equal protection for all people as provided in the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this, unlike the provisions we have in title V, does not include the test of force or threat of force.

Further, this amendment would be directed against anyone participating in any public demonstration. It would appear to me that this does not cover the same ground that is covered in title V. I would like to point out that title V would protect individuals from racially or religiously motivated violence while such individuals engage in federally protected conduct.

We are also trying through title V to protect those groups who assemble peacefully in order to assist others who are seeking to enjoy their own rights. I believe that to adopt this amendment would be to defeat the purpose of title V and would not get at the heart or the core of the problem that we try to get at; namely, to protect individuals in the pursuit of certain specific federally constituted rights.

Title V requires racial or religious motivation in connection with the use of force. And it penalizes the use of force when the intent is to discourage others from participating in federally protected activities.

The amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE does not get at this problem at all—it would nullify the objective of title V. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 77, immediately after line 12, insert the following new section:

"PROTECTION OF RIGHTS

"SEC. 502. Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, with intent to—

"(1) incite, promote, encourage, or carry on, or facilitate the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other violent civil disturbance; or

"(2) commit any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act which is a felony or high misdemeanor under Federal or State law, in furtherance of, or during commission of, any act specified in paragraph (1); or

"(3) assist, encourage, or instruct any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraphs (1) and (2);

and thereafter performs or attempts to perform any act specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

And renumber the following section accordingly.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRAMER was granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is one of the most important amendments offered to this bill.

We have seen day after day and week after week people from outside of a State going into a State, mailing material into a State, and inciting people within a State to riot. We have seen innocent citizens killed. We have seen situations equaling anarchy in America developed.

I say to the Members, if we are going to protect the right on the one side to demonstrate and to be protected with regard to free speech and so forth—as we are doing in this title—we ought to protect as well every citizen in America from the professionals who are making a business out of rioting, and capitalizing on the recent preaching of civil disobedience.

Yes, I am talking about George Lincoln Rockwell; and I am talking about the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan just as much as I am talking about anybody else. This is an antiriot, this is an anti-Rockwell, this is an anti-Ku Klux Klan amendment.

If you believe in peaceful living in America, or if you believe that someone who has a store has a right not to have it looted—if you believe these are civil rights just as deserving as the other rights we are talking about protecting, then you will vote for my amendment. If you do not, you will vote against it. That is how simple it is.

This is an amendment which has been carefully thought out. It is patterned after the Fugitive Felon Act. It has many precedents in the law.

Mr. Chairman, fires, looting, vandalism, violence, and death—these have become the bywords of the American summer. Sections of this country's great cities have been turned into battlefields. Numerous individuals, many of them innocent bystanders, have lost their lives and their fortunes as a result.

With these events in mind, I am proposing an amendment which would make it a Federal offense to use interstate commerce with the intent of inciting riots and other forms of violent disturbance and violent civil disobedience.

This amendment is the result of evidence which supports the contention that this violence is the work, in part, of well-trained outside agitators who come into these communities for the express purpose of inciting violent civil disobedience.

I am also proposing to deal with terrorism in American cities and in other places, by the Ku Klux Klan, a heinous organization which knows no State boundaries. Mr. Rockwell's organization would also be covered by my amendment.

I emphasize here and now that this amendment is aimed at protecting the civil rights of all the people of all races, of all creeds, and of all colors.

I submit that there is no difference between the hooded Ku Klux Klanner traveling from North Carolina to South Carolina to terrorize Negroes and whites, and other agitators traveling from Los Angeles to Chicago to terrorize whites and Negroes. In both situations the civil rights of the victims are being infringed. If we do not protect those civil rights as well, in this title V, we will not be doing our job as the Congress.

The indications are strong that outside agitators are at work in these riots. Columnist Jack Anderson—if we can believe what he says—writing in the July 27 edition of my hometown paper, said:

> The FBI has positive evidence that professional Communist agitators have helped to stir up recent Negro riots. This doesn't mean that the riots were provoked or controlled by the Communists. However, some of the same agitators who helped fire the mobs in Los Angeles were spotted egging on the rioters in Chicago.

In the July 16 edition of the Chicago Tribune, Chicago Mayor Daley was quoted as saying that outsiders are responsible for fomenting the unrest that has led to the violence and looting on Chicago's West Side.

Joining Mayor Daley in this accusation was Dr. H. J. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, the largest organized body of Negroes in the Nation. Dr. Jackson said:

> I believe our young people are not vicious enough to attack a whole city. Some other forces are using young people.

I agree with that.

Dr. Jackson went on to blame outside interference for agitating the West Side youths to wholesale vandalism.

In Cleveland, Safety Director John N. McCormick said he had received information that persons from outside Cleveland were instigating some of the trouble. In a July 21 article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, he said:

> We are worried about outside influences from other parts of the country that may be playing a role in this disturbance.

Columnist David Lawrence, writing in the August 1, 1966, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, summed up the situation with the following pungent remarks:

> The administration argues that Congress has virtually unlimited power to protect civil rights by invoking the clause of the Constitution which authorizes it to regulate interstate commerce. If so, there is a parallel obligation to insure the safety of all citizens, irrespective of race or color, in their homes and on the streets.

That is the issue before us with this substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, believe there is a reciprocal obligation, and I think it is time this Congress accepted it and acted on it. It is time that the Federal Government, which has no hesitation in fighting in the jungles of Vietnam, protect rights at home that are being trampled on in racial wars and protect against anarchy as demonstrated by battles fought in the asphalt jungles of the United States. It is high time that the Congress recognizes the term "civil rights" has a broad application to all people's rights. The property owner whose building is burned to the ground has lost certain of his civil rights. The shopowner whose store has been looted has lost certain of his civil rights. The woman who was shot in the head and lost her life lost all of her civil rights.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, these are basic rights which are crying out for protection, and which my amendment will protect. So, if you are against rioting, against looting, against thrill killing, and against outside agitators promoting rioting in the streets, vote for my amendment.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. I am sure the gentleman wants to be perfectly plain in the understanding of the word "riot." In order that appropriate legislative history may be written, may I read the definition of that word from the case of the *State* v. *Stalcup*, 23 North Carolina 30:

> A tumultuous disturbance of the peace by three persons or more assembling together on their own authority, with an intent mutually to assist each other against any who shall oppose them, in the execution of some enterprise of a private nature, and afterward actually executing the same in a violent and turbulent manner, to the terror of the people, whether the act intended were of itself lawful or unlawful.

May I ask the gentleman from Florida does that substantially express the definition of the word "rioting" as he intends it in the amendment which he now has pending?

Mr. CRAMER. The case stated by the gentleman from Virginia is a prime example of what is meant by "riot."

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Would the gentleman from Florida say that the phrase "violent civil disturbance" is as strong as and has the same general meaning as the word "riot"?

Mr. CRAMER. It does.

Mr. McCULLOCH. And it does not weaken the language in any manner to have the phrase "violent civil disturbance"?

Mr. CRAMER. Not in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], does the gentleman feel that this amendment is justified in this legislation?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am very pleased to say that I am for the substitute which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

I feel that the exigencies of the times and the nearly unbelievable civil strife that has been going on in the large cities in this country and at the crossroads need this attention, and I hope that the substitute will be agreed to.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] very much for his remarks.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like first, Mr. Chairman, to commend the gentleman from Florida for the purpose of his amendment, and say to the gentleman that I believe that it is a purpose which all of us can support.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, may we have order?

Mr. WHITENER. But if I may refer to section 502(b)(2), of the proposed amendment, which says that "commit any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act which is a felony or high misdemeanor under Federal or State law, in furtherance of, or during commission of, any act as specified in paragraph (1)——"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of concern since the Steve Nelson case with reference to the preemption of State jurisdiction by the Federal authorities where statutes of this type have been enacted—and I am sure that the gentleman will agree with me that the States should not be deprived of their jurisdiction to punish any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other violent crime occurring in the State.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman from North Carolina has raised a very important point, for two reasons: No. 1, the language to which the gentleman from North Carolina has referred has been refined to conform to the Fugitive Felon Act which this Congress passed in 1961, so that it involves only that which is a felony or high misdemeanor under New Jersey law—under Federal and State law—and therefore is clearly defined as we so defined it in the Fugitive Felon Act.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that local prosecutions for acts of violence and such will still remain in full force and effect. This amendment merely involves the use of interstate commerce to accomplish that end result, clearly within the Federal jurisdiction.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, it acts as a deterrent against agitators coming into the State or shipping materials into the State and thereby agitating within the State, which the local authority has no power to deal with.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I take it, it is the intent of the author of this amendment that nothing in this amendment would deprive any State of jurisdiction which it had otherwise, or which it would otherwise have?

Mr. CRAMER. Absolutely not. And, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I would be the last person to offer an amendment to deprive the State of such powers which they already have with which to preserve the peace.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear in my own mind the elements which would be required in connection with the new Federal statutory powers which would be created by this amendment. It would require, as I read a copy of the gentleman's amendment, not only the actual commission of a crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act, which is a crime under Federal or State law, but would cover any person with intent to "incite, promote, encourage, or carry on, or facilitate the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other violent civil disturbance," but it would also require that proof be made that the individual traveled within interstate commerce with the intent at the time he traveled into another State, across the State lines, to carry out this type of activity?

Mr. CRAMER. Whether or not he uses any interstate facility to accomplish that end result?

Mr. EDMONDSON. So that the travel would not necessarily be an incident but there would have to be demonstrated that the travel occurred with the intent of carrying out this type of illegal activity. Is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. The travel is with the intent to encourage, incite, and promote.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman has a very necessary amendment and I will support the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen evidence of Dr. Martin Luther King traveling from some area in the South to Chicago very recently. During the course of this period there were demonstrations. He had meetings. This is the point, they had a silent vigil before a real estate office.

As a result of this silent vigil there happened to be rioting that occurred which was in the nature of a race riot. Would you say that Dr. Martin Luther King would be covered by the provisions of your amendment?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman's question is not only well taken but I am delighted he asked it because it gives me the opportunity to clearly state what we intend to do and what the amendment actually does.

If Dr. Martin Luther King goes to that area for the purpose of peaceful demonstrations, it would not have any effect. If the intentions of the visit are actually for the purpose of the incitement of such civil disobedience, he would be guilty of a crime.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's question is extremely well taken. I am glad he asked it.

It is not the intention to get at anyone who participates in peaceful demonstrations, who does not go to an area with the specific intent and purpose of inciting a riot, looting, bombing, or what-have-you.

Mr. GILBERT. As the gentleman knows, intent is a state of mind and it is a very difficult thing to establish. I would like to know how you would establish the fact of Dr. King going from one State to another or Roy Wilkins as opposed to some of the people you have been talking about. How do you distinguish between them?

Mr. CRAMER. I distinguish between them by what the statute specifically says, or in the proposed language rather "whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to incite, promote, encourage, or carry on a riot." As I said before, that includes the Ku Klux Klan leader if he engages in a demonstration and likewise Mr. Rockwell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Florida knows, I have discussed this amendment with him on several occasions and had a similar amendment of my own at the desk to offer. However, the gentleman from Florida, being a member of the committee, is entitled to prior consideration on this amendment, and I am happy to yield to him and to offer my support for his amendment.

This Nation has been disturbed from border to border by incessant riots and acts of violence not only against private property but against the person of law-abiding citizens, and this Nation can no longer condone such activities.

Many people trained in the art of revolution, riot, and violent civil disturbances are traveling from State to State inciting such activities. These are professionals indulging in the business of creating riots and destroying property and infringing upon the rights of innocent people and law-abiding citizens. This must be brought to a halt.

It is known among members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that certain Communist groups are responsible, in some occasions, for inciting these riots. Recent reports from Cleveland have indicated that persons from outside the State of Ohio were, in some measure, responsible for the violence and disorder created there. All citizens are entitled to safety and protection in the enjoyment of their property, business, and homes; and it is in that vein that this amendment is offered.

It is an effort to protect all citizens of all races, color, national origin, and religion from being illegally harmed or irreparably damaged. If this Nation is to prosper and to progress, law and order must be maintained. Certainly peaceful and lawful demonstrations are legal and acceptable under our constitutional form of government, but riots and violence have no place in our society.

The civil rights of many innocent persons of all races are denied by such violence and intimidation. Furthermore, these riots and violent civil disturbances are prejudicing the rights of those lawfully seeking recognition of their constitutional rights.

This amendment in no way infringes upon the prompt prosecution of those violators of State and local law, but, to the contrary, will permit them to exercise every jurisdiction they have over these incidents. It will, however, enable the Federal Government to prosecute those persons who move in interstate commerce for the purpose set forth in the amendment; and will certainly provide an additional measure of protection and safety for the citizens who are lawfully and legally in the pursuit of their affairs.

I urge the adoption of the Cramer amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

In the past several years there has been a great misunderstanding created concerning civil rights. Many Americans seem to feel that only minorities are entitled to civil rights. But what are civil rights? They protect the right of every person in this land to life, liberty, possession of property, and every other fundamental right outlined in the Bill of Rights, the basic law of our land as it concerns the individual.

All Americans are entitled to these civil rights, and what is a more sacred right than the right to your life? What is a more basic right than the right to own private property and have it secure from mobs and vandalism? For months now, indeed for the past 4 years, under the present administration every concern has been given to protect the rights of the few while sacrificing and ruthlessly smashing the rights of the many.

We have seen the sorry spectacle of hoodlums running wild in the major cities of the Nation, killing, burning, looting, and they have been excused by some of the highest officials of the land in the name of civil rights. Only a few days ago the mobs were encouraged by the Vice President of the United States to further violence and destruction. We have witnessed so-called civil rights leaders traveling from one end of this country to the other to incite and direct riots and the destruction of life and property. They piously preach nonviolence while at the same time they encourage violence.

It is time that all those who violate the law are called to account. It is time the civil rights of all Americans are given some consideration by this Congress. If the civil rights of all are to be protected it will have to be done by Congress, because the administration has made it plain that its only interest in civil rights is how many votes it will mean. With such an objective the constant appeal is to minorities and to bloc votes. If the civil rights of all Americans are to be preserved it will have to be done by Congress, because this administration has proven its total lack of responsible leadership and inability to control the mobs once it has encouraged them to violate the public interest. No administration in the history of this country has a more miserable record of failure, of bankrupt leadership, nor has shown a greater lack of courage defending the rights for all of the people of America.

Innocent people of all races in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Perth Amboy, South Bend, and other cities have been murdered in mob violence, and the administration can find no means to put an end to this lawlessness except to demand that Congress appease law breakers by greater Federal handouts and by further encroachment upon the rights of all the citizens of this country. At one of the most perilous moments in history its a tragedy that America is headed by an administration whose only goal seems to be to keep itself in office even though to do so means that every decent motive is buried under the slimy mud of political expediency.

The United States is bogged down in a jungle war with Communists in Vietnam, and thousands of American boys are dying because the administration refused to face up to the problems it had created until it was sure the voters would approve. A President who is ever quick to draw the pistol of Federal power against business refuses to take a stand or accept any responsibility in the labor-management dispute that is tying up a major means of transportation and bringing misery to millions of Americans in many walks of life.

It is this administration which has shown no courage on any issue, which has a miserable record of failure in dealing with problems both foreign and domestic that is now insisting that we pass this bill to garner additional votes for itself. It matters nothing to them that the Bill of Rights is being torn to shreds and that the civil rights of all the people are being trampled into the dust. It makes no difference to this administration that the ownersip and management of private property may be destroyed by this legislation. This administration could care less what the impact of this bill will be on millions of hard-working, industrious, law-abiding American citizens who have spent a lifetime to build a home and a future for themselves and their posterity. The business of this administration is politics. The business of this administration is votes and there is no loyalty to anyone, to any race, to any creed, indeed to any individual who interfers with the business of politics.

So I say it is up to Congress to protect the people in their homes, on the streets, and in their places of employment and business. That is why this amendment, in my opinion, is the most important amendment introduced thus far. Only under such an amendment may we even hope to give our law enforcement agencies a weapon which will enable them to protect the lives and property of American citizens. I urge that this amendment be adopted. While I am opposed to this bill in its entirety, I know there are Members who are sincere in their support of its objectives. It is to these Members I appeal. Surely if our objective be the protection of civil rights then let us make unlawful rioting and other violent civil disturbances, which are depriving all of the people of their rights, a part of this law.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I support the Cramer amendment. It gets at the individual action of those who would travel across State lines for the purpose of stirring up civil disobedience in the name of civil rights, or for whatever purpose.

Unfortunately, over the last few years, many of us from the South have asked for help as the hordes descended upon us crying for civil rights, but leaving violence in their wake.

I even requested the President of the United States by letter dated March 24, 1965, to encourage those from outside Alabama who were doing such damage during the so-called Selma-Montgomery march, to leave our State. My letter to the President said in part:

> Progress in this direction (solving Alabama's problems) can continue and harmony among the races can return to Alabama only if the outside demonstrators who provoke so much violence and hatred will return to their homes.

The President, through Lee C. White, special counsel to the President, replied on March 29, 1965, and said in part:

> With respect to the suggestion that "outsiders" be kept out of Alabama, once again this is contrary to our total national heritage and tradition and I do not believe it to be the responsibility of the federal government to order or discourage people from traveling within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, well of course no one wants to discourage people from traveling in the United States. Certainly the people of Alabama encourage all peaceful pepole to come to our State. And I did not ask the President to "order" anyone out of our State. I still believe that if the President had used his well-known persuasive powers there would not have been such violence. Or maybe he felt that there was no Federal law to prosecute those who came to Alabama with the intent to create violence and incite riots and therefore remained mute.

At any rate it took riots in the big northern cities before the people of this Nation finally woke up to the fact that what we had been saying all along was really true; that there are those who travel from State to State stirring up trouble; that there are those who use the mails and the telephone lines of this country to incite people in troubled areas; that Communists are involved in these riots.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Cramer amendment will provide the necessary criminal statutes to protect the law-abiding people of this country from those crossing State lines to do violence. The Cramer amendment is a good amendment and should be supported by all those who are concerned about the innocent merchant who has his store burned, or the shopkeeper who has his shop looted, or the poor man on the street who is shot in the head while minding his own business.

The Cramer amendment simply says to those who come into a State knowing that such damage, injury, and death will result from their acts—you shall not go unpunished for your dastardly deeds.

I urge adoption of the Cramer amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I would like to direct some questions to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Does the gentleman have a copy of the revised amendment before him?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not have a revised copy. I am familiar with it, I believe. I am referring to section 502, is that in your amendment?

Mr. CRAMER. The staff is handing you a copy of the revised amendment that was worked on carefully over the weekend and I am certain we did what we wanted to do without doing violence to any other section.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I think you have stricken the subsection (a) out of your amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, because it as determined that a finding was not necessary. It was put in principally to make the amendment completely germane. There has been no point of order raised. Other amendments were offered without a point of order and I, therefore, struck it. I consulted with the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I continue? Do I understand that this would not in any manner interfere with any State prosecution for a similar crime? Is that your contention in this case?

Mr. CRAMER. As it presently is under the act which we passed in 1961, whoever moves or travels in interstate commerce under the Fugitive Felon Act, the State retains the right of jurisdiction for a crime committed within its borders—I am sure the gentleman knows. That issue was fully debated.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I asked the gentleman the question is because it does not appear clear from the amendment whether or not the Federal law preempts State law as the Supreme Court held in the Steve Nelson case. So I think it is well that we develop legislative history as to whether or not the amendment intends that the Federal Government, because of the element of interstate commerce, intends to occupy the field and prevent a prosecution at the State level.

Mr. CRAMER. The crime being created by this amendment is similiar to the new crime created under 87–368, the Fugitive Felon Act. That issue was debated at that time. It was clearly determined that State statutes for State crime are not preempted. This would create a new crime of a Federal nature, where interstate commerce is used to accomplish the objective.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I know the gentleman is familiar with title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, which is Public Law 86–449. In that law we provide that—

> Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody, or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for willfully attempting to or damaging or destroying by fire or explosive any building, structure, facility, vehicle, dwelling house, synagogue, church, religious center or educational institution, public or private, or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding relating to any such offense shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

It is not your intention, is it, under this amendment to do away with that part of title III of the Civil Rights Act?

Mr. CRAMER. It merely supplements it. It does not in any way affect the existing statutes; but, more importantly, it would be a further and additional tool to stop bombing of all kinds.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As you indicate, the act must be in interstate or foreign commerce before the Federal Government would step in.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from Virginia read the definition of "riot or other violent civil disobedience." Forgetting for the moment the word "riot," let us examine the words "or other violent civil disobedience." Does this term mean that if one traveled from Alabama to Chicago and talked to a group of people, "other violent civil disobedience" would have to be in the mind of the individual who left Alabama to go to Chicago. Would it be necessary to prove that he went there for that purpose?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. You have to have the intention to create a violent disturbance, and the citation for language of that nature is *State* v. *Stalcup*, 23 N.C. 30, and *Symonds* v. *State*, 89 P. 2d, 970, in which the language is used, "a tumultuous disturbance of the peace by three or more persons assembled together," and so forth. The gentleman from Virginia read that language.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But if, for an example, he left Alabama on a peaceful mission——

Mr. CRAMER. Then obviously he would not be included. There is no reason to include it. The State law covers him if he creates a violent disturbance, not intending to do so when he left the other State.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am having difficulty, as the gentleman from Colorado seems to be, understanding what this amendment will do. As I understand the explanation of the gentleman from Florida, we would make the principle of the Fugitive Felon Act apply to interstate traveling for the purpose of doing certain acts and things, and that would be a Federal offense. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] did not hear the colloquy.

Second, in the unnumbered portion on page 2, it would then make, as he said, performance or the attempt to perform any of those acts a Federal crime.

So we have the Fugitive Felon Act plus the creating of a new crime, but the gentleman says there is no danger of preemption of the State's jurisdiction in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Will the gentleman from Colorado yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. But, yet, the gentleman's amendment does not tie into any existing statute which has an antipreemption provision in it. I ask this for information, not to confuse.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier in answer to a question, this was patterned after the Fugitive Felon Act, which likewise did not have a preemption. This creates a new crime based upon use of interstate commerce.

Mr. WHITENER. That seemed to me precisely what the gentleman was doing in one part of the amendment. When we come down to the unnumbered portion of the last four lines of the amendment, then we have a Federal crime if these unlawful acts or actions have been committed, such as bombing, arson, riots, and so forth. We do not have any saving clause to protect from preemption.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The total description of the crime rests upon the travel in interstate commerce with the intention to commit an act set out 1, 2, 3, as described in the last paragraph which the gentleman read. There is not any problem involved with State statutes or otherwise.

Mr. WHITENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me what we are doing is creating two propositions: One, to travel in interstate commerce with the intent to do certain acts—if we have that, this is the Fugitive Felon Act adaptation—but then we go on to the second part of the amendment, we say that once having traveled in that manner, we create a new crime, to wit, the doing of these acts in which there must be two elements of proof, the first being he traveled in interstate commerce, and the second that he committed these unlawful acts or acts of violence after the riots, and so forth.

Mr. CRAMER. I believe it is quite obvious what the House wants to get at and what I want to get at. The person must travel in interstate commerce with the intention of creating a riot, and then he must do something in the State that shows that indeed was his intent.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I wholeheartedly agree with his stated purpose, but I do not agree that we should do anything that would prohibit the State of North Carolina, or the State of Florida, or the State of Colorado from prosecuting any person who committed a crime of arson, robbery, riot, or any other crime of violence simply because the person traveled in interstate commerce. I know the gentleman would not want that.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina, I am equally concerned about preemption. That was carefully considered in drafting this amendment, just as it was done in the Fugitive Felon Act. It takes the conjunction of travel plus the intent or performance of the acts in one, two, or three—the two together—to create the Federal crime. Therefore, there is no question about preemption, about State's statutes, double jeopardy, or anything else involved. There have to be the two elements to create the Federal crime.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there is some question in my mind concerning the issue of preemption, in view of the Steve Nelson case, where the Court set aside the statutes of the State of Pennsylvania because it found that the Congress of the United States had occupied the field by the enactment of the so-called Smith Act.

It was suggested that perhaps we should in our legislation come forward and agree that we do not intend to occupy the field but rather will permit not inconsistent State statutes to stand. It may be a worthy amendment to what the gentleman has proposed.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Would the gentleman agree that under the amendment of my friend from Florida one must prove that the people are engaged in interstate travel?

Mr. CRAMER. Are using interstate commerce?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes. In my amendment no such proof is necessary; is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. I have not had an opportunity to carefully examine the gentleman's amendment, but I understand that is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CORMAN TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Cramer substitute amendment for the Ashmore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CORMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 77, immediately after line 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 502. Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, in furtherance of a conspiracy to commit any act of violence, arson or bombing which is a crime under Federal or State law in order to incite or carry on a riot and thereafter commits or attempts to commit or induces another to commit any such act of violence, arson, or bombing shell be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I can see there is only one basic difference between my amendment to the substitute and the substitute amendment itself. They both seek to accomplish the same purpose; that is, to bring to bear the authority of the Federal Government to stop crimes of violence, arson, and bombing.

Your committee has no evidence that any State is reluctant to enforce its laws against violence within the State. They sometimes have difficulty doing it, but it is not because of any reluctance or any unwillingness on the part of the States and local authorities to enforce such laws.

In the amendment which I offer to the substitute we would legislate against interstate conspiracies. We would get at the people who have been a part of inciting the riot but who lie outside the State and therefore are not reachable by State authority.

This is a sound reason for the Federal Government to act with complete respect for State's rights, because we will be getting at one who is committing a crime but who is beyond the reach of the State.

I have discussed this proposal with the Justice Department. They have compared it with the Cramer substitute and have indicated to me that it would be much simpler to enforce because it is more precise in the conduct which it prohibits.

There is justification for this Federal legislation, because we would reach conduct beyond that which a State is able to reach.

There is no question that race relations are raw, in many of our major cities. It is like having dry grass in the streets.

The racist, whether he be black or white, is the match that will set off that fire.

The only way to stop it is for local law enforcement officials to be able to move quickly and firmly and effectively to stop it before it spreads. The place they need the Federal Government to assist is in those conspiracies which are started outside of their States and which they cannot reach.

I think there is a distinction between the Cramer amendment and the fugitive felon law. We have the fugitive felon law for a very good reason. Not because States are not willing to enforce laws, but, rather, because the fugitive who arrives in a new place has committed no offense there and so is not subject to prosecution in the new State to which he fled. We say that ought to be the concern of the Federal Government. I suggest to you that with respect to those acts of violence solely confined within a State the Federal Government has no reason at this time to take away the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. It seems to me what your amendment would do is deprive the Federal Government of jurisdiction and authority with regard to a disturbance and violence and a riot in an area while at the same time by Federal statute under title V we are undertaking to protect demonstrators, but when they go beyond bounds we deprive the Federal Government of authority.

Mr. CORMAN. That is a warped interpretation of title V. The gentleman knows we had considerable evidence before our committee that there are some kinds of criminal laws that some jurisdictions are not enforcing. These the Federal Government would enforce. We did not have a scrap of evidence that any jurisdiction has failed to enforce laws against riots in the street, whether they were carried out by black racists or white racists. There is no reason for the Federal Government to usurp the State's jurisdiction in that field if the total crime is within the State involved. There is reason for the Federal Government to act in those instances where States refuse to enforce the law. There is an abundance of evidence that that is the situation in some States in relation to crimes recited in title V.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], a member of the committee.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am sure he is familiar with the present so-called conspiracy statute which is section 371 of title 18 of the United States Code. That reads in part as follows:

> If two or more persons conspire to commit any offense against the United States.

Clearly the phrase "any offense" would include all of those offenses mentioned in the gentleman's amendment in context with the Federal law. The gentleman's amendment, however, goes further and embraces any act of violence which is a crime under State law. My question of the gentleman is, would not that latter language embrace a minor act of violence such as a simple assault which is defined under State law as a crime?

Mr. CORMAN. If it were violence, yes; my amendment would be intended to reach that kind of conduct if the other required elements were present. That is the reason for this amendment, which goes beyond the existing conspiracy law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I wanted to raise a similar question to that raised by the gentleman from Virginia in a little different context. I think that the gentleman is very correct in his desire to reach the person who remains outside of the State and is part of a conspiracy to commit acts of violence or commit riots within another State, but I did have the feeling our general conspiracy statutes would operate to reach that situation if we do establish the separate violation of law that is intended by the Cramer amendment. Will the gentleman tell me why, if the Cramer substitute is adopted, the general conspiracy statute would not operate to reach the individual who remains outside of the State?

Mr. CORMAN. The Cramer substitute deals both with crimes covered by my amendment and with conduct all of which is carried out within a State. It would be a serious violation of our theory of the separation of powers if we adopt the theory that the Federal Government may prosecute anyone who travels in interstate commerce and subsequently becomes a criminal because once we do that, then we have assumed responsibility for most criminal law.

If there were evidence of reluctance or inability, on the part of State authorities to curb riots in the streets, then I would support the Cramer theory.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. How would the gentleman's proposed substitute reach a situation of a solitary individual who conceives the idea in one State of inciting a riot in another State, and thereafter travels into the other State and plays a key role in another State in the carrying out of a riotous act of violence?

Mr. CORMAN. He would not be reached by the Federal Government. He would be reached by the State government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of those who have offered the several amendments and substitutes now pending seek a common goal.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I must say that only one of the three amendments will reach that goal, effectively.

First of all, it seems to me that the amendment first offered by my distinguished friend and learned counselor from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] is somewhat lacking an appropriate constitutional nexus.

Second, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] fails to accomplish what its author intends.

Mr. Chairman, if the author of the amendment intended it to extend the scope and the depth of the Cramer amendment, then he fails. The Corman amendment is simply a reiteration in substantial part of what is now already the law, principally, the conspiracy statute.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, since I mentioned the gentleman's name, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. The gentleman mentioned the fact that I probably do not have a sufficient constitutional base. I say it is based upon the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States which says that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law."

Mr. Chairman, the innocent citizens should be protected the same as the demonstrators. That is the basis for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me give to the gentleman from Virginia an illustration which would cover the offenses of the type which we have in mind.

Mr. Chairman, whereas the Cramer amendment would not cover such a situation, the other day I read in the papers of a situation which involved parties involved in the riots which occurred in Cleveland.

Mr. Chairman, two white men were standing on the corner. They were doing nothing to anyone. Negroes came by in an automobile and said "Get Whitey." They shot the two white men standing on the street corner.

Mr. Chairman, if those two Negroes, or how many there were in the car, had come from without that State, from the State of Illinois, into the State of Ohio, the Cramer amendment would cover them, if they had been residents of that State where that act took place. However, they would not be covered by the substitute amendment; whereas they would be covered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina makes a most respectable argument with respect to the 14th amendment, but with or without reference to the 14th amendment, the very same conduct would constitute a crime under the law in the State in which it was committed.

Mr. ASHMORE. Surely.

Mr. POFF. And, I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina will agree with me that criminal law is the responsibility, first, of the States and that they should assume that responsibility, and prosecute offenders first. Federal jurisdiction and responsibility should begin only when an element—an important element—of the total crime is related to movement in interstate commerce.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. The entire fifth amendment is covered by various and sundry State laws, everything therein contained. If you want to pass a better law to do these things to protect the paraders and demonstrators, you have just as much right under the equal protection of the law section of the Constitution to protect innocent people.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he might appropriately use exactly the same argument to justify the creation of practically any offense as a Federal crime. I know the gentleman does not want to go that far.

May I say further in response to the argument made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, who urged that the Cramer substitute would not cover the conspiracy committed out of State. His argument is mistaken. Most clearly the Cramer substitute would cover it. Under the gentleman's amendment, I know this is true as well. But inasmuch as his amendment would restrict and limit the effect of the Cramer substitute, I hope he will agree and join with us in support of the Cramer substitute.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what distinguishes the Cramer amendment in a situation of a man crossing a State line to commit a murder, from a man crossing a State line conspiring with somebody else to commit murder? I am sure he does not suggest that the Federal Government must assume the responsibility for enforcing State laws against murder just because they are such heinous crime?

Mr. POFF. No. The answer to the first question is only one person involved may activate the Cramer substitute. The Corman amendment requires two or more and would not cover the hypothetical Rockwell case, for instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we should adopt the Cramer amendment and we should defeat the Corman amendment since we are providing in title V for Federal protection of civil rights demonstrators and unless the Cramer amendment is adopted we will be renouncing Federal authority with respect to those who might be injured or who might suffer at the hands of violent demonstrators who are receiving protection. At the same time we have to limit this to those who would incite to riot or who would advocate and promote violent disturbances from without a State and not, of course, try to cover the whole gamut of intrastate activities. If we adopt the Cramer amendment, it would seem to me we would be accomplishing an appropriate result.

I cannot help but feel that these violent disturbances, these riots, are doing serious and irreparable injury to the whole civil rights cause. Unless the Congress takes action to provide a Federal law with regard to this subject we are going to lose a great many of the goals we are attempting to achieve through this and other civil rights legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California a moment ago said that to move in the direction of the Cramer amendment would be to attempt to establish a precedent in effect for Federal interest in crimes like murder when somebody crosses a State line and commits the crime of murder.

Of course, we already have clear precedent in the law covering unlawful flight to avoid prosecution by going across a State line.

When somebody does commit a murder in a State and then flees across a State line to avoid prosecution there is a clear Federal interest in that situation and prosecution is in order.

Mr. Chairman, to me it seems every bit as much in order to look at the situation where somebody conceives the idea of committing a crime that very definitely affects the public order and the safety of the public as it is covered by this amendment in one State and with the intent to carry out that illegal act moves across a State line and thereafter engages in that type of illegal activity in that situation, there is just as much reason for the Federal Government to be concerned as it is for the Federal Government to be concerned in cases of unlawful flight to avoid prosecution which we have in the law today.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call again to my colleague's attention that there is a decided difference between the fugitive felon law and what we are talking about. The fugitive felon law is a situation where a man escapes the jurisdiction from where he committed the crime. In this instance he is going into the jurisdiction in which he commits a crime and the local authorities have jurisdiction to arrest him and prosecute him. There is a substantial difference between the two.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I will agree that there is a difference but under the gentleman's amendment all Federal authority would be out the window except with regard to conspiracies which were developed outside the State.

It seems to me we want to protect those who act in interstate commerce, who do organize or direct violent disturbance or riots from without the State and then move into the State to carry them out.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, title 18, United States Code, section 1952, "Interstate and Foreign Travel, Transportation in Aid of Racketeering Purposes," is the absolute answer to the gentleman from California.

My amendment is patterned after that provision. It has similar language and with the similar limitations.

Mr. McCLORY. And it is an absolute answer to the point raised by the gentleman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On that point, could you say there was less Federal interest in a Mann Act violation, when one crosses a State line for carrying out an immoral purpose, as is the case under the Mann Act? Would you say there was any less Federal or national interest in the situation we are talking about today and trying to meet with the Cramer amendment? I think the national interest is even more obvious. Certainly the argument of the gentleman from California that jurisdiction rests in the State where the actual offense occurs does not prevail any more strongly against the Cramer amendment than it would against a case under the Mann Act.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, title V is born of necessity; acts of violence committed against those lawfully pursuing their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities cannot be tolerated. Federal rights are involved and if State laws are inadequate or if they are inadequately or unjustly enforced, then the Federal Government must make and enforce the laws. Congress so decided nearly half a century ago when it enacted what is now title 18, United States Code section 242. That Statute, written in 1909, reads in pertinent part as follows:

> Whoever under color of any law * * * wilfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District, to the deprivation of

> any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States * * * on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Although title V as reported by the committee is too broad, too loose, and too imprecise, it is in concept a logical extension of the 1909 law to cover the violent acts of private citizens against their fellow citizens.

If title V is born of necessity, if it is the offspring of social injustice, then the Cramer amendment is no less. One concerns injustice against individuals. The other concerns injustice against society. Just as this Congress cannot tolerate acts of violence committed against those pursuing their constitutional rights, just so Congress cannot tolerate acts of violence committed against the persons and property of innocent, neutral, law-abiding citizens who by the accident and misfortune of fate find themselves in the path of the maurading mob.

It is, of course, the prerogative and the duty of the State first to protect society against mob violence. The Constitution leaves the police powers with the States. True, all States have laws for this purpose. Yet, State and local officials are reluctant to act under those laws. Why? They know that their actions, no matter how lawful or how moderate or restrained they may be, will precipitate charges of "police brutality." Such paralysis in State law enforcement is hurtful to society, just as State failure to protect those who are lawfully pursuing their constitutional rights. And when the State fails in either responsibility, the Federal Government must assume the responsibility. The Nation, the security of the individual, civilization itself depend upon the maintenance of law and order. And the injunctions and sanctions which make for law and order must apply with equal force and effect to all who defy them—the man who bombs a church and the group of men who set fire to a department store; the man who shoots from ambush a lawful marcher along a public road and the group of men who commit acts of violence against the property and person of hapless bystanders.

This House is face to face with an ugly emergency. We have a stern duty to perform. History will judge us ill if we shirk it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Corman amendment to my substitute amendment. I will not take the 5 minutes allotted to me unless someone wishes to ask some questions. It seems to me quite obvious that what the Corman amendment would do would be to gut the Cramer substitute. Accordingly, the Justice Department has said that we must treat with this subject. I think it is obvious that the American public are demanding that it be treated with. They have said, "Let us gut the Cramer substitute." They know what my amendment would do. In good faith I submitted it to every Member of the House last week. I gave notice that it was my intention to offer such an amendment and stated what the objective would be. Everyone has had plenty of opportunity to consider the amendment. The Justice Department has done so, and they have come in with a substitute that would take away the basic part of the whole proposal. Lincoln Rockwell could come into any State he desired to and, under the Corman amendment to my substitute, he would not be subject to being guilty of a Federal crime. He could act from without the State individually and not be subject to the amendment. The sponsor of the amendment has so admitted.

The Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan could call the shots for Atlanta, Ga., or wherever he lives on the telephone and by importuning or otherwise individually, he would not be subject to Federal action. I want to get those two birds as much as I want to get anyone else.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The Corman amendment to the Cramer substitute provides in part that "whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce, or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, in furtherance of a conspiracy to commit any act of violence." Now, the key word there is "conspiracy." To get the perspective, does not the conspiracy statute require, first, that two or more persons conspire outside a State and then go into a State and commit a crime and is it not necessary to prove conspiracy outside and then inside after commission before they would be guilty of this conspiracy?

Mr. CRAMER. The number of persons the gentleman has asked the question about is correct. Conspiracy is defined as two or more persons acting under 18 United States Code 371.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentleman answer this question: Under the language of this Corman amendment to your substitute, would for example the man who left Tennessee, crossed the State line, and went into Mississippi by himself and shot James Meredith a few weeks ago be punishable under the language of this Corman amendment?

Mr. CRAMER. So far as his being an individual, he would not be covered in that he would not have conspired with someone else relating to the act he was going to commit.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, obviously, if the gentleman will yield further, the language on the Corman amendment certainly does not meet the criteria necessary to control this riot or violence problem. In fact it will insure punishment in only one direction. The Cramer substitute should be adopted. The Corman amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, each of these three proposals have problems in them for me. That is why I take this time to see if in some way we can get around to explaining some of them.

I believe I understand the use of the word "conspiracy" because of the intimation by the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Guest, in March of this year, when they said in effect, as I understand it, that the 14th amendment is not limited to State actions alone where there is a conspiracy which brings about a situation. I do not agree with what the Supreme Court says about that, but that is what Justice Stewart seemed to say, and the other Judges seemed to agree with him on it, with the exception, I believe, of Justice Harlan.

I can see, I believe, why the term "conspiracy" is used, to try to bring it within the 14th amendment. Yet, Mr. CRAMER, in his amendment would bring it not under the 14th amendment, but under the commerce clause of the Constitution. I am sure that he can do that under the principle which is the constitutional basis for the Fugitive Felon Act and other acts.

Yet, it seems to me both Mr. CRAMER and Mr. CORMAN have created a problem of preemption of the State's jurisdiction to try certain criminal offenses, to wit, crimes of violence which occur in furtherance of a conspiracy, as Mr. CORMAN says, to engage in civil disobedience, to use the general term.

Mr. ASHMORE has stated his amendment would be based under the 14th amendment of the Constitution and not be concerned with the commerce clause. This brings us to the problem of what the Congress can do under the 14th amendment. I am afraid, if we follow that reasoning, that we lay ourselves right in the trap of the proponents of this total bill, who would seek to stretch the 14th amendment to include individual acts unrelated to State actions or actions by the Government.

So it seems to me, whatever we do here, whichever one of these propositions we adopt, that we will still need an antipreemption provision, or what we commonly refer to as H.R. 3. This will protect the States from having their jurisdictions usurped, as was done in the case of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelsen, where the Smith Act was involved.

So I do not make these comments to create confusion. I do so to see if as a result of these comments someone can help clarify the legal atmosphere, and let us try to decide which of these approaches to take. I am sure each of the proposers of these amendments desire to eliminate or hopes to eliminate some of the civil disobedience which has resulted in injury to persons and damage to and theft of property.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to clarify two things. The gentleman from Louisiana talked about the Meredith case. I assume that when he was shot that that was clearly a violation of section 501(b) of the bill.

The statement of the gentleman from Florida was correct with one exception: that is when a man outside the State uses the mail or otherwise communicates with someone within the State in the furtherance of a conspiracy to commit an act of violence, arson, or bombing—that is clearly a violation under my amendment. Our aim is to apply criminal sanctions against the people outside the reach of the State.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and in opposition to the substitute. In my opinion this amendment is just as necessary as the provisions on fair jury selection and fair housing may be.

This amendment, stated simply, would make it a Federal offense to travel in interstate commerce with the intent of inciting riots and other forms of violent civil disturbance. I hasten to assure the House that the constitutionally protected right of freedom of assembly is not in any way restricted and neither is the right to peacefully protest. The Byrnes Act makes it a Federal offense to move in interstate commerce for the purpose of engaging in strikebreaking. Surely the same principle which is broad enough to protect the right to strike is broad enough to protect the community against violence whether they be instigated by certain minority groups of Negroes or minority groups of whites such as the Ku Klux Klan. Mr. CRAMER's amendment would cover both.

Mr. Chairman, since my first day in the House I have supported and shown concern for efforts to protect minority rights. I have introduced civil rights legislation on my own and supported legislation to repeal the poll tax in the 87th Congress, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the 88th Congress and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in the 89th Congress. I would very much like to support this bill, but at the same time we must protect the rights of the minority of one—the person whose life is endangered or whose property is threatened. This person, too, is a minority—often a forgotten minority—it seems. He is the citizen in Chicago, Cleveland, or New York who fears to leave his home or drive for his car may be overturned or take an evening stroll for he may get a rock intended for someone else.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what has happened today is an illustration of what can happen in this body when we try to write legislation on the floor.

The gentleman from Florida says—and I am sure he speaks truly when he says—that he has carefully thought out his amendment. But I should like to point out that the matter of Federal riot control was not brought up in the subcommittee or in the full committee. All the pages of the hearings are silent so far as this subject is concerned. If there is a need for a Federal law on riot control, then there should be hearings. I do not believe we should be writing this section on the floor in the Committee.

The amendment of the gentleman from Florida is not relevant. Title V has to do with civil rights crimes, and the crimes are carefully defined. Title V provides Federal criminal law to protect people who are exercising certain federally protected rights, such as on voting, on the use of public accommodations, on public education, on employment, on housing, and when people are exercising free speech or peaceful assembly.

The riots in our large cities have nothing to do with the great peaceful nonviolent civil rights movement, which is a crusade every American is proud of and which reflects so favorably throughout the world on the United States. Nor are civil rights leaders involved in these riots, except in urging peaceful solutions to them and in seeking to remove the basic causes of these urban riots.

These are slum riots. They occur in every society where one segment of the population is denied education, jobs, housing, or a decent way of life.

I am glad to see that the gentleman from Florida is concerned with the problems of our great northern urban cities. His support would certainly be welcome in the domestic programs designed to eliminate the root causes—programs such as manpower retraining, antipoverty, and health and education.

I say that it is wrong to include in this bill a new Federal law concerning riot control in our cities. The matter of law and order and keeping of the public peace in our cities has always been traditionally a matter of local control.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, in all the weeks of hearings there has been no evidence presented whatsoever that Federal intervention, a new Federal law, is required insofar as riot control of the cities is concerned.

I might point out that the distinguished Members of this body who constantly fight against further Federal encroachment and who support States rights day after day are now asking for a new Federal law that would require and authorize new Federal intervention in the matter of keeping law and order in the cities.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I guess we have all come to a rather unexpected turn of events in this debate when we find previously the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] is basing an argument on the 14th amendment and certainly an unexpected turn that I never expected to see when we find previously the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] arguing for once in his life for States rights. It is indeed an about face. I never knew the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] felt the States had any rights.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman very much, and I point out that I am from California but my name is Mr. EDWARDS and not Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 which in particular represents one of the foundations of the purposes and scope of H.R. 14765. Title V seeks to eliminate violence against our citizens who seek to exercise their constitutional rights.

Too often acts of racial violence have gone unpunished and a reign of terror has resulted in the attitude of indifference toward the rights which Congress has sought to protect by past civil rights legislation. Unfortunately, in some areas of our Nation, local law enforcement officials have been unwilling or unable to solve and prosecute crimes of racial violence.

As a result of these incidents of violence designed to deter citizens from exercising their civil and human rights, the need for Federal legislation became clear. Congress has the responsibility to enforce the legislative intent which it has made clear in enacting prior civil rights bills and to provide the vehicle for punishing those who would flout the will of Congress and the Constitution of the United States.

When a single citizen is attacked in order to prevent him from exercising his rights, it is not merely a local matter. I have stated before that I believe that the rights of all are in danger when a single American is deprived of his rights. The persecution of the Negro must be of concern to all Americans for just as we deplore the persecution of Catholics in the Congo, Buddhists in Vietnam or the Jews in the Soviet Union. We must be equally concerned about justice for all at home. Let the eyes of the world look on the United States without seeing justice blinded by hatred and bigotry, for until that day, our image abroad will not be that of a true democracy.

Section 501(a) provides criminal sanctions against those who by force or threat of force, injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin while he is lawfully engaged or seeking to engage in the areas of protected civil rights.

The areas of activity protected include voting, public education, public services and facilities, employment, housing, jury service, use of common carriers, participation in federally assisted programs, and public accommodations.

Section 501(b) makes it a crime for private individuals or public officials to use force or threat of force either to deter participation in any of the protected activities described in section 501(a) or to retaliate against those who have participated in such activities or urged others to do so.

Section 501(c) protects from violence or threat of violence public officials and private persons who have duties to carry out with respect to the protected activities, if the violence is intended to discourage them from affording, or is a reprisal for having afforded, other persons equal treatment.

The remaining sections of title V relates to penalties for violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

I urge my colleagues to support these provisions as a means of providing to our citizens the security which renders freedom meaningful and to abolish the fear of retaliation or intimidation which is caused by violence against those who attempt to exercise those rights guaranteed by the Constitution and spelled out by Congress. I urge approval of title V.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject in which I have long been interested. I introduced a bill along these general lines in the 88th Congress and again at the beginning of the 89th Congress. Both times my bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and no action was ever taken on the same thereafter. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion with reference to the legal applications of these various amendments. I want to say that I favor the one that will do the most good and accomplish the objectives we seek to attain.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUCK. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for those complimentary remarks. The interstate commerce use approach I made was similar to the gentleman's bill. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. TUCK. I did not mean to imply that I was trying to take credit away from my distinguished and learned friend from Florida but simply wanted to point out to him and to the Members of the Committee that this is a subject in which I have long been interested. We all know that anyone who has experience in these riots and these disturbances knows in every place where they have occurred they have been instigated by those who came from the outside and who precipitated the riot or the strife. We also know that the local police have been able to handle these things ordinarily, but the difficulty is heretofore the Federal Government in certain places, at least in Virginia, sent men in from various departments who consulted and consorted with these people who swarmed upon us like the locusts of Egypt to bring harm and detriment to that community in creating havoc in the enforcement of the law. I do not know which one of these three amendments is the best. I have some doubts about the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, because I have always been reminded of that old adage, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts."

I am somewhat in the position of the man who got a telegram from faraway California saying that his mother-in-law had died. They asked him to wire instructions as to the disposition to make of the body. They asked, "Do you want it embalmed, cremated, or buried?" He wired back and said, "Take no chances, do all three."

So I am in favor of doing whatever is necessary to bring an end to these disturbances and riots. The people of America are incensed and alarmed over what is going on. The time has come when it must stop.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], for the very fine and able work that they have done and what they have contributed to these discussions here on the floor. I can certainly say the same thing goes for my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], as well as others and particularly the dean of the Virginia delegation, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, who in my judgment, is one of the greatest men who has ever served in the Congress of the United States in any period.

I would also like to compliment my friends on this side for their skill and dexterity and for their talent in what they have done, although I am in violent disagreement with their objections. As I have often said to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], it is a great pity that the Lord did not endow him with the will to marshal his extraordinarily valuable talents in the right direction. Even though we disagree on legislation the gentleman knows I am very fond of him personally.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is quite evident, I believe, from the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, preceded by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, that there is some confusion in our minds with respect to this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are in an unusual posture.

The gentleman from South Carolina advocated that the Federal Government participate in the various States, and the gentleman from California advocated States rights in this instance. So you will have to take a choice. I believe, though, it is quite clear that the Cramer amendment, as perfected by the substitute which has been offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], is clearly the most desirable means by which to achieve the end, which obviously a great majority of us want. We want this protection added to the law.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Of course, I yield to my dean.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman meant to refer to the Corman substitute.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. To the "CORMAN"—that is his name, CORMAN.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman used the name "CRAMER."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I did. I used it, as perfected by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN]. Is that not our situation? I believe it is.

Mr. Chairman, no one here in this body is an advocate of riots. Everyone here in this body, I am certain, wants very much reasonable Federal legislation as title V is drawn, to prevent this type of activity, especially as it would be amended by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the gentleman's amendment is as broad as it can be.

Mr. Chairman, there was some reference to impunity on the part of one using the telephone in interstate commerce. I believe it is clearly covered, as is the mail specifically and clearly covered.

And, if there are other transgressions in interstate commerce, for one beyond which, let me say, the gentleman has no right to go whether it be in the proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina or by anyone else.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly advocate that we support the Corman substitute, and then we will have a viable, feasible, workable, and reasonable law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, the Ashmore amendment, and all amendments thereto, conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 2:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard much in this Chamber during the last 2 weeks about the virus of discrimination, and it is rightfully something with which we should be concerned. Let no one, however, suggest that the only problem we face in this sensitive area of race relations is the problem of discrimination.

I think there is another virus that is affecting the body politic in this country today and that is the virus of lawlessness and violence. We just heard the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] say, "if" an antiriot statute is necessary. He thereby questioned the immediacy of any need for antiriot legislation. Gentlemen the fires of racial tension are burning in this country and not just in a figurative sense but in a literal sense.

For anyone to stand before this Chamber and say we have to expect riots, and that when people in our society are deprived that they are naturally going to riot is to adopt the line in a Broadway play of a couple of seasons ago that said, "We are depraved because we are deprived."

Because of that deprivation, we are supposed to submit to acts of moral depravity that we have witnessed on a fantastic scale all over the country in recent weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to suggest in the very strongest possible terms that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is not a perfecting amendment; it is a gutting amendment. These words "in furtherance of a conspiracy" are very carefully selected words of art that are designed to increase the quantum of proof to the point where it would be almost impossible to obtain a conviction under the statute.

As a former prosecutor, I know a little bit about how difficult it is to do anything in the prosecution of a criminal conspiracy. I think I can offer you yet another reason, gentlemen of the House, why they are seeking to "perfect"—and I put that word in quotation marks—the language of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. It is because the idea of conspiracy is not popular with this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Katzenbach, on the television 2 weeks ago on Sunday. Maybe some of you saw the program "Issues and Answers."

He was asked the question:

> Mr. Attorney General, do you think that a criminal conspiracy is behind the acts of terror and violence that we see sweeping the streets of America today?

Very blandly, Mr. Katzenbach said:

> Oh, no. It would be a tragic mistake to assume that there is a conspiracy.

He said:

> There are people who are trying to take advantage of the situation. We have our eye on them. We are going to watch them.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come to do more than just have our eye on these people and watch them.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to enact the kind of positive deterrent legislation that will put these people on advance notice that if you travel—as the language of the amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] makes abundantly clear—that if you travel in interstate commerce with the intent to commit acts of violence that you are violating the criminal laws of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do something. Somebody said that no one in this House is against antiriot legislation. I think that does take in almost everybody, but there are apparently some people in this Chamber who do not want to see the kind of clear and concise language adopted that would tell the people of America that the Congress is concerned and the time has come when we are going to do something about it.

I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] come before the House just a couple of days ago and say with respect to title IV, "This is tough legislation." Gentlemen, he boasted it was tough language in title IV. I say—let us get some tough language in title V. Let us do something to protect the rights of some of the innocent people in this country who have seen their property plundered, destroyed, pillaged, and looted in recent days and weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], the so-called perfecting amendment, ought to be voted down and that then the House ought to adopt the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent statement and say that what this legislation badly needs is a strong civil responsibility clause as suggested by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with the gentleman from Iowa. But somehow it has become very unpopular and very difficult for anyone to stand up in this House and to suggest that we ought to equate responsibilities with rights, and yet not to do so is to encourage a spirit of lawlessness and violence that could tear down and destroy the America that everyone of us loves.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have seen a lot of new visitors come into the Chamber. Would the gentleman confirm as a good lawyer the fact that my substitute amendment would cover Rockwell, the Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, the assailant who—acting individually and on his own—shot James Meredith—whereas the amendment of the gentleman from California would require that any troublemaker would have to be acting in concert with somebody else.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, absolutely. I think once again my friend from Florida has emphasized a very important point that this is no racist amendment. It was not designed against anybody who because of the particular color of his skin has gone out and has sought to incite or commit violence. This affects the white race as well as the members of the Negro race who advocate violence. As well it should.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I agree with every word the gentleman from Illinois has uttered. I think it is what we have been needing for quite some time. I am sure the American people will be glad to read his statement and know that some of us feel that very way about this situation.

Perhaps my amendment is too strong. Maybe I cannot get enough votes to adopt it. Probably I cannot. Nevertheless, I am glad I came here and offered it to you for discussion, consideration, and analysis. I believe the Cramer amendment is a little weaker. It does not cover quite so much as mine and a violation of the law would be a little more difficult to prove under his amendment.

The amendment of my friend, the gentleman from California, would weaken my amendment still more. It would eliminate some other people who ought to be prosecuted and who ought to be in the penitentiary for some of the things they have been doing and are continuing to do.

So I would urge that you vote down the Corman amendment and then vote for the Cramer substitute amendment. If it does not pass, then I ask you to vote for my amendment. I have no particular pride in authorship. Let us do what we know ought to be done in this area here today and make the American people proud of us.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I think some of the difficulties here in which we find conservatives, so-called, whatever that means, and liberals, whatever that means, on both sides—the conservatives arguing for the 14th amendment and liberals arguing for States rights—is due to an inherent defect in this title. This title is directed toward people protecting them because of what they are doing, because they are engaged in civil rights activities. I think it is analogous to statutes that some of our States have or once had that made the crime murder if a policeman were killed. Finally someone took a rather scholarly approach to the question and found that in all cases where there was murder the crime would have been murder anyway, and the fact that a policeman was involved should not make any difference.

I am suggesting that we are legislating civil rights crimes. I think someone used that phrase. In doing so, all our people should be entitled to equal protection, protection of the same sort, whether they are engaged in civil rights activities or not. If they were engaged in civil rights activity and would have an egg thrown at them, I suppose they would then be covered under this title. Or they might be taking a U.S. census and be killed, in which case they would not be covered by this title.

I think equal protection demands that we look at something more than the motivation and the activity in which these people are engaged.

It has also been mentioned that during the weeks of hearings certain things were not brought up. Gentlemen, there were no hearings in the full committee. Just so the record is straight on that point, the Mathias amendment first appeared in the full committee. There were no hearings in the full committee.

I thank the Chair and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that I am unequivocally against rioting and looting. I am against rape. I am against murder. I am against robbery. I did say that there is no evidence that the States are unwilling to or incapable of enforcing criminal law prohibiting each of those crimes. What you call the gutting amendment, I say is an amendment which gives us a reason for legislation in this field. We are reaching people who cannot be reached by State authority. To imply that I condone that kind of conduct because I am willing to leave to States the right and responsibility to enforce the law is not fair.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am sure that the gentleman from California, being the responsible legislator that he is, certainly does not condone crime and violence. But let me say this, that I would have been a little more impressed by the argument that he has just made, about how desirous he is to avoid the preemption of State action, and of State ability to act in this field of criminal law, if he had shown a similar solicitude when we were debating title IV of this bill. We talked time and time again about the 17 or so States of this Union that had already adopted the fair housing laws and fair housing legislation. There was not any concern at that time as to whether or not the Federal Government ought to step, heavyhanded and with both feet, into this field of fair housing under title IV, and to preempt the field as far as the States are concerned. I find it a little inconsistent when we are talking about State criminal laws for the gentleman to show this kind of concern.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that we have substantial evidence before our committee of failure on the part of many States to act in this field. We have not a shred of evidence of failure on the part of the States to act in curbing riots and other crimes of violence.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman feel, despite the riots and the disorders and the looting and the burnings that we have seen over the past few months, that there have been very many prosecutions in any jurisdictions?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, there have been a substantial number of prosecutions in the State of California. I cannot speak for others.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Does the gentleman feel they have served as any considerable deterrent to activity of that kind?

Mr. CORMAN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do. The State of California has the ability and the desire and the resources to handle this problem. I have confidence they will do it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. ST. ONGE. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I thank him for his indulgence.

I am sorry I do not share the extreme optimism of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] about the course of events in this country. I receive on my desk every day, as we all do, a press summary of events around the country. I remember days when there were pages and pages, solid, devoted to nothing but riots and disturbances and so-called civil commotion going on in various States all over the country. If the gentleman feels in his heart that they can take care of that sort of thing in the State of California, well and good. But it seems to me, after what we have seen in State after State, and city after city, across the land, that this Congress ought to stand up and let the country know we are concerned about this situation, concerned enough to take the action suggested by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] in the amendment he has offered.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. I know there has been some confusion of names here. I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

I believe that the substitute being offered by the gentleman from California does weaken the basic purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. This whole dialog on the three amendments—one of which we have reason to believe will be adopted—demonstrates again the old adage that there is no greater force than an idea whose time has come. This Congress is beginning to realize that the time has come to deal effectively with the problem of civil disobedience now sweeping America. The amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER is similar to one I had prepared for introduction as soon as I was recognized. I had told the committee I would offer an antiriot amendment because I am firmly opposed to the fact that among some people in this country, rioting, mass demonstrations, and contempt for law and order have become a way of life.

I am not at all persuaded by arguments that this amendment was not presented to the committee and there were no hearings on it. On Friday afternoon, we voted down an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] to strike from this bill the Fair Housing Board, even though there were statements made on this floor that neither the President of the United States nor the Attorney General had requested such legislation, and that there had been no testimony presented upon this. So let us not be deluded by any arguments here that Congress cannot work its will on the floor of this House.

We are having very troublesome and dismal days in Chicago. On both sides of this issue, there are powerful forces at play, appealing to race hate and prejudice.

Earlier today I called the FBI to inquire what the agency was doing in Chicago to pick out those who start these riots. I was annoyed to learn the FBI has no right to go into a situation like this even if only to investigate. The amendment before us would give the FBI such a right.

The amendment which the gentleman has offered would go a long way toward helping remove from this struggle those who have nothing in mind but dissention; those who have contempt for human dignity and travel from city to city, sowing their seeds of dissention.

The FBI and our own police in Chicago have proof that there are all sorts of forces from all over the country coming into Chicago, coming into Cleveland, and so forth. These are people who have no basic concern for civil rights or the dignity of men. They are people trying to take advantage of the great revolution which is taking place in America.

These people should be exposed, and they should be prosecuted through the means either of the State or city government, or the Federal Government.

In Chicago, in the most brutal kind of appeal to race hate and prejudice we have seen, they are circulating this sort of brochure, as the one I have here, alleging that science proves human races are different. I will not insult the Members or this RECORD, by reading from this scurrilous pamphlet, but I say that those who are distributing it, don't have enough courage to identify themselves other than only a designation "P.O. Box 6665." They are afraid to become identified as to who they are or what they stand for, but never hesitate to fire up emotions and passions of people on both sides.

Last Friday Dr. King was struck on the head by a rock, thrown by someone in the crowd; someone who obviously had nothing but hatred in his heart.

These passions have been aroused to a great extent by people who have no interest in human dignity or civil rights.

J. Edgar Hoover stated the situation correctly, when he quoted William Foster, head of the Illinois Communist Party, as saying that they will take every advantage they can by arousing hatred and distrust among both sides. They are stirring up the white people on the North Side of Chicago and the Negroes on the South Side, because they have only one aim, and that is to break down law and order in this country.

In too many instances they are people who do not even live in Chicago. The Cramer amendment would bar them under heavy penalty from crossing State lines for the purpose of inciting riots. Actually, the substitute amendment submitted by the gentleman from California would weaken existing law. Right now we have a law on the books, in title 18, which makes arson a Federal offense. We passed that law in the Congress. As a matter of fact, it goes further and writes in a rebuttable presumption that there has been a crossing of State lines when arson is involved.

We have seen in too many instances people from one part of the country go into another part to incite riots. This amendment would bar such interstate traffic in unrest whether it be conducted by the American Nazi Party, whether it be conducted by the Ku Klux Klan or anyone else sowing distrust and chaos under the banner of civil rights.

Congress cannot leave here, and this bill cannot be voted out unless we deal equally and effectively with the protection of those who legitimately are trying to defend their rights as Americans on the one hand, and those who are trying to protect their properties, on the other.

I firmly believe our people can resolve their problems. I have great faith in the American people. I believe the average American is a reasonable man, if he is not fired up by these false appeals to race hate and prejudice.

Left alone, I am certain our people can reason together toward resolving their problems. But these peddlers of hate don't want communities to work out their problems in an amicable way. They want rioting, looting, damage, distrust. For the more of any of these they can stimulate, the closer they are to their goal of breaking down law and order and taking over. I have been in the forefront here in Congress in denouncing mobocracy. This amendment will go a long way in helping stem it in an interstate level.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, someone raised the question of how will this effect unions, that is a smokescreen. This amendment will not hurt unions or anyone else who is engaged in a legitimate, peaceful campaign to secure basic rights. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

If the rights of the minority to demonstrate are protected, Mr. Chairman, then the rights of the majority should be protected against the professional agitators who knowingly and purposely incite violent civil disobedience.

Debate on previous special privilege bills, such as the one that is before us today, has brought forth the argument that additional legislation of this nature was necessary to take the civil rights movement out of the streets and put it into court. Experience has shown, however, that the reverse has been true.

The passage of each force bill has simply increased the appetite of the irresponsible elements of our society. As mob violence has brought a favorable response to the demands of these elements, their demands have increased rather than diminished.

Unless action is taken to curb the lawless elements currently operating in our society, no neighborhood or city will be safe from violence and destruction. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, if the Members of Congress insist on passing additional civil rights legislation, then the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], is urgently needed and should be included in the bill presently under consideration. I therefore urge the adoption of the Cramer substitute.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer substitute amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending Cramer amendment and against limiting amendments. It is time that Congress recognized that the guarantee of protection of civil rights is one that should apply to all American citizens. I can think of no more important civil right than that of a person to be secure in his person, house, and effects, and in our America that right is seriously neglected. When interstate commerce is used, as evidence suggests it is being used to violate these rights, it becomes necessary that Congress act and act positively. A few years ago in St. Augustine in one of the few instances in which we have had racial disturbances in Florida, it was found that the principal agitators on both sides were imports. Florida people actually had very little to do with promoting or keeping alive the St. Augustine disturbance.

The amendments will accomplish the protection of people from recognized terror and violence promoted by professional agitators who use interstate facilities. When I read in the paper of 12-year-old Cynthia Day, who was hit in the face by glass shattered by a bullet in a riot in Chicago, I become disturbed about the violation of her civil rights. When I read about a Cleveland woman killed in the crossfire between snipers and police and another in New York who was shot while simply standing in her doorway, I wonder what has really been done to protect their civil rights. When I read in the paper about businesses and homes being burned to the ground by fire bombs and Molotov cocktails, I wonder how much longer citizens of this country everywhere will be safe in their homes.

I want my constituents to be safe in their homes at night, for their daughters to be able to walk home from school without fear of rape or murder, and for their stores and property to be safe from destruction and vandalism. I want their civil rights protected from riots and violence caused by professional outside agitators. This amendment will provide one additional step toward adequate protection for these rights. So much is needed to establish civil responsibility and civil responsibility is just as important as civil rights.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ashmore amendment and the Cramer substitute and in opposition to the Corman amendment.

The Cramer substitute makes it a violation of Federal law for a person to travel in interstate commerce with intent to incite or promote a riot or other violent civil disturbance or to participate in a riot or violent civil disturbance after crossing State lines.

We must find a way of stopping the troublemakers who go from city to city and State to State to promote riots and violence and stir up race against race and class against class. There is evidence that Communists are trying to take advantage of the civil rights movement to stir up trouble and damage our reputation as an enlightened people in the eyes of the world.

We are witnessing today an accelerating trend of civil disturbance and disrespect for law, in addition to an upsurge in standard criminal activity. Civil disobedience has nearly reached the state of anarchy in many sections of our country. Our large metropolitan areas are powder kegs. This is a deplorable state of affairs in a nation dedicated to the highest ideals of freedom and equal justice under law.

The time has come for Congress to speak up on the side of law and order in America. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

The Supreme Court has made certain that the criminals receive all of the protection to which they are entitled under the Constitution. Now is the time for Congress to protect the constitutional rights of the law-abiding citizen. The adoption of the Cramer amendment is a step in that direction.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a time to avoid any questioning of the motives or sincerity of any of us on this floor, and to look calmly and dispassionately at the situation which confronts this country. We must look calmly and dispassionately at the responsibility which confronts us as legislators and try to discharge that responsibility in the light of the situation facing us.

There is disagreement among some as to whether Communist agents or agents of their alien doctrines are participating in any great degree in some of the riots and disorders that have taken place and that have shaken this Nation.

There are some who say that they are a motivating and planning force in some of these serious disturbances that have taken life and destroyed millions of dollars of property. There are others who say they have merely taken advantage of the situation. However, whether they have merely moved about the country to take advantage of a situation or whether they have been a planning and moving force in some situation, is the national interest in meeting that problem any less either way you look at it?

And, is there any less a responsibility on us to try to provide Federal legislation to deal with those solitary agents moving about the country, whether they are the planners from the outset of a situation that explodes into violence and death or whether they merely move into a situation where there is high tension and explosive feeling within a community and then exploit it and carry it to the point of riot and civil disturbance?

I say to you regardless of what the role of that enemy of our country is, we have an opportunity here, a clear-cut opportunity, by a constitutional route that has a clear precedent in the Mann Act, if you please, to meet that situation through the Cramer substitute. I do not often take this well to speak on civil rights legislation. I certainly do not often find myself supporting the position of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], but I believe with all my heart that this is a sound and wise step for us at this time.

If we want this legislation to move constructively to meet some of the conditions that create riot and disorder and tension within our communities, do we not also want in this same legislation to punish the enemies of our country who exploit this racial tension, and do violence to law and order and to the very framework and foundation of our country?

I say to you regardless of whether you see it one way or the other, here is an opportunity to move responsibly and constructively to discharge a national responsibility. If it is a Federal violation of the law to cross a State line to carry out a plan to establish a house of prostitution, is it any less a responsibility of National Government to try to deal with the agent who crosses the State line with the intent and purpose of either creating a disturbance or a riot within a community or exploiting a situation that already exists and bringing it to the point of death and violence?

I say to you this is much more serious and our responsibility is clear. We should reject the Corman substitute and enact instead the Cramer substitute, thereby placing a law on the books which will meet this problem, doing it constitutionally and effectively and meeting our responsibility.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 2:50.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Ashmore amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:50. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could we see how many stand? I have noticed in prior occurrences that many stood after the time had been determined.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WHITTEN. I object at the moment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Cramer amendment, and the Ashmore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] has presented a constructive alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued to see the opponents of civil rights legislation, who usually argue most vociferously for States rights, supporting the Cramer and Ashmore amendments which would enlarge the Federal Government's role in law enforcement.

In the wave of emotion, which is engulfing this Chamber, this debate has lost sight of the purpose of title V. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that title is carefully drafted to protect those who are exercising their constitutionally guaranteed rights. Those rights have been specifically denied by acts of violence, violence intended to interfere with or discourage the exercise of those rights. Negroes have been shot at or harmed for registering to vote, for using public facilities, for attending public schools or universities. Contrary to statements made earlier on the floor by those who know better, James Meredith's attacker would be covered under title V as it is now drafted. It is intended to cover that kind of situation.

Mr. Chairman, a Federal criminal statute of this kind was made necessary by the refusal of State and local authorities to prosecute the offenders in certain States. Sheriffs refused to investigate; prosecutors refused to prosecute; juries refused to convict.

There is absolutely no evidence that a similar breakdown in law enforcement has crippled the States where riots have occurred.

Consequently, the Cramer and Ashbrook amendments are irrelevant to the purposes and findings of title V.

Mr. Chairman, while neither needed nor relevant, the Cramer amendment could be injurious.

It is not drafted in the same spirit as title V. Rather than punishing people for violence, as title V now does, this amendment would punish people for advocacy. There is a large and immensely important difference between these types of activities.

The effects of punishing advocacy should be well known by now. Who would qualify under this amendment as one who "incite(s), promote(s), (or) encourage(s)" a riot or "violent civil disturbance"? Could the Federal Government punish a public official who, in a public meeting which was widely reported, said that if he lived in a city slum, that he probably would lead a pretty big revolt himself?

The danger with laws which punish advocacy is that they know no limitation. That is why the first amendment was adopted for the protection of free speech.

The Cramer amendment contains a vice which was referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in his minority views set forth in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the language which I now quote is the language of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]:

> These provisions contain the vice of vagueness in violation of due process and may, as now worded, violate the freedom of speech guaranteed in the First Amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I disagree with his criticism of title V, certainly the gentleman's language is applicable to the Cramer amendment and is a sound reason for opposing it.

At a time of emotion and hysteria we must be especially vigilant to protect the Bill of Rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, this country is experiencing the worst widespread riots and violence and civil disobedience in its history. It is time for the Congress of the United States to speak out in opposition to such riots.

Here today, Mr. Chairman, we have an issue which is drawn crystal clear.

The amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] would condone such acts of violence. The amendment of the gentleman from Florida would prohibit, and put teeth into the enforcement of the criminal laws of this country, in order to punish conspirators and perpetrators of acts of violence and riots.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the time has come for the Members of this House to stand up and be counted on the side of law and order, or on the side in sympathy with violence, chaos, and anarchy.

Mr. Chairman, that opportunity will come on the votes on the Corman amendment and the Cramer amendment.

A vote for the Corman amendment and against the Cramer amendment will be a vote to condone riots, looting, arson, chaos, and anarchy. A vote against the Corman amendment and for the Cramer amendment will be a vote for law and order and a respect for law and order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude simply by saying this, that in an effort to show our respect for law and order in this country of ours the Committee should vote down the Corman amendment and support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Georgia would reconsider what he said, when he indicated that the Corman amendment would condone riots.

(The time allotted to Mr. Hagan of Georgia was granted to Mr. Flynt.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I will say in response to the gentleman from California that if I said that it would condone it, I would modify that to say that it would tend to condone the very acts of violence which we are seeking to prohibit by Federal statute here today.

Mr. CORMAN. If the gentleman would say that it would condemn them but it would leave to the States the right and responsibility to punish them unless there was an interstate conspiracy, then I would agree, but to say condone, I must object to that.

Mr. FLYNT. I would ask the gentleman from California how many indictments and convictions were secured as a result of the Watts riots of last year?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a substantial number. There were 3,645 arrests and 2,376 convictions. This clearly demonstrates the willingness and ability of State and local government to cope with the problem when it is purely intrastate in nature.

Mr. FLYNT. I urge that the Corman amendment be rejected and that the Ashmore-Cramer amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. Sikes, Mr. Williams and Mr. Hagan of Georgia and to Mr. Hungate, at their request, was granted to Mr. Whitten.)

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to yield most of my time to my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

I am in full accord with the Cramer amendment and I believe its enactment would serve to eliminate much of the racial tension which is now so prevalent in the country, especially in several large cities of the north.

Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that the House has spent far too much time on the civil rights bill. I think we should take a vote and move on to more important issues that favorably affect all Americans and not just a few whose demands can never be met as long as they ask something for nothing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, my friends throughout the debate many of us have repeatedly pointed out that while our country is suffering from the greatest wave of lawlessness perhaps in its history, certainly since reconstruction days, instead of doing something to help law enforcement the Congress is here passing a law declaring jury service a right even for irresponsible persons. Now is that not something! I ask you to read again my remarks on this subject which appear earlier in this Record.

Do you really want to go home and try to explain what you have done toward helping protect your people from riots, and end up by saying or admitting that during these grave and trying times in the Nation's history the best you could come up with was a bill giving the right of jury service to irresponsible citizens?

Mr. Chairman, the pending Cramer amendment, if adopted, certainly would give authority to the Attorney General to act when one or more persons goes into a State for the purpose of inciting a riot and of course makes a move toward that end. So far as those who make a practice of going from State to State doing those acts, the logical result of which would be to cause a riot, with this amendment I do not see how the Attorney General could fail to investigate and in many cases to act.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, a New Yorker, more than an acquaintance of people with questionable associations, came to my State to create strife. He and his followers succeeded. After finishing up in my State this man, Mario Savio, went to California where he spearheaded the turmoil which came close to wrecking the University of California. I was at the university when I spoke to the California Council of Growers, at San Francisco. Believe me, conditions at the university were bad.

The agitators virtually took over. The president resigned and from the press, many people raise the question as to whether the university has yet fully recovered. If you will check with people who know and who have taken the time to check, you will find that in many of the movements that have taken place here at the Capital, the very same people coming into this area are ones who took part in the Philadelphia disturbances. From all accounts the same is true of riots in Chicago, in Cleveland, and so on down the line.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, surely the gentleman does not mean to indicate that this amendment would make possible the prosecution of Mario Savio for traveling from Mississippi to California to go to college; is that what this amendment does?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say this amendment would require conclusive proof that he crossed a State line for the purpose of inciting a riot and under general law, of course, would have to have committed some overt act toward that end to be held responsible. Of course, my friend from Wyoming was facetious. In those cases where individuals do leave one State for another for the purpose of carrying on or inciting riots and committing acts toward that end, they would be subject to prosecution under this amendment.

As to the Corman amendment, requiring proof of conspiracy, those of you who have had experience in court know of the heavy burden that would be put upon the prosecutor's office for it is very difficult to show a conspiracy.

This amendment would call for each individual to be held responsible for his own actions, and if he crosses a State line from one State to another to continue his efforts to incite riots, in this bill we would have made at least a step forward which might help to bring back law and order to a country that so badly needs it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will support the Cramer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer]. All Americans have reason to feel deep concern about the new militant note of "black power" championed at present by certain segments of the civil rights leadership, by the signs of increasing subversive influence in this movement, and by the resultant wave of rioting and violence throughout the United States.

In a 20-day period in July, eight U.S. cities were ripped apart by race riots or near riots. These riots resulted in 7 killed, nearly 200 injured, and property damage running into millions of dollars. All of this in 3 weeks and all in the name of civil rights.

Title V as proposed offers great protection to civil rights workers. However, without the amendment now under consideration, it offers no protection to merchants, policemen, or ordinary citizens who become the victims of rioting, looting, and violence on the part of the perpetrators of civil disobedience.

This amendment will provide for a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both for anyone who travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, with intent to incite, promote, encourage, or carry on, or facilitate the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on, of a riot or other violent civil disturbances; or commit any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act which is a crime under Federal or State law, in furtherance of an act or activity as previously specified; or assist, encourage, or instruct any person to commit or perform any such act.

Within our Nation, there is no place for the substitution of mob violence and anarchy for due process of law. If mob action is to continue to be condoned, and legislation is enacted under the guise of protection for civil rights, which in fact affords protection to those who are bent upon the continued practice of civil disobedience, such as already resulted in the ravages of wanton rioting and civil chaos in our city streets, what will the end be?

Now is the time for the Congress to accept its responsibility in this matter, and to enact this amendment which will bring those responsible for fomenting rioting and violence under penalty of Federal law. Surely everyone who has read his daily newspaper on any day of any recent week would applaud such an act by the Congress, and find it to be timely and necessary.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I am unalterably opposed to this entire bill. I have made my feelings well known during this lengthy debate, and when the hour for the final vote arrives, I expect to join with what I sincerely hope will be a majority of the Members of this body in sending this ignominious legislative monstrosity down to defeat.

I am opposed to each title of the bill. I am particularly incensed with titles IV and V. This afternoon, however, when the amendment to title V, section 502, was proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], I felt that title was strengthened.

The gentleman from Florida's [Mr. CRAMER] amendment is an improvement which was needed. It gives some meaning and purpose to title V, although I am hopeful we will defeat the title later this afternoon.

There are some of our colleagues who would frown on the purpose of this amendment—to protect the civil rights of individuals who suffer from riots through absolutely no fault of their own. I find this a bit hard to believe, as these gentlemen spend long hours talking of equality for all, and equal protection under the law. What then has changed their minds? Can it be that this amendment finally reaches people that have heretofore been untouched and immune from the law for irresponsible actions which have incited riots? have created civil disorder and strife? have assisted and taught others to cause riots and civil disobedience?

Mr. Chairman, no one is more aware of the dangers of having outsiders come into an otherwise harmonious area and incite violence and civil disobedience. My colleagues will well remember the dangerous situation which existed in the State of Alabama, and indeed in my hometown of Montgomery—just as they remember Watts in California.

There is no doubt in my mind that had this amendment been adopted in the civil rights bill of 1964, most—if not all—of the violence we experienced in Alabama would have been avoided. I cannot speak for the Watts district. As I have repeated time and again, our greatest source of trouble in Birmingham, Selma, and Montgomery stemmed from outside agitation which was allowed to flourish uncontrolled in any manner. This amendment would have given the agitators pause to reflect had they faced a jail sentence, a fine, or both.

It is particularly delightful to note that under the terms of the amendment even the use of the mails to incite, promote, et cetera, riots or violent civil disturbances can be punishable. This should go far in holding down the violence which has been occurring in northern cities this summer. It should go far in preventing a Stokely Carmichael from whipping his supporters into a frenzy. It may give the overworked and overcriticized Chicago police force a well-deserved rest after weeks of attempting to keep crowds under control after they have been inflamed by out-of-State leaders interfering in Chicago's affairs.

Now I am well aware that one of the key words in this amendment is "intent." It is a key word in any criminal action. I can already hear some of the "black power" fanatics pleading before a sympathetic Supreme Court that they did not have any intention of causing crime, violence, or arson. Just because their followers chanted a few choruses of "Burn, Baby, Burn" shouldn't signify any intention to cause trouble. Well, we will face that hurdle if worst comes to worst and the civil rights bill of 1966 becomes law.

This afternoon we have struck a blow for the individual of this Nation. The harassed, innocent victim of violence will benefit and the offender punished. It is with a deep pride that I add my support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, the Ashmore-Cramer amendment as proposed to the Committee today would make it a Federal crime for a person to cross State lines for the purpose of inciting riots, mobs, and demonstrations which result in the destruction of property, death, or maiming of innocent persons.

Mr. Chairman, our local and State law-enforcement agencies can cope with local crime and local demonstrations. However, when organized mobs from other areas of the country invade a local community with trained agents, trained demonstrators, and those trained in mob violence, it becomes extremely difficult for local law enforcement officers to handle the situation.

Thousands who have been trained in mob violence could come into a State from other States and constitute an invasion of a local community. This type of situation solicits the urgent attention of the Congress.

This amendment must be passed. Those of us who have been in South Vietnam this year can testify that one of the greatest concerns of our men fighting in Vietnam is the demonstrations, violence, and disrespect for law and order in the United States.

We have Federal laws which prevent a criminal from fleeing from one State to another. We have a Federal law, the Mann Act, which prohibits transportation of persons across State lines for immoral purposes. We have laws governing fair business practices of those involved in interstate commerce. It is at least as important that we pass legislation that will prevent conspirators and pressure groups from going into the great cities of our country to loot, steal, and to ransack. The American people and, indeed, the entire free world, have been shocked to see pictures of mobs and rioters loaded down with appliances, television sets, radios, and furniture looted from the stores of honest taxpaying American citizens.

We have been shocked to see innocent bystanders shot down on the streets. Property rights, the sanctity of our homes, freedom of our person, the right of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness are being threatened by mobs in the streets of our country today. This is the greatest single domestic problem.

Our men are fighting and dying in Vietnam against oppression, terror, and tyranny. We must protect the American people at home from terror, oppression, and tyranny. We must protect the right of our people to own property and to make a reasonable profit.

When Calvin Coolidge was Governor of the great State of Massachusetts, looting and rioting broke out in the historic city of Boston. Governor Coolidge said "there will be law and order." Governor Coolidge was sent ammunition and support by the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat. That slogan "law and order" made Calvin Coolidge a popular President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the American people today are for law and order. They are for the Constitution. They are for individual freedom; they are opposed to injustice and discrimination. They will hold this Congress responsible for the enactment of responsible legislation. We must keep faith with the American people by passing this amendment to make it a Federal violation to conspire together and cross State lines to destroy property and lives of our people.

I support and say this House should and will pass the amendment offered by my distinguished and able colleague, a great American, and a Democrat, BOB ASHMORE, as amended by my distinguished and able friend, a great American, and a Republican, BILL CRAMER, from Florida.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Cramer substitute and oppose the Corman amendment. The evil which the Cramer amendment seeks to cure has generated strike and civil commotion. It matters not the race or color, or political viewpoint of those involved, or their social outlook, or their political objective. The evil of this matter is violence, which must be suppressed by all lawful means. We will make a step forward by supporting the Cramer substitute, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer amendment.

American citizens have witnessed in recent weeks, riots and civil disobedience to a degree never seen before in this country. America has been built and has grown and prospered on the principle that this is a country of laws, that respect for lawful authority is sound and is the basis for future progress. The rights of no man can be secure and safe if this principle is trampled upon and downgraded.

The Cramer amendment, by making it a Federal crime to cross State lines for the purpose of inciting riots, recognizes the serious state of affairs that faces this country. We have Federal statutes now that prohibit certain crimes and acts. The Congress has acted in the past to pass such laws. Why is it not important today that the Congress act to show plainly to those who have been responsible for and behind the riots that have taken place in recent weeks, that the American people are fed up with what is going on?

If in this same title of this Civil Rights Act, we can write into Federal law certain enumerated crimes, then in my opinion, this amendment is well within the overall purposes of this title.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I rise in strong support of the Cramer amendment and yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Is it not ironic that while we have been debating the Civil Rights Act of 1966 in this Chamber, riots and lawless acts have been inflicted on many innocent persons across the land—most occurring, I submit, in areas outside the Southland? Is it not ironic that the recent violence has come during congressional consideration of the most sweeping civil rights legislation in the Nation's history?

While it may be ironic, it is perhaps understandable.

Too often, too many have been led to believe that problems—social and economic—can be settled in the streets. Too many believe that they have a "right" to riot.

In my judgment, one of the most serious—and tragic—domestic problems of our time has centered on general disrespect for law. This situation has not only been tolerated, in some instances it has been encouraged as a necessary attendant to civil and social progress.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous doctrine in a civilized society when some are allowed to operate on the theory that they obey only those laws which they like.

Are not many of those on the scene of the current Chicago outbursts of violence the same ones responsible for the gleeful cries of "burn, baby, burn" in Watts?

Many of the riots which now disturb the serenity of a hot night in many neighborhoods across the country are instigated, incited and initiated by invaders intent on disturbance. They come as an offensive odor on a hot summer's night to inflame a neighborhood with which they can have only a passing interest with their incendiary message of hate and a call to violence.

The innocent people of this Nation have the right to be free and safe in their homes and on the streets. They have the right to expect to have their persons and their property protected from the hostility of professional instigators of violence. The Congress owes them this right and we who are the Members of it have the duty to afford them what should be a basic guarantee of freedom from violence.

We can and we should impede the growing lawlessness now rampant in our Nation which has seen crime increase more than 50 percent in the past several years. We can and we should by passage of this amendment erect signs at our State lines saying that you shall not cross this line to intimidate lawful citizens.

Enactment of the Cramer amendment, Mr. Chairman, will do much to return the rights of free men, the right to be free from the violence too often inflicted as the result of inflammatory acts by professional, foreign agitators.

I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer substitute to the Ashmore amendment and in opposition to the so-called Corman amendment.

For the third time in as many years, this House is being asked to approve sweeping legislative proposals in the name of "civil rights." It is regrettable that this House does not have the courage to speak its sincere convictions by turning down this legislation. Any thoughtful American of whatever political or philosophical persuasion, can see very clearly that this is another political decision in the making. Of course, I am opposed to this unconstitutional, unwise, and unnecessary legislation. If it must be passed, however, under the continuing banner of protecting the "rights of minorities," let us also make certain that its provisions protect the rights—yes, the life, liberty, and property of all Americans of all races, creeds, and colors.

It is regrettable that the Ashmore and Cramer amendments are necessary. If an appropriate amendment such as one of these, however, is not passed at this time in this legislation, there is little likelihood that this Congress will pass necessary law and order legislation. Personally, I would prefer separate legislation on the subject. The necessities of the hour require at least some semblance of protection for all Americans—the majority and minorities alike in this legislation.

Our people are naturally deeply concerned over the war in Vietnam. Beyond that conflict, nonetheless, if there is any other matter which the people of America are greatly concerned about, it is what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] so eloquently described as the virus of disrespect for law and order. They cannot understand how this great deliberative body can continue, along with the Supreme Court, to render decisions in the form of legislation which, however motivated, will have the impact of encouraging lawlessness.

I sometimes wonder if the majority in this body are really alert as to public opinion in this country—not public opinion in the South, but public opinion of the North, South, East, and West against violence and threats of violence all over this land. More than that, I wonder if the majority of us here are mindful to the increasing intolerance of our people to our seeming indifference to this growing problem of lawlessness. I wonder how many of us realize that this concern on the part of a vast majority of the people of America is rapidly taking the form of disrespect for and lack of confidence in their Government—the Supreme Court, the Executive, and now regrettably the legislative branch. It is later than we think. No longer do our people have to be told concerning the facts of life. They read them. They hear them. They see them daily. Make no mistake about it. They are angered. It might be better to say they are aroused with righteous indignation over things that are taking place on the domestic scene and the seeming unwillingness or indifference of their elected public officials to do anything about them.

Every day the headlines are: "Violence Continues in Chicago," or "More Violence in Cleveland." In city after city, riots and violence continue. Most assuredly we have a long way to go in making life more meaningful and more abundant for all of our people, including, especially, certain minorities. Nonetheless, is it not time for those in the highest places in our land—yes, those in the White House, those on the Supreme Court, those in the Congress of the United States and yes, leaders at every level of government and in all our Nation's citizenship-building institutions—to start preaching more and more about the responsibilities of all our people? Should we not emphasize and reemphasize that good citizenship is not inherited? It is grown. Like character, it is what we are and not what someone thinks we are. Should all of these intitutions not forthwith, before another hour passes, start saying—repeating over and over again—that for every right there is a corresponding duty or responsibility?

I, for one, am sick and tired of reading and hearing such a wonderful flood of doubletalk from theologians and sociologists trying to explain how it all happens, why it happens and what should be done to prevent lawlessness in our land. Much of what they say may be true, but they completely ignore even a suggestion of responsibilities as well as rights. Those who riot and those who attempt to stop riots are dealing not with theories, but with events that are happening fast and furious, leaving little time for thought. It is becoming increasingly clear that, however honorably motivated certain movements may be, sinister forces are at work within these movements and behind lawlessness, either before or after it breaks out. These forces of evil in this land, be they individuals or groups of individuals of whatever race, creed, or color, must be found, exposed, convicted, and punished.

As someone has said: "What is the difference between stimulating the masses to a fever pitch of violence under the guise of nonviolence and stirring up emotions of people with lawlessness as the objective?" I am convinced that the motive operation, the indicated design and organization, and the technique which seems to have been adopted by many of these groups are centrally managed. The advocates of "black power, get Whitey," and "take the gun and holster away from the white man and put it on the black man," have clearly adopted a course of extreme action which coincides with the action about which they seem to complain.

Church and civic leaders, including many clergymen in this country—many, I am sure, motivated with the best of intentions—have not all helped in our search for solutions to these problems. In fact, the increased defiance of law and order and of responsible and respected law enforcement officers whom we pay to protect us all in almost every section of this country, is in large measure due to their public support of the idea that "civil disobedience is justifiable if one believes the law to be morally wrong." Lawlessness has helped neither the cause and freedom of the Negro nor the freedom and image of America.

The time has long since passed when the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Supreme Court should say in no uncertain terms that violence, riots, burnings, pillage, theft, murder, and lawlessness in whatever form from whatever source, will not be tolerated in this land. If all the people of America are to enjoy, at least some of the fruits of the affluent society we have today, regardless of their station in life—whether they be white or black, rich or poor, high or low, educated or uneducated—they must support and defend law and order in this country. We cannot survive without it.

We cannot do a full job with the proposed amendments, but if this legislation is going to pass—and the majority of you, as of the moment at least, appear to have made up your minds to pass it—the Cramer amendment or the Ashmore amendment or some other amendment with the same intent is imperative. If this so-called civil rights bill of 1966 passes this Congress without some provision designed to protect honest law-abiding citizens of all races and faiths from the lawless elements in our land, it may hereafter be too late.

Here we are, a nation with over 300,000 of our finest sons giving their all, including many of their lives, in Vietnam in our fight against communism and in our defense of freedom and self-government throughout the world, while here at home the highest Court of our land, uninhibited by the most powerful legislative body in the world—this Congress, has opened wider the door of opportunity to communism through the Communist Party, to more and more materialism, secularism, and lawlessness.

I am reminded of two Biblical admonitions which are particularly appropriate for a powerful nation such as ours: "He that thinketh, he standeth. Take heed lest he fall" and "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What will it profit America if she wins the war against communism and lawlessness and godlessness in Vietnam—even throughout the world and yet loses the same war at home?

May I close with a suggestion that during all these manmade efforts, we as a people and as a nation need to call upon Almighty God for more faith in Him, for a better understanding of His magnificent purpose in our lives and for a greater courage to fulfill the many glorious tasks He has committed to our care.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state there is no man in this House for whom I have higher regard or respect than the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Jamie Whitten. However, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Florida. I believe it is good. I have so stated to him. I simply do not want its effect destroyed by any language in this debate which would indicate it is going to be used to prosecute any college student leading a demonstration peacefully and honestly for the good of his fellow men.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendments and the substitutes that are being debated now are under title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. Title V is to protect individuals against acts of violence against civil rights workers and others who may be working in a nonviolent way.

I do not believe in clear conscience, Mr. Chairman, that we can even begin to touch upon the seriousness of the problem, that is the root causes that have generated the unfortunate disturbances throughout our major cities. I believe they defy being answered by the amendments under discussion. So I am going to support the Corman amendment. I am going to hope that the real study that is needed to get to the root of the problems, regardless of whether the agitation is black or white, will be taken up in a little more formal way than has been attempted on this floor this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Poff yielded his time to the gentleman from Florida.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about these two amendments. When we examine the Cramer amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, it is plain that they have one objective in common, and that is to provide for a Federal crime against riots, disorder, and disobedience.

The Corman amendment, to my way of thinking, is better drawn. It comes nearer meeting the requirements of a definition of the crime which we are trying to reach. For that reason, I support the Corman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cramer amendment, the so-called antiriot amendment. With the increasing violence in every section of the country, it becomes increasingly obvious that we must prepare legislatively for any eventuality. The newspapers are filled with brash statements of many people who seem intent on inciting riots and generally resorting to violence in pursuit of their announced objectives.

As one who has consistently supported the reasonable requests of responsible civil rights advocates, I become increasingly disturbed over the current happenings in some sections of the country and among certain segments of the civil rights movement.

I have always worked to advance the "equal rights demands an assumption of equal responsibilities" doctrine. Rights and responsibilities go hand in hand.

There is no doubt but what there has been a deprivation of rights among many of our citizens over the years that has contributed to our overall problem. However, I would remind our colleagues that many so-called minority groups have overcome their problems by working together with others similarly affected to advance their cause through established organizations and institutions in the most responsible manner—I refer specifically to the Chinese and Japanese Americans, the Jewish people, and the various ethnic groups. All have had obstacles to overcome. For that matter, most of the Members of this House have been faced with some major obstacle to overcome in their lifetime.

With the rash of violence breaking out in many cities of this country, much of which gives the appearance of being organized and planned, I believe we, in the Congress, have to assume the leadership role in providing the legislative vehicle that will serve to counter this trend toward expanding violence.

Today, we are being subjected to pressures in our society that have heretofore been minor by comparison. This can be expected as the tools of technology are put to use in the communications and transportation fields. Again we must be eternally vigilant to the rapidly changing signs of the times.

There are many people openly calling for guerrilla warfare techniques to be applied here in this country—to be employed as part of the civil rights action programs. Gentleman, I submit, this is a very disturbing pronouncement and, indeed, will set back the Civil Rights progress as people become suspicious and concerned over this type of activity.

Therefore, we must take immediate action to "nip this type of dangerous and irresponsible activity in the bud" before we are the victims of a nationwide conspiracy organized and planned by people bent on advancing subversive causes that do not represent the best interests of our people.

I believe the Cramer amendment is directed toward that end and is deserving of our broadest possible support. I am further convinced the Members present will adopt this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, much has been said, but I do think it is important to note the difference between the Cramer substitute and the Corman amendment. Basically, the Corman amendment will get at, but it does not eliminate the Lincoln Rockwells or the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, or the man who went from Tennessee to try to shoot Mr. Meredith. My amendment will cover those individuals. The Corman amendment will not do so. Therefore, the Corman amendment would, in my opinion, gut the intent and purpose and objective of the Cramer substitute, which I believe is the will of this House and will be so expressed.

The situation to which it is addressed not only involves the actions of individuals I mentioned, whose objective is to create civil disturbance and civil disobedience, and to take advantage of the civil rights movement and the problems in America. But the people in this Nation are crying for this Congress to take action, to let the troublemakers know we are not going to sit idly by while they create civil strife throughout America. We have not done so, and we will not do so now.

If we want to meet the problem, then let us meet it. The American people are demanding support. I trust we will support the Cramer substitute and oppose the gutting Corman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I assure everyone I am as much against riots as anybody in this Chamber.

I do not believe it is proper for the Federal Government to assume responsibility for criminal law which is entirely intrastate when there is not a shred of evidence any one of the 50 States has had a breakdown of law and order or that there has been a reluctance on the part of the States to enforce laws against this condition.

I urge support of my amendment.

I do not believe it is a good precedent for us to move into the field of intrastate criminal law without a shred of testimony that there is a necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD yielded his time to Mr. McCULLOCH.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

I rise in opposition to the Corman amendment to the Cramer substitute. If the Corman amendment to the Cramer substitute were to be adopted, it would restrict, dilute, and weaken the Cramer amendment. If the Corman amendment were agreed to, a troublemaker, or one who wished to incite to riot, could travel in interstate or foreign commerce or use any facility in interstate or foreign commerce including the mail in furtherance of a conspiracy to commit any act of violence, arson, or bombing which now may be a crime under Federal law or State law in order to incite or carry on a riot, so far as title V is concerned, or so far as the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is concerned.

I urge the defeat of the Corman amendment to the Cramer substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], to close debate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, we, all of us, deplore lawlessness, violence and riots. I do not believe anyone in this Chamber condones such action.

But I believe that the Cramer substitute amendment would ask us to unequivocally recognize that all local law enforcement agencies have broken down. That they are unable to deal with these situations. I for one cannot concur that State and local authorities cannot deal with breaches of the peace, rioting, and other such acts.

I believe that the Corman amendment gets to the root of the real problem without providing that every imaginable case must involve the Federal Government.

The Corman amendment deals with this subject of violence in interstate commerce, directly. It deals with the subject of rioting, and deals with the subject of trying to protect an individual who may be pursuing his federally constituted right.

Therefore, I urge that the Corman amendment be adopted and the Cramer amendment as a substitute to the Ashmore amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the Corman amendment to the Cramer substitute amendment to the Ashmore amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to the Ashmore amendment.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], as amended by the Cramer substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: Add a new section after line 24, page 77, as follows:

"SEC. 504. Nothing contained in Sec. 502 shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which any provisions of the section operates to the exclusion of State laws on the same subject matter, nor shall any provision of Sec. 502 be construed as invalidating any provision of State law unless such provision is inconsistent with any of the purposes of the said section or any provision thereof."

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the colloquy with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], we had some discussion about whether or not there was danger of preemption by the language in his section. This amendment which I have offered is merely taking the language from title XI, section 1104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which I have discussed with counsel for the committee and with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] handling the bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. As I understand it, this amendment would recognize concurrent jurisdiction with those State laws that are consistent with title V. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITENER. It would merely say that nothing in this Ashmore amendment, as amended by the Cramer substitute, would take away from any State jurisdiction over any crimes that they had jurisdiction over now unless it was in direct conflict with the provisions of the section.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 74, line 14 in section 501(a) and on page 76, line 11 in section 501(b) strike the word "lawfully" and add a new section as follows on page 77:

"SEC. 503. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny, impair or otherwise affect the authority of any Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer to fulfill his duty to enforce the law."

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, title V could well be the most vital portion of this bill. It amends present statutes which were designed to protect people who are exercising federally protected rights such as voting, use of public accommodations, public education, employment, housing, jury service, free speech, and peaceful assembly.

Its passages will provide Federal jurisdiction for racially motivated crimes such as the murders of Medgar Evers, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, Jonathan M. Daniels, and Mickey Schwerner.

There are in existence, passed a hundred years ago, two Federal criminal laws which were intended to cover civil rights crimes. They are 18 U.S.C. 241 and 242. The difficulty is that these two statutes are deficient in draftmanship and too vague for useful enforcement.

There was overwhelming bipartisan support for title V in the Judiciary Committee, but unfortunately, it seems clear to me, an amendment was adopted that will seriously damage the effectiveness of the entire section.

The amendment was proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER]. It provided for the insertion of the word "lawfully" in section 501 (a) and (b). This does not, on the fact of it, appear to be a substantial change, but in fact, it could have serious consequences.

Mr. GRIDER's amendment was vigorously opposed by our chairman, Mr. CELLER. The Attorney General was opposed to the change. Unfortunately we did not have sufficient votes that day to defeat the amendment in committee. I rise today to ask this Committee to make the correction.

If the matter remains unchanged, an entirely new concept will have been introduced into the criminal law, a concept that could defeat any criminal statute into which it is introduced.

Consider the incident at Canton, Miss., during the recent Meredith march, when the marchers attempted to pitch tents on the school grounds and were tear gassed to drive them off. Even the most ardent civil rights supporters would agree that they were in technical violation of the trespass law. Suppose that instead of being sprayed with tear gas the marchers had been sprayed with machinegun fire. There would be serious doubt in such circumstances that the murderers could be tried under title V because of the requirement that the victims must be acting lawfully.

Suppose Mrs. Liuzzo had been exceeding the speed limit when she was killed? Under title 5 as presently written how do we know that a court would not rule that a traffic violation constitutes unlawful action and removes the person from the coverage of the statute?

I do not know of a single criminal statute, Federal or State, that refers to violations of the law by the victim. What mockery would be a State statute that would allow the thief of your automobile to escape prosecution because your registration has expired. Or one that would allow the bank robber to be set free because the bank's charter was defective.

Our colleague from Tennessee said in his speech on July 28, that the word "lawfully" would not remove from the protection of title V persons who were violating trespass statutes, local ordinances against demonstrations, traffic laws, and other "minor" violations of the law. However, as Mr. CELLER pointed out, there is no distinction made between "minor" and "major" violations. The term "lawfully" means completely in accordance with law.

In explaining his position, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER] emphasizes that the policeman facing an ugly mob must be assured that he will not face prosecution under title V if he forcefully restrains the mob from violence.

To reassure the gentleman from Tennessee, and to make sure that there is no doubt about the right of officers to enforce valid laws to keep the peace, and no intent to protect riotous activity in violation of the laws, my amendment in addition to striking the word "lawfully" in section 501 (a) and (b), adds an additional section to title V as follows:

> SEC. 503. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect the authority of any Federal, State, or local law-enforcement officer to fulfill his duty to enforce the law.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the Committee not to initiate a revolutionary concept into the criminal law, not to thereby encumber the Justice Department with a new burden of proof, and most importantly, not to impair the effectiveness of this vital section.

I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I have great respect for the views and the legal acumen of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California, I must disagree with him in this instance.

I never thought, Mr. Chairman, that the prestigious Committee on the Judiciary or this body would be asked to remove the word "unlawfully" from a law of this nature.

When testimony was taken on this part of the bill, the Attorney General emphasized the need in certain sections of the country to make it a Federal crime to convict those who had committed crimes in that section of the country where there had been a failure to get convictions in local courts. It was said that Federal jurisdiction was required.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. It is indeed required. I have searched the records of every one of those cases and in not one single case can I find an example in which the victim was acting in an unlawful manner.

I do not think it is the function of this body to pass laws to take care of hypothetical situations. But it is now argued that if the people in Canton had been trespassing and if they had been murdered instead of evicted, the people who murdered them would not have been prosecuted. I do not think that would have been the outcome, Mr. Chairman, but even if it had I submit that it is a hypothetical case.

It is now thought, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary to extend the protection of this law to demonstrators in the large cities, and that the word "lawfully" as here used will weaken that protection.

Mr. Chairman, we have an altogether different situation here and, considering the ugly tone that has spread through the demonstrations in the last few weeks, I submit that we do indeed most critically need to have the word "lawfully" injected into this legislation.

If the burden has to be somewhere, it certainly ought to be on the demonstrators. It ought not to be on the shoulders of the police officers or even the private citizen, Mr. Chairman, who hopes to defend his store or his theater against an ugly mob.

Therefore, without the word "lawfully," the burden would be on this poor guy to try to decide whether he could resist the force moving toward him without subjecting himself to prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, I should like now to point out one thing that will not meet the accord of some of those who agree with my amendment. I refer to the few words which the gentleman from California has tacked on here, which would exclude policemen and law-enforcement officers from this law while they were fulfilling their duty. That would be an open invitation to the Sheriff Clarks and people of that stripe. With this language in there the very opposite result would be secured.

Those policemen who do not want equal rights for all citizens could read that language as an open invitation, because it says: "Nothing in this title shall be construed to impair the local law-enforcement officer to fulfill this duty to enforce the law." I shudder when I think of what Sheriff Clark could have done with that had it been in the statute.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I oppose the proposed pending amendment, which would strike out the word "lawfully." Of course, to strike the word "lawfully" from the two places it is contained in the bill would actually and truly make title V a title which we could name the "Right To Riot" title.

Already under the terms of this bill, titles V and III, we need to give the Attorney General of the United States an additional title similar to that some of the kings and emperors used to have. We ought to entitle him the Attorney General of the United States, "discerner of the thoughts and the intents of the hearts of men." I do not think we have many people in the United States who could deserve that title.

I think you will agree with me that what we are seeing today is not victims who march and sing, but we are seeing rioters who loot and burn in the streets of Chicago, Cleveland, Omaha, and other big cities in the United States. The demonstrators, bless their innocent hearts, are still looting, burning, and rioting, seemingly every day of the week. This title will be bad enough as it is, but if the title is amended as provided by the pending amendment to make their actions not lawful, whether lawful or not, then certainly it would be impossible for the officers under the law to attempt to protect the people from the depredation of the looters and the carrying on that is rampant in our Nation. The truth of the matter is that over the past several months we have learned of cities whose police have been instructed to stand by and watch the looting and raiding that is going on, because the city-dads are afraid they cannot in good faith arrest them and try to prosecute them.

Bear this in mind. Once street demonstrations are initiated and passions aroused, it furnishes a chance for the criminally minded to begin using firearms and throwing fire bombs while other members of the mob take advantage of the disorder to steal from the stores and carry on all kinds of acts of vandalism.

Of course, we have had hoodlums throughout the history of mankind, but the police have been able to keep the crimes from affecting the community as a whole in the past.

What has happened, then, to cause this change? It is the sanction that is given to street demonstrations by influential persons in both political parties. That is the underlying cause of the riots we are having today.

Certainly this Congress does not want to say that the demonstrations have to be lawful and to put the brand of approval of Congress on what is going on. This points up the drastic need for keeping the word "lawfully' in this bill. We can offer all kinds—and they have already been offered—of examples of what is going on in Chicago. Just a few days ago a police car was stoned by more than 100 Negro youths.

The stoning occurred after five officers arrived to shut off three fire hydrants that were flooding streets in the vicinity of Throop Street and Roosevelt Road after teenagers had broken them.

Martin Luther King spoke in Chicago at the headquarters of the West Side Organization, where a sign on the wall said: "Burn, baby, burn—boycott, baby, boycott." Roving bands of youths and some adults broke windows and looted stores and stoned police cars and small police vans.

If we take "lawfully" out of this bill, then it is a perfectly legitimate act for these things to occur during civil rights demonstrations.

I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Grider], for having offered the amendment in committee to insert the word "lawfully" and for supporting his action on this floor.

I mentioned the other day that Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson in Chicago says that law-abiding citizens may be forced to live in walled communities while criminals roam the land unmolested. Mr. Wilson related that at the Governors' conference.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Wilson, at the recent Governors' conference, said he met a homebuilder who is developing a housing project which will be enclosed by a wall with a locked gate. The superintendent of the Chicago police said:

> Good people have to lock themselves in homes behind barred doors to protect themselves from assault. How much is a citizen willing to give up in life and property for the greater freedom of suspects?

Mr. Wilson did not exaggerate the plight of the law-abiding citizens when he said that.

A few hours after he spoke, there was a riot on the near West Side, in which a policeman was wounded, squad cars were pelted with rocks, store windows were smashed, and looting occurred. Dr. King promptly showed up and persuaded district and station commanders to release a half dozen prisoners in the interest of abating tension.

They could not prosecute those people for what they did if we take "lawfully" out of this bill. Maybe that is what the majority of this House wants—but your constituents do not want that—they want protection.

The night before this, a burly hoodlum beat a soldier on an elevated train, repeatedly hammering his head against the window frame, after demanding that the victim hand over his money. A dozen or more passengers cheered the assault, which was brought to an end by a pair of detectives who ran up from another car.

If we take "lawfully" out of this bill, even that protection will be removed.

If we are trying to reduce urban life to the level of the jungle, we could not be more successful, if this bill is enacted. The police, not the criminals, will be placed under restraint. Even if this bill is not passed, the situation will still be here and it will be aggravated immensely if "lawfully" is removed from the wording of the bill.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 202]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Baring
Berry
Blatnik
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Cameron
Celler
Conte
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, La.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Fino
Gibbons
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, La.
Love
McCarthy
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
Pepper
Powell
Randall
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Toll
Tuten
Ullman
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 376 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title V and all amendments thereto conclude at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on title V and all amendments thereto conclude at 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gerald R. Ford) there were—ayes 87, noes, 54.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Edwards amendment.

I will not take any great amount of time. I believe it is apparent that if we strike out the word "lawfully," as the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] suggests, it would constitute an encouragement by the Congress of unlawful conduct under the guise of civil rights advocacy. I am sure none of us wants to be a party to that. I believe that the committee action, approving the insertion of the word "lawfully" in the bill, is evidence of how the Committee on the Judiciary feels. I hope the House will support the committee in this respect.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Edwards amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would strike out the word "lawfully" from that part of section 501 which makes it a Federal crime to "injure, intimidate or interfere with any person while he is"—as it now reads—"lawfully engaging in or seeking to engage in" any of the nine enumerated categories of civil rights activities. This word "lawfully" unduly restricts the statute. I regret that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], is not with us this afternoon. I know he was very much opposed to the use of this word in this statute. He told me, before he went to the hospital, that he hoped an amendment would be offered to strike this from the title.

Title V, I suppose, would protect a person who was standing in line waiting to register, or a person who was riding on a bus, or a person trying to register who was registering to attend a university. But there are important civil rights activities which may not be protected with the word "lawfully" included.

I might point out that murder is murder, regardless of the legality of the conduct of the victim at the time of the murder. Under title V the murderer may be immune from prosecution if the victim is not lawfully engaged in exercising his rights.

This is the crux of the issue this afternoon. It is not difficult to imagine types of activity which might take the victim out from the protection of title V. Suppose Mrs. Liuzzo had been speeding when she was shot; or suppose Mr. Jonathan Daniels had been trespassing when he was shot; or suppose in Selma the marchers had been violating a traffic ordinance when they were assaulted.

It may be said by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Grider] that these are hypothetical cases, but let me point out specific cases which might not be covered under the present language. We know in the South that practically every time a civil rights worker was beaten or brutalized, he was also arrested for the violation of a local ordinance.

One of the most tragic cases which illustrates the point is that of the three civil rights workers who were murdered near Philadelphia, Miss. According to the local officials, at the time they were arrested, they were exceeding the speed limit. Would the murderers of those three civil rights workers be covered?

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield for an answer to that question.

Mr. GRIDER. Is it not a fact that they were murdered after they had been released from jail, after the arrest for speeding?

Mr. RYAN. Would the gentleman make that an issue of fact to be tried?

Mr. GRIDER. I do not see how it could possibly arise, in view of the fact that they were arrested at a previous date for speeding.

Mr. RYAN. Let me pose another question. Suppose the Reverend Martin Luther King were leading a march on a courthouse to register Negro citizens. Suppose there were a local ordinance which prohibited a march or parade without a permit, and he had not obtained such a permit. Would title V apply?

Mr. GRIDER. Has the gentleman read the case of Cox against Louisiana, in which almost that exact situation arose, in which the Supreme Court held that that type of ordinance discriminatorily enforced was not valid law and, therefore, the march was not unlawful?

Mr. RYAN. In other words, is the gentleman's position title V would apply?

Mr. GRIDER. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. Very well. Let me pose another question.

Suppose there were a statute which said that poll watchers could not enter the voting booths. Suppose the poll watchers were assaulted, and it was claimed that they had entered the voting booths. That is an actual case. Would the statute apply?

Mr. GRIDER. Let me answer that with another question.

Mr. RYAN. Please answer the question. I have only limited time.

Mr. GRIDER. I would say "No" unless there was some relationship between the exercise of the civil rights and the poll watchers entering the voting booth.

There has to be a relationship between the exercise of the civil rights and the lawful action.

Let us consider the poor Negro shopkeeper whose territory is invaded by a white mob. He is not a policeman. His only protection is the stick he has in his hand. He sees the white people marching toward him. He knows, in the atmosphere of the community, if he protects himself he is liable to be charged with a violation of the statute we are seeking to enact today.

Would the gentleman want him to make up his mind about whether or not he was authorized to protect his shop?

Mr. RYAN. Self-defense is always a defense. This statute would presumably make the attack upon him a Federal crime. That has no bearing on this statute.

Mr. GRIDER. It certainly does.

Mr. RYAN. It is obvious that the insertion of this word raises all manner of questions as to whether or not the statute would apply. The very answers which the gentleman has given today and his response to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] during general debate demonstrates convincingly the need to strike this word from the statute.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the example of the Negro poll watchers who were beaten up in Blackville, S.C., on October 12, 1965. Blackville city officials explained the incident by saying that the poll watchers attempted to enter the voting booths—reported in the Columbia State on October 13, 1965, and included in the Southern Regional Council report, "The Continuing Crisis."

Since it is presumably against South Carolina law for poll watchers to enter voting booths, the question remains: Would title V cover this situation?

According to the Arkansas Gazette, November 3, 1965, on November 2, 1965, a civil rights worker was "beaten with a large club or ax handle" while participating in a demonstration in Morton, Miss. He was taken to jail and charged with parading without a permit.

Mr. Chairman, there is no end to the list of assaults which might be excluded by this title if the word "lawfully" is not omitted.

For example, Mrs. Benny Catchings was refused service in a Greyhound bus terminal in Jackson, Miss., on March 20 of this year. When she protested, she was hit on the head with a lead pipe by the manager of the restaurant, and was then hauled off to jail and accused of breaking the State law against profanity. The case is currently in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Or consider the case of John Hardy, who was hit over the head with a pistol by the registrar in Tylertown, Miss., when he brought in two Negroes to register to vote. The registrar refused to register the Negroes, and Hardy was arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

Suppose that the NAACP wanted to protest the slow rate of voter registration in the downtown area of some town, and that the town required a permit to demonstrate, and that the NAACP was refused a permit. Suppose then that the demonstration took place and that in the course of it one of the demonstrators was assaulted. Would the assailant have violated the terms of title V?

Suppose that a candidate for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was campaigning for votes in the general election. Suppose that the campaign was in violation of Mississippi law which does not permit a losing candidate to run in both the primary and the general election. Suppose that while campaigning for office the candidate was assaulted. Would the assailant have violated the terms of title V?

Suppose that a "freedom election," similar to the one in Mississippi in 1964, were held which was not recognized by State law and one of the persons involved in the process was assaulted. Would the assailant have violated the terms of title V?

Suppose that a State law prohibits campaigning within a certain distance of the polling place and a campaign worker distributing literature within the proscribed limits is assaulted? Would the assailant have violated the terms of title V?

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the word "lawfully" can be a real mischief-maker. The cases which I have cited—and hundreds of similar ones—illustrate how easy it is to charge the victim of racial violence with the violation of some local ordinance or some law. If the local court or justice of the peace finds the victim guilty, then the U.S. attorney might not be able to prosecute.

The existence of the word "lawfully" in the statute might encourage local town councils and State legislatures to pass new laws which could easily apply to those people whom this title is intended to protect. Moreover, it seems quite possible that minor laws would be applied with extraordinary vigor by local police who did not want to see Negroes and civil rights workers protected by Federal law.

For those who have forgotten how easy it is for State officials to thwart civil rights activity, I might recall the kinds of criminal statutes which the Mississippi State Legislature passed in anticipation of the summer of 1964.

Title 11, chapter 1, section 2318.5 of the Mississippi Code, for example, prohibits "picketing which interferes with ingress or egress to and from public buildings, premises, streets, and sidewalks."

Section 2236.5 of the same chapter and title prohibits the printing or distributing of materials which are designed to interfere with a lawful business.

Thus, Mississippi State law makes illegal means which might be used to effect an economic boycott or a political demonstration.

Mr. Chairman, in every State there are laws which could apply to those intended to be protected by title V. The question is when they will be invoked. I fear that the use of the word "lawfully" in this title would make it possible for local officials to circumvent the intent of the title.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

In conclusion, I believe all of us are concerned about the application of this word "lawfully" as it appears in the statute. I simply appeal to the Members of the Committee to strike this. It will add nothing but confusion and doubt to the clear meaning of the statute as it was originally intended when the administration's bill was submitted by the Department of Justice to the Congress.

Title V was made necessary because local authorities in the South have failed to prosecute cases against those who interfere with civil rights workers and Negroes. If the word "lawfully" remains in the statute, we will, in effect, be handing the opportunity to thwart and delay such prosecutions back to those who have refused to prosecute them in the past.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask my distinguished colleague who suggested this word in the Committee a question.

May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER] about the example where we might find a group of people working perhaps in the civil rights movement who in the progress of a march would end up on a lawn, which might be, unbeknownst to them, a violation of a city ordinance. Would they be then without the protection of title V, because they had inadvertently violated an ordinance they did not know about?

Mr. GRIDER. I would say "No." Evidently the type of ordinance the gentleman refers to is one which has not been uniformly applied. No notice has been given to the public. It is hauled out of mothballs for the particular purpose of protecting the particular offender.

The Supreme Court has held time after time that ordinances have a valid basis and have to be uniformly applied. There has to be a reason for the ordinance. It has to be decided in an objective manner. In other words, a police chief cannot decide whether a permit should be granted or anything of that sort.

Mr. CONYERS. I will say to my distinguished colleague on the Judiciary Committee we do not always have time for these fine points of law to be resolved when a group of civil rights people perhaps encounter some hostile citizenry or sometimes people acting under color of law. Six months or two years later perhaps a court may rule that what you say is absolutely correct, but is there any immediate relief that could be provided by adding this word "lawfully"? As to title V, do you think that title V would not be just as safe and secure in providing protection not only to civil rights people but to all Americans as well, as some of the action here on the floor this morning has liberalized the provision.

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman first that I think it would have been bad if the word had not been in there, but it would be doubly bad if we took the word out now. Here is the reason why I say this. Visualize this situation. This is a lot more realistic than the hypotheticals offered before. Visualize this situation in which a man is trying to arouse a mob to engage in an unlawful civil rights activity such as integrating a children's matinee on a Saturday afternoon and getting up before the mob and saying, "We will march and they will be afraid to stop us because they will be charged with a violation of section 5 of the Civil Rights Act of 1966," because what we are doing does not have to be law. It is directed against "black power" as interpreted by the big city mobs. I think it is needed.

Mr. CONYERS. I certainly do not want to drag any civil rights slogans into a title V discussion, because we might be found guilty of doing what a lot of other people are doing; that is, seeking definitions of everybody who cares to define "black power." I do not think it has any real significant place in our discussion on this question. However, let me ask you a more realistic hypothetical question.

Mr. GRIDER. Will you yield on that point?

Mr. CONYERS. The facts in this hypothesis are more real because this happened in Washington, D.C., when some Americans from Mississippi were here across from the White House, and fortunately some dispensation was granted and they were permitted to stay. But suppose that had not been the case. Suppose—and I take it there is an ordinance that prevents people from camping out on the lawn in the park across from the White House—suppose there had been a disturbance and suppose these Americans who were pressing for a redress of grievance, my distinguished colleague, had gotten into an altercation, through no fault of their own. Would not the word "lawfully" operate to exempt them from full protection of title V?

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman first that I do not see any need for title V in Washington, D.C., under any conditions. This law was designed to apply in cases where discrimination is practiced against minority groups.

Mr. CONYERS. I will say to the gentleman that this law applies throughout the United States of America.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago the President signed into law the most drastic punitive civil rights measure enacted by the Congress since the radicals controlled this body during the days of Reconstruction. In his statement attendant to giving his approval to the bill, President Johnson stated:

> We believe all men are entitled to the blessings of liberty. Yet millions are being deprived of those blessings—not because of their own failures, but because of the color of their skin.
>
> The reasons are deeply imbedded in history and tradition and the nature of man. We can understand—without rancor or hatred—how this happened but it cannot continue.
>
> Our Constitution, the foundation of our republic forbids it. The principles of our freedom forbid it. Morality forbids it. And the law I will sign tonight forbids it.

That bill was forced through the Congress at the insistence of highly organized, radical, power mad, well-financed leftwing elements, and debated in an atmosphere of emotional hysteria. This new law, openly and patently directed against the laws, institutions, and people of a handfull of Southern States, was hailed throughout the country as the final word in civil rights. It was to be the answer to all of the Negro's problems in America, the realization of his fondest dreams, the creation of a utopian egalitarian society, and a guarantor of eternal racial harmony, peace, and happiness.

Mr. Chairman, the ink was hardly dry on the President's signature when a full blown first-class race riot broke out in Harlem. In the pitched battle that ensued, a number of people were killed, scores were injured, and millions of dollars worth of property destroyed.

Following on the heels of this melee came serious race riots in other northern cities including Rochester and Philadelphia.

Significantly, it was the Southern States who had been the target of that legislation and the subject of abuse from northern politicians and a slanted northern press. Equally significant is the fact that somehow all of this strife and violence occurred outside the South.

Even President Johnson, the progenitor, advocate, manipulator, and executor of all modern civil rights laws, was forced to admit on October 30, 1964, in speaking of these laws:

> What is most important it shows the law is being obeyed in those areas where some had predicted there would be massive disobedience.

Mr. Chairman, the past 2 years shows that southerners have been able to make a remarkable adjustment to the force and effect of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as difficult as it has been to do so. In most of our communities, good faith efforts have been exerted to comply even with the spirit and letter of its most vicious provisions. This has been accomplished peacefully, even though it has overturned customs that date back for centuries.

It has not been easy for our southern people to accept these deliberate and unwarranted encroachments on their rights. Because our southern people, by and large, are law abiding, they have yielded to the majesty of the law.

On August 6, 1965, President Johnson signed still another measure that made further unwarranted invasions against the rights of the several States in the name of civil rights. This measure, popularly called the "Voting Rights Bill," was intended to plug up all the loopholes left in previous civil rights bills, but only insofar as these loopholes were applicable in the Southern States. By clever draftsmanship, the bill did not apply to the rest of the country.

Just 5 days later, the city of Los Angeles fell victim of the most disastrous riot of modern times. For 6 long days and nights, death, destruction, looting, arson, vandalism, and terror roamed the streets of the Watts area, leaving in its wake 34 dead, 856 injured, and more than $200 million in property damage. Thirty-one hundred persons were arrested.

On August 11, Chicago's worst race riot in 13 years broke out and, during the 2-day battle that followed, 80 persons were injured, and 123 arrested.

Two days later, on August 13, Negroes rioted in Springfield, Mass., and race riots began to crop up in other northern cities.

Political ends must be served, though, and organized minorities must be appeased. Mr. Chairman, so, in spite of previous civil rights bills' failure to promote peace and harmony, the Committee on the Judiciary heaped more coal on the flames of racial discord on June 30, 1966, by reporting the bill now being debated.

Suddenly, Mr. Chairman, race riots began to break out in the great metropolitan centers of the North and Midwest. Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, Brooklyn, and South Bend, and other northern cities, found themselves terrorized by mobs on a shooting and looting spree. Here, again, death and destruction were the results. In Brooklyn, it had claimed the life, even, of an innocent 11-year-old child.

The southern white community has been able to adjust to these laws, and this applies, also, to most of the Negro community. It has been the radical segment of the Negro community which has failed to make the adjustment. There is no reign of terror in the South; the problem has moved to an embarrassed North where their protective cloak of liberalism is being stripped away to expose the hypocrisy of their own de facto segregation, social and economic discrimination. It is high time that Congress turned its eyes away from the peaceful South for a while, and devoted its energies and talents toward the solution of some of its self-made problems in other parts of the country.

The punitive legislation that has been aimed at the South has had its ill-fated consequences in the North. Supporters of this bill have risen in this debate time and again to point their accusing fingers southward as justification for the bill's passage, but I would warn them that they are paving the way for further trouble in their own districts.

Even now, Mr. Chairman, these bills have given birth to a revolutionary battle cry of "black power." The Congress, through these bills, has licensed "black power" mobs to commit trespass, arson, assault, mayhem, and vandalism with impunity and immunity from the law. How much further, Mr. Chairman, can this Congress go in passing such special privilege legislation before the great white majority in America arises in righteous indignation?

There have been no riots in Mississippi, the favorite target of liberal "reform" legislation. That does not mean, however, that radical Negro elements have not tried to incite violence. I can say categorically, Mr. Chairman, that the white people of my State have shown more forbearance and have exercised more patience in the face of almost unbearable provocation and incitation than any people in the history of our country. For this, they deserve the praise and appreciation of the entire Nation; they do not deserve further legal harassment.

Mr. Chairman, as an example of the provocation that has been leveled against the white people of Mississippi under an arrogance of black power, I am going to read a couple of paragraphs of a news story that appeared in the July 26 issue of the Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger:

> EVERS CALLS FOR BEATING OF NEGROES
>
> GREENVILLE.—A group of some 300 local Negroes were told Sunday afternoon to put the rod to Negroes who continued to shop downtown Greenville despite the boycott, but admonished his audience not to kill anyone.
>
> State NAACP Secretary Charles Evers, speaking at the Sacred Heart Gymnasium, told local Negroes "if you catch one doing wrong, go ahead and whip 'em." Evers went on to say that they should "go where he lives, grab him and give him a good belt whipping."
>
> In further comments, Evers said that Governor Paul B. Johnson was the most "do-nothing governor in the world," and that former Governor Ross Barnett "was a fool."
>
> The Mississippi whites were depicted as being "stupid" * * *.

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of provocation our people have suffered as a result of the atmosphere created by this kind of legislation. Somehow, none of these civil rights bills protect our Negroes against assaults by other Negroes as was demanded by Evers in his Greenville tirade. Such an overt incitation to violence is an insult to conscience, to the law, and to common decency; but there are no Federal laws to protect those who become victims of such outrages, because these will be crimes of Negroes against Negroes. They will not fall within the jurisdiction of this bill.

About the same time that Evers was calling for the beating of innocent law-abiding Negroes at Greenville, Miss., one Stokely Carmichael, the new head of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee was speaking in Washington, D.C., threatening to "disrupt" the city of Washington if Congress refused to knuckle under to his demands for home rule. According to Washington Post Carmichael told his audience:

> We've got to tell Johnson that if we don't get home rule, we're going to disrupt this city completely. The only people who can get home rule for the city are the black people.

Carmichael, who has been credited with originating the term "black power," let his audience in Washington know that he meant business, militantly predicting—or threatening, as the case may be—that—

> In six years, Negroes will control all major cities in this country * * * if we stick together. * * *

Mr. Chairman, the morning radio news reported more race rioting in Chicago and Lansing, Mich., last night, with a number of people injured, including five peace officers in Lansing.

Indeed, the harvests of the seeds of civil rights legislation are being reaped in the whirlwinds of the racial wars in the terror-stricken metropolitan centers of the Northern, Eastern, and Far Western States. Even Martin Luther King, Nobel Peace Prize winner and self-styled apostle of nonviolence, in whose footsteps bloodshed usually follows, has shifted his violent "nonviolent" battlefront to the northern areas, where he says he has never seen such hatred against Negroes, "not even in Mississippi or Alabama."

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law, the people of Mississippi can live with it; not because we will like it, but because it will be the law. We are accustomed to being victimized by punitive Federal legislation aimed at our people, our laws, and our institutions, and we have shown that we can survive their devastating and disruptive impact.

For 20 years, we of the Southern States have sought to caution our northern friends against trying to solve the race problem with punitive police state legislation, but our pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Once again, we plead with you, in the interest of the future of our great Nation, not to add the fuel of this new civil rights bill to the blazing inferno of race hatred and violence that grips the country today. Instead, let us declare a moratorium on this kind of trouble-making legislation, at least until these fires have died down, and internal peace can be achieved between the races. Let us teach that with every right goes a corresponding responsibility, and that those who would enjoy full economic, social, and political rights must be willing to assume the burden of obligations that go with the exercise of those rights.

Ours is a society based on morality, forbearance, individual responsibility, personal industry, and respect for the rights of others. No law or proclamation that can be enacted or issued is capable of instilling these virtues into any segment of society. There is no easy way to solve the problems attendant to racial or ethnic differences, and legislation has proven to be an aggravator of these problems—not a catalyst.

What is the eventual solution? Indeed, it must come about through the evolutionary processes of Negro education, acceptance and respect for duly constituted authority, adherence to recognized standards of morality, regard for the sacred institutions of marriage and legitimacy, personal pride and hygiene, economic opportunities through the application of individual industry and initiative, and patience.

Until our political leaders are willing to face facts, and refrain from using the Negro problem as a vehicle for political self-perpetuation in office, there will be no racial peace in this country, and our people will continue to endure the strife and suffering of a society at war with itself. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, let us defeat this new legislative attack on the rights of the people and this assault against our Constitution; let us get the rioters out of the streets and into the schools and homes and churches where they can be taught the blessings and responsibilities of American citizenship, and thus create for America a society worthy of its name.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], advocate a lot of peculiar things in the years he and I have been here, but unless I misunderstand him in his hypothetical questioning of the gentleman from Tennessee, he advocated that it ought not to be against the law for somebody to walk into a voting booth and interfere with a voter. Now, if this Civil Rights Act is going to say that it is legal——

Mr. RYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Just a minute and I will yield to you.

If the Civil Rights Act is going to say it is legal to walk into a voting booth and interfere with a voter and there is nothing to keep it from happening or you will be charged with a violation of title V, maybe we had better junk the whole bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to vote for a bill, but I do not want to vote for a bill that will do that.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, my statement was simply this: Title V is intended to make it a Federal crime to interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin who is exercising his constitutional rights. I cited an actual case where poll watchers, who had been assaulted, were then charged with entering the voting booth—an illegal act. I asked if this would make the assailants immune from prosecution under title V.

Mr. HAYS. Does the gentleman believe anyone—I do not yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Does the gentleman think anyone who walks into a voting booth and interferes with a voter is exercising his constitutional rights?

Mr. RYAN. I do not know——

Mr. HAYS. I know what you are trying to say. I know what you did say, and what you did say was that a man can walk into a voting booth and interfere with a voter, and if a voter takes a punch at him he is in violation of title V.

Well, get this: Whoever walks into a voting booth, he deserves what happens to him, title V or not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the right that is most fundamental is dealt with in this title, and that is the right to vote. In my opinion, the elimination of the word "lawfully" from this title would certainly raise a question as to whether there was any way you could interfere with an individual who is engaged in multiple voting, if he were going from precinct to precinct and voting in other precincts, and after being caught in the act of illegally voting. This has been known to happen in some precincts around the country.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there would be no way to handle that situation.

Mr. HAYS. When you advocate walking into a voting booth and interfering with a voter, title V would permit that, and I think that is ridiculous. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is hurting the very cause which he is seeking to help.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This would only become effective because of his race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HAYS. What does that have to do with it?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it has this to do with it: Before it constitutes a crime under title V——

Mr. HAYS. In other words, then, if someone walks into a voting booth and tries to keep me from voting, I have got to decide whether he is under the protection of the Constitution or whether I am going to take a punch at him?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No, no, no.

Mr. HAYS. That is, because of his race, color, or, in other words, where he originated?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If you injure, intimidate or interfere with, or attempt to injure, intimidate or interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin——

Mr. HAYS. Well, that is not the point at issue that we are talking about.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, listen——

Mr. HAYS. Now, do not stop me or tell me what to do. It is my time. You are just trying to throw up a smokescreen. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado, you have thrown up a good many smokescreens in this debate, but I am a rather difficult fellow to screen out with a smokescreen. I do not care what the language says in the proposed law, because when we come down to somebody going into the voting booth, and he wants then to be protected if the voter in the voting booth does not want someone else in there, I would say he has a perfect right to throw them out, kick them out, knock them out, or do whatever he wants to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. Yes; but do not try to give me any smoke bombs.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. All we are trying to do is carry out what is contained in line 15, page 74 of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. You read it, and I heard you.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That, on its face, says that this shall not be done because of his race, color, religion, or national origin. If that is not involved, it does not constitute a crime.

Mr. HAYS. Supposing an Arab walks in there and tries to interfere with me, and I resisted him because he was an Arab? Would that be because of his race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question is not interfering with the right of an Arab.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I do not know. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has made it clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 74, line 9 and 10, strike out "whether or not acting under color of law," and insert "under color of law, statute, ordnance or regulations".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the constitutional basis for title V as asserted by the proponents is the 14th amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this language which I suggest in the amendment would take it out of the never-never land in which it now is drifting and place it under the 14th amendment. Because the new language would say "under color of law, statute, ordnance, or regulations".

The 14th amendment, as I understand it, does protect certain rights of individuals. Among those, and I believe the only ones, would be these: The right of the citizen not to have his privileges or immunities abridged by the making or enforcement by a State of any law. You will note that I said, "making and enforcing."

Secondly, the right of all persons not to be deprived by any State of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Third, the right of a person within the jurisdiction of the particular State not to be denied by that State the equal protection of the law.

Here we have a proposal, title V in its entirety, which seeks to bring the Federal Government into play against actions by individual citizens totally unrelated to the State or any political subdivision of the State.

This section does not even meet the suggestions of the majority opinion in the recent case United States against Guest in March of this year. There the Court for the first time seemed to suggest that maybe the 14th amendment covered conspiracy where two or more persons were conspiring to deprive someone of a right. One of the judges said that the 14th amendment just could not be stretched that way.

I am not going to take a lot of time because we have limited debate already and I know the propensity of some of the folks who want to cut off debate to take up a lot of time. My amendment would simply say that in keeping with the interpretations of the 14th amendment that no State or political subdivision under color of regulations or ordinance could bring about any of the things which are inveighed against in title V. If anybody in that State operating under color of that law or statute or regulation undertook to do so he would be guilty of a Federal crime.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the gentleman's attention to the case of Kastenbach against Morgan, decided on June 13, in which it talks about the 14th amendment.

There the Court stated:

> Correctly viewed, section 5 [of the 14th amendment] is a positive grant of legislative power authorizing Congress to exercise its discretion in determining whether and what legislation is needed to secure the guarantees of the 14th amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman is equally familiar with many other decisions of the Court going back as far as 1883 in civil rights cases where it was held, and it has been continuously held, that the 14th amendment and the equal protection clause relate to State action and not to action by individuals.

No later than March of this year—and I will read it to the gentleman—the Supreme Court in the Guest case had this to say:

> As Mr. Justice Douglas more recently put it, "The 14th amendment protects the individual against State action, not against wrongs done by individuals." This has been the view of the Court from the beginning. It remains the Court's view today.

That is what Justice Stewart said on March 28, 1966, and I submit it is still the law of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITENER) there were—ayes 35, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 74, line 17, after "for elective office," insert "or qualifying or acting as a poll watcher."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment which I think is simple but significant. It would extend explicit protection under section 501(a) to individuals serving as poll watchers in any primary, special, or general election.

The amendment would make it a Federal crime to injure or intimidate, by force or threat of force, individuals qualifying or acting as poll watchers.

The poll watcher is a cornerstone of the electoral process. The full and fair performance of his function is an inseparable component of the basic, inalienable right of every American to vote. When poll watchers are able to perform their duties freely and effectively, their presence lends credence to the fairness of the election and restores confidence in the entire process in that segment of the community which has frequently been denied the opportunity to vote.

This legislation should be explicit in support of comprehensive protection for those willing to serve their community and their Nation to preserve the integrity of election procedures.

We must make clear today our collective conviction that if we are to lift the climate of fear where it exists, poll watchers must be free from violence and the threat of violence designed to discourage them from implementing their rights and the rights of others.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If I correctly understand the gentleman's amendment, it would be applicable only to one who is qualified or acting as a poll watcher pursuant to a State law?

Mr. REID of New York. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The amendment would relate to a poll watcher because of his race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mr. REID of New York. Consistent with section 501(a) and the language which circumscribes it therein.

Mr. WHITENER. Do you mean a poll watcher by reason of his race, color, religion, or national origin, or are you protecting him because of his race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mr. REID of New York. My amendment does not establish qualifications for service as a poll watcher. These determinations are a matter of State and Federal law. My amendment is merely concerned with the individual who is a poll watcher and who is injured or intimidated by force or a threat of force, to insure that he is covered under section 501(a)(1).

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the words of the very wise gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Ohio awhile ago, the only time this comes into play is when someone is interfering or intimidating on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. So how do you get the poll watcher into a racial fight, a religious fight, or a national origin fight?

Mr. REID of New York. It is to cover him with regard to any force or threat of force.

Mr. WHITENER. On account of race——

Mr. REID of New York. Well, it is under section 501.

Section 501 states:

> SEC. 501. Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force—
>
> (a) injures, intimidates, or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin . . .

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will yield, further, what he is saying is that someone can beat the tar out of a poll watcher for any reason at all other than race, color, religion, or national origin, and be home free.

Mr. REID of New York. I am not saying that.

Mr. WHITENER. That is what the bill says.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, of course the person who violates the law will be guilty of violating a State law and will be subject to all the penalties thereof.

Mr. REID of New York. That is correct.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman mind reading again precisely the language of the amendment and specifically say what the word "observers" will have to do in his amendment?

Mr. REID of New York. I advise the gentleman, first, that the word "observers" is not in the amendment.

It reads as follows: "voting or qualifying to vote, qualifying or campaigning as a candidate for elective office," and then my language, "or qualifying or acting as a poll watcher, in any primary, special, or general election." All that is added in 501(a)(1) in answer to the gentleman's question, is "or qualifying or acting as a poll watcher."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman, in offering a new amendment, is doing so on the basis of experience. Does the gentleman believe, and will he so advise the House, that this amendment is necessary as a result of actual experience in various parts of the country?

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comment. He is accurate. I believe there is a need to make this coverage explicit, particulary since we are dealing with a criminal statute which is subject to narrow judicial construction. There have been some instances called to my attention where an individual was allegedly threatened for the past or prospective exercise of this right.

Might I ask the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority Member, whether this amendment is agreeable to him?

Mr. McCULLOCH. This amendment is agreeable to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 74, lines 16 and 17, strike out "or campaigning".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered because of the further demonstrated absurdity of the total language of title V. Let us look at what the committee is recommending we do. They are saying we should create a Federal offense which is punishable by up to 10 years in prison or $10,000 fine if any bodily injury is done at all.

How could this bodily injury occur? According to the bill, looking at lines 16 and 17 on page 74, if anyone interferes with any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin, while campaigning as a candidate for elective office, then that person interfering can get a $10,000 fine and as long as 10 years in the penitentiary.

So if you have a Chinaman running for Congress out in California and some Japanese Nisei stands up in the crowd and yells, "I do not like Chinese and I do not think he has any business in Congress," and then throws an egg at the Chinaman and a piece of eggshell scratches the eyelid, we are going to put the Japanese in the penitentiary for 10 years or take $10,000 from him, or both. That is how absurd this bill is.

But the same fellow can stand up, and throw a hand grenade at that Chinese, and if the man throws the hand grenade at the Chinaman and yells, "I love Chinamen" and blows his leg off, the Japanese has to be tried in a State court of California and not in the Federal court.

Are they trying to offer some kind of protection to certain classes of candidates which they are not willing to offer to you and to me.

We all remember that President Truman used to say, "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen." I suppose one could paraphrase that and say, "If you can't catch a tomato occasionally you ought not get out at the home plate of a political arena."

I seriously urge Members to accept this amendment. It is ridiculous in a free country to say that we are going to pass a bill that will protect folks in a right to march over folks' property and get out in front of their houses and scream and carry on, but if he is running for office, if he is a member of that protected group, he will have advantages he would not have if he were a member of some other race.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I take it the gentleman means, by "Chinaman," a Chinese-American or American of Chinese descent?

Mr. WHITENER. I mean a Chinaman. He may be a red Chinese Chinaman. He might be from Red China and might have just gotten off, from a stowaway position, of a slow boat from Red China.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And by "Nisau" the gentleman means "Nisei"?

Mr. WHITENER. I said "Nisei."

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And by "Jap" the gentleman means American of Japanese descent?

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, this is all irrelevant. Perhaps my knowledge of the English language is not as good as it should be. I believe my knowledge of what this bill will do is fairly accurate.

Suppose we strike out any reference to Nisei and Chinese and let it be Greeks and Arabs, or Greeks and Turks.

Now, Mr. Brademas does not like that.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. In this day of international tension perhaps the suggestion to strike out all derogatory references to any racial group would be acceptable to this august body.

Mr. WHITENER. Perhaps we could make it the Cameroons against the Sierra Leones.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am always happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the smallest minority group in this Congress, as the only Member of either body of Greek origin. I just want the gentleman to know he has gone too far.

Mr. WHITENER. I should like to say to the gentleman that he may not be the only one. Many of us are honorary members of Ahepa.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Despite the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina has offered this amendment in what I consider to be good faith, I do not believe we can deal lightly with the subject we are trying to consider here today.

What would the situation be if a Ku Kluxer threw one of these bombs or intimidated a person who was of the Negro race who was campaigning for public office? Situations like that have occurred. This is what we are trying to provide for.

I believe the language of the bill is precise, and I am sure all of us in this committee understand what it means. For that reason I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Earlier in the debate today the Committee of the Whole adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina which added to title V a new section, section 504. Apparently by some inadvertence the language of the amendment was not as intended.

I have checked with the ranking member of the committee which has the bill in charge, and according to my understanding he will approve the unanimous-consent request which I now propose to propound.

That unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman, is that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union vacate the proceedings whereby the Committee earlier adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener], and in lieu thereof adopt in place of that amendment the following amendment:

Sec. 504. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which any provisions of the title operates to the exclusion of State laws on the same subject matter, nor shall any provision of this title be construed as invalidating any provision of State law unless such provision is inconsistent with any of the purposes of said title or any provision thereof.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

Mr. RODINO. If the gentleman is referring to "title," it was my intention when the gentleman from North Carolina proposed this amendment that it refer to "title," and I agree with the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia as well as the gentleman from New Jersey. When the gentleman from New Jersey and I agreed earlier about my amendment, at that time we had under consideration the Cramer proposal and were not thinking beyond it at the time. I do think what you two gentlemen have now worked out is much more desirable than what I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the rights to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia will yield to me.

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Would the gentleman characterize his amendment as a perfecting amendment?

Mr. POFF. Well, in the sense that it gives effect to the intent of the author and those who are handling the bill on both sides of the aisle, yes, but it might be more appropriately described as "corrective" rather than "perfecting."

Mr. MATHIAS. If the gentleman can call it a perfecting amendment, I would just welcome the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from North Carolina into the ranks of the order of great perfectors. I withdraw by reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as now restated by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Whitener: On page 76, line 7, after "establishments" insert "*Provided,* This title shall not apply to any establishment which contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire which is actually occupied by the proprietor of such establishment as his residence."

Mr. WHITENER. Now, Mr. Chairman, before I proceed discussing this amendment, let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias], that I heard his reference to me a moment ago. I suppose that the only reply to his trying to bring me into the ranks of the great perfectors would be to use the expression of that famous American, Sam Goldwyn, "Include me out."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. Momentarily.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think it is difficult to include you out when you have been including yourself in.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, there are many misadventures as we go through life.

This amendment which I have offered would take care of what I believe to be an oversight on the part of the committee. If you will look at page 75, subsection 9, it refers to "establishments which provide lodging for transient guests" which, as I gather it, would cover any type of lodging.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, it would not matter who lived there.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will place into this bill the language which we find in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the so-called famous "Mrs. Murphy" provision. The present law says "other than an establishment located within a building which contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire, and which is actually occupied by the proprietor of such an establishment as his residence."

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would merely take his language from existing law and place it into this bill so that no one could say that we had repealed, by implication, the existing law which we wrote in 1964 to protect "Mrs. Murphy," and Mr. CRAMER's "social security widow," down in Florida.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions I shall be happy to attempt to answer them.

If not, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POFF AS A SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 75, line 8, immediately before the semi-colon insert the following: "the sale, rental, lease, or occupancy of which is regulated by sections 403 and 403 of title IV of this Act".

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. Chairman, my substitute intends only to broaden the effect of his amendment. As the gentleman just indicated, the amendment which he offered would exclude the "Mrs. Murphy" type situation from the reach of the criminal sanctions contained in title V.

Mr. Chairman, it is his theory, and I share it, that if there is no civil action or action against a person who has committed a particular act or ommission under title IV, then surely there should not be a criminal penalty for that act or omission.

Mr. Chairman, while the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is confined to the "Mrs. Murphy" situation; my amendment would also take into account other exemptions provided in title V, principally the exemption for the homeowner, as perfected by the Mathias amendment, and as adopted earlier in the debate.

Under the exemption, as amended by the Mathias amendment, the homeowner has the right, without being covered by the title, to make two transactions within a 12-month period. The Mathias amendment extended the reach of that exemption to the real estate agent chosen by the homeowner.

Mr. Chairman, if the substitute is agreed upon, then both the "Mrs. Murphy" exemption and the homeowner exemption will be exempt from the criminal section of title V.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the substitute amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Does the gentleman intend that if a person is injured or intimidated because of his race or there is any such act of violence that takes place while the individual is in a boarding house that that person then would not be protected by this section?

Mr. POFF. The gentleman understands, of course, that any person injured in those circumstances will have all the civil rights available to him under the State law and if the act involved constitutes a crime under the State law, there would be a prosecution under the State law. All that this amendment would do would be to say that such an act would not become a Federal crime entailing as that does the power of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate and the duty incumbent upon the U.S. attorney to indict, impanel a grand jury, and later a petit jury in a Federal district court and then prosecute in pursuit of a Federal sentence imposed under this title.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. May I ask the gentleman is his amendment offered to subsection (5) on page 75 or subsection (9)?

Mr. POFF. The amendment is addressed to subsection (5) on page 75.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment was addressed to subsection (9). I thought there was some misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman. My amendment related to the section which refers to an establishment providing lodgings to transients and guests. That is why I felt that the existing law with reference to the housing occupied by the owner running it as a boardinghouse should be carried forward in this bill.

As I understand subsection (5), to which I have an amendment also to offer later to strike out, relates to the same subject matter that title IV in this bill relates to.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that explanation. I must say that I had understood the Clerk to read subsection (5) but apparently the Clerk read subsection (9).

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia to withdraw his amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to propound a question which I tried to ask earlier for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD. We use the term "homeowner" in title IV and we also use it under this amendment. The homeowner under certain conditions is excluded from this bill.

I have had many people ask me, Mr. Chairman, if condominiums or cooperative apartments and the people who own those types of homes would be included in the term "homeowner."

Mr. RODINO. Yes, I believe they are included under the term "homeowner".

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment which was accepted. I think it would apply in that instance too. The amendment provided that the homeowner has the right to rent to whomever he desires with or without any reason. I would think that would apply to the situation that you mention.

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. This section 501 has to do with a person who might be injured or intimidated when he is lawfully engaging or seeking to engage in a number of acts. So your amendment to section (9) goes over from page 75 to page 76, and then you put in the Mrs. Murphy exemption.

Now what if this person, for example, were a Negro and living in a boardinghouse that would qualify under the Mrs. Murphy exemption and he was intimidated while lawfully staying on his own premises. That would mean he would be exempt and would not have any rights under your amendment.

Mr. CORMAN. I yield very briefly to the gentleman from North Carolina to reply.

Mr. WHITENER. Why cannot a person who is injured or intimidated be a white person for once? Let us let him be white and be imposed upon because he is white.

Mr. REES. I will make him whatever you want to. I asked the question and I would like to find out.

Mr. WHITENER. Let us not say he is a Chinese or a Nisei. The purpose of the amendment is to say that regardless of one's race, color, religion, or national origin, he cannot force his way on Mrs. Murphy. If Mrs. Murphy, even though he might come in and say, "I have a lawful right to be here; this is a boardinghouse," and he may be just as calm and quiet and may not want to leave, if so, I think Mrs. Murphy ought to be able to use the shillelagh or whatever else she wants to use to get rid of him rather than go to Federal court and pay a fine of $10,000 or serve 10 years.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Whitener amendment and, when it is offered, to the Poff amendment, because it narrows the coverage of this title. All we are trying to do here is to stop acts of violence which are instigated because of race. There is no question but that there are people of violence of white skin and black skin and they commit acts of violence on people of the opposite color. This legislation is not written for either one. This legislation is written against acts of violence where there is a preponderance of evidence that the States have failed, refused, or are unwilling to prosecute.

I do not think this Congress wants to say that you cannot kill a man in a five-unit apartment but you can kill him in a four-unit apartment; you cannot kill him if he is in Mrs. Murphy's boarding house but you can if he is elsewhere. Title V is to stop acts of violence motivated by racial hatred.

I urge defeat of both amendments. The purpose of title V is clear and important.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia having been withdrawn by unanimous consent.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to state for the information of the Committee that should we complete title V before 6 o'clock, it is my intention to request that title VI be read and that the Committee would then rise.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DIGGS

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 203]

Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Daniels
Dent
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, La.
Everett
Fallon
Feighan
Fogarty
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gray
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Holland
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, La.
McCarthy
McMillan
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Moeller
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
Ottinger
Patman
Powell
Randall
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuten
Ullman
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 14765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] had offered an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIGGS: On page 77, immediately following line 24, insert the following:

"Civil Rights Indemnification Board

"SEC. 503. A board is hereby created and established, within the Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') to be known as the Civil Rights Indemnification Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed of five members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Commissioner not later than the close of the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act. The first members appointed shall continue in office for terms of one, two, three, four, and five years, respectively, from the date of appointment, the term of each to be designated by the Commission, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed: *Provided, however,* That upon the expiration of his term of office, a member shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have been qualified. The Commission shall choose a chairman from the Board's membership. No member shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any member may be removed by the Commission for neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board. The Board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"SEC. 504. The Board shall, in accordance with the civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary, and such attorneys, hearing examiners, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court.

"SEC. 505. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 506. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

"SEC. 507. All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid out of the fund established in section 517 of this title upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"SEC. 508. (a) Whenever any person suffers grave bodily injury, or damage to his property by bombing or burning, or is deprived of his life, and the action producing such injury, death, or damage would constitute a violation of section 501 of this title, the injured party, or his legal representative, may file a claim seeking indemnification for such injury, death, or damage with the Board.

"(b) Every claim shall be made on forms to be furnished by the Board and shall contain all the information required by the Board. Each claim shall be sworn to by the person seeking compensation, or by his legal representative, and, except in the case of death, shall be accompanied by a certificate of the injured person's physician, stating the nature of the injury and the nature and probable extent, if any, of disability.

"(c) All claims for indemnification herein must be filed with the Board within six months of the injury or damage for which an award is sought, except that where the injury results in death, the claim may be filed within twelve months of death.

"SEC 509. Whoever makes, in any affidavit, report, or supporting document required under section 508(b) of this title or in any claim for compensation herein, any willfully false statement, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 510. The Board, upon consideration of any claim presented to it, and after the completion of any hearing or investigation as it may deem necessary, shall determine and make an award for or against payment of compensation for such injury, death, or damage. Such award may include a reasonable attorney's fee, but shall not exceed $25,000, exclusive of such fees, or, if death occurs, shall not exceed $50,000, exclusive of such fees.

SEC. 511. The Board shall have power to issue subpenas for and compel the attendance of witnesses, to require the production of books, papers, documents, and other evidence, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses upon any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board.

"SEC. 512. Any assignment of a claim for compensation under any section of this title shall be void, and all compensation and claims therefor shall be exempt from all claims of creditors.

"SEC. 513. The decision of the Board shall be final unless it is fraudulent, or arbitrary, or capricious, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

"SEC. 514. The United States Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to review any final decision of the Board and render judgment thereon, subject to the monetary limitations contained in section 510.

"SEC. 515. (a) Any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Board may obtain a review of such decision in the United States Court of Claims, by filing in such court, within ninety days after the date of such decision, a written petition naming the Board as defendant, specifying with particularity the reasons why such decision is not entitled to finality under section 513 of this title or that the decision is clearly erroneous as a matter of law.

"(b) A copy of such petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Board and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, as provided for United States Court of Appeals, in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"Sec. 516. (a) When it appears, after a claim has been filed with the Board, that the person or persons responsible for the injury, death, or damage for which an award is sought is or are known, such person or persons shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in any proceedings instituted before the Board and to be fully heard.

"(b) In the event that such proceedings before the Board indicates that the injury, death, or damage resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the city, county, or other political subdivision under whose authority such action was taken shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the proceedings and to be fully heard.

"(c) Notice under this section may be by personal service or by registered or certified mail. Notice to a city, county, or other political subdivision may be given to the chief executive or principal legal officer of such political subdivision.

"(d) The Board may, if necessary to secure a full hearing for any intervenor, continue the proceedings from time to time.

"Sec. 517. (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the 'Indemnification Compensation Fund' which shall consist of such sums as Congress may, from time to time, appropriate therefor or transfer thereto and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this Act or any other Act of Congress. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the awards, judgments, and expenses authorized by this Act. The Board shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates of appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the 'Indemnification Compensation Fund'.

"(b) The Board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the disposition of any cases after judicial review for the immediately preceding fiscal year, including a detailed statement of appropriations and expenditures.

"Sec. 518. (a) Upon payment by the United States of any award made under this title, the Attorney General may institute, for or in the name of the United States, a civil action against the person or persons responsible for the injury for which the award is made and, upon proof of the facts upon which such award was based, shall recover, for the United States, an amount not exceeding the amount of such award. Any recovery so obtained shall be deposited in the fund established in section 517 of this title.

"(b) If the injury for which an award is made resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the city, county, or other political subdivision under whose authority such action was taken may be joined as a defendant in any action brought by the Attorney General under this section and shall be jointly and severally liable with the person or persons responsible for such injury.

"(c) In any case brought under this section against anyone notified under section 516, the findings of fact made or adopted by the Board, and, if judicially reviewed, sustained by the court, shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts determined by the findings, and the award of indemnification shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the damages suffered by the complainant.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted pursuant to this section.

"Sec. 519. Nothing herein shall deny to any person the right to pursue any action or remedy granted him under any other law of the United States or any city, county, or other political subdivision: *Provided,* That in the event that any person receives in any other action an award of damages for which an award of indemnification has been made under this title, the United States shall have a lien against such award in the amount of the award of indemnification. In the event such other award is made prior to the award of indemnification, the amount of such other award shall be considered by the Board in determining whether to make an award and, if so, the amount of the award."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the Record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HALL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same unanimous-consent request made by my colleague from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Committee rise at 6 o'clock regardless of the number of amendments pending, with no more amendments to be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Committee has fixed the time for debate on title V and all amendments thereto at 6 o'clock.

Mr. DICKINSON. And the request is that the gentleman be allowed 10 minutes, an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Five additional minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. That would be 10 in all.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs], is asking for 5 additional minutes to explain his amendment?

Mr. DIGGS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I did not offer an objection, and I do not believe anybody else ought to, after we have listened to nine pages of this amendment as read. I do not believe any human in this House can understand what is in this amendment, nor do I believe the gentleman can explain the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the text of the amendment, although lengthy in content, is on pages 18419 and 18420 and was entered into the Record on Friday. I was hopeful that over the weekend all Members would have an opportunity to review it.

However, despite its length, it is very simple in its intent.

I should like to indicate that it can be explained in a very brief period, and then we will go on to explain its implications.

This is not plowing any new ground.

Provisions to establish a program of indemnification for injuries or death inflicted to deny Negroes or civil rights workers their rights are contained in the Douglas-Case bill—S. 2923—and the Diggs bill—H.R. 12807—and other House bills. The essence of these provisions was offered as an amendment to H.R. 14765 in subcommittee and full committee by Congressman Rogers of Colorado.

This amendment would establish a five-man Civil Rights Indemnification Board within and appointed by the Civil Service Commission. The Board would receive complaints on behalf of persons gravely injured in person or property or killed in violation of rights protected by title V. The Board would conduct a hearing on the complaint. If it found the claim justified, it could make an award of up to $25,000—$50,000 in case of death—and attorneys' fees. The decision of the Board would be reviewable by the Court of Claims on application of any person aggrieved.

The Attorney General could institute an action for recovery of the award against the persons responsible for the injury or death. Such persons, when known, would be notified and could intervene in the Board hearing. Where the person responsible acts under color of law, the State or local subdivision would be jointly liable.

Payment would be made from a fund established under this amendment subject to appropriations by Congress. This would be supplemented by funds recovered in cases brought by the Attorney General.

Complaints must be filed in 6 months—12 months in case of death.

The chief objection raised thus far to the proposal has been that it does not apply to all victims of violence but only to victims of civil rights crimes. There are a number of reasons why this argument is not valid.

It is not unusual for Congress to act to cover only part of the field in which it can legislate. As a matter of fact, this is the general practice when it acts in new areas of legislation. H.R. 14765 itself is an example of this partial approach. Although the Congress had full power to protect all constitutional rights, it has seen fit in considering this bill to concern itself—under titles III and V—only with rights that are denied because of race, color, religion, or national origin. In this respect the proposed indemnification title would be consistent with this approach and would apply to rights protected under these parallel provisions of the bill. In short, it is a civil rights bill to protect Negroes and civil rights workers. It would be in no way extraordinary, therefore, but quite logical, to provide indemnification only for such persons in this legislation. The question of a general type of indemnification for other types of victims of crime could be considered separately. There is another reason for this separate approach. Compensation for all victims of crime would most likely be based on the general welfare clause. The indemnification here proposed can be justified under the 14th and 15th amendments, which are the principal bases for H.R. 14765.

The need for such a program of indemnification is amply demonstrated by the events of recent years. The widows and families of Medgar Evers and Rev. James Reeb, who were killed for their civil rights activities, would have been left without means of support except for the generosity of private organizations and individuals. The children of Col. Lemuel Penn, viciously and randomly shot solely because he was a Negro, were left orphaned within a year when their mother died. The brutal killings of the Chaney-Schwerner-Goodman trio left its legacy of misery and suffering. Vernon Dahmer lost his life and his family its business through the fire-bombing of his home and store, because he sought to assist Negroes to register and vote. George Metcalfe, because of his civil rights and voting activities, has been crippled for life. These and other similar cases cry out to the Federal Government to provide some type of indemnification, inadequate as it may be, to help the widows and children of victims killed, and the victims injured, to readjust to their changed circumstances and to have some chance to continue their lives with at least some financial security.

The fact is these victims of criminal activities are different from the usual victims of crime. They are denied their rights because they exercise Federal rights. They are specifically marked for death or injury because they seek to attain the national goal of equality, not selected at random, as the usual victim of crime is. The rights they seek to exercise are rooted in the Constitution and branch out into statutes such as the pending bill. Therefore, they and their activities are matters of special concern to the Federal Government, and anything it can do to protect and encourage them promotes the national interest.

In addition to this positive aspect of encouragement and protection, the indemnification proposal would have a deterrent effect on the Klan-type perpetrators of violence. If these night riders knew that their victims could be compensated for their losses and that they in turn could be held financially liable by the United States for their wrongdoing, they would be less likely to continue their criminal activities.

There is yet another and compelling reason for the enactment of this legislation. The violence directed against Negroes and those who support equal rights is in a true sense the result of governmental action. Ever since emancipation, State governments have permitted, encouraged, and in many cases participated in, through their officials, violence directed against Negroes. The rights guaranteed by the 14th and 15th amendments have been officially denied or ignored for almost a century.

The Federal Government is in no way blameless in this. Until recently it did little, except through the courts, to enforce the provisions of these vital amendments. This neglect is emphasized by the fact that it was not until this year that the Supreme Court, in the Guest and Morgan cases, was called upon to decide whether the Congress could, under article V of the 14th and article II of the 15th amendments, go beyond the courts in implementing these amendments. In deciding that the power of Congress under the amendments was greater than that of the courts, the Supreme Court underscored that Congress has until very recently failed to utilize this authority to make the amendments effective.

It is impossible for the Congress to compensate for this century of neglect. By adopting the indemnification amendment it could at least show that it is concerned with its past neglect and is attempting to use its legislative authority to help alleviate some of the existing effects of its nonaction.

The indemnification proposal here advanced is not without precedent in American law. A number of States have laws imposing upon cities and other municipal corporations liability for injuries to persons or property inflicted by mobs. These vary in the degree of liability they impose; some go beyond what is here suggested by imposing an absolute liability, without any further control by the legislature. What we suggest here would be subject to congressional appropriation each year for its effective enforcement. Attached is a summary of these State indemnification laws in a number of the jurisdictions in which they are in effect:

12 KANSAS STAT. ANOT. 201–202

201 "All incorporated cities and towns shall be liable for all damages that may accrue in consequence of the action of mobs within their corporate limits, whether such damage shall be destruction of property or injury to life or limb." Mob shall be at least 5 people.

202, Character, use, or manner of occupancy of property, reputation and conduct of person injured, diligence used to protect person or property may be shown in mitigation of damages.

KENTUCKY REV. STAT.

Section 411.100 Property damage cause by riotous assembly may be recovered from City, if city could have prevented damage, after notice.

17 MAINE REV. STAT. ANOT. 3353.3354

3353 If persons unlawfully and riotously assembled (12 or more armed or 30 or more armed or unarmed) pull down or begin to pull down or destroy any house, building, ship or vessel, or perpetrate any premeditated injury not a felony, they shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, 5 years imprisonment, and shall be answerable in a civil action for full amount of damages.

3354 Where injury to any such property amounts to $50 or more, the town where it is located shall indemnify the owner for ¾ of its value, to be recovered in a civil action, if he uses all reasonable care to prevent such injury and procure conviction of offenders. The town paying such sum may recover it in an action against the persons doing the injury.

82 ANOT. CODE OF MARYLAND 1–3

Allows recovery from county, city or town for damage done to property by "riotous or tumultuous" assemblage, if county, city or town failed to take action after notice.

NEW JERSEY STAT. ANOT.

2A:48–1 Municipality or county, if it has a paid police force, is liable for injury to real or personal property caused by "reason of a mob or riot."

2A:48–3 Excuses liability if property owner was negligent or aided or sanctioned violence or failed to notify officials.

2A:48–7 Allows recovery over of full amount of damages against parties responsible.

2A:48–8 Allows similar recovery for personal injury from lynch mob, not to exceed $5,000; choice must be made between 2A:-48–1 and this section.

GENERAL LAWS OF RHODE ISLAND 45–15–13

Allows recovery of ¾ of damages for injury to property of value of $50 or more resulting from riotous of tumultuous assembly (or 6 or more persons) from city or town where property is located, provided owner used due diligence.

45–15–14 allows recovering over from persons responsible.

WISCONSIN STAT. ANOT. 66.091

County or city shall be liable for injury to person or property by a mob or riot and many recover against any person inflicting the injury.

No person shall recover if he did not use diligence or notify officials.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES 7–108

Each city and borough is liable for injuries to persons or property caused by mobs, if they or their police officers have not exercised reasonable care to prevent or suppress such mobs.

The amount of damages is determined by the clerk of the city or borough or by a board of assessors if more than one city or borough are involved. Appeal is provided to the courts from this decision.

ILLINOIS REVISED STATUTES (1965) 24: SECTION 1:4:8

Any person suffering material damage to property, injury to person or death as a result of mob action, lynching or taking a person from custody has a cause of action against the city, village or incorporated town (of 5,000 population) not to exceed $30,000.

The injured party can also sue the guilty persons. The city shall have a lien or recovery for any money it has paid and can sue the guilty persons to recover the money it has paid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Attorney General, dated June 27, which reads as follows:

June 27, 1966.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: You have been supplied with a copy of a revised indemnification provision which is proposed for addition to the civil rights legislation now pending before your Committee. This provision would create an indemnification board within the Civil Service Commission, allow that board to make indemnification awards for death or injury resulting from violations of Title V of the proposed legislation, and provide for review of such awards by the Court of Claims.

As we have discussed, this revised title has been reviewed by the Department of

Justice and we have no objection to its adoption.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for offering this amendment. I believe that a Civil Rights Indemnification Board would go a long way toward compensating the victims and the families of the victims of the crimes that the gentleman from Michigan has outlined.

The need for such a board, I think, is perfectly plain. One need only think of the widow of Medgar Evers, the family of James Chaney, the families of the girls killed in the church in Birmingham, the family of Viola Liuzzo.

It seems to me that this is a highly proper function for the Federal Government. During the 100 years after the Civil War segregation was permitted to become imbedded in the South. Institutions, which plainly contradicted the Constitution and the purpose of the Civil War, developed.

Mr. Chairman, now the Federal Government has at last begun to insist that the South break loose of that old system and conform to the dictates of the Constitution. And the people of the South have resisted.

As a direct consequence, citizens attempting to exercise their constitutional rights have been shot and injured by those who are unwilling to accept the fact that the old system must now end. The victims are the casualties, in effect, of 100 years of Federal inaction.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Federal Government has a responsibility to the people who are harmed while trying to assert the rights which the Federal Government and the Constitution promise to protect.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a minute to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS], upon his amendment. I understand that as the gentleman has indicated, it is acceptable to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to call to the attention of the Committee an aspect of this amendment which is worth considering.

Mr. Chairman, all of us have become familiar with uninsured motorists' statutes which protect inocent parties against loss from damage due to the tortious act of another motorist who does not have liability insurance. All of us who drive cars contribute toward a fund that makes it possible to compensate for damages thus incurred.

Perhaps this amendment could be said to create an "uncollectable Klansman" fund. All of us would contribute towards it and be compensated from it in appropriate circumstances. A right of action would then accrue to the Government to recover from the person who committed the act, just as it does under State uninsured motorists' statutes.

Mr. Chairman, I belive the particular kinds of offenses that would be covered by this proposed amendment certainly justify special treatment for the damages incurred. At some future date, Mr. Chairman, we ought to consider at broadening this sort of indemnification procedure to protect victims of other types of crimes as well.

This however, is a good place to begin, and I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS], for offering the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I wonder if I could inquire as to the nature of the proceedings involved? Would this be a broad-type operation?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes, it would be a board proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act. The procedure would be that prescribed by the Administrative Procedures Act, and it would be reviewable by the courts as other quasi-judicial decisions are reviewable by the courts.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Are these appointments to be through the civil service procedure or would it be a presidential appointment?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The members of the Board would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I was very impressed with the statements with reference to the fact that this would be similar to uninsured drivers insurance.

The State of New York only this year adopted and enacted into law legislation where all the people who are victims of crimes of violence can receive money from the State in the form of indemnification from the State. This takes it even a step further and is very close to the legislation suggested by my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to join in commending the gentleman's helpful explanation of this important and desirable amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS]. I join too in urging that our colleagues adopt it.

In the State of California we have enacted legislation that provides some indemnification to victims of violence. It has been working very well. This I think is a very useful step in the direction of seeing that the innocent victims in these difficult situations do not, in addition to their physical injuries also suffer irreparable financial harm. So I would hope that our colleagues would join in supporting the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman tell me if this applies, for instance, to the youngster who was killed by a sniper's bullet or to the policeman who gets killed in some kind of a racial riot. Does it in any way indemnify the survivors of persons killed in that sort of a situation?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would have to advise the gentleman that it is very limited in its scope. It applies to those who suffer injuries to person or property as a result of an action which would also be a violation of section 501 of this title.

As I indicated, I would like to see the U.S. Congress review the entire question of compensation of those damaged by acts of violence. But this amendment is more limited in its scope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said here today that the Department of Justice approves this amendment. But, fortunately for the country, the Congress does the legislating and I do not think that what the Department of Justice thinks about a legislative approach is of particular relevance.

I would point out to all of our colleagues that this proposition was presented to the committee and it was rejected. It should be rejected now in my judgment because we have recently said to our men who are fighting to defend our country that they must pay a premium, as I understand it, in order to get a $10,000 coverage as they have to climb over the hills in Vietnam to engage in battle with the enemy.

I would also point out that this bill would allow two and one-half times the insurable amount of our military personnel for injuries—two and one-half times as much for injuries and five times as much for death as we pay the men who are carrying the banners of freedom on to the battlefields of southeast Asia.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has clearly pointed out the real meat of the coconut in this proposed amendment. Pandora's box never offered anything like this. There is no way under the sun to justify this amendment and it should be beaten.

We are saying to the men who serve in Vietnam, "Your life is worth one-fifth what the life of a civil rights demonstrator is worth if you are killed."

A man killed in battle in Vietnam will only have $10,000 worth of insurance to leave for his dependents that he has paid the premiums on, but a man killed in a civil rights demonstration would under this proposal make his dependents eligible for $50,000 compensation. This is the most wild-eyed preferential scheme I have ever heard of. What about the innocent bystander or the policeman. They are ignored.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I would point out that under this legislation they would seek, as I understand it, to take care of property damages that individuals might sustain in their mercantile establishments and other places. Yet we all know there is no prohibition whatever and no trouble about getting insurance to cover property damage of the type that has been done in many of the communities. But we all know that our boys who are in the military service have a difficult time buying a policy on their life which does not have a war risk exclusion.

I am not saying that anyone should be injured or damaged in any way, but I think it is unconscionable for us to suggest that any American, whatever enterprise he might be engaged in at the time of his injury, ought to get from his Government five times as much money as a young man who may have been involuntarily taken into the service of his country would get if his life were snuffed out by a sniper's bullet or by one of these people who engaged in unlawful conduct on the international front. I would hope that none of us, however we may feel about the things which have been mentioned here, would lose our bearings to the extent that we would bring about such a disparity in the action of this 89th Congress in dealing with indemnity for loss of life or injury.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I think it is important not to confuse the $10,000 national service life insurance that a member of the Armed Forces is privileged to buy and what benefits he might be entitled to if he is injured in active duty or if he loses his life on active duty and what benefits his dependents might be entitled to. You and I know that if a man in the armed services is injured while in line of duty, he can receive a monthly pension for the rest of his life or as long as his disability lasts. If he is killed in duty his dependents will receive a sum of money.

Mr. WHITENER. My friend from Michigan is not talking about the young man who was brought back from Vietnam in a box, because he is not going to draw a check for any months. The only check that he would draw, I presume, would be a $250 payment on his funeral expenses, and if he had some insurance, his beneficiaries in the insurance policy would get the money.

I hope we will defeat the amendment.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As I recall, and as has been stated previously this proposed amendment was offered to the committee, and as I recall the chairman of the committee opposed it and it was rejected. I would like to know from the gentleman from New Jersey what the position of the leadership is with regard to this proposed amendment.

Mr. RODINO. When the amendment was proposed before the subcommittee, it was rejected. Then when it was discussed before the full committee it was again rejected. So far as I am informed, the position of the Department of Justice was one that did not indicate any objection to it. I do not know that it was ever accepted as such. There are some constitutional questions about this section, and that is all I can advise the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Is it not true that the chairman of the full committee opposed this amendment in the committee?

Mr. RODINO. I cannot answer that question and do not recall what the position of the chairman was in committee. Unfortunately, the chairman is not here to state his own position.

Mr. McCLORY. What is the position of the gentleman from New Jersey? Are you supporting it or are you opposing the amendment?

Mr. RODINO. I have taken no position on it. Although the amendment has some merit it does raise some serious questions. Frankly I have had some reservations as to whether it is appropriate at this time. This is all I can indicate to you.

Mr. McCLORY. Do I understand that the managers of this bill on the floor of the House are taking no position with regard to this amendment one way or the other? Is that correct?

Mr. RODINO. I can merely repeat what the position of the committee was. The committee rejected the amendment.

Mr. McCLORY. What is the position of the managers on the part of the majority on the amendment now? I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. RODINO. I cannot speak for anyone else. I can tell you that the position of the committee—and this is all I can state here and now—was in opposition to the amendment. There was discussion before the subcommittee and the full committee and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLORY. That position has not changed, has it?

Mr. RODINO. Insofar as I know the committee's position has not changed.

Mr. McCLORY. Are you supporting the position of the committee?

Mr. RODINO. I am stating the position of the committee.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to say that this is a major change. It is a major amendment. I believe we had better be very careful what we are doing to this legislation. There are a great many stanch supporters of this Civil Rights Act of 1966. But I can say this: That support in this House is certainly jeopardized by major amendments such as this.

I do not believe anyone has any idea, how much money is involved in this proposal. If we get involved in a large riot in a large city, many millions of dollars or even hundreds of millions of dollars of liability could be incurred. I believe the whole subject warrants some committee hearings, some consideration by a committee before it is brought out here in the House in the last 10 or 15 minutes of debate with the idea of putting it through.

Especially I am appalled at the position of the managers on the part of the majority of this bill, that they do not have a more positive position with respect to this amendment, especially since I understood their position to be in opposition in the committee at the time it was offered there. I feel, at this point, that I want to offer support to the majority in opposing this amendment. I am sorry that the position of the majority on the committee is not more clearly stated.

This amendment would create another new board, a new commission. It grants all kinds of additional powers. It establishes a whole new principle in the field of civil rights, as well as in Federal legislation, as far as I understand it.

I know in my State there is a limit of $20,000 in cases of wrongful death. This amendment would more than double that. As a matter of fact, the limits of damages which are allowable in cases of injury are always much higher than cases of wrongful death. It seems to me that consideration of this amendment at this time would be very unwise. The proposal has not been clearly thought out. It is certainly not anything we should consider seriously at this date.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the RECORD is abundantly clear that the administration did not recommend this amendment to the bill. It was not in the bill when it was drawn in the Department of Justice. It was never considered more than 15 minutes—if that much—in the subcommittee which heard this legislation. It was not considered more than 15 minutes—if that much—in the full committee that heard the legislation. There is no positive recommendation, if the committee please, from the Department of Justice or Attorney General.

This is a new concept, a new principle as indicated by my able colleague from Illinois; there is no idea of how much this amendment to this bill could cost. There is no real idea how the law would be administered.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is a good deal like the amendment to the bill that came in on the fair housing amendment to the bill. I do not believe at this late hour, when there is no record in support of this amendment, either in the subcommittee or in the full committee, that we should approve it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge its defeat.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am glad to yield to my able colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to aline myself with the words the gentleman from Ohio has spoken. We have gone a long, long time. This is about the 11th day of this. We are trying to get a bill here that is reasonable and one that we all can support.

In my opinion, this enters into a completely new field. It does not take care of people like innocent bystanders who are injured or property owners who are killed or whose property is destroyed. It is directed too narrowly to one segment of the people participating in the disturbance.

As for me, I intend to vote against this amendment, and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

My heart goes out to those who have suffered in body and in property at the hands of the mob, but the way to resolve the problem and to make them whole is by a study in depth, so that when we finally pass something we will know it is the best the House can do.

Again I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 75, line 23, following the word "facility" insert "which serves the public and which is" and on page 76, line 2, following the word "entertainment" strike out the comma and insert "which serves the public,".

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and others have amendments to offer. This merely clarifies what the committee intended by reference to public facilities.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. As I understand the amendment, it clarifies and, in effect, goes to the word "public" which appears on page 76, line 3; is that correct?

Mr. FUQUA. This is true.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. We accept the amendment.

Mr. RODINO. We accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 75, lines 6 through 8, strike out all of subsection (5) of Section 501(a), and renumber the succeeding subsections thereof.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my two amendments may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 74, line 7, through page 77, line 25, strike out title V, and renumber each succeeding title of H.R. 14765.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the hour is late and there are others who would like to have at least 1 minute on their amendment. I shall not take more than that.

This amendment would merely strike from the entire bill title V. I believe we have had enough debate about title V to convince most of us who are thinking a little bit that it is a terrible provision proposed in the law and we ought to strike it.

I urge now a vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKINSON

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. DICKINSON: On page 74, line 13, after "person" insert the following: ", wearing a distinctive uniform or insignia prescribed by the Attorney General,".

On page 76, line 10, immediately before "(1)" insert the following: ", wearing a distinctive uniform or insignia prescribed by the Attorney General,".

On page 76, line 24, immediately after "person" insert the following: ", wearing a distinctive uniform or insignia prescribed by the Attorney General,".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand it is 1 minute?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the thrust of my amendment is to require that anyone availing himself of the privileges and immunities from arrest under this title should be required to wear a uniform or some other identifying insignia approved by the Justice Department so that the average police officer or anyone else acting "under the color of law" can readily identify one who is a civil rights worker or one who is demonstrating and thus exercising his constitutional rights from one who is engaged in illegal arson, looting, and riots. The danger of the title as it is now written is that it puts the burden on the police officer to make an arbitrary decision as to who is and is not acting legally in the exercise of his civil liberties and constitutional rights.

As an example, if this bill had been the law during the recent riots in Watts, California, the officers who arrived on the scene would have had to decide whether or not a human chain blocking the road so that the firefighting equipment could not reach the hydrants and put out the fires and who were singing at the time "burn, baby, burn" were simply exercising their right to demonstrate in connection with their protest for more civil liberties or were actually illegally obstructing due process of law. If the former be the case and any arrests were made in connection with clearing the streets for the firefighting apparatus then the officer making the arrest would be subject to a thousand-dollar fine and possibly a year in jail.

Take another case, for example, we have had sit-ins, teach-ins, and lie-ins. If a group, in order to make a point and gain publicity to emphasize its grievances, decides to block a public thoroughfare by 100 or more of them lying in the road and refusing to move, are they simply exercising their civil liberties or are they guilty of a misdemeanor? If a policeman makes an error in judgment then he is subject to a $1,000 fine and/or imprisonment by this bill.

We are all familiar with the photograph that appeared in the Washington Post 2 weeks ago, where a looter or demonstrator, as the case may be, was photographed removing an electric fan and other merchandise from a store in the Cleveland riots. There is even a policeman standing by observing. Now the point is, was he demonstrating for his civil rights, or was he guilty of burglary? The policeman would indeed be in a quandary if this present bill under discussion had been the law at that time because he would subject himself to fine and imprisonment if he made an error in judgment and it should turn out that the poor misguided fellow with the electric fan in his hand was only demonstrating and not a looter.

This bill puts an unreasonable and onerous burden on law enforcement officers and only by some identifying insignia can an officer really be sure as to whether one is a demonstrator or not. Just because one is unshaven and unwashed does not necessarily mean he is a demonstrator. It may raise a presumption in certain instances, but it is not conclusive and law enforcement officers should have some standard or criterion to guide them.

In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, anyone with a fair mind who looks at this bill can see that it is unreasonable and is, once again, striking at fundamental precepts and principles of our Constitution, and in laymen's terms is downright stupid. It has become very fashionable to lament the actions of our present Supreme Court and to vilify the Justices for their recent decisions that coddle the criminal at the expense of the average law-abiding citizen. However, if this body passes this law we will be giving a green light to more lawlessness and more rioting than this country has seen to date.

One other extreme example. What if a group similar to "Hell's Angels" should all get on motorcycles and decide to take over a town, as they have in the past, and decide they are protesting for their civil rights because they have been discriminated against due to a creed in which they believe? How is a law enforcement official going to know the best way to deal with this? Lawlessness is lawlessness by whatever name it is called, and our law enforcement officials must not have their hands shackled and be fettered in their attempts to enforce the law and protect the citizens of this country. Can you not hear now when law enforcement officials, whether they be policemen, National Guardsmen, or Federal marshals, in trying to quell a riot are faced at every hand by the remark, "You arrest me and it will cost you a thousand dollars and a year in jail"? I assure you, Mr. Chairman, it will have a telling effect. Suppose 100 demonstrators decide they all wanted to take out warrants against the people who arrest them. It would make no real difference whether the case was finally adjudicated and the policeman defendant was exonerated. He has been put to the task of defending himself—of hiring a lawyer, going to court, and having his property and/or liberty put in jeopardy by simply doing his job. I submit that this speculation is not only possible but probable, and will come about if this ridiculous law is passed.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with tongue in cheek to make a point. The point, I hope, has been made. I have another amendment at the desk which I offer now in all seriousness, and that is a motion to strike the entire title for the reasons just stated. I hope the House will vote in the affirmative on my motion to strike title V.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this title has been concluded, and that would include the preferential motion insofar as this title in concerned. The preferential motion will not obtain the gentleman time.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 75, after line 8, insert "*Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to apply to or affect the right of any person or his authorized agent, to rent or refuse to rent a room or rooms in his home for any reason, or for no reason, or to change his tenants as often as he may desire: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to the right of any person who is not in the business of building, developing, selling, renting or leaving dwellings, as defined in title IV, section 402(d) of this Act, or his authorized agent, to sell, rent or lease any dwelling or any interest therein; *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed to bar any religious or denominational institution, or any charitable or educational institution which is operated, supervised or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, or any bona fide private or fraternal organization, from giving preference to persons of the same religion or denomination, or to members of such private or fraternal organization, or from making such selection as is calculated by such organization to promote the religious principles, or the aims, purposes or fraternal principle for which it was established or maintained; *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply to an owner or his authorized agent with respect to the sale, lease or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence;".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 77, after line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 502. Whoever, basing his action on his race, color, religion or national origin, by force or threat of force—

"(1)(a) injures, intimidates, or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with any person while he is engaging or seeking to engage in any lawful activity; or

"(b) engages, or attempts to engage, against the peace and dignity of the United States, in rioting, destruction of or damage to private or public property, or theft of property, private or personal; or

"(c) injures, intimidates, interferes with or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with any public official or other person to prevent or discourage him from the discharge of his duties; or

"(2) whoever aids and abets another who is committing the offenses innumerated in (a), (b) and (c) hereof—shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if arson is committed, or theft of property of the value of more than $50.00, or bodily injury results, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years or both; and if death results, or the offense of rape occurs, shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

And renumber subsequent sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 1:

"TITLE VI

"SEC. 601. Title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 246; 42 U.S.C. 2000b—2000b-3), is amended to read as follows:

" 'TITLE III—NONDISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

" 'SEC. 301. The Attorney General may institute, in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for desegregation of public education and other public facilities, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, whenever he has reasonable grounds to believe that—

" '(a) Any person acting under color of law has denied, or attempted or threatened to deny, any other person, on account of his race, color, religion, or national origin, the equal protection of the laws with respect to any public school or public college, or any public facility which is owned, operated, or managed by or on behalf of any State or subdivision thereof, or

" '(b) Any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, has intimidated, threatened, coerced or interfered with, or has attempted or threatens to intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right to, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed any right to, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right to equal protection of the laws with respect to any public school or public college, or any public facility which is owned, operated, or managed by or on behalf of any State or subdivision thereof.

" 'SEC. 302. In any proceeding under section 301 the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

" 'SEC. 303. As used in this title—

" '(a) "public school" and "public college" shall have the same meanings as in section 401(c) of title IV of this Act.

" '(b) as applied to public education, "desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

" 'SEC. 304. The district courts of the United States shall have and shall exercise jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this title.

" 'SEC. 305. Nothing in this title shall affect adversely the right of any person to sue for or obtain relief in any court against discrimination in public education or any public facility: *Provided*, That this title shall be the exclusive means whereby the Attorney General may bring suits for the desegregation of public education.'

"SEC. 602. Sections 407 through 410 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 248-249; 42 U.S.C. 2000c-6—2000c-9) are hereby repealed."

Mr. RODINO (during reading of the title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the title be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRICE, having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight August 9 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WHO IS MAKING THE PROFIT ON THE AMERICAN CONSUMER?

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to take positive action and conduct a sweeping investigation into the question of who is making the profit on the American consumer. This past week the Senate Agriculture Committee reported price increases in bread, milk, butter, bacon, ground beef, flour, eggs, and other food staples.

I advocate that every agency of the Government responsible to the American people for trade, labor, and agriculture should be called upon to testify before proper congressional committees for the purpose of tracking down those guilty of gouging the public with unconscionable increases in food prices.

On August 4, 1966, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman appeared before the city council in New York City and stressed that an investigation be made on the increased cost of food prices. He pointed out, and I quote:

> We know that food, like other things, must be paid for. However, because we must have food to live and because food is an important item in our family budget, and because we buy it more frequently than any other item or service, we are likely to be very sensitive about them, too. This is as it should be. The focus of public attention is the most effective instrument for fair play that we have in a free society. Therefore, your investigation is a useful one, and I am pleased to do my best to contribute to it.

Last week we were informed of a $2 to $3 increase per ton on the price of steel and President Johnson on August 5, 1966 warned against price increases and stated that it will be necessary for the Government to further reduce expenditures in those areas where prices are rising in an inflationary way.

Regarding this price increase in steel, let us look at the price of necessary food items and compare their recent increases by the ton, and we find a shocking situation facing the American public.

Bacon has been increased by $295 a ton; pork chops by $140 a ton; butter increased by $100 a ton; ground beef by $68 a ton; bread by $60 a ton; eggs by $39 a ton; milk by $23 a ton, and flour by $15 a ton.

These are food items necessary to every home every day. These price increases are hitting the average wage earner and family and result in a crushing blow for large families, those in the low-income groups, and retirees on fixed incomes.

I believe Congress should summon people responsible for these increases, subpena their books, papers, and records and have them testify under oath concerning the need for these increases.

RULES COMMITTEE URGED TO HOLD HEARINGS ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SERVICE AND THE DRAFT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision last Thursday by the Armed Services Committee to suspend its hearings on the draft for this session of Congress, I have called upon the chairman of the Rules Committee to hold hearings promptly upon resolutions to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on National Service and the Draft.

Mr. Speaker, this request is given a special urgency as a result of the announcement by the Department of Defense last week to the effect that it has issued a draft call for 46,200 men in the month of October. The call is the largest since the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, if the present selective service is inequitable, as so many people now believe, then those 46,200 men will be selected unfairly.

By the time the present draft law expires next summer, more than 200,000 more men will have been selected by the current system.

A great deal has happened since I first introduced this resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 661—on May 19.

The Armed Services Committee has held hearings on the draft.

The President has appointed a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

A national poll has shown that more than 50 percent of the public considers the present draft unfair, while 80 percent would favor a system of national service.

The resolution for a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft has been introduced by 39 Members of the House and 9 Senators.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee decision not to hold further hearings this year points up the need for a joint congressional committee such as I have proposed. The committee said that it wanted to wait until it could review the results of the study by the President's Advisory Commission. But Mr. Speaker, those who urged a full review of the draft in 1964 were put off for similar reasons when the President announced that the Department of Defense had undertaken a study of the draft.

Mr. Speaker, while I am happy that the President and the Congress will have the benefit of a report by the Advisory Commission on Selective Service, it is no excuse for congressional inaction.

My own view is that questions about the draft should be raised in a much broader context than could be considered by any single committee of Congress. The study should consider the educational value of national service, the country's manpower needs, the need for young men to work in conservation, education, poverty programs, and in programs overseas.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress took the initiative on this matter of such vital national concern. It is time that a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft be established.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since May 18 when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara suggested that the United States consider a program of national service, the subject has become the subject of many thoughtful articles by academicians, Government officials, and journalists.

Harris Wofford of the Peace Corps discussed the educational advantages of national service in an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Prof. Eli Ginsberg will discuss the manpower implications of national service in a forthcoming edition of the thoughtful new periodical, The Public Interest. The presidents of both Yale University and Harvard University made national service the subject of their comments on commencement day.

Now the New York Times Magazine section has published a thorough discussion of national service. It was written by Marion K. Sanders, a senior editor of Harper's magazine.

Citing statistics on the manpower needs of the United States and presenting illustrations of how programs of national service have worked in other countries, Mrs. Sanders recommends the implementation of some form of national service.

She also reaches into American history to analyze the experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps in order to suggest how such a program might be most efficiently managed.

While some observers may quarrel with her conclusions, I think that all of those who are interested in national service or the draft owe a debt of gratitude to Mrs. Sanders for preparating a thorough and provocative analysis. She raises and deals with questions which we all should be asking. I urge all of my colleagues to read "The Case for a National Service Corps," which appeared in the New York Times Magazine section on Sunday, August 7.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine Section, of Aug. 7, 1966]

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

(By Marion K. Sanders)

"If now there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow."

So wrote William James more than sixty years ago in an essay whose title has proved more memorable than its content. A "Moral Equivalent for War" has endured as a dream of philosophers and poets. But few Americans have been attracted to the notion of an army of civilian conscripts.

Thus it was something of a shock—which reverberated in front-page headlines—when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara appeared to embrace the idea not long ago in a speech in Montreal.

"Our present Selective Service system draws on only a minority of eligible young men. That is an inequity," Mr. McNamara said. "It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad."

Mr. McNamara did not define the phrase "every young person." Was he referring to the more than three million male and female Americans who reach the age of 18 every year? Or was he thinking of the whole 18–26 age group of both sexes—numbering over 25 million? Either way, it is a grandiose concept. Reaction to his proposal on Capitol Hill was generally cool and the White House firmly disavowed the notion of drafting the young for civilian duties. Yet despite official efforts to shoot it down, McNamara's trial balloon remained aloft. For the idea of a national service program is appealing. It will be explored on an official level by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which was appointed by President Johnson last month and which will report to him in January.

Enthusiasts for national service see it as an outlet for youthful idealism, as an antidote for the moral lassitude of our time and as a practical means of tackling the immense problems of our society and of the world's less affluent nations.

But before it can be even considered a possible alternative to military service, a number of hard questions will have to be answered. Among them these:

(1) Should service be voluntary or compulsory? (2) Precisely what would members of the service corps do? (3) Who would mobilize, train and direct them

On the first point there is a sharp split. Secretary McNamara, for example, though he did not amplify his suggestion personally, allowed his office to issue a statement to the effect that the operative world in his proposal was "ask," meaning that young persons would be invited rather than required to serve Similarly, Dean John Monro of Harvard College is unequivocally opposed to the idea of compulsory service, characterizing it as "totalitarian." Young people, he said, should be free to make their own choice; they should be left alone to lead their own lives. Nonetheless, he heartily favors a comprehensive civilian program in which those who so desire can volunteer. This, generally speaking, is the "conservative" position.

It is the "liberal" side which favors compulsory service. One of its eloquent voices is Prof. Roger Shattuck of the University of Texas. Writing in The Texas Observer, he conceded that a draft for civilian service seems, at first glance, an invasion of political freedom. But he believes in a compulsory program because it is "a mission dedicated to peace and freedom and raising living standards. It could spell a political and moral regeneration for the whole country. Our colleges and universities are rapidly becoming institutions of higher segregation where sub-adults are kept at a low simmer, held apart from certified adults in the 'real world'." All young people, he argued, should be required to "help with their own hands in solving the technological, economic and moral mess we have got ourselves into."

A middle position is taken by Harris Wofford, Associate Director of the Peace Corps. "I don't know," he said recently, "whether this needs to be done by law or whether we can do it by spreading the volunteer idea and making it a recognized part of the citizenship training of every American."

Donald J. Eberle—who has spent many years teaching in Africa and is particularly interested in the possibilities of overseas service for young Americans—called together in early May some thirty interested educators, foundation officials, students and other concerned citizens who spent the day discussing a national service program at the Princeton Club in New York. Everyone present supported the idea of such a program but the conference reached no firm conclusion on how to go about putting it into effect. Subsequently, Mr. Eberle and a small ad hoc committee pulled together some tentative proposals which provide a concrete basis for discussion. This is their plan:

The program would be administered by the 4,000 existing Selective Service boards. (Women are not dealt with in this particular proposal, which is primarily designed as an alternative to the present draft system.) On being called up at 18, each young man would be offered the following options:

(1) Immediate military service for two years, including training;

(2) Immediate nonmilitary service for *three* years, including training;

(3) Delayed service—either military or nonmilitary—to be fulfilled before the age of 26; or,

(4) The young man could choose not to volunteer at all, in which case his name would be placed in a pool to be drafted possibly by lottery whenever the armed services might need him.

A key feature of this plan is the difference in length of service; this factor, it is thought, plus such added inducements as better pay and greater G.I. benefits, might entice enough youths into the armed forces to meet military manpower requirements. Though this may be so, most of the young people I have talked to regard three years—the period specified for civilian service in the program discussed above—as an excessive chunk out of one's life before the age of 26. Several felt, too, that it was presumptuous to place a time value on military versus civilian service. And how, others asked, could civilian service be considered "equality of sacrifice" compared with risking one's life in Vietnam?

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, a stanch advocate of universal service, also objects to the time differential. "Making non-military service of longer duration," he said, "would seem to indicate to the public that it is not as valuable as military service."

To most people, the closest equivalent to military duty seems the Peace Corps, which entails real hazards and hardships. Unfortunately, however, the Peace Corps cannot become an instrument for correcting "inequities" in the draft. There are only 14,000 volunteers in its ranks; in its first five years, 86 percent of its workers had A.B., B.S., or higher degrees; 11 percent had some college education and only 3 percent had never been to college. Obviously, Peace Corps service would provide an avenue of escape from the military for precisely the same group of well-educated young men who are now being deferred. Similarly, VISTA—the Domestic Peace Corps—has fewer than 3,000 in its ranks and 75 percent of them are college graduates. The newly launched Teachers' Corps likewise needs well-educated, specially qualified volunteers and is budgeted for only a few thousand.

The plain fact is that there are no existing service groups which could effectively absorb the large numbers of men and women that a national service program would provide. A new framework will have to be invented. It also seems evident that the whole concept will be badly skewed if—in the midst of a shooting war, and a frustrating and unpopular one to boot—we conceive of national service as primarily a solution to the "inequities of the draft."

This does not mean, however, that it is too early to give serious thought to a universal national service program; for surely only the blackest pessimists among us believe that we will forever need three million young men in active combat forces. When that necessity ends, we should be ready to launch a plan that will have constructive value for our young people and for our society.

What services actually could the members of a civilian corps perform? An illuminating statistical clue has been provided by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. Its report made a startling estimate of the jobs which currently needed to be filled to bring public services in this country up to "acceptable" levels. Here are the commission's estimates:

The jobs:	*The workers needed*
Medical institutions and health services	1,200,000
Educational institutions	1,100,000
National beautification	1 300,000
Welfare and home care	700,000
Public protection	350,000
Urban renewal and sanitation	650,000
Total	5,300,000

Could much of this work be done by members of a national service corps? And would their presence be accepted by organized labor?

I put these questions to Brendan Sexton, director of Leadership Studies for the United Auto Workers, who has recently completed a tour of duty in the upper echelons of the Poverty Program. His response, on both counts, was strongly affirmative. He is convinced that an immense amount of useful work could be done by national service corpsmen and women with a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create in effect new career opportunities—in the care of the aged and sick, in the rehabilitation of our cities and forests. And he believes that, despite the cost of such a program, there would be an economic gain in terms of mental illness, crime and delinquency prevented.

"Of course, there would be a kind of reflexive hostility at the outset on the part of some old-line unions," he said. "One way to handle this would be to involve plenty of retired craftsmen—plumbers, machinists, electricians, and so forth, as teachers in the program.

"Obviously all unions would object if volunteers took jobs away from workers at a time or in an area of unemployment. They would have a legitimate beef if—for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Park Department employes and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the catalogue of things that need to be done is so fabulous that there shouldn't be any danger of real competition on the job market."

It seems a conservative estimate that at least half of the more than 5,000,000 service jobs projected in the automation report could, at least in theory, be filled by suitably trained corpsmen and women. And it seems feasible and desirable to put many of them to work in existing public and private agencies and institutions which are, at the present time, desperately shorthanded.

This is exactly what has happened in our only state-run domestic peace corps—the Commonwealth Service Corps founded in Massachusetts in 1965 as a living memorial to John F. Kennedy. In an initial survey conducted while this corps was being planned, it was found that some 375 state, private and local public agencies could readily use more than 7,000 volunteers. Full-time Massachusetts corpsmen are paid $80 a month (there are also part-time volunteers who serve a minimum of 12 hours a week and are reimbursed for expenses, and students who receive up to $12 a month for at least six hours of service a week).

Some serve in the wards of mental hospitals, others as helpers in homes for the retarded; some run an information and referral service for welfare recipients; others work with prisoners and parolees; and some conduct study halls for teen-agers. The Commonwealth Corps is largely supported by Poverty Program funds; and it has been beset by the administrative, jurisdictional and political difficulties common to so many Poverty Program operations. Though it is functionally an inspiring example, the Commonwealth Corps does not provide an administrative model for a nationwide, large-scale service corps.

The most respected prototype, organizationally, is the Israeli youth service program which, as Harris Wofford put it in a recent talk, recognizes "the need to mobilize the whole younger generation. . . . There are no 4-F's in Israel. Everyone is 1-A in terms of national service."

The Israeli national service is run by the defense forces, in which all young people must enlist. Men between the ages of 18 and 26 serve for 26 months; those between 27 and 29 who have not been called up for one reason or another serve for two years; unmarried women from 18 to 26 serve for 20 months. (Deferment is granted students taking subjects of special importance to the country—namely, medicine, engineering, agronomics or teaching.)

The full period of service is not, however, devoted to military training or duties. In Nahal (Pioneering Fighting Youth) some young men and women do agricultural work in frontier villages or set up new ones. Others teach and provide a variety of social services to the many impoverished, ignorant immigrants who have entered Israel in recent years. The Israel defense forces and the Ministry of Education jointly run a youth corps, Gadna, which provides training along Scout lines for boys and girls from 14 to 18 and also stresses pioneering and agriculture.

A somewhat similar program of national service in Iran is also run by the military. Soldiers in uniform teach, build roads and bridges, give health and sanitation training and, in effect, serve as the shock troops of the country's war against ignorance, poverty, illiteracy and social deprivation.

In this country we have only prototype for a broadly democratic civilian service corps—the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps. Its peak enrollment in 1935 was 500,000; in all, 2.5-million young men passed through the camps, most staying for six months to plant trees, build reservoirs and fish ponds and check dams. They dug diversion ditches, raised bridges and fire towers, fought blister rust and pine-twig blight and Dutch elm disease, restored historic battlefields, cleared beaches and camping grounds. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has written in "The Coming of the New Deal": "They did more than reclaim and develop natural resources. They reclaimed and developed themselves."

The young men were recruited by the Labor Department. The Agriculture and Interior Departments organized and supervised the work projects. The camps themselves, however, were run by the War Department; one of the officers associated with them, Schlesinger notes, "was a Col. George Catlett Marshall, who organized 17 camps in the Southeast."

With World War II, the C.C.C. went out of business; but it is important to remember that the Army played a crucial role in making it work.

In any large national service program, our armed forces would have a key part—or in this country only the military has developed real competence in mobilizing, sorting out and training large numbers of men and women. It is fashionable, particularly among those who have never been in military service, to disparage the Army way—but the recruiting posters are not nonsense. The military does a remarkable job of training and of fitting round pegs into round holes. Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia, who is chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Commission, says: "On the basis of observations extending over a quarter of a century, I have no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as good as industry's. Of course you find some misassigned men in the Army—but the same is true in universities and industry. The armed services do a careful job of classification. The bizarre yarns you hear—about the man who was taught Japanese and then sent to France—represent rare exceptions."

Furthermore, thousands of young men have acquired useful civilian vocations in the course of their military service. The armed forces do not maintain follow-up records to prove the point. However, a still unpublished study conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is illuminating. A random sample of draftees in the lowest intelligence group eligible for military duty was followed for a period of years after service. The earnings of these men were compared with those of a similar group of men who had not had military service. The superiority in earnings of the ex-soldiers was characterized as "fantastic" by one man who participated in this study.

Although the armed forces no longer accept illiterates, they still maintain education centers where high school drop-outs can study during off-duty hours. In the 12 months ending July, 1965, high school diplomas were earned in this way by 43,558 soldiers—a result that stands up well alongside civilian attempts to cope with the same problem.

A compulsory national service corps would involve an administrative task of a scope we haven't seen since World War II, when 16 million men and women were mobilized in our armed forces. Here are the basic personnel figures we would have to work with should a compulsory service corps for both sexes be set up in this country:

Total men and women at present in the 18–26 age group: more than 25 million.

Exemptions: 11 million. (Mothers and men and women in essential jobs—7 million; men and women in the armed forces—2 million; physically and mentally unfit—2 million.) [*]

Total men and women available for a compulsory service corps: 14 million.

If each individual in this eight-year (18–26) age span serves for two years, then one-fourth of the 14-million group—i.e., 3.5-million—would be in service at any one time. What would a 3.5-million-strong national service corps cost? Adopting arbitrarily a modest figure of $3,500 per capita to cover training, equipment, maintenance and a token salary, the annual bill would be around $12-billion—exclusive of the undoubtedly heavy cost of tooling up. This is hardly a sum the Congress or the taxpayers are likely to approve at the present time—after all, only $1.5-billion annually has been allocated to the entire Poverty Program.

Apart from its cost, a compulsory program of the size we have projected is up against the fact that we do not have an adequate plan as yet for using the 3.5-million workers it would provide. And I can think of no surer way to foredoom a potentially admirable effort than to launch it without careful advance planning. Furthermore, after discussions with young people, educators and thoughtful public officials, I have concluded that there is an essential conflict between the concepts of conscription and humanitarian service.

I therefore believe that the answer, at least for the present, is a small *voluntary* national service corps, including both men and women. The response of Americans to well-planned voluntary programs has always been impressive. The men's and women's Job Corps, for example, have had to turn down, for budget reasons, nine out of every ten applicants. (There are fewer than 30,000 in the Job Corps today. Well over 500,000 persons—most from deprived backgrounds—have applied to date.) The dedicated service given by volunteers in Operation Headstart and other Poverty Program projects is a measure of a huge untapped reservoir of idealism among Americans. Judging by the figures on the 18–26 age group already given, I believe that it would be possible to mobilize at least two million young people in a service corps on a purely voluntary basis.

But a corps of two million is still too large for the moment. We are not yet tooled for it. I propose, instead, that Congress create a National Service Agency authorized to mobilize 500,000 civilian volunteers, selected initially on the basis of their dedication to and aptitude for the corps' varied missions. The cost would be in the neighborhood of $1.7-billion annually. This, theoretically, is how the corps would be set up:

Upon signing in, all volunteers would go to basic-training centers operated by the Army, which would perform the function it did for the C.C.C. The Army also would be requested to operate a classification system designed to match interests, skills and national needs.

Thereafter volunteers would be dispersed to newly established service centers around the country for training and duty. Some would work in conservation camps administered jointly by the Army and by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, in the C.C.C. pattern. Many would be assigned to public and private institutions to work as nurse-teacher-librarian aides; mental-health assistants; or in recreation and urban-improvement programs. The National Service Agency would be responsible for setting standards and maintaining a continuous check on the performance of volunteers and the agencies authorized to supervise them.

(Experimentally, I think it would be useful to make such voluntary service an alternate to military duty for the men. It seems to me unlikely that the armed forces would be shortchanged if this choice were offered. For only a minute proportion of the civilian corps could be accommodated in such "glamour" agencies as the Peace Corps. The vast majority would face assignment to rugged labor on conservation projects or to the relatively drab tasks cited above.)

Even before establishing a National Service Agency and embarking on this modest pilot program, however, we should take these steps:

(1) Enlarge the Peace Corps and VISTA and the Teachers' Corps to at least double their present size. This is an effort in which the colleges will have to help, as several are already doing.

(2) Increase the Job Corps tenfold—to an estimated 400,000. To do this will require a major shift in emphasis—stressing service to human beings and the career opportunities in welfare fields, rather than routine vocational training. This will also require a more democratic mix in Job Corps enrollment, with the better-educated volunteers spending at least part of their time as teachers of their less-well-equipped colleagues—as is done in Israel. The Job Corps, in effect, should be converted from a rehabilitation program for the poor into an opportunity for democratic service for all. The reconstituted Job Corps—and possibly also the Peace Corps, VISTA and the Teachers' Corps—would be absorbed by the National Service Agency when established. If, as is quite likely, there remains a need for a program

---

[*] These figures presuppose an eventual reduction in military forces from the present 3 million; deferments but not exemptions for students; and fewer exemptions for unfitness, since national-service qualification requirements would be lower than those of the armed forces.

of remedial education and vocational training, along the lines of the present Job Corps, it should be set up under educational auspices apart from the service program.

(3) Compile a national inventory of worthwhile conservation and urban-rehabilitation projects and of the urgent manpower and womanpower needs of institutions, schools and social agencies across the country. Supplement this listing with a catalogue of the new services desperately needed by the nation's old people, children, harassed working mothers and the footloose adolescents. Such a compilation is by no means beyond the capacity of the nation's social scientists and computers.

By thus translating the nation's human needs into perceivable form, I believe we would dramatize the fact that we do have more than five million unfilled jobs. And we would begin to see a national service corps, not merely as an "alternative to the draft" or as a corrective to the draft's "inequities," but as a tool for alleviating the anguish of neglected patients in our hospitals and mental institutions, the misery of lonely old people, the plight of neglected children and the decay of our neglected land and cities—the medieval blights in our affluent society.

WOMANPOWER

It has been fashionable in recent years to deplore the waste of "a great national resource—womanpower." Chief objects of concern have been the college-educated women who marry too young and languish in suburban domesticity. A tour of duty in a national service program might awaken members of this group to the realities of the society in which they live and attract them in increasing numbers to those classic "woman's vocations" which are now so woefully shorthanded—notably nursing, teaching and social work.

However, no more than 10 per cent of the 1.5 to 2 million girls who will reach the age of 18 annually in the next decade will become college graduates. Over 200,000 of the total group will be "nonwhite" and a high proportion of these predictably will come from impoverished, disorganized homes. Little has been done to date to develop the potential of girls who drop out or just make it through high school. The Job Corps, for example, has found room for less than a tenth as many girls as boys.

A national service program could open up vast vocational opportunities for this neglected group. Among many needed functions, they could help ease the lot of American working mothers. According to the latest Women's Bureau survey, there are 3.8 million children under 6 in this country whose mothers are away from home working full time. But in the entire United States there are accommodations for fewer than 300,000 children in licensed public and private day-care facilities.

This shocking gap in our social services will be closed only if we mobilize—on all levels—the womanpower which is indeed now wasted. Since not only child care, but a high proportion of the other tasks of the service corps can best be done by women, at least half of the enrollment should be women.—M.K.S.

FORTHCOMING ELECTION IN VIETNAM WILL BE AN IMPORTANT EVENT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I suggested to this Chamber that the forthcoming election in Vietnam would be an important event, regardless of the outcome: Important if not rigged and honest, as the basis of a viable and independent government; important if rigged and dishonest, as a way of discrediting whatever Vietnamese regime follows them as well as ourselves; important whether honest or not and whether carefully evaluated or not, as a source of uncertainty and controversy about their meaning and our own credibility.

Whether we like it or not, and whether the administration likes it or not, the statements about the honesty of the elections neither by the Government of South Vietnam nor by our own State Department will be taken seriously. They should not be. Both sources are interested parties.

If events progress at their apparently appointed pace, the elections will be held. Nobody will believe they were representative. They will be the source of endless argument and confusion. And it would be better if they had never occurred. We will have lost an opportunity at least as great as a major military victory. In fact, if we continue to refuse to consider seriously the great importance of the election's credibility, we will be heading, willy-nilly, into a setback as great as a major military defeat.

Why are we doing this? Are we smug? Are we preoccupied with military actions? Do we hope clever propaganda can overcome lack of substance? Have we neither an answer nor a set of alternatives?

I suggested one last week—perhaps the wrong one, but at least a suggestion—when I pointed out that the international press corps could be freed to assess the election and asked to prepare an evaluation of all its aspects. Other suggestions, such as the International Control Commission and the U.N. are said, unofficially, to be unworkable. Perhaps this suggestion is also. But we must have some answer other than the word of Premier Ky and the State Department, and I exhort them to act now rather than to remain silent so they can give us the word later.

This point has been grasped by the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, who recently visited Vietnam and came away with two conclusions: First, the solution to the conflict must be political as well as military; and second, we must have the patience and determination to secure such a solution.

I hope the State Department and Premier Ky do not respond to my suggestions by asserting that we should believe whatever they say about the elections. I know I will not. I know some others have grave doubts already. I fear these doubts will turn out to be merely the dew before the deluge.

To illustrate this, I ask permission to insert a news story from the Washington Post of August 5, 1966:

SAIGON ELECTION STIRS SKEPTICISM—PUBLIC INDIFFERENT

(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, August 4.—The election of an assembly to write a constitution for South Vietnam is barely five weeks away, and professional politicians here are skeptical and the public largely indifferent.

Suspicion of the election results runs so deep that one prominent politician estimates that in Saigon as much as one third of the electorate may stay away from the polls or deliberately spoil ballots.

These views emerged from interviews with candidates, journalists and qualified observers of politics in Saigon and the neighboring province of Giadinh, which together will elect 26 of the 117 delegates to the assembly. The interviews were restricted to Vietnamese. Nearly all those interviewed agreed that topic A in Saigon today is the economy, specifically the inflation which followed the June devaluation of the piastre. The public is largely indifferent to the election (the formal campaign period does not begin until Aug. 26), and that indifference is reinforced by what one observer called traditional suspicions and sniping from the sidelines by Buddhist militants who have vowed to boycott the balloting.

Among politicians, there is bitterness over Amendment 20 to the electoral law, the provision that allows the government to amend the constitution after it has been written, and requires a two-thirds majority of the constituent assembly to overrule it.

"This is the rule of the minority in an assembly elected to write a constitution," says Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the highly respected former government minister who heads an electoral slate in Giadinh. "It exists nowhere else in the world."

Somewhat less controversial is the provision, said to be unprecedented in Vietnamese politics, that candidates run on a slate in constituencies where more than one delegate is to be elected.

The intricate, complicated device of a slate was intended, by one account, to prevent Communists or neutralists from running for the assembly. An authentic nationalist, the argument went, would think twice before including on his slate a Communist who would almost certainly doom the entire slate to defeat.

If there are four slates composed of five men each contesting a five-seat constituency, and the front-running slate gets 60 per cent of the vote, the top three names on that slate are elected. The remaining two seats go to the top men on the next most popular slate, or slates, depending on the vote.

It appears to be an exercise in higher Vietnamese mathematics, but what the procedure does, in effect, is place a premium on being the top man on the slate.

Already there are charges, unsubstantiated by proof but widely believed, that wealthy men have bought the top place on certain slates by promising to pay the campaign expenses of their slatemates.

Anyone can get together a slate (there are 248 of them nationwide in the September election; 133 candidates are running on single tickets in districts where only one delegate will be elected), and the theory was that the most popular and highly respected would head the slate.

Some dissenters contend that the slates will promote harmony among candidates, but others are not so sure. The political rule of thumb in Vietnam is that if you have two men on a streetcorner you have two political parties. If you have three, you have two parties and a faction.

Wherever one talked, there was a rippling undercurrent of suspicion of government intentions. Nowhere was there proof of fraud, but everywhere there were doubts. "Up to now," said an earnest Vietnamese politician, "there have been only rumors, but no evidence."

Feeding the rumors are the Buddhist militants, with leaflets and handbills and gossip. The Vietnamese, according to Phan Khac Suu, the former chief of state in the Huong and Quat civilian governments, have been "victimized" so long by their leaders—President Ngo Dinh Diem's rubber-stamp congresses, for example—that it is easy for the Buddhists to subvert confidence, which Suu says they are doing with great skill.

Suu's view of a deeply suspicious electorate egged on by Buddhist propaganda is probably the majority view here, although some would differ.

One who does is Dr. Dan. He argues that while the electorate may be suspicious and indifferent, the Vien Hoa Dao (the Buddhist Institute) does not even represent a majority of Buddhists, much less a majority of Vietnamese (a point with which most independent observers would agree). In the end, Dr. Dan says, most Vietnamese will go to the polls.

The trouble is confidence, or the lack of it. A young government civil servant, who demonstrated in Hue against U.S. support of Prime Minister Ky and for civilian rule under elections, now says the constituent assembly elections are wrong. Why? "Not suitable," he says vaguely. "They will solve nothing."

What the Vietnamese expect to emerge from the election is elusive. The politicians, after paying homage to doubt and suspicion, appear to be anxious to test the levers of power, even under a government which would probably (under Amendment 20) hold a veto. Prognostications differ widely.

Dr. Dan Van Sung, the editor and publisher of the Saigon daily Chinh Luan and no friend of the Ky regime, who is a candidate for the assembly, predicts that as many as 80 of the 117 delegates will be supporters of the government. But he also says the minority will be vigorous, and places as his aim the creation of a legal opposition.

Former Chief of State Suu, an old Vietnamese political pro, says flatly: "If a candidate in this election supports the government, surely he will be defeated."

At least part of the problem revolves around the programs of the candidates. If the interviews are any indication, the men who face the electorate will talk about the constitution, the value of legitimate government, the high cost of living, the price of rice.

One moderate, very highly respected candidate who was said to be almost certainly a winner, declared when he was asked about the war that "Vietnam wants to negotiate with the North."

Would he say that on the election platform?

"No."

Why not?

His translated answer was that "every candidate has the right to express his views on the right things only—not on everything." It was not now "convenient" to speak of negotiation with the North.

WHILE ROME BURNS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the August 8, 1966, issue of the U.S. News & World Report carries an article "Can Riots Be Stopped?" The article lists every section and many cities of the United States where mobs have destroyed life and property. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that like any other problem we must determine and then correct the cause.

Law enforcement is the responsibility of and is dependent upon local government, the city, and its police; the county and its sheriff; and in emergency, the State and its militia. Under present conditions none of the officers of either of these governmental units can fully perform their functions of law enforcement because the Supreme Court with other Federal courts following has set up rules which frequently make it impossible for the police and local officers to protect the public. The Federal courts have been and are supported in this destructive course by the Attorney General and the Executive Department of Government. We can stop rioting but to do so we will have to stop courts from muzzling our law enforcement officers by new court-fixed rules governing procedures of local officers and admissibility of evidence. To this end we need the help of a responsible press, radio, and television—for frequently in the past few years, it has been hard to tell where honest news reporting ended and news promotion, almost to the point of inciting a riot, began.

Last week, I discussed this problem in some detail in connection with the bill before us, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966, excerpts from which I present here:

CRIME INCREASES

Mr. Chairman, like many of my colleagues, I served as district attorney. I know a majority of the Congress have had experience in the courtroom. If any Members do not believe it takes a man of a little more than average courage to bring in a conviction and send a fellow man to jail or to the penitentiary, or to punish him, those Members have not had experience in the courtroom.

All recognize that throughout the United States today, it is getting harder and harder to convict criminals, and have the conviction stand. The certainty of punishment is becoming uncertain. As stated by one of my colleagues, in recent years, the Supreme Court in 35 cases has found new rights in the Constitution. What do those newly found rights consist of?

They consist of newly found reasons for the Court to set aside convictions because certain procedures were not followed, even though an overall reading of the record would convince one beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendants guilt.

My friends, law enforcement is breaking down; yet our committees bring us a bill which will make punishment less certain, which will give many more chances for defense counsel to raise technicalities, which now that the Court has put technicalities far ahead of public protection will further increase lawlessness.

In fact the situation throughout much of the Nation has grown so bad that the Washington Post of July 27, 1966, carried this large headline: "Crime Increasing Steadily FBI Says but Number of Convictions Is Falling."

I would say the total number of such cases throughout the South is very small, from a numerical standpoint—as bad as some of them may be. The number is nothing like those that have occurred in northern cities in recent months.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to say that we do not have some problems in our area. Most of them, however, have been created since the leadership of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties began competing with each other to pass the strongest laws, directed primarily toward my section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, every department—Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Justice through the Attorney General, and others start with the statute and then demand agreement to Federal regulations which go much further than the intent of the law. We realize that in my State, with 2 million people, 5 Members of the House—which is about 1 percent of the membership—and 2 Senators, making 2 percent of the entire Senate, we certainly cannot run the country. But we believe the rest of the country is now able to see that while you have created problems for us, you have aggravated your own very dangerous situation and solved little if anything.

Mr. Chairman, on July 27, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1237, the title of which I read to you now.

"House Joint Resolution 1237: Joint resolution to establish a Commission to investigate the increase in law violation to determine the causes and fix responsibility for the breakdown in law enforcement, with the resulting destruction of life and property, to recommend corrective legislation, and for other purposes."

I hope we may have favorable action on that resolution. My colleagues, it took more than a thousand years for our forefathers to wrest from the crown the right of local self-government; the right to work and save, and thereby accumulate capital; the right to own property, which after all is the incentive for putting forth effort; the right to individual freedom from molestation by others; the right to choose and to have one's religion; and the right to have a government of laws, instead of men, to protect these rights.

For hundreds of years this Nation recognized the rights of other nations of the world to run their own affairs, just as here at home it was recognized that with the many differences between sections of this Nation, with the different backgrounds of the people, it was absolutely necessary that we guarantee States rights.

But in recent years, we are finding that the Supreme Court in effect is saying, "the public is not entitled to protection from this criminal who was convicted, because the officers waited a little bit too long to arraign him." He may be guilty, but somebody failed to conform to a technicality that had been established by the Court. They say that the officials, that the officers, working for small pay under trying circumstances, waited 4 hours and 45 minutes before they arraigned him. "Perhaps he is guilty, but we are turning him loose." My friends, if you read about the deplorable case of the eight student nurses who were killed a few weeks ago, and have since followed the case in the press, it is evident that the authorities who were responsible for protecting the public hesitated because they were afraid that in some way they might do something that would cause the courts to turn that man loose to commit more of the same type crimes.

If I judge correctly, the membership of this House is waking up to the fact that these efforts of the past number of years are creating new problems in their sections. It has been very noticeable in this debate that there is little enthusiasm, even on the part of the proponents of these measures, for this legislation.

RECENT MARCH ON MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman, during the recent march from Memphis to Jackson, the capital of my State, those participating went through counties in which I served more than 8 years as district attorney, and may I say, I am willing to match my record and the record of fairness of courts with those of any section.

With my people trying so hard to prevent any kind of trouble, we all regret that any trouble arose, though there are many curious factors involved in the assault near Hernando, including the fact that there were only four marchers, including TV and radio representatives; that the individual charged with the assault used birdshot, carefully judging his distance, stayed around after the shooting until still pictures, used by the press and on television, could be made. Only after the assault did competing national civil rights leaders rush to the scene and business picked up, so to speak. But even though the marchers would not use the new and spacious four-lane highway No. 55 from Memphis to Jackson, but used old Highway 51, so as to go through the towns and villages, their march did not serve to stir up sufficient turmoil to keep the television representatives satisfied. This group of agitators had to make forays to the east and to the west evidently seeking trouble—and even then there was little trouble to be found or even generated. I understand the television people expressed disappointment and complained at their expenses.

Mr. Chairman, my people have had to put up with the filthiest kind of language on the part of many of these agitators, with the widest variety of insults, and in one area this still goes on, all in efforts to get national attention. But, Mr. Chairman, as bad as it is, our people know how to live under existing conditions far better than those in areas of many of my colleagues, for there is more appreciation and respect between local members of the races in my section than elsewhere in this country. What is becoming so apparent is that those who thought these drives on the South, the passage of these laws, would solve or help the problems in Chicago, New York, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and all the rest, are finding out that what has been done has merely whetted the appetite of agitators in those and other areas. You may call it merely unrest if you wish, but the real result is a breakdown in law and order, which, if not stopped, will lead to the destruction of our Government.

HOUSING

I have been to New York City, to Chicago, and to Detroit, to the slum areas and to the tough areas, as a member of the Appropriations Committee which handles the school lunch program and the school milk program, making studies about improving the food distribution costs in those cities.

There are deplorable situations in those cities, and I know Members wish to do something about it. But, my friends, when you get ready to correct such conditions, you will have to do it locally.

I do not know in how many cities this situation exists, but I know it exists in one major city where one of the major reasons they do not have housing and the reason why they have the slums is that they have rent control and will not let the rents be raised high enough for owners to furnish decent quarters. Not only that, but they will not enforce housing regulations or require the people to be sanitary, so that the buildings will be safe for human use. In some such areas the city has to clean up the garbage from the streets three times a day, garbage thrown from the windows.

GOOD INTENTIONS GONE ASTRAY

After World War II we did much good to relieve the suffering left by the war. Then, under the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans, we set out to remake the world. We were going to teach the people of other nations the value of our system of government, the value of the right to a trial by jury, and of a government of laws and not of men. We were going to teach them that it is unsound to overthrow government and have mob violence in the streets.

Since then we have violated every lesson of history. We fight wars without any plan for winning.

We have injected ourselves into the internal affairs of many countries. In all we are having difficulty and, in most, we now wonder how we can get out. Over my opposition we have spent 140 billion dollars in the process.

WE TURN TO FOREIGN WAYS

We have seen the unfortunate and tragic death of an American President, on the order of what occurs in the turbulent countries which we copy. It is in our country where we see the right of jury trial gone. It is in our country where we see a minority group issue dictatorial orders and the Government back them up with troops. Yes, it is in our country where we have strikes and mob violence, and where property is damaged or destroyed without restitution or payment. It is in our country where people are being led to lie in the streets, to block the highways, to force their way into businesses to get what they want, to burn, to destroy, and to kill.

No longer are people being taught to work, save, and accumulate capital so they may get ahead in the future. We have accepted foreign ways. We accept their policy of the shortcut; to demand, strike, insist upon, divide, and to ask for what the other fellow worked for and has accumulated is condoned if not promoted.

The real tragedy is that a whole new generation is being taught that this is the way to get results. It is said individual rights must come ahead of property rights. My friends, if there are no property rights, there would be no individual rights to enjoy.

This bill will not improve anything. We find in the newspaper of August 2, 1966, reports from at least 8 or 10 States throughout the Nation where criminals were running wild, destroying lives and property. We read of the deplorable murder of the young nurses and of the 16 persons who were killed in Texas yesterday. Murders, which could well have been generated by the news of killings which have recently filled newspapers, radio, and TV. I say to you that while there is a wave of lawlessness across the United States we are finding the courts of this land, instead of trying to see that the general public is protected suddenly finding in the Constitution of the United States new court-created rights which give the defendant additional opportunities to avoid punishment for his crimes. We see on every hand the courts getting away from the rule on which orderly government was built, a general rule to the effect that if the record clearly showed the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, he or she was not released on the public on some technicality and particularly a technicality raised by the Appellate or Supreme Court itself.

WE MUST STOP FIDDLING

It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It strikes me that is about what we are doing here. At a time when our country is becoming the victim of the criminal, when our wives and daughters and we ourselves are afraid to walk our streets, we find the Congress spending these hours and days trying to grant the right of irresponsible persons to sit on a jury. I say to you again, these criminals are destroying our country. It is high time we showed a little discrimination or judgment not only in the selection of jurors, but of judges—if we are to stop this wave of lawlessness. We need to do something about crime and criminals. We need to make punishment more certain. We need to put the rights of an orderly, and law abiding society ahead of the whims of the Supreme Court. We have the same Constitution. The trouble is that the Court suddenly claims new-found rights of a defendant in our original Constitution, the result of which is to make it more and more difficult to punish those who are clearly guilty. I say that it is time to wake up here and quit fiddling. Rome is certainly burning, and if you do not believe it, read today's newspapers.

The bill before us is a step in the wrong direction. It is to be hoped that those Members who are giving faltering support will soon wake up to the fact that these and similar measures are destroying that which they seek to save, and pouring fuel on the flames they hope to abate. If those of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, who have grave doubts about these measures will vote with us who oppose them, perhaps we may yet save a nation.

FEWER PEOPLE REMAINING ON THE FARM

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Gazette, published in Alexandria, Va.—one of the oldest daily newspapers in America—carries a column entitled "News of Long Ago." The edition dated July 26, 1966, contained the following excerpt from the Alexandria Gazette of 100 years ago, July 1866:

> THE MARKET
>
> The market, this morning, was very well supplied with country produce; though there was hardly any decline in the prices of any kinds of vegetables. Corn from 12½ to 15 cents per dozen; potatoes 30 cents per peck; cabbages from 5 to 15 cents per head; tomatoes 20 to 30 cents per peck; beets, onions, cymblins and cucumbers are cheap. Butter 35 cents per lb. Eggs 25 and 30 cents per dozen. There are large supplies of apples and pears, at prices according to quality. Lima beans 35 and 37½ cents per quart! The vegetables and fruits are generally very fine. The Butchers had good supplies of meats at former prices. There was some good sturgeon on the fish benches today, 3 lbs. for 25 cents. The attendance at market, this morning, both of buyers and sellers, was large.

It is interesting to compare the relatively modest increase in prices of the items mentioned in this news article in the hundred years since 1866 with the large increase in consumer purchasing power during this period.

According to historical statistics of the Census Bureau, consumer income in the United States during the period 1869–73 was about $175 per person. In 1965 it was $2,409, an increase of nearly 14 times.

Even in terms of the current value of the dollar, per capita income today will buy between five and six times what it would 100 years ago.

On the other hand, with the exception of corn and tomatoes, prices of the other items mentioned in the article quoted above are only about twice what they were 100 years ago. The following figures give the comparisons:

[In cents]

Product	Price July 26, 1866	Price July 26, 1966
Corn: Per dozen	12½–15	95
Potatoes:		
Per peck	30	----------
Per pound	2	4
Cabbage: Per head	5–15	30
Tomatoes:		
Per peck	30–30	----------
Per pound	2	19
Eggs: Per dozen	25–30	[1] 39 [2] 59
Butter: Per pound	35	79
Lima beans:		
Per quart	35–37½	----------
Per pound	18	29

[1] Medium.

[2] Large.

While comparable information is not available for many other food items for this same period, the following comparisons obtained from the Department of Agriculture are significant. The retail price of flour in 1865 was about 4 cents per pound compared to 11.7 cents per pound today. Liveweight cattle prices at the farm were 5.3 cents per pound in 1869 compared with 21.8 cents at present. Hog prices at the farm were 7.4 cents per pound in 1869 compared to today's price of 23 cents. Home delivered milk sold for 6.8 cents per quart in 1890 compared to 26.3 cents in 1965. These increases in certain food costs are well below the comparable increase in consumer purchasing power for the same period.

A 50-year comparison for a few items for which earlier figures are not available is as follows:

[In cents]

Product	1916	1919	1966
Bread (pound)	7.3	--------	21.8
Round steak (pound)	24.5	--------	110.8
Bacon (pound)	28.7	--------	93.9
Oranges (dozen)	--------	53.2	79.0
Tomatoes, canned (303 can)	--------	13.6	17.8
Sugar (5 pounds)	--------	40.0	60.0

It will be noted that today's prices for oranges, canned tomatoes and sugar are very little above those for 1919. Even the prices of bread, bacon and round steak are well below the increase in per capita consumer income which has gone up about eight times since the period 1912–16.

With the present value of the dollar and increased price levels, consumer income will buy two to three times the amount of food it would 50 years ago and five to six times what it would buy 100 years ago.

Although it is a popular pastime among our housewives and nonfarm consumers to talk about the high cost of food to the average household, the records prove that food is the American consumer's best buy, despite the increased take of the middleman. While the cost of nearly every item in our modern family budget has increased through the years in direct proportion to the ever-rising per capita income, the cost of food has gone up far less in comparison.

The most efficient and productive agricultural system ever known to man has reduced food costs in the United States to the point where the average family now spends only 18 percent of its income for food. This compares with about 28 percent in England, around 50 percent in certain countries of Europe, including Russia, and 60 to 70 percent or more in less developed areas of the world.

The low cost of food in the United States leaves 82 percent of our income to be spent for the products of industry and labor. No other country or civilization in the history of the world has ever known the high standard of living we now enjoy in this country.

Official U.S. Government reports indicate that we have about 25 percent more automobiles in the United States than in all of the rest of the countries of the world combined. We have nearly twice the number of miles of paved and surfaced highways as the rest of the world, exclusive of the U.S.S.R. We have approximately 50 percent of all the television sets in the world, although we have only 6 percent of the world's population, all made possible by our bargain in food.

In addition to having the world's best buy in food, the American consumer enjoys an abundance of food, with the greatest variety and the finest quality available anywhere in the world. Further, such food is the most wholesome and healthful in the world. The threat of starvation, malnutrition, and related diseases has been virtually eliminated from our existence in the United States.

The greatest need of American agriculture today is the realization by the 93 percent of Americans not living on farms of their absolute dependence upon a healthy agriculture, and of the fact that agriculture is the base of the economic strength of the entire Nation. When food prices reflect less than cost to the producer the food itself will not be with us long; and if the take between farmer and producer keeps increasing, the consumer will suffer not only in cost, but in supply.

We have few new farmers because of hard work, long hours, increased investment and small returns. Figures from the Department of Agriculture show that average investment required to farm has increased nearly tenfold in the past 25 years, from $6,158 in 1940 to $59,519 in 1965. They also indicate that the average return on farm investment, including the farmer's own labor and management skills, has dropped about 88 percent during this period, from 14.2 percent in 1940 to 8.6 percent in 1965.

As a result, fewer and fewer people, particularly younger people, are remaining on the Nation's farms to maintain and operate our agricultural production. According to Department figures, an average of nearly 800,000 people have left the farms in each of the last 5 years. The farm population has decreased to about 12.5 million today, compared to double that number in 1950. The 1959 census, the latest official data available, shows that some 17 percent of all farmers in the United States were 65 or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 64 years of age. By 1970, it is estimated that nearly half of the farmers will be 55 years of age or over.

We had better quit kicking the farmer around. Because of his age, he is too brittle and will get hurt. And his son will not take over for him, for his son, like the rest of us, is working in town.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY TAX MEASURES PROPOSED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, some days ago my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], introduced two bills to deal with the threat of inflation. Because these proposals coincide with my own views of the developing situation in the economy I am introducing companion bills today.

In a newsletter some months ago I indicated that factors in our economy point to the need for fiscal measures to head off the threat of serious inflation. I am glad to say that some of those factors have tapered off in the intervening months. But we still have imbalances, and I think measures are required to prevent serious consequences.

One of the most disturbing developments is the excessive busines expansion arising from the investment tax credit. There can be no doubt that the tax credit enacted in the last Congress has stimulated business investment, and for the most part this has been good. What is wrong with it, however, is that growth has occurred at a too-rapid rate in the last year or so, and this needs to be checked.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I believe the war in Vietnam is pushing our economy a little too hard. Shortages are developing, both in materials and in manpower. Prices are creeping upward. Both fiscal and monetary measures are needed, in my judgment, to prevent an acceleration in this process.

The bills I am introducing today are two in number. The first would impose a temporary defense emergency tax of 4 percent on corporate income, an additional surcharge of 5 percent on income above a 1962–65 average, and suspend the investment tax credit. The second would give the President standby authority to restrict installment credit if he deems such action necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that corporate profits in the last several years of economic expansion have grown far in excess of personal income. The modest increase in corporation taxes proposed in this legislation will work no hardship on the business community, but rather will insure the stockholders of this Nation a sounder dollar and a sounder investment future.

Last March I suggested a temporary tax increase for both individuals and corporations. The legislation I have introduced today might obviate the need for an increase in personal income taxes. The arguments which led me then to advocate some kind of tax measures to combat inflation hold true today and I would like, therefore, to reprint here my newsletter of March 18, 1966:

DOES THE "NEW ECONOMICS" WORK BOTH WAYS?

When I was discussing the subject of this newsletter with colleagues here in the House, one of them suggested I entitle it "*Election Year Memo from a Political Lunatic.*" As you can see, I thought better of that suggestion. However I expect some of my colleagues will insist the title was appropriate.

What this newsletter contains is a prediction and a recommendation:

The prediction: Federal taxes will go up in 1966. They will go up in one of two ways—through *inflation*, a cruel, senseless, unequal and damaging way; or through a deliberate and, I think, sensible decision of Americans through their Congress to enact a moderate *tax increase* to head off inflation and keep our economic growth sound and healthy.

The recommendation: Let's do it by a tax increase and *not* by inflation. Let's do it even in the face of the national myth that voters in an election year invariably rise in indignant wrath if their taxes are raised as they are heading for the polls.

GROWTH WITHOUT INFLATION—5 YEARS OF SUCCESS

Between 1963 and 1965 we challenged and overcame a basic economic and political myth—the one that says you never cut taxes in times of prosperity and an already unbalanced budget. During those years we cut federal taxes by a staggering $20 billion. We did so because our economy, while prosperous, was lagging behind its potential and—more importantly—because we needed to create more jobs for our growing work force. The experiment was a tremendous success.

Because these tax cuts were timely we have marked up an unprecedented five straight years of economic expansion—the longest such period in our nation's history. The 1965 growth rate in the United States was 5%, greater than that of any other major nation—and this after our lagging behind for many years.

Last year's $47 billion increase in our Gross National Product—just the increase, mind you—was larger than the total Gross National Product of all but 12 countries of the world.

Corporate profits in 1965 were up another 20%, bringing the total growth to more than 60% since 1960. Personal income rose $39 billion during the year, making a 40% gain since 1960.

During 1965 alone we created 2.4 million new jobs, and unemployment has now dropped to 3.7%, a goal many said could not be reached.

In spite of dire warnings from opponents of the "new economics" inflation has been held in check through all these years of unprecedented growth. The average decline in the value of the dollar has been about half the rate of the preceding decade.

"NEW ECONOMICS" HAS TWO SIDES

I'm sure we all will agree this is a record of success. The picture is a bright one. But, at the risk of being called a wet sponge, I want to remind my readers that this "new economics", about which I wrote in three newsletters last summer, has two sides. And I think the time is approaching when we must put it to work, not to stimulate our economy, but to hold it somewhat in check.

As I explained in those reports, most economists now believe that, in times of a slack economy, with under-employment and under-utilization of our industrial capacity, you should cut taxes or increase spending (even in the face of an existing deficit in the budget). You can expect these results:

You stimulate production, increase employment, and head off the recession that otherwise might be expected as a period of advance "runs out of steam."

Government income won't decrease with the lower tax rates but, on the contrary, will increase because of higher incomes and increased business volume.

Because of the slack in the economy—and, more particularly, because there are people waiting for jobs and factories waiting for orders—wages and prices are likely to remain in the "normal" range of growth (something like 1% to 1½% per year).

That 1963–65 experiment has made "New Economic Christians" out of a lot of unbelievers like Wall Street bankers, the titans of industry and leading conservative business writers. Most of them are convinced the prescription set forth above actually works. It passed the test. But now a bigger test is standing outside our front door—or at least heading up the walk—and I hope we don't flunk it.

A prescription for low blood pressure won't work for high blood pressure, and we now must examine the other side of the "new economics." Here's what it says on the label: When the economy is operating at near-capacity, when unemployment is down and labor shortages are imminent, when you begin to see "too many dollars chasing too few goods", you put on the fiscal brakes. *You raise taxes or cut spending* (even in the face of an existing surplus in the budget). The expected result:

If this is done promptly and moderately—if the brakes aren't applied too hard—the economy will continue to expand, but less rapidly and within manageable limits.

If it is *not* done, if the first signs of excessive demand are ignored, if shortages of raw materials, goods and workers start to develop, the gains of economic growth can be lost through a spiralling of prices and wages, a burst of overproduction which cannot be maintained—and an eventual downward adjustment or recession.

As I explained in my "Silent Revolution in Economics" series, the prescription for a slack economy bordering on recession is for government to *put more money into the economy than it takes out*. In other words, you either increase expenditures or cut taxes. Conversely, you check an over-heated economy bordering on inflation by having government *take more money out of the economy than it puts in*. In other words, you cut expenditures or raise taxes.

To recall my earlier metaphor, when water is everything you act to meet a drought, but you also plan ahead to prevent a damaging flood.

IS THIS THE TIME TO ACT?

A high-level economic debate is now raging in Washington. The question is whether the time has come to put on the economic brakes. A few economists argue that there is still slack in the economy, that deflationary action is not yet indicated. A majority, however, including some of the leading advocates of the "new economics", see these signs indicating action:

It was estimated that the Gross National Product would climb this year from $676 billion to about $720 billion. It now appears headed toward $728 billion, and most of the difference is of the unhealthy sort associated with a mere bidding up of prices and wages.

Whereas inflation has been held within manageable or "normal" bounds for several years (average of 1.3%, 1960–64), we ended 1965 with a 1.7% rise in the Consumer Price Index.

Whereas the Wholesale Price Index has been almost static since 1959, it started to rise slightly last year and has spurted nearly ½% per month for the past four months. This index is probably the best indicator of supply-demand pressures in the economy.

Whereas we were using only 82% of our industrial potential in 1961, we're now using 91%—close to the optimum businessmen shoot for. Beyond about 92% efficiency drops off.

Wage and price pressures are mounting, and the Administration's "voluntary" guidelines and guide posts are meeting increasing resistance from industry and labor unions.

While the gain in consumer prices has been only 4/10 of a percent greater than that of recent years, the trend appears to be upward. And while our economy certainly can live with a 2% annual rate of inflation (the average for the years 1955–60), anything much over that could be serious.

It seems that an inflation psychology is developing. Plants are building up inventories of supplies, thinking they will cost more very soon; decisions to expand plants or machinery are being accelerated for the same reason; and all of these things feed on each other, pushing up the prices of supplies, equipment, building materials and services.

The war in Viet Nam is throwing many plans out of kilter. In just two years defense spending has increased from $46 billion to $60 billion—roughly a one-third increase. A big chunk of this boost has occurred in the last few months.

With indicators such as these to draw on, it seems clear to me that time is important; if we're going to act, we ought to act with dispatch. And I am convinced that action is needed to head off the excesses of inflation.

I might say that this same view is held by most of the economists who advocated the tax cuts of recent years—and, in particular, by Dr. Walter Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and chief architect of the "new economics" which has so advanced our economy since 1961.

WHY NOT CUT SPENDING INSTEAD?

But, wait, you say, aren't you overlooking something? Why not cut spending instead of increasing taxes? This would appear to be the easiest and quickest course: we have a war on; domestic needs can wait.

Perhaps so, but I am frank to say that I don't think this is a live possibility. In fact, we are applying far more of a pinch on domestic programs than people realize right now. And further cutting back could have serious effects on many problem areas.

In this connection, I was interested in a survey reported March 5 by the Saturday Review. Prominent businessmen, financial leaders and economists for large corporations were asked what steps they would take to meet mounting war costs. Only 15% specifically advocated curtailing domestic programs. The main thrust of their responses was toward increased taxation if war expenditures rise.

What we must remember is that 80% of our federal budget is virtually untouchable. We certainly can't cut defense spending. If anything, we should be spending more on international affairs. Perhaps we could cut some funds from the space program, but as our competition with the Soviet Union is growing more intense I don't think we will. The cost of veterans' benefits is as fixed as anything can be. We can't cut the interest on the federal debt, and the basic, housekeeping costs of the government must go on, no matter what happens. This leaves just 20%, or about $21 billion, to run every other department, agency and activity of the federal government and pay out over $8.5 billion in grants-in-aid to the states. There simply aren't many places to cut without endangering programs needed by the 195 million Americans who are not in Viet Nam.

FEDERAL SPENDING IN ARIZONA

Of course, spending cuts are always more attractive when they occur in other states and other regions of the country. But I think we ought to take a look at what's happening in our own backyard before we talk about sweeping reductions in domestic programs:

For example, recall what a storm was raised when the Defense Department announced deferral of $3.8 million in hospital and other construction at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson. The message was clear: this cut in anticipated spending was a blow to Tucson's economy.

Similar protests went up over the deferral of a $320,000 bachelor officers' quarters at Ft. Huachuca.

Even louder objections were raised when we learned that the new federal building for Tucson had "gone to war"—or at least been put off to some later time.

Right now I'm hearing from school boards, educators and parents all over Arizona who are alarmed about cutbacks in the school lunch program, special milk program and federal impact aid to local schools.

Arizona has been hoping to get a big new federal facility—a proton accelerator of the Atomic Energy Commission costing $350 million and forming the nucleus of a new scientific community. If that project, too, "goes to war," it's going to be a blow to those communities counting on the benefits it would bring.

On top of all this, reflect for a moment on the Central Arizona Project—the reclamation project so desperately needed to bolster our sagging water supply. Right now we are in our most favorable position in 15 years to see that project authorized. But we can be very sure that a decision to slash federal spending would put it in limbo for some time to come.

Thus, when we talk about spending cuts as the way to deal with the threat of inflation, I think we had better think carefully about what this would mean to Arizona. And if this is true of Arizona, it's true of virtually every other state of the union. In my judgment, while some cutbacks might be possible, I don't believe the country will let us make them or that they are necessarily the best solution to the problem.

BEST BET—A TEMPORARY TAX INCREASE

Instead, I think we ought to have an immediate, moderate tax increase for individuals and corporations. I would suggest that it have two features:

An immediate increase in all brackets of about 5% in federal tax liability (that is, 5% of the tax we're now paying).

After one year a return to present tax rates.

Maybe I'm wrong, but I think thoughtful citizens would accept this modest sacrifice at a time when our troops are heavily engaged in Viet Nam and when the people at home have earnings and incomes at all-time highs. As the end of the year, the situation could be reviewed, but in my judgment the immediate inflationary crisis might well have passed and the need for the special tax has ended.

Here is what the temporary tax increase might mean:

A wage earner who received $6,000 last year and paid $400 in taxes would pay $420 next year. In exchange, he might find his $6,000 depreciated $60 during the year instead of, perhaps $120 or $150.

An executive who earned $20,000 and paid $2500 in taxes would pay $2625 in taxes next year. In turn, he might find his $20,000 depreciated $200 instead of $400 or $500.

Pensioners and people on fixed incomes, perhaps noting no great change in their taxes, would be saved from the greater loss of real income that would result from a burst of inflation.

LET'S DISCARD SOME POLITICAL MYTHS

I give our citizens credit for a lot more sense and willingness to make tough decisions than do some of my colleagues. One of the oldest rules of "practical" politics is: "Vote for all tax cuts and all spending bills." Another is: "If you must vote for a tax increase, *never do it in an election year*." I reject these old myths. I think that people want leadership and want their leaders to talk sense and explain unpleasant truths when they exist. And this is what I'm trying to do in this newsletter.

The unpleasant truth I began with is clear to me: Taxes will go up this year—either by plan or by inflation. There is good reason to believe that the "new economics"—the most successful approach yet of what is certainly an inexact science—can give us even more of the remarkably stable, long-term growth we have had in the past five years. But this is possible only if we recognize that this machine comes with both an *accelerator* and a *brake*. I think the time has come to put on a little brake.

I don't like the thought of higher taxes any more than I like our being in a war. But I'd prefer higher taxes to the even higher costs of inflation or the sacrifice of needed programs.

WE SHOULD CURB MR. CARMICHAEL

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that during the past weekend my State had the unpleasant experience of a visit from Mr. Stokely Carmichael, supposed leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Mr. Carmichael's visit to Cleveland, Ohio, was obviously intended to undermine the policies of the Government with reference to the war in Vietnam and renew chaos in that riot-torn city.

As part of that presentation this demagog characterized American Negro soldiers participating in the conflict for freedom in Vietnam as "black mercenaries" and proceeded to counsel his audience to refuse to cooperate with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a point where a serious crisis could develop in the land when a man of this stripe can move in, so to speak, to a city which has recently been riot torn and make such an obvious pitch to promote riot, discontent, and disorder.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to the fact that I have this morning asked the Department of Justice to proceed to apply through the U.S. district court at Cleveland, Ohio, the penal provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act against Mr. Carmichael.

I would hope that the Department of Justice would take vigorous and immediate action to curb Mr. Carmichael and to make it clear to the rest of America that the U.S. Government is not going to sit quietly on its hands and permit anarchists such as he to turn America upside down.

An article on this subject follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Aug. 8, 1966]

SWEENEY BLASTS SNCC LEADER AS ANARCHIST

U.S. Rep. ROBERT S. SWEENEY, D-at-large, last night condemned Stokely Carmichael as "an anarchist . . . puppet leader . . . an individual masquerading as a supposed civil rights leader."

Carmichael is leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). During the weekend he defined "black power" and called Negro soldiers in Viet Nam "black mercenaries."

Speaking to the Catholic War Veterans at a banquet in SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in Lakewood, SWEENEY said he felt compelled to offer a rebuttal to Carmichael's statements.

"Here is an individual (Carmichael) masquerading as a supposed civil rights leader, who is nothing more than an anarchist and and extremist, who . . . will do more harm to the civil rights crusade than anyone who has appeared on the American scene in this decade, including Gov. George Wallace of Alabama," SWEENEY said.

"I think it appropriate that veterans' organizations in this county unite in their response lest one soldier in Viet Nam get the idea that there is any diluting of support on the home front for their sacrifices in the field."

SWEENEY called Carmichael "a dangerous American."

SWEENEY, a candidate in November for attorney general of Ohio, said he will consult U.S. Atty. Gen. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach as to whether appropriate "criminal action" might be instituted in the federal courts against Mr. Carmichael.

"This weekend, we came to understand what Mr. Carmichael meant by black power," SWEENEY stated, "and boiling it down to its simplest, it amounts to: let's raise havoc in the street and turn America upside down."

"If this doesn't constitute the advocacy of the use of force and violence to overthrow the duly constituted government of the United States of America or something close to it, then I miss my guess."

SWEENEY told the veterans group that every veteran can applaud the efforts of genuine civil rights leaders such as Roy Wilkins.

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK AND THE NEED FOR ACTION NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I am not going to present the full text of these remarks which I announced previously today that I was going to give on the economic outlook and the need for action now.

Mr. Speaker, in these remarks I am pointing out the dangers that confront our society at this very time of inflation and inflationary forces that are existent, and the fact that the administration is still not treating this with seriousness; and also the fact that the Congress under the Democrat Party control is not going into this area.

Mr. Speaker, not many years ago, the American people were advised to abandon the economic myths of the past and follow the teachings of the "new economics." Through the bold use of fiscal and monetary policies we were told that the Nation could enjoy unbroken and rapid growth, high employment, and a stable price level. The implication was that the business cycle, with all the vicious and unjust hardships it works on our people, could be tamed by Government action.

For a while, the "new economics" seemed to work. We have enjoyed rapid growth, unemployment has been reduced, the standard of living of our people has steadily increased, and, until recently, the price level remained reasonably stable.

It is no longer correct, of course, to speak of this as our longest peacetime expansion. Many of our recent gains, and especially the reduction in unemployment, have resulted from increased defense spending and the buildup in the Armed Forces. The fact is that we are now in a wartime economy.

In spite of our past gains and the anticipation of even higher military outlays, there now exists a deeply felt concern about our economic future. It is a concern shared by businessmen, economists, and consumers alike. The slump in the stock market in the face of record earnings and dividends is symptomatic of the economic jitters affecting the Nation. Is this simply irrationality? Or are there legitimate reasons to believe that we are headed for deep economic trouble?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these fears are not irrational. The roots of these fears lie in the economic policies of the Johnson administration. The administration is demonstrating what many, including myself, feel was implied in the practice of the "new economics." This is that Government readily adopts the popular and easy measures that lead to rapid, if temporary, economic gains, but often lacks the political courage to exercise expenditure discipline and to otherwise tighten the reins to insure balanced and inflation-free growth.

The practical result is that the American economy in mid-1966 is moving into a new and difficult period of adjustment to the policy excesses of the past. Imbalances and distortions are rapidly building up which require immediate correction by a policy of restraint and moderation. The attempt to do too much too soon has strained the resources of even this wealthy land. The classic economic problem of choice and priority face us once more.

By failing to take timely and effective action to curb booming demand the administration has laid the groundwork for an explosive cost-push inflation coming on the heels of the recent demand inflation. The economic forces let loose by the administration's policy of drift and delay could ultimately lead to a serious recession.

Even under ordinary circumstances this would be sufficient cause for alarm. But these are not ordinary times. The Nation today is engaged in a major conflict in Asia. At home, we are in the grip of a deep-seated social unrest which poses a threat to the Nation's domestic peace and unity. Even now, the war on poverty is being lost through inflation. In the event of a recession, the burdens would fall heavily on those most in need of steady jobs, better education and more adequate housing.

Now more than ever, it is important that we ask: Where does the economy stand today? Where is it heading? What is the appropriate policy for government?

Let me say at the outset that I believe inflation—not recession— is our problem for the immediate future. Inflation is not just a threat; it already is a reality. Nearly two-thirds of the increase in the gross national product in the second quarter was accounted for by price increases. In the first 6 months of this year, the consumer price index rose at an annual rate of 3.5 percent, while the wholesale price index rose 3.1 percent during the same period. This price behavior follows substantial increases in prices last year and is in addition to inflation which the administration has temporarily suppressed through jawboning and Presidential arm twisting.

Admittedly, there are some signs of a slowdown in our growth. Gross national product in constant dollars during the second quarter of this year rose at an annual rate of $3.7 billion from the first quarter. During the five preceding quarters, gains ranged from more than $7 billion to $13 billion. This slowing of activity is primarily accounted for by a drop in personal consumption expenditures on durables, particularly automobiles, and a serious lag in the housing industry. In part, this is due to the influence of interest rates which are at historically high levels. However, I do not think that the signs of a slowdown point to an early recession.

The chief stimulus to economic activity over the coming year will be the high and rising costs of the Vietnam war. It is already clear that a supplemental defense appropriation of up to $8 billion will be required in fiscal 1967. At the same time, capital spending should continue to boom at least through this year.

The combination of rising final demand and skilled labor shortages, with many industries operating at or near their preferred production rates, clearly points to continued demand inflation at least through the end of this year and possibly beyond. On top of this, it already is becoming evident that the dreary and self-defeating wage-price spiral that has marred our past economic performance is resuming. One of the great achievements of the Eisenhower administration was to wring out the inflationary psychology of the 1950's and to leave a legacy of cost and price stability upon which the later expansion was built.

The erosion of this valued heritage has already begun. In the first half of 1966, the average cash wage increase granted in over 1,200 wage settlements was 10.2 cents an hour, the greatest first half-year rise in 9 years. In nonmanufacturing alone, the average increase of 14.4 cents was the highest for the period since the late 1940's. And these figures do not include the value of fringe benefits increases.

The determination of the unions to maintain the standard of living of their members in the face of rising prices is illustrated by the time being lost through strikes. The airline strike is only the most dramatic example of the new labor militancy. In May—the latest month for which figures are available—over 2.8 billion man-days were lost through strikes, the highest May figure in 7 years. And 1966 is not even a heavy bargaining year.

In the words of one commentator, labor unions will be coming to the bargaining table next year "with blood in their eyes." More than twice the number of employees will be involved in major expiring contracts next year as compared to 1966. Particularly critical negotiations are scheduled in the auto, trucking, rubber, and clothing industries.

The drive for large wage gains by union leadership stems principally from the erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar which has taken place in the past year. In addition to inflation, real spendable earnings of factory workers has been reduced by higher payroll deductions, the increase in excise taxes, and higher State and local taxes. Taking all of this into account, the average worker's weekly paycheck actually buys less today than it did a year ago. In the second quarter alone, per capita disposable income fell by $10 at an annual rate. This erosion of buying power has occurred as our productive capacity increased substantially over the past year.

In view of the shrinking purchasing power of the dollar, who can blame union leaders for trying to protect the standard of living of their members? The blame should rest on the shoulders of those responsible for the excessively expansionary fiscal and monetary policies which lie at the root of the inflationary pressures.

Although unions will press their claims with some justice, the fact remains that wage gains in excess of productivity increases will have unfortunate results. Profits will fall, prices will rise, or there will be some combination of both.

In this setting, I would expect a sharp slowdown in growth, and possibly a recession, after the middle of next year. This would be particularly likely if defense expenditures level off in fiscal 1968.

All the ingredients for a drop in activity would then be present: the high cost and limited availability of funds, rising wage and material costs, shrinking profit margins, and a continued erosion of consumer purchasing power for workers in those industries where wages fail to keep pace with price increases. Under these conditions, investment outlays and personal consumption expenditures—the mainstays of the boom—would show a sharp drop from what many now regard as unsustainably high levels.

If this analysis is correct, if we are indeed moving into a period of slow growth and wage-push inflation, then we are entering the worst of all possible worlds. A situation of this type, once developed, is difficult to correct, requiring painful and politically even more distasteful remedies than are required now. What is worse, these remedies work only slowly and impose heavy losses on the economy in terms of output and employment.

The task of public policy is made even more complicated by the balance-of-payments deficit and the continued gold outflow. Although the deficit fell to $1.3 billion last year, it bounced back to an annual rate of $2.3 billion in the first quarter and is expected to show a deficit of nearly that size for the year as a whole. The trade surplus also is expected to drop by another $1 billion this year after falling by nearly $1.8 billion in 1965. Here, too, the deterioration in our overall payments position is the result of excessive fiscal and monetary stimulation added to the foreign exchange costs of the Vietnam war.

What has been the Johnson administration's response to the developing crisis? It claims that its fiscal policies are already tight. But quite a different picture emerges from a study of the administration's own tool for measuring Federal fiscal policy—the high employment budget. Policy is considered stimulative if the tax structure and spending programs result in a relatively small surplus or a deficit at high employment. A recent study by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis shows that the high-employment budget has been essentially in balance during the past 12 months compared to a $7.2 billion surplus in the first half of 1965. For the last half of 1966, the high employment budget will show a deficit of about $4 billion. Thus, in a period of inflation Federal fiscal policy is actually becoming even more stimulative, not less.

The administration has put the burden for fighting inflation squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Reserve System. The result is high interest rates whose impact is felt selectively on housing, small business, State, and local governments and the borrowing costs of the Federal Government. The cost and limited availability of credit have actually been increased by sales of Government financial assets which make the budget look better but which do not represent a real reduction in actual Government expenditures.

Without sanction of law, the administration continues to rely on the wage-price guideposts to contain inflationary pressures. Selective use of the guideposts against price increases—most recently molybdenum—is matched by administration acquiescence to wage gains in excess of productivity increases. In the airline strike, President Johnson undercut his own guideposts by backing a wage package which different experts calculated would increase wage costs anywhere from 4.3 percent to 7 percent a year over 3 years. In direct violation of the guideposts, it maintained the settlement would not be inflationary because productivity in this industry was increasing faster than the average throughout the economy. The guideposts are not only worthless as an anti-inflationary device, but they actually impede the fight against inflation by drawing our attention away from the fundamental steps required to restore price stability.

The administration has done nothing, either by word or deed, to inspire confidence in its ability to conduct its economic policies wisely in the coming months. It has resorted to budget deception, crude and inequitable enforcement of its guideposts, handwringing over high interest rates, endless double-talk about the costs of the Vietnam war, and ineffectual pleas to housewives and businessmen to cut back their spending. With its eyes fixed firmly on the November elections, the administration is incapable of offering effective economic leadership.

I propose that the administration take the following steps immediately to clarify the economic outlook and restore balance and order to the expansion:

First. Submit the supplemental defense appropriation bill to the Congress now for action before adjournment.

Second. Along with the supplemental request, submit a fiscal package to finance the additional military outlays needed. Ideally, this package should consist of reductions or deferrals of nondefense expenditures in the current fiscal year.

Early this year, I said that we could afford both guns and butter. I also said, however, that we could not afford wasteful and ineffective programs. This, of course, is still true. But today I believe we have reached a point where even desirable programs will have to be stretched out in order to balance off increasing war costs.

The fact is that nondefense spending has soared 20 percent from the first quarter of 1965 to the first quarter of 1966. And as I mentioned earlier the high employment budget is moving into a heavy deficit in the second half of this year.

A reduction and stretch-out in civilian programs would increase their effectiveness and reduce the waste in those which have been pushed too quickly. It also would afford an opportunity for a carefully designed increase in expenditures once the economy cools down. To claim that Congress alone is responsible for increasing spending is without merit. The President knows, as does the Congress, that funds appropriated need not be spent.

Third. If the administration refuses to reduce 1967 civilian expenditures, then it must face up to the need for a tax increase to offset increased Vietnam spending. Such a tax increase should be short-term, with a precisely stated termination date, and should be accompanied by some degree of expenditure control. If the administration chooses the tax route over a reduction in spending, then it must act quickly.

In the light of the obvious need for an increase in defense expenditures, it would be the height of folly to wait any longer to apply fiscal restraints which were required early this year. The worse course of action, and the one I fear that the administration is most likely to take, would be to ask for a supplemental defense appropriation and a tax bill to finance it in January 1968. A tax increase under these circumstances would begin to bite just when the imbalances arising from inflation begin to exert downward pressure on our growth.

The application of fiscal restraint now, preferably through reductions in civilian spending, would have several advantages aside from offsetting the inflationary effects of higher Vietnam spending. It would demonstrate forcibly to both business and labor the importance of exercising price and wage restraint. It would also alleviate pressures on the money markets. The reduction in demand for credit which would follow would put some downward pressure on interest rates and help to correct tight conditions in certain areas of the economy that have borne the brunt of the recent monetary policy.

In addition to these measures, I believe the Joint Economic Committee should meet its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946 and immediately review the economic outlook. These hearings should be held, if possible, by the first week of September.

The most favorable time to control inflation is now past. However, this cannot excuse further delay. If the administration fails to meet its responsibilities now, however difficult, it shall have to answer to the American people. At this time, more than ever in recent history, we cannot tolerate economic failure. In these times of rising hopes and aspirations among our poorer citizens, such a failure would have explosive consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following be included in the Record at this point: "Rising Inventories Cause Concern" by Harold B. Dorsey from the July 27 Washington Post; "Wage Inflation at 1956 Peak" by Sylvia Porter from the July 26 Washington Star; "Net Spendable Earnings: June 1966" released by the U.S. Department of Labor on July 21; "Builders Get Assurances From Weaver" by Rodney Crowther from the July 28 Baltimore Sun; "Some Food Costs Near New Highs" from the July 28 Baltimore Sun.

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1966]

Investment View: Rising Inventories Cause Concern

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

New York, July 25.—Even a casual inspection of the business statistics for the second quarter reveals significant distortions in the relative trends of highly important economic indicators.

Statistics show that Personal Disposal Income for the second quarter was less than 1 per cent higher than the preceding quarter. If this figure is adjusted for the quarter-to-quarter increase in the Consumers Price Index, the growth of the personal sector's ability to move units of goods and services into consumption was practically nil.

Personal Consumption Expenditures in the second quarter were only 0.7 per cent higher than the preceding three months. If this figure is adjusted for the price increases the units of goods and services moved into consumption by the personal sector showed no gain over the preceding quarter.

Final demand of the total economy for goods and services in the second quarter was only 1.1 percent above the preceding quarter, in spite of sizable increases in government expenditures and capital goods spending. (Final demand is the Gross National Product total excluding inventory changes.) A large part of the quarter-to-quarter improvement was accounted for by higher prices. So the improvement in the unit volume of goods and services moving into consumption was less than 1 percent on an annual rate basis.

New orders received by the manufacturers of durable goods—one of the leading indicators of business activity—for the second quarter were only 0.4 percent higher than the preceding three-month period. Expressed another way, the annual rate of improvement for this indicator was less than 2 percent. The improvement was even less impressive if allowance is made for higher prices.

With all this evidence of a flattening in the upward trend in consumption, what is the explanation for the continued sharply rising trend in production activity and the continued extraordinarily high demand for credit and capital? That is a tremendously significant question.

The FRB Index of Industrial Production—a measurement of unit volume (not dollars)—showed an increase of 2 percent in the second quarter over the preceding three months, i.e., it was increasing at the annual rate of about 8 per cent. This behavior is far out of line with the flattening in the upward trend of consumption.

The excess of production over consumption is causing a high rate of inventory accumulation. In the GNP figures, the annual rate of inventory accumulation in the second quarter was $12 billion in comparison with the already high $8.9 billion of the preceding quarter.

Furthermore, the FRB Index may reflect more heavily the sharp upward trend in business capital spending than the above-mentioned dollar figures of Final Demand. But the amplitude of the upward trend of capital spending is far out of line with the flattening trend of consumption. The growth in capital spending cannot continue to exceed substantially the growth rate of consumption.

All the evidence strongly suggests that the rate of production activity must subside to a closer parallel with the rate of consumption. Putting this another way, the longer the rate of production exceeds the rate of consumption, the more the economy is building up a maladjustment in the form of excessive inventories and over-expansion of the facilities to produce and distribute goods and services.

And to a very considerable extent it may be said that the continued high demand for credit and capital represents the financing of mounting maladjustments in the economy, i.e., the financing of excessive inventory accumulation and over-expansion of capital facilities.

It is becoming more obvious every day that the economy is facing some serious problems. But to some extent it may be said that the problems contain their own solutions.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 26, 1966]

WAGE INFLATION AT '56 PEAK

(By Sylvia Porter)

The average cash wage increase negotiated in the first half of 1966 was 10.2 cents an hour, highest first-half rise in nine years and matching the record 10.2 cents average for all of 1956.

In non-manufacturing alone, the average increase was 14.4 cents an hour, up 4.2 cents from a year ago and the highest for any January-June period since the Bureau of National Affairs, source for these statistics, began its studies in the late 1940's.

In construction the average increase was 19.8 cents an hour, up 4.3 cents from the 1965 period, and the steepest in the history of the BNA surveys.

In manufacturing, the average first-half settlement was 9.6 cents, up 2.1 cents and again the largest since 1957.

These represent cash wage settlements only; they do not take into account fringe benefits, which also have been climbing at a quickening pace. They reflect 1,231 settlements but in a period when significant wage negotiations have been unusually low; the real pacesetting contracts will come this fall and in 1967.

OUTLOOK REVIEWED

What do these figures imply in terms of the prices we'll pay, the profits corporations will earn? Here are my questions and the answers from William Beltz, managing editor of the BNA's Collective Bargaining Service.

Q: Is this wage inflation?

A: Of course it is, in the sense that these are the largest average increases in a decade. The average cash wage settlement is hard to translate into hard percentages but it obviously is in excess of the 3.2 percent rise acceptable under the guidelines.

Q: How serious is the threat to unit labor costs and prices?

A: So far, the impact on unit labor costs of companies has not been severe. While unit labor costs have been rising, the level is not much higher than a year ago. Also, so far, the impact on consumer prices has not been major. While the Consumer Price Index is 2¾ percent over a year ago, biggest rise since 1957's 3 percent increase, the upswing reflects much more than wage increases and it's still within the borderline of price inflation.

Q: Why has the impact to date been comparatively light?

A: Probably because the productivity of labor is increasing faster than statistics indicate, and industry has been able to offset higher wage cost through greater efficiency of operations.

DANGERS OUTLINED

Q: What about the impact of future wage raises?

A: With the economy operating at capacity, these are likely to have a more immediate and heavier influence on unit labor costs. They then will be translated into higher consumer prices or a squeeze on corporation profit margins—or both.

Q: Where are the key danger spots?

A: First, in non-manufacturing, more specifically, the services. Rising labor costs cannot be absorbed here as easily as in manufacturing and the tendency of employers is to pass on the higher costs directly to consumers.

Second, in construction. In this area too, productivity isn't rising as rapidly as in manufacturing and the higher costs are being passed on in higher building costs. With tight money on one side and peak building costs on the other, housing is in a real bind.

Q: What's the outlook?

A: The full year increase should be about 10.2 cents for the second quarter is usually the high point for wage increases.

But the pressures for continued big wages raises are enormous—reflecting the business boom, growing labor shortages, union aggressiveness. The chance of a slowdown are minimal.

Q: Then there is a deepening danger of a wage spiral?

A: Unquestionably.

[News from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, July 21, 1966]

NET SPENDABLE EARNINGS: JUNE 1966

Net spendable earnings—or "after-tax pay"—represent the factory worker's average weekly pay after deduction of social security and Federal income taxes. "Real" spendable earnings represent the buying power of the worker's net spendable earnings after adjustment for changes in the Consumer Price Index. These calculations are made for two representative types of workers—a worker without dependents and a worker with 3 dependents. The gross average weekly earnings for all factory production workers are used in the calculations.

The net spendable earnings of factory production workers were unchanged between May and June, the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. The factory workweek, which usually rises during this period, was unchanged at 41.5 and hourly earnings were also unchanged at $2.70.

At $99.22 for the worker with three dependents and $91.35 for the single worker, net spendable earnings in June were up by about $2.15 (or 2.3 percent) from a year earlier. The increase, the result of a 9-cent gain in hourly earnings and a slightly longer workweek, would have amounted to $3.50 (or roughly 3.7 percent) had not the social security tax deductions been increased in January 1966.

Due to the rise in consumer prices, factory workers' "real" net spendable earnings—or purchasing power—declined in June by about 25 cents for both groups of workers. As a result of the rise in consumer prices from a year ago, real net spendable earnings have declined by 0.2 percent.

Weekly earnings of factory production workers, June 1966

Month and year	Gross average weekly earnings	Spendable earnings,[1] worker with—		"Real" spendable earnings,[2] worker with—			
				No dependents		3 dependents	
		No dependents	3 dependents	1957–59 dollars	Index (1957–59=100)	1957–59 dollars	Index (1957–59=100)
June 1966[3]	$112.05	$91.35	$99.22	$80.91	117.5	$87.88	115.2
May 1966[3]	112.05	91.35	99.22	81.13	117.8	88.12	115.5
April 1966	111.24	90.73	98.57	80.65	117.1	87.62	114.8
June 1965	107.79	89.29	96.99	81.10	117.8	88.09	115.5
1957–59 average	84.17	68.87	76.30	68.87	100.0	76.30	100.0

[1] Spendable earnings are calculated by deducting social security and Federal income taxes applicable to 2 representative groups of workers from the gross average weekly earnings of all factory production workers. For further details see the technical note on calculation and uses of the net spendable earnings series, which is available on request.

[2] Real spendable earnings express the buying power of the factory worker's spendable earnings in dollars of 1957–59 prices. The index of these earnings shows the comparison with the 1957–59 base period as 100.

[3] Preliminary.

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 28, 1966]

BUILDERS GET ASSURANCES FROM WEAVER—SECRETARY SIDESTEPS BACKING CEILING ON INTEREST RATES

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The Johnson Administration today assured the nation's hard-pressed home builders it will support legislation designed to ease the tight money situation but it sidestepped backing the Patman proposal to fix a 4.5 per cent statutory interest rate ceiling on bank time deposits of under $100,000.

Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, told some 600 delegates representing more than 45,000 of the nation's home builders that there is unanimous support by the Federal banking agencies and the Treasury Department for other major features of the House Banking Committee bill designed to help solve the critical money problem.

A.B.A. DENOUNCES PROPOSAL

Similarly, the American Bankers Association, whose top officials met here today, strongly denounced the proposed 4.5 per cent statutory limitation on so-called "consumer" certificates of deposit, but said that generally it applauds the Banking Committee's desire to do something about the nation's inflation situation. As the bill stands, the A.B.A. said, it "must vigorously oppose it."

Arch K. Davis, president of the A.B.A., told newsmen that the proposal to set a fixed ceiling on interest is based on the "ill-conceived premise that by artificially restricting the ability of banks to attract consumer savings, Congress can materially increase the savings inflow to savings and loan associations."

HOME BUILDERS MET

However, the home builders who met in an early morning mass meeting and later descended upon both houses of Congress to plead for action to "stop the interest rate war" and "find ways to get money back into the home buying market," called for approval of the 4.5 per cent interest ceiling, and all other features of the Patman bill.

Secretary Weaver, in a letter to Larry Blackmon, president of the National Association of Home Builders, said that both he and Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of Treasury, support a provision of the Patman bill "to increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association by roughly $2,000,000,000."

SUBCOMMITTEE VOTES

This step, called for by the home builders along with a dozen other proposals, would, Weaver said, "permit continued purchases of home mortgages by the association in the secondary market."

Later in the day a Senate housing subcommittee, headed by Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, stepped into the picture and voted approval of legislation to provide the Federal National Mortgage Agency an additional $3,000,000,000 of borrowing authority.

Under existing law, the agency can borrow up to ten times its capital. The Sparkman bill would raise this to fifteen.

Another step designed to ease the tight mortgage market would loosen the mortgage agency's present restrictions by providing a special $1,000,000,000 of authority to buy home mortgages not in excess of $5,000.

NO MENTION OF CEILING

Significantly, Weaver omitted any mention in his letter of the controversial 4.5 per cent interest rate ceiling which the bankers as well as the Federal Reserve governors oppose. This was quickly interpreted as indicating Administration opposition to the statutory ceiling.

Some time ago Secretary Fowler did suggest to Congress that a temporary rate ceiling for both banks and savings and loan associations be fixed for deposits less than $100,000. The exact rate was not suggested.

Later, the Reserve Board issued an order lowering from 5.5 per cent to 5 per cent the permissible rate on "consumer-type" time deposits. At the same time it asked Congress for authority to set different rates for different types of deposits.

REPORT CONFIRMED

Secretary Weaver's omission of any mention of the rate issue today appeared to confirm the report that the Treasury had concluded, following the Reserve Board's action, that no statutory limitation would be needed.

In his letter to Blackmon, Weaver stated that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury unanimously agree to other features of the Banking Committee bill which would:

1. Grant to the Federal Reserve Board flexible authority to establish different categories of deposits for interest rate limitations.

SIMILAR POWER TO OTHERS

2. Give the same authority to the Federal Deposits Insurance Corporation.
3. Grant standby authority to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set maximum rates of interest on the share accounts of savings and loans.
4. Provide for coordinated use of these flexible authorities by the agencies named above.
5. Grant to the Federal Reserve Board the authority to raise reserve requirements on time and savings deposits to a maximum of 10 per cent.
6. Broaden the authority of the Federal Reserve System so that it can purchase the obligations of any agency of the United States Government.

LIQUIDITY CRISIS SEEN

Item five in the Weaver letter, approving authority to the Federal Reserve Board to raise reserve requirements on time and savings deposits to a maximum of 10 per cent, was found objectionable by the American bankers.

President Davis and Charles Walker, the association's executive vice president, said that any action upping the reserve requirements to such a level would "bring on a liquidity crisis."

"A jump like this," association spokesman said, "would be a very serious move and would merely intensify the crisis."

Asked whether they would favor a ceiling rate of 5 per cent instead of 4.5 per cent, Davis said:

"We oppose any statutory edict because it would impair the basic independence of the Federal Reserve Board."

Among other objections of the bankers to the Patman ceiling proposal was that "to set a statutory rate for small savers below that allowed for large investors is clearly discriminatory."

Moreover, Davis said, to enact the 4.5 per cent ceiling would "represent the first incursion of Congress into the direct determination of monetary policy." He declared:

"The cure for high interest rates is not statutory ceilings but the removal of the excess stimulation to the economy.

"This can only be accomplished if the Administration and the Congress face up now to their responsibilities by either cutting expenditures or reducing the purchasing power through increased taxes, or some combination of the two actions."

The home builders declared their strong support of legislation "to empower the Federal Reserve Board to buy Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Home Loan Bank debentures and other obligations as one step to help put money back into home building."

The banking association president called the provision in the Banking Committee bill to permit the Open Market Committee of the Reserve System to buy the Federal Home Loan Bank and Mortgage Agency obligations "questionable."

President Blackmon, in opening the builder's mass meeting, said, the industry is "facing a major crisis." He said the decline which has been forced upon home building will spill over into the rest of the economy if corrective action is not taken quickly.

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 28, 1966]

SOME FOOD COSTS NEAR NEW HIGHS—N.Y. MARKETS OFFICIAL CALLS SITUATION "PRETTY ROUGH"

NEW YORK, July 27 (AP).—The higher cost of living is being brought home to housewives across the country by rising prices of bread, butter, eggs and milk.

"The situation is pretty rough," Sol H. Renik, New York's deputy city markets commissioner, said. "Prices are either at or near their record highs."

Many bakeries have raised wholesale bread prices an average of 6 per cent forcing a two cents rise in the retail price of a one-pound loaf. The increases reflect rising costs of flour, labor and packaging, bakery spokesmen said.

COST OF FLOUR RISES

The cost of flour has risen about $1 per hundredweight, or 20 per cent. The cost of sugar is about 5 per cent above last year.

The boost in the flour price was blamed on a smaller than estimated wheat crop because a severe winter damaged seeds in the ground.

In the New York area, the price of butter has gone up 10 cents a pound to 81–87 cents. Eggs have risen from 50–53 cents a dozen to 67–69 cents. Milk went up a cent a quart to 25½–27 cents.

In New York, the Wonderbread division of Continental Baking Company lifted wholesale prices by 1½ cents per one-pound loaf, which means a retail price of 30 cents.

Russell J. Hug, executive vice president of Ward Foods, Incorporated, said "Everything in the book is up this year" and a price increase is "inescapable."

WATCHING SITUATION

A spokesman for Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company said it hasn't raised prices but is watching the situation.

Fuchs Baking Company, of Miami, which serves most of the Florida East Coast, plans to raise its wholesale price by 1½ cents on all loaves in August. The bakery also expects to boost some sweet-goods prices.

Wheat this week sold at Kansas City for $1.93½ a bushel, up 44¾ cents from a year earlier. Hard winter wheat flour wholesaled for $7.82 a hundred pounds in New York, 95 cents more than a year earlier.

Despite the decline in per capita consumption of bread in recent years, the average American family eats nearly two pounds weekly.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I trust that these remarks will be read, and I shall take the occasion at some time during this week to take the floor in the event that anyone would like to discuss these remarks, and in particular to rebut any of the points which I seek to make therein.

COMMUNISM, EXTREMISM, AND CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it can no longer be ignored nor denied: the doctrine of civil disobedience has brought terror and tragedy to the United States. Those who have advocated civil disobedience—the right to obey only those laws which you think are just—have sown to the wind and America is reaping the whirlwind. Listen to the whirlwind as it is reported in the August 8 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

> In a 20-day period in July, eight U.S. cities were ripped apart by race riots or near riots. The shocking record:
>
> Cleveland: four killed, 46 injured, many buildings burned in riots which started July 18. In addition, 10 people hurt in an earlier riot in June.
>
> New York City: one killed, 22 injured in Brooklyn in street clashes among Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and whites starting on July 17.
>
> Philadelphia: Scores injured as police fought Negro demonstrators on July 12.
>
> Chicago: two killed, 60 injured, widespread looting and fighting which began in Negro areas on July 12. Earlier, in mid-June, 16 had been injured in a Puerto Rican area.
>
> South Bend: seven wounded in rioting which lasted from July 17 through 19.
>
> Jacksonville, Fla.: three hurt in outbursts which started July 18.
>
> Des Moines: Negroes fought police in sporadic violence from July 5 through 7. No injuries, however, were reported.
>
> Omaha: one injured in violence in a Negro area over the Fourth of July weekend.

The riot total was 7 killed, nearly 200 injured and property damage running into millions of dollars. All of this, mind you, occured during only 3 weeks in 1 month, July.

Earlier this year, Los Angeles suffered a sharp sudden outbreak of violence on March 15 during which two people were killed and 20 were injured. Four others were injured in another riot in May. None of the 1966 riots has so far equalled the massive horror of the August 1965 riot in the Watts suburb of Los Angeles when 34 people were killed and 1,032 were injured.

Mr. Speaker, I take no delight nor satisfaction in this gruesome litany. Would God that the facts and figures which I have just recited were from some doomsday novel. But these riots are not fantasy but fact. They are not figments of some warped mind but real events in modern America, circa 1966.

Many of us have been warning for many months and even years that such conesquences were inevitable if certain individuals continued to preach a double standard of law and conduct, and if certain foreign influences continued to spread their poison throughout this Nation, particularly in the civil rights movement.

Intelligent men with positions of heavy responsibility have erred in echoing the insidious doctrine of civil disobedience. No less a personage than our own President used most provocative language in remarks to a group of college students at the White House last year:

> I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. Neither you nor I are willing to accept the tyranny of poverty, nor the dictatorship of ignorance, nor the despotism of ill health, nor the opposition of bias and prejudice and bigotry. We want change. We want progress. We want it both abroad and at home—and we aim to get it . . . I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here: that we are on the march against the ancient enemies and we are going to be successful.[1]

Let it be added quickly that President Johnson has spoken out and very forcefully in late July of this year about the riots. In Indianapolis last month, Mr. Johnson said:

> There are ways of protesting that any civilized society can tolerate. There are also ways that are unacceptable. . . . Riots in the streets do not bring about lasting reforms. They tear at the very fabric of the community. They set neighbor against neighbor and create walls of mistrust and fear between them. They make reform more difficult by turning away the very people who can and must support reform. They start a chain reaction, the consequences of which always fall most heavily on those who begin them . . .
>
> Our country can abide civil protest. It can improve the lives of those who mount that protest. But it cannot abide civil violence.[2]

That is well said and had to be said, if for no other reason than to counterbalance the incredible remarks of the Vice President a few days earlier.

Speaking in New Orleans when riots were racking the body of this Nation, Vice President Hubert Humphrey said, and I quote:

> I think you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions.

The Vice President also said that unless Congress provides rent subsidies for the poor—

> We will have open violence in every major city and county in America.[3]

Since then, the Vice President has restated his position, declaring that—

> Riots and violence cannot be tolerated or condoned. . . . When outbreaks occur, peace and tranquility must be restored as quickly as possible. Freedom and justice can never be the product of terror and injustice.[4]

But this restatement does not excuse or cancel what he said earlier at the worst possible time—when the Vice President should have condemned not condoned civil riots and civil disobedience.

The most famous statement regarding civil disobedience has been made by Dr. Martin Luther King:

> . . . I do feel there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to obey just laws. On the other hand, I think we have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws because non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good.[5]

Today, he disassociates himself from the concept of "black power" and tells his audience at a Negro rally in Chicago:

> Our power does not reside in Molotov cocktails, rifles, knives and bricks.[6]

But how many Negroes are listening to Dr. King and how many are listening to the new head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Stokely Carmichael, who has put the matter very simply for his followers? Here is Carmichael on black power:

> Negroes certainly see that this is the richest country in the world, and they want to share in the wealth. And the feeling—whether or not the white press likes this, whether or not the white liberals like it—is that if (Negroes) cannot enjoy part of that dream, they're going to burn the country down.[7]

Carmichael said that, by the way, in an interview in the National Guardian, the leading Marxist journal in this country.

Or perhaps Negroes are listening to someone like Hardy Fry, field secretary for SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—who asserted while on a march in Tennessee:

> I'm not going to stand around and let anybody beat me or anybody else on this march. I don't know the Lord's Prayer anymore. I've got me a new prayer now—and it shoots six shots.[8]

Fry's call to arms was echoed by SNCC chairman, Carmichael, at a rally in Chicago on July 28, when he said:

> We have to protect ourselves from our protectors. If they touch one more black man in Mississippi and Los Angeles, we are going to disrupt this whole country.[9]

That same day, Carmichael was asked whether he condoned the fire bombing tactics in Negro protests in Cleveland. This young Negro leader—he is only 25—first said that he considered the outbreaks to be "rebellions" rather than "riots." Then he responded directly to the question:

> It is not for me to condone, nor is it for me to condemn. If they are willing to face the consequences of their act, I am for them.[10]

So spoke the national chairman of the grossly mis-named Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Also on that same day in Chicago, Carmichael revealed that his organization would "join hands" with the Black Muslim leader, Elijah Muhammad, and with an organization called the Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM.[11]

Before we consider this provocatively named Revolutionary Action Movement, let us examine a few more of the inflammatory statements which have become the stock in trade of so many civil rights leaders. Although most of these inciters to rebellion and lawlessness are members of more militant groups like SNCC, it would be a mistake to think that civil disobedience has not infected ostensibly more responsible organizations.

---

[1] Speech at the White House, Aug. 3, 1965, as reported in U.S. News and World Report, Aug. 8, 1966.

[2] New York Times, July 24, 1966.

[3] U.S. News and World Report, Aug. 8, 1966.

[4] New York Times, July 29, 1966.

[5] "Meet the Press," NBC–TV, March 28, 1965.

[6] U.S. News & World Report, August 8, 1966.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Washington Post, July 29, 1966.

[10] New York Times, July 29, 1966.

[11] *Ibid.*

For example, in Washington, D.C., at a rally held at Lafayette Park in front of the White House, Alfred Jones of the NAACP Young Adult Council said, and I quote the Washington Post:

> Unless equal rights are extended to Negroes immediately, "brother, we're going to hear from Watts, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia. This summer there is a lot of unrest.[12]

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that this threat, with clenched and waving fist was uttered within a stone's throw—and I hope this figure of speech remains just that—of the White House. The conclusion is clear and obvious. Nothing is sacred or inviolate to people who have been aroused beyond the limits of reason.

For example, in Jackson, Miss., during the recent James Meredith march, Father John Morris, the head of the Episcopalian Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, and, I am told, a long-time civil rights activist in the South, was reported as saying:

> Willie Ricks (a SNCC staff man) is telling people to throw away their American flags. He's saying, "Those flags don't represent black people." [13]

Open threats in front of the White House, sneering references to the American flag, where will it all end, Mr. Speaker, where will it all end?

Stokely Carmichael has one answer. Asked at a news conference here in Washington, D.C., if "black power" was based on nonviolence, he answered the question with a question:

> Can you have power without violence? [14]

Those are the words of a committed revolutionary, and it is therefore not too surprising that Carmichael should "join hands" with an organization called the "Revolutionary Action Movement." But, I wonder, does young Mr. Carmichael know all that he should about RAM?

In its August 8 issue, U.S. News & World Report states:

> Another Negro organization, the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), is reported by officials to be teaching tactics of terror and sabotage in several big cities of the North.

And in April of this year, the authoritative American Security Council released a special Washington report written by a young man named Phillip Abbot Luce. Luce was a member of the Progressive Labor Party, a pro-Chinese Communist organization in this country, until he broke with the group because of its terror tactics and advocacy of violence. Luce has since cooperated with various Government agencies and has written a book entitled "The New Left."

This is what he says about RAM:

> The other organization in the United States that is preparing to launch a guerrilla warfare operation is the Revolutionary Action Movement. Founded in Philadelphia in the winter of 1963, RAM is headed by Max Stanford and Robert Franklin Williams. RAM is active in the large city ghettoes and has a hard-core membership of about 250 people. RAM closely follows Williams, who is listed as its "Chairman-in-Exile," and as the "Premier of the African-American Government-in-Exile." Williams acknowledged his role while speaking in Hanoi in November, 1964: "As a representative of the Revolutionary Action Movement, I am here to give support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression."
>
> Nearly a year ago a group of RAM followers attempted to destroy a number of national shrines and had planned a bombing raid on the Nation's Capital before they were rounded up by the New York police. The three Amercans involved in this bizzare plot were all members of the Black Liberation Front which was formed in Cuba during the summer of 1964. This Black Liberation Front was merely a front operation for RAM. Even the extreme leftwing has now admitted this fact. Robert Taber, one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and still an apologist for Fidel Castro, documents this relationship in his book on guerrilla warfare, *The War of the Flea*.
>
> Max Stanford has made it perfectly clear that RAM favors any means to wrest control of the government from white people. Writing in the Detroit, Michigan, monthly, *Correspondence*, he relates that RAM was formed by Afro-Americans who favored Robert F. Williams and the concept of organized violence. He stated that the philosophy of RAM was "revolutionary nationalism and just plain blackism."
>
> RAM has been explicit in its outline of how it will take power in this country. Advocating a guerrilla war different in nature from that described in the writings of Mao and the Chinese, RAM envisions using the urban areas as the base of operations. The revolutionaries in RAM believe that the black ghetto areas of our major cities hold the key to a successful guerrilla war. They specifically propose that black people be organized into small guerrilla units which will use the night to spread terror through a city. According to the plans of RAM, terror will be the major weapon—terror which will, in turn, lead to a demoralization of the will of the Government. Bombs will be placed in New York's Grand Central Station or other public places; key personalities will be assassinated; snipers will indiscriminately murder innocent citizens, theaters will be fired.
>
> Max Stanford puts it this way in a recent issue of *Black America*, RAM's official publication: "When war breaks out in the country, if the action is directed toward taking over institutions of power and 'complete annihilation of the racist capitalist oligarchy' then the black revolution will be sucessful. . . . The revolution will 'strike by night and spare none.' Mass riots will occur in the day with the Afro-Americans blocking traffic, burning buildings, etc. Thousands of Afro-Americans will be in the street fighting: for they will know that this is it." [15]

Finally, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has described the Revolutionary Action Movement as "a highly militant, secretive organization following the Chinese oriented Marxist-Leninist line and believes in replacing the capitalistic system with socialism."

And Mr. Hoover goes on to detail the means to this end:

> Although no timetable is known, RAM allegedly has its program organized into three stages, the first one being education and recruitment. The second stage is one of expropriation whereby efforts will be made to secure sufficient funds for the organization. This will include robbery and other means, legal or illegal. The third stage will be one of direct action whereby the present system of government will be replaced by RAM's Chinese-oriented society, to be accomplished by any means available.[16]

Is it surprising, therefore, that Cleveland Safety Director John N. McCormick, following the riots in his city, declared:

> There is no doubt in my mind that trouble was planned for Cleveland. The pattern here and in other cities is almost identical. I believe the whole thing was planned with a high degree of intelligence behind it.[17]

And U.S. Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, a most distinguished legislator, and a member of the majority party, stated on July 27 that a "National conspiracy executed by experts" is responsible for the wave of riots. In Cleveland especially, he said, the riot pattern "indicated design and organization" with "centrally managed tactics keeping the riot in progress."

The senior Senator from Ohio declared that "the riots have not been a help to the cause of the Negro. The advocates of "black power," "get whitey" and "take the gun and holster away from the white man and put it on the black man" are clearly adopting a course of extremism." Senator LAUSCHE added that increased defiance of law and order is due in large part to those "civil leaders, including clergymen" who publicly argue that "civil disobedience is justifiable if one believes the law to be morally wrong." [18]

Finally, on this subject of the why behind the riots, the foreman of the grand jury called to investigate the riots in Cleveland has stated:

> The Grand Jury saw enough to realize that the violence was organized and planned because of specific targets singled out for looting and burning.[19]

Who would have reason to plan such riots? What organization would benefit and profit by a reign of terror and anarchy in this country? What group would set out deliberately to set Negro against white and white against Negro?

I trust no one would accuse me of practicing "McCarthyism" if I answer, the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other Marxist groups.

Again, I quote FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last year:

> The ever-increasing evidences of racial unrest in the country during the past year have witnessed a parallel in the increased emphasis being placed by the Communist Party, U.S.A. on the Negro question and the racial movement generally. There are clear-cut evidences that the party has not only been "talking," but also has been directing

---

[12] Washington Post, June 28, 1966.

[13] Washington Post, June 27, 1966.

[14] New York Times, July 28, 1966.

[15] "Washington Report," American Security Council, April 11, 1966.

[16] Testimony before House Appropriations Subcommittee, March, 1965.

[17] U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 8, 1966.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] David Lawrence column, Washington Star, July 28, 1966.

> and urging the increased participation by its adherents in the racial movement. As in any similar party effort at infiltration, when there is participation there is influence in varying degrees.
>
> The past year found the party devoting maximum attention to its efforts to influence civil rights developments. Always alert to exploit discontent and promote disorder, the party continued to regard the civil rights issue as one facet of the class struggle within the capitalist system. With this Marxist-Leninist analysis as a guide, the party has as an objective the use of the civil rights issue to create a Negro-labor coalition which it would dominate to advance the cause of communism in the United States. As in the words of the party's general secretary, Gus Hall, "Jim Crow can be dealt with only by dealing with capitalism."

Mr. Hoover reiterated his conviction that Communists are making serious attempts to penetrate the civil rights movement in a 12-page report released on August 1, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The FBI Director said that although the Communists have not been able to recruit appreciable numbers of Negroes, they will continue to try to infiltrate civil rights organizations and turn them "into a hatchery for communism."

He added:

> The Communists are hoping to exploit situations of unrest in the United States.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: What more logical and promising area for Communists than the civil rights movement where leaders openly suggest that violence is necessary to gain power?

Communist leaders themselves have supplied the answer. In January 1964, U.S. Communist Party Leader Gus Hall said that "members of the Communist Party are very active in all the Negro organizations engaged in the civil rights struggle."[20]

And in late June of this year, during the Communist Party's national convention in New York City, Claude Lightfoot declared that the Party intends to move openly into the civil rights struggles. Lightfoot, a Negro and head of the Party in Illinois, stated that "we will allow no one in the civil rights movement or the white power structure" to block such a move.[21]

I believe that Billy Graham spoke for millions of concerned Americans when he declared that the identity and aims of extremist groups fostering racial discord should be exposed. Said Mr. Graham:

> The people need to know. It is time that the President identify these groups who are teaching and advocating violence, training in guerrilla tactics and defying authority.

The American public should be told the full truth about such organizations as the Revolutionary Action Movement and the Progressive Labor Party, which J. Edgar Hoover has described as "another group seeking to exploit Negro unrest—a Marxist-Leninist group following the more violent Chinese Communist line."

Here is what Phillip Luce, a former member of the Progressive Labor Party, has said about PLP:

> Progressive labor, acting in its capacity as the American arm of the Chinese Communist International, has prepared a number of its members for any eventuality. During the summer of 1964 the PLP initiated a plan dividing various "trusted" members into secret groups of four and then preparing them to go "underground" if a police crackdown became imminent. The PLP members were not simply to change their names and alter their physical appearance but also were to use the weapons provided to aid and promote a guerrilla operation in those cities where Progressive Labor had any strength, such as in New York and San Francisco.
>
> When Harlem erupted that same summer the Progressive Labor leader there, Bill Epton, used his previous training to instigate further rioting. He actually trained people in the techniques of preparing and using Molotov cocktails. Epton is presently out on bond, pending the appeal of the 1-year prison sentence he received as a result of his role in the riots.
>
> Once the Harlem riots reached their peak the Progressive Labor leadership considered spreading the chaos to other parts of the city. The editor of *Challenge*, the Progressive Labor weekly newspaper, signed an editorial published during the riots which stated. "The vision of half a million—or a million—angry black men and women, supported by allies in the Puerto Rican and other working-class communities, standing up to their oppressors, is haunting the ruling class. People have already begun to speak of 'guerrilla warfare' and 'revolutionaries.' "
>
> By December, 1964, the Progressive Labor leadership had embarked on yet another "underground" program which was to include a trip abroad during which the members would receive further training in guerrilla techniques. Today this program is operative: a number of Progressive Labor people have already dropped from sight. Jake Rosen, a former member of the Communist Party, USA, a traveler to China (1958), and the man responsible for bringing a number of guns to New York from the South, is in charge of this "underground" project.[22]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that only through a congressional investigation, through a full-scale investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities, will all the facts be brought to light and presented to the American public. How else will someone like Stokely Carmichael and other civil rights leaders who believe they can play with fire be brought to their senses?

Communist infiltration and penetration have never been tolerated by any major movement in the United States.

In the 1930's and 1940's, the Communists attempted to penetrate the trade unions, believing that the American workingman could be won over. The Communists erred badly. They never converted a significant number of American workers. But they did succeed in infiltrating and seizing control of a dozen trade unions in the United States.

The reaction of responsible union leaders was swift and decisive. Communist-controlled unions were expelled from the CIO. American labor cleansed its ranks of those who would rule it for a foreign power. And when American labor so acted, it strengthened itself, this country, and established a precedent for all other segments of our society—if they should ever be confronted by a similar threat of subversion.

Today, leaders of the civil rights movement should move decisively to cleanse their movement of all Communist taint and influence.

Some have already warned their members of Communist attempts to infiltrate and direct their organizations. They have rejected cooperation with extremist elements and their siren song of "black power."

We can all applaud the action of these Negro leaders. However, others have stated flatly that they will "work with anybody," they have raised strange banners rarely seen in our free society, and have opened the doors wide to Communist penetration and infiltration

There is no excuse nor rationale for this position. If it continues, these leaders will damage not only their own cause, but our country as a whole. It is time for responsible people in the civil rights movement and in government to act to prevent further infiltration and manipulation of the movement by Communists and other subversive elements

Such action by responsible Negro leaders would be perfectly consistent with the American Negro's traditional rejection of Communism. In 1964, the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated in its report, "The American Negro in the Communist Party":

> The fact that the Communist conspiracy has experienced so little success in attracting the American Negro to its cause reflects favorably on the loyalty and integrity of the vast majority of the 15 million Negro citizens.

In January 1953, J. Edgar Hoover stated that "the American Negro is not hoodwinked by these false messiahs" and in the report released by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 1 of this year, Mr. Hoover said that the Communists have been "acutely embarrassed" by their failure to recruit Negroes.

Stated the FBI Director:

> To their everlasting credit, the vast majority of Negroes have recognized the falsity of Communism and have turned it down. They know that Communism does not mean a better life for them, economically, politically or socially.

But a small minority of Negroes, especially if they are active and in a position to influence others, can wreak havoc on their fellow Negroes, and indeed, all Americans.

There are disturbing signs that younger, more militant Negroes are even indifferent to the consequences of their headstrong impetuous acts. Stokely Carmichael has stated on more than one occasion:

> We'll work with anybody . . . We aren't going to let the white man tell us who we can work with.[23]

---

[20] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 12, 1964.

[21] New York Times, June 25, 1966.

[22] "Washington Report," American Security Council, April 11, 1966.

[23] New York Times, July 24, 1966.

Carmichael and his advisers express little if any concern about the effects of slogans like "black power" and the Black Panther emblem used by SNCC in my own State of Alabama and elsewhere in the South. John Lewis, who was ousted as SNCC national chairman this past May, has admitted that the slogan and the emblem were adopted "to scare hell out of the white people."[24]

Carmichael originated what is called the Black Panther Party in Lowndes County, Alabama, before becoming head of SNCC—Washington Post, July 20, 1966—Carmichael has stated that SNCC will continue to organize all Negro political parties under a Black Panther emblem, similar to the parties now operating in Lowndes County and several other black belt counties in Alabama.

When Black Panther candidates run in November's general election in Alabama, he has said, SNCC will have on duty poll watchers recruited from Watts in Los Angeles, Southside Chicago, and Negro ghettos of the North.[25]

If Carmichael and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee are going to join hands and work with organizations like the Revolutionary Action Movement and the Progressive Labor Party, then we have not seen the last of rioting and violence in our cities. For those who think that I exaggerate, let me quote from an article in the New York Times on Sunday, July 24, 1966:

> Recently, Robert Stanford, a leader of the Revolutionary Armed Movement participated in a "black power workshop" with Jesse Gray, the Harlem rent strike leader, and about 30 other Harlem Negroes in the downstairs board room of the Harlem Young Men's Christian Association. The session was closed to the press.
>
> The armed movement's chief-in-exile is Robert Williams, who fled to Cuba from Monroe, N.C., to escape a kidnapping charge that was filed against him during an interracial clash in that city. From Cuba, Mr. Williams supplies members of the movement with treatises on how to make Molotov cocktails and to conduct guerrilla warfare.
>
> Robert Williams is an implacable advocate of violence, revolution and communism. Today, he is in Communist China, where he is lionized as a "noted U.S. Negro leader." Williams fled the United States in 1961 after kidnaping a white couple in North Carolina.
>
> He first went to Havana, where Cubans dubbed him prime minister of the "African-American Government-in Exile", and helped him set up "Radio Free Dixie" to broadcast to the United States. Williams also became the head of the Revolutionary Action Movement, which is believed to have hundreds of armed followers in major American cities.
>
> When he visited Red China in mid-1963, Williams got a red carpet welcome, being received by Mao Tse-tung and other Communist leaders. At one rally in Peking, 10,000 people turned out to hear him denounce the "racist reactionary American and his imperialist government."[26]

Williams specializes in racial hatred. Here is an excerpt from the May-June 1964 edition of the Crusader, which he edits.

> This year 1964 is going to be a violent one, the storm will reach hurricane proportions by 1965 and the eye of the hurricane will hover over America by 1966. America is a house on fire . . . Let it burn, let it burn.
>
> The Monroe explosion came prematurely because of our shift in emphasis from "self-defense" to publicly overemphasizing nonviolence.
>
> A six year effective campaign terminated in illfated untimely experiment with nonviolence.
>
> We had enough force and arms to reduce the city to ashes.
>
> The White supremacy masses must be forced to retreat to their homes in order to give security to their individual families.
>
> Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails), lye or acid bombs (made by injecting lye or acid in the metal end of light bulbs) can be used extensively. During the night hours such weapons, thrown from roof tops, will make the streets impossible for racist cops to patrol. Hand grenades, bazookas, light mortars, rocket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen anxious to make a fast dollar.
>
> Gas tanks on public vehicles can be choked up with sand. Sugar is also highly effective in gasoline lines. Long nails driven through boards and tacks with large heads are effective to slow the movement of traffic on congested roads at night. This can cause havoc on turnpikes. Derailing of trains causes panic. Explosive booby traps on police telephone boxes can be employed. High powered sniper rifles are readily available. Armor piercing bullets will penetrate oil storage tanks from a distance. Phosphorus matches (kitchen matches) placed in air-conditioning systems will cause delayed explosions which will destroy expensive buildings. Flame throwers can be manufactured at home.

While Negro leaders like Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, may attempt to restore some balance and perspective, the new breed of civil rights leaders, continue to wax more militant and extremist. At the annual convention of the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—in early July, Floyd McKissick, the new national director, said:

> You can interpret this any way you want, but all I am saying is that the black man's cup is running over in the ghetto and you can no longer expect him to remain nonviolent.
>
> I am not going to condemn him if he does become violent, either, because I have been pleading and begging for positive action from the government.[27]

And then McKissick made this truly incredible statement:

> Non-violence in this country may be Christian, but it is un-American.[28]

Can anything be more warped and distorted than to say that "nonviolence is un-American"? Can anything be more calculated to incite violence, to condone it, to encourage it? Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that some of these civil rights leaders could be likened to Pontius Pilate, in trying to wash their hands of the violence and riots which they helped create by their call for civil disobedience.

What a tragedy it would be if millions of good honest law-abiding people should be hurt by a willful group of young extremists who are unwilling to listen to older, wiser heads and to learn from the textbook of history. As the nationally syndicated columnist James Jackson Kilpatrick has written:

> Neither Los Angeles, nor Chicago, nor Omaha, nor Des Moines, nor any other community in the nation, large or small, will tolerate insurrection in its midst. An outraged society will demand harsh punishment of the rioters who strike at the roots of society itself. Public opinion ordinarily is a massive, slumbering giant, difficult to arouse. For ten years at least, in the courts, in legislative halls, in the communications media, public opinion has rested solidly in support of 'the Negro'. It may be the ultimate irony of the Negro tragedy that a relative handful of Negro malcontents should now be the undoing of their people.[29]

It is to prevent this tragedy, it is to bring out the full truth about extremists and subversives in civil rights, it is to prevent more and more riots and violence, that I once again state that an investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of possible Communist and extremist influence and infiltration of the civil rights movement has become imperative—not just for the movement but for all America.

WATERSHED PROJECTS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we on the House Republican task force on agriculture were happy to see our efforts and those of other Members of Congress and interested people bear fruit this past week when the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved 37 watershed projects submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Budget Bureau had, from the first of the year, refused to forward any projects of this type to the committees of Congress, the procedure provided for by law. Their refusal was prompted by the administration's contention that Congress should not have the power of decision over watershed projects.

It was only after a clamor was raised by State and local officials, members of the task force, and other Members of Congress that the administration, fearing voter reprisal, allowed the Budget Bureau to release the projects.

The 37 projects were among 55 that were held up by administration orders while they tried to engineer a move to remove from congressional hands the watershed approval power. The Budget Bureau finally submitted all 55 to Congress late in July.

---

[24] Los Angeles Times, July 29, 1966.

[25] Washington Post, May 24, 1966.

[26] Washington Post, July 24, 1966.

[27] Washington Star, July 3, 1966.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] Washington Star, July 21, 1966.

I commend the members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee for taxing themselves and the committee staff to provide for consideration and decision on the projects as soon as possible.

The delay, caused by an administration grab for power, caused hardship for both the many people in the country concerned about the projects and the Members of Congress who, in the interests of these people, worked at top speed to provide consideration and decision on the plans.

In the almost 500 watershed project approvals given by the committees of Congress in the last 12 years, they have maintained an admirable record of careful and intense consideration of them.

The recent approval by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee of these 37 projects is only a continuation of the smooth effective process that has functioned so well over the years and should be allowed to continue functioning in the future.

PROPOSED IRS RULINGS ON EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES POINT UP NEED FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION BY CONGRESS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has given notice that it intends to implement certain rules which would severely limit tax deductibility for certain expenditures made by individuals for educational purposes.

We are advised that the proposed IRS rulings, published in the Federal Register on July 7, 1966, are intended to clarify existing regulations pertaining to educational expenses which are taken generally as business expenses by individual taxpayers.

Under the proposed regulations, educational expenses are not deductible if they are "personal or capital expenditures, or elements of both."

Several substantial changes in previous IRS practices are contained in the proposed rules relating to educational expenses. For example, contrary to previous practice—if the minimum educational requirements for a trade or business, position, or specialty are changed, the fact that an individual has met the old requirements is immaterial in determining whether the expenditures for additional education undertaken to meet the new requirements are deductible.

Another substantive change is the proposed rule that after January 1, 1967, courses taken by a degree candidate will not be deductible when they are aimed at other professions or trades.

The proposed rules strike hard at the teaching profession. The National Education Association has registered a strong protest on behalf of its approximately 1 million members. NEA has pointed out that "the proposed regulations, if made final, will virtually eliminate tax deductions for teachers who incur educational expenses for broadening and improving their skills."

Mr. Speaker, it seems inconsistent that one Federal agency can "forgive" a loan made under the National Defense Education Act to an individual for educational purposes if he qualifies by entering teaching; while another Federal agency can rule against allowing a tax deduction for the teacher who invests her own money to meet educational standards in order to qualify for employment.

We should be moving to encourage self-education. However, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to stiffen the rules even further.

The teaching profession has been working for more than 20 years to obtain reasonable tax treatment for necessary educational expenses.

Early in the 89th Congress I introduced legislation, H.R. 6987, which has as its purpose the correction of certain inequities in rulings by the Internal Revenue Service relating to tax deductions for educational expenses of teachers.

There is an urgent need for Congress to enact such legislation which will provide precise language in the revenue code pertaining to the deductibility of educational expenses.

There also are many bills introduced in the House of Representatives, including my own, H.R. 9381, which would establish a program of tax credits for taxpayers who are paying the cost of higher education.

The Congress has recognized the need to upgrade the quality of education at every level. We view education as the key to eventually resolving such problems as unemployment, poverty, and making civil rights legislation more meaningful.

President Johnson in a message to the Congress, March 1, 1966, on health and education, declared that "the education of our people is a national investment."

In his message to Congress this year, the President proposed a total Federal investment in education and training during this fiscal year in excess of $10 billion—a threefold increase since 1961.

Despite the multibillion-dollar investment of the Federal Government in educational programs, the success of education depends upon what individuals can do for themselves.

We should encourage individual investment in education and training programs at every level through tax credits and tax deductions.

Today the Nation requires the services of more and better trained teachers.

Business and industry desperately are seeking skilled employees and technicians.

Professional people must constantly keep up with new innovations and developments and demands for their services.

I have written to the Director of Internal Revenue Service expressing my personal concern that rules might be interpreted which would be contrary to our national objective of improving and enriching the education and training of our citizens. It is possible that the Internal Revenue Service is limited by the present language of the Internal Revenue Code.

In such case it is incumbent upon the administration and the Congress to take legislative action which will encourage individual investment in education.

FUTURE FINANCING OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks the House Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, has had under consideration legislation to establish Federal "electric" banks to help finance future requirements of rural electric cooperatives. In an effort to resolve the differences and problems connected with the financing needs, I have today introduced H.R. 16896. A summary of my bill is as follows:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 16896

H.R. 16896 is designed to lodge with the Central Bank for Cooperatives (which is an established institution within the Farm Credit System), the responsibility for making and servicing loans to eligible rural electrification borrowers.

Section 1 of the bill states the policy of Congress which is (1) that additional sources of financing are needed by the rural electrification system, and (2) that many existing REA borrowers will continue to need loans under the terms and conditions presently provided pursuant to title I of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

Section 2 amends the Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1929 to authorize the creation and funding of a special revolving fund within the Bank for Cooperatives to meet the needs of rural electric borrowers. This section authorizes the annual appropriation of $35 million per year for each of the next ten years for this purpose. In addition, the Bank for Cooperatives could issue debentures to raise additional capital pursuant to its existing authority.

Section 3 amends the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to authorize loans to those borrowers who now are eligible to receive loans under title I of the REA Act. Loans would be subject to the following limitations:

1. As is presently the case under the REA Act, all loans would be self-liquidating and could extend for periods up to 35 years.
2. Interest rates for intermediate loans would be at the *lower* of the cost of money to the U.S. Treasury or 4 percent per year.
3. Interest rates for regular loans would be at the *lower* of the cost of debentures issued by the Bank for Cooperatives or 6 percent per year.
4. Adequate security would be required for each loan.
5. Loans could be made only for electrical distribution purposes.
6. Loans could not be made without the prior consent of State authorities.
7. As is presently the case under the REA Act, loans could be adjusted to extend 5 years beyond original maturity dates.

Section 4 would prohibit loans under section 5 of the REA Act after June 30, 1967. These loans are presently authorized to be made to consumers of REA borrowers for the acquisition and installation of electrical equipment.

Section 5 expressly preserves the present lending programs (with the exception of section 5 loans) now being carried out under the REA Act.

MOUNT RUSHMORE PILGRIMAGE OF BOY SCOUTS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 30 years, Boy Scouts and their leaders have made an annual pilgrimage to Mount Rushmore where appropriate religious and inspirational services are held.

The program has grown and expanded until nearly 1,000 boys are making this trek each year. This year, the pilgrimage will be held on October 2. Scouts from not only South Dakota but neighboring States are invited to attend this inspiring event.

The brochure on the pilgrimage is set out as follows:

> The Mount Rushmore Pilgrimage of Boy Scouts and their leaders is unofficially 28 years old this October 2nd. Originally started by a single Scout Troop back in 1938, the trek to South Dakota's Shrine of Democracy has grown to include nearly one thousand inspired, although foot-weary, boys and adults.
>
> Just a few Scouts from American Legion Troop No. 2 of Rapid City made the first Pilgrimage nearly thirty years ago. The first trip was from Rapid City, via the famous Stratosphere Bowl, to Mount Rushmore. A hike that took two and one half days and covered 22 miles cross-country through the rugged western range of the Black Hills of South Dakota. By 1949, interest had developed in this historic trek until the experience was offered to Scouts from all the twelve troops in Rapid City. In order to reduce the time involved, the last two-thirds of the original trail was set as a distance to hike. The Scouts camped at the Stratosphere Bowl Saturday night and rolled out early Sunday morning for their hike, after field Church Services.
>
> The idea of the annual Rushmore Pilgrimage was adopted by the entire Black Hills Area Council in 1953, and more camp sites had to be arranged for the several hundred boys and men from Western South Dakota and Eastern Wyoming who made the yearly Pilgrimage a reaffirmation of their Patriotism.
>
> Three camp sites were selected. The original Stratosphere bowl that is fourteen miles east of Mount Rushmore. Sheridan Lake, located an eleven rugged miles North of the Monument. Beautiful Sylvan Lake, nine miles Southwest of the Shrine of Democracy, but separated from the Four Faces by Harney Peak, a 7,000 foot high mountain that is climbed by the boys every year as they hike to their goal.
>
> A single file column of boys and men on a mountain trail becomes unwieldy as the numbers continue to mount into the hundreds. This year, a fourth camp site and starting point has been selected. Center Lake, ten miles South of Mount Rushmore. In order to more effectively control the timing and movements of four diversely located columns of lively Boy Scouts, a system of Citizen's Band radio control is planned for this year. There will CB portable units at the beginning and end of each column as it progresses cross-country. Several control point stations will be in operation at specified trail crossings, and a master control will be set up at the parking area of the Shrine of Democracy.
>
> The 1966 Rushmore Pilgrimage will be the largest ever, from the standpoint of numbers of participants. It will be completely coordinated by the use of modern communication equipment; and it will once again show the nation and the world that the youth of today has courage and vision. Courage to undertake a project of this magnitude, and vision of the love of Country and simple Patriotism that is their inheritance.

THE DRAFT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Johnson administration is sidestepping a critical review of the draft until after the November elections.

President Johnson's appointment of a 20-man commission to examine the draft looks like another secret study, just like the alleged analysis of the draft supposedly conducted by the Defense Department a year ago. It serves only to keep the truth from the public and to subvert the congressional committee process.

Congress has the primary responsibility, not a special executive commission, to be exploring through public hearings the critical problems inherent in the draft system.

The Johnson administration's sidestepping of this urgent problem is merely an attempt to persuade Congress not to do its homework and to take the heat off the issue for the 1966 congressional elections.

The present draft law expires June of 1967. I believe that appropriate congressional committees should commence hearings on the law this session, rather than waiting until 1967 when they might be handicapped by lack of time.

FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions I have sought to restore a sense of balance to U.S. policy regarding Rhodesia. While the United States and Britain acted with dispatch to cause the downfall of Rhodesia—all three members of the free world community—very little is being done to assist the many millions of people enslaved by the international Communist movement. As far back as March 23, 1965, I introduced for the second time House Concurrent Resolution 367, which would seek to place on the agenda of the United Nations this year the issue of self-determination for the captive nations. Instead of supporting the use of force as did Britain and the United States in the case of Rhodesia, House Concurrent Resolution 367 would use the facilities of the United Nations to discuss and implement peacefully the issue of restoring to the captive peoples their God-given rights. I asked the State Department for their analysis of this proposal, and unfortunately, they did not agree. This legislation, I feel, would provide a vehicle upon which the free nations could unite in emphasizing the principles upon which the United Nations was founded. Nevertheless, I shall continue to support this legitimate and peaceful approach to an injustice which now subdues so many millions of this earth's inhabitants.

According to an editorial in today's Chicago Tribune, the conflict between Britain and Rhodesia seems closed to a solution. I certainly hope the following analysis is correct and that these two members of the free world will settle their differences as soon as possible.

I insert the editorial, "Britain Between Two Stools," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Aug. 8, 1966]

BRITAIN BETWEEN TWO STOOLS

> Winston Churchill, who once valiantly affirmed that he did not become the king's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British empire, is spared the prospect of Britain's latest humiliation. Reports from London say that the Labor government of Prime Minister Harold Wilson is moving toward a compromise with the rebellious white rulers of Rhodesia.
>
> Arthur Gavshon of the Associated Press states that nine months after renouncing London's authority the breakaway regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith is still holding out against a world-wide campaign of sanctions led by Britain and supported by the United States.
>
> Meanwhile, Wilson faces a crisis over the pound and is eager to be rid of a costly quarrel which is gobbling up precious resources and menacing prized investments.
>
> Between these two stools, Wilson is bound to take a fall. He is reported to have come to the realization that compromise is the only way out, and any compromise is bound to be weighted in favor of Rhodesia and against Britain. One consequence is likely to be a swift deterioration in what survives of the concept of a British commonwealth, for the African commonwealth nations will rave at any settlement.
>
> "Only last week," the Associated Press reports, "Commonwealth Relations Secretary Arthur Bottomley confessed in parliament that Britain has no power to enforce her wishes on the Smith regime.
>
> "All this has brought the Wilson government to what may seem to some a moment of humiliating truth.
>
> "The truth is that Britain—mightiest power at the turn of the century—now has neither the resources nor the political resolve to crush a rebellion of 250,000 determined colonials. Compromise, accordingly, has been accepted by Wilson as the only practicable way out, even if it has to be compromise with a man Bottomley once branded a liar and a rebel."
>
> Rhodesia has been able to survive the campaign of sanctions thru the aid and support of South Africa, whose policy of

racial separation is also anathema to African countries. The South Africans have helped with oil, money, goods, and other supplies without which Rhodesia could not have sustained its defiance.

Britain, of course, does not take kindly to these arrangements, but without South Africa's good will 2.8 billion dollars in British investments would be lost. In a time of economic crisis, the Wilson government knows that such a blow could be fatal.

In these circumstances, the Labor government, tho, it has repeatedly condemned South Africa's racial policies for the record, is said to have been driven to seek the intercession of Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd of South Africa, in the hope of getting rid of the Rhodesian hot potato. Reports in London say that Wilson has been in secret contact with Verwoerd and has urged the South African to press Smith discreetly into an accommodation.

Few developments in current history afford as ironic an outcome as the British lion's disposition to cuddle up with regimes which have excited so many of its roars.

PROPOSED MERGER OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Subcommittee headed by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable EDWARD F. HÉBERT, has conducted exhaustive hearings relative to the proposed merger of the National Guard and the Reserves.

As a result of these hearings, we have introduced legislation to strengthen the Reserves and guarantee the permanence of the Reserves in our military force structure.

One of our finest witnesses in behalf of our proposed legislation was our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, who is chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations.

His testimony was so outstanding and so logical I feel it should be brought to the attention of all of our Members prior to the conclusion of our hearings and the reporting of the bill. I, therefore, include Representative SIKES' fine statement as an extension of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES TO HÉBERT SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 16435, AUGUST 5, 1966

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the privilege of appearing before you in support of "The Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1966." I consider the passage of this bill necessary. It is all that is ascribed to it in its title and more. It will remain, if enacted—and I do not doubt that it will be—a lasting monument to the fair-minded and patriotic judgment of this Committee and its Chairman and a perpetual tribute to the service of each in the Congress.

A great many bills are introduced in each Congress, and the number carried by this one attests to that fact. Most of them are born to be forgotten. But I am convinced that few bills under consideration by the Congress today have greater significance than this one, which historically will bear the name of the distinguished Chairman of this Subcommittee. I say this not only because of its bearing upon the national security posture of our country, but because it will represent a milestone in the long journey of our government along the path of constitutional government—a government of laws and not of men.

A number of us here today were in Congress in 1952 when the Reserve Forces Act was passed. It has been amended several times as important new facts were brought to mind and because of the lessons of Korea and Viet Nam. By the same token, your Committee now proposes to write into law not just your own views, but a compilation of the experience and wisdom of our military and legislative leaders gained in the field of the Reserve programs. I consider that it is an outstanding piece of legislation. It is fair, sensible and right. And it is timely. It will prevent a set aside—at least in part—of the Reserve Forces Act. The Congress should not delay its enactment.

Of transcendent importance is the fact that the principal thrust of this legislation is to guarantee strong back-up forces for our regular services. For that reason its enactment obviously is in the national interest. We want Reserve components for all the regular forces which are numerically powerful, well-trained, fully equipped, conscientiously supported and capably commended. This bill moves positively in that direction.

To my surprise, I hear that this measure may be controversial—that it is looked upon with less than enthusiasm in the Pentagon. This is astonishing. We all seek a strong defense. We all serve under the same flag. We should be able to join in support of such a meritorious bill. I would hope that its very simplicity, its common sense, its historic soundness do not work to make it unattractive in some quarters. The modern concept of legislation all too often is something vague and indefinite, incapable of interpretation, but which the Departments and the Courts later can twist to their own purposes. This is not such a bill.

It is a simple bill. It prescribes that certain minimum strengths, which are modest, must be maintained in all the Reserves and that these Reserve components have high level management, that they be properly encouraged, given adequate leadership and equipment with which to go about their missions.

Why then should anyone oppose this bill? In the long run it will save money. It will provide needed military training for thousands of young men. It will add an important element of discipline for those same young men. It will, most importantly, give our nation added assurance of an adequate military defense in time of danger. As a member of the House Committee which provides appropriations for the military services, I am one of a small group which for the past two years has wrestled directly with the problem of insuring the continuation of the Reserves. You have had the same experience. We examined the 1964 re-alignment program and we found it wanting. When it was proposed that the so-called Reserve and National Guard merger be brought about without legislative authority, we rejected that proposal. We in the Appropriations Committee believe that action such as this should be based upon the passage of legislation as, in fact, the statutes specify. The same proposal for merger was rejected again in 1966. In each instance our action was endorsed by the House and by the Senate. This should not go on indefinitely. This uncertainty is producing a chaotic condition within the Reserves which is highly injurious to morale and to efficiency. There has been a draw down from the Reserves even of the tardily supplied and inadequate equipment which they possessed. They need some certainty for the future. They need to know that their goals are positive and reachable goals, spelled out in the law of the land. This will not be true until there is legislation such as this bill which you now consider.

Now let me touch on a question which has been raised regarding the ability of the services to train those needed for the Reserve components specified in this bill. In the main these are the so-called "untrained" pool of reservists who are in the Army backlog. I consider the solution of this problem quite simple. All that is required is to expand the existing base or keep open one of those slated for closure, or reactivate a base which previously has been closed. If there is a need for trainees, this need can be met very simply and promptly by calling up some of the thousands of officers and men of the already trained Reserve forces for this purpose. There are many who want to serve.

It is as simple as that. All that is needed is the will to carry forward the program. There is no real or costly difficulty involved.

But before I leave the subject, let me point to the fact that those in the so-called "untrained Reserve" actually are being given training—in their Reserves Centers—by the experienced and capable non-commissioned officers and commissioned officers who lead these units. Many of these unit leaders have had combat experience. Under their direction recruits already are gaining training in military essentials on weekends and on weeknights. This training will enhance the active duty training which later will be required for them to achieve full readiness. I think the problem of the Reserve recruit is being over-emphasized.

As long as the future of the Reserves can be determined on the basis of personal decision rather than on the basis of law, we are confronted with the danger of failure of policy, the danger of a lack of foresight regarding military personnel needs, training needs and equipment needs, the danger of inability to see mistakes and correct them, even of the actual and awesome danger of an inadequate defense for the nation. No individual, however capable, and however well intentioned, should have imposed upon him such a responsibility. The law should spell out the exact future of the Reserves and provide guidelines for their most efficient maintenance and utilization.

This is indeed a bill of rights for the Reserves and its passage is greatly needed.

PROGRESS IN SOUTH KOREA

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great need for stability in the Far East and the continuing dangers of Peking's intransigence, I have been most interested in the developing conditions of countries on the periphery of Communist China.

In that connection, an excellent report on the economic progress being made by South Korea appeared in the July issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey, published by Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. I am submitting that article for the RECORD today.

As the article indicates, 1965 was a "year of brightening prospects" for

South Korea. This is of particular significance when considered in light of the great strides and increasingly constructive roles of Japan and the Republic of China on Formosa. South Korea's progress also, in part, is an example of how our foreign assistance efforts can reap sizable dividends. It would seem, and it is to be hoped, that the day is not too far off when South Korea not only will no longer need our financial aid but will be lending substantial assistance to less fortunate neighbors in free Asia, as Japan and Nationalist China already are doing. It is well worth noting that South Korea to date has contributed 25,000 troops to the Vietnam war effort.

The economic health of all three of these countries on the eastern edge of Red China is vitally important to the free world as a counterbalancing force for stability and peace in that part of the world. It is no less important than the outcome of events in southeast Asia.

The above-mentioned article follows:

South Korea—A Hard Year's Work

In South Korea 1965 was proclaimed by President Park Chung Hee the Year of Hard Work, but it should go down in the annals of the country's development as the Year of Brightening Prospects. A much-needed measure of price stability was achieved last year, slowing the rapid inflation which had accompanied economic growth the previous two years. Exports rose sharply, improving the balance of payments. And a long-sought accord with Japan was reached, guaranteeing South Korea considerable economic assistance from that source for the next ten years.

Indeed, for the first time since the Republic of Korea was founded eighteen years ago—in the wake of the cold-war confrontation which divided the peninsula into North and South—the optimistic feeling prevails in government and business circles that the economy is on the track of sound development.

A more optimistic feeling about Korea's prospects also has grown up abroad. Washington, a generous contributor of funds to Seoul since the end of World War II, believes the country has potential for self-propelled growth and is beginning to talk of phasing out U.S. development grants and low-interest loans in about five years. Foreign businessmen, moreover, are showing a new willingness to invest their capital and skills in the Republic's development.

Last year's turn for the better in South Korean affairs contrasts vividly with the instability—aggravated by misfortunes of partition and of the cold war—which lay at the root of the country's previously troubled history. The Korean peninsula had been ruled by Japan for 35 years—from 1910 until the end of World War II, at which time Soviet forces occupied the North and U.S. forces the South.

Most of the industrial development that occurred during the colonial period—mines, hydro-electric power plants, and some factories—took place north of the 38th parallel. Divided from the Communist North in 1945, the independent Republic of Korea thus started national life in 1948 severely hampered by a lack of resources. Primarily an agricultural economy, the new country had roughly two-thirds of the peninsula's population or 17 million people to support. (The population since then has been swelled by refugees and natural increase to 28 million.)

In 1950, before the young country had been able to do much to fortify its economic base, South Korea was attacked by North Korean forces. In the ensuing three-year war the South Korean economy suffered damage estimated as high as $3 billion. Since the war had made clear that the peninsula would remain divided for an indefinite period, South Korea thereafter set out not just to reconstruct its war-shattered facilities but also to develop the mining, manufacturing, and power which it largely lacked. It undertook this task burdened with the extra expense of maintaining a large standing army to protect its northern frontier.

During the 1950's the pace of reconstruction and development led to boom and bust. With Korean saving necessarily low after the war, economic growth was underpinned by substantial foreign financing, most of it coming from the U.S., which in the seven years 1953–59 poured economic assistance (grants, development loans, and food) into the Republic at a rate averaging nearly $300 million a year. In addition the U.S. provided $1 billion in military assistance during the period. Impatient for progress, the South Korean government speeded the process of development with deficit spending and expansive domestic credit formation. Economic growth gained momentum at the cost of soaring inflation. This in turn required a stabilization attempt, which succeeded in slowing the price rise at the end of the decade—but only at the price of halting real economic growth.

By this time the government of President Syngman Rhee, who had been in power from the Republic's beginning, no longer commanding popular support. A revolution in April 1960 overthrew the Rhee regime. The successor regime of Dr. Chang Myon was deposed in May 1961, when a military coup brought General Park to power. He has remained in power since, having been elected President in 1963 for a term of four years.

Employing the deficit-spending and credit-creation roads to renewed growth, the Park government shortly had another roaring inflation on its hands. Wholesale prices rose 21 percent in 1963 and 35 percent in 1964. Imports soared, with the result that foreign-exchange reserves fell in 1963 to their lowest level in six years.

THE STABLIZATION PACKAGE

It was in response to this situation that President Park's government formulated the stabilization measures that took hold last year. Budgetary restraint and limits on expansion of domestic credit and money supply were accompanied in 1964 and 1965 by a devaluation of the currency. Set free to fluctuate in response to market forces, the won's value declined in stages from 130 to the dollar to W270=$1. This step has been supported by the International Monetary Fund, which extended South Korea a $9.3-million stand-by credit last year, and in March of this year renewed the stand-by and enlarged it to $12 million. The devaluation was designed to slow imports, by making them more costly, and to encourage exports. To counter rising prices, moreover, the government released stores of rice during 1965 and early last year eased restrictions on imports, in part to permit entry of goods whose prices in the domestic market were rising too fast. Imports were further liberalized early this year.

With these measures inflation was slowed considerably. The rise in wholesale prices was held to 10 percent in 1965, and the cost of living increased at a rate less than half that of the previous year. Stabilization efforts continued to show results this year; wholesale prices in the first three months rose slightly less than in the same period last year.

One particularly important result of the slowing in price increases has been a renewed willingness on the part of Koreans to channel savings into bank deposits. After lagging for years, time and savings deposits began to climb impressively early in 1965. Then in November a sharp boost in interest rates paid on these deposits—to 18 percent a year for 3-month deposits and 30 percent for 18-month deposits—drew a further big inflow of funds into the banks. Time and savings deposits at yearend stood 94 percent above the level the previous year; and at the end of the first quarter of this year they had risen a further 27 percent. At the same time the interest rate banks are allowed to charge on ordinary commercial loans was raised to 26 percent a year.

The balance of payments also improved last year. Gold and foreign-exchange reserves rose $10 million to $146 million as of December 31, the highest level in three years. A 47-percent increase in exports to $175 million contributed importantly to the good showing. It partly reflected a boom in sales to Viet Nam, which in 1965 became the third largest buyer, after the United States and Japan, of South Korean goods. The export rise also reflected the devaluation, which made Korean prices more competitive abroad.

The Republic is aware of its need to increase exports and other sources of foreign exchange substantially in the next few years. The high level of imports needed to sustain domestic growth has resulted in large trade deficits each year, which have been financed to a large extent by U.S. military and economic aid. Scaled down in total since 1959, this aid incrceasingly has shifted from grants to interest-bearing loans.

With the U.S. planning to withdraw further, the treaty reached last year with Japan takes on special significance. It provides for Japan to extend South Korea $800 million in government loans, grants, and commercial credits over the next ten years, with part of the funds earmarked for a modernization of South Korea's fishing industry. The increased catch projected in the modernization plan is expected to give Korea's foreign-exchange earnings a big boost, raising exports some $100 million by 1968.

LOOKING AHEAD

A five-year plan for the years 1967–71, the drafting of which is nearly complete, reportedly will set ambitious targets for all sectors of the economy—with the aim of achieving economic "self-sufficiency" by the end of the period. Growth of gross national product is projected at 7 percent a year in real terms, just a notch below the 8 to 9 percent rates of the past three years. Special effort is to be given to improving agricultural production, which has lagged far behind the industrial growth of recent years.

The projected increase in domestic capital formation to sustain the planned growth, however, is considerably larger than has been achieved so far. This has aroused doubts among some observers about the plan's realism, and some question as to whether the understandable temptation to try to do everything at once may not result in a return to deficit financing. Such a development, of course, would be most unfortunate since it would reduce the likelihood of Korea's attracting the foreign capital it also counts on to help finance the plan, and so would be ultimately self-defeating.

THE OKLAWAHA

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been long associated with a project which is now nearing completion in my State; namely, Cross Florida Barge Canal. There has been an urgent and serious campaign by the conservation groups in the State of Florida to save a beautiful river in our State, which will be incorporated into this project. This river, the Oklawaha, is of great concern to the many conservationists who wish to preserve its beauty and antiquity, and who fear it will be destroyed by this project. Recently, interested citizens who have concerned themselves with the preservation of the Oklawaha met together on the banks of this river and heard an outstanding, movingly beautiful prayer offered by Dr. U. S. Gordon, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Gainesville, Fla.

This prayer which so perfectly expresses the philosophy of those who wish to preserve the Oklawaha, Mr. Speaker, I, therefore offer for my colleagues' consideration:

PRAYER OFFERED ON THE BANKS OF THE OKLAWAHA BY DR. U. S. GORDON, SUNDAY, JANUARY 23, 1966

> Almighty God, who has revealed Thy splendor and bounty in this created earth, we praise Thee for the order and beauty of nature in sea and cloud, in field and forest, in the blue lakes and the swiftly flowing stream. We thank Thee for all Thy creatures of the out-of-doors that creep and run and fly and swim and that Thou openest Thy hand and givest them meat in due season.
>
> We acknowledge with deepest gratitude our Florida heritage of natural resources and abundance in the out-of-doors. Especially do we thank Thee now for this shining stream, fed by deep, clear springs, winding its course in banks of peace and solace for men in the push and noise of these hurrying days.
>
> Forgive us that we have squandered our resources, that we have polluted our streams, that we have substituted ugliness for beauty and desecrated with man's clumsy efforts the handwork of God.
>
> Bless the efforts of this group dedicated to saving the remnants of a vanishing Eden, awaken our law makers and all citizens of this commonwealth to the sin of waste and to the immediate importance of saving for our children and for all posterity the Oklawaha and its surrounding wilderness—our heritage which we would fain pass on.

H.R. 16909, A BILL TO ENLARGE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FOR THE AGE OF FUTURE ENLIGHTENMENT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, despite references to a computer-tutor or a teacherless teaching machine, we are living in an age of extreme sensitivity, an age which acutely recognizes the need for more personalization and involvement in society. And these ideals aspired for in today's citizenry are the same ideals which created ancient Greece and the emergence of the whole man.

In the days of ancient Greece, the whole man could develop in a much easier and gentler fashion by combining the truth of science and the truth of poetry. A man of intelligence, in those days of the past, could even endeavor to acquire all of the available knowledge and apply it to his daily existence.

But today, we are confronted with the realization that more changes have taken place in the last 20 years than in all the previous millenia of recorded history. Therefore the concept of the whole man is much more difficult to attain particularly because no human being can operate like a computer and be capable of total information storage and recall.

Yet the overwhelming developments in space and technology, the revealing probings into the secrets of human life, and the many new peoples who have achieved their place on the map of the world make it essential for Americans to be enlightened. Today man's desire to be well informed cannot be achieved merely through perseverance and scholarly endeavors. Modern man must receive assistance in gaining knowledge and making a rightful contribution to society.

I believe that one of the best mediums for restoring the sensitive ideal of the whole man to 20th century America is through the aid of educational television. Television can, by its very flexibility and availability, bridge the ever-widening gap between science and the arts and facts and intuition. And educational television can and must bring quality to the viewing audience so that they can intelligently participate more actively in society.

No machine, no media, no piece of hardware can operate effectively without the careful guidance of an educated human being. An analogy can also be made to the workings of a civilization and culture. Greatness cannot be achieved by standing still in this whirlwind of change and mobility. Yet, we have arrived at a paradoxical stage when the performance of the machine is often dependent upon extensive specialization; while its harmony with the other machines is contingent upon a more broadened approach. Therefore, our citizens must be well rounded and able to cope with situations outside of their immediate realm of interest.

Educational television has the potential of reaching out to an extraordinary number of peoples; to the masses, to the children in school, to the adult desiring to perfect a skill, to the scientist who wishes to study art, or the artist who hopes to acquire some learning of science. We have an advantage over the Greeks, the advantage of the knowledge of the past in addition to the exciting new knowledge of the present. Yet this change in knowledge is so dynamic and continual that the present soon becomes the past all too quickly without the opportunity for our citizens to fully profit from it.

By amending the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the existing program for an additional 5 years and enlarge the program by raising the per-State limitation from $1 to $3 million for educational television broadcasting facilities, I believe that we can more successfully enable Americans to partake of their history and the provocative accomplishments which are taking place in all aspects of their life and the world. A famous American scientist once said that—

> A country which annually produces millions of refrigerators, dishwashers, automatic washing machines, automatic clothes dryers, and automatic garbage disposers can certainly afford the equipment necessary to educate its citizens to high standards of competence in the most effective way.

I look to educational television as the leader and teacher of this high standard of competence and to the future generations of a more enlightened America.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL FEDERAL POWER PROJECT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations presently has before it consideration of a request for $1,200,000 for continuation of preliminary engineering studies by the Corps of Engineers of the by now celebrated Dickey-Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric power project on the St. John River in Maine.

I am sure that I need not remind the Members of this House concerning the tortuous and sometimes devious course this project took through this Chamber last year. A majority of my colleagues in this Chamber supported my position last year for a thorough and complete study of this project before we proceeded with the ultimate expenditure of some $300 million. In the final action taken, however, the view of the House did not prevail and in a series of most unusual moves we ended up authorizing $227 million and appropriating $800,000 as a starter.

Now I expect that shortly the project will be before us again, the proponents looking for more money. I want to serve notice to the House at this time that there are a number of Members here who still feel that a thorough and complete study is in order and that it should be conducted before any further funds are appropriated.

Since consideration of this outmoded and obsolete project last year a number of new facts have been determined, largely on a voluntary basis by the investor-owned electric companies of the New England area. To my present knowledge we have received little or no comparable information from the Federal agencies involved in the planning of this project.

In the interest of keeping all of the Members of the House well informed on this project and in anticipation of considering the issue once again I expect for the next week of two to be inserting in the RECORD items of information that have been developed since our last consideration of the project.

For the information of the House today I should like, Mr. Speaker, to insert an incisive analysis of the project and the issues involved which was written by Mr. Raymond Moley and appeared in Newsweek magazine on February 28 of this year. In view of the very recently stated desire of the President to seek closer control of the Federal budget this is a most appropriate article.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, Feb. 28, 1966]

Guns and Butter Plus

(By Raymond Moley)

Inflation is no longer a threat. It is a fact. The most pratical way to lessen its impact is to cut Federal spending. But our President says we must have guns and butter too.

Even if we concede that Congress should continue military and welfare outlays at the present rate, however, there is plenty of fat in LBJ's 1967 budget of demands. And a lot of it is in that vast pork-barrel authorization in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965—a miscellany of handouts for local interests.

A good example is the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric dams proposed to be built on the St. John River, far up in northern Maine.

This project was once included in the famous Passamaquoddy dream child of FDR which over the years since 1935 has had several deaths and resurrections. In 1935 Congress provided $7 million for preliminary plans. In 1936 Senator Vandenberg induced the Senate to deny funds for construction. In 1941 the Federal Power Commission said the project could not economically compete with other sources of electric power. In 1948 the governments of the United States and Canada asked the International Joint Commission to investigate the plan. In 1956 the IJC reported that "Quoddy" was not feasible.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHEME

In 1961 Interior Secretary Udall, flushed with the power of his new job, induced President Kennedy to restudy the scheme, and in 1963 he recommended it to the President. In 1965 he decided that harnessing the tides of the Bay of Fundy was not feasible, but at his suggestion President Johnson permitted the Dickey-Lincoln project to be included in the Rivers and Harbors bill with $800,000 to make engineering studies.

The idea is to build a large dam at Dickey and a smaller "reregulatory" one at Lincoln School. The St. John River rises in northwestern Maine, flows north and for a short distance forms the international boundary. Then it turns into New Brunswick and flows on to the sea. The bureaucrats' estimate of cost is $321 million, which would include 421 miles of transmission lines to Bangor, Augusta, Portland and Boston.

The annual operating cost estimated by Jackson & Moreland, a consulting firm, would be $19 million rather than the Interior Department's guess of $11 million. There would be a deficit of $4,618,000 to be paid by the Federal government.

Since New England needs plenty of electric power, nineteen private companies have joined in a plan which will cost $1.5 billion to increase their plant capacity during the next seven years. This group would add 6,250,000 kilowatts to its production from four nuclear, five steam and one hydro plant and join all these by transmission lines. Dickey-Lincoln's capacity would be less than 1 percent to add to the total New England capacity.

HYDRO WHITE ELEPHANT

These companies would provide large sources of tax revenues for the State, local and Federal governments. That is the plus side, while the Dickey-Lincoln plan would be a further drain on Federal funds.

Moreover, the production cost per kilowatt in such a Federal project would be much higher than the costs in the nuclear, steam and hydro plants of the private companies. It is quite probable that even before, or at any rate shortly after Dickey-Lincoln is built and operating, the lower costs of nuclear and steam production would make such a Federal project with its transmission lines so costly as to be wholly impracticable.

Thus, the Federal government would have an expensive and unnecessary white elephant on its hands. This project, with many others in the United States, would stand as a grim monument to the follies of this and earlier generations.

The influences behind the building of Dickey-Lincoln are the demand of Maine for Federal spending the public-power zealots in and out of the Federal government, and the bureaucracy of the Interior Department and Army Corps of Engineers, always intent on having bigger and more expensive projects to construct.

Here and in many other parts of the Johnson budget are projects which should be eliminated. If there is to be economy, such proposals are where Congress should apply the ax.

CONGRESS, REFORM THYSELF

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Vivian] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent news column entitled "Congress, Reform Thyself," the well-known columnist, Roscoe Drummond, discussed the report recently issued by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, recommending a number of changes in the rules and procedures governing this House. In his opening paragraph, he began with:

> Congress urgently needs to lay hold of better means to transact the public business.

And in his closing paragraph, he concluded:

> Congress will not recapture its coequal role through the modest stream-lining measures proposed by the Joint Committee on Reorganization. It will need to go much further.

Mr. Speaker, I find Mr. Drummond's evaluation a valid one. I hope the Members will read this column by Mr. Drummond and consider seriously the specific suggestions he makes. I include it at this point in the Record:

Congress, Reform Thyself

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Congress urgently needs to lay hold of better means to transact the public business.

If it fails to do so, it faces further decline in the federal system.

Since Franklin D. Roosevelt, the powers of the presidency have been expanded during every administration—at the expense of the Congress.

But today Congress is not even the second most influential branch of the federal government. No congressional initiative has had such a sweeping impact on the nation as the two Supreme Court decisions, one banning segregation in the public schools and the other requiring reapportionment of the state legislatures on a one-man, one-vote basis. The latter decision may well do more than anything else to slow down the flow of political power to Washington.

UNEQUAL BRANCHES

We no longer have three coequal branches in the federal system. We have three unequal branches in this order of descending influence: (1) the presidency; (2) the judiciary and (3) the Congress.

Fortunately Congress is beginning to take some small steps in the right direction. They are modest inadequate, but useful as a start—not much of a start but in the right direction.

After laboring for many months the Joint Committee on Reorganization has at least brought forward something—proposals for a somewhat more adequate staff, more open hearings, some split-up of two overworked committees, opening House hearings to television and other peripheral reforms.

The Republican members of the joint committee offer on their own a reform which could be particularly valuable. They propose a special investigating committee in each House to be controlled by the minority. It is needed because when one party controls both the White House and Congress, there is no effective congressional oversight of the executive branch.

COEQUAL ROLE

But the reforms need to go much further if Congress is to begin to recover its coequal role in the federal system. By its own default Congress has lost most of its control over federal spending; it never gives real scrutiny to the total budget before it acts on it; it does not relate total revenue to total spending; it is so burdened with routine and so slowed by antiquated procedures that the Senate and House are not adequately free to concentrate on what is most vital. It needs more and better qualified committee and minority staff in order not to have to rely almost entirely on administration information, appraisal, and initiative.

On top of its cumulative loss of influence, Congress, especially the Senate, has lost standing because of the Bobby Baker scandal. The Dodd investigation—though the final verdict is still to come—is bound to hurt.

GOOD RECORD

I do not mean that the record of the Congress is all black. It has a good and productive legislative record through the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. From 1957 to 1966 it will have enacted valuable civil-rights laws, a sound tax reduction, a number of constructive social measures, necessary federal aid to education and, for the most part, has genuinely supported a bipartisan foreign policy which has varied little from one administration to the next.

On the basis of this record, the public opinion polls show that the voters are now giving Congress a somewhat higher approval rating than they have for a number of years. This is good. It is deserved.

But Congress will not recapture its coequal role through the modest streamlining measures proposed by the Joint Committee on Reorganization. It will need to go much further. If it doesn't, the voters are likely to say to the congressmen who most resist all change: "Make way for others."

PROPOSED NEW INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE REGULATIONS

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to register my opposition to the proposal by the Internal Revenue Service as announced in the Federal Register on July 7 to eliminate some of the few tax deductions now allowed to individuals for educational expenses. Internal Revenue proposes to disallow deductions for courses leading to a degree and for costs incurred for study or training to meet an employer's increases in occupational requirements.

In an era when the highest premium is placed on the amount and quality of an individual's education, it seems to me that we move in a backward direction if we now throw up an additional barrier in the way of pursuit of such learning. The importance of education to both the individual and to our society is fully acknowledged and encouraged at the national level through the many Federal programs of assistance to elementary and secondary schools, construction of facilities for higher education, and financial aid for students in colleges and universities.

The Internal Revenue's proposed changes would reverse this trend, in what appears to me to be a shortsighted attempt to deny the individual a tax break for further education once he has received his basic degree or trade certificate. Surely, we must take cognizance of the necessity for upgrading one's skills and knowledge, both for the betterment of the individual and for continuing economic progress and social advancement, and an assumption that education should be encouraged only until attainment of the basic degree or credential is not in accord with this realization. In teaching, for example, the bachelor's degree is considered only a minimal first step in accreditation and is no longer the termination of the teacher's professional preparation. The teacher, the accountant, the technician, and the many individuals in other occupations who could be affected by this ruling should be encouraged to continue, not discontinue their education.

Mr. Speaker, the educators in Hawaii are as disturbed as I am over the implications of the Internal Revenue proposal. I wish to insert in the Record at this point the statement submitted to me by the Hawaii Education Association, and urge my colleagues to join me in not only opposing any proposals that would discourage pursuit of higher education, but in also taking active steps to see that every encouragement is given to such individuals who are willing to improve themselves at great personal sacrifice.

STATEMENT OF THE HAWAII EDUCATION ASSOCIATION CONCERNING PROPOSED NEW INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE REGULATIONS AS PUBLISHED IN 31 FEDERAL REGISTER NO. 130 (JULY 7, 1966)

(By Daniel W. Tuttle, Jr., executive secretary)

The Hawaii Education Association, representing approximately 5,300 active teachers in the State of Hawaii school system, respectfully opposes the proposed new Internal Revenue Service regulations as published in 31 Federal Register No. 130 (July 7, 1966), pages 9276–78.

The Association takes this position for two major reasons. First, the proposed changes do little or nothing to clarify the overall tax status of teachers as professional persons and are particularistic in nature. They do not advance the long-needed clarification of the tax status of teachers. Second, in context, the detailed changes would, in substance, contradict the apparent intent of both recent Federal and Hawaii laws designed to encourage the improvement of instruction and the broadening of teacher perspectives. They would open the door to prolonged subjective interpretation. In addition, they appear to contradict the trend of recent Internal Revenue Service interpretations which have gradually come to recognize better that educational travel and improvement expense on the part of teachers cannot be properly treated as a trade or business expense.

For many years, in Hawaii and elsewhere throughout the nation, even as teachers have sought, amid increased public demand for improved instruction, to improve and expand their skills and perspective, they have been subjected to Internal Revenue Service regulations and varying interpretations of same which have fallen far short of encouraging educational advancement and travel. This, it may be suggested, has been largely due to the fact that "teaching" has been considered as a "trade or business" for tax purposes. Unfortunately, the concentration of all parties has been with the details, in such setting, rather than with the clarification (not to mention liberalization) of the tax status per se of those in the teaching profession. With this in mind and without being unappreciative (even in disagreement) of the announced intent of the Internal Revenue Service to clarify existing regulations, the Hawaii Education Association hopefully solicits the attention of all interested parties to H. Con. Res. 933, introduced on July 28, 1966 by Mrs. Patsy Mink, Congresswoman from Hawaii, which, in effect, asks for a moratorium on the proposed changes until Congress has had an opportunity to study, in broad national policy perspective, the tax status of teachers pursuing advanced education and travel.

Not only does our Association believe that Mrs. Mink has, in this instance, acted wisely on an interim basis but also it asks that the Honorable Mrs. Mink and her Congressional colleagues, in due course, seek appropriate amendments to the Internal Revenue code which will permit the Internal Revenue Service to develop future regulations for teachers which are consistent with the apparent intent of contemporary national (and Hawaii) policy in the field of education.

Review of the proposed new Internal Revenue Service regulations, in detail, by our Association has suggested that these proposals would eliminate as income tax deductions most of the expenses for education and travel normally allowed teachers when these are necessary to improve skills in presently held jobs or are required by the employers. They would also appear, in general, to eliminate the deduction of the teacher's own expenses while on sabbatical leave, perhaps leaving small portions of expenses "allowable" but still subject to various interpretations.

Our objections to these proposals may be summarized as follows and may differ from those voiced by teachers elsewhere in the nation only in their intensity due to Hawaii's distance from her sister states (which increases teacher expenses for out-of-state study and travel) and due to the proposals' apparent contradiction of dramatic recent Hawaii legislation designed to encourage in-service teacher study and travel:

(1) The proposals constrict rather than clarify and regularize throughout the nation, or, as we would prefer, further allow (within reasonable clear-cut limits), deductions for advanced study and travel.

(2) The proposed regulations do not indicate a basis for acceptance of any state or local finding that certain specified expenses and/or travel are directly related to educational improvement.

(3) The proposed regulations leave entirely to interpretation the realities of teaching wherein advanced education or travel, not taken for purposes of job advancement, may lead to same. In essence, this means that application of regulations would depend largely upon administrative interpretation of motives or intent, a highly questionable basis for the allowance or disallowance of deductions.

(4) The proposed regulations would open the door to a new series of interpretations applied to individual teachers throughout the nation which could (beyond a tragic repetition of the past) mean that annual increments or an "incentive" schedule, such as recently adopted in Hawaii, would be considered a "job advancement." (The 1965 Hawaii State Legislature provided an optional teachers' salary schedule which requires that teachers earn five credits every three years to remain on it and advance thereon. This, in turn, will inevitably lead to new degrees and further advancement which, under proposed regulations, could be ruled as non-deductible.)

(5) The proposed regulations would also, apparently, mean fractionalized deductions, whereby a small portion of travel expenses could be ruled deductible and the remainder ruled non-deductible on an individual basis.

(The above notwithstanding, the Hawaii Education Association does not, however, oppose all existing regulations as, for example, those which make educational expenses to meet the minimum requirements for teaching positions non-deductible.)

In fine, the objections of the Hawaii Education Association to the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulations are both extensive and, in detail, intensive. Yet, in an effort to avoid a tangle of tangential details, the Association believes, as does apparently the Honorable Patsy Mink, that the very nature of the field for present discussion strongly suggests a new cooperative approach between the Congress of the United States and the Internal Revenue Service. Such effort would, our Association believes, not only assist mightily in the more complete implementation of national educational policy, but also, within this context, give teachers equity, as to allowable expenses, with all other occupational groups, nothing more and nothing less.

AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on August 4, by a vote of 54 to 33, the other body passed Senate Joint Resolution 186 to halt the almost month-old strike against five airlines.

Twenty-seven Democrats and six Republicans were on the honor roll of those who voted against this measure. Courageously these 33 Senators stood up and expressed their support for the workingman's right to strike and for the principle of free collective bargaining.

The right to achieve human dignity through collective action without regard to race, creed, religion, or national origin has been established as an integral part of our democracy. To reject that right now is to reject the very principles and ideals on which our country was founded.

The historic struggle of working men and women is well known to all of us. The exploitation of the American worker in the mines and in the factories and in the sweatshops of America is a story that has been told and retold.

Out of this chaos and turmoil which threatened the American worker came the passage in 1935 of perhaps the most important piece of labor legislation in American history—the Wagner Act. This act established for the first time on a national level the policy of protecting the right of workers to organize and to elect their representatives for collective bargaining.

We have seen our gross national product rise year after year. I attribute this rise in our gross national product to the industrial democracy we have established here in America where people are exercising their inherent right to organize in unions of their own choice, to elect their own leaders in the American labor movement, and to bargain collectively with their employers at the bargaining table.

In America our workers must be free—free to join unions and to bargain collectively. Only in the gravest of national emergencies should the Government step forward to protect the national interest. As far as I am concerned, there is no national emergency.

The evidence shows that less than 1 percent of the people in America, or 150,000 out of 190 million, have been inconvenienced in their travels, and that less than 1 percent of the businessmen in America has been inconvenienced in transporting their goods.

More importantly, all planes flying cargo and personnel to Vietnam or other military posts through the facilities of the Military Airlift Command are on schedule and are being serviced by the International Association of Machinists.

The President, too, has indicated, through Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, that he feels the airlines strike does not constitute a national emergency.

In the light of this evidence, can the Congress in good conscience proceed to tamper with the established right of the American worker to strike? Can the Congress in good conscience force free men to work against their will?

Who would gain by abandoning this principle? Who would profit by denying the American worker the right to strike? Certainly, the private investors would gain. But we cannot abandon a basic American freedom for the sake of material gain.

I hear men in this Congress protest that we are weakening our institutions because of the great social legislation that we have passed, that we are slowly but surely becoming a grandfather, father, or big brother Government. Those of you who vote to take away the right to strike from the American worker will be perpetuating this grandfather, father, and big brother Government against which you have spoken.

The only deterrent I know that has worked effectively against communism is a well-organized labor movement. Take away the right to strike from the American worker and you destroy the American labor movement. And in destroying this labor movement, you open the gates to communism and Communists as they have never been opened in America before.

Over a hundred years ago, Abraham Lincoln declared:

> As an American I say thank God we live under a system under which men have the right to strike.

Let us continue to protect and preserve that right which has helped to build a better America for all of our people.

I urge my colleagues to uphold our historic democratic principles by voting against any legislation that would destroy the right of the American worker to strike.

NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED LEADER: JESSE M. UNRUH

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Jesse M. Unruh is known throughout the country as well as throughout California as a vigorous and progressive State leader. Speaker of the California State Assembly since 1961, last year Jesse Unruh was elected to the presidency of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, a stunning tribute to his legislative ability. The conference, originating in 1957, is designed to stimulate the exchange of ideas and approaches to problems among legislative leaders and to educate the public on the responsibilities of the legislative branch of government.

Because of his singular dedication to public service, Jesse M. Unruh has won a lasting place as one of our great State leaders. Those who have been privileged to work with him have awarded him their vote of confidence by electing him as speaker of the assembly every subsequent session since 1961. Under his leadership, the California State Assembly has become a more effective instrument of legislative responsibility; committee staffs have been enlarged, assemblymen have received additional staff assistance in their district offices, and experts in business, science, and academic fields are being called upon to design legislation. Most importantly, Jesse Unruh's dynamic leadership has brought new self-reliance to the assembly. No rubberstamp legislature catering to special interest groups, the California State Assembly, under the guidance of Speaker Unruh, is an equal partner in State government.

Jesse Unruh's achievements have been duly recognized by leaders in the academic world. In December of 1962 he delivered a series of lectures as a Chubb fellow at Yale University, an honor accorded to men of such stature as Adlai Stevenson, Harry Truman, Clement Attlee, Ralph E. McGill, and Abraham Ribicoff.

In 1963 Speaker Unruh was invited by our State Department to lecture at colleges and universities in the Far East. During this trip he developed a thriving friendship with members of the Japanese National League of Young Liberal Democratic Prefectural Assemblymen and later entertained this group when it visited California in April of 1964. Revisiting Japan in July and August of 1964 as a guest of the Japanese Foreign Ministry, Unruh addressed the national convention of the League of Young Legislators and presided over meetings of the Tokyo Conference of Pacific Basin Legislators.

I am very proud to have Jesse Unruh's assembly district within my own 31st Congressional District. In past years we have worked together when I served in the State assembly; and now, with our respective districts overlapping, we remain very close friends as well as colleagues. His cooperation has always been of inestimable value to me in my work in the U.S. Congress, for he is a nationally recognized spokesman for quality in government. California and the Nation are indeed richer for his contributions.

NEWS REPORTS FROM SAIGON EMPHASIZE THE NEED FOR ACTION TO MAKE THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ELECTIONS FREE AND MEANINGFUL

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I spoke to the House to urge actions to secure the free and meaningful elections that are desperately needed in South Vietnam.

The central issue posed by the elections of September 11, I said, is whether they will be truly free and honest, an accurate reflection of the mind of the South Vietnamese people, or a mere burlesque of democracy designed and executed to impart an aura of legitimacy to the present Ky regime.

On Friday, August 5, and Saturday, August 6, the Washington Post foreign correspondent, Ward Just, reported on the South Vietnamese elections. His articles, which are included hereafter, underline the urgent need for actions to secure free and meaningful elections.

The steps that should be taken forthwith are:

First, determined efforts should be made by the United States to bring about supervision of the elections by the International Control Commission for Vietnam.

International supervision is urgently needed to give the South Vietnamese people a basis for confidence in the fairness of the elections and to help overcome the legacy of suspicion that naturally results from the series of rigged elections under the French, the Vietminh, Boa-Dai, and Diem. The United Nations has played a useful role in supervising elections in South Korea and in five former trust territories. Since the shortness of time makes it impracticable to obtain U.N. supervision of the South Vietnamese elections, the members of the ICC, Vietnam—India, Canada, and Poland—should be asked to assume that role.

Supervision is needed now because more is involved than observation of the vote count to see that figures are not falsified or ballot boxes stuffed.

The Government will finance the election, print all literature, control advertising, radio time, and public meetings, provide or not provide police protection and transportation in the provinces. Thus it is absolutely essential to an election that would reflect the will of the people that Government action be even-handed.

The need for international supervision to help overcome ingrained suspicion of the validity of the election process was emphasized by the following observations in Just's reports from Vietnam:

> Suspicion of the election results runs so deep that one prominent politician estimates that in Saigon as much as one third of the electorate may stay away from the polls or deliberately spoil ballots.
>
> Wherever one talked, there was a rippling undercurrent of suspicion of government intentions. Nowhere was there proof of fraud, but everywhere there were doubts. "Up to now," said an earnest Vietnamese politician, "there have been only rumors, but no evidence."
>
> The trouble is confidence, or the lack of it.

Just goes on to point out that "Buddhist militants"—and presumably others who are desirous of subverting the elections—are playing upon existing suspicions to make the success of the elections even less likely.

Second, the United States should demand the revocation by the Ky government of decrees which will prevent the South Vietnamese people from choosing freely among the political alternatives available to them.

One of these decrees bars from the election all candidates who are "Communists and pro-Communist neutrals or neutralists whose acts are advantageous to the Communists."

Another decree condemns as criminal "all moves which weaken the national anti-Communist effort and are harmful to the anti-Communist struggle of the people and the armed forces" and "all plots and actions under the false name of peace and neutrality."

South Vietnam cannot have free and meaningful elections unless candidates are as free to espouse neutralism and peace negotiations as they are, for example, to advocate South Vietnam's membership in the Western alliance and continued warfare.

The stories from Saigon reflect the debilitating effect on the election campaign resulting from the decrees.

It is not that the decrees must be invoked extensively to be effective, although at least one candidate has already been haled before the Central Election Committee and faces exclusion from the election because an opponent accused him of Communist sympathies.

More important so far has been the intimidating effect. Candidates are not anxious to test the Government's intentions concerning enforcement of the decrees. Accordingly, they simply are not talking about the great issue before the South Vietnamese people—that of peace and war. Ward Just reports:

> One moderate, very highly respected candidate, who was said to be almost certainly a winner, declared when he was asked about the war that "Vietnam wants to negotiate with the North."
>
> Would he say that on the election platform?
>
> "No."
>
> Why not?
>
> His translated answer was that "every candidate has the right to express his views on the right things only—not on everything." It was not now "convenient" to speak of negotiations with the North.
>
> The question has been asked, how can there be an election with no reference to the war and ways to end it—or win it?
>
> The answer is that whatever the candidates may be thinking privately, publicly they will be talking about the constitution, the value of legitimate government, the high cost of living, and the price of rice.

One politician, interviewed by Just, rationalized this by claiming that Vietnamese electors are interested not in a candidate's position on issues, especially on the issue of the war, but on his record.

I suspect that Vietnamese voters are much like voters everywhere and want to know where a candidate stands on the major issues. The real reason for the sterile debate and the irrelevant platforms that have appeared to date is summed up in the following comment:

> Political arrests are not unknown in Vietnam, and now—weeks before the election—there is apprehension that the government's guardians of the ballot may be overzealous in screening candidates with alleged Communist or neutralist tendencies.

Third, the United States should request that the Ky government abandon the provision allowing it to amend the constitution adopted by the majority of the elected constituent assembly unless overruled by a two-thirds majority of the assembly.

Such power in the hands of a nonrepresentative movement embodies the threat that even if free elections are miraculously achieved the representative and democratic results will be destroyed by the decisions of the Ky government supported by one-third plus one in the assembly:

> Among politicians, there is bitterness over Amendment 20 to the electoral law, the provision that allows the government to amend the constiution after it has been written, and requires a two-thirds majority of the constituent assembly to overrule it.
>
> "This is the rule of the minority in an assembly elected to write a constitution," says Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the highly respected former government minister who heads an electoral slate in Giadinh. "It exists nowhere else in the world."

Free elections are worth the effort needed to bring them about. They offer the possibility, obtainable in no other way, of a viable national government commanding the support of a majority of the people and of the main social forces in the nation. Such a government, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed, would have a far better chance than the current military rulers of creating the rural development, the social and governmental reform which must underlie the military effort if peace and stability are to be achieved.

Let us take the actions that are needed. In the July 30, 1966, issue of the Economist, the Saigon correspondent commented on the outlook for the constituent assembly that will result from the present electoral process:

> In fact nothing would have been substantially different if the government had simply appointed a committee to draft the constitution.

If this dire judgment is confirmed by events, we—as well as the South Vietnamese—will be the losers.

The articles by Ward Just follow:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 5, 1966]

POLITICIANS ARE SKEPTICAL, PUBLIC INDIFFERENT ON SOUTH VIET ELECTION

(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, August 4.—The election of an assembly to write a constitution for South Vietnam is barely five weeks away, and professional politicians here are skeptical and the public largely indifferent.

Suspicion of the election results runs so deep that one prominent politician estimates that in Saigon as much as one-third of the electorate may stay away from the polls or deliberately spoil ballots.

These views emerged from interviews with candidates, journalists and qualified observers of politics in Saigon and the neighboring province of Giadinh, which together will elect 26 of the 117 delegates to the assembly. The interviews were restricted to Vietnamese.

Nearly all those interviewed agreed that topic A in Saigon today is the economy, specifically the inflation which followed the June devaluation of the piastre. The public is largely indifferent to the election (the formal campaign period does not begin until Aug. 26), and that indifference is reinforced by what one observer called traditional suspicions and sniping from the sidelines by Buddhist militants who have vowed to boycott the balloting.

Among politicians, there is bitterness over Amendment 20 to the electoral law, the provision that allows the government to amend the constitution after it has been written, and requires a two-thirds majority of the constituent assembly to overrule it.

"This is the rule of the minority in an assembly elected to write a constitution," says Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the highly respected former government minister who heads an electoral slate in Giadinh. "It exists nowhere else in the world."

Somewhat less controversial is the provision, said to be unprecedented in Vietnamese politics, that candidates run on a slate in constituencies where more than one delegate is to be elected.

The intricate, complicated device of a slate was intended, by one account, to prevent Communists or neutralists from running for the assembly. An authentic nationalist, the argument went, would think twice before including on his slate a Communist who would almost certainly doom the entire slate to defeat.

If there are four slates composed of five men each contesting a five-seat constituency, and the front-running slate gets 60 per cent of the vote, the top three names on that slate are elected. The remaining two seats go to the top men on the next most popular slate, or slates, depending on the vote.

It appears to be an exercise in higher Vietnamese mathematics, but what the procedure does, in effect, is place a premium on being the top man on the slate.

Already there are charges, unsubstantiated by proof but widely believed, that wealthy men have bought the top place on certain slates by promising to pay the campaign expenses of their slatemates.

Anyone can get together a slate (there are 248 of them nationwide in the September election; 133 candidates are running on single tickets in districts where only one delegate will be elected), and the theory was that the most popular and highly respected would head the slate.

Some dissenters contend that the slates will promote harmony among candidates, but others are not so sure. The political rule of thumb in Vietnam is that if you have two men on a streetcorner you have two political parties. If you have three, you have two parties and a faction.

Whenever one talked, there was a rippling undercurrent of suspicion of government intentions. Nowhere was there proof of fraud, but everywhere there were doubts. "Up to now," said an earnest Vietnamese politician, "there have been only rumors, but no evidence."

Feeding the rumors are the Buddhist militants, with leaflets and handbills and gossip. The Vietnamese, according to Phan Khac Suu, the former chief of state in the Huong and Quat civilian governments, have been "victimized" so long by their leaders—President Ngo Dinh Diem's rubber-stamp congresses, for example—that it is easy for the Buddhists to subvert confidence, which Suu says they are doing with great skill.

Suu's view of a deeply suspicious electorate egged on by Buddhist propaganda is probably the majority view here, although some would differ.

One who does is Dr. Dan. He argues that while the electorate may be suspicious and indifferent, the Vien Hoa Dao (the Buddhist Institute) does not even represent a majority of Buddhists, much less a majority of Vietnamese (a point with which most independent observers would agree). In the end, Dr. Dan says, most Vietnamese will go to polls.

The trouble is confidence, or the lack of it. A young government civil servant, who demonstrated in the Hue against U.S. support of Prime Minister Ky and for civilian rule under elections, now says the constituent assembly elections are wrong. Why? "Not suitable," he says vaguely. "They will solve nothing."

What the Vietnamese expect to emerge from the election is elusive. The politicians, after paying homage to doubt and suspicion, appear to be anxious to test the levers of power, even under a government which would probably (under Amendment 20) hold a veto. Prognostications differ widely.

Dr. Dan Van Sung, the editor and publisher of the Saigon daily Chinh Luan and no friend of the Ky regime, who is a candidate for the assembly, predicts that as many as 80 of the 117 delegates will be supporters of the government. But he also says the minority will be vigorous, and places as his aim the creation of a legal opposition.

Former Chief of State Suu, an old Vietnamese political pro, says flatly: "If a candidate in this election supports the government, surely he will be defeated."

At least part of the problem revolves around the programs of the candidates. If the interviews are any indication, the men who face the electorate will talk about the constitution, the value of legitimate government, the high cost of living, the price of rice.

One moderate, very highly respected candidate who was said to be almost certainly a winner, declared when he was asked about the war that "Vietnam wants to negotiate with the North."

Would he say that on the election platform?

"No."

Why not?

His translated answer was that "every candidate has the right to express his views on the right things only—not on everything." It was not now "convenient" to speak of negotiation with the North.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1966]

Past Records Called Key to Viet Election

(By Ward Just)

Saigon, August 5.—Vietnam has been at war for 20 years, and the impression is that the war is the dominant fact in the lives of nearly all Vietnamese. Yet that is not quite so, if interviews with informed Vietnamese are any guide.

The point is important in any discussion of the September election to choose an assembly to write a Vietnamese constitution. Because the election is the result of three months of political upheaval, it has strong emotional antecedents. The question has been asked, how can there be an election with no reference to the war and ways to end it—or win it?

The answer is that whatever the candidates may be thinking privately, publicly they will be talking about the constitution, the value of legitimate government, the high cost of living and the price of rice.

RECORD EMPHASIZED

Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the highly respected Gia Dinh physician who is heading an electoral slate, intends to base his campaign on his own highly visible qualifications, with references to what the constitution ought to be and how the Vietnamese economy ought to be improved to help the people. Dr. Dan indicated that most Saigon voters would vote for the man and his record, not what was said on the platform.

In any case, according to interviews with Vietnamese politicians, journalists and informed observers, the war to the mass of the people has lost its singularity, if it ever had it. It is as much a part of Vietnamese life as the heat. It penetrates everything and nothing, and references to it in the campaign, according to one politician, would more likely than not stir suspicion and dislike.

In the absence of a real political dialogue, then, on what basis will the Vietnamese choose their candidates? What will be the criteria?

What follows is tentative. It is the view of one veteran Vietnamese politician, a moderate, a senior civilian cabinet member in the government. He was interviewed in English.

MANIFESTOS IGNORED

The point about the Vietnamese, the official said, is that words mean very little. Campaign manifestos, promises and exhortations—even promises to end the war, or win it—are given scant credit. What counts is a candidate's record.

"They will look at Dr. Dan," the official said, "and they will say: fought against the French. Was against Diem. Was jailed by Diem. Is a good doctor, well-educated. And they'll vote for him."

Neither is ideology, or "platform," important or especially relevant to the political parties. For example, the Vietnam Quoc Dan Dang (VNQDD) a nationalist party considered the largest of all Vietnamese political parties is splintered into three regional groups—northern refugees, central Vietnamese and southern Vietnamese—and at least a half a dozen factions. Ideology appears to play no part in the splits.

The official said that the easiest way to differentiate between the various factions within the Hoa Hao, a religious sect-cum-political party, is to view it as a series of concentric circles working outwards from the government in power. The factions can be distinguished by their degree of disaffection to the "ins," whoever the "ins" happen to be. They have no particular relation one to the other but only in their attitude toward the government.

NO PAST—NO FUTURE

What appears to count is the degree of estrangement from the status quo: that, and in the case of the individual candidate, a record. "If a man has no past," the official said, "then for me he has no future."

Many Vietnamese have been careful with their records over the years. Political arrests are not unknown in Vietnam, and now—weeks before the election—there is apprehension that the government's guardians of the ballot may be overzealous in screening candidates with alleged Communists or neutralist tendencies.

Those whose suspicions are darkest about the intentions of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's are currently looking with interest at the case of Ho Ngoc Cu, a Saigon journalist who is running for the constituent assembly from Vinhlong province (according to the electoral law, a Vietnamese may run from any constituency he wishes, there is no residency requirement.)

Cu is associated with Dan Van Sung, the editor and publisher of the Saigon daily Chinh Luan (and also a candidate). Last week, one of Cu's opponents in the election, a Hoa Hao named Ngyun Van Vi, accused him of Communist sympathies and demanded that his name be withdrawn from the ballot. The case is now up before the Central Election Committee—composed of a judge, and four members of the people and armed forces council—for action.

RECORD SCRUTINIZED

Cu's record, which is now under scrutiny by the Committee, includes an arrest by the Diem regime in 1956. Cu says he was kidnapped by Diem's police, jailed and prevented from running in the congressional election that year. But more important than that, Cu believes that he had a brother in the Vietcong. He says he has not heard from the brother for years, and believes him to be dead.

Sung says that the charges against Cu are absurd. Perhaps so, Cu says, but one of the members of the Citizens and Armed Forces Council is a Hoa Hao. "I think he will support his comrade," Cu says.

"If they think I am a Communist," Cu said today, "they really should provide proof."

THE INFLATIONARY NATURE OF OUR ECONOMY

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, though our gross national product now exceeds $700 billion and our affluence has been well manifested, most Americans are nevertheless much concerned with the inflationary nature of our economy and the threat it poses to our well-being.

As representatives of the people, I think that we must seek every possible solution to suppress the mounting inflationary forces.

At the moment we are particularly confronted with the problem of a continual rise in food prices which, if unchecked, will no doubt serve to undermine most of what we are attempting to do in other areas of our economy.

While we attempt to lift the standards of living of our most needy Americans on one front, we seem about to be overrun by unchecked price increases. These increases affect the poor man more than anyone else as he must dig deeper into whatever meager funds he has to sustain himself.

It seems contradictory that we should wage a strong battle, involving billions of dollars, to help the needy and then allow rising prices to overcome whatever progress is made.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer remain idle with respect to the problem of rising food prices. An investigation must be undertaken in the very near future to ascertain the how and why of food price increases.

We must come to the assistance of those who contribute the major portion of their income to the market basket and, therefore, are the people most affected by this problem.

It was anticipated that the recent Federal excise tax cut would be reflected in a lower consumer price index at this time. Much to my dismay, this has not been realized. In the month of June we note the largest increase in consumer prices for any month during the past 2 years. Our expectations of lower prices fortunately were fulfilled in the decreased lists for automobiles and air conditioners. However, this in no way compensated for the grave and intolerable new levels in food basket items. A 6-percent rise in meat prices over the May level accompanied by an overall increase of 2 percent on food items simply contributed more fat into the raging fire of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, we must determine the reason and remedies for runaway prices of meat and other items contributing to this dangerous condition.

HOW A NONPARTISAN OBSERVER VIEWS THE NATION'S ECONOMY

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when any nation experiences continuous and rapid economic growth, there are bound to be periods of uncertainty or inflation. And yet, the unprecedented expansion of our Nation's economy in recent years has not resulted in the expected instability or inflation, and shows every indication of continuing in this vein.

It is encouraging to me to see that the healthy condition of our economy is recognized by such established economic authorities as the First National City Bank of New York. These people, who, in the past, have not always been in agreement with the administration's fiscal and monetary policy, now realize the strength of our Nation's economy. It is important to note that the following article represents the opinion of experts, who are concerned not with partisan politics, but with purely economic considerations. I now offer the article from the First National City Bank's Monthly Economic Letter for the consideration of my colleagues:

GENERAL BUSINESS CONDITIONS

As business moves into the normally slack summer season, the U.S. economy continues to turn in a highly impressive performance. With the slowing of the rate of expansion since March, business has settled back from an unsustainable burst of acceleration to a cruising speed less damaging to the economic mechanism. Much to the relief of both Washington and Wall Street, evidences of inflationary pressures have become less visible, thereby deflating talk of a tax increase before fall. Backlogs of orders have continued to increase, and industry generally—with the notable exception of autos and homebuilding—still faces a very hot summer, with production in many lines limited only by the availability of regular hands during the vacation period.

It is not the immediate outlook that divides economic observers and investors so much as the prospects farther down the road. Except for food prices—which have largely reflected swings in meat output—the inflation experienced so far has been milder than might be expected during a fairly large-scale war which coincides with a powerful capital goods boom amidst the longest and greatest economic expansion in recent history. The enormous financing burdens imposed on the money and capital markets by both the government and private borrowers have been absorbed so far without the severe liquidity squeeze that many have feared. Along with wages and farm incomes, corporate earnings have been well sustained despite concerns about a possible profits squeeze. And with the decline of Buddhist dissidence and the bombing of the Hanoi-Haiphong oil depots, the situation in Vietnam has, if not improved, at least become less confusing.

CONSUMER BUYING AND PRICE TRENDS

At the moment, the sharp cutback in output of 66 model cars has eased some of the pressure in the metals industries, and auto manufacturers' rebates to dealers are being passed on to new car buyers in lower prices.

But the negative impact of high food prices, stepped-up Social Security taxes and higher tax withholding rates—which contributed to the slackening in consumer spending after April—will wear off progressively in the coming months. Moreover, spending under Medicare, starting this month, is expected to run at an annual rate of about $3 billion. In addition to this direct spending, people over 65—and in many cases, their supporting children or relatives—will be able to spend for other things the money previously saved or used for these medical expenses. These factors should help restore some vigor to retail sales.

But looking further ahead, there are a good many question marks. Foremost are the material and financial requirements of the Vietnam war. While hopes for an early and acceptable end to the conflict are again on an upswing, businessmen must calculate the probabilities of increased defense orders and appropriations and—if these are large enough to threaten price stability—a possible tax increase next year if not in 1966. Under the influence of higher costs of services and some nondurable goods, the rise of consumer prices other than food may speed up over the next few months. Medical costs in particular—already climbing fast—are expected to go up even more under the impact of the Medicare program.

Businessmen and investors, viewing the heady gains in volume and profits over the past 24 months, understandably feel the pace cannot be maintained indefinitely, particularly while inflation, shortages and bottlenecks remain as the immediate problems. Thus, the remarkable performance of the economy, as it continues, comes more and more to inhibit expectations for future expansion.

The cutback in auto production has drawn attention away from the continued strong performance elsewhere. For example, while a rebound from the April coal strike figured in the 0.8 percent May advance in the seasonally adjusted Federal Reserve index of industrial production, the steel, business capital equipment and aircraft industries were also major contributors. If the wide fluctuations in the steel and auto industries are separated out, as shown in the accompanying chart, there has been no slowdown among industries which make up about 90 percent of industrial activity. In May, the index of "other production" rose at an annual rate of 11 percent, the same as in the first quarter and somewhat greater than the 9 percent gain during 1965.

Cutbacks caused by lagging sales and high inventories reduced the seasonally adjusted index for passenger cars by 7 percent in May. The bulk of the 300,000 car cutback in '66 model output will be concentrated in the summer months. Third quarter schedules for '67 models have been stepped up, and although July assemblies will be 37 percent less than last year, August and September output will be up 6 percent from a year earlier.

In many other industries, the vacation letdown in production will be less than usual this summer. Durable goods manufacturers report that order backlogs grew 22 per cent in the year ended May 31. As a result, many firms are foregoing the usual plant-wide vacation shutdowns this year; in such cases time off will be staggered or workers will receive vacation pay in addition to their regular wages.

EMPHASIS ON EXPANSION

With heavy civilian and military demands, it is not surprising that expenditures for expanding capacity are growing faster than those for replacing and modernizing existing facilities. The McGraw-Hill survey of plant and equipment spending plans in April indicated that manufacturers' outlays for expansion in 1966 will be about $13 billion, 48 per cent of total outlays, or about 28 per cent more than in 1965. Plans for modernization and replacement call for an increase of about 14 per cent over last year.

In May, the SEC and the Department of Commerce reported that businessmen were planning total plant and equipment expenditures of $60.8 billion in 1966—a 17 per cent increase over 1965. Manufacturers anticipated outlays of $27 billion, up 20 per cent. Even these plans do not accurately measure the full extent of investment wants because construction delays and postponed delivery dates are preventing businessmen from spending money this year as fast as they had planned to earlier.

The consistently high level of capital expenditures in the past few years has been a potent anti-inflationary force in the economy. The sharply higher cost of living this year has been concentrated in foods and services. There is little doubt that other consumer goods would also have had much higher price tags if we had not had heavy expenditures on plant and equipment in earlier years. Increased capacity has made it easier to meet rising demand, while improved technology has helped hold down costs.

MONEY MARKET MEETS THE TEST

The money and capital markets successfully weathered a period of unusual strain last month as extraordinary borrowing demands of governments and corporations coincided. However, changes of interest rates helped pull funds to where demands were greater, and the Federal Reserve System provided a substantial volume of reserves late in the month, thus facilitating banks' efforts to accommodate loan demands.

Much of the tension in the money market stemmed from fiscal devices employed to pare the Federal budget deficit for the 1966 fiscal year ended June 30. Corporations had to borrow more than usual, and convert more liquid assets to cash, because their tax payments had been bunched to add about $2.5 billion to fiscal '66 Federal revenues. In effect, the corporations were borrowing money for the Treasury. Similarly, the large issuance of Federal agency obligations and the sale of participations in government-owned loans merely served as substitutes for regular Treasury debt issues.

All told, corporation income taxes paid on June 15 were probably one third larger than a year earlier. Additional tax revenues were shifted forward into fiscal '66 by requiring large corporations to make payments of withheld income and Social Security taxes semimonthly rather than monthly. As a result, corporations paid an estimated $1.5 billion in taxes last month that would not have been due until the end of July under the old schedule.

All this was reflected in a rise of $2.9 billion in bank loans in the middle two weeks of June. This compares with an increase of $1.9 billion in the like period of June 1965 and $1.4 billion in 1964. Corporations also raised cash by running off $635 million of CDs, or about twice as much as over the June 1965 tax date and two thirds again as much as in March 1966. Banks were able to meet these heavy demands by offering unusually attractive rates to replace the large volume of maturing CDs. Finance companies similarly raised their rates in order to replace maturing paper.

Hard on the heels of $1.2 billion in new cash raised in May, Federal agencies borrowed $1.6 billion in June, including $925 million through sales of loan participation certificates. Because of the congestion in the market, some agency issues had to be offered at 5¾ per cent.

The most important question facing the financial markets concerns the direction of monetary policy, and here the major developments have been somewhat obscured by the pressures of the June tax date. Total member bank reserves (seasonally adjusted), which had climbed at a rapid pace through April, showed a downward trend through mid-June. Nevertheless, the public's holdings of cash balances in June were up substantially from a year earlier.

Late in the month, the Federal Reserve increased reserve requirements from 4 per cent to 5 per cent on that portion of a member bank's total time deposits (other than savings accounts) exceeding $5 million. This was apparently a response to the House Banking Committee, which had adopted a resolution urging the Federal Reserve Board to "take action" within 30 days to reduce bank competition with savings and loan associations for individual savings. The action taken will increase the effective cost to banks of CD funds by about six basis points and was a clear sign that the Federal Reserve was taking a more restrictive stance. Commercial banks followed by increasing from 5½ to 5¾ per cent the minimum rate on loans to business borrowers.

INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT: THE NEW PARTNERSHIP

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history there has often been a clash of interest between business and government in the field of social progress and reform. Too often, these two great sectors of our Nation have worked in conflict rather than in harmony; indeed, some have seen the rise of big government as a counterforce to big business.

Today, happily, industry and government are working together, in harmony, to mitigate some of the social evils which currently plague our Nation. Several of our Job Corps centers, for example, are being effectively operated by private firms. To illustrate an emerging trend toward a "social-industrial complex," I should like to insert in the RECORD a thought-provoking address by Lyle M. Spencer, president of Science Research Associates, Inc., a subsidiary of IBM.

THE NEW SOCIAL-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

(An address by Lyle M. Spencer, president, Science Research Associates, Inc., a subsidiary of IBM)

Little more than five years ago, Dwight Eisenhower, in his last message as President, warned of the growth of a military-industrial complex that could endanger American freedoms. It was an important warning. Commentators now and then honor it by repetition, but no one has yet suggested what to do about it.

Tonight I would like to strike a more optimistic note. I want to describe the early growth of a new complex in which industry and government also are intertwined, but towards a far different end. It might be called a "social-industrial complex." With the government acting as broker, a number of large American corporations are organizing some of the nation's best-trained and original minds in the fields of social reform, education and management to equalize the spread of opportunity in American life. Social causes which in the thirties, were the domain of college professors, labor unions and student demonstrations, are today, becoming also the new business of business.

To describe this new concern of American business, I wish I could find a better word than "opportunity." It is an ambiguous word that calls up much of the double-talk of an earlier day when business was strictly business and "economic royalists" blockaded social reform. "Opportunity" was the watch-word of early industrialists who often apologized for child labor by saying that any juvenile might grow up to be President, or better still, a millionaire. It was the word of Willie Loman's brother, Ben, who believed that anyone could strike it rich among the black flies of Alaska and the veld of darkest Africa.

I am not talking about that kind of opportunity. I mean the simple opportunity of doing a week's work for a decent paycheck, of living in a house one can afford on a street of one's choice, and, if you please, the opportunity of aspiring to live in a better house on a better street if one chooses. More than all these, I am speaking of the opportunity to acquire chunks of the accumulated knowledge which man leaves as a legacy to his children on printed pages and even in ordinary speech.

A few months ago, instead of "opportunity," I would have reached for the simpler and more specific word "education." I would have said that business is getting deeply involved in the problems of education, and left it at that. But my business competitors and I are rapidly learning that one cannot get involved in the difficult problems of education without also getting involved in the much more difficult problems of the organization of society itself. We talk about computer-assisted instruction, but we also talk about illiteracy and the so-called culturally deprived. If you overhear an IBM man talk about building an image, there's now a good chance he doesn't mean the corporate image. He may be talking about the citizens of New Bedford, a conservative old whaling town in Massachusetts, and the image they have of five hundred school dropouts in a Job Corps center at the edge of town. It happens that that Job Corps Center—known as Rodman—is operated by my company, Science Research Associates, a subsidiary of IBM. We have signed a contract with the people of the United States, in which we promise to deliver a product of social and educational reform.

If one swallow doesn't make a summer, neither does one contract make a social-industrial complex. But look at what is happening all around us. A list of the contractors for the Job Corps looks like a digest of trading on the New York Stock Exchange: Litton Industries, Xerox, RCA, Burroughs Business Machines, G.E., Packard-Bell Northern Natural Gas, and others.

We have all read of an epidemic of mergers and partnerships between electronics manufacturers and publishers of the printed word. When General Electric recently joined with Time, Inc., to form a new company called General Learning Corp., who did they install as the head of it? They hired Francis Keppel, the most forceful U.S. Commissioner of Education we have ever had. Mr. Keppel, whom many of you recall as dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, is not about to forget that his main work as Commissioner was to advance education by breaking down segregation, by establishing a network of educational research centers in universities all over America, and by supervising the passage of a billion dollars in Federal aid to education, chiefly to equalize the learning opportunities of the poor.

His company, my company, companies like Xerox and all the rest, expect to find themselves each day locked in ever-deeper competition. Competition for what? Merely to sell textbooks by the carload and teaching machines by the dozen? Hardly. We are in a competition to ask questions and find answers which recently engaged a relatively small group of academics cloistered in research libraries of teachers' colleges. We are looking beyond the pages of a textbook and into the mind of a child. Instead of asking "What should he be taught?" we are asking "What makes him learn?" Aware that a child seems to get eighty percent of his education *outside* of school, we are trying to formulate some hard, practical questions. We want to find out—and intend to find out—how a classroom can become a more effective organizer of a child's experience.

Recently, Mount Vernon, New York, School Superintendent John Henry Martin told a congressional committee that "the center of gravity for educational change is moving from the teachers' college and the superintendent's office to the corporation executive suite." That may be overstating it, but we do hope to find out more about how a child learns, not only in classes of twenty-five, but in classes of one hundred, in discussion groups of perhaps five and six, and what he can best learn sitting all alone at a study carrel.

We plan to find out more—because we must find out more—about what is specifically meant when we say that pre-school children of the ghetto become educationally disabled for lack of certain sensory stimulations and language experience. We plan to find out because at some early date American industry—the companies engaged in the new social-industrial complex—will be competing to design, produce and market learning materials for children of the ghetto. I don't know whether these materials will be sold to the Federal government, to local public schools, local community action programs, or whether newly-enlightened ghetto parents will buy them at the five-and-ten. But I do know that our country is at last committed to equalizing the educational opportunity of every young American and that many large business firms are involved in that commitment.

We hope to find out more—because we must find out more—about what is specifically meant when we say that every schoolchild learns but in his own way at his own rate of speed. We—and other companies—are experimenting with high-speed computers as aids in teaching children. Possibilities growing out of the new electronic-curriculum mix are without number. Whether tomorrow's machines will be mechanical tutors, television sets, do-it-yourself kits, or simply words printed on file cards, or combinations of all these, we don't yet know. But we are deeply engaged, in collaboration with the Federal government and local schools, in finding out.

We hope to find out more—because we must find out more—about what is specifically meant when we say that school dropouts can have the direction of their lives reversed. By what specific means do we change them to school *"drop-ins"* and persuade them to believe in themselves as rightful claimants to productive, secure, good-paying jobs? These high-minded problems require practical, hard-nosed questions. Just how handicapped is an 18-year-old who has learned the habit of consistent failure in ten or twelve years of schooling? Must he learn everything in the curriculum that he failed to learn before, or can he base a new, useful education on certain selected building blocks, such as reading and arithmetic? To what degree can he base a useful education on things he's really interested in, such as the mechanics of a hot rod, the social science of neighborhood gangs, the English of Popular Mechanics magazine, and the arithmetic of a paycheck in a work-study program?

We don't yet have many answers, but we are getting some new leads about where more of the answers lie. They lie not only in published materials and educational gadgetry, but in human relationships. We are finding out at the Rodman Job Corps Center some differences between conventional school teachers and what we choose to call tutor-counselors. We are finding out that school dropouts who never wrote a good school composition on "My Vacation Last Summer"—perhaps because they never had one—can turn out an electrifying issue of the *Rodman News,* the student newspaper at Rodman. They can write poems of surging anger and burning aspiration. Imagine one Rodman boy, John Castlebury, a failure in English and rejector of school, who found within himself this short poem for the *Rodman News:*

> "I am a sky without a heaven or stars.
> Sugar and no sweetness
> Man without love."

Are we to say that this boy is beyond education?

I know that most of these questions are not new to most of you. But I believe it is somewhat new to find yourselves lectured about them by a businessman, speaking in his capacity as a businessman. Why are companies like IBM, Xerox, and RCA getting their well-manicured hands dirty in the problems of poverty? Perhaps if we used our brains, electronic or otherwise, we at SRA would stick to our old business of designing precise tests for middle-class teachers to give to bright-eyed youngsters. Economically speaking, it's a much more reliable activity.

Let me say at the outset that we believe the problems of education can eventually turn into a sensible business, too. Right now, they add up to far more cost than profit. So did color television.

But direct gain is not our only incentive. Every business is also part of the American economy. To see clearly one of our incentives in improving the social and economic health of the poverty ghetto, one need look no further than at the generation of our parents, many of whom were impoverished immigrants. Millions of them came to America sheerly by the drive of their ambition. They came undereducated and unskilled. Some acquired learning and skill and, indeed, found prosperity around the corner. But most of them drearily labored their lives away to guarantee educational opportunity for their children.

This is the story that accounts for many of you sitting in this great university hall tonight. In a sense, it is also the story that accounts for the growth of a corporation like IBM. The computer has created 250,000 new jobs and at least a dozen new professions. In a generation, this country has changed from a nation whose preponderate number of citizens worked at dull, repetitive, unskilled jobs in factories to one of automated manufacture. Each year a greater proportion of our people sit at desks manipulating pencils, around conference tables figuring out questions for electronic brains to solve. Modern, prosperous America is the product of our parents' unquenchable worship of education. Every educated man makes his country richer and, if you please, makes the institution with which he works more prosperous. If you will allow me one more word in this vulgarity of attaching dollar signs to the spreading of wisdom, let me say that it's to the interest of business that every downtrodden, socially-disoriented member of the ghetto becomes an economic contributor—or to use Lyndon Johnson's earthy phrase, to become "taxpayers instead of tax-eaters."

Purposely, I have cast this argument in the shape of profits because that is what you expect a businessman to do. As Tex Thornton, chairman of Litton Industries recently said, "There are those who characterize the businessman as something less than patriotic and compassionate. . . . The word seems to have gotten around that the businessman is *for* poverty—*not* against it." While businessmen are against poverty in principle, too many of us have been indifferent to it in practice. We don't ask enough hard questions about its causes. We have not become sufficiently involved as businessmen with the national business of attacking poverty. We at IBM, and our competitors, are now beginning to do such thinking because it has become our business to do so.

This is a healthy development. The basic form of organization in American life is the organization of human beings into private enterprises. All other forms of great organization—government, labor unions, trade associations, even major sections of our schools—have grown in response to the demands of our basic form of organization. True enough, the degree of engagement by business in this attack on poverty is still quite small. But it will grow.

Both business and social reform stand to gain by a growing partnership. Until recently, agencies of social concern, chiefly government and education, stood at the short end of competition for our most vigorours minds. Business could easily win the competition. They offered the reward most valued in our culture—money. Academic skills and managerial talents that might well have been allocated to improving government and education have flocked into the manufacture of cars, into advertising of breakfast cereal and sale of insurance business that's where the money is. Only in times of deepest national need—I am thinking of World War II—did it become popular among our most able people to devote their best energies to public need.

Recently, however, there are signs of great change in what our culture values as high reward. Some months ago, a story on the first page of *The Wall Street Journal* created as much concerned conversation among top businessmen as any I can remember. That story reported that students in our leading universities, by and large, don't want to enter business. Beyond earning a good living, making money is not their consuming goal. What they seem to want is to feel they are part of social change. Many are joining the Peace Corps, VISTA, and volunteering to help us with the Job Corps.

On the other hand, men who have commited their lives to public concerns are today moving from public agencies into private enterprises without changing their commitment. Frank Keppel is one example. In our own company, Burke Marshall, the former assistant attorney general for civil rights is now the general counsel of IBM, and he has just accepted the chairmanship of a Presidential committee to re-evaluate the draft.

A new vice-president of our corporation, Eugene Fubini, came to us from government, where he was Assistant Secretary of Defense. Another kind of example involves a University of Chicago graduate many of you may personally know. Some years ago, here in Chicago, Jerome M. Ziegler headed a group called the American Foundation for Political Education. Something like the Great Books Foundation but with more specialized subject material, his organization was devoted to promoting discussion groups and publishing reading materials on the complexities of international affairs and public administration. Later, Mr. Ziegler was twice a candidate for Congress in the western suburbs. Today, employed by SRA and IBM, he is an active agent of social change as director of the Rodman Job Corps Center.

Let me turn now from these general ideas to specific ones we have had to cope with as a partner with government in operating a job corps center. When the first group of young men showed up at Rodman last August, what did Mr. Ziegler and his associates find? The typical Job Corpsman had quit school at the seventh grade. He couldn't pass a fifth-grade reading test. He was seven pounds underweight. Four out of five had never been to a physician or a dentist. Two-thirds are from a family whose head is unemployed. The family of one out of two is on relief. Almost one out of two come from broken homes. Out of this background, these boys build their self-concepts and are supposed to develop what we of middle-class values call aspiration. Is it any wonder that only one out of ten Corpsmen has ever held a job?

About half of these Corpsmen are of an eligible age for military service. Traditionally, such young men are attracted to the military life. As Richard Rovere recently wrote, "The military is to a large degree the Negro's high school and his Harvard." The same might be said of the Appalachian white. But like Harvard, the military has an academic barrier at its gate. Of Job Corpsmen who are otherwise eligible for military service, forty-seven percent fail their entrance examination—seventeen percent for physical reasons, thirty percent because of a relatively simple educational test.

With such a group of prospective students, who have cast school out of their lives and whom society has all but cast out of its life, you can readily see why SRA and our colleague corporations hesitated before undertaking Job Corps contracts. Were we ready to say that we could succeed where other public and private institutions have largely failed? Of all the various battle areas in the War on Poverty, only one section of the Economic Opportunity Act, the one establishing the Job Corps, allowed for participation by private contractors. Our alternatives were this engagement in the War on Poverty or the role of watching from the sidelines. We chose to get in.

Our task at Rodman is to equip 750 Corpsmen, deficient in reading, writing and arithmetic and non-believers in themselves, to be, of all things, operators of sophisticated office machines, competent in office procedures, and, wherever there is hope of success, computer operators and programmers.

Because so little is learned in classrooms, we have taken a total environmental approach—24 hours-a-day, seven days-a-week. One thing we learned almost immediately was that we were expecting too little from them. We had planned to take between 14 and 24 months to graduate them into on-the-job training. But the staff soon learned that the students' lack of education is not the equivalent of stupidity. While few of the boys could read beyond the fifth grade, their test scores in other abilities almost equaled those of a high-school senior class. The staff decided to aim at getting the average boy ready for on-the-job training in ten months, many in six. Very shortly, we will know whether that staff estimate is sound.

The Corpsmen are taught in small groups of five or six. They study alone or with buddies, or in small groups, progressing at their own pace with a variety of learning materials, including workbooks and self-instruction materials. We have observed an eagerness among these young men for what we call "hands-on" training. If they hate arithmetic books, they may love adding machines. One of our most successful experiments has been asking each student as soon as he arrives to write a letter home on an electric typewriter. Most students have never seen such a machine before, and they tackle their new tasks with enthusiasm.

We have learned never to call their teachers "teachers." That term only stirs up the Corpsmen's deep negativism toward schools. Instead, we call them "tutor-counselors," and that is what they really are. Tutor-counselors are young and knowledgeable about the backgrounds of students. They are accessible models of success with whom the boys can identify, and often the first friends they ever had in the outer world of the middle class.

If this description of what we do sounds as though we have found all the right keys, don't let us mislead you. We are only beginning to learn. We are not sure of where our education will lead us any more than we are sure of where theirs will lead them. But as one Job Corpsman wrote, "I truly think that it was the best mistake I have made—joining, that is."

One mistake we made at the outset was in thinking that running a Job Corps center was chiefly an educational task. We soon found out that our main adversary was hostility, not ignorance. The hostility of these young men is directed not only at school but at nearly every other established segment of our middle-class society, from which they feel excluded. At the same time, we have learned to be impressed at their determination to make the most of their Job Corps experience, which they openly describe as perhaps their last chance.

The boys seem to be torn by continuing struggle between their hostility and their positive determination. This struggle recently erupted in what citizens of New Bedford, Massachusetts, call a riot, although it was no such thing. Last May 21, word spread through the center that some local boys had attacked a number of Corpsmen in town. The Rodman Center and New Bedford had not always been comfortable with each other during their several months of living together. The Corpsmen felt the residents of this old New England town were cold and unfriendly. The townspeople had the impression that most Corpsmen had police records and were rowdies. Understandably, teenage boys of New Bedford were less than delighted at the import of hundreds of competitors for the attentions of their girl friends. In fact, one morning the sun rose to light a freshly-painted message on the side of an old brick building. It said, "War On The Job Corps."

This mutual mistrust, however, lay dormant until the rumor of May 21 swept through the camp. At 11:15 that night, about forty Rodman students, some with passes and some unauthorized, marched out of the center, down Rodney French Boulevard toward the center of town. Immediately, about twenty-five staff members left the center and overtook them. There in the middle of the boulevard, the staff members urged and cajoled the students to consider the consequences of their loss of temper. Meanwhile, alarmed residents along the boulevard called the police who cordoned off the area. The staff members, aided by a number of thoughtful students, persuaded the group to return to Rodman. The incident was over.

But today, weeks later, it is still talked about as the "Rodman riot." Soon afterward, a member of the city council sensed an emotional local issue and introduced a resolution asking President Johnson to remove the Job Corps from Rodman. Although we knew that many councilmen had serious misgivings, we were not wholly prepared for the result: the resolution passed unanimously. From the beginning, we greatly underestimated the importance of good community relations in running a successful Job Corps center.

Of course the Job Corps Center has not been closed, we trust it will not be, and we are hard at work to help the camp and the town understand each other better. It is not an easy task, but it surely is an educational one. Believe me, it takes a fearful amount of management time, and we are learning things about public relations with which few public relations men at IBM ever expected to find themselves concerned.

Perhaps one solution to this local problem in the War on Poverty is as predictable as one national solution I cited a few minutes ago. Perhaps the city fathers of New Bedford, including its leading businessmen, will understand their relationship to Rodman to the degree that we find ways of involving them in its problems.

Scratch almost any New Bedford critic of Rodman and you'll probably hear him say what national critics of the Job Corps almost always say. The cost of trying to save a member of the Job Corps from failure comes too high. Indeed, it is high. Estimates of the cost of training a Job Corpsman for employment run up to $11,250 for a full two-year stint. The Job Corps says it is trying to reduce that average cost to $7,765. Even at that, the government would be spending more than the estimated budget for an undergraduate's first two years here at the University of Chicago. That's quite a bill for teaching a kid who may still be learning his ABC's.

Well, there are some standard, obvious replies. An alternative cost for many a boy may be to maintain him in jail, after he is fully convinced that society and its laws leave no place for him. That cost is $2,450 a year, for Heaven knows how many years. Another possible alternative is public welfare. This cost skyrockets in proportion to the young man's virility, and then what does society do about *his* children?

On the other hand, the cost of keeping a Job Corpsman includes certain overdue obligations that society has never met. It includes the price of physical neglect. More than one-third of Corpsmen are fitted with eye glasses they should have had long ago. It includes the cost of an average of six dental filling per youngster. And it includes the cost of heaping upon them a quantity of food that has produced an average gain in weight of ten pounds per youngster. It includes all the cost of maintaining these Corpsmen 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week.

For those who like all their answers in dollars and cents, there is the promise that a successful Job Corpsman will eventually repay his government's investment through income taxes. Someone has figured out that if a Corpsman gradutaes into a job at the extremely modest pay of $1.68 an hour—*and never gets a raise in pay for the rest of his career*—he will repay the $11,000 investment by the taxes he pays during his working life.

If these fiscal arguments don't excite you, I must admit that I don't find them the most persuasive ones myself. As one interested citizen, I am more interested in finding ways to end this problem forever than in what it costs to enlarge the tax-paying potential of the 500 students in our center. I am more interested in finding and cultivating the roots of human potential than in a cost-accounting approach to misery. For all the talk of saddling future generations with today's public debt, my concerns lie with saving future generations from the continuing price of social neglect, human as well as fiscal, perpetuated by previous generations, including my own.

There is yet another thing that concerns me. As an educational publisher, I have observed that new approaches to education for a changing world do not come easily to the mammoth establishment of our middle-class-dominated educational world. The pressure for change usually comes from somewhere out in left field, and the location of left field keeps changing. Right now, left field is the War on Poverty. The so-called culturally deprived child sits in the eye of a hurricane that is shaking the foundations of education. For example, Project Headstart has already shaken loose an old, largely, unquestioned, but indefensible notion that six years old is the earliest age at which formal learning should begin. For many years hence, nursery schools for middle-class children will undergo change in reaction to new research among nursery-age children who happen to live in the ghetto.

Similarly, if we, involved in the Job Corps, can indeed construct a method of successful education for teenagers with whom established methods have failed, we will have helped make a fundamental contribution with implications far beyond the Job Corps. The eventual beneficiaries of our experience may be the sons and daughters of the middle class far more than of the poor. We will have learned something important about what makes youngsters want to learn. That will be a contribution in which I, for one, will be proud to have taken part, not only as one trained as a social scientist, and one who has lived his professional life on the rim of public education, but as a businessman.

It seems to me also that such a contribution to improving the quality of American life is a fit one for a corporation which may be sustained by the making of profit, but whose motives should and do include an obligation to earn its place as one of America's basic institutions.

MILLENNIUM OF POLISH CHRISTIANITY AND NATIONAL HERITAGE, 966–1966—POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN'S ADDRESS ON ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to be an invited guest at the magnificent banquet in the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington on Saturday evening, July 30, marking the first day ceremony for the Polish millennium stamp. This inspiring stamp was issued by the Post Office Department with the cooperation and suggestion of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien. On May 3, I was invited to the White House to witness President Lyndon B. Johnson sign a proclamation entitled "Commemoration of Poland's National and Christian Millennium."

The Polish millennium stamp commemorates both the national and Christian heritage of Poland over the last 1,000 years. It is a heritage of most remarkable accomplishment, and one in which the people of Poland justly deserve the plaudits of the rest of the world for tenaciously clinging to their Roman Catholic faith and national identity despite partition, occupation by foreigners, and persecution. There has been a tremendous response to the Polish millennium stamp. The Post Office Department issued 125 million of these stamps, indicating the warm feeling of friendship that exists between the people of America and the people of Poland.

Postmaster General O'Brien said in his address at the first day ceremony banquet:

> We Americans can join in many ways with the brave and proud people of Poland in celebrating one thousand years of identity as a Christian nation, one thousand unbroken years of tradition, one thousand years of a people who refused to bend their knees to toil and to trouble and to tribulation and to totalitarianism . . . but who always bent their knees to God.
>
> One of the ways we Americans can mark this great day in world history—not just Poland's history—is by the issuance of a postage stamp. This stamp, which seeks to honor Poland's thousand year bond with the Western World, was the result of a widespread sentiment on the part of the American people, of all nationalities and all political parties. It stirred up great support here in the United States.
>
> Let me say this about the Millennium Commemorative Stamp—it is a proud and noble design, fitting to honor a proud and noble people—and I am delighted that it has been issued by the United States Post Office Department!

Mr. Speaker, attending the banquet with me were two neighbors of Postmaster General O'Brien and mine from western Massachusetts, Zygmunt Barszewski, president of the Polish American Congress for Western Massachusetts, and Ignacy Szymala, past president of the Polish American Congress for Western Massachusetts. The speakers, in addition to Postmaster General O'Brien, were the most Reverend Aloysius J. W. Wycislo, Roman Catholic Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Chicago; and Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress. A message was read from American Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable John A. Gronouski. I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD the speeches of Postmaster General O'Brien, Bishop Wycislo, President Rosmarcek of the Polish American Congress, and the message from Ambassador Gronouski:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE FIRST DAY CEREMONY FOR THE POLISH MILLENNIUM STAMP, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 30, 1966

I am delighted to be with you here tonight and to bring to you, who represent the leadership of Americans of Polish descent, the personal greetings of President Lyndon B. Johnson. The President asked me to say to you that in marking this year of Poland's millennium we are actually marking one of the great sources of man's aspiration to be free and independent.

There are several reasons why this evening has a special meaning for me, and why I feel particularly moved by this most impressive display of unity in spirit and purpose.

First, my parents came from a land which, like Poland, both yearned and fought for freedom through many centuries. Both Poland and Ireland regained their national identity after World War I; Poland in 1918, Ireland three years later. We share a common memory of the denial of freedom, and having tasted the bitter hunger, we know the value of freedom.

Second, through my brother-in-law, Judge Frank Placzek, I am united by family ties to the Polish community.

Third, I am carrying on the work of an American son of Poland, a great Postmaster General, a man who made significant contributions to our mail service, and is now carrying out the difficult and delicate task of representing our Country in Warsaw during these trying times: my good friend Ambassador John Gronouski. And I don't believe I am violating President Johnson's confidence if I tell you that he has often told me how pleased he is at the extraordinary job being done by John Gronouski.

We Americans can join in many ways with the brave and proud people of Poland in celebrating one thousand years of identity as a Christian nation, one thousand unbroken years of tradition, one thousand years of a people who refused to bend their knees to toil and to trouble and to tribulation and to totalitarianism . . . but who always bent their knees to God.

One of the ways we Americans can mark this great day in world history—not just Poland's history—is by the issuance of a postage stamp. This stamp, which seeks to honor Poland's thousand year bond with the Western World, was the result of a widespread sentiment on the part of the American people, of all nationalities and all political parties. It stirred up great support here in the United States.

Let me say this about the Millenium Commemorative Stamp—it is a proud and noble design, fitting to honor a proud and noble people—and I am delighted that it has been issued by the United States Post Office Department!

In retrospect, I suppose the safest kind of postage stamp would have been a blank one with a color it yourself kit, but I know that the Polish people understand that the motivation behind this stamp had nothing to do with international politics and everything to do with admiration for them, their culture, their bravery, their contributions to America, and to world culture and their constant refusal to permit a love of freedom to be crushed by the heel of tyranny.

There are yet other ways by which we Americans were prepared to join in this millennium celebration. Certainly we were looking forward with great anticipation to the visit of Cardinal Wyszynski, but that hope has now been dashed by the refusal of his government to grant a passport to this great Churchman and distinguished patriot.

Many Americans, religious leaders and people from all walks of life, were hoping to join with His Holiness the Pope and tens of thousands from other nations and to make the pilgrimage to the great shrines of Poland's thousand years of religious and national history—and they, too, have seen the iron curtain of suspicion and animosity slam down to bar their path.

Of course, certain quarters would have us feel that the Polish people do not welcome our friendship. Recently, there have been three "spontaneous" demonstrations at our Embassy. These were unusual "spontaneous" demonstrations—in fact, I believe that is the first time in history that a "spontaneous" demonstration included the presence of a film crew who managed to get there ahead of the demonstrators. It was the first time that a "spontaneous" demonstration included professionally printed banners. And I do believe there is another first for a "spontaneous" demonstration—the leaders of the mob came equipped with portable loudspeakers.

Let us, in fact, hope that this cloud will soon pass away. It cannot hide from the American people the constantly shining sun of friendship that exists with the people of Poland.

But let us not dwell on the shadows and ignore the sunlight of this celebration of Poland's heritage.

I am told that the great glacial icecap in Greenland is of deep interest to scientists because the ice there consists of water several thousand years old. By removing cores from the icecap, it is possible to test that ancient water and learn much about the world as it once was, to discover trends in climate, to find out how our atmosphere is changing and, for example, the degree of pollution today compared with a hundred or a thousand years ago. All this is very important to those who wish to know more about the spinning globe on which we live.

Well, Poland's thousand year history is to me like that icecap. We can remove a core that passes all the way back to 966, and examine it closely, asking ourselves the question: "Why is it that this people, with no natural barriers to protect them against hostile forces that surrounded them, were able to survive? Why were they able to make enormous contributions to the world as well as survive?" Or, going back to our analogy with the glacier, "Why did this people remain rock solid in the face of terrible adversity, when other peoples have melted away, to be absorbed in the sands of the past?" Poland, too, can tell us much about the human family that inhabits this spinning globe.

Let us look at this thousand year core into the heart of man's history.

I think perhaps the two most outstanding and striking facts we see in that core are Poland's commitment to religion and Poland's commitment to brotherhood.

These facts, of course, are closely related, for it is from the deep religious sentiment of the Polish people, that they gain their understanding that we are all creatures of a Supreme Being.

But equally important, for an understanding of human history, is that Poland has not permitted this sentiment of brotherhood to be enshrined alone in books or words, a kind of theoretical ritual. Not at all. And this is where we come to the real essence of Poland's history. For Poland has a national motto that sums up this element of the national character: "Za Wasza Wolnosc i Nasza"—for your freedom and ours.

Following the dictates of that motto, which I believe must be engraved in the heart of every real Pole, you have again and again defeated the enemies of freedom, you have again and again achieved your national identity after being overwhelmed by superior material force, and you have again and again lent your courage and your fierce spirit to the cause of freedom elsewhere.

Certainly, this was reflected in our own struggle for liberty. As President Johnson said, "The same spark of freedom that flared into the American Revolution also burned in the hearts of the Polish people. Our Revolution was theirs, and to these shores, to help in our struggle, came two great champions of liberty: Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski." You have somehow been blessed with the clear understanding that freedom is invisible, and that no man's freedom is an island. This understanding comes to few peoples and few nations. It is a heritage without price, to be cherished and guarded.

This view, which is yours by nature and by tradition, is one that we in the United States must understand, not only that we may see the importance of the Millennium, but also because we many better understand the course, the present course, of our own foreign policy.

For those who ask, "Why are we in Vietnam?", I would tell them, that the United States has discovered on a thousand battlefields that there is no other policy but that of the Poles—"for your freedom and ours."

We are in Vietnam because powerful forces decided they could take over South Vietnam by force of arms. We are there because we want it plainly understood that aggression does not pay. We are there because, just as we showed in Korea that aggression through conventional war does not pay, just as we showed in the confrontation over the missiles in Cuba, that nuclear war would not pay; we are now showing in the jungles of Vietnam that guerrilla type subversion and terror tactics also do not pay.

President Johnson is committed to the task of driving this lesson home.

He has said again and again that our only aim is a peace based on an end to aggression.

There is no doubt in my mind that he will gain this aim. It may take many months or years of continued struggle—depending on whether the aggressors understand that we are fully committed to seeing this fight through.

In the Post Office Department we have a proud tradition that neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night will stop us from delivering the mail. Well, that spirit is not confined to the Post Office Department. It is a national trait, a "can do" spirit that has served us well in creating the most powerful nation in the world. And that same spirit will bring peace in Vietnam—for neither heat nor enemy threats nor domestic dissent nor Communist bluster will deter us from doing in Vietnam what must be done. And the sooner the enemy understands this the better he will be.

And I mean "better"—for the only war the United States seeks now or at any time is a war against man's oldest enemies of sickness and poverty of mind and body. Given peace in Asia, given Communist acceptance of the failure of this form of warfare, we can enter an unprecedented period of world cooperation. We can extend the helping hand in Asia and in Eastern Europe. No longer will the leaders of unfriendly regimes be able to use Vietnam as an excuse to dam up the stream of popular approval of democracy and the principles for which the free world stands.

Once our enemies, or more precisely those who make themselves our enemies, see the futility of their efforts and the fighting stops in Vietnam, I believe, as the President fully believes, that the world can enter an unprecedented period of prosperity. As President Johnson told the Australian Prime Minister, "We feel a new sense of fellowship and common destiny emerging in Asia." And may I add, this sense of fellowship certainly exists among the *people* in Eastern Europe, a fact brilliantly reflected by Cardinal Wyszynski's famous letter to the German bishops inviting them to join, in the spirit of reconciliation, in the ecclesiastical celebrations of the Polish millennium.

But, my friends, that sense of fellowship and common destiny, that joint effort to build, which I know is just over the horizon, will not come to pass for many years, if indeed it ever comes to pass at all, if we show ourselves weak in the face of aggression, if we show ourselves unconcerned about the freedom of others.

We must show the world that we are determined to see to a successful conclusion our fight for freedom in Vietnam—for, if we do not, we certainly cannot provide hope to those, in Warsaw or wherever they may be, who still hope for full achievement of freedom themselves.

To achieve this end, we must show that we are united behind the President's policy of fearless resistance to aggression.

As our President strives to convince the aggressors that this final form of warfare must be abandoned, we must not permit anyone to believe that his policy is a minority policy, that his policy resembles the foreign policy of so many Communist nations, where the people's wishes play no part. Let us end any delusion, any war prolonging delusion, by showing the President in unmistakable fashion that he has your support as well as your prayers in these trying times. If the Polish-American community responds, as I know it will, to the challenge that faces us, you will be making one more of your many contributions to a better world, a world good enough to deserve the many contributions made by your forebears during the last 1,000 years.

REMARKS OF THE MOST REVEREND A. J. WYCISLO, CHICAGO, ILL.

We are here this evening to commemorate the political and religious history of Poland through an act that binds two nations and its people together. A thousand years ago Poland embraced Christianity, directed her destiny to the West and identified herself indelibly with the political and religious history of Western civilization. The U.S. of America, a believing nation, whose founding fathers put their trust in God, now acknowledge that relationship and writes into the annals of history this day's issuance of a special stamp commemorating Poland's millennium.

I am sure that Mr. O'Brien, our far-seeing and gracious Postmaster General, had some anxious moments when he decided to issue a stamp of religious significance and firm historical background. Perhaps he also considered the serious aspect of protest—we had a sampling of that from Warsaw last week—but we hope that no one in the U.S. will use this occasion to protest acknowledgment of Poland's tradition of culture and art, so much admired by the world, and, let's also hope that a creeping secularism in the U.S. will not take the direction of telling government that it may not recognize and honor the culture and faith of some 7½ million of its citizens.

A stamp is one of the impressions of the arts and I beg leave to make even so brief a comment about the design of the stamp. I am mindful that I was asked to speak on the spiritual theme of this millennium—and my comments are spiritual, and I believe I would not be interfering with the artist who designed the stamp.

I see on that millennial stamp the cross of another believing nation that has earned the title: "Polonia semper fidelis".

I see also the soaring eagle of the Gospels that carries Poland's faith and devotion to the heights of St. Luke's Lady of The Bright Mountain. And I see in this millennial stamp, a rare occasion we must admit; I see a going forth by land and sea and air the mutual faith and destiny of two nations, of peoples who have been relentless in their pursuit of liberty, and who with combined faith in God, will preserve that liberty.

Here lies the focal point for the Christian millennium we commemorate this evening in Washington—the faith of a people—who despite their weaknesses have never watered down their destiny. In the annals of history of every other European nation, from an ancient Greece and beginning even with Rome, we can say that Christianity is an episode, perhaps even a decisive truth, even a factor of the history of those nations, *but never its whole* history. The Christianization of Poland and its integration into the Western community of nations began the history of Poland, which is the political and religious history of a nation. So it is that the millions of Poles in America can look back on their origin with much justifiable pride. A pride that in large measure finds its justification in the high moral principles that identify so intimately Poland with our native land, principles which guided our founding fathers in laying the foundations of our government and in launching this nation on its history. Need I emphasize to so knowledgeable an audience how many Poles had a hand in shaping that history of this beloved land of ours!

As we observe in this Capital City, Poland's Christian birth and her fidelity to God, memory and conscience serve notice that ignorance or the rejection of God and the moral principles which guided our founding fathers, can undermine our nation and the most sacred traditions of America. The evidence of our moral ills are too numerous and too obvious to acquire detailed exposure. *All that is needed is this reminder:* just as the high moral purposes of our early history stemmed from acknowledgment and belief in God, so now the flaunting and even rejection of moral law finds its basic cause in the spreading denial of our acknowledgment of the very existence of God.

If there is no God, then the old morality based on God is not valid! Is this why we begin to see in America a newly self-proclaimed *chance on physical science,* and in the pluralism of our religious patterns and the rising pressures of secularism, we begin to see our *schools without religion!*

The exercise of our national strength, which over so many decades attracted ever so many immigrants to our shores, must be guided by those principles on which our strength was built. Ours cannot be a dream of a Utopia of national well-being but a dream of America in which the reign of God is firmly established and followed; in which the principles of the natural law and of the Christian dispensation, upon which this country was founded, will be accepted and allowed the freedom of that norm of moral judgment so essential to the social order of so many of our people!

Our Poles, are citizens with pride in this America, our national land, but we love the people and the nation from which we spring. So as we commemorate this 1000th year of Poland's Christian birth we know that we must focus our vision on this, our American way of life, and set it in the perspective of the rich tradition of faith and culture and art that is our noble heritage.

No one may deny us, and we will fight for the principle that faith enriches and preserves the culture of a people. Poles have added their measure of the true coloring which enriches the mosaic of our American society. And we would like to believe that all the things we Poles hold dear in America are the common impression of everyones aspirations, of all the people in America. All the memories, the hopes and yearnings of our generation, were they not the memories, the hopes and yearnings of our forefathers, and will they not be the aspirations of our children?

If this America be our land now, if this be our day, then our woods, the sand, the mud, the hills, the plains, our streets, our homes, our towns and our cities; if all this be our rightful heritage in the new country, earned with the sweat of our brow and without compromise of a faith and culture, but comes from a thousand-year-old past—the stamp of the U.S. of America our government issues today is deserving of us; it is the rightful acknowledgment of what Poles have done for America, its faith, its culture and its way of life!

REMARKS BY CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, AT THE POLISH MILLENNIUM STAMP BANQUET, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 30, 1966

Millions of Americans of Polish origin deeply appreciate this historic gesture of the United States government toward Poland. The postal stamp commemorating the millennium of Poland, stands as a symbol of friendship and mutual respect that has always existed between the American and Polish Nations. This friendship dates back to Jamestown, Virginia when Capt. John Smith brought some Poles to establish the first glass factory in America.

This Millennium Stamp and this distinguished gathering tell the world that America is deeply concerned with the well-being and the freedom of the Polish Nation. Poland is not free today. Poland is not even free to celebrate its Millennium of Christianity with the solemnities and decorum which this occasion requires. Evil pressures and chicanaries of the Communist Regime against the Church and Primate Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, show the extent to which the Warsaw Government is committed to atheistic Soviet domination.

In the annals of every European nation, beginning with pagan Greece and Rome, Christianity was the turning point, but not the whole history of that nation. On the other hand, Poland's history begins with the acceptance of Christianity. Thus the whole recorded history of Poland is the history of a Christian Nation.

The first historic ruler of Poland was Mieszko, son of Ziemomysl. He was baptized on April 14, 966, thus joining his people with the civilization and culture of Western Europe. Through Christianity, Poland acquired priceless benefits in a spiritual and intellectual development. Rapid development of education, influx of Western ideas, acquisition of priceless manuscripts and works of art, were made possible through the steadily increasing contacts of the Polish people with the western nations.

The Poles are proud of the fact that the oldest document relating to Poland in the Vatican archives, is the letter written by Mieszko, shortly after his baptism, to Pope John XV. In this letter Mieszko pledges Poland's loyalty to the Catholic Church and places his domain under the protection of the Holy See.

From that time on, Poland's culture and her traditions took a specific and definite Christian form. One fact distinguishes Poland from the neighboring Slav Nations: and that is the profound influence of the Catholic Church and of Western civilization upon Poland's life. The church gave Poland the ethical principles for the state's development and growth. This spiritual force created a strong sense of unity which held the country together, as it still does in many internal and external crises.

During the years of partition, all the insurrections in Poland had a religious as well as a political character. The Church was present and active in every effort to regain national freedom and independence. Two priests—Hugo Kollontaj and Stanislaw Staszyc, were instrumental in drafting the famous Constitution of May 3rd, 1791.

Such in brief, was the influence of the Church over the Polish nation. It can be truly said that today's struggle of the Polish people for religious freedom and national independence, grew out of the millennial heritage left by Mieszko.

And the outcome of the struggle cannot be doubted in spite of the discouraging appearances to today. In the terms of history, Communism is only one obstacle to be overcome by the all-powerful wave of one thousand years.

(In a brief statement in Polish, Mr. Rozmarek pledged that Polonia's struggle "by all legal means" for a truly free and independent Poland will continue.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO POLAND

Mary and I deeply regret we are unable to be with you in person for the millennium of Poland stamp banquet. Not only are we deprived of a joyous evening in the company of dear friends. I particularly regret not being able to participate directly in this magnificent American tribute to the devout and courageous people of Poland.

We of Polonia owe a great debt of gratitude to my good friend Larry O'Brien whose decision to issue this beautiful and symbolic millennium stamp reflects his deep understanding and appreciation of the rich and endearing contributions made by the Polish people, in America and throughout the world, during the 1000 years of turbulent history.

In his remarks on May 3, commemorating Poland's Christian millennium, President Johnson observed that "the historic ties between our two great nations have remained as a symbol of friendship and hope. Today on this anniversary, we reaffirm that friendship and pledge ourselves to that hope."

The issuance of this millennium stamp is yet another symbol and evidence of the great bond of friendship and brotherhood that exists between the people of the United States and Poland.

On a personal note, I want you to know that Polonia's friendship and support have been for me a great source of strength and inspiration. I enjoy especially the visits and discussions some of us have had at the Embassy in Warsaw, and hope to see many more of you during your trips to Poland in the months ahead.

My best wishes to you on this historic occasion.

A REAL ESTATE BROKER'S STRONG SUPPORT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from a Chicago mortgage banker who is a very good friend of mine. Mr. Erwin Salk forwarded me a copy of his letter to Mr. Robert Cook, of the Illinois Association of Real Estate Boards, as he knew I would be glad to know of his strong support for open housing legislation. I commend his letter to all of my colleagues as one of the most honest and fair appraisals of the real estate industry's proper role in the struggle to guarantee the rights of every American citizen. Mr. Salk's pride in his chosen profession and his integrity as a human being underscore every word of his letter:

SALK, WARD & SALK, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., May 20, 1966.

Mr. ROBERT E. COOK,
Illinois Association of Real Estate Boards,
612 South Second Street, Springfield, Ill.

DEAR BOB: Pursuant to our conversation the other day, if I understood you correctly, you wish to have a few of the comments that I have used from time to time regarding the type of discussion that Allmart and I participated in in Glen Ellyn. I assume you dont want an article per se but just a few comments to be used so this is what I am sending along. If there is some other type of description that you wish don't hesitate to call me.

These will not be in any special order but just a number of observations. Some of my remarks will be from the Businessman's Credo, a copy of which you should have by now.

The major question that we must ask ourselves as businessmen and realtors is: What factors will strengthen and stabilize the real estate picture in our city and suburbs? We must analyze this question in terms of the practical choices open to us in the world in which we live.

Integration is coming about as a way of life whether we like it or not. Virtually every major industry in the United States is planning for integration with the exception of one, and that is the real estate industry. This lack of planning is the heart of the tragedy.

If our real estate organizations, of which I am a part, do not recognize their responsibilities in this arena, if they insist on abdicating their responsibilities, then they are refusing to assume the mantle of business leadership which has often been bestowed upon them. They are planting the seeds for self-destruction, corrosion, all of the debilitating effects which we can already witness taking place in many of our communities.

In order to stabilize the suburbs, the suburbanite has a responsibility to stabilize the city. I am convinced that the vast majority of white people who live in a changing area or contiguous to a changing area do not really basically wish to move, but they are caught up in what we may well call "a fright and flight psychology." It is a fear of what they may call the "unknown." Our greatest danger is fear, whether knowingly or unknowingly. This is, unfortunately, what controls much of our thinking and many of our actions. Often this fear is based on myth, and by promulgating and developing this fear based on myth we can, unfortunately, turn it into fear based on reality. Fear is the killer, the destroyer of progress.

It there was open occupancy which could apply to the noncontiguous white areas and the all-white suburban areas, and if it were possible to find Negro families who have a common base with the community to move into these areas on a planned or quota basis, if you like, then I am certain that many of the white families in the inner city would take a deep breath and feel that they have a rationale to stay where they are since they may well say to themselves—there is no sense in my fleeing because "they can follow me." They would then, in all probability, be willing to say "Let's go to work on our community and see what we can do to make it strong, safe and sound." The only people who can basically destroy a community are the people who live there, either by their actions or inactions. But by positive action and complete participation of all of the elements and groups in that community, they can solve virtually any problem to bring about and maintain stability.

If open occupancy were declared in the State of Illinois tomorrow, I doubt if there would be a shift in the Negro population of 1/10th of 1%, but it would force the people who live in the various communities and operate on the fright and flight psychology to face up to the problems of their community, and work towards a solution thereof.

As a businessman, I must inevitably realize and recognize the inescapable relationship between business and social problems.

I cannot properly plan ahead for my business without giving full attention not only to the existence but also to the solution of social problems in our midst from the choices available, since social stability is essential for good, sound economic development.

There have been sufficient studies made to show that property values do not go down when a Negro family moves into an area, and this myth has long ago been disspelled. It is only when there is a general flight that you have economic problems on a temporary basis.

We likewise know that the problems of the inner city with the resultant increased crime, juvenile delinquency, dope addiction, lack of education and so forth and the results thereof, do not miraculously stop at the boundaries of that city as, for example, at Howard Street on the north and Harlem Avenue on the west; that these problems and the diseases of our society attached thereto spill well over into the suburban areas, and there is no escape from the debilitating effects of these problems.

Victor Hugo once said, "There is nothing so powerful in all the world as an idea whose time has come."

Property has historically always been subject to regulations, whether it is for zoning, code enforcements, restrictions against public nuisances, or whatever.

The abolishment of slavery in our country is definitely an interference with private property rights. When people talk about having their property rights taken away they are dealing with myth rather than reality.

I must respect the decisions of groups like the Berkeley real estate industry, of which Mr. Maurice Read's organization is a part, who in their multiple listing system will not accept a discriminatory listing. I must respect the decision of companies like New York Life, who in March, 1964 issued a statement to all their mortgage correspondents that in no loan submissions was there to be any reference to race, religion, ethnic origin or the like. I must pay my respects to the Pepsi Cola Company, who have released two long-playing records entitled, Adventures in Negro History—even if the purpose may have been that we are supposed to poke our friends when they reach for a coke.

The dimensions of this problem are not only within the realm of the real estate industry, they are likewise the responsibility of other business groups, of the white liberal, of the church and synagogue organizations, of the Negro community, of all sectors of our society, both public and private. However, in matters dealing with real estate, leadership must be provided by the real estate industry in the solving of these problems. If we abdicate this responsibility, we shall have no cause for tardy complaint at a later date when these decisions are taken out of our hands.

We should be in the foreground in the drafting, preparation and presentation of bills, ordinances, laws and the like establishing a fair housing market which can only lead to a stabilization of the real estate picture throughout the country.

All of these decisions and actions are in our economic and social interest. They will create a more stable and productive real estate market which can and will have benefits for all involved.

The path is not easy. We must fight avarice and prejudice. The results of this battle if not successful will be decadence and self-destruction. The results, if successful—and they can be—will be a better life for all. Our potentialities—our capacities—in this country, in this community, are virtually untapped. We have the resources; our greatness lies ahead. The choice is ours. Our destiny lies within our own hands and nowhere else.

Some of this may be bit rought but, as I said above, if you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Erwin A. Salk,
President.

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin]

Law Day, U.S.A.—1966: A Businessman's Credo

As a businessman, I must inevitably realize and recognize the inescapable relationship between business and social problems.

I cannot properly plan ahead for my business without giving full attention not only to the existence but also to the solution of social problems in our midst from the choices available, since social stability is essential for good, sound economic development.

We business leaders are considered extremely important in our society and we owe our society the obligation of reciprocity. We are expected to create new dimensions in thought and action and provide leadership in solving problems. If our business community does not provide leadership and direction in seeking solution of both social and economic problems on a realistic and practical basis, then we are abdicating our responsibilities, have no basis for tardy complaints and must live with the consequences of our inaction.

These problems have no relationship to our likes or dislikes.

The maverick in the business world is the executive who refuses to correlate his economic thoughts with the potential solution of social problems which can and do affect his business as well as the community. He is in effect not doing what he can to stabilize the economic situation and achieve maximum profits; not serving the best interests of either himself or his clients; does not understand business and does not function as an efficient and sophisticated businessman; and is defaulting in his responsibilities in providing proper leadership for the economic and social development of his community.

The true strength of our community and our country does not lies in the number of bombs we possess, the size of our destructive arsenal, the number of our soldiers, nor even in the number of autos per capita, the miles of highways, the kilowatt hours of electricity we produce. Our true strength is basically in our human resources—the physical, economic, emotional and educational well-being of our citizenry.

The weakness of our country lies in not providing the opportunity for every individual to develop his growth potential to the maximum. Whenever an American is excluded from these opportunities, our community and our country suffers. Our society as a whole is then deprived of its maximum growth potential and is susceptible to decay and destruction as has happened to great civilizations in the past. When this occurs, then you and I as well as public and private coffers are robbed of their rightful due and we are not maximizing our potential growth.

We have learned well to spend billions for destruction, but in comparison spend virtually pennies for construction. We prepare for destructive efforts like giants and for building of a good and great society like pygmies.

We must ask ourselves time and again—do we have a great society or an aimless society?

The road to a better future is not easy. The results of our failures can only be decadence and self-destruction. Success can and will mean a better life for all.

We cannot countenance the archaic ways of yesterday, which rob you and me of our rightful due and diminish our growth potential. Our capacities are virtually untapped and unlimited.

We have many frontiers, not for exploitation but for positive development. We are, in reality, still in the infancy of our growth. We have the resources, natural and human. Our greatness lies ahead.

The choice is ours. Our destiny lies within our own hands and nowhere else.

Erwin A. Salk,
President, Salk, Ward & Salk, Inc.,
Mortgage Bankers.

NATIONWIDE SUPPORT GATHERS FOR 1966 CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have received an ever-increasing volume of mail from individuals and groups throughout the country in support of the 1966 civil rights bill which is now being debated on the floor of this body. It has been very inspiring to me to know that so many Americans are concerned about the passage of this particular legislation.

On many occasions important issues are before the Congress, issues which vitally concern every American, yet our daily stacks of mail do not grow. The letters which I would like to have inserted into the Record at this point are testimony to support which so many Americans are giving to this particular bill and to their concern for the rights of their fellow citizens:

American Newspaper Guild,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1966.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House.
Speaker of the House John W. McCormack,
The House of Representatives.
Representative Emanuel Celler,
The House of Representatives.
Representative William M. McCulloch,
The House of Representatives.

Gentlemen: I transmit herewith copy of resolution relative to the Civil Rights Bill of 1966 passed by the 33rd Annual Convention of the American Newspaper Guild, July 25–29, 1966, Washington, D.C.

Very truly yours,

Charles A. Perlik, Jr.,
Secretary Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

The Congress now has before it a Civil Rights Bill of 1966 which would ban discrimination in the selection of state and federal juries, guarantee to all access to public facilities—including schools—by broadening the government's authority to bring desegregation suits, guarantee more fully the safety of persons exercising their constitutional rights and guarantee equal access to housing.

Certain individuals and pressure groups, notably the National Association of Real Estate Boards, are seeking to prevent enactment of the bill, especially its section on open occupancy (Title IV).

Discrimination in housing is unjust and is the root cause of many racial problems throughout the country.

The 1966 Convention of the American Newspaper Guild (AFL–CIO, CLC) urges and demands:

1. That Congress pass the strongest possible 1966 Civil Rights Bill, including an unqualified open housing section;

2. That the House of Representatives remove from the bill now before it the proposed exemption of certain apartment houses of four or fewer units and the proposed exemption from coverage of real estate sales persons making fewer than three sales a year;

3. That all members of the House of Representatives resist any attempt to remove from the bill before it the provision establishing a Fair Housing Board to enforce the prohibitions against housing discrimination and to resist any and all other attempts to weaken the bill;

4. That all U.S. Guild locals and members inform their Representatives and Senators of the Guild position.

Adopted by the American Newspaper Guild in Convention assembled July 25–29, 1966, Washington, D.C.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 5, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.:

The AFL–CIO strongly supports inclusion of fair housing legislation as part of the 1966 Civil Rights Act. Elimination of this IV of H.R. 14765 would be viewed by the Nation as a repudiation of the principle of fair housing by the 89th Congress. AFL–CIO urges you to vote to retain title IV as amended by Representative MATHIAS.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Legislative Department, AFL–CIO.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
August 2, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.:

Fair housing title is symbolic and substantive core of civil rights bill. Our Nation cannot afford to tell 20 million American citizens that suburbs are off limits to them. We urge you to stand fast for open occupancy and oppose all weakening amendments.

Father JOHN F. CRONIN,
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
Rabbi RICHARD G. HIRSCH,
Synagogue Council of America.
Dr. BENJAMIN F. PAYTON,
National Council of Churches.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 29, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.:

We support a housing provision in the civil rights bill which includes coverage of real estate agents. We support the present title IV as reported by the Judiciary Committee and we oppose any weakening or clarifying amendments to the bill.

JOSEPH P. MOLONY,
Vice President, Civil Rights Chairman,
United Steelworkers of America.

FRIENDS GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: At its annual meeting on July 1, 1966, in Cape May, N.J., the Central Committee of Friends General Conference approved the following statement:

"The Central Committee of Friends General Conference, representing 30,000 members in more than 30 states, unite in expressing to our fellow Americans and to members of the Congress our support of the principles in the Civil Rights Bill now before Congress, in particular our support for the original provisions of this Act which attempt to end unfair and discriminatory practices in the sale or rental of all real estate. We also hope each Friend acting as an individual will without delay inform his Congressman of this support, bring this issue to the attention of his Meeting, and by other prompt action support these measures and their implementation into law and community action."

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. CORWIN,
General Secretary.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 8, 1966.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: In light of the June 6th attack on James Meredith, we urge you to assure prompt, favorable action in reporting H.R. 14765 to the full House. The need for Title V in particular is clearly demonstrated by this latest act of violence in connection with the civil rights movement. We have sent a message to members of the Sub-Committee to speed its report to the full Committee.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA W. MOFFETT,
Secretary, Community Relations Division.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1966.

The Honorable JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: The enclosed statement was unanimously adopted by eight women's organizations which are listed in the statement itself.

These organizations requested me to transmit this statement to you so that you may have the benefit of their views before you enter deliberations on the proposed Civil Rights legislation of 1966.

We sincerely hope that the Judiciary Committee will report the bill not only in its present form, but also strengthened by the amendments recommended by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Respectfully yours,

MARGARET MEALEY,
Executive Director.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT ON PENDING CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION ADOPTED JUNE 20, 1966

We believe that the proposed Civil Rights legislation, with the strengthening amendments urged by the major civic and religious bodies united in the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, will greatly support and extend the implementation of the 1964 and 1965 Civil Rights laws.

As women, we are particularly concerned to assure the inclusion of the Fair Housing provisions in this legislation. These provisions would bar discrimination not only by the owners of housing, but also by their agents and by those who provide the necessary financing.

We believe that the time is now, in fact is long overdue, to assure all citizens their rights, including the right to live, in a neighborhood of one's choice, and to have access without discrimination, to its housing.

We are opposed to any attempt to weaken the proposed legislation, including the section on housing. We oppose the postponing of a decision on housing which we know must be reached before the justice we seek can be achieved.

We know that residential segregation means segregation in schools, playgrounds, health facilities and all other aspects of our lives. It impedes full access to employment opportunities, creates a second-class status, and is a potential source of racial tension. Residential segregation means handicapping our children in the suburbs and ghettoes alike, in the educational experience essential to becoming mature adults in a society and world of many races. And, there is no other society today!

We pledge ourselves as National organizations, to continuing collaboration and call upon women of all races to join hands to create communities, rich in diversity, where the contributions of all citizens are needed and welcomed in the achievement of a new quality of life. We call upon all women to join in giving moral leadership and support to legislative and community action which will remove all barriers to racial justice, including the barriers to open housing.

The foregoing statement has been affirmed by the following 8 major National Women's religious and interracial organizations in the United States, with a total membership of more than thirty million women, of Catholic, Jewish and Protestant faiths:

National Board of YWCA of the U.S.A., Mrs. Lloyd J. Marti, President.

National Council of Catholic Women, Mrs. Marcus Kilch, President.

National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Joseph Willen, President.

National Council of Negro Women, Miss Dorothy Height, President.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Mrs. Merryle S. Rukeyser, President.

National Women's League, United Synagogue of America, Mrs. Albert Fried, President.

United Church Women, Mrs. Stuart E. Sinclair, President.

Women's Branch, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, Mrs. Mason H. Wadler, President.

The statement is the result of special collaboration of these organizations over a period of months, in preparation for a coordinated nationwide program of accelerated action in support of fair housing throughout all the United States.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N.Y., June 20, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: For your information we are attaching a story from the Baltimore Sun of Monday, June 20, 1966. It relates the experiences of Lee E. Riley, a colored serviceman, who after spending twelve and one-half months in Thailand, returned to his own country and found that there is virtually no housing for Negroes in the Odenton area near Fort Meade where he is stationed." Mr. Riley was forced to locate 23 miles away in Seat Pleasant, Maryland, in a two bedroom $129 a month apartment. His military housing allowance is $105 and this makes no provision for the driving expenses of a daily 46 mile trip.

This is typical of what many servicemen face around the country and it offers a compelling reason for passage of the housing title in H.R. 14765.

Sincerely yours,

Clarence Mitchell,
Director, Washington Bureau.

Attachment.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 20, 1966]

Meade Negro Faces Special Housing Bar

(By William F. Schmick 3d)

Fort Meade, Md., June 19.—Spec. 4 Lee E. Riley, a Negro, arrived here May 13 after twelve and one-half months in Thailand.

Though entitled to on-base housing, it was not then available and he spent days searching the Odenton area for quarters for himself, his wife and two children, ages 6 and 3.

DISGUSTED SOLDIER

Realtors explained to him that there is virtually no housing for Negroes, and he was forced to locate 23 miles away in Seat Pleasant, Md., in a 2-bedroom, $129-a-month apartment.

His military housing allowance is $105, he says, and makes no provision for the driving expense of a daily 46-mile trip.

His frustration led him to write a "to whom it may concern" letter which he signed "a disgusted soldier" and in which he states that "it is a disgraceful situation for the serviceman to come back to the States with absolutely no housing for him and his family.

"And there are more who feel as I do," he added.

Specialist Riley was lucky. After about a month he received his family housing from the military and—though he maintains he would rather live off but near the base—moved into base quarters.

But for the many lower-rank Negroes who are not so entitled, housing remains a problem. Real estate agents, lacking clients who will rent to Negroes, advise them to commute from Baltimore or Annapolis.

Catholic Interracial Council,
Davenport, Iowa, June 20, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conyers: On behalf of the 1,000 members of the Davenport Catholic Interracial Council, I urge you to do all in your power to keep a strong Title IV in the Civil Rights Bill of 1966.

Without freedom of residence, present racial problems will be intensified, and the effectiveness of previous civil rights legislation will be diminished.

Please do your best to report out, before the end of June, a strong bill containing the four amendments recommended by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Sincerely,

Catholic Interracial Council,
Rev. Marvin A. Mottet, *Chaplain.*

Catholic Council on
Community Relations,
Houston, Tex., June 21, 1966.

Mr. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Buildings,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: Racial problems in the United States will never be honestly faced nor will they ever be solved as long as those of minority groups are herded into ghettos. The Catholic Council of Community Relations of the diocese of Galveston-Houston strongly endorses the Civil Rights Bill of 1966, especially that section of it which pertains to open housing. It is my understanding that this bill is currently before your committee and I am very hopeful that you will present to the House a strong bill with Title Four intact.

I am certainly aware of the tremendous opposition that opposes this piece of legislation, and that you will be under pressure to maintain segregated housing throughout America. However, I am hopeful that your courage will enable you to withstand this pressure and enable our nation to take a great and decisive step towards the elimination of ghettos and slums.

Sincerely,

John McCarthy, *Chairman.*

July 7, 1966.

Rep. Conyers: I support the passage of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill, especially Title IV (dealing with fair housing practices), in as strong a form as is possible.

I believe this legislation to be necessary from a moral as well as a political point of view.

Sincerely yours,

Paul D. Turnley, S.J.

American Friends
Service Committee, Inc.,
Dayton, Ohio, June 24, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Friend: We often forget to write to support our friends in Congress in their efforts to secure human justice. I, therefore, want to write today to thank you for your wonderful work in trying to get Title IV from the Civil Rights Act of 1966 considered favorably. We know that you will be working for open occupancy housing, and as you know the Service Committee has been doing this for many years. We speak out of some experience, and know that if we are to have democracy in America we certainly must outlaw discrimination in regards to housing. I live, personally, in an integrated neighborhood, and I know that we would be much better off if we had a law which would make it possible for members of minority groups to obtain housing, if they so desire, in suburban sections of our city. I know that your constituents, or most of them, will back you in this effort. I only hope that they, too, will take time to let you know how much we appreciate your good work.

Since I am writing, I do want to say once again that we are grateful to you for your stand in behalf of trying to end the Vietnam war. You have been logical in refusing to vote appropriations to carry on that very tragic affair. We grieve that the President has once again announced that he will go for an all out military victory. It is not only morally wrong, but impossible to achieve and can only lead to further disillusionment on the part of the American people. The Service Committee has said many times, and I know that you have, that we must stop bombing of the north and south, work for a cease fire and negotiations on the part of everyone concerned.

Thank you and your fine staff for your good work, and our best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

Matt H. Thomson,
Regional Executive Secretary.

Washington, D.C.,
June 28, 1966.

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.,
U.S. House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support amendment to H.R. 14765 that would provide indemnification for victims of civil rights violence.

We also urge you to oppose any attempts to weaken title IV of that bill.

Roy Wilkins,
Chairman,
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

American Veterans Committee,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: Enclosed is a copy of AVC's statement in support of the Administration's Civil Rights Bill which we have sent to Senator Ervin.

We strongly urge you to include Title IV in the reporting out of the Civil Rights Bill.

We also would like to urge you to amend the wording of the bill to control sex discrimination in state jury service. We suggest that Section 201 be amended as follows:

"Sec. 201. It shall be unlawful to make any distinction on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status, in the qualifications for service, and in the selection of any person to serve on grand or petit juries in any state court."

We make this recommendation in order more effectively to deal with the widespread discrimination in jury service, on the basis of sex, which is current in some 25 states. The present language of Section 201 is not sufficient to prevent discriminatory jury selection in these states which discriminate between men and women solely on the basis of sex with respect to excuses or exemptions from jury service.

We hope that the Judiciary Committee will make this language change when it reports out the civil rights bill.

Sincerely,

Ben Neufeld,
National Vice Chairman,
American Veterans Committee.

Enclosure.

American Veterans Committee, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1966.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The American Veterans Committee supports the Civil Rights Bill of 1966, as recommended by the President S. 3296 (H.R. 14765 in the House), but we respectfully urge that your Committee make the following 5 amendments.

The first 4 proposed amendments are specifically supported by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and AVC, as a Cooperating organization of the Leadership Conference, concurs with these proposals. The Leadership Conference has not yet specifically considered the fifth proposal we here urge, but we believe the Conference would support it.

In essence, H.R. 14765 is intended to provide legislative tools:

(a) to end the discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status, which is still rampant in jury service in Federal and State courts;

(b) to eliminate two conditions (that an individual file a written complaint and that local residents are unable to bear the burden of litigation) before the Federal Government may bring suit to end racial discrimination in schools and public facilities. (The Attorney General already has authority, without such restrictions, to initiate suits to end racial discrimination in voting, employment and public accommodations).

(c) to declare a national policy against discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of all dwelling places.

(d) to protect people against interference, by violence or threats, with the exercise of their constitutional rights in voting, education, housing, employment, jury service, travel, and use of public facilities, public accommodations and federally supported programs.

The reasons and the necessity for these measures are cogently set forth in the President's Civil Rights Message of April 28, 1966. AVC believes, and we think that the overwhelming majority of the people of the nation believe, that these legislative measures are needed—that they are just and reasonable—and that their enactment by Congress will enhance our nation's democracy, welfare and security.

The amendments we urge be included in the bill are as follows:

1. To establish an Indemnification Board authorized to award monetary indemnities for injuries or death inflicted on persons as a result of violence intended to interfere with the exercise of the civil rights guaranteed under the bill. The Board also should be authorized to sue the persons and the governments engaging in such violence. Criminal punishment is only a partial sanction against such violence. Negroes and civil rights workers injured in the effort to give meaning to the civil rights laws must be protected against the personal losses and damages they suffer when racists resort to violence in efforts to interfere with the exercise of constitutional rights.

2. To provide for enforcement of the fair housing provisions of the bill through an administrative agency rather than merely by permitting aggrieved individuals to initiate court litigation. Experience with voting discrimination and school desegregation has clearly proven that to put on individuals the burden of enforcing their constitutional rights through personal litigation would largely undermine the effectiveness of the protection contemplated by the Constitution and the Civil Rights statutes.

3. To include state and local governments under the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which now requires private businesses engaged in interstate commerce to provide equal opportunity in employment. The amendment we here urge would establish a procedure for giving meaning to the Constitutional obligation of state and local governments to refrain from racial discrimination in selecting and employing state and local government employees. We urge, moreover, that this amendment be coordinated with the amendments to Title VII, which the House of Representatives adopted on April 27, 1966 (H.R. 10065) (and which we support), authorizing the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce the law more effectively through administrative cease-and-desist orders, etc., rather than depending solely on negotiation.

4. To provide automatic standards for sending in jury commissioners (along the lines of the automatic provisions for sending in federal registrars under the 1965 Voting Rights Act) to end discrimination in jury service, rather than relying merely on litigation to enforce the provisions of the bill concerning nondiscrimination in jury service.

5. Our fifth recommendation deals primarily with the inadequate language of the bill in controlling sex discrimination in state jury service.

Section 201 of the bill now provides as follows:

"Sec. 201. No person or class of persons shall be denied the right to serve on grand and petit juries in any State court on account of race, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status."

We urge that it be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. It shall be unlawful to make any distinction on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status, in the qualifications for service, and in the selection of any person to serve on grand or petit juries in any state court."

We make this recommendation in order more effectively to deal with the widespread discrimination in jury service, on the basis of sex, which is current in at least some 25 states.

The President, in his State of the Union Message of January 12, 1966, promised to "propose legislation to establish unavoidable requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts." When Attorney General Katzenbach testified on the Administration's bill before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 on May 4, 1966, he told you that Title II of the bill "prohibits discrimination in state jury selection processes on account of race . . . sex . . ."

However, the present language of sec. 201 is not sufficient to effectuate the President's purpose. It may be adequate to reach efforts to "deny the right to serve" on a state jury such as now is denied on the basis of sex only by the laws of Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, partially in Florida, and in some circumstances in Louisiana, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Nebraska. But it would not reach the discriminatory jury selection practices based on sex in some 25 other states which discriminate between men and women solely on the basis of sex with respect to excuses or exemptions from jury service.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women vigorously urged the ending of these discriminations to assure "equal jury service without distinction as to sex." (See pp. 46–47, American Women, 1963). So have most of the women Members of Congress (See Congressional Record of March 1, 1966, pp. 4492–4494.)

We support their views and urge that sec. 201 be amended as set forth above, to effectuate fully the President's promise to have "unavoidable requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts."

We believe that this bill and the amendments we propose will strengthen the ideals for which we, as veterans of the armed forces of the United States fought and bled to preserve and enhance for ourselves and the future generations of America.

We would appreciate having this letter printed in the record of the hearings on the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Sincerely,

John S. Stillman,
National Chairman.
Ben Neufeld,
Vice Chairman.

Jackson, Mich.,
July 27, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: I am writing to you to urge you to lend your support of passing of title IV and every title of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 and passage of the leadership conference amendments.

I realize pressure is being put out by the Grosse Pointe and Detroit Real Estate Boards, as well as others, and it takes real courage to stand up against this unfair and untrue propaganda, so I want to offer you my support.

Francis Higgins.

Battle Creek, Mich.,
July 26, 1966.

Representative John Conyers,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I am white, I live in a suburb, and I hope that you will vote for an enforceable housing law, that will allow Negroes to live in any place that they can afford, just as white people can.

Sincerely,

Marie Duesenberg.

National Association
of Social Workers, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: In behalf of the 46,000 members of the National Association of Social Workers, I should like to urge your support for the 1966 Civil Rights Act. We feel this bill is an important and necessary partner to the civil rights legislation of recent years. We have a special concern that housing opportunities be made available in this country without regard to race, religion or national origin and trust that title IV can be amended to ensure that a realtor cannot accept any discriminatory listing from an owner.

Sincerely,

Melvin A. Glasser,
Chairman, Social Action Commission.

Nazareth College,
Nazareth, Mich., July 25, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: In the name of justice and economic liberty please support the '66 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV and the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Sincerely yours,

Sr. Marie Jesse Morrison, Ph. D.,
Professor of Mathematics.

Nazareth College,
Nazareth, Mich., July 25, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: May I take this opportunity to urge your support of the 1966 Civil Rights Act and especially of Title IV on Housing.

Unless and until our Government takes definite steps to protect the rights of the Negro and particularly to make it possible for him to live in a community that is representative of our democracy, we cannot expect him to be a desirable type of citizen.

Our present system of crowding Negroes into limited and undesirable areas of our cities and towns is fostering a situation similar to the proverbial tinderbox. It will be too late when the "lid" flies off. The current riots and unrest prevailing in our society are but an indication of what may happen unless the Negro is allowed to be free in the choice of his residence.

I am writing to you, Representative Conyers, since I feel you have been chosen as a member of the House Judiciary Committee because of your personal convictions and commitment to the welfare of our country which deeply involves the cause of minority groups, and I am confident also that you are a man of action according to our own standards.

Sincerely yours,

Sister Marie Arthur Trese, S.S.J.,
Academic Dean.

Church of St. Anthony,
Hillsdale, Mich., July 22, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: I would like to urge your support for the 1966 Civil Rights Act especially Title Four and the amendments suggested by the leadership conference on Civil Rights.

I hope that you will be able to support this legislation and to encourage the House Judiciary Committee to report the strengthened bill out of committee before the end of June.

Respectfully yours,

Donald L. Eder,
Pastor, St. Anthony's Church.

Lansing, Mich.,
July 21, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: I would like to urge you to support the 1966 Civil Rights Act, most specifically the fair housing section (Title IV), and the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

The organized campaign of the realtors is very much opposed to the constitution of our state. Please do all you can to see that justice is done.

Very truly yours,

Julie B. Savage.

Lansing Mich.,
July 20, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: I would like to take this opportunity to indicate my support for *some* kind of open occupancy housing law. I believe that the "voluntary" way of equal housing opportunity presently espoused by organized realtors and other conservative interest groups simply does not work. We need effective legislation. However, I am concerned about possible excessive abuses (as I understand the wording of the proposed Title IV) and feel that some compromise should be devised whereby the rights of property owners could also be protected. Could I suggest an amendment that would place the burden of proof of discrimination on the plaintiff? I'm not a lawyer, and don't know exactly how it would work, but I think some means could be devised to allay fears of average homeowners like myself that anyone could, under the proposed Act, by claiming discrimination, tie up the sale of their home in lengthy and costly litigation. In new subdivisions, which are built on speculation, it should definitely be "first come, first serve," regardless of race, religion, etc. If it is sale of an owner-occupied home, through a state-licensed realtor, it should also be "first come first serve," provided the individual is in a position to finance the home at that time. I don't think the "right to buy" and the "right to sell" are incompatible. I think some means can be reached which would give equal weight to both rights. I strongly support both rights.

My prayers are with you in your deliberations.

Charles Miller.

Holy Innocents Church,
Roseville, Mich.,
July 20, 1966.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I write you not so much for you to listen to me. This can be an all too easy yet dangerous road, as expediency usually is. Numbers do not necessarily make right.

Listen, rather, to the real needs of your fellow Americans. Listen to the silent cries of those suffering injustice, the injustice of discrimination, especially in regard to housing. Listen to their needs as they suffer at hands of those who cry that their "right of free choice" is being violated, or their pocketbook. Listen, their cries are really much louder and more crucial.

Support the Civil Rights Act of 1966, particularly Title IV. Support also the passage of the amendments of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rev. Gerald Chojnacki.

July 20.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I write to ask you to support the Civil Rights Act of 1966, especially Title IV of this bill.

I feel this bill will further aid racial justice in the U.S.

Thank you.

Barbara Bleicher.

St. Vincent Home,
Lansing, Mich., July 21, 1966.

Congressman J. Conyers,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers, may I please urge your support of the '66 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV and the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It is only by courageously supporting this bill that we can hope to achieve our objective.

Very sincerely yours,

Sister M. Vivian, S.S.J.

New Buffalo, Mich.,
July 21, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.

Dear Sir: May we urge your support of the 66 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV.

Yours truly,

Don Siegmund.

Hall of the Divine Child,
Monroe, Mich., July 19, 1966.

Dear Sir: As a voting citizen and urban dweller and school teacher, I have noticed the recent opposition throughout our country of the Civil Rights Acts, particularly that part in favor of fair housing. I urge you to support the Civil Rights Act of 1966, and particularly the Title IV. In addition I urge you to pass the Leadership Conference amendment.

Respectfully,

Helen Marie Weber.

Center Line, Mich.,
July 17, 1966.

Dear Representative Conyers: Thank you for your support and effort of the Civil Rights Bill of 1966 and in particular for working towards the Open Housing Amendment.

If only our closed housing suburb people could see that housing is a major key to the great urban problems. So much money is being expended on poverty programs while the real cause of the poverty remains untouched. I have worked with these programs enough to see that at best they are providing some relief. But how much of this help can have permanent effect in the present housing situation is most doubtful.

I know you will untiringly continue your efforts in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Lawinger.

Southfield, Mich.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
Member, House Judiciary Committee.

Dear Representative Conyers: We urge you to give your support to the fair housing section (Title IV) of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

It seems to me that it is about time for us white Americans to cut loose from the real estate boards and assert the right of *all* American citizens to freedom of choice as to where they shall live. As you know, the real estate people claim to be "neutral," to be acting merely as agents. Yet they have mounted quite a campaign against open occupancy, which they assert they do not oppose.

Open occupancy is crucial. Please do all you can for this Democratic and democratic Bill and Title IV especially.

Yours truly,

William P. Godfrey.

Dear Representative Conyers: I support the passage of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill, especially Title IV (dealing with fair housing practices), in as strong a form as is possible.

I believe this legislation to be necessary from a *moral* as well as a political point of view.

I consider this issue important enough to decide my vote in a future election.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Rosenberg, S.J.

Huntington Woods, Mich.,
July 5, 1966.

Mr. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I will gladly forego my "Freedom of Choice" if in exchange I am guaranteed my right to buy or rent a house or apartment where I choose if I have the necessary financial means.

Although, I am not a Negro, the slightest use of my imagination makes it clear to me that "Freedom of Choice", if I were a seller or renter of property would be an insignificant right compared to my right to buy or rent when and if I am on the other end of the stick.

In view of this strong feeling—the only one I can have while professing to be a sincere American and Christian—I urge your unqualified support of the 1966 Civil Rights Act.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Donald W. Runde.

St. Clair Shores, Mich.,
July 3, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: We cannot urge you strongly enough to support the '66 Civil Rights Act, bill H.R. 14765. We feel, as I am sure many other open-minded American citizens do, that it is only fair and extremely necessary that we give the same equal rights in housing to each and every person living in our country.

We would appreciate your support of this and your kind attention at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Ensroth.

Danville, Va.,
July 5, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: As American Citizens of this great Democracy, we urge you to vote in favor of Title IV of the Fair Housing Section of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Very truly yours,

Danville Council, National Council of Negro Women, Inc.,
By Ruth L. Harvey,
Chairman, Social Action Committee.

June 29, 1966.

Reply to:
Robert M. Kaufman, Esq.,
Proskauer, Rose, Goetz, Mendelsohn, Esqs.,
300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

My Dear Sir: Enclosed please find copy of report adopted by the Committee on Civil Rights of the New York County Lawyers' Association.

Very truly yours,

Vincent L. Broderick,
Chairman, Committee on Federal Legislation.

[Report No. F-5, New York Lawyers' Association, New York, N.Y., June 29, 1966]

Report of Committee on Civil Rights on S. 3296 and H.R. 14765

(Civil Rights Act of 1966)

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 (S. 3296 and H.R. 14765, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess.)[1] was sent to the Congress on April 28, 1966, with a message from the President of the United States and an accompanying letter from Attorney General Katzenbach. Numerous other bills relating to the general areas covered by S. 3296 and H.R. 14765 have been introduced in both Houses of Congress. The only action which has taken place with respect to these bills, is the completion of hearings before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and the commencement of hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Scope of the report

After reviewing the Administration Bill and the communications accompanying it, it was the opinion of the Committee that it wished to limit its comments to the provisions of three general areas of the Bill which are particularly susceptible of legal analysis, and as to which the Committee felt it could make a further contribution on the law.

The areas discussed in this report are:

1. Titles I and II, relating to the selection of juries in federal and state courts;
2. Title IV, relating to discrimination in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use and occupancy of housing; and
3. Title V, relating to interference with constitutional rights.

TITLES I AND II RELATING TO JURY SELECTION

Conclusion

The provisions of Titles I and II, relating to the nondiscriminatory selection of juries in federal and state courts are within the constitutional power of Congress and their enactment will promote the fair administration of justice.

Discussion

Titles I and II of the Administration Bill are designed to assure to a defendant in a criminal case and to the litigants in a civil case a fair trial by jury. The broad aim of the provisions is to eliminate the widespread exclusion of racial minorities and the economically disadvantaged from jury duty.

These titles seek to improve the quality of justice, by standardizing qualifications for jury service on a nationwide basis and putting them in line with contemporary needs and realities. They set up specific procedures with respect to the selection of federal juries, and for the challenge of state jury selection procedures, and provide for the maintenance and availability of adequate records to furnish the requisite statistical data and to permit the courts to deal with the problems on the basis of adequate information and experience. Overall, these titles represent an organized approach on how and whom to select for jury service and sets up both the administrative and judicial machinery to achieve that result.

The transmittal letter from the Attorney General stated that present statutes are inadequate and that they offer uncertain guidance to the courts and judicial administrators. It stated that: "While this uncertain system appears not to have operated unconstitutionally, [and this premise is subject to question] in some districts Negro representation on juries has been substantially less than the proportion of the Negroes in the community and other classes have sometimes been inadequately represented on juries." The Committee agrees with Mr. Katzenbach's views.

The Judicial Code of 1948, as later amended, made a sharp departure from the earlier federal statute which had made state laws determinative of jury qualification in federal courts. Present section 1861, which now deals with jury qualifications, provides that any citizen over 21, not a criminal and in sound mind, can serve if he can read, write and understand English.

The proposed Title I does not change these essential requirements; it elaborates upon them. By declaring a policy and providing detailed directions, it prescribes who may serve (i.e., even the economically disadvantaged) and, what may in practice be just as important, it sets out who should not be kept off the jury rolls. It re-emphasizes that a jury panel should be composed of a genuine cross-section of the community, and provides for one or more jury commissioners in each district with detailed directions as to the way in which names of potential jurors are to be selected and processed. It proposes that the commission must use never less than 2,000 names and at least 1% of the total names on voter registration lists or from the other sources specified.

While the Administration Bill recognizes the problems of fair jury selection existing particularly in sections of the South, it gives insufficient recognition to decisions condemning efforts calculated at engrafting a caste system on the law, even where that system was for the purpose of securing minority group representation. For example, in *State v. Collins,* 242 La. 704, 138 So. 2d 546 (1962) Collins, a Negro, was indicted, convicted and sentenced to death for rape and attempted murder of a white woman. At the time of Collins' arrest, there were no Negroes on the Grand Jury then sitting. Consequently, Collins was held in jail for six months until he could be indicted by a new Grand Jury. The new Grand Jury of twelve was drawn by lot from a list of twenty persons, six of whom were Negroes intentionally selected because of their race to achieve "fairness." The twelve Grand Jurors ultimately selected included seven whites and five Negroes. Collins was convicted. His conviction was ultimately affirmed by the Supreme Court of Louisiana and certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court, 371 U.S. 843 (1962). A petition for habeas corpus was then brought and denied by the District Court 215 F. Supp. 805 (E.D. La. 1963). On appeal, the Fifth Circuit reversed, 329 F. 2d 100 (1964), *cert. denied,* 379 U.S. 901, holding that Collins had been denied the equal protection of the laws. The Fifth Circuit based its decision on two grounds: first, that a Negro stands equal before the law and is viewed by the law as a person, not as a Negro thus Collins was denied equal protection when the Grand Jury was selected with reference to his race, Collins was entitled to have the charges against him considered by a jury in the selection of which there has been neither inclusion nor exclusion because of race. The Supreme Court which had earlier denied certiorari to review the affirmance of Collins' conviction by the Louisiana Supreme Court, then denied certiorari to the Fifth Circuit, thus letting stand their reversal. See also, *Martin v. Texas,* 200 U.S. 316 (1906); *Hill* v. *Texas,* 316 U.S. 400 (1942); *Avery v. Georgia,* 345 U.S. 559 (1953) on the issue of "non-selective" jury selection.

By providing procedures for judicial review of transgressions in state jury selection, and by giving the Attorney General the power to come in and petition the court to rectify prevailing conditions, the Administration Bill provides, in our opinion, a realistic remedy. One very useful aspect of the legislation is in the clinical approach which it adopts in reaching for a solution of the problem. It properly recognizes the need for more sophisticated sociological inquiry in this area, in which statistics have not always been helpful.

Historically, the jury was to be drawn from the locality in which the litigant lived or where the crime was committed, so that a party would have the benefit of his own good character and standing with his neighbors. The provisions of the Administration Bill relating to federal jury selection leave this concept intact. Furthermore there is no federal interference with state jury selection unless discrimination is proved. They do not attempt to take away the states' right to establish their own fair procedures is undiminished and state criminal juries are affected only if obvious abuses exist.

Although the federal courts have jurisdiction under the 14th amendment to determine whether a defendant has been accorded due process, and to void his conviction if he has not, it is more desirable to assure a defendant the equal protection of the laws in the first instance, than to have on occasion to free a convicted felon as a deterrent to improper jury selection. This, Titles I and II seek to accomplish. While the implementation of these Titles may create an additional interim burden upon the federal courts, this condition should not long endure. Once the proper impact of these Titles has been established their administration should operate smoothly and result in further implementation of the rights sought to be protected.

TITLE IV RELATING TO HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

Conclusion

The Committee concludes that the provisions of the Administration Bill relating to housing are within the constitutional power of Congress to enact. This opinion of constitutionality is based upon established principles of constitutional law relating both to the Commerce Clause and to the Fourteenth Amendment. Further, it is the Committee's opinion that a substantial portion of the ends sought by the Administration Bill may be achieved without legislative action through the expansion of the existing Executive Order on housing discrimination. We believe that the Bill would be strengthened by the insertion of specific congressional findings as to the facts upon which the enactment of the Bill is based, including a finding based upon evidence presented at the hearings that there is a rational connection between the housing transactions regulated in the bill and interstate commerce.

Constitutional basis of housing discrimination legislation

The power of Congress to enact the proposed provisions of Title IV is based both upon the Commerce Clause (implemented through the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution) and the Fourteenth Amendment (enforced through the "appropriate legislation" clause of section 5 of that Amendment). Together, the congressional power based upon these provisions may reach all aspects of housing sought to be covered by the Administration Bill.

Whether, in an analysis of the reach of the constitutional power of Congress, the national housing market is considered as a whole or in separate segments, the proposed legislation is within that reach. If the housing market is considered as a whole, it is imbued with broad and multifarous impacts upon interstate commerce and is affected broadly by local, state and federal action. On a segmented basis, most identifiable segments of the housing market are ones as to which the power of Congress is beyond serious question. These include housing which is built with federal or local government assistance, or by the federal or local governments themselves and housing which is financed by or with the assistance of any government agency. In the case of federal

---

[1] For the purposes of this report, S. 3296 and H.R. 14765, as introduced, will be referred to as the "Administration Bill."

participation, these activities are covered by the plenary power of Congress over federal expenditures and the constitutional duty of Congress to avoid discrimination in federal activities. In the case of local government participation, the duties of the States under the Fourteenth Amendment and the power of Congress to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment by "appropriate" legislation provide the constitutional anchor for federal legislation. Housing located in the many metropolitan areas which cross or abut on state lines, and newly constructed housing for which the materials must travel through interstate commerce have an obvious impact on interstate commerce. Similarly, new construction and sales of existing housing which are financed in the interstate financial markets are reached through the commerce power over the flow of credit. It has been suggested that there is a major gap in the power of Congress to reach that portion of the housing market consisting of rental (without new financing) of existing units in old housing in non-multi-state housing markets. However, the Congressional power under the Commerce Clause and the Fourteenth Amendment so pervades each of the other areas of the housing market that it must, of necessity, also reach this last single segment. The relatively small size of this last segment is indicated by data in the 1960 U.S. Census of Housing. At that time over 25% of housing units were less than 10 years and 3 months old—(representing movement of new housing materials and labor in commerce) and 70% of the population moved into its present housing units within those 10 years and 3 months (representing movement of persons within and between the States). In any case, on the basis of the principles of constitutional law discussed below, it is our opinion that this segment of the housing market is such an integral part of the total market for available housing that Congress may reach it in legislating as to housing as a whole.

The Congressional power over commerce relating to the financial affairs of the nation supports the constitutionality of the Administration Bill in two ways:

1. With respect to the Bill's specific prohibition discriminatory practices in the making of mortgage loans and other financing incident to the purchase of real estate.

2. With respect to the effect of discriminatory practices in the sale and rental of housing upon the volume of such sales and rentals and upon new construction of housing, affecting the demand for, and availability of, capital funds in interstate commerce.

Mortgage lending today necessarily involves much interstate movement of credit as a result of the heavy volume of interstate lending done by finance institutions. This assertion is substantiated by a study undertaken by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Federal Reserve System in 1952. One of the findings stated:

"The data nevertheless suggest that an appreciable part of the funds for financing real estate in the Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Dallas Districts comes from the financial districts such as Boston and New York, and from Chicago and San Francisco . . . . The movement of funds from one part of the country to another has been encouraged by investors seeking outlets for large amounts of funds. . . . Both institutional and noninstitutional registrants participate in this movement of funds. Insurance companies and other institutional lenders hold large amounts of loans on real estate located at a distance and in many instances have them serviced by noninstitutional lenders close to the properties." (Real Estate Loans of Registrants Under Regulation X, 38 Fed. Reserve Bull. 620, 627, 621 (1952).)

Even where a mortgage is initially procured from a small local lender, it may be sold subsequently to a large out-of-state financing institution. Thus. the original lender affects interstate commerce. Numerous cases have held that a business need not be *in* interstate commerce to be subject to Federal regulation—it is sufficient that the business *affects* interstate commerce.

"The source of the restraint may be intrastate, as the making of a contract or combination usually is; the application of the restraint may be intrastate, as it often is; but neither matters if the necessary effect is to stifle or restrain commerce among the states. If it is interstate commerce that feels the pinch, it does not matter how local the operation which applies the squeeze." *United States v. Women's Sportswear Mfrs. Ass'n.*, 336 U.S. 460, 464 (1949).

Money plays a crucial role in the general housing picture. Few builders have sufficient working capital to engage in construction without the benefit of mortgage loans and must depend on long-term mortgage financing from insurance companies, savings banks, commercial banks, savings and loan associations and federal programs of financing.

It is now beyond serious question that the flow of credit and lending is an interstate activity. This issue was settled in *United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n.*, 322 U.S. 533 (1944), which determined that fire insurance companies dealt in interstate commerce for the purposes of application of the Sherman Act. Justice Black, writing for the Court, concluded:

"Perhaps no modern commercial enterprise directly affects so many persons in all walks of life as does the insurance business. Insurance touches the home, the family, and the occupation or the business of almost every person in the United States." (at page 540).

In answer to the argument that individual financial transactions are intrastate only, the Court stated:

"True, many of the activities . . . which constituted this chain of events [the insurance contract, negotiations, payments, communications, etc.] might . . . be regarded as wholly local." But "[a]ll . . . constituted a single continuous chain of events, many of which were multistate in character . . ." Ibid, at 537.

In *N.L.R.B. v. Northern Trust Co.*, 56 F. Supp. 335, 336 (N.D. Ill. 1944), the district court stated that the reasoning of the Supreme Court in *National Polish Alliance v. N.L.R.B.*, 322 U.S. 643 (1944) "brings the ordinary business of a bank, other perhaps than a very small local bank, within the meaning of the term interstate commerce." See also *N.L.R.B. v. Bank of America*, 130 F. 2d 624, 626 (9th Cir. 1942), describing the interstate nature of a bank's business. The Commerce Clause is also, in our opinion, able to reach factors which affect the demand for, and flow of, housing materials and labor for new construction and for maintenance, in interstate commerce.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court in *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294 (1964) is in point on this issue. That case, upholding the constitutionality of the public accommodations provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, dealt with a restaurant in Birmingham, Alabama which was not on an interstate highway and could be found to have primarily local business. The Court dealt with this point as follows:

"It goes without saying that, viewed in isolation, the volume of food purchased by Ollie's Barbecue from sources supplied from out of state was insignificant when compared with the total foodstuffs moving in commerce. But, as our late Brother Jackson said for the Court in *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942): 'That appellee's own contribution to the demand for wheat may be trivial by itself is not enough to remove him from the scope of federal regulation where, as here, his contribution, taken together with that of many others similarly situated, is far from trivial.' At 127–128." (At pages 300–301)

* * * * *

"The power of Congress in this field is broad and sweeping; where it keeps within its sphere and violates no express constitutional limitation it has been the rule of this Court, going back almost to the founding days of the Republic, not to interfere." (At page 305)

The Supreme Court decision in *N.L.R.B.* v. *Denver Building & Construction Trades Council*, 341 U.S. 675 (1951), clearly illustrates that interference with the flow of building materials across state lines constitutes a burden on interstate commerce. The Court held that the commerce clause gave the NLRB jurisdiction over a dispute in the building trade because the disagreement might have prevented building materials from crossing state lines. See *United States* v. *Employing Plasterers Ass'n. of Chicago*, 347 U.S. 186 (1954), in which a complaint alleging a conspiracy to suppress competition among Chicago plastering contractors affecting the flow of plastering material into Illinois was held to state a cause of action; also see *United States* v. *Employing Lathers Ass'n. of Chicago*, 347 U.S. 198 (1954).

The applicability of the Commerce Clause to housing is further supported by the generally broad interpretations given in various other areas. Courts have usually been ready to find interstate commerce in cases which otherwise satisfy statutory requirements. Thus, they have found that interstate commerce is burdened by the activities of janitors in a building where some of the offices did interstate work, *N.L.R.B.* v. *Tri-State Casualty Insurance Co.*, 188 F. 2d 50 (10th Cir. 1951) [Labor Management Relations Act of 1947], by the labor practices of a newspaper with an out-of-state circulation of ½ of 1%, *Mabee* v. *White Plains Publishing Co.*, 327 U.S. 178 (1946) [Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938], and by the price of milk which is produced and sold intrastate but which competes with milk shipped from outside the state, *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.*, 315 U.S. 110 (1942) [Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937].

In the building trades area, the Court in *N.L.R.B.* v. *Austin Co.*, 165 F. 2d 592 (7th Cir. 1947), held that:

"In this case it is obvious that interstate could be affected by industrial strife in the Chicago office. Any interference due to an unfair labor practice in the transmission of the blueprints in interstate commerce necessarily would retard construction and would disrupt the flow of building materials traveling in interstate commerce. This would constitute sufficient cause to bring respondent within the Act, because 'Interstate communication of a business nature, whatever the means of such communication, is interstate commerce regulable by Congress under the Constitution.' *Associated Press* v. *N.L.R.B.*, 301 U.S. 103."

The reach of the Commerce Clause to regulate what may at first glance appear to be purely local transactions, but which are part of a national market, has been made clear by the Supreme Court in its interpretations of the Commerce Clause. See, *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100 (1941); *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942) and cases cited therein. In the *Darby* case a unanimous Supreme Court held that Congress had ample authority to regulate the employment standards of workers whose jobs were performed entirely within the boundaries of a single state when some part of their work product (lumber) was shipped in interstate commerce. Similarly, in the *Wickard* case the Supreme Court upheld marketing penalties imposed for failure to comply with established quotas, even in connection with wheat grown for consumption on the farm. It is clear that the power of Congress under the Commerce Clause is not limited by the size of any particular regulated activity or of an individual's participation therein; rather, Congress is to be guided by the impact which the aggregate of similar activity has upon commerce. Speaking to this point, the Court in the *Wickard* case stated:

"That appellee's own contribution to the demand for wheat may be trivial by itself is not enough to remove him from the scope of federal regulation where, as here, his contribution, taken together with that of many other similarly situated, is far from trivial." Ibid. at 127–128

The Court also left no doubt as to the scope of Congressional power under the Commerce Clause when it remarked in the *Darby* case at page 115:

"The motive and purpose of a regulation of interstate commerce are matters for the legislative judgment upon the exercise of which the Constitution places no restriction and over which the courts are given no control."

The fact that the construction of a single house is involved likewise appears to afford no exemption from regulation by Congress if it chooses to invoke its full power under the Commerce Clause.

While the Commerce Clause is a principal bulwark to the constitutionality of Title IV, the Administration Bill contains no specific findings by Congress that discrimination in housing has any effect on interstate commerce.

The Committee urges that such findings be incorporated in the Bill and recommends their addition to Title IV.

Only recently, in *Heart of Atlanta Motel* v. *United States,* 379 U.S. 241, 258, 272, 279 (1964), the Court again indicated the usefulness to the courts of Congressional findings in establishing the necessary rational connection between the local activity to be regulated and interstate commerce. In analyzing the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Court observed that "the Act as adopted carried no Congressional findings." 379 U.S. at 252. The Court then comments at length on testimony and evidence adduced at Congressional hearings prior to passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 showing that racial discrimination in motels did indeed affect interstate commerce adversely. 379 U.S. at 252–253.

A similar analysis of the Congressional hearings and a similar comment that no legislative findings were made by Congress when passing the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is contained in *Katzenbach* v. *McClung,* 379 U.S. 294, 295, 296 (1964). The Court made the following statement of the rule governing the power of Congress to exercise its regulatory authority under the Commerce Clause:

"The commerce power invoked here by the Congress is a specific and plenary one authorizd by the Constitution itself. The only questions are: (1) whether Congress had *a rational basis* for finding that racial discrimination by motels affecting commerce, and (2) if it had such a basis, whether the means it selected to eliminate that evil are reasonable and appropriate." (Emphasis supplied) (*Heart of Atlanta Motel* v. *United States,* 379 U.S. 241, 258–59 (1964).)

Heart of Atlanta and *Katzenbach* makes it apparent that the courts would be aided in finding a "rational basis" for Congressional regulation of discrimination in housing under the Commerce Clause if detailed legislative findings were included as a part of Title IV, even though such findings by Congress "are not necessary." *Katzenbach* v. *McClung,* 379 U.S. 294, 299 (1964). There is ample precedent in statutes for such findings by Congress. See *e.g.* Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 786; Public Utility Holding Co. Act of 1935, 15 U.S.C. § 79a; Trust Indenture Act of 1939, 15 U.S.C. § 77bbb; Investment Advisers Act of 1940, 15 U.S.C. § 80b–1; Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 202; Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act), 29 U.S.C. § 141, see also 29 U.S.C. § 151; Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act, 29 U.S.C. § 301; Tobacco Inspection Act, 7 U.S.C. § 511a; Agricultural Adjustment Act, 7 U.S.C. § 601 and § 1311; Colored Oleomargarine Act, 21 U.S.C. § 347a. Such findings of fact have been of aid to the Court in establishing the requisite "rational basis" for Congressional regulation under the Commerce Clause in the past. See, *e.g.* *N.L.R.B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.,* 301 U.S. 1, 23, 37, (1937) upholding the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 under the Commerce Clause. Section 1 of that Act (29 U.S.C. § 151) as it then existed was cited and quoted in full by the court which stated that "it is primarily for Congress to consider [whether a burden to interstate commerce exists under the Commerce Clause] and decide the fact of the danger and meet it." Similarly, in *United States* v. *Darby,* 312 U.S. 100, 109 (1941) the Fair Labor Standards Act was upheld under the Commerce Clause with detailed reference to legislative findings contained in 29 U.S.C.A. § 202, as it then existed. See also *Block* v. *Hirsh,* 256 U.S. 135, 154 (1921); *Borden's Farm Prods. Co.* v. *Baldwin,* 293 U.S. 194, 209 (1934); *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board,* 367 U.S. 1, 94 (1961).

Past court decisions also make clear that where the Commerce Clause is not invoked specifically in a statute, as in sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which were declared unconstitutional in the *Civil Rights Cases* 109 U.S. 3, (1883), there is danger that the enactment may not be considered a statute regulating commerce.

Additional fourteenth amendment support

We do not wish to imply, by our detailed discussion of the Commerce Clause as an adequate constitutional support for proposed Title IV, that this clause is the sole constitutional basis available to the Congress for the coverage of much of the housing to be reached by the Administration Bill. There are equally persuasive cases under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments setting out the specific power of Congress to enforce the substantive guarantees of these amendments by appropriate legislation. To the extent that federal or local governmental action (either at the present time or in the sufficiently recent past to create presently existing effects) has caused the existence of conditions which Title IV seeks to remedy, the Equal Protection Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments apply to such acts and empower Congress to enact broad legislation to deal with them, so long as such legislation can rationally be found to be "appropriate".

Without feeling it necessary to discuss the applicability of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to these situations in greater detail, the Committee urges that such constitutional basis be given appropriate weight in both the findings and the enforcement provisions of Title IV. Such dual constitutional basis is neither unusual nor inappropriate. Much legislation is expressly founded upon more than one power of Congress and the Supreme Court has in the past relied upon multiple constitutional support in upholding the validity of various statutes, e.g., *Board of Trustees* v. *United States,* 289 U.S. 48 (1933); *Ashwander* v. *TVA,* 297 U.S. 288 (1936).

Coverage of public housing in title IV

The committee wishes to call the attention of the Congress to an important omission in the coverage of the proposed legislation even in conjunction with the existing Executive Order. The Administration Bill does not appear to cover housing owned or operated by local or national government agencies which are not listed among the "persons" to whom the legislation is to apply. Even if the existing Executive Order is retained in power and effect, there is no coverage of public housing erected under contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962, the cutoff date in the Executive Order. This is an irrational distinction which might well be unconstitutional. While such discrimination is already barred under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment cases brought by individual plaintiffs, there is no reason why the legislation should not specifically direct itself against this glaring problem. It is our recommendation that any ambiguity in this respect be resolved through the inclusion in the coverage of Title IV of national, state or local government and all instrumentalities thereof.

Extension of the existing Executive order on housing

This committee has previously reported[3] on the legal basis of Executive Order 11063, issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, which directed various federal agencies to take action with respect to discriminatory practices in housing. This Executive Order is still in effect. At the time of that report, this committee concluded that the Executive Order was based on sound and well established constitutional grounds and that it was well within the authority of the President—and his duty—to enforce the Constitution of the United States; that it did not establish any new rights which did not heretofore exist but established new procedures and directives for their enforcement; that the exclusion of certain contracts for the financing of housing entered into prior to the effective date of the order was not based on any appropriate legal distinction; and that the power of the President to enforce the Constitution extended substantially beyond the scope of the Executive Order and that the executive power to implement public policy through the inclusion of contract provisions extended even further.

The committee recommended then, and repeats its recommendation now:

1. That the Executive Order be amended to cover all public housing, irrespective of when constructed; all urban renewal projects, irrespective of when contracted for; and all other housing programs to which Federal grants, loans or subsidies are made.

2. That the Executive Order be amended to include subsequent sale or lease of property covered by FHA or VA insurance, on the ground that such sale or transfer subject to FHA or VA mortgages is a new action which should extend to new individuals the benefits of Federal action after the date of the Executive Order.

3. That the recommendation of the United States Civil Rights Commission with respect to the elimination of discriminatory practices in mortgage loans by Federally supervised mortgage lending institutions be given early implementation, through the use of the contract power or other proper tools of Federal supervision and action, with a minimum interference with concepts of free enterprise consistent with achieving effective results.

4. That the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission with respect to housing in Washington, D.C., which should be a model community demonstrating American freedom and equal opportunity in housing, be implemented at an early date by the Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

The Committee believes that the first step in the extension of anti-discrimination protection in the field of housing should take place through the further extension of the existing Executive Order. There is no constitutional or practical conflict between the full implementation of the President's power through Executive Orders, and either the pendency or the enactment of legislation dealing with the same area, so long as there is no specific conflict with such legislation after enactment or preemption of the President's power thereby. We will not repeat in this report the discussion of constitutional principles upon which our conclusions and recommendations were based in 1963. Suffice it to say, however, that all of the decisions rendered by the courts since that time have, to the extent applicable, reenforced the constitutional discussions presented at that time.

---

[3] Equal Opportunity in Housing—The President's Executive Order, A Report of the Committee on Civil Rights, New York County Lawyers' Association, Spring, 1963.

This committee therefore now renews its recommendation for the immediate promulgation of an Executive Order expanding the scope of the existing order carrying out the recommendations set forth above. Such action would have the following benefits:

1. It will expand federal action against discrimination in housing to a substantially larger area without the delay inherent in the present debate over the Administration Bill.

2. The flexibility in operation of an Executive Order makes it desirable to use such mechanism to as broad an extent as possible. It may well be that, in any case, the implementation of the Administration Bill, when enacted, will require executive or departmental orders similar in scope to those which may already be adopted.

3. The enforcement of constitutional rights have, in recent years, developed through a well balanced combination of action by the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. It is the responsibility of the executive branch to carry out its powers in this respect to the greatest extent possible and not to waive such responsibility to the legislative branch. The power to act through Executive Order, particularly in the field of contract provisions, is an executive responsibility.

THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V RELATING TO INTERFERENCE WITH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Title V would impose new criminal penalties upon any person who interferes either directly or by acts of intimidation or reprisal with the enjoyment of specified activities on account of race, religion or national origin. The provisions are operative whether the interference is directed at the actual participants in the enumerated activities or at other persons. Title V also increases existing penalties for violation of constitutional rights and makes them commensurate with the degree of crime committed.

It is beyond question that Congress has the constitutional power to punish interference with the exercise of rights arising out of the Constitution and to apply appropriate punishment upon conviction of such acts. The Committee believes that the constitutional basis for such Congressional action, and for the protection of individuals who aid those directly asserting their constitutional rights, is now beyond question. Whether such rights arise out of the nature of national citizenship; the rights created by federal statutes enacted under the Commerce Clause or the Fifth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments or the right to vote in federal elections; or any other basis for federal action is immaterial. The specific enumeration of the protected rights in Title V is an appropriate method by which Congress can eliminate any ambiguity as to the intended breadth of coverage. None of the enumerated areas in which protection is offered are outside the federal power as elaborated by existing judicial decisions.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

It is the opinion of the committee that the purposes of the Administration Bill, and particularly of Title IV as described in the statement of policy (§ 401), are laudable and necessary implementations of present policies which are intended to put to an end the remaining vestiges of the Negro's social, political and economic disadvantages based solely upon his race. New York State has been a leader in the enactment of legislation dealing with this problem, and New York's experience in operating under such legislation can be of immense assistance to any federal effort in the same area.

The proposed legislation seeks to fulfill the promise of equality inherent in the Emancipation Proclamation, the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, and the long and continuing struggle of minority group citizens of our nation for equal treatment based upon merit rather than upon the color of their skin or their religion. Discrimination in the selection of juries and in the availability of decent housing has been a continued blot upon the American image at home and abroad. Racial living patterns created by housing discrimination are basic causes of many other inequalities, such as de facto school segregation, unequal employment opportunities and unequal recreational opportunities. The arbitrary denial to American citizens not only of their rights but of their security and lives by those who feel that they need fear no punishment must finally end.

It is incumbent upon all branches of government to redeem the promise of a century ago; in particular, the executive and legislative branches must take the initiative in providing laws and practices to end the effects of these 100 years of shame.

This is the 100th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 which proclaimed the equal rights of all citizens to purchase and hold real and personal property. Thus, it is particularly appropriate that the Congress make these rights meaningful in the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Civil Rights, New York County Lawyers' Association: Robert M. Kaufman, Chairman, Peter D. Andreoli, Harold Baer, Jr., Michael A. Bamberger, William C. Breed, Jr., Helen L. Buttenwieser, Porter R. Chandler, Saul C. Downes, Arthur Q. Funn, Julius L. Goldstein, Richard W. Hulbert, Philip Kazon, John J. Loflin, Harold Mitherz, Stoddard D. Platt, Sol Rabkin, Guy G. Ribaudo, Robert K. Ruskin, Cora T. Walker, Thomas G. Weaver, Henry Weiner.

St. John the Baptist R. C. Church,
Scottdale, Pa., June 28, 1966.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I am formerly from Michigan. I urge your wholehearted support of Civil Rights Act of 1966. This includes the important section Title IV. Please give this your honest and wholehearted backing. The Negro American has a right to be free and this includes free from forced housing.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. Patrick J. O'Connor,
Codirector Auth. Intersocial Council,
Diocese of Greensburg, Pa.

Greater Pittsburgh Fair Housing Movement,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 24, 1966.

Dear Congressman: Title IV of the Administration's Civil Rights legislation (S. 3296 and H.R. 17455) which will come before your legislative body in the near future provides for preventatives to discrimination in the sale or rental of housing on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Though Pennsylvania and the City of Pittsburgh have fair housing laws, it is extremely important that freedom of residence become a national policy. Until city and state fair housing legislation can be supported by national policy the ability to make progress in all other areas of Civil Rights will be impaired.

Segregated neighborhoods are the fundamental cause of many social and racial problems we are experiencing today. Problems of de facto segregation in the schools for example arise because housing is segregated. It is unrealistic to suppose that we can effectively accomplish what is present public policy with respect to education without correspondingly having a public policy against discrimination in housing.

Problems of poverty, on which we are spending millions of dollars, have little chance of being resolved unless we provide an opportunity for the person we helped to come-out-from-under, to get out of the degrading and stifling environment they are in. Again for our public policy against poverty to have meaning we must also have a public policy against discrimination in housing.

Irregardless of whether you accept or reject the immorality of segregated housing patterns we cannot legitimately call America a free and open society unless we in fact make it free and open to all our citizens regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The time has come for you as a lawmaker to turn the light of reason on an area of darkness and turn away from emotional appeals of fear and prejudice and to see that justice rules.

For your information we are attaching a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Greater Pittsburgh Fair Housing Movement at a public meeting held June 15, 1966.

We ask, therefore, that you use your influence and your vote to insure that Title IV in fact becomes national public policy along with the other provisions of the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Sincerely,
Greater Pittsburgh Fair Housing Movement.

Resolutions Adopted by Representatives of the Greater Pittsburgh "Fair Housing Movement"

Whereas, Members of this group assembled here tonight have registered a commitment to the fundamental principle of equality for all, and

Whereas, Having demonstrated this commitment through personal actions in the quest for fair housing practices, and

Whereas, They recognize the Fair Housing Movement to be under attack by the Real Estate industry: be it hereby

Resolved, That this group, in its concern for the expansion of equality for all, recommends that persons of like concern immediately send letters to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Honorable Emanuel Celler, and Pennsylvania's United States Senators and Congressmen registering their support of Title IV of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill (H.R. 14765 and S. 3296); and be it further

Resolved, That this group recommends that all citizens register their concern for these objectives through maximum usage of "letter to the Editor" columns in their local and metropolitan newspapers; and be it further

Resolved, That this group recommends that each fair housing group purchase space in their respective local newspapers for the purpose of registering their support of pending federal fair housing legislation and reacting to the current attack by the Board of Realtors; and be it further

Resolved, That this group assembled here tonight begin the solicitation of monies to purchase space in the metropolitan newspapers and further designates the Allegheny County Council on Civil Rights to receive contributions for this purpose. (Note: Checks should be made to Allegheny County Council on Civil Rights—Title IV; and be it further

Resolved, That this group recommends that citizens inform their local realtors of their disapproval of the Pittsburgh Board of Realtors negative, action respecting fair housing and further requests these realtors to disclaim this action by refusing to pay the five dollars assessed by the Board of Realtors; and be it further

Resolved, That this the leadership of the Movement form an Ad-Hoc Committee to act as a coordinator for future actions in this immediate situation; and be it further

Resolved, That this Ad-Hoc Committee initiate a formal complaint to the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission and the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations on the basis that, the tension creating action of the Greater Pittsburgh Board of Realtors constitutes a threat to the welfare of the Community; and be it further

Resolved, That this Ad-Hoc Committee request the Attorney General of the State of Pennsylvania, investigate whether illegal common law restraints of trade are practiced by realtors, individually or in their trade association or multi-list organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That this Ad-Hoc Committee send copies of this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Pennsylvania's United States Senators and Congressmen, State and Local Public Officials and others whom it sees fit at the same time requesting their support of Title IV of the pending 1966 Civil Rights Bill.

This meeting was held at the request of the Fair Housing Movement at Holy Rosary School Gymnasium, 7120 Kelly Street (Homewood) June 15, 1966 at 7:30 p.m.

Lincoln University, Pa.,
June 20, 1966.

Mr. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I am writing to support Title IV and every Title of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. In addition I strongly urge your support of the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

I fully agree with the editorial in *The New York Times* for June 14, 1966.

At some point, hopefully, we will not need legislation of this kind to assure a free, open and democratic society. But now we do.

We can surely help erase the contradictions between America's actions and her creed by getting on with the business of democracy, properly understood.

Sincerely yours,
Charles V. Hamilton,
Chairman, Department of Political Science.

Washington, D.C., *June 21, 1966.*

John Conyers, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your vote for civil rights bill including fair housing plus Leadership Conference amendments.

The Reverend John B. Morris,
Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity.

June 17, 1966.

Representative Conyers: The Social Action Committee of our church urges passage of Title IV of the '66 Civil Rights Act.

I personally urge its passage. Mr. Levit made a good point when he said in effect that the bill would support real estate people who might be inclined toward open housing.

Walter H. Bishop,
President, Tennessee Valley Unitarian Church, Knoxville, Tenn.

Mercy Hospital,
Davenport, Iowa, June 23, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conyers: I urge you to work for the passage of the Civil Rights Bill of 1966, and especially to make certain that Title IV, the fair-housing section is left in the bill. Unless we have freedom of housing, the civil rights legislation already passed will be less effective.

Trusting that you will do all in your power to get this bill passed retaining Title IV, I remain,

Sincerely,
Sister Mary Ludmilla, R.S.M.,
Administrator.

Greenbelt Community Church,
Greenbelt, Md., June 26, 1966.

Dear Mr. Conyers: The following resolution was adopted on Saturday, May 21, 1966 by the Potomac Association of The United Church of Christ. The Potomac Association of ministers and delegates represents 22 churches in the Washington area composed of 10,288 members.

"Be it resolved that: The Potomac Association of the United Church of Christ endorses the objectives of the pending Federal Fair Housing legislation as being consistent with Christian principles and Democratic practices. We further express our belief that open occupancy housing patterns will increase understanding among our citizens and be a positive benefit to our nation."

Miss Joan Haner,
Scribe.
Mr. Harold Hufendick,
Moderator.
Rev. Kenneth B. Wyatt,
Secretary.

Leadership Conference on
Civil Rights,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1966.

Dear Mr. Congressman: This editorial from the *Sunday New York Times* for July 24 is such an apt presentation of the case for a meaningful civil rights bill that we wish to call it to your attention.

We, of course, agree with U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach on the scope of the Mathias amendment to Title IV. It does not permit brokers to accept discriminatory listings and it should not. We hope you will oppose any attempt to exempt brokers.

We also believe the addition of the seemingly innocent word "lawfully" to Title V of the bill, seriously limits the protections of that section and makes open game of civil rights workers and Negroes who may be charged with trespass or loitering in the course of asserting their constitutional rights.

There are other changes in the bill that we would like to see, but surely the Times is correct in saying that "the protection of the housing section against further enfeeblement and the restoration of the antiviolence section to its full effectiveness are the challenging decisions now before the House."

We respectfully urge you to vote against amendments that may weaken the bill further and to support any effort to strengthen it.

Sincerely yours,
Arnold Aronson, *Secretary.*

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1966]

The Civil Rights Bill

When the House of Representatives takes up the civil rights bill on Monday, it will have to make two difficult but crucial decisions.

The first is on Title IV, which is intended to stop racial discrimination in the sale and rental of property. This section as drafted by the Justice Department was excellent and needed no revision. Unfortunately, a bipartisan majority of the House Judiciary Committee yielded to the selfish clamor of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and approved an amendment offered by Representative Mathias of Maryland.

The purpose of the Mathias amendment was to exempt the sale of one-family houses and the rental of small apartment houses (four apartments or less) in which the owner occupies one of the units. This amendment would leave nearly two-thirds of the existing housing in the nation outside the scope of the bill and maintain the lily-white suburbs intact. Moreover, Representative Mathias told reporters that his amendment would permit a real estate broker to discriminate against Negroes when requested to do so by the seller of an exempt property.

Attorney General Katzenbach last week advised a Senate committee, however, that the amendment would exempt owners only if they themselves tried to sell or rent their properties. A broker would not be legally immune if he discriminated, even though he were acting under instructions from the owner. Since most property is sold through real estate agents, Mr. Katzenbach's interpretation renders the Mathias amendment relatively innocuous. The test for the House will come if Mr. Mathias attempts to strengthen his amendment to make it possible for brokers to discriminate.

The second critical test on the bill concerns the Judiciary Committee's insertion of the seemingly innocent and honorable word "lawfully" into Title V. This section of the bill is designed to punish acts of violence against civil rights workers and Negroes which occur when these persons are exercising their constitutional rights. The insertion of the word "lawfully" in this context tears a great, gaping hole in the bill.

Over and over again, civil rights demonstrators in Southern towns have been arrested for loitering, jaywalking, trespassing, or parading without a permit. Because a man is jaywalking, should he be tear-gassed? Because a man is "trespassing" on public property, should he be beaten with nightsticks or set upon by police dogs? It was precisely to prevent such violence, much of it committed under the thin color of legality, that Title V was drafted.

The bill has several excellent provisions, notably the improved procedure for nondiscriminatory selection of jurors. It could be further strengthened by providing financial indemnification in cases of death or injury resulting from civil rights activity. But the protection of the housing section against further enfeeblement and the restoration of the antiviolence section to its full effectiveness are the challenging decisions now before the House.

Washington, D.C.,
July 22, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you to be present Monday on vote scheduled for approximately 2 p.m. setting up 10 hours debate and vote on 1966 Civil Rights Act. On behalf of the UAW executive board and membership we ask your support against all weakening amendments and support for strengthening amendments recommended by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Roy L. Reuther,
Director Citizenship-Legislative Department, United Auto Workers.

Washington, D.C.,
July 22, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 next week gives the House another opportunity to correct old injustices and to protect the rights of American citizens. We respectfully urge you to be present when the House convenes Monday and to vote for taking up the bill (H.R. 14765). We also urge you to vote against any attempt to weaken the bill and to support efforts to strengthen it. We know you share our hope this this bill will prove another milestone on the road we travel to obtain full equality through legislative process.

Roy Wilkins,
Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

National Council of
Catholic Women,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1966.

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the statement of the National Council of Catholic Women in support of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

This statement represents a resolution of our 10 million members who are working at the local level in support of the bill.

We are most anxious that you consider our statement and the recommendations as you proceed with the bill in the House Judiciary Committee. We are looking forward to seeing a much strengthened bill emerge from your committee.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marcus Kilch,
President, NCCW.

National Council of
Catholic Women,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1966.

The Honorable Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Celler: Attached is the statement of the National Council of Catholic Women in support of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

We are most anxious that it be included in the record and considered by the members of the House Judiciary Committee relative to the hearings now being held on this bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marcus Kilch,
President.

Statement of the National Council of Catholic Women on H.R. 14765

The National Council of Catholic Women has been involved in the struggle for interracial justice since 1948. Our commitment is based on the recognition of man's human dignity, on the belief that each man is a unique individual, created by God, and as such, entitled to live under conditions most conducive to realizing his innate dignity.

We have engaged in the creation of understanding and communication between the races in our communities and have worked to educate ourselves and others in the causes of interracial tension.

We actively sought passage of the civil rights legislation of 1964 and 1965 and have continued to press for the strong enforcement of these laws.

We have reviewed the "Civil Rights Act of 1966," H.R. 14765, and strongly recommend its passage. Two statements adopted by our Board of Directors at their January 1966, meeting are particularly relevant:

HOUSING

We are aware that housing directly affects the stability and health of family life, and that many of our citizens do not enjoy the right to buy or rent decent homes in neighborhoods suitable to their means and family goals. We join the President of the United States in urging legislation to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

JUSTICE IN THE COURTS

NCCW expresses deep concern for the cause of justice in the courts resulting from the acquittals of the Alabama slayers of Jonathan Daniels, Rev. James Reeb, and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo.

Though we affirm our belief in the validity of the jury system, we believe the system itself is on trial so long as these juries are not representative of the community.

We urge the Attorney General be empowered to require nondiscrimination in jury selection in federal and state courts.

We further urge legislation to prohibit intimidation, attack and murder of civil rights workers and other citizens seeking to exercise their constitutional and civil rights.

We further urge that H.R. 14765 be strengthened to assure its enforcement. We would recommend:

1. Civil indemnification for the victims of civil rights violence and for those persons injured because of their race or color, while trying to exercise their rights.
2. The enforcement of the fair housing provision by an administrative agency.
3. A more automatic method of instituting procedures for ending jury discrimination.
4. The inclusion of state and local government employees under the coverage of Title VII, the Equal Employment Section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

YWCA,
June 8, 1966.

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: We are enclosing for your information a copy of the letter which the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A. sent to Congressman Celler concerning our support for the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 (H.R. 14765).

The shooting of Mr. James Meredith gives added urgency to the necessity of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Jean M. Whittet,
Bureau of Research and Program Resources.

National Board of the Young
Women's Christian Association
of the U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., May 31, 1966.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Celler: The National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A. would like to register its support of the proposed civil rights legislation incorporated in H.R. 14765, and request that this fact be noted in the record of the Judiciary Committee hearings on this bill.

We are glad to associate ourselves with the testimony already presented by Mr. Roy Wilkins of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights in behalf of the cooperating organizations who have worked together to support the civil rights legislation which your committee has developed.

We would also hope that the proposals which the Leadership Conference has made to strengthen H.R. 14765 be given due consideration.

As the enclosed copy of our letter to Attorney General Katzenbach indicated, the National Board of the YWCA has already indicated its concern for the strengthening of the civil rights laws enacted in 1964 and 1965. We are particularly glad to note in the new proposals measures to assure that all qualified persons should have the opportunity to serve on juries. We would particularly urge that all discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as race be eliminated in jury service.

The YWCA has been working continuously since 1908 when the first Negro joined the professional staff of the national Association to include people of all races in its membership and to work for an integrated society in which "barriers of race, nationality, education, and social status are broken down in the pursuit of the common objective of a better life for all." These words adopted at our 1936 Convention are echoed in the more recent statement adopted in 1964 when we pledged ourselves in addition to a more conscious and deliberate effort to achieve integration within our own fellowship to work as well for reconciliation and full integration immediately in all areas of the community's life including education, employment, housing, public facilities, and religious and social institutions.

One of the most important features of the new legislation, we believe is that calling for the elimination of discrimination in housing (Title IV). The YWCA believes that to work for freedom of choice in housing is an integral part of our efforts to work for an end to discrimination. We are concerned about open housing not only because we wish to see that the rights guaranteed to all citizens are in fact being implemented, but also because as women we recognize that if we are to live as good neighbors and to rear children of good will we must have the freedom to live freely in a multi-racial society. The artificial discrimination based on race has little validity in the kind of world we wish to provide for our children.

It is our hope that your Committee will be able to assure the inclusion of this important facet of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Lloyd J. Marti, *President.*

Transport Workers Union
of America,
New York, N.Y., June 9, 1966.

Dear Congressman: The outrageous and cowardly attack on James H. Meredith underscores the urgent need for immediate Federal legislation to provide protection for all Americans fighting for Civil Rights in all the bigoted corners of this country. The Civil Rights Act of 1966 now before you is such a bill.

The Officers and members of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, urge its passage at once. What happened to Meredith must not happen again.

Sincerely yours,

Matthew Guinan,
International President.
Douglas L. MacMahon,
International Secretary Treasurer.
James F. Horst,
International Executive Vice President.

International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine
Workers,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1966.

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.,
Committee on Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conyers: If any additional evidence is needed, the shameful ambush shooting of James H. Meredith demonstrates again the awful urgency for passage of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill. Almost without exception, southern juries and courts have failed to punish murderers and would-be murderers of civil rights workers.

Too frequently, these crimes go unpunished because the local jurors are more sympathetic to the criminals than to see that justice is done. By now every thinking American should be convinced that acts of violence with racial overtones must be made a Federal crime.

Of course it is already too late for such legislation to bring justice to the coward who shot Mr. Meredith on his brave pilgrimage through Mississippi to encourage voter registration. But Mississippi and Alabama and every one of our fifty states will be safer for James Meredith and all men of good will if only Congress does the job that it clearly must do by enacting the 1966 Civil Rights Act.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL JENNINGS, *President.*

COMMUNITY SERVICE SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y., July 28, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
The House of Representatives, Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: Enclosed is the statement of the Committee on Public Affairs with respect to the Civil Rights Act of 1966. The Committee feels passage of this legislation is important and urges your support.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. MATHIS,
Chairman, Committee on Public Affairs.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966—A STATEMENT

The proposed "Civil Rights Act of 1966" is the latest in a series of legislative efforts to set forth a clear national policy against racial, religious and ethnic discrimination, and to improve the machinery to implement and enforce the declared national policy.

The administration of policy would be strengthened through:

Titles I and II, which deal with the selection and challenging of Federal and State juries respectively;

Title III, which authorizes injunctive relief against imminent violations of individuals rights; and

Title VI, which deals with the judicial enforcement of the prohibition against discrimination in public schools and other public facilities.

Federal law would be clarified by *Title V*, which extends the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to racially motivated attacks on individuals, as well as to acts by private citizens designed to prevent the exercise of federally guaranteed rights.

Title IV sets forth the first time a general national policy against discrimination in the field of housing. But it is by no means the first federal activity in this area. In 1962, for example, President Kennedy's Executive Order prohibited discrimination in FHA and VA-financed housing as well as in federally-assisted public housing. The Title, furthermore, creates the administrative as well as the judicial machinery necessary to the effective enforcement of this important prohibition.

Experience has demonstrated that improvement is needed in the means of enforcement of existing national policies against discrimination in Federal and State jury selection, and in public schools and other public facilities.

Very often, the consequences of challenging a jury panel on the basis that its selection discriminated against members of a minority can be far more prejudicial to the interests of the challenger than any benefits he might achieve thereby. Furthermore, the information needed to sustain the challenge is very often not available to the challenger, or is so complex and extensive as to be beyond the resources of most litigants to use effectively. For all these reasons, it is necessary to authorize the Attorney General, on behalf of the United States, to enforce the prohibition against jury discrimination.

The present provisions of Federal Law with respect to the Attorney General's participation in actions to enforce the national policy against discrimination in public schools and other public facilities have proved inefficient. Many persons injured by violations of the national policy do not know they must file a written complaint with the Attorney General before he may sue, or if they do know of this requirement, are afraid of the consequences—economic, social and other—of filing such a complaint. In addition, the Attorney General must determine that local residents or other interested groups are unable to bear the burdens of the litigation. Title VI of this bill repeals the written complaint requirement as well as the one pertaining to the inability of local residents to sue, and it authorizes civil injunctive proceedings to be commenced by the Attorney General.

The interstate character of the housing industry, and the widespread pattern of racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing clearly make the problem a national one. Segregated housing is, as the Attorney General has said, "deeply corrosive both for the individual and for his community. It isolates racial minorities from the public life of the community. It means inferior public education, recreation, health, sanitation and transportation services and facilities. It means denial of access to training and employment and business opportunities. It prevents the inhabitants of the ghettos from liberating themselves, and it prevents the federal, state and local governments and private groups and institutions from fulfilling their responsibility and desire to help in this liberation."

The amended version of the bill, with its inclusion of administrative machinery for the enforcement of Title IV's prohibition, is a sound approach for dealing with this national problem.

Almost three years ago, in a statement about the bill which subsequently became the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Committee on Public Affairs noted the effects of racial and other forms of minority discrimination. It said "The long experience of the Society confirms that all too often those deprived of fair opportunity suffer a defeated spirit, surrender ambition, concede poverty and abandon trust in justice." The Committee believes that H.R. 14765, as amended and reported on June 30, 1966, will do much to eliminate the gaps which remain in the enforcement of the basic individual rights granted by the Federal Constitution. We urge its prompt adoption.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 26, 1966.

Representative JOHN J. CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

United Presbyterian Church Commission on Religion and Race urges your support H.R. 14765 strengthening amendments only.

Dr. GAYRAUD S. WILMORE,
Executive Director, United Presbyterian Commission on Religion and Race.

ANOKA, MINN.,
June 28, 1966.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: I certainly hope Congress is planning to stay on the freedom job! I do not think that Ho Chi Minh, the Birchers, the C.P., the Viet Cong or the KKK will just quit for the summer next week. So please work hard and quickly for passage this session of H.R. 14765, as improved by the Leadership Conference suggestions which strengthen the housing and the jury trial sections, indemnify wronged rights victims and put cities and states under Title VII of the 1964 Act.

Senator DIRKSEN and Co., in my opinion, should realize that, as we progress in equality, the reasonably free market and justice at home, our cause prospers in Viet Nam and the world!

R. W. NASH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

178th General Assembly of United Presbyterian Church urged United Presbyterians to support legislation insuring non-discriminatory administration of justice. United Presbyterian Office of Church and Society urges members of House Judiciary Committee, particularly in light of Meredith tragedy, to report favorably administration's civil rights bill at earliest possible date.

ROBERT D. BULKLEY,
Office of Church and Society.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 17, 1966.

Hon. Representative JOHN J. CONYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. CONYERS: We urge you to report out the work for speedy passage of H.R. 14765 strengthened by amendments including the following:

1. Application of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to employees of State and local governments.
2. Provision for administrative enforcement of the proposed housing title.
3. Provision for civil indemnification by a Federal board in cases where a person is killed or injured in person or property while exercising rights guaranteed by the Constitution.
4. Provision for automatic standards for sending in jury commissioners rather than reliance upon litigation to enforce the title dealing with non-discrimination in jury service.

It is our considered judgment that the expeditious passage of this bill so strengthened may serve to bring a measure of hope to many in our Nation whose constitutional rights are not yet secure and whose equitable share in the opportunities of our society has been too long denied.

Yours truly,

EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
For the Commission on Religion and Race, National Council of Churches, meeting June 17, 1966.

WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of days ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], spoke at a technical conference in New York City on the subject "What Next in Space?" His address was concise and to the point. I believe that all Members will find it advantageous to consider his remarks and, for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I include the address in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The gentleman from Minnesota is well qualified to speak on the subject "What Next in Space?" He has been a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee for 7 years and, for 5 years has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications. As one of the members of that committee, and as a person professionally trained in engineering and the sciences, I am pleased to be able to report not only that the gentleman from Minnesota performs his duties as chairman energetically, responsibly, and fairly, but also that he has learned the subject matter uncommonly well. I subscribe to the position he presents:

WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

(By Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, banquet address, AIAA/ASME/ASME Fifth Reliability and Maintainability Conference, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City)

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you this evening.

I am very pleased to know that so much is happening in reliability and maintainability, and that the professional societies sponsoring this symposium are largely responsible. Especially since we all realize that in the past there has been too much "lip-service" and not enough real action. Too many organizations—both industry and government—installed reliability staffs but did not bring them into the mainstream and did not insist that they be listened to.

This is, I am convinced, one of the central reasons why performance in some of our more difficult and sophisticated space missions has frequently been less than desired. In short, low reliability has resulted from lack of adequate management attention—both in industry and government—in bringing together systems design and reliability analysis.

However, I'm not going to talk about reliability as such tonight. After looking over your program, I decided that I should not try to compete with you on your "homefield". Rather, I want to share my thoughts with you on a problem that I've been spending much time on of late. Indeed, I'm certain many of you have also been thinking about it a great deal. It is: "What's Next in Space?"

This problem has been discussed extensively—within the Congress, the Administration, industry and the press. Quite simply, these discussions have been taking place because most of us believe that we're near a major decision point on what to do about our space program.

Some have indirectly compared the present situation to the 1960–1961 time period when we were seeking direction for our newly unfolding capabilities. They suggest that now we need to focus our attention and energies on a bold new undertaking which would capture the imagination of the people—as did the Apollo decision by President Kennedy in 1961. Most frequently advanced is accelerated manned exploration of the nearby planets—both flybys and landings.

Before getting to what I think we ought to do, I want to outline some of the considerations we must deal with. First, there is a need to recognize that there are some fundamental differences between now and the 1961 decision period.

In 1961 there was an intense emotional climate since we were still smarting from the sting of sputnik and there hadn't been much visible progress. Our inborn competitive spirit demanded decisions which would clearly permit us to catch up with the Soviets and surpass them. Today, we still have a strong competitive urge and give serious thought to our national prestige—but we have advanced far enough to be equally concerned about space achievement for scientific and economic purposes.

In 1961 we were frantically building a scientific and industrial capability: finding the right people, trying to decide what kinds of facilities we needed, and putting together organizations which could take on the new jobs. A good job was done, and today we are faced with how to use most effectively the vast government-industry-university team which we as a nation have put together.

By 1961 our obligational authority in space was only about 4 billion dollars and expenditures were just slightly over 3 billion. By the end of June 1967 obligational authority will pass 40 billion. (This includes NASA, DoD, AEC and all others.) As the investment mounts, I sense a stronger need for "economic payoff" and "scientific" considerations to be given greater weight in developing our overall program. By this I do not mean that each and every part of the program must meet a strict "economic payoff" test—because that would not be reasonable. However, on the whole there must be a reasonable rate of return on our total investment. It is my opinion, that if we are seriously concerned about a guaranteed future space effort, the "economic payoff" route provides the best insurance policy.

In 1961, after the lunar landing decision had been made, the purse strings were loosened and money was readily available. From 1961 on, NASA fared reasonably well with its money requests until the fiscal 1967 authorization. I don't mean that NASA got every dollar it asked for during the early sixties, but in general the Administration and Congress has been responsive to NASA's needs.

Today, domestic programs considered to be highly important plus our international commitments, including Vietnam, had led to a changed environment. Money is just not as readily available for space as it was five years ago. In short, the competition for available resources, while always difficult, has become acute.

Summing up these points, I would judge that today's conditions are markedly different from 1961 when it was necessary to capture the nation's imagination and marshal our resources for a bold manned assault on the moon. In other words, I believe this: we have advanced to the point where overriding emphasis should be placed on how best to continue with space applications and explorations in general. This is somewhat of a shift from automatically assuming that, for psychological reasons of prestige, we need to continue with a predominant emphasis on manned missions in the form of a quick move to the planets.

Please understand I am not speaking solely from the parochial point of view of Chairman of the House "Unmanned Space Subcommittee." It's just that I think the space program has "grown up" and been generally accepted. Also, please understand that I am not opposed to future manned space flight programs. But I am for a balance—a good balance of manned and unmanned programs.

My concern about emphasis in our future space activities was reinforced after a careful review of NASA's "future plans" presentations to both the Senate and House Space Committees this past year. They did an admirable job in identifying alternatives—but an inescapable conclusion on my part is that the principal theme of these presentations was "alternatives for constructing a manned space program."

Now, with this background in mind, let's move on to the central problem: deciding on our future space program within limited financial resources. One necessary step is to define some categories. I believe a good general way is this:

(1) Near-Earth (both manned and unmanned);

(2) Lunar (both manned and unmanned);

(3) Planetary (both manned and unmanned); and

(4) Interplanetary space and solar (unmanned only)—for example, Pioneers, certain Explorers, and yet to be developed deep space probes.

This division has a major disadvantage in that it doesn't correspond to the way Congress reviews and NASA manages—but it does help to give a more clear picture about relating various programs in terms of priorities and major policy factors.

A soon to be published staff study report of the House Science and Astronautics Committee identifies several major policy factors which must be evaluated collectively and individually as part of the criteria in developing a balanced, well ordered, national space program. These are:

(1) National security;

(2) Economic advantage;

(3) Scientific discovery;

(4) International competitive position;

(5) International cooperation; and

(6) Technological progress.

For example, in applying these policy factors to the program division I mentioned a few minutes ago, we can see that national security is only remotely related to planetary, solar and interplanetary space activity but would be an important consideration for near-earth orbital operations. On the other hand, it is very probable that if the "scientific discovery" factor rated higher, the above relationships would be essentially reversed.

While I am on the matter of policy factors, I would like to emphasize a point I have expressed on other occasions: we must continue to pursue forcefully a policy of peaceful, joint cooperation between the nations in the exploration of space. It is not too soon to negotiate agreements between all nations—possibly through the United Nations rather than on the present bi-lateral approach being used by ourselves and the Soviets. However limited their capabilities or participation might be we should try to bring other nations in. This participation can apply to manned as well as unmanned programs. It is then that space would become truly international.

Neither we—nor the Soviets—nor the other Europeans can afford to do all of the major explorations individually. Yet, for example, there has been little more than passing reference to international cooperation in NASA's plans for manned planetary exploration.

But listing categories, identifying policy factors, and defining alternatives are only the means to the end of deciding what to do. There remains the tough job of deciding what emphasis we should assign various policy factors and criteria in determining which programs get funded and which get postponed.

As yet I do not know what Jim Webb will recommend to the President and I am speaking for myself and *not* the House Space Committee. Nevertheless, I am going to suggest what seems to me a reasonable approach for the near term—and by the near term, I mean the 68, 69, and 70 budgets, which will determine what we do through the mid-70's.

I am going to develop my approach by backing into it. First, on the basis of high cost, low "economic payoff", and inadequate technological preparation—and background considerations mentioned earlier—I discard as the number one priority, an accelerated manned planetary program. Someone whose name I don't know, was right on target when he suggested we have a lot of "orbital homework" to do. For example, I believe there are some disquieting hints that man himself may be the limiting factor for extended stay in space.

Earlier I spoke about money. It is obvious that dollars will strongly affect what we will be able to do—but I want to be more explicit. Until the pressure of Vietnam eases, I do not see a six billion dollar NASA budget. It is much more likely to be closer to five than six.

A ceiling of this level seems to rule out—for the time being—the "balanced" manned space program suggested by one NASA official as the most desirable of the alternatives proposed to the Senate and House Space Committees. The estimated price tag for this manned program peaks at 4.2 billion per year for implementation—and does *not* include the cost of new technology. This would clearly mean a total NASA budget of close to 6 billion . . . assuming 600 million for Advanced Research and Technology and about one billion for Space Sciences and Applications—including Voyager. I'm not saying a 6 billion dollar budget is too much I'm a realist. I simply say it's not presently in the cards.

This "balanced" program includes proceeding with manned earth-orbit, manned lunar and manned planetary efforts. I would agree that this approach most accurately describes what we should do for the very long term—say 15 or 20 years. But under the circumstances for the near term, I believe the major manned emphasis must be on near-Earth missions. NASA has described this as the "economic benefits emphasis program". Even so, to a certain extent there would still be "balance" in what I suggest because some lunar missions should be undertaken and some preliminary planetary work could begin. But this would *not* mean a firm start on lunar bases and manned planetary flybys for the mid 1970's. They would come later—toward the end of the decade.

My reasoning then, for this option is based on expected budget levels, estimated program costs, and a growing conviction that "economic benefits" and scientific considerations must be given stronger emphasis in our total space program.

Switching now to the unmanned near-Earth programs—except for the complex observatory class of spacecraft, performance has been generally excellent. I am reasonably satisfied that there have been substantial economic, scientific, national security and prestige payoffs from our communications, navigation, geodetic and meteorological satellites. Therefore, I conclude that we should continue at least at the present level of support—and probably somewhat higher expenditures should be made.

By placing major emphasis on manned and unmanned Earth-orbit operations for the time being I realize the possibility of insufficient lunar investigation. Therefore, it might be prudent to provide some "offset" by not reducing the unmanned lunar program as much as it might be if there were an extensive manned program. I do *not* mean major new developments, however.

Turning to the planetary area brings me to Voyager . . . since I've already stated my ideas on manned missions. I remain firm in my belief that Voyager, in connection with extensive manned "orbital homework", provides the most effective sequence for eventual manned exploration of the planets. It is a matter of public record that we in the House believe strongly that adequate preliminary work should get started as soon as possible.

There has been less than unanimous agreement on this issue. I won't go into all the details again—but Voyager will be an extremely difficult program. The reliability demands will be as severe as any ever encountered. And as stressed during your meetings here—high reliability may be more closely related to the design phase than the production process.

Much of our experience with programs which have had a history of trouble leads me to believe that adequate time and attention have not been given to preliminary planning, design, and testing. In describing one set of troubled programs, one high NASA official has said, "Far more testing was necessary than was planned." Another said, "It would have been wiser to plan for trouble. Going all-out was a mistake." I agree completely and hope this approach will be applied to Voyager.

So, even within a five billion budget, I believe Voyager should get greater emphasis to insure its success. This is vital to subsequent manned missions and in furthering our advance in scientific discovery. It is the primary reason why the House Committee at an early date this year, recommended a 1969 Mars capsule lander problem rather than just the fly-by mission as proposed by NASA and acceded to in the Senate.

As a final point in the planetary area, I want to touch on Venus. I am not opposed to Venus exploration—as some have inferred from my recommendation to cancel the Mariner 1967 and transfer the funds from Mariner Venus to Voyager. To me it was a matter of a limited budget, higher priority for Voyager, and lack of a follow-on plan for the Venus mission.

Since NASA has now indicated follow-on plans for Venus exploration, and we have agreed in the Congress to an increase of 13 million dollars for Voyager, I now agree with continuation of the 1967 mission.

For interplanetary space and solar investigation, I believe that current resource levels should be modestly increased. They are really quite frugal in relation to other parts of the space program and the scientific payoff seems very promising.

Now, let me summarize my position on "What Next In Space?"

(1) Major emphasis for next several years should be on manned and unmanned near-Earth orbital activities. Economic benefits, national security, uncertain psychological and physiological effects from long duration manned flight, budget limitations and building a stronger technological base are the main considerations.

(2) Substantial work toward establishing manned lunar bases and manned planetary exploration should be lower priority for the time being. A shortage of available money is the big reason. Also needed is more "orbital homework."

(3) More extensive support should be given to unmanned planetary and interplanetary work—with most emphasis on Voyager Mars and Voyager Venus type missions. Scientific discovery and vital feedback to any manned mission planning are paramount considerations.

I believe this approach maintains a reasonable balance in working toward a wide range of objectives and I believe it combines the necessary with the possible.

But whatever is decided, you gentlemen will carry a large share of the responsibility for designing and building the means by which we meet the challenge of exploring the vast reaches of space.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Martin of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), today, on account of illness.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for August 8 and 9, on account of official business as Presidential representative to the inauguration of the President of Colombia.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for August 8 and 9, on account of official business as Presidential representative to the inauguration of the President of Colombia.

Mr. Murphy of New York (at the request of Mr. Delaney), today, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Curtis, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Buchanan, for 1 hour, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Hosmer, for 30 minutes, on August 9; and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Robison, for 30 minutes, on August 9; and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Dorn and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Diggs during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Talcott) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Berry.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Evans of Colorado) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.

Mr. Roncalio in two instances.

Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Powell in three instances.

Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Tenzer.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3421. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 5, 1966 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7327. An act to amend a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School; and

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 9, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2621. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2622. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2778. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11696. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16887. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 16888. A bill to provide assistance to first processors of cotton who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of cotton programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 16889. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 16890. A bill to permit the city of Kansas City, Kans., to count expenditures made for recently constructed board of education's library building and board of public utilities building as local noncash grants-in-aid toward the Kansas City, Kans., urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 16892. A bill to amend sections 281 and 344 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the statutory prescription of fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 16893. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16894. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 16895. A bill to amend section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to require the Secretary of Agriculture in certain cases to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 16896. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, as amended, and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 16897. A bill to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16898. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Education and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16899. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide Federal assistance for college-level instruction in correctional institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 16900. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide standby consumer credit controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16901. A bill to suspend the income tax investment credit and to impose on corporations a temporary defense emergency tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 16902. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to landlords and tenants; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16903. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 16904. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces in certain combat zones, and reduced postage rates for the air shipment of small parcels to members of the Armed Forces in those combat zones; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16905. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increases shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 16906. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 16907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 16908. A bill to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16909. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend and enlarge the program of grants for educational television broadcasting facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 16910. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept for administration under the act of August 25, 1916, donations of encumbered lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 970. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 971. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to create the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 972. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16911. A bill for the relief of Pietro De Vita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16912. A bill for the relief of Isabella De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16913. A bill for the relief of Leokadia Stanulewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 16914. A bill for the relief of Anna Vissa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 16915. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sylvia Pastrana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16916. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Fischmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God who art in heaven and on the earth and in all Thy works, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, the source of all goodness and beauty and truth. Thou hast called us, whose lives pass swiftly as a watch in the night, to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages.

Enrich our attitudes and actions, we pray, with that love for our fellows without whose golden gleam all that we say, though we speak with the tongues of men and of angels, is but as tinkling cymbals. Mastered by that love which seekest not its own, but whose passion is the coming of Thy universal kingdom, may the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be this day, and always, acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 5, 1966, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the pleasure of submitting to you the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

Last month marked two important milestones in the railroad retirement system. It rounded out 30 years of benefits paid under the original Acts of 1934 and 1935. And it saw the inauguration of an historic new benefit for railroad workers: Medicare.

In three decades, the railroad retirement system has grown from a controversial child of Franklin Roosevelt's first administration into a vital element of our national economy.

It has broadened the horizons of millions of retired workers and their families.

It has given them security and dignity in place of charity and dole.

During fiscal year 1965—the period covered by this report—$1,118 million was paid in benefits to 980,000 retired workers and survivors. This was nearly as much as was paid out during the first 10 years of the program, and it brings the cumulative total of benefits paid to more than $13 billion.

The report of Chairman Howard W. Habermeyer of the Railroad Retirement Board is comprehensive and detailed. I commend it to the Congress for review and study.

The report is, I believe, testimony to the vision and compassion of a great President and a great Congress of more than 30 years past.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *August 8 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 14875) to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Actions Taken Under 1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on actions taken by the Federal agencies under the 1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on General Service Graded Employees in National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the general service graded employees in that Administration, as of June 30, 1966; to the Committees on Appropriations and Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Actual Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended June 30, 1966; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Federal Home Loan Bank Board

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 553. A bill to consent to the Upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska (Rept. No. 1435).

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1436)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Harris, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Mundt):

S. 3695. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. Morton):

S. 3696. A bill to increase the maximum interest rate of investment yield which may be paid on U.S. savings bonds from 4¼ percent to 5 percent per annum; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3697. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Alberto Rojas-Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 3698. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Harris, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota).

S. 3699. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3700. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3701. A bill for the relief of Manuel de Benito Supnet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3702. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to further define "reasonable costs" for extended care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON SBIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator HARRIS, Senator TOWER, and Senator MUNDT, a bill which will provide a greater degree of control and responsibility to the Small Business Administration in the operation of the Small Business Investment Company program. Most Senators know of this important effort on the part of the Federal Government to help provide long-term loans and equity capital so vitally needed by America's small businesses.

The Small Business Investment Act was passed by the Congress in 1958. President Johnson, then a Senator, was the principal sponsor of the bill.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on the Small Business Investment Company program. As chairman of that subcommittee, I felt that the time for the hearings was especially appropriate. A new Administrator, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, had just recently been appointed for the Small Business Administration. He was confirmed by the Senate in May. Mr. Boutin has selected a very able man as Deputy Administrator in charge of the SBIC program, Mr. Howard Greenberg. I wanted to get Mr. Boutin's views on the SBIC program and hear his plans for the future. Mr. Boutin testified that while there were problem areas he was certain that they could be corrected. I commend him for his firm assertion of leadership. One of the major problem areas is in the field of supervision. The act was amended in 1961 to provide for suspension of SBIC licenses by SBA after administrative proceedings. Cease and desist powers and the powers to seek injunctive relief were added to the act in that amendment also. Later, in 1964 the act was amended directing the Administrator of SBA to issue rules and regulations regarding conflict of interest in the SBIC program. Our recent hearings show that these regulatory provisions of the act need strengthening.

The legislation I am introducing today would accomplish this. It does not make substantive changes in the SBIC program. It does not require the expenditure of additional funds. The provisions of this bill will enable the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to bring this program under tighter and more effective control.

Mr. President, all of the provisions of this new legislation, in essence, have been discussed in our recent hearings.

I believe this is a minimum package. We must move at once to enact it, and I pledge my full effort and support to get this done.

We must move in this area now, so that next year we can begin to look ahead. In the next session of Congress, I plan to introduce other legislation which will help the SBIC program in other areas. I am convinced that its benefits to the small businesses of this Nation have only begun to be tapped.

Mr. President, I am especially happy that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business—and probably the outstanding friend and expert on small business in the Congress—is a cosponsor of this bill. Also the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] who has been a great source of strength to the subcommittee as its ranking Republican member—and has repeatedly shown his dedication to small business—is a mighty welcome cosponsor.

In addition Mr. President, there is no doubt that this legislation received much of its impetus from the initiative taken by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and his Government Operations Committee.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] turned over the hearings on the small business investment program to the man who now occupies the chair, the brilliant young junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. He did a fine job of conducting those hearings last week. He developed a record that makes the necessity for this legislation very clear, as did the hearings conducted recently by the House Committee on Small Business, ably chaired by Representative JOE EVINS, and our own hearings of the Small Business Subcommittee on Small Business.

So, Mr. President, I am delighted that Senator HARRIS and the very able ranking Republican Senator on the permanent Investigation Subcommittee, Senator MUNDT are now cosponsoring the bill.

Mr. President, we really mean business in introducing this bill. We know the time is late in the session. But in view of the urgent need for action now, in view of the fact that the Administrator of SBA has personally requested the authority to provide adequate supervision of SBIC's at once, we have a responsibility to pass this legislation before we adjourn this year.

As chairman of the subcommittee that will consider the legislation in the Senate, I shall do my best to push it along just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very able statement, made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], supporting the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3695) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement and analysis, presented by Mr. PROXMIRE, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

I am happy to join with the Senior Senator from Wisconsin in the introduction of this bill which is designed to tighten the supervision of Small Business Investment Companies.

I am in full accord with the intent of the bill and with the general approach to the problems which were recently described to the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee. However, further study of the proposed bill may require a few adjustments to be fully effective.

In the hearings conducted by the able Senator from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee, it was disclosed that lack of proper authority and administration within the Small Business Administration in the past several years had created serious operating conditions within a number of the Small Business Investment Companies.

The purpose of this bill is to give the new Small Business Administrator the proper legal tools to prevent any further irregularities within the SBIC industry. I must say that in those hearings the Subcommittee was given excellent cooperation by the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, a very fine organization in which most of the SBIC's hold membership.

We were also favorably impressed by the testimony of Small Business Administrator Bernard L. Boutin who expressed a solid determination to strengthen regulation of the companies if given the additional tools we are hoping to provide in this bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

SECTION 1

Section 1 of the bill provides that the resulting Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1966."

SECTION 2

Section 2 of the bill contains two features. First, it repeals Title II of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, hereafter referred to in this Analysis as the Act, thereby eliminating the statutory structure of the Small Business Investment Division of the Small Business Administration. Second, it revises the table of contents of the Act to reflect the changes made in the Act by the bill.

SECTION 3

Section 3 effects certain technical changes.

SECTION 4

In addition to effecting technical changes, section 4 of the bill provides that each small business concern receiving financial assistance from an SBIC shall, where the Administrator finds it necessary or appropriate, be subject to examinations made by direction of SBA by examiners selected or approved by SBA.

SECTION 5

In addition to effecting technical changes, section 5 of the bill contains two features.

1. It authorizes SBA to take administrative action, subject to requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and of judicial review, to revoke, as well as suspend, the license of an SBIC for any of the offenses described in section 309(a) of the Act (i.e.,

for falsehoods or misleading assertions knowingly included in any statement required by the Administration; or for willful or repeated failure to observe any provision of the Act or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto; or for violation of any cease-and-desist order issued by SBA).

Section 5 would also delete a former restriction which limited the grounds for suspension to false or misleading statements filed for the purpose of obtaining a license. It would authorize the invocation of either suspension or revocation for such false or misleading statements, whether or not made for the purpose of obtaining a license.

2. It authorizes SBA to issue cease-and-desist orders against individuals, as well as SBICs, who have violated or are about to violate the Act or regulations. Such an order may direct the removal of an officer, director, employee or agent of an SBIC and prohibit further participation by such a person, or any other person violating the Act or the regulations, in the conduct of the affairs of an SBIC.

SECTION 6

Section 6 of the bill adds six new provisions to the bill.

1. It provides that wherever an SBIC violates any provision of the Act or regulations, such violation shall be deemed to be also a violation on the part of any person, including the officers and directors of such licensee, who participates in such violation.

2. It makes it unlawful for any participant in the management of an SBIC to engage in any act or practice in breach of fiduciary duty, if as a result thereof, the SBIC has suffered or is in imminent danger of suffering financial loss or other damage.

3. It provides that, except with the written consent of the Administration, no person may take office in or participate in the management of an SBIC who has been convicted of a felony, or convicted or found civilly liable for fraud or other dishonesty. It would also provide that persons hereafter so convicted or found civilly liable could not, without consent of the Administration, continue to serve or participate in the management of an SBIC.

4. It provides that an SBIC which violates any regulation or written directive issued by the Administrator, requiring the filing of any regular or special report pursuant to the Act, shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $100.00 for each day of the continuance of the failure to file such report.

5. It provides that any officer or director of an SBIC who knowingly participates in a violation of the Act or regulations or orders thereunder relating to the disbursement of funds or lending of credit by SBICs shall be personally liable for all indebtedness then owing to SBA by the SBIC, to the extent of the lesser of the damage caused SBA or the company.

6. It provides for personal jurisdiction in any action brought under sections 308, 311, 314, or 315 of the Act in the district where the SBIC maintains its principal office. Service of process in such actions may be made where the defendant maintains its principal office, transacts business, or wherever he may be found.

SECTION 7

Section 7 of the bill authorizes SBA to act as a trustee or receiver of a licensee.

SECTION 8

Section 8, in combination with section 2, reduces from four to one the number of Deputy Administrators authorized by the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act. At the same time, it provides for the appointment of three Associate Administrators.

RAISING FROM 4½ TO 5 PERCENT CEILING ON SERIES E SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today on behalf of six members of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Carlson, Senator Bennett, Senator Curtis, Senator Morton, Senator Dirksen, and myself, I am sending to the desk a bill the purpose of which is to raise from 4¼ to 5 percent the ceiling on interest rates on series E savings bonds.

Under the present law the President has authority to fix the interest rates on series E bonds "provided that in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield exceed 4¼ percent." Under this authority the President established an interest rate of 4.15 percent.

This bill being introduced here today merely raises the permissible ceiling of 4¼ to 5 percent. The President would still retain discretionary authority to fix the rates "not to exceed this 5 percent." The President likewise has discretionary authority to fix the ceiling on the amount of such bonds any one person can purchase during any 1 calendar year. This ceiling on the amount to be purchased in any 1 calendar year could be lowered to $5,000 or whatever level the President though best in the national interests. This limitation is necessary to prevent abuse by the large investor.

Interest rates today are at the highest level in recent years. Last week U.S. Government bonds with a maturity date of slightly less than 5 years were offered at 5¼ percent.

Just a few weeks earlier Government-guaranteed bonds were sold by FNMA bearing rates as high as 5¾ percent. Banks are offering from 5 to 5½ percent for deposits.

At the same time the small investors of America are being asked to buy series E bonds with interest rates of 4.15 percent.

One of the arguments in support of a lower rate for series E bonds is that these bonds carry a guarantee against any depreciation of principal. The investors in series E bonds, however, pay for this guaranteed redemption value by virtue of the fact that if the bonds are redeemed at the end of the first year the purchaser gets less than 2 percent interest and if redeemed at the end of the second or third year he receives around 3 percent. The series E bondholder is required to hold his bonds for the full 7 years and 9 months in order to obtain the 4.15 percent interest.

This rate is too low as compared to the interest being paid by the U.S. Government on its other obligations.

The small investor is entitled to equal treatment from his Government.

Furthermore, from the standpoint of fighting inflation it is very important that the Federal Government encourage rather than discourage the small investor to save his money instead of spending it in an overheated economy.

It is not enough to preach patriotism to the Government employees and members of the labor force as a reason for their investing in Government bonds at 4.15 percent interest. From a patriotic standpoint why are they under any greater responsibility than are the banks, institutions, and other large investors?

Today small investors, mostly wage-earners who are purchasing savings bonds under the payroll deduction plan, are lending money to the Government 1 to 1½ percent lower than the Treasury Department is paying large investors. This is wrong.

Heretofore series E bonds were designed to attract the small investors, and they should be so redesigned.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the history of series E bonds prepared by the Legislative Counsel be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

The authority for the issuance of United States savings bonds (series E and H bonds) is contained in section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. As originally enacted in 1935 this section provided that the interest rate, or investment yield, on savings bonds could not exceed 3 percent per annum. In 1957, this limit was raised, by Public Law 85–17, to 3.26 percent. In 1959, Public Law 86–346 added a new section 25 to the Second Liberty Bond Act which reads as follows:

"Sec. 25. In the case of any offering of United States savings bonds issued or to be issued under section 22 of this Act, the maximum limits on the interest rate or the investment yield or both may be exceeded upon a finding by the President with respect to such offering that the national interest requires that such maximum limits be exceeded: *Provided, however,* That in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield exceed 4¼ per centum per annum."

Subsection (a) of the attached bill would increase the maximum limit established by this section on the interest rate or investment yield of saving bonds from 4¼ percent to 5 percent per annum.

Subsection (b) of the attached bill provides that the new authority to increase the interest rate or investment yield to not more than 5 percent may be exercised with respect to United States savings bonds bearing issue dates on or after the date of the enactment of the bill. Subsection (b) also provides that the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury under section 22(b)(2) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, insofar as such authority is limited by section 25 of such Act, may be exercised with respect to series E and H bonds issued before the date of enactment of the bill. Section 22(b)(2) of such Act reads as follows:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to provide by regulations:

"(A) That owners of series E and H savings bonds may, at their option, retain the bonds after maturity, or after any period beyond maturity during which such bonds have earned interest, and continue to earn interest upon them at rates which (subject to section 25) are consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1).

"(B) That series E and H savings bonds on which the rates of interest have been fixed prior to such regulations will earn interest at higher rates which (subject to section 25) are consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1)."

Thus, under subsection (b) of the bill, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise his authority under section 22(b)(2) of such Act to give to holders of series E and H Bonds issued before the enactment of the bill the benefit, for periods after enactment, of any higher interest rate or investment yield established under section 25 of such Act, as amended by subsection (a) of the bill.

Respectfully,

HARRY B. LITTELL,
Senior Counsel.

JULY 26, 1966.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3696) to increase the maximum interest rate of investment yield which may be paid on U.S. savings bonds from 4¼ percent to 5 percent per annum, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **CARLSON**. I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have just been made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] with regard to the interest rate on series E savings bonds. I think it is only reasonable that small investors who purchase series E bonds should be given the same consideration as is given to large corporations and banking interests.

It is regrettable that we are in a high interest period. There is no question that it is regrettable, but we are in it. Therefore, I think there should be an increased interest rate given on series E bonds.

I wish to call attention to the fact that outstanding cooperative farm credit system loans were at a record high of $9.1 billion on June 30. During the past year farmers and their cooperatives borrowed $1.4 billion from Federal land banks, $4.5 billion from production credit associations, and $1.5 billion from banks for cooperatives, an increase of 17.2 percent over the 1964–65 figure.

I mention this because the system's banks and associations have increased their interest rates in recent months and there has been an increase of 1.5 percent in the interest paid for money. The Senate's Agriculture and Forestry Committee this week approved a bill taking the 6-percent limit off the interest intermediate credit banks can pay on debentures to get money that is reloaned. Their last issue was at 5⅞ percent and they expect they will have to pay more. Some PCA's now charge farm borrowers 8 percent, which shows the effect of the high interest policy.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his contribution. This bill is based on the experience quoted. It makes no difference whether we are for or against high interest rates; it tries to deal equitably with the small investor. Wage earners buying small bonds should share in the higher interest rates, particularly at a time when a homeowner has to pay high interest rates. The historic pattern has been that the saving bond has been far more attractive to the small owner than to the big owner, but that has been reversed.

Mr. President, in today's issue of Barron's, National Business and Financial Weekly, there appears an excellent editorial which should be read by every American. The editorial is entitled "Slip, Slide and Duck." It points out dramatically the manner in which this administration is paying lipservice to controlling inflation while at the same time its policies are causing it. It is time that the administration realized that a major cause of inflation is excessive Government spending and that it should practice the cutting back of nonessential spending rather than the approach of more and more spending. The American citizen and American business should be given an example of this by the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLIP, SLIDE, AND DUCK: WASHINGTON IS WAGING A SHAM BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION

Turning-points, as students of history or economics will ruefully concede, are rarely apparent at the time. To those who happened to be present, Gettysburg, the Marne and Midway must have seemed like just another battle. Peter Cooper's first steam locomotive became a standing joke, while the airplane figuratively took decades to get off the ground. After the 1929 crash, Washington and Wall Street continued to reassure one another that conditions were "basically sound." Contrariwise, 20 years later, on the eve of the longest spell of uninterrupted inflation and the greatest bull market in U.S. financial annals, most of the country—and virtually every follower of the late Lord Keynes—watched and waited for the inevitable postwar slump.

In the current era of managed news, visibility if anything has dimmed, nonetheless, against all precedent and heavy odds, we hereby venture a prediction. Unless we miss our guess, mid-summer of 1966 marks the end of the government's so-called wage-price guidelines. From their inception, the guidelines lacked either legal or moral sanction. During their brief heyday they fell not upon the just and unjust alike, but, in arbitrary fashion, upon those whose economic strength and political weakness singled them out for exploitation. Last week, to judge by what occurred in the airlines and in steel, they were finally—perhaps decisively—rejected by both union and management. The guidelines never commanded the authority to persuade; now they have lost the power to coerce.

Labor and capital, each in its own way, thereby has struck a mighty blow for economic freedom. However, to judge by other signs and portents, both at home and abroad, the struggle has barely begun. In Great Britain, where a highly touted "incomes policy" has failed as dismally as the guidelines, the Wilson Government is urging a total freeze on wages, prices and dividends. Where the Prime Minister (whom the White House a fortnight ago extravagantly likened to Winston Churchill) has dared to lead, the admiring President sooner or later may seek to follow. Meanwhile, mounting inflationary pressures in this country have led to a frantic search for scapegoats. In Washington and New York City last week—as in Diocletian's Rome—rang out the age-old hue and cry against "price-fixing" and "gouging." Freedom has just won a battle; it remains in danger of losing the war.

For as the sorry history of the guidelines suggests, the statist enemy is wily and relentless. The President's Council of Economic Advisers first propounded them in January 1962 as a "contribution to discussion." In brief, CEA averred that national productivity advances by an estimated 3 percent (subsequently upped to 3.2 percent) per year. Hence an industry that matches the average may increase wages by this amount without raising prices. The tentative thesis swifly escalated into official doctrine—last spring President Johnson called the guidelines the "cornerstone of American prosperity." Armed with them—and a federal arsenal of hidden persuaders and open threats—the White House, in one successful confrontation after another, forced its will and whim upon the banking fraternity and such basic industries as aluminum, copper, molybdenum, tobacco and steel. Last week, however, its string of easy victories abruptly snapped. On Monday the International Association of Machinists spurned an officially sanctioned settlement which went far beyond the guidelines. Next day the steel industry, led by Inland, raised prices on sheet and strip by several dollars a ton.

Thereupon ensued a pallid re-run of earlier dramatic episodes. The move was promptly branded as "inflationary" and "irresponsible" by Gardner Ackley, head of CEA and academic court jester who can juggle statistics with the best. To which charge one might properly retort: "By what standard?" For in the administration of the guidelines, standards have been notoriously arbitrary, principles conspicuous by their absence. Thus, without arousing Washington's ire, scores of manufacturers—notably of paper and packaging, castings and forgings, air-conditioning equipment, palladium, tantalum, electrical terminals, farm implements and whiskey—lately have raised prices. In the past year alone farm commodities (at wholesale) have jumped by over 5 percent, while consumer food bills are up still more. Meanwhile, even prior to the proposed airline contract, cost of which has been put at a whopping 6–7 percent, recent settlements in the automobile, communications and the building trades, had smashed the "cornerstone" beyond repair.

The guidelines, in short, have failed to restrain inflation. However, they have not been wholly ineffective. On the contrary, they have succeeded brilliantly in depressing security values, hindering the workings of supply and demand and worsening shortages. On Wall Street steel, aluminum and bank stocks lately have sold at the lowest price-earnings ratios in over a decade. By keeping a lid on molybdenum, sulphur and copper, Gardner Ackley has discouraged domestic expansion and spurred the diversion of scarce raw materials to overseas markets which will pay the freight. Similarly, the unofficial ceiling on interest rates last year lent vast impetus to the inflationary forces over which Washington now pretends concern. Finally, thousands of companies and millions of people have lost time and money because airline management and labor, thanks to doctrinaire public policy, have not been truly free to negotiate.

As some officials now concede, the guidelines have outlived their uselessness. Hence they have begun to eye fresh techniques of manipulation and coercion. Their alarm over inflation is clear: according to a Chicago Tribune reporter, who happened to uncover a supposedly closed meeting between Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and his party's Congressional hopefuls, the latter have been warned to shy away from discussing the rising cost-of-living. "I've been trying to figure out an answer for six years," confessed Secretary Freeman. "Slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can." As if to show the way, slippery Orville last week announced that he was asking the Federal Trade Commission to launch a nationwide investigation into recent increases in food prices, notably bread and milk, for which Agriculture is largely to blame. On Capitol Hill, meanwhile, sentiment is growing for sterner measures. "It may be," declared Senator Long (D., La.), "we need to have price, wage and credit controls now." All else having failed, London, as noted, is moving toward a blanket curb. On both sides of the Atlantic, the velvet glove is slipping off the iron hand.

Old and new, all such techniques are designed to divert public attention from the real villain of the piece, the inflationary fiscal and credit policies which government continues to pursue. On this score Dr. Arthur F. Burns, a rare scholar who values truth above party preference, plainly deserves the last word. "In all countries and throughout the ages," the economist recently told the House of Representatives, "it has been common practice of governments, when prices rose materially, to point the finger of blame at tradesmen or at industrialists or, in recent times, at trade union leaders as well, and to call them irresponsible and greedy. In a time of war still another epithet is frequently hurled at private groups: they are then described as unpatriotic. Very rarely does any government have the courage to blame its own management of finances or its own failure to keep a tight rein on the money supply."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Friday, August 5, 1966, entitled "The 'Word' From Ackley," which comments on the irresponsibility with which this administration is approaching the problem of inflation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The "Word" From Ackley

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers has put out the official word on the steel price increases. He is backed by President Johnson.

The word is "irresponsible."

As far as we can tell, the steel increases were modest; that is, within the "guidelines" the Administration has set. More modest than many wage and price increases which have occurred without a bleat from Mr. Ackley or his boss.

By hollering, or persuasion, or arm-twisting, whatever it is called, the Administration in the past has beaten back previous price rises in steel, and aluminum, notably. It has exacted some other, lesser retreats, as in cigarets.

But prices generally have been rising. Soft coal prices were raised, after the miners' union won a wage increase. Tires have gone up, to name another. Even chewing gum. The cost of living index hit a new high in June, largely because of higher food prices, some rather spectacular.

The Administration has stamped an occasional wage increase as "inflationary" but no new labor contract has been termed "irresponsible," not even in the construction industry where some pay boosts blew the "guidelines" full of holes.

The contract which the airline machinists rejected as too little included wage increases and other benefits well above the "guidelines." Mr. Johnson accepted that contract as "in the national interest," and there has been no charge that the union's demand for much more was "irresponsible."

The gross national product (statistical measure of all the goods and services produced in the nation) reached a record high in current dollars of $732 billion (at an annual rate) in the second quarter of 1966. But in terms of 1958 dollars, as computed by the Federal Reserve Board, these goods and services were worth only $644 billion. In short, in eight years inflation has cost us nearly $90 billion.

Mr. Johnson's budget for this fiscal year proposed Government spending six per cent above last year's spending—well above the "guidelines." And Congress is upping that figure.

Is this "irresponsible"? Or does Mr. Ackley reserve that term only for the conspicuous few?

MORE CONSERVATIVE CAPITALIZATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio, proposed legislation to relieve the St. Lawrence Seaway of intolerable financial burdens which threaten to cripple it.

Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway is even now a facility of fundamental economic importance to this Nation, and especially to its large upper Midwest and Great Lakes region.

This is as it should be. The whole purpose of our joining in the seaway was to benefit the Nation and that region by providing a fourth seacoast for the United States.

Today, however, we are in danger of largely defeating our purpose and severely hampering the seaway. A 10-percent increase in seaway tolls is under active consideration. At this early stage in the seaway's life, such a move will only serve to reduce traffic and cripple the seaway.

The increase in tolls is being considered by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and its sister Canadian authority. The Corporation held its hearings in June, and is expected to make its recommendation next week.

This immediate threat of a toll increase arises from the staggering debt burden which the seaway is forced to bear—a burden which is unique to it among all our waterways.

The original Seaway Act provided that the Corporation could borrow up to the $140 million authorized cost of construction from the Treasury at prevailing interest rates. The principal was to be repaid in 50 years or less. This was the first time that any waterway of the United States had been financed with a repayment requirement. And it was required that tolls be set high enough to make this repayment in addition to covering all other expenses.

Costs of maintenance and operation are among those expenses currently required to be paid by the Corporation from toll revenues. Again, this is the only federally constructed waterway ever to bear this burden at the expense of its own traffic.

Finally, and perhaps most difficult of all to understand, the Corporation is currently required to consider as an expense an amount calculated as depreciation. The theoretical or practical reason for this charge is difficult to imagine. Presumably it is based on the theory that the assets of the Corporation are slowly becoming worthless despite their maintenance. Even if this were so, full allowance for depreciation has the effect of making tolls cover double the cost of the seaway—once for repayment to the Treasury and once for depreciation.

All of these peculiarities of financing add up to a burden which is unprecedented in public or private enterprise. No wonder that the seaway runs in the red, even though shipping has been increasing and tolls are sufficient to pay reasonable operating expenses.

Toll rates at present are by no means low. There is now a charge of 4 cents per ton of gross registered tonnage of the ship, plus cargo tolls of 40 cents per ton of bulk cargo and 90 cents per ton of general cargo. An ocean ship with a general cargo can pay over $17,000 in cargo tolls alone for a trip through the seaway.

An analysis of last year's receipts and expenses illustrates the impossible position in which the seaway has been placed. Last year's shipping on the seaway was 44 million tons. This is somewhat less than the 50 million tons originally hoped for by 1965, but it was a very significant sign of health in view of the 1959 tonnage of less than half that figure. Gross toll revenues in 1965 were $6,372,000. But interest on the capital debt was $4,500,000. Interest on deferred interest from previous years was $390,000. Maintenance was $598,000. Depreciation was fixed at $1,686,000. These charges together amounted to $7,174,000—a sum far in excess of gross toll revenues of $6,372,000. And this does not even take into account the required repayment of capital.

Tolls which are set to keep abreast of this incredible burden are bound to be so high that they will simply deter traffic. It is apparent from studies of shipping on the seaway that by far the greater part of the cargo carried is in bulk, in such items as grain and iron ore. These bulk goods are very sensitive to changes in price. A difference of a fraction of a cent per bushel of wheat, for instance, will severely restrict sales.

The legislation which I am proposing is similar in most respects to legislation introduced recently in the House by Congressman Reuss, of Wisconsin, and 37 other Members. It would relieve the seaway of financial burdens which are causing the pressure for increased tolls and would place the Seaway on a sound financial basis for the present and future.

First, the bill would change the present capital debt and accrued interest into capital stock, to be held by the Treasury. This means that the Government of the United States would acquire an owner's interest in the seaway, which is entirely fitting for this national asset. From this ownership, the Treasury would receive an appropriate financial return in the form of cumulative dividends of 3.45 percent—approximately the present interest rate on the capital debt. The seaway, while thus paying its way to the Federal Government, would be relieved of its heaviest burden—that of repayment of the original cost.

Second, the proposed legislation provides that the cost of maintenance shall be paid from Federal appropriations. For nearly a century and a half the cost of maintenance of all Federal navigation works in the continental United States, including the entrance channels to major port complexes, has been borne by the Federal Government. Although the Federal funds provided for such maintenance and operations now exceeds $100 million each year, the St. Lawrence Seaway alone is required to pay its own maintenance costs. While the St. Lawrence Seaway's maintenance costs last year were only $598,000, the amount is nevertheless burdensome and discriminates against the seaway in comparison with such waterways as the Mississippi River seaway industrial canal, the Sacramento deep water ship channel, the Delaware River Waterway, and the Houston ship canal.

All of the named channels except the St. Lawrence Seaway are toll free; there is no direct financial return to the Treasury from operation of any one of them. And they represent huge Federal investments. The Mississippi River seaway industrial canal at New Orleans is a project of about $100 million for construction alone. Through fiscal 1965, the Delaware River Channel to Philadelphia has cost over $54 million for construction and $113 million for operation and maintenance; the Houston ship channel, over $34 million construction and $32 million operation and maintenance; and the Sacramento deep water channel, over $39 million construction and $10 million operation and maintenance.

I, for one, do not begrudge the Federal moneys expended on these channels. The resulting commerce through the ports involved has contributed far more in value to the economic health of their regions and the Nation.

But surely a similar national interest justifies the modest proposal to pay maintenance alone for the St. Lawrence Seaway. There is similar indirect economic benefit. In the last 6 years, 19 million tons of cargo have passed in foreign trade through the port of Duluth-Superior, contributing more than $85 million to the economy of the area. This was a bright spot in a region of my State which was federally recognized as distressed during much of this period. Certainly it is better to foster such commerce than to rely on additional Federal economic aid which would otherwise have been necessary in that region.

Other Great Lakes ports have similarly felt the economic benefits of seaway trade, and could testify to a multiplication many times over of the economic benefit I have described in my State. And this is true even though the seaway is just beginning to realize its potential. We must not jeopardize this major economic stimulus by tolls imposed upon the seaway because of unreasonable financial requirements.

The proposed legislation, by making the financial changes already described, would unquestionably end the need for any toll increase. Had it been law last year, it would have completely erased the Corporation's 1965 deficit. Therefore, the bill specifies that toll rates shall not exceed those in effect on January 1, 1966.

In addition, the bill sets a basis of calculation which will insure reasonable future toll rates. It requires that tolls be calculated upon capacity traffic, so that prohibitively high tolls will not result from early low traffic experienced. Tolls will be set to cover costs of operation, interest, dividends, and payments in lieu of taxes. The depreciation charge is eliminated as a required expense item. The result, I believe, will be rates which will encourage a maximum of traffic with the immense benefits such commerce will bring.

Mr. President, with reasonable toll rates reflecting a sound new financial structure, the St. Lawrence Seaway is bound to become the major artery of world trade it was intended to be. This legislation will free it to accomplish its great purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3698) to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the bill just introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE]. I have joined in the sponsorship of the bill because I believe that there ought to be a change in the responsibility which has been imposed upon the shippers on the St. Lawrence Seaway to bear fully the cost of building, maintaining, and operating the system. The shippers must bear the full cost because they must provide the moneys that will make the seaway financially self-sustaining. This responsibility is unique in character because there is no other water carrier system in the United States in which the cost of maintenance is not fully financed by the Federal Government.

There is one aspect of the Mondale bill that I question. The Senator from Minnesota contemplates substituting the present capital investment bonds held by the U.S. Government with stock certificates to be issued by the seaway authorities. I favor granting authority to the U.S. Government to receive stock certificates as evidence of the unpaid interest that is due the Government but not as capital investment. I have serious doubts about the soundness of giving stock certificates to the United States as a substitute for the bonds which it now holds as evidence of its $140 million loan used to build the seaway.

In any event, although there might be a difference of opinion as to certain aspects of the bill, the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota is sound, because it will bring this subject before an appropriate committee, where a complete study can be made to ascertain what finally should be done.

All of the sponsors of the bill and practically all of the port authorities of the Great Lakes are of the opinion that an increase in the tolls will aggravate the seaway financial difficulties rather than help solve them.

FAIR FARM BUDGET ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and Messrs. BURDICK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ERVIN, HARRIS, McGEE, McGOVERN, METCALF, MILLER, MONTOYA, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, PEARSON, PROXMIRE, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, the Fair Farm Budget Act, which will highlight the distinction between expenditures made by the Department of Agriculture for stabilization of farm income, and those which clearly provide benefits to the consumer, the businessman, and the general public.

This legislation will require the Budget Bureau to distinguish clearly in its budgetary, accounting, and reporting procedures between expenditures primarily for the purpose of augmenting and stabilizing farm income, and programs that clearly benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public. It requires the same distinction in requests for appropriations submitted by the Department of Agriculture, and requires, as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House, that general appropriation bills make this distinction clear.

It is my hope that this bill will contribute to a broader understanding of the farm programs carried out by the Federal Government, and place in perspective the cost of strengthening our amazingly efficient and productive family farm structure. I hope that this legislation will help us to destroy the myth that the American farmer receives a subsidy of $7 billion each year from the taxpayer. The fact that this misconception is widely held was clearly illustrated in an editorial in the Washington Evening Star on July 18, 1966, which stated:

> Back in 1940 when 23 percent of the population lived on farms, the federal outlay for agriculture was $1.4 billion. Now less than 8 percent of the population lives on farms and we're spending $7 billion on them. No voter group was ever treated with more solicitude.

But we simply are not spending $7 billion annually on the farmer alone. It happens to be true that only 36 percent of the fiscal year 1965 budget expenditures by the U.S. Department of Agriculture were primarily for maintenance of farm income. Of the total fiscal year 1965 expenditures of $7.298 billion, only $2.659 billion were spent on the farm price support mechanisms, while $4.639 billion were spent on programs which clearly provide benefits to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of costs falling under these two categories be printed in the RECORD at this point. This is the latest compilation of this information by the Department of Agriculture and clearly shows the truth about their budget.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Budget expenditures fiscal year 1965, and estimated, 1966 and 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	1965	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public:			
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:			
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies (title I, Public Law 480)	1,293	1,114	994
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples (title II, Public Law 480)	147	286	283
Donations of commodities acquired by CCC	211	206	200
International Wheat Agreement	35	75	3
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	41	34	41
Long-term supply contracts (title IV, Public Law 480)	200	301	262
Donations of dairy products to armed services and others	41	17	17
Total	1,968	2,033	1,800
Food distribution programs:			
Commodities distributed to the needy and others	393	373	268
Food stamp plan	34	89	133
School lunch program	179	186	168
Special milk program	87	89	37
Total	693	737	606
REA and FHA repayable loans:			
REA loans	381	181	184
FHA loans	247	37	−76
Sale of participation certificates in FHA direct loans			−549
Salaries and expenses for above programs	53	61	63
Total	681	279	−378
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural and natural resources:			
Forestry	323	362	352
Agricultural and forestry research	192	238	221
Plant and animal disease and pest control	68	76	68
Soil and water resource protection and development	214	276	294
Agricultural conservation program	253	276	247
Cooperative agricultural extension work	85	90	90
Inspection and other marketing service for agricultural commodities	76	80	23
Other	86	90	103
Total	1,297	1,488	1,398
Grand total	4,639	4,537	3,426
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others:			
CCC price-support and related programs:			
CCC loan, purchase, export, and related programs	−369	−445	−903
Storage, handling, and transportation expenses	422	332	315
Interest expense, net	442	270	291
Acreage diversion payments:			
Feed grains	914	829	655
Wheat	33	35	20
Cotton		112	237
Price-support payments:			
Feed grains	282	412	695
Cotton	51	58	496
Cotton equalization payments	435	331	
National Wool Act program	20	35	44
Total	2,230	1,969	1,850
Cropland adjustment program, adjustment payments			135
Conservation reserve program	194	148	140
Sugar Act program	92	94	85
Salaries and expenses for above programs	143	141	162
Total	2,659	2,352	2,372
Grand total	7,298	6,889	5,798

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, let us take a look at some of the specific items in the total of $7 billion that are blamed on the farmer. I am here using the 1966 estimated expenditures reported in the fiscal year 1967 budget submission.

The budget includes $4.5 million for nutrition and consumer research, under which studies are made of nutrition, consumer use and food economics, and clothing, but all of it is charged to the farmer.

It includes $38.3 million for meat inspection, $17.9 for poultry inspection, and $12.7 million for all other inspection, grading, classing, and standardization activities carried out by the Consumer and Marketing Service, but all of it is charged to the farmer.

It includes $100 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren, which the Congress has recognized this year as a welfare program, but all of it is directly charged to the farmer.

This budget provides $202 million for the national school lunch program—$99.9 million for the food stamp program, but these are charged to the farmer.

It contains an indirect subsidy of $69 million for the U.S. merchant marine.

$1.6 billion is provided for expenditures under titles I, II, and IV of Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, an invaluable tool of foreign policy and aid, but all of it is charged to the farmer.

The farmer is charged with $227 million for the U.S. Forest Service, as well as $371 million for rural electrification and telephone loans—which are repaid but without crediting the farm budget.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, once said half-jokingly that "if the moon is really made of green cheese, the cost of our space programs will be charged to the farm programs."

There is no question that some of these programs benefit the farmer as well as the general public, but these benefits to the farmer are incidental to the main purpose of the program. So if we can show that everyone clearly benefits from two-thirds of every dollar spent by the Agriculture Department, we will be able to reduce the resentment some urban taxpayers exhibit toward the farmer.

And this is not to say that only the farmer benefits from the one-third which is spent to strengthen farm income, for even here the general public is a beneficiary.

The $2.6 billion spent to support farm income is one of the best investments this country can make. Over the years this investment has enabled the American farmer to make food the best buy in the consumer's market basket, taking only 18 percent of our take-home pay, compared to 50 percent in Russia and even more in other countries. And if the price of food had increased as much as the price of all other products since 1952, the housewives of America would have had to spend over $7 billion more for food last year than they actually did.

Thus it is a gross injustice to criticize the American farmer for receiving a giant $7 billion subsidy every year, especially when the facts show just the opposite—that the farmer is doing the subsidizing.

For even though net farm income this year is at record levels, the farmer is still far behind the rest of the economy in terms of the income he receives for his labor and unbelievable productivity.

I pointed out before that the increases in farm productivity have released $7 billion of extra purchasing power to the consumer. If farm prices had advanced equally with other commodities, American families would have paid $7 billion more for food.

Agricultural products are the biggest export cash earner in world trade today, and account for fully a fourth of total U.S. exports. Farmers, as a group, use their purchasing power to consume annually more than $30 billion in goods and services—fertilizer, farm machinery and equipment, seed, rubber, and so on. They buy another $12 billion worth of consumer items.

We in the Congress depend upon the support of urban people for passage of farm programs. I think we owe them a fair look at the costs and expenditures of these programs, and a fair look at who benefits from them. It is my hope that this legislation will end once and for all the myth that the farmer is reaping a bonanza from the taxpayer when in actual fact only one out of every three dollars in the agriculture budget goes for farm income support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3699) to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefits consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EQUITABLE TAX TREATMENT FOR FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 732

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I propose to offer, the purpose of which would be to provide a $100 deduction for political contributions, as recommended by the President. I expect to offer it to the bill when it is before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 732) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

A REVISED BILL TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION TO VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIMES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 733

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I hereby submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 2155, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act I introduced in 1965. In developing this substitute amendment, I have retained the basic provisions of my bill. I am proposing to create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission, which would consider the claims of those injured by criminal violence. The Commission would consider evidence presented to it to determine whether compensation should be paid to the victim and in what amount. The maximum amount which could be paid to any victim would be $25,000. The bill applies only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power—the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States. I hope that the example this legislation would set would encourage the States to adopt similar plans, as indeed one State, California, has.

Mr. President, we need to begin to pay attention to the victim of crimes. The comment my bill has received since I introduced it last year indicates how true this is.

In that period, we have found undiminished callousness on the part of the public toward victims who are injured within the sight and hearing of bystanders who do nothing to stop what is happening. I have provided in my substitute amendment for compensation to "good samaritans" who are injured or killed while trying to stop a crime or assist a policeman in stopping a crime. During the past year, we have had much debate about the rights of offenders and alleged offenders, and the Supreme Court has handed down a number of extremely significant opinions on the subject of due process in criminal law. We must talk about and understand those decisions. But we must not let that discussion obscure an equally important subject which has been neglected—the status of the victim of the crime. I hope that introduction of this substitute amendment can further that most highly needed debate and dialog.

Since I first introduced S. 2155, there has been helpful comment on the idea of compensation to victims of criminal violence, and also on my bill in particular, in the law reviews published by several law schools. In addition, I have received thoughtful remarks in letters from other individuals. All this has made revision of the bill much easier, and has contributed to a piece of legislation which has received serious comment from the legal community.

The best overall treatment of the subject is to be found in the December 1965 Minnesota Law Review symposium on "Compensation to Victims of Crimes of Personal Violence." This symposium contains my article explaining my purpose in introducing the bill and also contains the text of the original bill.

I want to thank the following for their help and comments: M. Paul Martin, articles editor for the Houston Law Review, and several of his fellow students; John C. Fleming, editor, Harvard Law Review; William W. Johnson, Jr., for his article, "Compensation for Victims of Violent Crimes," in the December 1965 issue of the Vanderbilt Law Review; Prof. P. F. Rothstein of the University of Texas Law School, for his article in the November 1965 Texas Law Review; my friend, Attorney Percy Selden of Houston, Tex.; Prof. Norval Morris of the University of Chicago Law School; and, most particularly, Prof. James Starrs of George Washington University Law School, whose extended and detailed analysis of S. 2155 is most appreciated.

I have made a number of changes in the original bill. The major ones are as follows:

First. The Commission may utilize its representatives to hear cases and to take testimony, thus lessening the burden on the Commissioners while retaining their number at three.

Second. I have provided for a limited judicial review of the Commission's decision, although no de novo trial of the facts could take place on appeal.

Third. The section of attorney's fees has been changed to bring it in line with S. 1522, which the Senate recently passed. In brief, the Commission could allow whatever attorney's fee is justified under the circumstances.

Fourth. Payment would be allowed to the closest relative of a victim, not just his "dependents," in case of death; this would take care of the situation where a child, on whom his parents were not dependent, was killed.

Fifth. We have clarified the point that the Commission may take into account the victim's behavior in contributing to a crime against him, in determining both whether to make an award and in setting the level of an award; in the earlier version of the bill, such behavior could have been an absolute bar to compensation. I have also eliminated the prohibition of payments to relatives, as the Commission can examine their behavior in relation to the offense in determining compensation. A victim who is the wife or husband of an offender may also be compensated, but not if they will be unjustly enriched.

Sixth. In the original bill, the Attorney General could petition for suspension of proceedings when an offender was being prosecuted for the offense in question or when such a prosecution was imminent. In the substitute, the offender himself also may petition for such a suspension, which shall be mandatory. Suspension of proceedings is permissible at the discretion of the Commission when civil action is being taken against the offender. I have also provided that evidence introduced concerning the offender, a request for stay of the Commission action, or the announcement of a compensation award, may not be introduced in a subsequent prosecution of the offender. While my primary concern is with the victim, I certainly do not wish to decrease the offender's constitutional rights as a result of actions of the Compensation Commission.

Mr. President, I want to stress again the importance of our giving our attention to the victim of violent crimes. He must no longer be neglected. And we must manifest our concern concretely. The compensation provided by my proposed Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission would be a step in the right direction, and an indication that the Government does care.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the substitute amendment be printed at the end of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 733) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the 'Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1964'.

"Definitions

"SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'child' means an unmarried person who is under eighteen years of age and includes a stepchild or an adopted child;

"(2) The term 'Commission' means the Violent Crimes Compensation Commission established by this Act;

"(3) The term 'dependents' means those who were wholly or partially dependent upon his income at the time of his death or would have been so dependent but for the incapacity due to the injury from which the death resulted and shall include the child of such victim born after his death;

"(4) The term 'personal injury' means actual bodily harm and includes pregnancy and mental or nervous shock;

"(5) The term 'relative' means his spouse, parent, grandparent, stepfather, stepmother, child, grandchild, brother, sister, half brother, half sister, or spouse's parents;

"(6) The term 'victim' means a person who is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in section 302 of this Act.

"TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

"Violent Crimes Compensation Commission

"SEC. 201. (a) There is established a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of the office. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission who has been a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State for at least eight years, as Chairman.

"(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

"(c) The Chairman and one other member of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, except as provided in section 205 (b); and where opinion is divided and only one other member is present, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail.

"(d) The Commission shall have an official seal.

"Terms and compensation of members

"SEC. 202. (a) The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after December 31, 1965, shall be eight years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office after December 31, 1965, shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of four years, one at the end of six years, and one at the end of eight years, after December 31, 1965; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(b) Each member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment.

"(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

"(d) Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(e) Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 except the chairman who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III of such schedule.

"Attorneys, examiners, and employees of the Commission; expenses

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint such officers, attorneys, examiners, and other experts as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and the Commission may, subject to the civil service laws, appoint such other officers and employees as are necessary and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"(b) All expenses of the Commission, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of the Commission outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Commission under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Commission or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"Principal office

"SEC. 204. (a) The principal office of the Commission shall be in or near the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its powers in any place.

"(b) The Commission shall maintain an office for the service of process and papers within the District of Columbia.

"Powers and procedures of the Commission

"SEC. 205. (a) Upon request made to the Commission after the filing of an application under the provisions of this Act, the Commission or its duly authorized representative shall have a hearing on such application, shall fix a time and place for such hearing, and shall cause notice thereof to be given to the applicant.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, or its duly authorized representative, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the Act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend or testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpena may be made only by said Chairman. Subpenas shall be served by any person designated by the said Chairman.

"(c) In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is a child, the application may be made on his behalf by any person acting as his parent or guardian. In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is mentally defective, the application may be made on his behalf by his guardian or such other individual authorized to administer his estate.

"(d) Where any application is made to the Commission under this Act, the applicant, and any attorney assisting the Commission, shall be entitled to appear and be heard.

"(e) Any other person may appear and be heard who satisfies the Commission that he has a substantial interest in the proceedings.

"(f) Where under this Act any person is entitled to appear and be heard by the Commission, that person may appear in person or by his attorney.

"(g) Every person appearing under the preceding subsections of this section shall have the right to produce evidence and to cross-examine witnesses.

"(h) The Commission or its duly authorized representative may receive in evidence any statement, document, information, or matter that may in the opinion of the Commission contribute to its functions under this Act, whether or not such statement, document, information, or matter would be admissible in a court of law, except that any evidence introduced by or on behalf of the person or persons charged with causing the injury or death of the victim, any request for a stay of the Commission's action, and the fact of any award granted by the Commission shall not be admissible against such person or persons in any prosecution for such injury or death.

"(i) If any person has been convicted of any offense with respect to an act or omission on which a claim under this Act is based, proof of that conviction shall, unless an appeal against the conviction or a petition for a rehearing of certiorari in respect of the charge is pending or a new trial or rehearing has been ordered, be taken as conclusive evidence that the offense has been committed.

"(j) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the proceedings of the Commission.

"Attorney's fees

"SEC. 206. (a) The Commission shall publish regulations providing that an attorney shall, at the conclusion of proceedings under this Act, file with the agency the amount of fee charged in connection with his services rendered in such proceedings.

"(b) After the fee information is filed by an attorney under (a) above, the Commission may determine, in accordance with such published rules or regulations as it may provide, that such fee charged is excessive. If, after notice to the attorney of this determination, the Commission and the attorney fail to agree upon a fee, the Commission may, within ninety days after the receipt of the information required by (a) above, petition the United States district court in the district in which the attorney maintains an office, and the court shall determine a reasonable fee for the services rendered by the attorney.

"(c) Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with any proceedings under this Act any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if any compensation is paid, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"Finality of decision

"SEC. 207. The orders and decisions of the Commission shall be reviewable on appeal, except that no trial de novo of the facts determined by the Commission shall be allowed.

"Regulations

"SEC. 208. In the performance of its functions, the Commission is authorized to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations prescribing the procedures to be followed in the filing of applications and the proceedings under this Act, and such other matters as the Commission deems appropriate.

"TITLE III—AWARD AND PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

"Awarding compensation

"SEC. 301. (a) In any case in which a person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of the offenses listed in section 302 of this Act, the Commission may, in its discretion, upon an application, order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act, if such act or omission occurs—

"(1) within the 'special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States' as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code; or

"(2) within the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Commission may order the payment of compensation—

"(1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or

"(2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or

"(3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents or closest relative of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

"(c) For the purpose of this Act, a person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reason of age, insanity, drunkenness, or otherwise he was legally of forming a criminal intent.

"(d) In determining whether to make an order under this section, or the amount of any award, the Commission may consider any circumstances it determines to be relevant, including the behavior of the victim which directly or indirectly contributed to his injury or death, unless such injury or death resulted from the victim's lawful attempt to prevent the commission of a crime or to apprehend an offender.

"(e) No order may be made under this section unless the Commission, supported by substantial evidence, finds that—

"(1) such an act or omission did occur; and

"(2) the injury or death resulted from such act or omission.

"(f) An order may be made under this section whether or not any person is prosecuted or convicted of any offense arising out of such act or omission, or if such act or omission is the subject of any other legal action. Upon application from the Attorney General or the person or persons alleged to have caused the injury or death, the Commission shall suspend proceedings under this Act until such application is withdrawn or until a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission is no longer pending or imminent. The Commission may suspend proceedings in the interest of justice if a civil action arising from such act or omission is pending or imminent.

"Offenses to which this act applies

"SEC. 302. The Commission may order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act for personal injury or death which resulted from offenses in the following categories:

"(1) assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison;

"(2) assault with intent to commit mayhem;

"(3) assault with a dangerous weapon.

"(4) assault;

"(5) mayhem;

"(6) malicious disfiguring;

"(7) threats to do bodily harm;

"(8) lewd, indecent, or obscene acts;

"(9) indecent act with children;

"(10) arson;

"(11) kidnaping;

"(12) robbery;

"(13) murder;

"(14) manslaughter, voluntary;

"(15) attempted murder;

"(16) rape;

"(17) attempted rape;

"(18) or other crimes involving force to the person.

"Nature of the compensation

"SEC. 303. The Commission may order the payment of compensation under this Act for—

"(a) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the personal injury or death of the victim;

"(b) loss of earning power as a result of total or partial incapacity of such victim;

"(c) pecuniary loss to the dependents of the deceased victim;

"(d) pain and suffering of the victim; and

"(e) any other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

"Limitations upon awarding compensation

"SEC. 304. (a) No order for the payment of compensation shall be made under section 301 of this Act unless the application has been made within two years after the date of the personal injury or death.

"(b) No compensation shall be awarded under this Act to or on behalf of any victim in an amount in excess of $25,000.

"(c) No compensation shall be awarded if the victim was at the time of the personal injury or death of the victim living with the offender as his wife or her husband or in situations when the Commission at its discretion feels unjust enrichment to or on behalf of the offender would result.

"Terms of the order

"SEC. 305. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section any order for the payment of compensation under this Act may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate.

"(b) The Commission shall deduct from any payments awarded under section 301 of this Act any payments received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this Act), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this Act, but only to the extent that the sum of such payments and any award under this Act are in excess of the total compensable injuries suffered by the victim as determined by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may at any time, on its own motion or on the application of the Attorney General, or of the victim or his dependents, or of the offender, vary any order for the payment of compensation made under this Act in such manner as the Commission thinks fit, whether as to terms of the order or by increasing or decreasing the amount of the award or otherwise.

"TITLE IV—RECOVERY OF COMPENSATION

"Recovery from offender

"SEC. 401. (a) Whenever any person is convicted of an offense and an order for the payment of compensation is or has been made under this Act for a personal injury or death resulting from the act or omission constituting such offense, the Commission may institute an action against such person for the recovery of the whole or any specified part of such compensation in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides or is found. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment in any such action.

"(b) Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action under this section may be served in any other judicial district by the United States marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any action under this section is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

"(c) An order for the payment of compensation under this Act shall not affect the right of any person to recover damages from any other person by a civil action for the injury or death.

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"Reports to the Congress

"SEC. 501. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this Act including the name of each applicant, a brief description of the facts in each case, and the amount, if any, of compensation awarded.

"Penalties

"SEC. 502. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall apply to any application, statement, document, or information presented to the Commission under this Act.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 503. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Effective date

"SEC. 504. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1966."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 734

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings on the international education bills, S. 2874 and H.R. 14643, have been set before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for August 17, 18, and 19, 1966, starting at 10 a.m., in room 4232, New Senate Office Building.

The first day of hearings will be devoted to witnesses from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of State, and the remaining 2 days will be devoted to short oral presentations from representatives of educational associations and institutions and from representatives of other public interest groups.

In view of the relatively short time available to the subcommittee to take testimony, I am requesting that oral presentations be limited to 10 minutes with the assurance that full and complete statements will be accepted for the hearings record and will be given full consideration.

Those who have not already indicated to the subcommittee their desire to present testimony should immediately be in touch with the office of the subcommittee in room 4230, New Senate Office Building.

In view of the widespread interest that has already been made manifest in this legislation, I anticipate that our hearings record will predominately consist of statements which are filed.

DELETION OF THE INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBENTURES ISSUED BY FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1392, Senate Joint Resolution 178.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 178) to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 203(b) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1042), relating to debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks, is amended by deleting ", not exceeding 6 per centum per annum" therefrom.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1427), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to assure that the Federal intermediate credit banks can obtain funds they need for their lending and discounting operations by the sale of debentures to the investing public at the rates of interest required to make such debentures marketable.

COST

The United States does not guarantee or otherwise assume any liability with regard to the debentures of the Federal intermediate credit banks. Therefore, there would be no additional cost to the United States as the result of the enactment of this joint resolution.

BACKGROUND—FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

The 12 Federal intermediate credit banks, one in each farm credit district, are organized and operate under title II which was added to the Federal Farm Loan Act by the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923. Their function is to finance the 468 production credit associations and over 100 other financing institutions that make short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers and ranchers. The total of such financing by the credit banks during the fiscal year that ended June 30, 1966, was $5.9 billion. Over 90 percent of such business was with the production credit associations.

About 35 percent of the total capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit banks is owned by the production credit associations, and the other 65 percent continues to be owned by the Government. Under amendments enacted in 1956 and 1965, it is intended that the associations eventually will come to own all of the capital stock in such banks as their Government capital is gradually retired.

The credit banks finance the production credit associations and the other financing institutions by discounting for them, with their endorsement, the notes taken by them from the farmers and ranchers, and also by making loans to the associations and other financing institutions secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Loans may also be made to the associations without collateral to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration. The funds loaned by the credit banks are obtained chiefly through the sale of their consolidated debentures to the investing public so that the interest and discount rates which the banks charge depend upon the rates of interest which the banks have to pay on their debentures and administrative costs.

Under existing law the interest rates on such debentures are determined as follows (12 U.S.C. 1042):

"Rates of interest upon debentures and other such obligations issued under said section shall, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, be fixed by the Federal intermediate credit bank making the issue, not exceeding 6 per centum per annum."

The present amendment would delete, "not exceeding 6 per centum per annum" from the foregoing. This would permit the Federal intermediate credit banks to issue debentures with an interest rate of more than 6 percent if the higher rate is required for the debentures to be marketable.

Issues of Federal intermediate credit bank debentures, which are of 9-month term and average about $350 million, mature monthly. To assure that these issues will be paid as they mature, it is vital that ready access to money market funds be uninterrupted. If any issue were permitted to become in default it would seriously impair not only operations of the credit banks, but the future sales of bonds and debentures of the Federal land banks and banks for cooperatives which also are under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

On the sale of credit bank debentures for delivery on July 5, 1966, the market then prevailing required an interest rate of 5.60 percent. On July 20, 1966, an issue of credit bank debentures required a price of 5.875 percent.[1] If the present upward trend of interest rates continues, the Federal intermediate credit banks might soon be precluded from obtaining further loan funds. Should this happen, they would not be in a position to continue to perform their function of financing the production credit associations and other financing institutions. This would result in an intolerable situation since the credit banks would be faced with maturing issues of debentures and an important source of credit upon which hundreds of thousands of farmers depend would be extinguished.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1394 and the succeeding measures in sequence, excluding Calendar Nos. 1398 and 1399.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT OF EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11671) to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "schedule" to strike out "and" and insert "for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1429), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 11671, introduced as the result of an executive communication, is to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, and to authorize its execution by the Secretary of the Interior. The proposed amendatory contract provides that the district's annual payments to the United States toward the repayment of project construction and rehabilitation costs shall be computed by a formula based upon the availability of project water. By so doing, it establishes an equitable means of treating the district's frequent water shortages. When drought conditions occur, the application of the proposed variable repayment formula will result in extension of the district's repayment period.

NEED

This legislation is needed because of the long prevailing and continuing drought conditions in the project area. The average annual water delivery to the district has been inadequate to support the irrigation economy. About 3 acre-feet of water per acre is required annually to satisfactorily meet irrigation needs; however, during the last 15 years an average of less than 2 acre-feet per acre has been available, and in 4 out of the 15 years, the allotment was 6 acre-inches or less. It is this inadequate water supply and expected continuance of drought conditions which justifies an adjustment in the district's repayment arrangements.

COST

The enactment of this legislation will result in no direct cost to the Federal Government and the indirect cost will only be that which is entailed in extension of the repayment period. The amount to be repaid by the district is not reduced.

DISCUSSION

As already indicated, the proposed amendatory contract which H.R. 11671 would approve provides that the district's annual payments to the United States toward repayment of project construction and rehabilitation costs shall be computed by a formula based on the availability of project water. Under existing contract repayment arrangements, the district is required to pay fixed annual installments irrespective of water availability. Under the proposed formula, the district could repay its outstanding construction and rehabilitation and betterment obligations by variable installments geared to the availability of project water. This should provide an equitable solution to the district's repayment dilemma occasioned by the frequent and periodic water shortages. It relates the repayment amounts more closely to the district's ability to repay.

Construction of the Rio Grande project was begun in 1906 with the building of Leasburg diversion dam and canal. Elephant Butte Dam and Reservoir, the principal facility of the project, was authorized for construction by the Congress on May 4, 1907, and construction commenced in 1908. Additional project works have been authorized by Congress through the years. Principal project features include Elephant Butte and Caballo dams and reservoirs, Elephant Butte powerplant, power distribution facilities, four project diversion dams, plus the American Dam operated by the International Boundary and Water Commission, 141 miles of main canals, 462 miles of laterals, and over 460 miles of drains.

---

[1] In the letter to the President of the Senate, dated July 20, 1966, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration stated that on July 20, 1966, an issue of credit bank debentures required a price of 5.90 percent. This price was considered firm at the time the letter was written. On the same day, after the letter was sent, the price was revised in the light of the latest-available data and the issue was sold at 5.875 percent.

The project was initially planned to provide full irrigation service for 159,650 acres and supplemental irrigation water for 18,340 acres of land in New Mexico and Texas. The full service irrigated lands lie in a long narrow strip adjacent to the Rio Grande River and extend for nearly 130 miles from the first diversion in New Mexico to the Hudspeth County line in Texas. Most of these lands are located in El Paso County, Tex., and Dona Ana County, N. Mex., with a limited area in Sierra County, N. Mex. Full service project lands in New Mexico are in the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, and those in Texas are within the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. About 69,010 irrigable acres are in the El Paso district.

The initial repayment contract for the repayment of a share of Rio Grande project costs was executed with the El Paso Valley Water Users Association, the predecessor organization to the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. That contract was effective June 27, 1906. The first water deliveries were in 1912 and the initial installment toward repayment was made in 1923. Additional contracts as necessary have been executed over the years, first with the association and later with the district, to accommodate additional construction and/or adjustment of charges associated with the project.

The district's total construction obligation to the United States of $4,446,111 is currently being repaid at the rate of $98,863 annually. As of the end of fiscal year 1966, matured construction charges totaled $3,781,540, all of which has been paid. The district's unmatured construction charges total $664,571 and, under the present contract, this is scheduled for repayment by 1971. The district also entered into a contract on May 15, 1959, with the United States and assumed a further obligation of not to exceed $2,300,000 for costs to be incurred in the rehabilitation and betterment of project facilities. That contract provided for annual district payments of $133,860 less the amount payable under construction cost repayment contracts. Repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs commences in 1966 and is currently scheduled to be repaid in full by 1988.

The proposed variable repayment contract which H.R. 11671 would approve would permit the district to reduce its scheduled payments to the United States when less than a full project water supply is available to the district. The formula considers 3 acre-feet as a full water supply. Thus, if only 2 acre-feet were available, the district would pay two-thirds of the scheduled base annual charge. But if a full water supply is available, the district would pay the full base charge, which is the payment provided by existing contracts. Thus, if an adequate water supply is available, repayment would be completed by 1988 as contemplated in existing contract repayment arrangements. If the project water supply is less than adequate, annual payments would be reduced consistent with reduced water availability. The proposed variable repayment formula would apply to the total $133,860 construction and/or rehabilitation and betterment payment. Assuming the available water supply is approximately the same as that over the past 15 years, it will take until about the year 2000 to accomplish full repayment.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN FLUORSPAR AND FERROMANGANESE HELD IN THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 15485) to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1430), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would grant congressional approval for the exchange of approximately 25,105 short dry tons of metallurgical grade fluorspar now held in the national stockpile and approximately 6,667 short tons of ferromanganese now held in the supplemental stockpile, for a similar quantity and quality of new material to be procured and placed in storage by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., of Pueblo, Colo.

A companion bill, S. 3519, was introduced in the Senate by Mr. ALLOTT for himself and Mr. DOMINICK.

WHY CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of these materials is not based on obsolescence, the proposed exchange requires the express approval of the Congress.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

Approximately 25,105 short dry tons of metallurgical grade fluorspar in the national stockpile and 6,667 short tons of ferromanganese in the supplemental stockpile are now stored at the plant of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. at Pueblo, Colo. The storage site is leased by the company to GSA for a nominal rental.

The fluorspar and ferromanganese are credited to the respective stockpile objectives for such materials. Under existing stockpile criteria with respect to storage location, metallurgical grade fluorspar and ferromanganese in the quantities stated above must continue to be stored in the Pueblo area in order to meet the requirements of the steel industry in Colorado in the event of an emergency.

It is understood that the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. plans to expand its facilities at Pueblo and that the land on which the materials are stored is required for such expansion.

Under the lease of the storage site, it would be permissible for the company, at its expense, to move the materials to another storage location at its plant. With the authority which would be provided by H.R. 15485, however, the same objective could be accomplished, in effect, through an exchange arrangement at considerably less cost to the company and in a manner which would be more satisfactory to the Government. GSA does not have authority under existing law to effect such an exchange.

Under the transaction contemplated by the bill, the company, at its own expense, would purchase and place in storage at a new location at the company's Pueblo plant, to be provided and suitably prepared by the company, new materials of at least the same quantity and quality as the materials now stored. As the new materials are placed in storage, an equivalent quantity of the materials now in storage would be released to the company, for its use, in exchange for the new materials.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL GRADE MANGANESE ORE

The bill (H.R. 13772) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1431), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would grant congressional approval to the disposal of approximately 1.9 million short dry tons of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional approval is required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except in those instances where the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use during time of war.

Since the proposed disposal of these materials is not based on obsolescence, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

In addition, the bill would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. Thus, the waiver will permit the immediate disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore upon enactment of H.R. 13772.

Why disposal is proposed

The metallurgical grade manganese ore to be disposed of from the national and supplemental stockpiles is surplus to the stockpile requirements.

The objective inventory is composed of ore and upgraded forms of manganese. The ore component of the manganese objective is approximately 6.6 million short tons. As of March 31, 1966, the excess inventory over the objective amounted to about 3.8 million short tons of which approximately 1.7 million tons in the Defense Production Act inventory has been authorized previously for sale. Much of this DPA material is of such low quality grade that the General Services Administration has encountered difficulty in disposing of it pending the availability of higher grade ore to offer simultaneously. The bill under consideration accounts for the remainder of the excess except for that quantity which is being retained temporarily for strategic storage purposes.

Information on metallurgical grade manganese ore

Metallurgical grade manganese is primarily used in the production of steel as a desulfurizer and deoxidizer. It is also used to impart one or more of the properties of strength, toughness, and hardness to some steels. For these applications, manganese is usually introduced in the form of ferromanganese.

The United States imports metallurgical grade manganese ore chiefly from India, Brazil, the Republic of the Congo, Union of South Africa, Ghana, and Mexico.

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost per short dry ton of the metallurgical grade manganese ore in the national stockpile was $39.60 and in the supplemental stockpile was $43.09. The current market price is about $34.25 per short dry ton.

DIRECTION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ADJUDICATE A CLAIM TO CERTAIN LAND

The bill (S. 1684) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1684

A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Alabama

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is directed to adjudicate the claim of B. A. Cogle of Thomasville, Alabama, under the Color of Title Act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069), as amended by the Act of July 28, 1953 (67 Stat. 2276 43 U.S.C. 1068–1068b), to the lands described in section 2 of this Act. If the Secretary shall determine that the said B. A. Cogle has otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Color of Title Act, he may issue a patent under such Act to such lands without regard to the acreage limitation imposed in such Act.

SEC. 2. The lands subject to this Act are the following-described tracts of land all situated in Marengo County, Alabama, and described with respect to St. Stephens meridian:

(1) the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 3, township 13 north, range 2 east;

(2) the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, township 13 north, range 3 east;

(3) the south half of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 13 north, range 3 east; and

(4) the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 19 township 14 north, range 2 east.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1432), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate, under the Color of Title Act of December 22, 1928, 45 Stat. 1069, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1068–1068b, a claim of B. A. Cogle to approximately 234.90 acres of land, without regard to the 160-acre limitation in the act.

In essence, the bill authorizes the Secretary to determine whether B. A. Cogle otherwise satisfies the requirements of the Color of Title Act and to issue a patent to the land described in the bill, if the Secretary is satisfied as to such compliance.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Cogle previously received patent under the Color of Title Act for 159.88 acres of public land in Alabama.

He has occupied the land since 1923, and the committee accepts the fact that he was a bona fide purchaser of the land in question, and that for each parcel of land there is a chain of titles showing that many individuals thought they owned the parcel which they later sold, and which ultimately passed to Mr. Cogle—and that during all this time, the United States did nothing to assert its claim of ownership.

The Department of Interior report, agreed upon by the Bureau of the Budget, raises no objection to enactment of the bill if the Congress finds "there is justification for special consideration of Mr. Cogle's claim."

An appraisal made in May 1965, values the land at $26,320. The Geological Survey says the land is prospectively valuable for oil and gas, and a portion of it for sodium. The Interior report says there is no known Federal need for the land. There is some commercial timber on the land.

The House passed a similar bill, H.R. 2942 in 1963, but the bill did not get out of Senate committee, purportedly because the committee did not want to act on the bill without assurance that the Interior Department would allow Mr. Cogle's application. On June 11, 1964, the Department advised the committee that if the bill were enacted into law, the applications would be deemed "to be allowable ones."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 or 7 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past few days, a number of developments have occurred in connection with Vietnam which should not be overlooked by the Senate. Suggestions relative to the restoration of peace have been made in various Asian quarters. Whether they lead to any specific progress in that direction in the days ahead is another matter. In themselves, the Asian suggestions for peace are only straws which have yet to be picked up by the wind. If there is to be any progress beyond them, toward peace, it will depend on subsequent responses and initiatives.

The experienced and astute Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, has advanced the suggestion that the Asian nations themselves should seize the reins of the Vietnamese and other problems of their continent. He has urged that a peace conference be held, not in Geneva, but in Asia, and by the parties concerned.

Similar suggestions have been made by others in the past but not with nearly the clarity or the directness of the suggestions of the able Thai Foreign Minister. What Thanat Khoman is saying, in effect, is that there should be a meeting of Asian leaders, whether of South Vietnam or North, of Thailand or Burma, of the Philippines or Cambodia, of Peking or Tokyo or wherever. If the press interprets him correctly, he wants these leaders to get together somewhere in Asia and try to end the war in Vietnam before its spreading devastation puts an end to the remaining stability of that continent, including almost inevitably at some point, the stability of Thailand.

That is an admirable suggestion, Mr. President, and I see no reason why it should not have the support of all concerned. Certainly, if greater progress toward peace in Asia is promised by a conference of Asians who are intimately concerned with this problem rather than by a meeting in Geneva by nations, many of which are only remotely concerned, then let it be called in Rangoon or Bangkok, in Manila or Phnom Penh or, for that matter, even in Peking.

I do not believe the Thai Foreign Minister made mention of a U.N. role in connection with the Asian conference which he has proposed. Nevertheless, Mr. U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, has set forth a basis on which he believes peace might be established in Vietnam. He has advanced three points as preconditions for settlement. These points are: First, cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam; second, reciprocal scaling down of military activities in the south and then a ceasefire on all sides; and, third, willingness to enter into discussion with those who are "actually fighting." This latter category has subsequently been defined, obviously, to include not only the Hanoi and Saigon Governments but also the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, whose leadership is, in fact, composed of southern Vietnamese.

In the latter connection, it is interesting to note that Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, in a recent interview with an American correspondent, went so far as to suggest that the key to peace might lie not in Hanoi or Peking at all but rather in direct conversations between Saigon and the latter group; that is, the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front.

May I say from personal knowledge that Prince Sihanouk's observations on Indochina are those of one of the most active participants and effective national leaders in the great wave of change which has engulfed former Indochina as well as the rest of southeast Asia during the past decade and a half. In my judgment, Prince Sihanouk not only has a high sense of the needs of his own people but also a sharp perception of realities in Vietnam and elsewhere in Asia. His views as to where the key to peace in Vietnam may lie should be explored. I am delighted that Ambassador Harriman will be visiting with the Cambodian leader next month.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to make reference to the recent suggestion of the distinguished Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. It was her view that the International Control Commission in Vietnam should be strengthened in order to patrol the demilitarized zone at the 17th parallel and thereby forestall a further spread of hostilities. In my judgment, it would be desirable to enlarge the Commission to the point where it will be able not only to patrol the demilitarized zone but also to extend its operations along the Cambodian border. Prince Sihanouk has long advocated this course and the United States has recently concurred in his view that the Commission would be most helpful in the preservation of Cambodian neutrality and in prevention of the spread of the war. For whatever the reasons, the Soviet Union, as a cochairman, has been unwilling to join with the United Kingdom in reconvening the Geneva Conference in order to take up this proposition. That would appear to be one more reason for giving every possible and prompt consideration to a convening of an Asian conference in Asia.

If I may summarize, then, Mr. President, it would seem to me that these recent suggestions relative to Vietnam which have emanated from Asian sources, notably from the Foreign Minister of Thailand and the Prime Ministers of India and Cambodia, and from the Secretary Generanl of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, are most helpful. It would be my hope that there promise, such as it may be, will not be permitted to fade through inertia on the part of any nation. I am delighted that the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has already seen fit to respond to them in a most constructive fashion. Indeed, in a recent press conference, he gave every indication of the U.S. readiness to pursue any or all of these suggestions. I would certainly expect, therefore, that U.S. diplomacy, whether at the United Nations or down the line here in Washington or in nations abroad where it might conceivably be useful, will pursue and underscore the constructive responses of the Secretary of State to these excellent Asian initiatives.

I do not think it is too much to say that this Nation not only supports fully the search for acceptable Vietnamese and Asian solutions by Asians, but that, in all probability, we would find acceptable a solution on which the Asian nations themselves and the Vietnamese people, north and south, can generally agree.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include at this point in the Record pertinent extracts from the transcript of a recent press conference of the Secretary of State and a statement I made on Vietnam on April 18, 1966, on the Senate floor.

There being no objection, the extracts and the statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1966]

Excerpts From Rusk News Conference

Question. Mr. Secretary, the Soviet Union has charged that the United States planes have attacked its ships in the Haiphong harbor. Has this occurred? And what is U.S. policy on this question?

Answer. We have no information at all that would support the charge that we have attacked any shipping in the Haiphong harbor. Our strikes on the P.O.L. (petroleum, oil and lubricants) installations there were for that purpose, and that purpose alone. Indications from the strikes are that all of the bombs were in the target area. There was no indication that attacks on Soviet shipping occurred.

Question. You spoke of bombs, I think the Soviet note charged that this vessel, the Medyn, was hit by large caliber bullets.

Answer. We have no information at all on that. In an earlier incident, when such a charge was made, our judgment was that if anything at all reached a Soviet ship, that it might well have been North Vietnamese antiaircraft or something the North Vietnamese were doing. But it was not U.S. bombs that had anything to do with it.

Question. India is reported to be considering asking that the I.C.C. (International Control Commission) be expanded to control and observe in the demilitarized zone more thoroughly. What do you think of such an idea?

Answer. We would be very much in favor of a strengthening of the I.C.C. to do any of the jobs that are its responsibility, including the assurance that the demilitarized zone is in fact demilitarized.

Very substantial North Vietnamese forces have come through the demilitarized zone, and have been engaged by our Marine and South Vietnamese forces in the northern part of South Vietnam. Those North Vietnamese forces are back in the demilitarized zone, contrary to the understandings reached in 1954.

Another instance of I.C.C. activity that we would welcome would be to assure the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia. As you know, Prince Sihanouk has requested that that be done. We would be glad to see that that would be done.

ATTITUDE OF POLISH MEMBER

Question. Is it true that the Polish member of the I.C.C. is resisting proposals or efforts to get that commission into the zone to investigate conditions there?

Answer. Quite frankly, I don't have precise information on that point. I think probably we will know very shortly more specifically what their attitude is.

As you know, the South Vietnamese Government has repeatedly called the attention of the I.C.C. to violations of the demilitarized zone. Now Hanoi has put in a protest to the I.C.C.

All right. Let's do something about it. Let's get going. And I would hope that the three members of the I.C.C. could agree that they would assure the demilitarization of that zone. And I can assure you that any efforts on their side in that direction would be met with complete response by us, and that we would do everything we could to cooperate. We would hope the other side would.

Question. On another aspect of the Vietnamese question, Thailand has proposed an all-Asian conference on the problem of trying to reach peace in Vietnam, and has proposed that all the principals participate in such a conference. What would be your view on that, sir?

Answer. We feel that this is a constructive suggestion. I found when I was in Asia recently that the Asian countries were very much concerned about the possibilities of peace in Southeast Asia, and the ability of these smaller countries to live unmolested. We would hope that this suggestion might result in some constructive action.

As you know, we have been prepared for negotiations, discussions, conferences, contacts, through any channels: 17 nonaligned nations; the two co-chairmen of the I.C.C. or any of the other many third parties who have come forward to try to establish some contact between the two sides; or direct bilateral discussions between ourselves and, say, Hanoi or Peking.

I think this idea—that the nations who are really most immediately concerned, the Asian nations, might take some useful initiative—is a constructive one, and we will follow with great interest what results from it.

USE OF FORCES IN ZONE

Question. Is there a policy inhibition on the possible use of American ground forces in the demilitarized zone if the North Vietnamese continue to use it?

Answer. We have not wanted to go into the zone or cross the 17th Parallel. Our attitude has been that we don't want any shooting by anybody at anyone, and that we would be glad to see all of the shooting come to an end straightaway. We have no desire to destroy the regime in North Vietnam; we have no desire to drop any bombs on North Vietnam.

Question. There are reports that the North Vietnamese are stepping up their infiltration into South Vietnam despite the bombing of petroleum installations. What can you say about this?

Answer. Well, their infiltration continues. There are some time lags between their infiltration and our precise knowledge about just how much it is, and what it is. But I think it would be a mistake to suppose that since infiltration is continuing, therefore, the bombing has no point. Because that overlooks what might have happened in terms of infiltration had the bombing not occurred.

QUESTION FOR THE FUTURE

We know that the bombing has made infiltration substantially more difficult; that many supplies, military supplies, that have come down the trails have been destroyed by the bombing; that there is much less P.O.L. to support the trucks that bring men and arms into the South than there was before. We know that there are fewer trucks to bring men and arms down into South Vietnam. So the problem is not whether the bombing has stopped the infiltration, but what the infiltration might have been without it; and whether the bombing has made it more difficult and costly for the other side.

Question. Do we draw any policy distinction between possible use of ground troops in the southern part of the demilitarized zone and moving troops over into North Vietnam?

Answer. I think that that is a matter that is for the future, and would turn on events. As far as the immediate local, close-in situation is concerned, a commander will have to do those things that are necessary for the security and preservation of his own units, his own forces. But there need be no fighting whatever in the demilitarized zone, no bombing in the demilitarized zone, if North Vietnam would keep its troops out of there and not use that as a major infiltration route into South Vietnam. And we hope that they would realize that this would be an important thing to do in terms of a further buildup of the violence. We would like to see this violence reduced just as quickly as possible.

Question. Is there currently growing tension between the United States and the Soviet Union over this issue? The tickers from Moscow this morning report that the United States has refused to accept the Soviet protest note on grounds that it's inaccurate and abusive.

Answer. I think the principal word there is not the inaccuracy, because Governments are quite familiar with the process of sending inaccurate messages to each other. But the abusiveness of the note is not in accord with diplomatic practice, and so we did not accept it on that basis.

I really didn't answer your main question, which was growing tension. I would have to say that the Soviet position, with respect to bilateral relations and the general situation, is a difficult one under the circumstances of the Vietnam situation. We regret that. We would like to find ways to improve our bilateral relations with the Soviet Union, but we cannot do so by giving away South Vietnam.

What we would like to see is the use of the available machinery to bring peace to Southeast Asia. The Soviet Union, as a co-chairman, has not been willing to move with its British co-chairman to convene a conference or to take an active role in moving toward peace out there, not even with respect to Prince Sihanouk's request that the I.C.C. step up its action to assist Cambodia.

ESCALATION LAID TO HANOI

There is a crisis in Southeast Asia which cannot help but affect bilateral relations. We would like to see that crisis moved to a peaceful settlement. But we can't do that without some help from others, primarily, in the first instance, Hanoi, but others who have an interest in this and are concerned about it.

Question. Do you consider that there has been a continued escalation on the part of the North Vietnamese and possibly encouragement from Communist China to sending additional workers into North Vietnam to free their soldiers?

Answer. There has been a steady escalation of this problem by North Vietnam for the past five or even six years, despite the fact that for four or five years there was no bombing of North Vietnam, despite the major efforts made to find a political settlement in Southeast Asia. A full division of the North Vietnamese Regular Army moved into South Vietnam before there was U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, except for the strike in connection with the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

The demilitarized zone became an issue because a division of the North Vietnamese regular forces moved through the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam. Now, when you look at the chronology of escalation, it is based upon the fact that they keep coming. And this effort to seize South Vietnam by force is the thing which the United States and its allies cannot accept. If that ceases to be the problem, then peace can come very quickly.

Question. You spoke of willingness to try any kind of negotiations, including bilateral. In that connection, would you care to tell us what you think about Prince Sihanouk's proposal, in an interview with The New York Times, that the United States try getting in touch with the Vietcong and not looking to Hanoi and Peiping? It was answered in general terms here yesterday by your spokesman, but I wonder if you would address yourself more specifically to that idea.

Answer. I think I had better stay to the general language, because there is no indication from those who have the real influence on the other side that they are prepared for serious talks. I have said to you many times that there has never been a problem here of lack of contact with the other side. That is a pretty comprehensive statement. The National Liberation Front has an interest in peace. So the problem of contact is not the problem.

Question. One of the issues discussed before the bombing of the P.O.L. installations started was the question of foreign shipping in the harbor of Haiphong. Can you tell us what the volume of that shipping is—and what sort of U.S. policy applies to military flights over or combat operations over the harbor area?

Answer. We have not been hitting shipping in the Haiphong harbor. I don't have the exact figures on the shipping that might have been in the area at the time of our strikes. But that shipping was not in the area of the strikes and not in the target area, and was not hit. There has been considerable reduction in the free-world shipping into Haiphong. I think last month there was only one ship, the month before there were only five ships.

But we have not undertaken a campaign against the shipping in Haiphong harbor and, on the basis of the most accurate information we have—and to me it is utterly convincing that we have not been striking such shipping.

SOLDIERS OR DIPLOMATS

Question. There is a continuing clamor in some Communist countries on readiness to send volunteers to Vietnam if they are requested. How do you read the prospects that such volunteers might be requested and that, indeed, they would go?

Answer. I can't be a prophet on that point. What we would prefer is that they send some negotiators to Geneva and I will be there. That is the way to avoid the necessity of sending volunteers or to let this matter become further inflamed. What we want are some people in striped pants, not people in uniform. And I will be there to talk about peace in Southeast Asia—perhaps not with striped pants.

Question. In relation to what you said about Prince Sihanouk's proposal before, if the Vietcong did show some indication that it was willing to sit down and talk with the United States, would the United States show a similar willingness?

Answer. You're familiar with what President Johnson said about this in July of last year. This is not a question that can be discussed with those who can't stop the shooting, and I could sit here and negotiate that point with you, but I would much prefer to negotiate it with somebody who can stop the shooting. The President said there would be no insuperable obstacle to obtaining the views of the National Liberation Front if this issue of aggression was brought under control.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 8223–8224, Apr. 18, 1966]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA

Mr. President, during the past year, our Armed Forces, by their sacrifices, gave a new lease on life to the non-Communist military and political structure of South Viet Nam. But let us not delude ourselves. That new lease on life runs only so long as U.S. support continues and, in present circumstances, continues to grow.

Indeed, the price may be expected to rise once again as a result of the current chain of developments. Certainly, political changes since the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem have tended to increase the cost of support in terms of U.S. lives and aid.

It has been said that the French lost the war not in Indochina, but in Paris. It has been implied, in parallel oversimplification of this most complex problem that if the present war is lost, it will not be lost in Indochina but in the United States and, more specifically, in Washington, and perhaps even in the Senate of the United States.

I think it is about time to dispense once and for all with glib assertions of that kind. The great need is to probe for the dimensions of this complex and changing situation and for a rational role for the United States. The reality is that if Indochina is lost it cannot be lost by the United States which has never possessed it, does not possess it now, and would not possess it if it could. The reality is that, in any meaningful sense, Viet Nam cannot be won or lost in the United States or Washington. Nor can it be won, in a final or an enduring sense by Americans in Viet Nam who have carried their difficult tasks at such great sacrifice.

But if it comes to that, the future of Viet Nam can be won or lost in Saigon by a failure of Vietnamese leadership and by the continuing inadequacies of the present politico-military structure. It can be lost in Saigon, too, if we do not exercise in this matter a wise restraint against over-eagerness to help and in this recent crisis President Johnson has acted most commendably. It cannot be said too often that in this day and age, and in matters of political leadership in particular, our efforts cannot be substituted for the efforts which must come from others on behalf of their own peoples.

To sum up, whatever their outcome, recent events tell us that there is trouble in Viet Nam. It is deeper and more complex than we have heretofore been prepared to acknowledge. We will do well, now, to face up to that fact and to the fact that we are deeply enmeshed in the trouble. We may be prepared to let alone these inner conflicts in South Viet Nam but they will not let us alone. They may appear peripheral to us in view of the emphasis which has been given to other aspects of the problem. In fact, they may have very little to do with the war in which our forces are engaged. But the fact is, too, that they are inseparable from that war from the Vietnamese point of view. Indeed, for many in South Viet Nam, the present difficulties are more central to the problems of Viet Nam than the war.

We can ignore these considerations only at the risk of turning the war in Viet Nam into one which is, at best, irrelevant to the people of Viet Nam and, at worst, one in which their hostility may readily be enlisted against us. We had better recognize, instead, that these recent manifestations of schisms in Viet Nam lend added emphasis to the validity of the President's policy. He has designed that policy to serve U.S. interests by an active and continuing search for negotiations in an effort to end the war and so contain our involvement in Viet Nam within reasonable limits.

It bears repeating, therefore, at this time that there is only one really basic factor which from the point of view of U.S. policy is essential to a prompt end to the conflict by negotiations and to the withdrawal of U.S. forces. That factor has been described, in effect, time and again by the President, and without 'ifs," and "and," or "buts." That factor is the establishment of conditions, through negotiations, which will assure and safeguard an authentic and free choice to the people of South Viet Nam as to their political future and as to their ultimate relationship with North Viet Nam. That and that alone is the objective of the United States military effort and the President's policy.

It is most unfortunate that neither the United Nations nor the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conferences—that is the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—or other participants therein have been able to bring about negotiations looking to a peaceful solution along these lines. It may be, as the Soviet Union and others have said, that conditions do not exist at this time which permit them to take an initiative for negotiations. But it may also be that efforts to bring about negotiations may be pressed more usefully elsewhere than either through the Geneva Conferees or the United Nations. It may be that negotiations should be sought with greater vigor precisely in the region where the proximity of the conflict lends a greater sense of urgency to the necessity for its settlement.

It has been said many times and, in my judgment, correctly that a just settlement of the Vietnamese conflict by negotiations would serve the interests of this nation as well as other nations which are either painfully involved or threatened with involvement. If that is the case then perhaps there is something to be said for a direct confrontation across a peace table between ourselves and Hanoi, Peking, and such elements in South Viet Nam as may be essential to the making and keeping of a peaceful settlement in that region. Certainly, there would be no better place to locate a peace table of this kind than in Japan or Burma or some other proximate and appropriate Asian setting. It is not in Europe but in Asia and the United States where the pain of the war is felt. It is in Asia where the implications of this war are most grim. It is in Asia where other nations are immediately threatened by its spread. It is, in short, in Asia where the peace must be made and kept. It may well be, therefore, that it is in Asia where peace must now be—directly and vigorously—sought.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I listened to the remarks of the majority leader, I hoped inwardly that everybody, particularly officials in Washington, would give heed to those remarks when it becomes apparent, as it is now, the great difficulties which the United States will have even if we use all of our manpower and even if we use all of our resources in settling the affairs and restoring stability to the countries of southeast Asia.

Then, it seems that if southeast Asian countries themselves are willing to undertake this job of restoring peace and stability to that area, we should give them every opportunity to do so and every bit of our assistance, which can be interpreted as not being unwarranted interference with their affairs.

On Tuesday, July 26, in an exchange of views with the majority leader on the subject of General Ky and his willingness to assume leadership for the western democracies, I commented that I did not know whether to "swell with pride or to tremble with apprehension." Lest there be doubt, I now tremble with some apprehension.

I had grave misgivings as to the motivation of General Ky when he proposed to go into North Vietnam to destroy communism "in its lair."

Was he speaking only for himself? I hoped so. Was he speaking for some of his advisers? If so, I hoped none of them were Americans.

Yet, my hopes turned to doubt when I read in the press on August 6, that our Secretary of State did not rule out a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

In this connection, I came across an interesting article in the London Economist for July 9, 1966, entitled "How Not To Influence the Americans." The Economist, I may say, has not been dovelike. Nevertheless, one paragraph puts the situation posed by General Ky, and people who think like him, into such clear perspective that I wish to read it into the Record. In commenting on the expansion of bombings to the north, this paragraph reads:

> The reaction of China and Russia has been equally undramatic. They have done nothing since the bombing that they were not doing before. No doubt Russia and the other European communists will send more oil and lorries and anti-aircraft guns; no doubt the Chinese will issue more denunciations to add to the pile of 400-odd "grave warnings" they have already uttered on a variety of subjects. *But it is still unlikely that either China or Russia will risk a direct clash with the United States unless America seems to be threatening the very existence of communist North Vietnam. They might risk a world war to keep communists in power in Hanoi; they will probably not risk one to put communists into power in Saigon.* It is the difference between losing something you have, and failing to acquire something you haven't. The first is much worse. *So long as the Americans make it clear that they are limiting themselves to the defensive aim of trying to preserve an independent South Vietnam—no more than that—the odds are that the war itself can be kept limited and local.* (Italic supplied.)

I trust the President will impress on our erstwhile ally in Saigon and those of our own ambitious militarists that the sole aim of the United States is, in the words of the Economist: "to preserve an independent South Vietnam—no more than that."

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire Economist editorial and also an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Stop the Invasion Talk" printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Economist, July 9, 1966]

How Not To Influence Americans

In the last ten days Britain has come within an ace of chucking away its power to influence the actions of the United States. It does not have all that much power left; but it nearly lost what it has. This is what the revolt in the Labour party against American policy in Vietnam almost managed to achieve.

Mr. Wilson has appeased his left wing by going to Moscow to see Mr. Kosygin; it is a trick that should be good right the way through to the party conference in October. But this is dodging the left wing, not fighting it. The trip to Moscow is little more than a delaying device: Mr. Kosygin is unlikely to give his blessing to negotiations that North Vietnam is still not ready to accept. Mr. Wilson side-stepped the real issue by refusing to take his stand on clear-cut support of the American position in Vietnam. His negotiating power in Washington is thereby diminished; and cutting the left wing down to 30 abstainers on Thursday night by no means makes up for that.

If the British want to, they can give up the attempt to influence American policy. They can retire to the sidelines and blow raspberries instead. It is what the Labour left wing and the Tory right wing would like to do; it is what General de Gaulle has done. They will then be treated the way barrackers usually are treated, by being ignored. But if the British want to keep any influence over what the United States does, they must remember the basic rule for the only sort of relationship that gives Britain any pull in Washington, The rule is that Britain goes along with the main aims of American foreign policy in return for the right to nudge the Americans back on course when they seem to be deviating from those aims. It is a fair exchange. None of the main things the Americans want to do in the world conflicts with the main things Britain wants to do: in almost every respect except direct commercial competition, the two countries' interests run parallel.

Mr. Attlee followed this basic rule in 1950: he edged the Americans back on course when they were in danger of forgetting that their main aim was to defend South Korea, not to have a showdown with the newly emerged power of communist China. So did Mr. Macmillan in 1959 when he manoeuvred the Americans towards the necessary détente with Russia. And so did Mr. Wilson in 1964, when the scheme for a Nato nuclear fleet was in danger of snarling up relations with Russia: he reminded the Americans that relations with Russia came first. This right to dig the elbow into the Americans' ribs at critical moments is extremely valuable.

But only good allies get it; and it depends on picking the right critical moments. The bombing of the Hanoi and Haiphong oil dumps was not one of them. The reconnaissance photographs are now in; and once again, as in the Cuba crisis of 1962, the photographs bear out what the Americans said and what their critics refused to believe until the evidence stared them in the face. What happened on June 29th was that a smallish force of planes—46 light bombers, not the big strategic sort—dropped a relatively modest 91 tons of bombs with painstaking precision on two undeniably military targets in the soggy riverside area outside Hanoi and Haiphong. That is all. It bore as much relation to a mass attack on centres of population as a surgeon nicking out a polypus bears to a slaughterhouse. The available photographs and reports from witnesses on the ground suggest that the raid caused no more civilian casualties than a Vietcong bombing in Saigon, and a great deal fewer than when a Vietcong unit in the south opens fire on American troops from the cover of a village. The Americans had already bombed about a dozen other oil dumps in similar physical surroundings in North Vietnam without anybody saying that this was the time to break with American policy. The only difference on June 29th was that they moved inside the invisible dotted line that had up to then enclosed a large area of countryside around Hanoi and Haiphong.

So much for the "indescribably wicked" event (Lord Soper) that "overshadowed the whole planet" (Mr. Michael Foot), and which the BBC in one broadcast reported as having set fifty square miles on fire. There are seeds of hysteria in Britain today. True, the bombing will not bring North Vietnam's leaders running to the negotiating table. It is almost certainly nonsense to hope, as some Americans hope, that it will change North Vietnam's mind about the desirability of doing what it can to equip and reinforce the rebellion in the south. But it is equal nonsense to suppose that the chances of negotiation are today actually less than they were before the bombing, when the business of helping the Vietcong was easier than it is now. The North Vietnamese have probably lost something like half their stock of fuel. They will buy more, and conceal it better. But at the very least there will be a few weeks or months in which fewer lorries will bump down the Ho Chi Minh trail, and the communist forces in the south will be correspondingly weaker. It is one factor which may eventually persuade the North Vietnamese that they are not going to win the battle in the south. If they come to doubt their chances of winning, and if the Americans then offer them some face-saving formula, they may at some stage agree to talk. It is as undramatic as that.

The reaction of China and Russia has been equally undramatic. They have done nothing since the bombing that they were not doing before (see page 140). No doubt Russia and the other European communists will send more oil and lorries and anti-aircraft guns; no doubt the Chinese will issue more denunciations to add to the pile of 400-odd "grave warnings" they have already uttered on a variety of subjects. But it is still unlikely that either China or Russia will risk a direct clash with the United States unless America seems to be threatening the very existence of communist North Vietnam. They might risk a world war to keep communists in power in Hanoi; they will probably not risk one to put communists into power in Saigon. It is the difference between losing something you have, and failing to acquire something you haven't. The first is much worse. So long as the Americans make it clear that they are limiting themselves to the defensive aim of trying to preserve an independent South Vietnam—no more than that—the odds are that the war itself can be kept limited and local.

And this is the crux of the matter. For there are signs, outside the House of Commons, that a serious international debate is now opening up about the underlying aims of American policy in Vietnam. This is a far more important subject than the fiddling argument about the difference between a precision job three miles from Hanoi and another precision job 15 miles from it. It is a subject on which Mr. Wilson will want to put his views to Mr. Johnson when he sees him in Washington on July 29th.

The argument is about exactly what the Americans mean by an "independent South Vietnam." There are two different definitions of what the phrase could mean, and therefore two different courses of action that the Americans could follow. The first and more rigorous of the possibilities open to them is a Korean-style solution. It implies that the South Vietnam which would emerge from the war would be like South Korea after 1953. It would be a country in which the communists had been totally defeated, and in whose political life they and their friends would be allowed to play no part whatsoever. It would be a country tied to the United States by a military alliance, and by the presence of an American garrison on its soil. The military implications for the present war are obvious. To achieve a solution along these lines, it would be necessary to go on fighting until pretty well everybody in the National Liberation Front had surrendered or been killed. It would rule out negotiations with the communists in the south, and so with North Vietnam too, except on the terms of Vietcong's capitulation.

This is the "military solution" people have been talking about, and Mr. Johnson is plainly very tempted by it. It would be the safest solution if it could be achieved without paying an excessive price. But most people in Europe—including most of Mr. Johnson's best friends—doubt whether it can. It would call for a longer war and more blood-letting than a less ambitious policy would. It would mean more hysteria from the anti-Americans, and more doubts among the pro-Americans, and more fraying of the links between the United States and its allies. Above all, it would mean ignoring the one hard fact that has emerged from the fighting. This is that the National Liberation Front, which includes both communists and some non-communists, does represent the frustrations and hopes of a good many South Vietnamese. It could not have put up such a fight if it had not.

The alternative is a solution on the lines not of Korea, but of Greece. The Greek communists were beaten in the civil war that ended in 1949. But afterwards they were permitted to return, in a carefully controlled way, into the political life of the country. They are still not allowed to organize their own party. But they were gradually allowed to make their own point of view felt through the theoretically non-communist Union of the Democratic Left. Through this party, they have been a factor in Greek political calculations ever since the early 1950's. Most people would prefer to see the problem of the communist-led rebels in Vietnam handled in the same way. The war will probably have to go on until they accept that they represent only an active minority of the South Vietnamese. Even then, they will have to be prevented from making another attempt to seize power by armed rebellion. This will require some pretty powerful outside supervision. It is not a fool-proof solution. But it does hold out the hope of meaningful negotiations. It gives a chance of ending the war sooner than it could be ended by a policy of total suppression. And in the end, if peace in Vietnam were followed by a period of stability in south-east Asia, is could pave the way for a national reconciliation in Vietnam.

Mr. Wilson will almost certainly want to argue for a Greek-style solution rather than a Korean-style one. To make his point he will need all the influence he can bring to bear in Washington. It is his chance to do the sort of thing that Mr. Attlee did in 1950. This is what the whole business of British influence with America is about. What the irrelevent ructions about Hanoi and Haiphong have done is to endanger his chance of getting a serious hearing. Who is going to Washington? Is it Harold, the welcome confident whose ideas are worth listening to? Or is it General de Wilson, the irritating pontificator ripe for a brush-off?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

STOP THE INVASION TALK

Secretary of State Rusk's discussion of the possibility that American troops might invade North Viet Nam is frightening. It is difficult to believe that the United States would commit such a tragic blunder, and it is true that Mr. Rusk said, "There is no policy desire to move into North Viet Nam or the demilitarized zone" between North and South at the Seventeenth parallel.

But Mr. Rusk's discussion of the matter at a press conference indicated that an invasion, urged a few days ago by Premier Ky of South Viet Nam, was not out of the question. It will depend, Mr. Rusk said, "on the turn of events; the commander will have to do those things necessary to protect the security of his troops."

We concede that a field commander has this obligation. But his superiors have the obligation of instructing him to keep his men out of areas where such a course might appear necessary to him. A movement of infantry across the parallel would involve another drastic change in the nature of the war. It would be similar to the movement that brought the Chinese into the Korean war. It would alienate international opinion still further from United States policies. Ultimately, it might mean disaster.

The United States has recently been bombing not only North Viet Nam but the buffer zone in the vicinity of the Cambodian border, across which North Viet Namese troops are said to flee to sanctuaries. These raids, different in kind from an invasion, are taking place as Ambassador Harriman prepares to go to Cambodia to seek ways of keeping that peaceful little country out of the Indochina conflict. We earnestly hope he succeeds.

Standing alone, Mr. Rusk's remarks are not so disquieting as when placed in conjunction with what Premier Ky said on two occasions within the last two weeks. In effect Ky posed the alternative of a war of five to 10 years duration or an invasion of the North, which he said he did not think would mean Chinese intervention. The State Department refused to repudiate Ky's statements; instead, it tried to dissociate itself from Ky's proposals without appearing to offend Ky.

Unfortunately, the history of United States involvement in Viet Nam is one of escalation, and so there are additional reasons for viewing the Rusk and Ky remarks with trepidation. Perhaps this is mitigated to some extent by Mr. Rusk's repeated assertion of his desire for peace in Southeast Asia, and his willingness to negotiate for it.

Any chance of negotiation would be further jeopardized, however, if not destroyed, by an invasion, and the Administration ought at once to put a stop to any idea that it could take place. Talk has a way of creating a climate of acceptance; it should be terminated by firm assurance that invasion is unthinkable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican in this body, for the pertinent remarks which he has just made. As always, he is quite conservative in his use of words but he gets to the point rather quickly so that no one can misunderstand.

As I interpret correctly what the distinguished Senator is saying, in effect, quoting the Economist, is that the best way to carry on the war is to keep it limited and to try to prevent it from becoming open ended. If it does become open ended, then, of course, all bets are off and the dire possibilities are tremendous.

I would hope that this admonition would be kept in mind and that we would keep our eye on the ball at all times and be aware of the limited objectives, which we have because the President has stated time and time again that that is the nature of our engagement in that part of the world.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Montana. I try to view the war in southeast Asia in a practical manner.

When I realize the extent to which we have already gone in expending our resources and manpower, and the extent to which we will likely be called upon to go, in the event the war is not limited—certainly not beyond its present extent—then I realize the devastating effect on our country which an expansion of the war may have on its economy, I know that we have already gone so far that a great many people will have to pay a high price for the cost of this venture in southeast Asia, provided we go no further.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The two speeches we have just heard, one by the majority leader and the other by the ranking Republican Member, are very timely. They should be read with great interest and concern by the Senate and the people of the United States.

Yesterday, I read a statement by a writer in one of the newspapers that the war in southeast Asia might last for 8 years, and that it might involve the introduction of American troops into Vietnam to a total of 750,000 men. Of course, this is speculation. But, no one can foresee the future, and the prospect ought to lead to increased efforts for negotiation.

The majority leader has brought to our attention that movements seem to be underway at the present time by countries in southeast Asia toward some sort of negotiation.

I thought it was interesting that two of the foreign ministers at the recent conference, from the Philippines and Thailand, represented countries which are among our closest friends.

At times it may appear that there is little prospect of negotiation—and I am aware of the efforts of the administration to obtain negotiations—but the current efforts of Asian nations are important. They should be watched carefully and encouraged by the administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on their statements today.

It is most significant that these two outstanding leaders of the Senate have expressed their enthusiastic support of efforts to have the southeast Asian nations try to achieve peace, and to support U Thant and the United Nations, in their initiative to achieve this.

Mr. President, I also support the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Montana in their expressions of hope that we can, somehow, keep this terrible catastrophe in southeast Asia as limited as possible, consistent, of course, with achieving the prospect of independence for South Vietnam.

STRIP MINE STUDY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of reading an advance copy of an interim report by the Secretary of the Interior to the Appalachian Regional Commission dealing with the problem created by the strip mining of land to dig coal out of the earth. I commend Mr. Udall and all others who are participating in this study.

In the past, I have introduced three different bills calling for a study and asking that a determination be made by the Government concerning what part the U.S. Government should take in regulating the operations in which the surface of the land is stripped, the trees and grass removed, the coal excavated, and, finally, the land left useless and sterile. In many instances neither vegetation nor wildlife is on the land when the strip miners get through with it.

As I pointed out, I introduced bills on this subject on three different occasions: First, in 1962 (S. 3304); second, in 1963 (S. 1013); and third, again in 1965 (S. 368). Finally, in 1965, the contents of my bill were incorporated as an amendment to S. 3 and became section 205(c) of the Appalachian bill, which passed the Congress and was signed into law in March of that year and is now known as Public Law 89-4.

While my bills provided for a thorough study of strip and surface mining activities and problems relative to all minerals and all States, this interim report deals with the Appalachia States only, where the problems are most acute and serious. Section 205(c) provides for a nationwide study which will be reported in the Secretary's final report to the Congress.

EFFECTS OF STRIP MINING

Mr. President, the magnitude of coal stripping and land desecration in the 12 Appalachia coal-producing States is revealed in an up-to-date table contained in the interim report. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Status of strip and surface mined coal lands in Appalachia as of Jan. 1, 1965, in acres, as reported by State authorities*

State	Unreclaimed	Partially reclaimed	Completely reclaimed	Total disturbed [1]
Alabama	2,200	11,700	5,000	18,900
Georgia		75	225	300
Kentucky	31,487	4,439	12,363	48,289
Maryland	494	753	995	2,242
New York				
North Carolina				
Ohio	33,540	21,900	[2] 123,816	[3] 179,256
Pennsylvania:				
Bituminous	158,500		83,600	242,100
Anthracite	50,000		9,000	59,000
Total, Pennsylvania	[4] 208,500		92,600	301,100
South Carolina				
Tennessee	25,387	275	1,098	26,760
Virginia	15,014	13,549	503	29,066
West Virginia	[4] 145,718		46,320	[5] 192,038
Subtotal	108,122	52,691		
Total	[4] 354,218		282,920	797,951

[1] From inception of stripping to Jan. 1, 1965, unless otherwise noted.
[2] Represents reclamation for period 1948–65.
[3] Represents disturbed acreage, 1914–65.
[4] No breakdown reported by State.
[5] Represents disturbed acreage to Jan. 1, 1966.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the tabulation of the States in which the most extensive strip mining has been done contained in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, Pennsylvania seems to lead the list. I regret very much to say that Ohio is second in this grim treatment and abuse of the land.

I call attention in particular to the situation in Ohio where under law enacted while I was Governor of that State some reclamation admittedly has been accomplished, but it has been far too little. Of the total 179,256 disturbed acres, 33,540 are unreclaimed; 21,900 are partially reclaimed; and 123,816 are completely reclaimed.

The interim report of the Secretary does not distinguish the difference between partially reclaimed and completely reclaimed land. If any portion of the last cut or highwall of the areas inspected has not been substantially reduced by back filling and grading off, then I say the reclamation project is not complete. The Secretary of the Interior and his staff should pay particular attention to this phase of reclamation, for exposed seams of coal at the face of the highwall are the source of most pollution and the ungraded highwall itself is the greatest potential for landslides, highway destruction, and damage to adjacent unstripped lands.

Communities in unreclaimed spoil bank areas too suffer from blight, reduced tax revenues, and general deterioration. The Federal Government can no longer close its eyes to this spreading cancerous situation While I continue to emphasize that the ultimate and whole responsibility for adequate land restoration lies with the operator, I maintain that if State governments fail to enact adequate laws to protect the public interests, then it behooves the Federal Government to do so.

Mr. President, the interim report of the Secretary contains some excellent conclusions which are in substantial agreement with my views on the subject of reclamation. I ask unanimous consent that the chapter on conclusions contained in the interim report be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the conclusions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data developed in this study, two broad goals can be defined; to prevent future devastation of the environment while fostering economic growth of the minerals industries, and to alleviate damage caused by past strip and surface mining operations.

It is first necessary to explore the causes of the present situation if one attempts to allocate responsibility for reclaiming past strip- and surface-mined land. The large tracts of unreclaimed land existing today have resulted essentially from past failure to recognize reclamation as a necessary part of the cost of mining and of the products resulting therefrom. Instead of requiring reclamation, society, through ignorance or apathy, accepted the alternatives—erosion, acid drainage, lowered water quality, and other detrimental after-effects—as costs of "progress." Current protests against despoilment of the land imply that now, however, the public is probably willing to pay for the reclamation of strip and surface mined lands. It is soberly realized that some of the past benefits of that "progress" involved deferred costs for which payments have come due. In other words, benefits have already been realized; we are now confronted with deferred social costs from which there is no cheap and easy escape.

For lands mined and left unreclaimed in the past, this former public indifference thus represents what might be considered a cost now payable by the body of our society. But, to avoid sweeping up after tomorrow's miners, it is essential that effective strip mining and reclamation regulations be established. If this is done, reclamation costs will be included in the price paid by consumer, and society will have discharged its responsibility to the future.

Although strip mining for coal has promoted the economy and security of our country, this type of mining has burdened Appalachia with a number of complex problems. Approximately 800,000 acres have been disturbed by strip coal mining in the region. The result has been acid and sediment pollution of the streams, massive slides along outslopes, destruction of forests, damage to watersheds, thousands of acres of land isolated or made hazardous by highwalls, wasted natural resources, health and safety hazards, and impaired aesthetic and economic values. Some excellent reclamation has been accomplished, but most of the damaged acreage has not been adequately reclaimed.

The study has shown a need for Federal aid in remedying the detrimental effects of past mining operations. It is concluded:

That Federal participation with States, counties, municipalities, industry, associations, and private owners will be required to implement a long-range, comprehensive program designed to deal with the adverse effects of past strip and surface mining in the Appalachian region. Two types of projects should be included in such a program.

One is the "basic reclamation" outlined in this report. This would consist of applying corrective measures to past strip-mined lands and abandoned haul roads that are contributing to detrimental off-site conditions in Appalachia. This type of project would be designed primarily to alleviate sediment and acid-pollution of streams, reduce erosion, and provide vegetative cover where the public, rather than individual landowners, would obtain the greatest benefit. For such "basic reclamation" the Federal Government will probably have to bear most of the cost.

The second type of project would include special land-use objectives, such as recreational areas, lakes, industrial and commercial sites, and others which might contribute to the economic growth of the region. Such treatment would result in the enhancement of land values; for such projects the Federal contribution may not have to be as large a percentage of the total cost of reclamation. The study has also clearly revealed the need for controls to prevent future damage. It is concluded therefore:

That the Appalachian States should establish laws and regulations that will provide sufficient authority to regulate strip and surface mining—insure the reclamation of lands disturbed, or to prohibit such mining if reclamation is not feasible. Should the individual States fail to provide adequate controls within a reasonable period of time, the Congress can be expected to take such steps as may be necessary to protect the public interest.

To discharge the responsibilities of the Federal Government, it is concluded:

That the Federal Government should designate a central agency to administer all Federal activities related to strip and surface mining under a common set of objectives and procedural guidelines, and to correlate such activities with the total Appalachian program. Project planning, development, appraisal (including feasibility determinations), and the provision of technical assistance to Federal land-managing agencies, States, and private owners, also should be functions of the designated agency.

Several Federal agencies have competence in the various scientific disciplines related to the reclamation of strip- and surface-mined lands. Research programs, studies, and field demonstration projects are being conducted on reclamation and other related problems under Federal leadership. Certain agencies specialize in revegetation aspects of reclamation. Others are concerned with acid drainage from surface and underground mines, mine waste products, mine and refuse fires, conservation of resources, water pollution, and recreational values, all of which are interrelated. To provide a balanced program of investigation and corrective action these efforts must be correlated by one responsible agency in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Early reclamation efforts, primarily outside Appalachia, concentrated on reforestation of strip-mined lands. The knowledge and experience acquired has been successfully applied to reclamation projects located in similar environmental surroundings. Appalachia, however, presents complex and unique problems due to different physiographic, climatic, and other characteristics. Present technology does not provide complete solutions to these problems, therefore:

It is necessary to expand Federal programs, studies, and field demonstrations now being conducted on reclamation and other closely related problems. Specific attention should be given to mining methods and to environmental, technologic, and economic factors.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Because of the magnitude of the task, the reclamation of strip-mined land in Appalachia, whether through basic reclamation or special land-use development, will require a comprehensive, long-range program. Both categories should be treated separately under a system of priorities based upon need and specific criteria developed within each State.

Projects relating to water quality in Appalachia should be given high priority. Projects designed to increase the potential for economic development growth, to promote wildlife and recreation benefits, and to enhance aesthetic values should also have a high claim upon the funds available.

Where a hazardous condition exists, or land is eroding and contributing to off-site damage, purely physical feasibility may be the major consideration.

Projects relating to water quality should have priorities based largely on data showing the relative severity and nature of the pollution problem. Water monitoring networks have been in operation for several years; some of the data needed initially are available.

Another criterion for assigning priorities is the project's relationship to other programs. For example, strip-mine reclamation represents a comparatively small part of the over-all Potomac River basin problem, but the Potomac program is of such prime importance that reclamation in that river basin should have high priority.

Projects designed to promote use of the land for which there is urgent demand, whether for recreational, industrial, or other uses, should be evaluated with due regard to such demands—but where no such demands exist, reclamation should not be ruled out.

Certain special land-use projects will develop as the need becomes apparent. Individual States have developed somewhat the same concept—that public awareness at the local level brings the most pressing reclamation needs to the attention of appropriate authorities. Organized groups such as sports and recreation clubs, Chambers of Commerce, Soil Conservation Districts, planning commissions, service clubs, citizens' leagues, and local official bodies take an active interest in strip-mine conditions and are aware of their effects upon the community environment. This thought also is implied in the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which provides in its Statement of Purpose that: "That States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects within their borders, which will receive assistance under this Act."

GOVERNMENTAL ROLES AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Some wish to eliminate all strip and surface mining; others wish to continue mining without land reclamation requirements; neither position is tenable. If our economy is to continue to enjoy the benefits of the minerals produced without suffering the serious consequences resulting from destructive mining, effective regulations, combining both mining and reclamation criteria, must be established.

Role of State Governments.—Regulation of mining and reclamation practices is now a State and local responsibility. Unless assurance is provided by the State that lands strip- or surface-mined in the future will be effectively reclaimed—and that mining will not be permitted if reclamation is unfeasible, financial participation by the Federal Government in a reclamation program for past mined lands is questionable.

In the absence of a general Federal law governing mining and mined-land reclamation, it behooves the individual States to enact strip and surface mining laws that are stringent enough to prevent future despoliation of the land. As owners of lands mined in the past cannot reasonably be expected to defray the entire cost of reclaiming these lands, it is also incumbent upon the States to either initiate a land-reclamation program of their own, or in cooperation with the Federal government, in order to foster their own and the national interest. Under a Federal-State cooperative program, the States also should be responsible for working with landowners in initiating, planning, processing, and recommending reclamation project proposals—both for basic reclamation and for special land-use purposes.

The State also should conduct research on strip and surface mining techniques and reclamation practices, oriented toward the particular conditions and mineral resources of the State. For example, the mining method is an important variable. A great variety of techniques are available to the mining company, as with tandem mining and in the way shovels and draglines are handled. Others may involve the movement of spoil, e.g. dumping to the side rather than down hill in contour mining, separating topsoil from acid-forming material, etc. Thus, research on mining methods may reveal changes in technique that will prove extremely important. It is a well-known fact that reclamation—in most instances—can be accomplished more economically by use of the heavy equipment employed in stripping operations than by use of equipment that has to be moved onto the mined-out area at a later time.

Role of the Federal Government.—Federal ownership of land, of course, implies Federal responsibility for its proper management and maintenance. Federal ownership is of limited significance in Appalachia however. Although most, if not all, Federal agencies administering Federal land require reclamation after mining, it should be the policy of the Federal Government to require that all leases of such land for strip or surface mining purposes contain specific provisions for restoration of land to a condition compatible with the climate, topography, and ecology of the area in which the mined land is located.

Although some mined-land owners might invest in reclamation in the interest of public relations, profit, or for some other reason, most of the non-Federal lands mined in the past are not likely to be reclaimed at the owner's expense. Many of the problems associated with past strip-mined lands are interstate in character. The Federal Government, therefore, must assume a major responsibility for at least "basic reclamation," i.e., on-site efforts to stabilize the soil and reduce the generation of acid and other types of water pollution. Otherwise a Federally sponsored reclamation program would be modest in scope, since approximately 96 percent of the strip-mined land in Appalachia is held by private owners.

There is a possibility of some profit to landowners as a result of basic reclamation; but, because such efforts would be devoted largely to alleviation of off-site damages, the chance of inordinate profits accruing to private owners would be limited. However, in those instances where land values increase substantially as a result of reclama-

tion, and the restored land is sold, a proportionate share of the revenue should be returned to the Federal Government.

In areas where the extent, location, or complexity of the problem is such that no State, local body of government, or individual is able or willing to participate, it may be necessary for the Federal Government to assume the full cost. In some instances, this procedure might entail the acquisition of land titles by the Federal Government.

Solutions to the many problems related to reclamation will require Federal leadership and continued, active participation in technical and economic research, as well as greatly expanded collection and analysis of environmental, economic, and resource data. Criteria for mining regulations, reclamation standards, effective project planning, and legislation can be improved through developing a fuller knowledge of the total mined-land environment; procurement of such knowledge will require continuing research and experimentation.

General Principles for State Regualtions.—The vast area of Appalachia, nearly 183,000 square miles, lacks homogeneity in virtually every aspect. The terrain varies from almost flat lands to rugged, steep hills, and narrow confined valleys. Economically, it includes such highly industrialized complexes as the Pittsburgh area with a population density (Allegheny County) of some 2,220 persons per square mile and Heard County in Georgia with a population of only 19 persons per square mile. As previously mentioned, variables also occur from the standpoint of non-uniformity of State reclamation requirements to a total lack of legislation. Obviously, any measures to regulate future mining or reclamation in Appalachia, legislative or otherwise, must be made against the background of these variables. Thus, the following suggestions for State legislation to govern surface mining operations and land reclamation are of a broad, general character, and point out desired objectives, with the determination of specific procedures to be followed in order to achieve these objectives being left to the individual States:

a. Each surface-mined mineral should be regulated by the State if its recovery has a detrimental effect upon the local environment. The regulations should require posting of an appropriate bond, the forfeiture of which should automatically involve denial of further mining permits.

b. The regulations should be reasonably uniform and consistent with similar legislation in other States. Therefore, State laws regulating strip and surface mining and the reclamation of mined areas should be periodically reviewed and correlated.

c. The regulations should require that surface mining operations and reclamation procedures be pre-planned, and that such plans be submitted to an appropriate State agency for approval prior to the issuance of a permit or license.

d. Adequate enforcement powers must be provided by the State to insure effective enforcement of its regulations.

e. The State should provide adequate financial resources and personnel to enforce reclamation, monitor environmental changes, plan land use, and to conduct technologic research on reclamation—including the mining methods favorable to adequate reclamation.

f. Penalties should be established for strip mining without a license, and for willful refusal or failure to comply with regulations and orders of authorized State officials.

g. Reclamation work should be integrated into the mining cycle, and appropriate time limits established for the completion of reclamation.

h. State regulations should contain provisions, or criteria, by which the detrimental effects of the active mining operation can be kept to a minimum, and to assure that the disturbed or affected area is reclaimed to a condition that would not deleteriously affect the on-site or off-site environment.

i. The following objectives should be specifically considered in drafting State laws:

(1) The control or elimination of acid.

(2) Soil stabilization.

(3) Elimination of safety hazards in potential use areas.

(4) Conservation and preservation of natural resources.

(5) Return of land to productive use.

(6) Restoration of natural beauty.

j. Mining should be prohibited in areas where reclamation is considered economically unfeasible.

k. The statutes should also provide for the evaluation and reporting of environmental changes in active and dormant mining areas in order to provide data upon which the effectiveness of the law and its enforcement might be evaluated.

l. Serious consideration should be given to establishing formal training programs for operators, supervisors, reclamation, and enforcement officials in effective mining and reclamation practices and techniques.

m. Reporting by industry of data on progress, methods, and results of reclamation should be mandatory. Reports should be submitted frequently enough to assure a timely basis for coordinating and developing an effective, over-all reclamation program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently I flew over Ohio and Pennsylvania in a plane that was sufficiently low for me to see what was being done. I could not help but practically weep to see that what was once a land covered with trees and grass, vegetation and shrubs, reduced to barrenness.

Mr. President, the Federal Government, in my opinion, will have to take action with regard to this matter. It has taken the responsibility for underwriting extensive nationwide programs for highway beautification, soil conservation, the building of parks and recreational areas, rehabilitation of slum area in the cities, and many other programs. While moneys are being spent in that direction we are indifferent to the butchery and destruction that is taking place of many of our natural lands.

I continue to emphasize that the ultimate and the whole responsibility for adequate land restoration lies with the operator. I, however, maintain that if State governments fail to act to enact adequate laws to protect the public interest, then it behooves the Federal Government to do so.

The interim report of the Secretary of Interior contains excellent conclusions and recommendations. My hopes are deep that out of this report will eventually come action that will bring to an end this unpardonable offensive and, in my opinion, criminal butchery of the land.

AWARDING OF CONTRACT FOR NEW PHILADELPHIA MINT TO MATTHEW McCLOSKEY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently my distinguished colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] wrote to the General Services Administration protesting strongly against the awarding of a contract to Matthew McCloskey for the construction of a new Philadelphia Mint.

There is not any doubt that we need a new mint, but there is grave question why the contract should be awarded to Mr. McCloskey's company, because there is, as the Senator from Wyoming pointed out, among other things, a civil suit pending in the Federal Court to recover damages for incompetent work on a veterans' hospital near Boston. The letter stated that the siding on the hospital peeled off one day following completion of the project by McCloskey.

In addition, McCloskey has been accused of making an illegal $25,000 campaign contribution to the Democrat war chest.

He has also been accused of paying a $10,000 kickback so he could obtain the construction performance bond on the Washington, D.C., Stadium for his son-in-law's insurance firm.

In addition, it has been charged McCloskey is involved in three housing projects in Florida which were covered by Federal Housing Administration loans totaling $28.8 million, which loans were subsequently defaulted.

I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Albuquerque Journal of July 21, and an article which appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers on July 20.

The Albuquerque Journal editorial states:

> Sen. Milward Simpson, R., Wyoming, has solid grounds for protesting the award of a $12.6 million contract for a new Philadelphia mint to Matthew McCloskey, former Democratic national Treasurer.

At the end of the editorial it is stated:

> Senator Simpson has lined up a formidable array of arguments against the McCloskey contract award. But in view of McCloskey's powerful party connections, it appears likely his protest has come too late.

I hope this is not so. I hope the General Services Administration will reconsider the awarding of the contract in view of the conduct of McCloskey in his work and other questions which have been raised.

For the purpose of informing Senators who may be interested I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, July 21, 1966]

A Timely Protest!

Sen. Milward Simpson, R-Wyoming, has solid grounds for protesting the award of a $12.6 million contract for a new Philadelphia mint to Matthew McCloskey, former Democratic national treasurer.

Simpson's protest, aimed at General Services Administration, holds no contracts should be awarded McCloskey "until questions relating to the man's ethical and professional standards are clarified."

The questions Simpson referred to include:

—A federal court suit seeking to recover damages resulting from "incompetent work" on a Veterans Hospital near Boston—siding on the hospital peeled off the day following completion of the project by McCloskey & Co.;

—McCloskey "has been accused of making an illegal $25,000 campaign contribution to Democrat war chests;"

—"He also has been accused of paying a $10,000 kickback so he could obtain the construction performance bond on the Washington, D.C. stadium for his son-in-law's insurance firm;"

—McCloskey & Co. is involved in three Florida housing projects, covered by FHA-insured loans totaling $28.8 million—loans subsequently defaulted;

—McCloskey & Co. "constructed the most expensive office building in the world, the Rayburn House Office Bldg., at twice its original price . . ."

In his letter to Lawson B. Knott, GSA head, SIMPSON also noted it is "quite possible" pending court action against Bobby Baker—former Senate majority secretary—"will involve Matthew McCloskey."

Senator SIMPSON has lined up a formidable array of arguments against the McCloskey contract award. But in view of McCloskey's powerful party connections, it appears likely his protest has come too late.

MCCLOSKEY MINT JOB DRAWS FIRE

WASHINGTON, July 20.—Sen. MILWARD SIMPSON, R-Wyo., has protested awarding of a $12.6 million contract for construction on the new Philadelphia mint to Matthew McCloskey, former Democratic national treasurer.

SIMPSON has written Lawson B. Knott, head of the General Services Administration (GSA), charging that no federal contracts should be awarded to McCloskey and Co. of Philadelphia "until questions relating to the man's ethical and professional standards are clarified."

The letter to Knott was placed in the Senate record.

"I remind you that a civil suit is pending in federal court to recover damages brought about by 'incompetent work' on the Veterans Administration Hospital near Boston," SIMPSON said.

SIDING PEELED OFF

He said the siding on the hospital peeled off one day following completion of the project by McCloskey and Co.

SIMPSON referred to McCloskey and Co. as "politically powerful" and reminded Knott that McCloskey "has been accused of making an illegal $25,000 campaign contribution to Democrat war chests."

"He also has been accused of paying a $10,000 kickback so he could obtain the construction performance bond on the Washington, D.C. stadium for his son-in-law's insurance firm," SIMPSON wrote.

PROJECTS DEFAULTED

In addition, the senator charged, McCloskey and Co. is involved in three housing projects in Florida which were covered by Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans totaling $28.8 million and were subsequently defaulted.

"I'm sure you are aware also that it was McCloskey and Co. that constructed the most expensive office building in the world, the Rayburn House Office Building, at twice its original contract price," SIMPSON said.

He told Knott it is "quite possible" pending court action against former Senate Secretary Bobby Baker "will involve Matthew McCloskey."

VIETNAM WAR IMPACT ON ECONOMY FAR LESS THAN IN PAST WARS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, perhaps the most common economic fallacy in Congress and out is that the Vietnam war is feeding the fires of inflation, or is likely to do so soon, in a big and devastating way.

This notion is a fallacy because our economy has grown so immensely in the 15 years since our last war in Korea that it is able to take the current burden of belligerence—with all its heavy cost—without even using up all its economic slack:

One of the ablest economic commentators in the Nation is Edwin Dale, of the New York Times. In the first of a series on the impact of Vietnam on the economy, Mr. Dale writes this morning that—

> The war has had distinct effects on the economy and on the people and businesses that make it up, but the effects have been far less than in any other war in modern times.
>
> Figuratively speaking, the extraordinary American economy is carrying the war on its little finger, although the finger is hurting a little.

The article continues:

> The best evidence that the war is not causing a drastic change in the Government's financial situation is in the magnitude of the Treasury's planned borrowing, which is actually a little less in the last half of this year than had been estimated several months ago.
>
> Meanwhile, industry is adding to its plant and equipment at the record rate of $60.8-billion this year. This means that the capacity of the economy to meet the demands of defense without cutting back on the civilian economy is growing in line with the expanding defense expenditures, and possibly faster.
>
> In any event, almost no one foresees what has been associated with war in the past—shortages of consumer goods, raging inflation, enormous Government budget deficits and the like.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Vietnam War's Impact: Economy Is Hardly Hurt," written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and published in the New York Times for today, Monday, August 8, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM WAR'S IMPACT: ECONOMY IS HARDLY HURT

(NOTE.—This is the first of four articles in which correspondents of The New York Times have attempted to estimate the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy, the nation's politics, the lives of its citizens and foreign policy.)

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr., special to the New York Times)

WASHINGTON, August 7.—In the first six months of this year sportsmen and business executives bought more than 8,000 private airplanes, easily a record and nearly half again as many as those purchased last year.

This footnote to the American economy in 1966 illustrates a major truth about the war in Vietnam.

The war has had distinct effects on the economy and on the people and businesses that make it up, but the effects have been far less than in any other war in modern times.

Figuratively speaking, the extraordinary American economy is carrying the war on its little finger, although the finger hurts a bit.

Guitar strings have been reported in short supply in some music stores around the nation, and some retailers of men's suits complain that there have been delays in deliveries of a few sizes and models of fall suits because of the Government's demand for military uniforms.

As everyone knows, however, there has been nothing remotely resembling a shortage of consumer goods, as has occurred in past wars. From air-conditioners to gasoline, from swimsuits to rugs, the effort has been to sell rather than to turn customers away. Automobile dealers have the biggest unsold stocks of cars in history.

Prices have gone up—housewives are conscious of paying about 8 per cent more for meat than a year ago—and the costs of medical care have soared. Last week President Johnson lost a battle with the steel industry over a price increase, and investigators sprouted over higher prices for the consumer staples, bread and milk.

However, the inflation has been very small by comparison with the zooming price increases of the Korean War, World War II or even World War I.

For example, measured by the Government's Consumer Price Index, the rise in prices of the last 12 months of 2.5 per cent was only one-fourth as great as in the first year of the Korean War. Some items, such as automobiles, are cheaper now than they were a year ago.

FOOD PRICES CITED

Much of the price increase, and the hurt for the consumer, has been in food, where overall prices are up nearly 4 percent from a year ago. However, a reduced baby pig crop, drought and a smaller number of dairy cows have had far more to do with this rise than the war.

As for steel, prices have gone up much less than in the last peacetime inflation, in 1956–58.

Over-all, wholesale and retail prices have risen in the first half of this year at an annual pace of 3.5 per cent, enough to worry seriously both consumers and the Government, but less than in nearly all other industrial countries, which are not at war.

Taxes have gone up. The Government took away in April the reduction in the excise tax on telephone bills it had given in January, and it did the same for a 1 per cent tax on automobiles, amounting to from $20 to $35 a car.

These increases, however, are minor by comparison with the big cuts in income and excise taxes of 1964 and 1965, and by comparison with the tax increases of previous wars. The main change has been merely a speed-up in tax collections, including graduated withholding taxes that had long been advocated on their own merit.

TAX CUT CONJECTURED

What is more, there are reputable economists who think the Government will be considering another tax cut next year, with the war still going strong.

Interest rates have gone up—indeed, one of the steepest increases on record. Many individuals trying to buy a home have found a mortage difficult to obtain, and new homebuilding has slowed.

This "tight money" situation, not altogether caused by the war, has not, however, prevented a record expansion of total lending in the economy. The individual with a reasonable credit standing who could not get a personal loan has yet to turn up, and one personal finance company is drawing up business by sponsoring the Washington Senators' baseball games.

Business loans by banks have grown more rapidly in the last six months than in all but one or two years in the last 20. Even mortgage financing has only slowed, not stopped.

The war has worsened supply troubles in a few metals, such as copper and molybdenum. Some types of aluminum are on a delayed delivery basis and electric wire has been hard to acquire in the quantities manufacturers have wanted. As noted, textile and apparel mills have been hard put to fill Government orders at a time of booming civilian business, and some use of direct priority orders has been required.

There is a severe shortage of skilled manpower in the precision machining industry. As an example of how the problem can be made worse, nine out of the 23 apprentices in Muskegon, Mich., being especially trained to fill the gap, with Federal training funds, have been taken away by the local draft board.

CONTROLS SYSTEM LACKING

Despite these and other examples, and in sharp contrast to prior wars, there is no system of general allocations controls over materials or manpower, simply because one is not needed. In contrast with World War II and the Korean War, when every pound of the key metals and other materials was allocated by the Government, this time there is only a system of priorities for defense and one or two nondefense purposes, limited to steel, copper, aluminum and nickel. The "set-aside" of steel production for military purposes is only 6 per cent of total production, of copper and aluminum 13 per cent. Autos, highway bridges, color television sets and pleasure boats are jointly consuming far more of these metals than the war.

Moreover, in a telling illustration of the total picture, a spokesman for the precision machining industry, after describing the desperate labor shortage, recently told a House subcommittee on small businesses that was investigating problems of related industries that if the war should "dry up" tomorrow, the machine tool industry would still have nearly as great a problem.

The war has cost the Government money, and thus has reduced the availability of funds for domestic purposes. The President's budget last January cut $1.6-billion from the amount authorized in about 25 new Great Society programs in health, education, antipollution and the like.

In addition, only minor increases were permitted in two of the most important new programs—antipoverty and aid for elementary and secondary education. Such promising new ideas as automatic sharing of part of the Federal income tax with the states and direct income transfers to the poor were pigeonholed because of the $10.5-billion war cost estimated for the fiscal year 1967, which began on July 1.

The new welfare programs are not the only ones affected. Government public works starts were cut in half in the new budget, and the space agency, although still given the sizeable sum of $5-billion, was denied a few glamorous items, such as an advanced orbiting solar observatory, and suffered a reduction of planning funds for what comes after the first landing on the moon.

SOCIETY PROJECTS ON INCREASE

This is only part of the picture, however. In dramatic contrast with the past, spending on the new Great Society programs, although less than the full amount authorized by Congress is actually increasing in this fiscal year by more than $3-billion—and this does not take into account the start of the expensive new Medicare program.

In the last fiscal year, with defense outlays building up, total domestic spending, including Social Security, far from declining, rose $7.5-billion from the previous year.

Also in contrast with the past, the budget deficit has declined despite the war, and there is a chance that the budget will have a surplus in the current fiscal year.

Prices, taxes, credit, Government spending, shortages—all tell the same story. The war has had an effect, but an astonishingly small one.

TWO REASONS GIVEN

The explanation for this picture is agreed to by most economic analysts in and out of the Government. It has two parts. Both are in a sense obvious, but they do not appear to be altogether appreciated by the public.

One is that this is the first time the United States has entered a major war with a very large existing defense establishment. This means, simply, that the needed build-up has been comparatively small.

When the Korean war broke out, total military Personnel numbered only 1.5 million and this jumped to 3.3 million in a year, or a rise of more than 100 per cent. Equipment and weapons requirements increased proportionately.

This time the build-up in a year has been from 2.7 million men to 3.1 million, or about 15 per cent increase. No conceivable increase will equal or approach the Korean experience.

The defense budget more than doubled the first year of the Korean War from $12.5-billion to $30.5-billion, and it rose to $47-billion in the next 12 months. This time the increase in the first year was about $7-billion, to $54-billion, or only 15 per cent, and the next year's increase is likely to be about the same.

A MATTER OF SIZE

The second reason given for the relatively small impact of the war on the economy is the size of the American economy.

In the first year of the war since the major commitment began last July the gross national product—the total output of goods and services, and the best measure of the over-all output of the economy—has averaged $711-billion. The $6-billion cost of the war in that period represents the amazingly small amount of eight-tenths of 1 per cent.

The entire defense outlay, war costs included, ran less than 8 per cent of the gross national product by the second quarter of this year, less than some recent peacetime years when the gross national product was smaller.

By contrast in the Korean War this proportion zoomed from 4.5 percent before the war started to 11.3 per cent a year later and eventually to 13.6 per cent.

This single figure—a war cost of less than 1 per cent of the gross national product up to now—tells why the impact of the war, relatively speaking, has been so slight on the normal life of the economy. A $6-billion war in any other economy would have a far greater effect.

The cost of the war, of course, is still rising. At present it is probably running at an annual rate of about $12-billion or a little more, with total defense outlays now at a rate of about $60-billion.

However, the gross national product is also rising—hence the capacity to absorb the war with little strain. Unless the nature of the war changes—to an all-out conflict with Communist China, for example—the cost of the war above "normal" defense spending is unlikely ever to rise above 2 percent of the gross national product. It is now about 1.5 per cent:

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT

The relatively small impact of the war as measured against the total size of the economy has had its counterpart in unemployment figures.

In past wars the economy quickly moved to full employment—and a manpower shortage. This time, too, the war has spurred an economy already nearing full employment and added to the number working.

However, the improvement, seen in perspective, has not been spectacular.

In the 12 months from June, 1964, to June, 1965, as the economy was roaring ahead under the impetus of the big tax cut of 1964, the unemployment rate was reduced from 5.4 per cent of the labor force to 4.7 per cent.

In the next 12 months, with the war providing the additional stimulus, the rate dropped from 4.7 per cent to 4 per cent—exactly the same decline. There were still 3.1 million persons out of work in June, even after allowing for the normal rise at the end of the school year.

A DRAIN ON GOLD

In specific communities, of course, defense spending has had a much bigger impact than in the nation as a whole. For example, unemployment has been sharply reduced in the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia because of expanded helicopter production by the Fairchild Aircraft Company at nearby Hagerstown, Md.

Jobs attributable to defense, however, remain less than 10 per cent of the total, and the increase in jobs because of additional defense spending caused by the war appears to be no more than 2 per cent of the total. This does not count the 400,000 additional men in uniform.

Despite the relatively small impact of the war at home, it has had one serious economic cost not felt by the ordinary citizen: It is directly responsible for sharply worsening the deficit in the balance of international payments after a heartening improvement in 1965.

The direct foreign exchange cost of the operations in Vietnam will be an estimated total of $750-million this year. What is more serious, an unknown number of these dollars are finding their way to France, which now converts every dollar it receives into gold at the United States Treasury.

The worsening of the balance of payments has not brought on any financial crisis, nor does it threaten to do so, but it has delayed the day when the gold outflow will be stopped.

What if the war should end? What then for the economy?

James R. Hoffa, the president of the international brotherhood of Teamsters, has forecast a sharp jump in unemployment and, among other things, a consequent weakening in union bargaining power. There can be little doubt that millions of citizens instinctively fear that the present boom is a result of the war and that peace would bring economic trouble.

Once again, however, most experts disagree.

Defense spending, to begin with, would not decline abruptly but would taper off, they say. Some part of the reduction, they explain, would be replaced by the economic cost of reconstruction in Vietnam, possibly in both north and south, which could run $1-billion a year or even more.

Regardless of how much or how little defense outlays—and defense manpower—decline, the economic impact can be readily offset in either or both of two ways.

One is a tax reduction, which in effect simply replaces Government spending with private spending. The total demand of goods and services is unimpaired, although some individual businesses gain orders and others lose them.

The other offsetting factor is an expansion of Federal domestic spending. There is no lack of ideas for enormous expansion of outlays on the home front, ranging from direct transfer of income to the poor to a huge assault on the educational deficiencies of Northern slum areas. Spending on a number of Federal programs has been curtailed, although not reduced, by the war, and expansion could come quickly.

"I am convinced," said one respected Wall Street analyst the other day, "that peace would be bullish—bullish for the economy and bullish for the stock market."

Many economists agree.

FUTURE IS WEIGHED

Assuming no early peace, is the strain on the economy likely to increase as spending on the war continues to rise?

The strain might become a little more noticeable, depending on the place at which defense spending increases. However, although the Government has refused to divulge its latest estimates on defense outlays, officials are now assuming a rate of increase no greater than in the last 12 months.

This would mean some further rise in defense costs in relation to the national economy, with the "add-on" caused by the war coming to about 2 per cent of the gross national product in the first half of next year. Budget expenditures for defense will clearly be larger than the $58.3-billion estimated in the budget last January for the current fiscal year—probably about $5-billion higher.

Revenues, however, are growing, too, and faster than estimated. The best evidence that the war is not causing a drastic change in the Government's financial situation is in the magnitude of the Treasury's planned borrowing, which is actually a little less in the last half of this year than had been estimated several months ago.

Meanwhile, industry is adding to its plant and equipment at the record rate of $60.8-billion this year. This means that the capacity of the economy to meet the demands of defense without cutting back on the civilian economy is growing in line with the expanding defense expenditures, and possibly faster.

NO SHORTAGES FORESEEN

In any event, almost no one foresees what has been associated with war in the past—shortages of consumer goods, raging inflation, enormous Government budget deficits and the like.

Some economists, such as Oscar Gass of Washington, believe that economic capacity from now on will grow faster than total demand, including demand from war spending. In this picture, unemployment would be rising a little by the end of the year, with the war going full blast, and the Government might well be considering a tax cut to stimulate the economy.

If this happened, or if the President felt called upon to propose an increase of from $5-billion to $10-billion in domestic spending, it would be the most dramatic evidence yet of how readily a three-quarter-trillion dollar economy can cope with what is, after all, a sizable war.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL HAILS 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Milwaukee Journal saluted the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright, on the 20th anniversary of his great program of Fulbright scholarships.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful tribute from one of the Nation's finest newspapers to the remarkable chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, an editorial entitled "20 Years of Fulbrights," published in the Milwaukee Journal of August 7, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Twenty Years of Fulbrights

Sen. Fulbright (D-Ark.), embattled over Vietnam and the foreign aid bill, must have enjoyed a moment's respite Monday when he was able to mark the 20th anniversary of his brilliantly conceived and highly successful Fulbright program. Just two decades ago President Truman signed the Fulbright act, providing for international educational exchange.

Since then 14,174 American students have gone abroad and 33,220 foreign students have come to the United States, all on Fulbright grants. In addition 12,070 foreign lecturers and teachers have come here from abroad and 11,136 American lecturers and teachers have gone abroad under the grants.

Ironically, China was the first nation to agree to participate in the exchange program—on Nov. 10, 1947. And the first American grantee was a well known Sinologist from the University of Pennsylvania whose grant was for research to complete the second volume of a history of Chinese philosophy. That was before the coming of the Communist regime, of course, which has put relations between the two nations in deep freeeze.

Fulbright scholars have gone to all parts of the globe. A majority has worked and studied in Europe, next largest number in far east and, next in order, in Australia, New Zealand, near east, Latin America and Africa. A 1962 survey showed that, out of every 100 American grantees, about 55 studied, 25 lectured in universities or did research and 20 teachers or school administrators worked in classrooms or undertook special projects of professional development. Fulbright scholars in Greece worked on the restoration of the Agora, beneath the towering heights of the Acropolis. A Fulbright grantee helped developed a canning industry in the Shan states of Burma and showed the people how to make sauerkraut from discarded surplus cabbages.

The program hit a critical period in the early fifties. Sources of foreign currency which were essential to its continuation were drying up. McCarthyism, with its unfounded charges of Communist infiltration, focused on the Fulbright effort for a time. Fortunately, good sense prevailed and Congress kept the program going. In 1961, it received its most significant endorsement with passage of the Fulbright-Hays act. That measure confirmed the program's rationale, extended many of its features, gave it a broader field of action and more financial support.

The foreign teachers and lecturers who came here reached 311,725 American students, and American teachers returned here have reached the lives of some 3.2 million students going through elementary and secondary schools. Thus our educational system has been enriched, and we have helped enrich education abroad. The Fulbright program has made it a smaller and better world.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM ESSENTIAL FOR GOOD SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, legislation extending the special milk program for schoolchildren an additional 4 years as well as an appropriations measure funding the program for fiscal 1967 is still being considered here in Congress. Those who were so eager to see the school milk program continue on as it has so successfully in the past now assume that victory is theirs. It is true that the bill appropriating funds for the program for fiscal 1967 has passed both Houses. The only step that remains is for the House and Senate conferees to agree to resolve the difference between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill. It is also true that legislation extending the school milk program has been passed by the Senate and reported by two House committees.

However, this is no time to rest on our laurels. We must make the final push now if we are to insure the continuance of a healthy school milk program. The doubt and uncertainty that failure to act quickly on these two pieces of legislation will produce in the administrators that set-aside State and local funds for the program this fall could substantially damage its effectiveness.

Reduced program effectiveness, moreover, could have a direct impact on the scholarship of the poorer children among our school-aged population. For there is no gainsaying the fact that you cannot teach a hungry child. The school milk program, by providing underprivileged children with a midmorning milk break to take the place of the breakfast they did not have, has contributed substantially to the learning process among the very group that stand to gain the most from this process. Let us not fail these children. Let us act now.

THE VICE PRESIDENT WARNS OF FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, speaking in St. Louis, Mo., today to the Midcontinent Farmers Association, Vice President Hubert Humphrey has given a timely warning of potential food shortages ahead and declared that "next year will be a year for bringing a substantial part of reserve acreage out of mothballs" in the United States.

The Vice President points out that world reserves of wheat are seriously depleted; rice is in short supply, soybean carryover is minimal, and our feed grain stocks may be below a safe carryover level by October next year.

The Vice President's emphasis on the United States and world food supply situation is timely, for decisions on acreage allotments for 1967, and on incentives to get our agricultural producers to increase their output, are now being considered.

It is my hope that the allowance and the incentives to plant and harvest greater acreage will be provided, so our country will not have to cut back its conduct of the most important war—the war against want.

Because of its great significance, I ask unanimous consent to put Vice President Humphrey's address to the Midcontinent Farmers Association in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey to Missouri Farmers Association and Midcontinent Farmers Association Convention, Columbia, Mo., on August 8, 1966

Today America lives in abundance. Yet, the world around us remains much the same as President Truman described it in his inaugural address 17 years ago.

"More than half the people of the world," he said, "are living in conditions approaching misery. The food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas."

Today, then, I want to talk about both our own American abundance and about the challenge—and opportunity—facing us in the hungry world outside.

First, let us take a hard, clear look at the realities of our own American agriculture.

The best bargain in the world today is the food basket of the American family.

This is a reality not fully appreciated by those of us who pay for that food basket. We are better fed, at less cost, than any other people in the world. Last year only 18 per cent of our disposable income went for food.

In the last five years, the price of the 11 key foods in the consumer price index has risen by less than 9 per cent. During the same period the weekly earnings, after taxes, of the single worker in industry, for instance, have risen more than 20 per cent.

One hour of factory labor earnings in 1965 bought 12.5 pounds of white bread as compared with 11.1 pounds in 1960; 2.4 pounds of round steak as compared with 2.1 pounds in 1960; 3.5 pounds of butter compared with 3 pounds; 9.9 quarts of milk compared with 8.7 quarts; 5 dozen eggs as compared with 3.9 dozen in 1960.

If we make comparisons over a longer period, they are truly startling. We find one hour of factory labor earnings buying two to three times as much in key commodities as 10 to 20 years ago.

While the cost of farm products has been reduced, the farmer has had to pay more for what he buys.

Since 1960, the cost of things the farmer must buy has gone up by some 11 per cent. He has had to keep running to make even gradual gains in his net income.

Since 1960, farm productivity per man per hour has increased by nearly one third, compared with a productivity gain of about 18 per cent in the rest of our economy.

We must not lose sight of this: consumers benefit from having fair prices paid to farmers, just as farmers benefit from full employment and expansion in the rest of the economy. We all need each other for a full and balanced prosperity.

Farmers create millions of jobs in our economy.

More than 10 million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Nearly a million and a half have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. And thousands in rural communities make their livelihood providing services to farmers.

Total investment in American agriculture is more than 250 billion dollars. This is comparable to about three fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three fifths of the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents 30 thousand, five hundred dollars for each farm worker, as compared with an average investment of 19 thousand, six hundred dollars per employee in manufacturing.

In 1965, when our farmers realized a gross income of nearly 45 billion dollars, they spent almost 31 billion dollars to operate their farm businesses.

Last year they spent more than 3 billion dollars to buy trucks, tractors, and other farm machinery and equipment. They spent about 2 billion dollars to buy automobiles.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry. In 1965, more than 3 billion dollars was spent by farmers for petroleum, fuel, and oil, and repairs and operations of motor vehicles and machinery.

And all this productivity, all this economic activity is generated by fewer people than live today in the State of California. Our national farm population is today only 12 million.

Where does American agriculture stand in the world?

Exports of our farm commodities are up sharply.

This has a major positive effect on our balance of payments.

In fiscal year 1953, exports of farm products from the United States amounted to less than 3 billion dollars. By fiscal year 1966 the export figure had jumped to nearly 7 billion dollars. Products from 78 million acres of american cropland were shipped abroad. More than 75 per cent of these commodities were sold for dollars.

The market for feed and food grains, oil seeds, protein meals and vegetable oils is highly competitive. But we can and do compete. We can look forward to expansion of farm exports as the economies of other nations grow and their purchasing power increases.

Seneca once observed that "A hungry people listens not to reason nor cares for justice."

And, in that knowledge, we have, under the Food for Peace Program, reached and helped more than a hundred countries.

Under this program we have delivered 150 million tons of food, valued at 15 billion dollars, to needy and disaster-struck nations.

Our Food for Peace Program reflects the democratic and humanitarian character of the American people.

We will continue to share our abundance with people who lack it. But our programs of food assistance must support, and not deter, agricultural development in places which need it. Food aid is only one part of the war on hunger.

We need the help the developing countries with an export of ideas and techniques from our own experience. But these programs must be adapted to their way of doing things—adapted to problems of climate and water and social structure. Part of the assistance we can give is in establishment of local research institutes, using local staffing and resources, to undertake the same kind of agricultural research which has so contributed to our own productivity.

This is the essence of our new Food for Freedom proposals—to help others help themselves. When President Johnson proposed the Food for Freedom Program he said:

"... The time is not far off when all of the combined production, of all the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

Last month I carried this message again, as spokesman for our Government to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. This committee is composed of high-ranking ministers of the industrialized nations—countries that are in a position to be of help to the less developed areas of the world.

I made it quite clear that President Johnson has made a commitment on behalf of the American people to join with the other developed nations in an all-out effort to eradicate large-scale famine and hunger from the face of the earth.

And this brings me to the next reality of American agriculture we all must face.

In the past few years we Americans have come to know what we call "turnpike trance"—the hypnosis of the highway which has led to thousands of mishaps and accidents.

I say far too many Americans have also fallen victim to "surplus stare"—the blind belief, taken as fact, that our country is buried under unnecessary costly tonnages of food.

Today the age of surpluses is all but gone.

Already, our food stocks are dwindling. If we look toward sufficient production for our own needs, for our commercial exports, and for emergency food assistance for the developing countries, we find ourselves close to the safety margin.

The world has been eating into its grain reserves, sharply reducing the carryovers to a point where they should be rebuilt and restored to prudent levels.

In the last four years the world has consumed some 200 million bushels of wheat per year more than it has produced.

In the last four years it has utilized about 6 million tons of feed grains more than it has harvested.

In the case of soybeans, we are using all we produce. Carryovers are minimal.

It is clear that we must raise our production sights in rice.

Because any plan for agriculture must allow for ample lead time, we must always be deeply concerned about the level of reserves. Weather, as all of us know, is an unpredictable hazard. There are reports of drought in many areas of the country this year. We do not know what the size of this year's feed grain and soybean crops will be. We hope for the best, but we will all be concerned until the harvest is in.

It is now apparent that, at the end of the current marketing year, our wheat stocks will fall below the desirable reserve level. The same is true for soybeans, where no true reserve is in sight. Our production of milk is insufficient now. That is why we have raised the support level for manufacturing milk to four dollars per hundredweight.

We are living in a whole new area of demand for feed grains. United States consumption will hit a new peak. We produced a record crop in 1965, but we will use and export more than we harvested.

The number of animal units will go up about four per cent in the next marketing year. Exports are at about 30 million ton rate—about twice the 1959–63 average. It is possible that by October 1 next year our feed-grain carryover will drop below the desirable level.

Next year will be a year for bringing a substantial part of reserve acreage out of mothballs.

We must recognize that the long road of surplus has had its turning.

The farmers of this nation will be called upon to expand production.

This is news. It is good news for our farmers, for our consumers, and for hungry people throughout the world.

And as the American farmer rises to this challenge, his Government is determined that he shall stand on equal footing with the rest of the economy—that he shall have every opportunity for a fair and just return on his investment, his time, his energy and his extraordinary skill.

When President Truman looked out on a turbulent, impoverished and hungry world in 1949, he had little immediate hope that this nation—and our partners—would in his lifetime be able to challenge those conditions.

But today we are able to challenge them—and we are able to do so in large part because of the energy and productivity of American agriculture. Today our abundance is a weapon for peace.

We must use that weapon—ably, honorably and well.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM C. PLOWDEN, OF NEW ZION, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute today to the memory of one of South Carolina's greatest and most respected citizens, who passed away on July 16, 1966. It was my pleasure to know Mr. Plowden and his wonderful family for many years. In fact, the Plowden family name is highly regarded in South Carolina, largely because of the hard work, the business success, and the strong traits of personal character exhibited by the members of the Plowden family.

Mr. Plowden was twice honored by the Ford Motor Co., in 1952 and in 1962, as the oldest Ford dealer in the Carolinas, having served continuously as a Ford dealer for 54 years. He took a chance with the Ford dealership in 1913 in a small rural community, against the advice of his best friends who warned him that the model T would only be a passing fancy. Later he expanded this one dealership into several others, while also farming and conducting other business interests successfully.

However, more than all this, Mr. President, Mr. Plowden left an indelible mark on his friends, his community, and his State, by the splendid example he set for his fellow man in everyday Christian living and leadership. Mr. Plowden, long a leader in his Presbyterian church, practiced his religious principles at home, at work, and in all aspects of his life. This is why he was always so highly regarded and so loved as a Christian gentleman, businessman, father, and husband.

Mr. Plowden's widow, Mrs. Juanita Boykin Plowden, proved to be a very valuable companion and helped him tremendously throughout the years. Together they reared two fine children, Mrs. L. B. Keels, of Manning, and Col. William C. Plowden, Jr., of New Zion. Colonel Plowden has followed in all of the fine traditions of his father, in Christian character, service to his fellow man, and particularly as a leader in the American Legion, in which organization he served as department commander in South Carolina and as chairman of the Americanism Committee, and also as a successful farmer and businessman.

Mr. President, I join countless other friends and loved ones in expressing my deep sympathy to the family. I also ask unanimous consent to insert the following article from the Charleston News and Courier of July 13, 1966, concerning the death of Mr. Plowden in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. C. PLOWDEN, OF NEW ZION, DIES

NEW ZION.—William Coskrey Plowden, 80, well-known Ford dealer of New Zion, died Saturday in the Clarendon Memorial Hospital in Manning.

Funeral services will be at 5 p.m. Monday at Sardenia Presbyterian Church at Sardenia with the Rev. Dr. Russell W. Park and the Rev. Charles Kirkley officiating. Burial will be in the New Zion Methodist Church Cemetery, directed by the Floyd Funeral Home.

Pallbearers will be Charles N. Plowden, Alfred J. Plowden, John Plowden, James C. Plowden, L. A. Wallace and Ralph McDonald.

Honorary pallbearers will be officers of Sardenia Presbyterian Church and Dr. Joe King, H. L. Singletary, and Marion Davis.

Mr. Plowden had been a Ford dealer at New Zion continuously for 54 years. The oldest dealer in the two Carolinas, he became a dealer June 2, 1912, and three days later married Miss Juanita Boykin by whom he is survived.

In addition to the dealership in New Zion, he had the same in Lake City and in Pamplico. On June 5, 1952, he was given a banquet in Sumter by the Ford Motor Co. The occasion was a double 40th anniversary, as a Ford agent and wedding anniversary. At that time, he was recognized as the oldest dealer in the two Carolinas. A similar banquet was given in 1962 honoring his 50th anniversary. Mr. Plowden had been engaged in livery business and turned to the "Model T" much against the advice and urging of his friends, he often said. Many told him the auto was only a passing fancy and roads were not sufficient in this area for the horseless carriage. The brick building erected in 1927 at the New Zion Crossroads continued to be used by the agency with additions and extensions.

Mr. Plowden continued to go to his office every morning up until a few weeks ago. However, ill health forced him to turn most of the active business over to his son, William C. Plowden, Jr.

Mr. Plowden was a member of Sardenia Presbyterian Church where he has been a ruling elder for a number of years. He was the son of the late John Gabriel Plowden and the late Susan Elizabeth China Plowden and was born and reared in Clarendon County.

Surviving are: his widow, Mrs. Juanita Boykin Plowden; a son, William C. Plowden Jr.; a daughter, Mrs. L. B. Keels of Manning; a brother, John Plowden; a sister, Miss Belle Plowden of New Zion; and three grandchildren.

SHIPBUILDERS UNION URGES McNAMARA TO HALT AWARD OF SURVEY SHIPBUILDING CONTRACT TO BRITAIN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the decision of the Department of Defense to build American naval craft abroad has caused alarm in both the labor and the management segments of the maritime industry.

Characteristic of this state of uneasiness is a letter written by John J. Grogan, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara. Mr. Grogan's letter states in very clear and concise terms just why it is wrong to build American naval vessels abroad. I need not add, Mr. President, that I am completely at one with Mr. Grogan on this issue.

Mr. Grogan asks the Secretary of Defense:

> Are we to repeat the bankrupt, shortsighted, indifferent, and dangerous policy with the construction of naval vessels that has played havoc with our merchant shipbuilding industry? That policy pursued by the Congress has caused idleness and suffering for tens of thousands of skilled shipyard workers, waste of shipbuilding resources and capacity, lost purchasing power, and has burdened communities and states with unemployment, relief, and retraining costs.

This is the crux of the issue. It is an issue that deserves the immediate attention of the Congress. For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Grogan's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND
SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF
AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
Camden, N.J.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO, is on record as condemning the procurement of U.S. Navy vessels from British shipyards. The imminent order of two naval survey ships from a foreign shipyard is an outrageous threat to the welfare of our nation's shipbuilding industry and its skilled working force.

The decision of the Department of Defense to build American naval craft abroad, in our opinion, has spawned a policy which will trigger further efforts to construct naval vessels in more foreign nations. The Defense Department build abroad policy violates the historic and traditional fundamental of making U.S. naval craft construction available to American shipyard workers.

Moreover, the Secretary of Defense is required by the Defense Appropriations Act to carry out the affirmation of Congress "that none of the funds herein provided for the construction or conversion of any naval vessels to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign shipyards for the construction of major components of the hull or superstructure of such vessel."

The last ten years has witnessed the greatest migration of skilled shipyard workers to other industries. U.S. private shipyards building Navy vessels are advertising coast-to-coast for shipyard skills. The shipyard mechanics, with decades of experience in their specialties, have abandoned the industry because of the insurmountable hardships and obstacles in obtaining steady, uninterrupted work. Whereas in former years it was not unusual for our member fathers to enroll their sons and other male relatives in shipyard apprenticeship programs, few do so now, being loath to embark them on a career in a withering industry.

"Control of the seas can mean peace. Control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security," said the late President Kennedy. To grant British shipyards, or any other foreign yard U.S. Navy work, would be an act that would tend to contract our present naval supremacy.

This outlook is emphatically voiced by Admiral David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations. He has said that "national power at sea" is "the mix of military, technological and industrial capabilities related to the sea which cross cuts and intersects almost every aspect of our society." While all of the natural resources and our means of production contribute to the building of naval ships, our nation is completely helpless without an adequate skilled shipyard force. Every naval expert has testified that in times of emergency our naval sea power must under no circumstances be handicapped through reliance on shipyard workers or facilities in other countries.

Are we to repeat the bankrupt, shortsighted indifferent and dangerous policy with the construction of naval vessels that has played havoc with our merchant shipbuilding industry? That policy pursued by the Congress has caused idleness and suffering for tens of thousands of skilled shipyard workers, waste of shipbuilding resources and capacity, lost purchasing power, and has burdened communities and states with unemployment, relief and retraining costs.

A recent U.S. Senate Subcommittee report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary investigating internal security Administration, declared:

"Shipyards are the taproot of a nation's sea power. Over twenty American yards have gone out of business during the past fifteen years because of insufficient work volume, and most of the surviving yards today are engaged in intense competition for the limited work available.

"If relief in the form of larger shipbuilding programs does not come soon, it seems likely that there will be a further cutback in the size of the U.S. shipbuilding industry."

The United States, now in twelfth place among maritime shipbuilding powers of the world, lags far behind Britain. Governmental indifference to the important wartime roles of the shipbuilding yards and its skilled working force will inevitably make for the continued contraction of our nation's facilities and skilled shipyard craftsmen.

There is no easy shortcut for providing shipyard skills vital in a crisis. Economy measures, balance of payments expediencies, and other equally logical reasons today will be no substitute for the manning of our yards in the event of war.

We therefore respectfully appeal to you for the reasons set forth herein to halt the award of the survey shipbuilding contract to Britain.

Respectfully and cordially,
John J. Grogan,
President.

SERVICEMAN IN VIETNAM ASKS QUESTIONS ABOUT DEMONSTRATIONS AT HOME

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate in recent weeks, including myself, have spoken out against lawless racial agitation and mob violence in a number of our metropolitan areas. We have also deplored the conduct of those who have turned upon their own Government because of our involvement in Vietnam and who have, in effect, denounced the United States and given aid and comfort to the enemy.

I recently received a letter from a soldier fighting in Vietnam who simply but eloquently expressed his feelings of shock and dismay at some of the things we have seen taking place in America recently. This letter, which comes from a young American who is engaged in a foreign conflict in behalf of his country and freemen throughout the world, speaks for itself.

I commend it to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 26, 1966.

Senator Herman E. Talmadge:

I was sitting around waiting to go on watch and heard the news and about all the racial trouble in our country so I decided I would write you again and ask for some information. I discussed the matters that I'm writing about with some of the other guys here and they agree with me on the subjects. That if the people there fighting and killing want to see some action so much why not send them here and send us home to be with our loved ones. Some of us are here by choice others by chance.

The college students that are of age and demonstrating against our country being here in Viet Nam should see how we live and not have but two meals a day, and then not have enough to eat. They would see that the servicemen here are miserable.

If any of us should defy our country the way they are doing we could be tried for treason, with a possible death penalty because we are under the United Code of Military Justice and in a combat zone. We also think that our lives are worth more than sixty-five dollars a month, but that is all the Government is paying us.

What we want to know is why are we here fighting for another country's peace when there is fighting and killing in our own country every day, even though we know we are right in fighting against Communism, while there is Communism in our own country.

Cpl. Wayne T. Strickland, 2110657,
F Co., 2d Bn., 7th Marines, FPO San Francisco 96602.

THE STRUGGLE TO END HUNGER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this week's issue of Time contains an excellent essay outlining the magnitude of the world food crisis, and the types of steps that are essential to meet it. It recognizes that an effective world hunger program must combine expanded U.S. food shipments, using nonsurplus foods, with emphasis on agricultural self-help in food-short nations. It details the types of efforts that are needed to make this self-help effective, giving particular emphasis to tropical farm research to develop the techniques and crop varieties best suited to hungry lands.

As a Senator who has long supported an expanded world hunger program such as that provided for in the Food for Freedom Act now before the Senate Agriculture Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Time essay, entitled "The Struggle to End Hunger," be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks. I would add only one point. I feel it essential to recognize, as this essay does not specifically do, that the American farmer must receive adequate returns for his increased efforts if we are to expand our output enough to mount an effective attack on world hunger.

There being no objection, the Time essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Struggle To End Hunger

One of the greatest peacetime armadas ever assembled—600 ships from 50 donor nations—has borne 1,000,000 tons a month of mostly U.S. grain to drought-tormented India this year. Despite alarming predictions that millions of people might starve to death in that land, famine has been fended off. The massive U.S. effort, plus surprisingly effective distribution of rationed wheat and rice through India's bullock-and-leather-bucket economy, proved the apocalyptic prophets wrong.

Yet neither India nor other needy nations dare rely on largesse much longer. With world population in the past five years growing twice as fast, at 2% a year, as food output, man's struggle against hunger has reached a historic turning point. It has already forced dozens of ill-fed countries to start reshaping their pride-twisted economies. It has upset old notions of geopolitics. Most dramatic of all, it has virtually eaten up the perennial overproduction of U.S. agriculture, whose bounty now feeds one out of every 20 persons in Africa, Latin America and non-Communist Asia. The State Department last week told U.S. embassies to discourage requests for wheat because the nation must cut back such aid shipments by 25% this year.

THE GRAIN DRAIN

In the twelve years since the U.S. began dumping its awkward farm surpluses overseas on semi-giveaway terms, so much of the glut has disappeared that now the nation must try to expand farm output after 33 years of curbing it. Twice this year, Washington has increased its price supports for dairy products, and it is now asking farmers to plant 10% more rice, 15% more wheat. For lack of grain to store, Cargill, Inc. last month closed its largest elevator in Buffalo. With India consuming a quarter of the U.S. wheat crop this year, as against a fifth last year and an eighth five years ago, U.S. wheat stocks now stand at a 14-year low of just over 15 million metric tons, not enough for adequate protection against a domestic crop failure. The supply of soybeans, the dull yellow seed that goes into everything from vegetable oil to paint and constitutes the world's cheapest source of protein, equals just four months' consumption. Five years ago, Government warehouses were jammed with butter and cheese; now they hold none. Washington has had to go into the market to buy dried milk for its program of free school lunches for 50 million children in 52 foreign countries.

The U.S. shift from surplus toward scarcity leaves the nation with abundant food of every kind, but at prices rising swiftly enough to cause wrath among consumers in Manhattan, pandemonium on the grain market in Chicago, and smiles on farmers' faces from Keokuk to Calexico. Cash receipts by farmers are expected to rise 14% this year above their 1964 level, to a record $44.5 billion, and their net incomes will jump 16% to more than $15 billion. The change calls into question assumptions of many years' standing. For instance, does the U.S. still need crop-area controls and subsidies on such avidly sought foodstuffs as wheat? As things stand now, even though the market price of wheat has climbed 26.5% in a year to $1.91½, farmers are holding near-record amounts off the market in expectation of still higher prices—and Government wheat subsidies are helping to finance that gamble. The need for soil banking is also diminishing; 10 million of the 56 million acres of idle farm land, which costs taxpayers an irksome $1.6 billion a year, will be put to use to reach the new grain goals.

So far, man's ability to improve his environment has thwarted the 168-year-old Malthusian hypothesis that the human race is doomed to starve because population will outstrip food supply. Enriched by the 19th century industrial revolution that Malthus failed to foresee, Europe turned abroad for food. The U.S. began mechanizing its farming well over a century ago. Since then, compounding its prowess with irrigation, hybrid seeds, pesticides, continually improved fertilizers, and now even computers, the nation has marched to its present-day high farm productivity. Yet even without these benefits, the countries now called "underdeveloped" were able to feed themselves until World War II, and to export as much as 11 million tons of grain a year to Europe. Then postwar population pressures forced them to begin importing food, and now they bring in 25 million tons a year.

Now they are frighteningly short of self-sufficiency. Half a billion people—almost a seventh of the earth's 3.28 billion inhabitants—are "belly hungry," as an official of the United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization puts it. For another billion only a shade better off, poorly balanced diets smother their lives in lethargy, chronic illness and early death. Protein and vitamin deficiencies condemn millions of their children to such widespread, dwarfing diseases as kwashiorkor, which produces skin sores, swollen limbs and resentful apathy, and marasmus, which bloats bellies, shrivels limbs to the girth of the bones, and enfeebles brains to the point where schooling is useless. Imprisoned in poverty by ignorance and malnutrition, such virus fodder can contribute little to the development of their nations. Almost all of them live in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where farming is mostly mired in Babylonian technology.

In bejungled Brazil, which imports even some of its beans from Mexico, two-thirds of the population suffers from nutritional deficiency; the northeastern "Brazilian bulge" is one of the worst-fed areas of the world. In Africa's Bechuanaland, the population of 600,000 has subsisted on handouts from the FAO for five years of drought—a curse now spreading to Morocco and western Algeria. In fertile Nigeria, a food shortage has boosted prices 40% in six months, forcing the new regime to forbid the export of such African staples as yams, cassava flour (made from a high-calorie but protein-short root), corn and rice to neighboring countries.

THE HIGH COST OF INDIA

By any measure, India bears the most burdensome load of food problems—as elsewhere, mostly self-inflicted. The country is 75% illiterate, riven by language differences, hobbled by its caste system. Millions of impoverished peasants are at the mercy of the annual monsoon to water their crops, but the government has yet to survey many areas for underground sources of water. Though the seas around the subcontinent teem with protein-rich fish, which keep the Japanese healthy, religious taboos prevent orthodox Hindus from eating them. Farms average a mere two acres, precluding their mechanization. Why don't farmers pool their holdings in cooperatives, share the tools they so desperately need? Explains Punjab Farmer Kewal Singh: "Everyone suspects everyone else of being dishonest."

India loses a third of its harvest to insects, rats and rot, and high cost prevents big-scale food canning. From what should be fertile basins, India gets rice yields only a third of Egypt's, acre for acre, and grain production half that of the U.S. Misled by the example of Soviet industrialization, India for years concentrated on creating a socialistic state dominated by government-owned industries, diverting its own meager resources and $6.5 billions of U.S. economic assistance to do so, U.S. wheat helped to keep food prices low for industrial workers, but this cut farmers' incentive and prevented them from buying factory goods. At last, India's planners have realized that industry and agriculture must develop together if either is to thrive.

Now India's government has made overcoming its food deficit the first order of business, and Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies, believes that remedies can take root; better irrigation, more fertilizer plants, higher-yielding seeds, pest control. Equally vital are a farm-credit system, roads and storehouses (so that farmers need not dump their crops on the market at harvest time, when prices dip), and crop insurance to overcome the penniless farmers' reluctance to try new methods.

PROSPECTS AND PROPOSALS

Though India escaped famine this year, the pangs of world hunger are going to grow worse. Since DDT and antibiotics cut their death rates by one-third in the 1940s, backward countries have seen their once slow gait of population growth change to a gallop. Fully 80% of the post-World War II population spurt has occurred in the countries least able to support it. It took from the dawn of time until 1800 for the earth's population to reach 1 billion but only 130 years after that to reach 2 billion, and only 36 years more to reach the present 3.28 billion. Enough girls have already been born, FORTUNE points out, to be the mothers of sufficient children to raise the population to 7.4 billion by the year 2000—but birth control should cut that figure down a lot. So should reduced child mortality—by giving peasants less need to rely on sheer number of offspring as insurance that some will survive to care for them in their old age. In any case, most of the added people will live in regions already seething with the pressures of deprivation.

"Unless the hungry nations learn to feed themselves," warns Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, "there will be world famine in less than 20 years. More human lives hang in the balance than have been lost in all the wars of history." President Johnson warns that "one new element in today's world is the threat of mass starvation." Agrees FAO Director-General Binay Rajan Sen: "Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and stabilize population growth, or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude."

The threat of famine is real, but barring an improbable collapse of U.S. agriculture, it is not imminent. And the means for avoiding famine lie well within man's technology, if not necessarily within his politics. "If there should be a famine, it will be the result of ill-advised government action—in the U.S. and abroad," says Stanford Professor Karl Brandt, former director of its Food Research Institute. Plant Pathologist J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, holds that "we know enough today to transform the food production of the world. There is no longer any excuse for human starvation."

The gathering crisis has at least exposed the defects of the U.S.'s twelve-year-old $15 billion Food for Peace giveaway, Public Law 480. Even that program's first coordinator, Don Paarlberg, now a Purdue professor of agricultural economics, castigates it. "All that free food depresses foreign markets, discourages their farmers, makes them victims of food imperialism," says he. "It's not good for them, and it's not good for us." In effect, the bill was so explicitly designed to let the U.S. get rid of surpluses that it neglected to encourage foreign agriculture. Many developing countries—notably India, Egypt and Indonesia—used U.S. food as a crutch to let them spend money on prestige projects such as airlines, steel mills and monumental public works.

Acknowledging the old mistakes, the Administration's $6.6 billion Food for Freedom bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives and expected to clear the Senate without major difficulty, calls for a fundamental shift in U.S. food-aid policy. It still proposes to keep the world from starving by expanding food shipments abroad and drops the requirement of the expiring law that such aid must come from U.S. surpluses. But the bill would require countries receiving food to build up their own agricultural output through self-help. And it quite bluntly advocates that they take birth-control measures, too.

A few years ago, such a proviso might have raised cries of a Western plot against the growth of colored races. Hunger's pressures have helped to calm that fallicious fear. Even in the most unlikely region, Roman Catholic South America, resistance to birth control has dwindled. "Religion is getting out of the way," says University of Chicago Economist Theodore W. Schultz.

If the short-range solution to hunger overseas is more U.S. food, the long-range answer must be the export of technology, along with capital and brains to see that it is applied wisely. The rest of the world needs to catch up with the mechanization and efficiency of U.S. farms: Half the world's tractors operate in North America. California rice growers have gone so far as to plant, fertilize and spray their crops entirely from planes. A single U.S. farm worker now feeds 37 people, nearly twice as many as he did only a decade ago. And despite rising prices, U.S. consumers get off with spending the world's smallest share of their after tax income for food: 19% (v. 29% in Britain, 45% in Italy, 80% in India).

American-backed research has already begun that immense catch-up task. Mexico was able to convert its wheat deficit into a small surplus at least partly because the Rockefeller Foundation helped Mexican scientists to develop new high-yielding varieties, which are stubby enough not to topple over of their own weight (as native wheat did) when heavily fertilized. Transplanted the Mexican wheat is now doubling yields in West Pakistan, undergoing tests in India. In 1962, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations jointly set up an International Rice Research Institute near Manila. Already, its 20 scientists—half Americans, half Asians—have crossbred new strains of rice that have raised crop output in Pakistan and elsewhere.

The next task is research on tropical farming. Only 7.6% of the earth's land surface is cultivated today, because the rest is mostly too hot, cold, dry, wet or steep. Man's food supply is adequate only in the cool temperate zone, where grow most of the grains and soybeans that supply 60% of human energy. Crops in tropical rain forests are still grown as the Mayan Indians grew them 20 centuries ago: by burning off a tract, tilling it three years, then abandoning it.

Vital as research is, victory over hunger also demands that backward countries scale new heights of social, political and economic organization. As the U.S. example shows, it takes vast amounts of capital—$30,500 per U.S. farm worker v. $19,600 for an industrial worker. Some experts figure that developing countries must invest $80 billion before 1980 just to feed their growing populations at today's unhappy level. Beyond that, there is a need for chains of agricultural-research centers and schools abroad, partly staffed by an army of young U.S. technicians—one Congressman would call them the "bread and butter corps." Incentives that boost farm output by rewarding it must replace stifling state controls. The old Danish proverb applies: "When the mayor is a baker, the breads are always small."

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM

For the 25-year future, scientists are already busy with new ways to feed the hungry planet. Los Angeles' Rand Corp. feels confident that fish will be herded like cattle and raised in offshore pens, that kelp, seaweed, plankton and microscopic sea plants will be grown by divers living for months at a time in undersea bunkhouses. Oilmen have lately discovered how to derive a high-grade, edible protein from petroleum. The U.S. Army has figured out how to irradiate meats to preserve them for three years—a development of vast potential for refrigeration-shy countries. Would people eat such stuff? Happily, entrenched habits can be changed. In India's rice-shy Kerala state, people are learning to down wheat they once spurned.

The food-rich West has enough conventional resources to stave off starvation on less fortunate continents long enough for existing farm technology—plus increasing birth control—to restore the balance between food and people. What then? Says Harvard's Revelle: "One cannot go to India without feeling that the average Indian is a prisoner of biology and environment. The problem of development is giving these human beings the freedom they need. They will use it very well." America's fabulous farm underpinnings have conferred that freedom—and power—on its people. With carrot and stick, the U.S. now offers the underdeveloped world a chance—perhaps its last—to borrow U.S. techniques and reach for the same nourishing reward.

WHY NOT A LABOR COURT OF LAST RESORT?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the airlines strike is now in its 31st day.

Because of the widespread economic impact of the strike, the Senate has had to take ad hoc action to end the dispute. In view of the ever-increasing economic damage this strike is causing, it is my hope the House will take prompt action to get the planes back in the air.

But what of the future? The airlines fall under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act of 1926, as amended. It is evident that the provisions of this act can be invoked to postpone, but not prevent, a strike.

Thus, the obvious duty that faces Congress is to provide legislation that will safeguard the national interest and the public welfare, while providing equitable relief to the disputants.

It must be apparent to all that our Nation cannot continue to face annual crisis situations of this nature.

One answer, as I see it, is my bill to create a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations, which I introduced on February 8, 1966.

The Washington Sunday Star of August 7, 1966, has—in my mind—produced one of the most well-reasoned and researched editorials I have read on this subject and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

As the Star editorialist points out, the possibility of still further strikes in vital industries in 1966 and 1967, means that some serious thought must be given to breaking up logjams of this nature.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Why Not a Labor Court of Last Resort?" which appeared in the Sunday Star of August 7, 1966, be inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Aug. 7, 1966]

WHY NOT A LABOR COURT OF LAST RESORT?

The most widely-felt strike of the year is now entering its second month. The shutdown of five major airlines has had serious impact on travel in the United States and 23 foreign countries, stranding thousands abroad and hitting the whole economy of resort states such as Florida and Hawaii.

Influenced by the administration's statement that this is not yet a national emergency, the Senate last week pondered a number of ad hoc, temporary remedies, and finally enacted a compromise measure proposed by Senator MORSE. It shied away from a permanent solution, urged by Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio, which would have handed the power of compulsory arbitration to a government panel.

Yet it is obvious that a widespread loss of public confidence in voluntary collective bargaining has occurred. The situation demonstrates once again the need for some kind of government body able to propose and enforce solutions where the public interest is so clearly involved.

The idea of compulsory arbitration is neither new nor untried. Sweden, New Zealand and Australia have had such government power for many years, the latter two countries since the turn of the century.

The United States itself has turned to government-enforced solutions when pressures grew intolerable. An example was seizure of the coal mines in 1946, accompanied by a threat of fines on the United Mine Workers treasury and the union president, John L. Lewis, for contempt of court in failing to halt a strike. This grew out of provisions in the Smith-Connally Act.

Two years later Lewis was back before Federal Judge T. Alan Goldsborough in another contempt case for failure to end a walkout. Lewis denied he caused the strike; the union called it a voluntary work stoppage. In a celebrated reply, Judge Goldsborough held the union responsible nevertheless and said Lewis had merely substituted "a wink, a nod, a code" for the word strike. The strike ended quickly after Judge Goldsborough imposed heavy fines. The Supreme Court reduced the fines, but upheld the ruling of the lower court.

In modern times, the most celebrated and drawn-out dispute ending in compulsory arbitration was the 1963 decision by Congress in the railroad featherbedding dispute. It eliminated the threat of a nationwide railroad strike and clearly carried a "public interest" label.

Yet like last week's debate in Congress, this was a limited action, a temporary expedient in a single industry to get past a roadblock. The whole sequence of threats, walkout, and public inconvenience and financial loss can be expected elsewhere. The machinery does not now exist to end this cycle effectively.

What is needed is a kind of labor court with power to see its final decisions carried out. There is nothing novel about such an approach. An appeal for a high court with jurisdiction over labor-management issues was made by the late Bernard M. Baruch after World War I when the nation was faced with widespread industrial strife.

In his words, too many of the struggles between unions and industry were "not only waged at the public's expense but settled at it." He called the method judicial arbitration, but agreed it should be compulsory to be meaningful.

Other advocates of the plan in modern times have included Senator SMATHERS of Florida, Dean Paul P. Harbrecht of the University of Detroit Law School, and J. E. Wolfe, chief negotiator for the railroad industry. Although labor traditionally has opposed the concept, government employee unions three years ago declared at a San Francisco conference that a compulsory arbitration clause was needed to make their bargaining in government meaningful.

White House intervention, as now practiced, virtually carries a guarantee that the "solution" will be distorted by events. A highly-charged political atmosphere surrounds decisions. The President, already burdened by the other duties of his office, is drawn into industrial disputes month after month as contracts expire. He faces a particularly rough time in the next year and a half, with contracts running out in the electrical and communications industries in 1966 and in autos, trucking, machinery, construction and railroads in 1967. The situation promises to point up even more the need for a federal panel to break up logjams.

A labor court would not, of course, handle every labor dispute. When collective bargaining fails to produce a settlement, the test of public interest and welfare still would have to be met, and the usual sequence of state and federal mediation machinery and factfinding boards would have to be exhausted first. The point is that such a continuing tribunal, with competence in a broad range of industrial relations, could lift the present burden of politically-loaded decisions from Congress and the White House, and produce final answers. It need not take the step of forcing men to work against their will, but it could, as in the Lewis case, fine companies or unions and their leaders for contempt if a decision were ignored.

With the increasing complexity of society, a strike can disrupt public life out of all proportion to the number of workers involved. The New York City transit strike earlier this year not only paralyzed the city but cost the metropolitan economy an estimated $1 billion. A strike by longshoremen two winters ago depleted our foreign trade surplus by $20 million a day.

William E. Simkin, federal mediation director, in fact sees an increasing number of industries falling within the "public interest" concept. In the words of labor consultant Paul Jacobs, "Technology has freed America from much harsh and routine labor and greatly improved its living standards, but it has also made the people so interdependent that no one of them is free from the consequences of another's actions."

The answer must be a court of last resort for labor-management disputes.

ARKANSAS APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL LOANS AND GRANTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, previously I have inserted in the RECORD information about Arkansas applications for loans and grants pending before many agencies of the Federal Government. I ask unanimous consent to insert data on such applications pending in the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Applications to Farmers Home Administration for financial assistance for applicants in the State of Arkansas

Kind of assistance requested	Number	Amount		
		Loan	Grant	Total
Operating loans	167	$745,822	0	$745,822
Emergency loans	18	68,130	0	68,130
Economic opportunity loans (individual)	173	286,488	0	286,488
Farmownership loans	635	5,376,545	0	5,376,545
Soil and water loans (individual)	29	96,400	0	96,400
Rural housing loans	1,706	11,327,840	0	11,327,840
Labor housing loans (individual)	1	6,000	0	6,000
Soil and water association loans and grants:				
Sewer-water, or both	122	11,224,504	$11,140,151	22,364,655
Recreation	14	2,610,364	0	2,610,364
Grazing	2	85,000	0	85,000
Watershed loans	7	1,932,640	0	1,932,640
Economic opportunity cooperative loans	4	197,000	0	197,000
Comprehensive planning grants	13	0	98,300	98,300
Total	2,891	33,956,733	11,238,451	45,195,184

Watershed projects, 1967 fiscal year construction contribution program

	Estimated amount
Flat Creek	$44,000
West Fork Point Remove Creek	217,300
East Fork Point Remove Creek	417,100
Muddy Fork of Illinois River Watershed	235,000
Big Creek	213,000
Kelso-Rohwer	94,000
Poteau River	629,100
Mud Creek	140,700
Lee Phillips	508,500
Garrett Bridge	232,500
Upper Crooked Creek	369,600
Cooper Creek	347,200
Little Clear Creek	590,600
Fleschman's Bayou	247,700
Total	4,286,600

ARKANSAS: TELEPHONE PROGRAM, APPLICATIONS ON HAND AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

1. Southwest Arkansas Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Texarkana, Ark., amount: $450,000 for upgrading and expansion.
2. Northern Arkansas Telephone Company, Inc., Flippin, Ark., amount: $225,000 for upgrading and expansion.
3. Allied Telephone Company, Fordyce, Ark., amount: $2,000,000 for upgrading and expansion.
4. Mountain View Telephone Company, Mountain View, Ark., amount: $1,000,000 for financing, upgrading and expansion.
5. Perco Telephone Company, Perryville, Ark., amount: $250,000 for upgrading and expansion.

ARKANSAS: ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM, APPLICATIONS ON HAND AS OF JUNE 30, 1966

Arkansas Valley Electric Cooperative Corp., Ozark, Ark., amount: $1,345,000 for distribution purposes.

Applications pending June 30, 1966, grants for scientific research

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE	
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.: entomology research	$30,000
COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE	
State experiment station, Fayetteville, Ark.:	
Cotton research	67,000
Dietary research	50,000
Soybean research (insect, viruses, and environment)	110,172
Soybean research (processing procedures)	141,550

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, events and developments of recent years have shown that every State of the Union has water problems in one form or another. Therefore, I know that every Member of this body will be interested in the report of the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1967, issued by the Office of Science and Technology, which recently was received by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It will be recalled that the Interior Committee considered and reported S. 2 in the 88th Congress, which became Public Law 88–379 establishing the program. The report summarizes the activities of the Committee on Water Resources Research during the past year, and presents a tabulation of 1965 expenditures and fiscal year 1966 appropriations. It also includes the estimates for fiscal year 1967.

The Office of Science and Technology made a major report on achievements and progress in March of this year, entitled "A 10-year Program of Federal Water Resources Research," so the present report is rather brief. Both of these reports are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. President, in view of the national interest in our water resources research program, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be included in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COUNCIL FOR
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Through its Committee on Water Resources Research, the Federal Council for Science and Technology coordinates the efforts of 18 offices and bureaus engaged in water resources research. The Committee has recently completed a report which summarizes in a single document the proposed FY 1967 efforts of the agencies as contained in the Administration's budget. I am pleased to transmit a copy of this report entitled, "Federal Water Resources Research Program for Fiscal Year 1967" to you for your information and use.

Earlier this year, President Johnson transmitted a long-range study of the Committee entitled, "A Ten-year Program of Federal Water Resources Research." The FY 1967 program reflects the recommendations of that long-range study. The total cost of the proposed program this year is $107 million.

I believe you will find this report useful in the deliberations of the Congress and, to that end, I am sending copies of the report to the chairmen and members of the several committees concerned with water resources research.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. HORNIG,
Chairman.

U.S. INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM IS NOT LEGAL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, that the U.S. intervention in Vietnam is not legal is the opinion of William L. Standard, of the New York bar, and an eminent attorney expressed in response to an article in the May issue of the American Bar Association Journal. It is an opinion that Senator MORSE and I have long held and have expressed for 2½ years on the Senate floor.

In addition to that, we long expressed the opinion that it is not only illegal, but immoral, indefensible, and in every other way disastrous.

As our casualties mount, as the death toll both of our fine young boys and of the victims of our unrestricted bombing in both North and South Vietnam increases, the folly of our whole policy there will become increasingly apparent. Every passing day deepens my conviction that in all our history, the United States has not committed so grave an error. As I have said again and again, and now repeat, the alleged bases of intervention are false. Many Americans are not aware of it. They believe what has been the official justification. But the facts, which can be fully documented, are otherwise.

We were not invited in by a friendly country to help it repel aggression. We asked ourselves in.

We went half way around the world to inject ourselves into a civil war. When the United States intervened militarily—beginning first with the military mission after the French collapse in 1954; then in 1961, with the increase of the number of military advisers; then in 1965, by sending, for the first time, our troops into combat and starting the bombing of North Vietnam—the only outsiders, the only intruders, were the forces of the United States. All the others were Vietnamese.

We have since, by great pressure, managed to induce a few token commitments from nations whose governments feel obligated to do so because of our insistence upon it and their need to comply. But virtually we are carrying on the fight all alone. Ours are the heavy costs in lives and in money.

The SEATO treaty does not give us any authority to do what we have done, as alleged by the official propaganda. That too can be documented.

It is utterly indefensible to draft our young men, to send them to fight against and kill people against whom they have no grievance, and to die in the process. Last year, in 1965, let me repeat, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. Why should our boys be sent to fight and die for a cause that has such doubtful support from those whose cause we allege it is? We are supporting now in South Vietnam the eighth self-imposed government since the fall of Diem. It has little popular support. It has brought about a civil war within a civil war. It exists only because of United States armed and financial support. It would fall instantly were that to be withdrawn. We are imposing it on an unhappy, war-torn, distressed and ravaged people.

The so-called peace offensives and professions by the administration of eagerness to take the war to the conference table are meaningless as long as it refuses to offer to negotiate with those who are doing the fighting—the National Liberation Front or Vietcong. Those peace offensives are valueless as long as we engage in the double talk by which, on the one hand, we allege we are willing to go back to the Geneva Agreements, which stipulate a united Vietnam—North and South—following Vietnam-wide elections, an arrangement we pledged adherence to in the unilateral statement of Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, and which we then violated, and on the other hand, insist on an independent South Vietnam. These two positions are utterly contradictory and incompatible. Therefore, it is not surprising that we get no response from the adversaries, who are not, as our official position maintains, North Vietnam and Hanoi, but South Vietnamese fighting the coup-imposed junta of 10 generals, as they have fought the other Saigon regimes, beginning with Diem.

What is so indefensible about the U.S. position and illegal is that in invading Vietnam militarily, we violated every treaty to which we had committed ourselves—the United Nations Charter, the SEATO treaty, and the declaration of our policy by our Under Secretary of State, Walter Bedell Smith, in which we pledged our support to the Geneva accords and support of elections in 1956 to unite the temporarily separated halves of Vietnam—North and South.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by William L. Standard, entitled: "U.S. Intervention in Vietnam Is Not Legal," which appeared in the July 1966 issue of the American Bar Association Journal be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM IS NOT LEGAL

(Responding to an article in the May issue of the Journal, Mr. Standard asserts that the United States intervention in Vietnam violates the Charter of the United Nations, the Geneva Accords of 1954, the SEATO treaty and our own Constitution. He urges a cease-fire of at least six months' duration, during which the 1954 accords should be renegotiated. If this should fail, he declares that "a great power may withdraw with honor when it admits that it judged poorly")

(By William L. Standard)

Satire and sarcasm often have been weapons of effective, if deluding, advocacy. The aticle by Eberhard P. Deutsch, "The Legality of the United States Position in Vietnam", in the May, 1966, issue of the American Bar Association Journal (page 436) is a classical demonstration of this technique. The author takes issue with the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, as expressed in its memorandum of law, on the following fundamental questions: (1) The right of self-defense under the United Nations Charter; (2) Violations of the Geneva Accords; (3) Sanctions by the SEATO treaty; and (4) Violations of our own Constitution.

But the author concludes with the statement that the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee "is grounded on an emotional attitude opposed to United States policy, rather than on law". He seeks to demonstrate this by quoting the concluding paragraph of a 26-page, carefully documented statement of the applicable law, which in peroration states in the very last sentence: "Should we not spell the end of the system of unilateral action . . . that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed?"

The author then wields the weapon of sarcasm by contrasting the Lawyers Committee memorandum with the "temperate statement of thirty-one professors of law from leading law schools throughout the United States". The statement of these professors appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1966 (pp. 1408–1409), and the entirety of that statement is:

"As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic of Vietnam—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam."

This one-paragraph "temperate statement" is not buttressed by a single citation or authority. What is particularly deplorable is that it was issued in November of 1965 as a rebuttal to the committee's memorandum, which was issued in late September, 1965.

The author of the "legality position" article then contrasts the Lawyers Committee memorandum with "the simple resolution adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association". This resolution, in a concluding one-sentence statement, asserts that "the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the South-East Asia Treaty". The House of Delegates' resolution, too, does not support its conclusion with a single citation or authority.

When the Harvard Law Record on March 10 contrasted the memorandum of law of the Lawyers Committee with the "simple resolution" adopted by the House of Delegates, it had this to say: "Viewed against the background of the *sober and erudite* Lawyers Committee brief and Arthur Krock's research, the ABA resolution contributes little to the national dialogue on Vietnam" (emphasis supplied).

The satirical technique of the author of the "legality position" article is worthy of an undergraduate debater, but not of the respected Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. He does, indeed, wrestle earnestly with four basic propositions discussed by the Lawyers Committee, and it is to these propositions that I shall address myself.

I. UNILATERAL INTERVENTION VIOLATES U.N. CHARTER

The writer of the "legality position" article discusses the first exception of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which reads: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the *inherent* right of individual or collective self-defense *if* an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security" (emphasis supplied).

He asserts that "A thesis that members of the United Nations are not permitted to participate in collective self-defense to repel aggression, on the ground that the aggrieved nation is not a member of the United Nations, can hardly be supported on its face, in reason, logic or law." He cites as authority two distinguished writers.[1]

The Lawyers Committee in its memorandum concludes that Article 51 does not permit the United States to act unilaterally in the "collective self-defense" of Vietnam because Article 51 applies only if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations.

This limitation was not inadvertent. It was the result of careful draftsmanship by Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, who "was the principal negotiator in the formulation of this text" of Article 51.[2] In a statement of June 13, 1945, before the United Nations Commission that drafted Article 51, Senator Vandenberg said: "We have here recognized the inherent right of self-defense, whether individual or collective, which permits any sovereign state among us [i.e., members of the United Nations] or any qualified regional group of states to ward off attack . . ."[3]

Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., noted the following on May 21, 1945: "The parties to any dispute . . . should obligate themselves first of all to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judiciary settlement, *resort to regional agencies or arrangement* or other peaceful means of their own choice" (emphasis in original).[4]

Professor Julius Stone states: "The license [of individual and collective self-defense] does not apparently cover even an 'armed attack' against a *non-Member*".[5]

Furthermore, the United States has acknowledged that the right of "collective self-defense" applies to Vietnam only if it becomes a member of the United Nations. On September 9, 1957, in arguing before the Security Council for the admission of Vietnam to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, our representative, stated: "The people of Vietnam . . . ask now only . . . to enjoy the benefits of collective security, the mutual help which membership in the . . . United Nations offers."[6]

This does not mean, of course, that a nonmember state or entity does not have the "inherent" right of self-defense or that nonmember states may be attacked with impunity. But it does mean that in case of an attack upon a nonmember state it is for the United Nations to decide upon the necessary measures to be taken by its member states and not for any state to decide for itself that it will employ arms for "collective self-defense".

During the Suez crisis President Eisenhower said: "The United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of securing the peace in the Middle East and throughout the world" (emphasis supplied).[7]

And at the same time, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles characterized as "unthinkable" a proposal that the United States and the Soviet Union act jointly to restore the peace in that area, saying that that was the function of the United Nations. He said:

"Any intervention by the United States and/or Russia or any other action, except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force would be counter to everything the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations were charged by the Charter to do in order to secure a United Nations police cease fire."[8]

The author of the "legality position" article confuses the right of an attacked nonmember state to defend itself with the lack of right of a member state to participate in that defense in the absence of United Nations' authorization.

The issue is the lawfulness of the actions of the United States, which is both a nonattacked state and a member of the United Nations. It does not follow that because Vietnam has an "inherent" right to defend itself, the United States has an "inherent" right to decide for itself to participate unilaterally in that defense. Professor Hans

---

[1] Bowett, "Self-defense in International Law," 193–195 (1958); Kelsen, "The Law of the United Nations," 793 (1950).

[2] The quoted words are from a memorandum, "Participation in the North Atlantic Treaty of States Not Members of the United Nations", dated April 13, 1949, prepared by the Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, and reproduced in 5 Whiteman, "Digest of International Law," 1068.

[3] Memorandum, op. cit. supra note 2, in 5 Whiteman, "Digest of International Law," 1068, 1072.

[4] 12 Department of State Bull. 949–950 (1945).

[5] Stone, "Legal Controls of International Conflict," 244 (1954).

[6] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec., 790th meeting, 5.

[7] 4 "United Nations Action in the Suez Crisis: International Law in the Middle East Crisis" (Tulane Studies in Political Science, vol. IV (1956).

[8] New York Times, Nov. 6, 1956.

Kelsen, one of the principal authorities relied upon by Mr. Deutsch, has pointed out this critical distinction: "It is hardly possible to consider the right or the duty of a non-attacked state to assist an attacked state as an 'inherent' right, that is to say, a right established by natural law."[9]

The argument also makes the United States its own judge to determine the occurrence of an "armed attack" in Vietnam, whereas Article 39 of the United Nations Charter provides that "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression . . .". But as Philip C. Jessup, now a Judge of the International Court of Justice, has noted:

"It would be disastrous to agree that every State may decide for itself which of the two contestants is in the right and may govern its conduct according to its own decision. . . . The ensuing conflict would be destructive to the ordered world community which the Charter and any modern law of nations must seek to preserve. State C would be shipping . . . war supplies to A, while State A would be assisting State B . . . and it would not be long before C and D would be enmeshed in the struggle out of "self-defense" [emphasis supplied]."[10]

Acceptance of Mr. Deutsch's argument would destroy the concept of collective peacekeeping, which the Charter embodies, in the case of nonmember states or areas.

NO ARMED ATTACK WITHIN MEANING OF THE CHARTER

The author of the "legality position" article also seeks to justify the United States' intervention in Vietnam on the ground that "these attacks [against United States' naval vessels] are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression", to quote the Congressional Joint Southeast Asia resolution of August, 1964. The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam takes the position that the occurrence of an armed attack within the meaning of the United Nations Charter has not been established.

Under the clear text of Article 51 of the charter, the right of self-defense arises only if an "armed attack" has occurred. The phrase "armed attack" has an established meaning in the charter and in international law. It was deliberately employed because it does not easily lend itself to expedient elasticity or to arbitrary ambiguity.

"Self-defense" is not justified by every aggression or hostile act, but only in the case of an "armed attack", when the necessity for action is "instant, overwhelming, and leaving no moment for deliberation". This definition was classically stated by Secretary of State Daniel Webster in *"The Caroline"*[11] and affirmed in the Nuremberg judgment. It was codified in the charter by unanimous vote of the General Assembly at its first session.[12]

This strict limitation of permissible self-defense to cases of an "armed attack" was at the time of the framing of the charter being pressed by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain in the Nuremberg trials. The defense was offered that Germany was compelled to attack Norway to forestall an Allied invasion. In reply, the tribunal said: "It must be remembered that preventive action in foreign territory is justified only in case of 'an instant and overwhelming necessity for defense, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation.' (The Caroline Case, Moore's Digest of International Law, II 412.)"[13]

Thus, while any hostile act may be an aggression, not every aggression is an "armed attack", and forceful self-defense is not a permissible response unless there is an "armed attack."

On March 4, 1966, the Department of State issued "The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Vietnam". This 52-page memorandum acknowledges that an "armed attack" is an essential condition precedent to the use of force in self-defense and that aggression is not enough. Astonishingly, however, it glosses over the crucial distinction between the two. While it alleges the occurrence of an armed attack "before February 1965", it fails to furnish any facts or details concerning such an attack. Indeed, it admits that it is unable to do so. This is not like the situation in Korea, where the Security Council found that an actual, visible, forcible invasion beyond the demarcation line had occurred at a specific time and place by large forces. This memorandum states that because of the "guerrilla war in Viet Nam" (*i.e.*, the indigenous character of the conflict) the State Department is unable to indicate when or where the "armed attack" began. It also admits that 'the critical military element of the insurgency . . . is unacknowledged by North Viet Nam". The memorandum contends that acts of externally supported subversion, the clandestine supply of arms and the infiltration of armed personnel over the "years" preceding the direct intervention of the United States, "clearly constitutes an 'armed atack' under any reasonable definition".

These allegations, even if true (as appears below), indicate acts of aggression, but they do not show the occurrence of an armed attack "leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation".[14]

Such acts were well known as forms of aggression when the charter was drawn and long before. Nevertheless, the framers of the charter rejected the mass inadequate to justify the unilateral use of force. Except in the limited instance of an armed attack "leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation", they left nations to the peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations for collective redress against aggression.

Furthermore, the State Department memorandum refutes its own charge of the occurrence of an "armed attack". The long-smoldering conditions of unrest, subversion and infiltration cited in the memorandum are not acts that gave rise to such a need for an immediate response that "no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation" remained.

The memorandum does not sustain its charge of external aggression. It indicates that prior to 1964 the "infiltrators" from the North were South Vietnamese who were returning to the South. The lumping of "40,000 armed and unarmed guerillas" is not meaningful. Unarmed Vietnamese have an inherent right to move about in their own country. In the absence of the functioning of the International Control Commission, the subsequent movement of Vietnamese from one zone in Vietnam to another zone in Vietnam would appear to be an internal matter, not a violation of international law.

The Mansfield report (cited in footnote 14) shows that prior to 1965 infiltration of men from North Vietnam had been going on "for many years", but that this "was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964". On the other hand, it notes, "In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men." The Mansfield report makes plain that significant armed personnel were introduced from the North only after the United States had intervened to avoid the "total collapse of the Saigon government's authority [which] appeared imminent in the early months of 1965". The report states:

"U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of the opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.[15]

The introduction of North Vietnamese forces as a counter response is also emphasized by the observation in the Mansfield report that by May, 1965, about 34,000 United States service forces were in Vietnam and that "Beginning in June [1965] an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam . . .". Significant forces from the North thus followed and did not precede the direct involvement of the United States.

INTERVENTION NOT JUSTIFIED BY "COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE"

The State Department memorandum is structured on the wholly untenable assumption that the conflict in South Vietnam is the result of external aggression ("an armed attack from the North") and is not a civil war. For if it is a civil war, the intervention of the United States is a violation of its solemn undertaking not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

It is hardly open to dispute that the present conflict in South Vietnam is essentially a civil war among what James Reston has described as a "tangle of competing individuals, regions, religions and sects . . . [among] a people who have been torn apart by war and dominated and exploited by Saigon for generations".[16]

The State Department memorandum itself shows that before 1964 the so-called infiltration was of South Vietnamese returning to their homeland. Even if they were returning for the purpose of participating in the fighting in South Vietnam, that still constitutes civil war by any definition.

The Declaration of Honolulu also implicitly concedes that the conflict had its origin in the internal situation in Vietnam and not in an external armed attack. The stress which the declaration places on the urgent need for basic social reform is an acknowledgment that the war is essentially a revolt against domestic conditions. To this may be added the existence of a desperate desire for peace and independence from foreign intervention, which all neutral reporters have observed.

The author of the "legality position" article also argues that the conflict arises from an external aggression. This is contradicted by his failure to consider the role played by the National Liberation Front; yet it does exist and is unquestionably in actual control of most of South Vietnam and the government in those areas. The only conceivable justification for the refusal of the United

---

[9] Kelsen, op. cit. supra note 1, at 797.

[10] Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations," 205 (1948).

[11] 7 Moore, "Digest of International Law," 919 (1906).

[12] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec., 1st sess., res. 95(I).

[13] International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg) 171 (1946); Bin Chang, "General Principles of Law," 84 (1953).

[14] See the report of Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, DANIEL K. INOUYE, GEORGE D. AIKEN and J. CALEB BOGGS to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, dated January 6, 1966, entitled "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow", hereafter referred to as the Mansfield report. It is reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 161–162 (1966).

[15] Mansfield report, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 161–162, Jan. 13, 1966.

[16] New York Times, Apr. 3, 1966.

States to acknowledge the existence or the belligerent status of the National Liberation Front is that the front consists of rebels or insurgents. If that be so, then they are fighting their own government in a civil strife and are not foreign aggressors.

As stated by Benjamin V. Cohen in the Niles memorial lecture, "The United Nations in Its 20th Year": "True, the charter does not forbid civil war or deny the right to revolt. But it does not sanction the right of an outside state to participate in another state's civil war." [17]

It cannot be asserted that South Vietnam is a separate "country" so far as North Vietnam is concerned. The Geneva Accords recognized Vietnam as but one country, of which South Vietnam is only an organic part. The accords declared that the temporary military line that established the north and south military zones at the seventeenth parallel pending the elections "should not in any way be interpreted as a political or territorial boundary" (Section 6). And Section 7 stated that the political settlement should be effected on the basis of "the independence, unity, and territorial integrity" of Vietnam.

But even if North Vietnam and South Vietnam are deemed separate entities in international law, the United States may not respond to the intervention of North Vietnam in the civil war in the South by bombing the North. There is no legal basis to respond to an intervention of one state in a civil war by a military attack on the territory of the intervening state. It is sobering to reflect that not even Germany under Hitler or Italy under Mussolini claimed that their intervention in behalf of France during the Spanish Civil War would have vindicated their use of military force upon the territory of another state intervening in behalf of the loyalists. And no country intervening in behalf of Spain's legitimate government asserted a right to respond by military force against Germany or Italy.

Therefore, even if North Vietnam were an intervening state so far as South Vietnam is concerned, under the legal position advanced by Mr. Deutsch, the bombing of the United States by North Vietnam would have as much legitimacy as does the bombing of North Vietnam by the United States.

II. U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE VIOLATES GENEVA ACCORDS

The author of the "legality position" article suggests that United States intervention in Vietnam is not in violation of the Geneva Accords on the ground that "since their inception these accords have been violated continuously by Hanoi". He states that "It is an accepted principle of international law that a material breach of a treaty by one of the parties thereto dissolves the obligation of the other party, at least to the extent of withholding compliance until the defaulting party purges itself."

The Lawyers Committee takes the position that United States intervention is not justified by the purported breach of the Geneva Accords by Hanoi. The accords embody two central principles: (1) recognition of the independence and freedom of Vietnam from foreign control and (2) the unification in the elections set in the accords for 1956.

In its own pledge to observe the Geneva Accords, the United States recognized that the military participation in Vietnam was temporary and that, in any case, it was not political or geographic. Insofar as the United States referred to that country, it designated it as "Vietnam", not "South Vietnam" or "North Vietnam". The elections thus were to determine not whether North and South Vietnam should be united, but what the government of the single state of Vietnam should be. As the time for the arrangements for the elections approached, however, the Diem regime, which was then in control of South Vietnam, announced on July 16, 1955, that not only would it defy the provisions calling for national elections, but would not engage even in negotiations for modalities.

The reasons for not agreeing to the elections of 1956 are quite understandable. President Eisenhower has told us that the actual reason the elections were not held was because "persons knowledgeable in Indo-Chinese affairs" believed that "possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh".[18]

Under the Geneva Accords, the undertaking to hold the elections within two years was unconditional. The refusal of Saigon to hold the elections plainly violated one of the two central conditions that had made the Geneva Accords acceptable to all parties. That the Vietnam conflict ultimately did resume is, therefore, not surprising. For as George McT. Kahin and John W. Lewis, professors of government at Cornell University, asked in a question wholly ignored by our State Department, "When the military struggle for power ends on the agreed condition that the competition will be transferred to the political level, can the side which violates the agreed conditions ultimately expect the military struggle will not be resumed?" [19]

The military involvement of the United States in Vietnam also violates the second essential provision of the accords—the prohibition against the introduction of foreign troops and the establishment of military bases. Article 4 of the Geneva Accords prohibits the "introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel", and Article 5 prohibits in Vietnam any "military base under the control of a foreign power". Therefore, it is the presence of 250,000 American troops and the installation in Vietnam of massive military bases under the control of the United States that violate these agreements, not the presence of North Vietnamese in Vietnam.

III. U.S. INTERVENTION VIOLATES SEATO TREATY

Mr. Deutsch also challenges the conclusion of the Lawyers Committee with respect to sanctions under the SEATO treaty, which was adopted in September, 1954, Article 1 of the treaty provides:

"The parties undertake, as set forth in the United Nations Charter, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved, by peaceful means . . . and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

It must be pointed out that Article 53 of the United Nations Charter provides that "No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies, without the authority of the Security Council." Furthermore, Article 103 of the charter provides:

"In the event of a conflict between the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The use of our ground forces since the spring of 1965 is sought to be justified under the provisions of the SEATO treaty. But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim. In explaining the commitments under the SEATO treaty to the Senate, Walter F. George, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made the following statements:

The treaty does not call for automatic action. it calls for consolidation with other signatories. If any course of action shall be agreed . . . or decided upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process of each signatory government is provided for . . . It is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence also encompasses acts of subversion . . . but even in that event the United States would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation . . . to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is consult together about it.[20]

Richard N. Goodwin, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, in a recent article discussing the significance of our reliance upon the SEATO agreement as the basis for our intervention in Vietnam, states in part:

"One can search the many statements of Presidents and diplomats in vain for any mention of the SEATO Treaty. Time after time, President Johnson set forth the reasons for our presence in Vietnam, but he never spoke of the requirements of the treaty, nor did anyone at the State Department suggest that he should, even though they surely reviewed every draft statement. The treaty argument is, in truth, something a clever advocate conceived a few months ago." [21]

Furthermore, the SEATO treaty also clearly pledges the parties to respect the Geneva Declaration of 1954, which was agreed upon only a few months before the SEATO treaty. The State Department memorandum of March 4, 1966, referred to above, significantly misquotes the SEATO treaty on essential points. It asserts (Section IV B) that Article 4(1) of SEATO creates an "obligation to meet the common danger in the event of armed aggression". The term "armed aggression" is not to be found in the treaty. Article 4(1) speaks of "aggression by means of armed attack". In case of such "armed attack", "each Party recognizes" that it "would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."

Hence, only in case of an "armed attack" (in the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter) would the United States have, at most, the right, but no obligation, to assist the "Free Territory of Vietnam" until it was to be unified by July, 1956.

The invocation of the SEATO treaty is the latest of the evershifting grounds which the State Department has advanced to sustain the lawfulness of its position. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has characterized this argument as an "intellectual disgrace". Arthur Krock has described its origin as follows:

"The President had utilized the provocation of the Tonkin Gulf attack on the Seventh Fleet by North Vietnamese gunboats to get a generalized expression of support from Congress. This worked well enough until it was argued, against the public record, as approval by Congress of any expansion of the war the President might make in an unforeseeable future. Then Rusk shifted the major basis for the claim to the SEATO compact.

"But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim." [22]

The credibility of the argument that the SEATO treaty furnished a legal justification for the President's action is also refuted by the fact that the State Department in its March, 1965, memorandum, entitled "Legal Basis for United States Actions Against North Vietnam", did not even mention SEATO. Significantly, too, President Johnson in a press conference statement on July 28, 1965, explaining "why we are in Vietnam", made no mention of SEATO. This can hardly be squared with the present belated claim that the treaty imposed an obligation upon the President to intervene in Vietnam.

---

[17] 111 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2473 (1965). He cites Cohen, "The United Nations, Constitutional Developments, Growth and Possibilities," 53–54 (1961).

[18] Eisenhower, "White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953–1956," 372 (1963).

[19] Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "The United States in Vietnam", June 1965, p. 28.

[20] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 10, pt. 1, pp. 1051–1052.

[21] The New Yorker, "Reflections on Vietnam", Apr. 16, 1966, p. 57, at p. 70.

[22] The New York Times, "The Sudden Rediscovery of SEATO", Mar. 6, 1966.

Moreover, the invocation of SEATO does not advance the State Department's case. In the first place, Article 1 of the treaty is expressly subordinate to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and Article 6 expressly acknowledges the supremacy of the charter. Article 103 of the charter, quoted above, subordinates all regional treaty compacts to the charter, and Article 53 is explicit that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council . . .".

The United States is not obliged by SEATO to engage in any military undertaking in Vietnam even if it were otherwise permitted to do so under the charter. As noted by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, the SEATO treaty was "not a commitment to send American troops to fight in southeast Asia. It carefully avoided the kind of automatic response to aggression embodied in the NATO agreement . . .".[23]

Representative LAIRD pointed out that in soliciting the advice and consent of the Senate to the treaty, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey, who was a member of the United States delegation to the Manila Conference at which the treaty was negotiated and who was one of the signers of the treaty for the United States, emphasized that "Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces. . .". On the floor of the Senate on February 1, 1955, he said:

"Some of the participants came to Manila with the intention of establishing . . . a compulsory arrangement for our military participation in case of any attack. Such an organization might have required the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind.

"We have no purpose of following any such policy as that of having our forces involved in a ground war. . . .

"For ourselves, the arrangement means that we will have avoided the impracticable overcommitment which would have been involved if we attempted to place American ground forces around the perimeter of the area of potential Chinese ingress into southeast Asia. Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces in that fashion." [24]

Article 4, Section 2, is explicit that if South Vietnam were threatened "in any way other than by armed attack", "the [SEATO] Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense".

SEATO therefore *prohibits* unilateral assistance action. Indeed, the treaty originally required previous *agreement* among the other seven partners before any SEATO power could take any "measures", including nonmilitary measures, not to mention combat assistance. In 1964 the unanimity requirement was reinterpreted to mean that "measures" could be taken in the absence of a dissenting vote among the SEATO partners. The United States has not convened the SEATO powers because of the certainty of such a dissent. It can hardly claim, therefore, that SEATO *obligates* it to pursue its present course when in fact it is evading its treaty obligation to obtain collective permission for "collective defense", as even the name of the treaty indicates.

Finally, the United States actions also violate Article 53 of the United Nations Charter, quoted above, which unequivocally prohibits enforcement action under regional arrangements except with *previous* Security Council authorization. Hence, even if the United States had obtained the required consent from its SEATO partners, it would still need the authorization of the Security Council to make its "measures" legal.

Therefore, the United States, far from being obligated, is not permitted by SEATO or by the charter to engage in its military undertaking in Vietnam.

IV. U.S. INTERVENTION VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION

The President has repeatedly stated and acknowledged that the United States is at war in Vietnam.[25] The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam in its memorandum of law took the position that our intervention is violative of our own Constitution. The committee predicated its conclusion on the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause II, in which the power to declare war is confided exclusively to the Congress. Congress alone can make that solemn commitment. The clause granting this power does not read "on the recommendation of the President" or that the "President with the advice and consent of Congress may declare war". As former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers has observed, "The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative." [26]

The Supreme Court has held that

"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress. . . . With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations." [27]

President Woodrow Wilson underscored the President's lack of power to declare war in his historic statement to a joint session of Congress on April 2, 1917:

"I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making."

Congress has not declared war in Vietnam and the President does not claim that any declaration of war supports his actions in Vietnam. In fact, the President has been reported to be extremely reluctant to ask Congress to declare war.[28]

The writer of the "legality position" article, however, takes the position that the Southeast Asia resolution (Tonkin resolution) of August 10, 1964, is "undoubtedly the clearest and most unequivocal Congressional sanction of the President's deployment of United States forces for the defense of South Vietnam." The writer then quotes Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and WAYNE MORSE during the debates on the Tonkin resolution, and he concludes that since "the resolution authorizes the President 'to make war,' it surely has the same legal effect as a Congressional 'declaration of war' *in haec verba* would have had."

It would seem that the action of Congress under the conditions that prevailed when the Tonkin resolution was submitted constitutes, at most, an ultimatum and not a declaration of war.

Senator FULBRIGHT in a recent article stated:

"The joint resolution was a blank check signed by the Congress in an atmosphere of urgency that seemed at the time to preclude debate. . . .

"I myself, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, served as floor manager of the Southeast Asia resolution and did all I could to bring about its prompt and overwhelming adoption. I did so because I was confident that President Johnson would use our endorsement with wisdom and restraint. I was also influenced by partisanship: an election campaign was in progress and I had no wish to make any difficulties for the President in his race against a Republican candidate whose election I thought would be a disaster for the country. My role in the adoption of the resolution of Aug. 7, 1964 is a source of neither pleasure nor pride to me today." [29]

There have been instances when the President has sent United States forces abroad without a declaration of war by Congress. These have ranged from minor engagements between pirates and American ships on the high seas to the dispatch of our Armed Forces to Latin American countries and our involvement in Korea. But, except for the Korean War, none of these instances remotely involved so massive and dangerous a military undertaking as the war in Vietnam. And in the Korean War the United States fought under the aegis of the United Nations.

Since Mr. Deutsch assumes that the Tonkin resolution does constitute "Congressional declaration of war *in haec verba*", empowering the President to act, it is fitting to recall that on May 6, 1954, at a time when the fall of Dien Bien Phu was imminent, then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson criticized the President in these terms:

"We will insist upon clear explanations of the policies in which we are asked to cooperate. We will insist that we and the American people be treated as adults—that we have the facts without sugar coating.

"The function of Congress is not simply to appropriate money and leave the problem of national security at that." [30]

Congress should, therefore, exercise its constitutional responsibility as a co-equal branch of government of checks and balances to determine whether this country shall continue to be involved in the war in Vietnam. Under the rule of law, compliance with the forms and procedures of law are as imperative as compliance with the substance of law.

WHAT ACTION TO TAKE IN THIS SOLEMN HOUR

This is a solemn hour in history. We have a moral obligation to history to return to the high purposes and principles of the United Nations. We may be on the threshold of a further involvement in Asia. The United Nations Charter forbids our unilateral intervention in the circumstances which exist in Vietnam.

---

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5810 (1966).

[24] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 10, pt. 1, pp. 1052–1054.

[25] 52 Department of State Bulletin, 606, 838 (1965). Arthur Krock, "By Any Other Name, It's Still War", The New York Times, June 10, 1965.

[26] Rogers, "World Policing and the Constitution," 21 (1945).

[27] *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company* v. *Sawyer,* 343 U.S. 579, 642, 655 (1952) (Jackson, J.).

[28] The Wall Street Journal, "The United States May Become More Candid on Rising Land-War Involvement", June 17, 1965, p. 1.

[29] The New York Times Magazine, "The Fatal Arrogance of Power", May 15, 1966, p. 28. This article was based on an address at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced Studies.

[30] Jackson, "The Role and Problems of Congress with Reference to Atomic War," publication No. L 54–135, Industrial College of the Armed Forces (1954).

It may be that the world could be brought closer to peace if we agreed to the following:

1. Declaration of a six months' (or more) cease-fire to create conditions for negotiations.

2. That during the cease-fire period the Soviet Union and Great Britain (the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference in 1954) be requested to reconvene the 1954 conference and invite all the nations which participated at the "Final Declaration" of the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954, to renegotiate the 1954 accord.

3. If efforts to negotiate prove inconclusive we should resort to the candor urged by an eminent political scientist. Emmet John Hughes, after a searching recent visit to Vietnam, details his views of the conditions in that country and concludes his report as follows:

". . . And it means the wisdom to sense that American repute in Asia is not dignified but diminished by untiring war for the unattainable victory . . . and American honor is not tarnished but brightened when so great a power can say, with quiet assurance: we have judged poorly, fought splendidly, and survived confidently.

"I can think of no other way that the leaders of the United States might match the courage of the soldiers they have dispatched." [31]

TREATIES NEED FORCE BEHIND THEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as the war drags on and on in Vietnam, there is insistence from many quarters that the United States exert every effort to achieve negotiations to end this conflict.

Of course, the U.S. Government has almost on bended knees implored the Hanoi regime to come to a conference table and discuss peace. And as we all know, these efforts have been scorned at every turn.

Many authorities contend that the way to achieve peace in Vietnam is to make such a show of force—in the air and on the sea—that Communist North Vietnam will realize the futility of aggression. I thoroughly concur. By the same token, peace can be maintained by a continued demonstration of force which will have the effect of deterring action by would-be aggressors.

This point of view was discussed in a column on August 2 in the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer by editor Millard Grimes, who points out with great truth:

> Peace is kept by force rather than treaties. Its assurance cannot rely on man's trustworthiness, but only on his fear and respect for power. Treaties are useful, of course, but few nations have ever signed a treaty with a potential foe and then dismissed all of its soldiers and scrapped it guns, content in the knowledge that a scrap of paper was sufficient defense against aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial column be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES NEED FORCE BEHIND THEM

A research project at a university in Bucharest has discovered that about 7,500 international treaties were signed between 1500 B.C. and 1850 A.D. The average effectiveness of these treaties was found to be about two years, although the terms of all of them called for the treaties to remain binding for "eternity."

In the 115 years since 1850, an undetermined number of additional treaties have been signed and similarly disposed of in due time.

One of the most famous treaties was the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928 which pledged its signatories to renounce war as an instrument of foreign policy. Less than 12 years later, most of the Pact's participants were engaged in history's worst war.

Sadly, one must conclude from looking back at history that peace is kept by force rather than treaties. Its assurance cannot rely on Man's trustworthiness, but only on his fear and respect for power.

Treaties are useful, of course, but few nations have ever signed a treaty with a potential foe and then dismissed all of its soldiers and scrapped its guns, content in the knowledge that a scrap of paper was sufficient defense against aggression.

Today in Korea, 13 years after the cease-fire, American and South Korean troops stand guard against any new aggression from North Korea, and presumably, the North Koreans are convinced that their troops are assuring that their country will not be invaded from the south. But peace is maintained, and no treaty could have kept it for so long.

What the Bucharest study most plainly showed, I feel, is that while negotiations are preferable to fighting, they should not be taken seriously as durable arrangements between the combatants.

A great emphasis has been placed on the need for negotiations in Viet Nam, and President Johnson has spared no effort to bring about negotiations. In his publicized "peace offensive" of last December, an unparalleled campaign was waged to persuade the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong to agree to negotiations.

The campaign failed and the war continued.

Ironically, the ensuing months have placed the United States and South Viet Nam in a much stronger negotiating position than they enjoyed in January.

Not only has the military situation improved but the Saigon government of Premier Ky appears on firmer footing, and would be able to go to the negotiating table with added confidence.

But the North Vietnamese refused to negotiate in January for the same reason they continue to refuse. They realize even if the United States hesitates to admit it, that the only acceptable negotiated peace would involve a withdrawal of all Communist forces from South Viet Nam, and an end to the Viet Cong attempt to take over the nation.

Yet, that is the objective of the war, and the Communist forces can end the war at any time by simply abandoning that objective and pulling back their units.

To agree to negotiations would require North Viet Nam to admit that it is an aggressor, and that the Viet Cong are not a group of insurrectionists.

So, quite possibly there will never be negotiations in the Viet Nam conflict. The war may simply end slowly and without a dramatic final confrontation.

If that happens, its conclusion can nonetheless be as decisive and enduring as if a treaty was drawn up and signed.

Because as the Bucharest study indicated, treaties only provide breathing spells.

—MILLARD GRIMES.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRESS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, since the establishment of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the 88th Congress, thousands of words have been written about the strengths and deficiencies of OEO programs. Much of this comment, from about the Nation, has been critical of the effectiveness and the administration of OEO programs.

We in New Hampshire have been fortunate in the ability and the enthusiasm which New Hampshire people have brought to the various programs of the war on poverty. New Hampshire has a long tradition of support for programs designed to let men make the most of their own abilities, programs which open up new economic opportunities for disadvantaged citizens.

The Keene Evening Sentinel, of Keene, N.H., recently published an editorial titled "OEO Review," which summarizes the reactions of New Hampshire to the establishment of OEO programs in our State. I think that this editorial represents an accurate interim report on OEO progress in New Hampshire, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Keene (N.H.) Evening Sentinel, Aug. 1, 1966]

OEO REVIEW

Probably the most serious problem faced by the New Hampshire Office of Economic Opportunity, when it opened shop in the state less than two years ago, was to win acceptance in the face of widespread skepticism.

The OEO project was new and different, its announced aims were ambitious, and it was to cover a broad social field. Thus, there was a natural hesitancy to cooperate on the part of state agencies, some of which obviously expected to be interfered with or even eliminated by the OEO operation.

State agencies, both public and private, have now seen the OEO in action, and have gradually learned that some of their early suspicions were groundless.

As of July 1, more than $5 million in OEO funds had been committed to New Hampshire by the federal government, to underwrite a wide variety of social projects.

The New Hampshire Department of Health and Welfare will be receiving more than a quarter of a million dollars in two separate grants which will enable the Welfare Division to design a program to help families receiving public assistance to become self-sufficient.

Hundreds of welfare recipients will be involved, and already an age-old assumption is being discredited. The assumption has been that chronic welfare cases are hopeless; that after they reach a certain age, society may as well give up on them and concentrate on their children.

OEO projects already have trained some of these people in specific skills, and channeled them into the labor market. Thus, people who have long been non-productive welfare recipients are now producing.

In other OEO fields, there have been 11 Neighborhood Youth Corps groups set up in the state, serving more than 700 youths, and 20 Work-Study programs for students at nine colleges in the state. There are three at Keene State College. Under these Work-Study programs, some 700 students have been or are being employed at jobs on or near campuses, to enable them to earn income needed to stay in school.

---

[31] Newsweek, May 30, 1966, pp. 22–23.

There are also nine Planning and Development programs in the state, including ours in Sullivan and Cheshire Counties, which have set up offices to aid in developing community action programs.

The best-known, and up to this point probably the most successful OEO program, has been the establishment of Head Start Projects.

Last year there were 24 Head Start Projects (including ours in Keene), involving more than $288,000 and serving nearly 2,000 children. This year there are seven, on a regional basis, involving nearly half a million dollars. The average cost per child is about $200.

Another OEO project is called Foster Grandparents, and involves a $92,000 grant to the New Hampshire Social Welfare Council, a private agency. Impoverished elderly people are being trained in child care for service at public and private institutions.

A spokesman at the council's headquarters in Concord said last week that the project has been "highly successful." The most ambitious phase of it is being conducted at Laconia State School, where elderly people are assigned child patients to care for. The council spokesman said the experiment has reflected the enthusiasm that the elderly folk develop in being trained to do something useful, and has also revealed a need for additional, adequate foster homes and trained caseworkers.

Those who have been involved as representatives of public and private agencies conducting projects in cooperation with the state OEO, feel that it has eased some very substantial burdens which have long rested on state agencies alone. While they acknowledge the criticism the program has received in some parts of the country, they feel the OEO operation in New Hampshire has been effective and generally successful.

MILITARY POWER—THE LIMITS OF PERSUASION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the July 30, 1966, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature carries a most interesting and significant article by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin entitled "Military Power: The Limits of Persuasion." General Gavin is one of our most thoughtful military and political observers. He has demonstrated a remarkable understanding of the relationship between military strategy and political, diplomatic, and economic strength.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Military Power: The Limits of Persuasion—Economic Strength and Technological Change, Not War, Now Have the Greatest Impact on Foreign Affairs

(By James M. Gavin, Lieutenant General, U.S.A., retired)

(The author: Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, USA (Ret.), was one of the Army's most famous World War II paratroop commanders, and a senior Army planner and strategist until his retirement in 1958. His writings include *Airborne Warfare* (1947) and *War and Peace in the Space Age* (1958). He also has served as U.S. Ambassador to France, and now is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., management consultants, in Cambridge, Massachusetts.)

Since the beginning of time power has been used to persuade. Yet, paradoxically, at a time when we possess more power than any nation on earth, we are not very persuasive. It is frustrating and baffling, and public debate on the use of power in Vietnam rages throughout the land, Perhaps it would be well to examine the nature of our power and, more important, its changing character since World War II.

Usually we think of power in terms of military power—military weapons systems—and most of us have long considered these to be the primary source of power in world affairs. Of course, to exist, military power must have a base of economic support. In all past experience only a society that had the natural resources and, in addition, the inventiveness and industries to produce modern weapons systems, could bring them to combat and thus gain a decision in international conflict. Hence, from history we are inclined to think of military power as the dominant force, and the economic power which supports it as a secondary source of military strength.

History is replete with examples of aggressor nations adding to their total power by taking from others. In an excellent and comprehensive volume, *Power*, written in the 1930s, Bertrand Russell expressed it this way: "Economic power, unlike military power, is not primary but derivative." He then went on to illustrate how military power had been used to seize vast colonial empires from which great wealth could be extracted; wealth in minerals, oils, and arable lands, for example. Hence, the nation that could seize the most resources could, in the long run, develop the most powerful military forces.

I believe that there is a fundamental change taking place, and indeed it has taken place, in this relationship between military and economic power. Fundamentally, today technology can, if wisely directed, provide adequate resources for humans to live comfortably on this earth. At the same time, technology can, if so exploited, provide the weapons systems to destroy a major portion of the human race. Finally, technology is having, and will continue to have, such a tremendous impact on world affairs that it is changing the balance between economics and military power significantly. It is this change that I would like to examine.

First, let me call attention to the talk given by our Secretary of Defense in Montreal on May 18. He referred to the sources of unrest and discontent around the world, and emphasized that security is not military hardware; security means economic development. In fact, he stated flatly that, in his opinion, the concept that military hardware is the exclusive or even the primary ingredient of permanent peace in the mid-twentieth century is absurd.

During the past twenty years I have been closely associated with the use of military power, the planning and execution of national military policy, and, to a lesser extent, the conduct of foreign policy. To say that it has been an extremely active environment is an understatement, for we never have had such amounts of power available nor have we had so many problems associated with its use. And never has there been such widespread interest in our many commitments and involvements abroad, nor so much social turbulence at home.

Having been in the vortex of much of the discussion, I find it deeply disturbing that we have *yet* to get to the heart of the matter. To do so we must understand, and articulate, in much clearer terms than we have so far, our total *diplomatic* and *political* power, for this is the power that persuades: the economic, technological, and military components of such power. Part of this examination will be a consideration of the role that each of these will play in our national strategy.

Actually, we have been doing very well in the realm of economics and technology, especially during the past decade. It is in the area of applied military power, tactical military power, that most of the misunderstandings and frustrations seem to exist. In order to understand their cause, therefore, I believe that we should begin with an examination of the meaning of the most significant military event of our time—the detonation of the first nuclear weapon.

The shock waves from the Hiroshima blast went far beyond those predicted by the nuclear physicists. Nothing in our country's history has had a comparable impact upon foreign policy and military affairs. Governments have fallen, coalitions of nations have been formed and reformed to cope with the problems caused by the bomb's existence. The bomb was at the heart of De Gaulle's rejection of Great Britain's desire to join the European Common Market. The bomb was ever present in the mind of President Kennedy and his advisors at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. The bomb today casts a long shadow over all discussions on the future of NATO. For the fundamental nature of military power changed significantly with the advent of the bomb.

Few realized in 1945 that the bomb was the beginning of the end, if not indeed the very end, of man's search for energy to be used as military force. The more prevalent view was that a new era was born—the age of atomic force. Now, twenty years later, we understand better the place of the bomb in the spectrum of history. It was the end, not the beginning of an era. It was the end of man's search for force and it marked a beginning of a new quest—the search to find new ways and means of influencing the behavior of other humans. It was to be the age when the earth would shrink rapidly due to high speed air travel, space exploration, satellite communications, and rapid data processing systems, for example. More and more the nations of the earth were to consider themselves part of one large world community; the logical end of an evolutionary process that began many thousands of years ago with the family, tribal, and city-state, and later, national groupings.

Furthermore, in the armed forces the physical effects of the bomb alone made plain for all to see that all the boundaries between the traditional arenas of combat, land, sea, and air, were wiped out. The earth was soon to become one theater of operations, shrunken to such small size that no area was immune from attack from any other point on the globe. And when, in the traditional manner, our military recalled its own experience for answers to deal with the new problems of the day, it did not find them. For the answers were not to be found in a remembrance of things past, they could be found only in a thoughtful analysis of the future, in a profound search for the meaning of the period that we were about to enter. The classical military formula of escalating power until total victory would be achieved was to become absolutely meaningless. For wars, if there were to be wars, and the means that would resolve them, were going to be many orders of magnitude different from what they had been in the past.

In 1950, five years after the end of World War II and Hiroshima, Soviet-equipped North Koreans invaded South Korea. It was a costly experience for us. Possessing the most powerful military establishment in the world, well-equipped with nuclear weapons, we suffered more than 140,000 casualties and had to accept terms less than victory. Yet, despite the Korean experience our national strategic policy in the mid-Fifties was still based on massive retaliation. Admittedly there was much argument and discussion about the validity of this view. Indeed, our Promethean achievement seemed to have left us in intellectual disarray.

But from the mid-Fifties on, our total power seemed to paralyze our intellectual processes, and our response to challenges of lesser magnitude than total war were of a diminishing degree of credibility. This was because a number of myths prevailed in our thinking, and they stemmed from a tendency to look inward to our experience rather than to postulate technology and political trends into the rather clouded and hazardous unknown of the future.

The first myth is that war is a continuation of politics by other means. This Clausewitzian orthodoxy holds that wars will be fought and won, and sufficient power will be applied until they are won. Then war will be followed by peace, a period in which politics as usual will be the preoccupation of the world powers. This, in turn, very likely will be followed by a period of war, and the difference between the two will be quite discernible. I believe that by now most of us realize that this no longer is true.

In his recent Montreal speech, our Secretary of Defense discussed conflicts of recent years and pointed out that in the past eight years "there have been no less than 164 internationally significant outbreaks of violence, each of them specifically designed as a serious challange to the authority, or the very existence, of the government in question. . . . And not a single one of the 164 conflicts has been a formally declared war." From this experience, realistically, we must conclude that wars will not always be declared and that nations will not always commit their total resources to win in every confrontation. There will be wars that are not wars, if defined in terms of our experience before Hiroshima. In fact, for some nations it may be wiser to keep a shooting war limited and undeclared while pursuing national goals by other means, never admitting the existence of a war nor indeed a desire to bring it to an end.

The second myth is that if you destroy enough people and enough property you will overcome an enemy's will to resist. A corollary to this is that a nation should use as much force as necessary to win, since in war there is no substitute for victory. Actually, the nature of conflict being what it is, and the danger of a nuclear holocaust being ever present, it is compelling that solutions less than total war be found. The indiscriminate use of power has been further complicated by modern communications media that now bring more and more detailed information about the conduct of war into every home. The inevitable, and needless, loss of civilian lives has become the subject of concern to more than just the contending military forces. Thus, sensitivity to public opinion has made it necessary to consider restricting attacks to military targets whenever this is possible. Unless, of course, the nation's goal is to seek total war.

A third aspect of existing military thinking deserves mention. The thought still persists in many minds that the ultimate in sophistication and usefulness in weapons systems is the high-yield megaton bomb delivered by missile or aircraft. By its very nature it is believed that it should be able to cope with almost any threat to our survival. The fact is that it is the very effectiveness of our strategic air force, and the overwhelming, devastating potential of H-weapons, that prevents their employment in a conflict other than total war. And again, it is the devastation that would be caused by the use of these weapons by the strategic air arm that has given tremendous emphasis to the role of the other Services; those that have it in their ability to apply power with discrimination, flexibility, and restraint. It is this possibility of devastation that gives great emphasis to the need to find and understand the uses of other forms of power stemming from our science and technological programs and our great economic strength.

The changing nature of conflict today makes it imperative that we develop better means of dealing with limited wars, guerrilla wars, and other types of conflicts that we cannot yet anticipate with accuracy, but which will not be total war. Studies in these areas will require great effort not only in anticipation and planning, but in research and development as well.

Until World War II, we were protected by a shield of time and space. And while we were enjoying that protection, Hitler's forces ravaged Europe and, more important, his scientists developed the first surface-to-surface rockets, surface-to-air rockets, air-to-air rockets, the snorkel submarine, the first jet plane and the first rocket plane, nerve gas, etc. And he came close to developing the atomic bomb. After we entered the war, and finally overran his concentration camps, we found the gas ovens being enlarged—and he had already destroyed more than 6,000,000 human beings. Today we no longer enjoy the advantage of time and space. Our armed forces must be ready for every challenge that confronts our nation regardless of how sophisticated the weapon or the technology from which it springs. This will require a continuing expenditure of our national resources if we are to achieve an adequate state of readiness for every reasonable challenge. And this, in turn, necessitates a dynamic, imaginative, productive economy.

How good is our economy?

Most people will remember that after World War II the Soviets anticipated an economic collapse of the West, believing that our economy was entirely a war-based one. What we have accomplished has been truly remarkable, and during the past twenty years our economy at home has expanded at a tremendous rate. It is vital that we sustain this growth.

In 1966 our Gross National Product will be in excess of $700 billion. Our industry is doing very well. During the decade beginning in 1955 combined annual sales of the 500 largest industrial corporations increased by $100 billion (from $161 billion to $266 billion). Corporate profits last year before taxes were $73 billion, an increase of $9 billion over the previous year. Per-capita income reached $2,700 last year, a 6 per cent increase over 1964 income. Personal income was a record high of $528 billion, up $35 billion over the previous year.

These are impressive statistics. We should have no apprehension whatsoever about the outcome of any competition with the Communist countries in the realm of economics. Our apprehension, if any, should be concerned with whether or not we use our resources wisely and well: to provide a good society at home, to aid the emerging young nations abroad, while at the same time we provide our armed forces with weapons systems adequate to meet the broad spectrum of challenges that will confront us. We must give serious attention to the problems of exporting our economy abroad.

One of the most remarkable and farsighted programs ever undertaken by any country was the inauguration of our foreign assistance program in 1949. Through it, we were able to provide economic assistance, wherever it could be properly used, to the newly emerging nations as well as to many of the older powers. In 1949, this program amounted to a little over $4.5 billion and was 1.75 per cent of our Gross National Product. It has been overwhelmingly successful, and today South Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia, for example, all are monuments to the achievements of this program. In addition, a country geographically almost a part of the Eastern bloc, Yugoslavia, was able to achieve economic prosperity and retain its political independence from Moscow.

Our foreign aid program has been overwhelmingly successful in areas where the Communists can least afford to have us succeed. In areas where they would like to accuse us of colonialism and, indeed, do accuse us of economic colonialism today, we have been able in many countries to help achieve an unprecedented standard of living, far superior to anything that the Communists could offer. This has been accomplished despite the fact that we have steadily reduced the amount of foreign aid until today, in 1966, it is but .48 per cent of our Gross National Product, compared to 1.75 per cent at its inception in the late 1940's.

There is an old combat maxim that one should reinforce success; this we are not doing. In speaking at the Boston University Commencement exercises in June of this year, Lady Barbara Ward Jackson recommended that the "have" nations such as the United States, contribute 1 per cent of their Gross National Product to help the underprivileged and underdeveloped countries. Some attribute our unwillingness to do so to the cost of the Vietnam war. If so, this at least raises the question of whether or not we may now be following a course inimical to our long-term strategic interests.

Another area in which Americans have achieved great success has been in the exportation of products and business knowhow. Our exports, which amounted to approximately $37 billion in 1950, have grown to well in excess of $100 billion in the mid-Sixties. Our direct investment abroad has increased from $25 billion to $50 billion in the same period of time. In addition to this direct investment, we have indirectly invested $20 billion through stocks and portfolio holdings. Our direct investment abroad is now increasing at an average of more than $10,000,000 a day. With this investment we have exported entrepreneurial skills and management techniques that have proven to be very attractive to the Western world. So successful has this been that the return on our investments abroad today amounts to $4 billion annually.

This has all been possible because of a burgeoning economy at home and the aggressive drive of our businessmen to find markets and business opportunities abroad. At the same time, businessmen have sought to raise the standards of living wherever they have marketed their products and services. In this they have been, by and large, very successful. There is nothing that the Communists have done, or so far can do, that can compare with this. It is with great uneasiness, therefore, that thoughtful businessmen consider restrictions on the flow of dollars overseas. For the export of our entrepreneurial skills and products has been one of the most successful undertakings of foreign affairs in the history of our country, and the most productive of good in our confrontation with the Communist bloc. No tactical conflict, whether it be undeclared war or not, should be allowed to expand at their expense.

Maintenance of our position in the world community is based not only on those programs that we export abroad, but also on the kind of a society we have at home. World opinion will be formed by not only the prosperity and higher standard of living that we can help other nations achieve, but also by what the world knows that we are able to do in our own society. Through our ability to manage our own internal affairs, we export an image of America and of our way of life. And in this area there is much to be done.

We have made progress in dealing with some of the problems of the aged and of the very young, but, in my opinion, we have not yet begun to deal adequately with the problems of the teen-agers and the near teenagers. We must completely revitalize our educational system by bringing together the vast industrial, scientific, and technological resources of this country with our educators, to the end that we can significantly improve the education and technical training of our young. In addition, we must provide opportunities for those out of school for some time to return to educational centers to update their knowledge and to learn new skills.

Equally as important as directing the intellectual energies of our young people into useful channels is the problem of helping them to develop their physical talents. Very few countries do not have national amateur sports programs assisted and guided by a national council; the United States is one of them. It was the hope of our late President, John F. Kennedy, that some day every boy and girl, regardless of race or economic background, would be given an opportunity to achieve excellence in competitive amateur sports. President Johnson directed a study to this end some time ago, and, it is hoped, a program will be under way this year. The solution of this problem is intimately related to the problems typified by Watts.

Now, what does this discussion on the relationship between military power and economic programs mean when applied to problems of today? What, for example, does it mean in terms of Vietnam?

I think that we would all agree that we should not be in the predicament that we are in in Vietnam, but the fact is that we are there. The problem now is to handle our resources—men, weapons, aircraft, etc.—in such a manner as to neither impair our strategic efforts in other areas nor our tactical prospects in future conflicts. The cost of the Vietnamese involvement now is on the order of $16 to $18 billion a year. This has already made it necessary for us to curtail the flow of dollars overseas. We have also continued to cut back on our foreign aid programs. Our domestic economy is beginning to show the impact of the Vietnam struggle.

Obviously, we have reached the point where further escalation could seriously impair our strategic commitments—our exportation of capital and management skills, our foreign aid programs, and our science and technology programs—and our social programs at home. Perhaps we have passed this point. Furthermore, we should anticipate and be ready for a very serious struggle for Thailand and the Kra Peninsula. And if our involvement plunges us deeper into war in Southeast Asia, we should be prepared for a reopening of the Korean front. It is important, therefore, that we accelerate the measures to bring the Vietnam situation under control. Certainly, we should not willingly allow it to escalate.

For example, our present position in Vietnam is based upon the need to defeat the North Vietnamese aggressors who have carried their attack into South Vietnam. What is the nature of the aggressor's forces coming from North Vietnam, in weapons, size of forces, and current rate of buildup? Are they as numerous and as well equipped as we allege? It seems to me that answers to these questions should be obtained as a matter of highest priority.

One of the outcomes of the 1954 Geneva Conference was the establishment of an International Control Commission. This Commission should be abundantly equipped with helicopters, fixed-wing aircraft, and up-to-date communications equipment if it is to do its job. The staff supporting it should also be increased until it is capable of carrying out its intended task. It is not capable of doing this today. If we were to spend but a small part of what we are expending in combatting the North Vietnamese to determine with accuracy the nature and composition of their forces, we could probably make a significant contribution to the ultimate resolution of the problem. Concurrently with this improvement in the capability of the International Control Commission, we should ask for a reopening of the 1954 Geneva meeting to determine if other measures can be taken to bring the situation under control, and hopefully find a formula for resolving the conflict.

High on the list of national priorities must be the restoration of stability within the Atlantic Alliance. We have insisted for too long on maintaining the status quo in NATO, ignoring the powerful trend toward Europeanism and the towering strength of the European Common Market. Profound changes have taken place in Europe since NATO was originally established, and our policy does not reflect an awareness of these changes. At times we seem more preoccupied with isolating de Gaulle than with making positive proposals to which our European allies could adhere.

The most significant change that has taken place has been the growth of the European Common Market. Although conceived as an economic organization, it is rapidly assuming all aspects of a powerful military and political bloc. Purists will argue this point, pointing out that the Fouchet Mission to Brussels of five years ago failed in its efforts to have the members of the Common Market agree on a commonality of political, military, and cultural objectives. But the fact is that the European Common Market represents growing political and military strength. The need, therefore, is for a recognition of this within the structure of the Atlantic Alliance.

There are those who fear such a Europe as a third power, but now is not the time for such fear; it is a time for an understanding of Europe as a strong partner. Furthermore, Great Britain is part of Europe and must play a significant role in the affairs of Europe. Our reaction to de Gaulle's withdrawal of his armed forces from NATO has been to orient our attention more toward Germany as the leading power on the Continent. This policy has in it the seeds of disaster, for a German-dominated Europe would never be accepted by our allies and would be bitterly opposed by the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. A Europe without Great Britain's participation in its economic and political affairs will be an unending source of irritation and trouble for us. It is imperative, therefore, that we assist in any way that we can Great Britain's entry into the Common Market.

This should begin with an understanding on our part of the need for Great Britain to sever her special nuclear relationship with us, and for her to enter into frank discussions on the problems of nuclear weapons and the Common Market area. Based upon numerous conversations that I have had with responsible members of the de Gaulle government, including the General himself, I am convinced that Great Britain would be welcomed into the Common Market if she were willing to come in, bombs and all, and meet all the provisions of the Rome Treaty. Among other things, this will require a minimum period for the transition of the Commonwealth nations out of their special relationship to the U.K. economy.

As the strength of Europe increases, the need for U.S. military forces on the Continent will diminish. Our present commitment is based more on diplomatic than military need. A significant reduction of our troop strength, in my opinion, would improve our economic situation worldwide and thus add to our global strategic strength without increasing the military risk in Europe.

General de Gaulle's recent visit to the U.S.S.R. was a remarkable *tour de force*. Although generally denigrated in the American press, the General's achievements were noteworthy. There were many who remembered that the General had written in his memoirs, published in 1959, that it was his intent to insure the security of France by making arrangements with either the East or the West; hence, there was concern lest he enter into a conventional military pact following the withdrawal of French forces from NATO. On the other hand, many recalled how bitterly he opposed negotiations with the Soviets following Khrushchev's threat to the Berlin Corridor in late 1961. He had said at that time that he would refuse to enter into any "negotiations" since we were there by right and to agree to negotiate would suggest to the Soviets an intent on our part to give something away that was rightfully ours.

The remarkable thing about his trip, therefore, was that he so skillfully avoided leaving any impressions that he was negotiating over West Germany, despite the desire of the Soviets to talk about European "security." At the same time he was able also to finesse Soviet suggestions of the need to discuss recognition of East Germany. On the positive side, agreements were reached on technological, cultural and scientific exchanges. Since current French economic trade with the Soviet bloc is going quite well, the total package represents significant achievement. The ultimate outcome of his visit, therefore, could have profound military significance.

For some years the United States has exchanged visits of artists, athletes, and academicians as part of a program that had as its goal the relaxation of tension between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The time now has come to encourage the visits of businessmen between both countries, and to encourage our trade with the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. To an increasing extent, the profit motive is playing a significant role in the Soviet economy, and the Soviets are trading extensively with our Allies. Our President, in his State of the Union Message this year, urged Congress to pass the necessary legislation to enable us to get on with an increased trade. This should be done without delay, for increased trade will not only reduce tension, but will increase the standard of living and improve the social and economic prospects of people wherever the trading is done.

Conspicuous by its absence from this discussion is the problem of the unification of Germany. It should be absent, for until economic and political relations between Western Europe and the Soviet bloc are improved, there is little prospect of finding an acceptable reunification formula.

In the past two decades, the world has changed from a community of many independent nations, frequently remote from one another, to one small world community. It will look with great apprehension on any indiscriminate use of military power. In the meantime, from an unprecedented abundance of scientific and technological knowledge, man has acquired the potential for tremendous good and tremendous harm. This new knowledge must be channeled into the areas where the greatest good for the most can be realized; to help our Great Society at home and to help the emerging nations abroad. The most influential force in world affairs today is the economy of the United States. It should be sustained and enriched as a matter of sound strategic policy.

Tactical engagements that do occur should not be permitted to grow as uncontrollably as a malignant cancer. Fighting will certainly occur, from time to time, at any point along the abrasive interface between the Communist nations and the Free World. Our power must be used to persuade those who seek to improve their position through aggressive attacks upon their neighbors that they will be deterred and cannot possibly succeed. Concurrently, we should make clear our intention and ability to maintain a dominant position in global affairs. Our global power must be exercised with restraint and wisdom. At a time of Great Britain's greatness, Disraeli said, "All power is a trust—and we are accountable for its exercise." Now, we too are accountable, not only to the American people but to people of the world community of nations.

PROPELLER CLUB STATES POSITION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Propeller Club of the United States is a strong, active association dedicated to promoting and supporting the American merchant marine. For some years now, I have derived considerable enjoyment and edification from membership in the Propeller Club of Washington; this organization provides a valuable forum in which the problems of our merchant marine can be discussed with candor and authority.

When the Propeller Club takes a public stand, it deserves to be heeded by everyone involved with the merchant marine. Recently, the Propeller Club has taken a position on the implementation of our national maritime policy which is, I think, realistic and constructive. It is a position which I endorse wholeheartedly; therefore, I should like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the position on the implementation of our national maritime policy of the Propeller Club of the United States be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the Statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES POSITION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

BACKGROUND

At its National Convention in 1965 at Galveston, Texas, the Propeller Club of the United States adopted the following language in one of its key resolutions:

"The Propeller Club urges the continued development and vigorous application of a permanent, non-partisan, high level Administration policy which is firm in the conviction that this nation must have a strong and active U.S.-flag Merchant Marine to serve the commerce and defense needs of the country. The Propeller Club urges maritime agencies of the government to re-double their efforts in support of practices and procedures in consonance with the provisions of basic maritime law and the expressed will of Congress and calls upon such agencies to join in a forceful program to promote U.S.-flag shipping in a troubled world which vitally requires it for progress and survival."

Subsequent thereto concepts have been advanced and policies advocated which are in direct conflict with our national maritime policy, our basic maritime laws and proven shipping practices.

The very purposes, which the National Resolution of the Propeller Club was intended to serve, are being hindered by varied and sundry proposals that would weaken rather than advance the cause of achieving a strong American Merchant Marine.

It therefore becomes a matter of the highest importance that the Propeller Club of the United States reaffirm and implement its position on "high level Administrative policy" as expressed in the resolution adopted at its last National Convention.

POSITION

The Propeller Club of the United States vigorously reaffirms the principles of our National Maritime policy as expressed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and in implementation thereof calls upon the Congress, interested maritime agencies and maritime labor and management to give particular and continued support to the following:

The present cost-equalization parity concept of operation subsidy as distinguished from untried and unproven theoretical concepts of government support.

The existing essential trade route concept of our national maritime policy with such reasonable liberalization as is necessary for greater promotion of United States foreign commerce.

The present basic arrangements for participation of American flag liners in conferences with any necessary corrective measures contingent upon a study by a special government commission.

A construction subsidy program to replace current tonnage and capacity of existing unsubsidized liner fleets, coupled with operating subsidy arrangements contingent upon: (a) compliance with existing subsidy regulations, (b) agreement on fleet replacement, and (c) divestiture of all foreign flag operations.

A construction subsidy program with necessary attendant benefits including the establishment of a Construction Reserve Fund and provision for accelerated depreciation, to encourage the building in U.S. shipyards of a U.S.-flag dry bulk fleet capable of handling a substantial portion of the bulk trade.

The continuation of cargo preference laws which provide cargo for U.S.-flag ships and combat traditional foreign flag routing preferences and discriminatory practices.

A construction program with shipyard support sufficient to make our Merchant Marine a more effective instrument in our waterborne commerce and to aid in the national defense through expansion of U.S.-flag merchant fleet construction and repair in U.S. shipyards.

Establishment of a joint government-industry national research program to explore new technology for improving the U.S.-flag merchant fleet.

Vigorous application of our current nonpartisan national maritime policy as expressed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to best serve the commercial and defense needs of the nation.

FOREIGN SUPPORT OF U.S. DEFENSE OF FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the existing lack of support in foreign lands of the U.S. defense of freedom in Vietnam. What we do not hear is the fact that there are widespread areas of support and, in many instances, even more detailed and perceptive information published about the brutal Communist efforts to overrun freedom in some of the foreign press than is generally found in our own.

In this regard, the July 17 issue of the Italian newspaper, Lo Specchio, has been brought to my attention.

Lo Specchio—the Mirror—is the most pro-American weekly magazine in Italy and among the most pro-American in all Europe. Its publisher is George Nelson Page, an American-Italian who is the nephew of Thomas Nelson Page, U.S. Ambassador to Rome in the Woodrow Wilson administration.

Published in Rome and enjoying a nationwide readership, Lo Specchio has vigorously supported President Johnson and the Americans fighting in Vietnam. Especially is this true of its July 17 issue.

The entire front cover of this issue contains a picture of two American fliers being paraded through the streets of Hanoi with the heading of "Vietnam—Communist Torture for USA Pilots."

The magazine carried a two-page spread of a story from Washington describing the great support from the American public which President Johnson received after the bombing of the oil depots on the perimeters of Hanoi and Haiphong on June 29; it devoted four pages of a story and pictures of Communist atrocities from its correspondent in Saigon; a page containing the picture of Communist-led demonstrators in St. Peter's Square demanding "peace" in Vietnam; it devoted one page to the pacification program the United States is waging in South Vietnam villages, and carried an editorial by the publisher commenting on the plight of the American fliers held prisoners by Hanoi and threatened with trials as war criminals.

Certainly we Americans should be thankful for Lo Specchio's bringing the truth of the war in Vietnam so forcefully to its Italian readers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a translation of Mr. Page's editorial be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the translation of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Translation of editorial by George Nelson Page, publisher of Lo Specchio—the Mirror—magazine, Rome, Italy, July 17, 1966]

THE HANOI SAVAGES

No one knows what cruelties have been committed against the American flyers who fell into the hands of the Communist North Vietnamese, but pictures we have seen seem to justify the deepest pessimism. Moreover, the statements attributed by Hanoi to Captain David Hatcher and Commander Muligan show the moral standard—certainly below that of savages—of the North Vietnamese rulers who are no more than loyal followers of the Communist tyrants specialized in brainwashing and psychological murder which so often precedes the physical murder of their victims.

The shameful farce has already begun. According to the tradition of the totalitarian regimes, the mobs have been mobilized and ordered to claim death sentence.

The Italian "vestals" of our time, usually ready to rush to Piazza San Giovanni in Rome to cheer the speakers of the Communist Party who harangue in "defense of civilization" being threatend by American aggressors, keep silent.

When Daniel and Sinyavski were found guilty of writing without authorization by the Soviet Inquisition and convicted to penal servitude, those same "vestal virgins" were compelled—against their will—to say something in favor of the two Russian writers. On the other hand, our progressive "vestals" have not gathered their energies to protest the plight of the American pilots whose treatment is against any humanitarian principle and represents a violation of all rules on the status of war prisoners.

The impartial behavior of the Communists and their fellow travelers is really admirable; the gravity of a crime is judged according to who commits the crime! Stalin's murders, justified as a necessary purge when he was the leader of the Communist world, became crimes only after his post-mortem degradation by the bosses of the new regime.

The same is now happening in Vietnam; American war operations, even if carried out in full respect of international rules accepted by all civilized nations, are "criminal actions" while there is nothing wrong or, at least, deserving too much consideration, with torturing and killing soldiers taken prisoner in the accomplishment of war missions.

Luigi Longo (Italian Communist leader) will tell us whether and when tortures and murder deserve a written and verbal disapproval. Until that day we will not know.

Up to now the American authorities have been cautious in commenting on the barbaric behavior of the Asian Communists, probably because of the necessary delicate handling of wild beasts capable of the worst crimes. But the reaction of the American people is such that they cannot ignore it, just as they could not, in World War I, ignore the sinking of the Lusitania by German submarines, causing the United States to enter the war against Germany. Likewise, it was an aroused American public which caused the declaration of war 24 hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor. History has much to teach, even to the most inattentive observers.

The ultimate fate of the American flyers, for whom the "voice" of Hanoi claims a death sentence, cannot be foreseen, but the deepest concern is legitimate. What is beyond doubt is that if the Peking rulers are determined to provoke a reprisal from the greatest industrial power in the world with enormous means at its disposal, all they have to do is to ask Hanoi to administer the "justice" announced by the savages disguised as Asian "progressives."

TIMPANOGOS CAVE REGISTERS ONE MILLIONTH VISITOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the Nation's oldest national monuments under the direction of the National Park Service has just recorded its one millionth visitor. I speak of Timpanogos Cave National Monument, near Provo, Utah.

The Park Service opened Timp Cave, as we refer to it in Utah, in 1922. Since that time, this wonder of nature has been made more accessible, but it is still a short hike up a mountain trail from the new visitor center.

Timp Cave is not on a major highway, but it is only a few minutes drive from either Provo or Salt Lake City. The delicate crystal formations and the interesting Park Service tour are memorable for the many tourists who visit the monument each year.

Mr. President, the Daily Herald newspaper in Provo recently published a fine editorial on the millionth visitor. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Provo (Utah) Daily Herald, Aug. 5, 1966]

TIMP CAVE'S MILLIONTH VISITOR

Within a week Timpanogos Cave National Monument is due to have its one-millionth visitor since it was opened to the public in 1922.

The occasion is a good time to reflect on our good fortune to have a valuable asset like Timpanogos Cave here.

Although not as big as a number of other caves in the West and Midwest, Timpanogos Cave is certainly one of the most beautiful, with delicate crystal formations and it "great heart of Timpanogos."

The fact that our cave isn't on the main highway and that you have to hike some distance uphill to reach the entrance tend to slow the tempo of tourist visits in comparison with some other caves more readily accessible.

Nevertheless, Timp Cave is seen annually by persons from throughout the country and the tempo of visits seems to be picking up from year to year.

Travel to the national monument currently is 23 per cent ahead of that of last year. For the first five days of July over 5000 people visited the cave. This is a far cry from 1934, the first year the cave was managed by the park service, when only 1000 people visited the cave in the entire season.

If trends continue as anticipated, another million will likely see it within the next 10-year period.

This wonder of nature right in our own county is a fine an attraction as you will see anywhere. Without doubt it is one of our best tourist attractions and could be made even more of a drawing card with wider publicity.

Undoubtedly there are people right here in Utah Valley who have not visited the cave. For their benefit, we suggest an outing at an early date. Those who have not had the experience have missed a real treat.

RESIGNATION FROM BELGIAN PARLIAMENT OF PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the recent resignation from the Belgian Parliament of a most distinguished politician and diplomat, Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak. His was a long and successful career. He served the cause of postwar Western democracy with the dedication equaled by few other men.

We in the United States have sometimes been critical, and rightly so, of the tendency on the part of some leaders in smaller nations to be irresponsible in the conduct of their official duties, especially with regard to their reluctance to carry a fair share of the burdens of common defense and regional economic development. No such thing can be said about Mr. Spaak. His foresight and persausiveness helped to create an atmosphere which permitted Europe to recover from the ravages of World War II. Pointing to the past as a lesson not to be repeated, he helped temper those who understandably were hesitant to include Germany in any European partnership, realizing that a prosperous Europe could not exist without a healthy Germany. He was one of the earliest statesmen to recognize the merits of interdependence.

As the first President of the United Nations General Assembly, he warned of the perils of power politics in the atomic age. As Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Belgium, he guided that country into collective economic and military agreements which have permitted his people to enjoy prosperity.

Mr. Spaak is living testimony to the fact that international affairs are not conducted solely by men who are irresponsive to genuine partnership.

He has contributed greatly to the mutual trust which exists between the United States and our European allies. American diplomats will be among those who will sorely miss his wise counsel when dealing with international problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles appearing in the New York Times on this European patriot be submitted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1966]

BELGIAN STATESMAN—PAUL-HENRI SPAAK

During the third General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris, Paul-Henri Spaak turned to Andrei Y. Vishinsky, the Soviet delegate, and said:

"The Soviet delegate need not look for complicated explanations of our policy. I will tell him the basis for our policy in terms which only the representative of a small nation may use. It is fear of you, fear of your Government, fear of your policy."

This uncompromising comment characterized the Belgian statesman who was to become one of the principal architects of European unity and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The militant Socialist, who had led street demonstrations in Brussels in his early career, had been through the fire of World War II. He had seen his country's neutrality violated by the Nazi armies. He saw a prostrate, chaotic Europe as a helpless prey to the advancing tide of Soviet power.

Mr. Spaak was one of the Western European statesmen to understand what had happened to the established order in Europe as old empires and predatory states collapsed, to be replaced by a new and more powerful imperialist state. The starting point for Mr. Spaak's philosophy of European unity and of alliance with American power was his recognition that a fragmented, impoverished, wrecked Western Europe could never hope to build a counterweight to Soviet power.

MORE THAN A BELGIAN

In this context Mr. Spaak was more than a Belgian—he was a European who, in face of the new peril, had no difficulty in finding a common language with Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the creator of the West German Federal Republic, and with Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman, the French architects of European unity.

As a Belgian, Mr. Spaak, who is 67 years old, combines the qualities of his Flemish and Walloon forebears—an enormous capacity for work, tough-mindedness, a somewhat authoritarian attitude and a great flair for language. He is rated a powerful orator in French.

His turbulent 41-year career, the ending of which was announced yesterday, exemplifies the belief that it frequently requires more talent, political creativity, foresight and courage to govern a small country in a world of big powers than to manage a big power. Great powers can afford risks and mistakes, small ones cannot.

Mr. Spaak was trained for power and leadership. His mother was Belgium's first woman Senator. His maternal grandfather was Paul Janson, a 19th-century liberal leader. An uncle, Paul-Emile Janson, was a Premier and was known as the Cato of Belgian politics. Mr. Spaak's father was a successful author and director of the Brussels Opera.

A RANGE OF TALENTS

Young Spaak displayed a talent for bridge, versifying, jurisprudence, journalism, repartée and statecraft, and in his spectacular career, brought to fruition the diverse qualities of his family heritage.

Amiable and courtly though he is, Mr. Spaak is also capable of deep-seated political animosities and enmities. When the Nazi armies overran Belgium, he urged King Leopold III to flee to Britain, but the King refused, remaining during the Nazi occupation. After the liberation it was Mr. Spaak who led the movement to bar Leopold from the throne.

Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, who took the bitter road of exile, returned in triumph to her country, but King Leopold's postwar insistence on retaining his throne was greeted with antiroyalist riots and demonstrations. He was compelled to abdicate in favor of his son, Baudouin.

Interrupting an active career in successive postwar Governments, which he served as Foreign Minister and Premier, Mr. Spaak became Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1957. In his five years in Paris he sought to establish political consultation among the members and to head off conflict. However, he has been highly critical of President de Gaulle's opposition to the unified NATO command and to British membership in the European Economic Community.

Showing the flexibility of the great statesman, Mr. Spaak, despite his fear of the Russians, believed that efforts should be made to build bridges between East and West although he was convinced that little rapport existed between them.

EDUCATED FOR THE LAW

Born in 1899, Mr. Spaak was educated for the law, a profession he practiced for a relatively short time. He was elected as a Socialist member of Parliament in 1932 and received his first Cabinet post in 1935 as Minister of Transport and Posts. He was named Foreign Minister for the first time in 1936 and became Premier two years later. In all he held the Premiership twice and was Foreign Minister six times.

Mr. Spaak was elected president of the first General Assembly of the United Nations after having played a pre-eminent role at the founding meetings of the world organization in San Francisco in 1945. In 1957, he helped draft the Treaty of Rome, which established the Common Market.

Mr. Spaak's first wife, the daughter of a wealthy industrialist, died in 1964. They had three children. He remarried last year.

SPAAK IS ENDING POLITICAL CAREER—LEADER OF UNITY MOVEMENT IN EUROPE QUITS PARLIAMENT

BRUSSELS, July 27.—Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgian statesman and one of the founders of the European Common Market, has decided to retire from political life, it was announced today.

Mr. Spaak, 67 years old, has sent a letter resigning his parliamentary seat to the president of the Chamber of Representatives (lower house), Achille van Acker.

After having served his country six times as Foreign Minister and twice as Premier, Mr. Spaak left the Government last year.

He began public life in 1925 as political secretary to the then Minister of Labor, M. J. Wauters, a Socialist.

He became known as an international figure as a result of his eloquent speeches at the founding meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945. He was the first president of the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. Spaak's outstanding achievement was in his postwar contributions to European unity. He played a leading role in the negotiations on the treaties creating the European Common Market and Atomic Energy Agency in 1957.

He was said to be planning to resume a law career as defense counsel in a murder case in the fall. He is also writing his memoirs.

PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of the leading attorneys in the State of Maryland, and one of the outstanding authorities on criminal procedure, is William W. Greenhalgh.

Bill Greenhalgh is currently professor of law at the Georgetown Law Center. He directs the legal internship program there, providing counsel for indigent criminal defendants in the District of Columbia—a pioneer program which has won praise across the country.

Professor Greenhalgh was recently invited to address the National Bar Association Convention on the procedural aspects of the fourth amendment ban on unreasonable search and seizure. Since this is a matter of some importance to everyone concerned with problems of law enforcement, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Greenhalgh's lecture be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROF. WILLIAM W. GREENHALGH, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER, LECTURE TO NATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION, AUGUST 4, 1966, DETROIT, MICH.

I. PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ARREST WITHOUT A WARRANT

IVth Amendment provides:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

An arrest may occur where either:

A. Circumstances known to a reasonably prudent police officer by personal observation amount to a felony or misdemeanor committed, or attempted, in his presence or view (*McDonald* v. *United States,* 335 U.S. 451 (1948)), or

B. Information received is such as would justify a reasonably prudent police officer that a felony or excepted misdemeanor has been committed or is being committed (*Johnson* v. *United States,* 333 U.S. 10 (1948)).

1. Although probable cause may be based on hearsay information and need not reflect the direct personal observations of the police officer, he must possess some of the underlying circumstances from which the source of the information concluded that a crime had been or was being committed as well as some of the underlying circumstances from which the officer concluded that the source of information (whose identity need not be disclosed) was credible, or his information reliable (*Aguilar* v. *Texas* 378 U.S. 108, 84 S.Ct. 1509 (1964)).

a. informant of known reliability. (*Draper* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 307 (1959)).

b. Anonymous source of information. (*Mills* v. *United States,* 90 U.S. App. D.C. 365, 196 F. 2d 600 (1953)).

Thus, a police officer may not arrest upon mere suspicion (*Henry* v. *United States,* 361 U.S. 98 (1959), *Beck* v. *Ohio,* 379 U.S. 89 (1964), *One 1958 Plymouth* v. *Pennsylvania,* 380 U.S. 693, 14 L. Ed. 2d 170, 85 S. Ct. 1246 (1965)) but only upon probable cause (*Ker* v. *California,* 374 U.S. 23 (1963)). Nor may he arrest for "investigation"; yet he has a duty to approach (*Lee* v. *United States,* 221 F. 2d 29, D.C. Cir. 1954), confront and interrogate. It is the most useful, most efficient, and most effective method of investigation. Often it develops probable cause. Remember the validity of the subsequent search and seizure thus turns upon the question when the arrest occurred (*Rios* v. *United States,* 364 U.S. 253 (1960)).

In order for there to be an arrest it is not necessary that there be an application of actual force, or manual touching of the body, or physical restraint which may be visible to the eye, or a formal declaration of arrest. It is sufficient if the person arrested undertands that he is in the power of the one arresting, and submits in consequence. (*Kelley* v. *United States,* 298 F. 2d 310 (D.C. Cir. 1961)). In other words, there must be some detention of the person to consititue an arrest. (*Miranda* v. *Arizona,* 34 L.W. 4521 (1966)).

II. PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ISSUANCE OF ARREST WARRANT

"The language of the IVth Amendment, that '* * * no Warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause * * *' of course applies to arrest as well as to search warrants." *Giordenello* v. *United States,* 357 U.S. at 485).

Generally, the affidavit in support of the arrest warrant must allege: either

A. Circumstances personally known to the affiant providing for a sufficient basis upon which a finding of probable cause by the issuing magistrate could be made (*Go-Bart Import Co.* v. *United States,* 282 U.S. 344 (1931)); and/or

B. Circumstances attributed to the source of the affiant's belief providing for a sufficient basis upon which a finding of probable cause by the issuing magistrate could be made.

1. Again, although probable cause may be based upon hearsay and need not reflect the direct personal observations of the police officer, he must possess some of the underlying circumstances from which the source of the information concluded that a crime had been or was being committed as well as some of the underlying circumstances from which the officer concluded that the source of information (whose identity need not be disclosed) was credible, or his information reliable (*Aguilar* v. *Texas, supra*).

a. Informant of known reliability

b. Anonymous source of information.

III. PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ISSUANCE OF SEARCH WARRANT

"Affidavit for search warrants must be tested and interpreted by magistrates and courts in a common sense and realistic fashion . . . Technical requirements of elaborate specificity once exacted under common low pleadings have no proper place in this area. A grudging or negative attitude by reviewing courts toward warrants will tend to discourage police officers from submitting their evidence to a judicial officer before acting." (*United States* v. *Ventresca,* 380 U.S. 102, (1965)).

The fact that exceptions to the requirement that searches and seizures be undertaken only after obtaining a warrant are limited underscores the preference accorded police action taken under a warrant as against searches and seizures without one. The exceptions are where: (1) seizure is impossible except without a warrant—i.e., moving vehicle or necessitous circumstances and (2) search incident to an arrest—i.e., contemporaneousness.

A. An officer may request a search warrant *only* for

1. Fruits or Proceeds of a Crime

2. Instrumentality or means of committing a crime

3. Contraband or Property the possession of which is a crime (*Gouled* v. *United States,* 255 U.S. 298 (1921), *United States* v. *Lefkowitz,* 285 U.S. 452 (1932)).

B. The affidavit in support of the search warrant must contain either:

1. Circumstances personally known to the affiant connecting the crime and premises to be searched, which establishes a sufficient basis upon which a finding of probable cause

by the issuing magistrate could be made (*Riggan* v. *Virginia*, no. 887, 34 L.W. 3376 (1965), *Nathanson* v. *United States*, 290 U.S. 41 (1933)); and/or

2. Circumstances attributed to the source of the affiant's belief connecting crime and premises to be searched, which establishes a sufficient basis upon which a finding of probable cause by the issuing magistrate could be made.

a. Once again, although probable cause may be based upon hearsay and need not reflect the direct personal observations of the police officer, he must possess some knowledge of the underlying circumstances from which the source of the information concluded that a crime had been or was being committed as well as some of the underlying circumstances from which the officer concluded that the source of information (whose identity need not be disclosed) was credible, or his information reliable (*Aguilar* v. *Texas*, *supra*).

(1) Informant of known reliability (*Cecil Jones* v. *United States*, 290 U.S. 41 (1933)).

(2) Anonymous source of information.

Thus, where the circumstances are detailed, where reason for crediting the source of the information is given, and when a magistrate has found probable cause, the courts should not invalidate the warrant by interpreting the affidavit in a hyper-technical, rather than a commonsense, manner.

C. Affidavits should particularly describe premises to be searched and property to be seized. (*Stanford* v. *Texas*, 379 U.S. 476 (1965)).

D. Affidavit should contain *fresh* facts; if latest facts are four weeks old, there may be no probable cause to believe property is still there. (*Sgro* v. *United States*, 287 U.S. 206 (1932)).

E. Affidavit must be positive that property sought to be seized is on premises and provide such facts to support application if *nighttime* warrant is desired. (*Roy Jones* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 493 (1958)).

IV. EXECUTION OF ARREST WITH OR WITHOUT A WARRANT

A. Defendant's place of residence or dwelling-house of another.

1. An officer must announce his authority and purpose to arrest defendant in a loud clear voice; if no one answers and sounds are heard indicating destruction of evidence or entry is refused, the officer may break and enter.

An officer may break and enter without announcing authority and purpose, *Only* if he in good faith believes that he or someone within is in peril or bodily harm, or defendant is fleeing or likely to take flight, or evidence is threatened with destruction or removal (*Miller* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 301 (1958), *Ker* v. *California*, *supra*).

2. Upon physical arrest, the officer may search defendant and immediate vicinity for:

a. Weapons or means of escape

b. Fruits or proceeds of crime

c. Instrumentality or means of committing crime

d. Property possession of which is crime (*Harris* v. *United States*, 331 U.S. 145 (1947)), *United States* v. *Rabinowitz*, 339 U.S. 56 (1950)), *Ker* v. *California*, *supra*, *Fahy* v. *Connecticut*, 375 U.S. 85 (1963), *Stoner* v. *California*, 376 U.S. 483 (1964), *James* v. *Louisiana*, 376 U.S. 483 (1964)).

B. Defendant on public space or on the street.

1. An officer must announce his authority and purpose on sight. He cannot wait and follow defendant to place of residence to arrest him (*McKnight* v. *United States*, 183 F. 2d 977 (D.C. Cir: 1950)). He may search defendant as an incident to the arrest as indicated above.

C. Defendant in a moving vehicle.

1. Searches on the scene.

a. When a person is lawfully arrested in his car for any offense, those parts of the car immediately accessible to him may be searched for means of effecting escape from custody. The officer may search below the dashboard, under the seat, in an unlocked glove compartment, etc.

b. When a person is lawfully arrested in his car for an offense which has "fruits" or "instrumentalities" *any* part of the car which might contain the fruits or instrumentalities may be searched on the scene so long as the search is reasonably contemporaneous to the arrest. If the object sought could be contained in a locked glove compartment or trunk then these parts of the car may be searched (*Adams* v. *United States*, 336 F. 2d 752 (D.C. Cir. 1964)).

2. Searches at the Precinct.

a. No matter what the crime, once the accused is in custody and no longer has access to his car no investigatory search may be made for means of his effecting escape.

b. If the crime for which the arrest was made has fruits or instrumentalities and the accused was arrested in his car, a search of *any* part of the car which might contain the fruits or instrumentalities is permissible at the precinct so long as the search is reasonably contemporaneous with the arrest and the defendant remains in close proximity to the car throughout the search (*Preston* v. *United States*, 376 U.S. 364 (1964), *Schmerber* v. *California*, 86 S. Ct. 1826 (1966)).

D. Upon physical arrest, if defendant admits crime and states where are located either

1. Fruits or proceeds of crime, or

2. Instrumentality or means of committing crime, or

3. Property possession of which is crime obtain a search warrant.

E. Consent—If accused denies the offense while in custody, but consents to a search of premises, such consent must be shown to be unequivocal, specific, freely and intelligently given. Mere invitations to enter one's house, extended to armed officers of the law who demand entrance, are usually considered invitations secured by force. In other words, consent cannot be found from submission to authority or neglect or failure to argue with a police officer. In fact, intimidation and duress are almost necessarily implicit in such situations. And if the government alleges the absence of such duress or intimidation, it has the burden of convincing the court by clear and convincing proof that such consent was given (*Judd* v. *United States*, 190 F. 2d 649 (D.C. Cir. 1951)). Remember a wife cannot consent to a search of the home (*Amos* v. *United States*, 255 U.S. 313 (1921)), nor can a landlord consent to a search of the tenant's premises (*Chapman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 776 (1961)), nor can a hotel clerk consent to a search of a guest's room (*United States* v. *Jeffers*, 342 U.S. 48 (1951), *Stoner* v. *California* 376 U.S. 483 (1964)).

V. EXECUTION OF SEARCH WARRANT

A. Must be executed and returned within ten (10) days.

B. If not executed within ten (10) days, another warrant can be obtained only if fresh information received since issuance of prior warrant is added to information previously stated, so that the new affidavit shows probable cause to believe the property sought is still on the premises.

C. Must be executed between sunrise and sunset unless a nighttime (positive) warrant has been properly issued; however, search may continue after dark if begun in daytime.

D. Must announce authority and purpose in a loud clear voice; if no one answers and sounds are heard indicating destruction of evidence or entry is refused, they may break and enter.

E. May seize other than items particularly described in search warrant in premises to be searched if

1. Fruits or proceeds of crime

2. Instrumentality or means of committing a crime

3. Property possession of which is a crime (*Palmer* v. *United States*, 92 U.S. App. D.C. 103, 203 F. 2d 66 (1953)).

However, seizure of entire contents of premises for purpose of examination at police headquarters may render execution of search warrant invalid (*Kremen* v. *United States*, 353 U.S. 346 (1957)).

F. Upon entry, officer may arrest subjects found in a place which an officer reasonably believes to have been used as a secret rendezvous or hideout for illegal activities. In turn, those arrested may be searched as an incident to such an arrest. (*Wyche* v. *United States*, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 67, 193 F. 2d 703 (1951), *cert. denied* 72 S. Ct. 556 (1952)).

G. Must leave copy of search warrant at premises along with a receipt for any property seized.

H. Must present a written inventory under oath to Commissioner or Judge when the return is made.

THE NEED FOR REFORM IN THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, since 1954, the United States has shipped $16 billion worth of agricultural surpluses to underdeveloped countries throughout the world. This food-for-peace program was designed to alleviate hunger and prevent famine, while giving the participating nations a chance to help themselves.

I wholeheartedly support the program, because it has done a great deal to lessen the immense suffering throughout the world. In those underdeveloped nations, blessed with progressive administrations and willing to discard the inefficient, antiquated farming methods of their ancestors, the food-for-peace program has been of great use. It has, in fact, given these nations a chance to help themselves; it has kept famine from their doorstep, while reform measures could be successfully implemented.

While widespread starvation may have been postponed in some countries, the steps necessary for agricultural reform and increased productivity have in certain countries been delayed or ignored. In an article in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, says that "the program has actually retarded food production in needy countries." Some governments, he adds, have deliberately diverted funds from agriculture to be used instead for such extravagant projects as rocket development, only because they were confident that the United States would foot the bill for their own agricultural needs.

The time for carefully scrutinizing the management of our aid program is long overdue. Unless the underdeveloped nations of the world assume responsibility for reforming and modernizing their own agricultural programs, the help we give them will be futile; it will only postpone the inevitable—starvation for the people, and a breakdown of the antiquated farming apparatus.

Our Government should make it abundantly clear that the shipment of U.S. food surpluses abroad will be flatly denied to those nations who fail to take concrete measures aimed at agricultural reform, and increasing agricultural production. As Danielian pointed out: "They must devote more of their own budgets to food production and agricultural research," instead of charging the bill to us. They must demonstrate the willingness to solve their own problems, regardless of their reluctance to abandon traditional farming techniques. The United States cannot do everything; and it should never allow itself to become a partner to the indecision, inactivity, and mismanagement which have so frequently typified the agricultural bureaucracies of the underdeveloped nations.

As Dr. Danielian concludes:

> Food for Freedom can be made to work, and untold millions of people can be saved. But this is possible only if we keep the executive branch under constant pressure to recommend such economic reforms forcefully and to stand ready to cut off food aid to those countries that ignore them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert Dr. Danielian's article in the Record. An internationally recognized economist, he has taught at Harvard and has served as consultant to both the Department of Commerce and the Department of State. His views on this important subject should be of great interest and usefulness to the entire Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To Win the Fight Against World Starvation, Our Food for Peace Program, Far From Doing the Job Congress Designed It To Do, Is Risking Disaster—Yet the Program Can Work, if We Compel Its Administrators To Face the Hard Facts

(By N. R. Danielian)

In 1954 the United States began shipping its agricultural surpluses to overseas governments. Today, 12 years and $16 billion later, this Food for Peace spending has been stepped up to nearly $2 billion annually. We are distributing enough wheat, corn and rice in 52 countries around the globe to feed 64 million persons day in and day out. The program is keeping alive every 20th person in Latin America, Africa and noncommunist Asia.

And now, with wheat shipments draining our once vast surpluses below the safe reserve level for domestic consumption, a 15-percent increase in American wheat acreage has been ordered to meet our expanding commitments. Yet President Johnson is embarking us on a still bigger Food for Freedom scheme, for which he has sought authorization to spend $16.5 billion over the next five years. "The program will encourage and assist those who try to help themselves," he declares. While the benefiting nations are developing the ability to feed themselves, the shipments will be necessary, "to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine."

Such a massive undertaking is proof once again of the compassion in the heart of America. But will it really do what the President hopes? To date, food aid has fallen short of its promise. By the record—a record too often withheld from the American public—it has been plagued by bad judgment, waste, ingratitude, failure. Time and again Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other officials has assured Congress we would attach "strings" to our assistance, and thus compel economic reforms which would induce recipient countries to help themselves. Yet, because we have failed to back up such warnings, the program has actually *retarded* food production in needy countries. If the expanded program now proposed is to yield better results it is going to require a vastly more hard-boiled performance by our officials.

BULLOCKS AND LEATHER PAILS

Consider India, where we are pouring out more economic assistance than anywhere else in the world. Throughout history it has been racked by famine. In the 19 years since independence, its population has increased from 320 million to 480 million—and will double in the next 35 years. Clearly India's prime need has been the development of a bountiful agriculture.

But journey through the Ganges River basin from Calcutta to New Delhi, as I did last year, and you will see incredibly primitive farming. Bullocks, pulleys and leather pails draw irrigation water from local wells, five gallons at a time, just as they have for centuries. Here should be one of the world's richest food-growing areas, comparable to the Mississippi Valley; yet Indian rice production per acre is only half that estimated for Red China, a quarter of what the Japanese harvest. The per-acre grain yield has increased only three percent since 1900. In spite of increased acreage under cultivation, India's food production isn't keeping up with the increasing population.

India's ruling Congress Party and its entrenched bureaucracy have permitted agricultural productivity to stagnate while they diverted their nation's resources—and ours, too—to build a socialistic state dominated by government-owned industries. At the same time, private business is retarded by punitive taxation, price fixing and superregulation. Instead of accepting uncritically the country's grandiose plans for economic development costing the American taxpayers over 700 million dollars a year, U.S. officials long ago should have compelled India to come to grips with its food needs. It was so close to starvation in 1964 that, when a U.S. longshoremen's strike interrupted our wheat shipments, riots resulted in Calcutta and Bombay. Last fall there were renewed cries of famine. This year emergency aid is almost doubling our food shipments.

GOVERNMENT STRANGLEHOLD

One reason is that India's government-controlled plants have been able to provide Indian farmers with only three pounds of fertilizer an acre—as compared with 21 pounds in Russia, 59 pounds in the United States, 271 pounds in Japan. Yet until recently the Indian government refused to allow foreign capital and private enterprise to take any major part in invigorating this industry. And even now bureaucratic red tape and foot-dragging are such a handicap that Nelson White, president of International Minerals and Chemical Corp., recently testified that a plant which would take 18 months to build in the United States will take him more than six years to build in India.

In other fields, too, investors are eager to bring in capital, know-how and management. They could make up the shortage of pesticides in a country where rats and other pests devour as much as ten percent of the grain, where plant disease takes an incalculable toll. Instead, the government is proposing to strip existing manufacturers of their patent rights. The bureaucratic stranglehold grips local businessmen also. As one Indian business executive told me, "All these years the government has attached very little importance to investment—only to government loans by AID."

The United States has already sunk more than $7 billion in public aid to India. Its Minister of Planning recently requested an increase in world economic aid to $1.6 billion a year, with the U.S. share to be about $1.2 billion, a sharp boost over our previous commitments. Last March, Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, pleaded here that donors be tolerant and not impose conditions which would upset ancient India. But can we continue indefinitely pouring billions of dollars into a country in ways that prove inadequate and unsuccessful?

OUT THE BACK DOOR

Consider also the Food for Peace record in Egypt. While receiving nearly $1 billion worth of U.S. food, President Nasser has spent his own government's money to import Soviet and Czech arms, to hire German scientist to build rockets, and to send a 70,000-man invasion army into tiny Yemen. At one point, while we were putting $175 million worth of food through Egypt's front door, Nasser was sending $41 million worth of rice to Russia, Cuba, Red China and other communist countries. Another time we delivered $23,700,000 worth of corn for free distribution to Egyptians supposedly suffering a famine due to failure of the local crop. Our General Accounting Office later discovered that there was no evidence of crop failure and that nearly half the corn was not distributed free, but sold for the account of the Egyptian government.

Congress time and again has adopted legislation designed to cut off aid to Nasser. Time and again the executive branch has indicated that it would be cut off. Yet in spite of Nasser's deals with the communists, in spite of his telling us to take our aid and go jump in the sea, our food subsidy still goes to him year in and year out.

Blundering administration of our food program has led to waste and worse. The Greek government publicly advised its farmers to replace wheat with other cash crops, since Uncle Sam would take care of Greece's wheat needs. One South American country appealed for "temporary" Food for Peace disaster relief because of a flood; instead, it got a massive fivefold increase of food which continues unabated years later. While we fed Italians through Food for Peace charity grants, Italy exported so much macaroni to Britain that London newspapers complained of dumping. Indonesia's Sukarno was able to mortgage his nation's economy to pay for $1.1 billion worth of Soviet arms for military forays, because we were helping to feed his people.

COOLEY LOANS

Thus many countries neglect their agriculture and shift their food needs to Uncle Sam while they divert their own resources to various economic and military adventures. This results in large part from the mechanism we have used to pass along most of our Food for Peace. We "sell" it for the recipient country's own currency. Then we turn most of this paper back to the same government for its own use.

The futility of this approach led Congress in 1957 to insist that part of this foreign currency be put to work in loans to businessmen, both American and native, for agricultural and industrial development. Named after Chairman Harold Cooley of the House Agriculture Committee, these "Cooley loans" have enabled Purina to build an animal-feed plant in Colombia, John Deere to manufacture tractors and farm implements in Mexico, Pfizer to produce pharmaceuticals in Taiwan. They have financed manufacture of silos, corrugated board and petroleum by-products in Israel; fertilizer, steel and tires in Turkey; poultry farming and hotels in Pakistan; cattle ranches in Paraguay.

Such loans constitute foreign aid that succeeds where giveaways have failed. But jealous administrators, both American and foreign, eye the Cooley program as competition for their own government-run projects and so fail to enforce it. As of June 30, 1964, only a paltry three percent of the foreign currencies derived from Food for Peace transactions had been loaned to businessmen; 65 percent was handed back as gifts or soft loans for pet government spending schemes.

Two years ago the Senate Agriculture Committee angrily noted that "this record is not responsive to expectations." So Congress amended the law to require that our food currency be employed "to the maximum usable extent" for Cooley loans. Yet last spring the House Agriculture Committee protested that the intent of Congress had been ignored in case after case.

The United States "sold" the Philippine government $12 million worth of food, but offered only a meager ten percent to businessmen. Nasser has been allowed to get by with just a single free-enterprise loan. A sampling of 19 Food for Peace sales agreements showed that none provided more than 15 percent of our foreign currency for private enterprise.

IT CAN WORK

Clearly, it is time for Congress and the American people to compel realism on the part of our food-aid administrators. Our generosity will prove but a prelude to disaster unless we face—and force our food-aid recipients to face—these facts:

We are already on the brink of global famine. Thousands of people die of starvation and malnutrition every day, and more than half the world goes to bed hungry every night. Yet in five years the world's population will have increased by another 285 million, and within 35 years it will have more than doubled, from 3.3 to 7.4 billion. Of these people, six billion will live in countries where already four out of every five subsist on deficient diets.

Even the bounty of American agriculture cannot continue to stave off mass starvation. Last March, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman told a Senate committee that by 1985 the food needs of 66 developing countries will be so great that the United States cannot possibly fill the gap, even if we farm every arable acre at full capacity.

Those countries depending on us to make up their food needs must be compelled to devote their principal efforts to development of their own agricultural resources. The United States should not be burdened with the responsibility of determining who starves and who survives. For the good of all, we must insist that in the emerging countries a greater share of our Food for Freedom and foreign aid go for agriculture. They must devote more of their own budgets to food production and agricultural research. We must encourage vocational education to train farmers and agricultural technicians. We must insist that private incentive replace repressive taxation and regulation. We must further urge freedom for private industry so that agriculture will be a part of a balanced, growing economy.

To this end, we should require all aid legislation and executive action to fulfill the following conditions already defined by the House Agriculture Committee: "A proper climate for private initiative and investment should include, among other things, provision for maximum private ownership and initiative in new and existing industry, nondiscriminatory treatment between the public and private sectors, rates of taxation designed to promote maximum utilization of private investment capital, and adequate protection of industrial property rights."

Food for Freedom *can* be made to work, and untold millions of people *can* be saved. But this is possible only if we keep the executive branch under constant pressure to recommend such economic reforms forcefully and to stand ready to cut off food aid to those countries that ignore them.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Washington metropolitan area is encountering a growing problem of traffic congestion. Anyone who drives to work each morning and struggles to return home every evening can appreciate the difficulties of which I speak.

I was a cosponsor of the legislation which authorized a basic rapid rail transit system in the District of Columbia. Final planning for this system is now going forward on schedule.

Now as the Montgomery County Sentinel points out, the House and Senate must act to assure the orderly continuation of this system.

As a cosponsor, together with my distinguished colleagues from Maryland and Virginia, of legislation which would create the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority I urge the Senate to act favorably on this measure during this session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to place this timely editorial in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Montgomery County Sentinel, Aug. 4, 1966]

TRAFFIC CHAOS

President Johnson on June 9 made the following statement:

"In 1950, nearly three quarters of the (Washington Metropolitan) area lived within the boundaries of the District of Columbia. By 1970, however, that situation will be almost totally reversed. At that time, there will be an estimated 1,688,000 citizens living in our Maryland and Virginia suburbs—67 percent of the area's swelling population. Even today, this shifting population is creating massive traffic problems, with more than a million automobiles entering and leaving our city every 24 hours. Even with a full mass transit system—on a regional basis—that figure is expected to double by 1985. Without such a system, a complete breakdown in area transportation would be only a matter of time. We simply cannot allow that to happen. Our goal—the goal of both the Congress and the Administration—must continue to be a regional system of rapid rail transit."

The President made the statement in his message to Congress asking approval of the Interstate Transit Compact which would permit Maryland, Virginia and the District to plan a regional rapid transit system through the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).

Full compliance with the President's request is imperative on the part of Congress if a nightmarish situation is to be avoided here. Any delay on the part of Congress will delay that much longer this critically needed program. If suburbanites ever wrote their Congressmen, now is the time to do it. Traffic strangulation and chaos are approaching unless it is headed off—now.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the July 22, 1966, issue of the London Daily Telegraph carries a thoughtful article by Mr. Frank Robertson entitled "Vietnam: Optimism and Reality." Mr. Robertson underscores a number of significant developments in the Vietnamese war including the following observation:

> There are now strong indications that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese are reverting to phase one of their three-phase scheme of operations, breaking up into small units most of the time to wage guerrilla warfare.

Mr. Robertson points up the difficulty of waging a successful military effort against the Vietcong guerrillas at a time when economic, political, and social factors in the struggle are so unstable and uncertain. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM: OPTIMISM AND REALITY

(By Frank Robertson)

SAIGON.—America's mid-term elections in November cast a curious shadow over the war in Vietnam. For political purposes President Johnson has generated a degree of optimism over the war's progress that is far from justified.

There are now strong indications that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese are reverting to phase one of their three-phase scheme of operations, breaking up into small units most of the time to wage guerrilla warfare. This applies particularly to the Viet Cong, who know the country and its people so much better than the Northern invaders.

It is a pattern that must be particularly disturbing to Gen. Westmoreland, the American commander, massively equipped to fight a more conventional war. Devastating air power and the ability to air-lift three or more battalions count for little unless large bodies of the enemy can be found.

American air cavalrymen operating in the central province of Phu Yen found very few Viet Cong or Northerners after punishing weeks combing twisting valleys and steep hills. Yet it is believed that the enemy was assembling a division in this region.

QUICK RESULTS

The same is true of another long-established Viet Cong province, Phuoc Tuy, northeast of Saigon. Here the Australian task force has turned up only a few score Viet Cong after two months of rigorous effort in swamplands and overgrown rubber plantations drenched by heavy rain.

In recent weeks Washington has tempered its public optimism. But American military and civilian officials here remain under the heaviest pressure to produce bright results "immediately if not sooner," and inevitably this has led to some misrepresentation of the course of events, even to correspondents on the scene.

It is a blurred picture at best. The military segment is brightest, but this is a purely relative assessment considering the apparent change in Communist tactics.

The economy is in a most precarious state. Public dissatisfaction with the heavy increase in the price of food in recent weeks is widespread, and probably felt more keenly than the need to struggle against fellow Vietnamese said to be Communists.

This has a direct and disruptive bearing on political stability, the necessary requisite for success. Marshal Ky, the young Prime Minister, has confounded doubters and critics by remaining in power for over a year, but inflation can only strengthen the position of the lay and religious politicians working against him, and what is more dangerous, increased public apathy.

There is no doubt that the American troops, in particular, are doing well, but driving the enemy underground cannot produce victory. The Communists have time on their side, a fact driven home by the statement of President Ho Chi Minh that the Communists will fight for 20 years if necessary.

Allied intelligence puts enemy strength at 157 battalions, each of from 300 to 500 men. Of this number more than 60 battalions are from the North.

Last October the North Vietnamese sent thousands of engineers into Laos to improve the road network leading to South Vietnam, and for three or four months before the south-west monsoon began in May 1,500 lorries were in use transporting troops and supplies. It is believed that the infiltration rate then reached a peak of 10,000 men a month.

Now it is back around the 4,000 mark. No doubt American raids on lines of communications in the North, and greatly increased attacks on the road in Laos, have had some effect, but bad weather is the principal factor.

In the northern provinces of South Vietnam 50 percent of the enemy troops are North Vietnamese. In the centre including the highlands, they account for 65 percent, of the so-called main force—that is, excluding militia. There are no Northerners in the southern delta, and they make up on only 10 percent, of the forces in the provinces around Saigon.

By no means all of these are regulars of the calibre of the men who stormed Dien Bien Phu. Many are conscripts, and a lot are homesick lads of 15 or 16. For this reason at least one American divisional commander believes that seasoned Viet Cong units are tougher opponents than the mixed battalions from the North.

Morale certainly is lower among the Northern conscripts, as the rising number of prisoners testifies. There is a great deal of sickness, wounded are not repatriated and there is no system of rotation, which has led to the bitter statement found in not a few diaries: "born in the North to die in the South."

It is estimated that supplies, including food, fall 50 per cent short of requirements. This situation can only become worse as the southwest rains increase.

TACTICAL SLOGAN

Obviously the enemy badly needs a victory to boost morale, preferably against the Americans. Where he will try for this is a matter of conjecture.

The main areas of Communist concentration are north of Hué, the central highlands, the two central coastal provinces of Quang Ngai and Binh Dinh, and the province of Phu Yen, which long has been dominated by the Viet Cong, and is a principal source of rice. It is estimated that the enemy control at least 70 per cent of the nation's rice production.

The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese have a tactical slogan known as "four quick and one slow." The slow step involves careful intelligence work and sophisticated planning, stockpiling of ammunition, food and medicine, and meticulous rehearsal.

This is followed by a rapid advance and assault, fast clearing of the battlefield and, if necessary, quick withdrawal. Gen. Westmoreland's strategy is to search out and strike the enemy during the slow period of preparation, thus keeping him off balance, and this appears to be working.

But it is a long slow process, at which the allies work continuously. The American 101st Brigade, for example, has spent only four weeks in base camp since it arrived one year ago. Optimists who predict an end to the war in six months overlook the fact that only 2.4 per cent of the territory that the Communists held a year ago has been regained and secured.

Nor do the optimists consider the awfully high civilian casualty rate, possibly because it is not discussed either in Washington or Saigon. In the Da Nang area, for example, the American Marines have killed 2,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese since they arrived more than a year ago.

During that time the provincial hospital in Da Nang has treated almost 10,000 civilian battle casualties (many of them wounded by Viet Cong mines). The Vietnamese are an astonishingly stoic people, but this casualty rate, coupled with war weariness, certainly does not stiffen the will to fight.

At a time when the allies are said to be winning the war, depressed morale has caused increased desertion from South Vietnam's Regular Army. More Government troops are slipping away from their units now than ever before, despite recent pay increases.

VARYING QUALITY

But here again the picture is not sharply defined. During the first six months of 1966 9,500 Viet Cong soldiers came over to the Government, against 4,000 for the same period of 1965.

The performance of Government forces is uneven. Some battalions are very good indeed, while others are at the other end of the scale.

They have increased their strength by 30 battalions in the past year, and for what it's worth they have carried out 3,300 operations involving at least one battalion so far this year. But again, the fact that large numbers of the officers and men of the First Division sided with the Buddhists in Hué during the anti-Government demonstrations cannot be overlooked.

The Australians are breaking in two new battalions, which include a fairly high percentage of National Servicemen, and although they have been on several operations, they have not really begun to function effectively. Obviously they will be pressed to live up to the reputation established by the professional battalion they replaced.

The South Koreans, after a painful first few months adjusting to guerrilla tactics (their war had been fought largely from trenches), have become an efficient fighting force, soon to be augmented by a Second Division. Their civic action programme is one of the best in the country.

In purely military terms it is fair to say that the allies are winning whenever and wherever they find the enemy. Gen. Westmoreland accurately assessed the present position when he said: "If the military aspects of the war could be separated from the political, social and economic—and they can't—we've come a long way in a year."

On present evidence final victory, if it is possible at all, will take many more years.

DOVES VERSUS HAWKS CLARIFIED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, with all the controversy among doves and hawks these days, I am confident that Members of the Senate will enjoy a passing note by a distinguished ornithologist about the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Washington Post of August 8, 1966, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Doves Versus Hawks Clarified

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and a man who knows his birds, says doves are more bloodthirsty than hawks.

True hawks, the noted ornithologist said recently, are sensible, full of wisdom and not ferocious. He added that studies of animal behavior show doves to be cruel and insensate and far more bloodthirsty.

But it is not expected that this latest authoritative contribution to the hawk-dove debate on Vietnam will change any congressional opinions—or labels.

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY, COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President of all the groups in this country who deserve our thanks and our attention, perhaps the Disabled American Veterans rank at the top of the list. These men have made a sacrifice for their country—each of them has suffered an injury for his country. Many have lost arms or legs.

The retiring commander of the Disabled American Veterans is a Baltimorean, an outstanding attorney and citizen, and a good friend of mine. He is Claude L. Callegary, and he has done an outstanding job as national commander.

Yesterday's Baltimore Sun contained an article on Claude Callegary's achievements in this important position. As the article pointed out, he has visited every State in the Union, and traveled to Vietnam as well, during the past year.

Mr. Callegary deserves congratulations for a job well done. I ask unanimous consent that this Baltimore Sun article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Veterans' Affairs

(By Henry J. Knoch)

On the walls of the office of Claude L. Callegary, and on the desk and in innumerable drawers, are mementoes of his tenure as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans. But the one that reveals the extent of his efforts in behalf of the D.A.V. is the "over 500,000 miles" plaque awarded by United Airlines.

The 44-year-old Baltimore attorney, who rose from the rank of sergeant in the Army to the national commander of the D.A.V., has visited every state in the Union, including Hawaii and Alaska, in the past year, and was the first commander of a veterans' organization to go to Vietnam. He not only visited the hospitals caring for the GI's, but saw the South Vietnamese wounded in their hospital, as well.

Mr. Callegary's primary interest is the disabled veterans, but his organization was the motivating force in the new GI bill which extended the benefits to all veterans who served in the armed forces since 1955, instead of 1964, as proposed by the President.

ON STAFF FOUR YEARS

A school dropout at the age of 13, who later returned to class and became a lawyer, Mr. Callegary has served on the National D.A.V. staff for four years and is today presiding in New York at the annual national convention, which continues until Saturday, where he will hand down his mantle as commander.

Mr. Callegary is accompanied on many of his journeys by his wife, Catherine (she has been awarded a 100,000-mile plaque by the airline) and the pair has been frequent guests of President Johnson at the White House and at the President's Texas ranch. He is often called into conference by Government leaders to discuss programs pertaining to veterans and just recently was named to the State Veterans Commission by Governor Tawes.

The commander is a goodwill ambassador for Maryland on his trips. He never misses an opportunity to publicize the State, presenting a facsimile of "The Star-Spangled" to the governors, mayors and other dignitaries, as well as pens from Governor Tawes and pictures of the State House with a message from the top executive.

SURVIVED PLANE CRASH

Mr. Callegary enlisted in the Army in 1941 and served in the Aleutian Islands during the Japanese attacks. He later saw service in the South Pacific and was also assigned to Biak in the Netherlands East Indies, where his plane crashed. Mr. Callegary was one of three survivors of the fourteen men aboard the plane, and was unconscious fourteen days. After hospitalization in the area he was returned to St. Petersburg, Fla., for treatment of severe burns and other injuries. It was there that he took the Army's general education development test and because of his extensive reading and studying since he was a "forced" dropout (he left school after the seventh grade to help support his family) Mr. Callegary received unusually high grades.

Mr. Callegary was one of the first students admitted to the University of Maryland without having finished grade school or having attended high school. After two years at College Park he transferred to law school in Baltimore where after two years he took the Maryland State Bar examination and passed it in the top ten of his class.

He opened his law practice in January, 1950, and continued in law school to obtain his law degree in June of 1950. In the meantime he married Catherine Briggs, of Oklahoma, a fellow-student at University of Maryland, and the couple has six children, three girls and three boys. Their eldest son, who is 18, has a premed scholarship to the University of Maryland.

Mr. Callegary was joined in the law practice by his brother, Raymond, who recently was named judge advocate at the State convention of the American Legion. Claude's new position with D.A.V. will be a member of the National Executive Committee for one year.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 179 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Califorina [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the Senator from Louisiana has the floor, following the quorum call.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the next committee amendment be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, beginning with line 13, it is proposed to strike the following language:

STATE MAY IMPOSE SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2) the State law may provide that to be eligible for extended compensation an individual must have had a number of weeks (specified in such law, but not to exceed twenty-six weeks) of covered employment in his base period (or a specified wage or work history which is the substantial equivalent).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Friday the Senate voted on amendment No. 177 and adjourned before there was a chance to move to reconsider and then to move to table that motion. I now move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the last amendment, on Friday.

Mr. CURTIS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business now is the committee amendment which has been stated. The Senator's motion to reconsider would not be in order while other business is pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would it be in order after we dispose of this committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As soon as it is disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to agreeing to this committee amendment, but I ask for recognition immediately after this committee amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, even though the committee amendment is the pending question, that it be in order at this time to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the motion of the Senator from Delaware would be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate rejected the last amendment considered on Friday.

Mr. CURTIS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. Will a vote "yea" sustain the amendment that was made Friday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" will be a vote to table the motion to reconsider the vote on the amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. On what amendment are we voting to reconsider?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The last amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have forgotten which one it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The last amendment which was acted on by the Senate was defeated by a rollcall vote of 43 to 38. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] then moved to reconsider that vote; but before his motion could be acted upon, the Senate adjourned.

I have moved that we reconsider that vote, and the Senator from Nebraska has moved to table that motion. I merely desire to clear up the action on that particular amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Further debate is not in order.

In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Florida, the Chair will state that the question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 29 of the printed bill, lines 8 through 14, was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will a "yea" vote sustain the vote that is now being moved to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if we wish the vote to stand, we vote "yea," and if we wish the vote to be reconsidered, we vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Chair restate where the amendment appears in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, the vote on which the Senate is asked to reconsider, and on which the motion to table has been made, is on page 29 of the printed bill, lines 8 through 14.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the rollcall has been answered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rollcall is in progress. The clerk will proceed with the rollcall.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Allott
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Nelson
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—36

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
Metcalf
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Bartlett
Bennett
Dodd
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
Mondale
Murphy
Muskie
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So, Mr. CURTIS' motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 29, lines 8 through 14, was rejected, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the pending committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senate what I was denied the right to explain prior to the time the amendment was voted on. Had I been permitted to offer the amendment, I would have moved merely to amend what the committee was offering, to provide that 39 weeks of work would entitle a person to 26 weeks of benefits. Forty-one States and the District of Columbia already do that.

I gave the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] unanimous consent that he might displace me on the floor to make a motion to reconsider. I regret that he would not agree to a unanimous-consent request for me to have 2 minutes time to explain what I had in mind. But that is all right.

Mr. President, what is the next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment found on page 35 of the bill, to strike out lines 13 through 19, as follows:

> STATE MAY IMPOSE SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT
>
> (b) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the State law may provide that to be eligible for extended compensation an individual must have had a number of weeks (specified in such law, but not to exceed twenty-six weeks) of covered employment in his base period (or a specified wage or work history which is the substantial equivalent).

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is a conforming amendment. It conforms to the committee's decision to allow full Federal financing of the extended benefits provided in both the House and committee bills.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina will state it.

Mr. ERVIN. What is the amendment under consideration now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is found on page 35 of the printed bill. It is a committee amendment which would strike out lines 13 through 19.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is a conforming amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is more or less a conforming amendment. The next major amendment will come on page 41 when we make a decision as to the financing of the extended benefits. The question will then arise as to whether the extended benefits will be paid one-half by the State and one-half by the Federal Government, as has been done heretofore, or whether it will all be a Federal cost. That is the next question. In the meantime, there are three or four more or less minor conforming amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment is necessary to conform the language to the committee bill. If the House bill is going to be substituted for the Senate committee bill, then this language would not be necessary. Both bills provide that there would be extended benefits of 13 weeks in the event of a recession on a statewide basis, or a nationwide basis. Under the committee bill, if the person had as much as 20 weeks of work in a base period, he would be entitled to an additional 13 weeks, in the event of a recession within the State or in the event of a nationwide recession. Under the House bill, the State could require as much as 26 weeks, in order for a worker to receive extended benefits.

The approach of the Senate committee bill is that the Federal Government will finance the extended benefit cost entirely.

Under the House bill, the State because of its 50-percent financial sharing of benefits might require 26 weeks in order for a person to be eligible for 13 weeks of extended benefits.

But, since the committee version provides full Federal financing, this is merely a conforming amendment to the Senate text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before we vote, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the Senator in charge of the bill, to refer to page 17580 of Friday's Congressional Record. The Senator from Louisiana offered an amendment in which it was proposed to strike out lines on the bottom of page 28 and on the top of page 29, and then insert new matter.

I believe what the Senator had in mind was not to strike that out, but to insert the new matter on page 29.

Frankly, I do not know who put this bill together. It seems to me that we are in a state of confusion over it. It would occur to me that possibly the best thing that could happen to this bill, if it is going to have any chance at all, is for it to be sent back to the committee and let the——

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I cannot hear a thing. May we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Chair might state that the Chair is informed the Senator from Illinois has pointed out a mistake in the Record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have nothing to go by except what the Record discloses——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Record is correct——

Mr. DIRKSEN. It says very plainly, "Strike and insert the following." That makes it more or less meaningless to me. I do not know what we can do to straighten this thing out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment adopted was to strike out language on page 28, lines 24 and 25, and continuing to strike on page 29, lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

The Senator from Louisiana offered a substitute proposal which was adopted. It is clear in the Record what we did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if Senators will read the Record, it will be clear what the amendment I offered and which was accepted by the Senate, provides. Furthermore, there is no problem insofar as the Journal is concerned. As Senators well know, we are not bound by what is said in the Congressional Record, but we are bound by what is written in the Journal. It is clear in the Record what I was trying to do. It had been pointed out that the amendment was not in order, because it was offered at the wrong place. Consequently I merely modified it to carry it along for a few more lines in the bill.

If Senators will read what I stated in the Record, it is as follows:

> Mr. Long of Louisiana. I modify my amendment to simply make that amendment come at another place. The amendment we are getting ready to vote on ends at line 23, does it not?
>
> The Presiding Officer. It ends at line 24.
>
> Mr. Long of Louisiana. It begins at line 24. Where does it end?
>
> The Presiding Officer. Line 7, page 29.
>
> Mr. Long of Louisiana. If I may modify my amendment to make it come at the end of the same line, line 7, would it not be in order?
>
> The Presiding Officer. The amendment would be in order as an amendment to the committee amendment.
>
> Mr. Long of Louisiana. I so modify my amendment.

The Record shows stricken out matter which I did not propose to strike. But the Journal which is the official record reflects otherwise; and it is the Journal that prevails. The Congressional Record is not official.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not advised as to what the Journal shows, in the first place. Secondly, if we cannot rely on the Record at this time, do we rely on it subsequently at a later time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Journal reads as follows:

> The question then being on agreeing to the next committee amendment on page 28, line 24, through line 7 on page 29.
>
> Pending debate,
>
> The pending committee amendment was amended on the motion of Mr. Long of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Bartlett) on page 29, line 7, after the semicolon, by inserting certain words relating to certain certifications by the Secretary of Labor to the secretaries of state of the various States.
>
> Pending debate,
>
> The question being taken on agreeing to the pending committee amendment, on page 28, line 24, through line 7 on page 29, as amended, viz, insert the following:
>
> "(B) the State law shall provide that the weekly benefit amount of any eligible individual for a week of total unemployment shall be (i) an amount equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, or (ii) the State maximum weekly benefit amount (exclusive of allowances with respect to dependents) payable with respect to such week under such law, whichever is the lesser;"

Then there is the further statement of the printed amendment.

The remainder of the amendment printed in the Journal is as follows:

> Sec. 3309(a) Certification.—
>
> (1) On October 31, 1968, and October 31 of each calendar year thereafter the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary each State whose law he finds
>
> (A) is in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) and has been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the four-month period ending on October 31) and that there has been substantial compliance with such State law requirements during such period;
>
> (B) contains a benefit formula with respect to which the State agency has established as of July 1 of the applicable calendar year accords with the conditions of subsection (d).
>
> (2) The Secretary of Labor shall not withhold his certification to the Secretary unless, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearings to the State agency, he finds
>
> (A) that the State law is not in accord with the requirements of subsection (c) or has not been in accord with such requirements for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on such October 31 (except that for 1968, it shall be the four-month period ending on October 31) or that there has been a failure to comply substantially with such State law requirements during such period; or
>
> (B) that the State agency has not established as of July 1 of the calendar year that the benefit formula in its State law is in accord with the conditions of subsection (d). For any State which is not certified under this subsection on any October 31, the Secretary of Labor shall within ten days thereafter notify the Secretary of the reduction in the credit allowable to taxpayers subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State pursuant to section 3302(c)(4).
>
> (d) Alternative Conditions.—
>
> The State agency shall establish on July 1 of each calendar year after 1967, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor, that the benefit formula contained in the State law as of such July 1 and for substantially all of the twelve-month period ending on the immediately preceding June 30, would have had the result, for the immediately preceding calendar year (had such calendar year been their base period), of providing at least

> 65 percent of all individuals in covered employment in the State with a weekly benefit amount of at least 50 percent of each such individual's average weekly wage and at least 80 percent of all such individuals with a total benefit amount of at least 26 times each such individual's weekly benefit amount.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say that language was added to my amendment. I am sure this was done in good faith. It was, "On page 28 to strike out line 24" and so forth. That language was added. The language that was at the desk was in error, but I modified my amendment, as shown by the Journal, and the whole intent is shown by the colloquy in the RECORD. The only thing that confused it was that someone added language which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but does not appear in the Journal. Such language is in error. But what we adopted is in the Journal, and that is the official record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, we have no occasion to examine the Journal. We have to rely each morning on the RECORD, because it comes to our office or our homes. So it becomes our bible. Maybe there should be a little togetherness between the Journal and the RECORD. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the only record we get.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senate does not approve the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It never has. It includes a running account of what happens, sometimes erroneously, but we do not approve the RECORD, only the Journal, and that is the official record. I do not know what happened. But there is an error in three lines. How it got into the RECORD I do not know.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the committee amendment on page 35, lines 13 through 19.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish someone would tell me what the effect of the amendment is, in simple language, so anyone can understand it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the Senate bill there is provision that after 20 weeks a person is entitled to draw some benefits. There is a further provision that in the event of a recession by national standards in the Nation or in the event of a recession in the State an additional 13 weeks of benefits shall be provided.

The House bill provided an option to the State under which they could require 26 weeks of work for a worker to receive extended benefits. The Senate bill provides for extension of benefits after 20 weeks of work. The reason for the optional 26 weeks of work requirement in the House version was that the States were paying half the cost of extended benefit coverage. The Senate version provides for benefits available after 20 weeks of work, but the Federal Government would pay the entire cost.

This amendment merely establishes that by extending the benefits to a worker in the event of a recession, after he achieves eligibility on the basis of 20 weeks of work.

Mr. ERVIN. I thought the Senator had modified his amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not this portion. That has nothing to do with this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Whatever appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is in print the following day, before we know what is in it. This happened before I knew about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I understand that the House bill provided for 26 weeks of services to be required before the 13 weeks added pay goes into effect?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The House bill says the State may require 26 weeks. It may make it available after 20 weeks of work in a base period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the committee's proposal?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. After 20 weeks of work a person is eligible for extended benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the difference between the House bill and the committee bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the 20 weeks mandatory or permissive?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mandatory, but the Federal Government has to pay the whole thing. Under the House bill a 26 week requirement is optional, and the State and the Federal Government pay half each.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I must admit the discussion is still confusing. Does this mean whether or not a State allows 26 weeks, in the event this bill is passed, if there is a statewide or national recession, the Federal Government will foot the bill for 20 weeks in any event?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For the extended benefits. We are talking about the addtional 13 weeks of benefit payments.

Mr. PASTORE. Some States allow up to 26 weeks. Some States allow up to 20 weeks. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. In order to get full Federal participation, does the bill mean there can be extended benefits even in a State that allows 20 weeks, beginning with the 20th week, in a statewide recession. Does it mean that? If not, please tell us what it does mean.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Right now we do not know under the House version whether a State would follow the Federal duration standard or not. Under the committee version after a person had received all the benefits he is entitled to under the State law, he would be entitled to extended benefits of up to 13 weeks.

Mr. PASTORE. If so, in a State that allowed 20 weeks, he would get 33 weeks, and in a State that allowed 26 weeks, he would get 26 plus 13, or 39 weeks. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. If it were the desire of the Senate to maintain the House bill, then we would not strike this section out. The only reason it is proposed that we strike it out is to conform with some other things which the committee did.

Perhaps Senators wish to go back to the House bill. I generally believe we ought to, for various reasons, one of which is that the State unemployment commissioners, at their conventions, not once but three different times, indicated they wanted the House bill. It is already a generous bill. The House bill extends coverage to 2,300,000 additional people.

The Senate committee has outdone the House bill and has increased benefits available by $250 million and achieves this increase by mandatory instructions to the State commission as Federal standards.

That is where the committees bill has gotten in trouble.

Mr. PASTORE. How do we add it? I mean, no one has yet explained precisely what the Senate bill does. All I have heard here is that the Senate version may be better, or the House version may be better, and that we are conforming. Conforming to what?

Mr. SMATHERS. The committee bill applies the Federal standards irrespective of what the law is in a certain State. In some States, for instance, if you work 20 weeks, you get only 11 weeks coverage. The Senate bill says you are eligible regardless what coverage the State may grant by requiring coverage for a minimum of 26 benefit weeks for 20 weeks of work in any base period.

In addition to that, the Senate version provides a minimum benefit of 50 percent of whatever the wage is. If a cornet player in Florida or California was making $1,000 a week for playing in a band and became unemployed, he would be entitled to 50 percent of his average weekly wage as the committee bill now stands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute——

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me finish. He would be entitled to 50 percent of his average weekly wage. Again, it is setting a Federal standard for what has been historically a State prerogative. The States have been doing this themselves for the past 31 years. Why? Because some States are industrial, some have higher wage rates than other States. Idaho does not have the same rate as New York. Missouri does not have the same rate as Florida. The idea was, in this Federal-State partnership which has been going on for 31 years, that they would allow the States to administer the program and in so doing to establish benefit amounts, duration, and eligibility standards.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean to tell me that if that coronet player he is talking about, whether he comes from Florida or California, makes a thousand dollars a week, he is entitled to $500 a week in unemployment compensation?

Mr. SMATHERS. Not necessarily. It is possible under the bill as it now is before the Senate. But there are two provisions which say he is entitled to 50 percent of what he is making, or 50 percent of the statewide average weekly whichever is less. Obviously it cannot fall below 50 percent in either case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point. Fifty percent of the individual's past earnings, but not to exceed 50 percent of the average earnings for the entire State. So if the average earnings in a given State were $125, and this man earned $1,000, the most he could get would be $62.50.

Mr. SMATHERS. If that man had been making only $30 in another State. I would say to the Senator from Rhode Island it is possible that he could be getting $62.50 in a higher benefit State. He could be getting more unemployed than employed.

Mr. PASTORE. Under which version?

Mr. SMATHERS. Under the Senate Finance Committee bill as it has been amended by the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean to tell me that a man earning $30 a week would end up getting unemployment compensation of $62?

Mr. SMATHERS. He could almost end up getting more, by the way it is figured. That is why we ought to do what the State administrators request us to do. I do not think they are being penurious or ungenerous.

Mr. PASTORE. If that were really true, I agree with the Senator from Illinois; maybe it ought to go back to committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator from Florida pointed out, this would be a conforming amendment, but that to which it would conform has been stricken from the bill. Therefore, no matter what action the Senate takes the conferees would have to reinstate it anyway because it is an important part of the House bill, and if we leave it out of both bills we have no bill at all.

In the light of what the Senate did on Friday, by striking out the language on pages 29 through 34 the adoption of this amendment striking this language would mean nothing. So to keep in step with what we have done heretofore the amendment should be passed over at this time. I am not making any great point about it because it is a side issue and the conferees would have no choice except to reinstate it, no matter what we do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment on page 36 conforms to an amendment which appears on page 41 in the bill. It has nothing to do with the language the Senate struck out of the bill on Friday. This is a proposal where the Federal Government would pay the entire cost of extended benefits that are to be provided under the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. But was the Senator from Florida correct when he said that, if a man who earns $30 a week becomes unemployed, if one-half the average salary in that particular State comes to $62 a week, that that man, who used to earn $30 a week when fully employed, will be paid $62? That sounds preposterous to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Florida is slightly in error. That man, under this bill, would be entitled to $15.

Mr. PASTORE. Fifteen dollars. That is a horse of a different color. That is what I have been trying to find out. The mathematical manipulations of the Senator from Florida have been puzzling, to say the least.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason is the benefits that worker would receive, under the requirements of this measure as it presently stands before us, would be 50 percent of his average wage, but not to exceed 50 percent of the average wage in the State. So, if a man is making $30 a week, and he is out of work, then his maximum benefit would be $15 as far as this bill is concerned. The State may have some minimum that might help him, but the Senate bill does not require that. He would be entitled to $15 if he had been making $30. If he had been making $100 a week, and the State average wage was $90 a week, then he would be entitled to $45 a week, since that amount is one-half of the State average.

So he is limited in two ways. He is limited to 50 percent of what he has been making; and, if he was making a good salary and the average wage in the State was less than that, he would be limited to one-half of what the State average is.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the way we have the bill drawn now—if a man in a low-paying State is making $60 a week when he works there, and he qualifies for unemployment compensation in a higher benefit State—he would be eligible for a much higher benefit than he would be entitled to receive if he had not moved to a higher benefit State?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has traveled a number of States. But coming back to the example given by the Senator from Florida, in the instance where the man was earning $1,000 a week. If in the State where he became unemployed one-half the average wage would be $62, that is all he would get—just $62—is that not so?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is right.

Mr. PASTORE. But, if he moved to another State, where one-half the average wage would be $100, in his particular case, because he had been making $1,000 a week, he might be entitled to $100. But that would not affect the man earning $30 a week; he would always be limited to $15, would he not?

Mr. SMATHERS. Not under some conditions. He could move to the State of California or the State of Florida, where the average pay was higher.

Mr. PASTORE. And he would get more than one-half of his own actual wage?

Mr. SMATHERS. I believe under these calculations he could get a higher benefit. But he cannot stay in the same State and do it. He cannot stay in his regular State and do that. To that extent, the Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is conceivable that one can work out a rather far reaching mathematical quirk where, under certain circumstances, a person might move from one State to another and receive a higher benefit than the amount he had been receiving in wages. But that gets very complicated. He has to have a base period of employment in the second State. It means he must have been there probably at least 3 months, and in most cases the base period is the first four of the last five quarters.

If one really gets out his slide rule and thinks up enough complexities, it may be possible to devise a situation in which such a thing could happen. That would not be the case if a man were available to be hired and no job is available.

The quirk that the Senator is talking about exists in the present law. We are not changing it. There is no difference between the two.

Insofar as that anomaly could work out, the main reason for doing it is because of the variations in State law which the committee bill tries to reduce.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, concerning the question raised by the Senator from Rhode Island, do I correctly understand that in any event the $30 a week man, or anybody else cannot draw more than 50 percent of his own average weekly wage no matter where he moved?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is all the bill requires. The Senator understands that the State of Wisconsin could go further than these Federal standards.

Mr. NELSON. My point is that an employee may draw 50 percent, as I understand it, of the average weekly wage paid in that State, or 50 percent of his own average weekly wage, whichever is the lower.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we propose to incorporate a standard in the bill that a State must provide that a person eligible to receive benefits will receive at least one-half of what his average weekly wage had been. The State would not be required to provide one cent above that under any conditions. The amount would not exceed one-half of the average wage paid in the State, so that if the Senator is talking about a man who has been making $30 a week, that man would be entitled to receive $15 a week if the pending bill becomes law.

If the man is making $200 a week and the average weekly rate in his State is approximately $110 a week—then he would be limited to $55 a week, which is one-half of what the average man receives in that particular State.

That man would not be receiving half of his average wage. He would be receiving about one-fourth of what his average wage had been.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator will agree that, at the instigation and at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in order to provide for those people who do move, we placed a section in the bill to provide that they could go from one State into another and qualify under the law in the State to which they moved their residence or in the State in which they became unemployed.

If the man became unemployed in the State of Connecticut, which has a high wage rate scale, he would then receive 50 percent of the average payment. He could have been making $1,000 a week, or $3,000. However, he can never receive above 50 percent of the average in the State in which he finally makes his claim for unemployment insurance. On the other hand, if the State average were low, a worker could improve his position considerably by moving to a high wage rate State.

These are some of the reasons why this body should reject Federal standards in this program. They are inequitable, unjust, discriminatory and without doubt will destroy the Federal-State relationship which exists.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is in error on his statement concerning the Ribicoff amendment. However, I wish the Senator would wait and let us tackle that amendment when we get to it.

I thought that we were going to vote on something to which there was no objection and simply agree to a conforming amendment under which the Senate bill takes the approach that the Federal Government would pick up the check for the extended benefits.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 35, strike out lines 13 through 19, as follows:
>
> "State May Impose Special Eligibility Requirement
>
> "(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the State law may provide that to be eligible for extended compensation an individual must have had a number of weeks (specified in such law, but not to exceed twenty-six weeks) of covered employment in his base period (or a specified wage or work history which is the substantial equivalent)."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment which is pending is a conforming amendment, but it is a conforming amendment to a committee amendment which has not been agreed to as yet. The Senator from Florida has pointed out the glaring inequities that could exist under the bill, and he is correct.

The limitation that what a man could draw would be limited to 50 percent of his average wage or 50 percent of the statewide average was included in a committee amendment which has been rejected. There are no standards in the bill.

I have been a member of the committee for several years, but I have never seen such a state of confusion in dealing with proposed legislation as that which exists now.

I think that in the interest of good legislation the bill should go back to the committee and then return to the Senate in a clearer form. There are now no standards in the bill as to how much a man must earn to qualify for benefits in these respective States To qualify for benefits it can be as little as $1 a week for 20 weeks in any of the 50 States as the bill now stands.

I think that when it is said that we will clean it up later, it is meant that it will be cleared up on the floor of the Senate with a lot of amendments, and we will not know what we are doing.

On Friday, we voted to strike out the language on page 28 from line 24 down through line 7 on page 29. We now hear that that was not intended, but still that is what the Senate did. We should not be voting on the basis of what we may or may not do tomorrow.

I was making no issue over the particular amendment. The conferees would have no choice except to reinstate the amendment, regardless of what the House did. Otherwise, we would have neither a Senate nor a House bill.

We are dealing with a lot of words here until we decide whether we want the State or the Federal Government to underwrite the cost of the program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I will not yield. I have the floor. I want to explain the situation and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

All of this confusion would be no problem if those Senators who wish to oppose certain amendments would permit us to proceed in an orderly fashion.

The orderly way to proceed would be to agree to the committee amendments en bloc and leave the matter open so that any Senator can offer any amendment he wants and explain anything that he wants to explain.

There is no more confusing way in which to approach the pending bill than to insist that we must take up the amendments separately. When we come to an amendment such as this one, one which merely conforms to any matter that is sought to be amended later in the bill; we are taking up a technical amendment. Objection has been made and we cannot pass this amendment and come back to it.

We would agree to the right of any Senator to move to strike it out. However, they say: "We will agree to some parts, but we will not agree to other parts of it." It becomes very confusing to me who wishes to proceed in an orderly fashion.

We are considering a conforming amendment. I ask unanimous consent that we might accept the pending amendment and consider it as original text, subject to the right of any Senator to object and move to strike it so that we may proceed to the original bill and see if we can finish the bill in an orderly manner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What is the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator restate his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask that the pending amendment be regarded as original text, subject to the right of any Senator to move to strike it out subsequently, if at some subsequent date the Senate decides that it cares to strike this conforming amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I object to that, but I make this suggestion: I agree with the Senator that if we are to adopt the language on page 41, which changes the formula for payments to the States, assuming that the Senate adopts the language, these would be conforming amendments. Why not pass over the amendments on page 35 temporarily, and move to page 41, and then lay down the amendments on page 41, beginning with line 7, over to line 4 on page 42?

As I understand, the basic problem is whether the States are to continue to pay one-half, as they have done heretofore, or whether the Federal Government is to pay all of it. If that issue is decided in the affirmative, the amendments about which we are talking would automatically be adopted. If that issue is rejected, those amendments should come out.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, no one is speaking. The Senator from Nebraska seeks recognition.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How long may a Senator hold the floor without using it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield at this moment.

It is my impression that we should have been offered an opportunity to vote on the remainder of the committee amendment that appears on line 15, page 29, after the Senate had rejected those lines that appear immediately prior to that. I ask whether I am correct in that impression. I ask that those six lines be voted on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a point of order. That amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that we have already stricken from the bill the portion beginning at line 15, on page 29, down through and including line 7 on page 34.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand, it is not in order for that amendment to be offered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order. We have to dispose of the committee amendment now pending.

Mr. McCARTHY. After disposing of the committee amendments we could return to this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question now is on the amendment on page 35, lines 13 through 19.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Chair state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. The pending amendment is on page 35, to strike out lines 13 through 19, inclusive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not at this time.

This is the amendment we have been discussing for some time. It provides that, assuming the Federal Government is to pay the whole cost of the bill as reported by the committee, the State would pay whatever regular benefit the State would owe under law, and the Federal Government would pay for the entire cost of extended benefits.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the pending amendment is agreed to, is that necessity based upon the assumption that the Federal Government would pay the full cost of the extended benefits?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the Senate should reject the amendment and require the States to pay half the cost of the extended benefits? Would the pending amendment then be necessary?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senate should subsequently refuse to go along with complete Federal financing, we would have to do one of two things: Either come back to reconsider this, or else we would have to work it out in conference.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, a vote on this now gives no alternative to those of us who are opposed to complete Federal financing of extended benefits.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has plenty of alternatives. I have not been denying anyone his rights. However the Senator proceeds is all right with me. We can either accept this as original text, so that anybody can change it, or else we can agree to it. In the event that we should not agree to the substantive amendment later in the bill, we can come back and change it.

I am attempting to accommodate the Senate. If Senators insist on proceeding piecemeal with these amendments, I shall do the best I can.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the Senator be willing to lay aside all amendments from pages 35 to 41 and then, out of order, proceed to consider the amendment beginning on page 41, line 7, which strikes out the words "one-half"—then there are a few other changes—but consider all the amendments on page 41, down to and including the amendment on page 42, line 4, which deals directly with the question of whether the State will pay 50 percent or the Federal Government will pay 100 percent? If we settle that issue in the affirmative or the negative then all the others will fall in as a pattern.

The difficulty in adopting some of these conforming amendments now, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, is that we would be voting on something that may not amount to much except that we would be adopting the principle.

I believe that it would be better to settle that one major issue now and then go back to page 35. The decisions then would be determined entirely upon what we had done on page 41. If the amendments on page 41 are defeated not even the chairman of the committee would desire the other amendments; and if they are not defeated I would agree that they should go into the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that appears on page 36, which is the pending amendment, be considered en bloc with those amendments that appear on pages 41 and 42.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as far as I personally am concerned I do not care, but I am not in a position to say that we could consider them en bloc. I have attempted to state my position. I believe that my suggestion would settle the issue.

I have conferred with the Senators on my side of the Chamber, and they are willing to vote en bloc on the amendments as they appear on pages 41 and 42, and I believe we would make better progress.

I see what the Senator from Louisiana is attempting to do. Personally I would be inclined to accept that, except that I do not have the authority to do so. We can, however, get the same vote on pages 41 and 42, because the issue is whether one-half is to be paid by the States or whether 100 percent is to be paid by the Federal Government. I believe that it would be better to proceed that way; I cannot give consent at this time to considering other amendments en bloc. I do not have the permission of the Senators on my side of the Chamber.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the hope that I understand what the Senator is proposing, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote en bloc on those amendments that appear on pages 41 and 42.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will subscribe to the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware, because I do not think it makes much difference. The Senator from Delaware is seeking to give himself the benefit of a doubt, in case of a tie vote, and I do not believe that we are that close, anyway. The Senator from Delaware is intending to put the weight against the Senator from Louisiana, but the only time it would actually work in favor of the Senator from Delaware would be if there were a tie vote.

I do not think it makes that much difference. I do not care which way it is done.

The only complaint is that we are getting away from formal procedure. If there is a tie vote the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] will have the advantage. I do not think it is that close to make that difference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is all right with me. What would the Senator propose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The suggestion that I made was on page 41, beginning with line 7, the amendment on line 7, including all of those amendments down to and including line 4 on page 42.

The Senator can check with the staff, but it is my understanding that those are the key amendments that should decide whether it will be 100 percent federally financed or 50 percent federally financed and 50 percent financed by the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for a unanimous-consent agreement that we pass over the amendment now under consideration, the amendment on page 35, and consider the amendment beginning on page 41?

The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment beginning on page 41.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 41, line 7, after the word "to", to strike out "one half of"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "sharable"; in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "sharable" and insert "reimbursable"; after line 15, to strike out:

"Sharable Extended Compensation

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(A), extended compensation paid to an individual for weeks of unemployment in such individual's eligibility period is sharable extended compensation to the extent that the aggregate extended compensation paid to such individual with respect to any benefit year does not exceed the smallest of the amounts referred to in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 202(d)(1)."

On page 42, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "Sharable" and insert "Reimbursable"; at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; in line 4, after the word "is" to strike out "sharable" and insert "reimbursable";

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering these amendments en bloc? Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider these amendments en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, these amendments involve the question of whether we want the Federal Government to pay for 13 weeks of extended benefits. The House bill would require the States to pay one-half and the Federal Government to pay one-half. This committee proposal provides full

Federal financing. The triggering device in both bills is the same.

Mr. PASTORE. Where does the money come from? Does it come from the General Treasury?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, the net Federal unemployment tax.

Mr. PASTORE. From the fund?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, payment of extended benefits from Federal extended benefit fund is provided for in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. By the Federal Government?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Federal Government. The reason for the full Federal financing for this part of the program is that if we establish national standards, as I hope we will for the basic 26-week period, it would increase the cost to the States. It would take a larger portion of that revenue which goes to the States and they would not have the money to pay 50 percent of the extended benefits.

What we are voting for is the House proposal for 13 weeks with the triggering device in the House bill.

The difference is that we would propose that this be paid for 100 percent out of the Federal revenue from the unemployment tax.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In 1961 we passed a bill providing for 13 weeks additional benefits during a recession period. It provided full Federal financing. The Senate voted 84 to 4 that the Federal Government would require the benefits and pay for the entire matter.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, what puzzles me a little about this is what I remember in 1961. I was not here at that time, but I remember it.

Is it not correct that when that occasion occurs, which would be an emergency situation, in which we provide 13 additional weeks of unemployment compensation, as the Congress did in 1961, if the Federal Government is paying a full 100 percent instead of paying on a 50-50 basis, that those States, and among them the richest of our States, highly industrialized, with the largest fluctuating employment situation, in a recession situation end up having the benefit of taxing more stable States with smaller industrial bases, and taxing those employers to pay unemployment, which is lesser than those which have a more stable employment situation? Is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wishes to assume that one State would necessarily be the victim of a recession and the other States would not, that would be correct.

Mr. NELSON. I am not assuming that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But if we proceed on the assumption that one cannot tell where a recession is likely to strike or who is likely to be hit the hardest, that would not be true.

If the Senator is saying, on the other hand, that he wants to use experience rating to pay for recession benefits one cannot predict.

Mr. NELSON. In the event of a general recession, and we had one in 1961, and one prior thereto by a few years, is it not correct that those heavily industrialized States end up with the greatest amount of unemployment? Therefore, those highly industrialized States end up paying larger proportions and taxing their employers more heavily to take care of a problem which may be greater in other parts of the United States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That could happen, but the whole idea of the insurance is that we are talking about a recession that might involve a part of the Nation or the entire Nation. The idea would be that a Federal tax that would apply equally across the United States. The Federal tax would carry the burden of providing these benefits to whatever State might be an unfortunate victim of the highest degree of unemployment.

Mr. CURTIS. This is one of the important benefits the Senate will have before it. We are asked here for permanent legislation to have the Federal Government assume the full burden of the extended benefits. I do not know whether any minds will be changed today, but I predict that if this amendment is adopted—and it was narrowly adopted in the Finance Committee—it will be but the beginning for Federal benefits, not controlled by the States. In subsequent Congresses we will be called upon to increase the amount, duration, and it will undoubtedly come from general funds.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that if this triggering device had been in effect in 1958 it would have had essentially the same effect as the temporary program the Congress adopted at that time.

The same thing was true when we set up the special benefit program in 1961. If we had had it, it would have been triggered in 1958 and 1961. We have had demonstrated what difference would have been accomplished twice before in 1958 and 1961.

Mr. CURTIS. We have done it on a temporary basis.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Then we must keep in mind that this is administered by State officials.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. And we are rejecting the well reasoned position of the House when we provided that if the State is going to administer it that they pay one-half of the cost.

Mr. McCARTHY. The triggering device in the bill is a national triggering device although under certain circumstances it may be triggered for an individual State. The States cannot decide if it is triggered or not at the national level.

Mr. CURTIS. But they can decide in which cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is decided by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of data and it is published in the Federal Register. I do not see how State administrators, if they decided to conspire about this, could be effective in any case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When a promised recession or depression breaks out it hits certain States unequally. The States with durable capital programs will have higher unemployment than the States which produce primarily consumer goods. Therefore, the States which have heavy capital industries will have higher rates of unemployment. This is not a vice on their part. It is not their fault, because of recessions and depressions, general in nature, outside of the individual plant, or outside of the individual industry. There is no virtue in the States which have low unemployment having their rate low. They just happen to be fortunate and have consumer goods, or, let us say, a retail trade. Therefore, since these recessions and depressions are national in origin, it seems to me only proper that the increase in the extra costs should be met nationally.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think that Members should clearly understand that we are voting on the question of whether the States will pay one-half or whether the Federal Government will pay all of it. That is, of course, the issue. But the very next vote which will come after this will be on the method of financing it, assuming that this amendment will be adopted.

While it is easy to speak of percentages we are dealing with $500 million. There is a big difference here. I refer Senators who question that statement to the amendment appearing on page 46 where $500 million is proposed to be stricken and the figure $1 billion inserted. Those Senators who are going to vote for the 100-percent Federal financing might just as well get ready to vote the extra $500 million later. Another vote comes up right after that which will provide for a method to raise this to $1 billion. That is an increase in the tax rate over and above the House bill.

The House bill already increases the tax rate to some extent because there are substantial benefits in the House bill. In 1967 both bills are the same, but in 1968 the average increase of the Senate bill over the House bill will be $29 per worker. That is an extra tax because we raise the rate from $3,000 as provided in the House bill to $3,900. At 3.3 percent, the figure would be around $29 per worker extra tax. Then under this bill, assuming that we have this Federal financing, it stays at that rate until 1972.

After the 1972 presidential elections, however, there is another $18 extra tax per worker to finance the proposal, so that altogether we will be voting on $500 million that we are going to have to get ultimately by raising taxes as much as $47 per worker. The administration will be postponing some of this tax increase until after the congressional elections this year, however.

The second step very conveniently will not come up until after the 1972 presidential election, but the taxes will have to be paid. In addition to this increase, the actuary in the Labor Department testified before our committee that even with the tax increases now proposed—and which I am discussing—the fund will still be inadequately financed, and Congress in order to finance it fully, if there is any kind of recession at that time, will later have to raise taxes further. In other words, they now get a foot in the door with this lower price tag on the bill, but that tax will later have to be raised even further.

This is a similar situation to what Congress did with the medicare proposal a couple of years ago. When Congress passed that bill it was put through on the basis that one section of it would cost only $230 million a year, when everyone on the committee knew at the time or should have known if they were paying any attention—that it was going to cost many millions above that estimate.

Now that it has been enacted, the Department has come back to the committee and said, "Oh, we made a mistake—a little one. Well, it is now a $1-billion-a-year mistake. It will cost an extra billion dollars to finance that particular proposal as against the $230 million estimate first given to the committee.

The bill the Senate is now considering admittedly will cost an extra $45 per worker. Actually it will cost more than that if we have a recession. If the Senate wishes to vote for these tax increases let it be on notice that it will be an extra $500 million. This amendment should be defeated and the program continued on a basis of 50 percent paid by the States and 50 percent paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. If we are worried about inflation, which the country is alleged to be suffering from at this particular time, is it not reasonable to assume that most of these employers—and this is a tax on the employers, not on the employees—will pass this right along to the consumers? What will this do to the inflationary situation, if we adopt this $500 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no doubt but that any extra money in the economy would be inflationary. There is no question about that. The more money we pour into the economy, no matter where it goes, the more we will be creating an inflationary threat.

The House bill, as it is proposed, provides for very generous benefits. Likewise, if we approve the House bill, we could get it enacted into law this year.

We might as well face the fact that if we tamper with this bill too much and load it down with Federal financing and Federal standards we will not get it by a conference committee. We will end up with nothing. This is not a threat. This is a statement of the facts as they exist today.

Once we make this 100 percent Federal financed it will be an open invitation to every State in the Union to start a stampede of new benefits and say, "Why not do so if the Federal Government is going to finance it?"

That is what is happening under the medicare program now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the position of the commissioners in the several States who will administer the law with regard to the pending amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To my knowledge, no single commissioner representing the States testified in favor of the committee amendment. In their testimony the State administrators were predominantly in favor of the House bill. They thought it was a substantial improvement over existing law. In addition, the House bill provides the trigger whereby if we get a recession—and we might get one—we would be prepared to cope with it in a permanent law. I think we would be doing a great injustice to the working men of this country if we expand this bill to the extent whereby we finally get no bill at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I understand correctly, then, that the commissioners, or the administrators of the several States, favor the continuation of the program under which the States pay half the extended coverage, and the Federal Government pays half?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And oppose this amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They oppose this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. With reference to the two-tenths of 1 percent tax that would be imposed in the House bill, would that provide sufficient funds for the $500 million which would be required as the Federal Government's share?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. It would be sufficient under the House bill. Both bills provide for this increase of two-tenths of 1 percent. Also, the House bill raises it to $3,900 in 1969. The Senate bill advances that jump from $3,000 to $3,900 a year earlier, or in 1968. The Senate bill also, ultimately, goes to $4,800 a year, while the House bill stops at a $4,200 ceiling. They both follow the same rate, but the extra tax is picked up by a change in the base.

Mr. COOPER. But the increased tax and the extended base then would provide sufficient revenue to finance the $500 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the testimony before the committee, that the House bill was adequately financed as it was passed by the House. At the same time we were told that even with the tax increases provided under the Senate bill they would not be adequate to finance all of the proposed benefits and that ultimately the tax would more than likely have to be increased again.

Mr. COOPER. Would the four-tenths of 1 percent provided by the committee, showing an increase in the large base, adequately finance the $1 billion for the extended period of compensation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The committee report indicates that it would. The actuary who was before the committee was shaking his head all the time and told the committee the bill was not financed in a manner in which he would like to see it financed. The bill is inadequately financed as it is reported by the Senate committee.

This is not the first time we have seen such a procedure followed in this administration. It was done in medicare. We are going to have to raise an extra $1 billion annually over that which was estimated to finance the costs of that program as enacted. I think we should put a proper price tag on all bills when they are being considered. Let us have some "truth in government."

Mr. COOPER. The adequacy of the $500 million would depend on whether or not the States made a contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The $500 million is adequate if the States pay half and the Federal Government pays half. If the committee proposal is adopted there will be no choice but to increase the base to $1 billion.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any argument, in making a choice between the two, that in the case of an extended depression, where the need would be great in every State, some States would make the decision not to extend the benefit periods, other States might make a decision to extend?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the House bill takes care of the problem if we run into a depression.

Mr. COOPER. If a recession affected every State, would this bill provide for assistance to every State whether or not the State accepted the program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, it would. The bill as it passed the House would do a better job in the case of extended benefits than the emergency legislation passed a couple of years ago, which legislation was only for a temporary period. The House version of the bill writes this better provision into the permanent law.

Mr. COOPER. In the case of a broad recession where unemployment might be general throughout the country, is it true that in every case the program might depend on whether or not a particular State would adopt the extended period?

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as I understand the House version of the bill, it extends the benefits when a certain trigger is reached in national unemployment. This is important. That is why I think the House bill has an advantage. In the committee version of the bill there is a trigger, but it is more isolated than in the House bill. It is more clearly pointed out in the House bill. I think if the State of Delaware or Kentucky, for example, had the national figure, it would be better off under the House bill.

Mr. COOPER. Would the States be required under the House bill to pay a portion of the cost?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, they would be required to pay a portion of the cost.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just as they have been doing.

Mr. COOPER. I remember that when this kind of emergency arose in the late 1950's the Congress acted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But that emergency legislation expired at the end of a stated period. The House bill would provide these benefits as a part of permanent law.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it true that the proposed benefits in the 13-week extended period are greater in the Senate version than in the House-passed version?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In some States. In some States there are minimum earning standards under which they operate. One example is the State of California, in which there is a generous law. The State of California would be affected by the law in one instance. California has requirements that in the base period a person must have earned $720. If the bill as reported by the Senate committee is passed the State legislature would be required to repeal that section, because the base earning requirements would be reduced to a lower figure.

Mr. KUCHEL. With respect to the wording of the bill as it left the House of Representatives, what did the bill require with respect to any Federal standard for the 13 weeks of extended benefits?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would be extended on the same terms.

Mr. KUCHEL. And under the extension of the benefits available under the law of each State, the Federal Government would pay 50-percent contribution?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, under the House bill when it was triggered into effect.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, there may be objection but I have been requested to ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Objection is heard.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure the Senator from California's question was fully answered. As I understood his question, it was whether or not a State would be compelled to pay greater benefits in the extended period than it had prior to that time——

Mr. KUCHEL. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. The benefits would be the benefits provided in the base period. The States which had a better program in the base period would also have a better program in the extended period.

Mr. KUCHEL. My understanding, as a result of my questions to the Senator from Delaware, was that under the version of the bill as it came from the House the Federal Government would pay 50 percent of the extended period of 13 weeks benefits as those benefits were provided under the law. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. The difference is that the commitee bill provides that 100 percent will now be put up by the Federal Government. Either way, all of the money for this comes out of the taxes which will be imposed by the legislation. Part of the revenue will go to the States and part to the Federal Government. But it is the same kind of tax revenue. It is the same obligation To talk about an additional $500 million in the recommendation we are arguing for is to overlook the fact that the cost of the total program runs the same under both versions. The difference is that in the House bill the States will be required to pay 50 percent out of those taxes by which the bill provides revenue to the States. So, in terms of inflation or deflation, there is no difference between the committee's recommendation and the House bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, is it the Senator's position that the Senate committee did not increase the benefits?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not in the extended period. We are also attempting to increase the benefits in the base period. That is what the argument is all about. If there is an extended base period, there will be an increase in benefits, but only if the base period is increased by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If a State adjusts the base and increases it, it increases the benefits.

Mr. KUCHEL. Otherwise it is the same under the version of the bill on our desks and as it came from the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. As far as extended benefits are concerned, we simply reflect the same policy with respect to the base period.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no major difference between the House bill and the Senate version as between Federal standards and State standards. The original bill as introduced by the Senator from Minnesota provided an escalation. It started at 50 percent, then went up to 60 percent, and then to 66⅔ percent. The final bill dropped the later two escalations.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not in the bill now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The escalation provision was eliminated.

There is this difference, though, in the Senate bill: By laying down Federal standards we would change the formula of what some of the States can continue to do. I pointed out as a specific example under the Senate bill as reported that California would no longer be able to hold a minimum earning requirement of $720.

Actually, in the bill as it is before us now there is no minimum earnings requirement whatever. It could be a dollar a week for 20 weeks, and the employee would immediately be eligible for the full 26 weeks of benefits. This may be changed later.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is true only because of the opposition of the Senator from Delaware to a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no. It was by a Senate vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Which would have brought it all up for consideration at the same time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate has defeated a proposal for those benefits.

Mr. McCARTHY. But without the opposition this action could not have taken place as it did take place.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in this case, the proposed committee amendment requires the buildup of a fund to $1 billion to pay for extended benefits.

The sole question Senators are asked to vote on here is whether the Federal Government will raise the entire $1 billion, or whether we are going to pass a law and require the States to raise an equal $500 million in order to do it. If we are in favor of providing extended benefits, it seems to me we ought to do it the way we did it in 1961. Then we required the States to pay out these benefits, but when we were faced with the problem of cost we said to the States, "Here is the money to pay for it, and here is the tax to take care of it."

The question now is merely the question of whether on one hand the Federal Government should require the States to impose taxes and raise revenues at the State level in order to raise the $500 million which would be their half, or whether the Federal Government, in providing extended benefits will simply go ahead and raise that $500 million and pay for it as we have done in the past.

As far as all the talk about inflation is concerned, that is all irrelevant. In either event, we have to raise the money, whether it be a billion dollars from the Federal Government or half from Federal and half from State governments.

If we talk about the principle of States rights, it seems to me it is a less burdensome imposition on a State to say, "We require you to do this, and we will pay the cost of it," than to say to the States, "We require you to do it, but you will have to impose taxes and raise $500 million to build up your share of the fund."

As far as the principle of State rights is concerned, in my judgment, if the Federal Government is going to require extended benefits, the Federal Government ought to raise the money to pay for such a program. That is what the bill, as recommended by the committee, would do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in my judgment the committee reported a thoroughly responsible bill, leaving great areas of responsibility to the States, and the committee provided what we consider to be an adequate base for its operation. The statistician said it is tight, but he never said it would not operate. So we came to the Senate with a balanced package.

I think we have to face up to the question of whether or not in a case of this kind, we are going to surrender completely to the House of Representatives. That is what we are asked to do here, to take the House bill without any variation. I think 34 out of the 50 State directors of unemployment compensation came out in favor of a benefit standard equal to 50 percent of an individual's weekly wage, up to a maximum not less than 50 percent of the statewide average weekly wage in covered employment. If they were for that, they should have been in favor of the financing which was provided; and I think if we had pressed them with the question, "How are you going to pay for the extended benefits?" they would have said, "If we are going to have to pay for the increased benefits under the 50-percent standard, we think the Federal Government ought to pay for the total cost of the extended benefits imposed by Federal action."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. It is not a matter of surrendering to the House of Representatives; it is a matter of surrendering to the Federal Government; is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a question of how we want to do it. The argument is presented here that we ought to take the House bill without change. The same argument could be made on any complicated bill. On a tax measure, for instance, it could be argued that, once we have unbalanced it by some amendment, therefore, we ought to go back to the House bill.

I cannot accept that. I think the committee has done a very sound job on this measure. Confusion has been created largely by opposition to what would have been an orderly proceeding if the Senate had been allowed to base its judgment upon the basic propositions the committee brought before the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator, the legislative history was somewhat along this line: First, a bill was recommended which labor supported, and most of the State administrators were even in a position to support the controversial 50–50 financing standard.

The House considered the matter, and it adopted a bill under which the Federal Government would match the States in financing the extended benefit program.

Then all the employer organizations came before the committee and, without exception, asked us to take the House bill. Why? Because they were afraid the Senate might do something better for labor than the House was willing to do. I am not saying just as a matter of pressure, but for one reason or another, the overwhelming majority of the State administrators were persuaded to go along with the House version.

How do the working people, who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of this program, feel about it? They sent their spokesmen up here, and whether it be the viewpoint of George Meany, Andy Biemiller, or Walter Reuther, as far as the House bill is concerned, they would rather have no bill. Their testimony was, in effect if you cannot do better than the House bill, please just forget about it, because from our point of view, we would be better off with no bill than with what the House has here.

What did our committee do? We took only a portion of what the administration had recommended, only a part of what labor was seeking, and we provided what we thought were reasonable minimal benefits.

Those of us who favor the committee bill say that since the Federal Government would require that extended benefits be paid and how long it be paid, then the Federal Government should pay the whole cost of it. That is what we provided in the bill. That is the difference between the two approaches.

Mr. McCARTHY. The portions of the bill dealing with the financing were prepared on the basis of suggestions from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. May I say to the Senate that whenever he has proposed financing for any program, it has turned out to be sound financing. The part of the medical program for which he recommended the financing is sound; the part of it proposed by his opponents is in real trouble. I suggest that if there are those who cannot accept this on the basis of their own understanding, I hope they will take it on the recommendations he has made as to financing, since he is the principal author.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Granted that there is a difference between the Federal Government paying and the State government paying, what is important to me is, what happens to the employer who is going to be paying the taxes? What is the difference in the tax treatment of the employer in the two versions?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In one case, he would be taxed by the Federal Government to pay his share of the extended benefits, and in the other, equally by the State government and the Federal Government. Theoretically, it would be approximately the same amount of tax.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed about the Unemployment Insurance Act amendments that were reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee. These amendments would bring about a sweeping attack upon the Federal-State unemployment programs that have been carried out so successfully for the last 30 years. I am one who supports the principle of unemployment insurance as a basis of providing security for the wage earner who is unable to find work through no fault of his own. I realize that conditions of employment and the need for some form of insurance varies greatly from State to State. This is the reason why the unemployment insurance program, from its inception, has been administered on a State-by-State basis.

The individual States have given recognition to the need for changes through liberalizing legislation on benefits, eligibility, and so forth. And thus, there is no need for the establishment of so-called Federal benefit standards as proposed by the Senate Finance Committee. If the Senate were to make the mistake of accepting the amendments proposed by the Finance Committee, the unemployment compensation program would be handicapped to such an extent that it would not be beneficial for either the State governments or the unemployed.

No justification exists for the radical departure proposed by the administration and the Finance Committee. For the last 30 years that this unemployment compensation program has been in existence, there has been clear evidence that without the heavy hand of Federal intervention the individual States have adopted, modified, improved, and expanded their unemployment insurance programs to meet the peculiar conditions of each State so as to produce a better program than would have resulted if the States had been held to rigid Federal benefit standards. I know this to be particularly true in my State. Wyoming, in 1963, adopted a model unemployment compensation program. Wyoming's program has received considerable attention throughout the Nation and is a hallmark for those who seek to improve their unemployment compensation programs. The old Wyoming program had been riddled with abuse and the unemployed were taking advantage of the system and thus placing the entire program in a precarious financial condition. In 1963, our great Governor, Clifford P. Hansen, and a few business leaders in the State took the bull by the horns and came up with this model piece of legislation. Now that it has been adopted, union leaders are quick to admit that it was long overdue and has helped to create a healthy labor environment in our great State.

It would be a shame if the Federal planners would force upon my State the schemes and the plans that are proposed in this piece of legislation that has been reported. It would appear to me that the adoption of Federal benefit standards would set the State of Wyoming back. These standards would reverse the progress that has been made in recent years by our State government, responsible businessmen, and union leaders and thus would be to the detriment of our workers who are covered by the program. I consider the Federal establishment of the period for which beneficiaries would draw benefits an encroachment upon a fundamental State right that should be protected and preserved in this Federal-State program.

Under Wyoming's new law, a worker who quits or was fired for cause will receive no benefits. This is a reasonable and just requirement. Under Wyoming law, no one is eligible for benefits unless he has worked at least 26 weeks in a year, putting in at least 24 hours a week. The State also stipulates that full unemployment compensation and social security can no longer be collected simultaneously by the jobless worker. The State law also provided that until the unemployment benefit fund was built up to a safe level, all employers would pay an extra one-half of 1 percent on their taxable payroll. This was drastic medicine for a State where many people had come to regard easy access to public funds as a vested right. But the businessmen and the State leaders recognized a need and that need was met.

I am sure that the history of Wyoming's experience in the unemployment compensation field is not unique, but I say with certainty that it would be severely damaged if this legislation, as recommended by the majority on the Finance Committee, were to be enacted. We cannot afford to destroy this Federal-State program. We must reject the Finance Committee amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, en bloc, beginning on page 41, line 7, and ending on line 4, page 42. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 181 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Allott
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Bartlett
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that we have a confusing situation in the Senate, for the reason I stated on Friday.

We have before us a 51-page bill which the Members of the Senate did not have access to until last Thursday morning. Last Thursday, Members of the Senate had to spend the entire day on the floor of the Senate in order to vote on the joint resolution relating to the strike of the Machinists against the airlines. At the same time, last Thursday morning, for the first time, a 92-page committee report on this bill was presented to Senators. Members of the Senate, however, did not have an opportunity to study the report on that day, but were compelled to remain on the floor of the Senate all day for the purpose of voting on the resolution pertaining to the strike of the Machinists against the airlines.

In connection with this bill, we also have the committee hearings, which total 827 pages. I do not know exactly when they were made available to the Members of the Senate, but the hearings did not close until July 26. I would venture the assertion that no Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to read these hearings.

This is a drastic bill. It would make a drastic change in a program which has been in existence for 30 years and which has operated in a satisfactory manner during those 30 years. During those 30 years, we have had a program in which the State legislatures have prescribed the standards for compensation, for periods of duration and for eligibility for unemployment compensation within their respective jurisdictions. I believe that is wise, because conditions in respect to employment and unemployment throughout the United States are quite diverse; and it is the part of wisdom to retain the power in the States to prescribe the standards to govern unemployment insurance. That is where the taxes are paid. The bill presented by the Senate committee, with this amendment, undertakes to establish Federal standards which would result in Congress, having the task every year hereafter of passing on questions of whether those standards should be changed.

The unemployment compensation law in its present form is one of the wisest laws ever passed. But it is one of the most abused laws ever passed.

Unfortunately, when the rates of unemployment compensation are too high, the incentive of those receiving it to seek work decreases. The purposes of the law are to provide for people during unemployment and at the same time furnish an incentive for them to seek work rather than to continue to draw unemployment benefits.

Everyone who is aware of the tendencies of the Federal Government, as they have been exhibited during recent years, knows that if we have Federal standards in this respect, we will have a constant increase in benefits, and to such an extent that the incentive to go back to work will largely be destroyed.

Mr. President, I agree with my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that there is a lot of confusion about this matter. I believe we ought to clarify the matter.

The State administrators of the unemployment compensation system collaborated with the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and that committee brought forth a bill which contains wise provisions in harmony with the experience gained in the administration of this law.

In order to eliminate the confusion which exists in the Senate in respect to these committee amendments, and in respect to the problems which the committee amendments raise, I believe that this bill should be sent back to the committee, with instructions not to destroy the system in existence, but to retain the system in existence—that is, with the standards prescribed by the States.

For these reasons, I move that the pending measure be recommitted to the Committee on Finance, with instructions that the committee report a bill back, after a reasonable time, which will eliminate all the changes made and proposed by the Senate amendments to establish Federal standards in lieu of standards now prescribed by the legislatures of the respective States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from North Carolina held before him the committee hearings, and those hearing run to a total of 828 pages. They were conducted over a period of 2 weeks. They would have taken twice that long, except that those who spoke for the working people of this country agreed to present just one or two witnesses. The Secretary of Labor spoke practically parallel to their position. Mr. George Meany and Mr. Andrew Biemiller came before us to speak for the position of the AFL–CIO. Also appearing as a witness was Mr. Leonard Lesser, from the industrial unions associated with Mr. Walter Reuther's group.

Mr. President, it may be difficult for the Senator from North Carolina to sit here and listen to what we are talking about, but I am happy to tell the Senator that the worst is over. We have a couple of uncomplicated amendments remaining, which the Senate can vote on one way or the other.

I believe that it would be inappropriate for the Committee on Finance to be asked to return and decide what it should do with the bill, even before the Senate is through indicating what it wishes done. If the Senate wishes to tell us that it prefers to sidetrack the committee amendments and the recommendations of the committee and prefers instead to buy—lock, stock, and barrel—the judgment of the House of Representatives on the matter, as the Senate has been asked to do by the employers' associations, that is the privilege of the Senate.

But I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will show us the courtesy of voting on what we have recommended here.

I hope that the Senate would give the committee the consideration of considering a few more issues that we would like to present here, most of which will be easily explained, and then, that the Senate would give us a "yes" or "no" as to what its feeling is on recommitting the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, our present unemployment compensation system is more than 30 years old. It does need an upgrading. It does need some improvement. Those improvements are provided for in the House bill. That bill was passed by an overwhelming vote. I think that those who want unemployment compensation legislation this year should vote to support the House bill.

Not everything that has been adopted on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of this measure was ever before the Committee on Finance. Last Friday the Senate adopted an amendment to a committee amendment. This amendment appears on page 18382 of the Congressional Record. The amendment was not read before it was adopted. Senators were not provided—or at least I was not provided—with a copy of the amendment. The amendment was described as one to relieve the problem in the States with annual wage formulas, and to give recognition to dependents' benefits.

However, the amendment actually requires every State to meet a test that has not been contemplated by any of the committee amendments, and for which we have no cost estimates.

The alternative part of the amendment—and if Senators wish to turn to it in the Congressional Record it can be found on page 18382—would require the State to have a benefit formula under which 65 percent of all covered workers in the State could receive a weekly benefit equal to one-half of their prior weekly wages.

This language means that every employee in private employment covered by this law, whether he ever applies for a benefit or not, must have a weekly benefit amount; and that except for the top 35 percent of the people, this amount must be one-half of the prior weekly wage of the individual.

I am told that normally not more than a very small percentage of covered workers in a State ever apply for unemployment benefits. The phrase "covered workers" includes every movie actor, and it includes the president and the officers of every corporation. It includes every employed financial genius on Wall Street. This phrase also includes casual employees who work as little as one hour a year.

The important thing in unemployment compensation is how much is paid to the employee who has been laid off and is unemployed. The important thing is not how much a weekly benefit would be that is paid to the president of General Motors Corp. if he were unemployed and applying for the benefits.

The amendment provides that they take off the top 35 percent and everybody below that must have a benefit of one-half of their weekly wages. They do not say 35 percent of the claimants. They say 35 percent of the covered workers, which includes executives, salaried movie stars, and highly salaried people of all kinds.

This amendment, if finally agreed to in legislation, would establish a benefit standard that has never been proposed before. It is a standard that has practically no relevance adequately to benefit people; certainly it would appear that this amendment would force drastic changes in every State law in the United States.

Furthermore, I cannot conceive of any way in which this amendment could possibly be administered. There is no way of knowing the wages of all covered employees. In order to administer this standard there would have to be known the salaries of every officer of every corporation in the United States, the salaries of all covered employees of all employers, up and down the line, and then finding a figure to which a maximum benefit would not affect more than 35 percent of these people. I think that this is manifestly impossible. There are no reports that show the wages of every employee. The other part of this amendment that we voted on Friday would require the State to make sure that 80 percent of all covered workers—and again the term is "covered workers" and not the people actually asking for unemployment benefits—whether interested in unemployment benefits or not, would be eligible in case they were interested in the benefits, and would then be eligible to receive benefits for 26 weeks.

The term "covered employee" is new. It injects a new formula. It would require change in State laws. It has never been considered by the Committee on Finance and it had very little discussion in this Chamber. There were no copies of the proposal available.

I would hazard a guess, and I am quite certain that the figures would bear me out, that at least 20 percent of the applicants in many States are not eligible for benefits because they have not earned a substantial amount of wages. In such a case, this 20 percent would be the group that would receive the full 26 weeks of benefits. That would mean every applicant who has any eligibility at all would fall in the 80 percent and would have to be eligible for 26 weeks. This has never been before the Committee on Finance. It was not presented in printed form here.

I think we have reached a point, Mr. President, where, if we are preserving any stability in our unemployment compensation system, the bill must be recommitted; or else we must enact the House bill so that we can have some legislation this year, so that this law, which is over a quarter of a century old, can be upgraded.

We had an unusual situation in the House of Representatives. They labored a long time. The distinguished chairman of that committee, Congressman Wilbur D. Mills, and the distinguished ranking minority member, Congressman John Byrnes, each introduced the identical bill, which was passed by the House. It was passed by an overwhelming vote, a vote so large that it makes it possible that even though this is nearly the middle of August, if the Senate would pass it, it would be an improvement in unemployment compensation this year.

Now, if we proceed on what we have adopted—amendments which have been sent to the desk that are not available to Members, and that inject entirely new formulas for which there is no cost estimate—we may not have any legislation.

The entire proposal involves legislation for those for whom legislation is not desirable.

Finally, instead of relieving a few States with annual wage formulas, this amendment probably would upset every State unemployment compensation law in the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment does not upset the other States. It was offered and agreed to yesterday to give the States of Alaska, Oregon, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia, an opportunity to retain the theory of their annual wage laws. Those States provide benefits computed on an annual wage basis. They do not use the same week-by-week basis or quarter-by-quarter basis as other States do; therefore, in order to accommodate the bill's provision to what they are doing, we provided that if 65 percent of the people in a State get as much as one-half of their wage in benefits when unemployed, and if 80 percent of workers are eligible for 26 weeks of benefits in that State, the State law will qualify.

Thus, this is just a way of saying that these six States do not have to throw their laws out and start all over again. Since that time, the Senate voted to strike out the 26 weeks and the 50–50 standard. I hope the Senate will take another look to see if some compromise is not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr ANDERSON. It has been stated that this would upset the workers in these States, but it would not upset a single one; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would not upset a single one. It would have exactly the opposite effect.

When the bill was reported, and the Senators from Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and West Virginia found that the bill created an unnecessary problem for them, we were perfectly content to say, "Here is an amendment which will give your State credit for doing something that some other State is not doing."

This amendment was adopted with respect to States rights not to do anything if they wished.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand the amendment—we talked about it on Friday—it would mean that the way it is now, if the amendment is adopted, in the State of Washington—which is one of the six States referred to—the legislature would not have to change its laws; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. The whole purpose of it is——

Mr. MAGNUSON. They could change them if they wanted to, but they do not have to; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They do not have to change their basic law, if they would prefer to do it the way they are doing it now. Particularly if they have a level of benefits as required. They could go ahead and continue to do business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would not have to change their laws as to procedures?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is exactly right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On a formula to be determined?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is exactly right. The whole purpose of this is to relieve those States of having to change the theory of their laws merely to come in conformity on a procedural basis when substantially what they are doing now is similar in effect and could very well be adequate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Senator agree with me that this cannot get out of hand because of the limits on the States as to spending? It cannot be a burden on the Federal Government. They can spend the whole 2.7 percent in the States if they want to, within the limitations of this law. Any indication that this would leave the door wide open is to confuse the Senate about this complicated piece of legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, so far as the administrative problem that the Senator from Nebraska went into in great detail to describe is concerned, this amendment was drafted with the advice of the Department of Labor, seeking to work out some way in which certain States could be given credit for and relieved of the burden of unnecessarily changing their laws.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Now that the Senator has taken care of the 6 States, what about the other 44?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those States have laws in terms of weeks of work and average weekly wages. The amendment which we are discussing applies principally to annual wage formula States.

Mr. MORTON. So we would have to change 44 State laws?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not necessarily, depending upon what the States' judgment is in regard to certain other matters, we would see what changes might be necessary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier, the Senator from Delaware stated that the more money the Federal Government pumps into the unemployment compensation responsibility of the States, the more reckless will the States become. He further stated that actuarially the Federal fund now is not sound without having added to it an obligation of $500 million.

My question is: Does the record anywhere contain information showing the present status actuarially of the funds of the 50 States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is no extended benefit fund, as of this time. The creation of such a fund is contemplated by these legislative provisions——

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is: In what status are the funds of the 50 States dealing with whether the premiums in taxes imposed—the benefits paid—are of a character that the fund will continue to be actuarially sound?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They have $8,377 million in the trust funds as of this time. We cannot estimate that that is all they need for adequate funding at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, if the Senator will let me continue——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now, just 1 minute—let me answer the question, please. The committee bill undertook to provide additional revenue to pay for these extended benefits. The estimate of the actuary was that the Anderson proposal, which was to raise the wage here to $3,900 in 1968 and to $4,800 in 1972 would pay for the extended benefits. However the actuary said that this was a tight estimate. An actuary likes to be conservative. He likes to be on the safe side. He likes to have something to show perhaps 5 percent or perhaps a larger margin than that for eventualities which might come up. But the estimate of the actuary was that this financing was adequate, and so we provided for it on that basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that on the Federal level?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is on the Federal level. Keep in mind, Senator, on a State level that the State has to decide.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will yield further on that point, for 10 years I was Governor of the State of Ohio and I know what the problem is trying to keep the fund actuarially sound. In my judgment, the pumping of Federal money into this program will operate as an inducement for the States to unconcern themselves with the taxes imposed, to unconcern themselves with the amount of payments being made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1957, there was $650 million—will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. First, Mr. President, since I do have the floor, let me make this clear; namely, that this measure does not pour any money into State funds to pay for regular benefits of the State. The bill does raise a fund. It seeks to raise a Federal fund with Federal taxes, to have money available for the States to pay the extended benefits. But those benefits are not available unless and until the so-called triggering mechanism works and after State benefits have been exhausted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that, but when the Federal Government says, "We are going to pump in $500 million," that acts as a deterrent and as a dissuading influence on the States to try to get their own funds in shape to do the job.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, that is not $500 million. It is $1 billion we are talking about. But that is the size of the fund that is to develop before the money goes back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The new tax, according to the Senator from Delaware, is $500 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason the Senator from Delaware uses that figure is that under the House approach the Federal Government would raise $500 million and the States would have to raise that amount, while under the committee approach, the Federal Government would raise the whole $1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1954 there was $650 million in the Ohio fund. The labor leaders and management got together and agreed that there was to be a $70 million refund to management. The argument was that the fund was oversize; that $650 million was not needed.

I opposed the rebate. Finally I yielded and said I would go along with a refund of $35 million. I went along with that, but the legislature passed a bill refunding another $35 million, making it a total of $70 million.

In 1958, the fund was down to about $100 million.

The only point I am trying to make is, do not follow a course which will operate as an inducement to irresponsibility and imprudent management of these funds.

If a mistake is to be made, make it in the direction of the fund being oversolvent rather than insolvent.

One might ask, what relationship does that argument have to the question now before us? It is relevant because the Federal Government is being asked to step in and provide these funds. If I were in the State legislature, I would quit worrying; I would rely on the fact that, in election years, the Federal Government will step in and give whatever money it is asked to give.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no money here that would go into the regular program of Ohio. Ohio will pay what it is required to pay, and the Federal Government will pay what the Federal Government is required to pay into the extended benefit fund to provide extended benefits when necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Replying to the Senator from Ohio concerning the actuarial position of the funds, we were told it was actuarially sound as it stands today and that the bill as it was reported by the House was likewise adequately financed. But the bill as it was reported by the Senate committee was, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, very tight. In my opinion the Senate bill is inadequately financed. There is a question whether or not the tax provided in the Senate version of the bill is enough to pay the benefits provided. We should lean toward the conservative side to be sure the funds are adequate. It is agreed that the Senate version of the bill is not fully financed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, while it may be tight, we do not know what is going to happen in conference. We believe it is solvent as it is now. Actuarial experience indicates that it is sound. When we had the disability insurance measure before us, it was alleged that it was not going to be sound, but it proved to be sound. Some people said that when the medicare bill was adopted people would be standing in lines miles long, trying to get in under it. Nothing like that happened. Likewise, I think this bill will be actuarially sound.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senators will recall that the Senator from New Mexico was the author of the financing provisions of the medicare bill. We are operating within the estimates of the cost. We would be below those cost estimates if it were not that the Social Security Administration proceeded to be more generous than we thought it would be when we passed the bill. We might go on the low side. I have predicted that some of these costs are more than some have estimated, but assuming times stay good and we have no recession or depression, I think we will stay within the estimates. It might be that, if we should ever go into a depression, we might find that we should have provided more money. But as far as meeting our responsibilities is concerned, the bill does that.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ERVIN. Have not all of the Senate amendments which appear on pages 30 and 35 of the bill been eliminated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments on page 35 of the bill were passed over so we could consider the amendments on pages 41 and 42.

Mr. ERVIN. I am asking about pages 30 and 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments on pages 30 and 31 have been disagreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. That being true, it is apparent that at some stage of this proceeding it will be necessary to offer amendments to take the place of that portion of the amendments on pages 30 and 31.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To get the record straight, the amendment beginning on page 28, lines 24 and 25, all of page 29, page 30, page 31, page 32, page 33, and the top of page 34, down to line 7 has been eliminated.

There may be proposals later to insert other language. Substitute language has been adopted for the language appearing on page 28, beginning with line 24, and continuing on page 29, through line 7. But from page 29, beginning with line 8, and continuing through page 34, line 7, the language has been eliminated entirely. So more has been eliminated than the Senator from North Carolina is speaking about.

Mr. ERVIN. That being true, sometime before the bill is passed it will be necessary for the manager of the bill or some other Senator to offer an amendment to take care of the parts that have been eliminated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would have been delighted to do so, but I was foreclosed from doing so because the Senator from North Carolina was recognized for a motion to recommit the bill. He would have to withdraw his motion before I could offer an amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. I was about to say that since there has not been an order for the yeas and nays, I would withdraw my motion to recommit until I can ascertain what amendments will be proposed for the parts that have been stricken. I could then renew my motion to recommit in case I were not satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the prerogative to withdraw his motion and to renew it at any time prior to passage.

Mr. ERVIN. As I understand the situation, an amendment has been added following line 7, page 29. There was an adopted amendment to strike out subsection (C) on page 29, after it had been modified by the manager of the bill.

Additional amendments will have to be proposed.

In the interest of seeing what we shall have before us, I withdraw my motion to recommit. I hope that whatever amendment is presented will be in writing, and that a copy will be submitted to each Senator, so that we can see what is being offered. We should see the amendment with our eyes as well as hear it with our ears. We had to learn about the last amendment through our ears. Sometimes we understand a proposal better through our eyes than through our ears.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from North Carolina to recommit the bill with instructions is withdrawn.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my understanding that we would vote on an amendment in the nature of a conforming amendment. It is my hope that we may vote on that amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that we now return to page 35. We skipped over, Mr. President, the amendments between pages 35 and 41, which would have to be acted upon; but I agree, as we have heretofore stated, that the Senate has now decided the issue and that these amendments are more or less conforming with the action the Senate has already taken by its preceding vote. Therefore I suggest we go back and, beginning with page 35, dispose of those amendments up to page 41 very quickly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that it would require unanimous consent to go back to the earlier amendment which was offered and passed over until the remaining committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought we had a unanimous-consent agreement to take the amendment on page 41 out of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to clear it up, I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 35 and take up the amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senate will proceed to consider the amendment on page 35.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment appearing on page 35, lines 13 through 19.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the one we were discussing for some time earlier?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, that amendment was discussed quite a while. This is an amendment to conform to the amendment on page 41 on which we have voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment on page 35, lines 13 through 19, was agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, line 21, to change the section letter from (d) to (b).

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is another conforming amendment. I move its adoption.

Mr. **ERVIN.** Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, line 21, strike the letter "(d)" and insert "(b)".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 1, strike the words "not less than."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 11, strike "law;" and insert "law."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, strike the language beginning on line 12 and continuing through line 16, strike out the following: "except that the amount so determined shall (if the State law so provides) be reduced by the aggregate amount of additional compensation paid (or deemed paid) to him under such law for prior weeks of unemployment in such benefit year which did not begin in an extended benefit period."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, while these amendments are conforming I do not want the RECORD to show that they are being adopted without objection. There still remains the same objection to these as to the others. They embrace Federal standards. Some of us are voting against this entire proposal.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 36, beginning with line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, line 13, following the word "weeks," to insert the following language: "but if an extended benefit period begins by occurrence of a national 'on' indicator, such extended benefit period shall last not less than thirteen consecutive weeks succeeding the third week following the national 'on' indicator,".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The next committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, line 16, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 4, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, line 21, following the word "equal", insert the words "in the case of calendar year 1968," and, following the word "to", strike out "16⅔ per centum", and insert the following language: one-sixth, in the case of any calendar year after 1968 and prior to 1973, one-fourth, and, in the case of any calendar year after 1972, one-third,".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The next committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, line 21, strike the numeral "$500,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000,000."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, we want a direct vote on this proposal. There is no question, if the proposal is to be federally financed, that this additional $500 million will be necessary; but I believe that those who want it federally financed should be on record as voting for the increase. Therefore, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 46, line 21. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Tydings

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 46, line 24, after the word "to" strike out "two-tenths" and insert "four-tenths."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment conforms to the one the Senate just agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 46, line 24, after the word "to" strike out "two-tenths" and insert "four-tenths."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment conforms to what we just agreed to. If the fund is going to be twice as large, for Federal financing, it requires a four-tenths rate rather than a two-tenths rate in order to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 47, line 10, after "204," strike out (e) and insert (d).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President this is the amendment on page 47?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 49, after line 19, strike out the following:

"INCREASE IN TAX RATE

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax under Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '1961' and inserting in lieu thereof '1967',

"(2) by striking out '3.1 percent' in the first sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof '3.3 percent', and

"(3) by striking out the last two sentences.

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the calendar year 1967 and calendar years thereafter.

"INCREASE IN WAGE BASE

"SEC. 302. (a) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1968, section 3306(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out '$3,000' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,900'.

"(b) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1971, section 3306(b)(1) of such Code (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by striking out '$3,900' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,200'."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

INCREASE IN WAGE BASE AND TAX RATE

SEC. 301. (a)(1) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1967, section 3306(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "$3,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,900".

(2) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1971, section 3306(b)(1) of such Code (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by striking out "$3,900" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,800".

(b)(1) Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3301. Rate of Tax.

"There is hereby imposed on every employer (as defined in section 3306(a)) for the calendar year 1967 and for each calendar year thereafter an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ equal to 3.3 percent of the total wages (as defined in section 3306(b)) paid by him during the calendar year with respect to employment (as defined in section 3306(c)) after December 31, 1938."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the calendar year 1967 and calendar years thereafter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is this an amendment to strike and insert language, or is this just to strike?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To strike and insert.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then this is the financing amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment provides the taxes necessary to pay for the full Federal financing of the extended benefits the Senate voted. If we are to have the Senate bill, we should have this tax rate with it. I realize that the House bill would be almost a substitute, but I submit that if we have the Senate bill, we should have this tax rate to finance it. If we did not do so, we would be irresponsible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment would raise the tax $29 per worker beginning in 1968 above the taxes provided in the House bill. Beginning in 1971, there would be another jump of $17 or $18 per worker, with a total increased tax of about $47 per worker involved in this particular proposal. It should be made clear that the tax ultimately would be raised $45 per worker above the amount in the House bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I point out that the effect of this amendment is to reduce the tax the States would otherwise have to raise. This amendment provides for full Federal financing of extended benefits. If we do not agree to this amendment, we will have to require the States to raise half the money.

In one respect, it might be said that this amendment would provide $500 million of relief to the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The matter is not that simple; under the House bill where there was a 50-50 participation $500 million would have to be raised, with full Federal payment of these benefits a billion dollars would have to be raised. It should be made clear that the ultimate tax per worker would be $45 higher under the Senate bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that at the present time the base upon which the tax is paid is $3,000 per year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. And under the House bill, that would go to $3,900 in the first step and to $4,200 in the second step?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. While if we adopt the language of the committee amendment, the base upon which the tax would be paid by every employer would go from $3,000 to $3,900 in the first step, and to $4,800 in the second step?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The second step goes to $4,800, or $600 higher than the $4,200 limit of the House bill, and the $3,900 under the Senate bill would go into effect a year earlier. The first step is $900 over and above the House bill, which would cost about $27 to $29 per year; and instead of the second step going to $4,200, it would go to $4,800 with another tax increase of around $18 per worker.

Mr. CURTIS. In the case of an employee who earns the full amount of the proposed base amount, would the taxes be increased on one employee, if this committee language is adopted, by the end of the second step or after the second step?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The second step would increase the tax $18 per employee for the employer above the amount provided in the House bill. In 1968, the first step would raise the tax $29 per employee over the House bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Because it takes the step earlier?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

These increases would be necessary to pay for the full Federal financing as suggested by the committee. The actuary said that even these increases would not be adequate to finance the full cost.

Mr. CURTIS. To state the matter another way, this law went into effect some years ago based upon the first $3,000 of wages, and the House proposes to increase that in two steps up to $4,200, which is acceptable to the State administrators and to many others. The Senate would raise that ultimately to $4,800.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Under the House bill, as I understand it, the wage base would be changed on January 1, 1969, and under the committee amendment, the wage base would become effective January 1, 1968?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Up to $3,900 in 1968.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Did the committee give consideration to those States which would not have a legislative session in 1967 in order to conform their laws to this legislation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The tax would not be due until January 1969. So the States really would have a year longer than meets the eye. It is a calendar-year tax, and it would not be due and payable until January of the following year, until 1969.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Is it not correct that the tax must be levied effective January 1, 1968?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Federal tax is levied. We levy it, but it is not due. Against the tax that we levy, employers in a State have the benefit of a 2.7 tax credit against a 3.3 tax credit. A State legislature can act any time before October 31, 1968 and give the employer the full benefit of their action.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In order to comply with the full statute regarding unemployment compensation, if the amendment of the Committee on Finance is adopted, would that not mean that those States which do not normally have a legislative session in 1967 would have to hold a special session in order to conform their laws to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The point is that this is a Federal tax. The State legislature need not meet to impose this tax. We impose it by Federal law. The State legislatures would then meet and determine how they would make assessments by way of tax credits within their respective States. If they did not meet to do this, they would accumulate the money and work out the credits and refunds in the next session of the legislature.

The only pressure that the States might be under would be to meet in order to give tax credits to their employers who might otherwise pay a tax higher than required. The Federal Government imposes the tax. The only pressure on the legislature would be to meet in order to make their employers happy.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I will phrase the question another way. In order for the employers of the particular State to get the benefits to which they normally would be entitled, it would require a special session of the legislature; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, that is not necessarily correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the revenue law was put into effect this is what happened. It did not become effective until 1936. This money was accumulated and paid over at that time. It would be the same procedure now as it was then.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. The fact is, if it is desired to make adjustments for which employers would be entitled and if the legislature has not acted the funds would accumulate until they do act. However, in this case they will have time to act because it is an annual tax to be paid in 1969. They would have a chance to work the matter out in 1967 and 1968. I do not know any State that would not meet before 1969.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. A legislature that could not meet in 1967——

Mr. McCARTHY. Could not act until 1968. They could anticipate this problem and take care of the problem of their employers.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. At the present time the employers would not be disadvantaged?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. They would have most of 1968.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the certification under the act would be October 31, 1968. The Commonwealth of Virginia would have until October 31, 1968, to meet and act on this matter. I assume that in the Commonwealth of Virginia there will be a session of the legislature between now and then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy of New York in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 49. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Tydings

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. Now that we have completed the committee amendments, is an amendment in the nature of a substitute now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A substitute amendment is now in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 723

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 723 and offer it in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent to modify it in three respects as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. MORTON. On page 41, line 4, change "1971" to "1972".

On page 40, line 24, change "1968" to "1969".

Strike section 101, beginning on line 6 on page 1 through line 11 on page 2.

I offer this as a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as modified, will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

TITLE I—IN GENERAL

Part A—Coverage

Definition of Employee

Sec. 102. (a) Subsection (i) of section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Employee.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employee' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 3121(d), except that subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (3) shall not apply."

(b) Section 1563(f)(1) of such Code (relating to surtax exemption in case of certain controlled corporations) is amended by striking out "in section 3306(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 3121(d)".

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1968, for services performed after such date.

Definition of Agricultural Labor

Sec. 103. (a) Subsection (k) of section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Agricultural Labor.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'agricultural labor' has the meaning assigned to such term by subsection (g) of section 3121, except that for purposes of this chapter subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4) of such subsection (g) shall be treated as reading:

"'(B) in the employ of a group of operators of farms (or a cooperative organization of which such operators are members) in the performance of service described in subparagraph (A), but only if such operators produced more than one-half of the commodity with respect to which such service is performed;'".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1968, for services performed after such date.

State Law Coverage of Certain Employees of Nonprofit Organizations and of State Hospitals and Institutions of Higher Education

Sec. 104. (a) Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (12) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6)(A) compensation is payable on the basis of service to which section 3310(a)(1) applies, in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as compensation payable on the basis of other service subject to such law, and

"(B) payments (in lieu of contributions) with respect to service to which section 3310(a)(1)(A) applies may be made into the State unemployment fund on the basis set forth in section 3310(a)(2);"

(b)(1) Chapter 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 3310. State Law Coverage of Certain Service Performed for Nonprofit Organizations and for State Hospitals and Institutions of Higher Education.

"(a) State Law Requirements.—For purposes of section 3304(a)(6)—

"(1) except as otherwise provided in subsections (b) and (c), the service to which this paragraph applies is—

"(A) service excluded from the term 'employment' solely by reason of paragraph (8) of section 3306(c), and

"(B) service performed in the employ of a State, or any instrumentality of one or more States, for a hospital or institution of higher education, if such service is excluded from the term 'employment' solely by reason of paragraph (7) of section 3306(c); and

"(2) the State law shall provide that an organization (or group of organizations) which, but for the requirements of this paragraph, would be liable for contributions with respect to serve to which paragraph (1)(A) applies may elect, for such minimum period and at such time as may be provided by State law, to pay (in lieu of such contributions) into the State unemployment fund amounts equal to the amounts of compensation attributable under the State law to such service. The State law may provide safeguards to insure that organizations so electing will make the payments required under such elections.

"(b) Section Not To Apply to Certain Service.—This section shall not apply to service performed—

"(1) in the employ of (A) a church or convention or association of churches, or (B) an organization which is operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches;

"(2) by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order;

"(3) in the employ of an educational institution which is not an institution of higher education;

"(4) in the case of an institution of higher education, by an individual employed in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity;

"(5) in the case of a hospital (or in the case of a medical research organization directly engaged in the continuous active conduct of medical research in conjunction with a hospital), by an individual as a physician, dentist, osteopath, chiropractor, naturopath, or Christian Science practitioner, or by an individual employed in an instructional or research capacity;

"(6) in a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of—

"(A) rehabilitation for individuals whose whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, or

"(B) providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired physical or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market,

by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work; and

"(7) as part of an unemployment work-relief or work-training program assisted or financed in whole or in part by any Federal agency or an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof, by an individual receiving such work relief or work training.

"(c) Nonprofits Must Be Employers of 4 or More.—This section shall not apply to service performed during any calendar year in the employ of any organization unless on each of some 20 days during such calendar year, each day being in a different calendar week, the total number of individuals who were employed by such organization in employment (determined without regard to section 3306 (c)(8) and by excluding service to which this section does not apply by reason of subsection (b)) for some portion of the day (whether or not at the same moment of time) was 4 or more."

(2) The table of sections for such chapter 23 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 3310. State law coverage of certain service performed for nonprofit organizations and for State hospitals and institutions of higher education."

(c) Section 33303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at tbe end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Payments by Certain Nonprofit Organizations.—A State may, without being deemed to violate the standards set forth in subsection (a), permit an organization (or group of organizations) described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) to elect (in lieu of paying contributions) to pay into the State unemployment fund amounts equal to the amounts of compensation attributable under the State law to service performed in the employ of such organization (or group)."

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to certifications of State laws for 1969 and subsequent years, but only with respect to service performed after December 31, 1968. The amendment made by subsection (c) shall take effect January 1, 1967.

Students Engaged in Work-Study Programs

Sec. 105. (a) Paragraph (10) of section 3306(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) service performed by an individual who is enrolled at an educational institution (within the meaning of section 151(e)(4)) as a student in a full-time program, taken for credit at such institution, which combines academic instruction with work experience, if such institution has certified to the employer that such service is an integral part of such program;".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966.

Part B—Provisions of State laws

Provisions Required To Be Included in State Laws

Sec. 121. (a) Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) (added by section 104(a) of this Act) the following new paragraphs:

"(7) an individual who has received compensation during his benefit year is required to have had work since the beginning of such year in order to qualify for compensation in his next benefit year;

"(8) compensation shall not be denied to any individual by reason of cancellation of wage credits or total reduction of his benefit rights for any cause other than discharge for misconduct connected with his work, fraud in connection with a claim for compensation, or receipt of disqualifying income;

"(9) compensation shall not be denied to an individual for any week because he is in training with the approval of the State agency (or because of the application, to any such week in training, of State law provisions relating to availability for work, active search for work, or refusal to accept work);

"(10) compensation shall not be denied or reduced to an individual solely because he files a claim in another State or because he resides in another State at the time he files a claim for unemployment compensation;".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect January 1, 1969, and shall apply to the taxable year 1969 and taxable years thereafter.

Additional Credit Based on Reduced Rate for New Employers

Sec. 122. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "on a 3-year basis," in the sentence following paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "on a 3-year basis (i)", and by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ", or (ii) a reduced rate (not less than 1 percent) may be permitted by the State law on a basis other than as permitted by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Credits Allowable to Certain Employers

Sec. 123. Section 3305 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Denial of Credits in Certain Cases.—Any person required, pursuant to a permission granted by this section, to make contributions to an unemployment fund under a State unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 3304 shall not be entitled to the credits permitted, with respect to the unemployment compensation law of a State, by subsections (a) and (b) of section 3302 against the tax imposed by section 3301 for any taxable year after December 31, 1967, if, on October 31 of such taxable year, the Secretary of Labor certifies to the Secretary his finding, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, that the unemployment compensation law of such State is inconsistent with any one or more of the conditions on the basis of which such permission is granted or that, in the application of the State law with respect to the 12-month period ending on such October 31, there has been a substantial failure to comply with any one or more of such conditions. For purposes of section 3311, a finding of the Secretary of Labor under this subsection shall be treated as a finding under section 3304(c)."

Part C—Judicial review

Judicial Review

SEC. 131. (a) Title III of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 304. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Labor—

"(1) finds that a State law does not include provisions meeting the requirements of section 303(a), or

"(2) makes a finding with respect to a State under subsection (b) or (c) of section 303,

such State may, within 60 days after the Governor of the State has been notified of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located or with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a petition for review of such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary of Labor, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary of Labor to take further evidence, and the Secretary of Labor may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary of Labor or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"(d)(1) The Secretary of Labor shall not withhold any certification for payment to any State under section 302 until the expiration of 60 days after the Governor of the State has been notified of the action referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) or until the State has filed a petition for review of such action, whichever is earlier.

"(2) The commencement of judicial proceedings under this section shall not stay the Secretary's action, but the court may grant interim relief if warranted, including stay of the Secretary's action and including such relief as may be necessary to preserve status or rights.

"(e) Any judicial proceedings under this section shall be entitled to, and, upon request of the Secretary or the State, shall receive a preference and shall be heard and determined as expeditiously as possible."

(b)(1) Chapter 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3311. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

"(a) In General.—Whenever under section 3303(b) or section 3304(c) the Secretary of Labor makes a finding pursuant to which he is required to withhold a certification under such section, such State may, within 60 days after the Governor of the State has been notified of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located or with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a petition for review of such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) Findings of Fact.—The findings of fact by the Secretary of Labor, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary of Labor to take further evidence, and the Secretary of Labor may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(c) Jurisdiction of Court; Review.—The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary of Labor or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"(d) Stay of Secretary of Labor's Action.—

"(1) The Secretary of Labor shall not withhold any certification under section 3303(b) or section 3304(c) until the expiration of 60 days after the Governor of the State has been notified of the action referred to in subsection (a) or until the State has filed a petition for review of such action, whichever is earlier.

"(2) The commencement of judicial proceedings under this section shall not stay the Secretary's action, but the court may grant interim relief if warranted, including stay of the Secretary's action and including such relief as may be necessary to preserve status or rights.

"(e) Preference.—Any judicial proceedings under this section shall be entitled to, and, upon request of the Secretary or the State, shall receive a preference and shall be heard and determined as expeditiously as possible."

(2) Subsection (c) of section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) CERTIFICATION.—On October 31 of each taxable year the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary each State whose law he has previously approved, except that he shall not certify any State which, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, the Secretary of Labor finds has amended its laws so that it no longer contains the provisions specified in subsection (a) or has with respect to the 12-month period ending on such October 31 failed to comply substantially with any such provision. No finding of a failure to comply substantially with the provision in State law specified in paragraph (5) of subsection (a) shall be based on an application or interpretation of State law with respect to which further administrative or judicial review is provided for under the laws of the State. On October 31 of 1969 or of any taxable year thereafter, the Secretary shall not certify any State which, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, the Secretary of Labor finds has failed to amend its law so that it contains the provisions specified in subsection (a) added by the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966, or has with respect to the 12-month period (10-month period in the case of October 31, 1969) ending on such October 31 failed to comply substantially with any such provision."

(3) The table of sections for such chapter 23 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 3311. Judicial review."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. In applying section 3304(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by subsection (b)) with respect to the taxable year 1966, certifications shall be made on December 31, 1966, in lieu of October 31, 1966.

Part D—Administration

Amounts Available for Administrative Expenditures

SEC. 141. (a) Section 901(c)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "the net receipts" each place it appears in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five-sixths of the net receipts"; and

(2) by striking "0.4 percent" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "0.6 percent".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

Unemployment Compensation Research Program and Training Grants for Unemployment Compensation Personnel

SEC. 142. Title IX of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Unemployment Compensation Research Program

"SEC. 906. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) establish a continuing and comprehensive program of research to evaluate the unemployment compensation system. Such research shall include, but not be limited to, a program of factual studies covering the role of unemployment compensation under varying patterns of unemployment, the relationship between the unemployment compensation and other social insurance programs, the effect of State eligibility and disqualification provisions, the personal characteristics, family situations, employment background and experience of claimants, with the results of such studies to be made public; and

"(2) establish a program of research to develop information (which shall be made public) as to the effect and impact of extending coverage to excluded groups.

"Authorization of appropriations

"(b) To assist in the establishment and provide for the continuation of the comprehensive research program relating to the unemployment compensation system, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. From the sums authorized to be appropriated by this subsection the Secretary may provide for the conduct of such research through grants or contracts.

"Training Grants for Unemployment Compensation Personnel

"SEC. 907. (a) In order to assist in increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of administration of the unemployment compensation program by increasing the number of adequately trained personnel, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $1,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary for training such personnel.

"(b)(1) From the sums authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) the Secretary shall provide (A) directly and through State agencies or through grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, for training personnel who are employed or preparing for employment in the administration of the unemployment compensation program, including claims determinations and adjudication, and (B) directly or through grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, for special courses of study or seminars of short duration (not in excess of one year) for training of such personnel and (C) directly or through grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, for establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships for such personnel at such institutions, with such stipends and allowances as may be permitted by the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary may, to the extent he finds such action to be necessary, prescribe requirements to assure that any individual will repay the amounts of his fellowship or traineeship received under this subsection to the extent such individual fails to serve, for the period prescribed by the Secretary, with a State agency or with the Federal Government, in connection with administration of any State employment security program. The Secretary may relieve any individual of his obligation to so repay, in whole or in part, whenever and to the extent that requirement of such repayment would, in his judgment, be inequitable or would be contrary to the purposes of any of the programs established by this section."

Use of Certain Amounts for Payments of Expenses of Administration

SEC. 143. Section 903(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., sec. 1103(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "nine preceding fiscal years," in subparagraph (D) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fourteen preceding fiscal years,";

(2) by striking out "such ten fiscal years" in subparagraph (D) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "such fifteen fiscal years"; and

(3) by striking out "ninth preceding fiscal year" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fourteenth preceding fiscal year".

Change in Certification Date

SEC. 144. (a) Section 3302(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by—

(1) striking out "for the taxable year" after "certified"; and

(2) inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "for the 12-month period ending on October 31 of such year".

(b) Section 3302(b) of such Code is amended by—

(1) striking out "for the taxable year" after "certified";

(2) inserting after "section 3303" the following: "for the 12-month period ending on October 31 of such year"; and

(3) striking out "the taxable year" the last place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "such 12-month period".

(c) Section 3303(b)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On October 31 of each calendar year, the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary the law of each State (certified by the Secretary of Labor as provided in section 3304 for the 12-month period on such October 31) with respect to which he finds that reduced rates of contributions were allowable with respect to such 12-month period only in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a)."

(d) Section 3303(b)(2) of such Code is amended by—

(1) striking out "taxable year" where it first appears and inserting in lieu thereof "12-month period ending on October 31";

(2) striking out "on December 31 of such taxable year" following the words "the Secretary of Labor shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "on such October 31"; and

(3) striking out "taxable year" after "contributions were allowable with respect to such" and inserting in lieu thereof "12-month period".

(e) Section 3303(b)(3) of such Code is amended by—

(1) striking out "taxable year" where it first appears and inserting in lieu thereof "12-month period ending on October 31";

(2) striking out "taxable year" where it next appears and inserting in lieu thereof "12-month period".

(f) Section 3304(d) of such Code is amended by striking out "If, at any time during the taxable year," and inserting in lieu thereof "If at any time".

(g) Section 3304 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) CHANGE OF LAW DURING 12-MONTH PERIOD.—Whenever—

"(1) any provision of this section, section 3302, or section 3303 refers to a 12-month period ending on October 31 of a year, and

"(2) the law applicable to one portion of such period differs from the law applicable to another portion of such period,

then such provision shall be applied by taking into account for each such portion the law applicable to such portion."

(h) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the taxable year 1967 and taxable years thereafter.

TITLE II—FEDERAL-STATE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Short Title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1966".

Payment of Extended Compensation

State law requirements

SEC. 202. (a)(1) For purposes of section 3304(a)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a State law shall provide that payment of extended compensation shall be made, for any week of unemployment which begins in the individual's eligibility period, to individuals who have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law and who have no rights to regular compensation with respect to such week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an individual shall have exhausted his rights to regular compensation under a State law (A) when no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to him based on wage credits for his base period, or (B) when his rights to such compensation have terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(2) Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for extended compensation and to the payment thereof.

State may impose special eligibility requirement

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the State law may provide that to be eligible for extended compensation an individual must have had a number of weeks (specified in such law, but not to exceed twenty-six weeks) of covered employment in his base period (or specified wage or work history which is the substantial equivalent).

Individuals' compensation accounts

(d)(1) The State law shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application therefor, an extended compensation account with respect to such individual's benefit year. The amount established in such account shall be not less than whichever of the following is the least:

(A) 50 per centum of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to him during such benefit year under such law,

(B) thirteen times his average weekly benefit amount, or

(C) thirty-nine times his average weekly benefit amount, reduced by the regular compensation paid (or deemed paid) to him during such benefit year under such law;

except that the amount so determined shall (if the State law so provides) be reduced by the aggregate amount of additional compensation paid (or deemed paid) to him under such law for prior weeks of unemployment in such benefit year which did not begin in an extended benefit period.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), an individual's weekly benefit amount for a week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

Extended benefit period

Beginning and ending

SEC. 203. (a) For purposes of this title, in the case of any State, an extended benefit period—

(1) shall begin with the third week after whichever of the following weeks first occurs:

(A) a week for which there is a national "on" indicator, or

(B) a week for which there is a State "on" indicator; and

(2) shall end with the third week after the first week for which there is both a national "off" indicator and a State "off" indicator.

Special rules

(b)(1) In the case of any State—

(A) no extended benefit period shall last for a period of less than thirteen consecutive weeks, and

(B) no extended benefit period may begin by reason of a State "on" indicator before the fourteenth week after the close of a prior extended benefit period with respect to such State.

(2) When a determination has been made that an extended benefit period is beginning or ending with respect to a State (or all the States), the Secretary shall cause notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register.

Eligibility period

(c) For purposes of this title, an individual's eligibility period under the State law shall consist of the weeks in his benefit year which begin in an extended benefit period and, if his benefit year ends within such extended benefit period, the next thirteen or fewer weeks which begin in such extended benefit period.

National "on" and "off" indicators

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) There is a national "on" indicator for a week if—

(A) for each of the three most recent calendar months ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States equaled or exceeded 5 per centum (determined by reference to the average monthly covered employment for the first four of the most recent six calendar quarters ending before the month in question), and

(B) the total number of claimants exhausting their rights to regular compensation under all State laws during the period consisting of such three months equaled or exceeded 1 per centum of average monthly covered employment under all State laws for the first four of the most recent six calendar quarters ending before the beginning of such period.

(2) There is a national "off" indicator for a week if either—

(A) for the most recent calendar month ending before such week, the rate of insured unemployment (seasonally adjusted) for all States was less than 5 per centum (determined by reference to the average monthly covered employment for the first four of the most recent six calendar quarters ending before such month), or

(B) paragraph (1)(B) was not satisfied with respect to such week.

State "on" and off" indicators

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) There is a State "on" indictor for a week if the rate of insured unemployment under the State law for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks—

(A) equaled or exceeded 120 per centum of the average of such rates for the corresponding thirteen-week period ending in each of the preceding two calendar years, and

(B) equaled or exceeded 3 per centum.

(2) There is a State "off" indicator for a week if, for the period consisting of such week and the immediately preceding twelve weeks, either subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) was not satisfied.

For purposes of this subsection, the rate of insured unemployment for any 13-week period shall be determined by reference to the average monthly covered employment under the State law for the first four of the most recent six calendar quarters ending before the close of such period.

Rate of insured unemployment; covered employment

(f)(1) For purposes of subsections (d) and (e), the term "rate of insured unemploment" means the percentage arrived at by dividing—

(A) the average weekly number of individuals filing claims for weeks of unemployment with respect to the specified period, as determined on the basis of the reports made by all State agencies (or, in the case of subsection (e), by the State agency) to the Secretary, by

(B) the average monthly covered employment for the specified period.

(2) Determinations under subsection (d) shall be made by the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

(3) Determinations under subsection (e) shall be made by the State agency in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Payments to States

Amount payable

Sec. 204. (a)(1) There shall be paid to each State an amount equal to one-half of the sum of—

(A) the sharable extended compensation, and

(B) the sharable regular compensation, paid to individuals under the State law.

(2) No payment shall be made to any State under this subsection in respect of compensation for which the State is entitled to reimbursement under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act.

Sharable extended compensation

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(A), extended compensation paid to an individual for weeks of unemployment in such individual's eligibility period is sharable extended compensation to the extent that the aggregate extended compensation paid to such individual with respect to any benefit year does not exceed the smallest of the amounts referred to in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 202(d)(1).

Sharable regular compensation

(c) For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(B), regular compensation paid to an individual for a week of unemployment is sharable regular compensation—

(1) if such week is in such individual's eligibility period (determined under section 203(c)), and

(2) to the extent that the sum of such compensation, plus the regular compensation paid (or deemed paid) to him with respect to prior weeks of unemployment in the benefit year, exceeds twenty-six times (and does not exceed thirty-nine times) the average weekly benefit amount (including allowances for dependents) for weeks of total unemployment payable to such individual under the State law in such benefit year.

Payment on calendar month basis

(d) There shall be paid to each State either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

Certification

(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account to the account of such State in the unemployment trust fund.

Definitions

Sec. 205. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "compensation" means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment.

(2) The term "regular compensation" means compensation payable to an individual under any State unemployment compensation law (including compensation payable pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act), other than extended compensation and additional compensation.

(3) The term "extended compensation" means compensation (including additional compensation and compensation payable pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) payable for weeks of unemployment beginning in an extended benefit period to an individual under those provisions of the State law which satisfy the requirement of this title with respect to the payment of extended compensation.

(4) The term "additional compensation" means compensation payable to exhaustees by reason of conditions of high unemployment or by reason of other special factors.

(5) The term "benefit year" means the benefit year as defined in the applicable State law.

(6) The term "base period" means the base period as determined under applicable State law for the benefit year.

(7) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor of the United States.

(8) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(9) The term "State agency" means the agency of the State which administers its State law.

(10) The term "State law" means the unemployment compensation law of the State, approved by the Secretary under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(11) The term "week" means a week as defined in the applicable State law.

Extended Unemployment Compensation Account

Sec. 206. (a) Title IX of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out section 905 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Extended Unemployment Compensation Account

"Establishment of account

"Sec. 905. (a) There is hereby established in the Unemployment Trust Fund an extended unemployment compensation account. For the purposes provided for in section 904(e), such account shall be maintained as a separate book account.

"Transfers to account

"(b)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer (as of the close of January 1968, and each month thereafter), from the employment security administration account to the extended unemployment compensation account established by subsection (a), an amount determined by him to be equal to 16⅔ per centum of the amount by which—

"(A) transfers to the employment security administration account pursuant to section 901(b)(2) during such month, exceed

"(B) payments during such month from the employment security administration account pursuant to section 902(b)(3) and (d).

If for any such month the payments referred to in subparagraph (B) exceed the transfers referred to in subparagraph (A), proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred.

"(2) Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines pursuant to section 901(f) that there is an excess in the employment security administration account as of the close of any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, there shall be transferred (as of the beginning of the succeeding fiscal year) to the extended unemployment compensation account the total amount of such excess or so much thereof as is required to increase the amount in the extended unemployment compensation account to whichever of the following is the greater:

"(A) $500,000,000, or

"(B) the amount (determined by the Secretary of Labor and certified by him to the Secretary of the Treasury) equal to two-tenths of 1 per centum of the total wages subject (determined without any limitation on amount) to contributions under all State unemployment compensation laws for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year for which the excess is determined.

"Transfers to State accounts

"(c) Amounts in the extended unemployment compensation fund shall be available for transfer to the accounts of the States in the unemployment trust fund as provided by section 204(e) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1966.

“Transfers to Federal unemployment account

“(d) If the balance in the extended unemployment compensation account as of the close of any fiscal year exceeds the greater of the amounts referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer (as of the close of such fiscal year) from such account to the Federal unemployment account an amount equal to such excess. In applying section 902(b), any amount transferred pursuant to this subsection as of the close of any fiscal year shall be treated as an amount in the Federal unemployment account as of the close of such fiscal year.

“Advances to extended unemployment compensation account

“(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the extended unemployment compensation account, as repayable advances (without interest), such sums as may be necessary to provide for the transfers referred to in subsection (c).”

(b)(1) Section 901(f)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out “to the Federal unemployment account” and inserting in lieu thereof “to the extended unemployment compensation account, to the Federal unemployment account, or both,”.

(2) Section 902(a) of such Act is amended by striking out “the total amount of such excess” and inserting in lieu thereof “the portion of such excess remaining after the application of section 905(b)(2)”.

(3) The second sentence of section 1203 of such Act is amended to read as follows: “Whenever, after the application of section 901(f)(3) with respect to the excess in the employment security administration account as of the close of any fiscal year, there remains any portion of such excess, so much of such remainder as does not exceed the balances of advances made pursuant to section 905(e) or this section shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury and shall be credited against, and shall operate to reduce, first the balance of advances under section 905(e) and then the balance of advances under this section.”

Approval of State Laws

SEC. 207. Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) (added by section 121(a) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

“(11) extended compensation shall be payable as provided by the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1966; and”.

Effective Dates

SEC. 208. (a) In applying section 203, no extended benefit period may begin with a week beginning before January 1, 1969.

(b) Section 204 shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning after December 31, 1968.

(c) The amendment made by section 207 shall apply to the taxable year 1969 and taxable years thereafter.

TITLE III—FINANCING

Increase in Tax Rate

SEC. 301. (a) Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax under Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out “1961” and inserting in lieu thereof “1967”,

(2) by striking out “3.1 percent” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “3.3 percent”, and

(3) by striking out the last two sentences.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the calendar year 1967 and calendar years thereafter.

Increase in Wage Base

SEC. 302. (a) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1969, section 3306(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out “3,000” each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof “$3,900”.

(b) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1972, section 3306(b)(1) of such Code (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by striking out “$3,900” each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof “$4,200”.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, this is the exact language of the House bill with the single exception of perhaps the Dirksen amendment which was unanimously agreed to in committee which would strike out section 101; is that not correct?

Mr. **MORTON**. The Senator is correct. This is virtually the House bill as changed by the two dates, which can be reconciled in conference. It also follows the will of the Senate by conform to present law as witnessed by the Dirksen amendment to conform to present law insofar as the number of employees is concerned.

Mr. President, present law declares that the last four employees are exempt. The House-passed bill took it down to one employee. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate itself, by adopting the Dirksen amendment on the floor of the Senate, showed its will—that it wanted to continue present law insofar as the number of employees is concerned. Thus, with the exception of that amendment, which is the real substantive amendment and the change in the dates which I have made, which can be reconciled in conference, it means that this matter would go to conference. But, this is the Mills bill—the House bill—and it does not provide for Federal standards.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe that Senators would want to know that the House bill being offered is strongly opposed by organized labor. They testified that it would prejudice their hopes of ever getting additional substantial benefits for the laboring man of this country in the future. It is contended that they are so strongly opposed to the House bill as it passed the House and is offered in the Senate, that they would ask every Senator to vote against it, and if it passed, to ask the President to veto it.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Does not the Senator agree with me that this substitute is worse than the House bill?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. That is correct. From the point of view of organized labor, the House bill which passed and was sent to us is a bill which organized labor would ask the Senate to vote against and, if it carried, to ask the President to veto, because the bill, from the point of view of organized labor—the substitute offered or modified—is even worse than the House-passed bill.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. The only thing that would be in conference, if this substitute were to prevail would be that the number of employees would be four instead of one; is that not correct, everything else would be the same?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Basically, the answer is “Yes.”

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. I know that all of us have great consideration for organized labor. Certainly, all of us want to do what we can to be of benefit to organized labor.

However, I think that one of the worst things we can do to labor is to continue raising prices in this country. I believe that one of the worst things we can do to labor is to bring on a situation of inflation, because that will hurt them more than any other segment of the economy.

Last Saturday morning, a newspaper contained a headline to the effect that “President Is Greatly Worried About Increasing Prices.” In the next column, another headline stated, “Once Again President Believes More Stringent Controls Will Be Necessary Unless We Can Do Something About These Continued Price Increases.” He also warned labor on excessive demands.

We all know what has happened by virtue of the strike now going on in the airline industry, which could very well set a precedent, and which will cost us, including labor, and everyone else, a great deal more money for the things we buy. When the airline strike terminates then things will begin to happen in the steel industry and other industries because we all know that there are all kinds of situations developing. As a matter of fact the steel industry has already raised prices. Thus, we know that the country is beginning to move more swiftly into an inflationary period.

The pending measure, Mr. President, will do as much as any one thing can to contribute to more inflation, because the House bill will cost us $500 million, and if we pass the Senate bill, it will cost us $1 billion.

Mr. **MORTON**. $1 billion.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. $1 billion. So that within the next 2 to 3 years an increase must necessarily be passed on by big industry and big concerns to the consumer. We hear a lot of talk about what we are going to do for the small businessman and the little fellow who cannot compete very well. This is the man who must pay the increased tax—and this is an increased tax on his business, do not ever believe that it is otherwise. This is no contributory tax. Only one side will pay it, and that will be the employer. The small employer will pay it as well as the big employer. The big employer may have an easier time passing it along to the consumer, but the little man may not be able to do so. He can try to do so but, in effect, it will contribute enormously to inflation in this country and may result in his joining the ranks of the many small businesses that go out of business monthly. There is no doubt but that the adoption of Federal standards places the small businessman at a competitive disadvantage. Let us not break the backbone of this segment of our economy.

In addition, with our international balance of payments what it is, with the cost of the Vietnam war being what it is, and with the other situations going on which contribute to the inflationary spiral, I do not think that we should stoke the fires of inflation any more by passing the bill which the House of Representatives did not want and the State unemployment insurance commissioners did not want, but if passed will add $500 million in cost.

It seems to me that the small business man is the one who will be hurt the most on this particular proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me finish by saying this. Let us remember this about the House bill which is now before us. The House bill is a generous bill. It is not a miserly nor a niggardly bill. It is a fair and equitable bill. It would increase the coverage of workers some 2,300,000. It would increase the revenue by $250 million to provide adequate financing for extended benefits and administration. It is a move forward. It would bring coverage to agricultural processing workers who were never covered before. This is the kind of bill which the State unemployment insurance commissioners actually wanted. The insurance commissioners from all the States have met at least three times on this proposal and, as I understand it, at no time have they recommended that we go as far as we are going in this particular bill.

They met before the House Ways and Means Committee passed this measure. They recommended the House Ways and Means Committee bill. They considered again after passage by the House. They came before our committee and said they supported the House Ways and Means Committee bill without amendment.

With amendment the committee bill requires legislation being approved by 48 States and penalizing them if they do not. There is no way the States can conform with this bill except by having the State legislatures meet in 48 States and redrafting what has been done.

It seems to me we ought to recognize that for 31 years we have had a working partnership between the State governments and the Federal Government which has worked eminently satisfactorily. I do not know why at this particular stage we want to act as if the Congress of the United States does not believe that the members of the State legislatures are capable of taking care of their own particular problems with respect to unemployment. I do not know why we in the Congress should think that we have all the brainpower and should stop those legislatures from doing what they think they should do in their own States.

It seems to me the time has come when we should recognize that they are capable of doing what they have done for 31 years. Why should we, the Federal Government, invoke jurisdiction to the degree that the majority of the States disapprove?

In summary, it seems to me the time has come when we ought to begin to look at our own fiscal and monetary picture. If we look at the cost of our Government, in the light of what is happening in Vietnam, if we look at our international balance-of-payments position, it seems to me we are going to have to do some thinking about wage-price controls and increased taxes, in order to put our fiscal house in order to maintain a stable economy.

The bill as reported from the House is not an ungenerous bill. It seems to me we are running a course of irresponsibility if we continue to add on and on and on and give and give and build up and build up. Certainly the State administrators, who best know what to do within their own States, should have something to say about it. The Federal standard provisions of the bill passed the Finance Committee by a vote of 9 to 8. There is no overwhelming consensus on that committee, and there is none in this body, either.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Has it not been attempted to persuade Members of the Senate to vote for the committee version of the bill by saying that hundreds of millions of dollars are going to come from the Federal Government instead of the States?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Federal Government pay any taxes itself?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Federal Government reaches into the pockets of the people of Massachusetts, Kentucky, Louisiana, Georgia, and all the other States in order to get its money. The Federal Government does not have money of its own. It comes from the taxes which the people of this country pay.

Mr. ERVIN. It is not true that the money extracted from the pockets of the people of the United States, whether it is called Federal money or State money, is money taken by taxes on payrolls?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that State unemployment taxes are taken from the same payrolls?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that a tax is imposed on the same payrolls out of which come the Federal income taxes?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not the same payrolls which are providing the money for the increased unemployment benefits?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not from those same payrolls that not only come the unemployment taxes, but medicare taxes and other social security taxes?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I shall ask to have placed in the RECORD a tabulation showing how much each State will have to pay if the bill is adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Present State maximum weekly benefit amount compared with proposed Federal requirement (50 percent of statewide average weekly wage)

A. States which meet proposed Federal requirement (18): Arkansas, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

B. States which do not meet proposed Federal requirement (34):

	Maximum, present law	Maximum, under committee bill
Alabama	$38	$47
Alaska	$55- 80	86
Arizona	43	53
Connecticut	50- 75	58
Delaware	55	61
Florida	33	49
Georgia	43	46
Illinois	42- 70	61
Indiana	40- 43	58
Kentucky	45	49
Louisiana	45	50
Maryland	50	51
Massachusetts	50	53
Michigan	43- 72	67
Minnesota	47	53
Mississippi	30	41
Missouri	45	55
Montana	34	49
Nebraska	40	48
Nevada	41- 61	60
New Jersey	50	60
New Mexico	36	44
New York	55	61
Ohio	42- 53	60
Oklahoma	32	50
Oregon	44	55
Pennsylvania	45	54
Puerto Rico	20	29
South Dakota	36	44
Tennessee	38	46
Texas	37	50
Virginia	42	47
Washington	42	59
West Virginia	35	54

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. When the Senator refers to the bill, to which bill does he refer?

Mr. SMATHERS. I did not hear the question.

Mr. MORTON. Does the table which the Senator put in the RECORD refer to the House bill or to the committee substitute?

Mr. SMATHERS. The latter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to make clear the fact that the tax which we are voting on here does not start being collected until 1968. Insofar as that tax is concerned, nobody starts paying that tax until that year.

Some of us hope that this war in Vietnam might be over by that time. But even if it is not, if it is inflation the Senators are worried about, all of our economists agree that a tax takes money out of circulation, and in that respect is deflationary, because it is the excess amount of money in circulation, money seeking goods, that tends to be inflationary.

It is for that reason that there have been many suggestions that we ought to vote a tax increase now, rather than later. But the whole effect of a tax increase, as has been the case in every major war, has been the effect of both helping to finance the Government and to reduce inflationary pressure.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to make just one point, and that is that not all economists agree. I think we might say all economists agree that if you have a tax increase and the Federal Government does not spend the money, then there would not be an inflationary impact. But there are many economists who point out that if there is an increase in taxes, just taking the money out of the private sector and the Federal Government turning around and spending it does not reduce the money supply at all, and has absolutely no impact on the inflationary situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The whole idea of the unemployment insurance program is to work on an anticyclical basis. It is supposed to counter the business cycle, to take money out of circulation in good times, when people are fully employed, and put money in circulation in bad times, when there is a good deal of unemployment.

When you have many people employed, and a great demand for supplies and for the services of labor and others, you have inflationary pressures; and that is when it is considered good to resist the inflationary pressures by taxing some money out of circulation, and then putting it back into circulation in times when you have recessions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. What I heard the Senator say a moment ago would lead one to think the money was skimmed off and put somewhere in a vault. But it goes back to the States and is spent there in some way. It is collected for insurance purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This money here goes into a fund, and stays there until needed for these benefits; and to that extent it tends to be anti-inflationary.

I point out that the House bill would do some of that also. It also takes money out of circulation and puts it into a fund, to be paid out at a subsequent time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Any Senator who really wishes to attack the problem ought to propose a bill to abolish the whole thing.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator mean, then, that the reason we have inflation is because the American taxpayers, the American consumers, have been irresponsible and have been engaged in a spree of profligate spending, and they alone are solely responsible? Is that the implication of the Senator's remark?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, I did not say that. I did not suggest it.

Mr. TOWER. Then why do we have inflation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. You usually have inflation when you have more money in circulation than you have goods to satisfy the demand. That being the case, money tends to be cheapened. One of the things working against that type of situation, which tends to help save and restore the value of money, is to tax some of the money out of circulation.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that we have a tight money situation now, and there is a great paucity of mortgage money? Homebuilders cannot obtain financing; it is difficult to obtain a loan for commercial purposes or anything these days. What is the cause of that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the pending bill will not make any difference in that respect—not between now and 1968. I really do not see what the point is in arguing things that really do not make much difference one way or the other.

In 1968, people would start paying the higher tax. If we feel that there are inflationary pressures, it is argued by the fine Congressman from the Senator's State, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and others, that it would be preferable, instead of discouraging people from borrowing money by high interest rates, to go to a tax to take some of the money out of circulation.

But in the last analysis, both bills would increase the tax to pay extended benefits. One would do it half from the States and half from the Federal Government while the other is wholly by the Federal Government. But they both would increase taxes, and to the degree that you increase a tax of this sort, it tends to be anti-inflationary.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had intended to offer, at the proper time, what I feel sure is a noncontroversial amendment, with which the staff of my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, is acquainted. I am informed that if the proposed substitute is adopted, Senators, under the rules, would be foreclosed from offering any further amendment. I therefore shall offer an amendment to the substitute, and if the substitute fails, I shall then offer it to the bill. I wish to read a very short explanation of what I seek to do, and then I shall offer the amendment.

The present unemployment compensation law excludes from coverage students in the employ of schools, colleges, and universities, if service is performed by one who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at such college or university.

Historically, colleges and universities have provided students in need of financial assistance various opportunities to earn additional funds, to permit them to continue their education. Recently, and as a part of such assistance programs, employment opportunities have been extended to students' spouses.

Inevitably, at the conclusion of the student's collegiate education, both the student and the spouse move elsewhere to obtain gainful employment; and, unless excluded from coverage, the student's spouse may qualify for unemployment compensation benefits.

Since the employment offered is, to a large extent, a means of assisting deserving students, it has been recommended that students' spouses be excluded, as are students now, so that schools of higher learning would be encouraged to continue the practice of hiring spouses, and would not discontinue the employment of such personnel because of the cost involved in connection with the payment of benefits.

It seems to me that such a provision would be meritorious; and on that basis, I offer the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of my amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment proposed by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

On page 9, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

"EMPLOYMENT BY SCHOOL, COLLEGE, OR UNIVERSITY OF SPOUSE OF STUDENT ENROLLED THEREIN

"SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (10) of section 3306(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by section 104(a) of this Act) is further amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B) service performed in the employ of a school, college, or university, if such service is performed (i) by a student who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at such school, college, or university, or (ii) by the spouse of such a student, if such spouse is advised, at the time such spouse commences to perform such service, that (I) the employment of such spouse to perform such service is provided under a program to provide financial assistance to such student by such school, college, or university, and (II) such employment will not be covered by any program of unemployment insurance; or'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966."

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending amendment. I point out that during the 1st session of the 87th Congress——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that action may be taken on my amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I point out that during the 1st session of the 87th Congress I introduced a bill designed to accomplish exactly the same thing as H.R. 15119 to the extent that it provides extended benefits during periods of high level unemployment. That was S. 5, introduced on January 5, 1961.

Under my bill extended benefits would have been provided when the Secretary of Labor determined, first, that the total number of final benefit payments made in all the States for the preceding 3-calendar-month period equaled or exceeded 1 percent of covered unemployment in such States, and second, that the rate of insured unemployment for all the States for each of the 3 calendar months constituting the aforementioned 3-calendar-month period equaled or exceeded 5 percent of covered employment in such States.

My bill further provided for the termination of extended benefits whenever the Secretary determined that the total number of final benefit payments made in all States for the preceding 3-calendar-month period was less than 1 percent of covered employment in such States.

The extended benefit provisions of the bill reported by the Finance Committee incorporate and are substantially the same as the corresponding provisions of the bill I introduced in 1961. Under the committee bill an extended benefit period on a national basis would be established if, first, the seasonally adjusted rate of insured unemployment for the Nation as a whole equaled or exceeded 5 percent for each month in a 3-month period and, second, during the same 3-month period the total number of claimants exhausting their rights to regular compensation—over the entire period—equaled or exceeded 1 percent of covered employment for the Nation as a whole.

Under the committee bill a national extended benefit period would be terminated if the rate of insured unemployment remained below 5 percent for a month or if the number of claimants exhausting their rights to compensation added up to less than 1 percent for a 3-month period.

The bill reported by the Finance Committee also provides that an extended benefit period may be provided for individual States if the rate of insured unemployment for a State equals or exceeds 120 percent of the average rate for the corresponding 13-week period in the 2 preceding calendar years if such insured unemployment rate equals or exceeds 3 percent. I believe that this is a good addition to my original proposal and I shall support it.

The House-passed bill provides that 50 percent of the cost of extended benefits will be paid by the Federal Government. The bill reported by the Finance Committee, however, adopts the approach contained in the bill which I introduced in 1961 and provides that Federal funds will be used to pay the entire costs of extended benefits.

It should be noted here that Vermont is one of but only seven States which currently provides an additional 13-week period when high-level unemployment occurs and that this additional benefit period is now entirely funded from unemployment taxes imposed upon Vermont employers.

Vermont has not had a level of unemployment high enough to trigger its extended benefits provisions for over 2 years. Under the Vermont law, however, extended benefits become available whenever the unemployment rate is in excess of 7 percent for a period of 4 consecutive weeks, and are terminated when the employment rate is less than 7 percent for 4 consecutive weeks.

In April 1964 the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare filed a report concerning proposals for a comprehensive employment and manpower policy in the United States. I was one who signed minority views to this report. With respect to unemployment compensation for high-level unemployment the minority views contained the following recommendations:

> We recommend enactment of a program designed to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program at any time in the future when unemployment nationally increases beyond the level for which the regular program would be responsible.
>
> This program would include the following features:
>
> (a) Grants from the Federal Government to the States to help pay for supplementary benefits during times of national high level unemployment.
>
> (b) Extra benefits would be paid during the recession for about 13 weeks beyond the normal compensation period.
>
> (c) The standby unemployment compensation program would go into effect when certain economic indicators show that trouble is ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation of these recommendations which appears on pages 130 and 131 of the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

D. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR HIGH LEVEL UNEMPLOYMENT

We recommend a Federal program which could be called compensation for high level unemployment. Such a program would be designed to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program at any time in the future when unemployment nationally increases beyond the level for which the regular program would be responsible. This program would include the following features:

(*a*) Grants from the Federal Government to the States to help pay for supplementary benefits during times of national high level unemployment. Unemployment of great magnitude cannot be considered the sole responsibility of the individual States.

(*b*) We feel that the period during which extra benefits would be paid should be at least one-half as long as the duration to which the individual is entitled under State law or 13 weeks, whichever is longer.

(*c*) Our proposal, as extended unemployment benefits program for recession periods, would be activated when both of the following two conditions were met:

(i) When the total number of claimants who exhausted their regular benefit rights during 3 successive months equaled or exceeded 1 percent of employment covered by State unemployment insurance laws, and

(ii) When, during each of those 3 months, the average number of workers (seasonally adjusted) filing claims for a week of unemployment equaled or exceeded 5 percent of covered employment.

(*d*) Once activated, the program would continue until the number of workers exhausting regular benefit rights during 3 successive months was less than 1 percent of covered employment.

Since the proposed program is designed to deal with the problem of prolonged unemployment, a problem more characteristic of recession periods than of other times, there is considerable logic in the use of benefit exhaustions for determining the severity of the problem. While the rate of unemployment alone is usually a satisfactory basis for indicating the start and end of recession periods, for the purposes of this program, this would not always have been the best basis had such a program been in effect in the past. The rate of unemployment can rise temporarily at times other than recession periods, such as occurred during the steel strike in late 1959, without long-term unemployment becoming a widespread or serious problem. On the other hand, although less likely, the relative level of exhaustions can rise temporarily when the overall rate of unemployment remains moderate. The use of both exhaustions and the unemployment rate gives assurance that the program would not become activated unless a serious problem of long-term unemployment existed during a period of heavy unemployment.

Once a recession begins and exhaustions increase significantly exhaustions continue to be heavy for a period of time after the overall level of unemployment recedes. This is partly due to the fact that, because of seniority practices, frequently those first laid off are the last to be recalled to their jobs, if recalled at all. The unskilled, the old, and other workers considered by employers to be marginal are often affected in the same way. Thus, the problem of long-term unemployment persists longer than does the problem of high-level total unemployment. For this reason, the basis for terminating the program is confined to the exhaustion level alone.

The "trigger" point used for exhaustions is 1 percent of employment covered under State laws. With the latter currently running at a level of about 40 million workers, the "trigger" requires at least 400,000 exhaustions during a 3-month period, or a rate of over 1½ million a year.

The indicator described above has been tested against the experience of the last 15 years encompassing four postwar recessions. The program would have operated during each of these recessions covering periods of time considered satisfactory for the purpose intended.

The unemployment compensation program discussed in this section was incorporated in S. 5, introduced by Senator PROUTY in 1961. However, no action was taken on it by the democratically controlled Congress.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have received many letters opposing these provisions on the ground that they would require increases in the tax rate under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. The actual percentage increase will be two-tenths of 1 percent. Overall, the tax rate will increase from 3.1 to 3.3 percent with the net Federal unemployment tax being increased from four-tenths of 1 percent to six-tenths of 1 percent. The extended benefits program will be funded by using a portion of the Federal tax placed in a new account.

As I have already mentioned, Vermont is one of seven States that currently provides extended benefits during periods of high-level unemployment, funded entirely by State unemployment taxes. Despite the two-tenths of 1-percent increase in the Federal unemployment tax contained in this bill to finance extended benefits I believe that a benefit may accrue to Vermont employers as a result through a decrease in the amount of the State unemployment tax.

This bill also increases the taxable wage base over a period of years from the present $3,000 to $4,000, in 1972. Just as it has been necessary to increase the taxable base for social security purposes, however, I believe that this increase is necessary if we are to maintain the type of unemployment compensation system which is desirable.

I am completely opposed to the federalization of unemployment compensation services, just as I was strongly opposed to the recent efforts to federalize the State employment security operations with respect to employment services. However, the bill reported by the Finance Committee does not federalize the State unemployment compensation functions.

The bill reported by the Finance Committee does contain certain Federal standards.

The State of Vermont is one of the few States that already meets the Federal requirements contained in the bill. As a result Vermont has a comparatively high State unemployment tax. All States now receive and will continue to receive under the Finance Committee's bill a 2.7-percent tax credit. Under present law, however, this is extremely unfair to Vermont because States with low standards and poor unemployment compensation programs get exactly the same tax credit as States such as Vermont, which have outstanding programs.

For example, employers in all the States receive a 2.7-percent credit toward the current 3.1-percent Federal unemployment tax. The most recent figures are those contained in the transcript of the hearings held by the Finance Committee, which show that Vermont has an average State unemployment tax of 1.5 percent while, for example, Texas has an average State unemployment tax of 0.5 percent and Virginia has an average State unemployment tax of 0.4 percent.

Under the bill reported by the committee, all States will have to meet the minimum Federal standards.

I suppose it is natural for employers in States which have low standards and a low State unemployment tax rate to oppose this legislation, as there is no question but that those States will have to raise their State unemployment tax rates in order to comply with these minimum standards.

In my opinion, the type of minimum standards contained in this bill are necessary to protect employers in States such as Vermont which have enacted progressive legislation in the field of unemployment compensation.

I know that there are many factors involved in a company's decision as to whether it should locate a new plant in a particular State or move an existing plant from one State to another. I am sure, however, that the State unemployment tax rate is one of the factors given consideration in making such a decision.

Passage of the bill as reported by the committee will do much to prevent States with low standards and poor unemployment compensation programs from using the argument of a low State unemployment tax as an incentive to companies to locate in their States.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. President, I support passage of H.R. 15119 in the form reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JACKSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment for a brief statement in the RECORD. I would like to make it at this time while a number of Senators are present.

Last Thursday afternoon, just prior to the vote on the airline dispute legislation, I reported to the Senate a telephone conversation I had just had with the Secretary of Labor. In that telephone conversation the Secretary of Labor said "the position of the administration continues to be that it neither asks Congress to pass legislation nor does it ask Congress not to pass legislation. If the Congress in its wisdom decides to pass legislation, I am authorized to inform the Senate that it prefers the Morse resolution, which is the bipartisan resolution pending."

That evening the Secretary of Labor issued a press release which caused some confusion among newspapermen as to the accuracy of my report. In that press release the Secretary of Labor said:

> There was reference today during the Senate debate on proposed airline dispute legislation to my position on the proposals before the Senate. I have made no statement differing in any respect from the position taken at the Senate committee hearing on August 1.

The Secretary of Labor took the same position on August 1 when he testified before the Labor Committee as the administration's sole witness. I feel that he made clear that the administration was not asking the Congress to pass legislation, nor was it asking the Congress not to pass legislation. He said as the administration's witness before the Labor Committee that the principle of the Morse resolution would be preferable.

On Friday morning I released a statement in which I said I was advised by an authorized spokesman for the administration at the White House that the statement I made on the floor of the Senate in referring to my understanding of Secretary Wirtz' statement was an accurate statement of the administration's position. I stand on that statement.

I ask unanimous consent that my press release on this matter dated last Friday be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon, issued the following statement today:

"Yesterday, during the debate in the Senate on the airline dispute legislation, I reported to the Senate a telephone conversation I had had with the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. In that conversation, I advised the Secretary of Labor that I thought it was desirable that it should be made clear on the floor of the Senate what his position was, as the witness for the Administration, concerning the Administration's position with regard to legislation dealing with the airlines strike.

"The Secretary of Labor authorized me to state to the Senate, and I so stated that 'he thought he had made clear when he was before the committee that although the administration is not taking any position one way or the other with regard to the passage of legislation, if the Senate is to pass legislation, the Secretary of Labor would favor the Morse bill.'

"Later, in my speech and just before the vote was taken, I said to the Senate, 'Mr. President, as I announced a few minutes ago, when some Members of the Senate were not present, the Secretary of Labor talked to me within the hour and authorized me to make the following statement to the Senate in his public capacity as the administration's official witness in this case. . . . He said the position of the administration continues to be that it neither asks Congress to pass legislation nor does it ask Congress not to pass legislation. If the Congress in its wisdom decides to pass legislation, I am authorized to inform the Senate that it prefers the Morse resolution, which is the bipartisan resolution pending.'

"Last night, August 4, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, issued the following press release:

" 'There was reference today during the Senate debate on proposed airline dispute legislation to my position on the proposals before the Senate. I have made no statement differing in any respect from the position taken at the Senate Committee hearing on August 1.'

"Unfortunately, the Secretary of Labor's press release left the impression with many newspapermen, who have queried me today, that my statement on the floor of the Senate was inaccurate and placed the Secretary of Labor in a different position than that which he took as the Administration's witness before the Labor Committee.

"My statement on the floor of the Senate was an accurate reporting of my conversation with the Secretary of Labor. Further, the Secretary of Labor's statement to me over the telephone was completely consistent with the administration's position as reported by him when he testified before the Labor Committee.

"The final draft of the Morse Resolution, as submitted to the Senate, was not before the Senate Labor Committee at the time Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified. However, the basic principle of the final draft which was before the Senate at the time of my telephone conversation with Secretary Wirtz was exactly the same as the Morse Resolution which was before the Labor Committee at the time of the hearing, namely, that the Congress should vote to end the strike by extending the time period of the Railway Labor Act, and such an ending of the strike would become effective if, as and when the President signed such a joint resolution.

"In the Committee hearing, Secretary Wirtz made clear that the Administration was not asking the Congress to pass legislation, nor was it asking the Congress not to pass legislation. I think he also made clear that if the Congress, in its wisdom, did pass legislation, he, as Secretary of Labor, speaking for the Administration, would prefer the Morse Resolution in contrast to the one finally recommended by the Committee which sought to pass the responsibility for ending the strike to the discretion of the President.

"The statement Secretary Wirtz made to me over the telephone yesterday left no room for doubt that that was the position of the Administration, and I so reported to the Senate.

"Today, I was advised by an authorized spokesman for the Administration at the White House that the statement I made on the floor of the Senate yesterday was an accurate statement of the Administration's position.

"In fairness to the Administration, to Secretary Wirtz and to myself, I am issuing this release for the information of those newspapermen who have questioned me today."

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the amendment proposed by my colleague, Senator MORTON, which would substitute the bill, H.R. 15119, as passed by the House, for the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

There are provisions of the bill reported by the Senate committee which are of value. But it is the principle that is at stake—the determination of these matters by the States, according to their needs, their problems of employment and unemployment, which are not uniform throughout the States.

The Senate committee bill would establish uniform Federal standards for each of the 50 States as they relate to the eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits payable to unemployed workers under State programs.

Since the enactment of the first unemployment compensation program in 1935, as part of the Social Security Act, the administration of jobless benefits has been a joint responsibility of the Federal Government and the States. During this period the States have adopted, modified, improved, and expanded their unemployment insurance programs to meet their needs as determined by experience and the varying conditions in the States.

This initiative and flexibility on the part of the States would be lost under this legislation giving the Federal Government the power to impose national standards covering eligibility, amounts, and duration of benefits down to the smallest detail.

The history of this joint program is good evidence that it has been operated in a fiscally responsible manner in the States and increasingly in value for the benefit of the employees.

The average weekly benefits paid throughout the Nation has increased substantially from $10.66 in 1939, to $37.19 in 1965, an increase in excess of the increased cost of living. The average maximum duration of benefits was 15 weeks in 1939. Now all States, except three, have adopted a maximum duration benefit period of 26 weeks.

Furthermore, some nine States provide additional periods beyond the 26 weeks, extending payment of benefits for periods ranging from 28 to 39 weeks. The responsibility of the States to prescribe the periods over which beneficiaries will draw benefits has been a key part of our Federal-State system.

In recent years, State legislatures have adopted a "variable duration period" relating the length of the benefit period to the amount of base period employment of the claimant. While in 1941, 32 States had variable benefit periods, today all but 7 States have them.

The Senate committee bill before us today establishing Federal standards would require revision of the unemployment insurance programs of all 50 States.

I am pleased that Kentucky has demonstrated its ability to keep pace with changing conditions and the needs of our citizens by making changes in our State employment insurance program.

Kentucky ranks above the national average in many respects. The maximum benefit amount is $45 a week, with a benefit period of 26 weeks. Kentucky law goes further than several provisions of the committee bill. It provides for the payment of 52 percent of the individual's average weekly wage and requires 18 weeks of employment to qualify for benefits.

There are two provisions in the House bill which are retained in the committee bill, and I support them and want to comment on them. The original administration bill, H.R. 8282, would not retain the experiment-rating system—essential to the insurance concept—as a basis for granting the credit against the Federal tax. The primary purpose of experience ratings is to encourage employers to stabilize their employment practices and thereby reduce the taxes which they would otherwise pay. It reflects the cost of unemployment to the employer and to the consumer of his products.

Much of the program's success is due to this incentive and it is of the utmost importance to the employee—for it encourages and promotes continuous and steady employment of employee by employers. Employment at full pay should be the objective of both employer and employee.

Another provision in both bills is the provision for judicial review of determinations made by the Secretary of Labor with respect to plans of unemployment insurance. For the first time a State, threatened with the loss of the tax credit by arbitrary action on the part of the Secretary, is permitted an appeal to the courts. The effect will unquestionably be to grant more latitude for initiative at the State level. It is believed that this provision will be particularly helpful in enabling the States to adapt their programs of unemployment insurance, to meet the particular needs of the State.

I favor the establishment of an Extended Unemployment Compensation Account to provide for extended period of benefits for employees in times of persistent unemployment, when benefits of the employees are exhausted. But the committee bill would impose additional taxes of $1 billion on employers—as compared to $500,000 in the House bill and this, after additional taxes have been imposed for increased social security benefits, and medicare—for which I voted.

In times of persistent unemployment, the Congress has enacted special legislation to provide extended periods of unemployment benefits for those whose benefits are exhausted. The House bill so provides and I have voted, and would vote again, for such legislation.

The House bill does extend coverage to thousands of employees not covered today. It increases the base pay upon which the employer would pay taxes and increases the tax; the House bill marks a substantial advance for the benefit of the employee. It is unclear whether the committee bill before us is fiscally sound and would pay its costs. We had best stay with our present system of State responsibility which has worked, and is working well.

The House of Representatives voted for its bill overwhelmingly by a vote of 375 to 10. The Senate Committee on Finance voted out the Federal standards provisions of the bill before us by a vote of only 9 to 8. The Senate has defeated and eliminated some of these provisions of the committee bill, and these votes show that the Congress as a whole favors the House bill and the present system.

The record shows that the State administrators of the unemployment compensation system favor the House bill and do not favor the Senate committee bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks, a letter dated August 4, 1966, written to me by the Honorable C. Leslie Dawson, Commissioner of the Department of Economic Security, Commonwealth of Kentucky, who is administrator of the employment security program in Kentucky.

As the letter evidences, Mr. Dawson, as administrator of the unemployment insurance program for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, opposes the amendments adopted by the Senate Finance Committee—which would federalize the program—and he supports the House of Representatives version of the bill—which I support.

I will therefore support and vote for the House bill, and will vote against the Senate committee amendments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY,
Frankfort, August 4, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: We have been advised that the Senate Finance Committee, on July 28, reported favorably to the Senate H.R. 15119, the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966, with a number of Committee amendments. As Administrator of the Employment Security Progrem in Kentucky, I would like to make known to you our position with respect to this bill and the amendments proposed thereto by the above Committee.

We have heretofore indicated to the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies our support of H.R. 15119 as passed by the House of Representatives. While not in complete agreement with each and every provision of this bill, we believe that generally it is acceptable to a great majority of the states, including Kentucky, for which reason we favor its adoption without amendments.

Specifically we would like to convey to you our objections, as a matter of principle, to the Finance Committee's recommended amendments in the area of so-called benefit standards. This is a matter that has heretofore been left entirely to the discretion of the individual state legislatures to pattern in accordance with the economy and need of their particular state. We believe that generally the states have met their obligation in this field and that they will continue to do so without federal compulsion as conditions warrant needed changes in the future.

Particularly do we object to that amendment regarding the duration of benefits which would require the payment of not less than twenty-six times a worker's weekly benefit rate based on twenty weeks of employment. This principle runs directly counter to those adopted by a great majority of the states and would seriously endanger the solvency of a number of state funds by materially increasing the payment of benefits to seasonal and short-time workers as opposed to improving the protection afforded to the regular worker who normally works a much longer period of time and deserves the greater protection of the program.

We also are opposed to those benefit standards recommended by the Finance Committee which would require the states to pay a weekly benefit amount equal to at least least fifty percent of the individual's average weekly wage up to a maximum payment equal to at least fifty percent of the State-wide average wage, and the requirement that no worker may be required to have more than twenty weeks of employment in his base period to qualify for benefits. While Kentucky at the present time goes further than the proposed federal requirement with respect to two of these three proposals (paying fifty-two percent of the individual's average weekly wage and requiring less than eighteen weeks of employment to qualify for benefits), we still feel that these matters should be left to the discretion of the individual state legislatures.

While the remainder of the Committee amendments do not appear to us to be as objectionable as those regarding the benefit standards, we still feel H.R. 15119 as passed by the House preferable to that reported by the Finance Committee and solicit your support of such without the Committee amendments.

Sincerely yours,
C. LESLIE DAWSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I have taken this time so that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] can have the last word on the substitute.

For a long time I have cosponsored the original bill to strengthen the unemployment compensation system. I think what the Committee on Finance has done deserves the support of the Senator from New York. New York is a large, industrial State, and a higher standard for unemployment compensation throughout the country is very much better for competition for business and industry among the States than is the present, very unequal level among the States.

We are putting a concrete base, in my judgment, under the economy which is not inflationary. On the contrary, it contributes to the strengthening of our economic system.

I believe that there should be minimum standards of unempolyment benefits under a Federal system administered by the States.

Mr. President, the pending bill also contains two solutions to very difficult problems. One is not contained in the proposed substitute, and I shall be against the substitute on that ground as well.

First is the problem of multiple interstate claims for unemployment compensation. The present patchwork system often results in denial of benefits to those entitled to them. This especially affects actors and actresses, and we have so many of them coming out of the State of New York, but it also affects all workers whose employment takes them from one State to another. Along with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] I offered an amendment to the bill which the committee adopted and which is very helpful in doing justice to such people. It is an important factor in facilitating labor mobility, which our national economy increasingly demands and which the Congress has recognized repeatedly in the Tax and Manpower Development and Training Acts.

I am also very much gratified that under both the committee and House-passed bills nonprofit organizations are able to obtain unemployment compensation for their employees on the basis either of paying the unemployment compensation tax or of reimbursing the fund for benefits paid to their employees. Both New York and California—New York at my urging—have passed enabling legislation to take advantage of this law, when it becomes law. I have for some time introduced a bill to achieve this result at the Federal level. I believe it is desirable and that it will be helpful and just to the employees of those nonprofit organizations.

Finally, Mr. President, I shall propose an amendment, which is in printed form on the desk of each Senator, amendment No. 727, which fits into the extended unemployment compensation system as contemplated by the committee bill, to deal with the unique problems of people between 60 and 65 years of age, who have a very high incidence of long-term unemployment. People in this age bracket are especially prejudiced in a situation such as Senator HARTKE discussed, which occurred in Gary, of a plant shutting down and the people being thrown out of work before they could get social security. This situation also arises with respect to the mining industry—especially the mining of iron ore—where older workers find it difficult to be reemployed and suffer long periods of unemployment.

That is not a very expensive amendment, and I am hopeful that the committe may see fit to take it to conference. It would properly fit into the committee bill rather than the substitute.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I think it is my duty to my State to support the committee bill and vote against the substitute.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from Kentucky for having introduced a more constructive measure as a substitute than the measure before us, and I should like to be associated with him in this respect.

The remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida a few moments ago about inflation were certainly valid in connection with out discussion of this measure. Even if the expenditure is not projected until 1968, we must think in terms of long-range solutions to economic problems that stem from both the debasement of the purchasing power of our dollar and the present high interest rates and tight money.

In the Committee on Banking and Currency, we are considering legislation aimed at loosening up money, primarily for mortgage purposes, through a monetary policy.

Two factors cause tight money—fiscal policy and monetary policy. We attempt to remedy the evils of fiscal policy by resorting to legislation in the field of monetary policy, and that is foolishness. We are fighting to a Mexican standoff, as we say in Texas.

The basic culprit is the practice of the Government of the United States going into the money market and bidding up interest rates. If taxes are increases, this will have an inflationary effect, and we all know that the payroll tax will be spent. It cannot be considered anti-inflationary, because it will be pumped back into the economy. If we raise personal and corporate income taxes, the same thing will happen. The Government will still operate in the red, and we will pour gasoline on the inflationary fire and will not do anything to arrest it.

I believe that the Senator from Florida made an extremely valid point, one which should be taken into consideration at a time when we are being urged, even by the President of the United States, to attempt to cut expenditures. Cities and States are being urged to cut expenditures; Government agencies are being urged to cut expenditures and not to spend money that has been appropriated, because of the inflationary effect and because the Federal Government will have to bid up money rates in the money market again.

I believe that the approach suggested by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is the only reasonable approach we can take at this time, and I commend him for it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I should like to respond to three points, the first raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If I believed I could get his vote by accepting the Ribicoff amendment, I would be happy to accept it. It is a matter that I voted for in committee; it is a good program, and I am sure that in time we can work that out.

The distinguished chairman of the committee raised the point that we should be against the substitute because the unions are against the substitute. I realize that that is a point; but, frankly, I do not believe it is the compelling point. I believe the House voted 375 to 10 on this measure.

I happened to have been an employer during the 1930's, before this program became law. I called the men in our mill together, and I guaranteed them 40 hours a week work—we all went broke or we all prospered. This was in 1933.

I am not troubled about union leaders. I will take care of myself when it comes to getting the vote of the workers in the State of Kentucky.

The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico brought up the point that this was given to the House, that the only matter in conference would be the so-called Dirksen amendment and a couple of dates. I point out again that it was a 375-to-10 vote in the House, and I quote from the hearings, on page 415, at which point Senator ANDERSON is interrogating Mr. Meany:

> Senator ANDERSON. The House took certain action, sent a bill over here, which many people think is a very good bill.

They did—375 to 10.

> You say it is a completely unsatisfactory measure. If it came before the Senate in the House form, would you advise the Senate to vote for or against it?
>
> Mr. MEANY. Well, this would be a question of legislative strategy, and my offhand reply to vote for or against it.

Subsequently, at the bottom of page 415, Senator ANDERSON said:

> Well, I think it is a practical consideration that may come up in the Senate and may add up that way by passage of the House bill or recommendation of the House bill before we take final action. I wonder what our action will be.
>
> Mr. MEANY. Well, you keep in touch with Andy.

I assume that Andy is Andy Biemiller. So we are to keep in touch with Andy in order to find out how we are to vote on this measure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should not like the RECORD to be left in that status.

I sat there, and I heard Mr. Meany say that the unions had worked for a long time, hoping to get what they thought would be a much better unemployment compensation program. They had tried for many years, and they thought that on balance they would be better off with no bill than with this bill.

What Mr. Meany said—and the Senator from Kentucky can find it, if he wishes to look at the record—is that if we cannot do any better than the House bill, he would urge us to vote against the bill. If we insisted on passing it and sending it to the White House, labor would have to ask the President to veto it.

That was the attitude of labor, represented by Mr. Meany and Mr. Andy Biemiller, whom he mentioned, and Mr. Leonard Lesser.

I should like the Senator from Kentucky to keep in mind that that bill passed the House—as practically all tax bills do in the House—on a closed rule, where no one can offer any amendments to improve anything in the bill, but can just vote for or against the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. There was no vote on the floor of the House on the proposition of Federal standard. There was a vote in the Ways and Means Committee, and the vote there was 13 to 12. The Ways and Means Committee, which is the key to the House position on a matter like this, was practically a tie vote.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I dispute the theories of economics advanced by my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana says that we ought to pass this bill and increase taxes because inflation is reduced when money is taken from the taxpayers and put in the hands of the Federal Government.

I concede that there might be some truth in the Senator's proposition if the Federal Government used that money to pay its debts or if it put it in its sock and left it there. But everybody knows that when the Federal Government takes money away from the taxpayers, even in the form of money that goes into trust funds, the Federal Government immediately spends that money and puts one of its I O U's in place of the money.

I do not care how much economists say that you can fight inflation by having the Government take money away from the people in the form of taxes, and immediately spend such money itself.

Mr. TOWER. Could the Senator tell us who creates savings, the people or the Government?

Mr. ERVIN. The Government does not save anything, the people have to create savings. What is saved to pay people for unemployment compensation and social security benefits is taken out of the trust funds by Uncle Sam who substitutes for the trust funds some of his I O U's.

I have had experience in this matter of having taxes raised. When the Federal Government raises taxes and spends the money it feeds the fires of inflation, all of the theoretical economists to the contrary notwithstanding.

When I last practiced law, the Federal Government and Congress raised the taxes very high. The interest and installment payments on the mortgage on my home did not come down one penny. The cost of the law books that I bought from the West Publishing Co., Bancroft Whitney, and the Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Company, did not come down one penny. The cost of those who tried automobile cases did not come down one penny. Actually, these costs had a tendency to go up, and for a simple reason. Since my expenses did not come down I had to work harder to make more money, and I had to charge my clients more money for the services that I rendered than I did before the taxes were increased. For the same reason, the grocer had to raise the prices of his groceries.

As a result of my experience, all of the theoretical economists to the contrary notwithstanding, when taxes are raised the expenses of living do not go down. Everybody has to go out and make more money and charge more for his goods and services in order to meet the higher cost of living and increased taxes.

Therefore, it is not going to halt inflation for the Government to take more taxes for the unemployment trust funds, if Uncle Sam is going to do with the trust funds as he has before, and put in I O U's and then take the money out and spend it. I deny the theory that inflation can be stopped by Uncle Sam taking money from the people and spending it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think that the theory of the Senator is so sound. He says that if the Government levies a tax and applies the money on the debt, that is anti-inflationary. If the Government imposes a tax and borrows less money than it would otherwise borrow, that is less inflationary than borrowing the money.

Here we have a case where the Government puts more tax on the employer in order that the unemployed may have more money to spend, and that definitely is inflationary. It is that simple: to take it from the employer who is going to pass it along to us in the form of increased costs of goods, and who will turn it over to the unemployed so that the unemployed may have more money to spend.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to add one further word. I am opposed to this bill because I believe we should not concentrate more power in the Federal Government, and we should not destroy a program which has been under State control for 30 years and has operated in a satisfactory manner.

PRESERVING THE INCENTIVE SYSTEM IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the unemployment compensation system in Idaho is one in which most Idahoans take a great deal of pride. The benefits paid under the Idaho law rank it near the top among the 50 States.

But Idaho provides approximately 1 week of insurance benefits for every 2 weeks of work, a ratio that preserves an adequate incentive to work. By contrast, the bill recommended by the Senate Finance Committee provides 26 weeks of benefits for only 20 weeks of work. Many Idaho businessmen, from both large and small firms, have told me how critically important it is to reject this proposal. The State director, Mr. Fred Garrett, with whom I have discussed this legislation, tells me the committee amendment would work a great hardship in Idaho.

Taking all of this into account, I voted with the majority on Friday to strike the 26 weeks of benefits for 20 weeks of work from the bill.

I feel quite strongly that benefits should not exceed the working period, nor be so large as to weaken the incentive to work. Unemployment compensation should not be converted into a program for work relief. As it now stands, the Senate version is a much better bill than when originally presented by the Finance Committee.

Of course, no piece of legislation is all good or all bad. There are parts of the Senate version which I support. For example the Senate bill stipulates that all States must provide benefits of at least 50 percent of the average wage in the State. Thirty four States now provide less than 50 percent, although Idaho is not, as I have said, one of them. As the Finance Committee has pointed out, this puts States like Idaho at a competitive disadvantage. Other States are competing to see who can provide the lowest benefits in order to attract businesses anxious to lower their costs. This is unfair to Idaho, and so I support this portion of the Finance Committee's bill.

On balance, as it now stands, I feel the bill is acceptable to Idaho. Some changes are in order, since no major revision of unemployment compensation legislation has been undertaken since 1939. I will therefore vote against the motion to substitute the House version for the amended Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings].

If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—51

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Tydings

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is now at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

> At the bottom of page 29, to insert:
>
> "(C) the State law shall provide for an individual with 39 weeks of employment (or the equivalent) in the base period, benefits in a benefit year equal to at least 26 times his weekly benefit amount. Any weekly benefit amount payable under a State law may be rounded to an even dollar amount in accordance with such State law."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to ask that the pages distribute the explanations of the amendment to all Senators so that they may know what the amendment provides.

The language in the amendment can be found on page 29, on which the Senate has voted twice, with the exception of the change of 39 weeks' work a person would be entitled to draw 26 weeks of benefits. The Senate, by a margin of about six votes, voted to reject the standard which would provide for 20 weeks of work a person would be entitled to be fully protected with 26 weeks of coverage.

My amendment would go the other way around and provide that if a person had worked for 9 months—which is 39 weeks—he would be entitled to be regarded as a full-fledged member of the labor force and would be protected for 26 weeks of unemployment insurance.

There are 42 States in the Union that meet this standard at present and would not be required to change their laws.

Those States are listed in the memorandum which I have had placed on all Senators' desks:

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

There are a number of States—10—for whom the cost would be very small in order to come into line with the other 40 States to which I have referred.

They would be: Alaska—which already protects the worker for 25.3 weeks, so that it could simply boost its standard by a few days; Georgia—which has 19 weeks; Idaho, Indiana, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming.

The record is that most people are back at work within 6 weeks. That is about the average duration for the period of unemployment. The cost, I am told, is very small, so small that it is difficult to estimate what it would cost these States to come into line.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in the last analysis, this is a substitute for the provision which a majority of the Senate has twice voted down; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What a majority of the Senate voted down would have cost more money, and it would have required all but approximately seven States to modify their laws in order to comply.

What I am offering would only require 10 States to come in line with the other States.

Mr. ERVIN. It would provide Federal standards rather than State standards. The Senator is sacrificing a matter of principle rather than of dollars and cents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we are going to have minimum standards, and if we are to judge whether a worker, such as the construction laborer, is to have something to follow as a standard, we say that if he had worked for 9 months, he would then be entitled to be protected for 6 months. That is a much easier standard for a State to meet. Eighty percent of the States have it now.

Mr. ERVIN. At the present time, there are minimum amounts, but those are established by State law, and this amendment would establish minimum amounts to be established by Federal law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, but we are setting standards which 80 percent of the States now have.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, but this provision would give the Federal Government the right to vary those standards.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is a significant departure from the committee bill which recommended 26 weeks' coverage on the basis of 20 weeks' work.

The fact is insofar as eligibility is concerned, that 42 States meet the 39-week proposal. The pending amendment would apply only to those few States which do not provide compensation for 26 weeks. But in terms of the benefits involved, the cost of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, in contrast with the cost of the provision in the bill as reported by the committee, is roughly $100 million less. So this is a significant concession and represents a substantial reduction from what the Finance Committee recommended to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it, the change from 20 weeks to 39 weeks as a minimum requirement will have this effect—it will mean the adoption of the principle of Federal standards rather than State standards. The next time there can be a move to change the requirements to 26 weeks, or 20 weeks, or 10 weeks, or 9 weeks, once the principle of Federal standards is in the law.

That is putting it bluntly, but that is the intent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator likes to read into votes of Senators what those who vote do not mean. As far as I am concerned, I voted for a requirement of 20 weeks. I felt that after a man worked that long he should be regarded as a worker. I lost. What I am urging now is a requirement that a man must work twice as long as what the committee recommended in order to qualify for 26 weeks' benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But it would be Federal standards that would apply to the 39 weeks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems there should be some minimum Federal standards. For people who speak for labor, the defeat of the previous proposal was a big disappointment. They would like to have had that 26-week coverage after working for 20 weeks. That amendment was voted down. I do not propose to reopen that. I may point out that 80 percent of the States already have this provision.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. By this amendment the Senator would deprive the States of making their own determination on this point. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Below that minimum standard.

Mr. THURMOND. Why should not Louisiana or South Carolina establish those standards? This is a cooperative Federal-State program. What the Senator is proposing to do is federalize the entire program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There are all sorts of State decisions that the Federal law does not touch. The States have 50 different standards and 50 different ways of administering their laws as to what disqualifies or qualifies a person when a man loses his job. There may be a difference in determining whether he left the job voluntarily or whether he was fired by his employer. There seem to be about 50 different rules for the 50 States.

We do not propose to change that. There are all kinds of conditions we do not propose to change. It seems to me all we are doing is adopting standards that 42 States already have. Many of them are more favorable.

Mr. THURMOND. Because 42 States have done it, the Senator believes a law is required to bring about federalization of the program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think this principle should be adopted. History has shown it to be a good principle.

Mr. THURMOND. Therefore, the Senator is depriving the States of their rights by having Federal authority imposed on them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is a minimum standard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were to vote, he would vote "nay." If I were to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 185 Leg

YEAS—53

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—31

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Dirksen
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Long, La.
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So the amendment of Mr. LONG of Louisiana was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of page 29 insert the following new paragraph:

> (2) The State maximum weekly benefit amount (exclusive of allowances wtih respect to dependents) shall be no less than 50 percent of the Statewide average weekly wage most recently computed before the beginning of any benefit year which begins after June 30, 1968.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the language of this amendment was a part of a broader committee amendment which was rejected last Friday. That amendment contained two provisions, the provision embodied in the amendment I now propose and also the provision that for 20 weeks of work a man should be entitled to 26 weeks of benefits.

The latter provision has now been changed. We have just agreed to a provision that a man must work 39 weeks to be eligible for 26 weeks of benefits. I think it in order that the Senate should now consider the other part of the amendment which was rejected.

The action we have just taken reduces unemployment benefits, as provided by the committee amendment to the House bill, by somewhat more than $100 million in any one benefit year.

I do not think we should proceed to reduce further the benefits provided in this bill unless we intend to have nothing more than give a kind of endorsement to what the States have done.

I therefore offer this amendment which provides simply that an individual would receive 50 percent of his average weekly wage up to 50 percent of the statewide average weekly wage. The Senate last Friday, of course, adopted another amendment to provide that an individual be paid one-half of his average weekly up to the State maximum. This amendment provides that the State maximum not be less than 50 percent of the statewide average weekly wage. The effect would be, in a number of States, to raise the benefits which are paid to many workers, but no State will be required to pay any worker an amount larger than 50 percent of his individual weekly wage. Thus, the unemployement benefits received by the highest paid workers in the State would still be less than 50 percent of their individual weekly wage.

At present 18 States already meet the standard which would be provided by my amendment. However, it would require an improvement of the unemployment benefit payments in 34 States.

I do not think I need to explain it further. The Senators who participated in the debate on the compound amendment offered last Friday know what is required by the amendment.

I urge the Senate to agree to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the identical language of this amendment was defeated last Friday. It is now being offered piecemeal.

The Senate marched up the hill last week, and I think we ought to have a rollcall to let the American people see how, when they were confronted with Walter Reuther, George Meany, and Jimmy Hoffa the Senate turned around and marched down the hill.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, would the amendment raise the unemployment benefits in such a way that it might make the benefits more than the amount a man was earning from his work?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a limitation of 50 percent of his weekly wage.

Mr. ERVIN. If the amendment were adopted, would the requirement be that he should receive at least 50 percent of his weekly wage, or 50 percent of the average wage in the State, whichever was higher?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. He could not make more than he was earning. The low-paid worker might get more than 50 percent of what he was earning if State law permits it, but it would not be required by the Federal law.

Mr. ERVIN. Under this amendment, he would get 50 percent of the average State wage, would he not, and that might be higher than he was making. In other words, it might make it more profitable for the man to sit in his rocking chair and not work than to go out and get a job.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, he could not receive more than the one-half of his average weekly wage as determined by the State agency. Under my amendment the State cannot set the State maximum weekly benefit amount at less than 50 percent of the statewide average weekly wage; there is still the limitation, whichever is the lower. If the Senator would read the language on page 29, he would find that provision.

Mr. ERVIN. The trouble is that one provision is put in here and the other is put in there.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, is this the same provision which we discussed a few hours ago, when the question was raised by the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not hear that discussion. We discussed this on Friday as part of the compound amendment which also included provision for 26 weeks of benefits for 20 weeks of work.

This was a part of that amendment and it was rejected by the Senate.

We have now settled the number of weeks of work for benefits, and I am therefore offering this section of the amendment which deals with the percentage of benefits to be paid.

Mr. NELSON. That is what we discussed 3 or 4 hours ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not present.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that an employee may draw 50 percent of his average weekly wage, or 50 percent of the average weekly wage paid in the State, whichever is lower?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. And, in no event, can he draw more than 50 percent of his own average weekly wage.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, does the amendment not provide a maximum that the State must offer, rather than a minimum?

Mr. McCARTHY. It sets a limit under certain conditions. If a man were in the high bracket, he could not get more than 50 percent of the average in the State. The man the Senator talked about earlier—the business executive—as the bill now stands, I believe, could draw 50 percent of his average wage, which might be $1,000 a week. If my amendment were agreed to, that would not take place.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment of the Senator deals with maximums only.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. However, the bill, when taken together, would not permit a man to earn more than half of his weekly wage.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the idea of the Senator that his amendment should supersede the amendment to the amendment that was offered by the chairman of the committee on Friday, which amendment relates to 65 percent?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment that the Senator now has at the desk would raise the maximum as a mandatory requirement of the Federal Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. However, it would not affect the minimum. It would not do anything for the lower paid employee.

Mr. McCARTHY. It sets a minimum of 50 percent for the State. In this sense it sets a maximum for workers who are paid more than the State average.

Mr. CURTIS. It is a maximum.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It requires a maximum amount.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. However, it would do nothing to raise the minimum for the lower paid?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. However, the State is free to improve his benefits if it wishes to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee wou'd vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "Nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Allott
Bible
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Carlson
Cooper
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Dirksen
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, La.
Mansfield
Murphy
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So the amendment of Mr. MCCARTHY was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I send amendments to the desk. These amendments consist of technical language that was stricken from the bill when the committee amendments were offered en bloc on Friday. These amendments restore the technical language that is necessary with regard to the Federal standards relating to duration of benefits and to the level of the State average weekly wage. They do not involve any controversy on their own. They are needed for the proper functioning of the bill. I hope that they will be accepted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment so that we may see just how technical it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia). The clerk will state the amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of page 29, insert the following:

"(3) In determining whether an individual has 20 weeks of employment, there must be counted as a week, any week in which the individual earned at least 25 percent of the statewide average weekly wage.

"(4) For the purpose of subsections (c) (1)(A) and (C), the equivalent of 20 weeks of employment in a State which uses high-quarter wages is total base period wages equal to five times the statewide average weekly wage, and either one and one-half times the individual's high-quarter earnings or forty times his weekly benefit amount, whichever is appropriate under State law.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) 'benefit year' means a period as defined in State law except that it shall not exceed one year beginning subsequent to the end of an individual's base period.

"(2) 'base period' means a period as defined in State law but it shall be fifty-two consecutive weeks, one year, or four consecutive calendar quarters ending not earlier than six months prior to the beginning of an individual's benefit year.

"(3) 'high-quarter wages' means the amount of wages for services performed in employment covered under the State law paid to an individual in that quarter of his base period in which such wages were highest, irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law.

"(4) 'individual's average weekly wage' means an amount computed equal to (A) one-thirteenth of an individual's high-quarter wages, in a State which bases eligibility on high-quarter wages paid in the base period or (B) in any other State, the amount obtained by dividing the total amount of wages (irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under the State law) paid to such individual during his base period by the number of weeks in which he performed services in employment covered under such law during such period.

"(5) 'statewide average weekly wage' means the amount computed by the State agency at least once each year on the basis of the aggregate amount of wages, irrespective of the limitation on the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law, reported by employers as paid for services covered under such State law during the first four of the last six completed calendar quarters prior to the effective date of the computation, divided by a figure representing fifty-two times the twelve-month average of the number of employees in the pay period which includes the twelfth day of each month during the same four calendar quarters, as reported by such employers."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 23 of such Code (as amended by sections 103 (b)(2) and 131(b)(3) of this Act) is further amended—

(1) by striking out

"SEC. 3309. Short title."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 3309. Benefit requirements."

and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 3312. Short title.".

LIMITATION ON CREDIT AGAINST TAX

SEC. 152. (a) Section 3302(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) If the unemployment compensation law of a State has not been certified for a twelve-month period ending on October 31 pursuant to section 3309(a), then the total credits (after applying subsections (a) and (b) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection) otherwise allowable under this section for the taxable year in which such October 31 occurs in the case of a taxpayer subject to the unemployment compensation law of such State shall be reduced by the amount by which 2.7 percent exceeds the four-year benefit cost rate applicable to such State for such taxable year in accordance with the notification of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 3309(a)."

(b) Subsection (c)(3)(C)(i) of section 3302 of such Code is amended by substituting the term "4-year" for the term "5-year."

(c) Section 3302(d)(5) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(5) 4-YEAR BENEFIT COST RATE.—For purposes of subsection (c)(4) and subparagraph (C) of subsection (c)(3), the 4-year benefit cost rate applicable to any State for any taxable year is that percentage obtained by dividing—

"(A) One-fourth of the total compensation paid under the State unemployment compensation law during the four-year period ending at the close of the first calendar year preceding such taxable year, by

"(B) The total of the remuneration subject to contributions under the State unemployment compensation law with respect to the first calendar year preceding such taxable year. 'Remuneration' for the purpose of this subparagraph shall include the amount of wages for services covered under the State law irrespective of the limitation of the amount of wages subject to contributions under such State law paid to an individual by an employer during any calendar year beginning with 1968 up to $3,900, and beginning with 1972, up to $4,800; for States for which it is necessary, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate the remuneration with respect to the calendar year preceding the taxable year."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, after the precise reading of this amendment

I am prepared to vote. I understand completely and clearly all of these matters embodied in the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if this is a technical amendment, I hope that the chairman of the committee will not be offering an amendment with substance. This amendment is word for word with the exact language of the amendment that was rejected last Friday.

Mr. President, I ask for a ruling from the Chair as to whether this is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a part of the amendment rejected last Friday and a vote on the amendment offered today is in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand last Friday we got the ruling—and I very much liked the ruling, and I do want it to stand—that once an amendment has been defeated, reconsidered, and tabled, it is in order to offer it again one line at a time or word by word and that this would be in order after the full amendment had been rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is one portion of the total amendment that was offered and defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand. The question is: If the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] wishes to offer this amendment one line at a time it would still be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As long as it did not cover the entire original amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the reason I ask that question is that it is a rather significant ruling that if an amendment once defeated can later be offered line by line, word for word, without any substantive change. We have a ruling that can contribute greatly in a filibuster. This amendment has been defeated once.

Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The Senate defeated by a vote of 44 to 39 this identical language last Friday, and I would like for the country to see how much influence Walter Reuther and Jimmy Hoffa have in controlling the votes.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The language we are presently discussing was a part of the amendment we voted on Friday. We did not discuss or argue about it. The question was whether there were to be some Federal standards about the duration of benefits, and what the amount of those benefits would be.

As far as States conforming, what the technical language would be, and what States would lose if they failed to conform was not discussed. If a State does not conform to the Federal standards in the bill the employers in that State would have their tax credit limited to the 4-year average benefit cost in that State. That averages out to about 2 percent for the Nation as a whole. If this approach were not used, they would lose the entire 2.7-percent tax credit which the States moderate for them by way of experience ratings. So if we are going to fix any standard for noncompliance other than the standard that presently exists in the law, this would be more favorable to employees than requiring them to lose the entire 2.7-percent credit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate, but the record should show that the adoption of this amendment means that we will have restored every word of the language that was stricken from the bill last Friday, including periods, commas, and all other punctuation. There is not a single change in the language.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the amendment is agreed to, it restores most of the language that the Senate previously rejected, but it fails to restore the word "twenty" which would require that after 20 weeks work, the employee would be entitled to 26 weeks of benefits, and the word "difference" involves more than $100 million a year.

The Senator is only $100 million off in his estimate when he says we have restored everything that was originally there. That one word means a difference of $100 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not this amendment. This amendment does not change a word from the language of that portion of the amendment that was defeated last Friday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, but this was not the part that was debated and discussed when the Senate urged that we vote on the amendments en bloc. I agreed and lost. I am sorry that I made the agreement. There is no doubt in my mind that this is not what the Senate voted on last Friday when they voted en bloc.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it would be better if he did change the wording. The bill as it is now before us refers to the Federal requirement of 39 weeks employment. In the amendment which has just been offered it was not provided how to figure the 39 weeks of employment. There is provided how to compute 20 weeks of employment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That deals with the portion on page 28, paragraph 1, line 19, where we do provide that a person is entitled to regular benefits after 20 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if the present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would note "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—34

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] were agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier, the Senate acceded to a request that the wives of students be excluded, as they are at colleges and universities today.

The substitute was defeated. I send my amendment to the desk for consideration, and ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is as follows:

On page 10, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"EMPLOYMENT BY SCHOOL, COLLEGE, OR UNIVERSITY OF SPOUSE OF STUDENT ENROLLED THEREIN

"SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (10) of section 3306 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by section 104(a) of this Act) is further amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B) service performed in the employ of a school, college, or university, if such service is performed (i) by a student who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at such school, college, or university, or (ii) by the spouse of such a student, if such spouse is advised, at the time such spouse commences to perform such service that (I) the employment of such spouse to perform such service is provided under a program to provide financial assistance to such student by such school, college, or university, and (II) such employment will not be covered by any program of unemployment insurance; or'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is the same amendment which the Senator agreed to accept as an amendment to the substitute. I assume that it represents the will of the Senate and I am willing to accept it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly vote on the bill now before it. I have voted against all of the committee amendments. My premise in voting against them—and my intention to vote against the bill—is:

One. Economic conditions vary from State to State. Some States are predominantly industrial and others are agricultural.

Two. The cost of living varies in the different States.

Three. State legislatures have grappled with this problem of determining what the qualifications for and the rate and duration of payments should be. State legislatures, because of their proximity to the voters, are better circumstanced to prudently solve the problem which we are trying to solve, remotely situated from the economic forces that prevail in individual States.

My conclusions on these premises are:

Regardless of the greatness and the power of the Senate, it should not arrogate to itself the power of declaring that which is not identical to be identical.

The Congress of the United States cannot, by legislative power or fiat, declare white to be black or green to be gray. What the facts are remain unchanged in spite of a legislative declaration by the Congress of the United States.

I respectfully submit that when this Congress is attempting to declare uniformity in the rates of pay, the period of the duration of the pay, the conditions under which the pay shall be made, it in effect is saying that this great legislative body has the power, by legislative fiat, of declaring that which is unidentical to be that which is identical.

I shall vote against the bill when it comes to the final vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The amendment offered by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

In the definition of "statewide average weekly wage", after the words "State law" insert "(i)"; and at the end of the definition change the period to a comma and add the following:

"or (ii) during the calendar quarter in such law within such year prior to the effective date of the computation, divided by a figure representing thirteen times the three-month average of the number of employees in the pay period which includes the twelfth day of each month during the same calendar quarter, as reported by such employers.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with respect to unemployment compensation payments, Alaska is in a unique position.

We have a situation in which large numbers of nonresidents, come into Alaska each year either for purposes of fishing or to work on construction during Alaska's short building season. After the fishing or construction season is ended, these people leave the State of Alaska and apply for unemployment compensation benefits. Actually these transient workers contribute little to Alaska's economy. They do contribute to the economy of the States to which they return, but Alaska's employers are taxed as though the employees remained in the State during the off season when they are drawing unemployment compensation.

The amendment which I am now offering would help somewhat to alleviate this situation. The method prescribed for computing the average wage in a State may tend to overstate the wage for a State which has a markedly seasonal pattern of employment, such as Alaska. To permit adjustment for this fact, the amendment would provide an alternative method of computing average wages. The present method involves dividing annual wages by average employment during the year. Under the alternative, the statewide average weekly wage could be calculated on the basis of a single calendar quarter. The State legislature must determine which method the State would use. If the legislature selects the alternative, it must also designate which calendar quarter is to be used.

This amendment would merely leave the definition up to the State legislature.

I ask for favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have had occasion to study the amendment. It is of limited application. The amendment has merit, for it applies to a State in which there is much employment of a seasonal nature. Therefore, I hope the Senate will approve of the amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, was this the same amendment as was offered last Friday?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; this amendment has not been offered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, is this the same as the so-called Hawaii amendment?

Mr. GRUENING. No. This amendment is confined to Alaska.

Mr. MORTON. This amendment merely covers Alaska?

Mr. GRUENING. Only on the basis of what the State legislature would do.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator does not want his State to come under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. In this particular case.

Mr. MORTON. I wonder if an amendment would be in order to take Kentucky out.

Mr. GRUENING. This applies to Alaska, where we have many seasonal workers.

Mr. MORTON. We have racetracks that employ people for only short periods of time.

Mr. GRUENING. Many of these people come up there merely to do fishing for a short period of time. The amendment merely allows the State legislature to make the determination.

Mr. MORTON. We have more people who come to the racetracks in Kentucky than ever go to Alaska.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If Kentucky has a widely fluctuating labor force, as Alaska has, the amendment would be clearly applicable to Kentucky. If that unusual situation exists in Kentucky, it would be covered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think I understand. I have a copy of a telegram sent to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee by the Governor of Alaska on H.R. 8282 which relates to the Federal standards.

I read from that telegram:

> Our cost estimates indicate that, in order to conform to H.R. 8282 by paying 50 percent of the average weekly wage at the maximum and eliminating the interstate restriction, the package will cost Alaska, over an 8-year planning period, 4.78 percent of taxable wages. This is a deficit of 1.28 percent per year. Stated in dollars, outgo would exceed income by 3.7 million dollars per year based on recent payroll data until we raise our rate base structure substantially. Even if Alaska were to adopt a total wage base rather than

the present $1,200, we would be faced with a sizable deficit.

As I understand, the two Senators from Alaska, having voted for Federal standards, are now trying to get Alaska out from under the yoke. Perhaps it is now only right to give consideration to take their State out since they gave the administration a couple of votes.

I wonder if this amendment has been cleared with Mr. Hoffa and Mr. Reuther.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why does not the Senator make his statement general and say all who are for the bill have been called by Mr. Reuther and Mr. Hoffa. If it makes him happy to say that, I do not object to his having that joy.

Alaska is required to make a far higher contribution for the reason that Alaska has a great many workers who come up and are paid high wages and who work short periods of time during the warm season and then leave. Those workers make no contribution to Alaska when they leave. Washington State may find that it has an unusually large number of seasonal workers, too. There may be other States who fall in that category.

I have undertaken to try to be fair with every Senator with special problems who felt they should be considered. Frankly, if I do say so, I feel an obligation to Senators particularly who are not members of the committee, to see to it that their problems are given consideration. I felt this amendment had merit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For the Record, who defines what a seasonal worker is? Does each State have a right to make such definition?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All we are doing is looking at a quarter rather than the entire year. It will be up to the States to decide which quarter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand that Florida, for example, which has a large number of seasonal workers in hotels, or Michigan if it wanted to declare its automobile workers seasonal, could declare such workers to be seasonal workers?

Would construction workers, whose work by its nature is intermittent, be considered seasonal?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If you have enough seasonal workers in your State so that you have a very broad fluctuation in what the average wage is from one quarter to another, then your State—Florida, Louisiana, or any other State has that problem—can benefit from this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then if the State decides they are seasonal workers that decision stands, notwithstanding what the Secretary may think; is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the State makes the decision, it is the State's decision. The bill does not do anything about the problem of seasonal workers as such. That remains to the State to resolve.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We did something about seasonal workers in the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii. My question is, Who defines what a seasonal worker is? Is it clear that each State makes it own definition? Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, the legislature or the State administrator, depending upon the State laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 41, between lines 3 and 4 insert the following:

"(4) In computing the rate of insured unemployment and in determining a week of unemployment, there shall be taken into account all factors required to present a true and accurate picture of unemployment, including (but not limited to) the following:

"(a) registration and calls at employment offices and agencies by the individuals concerned;

"(b) their efforts to secure training and retraining;

"(c) their willingness to move to accept a job;

"(d) whether the individual concerned is interested only in part-time employment."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, what the Senator's amendment says is that these things would be taken into account: Registration and calls at employment offices and agencies by the individuals concerned; their efforts to secure training and retraining; and their willingness to move to accept a job.

I am told by the Labor Department that they do take those things into consideration administratively now. If the Senator wishes to write them into law, however, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that, Mr. President. I was about to point out that these factors and any others that are pertinent should be taken into account in determining what is the unemployment status of individuals. I think we are all aware of the fact that while our unemployment statistics are reasonably good, there are many gaps in them. In 1962, the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, through its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, published a report covering this very subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point that portion of the report beginning on page 4 and running through the middle of page 6, as indicated.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Certain recommendations are warranted without waiting for this report, since the subcommittee's hearings provided ample testimony on these points:

1. The most serious gap in our knowledge of unemployment concerns the nature and attitude of the unemployed. We need to know far more about their degree of aggressiveness in seeking work, as shown by registration and calls at employment offices and agencies, efforts to secure training or retraining, search of help wanted ads, travel to find jobs, willingness to move to accept jobs, and efforts at self-employment. We need to know more about the effects of income, especially unemployment compensation, relief payments, and social security benefits (described by one witness as the "social minimum wage") on the efforts and attitude of the unemployed in seeking work. We also need to know more about the relation of unemployed workers to family units—are they heads of households, second or third workers in households, or are they outside family units? More knowledge is also needed about the effect of poor health on susceptibility to unemployment.

The value of this information to effective policy cannot be overestimated.

The effectiveness of training programs and the mobility of labor, for example, depend above all on the willingness of those cut of work to accept the discipline of training and the sacrifices involved in moving to new locations. There have been recent reports of lack of interest in training programs among the unemployed in one area of heavy unemployment, and of the failure of at least two substantial private retraining programs because of a lack of worker interest.

Some—but not all—of this material is now being gathered in a study being made by the Department of Labor. The study should be expanded and used as a basis for designing a regular, recurrent survey.

2. More use should be made of the wealth of information being produced under existing programs. Data are available on demographic characteristics of the labor force; on employment and unemployment by industry, occupation, experience; duration of employment; geographic location; etc. It is now possible to make studies of the factors affecting the demand for and supply of labor on a scale and in a detail not previously practical. Such intensive analysis could be of great assistance to the Congress and the public generally by exploiting this rich vein of information to the fullest. In this spirit, we recommend that—

(*a*) A means be developed to improve access to this mass of labor market data, particularly that from the monthly household survey, perhaps in the form of an historical volume, including both data and necessary accompanying technical notes; and

(*b*) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in its monthly report on the labor force make increased use of the rich detail available to provide an integrated picture of labor market conditions, utilizing to a greater extent than at present the technique of combining at one place a chart, table, and text on a specific aspect, as is done in the Joint Economic Committee's monthly publication, Economic Indicators.

3. The nature, uses, and limitations of the Government's statistics on employment and unemployment should be explained in clear, nontechnical language in small booklet form that could be given wide popular distribution. This would go a long way toward clearing up much of the public misconceptions about these data. In this connection, we commend the Office of Statistical Standards for a fine example of this type of publication: "Unemployment Statistics: Meaning and Measurement," by Raymond T. Bowman and Margaret E. Martin, which was published in the record of the subcommittee's hearings.

4. Although the United States has the most complete information of any country on availability and utilization of labor resources, the official statistics do not yet include any overall measure of the extent to

which the available labor supply is idle or being used each month. Since 1954, each month the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, at the request of Senator Paul H. Douglas, has had prepared for his use, and for that of others who request them, estimates of the full-time unemployment equivalent to the time lost by workers involuntary on part-time schedules. This is only a partial solution. At the subcommittee's request, the Bureau of Labor Statistics this year experimented with some other alternative methods, the results of which were published in the paper by Gertrude Bancroft entitled "Some Alternative Indexes of Employment and Unemployment" in the joint committee print entitled "Unemployment: Terminology, Measurement and Analysis."

Further developmental work on this problem should be undertaken, leading to regular publication of one or more official indexes of the rate of labor force utilization.

In addition, to facilitate calculation of such an index as well as to provide supplementary data on unemployment, consideration should be given to obtaining each month, as part of the household survey, additional information on how many of the unemployed are interested only in obtaining part-time employment, and, if practical, which of the employed and unemployed are primary sources of income for the household and which are secondary workers.

5. More information on the nature and composition of the labor force is needed. The implications of the sizable movements in and out of the labor force need to be fully analyzed and understood. It was noted by several witnesses that at high levels of prosperity and economic activity many additional individuals are attracted into the labor force. It may be that the number of persons actively seeking work bears a fairly constant relation to the availability of job opportunities. As more jobs are created, more individuals enter the labor force to seek them.

Employment statistics should also more clearly spotlight what sectors of the labor force are and are not prone to unemployment. Some 10 million individuals, or 15 percent of the labor force, are self-employed. Unemployment in the usual sense hardly affects these people. Other measures of productivity, income, or welfare might reveal significant variations, but employment statistics as such do not. This suggests that usual unemployment rates should perhaps be calculated on the basis of that part of the labor force subject to employment fluctuations—leaving out the self-employed.

Further study of these and other aspects of the supply of labor would be extremely useful.

6. Research should be undertaken directed toward development of a regular monthly survey of job opportunities or vacancies to illuminate the demand side of the labor market in the way the present series measures the supply of labor. Experience here and abroad indicates that substantial difficulties must be overcome before a statistical series on vacant jobs can become operational but past success in using survey techniques to solve some other difficult data-gathering problems suggests that a useful program may be practical. In any event, the data from such a survey would be so useful in analyzing labor markets, in operating employment services, and developing practical worker training and retraining programs, that expenditure of some funds on research into this problem would be warranted.

Mr. MILLER. This section of the report listed the factors named in my amendment that should be taken into account in refining our unemployment statistics.

All that my amendment would do, as the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, is require that those factors be considered. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 727

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I call up my amendment No. 727.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. JAVITS (No. 727) is as follows:

On page 45 insert the following between lines 6 and 7:

"EXTENDED ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS OVER AGE SIXTY

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, an individual may not be denied extended compensation for any week, but in no event for a total of more than one additional year pursuant to this section, solely because he has, prior to such week, received the maximum extended compensation available under this title if—

"(1) such week occurs after such individual has attained age sixty, but before he has attained age sixty-five,

"(2) such individual (A) has been certified by the Secretary of Labor as being an individual whose employment skills have become obsolete by reason of automation, technological change, or other reasons beyond his control, or (B) resides in an area designated as redevelopment area under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act, and has been certified by the Secretary of Labor as an individual who does not pessess any employment skill for which there is an unfulfilled demand in the area in which he lives or in an area in which he could feasibly be relocated, and

"(3) he is registered as a person seeking employment at the State or Federal employment office nearest his place of residence."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment would provide unemployment compensation beyond the period that it would otherwise be provided by the bill, to those between 60 and 65 years of age, who are particularly susceptible to long terms of unemployment, provided—and I refer Senators to page 2 of the amendment—that they are individuals whose employment skills have become obsolete by reason of automation, technological change, or other reasons beyond their control; or they reside in an area designated as a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act, and have been certified by the Secretary of Labor as individuals who do not possess any employment skill for which there is an unfulfilled demand in that area or in an area in which such person could feasibly be relocated; and provided, of course, that such persons are continuing to seek employment at State or Federal employment office.

Mr. President, this amendment deals with the problems of people who have not yet qualified for social security—people like those, for example, who were released when a large automobile plant closed in Senator HARTKE's State, or when certain types of mining were abandoned in the Catskill Mountains of my own State, or on the Mesabe iron range in the State of Minnesota, when miners with certain types of skills became obsolete. The amendment is an attempt to help such persons until such time as they become eligible for social security.

I have discussed this matter with both the manager of the bill and the minority members of the committee handling the bill, and it is my understanding that what they are agreeable to doing is taking this matter to conference in order to consider it there. It is my clear understanding, which I now state to the Senate, that if this provision is found to be too expensive a proposition, they will consider it, and perhaps we will be able to do something about it in some other way; but if it is found not to be materially expensive, they will do something about including it. The time at which these people can be covered, of course, can be determined by the conference report. And, as with all compensation, perhaps even less than the extended compensation provided by this bill can be provided.

My own estimate, based on the best information I have been able to obtain, is that about 35 percent of the long-term unemployed are people in this age bracket, but that probably not more than 20,000 of those noble Americans would be affected at any one time. I doubt that a more appealing group of Americans in need of assistance, under the circumstances in which they are placed, could be found.

I understand perfectly that this is an effort to seize the committee of a problem in the conference. If it can be worked out in conference, it will be a very blessed thing. If it cannot, if it is found too expensive, then I will understand and those affected will understand that the matter cannot be acted upon here and now.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join the Senator from New York in sponsoring the amendment. It is a very simple amendment, which applies to a hiatus in the law regarding the situation in which older people often find themselves.

It will help a small, but yet a very important segment of our population—those elderly people between the ages of 60 to 65 who through no fault of their own suddenly find themselves out of work.

These elderly workers have reached a point in their lives where they are too old for retraining and too young for social security. No one wants to hire them because of their age; and yet, after they have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, what is to become of them?

I saw this tragic example of the inequities of our society when the Studebaker automobile plant in South Bend, Ind., was closed. Here were workers who had devoted the prime of their lives suddenly without work—too old to be rehired and too young to collect their social security.

This amendment offered by Senator Javits will at least provide additional benefits to help these workers through these times of tribulation. I understand from Senator Javits that this amendment will be taken to conference only with the understanding that if the costs are found to be prohibitive, it will be dropped.

We are not asking for a relief program; we are only asking for the righting of a wrong imposed by society.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment applies to a problem I have had no opportunity to study, but I personally have no objection to going to conference with the amendment and discussing it. As I say, we have not had the opportunity to study the amendment, and it does present a new problem, but it is entirely relevant to the bill, and if the Senator wishes to offer it, this would be the bill to offer it on.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to go on record as being against the amendment, because, as I understand it, it undertakes to convert the employment security program into something in the nature of a relief program. I merely wish to be recorded as opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on last Friday I voted against Senate amendments to the House passed unemployment compensation bill which were designed to change very substantially the duration and amount of compensation payments. I voted against the Senate amendment which would have authorized 26 weeks of compensation after only 20 weeks of employment. I supported a revised Senate amendment which would allow 26 weeks of unemployment benefits to a person who has been employed for 39 weeks during the year. This is very close to the South Dakota law which would permit 24 weeks compensation after 38 weeks of work. I voted again today against an amendment which would have set the maximum weekly benefit at 50 percent of average weekly wages in the State. South Dakota's present rate is 42 percent. I would prefer to leave this matter to the States.

However, in view of the modifications on the Senate floor which make the overall Senate amendments more acceptable to South Dakota interests, I am supporting the revised Senate bill in spite of my reservations about some aspects of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yars and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—31

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
Mansfield
Murphy
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So the bill (H.R. 15119) was passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 15119 be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered, and that, in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, designations, rearrangements necessary, and cross-references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15119), request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Bennett conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last Friday I did not hear the signal for the recorded vote on the first amendment that was agreed to by a recorded vote. That vote appears on page 18381 of the Congressional Record.

In my opinion, the matter contained in this amendment, which establishes a new Federal standard for the period of employment necessary to establish benefit eligibility, should have been left for the determination of the respective States; and if present, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage this evening of H.R. 15119, the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, the Senate has met its responsibilities in considering on the merits and in depth a most complicated and controversial piece of legislation. For the past 2 legislative days, we have had the benefit of the lucid and knowledgeable explanations of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. Long] and his fellow committeeman, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], who so ably and articulately assisted him in the management of this bill. There was in addition the able advocacy of the senior Senators from New Mexico and Illinois [Mr. Anderson and Mr. Douglas] both of whom have been leaders through the years in legislation of this nature.

Equally responsible for the lively and fast-moving debate of the past 2 days have been the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], whose concise and articulate advocacy contributed so much in making the debate so meaningful. Their views were strongly felt but always succinctly stated. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], are likewise commended for their contributions and their cooperation in permitting this issue to be resolved in an expeditious manner.

To the Senate as a whole, I express my thanks for the cooperation it has displayed in completing action on this bill today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senate disperses, I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for tomorrow it is the intention of the leadership to call up the Independent Offices appropriation bill which, I understand, will precipitate several votes because of several proposed amendments.

When that bill is disposed of, it is our intention to take up, not necessarily in the following order, the military medicare bill (H.R. 14088) which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services last Friday. And S. 3688, the so-called FNMA bill, which was reported last Wednesday by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

We anticipate several bills to be reported today and tomorrow from the Committee on Banking and Currency which will be scheduled later in the week; I will keep the minority leader informed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

LARGER WHEAT ACREAGE FOR 1967

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has announced today an increase of 8.9 million acres for the 1967 wheat acreage allotment. With the 7.7 million acre increase announced on May 5, the allotment for 1967 is now 16.6 million acres greater than for 1966. This means a total 1967 allotment of 68.2 million acres.

I applaud the Secretary's action in increasing wheat acreage. I have urged him to do so for sometime. We need to build up a modest wheat reserve to meet the danger of famine in the world and in our own country.

But I have also urged the Secretary to take steps to protect farmers against the possible market depressing effects of large reserves of wheat which could be dumped onto the market. I regret that the Secretary has given farmers no such assurance. This lack of assurance means that it is all the more urgent that Congress enact the bill which I and other Senators have advocated which would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from releasing wheat into the market at less than 115 percent of the support price.

Additional wheat reserves are needed to meet the needs of a hungry world and to protect us in time of famine. Such increased production can add to the prosperity of rural American—provided it is not released in times of abundance by the CCC in such a way as to depress market prices. I intend to press for a 115 percent CCC resale policy plus a provision for a national wheat reserve designed to protect the producer against price-depressing releases from the reserve.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Agriculture press release relative to today's announcement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, August 8, 1966.

Freeman Offers Wheat Farmers Opportunity To Plant More in 1967

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today increased the 1967 national wheat acreage allotment 8.9 million acres to a total of 68.2 million acres. With the 7.7 million acre increase announced May 5, the allotment for 1967 is now 16.6 million acres greater than for 1966.

"This action offers farmers the opportunity to plant more land to wheat where wheat production is profitable while maintaining their eligibility for program benefits," the Secretary said. "We expect wheat prices, even with the larger acreage, to be well above support levels next year because of strong commercial demand at home, continued export expansion, and large food assistance requirements. Therefore, farmers can expect increased income from increased production.

"Weather variations can change a deficit into a surplus very quickly, but with wise use of the new authority in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 the United States can avoid both of the twin evils of shortage and surplus.

"No one can be positive how much wheat we will need or how much the world will produce between now and July 1, 1968. I have increased the wheat acreage allotment so that farmers who want to produce more can help make sure that we don't run short.

Secretary Freeman said acreage allotments for future years will depend on the wheat situation at the time the allotment is determined.

The Secretary emphasized that wheat to be produced during the year covered by this program will not be harvested until June 1967 and represents our main supply until June 1968.

Secretary Freeman pointed out that the action today does not constitute a request for additional production but will enable those farmers who believe increased production will be profitable to plant more land to wheat while maintaining their eligibility for program benefits. Producers who plant within farm acreage allotment are eligible for price support loans on all of their production and for price-supplementing certificate payments on the farm's share of the domestic food market for wheat.

Farm soil conserving base acreages will be reduced to correspond with today's increase in wheat acreage allotments. (When wheat allotments were increased 15 percent recently, the Secretary announced that the 1966 program provision that called for diversion of 15 percent of the allotments as a condition of eligibility for program benefits would not be part of the 1967 program.) The land made available for cropping by this reduction in conserving acreages will make it possible for many farmers to plant more wheat for 1967 harvest.

Secretary Freeman said the program changes were needed because:

The former wheat surplus has been put to use, making increased production desirable;

Wheat stocks are being reduced below a desirable reserve level this year;

With feed grain stocks declining, the need for adequate wheat stocks is even more pressing;

Domestic and world demand for wheat continue to be strong;

Export expansion can continue if we have adequate supplies at competitive prices;

Grain requirements for foreign assistance programs, while not completely predictable at this time, are almost certain to continue to be large.

The Secretary emphasized that this action probably will not bring the wheat carryover in one year to the 600-million bushel level generally regarded as desirable but said he expects some increase in 1968 stocks.

He pointed out also that if drought reduced U.S. yields by 3 bushels an acre in 1967, production would be about 200 million bushels less than with a normal yield. "The larger allotment will help assure enough wheat in the event of drought in the U.S. or abroad," the Secretary said.

As announced previously, 1967 program benefits will not be conditioned upon diversion of any wheat acreage, and there will be no wheat diversion payments.

The new effective wheat allotment of 68.2 million acres is made up of a regular allotment of 63.3 million acres and a small farm allotment of 4.9 million acres.

The effective wheat allotment for 1967 announced May 5 was 59.3 million acres (regular allotment of 55 million plus a small farm allotment of 4.3 million). The 1966 effective allotment was 51.6 million (47.8 million plus 3.8 million).

A farmer can figure his new 1967 allotment by multiplying the 1967 allotment recently established for his farm by 1.15. County committees will send new allotment notices to farmers shortly.

Today's action does not change either the price support level or the number of bushels on which a farmer will qualify for certificate payments in accordance with the general wheat program announcement of June 9.

The price support loan level for 1967 will be $1.25. Domestic marketing certificates as required by law will be issued on approximately 520 million bushels of wheat, and the value of certificates will be the difference between the parity price of wheat on July 1, 1967, and the $1.25 loan value. This year's certificate value is $1.32 per bushel.

The Secretary also announced that barley will not be included in the 1967 feed grain acreage diversion program. The barley announcement was made at this time because barley, like wheat, is a fall-seeded crop in many parts of the country. Farmers cooperating in both wheat and feed grain programs next year may again plant wheat on regular barley acreage and on other feed grain acreage if they wish. The level of price support for barley and other feed grains will be announced later. Farmers will also be able to plant wheat on their oats-rye base as in 1966. There will be no oats-rye diversion requirements or payments.

In the Cropland Adjustment Program for 1967, Secretary Freeman announced today wheat, rice, and barley acreages are no longer eligible at a special payment rate related to wheat program benefits but are eligible only at the rate for non-allotment crops.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, ESSA, the Environmental Science Services Administration, was 1 year old on July 13, 1966. This new agency of the Department of Commerce exemplifies progressive change in Federal Government—for ESSA exists to provide vital environmental services to the people of this country, and vital scientific knowledge to mankind. The province of ESSA's research and service is immense, a composite of earth, sun, sea, and atmosphere, their interactions, and the hazards they present.

ESSA was created by President Johnson's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965, which combined the functions of the Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey, and which led to the establishment of the Environmental Data Service, National Environmental Satellite Center, and Institutes for Environmental Research. The Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, formerly of the National Bureau of Standards, became the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences and Aeronomy, joining ESSA's Institutes for Oceanography, Earth Sciences, and Atmospheric Sciences.

Since the creation of ESSA, for the first time, a single agency has the talent, equipment, and responsibility to investigate the total physical environment, and to apply the fruits of this broad investigation in the form of environmental science services.

The public will see how weather forecasts are made, how the size and shape of the earth are measured, how navigational charts are constructed, how ships search out the secrets of the global ocean, and how instruments "listen" to earthquake vibrations in the earth's interior. The public will see ESSA ships and aircraft, computers and satellite ground stations, observatories and research centers all over the United States.

Less easily seen, but very much a part of ESSA, are the improvements in the quality and quantity of environmental services offered the people of this country, and the strengthened foundation of environmental sciences research which underlies these improvements. The concept of a single composite physical environment led to the creation of ESSA, and is integral to every aspect of ESSA's work. Oceanographic research and survey ships are being used by meteorologists, ionospheric physicists, and other scientific personnel; and oceanographers are studying the oceans from weather research aircraft. Computer techniques developed for numerical weather prediction are being adapted to other environmental systems—pollution forecasts, ocean circulations, and interactions among the sea, land, and atmosphere. The ESSA weather satellites, which now photograph the earth's cloud cover on a routine, operational basis, will soon mature enough to carry a full range of environmental sensors into space.

The sense of interaction prevades the work of ESSA. The immense quantities of environmental data, once analyzed and stored separately, are now gathered simultaneously, and analyzed with a view toward understanding the total environmental system. This combination of geophysical, meteorological, and oceanographic information represents a major step toward viewing the environment as a composite system, and a major opportunity to master its myriad secrets. Thus, in ESSA, geomagnetic data are used in close conjunction with solar and ionospheric measurements, and weather information is augmented by the addition of oceanographic factors.

If interaction characterizes the work of ESSA, integration and combination have characterized the new agency's organizational shape. Consolidation of management has led to a pooling of major resources, and to the combination of existing systems, resulting in improvement of the quality of service. ESSA's development of a plan for a nationwide natural disaster warning—Nadwarn—system is an example of how such combinations can benefit every American. This plan, designed to improve natural hazards detection, disaster warning communications, and community preparedness, is expected to halve the toll of life and property we pay each year to tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, seismic sea waves, and other destructive natural events.

ESSA's first year is a study in successful innovation. Research in oceanography and sea-air interaction has taken major steps, with meteorologists and oceanographers working together to achieve new understanding of the complex relationships between the ocean and atmosphere. Such knowledge is needed to forecast weather for long periods in advance, and to improve predictions of ocean waves, water temperatures, coastal currents, and other ocean conditions. ESSA also mounted the most intensive and detailed study of the Gulf Stream ever undertaken. When the investigation is completed, scientists will have gained a much improved understanding of this huge "ocean river."

A major accomplishment during the year was the initiation of the world's first operational weather satellite system, which began with the launching of the ESSA 1 and 2 spacecraft in February. These two satellites provide almost total coverage of the earth's weather every day—one storing the photographs for transmission to large data acquisition stations, and the other sending pictures directly to ground stations around the world.

The ESSA satellite system is a forerunner of the World Weather Watch, a program proposed by the United Nations' World Meteorological Organization. The objective of the World Weather Watch is to bring the atmosphere under complete surveillance, and to provide rapid communication, processing, and analysis of global weather data. The major role to be played by the United States in this global weather system will be coordinated by ESSA.

On July 13, ESSA's new research and survey ship *Oceanographer* was commissioned. *Oceanographer* is the largest and most advanced oceanographic vessel ever constructed in the United States. Her design is unique in its satisfaction of environmental research requirements, for this new ship is equipped to study the ionosphere and atmosphere as well as the global sea.

As its first year draws to a close, ESSA can point to such achievements as accelerated modernization of its environmental research and survey oceanographic fleet, expanded environmental services, extension and improvement of natural hazards warning systems, and the intensified investigation of earthquake mechanisms.

Now ESSA is preparing for the challenges of its second year, and of the years ahead. Soon, ESSA will be providing increased support to development of Continental Shelf resources. It will expand its services to agencies responsible for air and water pollution control. It will seek answers to the difficult questions involved in earthquake prediction. It will accelerate its investigation into the prediction and modification of weather, for the general good. In its second year, and in the years beyond, ESSA will continue to apply environmental sciences research to new and improved services—to improve the human condition as it is enriched or threatened by the physical environment.

NATIONWIDE WATER SHORTAGE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post, written by Marquis Childs, entitled "Congress Stalled on Water Riddle."

The article points out the work of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who is chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The article surveys the situation very well. It relates the feelings of some of the people in the Southwest on this matter and refers to the opinions of the people in the Pacific Northwest. The article also refers to the commonsense approach that Senator Jackson has displayed in this matter, and discusses the entire problem of the shortage of water, which is nationwide, and is not confined only to certain areas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress Stalled on Water Riddle

(By Marquis Childs)

Washington.—As the long, hot summer wears on with temperatures soaring and the temper of a lagging Congress daily more explosive, it is not alone the problem of the Negro ghettoes that presses for action. The country is running out of water and a conflict over how resources will be divided and the role of the Federal Government in furnishing the billions of dollars for a remedy overshadows many noisier issues.

While the arid Southwest with its swift population growth demands first attention there is hardly a region that in one form or another does not confront the cry for more water. Water tables are dropping alarmingly in the Northeast. The level of the Great Lakes is receding. Lake Erie has all but been destroyed by pollution.

Because the Southwest knows this score so well the seven states dependent on the Colorado River are out ahead with agreement on a measure costing the Federal Government $1.7 billion. It is a response to the fantastic growth of Arizona, Nevada and Southern California where in a semidesert water resources cannot meet the demand of expanding cities and ever more irrigated land. Part of the big package parcelling out the water of the Colorado Basin soon to some before the House includes Bridge and Marble Canyon dams in the Grand Canyon.

Arizonans are particularly jealous of their rights in a state in which the Federal Government still owns and maintains 75 per cent of the land area. They react with downright indignation to the charge of the conservationists that the unrivaled beauty of the Grand Canyon will be impaired by the two dams. One of the fiercest of the challengers is William R. Matthews of the *Arizona Daily Star*, a fighting editor in the tradition of the Old West.

Not only will the dams not intrude on the geological magnificence of the Canyon, Matthews argues, but they will create lakes which will be wonderful playgrounds for people who live in a desert country.

But there is another challenge that suggests the future of the conflict over water not only in the west but throughout the country. That is the competition between regions for a resource vital to life. The Northwest looks with dark suspicion on what is believed to be the ultimate design of the Southwest to carry "surplus" water from the Columbia River down 2,000 miles or more to the Colorado Basin at a cost of anywhere from $15 to $30 billion.

The key to this part of the water riddle is Sen. Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. He wants to know why anyone should consider the water in the Columbia below the great Federal dams as "surplus." He notes that in his own state are 20,000,000 arid acres that could someday use this "surplus" water.

Jackson is backing a bill for a National Water Commission that originated with the White House. This provides for a commission of seven high-level citizens outside Government who would be given the means and the authority for a five-year survey of water resources. The Southwest insists that the water needs of that region are too urgent to wait for a five-year study and included in the bill reported out by the House, therefore, was a proposal for a commission with an injunction to complete a study by 1969. This would in turn, if the study proved the need, open the way for a long-range plan to be completed by 1970 for piping water from the Northwest to the Southwest.

Since Jackson regards this as an advance commitment he cannot agree to, he is likely to oppose the House package when it is passed and sent to the Senate. With the session wearing on in an election year, action by the present Congress is doubtful. The prospect of delay is deeply frustrating to the Southwest where the water table is dropping at an ominous rate as cotton farmers drill ever deeper for underground water.

Two things seem clear. First, the problem Nation-wide calls for more than piecemeal solution with competing regions fighting for water resources that are ever more scarce. Second, the Southwest at its present rate of population growth cannot wait for five years and an over-all study.

Already painfully evident is the dire need for a far more radical approach than anyone in Government has yet considered. As one of the witnesses before Jackson's committee, Prof. Ray K. Linsley of Stanford University, pointed out, the techniques proposed—dams, aqueducts, levees—are in essence those of the ancient Persians in the Tigris and Euphrates Valley 6,000 years ago. The new technology—desalinization, nuclear power—must be combined with the old.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14921. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported with amendments from the committee on appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been asked during the day whether there may be some rollcall votes tomorrow on the Independent Offices appropriations bill. I wish to state for the Record tonight, for the benefit of Senators who will see it in the morning, that there will be some rollcall votes on part of the bill. I believe that there will be some rollcall votes on the proposed amendments or cuts involving the Space Agency program. There is a controversy over the matter of Mohole, the National Science Foundation experiment in the ocean. Also, the matter of public buildings is very important. The House cut out of the bill all of the buildings for the District of Columbia. The Senate restored them partially. I believe there will be some discussion about that.

So that at least three major parts of the bill will be discussed.

AN ANALYSIS OF FISCAL YEAR 1697 NASA AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the appropriations for NASA will be taken up tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table of fiscal year 1967 NASA authorization and appropriation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A table of fiscal year 1967 NASA authorization and appropriation

	Fiscal year 1966 authorization	Fiscal year 1966 appropriation	Fiscal year 1967 authorization	Senate Appropriations Committee
R. & D	$4,536,971,000	$4,531,000,000	$4,248,600,000	$4,246,600,000
C of F	62,376,350	60,000,000	95,919,000	95,000,000
AO	591,048,850	584,000,000	655,900,000	650,000,000
Total	5,190,396,200	5,175,000,000	5,000,419,000	4,991,600,000

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the FY 1967 R&D authorization, after several program adjustments, is $282,400,000 below the FY 1966 appropriation.

Approximately $200,000,000 of the reduction results from the scheduled completion of the Gemini program during the first half of FY 1967. Concurrently, there is only a $7,000,000 increase in the Apollo program (over and above the FY 1966 level) even though extensive ground test operations are under way, initial Apollo manned flights will be conducted, and production of Apollo hardware will be continued at a previously established rate.

The authorization for space science and applications programs for FY 1967 is about $110,000,000 less than FY 1966. This reduction results from careful scrutiny of the several programs to effect economies. The major reductions resulted from cancellation of the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory program, deferral of the start of the Voyager (unmanned Mars) program for 1 year, anticipated completion of the Centaur development program, and a reduction in unmanned launch vehicle procurement.

The authorization for those programs in the advanced research and technology group is about $11,000,000 less than the FY 1966 authorizations and represents a level of research effort just slightly under that finally established by NASA for FY 1966.

The Congress authorized an increase of approximately $28,000,000 in the Tracking and Data Acquisition program for FY 1967 to support the increased launch and flight operations activity resulting from initiation of the Apollo flight program and the increased frequency and duration of unmanned spacecraft flights such as the Nimbus weather satellite, the OGO scientific satellite, Surveyor, Lunar Orbiter, etc. This increased flight activity necessitates more stations, more round-the-clock coverage, and more data processing resulting in attendant increased costs.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The NASA C of F appropriation for the past few years has been characterized by the large facility requirement for the Apollo program. These include research, development, manufacturing, test and launch facilities. FY 1966, at an authorized level of $62,376,350, and an appropriation of $60,000,000, signaled the completion of funding for those Apollo requirements defined upon initiation of the lunar landing program. It did not, however, preclude authorization of facilities which were being constructed on a phased basis as the need developed, or facility modifications or additions to test and launch facilities as the Apollo hardware became fully defined.

The FY 1967 construction authorization of $95,919,000 is significantly influenced by these factors particularly at the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) which was authorized $37,876,000 as compared with $8,195,000 in FY 1966, an increase of $29,681,000. Apollo operations are rapidly moving into the launch phase thereby necessitating increases in all phases of support activity. $29,500,000 of the $37,876,000 is for necessary building and equipment modifications to accommodate Apollo vehicle and spacecraft design changes and for continuing the outfitting of the vehicle assembly building, launch control center, and the launch pad. This work was not previously funded because the work was either not fully defined or was sufficiently far in the future that it did not warrant funding in prior years.

The latter situation is particularly true with respect to additional office and warehouse space. As noted above, the Apollo program emphasis is shifting into the launch phase and these facilities are needed now whereas the requirement could not be accurately forecast or the need justified before the phasing in of the Apollo launch activity at this Center.

The Space Committee carefully reviewed the need for each facility requested by NASA and considered all to be necessary. The C of F items for the Centers, other than KSC, are generally small additions to existing plant with four exceptions which I believe are of special interest

First, the Committee carefully reviewed the justification for $9,100,000 for a Lunar Sample Receiving Laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center, and was firmly convinced this facility was necessary to preclude any possiblity of contamination of the Earth with pathogenic organisms from the Moon. This facility is fully endorsed by the Public Health Service. However, recognizing the experimental nature of this laboratory, the Committee believed construction economies could be effected and a $1,000,000 cut, slightly over 10% was made. The House agreed with this action in conference.

Second, the C of F authorization contains a $14,000,000 expansion of the present propulsion systems laboratory at the Lewis Research Center, near Cleveland, Ohio. This facility is to provide a capability to conduct advanced research on supersonic transport propulsion systems. This research tool is essential to maintain the leadership of the Nation in aeronautics. It also has been reviewed and approved by the DOD through the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board as a necessary adjunct to the total research capability in aeronautics.

Third, the Committee recommended, and the Senate and the Congress authorized, $5,011,000 for a V/STOL research wind tunnel at the NASA Langley Research Center. The V/STOL system is looked upon by many as having the potential to make significant contributions to interurban transportation problems which are becoming increasingly large. V/STOL research requires a wind tunnel with different characteristics and capabilities from those used for fixed wing aircraft. The Space Committee concluded that this facility was needed now to enable NASA to carry out its statutory responsibility for aeronautical research.

Fourth, the Committee authorized $10 million to construct previously programed facilities at the new Electronics Research Center. The House authorized $5 million less on the basis that land acquisition delays did not enable NASA to fully utilize the full amount this year. The Conference Committee agreed upon $7.5 million for this Center. It has been repeatedly stated that over 50% of the effort in space endeavors involve electronics and electronic systems and that extended reliability of and improvement in such systems is the key to successful space missions. There is ample evidence of the significance of electronic systems in space flight today. In view of these factors it is believed absolutely essential to provide the capability to conduct research in the electronics field if we are to continue to improve our overall space performance as well as to realize the economies that accrue from successful hardware performance.

The House Appropriations Committee cut $26.5 million from the NASA C of F request on the basis that some facilities relate to operations after accomplishment of the manned lunar landing. No specific projects were denied. It is clear that the significant part of the FY 1967 construction authorization is directly related to the Apollo program. However, it is most evident that the remaining items of large monetary consequence are also vital to maintaining this Nation's scientific and technical competence, and that analysis shows that it is just not realistic to defer such facilities until after the manned lunar landing. NASA has statutory responsibility to conduct research in other areas such as aeronautics, and it is absolutely essential these facilities be provided now if the Agency is to carry out its responsibility and provide the national competence in aeronautics and space which it has now achieved.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

In FY 1966, the appropriation of $584,000,000 for Administrative Operations was $7,048,850 less than the authorization and $25,400,000 less than the NASA request. The last NASA budget plan for FY 1966 was $611,820,000, an increase of $27,820,000 above the appropriation. This is within the 5% transfer authority permitted by the appropriation act. The increase was caused by the 1965 Federal salary increase and salary adjustments for wage board employees, both of which were not budgeted for, increased support costs at the Kennedy Space Center occasioned by a more rapid build-up of launch activity than previously planned, and a transfer of the funding of a service contract at the Kennedy Space Center from R&D to AO as directed by the Bureau of the Budget. The latter is an accounting transfer effected during FY 1966 to allow comparison with FY 1967 projected operational levels. In addition, NASA deferred certain support contract costs from FY 1966 to FY 1967 to remain within FY 1966 funding limitations. The $611,820,000, therefore, reflects the most recent actual operational experience on which to evaluate funding requests.

The FY 1967 authorization of $655,900,000, with the Senate Committee recommended appropriation of $650,000,000, is $44,080,000 above the FY 1966 operating level, and $8 million below the NASA request. Analysis by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences revealed that the increase is primarily due to the full impact of the 1965 Federal salary increase; the addition of manpower to support the increased manned space flight activity of both Gemini and Apollo mission planning—flight control, launch, and tracking and data operation; previously scheduled staffing of the Electronics Research Center; reimbursement to the DOD for military personnel previously furnished without charge; organizational changes within NASA resulting from an overall personnel study; and service and support costs—utility charges, support services, materials, supplies, etc.—directly associated with the increased launch and flight activity.

The personnel items represent an estimated increase of about $21.5 million; the support cost increases at the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) and the Manned Spacecraft Center alone are estimated to increase about $20.4 million; and the remaining increase arises from very nominal increases at the other centers. The Senate authorization action recognized that the added personnel in manned space flight were not yet onboard and accordingly reduced the NASA personnel request $5 million to require NASA to further analyze its personnel needs and effect reduction in the proposed levels before hiring. The support service costs are not considered to be as accurately predictable in view of the current KSC facilities activation work and the fact that the Apollo program is entering the launch phase. These factors plus the presence of some deferred funding of service contracts from FY 1966 supports the funding increase requested for FY 1967 even though we cannot identify in advance all the unforeseen costs one must anticipate in activating a new facility. However, the Space Committee was convinced that the estimates for these activities were reasonable under the circumstances.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics reduced the NASA AO authorization request $19,689,850, of which $9,448,850 was a 5% across-the-board cut against advanced research and technology Centers, $3,500,000 was against space science and applications and $6,741,000 was against manned space flight. The latter two cuts were made in categories other than personnel, that is, utilities, supplies, maintenance, etc. The Senate Space Committee was unanimously opposed to the $9-plus million cut in Advanced Research and Technology as this activity is vital to maintaining the Nation's future scientific and technical competence and further, this area has been seriously constrained already because of overall Federal budgetary limitations. The Committee also did not agree with the other cuts for the reasons already mentioned.

The report of the House Appropriations Committee is silent on the basis for its $33,900,000 reduction in the NASA AO request; however, the action of the House authorizing committee might have been quite persuasive in this regard. It is considered most significant to note at this point that the House Space Committee receded over $11,000,000 to the Senate in conference resulting in an authorization only $3,000,000 below the amount approved by the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 9, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of Dahomey Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Republic of Dahomey as it enters its 7th year as an independent member in the family of nations, and to extend warmest felicitations to His Excellency Christophe Soglo, President of Dahomey; His Excellency Louis Ignacio-Pinto, Dahomey's Ambassador to the United States, and to all the citizens of that fine Republic.

A former French colony, it was granted its independence on August 1, 1960. It is a member of both the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

Since it began its quest for viability, Dahomey, like other newly independent African nations, has been beset with many major problems—high prices, low wages, recurring unemployment, greater imports than exports, and a large civil service representing a strain on the budget.

However, Dahomey may take great pride in the efforts it has made during the past 6 years to alleviate these problems. An artificial port was constructed at Cotonou to facilitate international trade. The Government adopted a 20-year program in 1962 to increase industrial and agricultural production. With one of the best educated populations in Africa, the Government places great value on education and has striven to expand educational services for its people.

I was particularly impressed by the imagination displayed by Dahomey leadership which came to my attention in a recent newspaper article. Realizing the loss of contact which often occurs between leaders and their people, the President and his Cabinet spent a week in the country working shoulder-to-shoulder with the farmers. In addition, he had the diplomatic corps flown in to participate for 1 day. His own wife worked by the side of the farmers. To quote the President's inspirational explanation of the intent of this project:

> We intend to keep up this warm and intimate contact with the peasants, for no matter how much our friends may aid us with their technicians and their equipment, only our own hard work will get us out of our present terrible troubles.

Another unique approach being considered by Dahomey leadership is to transfer hundreds of civil service employees, since the civil service now costs the Government 60 percent of its budget, to agricultural employment where they will be particularly useful in this primarily agricultural economy.

We wish both the leaders and the people of Dahomey continued success in their programs for the development of the proud nation they envisage—may their challenging future prove to be most rewarding. And may we again express American sympathy with their neutral position in world affairs and our appreciation of the cordial relations which exist between our two nations.

Firearms Legislation Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic slayings in Chicago and Texas have brought a new rash of demands for enacting the pending firearms control bills.

Congress should not be stampeded into enacting legislation in the emotional atmosphere which now exists. While these crimes require fervent efforts to combat the rapidly increasing crime rate, they should not be used as an open license to restrict the 50 million Americans who are honest, law-abiding citizens and yet own guns.

The new calls for legislation do not change the fact that the pending firearms legislation violates the constitutional right of bearing arms and contains a dangerous grant of power to the executive branch.

Postmaster Green Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a devoted Federal employee, Frank T. Green, retired on July 31, 1966, as postmaster of the Naugatuck, Conn., post office after 31 years of dedicated service. With his termination of service comes the loss of an able public servant. During his career he engendered many friendships while undertaking the task of making operations at the Naugatuck post office increasingly effective and efficient.

Having come to Naugatuck from the nearby community of Torrington, Conn., he indulged himself fully in the actions of a civic-minded citizen. Frank T. Green was elected mayor of his adopted town for three terms. Subsequently, he was appointed postmaster through nomination by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During his tenure as postmaster, he worked diligently to provide the borough of Naugatuck and its Union City station with the best possible postal service. Not only were the ordinary local needs met, but he did an excellent job of fulfilling unique requirements imposed by a large volume of industrial mail.

Certainly, it should not go unnoticed that during his career as postmaster the main post office in Naugatuck was greatly enlarged, and a new branch facility was constructed for the people of Union City. There was a commensurate increase in personnel to better serve these growing communities. Under his guidance, the postal service in Naugatuck became a shining example of the excellence that the U.S. postal service strives for but does not always attain.

The retirement of Frank T. Green will create a void—he will be missed--his shoes will be hard to fill. He was the type of individual who desired to serve the people of his community in every way possible. For over 20 years he headed the local March of Dimes campaign and with great success.

I call this record of service to the attention of my colleagues and ask them to join me in expressing congratulations to Postmaster Green for a fine record of service and to wish him many years of health, happiness, and wealth in retirement.

A New Approach to Aviation Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, because of pressing business here on the floor of the House, I was unable to attend the annual convention of the Lawyer-Pilots Association on Friday, August 5, in Jackson, Wyo., where I was to be the guest speaker that evening. Because the speech I had prepared contains many matters of great interest I thought I would submit this speech for your consideration—and the consideration of others who share our interest in these matters. Mr. Speaker, my speech follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO AVIATION SAFETY

It is most appropriate for those of us in the Lawyer-Pilots Association to hold our annual meeting in Wyoming. The future strength of all types of aviation is of particular importance in an area like Wyoming. Wyoming's large size, adverse weather conditions which make road travel hazardous, and the inadequate ground transportation in some areas all make for increased use and importance of air travel.

In my case, being a pilot was of utmost value in the last campaign because air travel was the only way in which I could cover the state as thoroughly as I did.

For the entire state of Wyoming, the potential for increased growth partly depends upon the quality and quantity of transportation services and facilities which we can offer to geographical areas with which we share a community of interest.

Concerning the entire United States economy, the airline strike has demonstrated the importance of aviation to our national wellbeing. Last year our commercial air carriers flew 66 billion passenger-miles, 16% more than in 1964. General aviation accounted for 24 billion passenger-miles, a gain of 13%.

NEW PROBLEMS OF A SUPERSONIC AGE

Aviation has undergone fantastic growth in this country and we are now on the verge of an era which promises even greater achievements. But if we are to extract the full measure of value from this growth, our minds must be able to operate on a par with the supersonic speeds of our planes. We must begin now to anticipate the needs and problems of the supersonic age.

One of the most important areas of concern in raising the quality of aviation is that of improving air safety. With a space program that contemplates a man on the moon within the decade, the least we can do is get a man around this earth in fairly good shape. Like Harry Belafonte said recently, we're going to spend all this money getting to the moon and then find out that everyone up there is black!

With the coming of the supersonic transports, which may hold up to 500 people apiece, we must now approach air safety in a new way. This new approach is also necessitated by such tragedies as the Boeing 727 crash in Salt Lake City last winter; 43 of the 91 occupants died as a result of that accident. Apparently none of the fatalities were due to traumatic injuries but all died from suffocation during the resultant fire. The interior furnishings probably contributed greatly to the spread of fire and the emission of heavy black smoke. There was also a possible maloperation of the emergency lighting system which failed to illuminate the emergency exits for passenger escape to safety.

THE CRUCIAL POST CRASH PERIOD

The old approach to safety was based upon the idea that these beautifully designed planes would never crash and that, when they did, little could be done to save the occupants. But now, perhaps, we ought to insist that airplanes be designed on the premise that they may crash. Those of us who are both pilots and lawyers may be able to make a real contribution in this new area by proposing legal standards which aircraft designers and operators should meet.

It is now becoming clear that many casualties in aircraft crashes occur in the critical period just after the crash during which an intense enveloping fire develops. The damage occurs between the initiation of the fire and the time of arrival of fire fighting equipment.

Three basic methods can be used to safeguard passengers during this critical period. We can work to improve evacuation means, to increase occupant mobility, and to "buy" evacuation time after occurrence of the fire.

IMPROVE EVACUATION MEANS

To improve evacuation means, the major step that needs to be taken is to provide more and larger emergency exits, designed to function in conditions of darkness and panic. Perhaps these exits could be activated not only by on-site mechanisms, but also by remote master switches in the cockpit and stewardess service areas, functioning like the jettison capsule of the fighter pilot.

The problem with the present exits is that standards for their number, size, and distribution were based upon propeller-driven plane configurations, which differ from the newer jetliner configurations in many ways, such as aisle width, seat pitch, and number of seats abreast, which all affect the rate of emergency evacuation.

As the number of exits are increased, studies have shown that the time required to evaluate an aircraft drops dramatically. A Denver engineering firm concluded that even doubling or tripling the number of exits currently available on jet aircraft would make post-crash burn and asphyxiation fatalities virtually impossible.

INCREASE OCCUPANT MOBILITY

Evacuation means could be further improved if passengers could be given more effective training in evacuation procedures. Much training is given to crew members, but practically none to passengers. Yet passengers were the ones who ended up opening 5 of the 6 exits at Salt Lake City, and they fumbled with 3 of these before getting them open. This delay may have cost many lives. Even supposedly experienced people, including an FAA inspector and a crew member, did not know where all the exits were during the Salt Lake accident.

By the way, one critic has pointed out that the pre-flight passenger briefings might be more effective if alcoholic beverages were not served on the ground before takeoff!

Flight attendants must supervise the passengers to provide safe, efficient, emergency evacuation. But to do so, the attendants must be alive and uninjured—yet airlines in some circumstances relegate the flight attendants to areas where they are exposed to injury in the crash, such as jumpseats, often facing sideways, coat closets, or even washrooms!

The FAA now requires operators to conduct evacuation tests to show that evacuation of the full seating capacity can be accomplished in 2 minutes or less through no more than 50% of the emergency exits. But this required demonstration is of little or no value in the case of some airlines, who have sometimes rehearsed participants, have allowed women to wear slacks and low-heeled shoes, and have used 100% healthy specimens.

"BUY" EVACUATION TIME

The Salt Lake City accident has also stimulated a number of proposals which would enable us to "buy" evacuation time after the crash. Fire tests have disclosed a number of deficiencies in the materials presently being installed in aircraft interiors. Materials are available which would be far superior to those now being used.

Another proposal has been to install automatic sprinkling systems. One idea was to fill the cabin interior with a stable insulating foam right after the crash. Portable emergency breathing apparatus could be provided for instant use.

This increased emphasis upon safety should apply not only to the commercial aircraft, but, perhaps more importantly, to people like you and me, the private plane operators, since general aviation accounts for many more fatalities than commercial flight. In 1963, there were 73 commercial accidents, 13 of them fatal. These 13 fatal accidents caused 264 fatalities. But there were 4900 accidents in general aviation, 477 involving fatalities, resulting in 900 deaths.

ACCIDENT CAUSES

The pilots' lack of knowledge and/or disregard of weather conditions are the major causal factors in fatal accidents. Weather accounts for about 38% of the total number of fatal accidents. The incidence of alcohol has been a major factor in fatal general aviation accidents. In 1963, medical investigators found measurable traces of alcohol in the blood of more than ⅓ of the general aviation pilot fatalities examined. In 1964, the incidence was somewhat higher, with about 4% of the total examined having an alcohol level high enough to indicate substantial intoxication.

Steps are being taken to improve the safety record in general aviation. The FAA is encouraging a voluntary refresher training course for certified pilots and is continuing research in the area of pilot training.

LEGAL PROBLEMS

The matter of safety regulation and investigations brings up another interesting legal problem concerning the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency. The CAB investigates all fatal accidents but has entrusted the FAA with responsibility for checking all non-fatal light airplane accidents. But it has been charged that the FAA, because of its other licensing and regulatory duties, is not able to give this group of accidents the kind of independent study and review accorded other accidents. This may be a little bit like asking the policeman to be the judge as well. Some consider this to be a distinct loss to general aviation. There can be a good case made that more is to be gained from talking with pilots who have survived an accident than from guessing at what the deceased may have done.

We lawyers are always interested in precedents and there is a good deal of apprehension among those in general aviation about the FAA's handling of passenger congestion at Washington National Airport. The FAA's action there might have derivative effects on the restriction of air traffic. The first-come, first-served policy is apparently being abandoned and quotas are being established instead. There has been a move to put instrument flight rules into effect at all times. Visual flight rules are now in force a good deal of the time. If other major airports follow this precedent, the VFR pilot would be limited—perhaps seriously—in where and when he could fly.

Another aviation problem of special interest to lawyer-pilots is that of user charges for airways. General aviation pilots join us in general opposition to this. The House Ways and Means Committee may be holding hearings on the subject this year. If and when they decide to do so, their staff has promised to notify me promptly so that I can prepare a statement on the subject for their hearings.

The advice of lawyer-pilots is needed on other legal subjects, as well, such as the proposal for a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation—and in regard to the Federal Airport Aid Program. I will be more than happy to give top consideration to any suggestions and proposals you may have on these and other matters pertaining to aviation law and regulation.

Because of their special qualifications and experience, there is a great deal that lawyer-pilots can contribute to the solution of the momentous problems that face us in this age of expanding air traffic. Solutions to the problems of safety standards, regulation, air traffic congestion, economics, and user charges, are not beyond the American genius to devise. For the sake of our nation's welfare, let us hope that they are not beyond the American will to produce.

"The Power Broker"—New Book on Practical Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the upcoming publication of "The Power Broker," by Joseph I. Lieberman.

This book deals with the career of John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and also the Connecticut Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Lieberman, a magna cum laude graduate of Yale and presently one of the shining lights of Yale Law School, is particularly well qualified to write about politics—having worked for both Chairman Bailey and Senator RIBICOFF.

An earlier draft of "The Power Broker," written during his senior year at Yale, won Joe Lieberman the Frank M. Patterson Prize.

Mr. Speaker, "The Power Broker" is must reading for those interested in the fine art of practical politics.

Disclosures of the Week—Part XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, again this week I am listing certain shocking disclosures, which have come to my attention, indicating that the Johnson administration needs to do some housecleaning.

CASE I

Foreign aid: From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1965, France received foreign aid of more than $9.4 billion. In that same period, France turned in enough U.S. dollars to siphon $2.6 billion of gold from Fort Knox.

U.S. gold reserves were down to $13.3 billion last July 1, the start of this fiscal year. Foreign claims which can be made against this gold now total $29 billion—more than twice the amount of gold available.

CASE II

Illegal defense spending: The General Accounting Office says that during 1964 our military spent $240 thousand for illegally transporting privately owned vehicles of Defense Department personnel. The law required such shipping be done on U.S. ships which were available at lower cost. Instead Danish ships were used.

CASE III

New Government bookkeeping: The administration pointed with pride to last year's deficit which was said to be down to $2.3 billion.

If the same bookkeeping method had been followed as was used in previous years the deficit was $10.2 billion.

CASE IV

War on poverty: A Negro militant who draws $1,000 a month to battle poverty used antipoverty funds to promote a San Francisco rally in which radical leftists demanded black power and harangued city officials.

CASE V

Merchant marine: One ship out of every five that sails the seven seas carries U.S. cargo. However, only 1 ship out of 25 is a U.S. ship. If Government shipments are excluded, only 1 ship in 40 is a U.S. ship. Eighty percent of the 645 cargo vessels now operating under the U.S. flag will be obsolete in 7 years. The average age is now 19 years.

CASE VI

High interest rates: The U.S. Treasury's debt managers are borrowing money at the highest interest rate the Government has paid in 45 years. Example: Nearly 5.1 percent interest on July 18 on 6-month bills. Two years ago the interest rate was approximately 3½ percent.

CASE VII

Crime jumps: Juvenile arrests—under age 18—increased 47 percent in 1965 over 1960. The population increase in this age group during the same period was only 17 percent.

According to the Mutual Broadcasting System's newsletter the crime rate in America is growing 500 percent faster than the population.

CASE VIII

Christmas vacations of Job Corpsmen: The total cost of $1,921,910 to the Federal Government for sending 13,602 Job Corpsmen home for Christmas and then returning them to their camps was disclosed in a letter from Sargent Shriver.

Servicemen on leave from Vietnam or military posts get no Federal money for transportation in the United States. They pay their own way.

CASE IX

Political advice:

> Slip, slide, and duck any question on higher consumer prices if you possibly can.

That was the advice to Democratic candidates for Congress from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. He urged if caught in a debate take the side of the farmer. He said housewives are not so well organized.

CASE X

Hard-core poor: The Indianapolis, Ind., News, points out that antipoverty policies are creating a breed of hard-core poor who are reproducing their kind at a rapid rate. This new "industry" pays off big for the welfare recipient.

For example, the city of New Haven, Conn., recently predicted that, at the present rate, it would have more illegitimate babies born per year by 1971 than legitimate births. The survey taken by the city showed 1 group of 100 women has had 340 illegitimate children during the past 5 years.

Aiken County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Aiken has long been noted as a famous winter resort.

It is now my honor to represent Aiken County in the Congress of the United States. For many years Aiken County was represented in the Congress by the Honorable James F. Byrnes—South Carolina's greatest statesman since John C. Calhoun.

The city of Aiken received its name from an illustrious American family, pioneers in industry and service in the Congress. William Aiken was the first president of the first American steam railroad. This railroad ran from Charleston to Aiken and later to Hamberg on the Savannah River. The Nation's first passenger train and the first train carrying U.S. mail ran through Aiken.

William Aiken, Jr., was Governor of South Carolina and served as Representative in the U.S. Congress from 1851 to 1857. During this period, after 133 ballots, Aiken missed being elected Speaker of the House of Representatives by only 1 vote. He served here in this House with courage and distinction. Later Aiken opposed secession and retired from public life. He was again, however, elected in 1866 but, although he opposed secession, ironically he was not seated in 1867 by the radical Congress which likewise so bitterly opposed secession.

A cousin of William Aiken, David Wyatt Aiken, was elected to the Congress and served in the House with honor and distinction from 1877 to 1887. David Wyatt Aiken's son, Wyatt Aiken, served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1903 to 1917.

Aiken is not only famous for its beauty, but is noted also for its history. The great Spanish adventurer and explorer, De Soto, visited Aiken County in 1540 in search of gold, crossing the Savannah at Silver Bluff. A painting of De Soto's discovery of the Mississippi River adorns the rotunda of the Capitol just outside this Chamber.

Col. Lighthorse Harry Lee, father of the immortal Robert E. Lee, captured a fort from the British on this same Silver Bluff in 1781.

One of America's oldest agricultural societies, the Beech Island Agriculture Club, founded in 1846, still meets at Beech Island. In 1910 Aiken County became the birthplace of home-demonstration work in the United States when Marie Seigler, a teacher, organized the first tomato club for girls.

One of the pioneer cotton mill regions of the South was located in Aiken County in the famous Horsecreek Valley at Vancluse and Graniteville. William Gregg founded the first typical mill village in the South around the blue granite factory at Graniteville in the year 1846. The Graniteville mill is still in operation.

Aiken County is the home of the now famous Savannah River plant where atomic energy is now being devoted to peaceful uses as well as national defense.

Aiken today is enjoying a fantastic economy made possible by a progressive dynamic people who look to the future. Aiken has one of the highest per family incomes in the South. It is a county with balanced agriculture and industry. Some of the Nation's greatest industries are located in Aiken. Kimberly-Clark recently announced a modern pulp and paper plant in Aiken County. Aiken is a beautiful modern city but one which still takes great pride in its magnificent magnolias, traditions, and gracious hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many disappointing things about reapportionment. May I assure you, however, that Aiken, being placed in my congressional district, is one of the few and most gratifying results of reapportionment that could come to any Congressman. I am highly pleased and welcome this great county to the Third South Carolina Congressional District. I hasten, also, to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues an invitation to visit this historic and beautiful county.

Jamaican Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean Republic of Jamaica has just celebrated another year of independence. I would like to take this opportunity to extend warm greetings and congratulations to His Excellency Sir Alexander Bustamente, Prime Minister of Jamaica; His Excellency Sir Neville Ashenbeim, Jamaica's Ambassador to the United States; and to all the citizens of that fine republic.

News items on Jamaica are more likely to appear in the travel sections of our newspapers than in front-page headlines. Most Americans tend to think of this young Caribbean republic as a tranquil and safe place, which has managed to avoid turmoil, revolution, and dictatorship. There is the image of "the island in the sun": tropical forests, sun-soaked beaches, golf courses, and colorful bazaars. Many thousands of tourists have come home with joyful memories of the hospitality and the liveliness of the Jamaican people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this independent members of the British Commonwealth and of the United Nations. Jamaica is young in its independence, sharing with the rest of the world many of its problems. In the short years since its independence in 1962 Jamaica has had to deal with the questions of development and economic self-sufficiency, of political stability and social justice.

Jamaica has made every effort to cope with the difficult tasks confronting it, and significant progress has been made during the last decade. The gross national product has increased more than threefold; social overhead investment has been enlarged to build roads, expand the communication system, improve housing, and better education. A long-range agricultural development program was started in 1960 aimed at improving agricultural output as well as rural social conditions.

Special attention is being given to agricultural education, the use of modern equipment and techniques, and the securing of water supplies through irrigation. Jamaica has become the world's leading producer of bauxite, and great efforts are being made to build up local industries and manufacturing enterprises.

The benefits of these development projects accrue to the people. Jamaica has pioneered in social work in the West Indies. Community development programs have been extremely successful in providing for self-help and in creating local sources of leadership. Low-cost housing and financial assistance to the poor have been provided. Housing has remained one of the most pressing problems, however, since many successful programs have suffered setbacks through the occurrence of natural disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes.

It is only appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we call to mind the great achievements of the Jamaican people. Present-day Jamaica is a microcosm of the world; we cannot but admire the efforts made to alleviate the serious problems facing any new nation, and we are proud of the Jamaican record of achievement. Jamaica has set an example for the rest of the world; the nation has made great progress in the fields of social, political, and economic development through self-help and cooperation with other countries; its many different peoples live together without tensions. Internal and external peace are the cornerstones of Jamaican policy, and the success of that course is clearly visible.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to compliment and congratulate the people of Jamaica and to voice our continuing concern and support for this valued Western Hemisphere neighbor.

Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on this act, several Members made reference to an alleged law that one in America has the right to discriminate in selling real estate. This is not a right that I find existing in real property law, and based upon nearly 20 years of legal practice, I am still waiting to see my first warranty deed giving one the right to discriminate in disposing of property. Nor was this a right in English common law nor was it in the Constitution of the United States. It has long been my position that it is a privilege, a privilege that has resulted in confining human beings into particular areas based upon their race or creed and without regard to individual worth. And it was a privilege too easily equated with liberty in our peaceful way of life.

To me the basic consideration of this legislation is whether or not Negroes should be allowed to live in various parts of town where and when they can afford the homes available. Apply this to my own State, my own experience in life, I cannot see where a restriction to certain areas in certain towns, based upon color, can be either moral or decent.

MELTING POT

I was born and raised in Rock Springs, Wyo., where this never was a problem. In the immediate neighborhood where I was born and raised were three homes—a Negro lived in one, across the creek was the Roncalio family, and next door was the Chinese family of the Lion Hand Laundry. If ever people lived more in harmony and in friendship and in true fulfillment of the American dream of "melting pot of the world," I do not know where it might have been.

I cannot forget that in World War II, I saw black men get shot and die in Aachen, Germany, in platoons of the American 1st Division; just as did yellow men in Italy, just as Spanish, English, and Swedes, and others died in American uniforms fighting the Hitlerian concepts of Aryan superiority, of racial grading of human beings.

SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Just a month ago 12 of my colleagues joined me in a tour through a hospital at Clark Field and in Vietnam where we found that a very substantial portion of our fighting men is now made up of American Negroes. Particularly I was impressed with one very handsome sergeant lying on a stretcher being transferred from a bus to a new superjet which would take him to stateside. He was an excellent appearing young man, except that he had no ankles or feet any more. They had been shot off. No legislative body should now state that this young man cannot come home and buy a house in the town where, by his talents, he could earn the money to pay for it.

In Cheyenne, Wyo., today we have multiracial living as a near-accomplished fact and we believe it has been done without loss or discord to those in any area of the community. Cheyenne boasts many members of minority groups. We would like to think we could set a guide in this regard, as does our neighbor, Denver, to the south.

Wyoming has, however, occasionally been harsh to some of its minority people, as have a good many other States and, indeed, has this Nation. Yet, we were the first State to strike away the discrimination against voting because of one's sex and it is only appropriate and proper that the sole Representative of that State in this body cast a vote here to kick over the last traces of discrimination of the grounds of race, creed, or national origin.

BLACK POWER

There is, however, Mr. Speaker, these days an ominous trend which ought to be noted and perhaps it is appropriate that one of my feelings toward this legislation should be the one to call it to the attention of the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, recently inserted several items into the RECORD seeking to define the term "black power." The fact that this definition encloses all of the matters which the chairman seems to give it, is of no small concern to me.

I do not believe in the righteousness of any type of power—black, white, civil, military, or whatever—when it clings for its legality and representation in proportion to the total numbers of any race, creed, or color. The gentleman from New York, who has been kind and gracious to me in the House, says that his policy of black power means that he will have to establish a particular number of racial types in every role of leadership in every town. His thesis is that if there are 10,000 voters and 5,000 are black, then the Negroes should get half the town officials. If this were to be the case, then how could we have a Negro chief of police in a town of 50,000 people of whom less than 1,000 are Negro? In Cheyenne, Wyo., we have approximately 49,000 and about 1,000 colored people. Who is our chief of police? He happens to be a colored man, and we are proud of his leadership. But where would he be if the "black power" definition is to take hold?

GREAT RIGHTS LEADERS

I would like to remind my colleagues that the successful leaders of the civil rights movement in the past, the men who have made the greatest gains for all Americans who take pride in the removal of discrimination from our land, are really the patron saints of the movement. These are the Honorable Thurgood Marshalls, the Martin Luther Kings, the Mr. Roy Wilkins, and the Clarence Mitchells of today. It grieved me to see, clawing to get included in their ranks, certain young cats of the "new breed" who apparently try to rally everyone on the streets of the Negro ghettos of America into disrespect for the law and the duly constituted authorities.

If their purpose is anarchy, or if their purpose is to downgrade America's efforts in Vietnam, or worse, then I believe that this is an ominous sign that could well remove any further progress in civil rights from the consideration of Congress for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial from the Washington Star, August 3, 1966:

VERY BAD ADVICE

It is one thing for Stokely Carmichael, head of the Student Non-Violent Coordinate Committee, to go around preaching his "black power" doctrine, whatever he may mean by the phrase. When on this theme, he stays well within the protection of the 1st Amendment, and, at worst, he does nothing more than discredit himself and his movement. He is skating on very thin ice, however, when he moves on to the subject of the war in Vietnam. In a speech to a rally Saturday night in Detroit, if he has been accurately reported, he said Negroes should refuse to fight in Vietnam, that they should "stay right here and fight right here." He was also quoted as saying: "We ought to tell everyone, 'We aren't going to fight your damned war.'"

This is bad advice—very bad. It does a disservice to the Negroes who are fighting and doing a first-rate job of it in Vietnam. It can bring nothing but trouble to any Negro who might decide to follow Carmichael's counsel when called for service. Finally, if such advice does not violate the law, it comes very close to it.

The Selective Service Act provides criminal penalties for any person who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or avoid service in the armed forces. What is Stokely Carmichael doing?

DISCRIMINATION IN REVERSE

The gentleman from New York would have Negro organizations purge themselves of white leaders. After some of us have given much for years to fight for integration, to fight for our race, the human race, are we now to find that the black power boys will bring us back into two races, a white one and a black one? For the black power advocates to make such proposals now, is indeed a tragedy of such magnitude that it would bring tears to the eyes of the angels, and I hope this appeal in the midst of this debate today will provide some sort of sustenance for those true leaders of American democracy and of humanity, and there are thousands of them of all nationalities, who still say, "Hold off, you young cats. Hold off your looting and your pillage and your plunder, you young lions. Don't destroy that which has been put together by tens of thousands of men of good faith, and men of goodwill of many nations over many, many generations past, lest you destroy all that means so much to so many."

There is not an office on Capitol Hill that has not received its share of the pronouncements of the leaders of the outstanding denominations of religions practiced in America, saying that this time we must not look the other way regarding this legislation.

In 1960 I was in Los Angeles for a full week, before the convention, in the interests of the Kennedy fulfillment. During that week I received several wires and petitions from Wyoming citizens, all warning me against the horrible danger to America that would certainly follow from the "un-American" act of electing a Catholic to the Presidency. These telegrams were from very good citizens of Wyoming—decent, God-fearing, and God-loving human beings—who had simply let fear get out of line, and who had forgotten for the moment to judge a man on his individual merit, not by his religion.

And so it is today if we can remember that, by and large, this matter will work itself out as has the matter of public accommodation laws. I believe that many of the fears that were raised in this Chamber these past few weeks, will prove ill founded.

Mr. Speaker, some of the criticism of this bill equates civil rights legislation with the advance of communism in America. I hope I can stress one point with all of the might and logic that I can muster and it is that this legislation advances those causes that will refute and eventually defeat communism in America. This bill will fulfill the dream of Americanism and will put teeth and reality into the American Bill of Rights and into the Constitution of our Nation.

ANOTHER TRANSITION

To those colleagues of mine who still feel that this legislation is damaging, I hope that they will bear with me for just one moment while we review in brief the fleeting time of our own existence on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, a hundred years ago, this body passed laws which prohibited one human being from exercising his former privilege to own another human being. Beginning about 30 years ago, this Congress began the passage of certain legislation which prohibited one human being from refusing food and the necessities of life to his fellow men of good deportment.

Today the time has come when one human being will be prohibited from exercising his present privileges to refuse adequate housing to his fellow human beings.

I think the situation is just as clear and just as inevitable as the passing of the day and the night.

Anniversary Tribute to the Ivory Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with many of our colleagues in recognizing and paying tribute to the Ivory Coast Republic on its sixth anniversary of independence, and take this opportunity to extend warmest greetings and best wishes to His Excellency Felix Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Ivory Coast; and to His Excellency Konan Bedie, the Ivory Coast's Ambassador to the United States, who also serves his country as Minister-Delegate for Financial and Economic Affairs.

Situated on the West Coast of Africa, the Ivory Coast proclaimed itself a republic on December 4, 1958. It was not, however, until August 7, 1960, that its independence from France was proclaimed and recognized. On October 31, 1960, the infant country adopted its present constitution.

This magnificent country, like many of the other newly independent and developing lands, is struggling through problems of independence and economic and social development, but unlike many of these countries, the Ivory Coast is more fortunate in its diversity of natural resources and more successful in its economic and social development.

It seems to me the people of the Ivory Coast Republic deserve our greatest admiration and help for the way they are succeeding in the very areas where the Portuguese, Dutch, English, Spaniards, and French before them failed; namely, successfully administering their territory, living in peace, and insuring a viable economy.

In contrast to almost all the other new countries of sub-Saharan Africa, the Ivory Coast is making extraordinary economic gains, so much so, that the respected American newspaper, the Journal of Commerce, commented almost a year and a half ago—February 12, 1965:

> The economy, based on sound fiscal and monetary policies, has produced a situation almost unheard of in a developing country—a balanced budget and a substantial trade surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment for just a moment on what this quotation means. First of all, this kind of economic progress does not come about in a politically unstable situation. Indeed, just the opposite is the case in the Ivory Coast. In addition, the Government has a pro-Western foreign policy which also holds the view that Red China should stay out of the affairs of African states.

The economy of the country is based mainly on agriculture, and between 90 and 95 percent of the country's almost 4 million persons make a living from the land. The land and its agricultural products contribute about half of the gross national product. The other half of the GNP is linked in many ways to the country's agriculture. Since the Ivory Coast became independent 6 years ago, the GNP has risen from $395 million to almost $900 million and the per capita income has mounted from $137 to almost $175.

The Ivory Coast is the world's third largest producer of coffee, which is the country's major crop. Following coffee are cocoa, timber, and bananas. The Government is making a concerted effort to diversify its agriculture, and major planning today includes private light industry.

The country is building roads, schools, ports, dams. In fact, there is so much work going on in the Ivory Coast Republic that they must import labor to keep up with production schedules.

The job these people have undertaken is a huge one, and they deserve our congratulations and our encouragement.

Vietnam Peace Conference Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has taken on an increasingly dangerous turn. Our engagement in South Vietnam is the most important and troublesome problem facing the Nation today. The people in my district are concerned and vexed by its complexities and its tragedies. I, therefore, deem it incumbent upon me to once again speak out to my distinguished colleagues on this issue.

I firmly support the traditional American spirit of free and open debate, hopefully, we may gain enlightenment from these talks. Our voices, however, need not always be raised in dissent—merely for the sake of dissent—but rather in the spirit of constructive purposeful proposal.

I have supported and will continue to support our basic commitment to the people of South Vietnam—our determination to allow these people to lead lives of dignity and freedom, with the right to choose their own form of government, free from aggression from without.

I have also supported all legislation to uphold the hands of our fighting men in South Vietnam. But I am at the same time deeply distressed, by what appears to be a continued prolongation and intensification of the war. We seem to be indeterminately sinking deeper and deeper into the perilous quagmire of an extended land war on the continent of Asia.

That is why, in March of 1965, I was among the first, if not the first, Member of Congress to conduct an open forum on Vietnam. More than 300 concerned citizens came to hear a State Department spokesman explain the basis for the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam. My constituents in turn expressed their views freely and all who were privileged to be present profited by the experience.

Shortly after the public forum, I was one of the first Members of Congress to propose a pause in the bombing as evidence of our desire for peace.

In the month of December 1965, I was among the first to urge the President to accept the Christmas truce and because the lines of communication were thus opened to extend the truce and the bombing. I was disappointed that the 38-day pause did not result in a reciprocal deescalation of the conflict.

In January 1965, I joined with 78 colleagues urging the President to continue his policy of measured restraint and not to consider our vote in favor of the defense appropriation bill as an indication that we favor an escalation of the conflict.

In July 1966, I was one of 47 Members of the House who criticized Premier Ky's irresponsible proposal for escalation of the war.

In August 1966, I was one of 22 Representatives in Congress who spoke out in favor of an Asian conference.

In August 1966, I joined with 177 of my colleagues in urging U Thant to continue as Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that all of these actions were consistent and in harmony with our President's policy of measured restraint and his earnest desires for peace. I have never been able to understand Hanoi's refusal to negotiate.

I feel, therefore, that it is now even more urgent for us to increase our efforts to bring about a reciprocal deescalation of military activities in Vietnam and a cease-fire, and to approach the termination of our own military involvement.

To accomplish this noble purpose I have sent the following letter to our President outlining my proposals for convening a Vietnam peace conference:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The conflict in Vietnam is the number one problem troubling most of my constituents. The increasingly dangerous course which the conflict is taking is of grave concern to all of us. Recent developments make it even more urgent, that we intensify our efforts to search for peace through diplomatic channels and by political means.

I recognize that our foreign policy is based on the principle that we encourage the development of a community of nations exercising the freedom to choose their own form of government. That is why our basic commitment to South Vietnam is morally correct. At the same time, a great Nation must have an equally great commitment to peace, and it is to this I wish to address myself.

I have told my constituents that you want peace as much as I do, and as much as they do. I have told them that you have the greater responsibility in making the day-to-day and hour-to-hour decisions.

I have told them of your efforts to search out peace and of your numerous proposals for peace. I related how you searched without success for signs of reciprocal de-escalation during the two pauses in the bombing.

Our Nation is the greatest and the strongest in the world and with that greater strength goes greater responsibility. Therefore, in exercising and carrying out that responsibility I suggest that we show to the nations of the world, and to our troubled citizens at home, that we can match our greater strength with even greater humility—because our common objective is world peace.

Mr. President, you have ofttimes stated that it is the policy of the United States to seek a settlement of the conflict by peaceful means; that we do not seek either territory or permanent bases in South Vietnam; that we are ready to meet any place, any time and that we welcome "negotiations without preconditions."

Mr. President, I suggest that you initiate a courageous and dramatic step to move the Vietnam war from the battlefield to the conference table. I make the following proposals, which, hopefully and prayerfully may bring about an end to hostilities and the beginning of negotiations for peace.

Announce to the world that you have:

1. Set the date, fixed the time, and appointed the place for a peace conference on Vietnam. (Consider Asia or Geneva);
2. Sent invitations to North Vietnam, South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and other interested parties to participate;
3. Agreed that twenty four (24) hours before the conference, as further evidence of our peaceful intentions, the United States will cease aerial bombings in North Vietnam, pending the appearance of Hanoi at the Peace table;
4. Agreed that seventy-two (72) hours, after the conference starts, there shall be a reciprocal cease-fire coupled with a cessation of all movement of troops and materiel while negotiations are being carried on in good faith. Provision for removal of the sick and wounded and movement of food, clothing and medical supplies, under appropriate inspection and supervision shall be made;
5. Agreed that if items 3 and 4 above have been complied with—then 48 hours after the cease fire, the Secretary of State will be present at the negotiations to meet with his counter parts of the other nations invited to the conference;
6. Agreed that the agenda to be mutually agreed upon may include the 14 points of the United States, the 4 points of the Hanoi government, the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962, and such other items which the parties may by mutual agreement add;
7. Extended an invitation to the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference, (the Soviet Union, and Great Britain), to the members of the International Control Commission (India, Canada and Poland) and to the Secretary General of the United Nations to take part in the conference.

Mr. President, by making these proposals you will have announced to the world and to our concerned citizens that the United States not only has the sincere desire, but also the determination to pursue peace, and that our government wants to see all killing and destruction stopped. By these proposals you will have seized initiative and given to the world the full measure of the continuing efforts of the United States to achieve a peaceful settlement.

Mr. President, you now have an excellent opportunity for creative diplomacy and dynamic statesmanship. Let us hope and pray that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will recognize our good intentions and come to the peace table. If they do, both sides will have gained much. Should they fail to appear, let the eyes of the world behold the empty chairs and let the ears of the world hear the thunder of the silence from those invited—but unrepresented at the peace table.

Lead us, Mr. President, in once again taking the first steps on the path of de-escalation and on the path towards peace. The world will recognize that you heeded the words of the Prophet Zechariah, 9: 10, who said: "And he shall speak peace unto the nations".

This act of courage and magnanimity will be applauded by the entire world and our citizens at home.

Respectfully,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to express their views on my peace conference proposal.

A Philharmonic Orchestra in the Mountains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the community of Evergreen, Colo., is nestled on the front range of the Rockies less than an hour's drive from Denver. It is one of the loveliest spots in the most beautiful State in the Union. Because of the energies and imagination of the people who live in Evergreen, a unique organization is now located there. The Colorado Philharmonic Orchestra, founded 6 years ago in Estes Park, has now moved to this growing, exciting community—Evergreen, Colo.

The orchestra is a training program for the young musician who will shortly be seeking a seat in a professional orchestra. In 11 weeks in Evergreen, this orchestra presents over 30 different concerts, building a wide repertoire.

The program of the Colorado Philharmonic was founded in summer of 1960 by Walter Charles, then conductor and music director of the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Symphony Orchestra. Charles well remembered from his own youth that the young musician, finishing years of intense study in a university or school of music, finds it difficult to obtain a seat in a professional orchestra due to lack of experience. He knew of the unending circle, experienced by young people in many professions, of needing experience to obtain a position—but of being unable to find anyone who will offer them a chance to gain this experience. Thus, the Colorado Philharmonic, then known as the Blue Jeans Festival, was founded.

Two thousand applications were received for 60 available openings. Charles chose his select group after personally auditioning students and performers at major conservatories, universities, and orchestras throughout the Nation.

Members of the 1966 orchestra range in age from 18 to 27. Younger members, as previously stated, are seeking experience to help gain a seat in a professional orchestra. Older members, most of whom are now with a professional group, seek the intensive training offered here to help them attain a better seat in the orchestra in which they are now playing—or to earn a seat with an orchestra of higher standing. Two members of this summer's orchestra have already been accepted for this fall with two of the top orchestras in the Nation—the Philadelphia Chamber Orchestra and the Cleveland Symphony. They came this summer for experience which will smooth their transition from school to professional position.

Not to be overlooked are cultural advantages brought to the Evergreen and Denver Metropolitan areas by the presence and performances of the Colorado Philharmonic. Concerts by the orchestra fill a void during the summer months created by the vacation period of the Denver Symphony and other fine arts groups in the Denver area. They also complement summer opera and theater programs presented at Central City.

The Colorado Philharmonic is now halfway through its first season in Evergreen. Hundreds of hours of labor and thousands of dollars in materials have been donated in order to make it possible to revise the budget down to a little less than $50,000. But at this halfway point, projections of ticket sales and cash donations received have caused the board of directors to face the reality of a possible $15,000 deficit.

The board of directors of the Colorado Philharmonic, the community of Evergreen, and many from the Denver area feel that this program is absolutely vital. The feeling also is, that if help is received to meet the obligations accepted for this 1966 season, the experience gained in the 5 frantic months allowed this year will enable the group to successfully meet the obligations for the coming year with relative ease.

The board of directors, therefore, has submitted a request to the National Council on the Arts for an immediate grant of $25,000 to insure the success of the 1966 season, hire a manager on a full-time basis, and allow a careful study of the experience gained in this first season. This would lay the groundwork for many more years of the Colorado Philharmonic Orchestra in Evergreen.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, for this quiet moment turning to Thee from all the pomp and show of the world, we pour contempt on all our pride. We come confessing that in the conceit of our self-sufficiency, too often with our burning thirsts we have turned to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. That delusive way has brought us, and our anguished generation, to tragedy and agony.

Our only prayer now, as we come in all our need, is "nearer my God to Thee, nearer to Thee." Keep us near to Thee in all our inner motives and in all our deliberations affecting the state and the world.

God be in our head and in our understanding;

God be in our eyes and in our looking;

God be in our mouth and in our speaking;

God be in our mind and in our thinking;

God be at our end—and at our departing. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 8, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, August 9, 1966, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 14875) to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 15485. An act to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947 (Rept. No. 1438).

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1437)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 7524) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators ALLOTT, JORDAN of Idaho, SIMPSON, and FANNIN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1439)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original bill (S. 3708), the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with minority views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3703. A bill to protect the employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

S. 3704. A bill to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City, N.Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 3705. A bill for the relief of Gamal Hassan Eid and his wife, Ekbaal Gouda Soliman Eid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 3706. A bill to amend the charter of Southeastern University of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3707. A bill for the relief of Eftihia Evmorfouchikou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 3708. A bill to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. MUSKIE, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

A BILL TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND TO PREVENT UNWARRANTED INVASIONS OF THEIR PRIVACY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill designed to protect the employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has held hearings in this field, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, no American is unaware of the history of the founding of these United States, of the dreams of freedom in the minds of those early pioneers, and in the hearts of all those who sought these shores over the years. I have always believed that the promise of this land was ever in the process of fulfillment for those who have looked for opportunity and yearned to live under a government responsive to the will of the people—a government of laws, administered by men whose decisions reflected the moral values of the governed. One of the glories of our form of government is that whenever administrative decisions have not reflected those values, the power of the ballot has quickly altered the cast of those responsible for administration, and by statute the representatives of the people have implemented constitutional protections and provided extensive protection for the rights of citizens against arbitrary administration.

Somehow of late, however, the topography of American values has frequently been needlessly altered by the winds of political expediency and the influence of technological change. Federal activities have rapidly expanded, and as our expectations of Government change, we more and more easily sanction departures from liberties once deeply cherished. In the vagrant hope of achieving sensational goals and politically satisfying ends, we often overlook the means used by administrations to achieve those ends.

For one large and vitally important segment of our population, this trend has recently meant a denial of the fruits of that principle of freedom which should imbue the actions of our Government. I refer to the employees and private citizen advisers who serve Government. It is ironic that the public servants who are so essential to the achievement of public policy do not reap the harvest of liberty. True, they have enjoyed the economic benefits of pay bills, retirement and fringe benefits, vacations and sick pay, and certain procedural guarantees. Yet reports currently coming to Congress concerning the Federal Government's attitude toward its own employees show that important areas of their liberty are being invaded and seriously circumscribed for reasons which have little or nothing to do with their jobs or with national security.

Some may be understandably skeptical about the extent of such a charge, and indeed it is difficult to see how we have let some of the practices develop.

I have expressed my concern to the President about the complaints of unwarranted privacy invasion which the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is receiving. I cannot believe that he has sanctioned the wholesale application of such practices as psychiatric interviews, psychological testing, probing interrogations about religious, family, and sexual matters, coercion to buy bonds and to support political parties, to fill out race and national origin forms, to disclose personal finances and creditors of employees and their relatives, to attend lectures, to participate in community functions having nothing to do with their jobs, and to conform their personal activities, behavior and associations outside the office to agency rules and a supervisor's whim.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> August 3, 1966.
>
> Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. President: For some time, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has received disturbing reports from responsible sources concerning violations of the rights of federal employees. I have attempted to direct the attention of appropriate officials to these matters, and although replies have been uniformly courteous, the Subcommittee has received no satisfaction whatsoever, or even any indication of awareness that any problem exists. The invasions of privacy have now reached such alarming proportions and are assuming such varied forms that the matter now demands your immediate and personal attention.
>
> The misuse of privacy-invading personality tests for personnel purposes has already been the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee. Other matters, such as improper and insulting questioning during background investigations and due process guarantees in denial of security clearances have also been the subject of study. Other employee complaints, fast becoming too numerous to catalog, concern such diverse matters as psychiatric interviews; lie detectors; race questionnaires; restrictions on communicating with Congress; pressure to support political parties yet restrictions on political activities; coercion to buy savings bonds; extensive limitations on outside activities yet administrative influence to participate in agency-approved functions; rules for writing, speaking and even thinking; and requirements to disclose personal information concerning finances, property and creditors of employees and members of their families.
>
> Two recent examples of this trend should be of particular concern to you, for they affect the entire civil service.
>
> The first is requiring federal employees to fill out questionnaires stating their race or national origin in the interest of conducting minority groups status surveys. Mr. President, such forms are appropriate for totalitarian countries but not for men in a free society. The euphemism dreamed up by the Civil Service Commission that the forms are "voluntary" is sheer nonsense, for the tactics employed to gain compliance in some agencies have become wholesale harassment of employees.
>
> The second device now being utilized to invade employee privacy is a conflict of interest questionnaire on which employees are required to disclose details of their personal finances, property, creditors and outside employment. Allegedly, this requirement is imposed on employees to prevent conflict of interest under Executive Order 11222. I cannot believe, however, that you intended to require such wholesale disclosure by tens of thousands of regular employees and private citizen-advisors. At the time your order was issued, emphasis was placed on disclosure by top political appointees. Although Mr. Macy has told the Subcommittee that he does not yet know how many employees and consultants will be covered, early replies to the Subcommittee's survey show that forty-thousand regular employees will be subject to disclosure in twenty-two agencies alone.
>
> The replies also show that procedures for reviewing and preserving the confidentiality of this personal information are haphazard, administratively unwieldy, and impractical.
>
> Many of the practices now in extensive use have little or nothing to do with an individual's ability or qualification to perform a job. The Civil Service Commission has established rules and examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants. Apparently, the Civil Service Commission and the agencies are failing in their assignment to operate a merit system for our Federal Civil Service.
>
> It would seem in the interest of the Administration to make an immediate review of these practices and questionnaires to determine whether the scope of the programs is not exceeding your original intent and whether the violations of employee rights are not more harmful to your long-range goals than the personnel short-cuts involved.
>
> I believe you will discover that they are.
>
> With best personal wishes, I am,
>
> Faithfully,
>
> Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
> *Chairman.*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the subcommittee has sought by hearings and investigation to remedy these problems on a case by case, agency by agency basis. Although response has been most courteous, it has brought no satisfaction.

I have therefore drafted legislation which is designed to halt many of the practices of which Federal employees have complained and to protect them from incursions into their privacy.

This measure is intended to be a bill of rights for Government employees.

The bill would first make it unlawful for an officer of any department or agency to require or request, or attempt to require or request, any employee or applicant for employment to disclose his race, religion, or national origin.

As I noted in the past, the subcommittee has become increasingly alarmed over the use of questionnaires to force employees to disclose their race, ethnic or national origins. The Civil Service Commission has said this disclosure is voluntary, yet the efforts to effect compliance with a minority group status survey have alarmed employees, the public and Members of Congress. In addition to the procedures involved, the contents of the survey are most disturbing in their implications. All present employees and all future employees are asked, or will be asked, to indicate whether they are "American Indian," "Oriental," "Negro," "Spanish-American" or "none-of-these."

As one employee writes:

> Would American Indian include the children of say, for example, Spanish-speaking Indian immigrants from Oaxaca, Mexico, or from La Paz, Bolivia?
>
> If a Negro marries a Caucasian, Indian or an Oriental, what are their children to be classified?
>
> Are Filipinos to be classified as Orientals?
>
> By Spanish-American would you mean the children of immigrants from Spain? Or would you include those from Hispanic America? What if only one of the parents is of Spanish ancestry?

He comments further:

> These were all questions debated and discussed in my Government office. The fact is that the majority of immigrants from a country like Mexico would be technically classified as Mestizos; the rest divided between pure Indians and Caucasians. There is no such thing as a "light-skinned Negro" in Brazil. If he is the offspring of a Negro and a Caucasian, he is a Mulatto; of a Negro and an Indian, a Cabocio. These are considered "third" races. In classification, some Filipinos brought up the problem of their mixed background and said they did not consider themselves "Orientals." The son of

Spaniards explained that he would fall under the "Spanish-American" category, while the daughter of Mexican immigrants considered herself a "Mexican-American."

A Puerto Rican writes:

> On no previous federal level census that I know of, have persons of Hispanic origin been singled out, and outside of establishing a precedent in singling all persons of Hispanic background, there is very little that this entry could accomplish. Persons of Spanish cultural background are too diverse, and some have been in this country for so many generations that they don't even know their family name had been Spanish. What outside of degrading Spain and the people of Spanish and Latin American origin could such an entry prove?
>
> While I have no doubt that the level of poverty among people of Hispanic origin is greater than that of the population as a whole, one look at the backgrounds of the large number of these people will show their lack of education, rather than outright discrimination, gives the answer.

An employee of Mexican origin writes:

> I have worked for the federal government since 1933 in Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado and Washington, D.C., and never has any job been refused me, to my knowledge, because I am a member of one of the so-called minority groups, nor has a promotion been denied for the same reason. I am quite proud of my heritage—my parents came from Mexico to make their home in Oklahoma (in fact, my father came to Indian Territory in the 1880's) and to contribute to a country they dearly loved until death. They were highly respected in business and made many personal friends through the years.
>
> If I cannot get beyond a grade 5 here or elsewhere without the help of the "minority group" assistance, but on my own merits—it's not worth it to me. I hope to continue in public service after my retirement. Most of us earn our respect for what we are individually—and certainly we Americans are made up from practically every race in the world.

The grandson of an Indian exercised his option and did not complete the questionnaire. He received a personal memorandum from his supervisor "requesting" him to complete a new questionnaire and "return it immediately." He writes:

> I personally feel that if I do not comply with this request (order) my job or any promotion which may come up could be in jeopardy.

He filled it out even though he did not know which box to check.

Mr. President, Congress has authorized a merit system for the Federal service, and the race or national origin of an individual or his forebears should have nothing to do with his ability or qualification to do a job. In fact, it is nobody's business. Nor is it healthy for our society to divide it up into four minority groups and "all others."

Secondly, this bill prohibits officials from requiring employees to attend lectures and meetings on matters unrelated to their official duties. In this connection, reports have come to the subcommittee that some agencies are requiring employees to attend lectures designed to indoctrinate them on subjects which have nothing to do with their agency functions. Directives announcing some of these lectures state that they are "voluntary" but continue that notice will be taken of attendance.

Another section of the bill prohibits requiring or requesting employees to participate in any function or activity not within the scope of official activities.

Reports have come to the subcommittee, for instance, that the Federal Maritime Commission, pursuant to civil service regulations, requests employees to participate in community activities to improve the employability of minority groups, and to report to the Chairman any activities unrelated to their employment. In addition to such directives as that of the Federal Maritime Commission, many instances involving this type of restriction have come to the attention of the subcommittee over a period of years. For instance, some agencies have either prohibited flatly or required employees to report all contacts, social or otherwise, with Members of Congress or congressional staff members.

Other complaints have alleged that some agencies even tell their employees where they can eat, or shop, or do business. Under this bill, therefore, officers may not forbid or attempt to forbid any employee of the department or agency to patronize any business establishment offering goods and services to the public.

Under the bill, furthermore, Government may not submit its employees or any applicant for employment to any interrogation, examination, or psychological or polygraph test which is designed to elicit from him information concerning his relationship to any person related to him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or experience in sexual matters.

Testimony received by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and other committees of Congress show that the instruments testing response to questions about such personal areas of an individual's life, habits, and private thoughts, are of questionable validity. FBI Director Hoover has said that that Bureau does not use polygraph machines for personnel purposes. For myself, I think they have all the validity of the bloodhound testimony offered to jurors in a criminal case I defended years ago when all the prosecutor had against my client was the fact that the bloodhounds went to his door when they were turned loose in front of it.

The invasion of personal privacy by use of such techniques, however useful they may be in the efforts of a psychiatrist to diagnose his patient's mental illness, has no place in the Government's relationship with its employees or applicants for employment. Nor do the interview tactics used on applicants for employment in some agencies.

Scandalous cases have been reported to the subcommittee involving high school graduates, young college students, and professional people who have sought Government employment and been subjected to harrowing sessions with security investigators, or psychologists, who probe about their relationships with friends and members of their families and about religious or sexual experiences. Surely, these practices can be doing the image of our Federal service no good and are assuredly bound to increase the turnover in good people and jeopardize recruitment.

Nor may employees, under this bill, be required or requested to support any candidate, program, or policy of any political party by personal endeavor or contribution of money or other thing of value.

A major area of complaint recently has related to outright coercion and intimidation of employees to buy everything from savings bonds to electric light bulbs for playgrounds. Therefore, the bill prohibits coercion or attempts to coerce employees to invest in bonds or other Government obligations or securities, or to make donations for any cause. This will not, however, prevent the use of appropriate publicity to persuade employees to so invest their earnings or make such donations.

What this bill would do is prevent such instances as that reported in several North Carolina daily newspapers that the Andrews Air Force Base Hospital was forcing employees either to buy bonds or check a statement "I do not accept my responsibility to support the President in this U.S. savings bond campaign." Or that reported in another agency where supervisors intimated that refusal to buy bonds was unpatriotic and had a bearing on an employee's security clearance.

One of the most recent and insidious practices for invading the privacy of employees and private citizen-consultants is the use of questionnaires on which employees are required to disclose financial interest, creditors, and property interests, not only for themselves but members of their families and relatives who live with them. This new program is designed to prevent conflict of interest and corruption in Government. To my mind, the 26 laws already on the books and the many regulations already governing ethical behavior, are sufficient, with the proper policing, to prevent any conflict of interest which such an invasion of privacy as this would disclose in the first place.

These massive disclosure requirements go far beyond the proper concern of the conflict of interest laws. At the time the President issued Executive Order No. 11222 last year, White House and civil service spokesmen mentioned that it would affect 2,000 political appointees. Now, as agency after agency issues regulations approved by the Civil Service Commission to implement the order, we find that not only has a big-brother counseling system been established in each agency, but that thousands of regular employees and private sector advisers and consultants are being required, with no option, to periodically fill out such questionnaires. Mr. Macy has written the subcommittee that he does not know yet how many people will be affected. The subcommittee does not yet know either, but, so far, early agency replies received to our inquiry show that of 25 agencies, 47,000 regular employees alone are being forced to disclose this information, on pain of being reassigned or dismissed. The numbers of private paid and unpaid consultants and advisers have not yet been tabulated.

As examples, however, we noted that the Post Office Department requires over 10,000 regular employees to disclose their personal finances and has appointed 513 deputy ethical conduct counselors, while the GS-3 employees in the Smithsonian Institution must disclose. Other agency replies show that 1,500 State Department employees, including interior decorators, 9,420 regular and special employees in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 3,500 in the Commerce Department, and 8,303 in the Treasury Department must report.

Aside from the invasion of privacy, and the fact that the Federal Government looks foolish, the expense of these programs to the taxpayers is just so much money poured down the drain.

Needless to say, the cost of civil service morale is already reflected in frustration and indignation. I agree with the employee who writes:

> I am in complete agreement with the objectives of the Standards of Conduct Directive and the Executive Order it purports to implement. I will continue to fully comply with these standards of conduct.
>
> I strongly object, however, to the unwarranted invasion of my privacy resulting from the forced compliance with the requirement to submit a "Confidential Statement of Employment and Financial Interest."
>
> This type of disclosure by Presidential Appointees and other high officials, when this is known to be a requirement of the job, is not an unreasonable requirement. However, wholesale application of this requirement to multitudes of lower level positions is either an act of no faith on the part of the Federal Government as an employer, or overzealousness on the part of an impersonal, insensitive bureaucracy.
>
> As many other employees are doing, I am completing the statement to avoid disobeying direct order. This in no way will change either my standards or my conduct.
>
> Such a lack of faith in the integrity of employees opens to question the good faith and judgment of the employer.
>
> The management philosophy underlying such policies will cause me and many others to re-examine the desirability of Defense Department and Federal employment.

In another example, an attorney who did a few hours of legal consulting work for one of the Government agencies, primarily out of interest in the program, submitted a bill for services and received by return mail the following:

First, pamphlet on "Preventing Conflicts of Interest on the Part of Special Government Employees"—the President's memorandum of May 2, 1963;

Second, "Security Investigation Data for Nonsensitive Position," standard form 85, revised December 1959, CSC;

Third, fingerprint card form 87 revised December 1959, CSC;

Fourth, statement of employment and financial interests form, optional form 29, September 1963, CSC; and

Fifth, applications for Federal employment form 57's.

This attorney's commentary was typical. She said:

> Suffice it to say, I have lost all interest in the matter.

Others write of instances where supervisors with access to financial information from employees have utilized it in personnel actions to invite older employees to terminate employment.

This bill, with a few very limited exceptions, would prohibit requiring disclosure of an employee's assets or liabilities or his personal or domestic expenditures or those of any member of his family.

An individual's economic liberty and his right to privacy are so important that an employee suspected of misconduct should not be required to submit to interrogation which could lead to disciplinary action, without the presence of counsel or any other person of his choice.

The bill gives him this right.

The subcommittee has studied this matter for some time, and has investigated numerous serious complaints involving this issue. In surveying the agencies, we found that many have written regulations allowing this right, others allow it if the employee insists, but have no such published rules; while still others refuse to allow it. It seems to me that where a man's job is at stake, he should not be required to confront the authorities who accuse him without assistance or a witness. The most hardened criminals are afforded this right before they are questioned about crimes: certainly, we can do this much for civil servants facing economic penalties in loss of jobs or loss of clearance for sensitive positions in Government and private defense industry.

By making it unlawful for any officer of any executive department or agency or anyone acting or purporting to act under his authority to require, or request, or attempt to require or request, the surrender of privacy through any of these forms of economic pressure, the bill enables the employee or applicant to look to the Federal district court at any point in the administrative process to halt the privacy invasions. He may ask for an order, injunction or other judgment and for complete relief against the consequences of the violation.

The bill makes it unlawful to discharge, discipline, or deny promotion to an employee who refuses or fails to submit to any of these prohibited requirements, requests or actions. Penalties are established for any officer who willfully violates the act.

Mr. President, the invasions of privacy under threats and coercion and economic intimidation which are rampant today represent tyranny of the worst sort. In their effect on individuals, in their impact on our society, they surpass any privacy invasions and illegal searches and seizures to which arbitrary rulers and administrators attempted to subject our forefathers.

They surpass the illegal searches and seizures against which murderers, robbers and rapists are protected.

And they constitute an admission by the Civil Service Commission and the agencies that they cannot operate the merit system, despite all the tests and rules for determining the qualifications of applicants and employees and making selection on the basis of merit.

People today are being forced to surrender what privacy they have left in a technological age, in order to obtain and hold jobs. I believe that this economic coercion to forfeit liberties is a form of tyranny which should disturb every American. It is important that these practices be stopped now, for if the Federal Government continues to expand its activities, soon the majority of our population will be directly affected by the guarantees afforded civil servants and applicants for Federal employment.

This legislation attempts to meet some of the major complaints which have come to the subcommittee from citizens.

I am not wedded to the particular language of the bill, and am sure that testimony at hearings will reveal alternative or additional methods of protecting employee privacy.

But congressional action on a bill such as this is long overdue to protect the rights of those citizens who are also employees of Government.

The tyrannies being practiced by the various departments and agencies of the U.S. Government might be appropriate to a totalitarian state, but they are alien to the spirit of a free society.

The bill (S. 3703) to protect the employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any officer of any executive department or any executive agency of the United States Government, or for any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, to do any of the following things:

(a) To require, or request, or to attempt to require or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency or any person seeking employment in the executive branch of the United States Government, to disclose his race, religion, or national origin, or the race, religion, or national origin of any of his forbears;

(b) To call or hold, or to sanction the calling or holding, of any assemblage, discussion, or lecture which is designed to advise, instruct, or indoctrinate any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency in respect to any matter or subject other than the performance of the task to which he is or may be assigned in the department or agency;

(c) To state or intimate, or to attempt to state or intimate, to any employee of the United States serving in any department or agency that any notice will be taken of his attendance or lack of attendance at any assemblage, discussion or lecture held or called by any outside parties or organizations to advise, instruct or indoctrinate any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency in respect to any matter or subject other than the performance of the task to which he is or may be assigned in the department or agency;

(d) To require or request, or to attempt to require, or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency to participate in any way in any activities or undertakings unless such activities are directly within the scope of his employment;

(e) To require or request, or to attempt to require or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency to make any report concerning any of his activities or undertakings unless such activities are directly within the scope of his employment;

(f) To forbid or attempt to forbid any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency to patronize any business establishment offering goods and services to the general public;

(g) To require or request, or to attempt to require or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency, or any person seeking employment in the executive branch of the United States Government, to submit to any interrogation or examination or to take any psychological or polygraph test which is designed to elicit from him information concerning his personal relationship with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs or practices, or concerning his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters;

(h) To require or request, or attempt to require or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency to support any candidate, program, or policy of any political party by personal endeavor or contribution of money or other thing of value;

(i) To coerce, or attempt to coerce, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency to invest his earnings in bonds or other obligations or securities issued by the United States or any of its departments or agencies or to make donations to any institution or cause of any kind: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit any officer of any department or agency of the United States Government or any person acting or purporting to act under his authority from using appropriate publicity to persuade any employee of the United States voluntarily to invest his earnings in bonds or other obligations or securities issued by the United States or any of its departments or agencies, or voluntarily to make donations to any institution or cause;

(j) To require, or request, or attempt to require or request, any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency, to disclose his assets or his liabilities or his personal or domestic expenditure or those of any member of his family: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not apply to any employee who has authority to determine final agreements which fix the tax or other liability of any person, corporation or other legal entity, or the provisions of contracts which require expenditure of moneys of the United States in excess of $100;

(k) To require, or request, or attempt to require or request any employee serving in the department or agency, who is under investigation for misconduct to submit to interrogation which could lead to disciplinary action without the presence of counsel or other person of his choice, if he so requests; or

(l) To discharge, discipline, or deny promotion to any employee of the United States serving in the department or agency by reason of his refusal or failure to submit to any requirement, request, or action made unlawful by this Act.

Sec. 2. Whenever any officer of any executive department or any executive agency of the United States Government, or any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, willfully violates or willfully attempts to violate any of the provisions of section 1 of this Act, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 3. Whenever any officer of any executive department or executive agency of the United States Government, or any person acting or purporting to act under his authority, violates or threatens to violate any of the provisions of section 1 of this Act, any employee of the United States or any person applying for employment in the executive branch of the United States Government affected or aggrieved by the violation or threatened violation may bring a civil action in his own behalf or in behalf of himself and others similarly situated against the offending officer or person in the United States district court for the district in which the violation occurs or is threatened or the district in which the offending officer or person is found to prevent the threatened violation or to obtain redress against the consequences of the violation. Such United States district court shall have jurisdiction to try and determine such civil action irrespective of the actuality or amount of pecuniary injury done or threatened, and to issue such restraining order, interlocutory injunction, permanent injunction, or mandatory injunction, or enter such other judgment as may be necessary or appropriate to prevent the threatened violation, or to afford the plaintiff and others similarly situated complete relief against the consequences of the violation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from Mr. John F. Griner, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees, addressed to me; a letter, also written by Mr. Griner, addressed to Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; and a letter addressed to me from Mr. Kenneth T. Lyons, national president of the National Association of Government Employees, all relating to the matters involved in this bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Federation of
Government Employees,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1966.
Hon. Sam J. Ervin,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: Knowing of your interest in the welfare of the federal employee over the past few years as evidenced by your press releases, statements on the floor, and the hearings held by your Constitutional Rights Committee concerning invasion of privacy, I am taking the liberty of attaching a copy of my letter to Chairman Macy of the U.S. Civil Service Commission concerning invasion of privacy. Your intense personal interest in protecting the constitutional rights of federal employees is greatly appreciated by this Federation.

I promise you the complete cooperation and support of this Federation in all endeavors of your Committee toward assuring the Federal employee that all constitutional guarantees of citizenship are his.

Sincerely,

J. F. Griner,
National President.

American Federation of
Government Employees,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1966.
Hon. John W. Macy, Jr.,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Macy: The U.S. Civil Service Commission is involved in two programs that are rapidly developing into untenable situations which I personally feel will contribute nothing to the necessary administrative efficiency expected of the Commission. nor will said programs accomplish their expressed goals as presently administered.

I refer specifically to the "Minority Group Status Questionnaire" and the administration of Executive Order 11222 signed on May 8, 1965.

Providing equal employment opportunity for all employees is not only laudable but absolutely essential in maintaining democratic procedures in the personnel management processes entrusted to your Commission.

Inherent in the obligation entrusted to the Commission is the responsibility of also being aware of the constitutional rights of all employees.

If the obligations of the Commission are properly consummated there is no need for any type of questionnaire, head count, or any other means of identifying different races for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a record of minority group status.

Equal employment opportunity for all employees can be effectively accomplished by the Commission through an adequate, stern, no nonsense inspection division with full authority to act on abuses discovered or substantiated after complaint. For example, we had a recent complaint concerning lack of promotion because of race and other reasons involving a WB–2 Negro. He was in this grade more than four years and watched many employees promoted over him, although he was fully qualified. Many of these promotions were to employees with less than six months' service.

After many frustrating attempts to resolve this situation at the local level, it was taken up at the national level. After many more months an investigation was orderd. the man was placed on the best-qualified list and he was promoted. The Agency informs us that they have the matter in hand. We think not.

The reason we think not is that the same persons responsible for this outrage are still performing the same functions. We think that a quick solution at the installation would be removal of promotion authority from them for one year, plus downgrading of responsible officials for inefficiency, or removal if their conduct were found willful.

You don't need race questionnaires, Mr. Chairman: you merely need proper enforcement of the obligations delegated to the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

The second "invasion of privacy" I am concerned about is Executive Order 11222, together with the Commission's implementation in the 735 series of the Federal Personnel Manual.

First of all Sec. 402 of the Order provides that employees required to submit financial statements shall be designated by the Commission. The general guidelines in F.P.M. 735–4–2 and 735–C1–through 5 are already being interpreted differently by a number of agencies as a result of the apparent delegation of this authority. For example, Review Section Employees in Internal Revenue Service are required to file financial statements because there is no periodic work report used in their work that provides for periodic certifications concerning conflict of interest.

Department of the Air Force is requiring grades GS–13 in a California installation to file financial statements. I do not know if this is because they are in procurement or audit work. But even if they are, the grade level is unrealistic because many employees in all components of the Defense Department work in audit or procurement areas at considerably lower grades.

Delegation by the Commission of the authority to designate employees required to fill out financial statements is resulting in an administrative chaos inconsistent with sound basic management principles. The reason for this is the complete and improper delegation of authority given to Agencies by F.P.M. 734-4-2-c. This section is inconsistent with Sec. 402 of the Order in that it permits Agencies to identify positions required to report financial interests. We feel that F.P.M. 735-4-2 goes well beyond the limitations shown in 401 of the Order.

Because of the time limitations for filing the confidential statements, my staff has received many calls from employees who, in varying degrees, expressed fear, anger, resentment, and, in some case, outright defiance.

It is entirely forseeable that under these procedures an employee may be required to make a request of a wife, mother-in-law, or other close relative living under the same roof, to reveal sources of income that they can quite justifiably refuse to divulge.

If this occurs, can the Agency discipline the employee because his family refuses to cooperate? When he shows their names on your Exhibit 1 in 735-D-3, will the Agency contact the wife and mother-in-law? The disturbing possibilities of these situations are immediately apparent. I can assure you any employee in this predicament will have the full and energetic support of the AFGE.

To make certain our position is not misunderstood, I assert to you that AFGE is 100% behind equal employment opportunity and the maintenance of ethical standards for government employees. It is only inept and improper methods of accomplishing these goals with which I take issue. The race questionnaire and financial statement requirements fall within these categories.

This Federation subscribes to the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States and the prohibitions against tyranny in any form that will destroy the inherent right of human dignity that characterizes our citizens and makes this the great nation it is.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, the American Federation of Government Employees will always fight to protect the dignity of the Federal Employee and lend its assistance to consistently improve the Federal Service. It will not, however, subscribe to methods that, in the long run, would create more injury and injustice than they attempt to rectify.

Sincerely,

J. F. GRINER,
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: I have been advised that your Committee will conduct public hearings in relation to psychological examinations and other tests that Government Employees are mandatorily being subjected to by the various Departments of our Federal establishment.

The National Association of Government Employees has on many occasions violently protested the entire concept of these examinations and we also have serious doubts as to any fruitful or valuable results of said examinations for many reasons.

Initially we believe that the structure of the examinations are such that some of these tests invade the privacy of an employee's life, plus the infringement of the examination into other personal areas.

We strongly support your proposed hearing and we would be most receptive to be provided with the opportunity to testify in opposition to the current wave of tests being conducted by some of our Federal Agencies.

Under separate cover I am forwarding copies of the "FEDNEWS", the official publication of the NAGE and I refer you to our front page article "Buffalo Rejects Test", as additional information for your perusal.

Hoping to hear from you at your earliest convenience, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH T. LYONS,
National President.

ELLIS ISLAND COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL "LIBERTY SERIES" ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the striking of a fourth medal in the Liberty series of commemorative historic medallions, three of which have already been authorized by Congress and created by the Treasury Department in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Monument American Museum of Immigration.

President Johnson on May 11, 1965, signed a proclamation making Ellis Island a historic landmark as an adjacent part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York Harbor. All of these historic landmarks, located in the downtown Manhattan area of New York City, have been recognized as national historic shrines, and are presently being reconstructed by National Park Service.

Pursuant to legislation which I introduced in the Senate and which was enacted into law in 1964, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to strike and furnish to the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board a series of three medals to be sold under the supervision of the Board, which was created by an act of Congress in 1955 for the purpose of advising the National Park Service and later authorized to raise contributed funds from the general public for the purpose of paying part of the expense of reconstructing and maintaining the shrines.

The bill introduced today calls for the striking of a fourth medal in commemoration of the new historic landmark Ellis Island. I am informed that the Board has conferred with officials in the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Mint, and if authorized by Congress the proposed fourth medal in the series will be designed in the Philadelphia Mint to conform with the previously issued three medals. The face will be identical in design with the others, presenting the Statue of Liberty National Monument as "Liberty Enlightening the World," which was the theme of the French sculptor, Auguste Bartholdi. The reverse of the fourth medal will depict the main immigration depot buildings still standing on Ellis Island, through which some 16 million immigrants passed coming to our shores in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

The reverse of each of the three already-issued medals differ in mint design as follows: The first shows Federal Hall as the first Capitol Building, where Gen. George Washington was inaugurated as first President of the United States, the first congressional sessions were held during 1789-90, and our departments of Government, including the Treasury Department, were first organized. The second depicts Castle Clinton as the last of a series of forts which, from the time of the Dutch settlement in 1624, guarded lower Manhattan, and was headquarters for Gen. Winfield Scott during the War of 1812. The third depicts the American Museum of Immigration now being constructed to complete the base of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, which will tell the story of the making of the United States by those who came to our shores from all over the world. All this indicates that the medal will look very beautiful and splendid.

I am advised that the gross sale of the Liberty series of medallions issued as of July 31, 1966, has exceeded a sum slightly in excess of $129,500 since the first medal was placed on sale at the Federal Hall National Memorial on Constitution Day, September 17, 1964.

The new bill calls for a total issue of not more than 255,000 medals to be struck over a period ending December 21, 1968. This conforms to the number of each of the medals previously authorized by Congress for creation by the Department of the Treasury. The New York City National Shrines Board will continue as previously authorized to supervise the sale of the Ellis Island commemorative medals, as well as the others in the series remaining unsold.

Completion of the three shrines had originally been estimated by the National Park Service to cost $5.2 million. Of this sum Congress had authorized $2.6 million, or one-half of the first estimated cost, leaving an equal amount to be raised if possible by the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board and cooperating groups. Continued rising construction and labor costs have now raised the estimated cost total to $6,667,822 according to the current report of the National Park Service dated July 29, 1966. The report also states that to date the National Park Service has received from the board $741,369 of donated funds.

I believe the enactment of this bill will be of material aid in achieving completion of these great historic landmarks. I hope action will be taken promptly so that the Board may continue in its work to raise funds from the sale of Liberty Series commemorative medals, which is certain to be stimulated and increased by the offering for sale of the proposed related fourth Ellis Island medal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3704) to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City, N.Y., introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 735

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1203) "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education, including certain travel, undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as cosponsors of S. 3580, a bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of S. 3654, to strengthen the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 308, MICHIGAN NATIONAL BANK BRANCHES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on S. 308, to permit the establishment and operation of certain branch offices by the Michigan National Bank, Lansing, Mich.

The hearings will be held on Wednesday, August 17, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2672, INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold an additional hearing on Thursday, August 18, on S. 2672, the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements should contact Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to announce, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, that the subcommittee will hold the third in a series of hearings on Federal support for international social and behavioral science research on August 15, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

THE UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATES OF WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1400, S. 553.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 553) to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 12, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, instrumentalities, permittees, or licensees in, over and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin, nor to impair or affect their capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 553

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the Upper Niobrara River Compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. Such compact reads as follows:

"UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT

"The State of Wyoming, and the State of Nebraska, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as Wyoming and Nebraska, respectively, or individually as a 'State', or collectively as 'States'), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the use of waters of the Niobrara River Basin, and being duly authorized by Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved August 5, 1953 (Public Law 191, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, Chapter 324, 67 Stat. 365) and the Act of May 29, 1958 (Public Law 85-427, 85th Congress, S. 2557, 72 Stat. 147) and the Act of August 30, 1961 (Public Law 87-181, 87th Congress, S. 2245, 75 Stat. 412) and pursuant to the Acts of their respective Legislatures have through their respective Governors, appointed as their Commissioners: For Wyoming, Earl Lloyd, Andrew McMaster, Richard Pfister, John Cristian, Eugene P. Willson, H. T. Person, Norman B. Gray, E. J. Van Camp: For Nebraska, Dan S. Jones, Jr., who after negotiations participated in by W. E. Blomgren appointed by the President of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I.

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for an equitable division or apportionment of the available surface waters supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin between the States; to provide for obtaining information on groundwater and underground water flow necessary for apportioning the underground flow by supplement to this compact; to remove all causes, present and future which might lead to controversies; and to promote interstate comity.

"B. The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Upper Niobrara River Basin constitute the basis for this compact; and neither of the States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Either State and all others using, claiming or in any other manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River Basin under the authority of that State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II.

"A. The term 'Upper Niobrara River' shall mean and include the Niobrara River and its tributaries in Nebraska and Wyoming west of Range 55 West of the 6th P.M.

"B. The term 'Upper Niobrara River Basin' or the term 'Basin' shall mean that area in Wyoming and Nebraska which is naturally drained by the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West of the 6th U.M.

"C. Where the name of a State or the term 'State' or 'States' is used, they shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River under the authority of that State.

"ARTICLE III.

"It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The States agree that the United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, may collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of information necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE IV.

"Each State shall itself or in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging stations as are found necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V.

"A. Wyoming and Nebraska agree that the division of surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River shall be in accordance with the following provisions.

"1. There shall be no restrictions on the use of the surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River by Wyoming except as would be imposed under Wyoming law and the following limitations:

"(a) No reservoir constructed after August 1, 1957, and used solely for domestic and stock water purposes shall exceed 20 acre-feet in capacity.

"(b) Storage reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West of the 6th P.M. and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North Range 60 West of the 6th P.M. shall not store in any water year (October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next year) more than a total of 500 acre-feet of water.

"(c) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates prior to August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to June 1 of the next year and at such times during the period June 1 to September 30 that the water is not required to meet the legal requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West. Where water is pumped from such storage reservoirs, the quantity of storage water pumped or otherwise diverted for irrigation purposes or other beneficial purposes from any such reservoir in any water year shall be limited to the capacity of such reservoir as shown by the records of the Wyoming State Engineer's Office, unless additional storage water becomes available during the period June 1 to September 30 after meeting the legal diversion requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West.

"(d) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to May 1 of the next year and at such times during the period May 1 and September 30 that the water is not required for direct diversion by ditches in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West.

"(e) Direct flow rights with priority dates after August 1, 1957, on the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be regulated on a priority basis with Nebraska rights west of Range 55 West, provided, that any direct flow rights for a maximum of 143 acres which may be granted by the Wyoming State Engineer with a priority date not later than July 1, 1961, for lands which had Territorial Rights under the Van Tassel No. 4 Ditch with a priority date of April 8, 1882, and the Van Tassel No. 5 Ditch with a priority date of April 18, 1882, shall be exempt from the provisions of this subsection (e).

"(f) All direct flow diversions from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North shall at all times be limited to their diversion rates as specified by Wyoming law, and provided that Wyoming laws relating to diversion of 'Surplus Water' (Wyoming Statutes, 1957, Sections 41-181 to 41-188 inclusive) shall apply only when the water flowing in the main channel of the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West is in excess of the legal diversion requirements of Nebraska ditches having priority dates before August 1, 1957.

"ARTICLE VI.

"A. Nebraska and Wyoming recognize that the future use of ground water for irrigation in the Niobrara River Basin may be a factor in the depletion of the surface flows of the Niobrara River, and since the data now available are inadequate to make a determination in regard to this matter, any apportionment of the ground water of the Niobrara River Basin should be delayed until such time as adequate data on ground water of the basin are available.

"B. To obtain data on ground water, Nebraska and Wyoming, with the cooperation and advice of the United States Geological Survey, Groundwater Branch, shall undertake ground water investigations in the Niobrara River Basin in the area of the Wyoming-Nebraska State line. The investigations shall be such as are agreed to by the State Engineer of Wyoming and the Director of Water Resources of Nebraska, and may include such observation wells as the said two officials agree are essential for the investigations. Costs of the investigations may be financed under the cooperative ground water programs between the United States Geological Survey and the States, and the States' share of the costs shall be borne equally by the two States.

"C. The ground water investigations shall begin within one year after the effective date of this compact. Upon collection of not more than twelve months of ground water data Nebraska and Wyoming with the cooperation of the United States Geological Survey, shall make, or cause to be made an analysis of such data to determine the desirability or necessity of apportioning the ground water by supplement to this compact. If, upon completion of the initial analysis, it is determined that apportionment of the ground water is not then desirable or necessary, reanalysis shall be made at not to exceed two-year intervals, using all data collected until such apportionment is made.

"D. When the results of the ground water investigations indicate that apportionment of ground water of the Niobrara River Basin is desirable, the two States shall proceed to negotiate a supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water of the Basin.

"E. Any proposed supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water shall not become effective until ratified by the legislatures of the two States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"ARTICLE VII.

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended by action of the Legislatures of the Signatory States and until such amendment is consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified and consented to in order to become effective.

"ARTICLE VIII.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal, or equitable, in any court of competent jurisdiction for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE IX.

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters; provided that, any beneficial uses of the waters allocated by this compact hereafter made within a State by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"B. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

"C. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"D. To affect the obligations of the United States of America to Indians or Indian tribes, or any right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes which is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"ARTICLE X.

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, all other severable provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE XI.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified by the legislatures.

"In witness whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the Archives of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and one copy of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Done at the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, this 26th day of October, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty-Two 1962.

Commissioner for the State of Nebraska
s/Dan S. Jones, Jr.

Commissioners for the State of Wyoming
s/Earl Lloyd
s/Andrew McMaster
s/Richard Pfister
s/John Christian
s/Eugene P. Wilson
s/H. T. Person
s/Norman B. Gray
s/E. J. Van Camp

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

s/W. E. Blomgren
Representative of the United
States of America".

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is reserved.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, instrumentalities, permittees, or licensees in, over and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin, nor to impair or affect their capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to extend my thanks to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for its consideration of this compact measure and for favorably reporting it.

The compact has the approval of the two States involved, and I urge the Senate to pass the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1435), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Upper Niobrara River Compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska, is to provide for an equitable division or apportionment of the available surface water supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin between the States.

This compact was negotiated pursuant to consent granted by the act of August 5, 1953, as amended, and has been signed by duly appointed representatives of the affected States and ratified by State legislatures. Federal participation in its negotiation was provided by a presidentially appointed representative.

The compact treats of the apportionment of surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River and its interstate tributaries west of range 55 in western Nebraska. This localizes the area of compact application to the stream system west of a point approximately 10 miles downstream from the Wyoming-Nebraska border. There are no existing or potential Federal water resource development projects in the area which would be covered by this instrument. The Department of the Interior testified that the language protects the rights and powers of the United States, its agents and instrumentalities, including rights owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes; the Federal interest appears to have been simply protected and safeguarded.

The committee feels that in the interest of interstate comity through equitable division and apportionment of the surface water resources of this stream, the compact should be approved by the Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most controversial aspects of the current debate over revision of our draft laws is the question of equivalent nonmilitary national service.

As a significant contribution to this debate, I commend to my colleagues a recent article appearing in the August 7 edition of the New York Times magazine entitled "The Case for a National Service Corps," by Marion K. Sanders.

Mrs. Sanders addresses her remarks primarily to a single National Service Corps, but she also introduces a new statistical approach to the question of equivalent service. Further, she demonstrates several new areas for constructive, and I believe creditable, national service in the national interest.

Because I believe that creditable national service properly extends beyond a single National Service Corps, I have proposed, through Senate Joint Resolution 166, that a National Service Board be established to replace—or supersede—the current Selective Service System. Through this mechanism, a far greater number of our youth could volunteer—if qualified—for national service throughout the Federal and State administrative structures. It only remains for the President, and on his behalf for the Presidential Commission, to identify those areas of service which can properly be classified in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mrs. Sanders' article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

(By Marion K. Sanders)

(NOTE.—Marion K. Sanders, a senior editor of Harper's Magazine, has written numerous articles on national affairs and is the author of the book, "The Lady and the Vote." She has also worked in the State Department and has been active in politics.)

"If now there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow."

So wrote William James more than sixty years ago in an essay whose title has proved more memorable than its content. A "Moral Equivalent for War" has endured as a dream of philosophers and poets. But few Americans have been attracted to the notion of an army of civilian conscripts.

Thus it was something of a shock—which reverberated in front-page headlines—when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara appeared to embrace the idea not long ago in a speech in Montreal.

"Our present Selective Service system draws on only a minority of eligible young men. That is an inequity," Mr. NcNamara said. "It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad."

Mr. McNamara did not define the phrase "every young person." Was he referring to the more than three million male and female Americans who reach the age of 18 every year? Or was he thinking of the whole 18–26 age group of both sexes—numbering over 25 million? Either way, it is a grandiose concept. Reaction to his proposal on Capitol Hill was generally cool and the White House firmly disavowed the notion of drafting the young for civilian duties. Yet despite official efforts to shoot it down, McNamara's trial balloon remained aloft. For the idea of a national service program is appealing. It will be explored on an official level by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which was appointed by President Johnson last month and which will report to him in January.

Enthusiasts for national service see it as an outlet for youthful idealism, as an antidote for the moral lassitude of our time and as a practical means of tackling the immense problems of our society and of the world's less affluent nations.

But before it can be even considered a possible alternative to military service, a number of hard questions will have to be answered. Among them these:

(1) Should service be voluntary or compulsory? (2) Precisely what would members of the service corps do? (3) Who would mobilize, train and direct them?

On the first point there is a sharp split. Secretary McNamara, for example, though he did not amplify his suggestion personally, allowed his office to issue a statement to the effect that the operative word in his proposal was "ask," meaning that young persons would be invited rather than required to serve. Similarly, Dean John Monro of Harvard College is unequivocally opposed to the idea of compulsory service, characterizing it as "totalitarian." Young people, he said, should be free to make their own choices, they should be left alone to lead their own lives. Nonetheless, he heartily favors a comprehensive civilian program in which those who so desire can volunteer. This, generally speaking, is the "conservative" position.

It is the "liberal" side which favors compulsory service. One of its eloquent voices is Prof. Roger Shattuck of the University of Texas. Writing in The Texas Observer, he conceded that a draft for civilian service seems, at first glance, an invasion of political freedom. But he believes in a compulsory program because it is "a mission dedicated to peace and freedom and raising living standards. It could spell a political and moral regeneration for the whole country. Our calleges and universities are rapidly becoming institutions of higher segregation where subadults are kept at a low simmer, held apart from certified adults in the 'real world.'" All young people, he argued, should be required to "help with their own hands in solving the technological, economic and moral mess we have got ourselves into."

A middle position is taken by Harris Wofford, Associate Director of the Peace Corps. "I don't know," he said recently, "whether this needs to be done by law or whether we can do it by spreading the volunteer idea and making it a recognized part of the citizenship training of every American."

Donald J. Eberle—who has spent many years teaching in Africa and is particularly interested in the possibilities of overseas service for young Americans—called together in early May some thirty interested educators, foundation officials, students and other concerned citizens who spent the day discussing a national service program at the Princeton Club in New York. Everyone present supported the idea of such a program but the conference reached no firm conclusion on how to go about putting it into effect. Subsequently, Mr. Eberle and a small ad hoc committee pulled together some tentative proposals which provide a concrete basis for discussion. This is their plan:

The program would be administered by the 4,000 existing Selective Service boards. (Women are not dealt with in this particular proposal, which is primarily designed as an alternative to the present draft system.) On being called up at 18, each young man would be offered the following options:

(1) Immediate military service for two years, including training;

(2) Immediate nonmilitary service for *three years,* including training;

(3) Delayed service—either military or nonmilitary—to be fulfilled before the age of 26; or,

(4) The young man could choose not to volunteer at all, in which case his name would be placed in a pool to be drafted possibly by lottery whenever the armed services might need him.

A key feature of this plan is the difference in length of service; this factor, it is thought, plus such added inducements as better pay and greater G.I. benefits, might entice enough youths into the armed forces to meet military manpower requirements. Though this may be so, most of the young people I have talked to regard three years—the period specified for civilian service in the program discussed above—as an excessive chunk out of one's life before the age of 26. Several felt, too, that it was presumptious to place a time value on military versus civilian service. And how, others asked, could civilian service be considered "equality of sacrifice" compared with risking one's life in Vietnam?

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, a stanch advocate of universal service, also objects to the time-differential. "Making non-military service of longer duration," he said, "would seem to indicate to the public that it is not as valuable as military service."

To most people, the closest equivalent to military duty seems the Peace Corps, which entails real hazards and hardships. Unfortunately, however, the Peace Corps cannot become an instrument for correcting "inequities" in the draft. There are only 14,000 volunteers in its ranks; in its first five years, 86 per cent of its workers had A.B., B.S. or higher degrees; 11 per cent, had some college education and only 3 per cent had never been to college. Obviously, Peace Corps service would provide an avenue of escape from the military for precisely the same group of well-educated young men who are now being deferred. Similarly, VISTA—the Domestic Peace Corps—has fewer than 3,000 in its ranks and 75 percent of them are college graduates. The newly launched Teachers' Corps likewise needs well-educated, specially qualified volunteers and is budgeted for only a few thousand.

The plain fact is that there are no existing service groups which could effectively absorb the large numbers of men and women that a national service program would provide. A new framework will have to be invented. It also seems evident that the whole concept will be badly skewed if—in the midst of a shooting war, and a frustrating and unpopular one to boot—we conceive of national service as primarily a solution to the "inequities of the draft."

This does not mean, however, that it is too early to give serious thought to a universal national service program; for surely only the blackest pessimists among us believe that we will forever need three million young men in active combat forces. When that necessity ends, we should be ready to launch a plan that will have constructive value for our young people and for our society.

What services actually could the members of a civilian corps members of a civilian corps perform? An illuminating statistical clue has been provided by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. Its report made a startling estimate of the jobs which currently need to be filled to bring public services in this country up to "acceptable" levels. Here are the commission's estimates:

The jobs:	*The workers needed*
Medical institutions and health services	1, 200, 000
Educational institutions	1, 100, 000
National beautification	1, 300, 000
Welfare and home care	700, 000
Public protection	350 ,000
Urban renewal and sanitation	650, 000
Total	5, 300, 000

Could much of this work be done by members of a national service corps? And would their presence be accepted by organized labor?

I put these questions to Brendan Sexton, director of Leadership Studies for the United Auto Workers, who has recently completed a tour of duty in the upper echelons of the Poverty Program. His response, on both counts, was strongly affirmative. He is convinced that an immense amount of useful work could be done by national service corpsmen and women with a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create in effect new career opportunities—in the care of the aged and sick, in the rehabilitation of our cities and forests. And he believes that, despite the cost of such a program, there would be an economic gain in terms of mental illness, crime and delinquency prevented.

"Of course, there would be a kind of reflexive hostility at the outset on the part of some old-line unions," he said. "One way to handle this would be to involve plenty of retired craftsmen—plumbers, machinists, electricians, and so forth, as teachers in the program.

"Obviously all unions would object if volunteers took jobs away from workers at a time or in an area of unemployment. They would have a legitimate beef if—for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Park Department employes and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the catalogue of things that need to be done is so fabulous that there shouldn't be any danger of real competition on the job market."

It seems a conservative estimate that at least half of the more than 5,000,000 service jobs projected in the automation report could, at least in theory, be filled by suitably trained corpsmen and women. And it seems feasible and desirable to put many of them to work in existing public and private agencies and institutions which are, at the present time, desperately shorthanded.

This is exactly what has happened in our only state-run domestic peace corps—the Commonwealth Service Corps founded in Massachusetts in 1965 as a living memorial to John F. Kennedy. In an initial survey conducted while this corps was being planned, it was found that some 375 state, private and local public agencies could readily use more than 7,000 volunteers. Full-time Massachusetts corpsmen are paid $80 a month (there are also part-time volunteers who serve a minimum of 12 hours a week and are reimbursed for expenses, and students who receive up to $12 a month for at least six hours of service a week).

Some serve in the wards of mental hospitals, others as helpers in homes for the retarded; some run an information and referral service for welfare recipients; others work with prisoners and parolees; and some conduct study halls for teen-agers. The Commonwealth Corps is largely supported by Poverty Program funds; and it has been beset by the administrative, jurisdictional and political difficulties common to so many Poverty Program operations. Though it is functionally an inspiring example, the Commonwealth Corps does not provide an administrative model for a nationwide, large-scale service corps.

The most respected prototype, organizationally, is the Israeli youth service program which, as Harris Wofford put it in a recent talk, recognizes "the need to mobilize the whole younger generation. . . . There are no 4-F's in Israel. Everyone is 1-A in terms of national service."

The Israeli national service is run by the defense forces, in which all young people must enlist. Men between the ages of 18 and 26 serve for 26 months; those between 27 and 29 who have not been called up for one reason or another serve for two years; unmarried women from 18 to 26 serve for 20 months. (Deferment is granted students taking subjects of special importance to the country—namely, medicine, engineering, agronomics or teaching.)

The full period of service is not, however, devoted to military training or duties. In Nahal (Pioneering Fighting Youth) some young men and women do agricultural work in frontier villages or set up new ones. Others teach and provide a variety of social services to the many impoverished, ignorant immigrants who have entered Israel in recent years. The Israel defense forces and the Ministry of Education jointly run a youth corps, Gadna, which provides training along Scout lines for boys and girls from 14 to 18 and also stresses pioneering and agriculture.

A somewhat similar program of national service in Iran is also run by the military. Soldiers in uniform teach, build roads and bridges, give health and sanitation training and, in effect, serve as the shock troops of the country's war against ignorance, poverty, illiteracy and social deprivation.

In this country we have only one prototype for a broadly democratic civilian service corps—the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps. Its peak enrollment in 1935 was 500,000; in all, 2.5-million young men passed through the camps, most staying for six months to plant trees, build reservoirs and fish ponds and check dams. They dug diversion ditches, raised bridges and fire towers, fought blister rust and pine-twig blight and Dutch elm disease, restored historic battlefields, cleared beaches and camping grounds. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has written in "The Coming of the New Deal"; "They did more than reclaim and develop natural resources. They reclaimed and developed themselves."

The young men were recruited by the Labor Department. The Agriculture and Interior Departments organized and supervised the work projects. The camps themselves, however, were run by the War Department; one of the officers associated with them, Schlesinger notes, "was a Col. George Catlett Marshall, who organized 17 camps in the Southeast."

With World War II, the C.C.C. went out of business; but it is important to remember that the Army played a crucial role in making it work.

In any large national service program, our armed forces would have a key part—for in this country only the military has developed real competence in mobilizing, sorting out and training large numbers of men and women. It is fashionable, particularly among those who have never been in military service, to disparage the Army way—but the recruiting posters are not nonsense. The military does a remarkable job of training and of fitting round pegs into round holes. Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia who is chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Commission, says: "On the basis of observations extending over a quarter of a century, I have no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as good as industry's. Of course you find some misassigned men in the Army—but the same is true in universities and industry. The armed services do a careful job of classification. The bizarre yarns you hear—about the man who was taught Japanese and then sent to France—represent rare exceptions."

Furthermore, thousands of young men have acquired useful civilian vocations in the course of their military service. The armed forces do not maintain follow-up records to prove the point. However, a still unpublished study conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is illuminating. A random sample of draftees in the lowest intelligence group eligible for military duty was followed for a period of years after service. The earnings of these men were compared with those of a similar group of men who had not had military service. The superiority in earnings of the ex-soldiers was characterized as "fantastic" by one man who participated in this study.

Although the armed forces no longer accept illiterates, they still maintain education centers where high school drop-outs can study during off-duty hours. In the 12 months ending July, 1965, high school diplomas were earned in this way by 43,558 soldiers—a result that stands up well alongside civilian attempts to cope with the same problem.

A compulsory national service corps would involve an administrative task of a scope we haven't seen since World War II, when 16 million men and women were mobilized in our armed forces. Here are the basic personnel figures we would have to work with should a compulsory service corps for both sexes be set up in this country:

Total men and women at present in the 18–26 age group; more than 25 million.

Exemptions: 11 million. (Mothers and men and women in essential jobs—7 million; men and women in the armed forces—2 million; physically and mentally unfit—2 million.)*

Total men and women available for a compulsory service corps: 14 million.

If each individual in this eight-year (18–26) age span serves for two years, then one-fourth of the 14-million group—i.e., 3.5-million—would be in service at any one time. What would a 3.5-million-strong national service corps cost? Adopting arbitrarily a modest figure of $3,500 per capita to cover training, equipment, maintenance and a token salary, the annual bill would be around $12-billion—exclusive of the undoubtedly heavy cost of tooling up. This is hardly a sum the Congress or the taxpayers are likely to approve at the present time—after all, only $1.5-billion annually has been allocated to the entire Poverty Program.

Apart from the cost, a compulsory program of the size we have projected is up against the fact that we do not have an adequate plan as yet for using the 3.5-million workers it would provide. And I can think of no surer way to foredoom a potentially admirable effort than to launch it without careful advance planning. Furthermore, after discussions with young people, educators and thoughtful public officials, I have concluded that there is an essential conflict between the concepts of conscription and humanitarian service.

I therefore believe that the answer, at least for the present, is a small *voluntary* national service corps, including both men and women. The response of Americans to well-planned voluntary programs has always been impressive. The men's and women's Job Corps, for example, have had to turn down, for budget reasons, nine out of every ten applicants. (There are fewer than 30,000 in the Job Corps today. Well over 500,000 persons—most from deprived backgrounds—have applied to date.) The dedicated service given by volunteers in Operation Headstart and other Poverty Program projects is a measure of a huge untapped reservoir of idealism among Americans. Judging by the figures on the 18–26 age group already given, I believe that it would be possible to mobilize at least two million young people in a service corps on a purely voluntary basis.

But a corps of two million is still too large for the moment. We are not yet tooled for it. I propose, instead, that Congress create a National Service Agency authorized to mobilize 500,000 civilian volunteers, selected initially on the basis of their dedication to and aptitude for the corps' varied missions. The cost would be in the neighborhood of $1.7-billion annually. This, theoretically, is how the corps would be set up:

Upon signing in, all volunteers would go to basic-training centers operated by the Army, which would perform the function it did for the C.C.C. The Army also would be requested to operate a classification system designed to match interests, skills and national needs.

Thereafter, volunteers would be dispersed to newly established service centers around the country for training and duty. Some would work in conservation camps administered jointly by the Army and by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, in the C.C.C. pattern. Many would be assigned to public and private institutions to work as nurse-teacher-librarian aides; mental-health assistants; or in recreation and urban-improvement programs. The National Service Agency would be responsible for setting standards and maintaining a continuous check on the performance of volunteers and the agencies authorized to supervise them.

(Experimentally, I think it would be useful to make such voluntary service an alternate to military duty for the men. It seems to me unlikely that the armed forces would be shortchanged if this choice were offered. For only a minute proportion of the civilian corps could be accommodated in such "glamour" agencies as the Peace Corps. The vast majority would face assignment to rugged labor on conservation projects or to the relatively drab tasks cited above.)

Even before establishing a National Service Agency and embarking on this modest pilot program, however, we should take these steps:

(1) Enlarge the Peace Corps and VISTA and the Teachers' Corps to at least double their present size. This is an effort in which the colleges will have to help, as several are already doing.

(2) Increase the Job Corps tenfold—to an estimated 400,000. To do this will require a major shift in emphasis—stressing service to human beings and the career opportunities in welfare fields, rather than routine vocational training. This will also require a more democratic mix in Job Corps enrollment, with the better-educated volunteers spending at least part of their time as teachers of their less-well-equipped colleagues—as is done in Israel. The Job Corps, in effect, should be converted from a rehabilitation program for the poor into an opportunity for democratic service for all. The reconstituted Job Corps—and possibly also the Peace Corps, VISTA and the Teachers' Corps—would be absorbed by the National Service Agency when established. If, as is quite likely, there remains a need for a program of remedial education and vocational training, along the lines of the present Job Corps, it should be set up under educational auspices apart from the service program.

(3) Compile a national inventory of worthwhile conservation and urban-rehabilitation projects and of the urgent manpower and womanpower needs of institutions, schools and social agencies across the country. Supplement this listing with a catalogue of the new services desperately needed by the nation's old people, children, harassed working mothers and the footloose adolescents. Such a compilation is by no means beyond the capacity of the nation's social scientists and computers.

By thus translating the nation's human needs into perceivable form, I believe we would dramatize the fact that we do have more than five million unfilled jobs. And we would begin to see a national service corps, not merely as an "alternative to the draft" or as a corrective to the draft's "inequities," but as a tool for alleviating the anguish of neglected patients in our hospitals and mental institutions, the misery of lonely old people, the plight of neglected children and the decay of our neglected land and cities—the medieval blights in our affluent society.

WOMANPOWER

It has been fashionable in recent years to deplore the waste of "a great national resource—womanpower." Chief objects of concern have been the college-educated women who marry too young and languish in suburban domesticity. A tour of duty in a national service program might awaken members of this group to the realities of the society in which they live and attract them in increasing numbers to those classic "woman's vocations" which are now so woefully shorthanded—notably nursing, teaching, and social work.

However, no more than 10 per cent of the 1.5 to 2 million girls who will reach the age of 18 annually in the next decade will become college graduates. Over 200,000 of the total group will be "nonwhite" and a high proportion of these predictably will come from impoverished, disorganized homes. Little has been done to date to develop the potential of girls who drop out or just make it through high school. The Job Corps, for example, has found room for less than a tenth as many girls as boys.

A national service program could open up vast vocational opportunities for this neglected group. Among many needed functions, they could help case the lot of American working mothers. According to the latest Women's Bureau survey, there are 3.8 million children under 6 in this country whose mothers are away from home working full time. But in the entire United States there are accommodations for fewer than 300,000 children in licensed public and private day-care facilities.

This shocking gap in our social services will be closed only if we mobilize—on all levels—the womanpower which is indeed now wasted. Since not only child care, but a high proportion of the other tasks of the service corps can best be done by women, at least half of the enrollment should be women.—M.K.S.

HEMISPHERE REACTION TO VIOLENCE AGAINST UNIVERSITIES IN ARGENTINA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to two additional items indicative of the reaction of Western Hemisphere governments to the new military regime in Argentina.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Lincoln Gordon, issued a statement which rebuked the military regime for its crackdown on Argentine universities and expressed his "dismay and concern" over the closing of these universities and over the police violence which accompanied these closings. I commend Secretary Gordon for his statement which, in my view, accurately represents the attitude of the American people.

In addition, a proposal to postpone indefinitely a meeting of hemisphere foreign ministers, originally scheduled to meet in Buenos Aires, was approved by a five-nation working group of the OAS on August 3. Such action was taken aften Venezuela, which does not recognize the Argentive regime, refused to attend such a meeting in Argentina.

This action by the OAS is significant of the atmosphere developing in the hemisphere toward the new military regime, and I sincerely hope that the regime will take careful note of this development and assure the people of free and proper elections and civil and human rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper articles, including the protest of the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Lincoln Gordon.

---

*These figures presuppose an eventual reduction in military forces from the present 3 million; deferments but not exemptions for students; and fewer exemptions for unfitness, since national-service qualification requirements would be lower than those of the armed forces.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 5, 1966]

U.S. Aide Rebukes Argentina for Crackdown on Universities—Gordon Decries Violent Steps by New Military Regime To Correct Campus "Abuses"

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, August 4.—A high State Department official issued today the sharpest criticism of the new Argentine military regime that the United States Government has made.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Lincoln Gordon, made public a statement saying that the United States had indicated its "dismay and concern" over the closing of the Argentine state universities, which was accompanied by police beatings of a number of professors, including an American.

The effect of Mr. Gordon's statement was to deny a newspaper report that, in paraphrase, had quoted him as having defended the crackdown on Argentine universities.

Mr. Gordon said in the statement that what he termed abuses in the universities "should be corrected through civilized and lawful means and not through violent police raids."

Although the United States has recognized the military government headed by Lieut. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania, which displaced President Arturo U. Illia at the end of June, Mr. Gordon did not use the word "government" in speaking of the Argentine authorities. Instead, he referred to them as "the regime in Argentina"—a considerably less polite form in diplomatic parlance.

Mr. Gordon's statement was issued after a State Department spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, had said that the department "associated itself" with the remarks attributed to the Assistant Secretary in an interview published today by the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The article paraphrased Mr. Gordon to the effect that the crackdown had been justified because the schools harbored professional agitators. It then printed a single quotation whose effect was somewhat different. It read as follows:

"It is unfortunate that the tradition of the free university has been abused to the point of some Latin-American campuses becoming asylums for gangsters. But the corruption should have been corrected in a civilized way, not through police raids and the assaulting of professors."

Mr. McCloskey said later that it was the quotation that the State Department stood behind not the paraphrase. Since this clarification was viewed as somewhat ambiguous, Mr. Gordon then issued his own statement, which follows:

"I do not wish there to be any confusion regarding my remarks about the university situation in Argentina. Specifically, I do not believe and did not say that the regime in Argentina was justified in 'cracking down' as it did in the universities. We have indicated our dismay and concern at this action, in which an American professor was hurt, both to the chargé here and to the authorities in Buenos Aires.

"As a former university professor, I have often lamented that the tradition of university freedom or autonomy, whose proper purpose is to protect the freedom of teaching, has been abused in some Latin-American institutions to the extent of their becoming asylums for gangsters or for professional students who have no interest in studies but only in subversive agitation.

"I appreciate that any Government might be concerned at this condition. But I believe these abuses should be corrected through civilized and lawful means, and not through violent police raids."

Although Mr. Gordon's remarks about the abuse of university autonomy were made in the context of Argentine developments, he has let it be known that he was thinking of a common problem in Latin America.

On the other hand, the deliberately harsh language of his statement was an effort to make plain what officials here have only hinted at until now: that they are unhappy with a number of developments in Argentina.

The United States waited two weeks before recognizing the military regime, and it has made no move to renew discussions on aid that were going on before the coup d'état.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 5, 1966]

More Teachers Resign

BUENOS AIRES, August 4.—Resignations by faculty members to protest President Ongania's take-over of Buenos Aires University mounted to 674 today.

There were approximately 2,000 teachers at the university, which has a student body of 80,000, including nearly half of the nation's advanced-level students.

Classes were suspended for the fourth day.

The Government closed all nine state universities Sunday for a two-week cooling-off period after violence erupted six days ago. The violence was in reaction to the Government take-over, officially described as having been aimed against Communist penetration. The universities had had autonomous status.

Three universities—those of Cuyo, the South and the Northeast—were allowed to resume classes yesterday after their rectors and deans had agreed to stay on as administrators under direct Government control.

There has been a trickle of resignations from the other universities.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1966]

OAS Unit Moves To Delay Meeting

WASHINGTON, August 3.—A proposal to postpone indefinitely a meeting of hemisphere foreign ministers originally scheduled for Aug. 29 was approved today by a five-nation working group of the Organization of American States.

The proposal, which is expected to be ratified next week, calls for a committee to meet within 60 days to discuss the desirability of setting a new date.

The plan to use Buenos Aires for the foreign ministers' meeting, which was to approve changes in the O.A.S. Charter and prepare for a meeting of hemisphere Presidents, was disrupted by the military coup d'état in Argentina, which overthrew the Government of President Arturo U. Illia in June, and by recent authoritarian steps taken by the new regime.

Venezuela, which does not recognize the new regime in Argentina, has said she cannot attend a meeting in Buenos Aires and has recommended moving the meeting to a different place. This has been opposed by the Argentines and the Brazilians. The only solution has been to postpone a decision.

It has been suggested that the foreign ministers' meeting might be merged with the summit meeting, for which no site has yet been fixed. This would avoid a direct affront to the Argentines as well as a boycott by the Venezuelans.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1966]

Riot Police Guard Closed Buenos Aires University

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

BUENOS AIRES, August 2.—The Argentine military regime ordered extra security preparations today as most of the 75,000 idle students at the closed University of Buenos Aires milled about buildings and classrooms.

Riot policemen took up positions at university sites, which are scattered about the capital, after Argentina's eight national universities were ordered closed for two weeks by Lieut. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania, the President, late Sunday night.

Last night the powerful Argentine University Federation issued a call to teachers and students to "throw off the educational dictatorship." The leftist leadership of the federation asked its members to stay near the closed schools and resist Government intervention, and it demanded that the universities be reopened.

Rumors that student leaders had appealed to labor leaders for support could not be confirmed.

COMBINATION CALLED ODD

Some labor leaders said they thought the idea odd because it was the rare combination of students and military that ended the labor-supported dictatorship of Juan D. Peron in 1955.

Moreover, many labor union men said they did not wish to provoke the military beyond labor's recent policy of "flexing one arm while extending the other in peace to the Government." Under this policy, labor has accepted the new military regime which has deposed President Arturo U. Illia on June 28, but has pressed demands for wage and other benefits, at times resorting to strikes.

President Ongania ordered the three smallest national universities—Bahai Blanca, Corrientes and Mendoza—reopened this morning after he had received pledges of loyalty from their rectors and faculty deans.

Many university people said today that they doubted whether the other schools could resume their functions on Aug. 16 because hundreds of teachers have resigned in recent days rather than pledge loyalty to the military regime, which seized power five weeks ago.

The rectors of the five largest national universities—in Buenos Aires, La Plata, Del Litoral, Cordoba and Tucuman—resigned with most of their deans immediately after President Ongania's decree seizing the universities—for the first time in Argentine history—became known Friday night.

Argentina's four Roman Catholic universities were not affected by the decree. Previously the federal universities were self-governing entities and were traditionally off limits to the police or Government security forces. The five closed universities have almost 85 per cent of the 150,000 students in Argentina's national universities.

Almost 200 of the 350 teachers on the faculty of Exact Sciences in Buenos Aires had resigned by this morning. Many said they were planning to leave Argentina. Their flight stemmed from fears of another attack of their school.

The Faculty of Exact Sciences was one of several colleges subject to an organized police attack in which hundreds of professors and students were systematically beaten. About 150 of the teachers and students were then jailed.

No explanation has been given by the Government for the police raids. However, Government bulletins issued over the weekend stressed that the decrees seizing the universities stemmed from efforts to raise levels of scholarly endeavor and to remove "extremist" elements from the schools.

Police officials said today that all those arrested had been released by last night.

Efforts to interview responsible Government leaders have been futile. Reliable sources say there has been general confusion there because of the inexperienced officials and the continued infighting between the various groups supporting General Ongania.

"We get conflicting orders all day; there are no direct lines of authority," one military aide declared.

One of the orders issued yesterday from Government House declared that henceforth no visitors might enter the presidential palace "unless properly attired." This presumably includes labor leaders, who are often seen without ties.

Government supporters also cite the confusion and lack of administrative leadership as reasons for the re-emergence of extremist groups of ultra-religious and right-wing elements.

MORALITY DRIVE STARTED

For example, the municipal police chief, Enrique Green, has begun his promised "morality drive to flush out liberal atheists who are paving the way for Communist rule by flooding the country with pornographic periodicals and corrupting Argentine virtue."

Appointed by his brother-in-law, President Ongania, the former navy captain and outspoken anti-Semite ordered today that all nightclubs operate with full house lights "so that police agents can see the different sexes and patrons can distinguish different denominations of money."

Other "morality orders" issued in recent days have resulted in several thousand arrests for such things as failing to have proper personal identification, necking in cars, "mingling of sexes on street corners" and being found in darkened parks.

Policemen, embarrassed by their orders, maintain that they have been warned that they would have their heads shaved if inspectors found these "criminal activities on our beats." The morality drive has also resulted in the confiscation of a wide range of publications from newsstands and the strict enforcement of traffic laws.

REGULATION OF MEDICAL LABORATORIES NEEDED FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, institution by the Department of Justice last month of a major antitrust suit against the College of American Pathologists alleging controls over laboratories and test fees resulting in higher prices to patients brings to the fore again the question of how well the public interest is being served by the Nation's 20,000 commercial medical laboratories. These are the laboratories which conduct bioanalytical tests on material obtained from the human body, including blood and tissue samples, and render reports on their findings which are of vital importance in the diagnosis and treatment of patients.

While the Justice Department is concerned with the economic aspects of the operations of medical laboratories, as a result of many published reports regarding incorrect findings by these laboratories, I became concerned with the public health aspects of their operations. Based on this concern, last year I introduced legislation to eliminate substandard and dangerous practices by medical laboratories engaged in interstate commerce by providing for inspection and licensing by the Surgeon General. This bill, the Clinical Laboratory Licensing Act of 1965 (S. 2184), is presently pending before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Commitee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The American Chemical Society, the professional organization representing many of the medical technicians, supports S. 2184. The society's committee on clinical chemistry has stressed that Federal regulation of the interstate shipment of specimens and materials to and from clinical laboratories is vitallly needed.

Most recently, the American Chemical Society underlined the importance of the early enactment of this medical laboratory control legislation when it indicated:

> It seems imperative, therefore, that some means be established to assure that such materials [human biological specimens] sent between states are directed only to the most qualified laboratories. At least, the public welfare would so seem to require.

The operative phrase here is the requirement of the public welfare.

Logic commends the conclusion that, if the Federal Government on behalf of the consuming public is taking steps with respect to the economic operations of these laboratories, then a complementary step should be undertaken with respect to the technical operations of these laboratories, also in the interest of the consuming public. It is for this reason that I again urge early and favorable interest by Members of the Congress in my proposal to effect appropriate public health controls, the Clinical Laboratory Licensing Act—S. 2184. The public interest requires such action.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Congress has considered and enacted into law legislation providing for various types of disaster relief. This relief is forthcoming when it is determined through administration agencies, at the request of the Governor of a given State, that a disaster has occurred.

These disasters are in many forms—they are due to floods, droughts, hurricanes, and other acts causing great disruption to the economy of an area.

Mr. President, the present strike of the International Association of Machinists against five of the major airlines is causing great disruption of a number of areas of the country. The State of Florida is greatly affected, as are the States of Hawaii, Alaska, New York, and others. Yet, Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor is unwilling to admit the existence of an emergency in those areas where the economy is so vitally affected and where losses up in the hundreds of millions of dollars have resulted from the current strike.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the same criteria should apply in a situation such as we have now in many areas of the country as is used in the case of disasters when the affected area is faced with losses, in many cases far less than the losses resulting from the strike of the International Association of Machinists.

Mr. President, on Saturday, August 6, 1966, an editorial appeared in the Miami Herald entitled "From Bad to Mr. Wirtz." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, because I feel very strongly that it is time that Secretary Wirtz should reevaluate his position that the current strike is having "only minor impact" on the vital economy as a whole.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 6, 1966]

FROM BAD TO MR. WIRTZ

The performance of W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, before the House Commerce Committee yesterday was a shocking demonstration that justifies a call for his resignation.

Of the crippling airline strike now in its 30th day, the secretary casually quipped it is having "only minor impact" on the "vitals of the economy as a whole."

Mr. Wirtz sees no emergency that justifies congressional action. On that point, said he, the government still has no position.

The President, later in the day, said both business and labor leaders had a responsibility for fair pricing and bargaining decisions

Perhaps the loss of over $300 million in revenue and wages is only a "minor impact" to those who count deficits in the billions.

Perhaps the "vitals of the economy" are not touched by the thousands thrown out of work, the greater thousands without air transportation, the delays and inconveniences to public and private business in this country and others as well.

Mr. Wirtz did not prod the House to get on with the necessary job of restoring air service. Instead his testimony was an attempt to justify an intolerable situation and an invitation for the Congress to dally.

It is a sad display for an official who, although he speaks for labor in the Cabinet, has an overriding obligation to all the American people.

Mr. Wirtz should step aside for someone who believes the public interest should come first.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to read two or three paragraphs from the editorial, in order to accent them:

> The performance of W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, before the House Commerce Committee yesterday was a shocking demonstration that justifies a call for his resignation.
>
> Of the crippling airline strike now in its 30th day, the secretary casually quipped it is having "only minor impact" on the "vitals of the economy as a whole."
>
> Mr. Wirtz sees no emergency that justifies congressional action. On that point, said he, the government still has no position.

Here is another portion:

> Mr. Wirtz did not prod the House to get on with the necessary job of restoring air service. Instead his testimony was an attempt to justify an intolerable situation and an invitation for the Congress to dally.
>
> It is a sad display for an official who, although he speaks for labor in the Cabinet, has an overriding obligation to all the American people.
>
> Mr. Wirtz should step aside for someone who believes the public interest should come first.

FHA'S EXPERIENCE INSURING MORTGAGES ON MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS IN ALASKA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today, I wish to discuss the results of the FHA's experience in insuring mortgages on multifamily projects in Alaska.

The most recent report available, December 31, 1965, showed that a total of 17 multifamily projects have been approved in the entire State of Alaska and of this number 12 have failed.

On the same date, applications for eight new projects in that State were pending and one of these had already been approved.

In the city of Anchorage, the situation is even more alarming. Out of a total of seven projects constructed in that city, six projects representing mortgage insurance of $11,655,200, had failed, and only one project with FHA insurance of $352,000 was solvent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of the 12 defaulted projects, including the 6 in Anchorage.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MORTGAGES ASSIGNED TO FHA (HELD)

Project No.	Location	Name of project	Amount of mortgage	Number of units
130-00001	Anchorage	Linda Arms Apartments	$1,007,900	80
130-00002	do	Hollywood Vista	4,614,500	360
130-00003	do	E & E Apartments	996,800	96
130-00006	do	S & S Apartments	2,518,300	224
130-00015	do	Martin Arms	1,256,500	104
130-00020	do	Asa Arms	1,261,200	104

PROJECTS ACQUIRED BY FHA (HELD)

Project No.	Location	Name of project	Amount of mortgage	Number of units
130-00004	Palmer	Pioneer Apartments	$301,700	24

PROJECTS ACQUIRED BY FHA (DISPOSED OF BY OTHER METHOD)

Project No.	Location	Name of project	Amount of mortgage	Number of units
130-00005	Ketchikan	Wingren Court Apartments	$1,640,400	121
130-00016	do	Austin Towers	1,676,900	124
130-00011	Seward	Bay View Court	483,700	42
130-00009	Valdez	Bradyville Apartments	601,102	48
130-00018	Whittier	Whittier Manor	1,161,800	100

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, notwithstanding this miserable record of failures in Anchorage, the FHA, as of the same date this survey was taken, was giving serious consideration to the construction of two more multifamily units at a cost of $4,464,300.

I have not been able to develop a ratio of the actual costs of these projects in that State to determine the extent, if any, of windfall profits resulting from overappraisal of lands, liberal builders' fees, and so forth, but the information here is enough to have alerted this agency long ago that its policies in that State need an overhauling.

RISING PRICES MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO HURT SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, rising prices for milk and other food have begun to cause considerable concern to many of us. The Senate Agriculture Committee has approved a resolution asking the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate these price climbs. New York City is conducting an inquiry of its own.

Those of us familiar with agriculture know that the farmer is not causing these price climbs to the levels at which they are reported.

My point, however, is this: Bills approved in both the Senate and House would assure the continuance of the special school milk program. But if these price increases continue, inflation will greatly reduce the amount of milk actually available under the appropriations approved and now awaiting conference.

For this reason, I strongly endorse the various efforts to determine the cause of milk price increases and urge those conducting the investigations to complete their work as soon as possible. If corrective action should be called for by Congress, we should be able to take it as soon as possible so that our schoolchildren will be insured of an adequate milk supply.

IT'S A DANGEROUS THING

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to attend the religious services conducted on Sunday morning, June 26, 1966, which were held in connection with the 48th Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, in Charleston, S.C. Those in attendance at the religious services were privileged to hear a sermon by the very capable chaplain of the South Carolina Department of the American Legion, Dr. Feltham S. James.

Dr. James' sermon, which was entitled "It's a Dangerous Thing," was an inspiration to everyone present and was one of the finest sermons that it has been my pleasure to hear. Dr. James' sermon had as its subject, the Bible, and dealt with the impact the Bible has upon the lives of everyone.

This sermon is worthy of much wider attention, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objecion, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's a Dangerous Thing

(By Rev. Feltham S. James, D.D.)

(A sermon preached at the 48th Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, held in Charleston, S.C., June 24–26, 1966.)

As you gentlemen of the Services know, a Chaplain in the Army has no power of command. He cannot command an outfit; he cannot issue orders. He is a preacher and a chaplain without the function of authority. However, as you veterans of the Armed Forces know, Army Regulations are not always carried out to the letter of the law. Such was the case with me one day. One battalion of the regiment of which I was the chaplain was located several hundred miles away from our station. It was my desire to visit that battalion and see if there was any service I could render. I expressed that desire to the Colonel and he approved. Two truck loads of ammunition were leaving the next morning before daylight for use by this battalion and I was to ride up with them. Late in the afternoon the Colonel called me and said, "Chaplain, I know I can't do it but I am putting you in charge of those ammunition trucks going to the third battalion tomorrow morning. We are short of officers and I do not have one to send along. You are in command and for God's sake don't have any accidents." The next morning I found myself in charge of two trucks loaded with ammunition. Each truck bore big red-lettered signs on the front and back: "Danger-Explosives." And so out across the hills rode the Chaplain and his dangerous explosives.

When I knelt at the altar and was ordained into the ministry of The Methodist Church, Bishop Warren A. Candler delivered into my hands a copy of the Holy Bible and said, according to the Ordination Ritual, "Take thou authority to read the Holy Scriptures in the Church of God, and to preach the Word." In so doing this commanding officer placed me in command of the "most dangerous explosive" known to mankind—The Holy Bible. The Bible is a dangerous thing, reading it is dangerous business; something might happen.

At the council of bishops and district superintendents of The Methodist Church held several years ago in Grand Rapids, Michigan, the late Bishop Edwin H. Hughes remarked while standing with a group in the hotel lobby that he was struck with the recent advertisements of the New Testament which were headlined with glaring red letters—TNT. He said it reminded him of a conversation he had had with Bishop James W. Bashford when that great leader was the spearhead of mission work in China. A Chinese teacher said to Bishop Bashford that the missionaries were responsible for the Boxer Rebellion in China. The Bishop withstood the charge and retorted, "No! no! We missionaries make it a rule never to interfere with the political side of the life of a nation." The Chinese teacher's final word was, "That is true, Bishop, but you bring with you a Book that contains dynamite." We think we have a powerful explosive in our nuclear weapons but even that is but a firecracker compared to the power packed within the pages between the covers of the Holy Bible.

The Bible is a dangerous thing to have in your home. Something might happen to you if you read it. Gone are the days when the Word of God was chained to pulpits and church pillars or when we, like the Lollards, must exchange a load of hay for the privilege of reading a Bible for a single day. Now it lies around on the living room table, on the bedside table, in the kitchen, on the bookshelf. You may run across it in a day of desperate need and by dipping into its pages find the dry rot blasted right out of your life. The resultant explosive may change your life and start you off in a new direction—a direction of holy living. You may in such an hour become so attached to Scripture that your affection for it will roll on and on until the cumulative effect of a Bible-filled life will stir you to permanent lifting power. TNT is dangerous thing to have lying around unless you want to be blasted into eternity. The Bible is a dangerous thing to have lying around if you want to continue living your sin-scarred life, serving the mammons of selfishness and ungodliness the rest of your days.

Robert Moffat, the great missionary to Africa, told how one day he met an African who was looking very down cast. He asked him what was the matter, and whether or not anyone had died. 'There is nobody dead," answered the man, "but my son tells me my dog has eaten a leaf out of the Bible." "Well," said Moffat, "that's not so serious. I'll be glad to replace the lost leaf." "Oh," exclaimed the man, "it's not the Bible I'm worried about, but my dog. That dog will never again bite anyone or fight the jackals. He will become as tame as the people who believe that book. All our warriors become as gentle as women under the influence of that book, and now my dog is ruined." The Bible is a dangerous thing if you want to keep on the road of unrighteous living.

John Wannamaker rose to be one of the merchant princes of America and led a most exemplary life. When he was a poor, country boy and had attended a mission Sunday School he had purchased a Bible—on the installment plan. He said, "Looking back over my life I realize that that little red Book was the foundation on which my life has been built, and has made possible all that has counted for me. I know that it was the greatest investment and the most important and far-reaching purchase I ever made."

Contrariwise, a dusty Bible resulting from neglect of its reading on the part of so-called religious people is a dangerous thing. It reveals dangerous evidence of spiritual sterility. Kipling wrote a story entitled, "The Ship that Found Herself." Like so many stories, it contains more truth than fiction. If our Ship of State is ever to find herself, if the individuals of the whole wide world are ever to find themselves, they cannot do it without the radiant confidence the Bible inspires. To fight the good fight of faith requires feeding from the Bread of Life.

Let me just mention one world-wide experience of the neglect of the Bible and the danger it is bringing to the world today. The Russian Communists have no Bible, with its Ten Commandments and Sermon on the Mount. This factor is of prime importance in that it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for Russia and America to walk hand in hand along the international highway. In the early nineteenth century Alexander the First was encouraged by his Secretary of State, Prince Alexander Galitzen, to become a patron of a Bible Society. This Bible Society aimed to acquaint Russians more widely with the Holy Bible by distributing a vernacular version throughout the land. The inspiration and some of the initial funds for this plan came from Protestants of other nations. However, Prince Galitzen's predecessor had antagonized the Russian Orthodox Church and it opposed the distribution of the Holy Bible. All this adds up to mean that the nineteenth century failed to meet the opportunity and obligation of providing an adequate number of Bibles for Russia as a whole, with the result in our present day that Communism, a government unacquainted with the Bible, the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, lords it over such Christian faith as exists among some of the Russian people. It is dangerous to neglect the Bible.

Educationally speaking, no country owes more to the influence of the Bible than the United States. For a hundred years the "New England Primer," which was essentially a Bible primer, designed by the colonists to teach children to read and to know the Bible, was the schoolbook of the overwhelming mass of Americans in colonial days. When the people began to populate the great spaces in the West, the little schoolhouse was ever the companion of the little church on the advancing frontiers of civilization. And yet, today, in spite of our knowledge of the danger of neglecting the Bible, it is the only book in literature forbidden in American schools. It is the only book in literature containing first hand teaching concerning a personal, eminent God. Every philosophy is freely taught in our schools except the philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth. When we consider the general present enlightenment we are ready to maintain that never, in any period or in any nation, has there been seen a policy so bigoted, so prejudiced, so subversive of public morals, as the barring of the Bible from the schools. I suppose ours is the only nation on earth whose schools are entirely divorced from religion. But a worse fact is, we are proud of it.

It is dangerous to let the Bible get into politics, for its teachings have overthrown monarchs, conquered caesars, and destroyed dictators. It has overcome selfishness and undermined power being used to degrade mankind. The Bible is a dangerous thing, if you want Communism and dictatorships, for the Bible is a Book of Democracy. The laws written on our statue books rest upon the Ten Commandments. The good-will observed in all communities, the recognition of the rights of citizens of all races and creeds, and the demand for peaceful behaviour among the nations have their epitome in a single sentence known as the Golden Rule. Ever since Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address described ours as a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," scholars have sought to trace the origin of that deathless sentence. We must pass by those to whom credit has been given for its first use, for John Wycliffe, in his preface to his translation of the Bible in 1284 said, "The Bible is for the government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

There is a striking link between the Bible and civil liberties. The book of more than a thousand tongues has taken part in more than a thousand battles for liberty. For, in the Bible, man is set forth as a being who has infinite value for God, his Creator and Redeemer. No human authority has a right to degrade or enslave a man or to deprive him of his right to self-development. He should be free to assume responsibilities for which he is best fitted. None should demand of him a love or loyalty which is due to God alone. The Bible has played a great part in securing for man his liberties and freedom. The United States, which more than any other country, was founded by men mastered by the Bible, has been the most hospitable country in history to divergent religious ideas and sects. The battle of religious liberty was won in America by men whose faith was grounded in the Scriptures. Let the Bible be repudiated as the supreme guidebook of mankind and freedom and liberty will die.

One of the most popular cartoons of the war, so far as the navy was concerned, sketched a combat-weary Marine stumbling upon a native Melanesian who was reclining against a palm tree trunk and reading from a Bible. Nearby a time-honored big black kettle was suspended over an open fire. Pointing to the Bible, the tired warrior is asking, "You don't believe in that do you?" The calm native responds with one hand on the Book and the other pointing to the fire, "If I didn't believe in this, you would be in there."

The Bible is a dangerous thing because it cannot be defeated nor destroyed. It has been the subject of continued criticism and bitter attack, but after all has been said that could be said, all urged that could be urged, the Bible has not only maintained itself and vindicated itself, but it has proven its detractors to be blind prophets and foolish wise men. The Bible is the best attested book in all literature. It is as it says of itself, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Back in the twelfth century Heine prophesied that by the twentieth century the Bible would be obsolete. And Robert Ingersoll declared that by the dawn of a century, which is now 66 years old, the Bible would be regarded as a myth, and would cease to influence the thought of the world. But what has actually happened? Precisely during these 66 years the Bible has known its greatest expansion and influence. After all the battering-rams have done their worst, the Holy Bible still stands. It cannot be destroyed.

OUR UNPROTECTED PUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a column of Philip W. Porter: "Our Unprotected Public" carried in a recent issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

In the first paragraph of the column, Mr. Porter states:

> A growing dissatisfaction and disillusionment with government at all levels, with the capacity of incumbent officials to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number, is present today all over the country. Ordinary people, who have long suffered from political angle-shooting and cowardice, can endure a normal amount of fumbling, but downright ineptitude they won't tolerate indefinitely.

I am in complete agreement with his views. Especially on the Federal level has there been a complete disregard of the rights of the innocent public. The Members of the Congress and also the White House are completely ill-advised in believing that a flight from the responsibility of performing a public duty will bring political profit at the polls. It will not.

The people of our country are wanting our Government to be supreme and not to allow it to be taken over by groups that claim that they can produce votes at election time and thus cower Federal officials to serve these special groups instead of serving the public.

Mr. Porter concludes his column with the statement:

> One of these days, there's going to be a dandy backlash by Ben Sapp, the long-suffering taxpayer and bagholder.

I agree with him that Ben Sapp, the long-suffering taxpayer, will inevitably and with furor assert his rights. He will ask Federal officials both in the executive and legislative branches—"Why have you forgotten me? Why have you bowed to the dictates of those wanting special privilege and ignored those that are merely asking for justice and the right to live as free citizens of the United States?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR UNPROTECTED PUBLIC

(By Philip W. Porder)

A growing dissatisfaction and disillusionment with government at all levels, with the capacity of incumbent officials to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number, is present today all over the country. Ordinary people, who have long suffered from political angle-shooting and cowardice, can endure a normal amount of fumbling, but downright ineptitude they won't tolerate indefinitely.

If you want examples, there are plenty:

Congress and the President, seemingly paralyzed and unable or unwilling to move in for 30 days to get the major airlines back in business.

State governments and city governments, unable or unwilling to enforce stringent laws against strikes by public employees. (The New York subway strike last winter, the teachers' strikes in New York and Michigan, the more recent strikes of city service department workers in Dayton, Youngstown and Lansing are examples.)

The city government of Cleveland is unable by itself to get urban renewal off the ground in the Hough area or cope with its own financial crises, depending on private citizens to do the job (the Little Hoover commission on finance and taxes, the new Besse committee on racial disorders).

The State governments, years too late in coping with water and air pollution and traffic safety, are just starting to become conscious of both as social menaces.

The state government, while clearing out acres of modest homes for vast freeway projects, at great inconvenience to residents, is letting itself get clipped handsomely on right-of-way settlements by shrewd, sharp operators who buy up property in the freeway path and get it quickly rezoned for apartments or business. Yet homeowners are forced to take settlements on the low side, wait interminably for their money and live their final months on the old street in the midst of vandalism and stealing. (Braemar Drive N.W.)

Callousness, complete disregard of the rights of those innocent bystanders, the public, is usually present among unions, and is certainly present in the current strike against the airlines. From the very beginning of the battle with the airlines, more than a year ago, the machinists have not receded one inch; they rejected solutions by the national mediation board, the President's emergency board, and the President himself. They apparently figure they have the government as well as the airlines over a barrel, but they may generate new laws they'll wish they hadn't.

In the strikes by public workers, what has happened to the once-exalted concept of public service? It doesn't exist any more. It's just another job. Teachers are willing to close schools, nurses willing to close hospitals, rubbish collectors willing to let their neighbors' rubbish pile up, motormen willing to halt subway trains and buses. Years ago, such strikes were outlawed (Ohio and New York have these laws, and the penalties are severe). But the penalties were forgiven after the strikers returned. So what's to stop them from doing it again?

We hear much about the decay of moral and ethical standards and the collapse of family discipline, and there's evidence of that, too. But far too many public officials, supposedly leaders of the community and the nation, don't seem to know what they're doing either.

One of these days, there's going to be a dandy backlash by Ben Sapp, the long-suffering taxpayer and bagholder.

NEED FOR INCREASED DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF OIL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the domestic oil producer daily is finding it more and more difficult to keep his production of crude oil at a high enough level to maintain even a small margin of profit above rising expenses.

Many reasons have been cited for the dire situation in our domestic independent oil industry. One salient factor, however, remains constant in the continual decrease of domestic oil production: the imports of cheap crude oil into this country for processing by east coast refiners.

For several months the independent oil operators, through their local and State associations, have been working on a proposal for the Department of the Interior which would provide a scale of increased domestic production for any increase which might occur in foreign imports of crude oil.

One of the most intelligent proposals was written by George Bruce of Wichita, Kans., for the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association presentation.

The outline met with widespread acceptance throughout the oil industry and was covered extensively by the publication, "Oil Daily," one of the most widely read publications in the oil business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "KIOGA's Oil Import Plan To Spur Exploration Wins Acclaim," and the actual text of the plan entitled "A Plan To Stimulate Exploration for Domestic Oil and Gas Reserves."

I commend this material to all Senators who know of the plight of the domestic oil industry, and again call for increased attention to this vital industry with some program to accelerate the deflated economy of the business.

There being no objection, the article and plan were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Oil Daily, July 18, 1966]

KIOGA'S OIL IMPORT PLAN TO SPUR EXPLORATION WINS ACCLAIM

WICHITA.—The Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association's plan for stimulating exploration for and development of domestic reserves by diverting a share of oil imports to producers has met with widespread acclaim, according to Tom Schwinn, KIOGA executive vice president.

"We have received requests for copies of the KIOGA plan from independents throughout the country," Schwinn said, "and to date we've mailed out more than 500 copies."

In essence, the KIOGA plan would distribute to domestic producers on a pro rata basis all increases in the import quota after Jan. 1, 1967.

It is one of a number of proposals that has been made by members of the Liaison Committee of Cooperating Oil &'Gas Associations for the consideration of an incentive study committee of the Independent Petroleum Association of America in Dallas on July 20.

Its basic structure was first outlined by George Bruce, prominent Wichita independent and former KIOGA president who now heads the National Stripper Well Association.

Under the plan, additional import quotas after Jan. 1, 1967, would be allocated and limited to individuals and firms actually engaged in domestic production as either operators or owners of working interests. No part of additional imports would go to refiners, marketers, chemical companies or any company affiliated with present quota holders. But such companies would retain present quotas.

The producer allocation would be distributed to producers according to credits based on their daily average production in the six months preceding the import period; but at the outset, no import credit would be given for production exceeding 1,000 barrels daily.

Import quotas would be bartered for domestic oil as presently done by domestic refiners, the exchange netting the producers about $1.25 per barrel.

Import increases following the Jan. 1, 1967, period would continue to be allocated to producers until they were equal to that of present beneficiaries then they would be equally divided among producers, refiners and chemical companies according to a yet-to-be-devised plan.

KIOGA's study group estimates that about 500,000 barrels daily owned by domestic producers would qualify for allotments.

In effect, a producer with 100 b/d would get an import quota of 20 b/d worth $25 per day. Similarly, producer with 1,000 b/d or more would get a 200-barrel quota. These would go up as imports increased.

This, KIOGA says, would effectively give the qualified producers the equivalent of 25¢ more a barrel for eligible production and provide a total of $45 million annually for reinvestment in exploration and development.

The plan as outlined "fulfills the original concept of the import program, involves no government subsidy, does not disturb present quotas and could be put into action under present executive powers."

"We think it is more reasonable than giving the quotas to refiners," Schwinn said, "because it has been demonstrated that the refiner subsidy hasn't succeeded in bolstering the domestic industry where it is needed. In fact, both reserves and prices have declined steadily under the present program."

Schwinn said that the most attractive part of the plan lies in the fact that the key production figures are on state record and it would be easily administrated.

The Liaison Steering Committee will time its final action to pick a final plan following a National Petroleum Council meeting on July 19, the IPAA meeting on the 20th and a subsequent Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association meeting.

[From the Oil Daily, July 18, 1966]

A PLAN TO STIMULATE EXPLORATION FOR DOMESTIC OIL AND GAS RESERVES

Preface: The Department of the Interior and others in government have become alarmed over the steady decline in new reserves of oil in the continental United States. Recently the domestic producers were invited to submit feasible plans to strengthen the domestic industry and encourage exploration for new reserves. The independent producers, who historically have found the major share of new oil reserves in this country, now have the opportunity and the obligation to suggest and support a program to accomplish these objectives. This plan is submitted for that purpose and in the belief that such a plan is essential to the national security and to save the independent producing industry, which has shown indications of disappearing from the American Industrial scene.

The fundamental problem with which the independent producer is confronted centers around the fact that while the cost of finding and producing oil reserves has steadily increased over the past several years, the price realized by the producer has declined. The only solution to the plight of the domestic producing industry lies in some program which will result in a substantial increase in the net realization for oil produced. This is the ultimate objective of this plan.

OUTLINE OF THE PLAN

(1) The inadequate price for domestic crude oil is the direct result of the importation of cheaper crude produced overseas. The level of oil imported on quota has increased steadily over the past several years and is now in excess of 1,100,000 barrels of crude oil per day. We propose that beginning January 1, 1967, all import quotas above the present total quota level be allocated to domestic producers under the formula set out below.

(2) In order to insure that the allocation of future import quotas is not absorbed almost entirely by the large integrated companies who already benefit from import quotas by direct importation or by quota allocation as inland refiners, the following restrictions are essential:

(a) Domestic producers qualifying for the program should be limited to individuals, partnerships, or corporations actually engaged. as working interest owners, in the production of oil wells located within the continental limits of the United States. No import quotas will be allocated under this plan to any refiner, marketer, chemical company, or producer who, under other rules or regulations, holds or is entitled to receive import quotas or any subsidiary, division, joint venture or other business organization owned or controlled by any such importers or quota holder.

(b) The total import quota available for allocation to the independent producers will be assigned to each qualifying producer pro rata on the basis of his daily production up to, but not exceeding, 1,000 barrels of oil per day. (Example: The partnership, or corporation with domestic production of 500 barrels of oil per day would receive one-half the quota allocation of a producer with 1,000 barrels of oil per day. A qualifying domestic producer with 1,000 barrels per day of production would receive the same quota allocation as a qualifying domestic producer with 2,000 barrels daily production.)

(3) No import quotas will be assigned to royalty or mineral interest oil because the basic purpose of the program is to encourage exploration for new reserves which is financed by the working interest producers.

(4) For simplicity in accounting, nonoperating working interest owners who qualify as domestic producers, may elect either to qualify directly with the Department of the Interior or authorize the operator of the wells to qualify the entire working interest, in which event the operator will be responsible for accounting to each working interest owner for his share of the net realization from import quotas assigned to the production.

(5) In order to establish a basis for allocation of the available import quota, each qualifying domestic producer will certify the total production in barrels accruing to working interest owned by him for the preceding six-month period. That figure, when divided by 180 (days), will furnish the daily oil production basis for quota allocation for the ensuing six-month period.

(6) Import quotas allocated to domestic producers can be exchanged or bartered for crude oil in the same manner as it is presently done between refiners. It is suggested that machinery is set up in the independent trade associations of each state to permit very small producers to assign their import quotas to the association which can then undertake the exchange of blocks of import quotas on the best terms available and account to the small producers for the proceeds.

DANGERS IN BRITAIN'S DEFLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the British economic illness is one which is a concern not alone of that nation but of the rest of us as well. In this interrelated world, so much more closely dependent on one another than ever before, we need to try to understand each other and the policies on which we, and others, operate.

Clayton Fritchey, in his column which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday, analyzes the "fiscal cure" for Britain which has been prescribed by Prime Minister Wilson. He finds that the remedy of deflation, accomplished by unemployment, reduction of output, and restraints on purchasing power are policies which are misguidedly based on an outmoded view of the economy.

Rather than this "belt tightening" process, for the sake of curing a balance-of-payments deficit, Mr. Fritchey notes the danger, and correctly in my view, that the deflationary policies may be successful for a short time, but not in the long run. Indeed, they may well develop "a self-induced recession." Production, not retrenchment, is the basis for economic development, and as the column points out, England's borrowing should be for the purposes of modernizing its industrial plant, not for the temporary end of propping up the pound.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S FISCAL CURE RISKS PATIENT

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Back in the 19th century, in the early days of the industrial revolution, workingmen, crazed by fear of losing their jobs, smashed the new machines they thought were threatening them and their families.

The world was shocked at this seeming vandalism, this blind attack on higher production, but the workers are forgiven now because they acted out of ignorance and fright. They mistakenly believed that the machine and its greater efficiency was their enemy, but time has shown that the high standard of living in the developed world today is based on machines and automation, plus the maximum use of natural and human resources.

Yet, now in the 20th century we find supposedly advanced governments, again acting in a state of panic, doing exactly what benighted workers did 100 years ago—that is, smashing away at increased production.

International bankers, foreign exchange speculators, farmers and labor unions may approve such a policy out of narrow and misguided self-interest, but is nevertheless profoundly wrong for a government to engage in it.

The latest practitioner of this dark age policy is England. Like the United States during part of the depression, the United Kingdom has now set out to cure its economic problem by deflation. It intends to create unemployment, reduce production and put a lid on purchasing power and the standard of living.

It has suggested to developed nations to plow under industrial and agricultural capacity. All this may make sense to one school of economists, but time will surely discredit them, as it has in the past.

Britain's present concern centers on what we in the United States call an unfavorable balance of payments. This simply means that England is spending more abroad than it is taking in, with consequent deficits, which have been made up in recent years by foreign borrowing, primarily from the United States. Now the day of reckoning has arrived.

The drain on the British pound can largely be traced to three conditions: first England is spending far more than it can afford on military establishments abroad; second, its exports are losing out in foreign competition because its plant and work force are not efficient enough, and, finally, the English public is buying too much abroad.

The cruel core of Prime Minister Harold Wilson's solution is to cut employment and hold down the wages. The theory is that unemployment will reduce purchasing power and the demand for imports, while keeping wages low will stimulate exports through better competitive prices. If the patient doesn't die in the process, this may be a successful operation, but not for long.

It isn't as if Wilson didn't have more constructive alternatives. As the flourishing nations of the European Economic Community have demonstrated, there are other and more benign cures for what ails England. Worst of all, it will very likely turn to these cures after needlessly enduring a self-induced recession.

Instead of borrowing to peg the pound, England ought to be borrowing to modernize its industrial plant so it can compete with more efficient rivals.

One reason France and Germany are enjoying record prosperity is that, unlike England, they are not spending huge sums on far-flung military forces. Also, unlike England they early joined the European Economic Community, which has provided a rich Common Market for their industries.

England is not going to find a lasting solution to its cramped economic situation until it, too, becomes a part of this great Common Market. It may have to pay something to get in, but it will be cheap at almost any price.

Lastly, if England hopes to compete successfully, it must abolish the union featherbedding and make-work practices which sabotage efficient production, and lower the general standard of living.

WILD RIVER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the magazine, the Naturalist, contains an inspiring poem entitled "Wild River." It is written by Karen Lynn Craighead, an 18-year-old daughter of John J. Craighead who is an outstanding conservationist and wildlife management specialist. I ask unanimous consent that the poem "Wild River" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILD RIVER

It challenged him to leave it be,
To let strand upon strand trickle,
Merge, entwine, and weave a fabric enmeshed
with life.
A warp of soil, a woof of plants—
A balanced bio-system.
It challenged him to use but not alter,
To leave the Master's handicraft intact,
To say, "Here it is unblemished."
To think that generations unborn will say,
"Thanks—for the original."
A Wild River

It challenged another to alter it,
To hack the rock and mold the soil,
Stem the flow, divert the runoff,
To shatter time and remake nature's fabric—
A man-made eco-system.
It challenged him to work eternal changes,
To outdo the Master's primordial effort,
To declare, "Here it is redone and better,
Serving man to live in masses."
Future generations will say nothing.
The original gone, who will know
The Wild River?

—KAREN CRAIGHEAD.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a recent traveler frustrated by the strike against five U.S. airlines wrote a letter to President Johnson describing his difficulties and hardships because of the disruption to air service caused by the 4½-week strike.

In order to report for work on time, he relates that he had to leave his wife and four children in Hawaii while he attempted to return to Boston.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, published in today's Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 9, 1966]

AUGUST 4, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As this letter is written we are both deeply involved in family affairs. You with a father's thoughts for his daughter and a new son-in-law. And I with fond concern for a wife and four children left behind in Hawaii . . . who will be stranded there unless United Airlines is flying by August 11.

You and I, personally, are among the lucky ones.

For your part, transportation arrangements appropriately befit your Office. For my part—as the saga which follows will relate—I am (or was) fortuitously endowed with sufficient physical and financial stamina to make it back from Honolulu to Boston in only 39 hours, after a mere 24 hour wait on First Class Stand-by in Honolulu.

The word "mere" is used by way of apology to the hundreds of Stand-bys that could not afford the $38 or $50, or more, of additional cost to "upgrade" their ticket to First Class and gain the advantage of seat availability in three classes of accommodations rather than in just one or two.

In addition, there were among the more than 1,000 people crowding the Pan Am area in the Honolulu Terminal at noon on August 1, hundreds of students and service men who were trying to fly on a "space available" basis to take advantage of your newly authorized student/military half-fare tariff.

We can both be thankful that available space was found for those military personnel on Emergency Leave and Pan Am did do a heroic job in trying to placate if not move as many of the rest of us as possible.

Whether the University of Hawaii summer session students are still on stand-by or not I know not—one of them claimed to be down to his last $1.27, and was very grateful for Dole's dispenser of free pineapple juice and Pan Am's free coffee with cream and sugar.

Also among the crowd of weary Stand-bys were three "working girls" from Los Angeles who had enjoyed their "package tour" to Hawaii, and still had some money left. But there was not enough money to "upgrade" all three of their "Thrift Tickets" so they had stuck together for better than two days on stand-by.

Then there was the grim slightly-bearded man from San Francisco with a played-out wife dozing on his shoulder as they sat on their luggage. The cab driver whose opening comments ran "You know, as a good union man I shouldn't say this, but those guys are nuts, they want too . . . . much."

Yes, sir, if you were on-and-off stand-by in Honolulu, then you would have seen a great deal more hardship than Secretary Wirtz is reported to observe.

By the time my name was called RCA had advised the Fairmont of my wish to cancel reservations (and that's $24 that San Francisco will never see again). And my 7:00 A.M. arrival on the West Coast was in time to make use of train reservations held on the Zephyr to Salt Lake.

Making stand-by at Salt Lake on Frontier Airlines 6:30 A.M. departure for Denver was an easy stand-by situation, and the Continental Agent in Denver was encouraging on a First Class Stand-by basis for Chicago.

The Naval Cadet, or Midshipman, ahead of me stuck with his military fare and joined me on the second flight out of Chicago, but the attractive college girl said she had been in and out of the Denver Airport for two days, and she still may be there awaiting "available space". The man whom I sat next to from Denver to Chicago had been visiting a carnation-growing friend in Colorado. This seat companion was unhappy because the nearest city to his home was without direct airline service. He said his friend was upset because he had been unable to ship carnations with a dollar amount equal to his annual profits. Chicago on Tuesday afternoon at American Airlines looked like a Mardigras, except no one was enjoying himself.

By standing in a few lines, tickets were secured and stand-by cards were acquired for Boston, Detroit, and Washington.

To Boston, because that was the desired destination.

To Detroit, because it was on the way, because American had a couple of turnaround flights from Detroit to Boston, and because there was a brother-in-law there with a 90-proof pantry.

To Washington, because it was on the way, and because I was becoming increasingly provoked by Senator MONRONEY's quoted prediction that there would be "extended debate of any measure designed to end the 25-day-old airline strike."

If I had managed to get to Washington, I was going to camp on Senator MONRONEY's doorstep until I could tell him how much my family had enjoyed their visit to Big Timber, and how I was able to join up with them in Billings by flying stand-by on American from Boston to Dallas, on Braniff from Dallas to Denver, and on Western from Denver to Billings. This sleepless 21 hour junket had circumvented earlier direct reservations on TWA from Boston to Chicago, United from Chicago to Minneapolis, and Northwest Orient from Minneapolis to Billings.

However, fortunately for me and my then-grizzly-frame-of-mind, the Washington flight would not have me, and I "lucked in" as a stand-by on American's subsequent flight to Boston.

Nearly 39 hours out of Honolulu, the airstrip at Boston was reached, and after 10 hours sleep, I made it to work this morning when I was expected to be there—so others could go off on vacation.

That's the "saga" of this lucky one.

Although I am well aware that Executive power is limited by Legislative authority, from what I read it appears that Executive initiative is still relatively untried—as least as far as hastening Congressional action is concerned.

Therefore, may I now join the chorus of worried and tired and frustrated and angry questioners in Honolulu, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Denver, and Chicago (to say nothing of the many areas where I have no personal experience) in asking:

"When is the President going to do something?"

Meanwhile, personal best wishes . . . and may all of your family and all of mine be spared from any undeserved hardship over the days, weeks, months, and years ahead.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD P. BABSON.

THE WIDENING SHADOW OF INFLATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on a previous occasion I stated that in recent years this country has been favored by prosperous times and that all Americans are rightfully grateful. I also stated that in recent months the shadow of inflation was widening and becoming more deep in tone and that all Americans were rightfully concerned.

Inflation is not an easy subject to understand, and its solution taxes the imagination, ingenuity, and skills of experts and students alike. One of the clearest statements on this subject was written by Mr. William L. White, editor of the Emporia Gazette and a roving editor of the Reader's Digest. Without hesitation I would term this article to be recommended reading, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE MUST STOP INFLATION NOW

(By W. L. White, editor, the Emporia Gazette and roving editor, the Reader's Digest, in which a condensation of this article already has appeared)

Will we have inflation in this country? We have had inflation for years. Millions of men and women now voting cannot remember a time when we did not have it. Inflation has become a part of our American way of life; maybe the most dangerous part.

A continuing wage-price spiral such as ours has one major cause. At its root lies the deficit created when our government spends more money than it cares to raise in taxes. It makes up the difference by printing and selling bonds to the Federal Reserve and Commercial banks and with the money it receives, pays off its creditors. But this is only the start of the damage. For the Federal Reserve considers that freshly printed government promise to pay to be an asset as sound as a gold bar, against which it may lend vastly more money to its member banks at cheap interest, and so, greatly amplified, the money goes out into business, industry and to the general public as additional credit inflation.

This new spending power, in credit or in newly printed paper dollars, does the trick. Because of it, prices *must* rise. It does no good for the Government, which is pouring out all this surplus money, to lecture manufacturers or storekeepers on the evils of raising prices. Persuasion or even threats are a waste of breath, for it is all that surplus money—from deficit spending and easy credit, both of them produced by the Government—which is *forcing prices up*.

PREACHING IS USELESS

It does even less good for the Government, in such a situation, to preach to unions on the wickedness of higher wages. Workers need more paper dollars to pay those ever-rising prices and, with all this new government-issued money running loose, they can get those wages.

Since World War II ended in 1945 we have had 21 years of roaring prosperity, during which the Government has bothered to balance the budget only six times. But where is the danger? If we have lived comfortably with our wage-price spiral for more than 20 years, why not another 20?

Our danger is revealed in what that wage-price spiral is doing to our stock of gold, for today every storm flag is hoisted, and is flapping a warning. During most of our country's history, gold has served us both as a valuable alarm system, and also has given the citizen a check on his government. If it was extravagantly spending more than it took in, so that its credit became shaky, a citizen could protect himself against paper inflation by demanding and getting gold for his paper money at any bank. These withdrawals were a stern warning to government and banks to put its affairs in order. For as a nation we were proud that our money was sound.

THE PEOPLE ARE HELPLESS

Today the American people no longer have this protection, nor this check on government extravagance. Our dollar still is distantly linked to gold, since our Treasury will still redeem its paper money by selling gold bars abroad at the rate of 35 paper dollars per ounce. But only foreign Central

Banks or foreign governments may buy these bars. An American citizen violates our law by buying, selling or even owning one. But even our distant link to gold is weakening, as our gold stocks dwindle. In 1949 we had $20.8 billion worth of gold bars in our vaults. Today we owe abroad more gold than we have. True, it has cost us money to arm foreign allies, to police and protect the Free World, and to fight poverty around the globe. But the greatest danger to our solvency could lie in our soaring price inflation here at home.

IS INFLATION NEEDED?

The men who manage our finances have been profoundly influenced by the theories of the late John Maynard Keynes, a British economist who argued that it was unwise to pay off a national debt according to any rigid schedule. Instead, he favored a flexible economy: government could prevent a recession by lowering taxes and interest rates and stepping up spending, or head off an inflationary boom by raising taxes and interest rates and cutting spending.

Such a system might work, were it controlled by economists, interested only in stability. But when this power is given to elective officials, they cannot resist temptation to win elections by a little dose of inflation which gives the illusion of prosperity.

Would Lord Keynes have favored our permanent wage-spiral, brought on by constant issue of ever-more-worthless paper money? On this subject he wrote:

"Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the Capitalist System was to debauch the currency. Lenin was certainly right. The process engages all the forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

But today an even newer school of economists, many of them high in government and calling themselves "Neo-Keynsians," argue that "controlled" inflation—say 2% a year—is needed for national growth. History does not bear them out. In 1790 we were a tiny nation of 3.9 millions, staggering under a Revolutionary War debt of $75 millions—a huge sum for our size and those times—and our wholesale price level was only 10% below the 1910–1914 price level of more than a century later.

By 1835 we had paid off all our national debt. By 1860, on the eve of the Civil War, we had grown to a nation of 31.5 millions. Our flag proudly flew on the Pacific Coast, everywhere railroads and canals were a-building and cities rising—but all of this with little price inflation, for that wholesale price index, based on dollars secured by gold and silver, stood seven per cent below the 1910–1914 level.

IS DEFLATION A DISASTER?

The Civil War temporarily took us off gold, saddled us with a $3 billion National Debt and a flurry of Greenback paper inflation—prices went up to 85⅓ above that 1910–1914 level. But quickly we got to work cleaning up this inflationary mess and getting back on gold. This meant a long period of deflation as we reduced the National Debt and contracted the supply of paper Greenbacks, with price drifting back down so that, by 1900, they were 18% below that 1910–1914 level.

Now this deflation, according to today's "Neo-Keynsian" economists, should have retarded development, producing unemployment and disaster. Instead we got, between 1865 and 1900, a roaring rate of economic growth. True, wages were about a dollar a day, as they had been during most of the century. But because of the enormous buying power of that gold-based dollar, they were the world's highest. Thousands of young men left our farms, eager to earn them, Europeans crossed the seas in droves to get them, and all this helped our population to swell from 36 millions in 1865 to 75.9 millions in 1900.

In those days we were too busy to compile any figure for Gross National Product, but perhaps one measure of it would be railroads. In 1865 we had only 35,000 miles of them. But during those 35 years of deflation, four railroads connected the Mississippi with the Pacific, and, fanning out into branch lines, grew into 200,000 miles—almost a six-fold increase. Because of them, tiny frontier villages which had been Omaha, Kansas City, Duluth, Denver, Portland, Seattle and Tacoma could grow into mighty cities, during those 35 deflationary years while prices were slowly falling because we were calling in greenbacks and cutting our national debt from $3 billions to $1.2 billions.

WHO WANTS IT?

If inflation is not needed for national growth, then who wants it? The word is not popular, but politically powerful groups in our country profit by inflation, and some must have it to survive, which is why we have it today.

The biggest gainers are those—either individuals or corporations—who are mortgaged up to their ears and buying all they can on the installment plan. Inflation will greatly increase the value of the thin equities they now own, and they can hope to pay off their debts in depreciated dollars.

Who pays for inflation? All people who save dollars, either in the form of bonds, saving accounts, building and loan shares, insurance policies or pension plans. For the dollars they get back will have shrivelled in purchasing power compared to the ones they have paid in. Our total debt (public and private) is now estimated at $1.3 trillion.

When inflation pushes up our living costs by even 2% a year, this means that $26 billion in values is taken away from those who, in our inflationary epoch, have been trying to save dollars, and given to others who have been shrewd enough to go into debt.

On other groups, the effect of inflation is mixed. Slowly rising inflation is only a minor nuisance to retail merchants, for they can keep their prices marked up to the rising wholesale price level, and the public is usually both able and eager to pay, or prices could not rise.

DOES LABOR CAUSE IT?

The interest of labor is split. Union members usually are well protected against a rising cost of living by escalator pay scales in those contracts which they pay their officials to negotiate. But if the "packet" includes a pension plan, to that extent the union member loses, for the dollars which those plans finally pay out in benefits will have far less purchasing power than the dollars now being paid in.

Are unions the cause of our wage-price spiral? Here is the chicken-egg argument, to which the answer is both no and yes. Union officials have a vital interest in this spiral for because of it they are needed to get escalating wage contracts for union members. But if prices should stop rising, then those contracts would be a danger to labor's rank and file. Manufacturers could not sell products based on ever-soaring hourly wages, production would lag, plants would close. To avoid this, our government obligingly inflates prices to fit the ever-soaring wage scales. So, if unions do not directly cause inflation, they are the principal political force behind those policies which produce our wage-price spiral.

Manufacturers who have signed escalating wage contracts need inflation just as desperately as do those union leaders with whom they sat down to negotiate. For unless inflation enables the public to pay ever-rising prices, manufacturers will be unable to meet the escalating wage scales provided in the contracts, and could face bankruptcy.

CAN WE LIVE WITH IT?

Since creeping inflation has so many powerful political friends in our country, why not accept it as a way of life? Inflation creeps today only because many still hope next year for a balanced federal budget which should help to stop it. A government that plans inflation always gets more than it wants. It may start by "tolerating" 2% a year. But once this rate is accepted, pressure for more is immediate. If it then yields and allows "guidelines" of 3.2 for wage increases, unions understandably take this as a floor, ask vastly more, and the public is lucky to end up with only 6% increase.

Inflation in the "creeping" stage is like a ship which, because of a small hole in her hull, is sinking into the water at the rate of a foot an hour. There seems to be plenty of time, and no great urgency about plugging the hole. But at last, in the case of a nation, comes that moment of crisis when its treasury has almost emptied of gold. Then confidence in its money can vanish overnight and, like the ship, its bow sinking under the waves and its stern rising high into the air, it plunges toward the bottom.

GETTING RICH ON PAPER

So it was with Germany following World War I, when her mark started out at a par value of four to the dollar. Unbalanced budgets at first brought creeping inflation. But once its treasury was low in gold and the budget still un-balanced, German inflation moved into the runaway stage.

By January 1921, the mark was selling in London, Paris and New York at 74 to the dollar. Within Germany, printing press money was forcing a slow rise in prices. There was, in Frankfurt-am-Main, a Home for the Aged, founded in 1816 and splendidly endowed, in which hundreds of elderly, middle-class Germans had bought annuities promising comfort to the end of their days. But with living costs now mounting, many little luxuries had to go.

By July, 1922, the mark was selling abroad at 7,620 to the dollar. Wages and prices in Germany were following, but so slowly that American college boys on vacation could live in the most luxurious hotels for a few American dollars a week. That heavily endowed Home for the Aged in Frankfurt, although it had hardly enough money to buy food, was now besieged with new applicants—old men and their wives waving handfuls of paper marks that had been their life savings (almost worthless now) pleading to get in. For where else could they turn?

DRIVEN TO SUICIDE

By July, 1923, the mark was 160,000 to the dollar, dropping so fast that workers in Germany demanded and got their pay each day, so they could spend it while it still had some value in the markets. Bookkeepers were committing suicide, driven out of their orderly German minds by a situation in which a business would show, at the end of the month, a profit almost shamefully huge—hundreds of millions of marks—but these would not buy enough to replenish shelves even for a week.

By September, 1923, the mark was 13 million to the dollar, now dropping so fast that workers were being paid twice daily, with time off at noon so that they could shop before prices had trebled by evening.

By October the mark had sunk to 242 million to the dollar, at which point that Old Peoples Home in Frankfurt found that their endowment income would not even buy a week's black bread for the inmates. Housewives were bringing to market suitcases stuffed with paper money to buy a day's groceries, since government presses could not print hundred-million-mark notes fast enough.

On the first of November, the mark was 230 billion to the dollar, but few people would now take paper money for anything; most trade was by barter.

INFLATION MADE HITLER

Before inflation was finally stopped with a gold-backed Rentenmark, the old mark had reached more than 4 trillion to the dollar, the German middle classes had lost all their savings, every pension wiped out, all security gone. So the people were ready, now, to listen to any demagogue who would voice their bitterness: his name was Adolf Hitler.

In America we seem to have enough gold left to make such dangers absurd. The trouble is that, with continuing inflation accepted, no one can predict. Our severe laws forbidding any American citizen from buying gold do not govern foreigners, so inflation has steadily weakened our gold position. Already it is wrecking our silver coinage. Silver is a commodity like any other. At the bottom of the Great Depression, silver was selling for 30c an ounce, and wheat at 30c a bushel. The inflation of recent decades has raised the price (in paper dollars) of all commodities. Wheat presently rose to about $1.50 a bushel, with silver not far behind. But it happens that, at any price above $1.29 per ounce, the metal in a silver dollar is worth more than a paper dollar.

HOW WRONG HE WAS!

Back in 1963 the price of silver was rising toward this point, but Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, because we had in our vaults at West Point, the world's largest supply, felt he could assure Congress that we had enough silver to ensure our coinage needs for "10 to 20 years" and guaranteed that "silver dollars will not vanish from circulation." What the Secretary did not foresee was that when the price touched $1.29 an ounce, a run would suddenly develop—long lines outside the Treasury, trying to exchange increasingly worthless paper dollars for hard silver ones whose value could only rise, with the result that our Treasury had to stop paying them out. It still will sell silver bars at that pegged price of $1.29 an ounce, with the result that since 1963 more than half of our silver supply (which was supposed to last 10 to 20 years) has already gone, and not only have silver dollars vanished from circulation, but since last fall silver 50-cent pieces have become a rarity.

JUNK MONEY NOW

And our Government, fearing a silver shortage, is now in process of replacing 50-cent pieces, dimes and quarters, with the kind of "junk money"—brass, nickel, copper—used in European countries which have been ravaged by inflation. The new 50-cent piece will contain only 40 per cent silver. The new quarters and dimes are copper slugs, sandwiched between thin sheets of nickel.

Until enough of this "junk money" has been turned out, the government dares not stop selling silver bars at the rate of $1.29 per ounce from our shrinking reserves. For only these sales are holding the world price of silver down to this level. If we dared to stop selling, then the world silver price might overnight soar above $1.38 per ounce, which is the point at which the silver in our old dimes and quarters would be worth more than the face value of these coins in paper dollars. Above this price they would vanish from circulation as quickly as have our silver dollars and half dollars, leaving us commercially paralyzed, with no way to make change, or to operate our cigaret machines and laundromats.

This run on silver is only an advance warning of what may happen to our gold, so why not look at the balance sheet?

THE SCORE CARD

In 1945 as World War II ended, our National Debt stood at $259 billion, and our money supply (cash and total bank deposits) was $138 billion. The treasury had gold stock worth $20.8 billion, but against them were $6.9 billion in short-term foreign claims. The owners of many such claims can, with a single trans-Atlantic telephone call, pull their gold out of our Treasury and have it aboard a plane, on its way to Europe. So our net gold stock, subtracting such foreign claims, was only $13.9 billions.

By 1960 our National Debt had climbed to $286.5 billion, an increase of 10.6%. But our Federal Reserve, pyramiding this deficit financing by cheap money policies, had increased our total money supply by 55% to $214 billion, with the expected result that our cost-of-living index had increased by 64.4% over 1945 prices. We still had $17.8 billions in gold stocks in our treasury but foreign claims against this had risen to $21.3 billions, so that had all demanded gold at once, we would have been short by $3.5 billion of being able to pay them off.

If the situation was not comfortable then, consider it today. Our National Debt has now risen to $320 billion, an increase of 24⅓ over 1945, of which more than half has come in the past six years.

This additional $33.5 billions in deficit financing since 1960 has been further amplified by the Federal Reserve's inflationary easy-money policies, so that our total money supply has more than doubled and now stands at $323 billion, an increase of $185 billion or 134% over 1945, of which $109 billion has come in the past six years. The terrific strain of all this paper money and credit has forced our cost-of-living prices up by 79%above 1945. Meanwhile our Treasury gold stock has sunk to $13.6 billions, and short-term foreign claims against it have soared to $29.3 billions—more than twice the gold we have, or a deficit of $15.7 billions.

HOW SOON?

By how much more will the buying power of our paper dollars have to shrivel before some of these foreign claimants decide that 35 of them are worth less than an ounce of gold? Because if that moment ever comes, with it will come a wave of trans-Atlantic telephone calls, sucking what is left of our gold into the bellies of planes and thence on over to Europe, leaving us wide open to run-away inflation. And however much we may be surprised and angered by this, can we blame anyone but ourselves?

How long will it be, if we continue our present wage-price spiral, before we reach this point? If we cannot predict this, at least we can prevent it, and the cure for our wage-price spiral is as simple as its cause, although to some groups it may be temporarily painful. That cure is a balanced budget, a sober credit policy, and an abandonment of the delusion that printing-press money is the cause of our prosperity. If this takes courage, it will far less painful than run-away inflation, which in the long run is our only other choice.

At stake are the honor and the solvency of our country. And there still seems to be time.

ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS IN NEW ORLEANS, JULY 18, 1966

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on July 18, 1966, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke to the National Association of County Officials in New Orleans about many things of interest to our country, including Vietnam, "creative federalism," local government, and the growing problems of our cities.

After receiving some letters from people who were concerned about some news reports that the Vice President had encouraged violence, I contacted the Vice President's office about this matter.

I was furnished a complete transcript of the Vice President's speech. I found the two paragraphs which had caused the trouble, and I found that the Vice President had also stated that he deplored and did not condone violence.

Mr. President, so that the matter may be viewed in perspective, and that other Senators may have the facts of the situation, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Vice President's speech be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF VICE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH, JULY 18, 1966

I want to say right now that, as hot as it's been up in my part of America, and as warm as it is here, if we had a heat wave all over, I'd hate to be stuck in a fourth flooor in a tenement with the rats nibbling on the kids' toes—and they do—with the garbage uncollected—and it is—with the streets filthy, with no swimming pools, with little or no recreation.

I'd hate to be put in those conditions, and I want to tell you if I were in those conditions and that should happen to have been my situation, I think you'd have had a little more trouble than you've had already because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions. But that's unnecessary.

What makes you think that the children at the country club ought to have a swimming pool and the kids in the slums ought not to have. This just doesn't work any more in America.

Ask yourself about slummism. It's not all in the cities, either. It's in rural America in some of our poor towns.

I'll only conclude by saying that, for every dollar you have to expend to make life worth living, you'll spend ten trying to put down revolts and riots. And you know it. The time is at hand for local government officials to face up to the fact that the National Guard is no answer to the problems of this country.

I don't want to be misunderstood. I believe in law observance. I believe in law enforcement. I not only deplore violence, I say it cannot be condoned. But I also say, having said that, that's not enough.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I also, as a result of my inquiry, received from the Vice President's office a statement issued by him on July 20, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT, JULY 20, 1966

Intolerable slum conditions are a seedbed for trouble, and every responsible American public official should be aware of this fact. This I referred to in my speech at New Orleans to the National Association of County Officials. But I also said that "we cannot condone violence, lawlessness, and disorder."

The American political and social system affords an opportunity for peaceful protest. There is no room in this nation for violence, riot, and disorder. Such actions only add to the troubles and do not in any way resolve them. The use of police and, indeed, the National Guard, may at times be necessary. But likewise, these instruments of law enforcement do not solve the basic problems. People who believe in law and order and social justice must redouble their efforts to provide every American with equal opportunity and a decent place in which to live, work and play.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, moreover, I was given a copy of the commencement address of the Vice President at the 77th session of the FBI National Academy. In this eloquent appeal for every American to respect and honor law enforcement procedures, the Vice President said:

> Within the limit of his capabilities every American, every citizen, has an obligation not only to uphold the law but to support it with all the reasonable means at his command. There can be no government of the people, by the people, and for the people if the people are unwilling to abide by it and support it.

This speech of the Vice President has been reprinted in the August 1966 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, and I ask unanimous consent that that article and the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, August 1966]

VICE PRESIDENT URGES RESPECT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

"Within the limit of his capabilities, every American, every citizen, has an obligation not only to uphold the law, but to support it with all reasonable means at his command. There can be no law of the people, by the people, and for the people if the people are unwilling to abide by it and support it."

This was the urgent plea of the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, in an address delivered at graduation ceremonies of the 77th session of the FBI National Academy on May 25, 1966, in Washington, D.C. Stressing every American's personal stake in the proper enforcement of law, the Vice President underscored the timeliness of his remarks with a reiteration of increasing crime rate statistics and a reminder that "A nation such as ours that cries out for law and order in this world needs to set a good example of it back home. . . ." He told the audience of his discovery made during his worldwide travels that "one of the most reliable barometers of the true national atmosphere is the attitude of the people in that country towards their law enforcement agencies."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the Vice President noted, more than any other American, is responsible for creating a new image of the law enforcement officer—an image well expressed by the motto of the FBI National Academy: "Knowledge, Courage, Integrity." It was Director Hoover, he continued, who established such an advanced formal training program for law enforcement officers which today "enjoys a position not only of *national*, but of *international* respect and prestige."

Citing some of President Johnson's programs to combat crime, Vice President HUMPHREY spoke of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, the sixfold expansion plan of the FBI National Academy as reported to Congress by the President, the War on Poverty, the youth opportunity program, and aid to education. Each citizen, Mr. HUMPHREY stated, can wage his own battle against crime by his willingness to observe and cooperate with both the letter and the spirit of the law. He pointed out the need for an indignant public, one which would treat every act of crime as a public wrong, and repeated the words of a wise old man of Athens who, when asked when he believed injustice would be abolished, replied, "when those who are not wronged wax as indignant as those who are."

Vice President HUMPHREY concluded his remarks by urging the members of the 77th graduating class "to use that training, that torch of enlightenment and knowledge, to light the beacons of knowledge and enlightenment elsewhere and to promote insight and the search of truth—because these are the beacons of greater service to humanity."

Another distinguished speaker, Maj. Gen. Carl C. Turner, The Provost Marshal General of the U.S. Army, proposed that the stamp of "professionalism" be fittingly placed upon the work of modern law enforcement. In enumerating the reasons which make the use of this term so apt, the general emphasized the knowledge, dedication, obligations, and ethics which characterize law enforcement today.

One obligation of experienced policemen in their professional status, General Turner contended, is to educate citizens in matters which concern public well-being and to present their views on controversial issues in order "to promote and extend public understanding of public problems."

Assistant Attorney General Ernest C. Friesen, Jr., and Mr. Hoover presented the diplomas to the 103-member graduating class. Represented in the group were 39 States, the District of Columbia, the Armed Forces, the White House Police, the U.S. Park Police, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Department of Defense.

Twelve law enforcement officers from 7 foreign countries and 1 officer from the Virgin Islands were also in the graduating class. The visiting officers represented the countries of Argentina, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United Arab Republic. With the addition of this class, the total number of FBI National Academy graduates stands at 4,936.

First Sgt. John D. Robey of the Kentucky State Police, president of the class, spoke on behalf of his fellow officers. He expressed their appreciation for the opportunity afforded them to enlarge upon their knowledge of law enforcement and to exchange experiences and ideas. Mr. Robey reaffirmed the graduates' commitment "to work diligently toward maintaining the critical balance between freedom and restraint—that balance which will yield a maximum degree of public safety with a minimum restraint of individual liberty."

Recognition for achieving the highest scholastic standing in the class was given to Capt. Orville N. Butts, U.S. Army, who was awarded the John Edgar Hoover Medal for Excellence in the Study of Law Enforcement. The American Legion National Academy Firearms Proficiency Award was previously presented to Sgt. Donald W. Ritter, Cincinnati Police Division, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Hoover, who presided at the ceremonies, introduced as distinguished guests the Honorable W. Marvin Watson, Special Assistant to the President, and Mrs. Watson. Invocation and benediction for the exercises were delivered by Dr. Edward L. R. Elson of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C.

A highlight of the musical program provided by the U.S. Marine Band, with Capt. James B. King conducting, was the introduction of "The J. Edgar Hoover March," composed by Special Agent Albert N. Nencioni of the FBI and dedicated to Director Hoover.

The address of Vice President HUMPHREY follows:

"Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Hoover, for your gracious and generous introduction, but most of all, for the gift of your friendship. Dr. Elson, General Turner, and the president of the class, Mr. Robey, the representatives here of the Department of Justice, my good friend, the Special Assistant to the President of the United States, Marvin Watson, and Mrs. Watson, and that distinguished, ever-glorious, marvelous Marine Band under the direction of Captain King—I just want to salute you once again. You always make these ceremonies just a little more important and dignified. "Ladies and gentlemen, there are many here that I should like to pay my respects to, but first I want to say a word about General Turner. I've always heard the old phrase, 'Beware of Greeks bearing gifts,' and now I want to say, 'Beware of generals with such humility.' That was a powerful address after having prepared you for what you might have expected would be less. Not only that, I must say to the general that it's well and good that he is a professional in police work, but this taking over the role of Bob Hope is a violation of jurisdiction. I shall take this up with the Screen Actors Guild at a later date.

"And then to have been inspired as we have today by Mr. Robey. It is indeed an extra challenge and a rare treat. You've had presented two very powerful, substantive, moving addresses, both of which give you cause for reflection and for encouragement.

"I consider it a special honor to be permitted to share this platform today with members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; with its distinguished director, Mr. Hoover; with our associates in the Department of Justice. I'm happy to say that our own Special Agent in the State of Minnesota in Minneapolis, Mr. Richard Held, sent me a note just the other day telling me how much he regretted not being able to be here but reminding me that two of the very best officers of the Minnesota police departments are here, and I intend to have something to say about them as we go along.

"To share in this graduation ceremony of the FBI National Academy is a particular pleasure for me. This is a professional school; as General Turner has noted, a professional establishment which has had a very profound effect upon law enforcement.

"When Director Hoover founded this academy in 1935, I believe it was, the skeptics far outnumbered those who thought that such an advanced, formal training program for law enforcement officers could succeed.

"But today, as is evidenced by the graduates of this 77th session, the FBI National Academy enjoys a position not only of *national*, but of *international* respect and prestige.

"Now this, of course, is but one of the many achievements of a truly great American, a man who has dedicated a life to public service, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover—and of the Bureau, the agency that he heads, the FBI. During his 42 years as the head of the Bureau, Mr. Hoover has made a truly outstanding record of devotion to duty, of public service, of patriotism beyond comparison.

"More than any other American, he is responsible for creating a new image of the law enforcement officer—an image well expressed by the motto of this academy: 'Knowledge, Courage, Integrity.'

"I am, as I said a moment ago, particularly delighted to note that there are two of my fellow citizens from Minnesota in this graduating class. One, a friend of long standing, Inspector Donald Dwyer of the Minneapolis Police Department. He is one among the 100 outstanding men receiving diplomas today. And the other, Deputy Sheriff Robert Drowns of Anoka County Sheriff's Department, a neighboring county to Minneapolis and Hennepin County, and I want to salute my two friends here.

"I am particularly delighted, too, to see the representatives from several countries other than our own—from Chile, from Argentina, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United Arab Republic—as well as the Virgin Islands—all represented in this graduating class.

"Now, Director Hoover has told me how much these officers have contributed to the success of this 77th session, and I'm hopeful that in the years ahead we can have a much broader representation of our friends and neighbors from other parts of the world in these training sessions of the FBI Academy.

"Now I can think of no greater reward for their efforts over the past 12 weeks than the accurate impression of American law enforcement—not only its equipment, its procedures and techniques, but also the forthright principles and the high caliber of leadership in American law enforcement—which these visiting officers have obtained from the National Academy program and from their association with other outstanding men, representing 39 States, on the roster of this class. If our friends from the other lands can go home with that impression, with an impression as to the caliber of leadership, with the principles in which we believe, and with a respect for modern crime prevention techniques, we will indeed have been richly rewarded for their presence.

"Courageous, efficient law enforcement is one of the many blessings which we Americans have come to take for granted, and I know of no group of people on the face of the earth that take more things for granted than we Americans. But law enforcement is achieved only at a great personal sacrifice by men of selfless devotion to duty—and frequently men of valor and virtue all too seldom recognized and too seldom extolled.

"Since I first came to Washington as a United States Senator, I've had the occasion, as has been mentioned by Mr. Hoover, to travel extensively as an official representative of the United States.

"In country after country, I have found that one of the most reliable barometers of the true national atmosphere is the attitude of the people in that country toward their law enforcement agencies. Are these law enforcement officers looked upon as public servants, or as instruments to suppress the public will?

"Here in America we have found that it is not enough for the law enforcement agency to win the respect of the people. You must win it and that respect must be maintained and it must be strengthened day after day and year after year.

"And it is here that the special police units for human relations or community relations—the titles vary—have such a timely and essential job to do. Police training today requires a broad knowledge of the social-economic structure of your community, a knowledge of the people, their backgrounds, their ethnic origins, their ideals, their traditions. Police training is more than just the application of force. And the officers who head these special teams in such fields as community relations, and the policemen who man them, have the most difficult and responsible of assignments. These officers and men must be carefully selected and trained, but it is absolutely essential that we have them.

"Now we do face here a very serious problem in the enforcement of law, and we shall need the widest possible support to meet and master it. You know the facts better than I.

"Since 1958, crime in this rich, powerful, wonderful country, where there are more opportunities available for more people than any place on the face of the earth, crime, nevertheless, has risen six times as fast as our national population.

"Last year alone, more than 2,700,000 serious crimes were reported to police departments throughout the United States. This is an all-time record. It means not only that more crimes are being committed, but that the *victims* of crime are mounting at a greater rate than ever before. And I think that when we look at the statistical evidence of the number of crimes that are recorded or committed, we ought to remember that the act of crime has its effect upon the victim.

"Now, I do not have to tell the members of this National Academy class that a disproportionate number of victims come from the ranks of law enforcement—particularly the local police, who bear the brunt of the responsibility for law and order in our land.

"Last year alone, more than 80 law enforcement officers gave their lives in the line of duty—53 of them were killed by dangerous felons and gunmen, and only last week an FBI Agent was tragically slain—the 20th to give his life in the service of this Bureau and this Nation.

"Thousands of other law enforcement officers came to physical harm last year. Statistics compiled by the FBI clearly show that, year after year, 1 out of every 10 police officers, I repeat, 1 out of every 10 is the victim of violent assault. Too often, that assault is carried out before the eyes of impassive bystanders who are otherwise responsible citizens. This, my friends, is something that is beyond my comprehension. How people who say they love and believe in law and order can stand passively by while a law enforcement officer is being mauled or attacked, or while an act of crime is being perpetrated, and never to even lift a finger or be willing to cooperate.

This is deeply disturbing. For, in a democracy such as ours, the preservation of law and order begins with the individual. It is not the sole duty of the professional, trained, paid police officer. Within the limit of his capabilities, every American, every citizen, has an obligation not only to uphold the law, but to support it with all reasonable means at his command. There can be no law of the people, by the people, and for the people if the people are unwilling to abide by it and to support it.

"Now what specifically does this mean? It means taking a genuine interest in the problems of crime and in the obstacles—legal, budgetary or otherwise—confronting honest, impartial, effective crime control.

"It means responding in the call of jury duty, and it means good juries, fair juries, a willingness to appear as a witness in criminal proceedings, promptly reporting the facts concerning violations of the law, and, most fundamental of all, conscientiously observing both the letter and the spirit of the law.

"A nation such as ours that cries out for law and order in this world needs to set a good example of it back home, and we have been having some difficulty. Maybe that's why we're not doing as well in the world as we ought to.

"Now, every American, and I repeat, every American does have a very important stake in the proper enforcement of law. At times this personal interest is more obvious than at others—for example, when a particularly atrocious murder or beating sends a shock wave of fear throughout a community and captures local headlines.

"However, indignation has a tendency to be short-lived. All but those most personally affected tend to quickly forget. The principle that every act of crime is a public wrong, a menace to the body politic, regrettably soon slips from view.

"Many years ago, a wise old man of Athens was asked when he believed injustice would be abolished. Let me quote to you his apt reply. It will be abolished, he said, 'when those who are not wronged wax as indignant as those who are.'

"Now I assure you that this Administration, the Administration of President Johnson, fully recognizes its responsibility for urgent and effective action against crime. In a special message to the Congress last year, President Johnson outlined a three-pronged attack upon crime and lawlessness.

"And the message constituted a call to action to every citizen—and action did follow, including the passage and the signing into law of measures such as the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, through which millions of dollars of Federal funds are being channeled into worthwhile State and local police uses to strengthen your own State and local police agencies. It resulted also in the appointment, as has been noted, of a President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. This Commission's work, in my mind, is of the highest importance.

"In March of this year, President Johnson submitted a second message to the Congress on crime and law enforcement.

"I was delighted to observe, Director Hoover, that the FBI National Academy occupies a position of prominence in that recent message. The President reported to Congress that a sixfold expansion of the National Academy is currently being planned. Following construction of your new academy building at Quantico, Va., 1,200 law enforcement officers—rather than the present maximum of 200—will be able to participate each year in this outstanding training course. This is a reform and an expansion long needed and it will pay great dividends throughout this entire land.

"The Administration has also taken measures to prevent crime—an aspect of law enforcement which progressive police departments have been stressing for many years. It has always been my contention that what we sould seek first is law observance, respect for the law, but a respect that comes out of an environment in a community which engenders respect.

"The War on Poverty may not seem relevant to some as a matter of law observance, but that War on Poverty which President Johnson launched 2 years ago is being planned and administered to eradicate the stagnant pools of bitterness, of anger, of cynicism and frustration which breed much of our present-day crime.

"I have said from several platforms of late that one of the great enemies facing this land is the enemy of communism—yes, without, that challenges us all over the world and challenges free men everywhere, and challenges us within.

"Yet there is another 'ism' that is gnawing at us and it is like a contagious virus; it is called 'slumism'—the deterioration, not only of buildings, but of people. And as I go from city to city, which is my privilege, I travel in these areas of our metropolitan centers that breed crime faster than any police department can enforce the law. So we seek now to find ways and means of getting at the root causes of crime, of tension and frustration and bitterness, and hatred.

"The historic measures enacted last year to support elementary and secondary education have, as their principal objective, helping to make our schools relevant to modern life, useful, meaningful, and worthwhile to the poor and the deprived, and the educationally handicapped children—so that fewer of them will be tempted to join the ranks of the school 'dropouts' from which so many juvenile delinquents are recruited.

"Now some of you may have heard about crime in Washington. That's a favorite topic for those outside of Washington, and it even concerns us here. I think you will be pleased to hear that the incidence of serious crime in this city has been falling, in comparison with last year's level, ever since November.

"And I congratulate Chief Layton, Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department—Chief Layton and his men for their effective work. I've met with these men to give them encouragement and a pat on the back. But some of the credit also belongs to the great programs of social welfare, the antipoverty programs which began to take hold in this city last summer, to the reduction of overcrowding in our schools, to the opening of playgrounds—and since I mention that term, I want to say to the people of Washington, you're a century behind the rest of the civilized world in playgrounds, and young people need recreation facilities. Next to atomic energy, youth energy is the most powerful. And it either needs to be directed in proper channels or it burst out in antisocial conduct.

"We also have less restrictive administration of our public welfare system.

"President Johnson's youth opportunity program, which we launched last summer and which is underway once again this year, has had an effect upon juvenile crime. It has reduced it. It has given young people a chance for a job, a chance for wholesome activity. Action against the conditions which lead to crime does help and it is your No. 1 ally. Mr. Police Officer, the better the schools, the better the social conditions, the fewer the slums, the better your record as a police officer.

"But law enforcement officers are still, as President Johnson has said, our 'frontline soldiers in the war against crime.'

"And they deserve the full support of the community—moral and material.

"Now I don't merely preach this—I believe it. As mayor of Minneapolis two decades ago, I practiced it. When I took office, there were underworld influences at work in our city and they were strong influences. I called the church, business, labor, and other civic leaders together. We appointed a law enforcement commission and I said to them:

"'I want your backing. I can't clean up this city alone. I want to be able to pay the best policemen the best salaries that we can. I want to give them good working conditions because we simply can't afford anything less than the best.'

"I can say quite candidly that most police departments and most police officers—indeed, the overwhelming majority—want to be efficient and honest. And if there's an honest politician in charge, there'll be an honest police department—it's just that simple. You get what you ask for.

"And the community needs to understand, as I tried to indicate, that law enforcement is everybody's business.

"Dr. Elson, I had to tell the clergy of my city that the salary that they paid the mayor of Minneapolis when I was mayor just wasn't enough for me to do the job alone and that I didn't think it was good enough just to ask for good living on Sunday, that we had to have it 7 days a week. And my friends who are here from the Twin Cities will recall that we had our law enforcement Sundays, we had our honor banquets to honor the police officers who in each month had performed outstanding duties. The city and the State and the Nation must learn to honor those who defend our rights and who protect the public interest.

"And I'm happy to say that after these frank visits with the leaders of our community, they did back me up. And I'm happy to say to this audience that I did come to see Mr. Hoover about whom we ought to have as police chief, to get his recommendation. He said, 'You don't need to come here. You have a man right at home that we've trained. His name is Ed Ryan.' He's today sheriff in Hennepin County. And, I said, 'My goodness, he's my neighbor. He only lives a block away.' He said, 'Go home and find him.' And I went home and found him and he was a great chief and he's been succeeded by great chiefs.

"Yes, I had the backing of that community. But I also want to say for the record, I backed my chief and I backed my department. And I think that is the duty of the politically elected officer. You cannot have high morale in a police department if you're going to run out every time there's some criticism. You have to stand with them.

"Now, I want to see our law enforcement officers paid at a professional level, and with professional health and retirement benefits. I want to see them backed up with the most modern equipment and facilities. Here, let me put in a special word now about precinct stations—and I run counter now to most all the public administration experts, but this is my platform for a moment. Many of these precinct stations around the Nation are a shame and a disgrace. They're obsolete and they're poorly equipped—yet policemen have to spend a lot of their lives in these stations—and they should spend it in reasonable comfort and dignity with the best of equipment.

"And I'm one that believes in the precinct station because it provides law enforcement on a neighborhood basis. It may not look as good on the charts of public administration courses that I once taught—I owe some of my students a refund—but the precinct station can be a bulwark of law enforcement and law observance because in many of our communities in America we need to know each other better—not only to know the law, not only to know our duty—but to understand what's going on in the area.

"I want Americans, young and old, to trust and respect the man with the badge—not merely because he wears it, but because he wears it with honor.

"Men of the National Academy, as you return home to resume rightful places of leadership and service in your communities, I ask that you carry proudly that torch of understanding that you've earned during your 12 weeks of intensive study with the FBI. You're going home better people, more professional, with greater competence. And, in the tradition of those who have preceded you across this graduation platform, I ask you to use that training, that torch of enlightenment and knowledge, to light the beacons of knowledge and enlightenment elsewhere and to promote insight and the search of truth—because these are the beacons of greater service to humanity.

"I congratulate the graduates. I feel that our country is the stronger and the better today because of your training here in this academy."

Following is the address given by Major General Turner:

"Thank you, Mr. Hoover.

"I am not really short, Mr. Hoover, it's just that my legs are not very long. Fortunately, they are long enough to touch the ground.

"Please do not misunderstand our regulations concerning the minimum height of military policemen within the Military Police Corps. We don't insist that our military policemen be at least 5 feet 9 inches because we think big men are better than little men. No indeed, it is they just don't have to prove it so often.

"Mr. Vice President, Mr. Hoover, ladies and gentlemen, and those who have not yet found a parking place for their automobiles.

"Receiving Mr. Hoover's kind invitation to speak at the 77th session of the FBI National Academy on the occasion of its graduation ceremony came as a delightful surprise. I must confess that I was flattered and proud because no greater honor has ever been bestowed upon me. I hope you will forgive me for this brief period of self-admiration—it didn't last very long because I turned the mirror around—and it's not hung very high either—when I realized that I just couldn't stand here and smile, I'd have to say something.

"Realizing that my audience would have just completed a course of instruction during which they had been exposed to the professional wisdom and technical proficiency of the world's finest investigative agency, it was clear that I dare not address my remarks to technical matters, lest my modest knowledge be exposed to the world. I hadn't yet recovered from the thought of this frightening possibility when I learned that I was to be permitted to share the platform with the world-renowned orator—the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY.

"The prospect of being found out professionally and overwhelmed oratorically almost caused me to earn the dubious distinction of being the first general officer in the United States Army who ever went AWOL.

"Now that I am here before you—my brief period of pompous pride long dissolved—and with the visible signs of anxiety reasonably controlled by the tight binding around my knees, I am overcome by another emotion.

"I stand here before Mr. HUMPHREY, the strong right arm of our beloved President Johnson, and Mr. Hoover, the world's most distinguished member of the law enforcement profession, and most significant of all, before a graduating class composed of police officers who have been carefully selected from police agencies all over the free world—whose selection was largely predicated on their obvious potential for enlightened leadership during the challenge-laden years that lie ahead. Gentlemen of the 77th session of the FBI National Academy, in your presence and mindful of the import your personal contributions, have had on law enforcement futures of the many agencies and countries you represent, I am overwhelmed with profound humility.

"You, the members of this class, your predecessors, and those who will follow you as participants in the sessions to come, together with your contemporaries who may not be privileged to attend this academy, are the men charged with the responsibility of leading law enforcement into the hallowed halls of true professionalism. Your responsibility is a weighty one. Your challenges will be many and complex. Your obstacles will emerge from unexpected quarters. You will not always receive support from those whose support you deserve. You will be disappointed by the attitudes and reactions of those whom you serve, and you will be attacked without justification and critized without fault, but—with a combination of courage, knowledge, and dedication—you will succeed.

"You, with the cooperation of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the governments you represent, will raise the law enforcement to the level of a profession in the most distinguished and dignified meaning of that word.

"The challenge inherent to the complexity of enforcing the law in our modern world deserves the application of professional talent and professional attitudes. Raising the law enforcement occupation to the level of a profession has been the worthy ambition of many police leaders for many years. There is an ever-increasing public clamor for improved and more sophisticated police service. There are those who insist—and with some basis in fact—that our companions in the field of administration of criminal justice—specifically the judiciary, the legal profession, the penologists—have progressed in their fields more rapidly than we as policemen.

"At any rate, we have come a long way from the mid-nineteenth century when the law enforcement in this country was largely characterized by lawless violence. No longer is the lawman—contrary to the popular TV western portrayal—a hired killer who carries his warrant and his penal code in his holster. In those not-so-golden days, a miscreant was fortunate to survive the arrest. If he did, he could only look forward to representation by a so-called lawyer of dubious training and ethical standards that would have nauseated a crocodile when he appeared before an unlettered judge whose wisdom was not diluted by annoying considerations of evidence and justice.

"Those in the legal profession—the penologist and those concerned with extra-institutional correction embraced by parole and probation concepts—having solicited public support by a determined program of public education and making their views known at every proper opportunity—now wear the mantle of professionalism when viewed by the public eye.

"We, the police, who deal with the criminal in the cold light of his depredation and violence, have not yet received total acceptance as truly professionals. Nor do we always give the public the benefit of our experience by making known our views on controversial issues.

"We, too, must educate the public to an appreciation of our contribution to our society. We must speak out and give our citizens a knowledge of our views. While our positions may not always parallel those of the jurist and the penologist, the legislators and the citizens they represent deserve the meaningful advice and counsel generated by our firsthand knowledge of crime and the criminal.

"We can properly be heard because we, too, have been moving forward over the years and have increased our stature in terms of knowledge and understanding.

"After a slow start and a number of alarming setbacks, we have moved rapidly since the early part of the century in the direction of police professionalism.

"In their dramatic battle with—and victory over—the gangsters of postprohibition days, the Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—G-Men, in the vernacular of the day—made abundantly clear to the public conscience that spirited enforcement by men of both qualification and integrity responding to inspired, determined, and courageous leadership was an essential ingredient of any stable social structure. The FBI example was, in my considered opinion, the catalyst that stimulated and sustained public insistence on police reform. The FBI National Academy and the complementary local training programs of the Bureau were largely responsible for satisfying public demand for additional technical competence and inspired the emergence of professional training for policemen.

"Today, we are in an era when the enforcement of the law can be cloaked with the dignity of the word 'professionalism.'

"We have proceeded systematically toward our goal. We are ready for the added responsibilities inherent to 'professionalism.' This word is ordinarily applied to only those pursuits which require substantial study and training. We have moved progressively in the direction of academic preparation. The public deserves to know more of our accomplishments in this area.

"The term 'professionalism' implies that one has undergone certain tests of his fitness and has given proof of his qualifications.

"A hallmark of a profession is a code of ethics—a way of life embracing a worthy body of moral principles. This code is being defined, in ever-increasing clarity, by men at all levels of responsibility for its final emergence. Speak out. Tell the community of our standards and our principles and its need to understand our position.

"Finally—and perhaps most important—'professional' implies devotion to loftier than material goals. It incorporates obligations to others within and without the profession, to society as an entity.

"As professional policemen, we have as our common goal the betterment of our communities, our Nation, and our civilization. We devote ourselves to this end, and you as police leaders instill in your subordinates an appreciation of personal dedication to principle—not mere compliance with regulations.

"Our obligation and the obligations of our subordinates do not begin at the onset of the working day and terminate when we leave the office in the evening. We evidence, in both personal and our official lives, an obvious dedication to the furtherance of the philosophy which defines our professional goals. Professionalism is not a garment that one puts on in order to adhere to acceptable standards of dress for a particular occasion. No, it is our way of life—a code of conduct with which we live.

"On the surface, the police role in the administration of criminal justice is clearly defined. The legislators enact the laws. We, the police, gather evidence of violation. The prosecutor presents evidence to the court. The judiciary interprets the law as it applies to specific circumstances and persons; and the penologists and their associates in the field of extra-institutional correction have the responsibility for the treatment and, to a large degree, the ultimate disposition of convicted offenders.

"All of us—the police, the prosecutors, the judiciary, and the penologists—are part of a team. The attitude and posture of any single member of this team have a direct and recognizable effect on every other member.

"The post-World War II years have been characterized by increased concern over—yes, even almost preoccupation with—the rights of the accused person in his relations with the police.

"I am in no way opposed—indeed, I favor—limiting the authority and prerogatives of policemen in order to assure that each of our citizens can enjoy a measure of privacy and protection commensurate with the inherent dignity of man. But we must not embark upon a path leading to a hateful circumstance where the legitimate interests of the law-abiding elements of our communities are subordinated to the selfishly dangerous, personal interests of the deliberate criminal offender. Almost daily we learn of interpretations which further restrict the prerogatives of law-enforcement officials. While these restrictions are sometimes presented to the public as advantages to everyone, they may not, in fact, be of practical benefit but only to those persons who can apply them to the concealment of their criminal guilt. Reasonable and prudent control over evidence collection procedure is a necessary safeguard; it is properly the subject of legislation. Legislators, charged with the heavy burden of accepting or rejecting proposed laws—and the public these legislators represent—have a right to thorough explanation by professional policemen of the reasonably expected impact of any proposed law on law enforcement in the community and its contribution to, or dilution of, the public order.

"As professionals, we are obligated to present our views in a manner calculated to promote and extend public understanding of public problems. We are obliged to recommend promulgation of laws which we recognize to be in the public interest and we should not hesitate to sound the clarion cry of warning when the public interest is threatened.

"Another problem facing police agencies today—and unless a remedy is found, will be an increased burden in the future—is the unnecessary and imprudent release on the community at large of convicted offenders whose criminal behavior pattern is unchanged or, indeed, even treated.

"I am alarmed and dismayed at the frequency in which criminals, who have repeatedly demonstrated their inability to conform to our standards or obey our laws, are permitted to return to their criminal pursuits after only a modicum of treatment in custody or, in many instances, without any confinement at all.

"Multisyllable words explaining their behavior notwithstanding, failure to remove the criminal from opportunity to commit crime—and to remove him for an adequate period when adequate periods have been prescribed by our courts—makes, in my opinion, a substantial contribution to the high incident rate of crime which confronts our society today.

"If you consider my views to be wrong or ill-founded, I urge you to speak out. If you consider my views to be of substance, I urge you to lend your voice to mine.

"The time permitting, I could enumerate dozens of subjects amenable to enlightened discussion by experienced policemen—dozens of controversial issues on which we as policemen are entitled to an opinion and should make our informed views known to those who defray the costs of our salaries.

"I am not, of course, inviting undisciplined public airing of capricious, ill-considered, dissident philosophies. I am, instead, urging law-enforcement officials with substantive appreciation of social problems to make known their views and recommendations in a dignified and objective manner under circumstances appropriate to their being heard.

"Our President, Mr. Johnson, has made public his deep concern over criminality in our beloved Nation. His own affirmative action in appointing a Presidential Commission to study the problem is clearly indicative of his concern and is an invitation for thoughtful contribution by all of us. I am happy to tell you that three U.S. Army Military Police officers are on full-time duty with this commission. I personally picked them, and I hope that they will be privileged to make some small contribution to the wisdom of its findings.

"Mr. Hoover, it has been a never-to-be-forgotten privilege to address this illustrious assemblage. I am deeply grateful. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, on behalf of General Harold K. Johnson, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, for permitting the attendance of our Military Police Corps officers at your distinguished national academy. I only wish you conducted them more frequently and could accept a larger number of our officers as students. We want so desperately to learn that which you have to teach.

"To you gentlemen of the 77th session—I say—have courage and may God bless you and guide you as you meet the challenges ahead.

"Thank you very much."

GROSSE POINTE AND THE NEGRO

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it has been said that one picture is worth a thousand words. I would like to change this expression for the moment to read, one article is worth a thousand words. I would therefore like to submit articles which vividly describe the degradation suffered by one of our Negro citizens in his efforts to find a decent home for his family and the efforts of a community to remedy the situation.

This article points up the great need which we in America have to search our own conscience and judge each individual on his merits and for our communities to act in a responsible manner in solving problems.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert the following articles from the Detroit News of July 27, 1966, into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROSSE POINTERS MEET AND QUIETLY ACCEPT THEIR FIRST NEGRO

(By Harold Schachern)

A community's moral fiber smothered its prejudices last night as Grosse Pointers at a public meeting accepted without protest the arrival of their first Negro neighbors.

The public session was called by the Grosse Pointe Human Relations Council at the community's main public library to discuss how and why Mr. and Mrs. A. Gordon Wright and their three children were able to buy their new $42,000 home on north Rosedale in Grosse Pointe Woods, one of the five Pointe communities.

It ended in tranquility and as a salute to the churches of many faiths in Grosse Pointe whose lay and clerical leaders have long prepared for just such a happening.

HEAR MOODY, FEIKENS

The group of about 100 heard the Human Relations Council's new president Circuit Judge Blair Moody, Jr., identify the council as the "laymen's arm of the Grosse Pointe churches."

They also heard John Feikens, Republican cochairman of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, describe the Grosse Pointe "move-in" incident as "typical of what is happening almost every week in previously all-white communities everywhere in Michigan."

The purchaser of the new home, Gordon Wright, is an attorney and was recently named Midwest regional director of the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Feikens said the Negro attorney "accepted this post at the urging of the President of the United States." His wife, Patricia, was described as "a college graduate, housewife and mother." Their children are aged 5, 7, and 9, and are to join their parents in Grosse Pointe shortly.

LETTER TO CHURCHES

A letter sent by Feikens' office to all of the Grosse Pointe churches and to civic leaders said "the Wrights have purchased the house with their own funds." The letter, or "fact sheet," was read from many Grosse Pointe pulpits last Sunday.

"They (the Wrights) lived in a similar home in Washington," it said. "Mr. Wright purchased the house at the original cost from a friend who had bought it through a real estate broker.

"Mr. Wright followed this procedure because he did not believe that he would have been able to buy the house directly from the broker had it been known that he was a Negro.

"No organization has sponsored or financed the Wrights, who decided to move to Grosse Pointe Woods because of the pleasant environment, the community's facilities, and the convenience of the location."

BOAT ENTHUSIAST

"The fact of the matter is," Judge Moody said, "this man is a boating enthusiast and wanted to be near the water.

"I understand he sold the boat he had in Washington rather than move it here, and most likely will be in the market for a new one."

Feikens, when questioned at last night's meeting, denied any "subterfuge" on Wright's part.

"I said that some people might interpret this as subterfuge," Feikens said, "but it is a time-honored practice as old as the law itself for an agent to represent an undisclosed party in a business transaction.

SEES NO DEPRESSION

"I would prefer that Mr. Wright be able to walk in and buy a house wherever he pleased, just as he does a car or furniture, but so long as these restrictions are placed on people of his race, I thank God that there are people willing to represent them and help them."

He told questioners, a number of them genuinely anxious, that they need have no fears of depressed property values, and that any disturbances resulting from the Wright family's arrival would be purely temporary.

"The commission is responding to these crises regularly—in Birmingham, Bloomfield Hills and Saginaw, to mention a few," he said, "and in all of them the trouble blows over rapidly."

He likened it to the increasing frequency with which Negro and white are finding themselves sharing the same two-bed ward in Michigan hospitals.

"By actual clocking," he said, "the shock in a hospital lasts about 30 minutes, and then one or the other says, 'Hi.' Pretty soon they are talking about their children, and before they part they are promising to correspond regularly.

"But if you ask them in advance if they would care to share the same room, the answer would be no."

PASTORS COMMENT

Fr. Ralph V. Barton, pastor of Our Lady Star of the Sea Catholic Church, 575 Ballantyne road, said he was one of a number who read the fact sheet from the pulpit last Sunday.

"We didn't actually preach a sermon on it," he said, "but merely commented that this was a factual report, and that they should be guided by it rather than by rumor.

"We advised our people to treat the whole thing calmly and to accept what had happened in a neighborly way."

Fr. Edgar H. Yeoman, rector of St. Michael's Episcopal Church, 20475 Sunningdale, said he also had read the Human Rights Commission report "so that the people would have the true facts, rather than depending on rumors."

REFERS TO RUMORS

"I find evidence of no organized or even sizable opposition in the parish," he said, "although there were some extraordinary rumors around.

"In matters of this kind you always are surprised at how people perform. I am proud of a good many of our people and disappointed at the conduct of some others."

The Rev. Gary R. Gruber, associate minister, said the fact sheet hadn't been read Sunday at Grosse Pointe Memorial Church (United Presbyterian) but that "our position is so well known that there didn't seem to be any particular reason to repeat it."

He said that last March 31 the Grosse Point Ministers' Association had published a statement supporting an open occupancy policy for the Grosse Pointe which had been signed "by all but one or two clergymen in the area."

PLEASED AT REACTION

"The pastors of the four Catholic parishes serving the Pointes aren't even members of the association," he said, "but they signed it anyway."

Fr. Norman P. Thomas, of the Archbishop's Committee for Human Relations, said the committee had functioned with the Catholic parishes "by keeping them informed of all the facts and developments in the matter."

"We are pleased that they reacted in such a responsible manner," he said.

Judge Moody described the entire issue as "a test of our Christianity and our patriotism," and said that continuing intergroup relations "must be carried on through the churches and their members."

TELLS OF VISIT

His immediate predecessor as president of the Grosse Pointe Human Relations Council, Dr. Charles E. Brake, educator, said he and Mrs. Brake spent Monday evening with the Wrights.

"We were impressed by them as a highly cultured, aware and articulate couple," he said, "and we hope to have them as permanent friends.

"They may experience some difficulties, but we always have been harassed by some kooks and screwballs, and we can't afford to pay any attention to them."

He said a Human Relations Council composed entirely of Caucasians had been trying to settle Grosse Pointe problems, and that "I rejoice that we now are going to have the representation and judgments of other groups."

Judge Moody said he had no "official" word on a second move-in reportedly scheduled for later in the week. Reports state that Wright's assistant in the Department of Commerce post will move into a rental property on Neff road in Grosse Pointe city.

RENTED BY OWNER

The assistant, Glen Brown, rented the residence from its owner and did not deal through an agent.

Brown, in his late 40s, is married and has sons aged 5 and 7. He retired from the Army as a major after 22 years' service and then served four years with the Peace Corps in Puerto Rico.

His present title as Wright's assistant is reports control officer and records analyst.

Judge Moody identified the man who was the intermediary in the purchase of Wright's new home as "a UAW attorney."

When a questioner suggested that his union affiliation created a "negative image" in Grosse Pointe, Judge Moody suggested ironically it might have been better public relations-wise if the attorney had been employed by Chrysler, Ford or General Motors.

GROSSE POINT NEGRO UNHAPPY BUT STAYING

The first Negro resident of the Grosse Pointes is unhappy over the hostility that left him "surprised and shocked" upon his arrival, but he declared today that "I'm here to stay."

A. Gordon Wright, 46, an attorney and the new Midwest director of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration, said:

"I have lived in Grosse Pointe Woods one week and it has not been a pleasant week.

"There have been cranks going up and down the street, walking or driving, and shouting, 'Nigger, get out!'

"You name it and they've done it. I just couldn't conceive of running into this sort of thing in 1966."

COMMENDS POLICE

However, Wright praised Grosse Pointe Woods police and the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, which sent letters to clergymen and civic leaders in the Pointes asking them to persuade residents "to treat this occurrence as it deserves to be treated—with calm good judgment."

"We have received the finest police cooperation, that I could possibly imagine," said Wright, "and the civil rights commission has done everything it could for us."

Wright went on: "I came here from Washington, D.C., where I lived in an area that was previously all white.

"I want to live here, raise my family and send my children to a good school. I really couldn't care less whether my neighbors love me or not.

GIVES HIS REASONS

"I just hope this will all die down. I hope my neighbors will go about their business and let me go about mine. Then we'll all be very happy.

"I moved to Grosse Pointe Woods because it is an ideal community in which to raise kids.

"It has wonderful community recreation facilities and a very good school system, and it's a nice, quiet community—or at least it was.

"What's more, I'm there to stay. You never solve any problems by running away from them—and we are not running away from this one."

SETTING THE REA RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an open letter written to the Madison, S. Dak., Daily Leader, by V. T. Hanlon, general manager of the East River REA Generation and Transmission Cooperative, of my hometown.

Mr. Hanlon is one of the best informed REA operators in the entire Midwest, and his reply to a recent column by Drew Pearson should be of interest to friends and foes of REA alike, since it is designed to set the record straight in connection with the facts involved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, THE LEADER:

Drew Pearson in a column Sunday, July 31, suggests that President Johnson could save several million dollars by abolishing the 2 per cent REA interest rate and cancelling the tax-exempt status of rural electric cooperatives.

President Johnson could cancel the tax-exemption and the Congress (not the President) could revise the financing program for rural electric cooperatives—and Mr. Freeman could (also) continue to rule out pork and butter for the armed services. Whether any of these ideas are any good or in the public interest is certainly subject for public discussion.

My viewpoint, of course, is that the rural electric cooperatives have been a boon to the rural areas, especially to South Dakota, and that they should be strengthened rather than weakened. Regardless of any viewpoint, however, the public should make its decisions on the facts of the case—rather than innuendoes, misrepresentation and inaccuracies which for the most part made up the Sunday column of Mr. Pearson.

Pearson charged that the rural electrics have built up to a point where they "rival" private industry. The fact: Rural electrics generate 1 per cent of the total electric power produced in this country, serve about 8 per cent of the people over 1,527,000 miles of distribution line. I'm sure most reasonable people would agree that the power company executives will be able to sleep a few more nights with the "rivalry" at this stage.

Mr. Pearson notes also that the power companies pay 6 percent for their bonds while the co-ops get 2 per cent money. Rural electrics, by both federal and state laws are confined to the uneconomic rural areas. They must retire their debt. The power companies generally serve the urban areas. They are permitted by law and by regulators to refinance their debt and to use part of their collections for new capital (up to 60 per cent of their capital needs for next year's construction are coming from retail rates for some companies) all of which results in their having a ratio of debt or debt service to investment comparable to the cooperatives at 2 per cent. There is no magic in the electric business. The REA cooperatives can pay the same for their capital, pay income tax and all the other so-called "disadvantages" pushed onto the power companies if given the same opportunities, primarily serving the urban communities.

Pearson also reports that Congress has passed a law exempting REA cooperatives from Federal Power Commission regulation. Congress has not done so and it is rather a sad commentary on the veracity of all of Mr. Pearson's columns if this type of reporting is typical.

He reports also, with apparently similar inaccuracy, that President Johnson has ordered no more REA loans after the fiscal year just ended (June 30, 1966). Johnson may well have done so but there is no other report of this. If there is some secret report would not a good reporter or commentator labeled it as such?

There is an honest difference of opinion on various phases of the rural electric and the public power programs. This is appropriate in a democracy. Mr. Pearson adds nothing to this discussion by paraphrasing power company advertisements and by his inaccurate reporting. After the blackouts in St. Louis and other places this year I would expect that many people are beginning to conclude that just because a big power company says something that it is not automatically unimpeachable and unerring.

Mr. Pearson's column Sunday makes it clear, too, that a big columnist's statements are not automatically unimpeachable and unerring. The public deserves better reporting. It deserves a presentation of both viewpoints. Commentary based on innuendo and inaccuracies serve no useful purpose.

V. T. HANLON,
General Manager,
East River Electric.

MADISON, *August 2, 1966.*

HILL-BURTON ACT BENEFITS WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, Charleston, W. Va., carried an article reporting some of the benefits which have accrued to the State of West Virginia as a result of the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, which became law 20 years ago this month. This act, which bears the name of two foresighted Members of the Congress including that of the distinguished Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, has enabled my State to achieve a high-ranking position among the States of the Union on the basis of the total hospital beds available per 100,000 citizens.

This article, "Hill-Burton in West Virginia," written by Mr. Edward Peeks, is a testimonial to the effectiveness of joint efforts by the Federal Government, State government, and local groups and persons in providing health services to communities within our Nation.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) State Gazette-Mail magazine, Aug. 7, 1966]

HILL-BURTON IN WEST VIRGINIA: COOPERATION BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL GROUPS HAS PUT STATE AMONG NATION'S TOP 10 IN HOSPITAL BEDS AVAILABLE FOR ITS CITIZENS

(By Edward Peeks)

Mountaineers have to look up, not down, to find where their state stands among others on the national list of available general hospital beds.

West Virginia ranks in the top 10 states on the basis of the number of beds available for every 100,000 persons.

The national average is 406 beds per 100,000 population as compared with 465 for the Mountain State, which is surpassed by only eight other states and the District of Columbia.

They are Colorado with 499 beds, the District of Columbia, 543; Kansas, 475; Minnesota, 490; Montana, 489; North Dakota, 565; Pennsylvania, 469; Vermont, 473, and Wyoming, 470.

The Mountain State stands tall when it comes to hospital facilities, according to figures released by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These figures have been offered to help the nation take a long hard look at its medical and hospital facilities on the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act, which became law Aug. 13, 1946.

Since then, more than 8,000 projects have been approved with provisions for nearly 350,000 general hospital beds.

These projects cost $7.9 billion, of which the federal share came to $2.5 billion. Through local, state and federal cooperation, money was pooled, plans were drawn and facilities constructed.

The original program called for construction of hospitals and public health centers with concern for rural areas where facilities were most inadequate or least available.

But now the program encompasses construction of long-term care institutions such as nursing homes, chronic disease facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, training and rehabilitation facilities.

It also offers grants to renovate rundown buildings and to replace outdated facilities, grants for areawide planning, research and demonstration projects.

Despite the new lease on life through Hill-Burton transfusions, it is sometimes said, "Our hospitals are sick."

Reference is made to obsolescent facilities whose replacement would cost the nation about $10 billion over the next decade, according to hospital authorities.

If hospitals are ailing, their condition would be far worse had not Senator LISTER HILL, D-Ala., and Senator Harold Burton, R-Ohio, rallied their congressional colleagues to act 20 years ago.

The nation and the individual states, without the Hill-Burton partnership, would lack means to launch a medicare program for the elderly and to look forward hopefully to meeting the increasing health needs of a growing population.

West Virginia has realized a total of 84 Hill-Burton projects, including 4,717 general hospital beds, or more than half the number of current beds in the state.

The total cost amounts to $111.2 million, with the federal share coming to $43.4 million. Through local and state efforts, West Virginians raised $67.8 of the total amount.

A project breakdown shows 17 general hospitals; 5 long-term care facilities such as nursing homes; 3 rehabilitation centers; the State Hygenic Laboratory in South Charleston; 5 public health centers; 8 nurses residences and training school facilities; and 45 additions to hospitals and similar institutions.

Charleston Memorial Hospital, the largest in Kanawha Valley, was the first general hospital built in the state with Hill-Burton assistance. Developers and community representatives broke ground for the hospital in 1949.

The next in the state was Webster County Memorial Hospital in Webster Springs, representing Hill-Burton concern to make modern hospital facilities available to rural residents.

Summers County Hospital in Hinton represents the newest project which is to be constructed at a total cost of $2.4 million. It has been appropriated $905,000 in Hill-Burton funds.

Others already established are Weirton General Hospital, Sacred Heart Hospital, Richwood; Broaddus in Philippi, Preston Memorial in Kingwood, Cabell-Huntington, West Virginia University Hospital, Calhoun General in Grantsville, Grant Memorial in Petersburg, Hampshire Memorial in Romney, Pleasant Valley in Point Pleasant, Union Protestant in Clarksburg, Reynolds Memorial in Glen Dale, Jackson General in Ripley and St. Joseph's Hospital in Buckhannon.

"Most of these nonprofit community hospitals have been constructed north of Charleston," said State Health Director N. H. Dyer, who noted that most of the private or proprietary hospitals are located in the southern part of the state.

"I consider the Hill-Burton program one of the finest programs of cooperation between the federal government, state agencies and local people for providing much needed hospital service in communities," Dr. Dyer said. "This is particularly so of rural areas where such facilities would be too expensive for local taxpayers to provide funds from their own resources."

Hill-Burton funds are administered in West Virginia through the State Health Department and its governing body which is the nine-member State Board of Health. The present chairman of the board is Edgar B. Moore, a Clarksburg pharmacist.

Dr. Dyer said, "The Hill-Burton program is based on a state plan which is revised annually to determine the need for hospital facilities of all types, health centers, rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes and to justify allocation of funds on a priority basis.

"The Harris-Hill amendments of 1964 introduced a new element, modernization of facilities," he added. "This expanding Hill-Burton program requires that each medical facility be graded by an architect or engineer armed with a series of uniform check lists to ensure a high degree of objectivity."

As overseer of West Virginia's hospital and medical facilities, the State Health Department conducts its work through the Bureau of Hospital and Medical Facilities, whose director is Paul D. Bibb.

"The total per cent of needed construction still exceeds that of the existing facilities," Bibb said of demands under Hill-Burton and other programs, particularly for expansion and renovation.

Hill-Burton assistance goes only to nonprofit groups for community hospital development, including church and civic organizations.

West Virginia has 76 general hospitals and nine special hospitals which together offer a total of about 8,500 beds.

State records show that 52 of the general hospitals are nonprofit institutions and 4 of the special hospitals operate on a nonprofit basis.

The nonprofit group includes public hospitals and medical facilities which share Hill-Burton funds.

Under the program, 45 additions have been made to hospitals and medical facilities in West Virginia. Most of these stand north of Charleston with comparatively few in the south.

Practically all general hospitals, originally built under the Hill-Burton program, have either made additions or are now in the process of doing so under the program.

Charles L. Showalter, administrator of Charleston Memorial Hospital and president of the West Virginia Hospital Assn., said:

"The two single greatest factors in making it possible for our communities to have the modern hospital system we have today are the Hill-Burton program and the Blue Cross movement.

"Hill-Burton provides capital funds on a matching basis to build or expand hospitals. The Blue Cross movement, which gave birth to the prepayment plans, makes it possible for people to defray the cost of hospitalization, thereby providing necessary operating funds."

Operating expenses exceed the construction cost of a hospital in a matter of a few years, Showalter explained, adding:

"Just as important is the recognition given by the federal government that once these facilities were built for the benefit of the community they were not to be dissipated and lost to the community at some point in the future. This has been accomplished by reorganizing depreciation on the total plant as an element of reimbursable cost, thus enabling the individual hospital to provide for replacement of plant and equipment when needed.

"We are greatly indebted to the West Virginia Department of Health for assuming the administration of this program and providing the necessary leadership to make the benefits of the Hill-Burton program available to the people of our state."

Under the program, the five, long-term care facilities constructed are St. Barbara's Memorial Nursing Home in Monongah, Peterson Place in Wheeling, the Summersville Nursing Home, Glenwood Park Methodist Home in Bluefield and the Greenbrier County Nursing Home in Fairlea.

Rehabilitation centers are in Parkersburg, Institute and on the grounds of Barboursville State Hosptal.

The five countywide public health centers are in Huntington, Moundsville, Wheeling, Beckley and Princeton.

Nurses' residences have been built at Thomas Memorial Hospital in South Charleston, Spencer State Hospital, Lakin, Denmar and Ohio County Tuberculosis Sanitarium at Triadelphia.

Residences and training schools for nurses have been constructed at Charleston General Hospital, Ohio Valley General Hospital in Wheeling and Camden-Clark Memorial Hospital in Parkersburg.

"Through the implementation of the Hill-Burton program, West Virginia now ranks among the top states in the country in hospital beds per thousand population," said Wayne Herhold, executive director of the Hospital Planning Council of Kanawha Valley.

"Future emphasis must be placed on the removal of obsolescent facilities and in providing an effective mechanism to ensure use of the facilities we have by more people in the state.

"There has been a good deal of emphasis on facilities, but now it is shifting to the needs of manpower, training and education," he added. "We need to make more effective use of what we have to train manpower and avoid duplication of services."

Thirty counties contain the state's 84 Hill-Burton projects of various description.

Populous Kanawha County leads with 17 projects at a total cost of $18,699,151, of which Hill-Burton funds supplied $8,536,655.

Next is Cabell County with 10 projects at a cost of $12,674,358, of which $3,671,784 came from Hill-Burton.

Other counties with more than one project, but fewer than 10, are Marion, 4; Marshall, 3; Mason, 5; Mercer, 2; Monongalia, 2; Nicholas, 2; Ohio, 7; Pocahontas, 2; Preston, 2; Randolph, 2; Roane, 2; Upshur, 2; Wetzel, 2; and Wood, 6.

Counties with one project are Barbour, Calhoun, Grant, Greenbrier, Hampshire, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Lewis, Morgan, Raleigh, Summers, Taylor and Webster.

Thus 30 counties, comprising a total of 40 communities, have benefited directly from $43.4 million in federal grants during the past 20 years. The state as a whole has gained from this assistance.

But, in view of the fact that there are 55 counties—although some are small—the location of Hill-Burton projects in only 30 counties raises questions about the equity of their distribution and their availability to many West Virginians.

True, for example Putnam County residents have access to hospitals and medical facilities in Kanawha and Cabell counties.

But similar access hardly applies to residents, say in Monroe County, which is one of eight counties listed recently by the State Health Department as having no kind of licensed health facility.

The other seven counties are Pleasants, Gilmer, Hardy, Pendleton, Clay, Wayne, Lincoln and Putnam.

This gap gives urgency to the question of making better use of existing facilities while striving to improve and increase the lot.

State health officials said this problem and others are under study with the aim of helping local communities find a solution.

Gov. Smith commended the State Board of Health and the State Health Department staff for "their hard work and promotion of the Hill-Burton program."

He said the program "has pioneered in new approaches to improve patient care through research into the development and effective use of health facilities and coordinated planning. It has been an outstanding example of federal, state and local cooperation to improve the health of all our people."

TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966—OPEN HOUSING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, during the current Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights hearings on the civil rights bill, many statements have been presented regarding title IV, the fair housing provision. Representatives of various real estate brokers' associations have undoubtedly raised the loudest and most dramatic outcrys against this title. At the same time, statements have been made which attribute some of the discriminating activities with regard to the sale or rental of property to the real estate community.

In this regard, I have received a letter from the Bagley Community Council, of Detroit, Mich., together with a copy of their letter to the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, which describes the problems created by such activities and the efforts on the part of the community to counteract such activities in order to maintain integrated neighborhoods and prevent the development of resegregated neighborhoods.

Although I realize that the great majority of our real estate salesmen and brokers are reputable businessmen and hence opposed to the tactics outlined in these letters, I feel that, if the American people are aware of the tactics utilized by some real estate operators in order to cause them to panic and sell, they will be more interested in the enactment of a strong fair housing proposal which will provide protection not only for the potential minority homeowner but the white homeowner as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters of the Bagley Community Council be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BAGLEY COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Detroit, Mich., July 21, 1966.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I am writing to you on behalf of the Bagley Community Council to express our support of your position on Senate Bill 3296 and in particular Title IV concerning "open occupancy."

Attached to this letter is a copy of a letter dated August 5, 1965, addressed to the Director-Secretary of the Detroit Commission on Community Relations. This letter outlines the historical role played by a neighborhood community council trying to protect itself from unscrupulous real estate practices. Even with the aid of local "Fair Neighborhood Practices Ordinances," no neighborhood can effectively cope with the traditional patterns unless "open occupancy" regulations truly extend beyond the city boundary and are the law of the land.

In our one square mile reside about 4,600 families who have experienced the full gamut of unscrupulous real estate tactics in the handling of the some $40,000,000 of real estate sales which has occurred in our neighborhood in the short span of 5 years. Certainly with stakes such as these, what is the forecast for other city neighborhoods now being caught in the trend of ghettoization? Must the usual historical experience prevail—desegregation of a city neighborhood only to be followed by "resegregation" by persons of another color or creed?

The answer to both these questions rest upon greater legislated control of the pattern of home real estate sales as well as men of good will who are not threatened economically and socially by integration.

I am pleased that I can report back to our neighbors your support of the "open occupancy" legislation.

Very truly yours,

John A. Nelson,
President.

Bagley Community Council,
Detroit Mich., August 5, 1965.

Mr. Richard V. Marks,
Director-Secretary, Commission on Community Relations, Water Board Building, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Marks: Your office has requested information concerning the way in which the "Notification of Request to Cease Solicitation", signed by residents of the Bagley area, was prepared.

Brokers to whom the notifications are addressed are those who had made persistent solicitations in the neighborhood during the two to three months immediately prior to the circulation of the petitions. We had received complaints regarding each of these 11 brokers from residents of the neighborhood and have copies of post cards, letters and other documentations regarding telephone calls and door-to-door solicitations.

The notification forms were then circulated by residents of the Bagley area. If you will refer to the copies which we have provided you, you will note that each form has been signed by the circulator, whose signature is also notarized. In addition, specific written instructions (a copy is attached) were issued to Bagley Community Council representatives who circulated the notices for signature.

All brokers who had previously been responsible for objectionable solicitation were not included, since their solicitations were not brought to our attention in the period immediately prior to the preparation of the notices. Those who have since resumed such solicitation will be addressed similar notifications now being prepared for circulation.

The responses from the recently formed group of Independent Real Estate Brokers Association and the private detective investigations of our Community Council by the John T. Lynch Company, made in behalf of some realtors, indicates how effective this procedure has been.

In order that the recent charges and statements by these brokers can be put in proper perspective, a review of the creation of the Bagley Community Council and the role which other Councils, as well as our own, played in the development of the Fair Neighborhood Practices Ordinance is in order.

In mid-1960, the first Negro family moved into the Bagley neighborhood.

In order to prevent panic selling, provide an atmosphere of welcome and prevent the re-segregation of the neighborhood, a phenomenon which had occurred in previous years with varying rates of speed in most other changing neighborhoods in Detroit, the Bagley Community Council was formed.

The basic principle upon which the Council was founded is "Good neighborhoods are engendered and sustained by good neighbors—without regard to ethnic considerations."

Our position was clear from the outset; we were and are in favor of open occupancy in all neighborhoods.

We were and are opposed to the artificial stimulation of real estate sales based on misrepresentations and involvement of racial overtones.

As soon as the Bagley Community Council was formed, we began to communicate with our neighbors and have continued to do so in several ways:

Membership meetings are held at which prominent local and national figures are the featured speakers; our policies are clearly outlined and discussed with the membership.

Newsletters are circulated periodically, advising residents of Council activities and urging their participation in and understanding of the Council and its functions.

Block meetings are held whenever it appears necessary in order to stem a potential "panic" situation an a block or upon request of a resident of the block.

We represented the community on several occasions before the Board of Zoning appeals; we appeared before the Common Council in support of the "Pawnshop Ordinance"; we became active in support of the schools serving our neighborhood and aided in campaigns for school bonding and millage.

Members of the Bagley Board of Directors also assisted a number of Communities throughout the city and suburbs in forming community councils and human relations groups.

Even before the creation of the Council, it was evident that the tactics of some real estate operators were a grave concern among many Bagley residents and were becoming a major factor in increasing the number of homes for sale in the area.

Tactics of harassment and intimidation by real estate brokers became frequent consisting of persistent solicitation by mail, phone and in person; the proliferation in the neighborhood of "For Sale", "Sold" and "Open" signs; and appeals to racial prejudice and fears in order to stimulate sales and listings.

Complaints by members of the Council and other residents to the Board of Directors made it clear that unless these tactics were stopped a large number of Bagley residents might be "panicked" into selling their homes and leaving the community.

Accordingly, conversation with Councilman James Brickley led to the drafting and presentation to the Common Council of the Fair Neighborhood Practices Ordinance.

A public hearing on the ordinance was held at which the several community councils which by then existed in northwest Detroit presented evidence of "panicmongering".

As a result of these efforts, in which we were joined by many responsible organizations throughout the community, the Detroit Common Council adopted the ordinance which prohibited the use of appeals to racial prejudice and fear, controlled the number of "For Sale" and "Open" signs which could be displayed, prohibited the posting of such signs on public property, prohibited the use of the "Sold" sign and prohibited the use of racial, religious or ethnic identification in any advertising.

Several months of effort to educate brokers then followed. Violations were brought to the attention of the Commission and directly to the brokers guilty of the violations. After several months, it was felt that the period of "education" had been sufficient and the Commission commenced to prosecute violations of the ordinance.

Several cases were brought under the ordinance and a number of convictions obtained.

The ordinance has been notably effective in three areas:

1. The daily newspapers have refused to accept advertisements containing racial identification.

2. The proliferation of signs, which had previously made such neighborhoods look like carnivals on spring and summer Sundays, has been eliminated (there are signs in front of those houses which are for sale, but they do not dominate the neighborhood).

3. The use of blatant appeals to racial prejudice and fear has been largely eliminated (however slightly more subtle appeals continue to increase in number).

But since the passage of the ordinance, brokers have continued their annoying tactics of personal solicitation throughout the community—by mail, phone and in person. Post cards advise residents that their "neighbors"—in many cases half a dozen blocks away—have sold their home. Phone calls vary from several in one day from different brokers to several in the same week from the same broker. "Flying squads" of salesmen descend on a single block and proceed from door to door; these tactics have persisted.

Accordingly, we vigorously supported the amendment of the ordinance to prohibit solicitation in accordance with the provisions of section "k" of the Ordinance.

The ordinance in its present form does not represent a total solution to the problem. The ultimate resolution of the problem of preserving integration and preventing re-segregation requires that all neighborhoods throughout the metropolitan area become "open occupancy" neighborhoods.

The successes of Bagley, Fitzgerald and an increasing number of neighborhoods in Detroit and across the country in slowing down the process of "re-segregation" and maintaining genuinely integrated neighborhoods provides the sort of example which will make the ultimate achievement of "open occupancy" possible.

Complaints came from white families interested in purchasing homes in the Bagley area that certain real estate agents would try to direct them away from the area or make it difficult for them to see available properties. One of the reasons for this is that a purchase of a home by a white person on a mixed block tends to stabilize or reassure the remaining white home owners who may be undecided on a course of action.

There is no effective way at the present time to require brokers to show homes in the Bagley and Fitzgerald areas to potential white buyers. Accordingly, the Fitzgerald Council started, and the Bagley Council has since joined, a "Community Housing Service." Its purpose is to make available to anyone who is interested in a home in the Bagley-Fitzgerald Area a list of such properties for sale or rent. The service is open to anyone who is interested and no fees in any form are charged or accepted for the service.

The economic best interest of every segment of the residential real estate industry lies in a continuation of a pattern of neighborhood "invasions and succession" resulting in re-segregation; and virtually every segment of the residential real estate industry is a participant in and a promoter of this process. Not merely the "panic-monger", who is the most blatant participant, but the so-called "ethical broker", who excludes Negroes from the neighborhood he is "protecting". This increases the pressure on those neighborhoods which are "open" and increases the likelihood that additional white residents will be frightened out of the changing neighborhood and will purchase homes from the "ethical broker" in the neighborhood he is "protecting". This process also provides a constant supply of frightened home owners for the builders in the suburbs.

This is the reason, despite protestations to the contrary of many real estate groups, that none of these organizations has ever made a meaningful contribution to the elimination of ghettoization in housing in Detroit.

We feel the very nature of the business real estate brokers are in, a business which operates under a system in which their economic self-interest appears to lie in the direction of continuous disruption of neighborhoods and continued segregation, causes their moral dilemma in the pursuit of profit.

The solution to the ethical problem of the broker does not lie in less regulation, but more. The redemption of the real estate industry and the improvement of their image requires controls which will make it illegal and unprofitable for brokers to disrupt families and neighborhoods and which will make it profitable and necessary for these men to do what they must know is right but which they do not do now because it is "bad business".

We are looking forward to the meeting between representatives of the councils and the brokers, which I understand your Commission is arranging. We will be pleased, at that time, to present to you and the brokers our suggestions for a code of ethical conduct and appropriate legislation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. NELSON,
President.

To: Bagley Community Council Representatives.

The purpose of the petition is to have on record names of persons who have requested the listed real estate companies that they do not want to be solicited.

We will make twelve copies of each of the completed petitions, using Thermofax or Zerox and we will send 1 copy to each of the 11 real estate companies listed and 1 copy to the Commission on Community Relations and keep one for our own records.

Point out to the signers that *after* the real estate companies listed have received a copy of the petition, it is illegal for them to solicit the signers.

Ask those who sign to contact the Community Housing Service, 16853 Livernois, UN. 3-1656, or their quadrant representative, if they receive any further calls or mail solicitation and to be sure to note the date, time and name of any caller from real estate companies.

Use a black ballpoint pen, if possible, so the copies will be clear.

The signature must be that of a *homeowner* and for the sake of economy, only one signature from each home.

The date should be written out, i.e., April 11, 1965.

The Circulator of the petition must sign at the bottom of *both* sheets.

Please return the petition, even if you have not completed it, to your quadrant representative by Wednesday, April 14.

The list of companies does not include all those who have recently solicited in the Bagley area, or those who may solicit here in the future, but since we wanted to list only those companies that we are certain have solicited recently, and since copies of the petition must be sent to all the companies listed, the list is brief. If it becomes necessary, we may draw up additional lists and circulate more petitions at another time.

Remember that by giving your neighbors the opportunity to sign the petitions, you are doing them a favor. These petitions will probably greatly reduce the amount of real estate solicitation in the Bagley area.

TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966—FAIR HOUSING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a few days ago, I submitted for insertion in the RECORD a number of letters expressing an interest in the enactment of title IV, the fair housing provision of the civil rights bill of 1966.

I have continued to receive interesting letters from thoughtful citizens who regard the passage of a fair housing law as indispensable to our continued development as the leading exponent of democratic principles.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL AMERICAN
LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Dearborn, Mich., July 27, 1966.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Your office recently forwarded to me a copy of S. 3296. Thank you. I have read Title IV very carefully.

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of a letter sent to the Detroit Real Estate Board. The enclosed letter is a response to the notice published by that agency in the *Detroit News* on Thursday, June 9, 1966.

Let me merely reiterate that passage of Title IV is no longer an option. It is a necessity.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HOFMANN,
Assistant Pastor.

JULY 27, 1966.

The DETROIT REAL ESTATE BOARD,
Penobscot Building,
Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: In mid-June your office forwarded to me literature which supports the view published in *The Detroit News* on June 9, 1966; namely, Title IV of the pending civil rights legislation represents a denial of free choice in the sale or rental of property.

I have read Title IV of both S. 3296 and H.R. 14765.

The notice in *The Detroit News* said, "It will deny you the right to exercise freedom of choice in contracting for the sale or rental of your property."

The pending civil rights legislation for 1966 does not limit freedom of choice except in cases of discrimination. When discrimination is involved, the freedom of the owner is not secured or broadened or exercised. It is, in fact, denied not only for the prospective buyer, but also for the owner. Freedom of choice as defined in the notice limits and denies freedom.

Furthermore, freedom of choice has never implied in the American tradition the right of any individual to do as he pleases when the public welfare is at stake. Yet, that is what the notice in the newspaper implied. No one including your office would want to push such a conclusion to its logical limits.

It might be more appropriate to define freedom of choice as given in the Christian tradition. Real freedom comes only as a person binds himself in obligation to all people. That is, real freedom is freedom from self-interest and freedom for the welfare of others.

Of course, the issue of private property is also at stake. The institution of private property has been an inherent part of the American tradition. And history bears out the fact that this institution has played a significant role in the uplifting of the dispossessed. In other words, the right of private property is not an earned right, but a given one.

The further question arises about any institution which becomes institutionalized. The institution of private property has served its function in American life when it betters the welfare of all the people. When the institution of private property ceases to do that, then it forfeits its place in American life.

I personally think it better to revive the rightful function of this institution rather than to do away with the privilege of private property. It cannot be revived, however, if the institution of private property serves as a tool of discrimination.

Wouldn't it be more appropriate for the Detroit Real Estate Board to throw its weight behind equal housing opportunity; to deal with the law out of an inward creativity instead of fearful compulsion; to declare itself unequivocally against discrimination in housing; to help in the struggle to avoid the consequences which await a society which discriminates against Negro people; and, above all, to encourage white property owners to do more than give ground grudgingly when the pressure is applied?

Not to do anything bold, constructive, and positive now may well result in a loss of the values which keep this society alive. I'm sure that continued discrimination in housing opportunity threatens the future of private property much more than it does the future of civil rights in American life.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HOFMANN,
Assistant Pastor.

JULY 25, 1966.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: For the second time in recent weeks, the Detroit Real Estate Board in paid news advertisements in the local news media, has urged a massive letter and telegraph avalanche on the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives by the homeowners in this area, to protest Bill H. R. 14765 and S. 3296 and Title IV of the Bill concerning Housing.

This is reminiscent of the very recent Medicare Bill scare by the also powerful American Ass'n, wherein a large, well financed lobby, fearful of losing some of their powers and financial gains, is attempting to use the individual to gain their own ends.

We trust you will investigate this self-evident twisting of facts by the realtors and realize their true motives, which is to control the housing patterns and markets, as they have been doing in the past.

Vote for bill H. R. 14765 and S. 3296, and a strong title IV, in the interest of equal civil rights for all American citizens in education, employment and housing.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. WALTER E. SELLMAN.
DETROIT, MICH.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 26, 1966.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I would like to commend you for your support of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill, especially Title IV on housing. As a private citizen who believes that human rights come before property rights, I feel that such legislation is both proper and desirable.

I hope that you will continue your fine work in this important area.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JO ANN KELLY.

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.,
July 26, 1966.

Hon. Senator HART,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HART: I am writing to urge that you support the bill that would give open housing. We cannot have desegregated schools with open housing. Everyone is aware that inferior education is being offered to the poor of the minority races. This will not be changed until there is integrated housing. The Negro must be given better education, as good as that given to white children. I feel that this can only be done in truly integrated schools, and integrated schools depend upon integrated housing.

Will we, who hold the power now, refuse to do this until forced to do so by riots and blood-shed in every major city?

Yours truly,

FLORENCE BEUTHER.

PONTIAC, MICH.,
July 27, 1966.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: As a resident of the state of Michigan I felt it to be imperative that I write to you at this crucial time to express my sentiments relative to the 1966 Civil Rights Bill (H.R. 14765) now pending in the House. I feel that this is a Bill that must, if it is to have any genuine significance, be passed in the strongest form possible. I trust you will and I urge you to vote for strengthening this Bill wherever possible.

Many sections of our Country presently find themselves caught in the midst of racial disharmony and violence; many of the people caught up in these situations are persons who can feel only despair, futility and hopelessness with their present environment and circumstances. While I, as do all other truly concerned Americans, deplore violence of this nature I also deplore the conditions under which the majority of minority group people are forced to live and ask if it's all surprising that incidents of this kind take place.

We as do all other human beings need to be able to feel a sense of hope for the future; we do not ask that we be given more than other citizens but, only that we be given the same advantages and opportunities in employment, education, housing and the other integral aspects of life that enable one to share in this Country's affluence.

Too, I specifically ask that you press for strengthening and passage of Title IV of this Bill as all the evidence points to dispersion of the Negro populace from the ghettos of our Country as a measure with many and varied positive possibilities. It is no exaggeration to state that this type of isolation is largely responsible for mutual distrust, misunderstanding, and overt violence, in some instances between racial, religious and ethnic groups and the prospect of creating heterogeneous neighborhoods will do a great deal to dispel some of our society's misconceptions.

Our society now demands of the Negro that he stop airing his grievances in the streets in the form of violence and social disorder but, you as our duly elected legislator now have some of the vehicles to prove to minority group persons that they can have faith in our government and do not have to resort to these measures.

So, in conclusion I ask that you make every attempt in your power to pass the best Bill possible.

Very truly yours,

ELVIN J. RYAN.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending order of business is the independent offices appropriation bill for 1967, H.R. 14921. As reported, the bill totals $14,107,580,000 in direct appropriations, which is $2,278,663,300 under the appropriations for 1966, $193,090,291 under the estimates for 1967, and an increase of $118,081,000 over the House bill.

Included in this bill are the appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which in previous years were provided for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Incidentally, the large amount by which this bill is below last year, over $2 billion, is directly related to the large appropriations made last year for urban renewal and urban transportation programs, which included funding for 1967.

The largest amount included in the bill for one agency is $5,958 million to the Veterans' Administration, of which $4,374 million is for compensation and pensions and $1,265 million is for medical care. The first item for the VA is for fixed charges.

The next largest amount is for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $4,991 million.

After those two, come the Federal Aviation Agency, with $906 million; the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with $642 million; the General Services Administration, with $571 million; and the National Science Foundation, with just under $500 million.

For the net figure of $193 million under the estimates for 1967, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is reduced $68 million, General Services Administration is reduced $37 million, Civil Defense is reduced $32 million, National Science Foundation is reduced $25 million, and NASA is reduced $20 million.

Of the $118 million over the House bill, GSA's public buildings is $44 million, NASA is $41 million, National Science for the Mohole project is $19 million, HUD is $5 million and Federal Aviation Agency is $4 million. These are the House figures.

In one instance the committee recommendation is over the budget estimate, to provide site and expense funding for a needed public building, by $2,438,000. This is the only place where the committee went over the budget estimate. The estimate for this lump sum was over $6 million below last year.

That is the substance of the bill.

Before I finish these general remarks, Mr. President, I wish to say for the record that this is the 12th year that I have handled the independent offices bill as chairman of the subcommittee. It is the 8th year that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has been the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, and the 18th year that Earl Cooper has been the clerk on the bill.

Over these 12 years, the subcommittee has endeavored to provide funds needed by the various agencies, such as for work backlogs, but in many instances we have curtailed new obligation authority when it was not fully justified. In the earlier years, there were needs that had to go over from budget estimates, such as payments to the civil service retirement fund, funds for public buildings, and some relatively small amounts for the veterans' medical service and hospital construction.

But I wish to point out that over these 12 years, and over the 8 years that the Senator from Colorado and I have had almost direct charge of the bill in the hearings and in conferences, the net reductions below the budget requests have amounted to more than $4 billion. This is a matter that is sometimes lost sight of. We in the Appropriations Committee, on this particularly complex bill, have a difficult job because it involves many of the independent agencies of the Government that must operate to carry out their functions as authorized by Congress.

But we have been as prudent as we think we should be in requiring these people to justify their amounts. We have kept employment in the agencies, in many cases, under their levels of 3, 4, and 5 years ago, and in most other cases on a plateau, so that new Government employment in these fields, with the exception of the Space Agency, which is the big item, has not risen at all; and I think I am justified in suggesting that we have taken action that has kept Government employment down, and still have been able to have these agencies function efficiently.

I repeat that in the 12 years, and particularly in the last 8 years that the distinguished Senator from Colorado and I have worked on the bill, we have cut the appropriations below the budget a total of more than $4 billion. That has required a great deal of work and a great deal of scrutiny, not only of what the agencies have asked for, but of what the budget—which itself has been somewhat austere in many cases—has recommended. We think we have done the kind of job the American taxpayers would want us to do, particularly in the way of Government employment and the reduction of the budget estimates by more than $4 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I notice that this bill, today, is under the estimates for 1967 by $193,090,291.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And under the appropriations for 1966 by $2,278,663,300. That would seem to be a remarkable achievement. But in examining the bill, it appears that all the agencies will still have more money than they had last year. I am just wondering how that came about. Where is the reduction?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of the agencies have a slight amount more. In most cases, I think I can say for the RECORD, the increase has been for pay raises that have been passed by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am wondering where the $2 billion savings, as compared with last year, are effected, when all the agencies, as I gather, will have more money next year than they had last year. Yet a claim is being made that the bill will save $2 billion. Is that to be covered by a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bulk of the $2 billion under last year was the saving that resulted from, first, the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the elimination of urban grants and urban renewal projects which were funded in the 1966 bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield. Will the Senator from Delaware speak a little louder?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then in reality the $2,278 million below last year's appropriation does not represent a reduction in the cost of government; it merely means a difference in the method of financing?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. It means a direct reduction in appropriations, a great part of it in the housing and urban development field, and grants in that field. It further results from reductions in the space agency and in the Office of Emergency Management from last year, and reductions of many smaller items which I will point out later in the bill, as we discuss them item by item.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, I note that $2.090 billion represents not a reduction, but the elimination of the consideration in this bill of urban renewal and urban mass transportation items. We have not stopped those programs, but the bill as reported eliminates them from the computations. I think I understand what has been done: They are financed either through a supplemental appropriation or from the proceeds of the sale of FNMA, participation certificates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot answer the Senator from Delaware about supplementals. The Senator from Colorado and I have dealt with the bill as it came to us. Our job was to look at what the budget recommended, and we have combed it with some diligence and a great deal of fiscal prudence, I should say. Other than where we had to raise the appropriations for the approximately 17 or 18 independent agencies because we have passed pay raise bills for them, we have held the line. We have tried and in most instances have been successful in not permitting any added employment to many of those agencies, with the exception of the space agency, but this year that is down. In the case of the Federal Aviation Administration—which has become responsible, as it has grown, for air safety, towers, navigation, among other things—even there, we have cut more than 700 people from that agency.

I cannot be responsible for what comes up in the supplemental appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am talking about this bill, not about the space agency. I am merely trying to get it clear just how the committee arrived at these figures.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill provides exactly what I just stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am trying to find out where the committee has saved the $2½ billion, when, at the same time, the agencies affected under this bill will all have more money. That is just not possible if I understand anything at all about mathematics.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think I can answer the questions that the Senator from Delaware has asked.

Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, for the excellent leadership he has provided to the members of the subcommittee in considering this difficult and unwieldy appropriations bill. We commenced hearings on this bill on May 9, 1966, and completed them on June 14, and I assure the Members of the Senate that we went into fine detail on the budget requests of the various agencies which came before the committee.

The distinguished chairman of the committee has already commented about Mr. Cooper of the staff, and I want to express my appreciation to him. However, I also want to include in that appreciation a minority member of the staff, Mr. Robert Clark, who has worked with us for 5 years on the bill, and whose contributions have been very great.

I will make only one or two comments on the contents of this bill because I know there will be discussion of many of the individual items this afternoon. In considering the total amount of the bill, which is $14,107,580,000, we should not be misled into believing that we have seriously cut below last year's bill, which was $16,386,243,300, and thereby saved some of the taxpayers' dollars. While there is about a $2.3 billion difference, we must consider that in the fiscal year 1966 appropriations bill we voted $725 million for grants for urban renewal programs for the following fiscal year, which is fiscal year 1967, and we voted $130 million in advance for fiscal year 1967 for urban mass transportation grants. Adjusting the total figures in this bill we are now considering for fiscal year 1967 by adding in these fiscal year 1967 items voted in last year's bill, the figure becomes for this year $14,962,580,000, and last year's bill is decreased to $15,558,120,300, so that this year's bill is only $595,540,300 less than last year's bill.

Mr. President, at this point I underscore what the chairman said. I think his figures are accurate, and I would like to say that in 1 year, 3 years ago, we were successful in cutting one bill $1.4 billion below the budget request. However, in the meantime Congress has added innumerable programs which the President and the Bureau of the Budget have asked us to supply money for.

Mr. President, this bill contains the House amount for the rent supplement program. The administration requested the authorized amount of $35 million for contract authorization, $3 million for direct appropriation, and $1,030,000 for administrative expenses. The House cut this to $20 million for contract authorization and apportioned the other appropriations to $2 million and $900,000, respectively. When the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development came before the committee, there was no request made for restoration of funds. I do not believe this was because the Secretary or the administration were satisfied that $20 million would fit into their plans as well as $35 million. There also was no administration request for deletion of the House amendment which restricts the use of these funds to projects which are either part of a workable program for community improvement under the Housing Act of 1949, or which receive local official approval. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the administration had previously fought very hard on the fiscal year 1966 rent supplement bill against this restrictive House amendment, but again, no request was made to delete this language from this bill. I assume, Mr. President, that this timidity on the part of the Secretary and administration reflects their attitude that they are lucky to get any funds for rent supplementals in this bill at all.

As Senators will note, I have filed a minority report of my individual views on Project Mohole in the committee report, which is on their desk. This begins at page 24 and I would like to highlight some of the observations therein.

Let me make clear at the outset that I have not and do not oppose the scientific objective of Project Mohole. What I oppose basically is mismanagement which in this case has cost many millions of dollars and several years of time. I will go into that in more detail later. According to the testimony of the experts, there is no firm evidence to show that we are in any sort of race with Russia in this area, but if we were we certainly have gone about it in the wrong way.

Project Mohole commenced in 1959 with phase I, which demonstrated conclusively that it is feasible to drill in the bottom of the ocean from a free-floating vehicle. Phase I was successful in all respects, at a cost of about $1.5 million.

Estimates at that time for the total cost of drilling to the earth's mantle—and this is the project that is ordinarily called Mohole—varied anywhere from $5 million to $20 million. The testimony at our Senate hearings this year put the cost at $127.1 million—at least 6 times the originally estimated cost.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to hazard the opinion here that before we ever pierce the earth's mantle, if we do, the cost of this project will push

$175 million, which is pretty expensive for a scientific study.

Phase II commenced in early 1962, and the estimate of total cost at that time was $35 million. The cost now is 3½ times what was estimated then. But, in addition, time has slipped away from us, without any return to show for our investment since phase II commenced. Originally, is was forecast that we would reach the Moho in 1967; today it is obvious that at best we will achieve the end in 1971 to 1972.

It is my conviction, Mr. President, that the principal cause for this unhappy state of affairs is the decision by NSF and its prime contractors to skip the logical next step of an endeavor of this sort, the pilot plant stage. The scientific advisers, the group which carried out phase I, and a special outside consultant group from the National Science Board, all agreed that the proper next step was an intermediate stage vessel to be used for testing equipment and gaining experience in deepwater drilling. The special committee appointed by the President from the National Science Board was under the chairmanship of Dr. Piore, and arrived at the same conclusion.

The decision was made, however, to immediately commence work on a drilling platform designed to drill to the Moho, bypassing the intermediate stage. The result is that we have no definitive data on design criteria and I suspect that the platform and equipment may be overdesigned for the job, and thus more costly than need be. For example, if an intermediate stage vessel had been built and was at work drilling while the final vehicle was under design, samples of all three crustal layers could well have been taken, and from these samples we could better define their densities and acoustic velocities, thus gaining a better idea of the true depth to the Moho and the difficulty of drilling the material which must be penetrated.

I think the most frustrating point of the action taken by the committee—by a divided vote, I might remark—is that we are continuing on the wasteful course the project took 2 years ago, when we have a chance to correct the situation and save millions of dollars.

There is now underway a national ocean sediment coring program, funded by NSF, which could take the place of the intermediate vessel once bypassed. Senators will find on page 26 of the committee report a listing of the scientific objectives of the program. It can be seen that the objectives are the same as those of Project Mohole, except that this program is not to drill as deep. At a cost of $2.7 million per year we can carry on this program, test equipment designed for Project Mohole, and get the data I have mentioned, to more rationally design the ultimate drilling vehicle and equipment. If we proceed with Project Mohole, the annual operating cost of the Mohole platform is estimated at $13 million, or five times the cost of the coring program each year.

As matters now stand, the Senate is voting to expend another $90 million on Project Mohole, when logically we should stop it until results are known from the sediment coring program. If the project were stopped today, the Science Foundation estimates the total cost would be $36.6 million. This is primarily for design work so far, and could not be considered a loss. However, the funds to be spent from here out are primarily for hardware, and this will be a loss if the equipment is either overdesigned, and thus more costly than need be, or underdesigned and will not do the job.

Of course, we should be aware that in discussing total cost of $127.1 million, there is no assurance that we will be successful in drilling the hole to the mantle on the first try, which is the state of affairs on which that cost figure is postulated. If the first attempt is not successful, I presume that they will keep trying, at $13 million per year, for another 3, 4, 5, or 6 years.

Because another, more rational, and less costly alternative is available, Mr. President, I have opposed inclusion of the $19.7 million for Project Mohole. As I say, we are committing ourselves to an expenditure of another $90 million at least, and I do not believe it can be justified, particularly this year, when we are all concerned about keeping the budget within bounds in view of our inflationary economy and the cost of Vietnam.

Mr. President, I will just comment briefly now on one final item in this bill, and that is the participation sales authorization which is explained in the committee report on page 22 under the Federal National Mortgage Association item. I just want to point out here that the effect of the language in the bill, which is an amendment by the Senate, is to remove a little over $3.2 billion from the public debt account. Now, I do not mean that the public debt of the United States, which is a debt owed by our Government and, therefore, by our people, will be reduced by $3.2 billion. Even the present administration cannot just get rid of our debts with a piece of paper. What these amendments accomplish, Mr. President, is to make it seem that the public debt of the United States has been reduced by $3.2 billion, because never more will these mortgage obligations of the Government be carried in our accounts as a part of the public debt. This, of course, is the essence of backdoor spending.

Also, we do not know under the language in the bill how much the sales of these Government obligations will cost us. An indefinite appropriation is written into the bill. There is no limitation. We will just be called upon to automatically appropriate such funds as are necessary for the Government to underwrite interest payments which will exceed 5 percent on commercial paper on which the Government is receiving only 3 percent.

With respect to this matter, Mr. President, I believe that the basic issue was brought out on the Senate floor a long time ago. I did not approve of the participation sales program, but it is part of the responsibility of this committee to make the authorization for the sales of the participation certificates which are in this particular bill.

I point out that in the report will be found language in which we requested a report from the FNMA, asking it to submit to us, on a quarterly basis, all disbursements made under the indefinite appropriation authorized in the bill, which will assist us greatly—I mean the committee and the Senate and the public—in keeping track of this item and knowing just exactly what its cost to the Federal Government is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for clarifying these figures. He has answered substantially the questions which I had asked earlier. In reality, this is not a $2¼ billion reduction in the expenditures of these agencies for the next year. The alleged $2¼ billion reduction is in reality a bookkeeping matter.

It is not really a savings nor does it represent a reduction in appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have to preserve the integrity of the committee and the chairman and the ranking minority member. It was not this committee which put the 1967 appropriations in the bill last year. It was the Senate, and it was the House of Representatives. Under the law, we had no choice about putting it in last year. We appropriated for 1967 last year. It is not in this bill. The chairman made it clear that it was not in the bill. I tried to make it clear, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not mean to suggest that the chairman of the committee or the committee itself was trying to confuse anyone. I was merely trying to straighten it out in my own mind and to make sure others understand it as well. I thank the Senator for clarifying that point.

In connection with the FNMA sales, as the Senator has pointed out, the record thus far indicates that the sale of these participation certificates and financing these agencies in this manner has cost the Government about six-tenths of 1 percent more in interest than if it had financed on the same day, in the normal manner.

I notice that in this bill is authorization for about $3.25 billion more sales. In order to carry out that program, the cost of operating the Government would be increased unnecessarily by this $20 million annual interest for the next 20 years. This practice was adopted for one purpose only; namely, to confuse the American people as to the true cost of these Great Society programs.

As the Senator has pointed out, when the $3.75 billion in mortgages are sold, the money is placed into the general fund of these agencies, used to defray the regular operating expenses and to defray the cost of programs for which money otherwise would have to be appropriated. These billions do not show up in the appropriation bills as a total, and they do not show up in the debt of the Government, although there is a Government guarantee to pay these obligations.

At the time this legislation was passed, I pointed out that the administration had made an eloquent plea for the enactment of truth in lending and truth in packaging, and I said I hope that at some time the administration will get around to giving the taxpayers some truth in Government. The American taxpayers are entitled to better treatment than being deceived, as they are being deceived, by the Johnson administration.

In this bill there is authority to sell assets in the amount of $3,230 million, which when sold will be used to pay normal operating expenses of the respective agencies.

Congress now has no choice except to go ahead and give its approval; that issue was settled before. Nevertheless, this $3.25 billion will result in what will appear to be a reduction in expenditures, when in reality it represents an increase. This procedure is merely a gimmick whereby these agencies can increase their spending to ever-higher levels year after year, while at the same time reporting to the taxpayers that they are reducing costs. If they continue to save money in that manner, they are going to save this country into bankruptcy.

I repudiate such a deceitful method of reporting expenditures to the taxpayers.

If the officials of a private corporation attempted such deceitful reporting they would be put in the penitentiary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am in accord with his concept about participation certificates and the sale of them. The first sales went at a 5.70 to 5.75 interest rate, which amounts to quite a deficit. But I would point out that while it is our duty to appropriate for these matters—and this is an obligation which has been put upon us by statute; by Congress, I might say, and not by the will of the chairman or the Senator from Colorado—we have done two things now that will bring this matter somewhat into focus.

First, there will be found in the bill the amount of sales which are authorized, which at least pins down that much. Then, there will be found in the report this language, which appears on page 22:

> The committee further recommends inserting in the bill new language creating an indefinite appropriation for the payment of participation sales insufficiencies, where payments to the holders of participation certificates exceed the payments received on the loans involved, as also requested in Senate Document No. 92.

Then, there is this pertinent language:

> The committee directs the Federal National Mortgages Association as trustee to report quarterly to the Committees of Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on all disbursements made under the indefinite appropriation authorized in the bill.

So, at least we will have access directly to the actual cost of this program reported quarterly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The committee should be congratulated on the precautions taken. It has tried and is trying to police a law which never should have been enacted. This is a constructive step to give us at least the information as to how much it is costing the American taxpayer by this unorthodox method of financing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I did not anticipate that I would be speaking this long. I shall conclude my remarks by saying one further thing.

First, I wish to underscore basically the statements of the chairman of the committee. I do not know of any bill in the Congress that is as long or tedious as this bill. We have gone through it and the committee has gone through it item by item. We have done everything we could to eliminate the expansion of Government employment. In some areas, such as FAA, they are down by about 700 employees from last year. There are some slight increases in other agencies. For example, there is an increase in the Civil Service Commission. There are many, but the demands for investigation by the Civil Service Commission which it receives from all over the country, warrant an increase.

I deplore the fact that we have to increase employment, but I would deplore it just as much if we were going to employ people under the civil service system in this country and abroad without having an adequate check on them.

As we go through the bill and as questions are asked, we can demonstrate and I hope explain to Senators that such increases as there are in the bill, and they are very small, have been justified by the fact that Congress has imposed in the last 2 years endless programs on these agencies with which they have to cope.

I close my remarks by paying my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee, and at this time I wish to thank him for his cooperation and help in bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, over the past 12 years we have reduced our independent offices bill by approximately $4 billion.

In the major cases where we had to raise the amount it was because Congress passed laws raising salaries, or something of that nature, and it is a fixed charge.

Then, I wish to point out that the Veterans' Administration, which is the big item in the bill, other than space, has been constantly growing, and that is by a directive of Congress over many years in bills affecting veterans.

We have found that the bulk of the veterans from World War II have reached the age where they require more attention in the hospitals, and that medical bill is now $1.2 billion plus. I have watched it over a period of time. We hope that it has reached a plateau now, not only for their sake, but for the sake of the money involved.

I wish to point out that medical research in the Veterans' Administration has been a small item when compared with the total appropriation, but it has paid off. I wish to reiterate this point. In the 181 veterans hospitals today every other bed is a mental case. We have watched that over the years. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I have watched it and we have not seen it go down. Every other bed is what they call a neuro case, or M.P. case; that is, a mental case. This is a startling thing. They have been able to do a great deal in connection with tuberculosis, for instance, where we have practically closed all wards; and in the field of cancer, heart, and outpatient care for some veterans who have reached an age where they need it. But this is somewhat startling and we hope to be able to do all we can for our veterans. This is one of the big items in the bill.

The other fixed charge is $4 billion for disabled veterans pensions, and others. Strangely, we found that the GI insurance program has been paying for itself. Those of us who took out GI insurance in World War II have been getting dividends each year sufficient to pay the premium. But it has helped the veterans and it worked very satisfactorily.

These are items in the bill that we have had to cope with, and we have not too large a margin to bring about economies.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I are great devotees of Parkinson's law. We believe that when there is hired an extra employee that that adds not only to the cost of his salary, but it adds to the cost of the taxpayer for much of the aid that he gets and assistance. That is why we try to question the agencies.

But the country is growing and naturally in order for the dependent agencies to carry out their responsibilities they must grow with the country.

No one would suggest that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have much more work than it had 5, 10, or 15 years ago. As the population expands, the economy expands. We have tried to do what we believe was a prudent job and I am pleased, looking at the results over the years, with those instances where we have been able to make cuts in the budget. We have been austere on many occasions.

I think that this is a contribution to economy, considering the kind of bill we have. It is a difficult thing. We handle 28 agencies in this bill, plus the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Therefore, it gets a little complex. We have to shift "mental gears" about every half hour during hearings and get onto another subject altogether. So that we feel we have presented the Senate with a bill which will not only keep the agencies of Government doing their jobs, but that it has also been prudent business.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for one statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I want to underscore this: In the figures I gave in my original statement, even adjusting for the 1967 appropriation which was made last year——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which was a 2-year program.

Mr. ALLOTT. Which was a 2-year program, but even making adjustments for that, we are still $600 million under last year's bill—approximately $595.5 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. On the one side, we are about ready to report the bill, and the Senate is in session and the roll is about to be called, and we will come up with a program that we have to act upon. At the same time, that we are ready to report a bill, I have always thought we should divide Congress in a sensible way, having a legislative session and then a fiscal session, so that the right hand would know what the left hand was doing occasionally.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree with everything the Senator from Washington has said. The fact is, I think it would be a salutary experience on the part of all Senators if more of the public would come to some of the hearings which are held by the various subcommittees. In many instances, we find—as the Senator brought out—that many times the public interest is forsaken and neglected because we do not have the proper personnel to follow through. For example, I speak of the Federal Power Commission——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Where there is so much to be done to protect the public interest on rates. Also the Federal Communications Commission, where we have to protect the public interest in the matter of telephone rates, and so forth. Many times we find that agencies have not kept pace with the growth of the country.

In many instances, the agencies are understaffed and therefore not able to do the things that should be done in order to protect the public interest.

I repeat, it would be a wonderful, wonderful experience on the part of all Members of the Senate if they could come to some of these hearings. Sometimes, there they are, the chairman all alone except for one or two Senators—usually the ranking minority member—and hour after hour, they are particularly meticulous in going through every item, line by line, in order to reach what is felt to be a proper answer, but, in many instances, a compromise.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many times we hear from the agencies and it is difficult to go through all of these items. The staff does an excellent job with the number of personnel we have on both sides.

But, this is the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H.R. 14921 be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propose a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. 1, if the Senator from Colorado should propose an amendment to strike the Mohole funds from the bill, would such an amendment be in order, provided unanimous consent was granted?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes; it would.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the event the Senator from Colorado offered such an amendment and it was defeated, would it still be in order to reduce the total amount in the National Science Foundation appropriation by the $19.7 million which the Mohole funds represent, without designating any particular reduction?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** It would be in order to propose an amendment to reduce the appropriation.

Mr. ALLOTT. By any amount the Senator from Colorado should desire?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,600,000", and, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$325,000" and insert "$450,000".

On page 3, line 13, after the word "activities", to strike out "$4,450,000" and insert "$3,500,000".

On page 4, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$11,600,000" and insert "$12,100,00".

On page 5, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "$21,400,000" and insert "$23,400,000".

On page 8, line 16, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$558,000,000" and insert "$560,000,000".

On page 10, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$27,500,000" and insert "$30,000,000".

On page 12, line 23, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$13,650,000" and insert "$14,000,000".

On page 14, line 4, after the word "moving", to strike out "$239,000,000" and insert "$240,000,000".

On page 15, line 14, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$101,565,000" and insert "$133,150,000".

On page 16, after line 14, to insert:

"United States Secret Service Training Center, Beltsville, Maryland, $1,232,000";

On page 18, after line 10, to insert:

"Federal Bureau of Investigation building (substructure), District of Columbia, $11,320,000";

On page 18, after line 12, to insert:

"Labor Department building (substructure), District of Columbia, $12,433,000";

On page 18, after line 14, to insert:

"United States Tax Court building, District of Columbia, $6,600,000";

On page 19, line 1, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$11,694,000" and insert "$15,224,000".

On page 19, after line 7, to insert:

"ADDITIONAL COURT FACILITIES

"For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space, facilities and courtrooms for the judiciary, including alteration and extension of Government-owned buildings and acquisition of additions to sites of such buildings; rents; furnishings and equipment; repair and alteration of rented space; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment and transfer of space; preliminary planning; preparation of drawings and specifications by contract or otherwise; and administrative expenses; $8,759,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 22, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,886,000", and, in the same line, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$18,800,000" and insert "$19,847,000".

On page 24, line 7, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$600,000".

On page 29, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$4,245,000,000" and insert "$4,246,600,000".

On page 29, line 10. after the word "law", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$95,000,000".

On page 29, line 23, after the word "property", to strike out "$630,000,000" and insert "$650,000,000".

On page 31, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$479,999,000," and insert "$499,699,000,".

On page 41, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$33,500,000".

On page 42, after line 6, to insert:

"NATURAL DISASTER STUDY

"For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to conduct studies with respect to methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of natural disasters, as authorized by law (79 Stat. 1301), $300,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 42, line 16, after "(42 U.S.C. 1435)," to strike out "$2,575,000" and insert "$1,575,000".

On page 43, line 5, after "(42 U.S.C. 1452a; 40 U.S.C. 461)," to strike out "$14,800,000" and insert "$15,373,000" and at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "*Provided,* That the limitation on funds for rehabilitation grants contained in the second proviso under the head "Urban renewal administration", in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, is increased by $9,000,000 for the current fiscal year" and insert "*Provided,* That the second proviso under the head "Urban renewal administration", in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1136), shall not be effective during the current fiscal year."

On page 44, line 10, after "$55,000,000," to insert a comma and "to remain available until expended", and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$850,000".

At the top of page 47, to insert:

"FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"Participation sales authorizations

"The Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, is hereby authorized to issue beneficial interests or participations in such obligations as may be placed in trust with such Association in accordance with section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended by Public Law 89–429, for the accounts of the following departments and agencies, in not to exceed the following aggregate principal amounts:

"The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, $600,000,000;

"The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $100,000,000;

"The Department of Housing and Urban Development, $1,420,000,000;

"The Veterans Administration, $260,000,000; and

"The Small Business Administration, $850,000,000:

Provided, That the foregoing authorizations shall remain available until June 30, 1968."

At the top of page 48, to insert:

"PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

"To enable any department or agency named in paragraph (2) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Charter Act, as added by Public Law 89–429, to pay the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee, such insufficiencies as may be required by the trustee on account of such outstanding beneficial interests or participations as may be authorized by this Act to be issued pursuant to said section 302(c), such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation."

On page 48, line 15, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a);" to insert "purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131)"; and in line 20, after the word "only;" to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$8,359,000".

At the top of page 49, to insert:

"OFFICE BUILDING EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHINGS

"For equipment, furnishings, and fixtures, not otherwise provided for, in connection with initial occupancy of a headquarters office building for the Department in the District of Columbia, to remain available until expended, $700,000 of which $25,000 shall be transferred from the appropriation for 'Public housing programs, Administrative expenses' and $100,000 shall be transferred from funds available for nonadministrative expenses under the 'Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration'."

On page 56, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call attention to a printing error in the bill which should be corrected at the next printing in order to avoid confusion.

On page 5, line 21, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," the amount for allowance is stated as $24.4 million. This should be corrected to $21.4 million. Of course, the Senate recommendation of $23.4 million is correctly printed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make that technical correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have talked a great deal about how complicated this bill is. It is a wonder to me that we do not overlook more than we do. One or two items have been overlooked. This one is small.

In this connection, I propose an amendment, that on page 13, line 16, after the word "office", to insert the following: "including not to exceed $2,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with special studies of governmental financial practices and procedures and."

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk. I want to point out that the amendment was requested by Comptroller General Staats when he assumed his new duties. The amendment was favorably discussed in the hearing. However, it was overlooked at the time we started to collect the scores of amendments to the bill.

The purpose of the amendment is to allow the Comptroller General to confer with panels of consultants on the difficult auditing and accounting problems that they run into. Similar authority and similar small amounts have been made available to other Government agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 13, line 16, after the word "Office", to insert "including not to exceed $2,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with special studies of governmental financial practices and procedures and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now, Mr. President, I hope that we will follow the usual procedure on bills of this kind. I do not expect to go through it item by item because that would take too much time of the Senate, particularly when there are many items not in controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment at any stage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I would therefore suggest that Senators who have amendments to propose direct themselves to that portion of the bill which they wish to amend.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPALACHIAN ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF ACCOMPLISHES EXCELLENT RECORD—ADEQUATE FUNDS NEEDED TO CARRY PROGRAMS FORWARD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment for myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amend that portion of the Independent Officers Appropriation Act, 1967, dealing with salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission to read as follows:

"For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,100,000."

On page 4, line 12, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,100,000".

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the able chairman [Mr. MAGNUSON] who is handling this legislation calling for appropriations for many agencies of the Government and one department, as has been indicated. I also compliment the ranking minority member [Mr. ALLOTT] on the subcommittee. I have been informed by their explanations of the measure.

Attention is invited to what I believe to be the necessary addition of funds for the Federal cochairman and his alternate and the staff of the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The House version would provide $1 million. The bill as reported by our Appropriations Committee recommends the same amount. This is $110,000 less than the budget request and therefore constitutes a reduction of approximately 10 percent. I believe a decrease of this magnitude is too drastic.

My amendment would add $100,000 to the $1 million recommended. This would be $28,000 less than the administrative budget appropriated to the Appalachian Commission for fiscal 1966—the first full year of operation of the Commission—when the total amount appropriated was $1,128,000. In essence, therefore, cutting the Appalachian Commission back to $1 million, as proposed for fiscal 1967, while imposing a 10-percent cut below budget requests, actually would be making a reduction of more than 12 percent below the fiscal 1966 level. It must be remembered, too, that the recently enacted salary increases may have to be absorbed in the reduced budget.

Mr. President, I urge the acceptance of the amendment because I fear that the work of the Appalachian Commission will be retarded in this second of its authorized 5-year program if its administrative budget is reduced as sharply as is proposed. I repeat, this is only a 5-year program, and this 1967 fiscal year is the important second year during which administrative effort must be both adequate and effective.

Mr. President, the cutback to $1 million as proposed is based on some unfortunate misconceptions—especially the belief in some quarters that too much is included in the administrative budget of the Commission for highway activity. The fact is that the contrary is true. A minimal staff effort has been required for the highway program for Appalachia. The Bureau of Public Roads has provided a substantial amount of technical advice and counsel and the Appalachian Commission has retained a professional consultant as its adviser on the developmental and access roads network for the region. The bulk of the work is being accomplished by the highway departments of 11 States of the region—New York being the 12th State but not included in the highway program—and by the Bureau of Public Roads. A budget of $1 million, or even $1.2 million, would be grossly inadequate if the bulk of the highway activities were not administered as part of the regular functions of the highway departments of the States and of the Bureau of Public Roads.

The Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Region Commission, Mr. Sweeney, has a staff of nine people who are responsible for developing all of the programs authorized by the Appalachian Act with the various Federal departments and agencies through which they are implemented. The staff of the Commission, as a whole—which numbers 55—is equally responsible to the member States and to the Federal Cochairman and is engaged not only in reviewing project proposals from the States, but also in their formulation.

The Commission staff, however, is directly responsible to the Commission, and the 12 State members thereof, for the planning of programs and projects under this act. The staff provides assistance to each of the Appalachian States in developing State investment plans, defining local development district areas, and planning local development district programs. A considerable staff effort has been required in the production of plans and guidelines for regional health centers authorized by section 202 of the Appalachian Act, timber development organizations under section 204, access road projects under section 201 and supplemental grant projects under section 214. Also, the staff has worked closely with the Corps of Engineers in carrying out the water resource survey authorized by section 206.

A brief review of the projects developed and approved by the Commission is indicative of the variety of staff missions which have been performed. The Commission, on the basis of competent staff work, has approved 150 applications for supplemental grants under section 214 of the Appalachian Act and under sewage treatment and vocational education projects under sections 211 and 212.

These projects involve in excess of $20 million in Appalachian Act funds and approximately three times that amount in other Federal, State, and local funds.

In addition to these grant-in-aid projects the Commission staff has worked with various elements of the State and Federal Governments in the development of State land stabilization and conservation plans which include 150 county programs and $6.4 million in Federal funds under section 203 of the Appalachian Act. Also, 24 mine area restoration projects, involving $10,777,000 in Federal funds, have been developed and approved.

In addition to the staff support needed to provide the Commission with an adequate evaluation of all the programs and projects which it is required to judge, the staff has, at the direction of the Commission, undertaken several research programs.

The Appalachian Act contemplates that various programs which it authorizes should be drawn together in a planning process to achieve maximum economic impact in the region. This planning process, both on the State and the Commission levels, goes well beyond the normal process of project submission and review.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include in the RECORD at this point a summary of the staff activities of the Appalachian Regional Commission during the past year.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF STAFF ACTIVITIES, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION, JUNE 1965–66

I. Review of application for Federal grants:

(a) Approved 150 applications for supplemental assistance to grant-in-aid projects totaling $20 million in Federal dollars.

(b) Developed state land stabilization and conservation plans including 150 county plans totaling $6,379,000.

(c) Reviewed applications for funds for mine area restoration—a new program—24 projects $10,777,320 Federal dollars.

II. Planning:

(a) Assistance to all states in developing state investment plans.

(b) Assistance to all states in defining local development district areas and planning their operation of LDD programs.

(c) Development, plans and guidelines for Regional Health Centers in conjunction with Health Advisory Committee.

(d) Developed with Corps of Engineers criteria and evaluation of projects and Regional Water Resource Study.

(e) To provide an information base that would be useful to the Commission in making its recommendations regarding timber development in the Appalachian Region.

III. Research:

(a) Research to make recommendations for ARC programs to develop the Region's human resources.

(b) Airport study for Appalachian Region to provide guidelines to evaluate location of air carrier and general aviation airports.

(c) Educational Television Study to provide recommendations to use educational TV to achieve Appalachian objectives.

(d) A resource program to determine key locational characteristics of selected industries growth in Appalachia.

(e) Recreation impact study.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from West Virginia in offering the amendment. The Senator from West Virginia has given the specifics which furnish the basis of our supporting the amendment.

Last year the Appalachian Commission was given $1.128 million for its administrative funds. This year, as the Senator from West Virginia has said, the budget request was $1.10 million. It has been reduced $110,000 to $1 million.

This program is based upon joint responsibility between the States and the Federal Government, and no program can be approved by the Commission until it has the approval of the States.

The Appalachian Regional Development program is new, and it has been operating very successfully. At present, taking both the commission staff and those who work jointly for the States and the Federal Government, there are only about 65 employees working under the Appalachian Commission. If this cut is not restored, it will mean that some of these employees will be separated and the Commission would not be able to carry on its work effectively.

I believe it is fair to say that the Commission has so far done a great amount of work with a relatively small staff.

The Federal Cochairman, Mr. John L. Sweeney, has established, with the States, a strong working relationship and strong programs, and he has provided the leadership which a new program must have if it is to meet the objectives set by the Congress.

The Governors of the Appalachian States, and their representatives, have met regularly with Mr. Sweeney, and they have worked to increase the efforts required of the States by the act.

I would hope that this modest amount, which is under the budget request, could be restored by the Senate, so that the 65 staff members could be maintained and could especially give attention to the newer programs, as well as the program for highway construction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator said nine employees.

Mr. COOPER. I say there are about 65.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are nine persons developing programs for the Federal Cochairman. There are 55 workers on the staff of the Commission, as I pointed out in my statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Commission has operated very effectively. The Senator from West Virginia and I cosponsored the Appalachian bill, and I am glad to join him in offering this amendment. We have followed the work under this act very closely. Every program must be approved by the Governors of the States and the State legislatures, and it is a unique and effective organization.

I hope very much the Senate will approve this restoration, as advocated so clearly by my distinguished colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has fought so long and so strongly for measures to develop our economy and provide industry and employment in our towns and counties.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee did not have any particularly fixed ideas on this matter. The House had held long hearings, and they had arrived at the $1 million figure. We asked for some additional data. It is true, and I think there is great justification, that when you talk about the whole Appalachian program, of the total cost about 77 percent, as I understand, will be in the roadbuilding program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The figure is approximately 82 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A little over 80?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total cost will run about $2 billion, when we get it all through. It would seem to me that if some of the administrative costs—although a great deal of those costs are taken up by the States and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, in this case—I was hopeful that perhaps they would do a little more on their vocational rehabilitation program and some of the other things they have started.

As I say, we have no fixed ideas about it. We went along with the House. In their report, they did not give any particular reason for the $100,000. Since we are talking about more than a $2 billion program, and we have to go to conference anyway with the bill, I am perfectly willing to have a voice vote on the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH for himself and Mr. COOPER.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 728

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 728, as modified, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, the aggregate amount appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by the various appropriation items contained in this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to determine and to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which of such appropriation items shall be reduced, and the amount that each shall be reduced, in order to effectuate the reduction provided for under this section.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, originally I had contemplated asking for a 20-percent reduction in the space program. I have conferred with a number of Senators and others about the matter, and it was generally felt that a 20-percent cut might be too severe—although I believe that the agency could stand a 20-percent cut—and for that reason, I have reduced it to 10 percent.

Mr. President, I wish to stress that the principal purpose of this amendment is to postpone some of the low-priority projects of the space agency, not to cripple the space agency or to kill the space program, or even to delay the Apollo project.

Mr. President, some Senators subscribe to the old economics—that we should keep Federal spending down and balance the budget every year or almost every year, especially in times of prosperity.

Other Senators subscribe to the new economics, which call for a deliberate Federal deficit and a conscious program of expanding Federal spending when the Nation's manpower and facilities are languishing with idle manpower and unused plant capacity.

But, Mr. President, virtually all economists—old and new—and virtually all Senators, in their economic thinking, recognize that this is a time when there is no benefit and plenty of danger in Government spending per se. Senators may strongly favor specific programs. But I think all of us agree with President Johnson that we should keep Federal expenditures to a minimum.

Mr. President, all Federal spending tends to exert an upward pressure on prices. After all, the Federal Government, when it spends money, buys goods—many of which are in short supply—or hires scarce workers, which tends to bid up wage costs and prices as well as pump more money into the economy.

But the spending of the space agency is peculiarly and especially inflationary. NASA does not hire unskilled workers—it hires exactly the kind of top sicentists and skilled workers who are most urgently needed; and it buys the kind of material and equipment that industry's building boom is holding up.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are a sufficient number of Senators on the floor at the moment, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in past years it has been argued that a cut in the space budget would result in serious dislocations among the huge industries that serve NASA. Well, this year such a dislocation—in the form of idled men and capacity—would not be a disaster. On the contrary, they would be most welcome.

In the aerospace industry huge backlogs of orders—some military, some civilian—await just such an idled capacity. Certainly no one can argue that a cut in the NASA budget is going to put anyone out of work.

In fact, such a cut might well mean that some of the Nation's scientific manpower that has been gobbled up at an ever-increasing rate by the space program could be returned to other urgent research areas.

HOW TO SPEND MONEY IN SPACE WITHOUT REALLY TRYING

We are rushing ahead with plans to shoot almost $5 billion into space this year. In spite of our increasing commitment to freedom in South Vietnam. In spite of the crying need for reducing inflationary pressure on the economy by reducing Federal expenditures.

No one looks forward more than I to an era when we can afford the luxury of all-out scientific exploration of space. But in this inflationary period of war and increasing shortages of skilled manpower and material, it makes sense for the Congress to require the space agency to cut its spending to the bone and to be required by Congress to establish priorities. This amendment cutting 10 percent from the space budget and leaving $4½ billion is the one way Congress can require stringent economy and painful but necessary decisions on priorities from NASA.

Certainly, with $4½ billion, this agency will not starve. It may have to postpone some of its lowest priority projects, but with defense, industry, and education crying for the same resources—in this inflationary year, this is exactly what they should do.

Getting the first man on the moon will cost us a total of $22.7 billion at a minimum. I am not proposing that we kill the space program. I am proposing that we move ahead with $4½ billion for space which, after all, is not chickenfeed.

Because this is a year of inflation—because the material and manpower needs directly conflict with our military and industrial needs, a one-half-billion-dollar cut, a 10-percent postponement makes sense.

This is a matter of priority. We cannot have everything. We will not cut the $58 billion the administration is asking for defense. Much of the rest of the budget represents fixed obligations. In fact, this $14.3 billion independent offices appropriation bill represents by far the biggest nondefense appropriation this Congress will consider. I challenge Senators to indicate where else they would cut a significant amount from the budget, if not from this bill and this agency.

Mr. President, all of us are for economy at one time or another. Here is our opportunity to demonstrate that we mean what we say.

Just last Friday, the President of the United States indicated where he would make his first priority cut if prices continued to rise.

And he focused right here on the space budget.

Mr. President, there is no question that this Government has made an absolute commitment to spend billions in space—to reach the moon and the other planets and beyond.

But if we are to have any regard for fiscal and economic responsibility—if we are to postpone—and postpone only in part—any of our spending—to relieve inflationary pressures and keep down spending, it should be right here.

It certainly is not essential to go to the moon simply because it is a "great adventure." To date I have seen no compelling evidence that the NASA program is essential to our military efforts. In fact there is a certain amount of duplication in the NASA budget with the Defense Department's manned orbital laboratory program. Furthermore, the Defense Department itself will spend over the very substantial sum of $1,621 million on space research and development in fiscal 1967 if its budget request is approved. This is almost one-third of the NASA budget and certainly should take care of our concern over adequate development of the military uses of space.

Mr. President, in 1963, during hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] asked Gen. Maxwell Taylor if he felt that the moon project had an indirect bearing on our military security.

This was General Taylor's reply.

> No, sir, I do not think it does.

Senator FULBRIGHT also asked if General Taylor saw any military significance in the program to put a man on the moon.

General Taylor's reply was:

> Personally, I see no present military need

General Taylor replied that he personally saw no present military need.

Dr. Harold Urey, one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, stated that the moonshot program "has no contribution to make to the national defense at all." In fact, he said:

> Very little of the space program outside of the first 500 to 1,000 miles above the earth has any importance to military things at all. It certainly has no importance from the standpoint of trying to deliver missiles from one part of the earth to the other.

Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., NASA Deputy Administrator, was quoted in the Washington Sunday Star earlier this year as saying:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future of being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

Mr. President, it is estimated that it will cost this country $20 billion to put a man on the moon in this decade. Think what this amount could mean to the festering slum areas of our great cities. Twenty billion dollars is more than 20 times the amount approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for taking care of these problems through the Cities Demonstration Act over the next 2 years. Twenty billion dollars is three times our expenditures on urban renewal in the 17 years since the program was first instituted. It is more than 12 times the full amount we will spend on the war on poverty this year.

Let me read an AP article that appeared recently in the Milwaukee Sentinel, on what scientists think of this objective of putting a man on the moon.

The article reads:

> MANNING MOON NONSENSE
>
> TUCSON, ARIZ.—Gerard P. Kuiper, chief scientist for the United States Ranger space shots, says the majority of scientists believe the idea of putting a man on the moon is nonsense.
>
> Kuiper, director of the lunar and planetary laboratory at the University of Arizona, said:
>
> "The decision to put a man on the moon before the Russians was a political decision. If scientists had made the decision there would be no national effort to put a man into space.
>
> "If you want to find out about the moon you do not send a man to the moon. Man is nuisance in space. He is only a noise in an electronic system. No real scientific study can be made by man in space. Only decisions relating to his survival can be made by man in space.
>
> "Let's face it, the moon and planets are no place for civilization. The reality of the solar system is such that man must adapt to this earth and not found colonies on the moon and stars. After all, we are extremely lucky to live on such a nice planet as this."

Mr. President, this is not some man in the street giving an opinion on saving money. This is the chief scientist for the U.S. Ranger space shots.

Dr. Warren Weaver, former president of American Association for Advancement of Science, as quoted in New York Times, November 30, 1965:

> If we are doing this as some ridiculous race against the Russians, I think that is just plain stupid.
>
> I think we are utilizing at the present time altogether too much money. We are utilizing too much of our nation's technical competence.
>
> We could give every teacher in the U.S. a 10 per cent raise a year for 10 years; endow 200 small colleges with 10 million dollars each; finance the education through graduate school of 50,000 scientists, at $4,000 a year; build 10 new medical schools at $200,000 each; build and endow complete universities for more than 50 developing countries; create three new Rockefeller foundations worth $500 million each—for the 30 billion dollars to get an American to the moon by 1970.

I think that $30 billion may be a little higher, but it is a perfectly possible level.

Mr. President, the New York Times in an editorial entitled "Economy in the Wrong Space," published on December 17, 1965, said:

> The indebtedness of the entire space program to research makes all the more ironic the announcement—on the same day the two Geminis met—that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is cutting back on the already sharply limited basic science portion of its program. The Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory project has been canceled, while there is danger that the planned exploration of Mars by unmanned instrument-carrying satellites will be slowed down even further.

Mr. President, the editorial goes on to point out that it is the manned part of the program that is the most expensive, and the unmanned part which is by far the less expensive.

It would cost a fraction of the cost to send unmanned scientific instruments, which will give us this knowledge, that it would cost to send a man into space.

Dr. Philip Abelson, Director of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and editor of Science magazine a few years ago conducted a straw poll of scientists not connected with NASA programs. This was in 1963. He reported that the vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar probe.

Mr. President, I am not seeking by my amendment to force any decision on the Space Administration such as eliminating the space project. It is only a 10-percent cut. If they wished, they would not have to drop the Apollo program. They would not have to drop any one specific program. It is simply a decision of establishing priorities, which they refuse to establish.

Again and again many Senators, including myself, have asked them what they would cut if they were forced to cut 10 or 20 percent. They cannot come up with any priorities. It seems to me that it is time that we should require them to do so.

Mr. President, let us take a look at the progress that our space program has made in matching and exceeding Russian achievements. This is certainly an area in which many people say we must stay ahead of the Russians.

We have spent more than three times the man-hours in space than the Russians have. The last manned Russian vehicle went aloft on March 18, 1965. Since that time, we have launched Geminis III through X, our latest launch being July 18 of this year.

Listen to this impressive U.S. record of firsts:

First manned orbital maneuver.

First docking of two crafts.

First orbiting solar observatory.

First closeup pictures of the lunar surface.

First space pictures of Mars.

The list goes on and on.

I think these are fine achievements, and I support them. However, I think that we should still recognize that when we emphasize, with the terrific force that we do, our manned space flights—and we must recognize that we have left the Russians far behind, certainly in the past year—to argue that we have to spend every dollar of this $5 million, certainly, it seems to me, is going too far. This after all is a space program heavily oriented toward manned space travel, which means the opportunities for economy by emphasizing far less expensive unmanned flight are very great.

Can anyone seriously contend that we have to take a second seat to the Russians, or that this modest 10-percent cut would force us to take a second seat?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tabulations setting forth in detail what I have just described to the Senate be printed in the RECORD. They indicate the number of manned space flights of this country as compared to the number of manned flights by the Russians. They also list the number of major space firsts achieved by the United States and Russia.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 8, 1966.

The first table is number of payloads successfully sent to Earth orbit and to escape (the Moon or planets, or around the Sun); it shows a substantial U.S. lead, but does not indicate that the Soviet Union has consistently held a lead in the total weight of payload sent to orbit each year.

	United States		U.S.S.R.	
	Earth orbit	Escape	Earth orbit	Escape
1957	0	0	2	0
1958	5	0	1	0
1959	9	1	0	3
1960	16	1	3	0
1961	35	0	6	1
1962	54	4	20	1
1963	60	0	17	1
1964	69	4	36	2
1965	94	3	66	7
1966	57	1	29	2
Total	399	14	180	17

The second table gives the number of manned flights, the number of hours of manned flight, and the man-hours of such flight. The 2 listed for the United States in 1961 were suborbital, the rest are orbital. Differences in tables of a very few minutes exist from one source to another even within NASA, but the figures given are substantially correct.

	United States					U.S.S.R.				
	Number	Time				Number	Time			
		Hr.	Min.	Man-hours	Min.		Hr.	Min.	Man-hours	Min.
1961	(2)	0	31	0	31	2	27	06	27	06
1962	3	19	04	19	04	2	165	19	165	19
1963	1	34	20	34	20	2	189	56	189	56
1964	0					1	24	17	72	51
1965	5	650	11	1,300	22	1	26	02	52	04
1966	3	153	51	307	42	0				
Total	12(+2)	857	57	1.661	59	8	432	40	507	16

The data given above for the United Stat es are from NASA and DOD. The Soviet data are from TASS.

Manned space flights

Year	United States	Time	Month and day	U.S.S.R.	Time	Month and day
		Hr. Min.			*Hr. Min.*	
1961	Freedom VII	0 15	May 5	Vostok I	1 48	Apr. 12
	Liberty Bell VII	0 16	July 21	Vostok II	25 18	Aug. 6
1962	Friendship VII	4 55	Feb. 20	Vostok III	94 22	Aug. 11
	Aurora VII	4 56	May 24	Vostok IV	70 57	Aug. 12
	Sigma VII	9 13	Oct. 3			
1963	Faith VII	34 20	May 15	Vostok V	119 06	June 14
				Vostok VI	70 50	June 16
1964				Voskhod I	24 17	Oct. 12
1965	Gemini 3	4 53	Mar. 23	Voskhod II	26 02	Mar. 18
	Gemini 4	97 56	June 3			
	Gemini 5	190 56	Aug. 21			
	Gemini 7	330 35	Dec. 4			
	Gemini 6	25 51	Dec. 15			
1966	Gemini 8	10 43	Mar. 16			
	Gemini 9	72 21	June 3			
	Gemini 10	70 47	July 18			

NOTE.—1st propulsion during docking: Gemini 10, July 18, 1966.

Listing of major space "firsts" achieved by the United States and the U.S.S.R.

	United States			U.S.S.R.		
	Event	Satellite	Launch date	Event	Satellite	Launch date
Science	Discovery of Van Allen radiation belts.	Explorer I and III	Feb. 1, 1958 Mar. 26, 1958	1st orbiting geophysical laboratory	Sputnik III	May 15, 1958
	Discovery that earth is pear shaped	Vanguard I	Mar. 17, 1958	1st photos of the moon's far side	Luna III	Oct. 4, 1959
	1st orbiting solar observatory	OSO I	Mar. 7, 1962	1st comprehensive cosmic ray station	Proton I	July 16, 1965
	1st successful probe of Venus	Mariner II	Aug. 27, 1962	1st pictures from lunar surface	Luna IX	Jan. 31, 1966
	1st geodetic satellite	Anna IB	Oct. 31, 1962			
	1st closeup pictures of the lunar surface.	Ranger VII	July 28, 1964			
	1st coded data over 100,000,000 miles	Mariner IV	Nov. 28, 1964			
	1st space pictures of Mars	do	do			
	1st comprehensive micrometeoroid satellite.	Pegasus I	Feb. 16, 1965			
Applications	1st active communications satellite	Score	Dec. 18, 1958			
	1st TV pictures from space	Explorer VI	Aug. 7, 1959			
	1st weather satellite	Tiros I	Apr. 1, 1960			
	1st navigation satellite	Transit IB	Apr. 13, 1960			
	1st missile detection satellite	Midas II	May 24, 1960			
	1st passive communications satellite	Echo I	Aug. 12, 1960			
	1st nuclear explosion detection satellite.	Vela Hotel	Oct. 17, 1963			
Bioastronautics and manned space flight.	1st manned orbital maneuver	Gemini III	Mar. 23, 1965	1st biosatellite	Sputnik II	Nov. 3, 1957
	1st manned propulsion outside craft	Gemini IV	June 3, 1965	1st orbited animals recovered	Korabl-Sputnik II	Aug. 19, 1960
	1st sustained space rendezvous	Gemini VII and VI	Dec. 4, 1965 Dec. 15, 1965	1st orbited human recovered	Vostok I	Apr. 12, 1961
	1st docking of 2 craft	Agena target Gemini VIII	Mar. 16, 1966	1st approximate rendezvous	Vostok III and IV	Aug. 11, 1962 Aug. 12, 1962
				1st multimanned craft in orbit	Voskhod I	Oct. 12, 1964
				1st man to leave capsule in space	Voskhod II	Mar. 18, 1965
Space flight and propulsion.	1st multiple payloads	Transit IIA and Solrad I.	June 22, 1960	1st satellite	Sputnik I	Oct. 4, 1957
				1st escape payload	Luna I	Jan. 2, 1959
	1st recovered payload	Discoverer XIII	Aug. 10, 1960	1st lunar impact	Luna II	Sept. 12, 1959
	1st air snatch payload recovery	Discoverer XIV	Aug. 18, 1960	1st orbital launch platform	Sputnik V	Feb. 12, 1961
	1st synchronous satellite	Syncom II	July 26, 1963	1st flight by Venus	Venera I	Do.
	1st multiple orbits	Vela Hotel I and II	Oct. 17, 1963	1st flight by Mars	Mars I	Nov. 1, 1962
	1st hydrogen-fueled rocket to orbit	Centaur II	Nov. 27, 1963	1st ion engine test in orbit	Voskhod I	Oct. 12, 1964
	1st suborbital test of an ion engine	SERT IA	July 20, 1964	1st plasma rocket tested in orbit	Zond II	Nov. 30, 1964
				1st Venus impact	Venera III	Nov. 16, 1965
				1st lunar soft landing	Luna IX	Jan. 31, 1966
				1st lunar orbiter	Luna X	Mar. 31, 1966
Auxiliary power systems.	1st solar cells on craft	Vanguard I	Mar. 17, 1958			
	1st craft with isotope power	Transit IVA	June 29, 1961			
	1st craft powered only by nuclear energy.	Transit VBN 1	Sept. 28, 1963			
	1st nuclear reactor in orbit	Snapshot I	Apr. 3, 1965			
	1st space use of fuel cell	Gemini V	Aug. 21, 1965			

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me simply say in summary that this amendment is not an amendment to gut the space program or to stop the space program or to kill the Apollo program.

This would simply require Administrator Webb to do something which, at least in my judgment, he has not done, and that is to make the painful choice of priorities in this year, 1966, when we are suffering from inflationary pressures, to make a choice of priorities which will put him in a position in which he can postpone—not eliminate, but postpone—the lowest priority project and when he can economize on some of the lower priority projects.

It seems to me that this is asking very little.

Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his very able speech.

It so happens that some years ago I had the American Society of Astronomers polled on the question as to whether there was real scientific value in putting a man on the moon. While I do not have the results with me, the vote was overwhelmingly against any scientific value being connected with putting a man on the moon.

I have talked with many military authorities, and I have yet to find one who thinks that there is any military value in putting a man on the moon.

We can probably hit any spot on earth from this country with rockets; certainly with rockets from a given orbit around the earth.

It is not necessary to go 264,000 miles to the moon in order to get any military advantage. The whole business is simply a prestige race with the Russians to see who can get there first. And what is the advantage in getting there first, if there is no purpose in getting there at all? This is a case of keeping up with the Joneses, to the mutual detriment of both nations.

It breaks my heart to think of the $20 billion being spent for this purpose, when we have 35 million people in poverty in this country, 17.5 million of whom are in abject poverty, when we cannot get enough funds to even make a start at reducing poverty, when the first desire of many people, who think of economizing, is to cut the heart out of the war on poverty. It breaks my heart to see us spending at least $20 billion, ultimately, to put a man on the moon. I believe it is the most wasteful proposal that we have indulged in for a great many years, perhaps the most wasteful of all time.

There is a fascination about this matter; the thrill of going out in space, marshals unthinking public opinion behind it; and I suppose in a superficial sense it is popular. But deep down, I cannot believe that the American people think it is worth while.

I am frank to say that I had hoped myself to move to cut a billion dollars out of the space program, and I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin, from his vantage point on the Committee on Appropriations, has had the courage to speak up. I am astonished at his moderation in coming down from a billion-dollar cut to a $500 million cut, but I wish to say that he deserves a tremendous amount of credit.

I believe that we should shake ourselves loose from this enthrallment to the idea that we must compete against the Russians in getting a man on the moon first, when it is not to the advantage either of the United States or of Russia to get a man there at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I ask this of the Senator from Illinois: In a year such as the present, 1966, when we obviously are beginning to suffer some inflationary pressures, if we pour as much money as we are pouring into the space program, which uses the scarcest manpower and uses other facilities which are in very scarce supply—the same kind that are being demanded by industry—is it not true that from an economic standpoint, this has an adverse and unfortunate impact and is an inflationary expenditure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say that trying to put a man on the moon would be ill advised at any time. But it is especially ill advised in a period of rising prices and a shortage of workers. I should think that on any scale of national priority, it is about at the very bottom—at least from my standpoint.

So the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin is not only sound sense, but it also is an effective means of reducing the pressure on the price of metals and upon scientific ability.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. He is not only an extraordinary Senator, but also is the one professional economist in this body.

The Senator from Illinois is past president of the American Economic Association. He is recognized throughout the world as one of the great economists in this Nation and in the world. When he speaks of the impact of the space program on the economy, we must give his opinion great weight.

Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senator to something that I revealed earlier, but I believe it is worth emphasizing. The Senator referred to a poll which he asked to be held by the astronomers. The poll to which I referred was by Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Geophysics Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington, editor of Science magazine; and he conducted a straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA programs. He reported that the vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar probe.

I wish to be very careful, once again, to emphasize that while I share the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, I recognize that my amendment would not end a manned lunar flight or even postpone a manned lunar flight. What it does is recognize that any agency should be subject to fiscal discipline and should be required to establish priorities and to exert stringent economy; and the only way that Congress can do that is to provide this kind of cut.

I might point out that the Senate proposal is well over that of the House, particularly with regard to administration and in some other respects. I believe that this amendment would have a salutary effect on the Space Agency, and would make sense for the taxpayer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have estimated that the cost of putting a man on the moon would total about $20 billion, and that was based on an estimate made by the then Director of the Budget, David Bell, before one of the committees of which I am a member.

In the last few minutes, I have found an article in the New York Times for January 1 of this year, written by Thomas O'Toole, who is a well-known writer on science, in which he puts the cost instead at $40 billion.

When we think of what $40 billion could do for the human race, to spend it merely in getting a man on the moon seems to me to defy all human sense.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his amendment.

I notice that in the last paragraph of the paper which he has very kindly circulated, he indicates that the "amendment would pare the NASA budget and force both stringent economy and a painful but necessary determination of priorities by NASA."

I commend that statement. I believe that beyond this program, we have to establish painful but necessary priorities. Whether we are for the program or against it, we are in an operation in Vietnam which is costing us between $1 and $2 billion a month. Nobody seems to know exactly how much. This will force on us, as Members of Congress, the necessity for making the courageous decisions and establishing priorities.

I think that by this amendment the Senator is approaching the matter in a sound manner. I agree with the Senator. I do not believe this cut will impair putting a man on the moon. This is a program with all the drama, all the glamor, and all the excitement of a new horizon.

I understand that some 40,000 subcontractors are in this area. Certainly, it has gone on because it has been a sacred cow. I believe that this amendment would impose on the agency a needed discipline without slowing it up.

I also am inclined to agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I am not so sure how important this program is.

I am reminded of a remark that was made by a former President of this country, General Eisenhower, shortly after leaving the White House. When discussing these problems, he said:

> Of course, it would be good to put a man on the moon. But let's have the price of a round trip ticket in the bank before we do so.

This is cogent advice today.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin, and I expect to support the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator go back through his notes and pick up with his comment about the attitude of the President toward the space program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe I can recall that.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator can, that is fine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator wish to ask a question about that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Here is what I said, to be precise:

> Just last Friday, the President of the United States indicated where he would make his first priority cut if prices continued to rise, and he focused right here on the space budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator be interested in knowing what the President said?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK assumed the chair.)

Mr. ANDERSON. It is in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents of Monday, August 8, 1966, when he was talking about the maintenance of the program and various things that we are doing:

> The maintenance of this program—like the conduct of so many Federal programs—depends upon the cooperation of major business leaders and union leaders. They must recognize in their price and wage decisions that there is a third party in the board room, in the union hall, and at the bargaining table—the people of the United States.

And then, there are these words:

> If we are to continue our space effort and continue to make the magnificent progress represented by our past achievements, we can do so only if business and labor leaders will make their contribution by responsible pricing and bargaining decisions.

Does that say what the Senator said?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator continue?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the end. I cannot continue. I would be glad to have the Senator look at it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Much would depend on the construction that would be put on it. The articles in the newspapers on the impression given by the President reported that the space program would have to suffer a cutback if prices continue to rise.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; not at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agreed with everything that the Senator and the President said about the space program. It is a fine program. I am proud of it. I would like to see it continue. But in a period of inflation, when we have to cut back somewhere and when we have a military budget of $58 billion and other higher costs that are fixed, this program should undergo some modest cutback.

I think that the President's statement supports my position.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can assure the Senator that he does not. He can talk to the President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How does the Senator interpret it?

Mr. ANDERSON. He wants the space program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He would not cut back the space program?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am going to say what he said. He wants the space program to continue. He was the first chairman of the Space Committee. He was chairman of the Space Council and he has not forgotten his loyalty to the space program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My understanding is that——

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does the Senator quote him as saying that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If labor and management continue to act in the way they have, then, in the judgment of the President we have no alternative but to cut back.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senator said that this function is the first one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The President did not indicate any other large area that should be cut.

Mr. ANDERSON. He did not indicate this one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He indicated that if industry, labor, and management continued in a way which is inflationary, he would have no alternative but to reduce the program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in support of the position of the chairman, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I would bring to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that the President already has cut the request from NASA by over $700 million before it was sent to the Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that and it was my interpretation of the President's remarks that he would cut this program back further if the inflationary situation in regard to labor and management continued.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be brief in connection with this matter because it is one that all Senators clearly understand.

I am not a scientist. I cannot evaluate all of the benefits or the lack of benefits of the Apollo project. But the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the rest of use have listened to testimony for many years on this project. One thing that is always said by those who do know whether the moon exists or does not exist is that if there were no such thing as a moon, we still would be undertaking 80 to 85 percent of this program because of the spinoffs, not only to the basic sciences, but to the military as well.

The military is spending a great deal of time and money trying to achieve whatever potential there may be in space platforms. The Defense Department, or those in the military, said there would be absolutely no value to the Defense Department in what NASA is doing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to finish my statement; then I shall yield.

They said it was not their research project, but they are a part and parcel of it in many respects.

I do not know whether going to the moon is going to be worth while. I am a little like the Senator from Illinois. I am not an economist, but sometime I think perhaps we could do many other things. If I had my way, I would devote this $500 million to oceanography and other areas in which we are far behind.

But the testimony of nearly everyone that we heard in the committee was that we can proceed in the oceanographic field and in space, too.

If we want to eliminate the Apollo project, let us not fool around with meat-ax cuts. Let us have a vote. Perhaps I could be convinced. Perhaps we could stop this project. But this is a little like sending a football team onto the field without having a left guard. If we are to continue with Apollo, we should provide the wherewithal to do the job that we want them to do or that we hope they will do.

It is easy to offer a cut in this program. We pressed the space agency in our committee about this matter. My figures may be off one or two points, but approximately 91 or 92 percent of all money is farmed out to different companies. I think there are 400,000 men and women in other places involved in different contracts. There are 20,000 nongovernment contracts.

We have listened to those people. It may be a very small portion of their business. It might not necessarily be an aerospace company; it may be an electrical company, an electrical research company, or it might be an airplane company. They reveal that there is a great deal of spinoff in what they do to man's environment. The medical spinoff is great. We have much testimony to that effect.

Whether the program is worth the money or not, I would not be a fair judge. But that is the trouble with these cuts in appropriations. People do not get down to the nub of the matter.

If we do not want the Apollo program, cut it out. But if we are going to keep it going, give it the necessary wherewithal to keep it going.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] suggests that for $500 million they would have to cut out the 10 lowest priorities. I do not know where the 10 comes from, but at least the lowest priorities.

We find that there is hardly a thing that the space agency is doing that does not have some interconnection with the whole. The budget this year was rather austere. Then, we had the benefit of the two space agencies of the House and the Senate which met within the last few days, and went over the entire matter with a fine-tooth comb.

As a matter of fact this bill is a little late coming to the floor of the Senate because we waited for all of these distinguished people in the House of Representatives and the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, to go over it with a fine-tooth comb.

I have never been able to disassociate the NASA program with nearly everything they do. It is always a part of the whole. Apollo is part of an interconnected program. I say that we should either give them the wherewithal or cut it out.

I suppose that there is some kind of race going on with Russia.

We have always contended and have always asked Director Webb, or whoever was before us, and all the other witnesses who appeared, that we hoped they were not going at this thing with the urgency of a race. The testimony is replete with the fact that, no, they have a program which they have laid out and will follow it in a regular way. Let me be frank, I think that we will have to meet it when we say, after Apollo, what? We will have to meet it. But they have had a program, and they say they are proceeding with the program consistent with their capabilities to reach a certain objective, no matter what Russia does.

Second, testimony shows that if Russia did not exist, we would still pursue this objective. Of course, sputnik woke us up, there is no question about that. So that this is the position with them.

If the President of the United States would want to suggest that this program should not go ahead, he would not have recommended it in his budget. He knew last January what the budget could stand and what it could not stand, at least in his judgment, right or wrong, and I have heard no indication to the contrary.

The opponents of the program have always quoted the polls from different scientists. I do not know, but the more I listen to the scientists, the more I realize that they do not seem to agree among themselves, they all have different ideas about everything; and, of course, they are honest differences of opinion.

But we give notice of these hearings on the space program, and we give a long-time notice beforehand. Everyone in the scientific world in the United States knows when we are going to have hearings. They are publicized in all the trade journals, they become part of their conversations and part of their meetings. We have yet to have any of them appear singly, or representing an organization such as the Senator from Wisconsin points out, such as the astronomers' organization, to come down and give us the benefit of their advice. I have not heard of any. Thus, we have to proceed with the groups of distinguished Americans in the scientific world who do come in and tell us what they think about the program.

We have based our appropriations upon that approach. I suspect that if we were going to cut out the Apollo program we would find many adherents.

But let us not put the team under a handicap. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, in all seriousness, that it is pretty hard to separate any of these activities. They are all part of the whole and they cannot be pulled apart.

I do not know of a space agency budget which has been gone over more this year with a fine-tooth comb than was done in previous years, in light of recent events.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me for a few moments, under the stress of a short appointment off the floor which I must make.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is possible for anyone to fully and clearly present all of the factors incident to the space program on the floor of the Senate, but I point out that there is no program that comes before the Senate during the year which receives better attention and more microscopic examination by the House committees and the Senate committees than the question which is presented to the Senate by this amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

I make special mention of our own authorization committee. I understand that the conferees from the House and the Senate had a series of splendid sessions on the authorization bill. Every phase of the entire program was carefully examined and evaluated. The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is the ranking minority member of the Senate committee and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is the chairman. On the appropriations bill, the Senator from Washington is the chairman and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is the ranking minority member.

I pause here to say this is another illustration of the outstanding work the Senator from Colorado does on this subcommitee, as well as our several other subcommittees on the Senate Appropriations Committee, a committee on which the Senator from Colorado is always active and renders a splendid service.

When any department or agency gets a dollar out of the Senator from Colorado, a strong and deserving case has been made. The Senator goes through these programs thoroughly. He is well informed on them. He knows what he is talking about. He has a love for work and fights for his beliefs. He has approved the figures here after his usual most careful examination.

Now, Mr. President, it is true that we have given NASA a mandate, a mandate for developing the science and technology of space. That is the purpose for which NASA was set up. That is its duty. That is the mandate which Congress gave to it, not the President, but Congress through the 1958 act. Now we must provide them the money in order to carry out that mandate.

I am certain that through the processes and considerations which I have described, the House and the Senate have already done a splendid job in paring the amounts and utilizing to the utmost—considering the subject matter—every dollar they recommend for the bill.

I believe that it would be a mistake to reduce this sum in any appreciable amount. It would be better if we just stop completely and renege on our mandate. It would be better just to cancel the whole project—which, of course, is unthinkable from a scientific and space viewpoint, as well as a military viewpoint.

Mr. President, I should like to remind my Senate colleagues that in addition to the Space Committee and Appropriations Committee, this matter of space has been of considerable interest to the Armed Services Committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee. While our national declaration is to develop our space capabilities for peaceful purposes, it is important to keep in mind that space is a place—like the oceans or the atmosphere—where men and machines can go and do things. And we cannot always be sure that other nations will always operate in space in ways that are not detrimental to our national security. We certainly can have no such assurance if we abandon this area in spite of clear evidence of a vigorous program by our adversaries.

Let us keep in mind that the national policy here is clearly stated in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958—which I supported, and was not opposed by a single one of you here today who was here then. That policy states that the national welfare and security requires adequate provision for aeronautical and space activities and declares that these activities be the responsibility of and directed by a civilian agency, except for the deveolpment of weapon systems and military operations. The point I wish to stress here is, that while the military of necessity retains the responsibility for development of weapon systems and military operations, the mandate for developing the science and technology of space—of telling us what space is like and how you do things there, and how you build equipment and train men to do them—this is the responsibility of NASA. And it is essential to the national security of the United States that we continue to support NASA in this difficult effort.

I believe that the appropriations approved and recommended by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington—who has followed this subject for many years—represents a barebones minimum if we are not to erode away our ability in this technological area which is so important to our national security. I urge the Senate to reject this and all amendments which would have this effect.

Again, I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me at this time.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for giving me these few minutes.

Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to actively participate in the formulation and the development of the national space program as we know it today. I have watched this program grow from its infancy to the many mission successes we have experienced to date. I trust we will have continued success, thereby demonstrating the solid technical base that has been established for this program.

During this period of time, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has gathered and welded together a most effective management and research and development team. Further, this team includes an integrated industrial base involving some 20,000 firms which attests to the impact of, as well as the broad base of the space program. We have through fiscal year 1966 allocated $9.7 billion to the Apollo effort and it is clear from the first two Saturn I-B flights recently completed that we are on the verge of capitalizing on the investment that has been made in research and technology over the past several years.

Mr. President, in my judgment it would be false economy to curtail this program at this time. The current budget request has been most carefully examined by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and subsequently by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I feel that these reviews have fully justified the necessity for the amounts before the Senate today, and that the actions of these two committees deserve the support of the Senate.

I further believe that, on the whole, the space program has been well managed and as testimony before the committee will show, NASA has performed within its annual estimates and is well along toward accomplishing the goal of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth in this decade within the original estimate for that goal. In addition, the NASA management has been diligent in keeping the Congress informed of its activities and has observed the advice and counsel of the Senate in the overall conduct of the program.

In summary, I would like to reiterate that we are on the doorstep of realizing a return on a substantial national investment and I am firmly convinced that we can only realize this if we support the program as represented by the amounts in the bill before us here today. To do otherwise at this point in the program would not only deter us in achieving demonstrated preeminence in space, but would also be false economy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, to corroborate what the able Senator just said, the testimony in the Appropriations Subcommittee by the Director of this program was that if the moon project was cut out entirely, 90 percent would have to be spent on what is in the Apollo project, which is to further investigate space. Later, Dr. Seamans, who is the No. 1 scientist of the program, said that in his opinion 95 percent would have to be expended unless this country decided that it did not want to pursue its investigation of space.

Mr. President, one action in the space program in my memory goes back 9 years ago to August 1957.

At that time a representative of the Armed Forces came before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and asked that $40 million additional be allocated to the space appropriations so the United States "could be sure to be first in orbit."

But only a few weeks later the first sputnik went up, and all of us remember the frustration of waiting for months until the United States put its first unit into orbit.

Shortly after this accomplishment by the Soviets in 1957, President Eisenhower, in conjunction with the Congress, determined that in space the United States would be second to none. In this effort he was fully supported by the then majority leader, who was named chairman of the Space Committee upon its inception, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States.

Upon being elected, President Kennedy also gave full support to the accelerating space program, and that program, as we all know, has been building steadily under President Johnson.

The space program, under the direction of James E. Webb—not only himself a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but one of the most experienced managers in Government—is austere, pared down to essentials, deferring many important new activities—activities that, were it not for the immediacy and heavy pressures placed upon the total budget this year, would and should have been considered as further steps toward our secure ability to operate freely in space.

Projects such as Voyager, the unmanned planetary exploration effort, and the exploitation of the powerful Apollo systems for a whole new range of scientific, technological, and economic uses, have had to be postponed. President Johnson had already reduced this program by $700 million before sending it forward to the Congress, as I mentioned a few minutes ago in a colloquy with the Senator from New Mexico.

Four committees of the Congress have examined this program in detail, and the severest reduction proposed among these informed committees—that recommended by the House Appropriations Committee—has only been $62 million.

President Johnson last Friday signed into law the fiscal year 1967 authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. That bill outlined a program of continued emphasis on key ongoing research, development, and space flight projects. The program, already constrained, just cannot stand any severe meat-ax handling.

Already the peak employment of the university and industrial partners of NASA has passed. By the end of this fiscal year, NASA estimates that as many as 80,000 fewer people will be employed on the space program. Any major reduction in funds in effect means now that every $10,000 cut means one less man working on the job.

The space job needs men to get it done—men in the plants, in the laboratories, at the test and launch sites. It needs the engineers, scientists, and workingmen that are paid from the "Research and development" appropriation. It needs the men to design and build the test facilities and equipment who are paid from "Construction and facilities." Most of all, it needs the men to man the NASA laboratories, to manage the contracts, to see that the job is done, who are paid from the "Administrative operations" appropriation.

This space effort is clearly important to our security, and I believe it the responsibility of the Congress to provide the resources to see it through.

If the Congress wishes to cut the space program in any such fashion as proposed, then it must face the consequences of that action—wasted resources, missed opportunities, evidence of weakness of resolution to carry out what we have begun. A spacecraft or a booster, or a building at a launching pad, incomplete for lack of money, has no utility. Speaking frankly, they end up as junk.

NASA's program is already stretched fine. It just cannot absorb a major reduction, or reorientation, without the gravest penalties.

This is the time to maintain the momentum of the Nation's growing capability in space. This is the time to examine carefully whether the great investment of the past and the great accomplishments of science, engineering, and management that have marked NASA's past record are to be seriously crippled.

I believe the Senate should sustain the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

It is my understanding that my able and dedicated friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, desires to reduce the space program by $500 million. This can only mean that many projects will be left half finished, projects valuable to the security and prosperity of the United States will be totally suspended, if not actually eliminated.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows the respect in which I hold him; therefore, I was somewhat surprised to see his insertion in the RECORD yesterday and his approval of an article which states the impact of the Vietnamese war on the economy has been almost negligible.

With respect to this article the Senator from Wisconsin himself states:

> Our economy has grown so immensely in the 15 years since our last war in Korea that it is able to take the current burden of belligerence—with all its heavy cost—without even using up all its economic slack.

The article states:

> Figuratively speaking, the extraordinary American economy is carrying the war on its little finger, although the finger hurts a bit.

If the tremendous cost of the Vietnamese war can be carried on the little finger, then surely the cost for carrying out our space program can be carried on our fingernail.

This article also states:

> Despite the relatively small impact of the war at home, it has had one serious economic cost not felt by the ordinary citizen: It is directly responsible for sharply worsening the deficit in the balance of international payments after a heartening improvement in 1965.

One great advantage of the space program is that it has practically no effect on the balance of payments, whereas the Vietnamese war affects it to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Basically, however, Mr. President, to cut severely the space program at this time, by taking $500 million out of a program that has been approved without reservation by President Lyndon Johnson and his two predecessors, would be comparable to walking out of a home that was half finished, on the grounds that we could not afford completion, even though that home was just as important for shelter as the space program is for security. Therefore why abandon a program which is half through already and contributes so substantially to our security and welfare?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is only natural, with respect to the program for putting a man on the moon, upon which billions of dollars have been expended, and for which additional billions will be expended, and in which there is such a vested interest, with many firms and profits closely connected with the program for putting a man on the moon, that its existence should be supported by industry and by a number of my able and respected colleagues. But this is no justification for wasting public money which is so precious.

One of the finest addresses which President Eisenhower made was the statement, just as he was leaving office, in which he warned the Nation of the "military-industrial complex" which had been built up, upon which billions of dollars were being spent, and about which he warned there would be claims for additional billions of dollars.

It was a very statesmanlike address, and it came from a man who had watched this struggle for 8 years; a man whose political life was behind him, and who could therefore speak with an eye to the future welfare of the Nation.

This, I think, is not really a "military industrial" project, but a scientific industrial project. And industries can be just as determined, in carrying out their programs and in getting additional appropriations, in the field of science as in the military field. Scientists can be just as rapacious in the pursuit of their objectives, just as determined to get large amounts of money for the things that they are interested in, and can be somewhat oblivious to what is for the general and universal welfare. They are human like the rest of mankind.

In the authorization bill which the President recently signed, of the $5 billion authorized, just short of $3 billion was authorized for the Apollo project. So I think we can say that the Apollo project of putting a man on the moon takes approximately 60 percent of current space expenditures.

My good friend, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as I understood him, stated that scientists had said that possibly 10 to 15 percent could be saved without injury. All that the Senator from Wisconsin is proposing is a reduction of 10 percent in the total appropriation, and of about 16 percent in the appropriations for the Apollo project itself.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Surely.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would say to the able and beloved Senator from Illinois that I hope he does not think those of us who may have some business in this field——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In our State are making this presentation on the grounds it would be of parochial assistance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, that was not present in my mind, and I hope no one will regard it as such.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able friend. Second, it is difficult to discuss certain security aspects of space on the floor of the Senate, for many reasons; but I would hope that the able Senator—not only a great economist and outstanding public servant, but an American with one of the most outstanding of all war records—will permit me to discuss this matter further with him at his convenience.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Finally, and as to the point the Senator just made, I recently presented testimony from Administrator Webb that even if we abandon going to the moon, but want to explore space properly, we would spend 90 percent of all expense specifically assigned to the moon project; and Dr. Seamans, their No. 1 scientist, stated he felt Mr. Webb was conservative, because 95 percent would be expended.

I would hope the able Senator from Illinois—always just, fair, and objective—would give consideration to this program, not only what it could mean in the security field but also in the communications field; the latter development could mean much to the future, in that it could be one of the chief methods of transmitting information around the world in the interests of a peaceful world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri. Even if there were a saving of only 10 percent on the Apollo project, that would be a saving of $300 million.

Then there are various items in the authorization bill, which presumably carry over in the appropriations bill, which undoubtedly have a side effect upon putting a man on the moon. So that, on the most conservative testimony from—I will not say biased—but strongly committed sources, I think the estimate of a $500 million cut by the Senator from Wisconsin is most modest indeed.

I was certainly not accusing the Senators whose emotions and whose senatorial careers have honestly been bound up with this project of being connected with those companies that are profiting from it. Certainly not. Nor am I accusing those companies necessarily of being self-seeking profiteers. But it is the nature of all of us that when we become committed to a line of action, when our lives, our fortunes, our prosperity, and our reputations depend upon continuing on that line of action, naturally men want to go ahead with it, and do not consider the general aspects and whether it is in fact in the public interest.

My own feeling is that in this year of 1966, when we are faced with increased expenditures for the war, that we do have to look for means of economizing. There will be some—and I suspect they will rise later in the day—who will say, "Take it out of health, take it out of the poor, take it out of the aged, take it out of the sick," and will say all that in the name of economy.

I say to my dear friends that taking care of people on earth is, to me, a more important national aim than getting a man on the moon ahead of the Russians. And I very frankly think that it will make a greater appeal to the peoples of the world if we put human values first, rather than putting a stunt first. Let us get a better sense of values, I believe that human beings should be put first.

So I hope very much that we will support and vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a clarification?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to make sure that this is understood. The Senator, as I recall, referred to the possibility of a 16-percent cut in the Apollo project. What the Senator from Wisconsin had in mind and what the language of the amendment provides is that the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to determine and to certify which of such appropriation items shall be reduced. He may cut the Apollo project, if he wishes to. He does not have to cut it at all. If not, he will have to cut other areas rather heavily. He is free to cut administration deeply or not at all. He may cut research. He is given discretion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is much more moderate in his views than is the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this subject has been thoroughly explored and ventilated. I should like to make two observations with respect to it.

I well recall the incident of sputnik and how it galvanized Congress into action. The first result was the passage of the National Defense Education Act. I am very proud to have been a coauthor of that act. I actually wrote many of its provisions.

But when a new President was elected in 1960, one of the first things that President Kennedy did was to declare as a national goal that the United States should put a man on the moon in this decade. As a result of that declaration, the Space Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate met and authorized an expenditure of funds for what is known as the Apollo project. This project has been reauthorized year after year since then and is now before the Senate today.

This committee has, in these successive years, authorized the money for the Apollo program. I would say we are too far down the road to reverse our decision at this time.

At the time that the late President Kennedy made his statement, I had my own reservations about the program to put a man on the moon in this decade, but I found few people, either in the Senate or outside of the Senate, or among the scientists of this country, who were willing to explore and discuss the abstract proposition or whether it was advisable or whether it was a proper national goal to determine legislatively that we should put a man on the moon.

So we went by that milestone, and we have gone by it now for 5 successive years.

I would like to suggest that, it seems to me, basically we have made the decision in this area.

Second, this has been gone over with a fine-tooth comb. I would not pretend that the consideration given to this particular matter in the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—as deeply as we tried to do it—was as deep as that given to it by our Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, chaired by my geographical cousin and my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and on which our esteemed lady Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is the ranking member.

I know that whatever authorization bill these two Senators reported had been thoroughly raked, sifted, discussed, explored, debated, and renovated. I could use many other verbs to describe their action, because they do not do anything in any other manner. I can say the same thing for the other distinguished Senators who are members of that committee.

When this matter went to conference with the House, my recollection is that it was further explored for a period of approximately 6 weeks. The members of that committee of the House and the Senate spent 6 weeks looking into the matter, arguing, discussing, and debating every possible item in it. They finally came forth with the recommendation for $5,419,000, which was a little below the budget, but it was what they determined should be done.

Third, I would make this point, and I hope the Senator from Missouri will listen to this. The point has been made here that there is no relationship of this program to the military program of this country.

There are many things, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri pointed out a few minutes ago, which we cannot discuss on the floor. However, one of the military applications which has been discussed at great length in the newspapers and in other places is what is known as the manned orbital laboratory, MOL. That is a project of the military, and it is fully conceivable in my mind that, as a necessary part of our whole national life, without designating the military alone, there will come a time when in order to fulfill our national purposes, we will have to put men in orbit.

I think the Senator from Missouri, who is a very deep student of this subject, and whose opinion I admire very much, will agree that a MOL would be impossible without the docking experience which has been secured from the Gemini program, unless the military carried on a complete repeat of all of the steps leading up through our Mercury capsules, our Gemini capsules, and the docking procedures.

As the distinguished Senator said, these things are all tied in together. We cannot pull out one string without unraveling the whole thing. If I thought there was a dollar that I could eliminate from this program, I would do it. I would have made the motion in the subcommittee to do it.

Mr. President, I believe that this is a hard, realistic budget.

Mr. President, I make this last point. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico raised the point. We are going to have to determine one of these days what our space program does beyond Apollo.

Many of us have been thinking about it.

If there are those who are critical of the Apollo program, then I would suggest, in all humility, that the time to look to the future is now. Those Senators should go to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in the coming year and let their ideas be known to that committee so that we do not unwittingly get committed to a type of space program which the country does not want, which the Congress as a whole does not want, and which the Senate does not want.

That is where the rule of decision on the space program should have been made. As I suggested, the rule of decision on the Apollo program was made back in 1961. I oppose the amendment and support the committee action.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Along with the chairman of the committee, the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], with my own chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and with the ranking member, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I believe there has never been a budget more closely analyzed by the authorization committee and by the Appropriations Committee.

I was especially interested in what the able Senator from Colorado said about the military aspects of the program.

What is beginning to worry me, and, what is more important, what is beginning to worry some of my colleagues more knowledgeable in this field, is whether we have begun to tailor our overall military program to a guerrilla war comparable to the war that is now going on in South Vietnam, and therefore have lessened, if not eliminated, some of the things we should have done on the premise that the gravest danger to the United States comes from countries which have missiles with nuclear warheads that can be delivered against this country within a matter of minutes.

If the war in South Vietnam is the greatest danger to the United States today then those who feel this space program is an unnecessary expense to the taxpayer may be right. But if the chief danger to the United States lies in the potential aggression of countries with nuclear capacity to attack the United States, then I believe it would be a major mistake, from the standpoint of our national security, to reduce further this already heavily reduced budget. That is why I was especially impressed with the remarks made by my able colleague, the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is a member of the NASA Committee, he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations on this subject, he is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and he is also a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. So that he has an excellent opportunity to see and to understand the needs of our continuing scientific research in this very important area of space, going to the moon, and what it means not only to our scientific efforts, but also to our military efforts.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am always impressed by the need, as the Senator has stated, of keeping the overall picture in mind, rather than confining it to Vietnam. The latter is of vital importance; but it is a different picture from the overall problem we must always keep in mind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able senior Senator from Massachusetts, one of the great authorities in the Senate on military posture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless some other Senator wishes to speak——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to sum up very briefly, if that would be all right with the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That will be all right, but I desire to add one statement.

I hope the impression has not been created that there is any hesitation on the part of the President of the United States to endorse this program and this austere budget. When I arose earlier, I forgot to mention that the President signed the bill only a week ago, so he has put his approval upon it.

While we are talking about benefits, I probably could list all the scientific benefits if I devoted the necessary time and thought to the matter; but it seems to me that there is an intangible value to this whole effort of science.

I suppose that if I were to justify my own vote for the space agency, aside from the accomplishments we have made in space, I can almost justify it by one item. There would not be a communications satellite program without the space agency. I believe that this is the most important event of all that has happened in the world. It could mean the difference as to whether millions of people throughout the world will talk Russian or talk English, or will be influenced by Russia or the Western World. Incalculable advantages and intangibles are involved, if for no other reason than the communications satellite. The communications satellite would be 5, 6, or 7 years behind its present status, were it not for the space program. This is one spinoff. I believe that we could enumerate many advantages, if we were to take the time.

I am sure that going to the moon can always be attacked. It is like my saying to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I have a car and I wish to see how it works and what I can find out about it, and that I will drive it to Chicago and back. When I get to Chicago, there will not be much to help me. But I wish to find out how the car works while going back and forth. This is what we are doing, and this results in many inherent benefits.

That is all I have to add, and I ask for a quorum call after the Senator from Wisconsin has finished.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in opposing this amendment. I agree with the distinguished chairman when he says that we should decide whether we will knock the program out completely or go ahead with it. Congress and the administration made that determination a number of years ago, when this was established as a national objective. We are about halfway there now. We are a little more than halfway there in terms of accomplishment. Therefore, it seems to me to be ill advised for us to talk at this time of slowing up the progress or removing part of our ability to get there.

I recall the hearings before the Space Committee, when we investigated the question of whether or not the moon project could be spread out over a longer period of time or whether it could better be accelerated, to attempt to save money for the United States. We were given the answers by the experts, the people who are expert in the field, that we were progressing along an optimum objective from the standpoint of getting the most money for our dollar, the most accomplishment for our dollar; that if we spread out the program over a long period of time, it would cost us more; that if we shortened the period of time and attempted to accelerate the program, it would cost us more.

Mr. President, I believe we have to rely to a degree on the advice of the experts. I believe that we are at an optimum time.

Incidentally, while I am speaking of the experts, the Senator from Wisconsin spoke at length about what distinguished scientists—who have nothing to do with the space program, I might add, and therefore could not be expected to be experts in this area—have had to say about the space program.

I should like to read what one scientist, a most respected scientist, Dr. Lloyd D. Berkner, representing the National

Academy of Sciences, said before the Space Committee:

> In expending more than $5 billion annually on our national space effort, we certainly have the right to ask what is this rationale that underlies such major efforts?
>
> I would like to make four points. First, basically, no nation of our stature can afford to lag in any major technology. That is, to surrender the leadership of that technology freely to others. I think we only need to be reminded of our despair on October 4, 1957, to recognize the basic truth of this assertion.
>
> A great nation cannot ignore the need to acquire the innovative dexterity that commands the great technology of the times.
>
> Indeed, in substantial measure the recognition of greatness stems implicitly from this mastery.
>
> The second point is that to achieve leadership in any major technology we must have goals. These are goals like those that were set by President Kennedy in 1961, to put a man on the Moon in this decade, goals that simply stretch our technological posture tautly, goals that President Johnson has so consistently striven to set and extend in this space program.
>
> Third, since our Nation must command space technology, our interest requires that our space effort be turned to the most constructive ends, the most effective ends. It could be quite useless and indeed wasteful to conduct mere space spectaculars without sincere and productive useful objectives. These ends, then, are the scientific exploration of space, since science cries for the data that space can provide, and the results of scientific exploration of space can benefit man and advance his civilization in many ways.

Mr. President, that is just a portion of Dr. Berkner's testimony. I submit that this testimony comes from a man in a very responsible position with the National Academy of Sciences, a man who is knowledgeable in the particular field, and that testimony certainly refutes the statements of those who are not particularly knowledgeable in this field.

I hope that the Senate will join us in defeating the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think that we should look at the amendment which has been offered. It provides that—

> The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to determine and to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which of such appropriation items shall be reduced, and the amount that each shall be reduced, in order to effectuate the reduction provided for under this section.

As far as I am concerned, I am not interested in finding out how Mr. Webb might reduce these items. He is a fine official. I get along with him very well. I like him fine. But I am not disposed to say to him, "You pick out the program you want," or the rest of the language.

During the hearings the question came up as to what we are doing for aviation. We put in about $126 million. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was very anxious to see what was being done to aeronautics. We had a fine hearing in the subcommittee conducted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is chairman. It developed that we should put more money into aviation. We put it in there. I do not want somebody else to take it out. That applies all the way up and down the line. We should leave it to the people who thought it out very carefully.

We would be going against the people who asked the questions, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who have done a fine job. A year or so ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] had some good questions and presented a new theory, and we had a fine discussion, which was much better than some presentations of the administrative department saying what they want and do not want. We worked hard on this bill. The hearings have been long and drawn out to carefully understand what we are doing.

People have heard about this $20 billion to go to the moon. The best witness on that is Dr. George Mueller. He said that only 10 percent of it would not be spent and we would spend the rest if we do not go there. The great expense is not going to the moon, but appropriations for doing other things in space that as a great nation we must do.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] pointed out some of the work that has been undertaken. A few days ago people were watching a soccer game in England. Simultaneously the picture was being shown here via Communication Satellites. Probably more important is the field of medicine. In the field of medicine great scientific discoveries are possible. Doctors in this country can demonstrate techniques to doctors all over the world. These are the kinds of benefits we are getting from our space programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the next few months or years we are going to have educational television via satellite.

Mr. ANDERSON. All over the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We spend billions of dollars to try to influence people. What better way is there than this?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. This is one of the best reasons why this amendment should be rejected. Some of us who have been in this matter for a long time know what it means to this country.

I am very happy with the statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I know how sound he is on military matters. I am glad to have his statement here today. It would be a fine thing if we pass the bill as it is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is part of my responsibility to serve on the Space Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and the Subcommittee of Appropriations that handles this measure. I want the RECORD to show that having watched the development of this program, not only this year but in prior years, it is a very great credit to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for the careful way in which they have worked in the authorization committee. The members of that committee have cooperated to make our task easier.

I wish to give credit for the work done by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the minority leader in that committee [Mr. ALLOTT] because they, too, have combed this matter with a fine-tooth comb.

I wish to assure my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who is the author of this amendment—which I think is a hurtful amendment—that when he says it will be painful for reductions to be made if his amendment is adopted, he is not only saying what is the truth, but he is saying what is already the fact as to reductions from what this agency wanted and went to the Bureau of the Budget with a request for—$5,723,900,000, which was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $5,012,000,000, or by $711,900,000.

I wish to say that that represented a series of painful reductions. Not only were all new projects banned—and I think that was wise in the long run because, after all, we are committed as a Nation to the Apollo project and things handmaiden to it and other projects already mentioned on the floor—but we curtailed the work on valuable projects underway, and those cuts were very painfully received both by the Administrator of the Agency and the executive head of the President's Space Council, and by these two committees. I want the Senator to realize that at this time.

If the Senator will look at pages 12 and 13 in the record of the committee hearing where Dr. Welsh the Director of the Space Council, answered questions of the Senator from Florida, and at pages 1913 to 1917, where Mr. James Webb, the Administrator of the Space Agency answered certain questions, he will find those questions related to the stoppage or slowdown of work in a very important project. At least the Senator from Florida thought it was a very important project. That is the development of solid propellent fuel for very heavy projectiles, which would tend to enable us to catch up and maybe surpass Russia in that field, the only field in which Russia has passed us, and that is in the ability to send great weights far distances into space.

The testimony of Dr. Welsh, who is the directive head of the President's Air and Space Council, and by Mr. Webb, who is the Administrator of NASA, both show that those reductions were painfully received by them. Both of them stated in response to my questions—and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will remember those questions in committee—that they very much wanted to proceed with the development of that solid propellant because they realized it was a step toward catching up in the one field in which Russia has surpassed us, and yet that was a part of the whole package or projects cut off for the time being, or slowed down greatly.

The point which I am making, Mr. President, and Senators, is that painful reductions have already been made; that this entire matter has already been combed with a fine-tooth comb; and that the President's budget is smaller than some of us thought it should be. The Senator from Florida thought it was a mistake to cut off the work in solid propellants. He was outvoted in the committee. It was a question of whether the work done by the Bureau of the Budget had been the most solid work possible to reach a figure with which the Administrator thought we could move forward in these critical times.

So, Mr. President, that item will not be in this program this year. I regret it, and many other Senators regret it. The testimony of Dr. Welsh and of Mr. Webb shows very clearly that they regret it, and that it was a most painful omission, so far as they were concerned. That is the feeling of many other persons.

I am merely inviting attention to this fact. I hope the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and my equally distinguished friend from Illinois will realize that painful reductions—most painful reductions—have already been made, and that this amount which we are being asked to appropriate, which is less than the budget, represents the minimum, in the judgment of the two committees which have worked long upon this project—that is, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is the chairman, and the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles this particular field—should be appropriated. We believe that all the reductions that this program can stand, in justice to the importance of the program, have been made; and we would fight against any sizable reductions, but particularly against a shotgun approach or a bludgeon approach of this kind, which would cut off a tremendous amount, without even indicating, for the guidance of anyone, where the reduction shall be imposed.

I sincerely hope that the amendment will not be adopted by the Senate. It would be most adverse to the national interest if it were adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

I admire the courage of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in bringing this before the Senate. I have often spoken about what appears to me to be our inadequate sense of national priorities. In a few minutes or a few hours we rush through an enormous military so-called defense—actually, it is a military offense—bill, to make it possible to continue the war in Vietnam, and to continue our other military activities all over the world. We authorized $5 billion in just a few hours for the space program the other day.

But, try to get money for education. Try to get money for poverty. Try to get money to clean up our streams. Try to get money to clean up our polluted air. Try to get money—and we are trying to get money in this bill, and we are not getting it—to rebuild our cities, to make America a place where every family can have a decent home to live in.

Try to do that, and the same people who will tell us that we dare not cut a nickel from the space program will be voting against aid to education, against the poverty program, and voting to cut back the Great Society programs.

Why?

In order to increase appropriations for the military, or to increase appropriations for space.

What has happened to our sense of compassion in the Senate?

As for the argument that we do not tell the administration where to make cuts, we did not tell the administration where to make the cut when we voted the $100 million cut in the military foreign aid budget the other day, did we?

I voted for that cut and supported it.

I believe there is too much belligerence in America today. There is not enough compassion, not enough understanding of the problems of the underprivileged people of the world, and also of the people of America.

Thus, I sincerely hope that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be adopted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his excellent and most spirited speech.

I should like to reply briefly to the criticisms of the amendment and would hope—and I agree with the Senator from Washington—that we can have a vote on the amendment in a short time.

Mr. President, this is not a motion to strike the entire space program. To listen to those who oppose the amendment, one would think it was. The amendment would cut only 10 percent, still leaving $4.5 billion in the space program.

From what the great Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and others say, one would think that the purpose of the space program is primarily to provide fallout.

The best way to take care of the military problem, the fighting in Vietnam, they say, is to shoot a man to the moon and then see what happens.

To me, this is an insult to our intelligence. Of course, there is fallout when we spend $5 billion on research on anything. We could spend $5 billion on a cure for baldnesss—sometimes I wish we would—[laughter]—I am sure there would be a great deal of fallout from that; but, it seems to me that the program should stand on its own feet. Any time we get a program that cannot stand on its own feet, the proponents always look around and say, "Yes; but look at the fallout benefits we get from it."

I submit that if we need a military space program, we should have it as such. In fact, Mr. President, we do. We provided almost $1.7 billion for the military space program, and if we need more in that area, then the case should be made on military grounds. But, as the Senator from Illinois has said so eloquently, we cannot possibly have a man on the moon, or be the first to get to the moon, without it being a great distraction from our military efforts. The fact is, I refer to what I said earlier when Maxwell Taylor was Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, when he said that there was no military value in the space program; and also from Robert Seamans, a NASA deputy—and, mind you, the NASA deputy is a man hired by NASA, represents NASA, and is paid a salary by NASA—when he said:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future of being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] stated that a cut in this program would result in one man having to leave the space program for every $10,000 cut. Of course, that adds up in the $500 million cut, to freeing of 50,000 men. I do mean freeing them, because in the kind of economy we are in today with the inflationary pressures upon skilled workers, the scientists and technicians of NASA would be rapidly absorbed by industry, by other military work and also, of course, by education. We know that there is a great need in these areas for them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say that for every man cut from the space program there is a job waiting in the urban program, there is a job waiting for him in the poverty program—there are jobs in many areas waiting for trained manpower.

The studies which have been made by the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment and Poverty, which I chair, established beyond a peradventure of doubt the lack of skilled manpower of all kinds in those areas of domestic concern, the Great Society program. The retraining necessary to fit skilled minds from the space program into these areas of domestic and American concern is relatively slight compared with the enormous benefits of the new kind of thinking which that kind of engineer and that kind of scientist could bring to the many domestic programs, including education, where they are so badly needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Of course, I wholeheartedly agree with him.

Mr. President, there are inflationary times when the space budget should be cut. There are also times when space spending might make the economy stronger. What is the situation today? Do we have an inflationary economy that requires that we cut back Federal spending? Of course we do.

I return to the statement made by the President of the United States which was first brought into this debate by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. What the President said was this, in referring to the program, and of course he is for the program as the Senator from New Mexico pointed out, as the President was the first chairman of the Space Committee and he perhaps had more to do with the space program than any other Member of the Senate at that time. But he did say this:

> However, it particular segments of our economy continue to raise their prices and

> increase the cost of this and other programs, it will be necessary for the Government to further reduce its expenditures, particularly in those areas where prices are rising in an inflationary way.

The President went on to say:

> If we are to continue our space effort and continue to make the magnificient progress represented by our past achievements, we can do so only if business and labor leaders will make their contribution by responsible pricing and bargaining decisions.

Mr. President, this has been interpreted by every newspaper I read as meaning that the President has indicated that if the inflationary situation continues in this area, he will cut back the space program.

Therefore, I say that it is perfectly proper and responsible for us to make this moderate cut at a time when we do have inflationary pressures. Certainly, if we are going to cut spending anywhere, it would seem to me that this is one of the best places to do it.

ELIMINATING WASTEFUL FEDERAL SPENDING IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator Proxmire's amendment calling for a $500 million reduction in spending for the space program. This is a 10-percent reduction in the space budget which will still leave the agency with $4.5 billion to spend this year.

The President has called for reductions in Federal spending at a time when inflationary pressures caused by the Vietnam war are heavy. This reduction is a chance to heed that request for economy in Government.

The savings will not end the space program; it will simply force the space agency to cut out some of the fat, take a more careful look at priorities and eliminate some of the low priority items.

I see no reason to race helter-skelter to reach the moon. It will add nothing to American strength or prestige to continue racing for the moon at a wasteful pace when we can get there a little later at much less expense with more careful planning and attention to the economy.

The savings in scarce scientific and technical manpower and money resulting from a 10-percent reduction in the race for the moon could be used to relieve some of the pressures on taxpayers or to finance the cost of better education, healthier cities, and a stronger rural America.

I hope the reduction will be approved.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, there are many places in which this bill can be cut, pressures of federally induced inflation force us to seek cuts, and I shall support many of the other cuts. But, the space program is not the place to make drastic, across-the-board slashes.

Let us note that the NASA budget has been very carefully pared down first by NASA itself, then by the Budget Bureau, then further by the House of Rrepresentatives. The NASA request before us today is a reasonable, responsible one.

It is particularly significant that this request provides the full budget estimate for the Gemini and Apollo programs, and also for the research and development programs. We cannot say today what benefits mankind will eventually reap from the discoveries of these programs, but we already have seen initial advantages in navigation, weather prediction, observation, and communication. Certainly, these programs should be brought to a successful conclusion without crippling cuts.

Despite the full funding of these programs, other judicious cuts have been upheld by the Senate committee. NASA is receiving the close fiscal attention every other agency gets. It is taking its share of the slowdowns forced on us by inflation. There is no reason to penalize the space program further simply for the sake of emotional impact.

I urge the Senate to adopt the committee recommendations for NASA and to reject crippling amendments.

On numerous occasions I have sought recognition on this floor to warn against legislation which would further increase our national debt and which would produce inflationary results. Time and time again, I have warned that certain legislation being ushered through the Senate was wasteful, ill-advised, and without justification by any standard.

Today we are considering comprehensive legislation to fund various independent agencies in the amount of over $14 billion. There are certain areas within this budget bill where significant cuts could be made.

But, my remarks at this time are not directed to these programs.

I am concerned that proposals are being made to sacrifice funds for our important space programs.

Mr. President, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has objectively proven its capability to handle this Nation's complex and accelerated space program. The personnel and the executives of our space program deserve accolades for the Agency's outstanding performance and achievements.

A budget cut for this Agency, which has in a few short years, achieved an almost unblemished record of success, could be interpreted as a vote of no-confidence by the Congress. I do not think we can do that to one of the most successful programs being undertaken by Americans.

Eight Gemini missions have been flown to date. Success has been the rule for this program, and we have become the beneficiaries of a tremendous amount of technical and scientific data—data which has applications far beyond the immediate goals of manned space flight.

With the imminent phasing out of the Gemini program, we are embarking upon the Apollo program which aims at a manned vehicular landing on the lunar surface and a return to earth.

The success of this Nation's space program has been awesome. Its impact and excitement has been felt, at some time, by every American old enough to understand the meaning of human achievement. By means of communications satellites, we are now able to receive television signals from distant continents.

Great strides in weather prediction have been made by utilization of our increased space capability. Perhaps most dramatic, at least from a personal standpoint, was the transmission and television broadcast of pictures of the surface of the Moon and Mars.

We have witnessed the orbiting and maneuvering outside the space capsule of our astronauts.

These achievements have been made in an astonishingly short time. Our scientists and engineers can claim credit for a long list of "firsts," including discovery of the Van Allen radiation belts, discovery that the earth is pear shaped, the first successful probe of Venus, first closeup pictures of the Moon's surface and the first space pictures of Mars, the first manned orbital maneuver and the first manned propulsion outside of a spacecraft, the first sustained space rendezvous, and the first docking of two crafts.

In the field of auxiliary power systems, the U.S. space teams are responsible for the first solar cells on a craft, the first craft with isotope power, the first craft powered only by nuclear energy, the first nuclear reactor in orbit and the first space use of the fuel cell.

These are but a few of the United States' many achievements. There are others.

In the search for the reasons for the success of our space programs there are many answers. The able director of the space program, Mr. James E. Webb, has singled out the imaginative use of limited resouces, a decentralized management structure with strong local program and project leadership, and dedication of both NASA and contractor personnel.

We are midway through a 10-year program to achieve preeminence in all fields of aeronautics and space. We have achieved values far beyond the cost which has been expended. The NASA management team and their approach have demonstrated their effectiveness. If the organizational capability that has been amassed is not to erode, we must fully fund the bare minimum program which the administration has requested.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LAUSCHE** (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. **GRUENING** (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw by vote.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Burdick
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Fulbright
Griffin
Kennedy, N.Y.
McGovern
Morse
Morton
Moss
Nelson
Proxmire
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Simpson
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—65

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Case
Ellender
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Lausche
Mansfield
Miller
Neuberger
Robertson
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 729

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 729.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 729) of Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

On page 29, line 4, strike out "$4,246,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,130,000,000".

On page 29, line 10, strike out "$95,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000".

On page 29, line 23, strike out "$650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$630,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I concur with the Senator from Wisconsin, inasmuch as this amendment covers practically the same subject, involving only a different amount, as his previous amendment, in asking unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to one-half hour, 15 minutes to each side, 15 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Wisconsin and 15 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the pending Proxmire amendment (No. 729), there be a time limitation of one-half hour on each amendment offered, with the exception of one hour on the Mohole amendment, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill; and that there be a time limitation of 2 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could I have the attention of the Senator from Ohio? The Senator from Ohio has his annual amendment on Civil Defense. Is that agreeable with him?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is agreeable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Washington will yield, I have two other amendments after this, and the Senator from Ohio has one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be others.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask that the able majority leader state his request as to time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One-half hour on each amendment, except for 1 hour on the Mohole amendment, and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would hope that more time would be allowed on one of the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], which deals with supersonic transportation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure that that could be arranged by taking time off the time on the bill and putting it on that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, there may be some discussion which may require longer than a half hour on the amendment concerning Federal buildings in the District of Columbia. Just to be safe, will the majority leader make it——

Mr. MANSFIELD. It can be taken from the time on the bill. There are 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two hours on the bill? That is sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may we have order, so that we can hear the Senator state the purpose of his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the NASA appropriation, not 10 percent but 3 percent. It reverts to the House figure for construction, from $95 million back to $75 million, which is the precise amount the House authorized; it reverts to the House figure on administration, from $650 million down to $630 million; and the rest of the proposed cut is on research and development.

Mr. President, from the debate which has just occurred, we are all aware that we want to do all we can; I am sure all

Senators wish to reduce Federal spending. We are aware that our commitment in Vietnam and the well-being of our domestic economy far surpass our space effort in their priority.

While this is a general amendment—giving the Director of the space agency the option of cutting where he wishes within the categories I described—there are a number of low-priority projects which can be cut without, in any substantial sense, impeding the space effort.

In the first place, the Apollo applications program calls for $41.9 million to buy long lead-time items for post-Apollo flights. Yet the Apollo applications program has no viable plan of action and, as roughly designed by NASA, it will duplicate to a great extent the Department of Defense's manned orbital laboratory. The manned orbital laboratory is cheaper, will be ready sooner, and is a much more efficient laboratory. It can be launched with existing Titan III rockets from either the west or the east coast, in both polar and equatorial orbits. The Apollo applications laboratory would require a more expensive and more complex Saturn II or Saturn V rocket, and could only be put into an equatorial orbit.

Moreover, the National Academy of Sciences and its many experts has stated that unmanned space flight is much more profitable on a cost-benefit basis and that we are in effect wasting a lot of valuable effort on manned flight long before the need to send a human into space exists.

The Mariner program will use $18 million to send a Mariner spacecraft past Venus in 1967. This flight was first dreamed up by NASA only last December. It is hastily conceived and will not use the Mariner craft as efficiently as it ought to. Moreover, the bill as it now stands provides $7 million more than the budget estimate for a Mars Mariner mission. I feel that NASA would certainly have requested whatever funds they needed for the flight and this additional appropriation is completely unjustified.

The advanced missions program is investigating the future roles of NASA in our space effort and is concentrating particularly on future manned flights. Since most scientific experts feel that unmanned flight is more valuable, I suggest that this item should receive only $5 million, a reduction of $3 million under the budget estimate.

The physics and astronomy program finances a number of orbiting observatories for various scientific purposes. If we would accept the House recommendation for the authorization bill, and cut $3 million from this program, we would simply defer launching of one or possibly two observatories, many of which are not scheduled until the end of this decade.

In bioscience, the House Space Committee recommended $32,400,000. I recommend reducing the appropriation bill by $2 million to that level; in other words, back to the House figure. This cut would simply defer investigation of lunar sample examination techniques and other nonessential studies.

In meteorological satellites, I suggest we could reduce the budget by $8 million. NASA officials have testified that we can expect few real benefits in terms of more accurate weather predictions until a more comprehensive system of ground observation points have been established. For this reason, it seems logical to reduce funds for this item and continue funding at a level approximately equal to the average annual budget expenditures for the last 2 years.

In communications and applications technology satellites, I propose cutting $6.5 million. The applications satellites are a new concept and the budget calls for funding of five before the first has even flown. This seems like an undue risk. NASA should certainly go ahead with the first and second vehicles, but could easily defer funding of numbers three, four, and five until they have had a chance to study the data of the first effort.

In launch vehicle procurement, I would simply propose cutting $10,750,000 as recommended by the House Space Committee. This money was to purchase a launch vehicle for the proposed Venus Mariner flight, which I favor deleting, and to provide for improvements of the Centaur which has not yet been built.

In the fields of construction and administrative operations, I recommend adoption of the recommendations by the House Appropriations Committee to reduce each of these items by $20 million. In particular, I object to the proposed construction of a lunar receiving laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center and a sterilization laboratory at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Both of these facilities would perform functions duplicated by existing Government installations

Thus, my proposal is not a drastic one. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration could easily absorb this small cut. I would prefer a greater one, but I feel that this amendment should cut a maximum amount with a minimum of impact, if any at all, on our space effort. NASA will continue to be a fat cat in a lean society, but anyone can lose a few pounds without feeling it.

During the course of previous debate, the Senator from Washington suggested that we specify areas in which there could be a cut in the program. This is exactly what I have done here. In general, the figures go back to the House figures. They are modest, limited, and permissive. Administrator Webb can use his best judgment. He does not have to follow my advice, except that he does have to stay within the three categories.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we agreed on a time limitation because this is similar to the last amendment, though in a smaller amount. It has the same effect.

The Senator from Wisconsin has made some suggestions as to cuts, but I do not know of any project that we get more benefit out of for the dollar spent than we do out of the weather program. I would hate to see that program cut one penny—which is what the Senator suggested.

This program is just beginning and we are getting value received for every dollar we spend on that. The benefits received from the weather program have been almost fantastic.

I hope that we reject the amendment. The budget has been gone over with a fine-tooth comb. If we are going ahead with the space program, we cannot stand any cut.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I supported the Proxmire amendment to cut the $5 billion NASA budget by 10 percent and to reduce it to $4½ billion. This was defeated.

I rise to support his much lesser cut to reduce the NASA budget by $156 million, or by 3 percent.

I think it is high time we got down to earth.

We have pressing needs on this planet which I consider far more urgent than these costly ventures into space. I am not opposed to them by any means, indeed, I favor them as a great national undertaking, but we have got to view them in relation to our domestic needs. Indeed, the proposed cut will not impair, jeopardize, or appreciably diminish our ventures into space. But while we are asked by the administration to cut vital domestic programs, clearly essential to the people on earth, we are simultaneously engaged in a frantic effort to be the first on the moon. We shall get to the moon, but I think it unimportant whether we get there in 1969, 1970, 1971, or sometime thereafter, and it is the high speed of our endeavor that is so costly. A slight slowing down would save hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, and enable these billions to be used for far more important needs of the folks at home.

I strongly disapprove of the administration's proposed cuts in education, milk for our children, resource development, and much else. The White House has issued several warnings to the Congress to cut expenditures. I would support these requests in areas which would cause the minimum of deprivation. Certainly cutting 3 percent from the NASA space program is one of these areas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (when her name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLARK. On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." If the Senator from Alabama were present and voting, he would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote nay.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Brewster
Burdick
Church
Cooper
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
McGovern
McIntyre
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Simpson
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Case
Clark
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Mansfield
McGee
Miller
Neuberger
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So Mr. Proxmire's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 730.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], is as follows:

On page 11, line 9, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the funds for the supersonic transport from $280 million to $80 million.

The Federal Aviation Agency wants $280 million to continue development of a civilian supersonic transport. This aircraft, provided it ever gets off the ground, will cost up to $4 billion to reach the production stage. Under current plans, the Government will pay a minimum of $3 billion of this development cost and may well have to assume an even greater share.

The SST will have little or no military value. It will be a purely commercial venture. The airline industry was not ready for the SST 2 years ago.

Why have they been attracted to it?

Because the Federal Government is guaranteeing everything. Would not a businessman fight for this kind of opportunity? What would he have to lose?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Chair restore order to the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Remember, the private corporation is not willing to risk its own capital to develop it. All it has to do is put down $100,000—a small enough sum considering the magnitude of the final payoff.

And the taxpayer is the pigeon, the fall guy—as Texas Guinan or P. T. Barnum would put it, the sucker.

The big airline corporations have everything to gain; almost nothing to lose. Of course they want this. Senators, Congressmen, businessmen, and a few wealthy international superjet travellers will enjoy zipping from New York to Paris in a couple of hours.

But, Mr. President, in a year of inflation, of a Vietnam war, of a shortage of just the kind of skilled manpower the $200 million additional Federal spending this supersonic transport research would absorb—is this the time to spend Federal money on this New York to Paris jet-set frill?

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator to point to a more conspicuously unjustified, extravagant, wasteful frill than this.

Oh, if Boeing and Lockheed want to spend their own money on this, let them. If the boys who want to beat the sun from Bombay to London want to pay the full cost of this, let them.

This is a free country. And that means people should be free to squander their own money any way they wish.

But, Mr. President, I submit that when one cannot find any military value in this expenditure with a microscope—when the Secretary of Defense has repeatedly refused to find any military use for this huge expenditure—Congress simply should not spend the money.

And another thing, Mr. President—it is a shame that these B-58's in their supersonic runs never flew over Washington, D.C., as they did over Milwaukee and Madison, Wis.

If Members of Congress had been jarred awake night after night by the crashing roar of the sonic boom, they might well have a different attitude than they now have toward a program that would appropriate $280 million this year and as much as $3 billion of the taxpayers' money to make that crashing, earsplitting, window-shattering, baby-waking boom universal.

Madisonians and Milwaukeeans did complain about the B-58's, but generally accepted the runs as a military necessity. But for the jet-set zooming from Monte Carlo to Las Vegas, I somehow do not think most taxpayers will fully appreciate why we are taking hundreds of millions out of their pockets in order to shatter their peace and quiet with this earsplitting racket.

Now, Mr. President, it may well be—I hope the day will come, and I think it will be soon—that the sonic boom problem and the radiation dangers of traveling so high and so fast will sometime be solved. I think that our military and space programs are bringing that day closer. When that day comes, private enterprise may find it worthwhile to build and operate a supersonic transport.

But, Mr. President, can any honest, objective Senator say that in 1966—this year of inflation, of a cruel and burdensome war in Vietnam, of a multibillion-dollar space program—Congress should take still more out of the economy for this immensely expensive research on a private commercial plane?

Here is a golden opportunity to save $200 million.

I would like to point out several facts which have often been ignored by the

FAA and supporters of the airplane: First, when the original Black-Osborn report on the SST was written in 1963, it provided a series of cut-off points where the program should be terminated if it failed to meet certain requirements. One of these stipulations was that industry must finance at least 25 percent of the development costs. Industry can now only afford to pay about 10 percent of the future development costs.

Second, the program also calls for reimbursement of the Government's investment plus interest. Although General McKee promised Congress last year to furnish a concrete proposal for recovery of the $3 billion or more that we will spend over the next few years, no plan has been forthcoming. The industry claims it will agree to a repayment plan, but still no method has been announced.

Third, the airplane is being developed by the FAA, the agency which will certify it for commercial operations. This is a very serious conflict of interest. There should be a definite separation of the SST development program from the FAA.

Fourth, we should explore the possibilities of private or semiprivate financing programs and look more closely at the entire SST program. I suggest that hearings be held early next year to determine the feasibility of the aircraft as finally selected and a specific, concrete proposal for recovery of the Government's investment before we gamble any more of the taxpayers' money on this booming, zooming gift to the jet set.

Fifth, while America's engineers are famous for their creativity and genius, any observer can see that the SST involves a multitude of highly complex technical problems, many of which cannot be solved overnight. We should investigate all possible problems much more thoroughly by use of existing supersonic aircraft before we spend another billion dollars building a prototype that, because of research discoveries by the XB-70 and the TFX in the interim, may be obsolete before it is built.

Sixth, the program represents what could become a very costly precedent for Government participation in the huge scale development of a commercial product. This program has never been authorized by the Congress. I feel strongly that an SST authorization bill should be considered by Congress.

The FAA is asking for $280 million on faith and faith alone. That is a whale of a lot of faith.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal on July 28 attacked this appropriation in a lead editorial called "A Senseless Urgency."

In its concluding summation, the Journal said:

> What it comes down to, apparently, is Washington's sublime self-confidence in its ability to accomplish anything right now if not sooner, even if it actually is impractical, immoderately expensive or inadequately planned. It would be a fine thing if the Government, not only in the field of supersonic transports but in other areas, would now and then stop to ask itself: Is all of this urgency really sensible?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial to which I have referred printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

A Senseless Urgency

By the end of the year the Federal Aviation Agency plans to approve construction of two model supersonic transports. Though the Government's outlay on the program is expected to top $2 billion, it's still entirely unclear whether mammoth engineering and economic problems will ever be solved and whether airlines or their passengers will want or need the 2,000 miles-per-hour aircraft.

This strange state of affairs is examined by John E. Gibson in the July issue of Harper's Magazine. Unfortunately, the SST program is all too typical of a Government that seems to think that it can fight a war, go to the moon and do practically everything else all at once.

Mr. Gibson can hardly be dismissed as an anti-science cynic; he is dean of engineering at Michigan's Oakland University and has done research for the Air Force, the Navy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In fact, he believes the supersonic transport is "an excellent long-range technical development goal" for the aircraft industry. All that he questions is the present "premature crash program."

Engineers are well aware that many technical obstacles must be surmounted if the SST is to fly by 1971, as per current schedule. Yet the picture Mr. Gibson presents of these difficulties may give pause even to an interstate airline traveler.

"At 70,000 feet, the proposed cruising altitude of the SST, there will be no need of oxygen masks if cabin pressure is lost," he notes. "The reason is that the human body undergoes explosive decompression, the blood boils, and death occurs within several seconds. This happens whether or not one wears an oxygen mask."

If that possibility, however remote, doesn't faze potential SST travelers, there are more mundane questions of passenger comfort and convenience. Air Force-sponsored studies predict that atmospheric turbulence at supersonic speeds will assure a far more bumpy ride than passengers get in present jets. Travelers may have to be strapped to contour couches for their entire trips to avoid injury.

Passengers may have to be immobilized for another reason as well. "In the SST," Mr. Gibson says, "the pilot must keep continual account of changes in the center of pressure in order to maintain control of his craft. One or two passengers moving the length of the cabin can affect this rather critical balance."

There are numerous other foreseeable problems, including the need for complete revision of airport handling techniques and traffic control systems. And once a new aircraft takes to the skies, technical difficulties become apparent that can never be forecast on the drawing board.

Assuming the eventual solution of the technical problems, there is likely to remain a huge hurdle for the SST as a commercial venture: Economics.

Each of the supersonic transports is expected to cost an airline up to five times as much as present-day intercontinental jets. For its money the carrier will get an aircraft with inflight operating costs running far higher than those on current airliners. If an SST has to wait as long as 30 minutes to land at the airport, scarcely an unusual delay now, it will burn 10 tons of extra fuel—which will take the place of about 100 fare-paying passengers.

All in all, it's a small wonder that airlines are not rushing to sign up to buy SST's. Or that Sir William Hildred, director general of the International Air Transport Association, should say, "I hope I shall not live to see the damn thing."

In this atmosphere, why in the world is the U.S. Government crashing along full speed ahead? One reason presumably is to race the Russian, British and French competition. But the Russians reportedly are finding it impossible to keep to their own supersonic timetable and the British, in their straitened circumstances, are less than happy with the heavy cost of their joint project with the French.

What it comes down to, apparently, is Washington's sublime self-confidence in its ability to accomplish anything right now if not sooner, even if it actually is impractical, immoderately expensive or inadequately planned. It would be a fine thing if the Government, not only in the field of supersonic transports but in other areas, would now and then stop to ask itself: Is all of this urgency really sensible?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask this question. If we were to reject the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire]—which I hope we will not do—would it not be said in later years that we had committed ourselves to the supersonic project and that we could not reverse ourselves, just as this was said on the measure we just passed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

This $200 million will be used next February for a period of 5 months, February, March, April, May, and June, to spend $40 million each month for the construction of a prototype.

Under the circumstances it will be said we cannot, having committed this much money, change our minds.

Mr. President, I submit we do not have enough information to decide this matter.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to ask whether or not it is not a fact that we are committed to private enterprise in this free land of ours.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct, and this is something that free enterprise should be able to say for themselves, whether they think it feasible.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator share the view that it is not proper for Government to interfere with private enterprise, and that private enterprise can take care of it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that the Government should not inject itself into private enterprise? This would be the totalitarian system, would it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator from Alaska. His views are unassailable and it makes sense in an industry that has become very profitable.

Mr. GRUENING. A large section of industry is immobilized, and this is not the time to increase production in this industry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a very telling point.

Mr. GRUENING. And we should see that the human problems on earth are settled before we engage in this extravagance. I support the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

I could not agree with his other amendments, because the job was at least 50 percent completed. Therefore, I felt I could not support them. But I join with him in his effort here to reduce our expenditures whenever possible.

Mr. President, I asked for further information on the SST as the result of reading an article placed in the RECORD some time ago by the Senator from Wisconsin, and received an address made by Mr. R. A. Bailey, vice president and general manager of Lockheed Aircraft.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

(By R. A. Bailey, vice president and general manager, SST, Lockheed-California Co.)

Dr. John Gibson makes a dramatic case in his recent magazine article, "The Case Against the Supersonic Transport," but a number of errors in fact lead one to feel that he is not fully informed of the advancing technology of supersonic flight.

There is a very simple and very sound case for the supersonic transport.

This new 1800 mile-an-hour airplane will:

1. Reduce travel times by half, saving priceless time for the traveler.
2. Provide the traveler with even more comfort and safety than he now enjoys on subsonic jet transports.
3. Provide 50,000 or more jobs, spread over nearly every state in the union.
4. Create a favorable balance of trade differential of some $13-billion over a period of years extending from 1974 to 1988 or beyond.
5. Continue this nation's domination of the world market for commercial air transports.
6. Take advantage of today's technology to produce the next logical step in air transportation.
7. Not be built at the taxpayer's expense.

There is neither time nor space to cover every point in Dr. Gibson's article. The record should be set straight on some of the more obvious inaccuracies, and these I will attempt to correct.

Dr. Gibson refers to the B-58 as the only aircraft providing pilots with experience in sustained supersonic flight. This is not true. For several years Air Force and Lockheed pilots have been gaining such experience daily with the Lockheed YF-12A and SR-71 titanium aircraft, flying at speeds and altitudes greater than will the U.S. SST. Many thousands of pilots from nations of the free world have logged thousands of hours at speeds of Mach 2 or better in such aircraft as the Lockheed F-104s and the McDonnell F-4, and this supersonic background continues to grow every day. Supersonic transport climb, cruise and descent profiles have been flown by airline pilots in specially instrumented F-104s within the past two years.

The skin heat of 300 degrees fahrenheit developed by the B-58 during the non-stop flight from Tokyo to England was anticipated, instead of "rather unexpected" as the author would have it. Failure of "an appreciable fraction" of the plane's electronic gear provided the aerospace industry with new knowledge from which to proceed with the development of the electronic equipment that is not failing under such circumstances today.

Earlier in the article, Dr. Gibson says "almost against their will, European designers were then forced across the sound barrier and told to design a plane which would operate at twice the speed of sound." The only "force" involved here is the desire of designers everywhere to move ahead into new "country" and the economic force to produce an airline airplane to capture the market.

To depart from these few of the many vague generalities that make this article less than a model of documentation, the "Taxpayer's Gamble" section is not in line with the facts.

The facts are that Lockheed and Boeing, the two airframe manufacturers, and General Electric and Pratt & Whitney, the two engine manufacturers, have invested millions of their own money in preliminary studies and facilities beginning in 1956. By the end of 1966, Lockheed will have invested $30 million directly in the SST program. This is in addition to $20 million invested in the Lockheed research and test center and facilities and equipment applied to the supersonic transport program. Since the Phase II part of the program began in June, 1964, we have been participating financially to the extent of 25 per cent of the development contracts. Where did Dr. Gibson get the impression that industry "refused to accept the principle of participation and has not accepted it to this day."

Obviously the total costs of the SST program will be high. But this does not mean, as is said in the foreword to the article, that it will be "at enormous expense to the taxpayer." On the contrary, SST financing plans call for the government to recoup its expenditures for development.

One of Dr. Gibson's footnotes quotes a Russian general in 1961, and concludes with this sentence: "Since that time there has been little sign of unseemly haste on the part of the U.S.S.R." May I point out that the Russians displayed their SST model at the Paris Air Show last year, and are expected to fly a prototype SST even before the British-French Concorde, which may fly in 1968 or 1969, some two or three years before the U.S. SST prototype is expected to fly.

Dr. Gibson states "to date, BOAC has not ordered the Concorde nor has it even paid a deposit for a delivery position," BOAC has ordered 8 Concordes. It has also deposited $600,000 with the FAA for six U.S. supersonic transport delivery positions. Twenty-four of the major world airlines have made delivery position deposits for 99 U.S. SSTs and 52 Concordes to date.

Gibson errs in stating that the FAA is handicapped by "complete ignorance of research-and-development management principle." Both General McKee and General Maxwell have been identified with R&D program management during most of their careers. Their predecessors in FAA, General Quesada and Mr. Halaby, were likewise closely associated with major R&D program management during their professional lives.

Passengers will not be strapped into contour couches, nor will they wear space suits, as Dr. Gibson fears. The SST passenger will sit, and walk, in the same comfort and environment as today's passengers, with his seat belt fastened only during takeoff and landing as is the custom today. He will eat, drink and have the same comfort facilities available as do today's air traveler.

Dr. Gibson is wrong regarding the avionics, aeronautics and bio-medical aspects of supersonic transport travel. He says that engine fuel will be pumped through vital parts of the SST to prevent it from melting. This just isn't so. Titanium can withstand SST temperatures with no cooling requirement. The fuel tanks will be used as heat sinks to absorb some heat from other aircraft systems; but fuel is contained in the tanks, several subsystem heat exchangers, and the lines to the engines.

The internal fuselage walls and cabin will be cooled by a refrigerated environmental control system which will be in triplicate, providing two backup systems should the "on" system malfunction.

If a cabin window were to blow out, the cabin altitude would change from the normal 6000 foot atmospheric density during cruise flight to about 22,000 feet. Blood would not boil, and the human body won't undergo explosive decompression. What will happen, as on today's airliners, is that an oxygen mask will drop in front of each passenger, who will breathe through it until the aircraft has descended to a lower altitude.

Dr. Gibson's fears concerning center-of-pressure shift in the transonic (Mach 1-1.4) speed regime are groundless. The Lockheed double-delta wing, consisting of a very slim forward delta and a very large aft delta, has proved in flight that excessive control surface trim is not needed during the transition from subsonic to supersonic speed. The slim forward delta begins to provide lift only at supersonic speeds, and is so designed as to almost exactly counteract the center-of-pressure shift. This has been proved in flight over and over again by the YF-12A and SR-71 double delta aircraft. The double delta wing is nearly as stable as a tennis court at all speeds and altitudes.

Upper air turbulence, tests have already shown, will be considerably more rare at 70,000 feet than at present day airline altitudes. Thunderheads will be encountered, as they are today, at lower altitudes in which the SST will be climbing or descending at subsonic speeds * * * so they represent no unusual hazard. Radar is sufficiently advanced even today to warn of thunderheads in ample time to fly around or over them. By 1974, when the U.S. SST enters airline service, airborne warning systems may be expected to be far ahead of today's technology.

Many of those who say the SST cannot make money were saying the same thing about subsonic jet transports before the airlines placed them in service. It is a matter of record that subsonic jets have provided the airlines with their best profits since commercial air travel began.

The SST will be at least as profitable for the airlines as is the subsonic jet. It is technically sound. It is based on adequate experience. It will not be built at taxpayer's expense. And it will be accepted as willingly by the travelers of tomorrow as the modern subsonic jets have been accepted by the travelers of today.

All except one of the dozen or so problems Dr. Gibson mentions have been solved or have proved on examination not to have been problems at all. The single remaining one, sonic boom, is one that is not so much solved as modified, since we will reduce the intensity of the boom by flying at high altitudes and by careful design of the SST external shape.

Every advance in technology has had its opponents. Dr. Gibson joins those who were against the steam engine, the automobile, electric lights, and—who knows—the wheel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was also sent an address by Mr. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, entitled "Technological Readiness for the Supersonic Transport."

This is a theoretical treatise which, nevertheless, did not answer all questions

brought up in the article in Harper's magazine of last July.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Bisplinghoff be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Technological Readiness for the Supersonic Transport

(By Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, National Aeronautics and Space Administration)

Is aeronautical technology sufficiently advanced to permit the Nation to commence the design and construction of a supersonic transport that will be both safe and profitable? This frequently asked question has been of continuing concern both to NASA and the FAA since the start of the supersonic transport program. Based on all of the evidence that is available, we believe the answer is yes.

As you know, manned supersonic flight has been possible for nearly nineteen years, commencing with the rocket-powered research aircraft, X–1, in 1947. Since the first supersonic flight of the X–1, aeronautical engineers have had almost continuous interest in examining the practicability of commercial aircraft that would fly faster than the speed of sound. In the early years of supersonic flight, commercial applications were clearly impractical because of the primitive state of technology. In 1956, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, predecessor of NASA, undertook a program of research directed specifically toward supersonic commercial air transportation. By 1959, the research had yielded enough data to indicate the technical feasibility of an SST. On December 11, 1959, NASA brought this information to the attention of the Federal Aviation Agency. Shortly thereafter, the FAA, NASA and the Department of Defense joined in a plan for Federal assistance to the aviation industry, as outlined by the three agencies in a 1961 publication entitled "Commercial Supersonic Transport Report."

Once the technical feasibility of an SST had been established in a preliminary way, both the FAA and NASA concentrated attention on improving the technologies of supersonic airframes and engines. Progress in these activities in the early 1960's played an important part in the decision, announced by President Kennedy in June 1963, that the United States would begin development of a supersonic transport under the direction of the FAA. Since that date, there has been sustained progress in further refining the technologies which underlie supersonic commercial air transportation, largely through through the efforts of American industry.

The purpose of this testimony is to give you an estimate of where these technologies stand. It is convenient to make this estimate within the framework of an important principle upon which airplane design is based. This principle, conceived by the French engineer Breguet, states that the range of an airplane, or the maximum distance it can travel, depends on two factors: flight efficiency and the ratio of the fuel weight to the gross weight at the start of flight. In evaluating the feasibility of any new airplane, the engineer first establishes goals in terms of flight range and payload and then asks how he can achieve the flight efficiency and the fuel to gross weight ratio to realize these goals. As you know, in the case of the U.S. prototype SST, our goals are 4,000 miles range with 40,000 pounds of payload.

Breguet conceived of flight efficiency as a a composite measure of the aerodynamic and propulsive efficiencies of the airplane. It is represented by a numerical quantity calculated by multiplying the Mach number of flights times the lift-to-drag ratio divided by the specific fuel consumption of the engines. The economic success of the supersonic transport will be in proportion to our skill in developing the highest possible value of the flight efficiency.

Flight, as you can see, is improved by increasing the Mach number of cruising flight. That is one reason why we prefer an SST with cruising Mach number of 2.7 over one with a lower cruising speed. Far higher cruising speeds are theoretically possible, but for the present, Mach 2.7 seems a reasonable level for commercial flight because of the severe problems that higher speeds would present in heating materials, subsystems and fuel to high temperatures.

The second component of flight efficiency is the lift-to-drag ratio of the airplane, denoted by the symbol L/D. Lift is the upward force produced by the flow of air over the surfaces of the aircraft. Drag is the total resistance the aircraft encounters as it moves through the air. Thus, L/D is a measure of aerodynamic efficiency.

It is perhaps true that more research effort has been expended in achieving optimum values of L/D than in any other single facet of the SST development up to the present time. The strong motivation to improve supersonic transport configurations has led to significant advances in the methodologies of aerodynamic research and developments. Applications of advances in machine tool technology have reduced the cost and time required to prepare accurate windtunnel models. Savings in the time required by engineers were achieved by improved machine processing of measured data. Finally, through the programming of supersonic aerodynamic theory in high speed computing machines, aerodynamic configurations were refined analytically, thus reducing the amount of windtunnel testing that was required. Through the use of the improved tools, the SST contractors working with the NASA/Langley Research Center have been able to demonstrate, through windtunnel tests, values of L/D at Mach 2.7 of approximately 8. Higher values of 9 and above have been achieved with idealized aerodynamic models and the contractors are making every effort to convert these findings into practical supersonic transport designs.

The third factor in Breguet's formula for flight efficiency is specific fuel consumption, that is, the weight in pounds of fuel burned per hour for each pound of engine thrust. Can the required specific fuel consumption be lowered sufficiently at Mach 2.7 to be economically attractive? The answer is yes, providing the engine can be run at a high enough temperature. What is required is an engine which can be cruised at Mach 2.7 at a turbine inlet temperature of about 2,200° F., or some 600° F. above the temperature now employed in airline operation. This desired increase in temperature cannot be achieved simply by the use of new engine materials. We find, however, that we can achieve it through convective and film cooling of critical engine parts, together with new materials. Although engine research and development has led to the clear conclusion that we can achieve the operating temperatures and hence the specific fuel consumption that we desire for profitable airline flight, we cannot yet say with certainty what engine life and reliability will accompany these operating conditions. We can only say that we are confident that the achievement of satisfactory engine life can be brought about with the SST engine, as it has in all past engines, through an orderly process of repetitive testing and incremental design improvements.

But flight efficiency is not the whole story in the achievement of payload and range. As I mentioned earlier, the designer must also strive for a high ratio of fuel load to gross weight at the beginning of flight. That is tantamount to saying that for a given fuel load and payload of passengers and freight, he must reduce the structural weight as much as possible. This is the perennial problem of the aeronautical engineer. The special structural design problems presented by the supersonic transport can be summarized succinctly as speed and longevity. One of the principal problems introduced by speed is aerodynamic heating resulting from the impact and friction of air molecules and producing leading-edge temperatures during cruise of about 500°F. The problem of longevity is one of providing airframe safety and serviceability for a life of 50,000 hours of flying time. As the aircraft structure is exposed to alternating stresses day after day and year after year, there is a tendency for the metal to fatigue and ultimately to fracture. Screening of materials by government laboratories and the aircraft industry has led to the identification of titanium alloys that meet the unique requirements for strength and stiffness at the temperatures of SST operation. The most promising of these alloys, and the one that we now expect will be used principally contains 90 percent titanium, 6 percent aluminum and 4 percent vanadium. As a result of recent design studies in the Phase II–C portion of the SST program, we are now confident that we will be able to achieve with a titanium structure the low weights and high reliabilities that we require.

In summary, then, by cruising at Mach 2.7 at supersonic lift-to-drag ratios of 8, employing convective and film cooling in critical engine parts thereby allowing turbine inlet temperatures at cruise of 2,200°F. and employing titanium as the principal material of construction, we believe that the payload-range goal that we have set for the prototype SST, namely, 40,000 pounds and 4,000 miles, is within our grasp.

I should remind you, though, that the development of a new and advanced aircraft requires more than technological readiness. The technologies in the final analysis are merely the building blocks which the designer employs to fashion an airplane. There is, in addition, the task of creating a well integrated design which fulfills the economic and functional objectives which have been set. What should be the overall configuration of the airplane? Which engines should be selected and where should they be located on the airframe? How should the airplane subsystems be configured relative to each other? How should the structure be arranged so as to achieve the desired weights and reliabilities? Questions such as these must be answered by design teams employing the new technologies supplied to them by research. We are seeking some of these answers now in the presently on-going Phase II–C portion of the SST program. Like every advanced aircraft, the design goals will not be achieved without difficulty. We have not, however, encountered any difficulties yet that we feel cannot be overcome by the concerted efforts of the best American aircraft designers.

I have talked so far about our technological readiness for an SST vehicle and the importance of creative design. There are, in addition, equally important concerns about our technological readiness with respect to the community problems that may be created by the presence of the vehicle. I refer here to the noise and sonic boom environment that the SST will produce in the vicinity of airports and along its flight path.

Increased noise has been historically a by-product of aeronautical progress. Increased engine power has almost invariably been accompanied by increased levels of engine noise. In the case of the SST, we are clearly dealing with a much larger and more powerful commercial airplane than any of the past. Noise must, therefore, receive the most careful attention. But we find in the SST some promising technical factors that give it potential noise advantages over its subsonic predecessors. One factor that shows some promise in alleviating the noise problem in the communities surrounding the airport is the inherent excess power required for the supersonic transport to accelerate past the speed of sound. Because of the excess of power, the possibility exists in climbing away from the airport more quickly and steeply than present day transports. At each point below its climb path, a noise level lower than that of the present subsonic jets may, therefore, be attainable. Although approach angles of the SST will not be significantly different from those of present subsonic jets, other factors indicate some promise for reducing the noise level of compressor whine during landing approach. Approach attitudes will be generally higher which, together with the relatively long inlet ducts of the SST, will tend to direct the compressor noise emanating from the front of the engine away from the ground. The possibility of approaching with choked inlets which attenuate that portion of the compressor noise leaving the front of the engine is also believed to be promising. It is our belief that it will be possible to achieve community noise levels at the three-mile point on take-off and the one-mile point on approach lower than the current values for large subsonic jets.

On the airport itself, sideline noise promises to be more of a problem than it is for the present subsonic commercial jets during the takeoff roll and the short periods of engine check-out. Although new concepts of engine noise reduction are being studied for the SST, such as ejector nozzles, it is not yet possible to predict their effectiveness in SST operation. External noise suppressors can be effective in reducing noise during check-out periods and sound deflection barriers can provide some relief along the sidelines during the takeoff roll.

Sonic boom presents a new dimension with which we have had no experience in commerical aviation. Our present knowledge of sonic boom phenomena and its effects has been gained primarily from laboratory studies and operational experience with relatively small military supersonic aircraft. We have gained through research at the NASA/Langley Research Center an understanding of the variables that govern the pressure changes in the shock waves that attach to a supersonic airplane and produce the sonic boom. This research has established that above the speed of sound further increase in speed, in itself, has comparatively little effect on sonic boom. However, increases in cruise speed dictate a higher cruise altitude which has a large effect in attenuating the sonic boom heard on the ground. Thus the net effect of increasing cruising speed is a reduction in sonic boom. The chief factors affecting the strength and character of the sonic boom are the shape and weight of the airplane and the distance above the ground. We have found, for example, that if an airplane of given weight is designed to have a shape for maximum aerodynamic flight efficiency, it will produce nearly a minimum level of sonic boom. Thus, for an aerodynamically efficient airplane of given weight, the only strong means at our disposal for making a significant reduction in sonic boom intensity is to fly at a higher altitude. This is, of course, one of the objects of SST operations, although flight altitude is very strongly dependent on inlet and engine size and characteristics and is therefore not a parameter that can be easily increased.

Although we have a clear understanding of the vehicle variables that govern the sonic boom and are thus able to predict the sonic boom created by a given vehicle, we are only beginning to understand in detail the effects of atmospheric variations and ground topography on the intensity of the pressure wave that sweeps over the ground. Effects of the sonic boom on ground structures are well understood in principle. Boom intensity levels are far below those required to produce damage in the major structural elements of houses and buildings. However, the triggering effect of the boom on damaging non-structural materials of a brittle nature such as glass or plaster, where incipient cracking already exists, is a quantity that is determinable only by statistical studies of a large number of houses and buildings subjected to repeated sonic booming.

This has necessarily been a very brief and simplified summary of our technological readiness for supersonic transport development. If one studies the start of large developments in the past, there are found various states of technological readiness. It is evident from this past experience that it is never possible, nor would it be desirable, to wait until every piece of technology is in hand before commencing a new development. On the other hand, it is clear that it is equally foolish to start with a technological base in which large and important elements are missing that would have to be supplied later. The large and important elements of supersonic transport technology are well in hand.

In summary, it is our view that the principal problem facing us now in the supersonic transport program is not one of technological readiness but rather one of creating a well integrated design which employs the available technologies and which fulfills the economic and functional objectives which have been set. Creation of a well integrated design is the principal purpose of the presently ongoing Phase II-C portion of the SST program. Our confidence in the skill of American aircraft designers gives us the belief that a supersonic transport design will evolve which is both safe and profitable.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after requesting more information the FAA sent an article entitled "Comments on the Case Against the SST," Harper's magazine, July 1966.

The second paragraph of this article said:

> We have so many disagreements, that a point-by-point rebuttal would be excessively long; instead we have elected to comment on each of his major points. The following are the major arguments Mr. Gibson makes and our comments on each.

Mr. President, if we are going to put up $280 million, we should not be too worried about the length of comments in reply to a critical article.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Comments on the Case Against the SST," Harper's magazine, July 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON THE CASE AGAINST THE SST, HARPER'S MAGAZINE, JULY 1966

Mr. Gibson makes a dramatic "Case Against the SST" in the July issue of Harper's. However dramatic his charges may be, they are not founded on the facts, nor does Mr. Gibson seem to be familiar with the technical aspects of the program.

We have so many disagreements that a point-by-point rebuttal would be excessively long; instead we have elected to comment on each of his major points. The following are the major arguments Mr. Gibson makes and our comment on each.

Statement: The U.S. is embarked on a "crash" program to develop and produce the SST.

Comment: This contention is simply not supported by the facts. The formal SST development program began in 1961 with the initial Congressional appropriation of $11 million. It is not expected to enter airline service until 1974. This time span of thirteen years is longer than the development cycle of any previous airplane. For example, the B-58, which began the design phase about 1951, was operational by 1960. The B-52 that began its early stages as a turboprop in 1946, was operational in 1954. These are the longest aircraft development programs on record. Comparing the SST schedule to these, it is clear that it is a reasonable program, deliberately paced and not a "crash" effort.

Mr. Gibson hints that we are responding blindly to the competition of the Concorde. That is not true, as demonstrated by the facts. The U.S. SST schedule is now three years behind the Concorde schedule. While time is certainly a factor in any competition, the U.S. SST Program is based on the belief that the best airplane is the one that is safest, most reliable and economical in operation. Every major management decision on the SST to date has reflected that philosophy. The decision to extend the design competition through the current eighteen-month phase demonstrates the determination to develop a sound design. The President directed that the SST be reliable and safe for the passenger, profitable for the airlines and manufacturers, superior to any comparable aircraft and introduced into the market in a timely manner. We do not have any fixed or arbitrary time objective.

Statement: The FAA is not equipped to manage such a major program, and it has a conflict of interest because it also must certificate the SST.

Comment: It's true that the FAA has never previously engaged in management of such a large scale development program. The solution to the problem has been to bring aboard the people who have long experience in management of large aircraft development programs. General McKee, Administrator of the FAA, has had long experience in top command and management positions in the Air Force. General Maxwell, the SST Program Director, was Chief of Bomber Development for the Air Force from 1952 to 1957, a period when all the current bombers, including the B-58 and B-52 were developed. Incidentally, the B-58 was the first aircraft to be developed under the Systems Concept. General Maxwell helped to pioneer these management advances, which are now used DOD-wide. As a matter of interest, the Program Director for the B-58 during its development cycle, Colonel Joe Howell (USAF-Retired), is a member of the SST Office. Many of the SST Office personnel are hand-picked people who have long experience in major development programs in Government and/or industry. From a quality standpoint, the SST is as well staffed as any other program office anywhere.

The FAA/SST Office is strongly supported by both DOD and NASA. For example, in the forthcoming evaluation these agencies are providing more than 200 of their most talented people. NASA has an extensive research and test program, including support in sonic boom B-70 flight test, as well as aerodynamic structure and propulsion at Langley, Lewis and Ames.

The Air Force Systems Command and Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base have advised and counseled on the management and procurement aspects of the program as well as provided strong support in the technical areas. We have used the Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tulahoma, and an extensive program is planned there in the future.

The Navy has provided strong support in engine development as well as aircraft structures, particularly weight estimation.

We have received much support from all Government agencies in our economic studies.

In summary, the FAA Office is not alone in this effort, but has an extensive and wide base of support throughout the Government of the most competent people available, and they are competent.

It is also true that the FAA must certificate the SST as well as the Concorde. Mr. Gibson suggests that FAA might be tempted to lower safety standards or otherwise compromise in order to justify a bad product.

The certification function in FAA is entirely separate and independent from the SST Development Office. The FAA Flight Standards Service sets the standards—in advance—that the SST—and the Concorde, and any other transport aircraft to be operated by U.S. airlines—must meet. These standards are the minimum safety standards that must be observed. The SST Program is determined to exceed every such standard set. Rather than inhibit certification or compromise it, the FAA will be in a better position to establish adequate standards because of the knowledge gained by having had the SST development responsibility. Furthermore, since a civil supersonic airplane has not been previously certificated, the Flight Standards Service has coordinated its efforts very closely with those of the British and French Government agencies that perform similar services for their countries. The SST will not only have to meet the U.S. standards, but those of Great Britain and France as well. Certification of the aircraft will be accomplished by the FAA Flight Standards Service working with the manufacturers on the same basis that any other transport is certificated.

Statement: Neither the manufacturers nor the airlines want the program and are not willing to share in its risk.

Comment: The competition between the manufacturers for this program is fierce. One only needs to examine the advertising in current periodicals and trade journals to verify that the keenest of competition exists.

Mr. Gibson's statement that the manufacturer(s) have "still refused the principle of participation and have not accepted this to this day" is not true. Manufacturers have shared in the costs of the program since its beginning. Through the current phase they have borne twenty-five percent of all allowable costs—and some costs that are not allowable, such as interest, advertising, customer relations, etc. The manufacturers will have contributed about $30 million each at the end of the current phase. By the end of prototype, we expect each to have shared about $90 million of allowable costs and to have made other major outlays, such as facilities, to make a total of more than $100 million each will have invested in the SST Program. This compares with a present net worth of each of about $300 million.

The airlines are interested, vitally so, in getting a good airplane. The airlines have a major voice in all decisions on the program. They have established a technical committee headed by Mr. Bill Mentzer, Senior Vice President—Engineering and Maintenance, United Air Lines, with technical panels to review all aspects of the design. Their participation has been enthusiastic and fruitful.

The number of delivery position agreements for the SST continues to increase, including six recent positions for United Air Lines, who Mr. Gibson says "found that the operating cost of a Mach 3 transport will be 26 percent higher than present generation jet transports for transcontinental flights." One hundred five delivery positions have been allocated to twenty-four airlines, for which they have deposited ten million, five hundred thousand dollars in the U.S. Treasury. We have inquiries in hand from other airlines. To date, every major U.S. flag carrier that has a foreseeable need for U.S. SST has placed deposits with the Government. Their only dissatisfaction appears to be with their relative position on the allocations list.

We don't know the basis for Mr. Gibson's statement that "BOAC had not ordered the Concorde nor has it even paid a deposit for a delivery position." It is a fact that BOAC received six of the first eighteen delivery positions, which were equally distributed between BOAC, Air France and Pan American. It is hardly conceivable that BOAC, a government-owned airline, will not order the airplane to which the British Government has committed itself to develop.

The U.S. SST Program is based on the proposition that the manufacturers and the airlines will share the risks of the program in acordance with their ability to do so.

Statement: The SST is technically unsound and will be unsafe and uncomfortable for the passenger.

Comment: Mr. Gibson displays a lack of familiarity with the technical state of the art in aircraft design or, indeed, of the accomplishments of aviation generally. For example, he says the B–58 experienced an "unexpected" temperature rise at supersonic speed. The B–58 is a cruise-dash airplane. It was designed for both subsonic and supersonic operation. Its operating temperatures can be easily predicted by any competent aeronautical engineer. It was not intended, however, to operate at supersonic speed except for brief periods, usually not over thirty minutes. The fact that the B–58 was not designed for continuous supersonic operations doesn't mean that it couldn't be, nor does operation at these temperatures pose any serious design problem. The B–58 was designed in 1952–53, thirteen or fourteen years ago, and much has transpired since that time.

Mr. Gibson's article makes only a passing reference to the existence of the RS–71 and YF–12 series airplanes which are designed to operate continuously at supersonic speeds that are well in excess of SST design goals, and they are doing so as a matter of daily routine.

The article states that, "Since the aircraft grows unbearably hot after a short stretch of supersonic flight, the engine fuel will be made to flow through passages in vital parts to prevent it from melting." The skin temperature of the SST will not exceed approximately 500 degrees. This will not melt a titanium structure whose melting point is on the order of 2000 degrees. It is common practice to use fuel to cool some parts of the aircraft. This is not a new technique, indeed, it is used on today's aircraft. Mr. Gibson suggests that, "When the pilot shuts off fuel to engines in preparation for descent, engine temperature will zoom 150 degrees higher in a few minutes' interval." We do not know the basis for this statement. It is not correct.

Mr. Gibson suggests that, "if the pressurization system failed at 60,000 to 80,000 feet, the cabin would probably collapse." Structural integrity under all conditions of flight are basic design criteria for the SST. Ample structural safety margins will be required on the SST just as on any other airplane. It is true that if the cabin is completely depressurized death would occur, but there is no reason to suspect that this will ever happen. Should a window be lost, the cabin depressurizes to about 20 to 25 thousand feet, much as today's transports would do. The passenger will be provided with oxygen, just as on today's airliner. The air conditioning and pressurization system will have triple redundancy to ensure safety under any emergency conditions. The pressure cabin will be subjected to the severest test programs that have ever been devised.

Mr. Gibson suggests there is something impossible about designing a hinge for a folding wing. He points out, "The entire stress of the wing must pass through this single pivot." This is not unusual in design; for example, the entire load of the Golden Gate bridge goes through the two cables that support it, helicopters depend upon a single rotor shaft, etc. The F–111 incorporates the folding wing feature and has had no difficulty with this mechanism. Extensive testing has already been accomplished on the SST hinge. It will not be mechanically possible to extend one wing without the other; furthermore, it is possible to land the airplane safely with the wings in the folded position in the remote chance that it ever becomes necessary, with a landing speed of just over 200 mph. There are many runways that can accommodate this.

Incidentially, the contention that the F–111 pilot will eject if the wings will not go forward is also erroneous. Furthermore, this problem has not arisen in a rather extensive testing program.

Mr. Gibson says that the SST will be far less comfortable than today's jet airplanes, even to the extent that, "passengers will have to remain strapped on a contour couch for the entire flight to avoid injury." We have conducted extensive analyses of the ride to be expected on the SST and find it would be quite comparable to that of today's jets. About the only thing to be said about clear air turbulence is that at the cruise altitude of the SST, we expect less of it than at today's subsonic jet cruising altitudes. Furthermore, in ascending and descending the aircraft will be equipped with a weather radar just as subsonic jets are and must cope with the same weather

Mr. Gibson also expressed concern that the aerodynamic center of pressure changes between subsonic and supersonic flight. The two designs being proposed—the double delta and the variable-sweep wing—automatically compensate for this change. We expect no restriction on passengers seating or movement in the cabin. Indeed, that is a design requirement.

Mr. Gibson also expresses concern about radiation effects. This has been the subject of careful study by the most expert people in the world and the conclusion they reached is that there are no real problems, except for the possibility of a solar flare, a relatively rare occurrence and for which we have ample warning. If a solar flare does occur, the aircraft simply descends to a lower cruising altitude. Such a warning net exists and will be used for the Apollo moon program.

He suggests a host of other minor problems such as hydraulic systems which must operate at high temperatures and supersonic rain erosion. There are solutions to all these and the plane will not only withstand rain, but it is going to be required to withstand hail, as well as the impact of large birds such as ducks and geese.

He also suggests that, "properly done, a sonic boom attack can maim and kill people while knocking down buildings in a wide swath from one end of the country to the other." He states that this may be even a "more effective weapon on an enemy population than an atom bomb." Despite deliberate efforts to achieve substantial destruction by sonic boom, the Air Force has been unable to do so. It is true that booms of aircraft at low altitudes can cause damage to windows, plaster, etc., but the SST is not going to fly supersonic under such conditions. Tests conducted to date under proposed conditions of supersonic flight for the SST don't reveal that any of this nature problem exists. The sonic boom is annoying and can, and does, cause some minor damage, but it is not a threat to life, limb and property.

Mr. Gibson states that reports have not been made available to the public on the Oklahoma City sonic boom tests. That is not true. Final reports have been published and are available to the public. A listing of these reports and information as to where they may be obtained is appended.

Mr. Gibson suggests that airway communications and traffic control are special problems for the SST. He says the B–58 was out of contact for a substantial portion of its supersonic flight from Japan to France. This was stated to be a temperature problem. We can't comment on that since we don't know the facts. But we do know that we can, and do, build communications equipment entirely suitable for the SST. The higher cruise altitude of the SST helps, rather than hinders, line of sight communications.

It's true that the SST will outmode the older navigation aids, but it will have its own, an inertial system with double redundancy capable of positioning more accurately than any system of today. Inertial systems are already under test now on regular airline runs. Our simulation of SST operations in our traffic control system does not reveal serious problems.

Mr. Gibson says that, "the sound of an SST taking off will make citizens living near airports long for the good old days of subsonic jets. The SST engines will be much louder." The SST has very exacting noise objectives that are lower than today's jets. Furthermore, we fully expect to meet them. The SST is the first program to incorporate noise limits as a design objective. The SST isn't going to require "dangerous noise abatement maneuvers." The powerful engines required for supersonic flight not only give the SST a margin of safety but provide the power to climb away from the airport quickly, thus reducing community noise exposure. The long variable engine inlet can be used to advantage in suppressing approach noise, particularly the fan or compressor whine. We think the SST world is going to be quieter.

Mr. Gibson expresses "concern about the wake turbulence of an SST, all craft must keep out of its track for as long as five minutes after it passes." While there is a persistence of the turbulent vortices for large aircraft, it is not nearly so severe or persistent as Mr. Gibson intimates. It is not peculiar to the SST, nor is it more severe in the SST than other large airplanes with powerful engines. Mr. Gibson also states that, "All craft must keep from in front of it (SST) since the SST, once committed to a landing is dangerous and expensive to wave off. Takeoffs likewise are critical." The SST has very favorable flight characteristics and a large excess of power during takeoff and landing. It uses less runway. It has better visibility. In short, it has every reason to be safer, not more dangerous. Expensive to wave off? Yes, but so is any large jet.

Statement: The SST can't make money.

Comment: Mr. Gibson says that an extra climbing turn will "require as much as 16,000 pounds of extra fuel," that a 30-minute hold will require "more than 10 tons of fuel." His figures are excessive. Nonetheless, our estimates of operating costs include such contingencies.

We are not familiar with the United Airlines study but we do know that United has now signed position allocation agreements and deposited the money for them. We have received other airline studies that show, as we predict, that the seat-mile cost of the SST will compare favorably with today's jet costs.

Mr. Gibson comments on the possibility that BOAC will order the Boeing 747 large subsonic jet. We fully expect that. This is not to be an SST world, but a world with SST's. There is room—and need—in the market for subsonic and supersonic airplanes.

We can find no substantive data in Mr. Gibson's arguments to support his sweeping conclusion that the "SST can't make money." Until he analyzes the data and conducts a thorough study of demand, operating costs and other economic factors, his conclusions must be challenged.

In summary, Mr. Gibson's article is so fraught with inaccuracies that we cannot consider him to be a competent critic of the program.

The SST Program does have problems—many of them. We can, and do, appreciate constructive criticism—but not the kind offered by Mr. Gibson.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in addition to the editorial referred to in the Wall Street Journal and Mr. Bailey's article, which I previously inserted in the RECORD, Mr. Bailey also wrote a letter to the Wall Street Journal entitled, "SST Not a Crash Program." This letter aroused my interest because at one point, after explaining the mutual participation on the part of various manufacturers and airlines, he states, "Therefore, the airplane will be built at no cost to the taxpayer."

If that is the way he feels, why are we being asked to appropriate $280 million today.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin because I think the program should be looked at more carefully. There will be a report in December and this still leaves $80 million for research.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the editor, written by Mr. Robert A. Bailey, vice president of Lockhead, to the Wall Street Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SST NO CRASH PROGRAM

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your July 28 editorial "A Senseless Urgency," referring to the supersonic transport, might have been on the subject of "Measured Deliberancy," if we may coin a word.

Far from being "a premature crash program," the supersonic transport has been developed with more deliberateness and circumspection than perhaps any other in our nation's history. Our own research on this transport goes back to 1956, and the National Aeronautics & Space Administration began its studies at about the same time. We have been accumulating actual supersonic flight experience since 1954 when we first flew the 1,500-mile-per-hour F–104, and now have several years of 2,000-mile-per-hour flight experience with the titanium YF–12A and SR–71, which fly for sustained periods at even faster speeds and higher altitudes than the supersonic transport.

When you reflect that, on the present schedule, the supersonic transport will not fly for the first time until 1970 and will not go into airline service until 1974, you realize that it will have behind it 20 years of research, development, production and flight testing before it finally sees service. And all this is to say nothing of related experience in high altitude and supersonic flight gained in many other programs.

The Government may well put up the greater part of $2 billion to finance development, as you point out. But you fail to mention that the manufacturers too will put up hundreds of millions of dollars as their own share of the development cost, that the manufacturers and the Government have already agreed on the basic principle of complete Government recovery of its investment, and that the airplane will therefore be built at no cost to the taxpayer.

It is also not true that "it's still entirely unclear whether mammoth engineering and economic problems will ever be solved." The major problems in both categories have been solved. We know we can build the plane, we know it can be flown safely, and we know it will make money. Each generation has always had its faint-hearts or its pessimists who have railed against technical progress. In each case the future overwhelmed them.

ROBERT A. BAILEY,
Vice President, Lockheed-California Co.
BURBANK, CALIF.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some of the questions I would hope could be answered in a little more detail are these:

First. What is the total estimated cost of this airplane?

Second. When is it expected the airplane will be in operation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield at that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator like me to answer him question by question? I do not believe the Senator has read the record sufficiently. All of these questions are answered in the record, over and over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes of the time of the Senator from Wisconsin have expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed time on the bill, which the majority leader said would be in order at the time I reserved my right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Just enough time to complete what I want to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am sure there are answers available to most, if not all, of these questions. I am not sure that I would agree with all the answers; therefore, I thought it well to read them into the RECORD.

The way the Gibson article was cut to pieces by many people interested made me in turn more interested in the article than before.

The second question: When is it expected the airplane will be in actual routine operation?

Third. Is it not true that the cost of development of transports in recent years has been largely absorbed by the military; but in this case, the military have dropped a comparable airplane, the RS–70, better known as the B–70.

Fourth. What is the current status of the Concorde?

Fifth. Are the British and French still working together on this development? Has there been any slowdown by either country?

Sixth. Why is it necessary to go to an airplane with a speed approximating mach 3, which will be three times the speed of the best present jets, and thereby multiply the engineering problems involved, as against a mach 2 airplane which even so would be over twice the speed of the best present jets?

We all remember the fine Lockheed Electra with a speed as I remember it, of about 480 miles an hour. The full jet pushed it out of production with a speed of 650 miles an hour. Because of the additional difficult problems in going to a speed of mach 3, where we move far into the heat barrier after passing the sonic barrier. I question the advisability of, putting all of the taxpayers money on a mach 3 development.

Seventh. Did Federal Aviation Administrator Quesada recommend a mach 2 airplane or a mach 3 airplane in 1960?

Eighth. Later, did the next Federal Aviation Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, say the Government would absorb 75 percent of the cost of the SST?

Ninth. If that is true, as mentioned, how can anyone say the airplane will therefore be built at no cost to the taxpayer?

All I can say is, if that turns out to be true, it is the first time ever.

Tenth. Even if there are plans to have the airlines pay back the multibillion-dollar investment of the U.S. Government, which history shows at best can only be doubtful, suppose the entire development is comparable to the many missile developments in recent years in that it just does not work out at all. If that is true, are the manufacturers or the airlines required to put up any of the loss?

Eleventh. Is it true that the Government has now agreed to put up 90 percent of the money; and if not, what figure has the Government agreed to put up originally?

Twelfth. Did the President's financial adviser, Mr. Eugene Black, recommend responsibility for the SST to be removed from the Federal Aviation Agency?

Thirteenth. Is it true that the FAA announced in 1964 that the first flight of the airplane would be in September 1968; and that type certification by FAA would be made by 1969; and that passenger service would start by May of 1970?

Fourteenth. If so, what are the present timetable figures in the three above categories?

Fifteenth. Is it true that this is the first time the FAA has ever administered a large technical development, specifically the development of an airplane that it itself must in turn decide whether said plane is or is not adequate in design for passenger service?

Sixteenth. In other words, is it right to have the Agency that will certify the airplane as operational be the same Agency that obtained these billions for its design, development, and production? Is there not a conflict of interest here?

Seventeenth. Does this not mean that, in effect, the FAA will be asked to certify that it has spent its money wisely and that its own technical judgment is sound?

Eigtheenth. One of the reasons I changed my position on the plan for the B–70, later the RS–70, was the fact the Secretary of Defense testified before the Senate that some of the engineering problems necessary before this airplane could be produced had not been worked out even on the basis of scientific theory.

If that was true of the B–70 military problem, is it not even more true of this comparable commercial proposal?

Nineteenth. Is it true that ejection from the TFX is on the basis of a completely enclosed pressurized cockpit which would let the pilot fall 5 or 10 miles in his escape capsule without risking "breathless air"?

Twentieth. What was the original development cost of the TFX? Air Force and Navy.

Twenty-first. What is the present estimate?

Twenty-second. What was the original estimated unit cost of the TFX for the Air Force?

Twenty-third. What is the present cost?

Twenty-fourth. What is the original estimated cost of the TFX, Navy?

I am talking about the unit cost, and read some figures recently which were surprising.

Twenty-fifth. What is the present estimate?

Twenty-sixth. Is it not logical especially considering the totally new atmosphere in which this research and development will be done, that the same type and character of cost increase can be expected in the development of the SST?

Twenty-seventh. My final question—Is it true that the Nation's largest airline made a study which found that the operating cost of a mach 3 plane will be 26 percent higher for long haul and 43 percent for short haul than present day jet transports?

Now, Mr. President, I am sure Mr. Gibson is not accurate in all his statements, but think it unfortunate that he was so heavily criticized by various people. I should like to read one or two sentences from his article:

> The Federal Aviation Agency is abandoning its historic role as the objective guardian of airways safety to push a commercial adventure for which little if any technical or economic grounds can be found at present. The Concorde consortium was used as an excuse to trigger our unobjective rush not to be left behind. The loud "second thoughts" by the British on the Concorde and the recently revealed distress of the consortium at skyrocketing costs have, unfortunately, not slowed the push on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Massachusetts qualified the Senator from Missouri as an outstanding expert——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, are we going to take up all the time on this?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This will take only about a minute and a half.

The Senator from Massachusetts qualified the Senator from Missouri as an outstanding expert because of his membership on the Armed Services Committee, the Space Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee. That is true in the space area. But here in the supersonic flight area, he is supremely qualified. I submit that of all the Members of this body, there is no one who is more of an authority on aviation than is the Senator from Missouri, a distinguished former Secretary of the Air Force, a man who has been an extraordinarily successful businessman. Therefore, in this area, which involves both aviation and business prospects, I do not think there is any Senator who is more qualified to speak, and I think the questions he has asked, the thundering unanswered questions make a convincing and devastating case for the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the totally undeserved remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not pose as an expert, but am curious, based on our considerable experience in the development of other airplanes, and the sad experience we had with respect to the B–70, later called the RS–70; and believe we should have more information, especially with respect to the proposal to go to mach 3 with a commercial plane.

I have very high regard for the Administrator of the FAA, and have known of his superb work for many years. There is no man in Government who has kept up with the subject of aviation more than General McKee. But this is an entirely new field for the FAA. I have been given information about this proposal by experts, and I am not sure going to mach 3 is sound. It is for those reasons I have made these observations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] suggested that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] told the Senate something. The Senator from Missouri told the Senate nothing; he simply asked questions, and I think logical questions. But he has not told the Senate anything about the SST. The SST is a research project. The Committee on Appropriations and other committees of the Senate, including the Commerce Committee, have been associated with it for some time.

I could answer the questions the Senator asked. I would not answer those questions from my own personal technical knowldege, but I could quote passage after passage in answer to every question the Senator from Missouri has raised.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has been an expert on aviation. I have had dealings with him in the past, even when he was Secretary of the Air Force. He is also a pretty good lawyer today. When I used to argue before juries, I would ask questions and leave the answers in the air. The jurors would say, "Yeah, that may be right." All a lawyer has to do is ask questions and leave the answers in the air.

The SST is not anything new. The authorization under the FAA for research started how long ago?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In 1962.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In 1962. It is an experiment designed to move the United States into the forefront in world air transport. We could wait until the French and British build their plane and then buy those airplanes. That would certainly help the balance-of-payments deficit, about which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has talked often and eloquently. Yes, we could wait for the British and French to build their airplane; but the decision was made, including that of the three Presidents, that we should experiment in the building of a better airplane.

There are some technical problems. The article written by the professor at

Michigan, about which there was the editorializing, was written on studies made 2½ years ago. Many things have happened since then.

I cannot guarantee that the airplane is going to fly. Perhaps I am like the fellow who saw the first airplane. He said, "They can't get it up." Then when it got up he said, "Yes, it's up there, but they ain't going to get it down."

There is no more inherent risk in this airplane, according to the evidence and the pages of testimony, than there was when we started at the same stage with the jet airplane. That is what the experts tell us.

There has been long competition in this matter, to the point where only four are left. I am not embarrassed to say that one of them happens to be Mr. Boeing. There are two left, really, Lockheed, Boeing, and the two powerplant companies—General Electric and Pratt & Whitney.

One of the problems involves the problem of heat, which is a legitimate question to raise. The experts say that the use of improved titanium will take care of the heat problem. This study has been going on a long time, and they are now ready. And Mr. McNamara, head of the Board, made the decision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my statement. We are under a time limitation.

Eighteen more months were allowed, because they wanted to permit the powerplant people to have an opportunity. The plans have been submitted. The money here provided is to finish the research. The announcement as to what is to be done with respect to the plane will be made in January. That decision will be evaluated by approximately 100 experts. A committee of around 100 experts will look at every phase of it. Everyone says it is commercially feasible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Every witness says it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All we can go on is what the witnesses tell us. I am not a builder of planes. We have had splendid experience over the years. This plane is commercially feasible to the same extent that the 707 is. It is a question of whether we want to go ahead and get it ready.

The Senator from Alaska asked, "Why should not the private people take care of this?" The reason is that it is going to cost so much. The best figure for the development through certification is $2.1 billion.

Mr. Kennedy, when he announced out at Colorado Springs in a speech, we should do this, said the cost ought to be divided 75–25. The Senator from Oklahoma held long hearings on this matter, and everybody testified, and it looked like that might be a little bit unrealistic; and the Black-Osborne committee agreed it was unrealistic. No one agreed as to whether it should be 90–10, 85–15, or what the division should be; but they asked the people to submit plans, which they have submitted, and the average investment for the companies would be, as was pointed out, about 22 percent. These are the plans which they submitted, which have not been entirely agreed to yet.

The airlines have been working at this for 10 years. I think Lockheed has been in it for 12. So it is not new with them. There is a total investment, conservatively, by the power people and others considered in the computation, of at least $100 million by private industry.

Let us take the two airplane companies. Mr. Boeing and Mr. Lockheed, if they sold out tomorrow, have net assets of about $320 million. They are about equal. This was a program the United States wanted to go ahead with, and they did not feel they could do it with the amount of assets they had. The plan is for them to participate, and that plan has been discussed with the committee, General McKee, the President, Secretary McNamara, and others on many occasions.

Then it was said the Government should get back its money. The plan for that is pretty well worked out. They are all committed, and the fact is—I do not know whether the Government is involved in the sale or not—that once the plane is ready to fly, there are over 96 orders for it already with advance deposits made.

But the plan generally—and everybody seems to agree on this, including the Presidential Committee—is that they would pay a royalty on the plane, some kind of royalty, something like a revenue bond. Then, if the plane flew, we would then get our money back for the investment cost.

That is the reason for the expenditure, to finish the project. The $280 million is merely a continuation of what we have done already. We have appropriated $231 million over the years, this year's appropriation would total $511 million in all, providing it prevails. We have done it because there is plenty of authorization from the FAA. Once it becomes a prototype and will be built; then, of course, we would have to have additional authorization.

The Senator from Oklahoma went through this in great detail. It is a question, of course, of whether we want to have what we call American superiority in the air. That is what most of of it is about, and whether or not we can compete with the British and the French.

One further thing I wish to add—I will take time on the bill if necessary—is that the Russians have started their supersonic program. We have evidence from people who have been there and seen it. They are not as far along as the French and the British. I do not know whether they are as far along as we.

Here, again, is involved the question of what we think we should do to be ahead in the jets, and to keep American air superiority. It will help the balance-of-payments program.

There are several other questions that have been asked, technical questions. I am sure we have many of the answers in the testimony. I do not remember them all.

There is a problem, frankly, on the sonic boom.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not ask about that problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know, but there is a problem. There is no use saying there is not. I do not think there is a problem, any more, on the powerplant.

All the studies indicate that economically, the plane will be as feasible as, to use the comparison I have made before, the 707.

Whether anybody wishes to fly to London in 2 hours and a half instead of 5, or whatever the time is now, I cannot answer. I am sure there are many people who said, when the jet came along, "What do I care about getting to Seattle or Los Angeles or across the ocean 4 hours sooner?"

Now everybody wants to fly the jets. This is inherent, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, having been part of it, in progress in aviation. We think it would be wrong to stop it now, when this impartial board is ready to make the decision. The Secretary of Defense himself as Chairman, and the financing has been presented to the White House by the Black-Osborne Committee.

That is the way this matter has evolved. It is not new. We have put all this money in it already, and now the Senator from Wisconsin suggests—and I suppose one could possibly wonder—"Well, suppose we do all this and it does not fly?"

Well, I guess we would be out. But there is not a scintilla of evidence by anyone who knows the aviation field, whether he be a technician or the president of an airline which is going to buy it, that there is any likelihood at all of that happening. The possibilities are so remote that they are all willing to take the chance. It will be a good airplane, and a good addition to our passenger fleet.

I cannot add any more. I am not speaking for myself personally; I am speaking from the wealth and the depth of the evidence on this matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand the Senator to say something about the use of titanium. What did he say about it? I did not quite understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Titanium is to be used instead of aluminum alloy for the plane.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought it had been condemned by the Secretary of Defense. It was not a proven material for the TFX.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not by the supersonic transport people. Both Lockheed and Boeing are planning on using titanium.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know, but it was condemned for the TFX.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was when Boeing offered to use it in the TFX.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This was perhaps before recent improvements and refinements of the metal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do know about it. I just wonder when it became suitable material out of which to build planes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what the witnesses said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did not the Senator have any curiosity about it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They said this would stand heat better than the aluminum alloy they have. The French and the British have an alloy they are using.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think there is any question about the value of the material, or the suitableness of it. But it was condemned for the TFX. Because of that condemnation, that was one of the reasons why Boeing, although it offered a better contour, a better design of plane, was denied the contract to build the TFX. Now we say we are going to use it in a supersonic plane. I just wondered if there was any explanation for that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would think if it was not suitable, they would have planned to use the other alloys.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator's 15 minutes on the amendment have expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on balance of payments, I agree with everything the able Senator from Washington has said. As I understand it, with relatively little experience, the British and the French now plan to build the so-called Concorde, which will be a mach 2 airplane, a plane that will have more than twice the speed of the fastest commercial jet of today.

The problems involved in going from a mach 2 airplane to a mach 3 airplane are many times the problems involved in going from a subsonic jet to a mach 2 airplane.

In addition, we already have had experience with a mach 2 airplane, in that we have created a fine bomber, the B–58, which is a large mach 2 plane, not a fighter.

If there is any company better at building big airplanes than Lockheed, it is Boeing. If there is any company better than Boeing at building big planes, it is Lockheed. Both of those companies are now in the finals on this airplane. But why do we have to go to mach 3, with all the tremendous additional problems?

I make this prediction. If we stick to mach 3, it will mean the business will go to the British and/or the French, and we will be stuck with one of these long and fruitless development programs that we on military committees know so much about.

The Senator from Arkansas made some interesting observations. We will not have a mach 3 plane flying for many years, regardless of whether Lockheed or Boeing gets the contract. They are both mighty responsible companies. At mach 2 I think we would be able to produce some fairly soon and maintain this market for ourselves. In any case statements in this article disturbed me. I did not get sufficient answers, and therefore asked these questions on the floor today. No doubt someone has all the answers to the questions raised by Mr. Gibson, in which case they should be made part of the record.

In my opinion, if we go to a mach 3 plane, we could lose a good part of the market, at a cost to the American taxpayer of billions of dollars.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope we can answer the question in this way. That is what the research is all about, to make the decision that the Senator talks about.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The decision has been made to go to a mach 3 airplane, so I have been told.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not completely.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have been told that by people who ought to know.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They can change their minds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for his tolerance and understanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we ought to define the terms. A B–58 is not a mach 2 airplane, with all due respect to my friend. It is a dash plane that can fly at mach 2 for 30 minutes, and then it slackens off. It has no relation to the type of plane that we are talking about.

The British and the French are going to build a plane with a maximum speed of mach 2.2. At that speed the alloy gets soft.

We have suitable metal for the use of airplanes going beyond mach 2.2. We have the best engineers in the world located in the American aircraft factories. They have carefully studied, investigated, and researched the planes. They know and believe this for sure, because we have had enough trials with the military planes and some of the very high flying planes to know that, for planes flying at mach 3, titanium is a satisfactory material. It can stand speeds and heat in excess of mach 3.

America has asked: "Why stop at mach 2.2 as the very limit and find that we can go further?"

The airlines want to buy an American plane because the American plane has great capabilities of going beyond the mach 3 stage.

That is what everybody wants. The Concorde will be an interim plane and our overseas airlines will have to buy some.

It will be several years before delivery of the Concorde, which is expected in 1971. The delivery date is 1974 for the SST that we plan to build—when it comes out of production and goes into service.

However, it will have range. It will have speed. Above all, it will have the capability of carrying passengers or payload that will be far superior to that of the Concorde. That is why every airline in the world with long-range schedules to meet is placing its orders and putting up its money to get in line for the SST.

They feel that the American engineers are the best and that the U.S. plane will be the best product.

The other plane is an interim plane and it will be phased out as soon as deliveries begin on the American SST.

Make no mistake about the voting down of the money contained in the bill. I do not think that we have explained it quite properly; $80 million is left in the bill for continuing the planning and the blueprints; $200 million would be cut out under the amendment. That is the money that would go into the prototype construction, to begin cutting metal and to building a flying prototype.

It will cost approximately $900 million, to complete the construction of two prototypes with their engines, and to complete the 100-hour test phase.

This is the money that will be necessary if we expect to have an SST. We can have the blueprints and everything else, but sooner or later we must put up the money to cut metal, and that is the money that would be cut out.

Make no mistake about it, if we vote down this money today, I predict that the SST, from the American standpoint, is dead.

The Concorde is a government enterprise of the British and French Governments. We will have to compete. We are trying to do it within the framework of the great engine and airplane plants.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, when the Senator speaks about mach 2 and mach 3 speed, how fast is that in plain English?

Mr. MONRONEY. Each step is approximately 660 miles. Mach 1 would be 660 miles an hour. Mach 2 will be over 1,300 miles an hour, for the Concorde. Mach 3 would be from 1,800 to 2,000 miles an hour. It varies with the altitude.

Mr. JACKSON. It depends on whether it is at sea level.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. At 37,000 feet the speed would be better than that.

If we kill the appropriation of this money, the program would be dead, because the Concorde would dominate the market. It would eliminate an aircraft that the airlines have been waiting for with which to equip their new fleets.

These airline people are not crazy. They know a lot about airplanes. They have been putting their money up and waiting for the American planes that will be made of titanium, planes which will have a speed of mach 3.

I do not think that we will be able to delay the program and let the British and French get far ahead of us. The world will think that the program is dead. We would not have any right to claim that we could regain our leadership.

The amount of payments that we are worrying about would be pretty severe, if the estimate of production is correct. The estimate has been made by both Lockheed and Boeing that there would be 1,200 of them produced and the plane would probably cost in the neighborhood of $30 million. That would expose us to a loss in balance of payments of about $36 billion on the plane itself, because we would have to buy the plane abroad if we do not produce it here.

We would lose that much in balance of payments that we would otherwise be able to earn and keep in America. We will also lose the market for the world, because they are going to buy the fastest plane available, and they are waiting for the mach 3. If they do not get it they will use the Concorde.

The balance of payments would not flow to America. We have been in the leadership. We have been experts in the transport field for many years. It has been very hard to win this position.

The SST is a natural step-up from the subsonic jet, which we have developed.

I feel that we would be making one of the greatest mistakes that we have ever made in forecasting the future of this country if we are timid at this time and lack faith in our airplane companies and engineers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, along the line of what the Senator just said, on page 348 of the Senate hearings, General Maxwell said:

> The balance-of-payments benefits that result from this program are about 50 percent based on the orders we have, and based on our projection of sales. We expect that 50 percent of the aircraft sold will be to foreign carriers, like BOAC, Air France, et cetera. Involved in this program are some 50,000 jobs, probably for two decades.

That would be lost.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the Senator. I know this is an unusual procedure. There is no one in the management business who can manage a program of this size, a program to develop the supersonic transport. Therefore, we have turned to the Federal Aviation Agency to find the best reservoir of talent, talent which is unbiased and is competent to do a good job on that score.

The man who is in charge of this program for the FAA is the one who was in charge of developing the B–58, which is the nearest thing we have had to the RS–70.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield. I will try to answer the question.

Mr. COOPER. The appropriation is for $280 million, which is to be available until expended. How much would be expended in the next fiscal year? The argument is made—and it is one that has weight—that we must consider the desirability of spending so large an amount during wartime.

Mr. MONRONEY. Eighty million dollars would be spent between now and January 1; $200 million would be available after January 1 for the actual construction of the prototype. This is an important part of the plane's development. The prototype construction and the flight test up to 100 hours will give us the really critical answer as to whether we will have such an airplane. This will cost $894 million.

Mr. COOPER. But all of the $280 million would be expended during the next fiscal year?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; $80 million would be spent now for completing the design; and $200 million would be for prototype construction. That is the first phase.

The cost for the next year, fiscal 1968, would be $450 million, which would round out the total cost to bring the plane up to the 100-hour flight test.

Mr. COOPER. About $500 million has already been spent?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; about $251 million has been spent, according to the figures I have—$251 million has been provided by the Federal Government and $27 million by the private manufacturers.

Mr. COOPER. Would the total $280 million actually be spent, or would it be obligated? Of course, I know that "obligated" means that the amount would have to be spent at some later date.

Mr. MONRONEY. My impression is that it will be spent, because we have to finish paying for the design and the initial stages of prototype construction.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. As I understand, the funds that are being requested in this appropriation will either be spent or obligated. Is that not the point? Not all of the funds that have been requested in the bill will be spent during the current fiscal year. But I gather that the funds will be obligated.

Mr. MONRONEY. As fast as the work goes forward on the development and production of the two prototypes that will be built, that money will be paid out. It is for the next fiscal year, and the fiscal year has already begun. The $80 million will apply to the completion of the design, and the rest to the prototype construction.

Mr. JACKSON. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma for the able statement he is making, and I likewise commend my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, for the fine way in which he has handled this matter in the Committee on Commerce and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations.

It seems almost inconceivable to me that the United States would permit the Soviet Union and the British and the French to take over the supersonic transport business. It seems to me that if we are to really move in this field, we must move now. Time is of the essence, is it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

If we abandon the position of leadership in commercial aviation that we have achieved through the efforts of our great manufacturing firms, our engineers, our Air Force designers, and the men who have produced the military planes from which have grown many of our good transports—if we abandon our position by making a decision here today that we are unwilling to believe that we can build the best supersonic transport in the world—then we deserve to be second place, and we will be a second-place nation if that continues to be our philosophy.

I do not believe that is what America wishes to do, nor is America ready to surrender the hard-won laurels that our jets have won for us—our DC–6's, and all the other planes through the years that have been the standard hallmark of safe airline transportation—and give up without a fight and say, "OK, Concorde, take it." We cannot say, "We do not want to risk building a plane out of titanium and stainless steel. We do not want to fly at mach 3. We will fly at mach 2, and let you have that world market."

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that, while the information is not available to any great depth, the Russians are moving very rapidly in this direction?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. It may well be that they are modifying their supersonic bomber. It may well be that they are embarking on an entirely new program. The experts seem to agree, however, do they not, that the Russians are in the process of building and will have available a supersonic transport?

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly they will. And we do not know, because of their secrecy, how far along they are on it.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact, further, that from a military point of view, looking ahead into the late 1970's, supersonic transports could play an important part in connection with our military airlift?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Unquestionably, when engines and planes are built that can fly across the oceans at three times the speed of sound, that technology is being moved forward on the advance of military aircraft, whether it is called that or not. When you prove means of handling and welding and working with titanium and stainless steel and new metals for the future planes, you are proving techniques that are valuable for the military.

I have voted for the space program, and will continue to do so. I followed my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, on the $5 billion NASA vote, and I resisted the proposed 3-percent cut in the space budget. Yet, this 3-percent cut that was offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin equals the total amount—$200 million—necessary to get us underway and keep us on a schedule in producing a usable item that the world is waiting to buy and to use.

I have as much faith in our engineers in the aeronautical field as I have in the engineers in the space field. Considering the things they are doing in space, I believe that we can overcome the obstacles that will be met at mach 3—the problem of temperatures and other questions that have been raised. About 80 percent of the objections that have been raised have already been met and answered in the production models of our aircraft that are flying today and in our military craft of high speeds. All these matters can and will be resolved as we move into the production stage.

I believe Boeing and Lockheed will turn out a trouble-free design. Probably there will be some bugs in it at first, but that did not keep the Wright brothers from trying at Kitty Hawk.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator mentioned my name with respect to votes on the NASA program. That program, however, is over 50 percent accomplished, whereas this one has just started and is still in engineering theory.

We have had experience with the plane the Senator referred to, the only country with any real experience in a large plane operational at mach 2. If we went ahead with a mach 2 plane, we would more than double the speed of the fastest commercial airplanes of today, and would be biting off a great deal with respect to holding our own and the world market.

In addition, if we wanted to do something in an engineering way that realists in France and Great Britain apparently will not even consider, continue to investigate the possibility of a mach 3 airplane with passengers, that would be fine. But now we say we do not want to double the speed of sound; we want to triple it.

In doing so, I believe we may be biting off so much, engineering wise, that the business will go where we do not wish it to go. People will buy British or French commercial airplanes, that fly twice the speed of any airplane today; and I doubt they will wait for us to give them a plane three times as fast, because the amount of money and delay involved will be great and time saved will be relatively small.

Actually, we have an airplane coming up today, the C-5A, which could be produced for commercial passengers. I understand that with this plane, fares could be as low as $75 to Europe, and it would get there in, say 6 hours. That is pretty fast.

The British and the French will take our experience and rush their mach 2 job, and take the business while we are working out all the additional problems inevitable in a mach 3 design.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have studied it. The French and the British have studied it. Our engineers tell us there is not much more difficulty to go to mach 3 after we break the sound barrier on a constant speed beyond the speed of sound than it is to build a mach 2. We are willing to take the chance on titanium or stainless steel to withstand the heat at that speed, and to be serviceable at that speed. It is better to have the best plane today that will be good for 25 to 30 years, as the flagships of today and tomorrow, instead of dropping back to 2.2, which some engineers point out is obsolete the day it is built because of the limits on the aluminum alloys which cannot go beyond mach 2.2.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only way to find it is to do what we are doing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two things that appeal to me along this line. Congress has appropriated $231 million to date. That carries the development through June 3 of this year. The 1967 budget request of $80 million will simply carry it to December 31 of this year. If we only appropriate $80 million the program stops at that time and the $80 million plus $231 million has gone down the drain unless we do something in another session of Congress even if we appropriate $280 million to authorize the prototypes to begin in 1967 and carry the program along. I want to see that we put the $231 million in what we believe is a plane that will be able to be sold in England and France and this country. We would be foolish to stop and let that money go down the drain.

Another reason is that we are going to compete with the British and the French and have a better plane than they have when we get this developed.

If we are going to compete we will have to go further with this research.

For those two reasons we should vote for the $280 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator. The plane that we are talking about building is the best plane. We should not surrender the market to a plane that flies mach 2, when we could go mach 3 and capture the world market. We would be making a mistake to say that we are afraid to go forward with the next step, which is cutting the metal and finding out what this plane will do on a 100-hour test. If that does not prove out we can quit and abandon hopes of developing the plane, but I do not think that American engineers are going to design a plane that will not meet this test.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on this subject and commend him for the fine explanation he has made on the SST.

I would like to ask one question. Is it not a fact that when the Russians got ahead of us by bringing out their sputnik, they did it through intensive research and experimentation?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Unless we go forward now with the research on this supersonic plane, is it not a fact that in a few years we will be trailing other countries that have this plane, and again we will be second?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. I am fearful that what is going on behind the Iron Curtain may bring about the development. In hearings we had reference to the Russian supersonic transport plane. The Russians are working hard on it. All of the information that we have is that they are trying their best to be first with a supersonic plane. I would hate to see us trail in the international field. This is something that reaches home to the average person. Supremacy in aviation is as important or more important than in space.

Mr. THURMOND. In the statement that was made by the Senator from Wisconsin it was said, "Defense Department denies the SST has any military value."

Is it not a fact that research of this kind will inure greatly to the national defense program of this country; and is it not a fact that it is bound to inure greatly to the national defense program of this country, as the space program which is under civilian control; and that research and experimentation is bound to inure to our defense program from a national standpoint?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not reduce this appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that while the Russians are going full-speed ahead and developing a nuclear navy, that the Secretary of Defense is blocking any corresponding progress on the part of the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand that to be a fact.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that a well-rounded nuclear navy now would be of greater importance to us than the development of the SST, however valuable that might be in the distant future.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it is very important that we have this supersonic plane to maintain world leadership.

Fun can be made of the plane saying that it is a jetset plane. But when the jets came out it was seen what happened to reciprocating engines and turboprops which went down in price more than half due to the development of the subsonic jet. With the supersonic jet the history of aviation leadership shows it will go to the country that produces the best and fastest transport, and the business will be theirs and not those moving along at a slower speed, whether they be mach 2 or not.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have never heard a more lucid or persuasive argument than that just uttered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The Senator has demolished completely the pending amendment, as it should be demolished.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has distinguished himself in the argument which he has presented here today.

I read this testimony in the Committee on Appropriations. Once again the genius of the United States is going to lead this world in the development of a new type transport.

I thank my able friend for his presentation. I note that on page 348, there appears the following:

> If you look at these numbers you will see when comparing today's subsonic times and the SST, that certainly Sydney (Australia) will be as close to Los Angeles as Washington is to Paris today.

This world is shrinking, as a result of the rapid advances in transport the Senator is talking about.

I know that the Senate will overwhelmingly stand once again to approve keeping America in front.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will ask the minority whip to yield to me such time on the bill as I desire.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I know that everyone wants to vote on the amendment. Yet it seems to me that this matter should be placed in its proper perspective.

It was in 1961 that I first carried through on the floor of the Senate the fight for funds for a supersonic aircraft in an appropriation for $11 million. Two years after that, President Kennedy spoke to the graduating class at the Air Force Academy, at which time he announced it as one of our national goals, and I have supported it not only from the initial appropriation but every time since.

I should like to recap this. We have come almost through two phases of the development of the airplane so far.

I do not want to say anything about this man, Mr. Gibson. I know nothing about him—whether he is a genius or whether he is a man of no capabilities whatsoever.

But, it is incomprehensible to me that an article written by a relatively unknown engineer 2½ years ago could cause such consternation when the fact is that the Senate has acted repeatedly, with full knowledge, for 5 straight years.

I think there is an answer. If I could just remember all the questions the Senator from Missouri asked, I think I could provide the answers for him from our record here.

But, there is one matter he raised which I happen to recall and I want to provide him with a direct answer. He asked a question about one major airline not being involved in this matter and having reported in its own shop that it was not interested in this venture, and that it was not feasible.

Well, I know the airline—I shall not name it here—but I remember that the facts are that the airline he was talking about, which is one of the largest airlines in the country, has gotten a place in line for orders for the SST and has laid hard cash on the line to firm up those orders.

Now, we have had 5 years of development. We have actually placed in this venture, to date, $231 million worth of development money. By December, the FAA will determine which of the two airframe manufacturers and which of the two engine manufacturers will be the winners in the competition toward building an SST.

It will require $80 million of the $280 million in the bill to bring the project along to that point.

The rest of the $200 million, as the Senator from Oklahoma has explained, will be committed during this year—but not all of it spent, I suppose, because that is the way it is done—toward the two prototypes of the airplane and engine which will be selected by the FAA.

Mr. President, the question has been raised, should the FAA be in this business?

No. 1, I want to point out to the Senate that NASA was not in this business 6 years ago, either.

But the FAA will certify the Concorde if it comes to the United States and the FAA will also have to certify the SST.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the Russian.

Mr. ALLOTT. And if the Russian plane should ever come here—but I am not concerned about the Russian plane as much as I am about the Concorde—the FAA will have to certify it.

Thus, in all three instances, let me say to the Senate, the same body in this country, the FAA, will have to certify those planes.

Now a short comment about: Why a mach 3 airplane?

It is not a mach 3 airplane.

What we have projected on the boards is a mach 2.7 airplane—2.7 times the speed of sound.

Why? Why not a mach 3 instead of a mach 2.7?

There is a very, very sound reason for it, and that is that between mach 2.7 and mach 3, temperatures rise so rapidly that we now have no material able to cope with it. We do have workable materials tested which can cope with a mach 2.7 speed, there is no question about that in my mind.

The argument has been made, "Let us go back to the pump—the old pump in the backyard." I should like to go back to the old days. I actually considered that myself when the first subsonic jet was projected. I wondered whether they would ever get enough money to pay for those planes which were going to cost $6 to $7 million each. I doubted it.

But, in every phase of development in this country, the people have taken to the new advancements and they have gone ahead with them, and they have used them. Just as we regard the old prop-driven DC-7's as ancient derelicts today, 10 years from now we will regard the subsonic jets as the work horses of the air. The real capabilities will be in the new supersonic jets.

With all due respect to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I asked him to join me when I spent 3 days out on the coast going through these factories, listening to their economics and their engineering arguments, tearing them apart as best I could, and questioning them intensively. When I came away, I was satisfied not only as to the economics but also as to the engineering feasibility so far as it could be explained to a complete amateur engineer like myself—and I am, really, an amateur, amateur engineer.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a brief question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. McGOVERN. Did I understand the Senator to say that the article written by Mr. Gibson was one written 2½ years ago?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is what someone said on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McGOVERN. The article appears to be in the current issue of Harper's magazine for July 1966.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to have the Senator tell me that. I was quoting what another Senator said on the floor this afternoon. I am glad to have the RECORD corrected accordingly. I would not want to imply anything either meritorious or unmeritorious to Mr. Gibson. I do not know anything about him. I am surprised, though, that one article could cause so much consternation in the Senate.

Mr. President, just one more question I wish to touch on, and then I will quit—if I can have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we face this situation: We are either going to move ahead with the times, or we are going to stand still.

The Concorde is slated for active service in approximately 1971. If the Concorde is put into service and we chop off this appropriation today, we could not start to build a prototype, put it in production and get it certified—even a mach 2 airplane—10 years from today.

Therefore, we are faced with a decision, as to whether we shall proceed with all the research which has been done, so that in 1973 and 1974 we will reassert our right to the world market in aeronautics, or whether we will fold up today and hand it over to the French and British.

I certainly, on my own part, am not willing to fold up our efforts and hand it over to the British or French.

I have gone through, with both companies, detailed studies of the effect on the economy of our country. Think what would happen if, instead of building our own jet airplanes in this country, we left it to France and England. They would love it. But where would our men go to work in this country?

The best estimate I can get is that between 1970 and 1980 the building of this plane will result in a difference of between $11 billion and $15 billion in the trade balance between ourselves and Europe, particularly England and France.

I am perfectly willing to gamble this amount of money, because I know we can do it. I know we are making jobs for Americans. We are not going to close down our factories and let those men walk the streets. We are making jobs for Americans. Eventually we may improve our balance of payments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in order to clear the record with respect to the discussion on the Gibson article, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article from Aviation Daily for August 2, 1966, which points out some errors in the Gibson article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Aviation Daily, Aug. 2, 1966]

Snipers at Work Against SST Project

An article in a national magazine by the dean of engineering of a small Michigan university has triggered a series of editorial and Congressional criticisms against the nation's supersonic transport program. Although the outbreak is small, it is perhaps symptomatic of the kind of opposition FAA will find as it seeks funds with which to get the prototype phase of the program under way next year.

"The Case against the Supersonic Transport" appeared in Harper's for July. The author is John E. Gibson, dean of engineering of Oakland University, somewhere in Michigan. A Yale Ph. D, Gibson was at Purdue for five years and has done work (not detailed) for NASA, Air Force, Navy and Signal Corps. He has a penchant for writing articles and books.

It would be difficult to find another article in a national publication which contained so many and diverse errors of fact—fact, as contrasted to opinions. Inasmuch as FAA was given an opportunity to rebut many statements in the article, and did so, it is surprising that Harper's went ahead with its publication.

On July 22, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin issued a blast against the SST project in the Senate and inserted Gibson's article in toto in The Congressional Record. In his remarks Proxmire said "the supersonic transport seems more and more to represent an immense gamble, with the odds against the pigeon whose money the Congress is gambling."

If the Gibson facts were correct, Proxmire would well have an argument for opposing the project. Unfortunately Proxmire took Gibson's article as the last word in authenticity personified and sounded the alarm.

One of the most astonishing results of the article was an editorial in the Wall Street Journal on July 28 entitled "A Senseless Urgency" which used the Gibson article as a platform and went even wilder into the blue with some misshapen conclusions indeed strange for a paper of WSJ's reputation. The writer must have been a summer substitute, for the editorial could have been written about the wheel, the steam engine, the automobile, electric lights and every other technical advance through the ages.

DETAILED REBUTTAL BY LOCKHEED SST HEAD

The Gibson article is too long and detailed to rebut item by item in the DAILY, but R. A. Bailey, v.p. and general manager of SST for Lockheed, has rebutted the article effectively in a letter to the Detroit News which had given Gibson considerable attention.

FAA in its budget hearings has used one of the world's foremost aeronautical engineers, Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, to state its technical case that the SST project is sound both technically and economically. At the time, Bisplinghoff was with NASA and now is head of the aerospace and astronautics department of M.I.T.

"Based on all of the evidence that is available, we believe the answer is yes," Bisplinghoff said in his brief for FAA, in answer to the question of whether the U.S. is ready to commence the design and construction of an SST that will be both safe and profitable. He endorsed the program completely and fully.

Since the SST is a technical project, FAA is concerned that laymen will be misled by pseudo-expertise such as arose with the Gibson article. It does expect some opposition in Congress, but is still hopeful of moving the program forward to a selection of one builder (Boeing or Lockheed) of two prototypes by the end of this year.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado regain the floor for the purpose of my asking him a question or two?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Colorado has made an excellent and persuasive case.

Quite aside from what certain people may attach to this undertaking, the Senator has suggested to the Senate that the SST will continue to keep American-built aircraft in the forefront and will be the cause of continued purchasing by foreign airlines of American aircraft in competition with those which could conceivably come from the United Kingdom and France and, indeed, from the Soviet Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator has made an excellent point. I did not want the opportunity to pass without congratulating him on the lucidity of his argument.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota on the bill.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT AND OTHER NEEDLESS FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriations bill (H.R. 14921) includes $280 million to allow the Federal Aviation Agency to continue developmental work on a proposed supersonic transport plane. Authoritative sources report that expenditures reaching $4 billion may be required even before the plane becomes airborne. In my opinion, this proposed plane has all of the markings of one of the most expensive and foolish ventures ever undertaken by our Government. The Defense Department sees no military value in the plane; the commercial airlines have shown no interest in developing it; it is a highly dangerous and unpredictable craft with enormous technical problems. Yet, the Federal Aviation Agency appears determined to continue this seeming folly against the advice of noted experts in the aviation field. I think it is a serious mistake for the FAA to jeopardize its major role as the guardian of air travel safety to press a highly questionable commercial plane that the airlines are reluctant to embrace and which may never be a financially sound investment. In any event, we need to proceed with more caution in this area.

I am opposed to the $280 million appropriation in the bill before us for a supersonic transport. My opposition is motivated primarily by two major considerations. First, the complex technical problems inherent in operation of the plane while in flight lead me to doubt seriously its ultimate safety. Second, in light of the President's plea to eliminate nonessential expenditures, I consider it commonsense to delete this costly frill from the budget.

Mr. John E. Gibson, a noted engineer, writing in the current issue of Harper's outlines a well-reasoned case against further investment of tax dollars for development of the plane. In commenting upon the technical and safety problems, Mr. Gibson states:

> At 70,000 feet, the proposed cruising altitude of the SST, there will be no need of oxygen masks if cabin pressure is lost. The reason is that the human body undergoes explosive decompression, the blood boils, and death occurs within several seconds. This happens whether or not one wears an oxygen mask. The only safeguard is an astronaut-type pressure suit. Engineers know this. They are also aware that the point of maximum threat to the integrity of the cabin pressure seal occurs at door joints and windows. This is why it was proposed on technical grounds to build the SST without windows. Psychological consultants felt, however, that passengers would grow uneasy without windows (something about a coffin complex perhaps). Thus in a later design, windows appeared beside each row of seats.

An equally serious problem to consider is the unknown effects of cosmic radiation on metal and electronic equipment of the plane while in flight at altitudes of 70,000 feet and, more significantly, the effects on the human body which may very well be deadly, indeed.

Also, the speed of the plane not only makes it extremely unpredictable in flight—especially in turbulent air, but also almost impossible to plot and follow by flight control centers. Its fantastic landing approach speed and excessive fuel consumption on takeoff necessitate clearing all other planes from the air around the airport when the SST is landing or taking off.

Engineer Gibson has suggested that, following the example of the great aircraft designer, Igor Sikorsky, that Congress should require all top officials of the FAA to be on board the SST on its first test flight. He would further require at least one FAA official to be on board each subsequent test flight for a period of 1 year. I believe this is a proposal worth the consideration of Congress if this project is approved for accelerated development.

The desire in some quarters to develop a plane capable of carrying 200 passengers at 2,000 miles per hour was apparently triggered by the British and French consortium organized for this purpose. But why not let other countries carry the burden for this apparent folly. If by some quirk they should in due course develop a plane that will fly under these conditions and can find enough adventuresome passengers to keep it flying, we could then consider whether we want to develop one of our own. We have an obvious lead in jet aircraft of the tested version. Why waste our resources on a highly questionable new version as long as other countries are willing to finance the experimental stages? I am satisfied to let the British and French experiment with the supersonic transport problems, and capitalize on their experience.

Complex technical problems are not the only factors to consider in the future of this craft. Studies conducted by major commercial airlines cast serious doubt as to the economic value of such a plane if a prototype is successfully produced. The major airlines have turned a cold shoulder on participating in the developmental costs of the plane.

There are countless other complex technical problems to weigh against the investment of additional Federal funds in the SST. I submit that the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages and that we should discontinue this questionable venture at least for the time being.

Mr. President, the long-awaited Great Society programs enacted by Congress were looked to with anticipation by the American public. But they are destined to become mere shadows of their original design unless adequate funds are made available for their operation. Much of the unrest and turmoil erupting in our cities across the land can be traced to a well-intentioned but inadequately funded poverty program.

I look upon the elimination of poverty among our citizens, the improvement of our schools, the strengthening of rural America—as more desirable goals than the development of a supersonic transport capable of reducing the flight time to Europe by a few hours. The funds contemplated for use in the further development of this plane should be saved or invested in worthwhile efforts to improve the quality of our society.

I intend to do what I can to cut $200 million of the $280 million now earmarked for the supersonic transport and the additional billions that will be proposed if we approve this year's request.

Instead of pushing the supersonic transport, I wish the FAA would give greater attention to the problem of congested airports and delays in takeoffs and landings. This problem was humorously highlighted by the columnist, Art Buchwald, in a column which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1966, at the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Because of the relevance of that column to the subject at hand, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLIGHT FAST, OH, THESE DELAYS!

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—"Good day, ladies and gentlemen, this is your captain speaking, and I'm happy to announce that this is the first supersonic flight from New York to Paris. We will be flying at an altitude of 60,000 feet and a speed of 1,800 miles an hour. Our flying time to New York to Paris will be two hours and 45 minutes. Now please fasten your safety belts and we will be ready to take off. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, I know you're wondering what the delay is, as we have been on the ground waiting to take off for the past two hours. Unfortunately air traffic conditions are very heavy at this hour and we have been asked to hold here on the runway. We are now the 20th in line for take-off. . . .

"Well, folks, we've been moving up as you might have noticed and we are now second in line. I'm sorry these last four have been so difficult, but the tower has assured us we will get clearance to take off in the next hour or so. . . .

"May I have your attention, please. It appears that there are more planes in the pattern than was expected, and we've been asked to hold further. Why don't you all relax? I've turned the 'No Smoking' light off. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, we've finally been cleared for take-off. Would you all please relax? I apologize for the six-hour delay at the runway, but this is something we have no control over. . . .

"Well, folks, we seem to have broken some sort of record. Our flying time to Paris was two hours and 31 minutes. Unfortunately, there are many planes circling the Orly airport and we've been asked to fly over to Copenhagen and hold there at 55,000 feet. Paris assures us that as soon as it is feasibly possible they will permit us to make an approach. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, this is your pilot speaking. Since I last spoke to you 90 minutes ago I regret we have not been encouraged by Paris to come in and they have asked us to maintain altitude and fly in a pattern over Sicily. The stewardess tells me there seems to be a shortage of drinks and water, so we are putting everyone on rations of one glass of water each.

"Also, I'm sorry to say we have run out of food.

"Some of you have complained about seeing the movie four times, so for the next two hours we'll play stereophonic music instead.

"You'll be kept informed as to our progress. . . .

"Folks, this is the captain again. I know you're all very tired and hungry and thirsty and so am I, but trying to knock down my door is not going to help anybody. We should be getting the green light from Paris any time now. . . .

"We've just heard from Paris and we are now in the pattern and will be permitted to land within the next hour. Please fasten your safety belts. . . .

"This is your captain again. As you can gather we are on the ground at Orly, France. Unfortunately there doesn't seem to be any room at the ramp and we've been asked to wait out here until someone leaves. It should not be more than 40 or 50 minutes. . . .

"Well, here we are at the terminal and I hope you've enjoyed your first supersonic flight. I'm happy to announce we beat the Queen Mary's record by four hours and 12 minutes."

Mr. McGOVERN. As long as the subject of Mr. Gibson's qualifications have come up, I think it would be well to read into the RECORD some of the qualifications of Mr. Gibson. He is dean of engineering at Oakland University in Michigan. He was professor of electrical engineering and director of the control and information systems laboratory at Purdue for 5 years. He is a Yale Ph. D. He has done research for the Navy, the Signal Corps, the Air Force, and NASA. He has written dozens of technical articles and several books on this and other related subjects.

I think pertinent questions are raised in his article in the current issue of Harper's magazine which are relevant to the issues raised here today.

It seems to me that the Gibson article is particularly pertinent in view of the questions raised by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], former Secretary of the Air Force, who has worked in industry for many years and knows aircraft development problems better than any other Member of the Senate. It seems to me in view of the questions Senator SYMINGTON has raised and the points made by Senator PROXMIRE, that it is difficult to resist the logic of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Senator from Wisconsin is not proposing to knock out all the funds for the supersonic transport. He proposes to reduce the amount from $280 million to $80 million for work and plans to start construction of this plane. There still would be $80 million left to be used in the blueprint stage, until such questions as those raised by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] can be answered. It seems to me that serious issues of safety and danger have been raised, as well as questions of economic feasibility. I can see no reason for this crash program. Why not let other countries carry on with what they are doing? If it appears that such a plane is worthwhile, we can move in, as we did with respect to the jet airplanes some years ago, and get into the manufacture of the airplanes in plenty of time.

I think serious consideration should be given to the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

I would like to call attention to the article written by Art Buchwald which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. The article by Mr. Buchwald contains an imaginary statement of a captain on one of these supersonic airplanes, explaining to the passengers why the airplane had been waiting 2 hours to take off, and then a couple of more hours holding to take off. Then he explains why the plane has had to circle over Paris for several hours. Finally he makes this announcement:

> Well, here we are at the terminal and I hope you've enjoyed your first supersonic flight. I'm happy to announce we beat the *Queen Mary's* record by 4 hours and 12 minutes.

I merely point out that the FAA could better use of some of its funds in dealing with the congestion at airports rather than spend $280 million now on this highly questionable venture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I did not think I was going to have to answer questions about what Art Buchwald wrote. I did not think that he qualified as an expert in this field.

Mr. McGOVERN. But he did make a pertinent point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He may be an expert in many things, but I did not think he was an expert in aviation. What has this provision got to do with congestion at airports? It has nothing to do with it. This is not FAA's main business. FAA was designated to do this research in airplanes. Many people are interested in trying to solve some of the problems as between Friendship and Dulles.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. The money saved in the proposed reduction could be used to solve some of the problems of congestion, and there are other fields in which funds are needed.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. If the article had been brought into the committee, Senators could have received answers to the questions raised in it.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. The article is really just off the press.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I wish Senators would have come into the committee and raised these questions. Perhaps the article contained some information, but I am sure the committee could have answered any question that the Senators had as a result of the article. I am sure any question asked would have been answered.

I am willing to put this whole volume into the Record so Senators can examine it.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. I hope we will have time to examine it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. All time on the amendment has been exhausted.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. **NEUBERGER** (when her name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Aiken
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Douglas
Ervin
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McGovern
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

NAYS—55

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Case
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
McCarthy
Miller
Neuberger
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So Mr. Proxmire's amendment (No. 730) was rejected.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin has one additional amendment. The Senator from Ohio is not present, but he has an amendment to offer. I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania has an amendment. So there will be three or four votes, and then there will be a vote on passage of the bill.

We still have a limitation of a half hour on each amendment, with the exception of the Mohole amendment which would have a limitation of 1 hour. There is not much time left on the bill.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, if more time is needed on the bill, because so much time was taken on the amendment just defeated, there will be more time allowed.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I wanted to notify the Senate of that so that votes may be expected at any time after 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

AMENDMENT NO. 734

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 734 and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

On page 15, line 14, strike out "$133,150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$102,797,000".

On page 18, delete lines 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

On page 19, line 1, strike out "$15,224,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,132,000".

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I understand that this will be the pending amendment when we reconvene tomorrow after the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, after consulting with the Senators in charge of the bill on both sides, and with the distinguished minority leader, as well as with other interested Senators, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] may be recognized immediately after the prayer tomorrow morning for the purpose of making some remarks not to exceed 45 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. **HART**. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until Wednesday, August 10, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 9, 1966:

Patrick J. Foley, of Minnesota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years vice Miles W. Lord.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Robert T. Gibson, dean, Christ Church Cathedral, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Wisdom of Solomon 6: 2–3: *Give ear, ye that rule the people, and glory in the multitude of nations. For power is given you of the Lord, and sovereignty from the Highest, who shall try your works, and search out your counsels.*

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the Supreme Lawmaker, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, and caused men to govern themselves, grant unto this Nation and her constituted Representatives the wisdom to seek and to know justice, and to make laws to uphold it in truth for all her citizens to live in peace and dignity. In the light of Thy counsel, O God, may they live and work to preserve and strengthen this Nation as truly "a land of the free and home of the brave." As God is our judge may each of us be true to our calling, and with courage live as Americans ought to live, and to the glory of God, the welfare of our people, and in the name of our Heavenly Father. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 15485. An act to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11671. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13277) entitled "An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1684. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala.; and

S.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks.

MRS. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty today to advise the House that Mrs. Augustus Hawkins, the wife of our distinguished Member from California, Mr. HAWKINS, passed away this morning.

I know I speak for you, Mr. Speaker, and for all Members of this House when I say that our hearts go out to him and to all his and her loved ones.

FOOD PRICES COULD BE LOWER

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed agricultural legislation because perennial subsidies are not in the long-run interest of the farmers, much less the taxpayer, for I feel they contribute to our overall high food prices. But one of the greatest factors in the recent price spiral, in my opinion, is not the farmer but is the result of costly, inefficient, and sometimes collusive practices by the middleman distributor.

Recently I have met with a number of food store and manufacturing executives in New York. Evidence of monopolistic practices and their attendant evils were brought out in this session.

Something is very wrong when the handling costs for a loaf of bread amount to 50 percent of its retail price and the cost of wheat is only 12 percent. There is something wrong when the price of bread includes 10 percent for stale bread that winds up as pig feed.

There is also something wrong if a retailer is forced by a monopoly of milk distributors to fix the price of milk to the consumer, even if he wants to reduce it. There is also something wrong in the fact that no new wholesale milk licenses have been issued in the State of New York for almost 20 years. There is something wrong when milk from the same cow is sold at one price to the consumer as fluid milk and the same milk at a lower price to an ice cream manufacturer.

There is also something wrong when almost three-quarters of a billion dollars are struck onto Mrs. Consumer's food purchases by trading stamps.

There seems to be a reluctance on the part of some Federal and local regulatory agencies to enforce the law in this area. If these agencies were to be more active in pursuing the public interest on behalf of the consumer, perhaps then we could have lower food prices instead of a rising spiral.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 204]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Ashley
Blatnik
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Conyers
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Feighan
Ford, William D.
Giaimo
Halleck
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Long, La.
McCarthy
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Moorhead
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Ottinger
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
St Germain
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Tuten
Ullman
Waggonner
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14765, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it had agreed that further reading of title VI of the committee substitute be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point. Are there any amendments to title VI?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a technical amendment to title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODINO: On page 79, line 1, strike "an" and insert in lieu thereof "on".

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Whitener: On page 80, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following new section:
>
> "Sec. 603. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "'Sec. 606. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue, any Federal financial assistance for any cause other than a violation of a provision of the Constitution, or an affirmative provision of a statute of the United States, which has been established by substantial evidence.
>
> "'(b) No rule, regulation, or order which may result in the termination of, or the failure to grant or continue, any Federal assistance shall be placed in effect unless it has been adopted after proceedings taken in compliance with the requirements of sections 4–10, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003–1009).
>
> "'(c) A determination under this title to the effect that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin exists, has existed, or in the future may exist, in the administration of any program or activity shall require a showing by substantial evidence that in the administration or operation thereof, conditions or requirements, are, have been, or may be imposed with affirmative intent to exclude, or with the necessary effect of excluding, individuals from participation in the benefits of such program or activity solely upon the ground of race, color, or national origin.
>
> "'(d) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal department, agency, or officer to issue any rule, regulation, or order for the purpose or with the effect of—
>
> "'(1) controlling or regulating the administration or operation of any school, hospital, or other institution for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin; or
>
> "'(2) depriving any class of individuals of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity, or of the facilities of any school, hospital, or other institution.'"

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, is it not customary for an amendment of this length to be submitted to the minority table so that we may know what is being discussed?

I have not had, nor has the minority table had, a copy of this amendment until this moment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to respond to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to state to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a statement——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not been recognized yet.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] for 5 minutes, but only when the Committee is in order.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, before commencing my statement, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that a copy of the amendment was given to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] some time ago. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Ohio has been a bit ubiquitous this morning and I just had not seen him and I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, if the gentleman will withdraw his objection to my request for additional time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to renew the objection that the amendment was not at the minority table and I must say that insofar as I can determine I was in the Chamber before the gentleman who is now in the well of the House. I was here all the time except for about 5 minutes. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe it serves a useful purpose when complicated amendments are offered that they be furnished the minority table.

Mr. WHITENER. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I renew my request that I be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the comments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]. I believe that after I have explained my amendment the gentleman will find that it is not really complicated, but that it is one which will appeal to the fairness of his mind which I know he always has.

Normally, Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to yield, but if I may make my statement without anyone interrupting at this particular time, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, in recent months it has come to my attention that important health, education, and welfare programs are being placed in jeopardy by an effort on the part of certain Federal officials to correct so-called racial imbalance in the States. I hasten to add that the Federal officials are not solely responsible because they are laboring under legislation, the provisions of which are vague and easily misunderstood. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a new section to H.R. 14765, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966.

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the ambiguities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is necessary to avoid the further submission of Federal officials to the pressures of outside forces which have compelled them to perform quasi-judicial functions and to allow them to concentrate on their statutory duty.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not intended to change the intent of Congress in enacting title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. On the contrary, it is designed to implement that intent. It is not designed to diminish the decision of the Federal courts; rather it is designed to rely on those decisions in applying the sanctions of title VI. Nor is it designed to permit unlawful discriminations—it only assists in defining such discrimination.

This amendment amends title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It would provide in section 606(a) that no funds can be withheld under any Federal program until a constitutional or statutory violation has been committed by the recipient of the benefits of such programs. Furthermore, such violation must be established by substantial evidence.

Subsection (b) provides simply that in making a determination with respect to alleged violations the particular Federal agency must follow the same procedural requirements as in the case of all other administrative adjudications. In the future, the recipient of such benefits must be accorded not only notice of the intention to withhold funds but also the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in its own behalf.

Subsection (c) provides that in order to support a determination of discrimination it must be shown that there has been an affirmative intent to exclude or the necessary effect of exclusion of individuals from benefits on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The purpose of this subsection is to negate the application of purely mechanistic and statistical criteria in the determination of discrimination.

Subsection (d) is a protective feature of the rights of potential beneficiaries and prohibits any Federal agency from exercising control over any school, hospital, or other institutions under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin. Furthermore, this subsection will insure that no class of individuals shall be deprived of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity financed or partially financed by the Federal Government.

Section 601, which is the heart of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, would be left untouched by my amendment. It provides:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination

> under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The remaining, implementing language of the title, however, brazenly transfers to the Executive the lawmaking power of Congress, and in doing so leaves the definition of discrimination and the application of sanctions to the uncontrolled discretion of agency officials. Congress has meekly surrendered the control of the Federal purse strings to the "equal opportunity officer" of each agency which he may use to effectuate his own notions of sociological progress.

And what has been the result? Not only have many officials predictably taken full advantage of their new power, but indeed some have usurped far more than was given them by the act.

I will mention three examples in North Carolina, only to illustrate how this legislative and judicial power which officials have assumed has resulted in the distortion of the original Federal programs they are charged with administering.

An adult basic education project in Charlotte, under which 1,400 Negroes and 170 whites in a total of 91 classes were being taught to read and write, was threatened with termination by the Office of Economic Opportunity because of alleged de facto segregation and so-called racial imbalance in two classes. This threat, without complaint from any local organization or individual, was made under the provisions of title VI.

In another North Carolina city, a hospital is under threat of losing Federal funds because nonwhites do not comprise as large a percentage of the patient load as is the percentage of the nonwhite population of the city. There is no allegation of discrimination or segregation in the staffing, in employment, or in the assignment of patients to wards and rooms. The only allegation is that the local populace does not become ill and choose the threatened hospital according to racial quotas.

Finally, there is the example of the Office of Education integration guidelines recently published for the South. There is no pretense in the language of the guidelines that their purpose is to prevent either discrimination or State-supported segregation. The whole thrust is so-called racial balance in pupil and teacher assignment according to percentages.

These mindless threats and fatuous guidelines cannot be remotely reconciled with the language or the legislative history of title VI or with the unlawful conduct—as defined by the courts—that was intended to be condemned. Two brief statements confirm this.

The best authority on congressional intent of any legislative act is the floor manager of the bill, and the Senate floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the then assistant majority leader, Vice President HUMPHREY. In developing the legislative history and articulating the intent of the act, the Vice President stated in 1964:

> While the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race. The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems:

The Vice President meant that the act was designed to eliminate segregation by legal compulsion. His words echoed those of the Federal courts as stated in Briggs against Elliott.

> It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided .... It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains.
>
> Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

But in not one of the instances I recounted in North Carolina did the Federal official responsible follow either the mandate of the 1964 act or the mandate of the Federal judiciary, or that of the specific poverty, education, or health program he was to administer.

In Charlotte, the poverty program official stated his purpose was to "promote maximum cross-cultural experience," according to his euphemistic, sociological jargon. The education of hundreds of illiterates, 90 percent of them Negro, was to be sacrificed to the overriding imperative of so-called racial balance. His integration program was of more importance than his poverty program. It was not those who administer nor those who voluntarily teach who would have been hurt—only those to whom the ability to read and write would have been denied.

If the incidence of sickness among nonwhites does not increase sufficiently and more Negroes do not come to our hospitals, so that, thereby, funds are cut off, it is not the hospital trustees nor the staff that will be hurt. It will be the charity patients whom the hospital can no longer afford to treat and many of whom are not white. Such tragically insane policies completely subvert the purpose of our health-care legislation.

Such a thought is surely confirmed by the new school desegration guidelines. In them there is this:

> The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

And one education official, in explaining these obtuse rules, said:

> Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

These statements fly blindly in the teeth of every Federal judicial decision concerning equal protection of the laws handed down in the last 20 years—decisions which state unequivocally that race cannot be a constitutionally permissible consideration in the enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws. To our Office of Education, the Constitution is no longer colorblind. On the contrary, race is the primary consideration in the ground rules of its great drive for so-called racial balance.

In ignoring the decisions of the courts, the guidelines equally ignore the intent of title VI. In fact, the sudden emphasis on so-called racial balance among classroom teachers violates the express language of section 604, which states that nothing in the title shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

And, again, who is hurt when a school system fails to achieve a so-called balance satisfactory to Federal officials? Not the school board; not the teacher. The only ones who lose are the students whom the Federal aid to education was designed to help and who have no control whatsoever over assignment policies. Yet the Federal Government would deny to those legally helpless students the equal protection and equal assistance which Federal law provides to all others.

As education bills are brought up in this body, we are admonished time and again that Federal control of schools is not the intention. I have accepted the assurances in good faith. Federal aid was intended to—and should—strengthen local school systems. That is not the current course of Federal aid, for the program has been twisted into a club held over the heads of local officials and used to enforce Washington's sociological notions.

The amendment I introduce today will prohibit such nonsensical interpretations of their own power under title VI as some Federal officials have divined. It will accomplish this by defining section 601 according to the intent of Congress, and the decisions of the Federal courts; if it is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not the whim of bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people for their sociological follies.

If my amendment is adopted, every American will be subject to the same guidelines and can ascertain what those guidelines are. No longer will "discrimination" mean something different in one year from what it means in the next as is presently the case. No longer can the title be applied in one section of the country and not in another, without the protections of due process, as is presently the case. No longer will "free choice" be allowed by one department or agency and not by another, as is presently the case.

Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues to consider this amendment carefully. I am confident that fundamental fairness and equal justice require its enactment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Although I recognize that the gentleman has undoubtedly labored long on the amendment he has presented to this Committee at this time, nonetheless, I would like to remind the gentleman that the amendment was never presented in the committee. It is entirely new to us. The language, although clear to the gentleman, certainly is vague to me and difficult to comprehend. All that I do understand is that it presents new criteria and restricts the workings of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The intention of the Congress in writing title VI of the 1964 act into law, was stated in section 601:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Were we to adopt this amendment, Mr. Chairman, despite the good intentions of the gentleman from North Carolina, I feel this would in effect be a complete repealer of title VI of the 1964 act. I believe that it would unduly restrict and hamper the workings of that program.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my friend from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], but I would point out to him and to my colleagues that in the 1964 act it was provided, among other things, that regulations or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with the achievement of the objectives of the statute should be made up by these various agencies.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act further said that no such rule or regulation or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President.

Some of us, my friends, who have dealt with these agencies in recent months, have found they have not adopted rules and regulations of standard application. There is no evidence I have been able to get from anybody, for instance, from Health, Education, and Welfare, that the President has approved any of them.

So my amendment, contrary to what the gentleman says, would merely implement the existing law and require that that be done, and that money not be cut off from schoolchildren simply at the whim of some faceless bureaucrat who none of us in the Congress knew would be down there.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, again I must say that I respect the gentleman's intentions, but I do not believe there is any evidence which has been presented establishing any need to enter into this new area.

According to the intent of the Congress in section 602, the rules, regulations, or orders to be promulgated were to be of general applicability, consistent with the objectives of title VI.

Mr. WHITENER. In section 601 of the existing law the proviso says that no such action shall be taken until the department or agency concerned has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with the requirements, and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means. That has not been the practice in these agencies. This is what the Congress said must be done. My amendment would merely assure the public that what we here said in 1964 would be complied with.

There is nothing new about my proposal. It is just implementing the intent we expressed before.

Mr. RODINO. It is my understanding that the rules are consistent with the objectives of the title. The spirit of the law is being complied with. The departments or agencies concerned have in no way indicated there is any difficulty in administering this law. For that reason, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], in his analysis of this amendment. The amendment should not be agreed to.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if the amendment were agreed to, the only ground, in my opinion, for the withholding of funds would be a direct violation of the Constitution or a positive, affirmative violation of a statute of the United States of America.

When we passed title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it contained a provision that rules and regulations which would authorize the withholding of funds must have the approval of the President of the United States and, furthermore, before there was a final withholding of funds, there had to be notice given to the political subdivision that was alleged to be in violation of such law.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that is sufficient notice and a sufficient reason for a political subdivision to put its house in order and to comply with the law and the rules and regulations pursuant thereto.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I decline to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Ohio makes me realize the absolute need to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

While I opposed the measure under discussion here, I know that the proponents attempted to—and did—write into that measure having to do with schools reasonable precautions to give any school an opportunity to be heard.

The point is that they are not carrying out the intent of the Congress.

I have on my desk now complaints from a number of schools, stating they have met the demands of the Department of Education, even though the demands go beyond the requirements of the law—and yet they are being threatened with lawsuits and funds are being withheld.

What I am saying is that the provisions in the law are not being carried out, the restrictions in the law are not being observed.

When it comes to withholding money, nonaction carries out the desires of those folks in the executive department who want to go much further than the law.

I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. The original decision and subsequent decisions for a time were that the opinions of the Supreme Court held only that the Constitution prohibited forced segregation. With time, that has been twisted around. Agencies have increased or broadened this court-made law by interpretation. We now find these agencies insisting that those decisions mean forced integration. That should not be.

But that is not where it ends. I am talking about the agencies now. They are writing guidelines which go much further than the law and are with holding funds not because the law is not met but because their guidelines are not agreed to.

I hope the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina will be adopted. All should agree that the Department of Education should not be permitted to require more than the law requires.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I have listened to many arguments presented since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. I have never listened to one presented with more clarity or more logic, about an amendment more badly needed, than the one just presented by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Likewise, I have listened to the arguments against it. Frankly, I do not see how anyone can argue successfully against the adoption of such an amendment.

I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Mississippi, who just preceded me, said.

I wish to ask the Committee's indulgence for just a moment, for the reading of a letter I wrote March 29, 1966, to the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, about these guidelines issued by the Office of Education in pursuance to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The guidelines which the Office of Education issued in pursuance of title VI of the Civil Rights Act have gone far beyond the authority in title VI of the act and actually are doing what the gentleman from Mississippi has just said, forcing integration and destroying the freedom-of-choice plan, which has been working so well.

May I read from the letter I wrote on March 29:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Following a reading of the "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in March 1966, I have looked carefully into the provisions of the public law authorizing federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools and I have also looked carefully into the provisions of

Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In making this examination into the laws and relating your Revised Statement of Policies under Title VI to these laws, I am compelled to the following conclusions:

(1) There are no provisions in Public Law 89-10, the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," and no suggestions in the legislative history of the act which require such rules or regulations as you have published under the "new guidelines" policies. As a matter of fact, the debate surrounding the passage of the act providing assistance for elementary and secondary schools emphasized that no such federal dictation was to flow from the act.

(2) In examining Title VI of the "Civil Rights Act of 1964" on which your new Statement of Policies is prefaced and looking also at the debate transpiring at the time this act was passed, I find nothing in Title VI of the act and nothing in the legislative history of the act requiring such drastic and precipitous new regulations and guidelines as have been issued. Moreover, in Title IV of the "Civil Rights Act of 1964," Section 401, paragraph (b) specifically states:

> "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

Clearly, therefore, one must reach the conclusion that the regulations issued in your Revised Statement of Policies are in direct violation of paragraph (b), Section 401, Title IV of the "Civil Rights Act of 1964." While your Revised Statement of Policies very carefully avoids mention of the purpose "to overcome racial imbalance," the Statement, nevertheless, is saturated with directives which, if complied with, can have no other result and, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the regulations were issued for no other purpose.

Your directives abandon the freedom of choice plan which, admittedly, is working slowly, but nevertheless is working. But to abandon the freedom of choice plan and enforce policies called for in your Revised Statement at this time will, in my judgment, not only be in violation of the cited Section of the law but threaten serious harm to our efforts to educate so many who need it so badly. After all, Mr. Secretary, isn't this the fundamental purpose in our efforts to provide assistance for public education?

It occurs to me that a more prudent course for your Department to follow in administering these laws would be to withhold the application of these drastic guidelines and give the local people conversant with the local problems an opportunity to work these problems out under the freedom of choice plan and, thereby, afford a more wholesome learning environment.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

PHIL M. LANDRUM.

Therefore the guidelines are in direct violation of section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Clearly, therefore, the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina is needed in order to prevent this Department from going beyond the authority in the law of 1964 and in order to prevent the forced integration in the schools where we have a freedom-of-choice plan.

Members of the Committee, let me urge upon you, if you want to see a public school program continued in this country, if you want to see Federal assistance to education working in this country, if you want to see education do what it has to do in this field before we have the end of the strife we are now suffering, adopt this amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina and then you will begin to see some other kind of order coming out of the chaos existing in this U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I join my distinguished and able colleague from North Carolina in supporting this amendment.

I do not say that I know more about education than any Member of this body or the other body, but I believe that I perhaps know as much as any Member of this body or any Member of the other body.

My late father devoted 35 years to public education—19 years as teacher and 16 as superintendent of education of my home county of Greenwood. My mother taught school for 32 years, and reared 10 children during the same period.

I served on the education committee of the South Carolina House of Representatives. I have five children who attend public schools in the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., area half of each year. This fall they will attend public schools in my hometown, Greenwood, S.C.

My brother is chairman of the board of education, and I know that education officials have done everything humanly possible in Greenwood to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

We have freedom of choice in Greenwood. No child is turned away from any school in the area of South Carolina where my children will be attending this fall. We have complied with the law, but, Mr. Chairman, when someone in Washington, D.C., far removed from the scene of real education at the local level, issues rules and regulations like the one issued the other day which demands of the board of education the reason a school is being built in a certain locality, and demands blueprints of the new building, I say this type of conduct on the part of those who are supposed to advance the course of education in America, is destructive of good education at the local level.

Mr. Chairman, I daresay that it has been my honor since last October to speak to as many high schools and colleges in nearly every section of the United States—I would say more—than perhaps any other contemporary American. It has been my honor and privilege to visit a number of colleges and universities, among them Harvard, Rensselaer, the University of Virginia, and Michigan State. I spoke at various junior colleges and high schools. As a result of my extensive contact at these institutions and with the outstanding educational institutions of my State, I can categorically say to the members of the Committee that the people of my State are complying in more good faith with title VI of the Civil Rights Act than any other area I have seen. South Carolina school boards have made sincere and genuine efforts to comply.

Every child in my hometown of Greenwood, S.C., has complete freedom of choice regarding admission to our public schools. Every schoolteacher of any nationality, race, or creed can apply to any school in Greenwood and have his or her application considered fairly without discrimination. We have complied with the intent of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Clemson University is in my congressional district and became a model of decorum, tolerance, and understanding in February 1963. The late President John F. Kennedy complimented Dr. Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, my people, and me for the admirable manner in which this situation at Clemson was handled.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen firsthand what is going on. These guidelines are not in the interest of education, they are not in the interest of the pupil, they are not in the interest of the teacher, they are not in the interest of the parents or the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, those men struggling at the local level to educate our children and to meet the demands of the space age, the age of astronautics, can no longer devote their time to education.

Instead, on orders from Washington, they must experiment with sociology and comply with unreasonable and impractical orders which are detrimental to education, detrimental to students, and detrimental to the teachers.

This amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is urgently needed in order that the orderly process of education might continue for my children and yours and the other pupils throughout this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I take a back seat to no one in promoting good will and tolerance in this great country of ours.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see these guidelines destroy education and, in effect, the little boys and girls of both races, of all creeds and religions and nationalities.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what they will do, if we permit these unelected bureaucrats to continue to issue these orders and decrees. This amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina should be adopted.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield to me at that point?

Mr. DORN. I shall be delighted to yield to my great colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the Committee, as the gentleman from South Carolina has suggested, that the act now under consideration carries the language now which was carried in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the exact language of section 401(b) of title IV of the 1964 act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. In reading, not from the act of 1964, but from the bill that we now have under consideration, on page 79 thereof, beginning at line 14 on page 79, this proposed act itself states:

> (b) As applied to public education, "desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina will yield to me further——

Mr. DORN. I yield further to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Let me say that the guidelines, developed and issued and now trying to be enforced by the Department of Education, are in direct contravention not only of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, section 401(b) thereof, but apply to the act that we have under consideration today.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from the great State of Georgia. I wish to state again, Mr. Chairman, that I am completely serious about this. We have complied with this law in my own hometown with which I am familiar. I have five children in the public schools. We have complied much more so than in the areas within the sound of my voice here in the great metropolitan area of Washington.

No one is turned down in South Carolina because of race, creed, color, or national origin. But these arbitrary rules handed down by some of these administrators vacillate. An order will be issued one month only to be changed a few days later. These arbitrary, highhanded orders are threatening our educational system at the local level as never before.

Mr. Chairman, I say we have done a magnificent job. We deserve the commendation and thanks and good will of the officers and the heads of the departments of HEW. But this harassment is more than our dedicated, devoted local educators can endure.

One of the finest educators in our district recently resigned solely because of these guidelines. Many others who have been in the field of education for 35 or 40 years are now considering retirement because of the arbitrary vacillating rules and regulations issued by people who know little if anything about real education.

Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], I would like to say that I happen to know that one of the greatest high schools in America, Central High School in High Point, N.C., where I spoke earlier this year, has no discrimination, yet under these guidelines administrators in charge of education cannot do a job for the teachers and for the pupils and for the cause of education.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I could not let the moment go by without endorsing completely what he has said.

Mr. Chairman, I see in my district and in my State the same thing that is happening in the State of South Carolina. Not only are the school administrators and teachers put in an impossible spot and harassed to the point of almost complete frustration, but it is going to be virtually impossible in the future to get any qualified and interested citizens to serve on the school boards of our counties and local communities. Public education is at the crossroads, Mr. Chairman, and if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not wake up and become more reasonable and sensible in the exercise of its authority they are going to ruin one of the finest educational systems in this country. We have had such a system in my district and in my State for the past 60 years, but I fear our future under the strong and arbitrary hand of the Commissioner of Education. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, again may I say my brother is the chairman of the school board in my hometown and is one of the best lawyers in this country. He and the local school officials have done everything humanly possible—everything humanly possible to comply with the law. The teachers, the administrators, the trustees and parents want to do the right thing. They are sincerely trying to do so. Then to have the bureaucrats demand to see the blueprints and data of a school building barely begun is reminiscent of the kind of government carried on by Adolph Hitler.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to rise to speak either on this title or elsewhere in connection with this bill, but this amendment is so serious that, notwithstanding my previous intent, I think it is necessary to speak against it.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this particular bill, not content to diminish it in every particular, have now sought to undo what we have done in the past. This intent would not only adversely affect the present legislation, it would gut title VI of the 1964 law.

By all means, my colleagues, we ought not to do this on this Committee floor.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which customarily has handled civil rights, constituted last fall a special ad hoc subcommittee for the purpose of looking into the administration and the application of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The three-man bipartisan subcommittee had extensive conferences on these particular acts with members of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Justice Department, the Department of Defense, and with all people concerned with the administration of those parts of our national laws to which the preceding speakers have alluded.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we were not only interested in what they said about the implementation of title VI and the rest of the laws relating to civil rights. We invited the attorneys general and the Governors of the Southern States, including those of North Carolina and South Carolina, to participate in these conferences, and in some instances they did.

The attorney general of the State of South Carolina actually came up here to Washington and conferred about title VI and about other aspects of this bill, and the ad hoc subcommittee made a report in January of this year.

If indeed title VI is to be changed, it should not be changed here on the floor of the House today. We need to do it by orderly process. There is a good question of whether title VI is effective and whether it is administered effectively. I think your ad hoc subcommittee had some doubts about that. But, indeed, we would never recommend to this House that all that we have done in the past years to make the civil rights laws effective should be undone by destroying title VI of the 1964 act, as the amendment would do. I could not too strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. He knows I have a warm affection for him, as I have told him many times. He and I probably vote alike in committee more often, for different reasons, than any two other Members in the Congress. In this case I would hope he would be voting with us even though he does not think like we do on the issue.

But may I point out to the gentleman the very first section of title VI of the 1964 act states:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

My amendment would merely provide that there would have to be rules and regulations duly adopted and published so that everyone in the country would know what they were, so that everyone would be under the same rules and regulations, and then if those rules and regulations are in violation of the act, the provisions of the existing title VI of the 1964 act, then any interested citizen could ask for a judicial review.

At present one set of rules applies to one school district and to one hospital and another applies to another school district and another hospital. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin feels that that is a proper way to administer this title or any other act.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I think that the appropriate agencies can issue proper guidelines. But I also think we need congressional oversight for this purpose. I do not think that section 606(d) in your amendment is the most devastating. But I think there are other aspects of your amendment into which I submit we need congressional inquiry.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to instances in which the Office of Education or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have carried out some of the guidelines which they have issued. I would particularly like to ask those who have announced their opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina, including the gentleman from Wisconsin who just preceded me in the well, the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Colorado, and others, a question. In the district in which I live, and which I represent, we have done everything in utmost good faith that can be done to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with title VI of that act, and we have made substantial progress, far greater than anyone has ever dreamed possible. Will these gentlemen reconsider their positions and support this amendment?

Yet we are now confronted, Mr. Chairman, with a situation in which the Office of Education will accept the plans submitted by one school district and refuse an identical plan submitted by an adjoining school district. As a result of this, about 10 days ago, in a conference in my home with 8 school district administrators and with some 41 members of the boards of education of those 8 school districts, we discussed and went over the figures which recite what has taken place.

We saw during this conference instances where the Office of Education and the Compliance Division of that Office have accepted plans which show a rate of increase for the school year 1966–67, of approximately 2.3 over the corresponding figures for 1965–66. Yet, in a county less than 20 miles removed, they rejected a plan which showed an increased ratio of 7.6 to 1 over what it had been during the preceding year.

When those figures were brought home to me—and we went through them as closely as we could to make certain that those figures were absolutely accurate—I then asked the Commissioner of Education and the Education Office Compliance Section to please tell us in black and white what would be required so that, if necessary, we could make additional efforts to comply.

What answer did I receive? The answer was "Mr. Congressman, we cannot tell you what we will accept because we do not know ourselves."

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee, if the Commissioner of Education and if the head of the Compliance Section do not know what they want and what they will accept, then I ask—and I ask it reverently—how in the name of heaven do we know what they want and what they will accept?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will tell us the name of the school districts where the plans have been rejected, or funds have been delayed or denied?

Mr. FLYNT. I can name 13 that have received letters of rejection or deferral.

Let me explain further about this letter of deferral. As I understand it, if the approval of funds to be issued is merely deferred, such deferral can suspend the funds forever, and there is no way to go into court to determine the validity of the withholding order.

I say to the gentleman from California, if funds are deferred or if they are withheld, if the funds are not made available when every effort has been made to comply, then I submit that it is evidence of bad faith on the part of those who withhold these funds.

Now, let me name these school districts which have received these letters:

Butts County.
Clayton County.
Coweta County.
Newnan City.
Fayette County.
Griffin-Spalding.
Heard County.
Henry County.
Jones County.
Meriwether County.
Pike County.
Hogansville City.
La Grange City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unimous consent, Mr. FLYNT was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FLYNT. If I may say to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, the Fayette County system is the one that shows a ratio increase of 7.6 to 1 over the preceding year, yet it has been disapproved. There are others, Mr. Chairman, which have approximately 2 or 2.3, which have been approved. If there would be some affirmative rule or regulation that the school administrators and the boards of education could understand, then I believe the work of all of us—those of us in Congress, those who are administering the school systems on a local basis, and the Office of Education itself—would be made easier, and we could do a much better job for public education in the United States.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Georgia yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. With the naming of the systems by the gentleman from Georgia, with the relating of the percentages to be accomplished in 1966–67, as compared with 1965–66, as related to the percentage of increase, and with the failure of the Commissioner of Education to approve in one instance and his acceptance in approving in other instances, we see clear evidence that the guidelines about which this discussion has taken place are being promulgated for the sole purpose of correcting an imbalance, which is in direct violation of paragraph 401(b) of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in direct violation of section 303(b), previously cited, of this bill now under consideration.

I congratulate the gentleman for presenting the statistics to prove that they are in violation.

Mr. FLYNT. I am in accord with the statements of my colleague from Georgia and I thank him for his remarks at this point.

Let me come back to the Coweta County system and the Newnan school system, both of which are located in Coweta County.

Recently the chairman of the board of education of the Coweta system and the president of the board of education of the Newnan school system received a call from two very capable and very fine special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They came in, identified themselves, and said, "We are down to investigate a complaint."

The first question naturally asked was, "What is the complaint?" The agent said, "We are under instructions not to inform you what the complaint is." Then they proceeded to ask further questions.

The chairman of the board of education, I believe quite properly, asked to see the complaint, or to at least be told its content. The information was refused. He asked the question, "If a man were accused of robbing a national bank or a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, would not a suspect be entitled to receive what amounts to a bill of particulars, giving the name of the bank, the city in which it is located, and the date upon which it was robbed?" The special agent said, "Yes, he would; but in this case we have been instructed not to give any information as to what the complaint is."

In this instance, Mr. Chairman, we have every reason to believe that the complaint is a malicious complaint not based upon any fact whatsoever.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Would the gentleman agree that the only thing the amendment I have offered would do would be to require the agency to promulgate rules which would be available for everybody to see, and then, if funds were cut off, the person would have, in effect, a bill of particulars as to which regulation was violated, or the Government agency would, and then if they felt that the agency had not legally cut them off under the terms of the present civil rights law they could bring an action in Federal court?

Mr. FLYNT. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe the proponents of the amendment may, by seeking to have it adopted, do the very thing they do not wish to do. They will perpetuate a continuing stream of Executive or administrative decisions bearing on the very questions and the very examples they have been citing.

The amendment refers to "violations of a provision of the Constitution," for example. When dealing with practical situations in schools or in welfare cases, or in other situations to which this amendment might apply, you are then going to have administrative officials of the Government, members who are in the executive branch, interpreting that very language.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall what the gentleman from Wisconsin said about the responsibility of Congress in this area. I would certainly like to associate myself with the observations he has made on the necessity for the continuing of oversight by the Congress. What this amendment would do is just kick it back again on a different basis to administrative officials. I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the ranking minority member on their foresight in appointing an ad hoc committee to study the continuing responsibility of Congress for oversight. I would join with the gentleman from Wisconsin who served as the chairman of the ad hoc committee and the gentleman from California who, with myself, was the other member of the committee, in hoping that the Congress will take a more active role in seeing how efficiently these acts have been administered and in seeing where corrective action is specifically needed in different programs. This is, however, a totally revolutionary idea that we simply deal in a wholesale manner with the question as this amendment proposes. It would be a step backward and would be a reversal of the tremendous progress that was made in this Congress in 1964. It would be a reversal of all of the forward looking and forward moving trends that have taken place in the meantime and to a large degree it would be an abdication of our real legislative responsibility here.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland what objections he has to a requirement that the regulations issued by the Office of Education be reduced to writing.

Mr. MATHIAS. I have no objection to that whatsoever, but I think that we have to deal with this thing on a responsible legislative basis. I think that the place, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, to do it is in a committee on oversight of the execution of these laws.

Mr. FLYNT. If the gentleman will yield further, will he not agree with me that Congress cannot know what the Office of Education is doing unless it has some regulations in writing to see what regulations are being promulgated? And would the gentleman from Maryland also agree that is the sole purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MATHIAS. No, I would not agree to that as your final conclusion, because I do not think it is. I do agree with the gentleman that the Congress has a responsibility here, but I think we have to deal with it in a detailed and special way and not wholesale. The gentleman from North Carolina has asked me to yield, and I am very happy to do so at this time.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman for his statement that this may be a revolutionary idea that we have a government of laws and not of men, because as I remember that did bring about a revolution on one occasion which our people won. However, I would point out to the gentleman a personal experience that I had down in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATHIAS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The Department of Education sent a gentleman named McKeechum down to North Carolina to meet with all of the school folks there and he outlined to them what they would have to do to comply with the Civil Rights Act. These people complied. They drew up their statements in accordance with it.

I went down with representatives of one of the school boards from the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. The HEW people with whom we met said, "Yes; that is right; that is what is Mr. McKeechum told you. We have now changed that. He is no longer with us and you have got to do something else."

Mr. Chairman, this is the type of thing that brings about the amendment which I have offered. We should have rules and regulations that everyone can read and follow.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that as an alternative to this amendment, it would be more satisfactory and more efficient and effective to achieve the ends which he seeks, if the gentleman will lend his support to a continuing standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which will have legislative oversight over the execution of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1965, and, hopefully, the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse and concur in the remarks of the chairman of the ad hoc committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], and my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. Chairman, we sat for a great number of hours listening to both sides concerning the enforcement of title VI. It is my own view that the failure on the part of the administration in this field is due to being too lax, not being too strict.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this to be a necessary amendment, if any of us are to know, or if any of our constituents are to know, where we stand in connection with these various bills that are being passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, of course we know that this time is no different from other times in the past when a civil rights bill is being debated. It is a highly emotional atmosphere that prevails in the House of Representatives. On occasion, however, when an amendment is offered and the case for it is compelling, and if we can get the Members to listen, there are some changes made in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, that has been demonstrated in this debate as well. I am sure that the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union have also noticed that when we have finally obtained the attention of the members of the Committee and secured the adoption of an amendment by the Committee, the managers would immediately shut off debate on that title and go on to the next title because they do not want amendments adopted even though they are necessary to the bill, and no matter how meritorious they might be.

Mr. Chairman, some of the schools in my district have had troubles with the Federal Office of Education, but I want to get into something else at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, Senator ERVIN had occasion to question the Attorney General of the United States at hearings which were being conducted in the other body on the Civil Rights Act of 1966; the Senator later, in commenting about this, stated:

> I directed a question to the Attorney General at the hearings being conducted on the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I asked him whether the health insurance for the aged is an insurance program. He stated, to the bewilderment and consternation of many of his listeners, that the Health Insurance for the Aged Act was not an insurance program at all but rather a "Federal assistance program."
>
> Secretary Gardner and the Surgeon General later agreed with him.

Now, as we have learned, our hospitals in getting approved for medicare have to get approved under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I had an experience just recently. My experience in this instance spread out over about 3 or 4 weeks. It involved a hospital that had done everything they had been told to do.

The hospital called me and told me that its approval for medicare was being held up. I called up downtown and asked about the problem. I was called back in a day or two and was told that the holdup was in Baltimore. I called the office in Baltimore and talked to them advising them of the problem. The man there told me he would call me back later. He did in a day or two. He said, "I want you to know that the problem on these cases in the departments is that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing." He said, "I will look into it for you further."

Later he telephoned me back in 2 or 3 days and said the hospital had been approved under title VI. I called the hospital and relayed the advice. In about a week the hospital called me again, that they had heard nothing, and still not approved. I again called Baltimore, inquiring why the hospital had not been notified of the approval, and was advised it would be investigated. A few days later, I received a return call, in which I was told I would have to contact their Dallas office. I called Dallas about the problem, and was told that I would be called back. When I received this return call, I was told it was somebody else in Dallas I would have to talk to. So I called him, and again went through relating the problem. He told me that he would call me back in a few days.

He called me back and said I would have to take it up with yet another office here in Washington.

I called them and talked to them and explained the problem.

This is over about a 3-week period.

Mr. Chairman, I explained the problem to that man. He said that he would call me back.

Then he referred me to someone else and I talked to that person here in Washington. This man referred me back to the office in Baltimore and he said that is where the decision would have to be made, where I had started off in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am a patient man, but I fear it had grown extremely thin by the time this circle in buckpassing had been completed.

A day later the hospital was approved.

But, honestly, they were telling me the truth when they said that their left hand did not know what their right hand was doing. I think it is time Congress required them to adopt some sort of regulations so that at least they will know what they are doing and perhaps we could find out; but it is problematical whether we can ever find out definitely what they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment certainly should be adopted. I sincerely urge all of the Members to vote for it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that an amendment such as that of the gentleman from North Carolina is needed if the chaos caused by the arbitrary and vacillating policies placed by Washington on our local communities is to end. As I understand the guideline procedures that have been followed to date, they violate the express prohibitions of the statutes. So something needs to be done to bring out into the light of day just what is occurring and what is planned. Perhaps in this way a more orderly and proper manner of handling these problems may be found.

Floyd Christian, State superintendent of public instruction of Florida, informed me this week that the U.S. Office of Education communicates directly with county superintendents and bypasses the State department of education; and that inconsistent decisions are made by the Office of Education, and by the area director of the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department; each purporting to speak for the Federal Government of the adequacy of the desegregation plans on a local level. The matter was further complicated in Florida by the Office of Education sending there a team of four young people, only one of whom had ever taught school and that one for only 1 year. The others are still students, and not even students of teaching.

Mr. Christian told me that this team told the local county superintendents and boards what they had to do, instead of trying to help them resolve difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to me that if we are to keep our beloved country as a country of laws and not of dictatorship, the amendment before us should be accepted.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The people in the State of South Carolina have made a desperate effort and in my opinion have bent over backwards in an effort to obey the civil rights law of 1964. However, the bureaucrats in the Department of Education have continuously harassed the individual school boards to the extent that schools are unnecessarily suffering a great setback. No school board can ever know when they have complied with the guidelines being issued by so many irresponsible people in the Department of Education.

The rules and regulations being submitted to the school boards in South Carolina and the other States are far beyond the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and it seems that the Congressmen from other States of the Union outside the South are condoning the action of the bureaucrats in the Department of Education by voting against amendments such as the one presented to the Congress by Mr. WHITENER.

We are only trying to compel the Department to use a standard set of guidelines and to continuously advise school boards that funds are being withheld when the local boards to the best of their knowledge have complied with every request made by the Department of Education.

This is one chance the Members of the House will have an opportunity to vote for a proposal that will bring some sense of reasoning out of the chaos in connection with our public school system in its effort to comply with the Department of Education guidelines.

There is a great desire on the part of Members of Congress from some certain States, both Republican and Democrat, to continue to crucify the Southern people in an effort to gain the vote of the colored people in their respective metropolitan areas.

I could not use words strong enough on the floor of the House to express my opinion on some of the unnecessary and irresponsible guidelines, rules, and regulations now being issued by the Department of Education in the name of civil rights.

I hope everyone will do some sound thinking at this moment and vote to correct this intolerable situation.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Following the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Office of Education issued guidelines to be followed by the Nation's school systems. While the majority of local school districts were in the process of complying with those guidelines, educators from coast to coast were startled last March by the issuance of extremely far-reaching new guidelines—guidelines obviously aimed at imposing "racial balance" in the public schools of our Nation.

The Commissioner of Education cites title VI of the Civil Rights Act as his authority in promulgating these new guidelines. In the opinion of many, however, the regulations far exceed both the scope and intent of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The first section of title VI of the act states:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

However, the first section of title IV of the same act, in defining the word "desegregation," states:

> "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

Throughout the debate on the 1964 Civil Rights Act, assurances were given that no attempts would be made to achieve "racial balance" in education and that the Government's efforts would be confined to what the Supreme Court had ordered in 1954; namely, that public schools could not remain segregated on the basis of race and must admit students without regard to color.

As a matter of fact, on June 4, 1964, Vice President HUMPHREY, who was then a Senator from Minnesota, in discussing a controlling Federal court case which was upheld by the Supreme Court, told the Senate:

> This case makes it quite clear that, while the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The fact that there is a racial imbalance per se is not something that is unconstitutional.

In spite of these assurances, however, and in spite of the fact that the majority of the local school districts were in the process of complying with the first guidelines spelled out by the Office of Education, these new stringent guidelines were issued.

As I understand the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], it defines section 601 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act according to the intent of Congress. If the Whitener amendment is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not according to the whims of fourth echelon bureaucrats.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is badly needed, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

It is a very useful amendment. It is a clear amendment. It is a needed amendment.

Frankly, I am somewhat surprised and disappointed that my esteemed and able friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] does not accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing revolutionary about establishing standards where there are no standards. This amendment can do no possible harm to the bill. It can make a substantial contribution by ending present confusion. And confusion is what we have now—confusion compounded.

This amendment does not undo any past legislation. It simply helps to spell out the law and clarify it. The amendment would actually put the intent of the legislature in a more workable form.

Mr. Chairman, the conditions which disturb me may not be general throughout the country but certainly in the South, school conditions in particular are chaotic. This is not because of a lack of conformity with the requirements for integration—that is not the problem at all. The South is accepting the law of the land and integration there is proceeding, Mr. Chairman, much more rapidly than most people thought possible. The trouble is with guidelines. We need this amendment to establish orderly procedure in the issuance and administration of guidelines. Today the guidelines are beyond the law. They are outside the law. They are a law unto themselves. I question their legality but that is at the moment beside the point.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will bring the guidelines within the law. Congress does have a responsibility to the people to bring about order and end the unproductiveness of confusion. This amendment would simply establish standards of procedure. It would get away from whim and irresponsibility. This is the controlling force needed. There is no controlling force now other than bureaucratic decisions on the spur of the moment.

In recent weeks a young woman of 26, with no experience, background, or qualification, other than a college degree and 1 year as a teacher of the second grade, has been going through northern Florida. She is accompanied by two or three college kids of both races. She is arbitrarily and irresponsibly directing conformity as she sees the need for it. This group is confusing and confounding elected officials who are trying to carry on a sound school system under the law. They do not know what they are doing other than to stir up trouble. They are the judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney on schools matters in every county into which they go, and they have left nothing but confusion behind them. They know nothing about education. They care nothing about education. Their only purpose appear to be race mixing. I do not object to their zeal but I object to the authority given to irresponsible people and I object to the destruction of our educational system, and that is what is taking place. Great harm is being done by such practices.

In my State we have had a minimum of racial problems and we are proud of that. But this is the sort of thing which will give us racial problems. If there is a continuation of the procedures that have been forced upon us, there may be serious racial problems despite our efforts to live within the law. The amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Florida, who preceded me in the well, because being on the same committee with him, I know his ability and his dedication. But just now I heard him say that the integration of the school system is proceeding more speedily than any of us thought possible. I would like to point out to my colleagues that the decision in the case of Brown against the Board of Education was handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, and here we are, in 1966, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education has issued a statement only recently in which he said that rather than making progress, the situation with regard to integration of the school system is worse today than it was at the time that decision was handed down in 1954.

What is going on actually is blatant, flagrant disregard and hostility to the law of the land, and I do not think the Federal Government can underwrite disregard of the law of the land. For that reason I vigorously oppose the pending amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the Whitener amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I know my colleagues from other sections of the country have become accustomed during the past few years to hearing criticism from the South about Federal actions involving civil rights and the way Federal agencies are administering some of these laws.

I am very much afraid also that consciously or unconsciously you have become accustomed to considering such criticism on the basis of its source rather than its merits. Naturally, you are hearing from many of us from the South today on the subject of title VI of the 1964 act because it is our section of the country which has suffered from the arbitrary and capricious acts of administrators.

Mr. Chairman, the matter which we are debating at this moment is one of the most important we have considered during this 2 weeks of debate on the subject of civil rights.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] said a few moments ago very eloquently—and some might accuse him of exaggerating when he says he has not seen such bureaucratic dictatorship, or words to that effect since the days of Adolph Hitler in Germany. I do not believe I am looked upon as an extremist in my views, yet I say to you that the gentleman from South Carolina has spoken the truth. In the administration of title VI of the civil rights law of 1964 in my congressional district and in many other areas of North Carolina, I have observed bureaucratic dictatorship and harassment at its worst. The hospital and school officials of my district will, I believe, agree with this assertion.

However, before going into a full discussion of the ways and means by which title VI has been literally and brutally administered and in support of the Whitener amendment, I want to express my general opposition to this sweeping legislation.

As I said yesterday for the third time in as many years, this House is being asked to approve sweeping legislative proposals in the name of civil rights.

I am opposed to passage of this bill because I believe its proposals are in part unconstitutional and—on the whole—unwise and unnecessary. However, it is not my purpose to discuss specific provisions of the bill in detail. My colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and other members of the Judiciary Committee in their minority views in the committee report, have done an excellent job of pointing out defects and dangers in particular provisions of the bill in their reports, and many Members of the House have done the same during the debate. I will, therefore, not take time to repeat the logical and convincing reasons they have given why the specific proposals of this bill should be defeated.

My purpose in speaking is to discuss additional reasons why this bill should not be approved under the present circumstances—reasons which are valid without regard to the merits of the bill's proposals. I hope my colleagues who advocate passage of the bill will listen with an open mind.

I do not question the good intentions of the sponsors of this legislation. But good intentions do not insure good laws—particularly when those good intentions involve complex, controversial and very important matters. When Congress acts on such subjects, it has a special responsibility to give calm, thorough and objective consideration to the possible results of its action. And Congress has an equally important duty to make unmistakably clear what is intended by the legislation it enacts.

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 calls for a number of complicated and potentially far-reaching changes in existing law. Despite their importance, these changes have not been thoroughly considered. It would have been extremely difficult to give adequate consideration to even one of this bill's eight titles in the time available to the Judiciary Committee for studying it. No group of men—no matter how hard working and how dedicated—could possibly give due consideration to the possible consequences of all eight titles.

While lack of time alone would have precluded adequate study of the pending legislation, there is another—and perhaps even more serious deficiency—in the consideration given this bill. Notwithstanding its title, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 contains provisions which could very well have serious and completely unintended effects on matters which do not even involve civil rights as the term is generally understood. Yet these proposals have been considered almost exclusively on the basis of their alleged effectiveness in promoting civil rights, with little or no attention being given to their overall impact on our society.

For example, the proposed legislation would make sweeping changes in existing procedures for selecting juries in Federal courts and create a possibility of substantial Federal interference with the jury selection process in State courts. It is argued that such changes are necessary to insure that juries are drawn "from a cross section of the community, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status."

There may be some justification for limited and carefully considered legislation designed to correct specific inequities in jury selection procedures. But such justification cannot be found in the report of the Judiciary Committee. Nor is there any indication that the committee has considered the possible repercussions of the changes it proposes.

What assurance do we have that the proposed changes will not place substantial unforeseen burdens on both courts and litigants? Who can tell us what further difficulties might be added to the already overwhelming task facing prosecutors in criminal courts? How do we know that unexpected adverse effects may not far outweigh any benefits of the proposed changes?

I ask these questions in all sincerity. They are not answered in the report of the Judiciary Committee, nor does it appear that these and other questions have even been considered.

It is bad enough that Congress is being asked to approve a bill which, if enacted, may produce very serious adverse effects which are both unintended and completely unexpected. What is even worse is that the hastily drafted language of the bill does not even make clear what is intended. When it enacts legislation as controversial and important as that proposed in the pending bill, Congress has a particular responsibility to leave no doubt whatever about what is intended. Yet even the proponents of this bill disagree among themselves as to the meaning of some of its provisions.

I ask my colleagues who support this bill: Can you honestly say that it has been as thoroughly considered and as carefully drafted as its subject matter warrants?

Let me also ask another question, which I believe is equally important. If you approve this bill and it is enacted into law, how will it be administered?

Wise and prudent administration by the executive branch of government can sometimes compensate at least partially for legislative defects. But when laws which have been inadequately considered and hastily drafted are poorly administered, the result can be disastrous.

I do not, of course, support the pending legislation. But even if I did support it, I would have serious reservations about voting for it because of my very deep concern about the manner in which it is likely to be administered. This concern is based, to a considerable extent, on what has already taken place under the alleged authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly on very serious abuses relating to title VI of the 1964 act. Because of the danger that the pending bill would be administered in the same manner, I should like to discuss the administration of title VI of the 1964 act in some detail.

The stated purpose of title VI of the 1964 act is to insure that no person "shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" on the ground of race, color, or national origin. Federal departments and agencies which administer programs or activities involving Federal financial assistance are authorized under certain circumstances to terminate or deny such Federal assistance as a means of accomplishing the objectives of title VI.

I do not quarrel with the stated purpose of title VI that programs receiving Federal financial assistance should be available to all without racial or ethnic discrimination. Moreover, while the language of title VI might perhaps have been improved, it is quite clear that Congress did not intend to allow termination or denial of Federal funds on an arbitrary or capricious basis. Specific provisions designed to prevent unjustified action by Federal departments and agencies and to insure that beneficiaries of Federal programs received fair treatment were enacted by Congress as a part of title VI.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count.

Ninety Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 205]

Andrews,
  George W.
Blatnik
Celler
Clark
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Goodell
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
King, N.Y.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Powell
Purcell
Rogers, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Willis
Wilson,
  Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 406 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The **CHAIRMAN.** When the Committee rose, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] had been recognized for 10 minutes. He had consumed 4 of those 10 minutes. He is recognized, therefore, for 6 minutes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, before the quorum call—which, incidentally, I did not request—I was discussing some of the problems we in North Carolina have had in connection with the unwise and illegal administration of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and speaking in support of an amendment offered by my able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] an amendment—to this pending bill—designed to force the agencies involved to comply with the spirit and intent of those provisions of title VI dealing with the withholding of Federal funds.

Before proceeding further, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] who says he heads up an ad hoc committee which has been making a study of the way in which the various titles of the acts are being administered that at some time during the course of this debate he take the time to outline to the Members of this body just what his committee has been doing, what it has found, whether or not the so-called school and hospital integration guidelines applicable to only 17 States are being wisely, fairly, and legally administered, and what recommendations, if any, his subcommittee has already made. If there have been violations, to what extent has he expressed himself to the appropriate agencies? I believe I know the answer. I am anxious to read his report if it is ever filed.

Mr. Chairman, let me get back to title VI of the 1964 act. Title VI includes two provisions intended by Congress to prevent unreasonable demands by Federal officials under the alleged authority of that title. Let me repeat what I said before the quorum call. Rules, regulations, and orders issued to implement title VI are required by law to be "consistent with the accomplishment of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance" involved. Moreover, the law provides—and the gentleman from North Carolina quoted this—that "no such rule, regulation or order shall become effective unless and until approved"—by whom? "By the President." Lest I not get to that discussion because of limitations of time, let me tell you that the guidelines about which we have been talking have not been approved by the President.

In order to insure fair treatment for beneficiaries of Federal programs accused of noncompliance with nondiscrimination requirements imposed under title VI, Congress specifically provided that Federal funds should be terminated or refused only after there had been "an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure to comply." As a further safeguard, the law provides that no action to terminate or refuse Federal funds shall become effective until 30 days after the head of the Federal department or agency concerned has filed with appropriate committees of the House and Senate a full written report of the circumstances and grounds for such action. Congress also provided that any person aggrieved by action to terminate or refuse Federal funds could obtain judicial review of such action.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is certainly correct. The Committee is not in order.

The gentleman from North Carolina may proceed.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, the language of title VI of the 1964 act makes it very clear that Congress wished to prevent its abuse through arbitrary and ill-considered actions by Federal officials. The reason why Congress included procedural safeguards in title VI is also clear. Title VI applies to all programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance. In authorizing these programs and activities, Congress intended to serve worthwhile public purposes and to meet real and sometimes urgent needs. If the funds appropriated to carry out these programs and activities were to be denied because of capricious and unwarranted action on the part of Federal officials, the purposes for which Congress provided them could not be accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, regrettably, sometimes some of us are not heard because of the area of the country from which we come rather than the merits of our position.

Congress could hardly have spelled out more clearly the intention that federally assisted programs should not be jeopardized by unjustified conduct of Federal officials under title VI. Unfortunately, some of those charged with administering title VI have ignored—and on occasion appeared to deliberately defy—the clearly expressed intent of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNGATE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FOUNTAIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I do [illegible]ofess to know how title VI has been [illegible]ministered in all Federal departments and agencies. I am familiar, however, with what has happened in the case of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is responsible for administering vitally important Federal programs intended to provide better medical care and improved educational opportunities.

Some officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I regret to say, apparently do not regard title VI of the 1964 act as a law which should be carried out with due regard for the intention of Congress and a proper concern and respect for the rights of those affected. Instead, they have been using title VI as a convenient means of imposing unjustified demands upon participants in Federal programs. Moreover, they are doing this in a manner which makes a mockery of the procedural safeguards of title VI.

Those of you who do not live in 1 of the 17 Southern States are not yet familiar with the situation as those officials with whom many of us have talked have either said or implied—when they get through their brutal actions and harassment against southern people, they will go to work on you in other parts of the country where they say de facto segregation is and has been a long established practice.

The congressional requirement that title VI be implemented through rules, regulations, and orders approved by the President has been effectively evaded—if not deliberately violated. It is true that the President has approved broad general regulations for administration of title VI by HEW. But additional—and often unwarranted—demands are being made upon participants in federally assisted programs through so-called guidelines which have never been approved by the President or even through personal edicts of HEW officials.

The clear intention of Congress that those affected should have an opportunity for a hearing before Federal funds are denied is being circumvented. Those who wish to participate in federally assisted programs are being denied Federal funds without any opportunity for a hearing unless they agree to the demands of HEW officials—no matter how capricious or illegal those demands may be. HEW officials admit that they cannot legally "refuse" Federal funds without giving applicants an opportunity for a hearing. Consequently, they have devised an effective method of evading this legal requirement. Instead of formally "refusing" Federal funds to applicants who fail to agree to all HEW demands without question, HEW simply "defers" action on their applications indefinitely. As a result, such applicants are being deprived not only for Federal assistance, but of the right to be heard, which Congress intended to guarantee under title VI.

I feel sure that most Members of Congress are not aware of the shocking administrative abuses which have occurred under the alleged authority of title VI of the 1964 Act. Consequently, I am going to take time to cite some specific examples of unreasonable and absolutely indefensible conduct by officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HEW officials have demonstrated an almost unbelievably callous attitude in their treatment of some persons entitled to benefits under the medicare program. Medicare legislation enacted by Congress contains specific provisions prohibiting Federal interference with hospital administrative practices and guaranteeing medicare patients a free choice of hospitals. Despite these provisions, HEW officials have been—and apparently still are—willing to deprive elderly citizens of both races of the medicare benefits to which they are entitled unless hospitals in their communities agree to any and all demands made upon them by HEW, no matter how questionable the legality or the wisdom of such demands.

One North Carolina hospital was denied approval for medicare patients even though it had never been segregated, had an integrated staff and made its facilities equally available to all without discrimination. The sole reason for denying approval to this hospital was that it allowed patients a choice of assignments to rooms with other patients, when space was available, and the choices of its patients resulted in an insufficient amount of biracial room occupancy to satisfy HEW.

No court or authoritative administrative tribunal has held that a policy of honoring patients' requests for room assignments is discriminatory, and HEW itself officially stated in 1965 that such a policy was not discriminatory. Nevertheless, the hospital was told that it would not be approved for medicare patients unless and until it changed its policy.

Another North Carolina hospital has been—and still is being—denied approval for medicare patients because it has so far been unable to comply with a demand by HEW that it merge with another hospital. This hospital is willing and anxious to provide care to medicare patients of both races without any discrimination whatsoever. It cannot do so because HEW has arbitrarily refused to approve the hospital for medicare patients. Neither title VI nor any other law, of course, authorizes HEW to demand that two hospitals merge before it will approve them for medicare patients. However, that agency appears unconcerned about the fact that its conduct is both unreasonable and illegal.

Disregard for the procedural safeguards of title VI has also characterized HEW's administration of Federal programs for aid to education. It is interesting to note—and I hope my colleagues from the North will listen carefully—that one of the earliest instances of arbitrary action under the alleged authority of title VI involved the city of Chicago. In that situation, the Office of Education received unsubstantiated complaints from a local civil rights group alleging discrimination in the

Chicago school system. Before the complaints had even been investigated, the Office of Education publicly stated that Federal funds would be withheld from Chicago schools.

The position taken by the Office of Education was indefensible, of course, since there had not even been a pretense of compliance with the procedural safeguards of title VI, and it was reversed in less than a week.

Unfortunately, the present conduct of some officials of the Office of Education does not indicate that they learned any lasting lessons from the Chicago fiasco.

"Freedom of choice" plans, under which each student is permitted to decide for himself what school he will attend, is the method being used by most southern communities to desegregate school systems which formerly had separate schools for white and Negro students. The legality of such plans as an acceptable method for achieving desegregation has been consistently upheld by Federal courts. The Office of Education has also stated publicly that such plans are an acceptable method of desegregation. Office of Education guidelines specifically prohibit any official, teacher, or employee of a school system from attempting to influence, either directly or indirectly, the choices of schools by students.

Despite court rulings and their own guidelines, however, some officials of the Office of Education are telling local school officials that free choice desegregation plans will be considered inadequate unless a sufficient number of Negro students choose to attend formerly white schools. In effect, the Office of Education is saying officially that all students must have a free choice of schools and suggesting unofficially that some Negro students should be forced to change schools against their will if such a step is necessary to provide a racial balance satisfactory to the Office of Education.

I ask your indulgence for having spent a considerable amount of time discussing what has happened under title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I did so because I thought it was essential that the House have this information before it acts on the pending bill.

The administrative abuses which I have cited occurred in spite of the fact that Congress included what it thought were effective procedural safeguards to prevent such abuses. The present bill, in sharp contrast, contains no procedural safeguards comparable to those included in title VI of the 1964 act.

If such serious abuses can occur and are occuring under a law which contains relatively strong procedural safeguards, what can we expect to happen under a law which gives administrative agencies almost unchecked power?

I hope every Member of this House will make an honest effort to consider that question objectively.

As I have said, I know that my colleagues from other sections of the country have become accustomed during the past few years to hearing criticism—as I have said before I am very much afraid, that—consciously or subconsciously—you from outside the South have become accustomed to considering criticism from southerners on the basis of its source, rather than its merits.

It is becoming increasingly clear, however, that racial problems are national—not regional—in their scope. It has also become clear that racial problems outside the South, in many respects, are more serious and will be more difficult to solve than those in the South. I take no pleasure in reminding my colleagues from other sections of the country of their own racial problems, because such problems—wherever they are—should be a matter of grave concern to all of us. I mention them only to emphasize that racial problems do not begin or end at the Mason-Dixon line.

Bitterness and distrust between different sections of the country will do nothing to help solve what is essentially a national problem. What is needed are courses of action which will unite—rather than divide—us.

I want to emphasize once again that, as a matter of personal conviction, I do not approve nor do I support racial, religious or ethnic discrimination. I believe that every American should be treated as an individual—and that no one should be penalized because of his race, religion or national origin.

It is the duty of government to protect—on an equal basis—the legitimate personal and property rights of all its citizens. Without effective action by government to maintain law and order, none of us could peacefully enjoy the benefits of our society.

Government protection for the rights of all is a fundamental basis for any civilized society. But, while government can and must protect the rights of all, no government can insure that all will receive equal acceptance and equal opportunities from their fellow citizens. True equality can be achieved only by voluntary acceptance, not by governmental compulsion. And if government, in attempting to advance the interests of some of its citizens, takes away or seriously jeopardizes the rights of others, the resulting bitterness and resentment will inevitably retard progress toward true equality.

Passage of the Whitener amendment will make this a far less dangerous bill, but passage of the pending bill in its present form will do more to aggravate racial problems than to solve them. What is needed is more wisdom, understanding and more cooperation—not more "force" legislation.

I urge the House to adopt the Whitener amendment. The agencies may ignore it, but illegal action on their part will be more difficult.

In any event, whether or not this amendment is adopted, I urge the defeat of this malicious and unconstitutional legislation.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member will be recognized for approximately 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] for approximately 2 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be assigned to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana now is recognized for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has pending before this body a very fine amendment. The gentleman has explained in detail the purpose of the amendment and how his amendment would work.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman as to its need. I agree with those who have followed him in support of the amendment as to the abuses by the several Federal agencies, especially the Office of Education, in the administration of title VI of the 1964 civil rights bill, which is that section of the bill having to do with federally assisted programs, supposedly mutually beneficial to the Federal Government and to the several States and the people thereof. I will not be redundant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about a separate section of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 from that which has been discussed previously here today, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], who is presently the floor manager of this legislation, if the gentleman would consider the matter of hiring teachers to be an employment matter in public education, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] for the purpose of answering that question.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Louisiana state whether it is just the question of hiring teachers or are the teachers being hired for a specific purpose or are they just being hired?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No matter for what they are being hired, the answer would be the same. But if they are being hired to teach, would that be considered a matter of employment?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a matter of employment. However, if those teachers are then teaching children as teachers do, then it is a matter of education also.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey could not possibly have given me a better answer than the one he has given, because I believe it is obvious to all that the purpose of education has been misconstrued and misused by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, schools were created for education and teachers are employed for the purpose of teaching in the furtherance of education. Schools, however, are being improperly used to promote social reform. Education has become secondary.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No; I do not yield further at this moment. When I am through with this explanation and the discussion of this section, I shall be glad to yield, if the gentleman from New Jersey has a question.

Mr. Chairman, teachers are hired to promote education.

The gentleman from New Jersey has admitted that it is a matter of employment. This admission by Mr. RODINO in itself expresses the congressional intent of the Congress in passing title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and voids the demand of the Commissioner of Education for integrated faculties in public schools.

Now, Mr. Chairman, listen to what section 604, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 says:

> Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer.

Mr. Chairman, the Commissioner of Education has gone to the public school boards around this Nation and has said, "You have got to integrate your faculties," and the gentleman who is the floor manager of this legislation says in answer to my question that this is a matter of employment and in effect and as matter of fact he in so doing says the Commissioner of Education does not have the authority to require integrated faculties because it is a matter of employment.

Mr. Chairman, this very abuse of this section of title VI of the 1964 civil rights legislation fully discloses the need for this amendment. The Commissioner of Education has failed to cite in answer to a face-to-face question of mine authority to require integrated faculties. He cannot because he no authority.

Gentlemen of the Committee, this amendment should be accepted. The executive branch of the Government must adhere to congressional intent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has not only been abused, it is being crammed down the throats of the people of the South in an effort to destroy the social order of the South.

Mr. Chairman, this misfit whom we call the Commissioner of Education was so ignorant, so biased, so determined to change the whole social structure of the South—and his name is Harold Howe II. He should be cited as a disgrace to his office. He made a statement that dumbfounded the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. It dumbfounded Mr. POWELL when he made the statement in the presence of members of the committee from the South that he thought the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed against the South.

Now he has gone beyond the section under discussion and he has determined, he has mandated, he has decreed that we not only accept people regardless of race or color but we go out and carry on a crusade to recruit these people.

Think of such a thing. This is destroying the school system of the South. For you on my side of the aisle, it will destroy the Democratic Party of the South. As the Atlanta Constitution says, "All the Republicans have to do is to keep quiet, things such as this will destroy the Democratic Party," with people such as this administering the law.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has said is eminently accurate.

The commissars have held meetings in Columbia and other places in South Carolina where they have had seminars requiring that our people go out and recruit teachers for integration purposes.

The law does not say that. Yet, you have a dictator and as it is set up under this bill, which will destroy the autonomy of our country.

What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] has just finished saying about employment—these people are determined to change our part of the world and they have said, "We will make you bow to our will."

They are saving money. They are saving money at our expense—our own money—and taking it to other sections of America to advance the Great Society program. They are denying our people their schools, their lunch money, and their hospitalization to carry on these other programs against the law, against the intent of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of how the 1964 statute was worded, or the intent of Congress, as bad as that act was, they have gone beyond it.

Do you think we are not bitter? We are really bitter and somebody is going to pay for it.

Ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] what has happened in the county of Beaufort, S.C., where Parris Island is, where we have had integration long before many of you who are present here were born. They have found fault in that part of the country. This amendment should pass—yes. This is a disgrace to democracy—a man by the name of Howe, the Commissar of Education, is carrying on his own idea of democracy.

Mr. ROGERS, regardless of how your heart beats—and I assure the gentleman I have nothing but the best will for you, because I am going to ask you some questions if I get some additional time—but this section of the code has been raped. It is being misinterpreted. It is being carried on for a crusade—a crusade against the people of the South. It is destructive of our party and destructive of democracy as we understand it.

The amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the amendment for the simple reason that it was not presented to either the subcommittee or our full committee. In its form it is contradictory and would lead to confusion under title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

May I point out there are prescribed procedures provided in title VI that if rules and regulations are promulgated they must be made with the approval of the President. Then after they have been promulgated, there is an opportunity for compliance by those is entitled to Federal assistance. If there is a denial of funds, then it becomes the duty of the agency involved to refer it to the appropriate committee in Congress which has charge of that subject matter.

With that objective in view, we also provided judicial review in section 603 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with a right of appeal.

May I say to the gentlemen whose districts have been so badly abused that there are methods provided in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to follow an adequate remedy. The proposed amendment would place a burden upon the Government to prove every rule that it might make.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am most disturbed about the way HEW is handling their business in regard to hospitals over our Nation qualifying for the poverty program.

We have, in Neshoba County of my district, a very thriving hospital known as the Neshoba County Hospital, and I have never seen an administrator at any hospital work any harder for the welfare of the hospital, and of this county than has Mr. Lamar Salter, administrator of this hospital. Just recently while I was on a trip to Vietnam to visit our boys in that war torn country, the administrator of the Neshoba County Hospital was given a typical HEW run around.

In late May of 1966, an inspection team was sent to the hospital from the Atlanta regional office of the Equal Health Opportunity Division of the Public Health Service. The team, composed of a Mr. Black and a Mr. Settles, told the administrator that the hospital qualified under title 6 of the medicare bill except for assignments in semiprivate rooms.

On June 1, 1966, Mr. Williams of the Atlanta regional office was written a letter by Mr. Lamar Salter the hospital administrator, telling him that he would have completed complying to the semiprivate regulations by June 15, and this compliance was completed by this time and the news was published in the local newspaper known as the Neshoba County Democrat.

On June 17, the same Mr. Settles headed another inspection team from Atlanta and said he would recommend approval and that Mr. Salter should hear something in 4 or 5 days. Mr. Settles further told Mr. Salter not to discharge any elderly patients until July 1 because he would be approved by then and they would come under medicare.

By July 2, Mr. Salter had not heard anything, and was told to call a Mr. Watson who works for Mr. Robert M. Nash, chief of the equal health opportunity branch in Baltimore. Mr. Watson sent another inspection team. On July 6 an inspection team composed of a Dr. William Moss and a Mr. O'Shanahan inspected the hospital and informed Mr. Salter that he was in full compliance with the regulations and they reported same to Mr. Watson by telephone and in writing.

On July 8, Mr. Watson of Baltimore, told Mr. Salter that they should have their approval within an hour. Mr. Watson told Mr. Salter that a Dr. Richard Smith, a special assistant to Mr. Nash had been holding up the works for Mr. Nash. Because of my being out of the country, Mr. Salter called upon my colleague and friend, Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of Mississippi for help, and Congressman WILLIAMS readily went to work.

On July 18, the Neshoba County Hospital received another inspection team, and then received another team on July 20, but each team refused to let Mr. Salter, the administrator of this hospital, know what would be in their report. They told him not to worry.

On July 20, Mr. Robert Nash of Baltimore, called the Neshoba County Hospital and wanted another inspection, and they sent a doctor to inspect, but he also refused to say what would be in his report.

After seeing that Mr. Salter was not going to be pushed around by the HEW political machine, on July 22, he received a wire that the hospital had been approved as of July 20, with no explanation as to why he had not been approved as of July 1 as he had originally been told.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is anything but fair that you and my colleagues know why this particular hospital has been kicked around so badly by HEW, and why HEW needs a complete reworking.

This hospital happens to be in Philadelphia, Miss., where the three boys were found buried in the earthen dam. Every concerned American will agree that this was an awful happening, but I would point out to you that many times worse crimes, and much more of it, has happened in New York, Boston, and the Watts area of California. In these instances, HEW has poured in millions of dollars to try to appease the criminals.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the obligation of every Christian American to start taking a little inventory to see if someway, somehow, we cannot start in a small way to restore our Government once again back to the people to where equal rights must be accompanied by equal responsibilities.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, according to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, I find myself in the strange position of helping to save the Democratic Party in the South. May I say that from what I have observed it certainly needs salvation.

I rise in support of the amendment because, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Committee, What vice can there be in equity, in clarity, and in consistency in giving school superintendents, hospital administrators, and other public officials charged with compliance with this act some clear and firm ground upon which they can stand, knowing with confidence that when they stand upon that ground, they are within the law and complying with its requirements? What vice can there be in this, and what virtue can there be in confusion, in inconsistency, and in leading such public officials into a perplexing maze of bureaucratic evasion, doubletalk, and inconsistency?

The gentleman has offered a sound, reasonable and equitable amendment. It ought to be adopted by this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I took the information given me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] and I called the Department of HEW to ascertain their side of the story. I did not check all the school boards the gentleman mentioned. I did check five of them, which seemed a reasonable number for a spot check. Of these five, only one has funds withheld. That is Meriwether.

That school district was sent written uniform guidelines which required of them four things: First, to show some progress toward desegregation of faculties; second, that the freedom-of-choice program actually was a freedom-of-choice program, and that it showed some promise for integrating the schools; third, requirements as to how the freedom-of-choice program would be administered such as that parents be given written notice of their free choice 30 days prior to the time they have to make that choice; fourth, a requirement prohibiting artificial segregation by adjustment of geographic zones.

The school board was asked to agree to comply with those guidelines. Instead, they sent the guidelines back and said, "We will comply with title VI of the 1964 act as best we can." The Department of HEW said that that was not good enough.

The fact is that there is less than 4 percent integration in that school district. There are 2,933 Negro youngsters and only 118 of them attend integrated schools. The faculty is entirely segregated. There are no Negro teachers in white schools; there are no white teachers in Negro schools. The school board has indicated that they will send a representative to Washington to talk with representatives of the Department of HEW and indicate what they might be willing to do.

I appreciate the opportunity to clarify the situation as reported to me by HEW. The guidelines are in writing. They are uniform. They are reasonable.

Youngsters who started to school in 1954 are still going to segregated schools. This House, HEW, and the Meriwether School District cannot escape the fact that 12 years after the Brown decision, 96 percent of the Negro students in that school district are relegated to segregated and, I strongly suspect, second-class schools.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago at a time when I was off the floor for a matter of 3 to 5 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], after debate had been limited, and at which time under the rules I could not obtain recognition, attempted to take issue with certain statements which I had made earlier in debate.

I therefore ask, Mr. Chairman, that these remarks be placed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, as I have read the transcribed stenographic record of the remarks of the gentleman from California in which he stated to this Committee that he had talked to someone in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, presumably in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, and had been told that only one school district previously described by me had been issued a letter of rejection, disapproval, or deferral.

The information which I received, I received from the Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, who should be the highest authority in the Office of Education on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California informs me that his source of information was a person identified only by the name of Ruby Martin.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who Ruby Martin is and I doubt very seriously if the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] knows who Ruby Martin is.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do know, and the gentleman from California knows that Harold Howe II is the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Chairman, in my office, the Commissioner of Education told me that 13 school districts had received letters similar to the one which I showed him which had been received by the superintendent of education of the Griffin-Spalding County school system in Georgia, and I quote from that letter:

> Your State educational agency is being notified that your school system's assurance is unacceptable and that your system has been placed on the list of those districts for which commitments of Federal financial assistance for all new activities are deferred, pending submission of an acceptable assurance from your school system.
>
> We have taken this step, rather than start formal enforcement procedures at this time, in order that we make make further efforts to obtain voluntary compliance. It is our sincere hope that your school board will soon approve the submission of an acceptable 441-B assurance.

The other letter is to Mr. Patrick, superintendent of that school system, and it reads:

> As such, under the Departmental Regulation, the plan would no longer provide a basis for continued participation in Federally assisted programs, unless the lack of adequate progress can be remedied.

Each of these letters, as well as the letters to each of the other 12 school systems bears the signature of either the Area Director or the Assistant Commissioner.

The Commissioner of Education advised me that similar letters have been mailed to 13 school systems within the Sixth District of Georgia.

That appears as plain as the English language can make it, that these funds are being withheld or deferred by order of the Commissioner of Education.

I hope that the information read to the Committee by the gentleman from California is correct and that at least 12 and possibly all 13 of such plans and certificates have now been approved. Accordingly, I have requested confirmation of such approval from the Commissioner of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I renew the objection I made to the amendment soon after it was offered.

It will only confuse the confusion, wherever it exists now, to have this amendment adopted today.

It is strange indeed that the amendment was not proposed in the Subcommittee on the Judiciary, and it was not proposed to the Committee on the Judiciary. In most, if not in all, of the instances where complaints have been made, the complaints are no more well-grounded than those that have been explored by our colleague from California.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the amendment should not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] to close the debate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I must repeat what I said earlier in the course of debate on this amendment, that this amendment would be unduly restrictive. It would set new criteria. It would in effect repudiate and reject what the Congress did in title VI of the 1964 act, and what we have been trying to do.

I do not believe when the gentleman brings an amendment of this sort, which is so complex, that he could possibly expect this Committee to adopt his amendment. It was never presented to the subcommittee, nor to the full committee.

Might I also add, although there have been some experiences cited here, we have not had from the administration incidents reported where title VI was not working well. Title VI has worked well. It has helped in trying to achieve the objectives of nondiscrimination. Namely that "No person in the United States shall, on account of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity" under this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that despite the fact that my good friend from North Carolina has attempted to bring before us language, which he says will clarify an issue, about all it does will be to add confusion.

For that reason I reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITENER) there were—ayes 89, noes 104.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITENER and Mr. RODINO.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the number of amendments that are at the Clerk's desk on this title?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that there is at the desk one amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto conclude at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in view of what transpired here in the last few moments, with no indication of any hurry whatsoever, I object.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto conclude at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITENER) there were—ayes 98, noes 123.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will it be the policy of the Chair, as in the past, to recognize, first, those Members who have amendments to offer?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia that the Chair always endeavors to do that. Apparently, the Chair does not understand the parliamentary inquiry, because the motion was defeated.

Mr. POFF. Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not so understand it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, well, now, we have spent 3 hours on one amendment that emanated from the other side. In the past consideration of this legislation the Chair has recognized, alternately, one side and then the other.

Is it the intention of the Chair to permit the other side to offer all of the amendments, because it looks as if time is going to be cut off any minute here?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has tried to alternate but only observed one member of the committee standing when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas. Is the gentleman standing?

The gentleman is not a member of the committee, is he, the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida was not standing when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 78, line 1, strike out all of title VI.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the present law and the proposed title VI, as I understand it, is substantially this:

Under the present law the Attorney General has to receive a complaint in writing signed by the individual to the effect that he is being deprived or threatened with the loss of his rights of equal protection of the law before the Attorney General can impose himself into the controversy or start up a controversy on his own.

Mr. Chairman, the present law provides that the Attorney General has to believe that the complaint is meritorious and certify that the signer or signers of such complaint are unable in his judgment to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief and that the institution of an action will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation.

Mr. Chairman, under those conditions the Attorney General is authorized to institute a civil action for such relief as may be appropriate.

If we adopt this present title VI, striking the present law, then the Attorney General would not even have to believe he has a meritorious case.

Mr. Chairman, title VI can serve no good purpose. The present law gives almost dictatorial powers to the Federal Government through the Attorney General to control our schools and hospitals and other institutions. This title, as written, would make that power truly totalitarian.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House who have been here for any length of time will recall the warnings from myself and others that the so-called Federal aid-to-education would bring with it Federal control in progressive doses until it became total. In every instance, the proponents of Federal control would emphatically deny that it was their intent to have Federal control. They even went to the extent in some instances to provide in the bills they were advocating that control would be maintained at local levels, and that there would be no Federal control for schools. This proposed tite VI which my amendment would strike out once again gives the lie to all of those emphatic statements that were made here on this floor and elsewhere.

Even those who want total Federal control of our educational system must see that this title VI is not necessary to carry out their designs. The U.S. Commissioner of Education for the past 6 months, Harold Howe, assuredly does not believe he needs more power to do as he pleases in the control of our schools at all levels.

His expressions bear this out. He has told school administrators throughout this Nation that they will either comply with his orders concerning school desegregation or they will lose their Federal aid.

Furthermore, the school districts have been firmly told that they will be compelled to comply, even though they do not accept Federal aid.

He has repeatedly expressed his view that the most crucial problem in education in the United States today is to attain total integration of public schools.

Mr. Chairman, he has indicated that his next step will be to take aim on those "fortunate white families who flee to the suburbs to avoid integrated schools."

He says he is not going to let them escape his decrees and he has outlined some of his ideas which would prevent them from doing so.

He says he can alter school districts to bring the "social, economic, and intellectual strength of the suburbs to bear on the problems of the city schools."

He further aserts that the building programs of the future can be planned so that new schools will break up segregation of an economic sort as well as racial. He says his office will provide Federal planning funds for such efforts right now. And if he could get his way, his Office would also provide construction funds for such schools—that is for area schools.

Howe says that the concept of neighborhood schools ought to be abandoned and abolished. He seems not to be interested in schools for educational purposes, which I have always considered to be the primary purpose of having schools, that is, for educational purposes. But Howe says that if he can have his way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration. This is the one theme that runs through all his public statements, that Federal leverage must be exerted to achieve racial and economic balance in our schools, and that he can and will accomplish this end through the use of Federal funds and the powers of his office.

Under those circumstances what more do you want? What is the use of title VI of this bill? Is it just to build up the oppressive powers of the Attorney General and to give further reason for the creation of a national police force, which he talked about in the testimony he gave during the hearings on this bill? Such a police force would be destructive of liberty and would open the gate to totalitarianism. America is not ready for storm troopers.

Mr. Chairman, title VI is another of the titles that should be peremptorily removed from the bill. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The objective and purpose of title VI is to authorize the Attorney General to institute an action on his own initiative when he has reasonable grounds to believe that any person acting under color of law is violating an individual's right to equal protection of the law on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. The other provision authorizes the Attorney General to institute such an action against a private individual who intimidates or interferes with another who seeks to exercise his rights secured by the Constitution.

All we are doing here is to give to the Attorney General authority to institute civil actions on his own initiative where it is necessary to protect the Federal rights of the people of the United States. For that reason the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I wonder why the subcommittee which heard the evidence on this bill, and of which the gentleman from Colorado is a member, thought it wise to change title VI from the present law in the act of 1964, where it is provided that before the Attorney General could bring such a suit he would be required to receive a written statement from some person that his rights had been discriminated against.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will answer the question in this way. There is a case down in your own State where a former Member of this body, Judge Hemphill, required the Attorney General, before he could proceed, to divulge the identity of the people who were complainants.

Mr. ASHMORE. Is there anything wrong with such a requirement? Does not every citizen have the right to know who is complaining against him?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is exactly the reason for the title: to remove intimidation.

Mr. ASHMORE. Intimidation?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is the best reason I know of for the title to be adopted.

Mr. ASHMORE. I wonder if the Attorney General requested that he be given additional authority so that he could go out and bring suit against any person without the written complaint of a citizen?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not recall that the Attorney General, when he testified before the subcommittee, asked for such additional authority. However, I think you and I will agree that since the Attorney General represents the United States, he should have authority to proceed if he has reasonable grounds to believe that certain acts are taking place. You and I as attorneys recognize that if you hire an attorney to do a job, you should empower him to do the job that is necessary without hindrance.

Mr. ASHMORE. In this instance the Attorney General is not hired. He is working free, gratis, for the citizen who wants to enter a complaint.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You could not convince the Treasury that he is working free.

Mr. ASHMORE. He does not get any more pay when he brings suit than if he does not bring a single suit.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Still he has the duty and responsibility. Why should we not let him go ahead and perform his duty?

Mr. ASHMORE. I say he will be performing his duty if he has a written complaint from some citizen, and I see no reason to withdraw that requirement from the law, if you want to be reasonable.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I ask the gentleman if he was practicing law, would he require his client to put in writing the authorization for him to institute a lawsuit?

Mr. ASHMORE. I usually do when it comes to collecting a fee; yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; but the fee is not involved here, as the gentleman agrees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAWAY

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALLAWAY: On page 80, immediately after line 6, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 603. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252–253; 42 U.S.C. 2000d-

2000d-4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

> "'Sec. 606. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.'"

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the authority of various agencies of the U.S. Government to cut off funds appropriated by the Congress in order to secure desegregation of federally assisted programs and projects has been a source of controversy since it was proposed in 1963. Despite sincere attempts by its proponents to write legislative history that would make the scope of the power abundantly clear to all, title VI of the civil rights bill of 1964 has remained a storm center of controversy since its enactment. A basic question is whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has authority under title VI to withhold funds until a school district achieves a racial balance in its schools.

Last week I discussed the impact of the Federal Government's intrusion into the field of housing desegregation. I insert into the Record a letter I had received from the Secretary of HEW, the Honorable John W. Gardner. I had written the Secretary to ask if a free choice system which did not achieve the percentage of integration required by HEW guidelines, would result in a cutoff of funds even if the free choice system were operating perfectly freely and without complaint. The Secretary's reply is worth quoting again:

> Let me address myself to the question of whether a free choice plan offered in good faith operating freely would be accepted even if it resulted in no desegregation. The answer would be "no."
>
> Desegregation is a goal. A district may seek to achieve that goal through a free-choice plan, but if the plan doesn't achieve the goal, then other means must be tried.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the controversy is over what is meant by the word "desegregation." I am sure many other Members of the Congress have received letters and indications of concern from their constituents which describe how faceless, far-distant administrators of the Washington bureaucracy are relying exclusively on quotas as a measure of compliance with the requirements of the law against discrimination. I believe a great deal of this misunderstanding might be avoided if we were to specify under title VI what we intend "desegregation" to mean. That is the purpose of the amendment I now offer.

Let me make it clear that I wish to do no more than return title VI to its original meaning. Let me briefly quote for you the words of the proponents of this measure in the other body, that you may appreciate how completely the original intent of the bill has been subverted. The full debate may be found in the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 10, page 12715. Senator Byrd of West Virginia questioned Senator Humphrey, the floor manager of the bill:

> Can the Senator from Minnesota assure the Senator from West Virginia that under title VI schoolchildren may not be bused from one end of the community to another end of the community at the taxpayer's expense to relieve so-called racial imbalance in the schools?
>
> Mr. Humphrey. I do.
>
> Mr Byrd of West Virginia. Will the Senator from Minnesota cite the language in title VI which would give the Senator from West Virginia such assurance?
>
> Mr. Humphrey. That language is to be found in another title of the bill, in addition to the assurances to be gained from a careful reading of title VI itself.

In other words, the definition now found in title IV of the 1964 civil rights bill was intended to apply to title VI and if this were not absolutely as clear as it could be, one need only to look on page 12717 for an equally strong exposition of the meaning of title IV by Senator Javits:

> Taking the case of the schools to which the Senator (Senator Byrd) is referring, and the danger of envisaging the rule or regulation relating to racial imbalance, it is negated expressly in the bill, which would compel racial balance. Therefore, there is no case in which the thrust of the statute under which the money would be given would be directed toward restoring or bringing about racial balance in the schools.
>
> Mr. Byrd of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from New York for his interpretation of the language. I trust that it will help to clarify the intent of the title.

Unfortunately, Senator Byrd's trust was not fulfilled. HEW has since decided that the definitions in question are limited to title IV.

My amendment would simply give assurance that the law plainly and clearly means what its backers intended it to mean. It would correct the view of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as expressed in his letter to me and in his guidelines.

The Committee on the Judiciary is aware of the problem to which my amendment is addressed. If you will look at title VI of the 1966 bill, you will see that the committee felt it necessary to write into title VI of this year's bill the same clarifying definition of the word and the concept of desegregation which I am now seeking to write into title VI of the 1964 act. There is simply no reason to have a double standard in the school desegregation field. For the Department of Justice in bringing suits and the courts in deciding them, the authority is clearly defined. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is entitled to no less clear a definition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Callaway].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Now for those who think such an admonition of the Secretary of HEW is not warranted, let me again reemphasize that the funds for 61 school systems in Georgia have been cut off by the Secretary without the slightest attempt to comply with the printed words of title VI which require notice and hearings before funds are cut off.

I say to the gentleman from Colorado, who referred to this a few minutes ago and said it was necessary to have hearings before the committees of Congress, that not a single hearing and not a single notification has been given in respect to any of Georgia's school systems.

I am sure no Member of this body has forgotten the incident during September of last year when school funds to Chicago were cut off by HEW. You may recall that it took Presidential intervention in order to secure compliance with the law by HEW.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. And also the mayor of Chicago.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is correct. Accordingly, I ask your support of my amendment which will return to the original and I believe the continuing intent of the Congress and fairplay.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Title VI merely extends the right of the Attorney General to sue without the need of a written complaint in the areas of discrimination in public education and public facilities.

The gentleman's amendment would not refer to this extension of the right of the Attorney General to sue. It merely states that nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

I do not see the relevancy of this amendment to title VI. Actually, the gentleman brings us an amendment which is thoroughly new, which has never been debated before the committee or the subcommittee.

I urge the Committee to defeat this amendment because it has no relevancy whatsoever to title VI, the title under discussion.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The words put in were the best that could be drafted to give the exact definition now in title IV of the 1964 act and title VI of the 1966 act. The word "desegregation" does not appear in title VI of that act and it was necessary to write these words in the same way. I am sure the gentleman will agree that the words are virtually the same as appear in title IV.

Mr. RODINO. However, it has no reference to title VI of the 1964 act. I understand that the language the gentleman uses is the same. It is the same language in school desegregation title—title IV of the 1964 act—but in this area it has no relevancy, and I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I do not intend to take my full time, but the answer to the gentleman's question is that the wording as proposed is precisely the wording contained in the present law which is the law of July 2, 1964, in title IV. Nobody ever conceded such a problem could arise, I do not believe. I think I can say that somewhat authoritatively, because I was the one that offered on the floor of the House this similar amendment to this title IV in 1964. It was done with the full belief that it would be the definition used in title VI as well, and apply to the withholding of funds. For what unknown reason the administration did not see fit to apply that definition I frankly do not know. The debate on the Senate floor clearly shows it was the intention of the other body and clearly, in my opinion, it was the intention of this House. This is the opportunity to correct the wrong which occurred by administrative action and apparently by lack of legislative oversight.

The Attorney General specifically laid to rest for all time the question of whether up to this point the Supreme Court has at any time ruled that de facto segregation is illegal. I asked the Attorney General this specific question, and for the purpose of the Record let me read it. This is on page 1196 of the record:

> Mr. Cramer. It is your opinion, is it not, that racial imbalance or the bussing of students, de facto segregation, has not been outlawed by the court?
>
> Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct.

He answered without qualification. So if we do not pass this amendment, we are in effect declaring illegal that which the Court has never stated to be illegal under the Constitution. This amendment must be adopted to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I remember about 2 or 3 years ago when we first took up Federal aid to education, many of our colleagues here were yelling and screaming about what a terrible thing it was. They told us how horrendous it was and how it would pollute the public school system. Yet today I see these same gentlemen scratching and clawing for a share of the Federal money for aid to education. I am happy to interpret this as a confession of error and welcome them into the ranks of the enlightened.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. It is now the law of the land; furthermore the gentleman is probably not aware of the fact that the Office of Education told the school districts that they are going to compel them to confirm whether they accept any money or not.

I suppose the gentleman is not aware of that, because I imagine he does not have these problems in his district.

Mr. JOELSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will ask the Department of Education to refuse funds to his district.

Mr. DOWDY. I believe the gentleman failed to get the purport of what I just told him. The school districts certainly have the right to take advantage of any law passed by this Congress.

Mr. JOELSON. My point is that people here who were saying that the acceptance of Federal money would destroy local initiative and destroy the public school system are now in line for their money, and I believe it is a very good thing that they are and I am glad that they have seen the light.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I speak as one who has supported enthusiastically and has had a hand in the draftsmanship and passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1965, and, hopefully, of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia repeats on page 80 the exact language that now appears on page 79 of the bill we are considering. It makes crystal clear the 1966 intent of the Congress and reaffirms the intent of Congress regarding coercive efforts to achieve racial balance as expressed in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary and this body has spoken and has acted to eliminate racial discrimination. We have not acted, and I hope we shall not act here today by inference, to force integration.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of difference between the elimination of discrimination and legislative action or inaction to force integration. If this amendment is defeated, we will be putting our stamp of approval on administrative action to destroy the neighborhood school concept.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member this year of the subcommittee which deals with civil rights matters. I have been impressed with the statements made on the floor of this House today by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias], and the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman], on the work of the ad hoc subcommittee appointed last year to examine the administration of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate for us to take action here today that would short circuit the hard work already done by that ad hoc subcommittee. Based upon conversations with two members of that subcommittee, I know that as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier], stated earlier today, there are doubts about whether title VI is being administered effectively.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, we ought to make crystal clear here today that this Congress does not approve of the blatant violations of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that have occurred in the office of the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only Southern States which have been affected. I had some personal acquaintanceship, since I was in Chicago at the time, with the action taken in Illinois to withhold Federal funds. Without so much as a courtesy call to the Commissioner of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois, and on the basis of an unsubstantiated claim or claims, the U.S. Office of Education decided to withhold Federal money allocated to the schools of Cook County, Ill. This step was taken in flagrant violation of existing law, and it contributed nothing toward the goal of nondiscrimination in educational opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we shall be making a serious mistake here today if we, by failure to approve the Callaway amendment, put our stamp of approval upon the highhanded tactics of the U.S. Office of Education that have been disclosed here and with which many of us are familiar.

If there is a serious problem of deteriorating schools in our urban centers, and I believe there is, it will not be solved by forced transportation of children to distant school buildings. This is a problem that ought to have the imaginative attention of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. We might well heed the thoughtful observations and advice of syndicated columnist Joseph Alsop given in a series of three articles published last week. His full texts appear on pages 18441 and 18442 of the Congressional Record for August 5, 1966.

Mr. Alsop wrote in part:

> To go on with, short of a Constitutional Amendment, you could not even end de facto segregation by forcibly homogenizing all the schools in an urban school system that was only 30 per cent Negro. The careful research behind the Watts report shows that any school which is forced to accept as much as 25 per cent of disadvantaged children virtually ceases to be a school; and almost all the children of the ghettos are very seriously disadvantaged.
>
> Race has nothing to do with the effect on the school. The school becomes worthless because the teachers are unable to carry the huge extra burden of helping their disadvantaged pupils—whether they are Negro, or Mexican-American, or poor white. And when the neighborhood school goes to hell in a hack, all the middle and lower-middle income families in the neighborhood simply pick up and move to the suburbs, thereby creating another wholly segregated school.
>
> Since an amendment forbidding such movement is unlikely, the important thing is not to "end de facto segregation."
>
> * * * * *
>
> The answer is not just good urban schools, which we do not now have. Merely good schools are no longer good enough to reverse the sinister population trend that may soon make our cities into vast Negro reservations. The answer, I fervently hope and strongly believe, is immensely superior urban schools, fine enough to hold and even to attract all families that want the best schooling for their children.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There is only one expedient that offers much hope of reversing the present urban trend. The great cities must be given superior schools—not just good schools, mind you, but immensely superior schools, with a strong attractive power * * *.
>
> Why not, then, take the three following steps:
>
> First, let the President appoint a distinguished Federal commission, or even a series of commissions, to trace the true limits of the metropolitan areas of each of the great cities.
>
> Second, let the Federal revenues from each metropolitan area be ascertained.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Third, let the Congress therefore provide that of these revenues from each metropolitan area, a generous percentage will be returned to each city-center, in order to pay for the superior schools that offer the main hope of cure for the urban disease.

Mr. Chairman, let us put a stop to arbitrary and unauthorized actions by the Commissioner of Education to force acceptance of his solution to de facto segregation. His tactics will not end discrimination in education, and they are contrary to the clearly expressed intent of this House, of the Senate, and the President of the United States.

The Callaway amendment should be adopted.

Mr. **MARTIN** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MacGREGOR**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **MARTIN** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his remarks and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MARTIN** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to maintain the rights of the people to direct their local school systems, this amendment is absolutely necessary in order to prevent a dictatorship of education at the Federal level. Under previous civil rights legislation every school system in this country is now under the one-man rule of an appointed official, the Commissioner of the Office of Education.

If you do not believe that the objective of the present Commissioner is to absolutely control public education, you should read his own statements. I have met on several occasions personally with Harold Howe II, the present Commissioner and I can assure you his chief concern is the total integration of all public schools in the United States. Incidentally, "public schools" is a very loose term because Federal control of school systems may be extended to any school receiving any Federal money. So actually, no private or parochial school will be able to operate free of Mr. Howe's philosophies, and Commissioner Howe has made no secret as to what his philosophies are.

Several months ago when our Alabamians met with him on two occasions to ask that he use some reason and fairness in his demands that all Alabama schools integrate immediately, he made it clear that total integration is his goal. He was not concerned when we pointed out to him that local school boards in Alabama were making every reasonable effort to comply with the law. It did not bother him when we showed him that his unreasonable and dictatorial demands for immediate integration would hurt the education of thousands of schoolchildren of all races in Alabama.

An interesting sidelight on our visit to the Commissioners' office was the complete lack of any signs of material dealing with education. His whole attention was clearly given to total integration and when we asked him to produce some evidence that his Office was dealing with some matters of education, our request created much confusion and no such evidence was ever shown us. We came away from the meeting with the Commissioner of Education, gravely troubled by the haunting feeling that this Office, with the tremendous power of the Federal Government behind it, is not too much concerned with the quality of education in America, but rather in directing social changes in our society, subsequent statements by the high Commissioner of Education indicate that this is exactly the role he envisions for himself.

This appointed official who is not responsible in any way to the people, but only to the President whose policies he is carrying out, has told audiences across the land that in his view:

> The most critical problem of American education today is to achieve total integration in the public schools.

Many of my colleagues from northern cities have been made aware of Commissioner Howe's purposes because up to this point his devious designs have been directed mainly toward the South, but make no mistake, your State will hear from him soon. Speaking in Chicago on May 13—and I need not remind you what is going on in Chicago at this moment—Commissioner Howe made it clear that he does not intend to tolerate all white schools in suburban neighborhoods, and all Negro schools in the city ghetto. He told his audience he is contemplating some drastic measures to achieve his ends. He said he plans to do something about those "fortunate white families who flee to the suburbs to avoid integrated schools."

What Howe has in mind may be learned from his further remarks in Chicago.

For example—

He said—

> traditional school district boundaries often serve education badly and may have to be changed.

In whose opinion besides the Commissioner do local school districts serve education badly? Is Commissioner Howe so much wiser, so much more able to decide what is best for American schools than thousands of local school boards elected by their neighbors and those who are most concerned with the schools that he alone can decide on an entirely new concept to school boundaries?

In a speech at Columbia University on May 3, Commissioner Howe said:

> If I have my way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration.

In another address on July 19, the Commissioner said this would abolish the concept of neighborhood schools, but the concept ought to be abandoned anyhow.

There you have it, the real purpose behind such legislation as title VI of this bill. The Johnson administration, working through Commissioner of Education Howe, is going to abolish your local school system. You, as a parent are not going to decide what you believe is the best way to educate your children. You are not going to choose the schools your children will attend. Commissioner Howe, if he has his way, will do this for you.

If you move to the suburbs of Washington and Commissioner Howe decides it suits his plan for social rule to send your children to school back in the District of Columbia, that is where they will go, transported clear across State lines if necessary for him to achieve what he thinks is proper social conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I say we had better take some action now to stop such highhanded takeover of the rights of the people by an appointed official. If we do not act now by curtailing the power of such officials, freedom of education, freedom of worship, and finally freedom itself, will surely perish. That is why I am for this amendment. I for one, do not want to turn the future of my children or your children or the children of millions of God-fearing, law-abiding, freedom-loving Americans over to the social experimental laboratories of Commissioner Harold Howe. He has already caused such havoc with his school guidelines as to seriously jeopardize the education of all our children in the South. I hope I may save you, the North, from the awful consequences of such misuse of power by a Federal bureaucrat.

To conclude these remarks, I would like to insert a recent article by the nationally recognized editor and newsman, James J. Kilpatrick:

HEAVY HAND OF FEDERALISM—HOWE'S AIM: TOTAL SCHOOL INTEGRATION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

In the six months since he succeeded Francis Keppel as U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II has achieved a singular distinction: He has replaced Robert Kennedy as the Yankee most hated in the South. He also has acquired a new and unofficial title. He is the U.S. Commissioner of Integration.

Neither the honor nor the title is likely to impress the Connecticut-born educator. He has told Southern school administrators in coldly unequivocal terms what he expects of them. They will comply with his harsh and exacting "guidelines" for school desegregation, or they will lose their Federal aid. He has told audiences everywhere that in his view, the "most crucial" or "most critical" problem of American education today is to achieve total integration in the public schools.

Thus far, most of Howe's effort has been directed toward imposing his will upon the South, where many segregated schools still operate as a continuing result of nullified laws, old customs, and individual choice. The rest of the country will hear from him soon. Speaking in Chicago on May 13, the commissioner made it clear that he does not intend to tolerate all-white schools in suburban neighborhoods, and all-Negro schools in the city "ghetto." He is contemplating some "drastic" measures to achieve his ends.

Howe has some powerful tools to work with. His office administers 100 major programs in the field of education. He has large discretion over the disbursement of $3.3 billion a year in Federal aid. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he has broad authority to issue rules and regulations having the force and effect of law. And the rationale of Title VI, as he remarked in New York on June 13, is beautifully simple: "No desegregation, no Federal money."

In a series of speeches in recent weeks, Howe has hinted strongly that his next major step, once he whips the Southern school officials into line, will be to take aim on those "fortunate white families who flee to the suburbs to avoid integrated schoools." He does not propose to let them escape. He has a number of ideas in mind.

"For example," Howe said at Chicago, "traditional school district boundaries often serve education badly and may have to be changed. New York and New Jersey surrendered State prerogatives to form the Port of New York Authority in the interest of improved transportation. If we can make such concessions for transportation, I suggest that we can make them for education."

"We could, for example, alter political boundaries to bring the social, economic and intellectual strengths of the suburbs to bear on the problems of the city schools. Building programs for the future could be planned so that new schools break up, rather than continue, segregation of both the racial and economic sort. The Office of Education will provide Federal planning funds for such efforts right now, and if I have my way, the Office will provide construction funds before long."

Howe used the identical phrase in a speech at Columbia University on May 3. "If I have my way," he said, "schools will be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration." True enough, he said in another address on July 19, this would abolish the concept of neighborhood schools in many areas of the nation, but the concept ought to be abandoned anyhow:

"To a disturbing degree it has come to mean the polarization of families according to the size of their split-level homes or the size of their welfare checks. We are faced with the fact that we are becoming a nation of plush suburbs on one hand and mid-city slums on the other."

Howe's anger is directed at those "who live in a world of wall-to-wall carpeting, pleasant back yards, and summers at camp." Such affluent families "forget that their neighbors in the central city have children who play in alleys and live six to a room." By the judicious use of Federal funds, the commissioner will compel them to remember. His thought is to contrive "new boundary lines" that ignore county and city limits. He would bring ghetto children to the suburbs and suburban children to the ghetto. Or he would develop "educational parks" of perhaps 20,000 students, where a proper "cultural mix" could be imposed.

As he travels about the country, Howe gives lip service to the idea of local control of education, but these affirmations have no real steam behind them. The one theme that runs insistently through all his public statements is that the leverage of Federal aid must be exerted to achieve a racial and economic balance in the schools. "School desegregation is the single point on which we who call ourselves educational leaders prove that we really are so."

This is Harold Howe, II, Yale '40, Washington's leading zealot. The whole country should know him better. It is immaterial whether his title is Commissioner of Education, or Commissioner of Integration. In his eyes, the two functions are quite the same thing.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think the members of this Committee should be warned about the language in title VI of this bill as set forth in section 303(b). For those colleagues who have had no practical experience with what guidelines can mean, let me point something out. This language is identical to that which was used in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If this language is to be interpreted in the same manner that the language in title IV was, we are inviting a continuation of our present troubles. In fact if we blithely reenact the language of the 1964 act without change, the effect will be to encourage the Office of Education to continue its present unwarranted practices.

The schools in my district, and indeed all over the South, have paid a dear penalty and our districts will continue to pay a dear penalty for the language in title VI of this bill.

The Commissioner of Education has on one occasion after another pointed out the fact that language such as that contained in this amendment was absent from title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and it is upon this omission that he has arrogated unto the Office of Education, completely without justification, the right to defer the payment of Federal funds to school districts in the South for failure to comply with the dictatorial and extralegal "guidelines" drawn up and put into effect by the Office of Education.

Unfortunately, this condition has been allowed to prevail by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. John W. Gardner.

While I would have preferred that an amendment spelling out in greater detail and stronger language be included in the provisions of the title now before this Committee, I wholeheartedly support the amendment of my colleague from the State of Georgia and I associate myself fully with the remarks of my good friend from the State of Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], and I want to thank him for yielding to me so that I might include these remarks.

May I express my hearty approval of the fact that this amendment will put language into title VI of the act which will rob the Commissioner of Education of his reasons for adopting the position that funds may be withheld from school districts where "racial balance"—whatever that may mean—fails, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Education, to materialize even though this failure may rest in the voluntary choice of the citizens of the community.

It may well be that if the amendment were worded more strongly it would have the end result of bringing about the amendment's defeat here today so permit me to express the hope that it will be adopted and that the membership of this Committee will not see fit to oppose it.

Permit me further to observe that the amendment simply places in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 the clear intent and meaning of the language contained in section 303(b) of title VI of the bill now under consideration. This, incidentally, is the same language as that which appeared in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the membership has listened to the argument which was presented. While I opposed and am against the present law, the complaint that we have in my area is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or rather the Office of Education is requiring far more than even the law requires.

Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk an amendment and I have taken this time so that I may read it to you. I hope I may have your attention.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that my amendment would cause the Office of Education to at least follow the law.

I read my amendment to you:

> In any case where any official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or other Federal employee shall demand of any school or school board or other local body having supervision of any local public school that such school authorities take any action not required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or by this Act or other Federal law as a condition precedent to the allocation of Federal funds, the Attorney General upon being notified shall institute in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding to enjoin such Federal official or employee from continuing such demand and to require the release of all Federal funds withheld from such school.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Attorney General to take action to stop other Federal employees if they require more than the law requires as a condition precedent to allocating funds to a school.

If this amendment—when it is presented later, is adopted, you will have put back under the law the operation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is now requiring more than the law.

I hope to have the chance to present this amendment to you later, but in view of the hour debate might be cut off before I had a chance to explain it to you.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, while giving my unqualified support to the amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. Callaway], I would like to take this opportunity to issue a warning to my friends from outside the South on a problem they will no doubt face in the future if appropriate action is not taken by this Congress.

I am referring to the completely illegal, highhanded and tyrannical action taken by officials in the U.S. Office of Education in the pursuit of desegregation of public schools.

Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, has set himself up as a little Caesar. His bible is an unconstitutional set of guidelines which flout the intent of Congress. His weapon is the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds. His target, at the present time, is the South.

The legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 clearly shows that

Congress did not intend to authorize the Office of Education to work toward achieving racial balance in given schools. Mr. Howe's guidelines set forth percentages that school systems must meet with total disregard for a freedom of choice plan.

Section 604 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with great clarity says that nothing in the act shall affect employment practices. Mr. Howe's guidelines say that school systems will desegregate teaching staffs with total disregard to personal preferences of the faculty.

I could cite a number of examples to demonstrate Mr. Howe's illegal actions, but I could never capture his harsh and belligerent attitude in dealing with public school officials in the South.

My colleagues from the North and West may not be able to fully appreciate the problems my State and area are experiencing. But I say your time for a face to face confrontation with Mr. Howe will come. It may be too late if we do not take appropriate action at this time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, one of the great problem areas of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is the manner in which it is enforced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This has been covered extensively by other Members of this body and I shall try not to repeat their arguments.

Mr. Chairman, one gets the impression in dealing with HEW officials that in writing regulations and guidelines that they try to cover every area of the law, and there can be no objection to this; but, then, they invariably go that extra step and completely destroy whatever good may have been intended by the original law. Unfortunately, it does absolutely no good to point out any differences between the law and the guidelines to HEW. HEW officials will not listen.

Mr. Chairman, many school districts in my State signed the 1965 guidelines for a 3-year period in good faith, and have set about to comply with these guidelines in good faith. Then along comes the 1966 guidelines, changing the original guidelines and throwing these school districts into a turmoil.

I do not care how sincerely my colleagues here in this body feel about civil rights and integrated education. Members should not, in their zeal, close their eyes when the executive branch of the Government completely circumvents, or ignores, or disregards the laws duly passed by this Congress. I should think Members would rise up in anger at the very thought of a Federal agency issuing regulations or guidelines contrary to the law of the land. This is the issue today; this is the question we must decide; and it should not even require this much debate.

It will do no good to add examples on top of the examples already mentioned here today. Suffice it to say that the only real losers as a result of the illegal guidelines are the children of this country. Educational systems cannot be run properly when they are left in a turmoil by inconsistencies and changed directives from HEW.

I cannot conclude this statement without saying that I know the school boards of the South have not, in many cases, been enthusiastically diligent about complying with the 1954 Supreme Court decision. But, Mr. Chairman, considerable progress has been made over the last few years. What we need most, now, is a chance to comply with the law, without harassment, without constantly excessive pressure from bureaucrats in Washington, without the constant stream of do-gooders telling us how to run our school systems, and with a little understanding on the part of all citizens of this great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to require HEW to follow the law as it is written by supporting the Callaway amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 78, line 7, strike the word "nay" and insert "is authorized, after giving notice of such denial or abridgement to the appropriate State officials and after certifying that he is satisfied that such board or authority has had reasonable time to adjust the conditions alleged in such notice, to".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very simple. All it would do is precisely what we did relating to title II. By exactly the same words, an amendment, adopted by this body, would require notification to the State and local authorities that they are believed to be guilty of discrimination in jury selection. They would be given a chance to put their house in order before Federal action is brought. That is all the amendment would do.

Having adopted such an amendment to title II, we should adopt it to the present title. But of even greater importance is that such a provision is the present law. That is the present law relating to school integration.

This is one of those little nuances of the Attorney General's recommendations which they did not bother to spell out. All they did was completely repeal section 407 of the 1964 act that we had carefully worked out no longer ago than a year and a half.

This is precisely the language I am using. I just want to retain the present law and here is what it is—

> After giving notice of such complaint to the appropriate school board or college authority, and after he certifies that he is satisfied such board or authority has had reasonable time to adjust the conditions alleged in such complaint—

That is the present law.

When the Attorney General came before the Congress of the United States and before our committee and was telling us what he wanted to do relating to this title, he did not bother to volunteer that he was striking out what Congress specifically wrote into law—as an amendment on the floor—in 1964. I offered the amendment and it was adopted by a substantial majority, who approved giving notification to the States and an opportunity to do something about the alleged discrimination.

So the Attorney General—and we will not say it was done intentionally, it was an oversight—struck out the provision for notice.

Why is it important? Congress certainly does not intend to change its mind on this subject 18 months later. There is not a word in the record to justify such change, except the question I asked the Attorney General. There is nothing which would justify such action. Those who come from Chicago and who are concerned about the cutoff of funds—and it has happened in many other areas without even the mayor or the school authorities being given notice that they were going to cut it off—would be given an opportunity to correct the situation within a reasonable period of time. That is exactly what we did in 1964. That is what we did with regard to title II just last week or the week before last, in respect to a similar amendment I offered. This is precisely the language presently in the law, and I am asking that it remain in the law by the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sure the gentleman knows that this same procedure as provided in the bill is now required in suits to desegregate public facilities. The language relates to State officials. There is no need to give State officials any special notice. For that reason we would merely be encumbering the right of the Attorney General to institute such an action. For that reason I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 78, line 8, after "United States" insert "when he has received a complaint in writing signed by an individual to the effect that he is being deprived of or threatened with the loss of his right to the equal protection of the laws".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would engraft into section 301 again, or reengraft in it, language which this bill would seem to strike out.

Under Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 301(a), it says this:

> Whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint in writing signed by an individual to the effect that he is being deprived of or threatened with the loss of his right to the equal protection of the laws—

And so on, then the Attorney General can bring a civil action.

By the terms of the bill before us, the committee would rewrite section 301 to eliminate the provision for a complaint in writing. It is my judgment—and I believe this should appeal to all of us, and I certainly would think it would appeal to the Attorney General—that litigation in the name of the United States because some person has been deprived of or threatened with the deprivation of equal protection of the laws should be based on a complaint. It certainly is not asking too much to require that that be a written complaint.

We have heard a great deal of intimation, by some who think that there is something sacrosanct about this bill. They contend that to require a written complaint involves a great deal of trouble or a great amount of work. But yet, if two automobiles bang together out here in front of the Capitol this afternoon, and there is $50 worth of damage, there will be many statements written. All the witnesses have to do is to sign a statement to state their view about what happened.

Certainly when we bring a lawsuit, it is not unusual for us to go out and seek to have people give us a statement in writing as to what happened.

This does not mean that the individual has to sit down and write it out in some laborious handwriting exercise. There is nothing in my amendment to place any undue burden upon anyone who feels he is being denied equal protection of the laws or threatened with the loss of his right to equal protection of the laws.

I hope the Committee will accept the amendment. Perhaps the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] will tell us why, in writing up this bill, that language was removed from section 301 of title III.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think it is very evident that the reason for the change prepared by the bill is to place responsibility directly on the Attorney General without first requiring a written complaint from the individual who may have been discriminated against.

Mr. WHITENER. I believe I understand the gentleman's contention. I thank him. I understand the gentleman is suggesting that the Attorney General should engage in conduct which we used to call "champerty in maintenance," and go out and seek to discover lawsuits which he can bring in the name of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I always yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The section the gentleman is trying to amend winds up by saying, "Whenever he has reasonable grounds to believe." Does that connote champerty in maintenance in connection with a lawsuit?

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution. I can say to him I have reasonable grounds frequently to believe that many individuals in my community have a good lawsuit. As a lawyer I do not go out and suggest to them that I bring the lawsuit for them free of charge or for compensation.

I do not see that there is any relevance to the appearance of the words "reasonable grounds."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Whitener was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. A former distinguished Member of this body, Judge Hemphill, in Columbia, S.C., where this same Attorney General came into the court with some kind of fanciful idea that they had a complaint because of the act of 1964, said:

> Equal protection of the laws extends to the defendants as well as the plaintiffs.

Judge Hemphill also said:

> Sharp warning that the balance is in danger of being tipped is given when, as here serious questions of due process appear. Had there been the enabling intention that cases such as this were to be exempted from the rules, the Congress would have seen it drawn expressly into the (Civil Rights) Act—

Of 1964.

Mr. Katzenbach tried to justify his action by quoting the now Vice President when the bill was in the other body.

Let me ask the gentleman a question. The reason they have put this in the law now is that the courts do not recognize it and they want to have the Congress give approval to this fanciful idea that the law is being violated, when they do not have an individual whom they can produce so that the accused might face the accuser.

The gentleman's amendment should pass. The way this thing is now written and the way it is being enforced is just plain ridiculous and disgraceful.

Mr. WHITENER. I take it the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] feels that this is not an accidental omission in the language on the part of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course it is no accident.

Mr. WHITENER. Would the gentleman agree with the statement I made earlier that to strike the requirement for a written complaint would be in effect making the Attorney General an instrument of stirring up strife and litigation and perhaps almost touching upon what we used to know in the old common law as champerty and maintenance?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course. What the gentleman says is proper.

I saw a picture in the Washington newspaper last week, in respect to one of the Job Corps programs or some one of the programs, and people were going around the District taking pictures of families, asking them if they did not have some kind of complaint. They said, "You must have something to complain about."

That is what the Attorney General is doing all over my country, stirring up trouble.

The gentleman's amendment should pass.

Mr. WHITENER. I am most appreciative of the gentleman's comments.

I would say, in conclusion, to all of my colleagues, I believe it is only elementary that before a lawsuit is brought the least that should be required is that there be a written complaint to the Attorney General before he brings a lawsuit in the name of the United States.

We must remember that it is provided in the bill, and by the legislation which we recently passed through the Judiciary Committee and in the Congress, that when the United States is the unsuccessful party in litigation the costs of the action are taxed against the United States.

Now, that does not say that the costs are taxed against the Attorney General. They are taxed against the taxpayers of the United States. Certainly, before the Attorney General puts in jeopardy moneys out of the Treasury of the United States by filing lawsuits, he should at least have a written complaint from some citizen who feels he is being aggrieved.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As I attempted to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina, the objective of title VI, particularly section 301, which he now attempts to amend, is to give to the Attorney General the right and the authority to institute certain actions if he has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a denial of equal protection of the law. We all recognize that the Attorney General must have reasonable grounds before he can proceed with the action. The gentleman from North Carolina makes a point of the fact that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in section 301 provides that whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint in writing by an individual that he is being deprived of his rights, then he can institute the action. I would like to direct the attention of the House to the report of the Civil Rights Commission issued in February of this year wherein, beginning on page 35 and going on through several pages thereafter under the title of "Fear, Intimidation, and Harassment." The effect of this report is that when the Attorney General was compelled to go and get the complaint in writing and the same became known, the individual who made the complaint was subjected to intimidation and harassment. That is evidenced by the fact that in the State of South Carolina in an opinion rendered by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Robert W. Hemphill insisted that the Attorney General before he could proceed with an action of school desegregation must produce the written complaint in court and divulge the identity of the complainants. Thereafter, whoever made it would be subject to intimidation and harassment. That is a plain and fair consequence of the amendment that is put forth in section 301 that the gentleman now tries to amend.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. You know, I sometimes have difficulty in understanding the arguments of my friend from Colorado. He says that in the present bill the Attorney General must have reasonable grounds to believe certain things before bringing an action. But what the gentleman fails to take note of is that in existing law, section 301 of title III of the present Civil Rights Act, it is required a complaint be in writing and, in addition to that, the Attorney General must believe that the complaint is "meritorious." That is the same as saying reasonable grounds.

I would further point out to my friend another amendment in this bill—and I am sure this is unintentional—the subcommittee has stricken out the right of the winning party, the defendant, to get the attorney fees from the United States. I do not understand the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not understand why you would take from the Attorney General of the United States the right, duty, and responsibility to protect constitutional rights and hamper his enforcement authority by intimidation or unfamiliarity with technical requirements. The Attorney General under title VI of the bill has the responsibility to make a reasonable determination that there has been a denial of equal protection of the laws and thereafter institute the action without the necessity of having to go out and get somebody to make a complaint in writing.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado again confounds me because the present title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one which says that the Attorney General shall have a complaint in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. There is nothing that we would take away from the Attorney General. We want to keep the law as it is now. You and your associates are the ones that want to take away something.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, what we are trying to do in this bill is to eliminate the necessity for the Attorney General to first have a complaint in writing before bringing suit, as your amendment provides. Hence, I believe that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my 2 minutes came at a time when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] was not on the floor. I had not planned it that way, but we have been pressed for time.

It seemed to me I ought to pass on to the Committee the information which I received from HEW. It came from Mrs. Ruby Martin, an attorney. She has been an attorney for many years and is in the office of Secretary Gardner. She has some responsibility for the enforcement of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. She is an experienced attorney. She is a graduate of Howard Law School.

She informed me that as of the time I called her, there was only one school district of the five I mentioned that had its funds withheld. The others, Monroe, Butts, Fayette, and LaGrange, have all filed satisfactory statements of compliance and there is no plan to defer their funds.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask permission when we go back into the House to insert into the RECORD the guidelines and complete statement of Mrs. Martin as to the situation in the school district I mentioned.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of apprehension that I would want to argue with the distinguished gentleman from Colorado. But if I understood him correctly, he is objecting to what I have always considered a basic American right—the right to face one's accuser.

The gentleman says he does not want anything in writing and does not want the person accused of this thing to know who accused him. The gentleman wants them, the accusers, to hide behind the Attorney General of the United States. In other words, the accuser would be a faceless person.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor here more than once on just exactly the other side of this argument when I said that a man in the minority had a right to know who is accusing him. I think anybody who is going to be hailed into court by the Attorney General of the United States, with the power of the United States behind him, has the right to know who made the complaint.

If the gentleman cares to disagree with that, I would be pleased to hear from him.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the gentleman is getting the thing confused.

Mr. HAYS. No, I do not believe I am.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman will not hold still a minute.

Mr. HAYS. It is very difficult for me to hold still when the gentleman wants to obfuscate the issue.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield in a limited way but I will decide when I do not want to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I read a moment ago, we are changing this for the purpose of permitting the Attorney General to proceed without getting somebody to put it in writing to him.

Now when he gets into court, he must prove his case. What you are talking about when you go before a grand jury, who knows who goes before that grand jury to bring forth an indictment. Now that is exactly a similar situation.

Mr. HAYS. An indictment is a considerably different thing than going into court.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. There is no difference.

Mr. HAYS. Oh yes, there is.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman wait a minute?

Mr. HAYS. No, you wait a minute. Let me tell you about an indictment. Maybe you do not know about an indictment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. HAYS. When you go into a grand jury, when a witness goes in, he is going in before a jury. They are going to decide about it. But in this case, you are letting some Assistant Attorney General—let us be frank about it—make the decision about whether this fellow is going to be brought into court.

Mr. Chairman, right here in the front row of the Chamber we have a distinguished attorney from Ohio who is running for the office of attorney general of that State. I would like to hear what he has to say about it. I yield to him.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague from Ohio for the opportunity he has afforded me. As the gentleman in the well has suggested, there is a basic American right involved in this very, very important amendment. A few moments ago we adopted an amendment to this title which would bring into arrest the all-powerful right of the Attorney General to forge forward without regard to consulting the local authority on the community level. In that amendment we said that we wanted to give the local community an opportunity to make amendment and correction before the Attorney General ought to be vested with the arbitrary right to move forcibly forward.

I am fearful, as is the gentleman in the well, that all too often in this day and time the Attorney General's Department has exhibited an awfully well documented tendency to move forward without regard to individual rights and without making disclosure as to the identity of the complainant.

Mr. HAYS. And if they want to go on a witch hunt for somebody with whom they do not agree or somebody they want to harass, they would have a perfect opportunity to do so if this is adopted. Is that not so?

Mr. SWEENEY. I would agree, and I would say that we are swinging the door wide open if we in the U.S. House of Representatives are going to adopt the principle that a man is not entitled in a court of law, particularly in a Federal district court, to the opportunity of facing his accuser in a court proceeding.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished gentleman. If the people are so strong for the Attorney General to have this provision, they should stand up and be counted. But I do not want the present Attorney General or more likely some unknown assistant or any other Attorney General in the future or his assistant regardless of who he is, to have the privilege and the opportunity to harass people in this country without having any complaint, without having anything in writing, and without having anybody really say that they have committed a wrong.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am somewhat amazed that the candidate for the office of attorney general of the State of Ohio is joining in with the other gentleman from Ohio in connection with the duties and responsibilities of the Attorney General, be it of the United States or of the State of Ohio. What the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] overlooks is that we provide only that the Attorney General of the United States may act when he has reasonable grounds to believe there is a denial of equal protection of the law. I am sure the gentleman is acquainted with what the word "reasonable" means. I am sure that he knows that the Attorney General of the United States, in the exercise of his authority, is going to be reasonable and will understand what the duties and responsibilities of his office may be in connection with this subject. For the gentleman from Ohio to assume that he is not going to do so is to assume a falsity. If the gentleman becomes attorney general of the State of Ohio and is given a right to act, will he then require, before he takes an official action, that someone come in and give him something in writing?

The objective of this particular piece of legislation is to let the Attorney General use some reasonable discretion. Hence the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw the gentleman's attention to the specific language of the existing law, which I believe answers the point the gentleman from Colorado raises. The existing statute reads: "the Attorney General believes the complaint is meritorious and certifies" it as such. What experience have we from the Attorney General to document the committee's contention that the Attorney General should not have to have a meritorious complaint before he should be permitted to proceed?

May I have an answer to this question? Why are we taking the language, "must have a meritorious complaint," out of the law?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Civil Rights Commission has shown, that throughout the time we have had the 1964 Civil Rights Act in force and effect, every time an individual lets himself be known——

Mr. SWEENEY. Where does it say that?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have tried to point it out.

Mr. SWEENEY. Maybe the gentleman misunderstands my question. Let me rephrase it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. I said awhile ago and I say now, if you will read the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, of February, this year, and turn to page 35, under (b), it says:

FEAR, INTIMIDATION, AND HARASSMENT

Mr. SWEENEY. May I interject?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let me read:

> A substantial factor in the reluctance of Negro parents and children to select "white" schools is fear. Many Negro parents in Webster and Calhoun Counties, Mississippi, in Americus and Sumter County, Georgia, and in Anniston, Alabama, expressed such fear. In Anniston, the Negro parents were unable to cite any specific instance of intimidation, but referred to television and newspaper accounts of trouble in connection with school desegregation elsewhere.

If we are interested in knowing why the committee arrived at the conclusion to bring in this section, here is the proof of it.

Mr. HAYS. That is not proof.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will make the Civil Rights Commission survey of school desegregation available, and I will read various excerpts from it. I am sure that if the gentleman becomes attorney general of Ohio, he will give the same careful protection to the individual who may come into his office and say that certain people are violating the law. Sometimes the complainant does not want to be exposed for giving this information, and therefore, the Attorney General keeps it confidential. I am sure that the gentleman, as attorney general of Ohio, would keep the information confidential. Certainly he would not want to go into court and parade forth and say that "Joe Doakes came in and gave me this information."

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, what is the hazard we are going to encounter, or what is the period of slow-down we are going to encounter by first requiring that the complaining citizen make a complaint? I do not doubt the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and every Member of this House can well document a case where discrimination does exist. But what is the hazard in slow-down that we will encounter?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The hazard is that if their names are known, then they are approached and they may no longer be available as witnesses to the Attorney General.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to put this in perspective. I believe the gentleman first of all must recognize what we are doing here is to eliminate this requirement that the Attorney General first have a written complaint before he can bring a suit to desegregate public education.

Mr. SWEENEY. What disturbs me, if the gentleman will allow me, more than the fact that we are eliminating the requirement and the necessity of a written complaint, is that we are also eliminating the requirement that the Attorney General produce the accuser in a court of law before he may proceed. This is the point that I believe is the particular hazard in eliminating this phraseology from the 1964 Civil Rights Act. We are eliminating the phraseology in the existing law, which I am contending has served the national interest well, and that is that as a condition precedent to the complaint, that the one accusing another of discriminatory practices file a meritorious complaint, one of substance, and a complaint that in the opinion of the Attorney General warrants his initiating a formal public action in the U.S. district court.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to point out that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] in my opinion destroyed his whole case when he read from that document, because when he read it—and he was quoting—he said that these people could cite no instance of intimidation—no instance of intimidation, but they had seen trouble portrayed on television and read about it in the newspapers.

Well, I have read about a lot of robberies in the newspapers, but I guarantee that if somebody holds me up on the way home tonight and I know who he is I am surely going to come in and file a charge and take my chances on intimidation.

The whole case fell when the gentleman read that paragraph.

Mr. SWEENEY. I should like to address a question to the gentleman from New Jersey on the point of the administration of the existing law as written.

What can the distinguished gentleman, in charge of the committee bill, tell me with reference to the problems of the Attorney General with reference to the prosecution of existing law as written, which warrants us now taking out of the language the line:

> He must first have a meritorious complaint and so certify such a complaint.

Mr. RODINO. There have been cases of intimidation and harassment, and the people who have been intimidated and harassed are afraid to come forward to make a written complaint.

Mr. SWEENEY. Is this not true in any court of the land in any criminal proceeding? Is there not a prospective possible intimidation and harassment that could follow the person of anyone swearing to an affidavit on any criminal act? Is this not also a potential risk which someone who appears in the office of any prosecutor in the land assumes?

Mr. RODINO. This is not a criminal matter.

Mr. SWEENEY. No, but we are talking about the possibility of following the registering of a complaint, and after-the-fact harassment.

Mr. RODINO. I might point out to the gentleman there are other areas, such as voting and public accommodations, where the Attorney General can now go in without a written complaint.

Mr. SWEENEY. Do we not indeed give assistance to and support publicly the cause of enforcement of civil rights by having the person of the Attorney General join hands with the American complainant in a court of law, rather than to come in and to veil the identification of the supposed accuser?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I am delighted to yield for an answer to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Does not the gentleman believe that the Attorney General should do everything possible to desegregate the schools in the South?

Mr. SWEENEY. I certainly do agree but we must give the Attorney General encouragement along those lines without destruction of constitutional concepts.

Mr. RYAN. That is the purpose; to give the Attorney General the power to do it. The power of the Federal Government to desegregate schools and public facilities should not depend upon the bravery of an individual citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODINO) there were—ayes 99, noes 75.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITENER and Mr. RODINO.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment and ask unanimous consent that the reference to the subtitle shall be changed to 305(a) instead of 601(a).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 80, following line 3, add a new subsection 305(a) as follows:

"In any case where any official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or other Federal employee shall demand of any school or school board or other school body having supervision of any local public school, that such school authorities take any action not required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or by this act or other Federal law as a condition precedent to the allocation of Federal funds, the Attorney General upon being notified shall institute in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding to enjoin such Federal official or other official or employee from continuing such demands and to require the release of all Federal funds withheld from such school."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I read to you a few moments ago. In a nutshell this amendment provides that if the Office of Education or any of its employees requires more than the law requires as a condition to the release of funds or, in other words, holds up funds because of demands which exceed the demands of the law, upon the Attorney General being notified, the Attorney General shall file suit against such Federal employee and seek an injunction against such demands and obtain such other order as may be necessary to make the Office of Education release the funds.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat again, all this amendment does, is to grant relief if money is withheld because of the rules of the Office of Education which go beyond the law. The Attorney General, upon being notified, shall institute proceedings to see that the funds are released.

It is simple. It is plain. It will work.

Mr. Chairman, I say again as much as I oppose the law, this amendment does nothing to change the requirements of the existing law but it would prevent the Office of Education from making effective demands in excess of the law, and thereby deprive schools of funds to which they are entitled.

If you notify the Attorney General that such is the situation, under this amendment, he would be required to institute a suit to see that the money is allocated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will support the amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment, it provides that the Attorney General represents whichever side the law is on.

Mr. WHITTEN. It might be said that way. Under existing law the Attorney General represents the complaining party where certain things are not carried out. Under my amendment, if the Office of Education is requiring more than the law requires, the Attorney General, upon being notified, would have to use his good office to correct a bad situation and see that the money is allocated and would thereby be representing the side which is in the right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It just makes the Attorney General available to both sides when the circumstances are appropriate.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. It stops the Office of Education from going beyond the law of the Congress and wrongfully withholding funds.

Mr. Chairman, again this amendment does not limit either this act or other acts and will apply only where some Federal employee requires as a condition precedent more than the law requires before he will release money due to schools.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, evidently the intention of this amendment is really to gut the very purposes of title VI.

There are ample remedies already in the law which deal with the situation the gentleman refers to. I think it is clear now that the gentleman certainly does not intend by this amendment to preserve the right of the Attorney General to protect against certain areas of discrimination but would rather restrict the right of the Attorney General to do so.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. RODINO.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—PRESERVATION OF ELECTION RECORDS

SEC. 701. Title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1974–1974e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 307. Any officer of election or custodian required under section 301 of this Act to retain and preserve records and papers may petition the Attorney General to permit the destruction, prior to the retention period specified in this Act, of ballots, tally sheets, or other materials relating to the casting or counting of votes. Such petition shall set forth the grounds on which destruction is sought and shall be supported by such additional information as the Attorney General may require. If in the judgment of the Attorney General the destruction of these materials will not hinder, prevent, or interfere with the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act and of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, he may grant the petition in whole or in part, and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODINO: On page 80, line 18, strike "gorunds" and insert in lieu thereof "grounds on which destruction".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

We are reaching the end of the longest debate on this floor in the recent history of the Congress. Very shortly we will be voting on a bill which has consumed some 12 days of debate.

I would only bring to the attention of this House at this time the remarks of Dr. Martin Luther King. I suggest we mark them well, when we cast our vote today. I quote verbatim what he said on an NBC broadcast at 9 a.m. on August 9, and on the 6 p.m. news on August 8. Referring to title IV, which I understand may be embraced in a recommittal motion, Dr. King said:

> I am very unhappy about the bill, and I do not think the bill is even worth passing like it is.

Then on another point, referring to the same section of the bill, Dr. King went on to say:

> It will increase the despair, it will increase the discontent, and at the same time it will increase the possibility of violence.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in previous remarks during the consideration of this 1966 civil rights legislation, I addressed myself to the issue of racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. In other words, I expressed opposition to title IV, the open housing section.

Since then, Mr. Chairman, a so-called clarifying amendment to that title was adopted, dealing with housing.

As I understand, the language of the bill now provides that it is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race or religion, and so forth, in the purchase, rental, leasing, financing, and use and occupancy of housing. This policy will apply to the sale or rental of private housing, with two exceptions: a person selling his house without a real estate agent would be excluded, except where he had within a period of 12 months, been involved in more than two house sales or rentals; or, secondly, where this person used a real estate agent, he could be excluded and his agent excluded, providing he gave express written instructions that he wished to discriminate—and, further, provided the written instructions to discriminate were not induced by the agent.

The point I want to make is—why have exceptions? If it is morally wrong to discriminate, why the compromise to allow two sales or rentals before banning discrimination?

The inclusion of the real estate agent's exemption is hardly protection against charges of discrimination. That hardly lets the real estate agent off the hook.

But, as I say, why any exemptions? Does that justify taking property rights, which this bill certainly does do?

The Constitution, which I, as a Member of this House, am sworn to uphold, guarantees property rights. I cannot see how the Congress can pass a law to take away the right of private property as an inherent and inalienable right. Exemptions make the issue more—not less—flagrant. You may sin twice under this title, but not three times. And a real estate agent cannot sin unless instructed in writing by a property owner; provided the agent does not encourage the owner to order him to discriminate.

I support civil rights and oppose discrimination. I favor the other sections of the bill, to further protect the constitutional rights of Negroes and other minority groups.

But, in protecting those rights, this Congress should not take away the other basic constitutional rights of all people in the name of civil rights.

I, for one, believe it is wrong to destroy one person's right—the right to own, enjoy, and dispose of private property—in order to protect the rights of others.

Mr. Chairman, once, in Seattle, the mayor's civic unity committee, trying to obtain housing for a minority group family, asked me if I would object if my neighbor rented or sold his home to a member of another race. The answer was "No." I told them I had no objection. That was my personal feeling.

Today, I live in an integrated residential district; and, incidentally, property values are not, as a result, depressed. So this is not a personal problem with me.

All I ask is that my neighbors live respectably, maintain neat yards, and keep up their property, whether they are white or black.

I say this only to point up that racial prejudice has no influence on my opinion, which is simply a deep conviction that no law should violate property rights.

But, I do emphasize that the Federal Government has a right and a solemn obligation to see that where Federal money is involved, there should be no discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or national origin.

That is a different matter. I hope that distinction is clear.

Where the Federal Government finances or guarantees any housing, there can be no exemptions or discrimination in buying or selling, or loaning, or of any nature whatsoever.

The Government may and, indeed, must require regulations to prohibit its money or credit from being used in transactions by owners or agents or by anyone in a discriminatory way. Please, Mr. Chairman, let me get that straight.

On the other hand, where a homeowner controls his own property and the Federal Government is not a party to a transaction, then I think he has a right to sell to anyone he pleases, and that is why I voted to strike title IV and why, in all conscience, I intend to cast my first vote against a civil rights bill—if title IV remains in this bill on final passage.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, as we bring this historic debate to a close, and view the end-product of our labors, we will all agree that it is as complex as it is controversial. Made up of eight titles, the bill concerns itself with issues as diverse as the procedures for Federal jury selection and a prohibition against assignment of children to achieve a racial balance in the public schools. The bill creates a sizable list of new Federal crimes, but among them is an antirioting statute, so needed in this day of civil strife. The bill places in statute law additional tools for enforcement in a field where there is already an abundance of remedies available. They need only be pursued.

But complex and far-reaching as this bill is, the issue which has captured public attention is open housing. A man's home is his castle and he has the highest right to do with it and dispose of it as he chooses, doing no injury to his neighbor. The people are greatly disturbed, and race riots plague our cities because of a fear that right might be destroyed.

In the bill's amended form the right of a homeowner to sell his house to whom he pleases has been preserved. He may sell it to whomever he chooses, either directly or through a real estate agent. Not only may he sell one dwelling; he may sell two in a 12-month period without this bill's interference. Mrs. Murphy may operate her boardinghouse, renting to whom she will. Nor will the strictures of this bill affect a duplex or a three- or four-family dwelling.

The present unfortunate and explosive issue of racial integration in neighborhoods persuades me the better public policy would be to strike the housing provisions from this bill, and to remove the Federal Government from an area of at best doubtful constitutionality. I shall therefore vote to remove these housing provisions from the bill by supporting the motion to recommit. But if that motion to strike these provisions from the bill fails, I shall vote in favor of final passage, nevertheless, because the bill in its present form protects our traditional rights of the homeowner in real estate transactions involving his home.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as we come to the conclusion of this rather extended debate, as one who has occasionally participated in it, I would like to express to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union my most earnest appreciation and admiration for the magnificent manner in which he has presided throughout our deliberation.

In my brief tenure here in the House of Representatives, I have never seen any greater display of patience, wisdom, and understanding than has been displayed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] as he has worked with us as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], who has been our adversary from the time of the unfortunate illness of our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that we appreciate his forbearance in giving to us an opportunity, generally, to have full debate on this bill.

I believe there was only one exception when perhaps we had a difference of opinion about that.

All in all, I am prouder of my membership in this body than I have even been, because of the caliber of the debate on the part of the lawyers and the Members of Congress, who, albeit their opinions may have differed, have approached this matter with earnestness and with seriousness as they expressed their individual views.

I would hope that all of us would understand we cannot agree upon all of these matters, but certainly I can say to those who have been our adversaries from time to time, that you have been agreeable, and I hope it will always be that way.

(On request of Mr. ALBERT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the distinguished gentleman has said.

The gentleman in the well of the House has been one of the most active participants in this debate. His debate has shown great wisdom and understanding. He has made important contributions to this legislation.

The debate on this bill has been on a very high plane and has been of high quality. The issues have been thoroughly and ably discussed.

I join the gentleman in what he has said about the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], who has managed this debate skillfully, and about his colleagues on the committee.

I joined all Members who were present just a few minutes ago when the distinguished chairman of the committee returned to this Chamber. His very presence cast a ray of happiness throughout the House. The great dean of the House is also the dean of all those who have advanced the cause of human rights in this country. We salute him and we wish him well. We have missed him. I also congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who has always been fair, who has contributed greatly to this debate, and I congratulate his colleagues on the Republican side of the committee.

I certainly join in the tributes which have been paid today, as I did a few days ago, to the distinguished Presiding Officer, for the quality of his performance. The gentleman from Missouri has presided with fairness but with firmness. He has demonstrated great knowledge of the rules of the House, and this demonstration in turn has reemphasized the importance of the orderly conduct of legislative business.

I know that we are coming to the close of this debate. We are going to vote on an important bill. It may not be everything that everybody wants it to be, but I believe most people in this country will agree that it represents progress in an important area. Sometimes progress comes slower than some would wish, but I would think that most of us—and most of those who believe in human rights—would feel that this is a step forward and an important step forward in this area.

I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished leader on the other side of the House. There has been a minimum of differences of opinion on procedural matters during the consideration of this bill.

I believe the whole Chamber can be proud of the performance of the House of Representatives on this occasion.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. May I join with him in the words of commendation which he expressed to our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, whom we welcome back so gladly today, and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], and others on the committee on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For the past 2½ weeks the House of Representatives has been doing a very commendable job in the consideration of a very controversial piece of legislation. The progress which we have made can be substantially attributed to the excellent performance of the gentleman who occupies the chair, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

I also wish to welcome back from the hospital the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. We have missed him. Most of all we are happy that he is back here on his feet and in the arena again as we come to a vote on this important legislation. He has been ably backed up in his absence by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and the others who have carried the ball for the committee bill.

Naturally, I am extremely proud of the tremendously effective job done by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and the members of the Committee on the Judiciary on our side of the aisle.

There have been differences. These have been well expressed and ably put forth. I have mixed emotions about this bill. I expressed them concerning title IV. I feel that the motion to recommit should be supported. It will be the motion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. It will seek to strike title IV. I think it should be supported for the reasons that I gave the other day during the debate. Certainly all of us have had an opportunity to say our piece, to express our views, and to vote our convictions.

In this controversial, complex piece of legislation, I hope we can leave the Chamber with a maximum of good feeling despite our differences. I wish to commend the House for the job that has been done even though I have reservations about certain portions of the bill. I hope the legislation will be constructive in the final analysis.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, the ownership, sale, and use of private property is fundamental, basic, and essential for the preservation of the American way of life.

Section IV of this so-called Civil Rights Act even with the Mathias amendment will eventually deprive a real estate agency, a building and loan association, and even a homeowner the right to sell or build homes to and for whom he desires to contract with. The Supreme Court will interpret this act to cover every little property owner in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would live to see such a bold, brazen attempt to destroy property rights and individual freedom as is being proposed here in this bill.

The ownership of property has been the primary incentive for the fantastic growth of the United States of America. We have become the arsenal of democracy with the highest standard of living of any country in the history of the world because of our property rights, and free enterprise. It is the desire for property and a profit that motivated our forefathers in crossing the continent, exploring the wilderness, until today our gross national product is approaching a trillion dollars. This is proof to the world of the superiority of our system as fostered by the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. We dare not tamper with that system today.

The basic difference between our philosophy and the red Communist ideology with which we are clashing today in Vietnam is our belief in dignity of the individual, individual freedom, and property rights. We are clashing with this red Communist ideology on the road to Berlin, in Santo Domingo, and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, are we to undermine the efforts of our military in the field by the destruction of property rights here at home?

There is nothing more precious to the American citizen than his home. There is nothing of which he is more proud than his home. If we take away his right to sell that home to whomever he pleases then we destroy America and we destroy the individual.

The difference between socialism and totalitarianism and our way of life is that in America the private citizen has certain inalienable rights. High among these is the right to own property and trial by jury.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States of America would never have been ratified by the necessary nine States without the assurance that a Bill of Rights would be adopted guaranteeing trial by jury, and ownership of property.

Again, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the major differences between the American dream and Red communism, fascism, and nazism is trial by jury, justice of our courts and judges who are learned and trained in the law. I could not imagine the United States continuing to lead the cause of freedom and continuing to progress with stacked juries, legal decrees issued by bureaucrats and attorneys general here in Washington who imagine that something is "about to happen."

We hear a lot about the fifth amendment and the right of the accused not to incriminate himself. But the principal provision of the fifth amendment is: guarantee that "no citizen shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

This bill if passed will deny our people full use of their property. This bill is an unconstitutional usurpation of guaranteed rights and privileges of full citizenship.

It was these guarantees of property rights, and trial by jury that Madison and the Founding Fathers promised before even the Constitution could be adopted. Thus, in the first Congress Madison spoke for hours on the floor of the House pleading for adoption of the Bill of Rights. Madison was a man of integrity. He kept his word to those who ratified the Constitution with the assurance that a Bill of Rights would be forthcoming, and constitutional government, as we have known it, came into being. For that day we began to progress and grow.

This civil rights bill today follows the one last year. Last year's civil rights bill followed the 1964 bill. This is the third civil rights bill in 2 years. There will be another bill next year. This Congress must stop and refuse to legislate at the whim of the mob. Mr. Chairman, the demonstrators and the mobs are passing this legislation. We are only going through a mock parliamentary session. This act has been written, designed, and was instigated by demonstrators in the streets of America.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the fight here on the floor today is no less important than the struggle for freedom in Vietnam for which our young men are fighting and dying. Here we should legislate in a calm, cool, deliberate, and cautious manner or else this great institution could degenerate into a rubber-stamp Reichstag.

We defeated Mussolini, the bombastic dictator, but I well remember that he was reported as having referred to the American Congress as a bunch of parliamentary charlatans. Mussolini's reference to this great body could well become a reality should we become subservient to the mobs in our streets.

I plead with my colleagues today to stand up and be counted. Freedom, liberty, property rights, and the Constitution hang in the balance.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in expressing my pleasure that our able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], is back with us. We look forward to having him with us through the completion of the consideration of this important bill on which he has worked untiringly and to which he has given so much of his strength and wisdom.

He has been in the vanguard for many, many years in the cause of civil rights, human rights, and equal justice under law. The warm acclaim accorded him today is well deserved.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is very comforting indeed and heartwarming to hear the words expressed concerning my return to the well of the House. In that connection I am reminded of what happened on a very, very cold wintry day when a farmer at about 3 o'clock in the morning had to get up and milk his favorite cow Betsy. It was extremely cold and he went to the barn and pulled out the three-legged stool and he started to milk Betsy. Betsy turned to him and said, "Thank you for that warm hand." May I thank you all for the warm hand that you have offered me here.

I assure you that I missed in the last few days the usual gladiatorial display in this arena. I got a blow-by-blow description from my office, and it made me regretful that I was not present so that I could participate as chairman and floor leader. However, I was given to understand—and that understanding was reaffirmed when I returned here this afternoon—that my good friend, PETER RODINO, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, did an excellent job, assisted by BYRON ROGERS, the very fine gentleman from Colorado, and the gentleman from farther west, from California, JIM CORMAN, and other members of the Committee, even including the gentleman from North Carolina, BASIL WHITENER, who tried to row the boat backward a bit. But nevertheless we did make progress going forward.

I cannot let the occasion go by without paying tribute also to that redoubtable and splendid gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] who through weeks and weeks of arduous toil during the hearings and the fashioning of the bill gave very excellent service.

Mr. Chairman, I say the same of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] as well as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] who, likewise, started to row a bit backward but, nonetheless, the gentleman has made a contribution and I want to pay my respects to all of these gentlemen. Also the majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] has been most gracious and kind as has been the minority leadership [Mr. FORD].

Mr. Chairman, I assure the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that it is very wonderful to get back amongst all of you good people in this House. The like of this House has never been seen in the world's history because as I read history, there has never been a more representative House—representation of the welfare of the Nation and of the rights and liberties of its people. There has never been a forum whose members were more dedicated, where more cordiality and hospitality prevailed than in this very Chamber.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It adds a new title to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered for the purpose of adding a new title?

Mr. MATHIAS. Title VIII.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIAS

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS: On page 81, immediately after line 3, insert the following new section:

"Annual reports, section 801(a): The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and to the President an annual report concerning the enforcement of any activities undertaken pursuant to this section."

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the reading of the amendment, this is, in fact, an amendment to title VIII, to add a new section, line 3, to title VIII?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a substitute for title VIII and renumbers the existing title VIII. Page 2 of the amendment says to renumber the following section accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that it should be offered after title VIII has been read.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall withhold the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland withholds the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RESNICK

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RESNICK: On page 81, after line 2, insert the following:

"TITLE VIII—PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

"SEC. 801. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000) is amended as follows:

" '(a) Section 701 (a) of 42 U.S.C. 2000e (a) is amended by inserting "professional societies or organizations," immediately after "labor unions,".

" '(b) Section 701 (b) of 42 U.S.C. 2000e (b) is amended by substituting for the phrase "other than a labor organization" the phrase "other than a labor organization or a professional society or organization."

" '(c) By inserting at the end of section 701 the following:

" ' "(j) The term professional society or organization means any association of individuals engaged in the same vocation, occupation, business, or employment in the service of the public with the purpose of (1) governing the conduct of the members of the association in their public service, and/or (2) establishing or approving the standards of the education and training of those engaged in said vocation, occupation, business or employment, and/or (3) in cooperation with governmental agencies in determining the competency of those engaged in the same vocation, occupation, business, or employment to serve the public, and/or (4) in any manner tending either to encourage or discourage the pursuit of said vocation, occupation, business or employment by any individual."

" '(d) Subsection (c) of section 703 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–2) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs "A" through "C", respectively, by inserting "(1) immediately after "C" and adding at the end thereof the following: "(2) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a professional society or organization to exclude or expel from its membership or otherwise discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, sex, or national origin".

"'(e) Subsection (f) of such section 703 is amended by inserting "professional society and organization," immediately after "labor organization,".

"'(f) Subsection (j) of such section 703 is amended by inserting "professional society or organization," immediately after "labor organization,".

"'(g) (1) Subsection (a) of section 704 is amended by inserting "or a professional society or organization" immediately after "labor organization".

"'(2) Subsection (b) of such section 704 is amended by inserting ", professional society or association" immediately after "labor organization" the first place where it appears and (B) by inserting "or professional society or association" immediately after "labor organization" the second place where it appears.

"'(h) Section 706(a) is amended by striking out "or labor organization" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "labor organization, or professional society or organization".

"'(i) (1) Subsection (c) of section 709 is amended by striking out "and labor organizations" the first place where it appears, and inserting "labor organization, and professional societies or associations"; by striking "and joint labor-management committee" the first time it appears and inserting immediately after "labor organization" the second time it appears "joint labor-management committee and professional societies or associations"; by striking "or joint labor-management committee" the first time it appears and inserting immediately after "labor organization" the third time it appears "joint labor-management committee and professional societies or associations"; by striking "or joint labor-management committee" the first time it appears and by inserting immediately after "labor organization" the third time it appears "joint labor-management committee or professional societies or associations;" by striking out "or labor organization" the first time it appears and by inserting immediately after "employment agency" the third time it appears "labor organization or professional societies or associations".

"'(2) Subsection (d) of section 709 is amended by striking out "labor organization or joint labor-management committee" each time it appears and by inserting "labor organization, joint labor-management committee or professional societies or associations" immediately after "employment agency" each time it appears.'"

Renumber the following title and sections accordingly.

Mr. **RESNICK** (during reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order against the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve the point of order, if I may.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from Alabama reserves all points of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bring professional societies and associations—as defined in the amendment—under the broad umbrella of employment rights in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the equal employment opportunity title. This would mean that in addition to the numerous persons and groups listed in title VII, professional associations would also be prohibited from discriminating because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Specifically, the amendment would make it an unlawful employment practice for a professional group to exclude or expel from its membership or otherwise discriminate against any individual because of his race, as is the current practice.

I want to make it very clear that this amendment does not affect the exemption, explicitly stated in the 1964 act, of a "bona fide private membership club." The "private club" exemption refers to things like golf clubs and fraternal organizations.

A professional association, on the other hand, stands in relationship to its profession as does a union to its trade. The Congress in its wisdom noted that a union which discriminated in its membership practices effectively prevented Negroes from working on an equal basis with whites who were union members. So, title VII was passed, prohibiting just such discrimination.

Today, in order for a young man or woman to make good his or her investment of education and money spent preparing for a professional career, he or she must be a member of the professional group which governs that profession. But the young Negro, encouraged by the passage of the equal employment opportunity title 2 years ago, finds the professional associations unwilling to give him membership.

The typical professional organization is not simply a private guild, dedicated to the furtherance of its members' interests. It accredits courses of training, sets standards for entry into the profession, and serves as the communications medium for the evolution and development of the profession. Also, through some sort of a county-State and national network the typical association handles transfer of certification from one place to another. The typical professional organization is not a private club, it is a public or at least quasi-public organization and as such cannot be permitted to discriminate.

The American Medical Association, a prime example, acknowledges that it and other professional associations are subject to the provisions of title VII.

Almost 1 week ago I took the floor to address myself to some of the products of discrimination by professional societies; the AMA, in particular, of discriminating against Negroes at the local, State, and county levels. I listed just a few of the terrifying statistics on Negro health care in the South, and I attributed this national scandal to the unwillingness of the AMA to take even the smallest action which might allow the influx of needed Negro physicians in the South.

Since I made these remarks I have been contacted by many, many doctors—both Negro and white—supporting the amendment I offer today. Many of these same doctors told me of their personal grievances, of the bigotry and harassment they faced trying to practice in the South. But in all this time there has not been one letter, or telegram, or telephone call—not, in fact, one syllable from the AMA denying the charges. In the past the AMA has never been noted for its silence on public matters. No one knows—or will ever know—how many millions of dollars the AMA spent fighting against decent medical care for our elderly. But strangely enough, on this issue the AMA remains silent. And that silence is the silence of the guilty when everyone knows the truth and nothing except a full confession will be believed.

I suggest that we spare the AMA and the other professional organizations the pain of a public confession. We know the truth. I respectfully urge the acceptance of this amendment as a necessary remedy to the inequality of opportunity still faced by far too many in this Nation.

Mr. **CONYERS**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **RESNICK**. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **CONYERS**. I think we owe the gentleman from New York a debt of gratitude for offering an amendment which touches upon an area that has not previously been covered. In all fairness, the gentleman's amendment proposes to effectively eliminate the barrier of inequality which professional organizations have not removed. Is that correct?

Mr. **RESNICK**. That is correct.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair will now entertain the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Alabama. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, that it seeks to inject private organizations into a bill, the title of which makes it clear that public organizations only are involved. I insist upon my point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. **RESNICK**. Yes; I desire to be heard at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an omnibus civil rights bill. It covers a wide variety of activities in the civil rights and human rights field. In addition, the bill in many places would amend titles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It does not do it in 1 place; it does not do it in 2 places; it does it in 17 places. The amendment, very simply, would amend it in still another place. Therefore, I believe my amendment is germane and is not subject to a point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] offers an amendment which proposes the addition of a new title VIII to the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute. The gentleman's proposal would further extend the writ of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, an act which is elsewhere amended in the proposal before the Committee, to prevent discrimination in the membership of certain professional societies and organizations. The Chair has examined the amendment and the provisions of existing law it amends. In view of the fact that the pending bill amends several laws dealing with the subject of civil rights, including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and is comprehensive in its scope, touching on various aspects of civil rights, the Chair feels the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is germane. He therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a copy of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, regarding professional societies and associations, his remarks in the well of the House, and the context of the proposed amendment.

Were I not present for many facets of the debate on H.R. 14765, I could not bring myself to believe some of the fanciful dreams put forward in amendments thereto. Quite aside from the issue of civil rights, I am concerned deeply with what is apparently a hurriedly prepared amendment, attempting to define what a professional society or organization means. I am sure the Members of the Committee appreciate that a definition of this kind affects every professional society and organization in America, cutting across the entire spectrum of professional people, whether they be lawyers, physicians, architects, engineers, dentists, or others. Such an amendment certainly deserves full, open, and adequate hearings, with opportunity for all to examine the definition for the many consequences involved. Surely the leadership on both sides could not seriously recommend that this matter be so lightly treated, especially in view of the fact that nowhere else in the statutes, or the United States Code will be found a definition of professional society or professional organization.

Mr. Chairman, as to the context of the proposed amendment, it is obviously hastily drawn, there are many errors in the spelling, and I would like to ask why, on page 1, the definition of professional is totally incomprehensible as a proposed law because of the "ands/ors" so that it would be impossible to determine the meaning in a court of equity or justice.

It cannot be determined by reading the definition whether subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) are to be read in the conjunctive or disjunctive.

Furthermore, I cannot help but wonder why the gentleman has made reference to title 42 of the United State Code in the first page, and sections of the amendment, including the top few lines of the second page, and omitted it in the others. This is why it was insisted that the entire proposal be read. Subsequent references to title 42 of the United State Code are omitted.

Mr. Chairman, where is section (G) (2) (A)? I might add, why are paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 703 redesignated as "A" through "C" by paragraph D of the amendment? The copy available to me does not designate that all subsequent title, sections, and paragraphs will be renumbered accordingly. There is considerable question as to whether or not the general statute should not be amended on the floor during the close of the legislative debate, such as we have had the past 3 weeks on the civil rights bill of 1966, instead of a specific code with confusion as to whether it is that from the civil rights bill of 1960 or 1964.

For all of these reasons, but principally, Mr. Speaker, because of the danger in defining professional societies in the section of the bill, I call for the defeat of the amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization for appropriations

SEC. 801. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 802. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remainder of the Act shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIAS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS: On page 81, immediately after line 3, insert the following new section:

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 801. (a) The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and to the President an annual report concerning enforcement of, and activities undertaken pursuant to, this Act and all other laws of the United States designed to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Such report shall contain information concerning the activities of all departments, agencies, boards, commissions, instrumentalities, and establishments of the United States, relating to the prevention of discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, including complaints received and the disposition thereof.

"(b) Each department, agency, board, commission, instrumentality, and establishment of the United States shall cooperate with the Attorney General to effectuate and carry out the provisions of this section. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude submission to the Congress of reports of activities under any other provision of law.

"(c) The Attorney General shall submit the report required by this section as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year but no later than September 15 of each year. The first such report shall be due not later than September 15, 1967."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, there has been no subject before the Congress in the last decade to which as much attention has been given, and in which as much achievement has been gained, as civil rights. Starting with the historic Civil Rights Act of 1957, we have enacted major, progressive legislation on an average of every 2 years. It is perhaps fitting that our discussion of the civil rights bill of 1966 has occupied more of our time in debate than any other measure in the last half century.

Civil rights legislation of the past 10 years has had wide impact on the operations of the Federal Government. Federal activities under title VI of the 1964 act alone involve most of the departments and agencies of the Federal Establishment. The powers given the Attorney General under a number of statutes to bring suit to secure or insure nondiscrimination have produced a large number of court actions. They have also produced many Government-initiated negotiations in which situations have been ameliorated short of litigation. They have produced, too, many appeals by private citizens of groups to the Attorney General to use his good offices to secure correction of racial injustices.

The Congress hears too little of the widespread activities undertaken under these statutes. Most pertinent data on civil rights is presented in hearings on the current year's legislative proposals. While the Civil Rights Commission is to be commended for its detailed and searching investigations and reports, the Commission's essential function is—and should continue to be—general studies and inquiries into anticipated problem areas, and the assessment of difficulties as they arise. Moreover, the Civil Rights Commission reports, although based on objective considerations, offer essentially subjective conclusions. The purely objective report, consisting largely of statistical data, which is contemplated by this amendment, is not a duplication of the Civil Rights Commission's work or that of any other existing agency.

This amendment is designed to achieve stability and continuity in the legislative consideration of civil rights. The amendment proposes that the Attorney General submit an annual report on enforcement activities under existing laws of the United States. Such a report would provide a vehicle through which the responsible committees—in particular in the House, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and Labor—might exercise the degree of legislative oversight which is, I believe, essential to the solution of problems in the civil rights area.

The Department of Justice is clearly the proper department to coordinate such a report. In addition to having the major responsibility for enforcement of civil rights law, the Attorney General generally serves the Chief Executive as his principal adviser in civil rights matters. As the President stated in his message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 to the Congress on February 10, 1966:

> Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

Congressional assent to Reorganization Plan No. 1, transferring the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice, reaffirmed the similar view of the legislative branch as to the duties, responsibilities, and coordinating function of the Attorney General in the field of civil rights.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this year's bill has shown a need for increased continuity in congressional oversight of civil rights. If this amendment is adopted, we would no longer need to pinpoint acute civil rights problems and provoke discussion only by introducing legislation. By requiring the report toward the end of the legislative year, we could gain the factual background from which to anticipate more accurately the legislative and administrative needs of the following year. We would also gain an overall assessment of Federal accomplishments and experience in civil rights, enabling the Congress to review its enactments with a fuller awareness of their prospects and limitations.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the amendment; what will it accomplish?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment will provide for the Congress a statistical, objective report on essentially what is being done to effectuate the intent of the Congress in carrying out these acts. It will be statistical, objective, and factual, as opposed to the more subjective reports which will come from the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no objection from the Department of Justice.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I also rise in support of the Mathias amendment, which was adopted to section 403, and to the Cramer amendment, which was adopted to section 502.

It was the clear intention of your Judiciary Committee, in adopting the Mathias compromise, that rights spelled out for homeowners would not be lost because of the homeowner's use of an agent. The record is clear on that point. I urge "yes" vote on this amendment.

The Cramer substitute to the Ashmore amendment, which amends title V, is poorly drafted, difficult to interpret and broader in scope than it should be. But its objective, to bring the power of the Federal Government to bear in curbing riots, is commendable and worthy of support. I hope the Senate will improve the language. I urge a "yes" vote if there is a rollcall on the amendment.

I urge defeat of the Republican leadership's announced motion to recommit with instructions to strike title IV.

I regret that the political party which, historically, has done so much for responsible civil rights legislation, whose very roots are embedded in concern for the plight of Negro Americans, should have taken such an irresponsible position at this point in American history.

First, let me say that without the tireless effort of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the persuasive and effective leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], our committee would have been unable to reach a consensus. But we did reach one. We wrote a moderate, effective, badly needed housing section.

For the Republican leadership of the House to oppose that consensus is unfair to the hard-working Republicans on the committee, it is a betrayal of the founder of the Republican Party, and I fear it is an attempt by some to inject race relations into partisan political campaigns. If this be so, it can only add to racial disharmony and in the long run to loss of public support for those who have caused it. I would remind every Member on the other side of the aisle of the admonitions of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] before he votes for the motion to recommit.

I urge every Member who believes in equal justice under law to vote against the motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, as we near the final vote on a bill which has consumed more time than any other bill since the start of my service in the House, I would like to commend my colleagues on a thorough and fair debate of this complex proposal. Having participated fully in the debate on every title of this bill, I have made my decision to vote in its favor.

Even before the administration proposed H.R. 14765 in its original form, I had introduced H.R. 13340, a comprehensive civil rights law enforcement bill with sections paralleling most of the titles in the bill now before us. Although some changes have been wrought by the Judiciary Committee and on the House floor, the compromises made are well within the scope of my support for legislation in this area. Some sections of H.R. 14765 contain improvements in present law which are urgently needed if we are to have order and justice in this Nation.

Subsequent to my introduction of H.R. 13340, I submitted H.R. 15530, the Civil Rights Crimes Act which constitutes a needed clarification and strengthening of the Federal law against interference with a citizen's exercise of his constitutional rights. I am pleased that a title of H.R. 14765 accomplishes this purpose in much the same way as my proposal.

Although the civil rights bill I submitted last winter did not contain a fair housing section, I was most attentive to our debate on title IV of H.R. 14765, and I feel that I can support this title as amended by the committee and on the floor.

I voted for the amendment to the fair housing section of the bill, which would permit a real estate agent acting at the instruction of a seller to employ the same standards as those available under law to the seller acting individually. It would be an economic injustice to the real estate industry, in my view, if the individual seller had an exemption not available to real estate agents working in his behalf.

When final action is taken on the fair housing section, I plan to vote for the provision as I did for the clarifying amendment. It respects individual property rights because it does not affect the rental or sale of an individual's home. Further, while its coverage is less than New York State law, and similar laws in some other States, I feel it can help assure housing for minorities in sections of the country which have no antidiscrimination law on the books.

This bill reflects congressional conviction that where States or localities have not acted to end housing discrimination, there should be a Federal remedy.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I take this time, since we are on the title which provides for authorizations for appropriations, to make inquiry of the chairman of the committee or the distinguished ranking minority member as to whether they can give us some idea which will be helpful to us in regard to appropriations if this bill should pass, as to what the cost of the bill is going to be.

Mr. CELLER. Those figures have already been placed in the RECORD. The cost would run approximately $12 million.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us how many additional assistant attorneys general we are going to need if the bill becomes law?

Mr. CELLER. I shall be glad to read the letter. The letter, however, does not specify the number.

The communication I received gives round figures as to the cost of the various titles. I shall be glad to read the entire letter.

Mr. BOW. I would appreciate it very much if the gentleman would do so.

Mr. CELLER. Very well:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1966.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for information concerning the cost to the United States of the various provisions of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966.

The preliminary cost estimates and estimates of the number of man-years to be expended in connection with the administration and enforcement of the various provisions of the Act were computed on the basis of the provisions of H.R. 14765 as reported out of your Committee on June 30, 1966.

That does not take into consideration, of course, whatever additional cost would be involved in any amendments that have been appended to the bill.

The Deputy Attorney General also says:

The total annual average cost is estimated to be about $12,769,725. Of this total, $7,250,000 will be for the increase in fees for witnesses ($2,250,000) and increases in fees for jurors and jury commissioners ($5,000,000) provided in Title I.

Of the remaining sum, $808,725 (56 man-years) is for the Department of Justice to perform its additional and increased enforcement responsibilities. The Department of Justice must act to assure non-discrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service under Titles I and II, to provide for the protection of constitutional rights under Title III, including the bringing of civil suits for injunctive relief; to end the practice of discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or rental of certain housing under Title IV; to provide for the further protection of persons participating in activities protected by the Constitution and Federal Law in Title V; and to further the desegregation of schools and public facilities under Title VI.

The sum of $2,601,000 is allocated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to carry out its responsibilities under Title IV, Fair Housing. Of this, $2,101,000 (160 man-years) is for investigating and processing complaints; $500,000 is for studies and technical assistance. The remaining $2,110,000 (125 man-years) is for the Fair Housing Board created by Title IV.

These, then, are the components upon which the total estimate is based. In some instances it is anticipated that enforcement initially will require a larger commitment of personnel than is indicated by these averages. In others it is anticipated that the number of persons required will increase over time. We have endeavored to reflect these projections in the average figures discussed above. More detailed estimates projected for a five-year period as required by Public Law 84–801 will be provided to the Congress in due course.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

Of course, the amendment just adopted, offered by the gentleman from Maryland, provides for additional studies. We do not know what that would cost.

The letter I have just read gives a fairly clear idea of what the total cost would be and the breakdown so far as they could evaluate it at that time.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York. May I say I am delighted the distinguished gentleman is here on the floor today to be able to respond to my question.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, the Civil Rights Act of 1966. During the 8 years I have been privileged to serve in this House, I have consistently supported legislation to end discrimination by reason of race, religion, color, national origin, or sex. And I am pleased to support this bill before us here today as one more step in the direction of the full equality envisioned in the Declaration of Independence and specifically incorporated into the Constitution in the 14th and 15th amendments.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is not perfect. It goes beyond what some people would like to see and it doesn't go as far as others would like to see us go. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when I had the feeling that if we would just pass one more piece of legislation we would have pretty much licked our problem of civil rights. Many of us, I daresay, had that feeling last year, with the voting rights and public accommodations legislation—of which I was a cosponsor—that we had gone about as far as one could go legislatively in this field, and that from there on we would just have to let these bills work their way through the fabric of our society where discrimination had prevented some citizens from living up to their full opportunities.

But events demonstrated more quickly than any of us had realized, that even with the Civil Rights Act of 1965 we had not yet completed the basic legislative job that needed to be done. We discovered that there were still legal ways to avoid the changes the Congress had thought it had made. We found, for example, that crimes of violence against civil rights supporters, even clergymen, teachers, women, were going unpunished in local State courts of law in the South. We found that to some extent this result stemmed from a continuing practice of racial discrimination in local juries.

And so two of the major sections of this bill became necessary, titles I and II, to end discrimination in the selection of juries in both Federal and State courts, and title V, to make it a Federal crime to injure or to interfere with anyone because of his race, color, origin, or national origin, where he is exercising his rights as an American citizen.

In addition, this bill includes another title designed to eliminate discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. This is the title that has created the greatest controversy during debate on this bill. But as the title emerged from the committee, and as it has been amended here during our floor debate by the Mathias amendment, I believe it represents a fair and reasonable approach toward making our society truly free of inequality. I would point out to my colleagues that the present formulation of the open housing provision of this bill, title IV, is not even as strong as what has been the law in my home State of New York for many years. Yet, our experience in New York State has not in any way borne out the dire predictions of those who have opposed legislation in this particular field, any more than it has overnight eliminated the ghetto. In this field, as in too many others, we in New York State have led the way, and this bill will mainly have the effect of bringing other States up to the practices and procedures we in New York State have followed successfully for some time.

One cannot help but observe, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has been considered at the very time that racial riots were going on in a number of communities. Those of us who support civil rights legislation can only deplore such riots. They delay, not advance, the cause of civil rights. Those who incite to such riots harm the community and the basis of law on which our Nation and our society has been constructed. For this reason I supported the Cramer amendment to deal as effectively with those who would incite to racial riot as we propose to do with those who harm and even kill persons because of the color of their skins.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked long and hard on this bill. It will leave this Chamber as a truly bipartisan legislative product, particularly because of the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. Because of this strong bipartisan support I sincerely hope that we may look for early action, on a similar bipartisan basis, in the other body.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must vote against this bill in protest to the way this matter has been handled. My strong opposition to title IV leaves me no choice but to vote against any bill that incorporates it.

I have been an advocate all my life and as such I am sympathetic to those who have urged their cause upon the Congress. There certainly are many in the civil rights movement who have demonstrated their sincerity and sense of responsibility and thus have achieved much progress.

However, today, the threat of riots and violent rebellion hangs over the Congress should they not pass a bill including title IV. This is a particularly vicious type of blackmail and should the Congress yield under this pressure I do not believe that the dignity of this body can ever recover.

Furthermore, I have grave questions over the possible results of this legislation. I have listened with a great deal of interest to my colleagues from the great northern cities who have urged the passage of "the strongest possible" bill in order to eliminate ghettos. I find this an ironic observation since the largest ghetto in the United States exists in New York City in a State with a strong "open occupancy" law.

In all my correspondence and in many public statements I have indicated my support of the other titles of this bill but have steadfastly opposed title IV. I am still in support of the remainder of the bill as amended on the House floor and believe that it is a step in the right direction. However, it is my opinion that sending the bill to the Senate with the inclusion of title IV will mean the certain death of the legislation. Unless, as I sincerely hope, the other body, in its wisdom, sees fit to strike the housing provision and thereby returns it to us. I would then take great pleasure in casting an "aye" vote for the remaining provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the current debate on the civil rights bill includes a number of basic issues that have been the subject of controversy in our American society for some time. Controversy over title IV has often been described as involving a conflict between the right to property and the great principle of equality under law which is basic to the American constitutional system. There is little question on a historical basis regarding the power of the Congress to act positively in this area. What is often overlooked in this debate is that the invocation of fundamental constitutional rights has on previous occasions been given priority in the constitutional scale of values although the road to equality has been long and difficult.

Supreme Court Justice Gabriel Duvall, the first Justice appointed by President Jefferson to the Supreme Court, invoked in 1813 one of the most eloquent arguments on this matter. The early case of *Mina Queen and Child* v. *Hepburn*, 7 Cranch 290 (1813) concerned a claim for freedom of a slave based on the contention that one of her ancestors possessed freedom. Given the climate of opinion at that time, the claim was rejected by a majority of the Supreme Court on the grounds that hearsay evidence is not admissible in proving the freedom of a slave's ancestor.

Justice Duvall pointed out in his dissent that—

> The reason for admitting hearsay evidence upon a question of freedom is much stronger than in cases of pedigree or in controversies relative to the boundaries of land. It will be universally admitted that the right to freedom is more important than the right of property. And people of color from their helpless condition under the uncontrolled authority of a master are entitled to all reasonable protection.
>
> A decision that hearsay evidence in such cases shall not be admitted, cuts up by the roots all claims of the kind, and put a final end to them, unless the claim should arise from a fact of recent date, and such a case will seldom, perhaps never, occur.

Duvall's courageous dissent underscored a principle accepted as part of our constitutional fabric with the adoption of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Duvall argued that the right to freedom supersedes the right to property. So here, in modern America in the mid-1960's, in fulfillment of our constitutional imperative of equality before the law, discrimination based upon race must give way to equality of opportunity in housing as well as in other fundamental areas of our social system.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely support the general objectives of H.R. 14765 and believe that many provisions of the bill, if administered in a judicious manner, would assist in achieving standards of fairness, justice, and nondiscrimination. I feel as deeply as anyone in this body that justice has no price, in either Federal or State courts. Humanity is precious and individual freedom to move about in society is an inherent right of every soul.

I just say that some provisions of this bill cause me grave concern—title IV, in particular, because it severely infringes upon basic property rights granted to us by the Constitution and alters our basic concept of legal procedure. However, if this specific title can be stricken from the bill or its objectionable features removed I shall support this legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my position with respect to H.R. 14765 is well known to the Members of this body. I have attempted in the most constructive way to point out to my colleagues sound reasons for my position with respect to title IV of this legislation. I have expressed firmly my fears that in enacting title IV that we are invading a province via the legislative route which is secured to the people by the Constitution of the United States. I make no apology to anyone for this position that I have taken even though at times it seems old fashioned to argue that this legislation or any legislation is a violation of our Constitution.

Beyond my fears of the constitutionality of title IV of this bill are serious questions that I have concerning: First, its total effect if enacted on the problem that it seeks to resolve; second, its poor draftsmanship; third, its contradictory language; and fourth, above all, that in its enactment, no one individual in our society will be materially affected by its provisions. In total, it is an empty gesture and a step which I believe we in this Congress will regret. It invites further legislation for next year and the next year and the next year in the same area. Therefore, I feel the long-term consequences of what we do today will return again to us at future sessions of the Congress at which time we will be trying to again legislate in the area of title IV.

Mr. Chairman, more than anything else, those who support this legislation with title IV, I believe, have sacrificed a principle which in the future I feel they will find it difficult to return to and that is a principle that the Federal Government's rights to legislate in this field are very narrow indeed. Title IV in its present form gives away a principle which great numbers of individuals have been fighting to retain during most of their tenure in public life, and that is to prevent the ever mushrooming of the Federal Government, to the extent that what is in our Constitution means little or nothing, whereas by its terms, the people reserve for themselves and the States those matters not specifically granted to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against my first civil rights bill. The parliamentary situation as it is presented to me in order to be eligible to make a motion to recommit and test the question of title IV made it necessary for me to indicate to the chairman that I was opposed to the bill in its present form which I so indicated. I shall for the first time be opposed to civil rights legislation—a legislative area in which all my past activities, and I believe present as well, have been constructive.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, since July 25 and for 12 legislative days thereafter, covering parts of 3 calendar weeks, this House has thoroughly debated H.R. 14765. No one could deny every provision of the bill has been fully and completely considered.

For Members not on the Judiciary Committee it is easy to avoid being on the record with a statement of reasons for their action on the bill. But for a bill so far reaching in its consequences to remain silent would justify an inquiry whether he had any feeling at all about the bill. The oft used expression that a vote speaks for itself, is stretched rather far where more than one vote precedes final passage. For such reasons I think a statement of position is necessary on the several titles of the bill.

Title I is an effort by Congress to legislate in the field of the judiciary. My objection to this and title II is that they tamper carelessly and even recklessly with the most just jury system the world has ever known, in an effort to correct a very limited few of alleged miscarriages of justice whose repetition will undoubtedly be avoided in the future through that strong force known as public opinion. As further objection, it seems to me noteworthy that there has been no expression of approval of this title by either the Judicial Conference or the American Bar Association. It is equally noteworthy that from the many U.S. district judges who have been asked their opinion on title I only a few have stated the title was acceptable.

If title I is not acceptable, then title II is much worse because it provides for Federal intervention in the State jury system by an unwarranted extension of centralized control. This section amounts to Federal control over State jury systems. Although of doubtful constitutionality, clever trial lawyers could obstruct criminal prosecution by alleging some type of discrimination, not merely race, but upon the basis of religion, sex, ethnic groups, economic status, and other bases. These obstructive tactics under title II could be used all over the breadth and width of the land, not just in one section. This day of increasing crime is no time to make it difficult for prosecuting attorneys by imposing procedural obstacles or burdens against the prosecution of crime in our State courts.

Title III, which permits the Attorney General to institute suits on his own without the direct complaint of a citizen who considers himself aggrieved, is a step toward the end of the historic right of the accused to be faced by his accuser. As a practical matter, this title gives far too vast power to the Attorney General. Can anyone, by the stretch of his imagination, see how any one man except the Almighty himself could be capable of discerning and determining when "any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right"?

Is it possible that we are at last trying to enact into law a provision which makes certain subjective thoughts of a person or his feelings a Federal offense? Title III would call for increased surveillance by an investigator making innumerable investigations in person or else those who administer the act would seek to accomplish the same end by requiring an endless number of reports to be continuously filed waiting for some person to become careless and to be followed by prosecution because of an innocent mistake made in the preparation of a report.

There is enough that is objectionable in title IV to serve as the subject of a full length book. The efforts of those well-meaning Members to water it down do not reduce the basic objections to the title. If the title is unconstitutional the so-called Mathias amendment cannot escape the same judgment. The amendment after all is nothing more or less than title IV in smaller doses. The exemption provided in the Mathias amendment should only serve to emphasize the overall unconstitutionality of title IV. Surely a fewer number of housing units one owns or a lower frequency of sale will not improve constitutionality.

It is my opinion title IV is not constitutional. It violates the guarantee of free association provided in the first amendment. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission as far back as 1959 stated:

> The right of voluntary association is very important.

One can question the reasoning but it has even been suggested by opponents that title IV is in fact an ex post facto law, forbidden by article I of the Constitution because persons who have invested in real estate expecting to retain control over this property find themselves stripped by a subsequently enacted law of all freedom of choice over disposition of their property.

The real objection to title IV is the provision is unconstitutional. It is a frightening abridgment of the rights of the owners of private property. The announced purpose is to eliminate big city ghettos. Regardless of confusion of the terms "slums and ghettos," it is noteworthy that these continue to exist in many of our large cities that purport to enjoy State or city fair housing laws for many years. It is for this reason I suggest title IV may not be able to accomplish what it promises. Quite frankly, it is an effort to cure a particular social ill by moral legislation.

The efforts of proponents of this section to justify its legality is in my opinion pure sophistry. How can it be that a house already built and thereby immovable can be in interstate commerce? No, the constitutionality of title IV cannot be found in the commerce clause nor can it find a home under the 14th amendment. How can there be any violation of the 14th amendment when the protection of that provision of the Constitution does not cover private action unless it should be done under the color of some State statutes or city ordinances.

The opponents of title IV have a strong point when they argue it seeks to accomplish its objectives by the use of force. Perhaps the expression, "forced housing" is not an inaccurate description when in fact freedom of choice is denied in the contractual relations of sale or rental of property. The original proposal applied to every home, apartment, room in a home, and residential land. There followed a great public outcry. It was amended in the Judiciary Committee to exempt owners of four units of less if they live on the premises. This amendment was called compromise. I submit there should be no compromise with principle. Here is a principle at stake. How can it be an owner of a five-unit property is entitled to less protection from Federal harassment than an owner of four units or three or two or those who have only their own home? How is it possible to label a five-unit building as interstate commerce and subject thereby to Federal regulation? The very important question to ask is, How long will it be before the four unit, three unit, two unit, or your own home will no longer be exempted? Opponents of this compromise have referred to it as a "foot in the door," or the "camel's nose under the tent." These descriptions are justified if one takes a moment to consider the expense of defending complaints filed by the Federal Fair Housing Board with power similar to the National Labor Relations Board, as well as the expenses of defending suits brought by the Attorney General. In fact, innocent property owners may be put to the test of proving themselves innocent of thoughts which the bill would make unlawful.

Those who are sincerely concerned about the moral aspects of open occupancy and fair housing should recognize that these ends may be reached by voluntary efforts instead of by coercion. Private action should be used to do the job. Every State real estate association has a special committee on equal opportunity in housing and most of the States have been active in securing the moral aims outlined in this bill.

There have been some commendable attempts by local religious and citizen groups to obtain better housing for minority groups. This is precisely the place where these efforts should be left, in the realm of voluntary action in the various States and localities.

As a Member of Congress I have supported in every instance housing bills which would lead to the solution of the housing problems for minority groups. These cannot be accomplished by title IV. You cannot legislate morality nor economic status. Housing is an economic problem. I shall continue to support provisions for better public housing, and better low-income housing, but I cannot support a measure which converts everyone's own private housing into a sort of public utility with its massive invasion of individual rights. The right to own and freely dispose of ones home is an important bulwark of individual freedom.

Some progress has been made in the past few days in cleaning up the provisions of title V. This title originally provided some outrageous penalties for any act or attempt to deprive a person of his civil rights. But even with the Cramer amendment which is a wise addition there remains some serious reservations. In the hearings before the committee last year the Attorney General in testifying about a similar provision made it plain that "a national police force would be necessary to enforce such a law." Who can say that if this provision becomes law, the Attorney General would not ask for a national police force next year among his demands as a necessity to enforcement. Certainly, this should be one result we should all shrink from.

The foregoing remarks explain my objections to the provisions of H.R. 14765. Four civil rights bills have been passed by the Congress. Notwithstanding there seems to be an increasing multiplicity of racial disturbances in our large cities. Perhaps there are complex causes for these disturbances. But for how long can there fail to be a realization that legislation alone is not the answer for the betterment of these minorities.

I have supported every one of the four civil rights bills enacted into law. I firmly believe every American, regardless of his race, color, or creed should share in the rewards of our way of life but I also believe that everyone should share in the responsibilities of our national life. Let us not forget that the coercion and force that is provided for in the civil rights bill of 1966 may in time be turned against the minority it is now proposed to protect. Much of H.R. 14765 seems to be unconstitutional. Far too much of it violates plain ordinary commonsense. All of our people deserve better legislation than a bill drafted and considered in haste under the pressure of emotions. This is a bill which under the guise of protecting the rights of some Americans, unleashes forces that could well destroy the rights of all Americans.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, passage of the Callaway amendment to this so-called civil rights bill should serve notice to the Federal courts and the executive department that it is against the law to bus students into other school districts to bring about racial homogenation, whether in Montgomery, Ala., or New York City.

This is the second time the House has so voted and language very similar to that of the Callaway amendment is actually in the previous Civil Rights Act. Yet the clear intent of Congress has been ignored or perverted by so-called guidelines issued by agencies and departments such as Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Justice Department as well as by the courts.

The Callaway amendment provides:

> Nothing shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

It is highly significant that the House has twice passed such language, the meaning of which cannot be clearer. I hope that neither the courts nor the executive branch flaunt the law and the will of the people's elected Representatives.

There is an old saying that a civil service advises, but a bureaucracy imposes. The bureaucrats have imposed in this matter. They cannot do so any longer now that this House, traditionally the closest to the people, has indicated its wishes a second time after due debate and consideration.

I hope that the self-appointed and presidentially anointed bleeding hearts who want to change our social structure without authority to do so will carefully note the language of this bill and cease laying down "guidelines" and other forms of what has politely come to be called "administrative law" that conflict with the real law.

The withholding of our tax dollars from our school systems, our welfare programs, our medicare programs, and other Federal Government sponsored programs because we do not comply with the ideas of some bureaucrat's idea of right and wrong is unconscionable.

I believe the Callaway amendment, which I have supported, and for which I have voted, will end bureaucratic encroachment and imposition in this vital field. From New York to Los Angeles, in the North even more than the South, it has been made clear the people do not want busing of outside students, students who live elsewhere, into their school districts to break down the level of education so vital to our Nation's future. One has only to look at studies made in Watts, Washington, D.C., New York, and other areas to see that a majority suffer a reduction in education quality as the percentage of an artificially induced minority has been added to the system.

The House of Representatives has spoken twice. Let those who act against the law and its will beware. For this House votes appropriations, too, and alone, can originate them. I certainly hope Attorney General Katzenbach, Commissioner of Education Howe, Secretary Gardner of HEW can understand the meaning and intent of this wording of the amendment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the 1966 Civil Rights Act although I am concerned and disappointed that title IV of the bill has been amended to eliminate large areas of housing from its provisions, and although I believe that the amendment to title V introduced by the gentlemen from Florida represents an unfortunate response to an unfortunate situation.

However, Mr. Chairman, this legislation, and particularly title IV, is of the greatest of significance for millions of Americans whose rights it assures and protects. And, importantly, it also protects the rights of those who follow us.

For, by 1975, the population of the United States will jump to almost 223 million, a rise from present levels of about 25 million citizens, equal to the entire U.S. population in the immediate pre-Civil War period. Between 1960 and 1975, the urban population alone will skyrocket from 125 to 171 million. In 1975, there will be roughly 9½ million more households in the United States than presently, and more than 20 million new housing units will be built in new suburban and exurban communities which will virtually double our Nation's metropolitan areas.

The great question then, Mr. Chairman, is whether a large portion of those new people in those new households, in addition to the current population, will face discrimination in housing merely because of their skin color, religion, or national origin? How many of those new people would have to face the stigma of living in a slum or a ghetto if we do not pass title IV of the 1966 Civil Rights Act—even in its weakened form as amended?

Mr. Chairman, it would be the greatest of tragedies if the new communities which will explode across the face of our Nation during the next decade are not open to all citizens on a free and equal basis, as their purses and their tastes lead them. This legislation mandates a national commitment to close the door once and for all on those backward few among us who would welcome only some Americans into these new cities, and who would exclude by group label millions of other American citizens.

At last we will have placed the majesty of our Federal Government behind the dream of an open society which welcomes all Americans into free and equal participation.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by this overwhelming majority. I believe that the bill that the House has today passed is a better bill after the amendments that we have made to it. I received some complaints about title IV of this bill in its original form. Most of those who objected stated that they did not believe that it was proper to interfere with the right of the individual homeowner or resident apartment owner to sell or lease his property to whomever he chose.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that every objection which my constituents offered to this bill in its original form has been met, and I did not hear a single complaint from the Ninth District of Tennessee concerning the bill as it passed.

I am also honored to join with my Democratic colleagues from other urban centers of the South. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton], who represents Nashville; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner], who represents Atlanta; the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. Farnsley], who represents Louisville; the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. Pepper and Mr. Fascell], who represent Miami; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], who represents Tampa; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], who represents Beaumont, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez], who represents San Antonio.

I think it significant that each of these centers of urban population which I have mentioned have been markedly free in recent years from any large-scale racial disturbance. They are all progressive, expanding southern cities with their eyes on the future. I am happy to say that I number Memphis in this group. Memphis has not had racial violence or large-scale strife, and I am convinced that one of the reasons is because of constructive legislation such as this passed today.

The difference between this list of southern cities is underlined when it is compared with southern cities that are not on the list: Birmingham, Jackson, Selma, St. Petersburg, Little Rock, and many others.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we gain anything by pretending that problems do not exist in the fields of jury selection, housing and violence against civil rights workers. It is simply unrealistic and unconstructive to ignore these problems, to believe that they will disappear or to fail to act against them.

There is another critical problem which this bill is designed to meet. That is the ever-growing violence which racks the great cities of the North, East, and West. This amended bill meets this threat in two ways. First there is the antirioting provision which makes it a Federal crime to use the facilities of interstate commerce to foment a riot. The second is the insertion of the word "lawfully" in title V. All races will benefit from these changes.

Similarly, an amendment has been adopted in the housing section to outlaw that practice wherein unscrupulous people who, by the technique known as "blockbusting," exploit both races, destroy real estate values and profit no one but the exploiter. Legislation in this field is long overdue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a principle involved in this legislation and that I have voted for what is right. I predict that, when this act becomes law, our Nation will gain from it. I believe that among the principal beneficiaries will be the large, progressive urban centers of the South.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, the dark spot upon the glorious history of America is the tardiness with which we have removed onerous discriminations from many millions of our fellow citizens. Rather than lamenting the past, however, it behooves us to see how far we have come and to dedicate our efforts to speeding the day when every American shall enjoy that equality of right and protection which Thomas Jefferson envisaged in the Declaration of Independence.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence the words "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," none knew better than Jefferson that those words did not describe conditions as they then existed in the American colonies. Jefferson knew that all men's rights were not equally protected in the American colonies; Jefferson knew that what John Adams called the abominable institution of slavery existed in many of the colonies and some of the Members of the Continental Congress owned slaves; and Jefferson knew that the path to the pursuit of happiness was not equally open to all Americans.

Jefferson knew also that these principles would not become the policies and practices of an America which should burst full grown, like Minerva from the brow of Jove, from the Declaration of Independence. But Jefferson believed that those words would become the principles of the America which was to be; the America which should emerge from ensuing generations of Americans through bloody struggles, unremitting toils and dedicated sacrifices. But those words of equality were not idle or meaningless words. On the contrary they embodied in Jefferson's own immortal eloquence the promise and the challenge of the American dream.

And those words in that Declaration, "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," did not mean that Jefferson intended that the government aborning from this Declaration should have for its duty and function only the protection of the rights of citizens which existed at the time that government was formed. On the contrary, he contemplated that it should be the duty and the high purpose of that government to obtain additional rights to secure for the citizen ever a more perfect enjoyment of those rights which as a human being, a child of God, and an American, he was entitled to inherit and enjoy.

And so it has been for almost two centuries that that government which arose from Jefferson's Declaration, always tardily, sometimes faltering, but never failing, has continually stricken down laws, practices, and policies of discrimination against any American and approached nearer and nearer to Jefferson's goal of equality of rights and the enjoyment of such rights by all Americans.

The tragedy has been in the slowness of pace, at least until late years, which has characterized this struggle. It was nearly a hundred years and after a bloody war before the bonds of slavery were stricken from Negro Americans. It was nearly 150 years before women were emancipated to the full status of citizenship. It was nearly 175 years before Negro children were accorded equality of access to the public schools.

But, beginning with the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the drive of the American Government for equal rights and equal opportunity for all Americans became more determined and the pace of progress toward this ancient aspiration rapidly accelerated. President Roosevelt set up a Fair Employment Practices Commission by Executive order to help win the war and to enable all men and women regardless of race, creed, or color to help gain the final victory.

President Truman sent to the Congress recommendations for the removal of many of the discriminations against our citizens on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. The fight for civil rights, for equal rights for all our people grew in momentum and in intensity in the Congress and throughout the country. America was awakening to the challenge and the necessity that every American be treated like an American.

The really exciting beginning of the dynamic program of the American Government and the American people to secure equality of rights for all Americans began with a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in Brown against the Board of Education in 1954. Since 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court has decided in one way or another some 60 cases striking down discrimination against Americans on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in respect to voting, the enjoyment of public accommodations and facilities, access to educational institutions at all levels, housing, employment, the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting, and other areas of activity.

Beginning with the administration of President Eisenhower, at least 12 Executive orders have been issued by Presidents removing discriminations against some Americans in respect to employment and housing. Beginning with 1957, the Congress has enacted four civil rights acts and the House has now by a great majority enacted a fifth and most meaningful one.

The bill we have been considering and have now enacted extends the protection of the fair and nondiscriminatory administration of justice to those who have previously been denied membership on grand juries and petit juries in many parts of America.

But the crowning glory of all civil rights legislation which the Congress has enacted is to be found, in my opinion, in title 4 of the act which we have just passed. This title provides that when a man goes into the marketplace to acquire a home—with all that a home means—the seat of the family altar, the sacred area where the family, the little unit blessed of God, stands together apart from the world to share its joys and sorrows large and small—that man's offer shall not be spurned nor fall upon deaf ears because of his race, color, religion, or national origin.

This is the American way—to establish the rights of men through law rather than through riots and violence. In this latest civil rights bill we have made this doubly clear by imposing severe penalties for those who would rob and pillage and assault under the cover of the struggle for human rights for all Americans.

However many challenges may lie ahead, how thrilling it is to see how far we have come, in spite of the long journey which has been involved, toward the realization of Jefferson's dream.

On July 4, 1826, John Adams lay upon his deathbed. He aroused himself to inquire if Thomas Jefferson were still alive. When informed that he was, this grand old patriot uttered his last words "Thank God, Jefferson still lives."

When we contemplate what the Government of our country has done in late years to insure equality of rights for every American and especially when we note the stirring significance of the measure the House has just passed, we, too, can say with a fervor comparable to that of old John Adams, "Thank God, Jefferson still lives."

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 910, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Whitener amendment to title VI as it appears on page 78, line 8.

The SPEAKER. Is any other separate vote demanded?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Cramer substitute for the Ashmore amendment on page 77 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is any other separate vote demanded?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Mathias amendment to title IV, which amends section 403 by adding a new subsection.

The SPEAKER. Is any further separate vote demanded?

There was no response.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, is it proper to suggest that the amendments be read where a separate vote has been demanded?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendments upon which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk will report the Mathias amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS: On page 65, after line 14, insert the following:

"(e) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, or be construed to prohibit, a real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or employee or agent of any real estate broker, agent, or salesman from complying with the express written instruction of any person not in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, or otherwise not subject to the prohibitions of this section pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) hereof, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling owned by such person, if such instruction was not encouraged, solicited, or induced by such broker, agent, or salesman, or any employee or agent thereof."

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] rise?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 176, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—237

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Bates
Bell
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—176

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gilbert
Green, Pa.
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Mink
Moore
Morton
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Dent
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Hanna
Hawkins
Holland
King, N.Y.
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis
Young

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Young.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Toll.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. **WATSON**, **ROUDEBUSH**, **HAGEN** of California, and **GLENN ANDREWS** changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will now report the so-called Cramer-Ashmore amendment to title V.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 77, immediately after line 12, insert the following new section:

"PROTECTION OF RIGHTS

"SEC. 502. Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, with intent to—

"(1) incite, promote, encourage, or carry on, or facilitate the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other violent civil disturbance; or

"(2) commit any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act which is a felony or high misdemeanor under Federal or State law, in furtherance of, or during commission of, any act specified in paragraph (1); or

"(3) assist, encourage, or instruct any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraphs (1) and (2);

and thereafter performs or attempts to perform any act specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

And renumber the following section accordingly.

The **SPEAKER**. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] rise?

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 25, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—389

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum

Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—25

Barrett
Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Cameron
Celler
Cohelan
Conyers
Diggs
Dow
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Kastenmeier
Matsunaga
Mink
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Rees
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Dent
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Hawkins
Holland
King, N.Y.
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 78, line 8, after "United States" insert "when he has received a complaint in writing signed by an individual to the effect that he is being deprived of or threatened with the loss of his right to the equal protection of the laws".

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the amendment.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 201, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—214

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gray
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kee
Keith
King, Utah
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McEwen
McMillan
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morris
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—201

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bell
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Leggett
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Dent
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Hawkins
Holland
King, N.Y.
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.

Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Dent against

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **MOORE**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **MOORE**. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 14765, to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instruction to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: "On page 61, line 19, strike out "TITLE IV" and all that follows from line 20, page 61, down through page 74, line 6."

And renumber the following titles and sections accordingly.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The Speaker. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 222, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—190

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gray
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McEwen
McMillan
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morris
Morton
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Saylor
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—222

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Bell
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Weltner
White, Idaho
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hanna

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Fraser
Hawkins
King, N.Y.
May
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watson
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.

Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Fraser against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Ullman against.

Mr. **HANNA**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. If he were present he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—259

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Bell
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Huot
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi

Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—157

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Cabell
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McMillan
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morris
Morton
Natcher
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hanna

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Hawkins
King, N.Y.
Morrison
Murray
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Thomas
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Murray against.

Mr. Van Deerlin for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Toll with Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. DAGUE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill, H.R. 14765, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, August 10, 1966, it may be in order to consider District of Columbia business under the provisions of clause 8, rule XXIV.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say Wednesday? That is tomorrow that District of Columbia bills would be taken up?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation of objection?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. One of these bills the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], has asked several times to bring up as soon as possible. We missed two District Days because of the consideration of the Civil Rights Act. It is my understanding that consideration of the bills that are in order will require only a very short period of time.

Mr. GROSS. Will the bills include the picketing bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Such bills as are in order under the unanimous consent request which I have made may be called up by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GROSS. You have no knowledge of the bills that he proposes to call up tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. There are three, four, or five bills. I am not exactly sure. But the one in which there is the greatest interest is the teachers salary bill. It is one which has been reported out for some time. I do not see the distinguished gentleman on the floor, but he has assured me that it will take only a few moments. There will be no opposition to the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this could have been heard on Monday, I will object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we will proceed with the consideration of the bills on the schedule, including the Military Construction Authorization Act and the Highway Authorization Act. We are, of course, hopeful that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will yield and let us consider at least part of these District bills between now and the end of the week.

UNIFORM RECORDKEEPING SYSTEM FOR RADIATION WORKERS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for the consideration of the Congress today a bill which would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to provide financial assistance in the form of grants to the States for the purpose of defraying the additional costs which a State may incur in adopting and maintaining a uniform recordkeeping system for the radiation worker. The system, as conceived, would provide a mechanism for the development of accurate and relevant statistical data useful in the conduct of scientific research and medical studies on the effects of radiation on man. In addition, such a system would provide useful information to the States in their review and adjudication of workmen's compensation claims and in furthering their radiation protection programs.

In order to make the recordkeeping system most effective, participation by the States in the grant program will be contingent upon the States' meeting minimum requirements for recordkeeping prescribed by the AEC. In addition to the need for a recordkeeping system, it is also desirable that States participating in the program have workmen's compensation laws which meet minimum standards for coverage of radiation workers. The inadequacies of workmen's compensation statutes generally, and particularly for radiation workers, have been well established. Accordingly, the bill would provide that the standards established for participation in the grant program may also include minimum standards for workmen's compensation coverage of radiation.

Further, the bill would specifically authorize AEC to enter into contracts for studies of appropriate systems of recordkeeping and for studies of and reports on the various States' workmen's compensation laws, the administration of claims, and related matters.

In 1959 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on employee radiation hazards and workmen's compensation, looking to the problem of insuring the health and safety of workers employed in the radiation industry, the complex problem of compensation when a worker receives a radiation injury and the causal relationship between the two. One of the conclusions reached by the committee was that a review of the testimony indicated that there was practically universal agreement on the need for centralized records of individual exposures in order to know the amount of radiation which an individual had absorbed and also to prevent him from exposing himself unnecessarily to radiation.

The validity of this opinion has been borne out by studies and recommendations of both governmental and private organizations. The Council of State Governments, the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Labor have all recognized the need for a uniform and centralized system of recording individual radiation exposures and have recommended at various times that one be adopted.

The initial phase of the Commission's program leading to the adoption of a recordkeeping system and for the encouragement of States to improve their workmen's compensation laws was described by the AEC during hearings on its authorization legislation earlier this year. A number of States have already expressed their interest and desire to cooperate in the program. By authorizing this grant program, the Congress will provide an effective means to materially assist in accomplishing the objectives I have just described without unduly burdening the worker, employer, the State, or the Federal Government. As you know, most of the State legislatures will be in session in 1967. Many of the States may find it necessary to amend their workmen's compensation laws to meet the objectives of the Commission's program and to provide the legal authority for a recordkeeping system. Thus, it is important that you give, and I urge, your early and favorable consideration of this bill.

PROBLEMS OF THE OLDER WORKER

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House my bill, H.R. 11682, which I introduced October 20, 1965, to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to make discrimination in employment because of age an unlawful employment practice.

After many years of being considered a youngster in the family of nations, the United States is now regarded as a senior member in that fellowship. The growth and appearance of new nations in Africa and elsewhere have added rapidly to our seniority. Yet while we have aged in relation to the new nations, we are still representative of youth and vitality. This is true not only because the zeal and enterprise of our many cultural, economic, and social pursuits is so typical of youth, but because the chronological age of our population is getting lower each year. It is interesting and surprising to note that, today, half of our people are under 29 and, by 1975, half will be under 26.

As a natural result of this shift in our population structure, more and more attention is being focused on the problems of youth—the challenges they are faced with, their attitudes and responses toward these challenges, and their preparation for meeting them. Yet problems arise from this shift of interests and concentration, which is also very natural. This is the problem of our older citizens. Even with our growing concern for the future and our young people, we have devoted considerable attention to the plight of the elderly—those over age 65 who have retired from the work force and whose reduced earning power and activity often serve to make their later years less full and happy than they ideally should be. These too are serious and growing problems.

But, the group I want to talk about today falls somewhere in between the young people just on the threshold of their life's work and their aspirations, and the aged Americans who have retired from the work force and ask merely a worry-free and dignified old age.

The middle-aged worker in the United States is chronologically sandwiched between the beginner and the retiree. And, although we rarely realize it, he is feeling the pressure of both groups in his effort to maintain his place in the labor force. The young are crowding in from behind and the trend to rigid retirement standards is mandatorily limiting his work span—this in spite of the fact that he can look forward to longer and healthier later years than his grandfather or his father.

The problem usually does not arise unless the older worker—generally considered to be age 40 and up—suddenly finds himself without a job. It is one of the cruel paradoxes of our time that older workers holding jobs are considered invaluable because of their experience and stability. But let that same worker become unemployed, and he is considered "too old" to be hired. Yet, once unemployed, the older worker can look forward—if that is not an improper term—to longer stretches between jobs.

A recent study by the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce showed that 26 percent of 279 major firms did not hire any workers over 45. And, even more telling is a study conducted by the United States Employment Service in 1956. It took a survey of public employment offices in seven urban areas. The results showed that 41 percent of all job listings specified applicants under 45. That was almost 10 years ago, but we have no reason to expect that the trend has diminished in the intervening decade.

The problem is already severe and it is growing more so. The older worker who becomes unemployed, even though he may have a spotless and distinguished record of achievement and competence, is assailed by all kinds of slings and arrows of bad fortune.

For one, longrun occupational shifts work against the older worker. The jobs which are growing in importance today are concentrated more in white collar and highly technical occupations; they impose requirements that the older worker is less likely to possess than a younger competitor. This is especially true when the worker has become unemployed because his job—even perhaps the first and only job he ever held—has become obsolete.

Another reason, which I referred to briefly earlier, is the effect of the growth of private pension plans. This device to protect the worker against need and worry in old age has, paradoxically enough, brought on wider use of age restrictions. Because it is often not possible for an older entrant into these plans to earn enough credits for a pension and because often there is resentment against an older entrant for reaping the benefits that have been created by years of contributions by longtime employees, many employers refuse to hire such workers. Furthermore, pensions have encouraged the practice of automatic retirement at a fixed age, usually 65. And, such elements as recent union pressure for even earlier retirement as an alleviation for the unemployment problem only contribute more to the general reluctance to take on the older worker.

These, at least, are practical problems. They are the weeds that crop up in a fertile field of progress. Progress, as we are coming to see, is not an unmixed blessing. The techniques which relieve man from some of the most tedious, unpleasant, and time-consuming tasks also put many men—who know no other occupations—on the unemployment rolls.

For these problems, we must make adjustments and institute new programs for retraining those with obsolescent skills and for offsetting the disadvantages that better protection plans and earlier retirement ages pose for the older jobseeker.

But there is one problem confronting the older worker that is even more painful, more widespread than either of those previously mentioned. And that is discrimination.

Age discrimination is not the same as the insidious discrimination based on race or creed prejudices and bigotry. Racial or religious discrimination results in nonemployment because of feelings about a person entirely unrelated to his ability to do a job. This is hardly a problem for the older jobseeker. Discrimination arises for him because of assumptions that are made about the effects of age on performance. In some cases, of course, these assumptions are valid and are based on reason. One would not hire a 45-year-old woman to model teenage clothes. One probably would not hire an older man to work on placing girders in rising skyscrapers.

But, as a general rule, ability is ageless. A young man with capacities does not lose them with age, unless his capacities are dependent upon his physical characteristics or the speed of his reactions. In many instances, rather, a worker's skills are honed and sharpened by experience.

Studies have shown, in fact, that older workers bring qualities to a job that tend to make them very desirable employees indeed. For one, they rate high in dependability—they have a much lower rate of absenteeism than their young coworkers. They also have a high rate of job stability—they are less likely to move around from office to office, from place to place. And their rate of work injuries is lower than that of younger groups.

These qualities, which are prized by any employer, are the fruits of experience—experience gained through years in the labor force. Shakespeare once said:

> He cannot be a perfect man, not being tried and tutored in the world. Experience is by industry achieved, and perfected by the swift course of time.

Many employers are depriving themselves of a valuable source in rejecting older job applicants because of their misguided views about ability in older workers. The Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, put it very succinctly when he said:

> It doesn't make sense that the doctors and scientists can do so much better about removing the physical aches and pains of old age than the rest of us are doing about ending the bitter bruises of discrimination against older people.

Of course, the only effective way to offset the disadvantages under which the older jobseeker labors—or, rather, fails to labor—is to take active measures to counteract them. A man's inability to qualify for a job he seeks because of obsolescent skills or shrinking labor markets can be handled by providing him with retraining programs. This is being done, through such Federal programs as the Manpower Development and Training Act and, in some cases, by industries themselves.

The more difficult problem is the one of discrimination. This will require a broad program of education and persistent vigilance to offset. The Federal Government sets a good example by its policy banning age discrimination. The Executive order which contains this ban, issued by President Johnson early in 1964, prohibits Federal contractors and subcontractors from discriminating on account of age with respect to hiring, advancement, discharge, conditions of employment, and advertising or other solicitation of employment. It backs up its stated policy to protect the older worker against unfair elimination from job searches through the efforts of the U.S. Employment Service. The USES was one of the first agencies, public or private, to recognize the special position of the unemployed worker and it actively seeks to place older workers—as well as other "disadvantaged" sectors of the labor force—by supporting and counseling the workers in their search for employment and by trying to encourage prospective employers to look more kindly on the older job applicant.

These are still small, if essential, efforts. This country needs to have its private industries and businesses follow the Federal example in their attitude toward the older worker. The advantages are manifold. Not only would business and industry gain skills, wisdom, and experience accumulated during long working years, but they would be doing the workers themselves a service by showing that they have not outlived their productivity when they are merely on the threshold of middle age.

Studies and experience have shown that the older worker possesses a stability and steadiness that is not as common as among the young. This is a vital quality for progress and productivity.

Our youth cult may have allowed some of us to lose sight of the value of anyone over the age 40. I propose that we all work to educate our communities to the fact that this is not so.

It is an old saying that "life begins at 40." It can be just as true that new work can begin at 40 as well.

I trust that the House Education and Labor Committee will see the imperative necessity for early enactment of this long-needed legislation, and will lose no time in scheduling consideration of this measure.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT BOOSTS ECONOMY IN NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in northwestern Pennsylvania our countryside is rich in natural beauty and we have resources that hold great potential for development to serve new uses. People in the area are taking advantage of conservation legislation the Congress passed less than 4 years ago and, through joint local action in a resource conservation and development project, are developing land and water resources to improve their economy.

The Penn Soil Resource Conservation and Development project is one of the first in the Nation to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under the new legislation. It covers about 1½ million acres in Crawford, Mercer, and Venango Counties, most of which lies in the congressional district that I represent.

As planning got started about 2½ years ago, the project was considered an experimental approach to improved land use and development of natural resources. It was considered an approach whereby a large number of farmers, city people, communities, and organizations could join together to develop and use all resources of the area to improve the economy and offer more attractive opportunities to its young people. The accomplishments so far hold great promise for the success of the project.

Although this is a long-range program—with some measures not expected to be completed before 10 to 15 years—some effects can already be seen.

Important among the planned measures are the small watershed projects that are being developed for flood prevention and to provide new water impoundments for recreation and fish and wildlife development.

The Mill Run and Saul-Mathay watershed projects—which are both completed—are serving very effectively to control erosion and prevent flooding. And they are also providing a base for recreation developments.

Other project measures include industrial parks and other centers, the development of which is closely tied in with the R.C. & D. project plans and objectives. Six recreational developments and 15 multiple purpose water development are planned in addition to those in the small watershed projects.

In all, proposed project measures number 52. Sponsors estimate that after they are all completed, they will provide nearly 2,000 man-years of continuing employment. And the economy of the watershed community is expected to increase by nearly $10 million.

I have visited some of the watershed project activities in my congressional district and have observed the enthusiasm and the accomplishments attained by local group action. It is this same support of local people—multiplied several times over—that is the backbone of the resource conservation and development project. Its sponsors—the soil and water conservation districts and the county commissioners of the three counties covered by the project—are accomplishing their objectives with the active support of local, State, and Federal governments, and, most significant, the support of businessmen, civic organizations, industry, and the general public of the watershed.

This project has opened the door to social and economic benefits. I am glad to support the people in my congressional district in these worthwhile activities. They are leading the way for other communities.

SIERRA CLUB TWISTS FACTS ACCORDING TO DAM BACKER—WRITES LETTER TO BROWER

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SENNER**. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, Mr. David Brower, the executive secretary of the so-called conservation-oriented Sierra Club of California, has come under considerable criticism lately for distorting the facts in the controversy over the building of central Arizona project dams in northern Arizona.

Recently, Mr. Brower was quoted in a Phoenix newspaper article as saying that the tax-exempt status of his organization is being investigated because of the "Udall brothers and Arizona power interests."

In response to this uncalled for remark, Mr. Orren Beaty, a most knowledgeable person, particularly in regards to the facets of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, wrote a letter to Mr. Brower acquainting him with the facts, as many have attempted to do for months.

JULY 12, 1966.

Mr. DAVID D. BROWER,
Executive Director, Sierra Club,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DAVE: I have been increasingly dismayed and appalled at the accelerating abandon with which you have been disregarding fact and embracing fancy in your campaign to prevent the construction of any additional dams in the Colorado River. It appears to me you are quite willing to destroy, if this is within your power, any friends the conservation movement may have in government—willingly sacrificing the need of their future help and cooperation in order to win your current dubious fight.

These are my own personal views, and in spite of them I would not have written but for the intemperate, unsubstantiated statements attributed to you by the Phoenix press after your appearance there some 10 days ago. While you said unnamed "other sources" had identified "the Udall brothers" as helping bring about Internal Revenue Service investigation of the tax-free status of the Sierra Club, your other statements made it clear you were accusing Stewart Udall of being responsible. I have waited since July 1 articles for you to correct the statements, but there have been no clarifications published.

You well know that one of your representatives in Washington was sent to ask Secretary Udall if he had any part in asking IRS to check the club's tax-free status. And you well know he was told flatly, with no equivocation, that published newspaper accounts of this action were the first that either the Secretary or I had heard of it, that we had not discussed it with anyone and that we would not have recommended it.

How can you ignore this while pressing your attack strains my powers of comprehension. It is in keeping with your false charge that he has prevented some of the Bureaus of this Department from making known their views on the Colorado River Basin Project. You cannot deny the outstanding gains which have been made for conservation under Secretary Udall. Given responsibilities you and your organization do not possess, he must balance dreams of preservation of wilderness, park and recreation values against practical realities. There exists no blank check authorization from Congress to draw on and no bottomless money bag to reach into for the myriad worthwhile projects yet to become reality.

A year ago I would have thought you understood these basic facts. Today I lack that faith in your understanding, so spell them out.

No reply is necessary, as I regard this to be a severance of relations.

In all candor and finality,

ORREN BEATY.

A CALL FOR THE REFORM OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL STATUTES

Mr. **HANSEN** of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a most formidable subject—crime in the United States. Although New Jersey's crime rate fortunately has not been rising as fast as that of the entire Nation, I am still deeply concerned about the mounting problem of crime, as are all Americans. In the past 8 years, this Nation has seen its crime rate increase six times as fast as the population, 19 percent in the last 2 years alone. We live in a nation where there is a robbery every 5 minutes, a burglary ever 28 seconds and five serious crimes every minute.

In a Gallup poll of May 1965, 41 percent of those polled felt that crime was the most important domestic issue, surpassed in importance only by education.

Of the more than 12,000 of my constituents in the Seventh Congressional District, who replied to my recent questionnaire, 10 percent rated crime as one of the three most important problems facing our country, and an additional 4 percent ranked the related problem of narcotics as crucial. They placed crime high on their list, just below such much-discussed issues as Vietnam, inflation, and civil rights. Though many consider crime a critical domestic issue, it is one to which the Federal Government has paid insufficient attention in the past.

As crime mounts alarmingly, so too does its costs. A study in State Government News estimated the costs of criminal justice in California in 1965 at over $600 million per year, and estimated that these costs would rise by 50 percent within the next decade. The cost to the Nation as a whole is estimated by the administration at $27 billion per year.

There exists a definite need for widespread action in this field, particularly by the State governments. However, as the President said in 1965:

> In some areas . . . the Federal Government has a special responsibility—organized crime, narcotic and drug control, regulation of gun sales, and law enforcement activities in the District of Columbia.

Earlier this year, the Department of Justice began its "war" on organized crime, and the President called for studies on the causes of crime to aid in its eradication. Yet the Federal Government, for all its well-publicized work in this field, has neglected a further responsibility—the updating of the entire Federal Criminal Code.

In our age of modern police technology, we need modern laws. No one can contend that the present patchwork criminal code is suitable for a society which may soon have policemen checking instrument panels to see if all the doors of merchants are locked for the night, or halting fleeing suspects with harmless tranquilizer darts.

We are all aware of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court which radically redefine the rights of the suspect and the accused before and during trials. As a result, the Federal Criminal Code, which has been thrown together over the past century, and revised but twice, is in urgent need of revision.

In light of this, it is not difficult to understand why President Johnson, in his crime message of March 1966, said:

> A number of our criminal laws are obsolete. Many are inconsistent in their efforts to make the penalty fit the crime. Many—which treat essentially the same crimes—are scattered in a crazy quilt patch-work throughout or criminal code.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to set an example for the State governments by updating and modernizing its criminal code to reflect the realities of urban society. There must be a carefully directed effort made by the Federal Government to revise and reform the revelant parts of the United States Code. In doing so, we shall provide leadership in a sphere which is uniquely Federal and thus encourage the States to assume their proper role and revise their own statutes.

Today, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] and the gentlemen from New York [Mr. KING and Mr. SMITH], in introducing legislation which would enable the Congress to begin the formidable but vital task of revising title 18 of the United States Code, the crime and criminal procedure statutes. It creates a bipartisan commission, made up of Members of the House and Senate, Federal judges and private citizens to formulate and recommend new legislation and also to recommend revision and recodification of title 18 of the United States Code.

One of the key features of this bill is the establishment of an advisory committee which is to be selected by the Chairman of the Commission and which will carry on the yeoman work required in such a substantial undertaking. This committee will enable us to take the administration's entire "crime package" and put its findings into usable form so that useful legislation and reforms will emerge. This will do much more than continuing patchwork repairs on a patchwork system.

The careful work which has gone into this bill is evident. It insures a commission of a bipartisan, professional nature, authorizes a closed appropriation, and sets a final date for the report of the commission, thus preventing the establishment of a continuing, constantly spending, never-reporting commission.

The necessity for Federal action in the Federal sphere is clear to us all. The concept of a national commission to reform the Federal criminal statutes is already receiving strong support from Federal judges across the Nation. It now remains for us to act and have the Federal Government do its proper share in the war against crime.

THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have readily offered explanations for the race riots currently taking place over our Nation. However, in the August 1, 1966 issue of the U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence in his column states that the demonstrations causing the riots are used "as a means of coercing Congress into the passage of stricter civil rights laws and the grant of more and more money to rebuild slum areas."

I have maintained since the Watts riots of 1965 that the Federal Government through the so-called Great Society administration has given these people a blank check with "no strings attached," and as a result the beneficiaries have come to expect a continued handout. When they do not get what they demand, they know exactly what to do—demonstrate and riot.

I urge my colleagues to read this column and to heed the challenge offered by Mr. Lawrence:

WHO IS TO BLAME

(By David Lawrence)

A wave of discontent is sweeping the country today.

People are asking why the Government at Washington is seemingly indifferent to the riots and crimes in the big cities of the North—the latest in Chicago, Cleveland and New York. The disturbances are due in part to racial friction, but are intensified by acts of violence resulting from an abuse of the concept of "demonstrations." This device has been openly espoused as a means of coercing Congress into the passage of stricter "civil rights" laws and the grant of more and more money to rebuild "slum" areas.

It is to be noted that, within the last few years, the Government has undertaken a massive program of education and assistance to the underprivileged. Anti-poverty legislation has been enacted. Appropriations have been made to improve conditions in many of our cities. Government departments and commissions have been active in endeavoring to enforce "equal rights" and to assure "equal opportunity" in employment.

Why, then, are the leaders of the civil-rights movement preaching "nonviolence" but, in effect, arousing passions and inciting people to violence?

Why are the police in the big cities interfered with by pressure groups and charged with "brutality" when they try to maintain law and order?

Why has it been found imperative for the National Guard to be called out in State after State to help the local police quell riots and preserve order?

Why was a "long, hot summer" of trouble predicted repeatedly last spring by some of the leaders of civil-rights groups as if to threaten Congress that it must immediately comply with their demands?

Are the outbreaks spontaneous or planned? Why the sudden appearance of the firebombs and shotguns in the crowds? Why all the arson?

What is the record and background of some of the top advisers who sit beside certain gullible leaders in the civil-rights movement and plan "targets" for the mobilization of demonstrators?

Why has the information about subversive activities been withheld? Why is this minimized as incidental? The Rerevend Billy Graham told a news conference the other day that the Government, including the FBI, knows the offenders and should identify them to the public. The testimony of police chiefs in Cleveland and other cities is that the recent assaults were apparently organized in advance.

Why, indeed, are street "demonstrations" of any kind deemed necessary in a democracy to secure passage of proposed legislation or enforcement of existing laws?

What has happened to the system of communication between the people and their Government? Is it really no longer effective?

These questions are being asked on every side because they touch the fundamentals of life in America today. Mob violence and vandalism are emerging on a wide scale in many a community. Day after day the newspapers carry reports of innocent citizens being killed or wounded, private property looted or destroyed, and residential neighborhoods terrorized.

The slogan "black power" is widely proclaimed but it can only stir up more race consciousness and a cry for retaliation by "white power."

Many of the pastors openly preach "civil disobedience." A member of the President's Cabinet, himself a Negro, excuses it all as follows:

"If the average white American put himself in the shoes of the average black American, he would be just as angry, just as prone to violence as the Negro is today. The thing that surprises me is that it hasn't happened before."

Discontent is increasing largely because of a feeling that persons elected to public office have failed to take the steps necessary to maintain law and order. Congress seems hesitant to enact corrective laws for fear of offending Negro voters.

The Administration argues that Congress has virtually unlimited power to protect "civil rights" by invoking the clause of the Constitution which authorizes it to regulate "interstate commerce." If so, there is a parallel obligation to insure the safety of all citizens, irrespective of race or color, in their homes and on the streets.

The rising discontent in America may reflect itself in the autumn elections. It would not be surprising if the American people showed their dissatisfaction with the party in power by voting for the opposition candidates, even though no alternative policy on the issue of law and order is being offered by the Republicans.

Meanwhile, a passive Administration looks on, claiming to be without authority to intervene, but actually unable to perceive as yet that the electorate is steadily becoming embittered.

Who is to blame for this inaction? Plainly, those who hold office today are to blame, as they have the responsibility to see to it that whites as well as Negroes are given 'the equal protection of the laws."

CRAMER AMENDMENT

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should comment on the amendment offered today by Congressman BILL CRAMER, of Florida, which passed this House by a large majority. Congressman CRAMER who introduced the amendment, and Congressman JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois, who laid the facts on the table concerning the civil rights unrest we have experienced recently, will both go down in history as being the great Republican representatives of our Nation who put a little foot in the door to keep the criminals and subversives from having more rights than the taxpaying, property-owning, hard working citizens.

I am most thankful, at long last, to see Members of Congress, by their votes, show that they are waking up to the real motivation behind the arson, stealing, murder, and general unrest that has resulted from the so-called civil rights demonstrations. It is gratifying to me to see it being admitted openly on the floor of the House, and certainly not by the leftwingers, that this is an organized conspiracy. The true facts have not been laid before the American public in such a manner for many years.

I do not deny that I am probably more conscious of all this unrest over our Nation than many of my northern colleagues. Up until this time, every civil rights bill that has been passed has been pointed directly at the Southland, and I am not arguing that there is not crime in the South, but the record will show that there is much more to the north, and that it has continuously grown with the appeasement and promotion of civil rights bills.

The burden of blame must be put on the demonstrators that are causing all of the unrest, and taken from the backs of the unprotected property owners. The Cramer amendment, passed today, might be known as the first small step back in the direction of giving some protection to the taxpayer. It is my observation that my northern colleagues are now waking up to some of the methods of these demonstrators now that they have these organizations actively stirring up trouble in their own backyards. One thing that has disturbed a lot of my northern colleagues about this civil rights bill is that it covers the Nation, and not just the Southland. Some of my dear liberal friends have reasoned with me that the civil rights bill of 1966 goes too far—and my observation is that the reason they agree so much is that it goes too far north.

One reason there has been so much crime, immorality, strife, bitterness and disrespect for law enforcement officers of our country, has been because of the sanction that has been given by the so-called Great Society and their keynote speakers such as Dr. Martin Luther King who said "Burn, baby, burn" while property was being destroyed by fire, and the black power screams by McKissick, Carmichael, and the Harlem hoodlum. Just recently, two Atlanta civil rights leaders reported that after the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee prevented a traffic arrest its chairman, Stokely Carmichael declared:

> This is what we mean by black power. If we organize, we can get what we want.

ZOO ANIMALS SAVED

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, because of the intense interest of the public and of my colleagues here in the Congress, I would like to address a few remarks to the fate of the 55 beautiful wild animals en route to the United States from Mombasa, Kenya.

Last week, the shipping company involved in the transportation of these rare animals, the Ned-Lloyd line, was informed by the Department of Agriculture that because of stops at unauthorized ports, the import permits for these animals had been cancelled. Consequently, these animals destined for 13 zoos across the country could not be unloaded at the Clifton Quarantine Station in New Jersey as had been planned. As the ship, the *Masslloyd*, had already sailed from Lisbon, the shipping company announced that unless the USDA would make alternative arrangements for the disposition of its cargo of giraffes, gazelle, hartebeest and other rare animals, it would have no alternative but to dump the entire load into the Atlantic Ocean.

At that time, I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and asked that he intervene to prevent the senseless deaths of these lovely animals. Newspapers, magazines, and radio and television gave wide publicity to the plight of these unfortunate animals. Hundreds of letters and telegrams were sent to the Department of Agriculture asking that it take steps to prevent this tragedy from occurring.

I am now very pleased to report that these animals have been saved. On Friday, August 5, 1966, a meeting was held at the Department of Agriculture in which Congressmen, representatives of the shipping company, the animal importers, representatives of the zoological institutions, the Humane Society, and Department of Agriculture officials attended.

There it was announced that the Department of Agriculture had obtained from the Department of Defense, Fort Slocum, on Davids Island located off of Long Island Sound which would be suitable for the additional 60 days quarantine required to insure that these animals were free of any disease. Such arrangements were acceptable to all parties concerned. The only question left unanswered was who was to undertake the construction of pens for the housing of these animals at Fort Slocum.

Later that afternoon, Agriculture announced that it was sympathetic to the problems involved and that it would be willing to share in the additional expenses required by the agreed upon procedure.

Yesterday, Agriculture informed me that all arrangements had been made. Agriculture is to construct the required pens at Fort Slocum, the shipping company will pay for the transportation of these animals to that island, and the animal importers will pay for the costs of maintaining these animals for the quarantine period.

I am informed that the 13 zoos involved, including the Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo in my own district, may expect to receive their animals in about 3 months.

HIGHER RESALE PRICE WOULD ENCOURAGE WHEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's announcement of higher wheat acreage for the 1967 crop is viewed with concern by many farmers as likely to weaken market prices.

If this concern is widespread it may well not only hurt farm income, but prevent the higher production of wheat which Mr. Freeman sees as necessary to meet domestic and oversea needs.

In a letter August 8, I recommended to Mr. Freeman that he use his discretionary authority to price Government wheat stocks high enough to keep them out of normal market channels. This would not cause a buildup of Government holdings beyond levels desired by the administration. On the positive side, it would certainly give farmers the price confidence they need in order to boost wheat production.

Otherwise they may not increase plantings as desired. In most areas they have a choice of land uses and will naturally turn to the ones most promising from the profit standpoint. The ever-present danger that even today's limited Government wheat stocks will be dumped in price-depressing manner is a constant worry to farmers.

If the resale price of Government holdings is increased to $2 a bushel, as I suggest, this would give assurance that competitive marketplace disciplines would operate unemcumbered by Government sales, unless the market price of course should rise to $2.

Here is the text of my letter to Mr. Freeman:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand you are giving consideration to a further increase in wheat acreage allotments, in order to assure adequate supplies for domestic and overseas needs. Under present government sales policies, I question whether the simple act of increasing allotments will bring the desired increase in production.

To assure the increase, I urge that you raise to $2 a bushel—80 percent of parity—the minimum price at which government wheat stocks can be sold during the 1967 marketing year. This will give farmers confidence they will not have cutrate competition from the government's Commodity Credit Corporation when they market their crop.

By pegging the minimum government sale price at $2, you would, in effect, isolate government holdings from market channels and let competitive disciplines fix prices and balance supply and demand. Government wheat trading would be at a bare minimum. No longer would farmers and other grain merchants have to reckon constantly with unpredictable government sales policies, because the market price would undoubtedly remain below $2.

I feel confident that this insurance against government dumping would inspire farmers to increase production to the desired level.

The new policy on sales would seem to conform ideally with Administration objectives.

It would help to assure the desired wheat production. It would meet the President's stated requirement that Commodity Credit Corporation be operated so as to enable farmers to get maximum income from the private market.

An undesired buildup of government stocks would not occur, because official estimates put the maximum carryover the increased acreage would produce at a level within the minimum stockpile objectives. Government costs would not be materially affected.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY.

A BILL TO COMBAT AND CONTROL WATER POLLUTION FROM BOATS, VESSELS, AND MARINAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this country has experienced such a growth of pleasure boating in the last decade that today, in terms of dollar volume, this is the most important form of recreation in America.

According to Thomas F. Kelleher, programing officer for boats and marinas within the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, in 1950 there were 3.5 million registered pleasure craft in the United States. By 1965 there were 45 million people enjoying pleasure boating in more than 8 million boats, indicating a ratio of 1 boat for every 25 people in the United States.

A similar rapid expansion has been witnessed in the related industries which serve the needs of the boats and boaters. Over 5,200 marinas now serve the American boating public on our lakes, rivers, and coastlines. Moreover, the boating industry was reported as doing a $2.7 billion annual business as of 1965.

The problem is, that while the American people are spending millions of dollars each year to enjoy the water, they are at the same time causing millions of dollars to be spent to clean the water which they use. The fun is taken out of pleasure boating when sewage and other wastes are expelled into the water, thereby polluting our rivers, draining our natural resources, and endangering our health.

Most small recreational craft have no waste treatment facilities, and thus, the water becomes the receptacle for the boat users' waste. About 90 percent of the larger covered boats being manufactured today have galley or toilet facilities or both and the waste collected is also discharged directly into our waterways. In addition, thoughtless users of all size boats bombard our waters with every conceivable variety of trash. Floating cans, bottles, cartons, boxes, paper, shoes, mattresses, and tires are all too frequently a part of our water environment.

Communities in the United States have invested nearly $3 billion since 1956 to build new and improved plants to treat sewage and other wastes. Industry to a large extent has joined in the fight for clean water. Every State in the United States has an active clean water program, which in turn is receiving support from the ambitious Federal water pollution control program. I have heretofore introduced on March 15, 1966, a bill, H.R. 13627 to assist the States in their water pollution programs. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, 1966, page 5839, for my statement on this.

We must not allow boat owners and users and related industries, such as marinas, to impede the substantial progress being made in the general area of water pollution control. It makes little sense to spend millions of dollars and time and effort only to have the pleasure of boating destroyed by thoughtless pollution and our lives endangered by littered and contaminated waters.

It is with pleasure that I note that the Senate included in this year's water pollution control bill (S. 2947), which recently passed the Senate, a provision authorizing an investigation of water pollution from boats and marinas. Section 18 of S. 2947 would authorize the Secretary of Interior to make a thorough study of water pollution from boats and vessels and to submit recommendations to the Congress by July 1, 1967. Unfortunately, however, the situation with respect to the pollution to our lakes, rivers and waterways has presently reached the critical stage.

Several interested citizens, including one of my constituents, Mr. Howard A. Zeimer, have suggested that concrete steps be taken now to reduce the tremendous volume of pollution being injected into our Nation's rivers, lakes, and waterways by boats and marinas.

From a practical standpoint, there are three principal types of antipollution treatment devices to control water pollution from boats: First, chlorinators are devices designed to hold sewage for at least a nominal period to permit introduced dosages of disinfectants to kill bacteria contained in them. Second, incinerators are units designed to trap the waste material, usually a previously inserted bag, and to hold the materials until the device is activated and the sewage materials burned. Third, the third type of treatment device, known as a holding tank, is simply a waste tank placed on board the vessel and attached to the main toilet so that materials are pumped from the toilet into the tank. The holding tank seems to have the greatest appeal to health officials, most likely because they are thought of as the next best thing to actually sealing a toilet. All three types have some advantages and certain disadvantages. The important thing to note is that there are presently treatment devices which can and should be used by boats to protect water presently being polluted.

At this very moment States are in the process of formulating regulations in their attempts to comply with section 10(C) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—Public Law 89-234. The States have a right to know what is expected of them in their efforts to cooperate with the Federal program.

Accordingly, I have introduced today a bill which would amend section 10(C) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide that the criteria and plans to be established for the States in compliance with section 10(C) of the act shall specifically include provisions and standards for the control of water pollution from boats and vessels and marinas.

This legislation, similar to that introduced in the Senate by Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, would go a long way to reduce the serious proportions which the problem of water pollution from recreational craft has reached.

The Pollution Study Committee of the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators has requested the Outboard Boating Club of America to prepare a model law dealing with the general subject of pollution from recreational craft.

Mr. Speaker, I include this model law at the end of my statement and following a copy of my bill, with the hope that the States will be provided with some guidelines which may be helpful in preparing their own regulations and insuring some degree of uniformity from State to State.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the millions of Americans who look to the beautiful waterways of America for their fun and relaxation to accept their sober responsibility in seeing to it that the water they use remains clean. I strongly urge cooperation between all segments of the population and the Federal, State, and local governments in the effort to retard the advance of pollution of our lakes, rivers, and waterways.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and because of my continuing interest in water pollution control, I hope that this legislation will receive the enthusiastic support of the House.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of my bill and the model bill, entitled "To prohibit littering and the disposal of untreated sewage from boats" follows:

H.R. 16938

A bill to provide that plans and regulations established pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the control of water pollution shall apply to vessels (including boats) and marinas

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) State criteria and plans for the purpose of paragraph (1) of this subsection and standards established by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2) shall include such provisions for the control of pollution of any kind from buildings, vessels, boats, or marinas including, but not limited to the discharge of any organic or inorganic matter which is injurious to edible fish and shellfish or the culture thereof, or from the dumping or release of garbage, oils, excrement, sludge or refuse of any kind into the water."

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT ESSENTIAL TO MEET THE WATER NEEDS OF THE EXPANDING WEST'S SPIRALING POPULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, America's population is rapidly increasing, particularly in the arid West. The basic need of future generations for water as a necessity of life must be met. The Colorado River Basin project, embodied in H.R. 4671 with its Hualapai—formerly Bridge Canyon—and Marble Canyon Dams, is essential for this purpose. Under the flag of conservation, the Sierra Club has mounted a vast national lobbying effort against these dams, alleging they will ruin Grand Canyon National Park and flood one of the great scenic wonders of the world. Many people have been taken in by these extravagant and completely erroneous charges. The Washington Post on July 14 put it succinctly and correctly by describing these claims as "plain nonsense."

The truth is that Marble Canyon Dam would be built 13 miles upstream from Grand Canyon National Park and nearly four times that distance—around 50 miles—from the traditional south rim observation points.

Hualapai Dam would be built 80.3 miles downstream from the western border of the park and 149.5 river miles from the south rim. Even the recreation lake created by Hualapai Dam would be 55.5 miles from the south rim.

No dams or lakes would be visible from any easily accessible public observation point anywhere in Grand Canyon National Park. The Colorado River would flow exactly as it does now through the 104 miles of the interior of the Grand Canyon National Park. The only effect would be a very narrow lake 13 miles along the park's western boundary, deep in a canyon the general public never sees or visits.

The park will not be flooded. It will not be inundated. It will not be ruined.

The very act of Congress in 1919, which created Grand Canyon National Park, provides specifically for hydroelectric developments in or along its borders. The act did not mention Marble Canyon for the simple reason it is not even part of the park.

The Sierra Club, having lost all perspective in a frenzy of exaggerated charges and with complete intolerance for any views but its own, has decided that it will accomplish its goal by the strategy of destroying one of the most delicately structured compromises ever placed before Congress. Its target is H.R. 4671, a bill which recognizes the needs for life-giving water of 30 million people now living in the seven States of Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California, and the double and treble times that many people who will be living there in generations to come.

And what is that goal? Time and again the Sierra Club and its allies have admittedly tacitly that the Grand Canyon is in no danger of ruination by this project. They have done so by saying, in effect, "we are taking on this project because it will set a precedent for building dams in national parks; we will beat this one and it will save the others." Now that is a piece of rationale that has more holes than a piece of old Swiss cheese.

Apparently they have forgotten, conveniently as usual, about beautiful Jackson Lake and dam in Grand Teton National Park, and beautiful Sherburne Lake and dam in Glacier National Park. And then there is Fontana Lake and dam that abuts Great Smoky National Park in the same manner which the proposed Hualapai Lake will abut the far northwest boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. All of these lakes have been visited by millions, who can tell you that these waters have enhanced—not ruined—the scenic surroundings.

Precedent having already been established, let us move on. I would remind my colleagues that the project will only be that contemplated by the act of 1919 establishing the park and providing in explicit terms for hydroelectric development. As a matter of fact, I seem to recall that the Sierra Club, as noted in its December 1949 bulletin, conditionally endorsed this very dam—the project its irresponsible leaders are now seeking to drown in a torrent of scare slogans, despite the fact its conditions have substantially been met.

And what other parks are they going to save? We now have almost 200 million Americans and not one of them—in public office or out—has proposed building any new dams in any other national park. There simply is no threat whatever of doing so.

The Sierra Club repeats its baseless charges at every opportunity despite the fact that reckless defeat of this project will relegate a major region of America to permanent drought and water shortage.

The Sierra Club and its madcap allies wantonly plunge toward their goal totally and unconscionably heedless of the catastrophic consequences and irresponsibly unmindful of the basic issue at stake. The issue is not conservation. It is water. The issue is not a place for man to play. It is a place for man to live.

The project opponents' tactics are to slander the dams by statements, speeches, newspaper ads, press releases, letters, articles, radio and television and almost every other means of communication known to man. Their primary objective is complete defeat of the bill. Failing that, they aim to lull the uninformed into supporting a substitute bill which would authorize only one of the many features of the basin project—the central Arizona project—with the remarkable allegation that this is the sole reason for the basin project anyway. I need only refer to the many statements of my Arizona colleagues, including former Senator Barry Goldwater, to demonstrate the falsity of this charge. I also remind the Sierra Club that when the central Arizona project was introduced as a separate project for the first time in 1947, it contained one of these dams—Hualapai Bridge—as a necessary part of that project and it has always been so considered. How much more necessary now is Hualapai, if needs in addition to Arizona's are to be met.

DROUGHT OR PLENTY?

H.R. 4671 realistically recognizes that the meager water supplies of the Colorado River are inadequate to meet the needs of our seven States, future growth and populations. Our starting point is the realization that we are dealing with a bankrupt river. The bill provides both for studies to determine feasible means of augmenting the regional water supply and the means to help pay for it; namely, the two dams. Without these dams seven States with an insufficient water supply are relegated to a certain future of deprivation, distress, and economic stagnation. Without these dams, and therefore without water augmentation, even the Sierra Club substitute containing only the central Arizona project would have only a 20-year life simply because increased water uses upstream in the years to come will consume the water otherwise available to it.

There are but two alternative results from this battle. If good sense prevails we will have the bill and we will have water. If the Sierra Club wins out there will be disastrous and lasting drought. Irrelevantly, in either event the Grand Canyon National Park remains essentially unchanged. With the dams the canyon will remain as it now is with this exception only: a narrow lake, about the width of a football field, running 13 miles along the northwest border of the park. Just how this could ruin the park, which is about the same size as the State of Rhode Island, is wholly inexplicable. However pure the motives of the Sierra Club may be, they do not excuse the perpetration of this ridiculous hoax on the American public about ruination of the Grand Canyon.

As a Californian I am particularly concerned that this irresponsible position of a usually responsible private club does not defeat H.R. 4671. Down the drain with the wreckage will go the water future of my own State and six neighboring States, simply because funds will not be available to augment the Colorado River's inadequate water supply. As a Californian I am also particularly concerned that the Sierra Club's fall back position of gutting the bill and its dams and building only the central Arizona project be rejected. California's stake in this bill is greater than many residents of my own State realize. Its present language is the result of months of hard-fought bargaining. The "central Arizona only" tack ignores the needs and rights of the six other States, each of which has a vital stake in this critically overtaxed river. It also dumps sound provisions of the bill which give my State basic and vital safeguards relative to the river.

These safeguards essential to California are:

BURDEN OF SHORTAGES

First. The burden of water shortage must be borne by the new central Arizona project. Diversions by that project must be reduced to the extent necessary to protect existing, long-operating projects in Arizona, California, and Nevada. However, California's protection also is restricted, necessarily, to 4.4 million acre-feet, because we agreed to that in the 1929 Limitation Act. We stand by our bargain with Arizona that this protection shall continue until, but only until, it is made unnecessary by the completion of works to import 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the Colorado. The Sierra Club substitute strikes out this protection for California, but authorizes the central Arizona project anyhow, thus imposing a surer shortage on the river while relieving Arizona from her already expressed willingness to bear the consequences. And to what gain? Practically nothing, as upstream water users will exercise their water rights, increasingly drain the river, and in doing so cut back the amount available to Arizona within about 20 years. Beyond then the shortages will be so severe that her project must be restricted in any event. No Californian can vote for giving away our hard-won agreement, which is in strict accord with the Supreme Court's 1964 decree. No other States' Congressmen should vote for a water project whose life may be foreshortened drastically while at the same time voting against the means of relieving that shortage. But this is just what the Sierra Club is asking Congressmen to do.

REALISTIC WATER AUGMENTATION INVESTIGATION

Second. There must be a realistic and immediate investigation of water augmentation projects to avoid shortages in the Colorado, coupled with fair and adequate protection for areas of origin. Shortage of water in the Colorado River Basin is inevitable unless the Basin's water budget is rebalanced. The water budget can be balanced either by increasing the supply, or decreasing the demands; that is, by reducing existing uses. The first creates new assets; the latter destroys existing ones.

Eighty percent of the water used in southern California comes from the Colorado River and our homes, farms, and factories are heavily dependent upon it. With more and more new residents arriving every day, it is obvious that more water is necessary, not less; yet again, this is what the Sierra Club is asking us to do. They tell us to build the central Arizona project which we know will reduce the water available to California—and we recognize Arizona's right to do this—yet in the same breath they erase even our investigation of sources to increase our supply. The bill as written calls for full investigation of means to augment the water supply by importation, by weather modification, by desalting or any other feasible means.

As water becomes more dear, the basin's five other States inevitably will feel the pinch. They are the club's secondary targets. Arizona does not ask for the reduction of the bill to a parochial central Arizona promotion by the elimination of those features of H.R. 4671 which make it a regional plan valuable to all seven States. Since Arizona does not ask that California or her other sister States commit hari-kari, why should any one else, or why should we volunteer?

DAMS MUST HELP FINANCE AUGMENTATION

Third. Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams must be in this bill for two reasons: First, to provide power for pumping central Arizona project water, a function which does not concern California particularly. Second, and more important from California's viewpoint, to provide revenues from power sales to be used for two purposes: First, to assist in the repayment of the costs of the central Arizona project to the extent that the water users cannot pay for it; and, second, to help finance whatever augmentation program or programs found feasible for balancing the Colorado's water budget.

Consider these two revenue functions in the same order. The two dams, in 75 years, are expected to produce a net income of about $1.2 billion to finance augmentation in addition to helping pay for the central Arizona project. The Sierra Club's plan to delete both dams would leave no money for augmentation. It would cast the whole burden of subsidizing the central Arizona aqueduct on Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams—that is, on the users of power produced by these dams, who would have to pay higher power rates to replace the lost Hualapai-Marble revenues. Who are these power users? Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, Southern California Edison Co., Imperial Irrigation District—these, among others pick up the tab. Metropolitan is the biggest single billpayer at Hoover Dam, paying as much as Arizona and Nevada combined. The Sierra Club simply commands California's power users to pay higher rates to subsidize a project which would take water away from them. We cannot buy it.

Next, if Hualapai and Marble are not to help us pay for augmentation, what will? There are only two prospects: the Federal Treasury, or California and Arizona water and power users. And just to rub it in, the Sierra Club wipes out our hard-won agreement with the Bureau of the Budget that the cost of the water import works necessary to meet the Nation's obligation to Mexico under our 1944 treaty shall be nonreimbursable. Scuttling this agreement casts an added burden, perhaps more than a billion dollars, on the water and power users of California and Arizona while depriving them of Hualapai and Marble revenues to help carry any of the burden. Attractive, is it not? Or is it?

GRAND CANYON'S "RUIN" A HOAX

The Sierra Club's agitation against Hualapai and Marble is the most outrageous demagoguery to hit town since Barnum left. Marble Canyon Dam, not in the Grand Canyon National Park at all but 13 miles above it, will not affect the "wild river" below it. The river ceased to be "wild" when Glen Canyon Dam, upstream from Marble, began storing water, as much water as Lake Mead. Marble will simply generate power with the water that Glen regulates and releases.

Hualapai is 80 and a fraction miles below the downstream park boundary. True, it will create a lake large enough to border, but not enter, the park for 13 miles. This lake will be 89 feet deep within a narrow inner gorge where it first touches the side of the park, dwindling to nothing 13 miles upstream. The canyon walls here are over 3,000 feet high. The ratio of 89 to 3,000 is about that of the thickness of a brief case, lying flat on the floor to the height of the ceiling. In length, the 13 miles of the canyon bottom, now inaccessible, that would be made visible from the new lake, bears about the ratio to the length of the river in the park as the length of a brief case, there on the floor, bears to the length of an average living room. As to relative volume, the ratio of the lake's little puddle to the vast emptiness of the canyon overlying it is too small to be calculated, a minuscule fraction of 1 percent. To say that this will "ruin," "inundate," and "flood" the Grand Canyon National Park, as the Sierra Club said in its paid advertisements in the New York Times and the Washington Post, deserves the reply made in the Post's editorial of July 14:

> It is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the Park as ruining the Grand Canyon.

Do not fall for it.

Not only will the Grand Canyon not be ruined, but a beautiful new lake stretching many miles up from Hoover Dam's Lake Mead will be created, accessible for the enjoyment of all Americans, not just a few hardier and wealthier Sierra Club types. It will be as lovely as Lake Powell, offering the area's beauty and inspiration to at least as many visitors as the 3.5 million people annually who visit Lake Mead—the beauty of a little fragment of the canyon bed now denied to all. Better than Lake Mead and Lake Powell, Lake Hualapai must be held to fluctuations of less than 10 feet by the terms of H.R. 4671. There will never be exposed mudflats.

The National Geographic magazine for July 1966, contains an article by the Director of the National Park Service about the population pressures on the national parks. See that article's breathtaking pictures of Lake Powell, being enjoyed by non-Sierra Club members, and of Rainbow Bridge, accessible now by a gentle hike from the lake that the Sierra Club so despises. Secretary Udall is quoted as predicting that in few years reservations, months ahead, may be necessary for overnight visitors to stay in Grand Canyon National Park. More recreational areas, like Lake Mead, Lake Powell, and Lake Hualapai, must be created to relieve the population pressure on national parks like Grand Canyon. It is a fine thing to be pronature, but to do so it is not necessary to be antipeople and antiwater. That is about the stance to which the Sierra Club's hysterical campaign has reduced that once respected organization.

STRIKE LEGISLATION NEEDED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **ROBISON**. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 12 of this year we convened here in this Chamber, in joint session, to listen to the annual state of the Union message of the President.

On that occasion, President Johnson—in his address—touched upon many things, and among those we find this statement of intention:

> I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

That Presidential request has yet to be received by this Congress.

Subsequently, in his annual Economic Report as transmitted by President Johnson to the Congress in January of this year, we find this passage:

> The recent transit strike in New York City illustrates our helplessness in preventing extreme disruption to the lives and livelihoods of a city of 8 million people. I intend to ask the Congress to consider measures that, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us to deal effectively with strikes that may cause irreparable damage to the national interest.

And that Presidential request has yet to be received by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, why has the President not followed through on his promise?

And it should also be asked for—contrary to what has seemed to be a developing trend whereunder Congress awaits executive initiative—Congress, itself, does indeed have a responsibility, too: Why has Congress not acted on its own?

This legislative area is one where action must perforce come slowly, for it is a most difficult and complex problem we face.

And, though it is not my intention to point the finger of political timidity at any one, I do state, unequivocally, that the public interest is not served by our continued improvisation in dealing with such disruptive strikes as the airline strike under which the Nation now suffers.

What is needed—and needed badly—is new, permanent legislation adding new tools to those now at hand for dealing with labor disputes of the type that—in the words of the President: "may cause irreparable damage to the national interest."

It is not my purpose here, today, to go into the issues involved in the airline strike—nor to discuss the provisions of the stopgap measure so recently passed in the other body and which may, or may not, eventually come before us for con-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

sideration as one method to use to produce a settlement of that strike.

Nor is it my purpose—since I am not well enough experienced in this area to try to do so—to even suggest what new, permanent legislation may now be needed.

What I would like to discuss is a method under which—the political pressures of an election year being what they are—the next Congress may be enabled to consider this national problem in the objective, responsible fashion it demands.

Mr. Speaker, I say "the next Congress" because I have no hope that this Congress can or will rise to the occasion. The buckpassing of the past several weeks which has reflected no credit on either the President or this Congress—the evident unhappiness in the other body with the stopgap measure they did finally manage to put together—the equally evident caution with which our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is approaching that measure, which seems to be unwanted by anyone—all these things have convinced me that, if anything useful is to be done, the next Congress will have to do it.

How can we now help it to act?

Let us look at that problem while we wait for some break in the present impasse.

Last Friday's lead editorial in the Evening Star—here in Washington—had this to say among other things:

> The Senate's strike bill now goes to the House, where its fate is uncertain. It contains one provision, however, which should stay in any bill that may finally emerge. It directs the Secretary of Labor to send recommendations to Congress by next January 15 for "improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes." Unless something of this sort is written into law, the American people can look forward to one strike after another in which they will be the real sufferers.

So far so good—for I would certainly agree that this is or could be one way toward obtaining the kind of action the next Congress will have to come up with.

But, it is the best or only way?

It seems to me it is not and, basically so, because this only puts us back more or less to the position we have been in since last January when such a recommendation was promised by no less a personage than the President.

It is also my understanding—though I have no proof of this—that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, now tends to feel that the existing machinery is adequate.

It is also my understanding that, though Executive Order 10198—which is the charter for the top-level Presidential Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy—lists collective bargaining procedures as first among its concerns, this Committee has not issued a report on this subject since May of 1962 and that no further reports are planned.

Though I dislike dealing in rumors, there is also a rumor to the effect that the President did, indeed, produce the promised administration draft bill sometime this past winter; that this was based on the Advisory Committee's 4-year-old report, and that the bill was then quietly circulated at the AFL–CIO convention at Bal Harbor in February where it did not receive a favorable reaction and that, since then, Secretary Wirtz has lost whatever initiative he may formerly have had in this direction.

Well, be all this as it may, what alternative source for legislative recommendations are there?

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to go back to the editorial page for an alternative.

In the Washington Post for last Friday, I also find this editorial comment on the airline problem and the need, again, for amending the Taft-Hartley Act and the Railway Labor Act so as to provide "improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes":

> We hope—

Says the Post—

> that the Administration will have constructive advice to give in regard to this problem by next January or before. But the truth of the matter is that the President and many of his aides have been studying the problem since last January without coming up with anything satisfactory. Nor has Congress produced any acceptable formula. In these circumstances it might be more useful to create a joint executive-legislative body to work out some feasible program than simply to kick the football to the White House end of the avenue.

Thus, the Post's suggestion—even though it overlooked the strong probability that, if the present "Alphonse and Gaston" act continues, anything we might kick to the White House end of the avenue would be kicked right back up to Capitol Hill.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what I think is wrong in this idea—for it, again, would leave us in somewhat the same situation as we now find ourselves with neither the Executive nor the Congress willing to grasp the initiative.

All right, then, where now?

Well, back to the editorial pages once more, and now, in the August 1 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, we find still another discussion of the universally agreed need for permanent legislation and this suggestion:

> Perhaps Congress, with the help of the Department of Labor, should draft the legislation. But we wonder if a broader viewpoint might not be needed. Would it not be worthwhile for the White House to appoint a national committee of scholars on labor questions to come up with recommendations? Such a committee would, or should, be free from political fear. It would, we hope, be free from either a pro-business or pro-labor bias.
>
> What are needed are recommendations which the American people can believe are drafted without fear or favor and solely in the broad national interest. We think that a non-partisan scholars' committee might provide an answer. Politics must not be allowed to hamper or delay early action from whatever source.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion makes eminently good sense to me—and I hope it does to my colleagues for I have, today, introduced legislation to create just such a Commission on Labor Relations, to be composed of 15 members of the academic community who are particularly qualified not only in the theory but in the practice of labor relations.

The members of the Commission—which would be a temporary body similar in nature and in power to others created to serve comparable purposes—would be chosen and appointed by the President on a nonpartisan basis, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and would be required to report back to both the President and the Congress with their recommendations for legislation within 6 months after creation of the Commission.

If we so reach outside the confines of official, politically hamstrung Washington for help in finding a solution to our problem, can we find, Mr. Speaker, qualified "scholars" in the labor relations field—as the "Monitor" describes them?

We most certainly can, and I need look no further in my own particular case for proof than to the campus of Cornell University, in my congressional district, where we find—as a contract college of the State University of New York—the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations. This school, created in 1944 with the Honorable Irving M. Ives, later a distinguished Senator from my State of New York, as its first dean, has become one of our country's outstanding centers for the study of industrial and labor relations. On its present faculty it now numbers several highly qualified and experienced individuals who would be outstanding candidates for Presidential consideration as appointees to serve on the Commission I suggest, and would, by virtue of their training, background, and experience, be capable of making a valuable contribution to the successful completion of its contemplated task.

There are other academic sources from which such "labor relations scholars" could be drawn. In fact, there are a surprising amount of such sources, having broad geographic-representative possibilities, and I would like to point out that many of the individuals who do serve, now, on the faculties of these schools have had, prior to such service, years of practical experience on either the labor side or the management side of labor relations, or on State mediation boards or on temporary fact-finding commissions involved with the settlement of labor disputes, prior to choosing an academic life, and that, since doing so, many of the same individuals continue to perform valuable services on such mediation boards, fact-finding commissions, and so on, in addition to their teaching duties.

So to those, Mr. Speaker, who might be inclined to say: "But why academicians only on your proposed Commission," with the thought in mind that those who might serve thereon were versed in the theory of labor relations but not experienced in the practical day-to-day application of that theory, I believe it could be answered that—if the members of my proposed Commission were picked with the care I know would accompany that requirement—these 15 individuals would be highly qualified for the difficult assignment we intend to hand them and, moreover, would carry the weight and respect required by both the public and the Congress to produce the progress toward new, permanent legislation now so badly needed in the public interest.

To those who might be interested in this suggestion—and obviously it is my hope that this includes the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now considering the Senate bill—the following is a partial list of some of the schools similar to that at Cornell from which members of my proposed Commission could be drawn:

Industrial Relations Center, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena.

Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley.

Industrial Relations Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.

Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Department of Industrial Administration, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

New York State School of Industrial & Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca.

Industrial Relations Division, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Harvard University Trade Union Program, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Industrial Relations Center, College of Business Administration, Univ. of Hawaii.

Institute of Labor & Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Personnel & Organizational Behavior, School of Industrial Relations, Univ. of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana.

Bureau of Labor Management, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Industrial Relations Center, Loyola University, Los Angeles.

Industrial Management Department, College of Business Administration, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Industrial Relations Section, MIT, Cambridge.

School of Labor & Industrial Relations, Michigan State, East Lansing.

Bureau of Industrial Relations, Graduate School of Business Administration, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, Wayne State University, Detroit.

Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Institute of Labor Relations, New York University, New York City.

Bureau of Business and Economic Research, Northeastern University, Boston.

Industrial Relations Section, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Labor Relations Institute, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras.

Labor Education Division, Roosevelt University, Chicago.

Institute of Management & Labor Relations, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Institute of Industrial Relations, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.

Industrial Relations Bureau, San Diego State College, San Diego.

Labor Management School, University of San Francisco.

Institute of Industrial Relations, San Jose State College, San Jose, California.

Division of Industrial Relations, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Institute of Industrial Relations, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Institute of Industrial Relations, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Industrial Relation Research Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Labor & Management Center, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, as earlier noted, it is my thought that the members of the proposed Commission should render their report within a 6-month period following its creation. That period may not be long enough, in view of the complexity of the problem. Perhaps a 9-month period, or even a full year would be better—and perhaps my feeling of urgency about the need to get at this problem has colored my judgment, here. But I am not wedded to any particular time period—nor for that matter, to any of the other provisions of my bill, if someone believes they can be improved upon.

I do believe, however, that this is a constructive suggestion—that it deserves early consideration by this Congress in the context of today's specific problem and in the light of tomorrow's certain need.

I trust, and hope, it will receive such consideration.

OUR CRUMBLING FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. foreign policy is crumbling and breaking up in failure. With each passing year the map of the free world shrinks and the territory of this planet which is exclusively dedicated to freedom diminishes. In 1917, 10.1 percent of the world's population lived in 8,603,000 square miles of Communist territory. In 1963, 34.99 percent of the world's population lived in a Communist world which includes 13,761,000 square miles.

The world map is a seething blot of Communist-inspired trouble and stands as convincing proof that dollar-sign diplomacy has failed.

The time has come when Congress, along with the executive branch of our Government, must take stock of our foreign policy failures, determine what caused them, and consider constructive suggestions for correcting what is wrong.

I address the House today in pursuit of these purposes.

An intelligent critique of our foreign policy must begin with an understanding of certain axioms. Communism does not take firm root in an affluent society but only where human beings are oppressed, hungry, and in need. And the shifting of power toward the political left usually follows inertia and indifference on the right.

It was the sweatshop and the exploitation of human labor by the industrial barons of the 19th century which paved the way for labor unions and the great control which they now exercise over national affairs.

It was the failure of organized medicine and private insurance companies to squarely face up to the fact that medical care for the aged was a serious problem, which finally led to medicare.

The failure of the automobile industry to do something about safety has led to the certainty of regulation by the Federal Government.

The failure of the South to recognize the inevitability of integration led to the violent upheavals of the civil rights movement.

An understanding of this point is crucial to an evaluation of American foreign policy since we find many of these same forces operating in foreign affairs.

For example, French colonialism and exploitation in Indochina gave communism its foothold. There, human problems were ignored by the French until it was too late and communism had won.

History has not been kind to exploitation and indifference. All too often the change which follows neglect and indifference to human problems is drastic and turbulent. Frequently the power structure shifts from one extreme to the other. And when it does, the uneducated, those unpracticed in the proper exercise of power, and those most susceptible to the promises of the Communists, are the ones who assume power.

Our foreign policy has never squarely faced these realities.

First, we held tenaciously to the principle of isolationism at a time when improving transportation and communication facilities were bringing us so close to the rest of the world that to ignore its existence was naive and impossible. Then we rushed to the opposite extreme to adopt an internationalist attitude, become the world's policeman, and carry most of the burden in the military containment of communism. In support of this policy we have handed out $100 billion to over 100 nations since World War II.

Our containment policy has failed miserably. Instead of being confined within Russia, communism has spread to China and is now creeping down all of Asia. It has made rapid inroads in India, all across the Middle East and particularly in Africa. It has been exported to Cuba in this hemisphere and is growing by leaps and bounds in South America. Since the Second World War communism has enveloped an additional 950 million human beings.

Lest we be overly disparaging of ourselves, let us not forget that when originally postulated in the late 1940's containment did represent an intelligent policy. Then the problem was precise and clear cut and it was simple enough to create military bastions against expansion of the Communist world by military force as we did in South Korea and in Europe. It was possible to maintain the independence of countries like Greece, Turkey, and Thailand, that were threatened by Communist insurgency. Our Marshall plan goal of preventing Communist exploitation of the economic chaos that prevailed in Europe after World War II was realized admirably. Because of our aid, much of Europe was saved from Communist takeover and to this day is free and prosperous.

Today, the nature of the challenge we face has changed, while our response to that challenge has not. With the exception of the Peace Corps, nothing new and imaginative in foreign policy has evolved in almost a generation.

Our aid to Europe following World War II was immediately successful because the skilled and energetic populations, good leadership, ideologies, and institutions needed for the rebuilding of Europe were already on hand. Our dollars alone were sufficient to push these countries back over the top. Today's critical areas—Asia, Africa, Latin America—almost totally lack such assets. In these new arenas of conflict, the struggle between the Communist and free world has thus been vastly complicated by the entrance of a new force—that of the submerged envy, hostility, and bitterness of the underdeveloped world. Here fancy technological projects are meaningless—and acceptance of communism is probable—because human beings are exploited, their basic needs are unmet, and their awakening human aspirations are unfulfilled.

The reasons for the success of communism and our failure to contain it in these new areas are, therefore, somewhat similar to those which have always produced violent and perhaps undesirable change—indifference to, and reluctance to actively seek new solutions to new challenges. Our recent aid programs have not been planned with an awareness that the source of power in any country must eventually be the people, and if they are exploited by the existing power structure, revolution or a violent swing to the left is likely.

Because of our reluctance to meddle in internal political affairs and influence foreign governments along democratic lines, we have accepted and worked with all kinds of leadership. As a result our aid has often gone to personal bank accounts and pet prestige projects of the exploiting and corrupt ruling classes, and has lost the trust of the very people we hoped to aid.

Under the naive assumption that dollars in sufficient quantity would buy friends, our aid has been misdirected and carelessly proliferated over one-half of the world's population. We have never stopped spending long enough to catch our breath and formulate realistic goals aimed squarely at the human problems of underdeveloped countries—overpopulation, disease, and the frustrated aspirations of exploited people.

This shotgun approach has spread our foreign aid too thinly to produce tangible change in the everyday lives of poor and oppressed peoples. The Communists by contrast have counteracted our aid on a selective basis with the pinpoint accuracy of a rifle. Their gains have been made by concentrating on one piece of geography while sowing the seeds of discontent among disadvantaged peoples in the next target area.

Clearly, the time has come for a serious reevaluation of our crumbling foreign policy and the development of a new and imaginative approach.

First, Americans must accept the reality, as President Kennedy suggested, that we alone cannot right every wrong, nor reverse every adversity. There cannot be an American solution to every world problem for the simple reason that we have neither the capacity nor should we have the desire to become the world's conscience or its police force.

It is essential that we show by word and deed that we favor and insist upon free elections in Vietnam, and serve notice that we will abide by the outcome of such free elections even to the point of withdrawing from our position there. If our national administration is to justify its position in Vietnam as opposition to the use of force by Communists in imposing their political system on the South Vietnamese, then we must be certain that we are not guilty of the same offense. Strict adherence to the principle of self-determination would eliminate much of the seeming inconsistency in our present position in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Further, plans should be made for a conference of the United States, Australia, and all free Asian nations which have demonstrated a desire for self-determination and to oppose Communist aggression. The purpose of this meeting would be to arrive at a free Asian policy on Vietnam, to formulate a plan for resistance to Communist aggression and for each country to make the necessary economic, financial, and military commitments to implement the plan agreed upon. The Asian nations under the Communist gun must decide for themselves if they truly want to resist Communist aggression. If the United States cannot achieve the clear-cut approval and support, including military, of free Asia, then it is time to reappraise our military commitment.

Another major effort in a new national strategy should be directed toward a reevaluation of international organizations and regional agreements with an aim to revitalizing them.

The United Nations must be preserved and strengthened as a social action agency and international forum. Unfortunately, with its tremendously increased membership, the U.N. is now numerically dominated by countries which do not consider the difference between democracy and communism as significant in keeping the peace. To new nations inexperienced in either system, communism is not necessarily to be dreaded or democracy to be cherished. As a result these nations avoid a philosophical confrontation of the two systems.

So, the United Nations is completely shackled whenever the issue of communism is involved. It is undoubtedly useful as a forum for the discussion of international differences, but the free world needs a forum where communism and the international Communist conspiracy is recognized for what it is—as a force dedicated to aggression and in conflict with the spirit of the U.N. Charter. To this end I have introduced legislation which would be a first step toward the creation of a Council of Free Nations, as suggested by former President Herbert Hoover. The Council would not replace the United Nations but would supplement it. Because opposition to communism would be a requirement for membership, it would not be important, as the U.N. presently is, whenever the best interests of communism conflict with the best interest of peace.

It is urgently necessary that the unity of the 40 Western nations be revitalized to avoid contrary policies which defy a common interest. Atlantic Union envisions bringing these nations together under an effective international agency to coordinate efforts, and equalize responsibilities.

Such a Union is worthy of our earnest study and thought. We should not shrink from such study in the face of a doctrinaire assumption that Atlantic Union would dilute our sovereignty and freedom. The freedoms supposedly lost would be those which no citizenry should expect in today's world—the freedom to undercut, to work at cross purposes, to involve others in a crisis which they had no voice in making, and perhaps the freedom to shirk responsibilities in defense of freedom while throwing the burden on others.

If the free will seize the initiative and act together, we, not our adversaries, may determine how history is to be written. This is why I have joined with a large bipartisan group of both conservatives and liberals in introducing a resolution to form an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 eminent citizens including former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower to explore the possibility of Atlantic Union with other free Western nations.

In the meantime and of great urgency is the strengthening of NATO which is so deeply in difficulty at present. It would be folly of the highest order to misinterpret recent Russian actions as a lessening of her aggressive instincts and as justification for letting NATO collapse. A look at military reality shows clearly that such a policy would be wishful and foolish thinking. The U.S.S.R. still has 95 divisions west of the Urals, 20 of which are capable of launching a surprise attack. There are 800 missiles trained on every target in Europe, and despite claims to the contrary, Russia has never cut her defense budget and is actually increasing the strength she can throw against Europe. She is stronger today than when the NATO treaty was first signed in 1949.

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—was critically weakened and failed its first test in 1961 when the United States, acceding to French and British wishes, did not support SEATO members who wanted to meet the Communist threat in Laos. SEATO must be given stronger U.S. support so that its membership can be enlarged to maintain an effective military force capable of maintaining peace. SEATO must, of course, be charged with the responsibility of carrying out policies agreed upon in a Free Asian Conference. It is also vital that SEATO nations commence common funding for an enlarged and soundly based program of social and economic development. This aspect of SEATO was stressed in the original treaty but has been largely ignored.

As previously indicated we need a complete change in our approach to foreign aid. It is essential that we discard notions based on emotion or outmoded policies which were successful in another and different era. We must update, modernize our thinking, and determine what will work in 1966, not what worked under the circumstances of 1945.

Perhaps we have forgotten to press our natural advantage; the proven fact that a free society will always outstrip one which is regimented. If given the right kind of aid in sufficient volume to overcome economic inertia, a new nation which can use the full resources of a free people will do the best job of satisfying its people's needs.

Our aid should be strictly limited to places where it can do tangible good and to countries whose institutional structures are dedicated to the maximum well-being of their own citizens. The value of our aid dollars would be immeasurably enhanced by concentrating them on countries which are effectively pursuing self-help policies and working to combat their own social problems. Under these circumstances our foreign aid expenditures would yield identifiable improvements in the life of the average citizen, and provide a concrete answer to the deceptive claims and false promises of communism. Under no circumstances should we delude ourselves that aid to Communist countries through Communist leaders may wean those leaders from their beliefs. American aid must never again be given at the sacrifice of principle.

By focusing our aid upon selected areas of the world where we know we can do a good job, we could create "islands" of freedom surrounded by seas of communism. The contrast between the two ideologies or systems would be spotlighted and featured "front and center" on the international stage.

Berlin, for example, has provided a true showcase of what freedom can do. Even after the concentrated effort of the Communists for more than a dozen years, the stark contrast between East and West Berlin is obvious the moment one crosses to the East at Checkpoint Charlie.

Japan with its thriving free economy and great prosperity stands in striking contrast to Red China and Communist-dominated countries.

Formosa, which got its start from American foreign aid and is now self-sufficient, is increasing its gross national product at fantastic rates and is fast pulling itself out of poverty.

These countries stand as examples of what freedom can achieve if it is assisted in an effective manner by the free world.

By selecting what we feel we can afford and doing a forceful job of seeing that freedom works in those spots, we can do more toward containing communism than all of the billions of dollars in foreign aid and our widespread military involvements of the past 15 years.

In each island of freedom, exploitation of human beings must be eliminated as a condition for our aid. And we must rigidly require that no recipient of aid may "play both sides of the street."

Our islands of freedom, like oil spots, would expand outwardly to envelop ever-increasing areas and groups of people who would crave a taste of the success they see at the center. They could be the key factor in our effort to foster a world of strong and independent nations in which peace is maintained by the cooperation of free men.

Finally we must not forget the psychological lessons we should have learned in the last 20 years of the cold and hot war against communism. In the battle for men's minds the initial advantage is frequently decisive, particularly in backward and impoverished areas. It should be obvious by now that the Communist system of propaganda and subversion is working and that our response has been of the wrong kind and too late.

In view of our consistent failure to match Communist propaganda, does it not seem wise that we take stock of what has produced the success of our enemies and meet it on the ground of that success?

After Lenin and his followers assumed power in Russia, they established a training system that has grown to 6,000 special schools which teach the tactics of espionage, subversion, infiltration, agitation, and propaganda. Admittedly, this is not a proper free world tactic, nor would we want it to become our practice. The basis of freedom is freedom of choice, and we do not wish to impose our choice upon others. To do so would be to defile the essence of freedom. But to allow a vacuum into which Communist propaganda can move is to create an environment where the Communist way can win without opposition. This is not freedom of choice.

Our State Department employs the cliche "indoctrination" to indict any suggestion from non-State Department sources for a propaganda effort to influence people in behalf of freedom as opposed to communism. This reaction is a carryover from the modern intellectual's proper and justified respect for academic freedom. But it employs a basic fallacy.

Academic freedom exists in an academic environment where knowledge is freely available. But in the target areas for Communist propaganda, only Communist knowledge is available unless we present the other side. It is not indoctrination when one side presents its case, knowing full well that the other side will do likewise. To reject our propaganda mission, then, is to promote indoctrination rather than renounce it.

Our long and consistent record of failures to meet the Communist propaganda offensive proves that it is time to break the diplomatic monopoly which seems to consider any public relations or educational program that the State Department does not suggest and control as "indoctrination."

Psychological warfare, public relations, propaganda, or whatever you choose to call it, is a science and a definite technique which must be learned through specialized instruction. Our diplomats have often failed because they have not been trained in a highly skilled technique. It is time we recognized that Communist propagandists have filled the vacuum caused by the inactivity of freedom's proponents and are winning the war for men's minds.

To fill this vacuum, I have introduced legislation to create a Freedom Academy. If enacted it would give our overseas personnel the training which will enable them to recognize Communist propaganda for what it is and resist it on the spot. It will train them to act instead of react.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, if the Gospel according to St. Luke is ever to be realized, if mankind is ever to know "On earth peace, good will toward men," then the United States of America must lead the way.

As a nation which proudly claims "In God we trust," we cannot shirk the responsibilities of world leadership which history has thrust upon us. We can do nothing less than take up the burden and lead mankind in the continuing quest for peace.

We must recognize our failures.

We must candidly assess the strength of the forces which work against us.

We must review our mistakes and determine to correct them.

We must abandon the false premise that enough American dollars carelessly spread across the globe will buy peace.

We must dampen the fervor of those who say that military force alone can stop Communist aggression.

We must resist the urging of those who would concede principles bit by bit and appease an aggressor.

We cannot isolate ourselves and hope to contain the forces of aggression.

Nor can we adulterate our leadership by attempting the impractical and impossible.

The time has come when this Nation must embark upon a consistent foreign policy based upon principles which do not vary from Rhodesia to Vietnam, and which recognizes individual human beings, their hopes and legitimate aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, throughout these remarks I have tried to deal in specifics, but it may be best to conclude with a generality which should form the basis of every specific in our national strategy. Money and force, admittedly useful tools in the building of peace, are secondary to human considerations. And any foreign policy which does not recognize this fact is doomed to failure.

As John Milton wrote:

> Who overcomes force, hath overcome but half his foe.

HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT PLAN

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to announce that Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., a pharmaceutical firm of Nutley, N.J., has taken the initiative to inaugurate a medicare reimbursement plan. This program is offered to the Nation's 10,000 hospitals and provides a 25-percent discount on all Roche prescription drugs used by medicare patients during their hospitalization.

The medicare reimbursement plan is designed to ease the financial burden of medicare to the public and is in accordance with President Johnson's plea to prevent spiraling costs. It is a supplement to the Roche indigent patient program and is another example of the humanitarian spirit of this company promoted by its president, Dr. V. D. Mattia.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The latter program permits physicians in private practice to obtain any Roche drug for needy patients without charge.

I am indeed privileged to represent this forward-moving company within my district and wish to commend Hoffmann-La Roche for being the leader in establishing such a worthy program. I wish to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on August 7, 1966, citing this public-spirited program.

DRUG PRICES REDUCED FOR MEDICARE

(By John Soloway)

A multi-million dollar program to ease the financial burden of Medicare to the public—the first in the nation—was inaugurated yesterday by a New Jersey pharmaceutical company.

Details of the plan, characterized by drug industry figures as "bold" and "public-spirited," were revealed by Dr. V. D. Mattia, president of Hoffmann-La Roche Inc, of Nutley.

The program, lauched by Roche Laboratories division of the worldwide drug firm, offers the nation's 10,000 hospitals a 25 per cent discount on all Roche prescription drugs used by hospitalized Medicare patients.

SAVINGS PASSED ON

The hospitals, in turn, woud pass on the savings from the "Roche Medicare Reimbursement Plan" to the federal government.

The discount plan, it was noted, supplements the Roche Indigent Patient Program, instituted in 1962, through which physicians can obtain any Roche product without charge for the treatment of needy patients, regardless of age.

In announcing the discount program in behalf of Medicare, Dr. Mattia, a Newark-born physician, said in letters to the nation's 300,000 doctors:

"We initiate the Roche Medicare Reimbursement Plan with deep conviction in an effort to help ease the financial burden of Medicare to the public, and with an abiding awareness of our civic responsibilities.

"It is another way in which we seek," added Hoffmann-La Roche's president, "to strengthen traditional physician-patient relationships. We welcome widespread hospital participation."

Under the new Roche plan, hospitals need only to complete a simple four-by-six inch agreement of participation form to obtain the 25 per cent discount on Roche drugs used by hospitalized Medicare patients.

The reimbursement to hospitals will be made quarterly by Roche Laboratories, accarding to Dr. Mattia's letter to hospital administrators and pharmacists, copies of which were scheduled for mailing tomorrow to physicians as well.

Hospitals will be required to furnish a patient's Medicare number, the name and quantity of the Roche prescription drugs dispensed and the purchase price of the medicine.

A Roche company spokesman said Medicare authorities and other government officials had been advised of the Nutley firm's plan, and the reactions were "quite gratifying."

Inauguration of the Medicare discount plan is the second major program in two months announced by Roche since Dr. Mattia became the company's president last Jan. 1.

In May of this year, Hoffmann-La Roche's chief executive developed a joint research venture with the Radio Corporation of America under which RCA will manufacture and Roche will market medical devices stemming from the project.

Meanwhile, Warner-Chilcott Laboratories in Morris Plains announced a 15 per cent reimbursement to state governments on its products prescribed for patients under welfare medical assistance programs.

Under the programs, retail pharmacists supply medication to the medical assistance patients and are then reimbursed by the state.

According to Robert B. Clark, Warner-Chilcott president, "The plan assures the welfare patient the same freedom of choice in selecting his pharmacy as enjoyed by the private patient. It also gives the physician wider latitude in prescribing medicines consistent with the highest quality of medical care.

Warner-Chilcott's program was developed over the past few months after consultations with Dr. Joseph Pesare of Rhode Island and other state medical officers.

Under terms of the plan, Warner-Chilcott will reimburse the state 15 per cent of the actual cost to the pharmacy for medicines dispensed under the program on all products in its line except Coly-Mycin, an antibiotic used almost exclusively in hospital practice.

To receive this monthly reimbursement, a participating state must simply furnish Warner-Chilcott with a monthly total of all company drugs dispensed by retail pharmacies under the medical assistance program.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR STRIKING OF ELLIS ISLAND COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL "LIBERTY SERIES" ISSUE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce today a bill to provide for the striking of a fourth medal in the Liberty series of commemorative historic medallions. In the Senate, Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY of New York are today sponsoring identical legislation.

On January 13, 1964, President Johnson approved an act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board, a series of three medals. These medals, authorized by Congress, and created by the Department of the Treasury, were in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, the Castle Clinton National Monument, and the Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration. It was my honor, as the Representative wherein these landmarks lie, to have introduced this legislation.

On May 11, 1965, President Johnson signed a proclamation making Ellis Island a historic landmark as an adjacent part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York Harbor. Ellis Island is also part of my congressional district; hence my desire to introduce this legislation to commemorate the new historic landmark.

This fourth medal, if authorized, will be designed in the Philadelphia Mint to conform with the previously issued medals. The face will be identical in design with the others, presenting the Statue of Liberty National Monument as "Liberty Enlightening the World." The reverse side will depict the main immigration depot buildings still standing on Ellis Island through which passed some 16 million immigrants who came to this country in the late 19th and early 20th centuries to find freedom.

The new bill calls for a total issue of no more than 255,000 medals to be struck over a period ending December 31, 1968. This conforms to the number of each of the medals previously authorized by Congress for creation by the Department of the Treasury. The New York City National Shrines Board will continue, as previously authorized, to supervise the sale of the Ellis Island commemorative medals, as well as the others in the series remaining unsold.

The gross sale of the Liberty series of medallions thus far issued has exceeded a total sum slightly in excess of $129,500 since the first medal was placed on sale at Federal Hall National Memorial on Constitution Day, September 17, 1964. Through the continued sale of the three previously authorized medallions and the sale of this fourth Ellis Island medallion it is hoped that sufficient funds will be obtained from the general public, to be turned over to the National Park Service, to pay—together with a contribution from the Federal Government—for the construction and maintenance of the shrines.

I believe the enactment of this bill will be of material aid in achieving completion of these great historic landmarks.

A bill to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City, New York

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in commemoration of the designation by the President of the United States of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York City, New York, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board a fourth medallion in the Liberty Series of no more than two hundred and fifty-five thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the advisory board in quantities of not less than two thousand. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such cost.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this bill shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such advisory board.

SEC. 4. After December 31, 1968, no further medals shall be struck under the authority of this Act.

VIETNAM WAR'S IMPACT: ECONOMY IS HARDLY HURT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a very perceptive article from the New York Times for August 8, 1966, on the impact of the Vietnam conflict upon the American economy. Presented against the historical background of the effect of earlier 20th century military engagements on the economy, the author concludes that our present economy has hardly been hurt, inflation has been minimal. His article is an excellent analysis. It is also a factual response to those allegations about impending inflation and the importance of military spending in causing inflation. Even more, the article is a tribute to the general health and viability of the American economy today, particularly in comparison with foreign countries now and our own economic picture of the past.

The article follows:

VIETNAM WAR'S IMPACT: ECONOMY IS HARDLY HURT

(NOTE.—This is the first of four articles in which correspondents of The New York Times have attemped to estimate the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy, the nation's politics, the lives of its citizens and foreign policy.)

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr., special to the New York Times)

WASHINGTON, August 7.—In the first six months of this year sportsmen and business executives bought more than 8,000 private airplanes, easily a record and nearly half again as many as those purchased last year.

This footnote to the American economy in 1966 illustrates a major truth about the war in Vietnam.

The war has had distinct effects on the economy and on the people and businesses that make it up, but the effects have been far less than in any other war in modern times.

Figuratively speaking, the extraordinary American economy is carrying the war on its little finger, although the finger hurts a bit.

Guitar strings have been reported in short supply in some music stores around the nation, and some retailers of men's suits complain that there have been delays in deliveries of a few sizes and models of fall suits because of the Government's demand for military uniforms.

As everyone knows, however, there has been nothing remotely resembling a shortage of consumer goods, as has occurred in past wars. From air-conditioners to gasoline, from swimsuits to rugs, the effort has been to sell rather than to turn customers away. Automobile dealers have the biggest unsold stocks of cars in history.

Prices have gone up—housewives are conscious of paying about 8 per cent more for meat than a year ago—and the costs of medical care have soared. Last week President Johnson lost a battle with the steel industry over a price increase, and investigators sprouted over higher prices for the consumer staples, bread and milk.

However, the inflation has been very small by comparison with the zooming price increases of the Korean War, World War II or even World War I.

For example, measured by the Government's Consumer Price Index, the rise in prices of the last 12 months of 2.5 per cent was only one-fourth as great as in the first year of the Korean War. Some items, such as automobiles, are cheaper now than they were a year ago.

FOOD PRICES CITED

Much of the price increase, and the hurt for the consumer, has been in food, where overall prices are up nearly 4 percent from a year ago. However, a reduced baby pig crop, drought and a smaller number of dairy cows have had far more to do with this rise than the war.

As for steel, prices have gone up much less than in the last peacetime inflation, in 1956–58.

Over-all, wholesale and retail prices have risen in the first half of this year at an annual pace of 3.5 per cent, enough to worry seriously both consumers and the Government, but less than in nearly all other industrial countries, which are not a war.

Taxes have gone up. The Government took away in April the reduction in the excise tax on telephone bills it had given in January, and it did the same for a 1 per cent tax on automobiles, amounting to from $20 to $35 a car.

These increases, however, are minor by comparison with the big cuts in income and excise taxes of 1964 and 1965, and by comparison with the tax increases of previous wars. The main change has been merely a speed-up in tax collections, including graduated withholding taxes that had long been advocated on their own merit.

TAX CUT CONJECTURED

What is more, there are reputable economists who think the Government will be considering another tax cut next year, with the war still going strong.

Interest rates have gone up—indeed, one of the steepest increases on record. Many individuals trying to buy a home have found a mortgage difficult to obtain, and new homebuilding has slowed.

This "tight money" situation, not altogether caused by the war, has not, however, prevented a record expansion of total lending in the economy. The individual with a reasonable credit standing who could not get a personal loan has yet to turn up, and one personal finance company is drawing up business by sponsoring the Washington Senators' baseball games.

Business loans by banks have grown more rapidly in the last six months than in all but one or two years in the last 20. Even mortgage financing has only slowed, not stopped.

The war has worsened supply troubles in a few metals, such as copper and molybdenum. Some types of aluminum are on a delayed delivery basis and electric wire has been hard to acquire in the quantities manufacturers have wanted. As noted, textile and apparel mills have been hard put to fill Government orders at a time of booming civilian business, and some use of direct priority orders has been required.

There is a severe shortage of skilled manpower in the precision machining industry. As an example of how the problem can be made worse, nine out of the 23 apprentices in Muskegon, Mich., being especially trained to fill the gap, with Federal training funds, have been taken away by the local draft board.

CONTROLS SYSTEM LACKING

Despite these and other examples, and in sharp contrast to prior wars, there is no system of general allocations controls over materials or manpower, simply because one is not needed. In contrast with World War II and the Korean War, when every pound of the key metals and other materials was allocated by the Government, this time there is only a system of priorities for defense and one or two nondefense purposes, limited to steel, copper, aluminum and nickel. The "set-aside" of steel production for military purposes is only 6 per cent of total production, of copper and aluminum 13 per cent. Autos, highway bridges, color television sets and pleasure boats are jointly consuming far more of these metals than the war.

Moreover, in a telling illustration of the total picture, a spokesman for the precision machining industry, after describing the desperate labor shortage, recently told a House subcommittee on small businesses that was investigating problems of related industries that if the war should "dry up" tomorrow, the machine tool industry would still have nearly as great a problem.

The war has cost the Government money, and thus has reduced the availability of funds for domestic purposes. The President's budget last January cut $1.6 billion from the amount authorized in about 25 new Great Society programs in health, education, antipollution and the like.

In addition, only minor increases were permitted in two of the most important new programs—antipoverty and aid for elementary and secondary education. Such promising new ideas as automatic sharing of part of the Federal income tax with the states and direct income transfers to the poor were pigeonholed because of the $10.5-billion war cost estimated for the fiscal year 1967, which began on July 1.

The new welfare programs are not the only ones affected. Government public works starts were cut in half in the new budget, and the space agency, although still given the sizeable sum of $5-billion, was denied a few glamorous items, such as an advanced orbiting solar observatory, and suffered a reduction of planning funds for what comes after the first landing on the moon.

SOCIETY PROJECTS ON INCREASE

This is only part of the picture, however. In dramatic contrast with the past, spending on the new Great Society programs, although less than the full amount authorized by Congress is actually increasing in this fiscal year by more than $3-billion—and this does not take into account the start of the expensive new Medicare program.

In the last fiscal year, with defense outlays building up, total domestic spending, including Social Security, far from declining, rose $7.5-billion from the previous year.

Also in contrast with the past, the budget deficit has declined despite the war, and there is a chance that the budget will have a surplus in the current fiscal year.

Prices, taxes, credit, Government spending, shortages—all tell the same story. The war has had an effect, but an astonishingly small one.

TWO REASONS GIVEN

The explanation for this picture is agreed to by most economic analysts in and out of of the Government. It has two parts. Both are in a sense obvious, but they do not appear to be altogether appreciated by the public.

One is that this is the first time the United States has entered a major war with a very large existing defense establishment. This means, simply, that the needed build-up has been comparatively small.

When the Korean war broke out, total military personnel numbered only 1.5 million and this jumped to 3.3 million in a year, or a rise of more than 100 percent. Equipment and weapons requirements increased proportionately.

This time the build-up in a year has been from 2.7 million men to 3.1 million, or about 15 per cent increase. No conceivable increase will equal or approach the Korean experience.

The defense budget more than doubled the first year of the Korean War from $12.5-billion to $30.5-billion, and it rose to $47-billion

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in the next 12 months. This time the increase in the first year was about $7-billion, to $54-billion, or only 15 per cent, and the next year's increase is likely to be about the same.

A MATTER OF SIZE

The second reason given for the relatively small impact of the war on the economy is the size of the American economy.

In the first year of the war since the major commitment began last July the gross national product—the total output of goods and services, and the best measure of the over-all output of the economy—has averaged $711-billion. The $6-billion cost of the war in that period represents the amazingly small amount of eight-tenths of 1 per cent.

The entire defense outlay, war costs included, ran less than 8 per cent of the gross national product by the second quarter of this year, less than some recent peacetime years when the gross national product was smaller.

By contrast in the Korean War this proportion zoomed from 4.5 per cent before the war started to 11.3 per cent a year later and eventually to 13.6 per cent.

This single figure—a war cost of less than 1 per cent of the gross national product up to now—tells why the impact of the war, relatively speaking, has been so slight on the normal life of the economy. A $6-billion war in any other economy would have a far greater effect.

The cost of the war, of course, is still rising. At present it is probably running at an annual rate of about $12-billion or a little more, with total defense outlays now at a rate of about $60-billion.

However, the gross national product is also rising—hence the capacity to absorb the war with little strain. Unless the nature of the war changes—to an all-out conflict with Communist China, for example—the cost of the war above "normal" defense spending is unlikely ever to rise above 2 percent of the gross national product. It is now about 1.5 per cent.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT

The relatively small impact of the war as measured against the total size of the economy has had its counterpart in unemployment figures.

In past wars the economy quickly moved to full employment—and a manpower shortage. This time, too, the war has spurred an economy already nearing full employment and added to the number working.

However, the improvement seen in perspective, has not been spectacular.

In the 12 months from June 1964, to June 1965, as the economy was roaring ahead under the impetus of the big tax cut of 1964, the unemployment rate was reduced from 5.4 percent of the labor force to 4.7 per cent.

In the next 12 months, with the war providing the additional stimulus, the rate dropped from 4.7 per cent to 4 per cent—exactly the same decline. There were still 3.1 million persons out of work in June, even after allowing for the normal rise at the end of the school year.

A DRAIN ON GOLD

In specific communities, of course, defense spending has had a much bigger impact than in the nation as a whole. For example, unemployment has been sharply reduced in the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia because of expanded helicopter production by the Fairchild Aircraft Company at nearby Hagerstown, Md.

Jobs attributable to defense, however, remain less than 10 per cent of the total, and the increase in jobs because of additional defense spending caused by the war appears to be no more than 2 per cent of the total. This does not count the 400,000 additional men in uniform.

Despite the relatively small impact of the war at home, it has had one serious economic cost not felt by the ordinary citizen: It is directly responsible for sharply worsening the deficit in the balance of international payments after a heartening improvement in 1965.

The direct foreign exchange cost of the operations in Vietnam will be an estimated total of $750-million this year. What is more serious, an unknown number of these dollars are finding their way to France, which now converts every dollar it receives into gold at the United States Treasury.

The worsening of the balance of payments has not brought on any financial crisis, nor does it threaten to do so, but it has delayed the day when the gold outflow will be stopped.

What if the war should end? What then for the economy?

James R. Hoffa, the president of the international brotherhood of Teamsters, has forecast a sharp jump in unemployment and, among other things, a consequent weakening in union bargaining power. There can be little doubt that millions of citizens instinctively fear that the present boom is a result of the war and that peace would bring economic trouble.

Once again, however, most experts disagree.

Defense spending, to begin with, would not decline abruptly but would taper off, they say. Some part of the reduction, they explain, would be replaced by the economic cost of reconstruction in Vietnam, possibly in both north and south, which could run $1-billion a year or even more.

Regardless of how much or how little defense outlays—and defense manpower—decline, the economic impact can be readily offset in either or both of two ways.

One is a tax reduction, which in effect simply replaces Government spending with private spending. The total demand of goods and services is unimpaired, although some individual businesses gain orders and others lose them.

The other offsetting factor is an expansion of Federal domestic spending. There is no lack of ideas for enormous expansion of outlays on the home front, ranging from direct transfer of income to the poor to a huge assault on the educational deficiencies of Northern slum areas. Spending on a number of Federal programs has been curtailed, although not reduced, by the war, and expansion could come quickly.

"I am convinced," said one respected Wall Street analyst the other day, "that peace would be bullish—bullish for the economy and bullish for the stock market."

Many economists agree.

FUTURE IS WEIGHED

Assuming no early peace, is the strain on the economy likely to increase as spending on the war continues to rise?

The strain might become a little more noticeable, depending on the place at which defense spending increases. However, although the Government has refused to divulge its latest estimates on defense outlays, officials are now assuming a rate of increase no greater than in the last 12 months.

This would mean some further rise in defense costs in relation to the national economy, with the "add-on" caused by the war coming to about 2 per cent of the gross national product in the first half of next year. Budget expenditures for defense will clearly be larger than the $58.3-billion estimated in the budget last January for the current fiscal year—probably about $5-billion higher.

Revenues, however, are growing, too, and faster than estimated. The best evidence that the war is not causing a drastic change in the Government's financial situation is in the magnitude of the Treasury's planned borrowing, which is actually a little less in the last half of this year than had been estimated several months ago.

Meanwhile, industry is adding to its plant and equipment at the record rate of $60.8-billion this year. This means that the capacity of the economy to meet the demands of defense without cutting back on the civilian economy is growing in line with the expanding defense expenditures, and possibly faster.

NO SHORTAGES FORESEEN

In any event, almost no one foresees what has been associated with war in the past—shortages of consumer goods, raging inflation, enormous Government budget deficits and the like.

Some economists, such as Oscar Gass of Washington, believe that economic capacity from now on will grow faster than total demand, including demand from war spending. In this picture, unemployment would be rising a little by the end of the year, with the war going full blast, and the Government might well be considering a tax cut to stimulate the economy.

If this happened, or if the President felt called upon to propose an increase of from $5-billion to $10-billion in domestic spending, it would be the most dramatic evidence yet of how readily a three-quarter-trillion dollar economy can cope with what is, after all, a sizable war.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, KINGS POINT, N.Y.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the 19th meeting of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy was held at the administration building at the Academy in Kings Point, N.Y., on January 14, 1966. Present were Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, Representative Lester L. Wolff, of New York, Hugh L. Carey, of New York, Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia, John M. Murphy of New York, and Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio. Senator Williams acted as chairman of the meeting. The Maritime Administrator, Mr. Nicholas Johnson, by invitation of the Board, was present during the meeting. The meeting was opened by the Superintendent of the Academy, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, USMS, who stated that he would submit his report substantially in the order of his statement to the Advisory Board of the Academy.

Admiral McLintock reported that on June 25, 1965, he had been advised that the continued accreditation of the Academy by the Middle Atlantic States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had been approved. The Academy received its regional accreditation in November 1949 and subsequently it had been approved and registered by the New York State Department of Education. Many prominent mideastern colleges and universities are accredited by the Middle States Association.

In connection with the Academy's reaccreditation, the Board unanimously passed the following resolution:

> The re-accreditation by the Middle States Association, the raising of the standards of the Academy, and the continuing progress of the Academy are due to the ability, diligence and devotion of the Superintendent, and his faculty and staff, and are deserving of commendation by the Board.

The admiral stated that some of the laboratory facilities at the Academy had been modernized thanks to somewhat larger appropriations during recent years but that a number required substantial improvement. He stated that the analog computers installed in connection with the NS *Savannah* simulators were being utilized for the conduct of courses for the students but that no digital computers were available. The latter are required in general engineering courses and also by reason of the fact that digital computers are increasing in use on vessels at sea. He stated that such a computer could be rented from IBM but that it would entail the expenditure of some $250,000 a year for the next 5 years. He also pointed out that various other laboratories were operating with equipment secured from World War II vessels and that it was essential that these laboratories be updated in view of developments since their creation.

Congressman CAREY inquired why National Science Foundation support for such items as computers could not be secured. Congressman MOSHER pointed out that the National Science Foundation was prohibited from subsidizing other Federal agencies and suggested that an attempt be made to secure direct appropriations.

The Maritime Administrator, Hon. Nicholas Johnson, pointed out that the lag between the conception of a program and the availability of funds was some 18 months and that on various occasions mandatory salary increases had intervened and that by reason of these increases it had been necessary on occasions to divert money for the payment of salaries from other uses, such as upgrading laboratories. He pointed out that no automatic provision is made for reimbursement of such diversions and that in consequence the development program of the Academy suffered from such loss of funds.

Admiral McLintock reported that at the present time the positions of Dean, Assistant Dean, Regimental Officer, and Academy Training Representative in New Orleans were vacant. He stated that all four of the positions were filled by qualified officers of the Academy on a temporary basis.

Mr. Carey inquired why if the acting incumbents in the positions were satisfactory, they had not received permanent appointments. Mr. Johnson stated that there was presently a search underway to secure a Dean for the institution but that selection of a Dean must necessarily await the determination of the mission of the Academy. He stated that at the present time the Academy is under the direction of the Office of Personnel Management although matters of importance were discussed by the Superintendent directly with him without reference to channels of communication. He pointed out that the Academy represented the expenditure of but $4.5 million per year out of $350 million handled by him and that his major attention had to be devoted to the areas of greatest expenditures, although he believed that he had given more attention to the Academy problems that many of his predecessors.

At this point, after discussion, the Board felt that the Superintendent should report directly to the Maritime Administrator and not to the Office of Personnel Management, or any other office of the Maritime Administration.

Prof. Preble Stolz was then called upon to present details of the report he had submitted to the Maritime Administrator on the Merchant Marine Academy. Mr. Johnson stated that the intent of the report was to focus more attention on the Academy and that the purpose of the report was only to promote discussions to this end that the mission of the Academy could be more specifically determined.

Discussion was had with respect to specific items contained in the report but it was agreed that any action would be deferred pending a meeting with the Advisory Board.

It was stated that at present the Academy functions basically through the Superintendent and that under the law the Maritime Administrator had the authority to appoint an Advisory Board of not more than seven members. Such an Advisory Board presently functions but Mr. CAREY suggested that the aims of the Academy and their effectuation could better be achieved through a Board of Trustees that would have the basic responsibility for the policy of the institution. Mr. Johnson stated that this could be achieved through the present Advisory Board and that any attempt to establish a Board of Trustees with full power over the institution would require legislation, possibly divorcing the Academy from the control of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Johnson referred to Gallaudet College as a possible model but it was pointed out that this was a private institution supported by Government funds. It was then suggested that the legislation establishing the National Technical Institution for the Deaf might present a working model for this institution.

Discussion was had with respect to the present manpower shortage as evidenced by the difficulty in securing crews for shipments to Vietnam and inquiry was made with respect to what steps could be taken either by the Maritime Administrator or by the Academy to increase the production of licensed officers and men for this service. The Maritime Administrator stated that in his opinion there was no problem with respect to manpower at the present time but that difficulty was being encountered in inducing trained men to return to the sea. He stated that the cost of any crash program would be substantial and that he felt that the alternative of a campaign to induce trained men to return to man the vessels would be cheaper and more productive, and certainly faster than any program to train new people.

Mr. MURPHY pointed out that the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had in being a Special Subcommittee charged with the responsibility of evaluating the State maritime academies, the Coast Guard Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and that it was very likely that this committee would be in a position to submit a report by the end of the year. Meantime, it was anticipated that the Board of Visitors would make arrangements to meet with the Advisory Board at its next meeting to be held in Washington on February 15, at which time it was hoped that further discussion could be had with respect to strengthening the position of the Advisory Board.

Prior to adjournment, the Board approved the following statement by Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY:

> I think it should be said for the record that it is fortunate that Admiral McLintock has been here for the last dozen and a half years and it is he who has kept the Academy at its consistent high level in spite of less than sympathetic (Maritime) Administrators. I think that more emphasis should be given to the Academy and its leader's recommendations. We owe the Academy a debt of gratitude. Probably, without too much assistance from the top, it has carried on splendidly.

The Maritime Administrator, Mr. Nicholas Johnson, concurred in the Board's statement.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

WHITE HOUSE HONORS PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on August 2 a historic event took place at the White House here in Washington, when President and Mrs. Johnson gave a dinner honoring President Zalman Shazar, of Israel, and his wife, who were visitors in our country.

For 18 years we have nourished and admired the heroic achievements of this land of Israel. In less than two decades, this small country has become a bastion of democracy, dedicated to the principles we ourselves hold most dear—peace, freedom, and the dignity of man.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the remarks made by President Johnson in welcoming President and Mrs. Shazar to our shores; and the toast made by President Shazar in return.

The texts of these remarks follow:

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S TOAST AT THE WHITE HOUSE DINNER HONORING THE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

In the traditional Hebrew greeting I welcome our esteemed guest: *baruch hab ah* . . . blessed is he who comes to our shores as the leader of a people for whom we hold the greatest admiration.

Mr. President, as a renowned scholar and educator, and as a pioneer in the new Israel,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

you are deeply versed in the teachings of the Bible.

And you know that our Republic, like yours, was nurtured by the philosophy of the ancient Hebrew teachers who taught mankind the principles of morality, of social justice, and of universal peace.

This is our heritage, and it is yours.

The message inscribed on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is the clarion call of Leviticus: "Proclaim ye liberty in the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

It is a message not only for America, or for Israel, but for the whole world.

We cannot proclaim today that all men have liberty, that all men are moral, that all men are just. We do not have universal peace.

But those of good will continue their work to liberate the human spirit from the degradation of poverty and pestilence, of hunger and oppression. As spiritual heirs of the Biblical tradition we recognize that no society anywhere can be more secure unless it is also just.

Israel today carries forward its pursuit of spiritual values, and is sharing its own experience with other countries.

We in America are keenly aware that God showered our land with abundance. The sharing of our blessings with others is a value we hold in common with Israel.

Above all, Mr. President, we share in common the vision of peace you call shalom.

The Prophet Micah described it in this way: That every man sit under his vine and fig tree and "none shall make him afraid."

We are deeply committed to this ancient ideal of peace among Nations. As President Kennedy said on May 8, 1963: "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors . . . We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East . . ."

We shall continue that policy.

This I say in friendship for all the peoples of that region. We extend to all the hand of friendship, and offer to help all in meeting the challenges of fear and pestilence and poverty.

We look toward the happy and peaceful pursuits that can bring tranquillity and the blessings of knowledge and understanding to all, without fear of war.

We welcome you tonight, Mr. President, in friendship and in respect for you and your people.

I ask all gathered here to join me in the traditional Hebrew toast in honor of our distinguished guest . . . to life, to peace, to blessing for all mankind.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY PRESIDENT ZALMAN SHAZAR OF ISRAEL AT THE DINNER GIVEN BY PRESIDENT AND MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1966

Mr. President and Mrs. Johnson, before I respond to your gracious words of friendship, Mr. President, may I, on behalf of Mrs. Shazar and myself, express to you and Mrs. Johnson our heartfelt congratulations on the occasion of the marriage of your daughter, four days from now. May she and her husband enjoy a long life of happiness.

I would like to give voice tonight to the deep appreciation which I feel and which, I believe, is shared by men and women in many lands for your leadership in the effort to achieve a world in which every nation would be left alone to lead its life in accordance with its own free choice, with its independence and integrity respected.

You name will always be associated with the concept that the only real enemies of men are ignorance, poverty and disease and the degradation of man by his fellow man.

Under your leadership the American people has been foremost not only in projecting this vision but in helping to realize it. Many are the countries which have reason to be grateful to the United States for the help they have received in tackling these enemies and maintaining their freedom.

Mr. President, I bring you a cordial message of greeting from Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and from all the people of my country. On behalf of the government and people of my country, I wish to record our appreciation of the understanding which has marked your approach to our problems and my satisfaction at the continuous growth of the friendship between our two countries.

It is a great honor for me to ask this distinguished gathering to join me in wishing you long life and continued success in moving mankind towards the goals of peace and greatness. With the greetings of L'Chayim uL'Shalom, to life and peace, I raise my glass to the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson.

TO PRESERVE PRIVACY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, just recently the Government Operations Committee's Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, chaired by our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] held hearings on a proposed National Data Center.

There has been much opposition to the establishment of such a device, and the proposal has been the subject of many articles, editorials, and cartoons.

The New York Times carried an editorial in today's issue, which is especially timely, and which should be read by all those who are concerned about the possibility of having such a computer developed and put into operation. The editorial, entitled "To Preserve Privacy," is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, and I hope that its message will be carried home to all who read it.

As a member of the above-mentioned subcommittee, I am and have been very much disturbed over current and proposed invasions of privacy, and feel that the trend toward complete surveillance, particularly on the part of the Federal Government, must be reversed. Personal privacy is, and must remain, one of the basic rights of all our American citizens. We must work to preserve that right.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1966]

TO PRESERVE PRIVACY

Can personal privacy survive the ceaseless advances of the technological juggernaut? Many in public and private life now fear to use telephones for conservations they would keep confidential, while the variety of electronic "bugs" available to eavesdrop on even whispered communications staggers the imagination. And young lovers would be well-advised to remember that the skies are increasingly full of sputniks equipped with cameras capable of taking extraordinarily detailed pictures of what transpires under the moon as well as on it. George Orwell foresaw the logical end of this trend in a device that would enable "Big Brother" to keep an eye on everyone anywhere.

The Orwellian nightmare would be brought very close indeed if Congress permits the proposed computer National Data Center to come into being. We already live with the fact that from birth to grave Federal agencies keep tabs on each of us, recording our individual puny existence, monitoring our incomes and claimed deductions, noting when we are employed or jobless, and—through the F.B.I. and similar agencies—keeping all too close watch on what we think or say, what we read and what organizations we belong to.

If this situation is still somewhat tolerable, it is because each agency keeps separate files and it takes some considerable effort to find and bring together all that is known about a particular individual. What is now proposed is the amalgamation of these files, and the creation of a situation in which the push of a button would promptly dredge up all that is known about anyone.

Understandably, this idea has brought vigorous protest, in which we join. Aside from the opportunities for blackmail and from the likelihood that the record of any single past transgression might damage one for life, this proposed device would approach the effective end of privacy. Those Government officials who insist that the all-knowing computer could be provided with safeguards against unauthorized access are no doubt of the same breed as their brethren who "guaranteed" that last November's Northeast electric blackout could never occur. Even the Swiss banks have learned to their own and their clients' sorrow that the device of numbered accounts is inadequate to frustrate determined would-be blackmailers.

Perhaps in the long run the fight to preserve privacy is a vain one. But, like the struggle to preserve life, it must be continued while any shred of privacy remains.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN REVIEWS OPPORTUNITIES IN RURAL AMERICA FOR COLUMBUS, IND., GROUP

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last month to have Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman visit in the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana on one his "report and review" sessions.

Secretary Freeman made two appearances in the Ninth District, the first, a luncheon address at a meeting sponsored by the Columbus, Ind., Chamber of Commerce. At a second meeting, at the Seymour, Ind., high school auditorium, he met with ninth district farmers in an open session.

At the Columbus meeting, Secretary Freeman reviewed for business, professional, and civic leaders from across the district this Nation's advances in agriculture and the promise of new rural development programs.

There are many signs of progress in the ninth district, and Secretary Freeman took note of them.

Mr. Speaker, because of the significance of the Secretary's remarks, I ask

unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, COLUMBUS, IND., JULY 22, 1966

I have just returned from Japan, and I'm struck by the thought that many Americans consider that country one of the most densely populated on earth.

Japan *is* crowded, but I wonder how many of you realize that within a generation 4 of every 5 Americans may be living in cities with population densities far in excess of present day Japan.

By the year 2000, the average population density of the urban areas of this country will be 774 people per square mile. Crowded as it is, Japan today has only 672 people per square mile.

Within 35 years, if the present trend continues, 240 millions Americans will be jammed onto only 8.7 percent of the land, while only 60 million will occupy the remaining 91.3 percent.

Now 35 years may seem a long time away. It isn't. And, it's already later than some of you may think.

Right at this moment, my friends, no less than 70 percent of your fellow Americans are living on only 1 percent of the land area of this great and spacious nation!

Some say this concentration of people in the cities is desirable. Many others say it is inevitable.

I say it is neither.

I say it is national folly. I say it is cultural and economic idiocy. And I want to tell you why.

But first let me briefly outline how this all came about . . . how our once agrarian society adopted, in a relatively short span of history, an industrial, commercial, and urban-oriented culture.

This nation was born as a nation of farmers, but it was, in fact, the very genius of these farmers which spurred the ensuing exodus from the land to the cities.

As the farmer began to produce more than enough for his own needs, some were freed for other pursuits. The technological advances later made in agriculture made it possible for fewer and fewer farmers to feed more and more people.

Until well into this century, this trend presented no great economic or social problems. Indeed, it was a healthy trend, for the growth of the great urban centers was undoubtedly a key factor in the phenomenal economic development of this Nation.

The cities remain important. They always will be. But to be important . . . to make a positive contribution to the economy and to society . . . they must be healthy. And too many of them are sick today!

There are many reasons why so many of our cities are sick. But behind each of the specific causes is the broad cause of simply too many people for too little space.

This, in turn, means too many problems for too few solutions. It means too many demands for services and too few tax dollars to pay for them. It means too many pupils and not enough classrooms. It means smog in the air and filth in the water. It means too many poor and too much crime, and overworked and understaffed police forces and welfare agencies. It means slums in the heart of the city and suburban slums at the outskirts.

And it means the foment of frustration compounded by congestion . . . and riots in the long hot summer.

No one can ignore the slums and ghettos of the cities. They are there. They are real. In a matter of hours, you can drive from here to the core of many a big city and find yourself in a virtual jungle where frustration breeds crime, crime breeds more crime, where hopelessness and gloom are the order of the day, and the smell of poverty hangs over all.

We are now in the midst of the longest, uninterrupted prosperity ever enjoyed by this Nation. And there are no signs of it coming to an end.

Yet despite this unprecedented economic bounty, there are still more than 38 million poor Americans. Perhaps we shall always have some poor. But we need not have 38 million of them.

Much is being done to combat poverty. Much more will be done.

In his determination to see a Great Society created in this Nation, President Johnson has marshaled many weapons for the War on Poverty. At his urging, the Congress has enacted legislation which created a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and a National Teacher Corps to work in poor areas. The Congress also has enacted legislation which provides for increased job training, more medical care and housing aids, and aid for local police forces . . . all designed to defeat poverty and cure urban blight.

But great as these weapons are, how can they win a final victory as long as millions of people continue to pour into the cities from the countryside each passing year?

The ultimate victory in the war on urban poverty and urban blight will be won only when we have stemmed the exodus from rural America . . . and indeed reversed it.

This will serve not only to help restore health to the cities . . . but also to cure an ailing rural America.

Psychosomatic or not, some parts of rural America *are* ailing. But today I am happy to say there is hope, there is determination . . . *and there are encouraging signs of progress all around.*

I came to the Midwest this weekend to hold meetings with farmers in four States, to review and discuss with them the status of agriculture in America today.

I'm doing this because my mail from the Farm Belt reveals some concern, some apprehension, and some misunderstanding which has come about, in large part, because of misinformation.

Farmers are asking me—"What is our future?" "Should we stay on the land, or should we look for jobs in the cities?" "Can we ever do as well as our city cousins?"

I've come to the Midwest to answer their questions directly. To communicate with them on a face-to-face basis. And I will tell them that while we are not yet satisfied, while there are still many things to be done, the farmers of America have made truly remarkable progress in the past five-and-a-half years.

Indeed, I will tell them that on the strength of that record of progress I can now safely predict that by the end of this decade we *can* achieve our long-sought mutual goal of *full parity of income for the adequate size family farming operation.*

This Administration took office with two goals in mind for agriculture. We were determined to reduce the mountainous grain surpluses which were depressing farm prices and gouging the taxpayer. And we were determined to see farm income increased.

I think the record will show that we are succeeding. In five-and-a-half years we have reduced the wheat surplus from 1.4 billion bushels to approximately 550 million bushels—and this spring sharply increased the acreage allotment—and we have reduced the feed grain surplus from 85 million tons to 50 million tons.

Farm income has risen during the same period. Gross farm income will be nearly $10 billion more this year than it was in 1960, and net income per farm will approximate $4,800 this year in comparison with only $2,956 six years ago.

The products moved into foreign markets from our farms will return $5 billion hard dollars this year . . . a dollar sales figure more than 50 percent greater than it was in 1960.

We in this Administration are proud of this record. But we are far from satisfied yet. We know that while farm prices have risen since 1960, they are still 18 percent below what they were in 1951. And we know that while the income gap between farmer and non-farmer has been narrowed by 18 percent since 1960, farmers still earn only ⅔ as much as city people.

Nevertheless, on balance the agricultural sector of our economy is making real progress and will do even better in the years ahead. So I will tell our Midwest farmers that there are far more reasons for them to be optimistic than pessimistic, and many more reasons to be encouraged than discouraged.

I only wish the picture were as bright for the remainder of rural America. In many respects, it is not. But wherever I go, I see an enthusiastic determination to do something about it and encouraging evidence that something *is* being done about it.

The illness that afflicts the small towns and cities of America is in large part psychosomatic. Somehow, some time in bygone years, a peculiar mental set developed. In some way the suspicion that rural America was empty of opportunity became a conviction, and hordes of country people moved to the cities in quest of money and success.

Now, in hindsight, we see the irony.

Just consider for a moment what rural America offers.

Think of what it offers in the way of the good life for the individual American. A closer communion with nature. Open skies. Trees. Sparkling streams and lakes. Freedom from congestion. Space to breathe and live and grow and play. Space to drive and space to park. Recreational opportunities of myriad variety and ready access. The chance to identify with the community . . . and take pride in where you live.

Many people want to live in rural America. A Gallup poll report published earlier this year revealed that nearly half of all persons surveyed said they would like to live in a small town or on a farm. Yet less than a third of them do.

But they could, my friends. They could. If we can just overcome the unjustified disenchantment with the countryside . . . if we can take positive steps to provide the opportunities there that many mistakenly believe exist only in the cities . . . we can hold people in Smalltown America and bring many back from the cities.

Now, how do we do that? We do it by selling those who create jobs—business and industry—on the advantages of rural locations.

What are those advantages? Just about everything business and industry seek: clean air, pure water, lower land costs, building costs, utility costs and service costs . . . and a built-in skilled and trainable labor force.

Some areas offer even more. In the absence of an industrial tax base, the individual home owners and retail store owners of some responsible communities have willingly shouldered heavy tax loads to provide good schools and teachers for their children, to carry out sound local welfare programs, to support good police forces, and to build excellent community health facilities.

And some have gone beyond that. Some have formed local new industry committees which work day and night to find good industrial locations, provide the facilities, services and buildings industry seeks, and to encourage industry to locate in their towns.

I can assure you that enlightened businessmen and industrialists are looking for such advantages. They know that these

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

things pay off in low personnel turn-over, high staff morale . . . and increased profits.

Not long ago, I told a gathering of the Nation's top industrial and business leaders that modern transportation and communication facilities, coupled with the ready availability of unemployed or underemployed trained and trainable rural labor, refute the traditional case for locating business and industry only in the big cities.

I told them that in today's America few industrial plants need be more than an hour or so away from raw materials and sales markets, nor more than minutes away from power supply and manpower . . . no matter where they are located.

I called their attention to the acres of choice industrial land to be found in rural America, land which would accommodate their present needs and future expansion, locations which would help improve service to regional and local markets, service growing new markets created by an expanding and mobile population . . . and at the same time reducing their operating costs.

I told them that most rural communities have an abundant supply of water for industrial needs and recreational pursuits, a ready source of industrial fuel and power, access to rail, highway, air, and, in some cases, water transportation facilities, and a ready-made labor pool.

And I told them that local development committees, State business and industrial development committees, and the Federal government stood ready to assist any businessman or industrialist who was considering opening a plant in rural America.

I also made it crystal clear, however, that I was not encouraging "runaway" plants, industrial "piracy" or the unscrupulous exploitation of the job-hungry countryside.

I took that occasion to announce the launching of the Department of Agriculture's new Rural Industrialization Program, a program which I am confident can make a valuable contribution to the well-being of the entire Nation.

Through this program we hope to bring the profit potential in America's smaller communities to the attention of industry. The Rural Industrialization Program staff will consult with businessmen in Washington, or in their own offices. Staff members will assist them to find the proper location and will serve as a liaison in arranging whatever financial and technical assistance is needed.

We will soon have available brochures which describe worker training programs financed by the Government, offer specific information on industrial financing programs, discuss industrial sites, water supply, natural resources, and transportation facilities available in rural areas, and specifically spell out how the Department of Agriculture can help businessmen open new plants in the countryside.

All of this does not constitute a sudden new effort to revitalize rural America. The need has been seen for years. The Rural Industrialization Program is an important new tool to bolster and supplement those already at work. The Rural Areas Development program was started in 1961, for instance, and since that time has mobilized 150,000 rural leaders to work to create new job opportunities and improve rural living conditions. The Rural Community Development Service was launched a little more than a year ago to carry to community leaders information about the full range of Federal services, the relationship of one to the other, and the procedures for achieving their use.

And still another important new tool, the Community District Development Program which I will detail in a moment, is now pending in Congress.

The countryside-to-city population movement *can* be stemmed *if* we can put jobs in our small towns and cities, and today I am asking your interest and your wholehearted support of this effort. I am asking every small town businessman and workingman to budget some of his time and effort toward working to make his community attractive to industry. And I am asking industrialists and businessmen throughout the Nation to give careful consideration to the profit opportunities to be found in rural America.

Just as I have come out here to reassure the farmers, to tell them they are making significant progress and that the future is brighter than ever, so, too, am I here to tell the businessmen of the towns and small cities to have faith in their future to have confidence that we can keep people in rural America by increasing opportunity there.

We *can* stem the exodus. Not only can it be done, it is already *being* done. It is being done whenever people in small cities and the open countryside seize the initiative and begin working together to build water and sewer systems, recreation areas, industrial parks and new homes.

The people who are doing these things are doing them with the full cooperation and assistance of their Federal and State governments.

Let me just cite a few statistics to give you some idea of how massive is the Rural Areas Development effort being carried out by the people with their Government.

Since July of 1961, 1,412 rural community water systems to bring modern water service to some 910,314 people have been financed by government loans totaling $187,871,065.

Since January of this year, when the necessary legislation was passed, 18 sewer projects and 7 combination water and sewer projects were financed for rural communities by Government loans and grants totaling $7,000,750.

Between 1961 and 1966, the 62,965 housing loans to non-farm rural residents were made. These loans totaled $618,410,998.

Since 1963, Farmers Home Administration loans totaling $36,052,808 have made possible the establishment of 288 community recreation centers serving visitors as well as more than 324,000 family membership holders.

Since 1963, 122 senior citizens' rental housing projects in rural communities have been financed by Government loans totaling $6,713,630.

Economic Opportunity loans have been made to 11,027 non-farm, low-income rural families to help them establish trades and services needed in their home areas. Since this program's inception in January of 1965, loans have totaled $19,745,101.

On the conservation and recreation front, the number of small watershed projects approved for operations has increased from 212 on January 1, 1960, to 729 on July 1, 1966, a 244 percent increase. In fiscal year 1966, 94 projects were approved.

And during the last five fiscal years, 1,777 National Forest campgrounds have been added, together with 385 picnic grounds, 49 swimming sites, 243 boating sites, 15 winter sports sites, and 97 more observation sites.

We can see the effect of this community approach to rural areas development throughout the Nation . . . and we can see it right here in southern Indiana where there are now . . .

. . . The Bata Shoe plant at Salem with 600 jobs . . . Indiana Sand and Glass at Corydon with 50 jobs . . . the Borden plant with 375 jobs . . . a new airport at Tell City . . . the Storrs wood plant will provide 64 jobs when construction is completed . . . more than 30 community-wide water systems have been built . . . 67 picnic areas and 3 new camping areas have been developed in Hoosier National Forest.

Unemployment in the area was as high as 18 percent in the spring of 1961. Now it has dropped to about 6 percent in most southern Indiana counties.

Twenty-one of those counties had been designated as redevelopment areas by the Commerce Department because of low income and high unemployment rates. Now, with the economic progress made, only 8 are still eligible for commercial and industrial redevelopment loans, and none qualify for the accelerated public works provisions to combat unemployment.

The State of Indiana, through its industrial development revolving fund, has helped local development groups finance a number of industrial projects. I am informed that the nearly $2 million loaned by the State helped develop plants that provided more than 1,800 jobs throughout Indiana.

All of the counties in southern Indiana and most other counties throughout the State have organized community action programs in an effort to eliminate the remaining pockets of poverty

One of the most recent War on Poverty projects will help beautify the highways in 10 southern Indiana counties, while providing incomes and job training for 120 senior citizens. The State Highway Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity are cooperating on this project.

All of this proves that much can be done to build the kind of resources needed to keep people in the countryside when there is active and dedicated leadership at the community level, and an active and cooperative response at the Federal and State levels.

And soon we will have another major implement to use in the effort to bring new opportunities to rural America. I speak of the Community Development District Act which has been passed by the Senate and is now before the House of Representatives.

This legislation will provide Federal funds to enable people in towns, small cities, and counties to organize Community Development districts and to hire professional planning staffs. The planning staff will be hired and directed by a board or commission that is appointed by, and answerable to, the county and municipal governments within the district—at least those that choose to participate in the planning district.

The typical district might include one or more small or medium-sized cities, a number of smaller towns, and the open countryside within 30 to 50 miles of the service or commuting center. In effect, it will recognize predominant commuting patterns traced by the residents themselves in their day-to-day travel to work, to school, to shop, and in pursuit of social activities.

By pooling resources, and with coordinated planning, the small city and surrounding countryside could develop new economic opportunities and a broader range of public and private services than either would likely achieve on its own . . . and could avail itself of the kinds of governmental programs already benefiting other communities.

The Community Development District bill, the Rural Industrialization Program, the many other Rural Areas Development activities, and the War on Poverty efforts all will obviously help our metropolitan areas as well as our towns and small cities.

By creating a greater range of opportunity in the countryside, they will slow the movement of people from the country to our already overcrowded cities. This, in turn, will give city officials the breathing time they need to cope with the problems of inner city decay and suburban sprawl, social strife and congestion, rising welfare costs, crime and juvenile delinquency.

Never before have I encountered such enthusiasm, such determination—the feeling that we can correct the handicaps of both city and countryside . . . and realize the full potential of our dynamic and expanding economy.

If we cooperate—if we work together—if we pool our resources and our talents . . . then the day will come when every man can decide—without being forced by economic considerations—whether to live his life and pursue his career in the Big City . . . or in Smalltown, USA.

I hope to see that day. I know you do, too.

Thank you.

TIGHT MONEY SITUATION COULD COST HOUSING INDUSTRY $21 BILLION

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions recently I have addressed this body concerning the tight money market and its particular effect on the housing industry.

I am certain that every one of my colleagues is vitally aware of this problem and the effect that it is having in his own community. Not only has the lack of mortgage money prevented new housing starts, but because of the building lag virtually every business in this country has been or will be affected, since a slowdown in an industry as large as the homebuilding field drains vital funds from the economy. It is very basic economics that if there are no houses to be built, there is no work for the carpenter and the bricklayer; and if the carpenter and bricklayer do not work, they are not paid. Consequently, their purchasing power is greatly reduced. It can easily be seen that this effect can run full circle through our economy and wreak havoc. The Chicago Tribune of Sunday, August 7, reported that the homebuilders originally planned 60,000 new homes in 1966, but faced with a drain of funds from the mortgage market, the builders have revised their estimate to less than 40,000 units, a drop of more than 33 percent. This same article warned that if the drain of mortgage money continues, there will be a loss of $7 billion in construction expenditures and $14 billion will be lost in related industry outlays.

It is not a mystery as to the reason for this loss of mortgage money. Commercial banking institutions have continually raised their rates on savings and have attracted money away from mortgage-oriented savings institutions to the commercial banks. Unfortunately, banks do not engage to a large degree in mortgage lending; and even if they did, they would not be able to tie up high-rate savings in long-term mortgages. In order to pay the increased interest to savers, banks must indulge in speculative short-term lending with its accompanying risks. The savings institutions cannot compete with the high rate offered by commercial banks and, thus, when their income of savings is curtailed, they must also cut back in their mortgage lending. Many savings institutions have completely closed their mortgage-lending windows and have no prospects of opening them immediately. Even if the situation could be resolved completely at this very moment, it would take from 9 months to a year to return the homebuilding industry to its normal level.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this body take immediate action to solve this situation. The first step has already been made. The Banking and Currency Committee recently reported H.R. 14026—a bill designed to limit the amount of interest that commercial banks could pay on certain savings accounts. The bill is presently awaiting a hearing before the Rules Committee so that it can be reported to the floor for consideration.

I strongly urge that the Rules Committee grant an immediate hearing on this bill so that we can put the homebuilding industry back on its feet.

I call this important article to the attention of my colleagues.

HOME BUILDERS EXPECT SHARP DECLINE—MAJORITY BLAMES TIGHT MONEY FOR 33 PERCENT DROP

(By Alvin Nagelberg)

A nation-wide cross section survey of members of the National Association of Home Builders indicates a sharp drop is expected in home building being planned for the future.

Last fall builders in the survey planned nearly 60,000 units during 1966.

A study in June disclosed that these plans had been reduced to less than 40,000 units for a drop of more than 33 per cent.

REDUCTIONS SHOWN IN SURVEY

A tabulation of the survey, based on responses from 400 firms, showed that in the fall of 1965 builders planned to erect 41,686 single family units and 17,564 multiple dwelling units.

In March, 1966, the builders revised their plans and decided to erect 32,008 single family homes, a 23.22 per cent decrease, and 14,250 multiple dwelling units, an 18.87 per cent drop.

In June, 1966, the plans were revised to build 26,647 homes, a further decline of 16.75 per cent, and 11,717 multiple dwelling units, and added decrease of 17.78 per cent.

The study shows that 52.7 per cent of the builders reported tight money as the primary cause of the reduction.

The remainder of the cutback was attributed to general economic conditions and rising labor and material costs.

New homes had increased 5 per cent between June, 1965, and June, 1966. The average price of a new home rose from $22,500 to $23,600 during that period.

REASONS FOR INCREASE

Material costs accounted for 34.1 per cent of the $1,100 increase; finance costs accounted for 28 per cent; labor costs for 20.9 per cent; land for 13.3 per cent; and other costs for 3.7 per cent.

The average price increase in prior years has been only one-third as much as it was during the last year, the N. A. H. B. reported.

The Chicago area activity is following the national trend, but the decline here is not as sharp, according to the survey. In June, home permits issued in the metropolitan area were down 9 per cent from the corresponding month a year ago. Apartment permits were down 34 per cent.

Larry Blackmon, president of the N. A. H. B., has warned that if the present money market continues there will be a loss of 400,000 units in the national market during the next 12 months.

This could be translated into a loss of 7 billion dollars in construction expenditures and 14 billions in related industry outlays.

THE ALARMING RISE IN THE RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the areas of growing concern in this country is the alarming rise in the retail prices of certain food products. This is a problem which affects every American, young or old, rich or poor—and we must do something about it.

Today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a House resolution to create a seven-member bipartisan committee to investigate the reasons for the rapid rise in the retail prices of food.

I have noticed that in my city of Boston during the months of May and June alone the retail price of a half-gallon of milk rose by 3 cents. The retail price of a loaf of bread also rose by 3 cents during the same time. And I am told that the retail prices of these basic commodities and certain others have risen by the same amount in New York City and other areas.

Somebody is making a lot of money because of these price rises—and by doing it they are causing irreparable harm to the economy of the Nation. I do not know who is soaking the public—the agricultural producers, the middlemen, or the retailers—but it is time we found out.

I have always been for profit, and I am for profit now. Profit is the lifeblood of our economy. But there are limits to everything, including profit, and these recent price hikes go beyond those limits.

It would be tragic indeed if, because of the shortsightedness of a few, the whole Nation would have to suffer. We are reaching a critical point in our economic life, and we must soon choose between a reasonable course in which everyone exercises a little restraint or, alternatively, mandatory measures which would be satisfactory to no one.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution—to investigate, to put the blame squarely on the shoulders of those who deserve it, and to help rectify this problem.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT, MAINE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, as I stated several days ago, I would be placing items before the House concerning the Dickey-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric project in Maine from time to time.

As many of the Members know, this project was thoroughly and completely analyzed in depth by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, a study which concluded, incidentally, that the power to be produced by this project would cost anywhere from 15 to 20 percent more in the mid-1970's than power then being produced by the private electric companies of the area.

Were it not for the great length and detail of this report I would include it here in the RECORD. But copies of it are available and I would be very happy to provide them to any of my colleagues who are interested.

But one item which is short and concise enough for the RECORD is a letter to the editor of the Boston Globe which appeared on June 6 of this year. As the letter indicates, it was written by Mr. John M. Wilkinson, a resources economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and, as I understand it, a man who was deeply involved in the preparation of the full report:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, June 4, 1966]

EXCEPTION BY FEDERAL RESERVE ECONOMIST

The Globe referred (May 12) to my study on New England public power proposals, in the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston's April 1966 New England Business Review, in a manner which grossly distorts its major conclusion.

You attribute to the study the conclusion that competition between public and private power is the most immediately practical way to produce lower costs, that a Federal "yardstick" is needed and that regulation by competition is more effective than regulation by utility commission.

This could hardly be the conclusion of this study, which also states:

"By 1977 it is expected that peaking power from this privately-financed and taxed plant (the Western Massachusetts Electric Companies' Northfield Mountain pumped-storage project) could be delivered to the inter-connected systems of southern New England for 15 to 20 percent less than the delivered cost of comparable peaking power from the Federally-financed and tax-exempt Dickey project."

The Dickey project costs in this comparison were computed at January, 1964, price levels. They could be substantially higher at current price levels. Also, Dickey project would add less than one percent to New England's future power supply. Furthermore, the study questions the ability of other public power proposals to bring lower-cost power to New England than can be brought about by the present industry plans.

Also, your interpretation could hardly be the conclusion of the study, Part I of which analyses the private industry in detail in the February, 1966, issue of the bank's New England Business Review from which the following is quoted:

"A quiet revolution in electric power technology is bring forth new opportunities, new concepts, and the new plans which promise dramatic change to historical circumstances and traditional ways. Publicized regional differences are narrowing as persisting regional disadvantages are overcome. New England's utilities are active participants in this revolution, and they propose to put its benefits to work in power markets of the 1970's and 1980's. . . . The one-system concept may be made operational in most of New England in the years ahead, bringing increasing economy and reliability, and presenting a formidable private industry yardstick of power costs and service."

Your paper quotes only in part from the study's concluding paragraph, as follows:

"There is justification for the belief that, in general, commission regulation of rates and service has been neither very effective nor very positive in the past. There are many exceptions, of course, but too often the incentive to reduce costs has not been present. . . . For the bold expansion that the future demands, many feel that another tool—regulation by competition—may better serve the region."

You do not quote from the same paragraph the central point of the study, as follows: "But, in a natural monopoly situation, competition too may come at some sacrifice in efficiency, as this review suggests."

Clearly, the prospect of competition—however unequal are the terms, due to lower-cost financing and tax-exemption of public projects—has spurred the private industry to bolder expansion plans, but it is equally clear that the prospective competition so far advanced may not be the lowest cost power for New England, as my analysis shows. The real yardstick is a privately-sponsored yardstick—exceptionally low cost pumped-storage peaking power and nuclear baseload power, integrated into the existing coordinated systems—regulated by New England's state utility commissions and the Federal Power Commission.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston is dedicated to the public interest of the New England region, and will continue to work for the lowest possible power costs for its citizens.

JOHN M. WILKINSON,
Resources Economist,
Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

A BACK-TO-SCHOOL DRIVE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is currently taking place in the First Congressional District of Ohio a most worthwhile project. It is the NAACP back-to-school drive, sponsored by region III, NAACP youth and college division. This drive began on August 1, and lasts until August 31 of this year. A Cincinnatian, Herb Smith, chairman of region III, youth and college division, and Bill Hardy, field director, are the sparkplugs of this drive.

It is now regional in scope, and includes the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. It is hoped that it will be a national drive within a matter of days.

The purpose of the drive is to encourage all youths to return to school, and to stay there. Although this drive is sponsored by the NAACP, the program takes in all youths in all areas, of whatever race. Because unemployment and poverty are colorblind, so is this project.

Because of the importance of this project to our Nation, I am inserting in this RECORD the message Herb Smith has been giving to the youths of my district:

Education does not cost, it pays. It has been shown that for every dollar invested in high school education, there is a return of five. For every five dollars invested in a college education, there is a minimum return of thirty dollars—a six hundred percent return.

An education does not guarantee success. However, it does open doors to many opportunities. It gives one the foundation for a fuller, richer, more satisfying life.

Between 1965 and 1975, thirty million young men and women will be looking for their first job. Of these, eight million will be drop outs from high school. What chance do they have? Presently thirty-two of every one hundred drop outs are unemployed. Eighteen of one hundred graduates are unemployed.

The drop out earns an average of $5900 per year; the graduate has an average earning of $6800 per year. The graduate who goes on to college earns a minimum of 42 percent more than the high school graduate, and 83 percent more than the drop out.

An education gives you the chance to select your occupation. You choose your job. If you lack education, the job picks you. Education is the start of life. From this jumping off point, you begin to learn habits you'll need all through life. You develop your God-given talents. You learn the importance of human relations. And, you discover more ways to the good life.

Your ambitions, emotions, and achievements are influenced by the knowledge you acquire and continue to acquire. This means a more meaningful life as a human being and a salary earner.

School is your big chance. School years are nothing alongside the life expectancy of modern man. These school years are the difference between poverty and prosperity. From education you reap rich rewards—better jobs, more opportunity. Be ready for what tomorrow brings.

It takes guts to stay in school and finish. Can you do it?

SAMUEL M. MICHELSON: MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Petach Tikvah congregation in Baltimore and an honorary member of its governing board, it is with pride that I rise today to bring to the attention of this august body the achievements of a good friend and a dedicated Government employee.

Samuel M. Michelson, a fellow member of the congregation, has devoted much of his adult life to serving this congregation in various capacities. He has used his rare talents of leadership, service, and sympathetic concern for humanity to weld together and instill in his working committees the same devotion and sense of urgency in meeting human needs.

These outstanding qualifications recently earned for him the Man of the Year Award from the Petach Tikvah congregation "for outstanding service and devotion to the best interest of the congregation." A hand-illuminated parchment certificate, beautifully framed, was presented to Mr. Michelson at an impressive ceremony.

Mr. Michelson is the son of an illustrious father, who was one of the founders of the synagogue, its first president, and who, for more than 40 years, was the senior elder, and twice the recipient of the Man of the Year Award—first in 1922 and again in 1952.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Sam Michelson should display the same characteristics. He is presently the treasurer of the congregation, serving his fourth consecutive term, and is also a member of eight active committees.

Mr. Samuel J. Oshrine, who made the presentation, referred to the unique leadership displayed by Mr. Michelson with his committees, as follows:

> A group of forty men and women—husbands and wives—are members of one of the committees and the personnel has not changed from the original in four years except for an additional name or two. Mr. Michelson has proved that the volunteer may still be found in numbers and will serve when pleasantly directed. As a literary contributor to the Shul bulletin, his articles and news stories show an insight into the teachings of the Torah and man's consideration for his fellow man.

It is with pride that the officers of the congregation added Samuel M. Michelson's name to the family of Man of the Year recipients.

DETROITERS SPEAK OUT IN SUPPORT OF 1966 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as we near a final vote on the 1966 civil rights bill which seeks to correct some of the problems overlooked by the 1964 and 1965 civil rights legislation, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the many persons from the Detroit area who took the time to write me in support of the bill. Some of these persons who have written me concerning the 1966 civil rights bill may be somewhat disappointed because the bill which we will vote on today has been amended a great deal during the course of debate. However, I would still like to share these letters with all of my colleagues as it is my firm belief that every individual has the right to be heard by as many listeners as possible. I insert these letters following my remarks:

Detroit, Mich.,
July 27, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your general support for the 1966 Civil Rights Act with special emphasis on the need to amend title 4 to insure that realtors will not accept discriminatory listings from owners.

Elaine F. Reed,
ACSW Chairman, Metropolitan Detroit Chapter, National Association of Social Workers.

Metropolitan Methodist Church,
Detroit, Mich., July 24, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I feel certain you will be in favor of the strongest possible civil rights bill pending before the house this week, but I want to take this opportunity to express my support of such a bill. I am particularly concerned that Title 4 of the proposed bill pertained to housing be made as strong as possible. I would hope you will find it possible to support the act as reported out of committee and that you will be successful in resisting any attempt to modify the Mathias amendment.

I understand also that Title 5 is in need of support of amendments to strengthen it.

Be assured that I and the people of this church feel that the passage of this bill is a matter of justice and we stand behind you in whatever support you can give it.

Sincerely yours,
Robert L. S. Brown,
Minister of Membership.

City of Detroit, Commission on Relations,
Detroit, Mich., August 5, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conyers: We urge support for Title IV, Fair Housing Section, 1966 Civil Rights Act, with particular attention called to:

1. The Bingham-sponsored and anti-block busting amendment, prohibiting unscrupulous practices and references to race by real estate agents to induce or attempt to induce the sale of housing.

2. Real estate brokers as businessmen and as licensees of the State should not be allowed to discriminate even with instructions from the seller, therefore, we urge defeat of the Mathias Amendment. Such prohibition would make the Federal law consistent with the Detroit ordinance administered by the Commission on Community Relations, which reads: It shall be unlawful "To refuse, when acting as an agent, to show real property listed for sale, rent or lease, or to refuse to accept and forward an offer to the owner of the listed property, because of the race, creed or national origin of the prospective purchaser."

3. Creation of an administrative agency responsible for enforcement of Title IV is essential to effective implementation, therefore, we urge for the Conyer's Amendment.

Very truly yours,
Richard V. Marks,
Secretary-Director.

Coordinating Council on Human Relations,
Detroit, Mich., July 25, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: The Coordinating Council on Human Relations is an intergroup relations organization with seventy-four affiliated agencies.

The CCHR has long been interested in, and involved with the issue of equal housing opportunity.

Therefore, the CCHR stands in support of the 1966 Civil Rights Act (House Bill 14765) that is now being debated on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. We particularly encourage your support of the Administration's Fair Housing Section Title IV. The CCHR feels that with a Federal law on the books, the solution to this problem will be eminently foreseeable.

Your very truly,
Rev. Robert L. Potts,
Chairman.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 2, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Conyers: In view of the extraordinary efforts being made by certain groups to have you vote against improved housing conditions for Negro Americans, I think you should know that a large number of people are in favor of open occupancy.

Quite naturally real estate brokers, bigots and other vultures who prey upon the Negro community would urge a no vote. However, the progress of this country and its citizens is interdependently tied with the progress Negro Americans can make, and a favorable open occupancy vote would at least give us a feeling of acceptance and freedom so unjustifiably denied us today.

Respectfully yours,
Leonard Douglas.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 1, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.,
House of Representatives of United States,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urge retaining strong title IV provision and Civil Rights Act under debate.

Grace Episcopal Church,
Virginia Park Rehabilitation Citizens Committee.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 1, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.

Strongly urge retention of firm title 4 in Civil Rights Act.

Rev. William S. Logan,
Episcopal Diocese of Michigan.

Detroit, Mich.,
July 29, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I want you to know that I support Title IV the Housing provision of 1966 Civil Rights Act.

Thanking you for the good job you are doing, I am,

Gratefully yours,
Mrs. Myrtle I. Willoughby.

John Conyers, Jr.,
425 Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We the undersigned are asking that you vote "yes" on the housing bill.

Aaron Gay,
Roosevelt E. Wine,
Gus Siamolton,
Pernell Allen,
Josephine E. Gay.

Circulated by Aaron Gay.

July 27, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Conyers: This is just to let you know that you have my unqualified support as you work for passage of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill, including the open housing provisions.

Very truly yours,
Mary L. McGregor,
Detroit, Mich.

C. & C. Investment Co.,
Detroit, Mich., July 25, 1966.

Mr. John Conyers,
Representative,
Congress of United States.

Dear Mr. Conyers: I, Clarence Hudson, of the Detroit Real Estate Brokers' Association,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

wholeheartedly support the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, and especially Section four (4) thereof, in respect to equal opportunities.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE HUDSON.

JULY 24, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For the second time in recent weeks, the Detroit Real Estate Board in paid news advertisements in the local news mediums, has urged a massive letter and telegraph avalanche on the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives by the homeowners, to protest Bill H.R. 14765 and S. 3296 and Title IV of the Bill concerning Housing.

This is reminiscent of the recent Medicare Bill scare by the also powerful American Medical Ass'n., wherein a large, well financed lobby is attempting to use the individual to gain their own ends.

We trust you will investigate this self-evident twisting of facts by the realtors and realize their true motives, which is to control the housing markets and patterns for their own interests, as they have been doing in the past.

Vote for bill H.R. 14765 and S. 3296, and a strong title IV, in the interest of equal civil rights for all American citizens in education, employment and housing.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. W. E. SELLMAN.

DETROIT, MICH.

REDEEMER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
(UNITED PRESBYTERIAN),
Detroit, Mich., July 24, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: I hope that this letter is not too little too late. I am concerned, as I know many others are, over the present status of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill which is due to be reported out of the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 this week.

Any watering down of this bill, especially in the housing section, would be a step backward for all of us. The full intent of the original bill must be maintained.

Also, I believe that your amendment for the establishment of a Fair Housing Board to enforce the code is of paramount importance.

Sincerely yours,

PETER W. PILLSBURY,
Pastor.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 25, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: I urge you to support the fair housing section of the proposed 1966 Civil Rights act.

Since I am a housewife living in an all Negro neighborhood where we seldom see a white person outside of a bill collector or missionary, my main exposure to candid white opinion is listening to Detroit's "talk" station WTAK. It is angering to hear a steady barrage of anti-Negro expressions coming from white people who seem to feel that open housing is somehow un-American. Much advice has been volunteered on what Negroes should do about the race problem. Is it not time now for white people to begin to educate themselves on how to get along with Negroes who have an increasing awareness of their strategic position in a world where they are NOT a minority, but a part of a two-thirds majority?

The press with its unwarranted hysteria over Black Power and the smug suburbanites who take every opportunity to "talk" their prejudices over the airwaves do more to impel us in the direction of Black nationalism than any speech by Stokely Carmichael who we never hear except via a critical news media.

We urge you not only to support Title IV on housing, but we would like to see you rebut some of the anti-Negro diatribe around here (Detroit News, Free Press, station WTAK, etc.) so that we will know elected officials are speaking on our behalf and that the ballot is indeed better than bullets.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JESSIE WALLACE.

THE PRESBYTERY OF DETROIT,
Detroit, Mich., July 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: At this crucial time in the debate concerning the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, I take this opportunity to express the concern of the Presbytery of Detroit that you give your full support to the bill as it was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee with the following exceptions:

1. Title IV—the Mathias amendment be maintained as written in the committee.
2. Title V—the word "lawfully" be deleted; that indemnification awards be written into the bill; and that provision be made for transfer of civil rights cases from State to Federal courts.

This we feel is the minimum that the Federal government can do to continue the drive to insure the constitutional rights of all citizens.

The Presbytery of Detroit, representing 102 churches in the metropolitan Detroit area with a membership of 81,260, did, at its stated meeting on June 28, 1966, take unanimous action in support of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill.

Sincerely,

DAVID B. LOWRY,
Stated Clerk.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
SYNOD OF MICHIGAN,
Detroit, Mich., July 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: At this crucial time in the debate concerning the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, I take this opportunity to express the concern of the Synod of Michigan that you give your full support to the bill as it was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee with the following exceptions:

1. Title IV—The Mathias Amendment be maintained as written in the committee.
2. Title V—The word "lawfully" be deleted; that indemnification awards be written into the bill; and that provision be made for transfer of civil rights cases from State to Federal courts.

This we feel is the minimum that the Federal government can do to continue the drive to insure the constitutional rights of all citizens.

The Synod of Michigan, representing 295 churches with a membership of 163,514, did, at its stated meeting on June 15, 1966, take unanimous action in support of the 1966 Civil Rights bill.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. YOLTON,
Executive.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 21, 1966.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope I am not too late in writing this.

I am convinced that whenever legislation is enacted to protect any "right", particularly a moral and social justice, people will be hurt in the process and correct and "right" intended individuals will suffer. The housing segregation existent presently in our communities *must* cease or we must force many generations to come who will continue suffering those outmoded prejudices presently hurting an older generation of property owners intolerant of the pains of growth and change.

I thoroughly concur in the thinking that "a man's home is his castle" but to predetermine the buyer in a high school sorority framework of similarities is so wrong and so filled with fallacies it is difficult to conceive that it still exists.

If legislation is the only way to alter society's puritanical concepts of pre-judgment then by all means let it be passed and I pray it soon would become an unnecessary and out-dated law.

I hope you receive the encouragement and strength of backing necessary to actively promote the passage of Bill H.R. 14765 and S. 3296, Title IV and any and all Civil Rights Bills to *quickly* promote "man's understanding of man's rights" and human respect as needed in all categories of human endeavor before physical revolution or moral degradation does the determining of our social justice.

Very sincerely yours,

ESTER M. YAGER.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 20, 1966.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have recently read a report of the ridiculous assertions about Negroes and middle class housing in the testimony of the Michigan Real Estate Association before the constitutional rights subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee (as reported in the Detroit News).

I am white; I live in the inner city of Detroit. I have walked and driven through numerous neighborhoods where middle and upper income Negroes live in high quality housing. I am utterly at a loss to know what Mr. Kenyon of the M.R.E.A. was talking about when he asserted that Negroes need "a kind of training period in high quality housing before being allowed into white suburban neighborhoods." Those whom I observe seem to have accommodated themselves quite well to living in quality housing, without the benefit of Mr. Kenyon's "training period". Besides, when does anyone in the selling business ever question whether any home-buyer who has the money to buy in a particular price range needs a "training period" to live in that price housing?

Mr. Kenyon also cries about redress for "losses" to brokers or property owners. It is well known that the only reason for losses to homeowners (the real estate business has never "lost" any sales to Negroes in white neighborhoods) is that the real estate interests will incur are loss from the illegitimate, panic selling in neighborhoods after the first Negro has moved in. The actual value of the property itself is no different the day after the Negro moves in than the day before. The only losses that the Real Estate interests will incur are lose from the illegitimate, unethical business activities that many of them have been carrying on. I fail to see how the honest ones can lose money while adding Negro purchasing power to a legitimate housing market.

As a citizen I demand that the Congress articulate unequivocally through Title IV of the Civil Rights Bill that no citizen shall be denied a free choice of housing solely on the basis of race, religion or national origin. This must apply to private home-owners as well as all those involved in selling, building, managing, or financing. We must take the pressure off our minorities caused by the absence of a free housing market. Otherwise, we are asking for the lid to blow off in the areas where we have them boxed in.

Please convey these demands to the members of the Judiciary Committee.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN I. HOWE.

METROPOLITAN DETROIT
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
COMMISSION OF RACE AND
CULTURAL RELATIONS,
Detroit, Mich., July 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: At this crucial time in the debate concerning the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, I take this opportunity to express the concern of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches that you give your full support to the bill as it was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee with the following exceptions:

1. Title IV—the Mathias amendment be maintained as written in the committee.
2. Title V—the word "lawfully" be deleted; that indemnification awards be written into the bill; and that provision be made for transfer of civil rights cases from State to Federal courts.

This we feel is the minimum that the Federal government can do to continue the drive to insure the constitutional rights of all citizens.

The Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches, representing 800 churches in the metropolitan Detroit area, did take unanimous action in support of the proposed bill on June 9, 1966.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. HOPPE,
Executive Director.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 15, 1966.

MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I think it is all wrong to force unwilling owners to sell or rent his property to some one you do not desire. It denies us our freedom. That is what America stands for *freedom*. It denies us who we want to live with or have in our home. What a shame.

How can we expect to bring up our children to be good citizens and then be expected to rent or sell to any undesirables of which they will come in contact with. One bad apple spoils a barrel. We can expect more riots and trouble and stabbings.

Sure hope this bill will be rejected.

MRS. EVELYN BAUMAN.

THE MICHIGAN CANCER FOUNDATION,
Detroit, Mich., July 18, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Representative from Michigan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: I am writing to express my support for the 1966 Civil Rights Bill, and particularly for Title IV of that Bill. I understand from the Newsletter of the Archbishop's Committee on Human Relations that your mail has been running very much contrary to support for this Title of the new law.

As President of the Michigan Cancer Foundation I encounter a good many people. I am also a member of the Plan Commission in Grosse Pointe Park, and a member of several committees of the Wayne County Medical Society. I shall do my best from whatever podium comes available to me to argue in favor of this Title, and I certainly hope that you will vote in favor of it.

Racial segregation must be opposed with great vigor and laws of this kind will help in reducing the injustices by racial prejudice in our city.

Very sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. BRENNAN, M.D.,
President, Michigan Cancer Foundation.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 11, 1966.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As my Congressman I am sending to you copies of letters sent to our Senators.

Since I already know what your vote will be on this important bill this letter is for the record to show one more of the number of letters received by you in favor of the Open Housing section of the bill now before you.

Sincerely yours,

M. STEWART THOMPSON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 11, 1966.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to cast your vote in favor of an Open Housing bill. Realtors have made too much money already from segregated housing by treating Negroes as colonials and selling to them housing in only designated areas and refusing to sell to whites in these areas.

Think what it will mean to our country in removing this last condition of slavery and colonialism which custom has created but which laws are needed to stop. Think also what it will mean to the minorities to have the reconstruction amendments of a hundred years ago implemented.

I shall look with anticipation at your conduct in this instance.

Sincerely yours,

M. STEWART THOMPSON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 11, 1966.

Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to cast your vote in favor of an Open Housing bill. Realtors have made too much money already from segregated housing by treating Negroes as colonials and selling to them housing in only designated areas and refusing to sell to whites in these areas.

Think what it will mean to our country in removing the last condition of slavery and colonialism which custom has created but which laws are needed to stop. Think also what it will mean to the minorities to have the reconstruction amendments of a hundred years ago implemented.

I shall look with anticipation at your conduct in this instance.

Sincerely yours,

M. STEWART THOMPSON.

THE CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL
COUNCIL OF DETROIT,
Detroit, Mich., July 19, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: Just to keep you posted, the enclosed copy was sent to several members of the House Judiciary Committee hoping that it has helped you in your efforts. Keep up the good work!

Sincerely yours,

RUFUS P. KNIGHTON,
President.

JULY 19, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD HUTCHINSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: Our members are very interested in the 1966 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV on Housing. At our meeting July 13th, our Council voted unanimously to endorse this legislation and to urge Congressmen to vote for it.

Your position on the House Judiciary Committee gives you a particular opportunity to do a real service to the nation. We are seeing that enforced segregation as it exists in such separate places as Watts, New York and Chicago can disrupt the peace of the total community. By giving access for all Americans to the liberties we should enjoy, this legislation will give us the tools to work for neighborhood peace.

In the face of the national campaign by some real estate interests, voting for this legislation will take a steady insistence on principle. Contrary to their propaganda, this legislation will benefit the individual home owner. Present real estate practices make it almost impossible for an individual home owner to sell his property to the buyer of his choice—if he wishes to choose a minority group buyer, for instances. In criticizing the position of the Detroit Real Estate Board, the Detroit News in a June 16 editorial characterized the real estate industry as subtly segregationist.

Again, may we ask your vote to get this legislation out of committee and to the floor where all Congressmen will cast their votes.

Sincerely yours,

RUFUS P. KNIGHTON,
President.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 26, 1966.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote yes on open occupancy bill.

Mr. and Mrs. LESTER J. COLLIE.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 25, 1966.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Feel imperative you support Civil Rights Act as reported out of committee especially Title 4.

Pastor JAMES HEINMEIER,
Nazareth Lutheran Church Det.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With the housing situation being as it is, I am adding my voice to those who urge passage of a strong & fair bill.

I feel that the Federal Government must lead the way in legislation against discrimination.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. WILSON.

SACRED HEART SEMINARY,
Detroit, Mich., July 17, 1966.

Mr. JOHN CONYERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: I wish to indicate my support of Title IV of the '66 Civil Rights Bill and to urge you to give it full support.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. THOMAS F. HINSBERG.

ARCHDIOCESE OF DETROIT,
Detroit, Mich., July 16, 1966.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: I feel very strongly that our Federal Laws should protect the civil rights of all of our people, and I am especially concerned that you will give your support to the Civil Rights Act of 1966, especially Title 4 which touches on the very important question of open housing.

Sincerely yours,

Very Rev. Msgr. T. J. GUMBLETON,
Vice Chancellor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DETROIT,
July 17, 1966.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: I urge you to support the '66 Civil Rights Act especially title IV on housing. I also urge you to support the passage of the Leadership Conference amendments.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE BROWN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 15, 1966.

Mr. JOHN CONYERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: May I urge you to support the '66 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV and the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

As a citizen, I am confident that you will support this legislation. Thank you for whatever you can do in this regard.

Sincerely,

MARGUERITE SCOFIELD.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to vote for the Civil Rights Bill of 1966 and especially to support and vote for a strong fair housing provision in this bill. We also urge you to vote in the support of Home Rule for the District of Columbia the capitol of the land of the free.

MARIE G. LEATHERMAN,
Grand Basileu Lambda Kappa Mu Sorority.

CHURCH OF ST. BARNABAS,
East Detroit, Mich., July 15, 1966.

MY DEAR MR. CONYERS: I am writing to urge you to support the 1966 Civil Rights Act, especially Title IV and the amendments suggested by the Leadership Conference o[illegible] Civil Rights.

We certainly hope and pray that every citizen in our country will be able to enjoy the freedom which is supposedly guaranteed by our constitution.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Rev. J. F. O'CALLAGHAN.

ARCHBISHOP'S COMMITTEE ON
HUMAN RELATIONS,
Detroit, Mich., July 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Member of Congress,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: We urge your support of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

We are enclosing a copy of the official position of the Catholic Church in Michigan on Equal Opportunity in Housing which may be of some assistance to you.

We feel that Title IV is the important section of the 1966 Civil Rights Act. If it is not as strong as originally proposed we will have failed.

In Detroit on June 19 the Reverend Martin Luther King said that many people were asking him if he is going to abandon nonviolence since the majority of Negroes seem to be rejecting it. King states that the leader does not follow the consensus but molds it. We do not underestimate the negative pressure on Title IV which are being exerted by vested interests. But we call upon you to lead, to help in molding a just and American consensus by your support for a strong Title IV in the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

Sincerely,

Rev. JAMES J. SHEEHAN.

UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT,
Detroit, Mich., July 8, 1966.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: I urge you to do everything in you power to retain Title IV, the fair housing section of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. Our students come from all over Michigan as well as from other States, and we feel that this national problem will only be solved by Federal legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. ARTHUR E. LOVELEY, S.J.,
Professor of Theology.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 7, 1966.

MR. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.: I strongly urge you to support every Title in the 1966 Civil Rights Act and especially Title IV which is being questioned by some pressure groups.

I also feel that the Leadership Conference Amendments should be passed.

Sincerely,

EILEEN MARIE SHAW.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 7, 1966.

MR. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.: I strongly urge you to support every Title in the 1966 Civil Rights Act and especially Title IV which is being questioned by some pressure groups.

I also feel that the Leadership Conference Amendments should be passed.

Sincerely,

MARY FAITH BELL.

CALVARY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., July 6, 1966.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please do all in your power to see that we get a strong 1966 Civil Rights Bill. We are especially anxious that Title IV is not watered down. We follow your record with appreciation.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND H. SWARTZBACK.

CITY OF DETROIT, COMMISSION ON
COMMUNITY RELATIONS,
Detroit, Mich., July 6, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution, unanimously approved by the Detroit Commission on Community Relations at their June meeting. The resolution endorses the principles of the housing section of the 1966 U.S. Civil Rights Bill.

On behalf of the Commission, I urge you, as an elected official representing the interests of all people, to support the ideals of fair housing embodied in this legislation. It is only by eliminating barriers in the housing field that we will create a free and competitive housing market where property is accessible to any person without discrimination.

We would be interested in knowing your position on the housing section of the Bill.

Sincerely,

EDWARD L. CUSHMAN,
Chairman.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE HOUSING SECTION OF THE 1966 U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS BILL BY DETROIT COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The Detroit Commission on Community Relations endorses the basic principles of the Housing Section of the 1966 U.S. Civil Rights Bill which would extend to all citizens without regard to race, creed or national origin, the basic right to rent, lease or purchase real property.

The Commission is registering its position with U.S. Senators from Michigan and Congressmen from Detroit, urging them to declare their support for the basic ideal of fair housing.

The recent public hearings on housing discrimination held by the Commission demonstrated clearly the need for such legislation. The hearings pointed out the active part of certain elements of the local real estate industry in the maintenance of segregated housing and the attitudes which perpetuate it. On the national level, an organized campaign against the proposed housing legislation is being stimulated largely by the National Association of Real Estate Boards. While claiming to uphold freedom of choice in property transfers, a significant number of persons in the real estate industry opposed the legislation which would insure an open competitive market.

The Commission on Community Relations commends the President for his leadership in requesting this needed legislation and asks that all citizens of this community as well as its governmental leaders voice their support of the principles in the housing portion of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill.

ST. BERNARD CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., July 8, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Please support positively the Title IV of the 1966 Civil Rights Act. As we both know housing is a critical issue in the civil rights movement, we are most anxious to hear your voice raised on this issue.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 5, 1966.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: I am writing to urge you to support the passage of Title IV and every other title of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 as well as the leadership conference amendments. I believe that in the long run, Civil Rights will be more crucial for America than the war in Viet Nam.

Sincerely yours,

IRWIN SHAW.

ST. BERNARD CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., July 5, 1966.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: Please support the 1966 Civil Rights Act. esp. Title IV on housing.

Housing is of the very essence of the civil rights struggle. Do not by dismayed by the tactics of unscrupulous groups.

Please back this Title IV with all of the moral persuasion possible.

Sincerely,

Rev. THOMAS J. KERWIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 4, 1966.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee:

I am in favor of House bill 14765 including Title IV.

PHILIP J. WYELS,
LORETTA S. WYELS.

P.S. Ruth Wyels (our daughter, currently out of the city, a voter, is definitely for this bill.)

DIOCESE OF MICHIGAN,
THE DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM,
Detroit, Mich., June 29, 1966.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As you continue your examination of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, I would like to record myself as wholeheartedly in endorsement of the Administration Bill as presented to you and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights' amendments, designed to strengthen the jury trial and housing sections, create a new board to indemnify

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

victims or civil rights violence, and require state and local governments to hire without discrimination.

We are especially sensitive in Detroit to the urgent need to narrow the gap between the negro and white communities in every area of human endeavor and opportunity.

Appreciating your consideration and cognizant of your great responsibility, I am

Faithfully yours,

Rev. Frederick B. Jansen.

Newman Apostolate,
Detroit, Mich.

Dear Congressman Conyers: Interested in civil rights for all and knowing the evils of segregation, I ask you to support the 1966 Civil Rights Act, particularly title IV on housing.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. Gerald J. O'Bee.

The American Jewish Committee
Detroit, Mich., June 20, 1966.

Representative John Conyers, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Conyers: This is a note of strong support for the position you took supporting Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of this year. This housing provision is key in our northern urban centers for so many of the problems of education and economic opportunity are tied to housing segregation.

Sincerely,

Leonard Gordon.

Detroit, Mich.,
June 10, 1966.

John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am sure that you are well acquainted with the recent propaganda that the Detroit Free Press printed about the fair housing bill. It was a masterpiece of clear-ringing phrases that stir the heart and move the soul. It was a herald trumpet filled with empty words that skirted the real issue involved. It is a clear attempt to keep the Negroes into what is termed "their place," a ghetto area that sickens anyone who enters it. I have heard all the arguments I ever want to about gradual desegregation that will eventually come about when we noble Caucasians experience a change of heart and welcome them into the fold. It will never happen without force and the Negroes cannot be expected to bring enough to bear. The advertisement urged me to write to my representative, and that is exactly what I am doing. I applaud you.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Blouin.

June 20, 1966.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, House of Representatives Judiciary Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Celler: The Board of Management of the Oakland Branch of the Metropolitan Detroit Y.W.C.A. urges the passage of HR 14765 Civil Rights Act of 1966 during this session of Congress. Support for such legislation has been a part of the Y.W.C.A.'s program for at least twenty years.

At the 23rd National Convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, April, 1964, the following resolution was passed:

"Support measures which will provide all persons without regard to race, creed or nationality back ground, the right to share on an integrated basis in education, employment, *housing and transportation and all services financed to any degree by the Federal government.*"

Since the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 have been inadequate to achieve the full purpose of the above Resolution and since HR 14765 offers concrete protection for those attempting to exercise the rights guaranteed to them in the former Civil Rights Acts it seems imperative that HR 14765 be enacted into law this session of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Edith Smitley,
Chairman, Board of Management.
Mrs. Joanne Sibille,
Corresponding Secretary.

Detroit, Mich.,
June 27, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers: I know there have been attempts to delete or cut out the open-housing part of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill. I urge you strongly to fight these efforts with everything at your disposal, it is highly important that any person be able to rent or buy anywhere he is financially able to do so. I am sure you would do this anyway and I want you to know that you have my support and the support of many of the people in your District.

Respectfully yours,

Jay H. Moore, Jr.

Inkster, Mich.,
July 26, 1966.

Dear Congressman John Conyers: We need the new Civil Rights Bill don't water it down.

Sincerely,

Dr. Norman V. Mitchell.

Detroit, Mich.,
July 27, 1966.

John Conyers,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Ninty-nine Michigan residents representing church labor civic groups had chartered a plane to be in Washington today to urge you to vote for the strongest H.B. 14675. Plane grounded due to pressure leak. No alternate transportation available, letters from individuals following.

Task force in support of 1966 Civil Rights Act.

R. A. Hoppe,
Detroit Council of Churches.

Council of Michigan YWCA's,
Detroit, Mich., June 16, 1966.

Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
House Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Jacobs: The Council of Michigan YWCAs wishes to express to you its support of H.R. 14765, the new Civil Rights bill, now before the Congress. We urge you to act favorably on this essential legislation during the present session. We believe all of the following features should be included in the Act:

1. The prevention of discrimination in the selection of state and federal juries.
2. The means for facilitating the desegregation of public school and other facilities.
3. The protection for Negroes and civil rights workers against violence when exercising their constitutional rights.
4. The prohibition of all racial and religious discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. This provision we consider of special importance at the present time.

The Council of Michigan YWCAs also urges you to consider the recommendations of the White House Conference, which is urging a strengthening of H.R. 14765 in a number of ways. Experience has shown that successful administration of civil rights legislation requires strong administrative agencies, as suggested by the Conference.

Very truly yours,

Frances E. Coburn,
Chairman State Public Affairs Committee.
Eloise E. Spencer,
Executive Secretary.

Detroit, Mich., *June 14, 1966.*

Dear Congressman Conyers: I'm writing to let you know that I support you in your efforts to bring about the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. As I'm sure you'll agree, this matter is very important for the future of intergroup relations.

In your support,

Julius R. Brown.

New Calvary Baptist Church,
Detroit, Mich., June 20, 1966.

Congressman John Conyers, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The members of our congregation respectfully urge the use of your good office to bring from Committee the Civil Rights Act of 1966 with all its Titles and the Amendments of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Yours truly,

Charles William Butler,
Pastor.

The Woman's Convention, Auxiliary to the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.,
Detroit, Mich., June 24, 1966.

Hon. John Conyers,
House of U.S. Congress.

Dear Sir: Would you please vote for the passage of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill and the four additional Recommendations?

I would appreciate this very much.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Mary O. Ross,
President.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Charles H. Wilson] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole] made a statement in regard to trips to Vietnam by congressional candidates; namely, one Clive DuVal, a nominee for Congress from the 10th District of Virginia. A great deal of misunderstanding has arisen as a result of this statement, misunderstandings which Mr. DuVal has very effectively clarified to the voters in the 10th District. And, based upon my personal knowledge of Mr. DuVal and my understanding, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, of the character of trips to this wartorn nation, I have a few remarks which I would like to share with my colleagues on this important topic.

Mr. DuVal's concern with the situation in Vietnam was sharpened by his experiences in campaigning door to door for the Democratic nomination to Congress. Talking to the voters of the 10th District, he found that the situation in Vietnam weighed heavily on their minds. Many people were anxious to know where a candidate for Congress stands on the Vietnamese war and why.

Consequently, he decided that what was needed was thorough study of the situation, a study which could only be valid if assessed on the scene. So, at his own expense, he undertook the arduous 24,000-mile trip to Saigon and return.

It might be added that Clive DuVal is one who strongly believes at looking at problems for himself, and he has done so in past campaigns—personally seeing for himself the education, transportation, and pollution problems of northern Virginia.

Mr. DuVal's tour of Vietnam was undertaken on an unofficial basis at his own expense. The Federal Government did not contribute any money toward the trip and DuVal's visit was controlled by Ambassador Lodge's guidelines. In going to Vietnam, DuVal wanted merely to assess U.S. military posture firsthand. His days and nights were not spent frivolously; his grueling visit was spent in the pursuit of truth to make men free.

DuVal wanted to know if U.S. intervention in South Vietnam was just. He wanted to discover what Americans there thought of the war. He wanted to know what Vietnamese officials, students, intellectuals, Buddhists, Catholics—the people themselves—thought about the war. And he wanted the views of the many American, British, and French newsmen stationed there.

He found—

That militarily the United States is gradually wearing down the North Vietnamese and Vietcong guerrillas;

That the United States must do much more in pacification and reconstruction efforts than it has in the past;

That the Vietcong do not represent a substantial number of South Vietnamese; they are, in fact, essentially a front for the Hanoi government;

That, in view of the progress to date on the military and civilian fronts, he would oppose any escalation of the war that might directly involve Communist China or the Soviet Union; and

That the conflict has become the chief test of the U.S. announced intentions and capabilities to help small and weak nations develop peacefully in the way they wish.

Incidentally, Ambassador Lodge told DuVal that he felt such firsthand looks at the war by congressional candidates were extremely valuable to the candidates and to the voters by enabling them to think intelligently about our Nation's most pressing foreign problem.

I am in full support of the views which my very able and discerning Chairman Mendel Rivers expressed in a letter to Secretary McNamara against "political gravy" trips to Vietnam. However, I heartily favor, as does Chairman Rivers, trips made in the serious spirit of inquiry; and, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can testify to the great value of a trip to Vietnam taken in this spirit. My experiences there enabled me to better understand our involvement and to contribute this understanding to my constituents. All who have made such a study trip to southeast Asia know that it can hardly be called a "junket" or, in other words, a smoothly traveled trip to a pleasurable spot. Mr. DuVal's trip took over 42 hours, including fueling time, to travel from Saigon to Washington. And, once there, he faced the dangers of unfamiliar food, unsanitary water, and terrorist attacks.

Is it not ironic that, when Mr. DuVal was criticized for his visit to the war zone, no similar criticism was leveled at Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio, and Newton Steers, of Maryland, two Republican congressional candidates who have also toured Vietnam this election year?

We can boil this whole controversy down the question: Do the people of Virginia's 10th Congressional District have the right to know the facts on the various issues which confront them? I feel that every voter, not only in the 10th District but in this country, should have available as much information as possible. On this premise, I feel that Clive DuVal has done a great public service for the people of the 10th Congressional District by acquiring firsthand information on the most critical foreign policy issue of today: Vietnam.

THE HEROISM OF CLEVELAND FIREMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly before 11 a.m. last August 4, a fire alarm was turned in from the Metallurgical, Inc., plant at 9801 Walford Avenue in my home district in Cleveland.

With sirens screeming, courageous Cleveland firemen rushed to the scene. Within minutes, they were in the building, performing their professional duty to protect lives and property at great personal risk.

A sudden explosion of aluminum dust showered the firefighters with flames and debris. Four firemen were killed and eight injured.

On behalf of all the people of the 20th Congressional District of Ohio, all the people of the city of Cleveland, and all the people of the United States, I wish to thank these men and their families for their devoted, heroic public service.

The four firemen who made the supreme sacrifice in line of duty were, Charles G. Doehner, John A. Petz, Ralph E. Simon, and Joseph G. Toolis.

All of us owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be paid.

In Cleveland, public-spirited businessmen have organized a group called Bluecoats, Inc., which has undertaken to provide educational and other benefits for the wives and children of police and firemen killed in line of duty.

Before sunset on the day of tragedy, representatives of Bluecoats, Inc., had called on the families of the fallen heroes, presenting each with a check for $1,000 and assuring them that further assistance would be forthcoming.

The members of Bluecoats, Inc., were speaking for the entire community, and assuming the obligation of the entire community. I commend them, and urge that similar organizations be established throughout the Nation to provide similar benefits for the families of police and firemen who sacrifice their lives performing a vital public service.

At the same time, I urge the people of all communities—including my home city of Cleveland—to take a look at the pay scales and working conditions of their firemen and police officers. It seems to me that these men are entitled to better consideration for the daily risks they run in serving the public.

LEGISLATION TO RELIEVE HAWAII FROM ECONOMIC DISASTER PROPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, legislation which presently is being considered by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee provides for the settlement of the current labor dispute which has grounded five of the Nation's major airlines since July 8. My information is that such legislation, already passed by the Senate, will soon come to the floor of the House. It is now an accepted premise that the airlines strike, coming at the height of the summer vacation and travel season for most Americans, has detrimentally affected the national economy to a very substantial degree.

The strike has produced consequences which generally have been described as "serious." However, this assessment of the effects of the airlines strike has generally been restricted to conditions which are found to prevail within the limits of the continental United States. In my own State of Hawaii, the strike has caused an economic emergency.

Hawaii, because of its unique insularity, depends largely on airborne tourists and freight as a source of revenue. The strike has reduced service to one major airline operating between Hawaii and the west coast, instead of the usual three. Thousands of prospective visitors have canceled plans to vacation in Hawaii. Thousands of other vacationers in the islands are having great difficulty in securing transportation to return to their homes on the mainland. The economic havoc that the airlines strike is creating for hotels and other businesses is evidenced by the fact that the weekly loss of revenue to Hawaii is estimated at upwards of $3 million per week. An item that is difficult of evaluation, of course, is the hardship and personal inconvenience that the strike has caused stranded travelers to suffer. Thousands have had to spend restless nights at the airport in the hope of replacing "no-shows."

Mr. Speaker, to prevent a recurrence in Hawaii of an emergency situation which inevitably follows an airlines strike such as we are now experiencing, I have today introduced legislation which is intended to provide necessary relief to the Island State. It is legislation which will not affect or be affected by the resolution which is presently under consideration by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Specifically, my bill would amend section 147 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue emergency operating authorizations to foreign air carriers to carry passengers and freight between points on the west coast and Hawaii.

Under existing law, the Civil Aeronautics Board has not authority to lift cabotage regulations covering foreign air carriers operating between Honolulu and points along the west coast even on a temporary basis. Because of this restriction, foreign air carriers have reportedly been departing from Honolulu for west coast destinations during the present airlines strike with an average of 1,000 empty seats per week. My bill would fill these seats in order to alleviate the intense problem that confronts Hawaii with every airline strike involving certificated domestic carriers.

The legislation I have introduced would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct an investigation on its own initiative or upon complaint in order to determine that air transportation services being offered by certificated carriers between Hawaii and the west coast is temporarily insufficient to meet the requirements of the public or the postal service because of a strike or other work stoppage affecting such carriers. Upon determination by the CAB that such services in fact are insufficient, my bill would allow the Board to issue a foreign air carrier an emergency special authorization to engage in air transportation between such points.

In order to reassure those who may have some doubts regarding the extraordinary provisions of my bill, I would like to say that the authorization to any foreign air carrier is to be issued only under emergency conditions and for periods of not more than 30 days at a time. Any authorization or extension will not be valid after the date of termination of the strike or other work stoppage as determined by the Board. Further, the emergency special operating authorization is not to be deemed a license within the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. Speaker, the unique geographical setting of the State of Hawaii requires the prompt enactment of the legislation I have introduced in order to avoid the severe and irreparable economic losses it is now suffering as a result of the current airlines strike. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this measure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Nedzi, for August 10–12, 1966, on account of death in the family.

Mr. Farnum, for August 10, and the balance of the week, on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hungate) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Charles H. Wilson, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Feighan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Matsunaga, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Gubser (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Kupferman (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho), for 30 minutes, on August 11; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bray (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho), for 30 minutes, on August 10; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Saylor.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hungate) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pucinski.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 15485. An act to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 14875. An act to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15485. An act to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2623. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2624. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on the financial, management, and procurement assistance activities of the Small Business Administration throughout 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2625. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting drafts of four private bills for the relief of employees of the Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3423. An act to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14754. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate a certain oil and gas lease; with amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 420. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11488. A bill to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10267. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which certain military, naval, and air service records may corrected; with amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16646. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 11555. A bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 15024. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require the Administrator of General Services to acquire certain additional property in the District of Columbia for public purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 16917. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 16918. A bill to provide for U.S. standards and a uniform national inspection system for grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16919. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 16920. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to provide financial assistance to States participating in a uniform recordkeeping system for persons engaged in occupations involving exposure to ionizing radiation, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16921. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 16922. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefit payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16923. A bill to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16924. A bill to make certain expenditures of Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Scarritt College eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16925. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 16926. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 16927. A bill to reclassify certain positions on the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 16928. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16929. A bill to amend section 417 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue emergency operating authorizations to foreign air carriers to engage in air transportation between points on the west coast of the United States and points in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 16930. A bill to establish the Commission on Labor Relations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16931. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 16932. A bill to permit the city of Wichita, Kans., to count expenditures made for its current civic cultural center as local noncash grants-in-aid toward the Wichita urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16933. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 16934. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16935. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 16936. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16937. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16938. A bill to provide that plans and regulations established pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the control of water pollution shall apply to vessels (including boats) and marinas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.J. Res. 1264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the offering of prayers or any other recognition of God shall be permitted in public shcools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 1265. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 973. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H. Con. Res. 974. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax-deductible educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Res. 961. Resolution providing for a special committee to study the operations, activities, and expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 962. Resolution providing for a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation to ascertain the reasons for the rapid rise in the prices of food, including dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 16939. A bill for the relief of the Kent Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 16940. A bill to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16941. A bill for the relief of Nino and Maria Theresa Vespa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 16942. A bill for the relief of Erika Findeiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16943. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Panoussis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16944. A bill for the relief of Peter Heinrich Joehnssen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H. Res. 963. Resolution extending the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the Wittenberg University Choir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Indiana Community Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from August 5 through August 13 the Borough of Indiana, Pa., will celebrate the sesquicentennial of its incorporation. The colorful and exciting history of this community is an inspiration that should always have a prominent place in the history of America's development and progress.

In 1795 a blacksmith from Lancaster County named Conrad Rice set out into the wild forest with his sons and put the future of his family on the site that was to expand into Indiana Borough—50 miles east by northeast of Pittsburgh. Wild animals of many descriptions—including bears, panthers, wolves, and fierce catamounts—stalked the area. Fortunately, the great Chief Cornplanter ruled the Seneca Tribe, and his men were beginning to accept the white settlers.

Prof. J. T. Stewart, in his history of Indiana County in 1913, best described the trials and difficulties that faced the Rice family and those who settled near them in this paragraph:

> It was a solitary spot, where even the rude son of the forest had not deigned to build his wigwam. But the time had arrived when the aspect was to be changed. A band of bold adventurers penetrated into the heart of the unbroken wild, and reared here the standard of civilization. Their progress was slow at first. Inconvenience had to be suffered, dangers met, and difficulties overcome. Cut off from the great thoroughfares of the State, with a sparsely settled district of country around them, and remote from mills, factories, markets and institutions of learning, their situation would not have been envied by men accustomed to live at ease, and less calculated for emergencies such as had daily to be encountered. These village pioneers were in all respects equal to the task before them. They possessed resolute hearts and strong arms, and were deeply impressed with that spirit of enterprise which is one of the leading characteristics of the American pioneer.

When Indiana was incorporated as a borough in 1816, its population was about 3,000. But by now a physician had located there, and lawyers, teachers, and clergymen came to be a part of the community. There were carpenters, chairmakers, wheelwrights, brickmakers, tanners, and painters. Indiana has won its way as a self-sufficient cultural center.

Yet an infant community, Indiana had its own electric light plant in 1891, and a sewage disposal plant was constructed in 1909. Water mains for fire hydrants had been constructed in 1887, thus preventing the spread of many fires that could have been disastrous.

Today the community is just above five times the size of the borough at the time of its incorporation, but it is easily one of the Nation's most attractive. Its State university, founded in 1875, presently has an enrollment of more than 5,000 students.

The borough of Indiana is the birthplace of many outstanding Americans, among them motion picture star James Stewart and the late Gov. John S. Fisher. The Nation should be proud of them all, from Conrad Rice through the long list of residents that have contributed so much to this country and its advancement.

Fifth Anniversary of Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Alliance for Progress nears its fifth anniversary, there is a growing realization that what started out as a 10-year program of social and economic development should continue far beyond the original decade. Comments from all quarters—public and private—demonstrate an increasing interest in and awareness of the need to not only follow present programs with more and better ones in an effort to achieve those noble goals set forth at Punta del Este on August 17, 1961—but to breathe new life into the Alliance.

To be sure, this vast hemispheric effort has its detractors, and not all are in the ranks of communism. Any program as huge and comprehensive as the Alliance is by its very nature susceptible to periodic charges of inefficiency or slowness in achieving its objectives.

We should not be discouraged nor overly depressed by adverse commentary. The majority of the most vociferous attacks come from our enemies who fear the progress our hemispheric alliance is accomplishing. And the more success we have, the more vocal these complaints will become.

Nor must we permit ourselves to become pessimistic. No great movement ever achieved its ends in a few short years, even as "Rome was not built in one day." That we have accepted this truth in regard to the Alliance was clearly pointed out during the Second Special Inter-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro last October where our Government officially pledged U.S. support to the Alliance beyond the original 10-year period.

What we are seeing is the coming of age of the Alliance. In its first formative years, from 1961 to 1963, a massive effort was invested in the establishment of the necessary machinery to make the Alliance function smoothly. Results during that period were not spectacular.

It was also a period of trial and error, a time during which both men and machinery had to come into a state of balance, and the principles outlined in the Charter of Punta del Este had to be reevaluated and spelled out in real terms and in action programs. It was a period for study and fixing priorities.

Although the United States and its partners in this revolutionary Alliance are still learning much about how to best achieve economic development and social justice within a free, democratic framework, the basic superstructure of the Alliance has been established and the foundations laid.

In these first 5 years of hard work and sincere dedication, much has been accomplished. U.S. economic commitments of over $5 billion have been matched by economic planning and self-help measures to achieve an astounding record of physical accomplishments. And it should be mentioned that the United States provides only one-tenth of the total—the bulk comes from the nations involved. Although it is true that the major problems of lack of production and an exploding population still hover like spectres above us, many positive steps have been taken in the right direction.

Permit me to cite just a few examples: 300,000 houses have been built or are being built; 2,000 rural wells and 1,170 potable water supply systems have been built; over 600,000 agricultural credit loans were extended involving some 3 million persons; 1,200 hospitals, health centers, and mobile medical units are in operation or will be shortly; 100 million people have been protected from malaria; 13 million schoolchildren and 3 million preschool children have participated in school lunch programs under food for peace.

These rather dry, cold statistics fail to tell the real story. A road hacked out of the jungle by humble people imbued with the spirit of community civic action; an aqueduct that will help insure a clean supply of water and add years of productivity and happiness to once stunted lives; new houses, clinics, and schools constructed by the sparetime, cooperative efforts of parents desirous of giving their children that gift they never had—a basic education—these and many other projects make up the real Alliance, a story of people and their search for a better life.

In Peru, high in the Andes, the people of the village of Navan needed a road from their town to get their products out to the highway. It was a distance of 6 miles. The villagers merely needed picks and shovels. With these tools supplied through the Texas Partners of the Alliance and a lot of back-bending work, the people of Navan achieved their link with the outside world. Now not only trucks ply the new road but two government teachers have started the first reading and writing classes in the village. Their motto, in keeping with a basic tenet of the Alliance for Progress: "We will help those who help themselves."

Not the least of the many difficulties faced by the Alliance has been the changing of old, static, complacent at-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

titudes into the dynamic, can-do psychology required to effect the peaceful revolution so necessary. These attitude changes are coming about as new roads, literally and figuratively, are being forged.

Rapid change is the watchword. Most Latin American countries have already set goals, made comprehensive national plans, pushed for reforms in education, devised housing and health programs and modernized tax laws, and land ownership systems. Some countries are making outstanding progress in these fields. Brazil, Colombia, Chile, and others have also done much in the development of essential institutions such as credit unions, savings and loan associations, farm cooperatives and community services organizations.

In the field of credit unions alone, nearly 2,000 have been established representing almost a half million members with a cumulative value of loans reaching over $87 million. The four leaders in this field in the number of credit unions established are: Peru, 532; Colombia, 444; Ecuador, 188; and Bolivia, 156.

Similarly dramatic growth has been made in savings and loan associations and cooperatives of all kinds.

In these and many other areas, self-help constitutes the basic pervading philosophy which lends impetus to dreams and plans as our Alliance partners marshal their own internal resources. The United States could pour in millions of dollars, and unless there are corresponding steps, tough decisions, and many sacrifices on the part of the recipient country, they would go for naught.

Just what are our neighbors doing to uphold their share of the development effort? In the first place they are making a multibillion-dollar contribution, in both public and private funds, to their own development. It is estimated this contribution is in the neighborhood of $35 billion.

What other progress have they made? In the key field of taxes, collections have increased from $7.3 billion in 1960 to $9.2 billion in 1964, an increase of 26 percent in 4 years.

Budgets are earmarking more funds for education. With AID assistance, some 160,000 teachers have received training and over 25,000 classrooms have been built.

Land reform laws have been passed in 15 countries. Agricultural credit for the farmer is now available at reasonable interest rates in at least 15 countries.

Thirteen countries have established or are establishing public and private development banks or private investment funds.

In the last 2 years Latin American countries have had an average per capita gross national product increase of 2.5 percent or better, while export earnings have increased by more than than 25 percent for the region.

These and more figures can be cited to show the determination of Latin American countries in general to forge their own improved future. I cite them merely to demonstrate honest efforts which, in my opinion, merit continued U.S. support. At the same time these endeavors have not gone unnoticed by other developed nations, as well as by private investors who are making increased amounts of capital available.

There can be little doubt that the Alliance has already made a lasting impression on Latin America, its leaders and its people. We have but to refer to some recent statements by outstanding statesmen from the Rio Grande to Tierra del Fuego to realize the impact the Alliance and its programs have had.

Recently the President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz said:

> The Alliance for Progress is a program which must continue. In the case of our country, we can affirm that the Alliance has operated satisfactorily.

President Guillermo Leon Valencia of Colombia stated:

> To be sure, at the beginning, there were some procedural difficulties in the Alliance, as there are in every important work in the beginning, but, with the passage of time, the efficacy of the Alliance in Colombia has been extraordinary, and I hope it has been the same in other countries of the Hemisphere.

How does Colombia's President-elect, Carlos Lleras Restrepo, feel about relations with the United States under the Alliance? In one of his first statements on the subject he said he considered "friendship with the United States" the cornerstone of Colombian foreign policy. Dr. Lleras Restrepo is an outstanding economist dedicated to social and economic reform, as are many of Latin America's executives today.

In Central America more than 5.5 million textbooks have been printed for free use in the public schools under the Alliance. This major contribution in the educational field is currently providing texts on reading, language, mathematics, social studies and science. The program, now in its third year was a first major step by the Organization of Central American States—ODECA—to standardize primary education in the region. ODECA's Secretary General, Dr. Albino Roman y Vega says the philosophy behind this program is simple and plain:

> Every child is entitled to an equal opportunity for an education—the child in the remotest hamlet of our countryside as well as the child in our capital city.

President Osvaldo Lopez Arellano of Honduras stated:

> In Honduras the Alliance for Progress has made it possible for thousands of Honduran children to obtain books for learning the ABC's; it has built schools; made an agricultural and livestock census of the country; and built hundreds of dwellings.

The Alliance for Progress has accomplished much but it still has much to do. Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States expressed his opinion recently on this matter when he declared:

> As for me, I believe the advances made already justify thinking of an Alliance not only FOR Progress, but an Alliance IN Progress. What were hopes and expectations in Punta del Este, in the face of problems of underdevelopment, have started to become positive realizations, and efforts that, in spite of inevitable contrasts, indicate that our nations are on the march, and that we are already in a progressive movement.

Indeed, there exists today in Latin America what we might call "an Alliance for Progress mentality." There is mounting evidence that governmental and other leaders are concentrating their attention and energies on development and modernization. Alliance issues have become the stuff of which politics is made in many Latin countries today. It is not surprising to see that election campaigns are now waged on platforms incorporating major Alliance principles and programs. It is encouraging to see that important elections in key Latin American areas have been accomplished in a tranquil, democratic atmosphere, with candidates dedicated to the social and economic development of their countries.

This forward looking attitude is well expressed in the words of Julio Adalberto Rivera, President of El Salvador:

> In El Salvador, we consider the Alliance for Progress not as a program of the United States, but as a multilateral plan structured by the peoples of America, to fight through practical means, against hunger, economic misery, disease, ignorance, and injustice.

President Rivera knows of what he speaks, for under his leadership El Salvador has become a leader among Latin American democracies seeking their rightful place in the modern world. He started his country's first personal income tax and has supported the active construction of houses, schools and hospitals. El Salvador's growth rate is about 8 percent a year, and reflects the general rate of growth throughout Central America, due in large part to economic integration under the Central American Common Market.

Economic integration is a prime objective of the Alliance. As you know we are strongly supporting both the Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association. The United States has authorized a $35 million loan for the Central American Economic Integration Fund to be administered by the Central American Bank for Economic Integration for financing regional infrastructure projects.

Progress has been striking. Economic integration under the Central American Common Market has accounted for a 123-percent increase in the last 2 years. On the basis of such an achievement, it would seem we can hope for some type of political union in Central America in the future.

In 1965 the Latin American Free Trade Association, which just completed 6 years of existence, more than doubled Intra-Association trade over the 1959–61 volume.

Top Latin American spokesmen in the development field are well aware of the importance of such multinational efforts in mutual cooperation. Dr. Roberto Campos, Minister of Finance of Brazil and one of Latin America's outstanding economic authorities has this to say about the Alliance and mutual assistance:

> External assistance should be temporary. It should be linked with the mobilization of

> internal resources. It should be a collective responsibility and not exclusively a responsibility of the United States, with new countries helping each other according to possibilities consistent with their degree of development.

This same sentiment was expressed by hemispheric leaders who demonstrated their consecration to progress in adopting the Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro last October.

More recently, at the last meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Buenos Aires, the Alliance nations demonstrated their determination to carry out their plans for a better tomorrow by adopting an action program for the coming year.

Throughout Latin America a wave of rising expectations together with a real desire to help themselves is prompting Latin Americans to carry out literally thousands of self-help, cooperative, community development projects within the spirit of the Alliance. Examples are legion.

In the mountains of Ecuador, the people of the village of Sigualo spent 5 back-breaking months last year hauling water, sand and rock 4 miles uphill to help build the two-room Simon Bolivar school and a residence for the teacher.

In Colombia, a United States-sponsored voluntary service organization called Futures for Children, conducts a self-help demonstration program involving some 40 villages in rural areas and urban outskirts. Projects include work on pure water supplies, sewage systems, small road and bridge building, home and commercial gardens, a garment-making cooperative, electric installations, and the construction of small schools and medical centers.

In a Central American fishing village early last year men who had fished all night came ashore in the morning and went to work again, voluntarily helping to build a new elementary school and dispensary for some 240 children of their town. Materials and technical assistance were supplied by AID and the local government.

The Alliance for Progress has accomplished a great deal in these first few years. But we cannot now nor in the foreseeable future be content to rest on past achievements. Age-old problems in health, agriculture, housing, education and other areas still exist and in some cases are becoming aggravated by the rate of population growth. We cannot afford to lose the momentum gained since Punta del Este. We must stand firmly by our commitments of human and financial resources and food and fiber to continue to help spur that peaceful revolution which we all know is the only adequate and just solution to the problems of our hemispheric friends and neighbors.

President Johnson has made it clear on numerous occasions that in this frontal attack upon the root causes of hunger, ignorance, and disease—

> Those who do not fulfill their commitments to help themselves cannot expect help from us.

We have seen that our Alliance partners understand and practice this fundamental principle. President Eduardo Frei Montalva of Chile put it this way:

> The principal aim of the Alliance, as it was conceived in Punta del Este, is to assist the economic development of the countries of Latin America. But to do this, it is necessary for Latin American countries themselves to make basic changes in their economic and social orders.

A recent editorial in Ultima Hora of Lima, Peru, summed up the feelings of a great many Latin Americans in all walks of life. It stated:

> It cannot be said that the Alliance for Progress has failed. The results we are experiencing in these very moments are clear and Latin American countries are receiving assistance in many ways. Consider the works, from loans to the anonymous and the individual labor of American youth in the "barriadas" (squatter settlements). Much time is needed for the Alliance to bear fruits that will be more evident to our peoples. It is not a question, therefore, of words only * * * but of action.

We too must gear ourselves for more action in keeping with the noble phrases in which we have spelled out our hopes for a prosperous and peaceful hemisphere for ourselves and our children.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 20–27 is designated as National Drum Corps Week during which the country will pay tribute to the hundreds of drums corps throughout the United States, including a number from my own district who are among the finest of them all.

Nearly everyone has thrilled to the drum and bugle. They have stirred people down through the ages, helping to bind them together in common cause and remind them of their nationhood. So it has always been with us. The drum and bugle gave rhythm to our Revolution, courage to our soldiers, brilliant salutes to our leaders, and made the people stand a little taller, filled with pride, when they heard the sound.

Drum Corps Week is the annual culmination of a year's preparation and drill by youngsters throughout the land as they carry on this wonderful tradition. These young people represent the real youth of America, the youth that goes little noticed by the writers of lurid headlines but which is really the vast majority. We see this spirit of the truly representative American youth in the drum corps, willingly accepting the strict discipline and teamwork required of them to gain proficiency. The resulting music and marching tell the story, they are so colorful, rhythmic, stirring, proud, and optimistic.

All success to the drum corps. And all good wishes for National Drum Corps Week.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms. Deuteronomy 33: 27.

O God, our Heavenly Father, who art the refuge and strength of all who put their trust in Thee, grant unto us a real measure of Thy good spirit as we lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer. Thou art the Father of all men and we are Thy children. Help us to love Thee as children ought to love their parents. Help us to love one another as we ought to love one another in all sincerity and truth. In this free land may we learn to live together in peace and good will.

Bless our country with Thy continued presence and may our Nation be Thy servant for peace and for freedom in this world of human need.

Lift upon us all the light of Thy countenance and breathe Thou Thy peace into our hearts. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 15119. An act to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15119) entitled "An act to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 553. An act to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the ranking minority Member?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I have been sent a note—and I have just received this—in which it is indicated that this was cleared by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMPARATIVE CONSUMER PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tabular material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a study of comparative consumer prices in the United States and other major countries indicates that our consumers are considerably better off than those of our major allies. I attach a worksheet with detailed data underlying a chart on price comparisons among the major industrial countries. Although the chart cannot be included the data will be sufficient, I believe, to make the comparative picture clear.

As recorded in the row for 1966–I, the most recent quarter showed the following indexes—1960 equals 100:

United States	108.2
Germany	117.6
United Kingdom	121.4
France	122.2
Italy	129.4
Japan	139.6

Consumer prices

[1960=100]

Period	United States	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Germany	Japan
1961—I	100.8	101.6	101.8	101.2	101.3	102.8
II	100.8	102.8	101.5	101.6	102.1	103.5
III	101.3	104.1	102.6	102.2	102.7	105.7
IV	101.5	105.3	105.2	103.2	103.1	109.4
1962—I	101.6	106.4	106.6	104.7	104.3	110.7
II	102.0	108.6	107.6	106.3	105.7	112.2
III	102.5	108.1	108.6	107.4	105.7	113.1
IV	102.7	108.1	109.6	109.1	105.8	114.2
1963—I	102.9	109.7	111.5	112.8	108.3	118.4
II	103.1	110.3	112.7	114.3	108.7	121.2
III	103.9	109.6	114.3	114.8	108.0	122.2
IV	104.2	110.4	115.5	117.3	109.1	122.3
1964—I	104.5	111.3	116.3	119.1	110.3	122.4
II	104.7	113.4	116.6	120.5	110.9	125.1
III	105.0	114.3	117.5	122.5	111.3	126.1
IV	105.4	115.3	118.2	124.3	111.8	128.8
1965—I	105.6	116.4	119.1	125.7	113.0	131.4
II	108.4	119.3	120.4	121.5	114.4	136.0
III	106.8	119.8	120.6	127.7	115.6	136.2
IV	107.4	120.6	121.2	128.5	116.2	137.3
1966—I	108.2	121.4	122.2	129.4	[1] 117.6	139.6
II						
III						
IV						
OECD Bulletin:						
History, 1955–64, page	79	429	203	292	237	117
Current, May 1966, pages	58–59	106–107	74–75	86–87	80–81	64–65
1961–66, I:						
5 years	1.0734	1.1949	1.2004	1.2787	1.1609	1.3580
Percent per year	1.4	3.6	3.7	5.0	3.0	6.3

[1] 2 months.

Source: Department of Labor and OECD.

PROPOSAL TO MAKE AVAILABLE COPIES OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, like many of the Members, I was enormously impressed with the quality of the debate during the 12 days in which the House was considering the civil rights bill, but I was also struck by the frequent difficulty of ascertaining the exact language—or even sometimes the general purport—of amendments offered. Sometimes, copies of amendments being considered are available at the committee tables; at other times they are not. And in any event, Members are naturally reluctant to disturb those at the committee tables who are managing the bill. Would it not be possible—indeed relatively simple—to provide a procedure that would make copies of amendments promptly available to Members seeking them? With today's marvelous copying machines, there would seem to be no reason why copies of amendments could not be run off as soon as they are sent to the Clerk's desk, so as to become available to Members shortly thereafter.

Another method might be to require the mover of an amendment in the normal course to make available for distribution from the Clerk's desk or by the pages a specified number of copies of the amendment in question.

It seems hardly necessary to argue that the Members would be in a better position to judge the merits of amendments presented if they had copies to examine, instead of having to rely on a rapid reading by the Clerk and a brief explanation by the proponent.

This is even more true when, as happened at the close of the debate on amendments to title IV, no explanations could be made, and the only information available to the Members came from the reading of the amendments.

As a new Member of this body, I am hesitant to make any suggestions with regard to rules and traditions that have been in effect for many, many years. Nevertheless, I am emboldened to do so now because in this case it may actually be an advantage to look with an unpracticed eye upon the procedure followed. Perhaps there are reasons unknown to me why the present procedure, which seems to favor making a mystery of the text of proposed amendments, should be continued. Failing that, I would urge that at the appropriate time consideration be given to modernizing our procedures and making use of up-to-date techniques for rapid reproduction of important documents.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that for the Congress to intrude in the airline dispute would put us in the position of having to take up each and every labor dispute which becomes a public inconvenience. And in this complicated day, any strike that involves a major industry almost inevitably becomes inconvenient if prolonged.

The airline strike certainly is a severe inconvenience, particularly in the Northwest where we rely on air transportation perhaps more heavily than in many parts of the country. But it is not a national emergency, or at least it has not been found to be so at the present time.

In the absence of an emergency, I do not believe Congress should interfere with the collective bargaining process and force men to go back to work against their will. Congress should remain a court of last resort and deal only with emergency situations in labor relations.

If the collective bargaining process cannot cope with labor disputes, then the answer is to revamp our laws governing collective bargaining. If we do not have permanent machinery to deal with long strikes that affect the public interest, then the Congress should be taking action to set up such machinery—and in doing so, making sure that substantially more attention is paid to the public interest than is presently the case.

I sincerely hope the disputants will be able to resolve their differences soon. But that remains their privilege and their duty, and Congress does not belong there.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF DONATED GOODS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, when I was at home last weekend, my neighbors handed me the following letter:

> NHA TRANG, VIETNAM,
> *May 20, 1966.*
>
> GENTLEMEN: While in Saigon recently at the Continental Palace Hotel I ordered a package of Winstons. I had to pay 40 cents for them.
>
> You can imagine my surprise when I read your label.
>
> I thought you might be interested to know where your donations are winding up. I don't know who you donated to but leave it up to you to consider.
>
> Thanks a million for your gesture anyway.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> R. B. JAMES,
> *Safety Engineer,*
> *%RMK–BRJ (150).*
>
> APO SAN FRANCISCO 96240.

Quite naturally, I was dismayed to see the letter and the enclosed cigarette package, on which this label appeared:

> FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION—NOT TO BE SOLD
>
> Compliments of the employees of Tompkinsville Mfg. Co., Division of Hayes Mfg. Co., Tompkinsville, Ky.

It is appalling that the black market in Vietnam operates so openly and in insulting defiance of the representatives of our Government who are in that country for the sole purpose of helping the people. And furthermore, all of us are aware that great amounts of American supplies are being pilfered and are finding their way into the hands of the Vietcong and dissident groups in that area.

I sincerely hope our Government will be able to employ the means necessary to stop this ridiculous waste of our American supplies.

GRAND JURY CITES ORGANIZED VIOLENCE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to read in this morning's Washington Post the following account datelined Cleveland, August 9, which reads as follows:

> GRAND JURY CITES ORGANIZED VIOLENCE
>
> CLEVELAND, August 9.—A Cuyahoga County grand jury reported tonight that the racial violence in Negro slums on the East Side last month was "organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business."
>
> The jury report said the "professionals" were "aided, and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist Party."

To this, Mr. Speaker, I can only say "So, what's new?" I have often pointed out the existence of this situation, and on at least two occasions—one on March 30 and then again on April 27 of last year—I documented my charges as to Communist infiltration into civil rights movements, which speeches can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 5, page 6333, and volume 111, part 6, page 8592, respectively. In the past such facts were met with apparent apathy by a majority of the people all over the country. It seems that no one cares or is concerned unless it is his own ox that is being gored.

Mr. Speaker, I called for it before and I renew my call for the Congress of the United States to officially take a look at what is going on behind the scenes and to become aware of the elements that are involved in these riots and insurrections that operate under the euphemism of "civil rights."

THE GUAM ORGANIC ACT GIVING AUTONOMY TO THE PEOPLE OF GUAM

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in 1950, the Congress passed what was known as the Guam Organic Act, giving autonomy to the people of Guam.

There was considerable publicity at the time intended to demonstrate that the United States means what it says when it talks about recognizing, building up, and improving not only the economic but the political life of underdeveloped countries.

This is the reason that the present political crisis in Guam is of such great importance, not only in Guam but throughout the underdeveloped nations.

The fact is that the Guam Legislature, elected by the people and representing the people of Guam, passed a right-to-work bill which was vetoed by Governor Guerrero. On July 11, the legislature passed the measure over the Governor's veto.

However, under the provisions of the Organic Act, effectiveness of a bill passed by the legislature over the veto of the Governor can be stayed by referring the bill to the President of the United States, who has 90 days in which to take action, either overriding or approving the Governor's veto.

The world of so-called underdeveloped countries is watching the action of the President in this instance and is asking the question, "Were the people of Guam actually given autonomy or does that autonomy exist only so long as the people of Guam, through their elected representatives, act and vote along lines acceptable by the administration in Washington?"

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the right to work but of the right of the people of Guam to make their own decisions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 211]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Baring
Blatnik
Burton, Utah
Celler
Conyers
Diggs
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Farnum
Flood
Garmatz
Goodell
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Jones, Mo.
Karth
King, N.Y.
Latta
McEwen
Martin, Ala.
Morrison
Nedzi
Passman
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Smith, N.Y.
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WHEAT, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Wheat of the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 929, Rept. No. 1831), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 929

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1967, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1966 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influences (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1966, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1967, as hereinabove provided.

HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. Bolling), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 965, Rept. No. 1830), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 965

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13228) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 13228, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3005), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 13226 as passed the House.

COORDINATING THE NATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAM AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 964, Rept. No. 1829), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 964

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13290) to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for highway safety research and development, certain highway safety programs, a national driver register, and a highway accident research and test facility. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 13290, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3052) and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 13290 as passed by the House.

SCHOOL CONDITIONS IN MERIWETHER COUNTY

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Committee of the Whole during the discussion on the civil rights bill there was some discussion between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT], and myself concerning the school district in Meriwether County. I submitted for the RECORD some information which had been given to me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The information given to the gentleman from Georgia by the local school district is quite different from that.

I am going to withhold judgment as to the conditions there until we have the opportunity to verify the facts. I would urge the House to withhold its judgment also.

I have asked the chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee [Mr. KASTENMEIER] to inquire into this matter, to hold hearings and hear witnesses on both sides, because I think the Department owes it to this Congress to give us the truth about the matter. We will inform the House as to whether or not their statements are credible.

CONFLICTING INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION CONCERNING GUIDELINES UNDER TITLE VI, 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] made the statement he has just completed. The subject of the discussion yesterday between us is typical of the information which many Members of Congress have received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the guidelines. We receive doubletalk and conflicting statements from "guideline administrators" who know little about the facts relating to local school systems and have no curiosity to ascertain the truth.

In this instance it appears that the information furnished to me and the information furnished to the gentleman from California contain many and very significant discrepancies. I join with him in his suggestion that the ad hoc committee headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] be called into session to inquire into this question. Both the superintendent of schools of Meriwether County and I expect to be present when the committee meets.

My letter to the gentleman from California is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1966.

Hon. JAMES C. CORMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Your remarks yesterday (page 18714 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) reflect a willful misunderstanding and constitute an effort to mislead the House of Representatives.

I can think of no circumstances under which, on five minutes notice, I would attempt to superimpose my judgment over yours on a matter restricted to your district. I have not only represented the district in which Meriwether County is located for all or part of seven terms, but I have lived in this district all of my life. I have a more direct knowledge of that district than you do, and I would not misrepresent a set of facts to the House of Representatives.

The last words which appear as a part of your remarks on page 18714 are remarks which are derogatory to the people of Meriwether County. Your statement that you believe certain schools to be second-class schools is untrue. I have been in every school in that county, and I shall visit every school in that county often in the future. I doubt if you have ever been in a single school in that county and that you ever intend to do so. You may never have been in that county.

These schools are not second-class schools; if there is any difference, they are newer and more modern schools than certain other schools in the same county.

The Superintendent of Schools of Meriwether County is in Washington today, and he can tell you that your remarks do not accurately apply to the Meriwether County schools.

Since talking with you on the floor yesterday, my office has talked with the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Howe, and Mr. Howe has informed me that there are presently outstanding at least thirteen letters of disapproval, rejection, or deferral, and that he expects to recommend that all thirteen school systems be held in non-compliance. His statement is consistent with the remarks which I made which appear on page 18706, and on pages 18714–18715. It is inconsistent with your remarks which appear on page 18714.

I think that you owe the House of Representatives an apology for attempting to deceive it yesterday, and I think that you owe the Meriwether County School System an apology for misrepresenting facts about that school system.

It is difficult to believe that you would arrogate unto yourself an ability to assert an authoritative position on a section of the country, a state, a district, or a school system more than 2,000 miles from the district which you represent on the basis of a five-minute telephone conversation with an anonymous individual.

Sincerely,

Jack Flynt,
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 952 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 952

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 952 provides for consideration of S. 3105, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of the bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1967.

The authorization bill is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the Defense Department during fiscal year 1967. The bill totals $1,065,973,000 and provides construction authorization in support of the Active Forces, the Reserve components, defense agencies, and military family housing.

The Department of Defense this year requested only about 54 percent of the amount requested for last year's authorization. The Armed Services Committee in its wisdom increased the bill by $21 million in order to provide for certain requirements of the services which it was felt were of a valid and justifiable nature, but which the Defense Department had not seen fit to request in this year's program.

All the construction authorized by the bill will occur at existing bases and military installations throughout the world, there being no new bases proposed in the bill.

S. 3105, as amended, prohibits the closing or abandoning of a military camp, post, station, base, or yard until the expiration of 30 days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department makes a full report of the fact including the justification of such proposed action to the Congress. This requires the report to be submitted not only while the Congress is in session, but also within a time frame to enable the Congress to act before the base could be completely closed.

In this bill the Bolling-Anacostia complex would be retained in the military inventory until July 1, 1972. It is hoped that this will help solve the critical air traffic problem in the Washington, D.C., area by entering into a leasing agreement with the FAA for a period not to exceed 5 years and subject to a 1-year revocation provision whereby the Federal Aviation Agency or its designee may operate the runways, taxiways, hangars, parking aprons, and other related facilities in the Bolling-Anacostia area for appropriate aviation purposes. This should relieve the congestion of traffic at the Washington National Airport.

As amended, the bill would require advance notification to the Committee on Armed Services prior to the award of any contract for planning and design involving architecture-engineering services costing $50,000 or more, and provides that no building to be constructed with Federal funds for the purpose of substantial occupancy by personnel of the Department of Defense shall be commenced until after the expiration of 30 days upon which a report of the facts is submitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

Minor construction authority of the Department of Defense is increased from $15,000 to $25,000.

Authorization on the projects which the Secretary of Defense deferred last December is extended until October 1, 1968. Otherwise, they would have automatically terminated on October 1, 1967.

The House committee accepted a Senate amendment which prohibits construction of any projects authorized by this act until such time as those military public works projects previously authorized and for which funds have been appropriated and for which authorization has been extended, are constructed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that it would be inappropriate at this time, and in this connection, to point out that the present chairman of this important Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable Mendel Rivers, is performing a splendid job in conducting the affairs of this decidedly important committee. He apparently has the knack as well as the ability to conduct the affairs of the committee with alacrity and yet with the necessary deliberations to do a good job. Moreover, he has indicated in his short term in this position the necessary independence of thought and courage to give the Congress, as one of the three divisions of Government, a voice in providing the Military Establishment with the necessary arms and ammunition for the conduct of the defense of the country. This is, of course, as it should be and as provided by the Constitution of the United States. More power to him.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 952 will provide for 3 hours of debate under an open rule for the consideration of S. 3105—the military construction authorization bill—which is necessary for enactment before the appropriations can be provided to finance construction activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1967.

The bill as approved by the Committee on Armed Services totals $1,065,973,000, and provides construction authorization in support of the Active Forces, the Reserve components, Defense agencies, and military family housing. This can be broken down as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Army	151, 808
Navy	154, 104
Air Force	217, 427
Defense agencies	5, 875
Family housing	510, 236
Deficiency authorizations	9, 323
Reserve Forces	17, 200
Grand total	1, 065, 973

When the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee appeared before the Rules Committee, he told us that this was an austere and disappointing bill, and, certainly, if we are to look at it in terms of last year's total authorization of $1,934,927,000, it does seem austere, particularly at a time when our forces are expanding. Last year, we were told that if the Congress authorized and funded at the rate provided last year, it would take approximately 13 years to modernize physical plants of the services. Apparently the modernization program has been stopped and the effort this year is to provide only those facilities which are urgently required for the prosecution of our efforts in Vietnam.

I think it is always interesting to note the land acquisition program of the Department of Defense. This year, the acquisition of approximately 25,500 acres has been authorized at a total estimated cost of $2.4 million. While this is slightly more acreage than was requested last year, the acquisition cost is less than half compared to last year's $5.5 million. The bulk of the land acquisition involves the fee acquisition of 23,603 acres of land for the expansion of range facilities at the Cannon Air Force Base, Nev., and McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.

Mr. Rivers indicated in his appearance before the Rules Committee that when the bill was presented to them this year that the committee and Congress would be faced with a dilemma because it appeared that many of the projects requested in this year's bill were of less importance than many of the projects deferred last December 21 by Mr. McNamara. As you are aware, on that date the Secretary of Defense deferred $620 million worth of military construction projects which were authorized and funded by the Congress for fiscal year 1966.

As a Member of the Congress, I share with the members of the Armed Services Committee the dilemma they are faced with, and I completely agree with their position that the deferrals were not only unwise, but unwarranted.

I am happy to note that the House Armed Services Committee accepted an amendment initially put into the bill by the Senate which limits construction of anything that is authorized by this bill until the projects which were authorized and funded for last year are constructed. There are two escape clauses for the Secretary of Defense. One would require him to certify that any particular project authorized and funded for fiscal year 1966 is no longer required. The other would permit him to certify to the Committees on Armed Services that a project in the fiscal year 1967 bill is urgently needed for national defense. The Congress must have some method of control over military construction.

Now I would like to touch upon a few highlights of the bill. The bill provides new operational facilities in the amount of $559.2 million to support the Active Forces, $17.2 million to support the Reserve Forces, and authorizes for military family housing the amount of $510.2 million. This sum does not include any authorization for the construction of new family housing units.

It provides support for our strategic and defense forces, our general purpose forces, our airlift and sealift forces, and the Reserve Forces.

It is significant to note that there is nothing in the bill this year to take care of facilities for the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve Forces, because a final determination has not as yet been made as to a possible realinement. During the hearings, the committee learned that there was approximately $30 million in unexpended authorization for the Army and National Guard forces.

In addition, the committee authorized new construction in support of various research and development programs in the amount of $110 million.

The largest single element in the construction program is the provision for general support facilities. This includes new operational training and maintenance support facilities for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Probably an item of greatest importance is some $22 million for tactical aircraft shelters, dispersal, and air base camouflage in Europe to reduce the vulnerability of tactical air forces.

Chairman Rivers has expressed disappointment in the number of barracks and BOQ spaces requested in this year's bill, as well as the almost total absence of community facilities. I share with him his disappointment and believe it is essential that we construct permanent facilities to take care of men who are being required to perform their basic training while living in tents.

Unlike the bill of last year, this bill does not authorize the construction of any new units of family housing. This, too, is a disappointment to all of us in the Congress.

During the hearings on the military construction, the Committee on Armed

Services modified the bill submitted by the Department of Defense in several major regards. First, the committee provided that no more than 75 percent of the basic allowance for quarters could be charged for a serviceman living in Government-owned substandard quarters. Under the present law, those who occupy substandard housing are required to pay the same amount as like quarters in the civilian economy—thus, in crowded areas, a forfeiture of their entire BOQ. Second, the committee eliminated the requirement for authorization for section 810 housing. Third, and probably the most important amendment of the bill, relates to base closure actions by the Secretary of Defense. It prohibits the closing until the expiration of 30 days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department makes a full report of the facts, including the justification of such proposed action, to the Congress. I recall vividly the statement of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee after the veto mesage on the first military construction authorization bill of last year, in which he told the Congress that he had the assurance from the highest source in Government that no base closure announcements would be made while the Congress was out of session. Shortly after the Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Defense made such an announcement. The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee contacted the Secretary of Defense and was informed that he was not made knowledgeable of any such understanding. I think it is extremely important that the report be made to the Congress within a timeframe to enable the Congress to act if it so desires before a military base can be completely closed.

Another important amendment to this year's bill relates to the use of the Bolling-Anacostia complex. It prohibits the Secretary of Defense from declaring excess any portion of this complex until July 1, 1972, and will permit the Secretary of Defense to enter into a 5-year leasing arrangement with the FAA to use the runways and other related facilities in this area for appropriate aviation purposes. The lease would contain a provision which would be revocable in 1 year. Personally, I think this is a sound amendment and would do much to relieve the current congestion at the Washington National Airport, and I commend the committee for its farsighted action.

The committee added a number of other amendments to the bill. They relate to an increase in minor construction authority; review of advanced planning by the Department of Defense; notification before construction begins on any buildings built for substantial occupancy by the Department of Defense by the General Services Administration; and, civil defense.

I believe each of these changes represents significant improvements in the bill which was submitted by the Department of Defense. I believe, too, that this bill, which will be presented by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, reflects the painstaking care with which he and the committee scrutinized the Department's request.

I urge the adoption of the rule, and reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in my 14-year tenure as a Member of the House I have seen the parliamentary and legislative situations reach many pinnacles of irony, but today we approach the highest ironic pinnacles of them all.

Yesterday we concluded 2 weeks and 2 days of debate, and one of the central issues involved in that debate was the question of how we could make housing available without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. In pursuit of that purpose this House placed restrictions on an individual citizen's previously unquestioned rights to dispose of the fruits of his labor, of his private property, as he chose.

Now, on the very next day, we consider a bill, which has traditionally provided housing for the men and women and their families who serve in the military forces and who protect this Nation. But this year it does not, because Secretary McNamara did not request any. The committee knew it was useless to include military housing in view of the fact that last year Secretary McNamara froze the funds which were voted to provide family housing for our military men and women, and troop housing and barracks for the young men we are drafting and will be sending to Vietnam.

I call upon this administration, including Mr. McNamara, to prove its sincerity about the question of fair housing, and to release funds to build housing for the men who will be called upon to do the fighting and dying, as they protect our freedoms.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now that the House Judiciary Committee has disgorged itself of the latest civil wrongs bill, I hope that the committee will take the time and energy to investigate the charges of one Federal judge in this country, who accuses two of his district judge colleagues of misconduct and worse. I believe it is most appropriate at this time that the committee go into this subject, because I cannot conceive that we should have serving in the Federal judiciary in this country, in view of the harassment that is going to be meted out to some citizens of this country through this latest civil wrongs bill, anything less than the highest quality of judges. There should be no unresolved question on the part of one judge as to the serious misconduct on the part of two other judges presently serving on the bench of the U.S. Federal courts.

There should be no further procrastination on the part of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3105 with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I come before you today to present the fiscal year 1967 military construction authorization bill. In doing so, I want to assure the membership of this body I am bringing to you a bill which was approved by the Armed Services Committee by a unanimous vote.

Frankly, it is an austere and a disappointing bill. It is austere not only in the amount but also in the type of facilities requested. It is disappointing in the sense that facilities which would provide for the human welfare of service personnel have been ignored. Apparently gold flow, mission reassignment because of the base closure decisions along with operational requirements are paramount in the minds of Pentagon planners to the needs of human beings.

We believed the bill so austere that we added a small number of facilities to the bill as follows:

West Point: Training facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $15,747,000.

Fort Wolters, Tex.: Academic building, $1,026,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Coal to gas conversion, $813,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, New Hampshire: Operational facilities and utilities, $295,000.

Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass., $9,300,000.

Naval hospital, Memphis, Tenn., $6,613,000.

Fort Jackson, S.C.: Sewage disposal installation, $1,441,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $1,280,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Bachelor officer quarters, $727,000.

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee: Airfield, $1,861,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Coal to gas conversion, $900,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Calif.: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $514,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.: Gymnasium, $436,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Service club, $493,000.

Boston Naval Shipyard, Mass.: Replacement and construction of piers 1, 2, 3, and 4, $11,332,000.

Naturally, during our consideration, we also deleted a number of items so that the bill is increased only by a very small amount.

Yet, with these observations, I am still bringing the bill because these facilities which are requested herein are absolutely essential in order to meet operational schedules of the military and to support new missions or missions which are required for other compelling reasons such as the health and welfare of service personnel.

But before I get into this year's authorization, let me tell you that when the bill was presented to our committee this year, the committee found itself in a strange if not untenable position of being asked to pass upon many projects that seem to be of secondary importance to many of these projects which were authorized and funded by the Congress last year but which were deferred by the Secretary of Defense.

At this stage, we have been given no assurance from Department of Defense witnesses that funds which were withheld, may be released for construction of the deferred projects in the near future or, for that matter, whether these deferred projects would be placed under contract prior to or simultaneously with those contained in the current bill.

As you know, when the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1965 was before our committee, responsible witnesses of the Defense Establishment offered assurance that the authorization requests contained in that bill were for construction to support the latest approved program which should be in place no later than the end of fiscal year 1967. We were assured by the departments involved that their requests represented their most urgent construction needs. The committee was led to believe that this program had been closely coordinated within the Defense Establishment.

This bill was signed into law August 1, 1964, yet, on November 19, 1964, with little prior notice to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense announced 95 actions to consolidate, reduce, or discontinue altogether Department of Defense activities in the United States and overseas. Surprisingly enough, several construction projects had been included in the recently approved construction bill for installations that were announced for closing. As a result of this, the committee and the Congress took two actions when considering the fiscal year 1966 construction program: first, each witness was placed on notice that it was his responsibility to advise the committee of any projects being requested in that bill for any installation where tenure seemed in doubt and, second, the bill finally agreed upon by both the Senate and the House of Representatives contained a provision designed to assure some advance notice to the Congress of any future base closures proposed by the Department of Defense.

Again, when the fiscal year 1966 construction bill was before the committee, assurances were given that the projects included in the bill represented the fiscal year 1966 segment of the approved 5-year plan and must be in place not later than fiscal year 1968 to coincide with overall objectives for this period. The committee again accepted this appraisal in good faith and the bill was signed into law on September 16, 1965. On December 21, 1965, however, and again with little advance notice to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense announced the indefinite deferral of nearly 50 percent of the recently approved construction program for a total of $620 million. This included 8,500 units of military family housing and many badly needed barracks and bachelor officer quarter spaces so necessary to the welfare of the troops.

Therefore, the committee accepted a Senate proposal in an attempt to rectify this current situation by including in the bill section 607 of the general provisions. The provision is designed to prevent the execution of the construction authorized in this bill prior to that authorized in prior years that has been deferred, if such construction continues to be current, valid military requirements. However, the committee recognizes that there may be some projects that have been deferred because of lack of funding or because a legitimate military requirement no longer exists. Conceivably, too, the current bill could contain some projects that are urgently required in the interest of national defense that are more essential to the interest of national defense than those that have been deferred. Therefore, an escape clause has been provided but it is not intended as a loophole to circumvent the intent of this committee. It is expected that candor and sound judgment will prevail in carrying out the intent of this provision.

Frankly, the planning of the Department of Defense, in my opinion, leaves much to be desired. For a moment, let us look at the record. Last year, the Congress authorized 13,040 barracks spaces at the following five locations: Fort Knox, Ky.; Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Hood, Tex.; and Fort Gordon, Ga.

The Army Engineers in preparation for the construction of permanent barracks, stripped and removed from the existing temporary barracks, plumbing facilities, furnaces and electrical conduits, thus making 1,092 barracks spaces at Fort Devens, 2,400 barracks spaces at Fort Dix, and 558 barracks spaces at Fort Hood totally uninhabitable for the troops, and actually demolished 776 barracks spaces at Fort Knox and 1,100 barracks spaces at Fort Gordon, Ga. Then Mr. McNamara made his announcement to defer approximately $620 million of facilities authorized and funded by the Congress. The result is that we are worse off this year than we were last. As of June 30, we had 5,744 enlisted men living in tents.

This situation is intolerable, and I shall continue to insist on wiser, more thoughtful, and more prudent planning in the area of construction at the Department of Defense level.

GENERAL FACTS

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the Defense Department during fiscal year 1967.

This is an authorization bill which is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the Defense Department during fiscal year 1967.

COMPARISON OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1966 AND FISCAL YEAR 1967 REQUESTS

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense totaled $1,051,084,000, which included $6,430,000 for deficiency authorizations.

The bill as submitted by the Department included $521,900,000 for all housing expenditures of the Department proposed for fiscal year 1967. This sum did not include any authorization for construction of new family housing units.

Therefore, the bill, exclusive of housing costs, represented a total of $529,184,000 for construction.

Last year, the Department requested a grand total of $1,945,497,000 for new authorization.

This year, the Department requested only about 54 percent of that amount.

This year's request is drastically reduced from the previous year's program and was presented with the statement that it represented only the most pressing military needs necessary to meet operational schedules, new missions, or for other compelling requirements such as health and safety of personnel.

Our committee defers to no other committee in this House in its zeal to reduce unnecessary expenditures and to cut budgets when in the judgment of the committee such reductions may prudently be made without eliminating some vital function or need. However, the deferral in last year's program of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of military construction at a time when our forces are expanding and our commitments growing, taxes the wisdom and understanding of our committee and, I think, the entire Congress.

Viewed against that background, our committee closely questioned the witnesses from both the Defense Department and the military services as to the adequacy of the program presented to support the forces in being or planned. Based on their response and in the absence of solid evidence to refute their reassurances, we are recommending authorization of this very austere program.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ACTION

The Armed Services Committee, after extensive hearings by the full committee, reviewed each of these line items requested by the Department and ultimately increased the bill by $21 million in order to provide for certain requirements of the services which the committee felt were of a valid and justifiable nature but which the Defense Department had not seen fit to request in this year's program.

In view of the very limited and austere nature of the request, the committee found relatively few projects which did not appear to be essential needs, and the few reductions that the committee was able to effect generally were of relatively minor scope and value within the bill's total.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that these minor reductions will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

NUMBER OF BASES AND LINE ITEMS IN THE BILL

This bill authorized construction at 280 military bases throughout the world.

Included in the construction authorization for these 280 bases are approximately 650 line items.

All the construction authorized by this bill will occur at existing bases and military installations throughout the world, there being no new bases proposed in this bill.

Before I get into the specific areas of projects authorized, I feel I should mention some of the amendments added by the committee. They are several in number and, in my opinion, especially significant in scope.

The most important one relates to base closures in which we amended the language which was ultimately approved last year after Presidential veto on the first military construction authorization bill. It prohibits the closing or abandoning of a military camp, post, station, base or yard until the expiration of 30 days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department makes a full report of the facts including the justification of such proposed action to the Congress.

This differs from last year's bill in two respects: First, it is notice to the Congress rather than to the Committees on Armed Services; second, it requires the report to be submitted not only while the Congress is in session but also within a timeframe to enable the Congress to act before the base could be completely closed.

Another important amendment to the bill relates to the Bolling-Anacostia complex. In last year's bill, we included a provision which would prohibit the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department from declaring any portion of the Bolling-Anacostia complex excess to the needs of the military until July 1, 1967. This year, we have amended that language to retain this property in the military inventory until July 1, 1972. But more important, in my opinion, is a provision which I think will help solve the critical air traffic problem in the Washington, D.C., area.

We have authorized the Department of Defense to enter into a leasing agreement with the Federal Aviation Agency for a period not to exceed 5 years and subject to a 1-year revocation provision whereby the Federal Aviation Agency or its designee may operate the runways, taxiways, hangars, parking aprons and other related facilities in the Bolling-Anacostia area for appropriate aviation purposes.

The effect of this will be the relief of the congestion of traffic at the Washington National Airport by permitting light planes to use the runways and facilities already existent at the Bolling-Anacostia complex.

I have been assured that if the Secretary enters this agreement with the Federal Aviation Agency, it will in no way interfere with the proposed construction of a $100-million defense office building in the Bolling-Anacostia complex.

We also added an amendment which would require advance notification to the committee prior to the award of any contract for planning and design involving architecture-engineering services costing $50,000 or more.

Another amendment provides that no building to be constructed with Federal funds for the purpose of substantial occupancy by personnel of the Department of Defense shall be commenced until after the expiration of 30 days upon which a report of the facts is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services.

Still another amendment increased the minor construction authority of the Department of Defense from $15,000 to $25,000. In the area of family housing, we added two amendments. One limits the rent to be charged to service personnel to no more than 75 percent of the basic allowance for quarters when such service personnel are assigned Government-owned substandard quarters. The other removes the requirement for line authorization by our committee for 810 housing.

Turning now from the amendments, the committee extended the authorization on the projects which Mr. McNamara deferred last December until October 1, 1968. Otherwise, they would have automatically terminated on October 1, 1967.

And speaking of the deferred projects, the committee accepted a Senate amendment which prohibits construction of any projects authorized by this act until such time as those military public works projects previously authorized and for which funds have been appropriated and for which authorization has been extended, are constructed.

There are two exceptions to this requirement: One permits the Secretary of Defense to certify to the Committees on Armed Services that such project which was authorized and funded is no longer required. The other permits construction of projects authorized in this bill before the deferred projects are constructed if he certifies to the Committees on Armed Services that such project is urgently required in the interest of national defense and is more essential to the interest of national defense than those military public works previously authorized by law.

Now, I would like to get into the general authorization provisions. The military construction authorization for fiscal year 1967 as reflected in S. 3105 contains two distinct parts:

First. The authority to provide and construct new operational facilities in the amount of $576.4 million to support the active and reserve forces; and

Second. The authority for the maintenance of existing military family housing in the amount of $510.2 million.

Now, I would like to briefly review the $576.4 million authorization for the active and reserve forces by relating it to the nature of the support which this construction is intended to provide the operating forces.

STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE FORCES

In support of these forces, we have authorized $39.4 million in construction. This includes facilities for offensive missiles, our manned bomber force and our continental air and missile defense forces. Facilities to support these missions are sharply reduced over previous years, and amount to only 6.8 percent of the fiscal year 1967 program. Work on new ICBM sites is essentially completed except for improvements and updating of the Minuteman system. Additional facilities within these force elements are requested to support realinements within the strategic bomber force and to improve defensive systems.

GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES

The committee has approved approximately $152.4 million of new construction in support of our general purpose forces.

This category of construction includes new operational, training, and maintenance support facilities for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Of particular significance, some $22 million is proposed for tactical aircraft shelters, dispersal, and air base camouflage in Europe to reduce the vulnerability of tactical air forces.

AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT FORCES

The committee provided $9 million in support of our airlift and sealift forces. All of this would go into the Department of the Air Force to provide support facilities for the new C-141 transport aircraft now entering inventory, and to provide facilities in support of our military airlift capability worldwide.

RESERVE FORCES

Authorization for construction of Reserve facilities proposed in fiscal year 1967 is substantially reduced over fiscal year 1966 since no additional authorization is proposed at this time for the Army Reserve Forces.

The amounts approved for the Air Force and Navy Reserve Forces again follow the lump sum authorization procedures reinstituted by the Congress in 1963 under which the Congress is notified in advance of the specific projects to be undertaken. A total of $17.2 million is programed for these purposes, consisting of the following:

	Million
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	$5.0
Air National Guard	8.9
Air Force Reserve	3.3

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee authorized new construction in support of various research and development programs amounting to $111 million—$31.3 million of this is intended for support of the Nike X development and test program on Kwajalein Island.

An additional $79.7 million will provide various research and development laboratories and support facilities for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

GENERAL SUPPORT

As might be anticipated, the largest single element in the military construction program is the provision of general support facilities.

Included in this category, which totals some $196.6 million, are approximately $50.7 million of new military operational and training facilities including communications facilities. Only some $53.9 million is included for troop housing and commuity support facilities. The committee feels that this is a shockingly low figure to request against the great backlog of need for such facilities that exists throughout the military services. Our committee has continuously pressed for an accelerated pace in replacing these old obsolescent and costly to maintain structures which abound in our military installations, but this year the Defense Department has cut back this program to a mere token of what we feel is needed.

The entire program in fiscal year 1967 for troop and officer housing contains only some 20,000 barracks spaces and 3,000 bachelor officer quarters.

FAMILY HOUSING

Frankly, I am very disappointed that the Department of Defense did not request any new units of family housing in this year's bill. There is still a shortage of approximately 42,000 units of housing in the military inventory. As a substitute, therefore, the Department requested an increase in rental authorization from 7,000 to 13,075. The committee continued the authorization at the 7,000 level because it learned that only approximately 5,000 units of leased spaces had been utilized even though 7,000 is currently authorized.

Section 504 authorizes $510,236,000 in support of family housing. Although this figure of approximately $510 million in support of military family housing may seem large, let me point out that more than this amount would be required as an annual Federal disbursement whether or not we have any military family housing. This would occur since military families occupying the more than 365,000 sets of family quarters will forfeit their quarters allowances in an estimated amount of $524 million. Thus, if there were no quarters available, these individuals would be eligible for and receive a monetary allowance in lieu of Government quarters. This cost would then be reflected in additional requirements by the departments for military pay and allowances.

HOSPITALS

Included in S. 3105 are authorizations amounting to approximately $29.4 million for medical facilities of all types. These include hospital additions, dispensaries, dental clinics, and complete hospitals.

Approximately $26 million of this total authorization is allocated for construction of five new hospitals.

These five hospitals are distributed as follows, all in the Navy:

Place	Number of beds	Cost
Navy Submarine Medical Center, New London, Conn	125	$4,957,000
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash	35	1,674,000
Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, P.R	80	3,685,000
Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass	364	9,300,000
Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tenn	234	6,613,000
Total		26,229,000

Here, in the case of medical facilities, the committee found itself in strong disagreement with the relatively small amount of medical facilities requested which is substantially lower than last year's request. The committee feels strongly that the pace of replacement for many of the outmoded World War II hospitals should be accelerated and has added two hospitals to the bill, one at Chelsea, Mass., and one at Memphis, Tenn.

The costs for the military hospitals contained in this bill have been carefully reviewed and it is gratifying to note that these continue to compare very favorably with the costs for civilian Hill-Burton hospitals.

The actual dollar cost for military hospitals in a normal cost region varies from $29 to $33 per square foot depending upon the size of the hospital.

UNUSED AUTHORIZATION

The Committee on Armed Services has made a determined effort over the past few years to reduce the amount of unfunded and unused construction authorization available to the military departments.

In order to avoid the unnecessary accumulation of unused authorization, the committee has reduced the period of validity of authorizations provided in the annual military construction bill to a 2-year period for all facilities other than military family housing.

In the case of military family housing, the authorization is limited to a 15-month period.

LAND ACQUISITION

The bill as submitted by the Department proposed the acquisition of approximately 25,500 acres of land at a total estimated cost of $2.4 million. This is slightly more acreage than was requested last year, but the price of acquisition is less than half compared to last year's $5.5 million.

The committee approved without change the departmental request for land acquisition.

The bulk of the land acquisition included in the 25,500 acres approved by the committee involves the fee acquisition of 23,603 acres of land for the expansion of range facilities at Cannon Air Force Base, Nev., and McConnell Air Force Base, Kans., at a cost of approximately $1.7 million.

SUMMARY

I have attempted to provide a general overall view of the more important features of this legislation.

As I mentioned at the outset of my statement, approval of this legislation by the Congress will provide authorization for the Defense Department and the military services for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $1,065,973,000 which includes authorization for both the active and reserve forces.

The Committee on Armed Services approved this bill as reflected in S. 3105 by a unanimous vote.

I am hopeful that this measure will have the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the gentleman and the House Armed Services Committee for the provision they are making in this bill to retain possession of Anacostia and Bolling Fields for the purposes the gentleman has stated.

I would only add that I regret the committee did not provide for a 10-year extension instead of a 5-year extension—or, even better, a permanent extension.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Later in the debate I will read to the committee some of the testimony adduced from the defense witnesses on the need for space in the Washington area.

We are going to build two new buildings to house personnel. I am not talking about military housing or the like, but we are going to build two new buildings. One will be on 4th Street, called the Forrestal Building, and one will be at Bolling-Anacostia, for $100 million.

Witnesses from the Defense Department have testified that after the buildings have been completed, there will still be a deficiency of more than 14,000 office spaces for defense personnel.

Where are we going to put them?

In addition, the Department of Defense officials testified before the committee that the Department of Defense is housed in the Washington area in more than 84 separate buildings. They are paying approximately $4 million a year in rent. About 60 of the 84 buildings are rental buildings.

We have land across the river here which is vitally needed for the expansion of our military requirements, not counting the housing that we must have in this area.

Moreover, there are thousands upon thousands of your flesh and blood, by way of enlisted men, working in these military establishments without family housing. The basic allowance for quarters is not adequate for these men to get proper housing for their families, and they are compelled to live at the mercy of the real estate industry in the District of Columbia. That is a fact.

Consider the junior officers, the majors and lieutenant commanders. I believe our colleague from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] is a lieutenant commander. He will understand this.

The most vital area in our military is the retention of these junior officers, the majors and the lieutenant commanders. They shun Washington as one would shun a viper. They do not want to come to Washington. They cannot afford it. We must provide a place for these men to live if we are to have any future leaders in the military. If we do not, they are going to leave. They do not want to come here.

This, among other reasons, is why we request and demand the Secretary of Defense to come to us with a master plan to utilize Bolling-Anacostia complex so that we may utilize it for further expansion.

Before me sits a distinguished commander of a nuclear submarine [Mr. Grider]. He knows the need to keep these junior officers. If we do not keep them, we will not have a Navy. We want to make provisions now to retain these men.

Secretary McNamara cut out 8,500 housing units for your flesh and blood, and in the civilian industry they are building a million units for the explosion of our population throughout America. But in the Department of Defense Secretary McNamara says, "We cannot afford it."

This, among other reasons, is why we are not giving away this land across the river. We need it more than is realized.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Am I to understand that this land will be used for housing and not for an airfield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The airfield is a temporary expediency. Ultimately, this land will be used for everything connected with the military. It will be used for housing and for office spaces. There is a shortage of land nearly everywhere. They are looking out now all over America for additional graveyards to bury these boys in.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; but we have a graveyard out at Dulles and we ought to shift some flights to Dulles.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is right. Let us say we should want to expand Arlington Cemetery to the south. We run right into a Marine installation there. Why should not that Marine installation be moved over here on land to serve in the Anacostia-Bolling complex? I am not talking about Dulles.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I agree with you.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course you do.

Mr. FRIEDEL. But not for airfields.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am talking about general aviation. You are not interested in that.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, I am.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. You are interested in jet aviation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Jet aviation and all aviation for Friendship and Dulles and all of them.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. You are generally right, but you are not right this time. You are right about 95 percent of the time.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. I want to compliment and commend my beloved and distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of this great committee, for retaining the Anacostia-Bolling complex for the people of the United States and all of the people of this country. It will be needed in the future, and I want to commend him. I think he represents 99 percent of the thinking of the people of this country.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me get back to my statement. We can use Dulles; we can use Friendship. The need for general aviation—and I have some figures that I will put in the Record on it—general aviation, which is executive and private flying is one of the largest and fastest expanding industries in America transportationwise. In the blink of an eye it will be so heavy over here at National Airport that we cannot stand it. We will never get to Chicago from National Airport if we do not remove some of these hazards and this congestion which is now entailed by way of general aviation plus the accelerated use of these high-performance aircraft.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand, but last year, a little less than a year ago, the FAA said that it would be infeasible to use Anacostia and Bolling because they are in the same flight pattern and it would be very dangerous. Read their testimony of over a year ago. Why are they changing their minds today? I think it would be dangerous for the safety of the people. If you want it for housing, then I am for it 100 percent, but I think for general aviation it should not be used for an airfield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank you very much, and I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Chicago.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The distinguished chairman has given a very thorough delineation of the military needs of the Department of Defense and has really brought home the nature of the expanding Department. Is this because of the war in Vietnam, or is this going to be a permanent condition?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are led to believe this will be a permanent condition because the Forrestal Building is a permanent one and the new building in the Anacostia-Bolling complex is to become a permanent one and they will need another.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman spoke of there being a deficiency of 14,000 spaces.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It is all in the record.

Mr. YATES. The question is whether or not this is for a permanent Department of Defense or a temporary situation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No. This is permanent.

Mr. YATES. That is permanent. That is amazing.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It amazed the committee. It amazed the committee. I will get Mr. Cook to let you see it, and I will put it in the Record, but the witness told us then and there he wished he had an additional building now.

Mr. YATES. The military budget for this year was something like $58 billion without regard to the expenses for Vietnam. Is that a budget we can look for on a permanent basis in the future, does the gentleman believe?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have no reason to believe it will be reduced.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I think our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], has covered most of the points that I wanted to get the gentleman to touch upon in his comments which he has already made.

I do believe, however, that it might be appropriate at this time to point out from the testimony of Mr. Airhart in connection with the matter about which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] was just inquiring.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that we need housing for at least another 14,000 people and, speaking personally, that he could use another building right now of the size of the Forrestal Building over at Bolling Air Force Base.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Airhart said he needs another building of the size of the Forrestal Building.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how this Department of Defense is expanding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], who is such a prominent member of the Committee on Appropriations and who also is so greatly interested in this problem, that over at Arlington, the Defense Intelligence Agency has been trying to construct a building over there, and they have been in a hassle with the commissioners of that county which has been going on with reference to the construction of another building. We own this college over there. What is the name of it, Mr. Hardy?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, Arlington Hall.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They have been begging us not to build. However, we have to go somewhere. This agency about which I speak is strewn out all over the District of Columbia, in 10 or 15 different locations, and how can it be efficient?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, everything over at Arlington Hall and at South Post is going to have to be relocated upon other premises, and if we do not have this property available, where do we go?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if we give away this post at Bolling-Anacostia it would be the most unwise decision which this Congress ever made. We need this in order to handle our expanding requirements.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] will rise in a little while and address his remarks to the language school which the gentleman is trying to have located in the District of Columbia and, surely, there is a need for this. We have many areas of interest and we are requesting and demanding that the Secretary of Defense keep us closely advised and bring us into his confidence on any master plan designed for the utilization of the land which we now own and which we shall never relinquish.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Has the gentleman's committee gone into the question of distributing any of these agencies out into other parts of the country?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We do it every day, we do it every day.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his action in retaining the use of the Bolling-Anacostia Field.

Mr. Chairman, general aviation has reached a point where it is no longer a stepchild or a supplement to aviation as such. It is a bright moving force in the field of general aviation, and we have got to find fields that are consequently useful and acceptable to general aviation.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we must take care of the required housing which is necessary, and we shall do that. But if we give up that territory over there at the Bolling-Anacostia complex, there is not another airfield to which these people can go, except one located 20 or 30 miles away. That is, therefore, a very important consideration, especially to those operations which are called general aviation flights. So of course, we must maintain that area and I commend the Committee on Armed Services for its action in holding that land for us until we can see what the needs are at a later date.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is all we want to do.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have seen criticism which has been directed at the distinguished gentleman and his committee for their action in trying to hold this land for probable military requirements.

I know something about this problem. I have seen similar situations develop time and again. Military space requirements are constantly expanding. Particularly that is true in the Washington area. Very probably this land will be required within a short time at Bolling-Anacostia. If we release it now, we simply will have to buy additional land later at very high prices.

The committee is doing exactly right in holding this land until we can determine what the facts are, and what the needs are going to be.

The House should very strongly endorse the action of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I will try to summarize the remainder of the bill.

We have another amendment which will require the GSA to give us notice of any construction of any building in which 50 percent of the occupants will be the Department of Defense.

Should we run into conflict with the distinguished gentleman from Maryland's Committee on Public Works, we will be perfectly willing to work it out to the satisfaction of the distinguished chairman. We recognize the comity between our committees, and I think his arrangements will be satisfactory to us.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished chairman that I think we can make satisfactory arrangements, so that you will be notified in every respect on anything that comes before us.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is all I want.

Mr. FALLON. And we will leave it to your judgment to see if you feel you should sit in and discuss any prospective action that the military might take to house it in any one of the installations.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman has told me that his committee will give us advance notice, and give us an opportunity to receive the information even before the GSA. That is all we want. We want to know what is going on.

The gentleman's fine cooperation is traditional with this great committee, and it is certainly a hallmark of his distinguished leadership. We will be very happy to work this out with him. We have no intention of encroaching on the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee—indeed, we have enough trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have some general provisions here which will come up further in the debate. At this moment I am going to yield some time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], so that he can have something to say on this important bill. We do want to finish this as fast as we can.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman and member of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I just want to assist the chairman in putting to final rest the old refrain about the danger of flight patterns in the Anacostia-Bolling Field complex vis-a-vis at least in the Andrews-National-Dulles-Friendship airports.

Is it not true that in the last 3 years while the Anacostia-Bolling complex has been lying idle, that up here in Loudoun County, Va., the FAA has taken over the direction and control of all landing patterns including the military, which would obviate instrument landing systems—ground crew approach, and many other difficulties that might have ensued while there was separate military and civilian control prior to 3 years ago?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is our understanding.

I might say that this whole complex over at Bolling-Anacostia, plus the National Airport, will be on one control pattern, and there will be no problem as I understand.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California, who too has urged us to enter into this agreement with the FAA.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and the members of the committee for their action relating to the Anacostia-Bolling complex. As I understand, the committee's position, this recommendation will provide an interim solution to the traffic problems associated with the Washington National Airport.

I do not believe that anyone fully expects that this particular airport facility will be a permanent solution, but it certainly will provide an interim solution until such time as we can provide general aviation access to the Nation's Capital on a permanent basis.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE]. He has wisely pointed out the extreme urgency for this Congress to cooperate with the FAA and give proper recognition to the increasing and quite frankly, explosive, needs of the general and business aviation fleet of this country. There are nearly 100,000 aircraft in this fleet compared with some 2,000 aircraft in commercial aviation. For too long, general aviation has been the stepchild of the aviation community. We in the Congress have the responsibility of doing something positive about changing this situation. The least we can do, is to start right here in the Nation's Capitol to establish the proper airport facility example for other communities in the country to follow.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further need for time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Armed Services Committee since its inception. I say that with considerable pride.

We look upon ourselves as custodians of our national safety. We are the arm of the Congress, commissioned by you, to carry out the clear mandate of the Constitution that the Congress shall determine the size and kind of a national defense we shall have. In discharging this responsibility our committee has at no time been motivated in any decision we have made by any partisan political consideration of any kind. In our deliberations we have had individual differences of opinion, to be sure. That is healthy. It has insured us against any improvident judgments and made certain that all the facts and factors of every question were fully explored and evaluated.

Paradoxically, we have as Secretary of Defense a man who listens only when he asks, and he rarely asks; and, we have as our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who both regularly asks and attentatively listens. He has revitalized our committee as a committee of 38, all with an equal voice, whether of the majority or of the minority. That is why our committee has been able to accomplish so much with such a high degree of unanimity, not alone on the bill as a whole but even on the multitude of items it may embody.

The military construction bill before us is a committee bill in the fullest sense of the word. It has my full support, and I am confident it will have the full support of the entire House.

I need hardly say more, particularly in view of the detailed explanation of the measure made by our committee chairman [Mr. RIVERS] and our ranking minority member [Mr. BATES]. But as a member of the subcommittee which conducted a study of the arbitrary deferral by the Secretary of Defense of those projects authorized and funded last year, I feel it incumbent upon me to make some observations on this specific aspect of the pending bill. I commend to your examination the findings and conclusions embodied in our subcommittee report filed March 8 and printed as a public document on April 5.

It does not make sense for the Department of Defense to ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate funds for a military construction program it claims essential and just 3 months after we take this action have the Secretary of Defense suddenly decided for himself to defer nearly 50 percent of the program.

I repeat what I said at the time our subcommittee released its report:

> Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, that he is grown so great?

Without consultation with any of the responsible committees of the House or Senate, or even with the respective services affected, Secretary McNamara and Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance arbitrarily decided between them that their judgment was better than the collective judgment of four committees of Congress and the Congress as a whole.

Let me briefly review the chronological facts. In February of 1965 the Department of Defense submitted a military construction request of $1.9 billion. They assured us this represented only their urgent construction needs for the fiscal year 1966.

Our Committee on Armed Services examined this request. The Senate Armed Services Committee did likewise. In due course, with some reductions not deemed essential, the bill passed both the House and Senate. But it was vetoed by the President on August 23, 1965. It was vetoed not because of the expenditure authorized but solely because it contained certain provisions the President considered an encroachment on the Constitutional prerogatives of the Executive.

The Defense Department urged that a new construction bill be promptly passed authorizing the same projects. Again our committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee reviewed the proposed construction program. Again, we had impressed upon us by the Department the imperative need for these projects. We acted promptly and on September 16, 1965, the authorization was signed into law.

In the meantime, both Senate and House Appropriations Committees meticulously examined the proposed program for fiscal year 1966. Again, both Houses of the Congress acted on the appropriation bill.

That this whole program was considered by the Congress with great care is evidenced by the fact that the amount finally authorized and appropriated was approximately $600 million less than the Department had requested, or a total of $1.3 billion.

On September 29, 1965, the appropriation bill was signed by the President. Not once during all this, with the military construction legislation before the Congress no less than three times—not once during all this from February, when first submitted, through September 29 when funds were made available with the President's signature, was there any suggestion from anyone but that the program authorized and funded was not essential to meet an immediate need.

Three months later—on December 21, to be exact—when the Congress had adjourned—when our "back was turned," if you will, for we were helpless to make a collective protest—Secretary McNamara announced an indefinite deferment of $620 million, or nearly one-half of the recently approved construction program.

What happened in this 3-month period that he should take upon himself, in consultation only with Deputy Secretary Vance, to take this action. We could conclude that notwithstanding all his computers, impressive charts, and graphs, that he had made a big mistake in his allegedly infallible defense planning. He would hardly admit to that, even if it were true. We in Congress examined the program exhaustively three times and became convinced of its basic soundness. We ourselves reduced it by over a half billion dollars from what was originally recommended.

The explanation given our committee for this arbitrary decision is as fatuous as the decision itself. We were simply told that the Secretary of Defense concluded he should defer $620 million worth of military projects, although admittedly necessary and desirable, in order to relieve the mounting inflationary pressures.

There is no denying the existing inflationary pressures from Government spending. But there was no faster acceleration of these pressures in the period from September to December than there had been during the past 2 years, including the 8-month period the Congress had the program under consideration.

And, Mr. Chairman, even if there were a marked increase in the inflationary trend during this period, it is not for the Secretary of Defense to take it upon himself to decide to cut back on defense projects. I am not aware that the Secretary of Defense is also assistant president responsible not alone for our defense posture but for the country's overall fiscal policy and economic well-being. To the best of my knowledge President Johnson had not made any specific recommendations to us of any reductions in Government spending because of inflationary pressures. On the contrary, the White House itself was applying pressure on the Congress to effectuate all of the Great Society programs for new domestic spending.

It is for the President to recommend, and for the Congress to decide, in what areas of Government spending a retrenchment should be made by virtue of our overall fiscal situation. And we have repeatedly urged that he establish a list of priorities. But now, Secretary McNamara in the assumed role of Assistant President proceeds to decide that our national economic situation is such that he should defer $620 million of projects we had just authorized and funded.

Our subcommittee looked into the nature of the defense projects Assistant President McNamara suddenly decided to defer in the interest of our national economic well-being. He claimed that while these projects were desirable and necessary, they were not essential. You will find them listed in the special report of our subcommittee.

A substantial number of the projects consisted of housing for our servicemen and their dependents, messhalls, and medical and recreational facilities; new construction and much needed repair of existing ones. Last year, for example, we authorized 57,700 new barracks spaces. The action taken by Secretary McNamara meant that only 6,041 would be constructed.

He claims they are not essential, notwithstanding that in the very places there were deferrals of barracks for our servicemen, over 5,000 in basic training at Fort Knox, Ky.; Fort Gordon, Ga.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and Fort Jackson, S.C.; are required to live in tents. And it is likely that additional personnel at other military installations will also be required to live in tents.

Not essential? What could be more essential? It is my view, it is the unanimous view of our Armed Services Committee, and I am sure it is yours, that at the very least our servicemen and their families should be provided with adequate housing. It is my view that in any determination as to what is essential and what is not, the highest priority should be given to our service personnel. They are the ones making sacrifices for all of us.

It is a pathetic paradox—beyond all understanding—that the administration is more interested in seeing that the Job Corps trainees get adequate housing, adequate medical care, adequate recreational opportunities and adequate everything that in seeing that even the most basic of needs are provided those called upon to defend us to their death, if need be. As important as the Job Corps may be, it is by no means near as important as those in the U.S. Army Corps. If the Job Corps housing and facilities are essential in this so-called Great Society, military corps housing and facilities are doubly so, and more than doubly so. But I have heard no suggestions made from the Great Societyites that we deprive the Job Corps anything.

It is beyond all understanding that military trainees should be obliged to do without proper housing while we spend countless days passing all manner of housing bills and spend doubtless millions of dollars to provide all manner of housing of one kind or another for the comforts of the civilians here at home.

It is beyond all understanding that there is so much concern whether trees and flowers adorn our highways, and so little concern whether our fighting men have so much as a roof over their heads. What price highway beautiful when we cannot afford any more than a tent for those who must march.

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many places in this so-called Great Society program where substantial spending reductions can be made and should be. Why not make them? Why has the administration deferred urgently needed defense spending so that funds may be available for unnecessary, much less desirable, domestic spending?

First things first; and, in my book, the serviceman comes first.

This bill extends the authorization we previously made but which the Secretary of Defense deferred and makes an additional authorization for military construction. And yet, it does not begin to provide what our servicemen need and should have. As our distinguished chairman has pointed out in his remarks, the bill is austere and disappointing. It is what I would call a "bare bones" bill, but I am realistic enough to recognize that this is as much as we can do at the present time.

The time has long since arrived, Mr. Chairman, when we here at home should begin to make some sacrifices.

I urge the adoption of the measure before us. Let there be no further deferment of a defense program for our service people. Instead let there be a deferment of the spending programs here at home.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Armed Services has been meeting over the past several weeks for hearings on the defense military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1967. Prior to these hearings each member of the committee was furnished a set of program books by each participating military department or defense agency to acquaint the committee with the items involved preparatory to the actual presentation and consideration of testimony. In 657 pages of hearings the committee examined the construction requirements of the Department of Defense in great detail.

As ranking minority member of your Committee on Armed Services I agree fully in the remarks by our able chairman in his presentation of the military construction authorization bill. It has my personal support. The committee chairman has been clear and succinct in his outline of the details of this bill. He has set out several problems with which the committee was concerned and has indicated the proposed solutions. I believe the outlined proposals indicate the responsibilities and prerogatives of the Congress.

In view of the overriding demands for resources associated with the support of activities in southeast Asia for which the authorization was provided earlier this year, this bill includes those projects which must be started in fiscal year 1967 to meet operational schedules, to support new missions or which are essential for other compelling reasons such as the health and safety of personnel and improvements to eliminate the most serious troop housing, training, and support deficiencies, and certain items which in view of testimony on deficiencies, the committee felt compelled to add to the bill. The program proposed includes all types of structures needed for the operation and support of our military forces.

The bill would authorize construction at approximately 280 named bases throughout the world and includes approximately 650 line items. This might be contrasted with the 419 military bases and approximately 1,300 line items provided for in the bill for last year. New authority granted in this bill totals about $1,086,000,000 as compared with $1,770,239,000 in the annual authorizing legislation last year. Of the total in this bill, about $576 million is for construction and $510 million for operational support of family housing. There is no authorization in this bill for construction of new family housing units.

It should be kept in mind that on December 21 of last year the Secretary of Defense announced that he was deferring indefinitely some $620 million of construction approved by the Congress in fiscal year 1966 and prior years. Of this amount $420 million was in support of normal military objectives and the balance for construction of military family housing.

Although this year's bill is greatly reduced in scope the committee found the reviewing of each line item no more simple since it was necessary to evaluate the importance of last year's requests with the numerous projects which had been deferred.

I should like now to speak in support of the specific titles:

TITLE I—ARMY

Title I proposes new authorization for the Army in the amount of $151,808,000. Of this amount, $72,667,000 is for projects inside the United States; $36,141,000 is for projects outside the United States; and $43 million is for classified projects.

The Army is continuing its effort initiated several years ago to emphasize replacement of its inadequate temporary facilities. Prior to this request, the Army had succeeded in reaching an adequate rate or level of effort for replacing troop housing and other elements of the physical plant. This level of effort would have required about $300 million per year for replacement and modernization alone. Because of construction costs, the use of resources to support military operational activities, and the reduced military construction program, later resumption of the modernization will require an increased level of effort.

The bill provides new authority at 38 Army permanent installations, 36 of which are inside the United States and 2 of which are outside the United States.

Let us now consider title I from a standpoint of major categories of construction. In the category "Troop housing and community facilities," we have approximately $24 million. We now authorize troop housing largely in terms of barracks complexes which are manageable units of barracks construction with essential associated troop support facilities. This bill would authorize 6,194 enlisted men's barracks spaces in the United States. The bill would also provide for 66 spaces for bachelor officers.

The next important category is "Operational and training facilities," $83 million. This provides a range of items such as air defense facilities and improvement and modernization of training facilities and ranges and includes $33 million for military assistance program in South Vietnam to support free world forces.

The largest requirement in the $42 million research and development facilities package is $31 million for facilities required to support the test and evaluation of the Nike X missile system. Decision concerning the future deployment of the system will depend upon test and evaluation using the proposed facilities.

The sum of $3 million is proposed for maintenance facilities to keep Army materiel in first-class condition.

The remainder of the proposed authorization is devoted to essential items such as utilities improvements and expansions and supply facilities and $10 million for emergency construction.

TITLE II—NAVY

The Navy would be authorized military construction in title II in the total amount of $154,104,000. This amount includes $126,398,000 for projects inside the United States, $13,918,000 for projects outside the United States, and $13,788,000 for classified projects.

The bill initially proposed for authorization this year presented a program which conformed to the Navy's bureau organization. As of May 1 this year, the Navy Department has been reorganized and some of the traditional bureaus eliminated or consolidated into naval commands. The bill has been adjusted to conform with the Navy reorganization.

In recent years the Navy has had to modernize its shore facilities in keeping with the modernization of ships, aircraft, and weapons systems. Major portions of the budgets during those years were for projects having direct impact on its operations. As a result, less than 15 percent of those budgets were for improving living conditions for sailors and marines. Many of these dedicated officers and enlisted men serve protracted tours of duty at sea and at advanced bases separated from families and friends. To mitigate these hardships, the Navy, last year, assigned approximately 25 percent of its program to what can be called care for man. This year, 40 percent is for this same purpose and provides barracks, bachelor officers quarters, messhalls, and a few recreation facilities, all to support new or expanded missions or compelling corrections of deficient capacities or correction of hazards to health and safety.

The Navy has continuing requirements ashore to support its fleet of surface ships and submarines and this bill would authorize the modernization of various shipyard facilities totaling $21 million. This program would affect all of the naval shipyards remaining in active status. The projects include modernization of shops for maintenance and repair of equipment and devices common to modern warships, improvement of drydocks, and increased scope of utilities to support the demands of modern ships. Last year, convinced by testimony of certain deficiencies at the Boston Naval Shipyard, the committee approved two additional line items for this yard for an estimated $4,500,000. As a result of further study, some dimensions of the drydock No. 5 were changed and the estimated cost was determined to be $7,393,000. The increase of $2,893,000 is included in this bill. It has also been determined that three new piers are necessary to replace four deteriorated and outmoded piers. For this replacement $11 million is included in the bill.

The need for shore support of our ships extends beyond naval shipyards. From time to time ships must return to their home ports or stop at other bases for logistic reasons. They berth at piers to conduct routine maintenance or emergency minor repairs, to refuel, to off- or on-load troops, supplies, and so forth. This bill would authorize approximately $11 million for the construction of projects at a number of our naval stations and bases to improve their capabilities to carry out these functions efficiently and effectively. Projects in this bill are for needs at east and west coast stations.

Within the Navy's revised organization, the Naval Air Systems Command supports Navy and Marine Corps aviation installations. Projects in this bill for these activities total $42 million. Projects in the bill for the air activities range through the construction categories. They include such line items as communication facilities, training building, maintenance hangars and shops, storage, research and development, and administration buildings and utilities. The first of the classes of air stations represented in this bill consists of five training stations where the embryo pilots and ground technicians are trained. The second group of 12 stations is widespread from north to south on each coast and in the Atlantic and Western Pacific areas. These stations conduct operational training of naval aviators and perform actual operations in support of units of the fleet. The third class of air stations are those which support Marine Corps air units. These are four in number and are located on the east and west coasts. They perform much the same mission as the naval air stations but with emphasis on the support of Marine Corps ground forces. A fourth group of four stations perform research and development with respect to aviation requirements. A fifth group represented by stations in this program handle naval aviation needs outside the United States.

The bill contains $5.7 million for facilities at the ordnance stations which are now under the Naval Ordnance Systems Command. The ordnance stations support the fleet and are located on the east and west coasts and in Hawaii. The facilities are for handling, maintaining, and storing ammunition and special weapons and disposing of faulty ammunition.

The committee has also approved projects in the amount of $6 million at five installations for Marine Corps ground forces. Approximately 50 percent of this amount is for improvement of training facilities to accommodate the increased training loads.

The three Marine bases at Camp Pendleton, Twentynine Palms, and Camp Butler, Okinawa, are utilized for operational training to maintain the marines in combat readiness for rapid deployment. The recruit depots at Parris Island and San Diego are for indoctrination and basic training of recruits.

The bill contains authorization for three naval hospitals at New London, Conn.; Chelsea, Mass.; and Memphis, Tenn., in the total amount of $20.8 million. As submitted, the bill contained the hospital at New London, Conn. Convinced by testimony of the need for additional medical facilities at Chelsea and Memphis, the committee approved these two additional items.

Because of the nature and sphere of its operations, the Navy continues to place great dependence on reliable, accurate, and rapid communication. The bill would include $5 million for projects within the Navy's worldwide communications systems. These are to improve and augment existing facilities to support new and expanded missions.

The relatively large turnover of naval personnel and the increasing complexity of ships and weapons systems generates the need for continued improvement and augmentation of the facilities for the training of recruits and the retraining of officers and enlisted men in the advanced skills and technology. Projects in this bill in the amount of $26 million would support the Navy's training program. Of this amount, almost $15 million is for a new recruit training base at a location to be determined, and $6 million for barracks and bachelor officers quarters at San Diego to prevent hazardous overcrowding.

The remaining three groups of naval facilities provide essential augmentation of utilities, supply facilities, and a research facility at Barrow, Alaska. This research facility is necessary to permit continuance of Arctic research programs by the Navy and associated university laboratory programs.

As has been provided for the Army and Air Force, the bill contains $10 million authorization for the Navy to accomplish emergency construction.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

Title III proposes new authorization for the Air Force in the amount of $217,427,000. Of this amount, $107,889,000 is for projects inside the United States, $95,447,000 for classified projects, and $14,091,000 for projects outside the United States.

This year the program provides for construction at 130 major installations. Of these, 95 are within the United States, its territories, and possessions.

The Air Force real property facilities, like those of its sister services, consist to a surprising degree of buildings that have been kept in use long beyond their expected lifespan. As stated last year, the increasing obsolescence of the real property in the nonoperational categories continues to be a matter of concern. In many instances, the facilities must be replaced at the earliest possible time. The requirements for operational demands in other areas are recognized and this program does not attempt to modernize or replace facilities unless there is a high priority operational requirement or a marked deficiency in troop housing or community support.

I will now provide some details of the content of title III. The bill would provide construction to support the operation of our strategic forces in the amount of $38.9 million. The major share of this amount, $23.7 million, will be spent at Minuteman missile sites in a continuing program of improving the capabilities of these sites to withstand attack and in retrofitting the first missile silos built to accommodate the greatly improved Minuteman II missile.

To achieve the adjustment of the basic bomber force and the base structure of the Strategic Air Command, we must provide facilities at bases receiving increased numbers or different types of aircraft, or both, as a result of base closures and consolidations. There is $7 million in this Strategic Forces program directly in support of the announced force realinement and base consolidations including nearly $1 million to provide facilities for the FB–111.

The continental air and missile defense segment of the Air Force program, which amounts to $20.8 million, is a prime example of the range of technologies and weapons being brought to bear on the defense of the North American Continent. It is also an illustrative cross section of the construction that must be provided to support these systems. Projects in this package range in location and complexity from airmen dormitories in Alaska to the Norad underground command post, in Colorado, from alteration of radar towers in

Greenland to a satellite tracking camera installation in the Pacific area.

The construction of the Norad command post was a unique undertaking. As such, there has been a continuous evolution of the construction required as new and unforeseen problems arose and solutions were determined. The bill includes $3.8 million to cover these types of new requirements and to cover additional costs validated to date on earlier work now complete.

The announced transfer of Biggs Air Force Base, Tex., to the Army requires the relocation of some Air Force units now stationed there. One of these moves is into Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex. This bill would provide $2.8 million at Holloman Air Force Base to accommodate this unit.

Authorization in the amount of $1.8 million has been approved to provide the fourth increment of the installation of backup interceptor control equipment for SAGE. This program, called BUIC III—backup interceptor control—involves a number of currently owned sites in the United States. It provides a capability for continued control of the air defense system after an attack, if the primary system is destroyed. This bill would also provide $1.5 million for 5,000 kilowatts additional generating capacity at the powerplant at Eielson Air Force Base in Alaska.

The emphasis on expanding and improving the capabilities of the tactical forces is reflected in the proportion of the Air Force program earmarked for general purpose forces. Last year, and again this year, one quarter of the proposed program is in support of these forces. The $52.7 million approved for general purpose forces will provide a significant improvement in operational capability. This includes the first increment of a program designed to insure minimum protection and survivability of the forward tactical force when under conventional attack. This wide ranging force requires facilities in the United States for the basing and training of the units. It requires facilities in Europe and other overseas locations for operational deployment.

A significant departure from previous programs is the inclusion of $5.7 million in this package to support the Air Force of the Republic of Vietnam.

The continued introduction of the F/RF-4 aircraft into the general purpose forces requires $6.3 million for flight simulator buildings, weapons calibration shelters, engine shops, armament shops, and support facilities at bases where this aircraft is deployed.

The major items in the tactical command and support area provide for the relocation of the 12th Air Force Headquarters and supporting units from Waco, Tex., to Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex. A new headquarters building is included at $2.2 million and certain ancillary structures for the supporting control and communications groups.

Specialized combat crew training for tactical aircraft pilots is conducted at Nellis Air Force Base, Nev. The bill would provide $1 million for a flight simulator, field training building, and supporting shops peculiar to this aircraft to enable this school to conduct training for the F-111 aircraft.

The most rapid evolution of any of our forces, notwithstanding that which is taking place in the strategic and tactical forces, has occurred within the airlift force. The Military Airlift Command has rapidly assimilated the first deliveries of the C-141 Starlifter. The Air Force is now making deliberate preparations for the full and immediate exploitation of the C-5 aircraft when they enter the operational force. Construction of facilities is a key element in realizing the full potential of these aircraft. The bill includes about $13 million for operational, maintenance, and fueling facilities for the C-141.

Research, development, and testing are areas of major effort where the scientific equipment to be housed and the brick and mortar construction frequently merge and become one and the same. Providing the scientific community with the facilities essential to their tasks calls for the highest in professional engineering management. Approximately $49.2 million would provide support for the wide variety of investigations, applications, and tests conducted by and for the Air Force. These include $8.7 million for shops and assembly buildings required to prepare the manned orbiting laboratory—MOL—for launch into orbit. The bill would also provide $6.6 million for continued development of the Western Test Range—WTR—to enhance its test capabilities for all launch missions, including MOL.

As the number of satellites, boosters, and other material in orbit continues to increase, the equipment needed and the work involved in tracking, evaluating, and reporting on each item increases exponentially. This bill would provide $12.4 million for facilities at Sunnyvale, Calif., and at existing tracking stations.

Expansion of the Air Force Academy to house the approved increase in the student body is proceeding. This bill includes $10.8 million for the third phase of the requisite construction.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Under title IV the bill would authorize $5,875,000 for projects in support of four Department of Defense agencies. These facilities are minimal to further the work of the defense agencies in the fields of atomic support, communications, supply, and security. Of particular significance is the project to expand the test facilities at the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Md., for research into the effects of atomic explosions.

TITLE V—FAMILY HOUSING

Title V of the bill contains $510 million for military family housing. This amount is to cover all costs of the military family housing program other than new construction. The committee was advised that expansion of the war effort in Vietnam requires that military expenditures for all but operational requirements be deferred at this time to be resumed as soon as economic conditions permit. Although the Department of Defense proposed an increase in the domestic leasing program as a temporary measure to meet the more pressing needs for military family housing, the committee is recommending no increase in the domestic leasing program.

TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES

Title VII would authorize $5 million for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8.9 million for the Air National Guard and $3.3 million for the Air Force Reserve. These amounts are substantially less than in recent years for two important reasons. First, the substantial requirements to support southeast Asia activities dictate that only the most urgent facilities needs of the Reserve components should be provided at this time and second, additional authorization for facilities for the Army Reserve Forces is not essential until resolution of the proposed realinement of those forces toward which legislation is pending before the Congress. The $9.2 million authorization provided by Congress for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 1966, together with the unused balance from prior years authorization totals approximately $30 million will provide adequately for an accelerated construction effort once the realinement question is resolved.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to compliment the committee on its report and particularly on what is said on pages 2 and 3 concerning these deferred projects. As the gentleman knows, I serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that handles the funds for military construction. Based on my experiences on that subcommittee, I concur in what the committee said in this report about the embarrassing situation that committees of Congress are placed in when representatives of the service departments come before us and justify funds for military construction as being essential and necessary and then have the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily freezing the funds appropriated to construct the facilities that your committee first approves and ours then appropriates for.

This is particularly true in the field of family housing when he refuses to use funds provided to construct 8,500 housing units. There is something lacking in the liaison between the service witnesses that appear before our committees and the Secretary of Defense. I am beginning to wonder whether we are getting the correct story from these witnesses when they tell us these facilities are absolutely necessary and we persuade Congress to put up the money and then the Secretary of Defense freezes the funds and defers the projects because he claims, at this late date, that they are not necessary. I am glad to note that the Committee on Armed Services has interested itself in this matter and is trying to put a stop to this practice. I think with the heavy backlog of funds piled up in the bank that there ought to be some priorities established here. If those projects were as essential as they were represented to us as being, then they ought to be constructed before new facilities are constructed.

Mr. BATES. Of course, that is the provision, as the gentleman knows, which we put in the bill which will require the units previously authorized to be constructed before anything in this bill unless the President for national emergency reasons or because of an unusual change in circumstances decides that the new ones should have priority.

Mr. JONAS. I notice that provision is in the bill, and I commend the committee for placing it there.

Mr. BATES. All we can do is write legislation to be as effective as possible. We do not administer the law, but nevertheless, I believe we have gone as far as we can at this time.

I have talked personally with General Quesada, the predecessor of Mr. McKee. He believes it would be a wonderful idea for us temporarily to turn this property over to the FAA for private aircraft so that they will not get in the way of these fast jets that are landing in here at fantastic speeds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our committee did the prudent and the wise thing in restricting the sale and transfer of this property. I sincerely trust that the Committee will endorse the proposal now before you.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 212]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Conyers
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Farnum
Flood
Gubser
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Holifield
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Landrum
McEwen
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Moorhead
Morrison
Nedzi
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Scott
Smith, N.Y.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 3105, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 391 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the provisions of this bill which would authorize over $1 billion of new facilities for our armed services. I rise, however, to express grave doubts concerning section 611—a rider attached by the Armed Services Committee which would prohibit the Department of Defense until July 1, 1972, from declaring 452 acres of the 920-acre Bolling-Anacostia military complex in excess of foreseeable Defense Department land needs. The only civilian use of this valuable property authorized by the rider during the next 6 years is a lease to the FAA of the Anacostia airport facilities for use by small business and pleasure aircraft.

Enactment of this rider would be unwise and untimely.

It would prevent the District of Columbia from purchasing the excess 452 acres of the Bolling-Anacostia tract for development of a new town. A showplace city within a city, serving 20,000 low-, middle-, and upper-income residents, is being planned for this tract by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The $421,000 study, to be completed by July 1, 1967, already contains plans for an exciting new community of 6,000 to 7,000 housing units, schools, shopping centers, and recreational facilities. Included in these plans is a 2-mile-long public greenbelt waterfront park running the entire length of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers which border the tract for the enjoyment of all residents of the District of Columbia area.

The projected new town development makes good economic sense. Uncle Sam will be paid full fair market value for the tract. And the development of a new community would return the tract to the District's depleted tax rolls at an estimated assessed value of at least $40 million, producing over $1 million in additional annual property tax revenues.

Under this rider, however, this new town development would not go forward. The excess 452 acres must be retained for 6 years by the Department of Defense, even though in the hearings the Department declared that it had no foreseeable need for the tract and indicated that it proposed to declare the tract excess to Defense needs.

Let there be no mistake. The Defense Department is not recklessly proposing to sell the Bolling-Anacostia complex, only to be saved from its unfoolishness by the Armed Services Committee.

It has carefully studied and restudied this matter. And it has reserved for its own use the lion's share of the Bolling-Anacostia tract. Of the 920 acres, 468 acres of the best land are or will be used for a Naval Research Laboratory; a housing complex containing 2 barracks for 3,000 enlisted men, 588 units of family housing for enlisted men, and 50 to 60 units for officers housing; and a "junior" pentagon building, one-third the size of the Pentagon, with office space for 10,000 people.

Yet in the face of the Defense Department's determination that the remaining 452 acre tract is surplus to its needs and in the absence of any Department of Defense plans for its use, the Armed Services Committee proposes to forbid its disposal for 6 years.

The sole civilian use authorized by this rider is for the Federal Aviation Agency to operate the Anacostia airfield, on lease from the Department of Defense, for the benefit of small business and pleasure aircraft.

The Federal Aviation Agency has not yet publicly endorsed this proposal. It has made no study and, so far as I can find out, plans no study to determine whether this reopening of the Anacostia airfield is feasible, what it will cost, and what will be gained in terms of relieving ground facility congestion at National Airport and otherwise. Questions like the following need to be answered:

First. How many planes will use Anacostia airfield, and under what flight restrictions?

Second. How will the reopening of the airfield affect air safety?

Third. What will be the cost of preparing the airfield for small aircraft?

Fourth. Would use of the Anacostia airfield be compatible with the new military housing and the "junior" pentagon building to be built on the Bolling-Anacostia site by the Department of Defense?

Fifth. How much will ground congestion be relieved at National Airport? Rough calculations indicate that on an average, in a peak hour, only 10 small planes carrying 30 passengers would be diverted from National to Anacostia.

Sixth. What changes in air traffic control rules at National would the Federal Aviation Agency propose in light of this small relief of National's congested facilities? If no changes were made in the traffic control rules, the 10 small-plane operations transferred to Anacostia would be replaced by 10 operations by larger planes, which would actually add to the congestion.

This House should have answers to these questions before it is asked to legislate that a small airfield is the only civilian use authorized for this valuable tract.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need to act now on this rider. At best the proposed 6-year freeze on the excess portion of the Bolling-Anacostia tract is premature.

Under last year's Military Construction Authorization Act, as written by the Armed Services Committee, the Department of Defense has been forbidden to dispose of the land until July 1, 1967—11 months from now. By this time the $421,000 Department of Housing and Urban Development financed planning study for the new town development will have been completed.

And if the proponents of reopening Anacostia airfield for small business and pleasure aircraft wish to present a well-founded case for the reopening, they will have this time to prepare it.

By next summer the facts upon which to base a reasoned decision will be before us. In fact, a reason for writing the July 1, 1967, date into last year's act was to allow time for positions to be developed. No definitive action was to be taken before then.

The July 25 Armed Services Committee report on this bill states:

> The use of the Bolling-Anacostia complex for appropriate aviation purposes has the strong endorsement of the Vice President of the United States.

I have here a letter dated today from the Vice President clarifying his position. It reads as follows:

> THE VICE PRESIDENT,
> *Washington, D.C., August 10, 1966.*
> Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR HENRY: I am glad to clarify my position on the question of the use of the Bolling-Anacostia airbase for general aviation and housing purposes.
>
> I realize fully the importance of providing additional housing and urban renewal sites for the residents of the District of Columbia. We are all deeply concerned about the overcrowded housing conditions which exist in the nation's capital.
>
> Therefore, my advocacy of the use of Anacostia Naval Air Station for general aviation purposes was based on the notion that this would be an interim use while planning for the housing and urban renewal project went forward. At the time that construction of these facilities was to begin, the use of this land for general aviation purposes should terminate at once.
>
> The Federal Aviation Agency has assured me that this is their understanding of whatever arrangement may be possible.
>
> It is also my understanding that the Department of Defense has once again come to the conclusion that a large portion of the land at the Bolling and Anacostia bases will not be needed for national defense purposes.
>
> Finally, this proposed plan must await the determination of whether or not Congress places any additional limitations on the use of the Bolling-Anacostia sites.
>
> I hope this helps clarify my position on this matter.
>
> Sincerely,
> HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Last September 16 President Johnson, referring to this time schedule, said:

> It is important that the planning which is now being done by the National Capital Planning Commission * * * continue at the same time that the Defense Department is making (its) studies. That way, when the time comes for a decision as to the military or other purpose or purposes for which the property may be used, we will have all of the choices spelled out for us to see.

It is unfortunate that this rider to S. 3105 forces the House to make a premature decision.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, although I support the authorization, I am concerned, as is the gentleman in the well, about the section 611, about the amount of time that we are extending the Defense Department control. It seems needless to extend it to 1972, which is much too long.

I believe under Public Law 89-188, the present law provides for an extension to July 1, 1967, which is adequate time to study the Planning Commission's report. Under the present law I believe there should be adequate time for the report from the National Planning Commission to be submitted. There should not be the need to extend the time of the Defense Department control over this property beyond July 1, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the future utilization of the Bolling-Anacostia military complex.

Section 611 of the bill before us provides that the Bolling Field property remain under the ownership and control of the Department of Defense until July 1, 1972.

My concern is based on the following facts:

First, the Defense Department has not yet made it clear that it needs the entire property for military use.

Second, under a Presidential directive, the National Capital Planning Commission is conducting a 3-year, $400,000 feasibility study of the site for additional balanced housing for the District of Columbia. The final report will be received within 60 to 90 days.

It seems to me imprudent action for the Congress to preclude the use of the land for any purpose other than military or possible civilian aviation during the next 6 years.

Every indication is that DOD does not need the property and there is an obvious need for additional housing in the District of Columbia.

I am suggesting that it would be a wiser course for Congress to retain control of the base in the Defense Department until all of the facts are before it.

This would be the case if the so-called "rider" in section 611 were deleted from the bill.

Without section 611, the Military Construction Authorization Act of last year (Public Law 89-188) would control.

It provides that the Bolling complex remain under the ownership of the Defense Department until July 1, 1967.

There would be no waste of the $400,000 spent for the Commission's study.

And we would then have the opportunity to give the Commission's report the serious consideration which it deserves, as well as to assess the full military needs for the area.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I support the remarks the gentleman is making with regard to the use of the Anacostia-Bolling area.

I support this authorization bill, but I regret the inclusion in a bill, otherwise designed to increase our Nation's ability to preserve a democratic way of life, of a provision which would effectively freeze out any consideration by Congress or by executive agencies of the expressed needs of the citizen of the District of Columbia for additional adequate low and moderate income housing. I am referring to the provision in this bill which would freeze in the hands of the Defense Department the Bolling-Anacostia airfield complex until 1972.

This protection of the interests of the Department of Defense, which in the past has expressed no interest whatsoever in retaining this area, is unwarranted in the face of a provision already in the law which retains the land in the Department's hands until July 1, 1967. It is unwarranted in light of a housing study, prepared, at the request of the President himself, who surely must know what the needs of the other executive departments are. This study is nearly ready for release, and deserves the consideration of Congress before any attempt is made to decide the fate of one of the few remaining open land areas left in the District of Columbia.

The need for housing in the District is crucial. It is detailed in report after report, but more importantly, this need has been documented and described by the people of the District themselves. Their feelings with respect to the possible use of the Bolling-Anacostia area are well known, but are not being adequately considered by Congressional action so far on this bill. The shortage of housing is so acute that it even makes difficult rudimentary code enforcement activities. One private organization attempting to improve living conditions in the District's slums found, for example, that with demand so outpacing supply, landlords have little need to consider their tenants, and can simply evict them with no worry over renting their units. The organization ended up playing musical slums with evicted tenants after code violations were reported, having no alternative but to switch families around, if they were to have any place to live at all.

I had hoped to submit an amendment to eliminate this provision for 1972 from the bill, and return the situation to a July 1967 dateline. Last night I learned that a claim is being circulated that the real reason for retaining the land until 1972 in Defense Department hands was the Vietnam war and Defense Department needs relating to that war. It has been impossible to track down the validity of this statement, which is questionable in light of past Defense Department statements rejecting any future use for the Bolling Field area, and in light of the language of the bill itself, which allows the Defense Department to lease the field to the Federal Aviation Agency, I am certain that this House would reject the present provision if all the facts were known, and there was full time for its consideration. Under the circumstances, however, I believe it best to have the other body work on this proposal, in the hope that my views and those of others of my colleagues will be accepted in the final version reached between House and Senate.

One of the facts that needs clarification is the strange reversal of opinion by the Federal Aviation Agency. As late as May 23 of this year, in a letter to the junior Senator from Colorado, FAA Administrator William F. McKee stated:

> Reopening Bolling Field would not be a feasible solution. Reopening it would generate additional traffic and reintroduce the congestion that resulted in its closing in 1962.

Given the confused situation that the FAA has built for itself in terms of overall air traffic in the Washington-Baltimore area, I cannot give much weight to the abrupt turnabout by the FAA in this regard, and I would hope that the Senate would take the time to sort out the facts. There has been, no doubt, considerable pressure placed on the FAA by the general aviation people whose private plane users, according to a March

5, 1966, article in the Washington Post, have intimate connections in Government circles. Perhaps there are some who would prefer not to choose between the demands of general aviation and the needs of the general citizenry. I for one, have no difficulty in recommending favorable consideration of the urgent housing needs of the low and moderate income residents of the District of Columbia.

I would like to place into the RECORD at this point editorials from both the Washington Evening Star of July 28, 1966, and the Washington Post of July 23, 1966:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 28, 1966]

WRONG THINKING

The latest effort of the House Armed Services Committee to block an urgently needed District urban renewal project on a part of the old Bolling-Anacostia flying fields makes no more sense today than a similar effort made a year ago.

In defense of this ridiculous action, L. MENDEL RIVERS, the committee chairman, is sticking largely to the same phony argument as was used before: That the entire vast Bolling-Anacostia complex should be "preserved" for a future military use.

What future use? The Pentagon, which is in the best position to know, is unaware of one. The truth is that Washington federal and local planning agencies have been working hand-in-glove with the Defense Department in laying out the renewal area. The immediate and future military needs, including space for a "Little Pentagon" office building, have been fully agreed upon as a starting point. Accordingly, the land left for urban renewal has been trimmed to less than half the total of 940 acres. And military officials are fully in accord with the arrangements.

Perhaps recognizing the flimsiness of his position on this score, Mr. RIVERS has dreamed up another argument to bolster his committee's latest proposal for a five-year "freeze" on the area. Instead of being used for urban renewal, Mr. RIVERS now says, parts of the large tract might be converted to use as a "general airport" for private flying to relieve the load on National Airport. And what is surprising about the scheme is that it has drawn support from the Federal Aviation Agency.

The FAA switch is surprising first because it conflicts head-on with President Johnson's own clearly worded directive of only a year ago to the effect that work should proceed immediately on a Bolling-Anacostia urban renewal plan, to be completed no later than July 1, 1967. It is surprising, secondly, because the FAA, no less than a year ago, vehemently opposed any type of air operations at Bolling-Anacostia as a hazard to National's flight patterns.

To be sure, the influx of jets at National has modified that airport's flight patterns to some extent. And FAA officials claim they endorse the RIVERS scheme only as a "temporary measure," which is not intended to block the urban renewal program for all time.

As the FAA is well aware, however, the type of "temporary" program advanced by Mr. RIVERS, once begun, would surely not be cut off by the time the urban renewal program is slated to begin a year from now. The consternation and outrage expressed at the House committee action—and at the FAA position—by the Planning Commission, the United Planning Organization and the District Democratic Central Committee are wholly justified.

Two steps are in order. The White House should reiterate the fact that the mischievous "freeze" order, attached by the House committee to a military construction bill in the form of a rider, is directly contrary to administration policy regarding the urban renewal projects. And the House, when it has the opportunity, should strike the rider from the bill.

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1966]

THE RIVERS RIDER

The only justifiable use of the Anacostia-Bolling Field is to provide sites for the housing that this crowded city desperately needs. Congressman RIVERS of South Carolina, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has for years been determined to prevent this valuable piece of open land from being devoted to any useful social purpose. He has now attached a rider to the military construction bill to forbid any disposal of the land before 1972. The present embargo would expire next year. Mr. RIVERS insists on holding the land vacant for five more years, on the fiction that it may be needed for private aviation.

By seizing this straw, Mr. RIVERS is apparently conceding that, as the Pentagon has said for years, there is no further military need for the field. But it will not take the Federal Aviation Administration five years to tell Congress that Anacostia-Bolling is unsuitable for modern flying. The field was closed four years ago because the runways are inadequate for the new aircraft and, most important of all, its flight patterns dangerously overlap those of Washington National Airport across the river. Private aircraft include, after all, very fast jets.

Senator BREWSTER of Maryland is wholly right in pointing out the dangers in Mr. RIVERS' proposal. The Senator deserves the city's applause for his opposition to it. When the Rivers rider goes to conference, the city must hope that the Senators can delete it and rescue the field for the greatest public need. By any rational scale of priorities, that land ought now to be used for housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

I point out to the Members of the House that when the redevelopment of Washington was planned well over a decade ago, there was no Federal middle income housing program in existence. So the 650-acre southwest urban renewal area was planned for a small public housing program serving the low income community, and a major urban renewal complex serving the professional, business, and Government career groups. But there was no device by which the vast moderate income group could be served.

This lack of balance in the District's redevelopment program has caused, over the years, a great deal of resentment and disappointment in the Washington community. And now that we finally have a full tool kit of Federal housing programs which enable us to plan a community serving the entire spectrum of income groups, we run up against the frustrating reality that there is virtually no available land left in downtown Washington. The Anacostia-Bolling complex appears to be our last and only hope to achieve the promise of a new community in central Washington which serves all income groups.

In recent months we have seen tangible evidences of the tension and dissension caused by the lack of adequate recreational and cultural community facilities and services of all kinds in the downtown Washington area. On more than one occasion, the simple lack of wholesome places to go and things to do for the youth of our Nation's Capital has exploded into violence.

A creatively conceived and comprehensively planned new community in the Anacostia-Bolling area could provide a healthy and vital environment cutting across economic, cultural, and ethnic lines and serving the total Washington population. At the same time, it could provide the recreational, cultural, and community facilities and services of all kinds which are in desparate short supply for the downtown Washington population.

In short, this new community could be a model which would be admired across this country and around the world, and of which Congress, as a guiding participant, could be very proud.

I urge that, in future consideration of this measure, my colleagues in both Houses take advantage of this marvelous opportunity, not likely to come our way again, to free up this land for the development of an exciting new, model community. All departments of the executive branch of the Government which have been involved, directly and indirectly, in the long history of this controversial site are eager to grasp this great opportunity.

We in the Congress should not be frustrating them. We should be providing constructive and imaginative leadership.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, last year Congress authorized and funded $18,485,000 for military construction at Fort Gordon, Ga.

In December of 1965 the Secretary of Defense deferred construction on:

Signal school phase II	$7, 450, 000
Enlisted men's barracks and mess	8, 895, 000
Enlisted women's barracks and mess	604, 000
Enlisted service club	648, 000
Total	17, 597, 000

This year the Secretary of Defense has asked Congress for $12,630,000 to construct an enlisted men's barracks complex.

The funds requested this year are required to provide troop housing and supporting facilities for 3,586 enlisted men. Current buildings are substandard and living conditions are substandard. The need is now being met by using World War II mobilization-type barracks constructed in 1941. If this item is not approved and constructed, the result will be continued use of facilities that are rapidly deteriorating. The housing of troops in obsolete quarters affects health and morale. 163 buildings totaling 619,928 square feet will be torn down for site clearance and accommodations built for the following purposes: 11 enlisted men's barracks for 326 men, 4 enlisted men's messes, 4 battalion headquarters and classrooms, 4 administration and storage, expansion of present heating plant, 1 unit chapel, 1 group headquarters building, 1 group gym, 1 group dispensary, and 1 post exchange.

I urge that this appropriation be authorized and request that the Department of Defense not only use these funds but also restore the deferred construction.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of S. 3105 as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services. Under existing circumstances the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1967 is an austere bill. It is necessary. The national security requires its passage.

I am convinced of the wisdom of the committee in providing in section 611 for the authorization of a leasing arrangement between the Department of Defense and the Federal Aviation Agency for a period not to exceed 5 years under which the Federal Aviation Agency or its designee may operate the runways, hangers, and related facilities at the Bolling-Anacostia complex for general aviation. The leasing arrangement is in nature experimental. It will be subject to a 1-year revocation clause.

The rapidly increasing growth of air travel, both on scheduled airlines and by personal and corporate aircraft has been particularly noticeable at Washington's National Airport. Moreover such travel will continue to grow in the future. National Airport is very seriously overcrowded at present. The number of commercial flights in and out of the airport are subject to restriction. The number of general aviation flights—corporate and private aircraft which can arrive and depart at National Airport is very heavily restricted.

The Nation's Capital is urgently in need of an airfield specifically to handle general aviation operations.

The Bolling-Anacostia airfield facilities offer an airfield which can serve the Capital needs for private and corporate aircraft.

Moreover it will reduce congestion at and permit more commercial flights in and out of National Airport.

The tower at National Airport will control all arriving and departing flights both at National Airport and at the runway to be used across the river at Bolling-Anacostia airfield. Hence there will be no degradation of safety.

There is no other area in the District where an airfield can be provided for general aviation. If this opportunity is lost the National Capital will face the future with no adequate facility to handle the enormous flow of traffic by general aviation which the future will generate.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], a member of the committee.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to the question previously spoken to by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

The dispute over Bolling-Anacostia has had a very long and turbulent history. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have been particularly interested in this dispute.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, I should like to go over some of the history of the controversy.

The Executive Office of the President of the United States in 1959 showed an early interest in the Bolling-Anacostia complex. On May 12, 1959, the Office directed the Department of Defense to make a study of Bolling-Anacostia and to come in with a report as to how much of the land would be considered excess to the needs of the Defense Department. On October 15, 1959, the Department of Defense furnished its report, in which it retained about two-thirds of the land at Bolling-Anacostia.

Then the National Capital Planning Commission stepped into the act and persuaded or at least made a report to the President which caused a rejection of the report filed by the Department of Defense. Under such pressure the Department of Defense went back again and looked at the Anacostia-Bolling complex and came in with a new report. This time they only retained 468 acres and agreed to release 452 acres or almost half of the land at Anacostia-Bolling. Since that time everybody has gotten into the act. The Smithsonian Institution has tried to get the land; the GPO has tried to get the land; general aviation in certain cases has tried to get the land. All this time, back in the wings, drooling at the mouth, have been the real estate interests of the city of Washington circling over Anacostia-Bolling like a flock of buzzards waiting for their prey to die. I highly commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of my committee for this action—inserting section 611. This provision should be passed overwhelmingly by the Members of this House on humanitarian grounds, if for no other reason, because the military planners at Anacostia-Bolling have been pushed around, they have been shoved around, they have been harried and pressured to the point where they do not know which way to turn or which way to go. The gentleman from South Carolina by this provision has breathed life into the intended prey, and by his action the fellows doing the planning over at Anacostia-Bolling will be relieved of this unconscionable pressure until 1972 and left to plan for the use of the area as it should be planned.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, S. 3105, but some of us of the House Armed Services Committee feel it should have been larger. I would like to call to your attention some of the things that are not in the bill or are so small as to be negligible.

But before I do that I should make some general remarks to put the subject in proper perspective. This bill proposes $151.8 million worth of specific new authorization in contrast to the $299.5 million granted the Army last year in Public Law 89–188. Thus, you can see that this year's authorization program is only half as large as last year's. We were informed by the Department of Defense that the demands for resources associated with the support of activities in southeast Asia are such that construction authorization requested by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967 in support of normal objectives is substantially lower than prior years' submissions. The figures I have just quoted bear that out. I feel that in his zeal to limit expenditures the Secretary of Defense is losing sight of long-term objectives.

Several years ago a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee made an inspection of Fort Dix, N.J. What they found was representative of most Army installations; namely, that the Army was poorly housed, largely in World War II temporary buidings that had long since outlived their planned 5-year life and usefulness. With the enthusiastic support of our committee the Army undertook an aggressive program of replacement and modernization at its hard core installations inside the United States. For several years the Army made progress in replacing World War II troop housing with modern permanent barracks and supporting facilities. A comparable rate is needed for other construction categories to permit replacement and modernization of the physical plant by about 1978. Based upon requirements and permanent assets the cost of replacement and modernization is estimated to be $300 million per year. Last year's authorization bill provided $223 million for this purpose. This year the bill before you contains only $45 million for this purpose.

Now as to the specifics of what is not in the bill or of such insignificant size as to be negligible. This bill contains no medical facilities, no administrative headquarters, only a small amount of barracks replacement, no permanent bachelor officers quarters and negligible general support.

A large part of our Army medical facilities needs replacing, especially at Fort Polk, La. At least six of our hospitals, including the one at Fort Polk, should be replaced immediately and eight permanent hospitals need enlarging. Many smaller medical facilities—dispensaries and dental clinics—also need replacement. Medicine and surgery have made great strides in the past two decades; the

Army should have modern facilities in which to practice modern medicine.

Likewise the Army needs adequate permanent office building space at major installations in which to perform the vast amount of essential command, management, fiscal control, and related administrative functions of a multibillion-dollar business. The use of obsolete buildings and scattered miscellaneous temporary buildings degrades the management effort; this is especially true at Fort Polk, La.

This bill provides for the replacement of only 6,194 enlisted men's barracks spaces and supporting facilities at a cost of $22.8 million. There is still a deficit of 150,000 permanent enlisted men's spaces. If we do not push this replacement program actively the old temporary buildings are going to fall down before we can replace them. Morale of the troops is an additional consideration. Soldiers in bivouac expect to "rough it" but in garrison they are entitled to accommodations at least as good as those provided by our Government in institutions for the handicapped and the confined.

There are no permanent bachelor officer's quarters provided by this proposed authorization. There is still a deficit of approximately 13,000 permanent bachelor officer's quarters spaces. This is of special concern to me at this time. Many junior officers—ROTC graduates and other reservists—are on duty in our currently expanded Army. In order to meet the continuing officer corps requirement—in addition to West Point graduates—we must induce many of these young men to choose the Army as a career. Lack of decent bachelor housing is a major deterrent to the Army's officer procurement program.

Lastly, community support and roundout items to complete troop housing complexes are negligible in this bill. In order to achieve program balance each year's authorization bill should carry a reasonable number of these projects. Next to adequate housing they are an important morale factor to military personnel and their families.

Military construction is but a very small percentage of our military budget. The Army will be with us for a long time. I hope that short-term considerations and "brush fire" wars will not obscure our long-term military objectives. I sincerely hope that when the fiscal year 1968 program is submitted to the House Armed Services Committee it will reflect a reversal of the precipitous downward trend evident from what I have just described to you.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Committee on Armed Services.

Nearly every Member of this House has frequent occasion to use National Airport. It is an integral part of the working lives of many of us. We perhaps are the most airminded group of individuals in the Nation, dependent as we are on swift commuting service between our districts and Capitol Hill.

Each of us who uses National regularly is mindful of the congestion there, both in the air and on the ground, and extending even to the automobile parking facilities. We are constantly exposed to these conditions and we are reminded of them by our visiting constituents who frequently are inconvenienced by the crowded conditions at the terminal.

Congestion at National is an accepted fact and one which scarcely requires discussion, much less debate.

Aside from this matter of safety and convenience, there are other compelling reasons why we should support the committee. The United States is involved in a vast and unpredictable conflict in which we are expending billions and billions of dollars. It would be foolhardy to sign away defense property when there is no way of predicting whether or not it might some day be essential to our military effort. The Armed Services Committee feels, and I concur, that the idea of permanently abandoning Bolling-Anacostia Field to make way for a civilian housing project does not make sense. He suggests that it is well for Congress to start showing some concern for the housing needs of our enlisted men and junior officers, who are risking their lives in defense of this Nation, and again I concur.

I hope that this House will give an overwhelming endorsement to the position of the committee. By doing so the Bolling-Anacostia area can again be used as an airport—an airport for general aviation aircraft that are now using Washington National. It will relieve the congestion and accompanying safety hazards from National, it will provide a second convenient terminal for the area's multimillion air passengers, and it will preserve an important base for the Department of Defense if and when it ever becomes necesary to reestablish it for military purposes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to tell the Members of the Committee that I believe the House of Representatives would make a serious mistake if it does not go along with the position which has been taken by the Committee on Armed Services in preserving the property at the Anacostia-Bolling Air Force Base.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction under the chairmanship of my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and we have seen time and again when the Government comes in and is required to buy property at exorbitant prices. And, here, we find ourselves now with this property. And, Mr. Chairman, if the Department of Defense ever relinquishes it, or if the Congress ever goes along with the idea to relinquish it, it will be making a serious long-range mistake.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that as expansion is taking place in our Military Establishment, not only in Washington but all over the country and all over the world, if we leave this property go, we will sometime in the future be required to purchase property at exorbitant prices.

Mr. Chairman, this would in my opinion represent a very serious mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Department of Defense does have plans for the construction of facilities of what one might call a "little Pentagon" sometime in the future, and it is going to be needed.

Mr. Chairman, if we consolidate the resources of the Department of Defense that are scattered all around the District of Columbia at the present time this is certainly the case.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not make the serious mistake of relinquishing this property. Let us keep it under the control of the Department of Defense and prevent further expenditures of thousands of dollars per acre at a future time when we may have to purchase property for future construction needs on the part of the Department of Defense in the Washington area.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended at the outset to take this time, but in light of what has happened on the floor of the House this afternoon I feel I should probably offer these additional comments.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of air transportation into and out of Washington has occupied our attention for some time, but recent developments have brought this problem into sharp focus. The basic problem to which I speak is that of the inadequate planning for airport facilities to serve our Nation's Capital and the efforts of the Federal Aviation Agency to solve the congestion at Washington National Airport by placing restrictions on all air operations into and out of that airport. The strike of airline mechanics has somewhat clouded the basic issue, but it remains a serious problem—and one that must be solved by the Federal Government, which has the responsibility for airport facilities to serve the needs of Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital.

The problems of the scheduled airlines with respect to overcrowding and congestion of the passenger terminal facilities at Washington National Airport are being worked out by joint efforts of the airlines and the Federal Aviation Agency. Unfortunately, little attention has been paid to the drastic restrictions that are being placed on the private and business aircraft users of Washington National in an effort to solve the problem of the airlines.

The new FAA policy for use of the airport, announced by Administrator McKee on July 1, would reduce general aviation flights at the airport during the normal use hours of the day by something in the order of 50 percent or more according to the spokesmen for the private and business aircraft operators. These reductions would seriously affect the large number of general aviation flights that heretofore have brought business and political leaders to this city for consultation and business with the Congress, and with the various Government agencies, including the Department of Defense.

The extent of this kind of air transportation into Washington was explored thoroughly in a hearing in the spring of 1965 before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics under the chairmanship of our colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

The matter under consideration by the subcommittee at that time was a proposal set forth in H.R. 699, H.R. 2249, and H.R. 4530, sponsored by Congressmen WILLIAMS, UDALL, and myself, for the use of a small part of the Bolling Field landing facility for general aviation aircraft. The objective was to relieve part of the load on Washington National Airport and still provide close-in airport facilities for our Nation's businessmen and citizens who come to us in general aviation aircraft. The testimony presented at that time is still valid, and has, in fact, gained force with the passage of time. Washington National remains the only close-in terminal at Washington with adequate facilities and services needed for this very important traffic. Currently, general aviation represents some 27 percent of the total runway use of Washington National, but that use is concentrated during about 12 hours of the day, making the use rate more in the order of 50 percent during that period.

While general aviation does not use the passenger terminal facilities at Washington National and is not directly involved in the current problem of passenger terminal area congestion, or lack of airline ramp and gate space, private and business airplanes do become involved in the air traffic landing and taking off at the airport and it is obvious that a separate runway, across the Potomac River in this case, would expedite the movement of all traffic.

Washington National does not have sufficient land area to accommodate the construction of parallel runways, which is the device used by most large airports to expedite traffic. However, we do have available a complete set of airport facilities across the river, with adequate separation between the main runway at National and the principal runway at Bolling-Anacostia. This is as good as, if not better than, the separation between parallel runways on many of our other major airports.

I have reviewed the testimony given before our subcommittee in 1965 and reconfirmed its validity to the effect that simultaneous operations can be accommodated at Washington National and on one runway of either Bolling or Anacostia, using nonconflicting traffic patterns, and under control of the able traffic controllers of the FAA to insure complete safety from collision. We have a readymade solution to relieve some of the air traffic pressure on the runways at Washington National, and we have it in the form of complete airport facilities that are now in possession of the Federal Government. All we need to do is to provide the direction and guidance to the FAA and the Department of Defense to bring this solution into play. I understand that the Air Force is in the early stages of construction of buildings on the main runway at Bolling Field, but the facilities of the Anacostia Naval Air Station still remain intact and usable as an air facility. Are we going to stand by and let these valuable landing facilities go by default while we decry the congestion at Washington National and belabor the FAA for not taking action? Or, are we going to provide some direction and guidance to the Government agencies involved to help solve this problem in a constructive manner?

I believe the Armed Services Committee by their action and recommendation today have taken a major step to find a solution. I commend them for their action.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point the testimony to which I referred:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Victor J. Kayne. I am Director of the Office of Policy Coordination of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA). A résumé of the nature of AOPA is presented for your information in Annex A to printed copies of our statement.

We greatly appreciate the interest shown by members of the Congress with regard to providing adequate facilities for general aviation, as evidenced by these hearings on Bills H.R. 699, 2249 and 4530 for the use of Bolling Field as a general aviation airport for the Washington metropolitan area. We are grateful too for this opportunity to present the views of our Association, representing over 110,000 members who make extensive use of aircraft for personal and business purposes.

My personal qualifications to speak on this subject are detailed in Annex B to the printed copies of this statement. To briefly summarize them, I was Chief of the old Washington Airport control tower and later Chief of the Washington National control tower. I spent some twelve years in the CAA, forerunner to the FAA, and was Assistant Chief of the U.S. air traffic control system at the time of leaving Government service for private employment in 1954. My active participation and association with control of air traffic in the airspace encompassing Bolling Field, Washington National Airport and its predecessor airport extends back to 1935. I have flown airplanes from both Bolling Field and Washington National Airport.

THE PROBLEM

Washington, as the Nation's capital, attracts a large number of industry and political leaders, who come to Washington to do business with the Congress and with the various Government agencies, including those in the military establishment. Much of this travel to Washington is done in general aviation aircraft. As an example, a White House conference with top level business leaders from across the nation will invariably result in massive congestion of the general aviation parking ramps at Washington National Airport. Washington has a number of small general aviation airports around its periphery, but these are located some distance from the heart of the city and they do not offer adequate services for the type of traffic in question. Only Washington National is located sufficiently close to the Capitol and other Government offices and has the services and facilities needed to adequately care for the quality and type of general aviation aircraft that are used by our nation's business leaders.

The volume of general aviation traffic at Washington National increased from 23,890 operations in 1953 to 75,126 in 1963. Air carrier operations during the same period went from 164,121 to 210,714, representing an increase of 28 percent as compared to a 214 percent increase for general aviation.

This tremendous increase in general aviation traffic has resulted in congestion of the very limited ramps and aircraft parking facilities allotted to non-airline traffic. During periods such as the Presidential Inaugural, general aviation aircraft bringing important participants to Washington were permitted to unload and then were shunted to Baltimore or Dulles for parking and servicing because there simply was no place to park them on Washington National. While the lack of facilities is an inconvenience to the operators of these aircraft, the growing amount of general aviation traffic also has its impact on the scheduled airline service into and out of this airport. It is not unusual to see a dozen or more airline and general aviation aircraft intermingled and waiting patiently for their turn to takeoff. The same is true in the air where a corporation Convair is accorded the same "first-come first-served" treatment as an airline Convair. All must use the same set of runways and taxiways simply because there is no other adequate facility for those who might be able to land elsewhere. The net result is delay to many flights, including those of the scheduled airlines.

There has been some talk of a tentative plan within the FAA to expand Washington National by the addition of a dual runway so as to alleviate these delays.

In his testimony on April 27, Mr. Thomas of the FAA indicated that the tentative plan to expand the existing Washington National Airport contemplates addition of a parallel runway to the east or outboard of Runway 18–36. This would require additional fill in the Potomac River and would place traffic using the new runway closer to any construction or other activity on the Bolling-Anacostia site. It also would cause a greater conflict with the prohibited area, requiring much tighter turns for aircraft using this runway. We understand that this plan calls for demolishing the present terminal building and the construction of a new terminal on the hill west of the present terminal. This necessarily would be a long range plan that would entail tremendous cost and untold disruption of normal operations, which ill can be afforded. Meanwhile, the airport will continue to become more congested with general aviation traffic with every passing month.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided the Clerk of the Committee with copies of the November 1964 issue of the Pilot mazagine, which contains an informative article on Bolling Field. This material has been provided for the information of your Committee, but is not included as a part of our testimony.

THE PROPOSAL

The Bills introduced by Representatives WILLIAMS, UDALL and CLAUSEN, and now under consideration by this Committee make a proposal that would provide almost immediate relief for the overtaxed and inadequate general aviation facilities at Washington National. Further, a continued healthy and safe growth of both general aviation and airline traffic into the metropolitan area would be assured for some years to come. The costs and other penalties of trying to expand the existing Washington National Airport through demolishing the terminal building to make room for another runway must be weighed against the use of a runway and other facilities that currently are laying dormant at Bolling Field.

We noted with interest a statement by Mr. Halaby last September that some 30,000 people might be housed on the Bolling/Anacostia complex if the land was used for housing purposes. We all know of the noise problems of communities adjacent to airports and we should have long ago learned our lesson that we simply do not plan residential housing as close to an airport as this land is to the traffic patterns for Washington

National. Moreover, residential use would be counter to the long-standing FAA policy most recently restated in "Policy Statement of the Federal Aviation Agency, April 1965", that the use of land adjacent to airports should be compatible with airport use. Keeping people away from noise—and hence airports—is one of the FAA's approved methods. Further, apartment houses or other relatively high rise buildings would offer an increased degree of fixed and uncontrollable hazard for those aircraft using Washington National. On the other hand, air traffic using the Bolling site would be controllable and the hazard of collision with tall buildings would not be present.

The residential areas currently adjacent to the Bolling site were subjected to the noise of military operations for many years and are somewhat conditioned to the flight of aircraft nearby. Of course, the average general aviation aircraft would not produce anywhere near the amount of noise that its military predecessor did when Bolling and Anacostia were active military bases.

Before we leave this point, we may wish to consider that retention of Bolling as a general aviation airport also would retain it for possible future military use in event of a national emergency or other situation calling for a landing facility in close proximity to our seat of Government.

The use of Bolling Field for general aviation traffic would drain off a significant number of the operations now conducted at Washington National. Not all would leave, since those with connecting airline passengers still would have to use it, as would those whose business was closer to National than to Bolling.

We visualize the use of Bolling as essentially a VFR airport, with most traffic arriving and departing under relatively good weather conditions. Only six percent of the arriving general aviation traffic currently using Washington National make instrument approaches. These could continue to be accommodated at Washington National during instrument weather conditions, although even some of this traffic could land at Bolling during times when the weather was borderline. The Air Force weather minimums for Bolling prior to its closing were a ceiling of 600 feet and one mile visibility for a straight-in landing to runway 2 (from the south), and 800 feet and one mile for a circling approach. Essentially the same minimums would work nicely for general aviation traffic, especially since these aircraft are generally more maneuverable and have greater flexibility of control at approach speeds.

Some concern has been expressed regarding the traffic patterns and control of air traffic using Washington National and Bolling Field under this proposal. There is attached as Annex C to the printed copies of this statement a reprint of the Rules of the (FAA) Administrator, Part 619.1, "Washington National Airport Special Traffic Rules". This reprint, courtesy of the Jeppesen Co., also shows the traffic patterns in use in the area of Washington National, Anacostia Naval Air Station and Bolling Field at the time that all three were operating. The separation of traffic between Bolling and Washington National revolves around a quite simple division of the airspace, namely that of Bolling traffic staying on the east side of the Potomac River and Washington National traffic using the west side of the river.

Previous testimony has indicated that general aviation traffic using Bolling Field would conflict with military traffic at Andrews Field. It should be noted that the traffic patterns previously used when Bolling Field was in operation extended approximately 2½ miles to the east of Washington National Airport and remained 2½ miles within the 5-mile radius traffic area surrounding Washington National. The Bolling pattern thus was approximately 7½ miles from Andrews Field and 2½ miles outside of the 5-mile radius traffic area of Andrews. This is adequate separation.

It is significant to note that the FAA traffic statistics for Washington National show that it reached its peak year in 1960 with a total of 316,597 operations. It declined to 288,289 in 1962, the year that Bolling was closed, went up slightly to 294,181 in 1963 and declined again in 1964 to 290,640. This is some 26,000 operations below the 1960 peak. If Bolling and Anacostia could be operated along with Washington National under the peak conditions of 1960, then a single runway facility at the Bolling site serving the more flexible general aviation aircraft certainly should pose no great air traffic control problem.

The Air Force provided a control tower at Bolling Field during its operation. This tower was under the "master" control of Washington National and normally provided for the control of visual flight rules traffic. The control tower at Washington National provided radar service and control of instrument operations. Because of the distance from the Washington tower cab to the far reaches of the Bolling traffic pattern, we believe that a simple satellite control tower at Bolling would be required for the proposed general aviation operation. This facility also would provide control of aircraft on the ground at Bolling, but would be under under the general supervision of the Washington National tower with regard to coordination of traffic in the area surrounding the two airports. A control tower structure currently exists at Bolling, thus reducing the requirement to a minimum staffing of personnel and the rather simple radio equipment needed for this type of control tower. A direct interphone line between the two towers formerly was used for fast coordination of traffic, and this line would merely need to be reestablished to serve the new facility.

The Federal Aviation Regulations require radio control of all traffic operating into and out of an airport with a Federal control tower. Thus, there would be no uncontrolled operations at the general aviation airport. All traffic would be under control and would be required to adhere to traffic patterns similar to those shown in Annex C hereto.

RECOMMENDATION

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association recommends favorable consideration of the proposal for the establishment of a general aviation facility at the Bolling Field site as set forth in the Bills before this Committee hearing. We believe that the reactivation of Bolling Field for general aviation purposes is in the national interest in that it will reduce delays to all civil air traffic destined for the close-in metropolitan area (including the scheduled carriers); it will enhance safety through the elimination of the now required split-second timing between arrivals and departures at Washington National; it will provide for a greater flow of air traffic and passengers into the area with improved convenience; it will extend the useful life of the present Washington National Airport without costly modifications; and it will preserve the Bolling Field site as an airport available for immediate use to serve downtown Washington and the various Government offices in time of disaster or national emergency.

In connection with this latter point, we see no reason why non-tactical military aircraft types that are similar to general aviation aircraft should not also use the revitalized Bolling Field to speed the transportation of key military personnel to Capitol Hill and the surrounding area. The present military helicopter operation at Anacostia Naval Air Station also could be transferred to Bolling, thus releasing that area for other uses.

It is believed that the general aviation facility would require only that land and the facilities west of the present hangar and operations line at Bolling. The land, buildings and facilities to the east of the hangar line, including the Officer Club, could be retained for military or other appropriate use.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes our prepared statement. We wish to express our appreciation to you and to the other members of the Committee for your courtesy in hearing our views on this subject.

ANNEX A

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association is an organization which provides services to more than 110,000 members located in every state in the Union. It is a non-profit association incorporated under the laws of New Jersey.

Purpose: It was formed 26 years ago to promote, protect and represent the interest of its members in aeronautics and the pursuit of flying; to promote economy, safety, popularity and use of aircraft by members. To accomplish these purposes, we seek several specific objectives: maximum freedom of the airspace for all users consistent with safety, improved aviation safety, an adequate airport system, an adequate system of air navigation aids, production of improved aircraft, reduction of frustrations in aircraft ownership and use, facilitation of international travel by private aircraft and wider public support of general aviation requirements.

Membership: Half of the active general aviation aircraft in the United States are owned and operated by our members. Our 110,000 members comprise about 30% of all the active civil pilots in the entire country. 63% of our members hold private certificates, 24% hold commercial certificates, 2% hold airline transport ratings, 8% hold student certificates and the balance are pilots in military service. AOPA is not a profession or trade association in the commonly accepted sense of those terms. The majority of our members are non-professional pilots and therefore do not join for the usual professional or commercial reasons characteristic of unions or business trade associations. AOPA is a service organization more analogous to the American Automobile Association or the National Rifle Association.

AOPA staff: To serve our members, who fly for business, personal and recreational purposes, we have assembled a full-time staff of 100 people. Our professional staff is composed of specialists who are acknowledged experts in their respective fields. We cover virtually every field of significant interest to the owner or pilot of a non-commercial aircraft. Many of these fields are also of interest to commercial operators. Our headquarters is located in Bethesda, Maryland.

Method of policy formulation: You will recognize the inherent problem in policy formulation in an organization with so large a membership. It is not unlike your own problems in representing your constituents on specific issues. Like you, we pay very close attention to the substance and volume of mail from our members, as well as our personal contacts with members throughout the country. AOPA policy is formulated, in the light of extensive member comment, by the professional staff members, who combine their knowledge, background and understanding of aviation problems. Our rapid growth in 26 years from zero to 110,000 members, is practical testimony to the success of this method and the accuracy with which our staff reflects member desires—for our support depends upon voluntary membership.

ANNEX B

QUALIFICATIONS OF VICTOR J. KAYNE

Control Tower Operator, Washington Airport, 1935.

Chief Control Tower Operator, Washington Airport, 1937.

Chief Control Tower Operator, CAA Washington National Airport, 1941.

Air Traffic Control, Inspector-at-Large, 1942.

CAA Headquarters Office: Duties included inspection of air traffic control centers and towers in the U.S., its territories and possessions. During this period, headed a mission to Brazil in 1944 to lay the groundwork for the establishment of air traffic control and air navigation facilities which were the foundation for the present Brazilian airways system.

Chief, Operations Inspection Staff, CAA Headquarters Office, 1946. In charge of inspection of all air traffic control and communication facilities operated by the CAA.

ICAO Regional ATC representative, CAA Headquarters, 1948. Spokesman for the U.S. on air traffic control matters at ICAO Regional Air Navigation meetings.

Assistant Chief, Air Traffic Control Division, CAA Headquarters, 1949. Duties included directing the day-to-day operations of the U.S. air traffic control system.

Assistant Chief, Airways Operations Division, CAA Headquarters, 1950. Previous duties enlarged by addition of CAA communication facilities.

Aeronautical Consultant engaged in private business, 1954.

Staff Consultant on air traffic control, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, National Headquarters, 1956.

Director Policy Coordination, AOPA National Headquarters, 1959. Responsible for coordination of AOPA policy in the general field of flying operations and specifically in air traffic control, communications, airspace, airports and international matters.

Currently holds private pilot certificate with approximately 750 hours. Co-owner of Cessna 182 aircraft.

Author of some 25 published articles on air traffic control. Has represented the United States on approximately 20 international meetings on air traffic control.

ANNEX C

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT TRAFFIC AREA

SUBPART A—INTRODUCTION

619.1 Purpose. This Part contains special air traffic rules, in addition to those air traffic rules contained in Part 60 of this title (14 CFR Part 60), which apply to airport traffic areas as designated in this part.

SUBPART B—OPERATING RULES

619.10 Washington National Airport Traffic Area. The Washington National Airport Traffic Area shall consist of the airspace prescribed by a 5 statute mile horizontal radius from the geographical center of that airport and extending upwards from the surface to, but not including, 2,000 feet mean sea level (m.s.l.). All aircraft shall be operated within the Washington National Airport Traffic Area in accordance with the following rules unless otherwise authorized by air traffic control and, in addition, shall be operated in accordance with such other provisions of the Civil Air Regulations as may be applicable.

(a) General Rules:

(1) Avoidance of Airport Traffic Area. Enroute aircraft shall be flown so as to avoid the Washington National Airport Traffic Area.

(2) Communications: Two-way radio communication shall be established with the Washington National Airport Traffic Control Tower prior to entering the Washington National Airport Traffic Area for a landing at that airport and prior to take-off from that airport: Provided, That pilots may take off or land aircraft not equipped with functioning two-way radio if prior authorization from the airport traffic control tower has been obtained.

(3) Traffic Flow. All aircraft, except helicopters, taking off from or landing at the Washington National Airport, Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station and any other airports within the airspace of the Washington National Airport Traffic Area, shall be operated so as to conform to the flow of traffic as depicted on the diagrams included herein. Helicopters shall be operated in accordance with the helicopter rules stated herein.

(b) Airport Traffic Area Entry:

(1) Bolling Air Force Base-Anacostia Naval Air Station. Fixed-wing aircraft landing at Bolling Air Force Base or Anacostia Naval Air Station shall be flown so as to enter the airspace of the Washington National Airport Traffic Area east of the east banks of the Potomac and the Anacostia Rivers.

(2) Washington National Airport. Fixed-wing aircraft landing at Washington National Airport shall be flown so as to enter the airspace of the Washington National Airport Traffic Area west of the east bank of the Potomac River and unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, at an altitude of at least 1,500 feet m.s.l.

(3) Washington-Virginia Airport. All aircraft landing at Washington-Virginia Airport shall be flown so as to enter the airspace of the Washington National Airport Traffic Area at an altitude not above 1,200 feet m.s.l. and west of an imaginary line extending north and south through the center of the Washington-Virginia Airport. After entry into the Washington National Airport Traffic Area, such aircraft shall not be flown above an altitude of 1,200 feet m.s.l. and beyond one-mile from the boundary of the Washington-Virginia Airport, when operating east of the imaginary north-south line.

(c) Traffic Pattern Altitudes. Unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, fixed-wing aircraft shall be operated within the traffic patterns of Washington National Airport, Bolling Air Force Base and Anacostia Naval Air Station at an altitude of at least 1,500 feet m.s.l. and such altitude maintained until maneuvering for landing requires descent.

(d) Departing Aircraft. Fixed-wing aircraft taking off from Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station, Washington National Airport, and Washington-Virginia Airport shall be operated so as to conform to the following altitudes and flight paths while operating within the Washington National Airport Traffic Area:

(1) Bolling Air Force Base-Anacostia Naval Air Station.

(i) Climb shall be made to at least 1,500 feet m.s.l. as rapidly as practicable, unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, and

(ii) Aircraft shall be flown so as to remain east of the east banks of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers.

(2) Washington National Airport Departing Aircraft Using Runways 3, 33, and 36.

(i) Climb shall be made to at least 1,500 feet m.s.l. for twin-engine aircraft, 2,000 feet m.s.l. for four-engine aircraft as rapidly as practicable, unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, and,

(ii) Climb to 1,500 feet m.s.l. for twin-engine aircraft, 2,000 feet m.s.l. for four-engine aircraft shall be made north over the Potomac River before proceeding on course, remaining West of the east bank of the Potomac River, except that, those departures proceeding via Riverdale Departure Corridor shall be flown so as to remain west of the Anacostia River, and,

(iii) Aircraft taking off on runway 33 shall be flown so as to avoid flight over the Pentagon when practicable.

(3) Washington National Airport Departing Aircraft Using Runways 15, 18, and 21:

(i) Climb shall be made to at least 1,500 feet m.s.l. for twin-engine aircraft, 2,000 feet m.s.l. for four-engine aircraft as rapidly as practicable, unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, and,

(ii) Climb to 1,500 feet m.s.l. for twin-engine aircraft, 2,000 feet m.s.l. for four-engine aircraft shall be made south over the Potomac River, before proceeding on course, remaining West of the East bank of the Potomac River.

Note: Northeastbound traffic taking off in a southerly direction may pass over the Washington National Airport, with approval of the Washington National Airport Traffic Control Tower. Such a procedure is encouraged in order to avoid the military traffic which may be operating to the east of the Potomac River.

(4) Washington-Virginia Airport. Aircraft taking off from Washington-Virginia Airport:

(i) shall be flown so as to remain within a one-mile lateral distance of the airport boundary of the Washington-Virginia Airport until west of an imaginary north-south line extending through the center of that airport, and,

(ii) shall be flown at an altitude not above 1,200 feet m.s.l. until clear of the Washington National Airport Traffic Area.

(e) Helicopters. Helicopters taking off from or landing at Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station, Washington National Airport or any airports located within the Washington National Airport Traffic Area shall be operated so as to conform to the following rules while operating within such airport traffic area, except that helicopters taking off from or landing at Washington-Virginia Airport shall be operated so as to conform to the rules contained in paragraphs (b)(3) and (d)(4) of this section:

(1) Landing Helicopters: Unless the VFR distance-from-cloud criteria require otherwise, landing helicopters shall be flown so as to enter the Washington National Airport Traffic Area at or below 1,000 feet m.s.l. but not less than 800 feet m.s.l. After entry, such altitude shall be maintained as long as practicable and the approach to land shall be made in a manner which avoids the flow of fixed-wing aircraft, and,

(2) Departing Helicopters: Helicopters taking off shall be flown in a manner which avoids the flow of fixed-wing aircraft. Climb to an altitude between 800 and 1,000 feet m.s.l. shall be made as rapidly as practicable, unless the VFR distance-from-cloud-criteria require otherwise.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], a member of the committee, 2 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I fully support the position of the committee with respect to the Bolling-Anacostia property reservation. Certainly I will support on the floor of the House or in committee any program to enhance the right of the people of Washington to secure better housing accommodations for themselves. However, to go out and to set your sights on the best industrial, the best green belt, the best park, the best general services property adjacent to a watercourse, and say, "This I want for single-family or multiple-development residential property," I think is very, very poor planning.

I think we would not approve of this in our own hometowns. I do not think it makes for good planning here in Washington. I do not think we should take the heat off the demand of the residents and citizens of Washington for high-grade housing at reasonable rentals in downtown Washington.

Eighty percent, as I view the property occupied in downtown Washington for housing, is what I consider sub-substandard. It is substandard by western standards. I think it is substandard by the standards of occupancy of the people in Washington.

We should expand now some of our redevelopment programs. If we have made mistakes with respect to the development of the southwest area—if we have allowed this to get out of hand and get into the hands of the rich property developers, we should take guidance from this and take every opportunity to see that substantial property is placed on the market, and is available for reasonable rental housing in downtown Washington. I think we should do that. We have a big job to do, and I think we can do that without eroding some of our green belt areas in the southern part of the Washington area.

Mr. Chairman, alining myself with the chairman of our Armed Services Committee, I concur in his remarks on the Department of Defense military construction program for fiscal year 1967. I fully support his proposal that the authorization bill be enacted without change.

The committee has spent considerable time and effort in delving into the very marrow of this bill. Last December the Secretary of Defense deferred the construction of a major portion of the projects that had, only a short time previously, been authorized and funded in the fiscal year 1966 program. I am not alone in the belief that this action resulted in certain hardships within the services. This and other pertinent factors were weighed in the decisionmaking process of the committee. It was unanimously agreed that this is a tight, minimal program; and that each individual segment is urgently needed. If the committee were to recommend disapproval of any sizable portion, it would merely compound the existing difficulties of the military departments in meeting their requirements. In this regard I want to point out that the abatement of $625 million of the 1965 construction program on the basis of inflation in the construction industry is highly inconsistent with the $2 billion demonstration cities program now passed out of Senate committee.

Historically the Navy program, title II of the bill, has been the smallest of those for the three military departments. It supports the fleet and the Marine Corps, including the air arms of both of these services, in carrying out their worldwide commitments.

The program initially submitted by the Navy totaled only $126,835,000. This amount was reduced by $271,000 during the hearings when the Navy withdrew three line items it no longer required. This program consists of 173 line items at 97 installations inside and outside the United States. It is worth noting that only 12 percent of the total amount, or $15.3 million, is for overseas projects and less than $8 million is in gold flow problem areas.

Basically, the bulk of the program consists of facilities to improve the capabilities of the Navy and Marine Corps in the fields of fleet operations, training, and troop housing. A reasonably proportionate amount, $20.7 million, is for facilities to promote research and development at shore installations. The new facilities will further the modernization of the naval shipyards, including $2.7 million for drydocks at the Mare Island unit of the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard, naval stations and air stations; and will reduce deficiencies at many of the naval and Marine Corps activities included in this program.

Last year the Navy emphasized the importance of providing adequate personnel facilities when it assigned approximately one-quarter of its program to this commendable purpose. This year 30 percent, or $37.3 million, has been allocated by the Navy for troop housing projects. These projects are required to satisfy numerical deficiencies and to meet new requirements for living space for our Navy and Marine Corps personnel. In summary, they will provide suitable space for 10,556 enlisted men and 898 officers. By approving these facilities projects the Congress will present concrete evidence that it is concerned about the health and welfare of our uniformed citizens. A beneficial byproduct will be improved morale and promotion of the services as a desirable career. We could do so much more by proceeding with the 1965–66 family housing program.

The Armed Services Committee has approved each line item proposed in the Navy's fiscal year 1967 program. You are all well aware that this was no rubber-stamp action. Each item was studied carefully as to scope, price, and need. Each one was thoroughly justified. Last fall the Military Construction and Housing Subcommittee—of which I was a member—of the Armed Services Committee inspected representative military installations throughout the country. Our observations confirmed the requirements for many of the projects in this bill.

Since the Navy program is so small in scope it necessarily excludes many of their urgent requirements. Our committee knows this. Consequently, in its wisdom, the committee added four projects which should be deferred no longer. Two of these will be at naval shipyards. The first is at the South Annex of the Boston Naval Shipyard. It will provide for replacement of four narrow, World War II timber piers that are deteriorated to the point of unusability, by three permanent piers to support modern ships. The second project will be at the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H. It will be for installation of steam lines needed now and for the duration of the active status of this yard, which we all hope will be a considerable period.

The other two added projects are similar. They are for construction of new hospital facilities to replace existing old structures. One project will provide 230 beds for the naval hospital, Memphis, Tenn., to take the place of the present temporary World War II medical facility. The remaining project will be at the naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass. It will provide 364 beds to replace wornout structures. Some of the Chelsea structures, incidentally, were built in the 19th century. The Navy plans include both of these replacement hospital projects. As a result of the sensible changes the committee has made to title II of the bill, the new total for the Navy program is $164,104,000.

In conclusion, I wish to reassert my strong backing of the Navy program and of the entire bill. I urge every Member of this body to support the action of the committee by the prompt enactment of this 1967 military construction authorization bill.

I would hope that the 1968 construction program would include the first increment of a crash shipyard modernization program pursuant to the promise of the Secretary of Defense of a $500 million to $1 billion magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, which would authorize military construction urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time. The bill provides construction and other related authority for the military departments and defense agencies within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components.

This legislation is necessary for the maintenance of our military efficiency, and we have screened it very carefully in an effort to hold down the cost of construction.

As approved by the committee, the bill totals $1,065,973,000. Part of this money will be used to meet new and expanded missions of our Armed Forces throughout the world, as well as to undertake the most urgent of our continuing requirements for replacing and modernizing old and obsolete facilities. The balance will be used to provide for continuing requirements to support existing and previously authorized family housing, including such items as operation, maintenance, leasing, and mortgage payments.

Construction has been authorized for only those projects which we were convinced had to be initiated in fiscal year 1967 for compelling reasons. The Department of Defense request was lower than prior year requests for construction in support of our regular establishment in recognition of growing defense commitments in southeast Asia.

We are hoping that the construction authorized in this bill will substantially improve the military housing situation. We feel it is important to provide our servicemen with satisfactory living conditions since this contributes to morale and should make it easier to retain skilled military personnel. We will expect continued emphasis in this area by the Defense Department until a better standard of barracks, bachelor officers quarters, and family housing is achieved.

Our committee was faced this year with the Defense Secretary's deferral of more than $600 million worth of projects from last year's authorization. The committee, therefore, has included in this year's bill a provision designed to encourage the Defense Secretary to proceed at the earliest opportunity with those priority projects he deferred last year.

We now have a bill that will maintain our military forces and our military posture as they should be if the funds are spent as we have authorized them. I believe this is a good bill and urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Construction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I endorse and support the position of the committee on the Bolling-Anacostia matter.

There are always those who want to move in and take over when a piece of Government property is vacated. When that Government property is near a thriving metropolis like Washington, the competition is doubly keen. And you can be sure that all of those who want a piece of the available land have an ax to grind. The situation at Bolling-Anacostia is no different from many others that we have known. I commend the Committee on Armed Services for holding this complex in status quo until future needs can more definitely be determined.

It just happens that I have been through this picture many times at many locations. I can relate to you instance after instance where Government land was declared surplus and sold, and a need developed later for the property. Very frequently it had to be reacquired or other land purchased at a greatly enhanced cost. It was dear old Uncle Sam who was left holding the bag because someone got in too big a hurry to dispose of Government property. I have seen other instances where Congress refused to go along with proposals to dispose of Government property and where within a short time the wisdom of Congress was substantiated when the Government agency involved found that it had a requirement for the property after all.

Modern defenses require involved and elaborate training installations. Modern forces require huge training complexes. Never does a year pass but that we must buy additional land or easements for defense needs. Why dispose of property that the Defense Establishment may need next year or the year after? The Government is losing nothing in the meantime. The property will be there. Another year or two will give us a clearer picture of the best purposes for which it can be used.

There is the possibility that the area can be used to relieve some of the congestion in Washington National Airport. This would be welcome indeed. Whatever the final disposition of the property, we will lose nothing by accepting the recommendations of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

There has been severe criticism by some of the Washington experts who have their own plans for the utilization of the property. Most of them are not cognizant of possible military requirements in the area. Their plans for the property may be spoiled and that disturbs them. But this is not a reason to abandon the logic assembled by the House committee in developing its recommendation.

As a matter of fact, it will do no harm if the expansion of Government itself is slowed a little. Not many people here seem even remotely concerned now about the fact that Government agencies are growing all out of proportion. I think the taxpayers would welcome a slowdown.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to say a few words about the Bolling-Anacostia complex, because a year or so ago I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee to look into this matter.

There are some 70 to 80—perhaps more—pieces of real estate in the District of Columbia which are now rented by the Federal Government for defense purposes. This piece of property at Bolling-Anacostia has aspects to it which have already been described in some detail. There are a few others I would like to mention.

One is the fact that some of the buildings at Bolling-Anacostia complex are extremely expensive buildings and buildings which really cannot be fully utilized for their intended purposes unless this complex does remain a military complex.

Most of us have visited some of those facilities and know of the expensive housing that is there, the officers' clubs, and facilities of that type. If this facility is to be changed in nature to something else having nothing to do with the military, many of the values of this property in which many Federal dollars have been invested would actually be thrown away.

There is a housing problem in the District of Columbia. Senator Tydings has introduced a very fine bill on the subject, and I have cojoined with him on the House side. I think Congressman Widnall has as well.

The real problem in relation to District of Columbia housing is primarily that we do not tear down the slums or require them to come up to adequate standards. The greatest blessing that could happen in the District of Columbia would be the passage of a strong law that would say that the slums, which are the sources of the applications for low-rent housing, shall either be destroyed or brought up to proper standards. We should stop the process of justifying new low-rent housing at Federal Government expenditure on the basis of the slums which exist, and then letting those slums continue to exist, as we are doing today, filling up again, and again being the source of new requests for new low-rent housing. We are enticing people into the District of Columbia to occupy slums at the present time.

This situation must be brought to a halt, and the only way to bring it to a halt is to enact a strong law which would require slum areas to be brought up to proper standards or be destroyed. Many buildings in the District of Columbia can be brought up to proper standards economically. So much for that.

I want to refer to the Bolling-Anacostia question, in what I would call its military aspects. There are many needs of the military which are now unmet in this area, in addition to the ones I have mentioned with regard to renting facilities at the present time. There are military needs which we know of right around the corner which should be met and must be met if we are going to do our proper duty to the people of our country.

The land involved is expensive and is needed in the future by the Department of Defense. I heartily sustain this portion of the bill as well as its other provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically support the committee's position on another subject, that is allowing the Navy Department to choose the location for its third recruit training camp. I would like to make a few remarks on that before I take my seat.

The Navy plans to establish a third male recruit training center on the east coast in order to relieve the overcrowding at the existing centers at Great Lakes and San Diego, thereby at the same time improving health conditions and training efficiency. This third base is vitally needed to meet the training needs of the Navy, which requires the capability to train 26,000 recruits simultaneously.

The Navy proposes to establish this training center at the existing Orlando Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla., which is phasing out. Seven line items for $14,900,000 are included in this bill as the first increment for two 4,000-man recruit camps, both to be at one base.

Orlando has been chosen by the Navy as the superior base for the new facility. It is superior, according to the Navy, from cost to health conditions, training efficiency, community support and good morale environment.

In November 1965, the Deputy Secretary of Defense approved a Navy training center at Orlando, based on the superior location and the immediate advantages in military construction.

The dollar savings alone make the Navy's decision the correct and right one for its new training base.

The total estimated cost for the facility in Orlando is $81.7 million, of which $14.9 million is included in this bill. The total estimated cost for the same facility if constructed at Bainbridge, Md.—the next best alternate site considered—would be $99.4 million, which is $17.8 million more than at Orlando.

Included in the total of $99.4 million for Bainbridge is $13.1 million, for family housing, which would be required there.

While the costs mentioned are the current Navy estimates, it should also be pointed out that the cost estimates to construct this facility at Orlando have always been lower than those to build at Bainbridge. Original Navy preliminary estimates were $82 million for Bainbridge and $77.6 million for Orlando.

There are other factors in the Navy's positive approval for the base at Orlando:

First. There is an existing hospital at Orlando which is adequate to meet the needs of the center until a replacement can be built, while at Bainbridge immediate construction of a hospital would be necessary.

Second. The condition of the subsistence buildings at Bainbridge, World War II substandard facilities, are marginal for rehabilitation, and consistent with good engineering practice, replacement with new construction would be required.

Third. Cost estimates favor the Orlando site. All cost estimates for facilities have been based on a 1.05 area cost factor for Orlando and 1.10 for Bainbridge. These factors, based on Navy experience and cost guides, result in a 5-percent additional cost for Bainbridge facilities. The cost of construction is higher at Bainbridge in view of the higher cost index.

Fourth. Location of a training center at Orlando would provide a more suitable climate for maximum effective training—since the recruit spends about 60 percent of his time outdoors.

Fifth. There is sufficient land available at Orlando to accommodate the total training center functions and the many lakes in Orlando provide a valuable asset to recruit training.

Sixth. Adequate housing in the community is available for families, commercial transportation is readily available and there are extensive recreational facilities in the area.

The Navy fully supports a third training center at Orlando. Rear Adm. Harry Hull, U.S. Navy, said in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, May 25, 1966:

> We are enthusiastic and unanimous in the Navy in our position that Orlando is the appropriate site. There are substantial savings in military construction costs at Orlando. Adequate housing is available for all our families there. The climate is conducive to outdoor training, there is enough land, community and base personnel support facilities are excellent, commercial transportation is available, and there are extensive recreational facilities in the area. In sum, the environment of Orlando is outstanding for a Naval training center.

There has been some contention by some Congressmen from Maryland that the base should be placed at Bainbridge despite the fact that the Navy prefers Orlando. An argument that is made is that one admiral, on a tentative basis, once thought Bainbridge would be a good location; but significantly the Navy had never approved Bainbridge over Orlando and the only choice ever made by the Navy has been Orlando. Further, this admiral, now that full data have been accumulated on the subject, has become a strong advocate of Orlando as the better location.

When the issue was presented in the House Armed Service Committee, it was decided to leave in the House measure the language of the Senate measure: that the center should be built, the location being left up to the Navy to decide. The vote was 25 to 1 in the House Committee, the only dissent being a Maryland member.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the base should be placed at Orlando for economy and efficiency reasons. I sincerely hope that the language now in the bill will be retained to make this a certainty; or if there is further legislative contention on the matter, that the language be changed to spell out Orlando as the site, as the Navy desires.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation and to express my congratulations to the distinguished chairman of our committee for what I believe is a well-thought-out bill and a very useful piece of legislation and, as he has already indicated, an austere bill. There have been times in the past when I have been one of the group known as "the Fearless Five," but that was another day. I feel that this is a good bill today, one that we as a committee and as a House ought to support unanimously, without amendment. It is in many ways a barebones request, and yet it is a bill which represents a very great deal of careful thought on the part of the committee.

Let me just point out one item that might be of interest to members of this committee, to show we have cut out any unnecessary expenditures. One of the items which the committee cut out, for example, was $3.3 million for the construction of facilities in one part of the country which were being moved from another part of the country. When we looked into that particular expense, we found it was unnecessary. Not only that, but we found that it could actually be harmful to our defense posture. Although $3.3 million may not seem to be a great deal of money, I believe this shows the kind of detailed care that our committee has exercised in writing this legislation.

I had the opportunity a few months ago, Mr. Chairman, of serving as chairman of a special subcommittee of our committee to go to Vietnam and report on the situation there. One of the things that our distinguished chairman asked us to report on were material shortages. We came back and reported to this House and to the committee that there were not any serious material shortages in Vietnam. We felt the supply situation was being very adequately handled. There were some temporary shortages, but no serious ones.

But, to be perfectly honest, Mr. Chairman, there is one serious shortage in Vietnam. It is a shortage that has plagued our armed services for many years. That is the shortage of trained Americans who can speak the required foreign languages of those countries in which we are forced to conduct our military operations. Unfortunately we do not have many top-ranking American people who can speak Vietnamese today. Over the years we in this country have failed in developing our language capability. We have been inclined to let the other fellow learn our language, rather than taking the trouble to learn his.

We found after Pearl Harbor that there was a shocking lack of Americans who could speak Japanese. So the Navy and the Army were forced to go out into the highways and byways and bring in anybody they could to learn the Japanese language. I was one of those who was brought in in that particular haul, and I had a chance to see what is involved in learning an oriented language, and I learned the importance of our defense language capability. I resolved then that anything I could do to insure that we had a strong language capability in the future, I would do.

This bill as it came from the Defense Department contained a proposal for the transfer of the east coast branch of the Defense language school, located here in Anacostia—and we have just been talking about Anacostia—to the western tip of Texas, to El Paso, at a cost of $3.3 million. Why the east coast branch should be located at the western end of Texas, I have no idea. But obviously a transition of that kind was bound to have a very profound effect on our language capability and that was what disturbed me.

I looked into it, and found that the decision on this move was made, not by the language people of the Defense Department, not by the intelligence people who have to rely on our language capability, not even by the educational people in the Defense Department, but by the real estate people. Somebody told the real estate people that they had to find something to go into an empty SAC base, the Biggs Air Force Base in Texas.

I am sure all of us who have had bases closed in our area would like to have this kind of concern expressed for us in the Defense Department and for our districts. But the fact is that this is not the way to defend and insure and enhance our military language capability.

I learned, for example, that the move to El Paso would mean that of 72 instructors now located in the language school in Anacostia—and you cannot have a school without faculty—only 7 would move to El Paso. You would gut the present faculty of the school and in El Paso they would have to start all over again from scratch in building a faculty for the school.

While there are 6,000 acres at the old Biggs Air Force Base, and only 2 acres at Anacostia, the fact is that all the housing units now located at Biggs, all the barracks and all the BOQ's, are already occupied by overflow personnel from Fort Bliss, so there would not even be any available facilities for the language school to move into. They would have to start from scratch on facilities too.

Surely this is not the way to protect our language capability. Surely this is not the way to fill a vital need we have, I fear, tended too much to neglect in the past.

I commend the chairman and our committee for their wisdom in holding up this move until the committee and those who are concerned about our educational facilities can look into it more fully.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Having served with the gentleman from New York in the Japanese language school conducted by the Navy in World War II, I know of his deep interest in and knowledge of the subject. I want the gentleman to know that what he has said has persuaded me. I also congratulate the committee.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I might say to the members of the committee that the gentleman is much more proficient in the Japanese language today than I am.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Everything the gentleman from New York has said by way of criticism of the proposal to move the language school to El Paso, Tex., could be said in far more costly terms with respect to the McNamara award of the TFX fighter plane contract to a firm in Fort Worth, Tex., at a cost to the taxpayers of some $400 to $500 million in excess of the offer of another firm to build an even better plane. However, the gentleman and the committee are to be commended for cutting out the unnecessary spending of $3.3 million.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks as this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I rise in support of this bill.

During the early 1950's, this Nation relied on a strategy of massive retaliation for our defense. To that end our national development effort concentrated on strategic weapons and defense systems. Most of the resources available to our Air Force were consumed in satisfying these urgent requirements. In retrospect, our decision to focus on nuclear delivery systems cannot be questioned. Mr. Khrushchev's statement, "The paper tiger has nuclear teeth," affirms the wisdom of that decision.

Today, however, our free world responsibilities and our national security demand that we promote the development of all segments of our Air Force structure. As we consider the full scope of requirements and resources, we cannot neglect the fact that none of the systems oriented programs would be possible without the technology advances which result from our basic research, exploratory development, and advanced development programs. Only in these latter areas are we able to develop the technological base which is essential for weapon system development and which permits us to focus both research and development as the occasion demands. For example, without a broad and aggressive propulsion development program, we would not be able to proceed with the timely development of a C–5A or a Minuteman missile. In the same way, other technology programs provide the inertial platforms, or the radars, or whatever else is required to design effective systems as soon as the need is apparent.

We must always guard against the temptation to defer the technology programs and to reduce the R. & D. effort in favor of forces in being. The consequences of deferred technology are deferred capabilities, missed opportunities, and ultimately, the inability to compete technologically or militarily, with or without "costly crash programs."

In the fiscal year 1967 military construction program, the Air Force has requested $47.3 million to cover the facility requirements of the technological base for our future survival. The principal items supporting the Research and Development are:

First. Satellite control facilities at $12.4 million to increase the on-orbit tracking and control network. This item will include the expansion of the Satellite Control Center at Sunnyvale, Calif., to increase the capability of this vital nerve center of the worldwide satellite control facility network. It will also include alterations and additions to various satellite tracking stations around the world.

Second. Supporting facilities at $8.7 million for the manned orbiting laboratory—MOL—to be launched from Vandenberg AFB. This item will provide for MOL peculiar facilities which must be integrated with standard Titan III initial-launch-capability presently under construction.

Third. Improvements totaling $11 million at the eastern and western test ranges. The facilities included in this item respond to requirements generated by an increasing workload in the development testing of advanced ballistic missile systems, unmanned satellite systems, and the manned orbiting laboratory. Major programs supported by the ranges include Polaris, Minuteman, Titan III, Pershing, Gemini, Apollo, and NASA satellites.

Also included are alterations and additions to the advanced ballistic reentry system, ABRES, test facilities at Vandenberg. The continuing support of this program is essential to the security of our Nation. We must have the capability to penetrate enemy defenses and place warheads precisely on target in the most effective and economical manner. The reentry system is the attack element—an entity which can be modified or replaced to increase the operational life of missile systems. Since potential enemies constantly seek a defense against our reentry vehicles, we must constantly develop new and more sophisticated reentry systems to assure target penetration.

In-house laboratory support at $10.7 million is required to provide laboratory and support facilities such as a new electronics data control laboratory and modification of the climatic test facility at Eglin Air Force Base; a celestial guidance laboratory at Holloman Air Force Base; modifications to the toxic hazards laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; and replacement of propulsion engine test cells at Arnold Engineering Development Center. Also included and important to the research and development mission is $4.5 million for base support facilities at our major research and development bases.

Gentlemen, I know each of you are keenly aware of the critical importance of our research and development programs. Our current obligations in southeast Asia bring into focus the potential military threat that we are facing today from Red China and emphasizes the threat that we have faced since the end of World War II from the Soviet bloc. As a part of the national effort to meet this threat, we need to maintain the technological initiative. We must supply the resources required by providing our scientists and engineers with the modern facility tools required to advance research and development and to insure our technological advantage. This bill clearly supports national objectives and will provide the Air Force with the technical resources most urgently needed to exploit and evaluate the effectiveness of advanced technology to meet the vital requirements in all phases of our military capability.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the other distinguished gentleman from New York who is a member of the committee [Mr. Pike].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say first to the gentleman who preceded me in the well that as one of the few survivors of the erstwhile "fearless five" we lament his passing.

I do not like to do anything to throw rocks at this bill. I am going to vote for this bill. I supported this bill in the committee.

But I am obliged to say I am disappointed deeply by some of the language in this bill.

Last year, in the military construction bill report, there was language to make our spirits soar. I call attention to the report of last year, in which it was said:

> Some of the general provisions contained in this year's bill are almost identical to those provided in previous years. Another represents a rather severe departure by having the effect of returning to the Congress the powers granted to it by the Constitution.

What were we talking about? We were talking about the right of the Congress to have some power in regard to the closing of military bases.

We reported a bill unanimously which gave Congress some power in this regard, and the Senate did not go along with it. We came in with a conference report in which there was no power. There was a right to be notified.

That is all there is in this bill. When all is said and done, there is no power whatsoever in this Congress to do anything about the closing of bases.

Because one of the favorite games we play around here is to examine the motives of anybody who gets down in the well and says anything on any subject, I will admit I did indeed have a base in my district which was closed. But I will also say that I supported that closing at the time, that I thought it was a wise closing, and I said so publicly at the time.

The question is not whether individual bases should be closed. I happen to have a lot of respect for the Members of this body. I happen to believe that we have the intestinal fortitude to do those things which are right when we are presented with evidence.

The issue is not whether bases shall be closed, but the issue is whether or not Congress is going to have any power whatsoever in the question of closing bases. I simply do not see how it is possible by the wildest stretch of the imagination for Congress to perform its own constitutional function of raising and supporting armies and of providing and maintaining a navy if the President has the absolute, untrammeled right to close every base in the country without the consent of Congress. The bill which we have before us today says that he can do exactly that. It says that he and he alone has the power to decide whether or not to do it. It says after he makes up his mind as to what he is going to do, then he will tell us what he has decided to do, and if the past is any example of the future, then we are going to find out about it by reading our morning paper over a cup of coffee or find out about it because some reporter calls us up in the middle of the night. A great many Members of this body, including myself, have done a great deal of huffing and puffing about this flow of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government, but we have never taken any real action to stop that flow. In the Committee on Armed Services this year we were told that this was the wrong issue. The right issue, we were told, was the building of nuclear frigates. Now, you all know what happened to that language.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield? Why do you not tell them what happened to the language on the nuclear frigates?

Mr. PIKE. Yes. I will be very happy to do that.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will give you the time.

Mr. PIKE. Of course, you have only so much time to allot, but I will tell them.

What happened to the language on the nuclear frigates is this: It says that the Secretary of Defense shall build these nuclear frigates unless—and the "unless" is the key word of the whole thing—the President decides not to build the nuclear frigates and tells the Congress why he has decided not to build the nuclear frigates. That is what the language on the nuclear frigates is.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman is exactly 100 percent wrong. Exactly 100 percent wrong.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further at this time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will give you some more time.

Mr. PIKE. All right. Then, I am happy to yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Here is what this language says. The Secretary of Defense shall build the nuclear frigates unless the President fully reports to the Congress of the United States that not building them would be in the national interest. What could be more positive? What could be more positive?

Let me say this, too: Maybe if the gentleman served on a conference with the other body, he may have a little different perspective. If there were only one body of the Congress, I might be persuaded by the distinguished gentleman's argument, but there happens to be two bodies, and we have to meet with them. Maybe if the gentleman served on a conference committee, he would have a different understanding than he does. In time perhaps you will.

Mr. PIKE. I hope I will live to fulfill that function, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that I have been on such a conference committee, but I do not think that this body ought to legislate based on what the other body is going to do. I think that this body ought to legislate according to what we think is right and not according to what they are going to do over there. I think we ought to have the courage to do what we think is right in this body and then go into conference on it and not undercut ourselves before we start. I am not going to make any motion to strike out this wishy-washy, meaningless language, because there is obviously no will on the committee and there is no will in this Congress to fight the executive branch on this issue. I simply want to call the attention of the Members to the language contained in section 614 of this bill starting on page 89 and say that in this language Congress once again admits that it has not any power whatsoever. It endorses the right of the President to do what he wants to do insofar as military base closings are concerned and it adds one more grain of sand to the avalanche of Executive power which is burying the Congress of the United States and the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire any additional time?

Mr. PIKE. No, I have had adequate time. Thank you.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that what the committee has done this year does require that the President report to the Congress, while in continuous session, 30 days before any base is closed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we have marched up the hill and down the hill. I, positively, have not.

Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid of anyone from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, across the river and back again. I do not think I respond to that pressure.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do think when one walks into a stone wall, he ought to have sense enough not to repeat that performance. This is what happened across the way.

Mr. Chairman, we put the strongest language—I put the strongest language—of which I am capable in order to carry out the intent of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if I thought I could cross the threshold on the other side of the Capitol and accomplish the desires of everyone in this matter, I would be happy to do so.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, "There ain't no education in the second kick of a mule; there just ain't none."

Mr. Chairman, as I say, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] is a valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services. I am going to appoint him as the head of a subcommittee.

But, Mr. Chairman, on this matter the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] has been wrong. However, all of us cannot be right all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage disagreement with the committee. I do not want anyone to be afraid of me, to be afraid to disagree with me and the actions of the Committee on Armed Services. If they will look at me, they will find that there is no reason to be afraid of me. I am not mad at the gentleman, and the more he disagrees, the more we develop his capacity to understand what may come up in the future. The gentleman is a valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services and I welcome those disagreements.

And, Mr. Chairman, before night is over, I predict that I shall have appointed him to a subcommittee and that he will perform well the job assigned to such subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no one who can do a better job than the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike], but on this matter the gentleman just happens to be wrong.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that there was in the bill last year a provision to make spirits soar. I do not know quite how to spell that last word. I think that the provision made some spirits in the White House "s-o-r-e."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This is of no consequence to me, because the reason we wrote this language this year was because of the understanding which I had with the White House last year. But I said on the floor here certain things with reference to the matter of the closing of bases. This I did not like and it will not happen again so long as I am chairman of the Committee on Armed

Services. Therefore, there will be no agreements carried out not written into the law without their first being cleared with the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we all have high respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE]. I rise at this time only to indicate that the gentleman's construction and his interpretation of what we say here is not in accord with my own.

Mr. Chairman, by no stretch of the imagination do we surrender our power to the other body, or to the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the gentleman from New York, who has never been in conference with the other body, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and myself, and other conferees have sat there hour after hour arguing with the Members of the other body. We even walked out of the conference. But, ultimately, you must have a solution to the problem. As a matter of fact, I believe that perhaps we did as well as we could. But somehow we must remember that there is a war going on in Vietnam. This is a military bill. We could be obstinate forever in order to attempt to obtain our way.

But I do want to say that the intentions of the gentleman from New York are totally in accord with my own point of view. I just do not believe the gentleman has grasped the feelings of the Committee on Armed Services and the language which we have contained in the report here today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think that is an accurate statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and in particular section 611.

As a freshman member, and as a Member of this Congress representing that part of Maryland that is as close to the District as any other part, and perhaps being a Congressman living officially at home as close to the Capitol as anyone, I am very cognizant of the problems in the District of Columbia, and cognizant of the need for adequate housing in the District of Columbia.

I would suggest that the District of Columbia Committee appoint a subcommittee to make a study of all land owned by the Federal Government that may not be used to its utmost, such as the National Training School, the Navy Yard, the Bureau of Standards, and perhaps many others that may be discovered. The subcommittee should then develop a plan for the maximum utilization of these lands within the framework of existing laws and I would hope that all surplus land will be used for housing for purchase by median income families.

As a member of this committee I have found our chairman and the senior members of the committee to be very fair and helpful. Your chairman has been very democratic in seeing that everyone could participate in the activities of this committee.

When the discussion of the Bolling-Anacostia complex began, and the question of the FAA using it for a limited period of time, I raised the question as to whether or not there might be a question of safety involved because that was the basic reason that the Navy and the Air Force moved to Andrews Field a few years ago.

I was assured by other members of the committee that the use of the fields would be directed through one control tower. However, you will note in the report that there is a caution that it permits the use by FAA if that is found to be desirable. Thus my objection was overruled by the majority vote.

As far as not letting this land be turned over for public housing or any type of housing at this time, the record is complete. I am not going to be needlessly repetitious. You have heard what has been stated by our colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]. That is, the Defense Department will need this property in the foreseeable future.

I too was interested in this Language Institute and the problem of its instructors and the need to keep it here in the area. I too wanted to block seeing that it was moved to Texas. I too know that the Defense Intelligence Agency is spread all over Washington and Virginia. I too know that there are some 70 to 80 buildings being rented by the Defense Department in the metropolitan area.

So I say let us not be penny wise and pound foolish by getting rid of this very, very valuable land and later possibly having to buy more, as has been discussed by Members of the House and the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee who have been working with this. It is unfortunate that some political opportunists in the area shoot from the lip when they urge a housing use for the site without bothering to study the record.

I commend the chairman of our committee for the action he has taken, and I hope that he will be unanimously backed up by the Members of this House.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, according to a statement issued to the press in connection with the matter under debate here today, a wholely extraneous subject is to be introduced in the form of an amendment—an amendment which would disrupt the longstanding procedure for disposing of surplus Government land—land which in this case has not even been declared surplus, an amendment which would deprive our military enlisted men, junior officers, and their families of sorely needed housing space.

I refer to Bolling Air Force Base, Mr. Chairman, and the misguided attempts which are being made to circumvent all orderly procedures for sensible use of this recently demilitarized area.

The issue has been rejected in this debate by some of our colleagues, and has been dramatized by civil rights rowboat invasions of Bolling Air Force Base.

I regret that the issue of low cost housing and civil rights have also been injected here, but since they have I propose to address myself to the subject before serious mistakes are made and longstanding Government policies are altered without adequate consideration of the consequences.

The proposed amendment, if adopted, would lead to a backlash of confusion that will harm almost every agency of the Federal Government in the orderly planning of its growth, and in the adequate care of those who are employed by it.

Bolling Air Force Base is an area of 900 acres of land, probably the most valuable piece of property in the metropolitan area of Washington, if not in the entire Nation.

Under present procedures, if it is declared no longer usable as an air station, it must be offered to the other services first, then through the General Services Administration to all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and then to State and local bodies before it is made available for public disposal.

Any announcement to the contrary—and one has been made by the Secretary of Defense, offering 500 acres of the land for urbanization—is clearly illegal and should be ignored.

There is the question, too, Mr. Chairman, of the apparent inability of the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Redevelopment Land Agency to clean up its own slums and construct adequate low-cost housing on the property it already owns or has access to, before holding forth visions of shifting large numbers of its people into areas needed desperately for military housing and other Defense construction.

Bolling Air Force Base is now in the hands of the military. It should remain in the hands of the military. It is ideal for new construction, for the Defense Intelligence Agency, now housed at Arlington Hall on a site which could be used for the erection of a badly needed college in Arlington County.

Bolling is adequate for construction of housing for the families of our fighting men who are called to Washington for duty, or whose breadwinners are sent overseas. As of now, Mr. Chairman, these families—some living in trailers—are forced off military bases when their soldier husbands and fathers are sent overseas. Once ejected they are victims of an inflationary economy without adequate incomes to live as the dependents of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen are entitled to live.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, 90 percent of our military personnel are inadequately housed in the Washington area. In fact, most of them are forced to "moonlight" as waiters, cabdrivers, filling station operators, and nightclub musicians, to make ends meet at this hardship post.

I know this for a fact, Mr. Chairman. They come to see me as constituents and talk to me about it.

The occupants of temporary building 7, which is needed to relieve the Washington National Airport congestion, could be moved there. The occupants of temporary building 8, now housing the offices of the Surgeon General of the Air Force and the Chaplains Corps Headquarters, are working in virtual squalor, and could well be moved to a military complex at Bolling. They will then become part of the efficient military force that we need to meet our commitments around the world.

The Secretary of Defense, it might be noted at this point, has agreed to relinquish the space now housing 4,000 military workers in T–7 at the Washington National Airport sometime in 1968, but he has no plans that we know of for providing about half of them with new offices. Yet he grandiosely offers to give away 500 acres of Defense Department property tailor-made for new military installations.

I should like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that if some of my colleagues are seized with the sudden urge for giving away Government land they might well consider the Suitland military reservation, where 371.4 acres of odds and ends of Federal Government operations are now housed. All of these could literally be moved across Suitland Parkway, making this land available for low-cost housing.

The question can also be raised, Mr. Chairman, of when do we reach the millennium of public or low-cost housing? Thousands of units have been constructed during the years I have been in Congress—most of which have been priced out of the market for those who need it the most. Now to rectify those mistakes it has been and is being proposed that the Congress penalize the men and their families we are asking to sacrifice and fight for us.

Certainly there is a need for continued subsidization of low-cost housing. I am sure it is the understanding of this body that this is being done, and for the people who we are told need it.

Surely we read of countless programs of renovation and rent assistance. Perhaps what we need now is an accounting of what has been and is being done to meet the needs as Congress understood them over the years. Perhaps the Great Society planners should be called upon to reveal the effectiveness or lack of it before massive new efforts are undertaken or planned, to house the ill housed who never seem to be there when you knock on any door.

We are being barraged, Mr. Chairman, almost daily, with sit-ins, float-ins, row-ins and long and hazardous marches in which our people are impelled into the streets as the demands for more and more low-cost housing and other problems are dramatized.

Just what is the true low-cost housing picture, Mr. Chairman? Are we to go on endlessly gobbling land here and there without knowing when and where we call a halt?

I ask too, Mr. Chairman, if the cooperation of private enterprise has been sought to the degree it is able to perform? Under the Redevelopment Land Agency, of which the District Commissioners have access to plans and funds, the Agency is charged with assembling slum property, substandard housing, or vacant land in such a manner as to make it available for development for rent housing by private enterprise.

I do not believe that these guidelines were laid down to build and promote high-cost apartments, and houses, as seems to have been the case in the urban development we have had so far in the District of Columbia.

Let us look again at what we have here, Mr. Chairman.

We need a college in Arlington County and by centrally locating a Department of Defense installation at Bolling we can have adequate land for that sorely needed educational institution.

We need many more acres of space at National Airport, and by moving Defense Department personnel from buildings there to a military complex at Bolling, that space will be available to make National an airport we can be proud of.

The main Navy building on Constitution Avenue is falling down around the ears of those who work there and has been ordered torn down. What better place than Bolling for these employees, housed in a complex of tri-service facilities, using land and space already in possession of the Department of Defense.

Scattered around Washington are dozens of other minor Defense installations, all of which could be housed in a Bolling military complex.

Arlington Cemetery, Mr. Chairman, is another case in point.

To stay in existence as a national shrine, Arlington Cemetery must acquire more land by 1968, and has undertaken steps to gain access to the South Post at Fort Myer.

Where are the officers and enlisted men at South Post to go, Mr. Chairman, except to Bolling where they can be comfortably housed and have at hand the facilities needed for an economical and efficient days work in our national defense?

No, Mr. Chairman, the answer to low-cost housing does not lie on the Bolling Air Force Base site. The answer to many other problems does, however. Here there can be a comparatively economical ingathering of people and facilities for a more efficient national defense; here a central location is available, ready made for the purpose for which it was first claimed as a defense site; here is the need and the hope of thousands of military men and who are now being treated as second-class citizens in housing, recreation, transportation, and working conditions.

It is incumbent on us to consider their needs, Mr. Chairman. They are not allowed a Magellan to guide them in protests across the water; they have no leaders in mufti to lead them down our streets in protest. But their needs are just as vital, just as pressing and equally justified. I propose, Mr. Chairman, to continue fighting for them until they too receive adequate attention from the Congress of the United States.

This amendment is ill advised and a disservice to them. I protest it, and I shall fight it. Thank you.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I vote for the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1966 (S. 3105).

My reluctance springs from the fact that contained in this bill are the necessary funds for the Department of the Navy to begin transferring certain of its facilities from the Bainbridge Naval Recruit Training Center in Cecil County, Md.

As the Representative in this House from that county, I want to echo the feeling of the citizens there who regard the Navy's planned exodus from Bainbridge as the dealing of an economic blow below the belt to Cecil County.

I am not convinced that the proposed transfers are in the best interests of the country, its defense, or the Navy.

I am not convinced that the proposed transfers will result in efficiency or improved performance of the specific functions involved.

However, I am convinced that this sudden change in the Navy's planning course is proof of poor management and embarrassing evidence of a lack of long-range planning by the Navy.

What has happened is this. Two years ago the Navy indicated its desire to expand the Bainbridge base by establishing a third boot camp training center for men there.

Those at Bainbridge and their civilian neighbors, the fine people of Cecil County who have been excellent and cooperative hosts to the Navy for years, thought 8,000 additional naval personnel would be added at Bainbridge from such an expansion.

But then the Navy's thinking tide began to change and suddenly we find that instead of boosting operations at Bainbridge, the Navy wants instead to shift about 4,000 personnel normally stationed there to other bases in other parts of the country.

The Bainbridge Naval Training Center would be left almost high and dry. An investment of millions and millions of defense dollars would become a Navy gray elephant with little function left.

Cecil County would be forced to undergo the draining away of one of its present economic mainstays.

So far, despite continued questions from myself and my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, the Navy has no plans to utilize the base for other operations.

We are told, "Well, we are working on that; just be patient."

It is not just the people of Cecil County who are losing by this poor management; it is, in my opinion, all of the Nation's taxpayers who have invested over the years in the Bainbridge facility.

I will do everything possible to prevent the proposed transfers until I am convinced and the people of Cecil County are convinced that the Navy has Bainbridge in its future and that the transfers are demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt to be in the best interests of the taxpayers, the Navy, and the defense posture of this country.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass S. 3105 as reported by the House Armed Services Committee, which authorizes certain construction at military installations. This bill is of vital importance to the 19th District of Illinois, as it contains the authorization of $3,246,000 for research, development, and test facilities at the Rock Island Arsenal in Rock Island, Ill.

The Rock Island Arsenal is a very important installation in the Army Weapons Command, and plays a unique role in the research, engineering, and prototype production capability of the Army Weapons Command. In fact, this arsenal is the Army's largest and most versatile job shop.

The authorization contained in this bill will enable the Rock Island Arsenal to accommodate the move of the residual mission from the Springfield Armory in Springfield, Mass. After a long study by the Army Materiel Command and an independent engineering firm, it has been recommended that the Springfield Armory be closed and the engineering, research, and development facilities be moved to Rock Island. It is estimated that the transfer of these facilities to the Rock Island Arsenal will result in an annual savings of $3.1 million. In the interest of efficiency and economy, I urge the House to approve this authorization contained in the bill.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to register my support for the continuation of the Bainbridge Training Center at Bainbridge, Md.

I concur with Congressman Long's opinion that removal of the training center would entail unnecessary expense in new construction, as well as in transportation costs. Undoubtedly, too, there, would be additional costs incurred in relocating some of the services now available at Bainbridge, whether these be moved to a Florida site or elsewhere. There is, also, sufficient land available at the Maryland location for any anticipated expansion of activities in the future.

Although Bainbridge Training Center is not in my district, it is of special interest to me. Some 300 to 400 Pennsylvanians from the 19th District are employed at the Bainbridge Training Center in Maryland.

I believe that this kind of disruption of the activities of a training center, accompanied by additional costs and many hours wasted in the moving is offset by no advantages in this case. Nor can I justify another effect—disruption of the lives of those individuals now employed at Bainbridge. These people have anticipated continued employment there as a result of the recent expansion the training center has enjoyed.

For these reasons, then, it is my hope that the Bainbridge Training Center will be maintained and encouraged at its present site in Maryland.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], not only in supporting this bill but particularly with respect to the provision relating to the use of Bolling Air Force Base property for air service in the Washington area.

We all know and recognize that air traffic at Washington National Airport has resulted in congestion and overcrowding. Facilities are available at Bolling to help alleviate this situation. Runways are there, buildings are there, and the property which is owned by the Air Force should be put to use by the Air Force.

I support the chairman's position on this matter completely.

Permit me also, Mr. Chairman, to make reference to what I consider to be the unwise action of the Secretary of Defense in proposing to close Sewart Air Force Base at Smyrna, Tenn.

This is a vital, operational base that today is performing a vital and necessary function in the transporting of our troops and forces to South Vietnam.

The proposal to close this permanent and strategically located base is unsound, unwise, uneconomic, and costly to the taxpayers.

I direct the attention of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force to the report of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on Armed Services issued on April 6, 1966. This report calls for a reconsideration of the plan to close Sewart and describes it as a "vital airbase." This report was issued after a full, lengthy hearing and was the result of a careful, considered study. This facility should be retained as a permanent base.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt passage of this legislation.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with appreciation that the committee report accompanying the bill, S. 3105, expresses the committee's concern about what it refers to as "reported deficiencies in facilities at a number of Army installations used for the 2 weeks of annual field training required of all National Guardsmen and reservists." The committee report then makes specific mention of the seven major installations used for this training, the first mentioned being Camp Drum, N.Y. Mr. Chairman, I would commend the distinguished chairman and members of the Committee on Armed Services for the attention that they have given to the deficiencies in these facilities. I am sure that the committee's expressed concern is, in large measure, responsible for the expressed expectation that the Department of Defense will, in the words of the committee, "institute such corrective measures as will assure, first, that effectiveness of the training exercises is not diminished by the lack of or condition of facilities; and second, that the health and welfare of the troops are protected."

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is obviously futile to continue to protest against the swollen expenditures of the military agencies of our Government. In effect, today the military is the Government of this country—the remaining incidental functions carried on by the Federal Government receive by far the smaller percentage of the taxpayer's dollar, and the percentage is decreasing each year.

The most alarming part of this amazing development is that the Congress of the United States, once a coequal branch of the Government, has largely abdicated its power over all things military. The authority to declare war, clearly spelled out in the Constitution as belonging only to the Congress, is now left entirely up to the executive branch.

The control of the Nation's purse strings in matters involving the military is, similarly, a dead letter. We merely wait to hear from the executive branch how much it wants. Not only do we vote that amount, with little debate and hardly a dissenting voice, but we generally add to it a few tens or hundreds of millions for the pet projects of powerful Members of Congress.

Perhaps this bill authorizing certain military construction projects is a poor vehicle to use to voice again my dissent from the military policies of my country. After all, it only involves a little more than a billion dollars. The fact that my own State of California receives by far the largest share of these funds—$46,154,000, compared to $28,273,000 for the next most fortunate State—makes such dissent even more unwise from a political viewpoint. Probably half of this billion dollars I could support as being a wise and necessary allocation of the Nation's resources. A substantial part of the funds authorized are to provide for military housing—barracks and homes for military personnel.

Yet, despite these facts, I must oppose the bill. An undisclosed amount, but obviously many millions of dollars, will be used for construction of facilities in Vietnam and in other parts of Asia—spent in carrying on a war not declared by Congress, and a war resulting from a foreign policy that is outdated and blind to the realities of this modern world.

The funds for military housing, which I would normally vote to approve, are required because of expanding draft calls and growing military manpower ceilings in all the services. The demand again is directly due to the increasing and, apparently, unlimited requirements of the undeclared ground war in Asia.

It is interesting to contemplate the ease with which we can authorize a half billion dollars for the housing needs of our military personnel as compared with the struggle for a few millions we authorize to provide better housing for the dwellers in the slums of all America's cities. Many of these slum dwellers are also veterans of this or the last war, or the parents and relatives of the men we are sending to Asia now.

Realizing that one vote can hardly stem the tide of larger and more sweeping military spending, I must still voice my hopes for a change toward a course of reason and sanity in the world today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following telegrams, letters, and communications relating to the utilization of certain facilities at the Bolling-Anacostia

complex for general aviation purposes in connection with S. 3105, the fiscal year 1967 military construction authorization bill:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
July 29, 1966.

(Following message sent night letter to Senators MURPHY and KUCHEL and all 38 Congressmen, Washington, D.C.:)

Sincerely urge you to support S. 3105 to salvage Washington, D.C. Bolling Field airport. Greedy Washington real estate brokers will otherwise put housing on it and forever lose Washington, D.C. an opportunity to develop desperately needed close-in downtown airport.

C. P. BARNETT,
Director, California State Aeronautics.

JULY 29.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In view of present FAA proposed limitation for general aviation traffic on Washington National Airport and lack of convenience of Dulles International we highly recommend your support of Congressman RIVERS' amendment to S. 3105 Military Construction Bill which would preserve Bolling AFB for general aviation use under authorization from Department of Defense.

CHARLES A. LYNCH,
Director, Montana
Aeronautics Commission.

JULY 29, 1966.

Congressman JAMES BATTIN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In view of present FAA proposed limitation for general aviation traffic on Washington National Airport and lack of convenience of Dulles International we highly recommend your support of Congressman RIVERS' amendment to S. 3105 Military Construction Bill which would preserve Bolling AFB for general aviation use under authorization from Department of Defense.

MONTANA AERONAUTICS COMMISSION.

To All Tennessee Congressmen:

Respectfully urge your support of Congressman RIVERS' Amendment to S. 3105 which would preserve Bolling Field for civil aviation. The Washington Airports are now saturated with air traffic placing a significant restriction on civil aviation activity in that area.

JAMES E. MARTIN,
Director, Tennessee Aeronautics Commission.

JULY 29, 1966.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Word has reached this department that the National Capital Planning Commission and other Washington groups are putting great pressure on Congress to make Bolling A.F.B. available for a housing development.

The Arkansas Department of Aeronautics would appreciate your vote and support to preserve Bolling A.F.B. for civil aviation.

The location of Bolling is only five minutes from our nations capitol, and is one of the nations finest down town airports.

The bill should reach the house floor for vote within ten days and we urge you to support Congressman RIVERS' amendment to S. 3103, which would preserve Bolling A.F.B. for civil aviation.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF
AERONAUTICS,
JIMMY WOODARD,
Executive Director.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. J. OLIVA HUOT,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR OLIVA: Col. A. B. McMullen, Executive Vice President of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, has advised me by telegram that the House Armed Services Committee has amended S. 3105, a military construction bill, which would authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use. As you are well aware, the Washington National Airport has reached a point of saturation. Action has been taken by the Administrator to reduce general aviation traffic at Washington National on or about 1 October 1966.

While on active duty with the Navy I frequently used both the Bolling and Anacostia air facilities. Neither of these caused any major problem with the traffic at Washington National. As you know Bolling and Anacostia were closed on the basis of an economy move by the Secretary of Defense and the units formerly located there were transferred to Andrews Air Force Base.

It is my understanding that this bill should reach the House floor for vote within ten days. I strongly recommend your support of S. 3103, as amended, to permit the lease of Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use.

Your support in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NEW HAMPSHIRE AERONAUTICS
COMMISSION,
R. J. CROWLEY, Jr.,
Director.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Col. A. B. McMullen, Executive Vice President of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, has advised me by telegram that the House Armed Services Committee has amended S. 3103, a military construction bill, which would authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use. As you are well aware, the Washington National Airport has reached a point of saturation. Action has been taken by the Administrator to reduce general aviation traffic at Washington National on or about 1 October 1966.

While on active duty with the Navy, I frequently used both the Bolling and Anacostia air facilities. Neither of these caused any major problem with the traffic at Washington National. As you know Bolling and Anacostia were closed on the basis of an economy move by the Secretary of Defense and the units formerly located there were transferred to Andrews Air Force Base.

It is my understanding that this bill should reach the House floor for vote within ten days. I strongly recommend your support of S. 3103, as amended, to permit the lease of Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use.

Your support in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NEW HAMPSHIRE AERONAUTICS
COMMISSION,
R. J. CROWLEY, Jr.,
Director.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Col. A. B. McMullen, Executive Vice President of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, has advised me by telegram that the House Armed Services Committee has amended S. 3105, a military construction bill, which would authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use. As you are well aware the Washington National Airport has reached a point of saturation. Action has been taken by the Administrator to reduce general aviation traffic at Washington National on or about 1 October 1966.

While on active duty with the Navy, I frequently used both the Bolling and Anacostia air facilities. Neither of these caused any major problem with the traffic at Washington National. As you know Bolling and Anacostia were closed on the basis of an economy move by the Secretary of Defense and the units formerly located there were transferred to Andrews Air Force Base.

It is my understanding that this bill should reach the House floor for vote within ten days. I strongly recommend your support of S. 3105, as amended, to permit the lease of Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use.

Your support in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NEW HAMPSHIRE AERONAUTICS
COMMISSION,
R. J. CROWLEY, Jr.
Director.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NORRIS: Col. A. B. McMullen, Executive Vice President of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, has advised me by telegram that the House Armed Services Committee has amended S. 3105, a military construction bill, which would authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use. As you are well aware the Washington National Airport has reached a point of saturation. Action has been taken by the Administrator to reduce general aviation traffic at Washington National on or about 1 October 1966.

While on active duty with the Navy, I frequently used both the Bolling and Anacostia air facilities. Neither of these caused any major problem with the traffic at Washington National. As you know Bolling and Anacostia were closed on the basis of an economy move by the Secretary of Defense and the units formerly located there were transferred to Andrews Air Force Base.

It is my understanding that this bill should reach the House floor for vote within ten days. I strongly recommend your support of S. 3105, as amended, to permit the lease of Bolling AFB to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use.

Your support in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NEW HAMPSHIRE AERONAUTICS
COMMISSION,
R. J. CROWLEY, Jr.,
Director.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
August 1, 1966.

Col. A. B. MCMULLIN,
Executive Vice President, NASA, Washington, D.C.:

The Utah Aeronautics Commission urges your support of Congressman RIVERS amendment to S. 3105. Bolling AFB as you know is one of finest downtown airports in US. Five minutes from Nations Capitol we must preserve this fine facility for civil aviation if at all possible may we please have your support.

B. V. WALKER,
Director,
Utah State Aeronautics Commission.

(This same letter also mailed Special Delivery to: Senator **Muskie**, Representative **Hathaway**, Representative **Tupper**.)

STATE OF MAINE,
AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Augusta, Maine, August 1, 1966.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I understand from Col. A. B. McMullen, Executive Vice President of our National Association of State Aviation officials, that the House Armed Services Committee amended S. 3105, Military Construction Bill, to authorize DOD to lease Bolling Air Force Base to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use.

Our National Association, for some time, has recommended that if and when Bolling AFB should be deactivated that it should be immediately taken over by FAA for general aviation use. This would alleviate the tremendous traffic problems at Washington National Airport which have recently been further compounded by the use of air carrier jet traffic. Bolling AFB would provide one of the world's finest downtown airports for general aviation use—five minutes from the Nation's capitol.

I further understand that the Nation's Capitol Planning Commission and other local groups are putting great pressure on Congress to make this area available for housing development. It is estimated that the bill should reach the floor of the House for vote within a few days.

The Maine Aeronautics Commission strongly urges you to investigate the necessity, and vote for preserving Bolling AFB for civil aviation.

Sincerely yours,
SCOTT K. HIGGINS,
Director,
Maine Aeronautics Commission.

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator of Idaho,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Aviation is one of the four common transportation mediums on which our nation must prosper and grow in centuries to come. Both the executive and legislative branches of government have repeatedly urged the furtherance of airports and aeronautical progress for our nation.

Accordingly, we believe it is contrary to the best interests of aeronautical development to permit established airports, built by taxpayer dollars, to be diverted from aeronautical purposes and tendered, instead, to housing developments.

We wish to respectfully urge your favorable consideration of S. 3105 which would preserve Bolling AFB for civil aviation in general aviation service to the Nation's Capitol.

Respectfully,
CHET MOULTON,
Director,
Idaho Department of Aeronautics.

AUGUST 2, 1966.

Congressman ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
House Office, Washington, D.C.:

Noted and commend action Armed Services Committee release Bolling Field for general aviation. Hope action will be sustained on floor. This is only hope for reasonable access to Washington by general aviation.

EDWARD F. KNAPP,
Commander.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Lansing, Mich., August 2, 1966.

Subject: Senate bill 3103.

It has been brought to my attention that the House Armed Services Committee amended S–3105, Military Construction Bill, to authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling Air Force Base to the Federal Aviation Agency for general aviation use. This amendment in my opinion is not only highly desirable but essential if something is to be done to meet the growing needs of civil aviation in the Washington area.

Washington National Airport, which most adequately serves short-range scheduled air operations, as well as itinerant civil air operations, is now virtually operating at full capacity. The FAA recently issued certain operating rules, which would restrict the use of this facility to all categories of users. Providing Bolling Field for general aviation use would assist not only the itinerant civil aircraft but the scheduled aircraft industry inasmuch as it would relieve congestion at Washington National, thus making it possible to accommodate more schedules.

It is evident beyond any reasonable doubt to all of those knowledgeable of the situation at Washington National Airport that something must be done. It is my belief the proposed amendment would go a long way toward alleviating the problem and would do it with a major savings to the taxpayer. Bolling Field is there; it is suitable for the purpose. If this facility is not utilized, it unquestionably will mean an expenditure of tremendous sums of public money to either expand Washington National Airport or to construct additional facilities to handle this traffic.

I sincerely urge and respectfully request your support of the subject amendment to S–3105.

Sincerely,
JAMES D. RAMSEY,
Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

OKLAHOMA AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., July 29, 1966.

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senator,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: Your support is urgently requested of Congressman **Rivers'** proposed amendment to S. 3105 which would preserve Bolling AFB for use by civil aviation. It's about time that someone started giving some consideration to general aviation (non-airline). Figures just recently released by the Federal Aviation Agency show that general aviation pilots last year flew a record 2.6 billion miles in 16.7 million hours with 95,442 aircraft, while achieving the lowest fatal accident rate in history. The airlines make up less than 2% of the total aircraft flying or only about 2,000 aircraft.

* * * * *

NATIONAL PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

THE EDITOR,
The Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorials of July 28 and August 7, 1966 on the future use of Anacostia/Bolling Fields require comment from the standpoint of accuracy and, in our opinion, sound planning and judgment.

You speak in both editorials of the use of these former military airfields for "private flying." This term implies the use of privately owned aircraft for personal gain or pleasure. The more commonly accepted term is "general aviation" which covers all types of civil flying except that by the scheduled airlines. General aviation includes use of aircraft for business purposes, air taxis, emergency flights and the carrying of essential supplies including medicines and drugs. The Federal Aviation Agency estimates that in 1965 general aviation carried half as many people in intercity travel as the scheduled airlines and probably as many people as the airlines taking into consideration all types of general aviation flying. General aviation is the fastest growing element of the transportation system in the United States.

One of the most agonizing and baffling problems facing many communities is that of airport noise. To plan future mass housing immediately adjacent to a busy airport is most unwise, in our opinion. It will inevitably lead to many public protests in the future. In the case of Anacostia/Bolling the the problem is even more serious not just because of the short distance between the site and the airport but the distance is almost entirely over water where sound travels most easily.

The temporary solution to the severe congestion at Washington National Airport as advocated by the FAA Administrator and Chairman **Rivers** of the House Armed Forces Committee is the only prompt solution to the problem. We agree with your recommendations that the FAA should be encouraged to find other sites for general aviation airports in the Washington area but this will take time. Would you not agree that planners for low cost housing sites should also seek alternate sites that would not create future problems?

The FAA estimates that the facilities at Anacostia Field could be put into active use for general aviation purposes within two weeks at minimum expense. This is surely the most economical and efficient way to use this property for the safety and convenience of the nearly eight and a half million people per year who are using Washington National Airport.

Yours sincerely,
DAVID H. SCOTT,
Executive Vice President.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Boston, July 22, 1966.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: I have just seen a press release dated July 15th from the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committe outlining a suggested amendment to the military construction authorization bill which would permit the FAA to lease portions of Anacostia and Bolling from the DOD for civil aviation use.

Based on a good deal of recent personal experience, I can say that the airplane traffic situation in Washington, both in the air and on the ground, is a mess and I have wondered for a long time why the obvious and inexpensive step of making Bolling or Anacostia or both available for civil operations has not been taken.

I certainly hope you will support the chairman's recommendations.

Yours,
CROCKER SNOW,
Director of Aeronautics.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Boston, July 22, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I have just seen a press release dated July 15th from the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee outlining a suggested amendment to the military construction authorization bill which would permit the FAA to lease portions of Anacostia and Bolling from the DOD for civil aviation use.

Based on a good deal of recent personal experience, I can say that the airplane traffic situation in Washington, both in the air and on the ground, is a mess and I have wondered for a long time why the obvious and inexpensive step of making Bolling or Anacostia or both available for civil operations has not been taken.

I certainly hope you will support the chairman's recommendations.

Yours,

CROCKER SNOW,
Director of Aeronautics.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Milwaukee.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. RIVERS: I heartily endorse and am asking Congressional support of your amendment to Senate Bill 3105, Military Construction Bill, to authorize the Department of Defense to lease Bolling Air Force Base to the FAA for general aviation use. This action will relieve the traffic congestion now taking place at Washintgon National Airport and in turn will help assure that Milwaukee will retain direct airline service to Washington National.

Milwaukee to Washington, D.C., air volume now totals approximately 100 passengers daily on five outbound and four inbound flights. The service has been in effect for over three and one-half years and the continuance of the non-stop flights to and from Milwaukee is an important part of Milwaukee and Wisconsin air service.

Yours truly,

HENRY W. MAIER, *Mayor.*

NATIONAL PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1966.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. RIVERS: I take pleasure in forwarding to you a copy of a letter under today's date that I have sent to the Vice President of the United States for your information.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID H. SCOTT,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: It is our understanding that you are supporting the efforts of the Administration and key members of Congress to help the Federal Aviation Agency solve the acute problem of air traffic control at Washington National Airport through obtaining the temporary use of the existing facilities at Anacostia Field. May we commend you for this forthright position and extend to you our support as well as that of the nearly half a million pilots who are concerned with air safety.

Here in Washington the use of Anacostia Field will directly benefit the safety and convenience of the eight and one half million pepole who use Washington National Airport each year.

We are greatly concerned over the proposal to use the Anacostia/Bolling complex for a housing development. Airport noise is one of the most critical and agonizing problems that faces many communities. To deliberately build new housing in the immediate vicinity of a very active airport would not only be unwise but would lead to most serious complaints and trouble in the future. May we point out the unusual disadvantage of the Anacostia/Bolling site for housing purposes because it is separated from National Airport by water: a most efficient carrier of sound.

Actions taken in Washington frequently set a pattern for developments in other parts of the country. We, therefore trust that you will continue your support to permit the FAA to use Anacostia Field as a temporary site to relieve the present airport congestion at Washington National. In time, other solutions for alternate airport facilities may be found but the only prompt solution to the problem is that proposed by FAA Administrator McKee and L. MENDEL RIVERS, Chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee.

Yours respectfully,

DAVID H. SCOTT,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF STATE AVIATION OFFICIALS,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.

Mr. J. R. BLANDFORD,
House Armed Services Committee,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLANDFORD: In compliance with our telephone conversation of this day attached are copies of telegrams and letters various State Directors of Aeronautics have recently addressed their Senators and Congressmen in support of Mr. RIVERS' amendment to S. 3103, authorizing Department of Defense to lease Bolling-Anacostia Air Bases to the Federal Aviation Agency for five years.

Permitting this multi-million dollar, close-in airport, five minutes of the Nation's Capitol, to be used for other than aviation purposes at this time would not only be a waste of taxpayers money, but a disastrous setback to commuter type air transportation.

Please advise if NASAO can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A. B. MCMULLEN,
Executive Vice President.

AOPA SUGGESTS SOLUTION TO BOLLING CONTROVERSY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Officials of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) today offered a proposal to the White House in an effort to help solve the growing controversy over the future use of the Bolling Air Force Base-Anacostia Naval Air Station complex near downtown Washington, D.C.

In a letter to Charles A. Horsky, advisor to the President on National Capital Affairs, AOPA pointed out that currently unused runways, taxiways and other aeronautical facilities at the site could be immediately adapted to private and business flying activities, relieving congested conditions at Washington National Airport. Since aviation activities probably would require no more than 100 acres of the 940-acre tract, a major portion of the remaining property could probably be used for other purposes, if and when it is relinquished by the Department of Defense, the 130,000-member Association of private aircraft owners and pilots suggested.

The Bolling-Anacostia complex was acquired by the military establishment for use as an airfield in 1912. From then until military fixed-wing aircraft operations were suspended in 1962, millions of dollars were expended on development of runways, taxiways and associated aeronautical facilities. In testimony given during Congressional hearings last year, AOPA, along with other aviation interests, urged the safeguard of the Federal investment by reopening the facility to light aircraft operations.

"While Bolling and Anacostia are not suitable for the operation of modern military tactical aircraft," AOPA said, "the lighter and more maneuverable general aviation airplanes can be accommodated safely with controlled traffic patterns to insure against conflict with aircraft at Washington National Airport and Andrews Air Force Base."

The need for additional close-in airport facilities for general aviation is emphasized by the proposal of the Federal Aviation Agency to restrict operations at Washington National, AOPA told Horsky.

The current controversy over use of the Bolling-Anacostia property flared recently when U.S. Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee added an amendment to the Military Construction Bill, permitting the Department of Defense to lease all or part of the land to the FAA for a period of not more than five years. The purpose of the amendmet was to allow FAA to use Bolling-Anacostia as a general aviation airport to help relieve overcongested conditions at Washington National Airport, directly across the Potomac River.

"This would permit the FAA to establish a general aviation landing facility as an interim measure to relieve the runway pressure at Washington National until such time as a permanent solution to that problem can be worked out," AOPA told Horsky. "The five-year period called for in the Rivers amendment would provide ample time for completion and analysis of all studies and proposals for ultimate disposition of this land," it added.

"We solicit your support for the program for general aviation use of a part of the Anacostia Naval Station, which would retain its use as a limited military air facility at at present," AOPA told Horsky. "This program could be implemented so as to meet the needs of all parties having a legitimate interest in the ultimate use of the Bolling-Anacostia area."

The Association noted that general aviation aircraft carried about 39 million passengers last year as compared to 77 million carried by commerical airlines. As the Nation's capital, Washington is the terminal for a significant number of those general aviation operations. The need for additional close-in airport facilities is therefore vital, AOPA said.

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND
PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.

Mr. CHARLES A. HORSKY,
Advisor to the President on National Capital Affairs, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORSKY: This letter concerns the present controversy regarding the future use of the Bolling Field-Anacostia Naval Air Station land area. The central issue is whether the airport facilities on this land may be used for a general aviation airport.

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, representing more than 130,000 members who own and fly airplanes for business and pleasure, has urged the FAA Administrator and the Congress to take action to utilize a part of the existing runway and airfield facilities to establish a general aviation airport. A copy of our testimony before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics in 1965 is enclosed. At that time, we were directing our efforts at Bolling Field. However, some construction has started on a runway there, so the present effort is being directed at the Anacostia facility, which still is operating as a limited air facility to handle the military helicopters that serve the White House.

The need for additional close-in airport facilities for general aviation is emphasized by the notice issued by the FAA on August 2, 1966, proposing to restrict general aviation operations at Washington National Airport. General aviation includes all non-airline civil flying and encompasses the private and corporation aircraft used to bring to Washington so many businessmen, state and local government officials and other citizens who have business in the city. General aviation is used extensively for transportation of people who contribute to all facets of our community and national welfare. They are involved in a broad range of cultural, economic, business and political interests which are vitally important to Washington community life. As an example, the general aviation aircraft facilities at Washington National become overwhelmed on the occasions when the President calls in major business leaders for discussions at the White House. There is no other close-in airport that can provide the service required by these important people.

It should be noted that FAA statistics reveal that general aviation carried 39 million persons in 1965, as compared to the 77 million carried by the scheduled airlines. As the nation's capital, Washington is the terminal for a significant number of these general aviation operations. The need for additional close-in landing facilities here is therefore vital. While Bolling and Anacostia are not suitable for the operation of modern military tactical aircraft, the lighter and more maneuverable general aviation airplanes can be accommodated safety with controlled traffic patterns to insure against conflict with aircraft at National and Andrews. Further, general aviation aircraft do not create the noise problems associated with the heavier airline jets and propeller aircraft.

I believe that most of us close to the situation are aware of the status of land ownership and the studies that are being made for possible future use of this land by both the Department of Defense and for public housing. The fact remains that the land still is owned by the military establishment and they have not declared it surplus to their needs. To the contrary, they appear to have plans for its continuing use as a military establishment.

The amendment sponsored by Congressman **Mendel Rivers** would continue an existing provision of law which forbids the Department of Defense from declaring this land surplus but modifies this prohibition to permit the Department to lease all or part of the airport facilities on this land to the FAA for a period not exceeding five years and subject to a one-year revocation provision. This would permit the FAA to establish a general aviation landing facilitiy as an interim measure to relieve the runway pressure at Washington National Airport until such time as a permanent solution to that problem can be worked out.

You may note from our Congressional testimony that, speaking of Bolling Field, we indicated that only a limited portion of the land would be required for a general aviation facility and that the remainder could be used for other purposes. The same situation applies to the present contemplated use of Anacostia. A general aviation facility probably would use only one of the runways, plus the necessary ramp and service buildings adjacent thereto. This probably would amount to less than 100 acress out of the total of 940 in the Bolling-Anacostia complex, and would not preclude use of the remaining acreage for other purposes. Any decision to use the total land for other purposes could be implemented on a progressive basis, first utilizing the more than 800 acres not required for an airport facility.

The five-year period called for in the Rivers amendment would provide ample time for completion and analysis of all studies and proposals for ultimate disposition of this land. Considering the history of the Southwest redevelopment program, this period is not too long. While speaking of the Southwest redevelopment program, we seem to recall that it too was designed to provide modern housing in place of the substandard structures that were torn down as a slum clearance project.

Our recommendation with regard to the use of a runway at Bolling-Anacostia is one of ten recommendations that we have made to the FAA in a constructive effort to help provide the City of Washington and the metropolitan area with fast and convenient air transportation. The enclosed material gives complete details of our recommendations.

We solicit your support of our proposed program for general aviation use of a part of the Anacostia Naval Air Station, which would also retain its use as a limited military air facility as at present, and which could be implemented so as to meet the objectives of all parties having a legitimate interest in the ultimate use of the Bolling-Anacostia land area.

Sincerely,

J. B. Hartranft,
President.

Statement of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association on H.R. 699, H.R. 2249, H.R. 4530 (Bolling Field)

(Presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, U.S. House of Representatives)

ADDENDUM TO AOPA STATEMENT ON BOLLING FIELD

Page 2—Insert prior to last sentence at bottom of page, "In his testimony on April 27, Mr. Thomas of the FAA indicated that the tentative plan to expand the existing Washington National Airport contemplates addition of a parallel runway to the east or outboard of Runway 18–36. This would require additional fill in the Potomac River and would place traffic using the new runway closer to any construction or other activity on the Bolling-Anacostia site. It also would cause a greater conflict with the prohibited area, requiring much tighter turns for aircraft using this runway."

Page 3—Insert at the end of the first paragraph, "Mr. Chairman, we have provided the Clerk of the Committee with copies of the November 1964 issue of the PILOT magazine, which contains an informative article on Bolling Field. This material has been provided for the information of your Committee, but is not included as a part of our testimony."

Page 5—Insert at the end of the first complete sentence (ending on line 6), "Previous testimony has indicated that general aviation traffic using Bolling Field would conflict with military traffic at Andrews Field. It should be noted that the traffic patterns previously used when Bolling Field was in operation extended approximately 2½ miles to the east of Washington National Airport and remained 2½ miles within the 5-mile radius traffic area surrounding Washington National. The Bolling pattern thus was approximately 7½ miles from Andrews Field and 2½ miles outside of the 5-mile radius traffic area of Andrews. This is adequate separation."

STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Victor J. Kayne. I am Director of the Office of Policy Coordination of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA). A resume of the nature of AOPA is presented for your information in Annex A to printed copies of our statement.

We greatly appreciate the interest shown by members of the Congress with regard to providing adequate facilities for general aviation, as evidenced by these hearings on Bills H.R. 699, 2249 and 4530 for the use of Bolling Field as a general aviation airport for the Washington metropolitan area. We are grateful too for this opportunity to present the views of our Association, representing over 110,000 members who make extensive use of aircraft for personal and business purposes.

My personal qualifications to speak on this subject are detailed in Annex B to the printed copies of this statement. To briefly summarize them, I was Chief of the old Washington Airport control tower and later Chief of the Washington National control tower. I spent some twelve years in the CAA, forerunner to the FAA, and was Assistant Chief of the U.S. air traffic control system at the time of leaving Government service for private employment in 1954. My active participation and association with control of air traffic in the airspace encompassing Bolling Field, Washington National Airport and its predecessor airport extends back to 1935. I have flown airplanes from both Bolling Field and Washington National Airport.

The problem

Washington, as the Nation's capital, attracts a large number of industry and political leaders, who come to Washington to do business with the Congress and with the various Government agencies, including those in the military establishment. Much of this travel to Washington is done in general aviation aircraft. As an example, a White House conference with top level business leaders from across the nation will invariably result in massive congestion of the general aviation parking ramps at Washington National Airport. Washington has a number of small general aviation airports around its periphery, but these are located some distance from the heart of the city and they do not offer adequate services for the type of traffic in question. Only Washington National is located sufficiently close to the Capitol and other Government offices and has the services and facilities needed to adequately care for the quality and type of general aviation aircraft that are used by our nation's business leaders.

The volume of general aviation traffic at Washington National increased from 23,890 operations in 1953 to 75,126 in 1963. Air carrier operations during the same period went from 164,121 to 210,714, representing an increase of 28% as compared to a 214% increase for general aviation.

This tremendous increase in general aviation traffic has resulted in congestion of the very limited ramps and aircraft parking facilities allotted to non-airline traffic. During periods such as the Presidential Inaugural, general aviation aircraft bringing important participants to Washington were permitted to unload and then were shunted to Baltimore or Dulles for parking and servicing because there simply was no place to park them on Washington National. While the lack of facilities is an inconvenience to the operators of these aircraft, the growing amount of general aviation traffic also has its impact on the scheduled airline service into and out of this airport. It is not unusual to see a dozen or more airline and general aviation aircraft intermingled and waiting patiently for their turn to takeoff. The same is true in the air where a corporation Convair is accorded the same "first-come first-served" treatment as an airline Convair. All must use the same set of runways and taxiways simply because there is no other adequate facility for those who might be able to land elsewhere. The net result is delay to many flights, including those of the scheduled airlines.

There has been some talk of a tentative plan within the FAA to expand Washington National by the addition of a dual runaway so as to alleviate these delays. We understand that this plan calls for demolishing the present terminal building and the construction of a new terminal on the hill west of the present terminal. This necessarily would be a long range plan that would entail tremendous cost and untold disruption of normal operations, which ill can be afforded. Meanwhile, the airport will continue to become more congested with general aviation traffic with every passing month.

The proposal

The Bills introduced by Representatives **Williams**, **Udall** and **Clausen**, and now under consideration by this Committee make a proposal that would provide almost immediate relief for the overtaxed and inadequate general aviation facilities at Washington National. Further, a continued healthy and safe growth of both general aviation and airline traffic into the metropolitan area would be assured for some years to come. The costs and other penalties of trying to expand the existing Washington National

Airport through demolishing the terminal building to make room for another runway must be weighed against the use of a runway and other facilities that currently are laying dormant at Bolling Field.

We noted with interest a statement by Mr. Halaby last September that some 30,000 people might be housed on the Bolling/Anacostia complex if the land was used for housing purposes. We all know of the noise problems of communities adjacent to airports and we should have long ago learned our lesson that we simply do not plan residential housing as close to an airport as this land is to the traffic patterns for Washington National. Moreover, residential use would be counter to the long-standing FAA policy most recently restated in "Policy Statement of the Federal Aviation Agency, April 1965", that the use of land adjacent to airports should be compatible with airport use. Keeping people away from noise—and hence airports—is one of the FAA's approved methods. Further, apartment houses or other relatively high rise buildings would offer an increased degree of fixed and uncontrollable hazard for those aircraft using Washington National. On the other hand, air traffic using the Bolling site would be controllable and the hazard of collision with tall buildings would not be present.

The residential areas currently adjacent to the Bolling site were subjected to the noise of military operations for many years and are somewhat conditioned to the flight of aircraft nearby. Of course, the average general aviation aircraft would not produce anywhere near the amount of noise that his military predecessor did when Bolling and Anacostia were active military bases.

Before we leave this point, we may wish to consider that retention of Bolling as a general aviation airport also would retain it for possible future military use in event of a national emergency or other situation calling for a landing facility in close proximity to our seat of Government.

The use of Bolling Field for general aviation traffic would drain off a significant number of the operations now conducted at Washington National. Not all would leave, since those with connecting airline passengers still would have to use it, as would those whose business was closer to National than to Bolling.

We visualize the use of Bolling as essentially a VFR airport, with most traffic arriving and departing under relatively good weather conditions. Only six percent of the arriving general aviation traffic currently using Washington National make instrument approaches. These could continue to be accommodated at Washington National during instrument weather conditions, although even some of this traffic could land at Bolling during times when the weather was borderline. The Air Force weather minimums for Bolling prior to its closing were a ceiling of 600 feet and one mile visibility for a straight-in landing to runway 2 (from the south), and 800 feet and one mile for a circling approach. Essentially the same minimums would work nicely for general aviation traffic, especially since these aircraft are generally more maneuverable and have greater flexibility of control at approach speeds.

Some concern has been expressed regarding the traffic patterns and control of air traffic using Washington National and Bolling Field under this proposal. There is attached as Annex C to the printed copies of this statement a reprint of the Rules of the (FAA) Administrator, Part 619.1, "Washington National Airport Special Traffic Rules". This reprint, courtesy of the Jeppesen Co., also shows the traffic patterns in use in the area of Washington National, Anacostia Naval Air Station and Bolling Field at the time that all three were operating. The separation of traffic between Bolling and Washington National revolves around a quite simple division of the airspace, namely that of Bolling traffic staying on the east side of the Potomac River and Washington National traffic using the west side of the river. It is significant to note that the FAA traffic statistics for Washington National show that it reached its peak year in 1960 with a total of 316,597 operations. It declined to 288,289 in 1962, the year that Bolling was closed, went up slightly to 294,181 in 1963 and declined again in 1964 to 290,640. This is some 26,000 operations below the 1960 peak. If Bolling and Anacostia could be operated along with Washington National under the peak conditions of 1960, then a single runway facility at the Bolling site serving the more flexible general aviation aircraft certainly should pose no great air traffic control problem.

The Air Force provided a control tower at Bolling Field during its operation. This tower was under the "master" control of Washington National and normally provided for the control of visual flight rules traffic. The control tower at Washington National provided radar service and control of instrument operations. Because of the distance from the Washington tower cab to the far reaches of the Bolling traffic pattern, we believe that a simple satellite control tower at Bolling would be required for the proposed general aviation operation. This facility also would provide control of aircraft on the ground at Bolling, but would be under the general supervision of the Washington National tower with regard to coordination of traffic in the area surrounding the two airports. A control tower structure currently exists at Bolling, thus reducing the requirement to a minimum staffing of personnel and the rather simple radio equipment needed for this type of control tower. A direct interphone line between the two towers formerly was used for fast coordination of traffic, and this line would merely need to be reestablished to serve the new facility.

The Federal Aviation Regulations require radio control of all traffic operating into and out of an airport with a Federal control tower. Thus, there would be no uncontrolled operations at the general aviation airport. All traffic would be under control and would be required to adhere to traffic patterns similar to those shown in Annex C hereto.

Recommendation

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association recommends favorable consideration of the proposal for the establishment of a general aviation facility at the Bolling Field site as set forth in the Bills before this Committee hearing. We believe that the reactivation of Bolling Field for general aviation purposes is in the national interest in that it will reduce delays to all civil air traffic destined for the close-in metropolitan area (including the scheduled carriers); it will enhance safety through the elimination of the now required split-second timing between arrivals and departures at Washington National; it will provide for a greater flow of air traffic and passengers into the area with improved convenience; it will extend the useful life of the present Washington National Airport without costly modifications; and it will preserve the Bolling Field site as an airport available for immediate use to serve downtown Washington and the various Government offices in time of disaster or national emergency.

In connection with this latter point, we see no reason why non-tactical military aircraft types that are similar to general aviation aircraft should not also use the revitalized Bolling Field to speed the transportation of key military personnel to Capitol Hill and the surrounding area. The present military helicopter operation at Anacostia Naval Air Station also could be transferred to Bolling, thus releasing that area for other uses.

It is believed that the general aviation facility would require only that land and the facilities west of the present hangar and operations line at Bolling. The land, buildings and facilities to the east of the hangar line, including the Officers Club, could be retained for military or other appropriate use.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes our prepared statement. We wish to express our appreciation to you and to the other members of the Committee for your courtesy in hearing our views on this subject.

ANNEX A.—AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association is an organization which provides services to more than 110,000 members located in every state in the Union. It is a non-profit association incorporated under the laws of New Jersey.

Purpose: It was formed 26 years ago to promote, protect and represent the interest of its members in aeronautics and the pursuit of flying; to promote economy, safety, popularity and use of aircraft by members. To accomplish these purposes, we seek several specific objectives: maximum freedom of the airspace for all users consistent with safety, improved aviation safety, an adequate airport system, an adequate system of air navigation aids, production of improved aircraft, reduction of frustrations in aircraft ownership and use, facilitation of international travel by private aircraft and wider public support of general aviation requirements.

Membership: Half of the active general aviation aircraft in the United States are owned and operated by our members. Our 110,000 members comprise about 30% of all the active civil pilots in the entire country. 63% of our members hold private certificates, 24% hold commercial certificates, 2% hold airline transport ratings, 8% hold student certificates and the balance are pilots in military service. AOPA is not a profession or trade association in the commonly accepted sense of those terms. The majority of our members are non-professional pilots and therefore do not join for the usual professional or commercial reasons characteristic of unions or business trade associations. AOPA is a service organization more analogous to the American Automobile Association or the National Rifle Association.

AOPA Staff: To serve our members, who fly for business, personal and recreational purposes, we have assembled a full-time staff of 100 people. Our professional staff is composed of specialists who are acknowledged experts in their respective fields. We cover virtually every field of significant interest to the owner or pilot of a non-commercial aircraft. Many of these fields are also of interest to commercial operators. Our headquarters is located in Bethesda, Maryland.

Method of Policy Formulation: You will recognize the inherent problem in policy formulation in an organization with so large a membership. It is not unlike our own problems in representing your constituents on specific issues. Like you, we pay very close attention to the substance and volume of mail from our members, as well as our personal contacts with members throughout the country. AOPA policy is formulated, in the light of extensive member comment, by the professional staff members, who combine their knowledge, background and understanding of aviation problems. Our rapid growth in 26 years from zero to 110,000 members, is practical testimony to the success of this method and the accuracy with which our staff reflects member desires—for our support depends upon voluntary membership.

NATIONAL PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1966.
Hon. MENDEL RIVERS,
*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. RIVERS: In view of the current controversy over the future use of the Anacostia/Bolling Field acreage, may we express to you the support of the National Pilots Association for your efforts to use these existing runways to relieve air traffic congestion at Washington National Airport. We believe that this is the most economical and efficient way to provide safe transportation facilities for the 8½ million people that use Washington National.

We are very much concerned over the proposal to use Anacostia/Bolling for mass housing purposes. There is no more agonizing or baffling problem facing city development than the control of airport noise. To deliberately place housing developments next door to a very busy airport is not only unwise but will lead to severe public reaction in the future. Anacostia/Bolling is not only too close to National Airport, but being separated by an expanse of water, over which sound travels most easily, makes the problem of noise control even more difficult. It is possible that proponents of the housing development foresee the closing of National Airport as the only solution to the problem they have created. Should this be done, it would sacrifice the benefits this convenient airport offers to the entire community, including the 8½ million people who use it, for the benefit of the 3 or 4 thousand families that might live in the new housing development.

You have our support in your efforts to help the Federal Aviation Agency solve the problems of overcrowding at the Washington National Airport.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID H. SCOTT,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following statement in connection with the proposed utilization of the Bolling-Anacostia complex for public housing purposes. On the Archives Building in Washington there is engraved a statement, "What is past is prologue." I think the following history of the redevelopment of the Southwest Washington area is a prolog to what would happen if the Bolling-Anacostia complex were used for public housing. It also makes clear the reasons for the adverse publicity that the House Armed Services Committee has received for desiring to retain the Bolling-Anacostia complex in the military inventory. Let us look at a bit of that history.

The Redevelopment Act of 1945 was enacted by Congress for the purpose of eliminating substandard housing conditions in the District of Columbia through the use of condemnation powers in such areas for the assembly of land to make it available for the development of low-rent housing. The Redevelopment Land Agency was established to execute project plans which were developed to carry out the urban renewal program in the District of Columbia.

By 1952, urban renewal was actively underway in the District of Columbia. In Southwest Washington, approximately 5,000 dwelling units were to be demolished under this program in an area of nearly 600 acres. During the 10-year period from 1952 to 1962, and after an expenditure of more than $100 million, not a single low-rent housing unit was constructed by any private developer in Southwest Washington to provide housing for any of the persons displaced from low-rent or substandard housing in Southwest Washington. During this period, the National Capital Housing Authority built some public housing units in Southwest Washington as well as in other areas of the District of Columbia.

Essentially all of the urban renewal areas in Southwest Washington were developed by preferred private developers for luxury-type, high-rise apartments, townhouses, and commercial facilities. Within that same period of years, the District of Columbia developed a backlog shortage of 2,000 units of low-rent housing and 8,000 units of public housing.

In southwest area B, the original project plans called for one-third of the units to be constructed for low-rent occupancy at a rental rate of $17 per room per month. The land was disposed of to the preferred developers under appraisals not made according to the requirements of the Redevelopment Act and land was disposed of for as low as $0.92 per square foot. After land prices had been set and contracts for disposition completed, at the same time the National Capital Housing Authority was paying as much as $3.45 a square foot for land in the area. After the redevelopers had acquired the land, plan changes began to filter through the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia eliminating entirely the low-rental units from the project area and ultimately more than doubling the number of dwelling units which were permitted under the original plan. The result was that the redeveloper had the benefit of land purchased on the basis of residual appraisals for low-rent housing which was developed into luxury housing at more than double the density. The average rental per room of the housing in the project area is presently more than $50 per room.

The critics of the proposal to reserve Bolling-Anacostia Air Force Base, namely, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commissioners, the Washington Housing and Planning Association, and other groups, were utterly silent on the question of low-rent housing and, in fact, supported the very changes that eliminated low-rent housing from the urban renewal program. By their own actions, they developed the very backlog of housing shortages which now exist.

The planning agencies and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia continued to bait the public with repeated promises to build low-rent housing in urban renewal areas or with promises that such housing would be developed in future urban renewal programs. There is no more reason to believe these agencies will use this area for low-rent housing than was the case in the original urban renewal undertakings in Southwest Washington.

The Redevelopment Land Agency and the District Government have failed in their obligations under the Redevelopment Act to provide safe, sanitary, and decent housing as a part of any project in Southwest Washington and by doing so they multiply the reasons and excuses for taking over additional land areas to meet the housing shortage problem.

The General Accounting Office in its study shows the failure of these agencies in their relocation of displaced persons and exposed the fact that the Agency illegally received millions of dollars in payments. Additionally, the Agency has been the beneficiary of millions of square feet of federally owned land in public streets and alleys which have been made parts of project areas and much of it sold to redevelopers without competition at extremely low prices.

Hearings before the House District Committee investigating the urban renewal program disclosed that a private secretary of one redeveloper on the basis of a $100 investment stood to gain a profit of $127,000 within 3 years. In another instance, an investment of $75 showed a potential return to an employee of a redeveloper of in excess of $2 million during the life of the mortgage term.

When the Planning Commission, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and other groups who support urban renewal on the ground that low-rent housing is necessary begin to give more lipservice and support a program which is for the benefit of the public and not of chosen redevelopers, their pleas may have some merit. As long as this program is operated for the benefit of selected private developers who are permitted to make windfall profits through changes in plans, through special land appraisals, and without any semblance of competition, the needs of low-rent housing units in the District of Columbia will never be met and placing additional land areas at the disposal of these agencies of the city will never accomplish the purpose.

The Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the District of Columbia, have proceeded without legal authority and secured Federal funds for expenditures on planning for lands which were titled in the Federal Government and were not subject to their jurisdiction and control and they now come before us and plead that they have spent the money and, therefore, they should be permitted to have the land. This is a completely unjustifiable basis for urging that Anacostia-Bolling Air Force Base be turned over to these agencies for a housing development.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute amendment printed in the bill as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparations, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

United States Continental Army Command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Troop housing, $7,117,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Training facilities, $1,914,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $957,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, and utilities, $2,536,000.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $15,747,000.

(Third Army)

Armed Forces Examining Entrance Station, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, $235,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, $355,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Troop housing, $12,630,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Training facilities, and utilities, $4,072,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, $318,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,636,000.

Fort Chaffee, Arkansas: Utilities, $225,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Training facilities, and utilities, $1,871,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Training facilities, $861,000.

Fort Wolters, Texas: Training facilities, $1,026,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing, $3,100,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Ord, California: Training facilities, $596,000.

United States Army Materiel Command

Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia: Utilities, $237,000.

Charleston Army Depot, South Carolina: Utilities, $200,000.

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $3,293,000.

Frankford Arsenal, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, $249,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, $193,000.

Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, $109,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, $620,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Research, development, and test facilities, $600,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,246,000.

Sacramento Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $31,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $367,000.

Tooele Army Depot, Utah: Supply facilities, $457,000.

Watervliet Arsenal, New York: Research, development, and test facilities, $955,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,336,000.

United States Army Security Agency

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Operational facilities, $145,000.

United States Army Strategic Communications Command

Fort Lewis, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $916,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Utilities, $791,000.

United States Army Alaska

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,814,000.

Fort J. M. Wainwright, Alaska: Operational facilities, and utilities, $912,000.

Outside the United States

United States Army Pacific

Okinawa: Utilities, $619,000.

United States Army Forces, Southern Command

Panama Canal Zone: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,011,000.

United States Army Materiel Command

Kwajalein Atoll: Research, development, and test facilities, $31,333,000.

United States Army Security Agency

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housng and community facilities, and utilities, $1,970,000.

United States Army Strategic Communications Command

Various locations: Operational facilities, $208,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $43,000,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1967, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows: (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to "Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama", strike out "$2,015,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,881,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502, the amounts "$119,330,000" and "$296,809,000" and inserting in place thereof "$120,196,000" and "$297,675,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 87–554, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows: (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to "Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania", strike out "$411,000" and insert in place thereof "$466,000".

(b) Public Law 87–554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$102,315,000" and "$150,824,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,370,000" and "$150,879,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)", with respect to "Fort Belvoir, Virginia", strike out "$1,083,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,213,000".

(2) With respect to "section 102", strike out "$8,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$9,112,000".

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$155,696,000", "$8,900,000", and "$200,353,000" and inserting in place thereof "$155,826,000", "$9,112,000", and "$200,695,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)", with respect to "Fort Belvoir, Virginia", strike out "$3,564,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,113,000".

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)", with respect to "Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania", strike out "$5,244,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,808,000".

(3) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)", with respect to "Fort Knox, Kentucky", strike out "$7,778,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,566,000".

(4) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)", with respect to "Fort Benning, Georgia", strike out "$5,452,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,483,000".

(5) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Fifth Army)", with respect to "Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana", strike out "$1,652,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,836,000".

(6) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Sixth Army)", with respect to "Presidio of San Francisco, California", strike out "$283,000" and insert in place thereof "$349,000".

(7) Under the subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMAND (Alaska Command Area)," with respect to "Fort Richardson, Alaska", strike out "$767,000" and insert in place thereof "$882,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "$249,697,000" and "$300,758,000", and inserting "$252,994,000" and "$304,055,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 89–188 is amended under heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, LESS ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND (First Army)", with respect to "Fort Devens, Massachusetts", strike out "$11,008,000" and insert in place thereof "$11,964,000".

(2) Under the subheading "ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to "Jefferson Proving Ground, Indiana", strike out "$52,000" and insert in place thereof "$71,000".

(3) Under the subheading "ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to "Sharpe Army Depot, California", strike out "$175,000" and insert in place thereof "$261,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "$252,661,000" and "$309,522,000", and inserting "$253,722,000" and "$310,583,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Naval Ship Systems Command

(Naval shipyards)

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $11,397,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,928,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $535,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $186,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,628,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $940,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,368,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and utilities, $295,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Maintenance facilities at Hunters Point and on Mare Island, $2,782,000.

(Research, development, test, and evaluation stations)

Navy Marine Engineering Laboratory, Annapolis, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $600,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,124,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Brooklyn, New York: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,700,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach California: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,658,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $2,377,000.

Headquarters Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $500,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $1,124,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $719,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $1,346,000.

Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, $1,353,000.

Naval Air Systems Command

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $93,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, and troop housing, $3,882,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Real estate, $377,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Utilities, $44,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Troop housing, $800,000.

(Field support stations)

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,440,000.

Naval Air Station, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,100,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $619,000

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,706,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $69,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $251,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Troop housing, $280,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $2,512,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Troop housing, $1,920,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,466,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and ground improvements, $1,816,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Medical facilities, $1,674,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Supply facilities, $491,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $572,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Troop housing, $486,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational facilities, $406,000.

(Research, development, test, and evaluation stations)

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $198,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $743,000.

Naval Aerospace Recovery Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $430,000.

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $691,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $283,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Research, development, and test facilities on San Nicolas Islands, $343,000.

Naval Ordnance Systems Command

(Fleet readiness stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Operational facilities, $189,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $260,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Production facilities, $97,000.

Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $1,274,000.

(Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Stations)

Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities and ground improvements, $86,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,847,000.

Naval Supply Systems Command

Naval Oceanographic Distribution Office, Ogden, Utah: Administrative facilities, $236,000.

Naval Supply Center, Puget Sound, Washington: Administrative facilities; and at the Seattle Annex, administrative facilities and community facilities, $940,000.

Navy Fuel Depot, San Pedro, California: Supply facilities, $111,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,166,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Real estate, $168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $781,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $1,042,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $2,803,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Training facilities, $2,128,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, $24,000.

Fleet Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, $167,000.

Naval Training Center, location to be determined: Training facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $14,900,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Facility, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $452,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, and utilities, $5,727,000.

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California: Training facilities, $44,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Massachusetts: Hospital and medical facilities, $9,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tennessee: Hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $6,847,000.

Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut: Hospital and medical facilities, $4,957,000.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Community facilities, $48,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, $1,197,000.

Naval Radio Station, Northwest, Virginia: Utilities, $132,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $1,057,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska: Research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities and utilities, $3,000,000.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $66,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Ground improvements, $100,000.

Outside the United States

Naval Ship Systems Command

Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center, West Indies: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,371,000.

Naval Air Systems Command

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $159,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Troop housing, $530,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $2,333,000.

Naval Air Station, Keflavik, Iceland: Operational facilities, $203,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naples, Italy: Operational facilities, $37,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Troop housing, $1,142,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,056,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Hospital, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Supply facilities, and medical facilities, $279,000.

Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $3,970,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri, Greece: Troop housing and community facilities, $363,000.

Naval Communications Station, North West Cape, Australia: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $708,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Troop housing, $476,000.

Naval Radio Station, Totsuka, Japan: Operational facilities, $576,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $715,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $13,788,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1967, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Naval Weapons Facilities (Field Support Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, and the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, by striking out "$150,000" and "$3,242,000", respectively, and inserting in place thereof "$182,000" and "$3,640,000", respectively.

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "$115,601,000" and "$202,500,000", and inserting in place thereof "$116,031,000" and "$202,930,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 89–188 is amended in section 201 under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Bureau of Ships Facilities", with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts, by striking out "$5,105,000" and inserting in place thereof "$7,998,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "$225,877,000" and "$311,412,000", and inserting in place thereof "$228,770,000" and "$314,305,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects.

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Troop housing, $260,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Utilities, $422,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $528,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $3,797,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $61,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, $53,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Operational facilities and utilities, $154,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $1,280,000.

Air Force Logistics Command

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Research, development, and test facilities, $225,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,504,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, administrative facilities and utilities, $450,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,281,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $154,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,615,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,100,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, $2,835,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,366,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $6,277,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Airfield Number 9, Valparaiso, Florida: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $705,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research development, and test facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $4,575,000.

Los Angeles Air Force Station, Los Angeles, California: Administrative facilities, $195,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $484,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,192,000.

Air Training Command

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities and utilities, $586,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, $226,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $220,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $675,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities and utilities, $2,615,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities and troop housing, $2,359,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $225,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $236,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $546,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,935,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,169,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $226,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $331,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,655,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,265,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,200,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,033,000.

Military Airlift Command

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $212,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, $1,920,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $7,706,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational facilities, $514,000.

Pacific Air Force

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Supply facilities, $193,000.

Strategic Air Command

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,263,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, $106,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,231,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $2,203,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Training facilities and utilities, $494,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $591,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Maintenance facilities, $397,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $941,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $361,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $3,240,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $199,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Troop housing, $440,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Administrative facilities and utilities, $762,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $622,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Troop housing and utilities, $350,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities and troop housing, $358,000.

Tactical Air Command

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,580,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and real estate, $2,147,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,187,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Training facilities and administrative facilities, $598,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Utilities, $468,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, $203,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $1,006,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Training facilities and real estate, $609,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $371,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,165,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $473,000.

United States Air Force Academy

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Troop housing and utilities, $10,758,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $3,713,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Community facilities, $493,000.

Outside the United States

Air Defense Command

Various locations: Operational facilities, $238,000.

Military Airlift Command

Various locations: Utilities, $396,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,189,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, $22,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Real estate, $63,000.

Various locations: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $1,303,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,513,000.

United States Air Force Southern Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,244,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and utilities, $1,123,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $95,447,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1967, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 87–554, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Tactical Air Command", with respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, by striking out "$3,136,000" and inserting in place thereof "$3,416,000".

(b) Public Law 87–554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 the amounts "$131,679,000" and "$743,407,000" and inserting in place thereof "$131,959,000" and "$743,687,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 88–390 is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, by striking out "$687,000" and inserting in place thereof "$786,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 the amounts "$165,228,000" and "$303,348,000" and inserting in place thereof "$165,327,000" and "$303,447,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, construction, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,890,000.

Defense Communications Agency

Headquarters, Defense Communications Agency, Building 12, Navy Department Service Center, Arlington, Virginia; Utilities, $290,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Supply facilities, $59,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Supply facilities. $171,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $257,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy, California: Supply facilities, $50,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $428,000.

National Security Agency

Fort Meade, Maryland: Troop housing, $550,000.

Kent Island, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $30,000.

Outside the United States

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Johnston Island: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,750,000.

National Security Agency

Frankfurt Post, Tanus District, Germany: Operational facilities, $400,000.

TITLE V

Military Family Housing

SEC. 501. The first sentence of section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 352), as amended, is amended by striking out "1966 through and including 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "1967 and 1968".

SEC. 502. Section 1594j of title 42, United States Code, is amended at subsection (a) by deleting the period at the end thereof, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding the fair rental value of such quarters, or of any other housing facilities under the jurisdiction of a department or agency of the United States, no rental charge for occupancy of family units designated as other than public quarters shall be made against the basic allowance for quarters of a member of a uniformed service in excess of 75 per centum of such allowance, except that in no event shall the net rental value charged to the member's basic allowance for quarters be less than the costs of maintaining and operating the housing."

SEC. 503. Section 406(a) of the Act of August 30, 1957, 71 Stat. 556 (Public Law 85–241), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities, unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 1594a of title 42, United States Code; (2) rental guarantee family housing authorized under section 507 of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307, 326) as amended by section 505 of the Act of September 16, 1965 (79 Stat. 793, 814): *Provided,* That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall not exceed such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units; and (3) housing units leased for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 2675 of title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 504. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense or his designee as authorized by law for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed $510,236,000.

TITLE VI

General Provisions

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $72,667,000; Outside the United States, $36,141,000; section 102, $43,000,000; or a total of $151,808,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $126,398,000; Outside the United States, $13,918,000; section 202, $13,788,000; or a total of $154,104,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $107,889,000; Outside the United States, $14,091,000; section 302, $95,447,000; or a total of $217,427,000.

(4) for title IV: a total of $5,875,000.

(5) for title V: Military Family Housing, a total of $510,236,000.

Sec. 603. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

Sec. 604. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

Sec. 605. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. Regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense implementing the provisions of this section shall provide the department or agency requiring such construction with the right to select either the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, as its construction agent, providing that under the facts and circumstances that exist at the time of the selection of the construction agent, such selection will not result in any increased cost to the United States. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 606. (a) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 606 of the Act of September 16, 1965, Public Law 89–188 (79 Stat. 815), all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing), contained in the Act of August 1, 1964, Public Law 88–390 (78 Stat. 363), and all such authorizations contained in the Act of September 16, 1965, Public Law 89–188, including prior authorizations extended by section 606(a)(3) of said Act of September 16, 1965, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, and not superseded or otherwise modified, are hereby authorized, and shall remain in full force and effect until October 1, 1968.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of September 16, 1965, Public Law 89–188 (79 Stat. 815), effective October 1, 1968, all authorizations for construction of family housing which are contained in this Act or the Act of September 16, 1965, Public Law 89–188, including prior authorizations for construction of family housing saved from repeal by the provisions of section 606(b) of such Act of September 16, 1965, are repealed except the authorization for family housing projects as to which funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date.

Sec. 607. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the military public works authorized by title I, II, III, or IV, of this Act may be placed under contract until such time as those military public works previously authorized by law, and for which funds have been appropriated and for which the authorization has been extended by section 606 of this Act, have been placed under contract. The foregoing provision shall not apply to military public works previously authorized by law which have heretofore been deferred and which are certified by the Secretary of Defense to be no longer current and necessary to the mission of the military department or military installation concerned. Certifications by the Secretary of Defense under this section shall be made in writing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any military public work authorized by title I, II, III, or IV of this Act may be placed under contract if the Secretary of Defense determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that such project is (1) urgently required in the interests of national defense, and (2) more essential to the interests of national defense than those military public works previously authorized by law, described in the first sentence of this section.

Sec. 608. The last sentence of section 2674 (a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended, is amended by changing the figure "$15,000" to "$25,000".

Sec. 609. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

Sec. 610. (a) On and after the date of enactment of this Act all construction authorized in annual military construction authorization Acts shall be designed using techniques developed by the Office of Civil Defense to maximize fallout protection, where such can be done without impairing the purpose for which the construction is authorized or the effectiveness of the structure, unless exempted from this requirement under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall make appropriate provision for the utilization of technical design and construction methods in the preparation of design and construction plans and in construction under this Act, to assure carrying out the purposes of this section; and for such purposes expenditures on individual projects shall not exceed one per centum of the amount authorized for that project.

Sec. 611. Section 607(b) of Public Law 89–188 is amended by deleting the words "July 1, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1972" and adding at the end thereof "nor shall any of this land be set aside or committed by the Department of Defense for use by any other agency of the Federal Government other than the Department of Defense. However, the Department of Defense may enter into a leasing arrangement with the Federal Aviation Agency for a period not to exceed five years and subject to a one-year revocation provision whereby the Federal Aviation Agency or its designee may operate the runways, taxiways, hangars, parking aprons, and other related facilities at the Bolling-Anacostia complex for appropriate aviation purposes. The said lease shall not include facilities which are required for military activities. Such leasing arrangements shall be reported to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Sec. 612. In the case of any public works project for which advance planning, construction design and architectural services are estimated to cost $50,000 or more, which are to be funded from moneys hereafter appropriated for such purposes pursuant to authority of section 723 of title 31, U.S.C., the Secretary of Defense shall describe the project and report the estimated cost of such services not less than 30 days prior to initial obligation of funds therefor to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Sec. 613. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no building to be constructed with Federal funds for the purpose of substantial occupancy by personnel of the Department of Defense, other than buildings constructed pursuant to statutory authority otherwise specifically granted to the Department of Defense, shall hereafter be commenced until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts thereof is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Sec. 614. Section 611 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 818), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No camp, post, station, base, yard, or other installation under the authority of the Department of Defense shall be closed or abandoned until the expiration of thirty days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department makes a full report of the facts including the justification for such proposed action to the Congress.

"(b) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but in the computation of the thirty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

"(c) This section shall apply only to posts, camps, stations, bases, yards, or other installations that are located in the United States and Puerto Rico and have a total military and civilian complement of more than two hundred and fifty. It shall not apply to any facility used primarily for river and harbor projects or flood control projects."

Sec. 615. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1967".

TITLE VII

Reserve Forces Facilities

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $5,000,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $8,900,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $3,300,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1967".

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (interrupting the reading). I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sikes: On page 87, line 10, strike out all of lines 10 and 11, and insert:

"(3) $3,450 per man for permanent barracks;

"(4) $10,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;".

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Sikes was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been cleared with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, and with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the committee. I have great respect for the judgment of both.

The amendment will simply update the cost limitations on barracks and bachelor officer quarters, to reflect the actual present-day costs, and to provide facilities more in keeping with the caliber and training of today's military personnel. It will help to give them a decent place to live. All too often, Mr. Chairman, that is not true today. The living quarters of America's servicemen includes some of the poorest in the land. I have seen them. The members of this distinguished committee have seen them. Such quarters should no longer be tolerated.

Before I get into the details of the discussion, let me comment briefly on the contributions and work of this committee, because, Mr. Chairman, under the dynamic leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], this Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives has done more in this 2-year span to improve the standards of living of the people who wear the uniform of our Nation than has been done at any other period in our history. It is deserved. It is timely. In fact it is far overdue. I commend the chairman and I commend his committee. These things were sorely needed.

My amendment will simply add to the luster of that fine record. Simply stated, this amendment will provide increases in the statutory cost limitations for enlisted men from the present $1,850 per person to $3,250. For officers the increase will be from $8,500 to $10,500.

The present limitation of $1,850 per person for enlisted housing was authorized in 1956, more than 10 years ago. That is the limitation which exists today. Since 1956 there has been a 35-percent increase in cost of construction.

The limitation for bachelor officer's quarters in 1956 was $6,500 per man, and today, despite the fact that the Congress subsequently authorized $8,500 per man, the Department of Defense still is requiring the services to construct to a standard of $7,000, which bring the present total cost far below the 35-percent cost increase. This means we are building substandard facilities. We are building the slums of tomorrow and asking uniformed personnel to live in them.

What do these criteria actually translate into as far as housing is concerned? Let me use the Navy as an example. In fiscal year 1965, there were 19 troop housing items in the Navy program. Not a single one of these items could be awarded based under the authorized DOD criteria. Some of them had to be greatly reduced in scope to even stay within the funds made available under the cost limitations and four required specific waivers from the Secretary of Defense as to these limitations. The story in fiscal year 1966 was exactly the same. Bids have been received on eight Navy troop housing projects. Only two of them could be awarded with the fund limitations even at the reduced criteria. Let us bring the situation more up to date. In preparing its budget for the fiscal year 1967 program, the Navy prepared estimates to provide for design to the full authorized DOD criteria. Not a single item of troop housing at any location in the United States could be designed to the full criteria under the existing cost limitations imposed upon the services. It is generally admitted that even full DOD criteria are inadequate as far as providing realistic living conditions for military bachelor personnel.

Numerous studies by the Department of Defense, and civilian agencies working under contract for the Department, have pointed up the pressing requirement for adequate bachelor troop housing for military personnel.

These studies have documented over and over again the fact that improved bachelor housing will provide a strong career attraction-career retention element in building the professional military service this country so sorely needs.

Other studies by the Department of Defense have found that between 41 and 46 percent of all bachelor military personnel, who were questioned about the adequacy of their quarters, are dissatisfied with their living accommodations. But nothing comes of these studies.

There are many facets to bachelor troop housing. There are many areas which must be clarified. There are various ways of meeting the requirements for improved standards. This could include additional BAQ payments and permitting certain bachelors to live on the civilian economy. But these improvements can only partially reduce the vast deficiency existing in numbers of bachelor troop housing spaces required by the several services. There are presently a shortage of over 33,000 BOQ spaces and more than 348,000 barracks spaces.

The inadequacy of this space can best be shown by comparison with other housing standards. For example, the current DOD housing standards for enlisted troops are barely above the level established by the Government for convicts in Federal prisons. They are lower than those for prisoners at the Youth Correction Center at Lorton, Va.

In all other categories of civilian housing recently studied by the Department of Defense, these standards fell far short by comparison. These included facilities such as those for students in college residence halls.

Although bachelor officers fare better by comparison than bachelor enlisted personnel, there is plenty of room for improvement in this area if we are to retain these essential personnel. For example, junior officers in the District of Columbia Fire Department are accorded more living space in their quarters than are officers of the Armed Forces.

These have been known facts for some time. As I stated, the Department of Defense has made studies. A task force reporting to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, in May 1966, made recommendations. These recommendations have not been acted upon. Hopefully, they will be submitted in connection with the fiscal year 1968 program, but there is already a great deal of evidence of the customary foot-dragging in the Department of Defense.

In 1964 the Office of the Secretary of Defense received recommendations from the three services for an upgrading in these bachelor troop housing standards. Briefly, this so-called triservice proposal provided approximately the same living space for the E–1 enlisted man in cubicles or open bay dormitories as at present. But then it provided additional living area according to rank for other grades of enlisted personnel beginning with 122 square feet per man for grades E–2 through E–4 with two to a room and four to a bath, and going up to 195 square feet per man for an E–9 with a private room and bath.

Quarters for bachelor officers were increased from approximately 330 square feet of gross living area to 450 to 550 for junior officer personnel with basically a one-bedroom apartment to 550 to 700 square feet for senior officer personnel.

The unit cost to effectuate these improvements would be $3,450 for bachelor enlisted peronnel and $10,500 for bachelor officers. These are the figures I have incorporated in my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to have the professional military force that this country requires, we must attract skilled, intelligent people to military careers. This cannot be done without adequate living facilities. They cannot be achieved under existing statutory cost limitations. It is simply penny wise and pound foolish to provide facilities of this type for our military personnel. They are not only far from satisfactory but are being built at reduced construction standards and specifications which can only call for increased maintenance expenditures in the future.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman restate the amounts to which he would increase these two figures?

Mr. SIKES. I shall be happy to do so. I propose to increase them to $3,450 for enlisted personnel and $10,500 for bachelor officers.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. From $1,850 and from $8,500.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Would it not be well to say "not in excess" of these amounts, since there are differences in construction costs throughout the country?

Mr. SIKES. That is inherent in the language to be amended. This is a cost limitation. We would be raising the ceiling to that limit. There is no mandatory requirement that the money be spent. Of course, we do not want the services to spend any money that it is not necessary to spend.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The reason why we are happy to accept this amendment is that the distinguished gentleman's committee over the years has established cost differentials which we regard as the authority for construction. Because of his fine work over the years, and of the committee which deals with this construction under the Appropriations Committee, we have had this called to our attention. We believe it is wise. We believe it is timely.

We are happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the fact that my distinguished friend has stated that the committee is prepared to accept the amendment. My committee has in fact studied the cost situation on housing very carefully. We are on safe grounds in what is proposed.

America's uniformed personnel are expected to give of themselves whatever is required in the line of duty anywhere in the world. This involves separation from loved ones, hardship, danger, and even death. It is not too much to give them a decent place to live in rich prosperous America.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I support the gentleman's amendment. The figures which the gentleman has stated as existing at the present time are totally unrealistic in regard to today's construction costs.

I assure the members of the Armed Services Committee, as one member of the committee under the gentleman from Florida, we will keep our eye on the Defense Department, to see to it that they live within these figures and that they provide the quarters which are essential to keep our men in the service.

We have to be realistic. There has been in the past, because of these restrictions, some cutting of costs in the construction of these facilities, which has resulted at a later time in higher maintenance costs. When we get into these higher maintenance costs as a result of cutting back on construction, it is foolish not to provide what is necessary for the initial construction.

Therefore, I think that this amendment is necessary. Possibly it might not be necessary to go as high as this, but I think the gentleman will agree that we on our subcommittee will be sure we get our money's worth for the dollars spent.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has stated the situation very well indeed. I am grateful for his contribution and for his fine help in my committee where he is the ranking minority member.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATES. I want to say that I am in accord with the provisions of this amendment, but I do have this one question. I wonder whether or not the gentleman has conferred with the Department of Defense for this reason: The present limitation is $8,500 per man, but the Secretary of Defense imposed an administrative ceiling of $7,500 per man. Can the gentleman enlighten us with respect to the imposition of this limitation?

Mr. SIKES. This is an arbitrary limitation imposed by the Department of Defense. It is unfortunate that it has been imposed for it means we are getting quarters which are built to standards even lower than those of 12 years ago. This situation should not cause the Congress to delay in providing a realistic ceiling. I hope that the adoption of this amendment and the support which has been shown for it here in the House of Representatives will result in recognition by the Pentagon that it is an unrealistic limitation which should be dropped.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD, under permission previously obtained, cost estimates and other data to show the soundness of this amendment:

Navy waivers

Location	Size	Amount per man	Design or deducts below OSD criteria
Fiscal year 1965:			
NALF, San Clemente, Calif	20-man BOQ	$7,821	Yes.
Do	166-man barracks	1,988	Yes.
NALF, El Centro, Calif	128-man barracks	2,236	Yes.
NCS, Oahu	214-man barracks	2,160	Yes.
NSGD, Northwest, Va	100-man barracks	2,061	Yes.
Fiscal year 1966:			
NH, Philadelphia, Pa	166-man barracks	2,100	Yes.
NAS, Glynco, Ga	do	2,100	Yes.
NTC, Great Lakes, Ill	2,000-man barracks	2,035	Yes.

Cost estimates, bachelor officer quarters, fiscal year 1967 program

	Men	Unadjusted PCE cost per square foot	Adjusted estimate, cost per square foot [1]
Cost area .90: MCAF New River, N.C	50	$18.45	$20.30
Cost area .95:			
NAS, Oceana, Va	100	17.33	18.20
NAS, Cecil, Fla	98	19.76	20.70
NS, Mayport, Fla	43	17.25	18.10
NAAS, Whiting, Fla	250	19.20	20.20
Cost area 1.05:			
NATC, Patuxent River, Md	200	15.50	14.75
NTC, San Diego, Calif	276	19.97	19.00
Cost area 1.10: NS, Philadelphia, Pa	147	17.56	15.80
Cost area 1.25: NH, St. Albans, N.Y	155	22.00	16.50
Average costs	------	18.53	18.17

[1] Adjusted to equivalent cost for a normal construction cost area (cost index=1.0). Present cost limitations equate to approximately $14 per square foot.

Cost estimates, enlisted barracks, fiscal year 1967 program

	Men	Unadjusted PGE cost per square foot	Adjusted estimate, cost per square foot [1]
Cost area .90:			
MCAF, New River, N.C	252	$15.45	$17.22
NAS, Glynco, Ga	332	14.45	15.90
Cost area, .95:			
NAS, Norfolk, Va	[2] 120	16.75	18.51
NS, Portsmouth, Va	[2] 100	17.95	19.29
NAS, Sanford, Fla	500	18.06	19.26
NH, Memphis, Tenn	104	15.96	17.56
NAS, Jacksonville, Fla	40	16.80	18.78
NH, Portsmouth, Va	100	17.72	19.02
NAS, Oceana, Va	700	14.93	16.93
NAS, Norfolk, Va	121	18.40	20.28
Cost area 1.00: NS, Subic Bay, Philippines	180	20.00	20.26
Cost area 1.05:			
NTC, Bainbridge, Md	1,500	14.97	15.16
Do	720	16.50	15.09
NTC, San Diego, Calif	1,350	16.80	16.38
NSGA, Marietta, Wash	62	18.51	17.82
Cost Area 1.10: NSB, New London, Conn	540	17.29	15.55
Cost area 1.15: MCSC, Barstow, Calif	172	22.33	19.69
Average cost	------	17.17	17.74

[1] The adjusted estimate provides for design to full criteria, including prefabricated wardrobes and desks. The estimate has also been adjusted to equivalent cost for a normal construction cost area. (Cost index=1.0). Present cost limitations equate to approximately $14 per square foot.

[2] WN.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal]

BACHELORS MAY GET PENTAGON OK TO LIVE OFF BASE; DOD FINDS PRISONERS FARING BETTER THAN MILITARY

(By Louis Stockstill)

Large numbers of Service bachelors—both officer and enlisted—may be authorized to to reside off-base as the result of a BOQ/barracks study recently completed by the Department of Defense (The Journal, 14 May).

The study revealed that enlisted personnel in the Armed Forces fare little better than convicts (in some instances not as well) in housing standards set by the Government.

New policies and programs stemming from the study are due to be announced by DoD within the next few weeks.

Pending public release of the detailed recommendations of the study. Pentagon sources have disclosed some of the data uncovered by the bachelor housing survey.

One of the biggest surprises was the finding that most commanders (about 74% of those queried) say their bachelor officers and warrant officers could live off-base without impairing the command mission. Some 88% of the CO's arrived at the same conclusion with respect to bachelor enlisted personnel in pay grades E–7 through E–9.

Thousands of officers and men who completed questionnaires said they would prefer to live away from the base. Data collected by the study revealed that commanders believe civilian accommodations are readily available throughout many areas of the country.

The study also documents the fact that improved bachelor housing would provide a strong career-attraction, career-retention tool.

One of the most shocking disclosures of the study was the finding that current DoD housing standards for enlisted troops are barely above the level established by the Government for convicts in Federal prisons, and lower than those for prisoners at the youth correction center at Lorton, Va., a stone's throw from Washington, D.C.

In all other categories of civilian housing investigated by the study group, the DoD standards for enlisted barracks and dormitories also fell short by comparison. The number of square feet allotted to students in college residence halls, for example was far greater than that authorized for Armed Forces enlisted quarters. The typical single hotel room had almost three times as much space.

The significance of the data is brought into sharp focus when considered in light of the fact that current DoD construction "standards" comprise goals rather than achievements. Much of the bachelor housing in the Services does not match the official standards.

Bachelor officers fared somewhat better in the comparison of DoD standards with those used in various types of civilian construction. The data revealed that current BOQ standards, for example, are approximately the same as those in a typical single room in a Holiday Inn and exceed those of the typical single hotel room or college residence hall. They also, unlike the enlisted quarters, are far superior to those in penal institutions.

Yet the study disclosed that bachelor officers, even so, do not fare as well as many civilians, junior officers in the District of Columbia fire department for examples, are accorded more living space in their quarters than are officers of the Armed Forces.

Three important features of the DoD study involved (1) estimations of current bachelor housing space-deficiencies, (2) the comparative cost of eliminating the deficits under OSD criteria and under criteria recommended by an earlier tri-Service study, and (3) a comparison of the basic allowance for quarters paid to single personnel and married personnel.

The requirements analysis showed on a DoD-wide basis, that the Services currently are short some 33,023 BOQ spaces and more than 348,000 barracks spaces. This takes into account construction programs already underway.

In the BOQ area, the Army has the biggest deficit—a shortage of some 51.4% of required spaces; the Navy and Marine Corps follow with the combined deficit of 45.8% and the Air Force with 34.9%.

In the enlisted area, the Navy and Marine Corps have the biggest shortage—some 159,000 spaces compared with a shortage of 129,400 spaces in the Army and 60,000 in the Air Force.

To eliminate the deficits under current DoD standards (which are lower for officers than those established by Congress), the study estimated that it would cost about $1.3-billion. The cost would soar to more than $3-billion under the earlier tri-service proposal which urged substantially greater gross living area for all ranks on a graduated scale.

DoD sources indicated that the square footage requirements urged by the tri-Service study were arbitrarily conceived, unrealistic and likely to be disapproved.

The analysis of BAQ payments underscored the fact that single personnel (officer, warrant officer and enlisted) suffer by comparison with their married contemporaries except in the lowest enlisted ranks.

In the officer category starting at the O–1 level. BAQ payments for bachelors range from $85.20 to $160.20. For married officers the range is from $110.10 to $201.

One result of the study may be a decision to level-off BAQ payments at the same or close to the same rate in each rank, regardless of marital status.

In addition to the fact that bachelor personnel receive smaller BAQ payments than their married contemporaries, a DoD source said that because of current BOQ and barracks deficiencies, many single men are forfeiting their quarters allowances for quarters which are not worth the money.

The study found that 41% to 46.1% of all bachelor officer and enlisted personnel who were questioned about the adequacy of their quarters are dissatisfied with their living accommodations. The "general dissatisfaction level" was recorded as 41% among both male and female officers, 45.1% among enlisted men and 46.1% among enlisted women.

Another result of the study which is likely to have an important bearing on the final "action" decision by DOD was the finding that the Services are spending proportionately much larger sums of family housing than on bachelor quarters.

An analysis of construction, maintenance and operation costs of family housing in the conterminous United States as compared with such costs for BOQ's and barracks, disclosed that the Defense Department pays out about $158 per month on a 3-bedroom home for officers in pay grades O–1 through O–3 and about $139 per month on a 3-bedroom home for enlisted personnel E–4 through E–9, compared with monthly costs of about $57.29 for a bachelor officer and $14.42 for a bachelor enlisted man.

Although the final recommendations of the study group have not been revealed, it is expected that they will soon be made public. They already have been reviewed by Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) Thomas D. Morris and discussed with Secretary McNamara, and are now being studied by the Services. They also are being coordinated with the DoD Comptroller and Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics.

DoD advised Congress about this time last year that it was making such a study and would submit the results to Capitol Hill when completed.

It has been reported that one of the recommendations calls for the establishment of a DoD bachelor housing office. Such an office already exists for family housing but, as the current study notes, more than half of the enlisted personnel and 13.2% of the officers in the Armed Forces are unmarried.

When DoD announces its plans for implementing the recommendations it seems reasonable to assume on the basis of the study group findings, that:

(1) More entrances will be authorized to fire escapes.

(2) Higher standards will be prescribed for enlisted quarters on base.

(3) BAQ payments will be reexamined to determine whether to bring amounts paid married and unmarried personnel into closer conformity.

(4) Construction and operations expenditures for family quarters and bachelor quarters may be more closely aligned and,

(5) A special DoD office may be organized to supervise the construction and management of bachelor housing.

The decision to authorize more men to live off-base, if it comes, will likely be pegged to the need to afford "immediate relief" from the current housing deficit instead of waiting for a long-term building program to provide additional and improved quarters at some date well into the future. DoD also can justify the move on the basis of keeping construction costs within reasonable limits, and as a means of satisfying the individual desire of large numbers of personnel to find their own living accommodations in the civilian community.

Chances are that the final recommendations will be released within a matter of weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 89, line 9, strike out lines 9 through 18, inclusive and renumber the following sections.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, before I explain the purpose of the pending amendment, I want to take this time to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the important Committee on Armed Services, and his committee for bringing to the floor of the House a very good bill. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works, I particularly want to commend the Committee on Armed Services for their intelligent and forthright action in preserving the land at the Bolling Air Force Base. I think this is a very worthwhile proposal of the committee, and I hope that the Committee of the Whole will support the Committee on Armed Services in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, as usual, the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RIVERS], is alert and energetic in behalf of the subjects before his committee. The gentleman from South Carolina has expressed concern about nonmilitary public buildings constructed by the General Services Administration where such buildings are to be occupied 51 percent or more of the time by agencies of the Department of Defense. The Public Buildings Act of 1959 is administered by the House Committee on Public Works where I have the honor of serving as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This committee must approve all prospectuses presented to Congress by the General Services Administration. Section 613 now in the bill before us would require the Administrator of the General Services Administration to report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services as to their plans for construction of any building where 51 percent of the space is going to be occupied by agencies of the Department of Defense. Our Committee on Public Works feels that we as a committee should notify the Committee on Armed Services of any such proposals instead of the General Services of any such proposals instead of the Administration. If the Committee on Armed Services objects to the proposed building, our committee is the place to work out the differences and the problems and not wait until after the project is authorized as called for in section 613 of the bill. I hope that the committee will accept my amendment with a definite promise that the House Committee on Public Works will notify the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and his committee of any such buildings proposed by GSA where 51 percent or more of the space is occupied by agencies of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, this will accomplish in a better way what the committee has proposed in the legislation before us. I hope that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina can accept the amendment with the understanding given the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This would give our committee an opportunity to make representations to his committee and work out with his committee whether or not the Department of Defense is running our committee.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is exactly right. The only difference is this: My amendment allows us to take the proper action before it is authorized and not after, as called for in the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I further believe that it would save money in the architectural-engineering area.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, with this understanding, my only objective is to work with the gentleman's distinguished committee, and we seek no jurisdiction which his committee now has.

Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I see no reason why we should not accept the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina very much.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the problem that bothers me about this amendment is not one of the committees of the House working together, but I had hoped that with this language we would have some report from the Department of Defense before they went to the GSA and requested that they program a building for you. This seems to me to be the point. In fact, the thing should be acted upon only after GSA has been requested to provide space and has come in with plans.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is exactly correct. This is why we feel the section now in the bill does not do what the gentleman wants done. I feel that if the Department of Defense came to us through the General Services Administration, we could consult with the gentleman's committee and make certain that the gentleman is satisfied with the DOD and GSA proposal. If not, we would not adopt it.

Mr. Chairman, under the language as contained in the bill, it would require the General Services Administration to inform the Armed Services Committee after they are ready for construction and spent money for plans and specifications, thereby nonmilitary agencies would be left without housing if the Armed Services Committee did not want to go along with the Department of Defense. If we adopt my amendment the whole matter can be settled before authorization.

Mr. HARDY. Insofar as the gentleman's interpretation of the language is concerned, I am in complete agreement with the gentleman.

I believe the committees can work together very well on it. But my understanding of what we propose in this language is that the Department of Defense would have to make its requirements known and let us know what its plans are, before it went to the GSA. I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois would have any objection to that, even if the language is stricken?

Mr. GRAY. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia wholeheartedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE OF TEXAS

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Texas: On page 46, line 3, after "Texas" insert "training facilities," and on page 46, line 4, strike out "$1,636,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,936,000."

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment only restores to the bill language deleted from the bill and deferred by the Armed Services Committee. A controversy arose amid some confusion over a decision of the Defense Department to move a unit to Biggs Air Force Base, in El Paso.

Before describing this move, may I first express my appreciation to the able chairman, the Honorable Mr. RIVERS, and to the dedicated membership of the Armed Services Committee for their patient deliberation of this voluminous bill, and for their courtesies toward me. The offering of this amendment does not in any way detract from my highest regard for this committee and its membership.

But, in the volume of responsibilities, and in the confusion of insufficient information to the membership by those in authority, I fear a very worthwhile decision by the Department of Defense is not being implemented.

Our country is now in conflict with dangerous enemies. Our position as leader of the free world is challenged. We are forced to a position of defense and response born out of the peculiarities of a world not at war, and yet in conflict. The success of our defense effort and the economy of the lives of our troops demands hard decisions in favor of national security. Such a decision was made by the Defense Department, above any sentimental attachments and beyond personal considerations.

We must adequately train our military in foreign languages for the battlefield. If we are to fight among a people, and protect them, as in Vietnam, we must be able to speak their language. As a Japanese interpreter in the U.S. Marines during World War II, I know that understanding, speaking, and reading the language of the enemy can save lives of our own troops and win battles. The Battle of Midway is a prime example.

Many of our troops being educated in foreign languages are now being trained in Washington, D.C. Their facilities are grossly inadequate and run down. Over half the troops are scattered over the entire areas to study in private schools. The troops are not kept together, so military discipline must suffer. Many of the troops live off base, in a high cost economy, and fight daily traffic getting to their private schools. So, at best, our program is poor.

Now, we are greatly stepping up our training in the Vietnamese language, and there is no place to put the additional troops. The Interior Department owns the present site at Anacostia and wants to tear down these facilities to carry out the National Park Service plans for the beautification of Washington.

Knowing that these troops must move, and that there is no place in Washington to properly train them, where should they go? A similar situation exists in San Antonio where allied students are being trained in English in overcrowded quarters at Lackland Air Force Base. The Air Force needs these quarters for its basic training program. The security of the United States is the first consideration, and this means adequate training and housing.

The Department of Defense took all the prerequisites together, and strongly decided on Biggs Air Force Base as the site of the Defense Language Institute. Why? The base is empty, and has $50 million worth of permanent facilities. Expansion possibilities for the program are unlimited. It would be about the least expensive to convert—$3.3 million to install first-class facilities, including the latest electronic teaching equipment. Figures given by the Defense Department for an alternate location have been in the neighborhood of $11.2 million.

A military base, Fort Bliss, with all the accessory facilities the Defense Language Institute will require, adjoins Biggs Air Force Base. The base itself has all the barracks, family housing, commissaries, and so forth, they could hope to ever use, and more, so all the troops could live on the base.

The area has excellent weather; a large general military hospital adjoins Fort Bliss, and it has its own airfield for military transportation connecting the entire country.

But, you might say, "other places have these, too." Well, the Defense Department made its inventories and did not come up with any other alternatives. But there are other reasons why the Biggs location is ideal.

When you train language students, they should not only be together all day, for total immersion studies, but they should have a chance to practice in the vernacular with other than their instructors.

Fort Bliss is the missile training base for the entire free world. Forty-three nations send their troops to train and practice at Fort Bliss, Tex. A stream of dignitaries flood through El Paso, visiting these troops in operation as one of their official stops in the United States. Uniforms of every nation of the free world, including those of Free China and Vietnam, can be seen on the streets of El Paso. These troops are given warm hospitality in the homes of El Pasoans, and have been for over 15 years. El Paso is the international city, one of the few bilingual cities in the United States. El Paso warmly welcomes this Defense Language Institute. The University of Texas, the University of Texas at El Paso, and New Mexico State University, only 40 miles distant, have pledged total cooperation in every aspect, and are preparing to gear up their language departments even more, in order to cooperate fully with the Defense Language Institute. No community has ever so welcomed a branch of the U.S. Military. For over 100 years, we have been regarded as having an excellent community-military relationship, recognized by the Armed Forces as among the best in the United States.

I appeal to the membership to augment this decision of the Department of Defense. Do not impede our defense effort. Let us develop a first-rate language program and save American lives thereby. Even a year's delay can cost us lives and victories. Give the Department of Defense the $3.3 million to construct the necessary implementation, and you will never regret your decision.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as much as I would like to, I cannot go along with the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. We discussed this subject very fully in the committee and the committee in its wisdom, by vote, turned it down. Two members of the committee are particularly knowledgeable on this subject. One is the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]; the other, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], as well as Members of the minority.

We do not think that now is the time to make this move. There are other considerations which should be brought to the attention of the Congress which were brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time and will let these gentlemen who have studied this question and are capable of explaining it take the time to present the position of the committee.

Mr. BATES. Yes, I would agree with the gentleman. I understand this property is being built up very rapidly. In addition to these reasons, I think we have the very serious question of the personnel presently at the school. I understand that there are now seven with Ph. D.'s and master's. Out of the number of seven, two are going to Cornell, one is going to Fort Belvoir, another is looking for a position in the Washington area, and another is going to the Hummrao Research Resource Organization, and that only one out of eight in the headquarters, separated from the school itself, with a GS-12 or over, will go to Texas. If that is the situation, we not only have limited facilities, as the gentleman has so well indicated, but it looks as though we will be operating without a faculty as well.

During any move to Texas, and the consequent recruitment of faculty, and establishment of an academic atmosphere, the defense language program would be seriously jeopardized for at least 5 years.

If the institute were to remain in the Anacostia area, it would cost only $150,000 to rehabilitate the Naval Station Annex, and part of Fort Myer, if necessary, whereas it will cost at least $3,300,000 to fit up Fort Bliss.

As the school presently operates in Washington, it can cooperate with private commercial schools for those languages which are not needed as frequently or by as many students. In Washington teachers for the unusual courses can be drawn as needed from the diplomatic corps, from the international organizations and from the local educational institutions. In addition, location in Washington permits full cooperation between the Language Institute and the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the one hand and with the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, the Office of Education, the local universities, and the interagency language roundtable. Cooperation in all of these ways has provided the language institute with native talent able to teach the students in native dialects—not theoretical tongues.

Mr. Chairman, in sum and substance, this is a very serious matter. This school is a vital part of the national defense.

This committee should study this entire matter and under no circumstances approve this project at this time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I, too, rise in opposition to the amendment. It was the consensus of the committee, after hearing all the testimony that was presented on this subject, that this move—if it probably is ever justified—is probably premature at this time, because it has not been adequately explored and the most urgent use that might be made of the facility at Biggs has not been determined.

My opposition is to the proposal to move from Lackland the English training school which would be involved. That training facility takes care of a great many foreign students, 450 to 500 at a time, who come and are given training in the English language. Under the proposed amendment, it would be moved to Biggs Air Force Base.

The people in San Antonio feel very strongly—and I feel that it is shared by many of the military—that the move from Lackland at this time would not be a wise and a proper thing to do. Right now, there are several efforts being made to determine expansion possibilities down there. While that is going on, out of deference to the area that I represent, I certainly feel that they should have an opportunity to explore that very thoroughly before any final decision should be made in this area.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman, in the establishment of any language school in any area, including the fine language school at Monterey, did we not start from scratch, with no instructors, and did we not bring them in from other pools of talent throughout the United States; this Nation is a melting pot of many nationalities? In fact, we would not have to worry about training personnel upon the establishment of a base there at Fort Bliss, or Biggs Air Force Base, as far as teaching facilities or any other characteristics that would be needed to make a foreign language school.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is correct. I think it would make an excellent facility. I do not believe that is the real issue we have before us at this time. I believe the problem is whether this matter has been thoroughly explored. It involves a great deal that was not the subject of very full study by the Pentagon before this decision was made. I believe that has been very apparent to the committee.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there may be other reasons why the gentlemen do not desire at this time to support this amendment. I wonder about one other aspect of this. As a matter of fact, there are adequate facilities that would still be available to any troops sent in to establish a language school at Biggs Air Force Base. I would not want the House to have the concept that Biggs is being flooded with troops and there would be no room whatever in the event the Department of Defense decision was implemented.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the position of the gentleman. He made an excellent presentation before our committee when he came there. Certainly El Paso is an environmental area that would lend itself to this sort of training mission. Likewise, he presented it very well in the discussion here today. But I believe I would second the views of most of the members of the committee, who feel it should have further study because of the number of aspects that were not thoroughly explored before this was submitted to the Congress.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for their splendid work on this important bill for military construction. I also commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] for his zeal in promoting the transfer of this extraordinarily important east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute from Washington, D.C., to an obsolescent airbase in his district.

What might be good for his district would not be good for our country, our military, or our language capability.

We—our Nation and our military—are suffering from serious language deficiencies now. We should not degrade the DLI more by moving it to Texas. The DLI is as much a university as a military base. Professors are more important than barracks or landing fields nearby. Teachers of foreign language prefer the Washington, D.C., area—near the Nation's Capital and the embassies—even though the climate and living conditions may be inadequate.

The DLI is a language laboratory—for a very special science. Special equipment is necessary. Empty barracks which would need extensive remodeling before they would be suitable for language teaching or dormitories for language students are not enough.

We should be increasing this bill by $10 million to construct a language facility that would measure up to our vital language needs.

Less than one-half of 1 percent of our military personnel in Vietnam can speak Vietnamese. This is disgraceful and hurtful. An election is scheduled in Vietnam in September. We have a vital interest in the outcome. Language will be more persuasive than munitions in the winning of elections.

Language may be our most important weapon for waging peace. We are making some progress in teaching Vietnamese but we are dreadfully behind most nations of the world in language proficiency.

The highest ranking officer in the DOD with language responsibility is a colonel—in Russia, he is the equivalent of a three-star general. It would behoove us to catch up.

The DOD has been arrogant about language learning. The old attitude has been, "if any foreigners want to talk with us, tell them to speak English." Some in the Pentagon are beginning to recognize the desperate need for language learning.

The Pentagon's suggestion for moving the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute to Texas is an example of lack of understanding of language teaching which degrades language learning.

I commend the committee for not accepting this shortsighted proposal. I urge the Committee to defeat this amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the committee's position.

Before I speak on the gentleman's amendment, I should like to say a word of commendation for the appearance which the gentleman made before our committee, and for the obvious energy and dedication he has demonstrated all along in representing the interests of his great district. I believe we all have been very much impressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] and by the way he has supported his proposal and fought for El Paso. He is serving his area and his district now, by offering this amendment, and we all respect him for the fight he is making.

If it were a matter of personalities, I would be reluctant to oppose his amendment. But I believe the crucial issue here is whether the decisions with regard to our Nation's defense language capability—one of the most important parts of our whole defense structure—should be made by real estate people. If real estate officers in the Defense Department can locate the east coast branch of the language school in the western part in Texas today, then tomorrow they can locate the west coast branch, which is now in Monterey, Calif., somewhere else. I believe these decisions can only be made from the point of view of the effectiveness of our educational curriculum, the strength of our language training, and the needs of our intelligence services.

I do not need to repeat the comments already made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and by others. The facts speak for themselves. Only 7 out of the 72 members of the school's faculty have indicated they would move to El Paso. Remember, these professors are not military personnel; they are civilians.

And the facilities which are supposedly available there at Biggs Air Force Base are actually already being occupied by personnel from Fort Bliss. As a matter of fact, the Defense Department itself, as shown on page 9177 of the hearings, indicated to the committee that in order to make this whole move feasible they would have to do three very complicated and costly things:

First. They would have to recruit qualified instructors throughout the entire United States and then pay their transportation costs to El Paso.

Second. They would have to create, virtually from scratch at El Paso, a whole new academic complex and atmosphere suitable for trained professional students of language.

Third. They told us they would have to revise the whole civil service career promotion program to make it more appealing to linguistic personnel, and that would take a long time to do.

I believe it is clear that this kind of school is so important that the decisions with regard to its future must be made by those who are connected with our intelligence and educational activities. They have not thus far been heard from in this case.

The committee deleted this money, from the bill so that just this kind of study could be made. I myself believe that the proper location for such a school would be in a metropolitan area. In fact I should like to see the school retained where it is, right here in the city of Washington.

We talked a little earlier about the Anacostia-Bolling complex. If it is necessary to have the area in Anacostia where this school is presently located for a recreation area, then what about the Anacostia-Bolling complex? The school, after all, requires only 2 acres. They do not need the 6,000 acres there are available at Biggs Air Force Base.

I believe the proper place for this school would be in the old Naval Air Station at Anacostia or at Bolling Air Force Base. This is the kind of facility we need to use that land for, as the distinguished chairman of our committee has already said so eloquently.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize, the committee refused to authorize $3.3 million to provide for improvements to facilities to former Biggs Air Force Base at El Paso, Tex., for the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute and the Headquarters, Defense Language Institute, both of which are located at Anacostia.

The committee spent more time in consideration of this matter than any single project contained in the bill. We heard from the local Congressman. We had letters from the Texas Senators and were flooded with correspondence from residents of El Paso.

The committee tried to examine this question very objectively. In December 1965, the Secretary of Defense announced that the Strategic Air Command Mission of Biggs Air Force Base will be inactivated by July 1966. Thus, the Department of the Air Force no longer has requirements for the facility. The Secretary in his announcement of the base closure, also announced the proposed transfer of the air base to the Department of the Army for consolidation with Fort Bliss, a contiguous installation having over 1 million acres of land. Under the present request, the site would be used as the home of the headquarters and east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute now located at the Anacostia Naval Annex, Washington, D.C., and the Air Force English Language Training School now located at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas.

At Biggs, there are 800 units of family housing, 289 miscellaneous structures, airfield facilities, roads, and utilities constructed at a total cost of approximately $49 million.

At first blush, it seemed logical to move some military function to use the base that was being vacated by the Air Force, but during the hearings we learned that because of the present buildup of military forces, every unit of family housing which was vacated by Air Force personnel at Biggs was already being utilized by personnel from Fort Bliss and that the overflow from Bliss was filling up the bachelor officer quarters and enlisted personnel spaces in the dormitories so the immediate need to utilize this base became less and less apparent to the committee.

At the present time, the headquarters for the Defense Language Institute at Anacostia and the east coast branch of the Defense Language Institute are located on 2 acres of land which were obtained from the Department of Interior, and indications are that the Department of Interior wants this land back for park purposes. Sometime in the future, it will probably be necessary to relocate the headquarters and the institute.

It became obvious to the committee during the hearings that after the decision was made to vacate Biggs Air Force Base, an effort was being made by the services to find something to move there to fill up this space. Biggs Air Force Base contains over 6,000 acres of land.

But facilities are only one of the problems involved in this matter. It became apparent during the hearings that responsible officials of the Defense Language Institute did not select Biggs as a site for possible relocation nor was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education even consulted concerning this move. We were told during the hearings that there was a great need to expand the language program in the Department of Defense. We do not doubt the necessity for this expansion program but if there is present need for expansion the committee was of the belief that the movement to Biggs would not solve the present problem.

For instance, of the present inhouse faculty of the Defense Language Institute, only 7 out of the 65 instructors have indicated a willingness to move to the El Paso area. It should be borne in mind that of the present faculty many are part-time employees and are foreign personnel who are stationed here in Washington as a result of their spouses' association here with embassies of foreign missions. Thus, a complete new recruitment program for faculty would have to be undertaken.

Assurances were given that the University of Texas, which is located nearly 600 miles from Biggs, would increase its faculty and would establish a branch at El Paso to assist in this teaching mission. Also, we were told that one of the universities in New Mexico would expand its language facility to meet this need. In other words, it became apparent to the committee that if the Defense Language Institute were moved to Biggs we would be almost starting out from scratch to build a faculty and a language school because of the base closure at Biggs.

But then when we examined closely into the matter, we found that not even the facilities at Biggs would be available. For instance, as recently as July 16, 1966, the Army activated a new air defense unit, the 4th Battalion, 60th Artillery, which is composed of four M-42 batteries and one quad 50.

We have no housing there that is currently available and really no bachelor officer quarters or dormitory spaces which are available.

So, without either faculty or facilities available for the move, the committee decided that more study must be given to this matter before authorization to improve the facilities could be given.

But of equal importance is the very mission of the Defense Language Institute. In the first place, it is designated as the east coast branch of the institute. It was hard for the committee members to fathom Texas as being part of the east coast.

It was difficult for the committee members to justify any cost savings with the cost of transporting students from all over the eastern sector of the United States to El Paso.

Frankly, another consideration must be borne in mind: that much of the foreign language training program is associated with Defense Intelligence activities and the headquarters for Defense Intelligence is located in the Washington, D.C., area. It is important that people going into this work associate and familiarize themselves with embassy personnel in the Washington area.

Still another consideration entered into the committee's action and that relates to the total language program in the Department of Defense. For instance, at the present time, the Army is teaching the Special Forces the Vietnamese language at Fort Bragg, N.C. The Navy is teaching the amphibious forces some Vietnamese in Coronado, Calif. These programs are not under the direction of the Defense Language Institute. In addition, dozens of foreign language courses in the country are under various service programs. It seemed that study should be made toward consolidating the responsibility for these various language programs under one central authority.

There were so many unresolved questions that to authorize $3.3 million to provide for improvement to facilities so that the language school could be transferred was very unwise at this time.

I hope you will accept the committee position that this matter should be given considerably more study.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, to comment upon the effect of section 607. As the gentleman from South Carolina well knows, I share his concern about the shortage of troop housing, and particularly so when 5,000 of our boys are now living in tents at Fort Knox, Ky.; Fort Gordon, Ga.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and Fort Jackson, S.C.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] and I had the opportunity personally to inspect the facilities at Fort Leonard Wood, where we have several hundred boys now living in tents and they are not scheduled to get out of the tents until December 15. I hope that the commanding general is able to meet that schedule, but I would point out to the Members of the House that it gets pretty cold in Missouri even by December 15.

As I understand, section 607 for all practical purposes, would compel the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the construction of deferred military troop housing at these installations. I would observe that the language apparently avoids the constitutional question as to whether the Congress can force the Executive to spend money it appropriates, but as a practical matter will we not be assured of the construction of the deferred housing due to the fact that before the Secretary of Defense can let a contract for the housing and the public works under this bill he must have let the contract for the deferred housing. Am I correct in that assumption, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This language is an amendment that was inserted by the other body and our committee accepted it. We think it is a good amendment. It is the nearest thing we can get to compelling the Secretary of Defense to go along with the projects we authorized and funded last year. As a condition precedent to moneys being spent under the present authorization and later appropriation, they must go forward with this construction which the Secretary of Defense in his wisdom deferred. That is the nearest that I can answer the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CALLAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to point out to the House that the Lincoln Air Force Base in Lincoln, Nebr., has 1,000 fine housing units. They have been empty now for about 6 months and are deteriorating. A very fine installation out there is crying for some people. I would like to point out to the Committee on Armed Services that if you need housing, we are looking for somebody to fill 1,000 vacancies in Lincoln.

Mr. ICHORD. I would suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska that he take it up with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that I, too, at the request of our distinguished chairman, have witnessed at the many bases in the Southeast and other parts of the country that our men are living in tents. The need is very evident when you go there and see it. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri as well as our distinguished chairman.

Mr. ICHORD. I would state to the gentleman from Georgia that the report points up the incongruity of facts when we have 51,000 units deferred and at the same time we have the Department of Defense constructing about 17,000 temporary barracks spaces with the supplemental money which we gave the Department earlier this year.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The gentleman is certainly correct.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I can certainly agree with the gentleman as far as Fort Knox is concerned, because I have the honor to represent that area. As for the other areas, I will take your word for it. I think the chairman of this great committee will agree with me that the money was authorized and appropriated by this Congress and was knocked out by the Department of Defense. They would not allow you to spend it. That is why they are in tents in various areas and at Fort Knox, Ky. Let us get with it today and pass this and make them spend the money. You are not going to be able to get it until you do.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill as submitted here today by the Committee on Armed Services, and as a member thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on special committees that have investigated troop housing for the past 6 years, wherein one particular ad hoc committee was formed and visited many installations on the east coast at the time of the Berlin "beefup."

Mr. Chairman, that was the time when we used the Reserve Forces that we had in training instead of the individual draft as decided by the Secretary of Defense with reference to filler and unit replacements.

Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, the distinguished Committee on Armed Services at that time decided that we did not believe in temporary housing, but we would use permanent construction funds in the construction of buildings adequate to meet the needs of the service's for housing.

I am afraid the Secretary of Defense has not done this.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to rise in connection with section 614 on page 89 of the bill. Lest the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] think he is flying only on one wing today, I would like to point out to the gentleman the fact that I submitted the amendment in the committee that this year held up this military construction authorization, pending some further strengthening thereof, because I submitted the same amendment—in lieu of that, which is now in section 614—that I had submitted previously in the Military Construction Act of the Armed Services Committee for 1965. I associate myself herewith to his remarks in the well of the house, and his supplemental views in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, that bill at that time said:

> The Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the military departments, or the designee of either, may not close, substantially reduce, or consolidate any military camp, post or station, installation or facility until the expiration of thirty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department reports the pertinent details of the action to be taken to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Then, Mr. Chairman, it further provides the usual explanation with reference to an action preventing closures in the continental United States by either one or the other of the Armed Services Committees.

Mr. Chairman, this was the wisdom of the committee, not finally passed in section 614 on page 89, which simply requires the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to make a full report of the facts including the justification of such proposed action to the Congress, and allow 30 days, legislative days of the Congress to elapse before any further action is taken.

Mr. Chairman, I share with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] the view that it does not put anything in the act and does not involve a constitutional power or the power of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this from another point of view; namely, that as one of the members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and Its Relation to Other Agencies; it was very important, and as printed in the report which is now in the hands of all Members, that the action be returned to the Congress and particularly to the Armed Services Committee.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I quote from the Congressional Record, volume 111, part 17, page 22975, the explanatory statements and the three separate statements including a quotation from the Constitution of the United States on this matter at the time when I asked for an immediate vote to override the President's veto. This motion was defeated on a motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services with only 19 voting against the motion to table, and no additional members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply submit that much of the oratory that has been made here today and that much of the hearings and many of the finest speeches I have heard for reinvesting the power in the Congress, it is time that we got that but we will not until we stand, be counted, and vote together. We should adopt and write tangible legislation so that indeed this power would be recouped if indeed it has been lost, and that it should be reasserted, if it has not been, so that under any device such as the Curtis-McCormack amendment or simply such as the raw assumption of the power of the Secretary of Defense, the Congress of people's elected representatives will remain in control.

I feel that if the Members will refer to not only the unanimous final vote on the military construction bill on September 7, 1965, but to the debate, the colloquy, and the preliminary motion to table rather than override the Presidential veto, they will see that time has justified events, and that the position taken at that time was strong.

I am sorry this is not a stronger bill than it is, but I am in full support of it, and I recommend that it do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in support of S. 3105, the military construction bill. It is an austere bill. Everything in it is absolutely essential.

My purpose in taking this time is to emphasize the statements of my fellow committee members and my colleague from Missouri [Mr. Ichord]. Together we visited Fort Leonard Wood as an ad hoc committee on military construction at that post. Let me emphasize there is no provincialism involved in my support of this bill.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., is about 175 miles to the southeast of my district, and Fort Riley, Kans., is about 100 miles to the west, but many of the draftees coming out of our district go to one of these training centers. The present military effort involves the matter of morale—the morale not only of the troops themselves, but the morale of their families. When parents read that their sons at Fort Leonard Wood are in tents, and with winter approaching in a few months, they begin to wonder whether the military has any real concern for the health of these young men. We get complaints, and some pretty harsh criticism from these parents.

Some bad conditions in housing exist at Fort Riley. There a lot of troops are housed in old housing that badly needs rehabilitation or replacement. As a member of an ad hoc committee to look at housing there I was disappointed to find soldiers must be trucked several miles from barracks to their classrooms at great expense and loss of time.

In the field of military housing there are two general types—family housing and troop housing. Either category can be good or bad to adequate or inadequate. The former leads to good morale—the latter lowers morale.

Every man on this committee was disappointed that the Secretary of Defense deferred housing authorized last year. Last year we authorized $620 million in family housing. This year I am delighted to report the committee has reauthorized and renewed or extended this authority to keep that funding alive.

The Secretary of Defense has said that if we go ahead with this authorized housing it would be inflationary, yet this involves only 8,500 new starts, as compared with 1 million new starts in the construction industry. How could such a small number be inflationary?

Mr. Chairman, this is an austere bill. It has only the absolute essentials. But on the subject of housing let us all hope that the Secretary of Defense or someone over in that five-sided house across the Potomac River gets the message that when this housing is reauthorized and the funding continued and then when the appropriation is made they get busy on the construction of this housing in the interest of better morale of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Repeating, as a result of this deferral action by the Secretary of Defense, many of our troops not only at Fort Leonard Wood but also Fort Knox, Ky., Fort Gordon, Ga., and Fort Jackson, S.C., are being housed in tents. These are basic training centers. It is likely that additional personnel at other military installations will also be required to live in tents if there is not a release on the funds so deferred projects can be constructed.

Far too many previously authorized and funded barrack projects remain in a deferred status. The shortage of living space for troops at Army installations in the United States is critical. Construction of previously authorized and funded barrack projects should be started immediately. I am sure I speak for every member of the committee when I say that authorized projects for either barrack complex or dormitory space should be released and construction begun at the earliest possible date. Morale is important. Adequate housing is an essential element in troop morale.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 952, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **RIVERS** of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 390, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—390

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson

Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza

Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain

Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love

McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino

Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Brown, Calif.

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring

Blatnik
Bolling
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conyers
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.

Farnum
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Karth
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Landrum

Long, La.
Martin, Ala.
Moorhead
Morrison
Nedzi
Passman
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Scott
Senner
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, S. 3105, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO THE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House of an addition to the program on House Resolution 929, authorizing the Speaker to appoint a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures of candidates for the House, that this will be called up tomorrow in addition to the bill previously announced.

PROPER USE OF U.S. TREASURY HOARD OF SILVER DOLLARS CAN SPEED THE DAY TO A SOLUTION OF THE DREADED DISEASES OF CANCER AND HEART

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee has before it bills which would allow the U.S. Treasury to sell silver dollars to the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association.

The Treasury would sell these dollars at face value and the health organizations would resell them with proceeds earmarked for research into the causes of cancer, heart disease, and stroke.

This legislation, which is embodied in H.R. 13150 and related bills, would give the Treasury an orderly means of disposing of its idle supply of nearly $3 million in silver dollars. At the same time, we would have an opportunity to give a meaningful boost to research into diseases which cause 71 percent of the deaths in the country.

Recently, the Providence, R.I., Journal carried a thoughtful editorial on this issue. I place this excellent editorial in the RECORD.

[From the Providence (R.I.), Journal, July 13, 1966]

THE PATMAN PROPOSAL ON SILVER DOLLARS MAKES SENSE

A fortune in silver dollars poses something of a problem for the U.S. Treasury. Nearly three million of the cartwheels now rest in the Treasury vaults. They are all that the government has left of some 460 million silver dollars turned out by the mints in earlier years.

No silver dollars have been minted since 1935. But until only a few years ago the supply seemed to be ample and most of the big cartwheels were in general circulation.

A run on the silver dollars began about three years ago. Coin collectors and speculators began snapping them up and the silver dollars soon vanished from general circulation. The Treasury's supply stood at 94 million early in 1963 just before the big run developed. But that supply dwindled to 28 million within a year, and it was down to only three million in March, 1964, when the Treasury called a halt and froze the remainder. The three million remaining cartwheels are still frozen in the Treasury vaults.

Coin collectors are particularly intrigued by the fact that the frozen remnant of the Treasury's hoard includes some 2.8 million silver dollars minted at Carson City, Nev., in the last century and never put out into circulation. These pieces have great numismatic value because of their condition and their rarity and might be worth as much as $15 each in the open market.

The Treasury isn't eager to let the silver dollars go at face value if that should mean large profits for a few lucky speculators, nor does it wish to melt down the coins into bullion, thus destroying their numismatic value.

At this juncture, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, has stepped forward with a proposal that would remove the Treasury's dilemma, get the silver dollars out into the hands of collectors, and accomplish some other beneficial results.

Mr. PATMAN is sponsoring a bill that would permit the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association to acquire the cartwheels from the Treasury at face value. The two organizations then would be permitted to resell the silver dollars for whatever they might produce in the open market.

The profits from the transaction would be used by the nonprofit organizations to finance their medical research.

Some difficulties can be anticipated. Scores of non-profit organizations are active in various specialized fields of health research. The patrons of these many organizations might want to know why they shouldn't be cut in, too, and why all the profit is to be channeled to the Cancer Society and the Heart Association.

It would be enormously difficult, of course, to allocate the profits fairly among all the many reputable and deserving organizations working in the field of health and medical research. In further justification of his proposal, Mr. PATMAN points out that cancer, heart disease and strokes are estimated to cause about 70 per cent of the deaths in this country, and that the Cancer Society and the Heart Association are the two principal national organizations working on research to reduce that toll.

All things considered, the Patman proposal appears to offer an orderly way to dispose of the Treasury's problem, get the silver dollars into the hands of collectors, and at the same time provide two worthy organizations with additional funds with which to pursue their useful research.

HIGH INTEREST CAUSING SERIOUS PROBLEMS—CAN ONLY BE STOPPED BY UNDOING THE DEVASTATING AND UNNECESSARY STEP MADE BY THE FEDERAL RESERVE DECEMBER LAST—VOTE FOR H.R. 14026 TO EXPRESS WILL OF CONGRESS FOR LOWER AND LOWER INTEREST RATES—NOT HIGHER AND HIGHER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many people are losing their savings of a lifetime because of high interest.

The Federal Reserve Board in December 1965 raised interest rates 37½ percent on negotiable certificates of deposit which has caused the trouble we are now experiencing.

I do not see any relief for people who are being oppressed and economically destroyed because of high interest in the proposals that the Secretary of the Treasury has embraced. The Treasury admits the Federal Reserve caused it, but is apparently unwilling to do anything that does not meet with the approval of the Federal Reserve. Every day there are reports of the terrible effects of the high-interest policy. Since the Federal Reserve caused it and is refusing to make any correction of any kind whatsoever to ease the situation, Congress should do something about it immediately despite the Federal Reserve. H.R. 14026 reported by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House by a vote of 19 to 9 should come up soon. A vote for it will be a vote instructing the monetary authorities that Congress wants lower and lower interest rates—not higher and higher.

The Federal Reserve's seized independence contrary to law during the Eisenhower administration and the failure to come back into the Government at the end of the Eisenhower administration is the basic cause of the trouble.

The distinguished minority leader of the House, Mr. FORD of Michigan, in a television appearance recently in referring to economic questions and what he called inflation in particular said that the administration has not really gone back to the primary cause of inflation. The minority leader is correct; however, it applies to the Republicans the same as it does the administration in power. Any inflation that we have today was caused by the Federal Reserve raising interest rates 37½ percent last December. That is the basic cause and is also the basic cause of the high, uncontrolled competitive interest rates. It is my hope that the minority leader will have something to say against the Federal Reserve for its seized independence and that he will also recognize and condemn the ridiculous interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve under this seized independence.

How anyone can be for our form of government and be in favor of a few big bankers running the monetary and credit system of our country, despite the President and despite Congress, I cannot understand.

How can anyone say that it is good Americanism for the money trust—and it is a trust—to be allowed to seize the monetary and credit policies of the U.S. Government without effective protest from those of us in the Government elected by the people who have the responsibility to look after the people's welfare?

The Federal Reserve is not independent; its so-called independence is a fake and a fraud.

The Federal Reserve only has squatter's rights to the title it has seized and, unless Congress does something about it, the Federal Reserve will claim in a few years that these squatter's rights have ripened into a good title. So it is time for the Congress to act now; otherwise the interest burden for the national debt alone will be larger than we can afford to pay and everything else will have to wait. The top money paid by the taxpayers goes for interest. It comes first.

Many of the important members of the money trust are so much opposed to any type of social benefits to the people—like old age pensions and many other social benefits—that they will certainly do everything within their power to make it impossible for the Federal Government to pay these benefits. They are willing to use high interest as one of the weapons for the purpose of making it cost the Federal Government so much to service this debt that payments in the form of social benefits will be impossible. This is not difficult for them in view of the fact that they receive the principal benefits because of extortionate high interest rates.

The rates that people are compelled to pay now are little short of highway robbery in broad daylight. They are not competitive rates made in the marketplace. This is also a fake.

The Federal Reserve fixes the rates on Government securities and the Government debt is big enough that the rates fixed on the Government debt prevails in other parts of our economy.

Interest rates in the entire economy go up and down according to the Government interest rates. The Federal Reserve could fix interest rates on Government obligations at 1.99 or 3.07 or any other figure and cause the rate exactly where it is fixed by the Federal Reserve on Government operations.

The Federal Reserve determined since the commencement of the Eisenhower administration to make rates higher and higher until today we are paying twice as much interest on long-term obligations as we were paying 15 years ago. Short-term Government rates that caused the Government to pay $100 for the use of a certain sum of money for a certain period of time during World War II now costs the Government $3,000 for the same amount borrowed for the same length of time.

To argue that high interest was necessary to stop inflation was just as illogical as arguing that gasoline should be used to put out a fire.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES BILL CALLING FOR A CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER TO BE GRANTED TO THE POP WARNER LITTLE SCHOLARS, INC.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce a resolution asking that a congressional charter be granted to the Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc., the corporate body of Pop Warner Junior League Football. This organization is infinitely worthy of this honor, as is exemplified by the extraordinarily high caliber of the boys with which they are able to work. Pop Warner emphasizes the primary importance of the academic and the need for good sportsmanship, proper physical fitness, and a love of the game of football. The program strives to bring youth closer together through a common interest in scholarship, fellowship, and athletic competition.

The 1966 season marks the 38th year for the program, thus making Pop Warner Junior League Football the Nation's oldest and largest boys' football and scholastic training program. The program owes its inception in Philadelphia to the efforts of Joseph J. Tomlin, an outstanding lineman during his years at Swarthmore and an alumnus of Harvard Law School. Tomlin sought through Pop Warner football to expose boys of the ages of 10 to 14 to the game of safety-first football, emphasizing its qualities for building character and sportsmanship as well as pointing out the need for high equipment standards, proper coaching and officiating.

To aid his goal Tomlin adopted the name of the late great collegiate football coach Glenn Scobie "Pop" Warner. Born on a farm in western New York, Warner played varsity football at Cornell and went on to coach the Indians in Carlisle, Pa. When the school closed in 1914 he went to the University of Pittsburgh, then to Stanford, and finally Temple University. In his years of coaching he provided a continuing inspiration for all who worked under him and today his name remains a symbol of what the Pop Warner Junior League football program is attempting to achieve.

A very essential part of the program is the careful matching of youthful grid opponents by strict adherence to maximum and minimum age and weight requirements. To accomplish this the league has been split into five classifications: Peewee, Junior Midget, Midget, Junior Bantam, and Bantam. These divisions encompass all of the boys of pre-high school age, with prime consideration given to the safety of every child and secondarily, equality of competition.

As evidence of the enthusiasm for Pop Warner football, I cite my own constituency of Rochester, N.Y., as an example. Pop Warner is relatively new to the area, the first team having been started only 4 years ago. Since then as support has mounted each year, more teams have been added making a total today of 10 in the Greater Rochester area encompassing over 350 boys. The commissioner in Rochester, Mr. Joseph P. Miller, has often remarked on the enthusiasm which has greeted this program and the utter inability of the present number of teams to cope with the number of boys wishing to participate.

No better examples exist of what Pop Warner is trying to inspire than the 32 boys of age 12 to 14 who were chosen as members of the 1966 Pop Warner All-America Team of Little Scholars. The competition is open to all of the approximately 600,000 boys playing the Pop Warner brand of safety-first, academic football from coast to coast and several foreign countries. These outstanding boys were chosen on the basis of their scholastic achievement, participation in activities both inside and outside of school, and their performance on Pop Warner football elevens last fall. I was pleased to see that two of these boys, Thomas Lapple and Arthur Pires, were from my own district and I wish to personally commend their merit in achieving this honor.

Twenty of the 32 1966 All-America boys carried an "A" or better scholastic average and 27 of the 32 boys have attained a combined academic-football rating of "A" or "A-plus" as compiled by the Pop Warner headquarters. In recognition of their achievement, these boys have been invited to participate in the 1966 Pop Warner Little Scholar's pilgrimage which will take them to Disneyland, Calif., and to the centennial celebration being held in Vancouver, British Columbia, where they have been asked by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to give the official congratulations from the United States.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this time a letter that I received from Mr. John Scott, executive director of the Pop Warner Junior League football program, which expresses very clearly its great desire to be accorded the honor of a congressional charter.

POP WARNER JUNIOR LEAGUE FOOTBALL,
Philadelphia, Pa.
Congressman FRANK HORTON,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: We sincerely hope that your efforts on our behalf to have Pop Warner Junior League Football granted a Congressional Charter of Federal Incorporation similar to that granted to Little League Baseball will meet with the same success as the efforts of you and your colleagues on behalf of that worthy organization two years ago.

Pop Warner Junior League Football is the football counterpart of Little League Baseball and like that organization has operated for many years under the non-profit corporate status of a single state, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where the program was founded in Philadelphia in 1929.

The issuance of a Federal Charter will greatly broaden the scope of the Pop Warner organization and will give protection to the Pop Warner name and insignia, and the youngsters participating under their auspices.

More importantly, it will have the program fall within the guardianship of the Congress of the United States, and will see Pop Warner Junior League Football join Boy Scouts, Boys' Clubs of America, Red Cross and Little League Baseball in the select circle of organizations so honored.

The outstanding feature of Pop Warner Junior League Football which sets it apart from all other youth athletic programs is its scholastic improvement division called the Little Scholars. It is the aim of the Little Scholars phase of the program to instill in every Pop Warner player the desire to excel in the class room as well as on the football field.

Pop Warner Junior League Football has long enjoyed the personal support and backing of many of the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. This support and backing has greatly aided the program which this fall will celebrate its 38th year.

A Federal Charter will prove to be the crowning glory to an organization of humble origin which today serves more than a half million boys and girls who play and support the Pop Warner brand of safety-first football throughout the United States and in several foreign lands.

Sincerely,
JOHN D. SCOTT,
National Executive Director.

Having had personal contact with this organization and the magnificent job which it has done in aiding boys of all ages to get to know one another and themselves better through sportsmanship, scholarship, and athletic competition, I feel deeply honored to be able to introduce this bill as a fitting tribute to the men and boys that have made this great organization possible. Mr. Speaker, I urge you and each of my colleagues to give full support to my resolution, so that a congressional charter may be granted to the Pop Warner Little Scholars.

HORTON URGES ADEQUATE COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL CLERKS AND LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, to distribute the increasing volume of mail circulating throughout the United States requires the time, efficiency, and sincere devotion of the postal employees who perform this almost superhuman job. We all admire and respect the postal clerks and letter carriers who keep our mail service running smoothly, but little has been done to raise these workers' salaries to a level nearly comparable with the employees of private industry. It is time to remedy the situation.

Statistics released by the Post Office Department indicate that the workload volume for 1966 is already up 9 percent, however, postal employee work hours have not increased in the same proportion. Since work hours have only climbed 7.5 percent—not 9 percent—the postal employees must work even harder to maintain their present outstanding service.

My proposal, which is embodied in H.R. 16927, would reclassify specified positions within the postal field service and would raise all postal clerks and letter carriers in the first four compensation levels to the level immediately above their present level. Introduction of my bill lends force to my appeal for action.

The general Federal pay raise bill, while deserved, does not substantially benefit those at the lower pay levels in the Post Office Department. Previously, bills boosting postal employees' salaries have mainly helped those of the higher levels and basically ignored the men who are directly responsible for mail processing and delivery.

In the United States today, there does not exist a job entirely similar to that of the postal clerks. Yet in the past, these workers, for pay purposes, have been compared with Federal clerical office-workers, usually female. While there is no doubt that clerical workers occupy an important place in our Government structure, their workload, responsibilities, and efficiency requirements bear little resemblance to the standards set for postal clerks. Thus, the comparisons used to arrive at these men's salaries are obsolete.

Likewise, the letter carriers are long overdue for this updating of their salary scales. It may be old and worn, but the statement adapted from Herodotus holds true today as much as it did a hundred years ago:

> Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

Each day our letter carriers brave the elements and encounter all kinds of adversity, and still each day our mail gets through. How long can we permit to endure a system which does not reward these men for their sacrifices? I believe we cannot permit this situation to endure a moment longer.

In my belief, the clerks and the carriers together comprise a group which compares most favorably with any group in the history of our Government service. Their dedication and devotion to America provide a continuing inspiration to us all.

Yet we do not pay these individuals a decent wage.

I have received reports from across the country of many of our finest public servants leaving the Government service. We must cut down on this high turnover rate. Our postal service cannot afford to lose these men. Instead, we must retain these individuals who, by their ability and conscientious attitude, are the backbone of our public service.

Also, we must enable the postal service to attract new men and women of the highest quality. To do this, we have to offer wages which are comparable to private industry and which compare favorably with the rest of governmental service. Our Post Office Department must be able to continue to draw the finest and most capable people into its ranks. Now these employees are paid at rates which at most can amount to the regular civil service equivalent of grade 5 or a little over $5,000 on the first step. With the rising standard of living and insufficient pay increases in the past, even this maximum figure is lacking.

Now is the time for action on this bill. The longer we wait, the more outdated salaries of postal employees will became. We need to move now if we are to meet the demand created by rising living costs. The dedicated service of the postal clerks and letter carriers must be rewarded.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE A TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the 89th Congress over 50 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate have introduced measures to provide a tax credit for educational purposes. I was one of the early sponsors of this legislation, my bill being H.R. 978.

Thus it is most distressing for me to learn recently of the proposed changes advanced by the Internal Revenue Service with regard to tax deductions for education expenses which are presently permitted.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in their full and complete opposition to these changes which were announced in the Federal Register on July 7.

The Internal Revenue Service would eliminate the few tax deductions now permitted. Specifically, the changes would deny an individual a tax deduction for further education once he has received his basic degree or trade certificate.

This body, time and time again, has indicated its belief in the importance of education by such measures as the national defense loan program and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. These two measures are by no means the extent of our involvement in the betterment of education in this country, or of our legislation to provide educational opportunities for all citizens.

Since 1961, the President has recommended a threefold increase in the total Federal investment in education and training. This year over $10 billion was recommended.

In these troubled times, it may appear that some young men continue their education beyond the baccalaureate level merely to avoid the draft. This may be so in some very few cases. The trend in recent years, however, has been to continue schooling for a master's degree or even a doctorate degree, immediately upon obtaining the first degree.

In the teaching field, the bachelor's degree is considered to be only a basic prerequisite for teaching. California, I understand, requires 5 years of college before certification as a teacher.

In the field of engineering, many companies do not, and will not, recruit those who are completing work on their first degree. They want and need men with at least a master's degree. A cursory look at the page after page of advertisements in any major Sunday newspaper will tell you that these engineering firms are having a difficult time finding these engineers.

For those who wish to go into the legal profession, 3 years of additional study is required after the receipt of the initial degree. A delay after obtaining the first degree in order to obtain funds to finance the legal degree would postpone until almost 30 the age at which young men would enter the legal field.

Society has shown its need and desire for quality education beyond a baccalaureate level. Congress has indicated its belief in such a goal. Yet the IRS is trying to take away the few educational deductions now allowed. We cannot permit this, for in the long run we shall only be increasing the total cost of our educational package.

When families are denied these educational deductions, additional Federal appropriations will be requested to meet the demand of increased reliance on federally financed educational programs. The end result will be added costs in financing educational assistance, and a greater instead of lesser dependence by individuals on the Federal Government for the basic necessities of life.

REPORT ON CLEVELAND'S HOUGH AREA

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cuyahoga County grand jury, headed by the eminent Louis B. Seltzer, former editor of the Cleveland Press, has just completed an investigation of the recent terrible and tragic riots in the Hough area of Cleveland.

The grand jury has found evidence that the Communist Party played a leading role in the outbreak of violence and lawlessness. The report says:

> This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business. They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist Party.

These revelations call for an immediate grand-scale congressional investigation of the riots which have been systematically erupting across the Nation. I urge and support such an investigation so that the lives and property of the millions of law-abiding and patriotic Americans of all races, colors, and creeds will be protected.

I am inserting the story carried in this morning's Cleveland Plain Dealer on the grand jury's findings and I am also including the complete report of the grand jury issued just yesterday:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Aug. 10, 1966]

JURY BLAMES HOUGH RIOT ON PROFESSIONALS, REDS

(By Terence Sheridan)

A small but hard-core cadre of professional trouble-makers, including members of the Communist Party, was responsible for the harrowing Hough riots, the Cuyahoga Co. Grand Jury, said last night. The jury findings were released in a special 17-page report.

The Grand jury, called into special session, by Common Pleas Thomas J. Parrino, on July 26, based its report on testimony from 40 witnesses.

The report said:

"This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business.

"They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist Party."

The jury issued no indictments to add to those handed down during the first week of the investigation in the July rioting and fire-bombing.

The jury cited "some of principal and recurring personalities in the chain of events" before the riots. These included a city employee and a former city employee.

They are Lewis G. Robinson, a former city housing inspector fired for his activities connected with a rifle club, and Harllel Jones, city sewer department employee.

Robinson heads the controversial JFK House (Jomo Freedom Kenyata) at 8801 Superior Avenue, the alleged center of social unrest among youths.

Jones, according to the report, "espouses the ultimate revolutionary purpose for adjusting differences or obtaining desired ends." He is also affiliated with the JFK House.

Although there were no indictments, the report commented: "These senseless acts cannot be tolerated and the perpetrators should be subjected to severe penalties."

The report added: "This jury considers it regrettable and unfortunate for the community's sake that the legal statutes of Ohio and Cuyahoga County are either so outmoded or inadequate in their scope that these 'responsible irresponsibles' cannot at this time be reached by specific indictments for their infamous activities. By persistent additional investigative effort they may be reached later on in this fashion."

The grand jury urged new and more adequate laws in this respect.

The jury asserted that the majority of Hough area residents were blameless for the riots. "The majority of the people in the Hough area had no part in either the lawlessness or disorders," the report said.

"They have been hindered rather than helped by this major tragedy."

The throwing of fire bombs, bricks and bottles, along with pillaging, was "no casual happenstance or coincidence" the report said.

These acts were by "young people previously assigned, trained and disciplined in the roles they were to play in the pattern of these dual outbreaks separated by less than one month."

Robinson and Jones are the key figures in the report's catalog of "the principal and recurring personalities in the chain of events which preceded both the Superior and Hough situations."

Robinson "has been affiliated with the Freedom Fighters of Ohio, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club (which he helped found), the JFK House, of which he is the ultimate head, the Deacons for Defense and the Revolutionary Action Movement," the jury reported.

"All of these clubs to which Lewis Robinson belongs are Black Nationalist Clubs," said the report. The report said testimony discredited Robinson as a leader concerned with generally altruistic interests in youth but rather points to him as inciting these youths to focus their hatreds and as indoctrinating them with his own vigorous philosophy of violence.

Other testimony disclosed that Jones was an "outright exponent of violence, a Black Power apostle with a bitter hatred for all whites," according to the report. Another man, Albert D. Ware-Bey, 11611 Castlewood Ave., N.E., identified as belonging to the same clubs as Robinson and Jones, expressed no allegiance to the U.S. according to the jury report.

Ware-Bey "was not one who could have other than destructive influence upon youths either at JFK House or elsewhere," the report said.

The jury also said that evidence disclosed that "rifle clubs were formed, ammunition was purchased and that a range was established and used; that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for rifle clubs and that instructions were given in the use of Molotov cocktails and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect."

Further, irrefutable evidence was shown to the effect that Robinson pledged reciprocal support to and with the Communist Party of Ohio.

Robinson, however, was not accused of any specific crime by the jury.

The jury also established, according to the report, that four W.E.B. DuBois clubs and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough area disorders.

"They took up residence at 1844 East 81st Street, only a short distance from the central point of origin of the Hough area troubles," according to the report.

The four leaders—identified as Mike Byer (also known as Mike Davidow), Daniel Mack, Ronald Lucas and Steve Shreefter—came from Chicago and New York, the report said.

"They were seen constantly together," the report said. They made swift contact with the JFK House leadership, and with Phil Bart of Middlehurst Rd., Cleveland Heights, and his wife Connie who, the evidence showed, are leaders of the Communist Party throughout the Ohio Valley district, including Cleveland.

With specific reference to the W.E.B. Dubois Clubs, the report said "the four out-of-towners are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough area to the west side."

Special Grand Jury Report Relating to Hough Riot

Your honor, Judge Thomas J. Parrino, presiding judge, criminal branch, Common Pleas Court of Cuyahoga County:

As a preface to the attached report of the county grand jury convenes by you in special session for dealing with the recent Hough area riots, this jury would like to make some general observations to you.

These are reinforced by approximately six months of reviewing the status of law and order among the people of this county.

We assume that the people of Cuyahoga County are in the main typical of people of the whole nation during this latter half of the turbulent 20th Century.

It is our firm belief that what America needs more urgently than anything else is a renewal of good citizenship by all of us.

Of equal concern by this jury are the steady erosion of ideals and principles of God and country and their persistent replacement by the deification of material idols and material "principals." We profoundly believe that a rigid adherence by everyone to the established law and order of this country should instantly replace the guerilla warfare practiced in the streets and neighborhoods.

Whatever we in this country set out to achieve should be accomplished within the framework of the laws fashioned for the benefit and protection of every citizen and not by any means we think can be employed or the time we fix for ourselves.

We believe there should be a restoration of the qualities of good faith, of honesty and a willingness to hear out the other person or the other side without resort to violence and disorder, whether, around a bargaining table with capital and labor, or grievances among people of different background or ethnic origin. We believe in an elevation of ethical and moral standards and conduct, including those in high places in government, and in business and in the professions—a general going-over of our entire pattern of national life and values.

What this country and this community needs, in the opinion of this jury of laymen, themselves citizens and parents and in business and professions, is not so much a blood bath but a good cleansing spiritual bath.

I

This jury was called into special session and directed by presiding judge Thomas J. Parrino of Common Pleas Criminal Court to inquire specifically into what now has become known as the "Hough Area Situation."

Judge Parrino's directive was in two parts:

1—To establish the immediate cause of the fire-bombing, shooting, pillaging, general lawlessness and disorder.

The judge requested that this jury learn whether the outbreak of disorder in this two-mile square area housing 60,000 Negro people, was organized, and, if so, by whom.

2—To establish as nearly as possible the basic circumstance under which 60,000 human beings were living in this relatively restricted area and for whom the life, limb and property of all were placed in jeopardy by the disorders.

The jury has made this appraisal within the time limits and facilities available and herein reports its general findings.

NO. 1

This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals of this business.

They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist Party.

The majority of people in the Hough area had no part in either the lawlessness or disorders.

They have been hindered rather than helped by this major tragedy.

This jury considers it regrettable and unfortunate for the community's sake that the legal statutes of Ohio and Cuyahoga County are either so outmoded or inadequate in their scope that these "responsible irresponsibles" cannot at this time be reached by specific indictments for their infamous activities.

By persistent additional investigative effort they may be reached later on in this fashion.

(This jury later in this report urges new and more adequate laws in this respect.)

It is likewise observed by this jury that it did not have the necessary special investigative resources which could be and should be focused exclusively in tracking down the required immediate and far-reaching evidence for conclusive legal action against specific individuals.

However, in making this observation the jury wishes especially and particularly to commend those established arms of law enforcement which have worked so resourcefully, effectively and energetically in this aggravated situation.

By this the jury means, to be precise and specific, the Cleveland Police Department in all of its branches, from the Chief to the newest rooky, and to the Ohio National Guard when invoked by the Governor in this serious community emergency.

The jury nevertheless must emphasize that with the limitations imposed by the necessity of at all times guarding the community, the established arms of law enforcement are not equipped either with the resources or the investigative facilities to make such a total all-out and extended inquiry under this situation as is obviously called for.

This jury in consideration of the basic and wide public interest and exercising the latitude granted it under the laws which empower the creation of such a body as ours, nonetheless make reference to individuals and organizations that in varying degrees were contributors to the Hough area lawlessness and disorder.

It further notes the presence of many of these same individuals and organizations in another instance of lawlessness and disorder, that on Superior Avenue, which bore many of the striking similarities to the Hough area disorders.

It notes the further significant fact that the Superior Avenue episode preceded the Hough area disorders by less than a month.

Some of the same people were observed in both places on several nights of the disorders.

This jury further believes, that, even though what already happened is both regrettable and tragic in every conceivable human aspect there is a grave potentiality for repetition of these disorders or others like them occurring elsewhere in this community.

Different techniques might be employed; but the results would be equally disastrous or even more so.

Therefore, this jury believes its judgment should be made an important part of the formal record of what has happened and of whatever may happen in the rather unpredictable future toward which we all as citizens of this community are mutually moving wherever we may live or whatever may be our place in life.

Finally, before making specific reference to adult leaders in this crises areas, and the events leading up to them, the jury respectfully calls attention to the effective uses made of impressionable, emotionally immature and susceptible young minds by those who for one reason or another have set out to accomplish their designs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America and elsewhere.

It is no casual happenstance or coincidence that those throwing fire bombs or bricks or bottles or pillaging or generally engaged in disorder and lawlessness were in the main young people obviously assigned, trained and disciplined in the roles they were to play in the pattern of these dual outbreaks separated by less than one month.

Nor, by the same token, is it happenstance, or even just singular coincidence:

1) That the over-all pattern for fire bombing and destruction to both the Superior and Hough areas was so highly selective;

2) That the targets were plainly agreed upon;

3) That certain places were identified to be hit, and that certain other places were similarly spared.

On both of these occasions, the Superior and Hough disorders, the presence of teenagers previously referred to, was observed by the police, by plainclothes officers and undercover agents who had been assigned for long periods to observe these youths.

With this background firmly established by the jury's inquiry, and with the notable help of County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan and his staff, particularly Assistant County Prosecutor John T. Patton, this jury herewith makes reference to some of the principal and recurring personalities in the chain of events which preceded both the Superior and Hough situations:

THE J.F.K. HOUSE

The J.F.K. House, meaning Jamo Freedom Kenyata House, is located at 8001 Superior Avenue. The leaders are:

Lewis G. Robinson, and Beth Robinson, his wife, living at 1242 East 89th Street;

Harllel Jones, 9716 Hough Avenue; Albert D. Ware-Bey, 11611 Castlewood Avenue; and Philip Morris, 7806 Radell Avenue.

Lewis Robinson has been affiliated with the Freedom Fighters of Ohio, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club (which he helped to found), the JFK House, of which he is the ultimate head, the Deacons for Defense, and the Revolutionary Action Movement.

All of these clubs, to which Lewis Robinson belongs, are Black Nationalist clubs.

Testimony before this jury discredited Lewis Robinson as a leader concerned with generally altruistic interests in youth but rather points to him as inciting these youths to focus their hatreds and indoctrinating them with his own vigorous philosophy of violence.

He exerted a profound influence over the JFK youths and he still does.

Harllel Jones is affiliated with JFK House, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club, the Revolutionary Action Movement; he is vice president of the Deacons for Defense in spite of his public disavowals, and had frequently either presided over or sponsored meetings for Black Nationalists, and espouses the ultimate revolutionary purpose for adjusting differences or obtaining desired ends.

Along with Lewis G. Robinson, Harllel Jones caused 2,000 pieces of literature to be printed and circulated, citing alleged instances of "police brutality," and on the eve of the Hough riots circulated the greatest number of these to youths of non-voting age under the plausible guise of urging the defeat of a levy at the polls.

Special movies of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the jury presented Harllel Jones as an outright exponent of violence, a Black Power apostle with a bitter hatred of all whites, a co-founder of the Rifle Club.

Albert D. Ware-Bey, belonged to the same clubs as Harllel Jones. He declined to testify before the jury. Police agencies presented evidence that Ware-Bey, Robinson and Jones all purchased quantities of rifles, and all belonged to the Rifle Clubs here and in other cities.

Ware-Bey expressed no allegiance to this country, professed himself not to be bound by its laws and in the opinion of the jury, by both testimony and his own conduct, was not one who could have other than destructive influence upon youth either at the JFK House or elsewhere.

There was evidence placed before the jury that Rifle Clubs were formed, that ammunition was purchased and that a range was established and used, that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for rifle clubs, and that instructions were given in the use of Molotov cocktails, and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect.

Further, irrefutable evidence was shown to the effect that Robinson pledged reciprocal support to and with the Communist Party of Ohio.

In addition, Robinson attended many meetings at which imported Communist speakers talked and was arrested at one of these.

It was established before the jury that the leaders of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, and the Communist Youth Party with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough area disorders.

They took up residence at 1844 East 81st Street, only a short distance from the central point of origin of the Hough area troubles.

These men, who came from Chicago, New York and Brooklyn, were Mike Bayer, otherwise known as Mike Davidow, Daniel Mack, Ronald Lucas, and Steve Shreeter.

These were seen constantly together. They made swift contact with the JFK House leadership, and with Phil Bart of Middlehurst Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and his wife, Connie, who, the evidence showed, are the leaders of the Communist Party throughout the Ohio Valley district, including Cleveland.

With specific regard to the W. E. B. DuBois Club, the evidence further shows that Mike Bayer, Daniel Mack, Ron Lucas and Steve Shreeter, previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough area over to the west side: that they are not employed, are now so far as the jury knows without any visible means of support but nevertheless are able to carry on their advocacy and to maintain themselves with clothing, food and shelter from some undermined source. Finally evidence was presented that UJAMA is an organization dedicated to black power and has begun its effort to establish itself in the Cleveland area. Their philosophy is that black people should be governed by themselves in every respect and that anything pertaining to the rights of Negroes must be cleared through the central organization of UJAMA which has flourished in New York, and has spread into other places, and is embraced locally by Lewis Robinson and his lieutenants at JFK House. In attendance at one specific meeting at which plans for UJAMA in Cleveland were discussed were Robinson, Jones and Ware-Bey. Also in attendance at this meeting was Cornelius Freeman from Cleveland, Oserjiman Adefumi, also known as Serge King, and Gizengaga Latunji, representing New York UJAMA.

It is this jury's opinion that the investigative authorities have progressed sufficiently to justify the expectation they will ultimately, if either urged or permitted to follow beyond what they have thus far gathered be able to put together all of the pieces to this pattern of lawlessness and disorder.

Because of this jury's strong judgment in this regard it earnestly urges its successors to pursue the Superior and Hough disorders with the utmost vigor and determination.

Nothing less than this should be permitted in the public interest.

In this section of its report to Judge Thomas J. Parrino, the jury wishes to reiterate the fact that the overall majority of the people living in the Hough area distressed, frustrated, beset with problems, unimaginable to those who do not endure them, have nothing whatever to do with these disorders and destructions, and the jury on the contrary expresses its wholehearted admiration for the good citizenship and restraint in these tense and emotional times.

In the course of its investigation the grand jury has learned that police and firemen were targets for snipers and individuals throwing rocks and bricks.

Further, fire equipment was damaged, particularly hoses which were cut or attempted to be cut so as to render them useless in the protection of persons and property.

These acts were a direct affront to lawful authority and of necessity would lead to justifiable armed self-protection, unfortunately resulting in occasional injury and death to the innocent.

These senseless acts cannot be tolerated and the perpetrators should be subjected to severe penalties.

The police and firemen on the other hand should be commended for their efforts to maintain law and order in the face of great personal danger.

The general conduct of our police and fire departments, we feel, command and receive the highest respect of our law-abiding citizens from all groups.

It is a recommendation of this grand jury that all decent law-abiding citizens proclaim their support of law and order and their support of policemen and firemen in carrying out their duties toward that end.

This, in turn, will of necessity command a course of conduct on the part of police and firemen and particularly of the police, who have more intimate contact with the public, which will be of the highest calibre of efficiency and decency and patience and will thus contribute to a greater restoration of our American ideal of equal treatment.

As earlier in this section of the jury's report it was indicated, the jury now requests that the Cuyahoga County delegation to the next session of the Ohio assembly give serious consideration to the following suggestions for new and more inclusive legislation covering such situations as the Superior and Hough area disorders represent.

The jury's suggestions therefore are:

1. Inciting to riot.

2. No person with the intent to cause a riot shall do any act or engage in any conduct which urges a riot, or urges others to commit acts of force or violence, or the burning or destroying of property, and at a time and place and under circumstances which produce a clear and present and immediate danger of acts of force or violence or the burning or destroying of property.

Whoever violates this section shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than 20 years.

2. Definition of riot.

Any use of force or violence, disturbing the peace or any threat to use such force or violence if accompanied by immediate power of execution involving two or more persons carrying on such a conduct and without authority of law is a riot.

3. Enhanced Penalty for Arson or Attempted Arson during a riot.

An amendment to revise Code Section 2907.06 (this section concerns itself with the intent to burn or set on fire or to do any act preliminary thereto or the burning of buildings):

"Upon the proclamation of the Governor proclaiming a state of disaster or extreme emergency because of a riot, whoever violates this section during such period covered by said proclamation shall be fined not less than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 20 years or both."

4. Assault against a Fireman or Policeman acting in the course of his duty.

No person shall assault a fireman or policeman while such fireman or policeman is acting in the course of his duty. Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not less than one nor more than 20 years or both.

NO. 2

In addressing itself to the second of Judge Parrino's directives, namely, the conditions of life prevailing in the Hough area, this jury finds:

Poverty and frustration crowded by organized agitators served as the uneasy backdrop for the Cleveland riots.

Unfortunately it is the overwhelming mass of innocent and law-abiding citizens who pay the greatest penalty in any crossfire of violence.

The following inequities and practices contributed as a feeding ground for disorder:

a) the density of population in the Hough area.

b) inadequate and sub-standard housing.

c) charging of exorbitant rents by absentee landlords.

d) non-enforcement of the housing code.

e) woefully inadequate recreational facilities for children whose uncertain home life calls for this kind of wholesome community outlet, and for the constructive guidance and counsel to offset their regrettable environment.

f) sub-standard educational facilities as a consequence of long neglect which in substantial fairness have been greatly improved in recent years but which still call for further effort on the part of officials and community leaders.

g) excessive food prices in most instances accompanied by all too frequently with foodstuffs found to be inferior in freshness or quality.

h) the denial of equal economic opportunities.

i) diminished incentives by repressed and neglected people.

j) the present system of paying women for having children frequently out of wedlock or under a relationship loosely described as "common law"—which enables the father to walk out of his "marital arrangement" to escape his proper responsibilities.

(The current welfare system should be challenged in this respect for this effect upon the very people who are supposed to benefit. Children brought into the world under such callused and financially expedient circumstances are rarely seen by their fathers. This system the jury believes is anything but helpful either to the mothers or the fathers or the children or the community. Surely this jury believes those charged with social and moral responsibility in this community are capable of devising a much more equitable and effective formula than the prevailing one.)

k) regardless of how the very large addition of Negroes formerly widely dispersed throughout the deep and mid-south have migrated to the large Northern cities like Cleveland, the fact is that these men, women and children are here.

(In many instances the mode of life they find in such large cities as Cleveland differs substantially from that which prevailed in the places whence they came. Frequently they find themselves bewildered and unable quickly to adjust themselves to the demands of their new surroundings and thus find themselves frequently at cross purposes with the authorities and the older residents of the areas in which they find themselves currently.)

Impatience among the Negro people for the improvement of their citizenship is understandable, but the opinion has been expressed they may be attempting to exact too much too fast for the community to bear within an arbitrarily fixed time limit.

The fact nevertheles is that too many human beings, however, they arrive in our midst, or whence they come, or why, are living under such completely intolerable conditions in the Hough area at the present time, that that inevitably the consequences must be futility, frustration, bitterness and exposure to the abrasive forces advocating violence.

These factors make them prone to the almost immutable bi-products of such conditions; crime, delinquency, loose living, tragic deterioriation of moral behaviour and the brittle bitter hyper-sensitivity which emerges therefrom; and in the aggregate these effects represent potential danger not only to themselves but to the community as a whole.

There are no longer moats complacently situated in which any citizen can live under modern conditions safely removed from the turmoil and anxiety and bitterness of others, irrespective of skin or religious identification, or political inclinations or economic and social environment.

Whatever happens in the large cities of America, as in the community of greater Cleveland, eventually effects all citizens in one way or another.

All these complex social evils are used as subtle and inflammatory provocations by resident and non-resident organizers who exploit riots such as both the Superior and Hough area riots in Cleveland.

Wherever possible as earlier indicated this jury has diligently sought to pinpoint the cause of these riots.

At this time the return of any additional indictments based on community vengence and not upon evidence sufficient to convict in a court of law would not do credit to our democratic society.

Realistic and productive goals must now be set by this community and that near term emphasis be directed toward:

1) Improvement in housing code enforcement

2) Improvement in police action and court findings against prostitutes, cheat-spots, gambling and the profusion of the numbers of liquor license outlets

3) Continuing drives for improved garbage and rubbish collection. Stronger measures against landlords and tenants to make this task easier for the city,

4) Put the urban renewal program back on the track with the full cooperation of the federal government, as quickly as possible.

Our total resources must be marshalled to prevent a recurrence of this enormous tragedy—a potentiality which this jury strongly counsels is still present.

Where prejudice and injustice are cast aside, the willful and malicious agitator finds little support for his provocative and destructive acts.

This jury does not attempt in this report while sorely tempted to do so to fix responsibility on either individuals or on pressure groups or organizations where the community's failure to more adequately meet its responsibilities.

It does, however, wish to make unmistakably clear that it does not believe this community has adequately measured up to its responsibilities.

By the same token it does not believe that the influential leaders in either the Hough area or in other areas of this community have measured up to their responsibilities.

This jury does at this time urge upon the Mayor, upon the City Council, upon the business, financial and industrial leaders, upon the educators and the civic organizations, to act now either individually or in concert to put Cleveland in the forefront in meeting the sociological and moral challenges of our times as in the past this community has so conspicuously risen to meet the challenges of the past.

This jury cannot conclude its report without paying wholehearted tribute to those wise and long-range leaders of this community who in their great wisdom saw and recognized a situation which now rests uneasily on the conscience of the entire country and it applauds them for their selfless work, their patience, their substance, their cooperative efforts and the many tangible results of their good and wise leadership.

They have set for the rest of us a plateau of good citizenship for which we should all strive.

The time for total community action is now.

Louis B. Seltzer,
Grand Jury Foreman.

August 9, 1966.
Received for filing August 9, 1966.
E. J. Masgay,
Clerk.
By H. J. Reid,
Deputy.

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Ohio, and I would call again to the attention of the House the fact that on Monday last as recorded on pages 18503–18507 of the Congressional Record of that date of August 8, I had a special order in which I discussed in some detail the problem of evidences of Communist subversion in the civil rights field, and renewed my request for an investigation. I urge the Members to consult this speech and to act in this very needed direction.

COST OF LIVING INCREASES IN BENEFITS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in introducing legislation to provide an automatic increase of 3 percent in monthly old age and survivors insurance benefits whenever there has occurred a 3-percent increase in the cost of living.

Between the sporadic increases in social security pensions granted by Congress there has usually been a timelag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered from a drop in their purchasing power.

Congress itself, in the Federal Salary Act of 1962, section 1102, has set a precedent for such a provision by providing an automatic increase in civil service retirement pensions when there has been an increase of 3 percent or more in the retail price index.

An automatic increase in social security and railroad retirement benefits correlated to increases in the Consumer Price Index involve no increase in costs, as a level percentage of payroll wage increases usually precede increases in the other components comprising the Consumer Price Index. Increases in the wage level bring more covered workers nearer the maximum social security wage base and the result is increased tax revenues.

Additionally, the benefits paid represent a smaller proportion of an individual's wages as his wage approaches the maximum wage limit of $6,000. Because of these factors, there is no increase in the level of payroll—although there is an increased flow of dollars—involved in enacting an automatic benefit increase provision.

There is urgent need for such change in the law. Why should aged pensioners continue to suffer while run-away inflation further destroys the purchasing power of the pension dollar? Congress should provide for an automatic offset against the hardship inflation and its resulting rise in prices visit upon our senior citizens.

It is my privilege, therefore, to introduce today this bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder.

"SHOW ME" STATE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today the great State of Missouri celebrates the 145th anniversary of its admission to the Union. Missiouri was admitted on August 10, 1821, as the 24th State. During the 145 years since that date, Missouri has grown and prospered. It has been, and continues to be, a State of which the people of America as well as Missourians, can be proud. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is properly referred to as the mother and/or gateway of the West.

This 145th anniversary brings to mind the great statesmanship of Thomas Hart Benton, who was one of Missouri's first two U.S. Senators. He was the first U.S. Senator to be elected for 30 consecutive years. Senator Benton subsequently served in this House. Today, he would be dubbed as a great conservative who stood for responsible progress.

I call your attention to an article by Mr. Frank W. Rucker, which appeared in the Sunday News & Leader, of Springfield, Mo., on August 7. It points to Missouri's 17-year struggle for statehood and brings out Missouri's history as the "Show Me" State. The article is both interesting and educational. I submit it to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend it to my colleagues:

JOINED UNION 145 YEARS AGO—"SHOW ME" STATE'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Frank W. Rucker)

Wednesday will be the 145th anniversary of Missouri's admission to the union. Following 17 years of pleading by its inhabitants for statehood on the basis of their own desires and ideals, that part of the Louisiana Territory which was known as Missouri was admitted on August 10, 1821, as the 24th State.

In connection with this long and persistent struggle for statehood, there bobs up another good reason, among several that have been given, as to why our state is commonly called the "show me state," and why Missourians should be proud of that designation.

The sobriquet has been attributed to a train conductor who, during the time when members of the state legislature rode free, went through his train headed for Jefferson City crying out: "Show me your passes."

Credit has been given also to a member of Congress who at a high stage of argument in a committee meeting slapped his hand on the podium and shouted: "I'm from Missouri, and you have to show me."

There was also a coon song with the title, "I'm from Missouri and You've Got to Show Me." But these reasons seem trivial when we sense the real "show me" spirit of Missouri so dramatically displayed in her struggle for statehood.

If not spoken openly, there was intimated in every appeal to Congress in those days preceding her admission to the union these words: "Take us in, or show us the reason why." The demand began to take positive force in 1804, when the territory of which Missouri was a part was placed under the governmental direction of the Territory of Indiana.

There was a strong objection by Missourians to be being ruled by non-residents of their own territory.

"Show us why we can't be free to govern ourselves; we want that privilege now," was the demand upon the United States government, but not until 1821, when the Territory of New Orleans was admitted into the union as the State of Louisiana, were the Missourians given any consideration by Congress to encourage them in their move toward statehood.

Congress then brought Missouri a little nearer to her goal by raising her to the second rank of territories.

This encouraged Missouri to further press her demands, and up from the territory arose the cry for self-government louder than ever. "We here in Missouri furnished the bullets and the buckshot that helped bring victory to Andrew Jackson at New Orleans," the Missourians explained, "and we are entitled to consideration at Washington."

* * *

Seven more years then passed without any action by Congress favorable to Missouri. While the territory grew rapidly making it better qualified for statehood, the question of slavery entered the controversy.

Congressmen from the North wanted Missouri to enter the union as a free state, and the South wanted her to come in as a slave state. "This is not a question for you to decide, but for us to determine," said Missourians.

Then eventually Congress relented and on March 6, 1820, gave Missouri the right to form a state government without any restrictions concerning slavery.

Anger that formerly existed in Missouri then gave way to exultation. Dinners were held in various cities of the territory to celebrate the "triumph over Eastern policy and Eastern artifice."

Missourians spoke of Southern Congressmen as "a band of Spartans standing united at the pass of Thermopylae defending the people of Missouri," and many persons suggested that "an imperishable monument of everlasting fame should be erected to the honor of Northern Congressmen who had voted with the Southerners."

* * *

Steps were taken immediately to formulate a state government. Delegates were chosen to attend a constitution-making convention in St. Louis. Interesting indeed and emblematical of Missouri determination is the preamble to the constitution that was adopted: "We, the people of Missouri inhabiting the limits hereinafter designated by our representatives in convention assembled mutually agree to form and establish a Free and Independent republic by the name of the State of Missouri."

An election then was ordered to choose a congressman, a governor, lieutenant-governor, state senators and representatives. "The campaign was spirited," says Dr. Floyd C. Shoemaker in his "History of Missouri and Missourians."

"There were no opposing political parties. Each person voted for the man he liked."

Two United States senators were elected by the Missouri General Assembly when it held its first meeting three months later. The honor of becoming the state's first governor went to Alexander McNair. John Scott was chosen representative in Congress and the General Assembly made David Benton and Thomas Hart Benton United States senators.

With this done, Missouri felt she was established as a state, but when her representatives in Congress went to Washington to assume their duties, they found Congress still in an argumentative mood concerning Missouri's statehood.

Objection was made to a clause in the state's constitution which prevented free Negroes from coming into the state. This was denounced as being contrary to the constitution of the United States.

Missouri, however, gave assurance that the clause would not be enforced so as to deprive any United States citizen of his rights. With this assurance by the state, Missouri was admitted officially to the union. Her long and difficult struggle for statehood was over.

Missouri's resolute "show me" stand for the right to enter the union on her own terms comprises a glowing chapter in her history. Her citizens have a feeling of pride when their commonwealth is spoken of the "show me state."

NO COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, twice I have spoken from this well in clear statement of my position in the matter of compulsory arbitration. I might add that the gentleman from Illinois has been here a good many years, certainly long enough to know the great body of which he is a Member. I am convinced this body never will be a party to halting the onward march of labor with an edict for compulsory arbitration.

I am extending my remarks to include a statement from Reuben G. Soderstrom, president of Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations:

ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION
OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Springfield, Ill., August 9, 1966.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: Suppose you were my employee and I am making a profit out of your labor, and you desire to quit or strike and the Government comes along and says "you can't stop working for six months."

What is your status then? Actually you become my slave for 180 days because you can't quit.

No citizen of the United States should become a slave for 180 minutes or even 180 seconds.

Please vote against Senate Resolution No. 186 forcing airline machinists to return to work against their will. The Resolution is thoroughly bad.

With every personal good wish, I am,
Your friend,
R. G. SODERSTROM,
President.

Reuben Soderstrom's sentiments have been echoed by every telegram I have received from members of organized labor. I present only a sampling of these telegrams:

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 8, 1966.

BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Local Union 1033, representing 5,000 steel workers at Republic Steel Corporation in Chicago, fully support the airline machinists strike for a fair just and equitable contract settlement. We consider any congressional action against the airline machinists a blow against the labor movement and free collective bargaining. We respectfully urge your opposition to the Senate resolution and any other legislation against the striking airline machinists.

XAVIER SMYKOWSKI,
President,
JOHN STAPAY,
Secretary,
Local 1033,
United Steel Workers of America.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 8, 1966.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

This is to inform you that the members of Local 533 International Brotherhood of the Electrical Workers are voicing their position to S.J. Resolution 186 passed by the Senate and now awaiting action in the House trusting that you will take appropriate action in the interest of labor.

I remain, respectfully, your constituent.
JAMES R. CUMMINGS,
President, Local Union 533.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 10, 1966.

BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully request your opposition to adoption of airline strike bill, Senate Joint

Resolution 186. Inconveniencing travelers on expense account does not justify involuntary servitude.

R. W. COPELAND.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 8, 1966.

BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The members of Local 165 IBEW working for Illinois Bell Telephone Co. in Chicago are opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 186 which would force men back to work against their will. There are enough restrictive laws against free men in organized labor. Don't remove their only effective weapon—the strike. Let management come to the table and truly practice collective bargaining which has done so much to raise everyones living standards.

ROBERT A. NICKEY,
Business Manager, Local 165 IBEW.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 8, 1966.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The officers and members of local 9, IBEW, are opposed to any legislation which forces free men to work against their will for the profit of private investors. Senate Joint Resolution 186 passed by the Senate prohibits free workers from exercising their rights under present law. We strongly urge you to vote against any attempt to pass this or similar legislation in the House.

Respectfully yours,

NICK BURKARD, Jr.,
Registrar, Local Union 9, IBEW.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 10, 1966.

BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We respectfully urge that you oppose and vote against Senate Joint Resolution 186 which would force airline machinists back to work against their will for private profit. This joint resolution undermines free collective bargaining and destroys another of our cherished freedoms, the right to strike.

FELIX C. JONES,
General President, United Cement, Lime, & Gypsum Workers Intl. Union 7830.

CHICAGO HEIGHTS, ILL.,
August 10, 1966.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote against any legislation involving our Government in the dispute between the airlines and the machinists union. I feel that the parties should resolve their differences through collective bargaining.

SERAFINO FORMENTINI,
President, Local Union No. 65, USA.

WHO SEZ BIG BUSINESS IS BIG?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of demagogery in this country regarding big business. I for one have always realized that you cannot manufacture an automobile in a machine shop nor refine petroleum products in a corner filling station. Some industries are naturally large and will be so as long as our free enterprise system operates. This has brought us the marvelous system of mass production, distribution and technological improvement that would be curtailed if the Government planners and radicals of the left had their way in atomizing business enterprises.

Herb Philbrick, famous American and dedicated patriot of "I Led Three Lives" fame, publishes a news bulletin which always has worthwhile reading in it. In his July issue he has written an excellent article entitled "Who Sez Big Business Is Big?" I am including it with these remarks since I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. It contains some very fine answers to the specious contentions of those who are always berating business.

WHO SEZ BIG BUSINESS IS BIG?

A noisy segment of our society—the communists, the anti-capitalists, the pro-socialists, "social gospelers" and others—spend much time carping about "Big Business." It is a rare issue of the communist Worker which does not point accusing fingers at "billions of dollars in profits" made by American corporations.

There is no question but that some business establishments in Free America have become very big indeed. The largest of these huge corporations are the "Big Three"—General Motors, American Tel & Tel, and Standard Oil of New Jersey.

These three corporations altogether employ 1,600,000 people, that's more people than there are in the whole State of Nebraska, counting men, women, children and babes in arms. AT & T alone provided 762,000 jobs—and that's more people than we have in the whole State of New Hampshire.

In addition, the Big Three paid, before profits, $6.5 billion in taxes to the government. And the number of employees on the actual payrolls of the Big Three do not tell the whole story, either. General Motors, for example, buys parts and pieces for their automobiles from 26,000 suppliers, most of them small businesses.

Whichever way you look at it, that's pretty big business.

But now let's take a look at the Bureaucracy of the United States Government by comparison.

The figures show that there are more than 13 million people on the U.S. payroll. That's eight times MORE than the three biggest U.S. corporations put together.

The U.S. Government pays out more than $69 billion in salaries; that's six times bigger than the Big Three capitalist outfits put together.

The U.S. Government has a budget of close to $100,000,000,000.00—and that's twenty times the profit made by the three biggest corporations combined.

The moral to these facts is that anyone who worries about "big business," without showing grave concern about Big Government is suffering from an acute case of economic astigmatism.

UP, UP, AND UP

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., has added important documentation and some useful commonsense to the discussion of the dangerous upward trend of food prices. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include for the information of our colleagues the Journal's comprehensive survey of rising food prices and its accompanying editorial which were published on Monday, August 8.

As is clear from the information published by the Journal, the underlying cause of the shrinking power of the food dollar is inflation. While each price increase can be attributed directly to one or more of a number of causes, inflation is the factor common to almost all such increases. And until the administration and Congress take effective action to halt the inflationary spiral, then we can anticipate more of the same.

Just about a year ago, Mr. Speaker, on August 5, I joined with our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID], in reporting on the results of a food price survey we had just completed and calling on the President to adjust his economic policies to fight inflation in the Nation's supermarkets and corner groceries.

In addition to documenting price increases for many individual food items, we noted that the latest food price index, for June 1965, had reached 110, nearly 4 percent above the previous year and 8 percent higher than 5 years ago.

The Department of Labor now reports that the food price index has reached 114 as of June of this year, not only continuing but escalating market basket inflation. The Department of Agriculture's own statistics confirm the seriousness of the situation. Using 11 groups of food, all standard items, the Department found that the same market basket cost 5 percent more in March 1966 than it did just 6 months earlier in September 1965.

Overall, since November 1963, when the President assumed office, the retail price of food has increased by 18 percent.

In May and June of this year, I enlisted the cooperation of my constituents in Union County, N.J., to find out how and to what extent inflation was affecting individual households. Dozens and dozens of my constituents replied, detailing hundreds of price increases and demonstrating that inflation was hurting American families of all income levels, especially those with modest and limited incomes. Almost all, however, cited rising food prices as among their most burdensome problems. And several frankly reported that they had to go without necessities in order to stay within their food budgets.

The Journal article and editorial, Mr. Speaker, add further urgency to the need to act now to stop inflation. We are a rich and prosperous nation, but runaway inflation—nourished by governmental inaction and even acceptance—can destroy much of what our people have worked so hard to accomplish.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal]

THOSE FOOD BUDGET BLUES

There's to be an investigation by the federal government of food price rises. The inquiry will be conducted by the Federal Trade Commission and will take about 90 days. If the present trend continues, a lot of housewives will be bankrupt by then.

Handlers of household food money couldn't care less about the reasons why the cost of staples is soaring. They want a break instead of going broke.

But when people get up in arms about something, government always has to make a big noise of taking action. First, of course, there has to be an investigation. That's why there are enough federal reports stored in Washington and elsewhere to paper the globe.

The farmer is not the villain, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman insists, and he probably is right. He says the growers' share of the food dollar is less than 39 cents. Somebody is getting rich, and it certainly is not the housewife.

In Mr. Freeman's view, increases in farm prices have been earned, badly needed and modest. The modest doesn't apply away from the farms, however. Many retailers are getting two or three times more than the hike in prices at the source.

The old song about "how you gonna keep 'em down on the farm" comes to mind as the secretary argues—and it's valid reasoning—that unless growers are compensated adequately they will continue to give up farming. Such an exodus would put the household budget even more out of balance by creating shortages with resulting higher prices.

Let's look at what happens on food after it leaves the farm, Mr. Freeman suggests. A one-pound loaf of bread went up three cents from July 1965 to last month. At the same time the grower's return for the ingredients—somewhere from farm to table that's being spelled in-gredients—increased only half a cent.

Retailing costs are cited by the agriculture secretary as one partial explanation of the price rises. The consumer, he says, is paying for enlarged supermarket stocks, huge parking lots, trading stamps and other buying lures.

The Federal Trade Commission will give particular attention to the recent rises in milk and bread prices. In this area, bread has just gone up two cents. Milk costs a cent a quart more, with another penny boost due in November.

A woman queried in a newspaper survey of the reaction of housewives to higher food bills commented: "I think it's some kind of madness."

She's right. It is. It's inflation.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.), Daily Journal, Aug. 8, 1966]

FOOD PRICES GO UP, UP, UP AND UP—HOUSEWIVES' TEMPERS KEEP PACE WITH RISE—BUDGETS HIT BY SQUEEZE

(By Louise Peterson)

Daily Journal area housewives are adding their voices to the cries of the nation's consumers as food prices continue upward.

Food prices have been on the rise since December, but pains-in-the-pocketbook have been especially acute in the past month.

Eggs, milk, butter, fruits, vegetables, meats—you name it—the prices are all on the climb.

Mrs. Rita Ash of Elizabeth, upon hearing that The Daily Journal planned to do an article on rising food costs, said:

"Oh, good. I'm glad of it. I think it's terrible. I imagine people will just eat less, or women will have to fix economy menus."

Instead of following her regular route through the store, Mrs. Ash now counterhops picking up her major "must" items first. She then buys the smaller articles as her budget permits.

"You spend more time shopping than usual. That means you're away from home more. It's taxing on the nerves. It leaves you in bewilderment. Where is the money going?" she asked.

Mrs. Ash held up a bunch of bananas which was marked 67 cents. A few months ago, she noted, a bunch of the same size "cost 40-odd cents." "Stew meat is the price of steak," she added disgustedly.

A Cranford woman said tersely: "I bring home $10 worth of groceries in one small bag. It's been particularly noticeable in the past few months. Before I used to come home with a bigger bag."

SUMMER PRICES?

A Roselle housewife nearly yelled when asked about food prices: "They're absolutely hideous. Meat is astronomical. In the past couple of weeks, butter has gone up almost a dime a pound.

"This particular year, I think produce has been outstanding. Usually, when you hit your summer months and supplies are abundant, prices on lettuce, cucumbers and tomatoes drop drastically, and I have not found that this year. You're paying winter prices."

Asked whether she knew who was to blame, she snapped: "I haven't the foggiest notion, but I'd love to wring the neck of whoever is responsible."

A Springfield shopper seemed a bit sour as she complained about the price of lemons to Miss Anne Sheelan, county home economist in charge of the foods and nutrition program of the Union County Home Economics Extension Service.

"Yesterday I had to pay 49 cents for a bag of 10 very small lemons," the Springfield woman lamented. Miss Sheelan agreed that lemons normally would cost approximately three cents each, rather than close to a nickel. However, Miss Sheelan said citrus fruits are most abundant during the winter months.

But the women are not alone in their grumbling.

A Union man who does the food shopping for his family of six joined the chorus of lamentations:

"I'm boycotting onions. I love onions, but now I won't buy them." For a while, he explained, he boycotted bacon, but, he commented: "They finally scaled down the price of canned bacon to 69 cents a pound, so I'm buying that."

He noted the high price of lettuce and cabbage, but conceded that "potatoes are a good buy."

He does not, however, expect to sample much in the way of the famous Jersey tomatoes. "I haven't seen local tomatoes yet, but I read that the tomato farmer faces a disastrous summer because 15–20 per cent of the potential yield is gone because we didn't get enough rain," he explained.

A Plainfield man who keeps his eye on the food markets sees sociological implications in the jump in food prices.

"What's the use of the Federal Government's making anti-poverty grants, when, at the same time, it subsidizes many large, wealthy farmers and restricts acreage, all of which doubles the price of our food. The effects of the anti-poverty program are wiped out as far as I'm concerned."

CITES INCONSISTENCIES

The same man commented on pricing inconsistencies:

"The same chain, for instance advertised blueberries at 29 cents a pint when one of its stores in another town was selling the same pint for 49 cents."

Persons involved in the food business were, by and large, quite willing to discuss the matter.

An exception was Edward Buwalda, store manager of Food Fair, 546 Raritan Road, Roselle. "We haven't noticed big increases in general. We've had some ups and downs," he said with marked reticence. Another was Earl Meyer of the sales department of A & P, Newark. He stated tersely: "We've noticed the publicity involved, but noticeable increases in food prices are kind of hard to pinpoint."

Peter Sheridan, owner of the Orchard Meat Market, 102 Orchard St., welcomed the "publicity" accompanying the ascent of food prices.

CUSTOMERS KNOW PRICES

He declared that his customers deplored the higher costs "but, fortunately, the papers are carrying the stories. That helps me out a little. My customers realize I'm not just raising the prices to get rich quick.

"Actually, as the prices go up we make less and less. We have to absorb some of it. The small store can't compete with the chain stores. In a small store, the only way we can compete is by giving quality merchandise and good service."

Victor Januk, store manager of Foodtown Super Market, 1218 Roselle St., Linden, said consumers "are getting to the point where they're not watching prices anymore. They know items are higher. They hear about it all the time. It doesn't faze them anymore."

Edward Bangert, manager of the Big W, 511 Morris Ave., finds more grumbling about the sales tax, rather than food prices. "The biggest complaint now is the sales tax. I think they're overlooking prices and complaining about the sales tax," he stated.

INCREASES PINPOINTED

Some persons in the food business were quite exact in pinpointing increases.

In most stores, a one-pound loaf of any brand of bread now costs 30 cents. "We had an across-the-board increase of two cents a loaf applied to all loaves. It works out to approximately one-and-a-half cents on a one-pound loaf in the last month," George Meresca, manager of Dugan Bros., 421 E. First Ave., Roselle, said.

"From what I understand," he added, "there have been increases in the price of wheat."

That is the case, but increased wheat prices seem strange in a country which considers a huge surplus as normal and whose government controls the wheat acreage and gives much of its surplus away far a song.

However, poor weather conditions affected some of the acreage allowed to be planted and the amounts of wheat given to afflicted countries exceeded earlier expectations.

Januk noted that large eggs "are running a little more." A month ago, a dozen cost 54 cents; now the shopper must pay 58 cents. A two-pound bag of onions sells for 39 cents, the figure which distresses the Union man.

"Onions have been running high since the new crop came out about two or three months ago," Januk remarked. Asked why, he said, "You've got me."

As to the increases in general, he stated: "Everybody is looking for more money, and the money has to come from somewhere."

Sheridan said dairy products were "sky high," and he pointed out that in December and January he could sell two eight-ounce cans of corn for 29 cents. Now, he must ask 35 cents for two cans of the same size.

He could not give explanations for the price increase but did mention inflation and wage increases. "Maybe it's due to the war in Viet Nam because I remember during the Korean War food prices went up sharply too," he pointed out.

BLAMES OMI

The culprit in the case of rising milk costs is the New Jersey Office of Milk Industry, according to Sam Lampert, president of Lampert Dairy Farms, 1600 E. St. George Ave., Linden.

Lampert is among the milk jug dealers who have waged legal battles against the OMI and its practices.

There is, he believes, no necessity for controls on the price of milk. "They (the OMI) tell us every month how much to get, and this is what we've got to do. Consumers should get up in arms and ask why we should have controlled prices on milk.

"I think if we didn't have any controls, there might be a price which would fluctuate only one or two cents on the gallon a year," he stated.

LONGTIME CONTROLS

Price controls on milk went into effect in 1930 when there was an economic emergency. Such a practice now is tagged "outmoded" by Lampert. "It's a regulated commodity and allows no free competition. It's ridiculous," he remarked.

"The farmer is not getting any more. He's controlled by the federal government," Lampert pointed out.

The OMI escalator on milk prices, which is predicted a month in advance, is "tied to farm prices which are set by the federal government," Lampert explained.

Processors, retailers and other like groups which retained "heavy lawyers" are those responsible for keeping controls on milk, Lampert is sure.

'They aren't controlling it here because there aren't enough farmers in the state now. A lot of it is out-of-state milk. They're protecting the retailers," he noted.

LETTUCE PRICE HIGH

Miss Sheelan reported she had paid 45 cents for a head of lettuce. "That's absolutely outrageous. Yet it should be in quantity this time of year. Summer meals demand lettuce," she declared.

Fruits and vegetables, she believes, will continue to be undersized and in short supply. She said a marketing bulletin, which arrived at her desk, placed the blame on an extended drought. In this area, she indicated, "We've had odd weather conditions this year. There have been extremes of coolness and heat, and there was a frost around May 11."

She had an explanation for some of the high meat prices:

"About a year ago, the lamb and pork supplies were very low. This year, the animals are being held for reproduction purposes, rather than slaughter, so that there will be higher stocks. Fewer are on the market, and this places a great demand on beef." She expects the price of lamb to drop in the spring.

Miss Sheelan said turkey, plums, bartlett pears, and some seafoods, especially scallops and salmon, were good buys. She advised housewives to note the specials offered each week in different markets and to plan menus around the specially priced foods.

However, she cautioned the housewife to limit her search for specials to her own neighborhood, rather than wasting time and gas visiting stores all over town.

LEAVE HUSBANDS HOME

She also warned the women shoppers "to avoid impulse buying and to shop without their husbands and children. Husbands often drop in gourmet items. Children tease for foods and are a distraction."

"Food is still relatively a good buy," contends Frederick Perkins, extension specialist in marketing at the College of Agriculture, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

His belief is bolstered by a report which indicates, he said, "that the best buy for people today is food."

Perkins disagrees with the wide-spread notion that food prices have soared of late. He explained: "This is nothing new. This impact on food prices goes on all the time. Over the last five years, food costs have increased about nine percent; that is compared in increases in weekly earnings of 20.6 percent. In the years 1960-65, food prices went up 7.3 percent, while medical care went up 13.1 percent." His figures were based on his recollection of various government reports.

Perkins warned consumers to make allowance for the bad weather which has plagued farmers, increased labor costs and the price of modern improvements in transporting, packaging and processing foods.

HOUSEWIFE WRONG

He believes the housewife sometimes is in error about the amount she spends on foods. "About 20 percent of all purchases in supermarkets would be non-food items," he pointed out. The cost of these items should be substracted from the total in order to determine the cost of food alone.

But the nation's housewives with deflated purses are in no mood to make allowances. They just know that they're paying more and getting less.

The public outcry has aroused the attention of legislators and government officials, not the least of whom is Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, who has launched a food price study.

What the outcome of the study will be cannot be predicted. Whatever it is, it is sure to meet with critical response. Freeman is a man caught between Scylla and Charybdis. Consumers believe he always speaks on behalf of farmers. The farmers contend Freeman is consumer-oriented.

Of course, another possibility is that the whole matter will be dropped if the public outcry lessens in volume—no use stirring up the ire of any segment of the voters, legislators may figure.

NATION DRIFTING DURING LEADERSHIP GAP

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, some of the most perceptive commentaries on national and international affairs are those of John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers. Mr. Knight speaks out fearlessly about issues and personalities.

He has, I believe, done this Nation a service by his analysis in the Sunday, August 7, issue of the Miami Herald of this Nation's drifting course and its lack of resolute leadership in the White House.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read Mr. Knight's editorial comments, which I attach herewith:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 7, 1966]

L.B.J. KNOWS THE WAY, BUT NATION DRIFTING DURING LEADERSHIP GAP

DEFINE THE TERM

When things go awry in this reeling old sphere on which we live and toil the plaint is heard that we lack leadership.

Yet there is a supportable argument that perhaps we suffer from over-leadership and, as a result, find ourselves hopelessly confused and often misdirected.

What is a leader? He may be the President of the United States, a Casey Stengel at the height of his career, a beleaguered corporal in Viet Nam or the sagacious Walter Reuther.

In the ordinary definition of the word, leaders would include Stokely Carmichael, your football coach, a university president, Sargent Shriver, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and EVERETT DIRKSEN, Billy Graham or the head of a Boy Scout troop.

And then we have such non-leaders as Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, the Senate Republicans who ducked the debate on Viet Nam and scads of easy compromisers in business and commerce who shy away from any topic which smacks of controversy.

SHRINKING THE LIST

In newspaper terminology, anyone is a leader who heads a union, a civic enterprise, a poverty group or a cause of any kind. They may be rated from excellent to poor in the eyes of their fellow citizens. Still, the six-letter word which fits so neatly in the headlines continues to be applicable until such time as they either resign or are deposed.

So there is no dearth of leadership—if you accept that appellation without examining the quality of those so designated.

But when two limiting adjectives—responsible and constructive—are prefixed, the list shrinks perceptibly.

Immediately eliminated are the leaders who incite a mob to violence, public officials who may be honest but ineffective, the white supremacists and the advocates of black power, rabble rousers of every ideological persausion, U.S. senators who would rather embarrass the President than advocate positive action on their own, members of Congress who preach economy in government and then vote for appropriations larger than requested by the White House, little men snivelling over "police brutality" and injustices to the criminal scum, "easy" judges and and the great mass of pettish leaders who nibble and gnaw at progressive measures which may interfere with their selfish interests.

SOME GREAT ONES

In my time, Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman and yes, even Gen. Eisenhower in his prime must be given the accolade of leadership. One might disagree with them on philosophies or even specifics but never on the courage of these men when confronted with decisions of world import.

The late Herbert Hoover, a kindly and often wise man, was nevertheless a nonleader who failed to grasp or act in the economic calamity which fell upon him and the nation.

Generals Douglas MacArthur and Omar Bradley, Admirals Chester Nimitz and Forrest Sherman come to mind as military leaders who head a long roster of extremely able, courageous and dedicated Americans.

Civilian greats high upon the leadership list must include the late Alfred P. Sloan, Ohio's fearless Robert A. Taft who never compromised on principle, our late President John F. Kennedy so cruelly assassinated on the threshold of a magnificent career, Samuel Gompers of the labor movement and scores of other fine Americans who have contributed so much to civilization in the fields of education, science, industry, medicine, research and space exploration.

AND MR. JOHNSON?

The career of Lyndon Baines Johnson has yet to be objectively assessed. No one questions his flair for leadership. He was a superb majority leader of the Senate. At times, as in the case of bringing order to the Dominican Republic, he displayed the qualities of a great President.

President Johnson, determined, persuasive and even ruthless when occasion demands, is the undisputed master of the Washington scene. He has what the Detroit automobile makers call "tensile strength."

And yet the nation is troubled. First, by Mr. Johnson's judgment in escalating the war in Viet Nam; secondly by his huge spending programs which appear to be inconsistent with his pleas for economy; and then by the curious Washington economic mix which fires the flames of inflation while seeking to stamp them out.

On Thursday last, the President denounced producers of steel as "irresponsible" men for raising prices. Yet only last Sunday he approved wage hikes—since rejected—for airline mechanics which busted his wage guidelines wide open.

Buckpassing, rather than responsibility, is the descriptive term for acts of both the administration and Congress in the crippling airline strike. This whole sorry affair is steeped in politics.

THE BUGLE BLEW

The President, who now deplores anarchy in our streets, greeted civil rights workers at the White House last August with these words: "I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries . . . I hope you will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here; that we are on the march . . . and we are going to be successful."

This was leadership, no doubt, but was it responsible? Did President Johnson's ringing words actually encourage the radical and violent elements within the civil rights movement to pursue a course which could result only in rioting and bloodshed with a total disregard for the rights of law abiding citizens?

The great debate over Viet Nam has been muted since our bombing of Haiphong and the outskirts of Hanoi. For what remains to be said?

The President still believes, contrary to informed world opinion, that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese can be bombed into submission without substantial risk of retaliation from Red China and possibly Russia.

The Viet Nam adventure is now President Johnson's responsibility. He has played his hunch and we can only hope it will bring the wily Ho Chi Minh to the conference table. As yet, however, there are no visible signs that lend credence to this view.

CANDOR WOULD HELP

Mr. Johnson is still not eligible for the great leader category. The country is weary of government by consensus, the coddling of labor and the President's apparent reluctance to play it straight with the people.

The truth may be harsh, but it is preferable to remaining in ignorance.

The President, a believer in public opinion polls, might discover that complete candor is still universally admired. Every economist knows that a tax increase must be imposed to help pay for the war. So why the stalling until after this fall's elections?

Lyndon Baines Johnson has the ability and the courage to give this nation responsible and constructive leadership, untouched by the cloying hand of politics.

The nagging question remains: Why aren't we getting it?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join in the observance of the 92d anniversary of the birth of the late President Herbert Hoover, a man who made untold contributions to our Nation.

Fifty-two years ago Mr. Hoover gave up his very successful career as an engineer, and from that time until his death on October 20, 1964, he devoted his life to public service. The list of his humanitarian services to America and to the whole world is endless.

When World War I broke out in August 1914, Mr. Hoover was in Europe working with his mining interests. At the request of the American Government, he organized the American Relief Committee to supervise the repatriation of 200,000 American citizens who were stranded in Europe at the outbreak of the war. Upon succeeding in this undertaking, Hoover was asked by the French, German, and the United States Governments to head the Committee for Relief in Belgium, a group which eventually assisted 10 million hungry and homeless people.

When the United States entered the war in 1917, President Woodrow Wilson called upon Mr. Hoover to return home in order to become Food Administrator. In this position he was able to establish a relatively successful program of voluntary food conservation.

With the signing of the armistice, Mr. Hoover became Director General of the European Relief and Rehabilitation Commission. Twenty-three countries with a population of 500 million received assistance from the Commission. Mr. Hoover had opposed the food blockade because, as he later wrote in his memoirs, "stunted bodies and deformed minds in the next generation were not secure foundations upon which to rebuild civilization."

After completing his work with the Relief Commission, Mr. Hoover accepted the position of Secretary of Commerce in both the Harding and the Coolidge administrations.

Herbert Hoover's later humanitarian efforts included his studies of the German and Austrian economies after World War II and his leadership of a survey of postwar food conditions throughout the world, both of which were done at the request of President Harry S. Truman.

Mr. Hoover's service to the United States was continued during the administrations of President Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower as head of the comprehensive Hoover Study Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch.

And in his last years he was national chairman of the Boys Clubs of America.

Few men in the history of America have deserved greater admiration and affection from the American people than Herbert Hoover; yet few have received more criticism and invective.

It was indeed "an act of historic justice," as literary critic John Chamberlain stated it, that Herbert Hoover lived long enough to witness his vindication. People who now look on his life and accomplishments no longer see him as the architect of the depression but as the humanitarian who has been said to have "fed more people and saved more lives than any other man in history"; and as the dedicated public servant who, when asked why he had never accepted any payment for his public services, replied:

> Why should I take pay for what I have done? I was a boy with nothing, and this magnificent country of ours gave me my education and my opportunity. And after I had made my competence—fortunately rather early in life—I wanted to do something for my country. It's that simple. Besides, I didn't need the money.

The following passage from Eugene Lyons' "Herbert Hoover: Biography" captures wonderfully the greatness of Mr. Hoover's life:

> His life, I am convinced, will be measured less by what he did—colossal though it has been—than by what he was. Already, in fact, his countrymen instinctively appraise him in moral rather than conventional political terms. They think of him, if at all, not primarily as a President, however rated, but as a great American and a great human-being—as a truly good man, whose compassion reached out to embrace all humankind.

SENATOR COTTON DEPLORES "UNCERTAIN TRUMPET"; URGES REAL LEADERSHIP AND CLEAR CALLS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I paid a tribute to National Drum Corps Week, saluting the drum and bugle calls that sound so clear and certain and which have so often stirred nations in action.

This morning, I received in the mail my copy of the biweekly newsletter written by my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, NORRIS COTTON. He, too, speaks of trumpets and bugle calls in a ringing indictment of national policies and the leaders who make them.

Senator COTTON is known for the craftsmanship of his newsletters to his constituents. This one, about the uncertain trumpet that sounds in our land today, is, in my opinion, one of his best.

He mentions the off-color, wobbly notes sounded in the airline strike, in the crisis of violence in the streets, in the growing crisis of inflation, in foreign policy. I certainly agree with his view of the airline strike—that it is folly to give Congress the assignment of settling individual strikes. This bicameral body of 535 persons so subject to conflicting pressures and so understaffed—particularly with respect to the minority—is no place to settle individual labor-management disputes. Congress establishes general policy and assigns the executive branch the task of carrying it out in detail. That is why the Congress gives the executive broad powers and departments and agencies with expert staffs. It is an uncertain trumpet, indeed, which signals the transfer of this issue to the Congress.

Senator COTTON also points out the same contrast in approach to civil riot that I reported to my constituents in my own most recent newsletter. The contrast is between the President, who condemned them, and the Vice President who boasted of his own capacity to "lead a mighty good revolt." And they pretend they do not understand what is meant by the "credibility gap."

I hope my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will read and ponder the Senator's remarks, which follow:

NORRIS COTTON REPORTS TO YOU FROM THE U.S. SENATE

Despite all the fanfare and hoop-la, this country is not getting decisive leadership at a time when it's desperately needed. I am not one to sob at the wailing wall, but facts are facts, and Pollyanna herself couldn't gloss them over. Not long ago General Maxwell Taylor wrote a book, "The Uncertain Trumpet." The title came from the words of Paul, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" That is the text for this report.

After 2 days wrangling the Senate passed a bill to compel the airline machinists to return to work for 30 days. Three years ago when a national railway strike threatened, President Kennedy asked Congress for special legislation to stay it. Our Commerce Committee held 30 days of intensive hearings. The President told us exactly what he wanted and got it in a slightly modified form. This time, though the President had rushed to the microphone to announce an agreement which the union later failed to ratify, he refused to indicate what legislation he wanted, if any. After hasty hearings the Labor Committee reported a bill granting the President power for further action. This the White House wouldn't accept, so the Senate took the bull by the horns and voted a bill to send the men back to work. I voted against it.

Only the President can declare a national emergency. Only the President commands the aid of the Labor Secretary, the Mediation Board, and all the machinery for arbitration. Congress, with its 535 members of varying views and differing opinions, is no place to arbitrate labor disputes or settle strikes. It's like trying court cases in Town Meeting. The delicate balance between the public interest and the fundamental right of labor to bargain collectively and to strike, demands precision thinking—not stormy debate. It calls for one mind at the top, backed by experienced experts. In this emergency it's regrettable that the trumpet gave such an uncertain sound.

A fortnight ago, on almost the same day, the President in Indianapolis pleaded against "riots and disorders," while the Vice President in New Orleans proclaimed his willingness "to lead a mighty good revolt"—hardly a clear trumpet call. The ghettos in our cities are a national disgrace, and the guaranty of rights and opoprtunities for the Negro is a hundred years overdue. I voted for three of the four civil rights bills and hope to vote for another, if it doesn't ruthlessly override individual liberties. But "black power" and "white power" raging in the streets is not the remedy. We've come to a pretty pass when the daughter of the President can't be married in church without demonstrations outside. The upward surge of violence is the direct result of inflammatory utterances of men in high places of responsibility who should have known better. The trumpet must be sounded for law and order before it's too late.

The rising tide of inflation threatens to impoverish our people. Big Steel again sets the pace for higher prices throughout the whole fabric of our economy. Labor is on the move for higher wages. The dollar continues to shrink. The President warns that we must cut public and private spending or expect rationing, price control, and heavier taxes. Still he only nibbles at the edges of domestic spending, demands more billions for foreign aid, and it's quite clear there will be no tax bill until after election. Meanwhile, his Secretary of Agriculture baldly advises candidates to "slip, slide, and duck" when they are asked about rising prices and to remember that the farmers are organized and the housewives are not. Pretty sour notes from that trumpet!

Last week our representative again urged the UN to take action on the war in Vietnam. We should be demanding, not urging. When foreign aid was before the Senate, we formally disapproved of a nation furishing Red China a steel mill to mold weapons for our enemies. We had the finger shaken at us and were admonished that it might "offend" a friendy nation. Too long we have been uttering a weak "please don't" to nations that not only leave us to fight almost alone, but continue to supply our enemies—nations that we have saved and supported. It's time to give them the message loud and clear. Only by united action can the Communists be brought to the peace table and the bloodletting stopped.

Finally, the call of the trumpet is muted by our own internal confusion.

Forty years ago this week, Gertrude Ederle swam the English Channel. When she reached the British shore, bruised and buffeted by the waves, they had to shoulder aside a customs officer who was demanding her passport.

In this time of national need we lose sight of life-and-death decisions because we are being strangled with red tape and swarmed over by Federal officials.

Let the trumpet sound.

IS WEST GERMANY ABOUT TO GO NUCLEAR?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a seminar on nuclear strategy and foreign policy held recently at the University of Southern California, an important question was raised: "Is West Germany about to go nuclear?"

Mr. Robert Lawrence, a graduate research fellow in the school of international relations of the university cogently developed this point in a paper presented at the seminar. I believe his conclusions are worthy of the attention of this body. A summary follows:

IS WEST GERMANY ABOUT TO GO NUCLEAR?

Summary of a research paper prepared for the "Rand" seminar on nuclear strategy and foreign policy at the University of Southern California

(By Robert Lawrence)

Over the last decade, as France has continued to receive the major share of public attention as the dissident member of the Western Alliance, her sister republic, West Germany, has also been taking steps in what might turn out to be the same direction.

Since shortly after 1954, when she pledged not to manufacture atomic, biological or chemical weapons on her territory, West Germany has quietly gone along the road toward becoming a nuclear power.

She has taken the "peaceful uses" fork of the road, engaging only in non-military atomic research and development. But, as Arnold Kramish, a Rand Corporation nuclear physicist, stated recently in Fortune magazine, there is no meaningful distinction between peaceful and non-peaceful work on the atom.

As France has already demonstrated so well, independence in nuclear matters is only a precursor to "going it alone" in other matters as well. For this reason, if no other, West Germany's nuclear steps are well worth watching.

West Germany's motivation for looking in this direction is not hard to find: as Professor Henry A. Kissinger once remarked, in order for an alliance to function when its members have varying needs and responsibilities, it is necessary that the alliance's requirements never clash with what he termed "the deepest aspirations of one or more of the partners." In the case of West Germany, her deepest aspiration is to be reunited with the 17 million East Germans living under Communist rule; in the case of the Western Alliance, it has been virtually required policy to not do very much to achieve this end if anything like a high price is required for it.

"Further than this, one of the deepest fears now rooted in the West German mind is that someday Bonn might awake to find that the rest of the Western Powers (if not the U.S. alone) have made a deal directly with the Soviet Union that is not only behind Germany's back but, in addition, is one that sacrifices Germany's interests; e.g., trading the issue of re-unification for a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

As U.S. diplomacy has contributed to this fear, or done little to ease it, so has it pushed West Germany toward preparing itself for the day when it might feel that it has no choice if it truly wishes to realize its aspirations than to "go nuclear" by itself. Preparations for such a day are now well under way and West Germany's gains in nuclear science and technology are admittedly impressive.

She has launched the first European nuclear-driven cargo ship, the *Otto Hahn*.

She is now on her way to overtaking both France and the Soviet Union by 1970 in the field of nuclear power generation.

She has her own uranium deposits and, since 1958, has geared her industry to the production of uranium oxide, thorium, deuterium and heavy water, all necessary elements in an atomic device.

She completed research as long as six years ago on the centrifugal method of producing U–235, the so-called "cheap method" of producing material for atomic bombs.

And her help-mates in this field are certainly qualified: she has received assistance and data from EURATOM, the U.S. AEC under an exchange of information agreement and France, through a provision of the 1963 Bonn-Paris Friendship Treaty which specifically provides for joint atomic energy projects.

Suffice it to say that as of the present time, scientifically, industrially and economically, West Germany could "go nuclear" at any moment she wished to do so. Whether she will or not is a political decision and in this area, too, there have been some changes.

Up until late 1965 West German political leaders were either acquiescing to protective existence underneath the U.S. nuclear um-

> brella or, at the most, hinting at vague misgivings and thoughts of a greater role for West Germany on nuclear matters. Indeed, in late 1964 when the Red Chinese successfully detonated their first nuclear device, the only public German reaction was merely one of noting the new barrier this might raise to further progress in disarmament negotiations.
>
> Up until late 1965 West Germany had made it clear that virtually all of her aspirations in the nuclear area could be abundantly satisfied through her participation in a nuclear-armed multilateral or multi-national force. As the prospect for such a force continued to disintegrate under the leadership of the U.S., West Germans could only wonder on what disarmed oasis they were to be abandoned in the nuclear sea.
>
> When, therefore, in November of 1965, unofficial U.S. feelers were put forth in Berlin as to whether or not West Germany might not be adequately satisfied by being a part of an antiballistic missile system as an "alternative" to participation in allied nuclear strategy, it was no surprise to many that the Federal Republic's reply was a withering blast.
>
> Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, rising in the Bundestag on November 9, declared categorically to the world that continued denial of German participation in the West's nuclear defense system would be an injustice, with the strong inference added that it would not be tolerated forever.
>
> So that it could be clear to all parties, the Chancellor went on to add that West Germany sought a finger on the nuclear trigger not only to have just another means of military defense but, rather, so that West Germany could have in at least partial possession what he termed the "instrument of political strategy" that nuclear weapons have become. It was not just another weapon that he sought, it was what has become the only meaningful political lever in the hands of "great" nations today.
>
> And, again he stated, West Germany could not accept a continued denial.
>
> Shortly after this, the Chancellor flew to Washington to discuss this matter with the President. At the conclusion of their three-day meeting, a communique was issued stating that "arrangements could be worked out to assure members of the alliance not having nuclear weapons an appropriate share in nuclear defense."
>
> The Germans had been given some assurances that they would not be left out. Perhaps these were given just in time. Perhaps.
>
> Is West Germany about to go nuclear? Technically, the answer is "yes," she could. Politically, the answer is "no," she will wait. The real question is, for how much longer?
>
> The answer seems to lie within the hands of U.S. diplomacy.

As if to second the conclusions of Mr. Lawrence, the German newspaper Die-Welt of July 18, 1966, wrote as follows:

> A real victim of the present rift in the Atlantic Alliance is the Federal Republic of Germany. France is pressing the Federal Republic to pursue a European policy. The United States counseled the Atlantic way . . . The Federal Republic thus runs the risk of losing the precarious stability it has achieved since the war by dint of hard work and responsibility.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Their own insecurity and the wish to be good allies make the leaders of the Federal Republic accept American proposals not because they want to but because they believe it is expected of them.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The attempt to make the Federal Republic the vanguard of an anti-French crusade would be to mortage the future.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Legitimate German interests . . . must be taken seriously. It cannot be good for the cohesion of an alliance if one of its chief aims is to check the potential danger of one of its principal members. After fifteen years of responsible politics, the Federal Republic ought to deserve having its points of view accepted without mental reservations.

Mr. Speaker, how long can we wisely continue to treat the Germans as second-class allies? The generation that was in power during World War II will soon pass out of existence. How long will the new generation accept its second-class status?

I am not arguing that West Germany should have its own nuclear power, nor do I favor national nuclear power for any other country. What I am suggesting is that unless something is done to unify the free nations—at least in respect to nuclear weapons—they will inevitably undertake to establish their own nuclear power.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF ALBERT WOOLSON, LAST OF THE GAR

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of the death of Albert Woolson who died on August 2, 1956, at the age of 109. Mr. Woolson was the last member of that unique organization, the Grand Army of the Republic. The GAR, as it was affectionately called, was composed of veterans of the Union Army in the Civil War. At the height of its influence it was one of the most powerful organizations in this country. When it spoke the President and the Congress paid respectful attention.

Gen. John A. "Blackjack" Logan, the giant of Little Egypt in Illinois, was one of the most prominent members of the GAR and was the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1884 on the ticket headed by James G. Blaine of Maine. The history of the Grand Army of the Republic cannot be written without including the significant part played by Illinois and its people. General Logan was a commander and chief of GAR as were these other Illinois citizens: F. A. Hurlbut, 1866–67; Thomas G. Lawler, 1894; James A. Sexton, 1898; John C. Black, 1903; Barry M. Trimble, 1911; John B. Inman, 1925; John E. Andrews, 1939.

Illinois in addition to contributing the first permanent commander in chief—F. A. Hurlbut—was also the first department in order of seniority, having been organized on April 6, 1866. To Dr. B. L. Stevenson of Springfield, Ill., is attributed the genesis of the formation of the GAR. Early in 1866 Dr. Stevenson started work to form an organization and writing up his ideas he submitted them to several of his friends who approved of them, and on April 6, 1866, the anniversary of the battle of Shiloh, the first post was organized at Decatur, Ill.

The 66th national encampment of the GAR was held in Springfield, Ill., a city in my district, on September 18 to 23, 1932. At that time the membership of the GAR was 13,066 in 1,790 posts. There were 1,200 Union veterans in the annual parade in downtown Springfield.

As the years passed its ranks steadily grew thinner. The gaps in the picket lines grew wider every day until only a solitary sentinel stood guard waiting until the bugle call of the beyond would muster him out of the last command in the Grand Army of the Republic. Solitary sentinel Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., who had served in the Union Army as a drummer boy, passed away on August 2, 1956. With the death of this old, old man, a chapter in American history is closed forever.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1966, I introduced a bill to provide that plans and regulations established pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the control of water pollution shall apply to vessels including boats and marinas.

A copy of my statement and bill appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 9, 1966, at pages 18745 and 18746. The model law, however, prepared by the Outboard Boating Club of America, and referred to in my statement, was inadvertently omitted at the end of my statement and bill.

I would like now to include a copy of the model act to regulate littering and disposal of untreated sewage prepared for the Pollution Study Committee of the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators.

A copy of the model law follows:

A MODEL ACT TO PROHIBIT LITTERING AND THE DISPOSAL OF UNTREATED SEWAGE FROM BOATS

An Act to regulate the disposal of sewage from watercraft and to prohibit littering of waterways

Section 1. DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act, unless the context clearly requires a different meaning:

(a) The term "watercraft" means any contrivance used or capable of being used for navigation upon water whether or not capable of self-propulsion, except passenger or cargo-carrying vessels subject to the Interstate Quarantine Regulations of the United States Public Health Service adopted pursuant to title 42 United States Code § 241 and 243.

(b) The term "sewage" means all human body wastes.

(c) The term "litter" means any bottles, glass, crockery, cans, scrap metal, junk, paper, garbage, rubbish, or similar refuse discarded as no longer useful or useable.

(d) The term "marine toilet" means any toilet on or within any watercraft to discharge waste.

(e) The term "waters of this State" means all of the waterways on which watercraft shall be used or operated.

(NOTE.—In some states it may be desired to limit the application of this Act to certain waters only and thereby exempt large bodies of water or water areas that are remote from population centers and on which there is no congestion and no conceivable boat pollution problem. The waters subject to pollution control under this Act could be enumerated or the state agency which is designated to administer the Act could be authorized to make a finding that a particular waterway should or should not be affected.)

(f) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, firm, corporation, association, or other entity.

(g) The term "Department" means the (name of the State agency which shall administer this Act).

(The choice of agency lies within the discretion of each state. It is recommended, however, that consideration be given to the state agency dealing with boating matters in general.)

SEC. 2. LITTERING OR POLLUTING WATER—RESTRICTIONS.—(a) No person shall place, throw, deposit, or discharge, or cause to be placed, thrown, deposited, or discharged into the waters of this State, any litter, sewage, or other liquid or solid materials which render the water unsightly, noxious or otherwise unwholesome so as to be detrimental to the public health or welfare or to the enjoyment of the water for recreational purposes.

(b) It shall be unlawful to discharge, dump, deposit or throw garbage into the waters of this State from a watercraft engaged in commerce.

(This section is deemed sufficiently broad and flexible to prohibit any act committed on shore, in the water, or from aboard any description of watercraft, which litters or tends to pollute the water.)

SEC. 3. MARINE TOILETS—RESTRICTIONS.—(a) No marine toilet on any watercraft used or operated upon waters of this State shall be operated so as to discharge any untreated sewage into said waters directly or indirectly.

(b) No person owning or operating a watercraft with a marine toilet shall use, or permit the use of, such toilet on the waters of this State, unless the toilet is equipped with facilities that will adequately treat, hold, incinerate or otherwise handle sewage in a manner that is capable of preventing water pollution.

(c) No container of sewage shall be placed, left, discharged, or caused to be placed, left, or discharged in or near any waters of this State by any person at any time.

(This section prohibits the discharge of any untreated sewage from marine toilets.)

SEC. 4. MARINE TOILETS—POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICES.—(a) After the effective date of this Act every marine toilet on watercraft used or operated upon the waters of this State shall be equipped with a suitable pollution control device in operating condition.

(b) Pollution control devices that are acceptable for purposes of this Act are:

1. Facilities that macerate or grind sewage solids and which, by chlorination or other means, disenfect the remnants before discharge into the water.

2. Holding tanks which retain toilet wastes for disposal at dockside or on-shore pumping facilities or in deep waters away from shore.

3. Incinerating type devices which reduce toilet wastes to ash.

4. Any other device that is tested by a recognized testing laboratory and determined to be effective in arresting the possibility of pollution from sewage passing into or through marine toilets.

(This section recognizes that there are a variety of devices on the market designed to eliminate the possibility of water pollution from sewage passing into or through toilets aboard watercraft. Many of these devices have been tested by various state public health and water pollution control agencies and independent laboratories and found to be efficient for their purpose. However, with further improvements and innovations likely in this product area in the future, it is unwise to "freeze" specifications for such devices in statutory language. All technological changes can be readily incorporated into rules and regulations.

(The desirability of nationwide uniformity in requirements for marine toilet pollution control devices cannot be emphasized too strongly. Boatmen will have to incur additional expense to install and maintain such devices. It would be a hardship and an inconvenience for boatmen traveling from state to state to be subjected to different jurisdictional standards of acceptability of these devices.)

SEC. 5. "MARINE TOILETS—CHEMICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES—STANDARDS.—(a) Every chlorinator or chemical treatment facility shall be securely affixed to the interior discharge opening of a marine toilet, and all sewage passing into or through such toilet shall pass solely through such treatment facility.

(b) Sewage passing through a marine toilet equipped with a chlorinator or chemical treatment facility shall be deemed untreated unless the effluent meets the following minimum standards:

1. Sufficiently divided into fine particles so as to be free of unsightly solids.

2. Containing 1,000 or less coliform per 100 ml.

(This standard meets the requirements of the U.S. Public Health Service and is acceptable by most state public health agencies for swimming and bathing purposes.)

(c) The chlorinator or chemical treatment facility shall be of a type which functions automatically with the operation of the marine toilet, does not depend on septic action as part of its treatment, is easy to clean and maintain, and does not permit the escape of dangerous gases or obnoxious odors.

(b) The disinfecting agent used in the facility shall be of a kind that does not necessitate too frequent replenishment, is easily obtainable, and when discharged as a part of the effluent is not toxic to humans, fish or wildlife.

(The foregoing standards are generally acceptable under existing state marine chlorinator laws. In the interest of uniformity they are recommended to other states proposing the adoption of such laws.)

SEC. 6. MARINE TOILETS—STANDARDS FOR MANUFACTURERS OF POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICES.—Every manufacturer of a marine toilet pollution control device described in this Act shall certify to the Department in writing that his product meets the standards set forth in this Act or in any implementing regulations adopted by the Department. Every such certified statement shall be accompanied by a test report showing that the product meets the prescribed standards. It shall be unlawful to sell or to offer for sale in this State any marine toilet pollution control device that has not been so certified and approved by the Department.

SEC. 7. CERTIFICATE OF NUMBER.—The Department may require persons making application for a certificate of number for a watercraft pursuant to (statutory citation of State Boat Numbering Act to be entered here) to disclose whether such watercraft has within or on it a marine toilet, and if so, to certify that such toilet is equipped with a suitable pollution control device as required by this Act. The Department is further empowered to direct that the issuance of a certificate of number or a renewal thereof be withheld if such device has not been installed as required by this Act.

SEC. 8. ON-SHORE TRASH RECEPTACLES.—The owner or whoever is lawfully vested with the possession, management and control of a marina or other waterside facility used by watercraft for launching, docking, mooring and related purposes shall be required to have trash receptacles or similar devices designed for the depositing of trash and refuse at locations where they can be conveniently used by watercraft occupants.

SEC. 9. EDUCATION.—The Department is hereby authorized to undertake and to enlist the support and cooperation of all agencies, political subdivisions, and organizations in the conduct of a public educational program designed to inform the public of the undesirability of depositing trash, litter, and other materials in the waters of this State and of the penalties provided by this Act for such action, and use funds provided by the Legislature for this purpose. The Department is further authorized to utilize all means of communications in the conduct of this program.

SEC. 10. ENFORCEMENT.—All watercraft located upon waters of this State shall be subject to inspection by the Department or any lawfully designated agent or inspector thereof for the purpose of determining whether such watercraft is equipped in compliance herewith. The Department is further authorized to inspect marinas or other waterside public facilities used by watercraft for launching, docking or mooring purposes to determine whether they are equipped with trash receptacles and/or sewage disposal equipment.

SEC. 11. LOCAL REGULATIONS PROHIBITED.—Through the passage of this Act, the State fully reserves to itself the exclusive right to establish requirements with reference to the disposal of sewage from watercraft. In order to insure state-wide uniformity, the regulation by any political subdivision of the State of sewage disposal from watercraft is prohibited.

SEC. 12. RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Department is hereby authorized and empowered to make, adopt, promulgate, amend and repeal all rules and regulations necessary, or convenient for the carrying out of duties and obligations and powers conferred on the Department by this Act.

SEC. 13. FILING OF REGULATIONS.—A copy of the regulations adopted pursuant to this Act and any of the amendments thereto. shall be filed in the office of the Department and in the office of the (official State record keeping agency). Rules and regulations shall be published by the Department in a convenient form.

SEC. 14. PENALTIES.—(a) Every manufacturer of a marine toilet pollution control device who violates Section 6 of this Act or any regulations adopted by the Department pursuant thereto shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished with a fine of not more than $——.

(b) Any person who violates any other provision of this Act or regulations of the Department adopted pursuant thereto shall be deeemd guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished with a fine of not more than $——, or by imprisonment of not more than —— days, or by both such fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court.

SEC. 15. SAVINGS CLAUSE.—If any court shall find any section or sections of this Act to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such findings shall not affect the validity of any sections of this Act which can be given effect.

SEC. 16. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this Act will reference to requiring watercraft with toilet facilities to be equipped with pollution control devices shall take effect three years from the date of the adoption of this Act. The provisions of this Act prohibiting littering the waterways shall take effect immediately.

(It is suggested that the effective date of this Act be delayed so that all persons affected by its provisions will have a reasonable amount of time to become acquainted with it and secure the required treatment devices.)

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP FOR CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would not rise to comment upon a judicial nomination pending in the other body. However, the circumstances are such that I cannot be silent.

Constance Baker Motley, borough president of Manhattan, renowned civil rights attorney for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and, incidentally, a distinguished constituent of mine, was nominated for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by President Johnson on January 26, 1966. Hearings were held in April by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which reported favorably upon the nomination. Yet the full Committee on the Judiciary has not yet acted.

Mr. Speaker, no one need guess at the reasons for the delay. Mrs. Motley would be the first Negro woman ever appointed to the Federal bench.

As attorney for the NAACP, she has argued many important civil rights cases and was James Meredith's attorney when he gained admission to the University of Mississippi.

I do not need to remind the Members of the House that the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee is the senior Senator from Mississippi.

This very week Newsweek commented upon this, Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1966, in the Periscope. Newsweek stated:

> A federal judgeship for Constance Baker Motley, long a top NAACP lawyer, appears to be growing more remote, despite endorsement by New York Senators Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits. The Senate Judiciary Committee got the nomination from LBJ six months ago but Chairman James O. Eastland of Mississippi has blocked it. The betting now is that approval will be delayed until next year.

Since Mrs. Motley's name was submitted by the President, 14 Federal judges have been nominated and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Judiciary Committee of the other body today voted to make Mrs. Motley's nomination the first order of business when it meets again next Monday. The Nation will be watching to see whether the committee is at last permitted to approve of this excellent nomination.

I urge favorable action.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last month Americans throughout the Nation observed the annual Captive Nations Week. The 1966 observance surpassed all previous years in scope and depth despite the euphoria that has engulfed our people as a result of Moscow's deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence. This reserve of strength and politico-moral dedication in our country augurs well for the future when, without doubt, the Red totalitarians will have caught their full breath to press forward toward further takeovers in the free world.

Clearly, in adequate response to the captive nations movement, this is the time for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The existence of such a committee now would signify that we are not being fooled by imperiocolonialist Moscow's strategy, that we are not timid to stare into the facts of reality engulfing the captive peoples, and that we are preparing ourselves for the next thrust of the Red empire into the free world. The inability of our leadership to perceive all this at this time will add only another ineradicable blemish to our record in the cold war, for which indubitably a price will have to be paid later. Playing things solely by ear scarcely suggests vision and long-range judgment.

What is churning in the grassroots has been best revealed by the 1966 Captive Nations Week observances. The following items deal with this vitally important issue:

Bulletin 7 of the National Captive Nations Committee, Arizona Branch, July, 1966

"Our cause is the cause of all mankind, and we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own".—Benjamin Franklin.

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The above is part of the Joint Resolution 111, Public Law 86-90 approved and signed July 17, 1959. In accordance with this Resolution, the National Captive Nations Committee—Arizona Branch will hold a Rally on July 28, 1966 at Encanto Park Bandshell at 8:00 P.M. Admission—free.

Captive Nations Week Themes for 1966 are:

1. Build bridges of understanding with the Captive Nations rather than with the totalitarian Red regimes.
2. Allow Vietnamese nationalists to fight for the freedom of captive North Vietnam.
3. Concentrate on Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.
4. Oppose trade with communist countries.
5. Create a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the U.S. House of Representatives.
6. Establish a Freedom Commission and Academy to equip us in psycho-political warfare.
7. Oppose the Consular Convention with the USSR.
8. No admission of Red China to the U.N.
9. Captive Nations a major deterrent against war, a powerful force for real peace.

Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the political fabric of the Red Syndicate. It wants the thorn extricated. Your cooperation with us will prevent this—for our freedom and that of a billion captives.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY PROGRAM

National and Armed Forces Colors: U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, U.S. Navy Reserve, U.S. Air Force, National Guard, American Legion.

Invocation: Representatives of Catholic and Jewish Churches.

Pledge of Allegiance: State Senator John B. Conlan.

National Anthem: 541st Luke Air Force Base Band.

Rollcall of nations: Master of Ceremonies, Johnny Johnson.

Welcoming remarks: President, Captive Nations Committee, Walter Chopiwskyj.

Proclamation: Governor of Arizona, Samuel P. Goddard.

Introduction of distinguished guests: Master of Ceremonies, Johnny Johnson.

Tribute to our fighting men: Rev. Charles Lee.

Salute: Thunderbird Post No. 41, American Legion.

Taps: American Legion, Thunderbird Post No. 41.

Keynote address: Former Senator Barry Goldwater.

PERFORMANCES OF NATIONAL GROUPS AND MIA DANCERS

Day for Decision: Mia singing group.

Benediction: Representatives of Greek-Orthodox and Mormon Churches.

Closing of program: Dismissal of flags, Master of Ceremonies, Johnny Johnson.

July 31, 1966 (Sunday), members of the Captive Nations Committee, along with State Senator John B. Conlan and Dr. Weldon P. Shofstall, will appear on KPHO-TV Channel 5 to discuss the Captive Nations issue and the threat of Communism in the free world. Time 6:30 p.m. Don't miss this.

Trade as Part of the Cold War: "Trading with the Communist bloc would be a psychological as well as a military defeat for the United States."—Khrushchev, May 1958.

The policy of coexistence which at present rules the Western world is being carried out at the expense of our peoples, for they are being left to the communists and the latter's possession of our territories is silently being recognized as a legal right.

THIS CANNOT AND MUST NOT HAPPEN!

We must oppose and resist this until our historic and civilized nations attain the same right as has been granted to the peoples of Africa and Asia, who have long enjoyed life within their own independent states.

A violent battle against appearances of "local patriotism" and the "bourgeois remnants of nationalism" is being conducted in the non-Russian Republics of the USSR, against national traditions values and ancient customs, against national consciousness. "International Communist thinking," in other words, the Russian manner of thinking and the Russian world outlook is to be forcefully implanted into men.

The people are giving courageous resistance in all sectors of life in order to preserve their national characteristics and individuality. They place their hope in us, their fellowcountrymen in the Free World. It rests with us, whether we are to prove ourselves to be worthy as their spokesmen and representatives.

Our activities, our effectiveness, and our struggle may not be allowed to weaken. We must do more, attain more.

Our people look to the forces of freedom in the Western world, to those freedom-loving American, Briton, Canadians, Australians, Frenchmen, etc., who are hostile to every form of slavery. They should support our struggle, for Russian imperialism and Communism are a danger to the world. The struggle conducted by our peoples has held up the onslaught of Communist tyranny. We ask no one for anything; for he who helps us, is helping himself!

Freedom-loving peoples and individuals of the world, unite in the struggle against Communism. Unite in the struggle for the independence of nations and the freedom of men!

"I have sworn upon the Altar of God, Eternal Hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of men."—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT, INC. AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT PRESENT A NATIONALITIES' CONCERT

(In commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the mass deportations by the Communists from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and the enslavement of Albanians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Byelorussians, Croatians, Czechs, Estonians, Hungarians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Romanians, Serbs, Slovaks, Ukrainians, and other nationalities of eastern and central Europe.)

(Saturday, June 18, 1966, 8:30 p.m., Scottish Rites Cathedral, Masonic Temple, Detroit, Mich.)

HONORARY CO-CHAIRMAN

The Honorable George W. Romney, Governor of State of Michigan.

The Honorable Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of City of Detroit.

HONORARY COMMITTEE

Mary V. Beck, Councilman, Common Council, City of Detroit.

William A. Bell II, President, Urban League.

Alvin M. Bentley, Regent, University of Michigan.

Laurence V. Britt, S.J., President, University of Detroit.

Ed. Carey, President, Common Council, City of Detroit.

JOHN D. DINGELL, Member of Congress.

Zoltan A. Ferency, Chmn., Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan.

GERALD R. FORD, Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives.

Richard Headlee, Past President, National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

William R. Keast, President, Wayne State University.

Alfred A. May, President, Detroit Round Table.

Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, U.S. District Judge.

Elly Peterson, Chairman, Republican State Central Committee of Michigan.

Henry Versnick, President, Detroit Junior Board of Commerce.

NATIONALITIES' CONCERT SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Ilmar Heinaru, General Chairman.

Decorations Committee: Vilma Niinemann, Chairman.

Flag Committee: Emily Zaporozhetz, Chairman.

Patrons Committee: Lado Demeter, Chairman.

Program Committee: Bolette L. MacMullan, Chairman.

Publicity Committee: Inara Liventals, Chairman.

Program-Book Committee: Audrone Tamulionis, Chairman.

Ticket Committee: Bohdan Fedorak, Chairman.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT

Lado Demeter, Chairman.
Malvina Hauk Abonyi, Vice Chairman.
Arpo Yemen, Vice Chairman.
Emily Zaporozhetz, Secretary.
Mitchell Jachimski, Treasurer.

Leslie Abonyi, Krikor Aladjadjian, Hysni Aliko, Niazi Bardha, Michael Bazansky, Milan Buick, Antanas Dohcheff, Peeter Einpaul, Dwight K. Hamborsky, Gani Hamiti, Rev. Andrew P. Jacobs, Mr. & Mrs. Nicholae Pavel.

Dr. Justine Pikunas, Basil M. Pleskacz, Rev. George Preda, Dainis Rudzitis, Astrid Sako, Joseph S. Sazyc, Jan B. Sklenar, Alfred H. Sokolowski, M.D., Stelian Stanicel, Alex Zaparackas, Mr. & Mrs. Augustin Zemene.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT, INC.

Ilmar Heinaru, Chairman.
Vilma Niinemann, Vice Chairman.
Ingrid Kord, Secretary-Treasurer.

Al. Astasaitis, Daiva Bajorunas, Arturs O. Deksnis, Inara L. Liventals, Audrone Tamulionis, Ojars Upatnieks.

COMMUNITY LEADERS

Algird Ambrose, Jan Beliansky, Bohdan Fedorak, Wasyl Kolodchin, Mr. & Mrs. Ralph A. MacMullan, Mrs. Mirga Michaels, Adam Ostrowski, Frank C. Padzieski, Mrs. William Volker.

PROGRAM

The Star Spangled Banner. Francis Scott Key
Mrs. Charlotte McCray, Soprano
Mrs. Emilie Kuusk, Organist
Departure—Great Is the Sorrow. Mykola Fomenko
Yarema Cisaruk, Soloist
Lullaby ------------------ Hryhory Kytasty
Lyrics by Borys Olexandrew
Anna Tomiak, Soloist
March—The Ukraine------ Hryhory Kytasty
Lyrics by Ivan Bahriany
Yarema Cisaruk, Soloist
Young Bandurists of the Ukrianian Orthodox Youth League
P. Kytasty, Musical Director
E. Cuira, Conductor
Nocturne in C Sharp Minor. Chopin
(Posthumously transcribed by Milstein)
Souvenir De Poznan Opus 3. Wieniawski
(Mazourka Characteristique)
Oberek II, Polish Dance----------- Bacewicz
Noreen Smialek Sinclair, Violinist
Bronislaw Siarkowski, Accompanist
Melda uz Tevyne—The Prayer. Dambrauskas
Laisves—Freedom --------------- Zilevieius
St. Anthony's Lithuanian Mixed Chorus
Albertas Mateika, Director
Miss Ona Valys, Accompanist
Ave Maria-------------------------- P. Suda
Mrs. Emilie Kuusk, Organist
Blezdingele—The Swallow.

This dance imitative of the swallow, danced by farmers in autumn to bid farewell to their fields. Symbolically, just as the sad, yet hopeful swallows had to leave their nests during the oppressing winter and the farmer abandoning his field until spring, so we, too, had to bid farewell to our homeland during winds of oppression, but with the hope of the rebirth of freedom.

Ausrele—Before the Sunrise.

The young people go to the woods in the springtime before dawn to hail the sunrise with a dance. They praised the richness of the sun goddess' gifts of wealth and goodness. As the sun gave hope to life, the light of freedom gives us hope for a better tomorrow.

Silaine Folk Dancing Group (Lithuanian)
Galina Gobiene, Instructor
Vytas Marciukaitis, Accompanist (Accordion)
Fugue in G Minor----------------- P. Suda
Mrs. Emile Kuusk, Organist
Aglona------------------------- J. Norvalis
Lugsana no Kantates, Tevija—Prayer to the Fatherland. A. Jurjans
Mrs. Astra Kalnins, Soprano
Mrs. Nora Miculs, Accompanist
On the Yonder Hill-- Ukrainian Folk Song
A Girl Calling Her Lover. Ukrainian Folk Song
The Sun Is Shining-- Ukrainian Folk Song
Lyrics set to the words of the Ukrainian Poet T. Shewchenko
Girls' Bandura Chorus of the Ukrainian American Youth Association in Detroit
Petro Potapenko, Director
D. Trush, Manager
Greetings-------------- The Hon. Ed. Carey
President of the Common Council, representing Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of City of Detroit
Address -------- The Hon. George Romney
Governor of State of Michigan
The Flag Ceremony.

LEST WE FORGET

This year marks the 26th anniversary of the forcible occupation and subjugation by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and the 25th anniversary of the first mass deportations by the communists from these countries.

It was in June, 1941, and again during the post-World War II period, that hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians were deported by the Soviet invaders to Siberia. Many of the deportees perished from inhuman conditions, starvation, exhaustion, cold, and brutality.

Under present conditions, it is impossible to compile an accurate record of those deportations, the number of fatalities they involved, and their total impact on the populations of the Baltic States. It is known, however, that from the total number of deported and executed peoples in the Baltic States during the period of June 1940 until September, 1941:

In Estonia: 53,547 were men and 6.410 were women.

In Latvia: 23,016 were men and 7,218 were women.

In Lithuania: 16,633 were men and 13.852 were women.

By 1959, the population of those three countries declined by nearly 1 million—or one-sixth below the prewar levels.

The Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians will forever retain in their memory the sad events which took place starting in June 1940, and find encouragement in the fact that the government of the United States has never recognized the fabricated incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and continues to accord diplomatic recognition to the representatives before the Communist takeover.

But the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Communist Russia, through direct and indirect aggression, have also resulted in subjugation and enslavement of Albanians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Byelorussians, Croatians, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, Romanians, Serbs, Slovaks, Ukrainians and other nationalities of Eastern and Central Europe.

There were never any plebiscites held on the question of voluntarily joining the Soviet Union. Nor have these nations ever renounced their independence and freedom to become Soviet satellite countries.

We feel that the continuing subjugation, domination, and exploitation of these nations by the Soviet Union constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights which is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and injurious to the cause of peace in the world. It does also violence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It exposes the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union's outward concern for the rights of all peoples. The Soviet Union claims to be the champion of self-determination for the peoples of Asia, Africa, and of other areas; it would do well, therefore, to practice with respect to its own neighbors, what it preaches to others.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEEE OF DETROIT, INC.; THE CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT.

REMARKS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, BALTIC NATIONS AND CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEES' JOINT CONCERT, DETROIT, JUNE 18, 1966

It's a pleasure for me to take part in this stirring occasion. Tonight we remember the sacrifices of all those who suffered the loss of their freedom as citizens in past years. We renew our determination to extend freedom to all nations who still struggle under the yoke of communism which has been forced on them.

This is a time of special significance for the Baltic Nations, for this year marks the 25th anniversary of the ruthless mass deportation of thousands of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. But we also remember the citizens of all of the captive nations which have joined in sponsoring this concert.

For many of you here tonight, this occasion stirs sad memories of your native lands, and revives a new spirit of hope for the re-birth of the captive nations as free peoples. For those of us who do not directly share in your national heritage, this concert serves as a fresh and inspiring reminder of the great contribution which captive nations people have made to American life and culture.

America has been privileged to offer a new hope and new opportunity to many citizens of the captive nations who have escaped Communist rule. And, unquestionably, America has been greatly enriched by their resourcefulness, their craftsmanship, and their culture.

The citizens of Michigan share deeply the aspirations of all the captive nations for their independence. We pledge to continue our efforts to promote the right of self-determination and national dignity for all the peoples of the world. The freedom-loving people of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and as the leader in promoting freedom and independence throughout the world. We must not, and we cannot, let them down.

We should begin by greatly improving our contact and communication with the oppressed people of the captive nations. We should support the expanded use of such agencies as Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. The voice of freedom must be heard more often and more persuasively in the captive nations. Radio Free Europe should be encouraged to include programs beamed to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and other nations not now included.

America is locked in the greatest struggle for survival in all history with deadly, dedicated enemies. Either they will destroy us, or we will change them.

This is not a struggle to control territory, or even to control men's bodies. This is a struggle for minds and hearts. And in this struggle, we are denying ourselves our most effective weapons, through lack of faith in the appeal of our own principles and fundamental spiritual values.

These are the only weapons which can bring us certain victory.

These are the only weapons which the Communists can never match.

The Communists have an ideology. It is an ideology of tyranny and slavery. It must be defeated, if the people of the world—Americans included—are to be free. The Communist ideology can be defeated only by a stronger ideology.

We Americans have a stronger ideology. It is the ideology of the unfinished American Revolution. It is the basic American principle that all men—not just Americans, but all men everywhere—have the God-given right to choose how they shall live. It is the basic American faith that men, given a choice, will choose to live in freedom.

The Declaration of Independence, as Lincoln said, proclaimed liberty "not alone to the people of this country, but to the world, for all future time."

Today, around the world, the forces of freedom are on the defensive. We have handed the initiative—ideologically and in personal dedication—to Communism. This need not be.

We have it in our power to turn the tide—today, tomorrow, whenever we choose—by simple act of will.

We have it in our power to put freedom on the offensive around the world, as well as at home.

We have it in our power to re-ignite the fires of the American Revolution—the Revolution of free men, who will not forever consent to live under the oppressor's heel; not the revolution of war but the greater revolution of ideas.

For at stake is America's mission, the divine destiny to which we are called: to lift the weight of oppression and bondage of all forms from the shoulders of all men everywhere.

MEN WILL BE FREE

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, at the 12th annual Freedom Day Rally, Taipei, the Republic of China, 12 noon, January 23, 1966, Taipei Time)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you the greetings and the admiration of the Congress of the United States and the American people. As a member of the Advisory Board of the National Captive Nations' Committee and on behalf of that Committee I bring to you the best wishes of captive peoples all over the world. You, of the Republic of China, have won the enduring admiration of free peoples everywhere by your valiant and successful struggle to maintain the freedom of this Island. You are the hope of freedom throughout the Mainland. Your past is an inspiring saga of man's indomitable will to be free. Your present is a source of pride and hope to all who hate tyranny. Your future is nothing less than a promise to history.

We gather here today to commemorate the courage of the 22,000 freedom fighters who defied tyranny and chose freedom instead. We gather here today to commemorate those throughout the world who have similarly struggled to escape terrorism and torture, those who continue the struggle for freedom. We commemorate and pay homage to the millions who have died to preserve freedom.

It is fitting and proper that we observe Freedom Day. May we be encouraged and inspired to go forth from this spot as the spark of a great crusade to free the world of enslavement and oppression. The valor of these 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners will remain forever an inspiration to those who cherish freedom.

The eyes of the world are today focused on the Far East. For, as Abraham Lincoln said with reference to my own country, the world cannot continue half-slave and half-free. And it is here, in the Far East that the question is today being most sharply asked—will men be free or be slaves? It is here that the answer is being most plainly given. Men will be free.

It will not be easy—and there is no reason to think that it will be quick—for freedom faces a massive challenge in Asia, a challenge led by those as determined as they are evil. There will be disappointments, frustrations and setbacks in the future as there have been in the past. But men will be free.

They will be free because the determination on the side of freedom is inexhaustible—and you are the proof of that. They will be free because the resources of the side of freedom are more than sufficient and the will to use those resources is as firm as rock.

Let no one be in any doubt about the commitment of the United States to the cause of freedom in Asia. The propaganda from Hanoi and Peiping expresses the constant hope that the determination of the United States will weaken, that the effort of the United States will falter. They are engaging in a dangerous delusion if they believe their own propaganda. They are making the fatal mistake of tyrants when they misinterpret a free man's love of peace. Love of peace does not mean that we will meekly submit to tyranny. Love of peace does not mean that we will purchase it at the cost of freedom—ours or anyone else's. As President Johnson said earlier this month in his State of the Union Message, "We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

The Far East is the key area of the world geographically, economically and politically. If totalitarianism should conquer the Far East, then all of Asia would fall. With Asia in communist hands, Africa would be conquered. Western Europe would be outflanked and the forces of freedom would be in grave peril.

In Asia there are vast untapped resources of manpower, rubber, tin, oil, and uranium. These resources, under the control of communist aggressors, would be used for conquest and war. These resources, under communist control, would not be used for peace or enlightenment, for improved health and education. Under communist control these vast resources would not be used for the advancement of freedom. They would be used for war and enslavement.

May I remind you that the communist aggressors consider the individual as mere grains of sand on the seashore to be used by the masters of tyranny for their own selfish aggrandizement. We believe man is created in the image of an all-powerful being. We believe that man has individual rights and aspirations, that he is entitled to dignity and individual liberty. This we believe. This we will defend.

Lenin is reported as having said the road to Paris is the road through Peiping. The communists are ruthlessly liquidating the opposition and are proceeding on that road to Paris by way of Southeast Asia, the Near East and Northern Africa. To halt this blueprint for tyrannical power, conquest, and enslavement, the United States is spending its blood and wealth in South Viet Nam. The United States manifested its devotion to the cause of freedom by expending the flower of its young manhood to defend that cause in Korea.

Our Commander-in-Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is very wisely supporting with strength the freedom fighters in South Viet Nam. President Johnson will not preside over the liquidation of freedom in Asia. He will instead preside over the restoration of freedom in Asia. He is a determined leader in the tradition of the Founding Fathers of my Country. By his courageous action, President Johnson has encouraged people thoughout the world who are devoted and dedicated to the cause of freedom.

We support you, here in the Republic of China, with our wealth and with our armed might. Your struggle for freedom is ours. We will not withdraw and leave you to fight this battle alone. We are here to stay until freedom is secure in Asia and the aggressor collapses in his own evil structure.

In the history of the struggle for freedom you have produced one of the giant figures of our time. General Chiang Kai-shek was among the first to understand the diabolical tactics and sinister designs of the communist world conspiracy. He began his heroic struggle to oppose Communism on the mainland in the 1920's, and he has been a world-renowned champion in that struggle from that time to this. He and Madame Chiang long ago won the hearts of the American people and of freedom lovers everywhere. Madame Chiang is now in my Country, and we welcome her both as a valiant ally and as a warm and honored friend.

The Republic of China stands ready on the flank of communist aggression. The Republic of China is blocking the road of Communist expansion to the islands of the Pacific. The Republic of China and the magnificent forces of the Republic of South Korea are a deterring force to the announced communist plans to conquer India, Southeast Asia and move into the Middle and Near East. I salute you for this magnificent contribution to world freedom.

I salute you also for the assistance you are giving to the Free World effort in Viet Nam. You are one of the almost forty nations which are helping the gallant people of that beleaguered land build a better life at the same time that they defend themselves against a cruel aggression. Your Country is giving assistance in the field of agriculture. You have built power stations. You have sent medical teams. You have trained more than four hundred Vietnamese technicians. You have given warehouses, agricultural equipment, seeds and fertilizers, veterinary equipment and cattle, boats, airplanes and over half a million text books. And you have been generous in extending to our forces fighting in Viet Nam both material facilities and hospitality. You are playing your full role as part of the fraternity of free men opposing aggression in Viet Nam.

The United States is fighting in South Viet Nam as a member of that fraternity of free men. We are fighting there against stark communist aggression by terrorism, infiltration, sabotage, deception and murder—the most diabolical and dangerous form of aggression. We are fighting in South Viet Nam to preserve the right of self-determination of nationalities. We are fighting for peace, as opposed to the spread of war. We are fighting to help all of you in a righteous cause. We are fighting to prevent a world war. We are fighting to prevent a world holocaust of unparalleled carnage and destruction.

We are daily growing stronger on land, on sea, in the air, and in space. This strength is for freedom. This military might is dedicated to your independence, to your liberty. It will never be used for aggression, slavery and conquest. The United States has no territorial designs anywhere in the world. We are for liberty and individual dignity and freedom for peoples everywhere. We believe in lending a helping hand to the diseased and the underprivileged throughout the world.

We are standing beside all of you in this struggle for freedom to preserve your ancient heritage, your art, your culture—which precedes ours—to preserve your civilization, which began thousands of years before ours. We share your hopes and your aspirations for the future. In this age of science and astronautics, there is no room for communist suspicion, hatred, bigotry and deceit. I look to the future with hope and with confidence. I believe we are on the dawn of a new era.

The magnificent progress made on this island shows what free societies can accomplish. The growth in your production of both agricultural and industrial goods can only be described as startling. Your exports are rising, your economy is strong, your currency is sound. Most important of all, the benefits of this prosperity are going to the people. I am proud that my Country has assisted you in your efforts. And I know that you are proud that through your own efforts you have done so well that in your Country we have been able to end our foreign aid program.

The iron curtain in Europe and Asia is a manifestation of an inferiority complex. The iron curtain is necessary to hide tyranny and promote totalitarianism. The iron curtain is designed to keep people from knowing the truth—to prevent them from knowing the joys of freedom and self-determination of peoples, individual liberty, dignity and economic opportunity.

I can assure you that the United States will stand firm throughout the world. We fought in Korea. We are fighting in Viet Nam. We are with you here. We were with you in Korea, in Quemoy and in Matsu. We are supporting SEATO in Southeast Asia and NATO in Europe. We will oppose communist aggression wherever it rears its ugly head.

The time has come to launch an offensive—an offensive of truth about freedom, the truth about stark communist aggression and its sinister designs. We must offer hope for the captive peoples of the world to throw off the yoke of tyranny and again live in the sunlight of freedom. We must spread the truth, throughout the world, about communist imperialism and colonialism. We must tell the truth about class hatred and race prejudice of communist imperialists—the truth about their liquidations, murder and deceit.

We must not reward Red China aggression by giving Red China a seat in the United Nations. We must not dignify Red China by giving her a forum and a vote on the cause of freedom. We must not bolster her economic system with the trade of free nations and peoples dedicated to the cause of human dignity. It would be a grave mistake to bolster her sagging economy with the products of free enterprise nations. We must not make this same mistake again. The free nations of the world promoted trade with the dictators of World War II. It was their acquisition of products from free enterprise nations that largely enabled them to launch a war against private enterprise, property rights, dignity, and freedom of the individual. We cannot make this mistake again. Red China has the atomic bomb. She is perfecting the hydrogen bomb. Trade with the free world will enable her to have the hydrogen bomb, with which to launch an onslaught against civilization, in mass production at an early date. We must push our freedom offensive now.

Captive nations and peoples hold the key to the future security, independence and freedom of the world. Remain steadfast in your struggle for freedom. Captive nations are the "Achilles' heel" of Red imperialist aggression. Communism fears your yearning, your desire for freedom. Communism fears your courage and your ability to someday rise and turn back the tide of tyranny.

You have our hearts. You have our sympathy, our support and our understanding. We share your hopes. We share your aspirations. Most of all, we share your sure and certain vision of the future: Men will be free.

[From the Washington Star, July 22, 1966]

Captive Nations Week

Sir: For the eighth consecutive year the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. The Captive Nations Resolution (Public Law 86–90) established by a joint resolution of Congress and forming the basis for the week, requests the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The significant feature of the Captive Nations Resolution is that it recognizes and specifically names not only Central European nations commonly regarded as being captive, including Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Romania, and the like; but also recognizes and names approximately a dozen non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union including Ukraine, Lithuania, Armenia and others.

The desire of the people of the captive nations, both inside and outside the Soviet Union, to secure their independence constitutes the most powerful deterrent to war and the best hope for a just and lasting peace among nations.

Rockville. WALTER PRETKA.

Sir: In the course of our Nation's history, perhaps, no Congressional resolution has shown more substantive proof of this country's position as a vanguard of freedom than the Captive Nations Week Resolution passed by Congress in 1959. And, perhaps too, no resolution has been more grievously attacked by anti-freedom governmental systems. But quite possibly, the greatest pain in freedom's side is the one inflicted by some confused Americans who through lack of knowledge as pertains to these peoples—historic, geographic, ethnographic, linguistic—fail or refuse to recognize the great value potential of the resolution's context. To them, the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains are more an occult phenomenon than a hope of eventual reality. To speak in behalf of these millions of beleaguered political slaves is to be type-cast as "political," "partisan" or even "radical." Since when has the pursuit of freedom become synonymous with any of these?

VERA A. DOWHAN.

[From the Tablet, July 21, 1966]

Forget the Captive Nations?

(By Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University and economics editor of the American Security Council's "Washington Report.")

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But this will never happen!"

These are the words of Mikhail Suslov in reference to the 1965 Captive Nations Week observance, uttered on July 17, 1965 in Lithuania with reference to all captive nations. Who is Suslov? He is the secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and a member of its ruling Presidium.

Suslov was not alone in his denunciation of the Week. He merely voiced again the fear and concern of Moscow, which Khrushchev first enunciated in 1959 on the occasion of Vice President Richard Nixon's trip to Russia. Mr. Nixon, in his book "Six Crises," stated, "The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour."

WHY THE SENSITIVE REACTION?

Americans who are unfamiliar with these and similar accounts invariably ask, "Why the sensitive reaction?" The answer is simple. From the very start, Captive Nations Week has been a thorn in the side of Communist psychopolitical strategy toward us and the industrial West.

A cardinal objective of Moscow's deceptive policy of "peaceful coexistence" has been to establish our politico-moral acceptance of the Soviet Empire. The Soviet Russians and their collaborators insist that if we really want to coexist peacefully, we must forget about any captive nations. Moscow and its associated Communist regimes even demand that in order to achieve a real lessening of tensions—thus giving them a necessary breather for their consolidation efforts—we must show our good faith by forgetting the whole history of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and Communist conquests since 1918.

The Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by the U.S. Congress in 1959 and now Public Law 86–90, counteracts all this deception. By stressing the very essentials that Moscow and the Red syndicate would have us forget, both the law and the annual Week stand as a major obstacle to the Red psychopolitical design.

UNDERCUTS RED STRATEGY

The Captive Nations Week has great educational value. Its observance clearly outlines the perfidy, deception, and long-run dangers of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" strategy. This strategy has four dimensions: 1) to lull the West into a state of confusion, friction, and demoralization, 2) with this advantage of a breather, to consolidate the Communist empire through necessary economic changes, the elimination of all remaining resistance, the suppression of patriotic "bourgeois nationalism," and the strict maintenance of totalitarian power in the various Communist Parties within the Soviet orbit, 3) to pursue "wars of liberation" in the underdeveloped areas of the Free World, and 4) to strive to attain a scientific breakthrough in military and space technology that would facilitate a political blackmail of the West into surrender.

The existence of U.S. nuclear arms does not deter a Kosygin, visiting Egypt, from harshly maligning Americans as "Hitlerites" and "imperialists"; nor does it frighten a Brezhnev from greeting the Tri-Continental Havana Conference, held last January in these words: "Today, Havana attracts the attention of all fighters against the forces of imperialist aggression and colonialism and for the national and social liberation of peoples . . . The U.S. imperialists are challenging all progressive forces."

Repeated often enough without adequate challenge, all these blatant untruths will doubtless poison the minds of millions. Yet there are many in our country, in high places and low, who resist speaking the truth openly about the captive nations, particularly those in the USSR itself.

TRUTH AND THE GROWING WEEK

Fortunately, since 1959, the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week has steadily grown, and the basic truths about Soviet Russian imperialism, genocide and colonialist exploitation in the USSR, as well as the oppression of all the captive peoples by their totalitarian governments, are reaching more and more Americans. Although the White House unfortunately has played down the Week in recent years, our Governors, Mayors and citizens have broadened the annual observance.

REAL PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE WORK

One of the chief themes of the 1966 Week is the building of bridges of understanding with the captive nations—the people themselves, rather than with the illegitimate regimes that hold them in bondage and politico-economic slavery. The bridge of understanding can only be one link in the mutual struggle for freedom—their freedom regained and ours preserved. To believe that by arriving at "understandings" with the Communist rulers we shall be furthering the freedom of the captive nations is not only an illusion but also an affront to common political sense.

In addition, our wishful thinking about the early end of the Cold War—in itself a striking achievement of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" policy—has blinded us to the realities of the Red Empire and has exposed us to further illusions about "mellowed Communists in Moscow and Warsaw," "independent Communists in Bucharest and Belgrade," and "the growing nationalism among satellite Communist regimes." On the contrary, a little exercise of logic itself would demonstrate that the power center of the Red Empire is the Soviet Union and all other parts, even including Red China, depend for their ultimate survival upon this center.

HIGH COST OF SILENCE

The crucial fact is that our people are not being told the full truth about people of the captive nations and their plight in the totalitarian Red states. Unpardonable ignorance, a morally irresponsible indifference, and restraining fears are frequently the ingredients of omission that in the long run exact a disproportionate cost. On May 26, 1966, President Johnson unequivocally stated, "The United States cannot condone the perpetuation of racial or political injustice anywhere in the world." Nowhere in this world is such injustice greater and more ruinous than in the Red Empire of captive nations.

Those of us who have been active in Captive Nations Week have opposed measures which tend to perpetuate the control of Communist regimes over the Captive Nations. Such measures would include the liberalization of trade with Eastern Europe, the promulgation of the US-USSR Consular Treaty and proposals to admit Red China to the UN. The 1966 Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time to stress our support of positive measures concentrating on the freedom of the captive nations. Among them, we might include the support of public and private "Freedom Academies," creation of a special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations and the focusing of world attention on Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism.

[From the Washington Star, July 30, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

SIR: This year, Captive Nations Week came and went unnoticed by the public and unnoted by the press. Almost as unnoticed, 26 years ago, the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe were forced behind the Iron Curtain by Communist Russia.

During the 1966 Captive Nations Week, race riots throughout the U.S. captured this nation's attention and turned it away from a much more vital subject—Viet Nam, and the threat communism poses there today. It is unfortunate that neither the black nor the white segments of this country's population have never stopped fighting over their individual differences long enough to unite, and fight together against something that is as vitally important to one as it is to the other.

In Viet Nam, the Viet Cong are not particular as to what color man they kill, to them both black and white are equally American.

To those rioting in the U.S. over segregation or integration of a neighborhood, Viet Nam is a country too far away, located in too remote a section of Asia to post a threat to their nation, much less their own block.

However, Viet Nam does pose a very individual threat, and if America's populace does not stop bickering and stand united behind the administration's policy to repel Communist aggression in Viet Nam, next year the Captive Nations may have a new member.

ILZE FREIVALDS LOXLEY.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, June–July 1966]

ENSLAVED 1 BILLION PEOPLE

Over two decades have passed since the end of World War II. Yet Ukrainian nationalists—identified as such by the Soviet Russian press—are still being executed in Ukraine.

The Ukrainian liberation struggle, in fact, has been going on since 1920, when the country finally went down before Soviet bayonets after an epic three year struggle—two of which years came after World War I. Similarly, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) was put down finally in 1950, five years after peace had supposedly descended upon war-torn Europe.

Writing in *The New York Times* of June 19, 1966, British historian Alan Clark said of the Ukrainians: "On June 26, in the first week of the war (World War II), Ukrainian nationalists staged an uprising in Lvov which was savagely repressed by the NKVD and the retreating Red Army." This Red treatment of the Ukrainians continues to this day.

Yet poorly understood or even overlooked is the significance of this irrepressible people—who have fought for their freedom over a score as many years as did the American people for theirs.

RED REACTION TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The importance of Ukraine and indeed of all the captive nations under the Red yoke is lost under a mountain of self-nurtured illusions on the part of America and the West. Rampant is talk of "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe and of "the evaporation of the Cold War," of delicious anticipations of a Peking-Moscow "showdown," even of East-West trade to transform "lean" Communists into more pliant "fat" ones. The crowning illusion is that the policy of containment, leavened with dashes of peaceful coexistence, will somehow in time cause the Red menace to wither away. Yet the harsh reality remains that one billion people suffer today under the Communist yoke, with the virus of communism infiltrating steadily into Africa, South America, even into our own land.

Going hand in hand with our grandiose self-deception is the unrelenting campaign of the totalitarian Red empire to promote free world disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations. Since the days of Lenin and Stalin the necessity for this campaign has not diminished an iota. For domination of the world—the avowed ultimate goal of communism—is unthinkable without consolidation of the Empire.

Hence the strenuous efforts of Red psychopolitical warfare to downgrade and eventually eliminate Captive Nations Week, which, legislated by the U.S. Congress in 1959 (Public Law 86–90), recognizes the subjugation through communist aggression of some twenty-two nations.

This one clear-sighted measure among a myriad of myopic foreign policy formulations stung the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians in by far their most sensitive spot. For how to enlist the uncommitted nations in their cause if they were shown to be the amassers of an unprecedented empire, and moreover one put together by blood and terror in less than fifty years? Even more important, what of the effect of the Captive Nations Week upon their unruly "minorities"—the 45-million Ukrainians leading an aggregate of 100-odd millions in Soviet Union proper alone?

The Captive Nations Week Resolution named names. Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural—all of which succumbed to Red aggression in 1920. Turkestan, which fell in 1922. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania—enslaved in 1940. Albania and Bulgaria—which disappeared in the Soviet maw in 1946. Poland and Rumania—their freedom lost in 1947, followed the next year by Czechoslovakia and North Korea. 1949 saw the enslavement of Hungary, East Germany and mainland China. Tibet was overrun unlamentedly in 1951, North Vietnam was subverted three years later. And the peoples of the North Caucasus, the Far Eastern Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic and Cuba—these, too, vanished into the nether world (graced by the phrase, "an others," in the Resolution).

The Resolution also minced no words in stating that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations was vital to the national security of the United States. And, no less important, it saw that the desire for liberty constituted "a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace."

Small wonder, then, his "monolith" threatened at its foundations, a fuming Khrushchev should have said in 1959 to Vice President Nixon: "This resolution stinks," adding later that it represented a "hysterical campaign of petty provocation."

By October of that year Khrushchev was calling the Resolution an appeal for "interference in other people's affairs." By 1961 it had become a "farce."

The Soviet organs dutifully bayed along. "All progressive mankind greets the news of the 'Captive Nations Week' with a feeling of anger and indignation," asserted *Radyanska Ukraina* (July 25, 1961). "With foaming mouths the imperialist predators insist on the fantastic idea of restoring the capitalist order in the lands of the peoples' democracies and Soviet socialist republics."

In 1963 the Moscow *New Times* shrilly demanded: "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? Is is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.' "

In the same year from the Far East, the Pyongyang Radio contributed: "Kennedy is a third class clown proclaiming Captive Nations Week, which is a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

Recently a typical word came from Mikhail Suslov, chief Russian ideologist. On July 17, 1965, in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, this Soviet pundit said:

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demogogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But that will never happen."

The final irony of our shortsighted and misdirected foreign stance is that we should be labelled an imperialistic power before the uncommitted nations. This at the same time that we blindly refuse to capitalize upon the captive nations and the enormous threat they pose to their tyrants—despite the herculean efforts of Khrushchev, Suslov and their ilk over the years to let us know of the threat by their very protestations.

All our present difficulties—the needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, the self-flagellation of "arrogant power," "escalation" and the rest—can be traced to our woeful inability to act constructively along the lines implied by the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

In the United Nations we ought focus the spotlight of world attention on the Prison of Nations—the Soviet Union—which, Red Chinese saber rattling notwithstanding, remains the potent force in the enemy camp.

A sensible liberation policy, with paramount emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful para-military engagement, stands today as the real and winning alternative to the outmoded policy of containment. Yet we have not so much as created a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, urgently needed to study and to harness the forces of freedom crackling through the Red empire.

We have yet to establish a Freedom Commission and Academy for the only type of warfare possible in today's age of nuclear stalemate—the psycho-political. Had this alone been in existence ten years ago, with a do-it-yourself course for foreign nationals, the sacrifice of American lives in Vietnam probably would have been averted.

Captive Nations Week deserves more than bland rhetoric. It deserves more than a continuation of confusion, errors and appeasement dating back to the Thirties.

The enslavement of one billion people produced it. Our choice is either to live up to its precepts or to resign ourselves to swelling the ranks of the enslaved.

[From the Manion Forum, July 17, 1966]

Propaganda Pipeline—Moscow Uses Captive Nations To Gain Favorable American Press

(By Dr. Brutus Coste, consultant, University of Pennsylvania Foreign Policy Research Institute)

Dean Manion. This is Captive Nations Week. In 1959, by unanimous vote, Congress set aside the third week in July for commemoration by all of the people of the United States for the hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings then and now enslaved by so-called Communist governments. Three hundred million of these enslaved people are in formerly independent nations of Eastern Europe. The rest of these slaves are in Soviet Russia, China, Southeast Asia and North Viet Nam.

By direction of this historic Congressional Resolution the President of the United States makes an annual proclamation of our sympathy for these people enslaved under Communism. The President is directed by the Resolution to continue this annual proclamation of sympathy until these Captive Nations are once more free.

Now, anybody regularly in this audience who doubted the horrible conditions of this Communist slavery had those doubts removed when I introduced the Reverend Richard Wurmbrand at this microphone a few weeks ago. That broadcast caused what I hope is a lasting sensation throughout the United States, as have the television appearances the Reverend Wurmbrand made at the same time over the Manion Forum television network.

Reverend Wurmbrand, as you remember, had just finished fourteen years imprisonment by the Rumanian Communist Government for the crime, if you please, of teaching and preaching religion in Rumania. It is ironical, nevertheless, that the Rumanian Government is persistently in our American news today in an evermore favorable light as a Communist government that is really mellowing and with which we should establish more cordial trade and aid relationships.

In view of what Reverend Wurmbrand reported, I myself have been at a loss to understand this suddenly favorable press for the government that treated him and thousands of his fellow prisoners so horribly.

Today I have the great good fortune to have with me here at the microphone another distinguished Rumanian exile. He is Dr. Brutus Coste, a former Secretary General of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and a former member of the Rumanian diplomatic corps in the days when Rumania was free.

At the present time, Dr. Coste is a consultant to the Foreign Policy Research Institute, of the University of Pennsylvania. He is a lawyer as well as a Doctor of Political and Economic Science. He is well prepared to give us a postscript for what Reverend Wurmbrand said to us about Communism in Rumania.

Dr. Coste, you are very welcome to the Manion Forum.

Dr. Coste. It is an honor to be on this program, Dr. Manion.

Dean Manion. Doctor, there is a great deal of talk nowadays about changes in Eastern Europe. What, for instance, has changed in Rumania since Stalin's time?

Dr. Coste. Essentially, only one thing has changed domestically; instead of wholesale terror we now have selective terror. It so happens that in the twenty years the Communists have been ruling Rumania, they have had time to build up a police force which now has all the features of a professional police force and all the brutality of the Communist police. In the first ten years they had to base their police on reliables, without necessarily being equipped with professional ability to do a good job.

Now, they combine reliability and professionalism. They can pinpoint those who are dangerous to them instead of having to arrest ten thousand in order to catch two, as they have done in the first years. Secondly, the economic system—economic policies—haven't changed. The purpose is still to strengthen the State in its military power and not to cater to public welfare. Unlike other countries, Rumania has not even started studying economic reforms to make the economy, as a whole, work better and also to take care a little bit of the needs of the population. Also unlike most of the other captive countries, the Rumanian regime has not chosen to relent a little bit in the field of letters and arts. It is still very much of a Stalinist regime.

Dean Manion. What about changes in Rumania's relationships with Moscow? Has Rumania really recovered its independence as we read in our papers?

Dr. Coste. Fundamentally, I believe that what we are witnessing is an independence ploy which is essentially a substitute for the reforms which, I repeat, the Stalinist regime in Rumania is reluctant to undertake. It is reluctant to undertake them because the party is made up of ninety per cent opportunists. There were a handful of Communists when the Russians came in, so they do not want to loosen their grip on the people. And since co-operation on the part of the people, particularly in the economic field, is very important, the people are really dragging their feet. The Communists had to find another way of getting some acceptance and this is being done by playing up the independence line and by trying to convince people that are identifying them with national interests So, they have been playing nationalistic games for the last three years.

As a matter of fact, there is no question that the Soviet Union no longer needs, in 1966, to run the countries of Eastern Europe as tightly as it did at the beginning when the regimes were unexperienced and when there was a fear that the West might help the peoples of those countries to recover independence. Since the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, people have lost heart. The Communist governments are reassured so the Soviet Union has been able to sort of, I would say, lengthen the leash. But the leash is still there because, fundamentally, the governments which the Soviet Government set up in Eastern Europe are a function of Soviet power.

All of these Communist governments are anxious to appear as independent as possible but all of them know that without the certainty of Soviet help, in case they would find themselves in trouble with their own people, they would be lost. So, only so far are these governments prepared to go in weakening their ties to the Soviet Union.

Dean MANION. This weakening is advertised for propaganda purposes?

Dr. COSTE. It is advertised for propaganda purposes inland, to gain ground domestically, and also to get a better image in the Western world because a better image is conducive to what they are after, and this is large-scale Western credits to solve their economic problems.

Dean MANION. We have heard a lot, Doctor Coste, about the split between Russia and Red China, and this split is used equivocally, one way or another, by the people who want to apologize for the whole Communist apparatus. Assuming that there is a split—a basic split—is Rumania neutral in this division between Red China and Moscow?

Dr. COSTE. No, I do not believe that Rumania is neutral. This is a cliché which the press has somehow picked up. It has been repeating it *ad nauseam* the last few years. I think that the Rumanians have been chosen by Moscow to keep communications open with China. I could introduce in support of my thesis several arguments. One, when the Rumanians undertook mediations, in the winter, starting in 1964, the Rumanians started by proposing to the two sides—to Moscow and to Peking—two things. One was immediate cessation of all public polemics and the establishment of a commission of the Communist parties that would prepare, patiently and slowly, a meeting of all Communist parties.

Both of these positions that the Rumanians transmitted to Moscow and Peking have been, since the beginning of 1963—since the rift broke out into the open—Soviet policy. Russia has always advocated these first steps towards reconciliation. The Rumanians did nothing but repeat them. The fact is, the Soviet Union accepted within 24 hours the proposal of the Rumanians' suggestion of mediations, whereas it took the Chinese about two weeks to answer in a hedging way.

Secondly, every time the Rumanians went to Peking, they went through Moscow, and they returned through Moscow, reported and asked for instructions. I would say this, if the Russians were finding that the Rumanians were not doing the job for them, they could very easily deny communications. The Rumanians could go by way of Hong Kong if they were acting independently.

There is a good deal of circumstantial evidence to the effect that here is a role that the Soviet Union has assigned to the Rumanians. The Chinese accept, too, because the Chinese want to appear, at least domestically, as less isolated than they are in the Communist world. They would like to say that in addition to Albania there is another Eastern European country that has friendly relations with them.

Dean MANION. Doctor, we are told that Rumania has taken an independent position on the question of the suppression of the Warsaw and NATO Pacts. Is that right?

Dr. COSTE. I think that this is one of the biggest hoaxes of these last few weeks. The Soviet Union, for the last twelve years, since 1954, has been always advocating, for reasons which are very understandable from the Soviet point view, the withdrawal of foreign-based troops from Europe, because the withdrawal of foreign-based troops means American troops crossing an ocean and the Soviet troops pulling back 400 miles to the east, and so Europe would remain under the shadow of Soviet power.

The Soviet Union has always offered to swap the Warsaw Pact against the NATO—again for very understandable reasons. Without the Warsaw Pact, the Communist bloc will continue to exist; without NATO, there is no Western alliance. The Rumanians did nothing but repeat this point of view but they also carefully leaked to press correspondents the idea that this was an independent position, that this was defiance of Moscow. The press was so ready to pick it up, a great deal of publicity, favorable publicity, was given to the Rumanian Communist regime on this score—that they have been trying to suppress the Pacts independent of the position of the Soviet Union.

Dean MANION. On this matter of leaks, which you have mentioned in our conversations, why would Moscow leak news to Western newspapers which would not be printed in Rumania directly?

Dr. COSTE. The purpose is to further the present Soviet strategy in Europe, a strategy aimed at destroying any sense of danger in Western Europe, to sow complacency, to destroy any vestige of vigilance, and thereby to disrupt the Western alliances. Part of this is the attempt to project the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe as independent. Another part of this game is to project the Western European Communist parties as increasingly independent. Another element is the attempt to make people believe that the danger from now on is the so-called "Yellow Peril," as represented by China, and no longer Communism in the Soviet Union. The cumulative effect of all these propaganda efforts by the Communists is to create a state of affairs in Western Europe where the American alliance will no longer appear necessary.

Dean MANION. Well, I think this proves, ladies and gentlemen, that you have to be very careful and circumspect about what you believe, of what you read about what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. Thank you, Doctor Brutus Coste, for this timely and informative story of the Captive Nations, with particular reference to Rumania.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas, since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Viet Nam and others; and

Whereas, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

[From the Free China Weekly, July 24, 1966]

RED ENSLAVEMENT MUST END, PRESIDENT CHIANG TELLS RALLY

The "Captive Nations Week", initiated by the United States, was observed in China from July 17 to 23.

President Chiang Kai-shek, in a message to the Captive Nations Week mass rally in Taipei, said the movement "not only seeks to rescue those now being enslaved and enable them to be free again, but also promotes collective undertakings to prevent the expansion of Communist influences so that those now living in freedom will not have to suffer Communist persecution and enslavement."

The President pointed out that "the Communists on the Chinese mainland are carrying out bloody purges to counter a struggle of unprecedented proportions—a struggle against Mao Tse-tung and Communism. This struggle will deal a fatal blow to the Chinese Communist regime," he said.

"Since they seized the mainland, the Chinese Communists have been engaged in widespread infiltration and subversion which account for most of the chaos in our world today," President Chiang continued, "Communism is the source of all aggressive wars, and the Mao regime is the arch culprit. In order to save the enslaved people shut behind the Iron Curtain, we must first eliminate the nefarious Communist from the mainland."

Pledging to "do our utmost to launch our offensive at an early date in response to the anti-Mao, anti-Communist struggle now spreading on the mainland and put an end to the misery of our compatriots there," the President said that "with unyielding faith and with a pragmatic program of action, we shall be able to provide support for the people in all captive nations and enable them to cast off their shackles and regain their freedom."

Highlights of resolutions adopted here include:

—Calling on the United States and the free nations to help nations and peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain to gain independence and freedom.

—Calling on the free world to give wholehearted support to the anti-Communist war in Vietnam.

—Refuting the appeasement policy advocated by liberal elements.

—Calling on the United States to destroy nuclear installations on the Chinese mainland.

Some 300 mainland refugees and freedom seekers, at a rally in Taipei July 18, sent a cable message to President Lyndon B. Johnson calling on the American government to support the Republic of China both morally and materially in its projected counterattack against the Peiping regime.

Rallies were also held during the week by Chinese civic leaders, young intellectuals and foreign students in Taiwan. Special radio programs were broadcast for people behind the Iron Curtain.

Highlighting the celebrations was a rally held on July 23 at the Taipei City Hall, which adopted resolutions in support of the Vietnamese people and the suffering masses on the Chinese mainland.

Mass rallies were also held on the offshore islands of Kinmen, Matsu and in other major cities on Taiwan.

Program for the Taipei Rally in Observance of the Captive Nations Week, 1966

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Chairman and Members of the Presidium in chairs.
3. Audience standing up.
4. Band play.
5. National anthem.
6. Salute to National Flag and before the portrait of the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founding father of the Republic of China.
7. One minute's silence in memory of deceased captive peoples under Communist rule.
8. Reading the Message from President Chiang.
9. Reading U.S. President's Proclamation on Captive Nations Week by Acting Political Counselor Peter W. Colm of the American Embassy.
10. Report by Chairman Ku Cheng-kang.
11. Speeches by: (1) Vice President Yen; (2) Dr. Chung Yul Kim, Chairman of the APACL Korea Chapter; (3) Dr. Anthony Kubek.
12. Adoption of Declaration and Messages.
13. Chanting slogans.
14. Band play.
15. End of the meeting.

President Chiang Kai-Shek's Message to the Captive Nations Week Mass Rally in Taipei, Taiwan, on July 23, 1966

Our people in all walks of life have responded enthusiastically to the U.S.-initiated Captive Nations Week movement for the purpose of supporting our compatriots' anti-Communist revolution on the Chinese mainland as well as the struggle for freedom on the part of people in other captive countries. The movement not only seeks to rescue those now being enslaved and enable them to be free again, but also promotes collective undertakings to prevent the expansion of Communist influences so that those now living in freedom will not have to suffer Communist persecution and enslavement.

As we observe the Captive Nations Week of 1966, the Communists on the Chinese mainland are carrying out bloody purges to counter a struggle of unprecedented proportions—a struggle directed against Mao Tse-tung and Communism. Participating in the struggle are intellectuals and the masses of the people on the Chinese mainland who are taking this opportunity to get even with the Chinese Reds for their 17 years of tyrannical rule. This struggle will deal a fatal blow to the Chinese Communist regime. The expanding purge and the spreading anti-Communist struggle are sure signs that the internal crisis of the Peiping regime has been aggravated. The more repressive the regime becomes, the more powerful will be the anti-Communist movement of the intellectuals as well as all the people on the mainland. Thus, Mao's despotic rule is bound to be shaken to its foundations and to disintegrate as a result.

Since they seized the mainland, the Chinese Communists have been engaged in widespread infiltration and subversion which account for most of the chaos in our world today. Communism is the source of all aggressive wars, and the Mao regime is the arch culprit. In order to save the enslaved people shut behind the Iron Curtain, we must first eliminate the nefarious Communists from the mainland. To this end, we must do our utmost to launch our offensive at an early date in response to the anti-Mao, anti-Communist struggle now spreading on the mainland and put an end to the misery of our compatriots there. All those on the Chinese mainland, who oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought and tyranny, and who refuse to remain enslaved, will be our allies in the National Revolution as well as our comrades under the *San Min Chu I* (Three Principles of the People). They are expected to continue and expand their life-or-death struggle in an undaunted spirit against the Communist regime, wait for our assistance and join forces with us. By coordinated attacks from both within and without against the Peiping regime, we shall accomplish our sacred mission of national recovery and deliverance of our people from Communist rule.

It is our conviction that to combat slavery in the name of freedom conforms to the most basic requirement of humanity and the strongest aspiration of mankind. In observing the Captive Nations Week, all freedom-loving people throughout the world must unite for this common struggle. With unyielding faith and with a pragmatic program of action, we shall be able to provide support for the people in all captive nations and enable them to cast off their shackles and regain their freedom. Only thus can the world have security and peace and can mankind enjoy freedom and prosperity in perpetuity.

We of all walks of life in the Republic of China are gathered here to give support to the Captive Nations Week movement initiated in the United States. Our Rally is dedicated to the assisting of the enslaved nations and peoples in their struggle to regain freedom. The struggle has been developing in strength over a widespread area behind the eastern and western wings of the Iron Curtain. The Catholic demonstrations defying the Communist authorities in Poland, the "separatist" inclinations of Roumania as evidenced in her objections to the Warsaw Pact, and the resistance movement of the intellectuals on mainland China against Communism and against Mao Tse-tung are signs of fissure and cracking in the Communist rule and unity.

The fight carried on by the Chinese mainland intellectuals against Marxism-Leninism and the "thought of Mao Tse-tung" has been developed in full force. The new situation created is of great importance to our recovery of the mainland, and to the future of Asia and even the world. It is a most critical task for us to comprehend and make use of this revolution in order to create the opportunity to restore freedom to all the enslaved on the mainland.

This struggle going on there is distinguished by three characteristics: with the intellectuals and the great masses united, being the confrontation of traditional Chinese culture against Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung, its having penetrated to the core of the Chinese Communist Party, in which the anti-Mao revolt has reached the leadership level from the basic cadre. We foresee its growing stronger, commensurating with the increase of suppression, even to a possible all-out anti-Communist revolution. To cope with the growth of domestic resistance, the Communist regime resort to will the use of foreign "campaigns," meaning that the Anti-Russian and Hate-American campaigns will become more intense. Furthermore, the Communist tyrant in strongly suppressing the present opposition force will employ its military to revamp the Party, and then to revamp the political structure. This will destroy the doctrines of the Chinese Communists that "the Party will direct politics," "the Party will direct the military," and 'the power of the Party is supreme." They will thus begin to destroy themselves.

Visibly this is the opportune moment for us to effect a link-up of the forces of the Free World with the anti-Communist forces on the China mainland for the destruction of the Chinese Communist regime.

To the free Chinese people here and overseas we make our appeal. The widespread opposition on the mainland against Mao Tse-tung and Communism is waged by the intellectuals who are supported by the broad masses. It is shaking the foundation of the Communist rule and producing favorable conditions for our recovery of mainland China. We shall give this opposition our moral encouragement, material assistance and support in action. We shall immediately work in the following fields: (1) Show our support and encouragement to the rebelling people on the mainland through intensified broadcasting, airdrop activities, the use of balloons and other methods of psychological warfare; (2) Redouble our relief and assistance programs in Hongkong, Macao and other places near the China mainland, and appeal to the free nations to extend political asylum to those who escaped from or revolted against the Communist regime; (3) Support the June 16th statement by President Chiang (in which he reiterated the Four Items of Guarantee and Ten Articles and advocated our early mounting of military operations) by giving every active support to our Government in its preparations for mainland recovery, to be launched in conjunction with developments in the international scene.

Secondly we appeal to the people on the China mainland, and especially the intellectuals, the people who, defying Communist brutality, suppression and persecution, are fighting against Communism and Mao Tse-tung to maintain our traditional culture and the dignity of mankind, and whose persevering bravery is gaining the sympathetic support of free people everywhere.

President has said recently: "All the intellectuals urged or on the verge of being purged by Mao Tse-tung are comrades-in-arms of the Three Principles (of Dr. Sun Yat-sen). We will muster everything within our capability and come to your reinforcement by advancing the mounting of our military operations." Everybody in this land of freedom supports you. The Rally we are now holding in Taipei to observe the Captive Nations Week movement initiated in the United States is to rally the forces of justice everywhere in the Free World to your fight for freedom. We are sure of your continuation and enlarging of this fight, which will grow from a war of the mind against Mao to an active battle and an all-out revolution against Communism.

"Those who are not enemies are our comrades." You are now standing with us on the same front fighting against Communism. Under the leadership of President Chiang and with the aid of righteous forces in the world we will launch the offensive to retake the mainland at the opportune moment, when you will link up forces with us to destroy the Communist regime from two fronts: the front of re-invasion and the front in the heartland. The nation will be reunified and your freedom will be restored.

We address our third appeal to the Free World at large. The current struggle of the intellectuals on the mainland against Mao and or against Communism is a strong factor in causing the disintegration of the Communist regime. The Free World and especially the Asian countries must fully realize its importance and significance and not permit yourselves to watch passively, as in the sad case of the Budapest revolt in 1956, a bloody suppression of this struggle. The anti-Communist revolution on the mainland now stands in urgent need of outside assistance.

In his address to the American Alumni Council on July 12th, President Johnson of the U.S. said that "a peaceful Mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia," and that "lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of Mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world." These observations we subscribe to. We also believe that these words reflect his clear understanding of what constitutes the key to the problem of peace in Asia. But hoping for the Chinese Communists to abandon the policy of aggression will never achieve that "peaceful Mainland" or that "lasting peace" in Asia; for a half free and half enslaved world cannot remain for long. As there is no third road between freedom and enslavement, the best assurance of the Free World's defense remains to be the destruction of the entire Iron Curtain of Communism. The restoration of freedom to all the enslaved peoples is the effective way to safeguard the free. Therefore we maintain the United States should support the rallying together of nations in Asia and the Pacific, so that the strength of the Asian nations may be deployed in cooperation with the strength of the other countries of the free world to contain Chinese Communist aggression. The United States should also support the Republic of China, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Vietnam to unify their countries and deliver their people.

At this Rally in support of the restoration of freedom to enslaved nations and peoples, we announce our support of the firm stand taken by President Johnson of the United States towards the war in Vietnam, and his recent decisions to strike at the POL storage facilities near Haiphong and Hanoi. To facilitate the attainment of its objectives, the United States should blockade Haiphong to block the supply of strategic goods from the Chinese Communists, increase air strikes against the military and production installations of Hanoi, and be prepared to support the northward advance of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam to cause the thorough collapse of the Ho-Chi-Minh regime. We are convinced that the "lasting peace" will come to Asia, only if that peace is obtained through victory.

VICE PRESIDENT C. K. YEN'S MESSAGE TO THE MASS MEETING IN SUPPORT OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, in response to the Captive Nations Week of 1966, as proclaimed by the President of the United States of America, the civil organizations of the Republic of China jointly organize today this mass meeting. The purpose of our rally is to re-emphasize our determination to emancipate all peoples in captive nations and our faith in the final victory of freedom for mankind. I wish therefore to solemnly declare, on behalf of my Government and my people, our firm standing on this most important issue of human rights.

To struggle for men's liberty is one of the noble ideals inspiring the American people to declare independence. The history of the past one hundred and ninety years has unmistakably testified that for realizing this ideal, the American people have never failed once to pay the price, when necessary, in sweat, tears, and even blood. Because of this historical heritage, it is of unusual significance to both the Federal Government and the people of the United States to have their President to issue a proclamation every year since 1959, inviting them to observe the Captive Nations Week, which falls on the third week of July, with appropriate ceremonies and activities in order to manifest their sympathy and support to the enslaved peoples of the world. Again, because of this historical heritage on the part of such a great champion for liberty, the idea of Captive Nations Week has kindled the hope of mankind and a dynamic global movement has been set in motion.

We, the people of the Republic of China, in our dedication to bring about the above-mentioned noble ideal, are more than willing to offer our utmost efforts. The arch enemy to men's liberty today is the Chinese Communists: They are trampling on our territory, they are enslaving our compatriots, and they are threatening the liberty of men everywhere. It is our indomitable determination to wipe out the puppet regime of the Chinese Communists on the mainland in order to free our fellow men in fetters and secure this important human right on a permanent basis. On this common ground, there is but a completely identical purpose between the Chinese people and other peoples who also cherish this ideal in their hearts.

The will to set men free and the evil power to enslave them are heading for inevitable collision. As a matter of fact, they are already engaged in open hostilities in Vietnam. Hence, any assistance to the people of Vietnam is a direct help to the cause of liberty. Only last June, President Johnson of the United States declared in a very forthright manner, "We are not just fighting for 14 million. We are fighting for almost 3 billion people who also want freedom and liberty." This very fact clearly shows that the war in Vietnam is being waged for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom and liberty of the whole mankind. It further indicates that any attempt to appease the Chinese Communists is as useless as a daydream. It behooves the free peoples to join hands immediately on the battle ground of Vietnam, as the first step to shatter the chains on their enslaved brethren entrapped in the captive nations.

I wish to point out that during the past year the Chinese Communists have been increasingly rejected and repudiated both within and outside the Bamboo Curtain. As a result of their ruthless suppression of the people and their subversive activities against other nations, their evil nature has been completely exposed for every one to see. Especially, they have exhausted their resources to develop nuclear weaponry, consequently the people under their domination have been denied the minimum standard of living. Also, in utter defiance of the public opinion of the world, they have recently detonated a nuclear device for the third time in a row, attempting to further blackmail the peace-loving nations. However, they have evidently failed in this attempt of intimidation by showing their military might. On the other hand, they have only earned the intensified anger of hatred of the people on the mainland. We need only follow the progress of their recent purge to understand that all the pillars of the puppet regime, namely, the party organization, political apparatus, and military establishment, are beginning to crumble down.

That the Chinese Communists have to start the urge proves that their internal struggle for power has become very serious. The purge also bears witness to the fact that on the mainland the intellectual, the students, and even the party cadres being being fed up with communism. In many ways, they have also manifested their profound interest in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People as well as the traditional Chinese civilization and culture. Such a change of loyalty constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of the Chinese Communists, and, in a sense, forces the Chinese Communists to resort to terroristic measures.

However, as it is always futile to suppress the people's revolutionary resistance, the downfall of the Chinese Communists is not far away. Therefore, this is the right moment for us, the people of the Republic of China, to free our fellow citizens on the mainland. This is also the right moment for all the freedom-loving peoples to destroy the common enemy. President Chiang has reminded us about such a moment in his Inaugural Speech last May, by saying, "Hereafter, as long as we resolutely make more positive efforts, speed up our preparations, work in harmony and unity, and taking advantage of our own strength and the enemy's weakness, seize the opportunity for our counter-offensive when the moment arrives, we can, by engaging in struggles and by shedding our own blood, quicken the anti-Communist armed resistance and revolution on the mainland." We have full confidence in the bright future of free men. On the basis of this faith of ours, we offer cooperation to all peoples for freedom. Let us join together in this noble task, and make all possible efforts to secure for all men their inalienable right of liberty.

I thank you.

CABLE TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

From Taipei Rally by People from All Walks of Life in the Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain.

To President Lyndon Baines Johnson, the White House, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Chinese mainland struggles against Communism and Mao Tse-tung are increasing in intensity and extent from day to day. Led by Chinese intellectuals, these struggles have gathered such momentum as to shake the Peiping regime to its very foundations. With the Chinese Communists facing confusion and chaos, Your Excellency has further confounded the enemy's cause with the bombing of oil storage facilities in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. This has improved the outlook for the Republic of Vietnam and provides increased assurance that the people of South Vietnam will not become the victims of Communist enslavement.

At this juncture, we—more than 2,000 representatives of people from all walks of life in the Republic of China—have gathered in Taipei today for a grand rally in support of "Captive Nations Week", which was initiated by your own great country. At this mass meeting we are, on the one hand, conveying our admiration, our respects, and our full support for Your Excellency in your determined efforts to assist the people of Vietnam. On the other hand, we are expressing the high expectations that we have of Your Excellency at a moment when the anti-Communist, anti-Mao intellectuals and masses of the Chinese mainland are fighting for their lives against suppression, purge, and liquidation.

In an address on "Peace in Asia and the Pacific" on the 12th of this month, Your Excellency said that a "peaceful China is central to a peaceful Asia". In effect, Your Excellency added that a lasting peace can never be won in Asia so long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world. These views of Your Excellency are most accurate, and wholly in accord with our own. We are of the conviction that Your Excellency has come firmly to grips with the fundamental problems of Vietnam, of China, and of all Asia.

However, we still must admit to bewilderment at the tendency of some Americans to indulge themselves in the delusion that it is possible to coexist with the Chinese Communist. After all the bloody lessons of war with Communism—the Korean War and the present conflict in Vietnam—and in the face of the upsurging anti-Communist and anti-Mao movements on the Chinese mainland, it is beyond our comprehension that anyone in the United States could dream of peaceful coexistence with Peiping.

Undeniable facts clearly indicate that the Chinese Communists are the principal culprits in the Vietnam war, and that they are the root source of all the chaos and trouble in Asia. Neither Asia nor the world can have peace as long as the Chinese mainland remains under control of the Peiping regime. It is obvious, therefore, that only by eliminating this regime can the Asian region and the whole of the earth know lasting peace.

For these reasons, we voice this appeal to Your Excellency:

To take more positive, decisive measures for dealing with the war in Vietnam;

To go one step further in the selection of bombing targets so as to include all military and industrial objectives in the Hanoi area; and

To impose a naval blockade against the port of Haiphong so as to isolate and wipe out the aggressive power of the Vietnamese Communists and prevent assistance to the Viet Cong terrorists in the south.

Additionally, we join in urging Your Excellency to revise the United States' policy toward the Chinese Communists. As a result of recent developments on the Chinese mainland, this is the opportune time to adopt more positive measures so that the isolation there can be ended, as you have recommended. We hope that in the interest of our two countries, and to rescue and save the 700 million Chinese people now living under Communism, Your Excellency will extend America's moral and material support to the Republic of China, and assist this country in a counterattack against the Peiping regime, and in destroying Chinese Communist nuclear installations, at the earliest possible moment.

With such moral and material support, the armed forces of the Republic of China—together with the anti-Communist, anti-Mao intellectuals and people of the Chinese mainland—will quickly crush the Peiping regime and bring peace and freedom to this part of the world. In an instant, the Asian Iron Curtain will be torn aside and the enslaved people behind it will regain their liberty. thus will be accomplished the inspiring purposes for which your great country undertook the noble movement expressed in this Captive Nations Week.

CABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

From Taipei Rally by People from All Walks of Life in the Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain

To: Chairman Nguyen Van Thieu, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, Government of the Republic of Vietnam, the Military Forces and People of South Vietnam.

DEAR SIRS: Just as the war situation in your great country is growing increasingly better these days, the Vietcong, supported and instigated by the Chinese Communists, are still trying to expand the scope of hostilities as a final struggle. Both Your Excellencies have gallantly guided your people and armed services in the fight against the treacherous Communists, thus subjecting them to repeated defeats and frustrations. Your Excellencies have unmistakably demonstrated a determination to bring about unity in your great nation, to carry out administrative reforms, and to implement constitutional democracy. You have also clearly and resolutely made known your firm opposition to any peace negotiations with the Communists and have persisted in your decision to fight to the end until the Vietcong are eliminated. This dauntless spirit which you have displayed for the cause of safeguarding freedom has won our highest respect and admiration. And we shall go all-out in our support for the cause of your great nation.

In response to the U.S. sponsored "Captive Nations Week" movement, we, the people from all walks of life in the Republic of China, gather today in Taipei for a commemorative mass rally. Besides appealing to all the free world nations to continue and expedite their efforts in support of your great country, we are also planning other effective measures. Through this cable, we once more express our firm determination to stand by your side all the way. With best wishes and prayers for an early victory over Communism.

A CABLE MESSAGE OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE OFFICERS AND MEN OF THE UNITED STATES, THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

From Taipei Rally by People from All Walks of Life in the Republic of China In Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain.

To General William C. Westmoreland, Commander, U.S. Forces in Vietnam, and All Officers and Men of the U.S., the Republic of Korea, Australia, and New Zealand Fighting in Vietnam.

DEAR SIRS: You gentlemen—officers and men of the U.S. forces as well as of the forces of the Republic of Korea, Australia, and New Zealand in Vietnam—deserve the highest commendation for your courageous and cooperative efforts in dealing repeated effective blows to the Vietcong at a time when the Communists continue to escalate their war of aggression against South Vietnam. Thanks to you all, the Communists' insidious designs to conquer South Vietnam and enslave the Vietnamese people have now been crushed.

As a result of the bombing of the oil depots in the Hanoi-Haiphong area by the U.S. Air Force, the troop morale of the Vietcong has begun to slump day after day and the war situation in Vietnam is growing increasingly better.

You have made great sacrifices for the cause of safeguarding freedom and righteousness. You have displayed the great spirit of fearlessness. For you all, we people of the Republic of China have the highest respect and admiration. And we pledge to support you with all our efforts.

On this day, we—the people from all walks of life in the Republic of China—gather in Taipei for a rally in response to the U.S.-sponsored "Captive Nations Week" movement. At our rally, we again express our firm support for the independence and freedom of South Vietnam and our determination to fight shoulder to shoulder with you for our common struggle all the way. With best wishes for you all and our prayers for final victory over Communism.

To the Peoples of the Captive Nations.

DEAR FRIENDS: People of all walks of life of the Republic of China are holding a mass rally today here in Taipei in warm response to the "Captive Nations Week" Movement sponsored by the United States as an expression of their concern and sympathy with the peoples of various captive nations. It has also been resolved at the rally to convey to you their sincere solicitude.

Among the world communists there have been ideological differences: "Marxist-Leninism," the only truth subscribed by the Communists the world over, has been a topic for debate now by "dogmatists" and "revisionists." The Warsaw Pact, which has united all Communist states, is rocking at its very foundation as a result of the demand made by Rumania for independence. The captive peoples in Eastern Europe are striving for freedom. That several thousand Polish catholics not long ago held demonstrations in complete disregard to the suppression imposed on them by the Polish Communists is a case in point. All this explains that Communism as an ideology is on the way to collapse and the brutal rule of Communist regimes has been wavering. That being the case, now is the time for you to settle score with the Communists and strive for your freedom.

Like you, our six hundred million compatriots on the Chinese mainland are leading an enslaved life. As the Chinese Communists are particularly cruel, they suffer from even more dismal fate than you do. In fact, their life in the "People's Communes" is worse than that of beasts of burden. While they continue to subject peasants to liquidation and struggle in the form of "class struggle," the Chinese Communists are unfolding a large-scale purge and slaughter in the name of the so-called "cultural revolution" against intellectuals and youth. They have gone so far as to claim that their aim is no less than to "behead thousands upon thousands of people" under their domination. Their brutal acts, however, have given rise to widespread resistance on the part of intellectuals together with the masses who are putting up "life-and-death" struggle against the regime in Peiping.

Besides, the Government and people of the Republic of China are giving positive support to them in all effective forms to rescue them and have completed all preparations to launch counter-offensive against the mainland with a view to joining hands with them in the common struggle against the Communists. Therefore, we sincerely hope that you will help our mainland compatriots in the common effort to destroy the Iron Curtain in the East and West and to overthrow the totalitarian rule so as to regain the freedom of over one thousand million captive peoples at an early date.

Dear friends, freedom will finally triumph over slavery; so will justice over brutal force. Let us hope that we shall march forward shoulder to shoulder in our common struggle for the eventual victory of the cause of freedom.

DECLARATION ISSUED BY THE MASS RALLY HELD AT TAIPEI ON JULY 23, 1966

While the anti-Communist and anti-Mao struggle led by intellectuals on the Chinese mainland are intensifying, while the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe are striving for freedom and against slavery and while the war in Vietnam has gradually turned for the better, we 2,000 people representing all walks of life of the Republic of China are holding a Mass Rally here in Taipei today in support of the peoples of the captive nations to strive for freedom in enthusiastic response to the Captive Nations Week Movement sponsored by the United States as an expression of our deep concern and sympathy with the captive nations and also those nations and peoples who are suffering from Communist aggression. Therefore, this mass rally is of great significance.

The anti-Communist and anti-Mao struggle that is raging on the Chinese mainland, as we see it, is a spontaneous expression on the part of intellectuals and the masses of their aversion for the Red regime in Peiping. As a matter of fact, it is also a struggle between the traditional Chinese culture and an alien doctrine in the form of Marxist-Leninism" and mad "Mao Tse-tungism." So great is its influence and so wide is its impact that it has thrown the Red regime in Peiping into utter confusion.

All signs show that this struggle will eventually develop into an overall anti-Communist revolution of the Chinese people with the close cooperation of "workers, farmers and soldiers," thus creating a favorable condition for our counterattack against the Chinese mainland. Such being the case, it behooves all our people to seize this opportune moment, exert their utmost and use all available means to give the persecuted intellectuals on the Chinese mainland their moral and material support so as to accelerate the outbreak of an overall anti-Communist revolution and open the way for the counteroffensive against the mainland.

In this connection, we have to call on peoples of all the free world, especially those in the United States as its leaders, to pay due attention to the new anti-Communist situation that is taking place on the mainland. They must take stock of this new situation from which they will derive correct facts. Only thus can they clarify the mistaken view as expressed by those appeasers in the form of "containment without isolation" policy. By the same token, they will not entertain such illusions as "the Chinese Communists have taken root on the mainland and the only hope lies in the peaceful transition of the second generation of the present Peiping regime." Only when they have freed themselves from such mistaken views and illusions can they lay down a more positive new China policy.

From now on, they should not clamour any more for peaceful coexistence with the Chinese Communists so as not to dishearten the mainland people in their anti-Communist struggle. On the contrary, they should provide effective support to the anti-Communist struggle on the mainland and should not sit idly by without paying any regard to the persecution and slaughter imposed on the mainland intellectuals by the Communists, thereby repeating the tragedy of the Hungarian revolution ten years ago.

The warlike Chinese Communists are persecuting and suppressing the people under their tyrannical control. Besides, they are instigating the Communists in Vietnam to escalate the war in Vietnam with a view to enslaving the whole population in that war-torn country. Therefore, we must give our wholehearted support to the firm policy in Vietnam as enunciated by President Lyndon B. Johnson. We must give up the policy which does not seek complete victory in Vietnam. On the contrary, we must take firm and effective measures by dealing the regime in North Vietnam a fatal blow so as to thoroughly destroy all its aggressive strength and strive for the victory of the war in Vietnam at an early date.

The Chinese Communists are the source of all troubles in Asia. They are the chief culprits threatening the freedom of mankind. For the freedom and security of Asia as well as for the preservation of the peace of the world, we appeal to the peoples of both the United States and all other democratic nations of the world to seize the favorable opportunity resulting from the serious internal and external crisis facing the Peiping regime and the anti-Communist and anti-Mao struggle that is unfolding on the mainland. Therefore, it behooves them to give us both moral and material support without further delay so as to make it possible for us to launch a counteroffensive against the mainland in time to destroy the Red regime, to tear down the Iron Curtain in Asia and thus to bring about the disintegration of the Iron Curtain in Europe and Cuba. Only thus will the thousand million enslaved peoples regain their freedom. Only thus will the lofty goal of the "Captive Nations Week" Movement be fully realized.

Freedom is indivisible. A world in which half of its population is free and the other half enslaved cannot last long. Particularly at the moment when the mainland intellectuals are heroically putting up a struggle against the Communists for freedom, we cannot sit idly by and let them struggle on single-handed and be suppressed by brute force. We must take action, give them our positive support, and deliver them from the clutches of Communist tyranny. This is indeed a most important task of the present age. It is also our sacred mission. It is hoped that all our people both at home and abroad together with the freedom-loving peoples the world over will make up their minds, march forward bravely in their common struggle for the victory of the cause of freedom.

PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN RESPONSE TO THE U.S.-SPONSORED "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" MOVEMENT

DOMESTIC ACTIVITIES

Sunday, July 17

1. Contacting all newspapers here for carrying editorials in their publications on the Captive Nations Week movement, and for intensified news report on the movement during the week-long period.

2. Contacting all broadcasting stations and television company here for intensified broadcasting of special programs and news about the observance activities to people at home and abroad as well as in areas behind the Iron Curtain.

3. Contacting the Government Information Office and filmmaking companies for making news reels on the observance activities for shows at home and abroad and for exchanges of films with the United States, Japan, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, Korea, etc.

4. Flowing in main streets of Taipei banners bearing slogans for the occasion.

5. Post-mark bearing slogans for the occasion on all mails for a period of one week.

6. Contacting for all cinemas here to make slide shows or news reel shows for the occasion during the week-long period beginning from July the 17th.

7. Publication of a special pamphlet on Captive Nations Week.

8. Asking local governments all over Taiwan to give lectures on the theme of the Captive Nations Week movement at mass meetings or other gatherings during the week-long period.

9. Asking Catholic and Christian churches on Taiwan to pray for captive nations and peoples at their church services during the week.

10. Asking all transportation units on Taiwan to carry posters or banners on their vehicles during the week in order to give a wider publicity to this movement.

11. Requesting all commercial stores factories all over Taiwan to display at the doorways attractive posters bearing slogans in connection with the Captive Nations Week for a week-long period in order to expand the impact of the movement.

12. Requesting the Ministry of Interior to instruct all official organizations and civic bodies to deliver speeches on the theme of the movement when holding their monthly meetings during the week.

13. Requesting the Political Department of the Ministry of National Defense to instruct all military units to give the movement a wide publicity at their regular Weekly Meeting in memory of the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen during the week.

Monday, July 18

1. Contacting the Free China Relief Association for organizing a forum among anti-Communist fighters and escapees to extend support to captive peoples' struggle for freedom.

2. Contacting people on Kinmen and Matsu for holding on these off-shore islands rallies in support of the Captive Nations Week and other related activities.

Tuesday, July 19

1. Holding forums among young intellectuals in Taipei to support captive peoples' struggle for freedom. Invited to the forums will be also foreign students now studying on Taiwan.

2. Contacting for Kaohsiung City to hold rally in observance of the Captive Nations Week and other related activities.

3. Contacting for Buddhist temples on Taiwan to hold prayer meetings for the repose of souls of those who died under Communist slavery and persecution.

Wednesday, July 20

1. Asking academic and cultural bodies on Taiwan to hold forums to which professors will be invited to give lectures.

2. Contacting for Taichung City to hold rally marking the Captive Nations Week and other related activities.

3. Asking the Taoist faithfuls to hold prayer meetings for deceased people under Communist enslavement.

Thursday, July 21

1. Holding televised forum and interviews with freedom-seeking escapees and Chinese POWs of the Korean War.

2. Asking the faithfuls of the Shein-yuan religion to hold prayer meetings for deceased people under Communist slavery.

3. Contacting Hualien County to hold mass rally in commemoration of the Captive Nations Week and undertake other related activities.

Friday, July 22

1. Asking Mosques here to conduct religious services for deceased people under tyrannical Communist rule.

2. Contacting for Tainan City to hold mass rally in observance of the occasion and undertake other related activities.

Saturday, July 23

1. Holding a Mass Rally at 9:00 a.m. at Chung Shan Auditorium, Taipei City Hall to support captive nations' and peoples' struggle for freedom.

2. Asking the faithfuls of the LI Religion here to hold prayer meetings for deceased people under Communist enslavement.

3. Holding an evening party at the New Taipei Park for the occasion.

4. Contacting for Keelung City to hold a mass rally marking the occasion and undertake other commemorative activities.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. Asking the APACL Secretariat in Manila to notify all APACL member-units to make response to the Captive Nations Week movement.

2. Writing various international anti-Communist organizations to respond to this movement.

3. Writing to various organizations, asking them to write, in turn, to international organizations to make refutation to appeasement policy to the Communists.

4. Contacting for the "Voice of America" to make broadcasts in various languages to widely publicize the theme and functions of the movement as well as to make reports on the commemorative activities undertaken.

ACTIVITIES AMONG OVERSEAS CHINESE COMMUNITIES

1. Asking all authorities concerned to intensify their information services abroad, particularly the United States, Japan, Hong Kong and Macao, on the commemorative activities through the media of news reports, broadcasting, television and movies.

2. Asking the Government Information Office and other organizations concerned to make tape-recording on this movement, for exchanges with foreign broadcasting stations in order to widen the movement's publicity. Also, they will be asked to carry in their regular publications, supplementary pages and pictures in connection with the movement, in order to expand the impact of the movement.

3. Organizing refugee organizations in Hong Kong and Kowloon to warmly respond

to this movement, in conjunction with the religious groups there.

4. Issuance of Statement by anti-Communist escapees on Taiwan, appealing for U.S. support toward our efforts to re-take the mainland and thereby overthrow the tyrannical communist rule so as to deliver our compatriots there from under the Communist yoke.

ACTIVITIES INTENDED FOR AREAS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

1. Asking local broadcasting stations to tape-record the proceedings of the Taipei Rally for live broadcasts to the Chinese mainland, North Vietnam, North Korea, Laos and East European nations during the week-long period.

2. Inviting leaders from all walks of life and international anti-Communist leaders in Taiwan to deliver speeches on the air to captive peoples in Asia and Europe during the week-long period.

3. Asking various psychological warfare units here to propagate the movement to the Chinese people on the mainland by means of airdropping, balloon drifting, sea floating and mails as well as other effective methods.

4. Asking the international psychological warfare units in association with us to make special programs on this occasion for broadcasting to areas behind the Iron Curtain for one week.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the Record during the special order of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR ADVANCED DEGREES

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, our Government, being so large and complex, sometimes works at cross purposes. While this Congress and administration have shown admirable sympathy to higher education, one agency of our Government, the Internal Revenue Service, is retarding pursuit of advanced degrees by our Nation's teachers. The IRS does so through no lack of wisdom, I am sure, but through assiduous concern for its prime duty of revenue collection.

I am today introducing a bill which affirms our Government's willingness to allow tax deductions for teachers who are furthering their formal education. At present, if their efforts eventually entitle them to another degree, their expenses become nondeductible.

The Service claims that Congress has never endorsed deductions on expenses specifically for education. Educational expenses are considered normal business expenditures under some conditions, and are deductible for this reason. When a teacher is required to improve his skills to keep in step with his profession, as he is by State law in Colorado, or has to meet minimum, continuing educational demands set by his contract, his expenses are deductible.

The IRS says pursuit of advanced degrees is akin to neither of these cases. They say these teachers are attempting, instead, to advance substantially their personal positions within their profession. Hence, theirs are not normal business expenditures and are not deductible.

My bill overturns this ruling. All expenses for legitimate, formal education, whether they lead to a degree or not, are made deductible. I feel this bill is necessary if we are to avoid stifling the incentive of our teachers to improve themselves. We risk deterioration of our country's teaching resources if we impose penalties, rather than rewards, for intellectual effort.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF TEACHERS' EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today will clarify a most confused situation created by the Internal Revenue Service in relation to the deductibility of teachers' educational expenses. This bill is identical to H.R. 775 introduced by the gracious lady from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths].

I recently wrote to the Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue protesting the proposed regulation printed in the Federal Register for July 7, 1966, as follows:

> I am appalled at the Proposed Regulation 26 CPR Part 1, as carried in the July 7 Federal Register, which will in effect deny teachers the right to deduct necessary expenses incurred while improving their proficiency as teachers.
>
> The Congress, under the leadership of President Johnson, has enacted far-reaching programs designed to aid the schools and colleges to provide better educational opportunity to the nation's children and youth. Control to success of these programs is the competence of the teacher. The proposed regulation put forth on July 7 will be a major set back to the accomplishment of the objectives of these programs which, per se, necessitate that teachers voluntarily seek further training.
>
> It is inconceivable that the Treasury Department can so callously disregard the needs of American education that, assumedly in the guise of economy, they would impose this deterrent to improved educational opportunity. While the Congress has provided some funds through the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 for scholarships for teachers, these are so limited in number that they only scratch the surface of the problem of upgrading teacher competence. The vast majority of teachers must rely on their own meager financial resources to carry the cost of necessary in-service training. Certainly they should be encouraged, rather than discouraged, in this pursuit.
>
> I strongly protest the Proposed Regulation and urge that, instead, more liberal provisions than those presently in force be made for the deduction of teachers' educational expenses.

A response to my protest from Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, is wholly unsatisfactory. It seems clear that the Internal Revenue Service intends to persist in attempting to negate the gains made through Tax Court rulings on deducting teachers' educational expenses. Therefore, I believe that the only solution to this matter is by act of Congress. I hope that we can proceed to enact appropriate legislation before adjournment of the 89th Congress.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record today, as part of my remarks, the conclusions and summary of major recommendations as found in the report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia on the Metropolitan Police Department. Together with that, I am placing in the Record, as part of these remarks, the report of the crime study committee of the Washington Board of Realtors.

I am sure that many of our colleagues will, as I do, disagree with some of the conclusions and recommendations in either or both of these reports.

I am placing them before the Congress, however, because of the necessity of our discussing these matters fully and fairly in order to try to arrive at some solution. The excerpts from the President's Commission on Crime follow:

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS, AS FOUND IN THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ON THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

CONCLUSION

The Commission believes that the police department of the Nation's Capital should be a model of excellence. We have concluded, however, that our department trails behind the country's leading police departments in major phases of its operations. Fundamental changes must be made if the Metropolitan Police Department is to attain the desired standard.

The Department is presently deficient in vital aspects of its organization and management. Its structure permits duplication of function, encourages violation of lines of authority, and hampers effective supervision of the men on the force. Accordingly, we have recommended a major reorganization of the Department, and a reduction of the existing 14 precincts to 6 primary patrol areas.

Disturbing deficiencies in personnel and recruitment policies impair the Department's operations and limit its potential for change. An increase in police salaries is necessary, recruiting efforts in the District must be intensified, and reforms in promotional practices introduced. Vigorous efforts should be initiated to employ more civilian specialists.

The critical area of training has not been sufficiently emphasized by the Department. Recruits are inadequately schooled in the demands of police work in the community. Our recommendations seek to increase the intensity and relevance to recruit training and to encourage continuing professional growth for the officers and leaders of the Department.

The buildings and equipment are obsolete and notoriously second-rate; officers are poorly equipped and frequently work in cramped, dirty quarters. We have recommended the construction, as soon as practicable, of a new headquarters building and a modern training facility.

The Department's outmoded communication system cannot handle citizen calls expeditiously, and police units have difficulty in communicating with each other. Records are scattered, incomplete, and cumbersome to use. The Department cannot generate the kind of data it needs to deploy men and resources intelligently. The Commission has made several recommendations to remedy these deficiencies and ensure that the Department has the most modern and scientific equipment available.

In the area of police-community relations, we have found a serious breakdown in confidence and good will between the police and an important segment of the community. This development profoundly affects law enforcement in this city. During the past two decades the District of Columbia has undergone major transformations in the composition of its population; there have been vast changes in the social and economic structure of the community. In the Commission's opinion, the Department has not made a sufficiently rapid adjustment to these changes.

We assign a very high priority to the efforts necessary to improve the quality of police-community relations. The Commission specifically recommends that the Chief of Police issue an immediate directive prohibiting the use by policemen of trigger words derogatory of an individual's race or background. The Department should also issue an order concerning the appropriate use of force by the police in making arrests and prescribing standards for the treatment of persons in police custody. We urge that efforts also be made to increase the number of Negro policemen at all levels on the force. Improved procedures for enforcement of the disorderly conduct statute must be formulated, and more thoughtful consideration given to the deployment of the Canine Corps. Police training in community relations must be revised, and the Police-Community Relations Unit reorganized and strengthened.

In our view, the Complaint Review Board performs an important function in reducing tension between police and citizens. It provides a forum for airing grievances against the police and a mechanism for conciliation and, where necessary, recommending action by the police authorities. To achieve its full potential, the Board should be strengthened and its procedures simplified and expedited.

The Department is by no means unaware of the enormity of its problems and has begun to move toward improvement in several areas. It has requested the replacement of several precinct stations, a new headquarters building, and a training facility. It seeks additional vehicles, two-way radios, a new communications center, and the introduction of more sophisticated data-processing techniques. Civilians are being recruited for clerical and administrative jobs and the Cadet Corps is being expanded. Modernization efforts have been expedited by grants from the U.S. Department of Justice which were secured with the active support of this Commission.

It is imperative, however, that the reorganization and revitalization of the Department recommended in this Report proceed at an accelerated pace. The major overhaul necessary to create a top-flight department will involve drastic restructuring and policy changes. Resistance can be expected from some quarters within and without the Department. The Department must demonstrate a single-minded, dedicated resolve to accomplish change without delay.

The Commission has refrained from recommending an increase in the size of the force, for increased manpower will flow naturally from the elimination of substantial duplication of effort, the reduction in the number of administrative personnel, the increased utilization of civilian help, and the greater mobility of the force. Furthermore, the Department is over 200 men short of its present authorized strength; it would serve no purpose to increase that deficit by adding to its paper size. In not recommending an increase in Department size, we note that per citizen it is presently one of the largest and most costly police forces in the Nation.

The Commission has criticized the Department in a constructive spirit, conscious of the fact that the vast majority of our police officers are dedicated and self-disciplined men. The community is profoundly indebted to them. The immense and complex burdens which have been cast upon the police during a period of great social change cannot be underestimated. As the experience of other cities has tragically demonstrated, no police department, however modern or efficient, can carry out its responsibility for law enforcement where there is a widespread breakdown in community respect for the law. Although the Commission has focused its attention in this Report on the police, we underscore in the strongest possible terms the obligation of each individual citizen in the community to give his full support to the law enforcement efforts of the police. Public apathy or a defiant refusal to cooperate with the police will serve only to nullify the recommendations of the Commission and the best efforts of the Department.

To meet these demands for excellence, the Department must have the unfaltering commitment of the Board of Commissioners, the Congress, and the people of the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Organization and leadership

1. To improve management, supervision and leadership, the major reorganization of the Department recommended by the IACP should be instituted: The post of executive officer should be abolished and the functions of the Department assigned to four major bureaus—Field Operations, Administrative Services, Technical Services, and Inspectional Services.

2. To achieve more economical use of equipment and facilities and to free more policemen for patrol operations, the present 14 precincts should be consolidated into 6 districts. The consolidation should be considered an opportunity to replace outmoded and inadequate precinct buildings.

3. The Department's Planning and Development Division should be rapidly expanded, to facilitate the reorganization and to assist the Chief of Police in evaluating the effectiveness of the Department's operations and administration.

4. To improve supervision, the Department should increase the number of supervisory personnel, extend probationary periods, provide more transportation and equipment for supervisors, and improve procedures for inspections and investigations.

5. By means of the proposed Crime and Traffic Analysis Unit, the Department should develop precise information regarding the needs for police service in the community in order to deploy its officers more effectively.

Personnel and training

6. Because of an insufficient number of qualified applicants, the Department should consider weighting entrance requirements, so that an applicant's failure to meet certain criteria could be counterbalanced by other qualifications.

7. To help raise the standards of the Department, a rank of master patrolman, with a substantially higher starting salary, should be established for those with a degree in law enforcement or police administration.

8. Legislation raising starting police salaries should be enacted. In the future police salaries should be considered separately from those of firemen and should be linked with measures to upgrade entrance standards.

9. Efforts to recruit candidates from the Metropolitan Area should be intensified; more effective liaison with area universities and military bases should be established by the Department.

10. To increase the number of District residents on the police force, the Department should develop a project under the Manpower Development and Training Act which would provide specialized training and remedial services for suitable local applicants who have failed to meet the entrance requirements.

11. The recruit training program should recognize that policemen exercise broad discretionary powers in enforcing the law, and the curriculum should be revised to equip officers to exercise this discretion wisely. More instruction should be included in procedures for handling juveniles, patrol and arrest methods, citizen contacts, the collection and presentation of evidence, self-defense, and the use of firearms. The size of recruit training classes should be reduced, the training staff enlarged, and the recruits subjected to more intensive evaluation.

12. Indoctrination should be linked with field and formal recruit training in a comprehensive recruit training program. No officer should patrol alone before completing recruit training.

13. In-service training should be regularly conducted at rollcall; all personnel should receive formal in-service training not less than once every 5 years; and officers should be encouraged to continue their education. The Department should increase its use of formal schools and academies as training resources and effectively utilize the special skills of the graduates of such programs.

14. To inject needed vitality into the leadership of the force and encourage junior officers to compete vigorously for positions of responsibility, the IACP recommendations for improved promotion procedures should be instituted. The Chief of Police should have the authority to appoint qualified persons to key positions from within or without the Department without the prior approval of the Board of Commissioners.

15. The operations of the Cadet Corps should be improved, with a high school degree for admission and college-level courses made official requirements. Salaries should be increased to a level competitive with those offered by other police departments in the area, and fewer clerical duties should be assigned to Cadets.

16. To bring technical and special skills into the Department and to release officers for patrol duties, more civilians should be employed. Lateral entry should be permitted for skilled civilians as well as for talented officers from other departments.

17. The number of policewomen should be increased, and they should be assigned to a

greater variety of duties within the Department.

18. The Department should employ a permanent General Counsel, to assist in the preparation of training materials and the formulation of operational procedures, in collaboration with the U.S. Attorney and the Corporation Counsel.

Buildings, equipment, and supporting services

19. To replace the totally inadequate facilities now in use, a combined headquarters-training facility, or two buildings in close proximity, should be constructed at an early date in a central location in the District.

20. The Department should substantially increase the number of its vehicles, with particular emphasis on one-man patrol cars and patrol wagons. Police vehicles should be more clearly and conspicuously marked.

21. The police uniform should be redesigned to help officers present a more attractive and distinctive appearance.

22. To enable citizens to receive police service more rapidly, the Department's communications system should be redesigned and expanded. The Department should actively promote and facilitate citizen calls for service or to report suspicious circumstances.

23. The Department's methods of recording and clearing criminal offenses should be revised to provide for greater accuracy and to guard against under-reporting and questionable clearances of crimes.

24. The Department's program to computerize its records system, including the design of a computer installation and the purchase of necessary equipment, should be supported and expedited.

Police operations

25. The patrol force of the Department should be motorized to the maximum extent possible to deploy manpower more effectively and provide more responsive service.

26. The deployment of the Canine Corps should be carefully controlled and supervised under the terms of precise directives. The Corps should not be expanded, as presently contemplated by the Department, until a thorough study of its effectiveness has been made.

27. The Tactical Force should be made a permanent part of the proposed Special Operations Division, and the Department should promptly take the steps recommended by the IACP to make this operation more flexible and effective.

28. The Department should reduce the current racial imbalance in the precincts and should adopt and enforce a policy prohibiting an officer's or commander's racial preferences from influencing assignment to patrol teams.

29. The responsibility for the recreational services of the Boys' Activities Bureau should be transferred to the District of Columbia Recreation Department and officers should no longer solicit funds for these activities.

30. The Detective Division of the Department should be reorganized to improve supervision and administration. The process of selecting and training investigative personnel should be improved, with provision made for written examinations, formal qualifications, and regular, professional training.

Police-community relations

31. The Department should issue an immediate directive prohibiting the use by officers of abusive language or derogatory terms.

32. The Department should issue directives guiding and regulating the conduct of police officers concerning: (*a*) field interrogation of citizens when there is no probable cause for arrest; (*b*) enforcement of the disorderly conduct statute; and (*c*) arrest procedures, including the handling of arrested persons on the scene, in the patrol wagon and at the precinct.

33. The Department's human relations training should be revised to include intensive instruction in the proper police response in situations most susceptible to police-citizen conflict.

34. The Police-Community Relations Unit should be reorganized, relocated in police headquarters as soon as possible, and expanded to include sections on Community Liaison, Public Information and Program Development.

35. The precincts should substantially improve and increase their community relations activities, with guidance and direction from an expanded Police-Community Relations Unit.

36. The Department should hold a series of public meetings in high-crime districts for the purpose of discussing police policies and practices, educating residents as to their responsibilities in law enforcement, encouraging them to accept those responsibilities, and increasing their understanding of a police officer's job and its problems. The Commission urges the public to recognize that effective law enforcement requires the full support of each citizen.

37. Investigation of citizen complaints of police misconduct should be conducted by the Internal Affairs Division of the Department.

38. The Complaint Review Board should be provided an Administrative Assistant and appropriate clerical support. The Board should order supplemental investigation of complaints by its staff where this is deemed appropriate.

39. Complaint forms should be readily available to citizens in precinct stations and other appropriate locations.

40. The Metropolitan Police Department and the Complaint Review Board should collaborate to provide for more expeditious processing and disposition of civilian complaints.

41. Wide publicity should be given to the decisions and opinions of the Board, and the Annual Report of the District Commissioners should detail the disposition of all formal citizen complaints of police misconduct. The Board should be regularly notified of dispositions of all cases originating from sworn citizens' complaints.

The report of the crime study committee of the Washington Board of Realtors follows:

REPORT OF CRIME STUDY COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON BOARD OF REALTORS

SCOPE OF REPORT

Your Committee has for some months investigated the matter of crime in the District of Columbia. It has interviewed a number of persons in authority, including judges, prosecutors, police chiefs, and knowledgeable private citizens. Your Committee cannot compete with most of these sources in specialized information. The best it can do is to embody in the present report the reactions of ordinary men to the problem of crime—of crime on-the-march, a march seemingly forever upward. We do not think it would serve any useful purpose to repeat the tables of statistics of over thirty public agencies engaged in collecting and listing data on crime in this District. We rely on the settled feeling of ordinary men like ourselves that crime in this District is increasing in an ever-rising spiral. A police report released in March, 1966, states that crime in this District for February showed the 45th rise in a row. A total of 2,751 offenses was listed for February, 1966, an increase of 330 over February, 1965.

NEGRO CRIMES

There is a common impression that negroes commit most of the crime in this District. This would seem reasonable as 65% of the population is negro. It is a truism that the more people there are, the more crimes they commit. However, there is plenty of white crime in this District, and a good bit of plush white crime goes unreported. One thing is certain: negro criminals prey more on their own race than on whites. Negroes therefore have a greater stake than whites in suppressing negro crime. The decent negro knows this. They do not subscribe to the policy of one of our leading newspapers in reporting crimes, race undisclosed. They think that if a negro commits a crime the public, white or colored, ought to know it.

The likelihood that the majority of the population race-wise, commits the majority of crime in this District is increased when we consider the generally conceded fact of unequal economic opportunity for negroes. Each person is apt to apply the test of his own experience to whether this discrimination in fact exists. This is a false test. Decent people associate with decent people. If they don't discriminate themselves, they think their friends don't discriminate. We think there is substantial discrimination against negroes in this Area.

What has been said above about negro crime in general applies to juvenile negro crime. Around 90% of our public school children are negroes. Young people are unwittingly cruel to each other; the white child patterns himself on the white parent. The rabid Southern approach is all too frequent in both parent and child. It is not surprising that among children the unique should pass for the superior; the children imitate parental attitudes. What we have got to do is to bring the negro children into "our" world, to convince them that white people are not enemies—above all that the police are not enemies.

It is a truism to say that there is no quick and easy solution to the racial question. Certainly there is no solution by way of propaganda for illegal demonstrations, or "civil disobedience". The negroes new-found power should not be used solely as a sword. Laws depend for their effectiveness on community sentiment. This sentiment cannot be produced by force or dictation from above.

Common sense tells us that if the solution lies in community sentiment, the only way to improve that sentiment is by way of improvement in race relations. As the Afro-American said in a thoughtful and temperate editorial on April 30, last, "The only way is to improve the relations between the two prime forces, the people and the police". Particularly among the young this latter is important; the notion that the police are the natural enemies of the young people is an unhappy copy of adult attitudes. Improvement of race relations can never be 100%. The Southern racist in our midst will still continue, individually, to be a racist; the hooded spectres on the hill will still burn the fiery cross. But collectively, by and large, decent sentiment is continually improving. We cannot produce a big surge forward; we must be content with inch by inch progress. What we *can* do is to repress the common discourtesies,—such as a white police station deskman making a prominent negro lawyer wait fifteen minutes before he even takes note of his existence. Or a bus driver refusing to stop for two colored women in the suburbs at eleven-thirty at night. Or the habit the police had at one time of stopping any negro at all in a white neighborhood at night and searching him. An eminent lawyer, now a judge, told us that in the not too far distant past he was never sure as he left for the office in the morning of getting home again that night; he might readily end up in a police station. Incidents such as these promote insecurity and distrust; there can be no confidence in the white race while they continue to exist. Correspondingly, there is considerable negro discourtesy to whites.

HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

Poor housing undoubtedly contributes to crime. The overworked word "ghetto" is frequently applied to certain sections of this city. One reason we have slum housing is that landlords can't afford to give tenants anything better; the up-keep is too high. The senseless vandalism in slum housing passes description. One of our members has replaced an entire front door of such a house four times in the last six months. It is a common experience for a landlord, when a tenant moves out, to find the door-knobs gone and even some of the plumbing fixtures. We already have a statute punishing vandalism (D.C. Code 9 (1961) 22:3222) but it is inadequate and a dead letter. The D.C. Housing Regulations, Sec. 2501, 2104, places onerous duties of repair on the landlord, with very real sanctions (Sec's. 3302, 3303). This Code ought not to be a one-way street. How can we improve race relations when landlords are victimized day in and day out by irresponsible or vicious tenants. The solution does not lie in the "fix-it" bill now before Congress or new regulations by the D.C. Commissioners, all penalizing the landlords. It lies in negro-white understanding and cooperation and a lot of education to make slum tenants behave decently.

THE INCREASE OF CRIME IN THIS DISTRICT—THE BLAME

As already stated, crime in this District has increased for the forty-fifth consecutive month. These are police statistics. But no statistics are needed. Our citizens are actually afraid to use their own streets at night. Bill Gold, in "The District Line" in the Washington Post for May 3, 1966, states "I don't know any urban area in this District where unescorted women are safe at night". The question is: What is the explanation for this ten year explosion of crime, getting worse day by day. Our police force is well organized and brave; it has the conspicuously able leadership of Chief John B. Layton and his assistants. What is the answer to the enigma?

As usual, the answer is not one but multitudinous; there is a general answer and specific contributing causes. The general answer is decay of public morals. This, however, merely begs the question: What is the cause of this decay? A variety of answers can be made, ranging all the way from irreligion to alcohol to automobiles, to easy purchase of revolvers, to the movies, TV and crime stories in the newspapers. All these things and many others play a part.

Some of the persons interviewed by your Committee feel that a substantial contributing cause in this District is the decisions of our U.S. Court of Appeals. They say that these decisions have made punishment so uncertain that criminals no longer fear it. It is not so much the *Mallory* rule, or the *Durham* rule, or the other newly made rules. It is the belief that our Court of Appeals has lost faith in the entire set of policies that underlie our criminal law, such as, conspicuously, that Congress believes punishment to be a deterrent to crime. Some of our Court of Appeals judges apparently have no faith in this policy. One of them was heard to declare not long ago that if he were assigned to a trial court the public had better not expect him to give a defendant, any defendant at all, a jail sentence; that such a sentence did no good and merely penalized the felons family, who would be left destitute. Another appeals judge stated that he did not believe in death sentences, no matter what the crime, and wouldn't vote for one. As appeals judges do not vote *for* death sentences, but only against them, a former U.S. Attorney took him at his word and told his assistants not to ask juries for death sentences. Thus death sentences, though ordained by Congress, are a dead letter in this District.

Another frequent criticism of this court is what many people believe to be its' fly-specking attitude in reviewing criminal trials. Two federal statutes, 28 *U.S. Code* Sec 2111 and Rule 52(a) *Rules of Criminal Procedures* prohibit an appeals court from reversing except where the error below has affected the substantial rights of the accused. Many people feel the court merely pays lip service to this doctrine; certainly its views have dampened the attitude of the police and prosecuting officers.

There was no appeal in ordinary criminal cases in the federal courts for the entire period from 1789 to 1889. It is pointed out that the law already provides adequate protection for the defendant:

(1) The police officer must believe the man guilty, otherwise he wouldn't arrest him. He can arrest only on probable cause or if he actually sees the man commit the offense.

(2) A United States Commissioner or a Committing Magistrate finds probable cause to hold the man.

(3) The United States Attorney's office reviews the case. It cannot be believed that his office would present the case to the Grand Jury if it believed the man was innocent.

(4) The Grand Jury hears the evidence and finds probable cause before it can indict.

(5) A jury of twelve hears the evidence and must believe the man guilty beyond a reasonable doubt before it can convict.

(6) A Federal trial judge must believe the man guilty otherwise he would set the jury's verdict aside. Can we imagine him sentencing the defendant to jail if he thought him innocent?

A breakdown in any of these six steps means the defendant goes free. Is there any need for a seventh step, an ultra technical scrutiny on appeal?

LET THE JURY FIX THE SENTENCE

In Virginia (Va. Code 19.1–291, 292) and Indiana (4 Burns Ind. Stat. Sec. 9–1819) and perhaps in other States, it is the jury that fixes the sentence in felony cases. We think Congress might profitably extend this system to the Federal Courts. Who better than the men in the street knows the extent of crime in the community and the necessity of putting it down as best he may? What better cross-section of the community is there than twelve men sitting in judgment? If crime gets out of hand and shows an unusual increase, a jury's sentence is likely to be greater. There is nothing wrong in this result; it simply means that society has taken the obvious means to protect itself. Congress, not the jury, has prescribed the maximum and minimum limits of punishment. The twelve men in the box merely equate the punishment with the facts and circumstances of the particular case and the right of society to protect itself by adjudging, if need be, an additional period as a deterrent. They are, in a sense, making an informed estimate for that particular case, weighing what the defendant did, and how he did it, with the needs of society at the moment. Thus, at present, we are in a seemingly unending wave of yoking, stick-ups and rapes; most of the men and all of the women are afraid to go out at night. Who knows this better than the twelve men on the jury? Sentencing by the jury is therefore, in this Committee's opinion, a better system than sentencing by a judge. It puts the ultimate power where it ought to be, in the community, itself, in the person of its twelve representatives in the jury box. As all sentences are indeterminate and subject to the parole laws no harm can result from the excessive protection of society. If sentences are to be excessive, one way or another, let us, for once, have some *in favor* of society. The Judges power over the sentences should be restricted to sentences which shock the conscience of the Court.

OTHER CONTRIBUTORS TO CRIME

It has been suggested to your Committee that there are remoter but no less real causes of crime in this District, namely the newspapers and TV. The senseless violence portrayed day in and day out on TV establishes for susceptible people what they come to think is a normal way of life. It is no wonder that the young absorb it, or the criminal. Crime cannot be so bad, they think; there is so much of it.

The case of the newspapers is more complex. The hard fact is that there is no story in what is right, it is what is wrong that interests people. It is not surprising, therefore, that newspapers should devote so much space to crime, human misery and dissension. Behind the front-page story there is nearly always a battle of some sort. The dominant effect of the newspaper is that the most important thing in American life is crime and the most important people are the criminals. The newspaper, therefore, makes, whether it knows it or not, a heavy contribution to crime. In justice it must be said that its responsibility is an unconscious one. The newspapers have a right to print the news and their critics might properly be asked: what is the solution? Perhaps there is no solution, though the newspapers might at least act as if they were aware of the problem. Maybe, just to balance things, there is a story in the plight of the victim. Perhaps some political genius or maybe a rival newspaper may some day make the big break and exploit the latent interest of the decent citizen in the man who has been brutally wronged.

Your Committee takes no position on the problem of crime news in newspapers; it is too big a problem. We simply cite the views of their critics for thoughtful consideration by the newspapers themselves.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The solution of our crime problem is not only "respect for the law" but respect for the police who enforce the law. Particularly should this be so among young people who should be taught respect for the police by their parents and even by formal school instruction. Neither type of respect is promoted by people who cry for civil disobedience and illegal demonstrations. On a national scale, a riot is simply a nuisance; it may be a large-scale nuisance but in essence it is still nothing but a nuisance. Some are injured but the remainder are unmoved. It is a singular way to strive for tolerance.

2. Improved community relations between whites and negroes is the key solution of the racial question. This means active work by the responsible citizen to end discrimination in housing, in jobs and in social relationships. Every employer should ask himself whether a vacant job can't be filled by a negro.

3. In low cost housing, piling duties of repair on the landlord, "fix-it" laws and regulations, are useless unless vicious destruction of property by tenants is stamped out. As in the case of fire no one makes any money out of vandalism. Landlord responsibility ought not to be a one-way street; there ought to be equal tenant responsibility.

4. We ought to have more schools and better teachers and this means we must pay them higher wages. Schools should be built by bond issues instead of saddling living taxpayers with the entire cost. If this is done every place but here, why can't we do it here, and do it with proper safeguards?

5. As the problem is to get the young people off the streets we must strive for better recreational facilities, in-door and out. We must increase apprenticeship programs, teaching the practical by day, the theoretical at night.

6. We need more police officers and they must be better paid to attract the type of man

willing to make the job his life work. Also, why should not the police be paid for extra time they spend in court? Or the time they devote to the Metropolitan Police Boys Club?

7. Scientific police work should be promoted; the cost of new and up-to-date technical facilities is small compared to the benefits.

8. As to the administration of justice we suggest to our U.S. Court of Appeals the end of fly-specking and an understanding and respect for the court below and its hard working judges. The appellate court might well follow the English system by screening appeals for substantial error immediately on the appeal being filed. (See *Karlen*, 48. Am. Bar Assn. Journal 1128) Let the lawyer point out orally and on the spot the substantial error on which he relies. Such a system could probably be inaugurated by court rule, without resort to Congress.

9. Your Committee is impressed with the industry and dedication to duty of our Court of General Sessions and with the able direction and planning of its Chief Judge. Now that Congress has increased the number of judges on that court much can be hoped for in prompt law enforcement.

10. Serious thought should be given to putting the sentencing power in the jury and not in the judge, in order that the community's sense of justice, or compassion, may be directly exerted. Congress has determined the policy of the law (*Johnson* v. *U.S.* 163 F. 30, 32; *M.K. & T.R. Co.* v. *May* 194 U.S. 267, 270) which is that punishment is prescribed, partly at least, as a deterrent. No judge or set of judges should be allowed to water down that policy.

Your Committee also endorses most of the reported recommendations of the Crime Commission, in particular more and better paid policemen. Your Committee shares the worry of that Commission that its recommendations will die along with it. The Crime Commission ought to be made a permanent body.

WASHINGTON BOARD OF REALTORS
CRIME COMMITTEE,
HENRY E. NICHOLS,
Chairman.
THOMAS W. SANDOZ, Sr.,
WILLIAM H. EVERNGAM, Jr.
EARL W. FARR.
CHARLES H. PURCELL.
FREDERICK A. MARSTELLER.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by one section of both the House and Senate versions of the military construction authorization bill, S. 3105, and I should like to take this opportunity to point out my objections.

Both versions of S. 3105 authorize $14,900,000 for a naval recruit training center, but leave the location of the center to be determined. The lack of specification of location is due to the fact that no agreement was reached by either the House or the Senate Armed Services Committee after hearing divergent views as to whether Orlando or Bainbridge is the better site for the center. Thus, S. 3105 leaves the choice of a site for the new recruit training center up to the Navy, and there is little doubt that Orlando would be the Navy's choice. Yet, the Navy has failed to produce a consistent set of facts to justify its preference for Orlando, and should not be allowed to choose the site after funds have been authorized and appropriated.

The following facts, revealed for the most part by the Navy itself, demonstrate the advantages of Bainbridge, Md. over Orlando, Fla.

First. Military construction program costs would be nearly $10 million less at Bainbridge. Navy officials have stated that a major consideration in the decision to establish the proposed naval recruit training camp at Orlando was the Navy's determination that military construction program costs at Orlando would be less than the construction costs for similar facilities at Bainbridge. Economy is a major consideration in the selection of the naval recruiting camp, but it is doubtful whether this economy could be realized at Orlando. According to a 5-year cost projection period, the military construction program costs for Orlando would be $101.94 million. Military construction program costs at Bainbridge, on the other hand, would amount to $92.4 million—a difference of $9.54 million.

Second. Transporting recruits would cost less at Bainbridge. According to Navy estimates, an additional savings of $1 million a year in recruit travel costs would be realized if the proposed recruit camp were located at Bainbridge instead of Orlando.

Third. There would be great costs incurred in relocating functions from Bainbridge to Orlando. The Navy has estimated that it would cost approximately $3.4 million to relocate the Service School Command, the Nuclear Power School, and the WAVES recruit training camp from Bainbridge to Orlando. In addition, 35 percent of the work has been completed and nearly 100 percent of the funds obligated on a $1.2 million contract, awarded in the summer of 1965, to construct the WAVES barracks at Bainbridge—barracks which the WAVES obviously cannot use if the WAVES recruit training camp is relocated in Orlando.

Fourth. The relocation of the Nuclear Power School from Bainbridge to Orlando would increase travel costs between Orlando and the submarine base at New London, Conn.; and relocating the Nuclear Power School from Bainbridge to Orlando would increase travel costs between the school and the submarine base.

In addition to the savings of Bainbridge over Orlando, there are other advantages of locating the naval recruit training center at Bainbridge.

Fifth. More land is available for expansion of activities at Bainbridge than at Orlando. Navy officials have recognized that Orlando has a disadvantage in that the present land area limits extensive consolidation of training functions, in addition to activities which the Navy plans to move to Orlando from Bainbridge and an 8,000-man recruit camp. Orlando has 800 acres of land. Bainbridge has 1,220 acres of land—420 acres more than Orlando.

Moreover, any rational and orderly expansion of activities would be severely impaired at Orlando because the site is partially surrounded by water; the high cost of acquiring what land might be available would be a further deterrent to this expansion. Bainbridge, by contrast, is located in a rural setting and is totally surrounded by land; if expanded activities are required at Bainbridge, the cost of acquiring this land will be less. These facts take on particular significance in view of the increased manpower requirements for Vietnam.

Sixth. There would be a minimum of disruption of training activities at Bainbridge. Bainbridge is an operating training center, where new recruit training facilities could be introduced immediately with a minimum disruption of existing training programs. The Navy calls this a definite advantage of locating the training center at Bainbridge over Orlando.

Seventh. Locating the recruit training center at Bainbridge would offer better travel advantages for recruits. Bainbridge is near concentrated population centers, which would result in reduced costs of transportation of recruits from their homes and to technical schools after completion of recruit training. Furthermore, travel costs to recruits going to their homes while on leave would be reduced, thereby promoting better morale among enlisted personnel.

Eighth. Bainbridge is more conducive to training and study than is Orlando. In contrast to Orlando, the relative isolation of Bainbridge in its rural setting was cited in a 1964 Navy study as being advantageous to a naval recruit training center in that this provides an environment which is more conducive to study and training.

The decision to locate the naval recruit training camp at Orlando is patently inconsistent with earlier recommendations by the Navy. In October of 1964, a comprehensive study was conducted by the Navy at the request of the Secretary of Defense to determine the feasibility of relocating existing Bainbridge activities to Orlando. This study revealed that, first, there would be no gain to the Government in either monetary savings or in improvement to the national defense posture as a result of the relocation, and second, the facilities and space at Orlando could not accommodate the training conducted at Bainbridge. It was recommended that Bainbridge be retained with its current mission and that plans should be made to reactivate male recruit training at Bainbridge with an on-board load of 8,000 recruits.

On April 14, 1965, Navy officials testified before the House Committee on Appropriations that recruit facilities at Great Lakes and San Diego were overcrowded and that a third recruit training center was required at Bainbridge. They testified that they had studied and made visits to a number of installations which were closed, or had the prospect of being closed, and that none of them was acceptable as Bainbridge. Orlando was among those installations visited.

The Navy took the position that Orlando was unsuitable as a naval training center, and that—

> Bainbridge is very definitely hard core, it is in the right place, and we want to bring it up to date so that it will compare favorably with both Great Lakes and San Diego.

The advantages of locating the naval recruit training center at Bainbridge are clear and convincing: the short-term and long-term savings that can be realized; the opportunity for further land acquisition if required; the ease with which the recruit training center could be introduced; the travel advantages offered to recruits; the environment for training.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I oppose leaving the choice of a site for the new recruit training center up to the Navy. I urge the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to withhold appropriation of funds for this project until the next fiscal year to allow time for Congress to satisfy itself concerning the best location of a third boot camp and to explain the curious reversal of the Navy's long-standing and firm position that Bainbridge, Md., is the proper place for this important installation.

UPSWING IN THE FARM EQUIPMENT INDUSTRY

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the best indicators of the current farm prosperity is the booming farm equipment industry. The amount of farm equipment sales and production is the yardstick I have used throughout my career to gage farm prosperity, and I know of none better. Over 30 years of experience in this field have shown me the close relationship between the production of farming machinery and the economic health of our Nation's farms.

An article in a recent edition of the magazine of Wall Street dramatically illustrates the level of farm equipment prosperity. And so, as the farm machinery industry has experienced a great expansion, so has farm income risen. Net farm income for the first quarter was $2.8 billion ahead of last year's pace, and, as the article points out, the outlook for 1967 is especially promising. This overall high level of farm income is a result of, and a tribute to, the administration's farm program, which, although often the target of partisan attacks, has come close to its expressed goal—full parity within this decade.

I now insert the following article for my colleagues' attention and consideration:

THE CURRENT UPSWING IN THE FARM EQUIPMENT INDUSTRY SIGNALS A NEW OUTLOOK

(By Donald F. DeSenza)

The farm equipment industry, long considered to suffer from unexciting and static demand, is presently generating explosive growth. While the industry historically has been markedly volatile and unable to sustain periods of prosperity for very long, the evidence continues to indicate that today's boom may be only the first step of a protracted upward course.

The U.S. farm equipment industry is rapidly becoming international in scope and dependency, and, as such, it is increasingly subject to forces operating outside of the United States. Both the high degree of success accruing to the industry right now, and the greater degree which lies ahead, stem in part from the dynamism of these forces.

The current boom really began gathering momentum in 1965 under the impetus of a flourishing domestic farm economy concurrent with the steady push of expanding overseas markets. Equipment sales for the year soared 17% above the 1964 total. The vigor of demand, moreover, reveals no signs of abatement, and 1966 promises to be another banner year for the farm equipment industry. All relevant factors are strongly favorable. The health of the farm economy, for instance, is unquestionably robust. In the first quarter farmers' receipts from crop and livestock marketings increased 11% as both volume and prices gained over the corresponding period a year ago. Government subsidies, an important part of farmers' overall income, also rose significantly. Correspondingly, net farm income shot $2.8 billion ahead of its pace a year earlier.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES ON THE INCREASE

The Government is playing its part with higher commodity production allotments, higher price supports in at least one case, and bigger subsidies for farm exports as a result of the Food-for-Freedom program. The 1966 rice allotment, for example, is up 10% and the 1966 soybean price support is 10% higher than a year ago.

Under such conditions, new records for the farm economy seem assured. For the full year cash receipts are expected to rise by $2 billion to another new record level, and government payments should increase by at least $1 billion. The upshot will likely be a minimum increase in net farm income of $1 billion. Boosted by this highly favorable environment on the heels of last year's tremendous surge in farm income, the equipment market is leaping ahead.

Qualified observers, including industry spokesmen, anticipate another 15% (or better) rise in domestic farm equipment sales for all of 1966. Meanwhile, the overseas markets, excepting drought-ridden Australia and South Africa, continue to move ahead.

The experience of the big farm machinery producers thus far certainly supports the current optimism. In most cases, these companies are straining capacity in an attempt to supply their dealer organizations with ample inventories for reasonably fast delivery to farmers. So buoyant is retail demand, however, that the industry has been generally unable to prevent *declines* in dealer inventories despite booming production.

A LOOK AHEAD

At this point, assuming average weather conditions at the time, 1967 looks promising. Farmers will enter the period with a very affluent year behind them, the Government is expected to increase the 1967 wheat production allotment by 15% and the Food-for-Freedom program should be gaining further momentum. Additionally, farm equipment dealer inventories will in all probability be on the low side and the manufacturers will benefit by some measure of "pipeline filling."

The strength of the current market is not a temporary phenomenon, as was the bulge in equipment sales in 1959. The farm equipment industry in fact may be only on the threshold of a bright new future. This outlook is predicated upon the expected impact of the so-called "population explosion."

According to a recent study of anticipated world food requirements made by Dr. Louis M. Thompson, Associate Dean of Agriculture, Iowa State University, world population will increase by an incredible 700 million between 1965 and 1975, which is more than the entire population of the western hemisphere today.

In assessing the world's capacity for food output, Dr. Thompson concluded that since 1958 farm output has failed to match the growth of population, i.e. per capita output has been steadily declining. If large portions of the world's population are to be saved from starvation this trend must be reversed.

EXPANSION IN FOOD PRODUCTION SORELY NEEDED

The implications of this situation are obvious: both in the United States and, particularly, elsewhere throughout the world, usage of arable land must be increased and acreage yields will have to rise substantially. Most of the countries of the world are presently unable to meet their own food needs and, ironically, those which stand to realize the greatest population gains are among the deficit countries.

In order to overcome or at least narrow the gap, these nations must turn increasingly toward the technological tools with which the U.S. farmer has been so successful (e.g. the U.S. has long had a problem with farm *surpluses*)—mechanization and fertilization. Consequently, the growth of the overseas markets for farm equipment, which have long been outstanding should accelerate to an even faster clip.

AS U.S. CONTINUES TO FEED THE WORLD

Despite our astounding productive capacity, the United States farm economy must also expand in response to these needs. Clearly, as Russia and Red China have demonstrated, substantial elevation of a country's farm output is a very long-term process, and population growth throughout the world will not wait. The United States, already the world's largest exporter of food products, must fill the void with massive exports while the rest of the world strives for greater self-sufficiency.

According to Dr. Thompson,—by 1975 we must be utilizing all available cropland, which will bring back into play the 50 to 60 million acres now idled under various government programs. But this will not be enough—we must get even more acreage equivalent by lifting yields through more intensive application of the advancing technology and acceleration of the trend toward "industrialized agriculture," i.e., fewer but much larger farms operated via sophisticated management techniques and skills. Greater mechanization is both a necessary tool and a certain consequence of these changes.

The impact of the Government's recognition of the role the U.S. must play in meeting the escalating food needs of the world is already being felt. The administration's Food-for-Freedom program for example, has led to a bill, recently approved by the House Agricultural Committee, which would make more food products eligible and increase subsidies for U.S. food shipments abroad up to $3.3 billion. Additionally, farm product surpluses have been dwindling. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman recently indicated that U.S. food supplies are beginning to come into balance with our needs—both domestic and export—and that virtually all of our surpluses have disappeared except for cotton and tobacco.

LEGISLATION TO ADJUST STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that on May 23, 1966, I introduced legislation to permit Cuban refugees in the United States to adjust their status and become permanent residents of this country, if they so desire. This legislation, H.R. 15182 and H.R. 15183, presents two legislative approaches to this adjustment: First, permitting adjustment of status at the time of application; and second, permitting retroactive adjustment as of the date of last entry.

Today, the Immigration Subcommittee—of which I am a member—of the House Judiciary Committee, held hearings on my bill, H.R. 15183. I stated on the floor of the House on May 24, 1966—Congressional Record, page 11335—the reasons this legislation should be enacted. I restated these reasons before my subcommittee this morning and, with permission, I would like to again call them to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

I have a large number of Spanish-speaking people in my congressional district, many of whom are of Cuban descent. I have long been interested in their welfare and problems, and they stimulated my interest in the plight of Cubans who came to the United States to flee from communism.

I am keenly aware of and vitally concerned with the problems that these Cuban refugees have faced and are facing due to their temporary status in this country. The great majority of Cuban refugees in the United States are on a parole status—actually at the sufferance of our Government. Consequently, they are hampered in complying with State licensure requirements and find themselves unable to qualify for the benefits that are derived from a permanent resident status. Rather than have the U.S. Government financially continue to support a Cuban refugee program, it certainly seems much more feasible to me to offer permanent resident status to the Cubans so that they can become equal participants in community affairs and not be looked upon as temporary parolees.

I was the first member of the committee to introduce this type of legislation to authorize the adjustment of status of the Cubans. The response to my proposals has been very favorable. I am pleased to advise the House that the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have all strongly endorsed and fully supported my bill, H.R. 15183. When favorable reports were received during the first week in August, I renewed my request for a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that it is not only in the best interests of the Cubans to have permanent resident status in this country, but it is also in the best interests of the United States economically, socially, and politically that the Cubans have the opportunities and responsibilities that accrue from permanent resident status. The Cubans are proud people; the Cubans have been our longtime friendly neighbors who turned to the United States for asylum and the United States spontaneously responded. We cannot, however, continue indefinitely to maintain a parental attitude.

Cuban refugees have established businesses, the majority are employed, pay taxes, are far from being public charges; they are contributing greatly to the general welfare of the community.

We must give the Cubans an opportunity in the United States to move forward on their own and share the advantages which this great country can offer.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record for the attention of my colleagues in the House, the statement of the Under Secretary of State, Hon. George Ball, before my Immigration Subcommittee today, in support of my bill, H.R. 15183. He pointed out the reasons he felt my bill should be enacted. I would like to also quote for the Record from a letter to the gentleman from New York, Chairman Celler, of the Judiciary Committee, from Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark, dated August 4, 1966, in support of my bill. He advised that the Department of Justice recommends enactment of my bill.

The two statements follow:

Statement by the Honorable George Ball, Under Secretary of State, on a Bill To Adjust the Status of Cuban Refugees to That of Lawful Permanent Residents of the United States, Public Law (H.R. 15183)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to address myself to the provisions of H.R. 15183, a bill to adjust the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States.

This bill would permit natives and citizens of Cuba who were inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 to apply for adjustments to permanent residents status and to have their status adjusted in the discretion of the Attorney General, if they are otherwise eligible to receive an immigrant visa and admissible into the United States.

I believe this bill should be enacted. Its passage would ameliorate the plight of thousands of Cuban nationals who fled to the United States from the communist government of Cuba and who find it difficult to obtain suitable employment and to travel outside the United States because of the indefinite nature of their status in the United States. At present, a Cuban refugee can obtain a permanent visa only by leaving the United States, applying at a United States consular office in a country other than his native country, and then reentering the United States. This procedure has not proved satisfactory.

In the first place the trip abroad is costly to the Cuban refugees; for many the cost is prohibitive. Second, United States consular offices abroad do not have the staff to handle a large volume of immigrant visa applications from persons who reside outside their consular districts. It has, therefore, been impossible to issue immigrant visas to more than a small percentage of even those who can finance the trip abroad. Consular offices located in areas adjacent to the United States have found it necessary, because of staff limitations, to limit the applications which they can accept to persons who have a close family relationship to citizens or resident aliens, or who are unable, because of their lack of permanent status, to obtain employment for which they are qualified. Finally, these Cuban nationals often find it difficult to effect their admission into a third country for the purpose of applying for a United States immigrant visa.

The granting of a permanent residence status to Cuban refugees would further demonstrate the desire of the United States to play a full and sympathetic role as a country of asylum for refugees from communism, whether the country of flight is located in the Eastern or Western Hemisphere. Legislation previously enacted has made it possible for adjustment of status to be made, without the burden of leaving and reentering the country for many other aliens; for Hungarian refugees by the passage of the Act of July 25, 1958 (P.L. 85–559), for refugee escapees within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees by the Act of July 14, 1960 (P.L. 86–648), and for refugees from communism from outside the Western Hemisphere by the Act of October 3, 1965 (P.L. 89–236).

Passage of this bill should not and would not be taken as an indication that we believe that the Castro regime is here to stay. Our policy which we firmly share with the other countries of the OAS is one opposition to the Communist regime in Cuba. Our goal and strong desire is that Cuba shall be freed from Communist domination and shall return again to the free world family of nations. At such time the status of Cubans as residents or parolees would in no way affect their freedom to return to their native land. I am confident that the OAS countries and the free world in general will understand that this special help to Cuban refugees is being given for purely humanitarian and practical reasons and in no way reflects any change in our attitude or any lessening in our determination.

Excerpt From Deputy Attorney General Clark's Letter of August 4, 1966, to Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee

There are many reasons which would justify the granting of an exemption to Cubans from the proscription against natives of other Western Hemisphere countries as to eligibility for adjustment of immigration status while in the United States. As of July 1, 1966, somewhat in excess of 164,000 Cubans have come to the United States and have remained here in an indefinite and nonresident status, because of the upheaval in their native country causing them to flee to, and remain in, the United States. Since January 3, 1961, when the United States severed diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba, it has been impossible for a Cuban proceeding directly from that counrty to the United States to apply for an immigrant visa for the purpose of acquiring permanent residence in the United States. Hence, it is clear that the lack of permanent residence status on the part of the Cubans is not the result of any provision of law or policy specifically directed at them, but rather because of the physical impossibility of procuring a visa from a consular officer in Cuba. While some of these persons could travel to other countries for the purpose of applying for and receiving an immigrant visa, with which they could return to and enter the United States for permanent residence, that process would cause great personal hardships to, and impose financial burdens upon, people who are already impoverished by force of circumstances.

The Cubans' lack of permanent residence status prevents them, under the law, from accumulating the necessary residence in the United States, which is presently a prerequisite to naturalization as a United States citizen. The result is that many skilled and professionally trained individuals who would be a credit to this country are prevented from obtaining gainful employment here, either because of conditions imposed independently by employers, or because of restrictive statutes in many states which prevent the practice of one's profession, for example, as a dentist, lawyer, physician, or teacher, by one who has not acquired full citizenship or has not filed a declaration of intention. Enactment of this legislation would remove many bars to the self-sufficiency of Cuban refugees.

Along the same lines, it is also believed that the granting of permanent residence status would be of value to the Government in reducing the financial expenditures on behalf of those forced to flee from Cuba. It would aid in resettling these people within the United States, because they would be in a better position to qualify for employment in places other than in the Florida area. In addition, by granting residence status to Cuban students who fall into the category of persons benefited by H.R. 15183, they would be in a position to enjoy the advantage of being resident students of various institutions of learning with the possible attendant reductions in tuition costs.

Beyond this, it may be noted that Cubans, as natives of a Western Hemisphere country, are entitled to special immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(A); 66 Stat. 169; 79 Stat. 916). As such, they are not subject to the present numerical limitations upon immigration to the United States. Hence, by permitting them to seek permanent residence status under this bill, there would be no violation of the policy of the law in that respect. Furthermore, assuming that the reason for the restriction in section 245(e) of the Act against adjustment of status by a native of the Western Hemisphere was based upon a belief that such an alien could easily return to his own country to procure a visa, it is clear that such as assumption is not valid for Cubans because they cannot return to their homeland for that purpose.

The Department favors and supports the objectives of H.R. 15183 and, accordingly, the Department of Justice recommends enactment of this bill. . . .

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYS CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT TARGET OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the wave of riots and anarchy which has erupted in many of the larger cities has been a cause of great concern to all of us.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this civil strife has been the similarity of the consistent pattern and techniques that appear in these outbreaks of violence and the modus operandi of the Communist Party in its agitation around the world. This has raised a question as to whether, and to what extent, these riots have been influenced by Communists.

Columnist Jack Anderson said in the Washington Post of July 27 last:

> The FBI has positive evidence that professional Communist agitators have helped to stir up recent Negro riots.

In the same connection, I wrote the Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States on October 20, 1965, and again July 27 last, requesting an investigation to determine whether, and to what extent, Communist infiltration and incitement had contributed to the riots and civil strife that have been occurring.

By letter dated August 8, 1966, Mr. J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General, Internal Security Division, Department of Justice, has written to me in reply to my letter to Attorney General Katzenbach, pointing up the investigations currently underway, and making other pertinent comments regarding the violence, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues and others.

I ask unanimous assent that the letter from Mr. J. Walter Yeagley be included in the RECORD, together with my own letter to Attorney General Katzenbach, and the press report in the Washington Post dated July 27, 1966.

The letters and article follow:

JULY 27, 1966.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washingtion, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On October 20, 1965, I wrote you requesting an investigation of the extent of Communist infiltration and incitement of the riots and civil strife that have been occurring—and are continuing to occur in major cities of our Nation. It appears that rather than diminishing the riots are increasing to the point that in some cities virtual anarchy prevails in certain areas.

I am advised that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has found indications that certain of these riots are Communist inspired and agitated. In this connection, I would now like for you to send me a substantive report on the result of the FBI's investigation into this increasing wave of civil strife—what the FBI has determined, what action has been taken, what action is being taken and what specific action is planned.

An immediate report on this is urged and will be appreciated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,
JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, August 8, 1966.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of July 27, 1966, concerning possible Communist-inspired or -agitated riots and civil strife.

With reference to those demonstrations directed primarily against our policy in Vietnam, the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) has often been an organizer or a key participant. In October of 1965 the Attorney General instructed the FBI to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in the SDS.

Literature distributed by the SDS discloses that in 1905 a group of students and young professionals banded together to form the Intercollegiate Socialist Society which in 1917 changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy. The literature claims that during the 1920's the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the student department of the League for Industrial Democracy, distributed socialist literature, organized aid for striking workers and the unemployed, fought R.O.T.C. programs on college campuses, and organized student strikes for peace. According to the literature, the Student League for Industrial Democracy was reorganized in 1960 as the Students for a Democratic Society, and since 1962 has operated as an autonomous body. In late 1965 the SDS and the League issued a joint statement in which they mutually agreed to sever connections and disassociate.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has reported in "Turbulence on the Campus" as follows:

"At the core of the extremist elements of the New Left are doctrines of civil disobedience, disrespect for our constitutional process, and a desire to revolt against our economic, political, and social system. One of the most vociferous groups in the New Left is the Students for a Democratic Society, many of whose members dress in beatnik style. Here are some typical comments heard at a recent meeting of this group:

" 'When we have this utopia where everybody only works two hours a day, the processes of redistribution of power and economy will take care of themselves.' "

" 'We are a socialist youth organ and consider ourselves a revolutionary organization whose members do not believe society can be reformed as it presently exists.' "

With reference to disturbances involving racial issues, the Attorney General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have pointed out on a number of occasions that the civil rights movement is an obvious target for Communist infiltration, and its leaders should continue to be alerted to this possibility.

Mr. Hoover, in an address delivered before the Pennsylvania Society and the Society of Pennsylvania Women, stated:

"Let me emphasize that the American civil rights movement is not, and has never been, dominated by the Communists because the overwhelming majority of civil rights leaders in this country, both Negro and white, have recognized and rejected Communism as a menace to the freedoms of all. But there are notable exceptions—dangerous opportunists and morally corrupt charlatans who would form an alliance with any organization, regardless of its nature, to advance their own power and prestige."

With regard to suggestions in the public press that some of the recent strife may have been planned and organized by followers of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), or similar organizations, I can say that we do not have sufficient evidence at this time to support such a conclusion.

Every effort is made to keep abreast of subversive activity for purposes of formulating policy, initiating prosecutions, and proposing new legislation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has always provided excellent coverage of Communist Party and other subversive activities, and all pertinent information developed by the FBI is regularly furnished to the appropriate officials of the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. When sufficient evidence is available to show that a federal statute has been violated, this Department will promptly take appropriate action.

I trust that the foregoing will be of assistance to you. If I can be of help in any other matter, please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

Sincerely,
J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 27, 1966]

SAME REDS IN 2 CITIES' RIOTS

(By Jack Anderson)

The FBI has positive evidence that professional Communist agitators have helped to stir up recent Negro riots.

This doesn't mean that the riots were provoked or controlled by the Communists.

However, some of the same agitators who helped fire the mobs in Los Angeles were spotted egging on the rioters in Chicago.

The FBI also has evidence that the teenage gangs were taking orders from adults behind the scenes. Some messages were actually transmitted in code over a Chicago radio station.

What worries government officials is that similar riots are planned for other cities, including New York City, Baltimore and Washington.

YOUTHS TRAIN IN TROPIC SETTING FOR PEACE CORPS IN MICRONESIA

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Washington Post carried an interesting article concerning some 310 Peace Corps trainees who are preparing in Key West, Fla., for assignment in Micronesia. I should like to include this article in the Record. Having visited Micronesia twice as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am delighted to see fulfilled the promise of these Peace Corps men and women. I believe they can offer invaluable assistance to the people in this Pacific area we have administered with the United Nations since World War II. I know there is profound need for teachers, doctors, specialists of all kinds in the islands. This contingent of Peace Corps volunteers can help the Micronesian in many areas of health, education, and government. I look forward to hearing good things about their mission in Micronesia.

The article follows:

Hula Dancers in Florida Keys: Youths Train in Tropic Setting for Peace Corps in Micronesia

(By Matthew T. Kenny)

Key West, Fla., September 4.—On a palm-studded island near here beautiful girls in grass skirts are practicing hula-type dances at the edge of a blue lagoon.

Do not disturb, please. They are training for the Peace Corps.

If the setting seems like something out of a South Seas movie, that, indeed, it is. The film "PT 109"—about the late President John F. Kennedy's Navy exploits during World War II—was made in the same place.

But the Peace Corps chose the southern Florida Keys because of their similarity in climate and geography to Micronesia.

In its "most unique" and biggest single operation to date, the Peace Corps is training hundreds of volunteers to serve on the U.S. Trust Territory islands of the Pacific, a vast region known as Micronesia. "The Peace Corps goes to Paradise," is the way the program is billed.

Among the 310 trainees now here—most of them just out of college and in their early 20s—there are 60 single women and 180 single men. Also in the group are 35 married couples.

Some 64 Micronesians, flown here especially from their islands, are teaching the trainees the customs, culture and the nine languages of their Pacific homeland.

(A minor flap in "Paradise" was ended yesterday, when Key West barbers said they would be willing to cut the hair of the visiting Micronesians. Earlier in the week, a group had been turned down by two barbers who said they did not know how to cut Micronesian hair. Peace Corps officials said the dispute was racial.)

Practice in native dances is just one of the many touches to the training. Other items of instruction include coconut palm climbing, outrigger sailing, spearfishing and Micronesian-style cooking, with emphasis on fish, rice and breadfruit.

The trainees here will be assigned to teach the Micronesians English and assist in community development programs.

Another 240 trainees are preparing in Hawaii. They will specialize in sanitation and public health.

Only 97 of the 2,141 islands of Micronesia are inhabited. Some 88,000 persons live there.

A 1961 Peace Corps project for Micronesia got sidetracked, but it was revived this year in the wake of criticism by the Micronesians themselves of alleged U.S. neglect in administering the islands.

Among the married trainees are Jack and Ann Weiss, both 22, of Bangor, Mich., and both teachers. Sitting in front of one of the array of blue tents in which the trainees live during the "outdoors" phase of their study, they got a lesson in palm frond weaving from their Micronesian teachers.

"We've been thinking of the Peace Corps for several years," said Ann. Her husband elaborated: "We saw people going into this program and decided it was time to act."

All of the trainees seem to feel "real excitement" about working in Micronesia for the next two years.

Debbie Burns, 22, from Bend, Ore., tried on a grass skirt and said "I'm sure it will be great out there."

The training program being handled for the Government by the Westinghouse Electric Corp., began August 1 and concludes October 22. For a 2-week period this month the volunteers will be assigned to Miami to try their teaching skills on Cuban exile children there.

EFFECTS OF VIETNAM CONFLICT ON AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Craley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the Record the continuation of a series of articles on the American economy, the first of which I added to the Record yesterday. The article, taken from the New York Times, August 9, continues Mr. Tom Wicker's analysis of the effects of the Vietnam conflict on the American economy, this one discussing the impact on politics:

Politicians See War Issue Hurting Democrats in Fall—Party's Candidates Expected To Suffer Unless the Conflict Is 'Going Well'—Johnson's Grip Found Weaker

(This is the second of four articles in which correspondents of The New York Times estimate the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy, the nation's politics, the lives of its citizens and its foreign policy.)

(By Tom Wicker)

Washington, August 8.—Glenn Carney, whose work as a lobbyist and public relations man for the Anaconda Copper Company has made him an astute and experienced analyst of Montana politics, was asked recently what effect the war in Vietnam would have on Democratic Senator Lee Metcalf's re-election chances.

"The better the war goes," Mr. Carney said, "the more it helps the Democrats. The worse it goes, the more it helps the Republicans."

The answer was somewhat paradoxical because the Senator has been a mild critic of the war, one of 15 Senators who signed a letter to President Johnson in January asking him not to resume the bombing of North Vietnam. His conservative Republican opponent, Gov. Tim M. Babcock, intends to make that letter a campaign issue.

Nevertheless, political analysts, candidates, reporters and strategists across the nation tend to agree with Mr. Carney's assessment of the impact of the war on American politics.

They also tend to agree that the war, as yet, is not "going well enough" to be of assistance to the Democrats in this year's elections. In fact, most politicians believe that if anything, the war issue is likely to be damaging to Democratic candidates this year.

Gov. Grant Sawyer of Nevada, for example, a supporter of the Johnson policy, nevertheless believes that the frustrations and uncertainties of the war will do him more harm than good in his re-election campaign. Eugene Nickerson, a leading candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of New York, has said that he expects his party to "get it from both sides"—from those who want a greater peace effort and those who want a stronger war effort.

There is even wider agreement among political figures, however, that no sure predictions can be made. The dominant fact of politics today is that candidates and managers all over the country are nervous about what the war means to them, hesitant as to the safest or most profitable position to take, and in many cases reluctant to discuss it publicly.

Despite the prevailing uncertainties about its direct effect on the over-all campaign this year, or any specific election this year or later, it is plain that the impact of the Vietnam war on American politics has been sharp and perhaps in some ways lasting.

JOHNSON ON THE SPOT

It has embroiled the President in the major controversy of his career, cracked if not shattered the overwhelming consensus he was able to build up and maintain well past his landslide election in 1964, shifted attention from the domestic legislative achievements that he and his party registered in 1964 and 1965, shaken his once powerful influence in Congress, reawakened the liberal-to-left opposition his domestic successes and his campaign against Barry Goldwater had silenced, and may well have focused his political future and that of his Administration on the outcome—or even the progress—of a war many Americans thought they had voted to forestall in voting for him.

Because he has loyally supported Mr. Johnson on the Vietnam issue, Vice President Humphrey has been damaged with the liberal elements of the Democratic party on which he has based his career.

Aside from the fact that he must sink or swim with Mr. Johnson's policy, Mr. Humphrey at the very least has not been able to enhance his own chances for a future Presidency, and probably has seen those chances diminish.

KENNEDY WINNING SUPPORT

On the other hand, as Mr. Johnson's left flank has become politically exposed, Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York has become the most obvious rival to the President for the leadership of the Democratic party. By cautiously dissenting from the heavy reliance of the Administration on military action, and by suggesting such diplomatic initiatives as direct dealings with the Communist Vietcong, Mr. KENNEDY has earned favor among liberals who had formerly distrusted him and appears now to be the political heir of his brother, President Kennedy.

So sharply has Mr. KENNEDY emerged as an apparent rival to the President that some danger may exist of a premature Presidential boom on his behalf. He has denied any intention to seek the Democratic nomination in 1968 and few serious political figures attribute any such ambition to him.

However, if a strong liberal move in his behalf should develop—and it is talked of in some political circles—it could seriously embarrass the President and Mr. KENNEDY, and disrupt both the Democratic party and the already strained relations between the two men.

On the Republican side, the issue poses both opportunity and danger, in 1966 and 1968. Although many Republicans hope that a protest vote against Democratic management of the war will bring them significant gains this year, most Republicans have backed the President, either from conviction, bipartisanship or a reluctance to appear to be "playing politics with the war." Thus, they cannot freely exploit whatever public dissatisfaction with the war there may be.

For 1968, widespread and general frustration with the war and Mr. Johnson's leadership would clearly provide the Republicans with their best—perhaps their only—hope of victory. Yet the party might experience considerable difficulty in taking advantage of such a situation.

For one thing it would require some sophisticated political footwork for the Republican party to provide a clear alternative to Mr. Johnson's policy without becoming vulnerable to charges of offering—in the President's phrase of 1964—"more war or more appeasement."

For another thing, the gap on the Vietnam issue is widening between the two leading Republican Presidential contenders. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has consistently advocated a harder military line, and could hardly campaign for the Presidency on any other policy. Gov. George Romney of Michigan, although he has both muted and fuzzed his dissent, has clearly tried to remain flexible enough to run something of a "peace campaign" if he is nominated in 1968.

Thus, a split on the issue at the next national convention could add to the already deep divisions of the Republican party.

RADICAL WING DEVELOPING

There also exists, as a result of the Vietnam controversy, a possibility that could have even more lasting effects than these. There is now visible a movement toward a radical political party in America, splitting off from the old-line Democratic party and weakening it, as in some states the formation of sharply conservative parties has weakened the Republicans.

Seizing on the "peace issue," numerous candidates have entered Congressional races—in Connecticut, California, New York, Wisconsin, Oregon, New Jersey, Indiana and elsewhere. Most are running as Democrats, some as independents, but almost all outside of or without the blessing of Democratic leaders and organizations.

So far, little success for these candidates is in sight—and two of the most vigorous have gone down to defeat. In Oregon's Democratic primary, Howard Morgan lost a statewide race for the senatorial nomination to Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, despite the strong support of Senator WAYNE MORSE. In California, a youthful radical editor, Robert Scheer, offered a well-organized and tough opposition to Representative JEFFERY COHELAN, an old-line liberal from the Berkeley-Oakland area, but Mr. Scheer lost a close race in the Democratic primary.

Nevertheless, the vigor and numbers of the "peace candidates"—who are distinct from those otherwise regular Democrats who may dissent from the President's line—is impressive, and the Vietnam issue, if it remains alive until 1968, could crystallize the so-called "new left" into a potent new political force.

NEGRO VOTE CITED

This prospect particularly worries some Democrats because they see the possibility that the new left might absorb great numbers of Negro voters who in recent years have supported Democratic tickets. Their reasoning is that these Negroes might become convinced that war expenditures of money and energy have halted the momentum of the civil rights movement in the United States.

A politically powerful new left built on the Vietnam and civil rights issues appears unlikely to most professional politicians. The most far-sighted of them, however, are dismissing the possibility.

Nevertheless, for the immediate future, only Glenn Carney's proposition that a successful war is likely to benefit President Johnson's party has any wide acceptance. The basic problem for most politicians is that they do not know whether to gamble on that success, or on the alternative possibility that the war will drag on indecisively and arouse strong opposition to those who have managed and favored it.

This dilemma is heightened by the fact that many political figures today have two elections in mind. Even those reasonably convinced that there will be no striking success in the war by November, 1966, cannot be sure that such success will not have come by the Presidential year of 1968.

"SUCCESS" NEEDS DEFINING

Another complicating question is how to define success in the war. Would a negotiated settlement provide a popular ending, or does the public mood now demand some demonstrable military victory?

Opinion polls, after all, showed public approval both of the President's January "peace offensive" and his decision in July to bomb the oil dumps near Hanoi and Haiphong.

Ultimately confusing the issue are two political truisms. One is that patriotism demands support for American troops in action, even from those who do not approve of the war. The other is that in foreign crises the general tendency of the American public usually has been to support the President of the United States.

For all these reasons, only those candidates this year who have firmly held views of their own and who are willing to risk the consequences of stating them are likely to take particular issue with Mr. Johnson's policy of a limited war for limited aims.

However, even those who are willing to dispute the President are not united. Some wish an all-out military effort, including the risk of war with Communist China. Others wish to reduce by various means the present level of the military effort, although most stop short of urging complete withdrawal.

NO CLEAR-CUT PATTERN

Thus, as this year's political season moves toward its climax in November, no clear-cut pattern has developed around the Vietnam issue. Instead anomalies, contradictions and surprises abound. Here are some examples:

Many members of Congress who would normally be eager to get home to their campaigns in an election year are hoping the current session drags on into the fall so that they will not have to face too long a period of challenge about Vietnam.

President Johnson, however, in several early campaign forays, has made it plain that he intends to make support for the war a primary issue this fall—in defiance of the uncertainty of other politicians, of the general belief that his party's domestic record provides a better political argument, and of the fact that the most intense criticism of the war has come from Democrats such as Senators MORSE of Oregon and J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

The prime political concern of the Democratic party this fall is to return to office many of the bumper crop of freshman Democrats who were elected to the House in the Johnson landslide in 1964, and 48 of whom won seats away from Republicans. However, 25 of these freshmen Democrats have tended toward criticism of the war effort, some even to sharp disagreement.

It is generally believed that Gov. Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, one of the nation's better-known Republicans, unnecessarily risked his chances for election to the Senate by taking a strong position in opposition to the war. Now he is rated not much better than an even bet against Democratic Republican Duncan, who supports the President's policy and probably would not have been in the race had Mr. Hatfield not raised the Vietnam issue.

In what is widely considered the most important race of the year—that between Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California and his Republican challenger, Ronald Reagan—the war is not an issue at all, and neither candidate gives any indication that he will mention it.

Finally, most political analysts believe that the war, its frustrations and its peripheral effects—after prices and "tight money," for example—have badly damaged the President's always tenuous popularity. These same analysts concede, however, that the "safest" position on the war is probably one of simple support for the President's policy, because he is assumed to be the man "in the best position to know what to do."

LBJ AND THE CITIES

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post of August 10, 1966, by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak about "LBJ and the Cities":

INSIDE REPORT: LBJ AND THE CITIES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Although saying little publicly about the growing crisis of the Negro revolution in the big cities, President Johnson is working overtime in quiet ways to defuse the Nation's worst domestic problem.

One revealing glimpse of Mr. Johnson's private efforts came in a conversation (fruitless, as it turned out) with Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, a conservative Democrat and former Johnson ally who is now systematically opposing Great Society programs.

The call had one purpose: To line up BYRD's vote in the Senate Appropriations Committee last Thursday, when the rent-supplement bill was to come up for decision. Although this bill contains only $20 million for a pilot rent-subsidy program designed to break up Negro housing patterns in the big cities, Byrd was adamant. He told the President no! Said the President, according to Byrd's own account a few days later:

"All I'm trying to do is to help these people get out of the ratholes and let them see a little sunlight."

Byrd, whose state has no major cities at all, was unmoved. The problem, he told Mr. Johnson, is the Negroes themselves, not the Government. When the President warned that failure to make a start now at helping the Negro masses in the North would guarantee a far worse crisis in the future, Byrd only shrugged his shoulders.

When the rent-supplement program was approved in committee on a close vote last Thursday, Byrd showed up with a couple of proxies of absent Senators and cast them, along with his own, against this modest pilot program.

What the President attempted to do with Byrd is only one small example—the tip of the iceberg—of his desperate effort to take the violence out of the Negro revolution.

For example, it is a well-kept secret that Mr. Johnson has dispatched a top-level team of White House aides to at least four major cities in the North, and one in the South, to discuss education, employment, housing—and the racial crisis—with university and political experts.

Headed by Joseph Califano, these White House teams are giving the President new insights into the problems of the big city, the flight of the whites to the suburbs and the dynamics of the Negro revolution. Harry McPherson, the White House counsel, and Douglass Cater, the President's chief for educational matters, also have been assigned by the President to this work.

Beyond that, Mr. Johnson's personal intervention in a problem right on his doorstep—the possibility of a racial flare-up in the Capital—is now being studied in governors' offices across the country. When Mr. Johnson read a story in The Washington Post that Negro children could not turn on the fire hydrants in a bitter heat wave and play in the spray (a problem that triggered the riots on Chicago's West Side), he ordered Califano to step in.

Califano summoned District authorities to his office. Why no hydrants, he demanded? The answer: It would use too much water. How much? No one knew.

Califano demanded immediate answers and got them. The amount of water expended would be minuscule. What about collapsible swimming pools at strategic locations in the Negro ghetto. The District officials said no, they could never get enough lifeguards.

Acting under presidential mandate, Califano discovered by one telephone call to the Red Cross that a nonswimmer could become a full-fledged lifeguard within four weeks, a swimmer within one week. The hydrants were turned on and pools were ordered.

Still another example. A month ago, the President's top priority to the racial crisis in the big cities, the demonstration cities bill, was marked down as dated. Now, because of presidential missionary work, it's given at least a 50–50 chance.

Although public silence conceals these presidential initiatives, they prove how deeply aware Mr. Johnson is of the disaster that lurks in major American cities today.

ATTORNEYS' FEES BILL

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to testify before this distinguished subcommittee on a proposed reform which I consider of the utmost importance.

H.R. 12530, which I introduced in February of this year, would remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies.

At present, most Federal agencies are hampered by statutory restrictions as to attorneys' fees. Many of these limitations are outdated and most award fees which are not sufficient compensation for the legal services rendered. The cost of living has increased substantially since many of these limits were set. In some cases, attorneys are paid different amounts when practicing before different agencies though the nature of the work is very similar.

My bill is in the spirit of the Administrative Procedures Act. For years, Congress has sought to establish in the administrative agencies as much uniformity as possible considering the many diverse roles and responsibilities the Federal Government has assumed. The Administrative Procedures Act is a testimony to the success with which many of the procedures of these agencies have been simplified and their various procedural differences minimized.

H.R. 12530 provides that all agencies which are stung by restrictions as to attorneys' fees would be governed by one flexible standard in lieu of their present economic differentiations in the matter of attorneys' fees.

The basis established in this bill for determining attorneys' fees is one that has long served the legal profession well This is the rule of reasonableness.

The affected agencies will be enabled to enact such rules and regulations as they deem proper to insure that attorneys' fees will be an "amount equal to the reasonable value of the services rendered." This bill would, in effect, end present maximum and minimum limitations and any penalities which are presently imposed when these limitations are violated.

This bill is a frank recognition of the fact that a man should be fairly paid for his labor and that any arbitrary approach denies the basic facts of our constantly changing economic existence.

It cannot be denied that some cases involving our Federal agencies are very complex; yet the fee recoveries in many cases are small and inadequate for the legal assistance rendered. On the other hand, there are situations where an attorney renders very little legal service due to circumstances of the case; yet he must be paid a statutory fee in excess of the value of services given.

The thrust of my bill, if enacted, would be to provide a flexible standard to meet these diverse situations.

The law in the 1960's as we all know, is becoming increasingly more complex. I strongly feel that only through the adoption of the reasonable value standard can we assure attorneys and claimants that those who have legitimate and complex issues of law and fact to be determined will receive adequate legal representation and that those who represent these claimants will receive remuneration commensurate with the value of the services they have performed.

For it is vitally important that claimants against the Federal Government have confidence in the attorneys they employ. Attorneys are very human and will be motivated to do a proper job only if they have the incentive of adequate compensation for their work.

In closing, I would point out that not only would this bill assure attorneys proper compensation and their clients the representation they deserve, but it would engender greater respect and confidence by private citizens in the operations and fair play of the Federal Government.

Thank you.

AMERICAN BICENTENNIAL ADD TASKS AHEAD

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to plan the national celebration of the birth of American independence, many people considered it the natural thing to do. To be sure, there will be great celebration in 1976—and with good reason, for we have much to be proud of and thankful for. I wonder, though, Mr. Speaker, if the President, and indeed this Congress, might not have had other thoughts in giving us 10 years' notice of the event.

For while these 190 years have, in the main, been good to this great Nation and her people, there remains much to be done. The challenges of poverty, remaining inequality for some, blight in our cities, unclean water and air, and world conflict, and misery still confront us. And these problems demand our attention more than ever as we approach our 200th anniversary. What better time than now to reaffirm to those who doubt that the American Revolution is not dead?

To be sure, there is more than 10 years' work in these great undertakings. This Congress though, more than any other before it, has made the beginning. The job now is to continue, with unflagging fervor, the labor already begun.

What are some of the unfinished tasks that might be realized by 1976? Let me mention a few: I would hope to see an America where all children—rural and urban, wealthy and poor, Negro and white—are getting the best possible education this Nation can provide them. In short, the removal of educational shortcomings that now contribute to poverty and joblessness in our cities. I would further hope to see an America with cleaner waterways, neater highway rights-of-way, and cleaner, safer air to breathe.

Let us be assured by 1976, that America's farm families share fully in the wealth of this Nation, and, that any rise in food prices is shared by our farm population.

Let us have a nation of dynamic, livable cities. Cities that are lively and stimulating, clean and friendly, in short, cities for people.

I would also hope to see an America in a peaceful world. For it is only through world peace that our own peace can be assured. This will mean that nations will be working individually and collectively to eradicate poverty, disease and the evils that men inflict upon one another.

And there is more that we must work for: Let no one doubt that these challenges can be met. This country has the resources, and, I think, the will to move ahead rapidly to this end.

Let us be assured then, as we plan for July 4th celebrations 10 years hence, that most of our presently unfinished business should then be behind us, so that we can proceed with the new challenges that the interval will bring.

CORVAIR EXONERATED

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, a well-known product of the Second Congressional District of Michigan, my district, is being victimized by a campaign of image assassination. The victim? The Corvair, that easy-to-drive automobile so many of us have purchased and enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, charges have been spread about this year that the Corvair is unsafe—inherently unsafe to drive or ride in. Now I hardly listened to these charges, for in past years I and others in my family have driven Corvairs many thousands of miles—from Maine to Florida—and found the car safe and trustworthy. But the hard words have in truth caused unease. Drivers have thought to themselves—well, probably the charges are false, but why take any chances? And sales have dropped, drastically.

In Los Angeles Superior Court recently, a lawsuit was heard and concluded in which the safety of this car was the principal question at issue. After 22 weeks of consideration, with testimony from 41 expert witnesses, and examination of a total of 240 exhibits, Judge Bernard S. Jefferson held that the Corvair of the specific model years contested, was not defectively designed. To help regain the good name of this car, to help regain full-time work and needed income for the thousands of my constituents who have been employed in its manufacture and assembly, to help rebuild an image which has unfairly been damaged, I ask that excerpts from Judge Jefferson's opinion be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the public communications media, that were so quick to carry stories of the charges, also now carry the story of their refutation:

The Court is convinced from the evidence that the 1960 Corvair when driven at normal speeds and within normal driving ranges is not defective. The claim that the 1960 Corvair develops suddenly, and without warning, a treacherous and unpredictable oversteer characteristic is not established by the evidence. The Court is convinced from the evidence that normal driving in transient maneuvers does not produce any dangerous oversteer or other objectionable handling characteristics. If a driver is driving within the normal speed range, the oversteer characteristic in the Corvair will not be reached at all. If, however, a driver is accelerating at a high rate of speed upon entering a curve, the oversteer characteristic could be achieved suddenly. The sudden reaching of the oversteer characteristic in such a situation, however, is due to the driver's dangerous method of handling the car, rather than any characteristic of the car itself.

Mr. Drummond in his testimony said that, as he drove the Corvair, it felt different, that the steering felt, and was, light and easy.

It is common knowledge and experience that different cars will feel and handle differently in varying degrees. The feel of a rear engine car may well be different from the feel of a front engine car. A standard sized car with power steering and power brakes will feel different from the same car without power steering and power brakes. A sports car will feel different from a standard passenger car. A driver who is accustomed to driving a Cadillac, an Imperial or a Continental, cannot expect and does not expect that if he drives a Renault, a Fiat, a Volkswagen, a Falcon, a Corvair, or any other relatively small car, that he will obtain the same feel and handling characteristics as he is accustomed to in the larger car. A driver who is accustomed to power steering of a standard car, and then drives the same car without power steering, will feel that he has changed to driving a truck. But feeling differently and handling differently do not of themselves establish that the one car is defectively designed while the other car is not. The question is, how different in handling are different automobiles? Is there a significant difference to make one a more dangerous car substantially than another? As long as the particular automobile involved provides for reasonable safety in the two basic fundamentals of safe handling namely, (1) the ability to control the automobile and (2) to predict its behavior, it is not a defectively designed automobile, even though other cars may have superior handling characteristics in the eyes of the driver. The degree of difference becomes all important.

If it were established, for example, that most cars could negotiate a particular curve without difficulty at 50 miles per hour, and that the Corvair could not negotiate that same curve safely in excess of 20 miles per hour, such would obviously constitute a significant difference without some warning to the driver from the manufacturer that the car had such a lower limit of control than other automobiles. This is saying that if most cars have a limit of control in terms of a lateral acceleration figure of approximately .5G to .6G, while a Corvair had a limit of control at .3G, such a divergence from standard cars, without warning from the manufacturer, could well be considered unreasonably dangerous and defective. But no such evidence of a significant divergence in handling characteristics has been presented in this case.

In a consideration of the evidence in this case, the Court has applied and considered and weighed as evidence the presumption of due care in favor of the deceased driver of the Corvair automobile.

In determining the factual issues in the case at bench, the Court was impressed with the fact that Mr. Gerald E. Page, a retired Inspector of the California Highway Patrol, testified that he owned and drove a 1961 Corvair 54,000 miles throughout the country and never encountered any of the alleged dangerous handling characteristics which the plaintiffs' witnesses testified existed in the Corvair. Even more compelling is the testimony of Mr. Ralph Drummond, the owner of the 1960 Corvair involved in the accident in question. The evidence establishes that Mr. Drummond drove this Corvair between 4,000 and 6,000 miles between January, 1960 and the date of the accident, May 16, 1960. Mr. Drummond drove the automobile between different cities in California and hence negotiated many curves. He drove at speeds up to 65 miles per hour. There was thus an experience of negotiating curves and developing normal lateral accelerations. At no time during Mr. Drummond's driving of his Corvair did he experience the so-called jacking up of the rear end, or excessive positive camber of the rear wheels, or the sudden occurrence of oversteering, or any unpredictable, treacherous or dangerous oversteer, which made it difficult for him to keep the automobile under control. The only caution he gave to his stepson, Don Wells Lyford, about the Corvair was that it was a rear engine car and it might feel different from the 1956 Dodge that he drove.

It was not until after the accident of May 16, 1960, that Mr. Drummond, upon reading and studying certain materials, such as Ralph Nader's book, "Unsafe at Any Speed", and getting the opinions of others, formed an opinion and came to the conclusion that the automobile was dangerous and defective for the average driver. No such opinion resulted from his own experience of driving the Corvair for four months.

In considering the accident itself, the Court is convinced from the evidence that young Don Lyford, in exiting from the 400-feet radius curve to the right, was driving the Corvair in the area of 60 miles per hour and that he had the car pointed nearer to the right edge of the road than he desired, and then turned the steering wheel sharply to the left; that this steering wheel input to the left was far beyond what was necessary to stay in his lane of travel on the 800-foot radius curve to the left; that he failed to turn the steering back to the right in time to avoid going across the center line and colliding with the Plymouth.

It is the Court's conclusion that Don's speed was not a prudent one and was too fast for the conditions which prevailed. There is no evidence that Don had ever driven this road at night. He had no real experience with the Corvair and its easy steering. The force he used in turning the steering wheel so far to the left may have resulted from his experience in driving his 1956 Dodge which had no power steering. Whatever the cause, a speed of 60 miles per hour was excessive for the curves involved and the enormous steering to the left was excessive and without justification. It was simply foolhardy for Don to have driven the Corvair at night around the right-hand curve and into the left-hand curve at 60 miles per hour without having had more knowledge of, and experience with the Corvair beyond that gained from the few times he had driven the car for a few miles each time.

Several of the plaintiffs' witnesses expressed opinions that had young Don Lyford been driving his 1956 Dodge on the road in question, the accident would not have happened. This assumption is predicated on the opinions expressed that the accident was due to the oversteering characteristic of the Corvair, a conclusion which the Court has found to be unsupported by the evidence. It is, of course, a matter of speculation as to whether the 1956 Dodge would have been driven in exactly the same manner that the 1960 Corvair was driven. Had the Dodge been driven at a speed of 60 miles per hour, and had the steering wheel been turned to the left to the same extent at the same spot on the roadway where the Corvair steering wheel was turned to the left, it is just as probable that the Dodge automobile would have ended up in the oncoming traffic lane.

It is the Court's conclusion that the Corvair automobile of the 1960 through 1963 variety is not defectively designed nor a defective product; that no negligence was involved in the manufacturer's adoption of the Corvair design; that the Corvair matches a standard of safety which does not create any unreasonable risk of harm to an average driver; that the cause of the May 16, 1960, accident and the death of Don Wells Lyford was due solely to the actions of said deceased and not to the design or any handling characteristics of the Corvair automobile.

Judgment will be for the defendants. Defendants General Motors Corporation and Citizens Chevrolet Company are directed to prepare Findings and Judgment in accordance with the views expressed herein.

Dated this 29th day of July, 1966.

BERNARD S. JEFFERSON,
Judge of the Superior Court.

AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the continued impasse in the dispute between the machinists' union and the five airlines. Legislation is pending before the Congress that would directly involve the Congress in this dispute. That legislation is pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations—AFL–CIO—sought permission to testify before the committee. Permission was denied. It is not my intention to question that denial or to make any judgment on it. It would be presumptuous of me to do so. However, I do think it would be useful if Mr. Meany's comments were available to the House and for that reason I set them forth herewith. The statement that follows is that which Mr. Meany would have made to the committee had he testified:

> Mr. Chairman, I appear here on behalf of the AFL–CIO to express our total opposition to the bill before you.
>
> According to its proponents, this bill is necessary in order to protect the "public interest." We completely reject that claim.
>
> What is involved is a strike that unquestionably has greatly inconvenienced a substantial number of citizens who use the five airlines involved. This is, of course, regrettable. But as every expert witness has testified, there is no national emergency. Transportation is not paralyzed. The flow of men and materials affecting the national defense has neither been interrupted nor delayed.
>
> Where, then, does the "public interest" lie? Does it really lie with a statute which, for the sake of overcoming an inconvenience, would force free men to work against their will for private, profit-making corporations? We say no. We say the preservation of freedom outweighs the elimination of an inconvenience.
>
> Make no mistake about it, the preservation of freedom is what you are debating—the freedom of American workers to decide, collectively, the terms and conditions under which they will work, or will not work.
>
> This is a basic freedom; for the alternative is involuntary servitude.
>
> It is in that spirit that I ask you to weigh this bill. The love we hold for our country is not served by attacking the freedom of its citizens.
>
> Yes, everyone who has spoken on this measure has defended the right to strike. But the right to strike is not an abstract theory. It is an operating right. Anyone who believes in the right to strike must accept the proposition that strikes will take place. It is not enough to believe in the right to strike in every case except the strike that is going on at the time or the strike that inconveniences articulate citizens. Yet that is the substance of this bill.
>
> While it is not my purpose to argue the merits of the economic dispute between the parties, a few facts should be mentioned.
>
> First, the airline companies can easily afford a much more generous settlement than they have yet offered. Their profit figures prove it; they themselves admit it. But during the long period of negotiations, mediation and fact-finding—and even after the strike began—the companies limited their proposals. They also claimed to be serving the "public interest," this time described as preventing inflation. We reject that claim as well, both in general and in its application to these companies.
>
> This is not the time or place for an extensive discussion of the so-called "guidelines," except to emphasize our conviction that attempts to limit wages, when there are no effective ceilings imposed on prices, profits, dividends, corporate salaries, etc. do not serve the public interest—they damage it. These airlines typify the basis for our conviction. Their profits have soared far beyond what the government itself considers reasonable; and they have applied no "guidelines" in the executive suite.
>
> Second, the workers who are now on strike shared a succession of lean years with these companies. They accepted wage agreements that fell farther and farther behind those of workers with comparable skills and lighter responsibilities—fellow-members of their own union. Having shared the lean years, they now want to share in the fat ones—not excessively, only to the point of catching up with the general wage standards of their craft. I might point out that in addition, since their last contract expired, the cost of living alone has risen by 1.7%.
>
> Third, this is a legal strike. The union exhausted every procedure prescribed by law. It agreed to an additional delay during which the matter was studied further. After the strike began, the leaders of the union actually recommended terms of settlement. By secret ballot, the workers rejected these terms by three to one.
>
> It does not matter whether I think their decision was right or wrong. It does not matter what the Congress thinks of it. That is beside the point. It was a decision that free workers had every right to make.
>
> Now we have a bill that proposes to make this legal strike illegal. It proposes to force the strikers to work for these profit-rich companies on terms that are unacceptable to them, while the same procedures that failed earlier are repeated again.
>
> Meanwhile, bargaining between the parties has been totally disrupted. It stopped for almost a week after Senator MORSE first introduced his ill-advised bill. It resumed only when the Senate laid the question aside, to clear the way for the White House meetings that produced a tentative settlement. After the workers had rejected that settlement, Congress again intervened and bargaining again stopped. A new effort by Secretary Wirtz to bring the parties together brought no results.
>
> Of course not. The companies see no need to bargain when they expect Congress to break the strike.
>
> We in the AFL–CIO urge this committee to demonstrate the courage and the devotion to freedom that this issue requires.
>
> We urge you to vote this proposal down—to make it clear that the Congress will stand aside and let the process of free collective bargaining proceed.
>
> I am well aware that this will not be an easy course for you to take. But I confidently predict that if you follow that course, free collective bargaining will settle this dispute in less time than the Congress has already devoted to it.
>
> That is what I hoped to tell the committees. Let me add a few more words.
>
> The other day, Congressman STAGGERS called on the parties to reach an agreement to avoid legislation which, he said "you will regret for the rest of your lives."
>
> I would say it another way. I say to the Congress, do not pass legislation that you will regret for the rest of your lives. Do not legislate against the rights of free Americans.
>
> I repeat what I said at the beginning. This is a far more serious matter than a dispute between 35,000 machinists and five airlines. Those who vote for this bill will be voting—no matter how good their intentions—against the basic freedom of every union member and every wage-earner in America.
>
> It is hard to believe that this Congress will blacken its great record of social progress by curtailing the liberty of free men.

Airline profits

	Operating revenue	Profit after taxes
NORTHWEST		
1965	$263, 000, 000	$45, 690, 000
1964	$211, 610, 000	$26, 790, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+24. 3	+70. 5
1st 5 months 1966	$128, 124, 000	$21, 332, 000
1st 5 months 1965	$95, 647, 000	$13, 763, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+34	+55
TWA		
1965	$672, 790, 000	$50, 100, 000
1964	$575, 000, 000	$37, 000, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+17	+35. 4
1st 6 months 1966	$363, 304, 000	$19, 008, 000
1st 6 months 1965	$306, 603, 000	$15, 550, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+19. 1	+22. 2
UNITED		
1965	$792, 800, 000	$45, 770, 000
1964	$666, 400, 000	$27, 330, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+19	+67. 4
1st 5 months 1966	$355, 616, 000	$13, 518, 000
1st 5 months 1965	$289, 279, 000	$6, 920, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+22. 9	+95. 3
EASTERN		
1965	$507, 520, 000	$29, 670, 000
1964	$414, 270, 000	−$5, 830, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+22. 5	(1)
1st 6 months 1966	$284, 075, 000	[2] $19, 363, 000
1st 6 months 1965	$257, 117, 000	[2] $20, 500, 000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+10. 5	−5. 6

See footnotes at end of table.

Airline profits—Continued

	Operating revenue	Profit after taxes
NATIONAL		
Year ended June 30:		
1965	$148,220,000	$15,060,000
1964	$121,480,000	$7,860,000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+22	+91.6
11 months to May 1966	$166,091,000	$19,922,000
11 months to May 1965	$135,143,000	$13,816,000
Increase or decrease (percent)	+22.9	+44.2

[1] Moved from deficit to a net profit of over $29,000,000.

[2] The company paid no income taxes in 1965, whereas the aftertax profit for the 1st 6 months of 1966 reflects income tax payments of $6,954,000.

THE SMALL IMPROVEMENT IN REAL WAGES OF GROUND CREW MECHANICS

Gains in the buying power of ground crew mechanics, since the 1962–1963 settlement, have been very small.

In 1962, before the most recent settlement was negotiated, top-rated mechanics earned from $3.13 an hour at United to $3.22 an hour at Eastern.

The 1962–1963 settlement brought that rate up to $3.52 an hour on January 1, 1965.

The total increases ranged from 9.3 percent at Eastern to 10.7 percent at National, over the 3 years of the agreement from January 1963 to January 1966, and to 12.5 percent at United over the 3½ years from June 1962 to January 1966. On a yearly basis, this was from 3.1 percent per year at Eastern to 3.6 percent per year at National and United.

However, in the three years from January 1963 to January 1966, the cost-of-living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose 4.7 percent. And from June 1962 to January 1966, the cost-of-living rose 5.4 percent.

As a result, the real gains in buying power, during the terms of the settlement, were only from 4.6 percent at Eastern to 6 percent at National and 7.1 percent at United—merely from 1.5 percent per year at Eastern to 2 percent per year at National and United.

Moreover, the cost-of-living rose an additional 1.7 percent from January to June 1966—washing out more of the real value of the wage gains since the settlement of 1962–1963.

As a result, by June 1966, the total gains in real buying power, since 1962–1963, were down to only 2.9 percent at Eastern, 4.3 percent at National and 5.4 percent at United—or only eight-tenths of 1 percent per year at Eastern, 1.2 percent per year at National and 1.4 percent per year at United.

INTER-CITY FREIGHT TRAFFIC

The latest available information is for 1963—one-tenth of 1 percent of all inter-city freight traffic was carried by the airlines.

[Percent of all inter-city freight traffic]

Railroads	44.0
Motor vehicles (trucks, etc.)	24.0
Inland waterways	16.0
Oil pipelines	17.0
Airlines	0.1

WAGE INEQUITY

The top-rated airline ground crew mechanics, whose hourly rate is $3.52, include FAA-licensed personnel who sign out the engine, electrical equipment and frame of the planes they repair:

In contrast:

New York City Sanitation Department garbage truck mechanics, $4.53.

Denver, city auto and truck mechanics, $4.05.

San Francisco, city auto and truck mechanics, $3.91.

Western Greyhound bus mechanics, $4.61; plus increases to $5.09 (June 1968).

Western Greyhound machinist, $4.74; plus increases to $5.21 (June 1968).

San Francisco auto and truck mechanics, $4.33.

Chicago, Commonwealth Edison maintenance mechanics, $4.10.

New York City Consolidated Edison maintenance mechanics, $4.00.

Detroit Edison maintenance mechanics, $4.14.

St. Louis Union Electric maintenance mechanics, $4.10.

INTER-CITY PASSENGER TRAFFIC

The most recent figures are for 1963—5 percent of all inter-city passenger traffic was carried by the airlines. On that basis, only 3 percent of all inter-city passenger traffic is carried by the struck airlines.

[Percent of all inter-city passenger traffic]

Private automobiles	90.0
Airlines	5.0
Buses	3.0
Railroads	2.0
Inlet waterways	.3

SALARIES OF AIRLINE EXECUTIVES AND DIRECTORS

Since 1962, when the last Machinists contract was negotiated, airline salaries for officers and directors increased about 6½ to 7 percent a year.

Between 1962 and 1965, payments to officers and directors increased:

National Airlines, 22% or 7% a year.

Northwest Airlines, 20% or 6½% a year.

United Airlines, 20% or 6½% a year.

Similar information is not available for Eastern Airlines and TWA.

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE AIR TRANSPORT INDUSTRY

With the increasing use of jets, the productive efficiency of the airlines has skyrocketed.

In 1960, total revenue ton miles of all domestic trunk airlines was 3.3 billion—with total employment of 118,189. Revenue ton miles per employee were 28.2.

In 1965, total revenue ton miles were up to nearly 6 billion—but total employment increased only to 147-010. Revenue ton miles per employee were up to 40.7.

Between 1960 and 1965, revenue ton miles per employee increased 44.3 percent or 7.4 percent per year.

The increase in productivity in the air transport industry, in recent years, has been about twice as fast as the rapid advance of productivity in the economy-as-a-whole.

For the five airlines involved in the strike, the highs, in the first six months of 1966, were from 4 times to 12 times the highs of 1962—gains of 300 percent to 1,100 percent.

These increases in stock prices, from 1962 when the old contracts terminated, to the first-half of 1966, represent gains of about $100 per share for Eastern, National and Northwest; $87 for TWA and $57 for United.

Airline stock prices

	1962		1st 6 months, 1966		Monday, Aug. 8, 1966 (close of business)
	High	Low	High	Low	
Eastern	27¾	15⅞	123¼	74	90⅞
National [1]	12⅜	5½	104⅞	65¾	76⅞
Northwest [2]	10	5¾	124¾	58½	111¼
TWA	14¼	7½	101	57¾	76⅜
United [3]	17⅝	9⅛	74¾	49⅜	60⅛

[1] Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1965.

[2] Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1964 and 1966.

[3] Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1966.

Even if a share of these stocks were bought at the 1962-highs and sold at the lows of the first half of 1966, the gains would have been from $32 per share, or 190 percent, to $53 per share, or 442 percent.

On Monday, August 8, one month after the strike started, the closing stock prices were from 3 times to 11 times the highs of 1962—200 percent to 1,000 percent above the 1962-highs.

AIRLINE FARES

The last general airline rate increase was February 1962—a 3-percent increase. Since then, several small selective decreases have taken place.

August 1962—Family plan, first-class discount, 50 percent.

June 1965—Family plan coach—two-thirds rate for second member and one-third for others, except during peak periods.

August 1965—Baggage allowance liberalized. United cut first-class tickets of over 700 miles by 2 to 15 percent. No jet surcharge for short-haul jets.

March 1966—Twenty-five percent excursion fare discount. Youth fares.

The rate of return on investment last year for the 11 major airlines was 11.5 percent compared with the allowable 10.5 percent rate of return (allowable under CAB regulations).

WESTERN GREYHOUND STRIKE

Earlier this year, the workers of Western Greyhound were on strike for six weeks. Western Greyhound covers eleven western states. The average number of passengers per day is 135,000. But there was no talk in Washington of a national emergency.

The number of passengers per day on the five struck airlines is 150,000. But almost as soon as the strike started, there was talk of a national emergency.

Moreover, the Western Greyhound strike settlement provided $4.61 an hour for bus mechanics (to $5.09 in June 1968)—but the hourly rate for top-rated airline mechanics is $3.52. Yet when a bus runs into mechanical trouble, it can pull over to the side of the road. There is no roadside shoulder for a plane with mechanical trouble.

SERIOUS ERRORS IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY ON CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, I wrote Secretary of the Treasury Fowler a letter pointing out serious misstatements of fact in the testimony of Under Secretary Joseph W. Barr given before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on August 4 concerning legislative proposals to end the high interest-rate war between financial institutions.

Today I received a response to the letter I wrote to Secretary Fowler from Under Secretary Barr. In order that Members of both Houses of Congress might be fully informed of the significant questions raised in this correspondence, I insert my letter to Secretary Fowler and Under Secretary Barr's response at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: After reviewing the testimony of Under Secretary Barr given last week before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 3687 and other bills related to the interest rate situation, I would like to make several comments in regard thereto.

In response to a comment by Senator Proxmire, Under Secretary Barr stated that the House Banking and Currency Committee had approved a proposal with a flat 4½ percent limitation on all time and savings accounts. As you well know, this is a deplorable misstatement of fact, and I must register my objection to this misrepresentation in the strongest possible terms. H.R. 14026 as reported by this Committee contains a temporary, one-year ceiling of 4½ percent on time deposits only and affects only those under $100,000 in size. Mr. Barr's testimony failed to include mention of these most explicit conditions contained in H.R. 14026 with respect to the 4½ percent ceiling. Furthermore, he failed to mention that the 4½ percent ceiling does not apply to renewals of presently outstanding CD's carrying a higher rate nor that the bill provides that the 4½ percent ceiling can be raised by the appropriate agencies upon approval of the President.

Furthermore, the essence of Mr. Barr's testimony is that, if the 4½ percent rate ceiling is passed, it may very well cause a financial panic and recession. Unfortunately, Under Secretary Barr misled the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—unintentionally, I am sure—as to the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and I am hereby requesting that you take immediate action to correct the record.

Mr. Barr's testimony also reveals a definite uncertainty on his part as to the impact of the Federal Reserve's action of last December 6 setting off the current rate war. At one point, he states: "It seems clear first of all that excessive competition for savings is having a number of unfortunate effects that deserve attention." Later on in his testimony, Mr. Barr stated: "The purpose of this legislation is two-fold, sir. One, it is to try to curb any potential rate war that might develop in this country . . ." While probably just a matter of semantics, the seeming contradiction in these two statements by Mr. Barr indicate a hesitancy on the part of the Treasury Department to even admit that we do have at the present time excessive interest rate competition of the worst kind and that the results are present for all to see. Perhaps if the Treasury Department had a more concrete grasp of the facts of the present situation, you would not have found it necessary to switch your position several times on remedial legislation.

In this connection, I do not see how the Treasury can have any assurance that the present rate war will be ended by increasing the discretionary authority of the Federal Reserve Board over interest rates. For instance, Senator Douglas asked Mr. Barr this question: "Do you know what rate the Federal Reserve Board has in mind." Mr. Barr responded, "No, sir; we don't." Apparently, you assume but you do not know that the Federal Reserve Board would choose a figure in the area of 5 percent for time deposits under $100,000. Let me call your attention to Chairman Martin's testimony before the House Committee last June 16 when he said, "The 5 percent ceiling, as of last month, would have had only a moderate overall effect in curbing banks' ability to compete for savings in small denominations. Only about 190 banks were offering rates in May exceeding 5 percent on consumer-type time deposits." That the situation has not materially changed in this regard is evidenced by Vice Chairman Robertson's statement before the Senate Committee the same day that Mr. Barr testified—August 4. He said, "In contrast to the 5½ percent rate on money market CD's, available evidence indicates that relatively few banks are paying more than 5 percent on other time deposits."

So, even if the Federal Reserve would do what you have no assurance they will do, the impact would be minimal and would certainly fail to relieve the terrible shortage of mortgage funds which worsens day by day. Furthermore, if the Federal Reserve Board were really sincere in taking meaningful action to end the rate war and helping the housing situation, they would have used their present authority to increase the minimum maturity on time deposits from the present 30 days up to at least 90 days or six months. Governor Robertson's testimony was exceedingly clear on this point, giving it his strongest personal recommendations. Yet, the Federal Reserve Board has refused to take this action which even the American Bankers Association has endorsed.

I fail to see the source of your great confidence that the Federal Reserve Board can be depended upon to take voluntary action to correct the mistake they made last December when they even refuse to admit that they made a mistake in the first place.

I also would ask you whether in your official position as Secretary of the Treasury you support Mr. Barr's statement that "the fact that the Federal Reserve Board has permitted 5½ percent on these large, very rate sensitive CD's has contributed favorably to our balance of payments position this year." This seems to be an endorsement by the Treasury Department of the now discredited "Operation Twist". For example, Governor Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board, who is taking a leading role in the administration's balance of payments efforts, had this to say about the fallacy of artificially high short-term interest rates as a balance of payments weapon:

"Congressman Todd. I would appreciate some statement from the Board as to what errors may be contained in this paper because it indicates that Operation Twist increases the balance of payments by only $154 million and obviously this is not enough to be worthwhile. It means that Operation Twist was ill conceived.

"Mr. Robertson. It was, and that ought to be an answer to your paper."

If there is a disagreement, as it appears to be, perhaps the Banking and Currency Committee should hold hearings on this question to consider the differing views. On the other hand, if the Treasury Department is in agreement with Governor Robertson's statement, then I would hope that you would see fit to correct the misleading inference from Mr. Barr's testimony last week that Operation Twist is still official government policy. In any case, your Under Secretary must certainly be aware that Congress has by law specifically exempt foreign official time deposits from the "Regulation Q" ceilings. (76 Stat. 953) Mr. Barr somehow failed to mention this crucial point. I might add that one of the last official positions taken by former Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon—a Republican, as you recall—was to criticize strongly the use of high, short-term interest rates as a balance of payments weapon. Mr. Dillon said that such a policy would merely be self-defeating. I would also remind you that to the best of my recollection, Secretary Dillon never advocated removal of the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on long-term government bonds, as you recently did before the House Ways and Means Committee.

I will greatly appreciate your prompt attention to these comments, particularly in connection with the correction of the erroneous and ambiguous statements made by Mr. Barr before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on August 4. These statements must not be permitted to be part of the official record of the Congress.

Sincerely,

Wright Patman,
Chairman.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1966.

Hon. Wright Patman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Secretary Fowler has asked me to reply to your letter of August 9, 1966 concerning my testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last week.

You are quite correct in stating that I misrepresented the provision of H.R. 14026. I evidently misunderstood Senator Proxmire's question, and I did not correct his statement. I might add that none of the Treasury staff who accompanied me caught this error, and the lawyer who reviewed the transcript did not notice it.

To set the record straight I have this morning sent to the Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee the following letter and asked him to distribute it to his Members.

"Dear Mr. Chairman: On Thursday, August 4, 1966, in testimony before your committee, Senator Proxmire asked me the following question: 'Yes, Mr. Barr, as I understand it, at one point the House Banking Committee passed a proposal to have a flat limitation of 4½ percent on the interest payments. Was that to apply to negotiable certificates of deposit and what other savings instruments?'

"I answered: 'Yes, sir; on all time and savings accounts, which would include negotiable certificates of deposit.'

"I evidently thought that Senator Proxmire used the term 'considered' rather than 'passed' because my answer as printed is not correct. The correct answer is as follows:

" 'Senator Proxmire, the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported H.R. 14026 which provides for a temporary one-year ceiling of 4½ percent on time deposits below $100,000. Negotiable certificates of deposit are normally denominated in amounts of $100,000 or more so H.R. 14026 as reported would not have an appreciable impact on negotiable C.D.'s.'

"I regret this misunderstanding, and I regret that neither I nor the Treasury staff caught this error before the record was printed.

"I am not certain as to what line of questioning Senator Proxmire meant to pursue in the subsequent colloquy. If he meant to inquire as to the impact of placing a ceiling on all C.D.'s, my answers would stand. If he meant to inquire as to my opinions on the impact of the provisions of H.R. 14026, I would be pleased to supply this answer for the record.

"Sincerely,

"Joseph W. Barr."

If Senator Proxmire asks me to comment on H.R. 14026, I would state that the impact of H.R. 14026 and a flat ceiling of 4½ percent on all C.D.'s is quite different. Under the provisions of H.R. 14026 only about $18 billion out of an approximate $32 billion total outstanding C.D.'s is covered.

Thus, the impact of H.R. 14026 would be much less drastic than a flat ceiling of 4½ percent on all C.D.'s. However, I have testified before your Committee that a law limiting the rate on C.D.'s under $100,000 to 4½ percent might well have unpredictable consequences and that funds could move from C.D.'s into money market instruments bearing higher rates.

I have no comments on the other points raised in your letter of August 9 and I believe that the complete record as it stands, including the statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation give a fair portrayal of the objectives of the legislation supported by the Coordinating Committee on Bank Supervision.

Permit me to say that I regret this error in the record and appreciate the opportunity to correct it at once.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH W. BARR.

HEALTH EDUCATION

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, since its enactment in 1958, the National Defense Education Act has had far-reaching effects in nearly every area of education.

From the basic act, which concentrated on the sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, and guidance, we have progressed by including such areas as English, reading, history, geography, economics, industrial arts, programs for the disadvantaged, school library personnel, and educational media specialists. Since 1936 we have provided assistance, including teacher training, in the field of vocational education and with the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities we acknowledged the importance of these areas as well.

The one area in the curriculum which to date has received little or no attention from the Congress is that of health education and the training of teachers in that field. A great deal of confusion exists as to what constitutes adequate health instruction. All too often it is combined with other subjects and taught by coaches whose primary interest is producing winning teams, or by English and home economics instructors.

Just as the Congress has rightfully established and supported programs to strengthen the academic, vocational, and technical efforts of the Nation's schools, it is imperative that we now recognize the need to do the same for health education so that it may be placed on the same level as all other subjects.

The first bill which I am introducing today would correct this oversight by amending the National Defense Education Act in two instances:

First. It would make possible the acquisition of laboratory and other equipment by elementary and secondary schools under title III of the act so that our children can be trained in modern approaches to the health problems they encounter in daily living.

Second. It would bring the teaching of health in line with current developments by amending title XI to furnish support for teacher training programs to be conducted by our institutions of higher learning in order that the qualifications of those who are or will be engaged in the teaching of health subjects can be improved. Fortunately, there are a number of colleges and universities presently offering specialized training in health education at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Health education has a number of basic contributions to make to individual achievement. Studies indicate a direct correlation between physical fitness and academic achievement, showing that physical weakness is nearly 30 percent higher in children of low mental ability than in those of high intelligence. One out of five children today cannot pass a simple test of physical performance and one-third of all American young men are judged unfit for duty in the Armed Forces for health reasons.

Like so many problems, the pattern of physical neglect begins early in life and the place to correct it is with our young.

Action on the amendments which I am introducing today will strengthen health instruction and provide training institutes for teachers in the field. Enactment of this legislation will indicate to educators throughout the country that the Congress does not subscribe to the concept of a sound mind in a sound body.

Mr. Speaker, closely related to the amendments I have just offered is a second bill which I am also introducing today to amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under the act. Under the present interpretation of that section these persons are denied such opportunities at institutions of higher learning that provide specialized training in public health and school health education.

What is urgently needed today is a national commitment to health education from the first school years throughout the individual's life.

The legislation I have introduced today will provide the impetus and support to school and college health programs.

FOR AN ALL-ASIAN SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New york [Mr. FARBSTEIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of this body, I have become increasingly heartsick over the tragic events occurring in Vietnam. More and more of our sons have been sent to fight there. More and more of them are being killed. Yet the war seems no closer to termination than it did a year or 2 years ago. Our President has, I am sure, been doing everything possible to end the war, using the strategy which to him appears wisest. I think it is unquestionable that the national objective in Vietnam is peace. The dilemma, however, has been how to achieve it.

In the hope of resolving the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, I found gratification in the report last week that the Government of Thailand is making an effort to combine with the other nonbelligerent nations of Asia to end the Vietnamese war. The Thai Government points out that Vietnam is an Asian problem that most fittingly lends itself to solution by Asians. With this contention, I am in total agreement. The Asian nations, meeting together, can be expected to make powerful and persuasive recommendations in behalf of a settlement. I believe the Governments of the Philippines, Malaysia, Japan, Indonesia, and several other countries have already shown some interest in the wise and foresighted Thai proposal.

I have written to the Secretary of State to urge that he offer every possible incentive to these Asian states to find a fair solution in Vietnam. I asked him to communicate our sympathy to them. I asked him further to say that we would welcome their mediation ideas. I called upon him to make clear that we do not consider our national interest in conflict with theirs.

I note with satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, that since I sent my letter to the Secretary, Mr. MANSFIELD, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, has expressed similar sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary of State to make clear to the nations of Asia that we would be pleased to withdraw our troops from Vietnam in favor of having Asian forces patrol a peace settlement. I can foresee, for instance, the strengthening of the forces in the buffer zone between North and South Vietnam. I would also approve of extending that buffer zone into the area between Vietnam and its neighbors, Laos and Cambodia. Asian troops in this land would, I believe, be far more effective in keeping the peace than troops from the Western countries.

One might also predict, Mr. Speaker, that Asians would be far more sensitive, given their community of experience, to the needs and desires of the Vietnamese people than westerners can be. We who have watched the Vietnamese war are conscious of the many errors our Government, often in total good will, has made through lack of understanding. The injection of Asians into the effort to make peace may be a key to a solution that would appear fair to both sides. The Thai Government suggests that, for symbolic reasons, the next peace conference ought not to be in Geneva, but in Bangkok or Djakarta. I agree with that position, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, I might note in the Thai proposals the opportunity to welcome back Indonesia into the family of nations. By its own choice, Indonesia has been a hermit state, in the diplomatic sense, for some time. But recent events in Indonesia have changed the situation completely. It is time for the world to welcome Indonesia back to the constructive work that it can do as an energetic and populous nation. This could be a satisfying corollary to the Thai plan.

Mr. Speaker, the countries of Asia of which I speak want neither Communist nor American dominance in their affairs. They know that their welfare depends, above all, on stability in the Pacific area. In my view, ours does too. I believe we would be wise to put our confidence in the Asian nations who show an interest in acting as intermediaries for a peace settlement. I am grieved that an end to the war now seems so distant. I regard the Thai initiative as a most hopeful sign, which our Government should do its utmost to support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The text of my letter of August 5 to Secretary Rusk follows:

AUGUST 5, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State,
The Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find the information very encouraging that the government of Thailand has undertaken initiative to involve other nations of Asia in a Vietnam settlement. I believe it is quite appropriate for Asian countries to look upon the Vietnam dispute as essentially an Asian matter. Their interest in resolving the matter is extremely gratifying.

I would like to urge you to give every incentive to these Asian states, led by Thailand, to find a fair solution to the war in Vietnam. I suggest that our sympathy for their objectives be communicated to them. I would go farther and say that we would welcome their mediation proposals. I believe it should be made clear that we do not consider our national interest in conflict with theirs.

I foresee, as another advantage to the Thai proposals, an opportunity to welcome back Indonesia into the family of responsible nations. Indonesia's participation in peacemaking activities would lend substantial weight to any program put forth.

I think we should make it particularly clear that we would favor a substitution of Asian forces for our own to patrol any peace settlement that is reached. I believe it would be very salutary if some means could be found to extend the buffer zone not only between south and North Vietnam but also between Vietnam and its neighbors. I would be anxious to have Asians in the buffer zone between North and South Vietnam and along the Laotian and Cambodian borders. Such troops would be more influential than ours, I believe, in safeguarding the stability of a settlement.

Most important, I believe we must put our confidence in the Asian nations who show an interest in acting as intermediaries for a peace settlement. They know that their own welfare depends, in large measure, on stability in the Pacific area. They want neither American nor Communist domination. I believe they would be sensitive to the desires of the Vietnamese people. I regard the Thai initiative as a most hopeful sign, which our Government should do its utmost to support.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

HEALTH EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the event Members have not seen it, I recommend that you read the article published in the May issue of Today's Health entitled "What Our Kids Don't Know About Health." I believe you will be as amazed as I was to learn how many misconceptions the average schoolchild has in relation to his own health and well-being. This situation exists despite the fact that during the past three sessions, Congress has enacted 20 landmark measures in health and 19 in education. Appropriations for health programs have doubled and the budget for the Office of Education has been increased more than fivefold.

Major achievements in the health field include the medicare program; increased health services to domestic migrant agricultural workers; expanded maternal and child health and crippled children's programs; 32 new clinics for retarded children; construction assistance for 1,300 hospital and health facilities to add more than 56,000 new hospital beds; financial support for more than 16,000 medical research projects and advanced training for 25,000 scientists; construction starts for 62 institutions to enroll more than 2,400 additional students each year for training in the health professions.

Equally impressive are the accomplishments in education, including funds to improve educational opportunities for nearly 7½ million underprivileged children in 20,000 school districts; summer Headstart programs for 560,000 preschool children in 13,350 community education projects and year-round programs for 120,000 children; textbooks and other learning materials for more than 40 million children in every State; college work-study programs for more than 110,000 needy college students; and construction aid for 1,300 institutions of higher learning—including new classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

All these are testimony to the fact that this Nation is becoming increasingly conscious of the advantages of good health and education. The thing that concerns me, however, and it should concern you, is the fact that the results of the money spent in health research are not being taught with the money allocated to education in practical, everyday language—capable of daily application. Children need to know about personal health practices such as care of eyes, ears, and teeth. They need an understanding of community health agencies and the services they provide related to health care, air and water pollution, sanitation fluoridation of water, and similar services. With television commercials depicting cigarette smoking, the drinking of some particular brand of beer, the purchase of brand X cosmetic as assurance that it will make one more attractive, there is a great need for students to know the basic facts about smoking, drinking, grooming nostrums—all those items we are repeatedly urged to buy.

There has been great misunderstanding about just what constitutes health education. It has been combined with physical education instruction on some occasions and taught by coaches whose primary interest is producing winning ball teams or by teachers trained to teach English or home economics or whatever. I strongly favor winning ball teams and good English, but let us not lose sight of both objectives. Qualified health educators should be placed in schools to teach health education as an academic subject requiring the same instructional materials and facilities as those provided for other academic subjects.

Many of us saw and probably took the national health test which was telecast by the Columbia Broadcasting System. You must have shared my shock at the inferior level of understanding which was revealed. More than one-half the participating audience failed this elementary test of health knowledge. This confirms what the experts tell us—parents are no more equipped to teach children necessary health concepts than to teach them math or science. And our present methods of school instruction is no better.

Very pertinent to this problem was the school health education study, guided by an outstanding committee of physicians, educators, public health personnel, and school administrators, who conducted a nationwide study which included over 18,000 students in grades 6, 9, and 12 who were tested to determine what they know and do about their health. This study, housed in the National Education Association, determined where health education is taught, how it is organized and scheduled, who teaches it, how it is taught, who receives the instruction, what areas of health are emphasized, and what are the major problems confronting administrators. Glaring weaknesses and deficiencies were revealed in the areas of alcohol education, community health programs, consumer health education, environmental hazards, health careers, international health activities, nutrition and weight control, family life, smoking, venereal disease education, and others. The cause for these deficiencies was found to stem from grossly inadequate school instruction, including, first, lack of support for and understanding of the value of health education; second, inadequate time for instruction and failure to use time provided effectively; third, a lack of qualified personnel assigned to health instruction; fourth, a lack of progression in what is taught; fifth, repetition on some health topics and complete neglect of others; sixth, a need for local and State supervisory and consultant services; and seventh, a lack of teaching materials and facilities that are provided in other subject areas.

This study revealed that financial support is urgently needed for: first, instructional equipment, library and other materials; second, advanced study institutes for teachers and supervisors in service; and third, traineeships to meet the critical demand for qualified personnel in colleges and universities that prepare teachers.

All three of these immediate needs can be provided for by modification of existing legislation. The first two would be covered by the National Defense Education Act if titles III and XI were extended to include health education.

My first bill would make it possible for elementary and secondary schools, under title III of the National Defense Education Act, to acquire laboratory and other equipment necessary to train our schoolchildren in a modern fashion about the health problems which they encounter daily. It would help bring the teaching of health from the horse and buggy days to the jet age in which we live. The amendment to title XI would furnish support for teacher training institutes conducted in our institutions of higher education to improve the qualifications of persons who are or will engage in teaching health education or in the supervising or training of teachers of health education. There are a number of colleges and universities throughout the country which offer specialized training in health education both on the undergraduate and graduate levels. There are, in fact, 48 which offer a bachelor's program, 50 which offer a master's program, and 26 which offer a program at the doctoral level.

My second bill would amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act to make it perfectly clear that the traineeships for professional public health personnel authorized under this section would be available to individuals who wish to increase their competence in the teaching of health education. I am informed that the present interpretation of section 306 has been such as to deny these persons receiving traineeships at institutions of learning which provide specialized training in public health and school health education.

Amendments to the two acts would provide tremendous impetus and support to school and college health programs and could have a significant impact on health instruction.

In essence, what is needed, and what I urge, is a national commitment to health education from the first school years throughout the span of a person's life. To help solve this problem, I am introducing today two bills to strengthen the health education programs of the schools of this Nation which, when enacted, will dramatically enhance the opportunity for our children to know the facts about their own health and better prepare them to make future decisions in their own best interests.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor, along with the Congressman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], two bills which will materially improve the teaching of health in the elementary and secondary schools of this country. During the course of the past number of years, our Appropriations Subcommittee has heard countless hours of testimony relative to both the health programs and the education programs of this Nation. I have always been concerned somewhat by the fact that there has not seemed to be any effective tying together of these two programs. We have appropriated large sums of money for medical research and health programs. We have appropriated large sums of money to support the educational programs of the elementary and secondary and schools of higher learning in this Nation.

I was just as appalled, as was the gentleman from Rhode Island, and as I am sure were the other Members of this House, by the tragically poor score that was the result of the CBS national health test. As I have thought seriously about this problem, I am more and more forced to the conclusion that perhaps, to some degree at least, we have gotten the cart before the horse. It is awfully difficult to expect people to know something that they have never learned.

Now, I want to make it perfectly clear to Members of the House precisely what we are talking about. We are talking about instructions in health. We are not talking about physical fitness. We are not talking about physical education. We are talking about the better instructing of children in our elementary and secondary school systems about the true facts as they relate to their own personal health and to their community's health. There are many number of examples of what I am speaking about, but let me cite just one. Studies show that our young people are beginning the habit of cigarette smoking at an increasingly early age. The reason for this trend is not known, although there is much speculation about it. But I believe that it would be in the best interests of everyone if children were taught and could understand early in life what it means to them to acquire what for many is a lifelong habit.

The bills which we are introducing today would do three things, and I would like to explain exactly what is intended. First of all, title III of the National Defense Educational Assistance Act would be amended so that equipment needed for the modern-day teaching of health education would be available in the elementary and secondary schools. Now the kinds of equipment to which I refer would include audiovisual materials such as films, filmstrips, slides, recordings, posters, charts, vision and hearing testing equipment, displays, and videotapes for closed-circuit television. It would also include simple laboratory for practical experiments where certain essential foods are denied in the diet. These would provide a visual experience for schoolchildren and bring to them very graphically the precise need for a balanced diet and well-rounded nutritional habits.

Second, the bill would amend title XI of the National Defense Educational Assistance Act so that institutions of higher learning could conduct short-term courses and institutes whereby teachers in our school systems could be trained in the modern techniques of teaching health education and be brought up to date on the latest scientific knowledge as it relates to health and the health of schoolchildren. This would also afford an opportunity for the programing of health teaching in schools so that some items are not repeated and others omitted completely. Please bear in mind that the curriculums of these schools now include teaching in health practices or health habits and health education, but this is done in a most haphazard fashion. A recent study of school health education, referred to by the gentleman from Rhode Island, points out the fact that inadequate time for instruction, the lack of qualified teaching personnel, and a lack of progression in what is taught with a repetition of some topics and the neglect of others is contributing to the presently extremely deficient situation. My own doubts about the present situation were corroborated by some of the correspondence which was received by the school health education study. School administrators, teachers, physicians, college and university teachers and administrators, nurses from all over this country and from around the world have eagerly sought assistance in establishing a meaningful health education program.

Third, this legislation would amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act which provides traineeships for professional public health personnel. In my opinion, the language of the act as it presently exists should cover what we are trying to accomplish here today. Unfortunately, experience has proved otherwise. The interpretation of the language of the act has been so narrow that persons seeking to enter a school of public health to increase their competence in this area have been denied admission if they were intending to continue their vocation as school health educators. We want to make it perfectly clear that these persons are a legitimate and very essential and necessary part of the public health program of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this is legislation which is needed. Unless we can teach and train our young people to better care for their own personal health and the health of their families, we are going to be forced to spend increasingly large amounts of money to take care of problems that could have been prevented by enlightened citizens.

THE THREAT TO INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND PRIVACY BY THE PROLIFERATION OF COMPUTERS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, unless we take action now, I am afraid that the day will come when all the Federal agencies will deal with the individual as a code number on a computer card and, if the present trend continues, the individual will view his Federal Government as a heartless, computerized bureaucracy. There is already ample evidence to prove that the public is becoming dissatisfied with computerized treatment. Students object to being processed indifferently by universities, and individuals resent the cold treatment afforded them by many large corporations. The individual is subjected to a rapidly growing set of numbers that tend to depreciate his individuality. There are license numbers, social security numbers, telephone numbers, a different serial number for almost everything manufactured, employment and academic numbers, ZIP code numbers, bank account numbers, and numbers to keep track of numbers. Carried to the extreme, the individual could one day find his number more important than his name.

All of this points to a growing alienation of the American people by many depersonalized forces, including the Federal Government. The people resent the insensitive, depersonalized treatment they receive from business, schools, and the Government. This situation presents a direct challenge to a personalized Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, I stand opposed to any computerized Federal data center that would maintain dossiers on the personal lives of the citizens of this Nation. The loss of privacy that would result from this action could never be justified by the gain in efficiency it would allegedly bring. As the Christian Science Monitor so appropriately expressed it in an editorial on June 29, 1966:

> Whatever advantages officials may see in such a centralized "dossier bank," the dangers inherent in it are obvious. It would constitute a monstrous invasion of privacy and a threat to the liberties of every American.

It is important for our Government to be an efficient operation, and I certainly do not advocate a curtailment of the use of computers in Government. However, Congress cannot insist that the privacy of the individual must be violated. The Government must never lose its compassion for the people it governs. We in the Congress must not legislate against individuals and for numbers, codes, and other electronic designations that spell the destruction of privacy of the citizens. We must legislate for human beings. If we ever lose sight of this requirement, we will lose sight of the goals of democracy.

DUCK HUNTING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Grider] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of that great unnumbered body of American citizens known as the duck hunters. I speak particularly of those who populate the greatest of all of the areas over which the noble game bird flies—the Mississippi flyway.

I know them well, Mr. Speaker, for I used to be one of them and still try on rare occasions to join the fraternity again.

Mr. Speaker, these hunters, both men and women, represent all that is finest in America. Deep in their hearts there lurks a love of beauty and of the great outdoors. No man alive has described the beauty and thrill more eloquently or with more humor than Mr. Nash Buckingham of Memphis, Tenn., in his classic book, "The Shootinest Gentlemen," when he described it thus:

> We drove the boat behind the saw-grass clump and lashed it into as perfect a shooting niche as nature ever provides duck hunters. Our prow wedged and roped between two button willows; head-high buckbrush at our stern. A perfect hide and sound footing. A combination that takes up a lot of slack in the hit-and-miss business. We blew through our gun tubes for luck and safety and knocked ice particles from outside. Then we checked shooting time; so few moments can mean so much in life or death to wildlife—and sometimes to humans, too. Ben's new autoloader was chunking the new combination of an ounce-and-a-half of coppered 4's. My 10-pound Becker 12-bore Magnum carried an ounce-and-three-eighths of Lubaloy 4's, in 3-inch cases. Ben stood aft, and I, amidships.
>
> "Watch sharp to your right and from behind," I warned. "They'll come up on you all of a sudden—remember that susie that almost knocked your hat off last week?" Ben grinned. We could now see three fourths across the frozen lake and spot P. W. just rounding a cypress point to the north. Clouds of ducks suddenly began milling as far south as we could spot them past the headland. Skeins of quick-winged divers began scraping past our decoys' heads. From farther south we caught the faint gabble of voyaging geese. The hooded east turned rosy. We were set for "the commencement of happenings." Ben gently tuned in his call and then sent forth a tremendous notice to the effect that we were in business. I turned for a peek southward. From nowhere behind Ben, three gorgeous mallard drakes whisked waterward, banked steeply into the breeze, and, with hissings of salutation, braked over the decoys. They hadn't missed Ben's hat twenty feet. Ben spat out his call, glowered at the now serenely seated drakes and grinned at me sheepishly.
>
> "If you knock over all three of them on the lift," I warned, "you'll be three fourths of your way through the limit. Take it easy or you'll be meeting yourself coming back." Gun below his elbow, Ben sounded a loud "S-h-o-o-o!" The three visitors spun like humming tops, slammed their curved and thrusting wing tips against the water and left there amid vast splutteration. The center mallard crumpled. "Those coppered four's" Ben remarked, "are very, very strong medicine; remember when you began breaking me in on them—years ago?" Then we both shrank into the hide, eyes bulging with astonishment.
>
> From all sides and overhead a mantle of wildfowl suddenly blotted out the dawn. That crashing shot of Ben's must have disturbed the willow flats' still unsuspecting populations. Thousands of mallards, pintails, gadwall, widgeon and lesser fry were smothering our decoys. You could hardly see through the mass. "Hold onto your hat," whispered Ben. "This is worth sitting up all night to see—let's let them all get down—then we'll move them out carefully and they'll come drifting back. Let's not shoot anything but mallard drakes—pick the fat ones—too." Ben mounted the seat and waved his hat. It was fully five minutes before order was restored; in fact many resented eviction. "My kingdom for a camera," mourned Ben.
>
> Cruising from downlake six mallards swung in low from the right. Four drakes and six susies. Ben appraised this situation through slitted eyes. With lowered flaps and throaty hissings sent on ahead, the visitors were definitely bordering a status known as "borrowed time." Blind-wise with a partner, Ben let the two leading drakes slither past and into my swing. My big gun lowered the twain, and Ben's ensuing right and left rubbed out the followers. The hens leaped sky-high and departed the scene of carnage. Our limits of four each were now on a three-two basis. P.W.'s boat was spotted curving across the northern open water, and almost immediately a swarm of fowl appeared from that direction. They swept close overhead and behind us, but there was no use shooting; open water out front made easier pickups. Ben couldn't resist picking off a high-flying drake perfectly etched against a slowly smoldering east. My next two victims swung in from the north; a pair of drakes answering Ben's clucking call. "That does it," said my companion, taking the shells from his gun and blowing through its tube. "I'm not too sure we've even been duck shooting." He raised a war whoop.

These are skilled men, Mr. Speaker. No ordinary eye or arm can bring down the flitting teal on an instant's notice. No ordinary artist can speak the language of our feathered partner in the hunt and call back a flight of mallards from 500 yards by the artful use of the duck call.

These are dedicated men, Mr. Speaker. No one is more deeply concerned about the maintenance of the duck population. Its decline in recent years has been caused not by over-hunting so much as by loss of breeding grounds in the North. No group is so dedicated to the training of our youth in the sportsmanlike, mature, and careful use of firearms, and no hunter's eye ever lights so bright as when he is instructing a young boy in the arts and skills of hunting.

These are patient men, Mr. Speaker, above all, they are patient men. I refer not just to those who hunt but to those who make the hunting possible. The guides, the hunting camp operators, the sportsman's shop operators, the cooks, and indeed the whole army who furnish the essential services for the hunters. Only today I was discussing this with Mr. Henry Reynolds, the distinguished outdors editor of the Commercial Appeal, in Memphis. He was recalling that just a few years ago it was impossible to get a reservation in a hotel or hunting camp in or around Stuttgart, Ark., or Reelfoot Lake, Tenn., or near the Claypool Reservation. Last season when the mallard bag limit was reduced to one, these places stood virtually empty, their proprietors facing bankruptcy. Yet patiently have they waited for a better day.

Mr. Speaker, that better day is dawning. The waterfowl census conducted in January of this year revealed the presence of 9,100,000 ducks for the Mississippi flyway as a whole. This inventory was made after the closing of the hunting season in the 14 Mississippi flyway States and is a fair indicator of the number of ducks that return from the flyway to the breeding grounds. There was an increase of 16.8 percent over that found in January 1965, and 47.3-percent increase over the average number of ducks for the past 18 years.

The word from the breeding grounds is also good, Mr. Speaker. The words from our Ducks Unlimited friends in Canada indicate that the increased breeding population has enjoyed excellent reproduction. There is every reason to anticipate a large flight of ducks into the area during the coming winter.

We were told last fall by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife personnel that under the bag limitations there could not be an increase of more than 10 percent in the 1966 breeding population. There has been a 37-percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the hunting of ducks can survive another season like 1965. It will not be the ducks that disappear, it will be the hunters, the lodge operators, the guides, and all the many people associated with this great sport. The hunting lands will be drained and given over to agriculture.

I hope the day never comes when my children, grandchildren, and their children will not know the throat-gripping thrill of seeing a highflying V of mallard turn to the distant call, cup their wings and, against the rosy morning sky, swing into the wind and head down for the decoys.

This body has the power to insure that that day will indeed never dawn. I urge all of my colleagues, particularly those from the 14 States of the Mississippi Flyway, to speak out for an increase in the mallard bag limit for this season. The decision is being made soon, perhaps this very week, by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I would not urge a drastic or dangerous increase but surely an increase from one to three is reasonable, would not decrease the mallard population, and would insure the revival and strengthening of an ancient, honorable, and exciting sport.

AIRLINES STRIKE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all viewed with great disappointment the inability of the air lines mechanics representatives and representatives of the air lines themselves to reach some agreement after these many weeks of strike. We are hopeful that they can indeed reach some agreement and work this out in the traditional process of collective bargaining, rather than seek the necessity and the route of additional legislation.

I believe what we are witnessing today in this prolonged strike dramatically underscores the setback in collective bargaining and stability in industries resulting from enactment of the Landrum-Griffin amendments adopted in 1959.

Nothing demonstrates the adverse impact of this amendment more than the rebuff handed the leadership of the Machinists Union by the rank-and-file membership when it rejected the settlement recommended by President Johnson and described by Machinist President Siemiller as the best contract negotiated in recent years.

Rejection of this settlement by the rank and file demonstrates again a trend of an ever-increasing number of rejections of collective bargaining agreements recommended by the leadership and subsequently turned down by the membership. This trend demonstrates what many of us said in 1959 when the Landrum-Griffin bill was being debated in this Chamber. We said then that while we respected efforts for so-called greater democracy in unions, and while we supported that concept, we cautioned at the time that it would mean a diminution of leadership in many of the unions and a lack of understanding by the membership as to what the leadership has carved out through the process of collective bargaining. I think the election held in the current dispute demonstrates this point very well. Representatives of the Machinists Union had spent many days and many weeks in negotiations with the carriers at the bargaining table.

They had vast information made available to them on the various aspects of this dispute. They had books, records, studies, and surveys. They had reports from the Department of Labor. They had reports from the Civil Aeronautics Board. Then after a great deal of discussion and careful study of all the facts, responsible leadership, meeting with the President of the United States and representatives of the carriers, carved out what they thought was the best agreement they could under the circumstances and one which would not adversely affect the price structure of the carriers. The agreement and the full details on which that agreement was based were never really transmitted to the rank and file membership of the Machinists Union because there was no time. The time lag between the time that the rank and file membership voted on the proposal and the time that it was hammered out at the special White House conference was indeed very short. So the rank and file membership did not have time to familiarize itself with all of the facts involved in this dispute. It is perhaps understandable why the rank and file membership rejected the offer recommended by their leadership, but as I said a moment ago, it does illustrate the growing difficulty in collective bargaining under many of the restrictions imposed by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

In its fifth annual report, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (1962) emphasizes that one of the disturbing factors in contract negotiations "was the increasing number of rejections by union memberships of tentative agreements arrived by their negotiating committees." It further points out that this condition results in "uncertainty and instability in negotiations which are detrimental to the process of collective bargaining."

I would recommend to the chairman of my committee, the House Committee on Education and Labor, that an appropriate subcommittee look into this whole question of amendments to the Landrum-Griffin bill in dealing with this particular aspect. I am mindful of the fact that the airline industry does not come under the Taft-Hartley Act and that their problems are dealt with by the Railway Act, but the situation is analogous and the same.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come when we ought to take a look at the Landrum-Griffin bill and see how well are those amendments working which were indeed passed through this House as a substitute motion in an era of great emotion and passion. I well remember that the Landrum-Griffin bill had never seen a day of testimony before the committee.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was unknown to the committee until after the committee had reported out the Elliott bill. The substitute was offered the following Monday. There was not one day of public hearings, or public testimony, either from management or labor on this particular proposal which was reported to the House in a period of great passion. The Secretary of Labor was not asked for his opinion of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, today, 7 years later, perhaps, it would serve the cause of improving labor-management relations and, above all, improve collective bargaining—the process of collective bargaining—if we could instead look at this and see whether or not improvements are necessary in order to strengthen the hand of both parties at the bargaining table.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans feel that in our free economy, unless the process of collective bargaining is permitted, then we have lost the most democratic way that the working man can carve out for himself through his union representatives, a better share of the profits for his efforts; and the representatives of industry, have an opportunity to protect the interest of their investors at the bargaining table.

Mr. Speaker, no other country in the world guarantees the working man a better share of the profits under our capitalistic system than the process of give and take at the bargaining table.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the standards of collective bargaining are being eroded today.

David Previant, nationally known labor law expert, stated in his recent address, "The Impact of Landrum-Griffin on Collective Bargaining," before the New York University 16th Annual Conference on Labor:

> The broad power of investigation and its use by the government, some of which is to merely satisfy "administrative curiosity" continues to impair the image and the efficiency of labor unions.
>
> But it is as a result of the deeper and more pervasive atmosphere created and generated by the government that we find the greatest impact on collective bargaining. This is understandably so since we are dealing with institutions governed by mere mortal man with essentially the same fears, hopes, and self-interests, and subject to the same subtle but obvious psychological pressures, as in any other aspect of American life.

David Previant points out that title I of Landrum-Griffin forced union leadership to negotiate contracts on the basis of internal political considerations. He states:

> Thereafter, with the passage of Landrum-Griffin, the local union leadership itself became more acutely aware of membership reactions. While this leadership was not opposed to the concept of democracy in the affairs of labor unions, it recognized the encouragement implicit in the so-called "Bill of Rights" to the growth of dissident groups, and the overt invitation to attacks upon incumbent leadership. It had its choice, then, of overcompensating with extreme militancy in order to maintain its official position, or to permit the fullest exercise of the concept of "town-hall" democracy by letting the membership make all of the decisions. The leadership which adopted the negative policy merely submitted contracts to the members without, or with only faint, recommendation. Thus, in either case, the rejection rate increased as a direct result, I believe, of government activity and regulation of labor unions.
>
> Thus, contracts may also be rejected by irresponsibles who have been encouraged by law to become more active in, solely to satisfy some personal urge of their own. They may use opposition to the contract as a political platform. If such opposition or a two-party system is essential to trade-union democracy, then it can be a dangerous luxury for the institution of collective bargaining.

It is indeed paradoxical that today, it is the employer—the very one who advocated the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin—who is saying, "Too much union democracy in this area is dangerous; give the officers more power to accept contracts"; while union leaders say, "We will submit it to the members—it is their livelihood which is involved; they must make the decision."

David Previant concludes:

> Many trade unions feel that the immediate purpose of most of the more vigorous sponsors, as well as the demonstrable effect of the law, was to create a breach between the individual member on the one hand and his union on the other. The accomplishment of this purpose will, of course, weaken the unions. The obvious result has been the creation of mistrust and suspicion, and the instillation of fear and caution among the officers of trade unions in the handling of grievances, as well as in the negotiations of contracts.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I would like to recommend that an appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor take a look at this entire aspect and determine how we can strengthen the machinery of collective bargaining so that we will be able to avoid such strikes as we are experiencing today, a strike that has represented a most costly and fruitless struggle.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater waste of human resources, than workers who can work but who are out of work, because of a strike. This is not to say that we should deny labor the right to strike, because this is the only weapon labor has had to enforce its demands which are fair and just in a given situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, labor has to turn to the weapon of striking, because there is no other alternative to collective bargaining.

It appears to me that piecemeal legislation is not the way to deal with this problem.

I believe the time is long overdue when Congress ought to examine the purpose of collective bargaining, and take a hard look at the restrictions which we have imposed upon the leaders of labor in the collective bargaining process.

I am not surprised that there is labor unrest, because over the years we have imposed all sorts of restrictions upon this great democratic institution of collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the reasons we find this strike in existence today is because of the fact that there has been too much interference with the normal process of collective bargaining.

I believe a great disservice has been done to the employers and to the employees in the aircraft industry when 2 weeks ago voices began to be raised in the Senate to the effect that Congress ought to pass a law dealing with the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the employers decided to sit back and wait, because voices in the other Chamber began talking about legislation, and there are other voices in this country seeking to set guidelines, economic guidelines for the settlement of this matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, all of these extraneous forces that were brought into these negotiations merely prolonged this strike. I think that if both sides had been left alone they could have worked out their differences. Certainly at one point the carriers were willing to meet further demands of the union, but the carriers were somewhat frightened by the 3.2 guidelines.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress should take a whole look at the present rules and regulations governing collective bargaining, and see whether or not we cannot find a more effective way for labor and management to resolve their differences in this growing economy of ours without resorting to a strike which all of us can agree serves no purpose on either side.

I do not know of a single representative labor leader in this country who wants to strike if he can avoid it. It is clear that responsible labor leaders should have greater options to deal with a strike than the one imposed on labor now. I do hope we can get a full-scale review of the entire collective bargaining structure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Corman (at the request of Mr. King of California), for today, August 10, 1966, through August 19, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Grider (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Moeller (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 30 minutes, August 11; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Hanna (at the request of Mr. Gilligan), for 1 hour, August 16; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Pucinski, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Sikes to revise and extend his remarks and to include tables and extraneous matter in the Committee of the Whole, today, on S. 3105.

Mr. Don H. Clausen in the body of the Record immediately following his remarks in the debate on the bill S. 3105, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Hall to revise and extend his remarks made on S. 3105, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Mathias

Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Pelly.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gilligan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Schmidhauser.

Mr. Burke.

Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. McVicker.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 553. An act to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes, p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 11, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2626. Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report by the task force on Federal flood control policy (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2627. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of charges to defense contracts for use of company operated and chartered aircraft, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2628. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through improved controls over per diem payments to military personnel, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2629. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a claim paid during fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 78 Stat. 767; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2630. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid during fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2732 and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2631. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on positions established as of June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 75 Stat. 785, 791; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2632. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available by canceling hazard insurance policies on properties acquired upon default of housing loans, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2633. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity to reduce costs of providing protection from heat and cold on shipments of certain perishable commodities, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2634. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of certain active duty retirement benefits for Army and Air Force Reserve officers, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2635. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of financial administration of selected grants for health services made to State of Illinois, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2636. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to improve contracting procedures for employment of appraisers to value Indian lands, Department of Justice, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2637. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the utilization and disposition of excess beds and related bedding, Department of Defense, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act, 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 964. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13290, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for highway safety research and development, certain highway safety programs, a national driver register, and a highway accident research and test facility (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 965. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13228, a bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 929. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15244. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Camp Atterbury, Ind. (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 16945. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in health education and to provide for training institutes for personnel engaged in health education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16946. A bill to amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act so as to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under that section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 16947. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16948. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 16949. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 16950. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 16951. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 16952. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 16953. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies and shareholders in such companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 16955. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction on disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 16956. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 16957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 16958. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community and vocational college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16959. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 6 to 2 months the time for which a disabled individual must wait to receive disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 16960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 16961. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 16962. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 16963. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in health education and to provide for training institutes for personnel engaged in health education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16964. A bill to amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act so as to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under that section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 16965. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 16966. A bill for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 16967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of certain education expenses incurred by teachers and other employed or self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16968. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with the construction of a city hall in Allentown, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward federally assisted urban renewal projects in Allentown; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16969. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 16970. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in health education and to provide for training institutes for personnel engaged in health education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16971. A bill to amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act so as to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under this section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 16972. A bill to provide that certain expenditures made by the city of Twin Falls, Idaho, shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 16973. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 16974. A bill to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Sangamon River near Decatur, Ill., as the Henry Bolz Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16975. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 1266. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 1267. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Con. Res. 975. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. Res. 966. Resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the Committee on Public Works entitled "Relationship of Toll Facilities to the Federal Aid Highway Program"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 16976. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16977. A bill for the relief of Eugene G. Peterson, Harry E. Byers, and Russell W. Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16978. A bill for the relief of Cheramukhathu John Paul and wife, Mary Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 16979. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ben Elfline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 16980. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Khabbaza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16981. A bill for the relief of Modestino Caiazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 16982. A bill for the relief of Othon Da Rocha Rebelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 16983. A bill for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1966

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 9, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Facing today and the days ahead, problems which tax all the resources of Thy public servants in this historic Chamber, give them, we beseech Thee, the untroubled calm and confidence which illumines faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. And in the broad battlefield where truth and falsehood are locked in mortal combat, bar our own hearts to all cynicism and hatred; and as we fight the good fight, may our strength be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure.

We ask it in the ever-blessed name of the Holy One who has declared, *Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.* Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair lay down the order for today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order is that after the prayer, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the Senator from West Virginia arrives, he will be recognized, under the previous order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 14921.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the bill, I yield a minute to the Senator from New York.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make a parliamentary inquiry. When the civil rights bill of 1966, which is H.R. 14765, comes to the Senate, does the Vice President intend to have it read in its successive stages at the desk, so that Members may avail themselves of their rights under rule XIV or other rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would have the right, under the rules of the Senate, upon the receipt of the bill from the House, to lay it before the Senate and to have it read the first time.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to announce that it is my intention—I hope and pray the leadership does it; I have no desire to do it—to object to its referral to a committee after second reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will have the right to object to further proceedings on the bill after the second reading, if he is present to object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the acting minority leader, under the bill.

A PLEA FOR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in June the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held field hearings in Crescent City, Calif., on my bill (S. 2962) to create a Redwood National Park.

In his statement presented at the field hearings, Dr. Ralph W. Chaney, president of the Save-the-Redwoods League and a distinguished scientist and world-renowned friend of conservation, stated:

> More in sorrow than in anger (although that might be justified) we have to note that since the national park program on the Mill Creek watershed has crystallized, serious inroads have been made by lumbering operations within important segments of the virgin forests, particularly on the south boundary of the present Jedediah Smith State Park and along Mill Creek.

After hearing Dr. Chaney's statement, the other members of the committee and I had an opportunity to view, from helicopters, the cutting to which Dr. Chaney referred. What we saw caused us to share Dr. Chaney's sorrow. We were more than sad. We were indignant. We saw extensive new cutting in an area of virgin redwoods immediately south of the Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park and within the proposed national park area described in my bill. Detailed aerial photographs of the Del Norte County coast area, taken on July 8, 1965, and April 13, 1966, clearly show the recent cutting into the heart of our proposed Redwood National Park. Its effect would be to create an ugly corridor, a no man's land, separating the existing State park from the virgin area covered in my bill.

The Congress of the United States, as a great legislative body, by nature, acts slowly. The deliberative character of the national lawmaking procedure is being turned against the public interest by persons who forsake other timberlands under their control, and send their saws and axes into the virgin area precisely where we seek to establish a national park.

Dr. Chaney pointed out at the hearings in Crescent City:

> From our own observations and from their own statements, we understand that the Rellim Co. owns some 2,000 acres of first growth Redwoods outside the park boundaries. They inform us that their present rate of cutting is approximately 300 acres of first growth per year. On this basis they would have available a supply of Redwood stumpage for 6 to 7 years, which should give ample time to work out the establishment of the Redwood National Park.

Later, during the hearings, I put a question to Mr. Harold Miller, president of Miller-Rellim Redwood Co.—I observe that "Rellim" is "Miller" spelled backward—which resulted in the following exchange:

> Senator KUCHEL. Would it not be better, Mr. Miller, in the future, for us to agree that, while legislation is under discussion in the

Congress, precautions be taken that the area contemplated to be used as a park be left alone to the greatest extent economically feasible?

Mr. MILLER. It would certainly not be feasible. You just cannot move your operation around that way.

In earlier times, before the harvest of redwoods began, there were approximately 2 million acres of coast redwoods in California. Less than 20 percent of the original virgin forest now remains. Less than 3 percent of the original virgin redwood forest is in parks today.

No one is more conscious than I of the constitutionally protected rights of the owners of private property. The right to hold and dispose of private property is basic to our way of life. But should not every citizen, property owner or not, consider his obligation to society as a whole?

The bill I sponsor is supported by the President, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of California, and many conservation-minded Senators and Congressmen and citizens. The Save-the-Redwoods League urges its adoption. But, as the wheels of the legislative machine slowly turn, the private owners of this priceless natural resource have, it seems to me, a responsibility to their fellow citizens, a moral obligation far transcending the normal legal rights and obligations of landowners. They have, I think, an obligation to respect the efforts of the people's representatives to preserve these giants. Theirs is a responsibility to stop slashing down these ancient trees, hellbent on their almost complete obliteration.

Some of these redwoods have taken 2,000 years to grow to their present grandeur. Those who would sever them from the earth are not answerable to Congress or the courts. They are, however, answerable to the people of this country, and to posterity. These giant trees belong to the ages.

On July 13, 1966, I wrote Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. again urging it to announce "a suspension of cutting in vital areas of virgin redwoods within the proposed park boundaries until Congress had had time to act on this legislation." Mr. President, I ask that my July 13 letter to Miller-Rellim be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Nearly a month has passed and no responsive answer or announcement has been heard. I have received one letter from Mr. Miller's secretary and one from his attorney, but none from the man in whose hands the fate of the Redwood National Park lies. Mr. President, I ask that the letters which I have received from Mr. Miller's secretary and his attorney be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. KUCHEL. The sum of the responses from Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. is delay. And as the private owner stalls off my efforts to achieve a suspension of cutting within the proposed park boundaries, what is happening on the land? What is happening, Mr. President, is that Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. has slammed the gates to its property shut in order to keep the Congress from knowing how much and how fast it is cutting. I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter which Mr. Darrell H. Schroeder, vice president of Miller-Rellim Redwood Co., wrote to the National Park Service on July 26, 1966, denying the Park Service access to the Miller property so that the Park Service might be prevented from presenting the true facts at coming hearings on the legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is a fight for the people. It is a fight to preserve as a national park a plot of ground on which still stand these living giants. It is a fight against the spoliation of whole mountains, against the marauding devastation of virgin forests. It is a fight in which the people of my State and our country ought to enlist, to protect and to preserve a little, a precious little, ground on which the mighty redwoods grow.

When I add up what I have seen firsthand in visiting the Miller-Rellim property, what I have seen in aerial photographs, what I have heard from administration officials, what I have heard from respected conservationists, plus Miller-Rellim's failure satisfactorily to respond to my repeated request, I am compelled to conclude that the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. is pursuing a program designed to destroy the park value of this portion of its timberlands by cutting out its heart.

I again urge Miller-Rellim voluntarily to suspend cutting in vital areas of virgin redwoods within the proposed park boundaries until Congress has had time to act on this legislation. I ask the company to do so in a spirit of cooperation and with an awareness of the responsibilities imposed upon it as trustee of a great vanishing natural resource.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
July 13, 1966.

Mr. HAROLD A. MILLER,
President, Miller-Rellim Redwood Co.,
P.O. Box 356,
Crescent City, Calif.

DEAR MR. MILLER: During the recent Redwood National Park field hearings held by the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Crescent City, California, it was disclosed that in recent months your company has been moving its cutting operations into virgin stands of redwoods on your property south of the boundary of Jedediah Smith State Park.

Since you own substantial redwood acreage outside the proposed park boundaries, I asked you, during the hearings:

"Would it not be better, Mr. Miller, in the future for us to agree that, while this legislation is under discussion in the Congress, precautions be taken that the area contemplated to be used as a park be left alone to the greatest extent economically feasible?"

Your reply was:

"It would certainly not be feasible. You just cannot move your operation around that way."

No one is more conscious than I of the constitutionally protected rights of the owners of private property. The right to hold and dispose of private property is basic to our way of life.

The few remaining old growth redwoods represent a priceless, irreplaceable part of our American heritage. As the wheels of the legislative machine slowly turn and as legislation to create a Redwood National Park is pending in Congress, I believe that you, as the owner of properties which include this natural resource have a responsibility to our fellow citizens, a moral obligation, which far transcends the normal legal rights and obligations of land-holding. I believe that you have an obligation to respect the efforts of your fellow citizens to preserve some of these giants, and not to frustrate those efforts or render them meaningless. Yours is responsibility to refrain from felling these ancient trees at the very time some of us in Washington are attempting to save them.

I again urge you to publicly announce, in a spirit of cooperation and with an awareness of the responsibilities imposed upon you as trustees of this disappearing natural resource, a suspension of cutting in vital areas of virgin redwoods within the proposed park boundaries until Congress has had time to act on this legislation.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 2

MILLER REDWOOD CO.,
Crescent City, Calif., July 18, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In Mr. Miller's absence, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12th. While a photocopy of your letter has been forwarded to Mr. Miller, it is unlikely that he will have an opportunity to reply until after his return to this office on August 3rd.

Very truly yours,
VELMA JEREMIAH
Mrs. Velma Jeremiah,
Secretary to Mr. Harold A. Miller.

RAGAN & MASON,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On July 13, 1966, you wrote to Mr. Harold Miller, President of Stimson Lumber Company. For your ready reference, a copy of your letter is attached hereto.

In your letter you asked Mr. Miller to publicly announce, with the awareness of his responsibilities that he is suspending cutting in a "vital area of virgin Redwoods."

Mr. Miller and I have discussed your letter and it was agreed that I would respond as outlined below. However, I have recently been ill and consequently have not had the opportunity of responding to your letter until today.

Before responding in substance, I must refer to the record of the hearings at which time your point was also raised, and at which time I pointed out that over fifty members of Congress have supported legislation to impose the park elsewhere. I think you must agree that the predominance of support for a Redwood National Park is not on the *locus* of the Administration's proposal. As was pointed out in the hearings, the park proposal has been pending for a number of years and the predominant support for a park is not in the area affecting the Miller land.

We therefore respectfully request that you advise as to whether or not similar letters were sent to other companies that are involved in cutting adjacent to the other and more heavily supported park proposal.

I would also like to call your attention—and again not as a response in kind to your subject letter—to an article in the New York Times of July 31, 1966, a copy of which is enclosed. This article points out that the Federal Government is, of itself, harvesting millions of board feet a year from virgin Redwood timber supplies. Has the Department of Agriculture been requested to cease cutting until the issue is resolved?

Because of your keen and sincere interest in the park site for the people of your constituency perhaps, before our responding in kind to your letter it might be well if we had an opportunity for a discussion.

Very truly yours,

RAGAN & MASON,
WILLIAM F. RAGAN.

Enclosures.

cc: The Honorable ALAN BIBLE, HENRY M. JACKSON, B. EVERETT JORDAN, FRANK E. MOSS.

EXHIBIT 3

JULY 26, 1966.

Mr. ROBERT S. LUNTEY,
Assistant Chief, Office of Resource Planning, San Francisco Planning and Service Center, National Park Service, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. LUNTEY: This will respond to your letter requesting permission to take certain photographs of our property for purposes of showing them to the Senate Sub-Committee concerned with the proposed national park.

Please be advised that we have conferred with our Counsel in Washington, and we hereby deny your request. As you should be aware five members of the Sub-Committee, including the Chairman of the full committee, were recently in Crescent City and personally visited our lands. In addition to that the same group flew over the entire territory by helicopter. Accompanying the senators were representatives of the Park Service. As we are aware, many factors concerning this proposed park have been distorted and photographs similarly can cause an erroneous impression.

We consequently see no reason why in such a short space of time the expense of photographs to make expensive montages to impress the committee is necessary. Consequently, this request is denied.

Very truly yours,

RELLIM REDWOOD CO.,
DARRELL H. SCHROEDER,
Vice President.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 9, 1966, was approved.

THE GROWING PROBLEM OF CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, today this Nation is faced with a tremendous problem in a word which is appearing—unfortunately—each day in headlines of our newspapers—and that word is "crime." We live in an era of increasing crime and violence. Two mass murders have occurred in less than 3 weeks—in Indiana on July 14, and on August 1 in Texas—and a total of 24 persons died.

At this very moment somewhere in our country citizens are being murdered, assaulted, raped, and robbed. Though completely innocent themselves, they may bear for the remainder of their lives the scars given them by hoodlums and desperadoes. The time has come for every American to be concerned.

When we mention crime, we should not visualize merely a stolen car, a burglarized filling station, or a victim of assault. These are the evidences of crime—but in our complicated world of today crime has a much more far-reaching complex status than the common conception of murder or theft. There are, of course, the so-called aboveground crimes; namely, murder, assault, and theft. But, today, crime also abounds underground—in gambling, corruption, malfeasance in office, and is often known as organized crime. Crime also relates to probation and parole statutes, to law-enforcement agencies, to sex offenders, to the failure of citizens to understand their responsibilities in society.

Today I want to take sufficient time to discuss some aspects of the crime problem.

NATIONAL CRIME PICTURE

The waves of lawlessness are beating strongly against the shorelines of our national life. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, 2,780,000 serious crimes were reported during 1965, representing a 6-percent increase over the previous year. Of course, the total number of criminal acts that occur is unknown because many crimes never come to the attention of the police. This is an appalling tragedy.

Since 1958, crime has increased six times faster than our population growth. No aspect of crime is today taking a holiday. Last year, crimes of violence—that is, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—climbed 6 percent as a group. Property crimes of burglary, larceny $50 and over, and automobile theft were also up 6 percent, resulting in total property stolen in excess of $1 billion.

In 1965, a serious crime was committed every 12 seconds, with a burglary occurring every 27 seconds, an auto theft every 60 seconds, a robbery every 4½ minutes, a forcible rape every 23 minutes, and a murder every 53 minutes.

Crime showed no favoritism to any area of this Nation. Geographically, all regions registered increases, led by the Western States with a 10-percent rise, followed by the Northeastern States, up 8 percent, and the North Central and Southern States, up 4 percent.

Most of us would probably surmise that crime is increasing in large cities of at least 250,000 in population. This assumption is indeed correct, with crime reflecting a 4-percent jump.

But the rapidly expanding suburban areas around our big urban centers reflected an 8-percent jump—twice that of cities. This is the area where allegedly law-abiding, well-behaved, intelligent people live—yet in these areas we find lawlessness growing with fantastic speed. However, the FBI reports show that many of the offenders in suburbia are nonresidents. For example, in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, 31 percent of all persons taken into custody were nonresidents of the communities in which they were arrested.

The rural areas showed a 3-percent jump. My own State of West Virginia, a so-called poverty-stricken State, was 49th among the 50 States in the overall crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants, 49th in the number of burglaries, 50th in the number of larcenies, and 50th in the number of auto thefts.

The crime picture is today one of America's great, black spots of shame. Like a giant mushroom cloud, it puts its sooty finger on every American, regardless of where he may live.

Just why is crime on such a spree in a society which calls itself rational and intelligent? Why, last year, was murder up 6 percent, forcible rape up 9 percent, robbery up 6 percent, aggravated assault up 6 percent, burglary up 6 percent, and automobile theft up 5 percent?

The inner core of this tragedy is reflected even more in the statistics from the FBI concerning juvenile misbehavior. Last year, 63 percent of all arrests for serious crimes involved persons under 21 years of age. While the increase in the 10- to 17-year-age group population was 17 percent in the period 1960–65, police arrests of persons under 18 years of age, for serious crimes, jumped 47 percent during that period. Thus, it can be clearly observed that the percentage increase in the criminal involvement of those young persons, as measured by police arrests, is more than triple their percentage increase in the national population. However, it should be remembered that only a small percentage of the total young age population becomes involved in criminal acts—less than 5 out of 100.

Last year, persons under the age of 25 comprised 74 percent of all police arrests for serious crimes in large cities, 72 percent in rural areas, and 78 percent in the suburbs.

Male arrests for all crimes outnumbered female arrests 7 to 1; however, female arrests continued to increase more rapidly in 1965. Female arrests, overall, accounted for 13.4 percent of the total, 18 percent of the forgery, 20 percent of the fraud, 17 percent of the embezzlement, 17 percent of the criminal homicide, 4 percent of the auto theft, and 22 percent of the larceny arrests.

Nonwhites accounted for 52 percent of the arrests for forcible rape, in cities and suburbs, and 59 percent of the murders and nonnegligent manslaughters.

In 1965, the clearance, or police solution, rate nationally was 24.6 percent, virtually unchanged from 1964. Significantly, however, according to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports for 1965, there was a 5-percent decrease from the previous year in the number of adults found guilty and a sharp 13-percent increase in the number of acquittals and dismissals. Three out of every 10 murder defendants were either acquitted or their cases were dismissed at some prosecutive stage, over one-third of those charged with forcible rape were acquitted or had their cases dismissed, and over one-third of the persons charged with aggravated assault won freedom through acquittal or dismissal.

> A significant fact emerges—

States the 1965 FBI Uniform Crime Reports.

> Since 1962, acquittals and dismissals for the serious crimes, as a group, have risen 14 per cent.

The offense which had the highest percentage of acquittals and dismissals was forcible rape with 43 percent.

According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, 53 of America's finest law-enforcement officers were killed last year by the brutal assaults of criminal desperados. During the 6-year period, 1960–65, a total of 278 officers were killed by criminal actions. Records showed that, of those arrested for murdering these policemen, 76 percent had been arrested on some criminal charge prior to the time they killed the policemen, and, very significantly, over one-half of the group had been previously arrested for assaultive-type crimes such as rape, robbery, assault with a deadly weapon, and so forth. In fact, nine had been charged on some prior occasion with an offense of murder, seven of whom had been paroled on the murder charge. Sixty-eight percent of the persons responsible for the murders of the policemen had prior convictions on criminal charges, and more than two-thirds of the group had received leniency in the form of probation or parole on at least one of these convictions. More than one of every four of the murderers was on parole or probation when he killed a police officer.

The number of serious crimes is an affront to a nation which prides itself on being civilized. Murder and assault are throwbacks to the jungle, where man lived on the skill of his knife and spear. Surely, one of the characteristics of an intelligent and rational society is the opportunity of citizens to live in safety—whether in their homes, or on the streets or at their daily work.

Just who are the hard-core criminals today? Do we have any information about them?

THE HARD-CORE CRIMINAL

The FBI has undertaken a most revealing study of selected hard-core criminals. These studies indicate that our total criminal population is much smaller than total annual crime would suggest. The explanation is that our rate of criminal recidivism is high. For example, the FBI studied the criminal histories of selected murderers, bank robbers, and fugitive felons. Of the 900 persons arrested for murder at some stage in their careers, it was disclosed that they had an average of more than 6 arrests over a 9-year span. Twelve percent of these offenders had more than one murder charge on their record.

What did the FBI study show about bank robbers—always a dangerous breed of desperados? For bank robbers arrested and charged in 1963 and 1964 their average age was 31 and their average criminal career was over 10 years. During this time, they had averaged five arrests, almost one-half of them for serious crimes. More than three-quarters of these bank robbers had been arrested for other crimes prior to their arrest and charge for bank robbery. Only a small number of bank robbers—3 percent—had repeated this crime after first being arrested for bank robbery. Why this small rate of recidivism? The answer probably lies, according to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in the high conviction rate and prison terms given by the courts.

These facts indicate that the high volume of offenses in this country are being committed by a relatively small criminal population. The intensity of this criminal activity is highest in the younger age groups.

What does this mean? Simply this—more preventative action is needed in the early years to prevent these youngsters from being hard-core criminals. Moreover, we must look frankly at some of the abuses of judicial leniency.

PAROLE AND PROBATION

Although parole and probation are vitally necessary to the American judicial system, they are, unfortunately, frequently abused. The 1964 annual report of the U.S. Board of Parole pointed out that the maximum sentence imposed by the Federal courts during 1964 was 50.4 months, while the average stay in prison of all Federal prisoners was only 17.5 months. This clearly shows that Federal prisoners are serving much less than half of their intended sentences.

Has parole or probation or other forms of leniency such as the suspended sentence or the conditional release tended to rehabilitate criminals, lessen the crime rate, or stop recidivism? An FBI study of some 92,000 criminal offenders in 1963–64 showed that 76 percent were repeaters—that is, they had a prior arrest on some charge. Leniency in the form of probation, suspended sentence, parole, or conditional release had been afforded to 51 percent of the offenders. After the first leniency, this group averaged more than three new arrests. Murders, rapes, and aggravated assaults committed by those on probation all attest to the fact that there is indeed a severe lack of insight surrounding these cases.

Headlines of every major newspaper in the country reflect the daily onslaught on the American citizenry by deranged individuals who have received undeserved judicial leniency. In 1964, one of these sadists, a man who had pleaded guilty to two vicious murders in 1956 and was subsequently convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment, was set free to roam the streets again. This individual possessed nothing less than a 47-year-old criminal record. Yet, only 8 years was the penalty for his act. Less than a year later, this man was before the bar of justice again, this time for his alleged participation in a dual murder.

Another recent, tragic example of undeserved leniency involved a midwestern individual who had served 8 years in prison for the brutal slaying of two western police officers. The two policemen were cut down in the line of duty while attempting to arrest their slayer. The man was sentenced to life imprisonment and 25 years, the sentences to run concurrently. However, after only 8 years had transpired, the prison opened its doors feeling that society's debt had been paid.

I am not a man without compassion or forgiveness, but it outrages my sense of righteousness to think of this man walking free in society—a man who had cut short the lives of two officers of the law.

This is not an isolated case. Cases such as the ones I have described constantly arise. Undeserved parole and probation are open invitations to criminals, whether they be smalltime hoods, or bigtime operators, to continue their assaults against society.

Therefore, it is mandatory that a scrupulous eye be affixed to judicial leniency. Commonsense dictates that our society must be protected from people who, convicted of violent crimes, will do everything within their power to continue their nefarious way.

SEX CRIMES

Outside of murder itself, perhaps the most reprehensible crime perpetrated is that of rape. Last year, there were 22,470 forcible rapes or assaults in the United States. Above and beyond this figure many of these crimes are never reported to the police, primarily because of fear or embarrassment on the part of the victims.

For the period 1960–65, forcible rapes have increased 36 percent. These statistics can be more easily understood when we realize that in 1965, 61 such offenses occurred each day of the year—a rape every 23 minutes.

The rapist, the child molester and the "peeping tom" are basically depraved individuals. Unfortunately, sex crimes are the ones particularly susceptible to recidivism, that is, people with records of such offenses tend to commit them over and over again. Often, however, these people are placed on probation, especially if it is a first offense or they are sent to hospitals for "rehabilitation." Sadly enough, in many cases, this period of "rehabilitation" only consists of a short time after which the individual is released. A few days or weeks later he is again arrested for the same crime.

LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

American law enforcement today stands on the front line against the criminal. In 1965, according to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, the ratio of police to population in 3,613 cities with a population of 109 million represented some 1.7 officers per 1,000 population. Actually, this manpower is inadequate to perform the mounting task facing law enforcement. Today, especially in large cities, an ever greater demand is being made for placing officers on patrol duty. Often, for the sake of safety, they must go in pairs. But, as can be seen, patrol duty is an enormous drain on manpower. Too often, the chief of police does not have the men to do what he knows should be done.

In the suburbs, with a population of 40 million, which are today registering the largest increases in crime, the police employee ratio drops to 1.2 per thousand population. Actually, the average ratio of police to population has remained pretty much unchanged since 1958, despite an increase in the volume of crime, an increase in motor vehicle registrations, and a constantly rising demand for other police services.

What are the factors back of the appalling increase in the volume of crime here in America? There are, obviously, many factors such as population growth, a high rate of mobility, and so forth. However, there are two factors to which I especially wish to address my comments at this time. One of these concerns civil disobedience and demonstrations, and the other concerns recent court decisions which make more difficult the arrest, prosecution, and conviction of criminals.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Over the past 3 or 4 years our society has been subjected to a virtual wave of demonstrations. America has been afflicted by an epidemic of acts of so-called civil disobedience. Laws, whether in the form of municipal ordinances or in the form of State statutes, have been willfully and intentionally disobeyed by individuals and by groups. Private property has been subjected to deliberate trespass, and mobs have taken to the streets, interfering with commerce, creating disorder, and breaching the peace.

Wherever the so-called nonviolent movement has gone, violence has all too often accompanied it. In many instances it could have been, and was, anticipated that the highly publicized "nonviolent" demonstration or march would likely provoke violence, and it was probably hoped by some that it would do so. Violence was, in some instances, apparently the catalyst so necessary for success.

Aided and encouraged by vote-seeking politicians, by some segments of the big city press, by various church groups, and by sincere do-gooders, those who advocated, paritcipated in, and led demonstrations went on to advocate, participate in, and lead greater and larger demonstrations. From demonstration to demonstration, march to march, headline to headline—so it went. To lie down in the streets and be carted off to jail was heralded by some as an act of Christian witnessing, and a record of arrest for acts of so-called civil disobedience was considered a badge of honor for the person with such a record. To march in front of television cameras, arm in arm with demonstrators, became the craze of the times.

Civil disobedience was sometimes advocated from some of the pulpits throughout the land and was encouraged, upon occasion, by public officials whose voices joined in the refrain "we shall overcome." Sit-ins, wade-ins, and walk-ins became the order of the day. Demonstrators chained themselves one to another, to form human walls in front of business establishments. Children in schools were exhorted to absent themselves and participate in marches and demonstrations in violation of the law. Court orders were flouted by demonstration leaders. Frequently, the mobs were so large that the police were helpless to make arrests, and wrongdoers went on their merry way unchallenged. Not uncommonly, mobs converged upon jails to demand that those persons arrested for violating the laws be released to violate the laws again.

Literally hundreds of agitators, troublemakers, publicity seekers, as well as good and noble men and women crusading for what they believed to be a just cause, converged from all points of the compass upon troubled communities traveling by bus, by train, by airplane, and on foot to participate in this march or that march and then to depart as hurriedly as they had arrived. That they left behind them aroused passions, renewed hatreds, and exacerbated frictions was of little consequence. The march, after all, had gone forward to reach its goal, and had, therefore, been a success. Men and women sought to build or embellish reputations by participating in the marches or by getting themselves arrested, thus hoping to gain a little local, or even national, notoriety.

These acts of so-called civil disobedience were proclaimed time and time again by important public personages to be in the finest of American tradition, and it became rather commonplace to hear glowing references made to the Boston Tea Party as an act of civil disobedience on the part of our forebears and come to be equated with acts of civil disobedience lately being witnessed. Human rights were loudly proclaimed to be superior to property rights—among the oldest and most basic of natural and human rights—and demonstrators arrested and convicted for trespassing on private property were exculpated by the U.S. Supreme Court and their convictions voided.

It was said to be good Christian doctrine to disregard manmade laws which conflicted with one's own conscience. If one felt a particular law to be wrong, then he was to consider himself free, by a higher moral law, to disobey such a manmade law or ordinance. In other words, each individual was to become the self-determiner of those laws which he would obey and those laws which he would not obey. This was a curious and strange doctrine, indeed, in a government reputed to be a government of laws and not a government of men.

In the face of such a situation as I have described, is it any wonder that we have observed a growing disrespect for law and order? Should it come as a surprise that young people, seeing their parents and activist members of the clergy engaging in demonstrations and acts of civil disobedience, would come to believe laws are made to be broken rather than kept? Is it any wonder that young people came to look upon an arrest record as a matter of little or no concern? And, if it was excusable—or even popular—to disobey a municipal ordinance or to become involved in a minor infraction of the law, need one draw the line, and, if so, where?

If one law could be flouted with impunity, why could other laws not be similarly disregarded? If one could cavalierly disobey a municipal ordinance, why not disobey a State statute? If one could commit a misdemeanor and go unpunished, why not a felony? If it was the accepted norm for one's parent to break the law and heap abuses upon policemen, why was it not equally acceptable for the student to be disrespectful toward his teacher? In such an atmosphere of permissiveness, civil disobedience, and disrespect for civil law, the seeds of crime took deeper root, and the Nation is now reaping the harvest.

HANDCUFFS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

During recent years many court decisions have been rendered in the general field of civil liberties which affect the day-to-day work of law enforcement. From a society in which some constitutional rights were often ignored or overlooked, we have now become a society in which no constitutional right of any person is too unimportant for the courts and public opinion to scrutinize.

As a result, a number of court decisions have strengthened the rights of the individual and restricted the power of the police. No American, in any way, wants to see any abrogation of civil liberties or abuse of constitutional privileges. Yet, there is conclusive evidence that some judges, in their decisions, are today unnecessarily fettering law enforcement; that is, putting unrealistic handcuffs on the police.

Take, for example, a Chicago judge's decision in March 1965, which acquitted two defendants in a case in which two plainclothes police officers were attacked in a street assault. One of the officers was so severely gashed, he spent 23 days in the hospital, where 28 stitches were required to close his wound. One of the assailants had a broken beer bottle and the officers, after identifying themselves, drew their pistols and ordered the man to drop the bottle, which he refused to do.

In releasing the two men, the judge said:

> The right to resist unlawful arrest is a phase of self-defense. What is a citizen to do when he is approached by two officers with a gun?

Seldom has a more unrealistic judicial decision been rendered. Here was a case of a defendant who had used a broken beer bottle to attack officers who had properly identified themselves and who had drawn their weapons in justifiable circumstances. Yet, the arresting officers were criticized.

Never must we forget, Mr. President, that the citizens of the community also have rights. Where the balance is weighted too heavily in favor of the criminal, giving him every break and putting cuffs unnecessarily on the police, the cause of good society is not promoted.

On June 13, the U.S. Supreme Court hung yet another anchor around the necks of this Nation's police officers.

The 61-page decision, written by Chief Justice Warren and the concurrence of Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan, came as no particular surprise. It is in keeping with the trend of decisions which these men have handed down for years—decisions which hamper effective law enforcement, elevate individual rights out of perspective, and regulate the overall rights of society to a secondary position.

But there are many who were surprised to see Justice Fortas joining these four to form a majority and thus enable the Supreme Court to once again impede law enforcement. It was, after all, only last year that Justice Fortas testifying before the Judiciary Committee of this body which was considering confirmation of his appointment to the Supreme Court, declared that he believed the "adequate opportunity" for police interrogation of persons accused or suspected of a crime is absolutely essential to law enforcement.

In the words of an editorial from the June 15, 1966, issue of the Washington Evening Star, under the decision which Justice Fortas helped to make effective, "opportunity for police interrogation becomes, not adequate, but virtually impossible. Law enforcement, and especially the public, will suffer accordingly," the newspaper declared.

This landmark decision—and indeed it must be so characterized since it introduces an entirely new concept into police operations—interposes for the first time the full impact of the fifth amendment protection against self-incrimination on the police-suspect relationship.

The Court said:

> We hold "that when an individual is taken into custody or otherwise deprived of his freedom by the authorities and is subjected to questioning, the privilege against self-incrimination is jeopardized. Procedural safeguards must be employed to protect the privilege. . . .

Here are the safeguards demanded by the five men—the rules which they have imposed on all the police officers of this land:

> He (the suspect) must be warned prior to any questioning that he has the right to remain silent, that anything he says can be used against him in a court of law, that he has the right to the presence of an attorney, and that if he cannot afford an attorney one will be appointed for him prior to any questioning if he so desires. Opportunity to exercise these rights must be afforded to him throughout the interrogation. After such warnings have been given, and such opportunity afforded him, the individual may knowingly and intelligently waive these rights and agree to answer questions or make a statement. But unless and until such warnings and waiver are demonstrated by the prosecution at trial, no evidence obtained as a result of interrogation can be used against him.

The Honorable J. Edward Lumbard, chief judge of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, in September 1963, wrote in the American Bar Association Journal that there have been two distinct trends in the criminal law during the last 40 years—"to strengthen the rights of the individual and to restrict the powers of the police."

In April 1964, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, noted editor and newspaper columnist, summed up the feelings of many in a column he called "Weeping for the Innocent" with these words:

> It is time that decent Americans begin to yell bloody murder. The robbers have been chasing the cops long enough. Let's turn the race around. Let's recognize that honest people have some rights, too, and that among these rights is the protection afforded by making it dangerous to rob, loot, maim or murder them.

Well, a lot of decent Americans have been yelling bloody murder, but their shouts have gone unheeded by a Supreme Court which seems to hear only the sentimental and illogical gush of the small minority intent on elevating the rights of the individual above the rights of society. So, the scales of justice, which should be maintained at a delicate balance, have gradually but steadily been tipped in favor of the lawless.

Chief Justice Warren went to great lengths in his 61-page decision to belittle the impact which his "safeguards" will have on law enforcement. Blandly he asserted:

> The limits we have placed on the interrogation process should not constitute an undue interference with a proper system of law enforcement . . . our decision does not in any way preclude police from carrying out their traditional investigatory functions.

Yet, Mr. President, police interrogation of suspects long has been a traditional investigatory function, and the Court-imposed "safeguards" certainly will preclude police from carrying it out.

The Chief Justice cited the "exemplary record of effective law enforcement" on the part of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which through the years has advised suspects:

> At the outset of an interview, that he is not required to make a statement, that any statement may be used against him in court, that the individual may obtain the services of an attorney of his own choice and, more recently, that he has a right to free counsel if he is unable to pay.

He devoted four pages in his decision to outlining the FBI's procedures.

But is there justification for the Chief Justice's assertion that "the practice of the FBI can readily be emulated by State and local enforcement agencies"? He dismissed the argument that the FBI deals with different crimes from those dealt with by State authorities as not mitigating the significance of the FBI experience.

Justice John Harlan, in his dissent, rightly noted:

> In spite of the Court's obiter dictum . . . there is some basis for believing that the staple of FBI criminal work differs importantly from much crime within the ken of local police.

Then in a classic understatement, Justice Harlan declared:

> The skill and resources of the FBI may also be unusual.

Justice Harlan also pointed out that FBI agents in the past have not been encumbered by the now-required affirmative "waiver" before they could ask questions, nor were they previously prevented from attempting to prevail upon a suspect, who has said he did not want to talk, to change his mind.

To date, I have noted no comment by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover concerning the most recent Supreme Court decision which further complicates the work of the profession to which he has dedicated his life. But one can gain some insight into his feelings from the following passage from a statement he made in 1960:

> We are faced today with one of the most disturbing trends that I have witnessed in my years of law enforcement—an overzealous pity for the criminal and an equivalent disregard for his victim.

The Chief Justice also devoted considerable space to an attempt to show that the British have not suffered from similar safeguards in effect since 1912. Justice Harlan pointed out several significant differences in our newly formed rule of police interrogation and the British judges' rules.

That many British subjects are less than satisfied with their form of criminal justice also is quite evident. An article published in March 1965, in the American Bar Association Journal by Lord Hartley Shawcross, noted British lawyer, is a good example. He wrote that crime in Britain pays because "more and more people get away with it." He declared:

> We cling to a sentimental and sporting attitude in dealing with the criminal. We put illusory fears about the impairment of liberty before the promotion of justice. How are our liberties protected by making criminals and suspects a privileged class? The activities of the criminals are a far more serious invasion of our privacy and our liberties than those of the police.

This eminent British lawyer, with years of experience under the judges' rules, has learned his lesson the hard way. He has seen the folly of subordinating the rights of society to the rights of the individual in criminal matters. Thanks to our Chief Justice and his four associates, we must now experience this same folly.

The Chief Justice and his four concurring Associate Justices were not satisfied on June 13 with merely imposing new and severe restrictions on law enforcement. They also took the occasion to malign law enforcement through direct accusation and innuendo in a seemingly gratuitous manner. The Chief Justice quoted numerous excerpts from what he referred to as police manuals and texts to show the sinister trickery police are instructed to use in an effort to induce a confession.

But, as Justice Tom Clark pointed out in his dissent, not one of the so-called police manuals "is shown by the record here to be the official manual of any police department, much less in universal use in crime detection." The manuals quoted, said Justice Clark, are "merely writings in this field by professors and some police officers." Justice Clark also declared:

> The police agencies—all the way from municipal and state forces to the federal bureaus—are responsible for law enforcement and public safety in this country. I am proud of their efforts, which in my view are not fairly characterized by the Court's opinion.

To which I say, "Amen."

One of the greatest achievements of American law enforcement has been in preserving, nurturing, and strengthening the proper relationship of the individual to the state.

This Nation emerged on the basic principle that the individual must be protected from the tyranny of the state.

Law enforcement has assumed a frontline role in fighting to preserve and strengthen the integrity of free government, the dignity of man, the supremacy of law over force—the basic freedoms we hold priceless. The continuing challenge is to define and preserve the proper balance between the rights of the individual and those of society.

This challenge was being met in true democratic fashion. Justice Harlan pointed out in his dissent that there now is a massive reexamination of criminal law enforcement procedures on a scale never before witnessed. Involved in this vital project is a special committee of the American Bar Association, a study group of the American Law Institute, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, and Administration of Justice, and several other groups equipped to do practical research. Some of the best minds in all fields affected by and relating to law enforcement are involved in this undertaking.

As Justice Harlan asserted, great concern has been expressed that the long-range and lasting reforms being formulated by these careful studies may be frustrated by the Court's too rapid departure from existing constitutional standards. Justice Harlan continued:

> Despite the Court's disclaimer, the practical effect of the decision * * * must inevitably be to handicap seriously sound efforts at reform, not least by removing options necessary to a just compromise of competing interests. Of course, legislative reform is rarely speedy or unanimous, though this Court has been more patient in the past. But the legislative reforms when they came would have the vast advantage of empirical data and comprehensive study, they would allow experimentation and use of solutions not open to the courts, and they would restore the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs.

Let me underscore the last part of Justice Harlan's comment—the restoration of the initiative in criminal law reform to those forums where it truly belongs. One wonders if the Chief Justice and his associates have not become intoxicated by their recent forays into the field of legislation. Could it be that they viewed the various studies as a threat to their newly asserted power to legislate criminal law rather than rule upon it?

The Chief Justice and his four concurring Associate Justices "encourage Congress and the States to continue their laudable search for increasingly effective ways of protecting the rights of the individual while promoting efficient enforcement of our criminal laws." But they warn at the same time that any congressional or State action must go at least as far as the rules promulgated by the Court.

Justice Byron White in his dissent declared:

> The most basic function of any government is to provide for the security of the individual and of his property. These ends of society are served by the criminal laws which for the most part are aimed at the prevention of crime. Without the reasonably effective performance of the task of preventing private violence and retaliation, it is idle to talk about human dignity and civilized values.

My research indicates that the majority of Americans feel the Court has interpreted the Constitution as a charter of freedom for those who have chosen to ignore the Constitution and all our laws, who have chosen to defy law and order with their every deed, who have chosen to demand and expect every right for themselves while denying any rights to others.

Insuring maximum safety for the innocent sometimes works to provide protection for the criminal. Perhaps that is an unavoidable side effect, but our system of justice should exist not just to exonerate the wrongly accused but also to convict and punish the guilty. Clearing the innocent and convicting the guilty both are important methods for providing protection to the many millions of members of society who think the criminal is a greater threat to their well-being than is the police officer.

Many of our forefathers came from countries where this was not necessarily true. The State and its police were a greater threat to them and their property than the few criminals around. For this reason our Founding Fathers insisted on certain protections against police invasion of privacy and violation of rights. Thank God for them. But let us not interpret them out of all proportion—let us not so impede the work of our law enforcement agencies that they cannot provide the protection we want and need.

Always we hear the cry raised by the proponents of individual rights that we are in danger of a police state. But when the Constitution and Bill of Rights were enacted in the 18th century and interpreted with a much narrower view, we did not have a police state. We did not have a police state 100 years ago, 10 years ago, nor even the day before the Supreme Court made its landmark decision. Nor were we in danger of having one.

This Nation is in the midst of a war on crime—a war which must be won if we are to remain a free people with any rights either for society or the individual. The gravity of the situation can be seen in the fact that crime over the years since 1958 has increased six times faster than our national population growth.

We need all our resources in the fight against crime. We need especially the full services of our law enforcement agencies. These we cannot have now because five men on the Supreme Court have chosen to once again place a hindrance, a needless hindrance, in the path of law enforcement.

No thinking person can contest that the "safeguards" will impede effective law enforcement.

Listen to the words of Justice White's strong dissent:

> The rule . . . will measurably weaken the ability of the criminal law. . . . It is a deliberate calculus to prevent interrogations, to reduce the incidence of confessions and pleas of guilty and to increase the number of trials. . . . There is, in my view, every reason to believe that a good many criminal defendants, who otherwise would have been convicted on what this Court has previously thought to be the most satisfactory kind of evidence, will now, under this new version of the Fifth Amendment, either not be tried at all or acquitted if the State's evidence, minus the confession, is put to the test of litigation. I have no desire whatsoever to share the responsibility for any such impact on the present criminal process.
>
> In some unknown number of cases the Court's rule will return a killer, a rapist or other criminal to the streets and to the environment which produced him, to repeat his crime whenever it pleases him. As a consequence, there will not be a gain, but a loss, in human dignity. The real concern is not the unfortunate consequences of this new decision on the criminal law as an abstract, disembodied series of authoritative proscriptions, but the impact on those who rely on the public authority for protection and who without it can only engage in violent self-help with guns, knives and the help of their neighbors similarly inclined.

And then Justice White made what is perhaps the most pathetic statement contained in the entire 61 pages of the Court's decision and the 49 pages of dissent. He said:

> There is, of course, a saving factor: the next victims are uncertain, unnamed and unrepresented in this case.

Was this not another way of saying that the Court once again was playing Russian roulette with countless Americans who think they have a right to protection from all types of criminals?

One of the cases decided by the Supreme Court in handing down its 5-to-4 decision gives good insight into what impact the new "safeguards" may have on the war against crime. I refer to the case of Ernesto A. Miranda against State of Arizona.

Miranda was arrested 10 days after an 18-year-old girl was kidnaped and forcibly raped near Phoenix, Ariz. Taken to the police station, he was picked out of a lineup by the victim. He then was taken into another room and questioned by two officers. At first he denied his guilt, but after a short time he confessed and provided both a detailed oral and written statement, all of which was completed in less than 2 hours. There was no contention that any force, threats, or promises had been used. The statement he signed contained the wording that the confession was voluntary and made "with full knowledge of my legal rights, understanding any statement I make may be used against me."

The Chief Justice and his four concurring Associate Justices reversed the conviction since Miranda had not been advised of his right to consult with an attorney and since his right not to be compelled to incriminate himself was not effectively protected.

Concerning the decision, Justice Harlan had this to say in dissent:

> One is entitled to feel astonished that the Constitution can be read to produce this result. These confessions were obtained during brief daytime questioning conducted by two officers and unmarked by any of the traditional indicia of coercion. They assured a conviction for a brutal and unsettling crime, for which the police had and quite possibly could obtain little evidence other than the victim's identification, evidence which is frequently unreliable. There was, in sum, a legitimate purpose, no perceptible unfairness, and certainly little risk of injustice in the interrogation. Yet the resulting confessions, and the responsible course of police practice they represent, are to be sacrificed to the Court's own finespun conception of fairness which I seriously doubt is shared by many thinking citizens in this country.

There is another fact which we must now recognize and soon face as a result of the five men's new safeguards. The safeguards are certain to necessitate much greater expenditures of tax moneys at the Federal, State, and local levels in the fight against crime.

First of all there must be funds to pay the "stationhouse lawyers" requested by suspects—criminals who failed to steal enough to be able to afford their own attorney or who squandered what they took before they were arrested. But then this cost can hardly be charged to the war against crime, for these lawyers will not be at the police station to assist in the search for truth—they will be there to help the suspect beat the rap. As Justice White pointed out in his dissent:

> The Court all but admonishes the lawyer to advise the accused to remain silent. . . .

It would almost seem that the Chief Justice and his four concurring Associate Justices feel that a suspect is not capable of exercising his personal right against self-incrimination—he must have an attorney to do it for him. Justice White commented on this point:

> Instead of confining itself to protection of the right against compelled self-incrimination the Court has created a limited Fifth Amendment right to counsel—or, as the Court expresses it, a "right to counsel to protect the Fifth Amendment privilege. . . ." The focus then is not on the will of the accused but on the will of counsel and how much influence he can have on the accused. Obviously, there is no warrant in the Fifth Amendment for this installing counsel as the arbiter of the privilege.

Another obvious expense which will result from the safeguards will stem from the need for more and better law enforcement officers. To get them is going to require better pay than is now being provided our police in many areas. And they are going to have to be provided better and more extensive training to enable them to cope with all the redtape imposed on them by the Chief Justice and his four concurring Associate Justices.

On June 16, I sent a telegram to Police Chief John B. Layton, Washington Metropolitan Police Department, asking him to comment on the effect which the U.S. Supreme Court ruling would have on law enforcement in the District of Columbia. He answered as follows:

> The effect of this ruling, as I see it, will be to further reduce the opportunity for obtaining an admissible confession or admission after an arrest of a defendant has been effected or his freedom of movement curtailed by the police. This decision moves the protection against self-incrimination of an individual back to an earlier time than we have previously understood it. That is the privilege against self-incrimination and right to counsel is invoked not just at the trial stage, but as soon as the defendant is taken in custody, that is at the earliest stage of custody procedures.
>
> It would appear, therefore, that the only statements or admissions that would be admissible under this opinion would be those made outside of a custody situation or those where it can be clearly shown that the defendant made, not only, a voluntary but a "knowing" and "intelligent" waiver of his right to counsel.

In the same telegram, I asked Chief Layton if the ruling would make more difficult the work of the Police Department and, if so, why. He answered thusly:

> In my judgment, the enforcement efforts of the Police Department will be made considerably more difficult. Many criminal acts are perpetrated in a manner calculated by the offender to prevent later identification. Without fairly conclusive evidence, identifying a particular offender with an offense, the questioning process, using whatever evidence had been developed to substantiate the probable cause requirement for arrest, has been an important procedure in developing additional evidence in the nature of admissions or confessions or statements, intended to be exculpatory which through investigation, might be broken down and ultimately substantiate the defendant's guilt.
>
> Of necessity, more reliance will have to be placed on other individuals who may be witnesses to some aspects of an offense and it is remembered in this connection that many citizens already are reluctant to become involved as witnesses in Court cases. It is generally recognized that an Attorney's advice to a criminal defendant, originally, will be not to talk to the police. A defendant who would make admissions of a criminal offense in the face of such a warning, would be under strong personal compulsion to speak out. It would also seem natural that the criminal element in our society would become even more arrogant in any contact they will have with the police.

In answer to my question as to whether the ruling would "just about eliminate the use of confessions," Chief Layton answered by saying:

> The answer is yes. There would be very little opportunity, as I see it, to obtain a confession which would be ruled admissible under this Supreme Court opinion, especially if given after arrest.

I asked Chief Layton whether or not, as a result of the ruling, he foresaw an accelerated increase in crime in the Nation's Capital, to which question he responded in the following manner:

> I would not predict an accelerated increase, but I would not be surprised to observe some increase in crime. Those defendants charged with crime and particularly the recidivist will be aware that he is afforded advice of counsel at an earlier stage than has been true prior to this opinion. And the scales are now balanced somewhat more in his favor.
>
> While there are many factors causing crime, I can't help but note that the crime rate has been continuing an upward trend during a period where the exclusionary rules have been given more effect in the trial of criminal cases.

Mr. President, it certainly is regrettable that the Supreme Court, through a bare majority of its members, has become obsessed with this overemphasis of individual rights as against the rights of society. Our Nation and countless of its innocent citizens will undoubtedly suffer as a result, and, fearfully, the situation as to crime, in this country, will continue to grow worse. I hope that our Nation's highest tribunal will eventually experience a change of direction in dealing with criminals, and that public-spirited citizens everywhere will rally to the support of police departments throughout the land and speak out, at every opportunity, in behalf of obedience to law.

To quote a former Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court:

> Lawlessness, if not checked, is the precursor of anarchy. (Frankfurter)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a paper prepared by the Library of Congress which shows the period of service, in terms of prior judicial experience, of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 through 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Supreme Court Justices, 1789–1966—Period of service and prior judicial experience

Chief justice	Date of commission	Commencement of service	Service terminated	Appointed by—	Prior judicial experience
John Jay	Sept. 26, 1789	Feb. 2, 1790	June 29, 1795	Washington	Chief justice of New York (Colonial), 1776–79.[1]
John Rutledge	July 1, 1795	Aug. 12, 1795	Dec. 15, 1875	do	Chancery Court of South Carolina, 1784–89; Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1791–94; Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1789–91.
Oliver Ellsworth	Mar. 4, 1796	Mar. 8, 1796	Dec. 15, 1800	do	Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut (Colonial); Superior Court of Connecticut (Colonial), 1781–85.
John Marshall	Jan. 31, 1801	Feb. 4, 1801	July 6, 1835	John Adams	None.[2]
Roger Brooke Taney	Mar. 15, 1836	Mar. 28, 1836	Oct. 12, 1864	Jackson	Do.
Salmon Portland Chase	Dec. 6, 1864	Dec. 15, 1864	May 7, 1873	Lincoln	Do.
Morrison Remick Waite	Jan. 21, 1874	Mar. 4, 1874	Mar. 23, 1888	Grant	Do.
Melville Weston Fuller	July 20, 1888	Oct. 8, 1888	July 4, 1910	Cleveland	Do.
Edward Douglass White	Dec. 19, 1910	Dec. 12, 1910	May 19, 1921	Taft	Associate Justice of Supreme Court of Louisiana, 1878–80; Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1894–1910.
William Howard Taft	June 30, 1921	July 11, 1921	Feb. 3, 1930	Harding	Judge of Superior Court, Cincinnati, 1887–92; U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1892–1900.
Charles Evans Hughes	Feb. 13, 1930	Feb. 24, 1930	June 30, 1941	Hoover	Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1910–16.
Harlan Fiske Stone	July 3, 1941	July 3, 1941	Apr. 22, 1946	F. Roosevelt	Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court, 1925–41.
Frederick Moore Vinson	June 21, 1946	June 24, 1946	Sept. 8, 1953	Truman	U.S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia, 1939–43.
Earl Warren	Oct. 2, 1953	Oct. 5, 1953	(3)	Eisenhower	None.
John Rutledge	Sept. 26, 1789	Feb. 15, 1790	Mar. 5, 1791	Washington	Chancery Court of South Carolina (Colonial), 1784–89.
William Cushing	Sept. 27, 1789	Feb. 2, 1790	Sept. 13, 1810	do	Superior Court of Massachusetts (Colonial), 1772–74 Massachusetts General Court, 1774–75; Massachusetts Supreme Court, 1775–89.
James Wilson	Sept. 29, 1789	Oct. 5, 1789	Aug. 21, 1798	do	None.

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. Supreme Court Justices, 1789–1966—Period of service and prior judicial experience—Continued

Chief justice	Date of commission	Commencement of service	Service terminated	Appointed by—	Prior judicial experience
John Blair	Sept. 30, 1789	Feb. 2, 1790	Jan. 27, 1796	Washington	General Court of Virginia (Colonial), 1778–80; High Court of Chancery of Virginia (Colonial), 1780; Court of Appeals of Virginia, 1780–89.
James Iredell	Feb. 10, 1790	May 13, 1790	do	do	North Carolina Superior Court, 1777–78.
Thomas Johnson	Nov. 7, 1791	Aug. 6, 1792	Feb. 1, 1793	do	Court of Maryland, 1790–91.
William Patterson	Mar. 4, 1793	Mar. 11, 1793	Sept. 9, 1806	do	None.
Samuel Chase	Jan. 27, 1796	Feb. 4, 1796	June 19, 1811	do	Criminal Court of Baltimore, 1788–91; General Court of Maryland, 1791–96.
Bushrod Washington	Dec. 20, 1798	Feb. 4, 1799	Nov. 26, 1829	do	None.
Alfred Moore	Dec. 10, 1799	Aug. 9, 1800	Jan. 26, 1804	John Adams	Superior Court of North Carolina, 1798–99.
William Johnson	Mar. 26, 1804	May 7, 1804	Aug. 4, 1834	Jefferson	Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, 1798–1804.
Henry Brockholst Livingston	Nov. 10, 1806	Jan. 20, 1807	Mar. 18, 1823	do	Supreme Court of New York, 1802–06.
Thomas Todd	Mar. 3, 1807	May 4, 1807	Feb. 7, 1826	do	Court of Appeals of Kentucky, 1801–07.
Joseph Story	Nov. 18, 1811	Feb. 3, 1812	Sept. 10, 1845	Madison	None.
Gabriel Duvall	do	Nov. 23, 1811	Jan. 14, 1835	do	Do.
Smith Thompson	Dec. 9, 1823	Sept. 1, 1823	Dec. 18, 1843	Monroe	Supreme Court of New York 1802–19.
Robert Trimble	May 9, 1826	June 16, 1826	Aug. 25, 1828	J. Q. Adams	Court of Appeals of Kentucky, 1807–09; U.S. District Court, Kentucky, 1818–26.
John McLean	Mar. 7, 1829	Jan. 11, 1830	Apr. 4, 1861	Jackson	Supreme Court of Ohio, 1816–22.
Henry Baldwin	Jan. 6, 1830	Jan. 18, 1830	Apr. 21, 1844	do	None.
James Moore Wayne	Jan. 9, 1835	Jan. 14, 1835	July 5, 1867	do	Superior Court of Georgia, 1924–29.
Philip Pendleton Barbour	Mar. 15, 1836	May 12, 1836	Feb. 25, 1841	do	General Court of Virginia, 1825–27; U.S. District Court of Virginia, Eastern District, 1830–36.
John Catron	Mar. 8, 1837	May 1, 1837	May 30, 1865	Van Buren	Tennessee Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals, 1824–34.
John McKinley	Sept. 25, 1837	Jan. 9, 1838	July 19, 1852	do	None.
Peter Vivian Daniel	Mar. 3, 1841	Jan. 10, 1842	May 31, 1860	do	U.S. District Court of Virginia, 1836–41.
Samuel Nelson	Feb. 13, 1845	Feb. 27, 1845	Nov. 28, 1872	Tyler	Circuit Court of New York, 1823–31; Supreme Court of New York, 1831–45.
Levi Woodbury	Sept. 20, 1845	Sept. 23, 1845	Sept. 4, 1851	Polk	Superior Court of New Hampshire, 1817–23.
Robert Cooper	Aug. 4, 1846	Aug. 10, 1846	Jan. 31, 1870	do	District Court of Allegheny County, Pa., 1833–46.
Benjamin Robbins Curtis	Dec. 20, 1851	Oct. 10, 1851	Sept. 30, 1857	Fillmore	None.
John Archibald Campbell	Mar. 22, 1853	Apr. 11, 1853	Apr. 30, 1861	Pierce	Do.
Nathan Clifford	Jan. 12, 1858	Jan. 21, 1858	July 25, 1881	Buchanan	Do.
Noah Haynes Swayne	Jan. 24, 1862	Jan. 27, 1862	Jan. 24, 1881	Lincoln	Do.
Samuel Freeman Miller	July 16, 1862	July 21, 1862	Oct. 13, 1890	do	Justice of peace, Bourbonville, Ky., 1840's.
David Davis	Dec. 8, 1862	Dec. 10, 1862	Mar. 4, 1877	do	8th Judicial Circuit in Illinois, 1848–62.
Stephen Johnson Field	Mar. 10, 1863	May 20, 1863	Dec. 1, 1897	do	Supreme Court of California, 1857–63.
William Strong	Feb. 18, 1870	Mar. 14, 1870	Dec. 14, 1880	Grant	Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, 1857–68.
Joseph P. Bradley	Mar. 21, 1870	Mar. 23, 1870	Jan. 22, 1892	do	None.
Ward Hunt	Dec. 11, 1872	Jan. 9, 1873	Jan. 27, 1882	do	New York Court of Appeals, 1865–73.
John Marshall Harlan	Nov. 29, 1877	Dec. 10, 1877	Oct. 14, 1911	Hayes	County Court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858–59.
William Burnham Woods	Dec. 21, 1880	Jan. 5, 1881	May 14, 1887	do	Middle Chancery Division, Alabama, 1868–69; U.S. Court of Appeals, 5th Circuit, 1869–80.
Stanley Matthews	May 12, 1881	May 17, 1881	Mar. 22, 1889	Garfield	Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851–53; Superior Court of Cincinnati, 1863–65.
Horace Gray	Dec. 20, 1881	Jan. 9, 1882	Sept. 15, 1902	Arthur	Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, 1864–82.
Samuel Blatchford	Mar. 22, 1882	Apr. 3, 1882	July 7, 1893	do	U.S. District Court of New York, Southern District, 1867–78; U.S. Court of Appeals, 2d Circuit, 1878–82.
Lucius Quintus C. Lamar	Jan. 16, 1888	Jan. 18, 1888	Jan. 23, 1893	Cleveland	None.
David Josiah Brewer	Dec. 18, 1889	Jan. 6, 1890	Mar. 28, 1910	Harrison	Probate and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862–65; Kansas District Court, 1865–69; Supreme Court of Kansas, 1870–84; U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, 1884–90.
Henry Billings Brown	Dec. 29, 1890	Jan. 5, 1891	May 28, 1906	do	Circuit Court, Wayne County, Mich., 1868, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, 1875–90.
George Shivas, Jr	July 26, 1892	Oct. 10, 1892	Feb. 23, 1903	do	None.
Howell Edmunds Jackson	Feb. 18, 1893	Mar. 4, 1893	Aug. 8, 1895	do	U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1886–93.
Edward Douglas White	Feb. 19, 1894	Mar. 12, 1894	Dec. 18, 1910	Cleveland	Supreme Court of Louisiana, 1878–80.
Rufus Wheeler Peckman	Dec. 9, 1895	Jan. 6, 1896	Oct. 24, 1909	do	Supreme Court of New York, 1883–86; Court of Appeals of New York, 1886–96.
Joseph McKenna	Jan. 21, 1898	Jan. 26, 1898	Jan. 5, 1925	McKinley	U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, 1892–97.
Oliver Wendell Holmes	Dec. 4, 1902	Dec. 8, 1902	Jan. 12, 1932	T. Roosevelt	Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, 1882–1902.
William Rufus Day	Feb. 23, 1903	Mar. 2, 1903	Nov. 13, 1922	do	Court of Common Pleas, Ohio, 1886–90; U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1899–1903.
William Henry Moody	Dec. 12, 1906	Dec. 17, 1906	Nov. 20, 1910	do	None.
Horace Harmon Lurton	Dec. 20, 1909	Jan. 3, 1910	July 12, 1914	Taft	Chancellor, 6th Division, Tennessee, 1875–93; U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1893–1910.
Charles Evans Hughes	May 2, 1910	Oct. 10, 1910	June 10, 1916	do	None.
Willis Van Devanter	Dec. 16, 1910	Jan. 3, 1911	June 2, 1937	do	Supreme Court of Wyoming, 1889–90; U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, 1903–10.
Joseph Rucker Lamar	Dec. 17, 1910	do	Jan. 2, 1916	do	Supreme Court of Georgia, 1906–08.
Mahlon Pitney	Mar. 13, 1912	Mar. 18, 1912	Dec. 31, 1922	do	Supreme Court of New Jersey, 1901–08; chancellor of New Jersey, 1908–12.
James Clark McReynolds	Aug. 29, 1914	Oct. 12, 1914	Jan. 31, 1941	Wilson	None.
Louis Dembitz Brandeis	June 1, 1916	June 5, 1916	Feb. 13, 1939	do	Do.
John Hessin Clarke	July 24, 1916	Oct. 9, 1916	Sept. 18, 1922	do	U.S. District Court, Northern District of Ohio, 1914–16.
George Sutherland	Sept. 5, 1922	Oct. 2, 1922	Jan. 17, 1938	Harding	None.
Pierce Butler	Dec. 21, 1922	Jan. 2, 1923	Nov. 16, 1939	do	Do.
Edward Terry Sanford	Jan. 29, 1923	Feb. 19, 1923	Mar. 8, 1930	do	U.S. District Court, Eastern and Middle District, Tennessee, 1908–23.
Harlan Fiske Stone	Feb. 5, 1925	Mar. 2, 1925	July 2, 1941	Coolidge	None.
Owen Josephus Roberts	May 20, 1930	June 2, 1930	July 31, 1945	Hoover	Do.
Benjamin Nathan Cardozo	Mar. 2, 1932	Mar. 16, 1932	July 9, 1938	do	Supreme Court of New York, 1914–17; New York Court of Appeals, 1917–32.
Hugo Lafayette Black	Aug. 18, 1937	Aug. 19, 1937	[3]	F. Roosevelt	Police judge, Burmingham, 1910–11.
Stanley Forman Reed	Jan. 27, 1938	Jan. 31, 1938	Feb. 25, 1957	do	None.
Felix Frankfurter	Jan. 20, 1939	Jan. 30, 1939	Aug. 28, 1962	do	Do.
William Orville Douglas	Apr. 15, 1939	Apr. 17, 1939	[3]	do	Do.
Frank Murphy	Jan. 18, 1940	Feb. 5, 1940	July 19, 1949	do	Recorder's Court, Detroit, 1923–1930.
James Francis Byrnes	June 25, 1941	July 8, 1941	Oct. 3, 1942	do	None.
Robert Houghwout Jackson	July 11, 1941	July 11, 1941	Oct. 9, 1954	do	Do.
Wiley Blount Rutledge	Feb. 11, 1943	Feb. 15, 1943	Sept. 10, 1949	do	U.S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia, 1939–43.
Harold Hitz Burton	Sept. 22, 1945	Oct. 1, 1945	Oct. 13, 1958	Truman	None.
Thomas Campbell Clark	Aug. 19, 1949	Aug. 24, 1949	[3]	do	Do.
Sherman Minton	Oct. 5, 1949	Oct. 12, 1949	Oct. 15, 1956	do	U.S. Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit, 1941–49.
John Marshall Harlan	Mar. 17, 1955	Mar. 28, 1955	[3]	Eisenhower	U.S. Court of Appeals, 2d Circuit, 1954–55.
William Joseph Brennan, Jr	Oct. 15, 1956	Oct. 16, 1956	[3]	do	New Jersey Superior Court, 1949–51; Appellate Division of New Jersey Superior Court, 1951–52; Associate Justice of New Jersey Supreme Court, 1952–56.
Charles Evans Whitaker	Mar. 22, 1957	Mar. 25, 1957	Apr. 1, 1962	do	U.S. District Court, Western District of Missouri, 1954–56; U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, 1956–57.
Potter Stewart	Oct. 14, 1958	Oct. 14, 1958	[3]	do	U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1954–58.
Byron R. White	Apr. 11, 1962	Apr. 16, 1962	[3]	Kennedy	None.
Arthur J. Goldberg	Sept. 25, 1962	Oct. 1, 1962	July 20, 1965	do	Do.
Abe Fortas	Aug. 11, 1965	Oct. 4, 1965	[3]	L. B. Johnson	Do.

---

[1] The dates indicated represent the years in which service commenced and terminated. No attempt is made to indicate months and days.

[2] "None" indicates that an examination of generally recognized research sources failed to disclose any judicial service.

[3] Present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a transcript of a briefing on Ernesto Miranda versus the State of Arizona, by Mr. David G. Bress, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, on June 21, 1966, and issued to the police department of the District of Columbia in the form of a memorandum dated July 15, 1966.

This memorandum will indicate the extent to which the police departments of the country will be straitjacketed by the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling of June 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,

July 15, 1966.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Transcript of Briefing on Ernesto Mirando vs the State of Arizona by Mr. David G. Bress, U.S. Attorney for District of Columbia on June 21, 1966.

To the Force:

Deputy Chief Lawrence A. Hartnett, Chief of Detectives, introduced Mr. David G. Bress, United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, and the subject matter, the recent decision handed down by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Bress, Chief Hartnett, Chief Layton, Members of the Police Department, as all of you know, last Monday, June 13, 1966, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the *Miranda* case. The essence of that decision is that the privilege which the individual has against self-incrimination is jeopardized by custodial interrogation. We had not had that principle before. We had always understood that admissions and confessions were admissible in evidence if they were voluntary. This new decision injects into the law as we previously understood it, the principle that the privilege against self-incrimination does not begin at the trial where a person may not be compelled to testify against himself, but it actually begins at its earliest stage—when arrest occurs.

There has been an inkling of a move in this direction for many years. All of you know the requirement for early presentment of an arrested person before the United States Commissioner or a Committing Magistrate in General Sessions Court. Why was that necessary under Rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure? The reason why that was necessary was because it was felt that the privilege against self-incrimination that an arrested person had was sufficiently strong to warrant some judicial warning to him about his rights, so that he would be aware of the effect of what he might say.

There had not been any prior decision that held that the privilege against self-incrimination began at such an early stage, that is to say, at the arrest stage.

Now without going into a detailed explanation of the *Miranda* case, I'm going to give you what I think is the essence of the case and how I believe practically it should affect your work in the questioning of arrested persons or non-arrested persons.

The *Miranda* opinion, different from so many Supreme Court opinions, sets guide lines. It is a clear opinion in many ways and I think each of you should read the entire opinion. I'm sure the Department will make copies available to you. You don't have to be a lawyer to really fully understand it. It is written in very clear terms and sets up the guidelines to govern your work.

Now, you will recall that in August, 1965, the Police Department order, I think, 9–B, gave you specific instructions about what kind of warning to give to an arrested person, before he was questioned. You were told to tell him, in substance, that he was under arrest; that he had the right to remain silent; and that anything he said might be held against him. You also advised him that he had the right to consult with a lawyer; that he had a right to talk to any member of his family or a friend; and that if he did not have a lawyer, one would be provided for him when he first went to court. (This latter instruction meant that one would be provided for him under the Criminal Justice Act, when he appeared before the Committing Magistrate, that is, either the Commissioner or a Judge of the General Sessions Court.) Now, we continued under that order up to the present time. There was a proposal by me in the latter part of May of this year for some modification of that, but, as far as Police Department Orders are concerned, that is the order that continued up to the present time and it included the so-called 3-hour rule. Now the 3-hour rule is no longer valid under the *Miranda* case and you will see the reason for this shortly.

The necessity in all cases of early presentation before the Committing Magistrate is now also somewhat relaxed. The type of warning that has been given in the past by law enforcement officers is not adequate under the *Miranda* case. Under the *Miranda* case I have prepared what I consider to be an appropriate warning, the exact language of which I am not yet wedded to. I will probably try and simplify it for more effective use. That warning now should state as follows:

(1) *You have been placed under arrest. You are not required to say anything to us at any time or to answer any questions. Anything you say can be used against you in court.*

So far so good, that is not different from your prior warning.

The second part is also similar to the prior warning:

(2) *You may call a lawyer or a relative or a friend and they may come here to speak with you. A phone will be made available to you for that purpose.*

That, too, is consistent.

Now, beginning with the third and fourth—there are only four paragraphs to this warning—we have the essence of the case, and I will then go about explaining it. I think it is better to give it to you in this highlight first.

(3) *You have the right to consult with a lawyer before we ask you any questions and to have such lawyer present with you during such questioning. You may retain a lawyer if you are financially able to do so. If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be furnished to you if you so desire,* and that is before questioning, not as in the prior case, when you go to court.

(4) *If you fully understand these rights which you have, but, nevertheless, of your own free will desire to answer questions about the matter under investigation, without the presence of a lawyer, you may waive such rights and answer the questions.* If you decide to answer questions now without a lawyer present, you will still have the right to stop answering at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer.

While this sounds like a heavy burden it may be productive of a few statements. That, in essence, is what *Miranda* requires, and *Miranda* is the law.

In order to insure that each officer has knowledge of this warning, it is my recommendation that it be permanently printed on some card or plastic and carried by each officer. The warning should be appropriately posted in all precincts and other places where interrogations generally occur. These steps if followed will tend to insure that arrested persons are properly warned, so that their statements when made will be more readily admitted into evidence by our courts.

I have, therefore, developed about eight rules of conduct for the police in order for them to conform to the requirements of the *Miranda* case. I have given you so far the outline of a warning, now let me tell you what I think you must do, and why you must do it, in order to satisfy this new approach.

The case is perfectly clear that if a person is not under arrest and is not deprived of his freedom of action in any way (I'll explain that) no warning need be given and questions may be freely asked. This would include volunteers, that is, those that confess, or give incriminating statements, without being asked any questions. Therefore, the *Miranda* Rule has no relationship to people who are not under arrest. Accordingly, one conclusion to draw from the case is that in the course of your investigation you may interrogate suspects before you detain a person or place him under arrest. What you learn will be admitted in evidence and it is not impaired by this decision. I said if he is not under arrest. There are also a few additional little words in there—the alternative is if he is not deprived of his freedom of action in any way. You may not have expressly stated to the suspect that he is under arrest and therefore think you have the right to interrogate him freely. You do not. If by your conduct you would lead him, probably him, possibly a reasonable person, to believe that he can get up and go at will, the law is such a person is not under arrest. If his freedom of action is limited in any way the law will treat him as though he were under arrest. Therefore, for example, if one of your officers wants to interview a man at his apartment or his home and you knock on the door and state who you are, indicate your purpose, ask if you may come in and talk and he invites you in, you can go in and talk to him to your heart's content and whatever he says to you can be used, provided that by your conduct or your expressions you lead him to believe that his freedom of action is in no way being restrained. But if you walk into that same apartment with four or five officers with drawn guns and you don't say a thing about his being under arrest, but you start asking questions, the rules and warnings of *Miranda* apply. So that the first principal we get from this case, the first guideline is, there is no prohibition on questioning if the man is not under arrest or he is not being detained. I also say this principle applies equally to volunteers.

The court draws the distinction, as I'm sure you can readily understand, between a voluntary statement and the statement of a volunteer. A voluntary statement is one that presumedly is made by the exercise of free will. It can be made in response to questions. Such a statement is always subject to challenge as to whether it was or was not voluntary; whether the overall circumstances surrounding the making of that statement were coercive or not. Whereas, a statement of a volunteer is a verbal communication by a person who calls on the phone and says, "I just shot my wife." Or, he comes into the precinct and says, "I just did something terrible—I want to tell you about it." Those are the statements of a volunteer and the fewer questions asked the better; but such statements are not inhibited by the opinion.

The next principal is that, if a person is arrested or is detained without actual arrest, he may not be asked any questions without first being warned, that is the full warning, and this applies equally to questioning at the scene, in the cruiser, and at the precinct. I know this is tough. This is a new rule.

If you are investigating at the scene and you do not have a person under arrest or if a particular person is not detained, the court says everyone at the scene knows it is his duty to cooperate. If you are involved in a situation where there is no legal justification for the confinement of a person, then interrogation at the scene without the warning would be perfectly proper. Therefore, this highlights the importance of interrogation without arrests. But, if there is an arrest or detention, no questioning can be undertaken until the full warning is given and the wishes of the suspect complied with. Even after you have given the warning, if the person arrested or detained, either refuses to state whether he wants a lawyer or not, or, instead of refusing to state whether or not he wants a lawyer, in the alternative, he may expressly state that he does want a lawyer, in either case, of his silence or his express statement that he does want a lawyer, he has not waived his right to counsel and he may not be questioned. If, however, he states he wants a lawyer present, then it is incumbent upon the police to give him the opportunity to call his own lawyer, (which can't be done at the scene), then there can be no questioning in such a case until you get to the precinct—or if he has no lawyer, and this is the particularly new point, the police must make one available to him before questioning can begin. In such circumstances therefore, where he expressly states that he wants a lawyer, the questioning must be deferred until the lawyer arrives. It is expected that the local bar association will provide a telephone number to the police to be used by them to obtain a lawyer only in those circumstances where there is the request for a lawyer.

If the program bogs down, so that the bar doesn't answer the challenge of making lawyers available then under *Miranda*, if the man is silent and doesn't say whether he wants a lawyer or not, or if he expressly says he does not want to talk until he sees a lawyer, unfortunately, in these circumstances *Miranda* requires that there be no questioning.

Now, if a lawyer responds, either a retained lawyer, or a bar association furnished lawyer, this is the next logical step—what happens then? The arrested person should be afforded the opportunity to confer in private with that lawyer. After the conference between the lawyer and his new client, questioning may proceed in the presence of the lawyer—if the arrested person is then willing to answer questions. The lawyer may leave and may tell him that he may talk. The odds are certainly strong that the lawyer will generally advise him to say nothing, so that when the lawyer arrives and instructs him that there is to be no questioning that is the end of questioning. This again highlights those cases where it is possible—the need for questioning pre-arrest. Where the suspect declines to be interrogated, and the lawyer goes on his business, then the individual should be presented before a Committing Magistrate or to the Commissioner. The need for speed without unnecessary delay should be complied with, although there is really no penalty which results because there is no admission to be excluded. Nevertheless, it is a rule and a statute (Rule 5(a)), and reasonably prompt presentment should take place.

During any questioning in the presence of his lawyer, the lawyer may consult with the client (and this is a new principle but logically fits in here) and, if at any time during the questioning the arrested person says that he doesn't want to answer any more questions, you have got to stop. If his lawyer terminates the questioning at any point, even if he consented to it in the first place, questioning must thereafter stop. You can go back again and say do you want to resume? And, if they consent to resume, resumption of interrogation can take place. But even here there is no effective waiver in law by virtue of a person answering some questions that such person thereby waives the right to remain silent as to any remaining questions. The *Miranda* case clearly says that termination of questioning may take place at any time at the election of the arrested person. Needless to say, a detailed record of questions and answers should be maintained together with appropriate notations of any objections which the lawyer present may interpose to certain questions, so that you can turn over to the United States Attorney's Office as full and clear a picture as is possible of what took place during the interrogation process. Thus far we've considered what happens where he is silent and where he says he wants a lawyer—no questions. If he says he wants a lawyer, he gets the lawyer, and questioning then may be done only with the approval of the lawyer and it can be terminated at any point at the request of the lawyer or the person under arrest.

Now, we haven't obtained many statements up to this point. After the warning is given, under this decision, interrogation in the absence of the lawyer is proper where the arrested person has waived his rights under the warning. That is, every one of the rights, including the waiver of his right to remain silent, as well as his right to the presence of a lawyer. In the past, waiver has been found from the failure to ask for a lawyer in other jurisdictions. The case we now have expressly holds that waiver cannot be inferred from silence or from the failure to ask for a lawyer.

We now come to what I believe is the most important part of the whole case as far as you are concerned. The waiver that I mentioned a moment ago is only valid if it is expressed, it cannot be implied; there must be an express waiver, it may be oral, it may be written. Now what constitutes the waiver? The court says that a waiver is valid, that is a waiver of the rights under this warning, (waiver to the right of counsel, waiver of the privilege against self-incrimination.) The waiver is valid only if it is voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently given. These three words—voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently—I wouldn't have too much trouble about the "voluntary" part, "knowingly" gives me some concern, "intelligently" creates a real problem.

Whenever there is any interrogation in the absence of a lawyer, the government has, as the Supreme Court has said in this case, "A heavy burden" to demonstrate at the trial that a defendant voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waived his privilege against self-incrimination and his right to a retained or appointed counsel. Therefore, while you gentlemen may get any statement you want under a waiver, we, in the United States Attorney's Office, before such statement is offered in evidence have the burden to affirmatively make a showing that the defendant voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waived those rights.

I said a moment ago that this waiver may be oral or written. Of course, the written waiver is preferable and I have prepared a form of written waiver, if voluntarily signed, and knowingly signed, and signed with intelligence, then no problem will arise. But you can see how, depending upon the circumstances of the case, even though the written waiver is obtained, that the government will have to carry a real heavy burden in getting an admission in evidence with a waiver.

As an alternative to getting a written waiver signed by the person who is now about to talk in the absence of his lawyer, it is equally satisfactory if the essence of the warning and the waiver is summarized in the signed statement of facts executed by the arrested person, provided that the summary clearly shows that the oral waiver was given before questioning began and provided further that it also shows that the waiver remained in effect without being revoked during the entire interrogative process.

Remember, I said in connection with the illustration of what happens when the lawyer is present and you are asking questions, that questioning may be terminated at any point. That same right is not dependent upon whether there is or is not a lawyer present. The right to terminate questioning of a suspect by law enforcement officers at any point is even stronger when there is no lawyer present.

Significantly, however, nothing that you obtained in questioning is valid unless the warning has been given before the questioning began. Further, even though you can show the warning before and the waiver before, the rest of the statement may be invalid unless you also foreclose the possibility that the person under arrest may have terminated the questioning after the second question. He may have said, for example, after the second question, "I don't want to say anymore." Therefore, we do have a heavy burden, not only to show that the waiver was given before questioning began, and that it was voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently given, but that it continued unrevoked throughout the process of the entire statement.

In lieu of a separate document to be called a waiver, it is adequate for our purposes if, in the summary of your statement of facts, the essence is included in the signed statement—but it is not enough to say that "I waive my rights," you have to spell out exactly what the rights are. It is not enough to say that "the warning was given before the questioning began," because the questioning may have been terminated as far as the suspect is concerned before the statement was concluded. Therefore, those several possibilities must be covered in the statement.

Another principle which may affect you that is to be drawn from the teaching, in this case, is that the questioning should not be lengthy in the absence of the lawyer. Even with an express waiver, even in writing, the court has stated that lengthy interrogation before a statement is made is "strong evidence" that the waiver is invalid. The court does not tell us what is short nor what is long, but it does state that if you interrogate for a long time that is an indication that the waiver is invalid.

The Supreme Court has said that "An express statement that the individual is willing to make a statement and does not want an attorney followed closely by a statement could constitute a waiver." That is as close as the Supreme Court gets to the subject of the possible existence of an implied waiver. The implied as distinguished from the express waiver is as follows: The express waiver exists where the man says, "I know what my rights are, you have read me the warning, I understand about the privilege of self-incrimination, I understand about the right to counsel, I don't care about that, I waive the rights and I want to make a statement. I am willing to make a statement." That is an express waiver and that is valid whether it is oral or written. The implied waiver exists according to the Supreme Court where the person under arrest or in custody indicates that he is willing to make a statement (it doesn't use words of waiver)—he's willing to make a statement, and he does not want a lawyer; when that is followed by a statement closely in point of time, that could amount to an implied waiver.

Another lesson from this case is to be drawn not from *Miranda* but from *Westover*. You know we call it the *Miranda* case, but there were three state cases decided at the same time and one federal case. The federal case is known as the *Westover* case and *Westover* involved local police who had Westover under interrogation in Kansas City. I believe Westover was in local custody for fourteen hours and had been interrogated at length during that period, before the F.B.I.

had arrived. The question was what the effect of the fourteen hour period of confinement and interrogation by Kansas City Police—not related to the California bank robbery that the F.B.I. was interested in. The court found the atmosphere was coercive, as a result of fourteen hours interrogation or confinement by local police which carried over to in fact the F.B.I. interrogation which only lasted two hours. I called this principal from the *Westover* position of the *Miranda* combine of cases to tell you the following: That when a prisoner is taken by the District of Columbia Police from another jurisdiction where he has been subjected to questioning, it is recommended that the D.C interrogation following warning should not begin until the prisoner has been moved both *in time and in place* from his former surroundings.

Had the F.B.I. taken Westover from the Kansas City Police and moved him to St. Louis or to Los Angeles, what he said to the F.B.I. would have been admitted in that case under the prior rule.

What has happened to *Mallory* requirements, I know many of you must be concerned. As to those cases where the lawyer is present during interrogation, *Mallory* is of little or decreasing significance, because first there is no "unnecessary delay" involved inasmuch as you waited for the defendant to have his own lawyer present and the protection which *Mallory* was calculated to give to protect him in his rights by the presence of a magistrate, a judicial officer has now been given in effect by the presence of his own attorney. Therefore, the speed of presentation before the committing magistrate seems to be unnecessary any longer. Yet it is on the books, you will find it as a rule, so that when that process is over in ordinary course he should be taken before the committing magistrate but no admission in my opinion will hereafter be excluded because of any delay in presentment on *Mallory* grounds. However, with respect to statements obtained without the presence of a lawyer under the so-called express waiver or the implied waiver which I just mentioned, presentment, early presentment to the committing magistrate under *Mallory* is still required.

Gentlemen that is all I have to report to you on *Miranda* at this time.

The following questions were asked of Mr. Bress by various members of the Department present at this talk:

Question: You stated that if we have a man under arrest, he desires a lawyer and he does not have the money to hire one, is it incumbent on us to supply the lawyer?

Answer: It's incumbent on you to supply him with a lawyer unless you want to forgo taking a statement.

Question: We want to get a statement. It's 2:30 tomorrow morning that this happens, the man wants a lawyer, what do we do?

Answer: That's a new problem. What I think you will do is that the Bar Association will have to maintain, I hope, a panel of lawyers available around the clock and that the police may have the burden, and it may be a heavy burden, to contact that panel to see that a lawyer is sent in order for you to be able to question. If he has made the request, there must be a lawyer present or your questions will amount to nothing. As a subsidiary point to your question, I think there is involved the question as to what happens to the Mallory requirement of presentment to the committing magistrate without "unnecessary" delay in such a situation, and my opinion is, and I think I'm right, that since the delay is caused by his own request for a lawyer, that the delay is not "unnecessary".

Question: Should an arrested subject ask for counsel and after conferring with counsel, he is advised by counsel in the presence of the arresting officer not to make any statement or answer any questions, this arrested subject, despite this legal advice, and still in the presence of counsel, insists on giving a statement, what should the arresting officer do in this case?

Answer: If he insists on doing it in the presence of counsel, I certainly wouldn't turn it down. I would take it and hope that it might come in as a spontaneous statement. Remember, I stated initially that statements of volunteers, spontaneous statements, without interrogation, are admissible. If you don't ask the man any questions and he says he wants to tell you what happened and he tells you, without any questions, I think this is spontaneous and we would have no trouble getting it into evidence under the Miranda case.

Question: The problem there is still we have to prove the voluntariness of this statement?

Answer: Whether he knowingly, and intelligently made the statement voluntariness is not as great a problem as being able to show that the man, under the circumstances made the statement after his lawyer told him not to, was acting intelligently and knowingly.

Question: You have a prisoner, he signs a waiver. You ask some three or four questions. Among these questions, he may reveal where he hid the weapon or other evidence. And then all of a sudden he refuses to answer any other questions. On the basis of what he has already answered voluntarily and signed a waiver, you make application with an affidavit for a search warrant. I am wondering how this will affect your affidavit or if you would be able to admit this in Court as evidence?

Answer: Based on your hypothetical question, Captain, so far, what he had said up to the time that he said he wouldn't answer any more questions, it is entirely valid and admissible. It may be the basis for an application for a search warrant. It is also admissible in evidence as an incriminating admission.

Question: Before he is arrested, talking with him and he admits to you that he had, perhaps, committed a homicide, at what point are we required to arrest him? He gives you the whole story before you make the arrest?

Answer: You should, by all means, not arrest too soon. As a matter of fact, if you should move to arrest, then you are merely foreclosing yourself from getting further information. So, I think you have answered the question yourself.

Question: Well, how long is long?

Answer: Long enough, but not too long.

Question: You are in the process of executing a search warrant for narcotics, and upon arrival at the address and admittance has been gained, you notice three subjects in the room and upon a table are narcotics. You know that the narcotics belong to one of the subjects. Do you advise them of their rights, etc., before you ask the question, "To whom do these narcotics belong?" Would we be wrong in asking the question first?

Answer: I think the preliminary question should be: "What happened here? What's this all about? Who does this belong to?" Not addressed to any particular individual. It's not part of a series of questions. It's a matter of getting a better orientation and part of a general investigation. I don't think that type of questioning is prohibited.

Question: Mr. Bress, I had quite a few questions, but you have answered most of them, sir. We had a case in the Fourth Precinct just the other morning, in which we had a robber, a holdup. The suspects were captured by Captain Farran and citizens. They had been warned by one of my men on the scene at the time, of their constitutional rights under this ruling; to have the lawyer, remain silent, etc.; that they didn't have to say anything. Now, my question is this. While at the station giving instructions to these men and while the two individuals were being booked, the complainant was asked what time the offense had occurred. He looked at his wrist and he said, "they took my watch, too. I don't have my watch. I don't know." With that I walked over to the Station Clerk where the subjects were being booked for the arrest. I asked the Station Clerk if these men had a watch on them. He said, yes, they both had a watch. I said, "would you let me see them or let the complainant see them?" With that, one of the defendants spoke up and said, "ask him what kind of watch it is, because I don't want to be blamed for something I didn't do." He said, "I didn't want to hurt anybody. I just wanted the money. I even tied the man up loosely." Now, saying he makes this admission and I did not advise him of his constitutional rights because I wasn't addressing myself to him; I was addressing myself to the Station Clerk. And say we didn't need this confession as evidence in the trial, would your office submit the statement as evidence?

Answer: Did you say you did or did not need it?

Question: Did not need it. Would you use this statement or not?

Answer: If the Assistant felt the way I do about it, he would use it, because I would characterize that as a spontaneous statement, not the result of interrogation. It's a statement of a volunteer. You didn't put any questions to him. It wasn't in the course of interrogation. However, if the Assistant were wiser than I, and was interested in protecting his record on appeal and felt that he had a strong enough case without it, he might not use it.

Question: I understand. My question was directed with reference to a possible future interpretation of the law which we can look forward to. I'm anxious to see if that fell into the category of advising continuously during confinement of the individual.

Answer: They say sometimes that the law is "a ass", but that is not true in Miranda. I don't think that this teaching requires the constant rote repetition of a warning under such circumstances.

Question: Now, one other thing. You did speak on the three-hour rule that we had been working under, and just for clarification, we know that all of this is out—with reference to interrogation—but the Court did say when an individual is in custody on probable cause, the police may, of course, seek out evidence in the field to be used in the trial against them. Such investigation may include inquiry of persons not under restraint, generally on-the-scene questions, so forth.

Answer: Yes.

Question: I just brought that up, Mr. Bress, with the reference that there is no great hurry in arraigning this individual immediately or forthwith; that they do give us a limited time to complete an outside investigation free of interrogation of the person held.

Answer: Oh, yes. The force and effect of Mallory exists where no lawyer appears, and even though Rule 5(a) must be complied with, I think the force and effect of it has been diminished considerably now by Miranda.

Question: I think this Supreme Court ruling clears up what we asked for. We asked for a clear ruling on the subject of interrogation. I think we have it. Now, one other question, just for clarification. It is my interpretation an indigent, according to the court ruling, is any person who says, "I can't afford a lawyer."

Answer: No. That is not correct. The mere fact that a man says he's indigent and can't afford a lawyer does not necessarily mean that the court will accept him as an indigent. In most instances, when he says he is, he generally is. But according to the UPO, The Neighborhood Legal Services Program, so-called Poverty Program, the standard of indigency is $55.00 a week for a single person, plus $15.00 for each dependent. If a man earns more than that, or family earnings are more than that, they are not indigent. A man earning $55.00 a week and a wife earning $25.00 a week, are not indigent. They are not entitled to free legal advice.

Question: We have knowledge that an individual who says that he can't afford a lawyer and wants us to appoint one is making $150.00 a week, where does that put us in the interrogation angle?

Answer: I haven't considered this before. I know that we had considered it in NLSP and just denied service, but I think that for police purposes that if he says he can't afford a lawyer, you have got to assume that is true. What difference can you draw from his stating that he can't afford one when he can afford one, and the case where he says he can afford one but doesn't know one? He, in effect, is stating that "I want a lawyer." You can't interrogate him until a lawyer is present.

Question: One other question I would like a clarification on—I think I understand, but let's say that we have an individual in custody. He's been advised of his rights as set up by the Supreme Court. He has with him his lawyer. He's been told that he doesn't have to make a statement. He goes on saying certain incriminating things or makes incriminating statements.

Answer: In response to questions?

Question: In response to questions. And then he invokes after this continuous warning as the court holds must be given to him, he finally says, "I don't want to say anything else. I am going to remain silent." Then the interrogation is cut off. I think you said then the burden becomes upon the prosecutor to show that this was done timely, knowingly and intelligently. I wonder if we would be in a position to use what he did say that was incriminating?

Answer: I answered that in a prior question. Up to the point where he speaks that "I don't desire to answer anymore questions," everything that he said up to that point is valid and admissible. Anything that he says thereafter is not. It's presumed coercive unless you get from him an expression of a willingness to resume giving answers.

Question: After a defendant has had a preliminary hearing, has had the advice of counsel, has been told by his attorney to say nothing about the case, if he is interviewed while being held at the D.C. Jail and he decides to disregard the advice of his lawyer and makes a voluntary statement, what would be the effect of this ruling?

Answer: It can't be done now, couldn't be done even before Miranda. Under the decision in Queens vs U.S. in 118 U.S. App. D.C., where a lady was charged with a felony and at the preliminary hearing, the case was continued for her to obtain counsel, as she was entitled to under the criminal justice act, on the continued date when the preliminary hearing was to be held, the police officer went over to her and had a little conversation with her and she made some incriminating statements. Those statements were admitted in the trial and she was convicted. On appeal, the Court of Appeals held that those statements should not have been admitted on the grounds that her appearance at the preliminary hearing was for the purpose of having counsel appointed, and counsel not yet having been appointed, any interrogation was prohibited because it frustrated her right to counsel. It was in violation of her right to counsel. If counsel had been appointed, then it would also have been bad because of the Massiah and Escobedo cases. I think that answers your question, does it not, even before Miranda? Certainly it would be true now. You look as though you are not satisfied.

Question: No. A previous question, you said that he could disregard the advice of his counsel?

Answer. Yes. But when he disregards, he had already had the benefit of the advice of the lawyer and then has made a statement which I said might be a statement of a volunteer. Now, if he says his lawyer says I don't want you saying anything and he says I understand your advice, but I still want to make a statement, I still want to answer the question that these policemen want to put to me, I think you can still do that. The best kind of statement is one obtained in the presence of counsel.

Question: You say that we can talk to a person voluntarily of his own free will and accord and any questions that this man answers under this voluntary conversation is not considered under arrest, but yet I can cite cases under the Court of Appeals where a man has talked voluntarily to the police on the street, in the stations, in his own home and subsequently the Court of Appeals had ruled that the man was detained by the police and that there is not such a thing as voluntarily being detained by the police. And consequently, any information that was drawn from this conversation was used against him in trial without the presence of a lawyer there to advise him of his rights, when the conversation began.

Answer: I am familiar with those cases.

Question: Now, where do we stand if we talk to a man on the street and from the information that we gather from this conversation, we subsequently piece it together and make our case?

Answer: You stand precisely as I have indicated. That if he is being detained to the point that his freedom of action is limited—those are the very words of the Supreme Court—freedom of action not being limited in any way. Now, in each of the cases that you referred to, if they had gone as far as the Court of Appeals said that the circumstances operated upon the mind of the arrested persons in these cases—that is, made him feel that he was under detention and he didn't have the freedom to move about freely, those would still be treated as arrests. Now, there may be such cases arising in the future where you do not intend to detain, but a Court may say that you did detain. This man was frightened into thinking that he couldn't leave if he wanted to. That is still the test. If he is not arrested, nor is his freedom of action limited in anyway, whatever he says to you is outside the scope of Miranda.

Question: Sir, I think the Courts later on may rule that the primary mission of my conversation with this man was because he was a prime suspect and even though he had freedom of movement, freedom of limitation, the only reason I spoke to him was the fact that he was a suspect.

Answer: I think the Supreme Court takes cognizance of the fact that investigation by police is still to be continued and is very essential and they think that people should cooperate in answering questions to the police. I think there may come a day where you don't think that you have detained a person, but a Court may well hold that you did detain. I'm sure that we have that possibility and therefore, the purpose of this discussion is to alert you to the fact that you should make a conscious effort to see to it that the circumstances in pre-arrest questioning do not, in any way, impair the freedom of action of the man you are talking to. Tell him, "you can go." "You don't have to talk to me. You can go if you want to. You are not under arrest; I don't intend to detain you in any way, but I do have some questions." Now, it may be you are focusing on him as your prime suspect, but the focusing on him and his feelings of detention are two separate matters.

Question: I have one question. It pertains to the line-up sheet. How far can we go with the line-up sheet? Do we have to advise him? Do we have to wait for his lawyer before we start making the line-up sheet? There are quite a few questions we ask the individual in the line-up sheet.

Answer: Relating to the particular incident?

Question: No. To the person himself. You ask the person several questions; his name, address, age and try to get some background information from that individual. Has he been in the service? Family, prior record, quite a bit on the back and front of that line-up sheet. Now, how far can we go?

Answer: I confess to a lack of sufficient experience with the line-up sheets to be able to answer that question with confidence. I have seen them but I have not had occasion personally to use them. My impression is that if this is merely a background history of the individual involved, and does not relate to any effort to seek an admission or incriminating statement from him concerning the crime under investigation, then there is nothing objectionable about it. You can still pursue it to your heart's content.

Question: When a suspect leaves this jurisdiction and is arrested in New York and we forward a U.S. Commissioner's arrest warrant, by a United States Marshal, to New York, you don't want him interrogated in custody in New York? The next time we see him is in the District Jail. That would be the only time that we would be able to interview him would be at the District Jail. Is that right?

Answer: If he has not been subjected to intensive interrogation in the place of arrest, I don't think that the impediment of Westover would apply. If he's just been picked up on a warrant, from the District of Columbia in New York, you can go there and start questioning him right away, provided you have given him all the warnings. If I am understanding your question correctly.

Question: Well, say that he is arrested at 3:00 in the morning. It may be an hour or two hours before they notify us and it takes us, maybe, another three hours to get to New York or where he is. Well, that's five hours that he is in custody in New York. Would they say that he is in custody too long and that we can't talk to him there?

Answer: What was he doing during that five hours? Was he under interrogation in New York? If he was just being held in New York pending your arrival, I don't think that that is a Westover type of situation. But if he were arrested in New York—for example—on a housebreaking there, and they worked on him for a number of hours—well, Westover had fourteen hours and I don't have a crystal ball to put the right line time limit; but if they worked on him for a number of hours on one investigation and then you went to the same place and started interrogating him on another investigation, I think you would have a Westover situation. You ought to change the time and place for your questioning.

Question: Regarding juveniles, sixteen to eighteen years of age, that fall into the waiver category in Juvenile Court after we have advised them of their rights. Are we going to be able to use their confession in Court?

Answer: There are a number of cases that cross my mind that have recently been decided, that affect trials of juveniles waived to District Court and to what extent the statements made by them are admissible in evidence. The answer is that voluntary statements are not usable against them if they are made before waiver—under the Harling case. How, under Miranda, statements after waiver may also not be used—except when made in the presence of counsel—and that seems very unlikely. There is also the real danger of exclusion, as fruits of the poisonous tree, of evidence obtained from leads procured from pre-waiver statements.

Chief Layton: Mr. Bress, one other item that I would like to have you give some further consideration to, would be a queston that was raised; that is how long can our people talk with an individual who is a suspect prior to arrest, and I'm sure that this is a hard question. But it is also a hard decision for a police officer or a detective to make out on the street in a situation where he has sufficient probable cause to justify an arrest and yet he feels that by discussing the facts in the case he may get some additional evidence that would help to assure a conviction when the case gets to Court. As I say, this is a hard question for a police officer to make out on the street, if we leave it to him and say that he should talk to the suspect long enough, but not too long. Now, I don't know what definitive answer you might be able to make on further reflection, but I would hope that you might give that some further thought.

Mr. Bress: That might be a hard decision for you, Chief, but it's an even harder one for me; because my answer would indicate that there is a time limit and that if you fully exercise that time, the Court will say that the time was too long. I have no limit. All I can say is that the shorter the time, the safer it is. The longer the time, you impair safety by extending it. If there is no arrest and no detention, there is nothing in the case that indicates that there is any time limit at all. When there is no detention, but the longer you interrogate, I think the greater likelihood there is, particularly if you are focusing on that suspect, for an inference to be drawn that he was being detained or at least he would make it appear at a trial, months later, that he felt that he was being detained because you held him up so long. I would think that nothing more specific than that can be given.

Chief Layton: On the question of the telephone number, do you have any indication of when or what the prospects are of getting the phone number from the Bar Association for making calls at night?

Mr. Bress: No, sir, I have no indication as of this moment when they will make it available. Now, while I have all you gentlemen in one place, there is one other problem that has been disturbing me. And that is the matter of free press and fair trial. I am concerned and I know you must be with the problem that arises from pre-trial publicity. Particularly when some well publicized cases or exciting cases are coming up for trial; and a lot of information gets into the press that furnishes the basis for the defendant asking for a change of venue or postponements of trial; no good comes from unnecessary information being given to the press. The press is entitled to know everything that takes place in the Courtroom. The press is entitled to know certain things, within certain limits, that a man is arrested, what he is arrested for, what were the circumstances surrounding the arrest and so forth. They are not entitled to know—they are not even supposed to be told—what his criminal record is. The press should not be told that a man makes a confession. Those matters are likely to be disputed at a trial. So I would request that there be self-restraint exercised in releasing anything to the press, other than the basic data of time and place of arrest, the nature of the charge, identification of the man, period. Nothing about the gruesome details of the offense.

Question: I would like to say one thing. The police get blamed for a lot of this detailed information, Mr. Bress, when this information comes from another source.

Answer: I'm not blaming anybody.

Question: No, but I'm sure that you realize that the press is something to deal with. Number (1)—they call up the individuals involved; the individuals pose for them; (2)—they make statements on the type and size of the gun that was used. I couldn't agree more with you in your thinking; don't misunderstand me, but I would like to clear this up. We try to stick to the basic facts, but we find it almost an impossibility because of the other ingredients in the situation, such as the people involved. So, I agree that we should keep out these statements that give all detailed information, such as the caliber of gun we might be looking for, knife or any of the things that would be admissible as evidence in the Court. But we have another problem, I'm sure, you are aware of. We don't give all the information out. Most of this information that you are talking about comes from the persons involved. You see their pictures in the newspapers, on television, etc. I would like to ask this question too, while I'm here. Often times we are asked for photographs of the individuals, who are arrested and that judgment as to whether or not we release the picture is based on many things, but I read in the papers just recently where even if you showed the I.D. picture without the number on it, the Courts were considering this an invasion of the suspected person's rights. I wonder if you would say whether we should release these pictures or not.

Answer: Of a man under arrest?

Question: Yes, sir.

Answer: Well, I don't think that unless there is a question of identification involved in the case——

Question: Well, there is always a question of identification in a robbery, under any circumstances.

Answer: Well, then I would—if that is a picture of the man who is under arrest—that is not your statement. This is the man who actually committed the offense. This is the man you charged?

Question: Yes, sir.

Answer: We try to exercise self-restraint in the prosecutor's office and we are under limitations on what statements we can make. You will frequently see no comment in connection with any case that is pending trial. No comment about anything that occurs or who appears before a Grand Jury. For example, we are permitted under the rules of the Department of Justice to release only the following information. Now this doesn't necessarily bind you, but I think the philosophy should be the same; the defendant's name, age, residence, employment, marital status and similar background information. That's all right. The substance or text of the charge such as the complainant, indictment or information. The identity of the investigating and arresting agencies and the length of the investigation. The circumstances immediately surrounding an arrest including the time and place of arrest, resistance, pursuit, possession and use of weapons in connection with arrest and the description of the items seized at the time of arrest. That is as far as we can go. Now, these are the things that I think, in your own common sense, should be the limit of what is released. Observations about a defendant's character, statements, admissions, confessions or alibis attributed to a defendant should not be made. Reference to investigative procedures such as fingerprints, polygraph examinations, ballistic tests or laboratory test should not be made. Statements concerning the identity or credibility or testimony of prospective witnesses and statements concerning evidence or argument in the case should not be made. Those are the things that are verboten-prohibited.

Question: They are all fine words and we like that, but the 251 is a public record. Also, the arrest book is public record by law. Now, we have somewhat of a problem there, I think, because the 251 Form gives a detailed report of the offense of any arrest made, etc.

Answer: I think if it is a public record, the press has access to it. Thank you, Gentlemen. It has been a pleasure to be here before you.

Deputy Chief Hartnett: Well men, as Mr. Bress has told you, this is now the law, and we will have to adjust and we will have to comply with it. I know, and you know, we will have problems accompanying this adjustment. There will be Department Orders issued later.

Now, I urge you that if you have any problems to consult with your Precinct Supervisor or Squad Leaders, so they can present them to us and we, in turn, can present any particular problems to the District Attorney's Office for possible answer.

I doubt if I could inspire you with the equivalent of a half-time pep talk such as Knute Rockne used to give to his Notre Dame teams, but nevertheless, I sincerely say, don't get discouraged, but get out there and do the same good job that you have been doing all along.

Do you have anything else, Chief Layton?

Chief Layton: Nothing else.

Mr. Bress: Chief, I would like to say one thing. In my seven months as the United States' Attorney, my relationship to the Department has been excellent. My contact with the Chief has been wonderful. The work that I have seen your men do in the course of the past seven months has been inspiring. I compliment each one of them for the fine job. I don't think there is a better Police Department in the United States—but we must strive to make it even better.

By direction of the Chief of Police:

JOHN S. HUGHES,
Deputy Chief of Police, Acting Executive Officer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a general order which was issued to the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia by the Deputy Chief of Police, John S. Hughes, on July 16, 1966, the subject of which deals with the questioning of arrested persons.

There being no objection, the general order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
July 16, 1966.

[General Order No. 9–C, Series 1964]

Subject: Questioning of Arrested Persons.

To the Force:

Under date of June 13, 1966, the Supreme Court of the United States delivered an opinion in the case of Ernesto A. Miranda vs The State of Arizona.

In the cited opinion "Custodial Interrogation" is defined as: "Questioning initiated by law enforcement officers after a person has been taken into custody or otherwise deprived of his freedom of action in any significant way."

The Constitutional issue decided is the admissibility of statements obtained from a defendant questioned while in custody and deprived of his freedom of action.

The opinion states that the prosecution may not use statements stemming from custodial interrogation of the defendant unless it demonstrates the use of procedural safeguards effective to secure the privilege against self-incrimination.

To assure the proper procedural safeguards are employed the following measures are required.

Prior to any questioning, the person must be warned that:

A. He has a right to remain silent.

B. Any statement he does make may be used as evidence against him.

C. That he has the right to presence of an attorney whether retained or assigned.

* * * * *

QUESTIONING OF ARRESTED PERSONS

In accordance with the law now defined in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States and recommendations of the United States Attorney, members of the Force are directed that:

To comply with the provisions of the law the arrested person shall be clearly warned in the following terms:

You are under arrest. Before we ask you any questions, you must understand what your rights are.

You have the right to remain silent. You are not required to say anything to us at any time or to answer any questions. Anything you say can be used against you in court.

You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before we question you and to have him with you during questioning.

If you cannot afford a lawyer and want one, a lawyer will be provided for you.

If you want to answer questions now without a lawyer present you will still have the right to stop answering at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer.

If necessary, this warning will then be given in writing or explained in language which the arrested person can readily understand. If the arrested person is incapable of understanding any warning, by reason of alcohol, drugs, injury or other reason, the warnings may be postponed until the arrested person is capable of understanding the warning and questions put to him.

Officers should remember that the critical point is the time the arrest is made or the person's freedom of action is limited, for it is then that the person must be fully advised of his rights.

If a person is not under arrest and is not deprived of his freedom of action in any way, no warning need be given and questions may be freely asked.

Information obtained by interrogation before arrest is admissable and not impaired by this opinion.

When conducting investigations, officers shall attempt to develop and complete in every detail possible the accumulation of evidence against the suspect prior to making the arrest.

Whether under arrest or not, spontaneous statements made by an individual, not in response to questions, are admissable in evidence. Accurate notes should be made of such statements.

Unsolicited or volunteered statements of persons who appear at police stations, or call in by telephone and state they have committed a crime, are not barred or affected by this opinion.

If the defendant indicates in any manner and at any stage of the process that he wishes to consult with an attorney before speaking there can be no questioning.

If the defendant is alone and indicates in any manner that he does not wish to be interrogated, the police may not question him.

The fact that he may have answered some questions or volunteered some statements on his own does not deprive him of the right to refrain from answering any further inquiries until he has consulted with an attorney, and thereafter consents to be questioned.

If the accused decides to talk to his interrogators, he is still entitled to do so with the assistance of counsel.

The accused must be clearly informed that he has the right to consult with a lawyer and to have the lawyer with him during interrogation. This right does not depend on the accused making the request.

If the accused states that he wants an attorney, the interrogation must cease until an attorney is present. At that time the individual must have an opportunity to confer with the attorney and to have him present during any subsequent questioning.

If the individual cannot obtain an attorney and he indicates that he wants one before speaking to police, they must respect his decision to remain silent.

A defendant may waive these rights, provided the waiver is made voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently. This necessarily will require proof that the defendant did completely understand and freely waive his rights.

Waiver of rights by an arrested person, whether oral or written, shall be witnessed by other officers, but preferably, by other civilian witnesses already involved, or otherwise willing to do so.

Questioning should not be lengthy in the absence of a lawyer. Even with an express waiver, the Court has stated that lengthy interrogation before a statement is made is evidence that the waiver is invalid.

Whenever an express waiver is given and a statement obtained without a lawyer, prompt presentment before the United States Commissioner or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as required by Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, is still necessary.

The Supreme Court opinion states that an "express statement that the individual is willing to make a statement and does not want an attorney followed closely by a statement could constitute a waiver."

In order to fully apprise a person interrogated of the extent of his rights, it is necessary to warn him not only that he has the right to consult with an attorney, but, also, if he is indigent, that a lawyer will be provided to represent him before questioning. If he states he wants a lawyer present, it is then incumbent upon the police to give him the opportunity to contact his own lawyer or, if he has none, to make one available to him through one of the volunteer legal agencies.

In so doing, the arresting officer shall place the call to the agency, notify the person answering, of the name of the arrested person, the place of detention and the offense charged. A written record of the date, time, and the person so notified shall be kept as a part of the case history.

If a lawyer requested by the arrested person comes to the precinct station or Headquarters, the arrested person shall be afforded every reasonable opportunity for confidential consultation consistent with safeguards against escape or the commission of an unlawful act. If no lawyer appears, and if a relative or friend requested by the arrested person comes to the precinct station or Headquarters, it is advisable that one such person be permitted to talk for a reasonable time with the arrested person, though officers, in their discretion, may admit others.

Communication and access to an arrested person by a person other than a lawyer may be denied or postponed where there is a reason to believe that it is sought for the purpose of destroying evidence, concealing stolen property, intimidating witnesses, warning an accomplice, or arming or facilitating escape by the arested person. If such communication or access is denied, a record shall be made stating the reason.

In accordance with provisions of Chapter VI, Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Manual, every possible effort shall be made to communicate with the person or persons whom the arrested person wishes to notify of his arrest, including use of the telephone. A record shall be made of any request of an arrested person to communicate with another person. If there is no request, the officer shall so note.

After the accused person has conferred with counsel, and it is felt that interrogation is necessary or likely to be productive, the officer shall repeat the warning of rights previously given to the accused, while counsel is present and then proceed with the interrogation unless or until terminated by the arrested person. Close attention should be given by the interrogator to the questions asked and the answers volunteered so that a concise and accurate résumé can be made of the statement. When possible, and with the agreement of the accused and his counsel, this statement should be reduced to writing and offered to the accused for his signature, if time permits and it would not otherwise cause "unnecessary delay" of arraignment.

Although speed of arraignment is of less importance now, if a lawyer is present during interrogation, it still must be considered.

When a person wanted by this Department is arrested in another jurisdiction and has been subjected to questioning by others, whenever possible, interrogation by members of this Department, after advising of rights, should not begin until the prisoner has been moved in time and place from his former surroundings.

Nothing herein prohibits questioning for information necessary for the booking and processing of a prisoner through the Identification Bureau.

Accompanying this order is a "Warning and Consent" form which shall be executed whenever an arrested person indicates willingness to waive his rights and make a statement. This includes a "consent to speak" portion whereby an arrested person may indicate that he desires to waive his rights and that he fully understands what he is doing. He shall be given this form to read, or if unable to read the form it shall be read to him, after which he shall be allowed to sign the "consent to speak" portion thereof. The remainder of the form shall be completed and then signed by the officer and the witnesses. Other officers may be used as witnesses; however, it is preferable to utilize other than police personnel as witnesses, if available.

A copy of this General Order, with attachment, shall be distributed to each member of the Force in accordance with the procedure outlined in General Order No. 12, Series 1958.

By direction of the Chief of Police:

JOHN S. HUGHES,
Deputy Chief of Police, Acting Executive Officer.

Order rescinded: General Order No. 9-B, Series 1964.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have here a "Warning and Consent" form which has been distributed to the members of the Police Department of the District of Columbia by the Deputy Chief of Police. This is a form which shall be executed whenever an arrested person indicates willingness to waive his rights and make a statement. The form reads as follows:

WARNINGS AND CONSENT—WARNING AS TO YOUR RIGHTS

You are under arrest. Before we ask you any questions, you must understand what your rights are.

You have the right to remain silent. You are not required to say anything to us at any time or to answer any questions. Anything you say can be used against you in court.

You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before we question you and to have him with you during questioning.

If you cannot afford a lawyer and want one, a lawyer will be provided for you.

If you want to answer questions now, without a lawyer present, you will still have the right to stop answering at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer.

The suspect is then supposed to add his signature to the form. His signature will indicate that he understands his rights in this matter and that he desires to waive his rights.

That portion of the form reads as follows:

CONSENT TO SPEAK

I know what my rights are. I am willing to make a statement and answer questions. I do not want a lawyer. I understand and know what I am doing. No promises or threats have been made to me or used against me.

Signature

Date and time ----------------------------

Statement was read by Defendant ---------

Statement was read to Defendant ----------

Signature of Officer -----------------------

Witnesses: --------------------------------

This form is to be signed by the arrested person and also by the officers and by witnesses.

I hope that Senators will read this form and the general order issued by the Metropolitan Police Department, as a result of the Supreme Court's June 13 rulings, that they may fully understand the difficult burden which now has been added to those already carried by policemen in their efforts to secure evidence leading to the conviction of persons who have committed crimes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the source of this statement just read by the Senator from West Virginia—"Warning and Consent," "Warning As to Your Rights," and then "Consent to Speak," and finally the signature of the accused or the suspect?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The source is the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that what they are doing now?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is what is being done.

At first, I presented for the RECORD a transcript of a briefing by the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, Mr. David G. Bress. This was a briefing to the chief and to the members of the police department, and the briefing took place on June 21, which was 8 days after the Court decision on June 13.

This briefing was then put in the form of a memorandum and distributed to the police department personnel.

The next day, on July 16, the General Order No. 9-C was distributed to the members of the police force of the District of Columbia, and this had to do with the questioning of arrested persons.

Accompanying the general order was the form which is to be signed by suspects and by arresting policemen. Policemen are to carry this form with them; and if the suspect is willing to sign the statement, showing that he knowingly, willingly, and intelligently waives his rights, the suspect is to sign, and the arresting policeman is also to sign in the presence of witnesses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that prior to this Supreme Court decision, the information imparted to a suspect dealt primarily with the information that he had a right to answer questions or not to answer them, that whatever he said would be used against him in court, but that now the following statement has been added to that general procedure:

You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before we question you and to have him with you during questioning.

If you cannot afford a lawyer and want one, a lawyer will be provided for you.

If you want to answer questions now, without a lawyer present, you will still have the right to stop answering at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer.

Is that the substance of it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, I shall read from the transcript of the briefing by Mr. David G. Bress. This is what he said at that time:

Under the *Miranda* case I have prepared what I consider to be an appropriate warning, the exact language of which I am not yet wedded to. I will probably try and simplify it for more effective use. That warning now should state as follows:

(1) *You have been placed under arrest. You are not required to say anything to us at any time or to answer any questions. Anything you say can be used against you in court.*

So far so good, that is not different from your prior warning.

Prior to the Miranda case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was on the bench for 10 years, and that is the warning that was usually given.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

To proceed, he said:

The second part is also similar to the prior warning:

(2) *You may call a lawyer or a relative or a friend and they may come here to speak with you. A phone will be made available to you for that purpose.*

That, too, is consistent.

Now, beginning with the third and fourth—there are only four paragraphs to this warning—we have the essence of the case, and I will then go about explaining it. I think it is better to give it to you in this highlight first.

(3) *You have the right to consult with a lawyer before we ask you any questions and to have such lawyer present with you during such questioning. You may retain a lawyer if you are financially able to do so. If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be furnished to you if you so desire,* and that is before questioning, not as in the prior case, when you go to court.

(4) *If you fully understand these rights which you have, but, nevertheless, of your own free will desire to answer questions about the matter under investigation, without the presence of a lawyer, you may waive such rights and answer the questions.* If you decide to answer questions now without a lawyer present, you will still have the right to stop answering at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer.

That, in essence, is what the Miranda case requires, and the Miranda case is the law.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That answers the question clearly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following articles: an editorial from the July 28, 1966, edition of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser; an article from the June 15, 1966, edition of the Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio; an editorial from the June 15, 1966, edition of the Columbus, Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio; an editorial from the June 14, 1966, edition of the Chicago, Ill., Tribune; an editorial from the June 15, 1966, edition of the New York Daily News; a column by David Lawrence from the June 15, 1966, edition of the Washington Evening Star; an editorial from the June 15, 1966, edition of the Washington Evening Star; and a column by Richard Wilson which appeared in the June 17, 1966, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LENIENCY FOR OFFENDERS IS ENCOURAGEMENT TO VIOLENCE

The effects of leniency in dealing with criminals was made clear in the official report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, released today, reviewing the 6-percent increase in violent crimes during 1965.

In connection with the report Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach disclosed that crimes such as murder, robbery, burglary and aggravated assault during the year numbered more than two and three-quarters million.

The FBI record of 135,000 known offenders revealed that three of every four had a prior arrest. The entire group had an average criminal career of more than 10 years during which they averaged five arrests.

Forty-eight percent had been arrested in two or more states, and over half had benefited from leniency in the form of parole, probation, conditional release or suspended sentence.

After the first leniency the group averaged more than three arrests.

FBI records also exposed the extent to which repeaters contribute continuously to the national crime problem. A record of over 6,900 offenders who were released between January and June, 1963, after having been charged, showed that 48 percent were arrested for new crimes within two years.

Fifty-nine percent of the burglars, 70 percent of the auto thieves and 64 percent of the robbers repeated during that time.

How the United States Supreme Court and other tribunals can justify their recent trend of finding new unprecedented technicalities for releasing criminals in the face of these statistics is beyond the comprehension of the people that suffer from increasing violence.

The 46-percent increase in serious crimes just since 1960 should certainly cause some effort to apply the only known remedy—swift, certain and adequate punishment.

The trend of the times, however, is not only to show leniency to criminals but to create the impression that law-enforcement officers are a bunch of sadistic characters who get their kicks from brutalizing offenders.

The restrictions that the Supreme Court has thrown up to protect criminals from police questioning can open the way for almost sure acquittal from any crime.

If, for instance, Richard Speck, the man charged with the mass murder of eight Chicago student nurses, would ignore the advice of his attorney and insist on confessing despite constitutional rights recently set up by the Supreme Court, he would certainly make a good case for a plea of insanity.

The only apparent way out of this absurd situation for law enforcement is a constitutional amendment imposing reasonable conditions for accepting voluntary confessions in evidence.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, June 15, 1966]

SAXBE RAPS COURT RULING ON INTERROGATION—SAYS WAY OPEN FOR LAWLESS TO "TREE TOWN"

Ohio Atty. Gen. William B. Saxbe forecast bleakly Tuesday the U.S. Supreme Court has opened the way for the lawless "to 'tree' the town."

Saxbe borrowed the phrase from Western lore. It referred to desperadoes taking six-gun control of small settlements.

The attorney general joined untold numbers of police and prosecutors who received with dismay the court's Monday decision regarding self-incrimination.

The far-reaching, 5–4 decision, laid down rules which make it impossible for police to question an uncooperative suspect and further weakened the legal effect of oral or written confessions, Saxbe said:

"I think the decision is a bunch of ——— ———," the out-spoken attorney general fumed.

Saxbe, who has been instrumental in attempting to raise pay scales and employment qualifications for Ohio lawmen, asserted the high court has imposed a nearly insurmountable block to law enforcement.

"The police officer today has got to be a diplomat, a combat soldier, a psychologist, a social worker and an expert marksman—yet he gets paid less than a street cleaner," Saxbe stormed.

"Certainly there are places where the training—the background—of officers may be deficient, but with what those men are paid, we're lucky to have them," Saxbe argued.

The Attorney General pointed out that police, "to maintain law and order, must have the force. You can't just let the hoodlums have the muscle.

"They'll run wild while the poor policeman's behind the tree, reading his rule book to find out what he can do about it," Saxbe warned.

Justice John M. Harlan, one of the four who disagreed with the majority decision, had commented in his strongly worded dissent: "The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but hazardous experimentation."

Prior to the decision, attorneys general of 27 states had urged the High Court to impose no further limits on the questioning of criminal suspects.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, June 15, 1966]

RIGHTS OF LAWFUL SOCIETY SHAKEN BY WARREN OPINION

It takes a rare provocation to bring personalities into the ordinarily staid address of justices of the United States Supreme Court. But the division of opinion generated by Chief Justice Earl Warren's further limitation of interrogation as an instrument of law enforcement gave evidence that the popular misgivings about the chief justice's advocacy of permissiveness reach into the body of the court.

Most recent finding of the Warren-led majority which denies police the right to question suspects in criminal investigations without the subjects' consent brought a heated rebuttal from Justice John M. Harlan who contended the chief justice had introduced a "new doctrine" and warned against anyone being "fooled by it."

Justice Harlan's strongest point was made when he declared the ruling, which favors criminals over law-abiding citizens, "a one-sided proposition that ignored the other side of the equation—the side of society."

As in the 1964 Escobedo ruling this week's decision which extended the liberal philosophy of Escobedo was a close vote with the narrowest majority of one following the Warren leadership.

Each advancement of Chief Justice Warren's legal thinking weakens the case of the state in criminal actions. The task of law enforcement is multiplied at a time when it is already under heavy pressure from a rising crime rate.

Communism's fifth column is proffered a new security under the law and the day is readily foreseeable when contempt of official investigative bodies by the abuse of the Fifth Amendment will no longer be reprehensible.

Justice Byron R. White, another of the dissenting minority, assailed the Warren thesis as being without precedent or basis in the nation's law. He said:

"In some unknown number of cases the court's rule will return a killer, a rapist or other criminal to the streets and the environment which produced him, to repeat his crime whenever it pleases him. As a consequence there will be not a gain but a loss in human dignity."

We concur in the dissent.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 14, 1966]

WHY POLICE GET GRAY

A divided decision by the Supreme Court yesterday makes it even more difficult to hang a conviction on a criminal defendant. Taken in conjunction with a long series of previous holdings by the court, the decision throws up another roadblock in the path of the police and prosecutors.

The court embellished and extended its previously enunciated doctrine that a confession may not be introduced in court unless a man under arrest is given all the breaks. Police must warn a suspect from the outset that he may remain silent. He must be told that he is entitled to the presence of an attorney from the moment he is taken into custody, and even before that. He must be warned that anything he says may be used in evidence against him.

Only if the person under arrest waives these court-defined rights can the state or federal government take advantage of his admissions. But his decision to do so must be made "voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently," and at any stage in the proceedings he may break off and demand a lawyer. It takes little imagination to see what a fruitful field these conditions open on appeal. By asking for a lawyer anywhere along the line, a defendant stands a good chance of invalidating the whole of a confession. And, if he does not exercise his protective options, it can always be contended that he was not acting "intelligently."

Chief Justice Warren, speaking for the majority, remarked that the court had arrived at its decision after reviewing its 1964 decision reversing the conviction of an Illinois defendant, Danny Escobedo, accused of murder. The court on that occasion held that any incriminating statement made after refusal of a request to see a lawyer cannot be introduced into evidence, thereby overruling a case decided only six years before.

In yesterday's decision, governing four criminal cases, the court expanded the Escobedo doctrine, which extended the right to counsel to a suspect in a police station. Now the right to counsel operates from the moment a suspect is taken into custody or "otherwise deprived of his freedom of action in any significant way."

Three of four cases before the court were decided on a 5 to 4 vote, and the other by 6 to 3. Convictions invalidated involved charges in one case of the murder of a woman and the robbery of four others; of robbing two federally insured lending institutions; of the kidnap-rape of an 18-year-old girl; and the robbery of a dress shop. The court professed itself anxious "to secure the privileges against self-incrimination."

The court began to express its aversion to confessions of any nature as far back as 1957, when it forbade federal [but not state] police to use statements produced during pre-commitment interrogation. That ruling saved Andrew Mallory from a death sentence for rape in Washington, D.C. Three years later he was convicted of the same offense in Philadelphia and is now serving a state sentence of 11½ to 23 years.

In his dissent from the Escobedo decision two years ago, Justice White objected: "Until now there simply has been no right guaranteed by the federal Constitution to be free from the use at a trial of a voluntary admission made prior to indictment. . . . Today's decision cannot be squared with other provisions of the Constitution which, in my view, define the system of criminal justice this court is empowered to administer."

Yesterday Justice White and his dissenting colleagues found themselves hollering down the old Warren rain barrel, while the majority, in Justice Black's characterization of a year ago, continued blithely to sit as "a day-to-day constitutional convention."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, June 15, 1966]

SO WHY HAVE COPS AND DA'S?

The Earl Warren Supreme Court on Monday handed down a 5–4 ruling making it extremely difficult if not impossible for police to get confessions out of arrested persons—or for courts to admit any such confessions in evidence at the ensuing trials.

Arrestees must be told on arrest that they don't have to talk to the police and can demand attorneys at once (paid by the taxpayers if the accused is broke or says he or she is), and that anything they say may be used against them.

This is the British system, plus. Remember all those expertly written English murder yarns in which Inspector Gideon or Whom-have-you of Scotland Yard tells every arrestee: "I must warn you that anything you say," etc.?

The catch is that Britons by and large are law-abiding, and many criminal strains in the British population were cut off by the old laws carrying the death penalty for dozens of offenses—whereas the American people have a tradition of rebellion, for better or worse, going back to the Revolution and Civil War.

This new ruling may force police and district attorneys to do smarter detective work and evidence-assembling. Let's only hope it doesn't turn the criminal element loose on decent people, and thereby spark revivals of Old West-style Vigilante-ism. But let's not bet on those hopes.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 15, 1966]

THE NEW "SAFEGUARDS" FOR SUSPECTS

(By David Lawrence)

An unwitnessed crime hereafter may never be punished, particularly if the suspect knows enough to keep his mouth shut. Police officers have just been told by the Supreme Court of the United States that, immediately after they take a suspect into custody and prior to any questioning, they must warn him that anything he says may be used against him. They must specifically advise him of his right not to answer any question and of his right to have counsel beside him during any interrogation to which he may consent.

If the suspect indicates "in any manner and at any stage of the process" that he wants to consult with a lawyer before speaking or that he does not wish to be interrogated, there can be no questioning. Unless the prosecution demonstrates that it has used these "procedural safeguards" in behalf of the defendant, even voluntary confessions are not admissible as evidence in a court.

When the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-4 decision, said this week that these "safeguards" are required by the Constitution, a sweeping change was made in the methods of handling persons accused of crime in America. Law-enforcement agencies now are confronted with new obstacles to the protection of men, women and children and to the prevention and punishment of crime.

The Constitution does say that no individual "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself" and that an accused person has the right "to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." But until recent years this has been construed to refer to trial procedures, and never before have these rights been extended so broadly to include questioning at the police station. Police officers in some cases have undoubtedly intimidated persons suspected of a crime, and in other instances have managed in a tactful way to elicit what are called "voluntary" confessions.

Now if a suspect makes any statement which is later used in court, the police have to prove that before the interrogation he was fully advised of his rights and had available the services of an attorney—who must be appointed for him if he is unable to retain one on his own. The suspect can waive such rights only if it is done "voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently."

Chief Justice Warren—joined by Justices Black, Douglas, Fortas and Brennan—says all this is in accord with the basic requirements of the Constitution. Four of the nine members of the court—Justices Clark, White, Harlan and Stewart—dissented and take the view that the court has gone too far.

Certainly more police officers now will be required in order to detect crimes. Since a policeman or even a witness seldom is present when a crime is committed, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to produce indisputable proof when those suspected of complicity in the crime cannot be questioned without their consent.

Some of the justices in the minority think that it is enough to require that a confession be voluntary and that it wasn't necessary for the court to stress the need for the presence of counsel at all times or the fact that the suspect can remain silent if he wishes. Justice White, in his dissenting opinion, declares:

"The most basic function of any government is to provide for the security of the individual and of his property. The rule announced today will measurably weaken the ability of the criminal law to perform in these tasks."

Justice Harlan, in his dissent, says that the court now has extended the Fifth Amendment privilege to the police station, and he adds:

"Nothing in the letter or the spirit of the Constitution or in the precedents squares with the heavy-handed and one-sided action that is so precipitously taken by the court in the name of fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities."

Many states and bar associations have been struggling to find a system that would improve law enforcement, particularly with reference to the handling of suspects in police stations. Chief Justice Warren says that the decision this week does not interfere with further efforts in that direction. But many lawyers will wonder just how any rules can be drawn up that will induce suspects to tell the police anything if even mere conversation with a person in custody cannot be used in court against him and now is regarded as a form of duress.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 15, 1966]

Green Light for Criminals

The Supreme Court's 5 to 4 ruling on police questioning of criminal suspects will be received with rejoicing by every thug in the land. For without a doubt it is a ruling which will grievously handicap the police and make it much easier for a criminal to beat the rap.

The murky torrent of words embodied in Chief Justice Warren's opinion tends to obscure some aspects of the ruling. But the salient points come through clearly enough.

Henceforth, once the police have taken a suspect into custody, they cannot lawfully ask him any questions unless four warnings have been given. (1) The suspect must be plainly advised that he need not make any statement. (2) He must be informed that anything he says may be used against him in a trial. (3) He must be told that he has a right to have an attorney *present* throughout the questioning. (4) If the suspect is an indigent, he must be assured that he will be furnished a lawyer free of charge. Unless all of these conditions are met no confession or other evidence obtained during an interrogation can be used against the suspect.

The Chief Justice makes the remarkable observation that "our decision is not intended to hamper the traditional function of police officers in investigating crime." Intent aside, he must know that this is in fact a decision which will not only hamper but will largely destroy the traditional police function, at least as far as interrogation is concerned.

Why? Because any lawyer called in to sit beside a guilty prisoner is going to tell him to say nothing to the police. He would be derelict in his duty were he to do otherwise. In the face of this, the Chief Justice blandly suggests that there is nothing in the decision which requires "that police stop a person who enters a police station and states that he wishes to confess to a crime." How true! And how often in the proverbial blue moon will this happen?

The deplorable fact is that this ruling, as far as the public is concerned, will most directly affect the vicious types of crime—the murders, the yokings, the robberies and the rapes where it often is impossible to assemble enough evidence, without a confession, to obtain convictions. All the criminal need do is to demand a lawyer—and then the police, under the practical effect of this decision, will be unable to ask him question No. 1. What was it the President said about ridding our cities of crime so law-abiding citizens will be safe in their homes, on the streets and in their places of busines?

The dissents by Justices Harlan, Clark, Stewart and White were sharply-worded. It is necessary to read them to understand the frailty of the grounds upon which the majority rests this unprecedented ruling. But a few excerpts are helpful. Justice Harlan: "Nothing in the letter or the spirit of the Constitution or in the precendents squares with the heavy-handed and one-sided action that is so precipitously taken by the court in the name of fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities." Justice White: "The real concern is not the unfortunate consequences of this new decision on the criminal law * * *, but the impact on those who rely on the public authority for protection and who without it can only engage in violent self-help with guns, knives and the help of their neighbors similarly inclined." Justice Clark: "To require all those things (demanded in the majority opinion) should cause the court to choke over more cases than (those) which it expressly overrules today."

A final point. The newest member of the court, Justice Fortas, voted with the majority. But when he testified at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on confirmation of his appointment last year he said he believed that an "adequate opportunity" for police interrogation of persons accused or suspected of crime "is absolutely essential to law enforcement." Under this decision, which Justice Fortas joined, opportunity for police interrogation becomes, not adequate, but virtually impossible. Law enforcement, and especially the public, will suffer accordingly.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 17, 1966]

Court's 5-to-4 Ruling on "Human Personality"

(By Richard Wilson)

The demeanor of the Supreme Court when the recent opinions were read on getting confessions from suspected criminals revealed that the venerable justices are very wrought up over issues of high emotional content.

They are wrestling with a peculiarly modern problem much debated on the campuses of the universities and in intellectual circles. In the court's language this is the matter of respect for the "inviolability of the human personality."

This legally obtuse language can cover a lot of ground, ranging from the college boy who does not wish to be drafted to the demonstrator in the streets and on to the beat poet who peddles the delights of LSD and marijuana, all in the name of respect for the human personality.

The court has been seized with the problem over a wide range. The sanctity of the human personality emerges in the court's terms on such matters as the right to passports, birth control, school prayers, race relations, politics, Communist affiliations.

As most recently applied, the court comes down 5 to 4 with what amounts to a new law ending any attempt by the police to induce, trick or persuade suspected criminals into confessing. They can still confess, if they insist, but not until proof can be given that they do so of their own free will after being advised that they can remain silent and have a lawyer at their side. As a practical matter talking a criminal into confessing might as well be abandoned as a police practice from now on.

What the court is doing is debating the values of our time and not without rancor but wholly without consensus on matters vitally important to the general public.

The recent issue is only legalistically the principle of protecting the rights of the accused so that he is not intimidated or terrified by the atmosphere of the station house into acting and speaking against his own interests protected by the Constitution. If that were the case, the dissenting opinions revealed that the decision would have been better than 5 to 4.

The true issue involves the majority's eager crusading spirit tipping the balance of justice toward the criminal and without equal regard for those against whom the criminal has offended nor the responsibility of the state to protect life and property.

Social activism by the five justices usually thinking in concert is what is causing the trouble in the Supreme Court, and permits the vote of one man to decide issues of great importance. Franklin D. Roosevelt had a remedy for his time. He would have nearly doubled the court's membership so that its views would be more broadly representative, and thus more convincing.

But in Roosevelt's day the court was sanctified and immutable. One might as well have talked of increasing the membership in the Holy Trinity. Today we see the court in a different light, more as a tribunal than as a court in the hallowed sense, with five of nine tribunes issuing decisions that resemble laws, or edicts and who delve deep into the sociological and psychological unknown for guidance in interpreting or restating the Constitution.

What is being discussed here is not the school desegregation decision. That was unanimous. But for the last 12 years only one-third of the court's decisions have been unanimous, and the 5-to-4 line-up often

> emerges in critical cases. A 5-to-4 decision is not convincing. It can always be overturned. If President Johnson had appointed to the court a justice like John Harlan instead of Abe Fortas, the decision would have gone another way in the confessions case.
>
> The criticism of the Warren Supreme Court is not confined to those who don't like the school prayer decision or politicians who don't like the apportionment decision or the people who now fear that Warren permissiveness will help many a murderer, rapist and narcotics peddler beat the rap. Extremists who wish to "impeach Earl Warren" have a more rational counterpart in respected law professors and members of the Supreme Court itself who are becoming increasingly sharp, not to say heated, in their objections.
>
> When there is this much smoke there is bound to be quite a fire. Chief Justice Warren added fuel to it by not merely defining the principle of freely given confessions, but by writing an edict thousands of words long on the conditions of admissible confessions. This essay was so diffuse and so fuzzy that any first year law student should be able to void a criminal's confession, no matter how freely given. Warren said, in effect, that his edict could be accepted as if it were a law until Congress or the legislatures come up with something as good of better.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to compliment and commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who has made a major speech on one of the most troublesome subjects in our country today.

He has made a great deal of research on this subject, as he always does, putting his finger accurately on the facts and figures which we need to know.

I would hope that the Senate, the administration, and the people of this country would pay attention to the remarks made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], because they are to the point and call attention to a problem which is not getting better but is getting worse as the weeks go by.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Washington yield me 5 minutes of time, please?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio proceed on his own time for 10 minutes. The reason I am doing this is that we are running out of time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his very effective paper presented to the Senate on this day, dealing with the severe crimp that will be imposed upon the police of our country and upon law enforcement officials in the effective maintenance of law and order as created by the decision in the Miranda case.

Under the language of amendment 5 of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has interpreted the following clause as justifying the pronouncement that five of its judges made in the Miranda case: "nor shall—any person—be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

The court construed that to mean that when a person is apprehended under circumstances indicating his possible connection with a crime, the officers, before they question him, in addition to what had been the practice for years gone by, must go on to tell him that he has a right to have a lawyer present; that if he does not have the money to hire a lawyer, the Government will provide him with a lawyer; that if he begins answering questions succeeding that information without a lawyer, he may determine to ask for a lawyer.

My only comment is that I wish to join with the prosecutors, the judges, and the general public in expressing the view that the majority members of the Supreme Court for some strange reason look around for justification to impose this burden upon the law enforcement officials of our country. The criminal now is shielded beyond what the framers of our Constitution ever intended. The Supreme Court has thrown practically an impregnable barrier around the criminal, that barrier being so strong that it will be incapable of penetration, and making the prosecution of criminals most difficult.

GRAND JURY FINDS COMMUNISTS ORGANIZED CLEVELAND RIOT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday the grand jury of Cuyahoga County returned a report to the common pleas court of that county, dealing with the riots that took place in Cleveland a few weeks ago. The finding of that grand jury, in my judgment, is of the utmost importance to every citizen in the United States.

I wish to read the finding of the grand jury. It will be recalled that 96 buildings were burned down, lives were taken, bodies were injured, and many other trespasses were committed.

The grand jury of Cuyahoga County is made of 15 citizens. This particular grand jury had as its foreman Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, the former editor of the Cleveland Press, who served in the capacity of editor for 36 years.

This is what the grand jury reported:

> This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals in this business.

With respect to that finding, 10 days ago in Chicago I made the statement that the riots were so replete with expert action that only one conclusion could be drawn; and that was that the movements were centrally directed and planned.

The grand jury went on to say:

> They—

And by "they" is meant these professionals—

> were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some who are either members of, or officers, in the Communist Party.

Tragically, Mr. President, in the riots were hundreds of innocent people, and especially innocent Negroes. They did not know in their participation that in the background were Communists and organizers who precipitated and exploited the riots.

I read further from the report of the grand jury:

> This jury considers it regrettable and unfortunate for the community's sake that the legal statutes of Ohio and Cuyahoga County are either so outmoded or inadequate in their scope that these responsible irresponsibles cannot at this time be reached by specific indictments for their infamous activities.

With regard to this finding, I wish to call to the attention of Senators that an amendment has been placed in the civil rights bill in the House of Representatives which would make individuals who precipitate, organize, or plan violence and riots in a community subject to Federal prosecution. When that measure comes before the Senate, it behooves us to make certain that it remains in the bill.

I shall read further from the findings of the grand jury:

> This jury further believes that, even though what already happened is both regrettable and tragic in every conceivable human aspect, there is a grave potentiality for repetition of these disorders, or others like them, occurring elsewhere in this community.

I would add to that finding that there is a grave potentiality of repetition of riots not only in Cleveland but also in every metropolitan center in the country. In my judgment, the Lansing riot, the New York-Harlem riot, the Los Angeles riot, and the Cleveland riot are trial runs. They are drills under which these Communist leaders are perfecting their technique, making it possible for them to spread the destruction, spread the disorder, and spread the impotency of government throughout the country.

Mr. President, this is another finding:

> It was established before the jury that the leaders of the W. E. B. DuBois Club and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough area disorders.
>
> These men who came from Chicago, New York, and Brooklyn . . . they were seen constantly together. They made swift contact with other Clevelanders who, the evidence showed, are leaders of the Communist Party throughout the Ohio Valley district, including Cleveland.

I repeat that the tragedy of the riots is the fact that hundreds of innocent Negroes become enmeshed in demonstrations, not knowing at all that the Communists are standing in the background pulling the strings and directing the operations.

In Cleveland the rioters had supplies of Molotov bombs, and they met at the JFK club and discussed the planning of how they would snipe policemen and firemen.

There are innocent followers among the Negroes not knowing who is directing the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may proceed for 10 additional minutes. I wish to ask a question of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The further tragedy is that exculpation is constantly provided. I do not know of anywhere that the action by a grand jury has been made which has revealed to the people what occurred. The grand jury in Cleveland, Ohio is entitled to the deepest gratitude from the people of this country, not only in Cuyahoga County, in putting its finger on what is happening in our country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to suggest to the Senator that this is a revealing document which has nailed down for the first time, after very careful study—and I assume that testimony of witnesses and things of that kind—that this actually happened. It seems to me that since the House has now passed another civil rights bill which includes eight or nine sections—and I would be less than politically naive in the ways of this body—if I did not believe that many sections might be subject to long discussion, perhaps even a filibuster—and the possibility that these sections may not even be acted upon—I hope not—but there is a possibility in the Senate, this session.

It also seems to me that the section referred to by the Senator from Ohio concerning interstate movements of agitators and organizers, works both ways, and that section could probably get agreement in the Senate. I would think so, and I would hope so; and that the Judiciary Committee might well take that section as a separate bill, if necessary, and see that we get some action on this matter. I am going to so recommend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On that score, the amendment added to the civil rights bill in the House is directed at all individuals, whites and Negroes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. It will help both ways. I think that this is so important, and with all this trouble going on in this country, I do not know what may happen in the urban areas of my State, but I suspect that agitators will be starting to move in from the outside to begin organizing. I would think so, but I have no evidence of it. However, our law enforcement officials in the State of Washington are a fine group of men and women, who are probably conscious of this fact. But this law would surely help them a great deal, and would certainly help them to prevent riots. That section of the bill is so important and so necessary at this time that in case we do have controversy and some problems with other sections of the bill, it should be made a separate piece of legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Washington very much.

Mr. President, now in conclusion——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. What is the JFK Club?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The JFK initials do not connotate what is ordinarily understood to be, of course, John F. Kennedy. They mean: Jomo "Freedom" Kenyatta. In other words, the followers of the Mau Mau operations of Kenya of which Jomo Kenyatta was the chief.

I made inquiry in Washington, as to whether there was a meeting on the night of Wednesday, the 20th, at the JFK Club, and the answer was that there was no meeting on the 20th, but there was one on the 19th.

What happened on the 19th?

On the 19th, a group was assembled at the Mau Mau Club, discussing plans as to sniping at firemen and policemen. It was during this discussion that the Cleveland police burst into the meeting and broke it up and therefore no conclusions were reached.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Unfortunately, I did not hear the first part of the Senator's remarks, but I understand that his statement was made based upon the findings of the grand jury in Cleveland?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, the Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. They are based upon the findings of the grand jury.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And after a pretty thorough investigation, I understand?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I will read the first finding.

> This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated, and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals in this business.

Now, Mr. President, in conclusion, 96 buildings were burned down. One of the leading participants, in answer to the findings of the grand jury, made this shocking and I would say ridiculous and yet unpardonable statement, that the 96 buildings were burned down by white owners who wanted to collect insurance.

Think of the travesty, the insult to the intelligence, in making that kind of statement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, one-half hour of debate will be allowed on each amendment, with the exception of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], on which 1 hour will be allowed. On the bill itself, the proponents have 4 minutes remaining, and the opponents 47 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I understand, has an amendment pending, and I think he wants to bring it up now. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington withhold that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I withhold my request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] ask unanimous consent that the time for the call of the quorum not be taken from the allotted time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; that the time not be taken from either side.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I understand that my amendment, No. 734, is the pending business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself 6 minutes on the amendment.

Our economy is threatened with inflation. The capital goods market is very tight. Reducing public buildings projects would accomplish much and cost much less. My amendment (No. 734) to the independent offices appropriations bill would reduce the amount to be spent on General Services Administration construction, sites, and expenses of public building projects by $31 million to about $117 million for 1967.

I would simply deny funds for this year for any new Federal buildings in the District of Columbia. Mr. President, I stress that this would be simply a postponement to prevent the inflationary impact in this year when the economy is tight and $31 million added spending for Government buildings in the District of Columbia would make it tighter.

This spending is direct competition with home building. It will constitute one of the reasons why the experts expect home building to be depressed next year.

Under the 1967 budget, we would provide $30 million for new buildings in the District of Columbia. Many of these projects are extravagant. The new Tax Court, for example, will cost $6.6 million, or $32 per square foot, over 50 percent greater than the average for a Federal building.

I know the proponents of the bill will argue that the Tax Court building, for example, is necessary; that the people who work in this court have waited a long time for that building. That is true, but there is no question that they can work in their present quarters with virtually equal efficiency. There is no question that the postponement of this construction will help relieve the inflationary pressures.

We are asking to start a new building for the Federal Bureau of Investigation at a cost of over $11 million. But even by the completion date of this facility, the FBI cannot use more than 84 percent of the office space.

The proposed Labor Department structure will ultimately cost $40,617,000. The bill before us proposed to provide a down payment of $12,433,000 for the substructure of the building.

I know that the proponents of the building contend that they must have this building now because the Inner Loop Freeway which is in process of construction would interfere or block the building construction after its undertaking. The answer to this point, Mr. President, is, Why not postpone the freeway construction? That too will help ease inflationary pressure.

This is not the year for the Federal Government to pump construction funds into our economy.

Finally, the Senate Appropriations Committee has provided $1,092,000 for the planning of a GSA building in the District of Columbia. It is estimated that this giant will cost over $19 million to build. This is hardly the time to embark on such a venture.

The House wisely voted to reduce the public building projects to $120 million, largely by eliminating buildings planned for the District of Columbia.

In other words, my amendment would go back to what the House did.

I feel strongly that we should follow their example. We are truly giving a nonessential program a priority it poorly deserves.

Mr. President, Senators and economists may differ on the necessity for a tax increase now. We may disagree on the dangers of inflation or whether the economy is going to overheat in the next 6 months, as the Federal Reserve Bank of New York predicted on Monday of this week. But, Mr. President, I think most of us agree that this is the year when we should, if we can do so, postpone all but the most essential Government expenditures, and especially spending for construction. The President of the United States has repeatedly pleaded with American industry to do this.

The President and his economists have pointed to the boom in business investment in plant and equipment as the most inflationary element in the economy—as the economists have long categorized it—the accelerator.

Now, Mr. President, if private industry should postpone building when possible, why should not the Federal Government? What kind of example are we setting for the economy? Will we think one way and act another?

Well, Mr. President, this amendment offers an opportunity to ease up on the accelerator that is speeding us toward inflation.

Let me quote from the report of the the Federal Reserve Bank of New York of last Monday. The report said that business activity may "quicken in the second half of the year, intensifying the strains on the economy's productive resources."

And why is the economy likely to intensify this pressure? The report asserts, and I quote, "spending at all levels of government appears headed up strongly over the balance of the year."

Mr. President, this means, of course, that to the extent that the economy reflects the Federal Reserve view, the Board stands ready to continue to keep money tight and interest rates high.

And that means the kind of appropriation now before us which my amendment would cut about 20 percent, is exactly the kind of appropriation which will mean higher interest rates as well as higher prices, unless we reduce it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article published in the Washington Evening Star about the prediction of the New York Federal Reserve Bank with respect to Government spending for the rest of the year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE BANK'S PREDICTION: MORE EXPANSION INFLATION

NEW YORK.—The Federal Reserve Bank of New York predicts that business expansion will increase in the next five months and inflationary pressures will grow.

The bank, the largest and most influential of the 12 regional reserve banks, said in its monthly review yesterday that business activity may "quicken in the second half of the year, intensifying the strains on the economy's productive resources."

Strong pressures for higher prices should persist and possibly become stronger, the bank said.

Federal pay raises and the start of medicare should strengthen consumer spending, the report said, and capital investment by business should speed up if major labor strikes do not occur.

The banks said spending at all levels of government—local state and federal—"appears headed up strongly over the balance of the year."

The report of the bank is seen as an indication that the Federal Reserve will continue and possible strengthen its present policy of restraint on credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that I do not think this matter fits the generalities of the state of the economy as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. It is necessary to deal with specifics, and then to try to consider those specifics in relationship to what may be the general condition of the economy. It is not merely a question of needs; it is necessary to proceed to fulfill the needs in accordance with the general, overall picture.

The Senate committee, as has the House committee, responded to the general proposition that we should not proceed with as much public building as we normally do. The authorizations and fundings for public buildings over the years, as a rule of thumb, has always been between $170 million and $180 million, in some cases perhaps higher, but never more than $200 million for the whole country. For a country like ours, which is growing both in population and in the expansion of the economy, this is a modest amount. Percentagewise, it is probably less than is spent in any other country. Many other countries spend much more for public buildings in their national budget than the United States does.

We know that every year it is necessary to proceed to construct some public buildings. Many of our present buildings are inadequate. If Government agencies are required to function in inadequate quarters, that, in turn, does not help to serve the public needs. Also, some public buildings are so old that it is good economy to build new ones.

Another factor involved is that in renting buildings, the rental of space may be more expensive; or what rental space is available is too high priced when compared with the amortization of the cost of a public building.

So these are the criteria that are used in determining whether to construct public buildings. Many of them, particularly larger structures, can be amortized in the short period of 10 years at less than the cost of paying rent.

So that is the criterion. This year, the budget did reduce the funds for public buildings. Those outside the District, throughout the country, which are listed in the report, are only a few, where conditions seem to dictate that buildings should be built for reasons of high rental, deterioration, or the expanding needs of a rapidly growing population. So those buildings outside the District are buildings with definite priorities. They are few in number. They stand in line.

The Senator from Colorado and I never find out where these buildings are to be built until they come up and tell us; and they usually justify their requests with specific reasons to the House committee and to our committee.

Therefore, I say we have responded to the general proposition—with which no one could disagree—of the Senator from Wisconsin. This year, the total public buildings budget was $170 million, which follows pretty much the rule of thumb that seems to be necessary to stay alive these days, and used good commonsense on the question of public buildings throughout the country.

The House did cut out the buildings in the District of Columbia. One of those was the FBI building, which we authorized and for which sites and planning were started, 3 years ago. The land has been purchased, and they are ready to go. As Senators know, it will be located across from the Department of Justice on Pennsylvania Avenue, and is part of the planned rehabilitation of the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

But we thought perhaps it would be best not to go ahead with the whole building right now. It will be a building of considerable size, involving considerable cost; and we felt that perhaps funds for its construction should be delayed, even though the FBI is now scattered all over town. I do not know the exact number of locations; I believe the Senator from Colorado and I heard testimony that there are eight or nine places.

There is not much coordination. The work they do is so highly specialized that coordination is needed.

We did feel that since the land is ready, we might be justified in going ahead with the substructure—that is, the excavation. So we have put back in the bill the amount of money for the substructure for the FBI building, which is $11,320,000. We feel the ultimate completion of the building will not be delayed, because they will not be ready with the contracts, the design, and those matters, until probably next spring, anyway. We felt it was not necessary, as the budget suggested, to fund the entire amount. So the figure for that building was reduced some $30 million from what the budget had approved.

Then, as the Senator from Wisconsin suggests, we felt some urgency to take a good, long, hard look at the suggested new Labor building. The reason that we recommend funds for the substructure of that building, amounting to $12,433,000, is because an inner beltway is planned for the District, to come down from the plaza and underneath the Esso filling station—which is a familiar landmark to most of us down Constitution Avenue—and we thought we could save some money by having the substructure and excavation contractor working at the same time that the road contractors are building that tunnel. Because if they built the tunnel and completed the inner beltway, and then we decided to put up the Labor building, we would have to tear it all up, which might entail considerably greater cost. We do not have any definite figure, but we know it would cost more. So we put funds for that substructure into the bill, without funding any money for the building itself.

It has been my feeling, at least, that the Tax Court should have some kind of priority. I had hoped that the Senator from Wisconsin might split his amendment, so that the funds for these three separate buildings might be dealt with one at a time. The Tax Court has long needed a building. They have been moved around. Since the LaFayette Square plan was originated, they have been in three or four different places. Their work has increased—it naturally increases as we get more taxpayers in our population; more people, we hope, go to the Tax Court seeking justice on their tax bills; and I am hopeful that during the next session we will establish a small Tax Court for the little fellow whose claim is under $2,500, where he can have his case heard. We have a bill for that purpose; 55 Senators have cosponsored it, and I hope we can obtain more support next session.

But the Tax Court has been moved around considerably for 4 or 5 years, and I do not believe they can do their job as well as if they had their own building. It happens that the Securities and Exchange Commission, which used to be housed down below here in the temporary buildings, has moved. That plot is now available for the Tax Court, and that is where they expect to build their building.

This is what I mean by having to fit in each specific item, considering what the need is and what it is worth. Overall, I believe we have clearly done what the Senator from Wisconsin suggests. We have cut down the public buildings appropriation. I think we have done our share. The House wanted to go further; but I have been chairman of this committee long enough to believe that the House probably expected that we would put back in the bill some public buildings in the District, and we would have to go to conference with it; and that, too, is one of the reasons why we put these items back in.

It is a question of looking at each project to see whether it is likely to cost us more in the long run, when we know the projects are needed.

I know there is a great deal of building going on in the District. When I come down to work, sometimes I wonder if there is not too much. I think every Senator who drives to work or comes down to the Capitol, if he lives out some distance, has probably had that definite impression.

But the truth is that the Tax Court is needed. The truth is, I think, that we will save money on the substructure on the Labor building. The FBI building has been a long-established project, and that agency is scattered. We feel it is possible that by getting them a building and getting them together, we might save more in the long run.

The FBI is an important part of our Government. With the rising crime rate, they have more responsibility than they have had in the past. We want to give them working conditions by which they can carry out that responsibility at this time when it is so badly needed in the country.

That is the reason we have put these items back in the bill. We did not discuss very much, if at all, the GSA planning sites and planning. The GSA themselves, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, did not press that matter too much, as I recall. However, they were concerned as to the cost of the substructure of the Labor Department building. They were concerned about the top priority need of the Tax Court and the needs of the FBI.

We do not save anything in the long run by not going ahead with that substructure. That is the reason these items are in the bill.

Again responding to what we thought was our responsibility in these economic times, we cut down wherever we could. There is $32 million provided under the budget for the District of Columbia buildings, but $101 million is provided for the whole country.

That is about one-tenth of 1 percent of the budget for public buildings. I do not think there is a country in the world, Nigeria, Iceland, Great Britain, Japan, or any other country, that spends such a small percentage of their budget for public buildings.

That is why we think we are clearly carrying out our responsibility in these economic times by cutting this amount down as much as possible. But we did have to consider the specific needs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and join him as a cosponsor of it.

The argument that postponement would be expensive from the standpoint of the Labor Department building, because of the substructure, does not hold up. The GSA on many occasions has put out a different contract for the substructure than for the major contract. That procedure can be followed again.

The President has called on American industry to postpone construction on all projects which are not absolutely essential until such time as the Vietnam war requirements have been met or we can reduce the demand for goods and thereby check this inflationary spiral.

I think it is time that the Government starts to live up to its own recommendations to American busines.

There is no doubt in my mind that the argument of the Senator from Washington is good. The Senator argues that if we postpone these matters, as the result of the increasing inflation that will follow, it may cost more to build the projects later.

That is the argument being used by everybody in America—that, with the continuation of the inflation that is confronting us, if we do not build today the warehouse, plant, or home we want, it will cost more money to build later.

The cause of this inflation is the deficit spending of the administration itself. We are forcing inflation, but yet the administration is asking American businessmen to cut back and not hesitate to pay more later in order to reduce the strain on the economy now. Are we not willing to practice that policy in Congress?

I think the Senate should agree to the amendment.

I will have an amendment which I shall offer later to postpone the construction of all projects providing for public buildings under this bill in all of the States, including Delaware, until such time as we have won the war or have more money. This amendment would stop all projects unless the President certifies that the particular building is essential to the national interest.

We cannot say that no building can be constructed under any circumstances, for a building may be needed in our national defense program. However, that is not true with the post offices and other public buildings, many of which we have waited for years to build.

The Tax Court building in Washington does not have to be built today. We have done without the building for years. We can postpone its construction for a few more years until the war is over and the strain is removed from the economy. The only way to check inflation is to stop pumping money into the economy, and the only way to do that is to stop approving all these projects dreamed of in the various States.

Certainly if we are going to ask the American businessmen to cut back the Government ought to practice what we preach.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to suggest that the Senator from Colorado and I were thinking so much about the possibility of more cost being involved with respect to the Labor Department building substructure because of rising prices. However, we were definitely concerned that, if they went ahead with the inner beltway, we might have to tear the building down. That was the predominant consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I can understand how that might be possible.

But the GSA has, on occasion, contracted for the substructure separately from the main structure.

I thought that was a poor way to construct a building. Nonetheless, for no valid reason that has been advanced the GSA approved two separate contracts for the Philadelphia Mint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on the construction of the mint in Philadelphia, a year ago, the GSA, instead of putting that contract out for the complete building, divided it into two contracts, one for the substructure involving approximately $2,750,000; and a year after the completion of that work they advertised for bids on the rest of the structure. The remainder of the structure involved a cost of approximately $12 million.

It would not be at all impossible to carry out the objective which has been raised here. If it is essential that the substructure be put in we could still let the building be finished a year or two later.

The GSA has already set the pattern at a time when it was not necessary to do so. Today we can follow the same procedure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have 5 additional minutes. I think I used his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I will take 1 minute.

I reiterate that no member of the committee disagrees with the basic proposition of cutting down in these times. However, we must look at the needs and decide whether it is penny wise or pound foolish.

We do not accomplish anything by wasting money. I think that the Senator from Colorado and the other members of the committee have been careful concerning the items in the bill.

I still do not think that one-tenth of 1.3 percent of the Federal budget for Federal buildings would be adding too much to the proposition that has been mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin. It is probably the lowest percentage of any time in our history. I have made a research on this matter and it is the lowest percentage spent by any country in the world for public buildings.

That is the reason we think we have carried out our responsibility to keep the amount as low as possible, but we had to consider some of the needs and determine whether we were being penny wise and pound foolish in doing certain things.

Had this not been true, other buildings would have been included in here at a cost of probably $170 million to $180 million, which would be only two-tenths of 1 percent of our budget.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Finance, be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to explain why the District of Columbia is picked on in this case.

First, the economy is much tighter in the District than elsewhere in the country. Unemployment in the District in the recent months was 2.4 percent, compared with 4 percent nationally. So that here there is a particularly and peculiarly inflationary situation.

Second, this is what the House did; and we all know, from a practical standpoint, that it is much easier and more practical to accept what the House has carefully considered and acted on than to disagree with the House.

In the third place, it would set an example for the Nation that we are willing to take the action to postpone spending here in the District. It would set a wholesome example for the entire country.

This would not affect any educational or human need in the District. No one has contended, and no one can contend that postponing the Tax Court and the FBI buildings and these other two projects will have any effect on taking care of the children and the others in the District of Columbia.

Finally, I should like to also add that there has been much talk about economy in Government; but when it comes to acting on it, people can always find specific reasons for evading it. I am not saying that they should vote for all economy amendments. I would not do so, myself. But it seems to me that those who believe in economy have an opportunity here to follow a policy which our economists recommend, whether liberal or conservative, and to postpone this construction in a year when we have an inflationary building boom.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use on the bill.

I should like to say a word or two about the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. He is so zealous in his efforts to keep the budget down, that I cannot help but admire him, because he talks my language when he does so. But I believe something ought to be said about this amendment.

The President and the Bureau of the Budget authorized $170 million on this particular item. The House came up with a figure of $101,565,000; and with the additions that we have put in here, we are still some $37 million under the budget figure. This, in itself, I will admit, is not a justification for starting these buildings.

However, two or three situations are particularly involved here which deserve particular consideration. One is the Secret Service Training Center, which is absolutely necessary if this group——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. That would not be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. I understand that.

The second situation involves the Labor building. If I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I believe that the Labor building situation is not understood. The Inner Loop Freeway is planned to come across from the south to the north under the Mall. It is a fact that it is going to be there. And it is absolutely foolish to let them construct this loop under the Mall and under the site where the Labor building is to be built and not at the same time put in the substructure for the Labor building. No one can convince me that it will save money—in fact, we would spend millions of dollars extra—if we would put the highway under the building site now, and then later have to install the substructure for the Labor building and put it on top of that. The only logical way to do that is to put the two in together. That is the reason why the distinguished chairman and I recommended to the committee that we do this.

Another situation which has been pressing for a long time is that involving the Tax Court. At first, until I inquired into the matter, I was about half in opposition to it. We cannot ask people who have claims in the Tax Court to go up into the Internal Revenue building and convince them that when they walk into the Tax Court across the hall, they will get a fair shake. They think that the Tax Court and the Internal Revenue Service are hand in hand. This is the simple fact of the situation. And we cannot tolerate this, because if people do not have confidence in the justice and equity of our tax courts, then we might as well do away with those courts. Today, many people believe, when they go into an IRS building, with IRS offices across the hall, that the IRS and the Tax Court are one and the same. Actually, of course, the court is where people appeal the decisions of the Internal Revenue Service.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator HAYDEN, has desired the Federal Bureau of Investigation building for a long time. I might say this: We wish to cut expenses. But in considering these buildings, we also had to consider the factors that my good friend, the chairman of the committee, has suggested. However, I believe that the Members of the Senate should consider these additional factors. We will have these items in conference with the House. No one can foretell what the attitude of the House will be, but we did not put these items in just for fun. We put them in because we thought that they were a necessity, particularly inasmuch as they were so much under the budget.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **SMATHERS** (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

Several Senators inquired of the Chair how they had been recorded on the vote.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The regular order is called for.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Metcalf
Mondale
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Allott
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cooper
Curtis
Eastland
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Cotton
Dodd
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Miller
Morton
Smathers
Tydings

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I have been asked to object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Objection is heard.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. I will ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment after the amendment has been read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

> On page 43, line 13, before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation provided pursuant to this Act to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" shall be available for any building project until the President certifies to the Congress that the construction of such project is essential in the public interest."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes and will be brief.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I think we can vote on the amendment in a few minutes——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senate will please be in order. The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. We have just voted on the question of the elimination of three projects in the District of Columbia. However, in this bill, there are many projects for public buildings throughout the country in the various States, including one in Delaware, which I know my State would like to have, but in times such as these, with a war going on in Vietnam, with a shortage of materials, all of these projects which are not absolutely essential to the national interest should be postponed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will please be in order. Senators will please refrain from talking. The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment would not strike out any projects in the bill. It would merely have the effect of holding each one in abeyance until the war is over. None could be started, no work could proceed, nor any money spent unless or until the President had certified to Congress that construction of the particular project was essential to the defense of our country.

There is really only one way for the Senate to practice economy and that is to stop the construction of all public buildings which are not immediately essential until such time as we have the money or the economy of the country is in a better position.

An excellent argument was made that we need this Tax Court in the District of Columbia. I would agree with that argument, but I point out that the Tax Court has been in existence for 53 years, and we have done without the building so far, so we do not have to have it right now with a war going on. That is an example of a building construction which can be postponed, and so can many of these other buildings, regardless of how meritorious their construction under normal circumstances would be.

However, these are not normal times. There is a war on. There is a serious threat of inflation in this country. There is only one way for Congress to practice economy and that is to hold up the building of projects in every State in the Union, including the District of Columbia, hold them all in abeyance unless a particular project is found to be absolutely essential in the national interest.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to have the Record show that I was in my office. My bells did not ring. I was listening for them. I did not know about the rollcall until I was telephoned. I came over as soon as possible.

I would like the Record to show that had I been permitted to vote, I would have voted "aye."

I would also like the Record to show that the regular order was called and the usual courtesy was not extended to Members on their way to the Senate.

My office had just informed me that the bells in my office are at this moment being repaired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I approve of the general purpose of the Senator's amendment, but is it not true that the President already has this power?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Namely, that the appropriation need not be carried out if the President suspends it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but under my amendment Congress on an affirmative basis would stop these projects. It would be mandatory upon the President that he carry out this procedure. Why should we pass the buck to the President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will please be in order so that the colloquy can be heard between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to the Presiding Officer that I appreciate his efforts to get the Senate to come to order. I was afraid that I was going to be disturbing the Senate by addressing a question to the Senator from Delaware.

Let me ask the Senator, does not the President already have the power to suspend expenditures even though there has been an authorization and an appropriation made by Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. However, I wish he would exercise that power at this time, as President Truman did during the Korean war. President Truman issued a similar order during the Korean war. My amendment would make it mandatory that these projects be stopped unless there were affirmative action by the President certifying to Congress that a project was essential to the national interest.

I think the President should have been more diligent in exercising the authority to curtail expenditures that he has now. But I do not think it is quite fair for Congress to approve a series of projects for public buildings in our respective States and then pass the buck to the President and say, "Now, you stop them."

I am willing to vote to stop all this public building construction until the Vietnam war is over, including those projects in my State.

Let us stop them in Congress ourselves. We have the authority and the responsibility. This is a bill which provides for the construction of many new public buildings throughout the country, including one in Delaware as well as in many other States. This would merely hold them all in abeyance until such time as we were ready to act. Why not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the Senator is trying to do——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no one can hear what the Senator from Illinois is saying.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me on a matter of personal privilege, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I want to say that I am in the same situation as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton]. The bells did not ring in my office, either, nor did they ring in his. We were called that a vote was going on. I know that I left my office at the same time the Senator from New Hampshire did. We both left immediately and came over here, but I ran into the precipitate and rather unusual call for the regular order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have the floor, I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the regular order is often called for. I have no objection to any Senator calling for the regular order at any time. I think we abuse the privilege. As a matter of fact, there is no rule for our waiting and waiting and waiting. Some of us will miss some votes. The law of averages will catch up. This was only one vote. I had a right to call for the regular order. If the Senator from Iowa wants to call for the regular order and the Senator from Washington misses a vote, I have no objection.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely want to say that had I been here I would have voted "yea."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I agree with the Senator from Washington that one has a right to call for the regular order, but this was the first vote today. When Senators are waiting for the bells to complete work in their office this consideration has always been extended.

I assure the Senator from Washington that his invitation for the rest of us to call for the regular order will be accepted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I address an inquiry to the Senator from Delaware? I have great sympathy for what the Senator is trying to do, but the amendment would make it more difficult for the President. What the Senator is doing is providing that the President must authorize each project rather than have the power to proceed with the projects. While I shall vote for the proposal of the Senator from Delaware, if it is put to a vote, I merely wish to point out that it might have the effect of being point scoring and put the President under embarrassment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, that is not the intention of my amendment. The intention of my amendment is to put into effect during the Vietnam war the doctrine which President Truman put into effect during the Korean war when he said he was suspending all projects nationwide and that they would not be resumed until the war was over or they were certified as being essential in the national interest.

All I am saying is that we in Congress should go on record supporting this policy. This amendment does not at all put the President on the spot. Personally, I would be willing to act on these items one at a time, but that would delay consideration of the bill; besides, some may be essential. For example, there could be a project involving some military project. We could not just say that all of them must be postponed. This amendment would have the President proceed when the President thought it was essential to the national interest.

Under this amendment the President could approve the substructure of the Labor Department building in question if he felt it was in the public interest to do so.

I am not offering this amendment as any attempt to put the President under any political embarrassment—quite the opposite. He already has the same authority. This is the same proposal President Truman announced during the Korean war. It is a policy the President should have announced long ago. I am suggesting that Congress go on record since the President appears reluctant to act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This amendment is limited to the construction provided for in this bill? Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. President Truman covered all public works projects, dredging projects, and all others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Across the board.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, but this amendment is limited to public buildings referred to in this bill. I would prefer to go all the way, but under this proposal we are limiting it to the new buildings covered by the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware is limited to buildings included in the independent offices appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. President, I have asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to make a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, because it directs the President to take affirmative action before the money can be spent. It seems to me that this should be in the form of legislation. I therefore make a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask the Senator to withhold his point of order. I call attention to the fact that this amendment is to a part of the bill which likewise is legislation as reported out of the Senator's committee. I refer to page 43, lines 10 to 13. If the Senator will read the language on page 43, which language was included by this committee, that, too, is legislation. So I am proposing to amend a legislative proposal and, therefore, it is germane.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That does not mean that either one is not legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but I assume the chairman would not make a point of order against the language reported by his committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, I will make a point of order against the Senator's amendment. We fully understood that there might be a point of order against the proviso on page 43.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will find that the proviso on page 43 is legislation. Will he not agree that it, too, is legislation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think this: We often do that in the Appropriations Committee when we consider these bills. It is necessary sometimes to include legislation, but we expect to get a two-thirds vote approving the language. That particular provision is legislation, and I think the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have a strong suspicion that we would make much better progress if the point of order were not made against this amendment. I think I am entitled to vote on this amendment. This is the only way to do it unless we take up each item individually, and then we will have about 40 rollcalls. I hope the Senator will not insist on a point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all right with me; but if the Senator makes a motion to strike out this item, he is asking that the President must do something before he can proceed with any building.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is exactly what was done in the Korean war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not want to go to the White House and ask, "Will you please build a needed Federal building in my State?" I underline "needed." I think that would be putting the President in a position where he would be able to do what the Senator from Illinois suggested: "Oh, yes, surely. If you will do this, maybe I will do that."

We have tried to stop the so-called logrolling and exchanges with respect to public buildings. Proposals for public buildings are considered by the committee under a strict rule of priority and a formula. The committee never knows where the buildings will be constructed until the proposals are presented to us and their need is justified. The committee receives requests for buildings to be constructed all over the country.

I repeat what I said before: The cost of these buildings is far below what we have usually spent in carrying out what the Senator from Delaware has discussed. The bill provides $101 million for this purpose, which is one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. No other country in the world, at any time, has budgeted for public buildings in that ratio.

Mr. President, I renew my point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The point of order is sustained. The amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not question the point of order. I recognize that the amendment is legislation. But I was proposing to amend a legislative proposal.

Rule XVI, section 2, reads as follows:

> 2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

I make the point of order that the language, for example, on page 43 of the bill, line 10 through line 13, is legislation.

The bill contains various other pieces of legislation. I understand that a point of order may be made either against the amendment itself or against the bill, and I make the point of order against the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Delaware, Is his point of order being made against the specific amendment, or the entire bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make the point of order against the entire bill. This is legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the point of order being made that the committee amendment is legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make the point of order that the appropriation bill as reported by the committee does contain legislation in violation of the rule which I have cited, at page 43, lines 10 to 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The bill is recommitted to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I did not hear the ruling. The Senator from Georgia was speaking to me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate? Will the Chair command that the Senate be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I regret this and would be willing to proceed now, but I have no choice since there are points of order being made against my amendment, upon which it was my understanding we could get a vote. It now appears that the only way I can get a vote on it would be to have a motion to suspend the rules filed and lie overnight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If I can get an agreement that we can have a vote on this amendment and no point of order made, I am willing to proceed. Otherwise, I shall have to insist on my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will agree that his amendment is legislation——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which the Chair has ruled on both points of order, it will require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, it will not. Under the rules unless the point of order were made it would only require a majority. Unless there is a point of order made against either of them only a majority vote is required. That is the rule. I will withdraw my point of order against the legislation which the committee has put in the bill if the point of order against my amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator can make his point of order if he wishes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And we would have to appeal for a two-thirds vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, there is no appeal on this.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would be glad to have a vote on the Senator's amendment, if he agrees it is legislation, and will further state that his amendment is legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are both legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, both. The Senator can make a point of order on the other one if he wishes; the committee does not care at all whether it is in or out. It amounts to a very minor matter on urban housing. It is only put in there to be helpful.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the point of order stands. I do not withdraw it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hardly ever enter into debate on the technicalities of the rules. But I have been sitting here for 2 days now, listening, and at times, participating in the debate on this bill—as the managers of the bill, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington know.

We have debated and voted on a number of very important subjects. There were votes on amendments to reduce appropriations for the Space Administration. They were followed by quite an extended debate upon whether Congress should reduce appropriations for the civilian supersonic aircraft. I voted for these amendments.

This morning we had a lengthy debate upon appropriations for construction of buildings in the District of Columbia.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Delaware extends the substance and purpose of the amendments upon the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia. I sit beside my friend and colleague, the Senator from Delaware, and have great respect for him. But I believe that, since we have debated for 2 days on this bill, which affects nearly a score of important independent offices and agencies of the Government, we ought to continue and finish the bill.

So, with all respect to my friend and seatmate, Senator WILLIAMS, I hope he will withdraw his point of order, and permit the Senate to go ahead. He can propose another amendment to eliminate all of these projects, we can vote and we will reach the same conclusion, and we can proceed on the bill. I hope very much that we can proceed.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it would not be much trouble for the committee to have a meeting immediately downstairs, and come right back with the same bill unanimously—which they would do—it would be all right with me to do that. But in view of the fact that the Senator from Delaware has told the Senate—and I know he will verify my statement—that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, attached to a proviso in which the committee is not really interested one way or the other—it was really put in there to aid the urban renewal program, for better procedure, which we do occasionally in Senate appropriation bills, though I have never known of any legislation of major importance being put in an appropriation bill by a Senate committee, sometimes, to expedite things, we feel we have to do this—and the Senator wishes a vote, which he is entitled to, on his proposal—which would make the President the czar of public buildings in the country, not Congress; I do not know how I would fare under that rule, but I hope I will not have to ask the President to build a needed public building in my State—I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my original point of order, and I understand the Senator from Delaware will do the same.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The unanimous-consent request must be made that the ruling of the Chair be rescinded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the ruling of the Chair on the point of order of the Senator from Delaware also be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have talked with the Senator from Washington, trying to get an agreement, and I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said. But as I understand it the only way to arrive at a vote on my amendment would be to obtain an agreement with the Senator from Washington or to make the point of order, which I did.

But I now understand that the Senator from Washington is willing to withdraw his point of order, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the decision of the Chair on my point of order be withdrawn. We can then proceed to a vote.

I am, however, withdrawing my point of order with the understanding that no point of order will be renewed as to my amendment. If that were done I would have to renew my point of order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not object—it seems to me that in considering matters of as great importance to the country as are the items contained in the pending bill, the last 15 or 20 minutes has been an exercise in futility of the most outrageous sort.

I understand the aim of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, but I would like to point out to him—and reserve the right to object—that his entire amendment is an exercise in futility at any rate, because the President has a right, and always has the right, to exclude these items, and reserve any funds he wishes.

The amendment of the Senator is therefore an exercise of a supernumerary disposition to the President. It is unnecessary. It may give the Senator some great personal satisfaction to do this, but it has consumed the time of a great many people and is unnecessary.

I will not object to the amendment, but I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator was withdrawing the point of order he made against my amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent requests to rescind the two points of order and the two rulings of the Chair? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and the bill is once again before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, does the amendment of the Senator from Delaware apply to all public buildings contained in the bill or to certain ones?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It applies to all public buildings provided for under GSA appropriations. We cannot make a simple amendment and delete them by name since only a part are named. Many of the buildings are not named in the bill, and there may be others in prior appropriations that as yet have not been started.

The amendment is different than described by the Senator from Colorado. The President does have such authority now, but he has not used it. We do not delegate any authority to the President.

This amendment would stop the construction of every one of the buildings unless the President certifies that that particular building should be constructed in the interest of national defense.

We have a war going on. The amendment would stop the construction of all buildings which could be postponed until a later date.

That is the purpose and intent of the amendment.

I fully agree that the amendment is legislation. I believe it to be in order since I am amending a legislative proposal. However, I recognize that a point could be made against both of them. I withdrew my point of order with the understanding that we could proceed to vote on this question. If we adopt this proposal, we will have stopped the construction of all new public buildings in every State of the Union unless that particular building is essential to the public interest.

I think that with the war going on, we ought to stop such construction.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Washington.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great deal of construction is provided in this bill for the Veterans' Administration, veterans' hospitals, and remodeling. Would that be included?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This refers only to those provided in the General Services appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to ask the Senator a question, if he will answer it.

The Senator has made the statement that this covers 15 to 20 percent of the General Services appropriations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I did not mean to say that.

Mr. ALLOTT. That was my understanding of the statement of the Senator. All of the General Services construction is shown on page 10. This is what the vote will be on, and this is what the motion of the Senator applies to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Pages 18 and 19 itemize some of the projects. Over on page 11 and page 15 the Senator will find the figure of $133 million. There is nothing here on page 10.

Mr. ALLOTT. I refer to page 10 of the report.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I was speaking of the bill. We do not amend committee reports.

Mr. **COOPER.** Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Delaware exactly what buildings his amendment refers to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. On page 15 of the bill is a title referring to public buildings. The amendment would apply to all of the buildings under the General Services Administration appropriations. The GSA appropriation really starts on page 13 and goes to page 15, on construction of public building projects of all types.

Mr. **COOPER.** Mr. President, would it apply only to the buildings which are listed on pages 16, 17, and 18?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. No. It applies to some that are not named. The reason that the amendment is drawn in this way, rather than merely deleting those that are named, is that if we were to do that we would be leaving in some that were approved earlier this year in the supplemental appropriations.

The amendment applies to all public buildings as well as those included in the committee report and including one in my own State. This would further postpone all of them until such time as the war is over and we actually need the buildings in the public interest.

Mr. **COOPER.** Would the buildings not named be of the same type as the buildings named on pages 16, 17, and 18?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The same type; yes.

Mr. **ALLOTT.** Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for a number of years. I cannot vote for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

If we vote for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, we are in substance giving the President a veto power over the details of a bill, of items in a bill. The Senate has always resisted that on the ground that Congress has certain rights, and when Congress appropriates for a certain building or for a certain item, it is a part of the overall bill.

If we are going to allow the President to pick out one building and say it is in the public interest, and another building is not, then we will have an item veto in an appropriation bill. We have always resisted this.

I hope that the amendment is rejected.

Mr. **STENNIS.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** I yield.

Mr. **STENNIS.** Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not true, as he has pointed out here, that we would, in effect, be surrendering to the Executive one of the very vital constitutional functions of Congress, the function of appropriating money?

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** I agree. We have resisted that time and time again.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, there is a difference between this amendment and the item veto. This does not involve an item veto. Congress will be doing the vetoing of these projects.

If this amendment is agreed to the Senate would automatically be placing a veto of every project mentioned in the bill, and the only way that a project could be restored would be by the certification of the President that its construction is essential in the public interest in this war. Otherwise, we are vetoing all of them ourselves. I repeat, they would all be vetoed unless the President affirmatively certified that the construction of any particular building is essential to the national interest and that construction should proceed, notwithstanding the war.

This is the reverse of an item veto. We are not saying that he can veto these projects. He can do that now. We are vetoing them here and now if we approve this amendment. If we agree to this amendment we are vetoing all the projects in our respective States. The only way that any project could be reinstated, if the amendment is agreed to, would be for the President to certify that that particular project is essential to the national interest and that it is essential to proceed, notwithstanding the fact that a war is going on.

Mr. **DOUGLAS.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **DOUGLAS.** Mr. President, the Senator cited the example of President Truman in 1951 in suspending construction of certain buildings. There is also a precedent in his action in 1946 when, under inflation, President Truman similarly suspended the construction of a large number of projects.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **DOUGLAS.** Is it not also true that in the military appropriations act, the Secretary of Defense a number of times has refused to authorize the expenditure of money for projects which Congress requested?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. That is true; and in this particular instance we are taking the affirmative action ourselves. If we do not adopt this amendment, we will be authorizing $130 million to construct public buildings throughout the United States. Later we will stand on the floor of the Senate and say, "It is the President's fault. He should have stopped it." This is our responsibility. The question here is, Are we willing to give up the projects in our own States as well as those here in the District? Let us make the decision here.

Do we want the Government to run full speed ahead, constructing public buildings in all the States? Or do we want to recognize that a war is going on and that we should stop the construction of every public building in all 50 States until the war is over unless a particular building is absolutely essential to the national interest? In that event the President could so certify it.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. **ALLOTT.** I yield 1 minute.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** I say to the Senator from Illinois, most respectfully, that there is a great difference between Congress putting an appropriation in a bill and the executive department, headed by the President, not spending the money. We cannot object to that. This is completely different, because here we are asking the President to take an affirmative act before he can spend the money.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, I know—and I know that the Senator from Illinois knows—that sometimes many items that we put in are not built. But that is different from saying that nothing shall happen unless the President takes an affirmative act, because there is an item veto.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MAGNUSON.** I yield.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy for the objectives of the Senator from Delaware.

We are in a very expensive war, facing a huge supplemental appropriation for Vietnam next spring. I believe that we should go easy on all public construction. But I doubt whether eliminating all these buildings would be in the interest of economy. I am quite sure that architectural and planning work have been completed on a great many of these public buildings, much of which would be lost if construction is postponed for several years.

Mr. **MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

I say to the Members of the Senate that 30 buildings have been eliminated from the original request. The criterion is difficult—the need for public buildings. This is the rockbottom amount that we have here; and this is still, I repeat, one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget for the entire country.

Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. **MAGNUSON.** I yield 2 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with what the Senator from Delaware is seeking to accomplish. I am prepared to vote to eliminate any unneeded buildings.

But it seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would be putting into the hands of the President of the United States an additional weapon that could be used to the disadvantage of the Senators from the States that would be affected by the proposed legislation—the same argument which has been made by the senior Senator from Washington and the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The State of Virginia would not be affected by the proposed legislation. The only proposal concerning the State of Virginia is an FBI Academy at Quantico. So, as a practical matter, the State of Virginia would not be affected by the proposed legislation.

However, I am not willing to vote for an amendment that would require, for example, the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senators from the other States which are affected by this bill, 23 States in all, to go with hat in hand to the President of the United States and say, "Please give me this building which the Congress has said is needed." I do not believe that is a desirable thing to do. I do not believe such a proposal would strengthen the hand of the Congress; indeed it would weaken it.

Many people believe that the President of the United States has too much power now, and it occurs to me that this legislation would give him additional power; and for that reason, I expect to oppose the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

It is not my intention that the Senators go hat in hand to the President to get their projects. It is not my intention that the President approve these buildings on the basis of how much pressure he has received. The only building that possibly could be approved would be one that was certified as essential to be constructed in the national interest, to win this war. Otherwise, we would postpone the rest of them. For example, post offices and many of the other buildings, such as the tax courts, would not fall into that category.

So far as it costing more money later to build them, the only reason it would cost more money later——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Delaware first discussed his proposal, I must say that it had considerable appeal to this Senator from South Dakota. But the longer I have listened to the debate, the more convinced I have become that cranked into this proposal is what is virtually an item veto. Whether it is affirmative or positive is not important. It operates in that fashion.

Many times, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, I have opposed anything moving in the direction of an item veto for the Executive. The country is going through this experience now with the White House. The White House withheld for many months a number of fine watershed projects because the White House had decided that it should have the right to decide whether or not, after Congress has approved them by the ordinary processes, it should be the branch of Government to provide the final OK, which for 12 years has been exercised by the Appropriations Committees and by the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and the House.

Just 10 days ago, President Johnson said:

> This time I will permit those watersheds to go on, but never again. From now on, this is to be an Executive privilege.

I do not like to see that Executive power grow to the extent where it can say "yes" or "no" on projects of importance to the people, which have been approved by the Congress, so I shall vote "no" on the proposal of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 77, as follows:

[No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Aiken
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Javits
Lausche
Morton
Prouty
Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—77

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Mouroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Metcalf
Miller
Neuberger
Tydings

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 735

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No 735 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 39, line 24 strike out "$66,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$56,185,000".
>
> On page 40, line 11, strike out "$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$29,750,000".

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, briefly stated, my amendment will cut the civil defense appropriation by 15 percent and mean a savings of $15,165,000 of taxpayers' money. It would reduce the recommended appropriation for operation and maintenance from $66,100,000 to $56,185,000 and the appropriation for research for shelter survey and marking from $35 million to $29,750,000.

In the budget for fiscal year 1967, officials of the Department of Defense requested $133,400,000 for civil defense purposes. The House of Representatives cut this by $32,300,000 and the Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended the amount approved by the other body.

Mr. President, may I say at the outset that in my judgment this entire program should be scrapped. However, being a realist I have offered a modest amendment which at least would save more than $15 million for the taxpayers of this Nation.

The civil defense squandering over the years has been an unconscionable waste of taxpayers' money. However, I have been a Member of the Congress long enough to know that these petty bureaucratic empires do not crumble easily. Once entrenched, these bureaucrats—such as those now operating the so-called civil defense program—are as tenacious as the Bourbons of France, the Romanovs of Russia, or the Hapsburgs of Austria.

In fact, had these royal families studied the methods of entrenched bureaucrats, they might still be on their thrones.

Over the past 15 years, more than $1,500 million of taxpayers' money has been foolishly wasted on silly civil defence schemes. Today, 21 years after Hiroshima, the United States has no civil defense worthy of the name. Most of what exists consists of absurd plans on paper; the rest is confusion.

Throughout the years while this Nation and the Soviet Union were building up our nuclear capacities, Congress appropriated these huge funds for civil defense in piecemeal fashion but not for any really serious or effective plan of action. Actually, we were soothing our consciences just in case a nuclear war would come. Year after year we appropriated $150 million or $100 million or $80 million for civil defense purposes, always "just in case." It was only human to grasp at straws when faced by an overwhelmingly difficult situation, and in appropriating these funds which gradually began to total a staggering sum, no one in his heart really believed that the civil defense fishnet would be of any protection in a surging sea of nuclear destruction.

The fact is that the possibility of nuclear war with the Soviet Union has greatly diminished. The threat of aggression on the part of the Soviet Union with nuclear missiles is practically nonexistent. There is no other nuclear power in the world today capable of showering missiles with nuclear warheads on our cities. Our nuclear capability for instant retaliation is so overwhelming we could annihilate 100 million Russians, destroying their cities and air and missile bases in a matter of hours. Who are these fallout shelters designed to protect us from? Albania?

Does Defense Secretary McNamara, who talks economy sometimes, but who tolerates the civil defense boondoggle in his Defense Department, really believe Red China with its crude nuclear capability threatens the United States with a nuclear attack?

The Soviet Union, veering toward capitalism—now bitterly hostile toward Red China—no longer threatens Western Europe or our Nation as it did when Stalin was dictator in that grim cold war period directly following World War II. The Soviet Union is now a "have" nation—very definitely no longer a have-not nation. Our former colleague, Senator Barry Goldwater, made many wise statements in 1964. Possibly the wisest statement was a prediction he made in October 1964. Senator Goldwater, candidate of his party for the Presidency, said:

> Within 10 years the United States may be involved in war against Communist China and if that occurs I predict the Russians will fight as allies on our side against Red China.

Mr. President, again the Senate will hear the old time worn argument that we must have at least a minimum civil defense program "just in case." Last year more than $106 million was spent on the civil defense boondoggle. Does this Nation have any more civil defense in the event of a nuclear attack than we had a year ago? Is any American one whit safer today in event of a nuclear holocaust than he was 15 years ago when this boondoggle began? The answer to both questions is an emphatic "no."

Public apathy regarding our civil defense program could not be greater. The truth of the matter is citizens have completely lost faith in the civil defense boondoggle.

The facts are that in New York City, our largest and most densely populated city, officials last year abolished its civil defense program, following the example of other great American cities such as Portland, Oreg.; Los Angeles, Calif., and Baltimore, Md., where civil defense programs and expenditures have either been completely discarded, or ignored to the point where for all practical purposes they have been abolished.

The committee has recommended $35 million for research for shelter survey and marking. Simple arithmetic proves that any fallout shelter program large enough to be meaningful—if such a thing is possible—would cost many billions of dollars. Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it would cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. In their book "Strategy for Survival," Thomas L. Morton, dean of the College of Engineers at the University of Arizona, and Donald C. Latham, an electronics researcher, concluded that a national community shelter program would cost in excess of $37 billion. Herman Kahn, one of the foremost proponents of fallout shelters, has estimated that a reasonable program might involve a gradual buildup from about $1 billion annually to somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion annually. Prof. John Allman, chairman of the department of management of Hofstra College, estimates the cost as high as $302 billion. Regardless of which of the expert opinions is cited, the price tag would be astronomical. Even then, there is no guarantee that a shelter program would be at all effective. With extensive advances being made in rocket and nuclear technology and in chemical and biological warfare, it would probably be obsolete before completion.

Meanwhile, civil defense bureaucrats regularly continue to mark private and public buildings with black and yellow signs designating them as fallout shelters and stocking them with so-called survival biscuits while the general public pays no attention, simply ignoring this boondoggling. All this at a cost of more than $20 million a year.

Mr. President, there is no civil defense shelter building program in Great Britain, France, West Germany, or any of the major Western European powers. Reliable observers in the Soviet Union report that there is no fallout shelter program in Russia. Henry Shapiro, dean of the American correspondents in Moscow, wrote:

> No foreigner here has seen any civil defense shelters. The average citizen is unaware of the existence of shelters.

Preston Grover, of the Associated Press, took a similar position when he stated:

> Attachés from embassies who have looked around the country for sign of shelters have found nothing. Foreigners live in many of the newest buildings put up in Moscow, and they have no bomb shelters.

The New York Times a few years ago published a report from Moscow by Harrison Salisbury which stated:

> About 12,000 miles of travel in the Soviet Union by this correspondent in the last 4 weeks failed to turn up evidence of a single Soviet bomb shelter * * * Diplomats, foreign military attachés, and correspondents who have traveled widely in the Soviet Union report that there is no visible evidence of a widespread shelter program.

The committee has recommended more than $66 million for operation and maintenance of the civil defense organization. Almost 800 employees now work in the civil defense division of the Department of Defense. Of this number nearly half receive from $13,700 a year up to $27,000 a year. The average salary of all civil defense employees in the Department of Defense is more than $11,800 a year. Officials and employees of the FBI receive an average of $8,700 a year and in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—an agency with many scientists and highly skilled technical personnel—the average salary for officials and employees is approximately $10,300 a year.

I am sure that our Nation will be able to continue to struggle along if it should be necessary that some of these high salaried civil defense bureaucrats are dismissed or transferred to Federal agencies where they can perform a needed public service.

Mr. President, unfortunately, too few Governors, mayors, and county commissioners can resist the temptation of Federal matching funds to provide in many cases a comfortable haven in the political storm for political hacks and defeated officeholders. Frequently we Senators receive calls and letters from mayors and other municipal officials requesting assistance in having their applications for public works and other Federal projects expedited. At the same time, the Federal Government is encouraging these officials to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars for civil defense employees and on ridiculous civil defense programs. If we cut off the head of the bureaucratic octopus in Washington, its wasteful satellites in States and cities will soon wither away.

Mr. President, one example of a civil defense boondoggle is the shocking fact that there are 2,644 civil defense hospitals presently in storage throughout the Nation. Each contains 200 beds for a total of 528,800 hospital beds, rotting and mildewing in civil defense storage facilities. These emergency hospitals, so-called, have cost taxpayers $75 million. In Ohio alone there are 119 of these hospitals stored away. In Ohio a recent investigation of two of these stored hospitals revealed that thousands of dollars worth of medicines had wasted away while the usefulness of even greater amounts is rapidly expiring. Hospital beds and other equipment have been rotting away from mildew and neglect.

This same intolerable situation exists in other States, and is just one more example in a long list of silly schemes and unworkable programs concocted by boondoggling civil defense officials. Think of the good will we would engender in Asia were we to donate these hospitals to civilian authorities of South Vietnam and other nations in southeast Asia. Without a doubt thousands of these hospital beds and other equipment could be put to good use by our Medical Corps officials in Vietnam and elsewhere in the Far East.

Mr. President, by adopting my amendment $15 million can be saved without in any way impairing our national security or vital public services. Here is a way for Senators who favor economy to show they mean what they say. I do not know of a single proposal whereby we could more clearly demonstrate our desire for economy and to save taxpayer's money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the Senator from Ohio is proposing to cut approximately 15 percent in the total appropriation for civil defense?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. My amendment would reduce the amount by that modest amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The present bill does not contain provision for construction of fallout shelters?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But simply research, survey, and marking.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Marking them with those silly yellow and black marks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

This amendment, of course, should be defeated. I would like to call the attention of Senators to the fact that last year we provided $106 million-plus for this particular item. The budget this year was $133.4 million. That was cut by the House to $101,100,000. The Senate committee stayed with the House figure on that amount.

I have spoken in behalf of this item several times in past years on the floor of the Senate. It simply makes no sense at all to spend $60 billion a year on national defense, even granting that some $15 billion of that may be going to the Vietnam war, or perhaps $20 billion a year, and not to spend an absolutely minimum amount for civil defense.

It makes it appear to the rest of the world—and particularly those countries at whom we look with the most jaundiced eyes—our Soviet friends and the Red Chinese—that we are minimizing our civil defense to a point where it would seem we do not even consider that we have a problem.

But, Mr. President, if we ever come to that unfortunate time when we get into a ballistic missile war, by our civil defense preparations we will save many, many lives which we would otherwise forfeit.

I have only one further thing to say. The total civil defense budget amounts to only one and one-third hundredths of 1 percent of the total defense budget. It seems to me—and the committee has reviewed the matter very carefully—that this is the minimum that we can do.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, and I do, and call for a vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before yielding back the remainder of my time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, if my amendment is not agreed to, it is contemplated by these civil defense bureaucrats, who put in their time in the Pentagon sending messages back and forth to one another, devising shelter programs, and putting in orders for so-called survival biscuits—that they will add 117 more officials and employees to their already overstaffed agency. I have shown that their average salary exceeds that of the FBI, and even that of NASA, where so many scientists are employed.

Let us come back to the fundamental point. The distinguished Senator from Colorado said, "if we ever come to that unfortunate time when wet get into a ballistic missile war," our defense preparations will save lives.

Those of us who have been in the great subway in London know that there is not a civil defense sign in it. We know there is no civil defense program in any of the cities which are closest to the Soviet Union, the only nation which could possibly threaten us with nuclear war. The truth is that after spending more than $1 billion, this country has no civil defense worthy of the name. Of all the bureaucrats in our Government, the high-salaried civil defense people in the Pentagon and the Department of Defense are receiving the most for doing the least. I hope, Mr. President, that my modest amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator asked for the yeas and nays?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Fannin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Mansfield
McGovern
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—59

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ervin
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Miller
Montoya
Neuberger
Robertson
Stennis
Tydings

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (No. 735) was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 14 add the following: "*Provided, however,* That the funds made available for the Labor Department building shall not be available for expenditure until the General Services Administration certifies to Congress that construction of the

Inner Loop Freeway has been agreed upon and is to be constructed in a plan which will involve the site of the proposed Labor Department buildings."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think I can explain the amendment in perhaps a minute or two.

I feel confident that the managers of the bill will accept the amendment because it carries out the understanding which we had in the Appropriations Committee at the time it was decided to appropriate $12,433,000 for the substructure of the Labor Department building.

I was among those who voted "No" when we had a close vote, 43 to 42, on eliminating some of these buildings.

I felt that it would be wise to construct this building at the time we think it will be constructed, because this language would provide for it to be constructed, at the same time they do the work on the inner loop freeway.

It would save the country a tremendous amount of money as compared with having the building constructed later. Eventually we will have a Labor Department building.

It seems wise to build the foundations of that building at the time we build the inner loop freeway, if the inner loop freeway is built as presently contemplated, because this would be on the same site and thus eliminate a vast amount of reconstruction and revamping of the foundation structures and the freeway facilities.

It would be penny wise and pound foolish to start building each of the structures at a different time.

The language of this amendment simply brings them into compliance so that both projects will be constructed at the same time. The amendment withholds this appropriation until such time as we are sure that the inner loop freeway is being constructed in that area and has a relationship to the Labor Department building.

I believe that this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we discussed this in committee. We did intend to have a directive such as this, but the report is not quite as specific as is this amendment. I think it is a clarifying amendment and I would be glad to accept it.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that really this language should be attributed to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who came up with the idea during the committee hearings. We thought it would be reflected in the report—and he joins me in this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Georgia desired this type of amendment in the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is all time yielded back?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 4 on page 46, as follows:

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this amendment would cut from the bill the funds for the controversial, unproved rent supplement program.

It is time for us to make and implement decisions where inflation is concerned. There are many things we might like to spend money for, but inflation will no longer permit the fiscal and deficit luxuries of the past. Inflation demands of us that we set priorities and fund only the most necessary and proven projects.

Consumer prices are at the highest point in our Nation's history. The dollar is at its lowest value in our Nation's history. Interest rates are at their highest in 36 years. Loan money is critically tight. And, in the face of these ominous trends we are running another deficit Federal budget.

Instead of a sham war against inflation, let us do something meaningful to cut Government spending. And, if we must cut, let us cut first those new projects which might be nice but are not necessary.

Commerce Secretary John T. Connor, in a recent letter to corporation heads, enjoined them to "exercise reasoned restraint in purchasing, inventories, pricing and in deferring capital expenditures wherever possible."

In an address before the National Legislative Conference of Cities, the President of the United States announced recently that he has requested every executive department and agency to review and carefully examine how we can defer, stretch out or postpone any expenditures.

Mr. President, I support the President of the United States, and I submit that this is not a necessary expenditure. It is a new start, and at this time we should carefully scrutinize any new starts. It is an unproven program, and I honestly believe that we in Congress must be selective.

It is necessary that we act as shrewd managers of the purse strings in this time of inflation. We should strike from this bill this unproven rent supplement program. We can reconsider it at a future date when our monetary situation has stabilized.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield such time as the Senator from Rhode Island desires.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suppose I could say to the Senate that this is an old chestnut. It is one of the most talked about proposals and one of the least understood programs ever advanced to Congress.

Mr. President, we went through this matter thoroughly last spring. Our subcommittee went through this whole matter very exhaustively before the subcommittee and then again before the full committee. We took a record vote each time, and each time we voted to retain the program in the bill as a matter of record all we have done in our committee is to sustain the House.

It has been said here that this program has not proved itself. Mr. President, I believe that this constitutes one of the best programs ever conceived to fight poverty in this Nation. It should be more so that it could do more. It is regrettable that we cannot make it as extensive as we would desire to make it and as conditions require in order to be more effective in eliminating poverty throughout this land.

We have expended millions upon millions of dollars for a public housing program. That is all for the best. What is being attempted here is to encourage nonprofit organizations to rehabilitate existing housing, to make it habitable for people, and to build new housing, if possible, realizing that each unit will cost such a sum as to require a rent much more than the particular family can afford to pay. Is is absolutely important to understand that—to appreciate that—and to meet the condition so created.

For whom is this program destined? It is destined, No. 1, for people who are eligible for public housing. They must pay out of their own salary, out of their own income, one-quarter of their monthly income as their share of the fair rent. If the cost of rehabilitating the unit requires a rent beyond that the family can afford to pay, then we subsidize the remainder of the rent to the value that it cost the organization, on a nonprofit basis, either to build or to rehabilitate.

Mr. President, who are the people who came to testify before our committee? They were members of the clergy, for the most part; dedicated people who are living close to this scourge that plagues our society. They came before our committee, very sincerely—very simply—yet very dramatically and very emphatically stating their case.

If ever I believe in the efficacy and in the necessity of a program, this is it. It is regrettable that all the Members of Congress could not sit with that committee to hear the testimony from these people first hand.

What are we to do? The first year, we authorized $12 million. Out of that $12 million we already have proposals to take care of 9,900 family units—9,900 family units, up to $6 million. These proposals are being advanced by religious organizations, by philanthropic organizations and other nonprofit organizations.

All that would be done here would be to authorize a new amount of $20 million. It is our hope that with the present $12 million we will accommodate 20,000 families. Better than that, of course, when we pass the appropriation of $20 million, it will be accommodation for an additional 38,000 families.

Mr. President, it has been said that the adoption of this amendment denying these homes to the needy is the way to balance the budget. I say to you, it would unbalance humanity in our own society.

The need for this program is already pressing. Rehabilitation has already been begun on some premises so drastically needed they will have to be occupied by these people; and when they move in, the rent for each unit will be so high that some of these people can not possibly afford to pay it. So what would be the result? Delinquency would be encouraged, dropouts would be encouraged, and the fruit of delinquency and despair means reformatories and prisons will be built instead of housing. The testimony of the clergy, Mr. President, provided a dramatic feature that convinced me beyond all else. Because these church groups will be active in this environment. These people renting will receive friendly services that will help them to maintain a good social status and will help them to escape despair and eliminate delinquency.

Mr. President, I believe that this is a tremendously worthwhile program, and that it should be given a fair chance.

We did not advance or increase in any way the action of the House. All we propose to do is to go along with the House. Certainly, we should not do less.

I say to my colleagues that if they mean to fight poverty in this Nation, this is a step in the right direction.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Rhode Island mentioned that no one is eligible for these units except those who would be eligible for public housing.

Mr. PASTORE. That is under the first requisite.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator inform the Senate, as he can do so well, what else these people must do?

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, the person must be displaced, after he is eligible under the public housing program, which means that he has to be poor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very poor.

Mr. PASTORE. Then he has to be a person displaced by the same governmental action.

In other words, if we have an urban renewal program, and we displace all of these people and they have no place to go, what do they do? They descend from one ghetto to another ghetto. How much worse is it if the second ghetto does not exist? An alternate condition is that one of the members of the family—one of the spouses—has to be over 62 years of age. Or it may be that one of the spouses is paraplegic and has to live in a slum area.

If any program ever was intended for the poor, this rent supplement program is it. I hope that there is enough compassion, and I hope that there is enough understanding on the part of the Senate to realize that this is a good program.

I hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] a letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development making an up-to-date report on the program, the amount of rent supplements involved, and the number of units that are under contract authority.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the recent appropriation hearings in connection with testimony on the Rent Supplement Program, the Committee requested the Department to furnish a report on the reservations made under the initial contract authority of $12 million granted for the program. As of June 30, preliminary fund reservations had been made for a total of 91 projects involving 8,852 rent supplement units at an aggregate amount of contract authority for rent supplements of $5,436,170. The projects are located in 33 states and Puerto Rico. A tabulation by states is enclosed. In addition, we had on hand on June 30 requests for approximately $9 million in projects pending the receipt of further information and evaluation. Additional requests are being received daily.

The projects for which funds have been reserved are typically in a preliminary stage of development. As the projects proceed through later stages of development and processing, we may expect some adjustments and changes. We are reserving funds for additional projects on a daily basis as information concerning them is received and evaluated. I expect that we shall have reserved most of the balance of the initial $12 million of contract authorization in the near future.

The Committee also asked to be advised of our employment plans under the requested administrative expense appropriation for this program. Assuming approval of the rent supplement appropriation for administrative expenses in the amount of $900,000, we expect to use 75 man years of employment under this appropriation during fiscal year 1967.

Senator ALLOTT had expressed a particular interest in receiving the above information concerning the status of the Rent Supplement Program. We are, therefore, also sending this information by letter to Senator ALLOTT.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. WEAVER.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have nothing further to add except the part of the program mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and that also appeals to me.

We are trying to take this problem, that we have to take care of in any event, from public housing, in its literal sense, and place it into private enterprise where people will build these buildings. This is a switch back to take care of this matter under private enterprise. It has worked out so far and I think we should give it a further chance with the modest amount that we have in the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, if I thought that this supplemental payment for rent was going to be the panacea for all of our housing ills, was going to abolish slums, and reform schools, then I would champion this provision with as much vigor and dedication as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

But I think we are deluding ourselves if we think that the rent subsidy program is going to solve the problem of the slums. The fact is that it is not; $22 million is not going to do it. The fact remains that this is an unproven program.

While we stand here and talk about having compassion for the poor, let us recognize that inflation robs the poor first, and that any constructive steps we can take to stabilize and make sound and responsible the fiscal policy of the Government of the United States is a step toward arresting and curbing inflation, which robs the poor, and robs from the rich, as well. The people who really suffer are the poor.

I think that we should look closely at these unproven programs and not engage in new starts, not just in this program, but in other programs as well, and take a constructive step toward changing a fiscal policy which causes inflation and tight money and is the source of most of our economic problems now. I think that we in the Senate must have the courage and discipline to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes under the bill.

Mr. President, as most Senators well know, I have supported this amendment, first in the subcommittee of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], in the full committee, then on the floor of the Senate, in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, and in the full committee. On these occasions, I have voiced essentially the same thoughts voiced by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

I, like he, would like to see our housing problems solved. My basic objection to the rent supplement is that while it may help a few, we are committing ourselves to a 40-year program for which the authorization is $100 million a year with the carryover.

This is not a substitute for anything else, and herein lies the nub of the problem. We are now putting into the budget, and in this bill for public housing programs, a total of $351 million. A part of that is for the elderly, but we are putting $250 million into public housing, per se.

In addition to that, we discovered at the hearings this year that the Department of Housing and Urban Development also has another program going, for which they have an annual subsidy of $754 per unit per year, in which they lease premises, sublease them to tenants, and then pick up the rental differential, which amounted in fiscal year 1966 to $1,743,750.

So we have all of these programs going. If there were any attempt to bring order out of that chaos, I might look at the rent subsidy in a different manner today than I do.

It is only for this reason that I rise to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. This rent supplement might be the best way to handle our public housing problems, but we are not going to handle them by simply piling one program on top of another. That is what we are doing because we are keeping all of the old moneys in the bill and we have this rather modest amount, I must admit, but this is not what it is going to be in a year or 2 years from now. It is going to be a significant amount.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The distinguished Senator did not make clear that $250 or $260 million to which he referred for the present subsidy on public housing is a recurring item, and not just an annual item; but a recurring item and must be paid each year.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I am sorry that I did not make that point clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there are not often many things around here about which a big city boy can testify. This is one of them. I am the product of a slum family, raised in a slum, which is more accurately described as a ghetto. I have personal knowledge and experience of what passions rage in the hearts of people who may be rioting, out of frustration and despair, because they live under the same circumstances, in the main, in which I was raised.

I understand the analysis of Senators with respect to the different types of programs, including public housing, that are in effect. The same tests could be applied to farm subsidies, farm roads, technical assistance to farmers, the Farm Credit Administration, the REA, and the enormous structure of items in that area, as well as the merchant marine, aircraft, and many other things. Mr. President, these analogies are not apt. These things must stand on their own.

Notwithstanding that, everything suggested has not been enough to adequately meet the issue. Since 1949 I have been concerned with public housing. I was a cosponsor of the Taft-Wagner bill in the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thought the Senator yielded 4 minutes to me.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott].

The fact is that it is not adequate and it has not been adequate. For some years we tried to find an alternate to public housing. It was felt—and it is true—that public housing is what you get out of it. Realizing that certain elements of it are more expensive, perhaps we should yield in some instances insofar as the size needed for the situation. So we came along with the rent supplement idea which I thought was the freshest, the newest, and the brightest idea to come upon the scene in all these 17 years.

Now, if it is a good idea—and I think it is—and even conservative Members, whom I have heard, point out that we have tightened up so materially on the requirements and methods of administration so as to make it a program with a fine set of criteria.

Therefore, let us try to do this with some degree of understanding of the problem. Let those, especially those who are so deeply concerned about conditions which produce violence and difficulty in the big cities, understand that we cannot cure it with mirrors, that we must have help. This is one of the most effective kinds of help we can have. I have testified to that as a witness, personally.

I hope that, therefore, matching our performance with our protestations, and trying to do something about the effort to meet an admittedly difficult and explosive situation, we do not take away one of the strong programs which can be useful in that regard and excuse ourselves on the ground that there are other programs—as I have pointed out, that is true in many other cases—but, rather, employ the means which looks very congenial to the situation; and realize that while I join every Senator in deep determination that law and order shall be observed in this country, that no one, whatever may be his frustration, shall be indulged in his unlawfulness, it is a fact that as Senators, it is our duty to deal with the legitimate difficulties, provided we can find a reasonable and proper remedy. The Senate has said, the House has said, and the President has said before, that this is a reasonable and proper remedy. I think it would be shocking and shameful if we do not do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate, but the argument has been advanced this afternoon about balancing the budget and making our fiscal stability a thing of assurance.

Let me say to all Senators that we just got through voting for $5 billion—I repeat, $5 billion—to put a man on the moon. I suppose, when he gets there, our next worry will be as to how he will get off. But, here we are talking about an appropiation of a few million for the down-to-earth purpose of homes—homes to keep families together.

And we stand up and talk about fiscal stability.

Let us look at that budget—yes; there may be places where we can cut, but do not cut against the poor of this land—their hearts and their homes.

Those of us who have had intimate association and firsthand knowledge of this problem know how necessary a program of this kind is.

I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time which I do not have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The position of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McIntyre
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—51

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Miller
Neuberger
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 15, line 14, strike out "$133,150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,230,000", and on page 18, delete lines 11, 12, 15, and 16, and renumber the page accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, the first vote today was on an amendment offered by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], striking out appropriations for three Federal buildings in the District of Columbia and $1 million for facilities for the Secret Service.

Some of us were not able to arrive here to cast our votes on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COTTON. The amendment I am offering merely affects two of those buildings, the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building, in the amount of $11.321 million, and the Tax Court Building, in the amount of $6.6 million.

I want to make clear this amendment is not offered in a spirit of pique. I am offering the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], as both of us missed the vote on the previous amendment.

As I have said, the amendment is not offered in a spirit of pique. We did not arrive in time to vote, because we did not have timely notice of the vote, and before we could reach the Senate floor the regular order was called for.

In view of the fact that the regular order was called for, and since there was a difference of only one vote in the result, I felt it was logical for us to offer an amendment affecting at least two of the buildings, in order that we might have an opportunity to vote on the question.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, who is on both the full Committee on Appropriations and this particular subcommittee, dislikes and normally would not employ this procedure, of simply voting on an amendment striking out funds for a building, without engaging in full debate. However, in this instance, I think the previous debate thoroughly explored the question.

I do want to stress my conviction that when we are engaged in a war, costing an estimated $2 billion a month, we could delay the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia, even though some inconvenience may be caused. I think the least we can do, if a building is not essential for the effective and efficient administration of Government, but would merely add to convenience and comfort, is to wait before we start new construction that will cost millions in additional funds.

That is the reason that I offered this amendment, and wished to support it when it was offered in different form earlier in the day. I believe the same principle is true as to repairs, changes, or new structures anywhere in the Capital, unless, of course, there are dangerous conditions which must be corrected in the interest of safety. I believe it is reasonable, logical, and responsible to delay and forgo any unnecessary building of huge administration buildings here in the Capital until the situation elsewhere with its tremendous demands on our resources is resolved.

I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, with whom I serve on the Committees on Commerce and Appropriations had every right to proceed, and would not intentionally have deprived any of us of a vote; but in view of the fact that there was one vote difference on the previous amendment, and we did not have a chance to cast a vote, I wanted the opportunity, as did the Senator from Iowa.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time is yielded?

Mr. COTTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not think I shall take 2 minutes. I merely wish to confirm the fact that I am a cosponsor of this amendment. At least two of us were not present when the vote was taken. We would like the opportunity to express ourselves; and on these two matters, I have joined with the Senator from New Hampshire, and urge the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am among those who allege that there were faulty bell signals earlier this afternoon when the Senate was summoned to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin for the deletion of the four buildings here in the capital, to wit, the Secret Service facility, the Labor Department Building, the FBI Building, and the Tax Court Building. Had I been present on that occasion, I would have voted against that amendment. I am opposed to this amendment. I want to discuss the basic considerations that motivated the committee in approving these two buildings.

The Tax Court, Mr. President, needs adequate quarters, quarters separate from the Internal Revenue Service. It has neither at the present time.

The place which the Tax Court occupies presently and has for many years, was not designed for court use. It is not suited for the needs of the Tax Court. For some 15 years, this situation has been brought to the attention of Congress. Three years ago the building was finally authorized, Congress thereby indicating that it was convinced of the need for a new building.

The Tax Court needs separate and independent quarters. It is now housed physically in the same suite of offices and in the same building as the personnel of the Internal Revenue Service. What an incongruous situation that is. Every time the Court sits, those personnel participate in the Tax Court proceedings on behalf of the United States of America. So here we have the incongruous situation of a part of the judicial system not accorded the independence and separation to which it is entitled.

That condition has been called to the attention of Congress and of the Executive by the American Bar Association many times. The appropriation should be made so that construction can commence at an early date.

As to the FBI, we know what the inadequacy is there. That Bureau is now located in some nine locations. By having a single building, savings will be effected amounting to some $3½ million per year.

That building was authorized 4 years ago. The site has been acquired, and it is ready to accommodate the new building. A contract could be let next spring, because the plans will be completed in February.

The fact is that funds for construction were included in GSA's 1966 budget request, but were deleted because of the delay in completing the drawings and specifications. The funds were included in the 1967 budget request, but were stricken by the House of Representatives.

In 1966, the conferees stated in their report:

> A request for funds will be considered in a supplemental or regular annual appropriation bill if or when the GSA is ready to let contracts.

So that leaves them at a juncture where they are ready to let contracts within a reasonable time after this appropriation bill becomes law, but now Congress says "Wait, there is a war, and we must be careful how we spend our money during a war."

No one will agree with that proposition more thoroughly than I. But, Mr. President, we are involved in several wars. We have a war on crime; and that is a war which we are fast losing. It is not like the situation that we might have elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the Senator from Nebraska 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not like the situation that we have elsewhere; and I suggest that we pay some attention to that war on crime which we are fast losing. Consider the unsettled, riotous conditions and disorders in many of our cities. Only 2 weeks ago, a report issued by the FBI showed a figure of almost 2,800,000 serious crimes committed in this country during the calendar year 1965.

Here we have a building to house one of the chief law-enforcement agencies of the Nation. The duties and responsibilites being placed upon that agency are increasing almost every time we enact new laws. With that situation facing us the pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was recorded on the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I merely rise to say that I do not mind being recorded again. I have missed a few votes because of illness or for other reasons, and welcome the opportunity to improve my batting average.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, these items were discussed at length this morning. I do not believe there is any necessity to dwell on them in detail now. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire, I was hopeful that the items included in the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would be presented as separate amendments for each item, because the need for the Tax Court and the need, so well expressed by the Senator from Nebraska, for beginning the FBI Building, are two different things. I had hoped that the matters would be presented in that way. The Senator from New Hampshire, in his amendment, has narrowed it down to two.

I do not believe that delaying the beginning of the FBI Building, involving a matter of $11 million, after it has been delayed so long, would help or hurt our economy one way or the other. That building will require a long time to construct. In addition, administrative expenses increase every year we delay beginning its construction. That would mean about a 12-year amortization of the building, for the total cost. What is involved here is merely the substructure and the site preparation. I hope it will not be knocked out.

The building for the Tax Court should have great priority. It involves an amount of $6.6 million. They have waited a long time. I do not believe the expenditure of that amount will help or hurt the economy one bit.

As a matter of fact, the public building program is very little when compared to the budget. It is, of course, minimal when compared to many other factors in the present state of economy of the country.

I do hope that the amendment will be rejected. We have discussed it over and over again. I do not know of any facts that I could add.

I think that generally what the Senator from New Hampshire says is correct. No one disagrees with that any more than he would disagree with what the Senator from Wisconsin had to say about the need to curtail expenditures in these times.

I think the committee has been very responsive to that need. Thirty buildings that have top priority have been cut out of the bill. We have to look at these buildings as individual problems.

I am sure that, having cut the buildings out of the bill, it will cost more money to begin the projects again. Delay will cost money.

We picked them out one by one and required what we thought was more than normal justification for these buildings.

We did the same with the buildings throughout the Nation.

Ninety buildings which qualified under very strict criteria were eliminated from the bill. These were buildings that are needed in this great, huge country of ours.

I am hopeful that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on which we voted today would cut out three of the four buildings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would leave in the Secret Service Building.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire would cut out the Tax Court and the FBI Building and leave in the Secret Service Building and the foundation for the Labor Department Building.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct, the substructure for the Labor Department Building.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts, the Secret Service project involved only $1 million. That is why I am not including that item in my amendment. The Labor Department matter involves only the building of a foundation and not a superstructure. It is considered necessary to proceed with initial construction because of a new highway going through that area which must be accommodated. That is the reason it is not included.

The distinguished Senator from Washington says that after they have waited all of these years, the expenditure of these few dollars will not shatter the economy. There is no suggestion that the economy will be shattered by this. However, after they have waited all of these years, it will not be a catastrophe if they are required to wait 1 more year, at a time when we have an escalating war that is costing more and more each day.

Bear in mind that $11,320,000 would be appropriated for the FBI Building. The building would ultimately cost $45 million. Even if funds were provided, they would not be able to move into and start to use the building next year. The building would just be started. Therefore, it would not relieve the pressure now. It certainly seems that after waiting all this time, it would not be disastrous to wait a little longer in a time of war.

It also should be borne in mind that in the very next paragraph of the bill there is provision that these appropriations can be exceeded this year, to the extent of not more than 10 percent of savings effected in other projects.

Remember that the President of the United States has been calling on private industry not to expand at this time. He has been asking that private industry refrain from building new plants and making other capital expenditures while we are under this pressure, because it is inflationary. If it is inflationary for private industry, which pays taxes into the public till, to expand, it is more inflationary to start constructing new superstructures in Washington, buildings which pay no taxes but simply contribute to the expenditure of money.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was among those who voted "no" an hour or two ago when, by a vote of 42 to 43, the Senate in my opinion wisely decided not to cut out all four of these buildings.

I shall vote "yes" on this amendment because we face an altogether different situation.

I voted no in the first place because the Labor Department substructure, which we have already discussed and which is buttoned down by an amendment that has been agreed to, must be started at the time the freeway construction is started. That is economy since it avoids a duplication of effort.

The expenditure of $1 million for the Secret Service, for the General Services Administration, is not a major item. However, these other two buildings will eventually total a great amount of money.

What the Senator from New Hampshire says about the President urging the private sector not to engage in capital expenditures also holds for State governments. He has so recommended to the 50 Governors. He sent to the Governor of my State and the Governors of all other States a message urging them to slow down or curtail the expanding of public improvements which are not imperatively essential as of now.

Mr. President, it does not really help the war effort very much and it does not help to stop inflation very much for Senator after Senator to say: "There is a war. I know we are having an inflationary fire. Nobody believes in economy more than I, but not on this particular vote."

We have to start some place. While my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, talks about the war in Vietnam and says that is not the only war, that there is a war on crime, I submit that a war on the American dollar is also being fought in this Nation.

We are restricted to building these buildings with borrowed money at a time when the U.S. Government is paying the highest interest rate in 45 years. So, there is economy in slowing down for awhile the starting of these buildings which admittedly are desirable and which can and should be built when our Government either has the money or can borrow it more advantageously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, nobody is in favor of crime, but even my genial friend, the Senator from Nebraska, does not believe that the war on crime is going to be fought in the office buildings in Washington, and especially not in a building that will not be ready for occupancy for several years. We can meet the same objective by starting the building next year and funding it more rapidly.

I submit to my colleague, who recognizes that there is a war going on which costs us approximately $2 billion a month, that he should also recognize that we now have to build the buildings with borrowed money at the highest interest rate in 45 years. He should recognize that this might be a good time to delay the building of two buildings which are obviously needed, but which do not have to be started now when our Federal finances are so critical.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I never could understand why the Senator from South Dakota keeps talking about the building of any buildings with borrowed money. We have receipts coming into the Government. We do not borrow all the money. We borrow only the difference between the receipts and the expenditures.

Mr. MUNDT. At a time when we are already running into the red, the additional money has to be borrowed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not have to be borrowed.

Mr. MUNDT. It is either borrowed or manufactured.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hundred and fifty million dollars of receipts came in recently. That money can be used for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MUNDT. That is not enough to balance the budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. However, we borrow the difference between the receipts and the expenditure. About 3 percent of the amount would have to be borrowed.

Mr. MUNDT. This has to be borrowed because it is added to a deficit already created.

The President called the members of the Appropriations Committee down to the White House and said: "Please spend less money." Here is a chance to work with the President in repairing the budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President did not say any such thing. He called on private industry to curtail expenditures.

Mr. MUNDT. He called the members of the Appropriations Committee to the White House. The Senator was there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He said: "Don't invest in capital expenditures that can be put aside for a certain period of time."

Mr. MUNDT. Expenditures such as these two buildings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When we get right down to it, the whole argument is that it is not borrowed money. It is a question of whether it is good economy to set aside this particular substructure of the FBI Building. We have already spent $11 million for the land and other things that we had to do there. That is all that the vote is about.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. We have made the issue pretty clear now. Those Senators who believe that we have this excess money to spend and it is not borrowed should vote "nay," and those who agree with me that we will have to pay this high rate of interest on this money, when the budget is not balanced, should vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COTTON. I am ready to yield back my time and vote, if the Senator from Washington is also prepared to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield back his time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hickenlooper
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Allott
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Miller
Neuberger
Russell, Ga.
Tydings

So the amendment of Mr. COTTON was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 41, following line 25, insert the following:
>
> "COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS
>
> "For matching grants to States for authorized training and related activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies (including studies and publication of information), as authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801–805), to remain available until expended, $5,150,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $150,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

This amendment is cosponsored by Senators BREWSTER, HART, HARTKE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, MOSS, MUSKIE, PROXMIRE, RIBICOFF, DODD, JAVITS, CASE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, McCARTHY, NELSON, SCOTT, GRIFFIN, LONG of Missouri, YARBOROUGH, MONDALE, INOUYE, YOUNG of Ohio, and MORSE.

Mr. President, this is an administration amendment. I am proposing it at the request of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The purpose of the amendment is to fund an authorization unanimously adopted by the Committee on Banking and Currency as a part of the Housing Act of 1964, passed without controversy by the House of Representatives, passed without controversy by the Senate, and signed by the President. Both last year and this year, for reasons quite obscure to me, the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies have refused to appropriate 1 cent for this duly authorized program.

The purpose of the program is to make available to the States on a matching grant basis $5,150,000 for the purpose of assisting State, local, and other governmental bodies in training technical and professional personnel in the community development field. These are individuals whose skills are in short supply—as I can testify as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty. From all over the Nation we are receiving complaints from local operating officials about their need for more trained manpower to operate their programs of community development. Experts are badly needed in every field from transit to housing, and from urban redevelopment to zoning, if our efforts to rebuild our cities and metropolitan areas are to succeed.

These governmental units need more code enforcement officers, relocation specialists, public housing managers, neighborhood center staff workers, and land acquisition specialists, to name but a few of the skills in critical demand. There are presently no training programs to meet this very specialized need. The Higher Education Act does not cover them. The Manpower Development Training Act does not do the job. The poverty programs are too minimal.

The final report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress issued earlier this year made it clear that our public manpower needs in the next decade are great, and are not being filled.

Mr. President, I think that is about all I need to say on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Connecticut. After that, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not true that the bill provides for $642,392,000 in appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. How will we be able to administer the program if we do not have the skilled personnel to do it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not also true that one of the greatest problems facing the Nation today, one that is in the headlines of every newspaper across the country, is the great turmoil of the cities of America? Is it not only the large cities and the metropolitan areas, but also cities such as Omaha, Nebr.; Lansing, Mich.; and Cicero, Ill., that today are really "on fire"?

Mr. CLARK. Also Bridgeport, Conn., and Hartford, Conn.—and a score of other cities including Reading, Pa.; Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, and the like. The Senator is obviously correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the committee recommendations do not provide funds for one important program—grants for community development training. As the problems of local government have become more complicated, so has the governmental machinery to solve them. And no machinery—no matter how sophisticated—can work without trained people to administer the programs and deal with the problems of our cities.

The money we appropriate—the programs we authorize to deal with the problems of urban America—will be of little avail without trained people with technical knowledge at the local level. By 1980, the Nation will need about 400,000 trained specialists working in American cities. Unless we begin to help those people now, they will not be there.

We hear much today about the need for effective cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments. If the Federal Government is not to carry the responsibility for doing most of the job in our cities—and I do not believe any of us want that—then we must take steps to make sure that city and local governments can contribute their share of the work.

No other Federal training program meets this need. Forty-three States have already indicated their interest in this proposal—and 20 States have already drawn up preliminary plans. In fact, there has never been any organized opposition to this program.

Through appropriations and legislation Congress has voted year after year, the Federal Government is spending some $25 billion directly or indirectly in the cities of America. These are Federal funds designed to help the cities in the national interest. If these funds are not being administered efficiently and effectively, then are we not wasting large sums of money which the taxpayers are paying for through their tax bills year in and year out?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. How can anyone administer a program without skilled personnel?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not also true, as every Senator realizes, that much of our time is spent with representatives of cities who are not familiar with the many programs the Federal Government has set for them? We recognize that there is a lack of information and a lack of technical skill at the local level which in turn places this work upon the respective staffs of Senators connected with problems of cities and the Federal Government.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Connecticut probably has the same experience I do; namely, that people come in from local school districts, from the local housing authority, and from the county authority, who seem to be absolutely at a loss to know where to go in Washington. They do not understand the programs. They do understand that money is available, but they do not know how to go about getting it.

This amendment would give them an opportunity to get an adequate, minimal, and primary training so that they would know tomorrow far more than they know today.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not correct to say that one of the problems regarding Federal programs, at least the problems in the cities, is that the Federal agencies in the cities sometimes are not even aware of the duplication in programs which takes place; that with all the money being spent in the cities, we should at least know how the money is being spent and how we can make the best use of it, and not waste the Federal dollars which are being spent in the cities. We would be short-sighted in not assuring the proper utilization of Federal dollars going into the cities of America.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. They come into my office and talk to me about those things. I held two seminars in eastern and western Pennsylvania to acquaint local personnel in the State and local governments with the various Federal programs, so that they can make intelligent application to get their share of the money. Very often, they did not know what I was talking about.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not true that the Senate, if it really wishes to save money, should demand full value out of every Federal dollar given to a community? But how can they actually handle those expenditures which we vote without wasting them, if the communities do not know what is expected of them, or how to handle the money which is being spent in the cities of America? We are spending billions of dollars in America, but they are not being used effectively. The time has come for us to realize that if we are to appropriate Federal dollars in the cities of America, at least we should have the necessary personnel to know how to spend that money wisely.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I point out for the benefit of my friends from primarily rural States, that this money will be helpful and useful to them, too. There is hardly an area in America today where community facilities are not in short supply, and the personnel necessary to operate them. There are many rural counties which will benefit from this program.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely. We are talking about cities, but we are not talking about metropolitan areas only. We are talking about every city, every small town, because the bills that Congress passes and all these facilities, really, are utilized by every city in America regardless of their size. There is not a State in the Nation which does not have a city which is a beneficiary of Federal programs.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. I want to thank the Senator for his helpful intervention, because he is about to hold what I believe to be some of the most progressive hearings ever held on the needs of the cities. I am sure that he will find, in the course of those hearings, that this kind of legislation is vitally important in meeting the crises of the cities.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I add one point. We had better recognize, for the survival of the Nation, that we are going through one of the great crises in the entire history of the United States. We would be short sighted, indeed, if we did not recognize that a revolution is taking place in America today.

Indeed, it is a revolution which is taking place in America. There is lack of coordination between Federal bureaus and Federal agencies whose programs affect urban America.

Since we will spend this money, we should spend it efficiently and wisely.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for taking the leadership in getting skilled personnel to spend the money that we in the Federal Government are sending into the cities of America.

Mr. CLARK. Again, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his helpful intervention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Florida, but I see that he waves his hand at me, and I am therefore happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for offering his amendment. I join him as a cosponsor of it.

I want to endorse everything the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has just said. I should like to make the plea to the chairman of the committee to agree to take the amendment to conference, because here is an amendment that will save, in my judgment, the taxpayers' money many times over the so-called cost of the amendment. So far as the funds for it are concerned, it will also result in much sounder planning programs.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is in the Chamber, as well as the Senator from Pennsylvania. They are both members of my Subcommittee on Education. I know that in this field, too, particularly in connection with rural areas, we have agreed to go along with the recommendation—and they will be bringing it to the floor of the Senate in due course of time—in which we will be advancing money to school districts and areas at the local level in order to give greater assurance that the planning they do will be good planning and will involve a wise expenditure of those funds, which they are going to get in any event.

If we really are to have wise spending, we should support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I wish that the chairman of the committee would agree to take the amendment to conference because I think it is one of the soundest amendments from the standpoint of saving the taxpayers' money that can be offered.

Mr. CLARK. I completely agree with my friend from Oregon. Let me say, for his benefit, that last year, the administration asked for $10 million. This year, they ask for $5 million plus. Last year, the genial, attractive, and able chairman of the committee agreed to take to conference the $4 million appropriation. This year, however, to my deep regret, his heart is as stone, and I have been unable to persuade him to go along.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield to me on my own time——

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington. Let me say to him that, of course, I was speaking in light vein.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am speaking now on my own time. I have handled many of these bills. A bill is not always the way I want it. I did not write it. I am a servant of the committee, and of a majority of the committee. I try to be the best advocate I can for the committee's viewpoint. Now, personally, I think this is not too bad a program and would be willing to try it again with the House; but, personally, I could not speak that way for the committee. The House has turned it on three previous occasions.

The Senate has considered it in previous supplemental requests.

Mr. CLARK. The Senate committee is improving. Last year we took a substantial amount to conference. My recollection is that, since it was in the Housing Act of 1964, this is only the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If there is anything the House is adamant on, it is on this item. We had a long discussion about it. The testimony of Secretary Weaver on this matter is not very enlightening to the members of the committee as to what is being done. Only two States have gone ahead with some kind of agenda or vague layout as to how they are going to operate. One of the States is California. The Secretary has quoted that State as having determined an individual approach. The other proposal is from North Carolina.

Forty-three States have indicated an interest in participating. The interest is that there might be a grant for them, but they have done very little to start a counterproposal within their own States to take advantage of a grant.

Mr. CLARK. How can they, without Federal money, I ask?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is a grant. The States can set up their programs and obligate themselves to a certain starting amount, and then the Federal Government will come in and see what their program is. This is why many members of the committee felt they just did not know what was going to be done and that they should not lay out Federal money and say, "Here it is. Go ahead and get something ready," when the States have not shown hardly any initiative.

As far as the testimony is concerned, it did not show that the States were ready to participate. This is the best way I can relate what happened in the committee. There may be States that are ready and could participate, but have not given testimony.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with due deference to my able friend from Washington, I have read the testimony of Secretary Weaver, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of 43 States which have indicated an interest in developing training programs, starting, alphabetically, with Alabama, and going through to Wyoming.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES INDICATING INTEREST IN DEVELOPING TRAINING PROGRAMS

Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of 20 States which have actually applied for training assistance. Both lists came from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE APPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING ASSISTANCE

[*State, agency preparing plan, and stage of application*]

California: University of California, Preliminary plan received.

Georgia: University of Georgia, Preliminary plan received.

Illinois: Board of Economic Development, Preliminary plan received.

Iowa: State Development Commission, State-wide meetings and discussions in progress.

Kansas: Kansas State University, State plan being compiled.

Kentucky: University of Kentucky, State plan being developed.

Massachusetts: Department of Commerce and Development, Plan being developed.

Michigan: Department of Economic Expansion, Perliminary proposals received.

Minnesota: University of Minnesota, State plan being compiled.

Missouri: Administrative Assistant for Urban Affairs, Preliminary plan submitted.

Nebraska: Chief, Board of Nebraska Resources, State plan being compiled.

New Jersey: Department of Conservation and Economic Development, State-wide discussions in progress.

New York: The State Education Department, State plan being compiled.

North Carolina: Department of Conservation and Development, Preliminary plan submitted.

Ohio: Ohio Board of Regents, State-wide meetings held.

Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, Preliminary plan received.

Pennsylvania: State Planning Board, State-wide discussions underway.

Tennessee: Commissioner of the Department of Finance and Administration, State-wide discussions underway.

Washington: Director, Department of Commerce and Economic Development, State-wide discussions underway.

West Virginia: Department of Commerce, State-wide discussions underway.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Weaver's full statement made before the committee on this subject be printed in the Record at this point. It was made approximately 40 days ago. Perhaps in 40 days some States have shown some interest, or perhaps he has been father to the thought.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Secretary Robert C. Weaver

The next item, Mr. Chairman, deals with the Community Development Training Program authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964. For this purpose the budget request was $5 million plus $150,000 for administrative expenses. The House allowed nothing.

I feel most strongly that this very valuable and badly needed program should be given a fair test. I appeal to this Committee to consider—for example—the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars which the Federal Government itself is putting into our cities, towns, counties, and metropolitan areas. Yet the end result—the achievement of the Federal objectives in these programs—is most often in the hands of local officials; as indeed it should be. Local administration, like administration anywhere, is only as good as the people who are performing it. This program is designed to augment and upgrade the local officials who carry out Federally-assisted and related local programs. Such action is long overdue and will facilitate more effective utilization of public expenditure, especially those funded in part by the Federal Government. It is a prudent and timely investment.

I know from my own travels, and from conversations I have almost daily, that securing and developing qualified staffs are a problem in cities and other local governments all over this country. It is an acute problem. It is an important problem to the local people, and it is an important problem to the Federal Government as long as we have these many, complex and important programs which under our system are and should be administered by local units of government. I invite the Senators on this Committee to think about their own States. How many cities can you think of which have an adequate staff of skilled semi-professional and professional workers to produce the kind and quality of local administration you think desirable? How many, especially, have an adequate supply of well-trained young people coming along, who have chosen local government as a career? The fact is that most of them are engaged in a fruitless struggle, hiring people away from each other.

We urgently need to do something to increase and especially to upgrade the supply of trained people in the various skills involved in urban development. I do not mean to suggest that the Community Development Training program we are proposing will solve the whole problem; of course, it will not. But it will make a valuable contribution. And it will stir up other interest and activity. I predict that its effects will be felt on a far greater scale than the relatively modest appropriation might suggest.

I get the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the House Committee has been reluctant to fund this program for fear it will get to be some sort of political grab-bag for city hall. I honestly think there is no reason to fear such a result. The law requires the Governor to designate a responsible State agency to supervise the program. The State Agency must formulate a program, which the Secretary must approve. That program must spell out in detail how the States plan to administer their training; who will perform the training and how the trainees are to be selected; how the money is to be spent and accounted for. The whole operation will be conducted subject to the scrutiny of the Department and of the Congress. I am sure that there are adequate safeguards against abuses.

We recommend this approach, and we believe it will produce valuable results. The Congress agreed. I do not recall that it was seriously objected to in either House. Yet it has never moved, for lack of funds. To me it does not make sense to let the program lie still-born, when the problem is so widespread and the cost is so small. I urge this Committee to give this program a fair try. After all, the Department will be back before you every year. If the program doesn't work—an eventuality I do not anticipate—the Congress can cut it off at any time. But let us not let it lie dead upon the statute books. I hope, and I strongly urge, that this Committee add the $5 million appropriation requested for this purpose to the pending bill.

Estimate, $5,150,000; proposed by Committee $-0-; in Act $-0-.

(House hearings, pt. 2, pp. 836–842)

Page 44, after line 14, insert the following:

"COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

"For matching grants to States for training and related activities and for expenses of providing technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies (including studies and publications of information), as authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801–805), $5,150,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $150,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

The estimate, and $5,150,000 above the amount allowed by the House Committee.

House report

(Pertinent excerpts, H. Rept. No. 1477, p. 18)

Community Development Training Programs.—The budget this year again proposes a program of grants for training programs in community development. On three previous occasions the Committee has denied requests for funds for this purpose and has not approved the $5,150,000 budgeted for this purpose.

Justification

There is no substitute for trained, fully qualified public servants. Each year the many financial assistance programs of the State and Federal governments are at work in cities, towns, counties and metropolitan areas throughout the country. In the final analysis, the success or failure of these programs rests squarely in the hands of the local governmental bodies which all too frequently are under-staffed with under-trained personnel.

Local governments which are trying to recruit qualified individuals to staff expanding urban development programs, many of them Federally financed, are confronted with a critical shortage of qualified individuals for positions in city planning, finance, engineering, traffic and transportation, and the up-dating and enforcement of building codes and zoning ordinances.

The Community Development Training program was enacted in 1964 in response to the finding by the Congress "that the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas and urban populations have caused severe problems in urban and suburban development and created a national need to (1) provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development . . .". In passing this legislation the Congress recognized a Federal responsibility for taking action on a National problem which was, at least in part, a product of the growth of Federal programs to aid local governments.

At the time of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1964, it was pointed out that there were thousands of unfilled professional and technical positions in local government—the situation has not improved. It has, in fact, deteriorated. Current estimates of local government's requirements indicate that the need for professional and technical staff will increase by 40 percent in this decade. Moreover, by 1980 it is estimated that local governments will need to have five professional and technical employees for every three that they had in 1960—this would require approximately 400,000 individuals.

Although the Community Development Training program cannot be the panacea for all the training and recruiting problems of local government, it can provide a start toward the goal of up-grading the skills of present local employees through in-service training and it can furnish an incentive which is needed to attract young people to a career in local government.

Program Description

This program of matching grants to States will assist them to strengthen the capability of local governments. The States will bear responsibility for the development of plans and programs to meet these training and recruiting needs. Once completed, State plans must be submitted to the Department.

State plans will include:

(1) The objectives of the plan and the proposed uses to which the requested funds would be put.

(2) The method by which the State would provide its share of the matching funds.

(3) A system for providing adequate fiscal controls and accounting procedures.

(4) A procedure for providing the Secretary with such reports as he may deem necessary.

(5) The designation of a responsible State agency or officer who will administer the program.

In developing and carrying out these plans, States shall be encouraged to work with local governmental bodies, public and private colleges and universities and, where they exist, urban studies centers.

Development of State programs

Forty-three States have indicated a serious interest in participating in this program. It appears that twenty of the States will be far enough advanced in their development of State programs to file formal applications for Federal grants during the fiscal year, if funds are made available.

California proposals

Although it is expected that each state will take its own individual approach to its needs and program, the plans under development in California may be taken as illustrative.

(1) *Problems in Urban Development.*—A brief but intensive course for personnel who make major policy decisions affecting development.

(2) *Current Techniques and Methods of Fiscal and Administrative Management.*—A part-time continuing course for city and county managers as well as budget and finance officers offering up-to-date information about new techniques and systems of urban management.

(3) *Administration of Zoning, Building and Housing Codes.*—Short courses for codes personnel introducing current methods and procedures.

California will provide training in a variety of ways including one to three-day institutes offered by the University of California Extension Division, the State College System, and the University of Southern California and expansion of extension courses to include courses for municipal personnel.

In cooperation with the League of Cities and the County Supervisors Association, the University and the State Colleges will organize a small traveling faculty which will offer short training programs in urban development in several parts of the State.

The California program contemplates initial activities headquartered at ten different institutions in nine cities with extension programs in more than a score of other communities. The program is being developed by a broadly representative committee appointed by the Governor, including representatives of various levels of State and local government and public and private educational institutions. Necessary administrative and accounting procedures are also in preparation.

North Carolina Proposals

As a second example, *the North Carolina program* identifies a need, based on a questionnaire survey, for training in 17 specialties. Another questionnaire identified the State and local agencies and academic institutions in the State which could participate in providing the needed training. The preliminary State plan reflects the needs and resources identified in these surveys.

North Carolina has attached the highest priority to establishing the following training programs:

(1) *Code Inspection Training.*—Training sessions for code inspectors to be established by the North Carolina League of Municipalities.

(2) *Uses of data processing and methods of analysis in urban planning.*—Short courses of intensive instruction for professional city and regional planners.

(3) *Techniques of Transportation Planning.*—Instruction for municipal planners and highway officials in planning community transportation systems.

Administrative Expenses

The appropriation and limitation of $150,000 for administrative expenses for the first full year's operation of the program is based on a staff of 10 to initiate and administer this program; a program director, 6 professional and technical staff members, and 3 clerical and supporting positions.

The functions to be performed by this staff will include:

(1) Advising states on Federal requirements for participating in the program and providing professional and technical advice on the development and initiation of state plans.

(2) Developing policies and detailed procedure for the operation of the program, including application and contract forms and instructions, eligibility criteria, and the like.

(3) Reviewing applications for grants and accompanying state plans for conformity with program and budgetary requirements.

(4) Reviewing state programs in progress to assure they are being carried out in accordance with approved state plans and Federal requirements.

(5) Evaluating experience under state programs and research activities and analyzing, abstracting and preparing for distribution material of value as technical assistance to states and units of local government, as authorized by the Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from New York, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 or 3 or 5 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to support the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I do not think he should be discouraged, because the times are catching up with the vital issues and problems involved. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is to begin hearings with relation to what is to be done with respect to the cities and their problems.

In my opinion, there are four or five issues which will determine the next election: Vietnam, the high cost of living or inflation, riots in the streets, the civil rights struggle, and what to do about our cities.

Unless we have the brains and the experts to be assigned to cope with the managing of the problems and provide the means for doing so, we will be charged with bankruptcy and failure in the Congress. We know that only trained people can cope with these problems in the cities.

In New York City, even with the local pride we have, we had to reach out to Philadelphia and New Haven for experts. This is true of other cities. So we need not be chauvinistic about it. If we do not provide the funds we cannot have the personnel to administer the new program.

We must keep pressing for it. There may be frustrating defeats, but sooner or later it will catch up even with the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time, if the Senator from Washington is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think we all understand what this is about and what we are presenting on behalf of the committee.

I yield back my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I observe that in the discussion of the committee, the State of California is singled out as an example of a State government which not only has a plan but has implemented that plan and is making progress with respect to the whole field of training people in community development programs. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The Secretary stated that 43 States had indicated an interest, but California and North Carolina have done something about it.

Mr. President, I received a letter from the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in which he urges adoption of this item, and I ask unanimous consent to have that letter placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
July 28, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Independent Offices Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you probably know, the Administration is urging prompt action on its proposal to give to the Federal Agencies which supervise the operation of financial institutions, additional regulatory powers in the matter of issuing cease and desist orders when irregularities in the operation of a bank or savings and loan association have been discovered, but short of the drastic action of closing the institution at a loss possibly to the government on insured accounts as well as to stockholders and shareholders. After voluminous hearings, I prepared a substitute bill for the Administration bill previously introduced by request and I have scheduled hearings on that substitute bill for 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 2nd.

The importance of acting promptly on that bill is such that I will be unable to attend a meeting of your Subcommittee on Independent Offices when you mark up that bill. I am, therefore, writing to indicate my interest in an item in the House Bill of $5 million for the Housing and Urban Department to make grants to the States for training programs, etc. Please record me as being in favor of retaining that item in the Senate bill and should an effort in the Subcommittee be made to eliminate the item, please announce to my Senate colleagues that the multiplicity of problems growing out of urban development convince me that the proposed new program is a sound one and should have our support.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee is present on the floor. He can speak for himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I looked but did not see him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the position of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is that he felt more money was provided than should be. He was advised by friends in the State of Virginia that if we trained these people more, it would be a good investment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not disagree, but Secretary Weaver said that only 43 States had expressed an interest, and 2 States had done something about it. What he told the Senator from Pennsylvania I do not know.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is not a question of the States expressing interest. There has developed and is developing a direct relationship between the Federal Government and cities. The mayors of cities come to the Federal Government now, and not to the States. That is the difference.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made a good point. He pointed out that when the mayor of the largest city in this country wanted to get personnel, he had to raid talent from other sections of the United States. I know he raided my own city of New Haven, and he raided the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. CLARK. New Haven had its top man stolen by Mayor Lindsay.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not yet, but he is on the way to doing it.

Mr. CLARK. And he stole the police commissioner of Philadelphia.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is like a game of musical chairs. The city of Boston got hold of an urban expert who came from New Haven.

A new mayor of New York is elected. He wants a good job done. So he goes to Boston and tries to get the man who originally went from New Haven to Boston, to come to New York. If a problem arises in Los Angeles, the home of the distinguished Senator from California, they will be looking around at New York and New Haven, to try to take the people away from New Haven and New York.

So we have a constant blowing up of higher and higher salaries, as one city raids another all over America. The reason for the raiding is the lack of trained personnel.

So the point the Senator from Pennsylvania makes, and makes so cogently and well, is that we should have enough personnel to do the job in our big cities of America, without the necessity of one city raiding another for the handful of trained men.

It is not a question, any more, of only involving the States. We have set up these programs for a direct relationship between the Federal Government and the cities; and we should recognize that. The Senator from Oregon makes a very good point. He recognizes, in the job that he holds as chairman of a most important subcommittee, that all the education and training programs we have in this entire Nation are wasted, and the money we spend is not spent effectively if we do not have qualified personnel to administer the programs. I say it is foolish for us, as U.S. Senators, to appropriate these billions and billions of dollars, if the programs are ineffective because the men who administer them do not know what they are all about. I think the time has come for Congress to stop and take a careful look, and then proceed with great caution on some of these programs. I would much prefer to see Congress vote $5 million for trained personnel before we vote $600 million, and waste the money for lack of proper administration. The cart is really being put before the horse when we do otherwise.

I am sure the hearings we will start next Monday will show that billions of dollars of Federal money are not always effectively used because the people who administer the programs do not understand the programs or the problems involved. I think the time has come that, before we vote to spend these large sums of money, we ought to make sure that there are people who know how to administer the programs.

I think it is tragic, in a bill such as this, to appropriate $640 million, and at the same time be unwilling to vote $5 million for trained personnel to administer the expenditure of those funds. We are reaching a stage in the growth of our cities, with 100 million additional people expected by the year 2000, that we will need 400,000 trained personnel to administer the cities; and yet, with all the billions of dollars we vote, we are so shortsighted as to fail to provide for the trained personnel to administer those billion-dollar programs we vote for, year after year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I must say I am sorry to hear all about this kidnaping going on between the cities. Maybe we should have a bill to prohibit that. But what is involved here is the question of whether the Federal Government should make these grants to the States, and only to the States, which in turn can give the money to the cities, when there is not any testimony to show tha they have much of anything in the way of plans for its use. That was the general consensus of the committee, and that is all I can say.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Griffin
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—45

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Dirksen
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
McCarthy
Miller
Neuberger
Smathers
Thurmond
Tydings

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, following line 25, insert the following:

FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 811), $530,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $30,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require, but I say to my colleagues that I do not intend to ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to fund section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 which authorized the provision of some desperately needed fellowships and scholarships in the field of metropolitan area, city, and, generally speaking, urban planning. Experts in these fields are in desperately short supply.

The Appropriations Committee, again, for reasons obscure to me, has never been willing to fund this authorization which was approved by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the House and the Senate, passed by Congress, and signed by the President.

I have no idea why they have not funded this money. It is perfectly clear that these people are desperately needed and they are not now being trained in adequate numbers.

I invite the attention of my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, to this. As one example, I serve as a member of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board.

We had a vacancy in the office of executive director of the State planning board. We were unable to find a qualified individual in Pennsylvania. We went outside of the State and finally ended up hiring the city planning director of Nashville, Tenn. I have no doubt that Nashville, Tenn., went down the line and stole somebody else.

These people are in desperately short supply. There are adequate schools of city planning, urban planning, and metropolitan area planning in which these individuals can be trained.

Often they come from families of no particular affluence. They are not able to afford the graduate work necessary to get a degree to enable them to qualify for the available jobs.

The reason I am not calling for a rollcall vote is that, to my deep and bitter disappointment, this relatively minor sum of $530,000 was not included in the budget, and I have no particular confidence that a sum can now be added to this bill which was not in the budget.

I regret very much that the administration took this point of view. I regret even more that the collective hearts of the members of the Committee on Appropriations were again frozen.

I ask unanimous consent that the justification for the grant for fellowships for city planning and urban studies, which appeared in the House report in last year's appropriation bill may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

HOUSE REPORT

(Pertinent excerpts, H. Rept. 320, p. 11)

Justification

No funds were provided by the House and the budget amendment proposes an appropriation of $530,000 of which $30,000 is for administrative expenses. The appropriation would allow the Agency to implement the program as enacted in the House Act of 1964.

As indicated in the preceding section on the Federal-State training programs, the supply of professional and technical personnel is lagging far behind the rapidly expanding needs of our urban centers.

Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 enacted two new programs of Federal aid to help meet these needs—the Federal-State training program and the program of fellowships of city planning and urban studies. The Federal-State training program, already described, is directed toward assistance to State programs of training and research in subjects essential to orderly community development. The program of fellowships for city planning and urban studies, described below, represents an effort to attract more young students into careers in the field of urban planning and development.

ACTION, the nonprofit organization concerned with community development, reported in a recent study "a prime need to establish several hundred fellowships to sustain talented graduate students in urban renewal and redevelopment, public administration, urban transportation, housing and land economics, and urban sociology (as well as in urban planning * * *)."

University officials state that there are two or three times as many qualified applicants in urban development and planning as can be supported through existing endowments. Many for whom financial assistance cannot be provided seek out other opportunities and are lost to the growing field of urban planning and development.

There are now 35 schools offering graduate degrees in city planning, and producing between 200 and 300 planners per year. It is estimated that they could turn out twice that number if sufficient financial aid to students were available. Planning schools cannot now get students in sufficient numbers because other fields offer more and better graduate fellowships. Three universities expect to launch planning programs within the next 2 years.

In addition to the emerging national interest in the problems of urban planning and growth, the Federal Government has a very substantial financial stake in the competence of planning and administration at State and local government levels. The prudent expenditure of large sums of Federal funds depends first and most importantly on the training and ability of local officials. This consideration is not limited to housing and urban renewal, but applies equally to such major and diverse programs as highway development, airport construction, urban mass transit, air and water pollution control, and many others. Federal interests, therefore, will be directly served by a program to encourage talented students in institutions of higher education to choose and prepare themselves for careers in the various skills essential in urban planning and urban development activities at the State and local level.

Program description

The fellowships awarded under this program will be for graduate study for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development. Applications will be accepted for training in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields, including architecture, civil engineering, municipal finance, and public administration.

Applicants will apply to the school of their choice, and accredited institutions will submit a limited number of applications to HHFA. Students will not apply directly to HHFA; applications will undergo a preliminary review by the school to which application was made.

Persons will be selected for fellowships solely on the basis of ability, and upon the recommendations of the Urban Studies Fellowship Advisory Board which is required to be established by the authorizing law. The Board, to be appointed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, will consist of three persons from public institutions of higher learning; three from private nonprofit institutions, who are the heads of departments which provide academic courses appropriately related to the fields in which fellowships will be awarded; and three persons from national organizations which are directly concerned with problems relating to urban, regional, and community development.

It is expected that each fellowship award will be for $3,000 and will be renewable for a second year.

Fellowship grants

Section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 authorizes annual appropriations of $500,000 for a 3-year period starting July 1, 1964.

The $500,000 appropriation requested for fiscal 1966 will support 80 to 85 fellowships of $3,000 per annum.

Administrative expenses

The appropriation and limitation of $30,000 for administrative expenses in fiscal year 1966 would provide a staff of three employees to institute and administer this program. This staff would be employed in program policy and procedural steps, informational activities, receipt and analysis of proposals, and the making of fellowship grants as provided by the statute. The requested appropriation would also cover the expenses of the Urban Studies Advisory Board authorized in section 810(b) of the act.

It is respectfully requested that the Senate amend the pending bill to provide $530,000 so the initial steps may be taken to implement the program as authorized in the Housing Act of 1964.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I make a last plea for the last remaining drop of compassion in the hearts of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington, in the hope that they will take this to conference?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it is difficult to woo us so quickly. If he had started his courtship in this matter with us in the committee and had made such an eloquent plea to the committee, we might have been susceptible at that time.

Mr. CLARK. I have been making love to the Senator's committee for 3 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say that to me, this is a much more sensible approach—at least, in the field of planning—than the other approach. If we would encourage a number of these people to be highly trained, there would be more available. They would all get jobs.

I hope that next year this item will be in the budget. I should be glad to join in a letter to the Budget director in this respect.

I believe it is much easier to do it this way, to create these available schools where the people could be trained in these fields, because then they would be employed by the cities and other places that need them. The difficulty is that we have too few schools that pay much attention to this matter.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that under the proposed amendment we might train 83 qualified city planners and the like in various schools which are available. For every city planner trained under this amendment 10, 20, or 30 persons would have to be trained to do the pick-and-shovel work in the counties, cities, and States. This is the problem to which the other amendment was directed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

I must oppose the amendment, because it is not in the budget, and we had no chance to hear it. Although I believe it is a good idea, on behalf of the committee I would have to suggest that we——

Mr. CLARK. May I say to my good friend, the Senator from Washington, that the committee took it last year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to suggest that I am representing the committee, and I do not believe the committee would allow me to come here and run the matter myself. They would be afraid that Senators would get me to a point where I would take everything, because I am so impressed with some of these arguments that I have to look around to find the rock of Colorado, and I say: "Shall we take this? No."

Then I get back to the committee again. So I am in that position.

Mr. CLARK. May I say, in all candor, that if the other members of the Committee on Appropriations would only follow the heart and mind of the Senator from Washington, we would all be better off.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I urge the Senator from Washington to take this amount to conference. It is not a large amount. I believe it answers the reason why many of us on the Appropriations Subcommittee reluctantly had to vote against the $5 million figure, because we did not believe that there were enough universities offering opportunity for high-skill training in this particular field.

This would make a start. It would encourage these universities to come forward with programs and help to spread opportunity to get some training, through these universities, throughout the country.

I urge the chairman to take this amount to conference, as a very able start on a program that I believe will grow and will be necessary in helping our cities of the future.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to do what my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, has suggested. I am impressed by all these comments, but I have listened all day to the anguish. The difficulty is that this is not in the budget. We have to be consistent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator just saved $5,150,000 by refusing to take to conference an authorization provided for in the budget. I should think that an appropriation equal to only 10 percent of this item, which is only $530,000, would still leave the Senator ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or we can take out of the urban renewal program a few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. CLARK. Half a million dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry on a matter that is not immediately connected with the subject discussed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

To my office have come representatives of a beryllium company in Ohio. These representatives state that in Montana, Ohio, and North Carolina are beryllium plants operated by private enterprise. They contend that the Atomic Energy Commission has now established an in-house manufacture of its own of beryllium.

Is there any discussion of that subject in this bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. We do not have that. That will be in the appropriation for public works.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am prepared to take up the Senator from Washington on his suggestion——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow us to complete this discussion?

Mr. CLARK. I thought the Senator from Ohio had finished.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from North Carolina is interested in my subject.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I share the views expressed by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio. I believe that it is unsound for us to tax private enterprise, to assist the Atomic Energy Commission or NASA to operate, and then for NASA or the Atomic Energy Commission to go into competition with free enterprise.

I hope that no appropriation bill will come here in which either of those agencies will be authorized to go into competition with private enterprise, in a field which private enterprise is fitted to fill adequately.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from Montana whether it has come to his attention, from a privately operated beryllium plant in Montana, that the Government of the United States has started to manufacture beryllium on its own, practically creating an absolutely insurmountable impediment to the ability of these private enterprises to continue in existence?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. There is a beryllium research plant at Anaconda, Mont., where the big smelter is. The Anaconda Co. has beryllium which it acquires from deposits in Utah. It was spending a lot of its own money developing this project, which was very necessary, I understand, under the atomic energy program; and now the Atomic Energy Commission has stepped in and created a situation which is quite difficult for that blossoming, growing, small industry in Montana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any money in this bill to finance that in-house manufacturing of beryllium?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had enough trouble yesterday with titanium, without getting into beryllium.

I would agree with what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and others have said: When the full Committee on Public Works meets on this matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is almost as bad as Secretary McNamara trying to build his own ships to handle the merchant marine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If I were to modify my amendment by moving to decrease the appropriation for urban renewal by $530,000 would the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] then take this amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and I so move.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I amend my amendment to provide that the $530,000 that is provided therein——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Make it an even $500,000.

Mr. CLARK. I modify my amendment to provide that the $500,000 to be appropriated for fellowships and scholarships is to be deducted from total grants for urban renewal.

I hope that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will take that amendment, as modified, to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 41, following line 25, insert the following:

"FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

"For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 811), $500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $30,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That this sum shall be deducted from grants for urban renewal."

Mr. MAGNUSON. After consultation with some other members of the committee, we would be glad to accept that and take it to conference, because it fits into the urban renewal program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], as modified.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is in excess of the budget and it would be extremely difficult to hold this amount in in conference.

Mr. CLARK. It will not be if it is deducted from urban renewal.

Mr. ALLOTT. Still, it would be difficult.

Mr. CLARK. I am confident that it can be worked out with the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be reported.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 31, line 23, strike out "$499,699,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$479,999,000".

On page 32, line 3, strike out "teachers:" and insert in lieu thereof "teachers: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used for Project Mohole:".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The galleries will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we come to the so-called Mohole amendment which, from the inquiries I have had, has caused considerable interest.

Speaking for myself, while there is an hour allotted on the bill, I do not anticipate speaking for over 10 to 15 minutes. I say this so that Senators may judge their time accordingly, and I do appreciate the attention of those Senators who have abided in the Chamber in order to listen to the discussion of the subject.

Mr. President, yesterday I was called from the Chamber to an interview with a certain gentleman of the broadcasting industry, and the first question that he asked me was: "I understand that you have a company in Colorado that is very much interested in this project."

About 3 years ago a certain scientific journal made a similar allegation. I am not sure they ever made a formal retraction, but when I straightened them out we heard nothing further from them.

First I want to make very plain that there is only one company in Colorado that I know of that has any interest in this particular amendment. That is a subsidiary of Brown & Root, and they are not in accord with the position I have taken.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear in the beginning that I have no constituents that I know of who are interested in the outcome of this amendment. Furthermore, I shall go one step further and say that I have no financial interest in any company that could possibly have any interest in this amendment.

I am a little astounded that the defenders of the Mohole project would go to this extent to try to justify their cause. I am concerned about it, but it only reflects the low state to which some people think they can resort in order to accomplish their purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to make one other point very clear. I have called the attention of the Senate to the situation of Mohole for 5 straight years. I have called the attention of the Senate to the mismanagement, to the constant growth of cost every year for 5 years, and the Senate, except for 1 year, has not paid any heed to my call.

So I come here today wholly objective. I have nothing to gain individually. I have nothing to gain for my State. I shall repeat this and make it very clear. I have not asked one Senator, either in committee or out of committee, to support me on this matter, because to me an objective, analytical examination of the matter should persuade any Senator to vote either for or against it.

Mr. President, this matter originated a long time ago. In 1959, phase 1 of this program was started with a vessel called *Cuss I*. Phase 1 was very successful, drilling in intermediate or shallow waters, carried on under the auspices of the so-called AMSOC committee. That stands for American Miscellaneous Society, which was, in fact, a part of the National Academy of Sciences.

In August 1961, Dr. Waterman, then the Director of the National Science Foundation, held a 2-day or 3-day meeting in Washington, to which he invited everyone in the country who was interested in the prospect of working on the second phase, which was the so-called Mohole. "Mohole" derives its name from that area of the earth's crust which was defined by Professor Andrija Mohorovicic. The "Moho" is the transitional area between the crust and the mantle of the earth. Persons who are interested will find on page 1630 of the hearings a diagram which will give them an understanding of what is contemplated.

After much mismanagement in the selection of contractors, a contract was awarded in February 1962, as I recall it, to Brown & Root.

In the spring of 1962, the National Science Foundation estimated before our committee that the cost of the project would be between $35 million and $50 million. They had previously told us that the cost would be between $15 million and $20 million. In the last few weeks, they have said that that was merely an estimate by the scientists. Nevertheless, the fact is that on the basis of their statements to us, which we accepted as we would accept their sworn word, Congress committed itself on the basis of the figures that had been submitted.

In March 1962, Dr. Waterman testified at a Senate Committee on Appropriations hearing that the cost would be between $35 million and $50 million. By August of 1962, Dr. Waterman stated that the cost would be approximately $50 million.

In June 1963, about 9 months later, he stated that the cost would be about $70.39 million.

Then Dr. Haworth assumed the directorship of the National Science Foundation, and in November 1963, he modified the $70 million figure slightly, and said that the cost would be between $68 million and $70 million.

By June of 1964, in the appropriations hearings, Dr. Haworth testified that the cost would be $75 million.

By May of 1965, he had raised that figure to $90 million.

In an August 1965 letter to me, upon inquiry, he stated that the cost would be $104 million.

In September of 1965, Business Week published an article on this subject in which it was estimated that the cost would be $110 million.

In March of 1966, in House appropriations hearings, testimony by Dr. Haworth was that the cost would be $113.5 million.

This was in March of this year that Dr. Haworth testified to $113.5 million, in the House.

By June of this year, Dr. Haworth testified before the Senate Independent Offices Subcommittee that the total cost would be $127.1 million, which includes all of the equipment and everything that was sought to be done for it in 2 and a fraction years of operation at $13 million a year.

Yesterday, I stated on the floor of the Senate—and I believe this to be true, that the total cost of this project will run approximately $175 million. Many people thought 2 or 3 years ago that I was making wild cost predictions, but those predictions have come true.

This is quite a growth for little Topsy, which started out at $15 million to $20 million.

Mr. President, in the original instance, I did not oppose the scientific objective of Project Mohole. What I have opposed is the mismanagement and lack of knowledge which has cost the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars and will cost them many more millions of dollars before we are through. The National Science Foundation cannot possibly operate this project for another 3 years at the $13 million figure they have given. The $13 million annual operating expense will have to be expanded to $20 million or $25 million a year operating expense.

The estimate at the time of the original drilling, of course, was a cost of $15 million to $20 million. I think that the prime cause for this difficulty of tremendous cost increases lies in the determination by the National Science Foundation and the prime contractor to skip the next logical step after phase 1, the so-called *Cuss I* ship. This would ordinarily qualify for the pilot plant stage in any scientific investigation.

The scientific advisers, those who carried out phase 1, and a special outside consultant group from the National Science Board, appointed by the President under Dr. Piore, all agreed that the proper next step was an intermediate stage vessel to be used for testing equipment and gaining more experience in deepwater drilling.

The decision, however, was made immediately to commence work on a drilling platform designed to go clear through the earth's mantle. If it is placed where it is proposed to be placed now, it would drill in approximately 15,000 feet of water and through 20,000 feet of crust into the mantle, or a total of 35,000 feet.

The result of that decision not to build an intermediate vessel is that we have no definitive design criteria for the platform which is now being built. For example, if an intermediate stage vessel had been built and was at work drilling while the final vehicle was under design, samples of all three of the earth's crustal layers could well have been taken, and from these samples we could have far better determined their densities and acoustic velocities and, thus, gain a better idea of the true depth to the Moho and the difficulties of drilling the material which must be penetrated.

Mr. President, I think the most frustrating point of the action taken by our committee—by a divided vote, I might point out—is that we are continuing on the wasteful course the project took 2 years ago, when we now have an opportunity to correct the situation and save millions of dollars, which is the action that the House did take this year in cutting the Mohole project out of the bill.

There is now underway a national ocean sediment coring program, also started by the National Science Foundation, which could take the place of the intermediate vessel once bypassed.

Senators will find on page 26 of the committee report a listing of the scientific objectives of this program.

I proposed to compare them with the goals which the National Science Foundation asserts are a part of the Mohole itself.

I read from page 26 of the report what this intermediate drilling hopes to accomplish:

> The long record of the earth's climatic history. Changing events can be traced through radioactive dating and study of fossil organisms in the sediments, thus expanding our knowledge of both long- and short-range climatic cycles.
>
> The history of the major ocean current systems and water masses.
>
> How and when the ocean basins attained their present configuration. The evidence obtained may well cast light on continental drift and the renewal of the oceanic crust by upwelling connected with deep-seated convection cells, and other currently controversial ideas about the dynamics of the earth.
>
> Changes in the earth's magnetic field.
>
> The composition and rate of accretion of cosmic particles imbedded in the sedimentary rock.
>
> The origin of extraordinary concentrations of metallic oxides such as the manganese nodules found widely on the ocean floor.
>
> The evolutionary history of shelled, one-cell plants and animals, including the profound changes in these organisms that occurred about 100 million years ago.
>
> In addition, scientists will be able to compare information obtained from core samples with theories developed from indirect geophysical measurements such as the changing speeds of seismic waves traveling through the earth.

And what do they think they can accomplish in Project Mohole? On page 1631 of the committee hearings, Dr. Haworth's statement says we will obtain:

A better age determination for the earth.

A determination of the age and origin of the ocean basins and their contained sea water.

A better understanding of how the earth-moon system came into being.

An understanding of the distribution of the chemical elements in the earth, which in turn bears on the origin of the sun and perhaps other stars.

An understanding of the origin of continents and whether or not they are drifting about on the earth's surface.

Knowledge of the mantle's composition and the origin of magnetic and gravity anomalies that have been discovered beneath the sea.

A better understanding of the origin of life and the carbon cycle with which it is closely connected.

Except perhaps for the actual composition of the earth's mantle, all the matters mentioned could be accomplished in the intermediate project.

With the lack of design criteria, we are engaged in building a fantastically expensive vessel, which at present is estimated to cost $54 million—$30 million for the vessel alone and $24 million for equipment. It is almost what could be called overdesigned.

The question has been raised, and it deserves an answer, What will it cost to cancel it out? We have appropriated $55 million on the Mohole project.

The recent testimony of Dr. Haworth, supported by a call which he made to a member of my staff, and to the committee, was that it would cost $36.6 million to cancel it out. The question is, Are we to put $90 million more down a bad hole, or stop at this point, regroup ourselves for an intermediate exploration in ocean drilling, and then by the experience gained, proceed, if that is the will of the Congress, with the drilling to the Mohorovicic discontinuity? This is the question Congress faces. We will have paid $36 million for it, but we will have all the design and experimental experience which has resulted thus far.

The supporters of the project have said they have had a tremendous fallout from the project. There may have been, but I do not know where it is. One of the benefits they talk about is a drill. When analyzed, the proponents' statements about the drill turned out to be bogus. They have refined an existing drill. It can hardly be called a scientific find.

So we face the problem today—and I say this without any personal feelings at all—of whether we have gotten to the place where we should stop this project and go at the whole problem with a logical approach, wait until we have done some of the intermediate drilling, find out what problems we shall face, or whether we should rush full blown into it and spend this money, which, in my opinion, will be above $175 million—although we are not sure—and destroy what otherwise might be a worthy scientific endeavor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read part of the record to which the Senator has just referred. Is the name of the doctor, Dr. Haworth?

Mr. ALLOTT. Dr. Haworth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He finally arrived at a figure of $125 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. One hundred and twenty-seven million dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Colorado tell us what the original estimate of cost of this project was supposed to be?

Mr. ALLOTT. When the National Science Foundation first discussed it, it placed the cost at between $15 million and $20 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How did the cost ascend from the time the original estimate was submitted?

Mr. ALLOTT. Astronomically; and my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says geometrically, also. It ascended, as I read into the RECORD, year by year. From 1959, when the estimated cost was between $15 and $20 million, it went up to $35 million in 1962. It is about $127.1 million this year.

I think it is significant how the figure has changed since March. Between March and June of this year the figure increased from $113 million to $127.1 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the significance of the figure in March? Were the hearings held at that time?

Mr. ALLOTT. That figure was given in the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the difference between the figure testified at the time of the House hearing and at the time of the Senate hearing was how much?

Mr. ALLOTT. A little short of $14 million. The figure given to the House committee was $113 million. The figure given to the Senate committee was a little over $127 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator any estimate as to how much it will climb beyond the $127 million estimate?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator heard my statement that it will continue to climb.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suppose the Senator has the same assurance that he had originally, when the original estimate of the cost was between $15 and $20 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. We have exactly the same assurance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many assurances in the past has the Senator had?

Mr. ALLOTT. The original estimate was in 1959, at the start of phase 1. The different estimates were made during the period of 5 years, 1961–66.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What are the practical benefits that will come out of a successful drilling down into the earth about 50,000 or 60,000 feet, or whatever the figure is?

I heard the Senator read a description of the information that they will be able to obtain with respect to the relationship of the earth and the moon, the composition of the earth, how it became solidified, how this information will be interesting to scientists; but is there any testimony in the record about the utility that will come from this information? I understand the bathyscaphe explorations include getting information with respect to the habitation of fish and means of communicating in the water. Arguments have been advanced as to the utility that will come from such explorations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Not being a scientist, it would be presumptuous of me to say anything about the scientific field; but the only testimony that we have had is that there have been certain practical applications and techniques arising with respect to the design and construction of the vessel.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has between 3½ and 4 minutes left.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just one further question. How much money has thus far actually been spent, as distinguished from appropriated and unspent?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sorry, I cannot give the Senator the answer to that. We have appropriated $55 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in answer to that last question——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find on page 1640 of the record of the hearings that there has been obligated a total of $54.5 million. But I cannot say how much of that has actually been spent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, most of it has been spent, if it is contracted for.

Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor the Mohole project in the Senate today. It has been the subject of a great deal of discussion, of course, in the subcommittee and in the committee. The facts and figures stated by the Senator from Colorado are correct. I recall when they first proposed the project, no one stated an exact figure on what the cost would be. The estimate was $15 million to $20 million. That was some years ago. Since that time, they have enlarged the scope of the project, and the costs have gone up. But the figures stated by the Senator from Colorado are correct. The whole, broad project has been enlarged a great deal and what they think they can accomplish has been elaborated upon a great deal more than was anticipated at the beginning.

I wish to state for the RECORD, because I think it should be stated, the other side of the question. We have appropriated a great deal of money, and the amount necessary to close the project down, I think we are all agreed, would be about $36 million, to pay the contract liability unrecoverable costs and other necessary costs. So that factor has to be considered.

I think the original mistake made, with all due respect to the head of the National Science Foundation—and I believe the Senator from Colorado will agree with me—was that they were completely naive, in the beginning, about how to contract for anything. I believe they would have been better off, dollarwise, if they had turned over the contract and the proceedings to the General Accounting Office, or to Army Engineers who knew something about it. However, that is, so to speak, water that has been left in the ocean; and we still have the Mohole project, with all it entails, and all of the vast amount of interest in it, both national and international, and the stamp of approval of most members of the National Academy of Sciences and many others, including those who look forward to a great deal of spinoff in marine engineering, in the field of oceanography, in the field of drilling, and in the field of being able to know how to use a platform in the ocean. Those potential benefits still exist.

Mr. President, on this project, I have gotten together a set of facts which, as it were, the proponents of Mohole would give to the Senate if they were called on a witness stand as of today.

The project, of course, is an effort to explore and sample all layers of the earth's crust, and the unknown mantle beneath the crust. They plan to drill near Hawaii, to a depth of 32,000 to 35,000 feet, in 15,000 feet of water. The mantle comprises 85 percent of the earth's volume.

Mohole is the largest undertaking in the field of the Earth Sciences. We have space scientists; and the scientific aspects of this project involve the whole field of oceanography. This is the third big field in which all scientists are groping in the areas of basic research, as well as the hope for actual valuable commercial spinoff.

Supporting agencies are National Academy of Sciences, Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, and liaison from NASA, the Navy, the U.S. Geological Survey and AEC.

All these agencies are vigorous and active sponsors of the project. Mohole is the highest priority project in the U.S. participation in the international upper mantle project, which is a combination of scientists from all over the world in these fields. Forty countries are participating, including Russia, who is competing with the United States by preparing to drill on the Kola Peninsula, at Azerbaidzhan and the Kurile Islands.

The Mohole inner space probe will provide fundamental data which will contribute greatly to our knowledge of the nature and composition of the earth as a planet. Space in this fact sheet does not permit a description of all the benefits to be gained from coring the mantle, such as guiding our reasoning with regard to phenomenon already gathered from such celestial bodies as Mars, Venus, the Moon; predicting earthquakes; increasing our knowledge and capabilities in exploring the earth's mineral resources; giving us a better idea of how much heat in the mantle can be ascribed to radioactivity, and how much to other sources as yet unknown. It will help our Nation maintain its leadership in science and enhance our international prestige.

PROGRESS TO DATE

It is a venture already 4 years underway with most technological problems solved and much of its equipment procured and fabricated or nearing completion. That statement is borne out by all the evidence. The total integrated drilling unit had to be conceived, studied and developed. This represented the efforts of a large team of engineers and experts carefully selected and assembled from throughout the United States for their particular capabilities.

The drilling will be from a floating platform of islandlike stability which itself constitutes a breakthrough in marine engineering and naval architecture. This great mobile oceangoing research vessel is under construction.

It was first thought that they could construct it on the east coast, but they found that, the project again being enlarged from the ocean platform itself, if that were done, they would have to go clear around by the Straits of Magellan; so, a bid having been made by a firm in California, National Steel, that firm is actually building the vessel.

Mohole has produced 103 inventions to date, of which 15 have already been approved for patent application.

This project has already received—and the evidence will bear this out—national and international acclaim. Over 400 technical or scientific presentations have been made here and abroad and over 50 scientific, engineering and naval architectural papers have been published. Recognition of the need to complete the project has not been limited to scientists. Educators and editors of school textbooks, encyclopedias and school science publications have recognized and stressed its importance.

Industry and Government are readying their forces for the exploration of the oceans, which comprise 70 percent of the earth's surface, and have established liaison with Project Mohole to take advantage of the platform design and new materials and techniques developed for deep ocean operations.

Mohole research and development work is regarded as being of vital importance. Of course, many articles have been written in the trade magazines of marine engineering, steel, ocean work, and science, on this phase of the project.

The stable platform and its future prototypes can be used as: First, an observation station and laboratory for experiments at sea; second, a backup vehicle for submarine rescue and salvage; third, a means of accurately placing scientific and ASW equipment on the sea floor; fourth, a vehicle for detection and recovery of lost equipment in the deep ocean, such as missile launching vehicles; fifth, a means of obtaining scientific information of importance to military operations; sixth, a platform on the ocean for satellite tracking, concerning which they are working with NASA; and seventh, a vehicle for equatorial launch of missiles.

I do not know what the value of that is, but I imagine that if the vehicles are launched close to the equator more benefits are derived. There are many other benefits to the project. The testimony is replete with these things. We have the so-called spinoff benefits.

Many believe it is economically mandatory that we exploit our oceanic natural resources. The many new tools and techniques from Project Mohole will help us to maintain world leadership in developing energy, food, and mineral resources.

As to the costs involved, I hope that the Senator from Colorado will correct me. I believe that our figures are exactly the same.

The Senate Appropriations Committee report No. 1433, of August 4, 1966, states with respect to the financing of H.R. 14921:

> Restoration of $19,700,000 is recommended by the committee in order to continue Project Mohole.

That is for the next fiscal year.

The report further states:

> The total amount provided for the National Science Foundation is $499,699,000, which is

> $25,301,000 below the budget estimate. Completion of the fully equipped platform is planned for December 31, 1967. Funds to complete it would be furnished by the $19,700,000 budgeted for 1967, plus $10,500,000 of the $18,500,000 to be budgeted for 1968. The pre-operational costs will then total $85,600,000, and, with the addition of operational costs of $41,500,000 to be provided through 1971, will provide a total amount of $127,100,000 through the drilling of the first hole.

There is also testimony that the operational costs, after this is done, would be $13 million a year after the first hole is drilled.

The report further states:

> The committee believes it would be a serious mistake to suspend the project. The loss in prestige and in progress would be tremendous. The monetary costs are sizable; the irrecoverable costs and the contract termination costs are estimated at $36,600,000.

I think that fairly states the facts involved in this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that this hole or these holes will be drilled at a point at which the depth of the Pacific Ocean is the greatest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. It would be drilled at the point at where the crust which is over the mantle of the earth is the least thick. Somebody asked how they could find this out. They do that by seismographic findings.

The scientists first thought that they had found a place off the coast of Cuba at which the crust was the thinnest. However, after some more studies and going to this area, they discovered that, north by northwest of Hawaii the crust was not as thick.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, when the Senator says "crust," does he mean the floor of the ocean?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. The floor of the ocean, which goes down to the hard mantle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How far down are the holes to be drilled?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The hole drilling will be 32,000 to 35,000 feet. It will be about 15,000 feet of water, and then it will be from 17,000 to 20,000 feet below that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any anticipation as to what they will find once they get there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose they want to find out first the nature of the crust, and, second, the nature of the mantle. They also want to find out how much radioactivity there is and how it affects the oceans.

A great deal of basic research is involved.

They hope to find these things:

First. A better age determination for the earth.

Second. A determination of the age and origin of the ocean basins and their contained sea water.

Third. A better understanding of how the earth-moon system came into being.

Fourth. An understanding of the distribution of the chemical elements in the earth, which in turn bears on the origin of the sun and perhaps other stars.

Fifth. An understanding of the origin of continents and whether or not they are drifting about on the earth's surface.

Sixth. Knowledge of the mantle's composition and the origin of magnetic and gravity anomalies that have been discovered beneath the sea.

Seventh. A better understanding of the origin of life and the carbon cycle with which it is closely connected.

That is closely connected with human beings and life itself. That is what they suggest they would like to explore generally.

Many specifics are involved in this. They would explore generally on the floor itself. Some of the items which I have read come from the spinoff that they claim on the building will be derived from the ships and the platform. Also, while they are there, they would learn a lot about the ocean in that area.

When they complete their work there, they can change their location and do any general thing in oceanography. They would have a stable platform.

May I say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that beginning on page 1629 of the transcript of hearings many questions were asked, some of which are similar to the questions asked by the Senator. I think the Senator will find it very interesting.

Mr. MOSS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I oppose any cut in the appropriation for Mohole. I believe the amount requested is $19.7 million. The amount requested by the President and set out by the Appropriations Committee is modest indeed.

The Senate on yesterday voted on our space exploration program and we will spend approximately $5 billion for that.

I believe that the exploration of the floor of the ocean and the crust of this planet and the mantle beneath it is of equal scientific value to us, perhaps even more than the exploration of space. The latter is a little more dramatic, because we can have the television cameras bring in the picture of our astronauts making flights around the globe—and this is something that we should do. I do not say that I am opposed to that. But I believe that this relatively modest amount for Mohole is of equal value, and I believe it would be penny wise and pound foolish if we were to cut it off.

Project Mohole is the name given to the U.S. program for deep drilling which is part of the deep crustal studies of the earth undertaken by a number of nations. The international program is known as the Upper Mantle Project. The U.S. purpose is to drill through the earth's crust, and into the mantle, a core some 1,500 miles thick that constitutes the bulk of the planet. This will help to determine the distribution of chemical elements within the deep crust of the earth and the mantle and will provide information on the age and origin of the ocean basins.

The hole will be drilled near Hawaii where the earth's crust is very thin. The drilling will take place from a unique drilling platform that will be capable of navigation and sustaining itself on location. The operation will drill through 15,000 feet of water and 17,000 feet of rock to a total depth of 32,000 feet below sea level.

The engineering effort being expended on Project Mohole will not bring scientific knowledge alone. The knowledge gained in developing new tools, techniques, and equipment will increase the depth capability of the oil industry by 40 percent. Deep drilling is also of interest to the budding ocean mining industry which is engaged in deep ocean and continental shelf sampling and mining activities. The new drilling technology developed for Project Mohole will find immediate application wherever drilling, coring, and sampling are done, whether on land or sea.

The long range importance of the knowledge to be gained through Project Mohole should not be underestimated. This project will be the first step in opening up vast areas of rich mineral deposits known to exist in the ocean. The use of heat from the earth's mantle can be used to bring mineral rich waters near to the surface. Or, this heat may be utilized as a source of power. Earthquakes may be more easily predicted through the better knowledge of the mantle and its heat sources.

These benefits are appreciated by the Russians. An article from the Soviet Weekly this year told of the Soviet efforts to recover samples from the earth's mantle. The Soviet Union already has begun drilling, the only country to do so of the seven countries that have deep drilling programs in the international project.

The expenditure on equipment to complete the project has also produced valuable gains. The drilling platform being constructed is the largest ever designed. It provides such great stability that drilling can continue even in 30-knot winds and 25-foot waves. The drilling system will have a capacity 40 percent greater than the present state of the drilling art. NASA and the Navy have expressed keen interest in this platform. This type of platform could provide for drilling at great depths, a tracking station, recovery of military equipment, and a submarine rescue base.

The new diamond drill and turbocorer being developed will provide a means of changing bits without withdrawing the entire coring apparatus from the ground. This bit will be field-tested shortly. The widespread value of this development, especially in the oil industry, is recognized by everyone.

The general advancements in the state of drilling art directly attributable to this project will greatly benefit the U.S. drilling industry which spends an estimated $350 million a year in offshore drilling. If the United States is to lead the way in utilizing the oil and gas fields under deeper areas of the ocean, they will need the information gained from Project Mohole.

President Johnson has asked for $19.7 million for Project Mohole in fiscal year 1967. During the years 1962–66 a total of $55 million has already been spent on the program. The decision is now whether to throw away these "sunk" costs or to provide the additional funds to carry the program forward. The funds provided will be spent on contracts in California, Louisiana, New York, Ohio, Utah, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia, New Jersey, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Mississippi. The benefits derived from these contracts will benefit the entire United States, and especially the States with offshore oil. The benefits in oceanography will interest all those who depend on the ocean for a livelihood.

The United States has already invested in the Mohole program $55 million. This includes:

First. The largest and most stable ocean platform yet devised, 10 percent complete.

Second. Dynamic computerized positioning system, 90 percent complete.

Third. Improved turbocorer for fast drilling, 95 percent complete.

Fourth. Revolutionary retractable diamond coring bit, prototype built.

Fifth. Largest drawworks known to the world, 50 percent complete.

Sixth. Automated pipe racking assembly—after 15 years' effort, completed.

Seventh. Largest logging winches in the world, completed.

Eighth. Deep ocean untended digital data system, completed.

Many other phases of the project are in similar stages of completion.

The benefits to be gained from this program should be carefully weighed against the costs of delaying a program so advanced. In my view, this is an undertaking where the benefits are well worth the additional investment.

I ask the manager of the bill, the senior Senator from Washington, if it is not a fact that, having gone this far in preparing for Mohole, having done research and development and actually begun the construction, we would really be wasting money if we now stopped at this point and tried to roll it up and close it, as it were, and spend nearly as much in doing that as if we went ahead now and actually made the bore into the crust.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that the assumption of the Senator from Utah is correct, based upon the assumption that we will learn many things. If we would not learn anything and if the project had no value for basic research and many other things that have been discussed, I would say that we should stop it. However, the further we go in this field, the more benefits we find. Of course, some of the benefits are intangible, some must be anticipated, some we hope to find. But the Senator has made a good comparison.

Let us consider this year's budget. All the people in the world—scientists and others—are concerned with three great scientific areas. One is space, one is the oceans, and one is what is called earth sciences.

We are spending $5 billion on space, and for all of oceanography—it is in 17 departments, Woods Hole, and others—we are spending about $211 million. Five billion dollars is provided for space and $211 million for oceanography. It is true that this year the amount for Mohole will be $19,700,000.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator.

I believe very much in this project. It would be foolhardy for us to cut off such a program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mention some of these benefits, and I am repeating what people have said and what the testimony seems to be replete with.

We cannot guarantee anything. No field is more difficult to discuss with members of the Committee on Appropriations or members of legislative bodies—including the Senate—than the field of basic research.

Many times a man has come in who has had a grant for basic research, and I would say: "All right; what have you to show for it?"

Perhaps he does not have anything to show at that moment, in June, but he might have something in August. Perhaps he has some of it in his head and has experiments in progress.

Sometimes I believe that if he concocted something, put it on the table, and said: "This is what I have to prove for it"; and were asked, "What does it do?" And he answered, "It does this and that," we would say it is a pretty good job.

Basic research is a difficult field, and earth science is in that preliminary field.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes remain on the amendment, and that time is under the control of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to have time yielded to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that time be yielded to me, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Colorado, the majority leader, and I have an agreement that if we run out of time, we shall ask unanimous consent to provide time to Senators who wish to speak on this matter.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time has the Senator been yielded?

Mr. INOUYE. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have listened to the opening statement made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, in opposition to the Mohole project and should like to spend a few moments responding to it.

It is true that the original estimates submitted by the Mohole project supporters were much less than the present estimate.

But I feel certain that the Senator from Colorado will agree that our Mohole undertaking, like our space efforts, is a visionary type of project.

In 1959, when we started the space project in earnest, I do not believe that any Senator—or, for that matter, anyone in the scientific family—had any idea as to what the cost would be to the United States to place a man on the moon. Since 1949, we have spent $22 billion on a space program, and yesterday the Senate approved the appropriation of $5 billion-plus to continue that project.

I am for the space program. The record indicates that I have supported it every year since coming to the Senate. But I believe that we should also consider the importance of the Mohole project and what it is expected to accomplish. We are asking in the bill for $19.7 million to continue this project.

A question has been asked as to whether there will be any benefits. The distinguished Senator from Washington has listed many benefits, but I should like to add a few which I feel are of personal concern to us in Hawaii.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order? I am sitting next to the Senator from Hawaii, and I cannot hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. INOUYE. The many scientists supporting the project have indicated that it is possible that this project will supply answers to how to predict earthquakes.

Mr. President, earthquakes are of great concern in the lives of Hawaiians. As everyone knows, we have suffered from earthquakes and tidal waves. If the Mohole project can somehow supply the answer to the prediction of earthquakes and tidal waves, the Nation, my State, and many other countries would save many millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives.

In addition, if this type of platform had existed many years ago, perhaps it would have been possible to save the lives of the men who had been isolated in the submarine, U.S.S. *Thresher*. At that time the United States did not have a stable deepwater platform. If this type of platform had been available I feel certain it would have been used to recover the bomb that was unfortunately dropped off the coast of Spain. Scientists have estimated that if the bomb had gone down another 400 feet in the ocean, it would have been impossible with present equipment to have recovered this bomb.

Time will not permit us to cover this subject completely. I shall support this venture. It is a visionary venture. It is important, and it is in the interest of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fact sheet on the Mohole Project.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOHOLE PROJECT FACT SHEET

I. WHAT IS IT?

1. It is the United States' effort to explore and sample all layers of the earth's crust and the unknown mantle beneath by core drilling near Hawaii through 15,000 feet of water and about 17,000 feet of rock to an approximate total depth of 32,000 feet. All equipment, machinery and instrumentation has been designed to perform to 35,000 feet below sea level.

2. Mohole is the largest single undertaking in the Earth Sciences, administered and supported by the National Science Foundation. Additional sponsoring agencies include the National Academy of Sciences, Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, and liaison from NASA, the Navy, the U.S. Geological Survey, and AEC. Mohole represents the U.S. participation in the International Upper Mantle Project which is participated in by 40 countries including Russia. She is competing with the U.S. by preparing to drill on the Kola Peninsula, Azerbaidzhan and the southernmost Kurile Island north of Hokkaido, Japan.

3. The drilling will be accomplished from a stable platform which itself constitutes a breakthrough in marine engineering and naval architecture. It will have the capacity to move itself from location to location—ocean to ocean—and to handle great loads with minimum motion. This particular platform is under construction and is being watched with keen interest by ship designers and shipbuilders throughout the world. When it physically demonstrates capabilities proven by model basin tests, many versions will come into use worldwide for commercial and military applications.

4. This project has already received national and international acclaim. Over 20,000 separate pieces of information have been mailed to the general public by Project Mohole in response to individual and industrial requests.

Over 400 technical or scientific presentations have been made here and abroad to national and international professional societies and to the general public by Project staff members.

More than 50 scientific, engineering and naval architectural papers have been published in such organs as the *Journal of Geophysical Research, Geophysics, Geological Society of American Bulletin, Transactions of the Society of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering, Petroleum Engineering, Oil and Gas Journal, World Oil, Newsweek Magazine, U.S. News and World Report.* Textbooks also mention Project Mohole as a significant endeavor being undertaken by the U.S. government.

5. The sedimentary drilling program (now called deep-ocean drilling program) and the Mohole Project are not comparable programs. The sedimentary drilling program is dedicated to sampling soft sedimentary deposits on the ocean floor but well above the mantle. The core holes will penetrate only a few hundred feet, and are limited to the performance of a single bit, because the borehole cannot be reentered after the drill stem is removed. The objectives of Mohole have been reiterated many times, namely, to core a hole in the earth and secure a sample of the *mantle*. This exploration is in quest of knowledge relative to the basic planetary evolutionary processes. Concurrently, many desired scientific samplings and measurements will be accomplished.

The two programs are decidedly different both in objectives and in equipment required to perform each job. The Mohole equipment could, of course, perform the sampling desired by the sedimentary drilling program. On the other hand, available equipment that could possibly do the sedimentary drilling program could by no stretch of the imagination approach the accomplishment of the Mohole deep drilling program, nor secure the many other scientific measurements that are programmed.

The sedimentary program is limited to the capability of holding an *approximate* position, lowering a core barrel on drill pipe to the ocean bottom and coring till the bit is dull which completes that hole.

II. WHY DID THE UNITED STATES DECIDE THE PROJECT WAS NEEDED AND WILL IT PAY FOR ITSELF?

Succinctly, Mohole is needed to give us knowledge of our most basic resource—the earth itself. It is a venture already four years underway with most technological problems solved and much of its equipment procured and fabricated or nearing completion. The total integrated drilling unit had to be conceived, studied and developed. These developments represent the efforts of a large team of engineers and experts carefully selected and assembled from throughout the United States for their particular capabilities.

In addition to continuing technological and engineering successes, this project has and will make significant contributions to industry, commerce, to the support of human life, government, and science.

1. As of March 1966, Mohole has produced 103 inventions, of which fifteen have been approved for patent application.

2. The mining of rich deposits of raw metals on the deep ocean floor—which are known already—will commence in the near future to replenish our continually diminishing supplies. Stabilized position-holding platforms for which Mohole is a prototype will play key roles in such operations. In fact, some of the techniques which already have been developed by the Project are now in use to recover hydrocarbon and minerals off the coasts of several nations. The metals of our ore deposits ultimately came from the mantle, and understanding their concentrations in mantle materials would develop a better idea of the process by which they have been removed, moved and finally redeposited in the crust. Therefore, if we understand how ore deposits are emplaced in the mantle, we will be better able to guide prospecting for deposits which are not exposed at the land surface.

As the world's population increases, it shall be necessary for us to explore the oceanic areas in greater detail for energy, food and mineral resources.

3. The use of a heat source installed on the ocean bottom can cause convection currents that will bring the mineral-rich lower strata of water to the surface. This influx of highly fertile water from the fallow depths will cause an accelerated growth of both fish and plants. In the not too distant future, the seas will be "farmed" to produce life giving substance.

4. Knowledge of heat levels in the earth's interior could point the way toward possible utilization of this planet's internal heat through thermal wells. Technological advances through the Mohole Project will assist in the development of ways and means of converting this tremendous heat into electricity, thus augmenting the world's present source of power.

5. NASA has expressed to the National Science Foundation interest in the Mohole platform as a prototype for: a) marine satellite tracking stations, b) testing various kinds of dangerous new rocket fuels at sea, and c) stabilized marine launching stations including those for highly desirable equatorial launchings.

6. The United States Government is losing many millions of dollars in boosters which fall into the deep ocean. With the equipment, and with the know-how in part acquired through this project, we will be able to locate, identify, and then to lift from the ocean floor such objects up to one million pounds in weight.

After the submarine Thresher went down in the Atlantic, the Deep Submergence Systems Review Group came into existence by order of the Secretary of the Navy. At the time of the accident, the U.S. could not provide rescue for a submarine disabled on the bottom with its crew aboard in depths much greater than 500 feet. The Navy Department has informed the Foundation that stable platforms of a design similar to the Mohole platform would be useful for submarine rescue backup. The Mohole platform itself will be capable of lifting a submarine from the bottom to a shallow depth where rescue could be accomplished. It could also drill into submarines and other sunken vessels and, with the use of low density glass micro balloons (developed through Project Mohole), displace the water and provide buoyancy for recovery of the vessel.

7. The Navy is also interested in this platform design for replacing or removing heavy deep sea anti-submarine warfare equipment, for searching for and recovery of lost equipment from the sea floor and as a stable oceanic research station. *In short, the U.S. Government stands to realize many other benefits through this platform design, including nuclear and other payloads that may be lost in deep waters,* e.g., if the recently lost hydrogen bomb off the southern coast of Spain had fallen in waters only 400 feet deeper, existing equipment and methods could not have recovered it.

8. Fundamental data acquired by Mohole will contribute towards techniques that will enable geophysicists to accurately predict earthquakes.

Since the energy for earthquakes and volcanism has its origin in the mantle, it behooves us to know as much about the mantle as possible. This energy is thermal and one possible source is radioactive elements such as potassium uranium and thorium. Therefore, a sample of the mantle will give us a better idea of how much heat in the mantle can be ascribed to radioactivity; how much is due to other sources as yet unknown.

9. The unique depth capability which is only available through the Mohole drilling system will enable the U.S. to penetrate the deepest oceanic sediments which many scientists have postulated contain the remains of the earliest forms of life on this planet.

Thus the United States has the singular opportunity to determine the origin of life on this planet.

10. Approximately 600 meteorites strike the earth each year. We recover about 20. Scientists believe these may be remnants of a disrupted planet, and that these rocks are similar to those of the earth's crust, mantle or core. It is known that the mass and density of the moon is such that it could have been spun off the earth. With samples from the mantle through Project Mohole, many of these issues should be clarified.

Mohole will assist in gaining the complementary information from the earth as a planet to guide our reasoning with regard to such similar celestial bodies as Mars, Venus and the moon. Since the mantle comprises 85 percent of the volume of the earth, we must know its nature and composition to tackle the most fundamental problems concerning the earth as a planet.

11. At the annual meeting of the production division of the American Petroleum Institute, it was indicated that within 5–10 years the petroleum industry will be drilling wells in 3,000 or more feet of water, and that improved drilling platforms, better methods of positioning, free floating drilling rigs over the holes, derricks, and hoisting systems built to handle twice the loads now carried by most rigs, would be required. Most of these tools and techniques have been and will be spinoffs from Project Mohole. Much of this already has found its way into commercial use, and in fact already has led to substantial reduction in the cost of deep drilling. This know how will expand the petroleum industry's drilling depth capability by as much as 40 percent, and most certainly will increase substantially the hydrocarbon resources of United States interests. Project Mohole has

been responsible for consolidating the individual efforts of many oil companies and associated manufacturers. Mohole accomplishments have resulted in designs that had no prior existence, e.g., a) a stable drilling platform, b) a riser-buoyancy system, c) adequate drill pipe, d) borehole reentry and a dynamic positioning system. The above enumerated breakthroughs constitute major spin-offs to the petroleum and related industries.

III. WHAT COSTS ARE INVOLVED

The National Science Foundation has asked for $19.7 million for Project Mohole for FY '67.

$55 million has been provided from FY '62 through FY '66.

The Foundation estimates the total cost of completing Project Mohole, including three years of drilling, to be $127 million. This is broken down as follows:

	Million
Completely equipped platform prior to drilling	$85.6
Drilling operating costs for 3 years, at $13.0	39.0
Nonrecurring costs (first 6 months of operations)	2.5
Total	127.1

Termination costs would be between $35-45 million.

The prime contractor for the Mohole Project, Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Texas is operating under a cost-plus-fixed-fee, a fee which does not escalate, and which remains at $1.8 million for the entire contract period.

Subcontracts thus far have been awarded in 14 states. Less than 15 percent of the total project cost will accrue to the State of Texas.

The following is a list of a few major Project Mohole engineering accomplishments, giving costs and status:

1. Mohole drilling platform. ($30 million competitively fixed price contract awarded in 1965—hull structure being fabricated.)

2. Unique platform dynamic and computerized positioning system. (Cost $3 million—95 percent completed.)

3. Improved turbocorer and diamond bits for fast drilling in ultra hard rock without rotating drill pipe and associated electronic monitoring package. Turbocorer has been satisfactorily field tested in similar rock to that expected in lower crustal layers. ($200,000 and only minor modifications to be completed.)

4. Revolutionary retractable diamond coring bit which enables changing of bits without pulling up entire string of drill pipe. (Cost $150,000—prototype being fabricated.)

5. Largest drawworks (hoisting power) known to world drilling industry (4000 H.P.). (Cost $300,000; 65 percent completed.)

6. Automated pipe racking assembly. (Cost $500,000—first successful attempt after fifteen year industry effort.)

7. Two largest logging instrumented winches in the world capable of spooling 40,000 feet of 7 conductor double armored logging cable. (Cost $360,000—100 percent completed.)

8. Deep ocean untended digital data acquisition system which will measure the velocity and direction of ocean currents at 17 selected depths, temperature at 7 selected depths, wave heights and periods as well as meteorological information and transmit all this to a shore base. Will be planted at the Mohole site off Hawaii in about 15,000 feet of water in near future. (Cost $300,000—98 percent completed.)

9. Sonar reentry system to enable reentering hole in ocean floor with drillpipe. (Cost $250,000—60 percent completed.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I yield.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, this project has been criticized on the ground that the cost has gone up over the original estimates. The only two efforts being made in the world—or that have been made in the world—to bore through the earth's crust and get down to the mantle have been the one underway by the United States and the one by Russia. This is the first experience of the human race in the cost of this project. Mankind has been building on this earth for thousands and thousands of years, and if people just followed the example of Congress with the Rayburn Building or the New Senate Office Building or the east front, they would know that estimates go up and up.

This is far more reason for trying something new, untried, and that has never been done before, than building a new building where we have been building multistory buildings for at least 6,000 years.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the message from the President dated May 18, 1966, urging Congress to appropriate the funds so that what the President calls "this vital instrument" can begin promptly.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY, MAY 18, 1966

(The White House made public today the following letter from the President to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:)

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: (DEAR MR. SPEAKER:) I am pleased to forward for consideration by interested committees of Congress the National Oceanographic Program for Fiscal Year 1967. This report describes the activities of all Federal Agencies currently engaged in oceanography.

Although we are daily learning more about the stars and skies above us, the sea around us remains largely a mystery. This "hydrospace" covers seven out of every ten miles of the earth's surface, yet we have glimpsed only faintly the vast promise which the world's oceans hold for the benefit of mankind.

That promise is as boundless as the sea itself. One day, the sea may yield fertile harvests to nourish the hungry. Ultimately, we may be able to tap the abundant store of minerals, chemicals, and energy locked in the sea so that no nation—large or small, young or old—will lack the resources essential for the prosperity and well-being of its people.

Our National Oceanographic Program will help us drive back the frontiers of the unknown through marine research, surveys, and ocean engineering. From this work, we will gain knowledge which will help sustain our prosperity, enhance our national defense, and:

Develop faster and more comfortable means of transportation.

Step-up our attack against water pollution.

Permit more accurate forecasts of the storms and tides that endanger life and property.

Exploit marine and mineral resources to their fullest potential.

Over the past years, we have moved closer to the fulfillment of some important objectives. Recent significant and exciting advances include:

1. The Sea Lab II—This is the Navy's "Man-in-Sea" project. Conducted off the coast of California late last year, it showed that man can live and work for long intervals, and at great depths, in an undersea habitat.

2. Project Mohole—Design of the world's largest stable deep-ocean drilling platform has been completed by the National Science Foundation. I urge that Congress appropriate the funds so that construction of this vital instrument can begin promptly. The Mohole Project will provide the answer to many basic questions about the earth's crust and the origin of ocean basins. It will teach us how to drill in the ocean depths—the prelude to the future exploitation of resources at the bottom of the sea.

3. Nuclear Research Submarines—A nuclear-powered long-endurance, deep-water research vessel is under construction by the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission. When completed, this vessel will help us map the ocean bottom, give us new information on the control and use of marine life and minerals—and how to find and retrieve from the ocean objects of commercial, scientific and national security value. This revolutionary vessel will perform a variety of tasks thought impossible only a few short years ago.

The Government-wide character of the National Oceanographic Program bears special mention. Through the planning of the Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, the many separate elements of the program are coordinated into an effective and efficient effort. Working together with industry, the universities, and state and local governments, the Federal Government must continue to keep this Nation in the forefront of oceanographic science and engineering.

As Longfellow well observed, the sea divides—but yet unites—mankind. Through our exploration of the sea, we can move toward a new era in which science can fulfill its creative promise to bring a better and happier life to all the peoples of the world.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has expired.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG.]

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. There are only 3 minutes remaining to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, on the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Six minutes are yielded on the bill for the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I regret that the motive of the distinguished Senator from Colorado in connection with Project Mohole has been questioned. I know that the distinguished Senator from Colorado is a man of great sincerity, integrity, and character. His motives in opposing Project Mohole are absolutely beyond reproach.

I strongly denounce any attempt to question his integrity in this matter.

I am very strongly in favor of appropriating $19.7 million in order to continue the Mohole program, as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Yesterday we appropriated $5 billion for the space program. The sum of $19.7 million for Project Mohole is only one two-hundred-and-fiftieth of that tremendous sum of $5 billion for outer space.

The situation reminds me of a young man who asked an older man whether he knew how many stars there were in the heavens. The older man replied, "Why talk about the heavens so far away when you do not even know how many hairs there are on your head?"

In exploring outer space, we are trying to probe the universe, yet we know so little of the earth we inhabit. This is the earth which gives us our sustenance—the land which makes possible the civilization we have. We certainly should give more attention to the earth planet we live on even while we explore outer space. I am not opposed to the outer space program, but I believe we should devote more of our efforts toward the support of the earth sciences.

Project Mohole gives emphasis to the study of our earth—a subject neglected for too long.

The project, in my opinion, is necessary, feasible, and important to the national interest. In the words of Dr. George P. Woollard, director of the University of Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, Project Mohole is "the most significant single scientific experiment of the century in earth science."

We in Hawaii agree with him. Our people have a keen appreciation of the significance of this project. As an island community, we have experienced costly volcanic eruptions and destructive seismic waves caused by earthquakes. We have been told by earth scientists that Project Mohole can advance the scientific knowledge of the energy behind the forces in the earth's interior—knowledge which will help the scientists to understand more fully these earthquakes and eruptions.

Project Mohole would not only provide an insight into many earth processes that are not now understood, but it would also have a significant bearing on the planetary space exploration program.

In the opinion of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the characteristics and operational performance of the drilling platform are closely related to those which would be required in a stable ocean platform as a base for an instrumentation facility for space operations and support. NASA further believes that the geological findings of Mohole, when correlated with scientific knowledge expected to be acquired through lunar planetary exploration, could make a significant contribution to the study of the origin of our solar system.

As for the possible defense applications of the Mohole platform, I am advised that the Navy considers the lift capacity, platform stability, seaworthiness, and positioning capability provided in the platform attractive for defense-related areas such as first, submarine rescue backup; second, accurate placement of bottom-mounted antisubmarine warfare equipment; third, recovery of lost equipment from the deep sea; fourth, provision of scientific information of military importance; fifth, ocean bottom engineering and construction; and sixth, support of bottom search operations.

Project Mohole would also greatly advance techniques for the exploitation of the earth's natural resources, particularly in the mining and petroleum industries.

It was the first exploratory tests off lower California under this project to demonstrate the feasibility of drilling from a floating platform in deep water that proved the accessibility of offshore oil and gas fields out to and beyond the edge of the Continental Shelves. This development has much to do with the subsequent expansion of our oil and gas reserves at a time when domestic reserves were inadequate.

Also, from a practical point of view, it is in effect extended our national boundaries out to the 100-fathom line, which in places lies 100 miles offshore. It was the successful tests of the turbo drill for Project Mohole that is now making it feasible from an economic standpoint to drill deeper exploratory oil and gas wells.

It was also the first floating platform tests that gave the impetus to offshore mining for diamonds off South Africa, tin off Malaya, iron off Japan, and gold off Alaska. The economic value realized to date from the technological advances achieved through pioneer developments under Project Mohole already far outweigh the total cost of the project.

Another aspect of the operation to date which should not be be overlooked is that the establishment of new offshore petroleum reserves has made the country less susceptible to political unrest, subversion, and confiscation of our oil investments in foreign areas.

It would be repetitious here to review in detail the far-reaching benefits expected from Project Mohole. Many Senators have already spoken with respect to the various benefits that would accrue to the United States and mankind from this program.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] said that the objectives of Project Mohole and the ocean sediment coring project are the same, except that Mohole would go deeper into the mantle. Apparently there is some confusion between the ocean sediment coring program and Project Mohole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement by the National Science Foundation relative to the objectives of sediment coring and Project Mohole be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Both the ocean sediment coring program and Project Mohole are concerned with gaining new data about the earth, and both will utilize floating drilling vessels. But the actual objectives and the equipment needed are quite different. The sediment coring program will be limited to the upper one to two thousand feet of soft sediments that cover the floor of the ocean; the Mohole, in contrast, will penetrate below these sediments through some 15,000 feet of hard crustal rocks and finally into the mantle. The projects are thus complementary rather than duplicative, and it is a mistake to say they will do the same thing.

The crust of the earth beneath the oceans consists of three layers. The uppermost of these consists of soft, unconsolidated sediments, from one to two thousand feet thick. Below this is layer 2, 3,000 to 5,000 thick, about which we know very little except that it transmits earthquake waves at velocities of 4.5 to 5.5 kilometers per second. This layer may be all volcanic rocks, consolidated sediments, or a mixture of both. Layer 3 of the crust is 10,000 to 15,000 feet thick and we know virtually nothing about it except that it transmits earthquake waves at velocities of 6.5 to 7 kilometer per second. Below this lies the mysterious mantle that makes up 80 percent of our earth.

As has been stated many times, the ultimate objective of the Mohole is to obtain a sample of the mantle, but, as has also been stated, the overall objective is to sample all of the crustal rocks as well, extracting from them as well as from the mantle data that will greatly enhance our knowledge of the earth. Among the properties to be measured on both the samples and in the hole itself are: the density, the bulk chemical composition, the mineral phases, the natural radioactivity, the lead-uranium ratios, the gas content, the temperature gradient and conductivity, and the magnetic and electrical properties. And these types of measurements should give us invaluable data pertaining to problems such as: the age and origin of the earth; whether the earth is actually getting hotter or colder; the nature of the forces that make mountains and cause earthquakes and volcanoes; and the nature and possible origin of the earth's magnetic field. An extremely important feature of the Mohole is that it will allow us to put very sensitive instruments deep within the crust and into the mantle. Measurements with these instruments plus analysis of the samples will allow us to make much better interpretations of the geophysical measurements we make from the earth's surface and from aircraft or satellites. It will certainly also help our interpretations of similar measurements we hope to make on the moon and planets.

The measurements and data just described will come from all the crustal layers and the mantle, and most will be made in and on the hard rocks of crustal layers 2 and 3 plus the mantle.

In contrast to the Mohole, the sediment coring program will be limited to the soft sediments of the top crustal layer at a number of different locations. This in itself is well-worth doing, because a detailed analysis of the sediments from many parts of the ocean should give us a wealth of data on many problems, but the data from the sediments will be very different from the data of the deeper rocks; and we need both types.

It has been asked why not do both projects with the same vehicle. The answer is simple. Phase I of project Mohole showed that the sampling of the sediments, although difficult, was very easy compared with the problem of drilling all the way to the mantle. The sediment sampling can be done with conventional drilling equipment and by existing techniques; the Mohole, as subsequent engineering studies have shown, requires the development and construction of an elaborate and sophisticated drilling platform, incorporating new and different types of equipment. Obviously this also makes the Mohole much more expensive than the sediment coring program.

The Mohole platform can of course easily core the soft sediments, and indeed it will, both during its shakedown cruise and at the Mohole site. But it is expensive both to build and to operate, and it would be uneconomical to use it for a long period of sediment sampling when this latter can be accomplished satisfactorily with a much more flexible and economic drilling base such as a vessel. The sediment-coring vessel, on the other hand, couldn't possible be used for the Mohole. In order to drill into the hard layers of the deep crust and the mantle, the drilling base—the platform—must be able to stay on station two years and more, in contrast to the day or two required to penetrate the soft sediments in any locality. This in turn requires much more elaborate positioning equipment, much more complicated electronic gear, larger and more elaborate drilling apparatus, and the equipment to re-enter the hole when the drill pipe has been pulled to change bits. It is not possible to add all these things to existing drilling vessels and still have them capable of drilling in 15,000 to 20,000 feet of water; they just can't carry it all. By the time a vessel large enough to handle all this was built, and by the time the more expensive equipment was added, the cost would be of the magnitude projected for the Mohole.

Much of the money spent to date on the Mohole has been for the design, model testing and fabrication of the drilling platform and the equipment which together will constitute a facility that will be used for scientific and engineering research for many years. Most of this equipment is not necessary for sampling just the sediments, and indeed could not be used on the smaller drilling ship that would be used for the sediment coring. Therefore, if the Mohole were to be cancelled, the funds already expended would have been largely wasted; and, as the committee report states, the funds expended plus termination costs would total at least $36 million.

The scientific objectives of Project Mohole remain as valid as when they were first stated; the difficult engineering problems involved in this drilling have been solved; and the platform with its new equipment has been started. To cancel the project at this time would be a loss to science, a blow to our international prestige, and a waste of the funds already expended.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the concept of drilling to sample the earth's mantle has been firmly accepted by all who have studied and investigated the project. Project Mohole has come a long way since it was first conceived as a scientific venture. The very difficult problems of designing the complex, oceangoing platform are past. Completion of the drilling platform, now well underway, is less than a year and a half away.

To suspend or abandon the project at this point would be most uneconomical. Since closeout costs would amount to between $35 and $40 million, it would be a costly proposition to give up now. It would be false economy to abandon the project when so much of the most costly work has already been done or committed.

Because Project Mohole has vast scientific value; because it has far-reaching application for the exploitation of mineral and other resources under the ocean; and because it has outer space and defense applications, I strongly urge the Senate to approve the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee and restore in full the $19.7 million requested by the National Science Foundation for the project for the current fiscal year.

I urge Senators to reject the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], although I do not know which way he is going to argue.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is extremely generous. I intend to oppose the amendment. In view of the arguments made against the exorbitant expenses of the space program, I shall explain why.

I believe that man's knowledge of our environment, particularly in terms of oceanography and the air sciences, should be increased. I believe this can be done at a cost which will not affect adversely the education program, the poverty program, or the effort to clean up our streams and rebuild our cities. It is true, however, that this is an appropriation for $19 million, and it is not the end.

Nevertheless, this cannot be compared with the space program, which unfortunately has developed some of the aspects of a comic strip program. Nor can it be compared to the supersonic aircraft program, which to me is merely an effort to stay ahead of the Joneses. I support the basic research required to find out about man's environment, to expand our knowledge of the earth sciences, to learn more about the crust of our earth, and to pursue knowledge, as Tennyson said, like a sinking star, beyond the utmost bounds of human thought. I think that, in this case, the game is worth the candle. I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Dr. Haworth, in testifying said:

> The project has created great interest in international scientific circles, so much so that a significant element of national prestige is involved.

That argument of national prestige has been raised on practically every controversial issue that has come before us on this bill. I am conscious of the need for maintaining national prestige. That transcends the esteem which people around the world will have for us because of our scientific accomplishments.

But we have problems confronting us: The challenge of inflation, which is spoken about by the President and the Treasury Department practically every day, and the problem of taking care of those among our society who are in need. The query comes to me whether we are not acting vainly when in everything we do we are motivated by the goal of national prestige.

Secondly, who is to have the benefits of these 15 patents that have already been granted? Are the benefits to come to the citizenry of the United States? Are they to go to those who drill into the earth to find materials that can be commercialized and sold?

It looks to me as though the oil companies will benefit by the patents that will come out of this program of drilling 15,000 feet down into the earth, beginning at the floor; and, of course, another 15,000 or 20,000 feet above. The Senator from Illinois has put the question whether the drilling was not to be at the lowest point of the ocean. That would be 32,000 feet. I believe that there is testimony in the record that that is what was contemplated. That obviously has been changed on the basis of what the Senator from Washington has stated.

I contemplate joining the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Colorado in voting against this measure, because I do not believe it is sound.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I understand correctly that all the time against the amendment has now been consumed and that I have 3 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been utilized.

Mr. ALLOTT. I disagree with that, because I have not yielded any time on the amendment, but I will take time from the bill. It is of no consequence.

If every Senator who feels that he must discuss this amendment has now spoken, I should like to have the opportunity for 3 or 4 minutes, out of the time on the bill, to conclude my presentation.

I repeat, I have no personal interest in this project. My only desire and my only interest is to lay before the Senate a project conceived in such loose and vague terms that it stands as an outrage against those who started it and those who have conducted it.

So far, we have appropriated $55.4 million, which is easily sufficient to cover the termination costs and the expenditures to date, all of which come to $36.6 million.

If we do not stop the project today, the $55 million would be spent this year, plus what we would appropriate. But if the Senate votes to stop the project, it is my intention that any procurement of hardware would cease forthwith, but that the National Science Foundation would use its judgment in continuing studies now underway. I would expect them to finish those which might be finished in a short time, at no substantial additional cost, and to publish all results to date.

With the distinguished Senator from Hawaii now in the Chamber, let me say that the argument was used that we could have saved the *Thresher*. Yet here is a vessel which can travel at the most only 8 knots. It will be located in the Pacific. It cannot get through the Panama Canal. If anyone can describe to me how such a vessel could save a submarine, even in the remote areas of the Pacific Ocean, without taking 2 or 3 weeks, first to pull up, and then to reposition this particular vessel after taking off all the drilling equipment hanging down to the ocean floor, I would be happy to hear how it could be done.

The same principle, of course, applies to a bomb or missile recovery. If we are going to have this vessel in the position of trying to make a penetration of the Mohole, we cannot be moving it all around the world to recover submarines, or bombs or missiles, because it just will not move that fast in the first place. It would also destroy the whole experiment, if we did.

The National Science Foundation differentiates Mohole from the national ocean sediment coring program slightly, but I say that the significant information we have will be available to us through this source. There is not much additional that we can get through Project Mohole. If the time comes when we can afford to go there, that is fine, but let us build the intermediate vessel first. Let us get the experience from this, and we can design the vessel and design our experiments accordingly. But it would be insane, I think, if we went ahead with this experiment, in view of the gross mismanagement and the gross growth of expenditures.

One other figure as a sample. On June 30, 1964, in a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing, we were told that the vessel itself would cost $13.6 million.

On September 28, 1965, 15 months later, that cost had jumped to $29,967,000, which is almost $30 million, and more than double the earlier estimated cost.

I am not talking about experiments. I am not counting the miscues which may go on while conducting experiments, but only the "barebones" platform. This figure more than doubled in a 15-month period.

Now, Mr. President, it is up to the Senate. I am ready to vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The figures of the Senator from Colorado are absolutely correct, but I think it should be realized that most of the figures which were originally given to us on the platform were estimates. They were not cold, hard figures, which we knew. I think in gaging the estimates they may have been wrong, but I do not think there is any guarantee on that kind of thing.

Mr. ALLOTT. The contract to Brown & Root was let in February of 1962. The Senator from Washington certainly would not contend that the figure given to us on June 30, 1964, was not given to us as a hard figure? It was given to us as a hard figure for the vessel of $13.6 million. It jumped to $30 million within 15 months.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because they asked them to put more on the platform. They changed it.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is on the vessel itself—nothing more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that they asked that more be put on it. But, anyway, the Senator's figures are certainly correct.

I hope there is no misunderstanding. No one sought to convey the impression that this particular vessel was going out to rescue submarines or recover missiles or bombs. What I meant to say was that the testimony disclosed that the experiment in building the vessel would be a prototype of a similar type of vessel which could be or might be used for that purpose. That was one of the benefits anticipated, but not with this particular vessel.

The only other thing I should like to add was brought up—and I do not know why it was not mentioned in my original remarks. The Senator from Ohio mentioned it briefly. He drew attention to the contract with the contractor, which was placed in the record in full on page 1657 of the hearings, part 2, relative to article 20, and I will read section (a) which I should have mentioned in my original statement:

ARTICLE 20. RIGHTS IN INVENTION

(a) Whenever any invention is made or conceived by the Contractor or any of its employees or by any person directly associated with the Contractor in technical or professional work in the course of, in connection with, or under the terms of this contract, the Contractor shall furnish the Foundation with complete information thereon. The proper distribution of rights in any such invention shall be determined by the Foundation in the light of the public interest and after due consideration of the equities of the parties and an opportunity for a full hearing or review in each instance. Factors which will be taken into account, among others, in determining the equities include the prior contribution of the inventor, and the need, if any, to bring the inventions to the point of practical application.

Thus, it is entirely up to the Foundation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not negate my proposal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, but I just wanted to put this in the RECORD so that there would be no question about the patent rights.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 198 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Griffin
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—46

Aiken
Anderson
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Miller
Neuberger
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Thurmond
Tydings

So Mr. ALLOTT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska, I understand, does not wish to propose an amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted to be sure that that was understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is one further matter which will take only a very short time.

During the hearings, we had a long discussion about airports and other matters involving the Civil Aeronautics Board; and during the course of the discussion, many people commented about servicemen sitting around waiting for airplanes. That was before the strike; now everybody sits around waiting. But we promised that we would state publicly the reason why servicemen sometimes have to wait in line to board planes.

The reason is that they travel at half price. For that reason, they must be on standby. We said we would make this fact public on the floor of the Senate. The servicemen who travel at half fare on a standby basis are not on official business. Those on official business are moved as rapidly as possible. They are usually on a furlough or on liberty, going home, which is important to them individually, and they want to take a plane. That is the reason that we sometimes see large numbers of servicemen waiting in airports. There has been considerable comment from people who wonder why they are standing there. They are on standby because all airlines permit servicemen to travel at half price when they are on furlough or liberty.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I urge approval of the bill before us at this time. It contains certain funds for many worthwhile and important programs. Late yesterday, however, it was with considerable reluctance that I voted to reduce by one-half billion dollars the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. My reluctance rests on the personal belief that our space program is extremely important. Like other Americans, I have taken pride in the accomplishments of our scientists, engineers, technicians, and astronauts. I want America to meet the goal set by President Kennedy: to put a man on the moon and to return him safely to earth by 1970. I want America to solve the scientific problems of the space age and to explore our solar system. I am convinced that the knowledge we gain will be useful and beneficial to us in this swiftly changing world.

However, I am aware of the military commitments that we have in southeast Asia and elsewhere. The latest talk now is that by Christmas, the United States will have the Korean war level of manpower in Vietnam, and that we are preparing for an 8-year war.

Mr. President, prices and wages are rising. Inflation pressures are real and are threatening every citizen. Spending must be checked. Many agree that Government spending must be trimmed, but few offer, or even agree on, the areas to be cut.

Currently, many would postpone or cancel spending for our vitally needed water resource development projects. The central Utah project in Utah is a prime example. The needs for additional development of our water resources demand prompt action because of the long "leadtime" between authorization by Congress and turning the taps to release the first water from a newly constructed dam. We face a crisis, in the next few years, of complete drought in our cities and on the farms of the West.

I would prefer to spend our tax money on Federal activities such as the central Utah project, where the money will be repaid to the Treasury, before we appropriate funds for the race to the moon. I would like to finance both endeavors, but if I must choose, I say let us first spend on projects of great need on this planet.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the first page of the committee report be printed at this point in the Record, which would indicate that the bill which was just acted on is $2,278,663,300 under the appropriation for 1966. Then I will point out the fallacy of this claim.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$13, 989, 499, 000
Amount of increase by Senate	118, 081, 000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	14, 107, 580, 000
Amount of appropriations, 1966	16, 386, 243, 300
Amount of budget estimates, 1957 (as amended)	14, 300, 670, 291
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the esimates for 1967 (as amended)	193, 090, 291
Under the appropriations for 1966	2, 278, 663, 300

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not accusing the committee of making a false report, but as a result of action which the Senate took some time ago in authorizing the sale of the assets of this administration we are seeing the first example of the false picture that this can give to the American people. This is the result of this type of deceitful bookkeeping which has become the practice of the Johnson administration.

The agencies that are provided for under this appropriation bill that was acted upon here today actually get a little over $1 billion more than they received under last year's appropriation. I make this statement notwithstanding the fact that the report shows that the amount has been reduced $2.25 billion. That difference is partly explained on pages 47 and 48 of the bill, where one will find that under the title "Federal National Mortgage Association Participation Sales Authorizations" the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture gets $600 million; the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $100 million; the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $1,420 million; the Veterans' Administration, $260 million; the Small Business Administration, $850 million.

These are proceeds from the sale of participation certificates by FNMA which total $3,230 million. Then part of the 1967 appropriations was included in an earlier supplemental appropriation.

As a result of this new Texas twist about $3 billion does not appear as a part of the appropriations. The result that Congress is passing this bill and telling the American people that $2¼ billion is being saved when actually $1 billion more is being spent than was spent by the same agencies last year.

I ask that page 47 and the first 10 lines on page 48 of the bill, outlining the distribution of this $3¼ billion be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Participation sales authorizations

The Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, is hereby authorized to issue beneficial interests or participations in such obligations as may be placed in trust with such Association in accordance with section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended by Public Law 89–429, for the accounts of the following departments and agencies, in not to exceed the following aggregate principal amounts:

The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, $600,000,000;

The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $100,000,000;

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, $1,420,000,000;

The Veterans Administration, $260,000,000;

The Small Business Administration, $850,000: *Provided,* That the foregoing authorizations shall remain available until June 30, 1968.

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

To enable any department or agency named in paragraph (2) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as added by Public Law 89–429, to pay the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, such insufficiencies as may be required by the trustee on account of such outstanding beneficial interests or participations as may be authorized by this Act to be issued pursuant to said section 302(c), such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What we need is a little more truth in government. I hope that this administration

will start telling the American people the truth as to the cost of this Great Society program.

I shall vote against this bill. I will not be a partner to this deceit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the call of the roll, I feel that I ought to pay a compliment and extend an accolade to the members of the subcommittee who handled this bill, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I believe they did a superb job, not only in lucidly explaining the bill, but also in making the case on every item where there was any controversy or contest. I think they deserve the warm congratulations of the Senate and of the people of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished minority leader, and echo his words. Passage of H.R. 14921, the independent offices appropriations bill, will be a significant step forward in completing the business of the Senate this session. The bill is a large one with great importance for the Nation in fields ranging from space exploration to benefits for veterans. The Senate would be remiss if it did not give public credit to those who made important contributions to the debate and passage of the measure.

Special credit must go to the distinguished Senator from Washington, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee. Under his forceful and vigorous leadership the bill has moved to final passage with a minimum of changes or delay.

In addition to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator MAGNUSON, and the minority members of that subcommittee whom the minority leader has singled out, the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL], from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], are to receive an equally high compliment and accolade for their tireless efforts in the subcommittee and full committee as well as on the floor these past 2 days. Their efforts have meant so much in bringing about this achievement today.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] who, as ranking minority member of the subcommittee, did much to help fashion a bill acceptable in the main by Members of both parties. His performance in the debate was marked by the competency and courtesy which have become his hallmark.

Credit must also go to those Members who, through their amendments or in general floor discussion, contributed to a sharpening of the issues. I refer particularly to Senators PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and CLARK.

To all of these Senators, and to others whom I may have missed, I express the appreciation of the Senate leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—2

Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
Miller
Neuberger
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Thurmond
Tydings

So the bill (H.R. 14921) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make punctuation and technical corrections in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG of North DAKOTA, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider certain nominations favorably reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objective, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive nominations.

SUNDRY NOMINATIONS REPORTED FAVORABLY BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations as follows:

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida;

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit;

Alfred W. Moellering, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years;

John P. Fullam, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE FRITZ GARLAND LANHAM FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1403, H.R. 10284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10284) to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, can the distinguished majority leader advise us concerning the program for the rest of the day and, if possible, for the rest of the week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, after the consideration of S. 3688, the so-called FNMA bill, the Senate will consider the Housing Act Amendments of 1966, which has been reported today from Banking and Currency Committee, and for which the reports and transcript of hearings will be ready tomorrow.

We will then consider the mass transit bill and the demonstration cities bill.

It is anticipated that during the morning hour tomorrow, under the managership of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], Calendar No. 1399 (H.R. 14088), the military medicare bill, will be considered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. It is anticipated that the FNMA bill and the housing bill will probably take the bulk of the day tomorrow, in which case is it the intention of the distinguished majority leader to lay down the mass transit bill for consideration on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. And if we cannot complete both the mass transit and the demonstration cities bills, the demonstration cities bill or the mass transit bill will be carried over to Monday, but the bills will follow in that sequence?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what will happen. We can be fairly sure that the demonstration cities bill will not come up until Monday.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the majority leader.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since there was no period for the transaction of routine morning business today, that it be in order to lay before the Senate messages and communications, receive bills for introduction and refer them, and to print various routine matters in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of Senators JOHN O. PASTORE and BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER to attend the 10th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, to be held at Vienna, Austria, on September 21, 1966.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUTHORIZATION OF DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial, management, and procurement assistance activities of that Administration, for the year 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nev., remonstrating against certain provisions of the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Gustavo Eugenio Gomez (Rept. No. 1441);

S. 3039. A bill for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro (Rept. No. 1442);

S. 3311. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr. (Rept. No. 1443); and

S. 3318. A bill for the relief of Yung Mi Kim (Rept. No. 1444).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1370. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Konstantinos Sikaras (Rept. No. 1446);

S. 1878. A bill for the relief of Elias Lambrinos (Rept. No. 1447);

S. 2486. A bill for the relief of Dr. Earl C. Chamberlayne (Rept. No. 1448);

S. 2809. A bill for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran (Rept. No. 1449);

S. 3042. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oscar Lopez (Rept. No. 1450);

S. 3329. A bill for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando (Rept. No. 1445);

S. 3395. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gonzalez-Mora, and his wife, Natalia Sandoval Gonzales-Mora (Rept. No. 1451); and

H.R. 5213. An act for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay (Rept. No. 1452).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2166. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margareta L. Agullana (Rept. No. 1453); and

H.R. 3078. An act for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke (Rept. No. 1454).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September 1966 as "International Literacy Day" (Rept. No. 1440).

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1455)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 3711) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon, which bill was placed on the calendar and the report was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John P. Fullam, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. **BAYH**, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alfred W. Moellering, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

By Mr. **DIRKSEN**, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

By Mr. **SMATHERS**, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

By Mr. **MORSE**, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3709. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and related provisions of other acts to permit individuals insured for benefits under part A of such title to receive, for a limited period, certain payments with respect to inpatient hospital services and outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished to them by certain hospitals not participating under the program provided under such part A; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3710. A bill for the relief of Chief Petty Officer James G. Dole, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3711. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3712. A bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to authorize a study and investigation of an information service system for States and localities designed to enable such States and localities to more effectively participate in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XVIII OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN HOSPITAL INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT SERVICES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the basic purpose of medicare is to pay the hospital bills of older people. But, as matters now stand, many older Americans, through no fault of their own, will not have those hospital bills paid. They will not have those bills paid because of the fact that their local hospital does not participate in the medicare plan. That hospital may very well be the only medical institution in an area of many miles.

These nonparticipating hospitals are staying out of medicare for a variety of reasons. They may not be able to meet the standards of quality of care required, or they may be unwilling or unable to comply with the title VI requirements of the Civil Rights Act.

The key point which has been completely overlooked in all of this hoopla is that the older person—of whatever race—is the one who suffers most in this situation. The hospital has a choice as to whether it wants to participate. The older individual, however, has no choice in the matter. He does not pick his hospital. He goes to the hospital with which his doctor is affiliated. The doctor chooses the time and place of treatment—not the sick old person.

When his doctor happens to be on the medical staff of a hospital which is not participating in medicare, the older person has just two equally unfair choices. In order to get his care paid for, he can abandon the doctor who may have cared for him for 20, 30, or even 40 years and try to find a new physician on the staff of a participating hospital. In this case, a longstanding relationship of trust and understanding must go down the drain so that dollars can change hands in accordance with regulations. The alternative to this sacrifice for the sick old man is for him to just dig down deep and pay for care out of his own pocket.

Those are tragic and terrible choices to force upon sick, helpless, older Americans. Medicare was supposed to relieve the "financial nightmare" of illness—and not to substitute one bad dream for another.

Now, I can understand that the administration wants these hospitals to meet all of its tests and standards. But the primary obligation of medicare is to the older people of this country—all of the older people of this country. The Congress intended that every single older person who needed hospital care would get that care paid for—at least in large part. Of course, I do not think we intended to pay for care in a substandard hospital—substandard in the sense that it did not meet proper medical standards. But, any refusal to pay for necessary care—other than that in medically substandard institutions—reneges on our promise to 19 million aged Americans.

Mr. President, the bill which I now introduce, for appropriate reference, is specifically designed to help fulfill that congressional promise to our fine older people.

My bill would pay directly to the older medicare beneficiary 75 percent of the reasonable charges for his treatment in a hospital which is not participating in the medicare program. In order to assure that the care was provided in a hospital meeting proper medical standards, payments would be made only if the treatment were in a hospital accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals or the American Osteopathic Association.

This benefit, effective as of July 1, 1966, would be available until July 1, 1968, so as to provide a reasonable transitional period during which many hospitals might make the adjustments and decisions necessary to permit them to participate in the medicare program. The Congress could reevaluate the situation in 1968, when the benefit would expire.

The reason for selecting 75 percent as the basis for reimbursement was to offer significant assistance to the aged—but in an amount not great enough to offer hospitals a financial incentive to continue to stay out of the medicare program.

Benefits available under this transitional provision would essentially be subject to the standard medicare limitations on days of care authorized, kinds of services for which payment might be made, etc. The overall limitations would apply regardless of whether care was provided in participating or nonparticipating hospitals.

Mr. President, the proposal I offer is not intended to serve as a means of enabling hospitals to evade the Civil Rights Act or any other legislation which may or may not apply to medicare. I want to assure Members of the Senate that my intention in developing this bill was not to introduce clever and artistic legislative loopholes into medicare.

What I want to see to, Mr. President, is that every older American who needs and receives hospital care will have that care paid for in accordance with the U.S. Government's commitment. Let us honor and fulfill our promise. And that promise was made to people—not hospitals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this will be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3709) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and related provisions of other acts to permit individuals insured for benefits under part A of such title to receive, for a limited period, certain payments with respect to inpatient hospital services and outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished to them by certain hospitals not participating under the program provided under such part A, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART C—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS FOR SPECIAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PROVIDED BY CERTAIN HOSPITALS NOT PARTICIPATING UNDER PART A

"ENTITLEMENT; BENEFITS

"SEC. 1891. Any individual who, prior to July 1, 1968, receives inpatient hospital services, or outpatient hospital diagonstic services with respect to which—

"(1) he is not entitled to hospital insurance benefits provided under part A, and

"(2) he would have been entitled to hospital insurance benefits provided under part A, if the hospital furnishing such services (whether directly or under arrangements, as defined in section 1861(w), with it) had, at the time such services were furnished, had an agreement in effect under this title,

shall be entitled to receive a money payment, with respect to such services, equal to 75 per centum of the amount of the actual and reasonable charge imposed by such hospital for such services, if the hospital furnishing such services (whether directly or under such arrangements with it) is accredited as a hospital by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals or the American Osteopathic Association.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 1892. Payments to which individuals are entitled under section 1891 shall be paid upon application therefor to the Secretary (submitted in such form and manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe), and shall be paid by the Secretary from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office."

SEC. 2. Section 1861(e) of the Social Security Act is amended, in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting "section 1891," after "section 1814(d),".

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (as added by the first section of this Act) shall, for purposes of section 103(c) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, be regarded as payments made under part A of such title XVIII.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the preceding provisions of this Act are repealed effective July 1, 1968.

ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and permit the adjustment of status of Cuban refugees in the United States.

My bill eliminates the technical requirement which requires aliens such as Cuban refugees to leave this country and reenter in order to become eligible for permanent residence and eventual citizenship. I do not question this requirement for aliens who come to our country through normal procedure and in casual circumstances, and then elect to have their status adjusted to that of permanent resident. I believe, however, the requirement has little justification in the case of refugees from Cuba. Their entry into this country is anything but normal and casual—they are under duress and fleeing oppression.

I should point out the bill I am introducing today would make retroactive the refugee's application for adjustment of status, to the time of his last entry into the United States. This is just and equitable.

The talents of many Cuban refugees are going to waste because State professional licensing laws keep those without permanent residence status from practicing their skills and professions. This situation, and the expensive and laborious procedure to obtain this status under present law, is keeping refugees in various difficult circumstances, which do not befit our humanitarian traditions.

I am thinking of examples all over our country, where, because of their immigration status, qualified Cubans have been unable to teach Spanish in the local schools.

I am thinking of similar problems involving Cuban doctors, dentists, nurses, lawyers, skilled workers, and others. It is obvious that such refugees could fill an urgent need in our society if given the opportunity for adjustment of status.

Moreover, the parole status of many Cuban refugees has inhibited the rather substantial Federal program of assistance administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose of this program is to give effective asylum by providing the refugees with opportunities for self-support. Approximately $42 million in Federal funds were spent in the last fiscal year in the Cuban refugee program. The figure for the current fiscal year will approach $51 million, and officials in the executive branch have indicated a rise in that amount can be anticipated for fiscal year 1968.

These sizable amounts indicate clearly the importance that these funds be directed toward making the refugees self-sufficient, so that we can anticipate a decline in expenditures in future years. The bill I offer today will be extremely helpful in this matter.

I would also hope, Mr. President, that legislative action on adjusting the status of Cuban refugees would encourage the resettlement of some refugees to other countries in this hemisphere, where refugee talent would contribute to economic, political, and social development. Today, however, refugees are hesitant to leave the United States. Under their present immigration status as parolees, they are not assured of reentry if, for valid reasons, they choose to return. My bill will help to remedy this situation.

Mr. President, for some time I have been very much concerned with the problem I have outlined today, and as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, have conducted a number of hearings in Washington and elsewhere which dramatically document the need for the legislation which I have proposed today. Recently, on July 14, Secretary of State Dean Rusk in response to questions before the subcommittee on refugees said he placed a "high priority" on legislation to adjust the status of Cuban refugees, and he strongly urged the Congress to take action in this important matter. Legislation is also supported by the Departments of Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The adjustment of status for Cuban refugees has been pending in the Senate since February 1962, when our very able and distinguished colleague and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Senator HART, first introduced a bill for this purpose. And I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan for his leadership in this area. The Senate, in fact, provided for the adjustment of status for Cuban refugees in the general immigration bill passed during the last session. Unfortunately, this provision was deleted at the last minute in Congress. I am delighted to note that hearings on this subject are being held in the other body.

As Senators know, the record in the Senate is rather extensive on this matter. In order to consider the bill which I introduced today, and another related bill, of which I am a cosponsor, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, has scheduled a public hearing to be held on Tuesday morning August 16. The witnesses will include officials from the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a representative from the American Council of Voluntary Agencies.

Legislative action adjusting the status of Cuban refugees in the United States is long overdue, and I hope the Senate will quickly reaffirm its consensus of 1965 on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3712) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH INFORMATION ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to study and investigate the feasibility and design of an information system which would enable States and localities to participate more effectively in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs.

The relationship between the Federal Government and State and local governments is an increasing paradox: As more and more Federal programs become available, State and local governments become less and less able to sort them out and decide which ones could help them most. The Federal programs are beneficial; the State and local governments want to benefit from them. But the very proliferation of Federal programs is bewildering to the local communities for which they are designed. And this bewilderment is working against the creative federalism which President Johnson spoke of 2 years ago in a historic speech at Ann Arbor, Mich.: A federalism based on local initiative, Federal support, and close cooperation between Washington and city hall.

No one in this Chamber knows more about the problems of making creative federalism work than the distinguished junior Senator from Maine. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senator Muskie has dedicated his energies to finding ways by which we can strengthen the cooperative basis of our Federal system.

The 3-year study recently completed by his subcommittee makes clear the benefits of creative federalism, and it also makes clear the problems which are raised by confusion and a lack of coordination between levels of government. Senator Muskie has introduced a host of extremely constructive legislative proposals to overcome these problems.

The legislation I introduce today supplements his efforts and the efforts of others to build efficiency into government. It is directed at one very important part of the overall problem—the need to build an effective communications system between local, State and Federal levels of government.

We are all aware of the dramatic rise in the demands on State and local governments. This rise reflects increased public needs and responsibilities which have been shouldered by local officials. And there is every indication that these needs will grow because of the innumerable problems associated with urbanization, economic expansion, and population growth.

In the face of growing public needs which could not be met completely through local funding, the Federal Government has increased its programs of assistance. In little more than a decade, total Federal aid to State and local governments has quadrupled, rising from $3.1 billion in 1955 to an estimated $14.6 billion in 1967. As Senator Muskie has pointed out, almost twice as much Federal aid has been appropriated during the past five sessions of Congress as the total appropriated by all previous Congresses going back to 1789.

I support these Federal programs. They are designed to help individuals and communities meet their goals for social and economic development. They are intended to build a better and stronger society.

These programs are not predicated on some master plan or grand design of the Federal Government. They depend primarily on the initiative and resource of people at the local level, who get them started and keep them going.

But if our Federal programs of assistance are to be most effective, every State official, every mayor, every city and town administrator, when faced with a community problem, should have complete information on the full range of Federal programs available, so that he can choose the programs that his community needs and shape them so that they will be most effective.

What these local administrators need most is information. Without information to help them make their decisions, many communities miss out completely on programs of Federal assistance for which they are eligible, others are extremely slow in getting programs started, and still others choose to pursue programs poorly suited to meet highest priority needs even though better programs are available.

Government action based upon inadequate information is wasteful and costly. It is costly to the American taxpayer whose money is not widely or effectively spent; it is costly to the communities who are denied benefits or delayed in getting them; and it is costly to the Nation as a whole when haphazard and ill-informed decisions result in a misallocation of resources.

There is no question that we need a more effective communications system between the various levels of government. Yet it will not be easy to achieve one, because the increase in the number and scope of Federal programs is staggering to contemplate.

For instance, the Federal Government has set up almost 300 programs which deal with education, environment, poverty, or community development. They are administered by more than 100 departmental subdivisions at varying organizational levels in 18 different departments and agencies.

More than 40 different Federal programs provide aid for urban development, though there is little evidence of a unified urban development policy.

Four different agencies handle similar grant or loan programs in the area of local waste disposal facilities, and handle them in dissimilar ways.

Five Federal agencies are involved in community planning—the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Economic Development Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Agriculture, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations after 3 years of study observed that there is "substantial competing and overlapping of Federal programs sometimes as a direct result of legislation and sometimes as a result of bureaucratic empire building."

The conditions precedent to obtaining funds, furthermore, vary considerably from program to program, agency to agency, project to project, and also within agencies and programs over time. And these variances are aggravated by the sheer size and complexity of these Federal agencies and their missions.

Our Nation's Governors at their annual conference in Los Angeles last month described this proliferation of programs as "an administrative jungle—lacking in coordination and so complex that State officials are at a loss to keep up with what is going on."

What has happened is that Federal programs of assistance have provided community executives with so many alternatives that they cannot keep track of all of them or distinguish between them. The problem has been aptly described by Patrick Healy, the executive director of the National League of Cities, and John Gunther, the executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors:

> The rapid expansion in the number, size and interrelationship of urban oriented federal programs has resulted in growing concern within many city administrations that they may not be aware of all of the opportunities to effectively utilize federal programs.

And at the same time, there has been no concerted effort to develop a communications system to keep up with the expansion of activity.

Thus, local participation in these programs has been essentially haphazard. Local officials, lacking large staffs, are often bewildered by the mass of Federal programs which confront them, uninformed about the Federal funds and projects they might obtain, and ill-equipped to determine which available Federal programs best meet their community needs.

In short, we are faced with a crisis in communication.

This conclusion is confirmed by the 3-year study made by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and by a comprehensive survey of Federal programs administration conducted by two private business organizations, Basic Systems, Inc., and University Microfilms, Inc., two subsidiaries of Xerox Corp.

It is the conclusion I arrived at after numerous conferences and conversations with State and local officials in Massachusetts, and with other Congressmen who have observed the same problem in their own States.

And it is demonstrated by the great variety of actions already taken by both public and private organizations to relieve this communication bottleneck.

For example, State and local governments on their own have been deploying representatives to Washington to set up a clearinghouse for information on Federal programs. A system designed to provide interested groups with a single, continuing source of intelligible data on Federal programs has been established here by Basic Systems, Inc., and University Microfilms, Inc. And the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors have joined together through the Joint Council on Urban Development to provide such a service to cities on a contractural basis.

Federal agencies have begun to compile catalogs and handbooks on aid programs. Last year the catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement published by the Office of Economic Opportunity required 414 pages just to give the briefest description of each program. Similar catalogs have been developed by Senator Muskie's subcommittee and by the Economic Development Administration, and a "Mayor's Handbook of Federal Assistance Programs" is currently being prepared by the Bureau of the Budget. In addition each agency charged with the administration of a Federal grant-in-aid program has a vast amount of literature available concerning all aspects of its particular programs.

Indeed, there has been such a proliferation of catalogs to cope with the proliferation of Federal programs that the Advisory Commission for Intergovernmental Relations has recently published an index of them—a "catalog of catalogs."

President Johnson's personal interest in solving these communications problems is reflected in the Federal Inquiry Center recently established in Atlanta, Ga., as a pilot project of the General Services Administration to supply information about all the functions and programs of the Federal Government and proposed Federal legislation dealing with the war on poverty and the demonstration cities program would support the establishment of information and technical assistance centers at the State and local levels.

But none of the initiatives I have mentioned attempts to deal with the problem in comprehensive terms.

The problem will not be solved by an increase in indexes of catalogs. We don't need more books, we need handier information. And we need to coordinate what is becoming a massive effort in duplication of activity, each bit helpful, but not sufficient. We need a single source of detailed information, bringing together the piecemeal information projects presently going on, available through a modern information retrieval system, operated on a decentralized basis, to which officials can turn to identify their options and to select the best of available Federal programs.

The joint resolution I propose authorizes the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to conduct a thorough investigation into the feasibility of developing a comprehensive information service system that would make use of automatic data processing equipment and other forms of advanced information technology to serve our States and localities.

I have no special experience in the area of automatic data processing, but I have long been impressed by the scientific advances which have been made in computer and information retrieval technology, and their possible application to the development of a national intergovernmental information system.

What I have in mind is a computer-based information system, using satellite centers, which would provide each State and local government with detailed information on which programs were available to it and which would be most appropriate for it. With a profile of each community, a satellite computer could be programed to inform the community of what new programs are available, what programs have filled their quotas, what programs have changed, and what programs have been discontinued. In every case, the information provided would be based on the needs of the State or community in question.

Such a system has been used with great success by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in their technology utilization program to provide private industry with detailed information on technological advances that may be of benefit to particular industries. The Post Office Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Census, and other major Government agencies are all using data processing equipment to bring greater efficiency to their operations. Given this background, I think it would be a disservice to State and local governments if we failed to investigate the possibilities of using advanced information system technology to provide the information which local executives so desperately need.

In recent months I have spent considerable time exploring the feasibility of such a system. I have spoken with representatives of a number of large industrial firms involved in this field, such as Diebold Associates and International Business Machines, and explored this question with knowledgeable people in the administration and in the universities. My conclusion is that we have every reason to expect that such a system could be constructed. But it is also apparent to me that a comprehensive study of the problem is necessary to determine whether this kind of system should be constructed, and if so, what form that construction should take.

IBM, at my request, did a preliminary examination of the feasibility and appropriate design of such a system. From their conclusions many of the specific questions which must be answered in this study became clear.

To begin with, the appropriate inputs of the systems must be determined. State and local officials must be surveyed and State and local government program planning and decisionmaking studied, in order to ascertain exactly what the informational needs and problems are.

On the basis of such a study, it would then be possible to determine the extent and form of input data required for the system, the most desirable form in which to receive this information and the degree and kind of interpretation of information needed. For example, IBM concluded that at least four kinds of input data would be required:

First. Socioeconomic data involving income distribution, education, law enforcement, health, and welfare, et cetera.

Second. Community resource data involving labor force and employment, industry and trade, transportation, housing and community facilities, financial, et cetera.

Third. Programs reference data concerning the nature and purpose of assistance programs, conditions of eligibility, information contact, authorizing legislation, and the administering agency.

Fourth. Programs status data involving the nature and extent of usage of various aid programs, the status of obligated funds, the names and numbers of communities involved, et cetera.

In addition, as I pointed out earlier, there are a number of information sources already developed or developing. The study I proposed will survey this growing field, determine what action must be taken to merge or otherwise synthesize these other information sources so that duplication of effort is avoided, identify what gaps exist in existing information sources and provide for the collection and indexing of whatever necessary additional information is needed to fill those gaps.

Once the input design is determined and data collected, it should be possible to construct an information system, capable of up-to-date data storage, retrieval, and sorting of relevant information, manned by skilled personnel to interpret and evaluate the information, which will enable State and community officials to most intelligently select those programs of Federal assistance which best serve their interests.

Even though feasible, whether such a system should be constructed is another question. The answer will depend on whether the costs of constructing it are less than the social costs involved in continuing as we do now. Thus the study would consider the designs of alternative information systems varying in complexity, provide cost estimates for each, and compare the costs to the benefits accruing from the introduction of such systems.

The system I visualize would be decentralized in nature. But careful study would be needed to determine how many satellite stations should be established, where they should be located, and whether the overall system would best be operated under the direction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Bureau of the Budget, the Census, the General Services Administration, the Legislative Reference Service, or some other Government agency.

An information system of the type I propose need not be limited solely to offering data on Federal programs. By keeping a record of the projects and programs carried out in the various communities, it should be possible for communities to learn from the system what programs other communities are developing and profit from their experiences.

Moreover, as experience is gained in dealing with communities, it might eventually be possible to assign to the system certain tasks of analysis and evaluation, such as the projection of socioeconomic trends, analyses of cost-benefit ratios and preparation of financial justification of projects.

Furthermore, through data phones and other link-ups, the system might be capable of providing Congress and the administration with a better measure of the needs and performances of the cities, States, and regions operating under these programs.

This could facilitate legislative oversight, as well as making possible speedy and more accurate adjustment of aid programs to meet existing needs.

Constructing such a system would involve certain risks to established political procedures, even though the system is intended solely as an aid to decisionmaking and not a replacement of the decisionmaker. For that reason, I think it important that the study also consider the political problems which may arise, and how we can preserve the existing desirable relationships between city and State officials, Members of Congress, and administration officials.

Finally, the study of systems design must carefully consider the fact that the system and the information required by the system will not remain static. Specific attention must be given to the incremental development of the system. As programs requirements change and new ones are added, the store of information must be reviewed and kept up-to-date, and provision must be made for standardizing the structure and collection of data.

In short, Mr. President, though, in my judgment, the basic idea is sound, and the need apparent, a thorough study of the entire question is a prerequisite to effective action.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations seems to me the ideal body to conduct such a study.

The Commission was established in 1959 for the specific purpose of studying how our Federal system could be strengthened through greater cooperation, understanding, and coordination at all levels of government. Its statutory mandate specifically provides that the Commission should study and provide a forum for discussing administration and coordination of Federal programs as well as encouraging study of emerging problems requiring intergovernmental cooperation.

Furthermore, since its inception the staff of the Commission has concentrated its activities on the problems of Federal-State-local relations, thereby building a base of expertise which should be of great help in performing the study. And their work has been of a uniformly high quality.

In addition, the composition of the Commission is uniquely suited to perform this kind of study with insight and understanding.

The Commission is unique among organizations involved in intergovernmental operations because it is both a continuing agency and is also broadly representative of all levels of government. It is not a Federal agency in the usual sense: Its members include representatives of the executive and legislative branches of all levels of government.

As Patrick Healy of the National League of Cities put it:

> We believe that the heterogenous nature of the Commission, it consists of both executives and legislators representing all levels of government, is one of the features which allows it to make important contributions to the field of intergovernmental relations.
>
> When this hybrid group of people sit down to consider the research activities of the Commission, the full interplay of opinions and interests creates a new understanding of the problem under discussion. This is governmental interactions at its best, because it maximizes the opportunities the Commission presents for reasonable men to arrive at desirable and practical solutions to the problems of intergovernmental relations in our federal system.

Finally, it was contemplated at the time the Commission was established that special studies of a long-term nature such as this one would be conducted. Several proposals have already been made to have the Commission conduct a comprehensive study of the Nation's intergovernmental tax and revenue structure.

Congress has recognized that if such studies were authorized, separate appropriations would be provided for that purpose; the legislation establishing the Commission, Public Law 86-380, already provides authority for the Commission to employ the technical consultants necessary to accomplish this study, and the study itself would dovetail with many of the other studies and reports that the Commission is currently engaged in.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that as a result of this study it will be possible to place into operation quickly thereafter an advanced information system providing State and local executives with the kind of information they need to make informed decisions leading to maximum satisfaction of community needs through the fullest utilization of Federal programs of assistance. Such a system could make a tremendous contribution to our goal of a better society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 187) to authorize a study and investigation of an information service system for States and localities designed to enable such States and localities to more effectively participate in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

STRENGTHENING OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND RESEARCH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 736

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2874) to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.

This amendment to amend the National Education Act of 1956, would authorize the U.S. Government to accept foreign currencies from qualified students and teachers in the less developed nations with currency conversion problems, in order to help their students study in this country.

Currency expenses would apply only to the less developed friendly countries where the United States does not hold a surplus of local currencies. This would be for the foreign student an adaptation of what we call the Fulbright plan for Fulbright scholars, and the facts and figures point out that we have a great opportunity to help foreign students. Very few of them study here without any help from the U.S. Government.

This is a field in which we compete so ardently with the Soviet Union and Communist China. The plan I propose would be an effective way to encourage this kind of study without costing the United States any material amount of money.

I hope very much that Senators will consider this plan, which I call an "education for peace" plan, and that it may have widespread support in the Senate.

This proposal would supplement the educational exchange program under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—the Fulbright-Hays Act—which presently brings between 5,000 and 6,000 students into the United States annually on a scholarship basis at a cost of some $18 million a year. Under my amendment, U.S. funds would not be used to finance the education of these foreign students but rather would be employed to enable them to exchange their foreign currency for dollars in order that they might be able to finance their own education or use local scholarship money for study in this country. Thus, my amendment will enable U.S. colleges and universities to increase their export of knowledge.

An exchange limit of $3,000 annually is set for each student, which is generally in line with the estimated average cost of $2,600 for a school year in a nonpublic U.S. college or university. For the first year of the program's operation, $10 million of U.S. currency would be made available; $15 million is authorized the second year. Thus, an estimated 3,300 students could benefit from the program the first year and 5,000 the second year.

Last year, 82,045 students from 159 countries and territories attended more than 1,000 colleges and universities throughout the United States. Of this number, 37 percent were studying on their own resources and only 7.2 percent received their tuition from the U.S. Government; the remainder received aid from their own governments or from private sources, including U.S. colleges and universities themselves. Since many nations still retain various forms of currency exchange control, this is a remarkable record.

But the numbers of such students—many of whom are destined for leadership in their home countries—could be appreciably increased if the United States made a policy commitment to accept foreign students whose homelands have currency conversion difficulties. We do much the same thing in sales of food abroad under our food-for-peace program.

This is, in effect, an education-for-peace program, exporting the knowledge of our colleges and universities rather than the harvests of our fields and farms.

The United States should be encouraged in its own efforts to attract foreign students by the serious problems the Communist nations are having with their programs. Many Africans studying in both the Soviet Union and Communist China have complained of racial discrimination, restrictions on academic freedom, politically oriented rather than professionally oriented courses and heavyhanded attempts at proselytizing. We have a chance to do much better by providing an increased number of foreign students with an opportunity to observe and absorb within the United States the meaning of freedom in

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 7, 1966]

Riots Prove All-Out Slum Fight Must Be Made

(By Thomas J. Foley)

An all-out war on city slums can be put off no longer.

A third summer of riots shows that the bargain basement, penny-pinching approach doesn't work.

President Johnson decided he couldn't pay for his Great Society program and the Vietnam war at the same time. So he cut back his commitment to plans that would help solve the increasingly serious domestic crisis.

It was a calculated risk, based on the hope that a slow start and the promise of more later would be enough until the Vietnam war is over.

A considerable body of expert opinion says it isn't enough, and that the riot headlines seem to bear this out.

A lot more is needed—billions more. It involves a significant shift in the division of the Nation's resources. It involves sacrifice for millions of Americans who would have to pay higher taxes, and it involves courage for the President to ask them to make the sacrifice. Economists both in and out of government agree that this richest of all nations can afford it.

It is not a question of means. It is a question of will.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

This will to take action undoubtedly will be strengthened by the scheduled public hearings by a Senate subcommittee into the "crisis in our cities."

In announcing an Aug. 16 beginning for the hearings, chairman ABRAHAM RIBICOFF (D-Conn.) said: "We need a better sense of priorities." "We are spending a great deal, but we have to inquire whether we are spending it in the right way."

The slum riots have brought a reaction in white communities that is based on fear, often accompanied by the purchase of weapons and unfortunately exploited by cynical politicians who should be leading rather than following public opinion.

As the riots flare from city to city, the bitterness becomes more deep-seated, leading to a breakdown of communication between the races. Then political action becomes impossible.

A LOOK IN RETROSPECT

In retrospect, which is the easiest way to look at events, it seems clear Mr. Johnson should have launched his major assault long ago. The summer of 1964 brought riots in New York City, Rochester and Philadelphia. Last year there was Watts, the worst of them all.

And indeed Mr. Johnson gave considerable thought last year to taking the offensive in a big way. With the major elements of his Great Society program already through Congress his plans were to center his 1966 program on the cities and their problems.

This would have meant some new legislation such as the demonstration cities program which calls for upgrading whole new areas. But mostly the new year was to bring the implementation and coordination of the manpower training, antipoverty, health and education programs already on the books.

The Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps are to make impoverished, poorly educated youths employable, or to encourage them to go back to school. The manpower programs would teach them the skills needed for the new automated economy. This can be done immediately.

INTERMEDIATE STEP

The elimination of tenements, or their transformation into livable areas through new rehabilitation techniques is the intermediate step. Rent supplements are part of it. So is the demonstration cities program now making its struggle through Congress.

The long-term programs center on education. New schools and new techniques are to be instituted. The results will take a number of years to show up.

In broad outline, this is what the program was to have been. But after the late-summer decision was made to sharply increase the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, President Johnson made the political decision to risk putting his Great Society program on the back burner.

The fire was not turned off, but it almost was. For the new fiscal year which began this month the President postponed about 2.5 billion dollars in spending Congress had authorized for Great Society programs this year. They were started, but just barely.

NEW TAXES AVOIDED

This decision enabled the President to avoid asking Congress this year. He knew, of course, that the political climate was not favorable for such a move, particularly if the revenue was used for civilian spending. The Republicans were already howling for a cutback in the Great Society because of the increased defense spending.

Robert Nathan, a private Washington economist of strong liberal persuasion, urges that the President seek the restoration of tax rates cut in 1964. This reduction amounted to an estimated 13.5 billion dollars a year in revenues but now would bring about 18 billion dollars because of the growth in the economy.

On the other hand, Government economists fear that such an anti-inflationary move would cool off the economy too much, causing an increase in unemployment. This would do harm to the antipoverty program they say, by making it more difficult for the poor and marginal worker to get a job. These workers depend on a tight labor market for finding jobs.

Most economists agree that as long as the ghetto war is financed by raising taxes—rather than by deficit financing—there would be no perceptible inflationary effect.

Thus the Administrative problem assumes major proportions. If there aren't well-thought-out plans, if there aren't people around to insure they are carried out, if there are no innovators willing to try new methods to solve problems, no program will ever succeed no matter how grand in concept.

This is particularly true in attempting to transform entire sections of major cities. Work training and education programs must be dovetailed.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AT WORK

Private industries already working in this field to an increasing extent, must be consulted and brought into these programs.

Some cities, such as Detroit and Pittsburgh, already have begun rehabilitation programs on a major scale.

In addition, the people of the ghetto areas themselves must be brought into the programs to make them work. This requires a high degree of imagination and expertise in human relations to make the effort successful.

For all of these reasons, the programs are not likely to balloon in size overnight. Recruitment of personnel will place an automatic brake on excessive and wasteful spending.

But that does not mean that a sizable buildup cannot be started in the next year. The framework for some of the programs, such as manpower training and antipoverty is in place, and the workload can be increased significantly and usefully.

This leaves the political problem—the most formidable of all. Taking money from some taxpayers to give, or at least to devote, to others is never easy.

NO TAX APPEAL IN NORTH

A tax increase for the purpose of fighting Northern big city ghettos does not appeal to the Congressmen from farm states, the South, the mountain states or even from the non-metropolitan areas of the major states.

And with riots continuing, it may not appeal even to any of the city Congressmen not actually representing the ghettos themselves. Mr. Johnson is obviously well aware of this problem and recently has been addressing himself to it more and more.

Furthermore, the President will not ask for the tax increase before January. At that time, a new Congress will have been elected which all politicians agree will have a reduced Democratic majority and thus will be less pliable to Johnson's will.

There is the problem of the governors, who don't like to see thmselves by-passed by direct lines between Washington and the cities in their states.

And there are the mayors, many of whom are more than glad to take Federal money but who scream when it is suggested that the money be spent according to certain standards.

It is not, however, an insuperable problem. It must be put to the public. It may not be popular, and Mr. Johnson may lose some more of his consensus.

But failure to act—and act now—would be disaster, not only for the Nation as a whole but for the President who has a keen sense of what he wants as his place in history.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 8, 1966]

The Need: Preventing a Racial Confrontation

(By Carl T. Rowan)

It has to be a special kind of tragedy embodying a special kind of warning when the greatest cities of the world's greatest, richest, best educated nation are beset by nightmarish rioting, looting, pillaging and racial conflict.

But that is our country's plight today, and it will be our plight tomorrow—judging from what I have seen and heard these last few weeks.

The people doing most of the talking have tried to stack the rules so that anybody "condones looters" who discusses Cleveland, Chicago or Brooklyn or is "an apologist for criminals" if he chooses to talk about what is wrong with these cities rather than what is wrong with Negroes.

Well, I happen to believe that most of the people who run banks and power companies, the television stations and department stores of our cities are decent people. They deserve to be saved from themselves and the faulty judgments of human relations that so often belong to the wealthy and powerful who never in their lives have known a Negro they considered their equal.

So I feel obliged to talk about some of the myths, nurtured by arrogance and ignorance, that are now being tossed around. For they are the poorly fused hand grenades that are sure to explode unexpectedly in some other city soon, setting off a chain reaction of violence, perhaps.

That small percentage of Negroes now resorting to violence is manifesting long pent-up frustration and bitterness. No one ought doubt that. But it is now being released so recklessly, so stupidly, so futilely, precisely because some new "leaders" in the field of civil rights have encouraged recklessness, wittingly or not.

thought and in the practice of daily American life as well as providing a thorough grounding in the skills which are so needed for advancement abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 736) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 737

Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Bartlett) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 28, 1966, the names of Mr. Clark and Mr. Williams of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3661) "to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds from the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes," introduced by Mr. Kennedy of New York (for himself and other Senators) on July 28, 1966.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON CATV

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will resume the public hearing on S. 1006, the copyright revision bill, as it relates to community antenna television systems.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, August 25, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone who wishes to testify or to file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the subcommittee, room 349–A, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and myself.

HEARINGS ON THE FEDERAL ROLE IN URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization's hearings on the Federal Role in Urban Affairs will commence on August 15 rather than August 16 as originally announced.

The reason for this change in schedule is that a number of Members of Congress have requested an opportunity to testify on the vitally important questions of the crisis in America's cities.

Members of Congress who wish to appear on August 15 in person or to present statements should contact Jerome Sonosky on extension 2829 by Friday, August 12.

Mr. President, the riots that have erupted in cities across the country are the shock waves of a social earthquake that threatens to destroy the fabric of our society.

Day after day, as the fires of frustration smolder, both in the cities that have experienced violence and those that have not, the Nation's leading journalists question the size, scope, and depth of our commitment in the cities.

Are we, they ask, willing to spend enough money? Are we, they ask, willing to state priorities and keep them? Are we, they ask, willing to treat causes rather than symptoms. In short, are we willing to listen to what these riots tell us? Are we willing to recognize that these are social problems, and are we willing to take the hard steps necessary to resolve them?

These are some of the questions the hearings will consider. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a number of recent articles bearing on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time To Pay the Piper

(By Tom Wicker)

Washington, August. 3.—The other day in Raleigh, N.C., the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. called for a domestic "Marshall Plan" costing $10 billion in each of the next ten years to eliminate the slum, poverty and educational conditions that he believes are at the root of Negro unrest and rioting.

In Philadelphia yesterday, McGeorge Bundy, the president of the Ford Foundation and formerly the special assistant for National Security Affairs to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, addressed himself to the same conditions. He said that it was "right and reasonable to suggest that the level of effort—financial and political and personal—which is here required is fully comparable to the effort we now make as a nation in Vietnam."

EFFORT LEVELS

While it would be unfair to pin Mr. Bundy to a specific figure on the basis of this general statement, it is nevertheless true that the financial "level of effort" the United States now is making in Vietnam runs at the rate of $10 billion a year in the current quarter.

While many may dismiss Dr. King as a biased or overwrought or radical or demagogic witness, Mr. Bundy's personal estimate of the "level of effort" required cannot be taken so lightly. And it is obvious that the judgments of these two men of such enormously different backgrounds are not far apart.

When analyzed, moreover, Dr. King's figure seems not so wild a dream. It is almost impossible to tell precisely what amount now is being spent to attack the conditions in which Negro dissidence is born, since Federal funds go into programs for all races. But a reasonably informed estimate can be made.

Negroes make up only about 11 per cent of the population, but their percentage of the poverty-level, unemployed, and slum population is much higher and has to be allowed for. By arbitrarily but reasonably designating about one third of Federal expenditures for public assistance, education and antipoverty programs, and a somewhat higher proportion of public housing funds as directly for the benefit of Negroes, a total of about $3.5 billion a year is reached.

Of this amount, something over a billion dollars probably is being paid to Negroes in various public assistance categories—or relief programs. And neither that figure nor the estimated total includes state and local funds.

What Dr. King is really suggesting, therefore, is an additional Federal expenditure in the area of $6.5 billion a year—less than the cost of the Vietnam war. This is an enormous amount, but it cannot be contended that it is beyond the capacity of the American people or that it would put too heavy a burden on them and their economy.

At present tax rates, the annual growth in Federal revenues is $8- to $9-billion a year. If the Social Security and other trust funds are omitted, the revenue growth in the administrative budget is at least $7.5 billion annually.

As a result, there is some speculation in economic circles that the revenue growth and the economic expansion that produces it might make possible another tax cut next year—despite the suspense in the past year as to whether an anti-inflationary tax increase would be necessary.

In that event, an increase in public expenditures would be a permissible economic alternative to a tax reduction. In any case, current revenue growth alone can make financially possible something like the domestic "Marshall Plan" suggested by Dr. King.

And if more funds were needed that normal revenue growth could produce, it still would be possible to adjust tax rates slightly upward, producing more revenue without turning the economy drastically downward. Thus, $10 billion a year—including amounts already being spent—would not necessarily force damaging cutbacks in other areas.

The question, in fact, is not really financial; nor is it as yet one of how best to spend such vast sums.

LOTS OF PLACES TO SPEND

A great assault on the low level of education in the ghettos alone could absorb much of the total; so could a huge social work program modeled on Project Headstart; measures to raise the level of Negro income—for instance, by a negative income tax or by direct payments—are another possibility. Money can always be spent, and sometimes even to good effect.

But it has to be made available first and, Mr. Bundy suggested, the real question is one of values and priorities. Will the American people and their leaders decide that after the long years of neglect and discrimination the time has come to pay the piper? Do they really want to correct the gravest injustice and the most dangerous imbalance in American life? It seems at least as important as the Vietnamese war, and cheap at any price.

only one-half done, when they outlawed segregated schools. Because of this country's shameful history of economic and other injustices to its Negro people, the great majority of Negro children are disadvantaged. Desegregation of the schools should therefore have been accompanied by legislation sharply increasing outlays on the school systems, and particularly on the great urban school systems.

That can still be done. The question is whether it can be done in a way to halt the white movement to the suburbs, and even to bring a lot of white families back into the city centers—thereby making a reasonable population balance in both cities and school systems, and thus preventing the growth of the city-sized super-Watts that now threaten us.

The answer is not just good urban schools, which we do not now have. Merely good schools are no longer good enough to reverse the sinister population trend that may soon make our cities into vast Negro reservations. The answer, I fervently hope and strongly believe, is immensely superior urban schools, fine enough to hold and even to attract all families that want the best schooling for their children.

If New York spent $1700 per child per year, or a bit more than Scarsdale does; if St. Louis did the same—in short if present urban school outlays were just about doubled in every great city—the cities would soon enough have the superior schools that are so desperately needed for social-political reasons as well as educational reasons.

That would leave the problem of safe streets, which has played a lesser, yet discernible, role in the white emigrations to the suburbs. For safe streets, more money must be poured out, not only on better police departments, but also on parks and playgrounds and other recreational facilities and all the other things that make a city a good place to live.

The total bill, as anyone can see, will be astronomically larger than the cities can hope to pay. But what if the Federal Government pays the whole cost of giving superior schools to the great cities, and further lets the cities use their present school budgets to make themselves habitable once again? That question will be examined in the last report in this series.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 5, 1966]

A Modest Proposal III

(By Joseph Alsop)

The right way for all Americans to look at the desperate American urban problem is simply to think of our great cities as very important patients in a very expensive hospital.

In a healthy family, the father and children do not complain about being on short commons for a while, in order to pay for the mother's medical expenses. And if one may be cynical, this tends to be especially true if the father, the bread-winner, the source of the family's income and prosperity, is the person whose recovery from a dire disease is going to cost a small fortune.

In our almost wholly urbanized America, the great cities are the major sources of the general prosperity, and they are indeed direly diseased. They grow less and less fit for human habitation, year by year. They are afflicted with the open ulcers that are the Negro Ghettoes, which should fill every single American, be he Rocky Mountain sheepherder or Wall Street banker, with inextinguishable shame.

Furthermore, because of the population trends already examined in this series, most of the great cities are threatened with early transformation into vast, impoverished Negro reservations—city-sized super-Watts, in fact. Unless something is done, and done soon, to reverse the white emigration to the suburbs, that will be the end of the road, not just in one great American city, but in the majority.

For the reasons set forth in two previous reports, there is only one expedient that offers much hope of reversing the present urban trend. The great cities must be given superior schools—not just good schools, mind you, but immensely superior schools, with a strong attractive power—and along with superior schools, the great cities must be given the resources to achieve safe streets again.

That means an astronomical expenditure. A good guess is that all the great cities' present levels of spending per child in school should be at least doubled. In many cases, further funds should also be provided for root and branch rebuilding of antiquated, jaillike urban schools. And in most cities, sums just about equal to the present school budgets are needed to get safe streets, by more spending on police, parks, recreational facilities and other neighborhood builders.

How, then, is the job to be done? There is no use talking about increasing the cities' tax rates. High urban taxes are another influence behind the white emigration to the suburbs. Only the Federal Government can do the job.

Yet if the Federal Government is to spend many billions per year to cure the disease of the cities, this necessarily means discrimination in favor of the great cities, and against the suburbs, the small towns and the countryside. Nothing could be more politically difficult, yet the job must be done.

Suggesting remedies is not usually the reporter's task, but the aim of this series is none the less to offer a modest proposal for a remedy. We should begin, I think, by recognizing that the great cities are not merely a major source of the national wealth; they are also the sole source of the wealth of the metropolitan areas that extend for hundreds, even thousands of square miles beyond each city's limits.

The cities, therefore, may be regarded as engines which generate the whole flow of Federal revenue from each metropolitan area. And the cities are deeply diseased, endangering the revenue. Why not, then, take the three following steps:

First, let the President appoint a distinguished Federal commission, or even a series of commissions, to trace the true limits of the metropolitan areas of each of the great cities.

Second, let the Federal revenues from each metropolitan area be ascertained, and let the Congress recognize that the revenues from each area are in fact mainly generated in the diseased city center.

Third, let the Congress therefore provide that of these revenues from each metropolitan area, a generous percentage will be returned to each city-center, in order to pay for the superior schools that offer the main hope of cure for the urban disease.

In this manner, the subsidies to the cities that are so desperately needed will at least be placed on a rational basis. If the whole school bill is footed by the Federal Government (while the schools, of course, continue to be managed by the municipal school boards), the cities will then have enough financial elbow room to do all the things needed for safe streets.

There are other advantages in the plan. The newly traced metropolitan areas could later be used as a basis for metropolitan authorities, on the pattern of the TVA, to handle such urban-suburban problems as transportation—problems which are also urgent and grave. The superior schools should not merely cure the urban disease; they should also open the door out of the poverty trap for the children of the urban ghettoes.

But enough has been said, except for one thing. If you once grasp what this urban problem is going to do to the American future, you will automatically agree that any effort, any outlay, any sacrifice is justified to achieve a cure.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 31, 1966]

Mere Existence of the Ghetto Is the Biggest Problem

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

President Johnson has told the rioters not to riot. But there is more he can do.

And the big cities, their ugly ghettos as barbaric as the violence that persists in them, can also do more than call for troops, and, after the damage is done, plastic swimming pools and scapegoats.

We must do more, for it is, unfortunately, safe to predict that we haven't seen the end of explosive ghetto unrest simply because we haven't begun to really get down to the guts of what may well be America's most serious problem, bar none.

The first thing to do is to recognize it clearly for what it is.

The ghetto violence is not essentially a problem of civil rights because where that problem is most acute—in the South—we see not riots but an orderly, nonviolent revolution. That's why Dr. Martin Luther King, the leader of that revolution, appears so helpless in the Chicago ghetto.

Nor is it essentially a problem of poverty because the young rioters suffer not so much from starvation as from frustration. They are deprived of material things, of course. But they are even more deprived of things to do and wrap their hearts around. They are deprived of a sense of identity and a place in the world.

Though closely related to civil rights and poverty, the guts of the problem is the existence of the ghetto itself. And even if we attain the hope of full equality and the dream of abolishing poverty, a dangerous evil would still persist in our society as long as the ghetto persists.

What we need then is a clear, generally understandable and widely agreed upon national strategy to disperse the ghettos in our big cities. And while such a strategy of comprehensive urban planning, set forth, perhaps, in what the British call a White Paper, is being hammered out in the highest councils of our Federal Government, the cities themselves need special task forces with the power to take comprehensive tactical emergency measures that would make life in the ghetto more bearable.

The word "ghetto," as distinct from mere slums aptly describes the situation that a majority of the people in this country may not be fully aware of. The word first appeared in Venice in the Middle Ages to denote the quarter of the city where Jews were forced to live.

Originally Jews freely chose to live together in communities of their own as perhaps, given full freedom of choice, many Negroes will eventually choose. What made the Jewish ghetto reprehensible and dangerous was the decree of Pope Paul IV in 1555, forcing Jews to live behind the ghetto walls. The gates were locked at night and during high Christian holidays.

Life within the ghettos was crowded and you can still recognize the old medieval ghettos in Italian cities because, for that reason, the houses are higher than elsewhere. Those within had to wear special identifying badges or hats and were easy prey to exploitation since Jews, for instance, were not permitted to own their homes or any real estate. The ghettos existed not only in Italy but also in Germany and the Papal territories of France. The last vestiges disappeared only about a hundred years ago.

Our Negro ghettos have no visible walls but their inhabitants are just as confined and subject to exploitation as the medieval

"Black power" is a slogan of recklessness, of desperation. Intelligent Negroes do not know, or do not agree on, what it means. That segment of Negroes now doing the rioting obviously thinks it means that Negroes who are "fed up" with Jim Crow, unemployment, slums and myriad other humiliations can seize first-class citizenship.

It is not simply braggadocio, it is pitiable self-deception, to assume that a 10 percent minority can force a 90 percent majority to grant it total equality.

But the tragedy is compounded when the 90 percent majority falls victim to another myth—that the minority is totally dependent, in the long run, on the good will, even the whims, of the majority; and that the way to stop the rioting is simply to "get tough," to "stop coddling" the Negro, to refuse to pass any civil rights legislation.

The number of Negroes in America is too small to "take" first-class citizenship. But it is large enough to make life miserable for the white 90 percent, to make the future less than a dream for Americans of any color.

The first responsibility of enlightened Americans, then, must be to prevent these ugly episodes from poisoning American life to the point where we have a brutal confrontation between a colored 10 percent and a white 90 percent. There can be no winner in such a conflict.

Some Americans are quick to seize—and spread—the claim that these big city uprisings are part of some great plot with sinister aliens manipulating the strings. Asked recently if Negro extremist groups fomented the riots in Cleveland and Chicago, Atty. Gen. Nicholas de B. Katzenbach said:

"We have information about such groups now and are keeping a close eye on them. Their power and personnel, however, are very much exaggerated. It would be a tremendous—even tragic—mistake to say that these riots were some masterminded plot. It would be a tremendous mistake to say that these groups were the cause of the riots."

Sure—the Communists, the Black Muslims move quickly to take advantage of any riot. But so do the sophisticated bigots who are eager to use the riots as an argument for preserving the discrimination and segregation from which they profit—as in real estate.

I have recently encountered the notion, held by some of my white acquaintances, that Negroes had better get busy restoring order because "this trouble is hurting your cause."

Protecting and revitalizing America's cities is everybody's cause. So is the eradication of illiteracy, the abolition of shameful injustice, the rooting out of degrading poverty, the broadening of the horizons of human freedom.

Anyone who prefers not to think so can go on nurturing old prejudices and paying the tragically costly price. He will discover that legitimate grievances, unmet, often become stronger than National Guards or all the other restraints the haves set upon the have-nots.

A Modest Proposal

(By Joseph Alsop)

The problem of the cities, in the form that it is now assuming, is the most urgent, the most difficult and the most frightening American domestic problem that has emerged in all the years of this country's history since the Civil War.

As a sort of farewell before a month's vacation, an attempt will therefore be made to sum up the problem, as it now stands, in a series of three reports. The only way to begin is with the terrible words of the general confession:

"We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done."

This includes, first of all, the almost complete failure to find out and to face the hard facts of the modern urban problem. The heart of the problem of the cities is the problem of the Negro ghettos, which have been flaming into riot in recent weeks.

As an illustration of the near-total lack of realism in most discussion of ghetto matters, it is only necessary to analyze the common school-slogan, "End de facto segregation."

To begin with, you cannot "End de facto segregation" in an urban school system, when the entire school system is already de facto segregated. Yet some people are still mouthing this slogan here in the District of Columbia, whose public elementary schools are now 91 per cent Negro!

To go on with, short of a Constitutional Amendment, you could not even end de facto segregation by forcibly homogenizing all the schools in an urban school system that was only 30 per cent Negro. The careful research behind the Watts report shows that any school which is forced to accept as much as 25 per cent of disadvantaged children virtually ceases to be a school; and almost all the children of the ghettos are very seriously disadvantaged.

Race has nothing to do with the effect on the school. The school becomes worthless because the teachers are unable to carry the huge extra burden of helping their disadvantaged pupils—whether they are Negro, or Mexican-American, or poor white. And when the neighborhood school goes to hell in a hack, all the middle and lower-middle income families in the neighborhood simply pick up and move to the suburbs, thereby creating another wholly segregated school.

Since an amendment forbidding such movement is unlikely, the important thing is not to "end defacto segregation." The important thing is to provide many more teachers, and much better teachers, for all schools carrying a serious burden of disadvantaged pupils. But there is no money to do that. Nothing for schools, and billions upon billions for freeways and expressways that promote the white emigration to the suburbs! That has been our rule for many years, again recalling the terrible sentence from the general confession.

The result is the present situation. This situation is not generally understood, yet the new SNCC leader, Stokely Carmichael, clearly understood it well enough when he boasted to a recent Washington rally that "We'd have black power" in most of the big American cities "within six years."

Six years is too short an interval, but school figures and population figures unanswerably indicate that most of the really major American cities are likely to have Negro majorities within the next decade, if not sooner. This is partly because of the growth of the ghettos, but the main cause is the flight to the suburbs of virtually all white families with children of school age.

Unless present trends are reversed, in short, most of our great cities are due to become huge Negro reservations—a series of super-Watts! When and if that happens, "black power" will no doubt be installed in City Hall. But when and if that happens, as any practical-minded man can foresee, there will be other consequences, too.

The change in the cities will not only accelerate the white movement to the suburbs, until the city centers truly are reservations in the grimmest sense of that grim word. This change will also, and above all, accelerate another movement that has already begun without anyone paying much attention.

Finance and business, industry and commerce will follow the flight into the suburbs; all the vast national investment in the centers will quite suddenly be almost worthless. And far worse still, these city-sized super-Watts of the future will have hardly more resources of their own to solve their problems than the Watts District of Los Angeles has today.

If we do not change the trend, there will be no hope of integration, no hope of equality for the Negro Americans. There will be an immense increase of the ugly race feeling that the riots have already begun to promote. There could even be one day, a President Verwoerd in the White House. Any effort, any expenditure, any presonal or national sacrifice, will be better than the thing we are threatened with, whites and Negroes together.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 3, 1966]

A Modest Proposal II

(By Joseph Alsop)

Why are most of the American great cities likely to be transformed into super-Watts? Why, in other words, do more and more of the cities have heavy Negro majorities in their school systems, predicting virtually segregated Negro cities of the future?

The first answer is the schools. Here in Washington, for instance, we have elementary schools that are over 90 per cent Negro; we have a city-wide population that is two-thirds Negro; and we have a voting population that is still only about one-half Negro. (These differences appear in all major cities, although other cities' figures are down in the scale as yet.)

But although Washington has already become a predominantly Negro city, the District of Columbia retains a white population of about 250,000. There should, therefore, be a great many tens of thousands of white children of school age in the District. And in reality, there are almost none!

To be precise, Washington had 26,000 white children of elementary school age five years ago. It has lost half that number since then. And of the 13,000 white children of school age still in the District of Columbia, far more than a third attend private schools.

Those figures mean only one thing: That nowadays, white families with children almost automatically emigrate to the suburbs. That conclusion can be cross-checked, too, in half a dozen ways.

The Southwest redevelopment, for instance, has caused many white people to return to live in the District of Columbia. But of these returners, almost none are families with children.

Again, there are two or three Catholic parishes in Washington with particularly strong parochial schools. As the Negro people moved into these neighborhoods, virtually all white Protestant families with children moved out, leaving the public schools almost solidly Negro.

But many of the white Catholic families have stayed, although the parochial schools, too, now have very high Negro percentages. This is because the parochial schools, being strongly led, have remained as good as ever, and the Catholic families therefore saw no reason to move.

It would be unrealistic to deny that the cruel fact of race prejudice has played a role in the white emigration to the suburbs. But the truly dominant role has been played, and is still being played, by the schools themselves.

If the admission of large numbers of disadvantaged children causes a school to go to hell in a hack, almost all families who are able to do so rather promptly move to a neighborhood with better schools—which nowadays means a suburban neighborhood. And as the Watts Report shows, the racial origin of the disadvantaged children has little to do with this emigration. The children's effect on the school, because of the extra burden they inevitably impose on the teachers, is the heart of the matter.

The truth of the matter is that the Justices of the Supreme Court left a needed job

Jews. A teacher at several schools in Washington's ghetto, for example, tells me that she is lucky if she can take her elementary school children outside the pale to a park or museum just one morning a year.

There is no fixed provision or budget for field trips in the school curriculum. The teacher, on her own initiative, must fight to get the time, arrange for the bus, see that the children get the carfare from their parents and often contribute her own money. Even many teachers in the Washington ghetto, she says, have never been across Rock Creek Park to see Georgetown, let alone the Great Falls.

This teacher has organized field trips for parents so they can see where they might take their children. When she took a group of parents to the Rock Creek Park Nature Center, many were reluctant to enter because they were afraid they would have to pay.

It's hard to find a job outside the ghetto when you don't even know what the world is like out there. Our automobile-obsessed city planning has terribly neglected the means of transportation into that world. That's why the Department of Housing and Urban Development has financed buses in Watts, one of the ghettos of Los Angeles where the riots started last summer.

This is the kind of constructive approach that a national strategy of ghetto dispersal is sure to include. In addition to giving new priority to the public transportation, it would clearly outline a bold new national policy for building New Towns, as the British have for 20 years now, for building satellite towns and for creating balanced neighborhoods of New Towns-Intown in the existing city. Most of all, we must devise a strategy to put industry and jobs where the workers are and vice versa.

Much of this is in the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 which is now before Congress with its fate still uncertain. But what with the bill's complex Demonstration Cities program, which piles complex new devices on already overly complex existing ones, there is much seemingly expensive and bewildering confusion. Hence the need for a White Paper with simple graphs, charts and brief text to spell out our national goal and the ways to attain it.

What's more the most important, the vital aspect of the ghetto problem is all but neglected. That is our disgraceful technical and political inability to build housing that people of below average income can afford. This is another reason why civil rights are only part of the answer. It won't help much to let nonwhites move into housing that isn't there.

It is also why urban renewal has not helped as much as it should have. On the whole, we have used the program's sweeping powers of condemnation to tear down the housing of the poor and replace it with luxury apartments and corporation palaces. The experts keep throwing statistics about the fate of the displaced people into each other's faces like kids playing in a sand box. But they all acknowledge and deplore the serious shortage of low-income housing that the renewers, along with highway builders and others, keep tearing down.

The Department of Commerce, three years ago, asked Congress for a moderate amount of money to start some research in housing construction. The lobbies with a vested interest in old-fashioned and expensive building killed the proposal.

Last March, the President called for a temporary national commission on building codes, zoning, taxation and development standards. Among other things, it was to make recommendations for getting us good housing for less money in a hurry. Considering our technological capabilities, this should not be an unsurmountable feat.

Now, 16 months later, this commission still has not been appointed by the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. When it is, it will probably be a large and unwieldy body designed to keep everybody quiet and happy. The problem must be taken out of the quagmire of building industry interests and given the status of national interest and priority, like our efforts in outer space. This, too, only the President can do.

The big city mayors, meanwhile, may find it necessary to set up small, effective emergency committees with the power to cut red tape. They would not study, or plan or find fault—but act. They would provide plastic swimming pools and put spray nozzles on the fire hydrants before and not after there is a riot.

They would provide special buses where needed. They would organize field trips and block parties for the ghetto dwellers. They would step up the efforts to kill rats and rush play equipment into empty lots.

In New York's highly crowded upper West Side the city has closed some streets to traffic and turned them into play streets administered by New York's Police Athletic League, or PAL. The American Machine & Foundry Co. has donated equipment to introduce the children to recreations that can become a lifetime habit, such as bowling, bicycling and golf. The play streets thus are not mere therapy but a way out of the ghetto.

There are a myriad of similar things that could and should be done. The city emergency committees, for instance, might start right now to put up heatable tents or quonset huts on vacant ghetto lots. Come winter they could be used for teenage dances, meetings, movies and day nurseries. In fact, it is not too early to start thinking about putting up gaily lighted Christmas trees in our more cheerless slums.

Where would the money come from? We might find that the emergency warrants diverting funds from longer range urban renewal and poverty war projects. We might also remember that it costs even more to pay the National Guard. And we don't seem to stint when it comes to fighting for a better way of life in jungles far more remote than the asphalt jungles of our ghettos.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News]

SPOTLIGHTS ON CITIES

As almost anyone can see by reading almost any headline these days, too many of America's cities are in trouble. Despite heavy local, state and federal expenditures, most include neighborhoods which are plain, undeniable slums.

Sen. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF (D-Conn.) thinks there must be answers to this and other urban paradoxes. Starting Aug. 16, the Senate subcommittee on executive reorganization which he heads will start asking Cabinet members, mayors, sociologists and possible other authorities on slum problems for their views and very best suggestions.

We hope that he finds some answers in short order. Certainly something is wrong when American city dwellers choose to riot for little or no valid reason. And it doesn't make sense when, for lack of decent mid-city housing, people are forced to live in inconvenient suburbs or in midtown shacks which haven't quite fallen down.

The best indication that the Senator may strike pay dirt in his city probings is that he, to date, seems realistic. He shows no signs of coming down with Appropriations Fever. That's the unhappy Washington malady which causes its victims to believe that, if you just throw enough money at a problem, it will go away.

One of Sen. RIBICOFF's stated objectives, in fact, is to find out how come, despite the massive billions of dollars the Federal Government already has handed our cities' self-proclaimed "improvers," so little improvement is seen.

If the Senator and his committee will turn stone-deaf ears to Washington's dreary tribes of do-gooders and the boondogglers, and pay their very closest attention to the mayor's and other genuine, on-the-spot city experts, his group's time may be well spent.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times,
Aug. 3, 1966]

CRISIS IN THE CITIES

Senator RIBICOFF's intention to hold hearings on the plight of America's cities deserves the full cooperation of all levels of leadership.

For in the urban centers where so many of us live—or shelter—social, physical and economic disintegration are rapidly undermining the values of property and of a justly ordered society.

The nation cannot go on this way. It cannot abandon its most sensitive geographical points to utter chaos and festering decay.

There is a crisis in urban existence. To surmount it we must find a way to keep our cities populated and liveable at a stage removed from the pervasive squalor and human blight that threaten to engulf them.

As Senator RIBICOFF asserts, we are faced with the urgent necessity to find answers to the problems of urban living for the urban populations of our time.

For many, the cities already are no longer places to live in, but places from which to flee, if one can.

The revitalization job has not been totally neglected, but neither has it been adequately organized or thoroughly supported. There is an apparent will to cope with the human and physical demands but the effective way to tackle the job is still obscure.

We do not operate, but rather gesticulate—deploring the decline of the cities, desparing of finding approaches to the various individual problems—and finally rush off in disordered crusade to treat with everything all at once.

Some priorities must be originated for no city can summon the resources to fling itself into the effort to achieve all goals simultaneously. Should tax reform come before housing reform? Should there be commercial district rehabilitation from which revenues might flow to finance better housing?

What are the procedural answers to the vast burden of the resettlement of our metropolitan centers so that they are fit and serviceable for habitation and for the transaction of business in our day?

Senator RIBICOFF indicates that we should be done with outmoded "tired answers that are 20 years old" and no longer fit the necessities. More emphasis must be given to "thoughtfully relate our efforts to the needs of people" and existing circumstance.

The hearings that are suggested, and the witnesses asked to comment, should present most helpful information to serve as a basis for legislation and planning. We have done great exercise in the city-beautiful and the city-utilitarian fields.

How futile, if nobody can live there in decency and only crime and violence measure the growth of tomorrow's city!

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I announce the cancellation, because of the unavailability of witnesses on that date, of hearings in regard to Federal support of international social and behavioral science research, previously scheduled for August 15.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him regarding the celebration of Old Settler's Day at Hillsboro, Ill.

ORDER OF AHEPA WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia announced that the week beginning August 14 shall be known as the Order of AHEPA Week in tribute to the International Convention of the Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—to be held in Washington, D.C., during that week. Over 15,000 people will participate in the deliberations and festivities. As the Senate Republican leader and on behalf of my colleagues in Congress, I extend greetings to the officers, delegates, members, and guests of this fine organization.

Mr. President, the Order of AHEPA is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to fraternal, charitable, civic, and public affairs activities in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Greece. At this convention our distinguished Vice President of the United States will be the principal speaker at the banquet and Members of Congress and other government officials from both political parties will participate in some of the programs. A number of Members of Congress, Governors, and mayors of both political parties are dues-paying members of the Order of AHEPA, of which I am one—being a member of the Peoria, Ill., chapter No. 234.

Mr. President, it would literally be impossible for me to enumerate the many fine charitable projects sponsored by the Order of AHEPA which run into the millions of dollars, the many and various categories of civic and public affairs projects which are of outstanding character and of great value to the community, and the many fraternal and social programs in the past 44 years which have aided the Greek immigrant to become fully assimilated in the American way of life within one generation.

However, I can briefly note that the Order of AHEPA has provided the type of leadership that has given great incentive to the Greek immigrant and his family that has brought forth outstanding businessmen, labor leaders, professional men, educators, churchmen, artists, writers, and leading figures in public life. George Christopher, former mayor of San Francisco, came to America as a Greek immigrant boy and Congressman John Brademas is the son of a Greek immigrant. Christopher is a Republican and Brademas is a Democrat. I say this is an excellent example of the Greek immigrant becoming fully assimilated in the American way of life.

The Order of AHEPA with other national Greek-American organizations in the early twenties helped to build church communities throughout the United States. AHEPA provided millions of dollars in scholarships to aid young men and women to gain a college education; urged its members and fellow Greek-Americans to become active in public affairs and public office; exercised its constitutional right of petition in urging Congress to amend the various immigration acts and special acts to aid immigrants from all foreign nations to come to America, to grant to Eastern—Greek—Orthodox faith a major religious faith status in the United States; and most important, urged the Americans of Hellenic linage to become outstanding American citizens while at the same time preserving the great Hellenic heritage that gave so much to the world and America.

Mr. President, I know that the delegates to the AHEPA convention will give serious consideration to both domestic and international problems that will come within the expertise of the convention's special committees and have these views made known to their representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, for the information of the readers of the Congressional Record I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record some of the basic facts concerning the Order of AHEPA.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Founded July 26, 1922 in Atlanta, Georgia.

Local chapters: Order of AHEPA, 459 Chapters. Daughters of Penelope, 345 Chapters. Sons of Pericles, 165 Chapters. Maids of Athena, 156 Chapters. The AHEPA family (Order of Ahepa and its three Auxiliaries) have a total of 1,125 Local Chapters.

Objects, purposes of the AHEPA: The Objects and Purposes of the Order of Ahepa are: (a) To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens (b) To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government (c) To instill a due appreciation of the privileges of Citizenship (d) To encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor (e) To pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny (f) To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture (g) To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness to their fellow man (h) To endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense (i) To promote Education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

AHEPA's contributions to worthy and charitable causes:

The Order of Ahepa has contributed financially to many worthy causes during its 44 years of existence. These contributions do not take into account the many local activities of our Chapters within the realm of their local communities. Local Chapters of the Ahepa Family have always given generously and vigorously supported local community projects in the fields of education, charity and civic improvement. The national and international projects and contributions include:

1. Relief of Florida hurricane victims.
2. Relief of Mississippi flood victims.
3. Relief of Corinth, Greece earthquake victims.
4. Relief for the War Orphans of Greece.
5. Relief of Dodecanese Islands (Greece) earthquake victims.
6. Funds for the Hellenic Museum in Greece.
7. Local, national and international scholarships for needy and worthy students.
8. Relief for the fatherless children of Refugees, through the Near East Relief.
9. Support of the Greek Orthodox Seminaries (Theological) at Pomfret, Conn., and Brookline, Mass.
10. Erection of the Ahepa Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial at Hyde Park, New York.
11. Erection of the Ypsilanti Memorial at Ypsilanti, Mich.
12. Erection of the Dilboy Memorial.
13. Relief of Turkish earthquake victims.
14. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Jerusalem.
15. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Constantinople.
16. Ecuadorean Relief.
17. Kansas City flood relief.
18. Greek war Relief Program during and after World War II.
19. Construction of Ahepa Hospitals in Athens and Salonika, Greece following World War II.
20. Construction of 7 Ahepa Health Centers in Greece following World War II.
21. Ahepa Agricultural College in Greece.
22. Ionian Islands (Greece) earthquake relief.
23. Ahepa Preventorium in Volos, Greece.
24. Daughters of Penelope Girls' Shelter Home in Athens, Greece.
25. Construction of Ahepa Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, New York.
26. Construction of Ahepa School at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, New York.
27. Sale of 500 Million Dollars in U.S. War Bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury Department.
28. Contributions to the Truman Library, Independence, Mo.
29. Contributions to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Cancer Institute, Miami, Florida.
30. Erection of the Ahepa Truman Statue and Plaza in Athens, Greece.
31. Donation of 40,000 American and Canadian books to schools and libraries in Greece.
32. Ahepa Medals for Scholastic Excellence for studies in the Greece Language to students.
33. Presentations of 7-volume sets of the Greek Classics to schools and libraries in the U.S. and Canada.
34. CARE Tool Kits for students of vocational schools in Greece.
35. Ahepa Refugee Relief Committee, to aid war refugees of World War II.
36. Sports Kits for Greek school children.

Citizenship: Ahepa's requirements stipulate that members must be American or Canadian citizens, or have indicated their intention to become citizens in which case the fraternity assists the new member in attaining citizenship. Ahepa Chapters assist newly-arrived non-citizens in attaining their full American and Canadian citizenship, and also instruct their members with the obligations that go hand-in-hand with citizenship.

Civic participation: The local Chapters of the Ahepa and its Auxiliaries are active in their own civic affairs and projects, all of which conforms to the fraternity's program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. These Chapters are active in aiding and contributing to local fund drives.

International relations: In the field of International Relations, the Order of Ahepa has constantly maintained an active interest in affairs aimed at further cementing the good-will and friendship between the peoples of Canada, the United States, and Greece, as noted in the heading of this Fact Sheet "Ahepa's Contributions to Worthy Causes." The fraternity takes an active part in America's "People-to-People" program which seeks a closer and more harmonious relationship between the peoples of the United States and other countries. Active roles have been taken by the Ahepa and its officials in several matters of international importance concerning the United States and Greece.

MANSFIELD ON ASIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of the reasons I am so proud to be a Marylander is the Baltimore Sun, which is one of the leading daily newspapers in the United States.

It was a matter of great interest to me, therefore, to read a Sun editorial this morning entitled "Mansfield on Asia." The editorial praised the proposal of the distinguished majority leader for an all-Asia conference on the Vietnam problem.

As the editorial points out, the opinions of the Senator from Montana are "as valuable as any in this country." I believe that Senator MANSFIELD's long expertise in Asian affairs is a valuable asset to this body. I am glad that the Baltimore Sun has paid tribute to this expertise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Aug. 10, 1966]

MANSFIELD ON ASIA

Peking's scornful rejection of proposals for an all-Asia peace conference, with Hanoi's rejection immediately following, does not mean that the idea must be abandoned. No one knows what form any discussions leading toward peace in Vietnam, when discussions finally come, are going to take. An Asian conference is surely one possible form, and it may be the likeliest. Among those who believe so, and have believed so for some time, is Senator MANSFIELD, whose opinions on Asian affairs are as valuable as any in this country.

For a good while Senator MANSFIELD has been urging a greater Asian initiative in the solution of Asian problems, including first of all the conflict in Vietnam. It is in line with this that he welcomes the conference proposal put forward by Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia. Last spring he himself suggested that Burma or Japan try to arrange such a gathering. Who arranges it does not matter, if it can be arranged, nor does the place of meeting matter. The site need not be Geneva: perhaps better somewhere else. Mr. MANSFIELD says, "Let it be called in Rangoon or Bangkok, in Manila or Pnom Penh, or, for that matter, even in Peking."

Of course no conference in Peking, or elsewhere, is immediately in prospect. The point is to keep the idea of an Asian solution open, in the air, so that if this turns out to be the way to peace we will be ready for it.

HOSPITALIZATION OF SENATOR BENNETT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has been hospitalized at the Bethesda Naval Hospital since July 30, when a bleeding ulcer developed in his stomach.

I am happy to report to the Senate today that my colleague is making a rapid recovery. His physicians were able to stop the bleeding within a few days after admitting the Senator to the hospital. He has been on a typical ulcer diet for several days. I have been told that he now feels quite well.

In cases like this, I understand, physicians like to keep their patients hospitalized until full recovery is evident. On this basis, the Senator will be in the hospital until the end of next week.

The ulcer has been described as quite small. In fact, it barely showed up on X-rays taken at the time he was admitted to the hospital.

I am sure that the Senate joins with me in prayers that the Senator's strength may be renewed so that he may return to his duties in the Senate on schedule.

RULES COMMITTEE BEGINS HEARINGS ON SCHOOL MILK BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to report to my Senate colleagues that the House Rules Committee opened hearings this morning on legislation that would, among other things, extend the special milk program for schoolchildren for an additional 4 years. This legislation, H.R. 13361, was reported from the House Agriculture Committee on July 29. It is similar to the Ellender child nutrition legislation passed by the Senate almost 1 month ago. A revised version of the Senate bill, S. 3467, was recently reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

The Rules Committee has not as yet heard all of those who wish to testify on H.R. 13361. Certain jurisdictional problems are created by the fact that the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee is quite similar. However, I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will meet again this week to receive testimony from the two or three remaining House Members who wish to make statements on the bill. I further hope that the Rules Committee will soon schedule the bill for floor action.

Early passage is essential if the school administrators around the country are to be able to act with any certainty on school budgets for the year to come. Without quick action these administrators will be uncertain as to whether the Federal Government is going to continue to commit itself to paying part of the costs of midmorning and midafternoon milk breaks.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S TRIBUTE TO ISRAEL'S PRESIDENT SHAZAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it was my honor on August 1 to attend a dinner sponsored by the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York in honor of President Shazar, of Israel, at the Hotel Plaza, in New York. At this dinner, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, delivered an eloquent tribute to President Shazar, to which I invite the attention of Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's address be printed at this point preceded by an introduction of Governor Rockefeller by Max Fisher of Michigan, national chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

There being no objection, the introduction and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER AT UJA DINNER HONORING PRESIDENT SHAZAR, AUGUST 1, 1966

Mr. MAX FISHER. The American Jewish community established UJA not only out of a sense of Jewish responsibility but also because it was concerned with the basic right of every man to be safe and free. Because of this humanitarian concern, Americans of every faith give their support to the United Jewish Appeal. Our next speaker is one such American.

Twenty years ago, one million and a half survivors of the Nazi massacres in Europe hovered on the brink of extinction. Right here in New York it was Nelson Rockefeller who took action to demonstrate that those homeless Jews had an urgent claim on the compassion of Americans, whatever their religion. Nelson Rockefeller founded the Nonsectarian Community Committee for the United Jewish Appeal and became its first chairman. He played a significant role in helping UJA in its first $100 million campaign in 1946.

Much has changed since that dark time. Those who were wasting away in the DP camps have found homes and new lives in lands of freedom. But one thing has not changed. Governor Nelson Rockefeller is still eminently concerned with UJA's humanitarian work. He still serves with distinction as honorary chairman of the Nonsectarian Community Committee of the UJA of Greater New York. He is with us this evening to express officially the greetings of the people of this state to our guest of honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Nelson Rockefeller.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE DINNER HONORING PRESIDENT SHAZAR OF ISRAEL, UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF GREATER NEW YORK, NEW YORK, N.Y., AUGUST 1, 1966

On behalf of the people of the State of New York, I bid you welcome, Mr. President—Shalom, Hanassi. We welcome you as a distinguished scholar and gifted writer; we welcome you as a revered philosopher; and, most of all, we welcome you as the leader of a young, vigorous and vibrant democracy that has captured the American imagination and won the American heart. I am also delighted to welcome Mrs. Shazar to our shores—for she is a remarkable woman, a true Israeli Halutza—a pioneer—and a fine author in her own right.

I'd like to point out, Mr. President, that you and I have a common responsibility. We are each accountable to about two and one-half million Jewish citizens. And our nations are joined by so many bonds of humanity, history and common experience.

In the last century, an impassioned American poet proclaimed the promise of America to the world:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses. . . ."

These words of Emma Lazarus are engraved for all time on our Statue of Liberty in the Port of New York. In this century, they could emblazon the ports of Haifa and Jaffa just as well.

Both of our nations—one of the world's oldest democracies and one of the world's youngest—have opened their arms wide to millions. As in the dreams of the Hebrew prophets, we have both been enriched by the gathering of the Exiles.

The more recent migration to Israel—still fresh in our minds—is one of the great, moving dramas of this age. Over a million people—a shattered remnant of the nightmare of Nazism—gathered at a small, barren and all-but-forsaken land. They came from over 70 nations. They took root alongside those who came before them. And just as in this country, the immigrant—by his sweat and by his toil, by his vision and by his creativity—helped to forge a new nation.

By these massive infusions of new blood, both our countries became half-brothers to the whole world—with something of almost every land to be found within us. In fact, long ago we almost became even closer.

One of my scholarly friends recently pointed out to me a fascinating footnote to American history. It seems that our Pilgrim forefathers seriously discussed making Hebrew the official tongue of the New World.

Other ties join us, but I want to mention just one more personal link between President Shazar and myself. Some years ago, Mr. Shazar had an able special assistant, a charming young Israeli woman by the name of Lea Ostrovsky Ben Boaz. On my own staff, I have an able Press Secretary in Leslie Slote. Today, the former Miss Ben Boaz is Mrs. Slote. All of which both Les and I regard as an extremely favorable U.S. balance of trade with Israel.

I would like to tell you of some thoughts I had when I received the kind invitation of the United Jewish Appeal to be here tonight. Two images flashed through my mind. The first was of the Israel we know today: a nation that made the Negev bloom . . . a nation that swiftly created great seats of learning—the Hebrew University, the new Tel Aviv University, the Weizmann Institute and the Technion . . . a nation throbbing with industrial activity and new agriculture . . . a nation of refuge and new hopes for humanity. Then my mind rushed back to a time two brief decades ago when all this was only a dream . . . and the only realities were tens of thousands of displaced Jews herded into the camps of Europe—and off in the distance a strange, untried land. The United Jewish Appeal played a heroic role in joining these people with that land.

I remember going to Eddie Warburg back in those days when he was the UJA chairman. I felt very deeply that the task of resettling this exodus of homeless Jews was a challenge and responsibility not only of the Jewish community but of free men of all faiths. Therefore, I asked him if he would permit me to organize a Non-Sectarian Community Committee for the New York United Jewish Appeal. His response was immediate, and I was proud to have become its first chairman.

To me, the work of the Non-Sectarian Committee dramatized an enormously important principle. It demonstrated our conviction that all civilized men shared the duty of redressing the outrage committed against the Jewish people.

Israel succeeded. The UJA played its part in that success. And I am grateful to have had the chance of playing even a small part over the years. But there is one thing, Mr. President, that I assure you we understand only too well.

Israel was born and Israel prospers in a sea of deep hostility. And as long as fear and danger cloud the lives of your brothers, as long as help is needed, I know that the UJA, under your able chairman, Max Fisher, will keep open its lifeline to Israel.

But I would also like to see fresh, new initiatives emerge from Washington in pursuit of a true and lasting peace for your troubled corner of the world.

America must not let its vital and active commitment to freedom in other parts of the world obscure the dangers to the peace of the Middle East. The United States should and must exercise its full moral force within the United Nations to bring Arab and Jew together in lasting peace.

Mr. President, over 140 years ago a great American said, "I am happy in the restoration of the Jews." In the fullest sense, Thomas Jefferson's words were premature. But today his sentiment is echoed by Americans from coast to coast.

We are happy in the restoration of the Jewish homeland. We are thrilled to have witnessed its birth in our time. We are proud to have assisted its swift growth. And we wish you and your brave, young nation long life . . . prosperity . . . freedom . . . and peace.

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS CONTRIBUTES GENEROUSLY TO THE RESTORATION OF ST. MICHAEL'S CATHEDRAL IN SITKA, DESTROYED BY FIRE LAST JANUARY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last January the Russian Orthodox Church at Sitka, Alaska—the Cathedral of St. Michael—was destroyed by fire. This historic edifice was the most beautiful and most expressive symbol of the century and a quarter of Russian occupation of Alaska. It was built in the 1840's and lifted its beautiful cross, dome and spire above the Sitka community and against the background of the surrounding mountains. Its loss was a tragedy from every standpoint.

I had been in Sitka early that week and was deeply impresed by the progress which that community had made, and was made heartsick when the following Sunday the radio brought the news of the destruction not only of this cathedral, but of the Lutheran Church nearby and half of the Sitka business district.

I flew back to Sitka from Juneau as soon as I heard of the fire and immediately started a drive for funds to restore it, making the initial contribution with a check for $100. Since that time, a little over $200,000 has been collected, which is somewhat less than half of what is needed. Today, I was greatly heartened by receiving a check for $500 from Archbishop Iakovos, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America. In transmitting this check, the archbishop wrote me as follows:

Dear Senator Gruening: I hasten to reply to your recent letter concerning St. Michael's Russian Orthodox Cathedral in Sitka, Alaska, which reached me upon my return from a short vacation following our Viennial Clergy-Laity Congress.

I was indeed appalled to hear of the unfortunate fire which destroyed the Cathedral. It was well known to me as a magnificent church of great historic and cultural value. Enclosed is a check for a modest contribution to the rebuilding fund.

As Chairman of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, I will bring up the matter of the rebuilding fund at the next meeting of the Conference. Thank you very much for your interest in this matter. Your initiative in starting the collection of funds for the reconstruction was most generous and is very much appreciated.

Cordially yours,

Archbishop Iakovos.

This is a most generous act on the part of the archbishop, and I hope that it will lead others to follow his example. If all the members of the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches in America would contribute even a token of $1 or so, the needed funds would be forthcoming. Of course, larger contributions will be equally gratefully received. It is to be hoped that these funds can be secured so that the centennial year of the purchase of Alaska from Russia—1967—may be ushered in by the glad tidings that the cathedral will be rebuilt.

THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the most contentious issues before Congress this session is the bill introduced by Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, and cosponsored by Senators Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, and Lee Metcalf, of Montana, to establish a Department of Natural Resources. Recently the Wall Street Journal published a column written by Alan L. Otten characterizing the bill as one which "is going nowhere in this Congress," but which must be passed in some form eventually.

The Otten column is a lively contribution to the dialog about the bill, and the argument over coordinating the management of the Nation's land, water, power, and mineral resources through reorganization of the Federal apparatus which governs them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Otten column, entitled "Resourcefulness," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Politics and People: Resourcefulness

(By Alan L. Otten)

Washington.—The bill is going nowhere in this Congress and may not go much further for years to come. But it is evoking considerable attention and uneasiness among lobbyists and Government officials all the same. They want to make sure its unpromising outlook doesn't improve.

The measure in question, sponsored by Democratic Senators Moss of Utah, Clark of Pennsylvania and Metcalf of Montana, seeks to unite Federal programs scattered among a half-dozen agencies into one new Department of Natural Resources.

The present Department of the Interior would be the nucleus. Several interior agencies would be moved out—the Alaska Railroad to the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The controversy, however, focuses on what would be moved in—the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, the Agriculture Department's Forest Service, Agriculture's conservation projects in smaller watersheds, the Army Corps of Engineers involvement in maintaining and improving waterways.

Reasons for creating such a new department seem compelling, if effective Government organization is to have any meaning. No overall pattern exists for developing the nation's land, water, power, mineral, recreation and wildlife resources. Programs are diffused through several agencies; duplication is common, and conflict frequent.

Agriculture's Forest Service and Interior's Park Service often differ over the importance to be assigned recreation in developing public lands. The several agencies developing water resources apply markedly different standards for figuring likely costs and benefits. Each bureau develops its own set of backers on Capitol Hill and at the local level. Groups seeking Federal projects wander bewildered through the Government maze.

Much of the organizational apparatus is out of date. The Corps of Engineers got into the water resource business decades ago when it was the Government's only effective engineering organization. Interior's Bureau of Land Management was created chiefly to get the Government out of the land business, while the Forest Service was to manage what was left; today the two perform almost identical chores. In Congress, money for Agriculture's Forest Service is provided through the subcommittee handling Interior Department appropriations, not the one handling Agriculture's. Still another appropriations bill—for public works—finances the Defense Department's Corps of Engineers, Interior's Reclamation Bureau, and the TVA, an independent agency.

Utah's Senator Moss, interested in a plan to divert water from Alaska and British-Columbia to the arid areas of both sides of the American Rockies, found himself hopping from agency to agency in order to obtain information and advice. "There ought to be," he reflects, "some one place where these decisions can be made. We've expanded our resources programs greatly in the last two Congresses, but we've failed to modernize the organization of the Federal departments that must administer them. We are piling new tasks of great magnitude on an old executive structure."

A new department, holding out promises of substantial economies and efficiencies, would seem logical for Lyndon Johnson to propose and support. The idea has been recommended, with varying details, by every task force that has studied the subject—from the first Hoover Commission in 1949 to Mr. Johnson's own Great Society task forces in 1963 and 1964.

Ever since the start of his Presidency, when he went around the White House turning out lights, Mr. Johnson has made a fetish of seeming to seek economies in Federal operations. Moreover, one of his constant operating principles has been to center on one individual the responsibility for a broad field of Federal activity—one man to finger for information, action, blame. He's done it for domestic programs—civil rights (Nicholas Katzenbach), city problems (Robert Weaver), transportation (Alan Boyd). He's done it for foreign trouble spots—George Ball for Cyprus, Ellsworth Bunker for the Dominican Republic, Robert Komer for political, economic and social progress in South Vietnam.

Yet the President has shied away from a Department of Natural Resources. The breadth and depth of the opposition intimidates even the legislative magician Mr. Johnson fancies himself—opposition from agency bureaucrats fearing loss of authority, from Senators and Congressmen who relish their present entree to the separate agencies, from outside groups happy with the influence they exercise among the existing autonomies.

Some public reaction to the Senator's bill is indicative. The American Waterways Operators, wanting a steady flow of inland projects, warns its members that "the future of navigation in the United States will be dim indeed if the Corps of Engineers loses its responsibility for civil works to a catch-all department. . . . The time build effective opposition to (the Moss bill) is now."

Other opposition has been more covert. Forest Service officials and forest operators apparently have been doing quiet missionary work among friends in Congress and around the country. Some TVA-state lawmakers have indicated they will not look with favor on any erosion of TVA's independence. Other likely foes have deliberately remained quiet, hoping the bill would wither away if it received little notice.

Yet Senator Moss and his co-sponsors are far from discouraged. They claim a surprising amount of favorable mail, and this fall, perhaps after Congress adjourns or even after the elections, they hope to hold hearings to publicize the issues.

A little headway toward consolidation already has been made; last month, a Presidential reorganization moved HEW's water-pollution controls to Interior, as the original Moss-Clark-Metcalf bill proposed. Mr. Johnson may be planning other similar transfers, nibbling further at the problem without risking a frontal assault.

Despite these signs of progress, most Administration officials and informed outsiders believe any full-blown Department of Natural Resources is far down the road. "Not in Lyndon Johnson's Presidency," concedes one White House man who's been studying the project, "but definitely in my lifetime." He's only in his mid-30s, however.

ADDRESS DELIVERED TO GOVERNMENT INTERNS BY PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR JACK HOOD VAUGHN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I recently participated in a special, interfaith service for student government interns and the Youth Opportunity Corps at the Washington Cathedral. As part of the service, the Director of the Peace Corps, Jack Hood Vaughn, delivered a most inspiring address to these fine young people. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vaughn's address be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS DELIVERED BY JACK VAUGHN, DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

My dear friends: I am troubled by the pulpit. In my own mind, I have always imagined the pulpit bears painful resemblance to the prisoner's dock in those British court room scenes. One is compelled by circumstance to speak the truth from both of them.

Moreover, I was amused to learn this week that the support and railing for a harpooner at the bowsprit on a whaling ship is also called a pulpit—which leaves much to the imagination about religion in Ye Merrie Olde New England.

As most of you are interns in the administration's program of summer service, I am certain you have often been welcomed to the heart of Washington, which is Government.

On behalf of all of us, I want to take this occasion now to welcome you to the soul of Washington, which is the spirit of service which reposes here.

I should think you would find your experience in the bureaucracy a source of great humility and forgiveness for those who service the paperwork of mammoth organizations—and I trust you will bear this in mind while waiting in next semester's registration lines.

After your experiences here, you may well be able to return to your respective campuses this fall and say with James Garfield—a sometimes preacher who became President: "Fellow Citizens! God reigns, and the Government at Washington still lives!"

It is good to have you in Washington. We are encouraged—indeed, elated—by people who share in the summer intern programs. In fact, we need you. You have become our annual burst of enthusiasm.

A young man trained for the ministry—Bill Moyers—reminded us recently that the Greeks had a word for people who failed to participate in the affairs of their day. The word was "idiot."

Accordingly, I propose that the opposite of idiocy is involvement. Being part of our times—sharing in its adventures—learning our way about the decision-making process: such is the vitality and sense of involvement we require in our leadership, whether young or seasoned. I can remember when we seemed satisfied with seminars and encampments to talk about problems.

Now, it seems we encamp in the midst of action. Our "get-with-it" summers cannot fail to find new standards of performance—for we have never learned to be satisfied with last year's rules.

I think this is vital to our future. Americans seem to be spending considerable energy lately, testing and assuring that our young people will fit specialized requirements of our own making and plans of our own design. We seem very devoted to the idea of performance.

I have no quarrel with that. Proven performance spells a welcome sense of security for the nation's future. But I would feel doubly confident in a generation trained to perform remarkably well in the field of ideas—a generation adept at calling its own shots and finding its own challenges.

Alongside a sense of achievement, we ought to encourage a keen sense of dynamics.

Along with mastery of the elements, ought to come mastery of personal identity.

A generation that builds mighty systems had better build even mightier individuals.

A generation out to design tomorrow had better remember to instill in its children a love of change.

We are building the Great Society—a place, as our President has said, "where the meaning of man's life matches the marvels of man's labors." For such an adventure we ought to build Great Citizens—a generation bred to derive the highest personal fulfillment from the most impersonal of structures; a people whose individual values originate in a robust love of life; a hardy people, built to withstand bigness all about them.

Vice President HUMPHREY expressed such feelings very clearly recently when he said, "It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung."

I think we have moved a long way down the road of history from Descartes' "I think—therefore I am," to the greater conviction of the individual, declaring, "I am—therefore I can become."

That's what I appreciate most about the programs embodied in the Great Society: We are speaking there about new opportunities for people to enrich their lives.

We are speaking about options for the individual.

What an ideal meeting place in history: An unprecedented opportunity for meaningful action, in a generation in search of action.

As you have been among us these weeks, sharing our labors and our heat wave, I have observed promising willingness in you to sharpen your abilities as well as your wits. And we thank you heartily for compelling us to do the same.

In such an interchange of values, you may have encountered some of the thought processes which motivate our own thinking at the Peace Corps: I have said that the soul of Washington is the spirit of service. We like to believe that the Peace Corps is the first-rate expression of the will to action in your generation.

But it is more: for it is cast in the environment of service of primary importance: Service to our fellow human beings—as President Kennedy said, "not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

Our cause is service to the House of Life itself. It is the cause of Peace.

Yet, as we are veterans of the battle, we ought to have a few ideas about the subject of Peace. And as you are fast becoming fellow veterans in service, I would like to share some of those ideas with you.

In the first place, we don't think very highly of that blissful word—Peace. It is not that we despair of its attainment—for we serve that cause, and you will find that Peace Corps volunteers are not impractical wanderers after will-o'-the-wisps.

The trouble is that Peace ought not have any limitations in time and space—and I believe that much of what has been palmed off as Peace in this century has been severely limited. At best, it has been "phony Peace." It has been an interval—and a politically determined interval, at that. It has "served a purpose"—but the purpose has been less than holy and the interval less than kind.

"Peace"—in your time has been a time of growing despair; a pause between the Wars, to refurbish arms, and skirmish and parlay at the conference table. Peace has been a prize of war, drummed after and paraded. There has been a kind of deliberate elusiveness attached to Peace, as if it might be wise to leave off from Peace, in order to cherish Peace all the more when the conflict is over—somewhat like the semi-adult nonsense game of fighting, because it is such fun to "make up" afterwards.

There is just a little too much irony in "safeguarding" such Peace. To safeguard Peace is to admit its peril. A restaurant which caters to ladies and gentlemen hardly ever requires the services of a bouncer. An establishment carrying such an employee on the regular payroll hardly can claim surprise when the patrons are unruly.

For the same reasons, I have often thought we ought not lean too heavily on the notion of vigilance as the price of liberty. I have no quarrel with that, as far as it goes. The trouble is, it is the obvious, made to sound solemn. Vigilance looks outward, to guard the temple. It cannot nourish our faith in freedom. Indeed, we have seen in your lifetime that our individual liberty at times seemed less important to some than the vigil itself.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself.

We assert this, moreover, not only at home, but for our fellowmen everywhere. Human freedom and the rights of the individual are the singular foundation of United States policy in its relationship with other lands.

We are troubled, however, because the problem of "vigil" keeps coming back to haunt us. Our fears are real enough: our concern abroad, as at home, is with the course of human freedom. Our nation began the modern assault on tyranny and it has never sat well with Americans, to watch people anywhere suffer unspeakable outrage in the name of some grand destiny.

So, we add our precious strength to the vigil, bitter in the knowledge that combat is not the true struggle. It is merely the way to hold back the night, while the process of freedom takes root. In such terms, I think it is somewhat inconsistent, that we all can agonize in shame when people do nothing to help a neighbor viciously assaulted right before their eyes—yet let that neighbor be a nation of free people struck down with no less cruelty or violence and suddenly we hear that it is none of our affair.

As always, the vigil steals the headlines, but the real war in our age is silent. It is the quiet contest of which John Kennedy spoke when he said:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation'—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself."

The struggle at hand is destined for no remote battlefield. It will be next to you, with you, and part of your life for years to come. Any man or woman who is involved with the world about them, shares that struggle. To partake of it is to lend meaning to our own lives, and impart reason to our existence.

The struggle is the cause of Peace itself: Not to keep the Peace, But to make the Peace worthwhile; not merely to halt war, but to enrich human existence.

Peace ought not be anything more to cheer about than the air we breathe. That we may be blessed with Peace is to grant us ever fresh beginnings—for Peace ought not be an end in itself.

Peace ought to be the realm of action. Peace ought to encourage genuine freedom of action: freedom to be restless without fear; freedom to be adventurous, to take risks, to grow, to stir, to match wits with nature and with our fellowman; freedom, if you will, to become civilized.

It is the special beauty of the benediction, "May the Lord lift up his countenance unto you and grant you Peace,"—that those words usually are spoken at the end of a ceremony, and I find in them a sense of new beginnings each time I hear them. It detracts nothing from their solemnity or their kindness, that they are an invitation to be at Peace with ourselves as we get up and get going on the tasks before us.

Your tasks are in new service here. There are approximately 6,000 interns serving in government this summer. Yet were their number gathered, everyone in one place, they would not outnumber the 7,500 young men and women, hardly a year or two older, who are entering Peace Corps service this summer.

For those young men and women, the path of action is as your own. It is involvement in the world about them. But as you are becoming specialists in Government—they are becoming specialists in man himself.

Whatever their achievements, they seek to encourage in the people about them, a keen sense of dynamics.

In aiding mastery of environment, they try to convey to those about them a strong sense of social identity.

Rather than build systems, they try to encourage a sense of leadership in strong individuals.

Above all, they try to convey confidence in the concept of social change.

Thus, Peace Corps service consists in grappling with the hard, gritty problems of man himself. It is less concerned with the systems men create for their own benefit, than with the will and spirit of men to move just far enough to create any system at all.

Therefore, the Peace Corps is the longest short-cut to Peace imaginable.

But considering the alternatives, it is probably the likely road in the long run. Young men and women who are part of that service have joined in the unseen battles and the silent victories of Peace. They are the quiet heroes whose politics is service, whose nationality is mankind.

In their labor we may learn that true Peace is not a state between nations—but a giver of life for all men.

Just a year ago this week, a dedicated man of Peace died in the service of his nation. His body lay in state in this very transept, before this pulpit.

Adlai Stevenson was the very essence of action in pursuit of reason. No man in our time better exemplified the search for the virtues of Peace—not only for Americans, but for people everywhere.

Some words of his commend themselves to us. I leave you with them—not to end, but to renew your thoughts of service. He said:

"It might be a good idea . . . to remind ourselves about the nature of men . . . and Man.

"Men are sometimes cruel, but Man is kind.

"Men are sometimes greedy, but Man is generous.

"Men are mortal, but Man is immortal.

"And I believe along with Faulkner that Man will do more than survive. He will prevail."

Thank you, and Peace be with you.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF POPE COUNTY, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Pope County, located in my home State of Illinois, will observe its sesquicentennial August 18, 19, and 20.

The history of this community is a vital part of the history of Illinois. Located at the southern tip of Illinois, Pope County was formed 3 years before Illinois was admitted to the Union. Since that time its progress and future has been intimately concerned with developments of our State.

It is interesting to note that Pope County contains within its borders one of our great national forests, the Shawnee National Forest, a beautiful area in which increasing numbers of people are finding rest and recreation.

And, Mr. President, I am proud to observe that the same farsighted attitude which characterized the early history of this county still prevails undiminished to this day. I welcome this opportunity to congratulate these fine people and wish them continued success and prosperity.

HIGH COST OF HEALTH FRAUDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, perhaps in a nation of 190 million persons we should expect a certain amount of outright medical quackery and subtle deceptions used to promote questionable health services or products.

But even though we may expect wrongdoing or confusion, we should not be complacent about the consequences. Those who promise false hope of cure often endanger any chance at all of recovery, and they quite often take dollars from those who need them most.

Fortunately, many organizations are attempting to get the facts about quackery to the public. The American Cancer Society has just issued a definitive report describing unproved treatments offered to the public within recent years. Seven Federal agencies are cooperating in a study of consumer receptiveness to questionable techniques or products. The American Medical Association is preparing for another national conference on quackery. And in Seattle, recently, a very comprehensive State conference was given on health frauds and quackery.

The authoritative Medical Tribune gave an excellent summary of current trends in the fight against quackery in its July 23 edition. This article will be of help to all those who are concerned about the many forms that quackery can take even during an age of remarkable scientific progress. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Quacks: Cancer "Cure" Is Called No. 1 Health Fraud

In connection with its recent conference on health frauds and quackery, the Washington State Medical Association noted that the first recorded prescription for growing hair appears to have been a compound of dog toes, horses' hooves, and date refuse. It was prepared for Queen Ses of Egypt some 5,400 years ago, and there is no reason to believe it was any more successful than many present-day substances that allegedly can reverse alopecia.

Despite the lessons of history, the advances of medical science, public education, and Federal and state laws, quackery remains a strongly rooted weed. In fact, Sen. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, an investigator of the extent of medical charlatanry in the United States, suggested a year ago that this is its golden age. More recently, a Senate subcommittee on frauds and misrepresentation affecting the elderly, of which Senator Williams is chairman, concluded that Americans "are now paying the greatest price they have ever paid for worthless nostrums, ineffectual and potentially dangerous devices, treatments given by unqualified practitioners, food fads and unneeded diet supplements, and other alluring products or services that make misleading promises of cure or end to pain."

For some years the most generally used estimate of the cost of quackery has been $1 billion annually. Whether this figure is shrinking under the impact of action by the Government and organized medicine or growing is not known, according to Oliver Field, director of research for the American Medical Association Department of Investigation. Perhaps reports to the Third National Congress of Medical Quackery, scheduled to be held in Chicago in October, will permit a measurement of the trend, he said.

"But we are not emphasizing the question of money cost of quackery so much," Mr. Field added. "We are concentrating instead on the cost of fraud in terms of time lost and wasted and its cost in needless early death."

While the expenditure for self-prescribed vitamins and cures for arthritis and rheumatism may be increasing, the number-one fraud—as judged by the number of complaints coming to A.M.A. headquarters—is the cancer "cure."

Background of that problem was recently the subject of a survey by Dr. Roald N. Grant, director of professional education for the American Cancer Society, and Irene Bartlett, program associate for its Committee on New and Unproven Methods of Cancer Treatment.

More than 500,000 Americans develop cancer every year, and 49,000,000 now alive will have the disease at some time, they noted. In the light of these facts, combined with fears of radical surgery and heavy dosages of radiotherapy, the appearance of unproved remedies that exploit the situation is not surprising, they said. Often contributing to the anxieties of patients and their grasping at the bright promise of remedies, it was pointed out, is the belief that their own physicians have given up hope. In contrast, proponents of worthless procedures present a cheerful and optimistic approach.

From 1960 to 1965, according to the survey, eight books were published that described favorable results obtained with specific unproved methods and three others that described unproved remedies in general. Mass-circulation magazines and periodicals devoted to "health" also popularized untested procedures. One of the latter, distributed late last fall, contained information on 44 unproved techniques it claimed were "very valuable in cases of cancer." It had a section that offered "practical advice for cancer patients, which can be followed very beneficially."

Dr. Grant and Miss Bartlett noted that the claims of most unproved methods are "difficult or impossible" to check because material for conclusive clinical study is often insufficient and proponents of the treatments are frequently uncooperative.

Formal gains in recent years, the survey said, have included new powers assigned the Federal Government in the Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the placing of the burden of proof on advocates of cancer remedies. Other advances are represented by legislation in California, Colorado, Kentucky, Maryland, Nevada, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania. But a large gap in the over-all fabric is lack of legislative control in the 43 other states, it was added.

Even where state legislation has been in effect, however, the struggle against cancer quackery remains Sisyphean. Two physicians in California, a state with a control statute since 1959, acknowledged some modest achievements in resisting the spread of cancer fraud. On the other hand, said Drs. James C. Doyle, of Beverly Hills, former president of the California Medical Association, and Eugene G. Miller, San Francisco, director of scientific activities for the organization, "false generalizations, the worship of coincidence, the substitution of emotions for facts, and the desire for the miraculous have in no way decreased in recent years."

Recommendations made in the survey by Dr. Grant and Miss Bartlett included establishment of a Federal information center, wider use of the facilities of national Government agencies, and coordination of efforts by official agencies, voluntary health organizations, and professional and medical societies. In addition, the report proposed extended public and professional education about treatment methods by such groups as the American Cancer Society and public meetings designed to expose worthless health practices.

The A.C.S. places emphasis on action at the local level. "It is in the local community that the cancer victim and his family first come in contact with cancer nostrums," said Dr. Grant and Miss Bartlett in a recent issue of *Ca,* a cancer journal of clinicians. "This can be devastating, for it is at this time that most lives are either lost or saved from cancer."

A recent example of action at the local level was the Seattle conference on health and frauds and quackery and an exhibit at that city's Pacific Science Center that ran for two weeks. Dr. Harry E. Worley of Mount Vernon, conference chairman, told Medical Tribune that 475 physicians, educators, legislators, and others attended the sessions. About 10,000 others from all parts of the state visited the exhibit and its areas devoted to current frauds in health foods and nutrition, cancer cures, and remedies for arthritis.

Summarizing trends indicated at the conference, Dr. Worley observed that quackery directed to the elderly "seems to be increasing." He added: "More and more older people have medical problems, such as arthritis, and there is a greater competition for their dollars."

But a historian of the subject, James Harvey Young, Ph.D., of Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., told Medical Tribune that the restrictions on large-scale fraudulent enterprise resulting from the Kefauver-Harris amendments may have cut "the statistical size of quackery" in comparison with a decade ago. Device quackery appears somewhat reduced, and the cancer situation may be generally better in view of the decision forbidding interstate shipment of Krebiozen, he said.

"Nevertheless, as things now stand," he continued, "fraudulent advertisers are more clever and understand the psychological motivations of their prey better than do those who issue warning. It should be said though that the rediscovery of quackery in the 1950s and the 1962 legislation do, to some extent, put a lower ceiling on the possibilities of such fraud."

Regardless of any gains, Dr. Young said, he does not expect the end of quackery in the foreseeable future. There have been gullible people and shrewd promoters throughout history, he commented, and the mechanism that leads the former to victimization by the latter is complex. A forthcoming study of the subject by the FDA and six other agencies may prove helpful, he said, but its results are at best some years away.

In a recent examination of the multiple reasons people are deceived by medical quackery, Dr. Viola W. Bernard, director of the division of community psychiatry, Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, observed that susceptibility to false lures may be intensified by "the brevity of contact and impersonality that has come to characterize a good deal of modern medical practice." She suggested that "personal relationship between doctor and patient provides a potentially strategic opportunity at time of illness for meeting the related emotional needs of the patient and thereby reducing his turning toward quackery."

The Arthritis Foundation estimated last year that arthritis victims spent about $250,000,000 a year on misrepresented drugs, devices, and treatments. The estimate this year is $310,000,000.

INTEREST RATES ON TIME DEPOSITS AND CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the hearings held last week on S. 3687, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter written by Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to me printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Under Secretary
of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1966.

The Honorable A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On Thursday, August 4, 1966, in testimony before your Committee, Senator Proxmire asked me the following question: "Yes, Mr. Barr, as I understand it, at one point the House Banking Committee passed a proposal to have a flat limitation of 4½ percent on the interest payments. Was that to apply to negotiable certificates of deposit and what other savings instruments?"

I answered: "Yes, sir; on all time and savings accounts, which would include negotiable certificates of deposit."

I evidently thought that Senator Proxmire used the term "considered" rather than "passed" because my answer as printed is not correct. The correct answer is as follows:

"Senator Proxmire, the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported H.R. 14026 which provides for a temporary one-year ceiling of 4½ percent on time deposits below $100,000. Negotiable certificates of deposit are normally denominated in amounts of $100,000 or more so H.R. 14026 as reported would not have an appreciable impact on negotiable C.D.'s."

I regret this misunderstanding, and I regret that neither I nor the Treasury staff caught this error before the Record was printed.

* * * * *

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Barr.

AGRICULTURE EXPORTS—VITAL FOR FOOD AND FREEDOM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American farmer has demonstrated his ability to produce, and one of the problems that is now confronting agriculture is to find markets equal to our productive capacity.

We have been making progress in both domestic and foreign markets, but there is still much to be done.

In 1954 our total agricultural exports were only $2.9 billion—in 1964 they had risen to about $6.1 billion—more than doubled—and in the 1965–66 fiscal year, our exports exceeded $6.5 billion. Four and a half billion dollars of our export agricultural crop was for dollars and our agricultural exports have increased faster than our other exports. Today the United States leads all other countries in agricultural exports.

Mr. President, Representative Robert Dole, of the First Congressional District of Kansas, spoke at the annual convention of the Missouri Farmers Association and the Midcontinent Farmers Association at Columbia, Mo., on August 8. He discussed agriculture exports, which are vital for both food and freedom.

Representative Dole is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and is one of the outstanding authorities in Congress on farm legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech he delivered at the Missouri Farmers Association and Midcontinent Farmers Association annual convention on August 8 be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Agriculture Exports—Vital for Both Food and Freedom

It is indeed a great pleasure to be here today on the program with my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Agriculture, Paul Jones, and our Vice President.

It has been a genuine pleasure to serve with Paul the past six years. We may differ from time to time—not often—and as you know, he is a most effective and constructive member of our Committee.

Today I would like to discuss a very important bill that is pending in the Senate after passing the House. I am, of course, referring to H.R. 14929, the "Food For Freedom" Bill.

Before going into some of the details on this legislation, permit me to spend just a few minutes going over a few basic facts concerning the importance of, and the details concerning, our various agricultural export programs.

IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Every American, farmer and non-farmer, should recognize the vital contribution that agricultural exports make to our balance of payments. Farm exports represent about one-fourth of all our merchandise exports. They have been rising quite rapidly the past decade. If agricultural exports had not risen but had held stable, the deficit in our balance of payments last year would have been twice as big as it was and the threat to our economic stability that much greater.

To the agricultural sector itself, exports are becoming of increasing importance. About 85 percent of our farm production is consumed domestically and the rest goes abroad. But with a high national income and most people in the U.S. eating just about what they want to eat, the domestic market for farm products expands slowly, about in line with the increase in population. The demand for food is rising much more rapidly in the rest of the world. Thus agricultural exports have become the fastest growing point in the outlets available to our producers. Exports of agricultural products by the United States in Fiscal Year 1965–66 are estimated to be the highest in history. The estimate of about $6½ billion, or even more, for this Fiscal Year exceeds export records set in each of the two previous years by at least $½ billion.

How far have we traveled? Few farmers realize today that from 1929 through 1944, a period of 16 years, our exports of wheat, for example, averaged only 65 million bushels annually. In 8 of those years, our exports were less than 50 million bushels, and the all-time low was in 1935 when only 7 million bushels were exported. You perhaps also know that the United States was able to produce 1 billion bushels of wheat or more only once prior to 1944, and that since 1944, we have failed to produce 1 billion bushels in only four years; and in each of these years, production was in excess of 900 million bushels. During World War II and the years immediately after, conditions in the wheat market were not normal, and I believe some comparisons starting in 1952, to the present, will be of interest.

To begin with, the domestic disappearance of wheat, including that used for food, seed, in industry and the amount used for feed both on the farm and in commercial feeds, in 1952 was 660.7 million bushels. Gradually down through the years, this total decreased until it reached 580.8 million bushels in 1963. Then with lower price supports, the amount of wheat fed to livestock jumped to an estimated 100 million bushels in 1965 and total domestic disappearance came to 687 million bushels.

Even at that domestic disappearance of wheat was only 26.3 million bushels more in 1965 than in 1952—and 1965 was by far the best year for domestic use in the 13 years. The big increase experienced in the marketing of wheat has been in exports.

While exports have increased markedly since 1952, dollar sales have remained relatively stable. In 1952, for example, 318 million bushels of wheat were exported. The amount sold for dollars in that year was valued at approximately 288 million dollars. In 1956 exports were about 550 million bushels but dollar sales were valued at only 174 million dollars. In 1960 exports rose to 661 million bushels, but the value of dollar sales remained relatively stable at 204 million dollars. In 1962 exports of wheat rose to 642 million bushels, but the value of dollar sales was down to 153 million dollars. In 1963 dollar sales went up because of the huge sales to Russia, but other than that year, 1963, dollar sales have not been higher than they were in 1952.

It would seem obvious, therefore, that our wheat surplus pile has been cut down not so much by a reduction in production as an increase in use of wheat—and the big increase in use has been in exports and the big increase in exports has been the aid programs, particularly P.L. 480. The export momentum has been building up since "480" was enacted in 1954, and "480" sales have helped to develop dollar sales as countries—Japan is the outstanding example—got on their feet with U.S. aid and then were able to enter the regular market for grain.

Yes, the program has been effective, but costly. No other nation has been as generous with its food supplies and, while we will continue this generosity, members on our Committee, Paul Jones and myself included, are insisting that some countries do more to help themselves and that other free world countries provide more food aid.

With this bit of background, let me again say that exports prospects have improved materially since last fall, due primarily to a step-up in exports of feed grains, wheat, oilseeds, and oilseed products and all of these commodities are important to Missouri and Midwest farmers.

As previously stated, the value of farm products exported by the United States in 1965–66 came to 6½ billion dollars—more than double the value sent abroad in 1953–54—the year before P.L. 480 shipments started.

TYPES OF EXPORT PROGRAMS

Farm products are exported from the United States under 3 general sales methods: (1) Commercial exports or dollar sales without export subsidies; (2) Commercial exports with export subsidies; and (3) Exports under specified government-financed programs.

Commercial exports without export subsidies refer to dollar sales of commodities which are fully competitive in world markets, such as soybeans, corn, and cattle hides.

Commercial exports with export subsidies refer to exports of certain U.S. price-supported commodities which will not move in international trade without some form of compensation. This compensation is provided to the exporter who purchases at the higher domestic price and sells in foreign markets at the lower world price. The government assistance to the exporter is the difference between the higher domestic price and the lower world price, either with cash, payments-in-kind, or sales of government stock below domestic prices. Cotton is an example of a commodity requiring export assistance. Under present price support legislation, this commodity, beginning with the 1966 crop, will be at about world price levels, and export subsidies are expected to be sharply reduced.

Exports under specified government programs, often referred to as "Food-For-Peace" or concessional sales, include (1) sales for foreign currency, (2) donations, (3) barter, and (4) long-term supply and dollar credit sales.

In Fiscal Year 1965 about one-fourth of the agricultural products exported by the United States were shipped under government-financed programs, primarily Public Law 480. Exports under such programs amounted to $1.7 billion.

Wheat and wheat flour shipments accounted for most of the exports under government programs. In the year ending June 30, 1965, wheat and flour made up 60 percent of the government program exports. Of the 1.2 billion dollars worth of wheat and wheat flour exported, 1 billion dollars worth was in some form of aid to the developing countries. Five years ago, the ratio of government-financed exports of wheat and flour was about the same, but the quantity of exports was then almost one-third less.

There is no question that exports of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans will expand in the coming years. Food aid to friendly developing nations will grow. And economic growth abroad is rapidly increasing commercial demand.

WHICH NATIONS RECEIVE U.S. FARM PRODUCTS

Fifteen countries received almost three-fourths of total U.S. exports of farm products in Fiscal Year 1964–65. Japan, as indicated earlier, has become our best customer and in Fiscal Year 1965 purchased 750 million dollars worth of agricultural products from the United States. Japan is now the largest cash buyer of farm products from the United

States. In Fiscal Year 1966, agricultural exports to Japan came to nearly 1 billion dollars, almost one-half billion above the next ranking country—India. India received over 500 million dollars worth of farm products in Fiscal Year 1965, but most of this was exported under government-financed programs. Right now we are sending a million tons of grain to India each month and nearly all of that for practical purposes is a gift. Japan's purchases also exceed by more than a half billion both the Netherlands and Canada—the second and third ranking countries in terms of cash purchases.

In this list of the top 15 countries receiving U.S. agricultural exports are the 6 member countries of the European Economic Community. The EEC countries received almost one-fourth of our total agricultural exports in Fiscal Year 1965, and almost a third of the dollar sales, about the same share as 5 years ago. The value of our farm products exported to the EEC has increased by over $200 million in the past 5 years. Much of the credit for this achievement very properly goes to men dedicated to agriculture, such as your own president, Fred Heinkel, who has worked closely with the Herter Committee in the Kennedy round of GATT Negotiations.

MAJOR EXPORT CROPS

Of the 10 major U.S. agricultural products exported in 1965, four commodities—wheat, soybeans, corn and barley—are of special interest to producers here in Missouri. Two of these products—wheat and soybeans—are right up at the top of the list. Over half of all sales of wheat and soybeans were sold to foreign markets in 1965. Corn and barley are farther down the list, but a sizable share was also sold through export channels. Compared with recent years, a larger proportion of our soybean and corn crops are moving abroad.

LOOKING AHEAD

Further substantial increases are in prospect for agricultural exports in the next several years. Many of the same forces contributing to expansion in recent past years will continue—growing populations and expanding demand will boost exports to developed countries and P.L. 480 recipients. If the trends of recent years continue, by 1970, U.S. exports of wheat and flour may average more than 1 billion bushels yearly—15 percent above the Fiscal Year 1966 estimate. U.S. exports of feed grains may approach 40 million short tons—over two-fifths larger than we expect to export in the Fiscal Year 1966. U.S. exports of soybeans may reach 375 million bushels—nearly half again as much as estimated for the Fiscal Year 1966.

It is clear that Missouri farmers will play an important role in these future export gains.

PENDING LEGISLATION

Now then, let's take a look at the legislation pending in Congress this year. Time, of course, won't permit me to discuss all the details involved, but I would like to touch on the major points of the bill and then devote the balance of my remarks to an amendment which I sponsored known as the "Farmer-to-Farmer" Program or the "Bread and Butter Crops."

The bill, which is now pending in the Senate Agriculture Committee, carries these main provisions:

(1) It extends P. L. 480 for another two years;

(2) It authorizes $3.3 billion per year for concessional sales and donations programs;

(3) It changes the concept of "surplus" which has been embodied in the act since 1954 to a concept of "available";

(4) It places heavy policy emphasis on self-help—particularly agricultural self-help—in underdeveloped countries;

(5) It recognizes the world population problems and offers the ways and means to implement family planning by those individuals and foreign governments voluntarily wishing to cope with population growth;

(6) It retains the friendly nation concept which prohibits U.S. food aid to the governments of communist countries and other nations acting against our interests in South Viet Nam;

(7) It emphasizes market development for U.S. farm commodities overseas;

(8) It accelerates a shift away from soft currency sales and toward dollar sales;

(9) It protects American citizens in foreign nations from expropriation.

(10) Last, but not least, it establishes within the USDA the authority for a farmer-to-farmer program.

Last fall, after returning from the Food and Agricultural Organization's 20th Anniversary Conference in Rome, Italy, where it was my privilege to serve as a Congressional adviser representing the House, I began to explore the feasibility of expanded U.S. technical assistance in the area of agricultural production and distribution. I talked with many people in and out of government on this problem and, when the Committee began its hearings with 10 outstanding public witnesses, their comments stressed the need for increased technical assistance. Meanwhile, I wrote to each state extension director and president of every land-grant college to solicit their comments and suggestions on how to best meet the growing world food problem. As a result of these contacts and the advice from my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle in the Committee on Agriculture, I introduced H.R. 13753, a bill to establish a "Bread and Butter Corps" on March 17, 1966. My proposal was considered at length by the Committee. It was revised, amended, and finally included as sections 406 and 105(i) of H.R. 14929.

DO WE NEED A BETTER COORDINATED AND ACCELERATED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM?

One need only look at the arithmetic of world population growth to get part of the answer. In 15 years, by 1980, present population trends indicate an increase in world population of one billion people. By the beginning of the 21st century, only 34 years from now, world population is expected to double. In Latin America, Asia, and Africa, the growth rate is much more rapid, and in a number of countries in these areas, their populations will double within 20 years.

In 1850 there were 750 million people in the world; in 1900 there were 1.5 billion; in 1960 there were 3 billion. In 2000, if present trends continue, there will be 7.5 billion.

Continuation of present trends in India will mean a population increase from 432.7 million in 1960 to 1,233.5 billion by the year 2000 (In other words, nearly triple). If India's birth rate is cut in half, her population by the year 2000 is expected to more than double to 908 million.

The hearings also revealed the cold, brutal and realistic fact that the United States and other developed countries will not be able to feed and clothe the unborn millions who are destined to populate the earth in the next few decades. Therefore, the clear mandate exists that we must do everything within our power to assist these people to help themselves meet their own basic needs if world peace and stability is to be maintained.

Another reason the technical assistance "know how" and "show how", self-help effort should be expanded is that when one looks to what currently is being done in this area, it shapes up as being really quite modest. For example, the FAO of the United Nations carries on a technical assistance program throughout the world.

As you may know, there are some 112 nations that belong to FAO, but do you have any idea how many people, how many actual individuals are in the field working in these projects? The fact is there are about 250. In other words, about 2 people per country, or put another way—the 250 people that FAO has in the field could easily get lost getting off the boat in Calcutta, India. When it comes to the AID technical assistance activities, testimony in our Committee indicated that there are in the aggregate about 1,000 such persons. Looking again at the massive scope of the problem and the size in populations of the nations which need this assistance, the present thousand people represent virtually a drop in the bucket in this effort. The Peace Corps, which carries a heavy emphasis on young people who are idealistically motivated, does not possess the agricultural expertise and knowledge that is of practical and substantive assistance in getting the results that are required if a world food and population crisis is to be averted.

Finally when expressed in just dollars and cents, the allocation of a small portion (1 percent under the bill) of our financial resources to self-help and local agricultural improvement programs will, in my opinion, prove to be a very good investment in the long run. It certainly will be less expensive to American taxpayers if India, for example, is able to meet most of here own food needs, rather than relying on the United States indefinitely for outright food gifts or quasi-gifts made under Title 1 local currency and long-term dollar credit sales agreements.

WHAT'S NEW AND WHAT'S OLD ABOUT THIS PROVISION?

During the hearings, almost every witness indicated the need for increasing our technical assistance to developing countries; however, there was nothing in the Administration Bill being considered which would do this. As this proposal has been debated, some have asked, "What is new about it?"

In the first place, "new" has been defined as something "old" that everybody has forgotten about; and in farm legislation it often is quite difficult to find proposals that are absolutely unique and original.

The concept of technical assistance is certainly one which has been around for a long time within the framework of our agricultural and foreign policies. The technical assistance program (Point IV) during President Truman's Administration, the International Voluntary Service Program of the Eisenhower Administration, and the Peace Corps of President Kennedy's Administration have all incorporated this concept to some extent. In addition, various foreign assistance activities administered by AID have been directed toward the expansion of American "know how" and "show how" throughout the world.

What then is new about this program? Actually, I believe, there are two basic innovations which have been implemented in this legislation. The first is better coordination. The second is the structuring of this program through land-grant colleges and other universities.

COORDINATION

The Coordination Effort proposed by Section 406 is directed first at the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself. The technical assistance program would be located in and under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. The Department would have the responsibility of coordination of the activities of the Federal Extension Service which includes the 4–H Club Program, the Federal-State Cooperative Research Service, and the Foreign Agricultural Service, together with other useful and appropriate agencies. Second, the legislation contemplates the coordination of this type of technical assistance within the framework of the U.S. Government. The Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to consult and cooperate with the Director of the Peace Corps, the Administrator of AID, and the Secretary of State. In establishing this line of coordination, it is contemplated that any personnel who are trained and prepared for overseas service could be made available to agencies other than the USDA (or vice versa) if the President thought their services would be more valuable with some other agency. Also, the legislation is directed toward preserving the traditional responsibility and authority for the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country to continue to be lodged in the hands of the Secretary of State.

Thus, the first point is coordination. Coordination, I have found, is weak in some areas at the present time. Coordination within the Department of Agriculture and within our Government will, I hope, more efficiently and effectively channel the export of our most valuable commodity—American agricultural genius.

THE ROLE OF LAND-GRANT AND OTHER COLLEGES

The second part of this proposal, which is new, is the structuring of the major responsibility through land-grant colleges and other institutions of higher learning. On a contract or grant basis, these colleges would have three responsibilities. The first would be to train or retrain people who are either skilled in agricultural science and have a formal education in agriculture or home economics or to prepare practical farmers, farm wives, or others who have a workable knowledge of farming and home economics for service overseas.

This effort, as I contemplate it, would be conducted by the colleges themselves and would not require the Federal Government to establish expensive new facilities or hire faculties or instructors to perform these educational services.

The second function would be to establish agricultural institutes—more like short courses in practical agriculture—both here in the United States and overseas. These specialized agricultural institutes would be directed toward the training of persons who serve as volunteers in this program and foreign nationals. To the maximum extent possible, foreign currencies generated by the sale of farm commodities would be earmarked for the payment of expenses incidental to the conduct of these activities.

The third function would be to conduct selective research activities in conjunction with the agricultural institutes, emphasizing tropical and subtropical agriculture. During the hearings, one of the points made by several of the expert witnesses the Committee heard was that there is a real lack of first-class localized research facilities in tropical and subtropical areas. Many times the technology of the north temperate zone of the Globe is not readily and feasibly transferred to a tropical area. Again, using local currencies as much as possible, it seems feasible to concentrate on localized conditions and then demonstrate to the agricultural industry in the recipient country the value of this new technology.

SUMMARY

In summary, the concept embodied by my amendment to H.R. 14929 is something old, but also something new. It takes the concept of technical assistance, coordinates it within the USDA, and within the U.S. Government. It is structured through the land-grant and other colleges to provide training programs, the establishment of agricultural institutes and research and demonstration activities designed to meet man's most basic need—the need for food—a need which, if unsatisfied, could lead to the destruction of world peace.

I would certainly hope that Missouri farmers will take an active interest in this program. With your help, it can become a reality and an effective instrument to meeting some of the many challenges that lie ahead for our country. Thank you.

DISSENT—FREE SPEECH ON THE CAMPUS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, while our Nation's papers daily report details of the dissent of our citizens it seems appropriate to invite my colleague's attention to a speech by Michigan's distinguished Attorney General Frank Kelley.

Addressing a freedom forum at Albion College in May, Attorney General Kelley made one of the best arguments for dissent I have ever heard.

Recognizing that free speech carries with it responsibility—and civil disobedients must be willing to bear the consequences of their acts—he also points out the fallacy of the "book-banners" and "mind censors."

Mr. President, I would do a disservice to a thoughtful, well-organized speech if I attempted to summarize it further. May I instead, ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in full in the Record and commend it to all.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dissent in Democracy: Free Speech on the Campus

(By Attorney General Frank J. Kelley, at Albion College Freedom Forum)

Somewhere in the dark caverns of time an ape-like man turned his back on the tribe with which he was living and refused to go along with a plan, perhaps to kill the occupants of the next cave, or perhaps he decided to wear an animal skin instead of going around unclothed as had been the custom. And in these acts the long history of dissent began.

Indeed, each new chapter in the history of mankind had begun with a dissent, whether it be storming the Bastille, firing at the ramparts of Fort Sumter, attacking the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg, or sitting in the *front* of the bus in Atlanta. Dissent is the great fermenter of history. Without it our institutions, our social orders, our governments would have remained stagnant and would have drowned in the heavy quicksand of their own immobility.

Thus, dissent is neither alien nor unwelcome. It is natural, and there should be no more natural place for dissent than in a democracy, unless it be on a campus in a democracy. Our colleges and universities, which provide the depositories of our knowledge and the proving ground for our new ideas, must inexorably be bound up with both the substance and the mechanism of dissent. After all, if not here, where?

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, formerly President of the University of Chicago, underlined the role of dissent on the campus when he testified as follows in 1952 before a House Committee:

"* * * a university is a place that is established and will function for the benefit of society, provided it is a center of independent thought. It is a center of independent thought and criticism that is created in the interest of the progress of society, and the one reason that we know that every totalitarian government must fail is that no totalitarian government is prepared to face the consequences of creating free universities.

"Education is a kind of continuing dialogue, and a dialogue assumes, in the nature of the case, different points of view.

"The civilizations which I work and which I am sure every American is working toward, could be called a civilization of the dialogue, where instead of shooting one another when you differ, you reason things out together.

"In this dialogue, then, you cannot assume that you are going to have everybody thinking the same way or feeling the same way. It would be unprogressive if that happened. The hope of eventual development would be gone. More than that, of course, it would be very boring.

"A university, then, is a kind of continuing Socratic conversation on the highest level for the very best people you can think of, you can bring together, about the most important questions, and the thing that you must do to the uttermost possible limits is to guarantee those men the freedom to think and to express themselves."

It seems to me that the point that colleges and universities are the most natural places for dissent is hardly arguable. But if that is so, why is Albion College devoting its prestigious and nationally-recognized Freedom Forum to the topic "Dissent in Democracy" with special emphasis on Dissent on the Campus? And why have you been able to attract so many keenly concerned spokesmen for so many important viewpoints and organizations?

I believe that the answer to that question lies in concern with what we dissent *about*, and *why* we go about dissenting. In other words, the subject matter of the dissent and the method of dissent represent the crux of this controversey, not the principle of dissent itself.

As a background for our observations, it would be helpful for us to remember the words of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. They provide in pertinent part: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech * * *."

The cases which have interpreted the scope of the First Amendment's protection of freedom of speech have indicated the broad nature of that protection. In the first place, it has been determined by the court that the right of freedom of speech which the First Amendment protects (from abridgment by Congress) is among those fundamental rights and liberties protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment from impairment by a state or by an agency of the state (such as, a state university).

It is also important to know that the United States Supreme Court has recognized that the First Amendment does not speak equivocally, and has ruled that it is to be taken as a command of the *broadest* scope that explicit language read in the context of a liberty-loving society will allow. Nor will the Supreme Court allow evasion by devious means; it has ruled that regulatory measures, no matter how sophisticated, will be struck down if their purpose is to suppress rights guaranteed by the First Amendment.

In a series of important cases, the Court has ruled that the right of free speech and free press is not confined to any field of human interest; that under the First Amendment the public has a right to every man's views, and every man the right to speak them; and that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable aspect of freedom of speech.

Now, these are broad and meaningful interpretations by the highest court of our land. Are there, then, judicially drawn limits to this broadly stated freedom? The answer is "yes," but they are carefully limited. The restrictions allowed are those necessary to the maintenance of a civilized society. And the power of the state to abridge the freedom of speech is held to be the exception rather than the rule.

"The clear and present danger rule," first enunciated by Justice Holmes in 1920, and amplified by Justice Brandeis and by other justices more recently, states essentially that the First Amendment provides protection for utterances so that printed or spoken words may not be the subject of prior restraint or punishment unless its expression creates a clear and present danger about a substantive evil which the government has power to prohibit. In other words, the government may not cut off a man's right to speak his views unless his words threaten clearly and imminently to ripen into conduct against which the public has a right to protect itself.

Very recently, within the last couple of years, the United States Supreme Court has even more sharply defined the broad scope of the First Amendment. It has been held that the First Amendment secures the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources, as well as freedom of expression on public questions; and further that the First Amendment requires that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide open. Such debate, the court has held, may well include *vehement, caustic,* and *sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials.* And, finally, that the protection given free speech and the press by the federal constitution was fashioned to assure unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people, and such protection does not turn upon the truth, popularity, or social utility of the ideas or beliefs offered.

These ringing statements by our highest court indicate that we have a legal tradition that jealously guards the right to dissent. They give broad protection both of the *subject matter* and the *method* of dissent. As to the method of dissent, the Court has held that freedom of speech is not limited to a particular medium of expression. The right to express one's views in an orderly fashion extends to the communication of ideas by handbills, by literature, by peaceful picketing, and by other means.

Certainly, such a wide-ranging legal tradition for our society as a whole suggests that the widest possible freedom for dissent be maintained for our colleges and universities wherein lies the vanguard of thought for our society.

But, unfortunately, there are those self-appointed guardians of the political faith of our students who feel compelled to attempt to impose their myopic restraints upon their would-be wards. They seek to build a Berlin-like wall around the marketplace of ideas which is the campus, and they hope by so doing to lock out what *they* consider to be poisonous ideas.

If they cannot burn the books, they attempt to ban them. They seek to bar the university's facilities from use by "controversial" speakers. When students organize and speak out and debate, these would-be censors of the mind fairly writhe in righteous indignation. They want the student to learn, but only so much; to listen, but only partly; to inquire, but only up to a point. In other words, they want these students to be just like them, to be their replicas, to think as they do, to act just as they would. There can be only one rejoinder to the horrendous possibility—"heaven forbid." These timid censors of the mind apparently have so little faith in the capacity and judgment of today's college population that they fear their exposure to any ideas which do not conform to their own narrow norm.

I do not believe that our present student population can be stereotyped in this fashion. Yesterday's stereotypes must be distinguished from the facts; just as some attempt to put students into a category of non-thinking, pleasure-seeking individuals, so are there those today who continue to use the trite dichotomy about the special interests of business and labor. All of business, in their view, is only concerned with profits and reactionary policies to support them, and all of labor is interested only in furthering its own goals. The truth is that business and labor are working closely together on many fronts to further the social and economic progress of the nation.

Just as the facts prove that these old stereotypes are wrong, so do the facts prove the censors of the mind wrong when they have no faith in our student population.

It is my belief that our current university generation displays an unprecedented maturity of judgment, an unparalleled awareness of the problems of our time, and an unmatched concern for their fellow man. Certainly, they evidence a greater awareness of the world around them than we, their fathers and their grandfathers, whose main collegiate concern were the raccoon coat, goldfish, and a bottle of hootch.

This maturity is indicated not only in the active dissent on the campus but in the reaction of other students to the dissenting activities of their fellows. John Pemberton, Jr., Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, who is a guest at today's Forum, has noted:

"It is to the credit of the student generation that the response of their 'hawks' to petitions, pamphlets, and demonstrations to end United States involvement in the Vietnam war has taken the form of counterpetitions, pamphlets and demonstrations more often than an attempt to repress the protest of the 'doves.'

Mr. Pemberton sees in this a positive effect on our society. He says:

"The new assertiveness of the student movement and the responsive chord heard from many of the students' elders may foreshadow an enlarged determination by citizens to use those rights essential to the working of self-government—to use them in the definition, analysis and resolution of matters, which, as consumers of government they find to be most urgent today.

"This is important not merely because it promises to resist tensions which work toward contraction of these right and liberties. Its importance lies in the necessity for procedures of self-government to be made to work effectively, so as to solve novel problems of enormous potential for social dislocation."

Nor is this evidence of dissent on the campus limited to the students. The faculties of many of our schools are intimately involved in various protests. Mr. Russell Kirk, a leading conservative, discussed this phenomenon in last Sunday's *New York Times Magazine.* He asked:

"Should the scholar give primacy to our present discontents? Should he issue manifestoes and fulminations on the principle issues of foreign affairs, protest and demonstrate, league himself with party and faction, offer a confident prescription for the woes of all the world?"

From the way he asked these questions you can judge that Kirk's personal answer is "no." He finds the professors' invasion of the world of discontent to be unseemingly and to put him in the class of an "ideologue" instead of a scholar. He describes an ideologue as a "political dogmatic hotly seeking his particular Utopia." He says that by his nature "the scholar is not calculated for direct action, nor is the professor endowed with the talents of neither lion or fox." And then, characteristically, Mr. Kirk quotes Nietzsche who said: "In politics, the professor always plays the comic role." I very seldom agree with Nietzsche, and this is no exception; and by the same token I cannot agree with Mr. Kirk. I believe that the scholar must be a vital part of his time, and, therefore, of necessity, he must participate in the day-to-day stresses and strains, and join, when moved, to dissent. Too long have the inhabitants of the ivory towers of academia been dropouts from the dialogues of the real world. Those who refuse to join the realities of today are in my view, not meeting their full responsibility.

In doing so, the university community must, in the words of John Kenneth Galbraith, spoken in Michigan just the other day, adopt "a few rules of sound political behavior."

"Men of substantial intellectual qualification should not imitate the tendencies of government officials, in whom error is a good deal more forgivable, by allowing themselves to be overcome by their own wishes.

"To identify oneself dramatically with an idea is not to serve it."

So what we need from the academicians is not only a commitment, but one which fits their responsibility and their intellectual maturity.

The point of all of this is that we should encourage diversity, not stifle it. The surest road to national ruin is that which follows the path of conformity. Free speech on the campus is one of the most reliable antidotes to such conformity.

Now, it is easy for those of you who are students to nod your consent to what has been said. I am sure that you want your full measure of rights, including freedom of speech. But if you are as mature as I contend you are, you also realize that freedom of speech carries with it a great measure of responsibility upon the individual who utilizes it. The capricious use of this freedom is detrimental to the freedom itself and in the long run is self-erosive.

As one who is sworn to uphold the law, and devoted to the rule of law as opposed to the rule of men, I cannot condone deliberate violations of the law which utilize freedom of speech as a cloak of self-protection. For instance, where it is possible to march in a parade in order to voice some kind of dissent, or to pass out leaflets, or to make a public speech, I feel that it is neither necessary nor legal to sit down in the middle of a busy street and block traffic. Where legal and effective channels for the expression of dissent exist, they must be used.

But is there a situation where one is justified in breaking a law which he considers unjust, and can he be protected under the doctrine of free speech when he does? Philosophers for thousands of years have debated the principle of civil disobedience. Thoreau and Gandhi, in more recent times, have expressed important views on this subject. Does an individual have a *right* to engage in civil disobedience when the law in question violates his own conscience, or what he regards as the natural law?

There are some who answer that question, "yes." Harrop A. Freeman, a Cornell University authority on constitutional law, claims that civil disobedience is a recognized procedure to challenge the law and to obtain court rulings. He says, therefore, that he "cannot see any reason for jail sentences, or sentences more severe than for those challenging law for other reasons" (for example, as when a person violates a contract in order to litigate its legality). Freeman, therefore, contends that civil disobedience should be given the protection of the First Amendment.

I cannot agree. I believe that one who violates the law must be prepared to accept the consequences. Listen to what Bayard Rustin, the civil rights leader who organized the Freedom March in Washington, has to say on the subject. Rustin contends that no one has the *right* to civil disobedience. Rather, he says, the individual has a *duty* to himself to engage in civil disobedience when the law violates his own conscience, or what he regards as the natural law. Rustin states that unless we accept the doctrine of the duty of civil disobedience, we cannot condemn the Nazi leaders whose argument was that they were merely following orders from above when they murdered millions of people in the name of the Third Reich.

But, he adds, the person who engages in civil disobedience must be prepared cheerfully to accept the consequences. He says:

"When the policeman taps me on the shoulder and says, 'You are under arrest,' I believe I strengthen my ability to educate the people in the South who disagree with me by answering, 'Yes, officer, I have broken the law because I believe it is wrong. I am perfectly willing to go with you. I don't want you to carry me.' And when I get to the judge, I want to say to him, 'I have done what society feels is wrong. I accept the punishment.' "

But while most of us would agree that the doctrine of free speech does not protect one engaged in civil disobedience, there are some who would refuse to permit the First Amendment's protection to be utilized by those who they consider to be spreading dangerous ideas. We need not look far for examples.

Less than 3 months ago, a majority of the Michigan State Senate passed a resolution seeking to bar Herbert Aptheker, Director of the Institute for Marxist Studies, from appearing on the campuses of our state universities. It was and is my opinion that this attempt to restrict freedom of speech was shocking, unwise, and illegal.

While the universities rejected the attempted intimidation and permitted Aptheker to speak, there were many who joined the chorus of those seeking to bar him. Their general theme was that while they believed that criticism of the American way of life should be permitted, Aptheker was, in his views particularly on Vietnam, attacking the very substance and security of our nation. On the day Aptheker was to speak in March, a newspaper said this:

"The sharpest criticism of the shortcomings if it serves to consolidate our society, to purify it, and strengthen it, has been, is, and will be, in every way encouraged. *But* criticism from positions of hostility and slander aimed at undermining the very foundations of our system and at sapping its strength has been, is, and, of course, will *always* be rebuffed."

The interesting fact, my friends, is that the quote I have just given was not from a Michigan newspaper giving arguments in favor of barring Aptheker from speaking on an American campus, but rather what I read you was a direct quote from *Pravda*, the official organ of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics, in defense of the Soviet Union's harsh punishment of two Russian writers who were charged, tried, found guilty, and imprisoned at hard labor for writing "anti-Soviet propaganda harmful to the Soviet people."

We condemn this kind of repression in the Soviet Union; dare we not condemn it here in this nation; indeed, in this very state?

So, it was very disturbing to note that support for the Senate's action came from high places. Our Governor said that while he agreed that the college presidents have the constitutional right to decide who speaks, he, himself, would probably have barred Aptheker as "a speaker who seeks to further the objectives of the Communist party."

As *The Detroit News* editorialized, "Even if that was Aptheker's purpose, isn't the Governor coming perilously close to the position of the Soviet Supreme Court in condemning those who don't think correct thoughts."

The case of Andrei Synyavski and Yuli Daniel, the two Russian writers, is a classic one of repression by the state of freedom of speech. We except this in a totalitarian regime, but we can neither approve nor permit similar repressions in our own nation.

Here on the beautiful campus of this excellent college, you have proven *your* devotion to free speech by the very creation and maintenance of these freedom forums. Let us ask the frightened few who tremble when the platforms of our universities are left open for all to ascend and speak—Do you really think that programs such as these, which permit the expression of divergent views, represent a danger to our youth and to our security? If you do, you have much less faith in the strength of our nation and our way of life than your super-patriotic posturings would indicate.

It is my personal belief that Mr. Gus Hall represents a party whose policies are determined by a foreign government for its own imperialistic interests. By the same token, it is my personal belief that Dr. van den Haag represents a point of view which is so disastrously reactionary that to adopt it would endanger over 30 years of social, economic, and political progress in this nation.

But, I believe that both of these men have a right to be heard. If there are some who do not wish to listen, so be it. But do not let them put their hands over the ears of others!

Let the ideas of all men pass through the ears and into the minds of all who are willing to listen. Our nation, our purpose, and our will, will be stronger for it.

Let us, in this nation, heed the plea made to his native India by the eloquent poet and philosopher, Rabindranath Tagore:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;

"Where knowledge is free;

"Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;

"Where words come out from the depth of truth;

"Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;

"Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;

"Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action—

"Into that haven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

Ladies and gentleman, *our* country *is* already awake; we can keep it that way only if we keep the doors to the mind open. Let that be our goal.

SECOND ANNUAL MAYORS PRAYER BREAKAST, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on March 3, 1966, the second annual mayors prayer breakfast was held in Chicago, Ill., with the mayor of Chicago, mayors of 31 Chicago area cities, and 1,000 in positions of leadership in attendance.

I understand that there have been 1,200 such mayors prayer breakfasts the past year and this event proved to be very meaningful, not only to those who gathered at the breakfasts, but also to millions of citizens across this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the program and the proceedings of this second annual prayer breakfast.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND ANNUAL CHICAGO MAYORS PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Presiding: Mr. John D. deButts, President of Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

Music: "God of our Fathers," the Northwestern University Glee Club, Mr. William Ballard, Director.

Invocation: Mr. William H. Avery, Attorney.

Old Testament Reading: Mr. Gardner H. Stein, President of Hillman's Inc.

New Testament Reading: Mr. William J. Quinn, President of the Milwaukee Road.

Solo: Mr. Glenn Jorian. Mr. Bud Kroedler, accompanist.

Remarks: The Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor of Chicago.

Message: General Harold K. Johnson, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff.

Closing Prayer: Mr. John H. Johnson, Publisher, *Ebony Magazine*.

Closing Song: "America the Beautiful," Northwestern University Glee Club.

Chairman JOHN D. DE BUTTS. The opening prayer will be offered by Mr. William H. Avery.

Mr. WILLIAM H. AVERY. Our Father, we thank Thee for Thy constant love, mercy and care. For Thy word through which we learn of Thee and Thy message. For Thy Son, Jesus Christ, through whom we seek Thy forgiveness of our sins of commission and omission and through whom we may be granted eternal life. For Thy priests and ministers, and for young people who are entering the ministry. We also thank thee, our Lord, for the freedom which we enjoy in this country of ours. And for the liberty which carries with it rights and privileges which we must exercise with responsibility as Christian citizens. For good health, which we usually appreciate only when we lose it. And for the multitude of opportunities which, we pray, we may realize and fulfill by serving Thee and our fellowman. We especially thank Thee for the opportunity to commune with Thee in prayer, in private or in a group as we do today. Our God, we pray for all mankind of every race and creed, knowing that all of us need Thee and through Thee may be reconciled with each other. For all who are in pain or in peril, at home or in foreign lands. For all persons who are in sorrow—that they may be comforted and strengthened. For all who are alone—knowing that through faith in Thee, one need never be alone. For Thy servants, that they may be sustained and inspired, despite all obstacles, burdens and disappointments. For all in positions of authority, that in exercising their authority, they may seek and do Thy will. And for all citizens, that we may have better insight and may realize the joy that comes in Thy service. Oh Lord, open our lives to Thee. Open our ears, that we may hear Thy message through Thy ministers and through the Holy Spirit, as we commune with Thee in prayer. Open our eyes to the manifestation of Thee, in all the wonders of nature, both on this earth and in space, which we are only beginning to penetrate, and in the lives of Thy servants.

Open our minds to Thy truth, as it may be revealed to us through the Bible, through science and through the experiences which we encounter in our daily lives. Open our hands and our hearts, that we may give back to Thee and share with others a substantial portion of what Thou hast bestowed on us. Open our mouths that we may carry Thy message to others. Finally, we rededicate ourselves to Thee, and Thy service. May we joyously and unconditionally surrender our lives to Thee . . . realizing that it is in loving Thee and doing Thy will that we fulfill the purpose for which we were created. All of which we ask in Christ's name. Amen.

Chairman DE BUTTS. On behalf of the 150 members of the Sponsoring Committee I am indeed happy to welcome you, one and all, to this continuation of what I consider an outstanding event in the civic and spiritual life of our metropolitan area.

Our gathering this morning, as many of you know from your attendance last year, is patterned after the Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast in Washington, D.C., a function which was begun several years ago by a weekly prayer breakfast that was held in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

Interest has grown immensely over the years and nowadays men like ourselves are holding similar events throughout the entire United States, and yes—even throughout the world.

We don't know what may come of this meeting or any meeting like it—where men seek to reaffirm their faith and their dedication to

God in daily life—public or private. Nor, do we necessarily look for any particular result from our once-a-year gathering.

Rather, we are a nucleus in the community of mankind, a group of citizens—including many leaders in social, political and economic endeavors—who wish to strengthen the spiritual foundations on which all our efforts must be based, if they are to be effective, lasting credits to our fleeting time on earth.

If this annual expression of our enduring faith in God helps us to become more aware of our responsibilities to our fellowmen, more conscious of the moral disciplines faith imposes upon us, and more able to inspire others with the spiritual rewards which come through faith—then we will know the true value of our meeting.

Let us now hear a reading from the Old Testament, which will be given by Mr. Gardner Stern, President of Hillman's, Inc.

Mr. GARDNER H. STERN. Isaiah, Chapter 58, Verses 1 through 14.

"Cry aloud, spare not, lift up your voice like a trumpet; declare to my people their transgression, to the house of Jacob their sins.

"Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as if they were a nation that did righteousness and did not forsake the ordinance of their God; they ask of me righteous judgments, they delight to draw near to God.

"Why have we fasted, and thou seest it not? Why have we humbled ourselves, and thou takest no knowledge of it? Behold, in the day of your fast you seek your own pleasure, and oppress all your workers.

"Behold, you fast only to quarrel and to fight and to hit with wicked fist. Fasting like yours this day will not make your voice to be heard on high.

"Is such the fast that I choose, a day for a man to humble himself? Is it to bow down his head like a rush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Will you call this a fast, and a day acceptable to the Lord?

"Is not this the fast that I choose: to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the thongs of the yoke, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke?

"Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover him, and not to hide yourself from your own flesh?

"Then shall your light break forth like the dawn and your healing shall spring up speedily; your righteousness shall go before you, the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard.

"Then you shall call, and the Lord will answer; you shall cry, and he will say, Here I am. If you take away from the midst of you the yoke, the pointing of the finger, and speaking wickedness, if you pour yourself out for the hungry and satisfy the desire of the afflicted, then shall your light rise in the darkness and your gloom be as the noonday.

"And the Lord will guide you continually, and satisfy your desire with good things, and make your bones strong; and you shall be like a watered garden, like a spring of water, whose waters fail not.

"And your ancient ruins shall be rebuilt; you shall raise up the foundations of many generations; you shall be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of streets to dwell in.

"If you turn back your foot from the sabbath, from doing your pleasure on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight and the holy day of the Lord honorable; if you honor it, not going your own ways, or seeking your own pleasure, or talking idly;

"Then you shall take delight in the Lord, and I will make you ride upon the heights of the earth; I will feed you with the heritage of Jacob your father, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken."

Chairman DE BUTTS. And now we will hear from Mr. William J. Quinn, who is President of the Milwaukee Road, and who will read a section from the New Testament scripture.

Mr. WILLIAM J. QUINN. Reading from the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, Chapter 13, Verses 1–13.

"Brethren, I may speak every language used by man or angel, but if I have not the gift of charity, I am nothing more than a blaring trumpet or a tinkling cymbal. I may have such gifts of prophecy that I know all mysteries and all that can be known. And I may have such perfect faith that I can move mountains. But if I have not charity, I am nothing. I may give away all my property to feed the poor and surrender my body to be burned—but if I have not charity, it is all worthless.

"Charity is patient. Charity is kind. Charity is not jealous. She is unassuming. She is not puffed up. She does nothing base. She does not pursue her own interests. She is not quick to anger. She does not remember an injury. She takes no delight in wickedness but finds her joy in true virtue. She is long suffering. She has faith. She hopes. She endures the end.

"Have you gifts of prophecy? They will come to an end. Have you the gift of languages? It will pass away. Have you the gift of knowledge? That, too will lose its value. For our knowledge is less than perfect, and our gifts of prophecy are less than perfect. And when that which is perfect arrives, all that is less than perfect will come to an end. Even so, when I was a child, I spoke as a child. I thought as a child. I reasoned as a child. But now that I am a man, I have no further use for my childhood ways. In this world, we see a vague reflection in a mirror—but hereafter we shall see face to face. In this world, I know less than perfectly. Hereafter I shall know just as I am known. In this world, there are three gifts which endure. Faith—Hope—Charity. And the greatest of the three is Charity."

Chairman DE BUTTS. And now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce a man who is known to everyone here as an outstanding civic administrator and public official, a man who has gained the admiration of everybody in this area—yes, throughout the entire nation—for his ability, his dedication and his unselfish devotion to the welfare of his city, a man to whom principle and high ideals are paramount—our Mayor of Chicago—The Honorable Richard J. Daley.

The Honorable RICHARD J. DALEY. Thank you very much. General Johnson, fellow mayors, ladies and gentlemen. This is another great day in the history of our city and our community, and all of us are better for attending this breakfast. If the spirit and the action of the Old Testament, as read by Gardner Stern, and the New Testament, as read by Bill Quinn, would be with us every moment of our daily lives, what a greater city we'd have and a greater country—a better country. And what a greater community.

I congratulate John de Butts and his fine committee, the founders of this breakfast. I congratulate you for your attendance. We all realize that we're human and that we make many, many mistakes in many, many years—in every hour of our lives. But with the constant use of prayer, we can, in my humble opinion, resolve much of the conflict and controversy into love and charity. You are better today for attending this affair. And may we take the theme of this breakfast with us and try to carry it out humbly and humanly as we live every minute of our lives.

Chairman DE BUTTS. Thank you very much, Mayor Daley. We are honored today, by the presence of a man with deep religious convictions—a man who has distinguished himself and his country many times. He has endured what most of us would consider the unendurable. And now he holds responsibility which few men are ever called upon to assume.

On July 3rd, in 1964—President Johnson designated him Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Our guest speaker is the youngest Chief of Staff since the late General Douglas MacArthur held the post.

Gentlemen, I am honored and extremely pleased to present to you one of the busiest men in the Pentagon—General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. General Johnson.

General HAROLD K. JOHNSON. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. de Butts, Mayor Daley. Just 27 days more than one year ago this morning, it was my great privilege to be the lay speaker at the Annual President's Prayer Breakfast in Washington. The prayer breakfasts, as some of you know, and I'm sure that many of you do not, are sponsored by International Christian Leadership.

My own association with International Christian Leadership has been only indirect. However, I can state categorically that it has only one objective and that is to turn men to God; to turn them to God—to seek advice when great wisdom is required—to seek comfort when in trouble—to seek strength to undertake or pursue difficult courses of action—and to seek a friend in those sometimes troubled periods when not a single friend appears to exist.

I have no reason to know why I was selected by the Committee for the Presidential Prayer Breakfast, except that a layman had not spoken for a number of years and a layman in a military uniform had never spoken. And I might say that my predecessor as a speaker was the Reverend Bill Graham and my successor as a speaker was the Reverend Billy Graham—and so apparently I didn't do very well. But as a result of that particular appointment two significant events have influenced my life. First, I became acquainted with the Executive Director Emeritus of International Christian Leadership and the founder of the movement, Dr. Abraham Vereide, who is now in his 80's.

He is the most remarkable and the most inspirational person that I have ever met. Any of you who have the privilege of knowing him I'm sure would agree—and any who don't—if you ever had the opportunity of meeting him—would be well served if you took advantage of that opportunity.

But the surprising thing to me was the quantity of mail that came in after that appearance and the bewildering thing was that people could be surprised that a man in uniform could express publicly his belief in Almighty God. And I simply can't understand this.

God is the soldier's refuge. God is the soldier's strength. God is the soldier's constant companion. It can't be any other way.

Now, not only must God be the soldier's constant companion, God must be a companion to all men. There can be no doubt in any man's mind, nor in any man's heart—that God is our sustenance and our strength. Each of us must believe wholeheartedly and fiercely in the power and the glory and the strength of Almighty God.

And I suppose, really, it would be more proper to say that each man must seek the companionship of God. Because, God is always there, always waiting, always filled with giving, if we will only seek his help.

Now each of us has a great variety of experiences that we recall from time to time. I know that I can vividly remember attending Sunday School and Church as a very young man and as a boy. I can recall a period of doubt and great inner anguish as I sought an eternal truth that is the illusive goal of all mankind, until they turn to God, until they make peace with themselves and until they establish some communication with their God. I can recall a period in 1931 when pacifist causes were springing up all over the United States and many of the church denominations were supporting those causes. And during one of the periods that a cadet in those days had summer leave from West Point, I removed my Certificate of Membership—church membership—from its frame on the wall in my room at home and I carried it back to my pastor.

Now I don't believe that I would take such an action today and I simply cite this as one evidence of this eternal struggle that goes on within each one of us all the time.

I can recall a Sunday morning in 1933, sitting with my father in a pew in a small Protestant Church in North Dakota. On this Sunday—the Sacrament of the Holy Communion was observed. And as my father arose and proceeded to the altar rail, he looked expectantly at me and I said, "I cannot." He didn't question me, because he felt my problems were my problems. We discussed this at great lengths, and my beliefs were my beliefs, not his.

And when the war broke out in 1941, the Philippine Scout Regiment, to which I was assigned, was about 97% Catholic, and as a result we had only Catholic Chaplains assigned. I'm a Protestant. Nonetheless, each of the Protestants in that Regiment turned to that Catholic Chaplain to help him reestablish his communication with his God.

Now I took my next Communion referring back to 1933, in far North Korea on Thanksgiving Day, 1950. Now I don't believe that I was an atheist or an agnostic during this period. As a matter of fact, I taught a Sunday School class while I was a student at the Armed Forces Staff College earlier in 1950. I simply describe my own circumstance, and forgive me for so much personal reference, but I describe it to make crystal clear what I believe to be a continuing competition between human appetites resulting in human misbehavior—human failure—and the always present, quiet, persuasive voice of God trying to guide us to the right path that we may contribute our part for the benefit of mankind.

Now what contribution can we make? The 12th Verse of the 7th Chapter of Matthew has a very simple answer.

"Treat other people exactly as you would like to be treated by them."

That's the way Phillips translates it. The St. James Version says this:

"Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law of the prophets."

And then Mark says, in the 43rd and 44th verses of the 10th Chapter:

"Whoever among you wants to be great must become the servant of you all; and if he wants to be first among you, he must be your slave."

One can ask, "What can a single person do?" I'd like to quote a short piece that has been attributed to many authors but none has been identified, to my knowledge, and this is called "One Solitary Life." I quote:

"Here is a man that is born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another obscure village. He worked in a carpenter shop until He was 30, and then for three years He was an itinerant preacher. He never wrote a book. He never held an office. He never went to college. He never put His foot inside a big city. He never traveled 200 miles from the place where He was born. He never did one of the things that usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but Himself. He had nothing to do with this world except the naked power of His divine manhood. While still a young man, the tide of popular opinion turned against Him. His friends ran away. One of them denied Him. He was turned over to His enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. His executioners gambled for the only piece of property He had on earth while He was dying—and that was His coat. When He was dead He was taken down and laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend."

And I continue to quote:

"Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone and today He is the centerpiece of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

"I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that ever were built, and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned, put together have not affected the life of man upon this earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life." End of quote.

Now while some among us may not subscribe to the Christian faith, I would like to quote from the 12th Chapter of the First Corinthians, Verses 4–11, and this comes from Phillips' translation.

"Men have different gifts, but it is the same Lord who is served. God works through different men in different ways, but it is the same God who achieves His Purposes through them all. Each man is given his gift by the Spirit that he may make the most of it. One man's gift by the Spirit is to speak with wisdom, another's is to speak with knowledge. The same Spirit gives to another man faith, to another . . . the ability to heal, to another . . . the power to do great deeds. The same Spirit gives to another man the gift of preaching the word of God, to another . . . the ability to discriminate in spiritual matters, to another . . . speech in different tongues, and to yet another . . . the power to interpret the tongues. Placing all these gifts is the operation of the same Spirit, who distributes to each individual man, as He wills."

Now what gifts do you have? What use are you making of your gifts? Are you giving of yourselves?

Obviously, a man must answer these questions for himself and to himself. He must face himself in the mirror every morning and be satisfied by what he sees. And then, in the second chapter of James in the 14th through the 24th verses—one finds these words—and I quote again from Phillips:

"Now what use is it, my brothers, for a man to say he 'has faith' if his actions do not correspond with it? Could that sort of faith save anyone's soul? If a fellow man or woman has no clothes to wear and nothing to eat, and one of you say, 'Good luck to you, I hope you keep warm and find enough to eat,' and yet give them nothing to meet their physical needs, what on earth is the good of that?

Yet, that is exactly what a bare faith, without a corresponding life is like—useless and dead. If we only 'have faith,' a man could easily challenge us by saying, 'You say that you have faith and I have merely good actions, but I can show you by my actions that I have faith as well.'

To the man who thinks that faith by itself is enough, I feel inclined to say, 'So you believe there is one God? That's fine. So do all the devils in hell, and shudder in terror!' For, my dear short-sighted man, can't you see far enough to realize that faith without the right actions is dead and useless. Think of Abraham, our ancestor. Wasn't it his action which really led him to offer his son Isaac on the altar? Can't you see that his faith and his actions were, so to speak, partners—that his faith was evidenced by his deed? That is what the Scriptures mean when it says:

And Abraham believed God,
And it was reckoned unto him for righteousness:
And he was called the friend of God.

"A man is justified before God by what he does, as well as by what he believes."

That's the end of that passage.

Now, what is our faith? What are our deeds? Someone years ago produced a poem that describes all too accurately the attitude that most of us have, far too much of the time. I'd like to quote it for you:

"I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord,
Real service is what I desire,
I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord,
But don't ask me to sing in the choir.
I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord,
I like to see things come to pass,
But don't ask me to teach girls or boys, dear Lord,
I'd rather stay in the class.
I'll do what you want me to do, dear Lord,
I'll yearn for the kingdom to thrive,
I'll give you my nickels and dimes, dear Lord,
But please don't ask me to tithe.
I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord,
I'll say what you want me to say,
But I'm busy now with myself, dear Lord,
I'll help you some other day."

I would only question—do we sing if we can? Do we teach when we can? Do we contribute when we are asked? Do we acknowledge our God with simple pride rather than with hesitant, reluctant shyness? Again, only each one of us can answer these questions, and only for himself alone.

Finally, I would close with the 16th verse of the 5th Chapter of Matthew.

"Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Thank you.

Chairman DE BUTTS. Thank you, General Johnson. We are extremely grateful that you were with us this morning.

The closing prayer will be given by Mr. John H. Johnson, the publisher of *Ebony Magazine*.

Mr. JOHN H. JOHNSON. Almighty God, once again we are turning to Thee to reaffirm our abiding faith in Thy infinite power and wisdom and to draw renewed strength and hope from the knowledge that this humble gathering may be assured of Thy merciful blessing. In these troubled times, wrought with global strife and problems at home, we beseech Thee to restore upon those among us whom Thou has found worthy of holding positions of leadership the foresight necessary to make prudent decisions, the courage or conviction to stand by these decisions in the face of opposition and adversity, and finally the energy of mind and spirit to see these decisions through to their fruition.

Stand by them, Oh Lord, in their daily struggle against mankind's greatest adversaries, ignorance, intolerance, hatred, superstition, poverty and disease. Impart to them the spark of Thy divine spirit that transcends human frailty and limitations. Do not let their unending search for Thy truths go unrewarded. But fortify them in their commitment to make and uphold just laws before which all men are as equal as they are before Thee, Oh Lord. This, Almighty God, we humbly ask of Thee in our unwavering knowledge that Thy will be done. Amen.

WHY THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS REPUGNANT MORALLY TO MANY YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an extremely thoughtful and timely article headed: "The Nation's Youth Feel the Primary Impact of the Effect of the Conflict in Vietnam," by Joseph A. Loftus, one of a series of four articles by correspondents of the New York Times on the impact of the Vietnam war on the American people, appears in today's, August 10, issue of the New York Times.

Mr. Loftus points out that a great number of our young people take the position and feel deeply that our war in Vietnam is repugnant morally and they see no threat to the United States security. They see their country interfering in another's domestic social revolution and supporting a corrupt government.

In this, Mr. President, they are entirely correct. Their estimate of our military involvement is sound.

Mr. Loftus quotes one of them as saying:

> If the United States was actually threatened—

The young men—

> would fight like hell.

The fact of the matter is that the United States was never attacked, or threatened by anything that had happened in Vietnam, and the American people have been systematically misled as to the justification for our military involvement there. Unless this is widely understood, as it should be by our fellow Americans, the reluctance of many of our young men to be drafted and sent to fight and kill people against whom they have no grievance, and who are fighting for the independence of their country, might be misjudged as a lack of patriotism. It is nothing of the kind.

These young men are among the increasing number of American people who are slowly finding out that we were not, as the official propaganda alleges, asked by a friendly government to help it repel aggression. The official record is completely bare of any such commitment to send our troops into combat in southeast Asia. President Eisenhower proffered economic aid, and only economic aid, to President Diem, whom we had brought from retirement in the United States and installed as our puppet in Vietnam, and President Eisenhower's proffer of economic aid was accompanied by conditions of reform and good performance which were never fulfilled. When there was a complete failure of compliance with these conditions, we should have pulled our economic aid out.

We did not cease giving that economic aid, but during the 6 years after the installation of Diem and during the remainder of the Eisenhower administration, we gave only economic aid and there were only a few hundred military advisers in Vietnam.

When President Kennedy came into office, he was misadvised by Secretary of Defense McNamara and increased the number of military advisers to some 20,000. But never during this period were any of our troops sent into combat. That did not take place until 1965, after President Johnson's election in November 1964.

A year ago, President Eisenhower gently corrected the allegation that he had made a pledge comparable to that which President Johnson asserted had been made by three Presidents. President Eisenhower pointed out he had only offered economic aid, which, of course, the record clearly substantiates.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message in January of 1965, and subsequently, has stated that three Presidents have made a solemn commitment to do what we are doing in Vietnam, which has, therefore, become a national pledge. The facts do not bear out this statement.

A really solemn pledge, I would say, was made to the American people by President Johnson, and so understood by them, during his campaign for election in 1964, when he said, among other things:

> There are those who say I ought to go North and drop bombs to wipe out the supply lines . . . But we don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia.

And also:

> We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves.

Despite these commitments made by President Johnson in the fall of 1964, he did "go north and drop bombs to wipe out supply lines" as early as February 1965. And he also did "send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles from home" and got them "tied down in a land war in Asia."

In these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that there is great distrust among the American people, particularly among our "American boys"—and their parents, too—in this war, and justifies the reluctance they feel to engage in it, which is so well expressed in Mr. Loftus' article.

In addition to the other misleading justifications from Washington officialdom is the one dredged up in recent months by Secretary Rusk and other defenders of our policy that the SEATO Treaty justifies our military intervention. This likewise is false. In fact, article 1 prescribes only peaceful action, and article 4 of the SEATO Treaty, which is cited by defenders of our military action, provides that in the event of a disturbance of the peace, the signatories to the treaty, who are, besides the United States: Britain, France, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, shall consult and, by unanimous agreement, decide on a course of action.

There has never been any consultation. The United States never asked for it, and had there been consultation, the required unanimity would not have been secured because both France and Pakistan are opposed to our policy in Vietnam. The basic fact is that we went half way around the world to inject ourselves into a civil war—for when the United States entered into Vietnam, the only people engaged in fighting were Vietnamese fighting each other.

In entering this civil war among Vietnamese, the United States violated every pertinent treaty to which it was a signatory. It violated the United Nations Charter—not once, but violated several provisions thereof.

Chapter 1, article 2, which provides in paragraph 3:

> All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

And in paragraph 4 thereof, which provides:

> All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force.

And chapter 6, of article 33, which states:

> The parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Obviously, as far as article 33 is concerned, we did not "first of all" try any of these eight alternative peaceful procedures which the article says "shall" and not "may," be done.

And article 37, which provides:

> Should the partners to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

As the United States failed to use any of the eight peaceful means prescribed by article 33, it was required by article 37 to refer the matter to the Security Council.

That, also, the United States has not done, for the obvious reason that the free discussion in that body might be detrimental to us in its revelations by representatives of other nations not subscribing to our presentation of our case in Vietnam.

Had the United States done so, the Security Council might, under article 36, have carried the efforts for a peaceful solution still further.

In addition to violating all these provisions of the United Nations Charter, we violated article 1 of the SEATO Treaty, which likewise provides peaceful procedures.

The United States also violated the declaration of U.S. policy made by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith on July 21, 1954, pledging allegiance to the terms of the Geneva accords and particularly its promise to hold elections throughout Vietnam in 1956 to determine who would be elected to govern the reunited North and South Vietnam, which had been temporarily divided for purposes of demobilization. Our reneging on these accords, plus the oppressive tactics of Diem, gave further impetus to the civil war between the South Vietnamese—Vietcong—and the government in Saigon, which had our support.

We then violated the agreement not to introduce additional armed forces and arms into South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese subsequently also violated this agreement, but only after the United States had done so, and to a much lesser degree.

Given these facts, all of which can be fully documented, one can only come to the regrettable conclusion that the United States is the aggressor in Vietnam.

The United States entered this civil war unilaterally and in violation of all pertinent treaties. It entered it for reasons that do not stand up under the searchlight of truth. While we now have, after much pressure and effort on the part of the administration, some token assistance from reluctant "allies," the United States is still fighting this war virtually alone.

South Vietnam has no legal or juridical validity. It was created by the United States in violation of the above cited treaties and agreements. It exists only because of U.S. Armed Forces and funds.

In addition to all this is the striking fact that during last year, 1965, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. Yet we are drafting our young men and sending them to their deaths to fight a war for which those whose cause it allegedly is show so little enthusiasm. Possibly their lack of enthusiasm is also understandable when we consider that they are being asked to fight for a corrupt, self-imposed junta of 10 generals—the eighth coup-imposed regime since the fall of Diem. It has little popular support. It owes its existence and perpetuation in office only to the support by the U.S. forces and U.S. funds. It is revealing that of these 10 generals, 9 did not fight for the independence of their country against French colonialism but supported France. And their leader, Air Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, let it be repeated, when asked who his heroes were, replied: "I have only one, Adolf Hitler." It is profoundly nauseating that Americans should be asked to die for so shady a cause and such shabby representatives thereof in Saigon.

Altogether, some 5,000 Americans have already died in combat and the toll is mounting every day at staggering costs, not merely in lives, but in substance which is steadily eroding our much needed domestic programs, so brilliantly legislated under President Johnson's leadership in the first session of the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article of Joseph A. Loftus, entitled "The Nation's Youth Feel the Primary Impact of the Effect of the Conflict in Vietnam," from the August 10 issue of the New York Times, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S YOUTH FEEL THE PRIMARY IMPACT OF WAR IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—*This the third of four articles in which correspondents of The New York Times estimate the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy, the nation's politics, the lives of its citizens and its foreign policy.*)

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, August 9.—"I went to graduate school to get a deferment," the young man acknowledged, apparently unabashed.

The threat of the draft has delayed his career, and the uncertainties of his contrived deferment have confused his choices on marriage and given him the uneasy feeling of being hemmed in.

Convinced that he was expressing the intellectual and moral position of thousands of other young men, he said:

"The war is imposing on them a demand to organize their lives on profane issues. They don't see any connection between Vietnam and American security. If the United States was actually threatened they would fight like hell—I know I would. This war is palpably made by old men. It's harder for Johnson to carry off even than it was for Kennedy."

His remarks, whether or not they reflect the majority's viewpoint, illustrate the primary impact of the war in Vietnam on American life—perhaps the most unusual and most disturbing result of any war in which the nation has participated.

A "small" war whose effect on the economic and material lives of most Americans has been virtually nil, the Vietnam conflict has nevertheless generated an intellectual, moral and ideological upheaval passionately centered among American young people.

For most older Americans, except those with sons and relatives in the fighting, the war may seem no more than headlines and shocking images on the television screen.

Consumer goods are abundant and summer brought vacations as usual—more disrupted by the airline strike than by the war.

Casualty reports remain well below the level of national shock. The Korean War, for example, resulted in seven times as many dead and missing as has Vietnam so far.

Thus, it is partly understandable that a woman barber who was recently asked for her views on the war could reply:

"I don't care what they do about it. They're paid to think about it."

Yes, she said, she had a brother in the Army.

"He was drafted. He likes it."

If the reluctant draftee and the woman deprived of son, husband or fiancé are affected by war's impact, for many people the conflict is not an unmitigated evil. For some it is even a positive gain.

Negroes, for example, are enlisting voluntarily at a rate that exceeds their ratio to the rest of society. More remarkable is the fact that after a first tour of duty, more than 49 per cent of Negro soldiers are re-enlisting, compared with less than 14 per cent of white soldiers.

The Marines report that their Negro reenlistment rate is 40 per cent, compared with 19 per cent for whites.

Obviously, the Negro male achieves in the service some goals not always reachable in his civil environment—a regular job, acceptance of his manhood, and most important, equality.

CAN ESCAPE DECISIONS

The Negro or white youth of limited education, with no career in mind, who may be unsettled even about a manual vocation, can drift into uniform and training camp as if on a tide; the drudgery of decision disappears until he is older and perhaps trained in a suitable craft.

College enrollment is no certain escape from conscription, although many view it as a refuge. Approximately 56 per cent of those deferred for college eventually enter the service, according to Lieut. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System.

The Army sends one out of three of its draftees to Vietnam. As American casualties have mounted and as American infantrymen have been worked increasingly hard in prolonged search-and-clear operations, military service in Vietnam has become ever more dangerous and arduous. Yet most young men who go to Vietnam will never see combat, and many will have a relatively good time at the bars and with the girls of Saigon.

For many American servicemen, Vietnam has always exerted an attraction because of its color and vibrant life. It is also true, according to reports from the field, that many of the troops most frequently in combat are absorbed by their duty and more than a little proud of their conduct. As men have always been, they are fascinated as well as repelled by combat.

OTHER WARS RECALLED

Three other wars in this century engaged the passions of Americans and all but smothered neutralism. All made themselves felt in the everyday lives of most Americans. None produced the burnings of draft cards, the unashamed draft evasions, all-night teach-ins, and critical speeches in churches and colleges. Students, in defiance of accepted manners and conventional logic, have walked out of commencement exercises at which Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara—who with President Johnson is regarded as the "villain" of the situation—received honorory degrees.

Observers believe objectors are a minority of draft-age males—probably even a minority of the draft-age males in college—but they reflect, nevertheless, a serious disaffection among students and among those who instruct and counsel tthem.

Although it is too much to say that the academic community, or the intellectual community, opposes the war, few issues of modern times have evoked such dissent from national policy by the educated.

It is among college graduates, according to the Louis Harris polling organization, that the President has lost the most support—down from 65 per cent to 45 per cent since January, 1966.

Critics find the Vietnam war repugnant morally, and see no threat to United States security. They see their country interfering in another's domestic social revolution and supporting a corrupt government. They voice doubt of their own Government's assessment of the war and speak with horror of new weaponry and of possible involvement with Communist China in an interminable land war or the accidental explosion of a nuclear holocaust.

MORALE FACTOR CITED

Among those who are simply apathetic, the reasons no doubt include the lack of stirring slogans and effective propaganda opportunities. There is no Tojo or Hitler for the mass mind to focus on, no "Yellow Peril" that would make racial sense in today's world. "Hate Communism" seems to many to be an irrelevant slogan when the Communist powers are divided and the United States relationship with the most formidable of these powers is less belligerent than it once was.

Another reason for the widespread dissent may also be the Administration's difficulty in defining its purposes and goals in the war. To many citizens it seems unclear whether the effort is aimed primarily at protecting South Vietnamese independence, at containing Chinese Communist expansion, at "Policing the world," at coping with the concept of "wars of national liberation," or at maintaining a position of American strength in Southeast Asia and a balance of power ,in the world—or perhaps all these objectives.

TWO GROUPINGS PERCEIVED

David Riesman, the Harvard social scientist, finds "a tremendous malaise" among draft-exempt students and thinks the labels "campus bum" or "draft evader" not entirely fair.

"The best students—the sensitive, reflective students," he says; "don't like to be exempt from the common lot. They don't enjoy privilege, but they feel this is not just a war. They feel it is a brutalizing war, for us and the enemy."

Lloyd and Suzanne Rudolph, a husband and wife team in the department of government of the University of Chicago, have worked closely with undergraduate and graduate students on the war and draft issues. They perceive at least two broad groupings.

"There is a striking difference from World War II," they say, "when a 4F (disability deferment) was a dreadful, personal disaster for many idealistic young intellectuals and non-intellectuals. In the present situation, other alternatives to the draft, are eagerly sought.

"For the unactivists the war is not so much wicked as morally and physically very far away. There is entirely unembarrassed discussion of alternatives that would lead away from the draft.

"It's partly that the rather gross racial appeals that were still possible in World War II cannot be used any more. Asia and Africa are too much with us."

"The case is different with the activists," they continued. "To a good number, the notion that there was a series of events which put the United States on the wrong side of morality was persuasive. Some are very angry and bitter. They feel that the society that lets Chicago's 63d Street (a slum street) get that way is the society that is killing self-righteously in Vietnam.

"When we speak of their bitterness and anger, and their willingness to take the consequences of their actions, we don't mean to imply they are fanatics, or ideologues. They are, if anything, the generation of existentialists rather than ideological rebels. It's not so much that they fight for causes as that they believe they must take responsibility. And they appear to feel responsible for a good bit. To allow yourself to be drafted is to take responsibility for Mr. Johnson's foreign policy. One must not cooperate with evil. That's what Eichmann did, and so forth."

Dr. Joseph T. English, a psychiatrist who has interviewed hundreds of Peace Corps volunteers and helped to orient them for foreign service, believes that today's youth want to do something for their country but that "it is going to be infinitely more difficult for us, as our young people become more sophisticated, to make war meaningful."

"They reject violence," he says. "They need to find, as William James said, 'a moral equivalent of war.' Many of them found it in the nonviolent civil rights movement and in the Peace Corps."

Dr. Gene Gordon of Washington, also a psychiatrist and a Peace Corps consultant, takes a less cheerful view of youth.

"What's really gone is hope of Utopia," he says. "I don't think they think anything important is going to happen."

Student dissent from political mores, particularly where Vietnam policy is involved, finds its most vigorous outlet through Students for a Democratic Society, whose spokesman and national secretary now is a woman, Jane Adams. The group contends it has a membership of "a bit over 5,000," spreading inland from concentrations in the eastern third of the nation and the West Coast.

Miss Adams finds students "more aware that the political life of the country is something relevant in their lives." She sees a reaction to the repressiveness of the McCarthy era, a greater awareness of the threat of nuclear war, and great concern with the racial situation.

The National Student Association, made up of student governments rather than individual members, is less activist but nevertheless went on record last fall with the observation that "United States policy has placed excessive attention on the military aspects of the present conflict and has failed to come to terms with its underlying social, political and economic aspects."

RELIGIOUS CONCERN GROWING

Religionists are by no means united on a Vietnam policy, but an active minority opposed to the war is growing in voice and visibility.

Seventy-three Americans attending a world church conference in Geneva recently cabled the President that they were "more keenly aware than ever before of church and world criticism and anguish over United States involvement and escalation of the conflict in Vietnam."

A church journal, Christianity and Crisis, whose publication board consists of leading theologians headed by the Rev. Dr. John C. Bennett, president of Union Theological Seminary of New York, has declared that United States intensification of the war "makes it difficult to be an American."

Conscientious objection is one way of avoiding combat, but the law recognizes only those who "because of religious training and belief" oppose war "in any form." There is no legal recognition of the conscientious objector to a particular war, which he may consider unjust.

Religious and student groups are offering counsel and encouragement to those who want to consider raising this objection. James Forest of the Catholic Peace Fellowship in New York says that "a number of Catholic conscientious objectors come to their position via a stringent application of the just war ethic, most concluding that a just war in the modern world is inconceivable." Roman Catholic participation in the peace movement has "skyrocketed," Mr. Forest says.

Students for a Democratic Society, in its "Guide to Conscientious Objection," says that "C.O.'s," as they are sometimes called, are not cowards or draft-dodgers.

"People who are afraid are frequently the ones who strike out violently," the guide says. "The work C.O.'s do is as vital to a strong and healthy country—and as tough—as what most G.I.'s do."

Superficially, at least, the view of war has changed. No public figure today would dare label Vietnam, or Korea, or any conflict, as John Hay, characterized the Spanish-American War—"a splendid little war."

Authorities in the field, however, are reluctant to say that the change in man's view is fundamental. William James, a famous philosopher who was a pacifist, wrote three score years ago that "our ancestors have bred pugnacity into our bone and marrow, and thousands of years of peace won't breed it out of us."

Prof. Nicholas Hoffman of Harvard, who teaches a course called "War," doubts that people have changed fundamentally but adds:

"There is greater wisdom in the ways of the world, an awareness of the burdens in a nuclear age. My own reading is that there is still a certain tendency to use force as punishment."

PHILOSOPHIC INTENT WEIGHED

In sum, Americans are carrying Vietnam as a minor material burden. Many Americans, excluding draft-age males and their families, remain undisturbed materially and spiritually, but for a large minority it has brought moral, emotional and intellectual conflict. It has stirred consciences to a new examination for the uses of force in an age of terrifying weaponry, and it has made dissent respectable.

BEHAVIOR OF JOB CORPS VOLUNTEERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to commend a newspaper in my State, the New Brunswick Daily Home News, and its publisher, Mr. Hugh Boyd, for their forbearance and moderation in the face of difficulties created in the New Brunswick area by Job Corps volunteers on leave from the adjacent Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center.

This lonely stretch of World War II barracks has become a battleground for one of the most crucial engagements in the administration's $20 billion war on poverty. At stake is the question of how the Nation's impoverished and disadvantaged youths can be saved from what was previously considered an unbreakable cycle of poverty, crime, and hopelessness.

If a real solution is to be found to the problems of these young men seeking a last chance to join society, it will have to be found with the help of the communities which are closest to these camps. Here is where the Job Corps volunteers are on display. And it is here where the boys are apt to get into difficulty.

The fact is that according to an FBI report completed in February 1966, the arrest rate for Job Corps enrollees is 14 percent lower than the national average for the age group, and if arrests for use and possession of alcoholic beverages are excluded, the arrest rate is 73 percent below the national average.

The New Brunswick Home News is to be praised for recognizing the relatively minor nature of these offenses, and while not excusing them, the Home News through its editorials has brought the matter into perspective for the community.

It seems to me that unless there are powerful voices speaking up for tolerance toward these young men, a community tends to react more strongly against minor infractions caused by Job Corps volunteers than they otherwise would if these acts were done by residents of the community.

In addition to making the residents aware of the realities of the situation, the New Brunswick Home News has put forward constructive suggestions to help curb problems created by this sudden influx of young strangers to the community. In an editorial on May 25, 1966, the Home News suggested that the Job Corps administration could assign personnel to work downtown with city police, much like the military police who did such a fine job at Camp Kilmer in World War II. This would curtail the growing number of minor offenses before the hot summer weather arrived with its influx of Job Corps men seeking recreation.

The Job Corps administration is to be praised for recognizing interested, helpful criticism. The suggestion was adopted and in spite of the growing number of Job Corps men seeking recreation in New Brunswick, the situation has been kept well in hand by city police and Job Corps personnel working as a team.

Both New Brunswick and Camp Kilmer have benefited from this cooperation. And the teamwork has paid other dividends besides reducing the arrest rate. Links have been established between the community and the camp. In time, these links can be widened and a highway of communication and understanding between the two can be established. This would have been impossible in an atmosphere of continuing intolerance and suspicion.

The New Brunswick Home News has met the highest standard of journalism by serving as the middleman between these two potentially antagonistic factions.

Acting as the voice and the conscience of the community, the New Brunswick Daily Home News has reminded its readers of the problems these culturally disadvantaged youngsters face. It has also reminded the Job Corps that cooperation is a two-way street. Both sides have accepted this very sound advice and today are working hand in hand to meet a common problem. This is how the war on poverty should, and can, be waged.

I ask unanimous consent to insert two editorials from the New Brunswick Daily Home News into the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, May 25, 1966]

More Policing for Job Corps

With the coming of milder weather, there seems to be a rising tide of minor offenses against the public order in downtown New Brunswick by members of the Job Corps from Camp Kilmer.

It is, of course, natural for the Corpsmen to gravitate to New Brunswick on their time off. In seeking recreation, it is probably natural, too, for some youngsters to try to do some drinking. And the natural answer is, of course, trouble.

These minor offenders create a policing problem, and Patrolman John Drury has been doing a good job in enforcing the law and bringing to court the more recalcitrant. Much as the city sympathizes with these disadvantaged youngsters, the city's law and order can not be subordinated to their inclinations.

When Camp Kilmer was an Army post, we had similar and more serious problems. But at that time we had Military Police from Camp Kilmer to help our policing job.

It seems to us that the present situation could be eased—it really has to be eased, else it will be aggravated when the hot summer weather arrives—if the Job Corps administration could assign personnel to work downtown with city police, particularly on weekends when the concentration of Job Corpsmen seeking recreation burgeons.

New Brunswick wants to cooperate fully with the Job Corps program, but cooperation has to be a two-way street.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, July 20, 1966]

Willie Mays Names Heroes

Over the long years the United Auto Workers has been an unusual union in that it has looked and acted beyond the needs and aspirations of its own members towards the needs and aspirations of the underdog beyond the union membership.

The UAW, for instance, in addition to encouraging Negro membership in its own ranks, has promoted integration and brotherhood on a broad scale beyond its membership.

In its very fine newspaper, "UAW Solidarity," there are often to be found illuminating articles on avoiding consumer frauds, on Social Security, on medicare, on health matters, on social problems.

In the July issue of UAW Solidarity there is an excellent exclusive article on Willie Mays and the Job Corps.

Last winter and spring Mays devoted much of his time talking to hundreds of Job Corpsmen who have carried his message along to untold numbers of their fellow corpsmen.

Sitting down with one small group of corpsmen, Mays heard one youngster get up and rant about the roadblocks that were thrown in his way in his attempt to become a minister. He was sputtering and almost exploding when Mays held up his hand and said, "Cool it, baby, I'm on your side."

The youngster quieted down and Willie said, "If you want to be a minister, you can be. Don't let anybody stop you. I never listened to anybody who told me I couldn't do something. If you do, you're defeated right away."

Mays added, "When I was 19—that's about how old you are now—I went zero for 24 with the Birmingham Giants. That was my first 24 times at bat, too. If I had listened to all the poor mouths who were giving me advice, I'd have quit baseball right then."

"It takes a great deal of hardship to be a minister and you have to keep trying. But if you want to be one, you'll keep on trying and you'll fight and overcome."

Cool it, baby. I went zero for 24. That's the kind of talk the youngsters listen to, and they can feel with Willie, because he made it the hard way as a child in Alabama.

One can almost see the boys taking Willie's advice to heart. One youngster said he wanted to be a great athlete like Willie. Willie snapped back, "That's what you say. But you're smoking and you know you can't do that and be an athlete."

The UAW Solidarity article reminds us, too, that the job corpsmen need a lot of understanding.

An analysis of the first 10,000 enrollees accepted is enlightening, and it must be remembered that to get the project off to a good start, the first 10,000 may have been less disadvantaged than later members.

With a 17-year average age, most of the first 10,000 were more like 13-year-olds in size. Most had never slept between sheets, never shared a room with only one other. Some never had had electric lights. Nearly two-thirds lived in substandard housing. More than 60 per cent came from families in which the primary wage earner was unemployed.

The average corpsman had never completed ninth grade and could read no better than a fifth grader. Fewer than one in 10 had ever held a job.

We'll let Willie Mays close this editorial:

"Kids today are no different than they were when I was a boy. They see television and they've got a right to dream. I was the biggest dreamer on our block. Then, when you're out of school a few years and you find you're drifting just like a lot of the older people, that's the time a kid says to himself: I gotta get out of this. Out!

"When a kid gets to that age—like these kids—when they say they gotta get out, that's when society has to let them in. This Job Corps is going to save these boys. They're going to make it. Without this chance, they were dead.

"These kids are my heroes."

PREMIER KY AND AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the August 1 issue of the Washington Evening Star contained two thoughtful appraisals of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's recent statements on the war in Vietnam. Because of the timeliness of these articles, entitled "Premier Ky Hits a Sensitive Nerve," written by Clayton Fritchey, and "Red China Riddle: Why Not Let It Grow Up?" written by Charles Bartlett, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Premier Ky Hits a Sensitive Nerve

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Everybody, it seems, is now jumping on Premier Ky—publicly in Congress, privately in the administration—for spilling the beans on what a victory in Viet Nam is finally going to cost the United States. It hardly seems fair.

After all, the premier, like most generals, is a simple fellow politically, and all he has done is blurt out what seems to him to be the obvious truth about the situation in Viet Nam.

It may be embarrassing to the Johnson administration, and perhaps Ky should have consulted his Washington patrons before letting the cat out of the bag, but the American people at least owe him a debt of gratitude for telling them what they can't learn from their own government, mainly, the price of "victory" (whatever that is).

In recent weeks, the President has repeatedly assured the public that the United States is going to fight to the finish, that we are going to win, and that "success will be ours in Viet Nam."

It is a disturbing fact, however, that it has been impossible to wring from the President or any other administration spokesman just what is meant by "success," or just what American citizens are going to have to pay in the way of men and money to achieve it.

The favored thought has been, just leave it to Lyndon and all will be well. Skeptics are shushed by claims of battle successes in the field, and the assurance that the enemy can't take it much longer, especially the accelerated bombing.

But U.S. success stories do not seem to have spoiled Premier Ky, who is also an air marshal and thinks he knows something about war, particularly in Viet Nam where he has been fighting for so many years.

The premier already knows what Americans are soon going to learn, and that is that the air attacks on the Hanoi-Haiphong area are not producing results as predicted. They are not materially slowing down the enemy or breaking his morale. On the contrary, he is fighting harder than ever, as our own Marines can testify.

In fairness to Marshal Ky, it should be remembered that he has obligations to his own country as well as to ours. Apparently, he feels that the South Vietnamese should understand the realities of the present situation.

As Ky sees it, the United States must launch an all-out invasion of North Viet Nam to win the war. He can see that this would probably mean war with China, but he thinks "it's better to face them right now" rather than later.

The alternative to "destroying the Communists in their lair," he says, is for the United States to go on fighting a guerrilla war "for 5 to 10 years." He frankly doubts that the United States has the "patience" for this.

This is a shrewd appraisal, for Ky recognizes that U.S. public support for the war is already shaky. It has been momentarily bolstered by hopes that the stepped-up bombing might be effective, but when these hopes are dashed there will probably be another sag in the public opinion polls. What then?

The war already is costing us over $2 billion a month. American casualties often exceed the South Vietnamese. Over 5 to 10 years, the cost would be $100 billion to $250 billion with casualities constantly mounting.

It is no wonder that Ky feels that Americans would not support such a prolonged stalemate. From his point of view, he is right in promoting and all-out attack. Even if it triggers a world war, what has he to lose? He knows that if the United States ever makes peace with North Viet Nam, it is the end for him and his fellow generals.

The State Department has declined direct comment. A spokesman merely repeated that the United States "does not seek any wider war," which is undoubtedly true, at least at the moment. But what will the President do when pressure mounts again for breaking the stalemate?

Nobody knows, probably including the President himself.

Red China Riddle: Why Not Let It Grow Up?

(By Charles Bartlett)

Premier Ky and the U.S. Senate have injected practical and immediate considerations into the controversy on what should be done about Red China.

Ky's assertion that this is the time to deal with the Chinese Communists is a strident echo of President Kennedy's private expressions that the great decision of this decade would be whether or not to halt Red China's growth as a world menace by pre-emptive attack.

This question has been laid aside since Lyndon Johnson became president and American forces became involved in Viet Nam. Washington's great aim now is to avoid conflict with the Chinese and many strategies, including the invasion of North Viet Nam, have been subordinated to this objective. Even Air Force commanders no longer find time to urge bombing raids on mainland China.

Ky's proposal is motivated by a deepening awareness that Ho Chi Minh will probably not be permitted by Peking to give the orders that will end the guerrilla war. Washington recognizes this probability and is concentrating as a consequence upon making life so hard for the guerrillas themselves that they will eventually stop fighting without orders from Hanoi.

But Ky is in a cocky frame of mind. His military move against the Buddhists succeeded despite almost unanimous warnings from American officials that it was a foolhardy step. He faces elections and he needs to demonstrate that he is not a puppet. He obviously hopes to rally support by stirring the nationalistic hatred of his people toward the Chinese.

The tin-horn militancy of Ky's recent interviews stands in weak contrast to the composure with which Ho Chi Minh last week rejected the offer by the Soviet Union and East European states to send volunteers. Ho is also afraid of the Red Chinese and he doesn't want to antagonize them by playing host to Soviet volunteers. So he rallies his people by telling them they are going to win the war with their own hands and with the "climate, snakes and mosquitoes" as their allies.

If Ho, who knows the Chinese well, doesn't trust them in their present mood and if the Russians, who also know them, find them irrationally dogmatic, why should the United States get involved with them? The Communists estimate that the Viet Cong and their families number only 800,000 of South Viet Nam's 17 million population. No major figure in the Johnson administration is attracted by the folly of tackling 800 million Chinese to suppress a rebellion of 800,000 Vietnamese.

The Senate reflected this nation's irresolution toward Red China in its vote to censure the consortium of European nations which plans to build a steel rolling mill in China. A majority of 56 senators voted for the censure and implicity for the thesis that a thin and hungry Chinese is less dangerous than a fat one.

The moderately fattened Russian is turning out to be a better world citizen than his ragged, revolutionary predecessor and the evolution of Communist doctrine into a pragmatic quest for a steadily rising standard of living is now regarded by most experts as a stabilizing factor in world affairs.

Certainly Red China's present adversities bring no assurances of peace. The desperate search for food, actually causing Chinese agents to compete with Russians in the Canadian and Australian markets, cannot render the government more stable. The decision to educate fewer students in Chinese universities, because the economy does not provide jobs for an expanding number of graduates, will delay the emergence of the professional class which now exerts a constructive authority in Moscow.

Experts of the Defense and State Departments have just sent to the White House an exhaustive study of the future that lies ahead for Red China. The short-term view is uncertain. No one can really predict how a government so beset by afflictions will react. But the long-term view follows the Soviet pattern—at some point the Chinese commissars will drop their visions of dominating the planet and turn to the real and pressing challenges of development at home.

The turn to maturity may come more swiftly in China than it did in the Soviet Union, where Joseph Stalin prolonged the revolutionary illusions. Containment, as in Russia's case, is apt to be a more maturing influence than the aggression envisioned by Ky or the deprivation sought by the Senate majority.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, to the annual convention of Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Jackson, Miss., August 8, 1966, be inserted at this point in the RECORD. It is a stirring and challenging message which merits widespread attention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy to the Annual Convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Jackson, Miss., August 8, 1966

I come here tonight as a young man, with the hope of the young that today's crisis can become tomorrow's opportunity. Much of your success is due to the young people who have worked in your movement.

I am proud to appear before this organization. For ten years, you have been in the forefront of the most important domestic issue of our time. You have been jailed and bombed, beaten and stoned. But you have persevered. Your work has given Negro men and women a new sense of dignity and self-respect. Your courage under fire has kindled the conscience of the white people of this country. Over the noise of battle, clearer than the cries of extremists on both sides, we have heard your simple message of non-violence, telling us that evil can be overcome with good; that hate can yield to love; and that it is better to suffer in dignity than to accept segregation in silence.

Your leader, Martin Luther King, has made his mark upon the world as a great spiritual leader who has also led the forces of social justice. His tradition is worthy of his teachers, Gandhi and Thoreau. I know the great respect that President Kennedy had for Dr. King. I am honored to share the platform with him today.

And I am proud to come to Mississippi, a state whose men have always answered bravely and patriotically the call to the colors; a state with a past full of glory and tragedy; a present full of struggle and change; a future bright with hope and promise.

This is a state with unlimited potential. From the rockets and shipyards on the Gulf to new industries in the north. Mississippi is gathering force for an advance which could, using the full energies of all its citizens, bring a greater day than it has ever known.

I come from a state with a proud tradition of leadership in the field of human rights. It was a citizen of Massachusetts who was the first to urge the use of nonviolence in the cause of civil rights. His name was William Lloyd Garrison, and his statue stands in Boston today. In 1831, he wrote: "The history of mankind is crowded with evidence that physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration; that sin can be subdued only by love; and that the violent who resort to the sword are destined to perish with the sword."

My state, as the other states in the North, has very difficult problems in the field of civil rights. I cannot come here to Mississippi and say that our hands are clean. We have done too little. We started quite late. The Negro in Boston, to our shame, goes to a segregated school, holds an inferior job, and lives in one of the worst parts of the city. Progress has been made, some important programs just in recent days, but we have a long way to go. So I am delighted that this organization is extending its work to the cities of the North. We need your help up there too.

Twenty years ago, segregation was a fact of life in America, accepted by both races. The Capital city of our country was totally segregated, in law and in fact.

Twenty years ago, the U.S. Congress could not even outlaw lynching. A distinguished Senator, Frank Graham, was turned out of office because he signed a report saying that Negroes should have an equal chance in jobs.

But then came the Supreme Court decisions. And the sit-ins, and the freedom rides, and your own bus boycott in Montgomery, touching off a movement that has brought about, in my opinion, the most important change in America in the last 20 years.

Since 1959, Congress has passed three civil rights bills, and this year will pass a fourth. The walls of segregation have come down in many places, partly through government, but largely through the private efforts of groups like yours. Over two million Negroes have registered to vote throughout the South, one hundred twenty thousand in Mississippi in the last year alone. The caste system in politics is through. Next year, in this state, in every election, men and women, white and black, will have a chance to have a voice. I think this will make a difference.

But in a larger sense, how far have we come as a nation?

After all the decisions of all of the courts, how many Negro children really attend integrated schools? In the South, less than 3 per cent.

After all of the programs that Congress has passed, how much has the life of the average Negro really changed? Not very much.

What good is a desegregated motel if you can't afford to stay there?

What use is the right to vote if you risk your job and even your life in order to vote?

Can a Negro soldier, drafted to fight for the freedom of the people of Vietnam, come back to his own country and enjoy full freedom and opportunity as an American citizen? I don't think he can. And that is the shame and the challenge of American life in 1966.

The rate of Negro unemployment is more than twice that of white—and the gap has increased in the past year. Even when the Negro finds a job, it tends to be in menial occupations with extremely limited opportunities for advancement.

The proportion of Negroes living in substandard housing is almost three times that of whites, and that proportion is growing. The Negro continues to be segregated in the great urban ghettoes, and that segregation is increasing. Negroes today in the cities of the North live their daily lives farther separated from white America than the rural Southern Negro ever was.

I find this country dividing more and more into separate societies, of the rich and poor, the white and the black, the complacent and the despairing; where the whites have jobs and the blacks have unemployment; where the whites live in suburbs and the Negroes in ghettos. Where each looks at the other with growing mistrust as the vise of apartness tightens.

This situation is wrong—morally, socially, economically wrong. It saps our strength. It offends our deepest traditions. It sows the seed of insurrection and riot.

I cannot think of a more dangerous future for America than the future we face if we let this situation develop as it has.

This situation has been aggravated in recent months by the desire of some Negro leaders to pull apart from the white men who have been assisting them. Now I can fully understand the feelings behind this. For one hundred years since the end of slavery you have collaborated with white men and many Negroes have little to show for it. But the fact is that the greatest gains in civil rights have come when black and white have worked together. The very basis of integration is working together with white people. If you cast them off—if you isolate yourselves—you will be strengthening the bonds of the whole system of segregation. You will be crippling your own effectiveness in what is basically not a white or a Negro cause, but an American cause. Dr. King put it well when he said: "The Negro's destiny is tied to the white man's destiny. The Negro's freedom is bound to the white man's freedom. We cannot walk alone."

I would add that just as the path of separateness is a self-defeating path, the path of violence is a dangerous path. You can reason with the white man, and pressure him and even shame him—but you cannot scare him. Dr. King once said that the civil rights movement owes as much to Bull Conner as it does to Abraham Lincoln. And I say to you that your cause is immeasurably hurt every time a young Negro throws a Molotov cocktail or a sniper fires on police from the roof of a ghetto.

I would be less than frank with you if I did not admit a growing feeling of concern about the "white backlash" in our country. A Negro leader in New York last week said he had never been so fearful about the future of race relations in our country as he is now, because a terrifying white backlash has set in and the Negro still has gained so little.

Let those who preach violence or the dishonoring of our individual obligations to our country or the destruction of Western civilization realize what ammunition they are giving the enemies of reason and justice.

But I would say just as strongly to the white man that you can no longer expect to keep the Negro "in his place." The only place for him is a position of full equality as an American citizen. If you think the Negro is pushing too fast, you are wrong. You cannot expect a man to go slow in obtaining what should have been a part of his birthright.

Seventy years ago a man named William Jennings Bryan spoke for the impoverished white man of the South and Midwest. What he said in his "Cross of Gold" speech expresses what many Negroes understandably feel today: "We have petitioned and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer. We entreat no more. We petition no more. We defy them."

So I say to the white man: You are not going to solve this problem with riot guns and billy clubs. The police and public officials cannot do the job alone. You cannot protect your communities against violence if you are unwilling to act against the conditions that breed violence. And you can no more justify violence and lawlessness in Cleveland and Chicago with the slogan of "White Power" than the Negro can with "Black Power."

My own Irish forebears were discriminated against just as fiercely in the last century as the Negroes are today. As an American proud of my country, I know that much of its strength is drawn from the contributions minorities have made as they have been given opportunities. I know that America will prosper best if we white men open wide the doors of opportunity to you.

If we can prosecute the War on Poverty, it will help white people as well as black.

If we can train more men for jobs, and end discrimination in jobs, it will increase the wealth of all.

If we can eliminate the slums and improve the schools of Chicago and Cleveland and Boston, it will make them better cities for everyone who lives there.

We need a program of action which can help bridge the gap in opportunity—and we need it now. Of course, we should continue to press for full legal rights for all citizens—the right to vote unintimidated; the right to be effectively protected from violence; the right to equal justice, free from jury discrimination; the right to go to school and live in a home free from arbitrary segregation. But in addition we need a massive commitment of national resources to the upgrading of Negro life in America.

We need community projects that can be done this summer and this fall: Construction of swimming pools and recreational parks in the ghettoes; installation of sprinklers for children in hot weather; better garbage collections and block clean-up campaigns; typing classes, and athletic instruction. Through these projects we can show young people that their communities do care about them—that there is hope for improvement, and that there are more creative outlets for their young energies than violence and disorder.

But we need more than these stop gap measures. There must be no less than a major up-grading of our schools and our cities, and of the housing and job opportunities for Negro Americans. Many of the programs to accomplish these objectives already exist.

What we must do now is determine to spend the money necessary to make these programs work. We must expand, not cut back, on our commitment to the War on Poverty. We must expand not cut back on our programs to equalize and upgrade education and, most important of all, we must expand not cut back on our programs to revitalize the ghetto and provide decent housing for all Americans.

I consider the segregation of our urban ghettoes the basic cause of the racial crisis that will continue to plague us. For as long as the Negro is isolated from white Americans and denied mobility and access to decent housing, his children will go to segregated schools of inferior quality, he will pay more for the inferior housing to which he does have access and he will be cut off from the power structures of government—unable to communicate or participate in the white society that surrounds him.

The expansion of these programs will cost a great deal of money; but we can afford it. We have the resources many times over. The only thing we may lack is the will. We are spending two billion dollars a month to defend the freedom of 14 million people in South Vietnam. Why shouldn't we make the same kind of effort for the 20 million people of the Negro race right here in America, whose freedom and future is also at stake?

The time has come to stop the talk and begin the action.

Let us stop talking about the need for young educated Negro leaders and make sure that every American who has the will and intellectual capacity has a chance to go to college.

Let us stop counting the slums and start tearing them down—followed by the greatest construction program in our history.

Let us stop deploring unemployment and create the jobs that will beautify our country and make our cities better places to live.

Let us desegregate our schools, but let us spare no effort to be sure that our children in school today have the educational opportunity to give their lives meaning and hope.

All these things should be done not just because they will stop the riots—although they will; not just because they will strengthen our economy—although they will. These things should be done because they are right and decent and the moral things to do.

So let men of both colors complete the agenda of freedom—together.

Let us together work so that a James Meredith can walk down the highway here in Mississippi free from the threat of violence.

Let us together wipe out the immoral system of jury discrimination so that the men who kill for hate will pay the price of their crime. So the men who killed those four little girls in the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham will be brought to justice.

Let us together work for the day when children of both races, in whose young hearts prejudice does not exist, can go to school together.

Let us together create open cities, free of slums, in every part of America—cities where men can reach new heights of civilization and people can live where they wish.

And let us keep working together until the last remnant of poverty, the last barrier to prosperity, the last obstacle to equal opportunity is gone from American life.

President Kennedy was the first President of the United States to state publicly that segregation was morally wrong. If his life and death had a meaning, if the life and death of Reverend Reeb and Medgar Evers and Jimmy Lee Jackson had a meaning, it was that we should not hate but love one another; we should use what power we have not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of freedom and opportunity that lead to peace.

No one denies the difficulties of your tasks.

No one can forget your courage and determination.

No one can blur your vision and your dream.

It is the vision of Americans and the dream of justice and opportunity for all of us.

Let us work together to make that dream reality, realizing that the greatness of our country depends on our success.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY TEXANS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Texans have many things to be proud of. But the folks around Denton have the added privilege of being proud—and fond—of Wick Fowler.

Wick is a retired Dallas newspaperman who has been covering the Vietnam war recently for the Denton Record-Chronicle. While there, he hit upon the idea of friendship kits to be sent from the United States to the marines in Vietnam to assist them in their civic action programs and efforts. The kits contain items such as pencil sharpeners, rulers, chewing gum, candy, and so forth.

The Denton Record-Chronicle recently carried several articles describing Wick's idea and how it was received by the Vietnamese.

Mr. President, I ask that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point so that other Senators may read for themselves of the people-to-people actions being undertaken by Texans who are concerned about international good will.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO VIETNAM: FOWLER RETURNS—IN SPIRIT

DA NANG, VIET NAM.—Wick Fowler—one of the biggest Texans of all—has returned to Viet Nam. In spirit, that is.

But Fowler in spirit is bigger than many men in their entirety.

Fowler, in person (who is huge enough without even considering the spirit!), came to Viet Nam last December as a special combat correspondent for the Denton Record-Chronicle.

A retired Dallas newspaperman, he was a combat correspondent in World War II in Europe and the Pacific.

Upon his arrival in Da Nang, headquarters of the III Marine Amphibious Force, Fowler immediately endeared himself to the Marines as well as to members of the civilian press corps.

He reported the war, as combat correspondents are supposed to do. But more than that, he was an entertainer.

There grew a saying that the only thing wider than Wick's ample girth was his even wider repertoire of homespun tales and jokes.

And Wick fired them at the Marines just as they fired their rifles and machineguns at the enemy—rapidly, effectively, and on the target.

There was a rumor that a Marine troop-carrying helicopter, which usually carries seven gear-laden Leathernecks into battle, couldn't get off the ground once Wick entered it—alone!

The rumor was never verified. But there is proof that a C130 cargo plane, with Wick aboard, did manage to stay airborne all the way on a flight from Da Nang to Saigon.

His fellow passengers testified to that—with great sighs of relief.

On another occasion, Wick boarded a Navy troop-carrying ship prior to Operation Double Eagle, which was to be the largest Marine amphibious assault on enemy territory since the historic landing at Inchon, Korea, in 1951.

The morning of the landing loomed dark, dismal and rainy. The sea buffeted the huge Navy vessel as sailors began lowering landing craft over the side.

Then the netting was tossed over the rails on either side of the ship, and Marines began scrambling down the nets toward the landing craft, bobbing and plummeting in the wild sea.

Wick had every intention of following the Marines. He was prepared to go over. But a cautious Marine company commander prohibited him from doing so.

Some onlookers thought it was because, well, because the Marine officer was concerned about Wick's safety (much to the rotund writer's chagrin.) Such a large man, and certainly not nearly as young and agile as the Marines.

But others wondered if it wasn't because the Marine officer was worried that Wick would take up more space in a landing craft than a squad of Marines!

Anyway, that was Wick Fowler and he did eventually get ashore on the operation.

Wick left for home late last February. He took with him two vivid pictures:

One, the picture of young Marines at war, with verve and with valor charging smack into the enemy, mixing with the enemy, defeating the enemy. (Wick talked so much about the Marines on his return that his son up and joined the Marine Corps!)

Two, the picture of these same young Americans, in the wake of battle, pouring their hearts and their energies and their resources into helping the Vietnamese people.

Wick vowed he wouldn't forget these two pictures. On his return to Texas, he launched himself on the lecture circuit, rallying support for America's fighting men and their efforts to assist the Vietnamese.

But he went further than that. He called on Governor John Connally of Texas, explaining to him about the Marine Corps' civic action program. Wick also spoke to officers of the Texas Air National Guard.

And a new drive was under way, a drive to raise friendship kits to send to the Marines in Viet Nam to assist in their pacification efforts.

Just recently an Air Guard plane touched down at the Da Nang Air Base. It was laden with friendship kits.

The kits, made of plastic mesh, contained items such as pencil sharpeners, rulers, needles, thread, soap, chewing gum, candy and cigarettes.

Each kit bore a message—in English and Vietnamese—which read:

"This friendship kit has been assembled by Texans, under sponsorship of the Texas Guard, as a message of our support of the cause of freedom for the people of South Vietnam. John Connally, governor of Texas."

And that's how the spirit of Wick Fowler returned to aid the Marines in Viet Nam—in the form of little friendship kits which will help a bit to brighten the lives of people in this long-suffering land.

It was a nice gesture, a typically big Texas gesture.

But then, Texas is a big state. And Wick Fowler is a big man.

KITS HELP SOOTHE FEELINGS—DURING SEARCH FOR CONG

DA NANG, VIET NAM.—"Friendship kits" from Texas were used to soothe hurt feelings today when a South Vietnamese hamlet was searched for evidence of Viet Cong sympathizers.

The treats were handed out to Vietnamese children and adults at a "county fair" operation in a tiny village about 10 miles northeast of Da Nang.

Such operations are routinely carried out in hamlets of South Viet Nam where the loyalty of residents to the government is questionable. Local militiamen, backed by U.S. marines, moved the villagers out of their homes for interrogation and a methodical search of the houses.

While the village men were being questioned to determine if any residents were Communist sympathizers and to learn if there had been any Communist troops in the area recently, the women were given canned fish, rice, cooking pots and stoves to prepare a community lunch. The activity is designed to make the search for Communists more like a picnic or county fair than a military operation.

Lt. Glenn Wapp of Riverside, Calif., who was running the show, said "the Leathernecks tried to cook the rice but the villagers didn't like that."

"They wanted to do it themselves," he said.

After lunch, the "friendship kits" were passed out causing a mad scramble among the village youngsters. The kits included candy, toothpaste, tooth brushes, pencils and balloons. Imitation Indian headbands—complete with feathers—were slipped into some kits.

Most bags contained packets of cigarettes, but some youngsters didn't resist the temptation to light up. The villagers were also shown movies and given medical treatment.

The "Friendship Kits" were the innovation of the Denton Record-Chronicle's Viet Nam war correspondent, Wick Fowler.

When he returned to Texas after three months of war reporting, he designed the kits and enlisted the aid of Gov. John Connally. Meantime, the Marines in Viet Nam agreed to distribute the kits as a test of their value in the Marines' civil action operations.

Two thousand kits, each containing a greeting from the governor, were sent to Viet Nam by the Texas Guard, a civilian group, in cooperation with the Texas National Guard. From California, the kits were flown across the Pacific by the California National Guard.

The kits included 1,000 drawings by school children of Denton.

Wapp, a marine platoon leader who had been wounded three times in eight months, was assigned to the civil affairs program five days ago.

"I've got six kids at home and I like being with kids," Wapp said. "This gives me a great opportunity to do that."

A TOURIST'S VIEW OF VIETNAM "WAR"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the greatest problems we have when we come to consider great foreign policy questions such as foreign aid or Vietnam is our inability to recognize the extent to which the objectivity of our judgment is impaired by our own image of ourselves. From time to time I have tried, not with any great success I fear, to call attention to this failing of ours.

Some of the clearest pictures which have been drawn of the American people and character have been those of foreign observers. In this connection one thinks immediately of distinguished names such as those of Alexis de Tocqueville or Bryce. A friend of mine in Arkansas, however, recently sent me an article of this nature written by a rather obscure—at least to me—observer appearing in a Philippine newspaper which could not have been expected to attract notice in this country. With due apology to the author, its style may appear not altogether that to which we are accustomed, but I suggest, Mr. President, that its content is well worth considering. While I would not entirely go along with everything in the article—for example the inference that the President has a low regard for human life—the author presents an interesting view of ourselves as others see us.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "A Tourist's View of the Vietnam 'War'," written by Cecile Afable in the Baguio, Philippines, Midland Courier be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOURIST'S VIEW OF VIETNAM WAR

(By Cecile Afable)

Advisers—a new breed of Americans, product of 20th century colonialism. Installed in air-conditioned sanctuaries, they are paid to think and hence to give "advice". This is taken very seriously by the American officials especially the civilians. The Americans in Vietnam are supposed to be only just "adviser", an excuse to make the American presence palatable to the world and to the American people. It is also a concession to their feeling and the Americans have a complementary need to believe and practice it. It provides the only excuse for their presence in Vietnam. At the same time it is the only way by which they can deny themselves the responsibility of what is happening around them, a way of shielding themselves from the ugliness of what is going on. In simple terms, it is a moral anesthetic.

These advisers say: "We are here to help the Vietnamese help themselves". That is exactly what they are doing—helping themselves. This advisory capacity is a gimmick invented by America to find a reason to intervene in developing countries. They come in all guises; "experts" under certain foundations or missions.

Why America will not withdraw. The Americans are committed to protect the South Vietnamese, it is a moral commitment. And if they should withdraw now a blood bath will ensue once the National Liberation Front gains control. Yet what is happening now is a thorough blood bath without end. Maybe if the Americans will leave there will be a bloodbath with an end, but right now there is no end to it. It is better to have an end with misery than to have misery without end.

Why are the refugees crowding Government centers? I visited Mai Tam in one of the centers and she said: "Bombings, it is the bombings and fighting on both sides, that drive them to our centers." The refugees are told to say that they were fleeing from VC terrorism and that they want a happy life under the Government in Saigon.

The new type of American soldiers in Vietnam. The majority of them are new types of dissenters, whose life has been disturbed when there is no immediate danger to it—has been ordered to go and fight in a distant war where the people are not even interested to fight for themselves. He thinks the war is "not worth a single American life, even a Vietnamese life." He has a high regard for human life and he hates to needlessly kill for the view of a few people like President Johnson and his advisers. He wants his country to pull out because, "I do not think communist control of South Vietnam will concern me in my life time."

Another type of soldier is the angry one. He wants to "bomb the ——" out of the villages and hamlets and let them get it. These are the most dangerous ones for they do it once in a while for fun and they might really do it more and more.

Another group are the professional army men who must have wars to direct and fight for they are useless in a peaceful country. To them must be victory at any cost.

Then there are the bitter draftees who are drafted because "they cannot afford to go to college". If they were in college they will not be there since they would have been exempted. One of them said, "I do not believe that communist control of Vietnam is a threat to ourselves. The commitment to Vietnam is all out of proportion to the importance of Vietnam." Another who was sounding like Lippmann said, "If we start here we will be doing the same thing all over the world."

The bitterest, anti-ideologists said, "The people here have been fighting a guerilla war for 20 years, I don't know anything about that kind of warfare. Must I die in it?"

An Igorot, (not Lamen) *looks at the war.* The Americans express the belief that their fighting in Vietnam is to oppose Communist China because this is the "expert" opinion of American experts. Yet they cannot prove that the National Liberation Front is Chinese beyond Hanoi. And to fight the Chinese through Vietnam gives it a stint of insanity. For here the death of the Vietnamese is unrelated to their lives. Do the Americans have to kill all the Vietnamese to stop the Chinese from threatening them? Then the Americans are involved in killing people to show other people to stop threatening them. Or do the Americans want to show the Chinese to stop threatening the Vietnamese, whom they are killing anyway? Then the Chinese threat obscures in advance the nature of the enemy. Shucks.

Who really is the enemy of the Americans in Vietnam? What does this enemy want? Why do the Americans always fail to recognize nationalism and its human aspirations? Not recognizing it they destroy it. By opposing it as is happening in this country, they drive it to self-defeating dependence upon major communists powers. Nationalism is a taboo subject in Vietnam.

The Vietnam soldier's part in this war. They are undisciplined, they are lazy and they smoke and chat too much while on patrol duty according to their American counterparts. Their disinterestedness is shocking and they are consistent deserters. Then they are said to create situations in order to increase American involvement in the war. "They would rather join bicycle races than help us fight their war," said one soldier, who also suspected that the Vietnamese is more interested in making a "fast buck than anything else."

Medicine man America. To an Igorot like me, America is a medicine man who is out to exercise the "forces of evil" from a people who refuse to give it up. That their processes of divination is cruder than that of my Igorot "Mumbonong" (priestess). Take their "domino theory" as an example, a clear thinking American cannot believe this and there are many more of them than their opposites. Where did the American policy makers get the idea that if Vietnam falls to Communist control, the whole of Southeast Asia will be swallowed?

If America wants to play medicine man to the entire world they should start learning more subtle techniques in divination and more gentler methods of exercising "forces of evils." This is only proper for their present role as the greatest, richest and most advanced nation in the world.

A MASSIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on Monday I delivered a speech in Jackson, Miss., in which I called for a much greater commitment to the upgrading of the life of the Negro in this country than we are making now.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to enter into the Record an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of August 9, which shows quite forcefully the steps we must take in this direction and the reasons we must take them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 9, 1966]

A Massive Program

It seems likely that the American people will soon be asked if they are prepared to spend large sums of money (and how much) for an all-out attack on those conditions producing today's racial unrest. When two such national figures as McGeorge Bundy, former White House special assistant and now head of the Ford Foundation, and America's foremost Negro public figure, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., raise the same question at almost the same moment, we can be fairly sure that here is an issue about which we shall all hear much in the near future.

Dr. King has proposed that during the next 10 years the United States spend $10 billion yearly for a kind of homefront Marshall Plan to attack the educational and living conditions which breed Negro discontent. Although Mr. Bundy named no figure, it would appear that he had roughly the same figure in mind in his suggestion of a nationwide effort to help the Negro.

Even if several billions of dollars are subtracted yearly for programs already under way, it is clear that both of these men envisage massive expenditures.

Three questions present themselves at once: (a) is such a program needed, (b) can the country afford it, and (c) will it do the trick?

It does not seem to us that there can be any doubt but that *something* of a massive and deep-going nature is needed. Efforts so far have clearly not succeeded in outrooting the cause of racial unrest. Indeed, such unrest appears to be spreading. It is by now a truism that the racial situation cannot be permitted to drag along, gradually worsening, without some new, inspired and workable effort to correct it.

Although we assume that Dr. King's figure was merely a general one, it would seem that the American economy (estimated to be presently growing at the rate of between $40 and $50 billion a year) could absorb without too great sacrifice such an effort. Indeed, the question might arise: Can America afford *not* to make such an effort? Furthermore, if such a program is reasonably successful, it could be expected to accelerate the nation's economic growth, becoming thereby in whole or in part self-liquidating.

It is, of course, utterly impossible to say whether even an effort of this size will, in fact, "do the trick."

It depends upon the extent to which these programs are oriented both toward providing greater opportunities and toward encouraging those improvements in mental, moral, and social conditions which will enable slum-dwellers to make adequate use of improved conditions. Spending large sums of money will not solve the problem unless it stimulates the deep-seated changes in attitudes, education, standards of conduct, and employability which are at the heart of the problem.

A year ago, following the Watts rioting, these columns called for massive, nationwide effort on behalf of the Negro. We believe that such a need is even more apparent today. But such an effort will be fruitless unless it simultaneously accomplishes three things. The first is the elimination of the physical conditions of slum living. The second is the elimination of those barriers of prejudice and discrimination which have helped force the Negro into the slums. The third is the elimination of those mental, social, and moral legacies of the past which help perpetuate the problem.

STIMULATION OF THE FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FHA- AND VA-ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1393, S. 3688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will have some remarks to make on this bill but that it will not be concluded this evening.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the committee bill, S. 3688, has as its purpose to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction.

This would be done in two ways: First, it would provide new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility of the Federal National Mortgage Association by authorizing FNMA to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times. The effect of this is to add about $2 billion new purchasing authority under this facility. Second, the bill would further increase FNMA's purchasing authority by authorizing an additional $1 billion in its special assistance function to purchase FHA and VA mortgages which do not exceed $15,000.

One of the most critical problems facing our economy today is the shortage of mortgage capital for home financing. The homebuilding industry is suffering one of its worst setbacks, from which it may not recover for many years to come. Building materials producers, real estate brokers, furnituremakers, and many other related activities are feeling the pinch of the mortgage credit shortage. More important, families seeking homes cannot buy even those houses already built because of the shortage of mortgage credit.

Mr. President, a recent survey of the impact of the credit shortage on future plans of the Nation's homebuilders revealed that residential construction starts will be down by about one-third for the remainder of this year. The latest monthly starts figures from the Department of Commerce show residential construction proceeding in June at an average annual rate of 1,264,000—down 18 percent from June of 1965. There are predictions that this rate will drop substantially below this in the coming months.

Mr. President, this situation is very disturbing to me, as I am sure it is to others who are concerned not only about homebuilding, but also about providing decent housing for our people. We realize that the basic cause of the mortgage credit shortage is the overall shortage of capital needed to finance an economy operating at full capacity levels. I understand this, but I do not believe that it is fair for homebuilders and home buyers to have to carry such a heavy share of this burden.

There are a number of remedies proposed to ease the shortage of capital on our economy and to create a better climate for mortgage lending. The Committee on Banking and Currency is considering these proposals and may make some recommendations in the future. Unfortunately, there are many problems in developing a consensus on the steps to take for a long-range remedy because of the involvement of so many groups whose interests may be seriously affected by the pending proposals.

Fortunately, however, the committee knew of no serious disagreement about the FNMA proposal now before us and gave strong bipartisan support for its quick passage by the Senate. Senator JOHN TOWER, ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, had introduced in the Senate S. 3482 which contained a FNMA provision similar in part to those in my bill S. 3529 which I had introduced on June 21. Senator TOWER can speak for himself, but I believe he strongly supports the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate has two sections. Section 1 would provide new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility by authorizing FNMA to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times. The effect of this is to add about $2 billion new purchasing authority under this facility.

Mr. President, I have a table which shows the status of the secondary market operation under FNMA. Under existing law, FNMA's borrowing authority is $4,016,256,930, whereas, under the proposed amendment, its borrowing authority would amount to $6,024,385,395, which amounts to an increase of about $2 billion. The existing unused borrowing authority is now $746,926,930; so that once this bill becomes law, the association would have a total unused borrowing authority of about $2.7 billion. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the FNMA table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal National Mortgage Association, secondary market operations, private borrowing authority

Capital and surplus (authorized at June 30, 1966)	$401,615,693
10-fold borrowing leverage (authorized)	4,016,256,930
15-fold borrowing leverage (authorized plus 50 percent) S. 3688	6,024,385,395
CAPITAL AND SURPLUS AT JUNE 30, 1966	
Preferred stock authorized	207,820,305
Common stock subscription and paid-in capital surplus	111,581,747
Preferred and Common equity	82,223,641
Total	401,625,693
BORROWINGS AT JUNE 30, 1966	
Debentures	2,180,050,000
Short-term discount notes	1,089,280,000
U.S. Treasury, interim	0
Total	3,269,330,000
Borowing authority June 30	4,016,256,930
Approximate unused borrowing authority	746,926,930

At June 30, 1966, $141,820,305 preferred stock was being utilized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, FNMA has placed restrictions on the purchasing of mortgages under its secondary market operations because of the concern that its funds would be quickly dissipated under current conditions. It has placed a ceiling of $15,000 on the amount of the mortgage it will buy. It has reduced the price to as low as 95 for 5¾ percent mortgages and it has limited its purchases to highly selective and good quality mortgage loans. Despite these limitations, the offerings have been so great that FNMA has purchased in the last month at an average weekly rate of about $43 million.

The pending bill would alleviate FNMA's problem and permit it to revise upward its ceiling of $15,000 and remove much of its present restrictions.

Section 2 of the bill would also increase FNMA's purchasing authority under its special assistance function with a $1 billion new authority in order to provide funds for financing low-cost housing which is not available under existing market conditions. This provision would limit the mortgage amount to $15,000 on FHA- and VA-assisted mortgages. The funding would come from two sources—$500 million from the Presidential authority, which now has an uncommitted balance of about $1.8 billion, and $500 million new Treasury borrowing. In view of FNMA's new authority to sell participations, the impact on the budget of such borrowing should be minor.

There has been some concern that the $500 million to be taken from the Presidential fund will deny some funds to the FHA section 221(d)(3) program. This concern is without foundation because $950 million of that fund is now scheduled for use in 1968 and 1969. All the amendment would do is to borrow from that part of the Presidential fund which the President has reserved for fiscal year 1969. Our problems today surely ought to be taken care of first before we worry about 1969. Those who express concern about this should be assured that adequate funds will be available to take care of section 221(d)(3) when the need is truly demonstrated.

The purpose of the new purchasing authority is to provide adequate funds for FNMA operations so that it can buy higher priced mortgages in its secondary market function and at the same time provide a market for lower priced mortgages in its special assistance function. These two operations, acting in conjunction with each other, I believe, will be a helpful support to the mortgage money market at this particular period.

I understand there has been some concern expressed about the $15,000 ceiling in the bill for the special assistance mortgages. Some homebuilders claim they cannot build homes today within this ceiling and therefore it should be raised or removed. I cannot understand this because I have figures to show that FHA is insuring at prices well within this ceiling.

According to figures given to me by the Federal Housing Administration, the range of averages for mortgages insured under section 203(b) during the last quarter of 1965 indicates that FHA has been insuring at levels well within the proposed $15,000 ceiling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing the FHA average mortgage amounts by State and by region for section 203(b) mortgages during the last quarter of 1965.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Average mortgage amount for proposed new homes with **FHA**-insured mortgages under sec. 203(b), 4th quarter 1965—Range of averages within region*

	Range	Low	High
New England		$15,051	$15,051
Connecticut	(1)		
Maine	(1)		
Massachusetts	$15,051		
New Hampshire	(1)		
Rhode Island	(1)		
Vermont	(1)		
Middle Atlantic		14,692	16,160
New Jersey	16,160		
New York	15,065		
Pennsylvania	14,692		
East North Central		14,725	16,255
Illinois	16,255		
Indiana	14,961		
Michigan	14,725		
Ohio	15,628		
Wisconsin	15,995		
West North Central		15,519	17,388
Iowa	15,981		
Kansas	(1)		
Minnesota	17,388		
Missouri	15,519		
Nebraska	16,234		
North Dakota	(1)		
South Dakota	(1)		
South Atlantic		14,167	16,462
Delaware	16,462		
District of Columbia	(1)		
Florida	15,604		
Georgia	15,568		
Maryland	14,167		
North Carolina	15,327		
South Carolina	14,917		
Virginia	16,012		
West Virginia	(1)		
East South Central		14,270	16,008
Alabama	16,008		
Kentucky	14,270		
Mississippi	14,560		
Tennessee	15,124		
West South Central		14,410	17,072
Arkansas	14,773		
Louisiana	17,072		
Oklahoma	14,410		
Texas	14,965		
Mountain		15,236	17,306
Arizona	15,236		
Colorado	16,409		
Idaho	16,938		
Montana	16,569		
Nevada	17,306		
New Mexico	16,943		
Wyoming	(1)		
Utah	16,114		
Pacific Coast States		14,586	19,493
California	19,493		
Oregon	14,586		
Washington	17,125		
Alaska	29,298		
Hawaii	21,970		
Puerto Rico	15,598		

[1] Not available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, these figures clearly show that homebuilders have, in fact, been building at levels averaging around $15,000 in almost all regions of the United States. It seems to me that when the Federal Government uses special assistance funds, they should be only for homes priced at a level that families of low and moderate income can buy. The need is obviously greatest at this level and I believe that the Federal Government should direct its greatest effort to the greatest need.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the FNMA bill, the housing bill, the urban mass transportation bill, and the comprehensive city demonstration bill, that necessary and appropriate staff members be given the privilege of the floor and admitted to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as we all know too well, inflation has grown very serious. Its symptoms and consequences have gone beyond higher costs, and now inflation is upsetting whole industries.

We are suffering an attack of what is called tight money.

Let us take a look at some of the pressures inflation has forced upon us:

Consumer prices have risen alarmingly to their highest point in our Nation's history. On a 100-point index based on 1959, consumer prices have risen to 112.9.

The current annual rate of cost inflation is between 4 and 5 percent. In only 6 months the cost of food has risen 2.5 percent. Commodities have risen 1.6 percent. Services are up 2.5 percent.

The 1933 dollar is now worth 40 cents. The 1940 dollar is worth 43 cents. The 1959 dollar is worth 88 cents. Never before has the value of our dollar been so low.

Higher taxes and higher prices more than wiped out whatever additional income Americans earned in April, May, and June. The average American had $10 less purchasing power in those months than he did during the first quarter of this year.

Interest rates have risen to their highest point, and bank liquidity has fallen to its lowest point in 36 years. The prime rate for bank loans is now 5¾ percent. Home mortgage rates are averaging over 6 percent, and rates of 7 to 8 percent and climbing are reported.

The U.S. Treasury's national debt managers are borrowing money at the highest interest rate the Government has paid in 45 years.

Interest rates on automobile loans and installment credit have increased in many areas.

A general credit contraction has occurred. It has become increasingly difficult for both businesses and individuals to obtain loans.

The Nation's savings and loan institutions are, for the first time in their history, facing a serious outflow of funds. In April alone they lost $1 million in deposits to other higher interest investment opportunities. U.S. News quotes a Houston savings and loan executive as saying:

> We're a $50 million loan operation, and we have not made a single new loan since May 1.

Because loan money is not available, residential construction has dropped sharply—in some places 30 percent—in reaction to both increased costs and the credit contraction. Homebuilding last month hit a 5-year low.

And, in the face of these ominous trends, the administration is operating with a budget sure to run a deficit of between $5 and $10 billion or more, the largest budget and possibly the largest deficit in our history.

We are now faced with this deteriorating situation because of Federal insistence on following a policy of "administered inflation." Inflation, which some bureaucrats hoped could be tolerated and controlled in small doses, has not been contained. It has grown beyond all safe proportions and has turned from threat into reality.

In the absence of administrative action, Congress can take some steps to better the tight money situation, particularly its harmful consequences for the housing industry.

In June, I introduced legislation to increase the secondary mortgage purchase authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. This would help place more loan money in the hands of savings and loan businesses so both home sellers and home buyers could complete transactions at lower rates.

I now have joined with Chairman SPARKMAN in sponsoring the pending legislation to increase by $3 billion the purchasing power of the Federal National Mortgage Association and to give it new authority to help finance FHA and VA mortgages.

I believe that this is an improved bill over the one that I originally offered. I wish to commend at this time the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in skillfully getting the bill through the committee without a ripple and securing a unanimous favorable report on the measure.

I believe it is absolutely necessary that this relief legislation be approved as soon as possible to offset the housing industry stalemate.

We will need other, longer term solutions to combat general inflation—controlled Government spending would do a lot—but the fact remains that fast action is necessary now to alleviate the tight-money strain on consumers, on banking and savings institutions, and on the homebuilding industry.

I am hopeful that this bill will be promptly passed with a minimum of controversy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand that we will not proceed with the bill tonight, but I would like to make a brief comment and ask the chairman of the committee a few questions, if the chairman would yield.

Assuming that the bill passes and we pump this extra $2 billion into FNMA, at what price is it anticipated they will buy these mortgages? The chairman said they are now buying them at 95.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amount is $2 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; $2 billion. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would simply allow FNMA to operate exactly as now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They would continue buying them at discount?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, both FHA and VA, each one of them, has a ceiling on the amount that they will insure. FNMA may buy in the secondary market at the mortgage level which FHA and VA insure. FNMA does not set that level. FHA and VA set it. I would be glad to supply those figures, but that varies according to the type of house. For instance, the mortgage ceiling for single home is one level and for a multiple-unit apartment home is another level per unit and for the entire building. The FHA has limits by laws and it has been this way all along.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me go further and say that under the Special Assistance Program, we propose to limit the mortgage to $15,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The question I should like to get clear is, assuming that John Doe has a $10,000 mortgage on his home insured by FHA which has been placed in one of the banks and the bank wants to sell it under this package assuming the bill goes through, what price will be paid, the same 95 at discount below par or at par?

Mr. SPARKMAN. At the present time, they are buying them at 95. We hope that this will give them flexibility enough so that they can move toward par.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the understanding I had, that they were perhaps going to take these mortgages over around par.

The next question is, if that is true, would this not be substantially a bail-out for the banking and mortgage institutions rather than an assistance to home buyers?

One problem which disturbs me is that while I realize the housing industry is in trouble, those I would like to help are the home buyers, but the talk I keep hearing about this bill is that the homebuilders need it.

I respect the homebuilders, but the purpose of this legislation should be to benefit the homeowner.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the home buyers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think that we should be talking about the homeowners and how this will benefit them. I want to make sure that this is not a bail-out for someone who has gotten caught with some low-interest mortgages on hand in this high-interest era.

For example, suppose these are now bought at par; that is, 5¾-percent mortgage.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say there that they will not buy them at par. They buy them at the market price. I do not believe anyone feels that it is good to have the price depressed to the extent it is at the present time. They have put that restriction on because the market is depressed, but it is the average home buyer—and I agree wholly with the statement of the Senator from Delaware—it is the average home buyer we are interested in.

Today, they cannot buy a home because the money is not available. The little bit of money that does become available is at this price which is depressed. The purpose is not to let them bail anyone out, but to provide an orderly and secondary market.

There is a secondary market now, but it is under restrictions, with no mortgage over $15,000 to be involved, and at the depressed price of 95.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One of the situations which has brought this about is the current high interest rates, generated, of course, from a shortage of money. The 5.75 percent, $10,000 or $15,000 mortgages, is hard to place today when the banks can buy a 5.9-percent Government-guaranteed obligation, as it is sold by FNMA today under the participation sales package. I understand that the last sales were around 5.90 percent.

If this bill passes and this $2 billion is pumped into the system, would they loan at 5.75 percent on home mortgages, or would they just buy the 5.9 percent to 6-percent AAA bonds which are so readily available? As long as we keep the 5.75-percent ceiling on mortgage rates is that going to help the problem so far as the buyer of a home is concerned? That is what is bothering me.

I am not sure this proposal will cure the situation at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One of the problems is the interest rate, as the Senator has stated. I made some reference to it in my statement. The law limits the rate at which FHA and VA can insure to 6 percent. That is the ceiling. But there is in existence today a 5¾-percent ceiling. We do not handle that. That is an administration decision of FHA and VA. They have moved it up. From the time we got into this high interest rise, it has moved from 5¼ percent in the case of VA to 5 percent. First, 5½ percent and then later 5¾ percent. They have moved it as the market moved, and it will continue to operate but under the statutory ceiling fixed at 6 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was not injecting the question of how we arrived at the high interest rates here. That is beside the point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. Let me say that I mentioned the Committee on Banking and Currency now has under consideration a bill which would make certain changes, changes recommended by the Federal Reserve Board and approved by the Budget Bureau, and different agencies such as Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., and so forth. That does involve several prospective changes. We have not come to any resolution as to what the details will be, but we do recognize that this, and this alone, will not solve the problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point. This was called to my attention. We know that we cannot place a 5.75-percent, $10,000 or $15,000 mortgage at par today. That is almost impossible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, and we recognize that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So to get around the 5.75 ceiling, we have this point system, or a practice of discounting the mortgage. Suppose we have a builder constructing a home which is costing him $14,000, for example. He needs this price in order to stay in business. Normally, if the mortgage were placed at par he would sell that house for $14,000. But now he cannot sell that home for $14,000. He recognizes that he must discount it six points. This is a fact of life. Knowing he will have to discount that mortgage by six of seven points he cannot sell for $14,000 and maybe have to knock off $800; this would mean selling the home at a loss.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what is happening now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Therefore, the builder is not going to continue to sell that home at a loss. So, what is he doing? He is going back to FHA, arguing out the fact that this point system is in reality a part of the cost and that he will not sell that home unless he gets the appraisal increased by the FHA. A compromise is reached, say at $14,800, so that he can finance the home and absorb the $800 discount in selling the mortgage. He gets the $14,000. The homeowner has signed a mortgage for $14,800, at 5¾ percent interest on a home which he normally would have purchased for $14,000 if it had not been for the point system.

That is what is happening.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So that the RECORD may be complete, let me remind the Senator that that home must be appraised.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It must be appraised by the FHA or VA, whichever one is operating. He cannot take a mortgage on that home and handle it or get it insured beyond the appraised value given by the FHA or VA. The inevitable result is that the builder, in order to sell—I will not say that he takes a loss—but sometimes he is lucky to break even or make a little profit. Therefore he has quit building.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Suppose he is building in an area where there is a need for homes; he does not continue unless he gets a valuation high enough so that after paying this discount he can stay in business. That is the situation. It is the home buyer who ultimately pays. Let us face it. Let us follow that home buyer who is paying the $800 under the point system. These are 30-year mortgages. The bank does not want to tie up its money at 5¾ percent so it only pays 92 or 93 percent of par for the mortgage. It gets 5¾ percent plus the 6 or 7 points amortized over the 30 years of the loan. With the amortization of these points added to the 5¾ percent interest the bank gets an interest of 6 or 6¼ percent. That is the reason for the point system. It is a gimmick to raise interest charges.

An even worse effect is this. Unscrupulous operators can make more money on quick defaults than on good credit risks. For example, when they pay $9,500 for a $10,000 mortgage and amortize the 5 points discount over the 30 years they get about 6 percent. But assume the home buyer defaults in 5 years; the mortgage is turned over to the FHA at par, and the 5 points is amortized over a period of only 5 years, which brings the interest up to around 7 percent.

If the mortgage is sold to a bad credit risk who keeps the home only 2 years, considering the same points it amounts to around 8 percent interest. If the default is made in 1 year the point system is picked up for the 1 year, and the yield is nearly 10 percent.

Therefore, we have a situation here where more money is made on the bad credit risk than on the legitimate home buyer who pays the mortgage off over a 30-year period.

That is the peculiar situation we are in. There is a question as to what extent it can be corrected in this bill, but we must recognize this is a problem. Any program that is operated in connection with a Government agency or private enterprise under which a man can make more money on a bad credit risk than he can on a good credit risk is wrong, and it should be changed.

There is no question here but that money is made on the mortgage that is in default. I think that is wrong. I think the profit should be made on the man who pays.

I have had several examples of such operations called to my attention. We should recognize the situation of what happens when on owner of a home through illness is out of work for a short time and is in default. Suppose Joe Doakes fails to pay his monthly installment. A mortgage holder who is anxious to get rid of the mortgage sends his collector, but they tell him, "Be sure he is not home when you go there."

The man fails to pay the second month. After he fails to pay the third or fourth month the FHA is notified, and the mortgage can be cashed at par. The point system has paid an excellent profit.

This bill does nothing to correct this abuse. In fact, it only pumps more money into the same system.

I have received letters from home buyers who as the result of hard luck became 3, 4, or 5 months delinquent in their payments. They were then able to catch up the full payments. The person who held the mortgage did not want to accept the backpayment because by doing so he would lose the extra profit he would make on the point system by turning the mortgage over to FHA for foreclosure.

I received a letter from a lady living in Texas whose husband is in Vietnam. She missed her payments for just a few weeks beyond the allowable time. She had the backpayments and wants to continue to live in the home. The mortgage holder does not want to accept the money because he wants to cash the mortgage in at par and collect the points. It appears that she is to be evicted and then have the house sold. Why should she not be allowed to make her payments?

To what extent is that situation corrected in this bill. I am not sure the bill should be passed. I point out that we should be trying to get at a solution for this type of situation. I think it is the home buyer who should be protected and not just a bailout for the holder of the mortgage.

That problem is not corrected under the bill before us.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee. Probably the problem should be dealt with in the bill which will follow this one, the amendments to the Housing Act, but we have a responsibility to face this problem and get a solution before we put out another $3 billion.

Perhaps we need to change the law so that the guarantee will be only on the amount paid for the mortgage. Then there will be no sure profit on the point system, and the mortgagor would have to take some chance on getting his money back. Somewhere we must find the answer. I do not support any program which puts a premium on a man who is a bad credit risk because more money can be made on defaults than on collections.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has raised a valid point, but may I point out that such a case as he has referred to is very, very rare.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, but even one is too many.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will remember that a couple of years ago our subcommittee—I believe he knows this—made a study of foreclosures at a time when there was a rise in them. The statistics given us indicated that the foreclosures are 1½ percent. I think that is a pretty fine record and certainly is not enough to prove a danger to this program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am familiar with the figures. I do not have them before me at this moment, but I will have them tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have them here. It is a complicated table.

In December 1965, which is the latest figure we have, the rate of default was 15.65 FHA home mortgages in default for every 1,000 mortgages in force. That is 1.56 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As related to the total amount insured by the FHA?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of the number in force at the time, not the number insured.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How many millions were insured as of that time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall have to see if I can find the answer to the question the Senator has asked me. As of December 1965, the number of FHA home mortgages in force is 4,090,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I mean in dollar volume, the total amount of insurance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would have to look that figure up, but I have referred to the number of mortgages. I shall check further to see if the dollar amount is given.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I received similar statistics. I merely wish to say this. Percentages are related to the total amount of insurance. If I recall correctly, about $50 billion of insurance was outstanding at that time. If we consider that only about 1½ percent is in default that may sound low. But when we speak of 1½ percent of the total we are speaking of $750 million, and that is a large amount of defaults in mortgages.

Around $1,150 million is the amount of inventory in defaulted mortgages that had been taken over in multifamily projects and homes. That amount did not include the hundreds of millions of dollars that were involved in which deferments of mortgages had been arranged.

So I do not want anyone to be misled. I do not mean that the Senator from Alabama is misleading anyone. I mean that while the percentages seem low they do not paint a true picture because they are related to the grand total; and when we look into it, we are talking about more than a billion dollars in defaults. That sounds to me more realistic than to say that, after all, it is only about 1½ percent of the total amount insured. It is still a billion dollars.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is approximately correct in his estimate of the total amount insured. It is about $50 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall discuss this subject further tomorrow. The reason I have raised these questions now is to point out that we ought to be certain that whatever Congress does is directed toward helping the buyers of homes. With all due respect to the homebuilders, who do a marvelous job, it is the homeowner with whom we are concerned here. The purpose is not merely to put homebuilders and construction workers back to work; it is to provide homes for those who want them.

To whatever extent the Federal Government underwrites the cost of this particular program the benefits of the program, so far as I am concerned, should go to the home buyers. I do not think they are getting the benefits as the system is operating today.

I agree that part of of this problem is the rapid rise in interest rates in the last few years. This is something that the FHA does not have control over. But there are factors over which it does have control, and I think that some of those deficiencies in their policies need to be discussed and pointed out.

I yield the floor for tonight.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have checked further on the FHA insurance. In December of 1965, it had a total of $42,045 million in insurance outstanding on one- to four-family homes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is multifamily and individual homes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, that is the total for one- to four-family homes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was discussing the totals for homes and multifamily homes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say that I find no fault at all with the statements the Senator from Delaware has made. I agree with him that we are concerned with the home buyers. I believe the Senator will find that in the opening statement I made, on every occasion I used the words "homebuilders and home buyers."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not directing my criticism at that alone.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We bring the homebuilders in because in order to meet the need for housing in this country, according to a study that our subcommittee made a few years ago, we need, by 1970, to be producing 2 million homes a year. Last year we produced, I believe, 1,520,400 or approximately that number. We are now running at about 1,264,000 a year. Even what we are producing now is largely a result of the momentum that was gained before this tight money situation developed; and it is predicted that there will continue to be a dropping off of homebuilding, and we will not be able to supply the homes that new families need.

That is the reason we bring the homebuilders in. We bring in the would-be home buyers because they are those families who need homes and cannot buy them today, because of the tight money situation in the home mortgage market.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was not criticizing the chairman of the committee. I am only stating facts. The conditions have developed in spite of and not as a result of what the committee has done, and we might say the same thing is true for the FHA as far as high interest rates are concerned. The interest rates are higher; that is a fact of life. We are not debating the merits of that now.

But I believe the FHA has been negligent in some factors which have aggravated this problem in that they have been approving the expansion in the building of these homes, multifamily projects primarily, on the basis of the statistics here in Washington and not on the basis of whether the market in the local area can absorb them. The result is that in some areas there is, even today, the overbuilding of homes and a high rate of vacancies in existing facilities. The result is that the owners and builders of these projects are going bankrupt. We have legitimate builders who had put their money in some of those projects, thinking they could make an income by renting them. But with the unusually large number of projects which have been approved by the FHA in their areas they are being put out of business. This results from overbuilding financed by the FHA.

I cite as an example the case in Alaska, to which I referred yesterday. In Anchorage, Alaska, there were seven projects insured by the FHA. Six of them are now bankrupt. There is no reason for that. That is the result of overbuilding and loose policies. They have an unusually high vacancy rate. Someone approved projects that should have been rejected. We will not correct that problem by putting more money in that area.

We are speaking primarily here today of small homes, but the multifamily projects of which I speak are where a lot of money of FHA has gone, money that they should have been putting it single homes. I think they should have been directing their attention to the individual home buyers, rather than approving a lot of multifamily projects to stand as monuments to the folly of some local administrator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not quarrel with the Senator on that point. Of course, it is hard to maintain an exact and proper balance.

May I say, with reference to the projects in Anchorage, Alaska, our subcommittee is looking into that right now. We have asked for a full report. Our subcommittee does try to keep up with these projects and programs all over the country. That is part of the work that is assigned to us under the resolution under which we operate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield the floor for tonight.

MARKETING OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BONDS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under current circumstances in the money market, there has been increasing discussion of the difficulties that must be faced by States, cities, counties, and other local governmental authorities in selling their bonds. The receipts from these securities, as is well known, have long been used to finance the basic capital structures of the community such as schools, water, sewer, and tranportation facilities, health, and, in some cases, recreational installations. Any problems in the marketing of these bonds seriously impairs the ability of our communities to provide the better services to our citizens of today and tomorrow.

A story in the Journal of Commerce of July 20, 1966, illustrates some of these difficulties. The article states that as a result of smaller banks liquidating their municipal portfolios, and institutional and insurance investors forgoing these securities, at the present time, there is an "intense downward price pressure on the entire municipal list."

History tells us that, as far back as 1700, colonial governments were familiar with short-term borrowing. Although no precise date can be set for the birth date of municipals, there are records of such issues in the early 1800's, and securities from about 1815 had many of the characteristics of a modern municipal bond issue. Since the building of the Erie Canal in the 1820's, these bonds have been a major source of financing improvements in the public sector.

By 1900, the volume of borrowing by use of this medium was about $300 million, and by the end of World War I it was more than $1 billion a year. Between 1946 and 1960, these borrowings have increased more than sevenfold to $7½ billion. In 1966 it is authoritatively estimated that the figure might reach $13 billion.

In my own State of Alabama during an 8-year period ending in 1964, municipal bonds were issued in the total amount of over $1 billion. The total was divided according to the following uses:

Municipal Bonds—$740.9 million.
School Bonds—$131.5 million.
Water & Sewage—$127.8 million.
Recreational Facilities—$6.6 million.

The marketing of these bonds has enabled many communities in Alabama to attract new industry, where new industry is vitally needed, by allowing a company to negotiate a lease up to 30 years on new plants and equipment without an immediate outlay of capital.

In Alabama, the Wallace Act and the Cater Acts provide that land, buildings, and personal property necessary for manufacturing, processing, assembling, storing, or distributing industrial or commercial items may be included within a bond project. Under the Wallace Act, the bonds are serviced from revenues gained from the particular project.

These developments, together with Alabama's dozen river ports, ample land and water, and favorable climate and tax structure, have meant new long-term leases on life for many communities in my State in adapting to the new industrial opportunities of our age. I believe that Senators from other States will have similar stories to tell.

Beyond this, the capacities of local government to borrow is at the foundation of their ability to grow and maintain the rightful significance of State and local government in our Federal system. The projects arise out of local initiative and are shaped by local planning. They are constantly subject to local approval and local control. The willingness of our citizens to undertake this increasing level of such activity should be a great source of satisfaction, and should be encouraged in every way.

The tax-exempt status of these bonds is, of course, a central feature, because it lowers the rate of interest that must otherwise be paid by the taxpayers for the borrowed funds. As we know, however, the interest rates have been increasing, and the article states that they are now pushing through the 4-percent level.

In recognition of the importance of municipal bonds as a foundation for sound community growth, on February 16 of this year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 137, authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 17 as the State and Municipal Bond Week. I was most gratified when the companion resolution House Joint Resolution 137 passed the Senate on April 5, was sent to the White House, and signed by President Johnson.

The enactment of these resolutions, I believe, demonstrates congressional recognition of the importance of maintaining an active market for municipal bonds.

Therefore, I call upon all concerned to take the action necessary at this time so that municipal bonds will not "go begging" and our local governments and local communities can look forward to a continued inflow of funds to provide for future progress. In the days ahead, I shall be doing all that I can to assist in this worthwhile cause.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal of Commerce, July 20, 1966]

FED FUNDS LURING SMALLER BANKS—MUNICIPAL BONDS GO BEGGING

CHICAGO, July 19.—Smaller midwest commercial banks, attracted by record rates for overnight money, are becoming increasingly active sellers this Summer in the Federal funds market.

The entry of smaller banks with cash reserves to spare into the Federal funds market is being spurred by the spirited 5.5 per cent and upwards bidding by major midwest metropolitan banks. These banks, already hard-pressed under the Federal Reserve's tight money posture, are strongly apprehensive over the possibility of a serious liquidity squeeze arising during the coming weeks in the event a sharp certificate of deposit runoff occurs.

The concern over the development of a major CD runoff is being generated by rising yields for Treasury bills and Federal agency securities. These are becoming more and more attractive to corporate treasurers worrying about the widening cash-to-current-liabilities gap and hesitant in today's money markets to tie-up sizable sums in even the 89-day CD's.

SIZABLE NUMBER

A Journal of Commerce survey of smaller midwest banks revealed that a sizable number have entered the Federal funds market as sellers for the first time this year. A larger number indicated participation in the Fed funds market less than three years.

While the $200 million estimated Fed funds offerings of smaller seventh district banks during recent week settlement periods are relatively minor in terms of total Fed funds volume, the recurrent return to the marketplace of these banks is noted with interest by their metropolitan correspondents. Chicago bank money desk officials indicate that transactions of as little as $100,000 are becoming fairly commonplace.

A strong motive for accepting or placing small Fed funds offerings at current high rates is the larger institution's desire to maintain and strengthen valuable correspondent ties. However, bankers admit that access to even small amounts of Federal funds can be useful in today's market.

The new Fed fund activities of smaller banks may turn out to be a case of jeopardizing opportunities for long-term profits for short-term gains, according to bank investment officers, since it involves the use of monies that might well be better employed to nail down some of the current record tax-exempt yields.

With high grade municipals pushing through the 4 per cent level, bank investment advisors report they are still finding it difficult to induce rural correspondents to make even minimum commitments in the tax-exempt sector.

Lack of smaller bank municipal buying and continuing tax exempt liquidation from portfolios of major metropolitan institutions under the tight money squeeze is maintaining intense downward price pressure on the entire municipal list. Also notable by their absence from the state and local obligations market are the institutional investors and major insurance groups.

The problem at mid-Summer appears to be everywhere the same—lack of money. The casualty insurers point out that expanded claims are making large inroads into available cash reserves and the life insurance companies report sharply increased calls for lower-rate contract loans from their policyholders. The acuteness of the situation is pointed up by indications from bankers that several life insurance firms are preparing to draw on their commercial bank credit lines for the first time since the early 1930's.

HAZARDOUS NOW

Further complicating the problems of the municipal sector is the inability to do any-tax-exempt hedging or short selling in current markets. Money market analysts note that the diverse maturities and coupons of the list makes switching and short-selling a highly involved affair. In any case, the extreme thinness of the market in recent weeks would seem to make hedging or short-selling hazardous until some revival of consistent buying occurs.

Meanwhile, non-bank dealers are finding it increasingly difficult to develop sources of municipal financing outside the commercial banking system. A possible approach reportedly being considered by several dealers is resort to repurchase agreements similar to those used to finance the Treasury securities markets.

Looking to the early Fall, municipal dealers are convinced that, with the calendar light over the next 90 days, the technical side of the market is set for a sizable rally. The triggering mechanism, however, still remains in the hands of an Administration reluctant to take the pressure off the monetary side by transferring some of the burden in the form of restrictive fiscal measures.

COLUMBUS HAD TROUBLE, TOO

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ran across a little item the other day in the Christian Science Monitor of August 4, 1966. To me it was most interesting, and I think it is particularly relevant at this time, because we have had some debates on the matter of providing funds for the space agency. The article is very brief, and I should like to read it. It is entitled "Columbus Had Trouble, Too."

The article is as follows:

> Columbus, it appears, had about as hard a time finding support for his revolutionary idea of sailing west to reach China as do space officials today who want to land on Mars and explore the other planets.
>
> One of the 15th-century navigator's appeals for help was to the Senate of his native state of Genoa.
>
> The Senate of Genoa, however, recognizing it knew little about oceanic exploration, did what comes naturally to senators of any age or state: They appointed a committee to study his suggestion.
>
> After months of debate they finally got out a report—which has only recently been discovered in a monastery library in southeastern Spain. The report ran—964 pages!
>
> The Senate committee also sent Columbus a letter, which, in brief, discouraged his westward voyage. Its letter ended with these memorable passages:
>
> "We feel that you will be quite pleased with the output of this progressive, forward-looking committee of profound scholars. Incidentally, there was one additional member of the committee, a rather rash and impetuous young engineer, lately of Florence, who was sent in place of the ailing Dr. Taglatti of the University of Milan. Though he came highly recommended, he showed his immaturity and poor judgment by advocating that the voyage itself be initiated immediately.
>
> "Investigation proved him to be quite eccentric (he talks of flying machines and fancies himself an artist), and he was therefore dismissed from the committee. He is the son of a Florentine notary, and in case you desire to contact him, his name is Leonardo da Vinci."

I add this note with some pride:

> Source of this historical gem is Dr. Hermann K. Weidner, Director of Research and Development Operations, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 11, 1966, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 10 (legislative day of August 9), 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

John P. Fullam, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

Alfred W. Moellering, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Old Settler's Day at Hillsboro, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on August 24 and 25 the good people of Hillsboro, Ill., are observing Old Settler's Day. I believe that this great historic occasion should be recognized by this body.

Hillsboro was established as the county seat of Montgomery County in 1821. In 1883, 2 days were set aside to bring the friends and neighbors of the town together and honor its past. This celebration, traditionally held on the last Wednesday and Thursday of August, has become a truly significant occasion for the people of Hillsboro.

The Old Settler's celebration pays tribute to the senior citizens who have contributed so much to the town. However, the citizens of this community, fully cognizant of the fact that the laurels of the past alone do not entitle them to the keys of the future, are making plans and improvements for the development of their city.

I welcome the opportunity to observe the Old Settler's celebration that has grown to be so much a part of the people of Hillsboro, Ill.

Great Society Fiscal Policies Trigger Current Labor-Management Difficulty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the present airline strike and the possible intervention by Congress in this dispute point the finger of blame at the actual root of the trouble which is the Great Society's unwise fiscal policy.

Inflation, skyrocketing Government spending, and a 3.5-percent jump in the cost of living in the past year are the principal reasons why the American public is now inconvenienced by the strike.

No one can really blame American labor for their fear that any contractual gains will only be lost in the galloping inflation. And no one can really blame business, which is feeling the pinch resulting from inflation.

More than likely Congress will act this week, but the chief cause of the difficulty will remain. Administration-fostered inflation will continue to hamper both business and labor.

Birthday of Iowa's President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 92 years ago today, Herbert Clark Hoover, Iowa's only President of the United States, was born in a two-room cottage in West Branch, Iowa, which is located in the district which I have the honor of representing. Just last Sunday, August 7, I had the privilege of participating in the annual ceremony commemorating his birthday, which is sponsored by the West Branch Heritage Foundation and the West Branch community, in honor of Iowa's native son who became the 31st President of the United States. At the dignified ceremony which is held each year, I presented to the community the pen which was used by President Johnson to sign my bill, H.R. 8111, which created Iowa's first major national park facility, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

For those of you who have not had the privilege of visiting this most serene town in my district, I would like to describe the setting in which the very fitting memorial is located. The simple, two-room cottage in which the late President was born has been restored and refurnished, and stands on the original site not far from the west branch of Wapsinonoc Creek.

Nearby is a well-executed replica of Jesse Clark Hoover's blacksmith shop, which houses an extensive collection of contemporary tools and other objects.

Nearby stands the Herbert Hoover Library. This structure, which was recently enlarged, will house the collection of papers accumulated by Mr. Hoover during his long career as a public servant, his collection of books, and other items of interest.

It is only about one-fourth mile to the southwest on a hillside overlooking the birthsite to the graves of Herbert Hoover and his wife, Lou Henry Hoover. The serenity and the beauty of the site are indeed magnificent. The graves are sheltered by a crescent-shaped planting of evergreen and the view down the valley to the birthplace is kept open in accordance with the wishes of the late President Hoover.

I am most pleased that today, on the anniversary of the birth of the late President Hoover, plans are proceeding with the development of the national memorial. When it is completed, the park will commemorate with dignity a great American and a great Iowan. The memorial to our late President will be such that it will recapture, as much as possible, the serenity and beauty of the area in which he was born and raised, and from which he drew the moral, as well as physical, stamina and serenity of outlook which characterized his public career.

Tax Deductions for Advanced Degrees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, our Government, being so large and complex, sometimes works at cross purposes. While this Congress and administration have shown admirable sympathy to higher education, one agency of our Government, the Internal Revenue Service, is retarding pursuit of advanced degrees by our Nation's teachers. The IRS does so through no lack of wisdom, I'm sure, but through assiduous concern for its prime duty of revenue collection.

I am today introducing a bill which affirms our Government's willingness to allow tax deductions for teachers who are furthering their formal education. At present, if their efforts eventually entitle them to another degree, their expenses become nondeductible.

The Service claims that Congress has never endorsed deductions on expenses specifically for education. Educational expenses are considered normal business expenditures under some conditions, and are deductible for this reason. When a teacher is required to improve his skills to keep in step with his profession, as he is by State law in Colorado, or has to meet minimum, continuing educational demands set by his contract, his expenses are deductible.

The IRS says pursuit of advanced degrees is akin to neither of these cases. They say these teachers are attempting, instead, to advance substantially their personal positions within their profession. Hence, theirs are not normal business expenditures and are not deductible.

My bill overturns this ruling. All expenses for legitimate, formal education, whether they lead to a degree or not, are made deductible. I feel this bill is necessary if we are to avoid stifling the incentive of our teachers to improve themselves. We risk deterioration of our country's teaching resources if we impose penalties, rather than rewards, for intellectual effort.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call special attention to the colorful and patriotic activity given emphasis each August during National Drum Corps Week. It would be difficult to imagine a parade or public event without the spirited pageantry and stirring music which are contributed by our Nation's drum corps. Yet, few of us have stopped to consider that an estimated 3 million citizens, both here and in Canada, are donating their time and abundant energy to make this enjoyment possible.

In my own State of Massachusetts, some 250 corps are offering young and old alike the opportunity to participate in this wholesome and invigorating activity as they contribute to the public spirit. The world open championship at Lynn, Mass., is one of 60 outstanding competitions held, from Maine to California, offering incentive and experience to the members of America's numerous corps.

The week of August 20 through 27, designated this year as "National Drum Corps Week," is of special interest and significance to all involved in the effort of our drum corps. During this week three spectacular displays of drum corps training and discipline will be on exhibition. Following a drum and bugle parade down New York's Fifth Avenue, the Veterans of Foreign Wars will sponsor the glittering "Million Dollar Pageant of Drums" in Jersey City with more than 8,000 enthusiastic participants. During the same week the national jubilee will be sponsored by the noted New York Kingsmen. And, as the week of festivities draws to a close in New York, the Nation's Capital will be opening its doors to the national convention of the American Legion and "The Parade of Champions," the grand finale of its national competition for the uniform group contest. Approximately 10,000 are expected to participate. My own district in Massachusetts will be honorably represented by the world champion Debonnaires Drum and Bugle Corps. This distinguished group also holds our State title as Mayflower Circuit Champions. While in Washington for the national competition, they will be performing on the House steps of the Capitol from 1 p.m. until 1:30 p.m., on Friday, August 26. I would like to extend a personal invitation to you all to stop by and hear this fine group.

The popularity of the drum corps in America has seen a revival in the last several decades. The fife and drum were used for several centuries in this country and throughout the world for signals and military music as armies went into battle. Our American Revolution began when the drummer, William Dinman, beat the call "To Arms" on Lexington Common. As late as World War I, drum signals were still officially prescribed in military manuals. But, gradually, this remnant of an inspiring part of American history was replaced by more modern means of communication. The drum corps were no longer a military expedient, but they became, instead, a vivid, living part of our heritage, a part which offers its participants enjoyment, a feeling of worth, and an invaluable opportunity for character growth.

To qualify for one of today's units, our young people must be willing to acquire a keen sense of duty and responsibility, both to themselves and others. They must learn the importance of cooperation, self-discipline and reliability, qualities which are badly needed in a country with a rising rate of juvenile crime. And, the precision drills and group training demands the proper respect for superiors.

In return the drum corps offers its members a sense of accomplishment and pride. It offers the opportunity to learn music and to share its enjoyment with others. It offers them, through the numerous public performances and competitions, an invaluable training ground for the development of poise and self-confidence. It offers them, also, a chance for travel and that important sense of belonging to a group.

The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other private groups and individuals, who have made the financing of the corps possible and who have given of their time, effort, and interest to promote them, are to be commended, also, this week for their very valuable service as we pay special recognition to the fine men and women comprising our Nation's drum corps.

As we observe National Drum Corps Week, it is with a deep sense of appreciation for the thousands cooperating together to give added vitality, patriotism, and enthusiasm to our national life. The spirit of the drum corps is contagious and the lives of all of us are richer because of it.

The Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the airline strike is now into its 34th day and because the negotiations have become muddled with politics they have become more involved and it takes a greater degree of give-and-take to reach a settlement.

In my own district, many small individual firms—for example, the florists and nurseries—are being financially crushed. To them, there is no difference between the airline strike and a flood: the damage to their business is there and it is almost irreparable. Identical situations are occurring throughout the country and while these personal disasters do not constitute a national emergency, the financial losses and inconveniences to these innocent bystanders are enormous.

There is now before Congress legislation to end this strike. However, the precedent that would be set if this legislation were enacted would have a negative impact on all—and Mr. Speaker, I emphasize all—future collective bargaining between labor and management. For it is easy to see that if Congress does step into this particular strike to force a settlement, there can be no serious collective-bargaining efforts in any future dispute between labor and management, for each side will expect that Congress will eventually legislate the settlement and will therefore be tempted to only go through the motions of negotiating until Congress steps in, thus setting back the gains we have made in the area of collective bargaining in the last 30 to 40 years.

I, for one, do not want to see this tragic step backward take place, and as I told my colleagues on July 14, it is my hope that the reasonable men on both sides of the issue will assume the grave responsibilities which are theirs and bring about an end to this unhappy situation.

Titusville and Winter Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 cities which it is my honor to represent here in Congress are among the top 10 in Florida which lead in growth, according to a special analysis made by a Miami research concern.

These 2 cities are Titusville, a space-oriented city in Brevard County, ranked second, and Winter Park, where I live in Orange County, ranked ninth, as having experienced the soundest and fastest growth in recent years.

Using the term "quality growth," the First Research Corp., of Miami explained that this refers to high levels of construction, population growth, income increases, retail activity, value of housing, industrial expansion, and many other factors that indicate rapid, but sound, community growth.

The study pointed out that Florida, in the 1960's, experienced the beginning of another boom period, but it is just the opposite of the boom and bust of land speculation in the 1920's.

The State's economy is described as healthier and better balanced than at any time in its history. This is seen as a result of the State capitalizing on its fast population growth in the 1950's, increased manufacturing facilities, a year-round tourist flow, and capturing a major share in the Nation's space program.

For that matter, I am privileged to represent the Cape Kennedy space complex in Brevard County, the Nation's moonport and the focal point of America's space endeavors for the world.

The 10 cities listed in order are Fort Lauderdale, Titusville, Naples, Pompano Beach, Hollywood, Fort Walton Beach, Gainesville, Boca Raton, Winter Park, and Plantation.

This is a fine commentary on central Florida's high rank as a place to live and do business.

Maryland Moves To Meet Changing Land Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the five counties of northwestern Maryland that make up the present Sixth Congressional District illustrate very well, I believe, the multiple problems of soil and water conservation that confront many areas in our rapidly growing Nation today.

Most of the Sixth District is rural, and much of it is mountainous and rich in natural beauty. But there is a growing urban concentration from the District of Columbia line in Montgomery County to Frederick. Dense urban development characterizes the southern end of the Sixth District. The problems presented in this area require the staying and guiding hand of the professional conservationist, and the understanding and cooperation of local, State, and Federal governments which must be concerned with the best use of the land and the preservation of our natural heritage.

I am happy to say that with the cooperation of land owners and operators, soil conservation districts, and local, State and Federal agencies, meaningful steps have been taken to correct soil and water problems in both the rural and urban areas of the Sixth District.

There are more than 4,160 soil conservation district cooperators in the 5 counties who have more than 623,000 acres under district agreement. Over 3,000 basic conservation plans cover 470,000 acres of land. Extensive conservation measures have been applied on this land—6,500 acres of strip cropping, 426 miles of improved drainage systems, 120,000 acres of improved pasture land, among other practices. More than 21,000 acres have been planted to trees, and over 23,000 acres are devoted to wildlife area development and preservation. Farming in the Sixth District has intensified with the diversion of agricultural land to other purposes. Proper land use is being made on about 1 million acres of the total 1.7 million acres in the Sixth District.

In Montgomery County a sediment control program has been developed which is aimed at helping land developers reduce silt pollution of Rock Creek and the Potomac River.

I am proud of what is being accomplished in the Sixth Congressional District to meet the changing demands upon the land. We are developing a more efficient agriculture, more extensive outdoor recreational opportunities, improved flood and pollution control measures; we are assuring greater protection and enhancement of the landscape in this region of exceptional natural beauty.

We have made great headway, but we realize that we still have not adequately assured the best protection and use of our invaluable land and water resources. We must stress even more the sound conservation and development of this constantly threatened natural heritage—now, while there is yet time to accomplish our aim.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of National Drum Corps Week, from August 20 to 27, has particular meaning for the people of Wyoming, for the Casper, Wyo., Troopers won the World Open Championship at Bridgeport, Conn., in August 1965.

Other honors won by the troopers in 1965 included the trophy for best musical unit in the mammoth parade of the VFW national encampment in Chicago; the VFW national color guard championship, the best horns, best color guard, and best drum major in the World Open; and first place in contests at Elmhurst, Ill.; Streator, Ill,; Sandusky, Ohio; Fair Lawn, N.J.; and Kingston, N.Y. Trooper Ken Davis won the VFW national competition for baritone bugle, and Pete Banta placed third on the French horn bugle.

Since the Casper Troopers made their first national appearance, they have been known as the Pride of the West. Enormous crowds have watched them perform in Denver, Omaha, Las Vegas, Minneapolis, Chicago, Cleveland, Boston, and at two world's fairs.

As a separate competing unit, the all-girl guard members have been national champions for 3 consecutive years.

DEDICATION TO PURPOSE

The troopers were organized in December 1957. The founding of this nonprofit organization was the fulfillment of an idea with two objectives—to provide the community with a character-building organization and to develop a drum and bugle corps that would be the pride of Wyoming. Through the dedication of countless citizens and organizations in Casper and throughout the West, these goals have been achieved.

HARD WORKERS

There are 130 troopers, from 12 to 21 years of age. Membership is open to all Casper young people. In the winter, each corps has a 2½-hour music rehearsal and a 3-hour marching rehearsal each week. The pace is increased in the summer. As the date for a tour approaches, the members often request 14 or more 3-hour rehearsals a week.

While on tour, each trooper must provide his own meals. Money for these expenses is earned by such activities as babysitting, washing windows, and shoveling snow.

OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS

The Casper corps has been blessed with a number of outstanding leaders, such as Organizer Jim Jones and the publicity director, Mrs. Dorothy C. Wade. On the field, the troopers are under the command of Drum Major Pete Emmons. The color guard commanders are Laurel Jones and Mary Shea. Miss Jones was named the outstanding girl in the organization in 1965; she is a student at Kelly Walsh High School. The outstanding boy of the year was Fred Sanford, tenor drummer, who is now attending college in California. The elected commander of the corps for 1965 was Walt Heath, also attending a California college.

The Casper Troopers have distinguished themselves as nationally tough competitors and hold a long list of distinguished awards. Wyoming is justly proud of them.

NATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

During National Drum Corps Week, we will salute numerous other groups across the country which have displayed the same dedication, hard work, and initiative as the Casper Troopers. Approximately 1 million persons are involved in drum and bugle corps activity.

These young people have been ambassadors of good will wherever they have gone and have thrilled audiences with their colorful uniforms, stirring music, and precision drill. The experience enables the troopers to gain an education from visiting faraway places and meeting new people.

It is most fitting and proper that Congress should recognize National Drum Corps Week as a tribute to this highly worthwhile endeavor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Rev. Joseph S. Johnston, D.D., Washington Street Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God of life and light and love, to whom men have turned in every age and of whose goodness they have never found an end, we pause in the day's occupation and draw close to Thee in prayer.

We praise Thee for Thy great goodness to us. We thank Thee for the marvelous gifts we have each received from Thy hands. Help us in evermore perfect ways to reveal to Thee our appreciation. May the nobility of our thoughts, the splendidness of our relationships, our strong support of what is good and true and beautiful, and our constant devotion to Jesus Christ be eloquent testimony to Thee of our gratitude.

As the servants of a great nation, we come to ask of Thee understanding minds that we may discern between good and evil; that we may make right choices and wise decisions. We come seeking that largeness of heart and that inclusiveness of spirit which will enable us to serve all the people of the Nation, without exception. Help us to serve with particular sensitivity to the needs of those who, in their daily battles against staggering odds, sorely need a champion. Amidst the pressures of our office help us to work with patience and with poise that every matter before us may have our careful consideration in a climate of boundless, intelligent goodwill.

On the wings of our prayer we lift to Thee all the people whom we serve as Senators but we remember especially now those who represent the Nation in dangerous and difficult posts around the world—who fly the skies, plow the seas, or tramp the seemingly endless miles of terrain—that freedom and justice may abide everywhere on the earth. Give these our friends, O God, the protective care of Thy love and the comforting awareness of the Nation's gratitude. Help each of them bravely to face the experiences he must. Help us as instruments of peace to hasten the day when their sacrifices are no longer necessary and when they may return to the family circle and to the satisfactions of a more constructive way of life.

Help us always to be courageous and faithful to our responsibilities. Give us the continued strength of Thy presence all the day long lest we grow weary in our well doing and, when this day is over and the hours of evening at last arrive, grant that in retrospect we may enjoy that inner peace that comes with a sense of work well done.

Hear our prayer, O God, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 10, 1966, was dispensed with.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, I am transmitting the annual report on the international educational and cultural exchange program for fiscal year 1965. Transmitted with this report is the U.S. Grantee Directory for fiscal year 1965.

The educational and cultural programs of our Government are conducted in a world so interdependent that it constitutes, in a sense, a single environment. In this global community, education must be international in focus if the cause of understanding and peace among peoples is to be served. Education for world responsibility is no longer an option. It is rather a necessity.

In addition to fostering an informed and responsible attitude toward the world among students, the program surveyed in this report has encouraged the flow of ideas among the leaders and thinkers of different nations and cultures.

But full heads and empty hearts breed disunity rather than unity. Therefore, the international educational and cultural exchange program, by bringing people of diverse nationalities together in common endeavors—of learning, teaching, truth seeking—has cultivated the humane virtues of sympathy, sensitivity, and tolerance.

In an age when men feel particularly threatened by impersonal forces and alienated from their fellows, this program unobtrusively reminds us that the mind and heart of man know no physical barriers.

I commend this report to the thoughtful scrutiny of the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1966.*

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] may be allowed to present the military medicare bill, because he must attend a very important markup session on the defense appropriations bill, and that the routine morning business follow thereafter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1399.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Military Medical Benefits Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 1071, 1072, 1073, and 1084 are each amended by striking out "1085" wherever it appears (in catchline or text) and by inserting in place thereof "1087".

(2) Section 1074(b) is amended by adding the following sentences at the end thereof: "The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the agreement of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, provide care to persons covered by this subsection in facilities operated by the Administrator and determined by him to be available for this purpose. Any such care provided on an inpatient basis for persons covered by this subsection shall be reimbursed at rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget."

(3) Section 1077 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1077. Medical care for dependents; authorized care in facilities of uniformed services

"(a) Only the following types of health care may be provided under section 1076 of this title:

"(1) Hospitalization.

"(2) Outpatient care.

"(3) Drugs.

"(4) Treatment of medical and surgical conditions.

"(5) Treatment of nervous, mental, and chronic conditions.

"(6) Treatment of contagious diseases.

"(7) Physical examinations, including eye examinations, and immunizations.

"(8) Maternity and infant care.

"(9) Diagnostic tests and services, including laboratory and X-ray examinations.

"(10) Emergency dental care worldwide.

"(11) Routine dental care outside the United States where adequate civilian facilities are unavailable.

"(12) Dental care worldwide as a necessary adjunct of medical, surgical, or preventive treatment.

"(13) Ambulance service and home calls when medically necessary.

"(14) Durable equipment, such as wheelchairs, iron lungs, and hospital beds may be provided on a loan basis.

"(b) The following types of health care may not be provided under section 1076 of this title:

"(1) Domiciliary or custodial care.

"(2) Prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles except that—

"(A) outside the United States and at stations inside the United States where adequate civilian facilities are unavailable, such items may be sold to dependents at cost to the United States, and

"(B) artificial limbs and artificial eyes may be provided."

(4) Section 1078(a) is amended by deleting the last sentence and adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "The charge or charges prescribed shall be applied equally to all classes of dependents."

(5) Section 1079 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To assure that medical care is available for spouses and children of members of the uniformed services who are on active duty for a period of more than thirty days, the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract, under the authority of this section, for medical care for those persons under such insurance, medical service, or health plans as he considers appropriate. The types of health care authorized under this section shall be the same as those provided under section 1076 of this title, except that:

"(1) with respect to dental care, only that care required as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment may be provided;

"(2) routine physical examinations and immunizations may only be provided when required in the case of dependents who are traveling outside the United States as a result of a member's duty assignment and such travel is being performed under orders issued by a uniformed service;

"(3) routine care of the newborn, well-baby care, and eye examinations may not be provided;

"(4) under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the services of Christian Science practitioners and nurses and services obtained in Christian Science sanatoriums may be provided;

"(5) durable equipment, such as wheelchairs, iron lungs and hospital beds may be provided on a rental basis.

"(b) Plans covered by subsection (a) shall include provisions for payment by the patient of the following amounts:

"(1) $25 for each admission to a hospital, or the amount the patient would have been charged under section 1078(a) of this title had the care being paid for been obtained in a hospital of the uniformed services, whichever amount is the greater.

"(2) Except as provided in clause (3), the first $50 each fiscal year of the charges for all types of care authorized by subsection (a) and received while in an outpatient status and 20 per centum of all subsequent charges for such care during a fiscal year.

"(3) A family group of two or more persons covered by this section shall not be required to pay collectively more than the first $100 each fiscal year of the charges for all types of care authorized by subsection (a) and received while in an outpatient status and 20 per centum of the additional charges for such care during a fiscal year.

"(c) The methods for making payment under subsection (b) shall be prescribed under joint regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) Under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of a dependent, as defined in section 1072 (A), (C), and (E) of this title, of a member of the uniformed services who is on active duty for a period of more than thirty days, and who is mentally retarded or physically handicapped, the plans covered by subsection (a) shall, with respect to such retardation or handicap, include the following:

"(1) Diagnosis.

"(2) Inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment.

"(3) Training, rehabilitation, and special education.

"(4) Institutional care in private nonprofit, public and State institutions and facilities and, when appropriate, transportation to and from such institutions and facilities.

"(e) Members shall be required to share in the cost of any benefits provided their dependents under subsection (d).

"(1) Except as provided in clause (3), members in the lowest enlisted pay grade shall be required to pay the first $25 incurred each month and members in the highest commissioned pay grade shall similarly be required to pay $250 per month. The amounts to be similarly paid by members in all other pay grades shall be determined under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(2) Except as provided in clause (4), the Government's share of the cost of any benefits provided in a particular case under subsection (d) shall not exceed $350 per month.

"(3) Members shall also be required to pay each month that amount, if any, remaining after the Government's maximum share has been reached.

"(4) A member who has more than one dependent incurring expenses in a given month under a plan covered by subsection (d) shall not be required to pay an amount greater than he would be required to pay if he had but one such dependent.

"(f) To qualify for the benefits provided by subsection (d), members shall be required to use public facilities to the extent they are available and adequate as determined under joint regulations of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(6) The following new sections are added after section 1085:

"§ 1086. Contracts for health benefits for certain members, former members, and their dependents

"(a) To assure that health benefits are available for the persons covered by subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract under the authority of this section for health benefits for those persons under the same insurance, medical service, or health plans he contracts for under section 1079(a) of this title.

"(b) For persons covered by this section the plans contracted for under section 1079(a) of this title shall contain the following provisions for payment by the patient:

"(1) Except as provided in clause (2), the first $50 each fiscal year of the charges for all types of care authorized by this section and received while in an outpatient status and 25 per centum of all subsequent charges for such care during a fiscal year.

"(2) A family group of two or more persons covered by this section shall not be required to pay collectively more than the first $100 each fiscal year of the charges for all types of care authorized by this section and received while in an outpatient status and 25 per centum of the additional charges for such care during a fiscal year.

"(3) 25 per centum of the charges of inpatient care.

"(c) The following persons are eligible for health benefits under this section:

"(1) Those covered by sections 1074(b) and 1076(b) of this title, except those covered by section 1072(2) (F) of this title.

"(2) A dependent of a member of a uniformed service who died while on active duty for a period of more than thirty days, except a dependent covered by section 1072(2) (F) of this title.

However, a person who is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under title I of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (79 Stat. 286) is not eligible for health benefits under this section.

"(d) No benefits shall be payable under any plan covered by this section in the case of a person enrolled in any other insurance, medical service, or health plan provided by law or through employment unless that person certifies that the particular benefit he is claiming is not payable under the other plan.

"(e) A person covered by this section may elect to receive benefits either in (1) Government facilities, under the conditions prescribed in sections 1074 and 1076–1078 of this title, or (2) the facilities provided under a plan contracted for under this section. However, under joint regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the right to make this election may be limited for those persons residing in an area where adequate facilities of the uniformed service are available.

"§ 1087. Programing facilities for certain members, former members, and their dependents in construction projects of the uniformed services

"Space for inpatient and outpatient care may be programed in facilities of the uniformed services for persons covered by sections 1074(b) and 1076(b) of this title. The amount of space so programed shall be limited to that amount determined by the Secretary concerned to be necessary to support teaching and training requirements in uniformed services facilities, except that space may be programed in areas having a large concentration of retired members and their dependents where there is also a projected critical shortage of community facilities."

(7) Section 1082 is amended by inserting "and 1086" immediately after "1081" and by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 1082. Contracts for health care: advisory committees".

(8) The analysis is amended by striking out the following items:

"1071. Purpose of sections 1071–1085 of this title."

* * * * *

"1073. Administration of sections 1071–1085 of this title."

* * * * *

"1077. Medical and dental care for dependents: specific inclusions and exclusions."

* * * * *

"1082. Contracts for medical care for spouses and children: advisory committees."

and inserting the following items:

"1071. Purpose of sections 1071–1087 of this title."

* * * * *

"1073. Administration of sections 1071–1087 of this title."

* * * * *

"1077. Medical care for dependents: authorized care in facilities of uniformed services."

* * * * *

"1082. Contracts for health care: advisory committees."

* * * * *

"1086. Contracts for health care for certain members, former members, and their dependents."

* * * * *

"1087. Programing facilities for certain members, former members, and their dependents in construction projects of the uniformed services."

SEC. 3. This Act becomes effective January 1, 1967.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the pending legislation, H.R. 14088, entitled the "Military Medical Benefits Amendments of 1966," would create significant statutory medical benefits for military retired personnel, and the various categories of military dependents who are covered by this bill.

This proposed program is the first expansion of medical benefits for military dependents since the passage of the Dependents Medical Care Act of 1956. This bill, as in the case of all medical legislation, is somewhat detailed and complex. I shall discuss the principal features of this legislation, and then attempt to answer any questions. There is before each Member a committee report explaining the details of this legislation, together with the changes recommended by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

PRINCIPAL EFFECT OF LEGISLATION

Mr. President, the principal effect of this bill in providing new or expanded benefits is to authorize in civilian medical sources for military retirees and the various categories of dependents the same types of medical care that are now authorized for Federal civilian employees under the larger high option Government-wide plan. The latter is known as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield high option program.

Moreover, the bill is more generous for the military dependents and retirees, in the sense that the Government will pay a greater proportion of the cost of this program than is paid by the Government in the case of the civilian high option program.

In addition, this legislation authorizes a new specialized program having no counterpart in any civilian health plan, providing for Government financial assistance for military members on active duty whose spouses or children are either mentally retarded or physically handicapped.

I would observe Mr. President, that there is another Government-wide high option Federal employee health program—known as the Aetna indemnity plan. This pending legislation, however in terms of types of care, is patterened on the Blue Cross-Blue Shield high option program.

WHO IS COVERED

Mr. President, the first question that might be raised with respect to this legislation is the matter of who is covered for the new or expanded benefits. The military member himself on active duty is not affected by this legislation. The persons who are affected by this bill are retired members and various categories of dependents. The definition of the word "dependent" is significant.

Where this legislation refers to benefits in civilian medical sources, the term dependents means spouses and children. Where the legislation refers to the use of military medical facilities, the term "dependent" refers not only to spouses and children, but also to parents and parents-in-law.

In addition, the question of whose dependents are covered is significant. In this context, the legislation covers dependents of active duty members, dependents of retired members, dependents of deceased retired members, and dependents of deceased active duty members.

The number of persons affected by this legislation totals 6,266,000. Because of the increase in the retired population, this figure by 1972 will have increased to 6,983,000, and by 1980 to 7,030,445. This information is set forth in detail on page 23 of the committee report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Mr. President, it would be appropriate at this point to note the existing programs for military dependents and retirees. For many years military medical facilities, both hospital, and outpatient, have been available to military dependents and retirees subject to the space-available concept, meaning the availability of facilities and personnel. Subject to this concept, generally all types of care have been available to retirees, and all types available to dependents, except treatment for nervous disorders and chronic diseases. At the present time, however, the Department of Defense estimates that military medical facilities can meet only about 66 percent of the hospital needs, and 69 percent of the outpatient needs for active duty dependents. For military retirees, and their dependents, military facilities are presently meeting about 57 percent of the hospital needs, and 37 percent of the outpatient requirements. This situation results from either limitations on the capacity of the military facilities, or because of the geographical separation of the retirees and their dependents from military facilities.

The other segment of the existing health program is the hospital care in civilian facilities now authorized in law under the so-called Dependents Medical Care Act of 1956. Under this program, dependents of active duty members are entitled, except for treatment for mental disorders and chronic diseases, to the normal types of hospital care in civilian facilities under a formula which results in the Government paying on the average approximately 92 percent of the cost, with the individual paying 8 percent.

At the present time, with the existing civilian program limited to hospital care, there is no program for active duty dependents under which the Government pays any portion of outpatient charges in civilian facilities. With respect to military retirees and spouses and children, along with the spouses and children of deceased retirees and deceased active duty members, there is neither a civilian hospitalization nor a civilian outpatient program.

ACTIVE DUTY DEPENDENTS—EXPANDED CIVILIAN HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. President, the bill expands the present civilian hospitalization program for active duty dependents by authorizing the treatment of mental disorders and chronic conditions in civilian facilities. The addition of these two types of care to the present civilian hospitalization program, together with those types of care already authorized, would result in extending to the active duty dependents the same types of hospital care now authorized for Federal civilian employees under the high option program.

On page 11 of the committee report there are itemized the specific types of care authorized in civilian sources.

There would be no change in the present cost-sharing arrangement under which the beneficiary pays $25 for each hospital admission, plus $1.75 per day where the hospital visit is over 14 days. This formula results, on the average, in the individual paying 8 percent and the Government 92 percent of the total hospital charges, including physicians' fees.

I might observe, Mr. President, that the Department of Defense is presently paying, on the average, nationwide, $65 per day for hospital care, including physicians' fees, in civilian facilities. The range is from approximately $35 to $95 per day. It is interesting to observe that the average nationwide cost in 1957 was $38.51 a day, as compared to the present $65 average.

ACTIVE DUTY DEPENDENTS—NEW OUTPATIENT PROGRAM IN CIVILIAN FACILITIES

The bill provides for active duty dependents a new outpatient program in civilian facilities—meaning routine doctor visits, drugs, and the like. Under this program, as recommended by the committee, there would be a $50 outpatient deductible formula, with the individual paying the first $50 outpatient cost each fiscal year, not to exceed $100 per family. The Government would then pay 80 percent of the remaining cost over this amount, and the individual would pay 20 percent.

RETIREES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—A NEW CIVILIAN HOSPITALIZATION AND CIVILIAN OUTPATIENT PROGRAM

Mr. President, for military retirees, their spouses and children, the bill provides both a new civilian hospitalization and a new civilian outpatient program, from the time the retiree becomes eligible for retired pay until he becomes eligible for social security medicare at age 65. Military personnel, on the average, are now placed on the retired list at age 44. These two new civilian programs will be a transitional civilian plan, until the retiree, or his spouse, becomes eligible for medicare at age 65.

With respect to the new hospitalization program, the bill provides for the same types of care in civilian facilities that are now authorized under the high option program for Federal civilian employees, and, therefore, the same types of hospital care that are authorized elsewhere in the bill for spouses and children of active duty members.

Those who would be covered in civilian hospitals under the retiree program, would be the military retirees themselves, their spouses and children, and the dependent spouses and children of both deceased retirees and deceased active duty members.

Under the bill the retiree, or beneficiary, would pay 25 percent of the cost of civilian hospitalization, including physicians fees, with the Government paying 75 percent of the total charges. This cost-sharing formula was recommended by the Department of Defense.

The bill also provides for a new civilian outpatient program for military retirees and their dependents, covering the same types of care that the bill proposes for active duty dependents. Under this program, the retiree or his dependents would be subject to a $50 outpatient formula, with the individual paying the first $50 outpatient cost each year, not to exceed $100 per family. The individual would pay 25 percent and the Government 75 percent, of the outpatient cost remaining after these deductions.

Let me observe that a deductible outpatient formula is customary under most health plans. The $50 formula proposed in this bill is only one-half the outpatient deductible required in the civilian high option Blue Cross-Blue Shield program which provides for a $100 deductible, not to exceed $200 per family for its supplementary program. Moreover, the $50 formula is the same as for social security medicare, under which each eligible person must pay the first $50 cost under the supplementary program.

I would emphasize that the privilege of receiving medical care in military hospital and outpatient facilities on a space-available basis will continue without regard to age, with the result that after age 65, military retirees would have two sources of medical benefits—the military facilities and civilian facilities under social security medicare.

DISCUSSION OF COST-SHARING

Mr. President, I would emphasize several aspects of the cost-sharing arrangement now in the bill before the Senate. As I have indicated, for the "active duty" dependents, the individual on the average would pay 8 percent of the cost, and the Government 92 percent, for civilian hospital care, including physicians' fees, and for the outpatient care the beneficiary would pay the first $50, not to exceed $100 per family, with the Government paying 80 percent of the remaining outpatient cost after the $50 deductible payment. Under this total civilian program, both hospitalization and outpatient care, the active duty dependents, on the average would pay 29 percent of the cost—and the Government 71 percent of the cost.

With respect to retired members and their spouses, and children, for the total civilian program, both hospitalization and outpatient care, the beneficiary on the average would pay 42 percent of the total charges and the Government would pay 58 percent.

With respect to the civilian high option Blue Cross-Blue Shield program, on the other hand, the beneficiary, either active or retired, pays approximately 68.2 percent of the cost and the Government 31.8 percent.

Under the House version, military retirees and all categories of dependents would have paid on the average only 12 percent of the charges and the Government 88 percent.

Mr. President, the significance of the foregoing comparisons is that the Senate bill provides the same types of care for military retirees and the various categories of dependents that are now authorized for civilian employees under the high option program but at the same time, the bill will provide these benefits at a lesser cost to the military retiree or dependents as compared to the cost which the civilians must pay under said high option program.

While the Senate version is less generous financially than the House provisions, since the Government would pay a lesser proportion of the cost under the Senate recommendations, it is nevertheless the opinion of the committee that the Senate version is both fair and generous under all the circumstances including the comparison of the recommended military program with that of the civilian high option plan.

STATUTORY CHANGES WITH RESPECT TO MILITARY MEDICAL FACILITIES

Mr. President, the bill provides for two changes in law with regard to military medical facilities. First, it provides that all categories of dependents may be treated in military facilities for mental disorders and chronic diseases. Second, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense, on a permissive basis, to program retired bed space in military teaching hospitals or where there is a critical shortage of civilian facilities in areas having a heavy retired population. In this connection, the Senate committee adopted the foregoing language in lieu of the House proposal which would have provided a mandatory program that at least 5 percent, not to exceed 20 percent, of new construction or replacement facilities in military hospitals should be built and reserved for retired bed space.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS WHOSE SPOUSES OR CHILDREN WERE EITHER RETARDED OR HANDICAPPED

The bill authorizes a new financial assistance program for mentally retarded or physically handicapped spouses and children of active duty personnel. There would be authorized four types of specialized care: first, diagnosis; second, inpatient, outpatient, and home treatment; third, training, rehabilitation, and special education; and fourth, institutional care in private nonprofit, public, and State institutions. Under the bill before the Senate all spouses and children with any degree of mental retardation or physical handicap would be covered. Under the House version, spouses would have been excluded entirely and dependent children whose retardation was only mild or whose handicap was less than serious would have been excluded. Under the House version of the bill, approximately 101,000 persons would have been covered under the handicapped program, as compared to approximately 297,000 under the Senate version.

The committee adopted the Department of Defense cost-sharing formula which would require the military member to pay from $25 to $250 per month, depending on pay grade, with the Government paying the remaining cost with a ceiling of $350 per month as a maximum on the Government's share of the cost.

I would like to acknowledge and express appreciation for, the assistance and cooperation extended by both Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts in connection with the newly proposed handicapped program. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY introduced a separate bill, cosponsored by other Members, S. 3169, and it is fair to say that the enlargement of the scope of the House provisions on the handicapped portion of this bill represents the suggestions contained in Senator KENNEDY's legislation.

Mr. President, the proposed program of financial assistance for active duty members whose spouses or children are either mentally retarded or physically handicapped has no counterpart in the civilian high option program, or, so far as we know, in other industrial or private plans in the country. At the same time this program is felt to be justified in view of the enormous financial and other difficulties imposed on military families who are confronted with the problem of mental retardation or physical handicap while in active military service.

DISCUSSION OF COST

This bill as recommended by the Senate Committee on Armed Services would involve a first-year 12-month cost of $151.2 million. The first-year cost of the House version would be $233.2 million. The first-year cost of the Department of Defense medical benefits proposals would have been $195.3 million. The cost details are set forth on page 23 of the committee report. The principal reasons for the lesser cost of the Senate version are twofold: first, the adoption of the $50 deductible arrangement for the active duty dependents, and, secondly, the revised cost-sharing formula for military retirees and their dependents involving the $50 outpatient deductible and the revised hospitalization features.

The committee considers this bill, which provides new or expanded medical benefits for over 6 million people, to be fair and proper under present conditions. It should prove to be a real career incentive for all military personnel.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill, as reported, proposes an effective date of January 1, 1967. Although the bill as passed by the House proposes a retroactive date of July 1, 1966, the committee believes that the effective date should be sufficiently prospective to permit an orderly implementation of this complex legislation. We might observe that the new financial assistance program for mentally retarded and physically handicapped spouses and children, totaling 297,000 persons, would be completely new, having no counterpart in other health programs.

In addition, the various contracting and financial arrangements with State and private nonprofit institutions will necessarily involve a period of time.

I should also emphasize that the new outpatient program in civilian facilities will create benefits for approximately 6,268,000 people and will involve all the complexities and negotiations of civilian fee schedules, plus the other necessary arrangements which must be made with American medicine.

The bill now before the Senate was unanimously recommended by the full Senate Committee on Armed Services. I urge the enactment of this needed legislation by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who has done so much to bring out this very worthwhile measure, which will be of benefit to the military. I know that he is operating under pressure at this time, because he has to attend a very important markup session on the defense appropriations bill.

I should like to offer, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], an amendment and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 13, after line 25, insert the following new paragraph:
>
> "(6) the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under regulations issued by them jointly, may require that drugs provided by the plans contracted for under subsection (a) be prescribed and furnished on the basis of a generic or nonproprietary name."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as I understand it, this amendment, in effect, would allow the Secretary of Defense to implement in the civilian medical sources covered by this legislation the same arrangement with respect to drugs that is now prevalent in military medical facilities.

Because the Senator from Louisiana only brought this up yesterday afternoon.

I did not have a chance to take it up with the subcommittee or the full committee. I did speak to the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I did speak to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]; and said I would be willing to take the amendment to conference, with the understanding we would discuss it in committee. That appeared satisfactory to them. It was also satisfactory to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], ranking member of the subcommittee, to whom I talked later.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], for whose assistance on the bill I have previously this morning expressed my deep appreciation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the efforts he has made in connection with this legislation. I know that the whole bill is far more extensive than the part of the legislation on which I was working, and in which I was personally interested. But I know from my testimony before his committee, and the testimony of others, the devotion and care that he gave to this subject.

There are many wives and many children of servicemen who will, over the next decades, owe a personal debt to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and other members of the committee for the conscientious effort and patience they gave to this difficult subject. Without this effort and without this commitment, many hundreds of our fellow citizens would suffer tremendously.

I came to the Senate Chamber to congratulate the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the members of the committee for the efforts they have made on this subject. I would also like to thank Mr. Ed Braswell of the committee staff for the thoughtful attention he gave to this entire matter and particularly for the patience with which he treated the various suggestions that I made. Miss Margo Cohn of my staff, too, contributed to the development and evolution of the legislation in a way which undoubtedly influenced the structure of the bill that is before us today.

There are a couple of aspects of the bill which may conceivably require reconsideration based on the pattern of experience which develops under it as time passes. The committee, after careful study of the likely cost of the bill, provided for a sliding-scale contribution by the servicemen to the cost of caring for the mentally retarded or physically handicapped wife or child, and a ceiling on the amount of the Government contribution. If these provisions prove burdensome to some—like the serviceman who has a multihandicapped child—we should be prepared to undertake consideration of appropriate revisions.

In addition, the committee, again after careful study of all of the problems involved, decided not to provide "well-baby care"—regular pediatric care of infants during the first year of life—in this legislation. This type of care can be most helpful in the early detection of congenital deformities and signs of mental retardation. I hope that we can insure its availability at an early date.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from Missouri for his leadership in connection with this entire matter. He and the committee devoted a great deal of time and personal attention to it, and this personal attention resulted in the reporting by the committee of what I regard as a particularly constructive bill. I trust that the differences between the Senate and House bills can be resolved soon, so that this legislation will become law as quickly as possible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for his undeserved but much appreciated comments.

The truth of the matter is that the presentation he made was so logical and related to a program that would prove to be relatively inexpensive, and so well gotten together, that the committee took it with relatively little comment. The handicap program will be of great assistance to many people. It is a new program for this type of problem, and has not been characteristic, to the best of our knowledge, of any previous program in this field. We were glad to accept it. May I again point out that, even after such acceptance, the bill submitted today for approval is tens of millions of dollars less than the bill presented to the Congress by the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for the undeviating interest he has shown in the plight of the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded. I commend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for accepting this amendment because he, too, has been aware of this situation down through the years, and he, too, has been in the forefront of finding a better way of life for these oftentimes forgotten people.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader, and am grateful for the remarks he made this morning on this bill and our efforts. I also thank all members of the subcommittee who participated in the extended hearings. This is a difficult and complicated problem. They were all assiduous in their efforts.

I also thank the staff of the Armed Services Committee especially Mr. Braswell for the fine work he did, customary in his activities.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am in favor of this legislation, and I trust that we will enact it without opposition. However, I did not want to have accepted the amendment offered by the majority leader in behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], without calling attention to the fact that this could have far-reaching effects.

As I understand the amendment, it would permit the military people to furnish drugs and medicine to civilians, which I think is quite a departure from our present situation. If the matter goes to conference, I would hope that they would give thought to that.

Mr. President, I did not oppose the amendment, but I am concerned about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is a bit unusual. May I point out to the distinguished Senator that it is all entirely permissive, and not in any sense mandatory.

Before we discuss it in conference, I hope we will discuss it in committee; and will take the liberty of reporting to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] after that discussion.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that rule XII be waived, and that a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the pending measure at 12:30 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I offer my friendly congratulations to my able friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], for, like him, I want to cast my vote in favor of legislation which will bring dignity and security, and a measure of happiness to American men and women who serve in the Armed Forces.

I wish to ask the Senator this question: How does the Senator dovetail this legislation with respect to social security benefits in the field of hospitalization for those over the age of 65? Is there provision in this legislation for a military person retiring at age 65?

Mr. SYMINGTON. As the Senator knows, one can retire in the military after 20 years of service.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, there are a great many retirees well below the age of 65. The House bill, in effect, continued the benefits of both civilian programs when the retiree or dependent became eligible for medicare at 65. The Senate version on the other hand provides that the benefits in civilian sources under this legislation will cease at 65 when the retiree or dependent becomes eligible for medicare. The benefits in military medical facilities would not be affected and would continue on beyond age 65. The following portion of the committee report, on page 15, covers this matter:

> SOCIAL SECURITY MEDICARE RELATIONSHIP TO NEW CIVILIAN PROGRAM
>
> Under the bill, as amended, the civilian care benefits of this legislation would no longer apply to military retirees or their dependents who became eligible for Social Security Medicare upon reaching age 65. The committee position, based on the recommendation of the Department of Defense, was adopted for the following reasons:
>
> (*a*) The benefits of this legislation should be considered a transitional civilian program for retirees, who now enter the retired rolls at about age 44, until they become eligible for Social Security Medicare at age 65.
>
> (*b*) Even under the Senate committee version military retirees would continue to have two medical programs upon reaching age 65—the use of the military medical facilities on a space-available basis and the Social Security Medicare program. Under the circumstances, it appears that the two remaining medical sources would provide a fair program of assistance.

Mr. KUCHEL. The eligible dependents and retirees would receive hospitalization and other benefits, as may be available under medicare?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. In a word, however, the passage of this legislation would bring to every retired citizen from the Military Establishment civilian health benefits from that time until he would reach the age of 65?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not only active duty but retirees and dependents.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. As usual, they are constructive.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I urge passage of S. 3169, the Military Medical Benefits Amendments of 1966. This bill would provide an improved health benefits program for retired and active members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

S. 3169 would have a fourfold purpose: to expand the hospitalization program and begin a new outpatient program for dependents of members of the uniformed services on active duty; to provide for a new hospitalization and outpatient program in civilian sources for retired and deceased military members and their dependents; to expand the care in military hospital facilities for all categories of dependents; and finally to establish a specialized program of financial assistance for members of the uniformed services on active duty whose families are either mentally retarded or physically handicapped.

The Senate bill has, however, amended the House bill, H.R. 14088, in some respects that I feel have lowered the value of the bill. There are many variances in these two bills in which I think the House bill retains more of the original and beneficial meaning of the legislation.

The need for this legislation is great. The lack of military medical facilities for those requiring assistance, especially dependents of military personnel, demands a good, well-thought-out Government-sponsored program for outpatient care. Under this legislation, active duty dependents will be provided with the same types of care that are presently authorized for Federal civilian employees. Likewise, similar coverage will be accorded to retired members and their dependents. Also severe family problems created frequently by the mentally or physically handicapped would be alleviated.

The principal effect of this legislation in either form would be to authorize for active duty dependents, military retirees, and their dependents, the same types of medical care that are presently authorized for Federal civilian employees under the Blue Cross-Blue Shield high option program. This bill would make a military career more attractive by improving the health care program for the dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services, to the end that the benefits available to such persons will be more comparable to those offered in the health care plans of industry and labor, and those offered under the Federal employees health benefits program.

Mr. President, this legislation deserves favorable action. The benefits to be accrued from increased medical benefits for our servicemen both active, retired, and deceased and their dependents are only a fair and equitable return to these men who serve their country so well.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, we have before us a most significant bill which I hope will receive prompt and favorable consideration. It would update and expand the medical care programs for active military personnel, their dependents and military retirees.

The bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee provides these important benefits at a lower cost than previously envisioned, yet gives this deserving group better coverage at less personal cost than is available under any other Government employee medical plan. It adds an entirely new program of assistance for the handicapped and mentally retarded.

It is important to note that the committee has met these needs while still dealing with the demands of current inflationary pressures for a general curtailment of Federal expenditures.

I am concerned about one provision of the committee bill which cuts coverage previously extended by the House to title III reservists with less than 8 years active service. Only 4,630 such personnel are affected, and I feel they could be included in the program at insignificant cost and should be. I am hopeful the House bill's provision in this instance will be accepted by the conferees.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. By prior order, the vote on final passage of the bill will be at 12:30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 1207. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1456).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3713. A bill for the relief of Julio Juan Castellanos Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3714. A bill to establish an annual or biannual national housing goal; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3715. A bill to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3716. A bill for the relief of Joe W. Caldwell and Carol C. Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. CASE).

S. 3717. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S. 3718. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 to provide grants to the States for developing plans and acquiring equipment for State computerized law enforcement data centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRIFFIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3719. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of the cost of acquiring a mineral property in an ABC transaction; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

HALF-DAY HOLIDAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN WASHINGTON, D.C., IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN LEGION PARADE, AUGUST 29, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) to express the sense of the Congress on excusing Government employees from work on the afternoon of August 29, 1966, to attend the parade of the American Legion in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ANNUAL OR BIANNUAL NATIONAL HOUSING GOAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an annual or biannual national housing goal, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3714) to establish an annual or biannual national housing goal, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the program of the President as expressed in his annual message to the Congress shall include statements and recommendations concerning a residential construction goal. In furtherance of the realization of this goal the President shall transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives, after the beginning of each session of the Congress, but not later than January 20, a report which shall include the following: (1) a statement indicating the minimum number of housing units which should be started during the then current calendar year, or such year and the next following calendar year, in order to be consistent with the program of the President, (2) an indication of the manner in which the law will be administered by the executive agencies to achieve the number of housing units specified under clause (1), and (3) any recommendations for legislative action that the President determines are necessary or desirable in order that the construction of such specified number of housing units may be started.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have a statement by Mr. Larry Blackmon, president of the National Association of Home Builders, in which Mr. Blackmon appeals for housing goals and long-range planning for housing printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the NAHB Journal of Homebuilding, August 1966]

If We Can Put Men on the Moon, We Can Put Them in Decent Houses

Surely a nation so creative, so daring and so capable that it can plan every move 10 years in advance to put a man on the moon can mount a similar long-range effort to put man in decent housing here on earth.

Opportunities for education, jobs, housing, a better life—these are the American goals here at home. Long-range plans to accomplish most of these objectives have been announced and public and private organizations are already at work. But, so far, long-range planning for housing has been given little more than lip service.

The current money crisis and Government inaction in the face of it has made it increasingly apparent that housing policy is considered an economic tool of Government rather than the instrument to fulfill a basic need.

At present the housing industry is drowning in a sea of indifference. As vital as the air we breathe is the money that is being denied this industry. We have presented proposals to solve this crisis and we will continue to fight until they are achieved.

Once the present crisis is eased we want to work with the agency for whose creation we struggled so that housing's voice will really be heard and heeded at the highest levels. I refer to HUD.

And that voice should speak in terms of needs and their fulfillment. Will it really take 50 years or more to improve the housing of low-income families? I don't believe it! Given the tools, the financing and the incentives, this industry could do it in half that time. Let's take a look at what the goal should be. I believe we will need 2¼ million units a year in 1976.

Sounds high? Just look at these estimates of the annual need 10 years from now; new household formations, 1,200,000; removals due to fires, storms, slum clearance, highway construction, etc., 600,000; replacement of substandard housing, 400,000; and additions to available inventory so you can pick and choose and move, 100,000.

What will it take to fulfill our housing ambitions? The same kind of planning, research, experiments, determination, resources and leadership that it takes to put a man on the moon.

Does anyone dare say our housing objectives are any less worthwhile?

Larry Blackmon,
NAHB President.

IMPROVEMENT OF AIDS TO NAVIGATION SERVICES OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, a bill to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary, together with the enclosure showing changes in existing law, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparison will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3715) to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparison, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, July 28, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill, "To improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard."

The proposed bill would amend sections 81 and 82 of title 14, United States Code, which contain the basic authority for the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation. The modifications to these sections may be summarized as follows.

Under the present terms of section 81 the Coast Guard has only limited authority to establish aids to navigation beyond the territorial limits of the United States. This authority does not extend to marking of wrecks which are beyond the territorial waters of the United States. Nor does it include authority to mark harbor entrance channels which extend beyond the territorial waters. Finally, there is no authority for marking areas where off-shore structures are located beyond our territorial waters. Experience has shown, however, that there is a need for navigational aids in these areas. To enable the Coast Guard to meet this need, the proposed bill would extend the Coast Guard's authority to establish navigational aids to include the waters above the Continental Shelf.

A second area in which the present law is unduly restrictive concerns electronic aids to navigation. Here the statute authorizes the Coast Guard to establish loran stations for certain purposes. The word "loran" has been interpreted as referring to a specific type of pulsed electronic aid to navigation system. This interpretation would restrict the Coast Guard from developing and utilizing other types of electronic aids to navigation systems. The Department feels that the service must be in a position to utilize any electronic systems which will aid navigation and that it should not be restricted to a single specific system. Therefore, the proposed bill would broaden section 81 by substituting authority to establish electronic aids to navigation systems for the present authority to establish loran stations.

The expansion of authority mentioned above is not intended to impinge on the authority of the Federal Aviation Agency which has statutory responsibilities in this field. At present, section 81 provides the Coast Guard with authority to establish loran stations required to serve the needs of the air commerce as determined by the Federal Aviation Agency. The proposed bill would make a slight change in the language of the present law to indicate more clearly that the Coast Guard would only establish electronic aids to air commerce upon request of that agency. (This would also conform the language to that used elsewhere in the section.) The language would also be changed to indicate that aids to air navigation established upon request of the armed forces would be those which are peculiar to warfare and primarily of military concern as determined by the Department of Defense. In addition, an amendment to section 82 of title 14 would update the statutory references found in that section to confirm that nothing in title 14 would limit the authority of the Federal Aviation Agency.

One minor change is made to clarify section 81(2) by including the Secretary of Defense among those who may request the establishment of air aids to navigation to serve the armed forces.

Enactment of the proposed bill would enable the Coast Guard to improve its services to the maritime community in many areas. Its enactment would not in itself result in any increased costs to the Government. However, the extension of aids to navigation services beyond the territorial limits would require increased expenditures, depending upon the extent to which these additional services become necessary. It is estimated that annual costs for the next three years to mark wrecks which are beyond the territorial waters of the United States and to provide necessary aids to navigation should not exceed $50,000. While the Corps of Engineers has only tentatively designated fairways in the coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico, the increasing numbers of offshore oil-well structures in this area will ultimately make the marking of some fairways essential for the safety of navigation. When this marking becomes necessary, it is estimated that it would result in annual costs for buoys and minor aids to navigation structures not exceeding $100,000. In some instances, however, some more sophisticated major offshore aids to navigation may also become necessary or desirable to mark fairways. The cost of such installations would, of course, be greater than that for buoys or simple aids but we cannot now predict what these costs would be. Expenditures for any form of aids to navigation would, of course, be included in the Coast Guard's appropriations and subject to the usual review by the Congress.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph W. Barr,
Acting Secretary.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE PROPOSED BILL

(Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter in italics.)

SECTION 81 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 81. Aids to navigation authorized.

In order to aid navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard may establish, maintain, and operate:

(1) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

(2) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States *peculiar to warfare and primarily of military concern* as [requested] *determined* by the Secretary [of the appropriate] *of Defense or the Secretary of any* department within the Department of Defense *and as requested by any of those officials;* and

(3) [Loran stations] *electronic aids to navigation systems* (a) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States *peculiar to warfare and primarily of military concern as determined by the Secretary of Defense or any department within the Department of Defense;* or (b) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (c) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as [determined] *requested* by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. [Such] *These* aids to navigation other than [loran stations] *electronic aids to navigation systems* shall be established and operated only within the United States, *the waters above the Continental Shelf,* [its Territories] *the territories* and possessions *of the United States,* the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located [, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established prior to June 26, 1948.]

SECTION 82 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 82. Cooperation with Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Federal Aviation Agency will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the [provisions of section 458 of Title 5, or by section 475(e) of Title 49 or subchapter III of chapter 9 of this title.] *Federal Aviation Act of 1958 as amended (chapter 20 of title 49)* or by the provisions *of sections 7392 and 7394 of Title 10.*

A BILL TO SPEED UP TOCKS ISLAND LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to facilitate land acquisition in the Tocks Island Recreation Area, now formally known as the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I am joined in offering this bill by my colleagues Senators CLARK and SCOTT of Pennsylvania, Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY of New York, and Senator CASE of New Jersey. These Senators have worked together on the initial legislation which authorized this magnificent recreation area. The fact that we are introducing this bill together demonstrates the concern that we feel at the problems which have already arisen before the completion of this new park.

The problem is very simple: land speculators are taking advantage of both the Government and the public by buying up land now which will eventually be bought by the Government. The land rush of these speculators has had the obvious result of forcing up land prices to excessive levels. We must act now to prevent either unnecessary cost to the taxpayer or an even more unfortunate result, reduced acreage in the park itself.

The solution we are offering is a simple one. We propose to allow the Secretary of the Interior to borrow up to $30 million from the Delaware River Basin Commission for accelerated purchases of land. Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be bound to use this money for land purchases only. The Delaware River Basin Commission would use its bond issuing authority to raise the money. As the loan to the Interior would be backed by the full faith and credit of the Government, I am sure that such an issue would be readily accepted. The loan would be repaid in part each year. The Secretary of the Interior could repay up to 10 percent of the loan each year.

Mr. President, the problem is serious and growing worse every year. At the end of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by John Kolesar describing this situation be printed in the RECORD. If the park is not completed with its planned size of 46,000 acres, millions of people will be denied its benefits. Almost 30 million people live within 100 miles of Tocks Island; almost 15 percent of our Nation's population live within easy driving distance of this natural wonderland. At a time when the size of our cities is gobbling up green land at a rapid pace and when urban pressures increase, it is important that we preserve and maintain areas of natural beauty for the rest and recreation of the harassed city dweller. This park will be a benefit to millions of people in the three States which are adjacent to it. It must be completed as planned—a large and beautiful place of nature. We cannot allow the thoughtless actions of the few to harm the interests of the many.

The original Tocks Island legislation proposes purchasing the recreation area property over a period of years, ending in 1972. The first appropriation for land purchases—$6 million—was made this year. But even before the designation of Tocks Island as a national recreation area, last year, a speculation and development boom was underway. Both administration and congressional spokesmen have warned that if the speculation does not stop, the size of the recreation area may have to be cut to keep the cost within reason.

In addition, subdividers are bulldozing roads and rights-of-way through many previously undeveloped areas, destroying the beauty and the natural values. In one burgeoning development alone, 9 miles of roads have been ripped through the woodlands.

In 1959, the Army Engineers estimated it would cost $19 million to purchase the park area. By 1965, when President Johnson signed the legislation, the estimate had risen to $37.4 million and property values have been rising steadily.

There is no way of estimating what this land will cost if we wait 6 years to complete the purchases. The only workable method of protecting the taxpayers and the park site is the one embodied in this legislation.

I hope the House of Representatives will act quickly on the bill. When it comes to the Senate, the six Members from the three States involved will certainly seek swift action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3717) to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, is as follows:

THE LAND SURGEONS: TOCKS SPECULATORS MAY DAM U.S. PARK

(By John Kolesar, staff writer)

EAST STROUDSBURG, PA.—"Oh, it makes you sick to see what they are doing," said Peter DeGelleke, planner-in-charge of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

"They are taking Uncle Sam and the public," he said.

He was talking about real estate developers conducting business as usual, subdividing lots and building houses within the boundaries of what is to be the biggest national recreation area east of the Mississippi.

"They are bulldozing roads through some beautiful, unspoiled sections of the area," DeGelleke said sadly. "They have already wiped out a unique hemlock swamp."

DeGelleke had tried his persuasive powers in an effort to stop the activity which he considers sheer land speculation. He failed, just as his boss, U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, failed. The development goes on and apparently will continue until the day the U.S. Army's Corps of Engineers buys the land from the developers.

The physical damage done by the developments saddens DeGelleke. But the financial threat to the recreation area project is even more worrisome. Subdividing vacant land into residential lots drives its price upwards.

AFRAID OF PRICE

The park planners are afraid the price of the land could be pushed beyond congressional tolerance, endangering or delaying the entire recreation area plan.

The project is the culmination of planning that started in the wake of the 1955 flood that crippled communities up and down the Delaware River.

The first object was flood control. The Delaware River Basin Commission was created and drew up a proposal for a huge dam across the river at Tocks Island, about six miles north of the majestic Delaware Water Gap.

The dam would create a lake 37 miles long, running almost to Port Jervis, N.Y. The 250-billion-gallon reservoir had obvious recreation potential and the plan was expanded to provide for a 72,000-acre park. The 112 square miles of lake and wooded hills would almost equal the area of Essex County in New Jersey.

By now the plan had grown to a $200 million project—more than $140 million for the reservoir and $56 million for the park. There were to be added effects: 10 million visitors a year spending $28 million; a billion dollars in housing construction by 1985.

New highways would put New York City barely an hour away, Philadelphia less than two hours. Even with today's mediocre roads, the Water Gap is less than two hours' drive from Trenton. (Trenton is already the headquarters for the Basin Commission and is due to be in the same congressional district with the recreation area under the state's new districting plan.)

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The enormous economic impact of the park is to be felt primarily in six sparsely settled counties—Warren and Sussex in New Jersey; Monroe, Pike and Northampton in Pennsylvania; and Orange in New York.

The scale of the project touched off a land boom even while things were in the discussion stage. The Army Engineers estimated it would cost $19 million to buy the recreation area land when they made their first study in 1959. By 1965, when President Johnson signed the bill authorizing the recreation area purchase, the estimate had risen to $37.4 million. And this did not include the 24,000 acres needed for the reservoir.

The bill had some features aimed at curtailing land speculation: no commercial ventures could remain in the park; no house begun after Jan. 21, 1963, could remain; no one who bought his house after Jan. 1, 1965, could stay. Only qualified, long-term residents would be given the option of staying for 25 years or the remainder of their lives, whichever they chose.

But the land boom went on both inside and outside the park. It was the speculation inside the park boundaries that bothered the Basin Commission, the Army Engineers, the Interior Department and the Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council (TIRAC, pronounced "tie rack" of course).

They passed resolutions condemning land speculation, sent letters to local governments asking a clampdown on new subdivisions and used all the persuasion they could. TIRAC, a voluntary organization set up by the six counties, sent a letter to every new property purchaser, warning him of the recreation area plans.

POWER PRICE BOOST

The New Jersey Power and Light Co. put in a set of special high rates for new electric installations within the borders of the future park. Since it would hold back housing development, the move won cheers from the park planners. But Walpack Township in Sussex County, N.J., due to be bought in entirety for the park, fought the rates before the State Public Utility Commission. There has been no decision yet.

All this time, the Army Engineers had no money to buy land. Unless persuasion worked, the development would continue. And persuasion failed in several crucial areas.

Development actually increased in 1965. The engineers estimated the developers had boosted the government's future land costs by $600,000 within one year. The $37.4 million price tag had a contingency allowance but it was being strained. If it were to be exhausted, Congress would have to be asked for more money, always an uncertain process.

An attempt to get a $3 million advance appropriation last April failed, but Congress finally allocated $6.4 million to start land purchases July 1. It was to be the first of six annual installments.

But even the news that the money was finally available did not halt the developers. It would take time to appraise, negotiate and purchase. Some of the developers had no intention of sitting idle during that time.

The largest development within the proposed recreation area is Blue Mountain Lakes, high atop some lovely hills in Walpack Township. It was started 11 years ago and covers 4,200 acres. Part of the Blue Mountain Lakes acreage has been subdivided into 3,500 lots selling for up to $5,000 each.

THREE HUNDRED HOUSES BUILT

More than 300 houses have been built by lot owners, some at a cost of $35,000. Almost every house will be torn down within the next half dozen years, after government purchase.

Last year, 400 lots were sold at Blue Mountain Lakes adding $450,000 to the Army engineers' price tag for the park land.

On July 2, the Walpack Township Committee granted approval to subdivide 478 more lots at Blue Mountain Lakes. It granted the approval in spite of pleas by Udall and TIRAC.

The failure to stop Blue Mountain Lakes is obvious to the naked eye. Signs directing customers to the development's office seem to be posted all over Sussex County.

If you drop in at the office, the salesman will give you a restrained spiel about the undeniable beauties of Blue Mountain Lakes. He makes no mention of the recreation area unless he is asked. But once asked he gives a reasonably accurate rundown of the government plans, though he makes them sound more "iffy" than they really are.

"The government says it is going to take the houses in six or seven years," he tells you. "But with this war in Viet Nam, who knows whether they will get the money? They might take another 10 or 20 years yet."

But DeGelleke plans to have an information center open to the public near the Water Gap next year. By 1972 at the latest the land is due to be bought. The park will be opened by stages between 1968 and 1975.

Blue Mountain Lakes consists of a sprinkling of Summer cottages around two manmade lakes and swimming pool. Its gravel roads are bulldozed through hardwood and evergreen forests in a maze that would dismay a Levittown resident. There are houses in all stages of construction.

Why would anyone buy a lot and build a house when he is almost certain to be evicted within seven years?

Some apparently buy without knowing they are going into a future national recreation area. But most seem to know where they are headed.

HAS FAITH

One woman, supervising moving men carrying furniture into her new summer cottage recently, explained it: "Even if we have only six or seven years up here, it will be worth it."

"And when the government buys us out, they promise to pay fair market value," she added, "so we won't lose money."

Her faith that she will not lose money was not supported completely by one of the government appraisers.

"There is a big difference between fair market value and cost," he said. "We will not repay a person who made a bad bargain. And few of the people buying property now will recapture costs for things like title insurance, searches and all that."

While Blue Mountain Lakes is the liveliest of the developments within the future park, there are others. There is Skyline Acres, with 1,500 lots subdivided in Walpack, and Hidden Lake, a 500-acre development in Middle Smithfield Township, Pa.

Hidden Lake was not started until October 1963, leaving it open to a much clearer charge of land speculation than Blue Mountain Lakes or Skyline Acres. But it has apparently been halted by the high level opposition. Few houses seem to have been built, its office is closed and most of the subdivision consists of "sold" signs propped against trees.

The Army Engineers have set up a land office in East Stroudsburg, sharing building with DeGelleke's planning operation. They expect to be doing a land-office business soon. The first $6.4 million will be spent on two targets: land between the Water Gap and the dam site, and the unsold property in the Hidden Lake and Blue Mountain Lakes developments. They hope to complete the purchases by next July 1.

Buying Blue Mountain Lakes may take a long time. The owners of the unsubdivided property reportedly want at least $12 million, one-third of the entire authorization for the recreation area purchase. In addition, there are an estimated 2,500 individual owners of subdivided plots.

CITE HARDSHIPS

Some of the people labeled speculators reject the title and contend they are being subjected to hardship by the government's slowness in buying their land. Burnett Yaseen, head of the firm building Blue Mountain Lakes, notes that his project started 11 years ago. People in Walpack Township say they have heard talk of the reservoir for decades and they cannot just close up shop and go bankrupt while waiting for the government land buyers.

The Interior Department and Basin Commission recognize some of the individual hardships involved. The only answer to the problem for both sides is purchase of the 72,000 acres as quickly as possible—three years is rated the best that can be done.

Since there is little hope Congress would step up annual appropriations to provide the money in three years, a bill has been introduced to allow the Basin Commission to float bonds. The idea is to borrow $10 or $20 million for the more critical land purchases, instead of waiting for six years of appropriations. The bill is in the first stages of its trip through Congress.

Meanwhile, people are buying lots, building houses and moving into Blue Mountain Lakes. Yaseen says that when he asked government officials what he should do until they raise the money to buy him out, he was told to continue business in a normal fashion.

"Which is what we are doing," he added.

AMENDMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, since 1960, the crime rate for the United States has increased 35 percent. Since that year, the number of crimes in America has increased about six times faster than the population.

Sadly, these statistics recall to memory the lines of a great midwestern poet, Carl Sandburg, in his "Playthings of the Wind."

Painting an unforgettable scene of desolation in a civilization that had been decimated by some unnamed reaper, Sandburg wrote:

> And the wind shifts
> And the dust on a doorsill shifts
> And even the writing of the rat footprints
> Tells us nothing, nothing at all
> About the greatest city, the greatest nation
> Where the strong men listened
> And the women warbled: "Nothing like us ever was."

Too often, we imagine that such devastation could be wrought only by some tragic mishandling of nuclear energy. However, I suggest the frightening possibility that crime, too, can wreak devastation on our civilization.

Crime can be as powerful a weapon against organized society as any mechanical device conceived by man. And crime—sometimes violent, sometimes stealthy—is stalking our city streets and our rural roads.

Let me repeat some of the statistics with which I began my remarks:

Since 1960 the American crime rate has risen about six times faster than the population. The overall crime rate for our Nation has increased 35 percent since 1960.

Violent crimes have increased by 25 percent during this period, and crimes against property have increased by 36 percent. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that there was a 13 percent increase in crime in 1964 alone.

In 1965 the crime rate went up even higher with an additional increase in crime of 5 percent over 1964 levels.

In my own State of Michigan, crime is rising at a frightful rate. The 1965 figures for Detroit should shock all citizens who cherish the greatness of our Motor City: homicide and nonnegligent manslaughter up 50.4 percent over 1964; forcible rape up 36.4 percent over 1964. Robberies increased 16.9 percent, burglaries 16.5 percent and theft of over $50 in value, 20.2 percent.

According to statistics received by the FBI, the total reported crime in Detroit for 1965 was 19.3 percent greater than in 1964.

Only those who live daily with fear for their lives and their material possessions can fully understand the terror that crime has struck in the hearts of millions of Americans. Perhaps the most tragic aspect of the picture is that crime usually strikes hardest and most often at the people who can least afford it—people with low or moderate incomes, and members of minority groups.

In many respects, the crime rate must be viewed as a reflection of failure on the part of our society to provide a favorable environment for many citizens to find opportunity and to achieve personal satisfaction and rewards. Measured by such standards, our society is ailing, and the crime rate indicates that much remains to be done. Every step toward equal opportunity for all Americans in education, employment, and housing is a step in the right direction.

I am convinced that America cannot solve its crime problem by creating a national police force or by destroying the constitutionally protected rights of the individual.

In a message to Congress in March, the President called for a war on crime. He stated:

> No more bitter irony could be imagined than this—that a people so committed to the quest for human dignity should have to pursue that quest behind locked doors.

Those are eloquent words—but where are the deeds of the administration? Until now, at least, the efforts on the part of the administration in this field have been too little and very late.

While the police powers belong to the States under the Constitution, there is an important role the Federal Government should play in helping the States to meet their responsibilities. Crime is waged on a massive interstate basis. The mobility of modern society, the importation of narcotics from abroad, the increasing number of auto thefts and the mobility of the modern criminal have blurred old lines of jurisdiction and responsibility Communication and coordination among local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies are essential if we expect to deal effectively with the crime problem.

Today, I wish to call attention to the first in a series of proposals which I plan to advance during the next several weeks in an effort to improve law enforcement and crime control in this country.

During the past months, there has been repeated cries for improved systems for the gathering and exchange of police information. For example, the Detroit Free Press recently carried an editorial entitled "A New Look at Crime," which read in part as follows:

> The quick exchange of information between law enforcement agencies should be sought to aid in the prevention of crime and the apprehension of criminals.

A few days later the same cry was again heard, this time in the Washington Post. The article quoted the recent FBI Uniform Crime Reports as saying:

> The need for police to centralize criminal information is . . . apparent.

The urgent cry for help should not go unheeded. When it is painfully obvious to all concerned that modern computers can provide the means to centralize our information and have it on hand instantly, and when we know that such pooling of information would greatly improve police work, delay is intolerable.

Yet progress has been very slow in achieving the centralized information systems which we need so desperately. In 1965 the FBI, acting under a 1930 statute authorizing it to exchange information on crime with the States, did start to implement a plan for a national crime information center. Now the Bureau foresees that its machinery will be in operation on an experimental basis, by January of next year.

How will this Crime Information Center work? At the present time, the FBI plans to store in a Washington-based computer three kinds of basic data.

First. It will have identification information on persons wanted for felonies.

Second. It will have information on stolen automobiles. Finally, it will have information on other identifiable stolen property, usually of a value of more than $500.

The National Crime Information Center will receive its information from State police authorities. The information on file in Washington will then be made available to the States to aid them in their law-enforcement activities.

The advantages of such a centralized pool of information are many. Let me suggest an example. Suppose a Detroit police officer sees an automobile which he suspects may have been stolen in another State. At the present time, a check with the national clearinghouse on stolen automobiles may take 5 days or a week. Usually this kind of delay is enough to discourage seeking information.

However, if the National Crime Information Center were in operation, the officer could radio police headquarters and obtain the necessary information via the State police, to Washington, within minutes. The response may reveal no record for the car. On the other hand, it may indicate that the car was stolen, in some far distant city in a distant State.

For the system to work effectively, however, it is important that there be State or regional computerized crime information systems. This is the "missing link" as plans go forward for the national information system which the FBI is now building.

The computers in Washington cannot do the job for all the country. They will contain only that information which is most likely to involve interstate crime. On the State and local level, computers are needed for much broader informational purposes. These computers should store information on all crimes within the jurisdictions involved. Furthermore, it is clear that until State information systems for collecting and reporting information are perfected, the national system in Washington will not be very useful.

In January of next year, the FBI hopes to hookup with 13 or 14 States or municipalities as part of the first stage of the operations of its national information center. If more of the States do not participate, it will not be because the FBI or anyone else doubts that such a new nationwide information network would be very useful. However, many States and localities have not allocated funds for such a project.

Obviously, the national crime information center is something of a chain which will be no stronger than its weakest links. It cannot operate effectively if State and local agencies do not have the facilities for gathering and feeding information into the national information center. Law enforcement in State A, a participant in the national crime information center, will surely be hampered if State B fails to participate in the program.

I propose a Federal program to be implemented through legislation, under which each State will be strongly encouraged to set up as rapidly as possible, a modern crime information facility, compatible with the National Crime Information Center in Washington. Under my bill, the Federal Government would put up 50 percent of the cost for each State which establishes such a facility.

Such a program will greatly facilitate the establishment and operation of State and local crime information centers. The cost to the taxpayers—about $25 million for the Federal share over a 7-year period—would be very modest, considering the tremendous benefits to be gained from such a program. While

Federal expenditures in the areas of education, and welfare have been skyrocketing, with good reason, it is noteworthy that Federal expenditures in the effort to combat crime have remained almost steady. This, despite a rapid increase in State and local expenditures crime control.

I believe the time has come—indeed, it is already late—for the Federal Government to take some bold, meaningful steps to help in the solution of this Nation's crime problem.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which would implement the proposal I have here advanced.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record, and that the bill lie at the desk until August 19, so that other Senators, if they wish to do so, will have the opportunity to join as sponsors.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 3718) to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 to provide grants to the States for developing plans and acquiring equipment for State computerized law enforcement data centers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Griffin (for himself and Mr. Tower), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 is amended by—

(1) inserting immediately before section 2 thereof the following: "TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CORRECTIONAL CAPABILITIES, TECHNIQUES, AND PRACTICES";

(2) striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 2 through to inclusive and inserting in lieu thereof "this title";

(3) redesignating sections 2 through 11 as sections 101 through 110 respectively;

(4) striking out in section 108 of such Act as redesignated in paragraph (3) of this section the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five";

(5) striking out section 109 of such Act as redesignated in paragraph (3) of this section and inserting in lieu thereof: "Sec. 109. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this title."; and

(6) adding immediately after section 110 of such Act as redesignated in paragraph (3) of this section the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMPUTERIZED STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA CENTERS

"Sec. 201. For the purpose of assisting the States to apply advanced computer technology to the prevention and control of crime, the Attorney General, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 206 of this Act, is authorized to make grants to States which have State plans approved by him under section 202 to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of developing plans and acquiring equipment for State computerized law enforcement data centers.

"Sec. 202. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this title shall designate or create an appropriate State agency for the purpose of this section, and submit, through such State agency a State plan which shall—

"(1) set forth a program for the development of a State computerized law enforcement data center and the acquisition or rental of equipment for such a center;

"(2) provide assurances that such State agency will make information from such a center available to law enforcement officials of other States;

"(3) provide assurances that such a center will be compatible with the National Crime Information Center, as determined by the Attorney General;

"(4) provide assurances that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the remaining cost of such program;

"(5) provide that such State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require; and

"(6) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting of funds received under this title.

"(b) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title or any modification thereof, without first affording such State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Sec. 203. (a) The Attorney General shall determine the amount of the Federal share of the cost of programs approved by him under section 202 upon the basis of the funds appropriated therefor pursuant to section 206 for that fiscal year and upon the number of participating States; except that no State may receive a grant under this title for any fiscal year in excess of $250,000.

"(b) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Sec. 204. (a) Whenever the Attorney General after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 202, or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Attorney General shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(b) A State agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Attorney General under section 202 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Attorney General or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Attorney General thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Attorney General or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Attorney General may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Attorney General as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Attorney General to take further evidence, and the Attorney General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Attorney General shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Attorney General's action.

"Sec. 205. As used in this title, the term 'State' includes each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this title."

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF COST OF ACQUIRING A CERTAIN MINERAL PROPERTY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on June 8, 1966, I made some rather extensive remarks concerning the proposed purchase by Continental Oil Co. of Consolidation Coal Co. The method of payment involves the notorious ABC scheme long practiced by various oil companies within the oil industry. This type of transaction is a tax dodge, and in my view should not be allowed.

Favorable ruling have been issued in the past by the Internal Revnue Service for transactions of this sort, but due to the secrecy with which rulings are normally handled by IRS, there has been little public knowledge, discussion or understanding of these transactions.

I intend to see to it, Mr. President, that the public and my colleagues become aware of this matter. Not only is there a question of legality and of tax equity, but there are also some broader implications of an antitrust nature. It has already been announced in the press that a somewhat similar deal is being arranged for the purchase of Peabody Coal Co. Now, Peabody and Consolidation are by far the two largest coal producing companies in the country. I can foresee a situation, not far off, when we will no longer have an independent coal industry. We may well have all major energy sources—petroleum, coal, uranium—under the control of a very few powerful corporations.

In my view the law is clear as to how these ABC transactions ought to be handled for tax purposes. Lifting costs attributable to a reserved production payment should be capitalized, since they actually form a part of the cost of acquiring the reserves left in the ground after the reserved production payment has been discharged. But there has been a series of private rulings given out by the Internal Revenue Service over the past several years which run somewhat counter to my interpretation of the law. The IRS ought to litigate this matter, if litigation is necessary.

In order to strengthen the hand of the Internal Revenue Service, and to make certain what the law is, I have now introduced a bill which would clarify the law. This bill merely states that the cost of acquiring a property in an ABC transaction includes the cost of producing the minerals applied in discharge of the production payment.

It is clear that the proposed ABC transaction involving Consolidation Coal would be abandoned if the Internal Revenue Service were to rule that the costs to Continental Oil of producing the coal to pay off the reserved production payment must be capitalized. Continental Oil would not be willing to submit that issue for decision by an impartial court. Continental Oil would fear, with good reason, that the court would hold such costs must be capitalized for the same reason that Continental Oil itself will capitalize—rather than expense—those costs on its own books.

Continental has argued that since the cost of producing any mineral which goes to the holder of a royalty interest can be deducted, the same rule ought to apply in the case of a reserved production payment. It is argued that since both a royalty interest and a reserved production payment are nonoperating economic interests, the costs of producing the mineral to discharge the obligations under those interests must be treated alike.

From the standpoint of the owner of the working interest, there is as much difference between a royalty obligation and the obligation to discharge a reserved production payment as there is between night and day. In the typical royalty case, the taxpayer produces eight barrels of oil and the holder of the royalty gets one barrel free of lifting costs. The lifting costs, of course, are deductible for they represent the cost of the current production of the seven barrels of oil retained by the taxpayer. The lifting costs of the one barrel paid as royalty do not represent in any manner the purchase price or cost of the reserves left in the ground. The lifting costs of the one barrel are properly chargeable to current production and not to future production. For that reason the lifting costs in the case of the royalty are not capitalized and are deductible. No oil company or accountant has ever, or will ever, capitalize the lifting costs attributable to the current royalty payments.

The reserved production payment presents a completely different case. In the typical ABC transaction, if the taxpayer—buyer of the working interest—produces eight barrels of oil, the holder of the reserved production payment receives seven barrels and the taxpayer keeps only one barrel. The taxpayer does not give seven barrels of oil to the holder of the production payment in order to get one barrel. He does not pay 100 percent of the lifting costs in order to acquire one-eighth of the oil. They are paid for quite a different reason. Seven-eighths of the lifting costs are paid in order that the taxpayer will be entitled to all the oil he produces after the reserved production payment is discharged.

Since a good part of the costs of mining the coal applied to the production payment reserved by Consolidation Coal are properly chargeable to coal which will still be in the ground when the production payment is discharged, Continental Oil proposes on its books to capitalize those mining costs—net of income taxes. This is in accord with the vast practice of Continental Oil since the company capitalizes lifting costs of oil and gas applicable to reserved production payments, and expenses of those costs over the life of the properties on a unit of production basis.

The correct principle is unmistakably clear if the reserved production payment is examined in its simplest form. Let us suppose that the production payment of $460 million reserved by Consolidation Coal is payable out of 100 percent of the production—instead of about 20 percent of the production—until paid in full. That is, all of the proceeds of the coal mined would go to the reserved production payment until $460 million plus interest had been paid, and Continental Oil would pay all of the costs of mining and receive none of the proceeds from the coal sold. The reserved production payment would then pay out in about 2 years as compared to the proposed 15-year payout. In such a case, it is obvious that the mining costs during the payout period cannot be considered as the cost of Continental's share of the current production, for it would have no current share. Obviously, all of the mining costs must be chargeable to the coal remaining in the ground which Continental can mine for its own account after the production payment is discharged. The capitalized costs would eventually be deducted by Continental through the depletion deduction as it mines its own coal free of the production payment. It is inconceivable that any court would allow Continental Oil in such a case to deduct currently the costs of mining the coal which go to pay the production payment. If in such a case Continental Oil were allowed to deduct the mining costs currently, it would have a loss which would wipe out any tax on its current income from oil and produce a net operating loss which would result in a refund of Continental Oil's income taxes for the past 3 years and no taxes for a number of years in the future.

A schoolchild would recognize that if all the coal produced must go to the holder of the production payment, all of the costs of producing that coal must be capitalized as the taxpayer's cost of the coal remaining in the ground which the taxpayer eventually can mine for his own account. It seems incredible that the Internal Revenue Service could conclude that the principle does not apply where 80 percent, or 50 percent, or 20 percent, of the current production goes to the reserved production payment instead of 100 percent.

Perhaps no such conclusion will be reached. I certainly hope not. But the bill I have just introduced would make a proper decision more nearly certain.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3719) relating to the income tax treatment of the cost of acquiring a mineral property in an ABC transaction, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HALF-DAY HOLIDAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN WASHINGTON, D.C., IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN LEGION PARADE, AUGUST 29, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on August 29 of this year the American Legion plans to stage the largest parade in the history of our Nation's Capital as a part of the 48th annual national convention of that organization. American Legion convention parades are traditionally among the most colorful and impressive of all parades held in this country.

It would be a fine tribute if Washington could have the largest turnout in the history of the American Legion for its parade on August 29.

Twelve years have passed since the Legion brought its national convention to Washington. At that time Government employees were excused from duty on the afternoon of parade day without loss of pay or annual leave time in order that they could attend that historic event.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am submitting a Senate concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that Government employees in the Washington, D.C., area whose services can be spared, should be excused from duty on the afternoon of August 29, 1966, to attend the American Legion convention parade, without loss of pay or charge to annual leave, as was done in 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Through the years I have worked closely with the American Legion in my State, and with its national leaders. I have observed the constructive approach this group has taken on the issues that confront the United States. The achievements of the American Legion on behalf of our country in its national defense program, its continuing fight against communism, its active program to promote Americanism, its alertness to the needs of our disabled, their widows and orphans, are enduring monuments to its usefulness. I am proud of the opportunity I have had to work with this organization and of the friendships which I share with members.

While observing many of the national conventions I have noted that Government offices in the cities where the conventions are held are closed during the mammoth parades that accompany such gatherings.

Mr. President, if employees are not permitted to attend the parade many of our veterans will be denied the opportunity of joining with their comrades, for a large percentage of our civilian employees are veterans. There might be a question about granting employees time off for 4 hours because of the cost. However, in my judgment it would be poor economy and poor public relations to deny citizens here an opportunity to fraternize with their home delegations which come from nearly every city and town in the United States. There will, in my judgment, be no loss at all, but on the contrary, there will be gain in terms of good morale, if our Government employees are given time off as provided in this resolution.

Many Legionnaires and their families have never visited Washington, and this convention will afford them an opportunity to enjoy their Nation's Capital. The crowd will be immense and in a parade of such proportions, it is probable that no interruption will be permitted in the line of march. Picture the resulting confusion, delay, and costs involved in keeping many of our Government employees south of the line of march from their normal quitting time until the close of the parade late in the evening.

Small communities throughout the length and breadth of this country have conducted drives and raised funds to send their contingents here for this convention. Large and small industries in many States are sponsoring their local drum and bugle corps and other groups. The time, effort, and funds involved are tremendous. We here in the Congress must consider those back home, and it is our duty to see that these former soldiers and their families are welcomed and greeted by their relatives and friends working here. Any other course, in my judgment, would be a withholding of hospitality and a show of little or no appreciation of what the American veteran has meant to the survival of our country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 104

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all officers and employees of the departments, establishments, and agencies of the Government, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia, who are employed in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia and whose services can be spared, should be excused from duty on the afternoon of August 29, 1966, without loss of pay or charge to annual leave, in order that they may attend the parade to be held in connection with the National Convention of The American Legion.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 738 AND 739

Mr. TOWER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 740

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3700, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

AMENDMENT NO. 741

Mr. JAVITS proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 3711) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL MINING AND MINERALS POLICY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 3636, to establish a national mining and minerals policy, which I introduced on July 21 for myself and Senators Dominick, Bennett, and Simpson, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Senators Gruening, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Young of North Dakota, Moss, Morse, Bible, Kuchel, Curtis, Montoya, Scott, and Murphy.

Mr. President, S. 3636 could form the basis for development of a truly constructive and effective national minerals policy—a policy our country sadly has lacked, to our detriment, for many years. The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels considered this measure in executive session on August 4 and voted unanimously to report it favorably to the full Interior Committee with an amendment.

I wish to call this measure to the attention of other Members of the Senate who are concerned with adequate supplies of minerals within our country and the restoration of a strong, healthy American mining industry. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 3636 as amended by the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee be printed in the Record at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the names of the cosponsors will be added; and the text of the bill, as amended, will be printed in the Record.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3636

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government in the national interest to foster and encourage (1) the development of an economically sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry, including production of precious metals, (2) the orderly development of domestic mineral resources and reserves necessary to assure satisfaction of industrial and security needs, and (3) mining, mineral, and metallurgical research to promote the wise and efficient use of our mineral resources. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this policy in such programs as may be authorized by law other than this Act. For this purpose the Secretary of the Interior shall include in his annual report to the Congress a report on the state of the domestic mining and minerals industry, including a statement of the trend in utilization and depletion of these resources, together with such recommendations for legislative programs as may be necessary to implement the policy of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 174

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 174) to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE MINERAL LEASING ACT WITH RESPECT TO LIMITATIONS ON THE LEASING OF COAL LANDS IMPOSED UPON RAILROADS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1372, S. 3070.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3070) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the *leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads*.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the measure which the Senate is considering at this moment is one which has been passed twice before and, therefore, we do not need to take the time to spell out its many details.

Very simply put, it tries to catch up with the mineral leasing laws with the changing face of time. It was first presented in 1957 by the late and great Senator Joseph O'Mahoney; and it was again presented in the 87th Congress under the sponsorship of former Senator J. J. Hickey and me. It did not become law since the House adjourned prior to taking any action upon the bill. This year, I have again introduced the legislation and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has unanimously given the bill a favorable report.

Since this matter has been before the Senate on previous occasions, I shall not take the time of my colleagues to explain the measure in detail.

Briefly, S. 3070 would do two things: First, it would repeal the 10,240-acre limit of ownership on coal lands by any railroad; and secondly, it would remove the restriction prohibiting participation in mining and use of such coal for other than their own consumption. These two stipulations, Senators may recall, were made part of the law of the land when, in an effort to stimulate railroad construction, every other section of land was given outright to the various railroad companies in the Western States. This, of course, was during the period when railroads operated coal-fired locomotives.

Since the passing of the coal-fired locomotive, however, the great coal deposits which underlie these various sections—particularly in my own State of Wyoming—have languished almost virtually untouched, since it is uneconomic to attempt to develop a coal mining complex under the present acreage limitations.

This measure, then, simply would remove these two archaic restrictions, allow coal acreages to be developed and mined conjointly and, thus, encourage the beneficial development of this great energy resource. The possibilities for thermal, mine-mouth generation become apparent when one sees the tremendous coal reserves which underlie these sections in the West. Indeed, the proven reserves are thought to be the largest in the entire world.

Mr. President, I believe we all agree that Federal laws enacted by Congress should encourage and stimulate business, industry, and employment and should not be unduly restrictive, and this is particularly true when the restrictions themselves appear to serve no good purpose. It is for these reasons that I have introduced this measure and urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. President, there is much merit in this proposal. It would redound to the advantage of the coal producers, the railroads, the laboring men, and the economy in general of the whole area of the West.

Therefore, I would hope that the Senate would concur again, as it has twice before, in the wisdom of this measure.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to associate myself with the remarks just made by my distinguished colleague. He has done a fine job on this bill in its presentation in cooperation with the work accomplished in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I agree wholeheartedly with what he states about the bill. It is of tremendous importance to the people of the West, not only in the State of Wyoming but also in Montana and the other Mountain States. It will mean much to the development of our lands out there.

I support S. 3070 because it is legislation that is needed for the development of my State and the other States of the West and because it would bring some equity and fairness into the management of our public domain. S. 3070 would amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 by striking that section which prohibits railroad companies from holding under permit or lease more than 10,240 acres of federally owned coal land.

Railroad companies can lease other Federal lands of mineral value and thus are given an opportunity to compete and develop the natural resources that they presently own except for coal land. By enacting this legislation into law, we would permit the utilization of our coal lands in the West.

When the railroad company built its line in Wyoming, it came across some of the richest coal deposits in the world. The Federal Government gave to the railroad company every other section in a checkerboard pattern 20 miles on each side of its line, and of course, the railroad chose their route where coal could be found easily. Thus, the railroad company now holds ownership of about 10 billion tons of recoverable coal in the State of Wyoming.

For proper administration and development of these lands, it is necessary that we consolidate the holdings that are now owned in a 40-mile band across the State on a 50–50 basis by the Federal Government and the railroad company. We must take the shackles off the railroad company so that these lands can be properly developed.

Wyoming's coal reserve of over 60 billion tons ranks fourth largest in the Nation, yet production in Wyoming has only been ranked as number 13. If we are to realize the full benefit of our coal reserves, it is important that the railroad companies be treated equally with individuals so that these great reserves can be developed beneficially in cooperation with others who own the rights to coal lands in our State.

In 1964, Congress enacted a law which would allow an individual to lease as many as 46,080 acres of Federal land. This legislation was important to Wyoming's development, as will be the enactment of S. 3070. At the present time, the best possible use for this coal which lies in such abundant quantities will be for the generating of electricity. The energy of coal can be transformed into electricity and can light up the whole West. "Coal by wire" is a new and successfully growing industry in Wyoming.

When we take the shackles from the railroads, joint corporate ventures will open up new lands that will bring mining jobs and allied employment to many thousands of people in our State. It will help to add to the electrical power that is needed to supply the growing demands of western America. I am optimistic about the future of Wyoming and its coal industry, but before we can realize the full benefit of the coal industry's contribution to the State's and the Nation's economy, we must adopt that legislation which will bring equality and fairness to those who are interested in developing those reserves through research for new uses of our coal and the carrying out of already proven successful programs.

Mr. President and fellow Members of the Senate, this bill is important to the State of Wyoming and I urge its passage today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to add my concurrence to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] regarding the presentation of his colleague, Mr. McGee. I am delighted that this bill is again before us. I am sure that it will receive unanimous approval of the Senate because of the efforts of the Senators from Wyoming in its behalf.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Does this bill have application only to public lands?

Mr. McGEE. That is correct. Public lands in which there were restrictions imposed in the areas that the railroads operate through. It is a sort of checkerboard arrangement. We are trying to put it together in one piece.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 2 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U.S.C. 202), is hereby repealed.

INTERNATIONAL LITERACY DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1405, House Joint Resolution 810.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 810) to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September 1966 as "International Literacy Day."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting two nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RESIGNATION OF EDWIN O. REISCHAUER AS AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the resignation of Edwin Oldfather Reischauer as Ambassador to Japan has evoked a sense of sincere regret among those who are acquainted with his work in Japan during the past 5 years. That feeling, I am sure, exists among the Japanese no less than among Americans.

When it became known that the Ambassador was determined to withdraw many of us in the Senate urged him to reconsider. So did President Johnson. The President was most anxious for Mr. Reischauer to remain in the public service, and I know how much he personally tried to dissuade him from his intention. However, the Ambassador felt it most desirable that he step out at this time and refurbish his insights by a return to academic surroundings.

The widespread concern at his resignation is a tribute to Mr. Reischauer's competence and effectiveness as Ambassador to Japan. It has been said that his great achievement in these past 5 years has been to repair "the broken dialog" between Japan and the United States. I am not quite sure what that phrase connotates. It is an apt phrase, however, if it means that Ambassador Reischauer encountered a trend of estrangement between Americans and Japanese on his arrival in Tokyo and that, in the subsequent 5 years, he helped greatly to check and reverse that trend. The fact is that Ambassador Reischauer has done much to fill the reservoir of reciprocal respect and understanding between Japan and the United States. The reach of his ambassadorial effort went far beyond the routine maintenance of excellent official relations. His great knowledge of and sensitivity to Japan and its peoples was felt deeply by Japanese society.

It is not surprising that the American press, on the occasion of Mr. Reischauer's resignation, has gone to great lengths in paying tribute to him and his charming, dedicated and equally hardworking wife, Haru Reischauer. Together, these two devoted Americans have combined to perform a splendid service for this Nation and for the development of constructive relations between ourselves and the Japanese.

I ask unanimous consent that a selection of press reactions to the resignation of Ambassador Reischauer be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 27, 1966]

AMBASSADORS

The resignation of Edwin O. Reischauer as our Ambassador to Japan comes as that country is moving steadily toward a more prominent role in Asia and as relations between the United States and Japan have been growing broader and stronger. In his five years as Ambassador, Mr. Reischauer has seen Japan reach outward toward new relationships with other nations, including the Soviet Union and Red China, as World War II receded into the past, and it is a mark of diplomatic ability that our relationship with Japan has improved steadily during this period. Mr. Reischauer, who has provided an outstanding example of the way in which scholarship and diplomacy can be joined, is expected to go back to a professorship at Harvard University. He deserves the thanks of his countrymen.

President Johnson's designation of U. Alexis Johnson, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, as the new Ambassador to Japan is a clear indication of the importance the Administration continues to give to the Tokyo assignment. As Deputy Under Secretary, Mr. Johnson has been the ranking career officer in the State Department. He is an expert on Japan and the Far East with many years of service there; his most recent assignment abroad was in 1964–1965 when he was deputy ambassador in South Vietnam. Mr. Johnson's appointment as Ambassador should be welcomed in Japan as it is here.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 27, 1966]

THE AMBASSADOR RETIRES

Our Ambassador to Japan, Edwin O. Reischauer, is giving up his post to return to Harvard, where he was teaching when President Kennedy appointed him more than five years ago. His credentials were patently tops: born in Tokyo, fluent in Japanese, well versed in Japanese and Asian affairs, married to a Japanese lady. But even better has been his outstanding performance.

During thse five years of dramatic change in Asia, Ambassador Reischauer has done an intelligent and constructive job of reporting on Japan to us, and representing us to the Japanese. He has steadily helped forge closer links between the United States, with our deep interests in Asia, and Japan, one of Asia's prime powers. In an important bit of peace-making on the side, he was instrumental behind the schemes in the restoration of normal relations between Japan and South Korea, its former colony.

So, three cheers! One for Prof. Reischauer. We will be listening for his voice on Asian affairs. One for professors and other eggheads of this cut, who can serve the country as well, or maybe better, than campaign contributors, fashionable hostesses, and the like. And one for Presidential appointees, over career diplomats, when the President has a good one.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 28, 1966]

THE EMERGENT STATUS OF JAPAN

Japan's continuing desire is for international status—or for general recognition as an independent and influential Asian power not forever seen as a client or protégé of the United States.

Moreover, the years since the signing in 1960 of the Japanese-American Security Treaty have seen Japan edging tentatively toward a more independent position in the world. The shame of the 1940's has been left behind. The country has grown miraculously in industrial and general economic vigor. And the Olympic Games of 1964—a triumph of staging in Tokyo—won worldwide recognition as a very Japanese achievement.

Inevitably the stirrings are accompanied by strains, nowhere more sensitive than in the all-important relations between Tokyo and Washington. During these years, the United States has been fortunate to have had as Ambassador in Japan Edwin Reischauer. He has understood as few other outsiders could what is happening in Japan.

It is perhaps an indication of how things have changed since Professor Reischauer went to Tokyo as Ambassador that announcement of his resignation coincided with a visit to Tokyo by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. (There is, of course, no direct connection between the two.) But who would have thought back in 1961 that five years later Japan would have been negotiating joint development of Siberia with the Soviets—without any fundamental change of government in Tokyo and without a chorus of loud protest from Washington?

Moscow's desire to involve the Japanese in Siberia is perhaps more surprising than Washington's apparent acquiescence in the move. The main reason for both is the possible long-term threat from China. Even if Japan is banned constitutionally from development of significant military strength, she remains the only real industrial power of Asia, and the only really developed country of the continent, too. Thus, it is natural that those who feel China a long-term threat are interested in bringing Japan into play as a counterbalance to the threat.

In terms of real estate, the Soviet Union is most threatened by China along their common border that runs for thousands of miles from Central Asia across Siberia to the Pacific, facing Japan. The emptier and less developed the vast area to the north of the border remains, the more tempting it is to China. Hence the Soviets' desire to develop it speedily, and their willingness to call in successful free-enterprise Japan to help them do it.

There can be little doubt that in trying to forge stronger economic links with Japan, the Soviets are simultaneously aiming at lessening United States influence there. At present the United States not only guarantees Japan's security but maintains bases on Japanese territory.

We are inclined to think that power in Japan is likely to remain in the hands of the men who have it now—provided they are able to show that they are furthering Japan's interests in the way thought best by the Japanese themselves. Nothing should please the United States more than a healthy, stable Japanese Japan. But nothing would be more likely to prevent this than outside pressure to get the Japanese to do what outsiders think is best for Japan. On that, surely the Japanese are the best judges.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1966]

AFTER REISCHAUER: JAPAN DIALOG CONTINUES

Tokyo.—The United States no longer needs another man "like Professor Reischauer" as its ambassador to Japan.

That perhaps is the greatest tribute to what Edwin Oldfather Reischauer and his wife Haru have achieved during their five years in the gleaming white mansion atop Reinan Slope here.

The ambassador has told friends that his main job, which was to repair what he called the "broken dialog" between the United States and Japan, has been achieved. Appointment of career diplomat U. Alexis Johnson as Mr. Reischauer's successor shows that President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk agree.

QUALITIES APPLAUDED

Japanese newspapers have reacted favorably to Ambassador Johnson's appointment. They note that he began his diplomatic career as a language officer in Japan, that his son Stephen was born in Japan, that almost all his career has been spent either in the Far East or dealing with the Far East.

They are flattered that Washington should underline the importance of the Tokyo post by appointing a man who currently occupies the No. 3 position in the State Department—Deputy Undersecretary for Political Affairs.

But the newspapers do not hide their regret over Mr. Reischauer's impending departure to resume a professorship at Harvard University.

While specific tributes vary from journal to journal, "sincerity" is the quality most applauded. The Asahi Shimbun, one of Japan's most respected newspapers and a frequent critic of Washington Asian policy, lauded the ambassador's "missionary zeal" in listening to and talking to the Japanese.

The Reischauers arrived in Japan in the wake of the greatest postwar crisis in Japanese-American relations—the antisecurity-treaty demonstrations of 1960.

These demonstrations had forced the cancellation of President Eisenhower's goodwill trip to Japan and caused the downfall of the Kishi Cabinet which had signed the treaty. The agreement provided for American bases in Japan to continue at least until 1970 and on a renewal basis thereafter.

The Reischauers' efforts have been characterized as multifaceted but never flamboyant. They never passed up any opportunity to strengthen and diversify the strands of dialogue between the two countries—from official speeches and glittering receptions to homely chats with village PTA's.

In a recent interview, Mr. Reischauer estimated he had visited all but three of Japan's 46 prefectures.

Almost all newspapers here note a change in atmosphere between early 1961, when the Reischauers took up their job, and today. They don't deny the existence of serious differences in viewpoints between Tokyo and Washington, notably on policy toward Peking and Vietnam.

POLICY DIFFERENCES

But the important thing, they say, is that the two countries can discuss these differences frankly, as equals, without offending one another's feelings.

As Deputy Undersecretary of State, as deputy ambasador to Saigon, and before that as ambassador to Thailand and to Czechoslovakia, incoming Ambassador Johnson helped to formulate American policies toward Peking, toward Laos, Thailand, and the two Vietnams.

During his Prague stint he dealt personally with the Chinese Communists during those periodic confrontations Washington and Peking have at Warsaw.

Some of these policies, notably the bombing of North Vietnam, have been severely criticized by the Japanese.

But one of the results of Mr. Reischauer's efforts to stimulate a many-strand dialogue between Japan and the United States has been the growth of a dialogue among the Japanese themselves. Doesn't Japan's own national interest demand a continuation of American bases in the Far East?

From a "national interest" viewpoint, what should Japan's relations be with Peking? With Washington? With Southeast Asia?

This kind of debate, unheard of in Japan when the Reischauers arrived, should make Mr. Johnson's task as a professional diplomat considerably easier, even when dealing with sensitive and emotion-rousing issues.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 30, 1966]

REISCHAUER: COMMUNICATOR

(NOTE.—Reviewing five years as Washington's "man in Tokyo," Ambassador Reischauer says there is still a tremendous gap in understanding between the United States and Japan. Nevertheless, things are "going very, very well today" as he and his wife prepare to take their leave.)

TOKYO.—A little more than five years ago, a Harvard history professor arrived here with a formerly Japanese wife as the United States Ambassador to Japan.

Never before had the United States dared to send an envoy to the home country of his foreign-born wife.

Furthermore, some people, both in the United States and here, looked askance at the thought of an "egghead" and liberal in one of Washington's most crucial ambassadorships.

But those were the heady opening days of a New Frontier in American experience. Anything seemed possible.

The professor's mandate was clear: To mend what he himself had described as the "broken dialogue" between Washington and its foremost Far Eastern ally.

Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer was reminiscing recently over his five-year sojourn here. And he looked ahead. It was already known here that he soon would be leaving to resume his life's work as a scholar and student of Asia's destiny.

"My major problem when I came here in 1961," he recalled, "was to try to overcome what seemed to me a rather serious breakdown in communication between ourselves and large elements of the Japanese public—not the government—who felt completely out of touch and out of sympathy, who felt they couldn't get their ideas through to us and couldn't figure out what we were thinking."

DISCONTENT EXPLODED

These elements included intellectuals, students, labor leaders, and leftist Opposition politicians who felt alienated from the conservative order that had ruled—and still runs—postwar Japanese society.

Their pent-up discontent had exploded into months of rioting the summer before. Those were the massive 1960 demonstrations against revision of the Japanese-United States Security Treaty, which forced President Eisenhower to cancel a state visit to Japan.

"When you look back," said Dr. Reischauer, "you realize how superficial was even the little communication that did take place. The Japanese people then were not ready to discuss a lot of the really serious problems, such as how peace, stability, and economic progress can realistically be achieved in the Far East. The great difference between then and now is that there is much more real communication on serious issues going on today.

"Things are going very, very well today," the Ambassador declared. "I think there is a great easing of Japanese sensitivity toward the United States. We're closer to having an equal relationship. We're very much less in the Japanese mind than five years age. And this is good."

MAJOR CHANGE SIGHTED

"The Japanese are much more understanding of themselves and where they stand in the world, much more concerned with looking at the problems of the world for themselves rather than just reacting to what American foreign policy may be. This is the chief change that has taken place."

Dr. Reischauer feels the Japanese will clarify their independent position on global issues well before 1970.

That is the year either Japan or the United States can end or revise the 1960 security treaty between them. This pact—keystone and symbol of Japan's postwar foreign policy—is still the most divisive issue between Left and Right in Japan. And leftists are girding for a showdown over it in 1970.

Dr. Reischauer, however, foresees no crisis in 1970. He concedes the coming debate over Japan's role in the world might become very sharp and even involve disorder. But he feels little doubt about its eventual outcome.

"Japan's interests in a peaceful, trading world are so overwhelming that they will see their way to playing a large role in aid to less-developed countries and helping them become independent, stable units. Also, the Japanese may take a more realistic attitude toward the problems of defense and collective security."

In April, Japan took its first concrete step toward a larger role among Asia's developing nations. It hosted eight Southeast Asian countries at the first economic development conference ever held on Asian initiative. In full public view, the Japanese Government announced it will raise its aid to developing countries to 1 percent of Japan's national income as soon as possible.

TURNING POINT SEEN

That conference, Dr. Reischauer declared, was "vastly important, a great turning point in Japanese history." Japan had little reason to call such a meeting unless it was willing to dispense aid.

Yet the government went through with it. And it reaped gratifying returns.

"The response from the Southeast Asians was much more friendly to Japan that people counted on," commented Dr. Reischauer. "And the response of Japanese people themselves was much more enthusiastic than might have been expected."

To the departing American Ambassador, the conference also was an encouraging portent of Japan's recovery from the "only really low point" in his five-year tenure here.

That was much of the year 1965 when the stepped-up war in Vietnam provoked great emotional excitement in Japan. Once more the Japanese tended to blame Asia's troubles on American Far Eastern policy and the American-Chinese confrontation. They reverted to severe criticism of the United States in almost all ways.

To Dr. Reischauer, it was a most worrisome time. The relationship he had so carefully nutured seemed to be retrogressing.

HOMECOMING RECALLED

Since then, however, Japanese alarm that the Vietnam war might involve them in the American fight has calmed down. The Japanese again are in positive search of their destiny.

For Edwin Oldfather Reischauer, son of American missionary parents, assignment to Tokyo was a homecoming to the land of his birth and the object of his lifelong interest.

Here he was schooled until age 16. And here he returned for graduate study after earning degrees at Oberlin College and Harvard University.

His father, August Karl Reischauer, had come to Japan in the Meiji Era and, among other things, helped found Tokyo Joshi Daigaku (Tokyo Women's Christian College). His mother helped start Japan's first oral school for the deaf

Yet it was no easy decision to return as ambassador. His wife, the former Haru Matsukata, granddaughter of a onetime Prime

Minister of Japan, "at first was absolutely opposed to it," Dr. Reischauer revealed.

"Here my country was asking me to do something, and in a way I'd been critical of some of the ways we'd handled things in our relations with Japan in the past," related the Ambassador. "It was a case of put up or shut up. So for various reasons, I felt I didn't have any choice. I just had to accept."

With his lifelong knowledge of the difficult Japanese language, his long familiarity with the people, his standing as a scholar, and his marriage to a Japanese, Dr. Reischauer made an ambassador with whom the Japanese could identify.

And identify they did! Few ambassadors have ever experienced as tumultuous a reception as Dr. Reischauer in 1961.

"At last someone who will really understand us," exulted Japanese newspapers at word of his appointment.

"No other American would receive such a warm welcome in Japan," said an Asahi Shimbun columnist, remembering the riots of the year before.

Because of a premature news leak and the lengthy routine of processing his FBI security clearance, however, it was some six weeks between Dr. Reischauer's selection and his arrival at Haneda Airport.

The long wait gave rise to innumerable rumors that President Kennedy might retract his appointment, that conservatives in Japan objected to a known liberal, etc.

"It was a very painful experience, particularly for a person who had never been in the limelight in that way before," Dr. Reischauer recalled. "But actually it worked out extremely well. Those six weeks or so allowed the Japanese to build this [his appointment] up to a pitch of such high intensity of interest that by the time my wife and I arrived, all we had to do was step off the plane and it was a great triumph. All we had to do was be around, go to receptions and break into this job, and we'd already achieved a great deal. I always felt that we could have gone home right then and still have done a great deal."

He was joking, of course, and his face creased into the eyebrow-arching laugh that comes so easily from him. Despite his official duties, the former professor has lost none of the zestful informality that made him such a favorite at Harvard, where students affectionately dubbed one of his courses "Rice paddies."

LEFT VOICED OPPOSITION

For all their anticipation, however, some groups in Japan did not quite know how to regard the new envoy when he arrived.

The extreme Left, for example, Dr. Reischauer related, went through "a period of a year or so in which they were very much in doubt about what to do with me." Finally they "decided I was a first-class disaster from their point of view and for the last three or four years have been very strong in their attacks on me.

"But I never expected that I could establish any dialogue with committed Communists and fellow travelers," he observed.

At the other end of the political spectrum, the Ambassador confided, "there are some really old-fashioned conservatives who have never gotten over the thought that probably I eat breakfast every morning with a lot of wild-eyed intellectuals.

"The truth of the matter is that I have had much less time to associate with Opposition elements than would be desirable."

At the outset of his tenure, however, he said, "we managed to create the mood that Americans and Japanese could talk about all sorts of things and that the Embassy is not a mysterious organization behind big white walls."

Nevertheless, "there is a tremendous gap in understanding between our two countries," Dr. Reischauer noted. For one thing, "attention in Washington has not been focused on Japan as much as it should. It has been glued on more immediate problems in all parts of the world."

In Japan, the gap is still "primarily with the Left, the Opposition." Officials in the government, "because of the nature of their jobs, because they have to face responsibilities, are probably much closer to being able to understand us than anybody else."

But this is not necessarily true of their supporters, the Ambassador said—"not by a long shot."

The next ambassador, Dr. Reischauer said, will have "much less of the role I've tried to play of developing the mood for dialogue, Japanese responsiveness is such now that special efforts on our part are not required. They themselves will carry the dialogue to us."

To resume his academic life, Dr. Reischauer hopes to return to Harvard ("It's the best place for recharging my batteries"). Three years ago, when he decided to stay on here, he had to resign his professorship and several top posts there. But there is little doubt Cambridge will welcome him back.

The outgoing Ambassador, of course, "would like to write about my experiences here—not just anecdotal things but something about modern diplomacy as a whole, from what I've learned through my stay here."

Another book he contemplates is one "on our whole Asia policy."

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 31, 1966]

JAPAN: REISCHAUER OUT, JOHNSON IN

Edwin O. Reischauer, the popular U.S. ambassador to Tokyo, resigned last week and veteran Asia diplomat U. Alexis Johnson was appointed to replace him.

Japan, meanwhile, was taking another step out of Asia's political sideshows toward playing a world diplomatic role more in keeping with its size and economic strength, a trend which began during Reischauer's five-year stay and has been encouraged by the United States.

Reischauer, an expert on the Japanese language and culture who has a Japanese wife, was at home from the moment he arrived at his post in April, 1961. But in the wake of the 1960 crisis over the revision of the U.S.-Japan security treaty and President Eisenhower's canceled visit he had a delicate fence-mending job to do. He gained the confidence of Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi's successors, reestablished contact with Japan's influential non-Communist left and encouraged frank debate by traveling around Japan talking and listening.

His words, style and family became favorite topics for Japanese press and television and he was credited with helping to restore what he called the "broken dialog" between the United States and Japan.

GROMYKO IN TOKYO

The Japanese last week were busy restoring another broken dialog. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko was spending six days in Tokyo consulting with his Japanese counterpart, Etsusaburo Shinna, Prime Minister Eisaku Sato and other top officials.

It was the first such visit by a Soviet foreign minister and its main accomplishment was an agreement on Japanese-Soviet cooperation in developing the economic resources of Siberia. This is expected to spur lagging Soviet-Japanese trade. Politically it is in line with the idea of strengthening Japan's hand in dealing with Peking by having good relations with both Washington and Moscow, as has been discussed recently in Japanese political circles. It was also a turnabout for the Russians, who used to guard Siberia jealously from Japanese encroachment and now fear the same from China.

Gromyko and Shinna also agreed to extend consular privileges between their two countries and to speed up negotiations on reciprocal airline rights.

ISLAND ISSUE SHELVED

The Japanese were turned down sharply, however, when they suggested talks about several North Pacific Islands taken over at the end of World War II by the Russians. Gromyko considered the matter closed because of wartime Allied agreements to strip Japan of all territories considered gained illegally or by invasion.

The Japanese claim to some of these islands has been a stumbling block to a peace treaty with Moscow, in the absence of which the two countries maintain diplomatic relations by special agreement.

There was no question, however, that Gromyko's visit moved Moscow and Tokyo closer as part of the changing Japanese diplomatic scene which Reischauer's successor will face.

Reischauer plans to leave in six to eight weeks and return to academic life at Harvard. His departure had been rumored for some time but officials in both Washington and Tokyo had hoped to persuade him to stay another year.

U. Alexis Johnson is no stranger to Japan. His first foreign service assignment was as a language officer in Tokyo in 1935. He was arrested by the Japanese in Manchuria in 1941 and later returned to the United States in a wartime exchange of diplomats. He served with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's occupation government after the war and since has been ambassador to Czechoslovakia and Thailand and was deputy ambassador in Saigon under former Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor. He is now deputy undersecretary of state for political affairs, ranking fourth in the State Department hierarchy.

Johnson is expected to continue strongly Reischauer's efforts to get more active Japanese support for U.S. actions in Vietnam which have recently caused new strain in relations between the two countries.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1966]

AS MRS. REISCHAUER

TOKYO.—Five years ago, the thought of becoming an ambassador's wife was "too horrible to think about" for Mrs. Edwin O. Reischauer. She much preferred the academic atmosphere of Harvard University, where her husband taught.

But today—one thousand and one teas, receptions, luncheon speeches, formal dinners and house guests later—the wife of the United States Ambassador to Japan has found her life "almost like a dream." [The ambassador's resignation was announced in Washington July 25.]

"You just can't help being a richer person by having this experience," related the granddaughter of a onetime Prime Minister of Japan in an interview at the embassy residence here. "You meet such wonderful, interesting people who are devoted to solving the problems of today."

She mentioned such recent house guests as Ambassador-at-Large W. Averell Harriman, the McGeorge Bundys, and another visitor whom she could not name "because it's a secret that he was out here."

From the beginning, Mrs. Reischauer has made it her first duty to relieve her ambassador-husband of as many unnecessary burdens and worries as possible. But this has not prevented her from assuming a very active schedule of her own.

Most of her activities have revolved around women, both Japanese and American. "I'm a member of about 14 women's clubs and an honorary member of I don't know how many," she related. "I was never in a woman's club before."

Like a professor's wife, however, Mrs. Reischauer has steered the ladies into more than "just hopping from one tea to the next." Two years ago, she initiated the Embassy Women's Club seminars "to put something into our heads." She asked various specialists on Japanese life to speak before embassy women, then answer questions.

Mrs. Reischauer has also arranged Japanese language instruction for embassy wives. "When I came here," she recalled, "I found that embassy wives were not getting free lessons whereas secretaries were. It's the wives that really need to know some Japanese."

As for Japanese women, Mrs. Reischauer has encouraged as many as possible to visit the United States. Since her husband became ambassador in 1961, she has arranged for most women members of the National Diet, who had not gone previously, to tour America. Their two-month trips have been financed by the leader grant program of the United States Department of State.

Juvenile delinquency, according to Mrs. Reischauer, is "the biggest problem Japanese women face today. Everywhere I go, I am asked questions about it. Japanese women are baffled by this problem. They want to know more about it, what it's like in the United States, how they can help their children."

Mrs. Reischauer also has spoken frequently before officers' wives' clubs at American military bases in Japan. Many military wives, she says, "cannot understand why they should run into anti-American feeling here when their husbands have come here in Japan's interests as well as our own. So I have to tell them."

She explains that many Japanese mistakenly consider Americans "a very militaristic people." This belief stems partly from their experiences with Japan's militarists before World War II.

Mrs. Reischauer is ready to assume the role of a professor's wife—if only to gain sartorial peace of mind.

"One of the greatest differences between being a professor's wife and an ambassador's wife is my wardrobe," she told the Great Heights Officers' Wives' Club some time ago. "I don't dare let my husband look into my closet to see how many dresses I have accumulated since coming here. Once he saw all my shoes, and he almost fell over with surprise."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Aug. 2, 1966]

Backs Japan Over China

Washington, August 1.—Japan, not Red China, will have the greatest impact on the future of Asia, retiring U.S. diplomat Edwin O. Reischauer said today. "China's influence is negative and recognized as such by everybody, whereas the positive role Japan can play is not so widely understood as yet."

[From the Saigon Post, Aug. 2, 1966]

Future of Asia More Affected by Japan Than Red China: Reischauer

Washington, Monday, August 1.—Edwin O. Reischauer, retiring U.S. ambassador to Tokyo, predicted today the future of Asia will be more affected by Japan than Red China.

"I feel quite strongly that, in the long run, Japan will probably do more to affect the future of Asia than China," Reischauer said in a copyrighted interview published in the magazine, U.S. News and World Report.

Two decades after a devastating military defeat, the Japanese are rapidly moving into "a role as the great economic and political power in Asia," the Ambassador said.

"China's influence is negative and recognized as such by everybody, whereas the positive role Japan can play is not so widely understood as yet," he declared. "But for the last year or so, Japan has been showing signs of getting ready to assume a new position of leadership."

Asked whether Japan would assume some of the U.S. burden in the Pacific, Reischauer said it was "inevitable."

But he said he would "assume that Japan will continue to look to us for nuclear defense," one reason being that the pacifist tendency in Japan "will remain strong among a large part of the Japanese public for some time into the future."

Reischauer also said chances of closer relationship between Japan and Communist China is not in the cards because Japan could not achieve this "without cutting off relations with Taiwan, and that is a price which they are not willing to pay."

Reischauer was Ambassador to Japan for five years until last Monday, when he resigned to rejoin the faculty of Harvard University.

During the interview, he made these other points:

—The United States has "no timetable" for the return of Okinawa to Japanese control, and although the U.S. hopes it can be accomplished soon, "security considerations come first."

—It is "hard to see" Japan catching the United States economically "but they are certainly getting closer all the time" and in the next decade, "may well pass the United Kingdom, France and West Germany to become the third (largest economic unit) after the United States and the Soviet Union."

[From Time, Aug. 5, 1966]

Foreign Relations: Dialogue Restored

In 1960, U.S.-Japanese relations were at their lowest postwar ebb. Student demonstrations against their country's security pact with Washington had culminated in the cancellation of a visit to Tokyo by President Eisenhower. In world affairs Japan still labored under the inferiority complex of a conquered nation. That fall, *Foreign Affairs* ran an essay titled "The Broken Dialogue" by Dr. Edwin Oldfather Reischauer, director of the Harvard-Yenching Institute dealing with Far Eastern studies. In his article Reischauer pointed up the "weakness of communication between the Western democracies and opposition elements in Japan"—and so impressed President-elect Kennedy that he subsequently appointed its author Ambassador to Tokyo.

"Easy Equality." By last week, when Reischauer, 55, confirmed that he is stepping down in order to return to Harvard, he could take major credit for a notable improvement in relations between the U.S. and Asia's most advanced nation. Lacking any previous diplomatic field experience, he brought to the job some extraordinary qualifications. Born in Tokyo of Presbyterian missionary parents, Reischauer is married to a member of a distinguished Japanese family, speaks the language fluently and is one of the world's leading authorities on Japanese history. In scores of articles in Japanese publications and in close personal contacts with Japanese from virtually every walk of life, the ambassador—who was respectfully labeled *sensei*, honorable teacher—was a powerful influence in restoring the nation's self-confidence.

The Japanese government has become increasingly aware of its international responsibilities. Moreover, though Tokyo and Washington still have their differences—most Japanese, for example, deplore U.S. bombing of North Viet Nam, while the U.S. opposes Japan's granting of long-term credits to Communist China—relations between the two capitals are more cordial than ever before. As Reischauer noted in a *sayonara* statement last week, Americans and Japanese now enjoy "a full and frank exchange of opinion on a basis of easy equality."

His Own Division. Picked to succeed Reischauer was U. (for Ural) * Alexis Johnson, 57, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and himself an old Asia hand. Also fluent in Japanese, Kansas-born Johnson started his career as an embassy language officer in Tokyo in 1935; on Pearl Harbor Day, as a vice consul in Japanese-controlled Manchuria, he was interned. Exchanged in 1942, he later joined General Douglas MacArthur's Tokyo staff. More recently, Johnson was deputy ambassador in Saigon before returning to Washington last year.

Though he occupies the State Department's No. 4 post, Johnson himself requested the Tokyo assignment. Like a Pentagon general or desk-based admiral, he explained, "You just want to have your own division or your own ship to run." Besides, fellow diplomats note, an assignment to Tokyo "is like going to the Court of St. James for European hands.' Johnson's principal challenge will be nurturing Japanese participation in cooperative economic endeavors in Southeast Asia.

Thinning Crop. Johnson's impending departure widens a leadership gap in State's upper echelons. The No. 3 man, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Thomas Mann, resigned in April, and the department's second in command, Under Secretary George Ball, hopes to leave by summer's end. There are no obvious candidates for any of their jobs. The vacuum underscores criticism that the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have failed to develop a new echelon of top career diplomats.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 11, 1966]

Japanese Role

In the opinion of Edwin O. Reischauer, who is leaving Tokyo after five years there as United States Ambassador, the communization of Japan is Peking's most important single objective. This is another way of saying that regardless of developments elsewhere, what happens in Japan in the years ahead can pretty much determine the fate of Asia. Merely to imagine the power of a Communist Japan allied with a Communist China is to make the point obvious.

Thus it is heartening to hear Mr. Reischauer's expert judgment that communism is a "shrinking danger" in Japan, as it is heartening also to find him convinced that Japan is unlikely again to try to become itself an imperial power, through wars of conquest. The Japanese have recognized, he says, that the old kind of nationalism which led them into the disaster of World War II is economically, politically and militarily not feasible.

None of this can be taken as meaning that Japan may be taken for granted by the United States as a nation ready to applaud and follow all American policy. It should be true, as Mr. Reischauer says, that the Japanese will perceive the common sense in continuing their security relationship with the United States, but beyond that they may be expected to follow an increasingly independent course. Not only their own interests, but ours as well, and Asia's, will be better served if they do so.

---

* He was not, Johnson insists, named after the river or the mountain range in Russia. His mother, he explains, wanted him to have a first name that would sound something like his father's—Carl—but not be so common. So she invented Ural.

[From Newsweek, August 8, 1966]

BRIDGE BUILDER

It was January 1961 when Edwin Oldfather Reischauer, a lanky Harvard professor of Oriental studies, dropped by the State Department to tell Under Secretary Chester Bowles about a trip he had just made to Korea. "We can talk about Korea later," Bowles said impatiently. "But first let's talk about you becoming Ambassador to Japan."

Swallowing his surprise, Reischauer found himself packing for Tokyo (where he was born of missionary parents) and taking on one of the most sensitive U.S. missions anywhere. Leftist demonstrations against renewal of the mutual-security pact between the two nations had so wrenched U.S.-Japanese relations that Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to cancel a visit in 1960. It was Reischauer's task to mend what he understated as the "broken dialogue." When he quit last week to return to Harvard at 55, there was solid agreement that he had done precisely that.

Open Door: Fluent in Japanese (and aided by his Japanese wife, Haru), Reischauer threw open the embassy doors to all comers, booked lecture dates, wrote widely for magazines and everywhere stressed a single message: that Japan's future lay in close ties with the U.S. and the free world. His open-door policy won friends and influenced people. ("In 1960," said one stunned socialist, "I was demonstrating outside the embassy gates. Now I'm having lunch inside.") And so did his judicious choice of words like "partnership" and "independence" for a nation still outgrowing its postwar occupation complex. Even as widespread public opposition to the war in Vietnam threatened to sour relations again, Reischauer's bridge-building helped cut tensions. Displaying his insight into Japanese psychology, he chided the press for "one-sided reporting" of the war—and got Japanese editors to tone down their excesses.

It was with genuine "deep regret" that Lyndon Johnson announced Reischauer's resignation. But he had another old Japan hand waiting in the wings: U. (for Ural) Alexis Johnson, 57, currently Deputy Under Secretary of State, recently deputy ambassador to Saigon, and a respected pro who started his Foreign Service career as a Japanese-language officer 31 years ago.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Aug. 7, 1966]

REISCHAUER ERA: GOOD FOR UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

(By Arthur J. Dommen)

TOKYO.—Americans and Japanese began finding out about each other in a serious-minded manner during the occupation that lasted from 1945 to 1952. Since then, although many Japanese ways of looking at things like Communist China's expansionist threat are still mysteries even to highly informed Americans, the two countries have found out a good deal about each other. Much of the credit for learning must go to the tall, outspoken teacher whom the United States has had as its ambassador in Tokyo since 1961.

When the Japanese look back on this most recent period of their post-war revival, they see Edwin O. Reischauer as an ambassador indefatigable in his efforts to show them the way of better understanding of the United States and its purposes in Asia. It is Reischauer the teacher, appointed to the post by President Kennedy, who has left his mark here more distinctly than Reischauer the diplomat. The proof is that while few treaties and agreements were negotiated during Reischauer's tenure, few deny that the bridge between the United States and Japan has been built anew on a firmer and more durable foundation.

As soon as Reischauer arrived in Tokyo he set about gathering for his staff the American specialists on Japan who had dispersed to the far corners of the globe after the occupation. Toward the Japanese, on the other hand, Reischauer also adopted a fresh approach. He saw that the foreign office bureaucrats with whom his counselors dealt did not represent more than a small fraction of Japanese political opinion and power. He therefore opened doors to men from many quarters of Japanese life who had been ignored for years by the embassy. In the quiet library of the embassy chancery he asked their views of Japan's future and tried to persuade them to think of America, too, as wanting a relationship of complete equality.

They included the directors of such companies as Yawata Iron and Steel and the Fuji Bank, whose financial contributions to the Liberal-Democratic Party made them an influential force in Japanese politics and whose interests did not always coincide with those of the foreign office. They included intellectuals who had been driven into protest movements despite the fact that many of them were not anti-American. They also included Japanese newspapermen, with whom Reischauer debated in his fluent Japanese rather than lecturing them as had been the practice.

Writing about foreign policy recently in a widely circulated Japanese magazine, Reischauer shrewdly observed: "In the past, Japanese have often seemed to approach problems of foreign policy by first trying to determine what 'American Far Eastern policy' was and then trying to accommodate Japan's stand to it, either by cooperating with it or else by trying to avoid what they felt to be its evil consequences. This I feel is an entirely wrong approach."

From his observations Reischauer distilled an analysis of what led to misunderstanding between Washington and Tokyo. Reischauer felt that Japan and the United States would never really understand each other until they could talk to each other freely about their basically similar interests in non-Communist Asia. It was not the degree of Japanese support for American foreign policy positions that counted, but whether or not Japan saw where its own national interests lay.

Through his old Harvard friend, McGeorge Bundy, Reischauer reported his findings to the White House. They formed a consistent argument with which Washington soon became familiar. By means of his reports he hoped to mend both sides of the "broken dialogue" (a phrase actually invented by Bundy, although often ascribed to Reischauer because it was the title of a celebrated article under the latter's signature in Foreign Affairs).

The magnitude of the task has been understated by Reischauer, whose words have necessarily been moderated by his official position. When Reischauer points to postwar Japan's isolation during the buildup of its economic strength, he is telling only half the story. The other half is that Japan has not been blessed with naturally gifted leaders of public opinion as have the European countries—men who could formulate long-term policies for their country. Ever since Shigeru Yoshida stepped down from the premiership in 1954 Japan has been governed by men more concerned with factional precedence than long-term goals, more interested in their party standing than in the support of the voters to back them on great and complex public issues.

Prime Minister Yoshida could argue for hours with John Foster Dulles that there would be no major war in Asia for a decade and tell him bluntly Japan would not cede to American pressure on Japan to raise a large standing army because the rehabilitation of the economy had to come first. But in the disastrous summer of 1960 Nobusuke Kishi chose to try to handle the security treaty revision issue with no more public explanation of this key commitment of Japan's future than he would have thought of according a bill for road improvements in his home constituency.

This is one reason so many Americans have until very recently been perplexed about the seeming lack of any Japanese foreign policy which they might take with a grain of encouragement rather than with a grain of salt.

The Vietnam war has raised anew the possibility of a crisis in understanding between Japan and the United States. This is not so much due to the likelihood of Washington putting pressures on Japan which risk boomeranging against the United States as it is due to the simple fact that while much is said about Japanese public opinion (which is automatically assumed to be against the war) little has ever been done by the Japanese government to lead public opinion. Consequently, Japan the ally stands accused in the United States of shirking its share of an international responsibility while in Japan itself the impression has got about that the government is being dragged willy-nilly into a dangerous venture for which the United States is largely if not, wholly responsible.

Nothing could be further removed from Reischauer's sincere hopes that the new Japan will develop its independent foreign policy as it sees fit. Hence, the need for a dialogue between the two countries has increased rather than decreased.

Indications are that it's going to be a long war and the American embassy in Tokyo is going to find living with it uncomfortable. Many of the arguments employed by American officials at home to justify perserverance in the struggle cannot be employed to any effect in Japan. The Japanese, for instance, say they have no sympathy with the Domino Theory of communist expansion. Popular opinion regards the theory as applying only to the underdeveloped countries of Southeast Asia that have little or no experience of democratic government and Japanese officials rest secure in the fond hope that trade solves all hostile feelings.

The men in the foreign office may nod dutifully when presented with American arguments for a Japanese commitment of support for the United States in Vietnam, but the men who count—the men with their hands on the purse strings of the party and government—have their own ideas about Japan's future.

For there is a larger perspective than Vietnam in Japan-U.S. relations. Let there be no doubt about it: Japan fully expects, and is even now making preparations, to play the role of a major power in Asia. Its gross national product already has overtaken that of mainland China, and as long as the raw materials keep flowing into its home islands this economic output will keep on growing. The statesmen of Southeast Asia are turning more and more toward Japan and the Japanese are quietly but effectively encouraging a growing tendency to think in terms of a regional Asian community.

The implications of this for the United States may be as great as were the implications of the Afro-Asian conference at Bandung in 1955, a grouping formed originally under the tutelage of Peking's Chou En-lai and since fallen into disrepair. If in the next few years the Japanese produce a statesman of Chou's stature, then the United States will have reason indeed to be thankful for the bridge-building of 1961–66.

For the moment, however, Japan has no statesman of world stature. Its course of independence in foreign affairs is charted by bureau chiefs who labor unheralded and unrecognized. The lack is painfully evident. President Kennedy could discuss Laos in complete confidence with Prime Minister

Harold MacMillan and President Johnson can pick up the telephone and consult with Harold Wilson on the carefully calculated escalation in Vietnam. No such easy-going relationship prevails across the Pacific.

Reischauer sought to guide Japan by educating the men who run its government and form its opinions. He largely succeeded. The educational process has been harmonious, except for one tense period last summer when the powerful Japanese press briefly showed signs of pursuing the same irrational inflammatory tangent on Vietnam that it had pursued five years earlier with respect to the security treaty.

It is small wonder, therefore, that many Japanese from all walks of life see Reischauer tuck the Asahi Shimbun newspaper under his arm and leave the embassy residence for the last time with much the same emotion as a college class takes leave of a professor who has won their respect and admiration. Reischauer, the last of the Harvard group of Bundy and John Kenneth Galbraith, is leaving his official position.

What approach Reischauer's successor, U. Alexis Johnson, takes with the Japanese remains to be seen. A professional diplomat with first-hand experience in Saigon, Johnson comes to Japan at a time when sensitivity to the Vietnam conflict is so high that a projected visit by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky last spring had to be discouraged. An opener of the Sino-American ambassadorial-level talks in 1955, Johnson will find the Japanese view of Communist China radically different from his own interpretation. Under Reischauer these differences of viewpoint were never allowed to become focal issues in Japan-U.S. relations. Even Japan's trade with Communist China and North Vietnam never become a cause celebre. Perhaps Johnson's wisest course will be to recommend that the State Department leave well enough alone.

Johnson's success as ambassador will also depend on how closely he keeps Washington informed about the trend of Japanese feeling about sensitive issues like American military bases in Japan and especially the American military occupation of Okinawa. The continuance of these irritants may serve the immediate needs of the United States. But what about American long-term interests? Judgments on these matters will be the test of Johnson's ambassadorship.

Johnson inherits an expanded perspective in Japanese-American relations. For Reischauer not only restored the broken dialogue between the two countries, he elevated it to a level of intellectual discourse rare in modern diplomacy.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 8, 1966]

The Miracle of Japan—Where Is It Headed Now?—Interview With Retiring U.S. Ambassador to Tokyo

(Note.—Where does Japan stand now, two decades after crushing defeat—and where is she headed?

(In this interview the retiring U.S. Ambassador, Edwin O. Reischauer, tells the story of an amazing comeback, and the explanation for it.

(Mr. Reischauer was interviewed in Tokyo by K. M. Chrysler of the International Staff of "U.S. News & World Report." The interview took place as the American official was winding up five years as head of the U.S. Embassy in Japan.)

(At Tokyo)

Question. Ambassador Reischauer, is today's Japan the story of a miracle?

Answer. Well, I don't believe in miracles. But Japan's is a remarkable story of great achievements in the last 20 years.

Question. What sorts of achievements?

Answer. Complete reconstruction of the terrible war damages, and then, on top of that, a tremendous surge forward toward further modernization and economic growth.

Question. Do you think American aid was much of a factor in the country's revival?

Answer. In the early days, American aid was certainly a help in getting Japan going again, just as the Marshall Plan was important to Europe immediately after the war. And, on the whole, I believe the U.S. occupation policies were wise; our record was good. But when you have finished mentioning those two things, you have explained only a small part of the total.

The main thing is the character of the Japanese people. First of all, their great capacity for hard work. Second, the high level of technical skill that already existed in Japan before the war. Third, a thorough understanding of the importance of knowledge and a desire to get as much education as possible—a yearning for learning. And, finally, great skill in social organization. By this I mean being able to operate Government institutions smoothly, organize giant industrial complexes, and so on.

This is an unbeatable combination, and Japan has had it since the middle of the nineteenth century. The great speed with which Japan modernized can be explained primarily by these characteristics, and they are the fundamental reasons for this country's success after the second World War.

Question. What standard of living has Japan reached, compared with the United States, or with other countries in Asia?

Answer. It's a good rule of thumb to assume that a Japanese worker or industrialist, college professor or merchant gets about one-fifth or one-fourth the income of his counterpart in the U.S. Compared with Communist China, India and the rest of Asia, it would vary from about 5 to 1 in Japan's favor to 10 or more to 1.

Question. Is your basic yardstick per capita income?

Answer. Yes, you can't do it any other way. But perhaps more important than absolute statistics are the relative ones. I can remember 10 or 15 years ago when I was telling people Japanese incomes were one-tenth those in the United States. The fact that within a few years they have moved up from one-tenth to one-fifth is the really important thing.

Question. Can Japan ever hope to enjoy the same standard of living as the U.S.?

Answer. With the much poorer natural base here and the much greater crowding on a small piece of land, it's hard to see the Japanese catching up with us completely, but they are certainly getting closer all the time.

Maybe the most interesting comparisons would be with Europe. While the Japanese standard of living is not equal to Northwest Europe as yet, it certainly has caught up with Southern Europe, and has probably passed much of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Question. Has the lack of a heavy defense burden made it easier for the Japanese?

Answer. Obviously, the fact that we have carried the largest part of the load for the defense of Japan and stability in the Far East all these years has allowed Japan to put only a little over 1 per cent of its gross national product directly into its own defense, only a quarter or a fifth of the rate of defense expenditures of most other advanced countries.

This is a partial explanation of the rapid postwar growth here. But the real lesson to be learned from Japan's postwar experience is that the wealth of a nation depends much less on natural resources than it does on human qualities. Such things as energy, skill, knowledge and organizational ability outweigh the natural-resources element many times over. There's no comparison between the two.

Question. Are there other lessons, too?

Answer. Yes. Japan is one of the best demonstrations of the advantages of a mixed economy, that is, an economy which, despite the need in industrialized societies for various types of Government controls, leaves as much room as possible for individual initiative.

Japan has shown that this kind of economy has a much greater potential for rapid growth than a completely planned economy. Japan has set the pace for the world in the postwar years, letting Government give coordination and aid where necessary, but leaving the basic economic development up to private enterprise.

Question. Many people maintain that Japan is the best living example of a Government-controlled economy——

Answer. The Japanese obviously have closer integration between Government and business than we have in the U.S., but probably no more than in some of the countries of Northwestern Europe, which have mixed economies, too.

There is ample room for private initiative in Japan, on both a big and small scale. This is the fundamental reason for Japan's success, in the past as well as today.

Japan's nineteenth-century history has been misread by a number of people who attributed its growth to a Government-planned economy. That was not the reason. The Government pioneered in a few difficult fields, and it provided social stability, a stable currency and a favorable environment for economic growth, but the chief push came from individual enterprise.

Question. Where do Japan's greatest opportunities for future trade expansion now lie?

Answer. It's a truism that advanced nations do more trade with each other than with anybody else, so I imagine the largest area for future Japanese trade will remain with the other advanced nations. The big role that America plays in Japanese exports and imports will probably continue without any diminution. And I would expect substantial growth in Japan's trade with Western Europe, which seems to me abnormally low at present.

Much of Japan's trade, however, is with the less developed parts of the world. Southeast Asia and other areas like it take close to 50 per cent of Japan's trade.

It could be that, as these countries become more stable and prosperous, they will come to account for an even larger proportion of Japan's total trade. But I don't see any one area suddenly expanding and becoming dominant. Certainly not Communist China, which simply does not have the economic potential. Historically, it has never been a particularly big Japanese trading partner, except for the rather special period when Japan was trying to build an empire in China and was making huge investments in Manchuria and trying to get back as much as she could from this investment.

This emphasis on China at that time was largely for strategic reasons and was not the product of natural economic forces.

Question. Would you say then that the gap between Japan and other advanced countries will narrow, while that between Japan and its neighbors widens?

Answer. There isn't much gap left with the advanced nations. Japan has already caught up in per capita income to the lower fringe of them, and will probably push up further in standing. In gross terms, Japan is now the sixth-largest economic unit in the world, and in the next decade may well pass the U.K., France and West Germany to become the third after the United States and the Soviet Union.

At the same time, Japan is undoubtedly drawing farther and farther away from the less developed countries. But this is a worldwide phenomenon. Almost all the advanced nations are growing faster than most of the less developed ones. This is the great tragedy and problem of our times.

Question. Is Japan now at a point where her role in Asia will expand?

Answer. It is expanding rapidly, right now. For almost 20 years, Japan played only a small role in Asia or anywhere else. This was, first of all, because of its defeat and the serious economic problems it faced at the end of the war. The psychological damages of the war lasted even longer than the physical damage. As a result, Japan's role until the early 1960s was much smaller than would be normal for a country of its size and importance. Now she is in the process of transition to what would be a much more natural role.

Question. What is that?

Answer. A role as the great economic and political power in this whole part of the world. I feel quite strongly that, in the long run, Japan will probably do more to affect the future of Asia than China. China's influence is negative and recognized as such by everybody, whereas the positive role Japan can play is not so widely understood as yet. But for the last year or so, Japan has been showing signs of getting ready to assume a new position of leadership.

I do not envisage this as an attempt to re-create through political domination a "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." But within the economic field, Japan is likely to play a major role in the Far Eastern area and perhaps more widely. She is capable of giving a great deal of economic aid and technological assistance, and she has already become the biggest trading partner of many of the countries of Southeast Asia.

Question. Is Japan likely to become a force for stability in this part of the world?

Answer. The only reason Japan can take on a larger role is because she is becoming more stable herself all the time. There is much argument and debate in Japan these days over her role in the world, but the fact that this is being debated so fully and freely indicates considerable progress over a few years ago when this subject was avoided as being too embarrassing.

Today, Japan is not only a stable economic and social unit, but extraordinarily stable politically. This is clear if one looks back over past elections and at what the real political life of this country has been.

JAPAN'S "REAL DEMOCRACY"

Question. Is there democracy here?

Answer. I would call Japan one of the real working examples of democracy. Because of a more shallow history of democracy, going back less than a century, its democracy is not as deeply rooted as in the English-speaking countries and parts of Northwestern Europe. But, next to those areas, Japan has perhaps as well-established and firm a democracy as any in the world. Therefore, being fundamentally stable herself and holding the concept of a peaceful, free and stable world as its ideal, Japan's contribution will be toward greater world stability.

Question. Do you look for Japan to take more initiative in political affairs?

Answer. With aid programs and other activities, Japan is now beginning to exert considerable economic influence. The political side will probably follow in time. The Japanese are still extremely cautious about such matters. There are still deep resentments of the Japanese in many parts of the Far East because of memories of the last war. Consequently, there's a tendency to hold back and be cautious. So I don't mean to suggest that Japan will move swiftly into a position of political leadership. But, thinking in terms of a five or 10-year period, I feel certain that Japan will exercise great influence—and in the right direction.

LEADERSHIP IN ASIA

Question. Do you foresee Japan's assuming some of the U.S. burden out here?

Answer. A country of this size and importance, located in this part of the world, will inevitably take over some of the leadership responsibilities we have in the past exercised almost alone, because others were not prepared to share the burden.

The past situation of almost exclusive U.S. leadership was an unnatural one, and it would seem inevitable that, while our economic and political responsibilities may not diminish, Japan will come to assume similar responsibilities.

Question. With our blessing?

Answer. This is the kind of world we believe in—co-operation between different countries. We'd be delighted to see Japan take more leadership and assume the responsibilities that go with it.

Question. Lately, the Japanese seem to be showing more interest in Vietnam—

Answer. I'm not sure you can describe it as "more" interest. Certainly, in 1965, there was tremendous interest—deep concern and great worry. In 1966, there has been some calming down of the excitement over Vietnam, and this perhaps has given the Japanese a chance to look at the problem as a whole in better perspective. Their interest may be a more soundly based interest, but it certainly is no greater than last year.

Question. Is there more understanding of United States policies in Vietnam?

Answer. The Japanese public, I believe, tends to be critical of U.S. policies. On the other hand, the Japanese are not as prone to all-out condemnation of the U.S. as they were last year. There is a greater realization that Vietnam is a very complex problem with no easy solutions. Therefore, there may be greater sympathy for us and more understanding now than there was last year of the difficulties we face in Vietnam.

Question. There has been considerable debate here in recent months about nuclear arms. Are the Japanese still content to look to the U.S. for defense against nuclear attack?

Answer. One of the most spectacular changes here in the last six or eight months has been the sudden upsurge in discussion of Japan's defense problems. In this connection, the Japanese are talking about the nuclear issue in public for the first time since the war.

As people become conscious of the problems of defense, one natural reaction is to desire an entirely independent defense position, so there are even people who suggest that Japan should take on its own nuclear defense. My own feeling is that this is not very realistic. I would assume that Japan will continue to look to us for nuclear defense.

Question. Indefinitely?

Answer. Well, I think the situation is comparable to that of most of our leading allies in Europe who look to us, perhaps indefinitely, for the same kind of defense.

Question. There are reports that Japan is hoping and planning to assume most of its own defense by the mid-'70s, preparing to bid the U.S. adieu militarily by 1980—

Answer. If there weren't some Japanese thinking this way, I would be surprised. But, I think, when they come to study the problem fully, they will probably find it is not to their advantage to do it that way.

Question. Are conventional Japanese defenses being increased?

Answer. Expansion to date has been very slow. Increases in the defense budget hardly more than accommodate rises in wages and prices.

The Japanese may decide to put more effort into defense, but nothing has actually been decided yet. And you must remember that even a doubling of Japan's defense expenditures would not get her beyond 2.5 per cent of gross national product, which would be only about half what most countries of this size spend.

Another factor to remember is that Japan is in a particularly isolated geographic position. She is the only great industrial nation in this part of the world and is not surrounded by other like-minded nations. This means that, unlike France, she does not automatically have the defense provided by the presence of other strong, industrialized nations around her.

Question. Pacifism has been preached hard in postwar Japan. Is the feeling as strong as they would have everyone believe?

Answer. When you say "they," you're talking about 100 million people with many diverse attitudes. There are many dedicated pacifists in Japan and a lot more people who just vaguely feel they hate war and don't want to spend money for defense, but who haven't really thought the thing through clearly.

I suspect the pacifist tendency will remain strong among a large part of the Japanese public for some time into the future. This is one reason why an all-out effort to take on all of their defense load alone is not very probable.

I believe that the Japanese, like many other people elsewhere in the world, will come to the conclusion that colective security is the only way for Japan to achieve real security.

In that case, they may also decide that a strong program of Japanese economic aid to less developed countries would be a better way for Japan to utilize its wealth than by spending very heavily on arms. This might prove better not only for Japan, but for the free world collectively.

FUTURE OF OKINAWA

Question. Still talking about defense: Do you sense much support in Japan for getting the U.S. out of Okinawa?

Answer. A recent public-opinion poll shows the return of Okinawa and the Bonin Islands as ranking next to nuclear proliferation as a problem the public wishes the Government to take up more actively.

While Okinawa is not necessarily on the minds of most people most of the time, it is something on which Japanese, left or right, can agree. Twenty-one years after the war, they are unhappy to see close to a million Japanese still not living under Japanese administration.

Question. Does the U.S. have any timetable for returning Okinawa to Japan?

Answer. No, there's no timetable. We've always said that we look forward to the return and hope it can be soon. But security considerations come first, including those of Japan itself, as well as the U.S. and the whole of the Far East.

Question. Are the Japanese likely to seek the return of any other areas that they were forced to give up at the end of the war?

Answer. Okinawa, the Bonins and the Kurile Islands are the ones in their minds. The pressure for the return of the southern part of the Kurile Islands is strong, and Japan's historical case is extremely good. But, however good the case is, the Russians have not shown any willingness to meet the demands of Japan.

Otherwise, Japan makes no territorial claims. The mandated islands of the Pacific, and Sakhalin, to say nothing of Korea and Taiwan, have been wiped completely out of their minds, as far as I can see.

Question. What is the probable future relationship of Japan and mainland China?

Answer. We all hope that someday Communist China will want to be a normal member of the society of nations, having contacts with the outside world at least as friendly as those of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Eventually, I presume, that is the kind of relationship Japan will want to establish with the mainland. However, I don't see any rapid motion in that direction, because the Chinese Communists insist that they will deal only with countries that support them in their effort to take over Taiwan, against the wishes of the people who live there. The Japanese, like us, value their relations with the Republic of China on Taiwan too much to accept these conditions.

The Japanese have a deep interest in Taiwan. They do a great deal of trade with it. They are proud of their record there in colonial days and are pleased that the native Taiwanese are friendly toward them. At present, Japan cannot achieve any substantial improvement in relations with Communist China without cutting off relations with Taiwan, and that is a price which they are not willing to pay.

Question. What does Communist China's possession of nuclear bombs mean to Japan?

Answer. I think it poses psychological problems. It's probably one of the main reasons why there has recently been such a heated, vigorous debate in Japan over defense matters.

But I personally find it hard to imagine China's developing a nuclear capacity to the point where it would really be a threat to a Japan which had a strong defense partnership with the United States. I don't think it poses a problem as long as there is a strong tie with a real nuclear power like ourselves.

Question. Is fear of China now replacing the feeling of a common heritage, traditionally held by so many Japanese?

Answer. Actually, the common-heritage feeling is strongest among old people. Younger Japanese feel the kinship and identity of culture much less, because there really isn't much identity. The Japanese and Chinese political and social systems have differed radically from each other for more than a thousand years. The divergence in the last hundred years, and particularly the past 20 years, has been more and more rapid.

As they move into the modern world, purely twentieth-century things become a bigger part of Japanese culture, and traditional elements shared with China, such as Chinese characters, Confucian philosophy and a classic, historical tradition, become a smaller part of the total. Just as, let's say, the modern Russian who shares our Judeo-Greek heritage finds little bond with us through that as compared with the divergence between twentieth-century American and Russian social and political patterns.

Question. Is there some special reason why the Japanese, as a people on a small island, are more successful than other Asian nations in ordering their affairs?

Answer. That's a dangerous question to ask a historian.

The question why Japan, some centuries ago, began to diverge from most other Asian patterns has always fascinated me. I dare say the isolation of an island environment had a lot to do with it. Probably the first key step was that, in this isolation, the Japanese developed a full feudal type of organization much like that of feudal Western Europe and quite different from what existed in any other Asian country. This, in turn, produced psychological, social and organizational characteristics more like those of Europe than Asia.

This divergence from the more normal Asian patterns is a deep thing reaching far back into the past.

It has been strengthened recently, of course, by a century of technological modernization. Japan has become a part of the modern world, while most of Asia has not. What were already sharp distinctions 100 years ago have become even sharper. Take, for example, the extraordinarily high rate of Japanese literacy. In the middle of the nineteenth century, before modernization had started, literacy may have been as high as 35 per cent, including women—higher than in many Asian countries even today. Now, of course, it is virtually 100 per cent.

Question. Is there anything in Japan's experience to suggest that China might thrive, despite an immense population, if it followed different policies?

Answer. I've always assumed that the Chinese, the Koreans and possibly the Vietnamese, who share a good deal culturally with the Japanese in the sense that they are hard-working and put a high value on education, could make more rapid progress than peoples whose cultures have not put the same store by such things.

Having said that, though, I have to admit that the Chinese are starting far behind where the Japanese started. There's a gap of centuries, and, unfortunately, the Chinese are utilizing a totalitarian method of modernization which, but cutting down seriously on individual initiative, hinders rather than speeds up growth.

DOUBTS ABOUT RED CHINA

Question. How do the Japanese size up the future of China?

Answer. There are different opinions, of course, all the way from the romantic view of the old-fashioned admirers of China who think of China as still the land of Confucius, to those who have complete faith in Communist techniques. I think, however, that there is a growing skepticism in Japan about Chinese ability to make very rapid economic progress.

Question. What will happen if mainland China continues under Communist leadership?

Answer. Most Japanese seem to feel that, since the Japanese will have the vast population of China as relatively close neighbors throughout history, they should learn to live with them as amicably as possible. But how this is to be done remains a problem for them as it is for everyone else.

Question. Are the Japanese convinced the Communists will always rule China?

Answer. Always is a long time. But I should say that most Japanese assume the the Communists will go on ruling for the foreseeable future.

They see no reason to expect otherwise.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished majority leader in regard to Ambassador Reischauer. His service on behalf of the United States in Japan has brought not only close cooperation between the two countries but has also greatly strengthened the economic programs between them.

Today, Japan is one of the outstanding nations in the world with respect to markets, not only export markets but also import markets. The agricultural and industrial trade between our countries is expanding every year. Our relations with Japan have been most friendly.

Ambassador Reischauer is entitled to great credit for his valuable contribution to those good relations. It is to be regretted very much that he is leaving Japan, but I am pleased to note that the Ambassador who will succeed him, Alexis Johnson, is also a distinguished career public servant, and I have every reason to believe that he will carry on the fine work which has been started by Ambassador Reischauer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader regarding Ambassador Reischauer. He is a great Ambassador, as all Senators know. For many reasons he came close to being the first American to bring Japan and the United States together after World War II. He speaks their language with complete fluency. He knows their culture. He has lived in Japan for a great deal of his life. He has become clearly and sympathetically identified with the Japanese while vigorously and successfully representing American interests.

However, what I rise to say is that it is good to have a man who has succeeded as brilliantly as Ambassador Reischauer in Government and who can return to the profession he so graces. He has not only been an outstanding Ambassador, but also a great teacher.

This Nation urgently needs great teachers and great professors. He made a brilliant record at Harvard University as a professor, and I am sure that he will have an equally great future and will contribute enormously to the welfare of his country in his capacity as a teacher.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. What a truly remarkable tribute to an American statesman. Surely, Ambassador Reischauer must be just that.

I can recall on the Senate floor, sometime ago, when tributes were being paid to him by the majority leader, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Wisconsin, and from our side of the aisle also, by the dean of our Republican delegation, the fine and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and many other Senators who have known Ambassador Reischauer personally, and who have spoken out so warmly in praise of the many successful official activities in which he has engaged as a representative of the American people to the great and gallant nation of Japan.

Some of us do not have the pleasure of knowing Ambassador Reischauer personally, but as we have read of his accomplishments, as we have heard with growing interest and admiration of the manner in which, as an American, he was able to strengthen the bonds between the Government of Japan and the people of Japan and the Government and the people of this country, it has deeply moved all of us to know that here we have an excellent fellow citizen, a skillful and intelligent and compassionate representative of the people of the United States, giving a portion of his time to the advancement of peaceful relations between our country and the people of Japan. I must add that I regret that he feels compelled to leave the public service.

I merely wanted to say that I am happy to associate myself with the remarks that have been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for what they have had to say about our retiring Ambassador to Japan. It is unfortunate that we are losing his services. I understand he is returning to this country a week from tomorrow. I hope his great talents and ability will be made available to the Government in the years ahead, because he can give us much in the way of advice and counsel. We regret his resignation.

Mr. President, this does not happen often on the Senate floor. To the best of my knowledge, in my 14 years in the Senate, this is the only occasion on which an ambassador has been singled out for commendation on both sides of the aisle, on a number of occasions, as has been the case with respect to Ambassador Reischauer.

I want to reiterate that when Ambassador Reischauer came back to see the President some weeks ago, at the President's request, he was asked to stay on in Government. He was offered several high positions in the Department of State. But Ambassador Reischauer and his gracious wife, who is of Japanese descent, and who has been a tower of strength in bringing about better relations between our two countries, felt we had reached a very satisfactory plateau in American-Japanese relations.

We will miss them. We hope their talents will continue to be of benefit to our country in the difficult years that lie ahead.

AUTOMOBILE FUME CURBS CALLED A SUCCESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the problem of air pollution is, of course, national, perhaps international, in scope, but it has been a vexation in the State from which I come for a long, long time. We call it smog.

The government of the State of California has taken a lead in antiair pollution legislation which has largely served as a model for what the Federal Government has done in this field.

Mr. Gladwin Hill, a distinguished California correspondent for the New York Times, has written an interesting article in the New York Times today, entitled "Auto Fume Curbs Called A Success—California Rules Will Apply to All States Next Year."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be incorporated at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 11, 1966]

Auto Fume Curbs Called a Success—California Rules Will Apply to All States Next Year

(By Gladwin Hill)

Los Angeles, August 10.—For the last year, California has provided a large-scale test of the antismog equipment that will be required on new cars throughout the country starting with 1968 models.

Today, engineers of the State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board reported that the experience with 800,000 of this year's models had been an almost unqualified success.

Exhaust controls and devices to suppress crankcase fumes, the engineers said, have generally operated effectively to reduce by 70 per cent the total of the principal obnoxious gases being discharged into the air.

The California law that made the equipment mandatory this year was the model for Federal regulations that go into effect in late 1967.

The law requires that cars emit no more than 275 parts in a million of unburned hydrocarbons and no more than 1.5 per cent of carbon monoxide.

The board's report, made public today, set the stage for these new steps toward reducing vehicular air pollution:

Two automobile companies, Ford and American Motors, announced they would introduce improved exhaust controls on some 1967 models. This promises some saving to car buyers.

The pollution control board took an initial step toward controlling a whole new family of automobile fumes, the oxides of nitrogen, which form brownish clouds and which at present are subject to no controls.

Like previous control criteria for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxides, the nitrogen oxide controls are expected to become a nationwide requirement eventually.

The board formally adopted a limit for nitrogen oxide emissions of 350 parts in a million. Most cars exceed this now by three or four times. The limitation will become legally effective only when manufacturers come up with equipment that can control these gases. Research is now in its early stages.

THE 1966 REQUIREMENTS

To control hydrocarbon and monoxide emissions, 1966 cars made for sale in California have to have tubes for ducting crankcase fumes back into the combustion chambers and arrangements for consuming excess exhaust gases.

The latter equipment was of two types. Most of the major companies adopted small air-injection pumps that caused exhaust gases to be burned as they emerged from engine combustion chambers.

Chrysler revamped its engine, carburetor and spark adjustments to improve the engines' normal combustion.

The Ford Motor Company got approval today for its own version of the Chrysler arrangement, called "Imco" (for Improved combustion). It will be put on all automatic-transmission Mercurys made for California with the new large 410-cubic inch engine—some 6,000 cars.

American Motors got approval for a similar system called "engine-mod," involving "a completely new engine designed with emissions as a basic criterion." This will be installed on 12,000 to 16,000 Ramblers and Ambassadors for California.

COST IS ABOUT $50

The current exhaust-control systems cost car buyers around $50 extra. For the 800,000 cars sold in California this year that aggregated $40-million Control Board officials and company spokesmen said improved combustion engines would entail a smaller extra expense, although specifics are not yet available because they depend on quality-production costs.

The assessment of 1966 control equipment performance was based on surveys of automobile dealers, garages, and motorists, and on exhaustive performance tests of 404 cars selected at random after they have been in ordinary use for various periods.

The sampling admittedly was an undesirably small one for 800,000 cars. But the engineers said it was the best they could do with current test facilities and equipment and in the absence of compulsory periodic inspection, which has not yet been enacted.

In Los Angeles, which has one of the world's worst smog problems, automobile fumes are held responsible for upward of 80 per cent of 14,225 tons daily of atmospheric contaminants.

WAGE-PRICE GUIDEPOSTS SHOULD BE FLEXIBLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is time for a strong and emphatic affirmation of support for the President's wage-price guideposts.

With all their faults—and their faults are evident and conspicuous—they have served the economy well—I might say brilliantly—since 1961, when they were first conceived.

In the 5 years immediately preceding the use of this voluntary system of keeping wages in line with productivity increases, in order to restrain price increases—in the 5 years before this policy—prices rose by 10½ percent, although the economy was declining, unemployment was increasing, and capacity was increasingly available. The classical economic analysis would have indicated that prices should decrease, but prices rose by 10½ percent.

Now, what happened since the Kennedy and Johnson administrations adopted wage-price guidelines? Remember that since 1961 unemployment has fallen, and fallen sharply, production has pressed consistently closer to plant capacity, the economy has been booming, all the conditions that should promote rising prices have been present and increasing.

In spite of this, Mr. President, prices during the past 5½ years since wage-price guidelines were instituted have not risen 10½ percent, or 10 percent, or 9 percent, but only 8½ percent.

This is not only by far the best price performance of any industrial country in the world; it is a much better price record than this country enjoyed in the 5 years before the wage-price principle was put into effect in 1961.

Now, Mr. President, how can we account for the far better price performance of the economy since 1961, when there was every economic reason to expect that prices would rise more rapidly?

How can we explain the fact that prices rose 10½ percent between 1955 and 1960, but only 8½ percent in the 5½ years since since then?

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator to dispute my contention that the difference—the only significant and conspicuous difference—is that since 1961 the President of the United States has vigorously administered the voluntary wage-price guidelines.

This is why I say the wage-price guidelines have served the country well—in fact, brilliantly. They deserve to be saved.

And yet, Mr. President, these guidelines are in trouble, serious trouble, because they have been misunderstood.

They are criticized on the grounds that they are inconsistently applied, that some wages have been permitted to go up above the guidelines. Some prices have increased.

The guideposts were never meant to be inronclad rules. It is important to recall their original intent and to form a realistic conception of their past and prospective usefulness.

The guideposts raise two central questions:

First. Is it possible to agree upon a concept of wage-price guidelines and a framework for their use by government which would be useful in promoting an anti-inflationary, full employment situation, consistent with the evolution of our economy and system of government?

Second. If some form of wage-price guidelines can be useful and consistent with American values, can it be put into practice, and if so, is the present procedure an optimal one?

THE PROBLEM

A principal threat to price stability during the postwar period has been the possibility of "cost-push" inflation, where large firms and large unions exercise discretionary pricing power. The cost-push explanation is advanced as one of the principal reasons for the substantial price rise in 1957 and 1958. This type of inflation is sometimes distinguished from "classical"—sometimes called "demand-pull"—inflation where the monetary demand for goods and services presses heavily upon the available supply. But in practice, the two types of pressures tend to be reinforcing.

As the economy moves toward fuller employment of its resources, the achievement of overall price stability becomes increasingly more difficult. Resources shortages—bottlenecks—appear in more and larger sectors of the economy, causing costs to rise as the expansion progresses. The demands for products tend to increase so that buyers are willing to pay more to get additional goods and services. Under these circumstances, large and powerful groups in the society are tempted to transform temporary market pressure into longrun advantage—since higher wages and prices are seldom rescinded after the pressures on the national economy diminish.

The promotion of maximum employment and consumer purchasing power in a free society requires that prices of American products must not rise faster than those of other nations of the world. In the domestic economy, general price stability must be maintained not only to honor the expectations of the people but to assure the most effective performance of the economy; and relative prices must reflect the scarcity of resources relative to the wants of consumers and to the priorities of national defense.

GUIDEPOSTS STATED

As one of the tools to deal with inflationary pressures, the Council of Economic Advisers in their annual report of 1962 suggested some general guideposts for wage and price changes. The guideposts which have been referred to and elaborated upon in each of their annual reports since state that, in general, the compensation of employees in any particular industry should increase at the same rate as the longrun increase in labor productivity for the Nation as a whole; and that product prices should decrease in industries showing above-average increases in productivity, remain the same if changes in productivity are average, or increase if changes in productivity are below average.

I may point out that, instead of all products having higher prices, there have been decreases in some prices, notably in the appliance industry, where prices have decreased 26 percent during the last 15 years.

Exceptions to the wage guideposts are provided for when higher than average wage increases are needed to attract workers to the industry, where wages are particularly low, or where there are substantial human costs associated with large gains in productivity.

This means that the wages can, consistent with this principle, exceed the precise guideposts and not be inflationary.

On the other hand, exceptions to the price guideposts may be called for when there is a rise in material costs, unit-labor costs, transportation or marketing costs; or the increase is necessary to attract needed capital.

USEFULNESS OF GUIDEPOSTS

I could stress the role which I believe that the guideposts—and when I say "guideposts" I also mean the full statement including the exceptions—have played in the phenomenal performance of the economy since 1961. Let it suffice to say that I think they have been extremely useful tools and skillfully used to preserve relative price stability. They have not been fully effective nor perfect, nor were they ever intended to be the sole consideration at the bargaining table. They have performed an invaluable service in bringing about a fuller realization of the issues, on the part of the public, labor, and management.

I believe that the guideposts are still not only useful, but vital to hold down prices, but it is important to determine what they can and cannot do. Guidelines can focus attention to the public interest and to the general conditions for price stability. The great difficulty is in applying the guideposts or representing the public interest in particular situations. Here it is important to recall the 1962 statement of the Council of Economic Advisers:

> Productivity is a guide rather than a rule for appraising wage and price behavior for several reasons. First, there are a number of problems involved in measuring productivity changes, and a number of alternatives are available. Second, there is nothing immutable in fact or in justice about the distribution of total product between labor and nonlabor incomes. Third, the pattern of wages and prices among industries is and should be responsive to forces other than changes in productivity.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I thank the majority leader.

In the operation of the guideposts, it is important to keep in mind the framework.

First. This involves a consideration of the longrun growth in demand for the particular product, or in the case of wages—the type of skill.

Second. It involves a recognition that some prices should fall, or in the case of wages—that average real wages in the long run and for the total economy can only rise about in line with productivity.

Third. It involves a recognition that advances in productivity should benefit workers and firms in the industry where it originates, as well as consumers in general in the form of lower prices. Thus, some inducement should be provided to encourage and reward advances in productivity, though the benefit should not be hoarded.

ADJUSTMENT NEEDED

Mr. President, while I agree in general with the method chosen for administration of the guidelines, I should like to say at this point that I think there has been serious error and inequity in one aspect of the way they have been administered.

One major improvement needed in the guidelines is the inclusion of a cost-of-living escalator to help give a more meaningful picture of real advances in prices and wages.

A wage settlement may exceed the 3.2 percent guidelines in terms of percentage increase. But with an expected inflationary increase of 3 percent this year, the real net gain could be far less.

As an example, if we have a 3.2-percent wage increase, and prices increase 3 percent, it virtually wipes out the wage increase, and the real income increase is virtually nil. If this is not taken into account, it means that the total benefit of the price increase goes into higher profits, which is exactly what has happened in our economy in the past 3 years. Profits have risen from $32 billion after taxes in 1963 to $46 billion today—by far the greatest 3-year increase in our history—while wages have not gone up nearly as much.

In the current airlines strike, the 4.3-percent increase unacceptable to the union members would have meant only 1.3 percent gain in real income, far short of the guidelines.

Mr. President, yesterday's lead editorial in the New York Times, entitled "Rebuilding the Guideposts," wisely emphasizes the very great importance of respecting and affirming the wage price guideposts.

It concludes that the "best defense for a stable dollar lies in adequate tax and monetary policies, backed by a wage-price program that recognizes the overall growth of the economy as the only real source of higher standards for owners, workers and consumers."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial "Rebuilding the Guideposts," published in the New York Times of Wednesday, August 10, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rebuilding the Guideposts

> Every American will benefit if the Administration can reconstitute its toppled wage-price guideposts in a way that will make them an effective anti-inflation tool. The first element in such a reconstitution is a recognition that both firmness and flexibility will have to characterize the application of the new stabilization standards.
>
> President Johnson is right in declaring that the long-term increase of 3.2 per cent

a year in over-all national productivity represents the best measuring rod of the gains to be shared among all elements in the economy. The guideposts were never intended to operate as a straitjacket, under which this limit would apply automatically to every industry. The Administration's goal was a balance that would keep the general price level stable.

One factor that upset this objective was the Government's failure ever to make any meaningful attempt to encourage price cuts in industries in which efficiency went up much more rapidly than the national average. The Council of Economic Advisers had warned from the outset that putting all the fruits of above-average productivity into higher profits would not only shut consumers out of an equitable share in the benefits but would spur union pressure for inflationary pay increases.

A second disruptive factor was the success of unions in construction, trucking and many other fields in forcing through wage increases far above the productivity standard. Thus, the striking airlines mechanics have made a major point of the "unfairness" involved in applying any stabilization yardstick to their wage demands when other unions in less publicized negotiations are getting much more without Government protest.

Obviously, no anti-inflation program can work if the determinant in every labor or management decision is going to be "look what the other guy is getting away with." The expedient currently under consideration in Washington of linking wage gains to the productivity of individual industries will simply aggravate the scramble for special advantage—doubly so, since such productivity figures fluctuate wildly on a year-to-year basis.

The best defense for a stable dollar lies in adequate tax and monetary policies, backed by a wage-price program that recognizes the over-all growth of the economy as the only real source of higher standards for owners, workers and consumers. That is particularly true when more and more Americans tend to fit in all three groups.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the importance of maintaining wage-price guidelines as the central and crucial basis for fighting inflation is evident in a column from Monday's issue of the Wall Street Journal. This column, by George Shea, points out that one price index has declined substantially:

In the midst of concern—or in some cases jubilation—over commodity price advances, one price index has declined substantially in recent weeks. It is a composite of 13 raw industrial commodities.

It reached its high for this year, and indeed for the whole period of 15 years since the Korean War, in March, when it averaged 123.5% of its 1957–59 level and for a few days during that month got close to 125. Then it declined in April and May, held steady in June and July around 119 and since then has fallen below 115, approximately its level of a year ago.

This action differs completely from the movements of other price indexes compiled by the Government, which are at or near record highs and are up quite sharply from a year ago. Most of them also have risen appreciably since March.

The article continues:

One important factor in the difference between behaviors of the two compilations is that the raw industrial index reflects a minimum of labor cost. This leaves it free to fluctuate widely in response to changes in demand and supply.

In other words, this index has indicated that demand in relation to supply has now moderated. What is holding up prices is the actual or potential increase in labor costs; plus the bargaining power of big corporations in many of our major industries.

So the indication is that demand in relation to supply may be easing. That would indicate we could have inflation. If we have it, it is because we have, unfortunately, abandoned the wage-price guideposts which have well served this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have referred, entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," written by George Shea, and printed in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, August 8, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

In the midst of concern—or in some cases jubilation—over commodity price advances, one price index has declined substantially in recent weeks. It is a composite of 13 raw industrial commodities.

It reached its high for this year, and indeed for the whole period of 15 years since the Korean War, in March, when it averaged 123.5% of its 1957–59 level and for a few days during that month got close to 125. Then it declined in April and May, held steady in June and July around 119 and since then has fallen below 115, approximately its level of a year ago.

This action differs completely from the movements of other price indexes compiled by the Government, which are at or near record highs and are up quite sharply from a year ago. Most of them also have risen appreciably since March.

The general wholesale price index, as reported elsewhere in this paper today, is down a tiny fraction in the latest week because of some decline in wholesale food prices, but is higher than a year ago or in March. Among its sub-groups, foods have remained approximately steady at or close to highs since winter, while industrial sub-groups at various stages of processing have crept up almost every month in the past year or so.

The same thing is true of consumer prices. Foods, which rose sharply from early 1965 to early 1966, have since then remained about steady, and commodities other than food have continued to make new highs month after month. Costs of services have maintained strongly their inexorable upward pace.

In order to seek the significance of the five-month contrary action of the index of raw industrials it is necessary to examine how it differs in make-up from the general wholesale index or its sub-groups. Its principal characteristic is that it is designed to reflect or even anticipate changes in economic conditions.

The index of 13 raw industrials is a subgroup of an index of 22 commodities, the other nine being foods. All 22, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, which compiles the index, are "sensitive basic commodities whose markets are presumed to be among the first to be influenced by actual or anticipated changes in economic conditions." It adds that they are "either raw materials or products close to the initial production stage which are traded through organized markets or through other markets whose activities are recorded in trade or Government publications. Highly fabricated commodities whose prices reflect relatively large fixed costs are not included."

This index differs from the general wholesale price index and its sub-groups in that it includes a far smaller number of commodites (the overall wholesale index covers 2,200), and in that it is not weighted; commodities in the general index are weighted according to the value of their shipments.

How differently the raw industrial index behaves in economic swings is illustrated by what happened in the Korean War and in the 1957–58 business recession. From 1950 to 1951 the raw industrial index rose from 119.5 (on the 1957–59 base) to 151.7, a gain of 27%. Furthermore, those are yearly averages and the extreme fluctuations from the lowest month's figure to the highest were much greater. The general wholesale index, by contrast, rose for those two years from 86.8 to 96.7, a gain of less than 12%.

In the succeeding year, while the war was still on, the raw industrial index fell to 113.2, or below its 1950 level, whereas the general wholesale index slipped only to 94, or well above its 1950 average. Furthermore, the lowest the general index has gone for any year since then is 92.7 or six points higher than in 1950, whereas the raw industrial index has been as low as 95.1 for 1958, or more than 20 points under its 1950 average.

The 1958 experience illustrates the industrial index's sensitivity to general business conditions. In the 1957–58 recession, it fell to the above-stated average of 95.1 in 1958 from an average of 102.2 in 1957. In contrast, the general wholesale figure actually rose, from 99.0 in 1957 to 100.4 in 1958.

One important factor in the difference between behaviors of the two compilations is that the raw industrial index reflects a minimum of labor cost. This leaves it free to fluctuate widely in response to changes in demand and supply, whereas indexes of commodities with a large element of labor cost tend to resist short-term fluctuations, especially downward.

This sensitivity of the raw industrial index to supply-demand changes gives it some forecasting value. Economists list it among so-called leading indicators, that is, economic statistics whose fluctuations have often in the past preceded changes up or down in the course of general business.

Of course, when this index changes direction, it is worthwhile before reading too much into it to make sure the change is not due solely or largely to a special situation in one commodity. For instance, the sharp recent change in the markets for copper, recorded in a story elsewhere in this paper today, is a big factor in the index's fall. However, in the latest week other of the sensitive commodities have fallen too, including cotton, hides, tallow, tin and wool.

Thus the change in the raw industrial index cannot be dismissed out of hand as having no significance. It adds another cautionary note about the future direction of general business to the ones sounded already by the rise in the cost of borrowed money and the fall in stock prices.

GEORGE SHEA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on July 11, during Senate consideration of the civil service pay bill, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware offered an amendment which would have made it illegal for political committees representing any officeholder to solicit contributions from Federal employees.

I was happy to support that amendment, and I am deeply disturbed that it was defeated.

My concern has been heightened by a letter I received from a troubled civil servant who identified herself only as "a typist."

Because this typist was subjected to invidious abuses which Senator Williams' amendment would have outlawed, I wish to make her letter public at this time.

It reads:

> Dear Senator: I am a civil servant, have never lived in New York, and have never seen, met, or written to Congressman ———.
>
> There was a time when one might get a card for solicitations, but now there is a new racket, the tickets are enclosed, then followed by dunning for the money.
>
> Once before in this year of 1966, similar tickets arrived for another Congressman, and although I returned same, was told that they were never received, and I have to pay for them; I do not have one hundred dollars.
>
> You are an honest man and have always done right by Government Employees. How our names get on lists that are sold and re-sold I do not know, but I do feel that this is an invasion of privacy with overtones of intimidation and mental harassment.

After a glowing biography of the Congressman, the "inivitation" this typist received contains this final paragraph:

> We have enclosed four tickets with a return card. Kindly let us know if you need more. Please come and enjoy an evening with your friend ———. If you can't make it, we will certainly appreciate your support.

Does this really sound like an invitation? Just how would a Federal employee refuse such a letter? The pressure is hardly subtle. The Congressman is not her "friend." Yet, there is no provision for returning the tickets, only for purchasing more. If she did not attend the reception, a contribution was obviously expected.

Such solicitation makes a mockery of our whole democratic system. It is blackmail pure and simple and cannot be disguised in the cloak of voluntary contributions. When a person's livelihood is at stake it is not a question of what one "wants to do." There is no choice.

I consider it a disgrace that the Congress should tolerate such a loophole in the Corrupt Practices Act. It is a loophole that has been increasingly exploited. We should be ashamed that people have been able to use their offices in such a way. It is a contemptible and mean form of extortion.

The situation points up the need for a thorough review of the Corrupt Practices Act, assuring consideration of new provisions to require disclosure of all sources and amounts of campaign contributions as well as all campaign expenditures.

No one knows better than the Members of Congress the weakness of the existing laws. It is time to bring out into the light all facets of campaign financing.

On the other side of the coin, there is no doubt that the amount of expenditures allowed to a candidate must be increased in the light of current realities and that a broader base of political contributions should be encouraged. This cannot, however, stand in the way of our progress on disclosure legislation.

I am dismayed by the bill recently approved by the Senate Rules Committee. About all the bill would do is increase the ceilings on campaign expenditures. It does not begin to correct the glaring inadequacies of the existing law covering campaign financing and the public reporting of contributions and expenditures.

The President's recommendations on this matter were apparently not even considered within the committee, leading one member, and a member of the majority party at that, to describe the committee's vote as "the most outrageous thing the committee has done."

That strong legislation is needed is universally acknowledged. The last amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act came during the 82d Congress in 1951.

Campaign spending has increased astronomically since then. The spending in the national election of 1964 was reported at $34.8 million according to the Citizen's Research Foundation in Princeton. This was more than twice the $17.2 million in 1956—only 8 years before—and representing a 39 percent increase from the $25 million spent in 1960.

The consensus of the experts who testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, a committee of which I have the honor of being a member, ran strongly in the direction of the need for fuller disclosure and stricter review of financial reporting.

Faulty reporting frequently occurs not only because of the volume of contributions leading to mistakes, but also because of deliberate omissions. Irresponsible bookkeeping and the short-circuiting of funds result in part from foreknowledge that campaign reports are unaudited except in cases of special investigation. Only outside inquiry can bring clarification or elaboration of reports that contain fragmentary, uneven, inconsistent, and sometimes deceptive information.

This issue is too important and necessary for cavalier treatment in any year, but especially in an election year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has had that letter printed in the Record.

I have received many similar letters from civil service employees who were being pressured to contribute to the Democratic Party.

This situation got so bad a couple of years ago that I introduced a resolution which called on the Attorney General either to enforce the law or, if he found the law inadequate, to make recommendations to Congress by a certain date as to what changes he felt were necessary in order to prohibit this practice.

The resolution was passed and sent to the Attorney General, and we have not heard from him since.

In addition, the President said in his message that he wanted something done to correct this practice. I take it that he had his tongue in his cheek when he said that, because I introduced an amendment to a bill this year which would have prohibited these solicitations. It would have closed this loophole, but not one word of support did I receive from the White House or from anyone connected with it. The amendment was defeated on close to party lines.

Mr. CASE. I called attention to that in my remarks, and I join wholeheartedly in supporting the Senator's efforts in this respect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

The only conclusion we can reach is that there is an organized shakedown of civil service employees going on today to finance this Great Society. The President knows it, he must like it, he condones it, and I assume he wants it to continue. That statement stands until he helps us to pass legislation. Let him put a little arm twisting on the members of his party to help pass it, rather than telling them to use this subject in political speeches but not to vote for it.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

REVIEW OF VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the past 2 years, I have devoted a good deal of my time and attention to the situation in Vietnam. I am now engaged in a three-speech review of this situation, covering first, the overall problem and a number of suggestions as to what U.S. policy ought to be; second, elections; and third, social and economic reform.

On August 8, I delivered the first of these speeches, "The Dilemma of Vietnam," in New York before the Convention of the Disabled American Veterans. The theme of this address was that the United States has taken its eyes off the real challenge in Vietnam, off the essence of guerrilla war; that these wars begin and end in the hearts and minds of the people themselves and they are nurtured in uncorrected injustices. Like guerrilla wars of the past, we should not count on this conflict ending either by means of a negotiated settlement or a military victory. Forces, of course, are needed in order to pacify the country, in order to provide a shield of confidence behind which free elections and social and economic reform can take place. But it is what goes on behind this shield that will determine ultimate success or failure.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of my speech before the convention of the Disabled American War Veterans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dilemma of Vietnam

As a nation we have passed the point of no return in Vietnam; it makes no sense to turn back or pull out. But it makes even less sense to charge forward head down, without knowing where we have been, without seeing the costs ahead, and without some certainty about the end and when it will all be over. There have been far too many unanswered questions about Vietnam, and there have been far too many answers that have rung hollow.

Yet, we are plunging forward, often armed with half truths, hoping for some decisive military victory, for the miracle of a peace conference, waiting for it all to end as suddenly as it appeared. These are illusions, illusions fostered by a false sense of optimism and nurtured by our own frustration. The facts are unpleasant, but unless we face them, we shall be carried step by step by events and by decisions into a situation that few willed and that no one can control.

What are we really trying to achieve in Vietnam? Can we achieve it by military means? Will differences be settled at the conference table? How long is the road ahead, and are we willing to travel it?

If we are to persevere, we must understand our goals and the costs. If we are to make further sacrifices, we must have conviction born of truth and not of illusion.

I believe we should persevere, but only if the Saigon Government takes the proper steps to legitimize its government by free elections under a constitution, and undertakes the necessary reforms to build a base of support responsive to the aspirations of the people. We should persevere only if we use our military power in a cautious and limited manner. It is fruitless to fight for those who have neither the will nor the conviction to fight for themselves, and it is folly to act as if the danger of a wider, perhaps even world-wide, war does not exist.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

The American people have been subjected to a whole kit of unconvincing reasons for our presence in Vietnam. We have been told that we are fighting for "peace in the world." But surely we cannot believe that the outcome in Vietnam will mean the end of war. We have been told that we are fighting for the "forces of freedom and justice." Diem and Ky hardly qualify as democratic types. Finally, we are told that this is a struggle to stop the expansion of Chinese communism. But, while this is true in part, it obscures a larger truth, and it also covers over the fact that the Vietnam conflict—going on since the late 40's—erupted as much from the injustices of colonialism as from outside promptings.

All of these explanations betray a lack of faith in the judgment of the American people. They spring from the belief that the American people will support efforts of this kind only if they are sugar-coated. I maintain just the contrary. I maintain that there would be less division and confusion within our own ranks if the real objectives were set before the people.

We are fighting in Vietnam for Asian stability, for time, and for a practical principle.

Stability, on the Asian continent so that Asia does not become the Balkans of the world, so that Communist China is not tempted to test our will in a wider and more dangerous context.

Time, for the non-communist countries of Asia to strengthen and solidify their own societies and to develop a sense of regional collective responsibility so that U.S. presence will no longer be necessary on the continent as such.

The practical principle, that in view of the risks of the nuclear age, change should not be brought about by force and terror and against the wishes of the majority of the people of a country.

Fighting in Vietnam will not necessarily prevent a guerrilla war from starting in Thailand, nor a resurgence of the Laotian conflict, nor a repeat of aggression in Korea. Indeed, it is very likely that the guerrilla war in Thailand, already going on, could reach significant proportions in two to three years.

The problem is not what we shall be able to prevent by our present efforts in Vietnam; it is how much more dangerous and difficult future conditions would be if we did not act now. In other words, the risks of inaction are greater than the risks of action.

It would be a decision of high irresponsibility for the United States simply to withdraw from Vietnam without due cause, for it would throw the continent of Asia into a situation of grave uncertainty and tension. It would make all future conflicts that much more difficult to control.

There should be no mistaking one central point—it is the U.S. commitment to the non-communist countries of Asia that keeps general instability from erupting into widespread violence. Of course, there is violence and risk of escalation in Vietnam right now, but, in my judgment, to do nothing in Vietnam would be an open invitation to aggression elsewhere.

There are none who realize this better than the Asians themselves. In July of this year, Prime Minister Sato of Japan said: "An increasing recognition should be made of the fact that the United States is making a major contribution to the security of the Far East, including my country." On June 18, 1966, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore, who in the past has shown no particular affinity for the U.S., stated: "A premature withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam could threaten the security of Southeast Asia." In March of this year, President Marcos of the Philippines said: "The fact that the United States shoulders the major burden of the Vietnam war does not change the fact that this is an Asian challenge."

Even more impressive evidence of these feelings is the Conference of Asian and Pacific Countries which met in Korea in June. The conference was composed of nine nations from this area, with Laos as an observer. The final declaration of this conference "upheld the inherent right of the Vietnamese people to self-defense and to choose their own way of life and their own form of government free from external aggression and subversion," and affirmed its solidarity with South Vietnam in this struggle.

The ASPAC Conference actually symbolizes the time factor I just spoke of. It represents the first concrete step by the nations of this area themselves in recognizing their common economic, political, and defense interests. It will take time for the nations concerned to develop common determination and combined muscle, and we must give them that time. Lack of U.S. staying-power in Vietnam would demoralize this effort and undermine confidence in our commitments. Just as NATO was necessary to provide a shield behind which a shattered Western Europe could reconstruct itself, so U.S. power is needed in Asia to give reality to the independence of this region.

Lastly in reviewing our objectives, we must not forget about the Vietnamese people themselves. There are some who assert that these people really want the U.S. out and do not really care if a communist takeover ensues. I do not know where they get their evidence or their certainty. No mortal can search the Vietnamese mind for the truth, all we can do is look at some facts and see what they indicate.

There are dozens of different groups and factions in South Vietnam each with its own point of view and desire for power. Among them, obviously, is a minority—perhaps even a sizeable minority—which supports and sympathizes with the Vietcong. But despite this powerful and organized minority and despite the terror it employs, the rest of South Vietnam has been able to wage a grueling and unwanted war for the good part of ten years. Yes, there have been defections from the ARVN forces and protests against the Saigon Government, but despite these, they continue to maintain over one-half million men-in-arms. Yes, the Buddhists dislike the U.S. presence in their country, but one never hears them ask us to leave. If the significant majority of South Vietnamese did not want to keep the communists out of power, the whole effort would have collapsed a long time ago—no matter what the U.S. did or did not do. We can supply men and arms, but we cannot create the will to fight on unless it already exists.

Our objectives in Vietnam are hard to understand. But in my judgment, the American people do not need demons, devils, and illusions, to understand their interests. The real issue is not whether we should be in Vietnam, but how we should conduct our diplomacy and our military action in order to reach the objectives of stability and time and live up to the principle of self-determination free from aggression and subversion.

PURSUING OUR OBJECTIVES: FORCE AND DIPLOMACY

Every war brings out a parade of prophets with bottled panaceas and pat solutions, of alarmists betokening us to concede more, and of town-criers advising us to kill more. This war in Vietnam, or indeed any guerrilla war, will not be ended by more concessions or more killings. Never since World War II have guerrillas been brought to the conference table or defeated finally on the battlefield.

What I think the American people must know is that there seems little likelihood of settling the conflict in Vietnam through negotiations or by means of increasing doses of force. This does not free us of the responsibility of refining and rethinking our diplomacy, nor does it relieve us of the necessity to use our armed forces. We should continue to seek peace through negotiations and to pacify the country through measured and limited armed strength, but we cannot base our policy on the success of either.

To dangle the prospects of a seemingly unlikely peace conference before our eyes is to invite public disillusionment and lack of confidence; and to pour more and more men and arms into Vietnam and to widen the bombing targets without firmly set limits to our operations is to escalate unknowingly and unwillingly into a major Asian land war.

Why am I so dubious about a peace conference? Very simply, the Hanoi regime and the NLF want much more than we can possibly give—they want guarantees prior to talks that U.S. troops will be evacuated from Vietnam and that the NLF should have the "recisive voice" in a Saigon Government before elections. On our part, we are concerned that, for the moment, any inclusion of communists in the Saigon Government would mean the immobilization of that government and its speedly fall into Hanoi's hands. We have good reason to be troubled about the extent of the popular base of support of the present Saigon Government, and the instability and pitfalls of a coalition government including the communists.

Yet, even with this big gap between the objectives of Hanoi and the NLF and our own, it is conceivable that negotiations could find some common ground and provide some guarantees—if only they would agree to talk about the differences. But as far as we can see now, this seems highly unlikely.

We have only to review the recent past for confirmation. At first, they said they would talk if we would return to the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Conference. We said we would, but there was no conference. Then, the stumbling block became the acceptance by us of the NLF sitting as an independent party at the peace table. We gave this assurance publicly and privately, but nothing happened. Next came the bombings. A conference could be had if only we would cease bombing targets in North Vietnam. We did for thirty days, but that did not turn out to be enough. Now we hear it rumored that Hanoi and the NLF are waiting for our promise to include them in a provisional government, to let them have a "share of the responsibility." We responded that we were ready to talk about anything. Again, there was no conference.

There has been a continuing stream of proposals for cease-fires, U.N. supervision and discussion, heads of state meetings, pressure on the Soviet Union to reconvene the Geneva Conference, military freeze and the recent Thai proposal for an Asian Conference of "all the principals"—some of them I made myself. But all of them were of no avail.

If Hanoi and the NLF have any doubts about our sincerety for negotiations, if they believe we are bluffing, and if they want to prove what they call our "hypocrisy", they have only to try us at the peace table. I hope they do, but I would not count on it.

I have supported our military efforts in Vietnam and I have voted the requisite appropriations, but I have made it plain each time that these efforts be limited and connected to rational policy objectives. I am concerned that out of frustration because the communists refuse to negotiate, we may be using force as an excuse for policy.

The theory behind the Administration's present military policy seems to be the idea of the breaking-point. It assumes that Hanoi and the NLF must have some point of damage acceptance at which it will no longer be rational for them to continue to fight. We have only to proceed along the spectrum of force—more troops, more and newer weapons, more bombings, new targets of devastating impact—to find their breaking-point and make them negotiate.

The assumption underlying this theory is faulty, and the consequences of the theory are dangerous. It assumes that we are dealing with a rational enemy, that he has a sense of proportion, that he was values more important than victory in the South. It seems to me that Hanoi, at least, has lost touch with reality. Hanoi appears willing to sacrifice its economy and its social fabric for its ends. Reaction to our bombing near Hanoi and Haiphong was to build more air-raid shelters and move people out of these cities to the country-side.

Hanoi and the NLF have their own theory about us. They believe that it is we who have the earlier breaking point, that they only have to continue a little longer before we become tired, before domestic opposition swells, and we withdraw. They are as wrong in their theory as we are in ours.

At worst, these mutual breaking-point theories can lead to World War III; at best, they will lead to a resumption of guerrilla war, leaving us back where we started. Let me explain this proposition.

We are bombing supply lines in North Vietnam. We have already bombed oil depots right outside of Hanoi and Haiphong. In a year's time, we will have upwards of half a million men in South Vietnam. What steps remain? Mining the Haiphong harbor, bombing the cities themselves, attacking airfields in the North and in China, invading North Vietnam, and starting the showdown with Peking. Crossing any one of these lines could produce a very new and more menacing configuration of battle, including greater if not direct Soviet assistance and the introduction of Chinese manpower. I do not think that either Moscow or Peking want to become directly involved in the fighting, but we should not force their hands.

Make no mistake—Vietnam is not Cuba, and if we challenge Soviet and Chinese interests directly, they will react. To speak as Premier Ky does of invading North Vietnam and having a showdown with Peking is the height of folly. Premier Ky says there can be no peace in Asia unless the U.S. defeats Communist China. This is tantamount to saying there can be no peace without World War III. Our own government should publicly disavow Premier Ky on these matters.

What happens, on the other hand, if we do not pursue the path of "quiet" escalation, and if, instead, we concentrate our military power in South Vietnam itself? While this is the course of action I prefer, it also has its limitations.

With half a million U.S. troops, a similar number of South Vietnamese soldiers, with allied support, with helicopters, modern weaponry, and air power, the communist troops operating at regimental and divisional levels in South Vietnam will get hurt and hurt very badly. Even if Hanoi infiltrates as many as six thousand troops per month, the attrition rate on these forces will be intolerably high. The Communists will soon discover that operating at Stage II of Mao Tse-tung's Theory of Revolution—at the conventional force level—is too costly.

But will their answer to this be negotiations? Most probably not. Most probably they will revert to Stage I, or strictly guerrilla type warfare. This, in turn, will leave us back where we were three years ago. True, we shall have more troops on hand, but the guerrillas will still be there.

If I were convinced that we could use more force without causing a general Asian land war, and that this would put an end to guerrilla strength in the South, or that this would bring about negotiations, such a policy would have my support. But I do not believe that force alone, even measured and concentrated force in South Vietnam itself, is the main route to peace.

THE REAL CHALLENGE: ELECTIONS AND REFORM

With our hopes tied to a peace conference and our remedies focused on force, *we have taken our eyes off the real challenge, off the essence of guerrilla war. These wars begin and end in the hearts and minds of the people themselves, and they are nurtured in uncorrected injustices.* As long as there is a sizeable number of people who feel they can receive a better deal from the Vietcong, or that the government is unresponsive to their needs, there will be guerrillas.

Force, of course, is required to meet the guerrilla on the battle field, to prevent the collapse of authority, and to pacify the country. Force can provide a shield of confidence behind which free elections and social and economic reform can take place, but it is what goes on behind the shield that determines success or failure.

This has been the case in every guerrilla war since 1945. The British and the Malays fought the predominantly Chinese guerrillas in Malaya for ten years, with a numerical superiority of twelve to one. Malaya being a peninsula, there was little outside help for the guerrillas, and the guerrillas being primarily Chinese were readily identifiable. Still, it took ten years. The Philippine Government battled the Huks, who had virtually no external assistance, for eight years. In both of these instances, the tide was not turned against the guerrillas until the individual peasant began to feel the fruits of reform in his own life and until he could give his loyalty to the government.

I am not saying that our government is unaware of this time factor; it is. I am not saying that our government has ignored the social and economic reform side of the war; quite the opposite is true. I am not saying that our government fails to comprehend how vital free elections are to obtaining the loyalty of the Vietnamese people; it knows this only too well. My point is that despite our Government's understanding of these problems, it has not taken the necessary action to resolve them. Consequently, a number of hurdles to success still exist: 1) the American public's impatience with the inevitably slow progress, domestic pressures for quick results; 2) our own hesitancy in pushing the Saigon Government along the necessary paths because we fear undermining its authority; and 3) the delaying tactics and equivocating of the Saigon Government and the wide-spread corruption throughout South Vietnamese society.

In effect, the Administration has not been straight-forward enough to dispel the illusions about quick results and has not been forceful enough with the Saigon regime to press for implementation of the aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

Our economic aid program to South Vietnam has been massive, considering it is a country with a population of only about sixteen million. Since 1954, and including what is projected for the next fiscal year, the total will be approximately $3.8 billion. This year alone, we are spending about $730 million for a variety of programs like rural reconstruction and pacification, financing of commercial imports and food assistance.

This is already a massive program, in some respects too massive since it has produced rampant inflation. We do not need to provide more dollars in aid; we do need to ensure that what we give is properly used and that it actually gets to the people.

As things now stand, the Saigon Government is dragging its heels on land reform, refugees, and corruption. The United States has to talk tougher to the Saigon leaders on these matters. We did get tough on the monetary side, and it worked—they reduced by half the value of the piaster and this did put the brakes on inflation.

We have been too squeamish on the matter of elections as well. After procrastinating, the military junta scheduled elections for a constituent assembly for September 11. This assembly is given a period of six months to draft a constitution, which in turn has to be approved by some virtually defunct body called the National Assembly, and then promulgated by the military junta itself. By November of 1967, if the constitution is approved and promulgated, the requisite national institutions are to be established. There is no provision, at present, for a general election of a civilian government. Equally distressing, is the section of the electoral law for the constituent assembly itself which prohibits "communists and neutralists" from participating. Some explanations have been offered about this, but they are unsatisfactory. It is my concern that the military junta will use those abstract classifications to prevent anyone from running for office or voting of whom they disapprove.

Genuinely free and open elections are the only real basis for generating peoples' loyalty for their government. With so much at stake, our own government should be direct and forceful in clearing up these ambiguities and in promoting free elections for a civilian government as soon as possible.

I have taken you along the road of my own thoughts on Vietnam, and these thoughts are not optimistic. I hope I am wrong. I hope there will soon be a peace conference; I wish our military power could produce negotiations without unacceptable escalation. But I would not count on either, and I would not allow myself to be taken in by false optimism, or phrases like "renewed determination." If I am right, if we face a long and uncertain future, the American people must know it, and we must accommodate our policy on Vietnam and at home to meet it!

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SHOULD KEEP PACE WITH INCREASED FARM COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this year farm costs are at an alltime high. In the second quarter of this year farm production expenses were estimated at an annual rate of $32.5 billion. This is an increase of $1.8 billion over 1965 and an increase of almost $10 billion since 1957. Yet in spite of this whopping 30-percent increase in farm costs, food prices have risen only 15 percent over this period. In addition, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman indicated only last week that 80 percent of the increase in food prices since 1947 was received, not by the farmer, but by the marketing agencies, processors, and other middlemen.

Mr. President, this is one way of showing why so many dairy farmers are selling out. It also should serve as a warning that our economy is going to have to give the dairy farmer a decent income if we are to continue to expect to receive plentiful supplies of milk at modest prices.

With milk prices going up, with dairy farmers getting a relatively small percentage of the increase, this is an extremely poor time for us in Congress to attempt to exercise false economy by putting a lid on the school milk program. By allowing the Federal Government to pay a part of the cost of the milk consumed by our schoolchildren, the school milk program has played an important role in encouraging milk consumption—thus improving child nutrition and dairy income at the same time.

If the program is to continue to operate effectively, we in Congress must do our best to make sure that adequate funds are made available to offset the recent rise in milk prices. This is why I intend to take a close look at the program as it proceeds in fiscal 1967 to see if Congress has provided sufficient funds. Additional money may be required in a supplemental bill. It is also the reason why I hope Congress will act rapidly to agree on the amount to be provided for the school milk program in the 1967 agriculture appropriation bill.

ONE VOICE FOR AMERICA IN VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, lately, there has been criticism of intensified U.S. air activity over North Vietnam on the grounds that it may discourage Soviet efforts to bring about peace through negotiation. For my own part, I question whether the Soviet Union has ever had any intention of bringing this conflict to the bargaining table.

The Soviet Union has endorsed so-called "wars of national liberation" and is supplying war material to North Vietnam. The New York Daily News recently reported the arrival of new shipments of Soviet-built aircraft to North Vietnam to counter American attacks. And, on July 6, Leonid Brezhnev announced that Soviet aid to the Communist north would grow.

In the same speech, Mr. Brezhnev charged that American acts have produced "a storm of indignation among all honest people of the world. Even the close allies of the United States." he argued, "are disassociating themselves from the crime committed by the American imperialists. Never before has the prestige of the United States fallen to such depths as now."

If the Soviet Union finds it so shameful for the United States to fight in Vietnam, why has she been so anxous to provide missiles and aircraft and military instruction to the north, and to urge aggression against the south, under the counterfeit cry of "war of liberation"?

If the world is outraged, let the U.S.S.R. show leadership, let her show that she will pave the way for the reconvening of a conference at Geneva. It was at Geneva that the agreement giving South Vietnam autonomy was reached, and the Soviet Union approved the agreement. As cochairman of the earlier conference, she has the authority, if not the duty, to act.

If the Soviet Union regards the Vietnam situation as a grave danger to peace, she should be prepared to persuade her North Vietnamese friends of the wisdom of such a course, even if it means incurring the wrath of the paranoids in Peking.

But this is a kind of leadership rarely found among totalitarians. While Brezhnev talks, Red infiltration, terror, and savagery continue.

It is clear that no meaningful effort at negotiation will succeed until the Communist side finally recognizes that it cannot succeed through force of arms and violence; but that, on the contrary, the United States, South Vietnam, and their allies are capable of putting an end to aggression and insurrection in the south.

There is a major communications problem in getting this idea across.

As usual, the Communist camp is counting on its double standard of morality in world affairs, which dictates that violence is permitted in the name of Lenin, Marx, and Mao, but not in defense of human freedom. Because Americans believe in human values, many of our citizens accept the argument that it is wrong forcefully to resist violence in whatever cause.

Sometimes, alas, it appears that America speaks with two voices. The Communists, judging others by a mirror of themselves, delude themselves into thinking we are playing a reverse of their own double game. For the American people are overwhelmingly united to see this ugly affair through. The Communists continue to misgage the firmness of our national will. They intensify their own military activity, believing that America is deeply divided and will give up, and that they are on the edge of victory.

I quote Ho Chi Minh on July 19:

> Of late the U.S. aggressors hysterically took a very serious step further in the escalation of the war: they launched air attacks on the suburbs of Hanoi and Haiphong. That was an act of desperation comparable to the agony convulsions of a grievously wounded beast.

What kind of self-hypnosis is this? This war has become far too deadly to tolerate further shadow shows. The oriental aggressors should look behind the screen to see that the tiger is real.

It is highly important that America's voice come through, loud and clear and officially. There is no second American voice. However hard some may try to mount one, it is a false voice.

If the Soviet Union wants to promote a just peace, it should seek it through diplomatic negotiations rather than propaganda. Those Americans who vocally demand some kind of abrupt ending to this war, and most of us wish we could be spared all of it, must recognize that amateur attempts at political action are only convincing to the other side, and that in fact they are a cause of intensified war efforts because they deceive the other side.

The point America must emphasize is that her people are united in a determination to see the conflict grimly through. It is time the message got through, too.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CHARLES DRESSEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to comment about Charley Dressen, Detroit Tigers manager, who died yesterday.

Charley Dressen was an outstanding son of Decatur, Ill., who got his start in baseball at Moline and once played for the Decatur Staleys pro football team—which later became the Bears. He loved and mastered baseball to an ultimate degree.

Modesty was not one of his virtues but everyone recognized Dressen's competence, his almost fanatical love for his way of life—baseball, and his concern for the well-being of his friends and team members.

DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, medicare, young as it is, has already brought us many blessings. Not the least of them is the increase in attention paid to our overall national health needs. Many experts and laymen are taking a new hard look at problems that affect, not only older Americans, but all age groups.

Dr. George A. Silver, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is among those who believe that action should be taken now to counter foreseeable pressures on our health protection resources.

In an enlightening interview given to the Medical Tribune for its July 25 issue, Dr. Silver said that he is much concerned, not only with medical manpower shortages, but also with inadequacies in the delivery of medical services. In the face of such shortages, he asks, should not we find ways to help medical personnel make the best possible use of their precious time?

Mr. President, Dr. Silver's views are as timely as they are significant. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIONALIZING OF DELIVERY OF CARE CALLED BEST IMMEDIATE PROSPECT

(The following news interview was obtained in the light of rapidly increasing pressures on medical manpower as part of Medical Tribune's coverage of these critical problems. Physicians are invited to express their own views in Letters to Tribune.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The nation's immediate health manpower problems are more likely to respond to the "rationalization of our systems for the delivery of medical and health care" than to programs designed specifically to increase that manpower.

That is the opinion of Dr. George A. Silver, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, one of whose more pressing responsibilities in that job is the health manpower problem.

Dr. Silver does not dismiss as useless the many efforts aimed at producing greater numbers of medical and health personnel, whether old, new, or prospective. Moreover, he applauded, in an interview, President Johnson's recent appointment of a National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower charged with recommending ways to help meet the "critical shortage" in these fields (Medical Tribune, May 18).

But, he said, significantly increased numbers of doctors, nurses, technicians, and aides will not be available for some time, and therefore the country's present body of health workers should be employed more efficiently to meet the needs of the present and near future.

TASK COMPLEX AND DIFFICULT

Dr. Silver is under no illusion about the complexity and difficulty of the task. "The profession opposes many of these suggestions," he told Medical Tribune, "and a variety of other special interests in the health field interpose themselves."

But he feels that there is a clear case for "improving the systems of delivery of medical care." There are at least two classes of people who would benefit from such an improvement, in his view.

The first, "significant in number," consists of those who have come to be termed the medically indigent, for whom services are fragmented, delayed, demeaning, unavailable—or all four at different times and places.

The second consists of those who are in fact "buying medical care," but who are not getting the best care we know how to give because the physicians who are delivering it are overburdened or lack adequate equipment or training or because the patients are in no position to find their way through the maze of contemporary sophistication in medicine.

The Department of HEW is in no way seeking to order these things better by fiat. It does, however, intend to look into the whole question of delivery of medical care. Secretary John W. Gardner, for example, believes that more has to be done in many ways and particularly in measuring performance from the standpoint of what the patient needs, Dr. Silver said.

Internally, also, the department is moving toward rationalizing its own approach to the selection and coordination of programs—defining a mission, examining the resources available, setting priorities, and allocating the resources to meet them.

OUTSIDE CONSIDERATIONS CITED

Naturally enough, a good many considerations from outside will enter into these rationalized calculations. Dr. Silver is not talking about mysterious pressures when he mentions these other considerations.

It is rather, a matter of simple fact that if, to take a hypothetic example, "people are thinking more about children than about old people at a given time, you will get better child programs than aged programs."

That, in his opinion, is "not a threat, but a democratic necessity." And, in any case, he said, "people here [in the department] are dedicated to the notion of the pluralistic society. If that sounds like a cliché I can only point out that if you love your mother and you say, 'I love my mother,' that's a cliché too, and it is also the truth."

While the manpower problem extends throughout the health field, the need for physicians is a striking example of time lag versus immediate necessity.

Dr. Silver is not disposed to lay great stress on arguments about the exact number of physicians or the physician shortfall, because he believes that whatever the over-all numbers may be, it is beyond argument that there are not a sufficient number of the right kind in the right places at any given moment.

If there are some 50,000 general practitioners and about 20,000 internists available for private practice, that's "nothing like enough to take care of the need we have for family health practice today."

NUMBER MAY SUFFICE

On the other hand, "if medical practice could be rationalized so that physicians used their time more effectively, if medical students could be channeled to the career goals where the need is greatest, if hospitals were regionalized—then perhaps we could get on quite well with the numbers we have now and are likely to have in the foreseeable future."

As to the numbers we are likely to have, he pointed out that since the big push to increase student intake began just two years ago, about 1,000 new places have been created in medical schools, new and old. The target of present legislation is another 1,000 places over the next few years.

Though a great deal has been heard about various kinds of curriculum reform, the adoption of any vast and sweeping change that would make a serious dent in the length of training is not to be anticipated in the near future, in his opinion.

Those two facts taken in conjunction add up to some additional physicians at some later date, but not a lot more right now.

Under the circumstances, Dr. Silver reverted to a theme he has sounded before. "I think there is a likelihood that there will be more experimentation with different types of physician assistants." If such experiments are successful, a great deal of the pressure on physicians for routine tasks would be lifted, freeing them for the more urgent tasks that do require professional training.

As to whether this inevitably means that there will be a growth of organized systems, akin to the prepaid group practice plans about which a great deal has been written, Dr. Silver has an open mind.

MIDDLE CLASS DROPOUTS

There is some evidence, he noted, that "middle class people do not like organized systems of that kind. Many in that classification have dropped out of such groups and shopped around. It may be that what has been offered to them in these systems has not been satisfactory to them and that some other sort of organized system would be. I don't believe that anyone can answer that question with certainty."

But this particular problem concerning a particular group of patients in one kind of system should not be mistaken for some sort of general disenchantment with the notion of group practice. Dr. Silver noted that, in the first instance, there is a clear pattern of growth for associated practice of various kinds among physicians themselves, and, in the second, that he is himself quite certain that group practice offers a more efficient means for the delivery of medical care and a better vehicle for introducing new techniques.

A couple of other things about which he is certain are that we need more and better answers to questions about many aspects of the medical care delivery system and that there are some problems where answers already exist without having been applied with sufficient vigor.

He is hopeful that the questions will not be shirked and that the answers will not be sloughed off.

NATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the week of August 20 to 27, there will be demonstrations by young people in virtually every city and town across the country. I want to salute these youngsters and those who have trained them for this activity.

I hasten to add that the demonstrations of which I speak will be staged by the 1 million persons involved in drum and bugle corps work who will be celebrating National Drum Corps Week.

These demonstrations will cause no fear, they will be far removed from the world of violence, they will not seek to promote a cause in opposition to a course on which their country is embarked, and they will not be designed to impose the views of the participants on the majority.

On the contrary, these displays will be colorful and entertaining affairs made possible by a love of music and the hard work and rigid discipline necessary for this demanding art form. The parades in which members of drum corps take part will inspire pride in their parents and in their leaders.

I am heartened by the motto which the youth of drum and bugle corps support: "Pageantry and patriotism, on the march."

In some circles today, it is considered old-fashioned to acknowledge deep feelings of patriotism for our country. Our heritage, our traditional values, and our freedoms won at great cost on many battlefields should still inspire pride and gratitude in all of us.

The drum corps invoke through the symbols of colorful costuming and careful cadence reminders of our great history, a healthy antidote to the ultrasophistication and cynicism to which we are so often subjected.

I am particularly pleased to pay tribute to these young people and to the adults who give their time to train and sponsor their activities because I feel we are frequently guilty of emphasizing the antisocial behavior of a few rather than the constructive projects to which so many boys and girls devote their time.

If we are ever to win the war against juvenile delinquency, it will not be with an attitude of deploring or by handwringing. But we adults can help by giving our full support to constructive activities, such as the thousands of drum and bugle corps throughout the country, and I am happy to lend my voice to this cause during the week set aside as National Drum Corps Week.

CONTROL AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal lately about antipoverty wars, job-training programs, manpower development, and the need for the whole Nation to pitch in to help our fellow citizens who are less fortunate. The programs passed by Congress and suggested to Congress by this administration to solve the problems have at least one common denominator; namely, control at the Federal level. Senators will recall the debate last year over whether or not Governors would be allowed to retain a veto over poverty programs scheduled for their States. Unfortunately, those of us, who felt that at least some of the responsibility and authority for the conduct of these programs should be placed in the hands of those most closely associated with the poverty and unemployment situation in their States, were overwhelmed by the superior numbers supporting the administration's view that all things should be controlled from Washington.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to cite each of the numerous cases during which this philosophical argument has been fought. I would, however, like to comment on a recent case which targets the issue even more plainly.

In a desire to speed up training of the unskilled and to engender a wider sense of responsibility and participation in this field among the private sector, a number of us have introduced legislation which would combine the forces of government and nongovernment in an effective way. These bills are S. 1130, sponsored by Senators ALLOTT, FANNIN, LONG of Missouri, SCOTT, TOWER, CASE, and FONG; and S. 2343 sponsored by Senators JAVITS, HARTKE, and SCOTT; and S. 2509 known as the Human Investment Act, sponsored by Senators PROUTY, myself, ALLOTT, CASE, COOPER, COTTON, DIRKSEN, FANNIN, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JORDAN, KUCHEL, MILLER, MORTON, MUNDT, MURPHY, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, and TOWER.

These bills would in one form or another amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit to employers for expenses provided in training programs for employees. Such an approach would open thousands of presently untapped avenues of work for the unemployed and unskilled. It would be perfectly consistent with the administration's expressed desires to fight the devastating effect upon the unskilled laborers from onrushing automation. It would supplement rather than supplant the present antipoverty programs. It would provide a means for utilizing the vast resources and imagination of millions of people not presently involved in the wars on poverty. It would provide jobs for the trainees, in the jobs they were being trained for. It would vastly increase the opportunities for those seeking work but not skilled in the available job openings. It would accelerate the ability of the unemployed to become economically independent. It would help solve the shortage of skilled and semiskilled labor. It would provide freedom of job opportunity. It would accomplish all these objectives through the imagination and creativity of the private enterprise sector.

The Finance Committee requested reports on these various bills, and I ask unanimous consent to place the report of the Bureau of the Budget into the RECORD at this point. I do so, Mr. President, because this report needs study by all members although I intend to comment on it herewith.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to the requests from your Committee for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1130, S. 2343 and S. 2509, bills to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit to employers for expenses of providing training programs for employees.

S. 2343 would extend the provisions of the investment tax credit under section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to include certain employee training expenses. S. 1130 and S. 2509 would provide a tax credit, limited to the amount of tax up to $25,000 plus 25 percent of the tax liability in excess of $25,000, for certain designated employer expenses in connection with employee training programs. A three-year carryback and a five-year carryover are provided for unused credits.

This Administration is placing and will continue to place a high priority on manpower training. The Bureau of the Budget is, therefore, in agreement with the objectives of these bills. However, we believe that the appropriate incentives should be based on direct assistance rather than on the use of tax credits for the following reasons:

1. Under direct assistance programs such as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the costs of the programs are readily identifiable in the budget and are subject to annual congressional review. In a most direct way the Congress and the public are able to know exactly how much the program costs and are able to measure the benefits of the program against these costs. Tax incentives, on the other hand, are not normally subject to annual systematic review and, in addition, leave the costs of the program, as represented by reduced liabilities, hidden in the aggregate business tax statistics.

2. The bills would tend to favor large corporations as opposed to small business. Small businesses often have little tax liability against which to write off a credit and too few employees to organize a formal training program.

3. It would be possible for an employer to formalize existing informal training merely for the purpose of obtaining the tax credit. Such a change in activities, while financially beneficial to the firm, would serve to distort the efficiency of the firm in an economic sense by causing it to employ resources in a manner which would yield less than the maximum productive return.

4. The bills might stimulate training in fields with a low national priority or need. Direct assistance programs, on the other hand, can be adjusted to existing and future occupational requirements.

The Bureau of the Budget, therefore, recommends against enactment of S. 2509.

Sincerely yours,
WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the administration has informed us through the report of the Bureau of the Budget that it is "in agreement with the objectives" of the bills but recommends against their passage. Since no mention is made of cost, it is interesting to note the philosophy spread before us as the foundation for the objection.

Summarized, it is that direct taxpayer assistance is preferable to the tax credit approach because:

First. Costs are more readily identifiable in the budget.

Second. Large corporations would get more benefit than small corporations.

Third. Employers could use the idea for employing resources in a less than maximum productive return.

Fourth. The bills might stimulate training in fields of low national priority or need.

My analysis of this gobbledygook is that the administration wants to control job opportunities for the future, to channel workers only into those fields preselected out of Washington, to cut down big business because it is big, to distrust small business because it is small and to oppose program developments which might be economically profitable. Am I reading things into this report? I do not believe so.

Now, Mr. President, certain national objectives have been set down by past Congresses and executive departments. Among these are: first, full employment; second, assistance to small business; third, training of unemployed; fourth, retraining of underemployed; fifth, freedom of job opportunity; and sixth, encouragement of private enterprise.

These bills would substantially assist in reaching all these goals. S. 2509, for example, is sponsored by 21 Republican Senators and supported I believe by the vast majority of Republicans throughout the country and by many members of the other party. It is a new and productive approach to solving age-old problems.

However, this report, Mr. President, is wholly inconsistent with those national objectives, and in fact raises once again in a direct and alarming fashion the specter of George Orwell's "1984" concept of Big Brotherhood. There "Government" with a capital "G" controlled jobs, training, education, marriages, costumes, and even ideas. We have not yet reached that point and God willing, we never will. But the tendency to move in that direction as bureaucracy grows is evident in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this report. Study them once again.

> 3. It would be possible for an employer to formalize existing informal training merely for the purpose of obtaining the tax credit. Such a change in activities, while financially beneficial to the firm, would serve to distort the efficiency of the firm in an economic sense by causing it to employ resources in a manner which would yield less than the maximum productive return.
>
> 4. The bills might stimulate training in fields with a low national priority or need. Direct assistance programs, on the other hand, can be adjusted to existing and future occupational requirements.

Are we to assume responsibility for determining whether a firm is or is not "employing resources in a manner which would yield less than the maximum productive return." Under what arrogation of superior wisdom do we gain this right? By what group of super genius' will the determination be made? Are we to train people only in fields of national priority or need? If so, why are we training young men in picking up sticks at the Job Corps camps and young women in knitting? Are these occupations of high national priority? In what way are we now adjusting direct assistance programs to existing and future occupational requirements? Are we training the unemployed to become atomic scientists? Are we training the unemployed in marine biology? Are we training the unemployed in machine tool construction and operation? Are we planning to do this? If so where are those plans and who has made them?

Mr. President, these are not idle questions. When the Bureau of the Budget recommends rejection of legislation specifically designed to implement national goals and to do it through the private sector and with freedom of choice for the employer and the employee, the reasons for such rejection should be studied with care.

My study at least leads me to the conclusion that the rejection is based purely and simply on the desire of this administration to control all things and all people from Washington, through redistribution of tax funds. The inevitable result, painted so clearly in the Bureau's report, is control of jobs, control of training, elimination of freedom of choice in job opportunities, further problems for small businesses, further attacks on big business, and further questions as to whether Government or management will control private enterprise.

Mr. Orwell may well be prophetic.

THE FRITZ LANHAM BUILDING IN FORT WORTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed H.R. 10284, a bill providing that the new Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of a distinguished Congressman and outstanding Texan. The late Congressman Lanham was a native of the Fort Worth area and ably served this district in the Congress of the United States for 28 years.

It is highly fitting and proper that such an honor should be bestowed upon Fritz Lanham for he served at one time as chairman of the Public Buildings Committee, a separate committee of the House until the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established the Committee on Public Works. Fritz Garland Lanham was a dedicated public servant and an effective Representative. The new Federal office building will be a fitting memorial to an able man and appropriate thanks from a grateful community for his years of diligent service. I am pleased that my fellow Senators have joined in passage of this bill to honor a notable Congressman, the late Fritz Garland Lanham.

CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIVITIES OF OUR YOUNG CITIZENS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, much is said today of our wayward youth, of juvenile delinquency, of youthful cynicism regarding patriotism. But not enough is said of the constructive activities of the majority of our young citizens, and the adults of our country who unselfishly use their leisure hours directing activities of our young men and women.

In the week of August 20 to 27, we shall celebrate National Drum Corps Week. I think it is important that we consider for a moment the many advantages of the many drum corps programs operating throughout the United States.

Drum Corps activities represent a great opportunity for all its participants. It means that youths will work under the direction of adults, and will learn from these experienced and dedicated leaders the benefits of proper discipline. It means that young men and women will be offered the opportunity to develop their leadership potential in worthwhile areas. Above all the drum corps program means a chance to check delinquency before its starts, and develop patriotism through active participation in the rich pagentry which has always been a part of our great American heritage.

Indeed, the very motto of drum and bugle corps members is a living tribute to their worthiness:

> Pagentry and patriotism, fight delinquency support drum corps activity.

Mr. President, I have personally witnessed the worthwhile effects of a drum and bugle corps program. In particular, I refer to one of the finest groups in the country—the Mattapan Crusaders from my own State of Massachusetts. The National Drum and Bugle Corps program, of which the Crusaders are a part, encourages in our Nation's youth the qualities that make good citizens. I heartily support its efforts.

DEATH OF ALBERT W. SMALL

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it is with sorrow and sadness that I bring to my colleagues' attention today the news of the death from a heart attack of Albert W. Small, one of the world's foremost cryptologists, on August 9, 1966.

Mr. Small was one of the principal analysts involved in solving enemy cryptographic systems during World War II, and his work contributed immeasurably to our military victories. Subsequently, he invented some of our secure communications systems.

For three decades, Mr. Small was a leading figure in the development of the science of cryptology, and this Nation owes to him an enduring debt for the part he has played in our national security.

His country owes him a lasting debt of gratitude.

QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES BY CERTAIN SAVINGS AND LOAN INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on August 7, 1966, a news item appeared in the Washington Post which greatly disturbed me. According to this Associated Press dispatch, some savings and loan institutions in California are raising interest rates on existing home loans by invoking fine print clauses in trust deed notes. These clauses allow the loan company to increase the interest rate, and, therefore, the monthly payment, on loans which have already been negotiated and closed.

Again, according to this news item:

> Most notes don't have such clauses. But executives of several firms say they are considering including them in making new loans. The current tight money situation is known to be putting a squeeze on the lending industry.

Mr. President, I submit that if any such practice as this becomes general, we will tend to return to pre-New Deal days, when homeownership was relatively rare among the young people with growing families, and when home purchases were financed through such unwise gimmicks as balloon notes. Such a practice, if widespread, would doom our homebuilding industry, as we know it today, and those industries allied with it.

Of course, officials of savings and loan institutions practicing or contemplating this kind of thing excuse it on the grounds that money is costing them more. This is, unfortunately, true, and this trend must be reversed.

I have spoken several times in recent days, weeks, and months against the tight money, high interest rate policy being pursued by the Federal Reserve Board and with the apparent approval of the Johnson administration. At least, actions taken and recommended by the administration have encouraged the Board in its mistaken and hurtful course.

High interest rates, under conditions we face today, do not help to curb inflation. It is doubtful that high interest rates have ever acted to curb inflation, although they have been of material assistance in bringing about recessions and in disrupting the economy.

Certainly, today, with big business in a semimonopolistic condition and with labor strongly organized, high interest rates serve to increase prices and are not at all helpful in dampening demand, except in areas where organization of an industry is loose, such as housing. And, in this case, serious imbalances are brought about which distort the economy, while the general level of prices continues to rise.

Criticism of Johnson administration policies is coming from all quarters, and has reached such proportions that some heed must surely be paid soon. A few days ago, for example, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, who has been described as the "high priest among Republican economic advisers" spoke out in favor of several actions, among them suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit and a cessation of "playing games with the Federal budget." Dr. Burns made other recommendations, as well, but with these two I am in wholehearted agreement.

It was obvious early this year that the most explosive demand area was in plant and equipment expenditures. It was also obvious that an inducement such as the investment credit would continue to spur these expenditures to levels which could not be sustained and which were not called for by true demand.

I made a strong effort to bring about a suspension of the investment credit, and to secure administration support for such a suspension. But to no avail. Instead, the administration preferred, as Dr. Burns has put it, "playing games with the Federal budget."

Of particular significance in this connection was the scheme to sell off certain capital assets such as VA and FHA mortgages, disguising the receipts from such sales, for budgetary purposes, as current income. I do not think this really fooled anyone. But it did definitely drain off some funds which might otherwise have gone into new housing, or into new loans on existing housing, and thus contribute to the difficulties of the homebuilding and related industries brought on by high interest rates and the competition for funds between banks and savings and loan institutions.

Mr. President, I am simply unable to follow the reasoning of those who constantly search for the apparently easy out. Hard decisions must be taken. The day of reckoning cannot be forever postponed. Budgetary legerdemain cannot be successfully substituted for realistic appraisals of economic conditions and firm action indicated by those appraisals.

But, back to the Federal Reserve Board and its actions and policies in the tight money, high interest rate situation.

As I have said before, the Board is banker-oriented and seems inclined toward keeping interest rates on the high side, no matter what economic conditions we face. But, in partial defense of the Board, let me point out that some members certainly feel bound in all conscience to take such actions as are open to the Board to stem inflation. When Board members see the administration taking steps which work counter to their policies, they often seem to feel that they have no choice but to tighten the screws even harder, even if in so doing a general recession is brought on.

President Johnson is remiss on at least two counts:

First, he should appoint to the Board men who are properly oriented;

Second, he should take actions and make recommendations which will assist in controlling inflation when inflation is clearly threatened, rather than dodging responsibility, and allowing the Board to do as it pleases—even lending encouragement through inaction for even greater stringency by the Board.

But, as pointed out by the Senator from Pennsylvania a few days ago, even given the defalcations of the administration, Federal Reserve policy is misguided and actually feeds the inflationary fires. A general reversal must be brought about. It cannot be brought about unless and until the President exercises sound and aggressive leadership in the right direction.

CATEGORICAL OR GENERAL AID TO EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF DENISON BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Board of Education of Denison, Tex., authorized a resolution recently regarding centralized Federal control of education.

My own views in preference of local control of education are well known. Education is so important that it is imperative that the Federal Government maintain a hands-off attitude.

If there are no objections, Mr. President, I ask that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

The Federal Government entry into the local school district financial picture has provided sorely needed funds. New programs and services provided with such funds have undoubtedly contributed to the advancement of public education. The many sources of these monies have, however, brought new regulations and restrictions that, more often than not, have circumscribed their use and made it impossible for the local board of education and school administration to establish programs that will serve the needs of the community as those needs are seen by the local school officials.

Therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Education of the Denison Independent School District:

That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to replace categorical aid to education with general aid, all of which would be administered through the State Education Agency. Subject funds should emanate from the Congress through the United States Office of Education.

Be it further resolved that the "grass roots" interest in and innovations for education have contributed to the present high state of public education and that it is imperative in order to maintain local community support and interest; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the 4th District Congressman from Texas.

Adopted and approved this 19th day of July, 1966.

S. J. BROWN,
President, Board of Education, Denison Independent School District, Denison, Tex.

Attest:

MANUEL COLE,
Secretary, Board of Education, Denison Independent School District, Denison, Tex.

AT LAST—A FIRMER, MORE REALISTIC U.S. POLICY TOWARD EGYPT APPEARS TO BE IN THE MAKING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recent press announcements seem to indicate that at long last the administration has taken a cold realistic approach to the United Arab Republic and will, in the future, discontinue the practice of giving economic aid to President Nasser to aid him in carrying on activities around the world inimical to U.S. interests and disruptive of world peace.

If this is true, and if this policy is maintained, then it will be truly gratifying to me and others in the Congress who for years have been seeking to bring this about.

Six years ago—on April 28, 1960—I joined in cosponsoring an amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1960, that that act and Public Law 480 be administered in such a way as to give effect to the principles that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between recipient nations.

That amendment was necessitated by the action of the United Arab Republic in prohibiting not only Israel ships from using the Suez Canal but also prohibiting ships of all other nations carrying cargoes either from or to the State of Israel from using the Suez Canal. I stated at that time:

> I believe it is highly desirable that the United States stop appeasing dictators, especially when they are in definite violation of their own agreements and conventions. The United States is now contributing about $6½ million to the United Nations police force to keep the peace on the border between Israel and Egypt—a third of the total U.N. appropriation. All of this could be averted if we were not constantly encouraging irresponsible dictators.

Despite the passage of this amendment, President Nasser continued and continues to stop Israel ships from using the Suez Canal and to deny access to the canal to cargos carried by ships of other nations to or from Israel.

Despite the passage of this amendment and the complete lack of compliance with its provisions by President Nasser, the U.S. aid program to the United Arab Republic in fiscal year 1960 amounted to $89.8 million.

In 1963—with President Nasser becoming increasingly more involved in fighting in Yemen, using U.S. aid to take the place of money he was wasting in that civil war—I tried again.

I offered an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill for fiscal year 1964 barring aid under the foreign aid program and under the food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, to any country which the President found to be engaged in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or any country receiving U.S. aid. Unfortunately, in order to secure passage of this amendment, an "escape clause" had to be provided. The President had to make findings that a particular country was engaging in or preparing for aggressive military action and, if such finding was made, no further assistance could be given until the President made a further finding that such aggression or preparations for such aggression had ceased.

Despite the fact that the United Arab Republic remained in a state of unilaterally declared war with Israel, despite the fact that Israel ships were still barred from using the Suez Canal, despite the fact that also ships of other nations carrying cargoes to or from Israel could not traverse the Suez Canal, and despite the fact that Nasser retained upwards of 30,000 troops in Yemen at a cost of more than $500,000 a day, the President did not make the findings required under my amendment.

Aid continued to flow to the United Arab Republic in large amounts—$199.7 million in fiscal year 1963 and $140.5 million in fiscal year 1964.

Repeatedly, during this period, together with many of my colleagues, I urged the President to be firm—to insist that as a condition to receiving U.S. economic aid, the United Arab Republic be required to adhere to the principles of international comity and desist from fomenting aggression in the entire Middle East.

Our urgings went unheeded.

Again this year, I was one of the cosponsors of an amendment to the foreign aid bill on the important subject of continued economic aid to the United Arab Republic. This time, however, to make certain that the message got through in no uncertain terms we specified in the amendment that "no assistance shall be furnished under this act to the United Arab Republic." But in order to obtain acceptance of the amendment, we had to insert an "out" in the amendment permitting the President to continue aid if he found "that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and further that such assistance will neither directly nor indirectly assist aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic."

After 6 long years of repeated attempts by me and many of my colleagues in the Congress to obtain action from both Republican and Democratic administrations to halt U.S. economic aid to the United Arab Republic unless it discontinued its aggressive forays in the Middle East, the present administration has finally moved to stop the flow of economic assistance to the United Arab Republic.

The Washington Post for August 9, 1966 reports a press conference held by the new AID Administrator, William S. Gaud, in which he is reported to have said:

> There is no expectation of an early resumption of aid to Egypt.
>
> The United States has been concerned about threats by Egyptian President Nasser to attack pro-West Saudi Arabia and Israel, and also about the opening of a Vietcong office in Cairo.

The administration is to be congratulated on taking this much needed step on the road to peace in the Middle East. I hope it will remain firm and work diligently to take the other needed steps which are still needed to bring about peace in that very troubled and potentially explosive area of the world.

My approval of the action taken is not based on any anti-Arab feelings. I would be first to propose and support the giving of economic aid to the United Arab Republic if it would be sincerely and properly applied to that country's own economic development.

But I approve the administration's actions in cutting off further aid to the United Arab Republic because President Nasser for years has not really been seriously and totally interested in the economic development of his own country, Egypt. Rather, he has been interested to a far greater degree in stirring up trouble in any part of the world—preferably, trouble which would be against the best interests of the United States.

To name but a few of President Nasser's actions over the years that have hurt U.S. interests abroad, he has:

Attempted to develop a United Arab Command with the avowed aim of obliterating the State of Israel, an oasis of democracy and civilization in a desert of backwardness and one of the few effective, democratic allies of the Free World in the Middle East;

Pressured Libya to force the United States to close its airbase there;

Provided Communist-made arms to the Congolese rebels, even while they were slaughtering innocent whites and Negroes and indulging in cannibalism;

Waged—and continues to wage—aggressive warfare in Yemen starting with 28,000 troops and building up to the present troop level of 70,000 troops there;

Used his extensive and expensive propaganda apparatus—built at considerable expense to the U.S. taxpayer—to hurl anti-U.S. propaganda into neighboring countries;

Attempted to undermine the prestige of the United States in Africa;

Supplied Communist-made arms to the Greek Cypriots to perpetuate the conflict in that island;

Recognized East Germany and pressured other Arab countries to do likewise;

Led—and continues to lead—the other Arab nations in an attempt to divert the headwaters of the Jordan to spite and injure Israel;

Instructed the Egyptian police force to stand back when raging mobs burned the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo.

I do not intend the foregoing to be an all-inclusive list of all the actions engaged in by President Nasser to thwart and disrupt not only the foreign policy of the United States but that of all the nations of the free world.

Since I first proposed a curb on economic assistance to the United Arab Republic in 1960, we have poured into that country $898.2 million and all during that period President Nasser has continued to be a thorn in the side of the Middle East, continuing as the No. 1 troublemaker in that area.

Recently, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I held hearings which brought out the abuses by President Nasser in the use of food given him under the food for peace—Public Law 480—program.

Public Law 480 specifically requires that wheat provided a country under title I of that act could not be used so as to cut down normal purchases by that country in the commercial markets.

But that is exactly what Egypt did with the wheat we supplied it. President Nasser did not use the wheat we gave him under the food-for-peace program to feed hungry people in the United Arab Republic. Instead, he used it to supplant his normal purchases of wheat in the open-market and diverted it for sale to obtain foreign exchange to support his aggressive actions.

But Nasser did more than divert the food for peace from his people for sale in the open market. The countries Nasser chose to sell the food to were Communist countries such as Cuba, the Soviet Union, East Germany, and Bulgaria.

This then was the country to which successive administrations continued to give economic assistance despite my repeated protests and the protests of my congressional colleagues over the years—protests which were given concrete form through amendments to successive foreign aid bills.

Now these protests seem to be bearing fruit. I hope the administration's adamant stand will continue until:

First. Egypt has declared its willingness to sit down at the peace table with Israel or publicly to proclaim that its unilateral declaration of war against Israel is at an end.

Second. The United Arab Republic brings to an end its prohibition of the use of the Suez Canal by Israel ships and by ships bearing cargoes to or from Israel.

Third. There has been a withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen.

There is one further step the United States could take to ease tensions in the Middle East.

At present, the arms race in the Middle East is set on a highly dangerous collision course. It can only end—as all arms races must end—in armed conflict.

Over the years, with Soviet Union assistance, Egypt has diverted its economic resources away from its own economic development to increasing steadily the arms it possesses, both in quantity and sophistication. It would be bad enough if this diversion of economic resources to an arms buildup merely slowed down Egypt's economic growth. But it is doing more than that. Because of Nasser's on-again, off-again open threats to the other Arab nations in that area, they too have diverted their own economic resources to arms. And, because of Nasser's even more virulent threats to drive Israel into the sea, Israel has had to devote economic resources it can ill afford to buying more and more arms to maintain a defense posture equal to Nasser's growing military strength.

This arms race must be brought to a halt.

The United States can play an important role in doing so.

Let up hope that our new, changed policy toward Nasser is the first step toward that desirable objective.

MARYLAND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BACKS COMPENSATION TO VICTIMS OF CRIMES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was very happy to note in this morning's newspaper that the Maryland Legislative Council has endorsed a bill to provide compensation to innocent victims of crimes of violence. I am very much interested in this subject, and earlier this week introduced an amended version of my bill, S. 2155, which would provide compensation to victims of crimes in the District of Columbia and other Federal jurisdictions. It has been my hope that my bill would serve as a model for measures in the States.

The proposal which was endorsed in Maryland and which will be recomended to the next session of Maryland's Legislature would provide a maximum payment of $30,000 to persons suffering injuries costing at least $150 or necessitating the loss of at least 2 weeks' pay. The program would be administered through the workmen's compensation commisson, rather than through a separate commission, as in my bill.

Maryland is setting a good example. I had hoped that the Federal Government would move promptly, and set an example, but it is heartening that some of the States are not waiting for Federal example, and are themselves pacesetters. Maryland has won the plaudits of the Nation by this forward step.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news item from the Washington Post of August 11, 1966, carrying the story be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bill Endorsed To Pay Victims of Criminals

Annapolis, August 10.—Maryland's Legislative Council endorsed today a bill to compensate victims for injuries suffered at the hands of criminals.

The measure was adopted for inclusion among legislation the Council will recommend to the next session of the Legislature. It cleared the Council's Budget and Finance Committee without a dissenting vote last night.

It would provide a maximum of $30,000 payment for permanent, total disability and would apply to persons suffering injuries which cost them more than $150 or two weeks' loss of pay.

Claims would be filed through the Workmen's Compensation Commission, which would make awards on the same scale it now does in industrial accident cases.

The bill is patterned largely after one by Sen. John W. Steffey (R-Anne Arundel), which was referred to the council by the Senate Finance Committee.

Sen. Harry R. Hughes (D-Caroline), chairman of the Finance Committee and head of the Council subcommittee which drafted the new bill, said that although no figures were available on potential cost, members were "convinced it will not open the door to a lot of expense on the part of the State or a lot of fraudulent claims."

He said California and New York have similar laws and New Jersey and Illinois are in the process of enacting one if they haven't done so already. England and New Zealand also compensate crime victims for injuries.

The draft bill declares as public policy that "the citizenry of the State have a moral responsibility to relieve the financial burden of the loss sustained" by victims of crimes.

FULLER DISCLOSURE BY SO-CALLED CORPORATE RAIDERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the last session I introduced a bill, S. 2731, designed to prevent, through appropriate disclosure, corporate takeovers by those interested merely in quick profits rather than legitimate operation of businesses. The bill has aroused a great deal of interest in the business and financial community.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has submitted a most helpful and very detailed report on S. 2731 and in general looks favorably upon the need for remedying the problems arising out of corporate takeovers. Since I think it would prove most informative and useful to those active in the securities field and to the general business community, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the memorandum from the Securities and Exchange Commission.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorandum of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, on S. 2731, 89th Congress

S. 2731 would amend sections 16(a) and 10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("the Act") to provide for fuller disclosure by and protection against so-called corporate raiders. Section 1 of the bill would amend section 16(a) of the Act so as to require every person who owns beneficially more than 5 per cent of any class of any equity security which is registered on a national securities exchange to file reports of his securities holdings and transactions with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("the Commission"). At present such a requirement extends only to beneficial holders of more than 10 per cent. The bill would also amend section 16(a) of the Act to provide that the term person therein shall be deemed to include two or more persons acting as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group formed for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or disposing of securities of an issuer.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 10 of the Act by adding proposed new section 10(c), which would prohibit any person, persons acting as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or disposing of securities of an issuer from

1. acquiring or increasing his or their beneficial ownership to more than 5 per cent of any class of any equity security registered on a national securities exchange, or

2. making a cash tender offer or requesting or inviting tenders for cash of such a security which, if consummated, would result in such person or persons owning more than 5 per cent of such security,

without mailing to the Commission and the issuer of the security at least twenty days before the acquisition or solicitation of tenders a statement containing such information as the Commission shall prescribe in the interest of full disclosure and for the protection of investors, including but not limited to information regarding

1. the background and identity of the purchasers,

2. the source of the funds used or to be used to acquire shares, and if the funds are borrowed, a description of the loan transactions and the names of the parties thereto,

3. the purpose of the purchases or prospective purchases,

4. the number of shares beneficially owned by such person and by each associate,

5. the dates and prices of prior purchases and the identity of the broker-dealer through whom the purchases were made or through whom the purchases are to be made,

6. the dates and amounts of short sales made during the period the stock was acquired, identifying the broker or dealer through whom such transactions were made,

7. detailed information as to any contracts, arrangements, or understandings with identified persons with respect to any securities of the issuer, including but not limited to transfer of any of the securities, joint ventures, loan or option arrangements, puts or calls, guaranties against loss or guaranties of profits, division of losses or profits, or the giving or withholding of proxies.

The bill would also require filing with the Commission and transmittal to the issuer of an amendment in the event of any material change in the facts as originally disclosed.

The bill would further provide (proposed section 10(c)(3)) that for the purpose of determining whether a person is the direct or indirect beneficial owner of more than 5 per cent of a class of any security, the class is deemed to consist of the issued stock except that owned by the issuer or held for its account.

The bill would also provide exemptions (proposed section 10(c)(4)) for

1. any acquisition or offer to acquire securities made or proposed to be made by means of a registration statement filed under the Securities Act of 1933 or of a proxy statement subject to section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act,

2. any acquisition or proposed acquisition which, together with all other acquisitions by the same person of securities of the same class during the preceding twelve months, does not exceed 2 per cent of the outstanding securities of the issuer, exclusive of securities held by or for the account of the issuer,

3. acquisitions by the issuer of its own securities, and

4. any acquisition or proposed acquisition exempted by the Commission as not entered into for the purpose of, and not having the effect of, changing or influencing the control of the issuer or otherwise as not comprehended within the purposes of the proposed bill.

Finally, proposed section 10(c)(5) would make it unlawful for an issuer to purchase its own shares in contravention of rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commission in order to provide holders of the securities with information relating to the reasons for the purchase, the source of funds, the number of shares to be purchased, the price to be paid, the method of purchase, and any other information not previously furnished which the Commission deems material to a determination of whether or not holders should sell their securities, or which the Commission deems material in order to prevent fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative acts or practices.

The Commission is in accord with the overall objectives of S. 2731. There are, however, certain areas in which we believe it could be improved both from the standpoint of providing a practical, effective means of accomplishing those objectives and from the standpoint of making the operation of the bill less burdensome to those who would become subject to its provisions. We also have one or two suggestions which are more matters of technique of drafting than of substance but which the Committee might like to consider if it does regard them as improving the mechanics of the bill. Our suggestions follow in the order of the sections of the bill to which they relate. Since our suggested changes are somewhat extensive we have put them in a "Comparative Print" which is attached and to which we refer herein from time to time.

1. Paragraph (1) of the first section of the bill would amend section 16(a) of the Act so as to impose its insider reporting requirements upon the beneficial owner of more than 5 per cent of any class of any equity security whereas those requirements presently apply

only to beneficial owners of more than 10 per cent. This change in section 16(a) would in turn impose short-swing profit liability under section 16(b) on all beneficial owners whose holdings were more than 5 per cent whereas that liability now attaches only in the case of holdings in excess of 10 per cent. This results from the fact that section 16(b) does not contain the "more than 10 per centum" phrase. Instead this section refers back to "such beneficial owner" as set forth in section 16(a) so a change from 10 per cent to 5 per cent in (a) would necessarily carry with it a similar change in (b). It is our understanding that the bill is designed to deal with so-called "take over bids" which is a somewhat different subject than recovery by an issuing corporation of short-swing profits made by its insiders. Accordingly, on the assumption that it is not the intent of the bill to increase the class of insiders who would be subject to section 16(b) short-swing trading liability, the Commission notes that the proposed amendment to section 16(a) would in turn necessitate an amendment to section 16(b), not present in the bill as now drafted, so as to continue to fix insider liability at the level of more than 10 per cent rather than to impose it on beneficial owners between 5 and 10 per cent. It is our suggestion that rather than to have to amend section 16(b) in order to offset the proposed amendment to section 16(a), consideration should be given to not amending either section.

As now drafted S. 2731 imposes the "more than 5 per centum" test in section 2 of the bill as to both the acquisition of beneficial ownership and the making of tender offers. In view of this provision in section 2 of the bill the only additional result which would flow from amending section 16(a) as now provided in the first section of the bill would be to require more than 5 per cent owners to report changes in their holdings on a month to month basis. While such reporting is, of course, highly pertinent to the provisions of section 16(b) its value from the standpoint of the underlying purposes of this bill is less clear. Subparagraph (iv) of section 2 of the bill provides that the issuer and the Commission must be furnished information concerning the number of shares beneficially owned, either directly or indirectly, and amendments must be filed if there are any material changes in the facts as previously reported. Thus it seems unnecessary to impose the month to month reporting requirement under section 16(a) to beneficial owners of more than 5 per cent, rather than 10 per cent, if these persons are not subject to section 16(b) of the Act.

2. Turning to section 2 of the bill we note that it is cast as an amendment to section 10 of the Act which is basically a section granting the Commission rule-making powers in the antifraud area to prevent use of the mails and interstate facilities incident to manipulative and deceptive devices. Furthermore, section 2 of the bill as presently worded would make unlawful through use of the mails or interstate facilities the acquisition of holdings in excess of 5 per cent and tender offers involving more than 5 per cent, in the absence of a 20-day advance notice given to the issuer and a 20-day advance statement filed with the Commission. The Commission suggests that proposed Section 10(c)(1)(A) of the bill, which deals with acquisitions as distinguished from tender offers (which will be discussed later in this memorandum), might better be couched in terms of an amendment to section 13 of the Act, a section dealing with reporting requirements, and be stated in terms of imposing a positive duty to give notice and file statements. Additionally, we would suggest that, in the interest of full disclosure, a copy of the statement be sent to each exchange where the security is traded.

3. Purely as a matter of form we see no reason to designate the paper which would be sent to the issuer as a "notice" and that which would be filed with the Commission as a "statement." We suggest that duplicate original statements go to the issuer, the Commission, and each exchange.

4. The Commission foresees difficulty in requiring 20 days advance notice of a proposed acquisition in excess of 5 per cent and believes that a statement filed not more than 5 days after the acquisition would be less burdensome to beneficial owners who become subject to it. Indeed, we envision some types of situations in which compliance with an advance notice requirement would be impossible, such as acquisitions by inheritance or by gift of which the recipient had no advance notice. We would also suggest that one who obtains the *right* to acquire or increase his beneficial ownership to more than 5 per cent should be made subject to the reporting requirements, in order to reach options or contracts to purchase, which are also relevant to the purposes of the bill.

5. As you will observe from subparagraph (A) on page 2 of our Comparative Print, the commission suggests that it be given rule-making power to require such of the information in the subparagraph numbered (i) through (vii) and such additional information as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. The Commission has analogous rule-making authority under sections 7 and 10 of the Securities Act of 1933 to determine what information or documents should or should not be included in a registration statement or a prospectus filed under that Act. Similarly, under section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 the Commission has been given authority to regulate the solicitation of proxies through the adoption of rules and regulations and has done so in its comprehensive Regulation 14A, the proxy rules.

6. Subparagraphs numbered (i) through (vii) in section 2 of the bill set forth certain matters which would be required to be contained in the statement to the issuer, the Commission, and each exchange. In the main these subparagraphs call for information which would appear to be pertinent and not unduly burdensome to supply and not subject to any reasonable objection that any harm would come from including them in the statement. The Commission would suggest, however, a revision of the latter part of subparagraph (i) which we believe would simplify the language and clarify its meaning while leaving the substance undisturbed. The proposed change appears in the Comparative Print. The Commission would also suggest that subparagraph (ii) require, in addition to the *"source* of the funds," the *amount* thereof, and that the words "or other consideration" be added to the subsection immediately following the word "funds" in both places. The amount of the funds is relevant to the purposes of the bill, and the addition of the words "or other consideration" would make it clear that purchases or prospective purchases involving an exchange are intended to be covered. The Commission would also suggest that the first word of subparagraph (iii) should be "if," that the word "is" should be inserted after the words "prospective purchases" and that the words "and, if made" at that point should be deleted. Such changes would appear to make the information to be required thereunder more directly relevant to the problem of corporate takeovers. The Commission also suggests that subparagraph (iv) be amended to include information of the number of shares concerning which there is a right to acquire. This is merely in line with a previous suggestion in paragraph 4 above.

The Commission suggests that subparagraphs (v) and (vi) should be deleted. (v) would entail disclosure of the relationship between brokers and their customers under circumstances which brokers would undoubtedly feel did not justify having the identity of their customers made public. (vi) is probably unnecessary as beneficial owners of more than 10 per cent of a registered security are already prohibited by section 16(c) of the Act from making short sales and persons owning less than 10 per cent appear to be rather unlikely to resort to short-sales as a technique to accomplish acquisitions or take-overs. If, however, experience should prove otherwise the Commission could adopt rules and regulations to require such disclosure in accordance with the rule-making power which is suggested be granted in this section.

The provision at the bottom of page 4 of the bill dealing with amending the statement to disclose any material changes is an important and necessary part of the bill. We think it should be amended, however, to provide that a statement be filed with the exchange, as is suggested above with regard to the initial statement. In addition, we believe that the words "appropriate" and "promptly" should be deleted and that the amended statements should be made to comply with rules and regulations to be adopted by the Commission. This would ensure the flexibility necessary to adapt to whatever changes may be indicated by practical experience or by changing circumstances, and would avoid uncertainty as to the meaning of "appropriate" and "promptly" in this context.

7. Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) in section 2 of the bill (top of page 5) would provide in substance that two or more persons acting "as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group . . . shall be deemed a 'person' for the purposes of this subsection." There is a like provision earlier in the bill as a part of the proposed amendment of section 16(a) of the Act but we did not comment upon it at that point in view of our suggestion that perhaps the portion of S. 2731 which would amend section 16(a) should be deleted. This provision is in effect an amendment to or an enlargement of the existing definition of "person" in section 3(a)(9) of the Act, though its impact at this point in the bill would be limited to the particular subsection (c) in which it is contained. Moreover, insofar as it refers to a "partnership" this provision is duplicative of the present section 3(a)(9) definition. As a matter of drafting technique, particularly to keep all definitions of terms in one section of the Act, namely, the present section 3(a), instead of scattered through subsequent amendments to other sections of the Act, we believe that the proposed subsection (c)(2) should be eliminated. The term "syndicate or other group" can be defined by the Commission, pursuant to its power under section 3(b) of the Act, as included within the meaning of "unincorporated organization," which is one of the meanings given to the word "person" in section 3(a)(9) of the Act.

8. Proposed subsection (c)(3) of the bill would provide that in determining what constitutes more than 5 per cent of a class of a security, such class should be deemed to consist of "the amount of such class which has been issued . . ." The Commission suggests that the quoted clause be changed to read "the amount of the outstanding securities of such class." This suggested change is more precise and more consonant with terminology found elsewhere in the bill including a provision in the next paragraph ((4)(B)) that the "the term 'outstanding securities of a class shall not include securities of the class held by or for the account of the isuer." The Commission also suggests and has inserted in its Comparative Print at this point ((*d*)(2)) a reference to pro-

posed section 14(d)(1) of its Comparative Print, dealing with tender offers, the purpose of which is to avoid the necessity of repeating in that section the conditions under which a person will be deemed a beneficial owner of more than 5 per cent of a security.

9. The Commission suggests that the introductory phrase of proposed subsection (c)(4) be revised and has done so in its Comparative Print ((*d*)(*3*)) to make clear that the various exemptions detailed there also apply to tender offers under proposed section 14(d). Under proposed subsection (c)(4)(A) these exemptions would include, among other things, acquisitions made by means of "a proxy statement subject to section 14 of this title." It is the Commission's view that the quoted language should probably be deleted. It is largely superfluous in that the provisions of proposed subsection (c) would seldom be germane to matters having to do with proxy statements which come within section 14 of the Act. Moreover in such rare exceptions as might arise, it is conceivable that it would be desirable to have the provisions contained in proposed subsection (c), as well as the provisions in the present section 14 of the Act, apply to the situation. At least it is difficult to conceive of a situation in which such application would be undesirable.

10. Proposed subsection (c)(4)(B) exempts from the bill any acquisition or proposed acquisition which, together with all other acquisitions during the preceding twelve months, does not exceed 2 per cent of the "outstanding securities of that class." The Commission suggests that the quoted clause be changed to read "outstanding securities of that class at the time of the acquisition." This suggested change makes clear that the 2 per cent is to be computed at the time of the acquisition or proposed acquisition.

Finally, the Commission notes that the last paragraph of the bill, subsection (c)(5), redesignated in the Comparative Print as (*e*), deals with a somewhat different subject than the rest of the bill but a subject which is closely related. This paragraph would give the Commission rule-making power in the area of issuing corporations purchasing their own equity securities, the rules thereunder being designed to provide existing holders of such equity securities with information on various matters "which the Commission deems to be material to a determination as to whether or not such securities should be sold, or in order to prevent such acts and practices as are fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative." It should be noted that under Section 10(b) of the Act the Commission has general rule-making authority to prohibit corporations from purchasing or selling their own shares in a manipulative or deceptive manner. Thus we assume that subsection (c)(5) of the bill is not in derogation of the Commission's power under section 10(b), but rather is intended to expand that power by enabling the Commission to adopt rules and regulations which will have a beneficial and prophylactic effect and which are designed to prevent, through appropriate disclosure, fraudulent or deceptive practices from occurring.

Purchase by issuers of their own shares can have a serious effect on the market and may be unfair to existing shareholders. Accordingly, the protections in subsection (c)(5) of the bill appear to be an appropriate counterpart to the protections preventing deceptive or unfair practices in attempts by others to take over from existing management. The Commission is accordingly in favor of this portion of the bill, although it proposes certain rearrangements of the language not affecting the substance of the section but rather giving the Commission more flexibility in requiring disclosure. We refer the Committee to sub-section (*e*) on page 6 of the Comparative Print where the proposed changes appear.

11. Turning back to that part of section 2 of the bill, (c)(1)(B), which deals with tender offers the Commission believes that it would be appropriate to place these matters in section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the proxy section, and incorporate in the proposed statute administrative machinery to handle tender offers similar to the Commission's proxy rules. We refer the Committee to page 7 of the Comparative Print where, under proposed section 14(d)(1), the language of the bill dealing with tender offers is placed. The Commission suggests the deletion of, and has deleted in its Comparative Print, the word "cash" wherever it appears on the ground that there does not seem to be any reason for excluding from the reach of the statute tender offers for the exchange of stock or other consideration.

The Commission also believes that the requirement of a 20-day advance notice to the issuer and the Commission is unnecessary for the protection of security holders to whom such offers would be directed and suggests instead that 5 days prior to the making of a tender offer notice be given to the Commission in a confidential statement. Such statement should contain such of the information contained in the statement dealing with acquisitions and such additional information as the Commission by rules and regulations may prescribe. The Commission also suggests a provision for filing additional soliciting material with the Commission at least two days prior to the time copies of it are sent to security holders. The Commission should also be given similar rule-making power with respect to the content of such statements. Under the Commission's proposal all copies of such preliminary statements would be clearly marked "Preliminary Copies" and definitive copies of all statements, in the form in which they are furnished to security holders, would then be filed with the Commission and sent to the issuer at the same time they are furnished to security holders. The Commission also suggests that any request or invitation or advertisement making a tender offer should itself be a part of the statement filed with the Commission and should contain such of the information contained in the statement as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe. This would assure that stockholders to whom written tender offers are made or who may read newspaper advertisements concerning such offers would have immediately available to them information from the statement, and any additional information which is deemed to be pertinent to arriving at an informed judgment on whether to sell or to retain their stock in the subject corporation. Finally, the Commission would be given discretionary authority to shorten the five-day and two-day time periods.

12. The Commission suggests, as proposed section 14(d)(2), that any solicitation or recommendation to security holders to accept or reject a tender offer should be made in accordance with the Commission's rules and regulations. This proposed section would provide the Commission with authority to regulate the manner and content of any opposition to or support for a tender offer. In order to place opponents of tender offers on a more nearly equal footing with proponents, the Commission contemplates the adoption of a rule similar to Rule 14a-12 under the proxy rules whereby opponents would be permitted, subject to certain conditions, to send out preliminary countersoliciting material almost immediately upon learning of the tender offer. There would, of course, be a rule requiring that all such preliminary countersoliciting material be filed first with the Commission for its review and that definitive countersoliciting material containing prescribed information be sent to security holders at the earliest practicable time thereafter.

13. The Commission suggests, as proposed section 14(d)(3), a provision that securities deposited pursuant to a tender offer may be withdrawn by the depositor at any time within the first seven days from the tender offer and at any time after 60 days from the date of the original offer except as the Commission prescribes otherwise. The purpose of the seven day provision is to afford time for those opposed to the tender offer not only to dissuade security holders from depositing their stock but also to convince them to withdraw it if already deposited. The 60-day time limitation is provided in order that investors may not have their securities tied up indefinitely while the offeror makes up his mind whether or not to accept them or seeks to obtain additional tenders before acting. The Commission is given rule-making power in view of the fact that in some situations the 60-day limitation might prove unnecessarily restrictive for bona fide offers.

14. The Commission suggests, as proposed section 14(d)(4), that where tender offers are made for less than all the outstanding equity securities of a class and more securities are deposited than the offer calls for, the securities will be taken up on a pro rata basis according to the number of securities deposited by each holder. We believe that a provision of this kind would be more fair to all security holders and would discourage hasty, ill-considered action by some who would assume otherwise that priority in the time of deposit would control.

15. The Commission suggests, as proposed section 14(d)(5), that where the terms of a tender offer are changed by increasing the price or other consideration to be paid for the securities, all holders should be given the increased consideration for their securities whether their securities have been taken up prior to the change or not. The purpose of this provision is to remove a purely fortuitous factor from the calculation of the amount security holders should receive for their securities by assuring them of the same price for their securities regardless of when they are taken up, and to avoid the discriminatory effect of paying some holders more than others, since security holders tendering their shares pursuant to a tender offer normally assume that all tendering security holders will receive the same price.

16. The Commission suggests, as proposed section 14(d)(6), a requirement that neither persons making or soliciting tender offers nor management or any other person who might circularize or solicit shareholders in opposition to or in favor of any such offer shall in connection therewith make any false, deceptive or misleading statement or omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading, or engage in such acts and practices as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative. The Commission believes that a provision such as this presents an additional protection, beyond the rule-making power suggested in other parts of the bill, against possible dissemination of inaccurate or incomplete information or fraudulent acts or practices by persons who make or invite tender offers and affords a more practical means of preventing inaccurate or incomplete persentations or fraudulent acts or practices by persons opposing or favoring such tender offers than would be provided by additional rule-making power with respect to acts and practices of such persons or to materials emanating from them in their efforts to get existing shareholders to accept or not to accept tender offers. This would appear to be especially true in view of the shortness of time for such persons to act after the tender offer is made and the fact

that possible grounds for opposing or favoring varying types of tender offers are so wide and unpredictable in scope as to make it a difficult area to deal with on a rule-making basis.

Comparative Print, S. 2731, 89th Congress, 1st Session

A bill providing for fuller disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

(Words to be added to the bill are in italics; words to be deleted are in black brackets.)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, [That section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended—]

[(1) by striking out "10 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum"; and]

[(2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "When two or more persons act as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or disposing of securities of an issuer, such syndicate or group shall be deemed a 'person' for the purposes of this section."]

[Sec. 2.] *That* Section [10] *13* of the Securities Sxchange Act of 1934 is amended—

(1) By adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

["(c)](*d*) (*1*) [Except as otherwise herein provided, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly,] *Every person, who* by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by the use of the mails, *directly or indirectly—*

["(A) to acquire] *acquires or obtains the right to acquire* the beneficial ownership of, or increases *or obtains the right to increase* his beneficial ownership to, more than 5 per centum of any class of any equity security which is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title *shall, within five days after such acquisition, or the obtaining of such right to acquire, send to the issuer of the security at its principal executive office, by registered or certified mail, send to each exchange where the security is traded, and file with the Commission, a statement as herein below described.* [or]

["(B) to make a cash tender offer for, or a request or invitation for tenders for cash of, such a security which, if consummated, would result in such person owning beneficially more than 5 per centum of such security.]

[until the expiration of twenty days after such person has sent to the issuer of the security at its principal executive office, by registered mail, a notice, and has filed with the Commission a statement, each of which]

(*A*) *Each such statement* shall contain such *of the* information *specified in subsections* (*i*)-(*v*) *of this section, and such additional information,* as the Commission [shall] *may* by rules and regulations prescribe *as necessary or appropriate* in the *public* interest [of full disclosure and] *or* for the protection of investors. [including but not limited to information regarding—]

"(i) the background and identity of all persons by whom or on whose behalf the purchases [previously effected or] *have been or are* to be effected, [have been or are to be made,]

"(ii) the source *and amount* of the funds *or other consideration* used or to be used in making the purchases, and if any part of the purchase price or proposed purchase price is represented or is to be represented by funds *or other consideration* borrowed or otherwise obtained for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or trading such security, a description of the transaction and the names of the parties thereto,

"(iii) *if* the purpose of the purchases or prospective purchases *is* [and, if made] to acquire control of the business of the issuer of the securities or to obtain representation on its board of directors, the plans of such persons with respect to the conduct and continuation of the business of such issuer,

"(iv) the number of shares of such security *which are* beneficially owned, *and the number of shares concerning which there is a right to acquire,* directly or indirectly, by (a) such person, and (b) by each associate (as defined in the rules and regulations of the Commission under this Act) of such person, giving the name and address of each such associate, *and*

["(v) the dates and prices of each purchase of the security theretofore made by such person, and the identity of the securities broker or dealer through whom such purchases were effected, or through whom the proposed purchase is to be effected,]

["(vi) the dates and amounts of any short sales (as defined in rule 3b–3 under this Act) with respect to such security effected by or on behalf of such person during any period in which he has acquired any of the shares, identifying the broker or dealer through whom such purchases were made, and]

["(vii)] "(*v*) information as to any contracts, arrangements, or understandings with any person with respect to any securities of the issuer, including but not limited to transfer of any of the securities, joint ventures, loan or option arrangements, puts or calls, guaranties against loss or guaranties of profits, division of losses or profits, or the giving or withholding of proxies, naming the persons with whom such contracts, arrangements, or understandings have been entered into, and giving the details thereof.

(*B*) If any material change occurs in the facts set forth in the [notice] *statements* to the issuer *and the exchange* and *the* statement filed with the Commission, an [appropriate] amendment shall be transmitted [promptly] to the issuer *and the exchange* and shall be filed [promptly] with the Commission[.] *in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.*

["(2) When two or more persons act as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or disposing of securities of an issuer, such syndicate or group shall be deemed a 'person' for the purposes of this subsection.]

["(3)] (*2*) In determining, for purposes of this subsection *and of section 14*(*d*) (*1*) *of this title,* whether a person is the beneficial owner, direct or indirect, of more than 5 per centum of a class of any security, such class shall be deemed to consist of the amount of *the outstanding securities of* such class, [which has been issued,] exclusive of any securities of such class held by or for the account of the issuer.

["(4)] (*3*) The provisions of this subsection *and of section 14*(*d*) *of this title* shall not apply in respect of—

"(A) Any acquisition or offer to acquire securities made or proposed to be made by means of a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933. [or of a proxy statement subject to section 14 of this title.]

"(B) Any acquisition or proposed acquisition of a security which, together with all other acquisitions by the same person of securities of the same class during the preceding twelve months, does not exceed 2 percent of the outstanding securities of that class *at the time of the acquisition.* As used herein the term "outstanding securities" of a class shall not include securities of the class held by or for the account of the issuer.

"(C) Any acquisition of an equity security by the issuer of such security.

"(D) Any acquisition or proposed acquisition of a security which the Commission, by rules or regulations or by order, shall exempt from the provisions of this subsection as not entered into for the purpose of, and not having the effect of, changing or influencing the control of the issuer or otherwise as not comprehended within the purposes of this subsection.

["(5)] (*e*) It shall be unlawful for any issuer to purchase any equity security which it has issued [in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors in order to provide the] *unless it provides* holders of equity securities of such class with *such* information relating to the reasons for such purchase, the source of funds, the number of shares to be purchased, the price to be paid for such securities, the method of purchase, and [any other] *such additional* information, *as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors,* [including financial information not previously furnished to the holders of such security] *or* which the Commission deems to be material to a determination [as to] whether [or not] such security should be sold, or in order to prevent such acts and practices as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative."

Sec. 2. That section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof new subsections as follows:

(*d*) (*1*) *It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, by the use of the mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce or of any facility of a national securities exchange or otherwise, to make a tender offer for, or a request or invitation for tenders of, any class of any equity security which is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title which, if consummated, would result in such person owning beneficially more than 5 per centum of such security, unless five days prior to the making of such tender offer or request or invitation for tenders, such person has filed with the Commission a statement containing such of the information specified in section 13*(*d*) (*1*) (*A*) *and* (*B*) *of this title, and such additional information, as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. All requests or invitations for tenders or advertisements making a tender offer or requesting or inviting tenders of such a security shall be filed as a part of such statement and shall contain such of the information contained in such statement as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe. Preliminary copies of any additional material soliciting or requesting such tender offers subsequent to the initial solicitation or request shall be a statement containing such information as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors and shall be filed with the Commission at least two days prior to the date copies of such material are first sent or given to security holders. All copies of preliminary statements filed with the Commission hereunder shall be clearly marked "Preliminary Copies" and shall be for the information of the Commission only, except that such statements may be disclosed to any appropriate department or agency of government and the Commission may make such inquiries or investigation in regard to such statements as may be necessary for an adequate review thereof by the Commission. Definitive copies of all statements, in the form of which such material is furnished to security holders, shall be filed with, or mailed for filing to, the Commission and shall be sent to the issuer not later than the date such material is first published or sent or given to any security holders. The time periods contained in this* *subsection may be shortened as the Commission may direct.*

(d)(2) *Any solicitation or recommendation to the holders of such a security to accept or reject a tender offer or request or invitation for tenders shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.*

(d)(3) *Securities deposited pursuant to a tender offer or request or invitation for tenders may be withdrawn by or on behalf of the depositor at any time until the expiration of seven days after the time definitive copies of the offer or request or invitation are first published or sent or given to security holders, and at any time after 60 days from the date of the original tender offer or request or invitation except as the Commission may otherwise prescribe by rules, regulations or order as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.*

(d)(4) *Where any person makes a tender offer, or request or invitation for tenders for less than all the outstanding equity securities of a class, and where a greater number of securities is deposited pursuant thereto than such person is bound or willing to take up and pay for, the securities taken up shall be taken up as nearly as may be pro rata, disregarding fractions, according to the number of securities deposited by each depositor.*

(d)(5) *Where any person varies the terms of a tender offer, or request or invitation for tenders before the expiration thereof by increasing the consideration offered to holders of such securities, such person shall pay the increased consideration to each security holder whose securities are taken up and paid for pursuant to the tender offer or request or invitation for tenders whether or not such securities have been taken up by such person before the variation of the tender offer or request or invitation.*

(d)(6) *It shall be unlawful for any person making or soliciting tender offers, or management, or any person or persons who circularize or solicit security holders in opposition to or in favor of any such offer, to make in connection therewith any false, deceptive or misleading statements, or omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading, or to engage in such acts and practices as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative.*

A FURTHER REPORT ON GRAND JURY FINDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH CLEVELAND RIOT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed the grand jury report of Cuyahoga County dealing with the recent riot in Cleveland. Today I wish to supplement what I said yesterday. Part of my statement today will be a repetition of yesterday's remarks, but in the main it will be supplemental material taken out of the grand jury report.

The following are excerpts from grand jury report filed in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 9, 1966:

> This jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business.
>
> They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism and some of whom are either members of or officers in the Communist Party.
>
> It further notes the presence of many of these same individuals and organizations in another instance of lawlessness and disorder, that on Superior Avenue, which bore many of the striking similarities to the Hough area disorders. It notes the further significant fact that the Superior Avenue episode preceded the Hough area disorders by less than a month. Some of the same people were observed in both places on several nights of the disorders.
>
> It is no casual happenstance or coincidence that those throwing fire bombs or bricks or bottles, or pillaging or generally engaged in disorder and lawlessness were, in the main, young people obviously assigned, trained and disciplined in the roles they were to play in the pattern of these dual outbreaks separated by less than one month.
>
> Nor, by the same token, is it happenstance or even just singular coincidence:
>
> 1. That the overall pattern for fire-bombing and destruction to both the Superior and Hough areas was so highly selective;
>
> 2. That the targets were plainly agreed upon;
>
> 3. That certain places were identified to be hit and that certain other places were similarly spared.
>
> Lewis Robinson has been affiliated with the Freedom Fighters of Ohio, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club which he helped to found, the JFK House of which he is the ultimate head, the Deacons for Defense and the Revolutionary Action Movement. All of these . . . are black nationalist clubs . . . Harlell Jones is affiliated with the JFK House, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club, the Revolutionary Action Movement. He is vice president of Deacons for Defense.
>
> Along with Lewis G. Robinson, Harlell Jones caused 2,000 pieces of literature to be printed and circulated citing alleged instances of "police brutality" and on the eve of the Hough riots circulated the greatest number of these to youth.
>
> Police agencies presented evidence that Ware-Bey, Robinson and Jones all purchase quantities of rifles and all belonged to the rifle clubs here and in other cities . . . Speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for rifle clubs and . . . instructions were given in the use of Molotov cocktails and how and when to throw them to obtain the maximum effect.
>
> Further irrefutable evidence was shown to the effect that Robinson pledged reciprocal support to and with the Communist Party of Ohio . . . It was established before the jury that the leaders of the W. E. B. DuBois (club) and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough area disorders.
>
> Finally, evidence was presented that UJAMA is an organization dedicated to black power and has begun its efforts to establish itself in the Cleveland area. Their philosophy is that black people should be governed by themselves in every respect and that anything pertaining to the rights of Negroes must be cleared through the central organization of UJAMA, which has flourished in New York and has spread into other places and is embraced locally by Lewis Robinson and his lieutenants at JFK House.

The report says these men moved into Cleveland from Chicago, New York, and Brooklyn and established themselves near "the point or origin of the Hough area troubles. They made swift contact with the J.F.K. House leadership and with the leaders of the Communist Party throughout the Ohio Valley district, including Ohio."

Mr. President, for the purpose of identifying the operations of the J.F.K. House, the grand jury report identifies "the J.F.K. House"—meaning the Jomo Freedom Kenyatta House in Cleveland—as sort of a general headquarters for the rioters. It identifies the J.F.K. House leaders as Lewis G. Robinson and his wife, Beth; Harlell Jones; Elbert D. Ware-Bey; Philip Morris.

FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on Monday, August 1, 1966, tragedy struck in Austin, Tex. A student at the University of Texas killed his mother and his wife, then mowed down 45 other persons, 13 of whom were fatally wounded. The student, armed with a fantastic array of guns and hundreds of rounds of ammunition, killed and maimed at will for 80 minutes before a brave young police officer was able to stop him.

It is sad and painful to recall the tragic events of that day. If it were possible, I would prefer to forget that such senseless slaughter could occur in the United States. However, it did happen—as the families of the dead and wounded persons know only too well—and we in the Congress have an obligation to limit the chances for a recurrence of such carnage. We cannot turn away from this responsibility.

The Congress now has a mandate from the President of the United States to enact an effective gun-control measure. In a recent speech, President Johnson stated that control of firearms is necessary "to help reduce the unrestricted sale of firearms to those who cannot be trusted in their use."

The Congress has a mandate from the people also. According to the Gallup poll, nearly 75 percent of the American people want some kind of effective gun-control legislation.

Finally, the Congress has a mandate from law-enforcement officers from across the Nation. Last fall, the International Association of Chiefs of Police overwhelmingly voted to support congressional efforts to provide stricter control of firearms traffic. It specifically urged support of S. 1592, which would amend the Federal Firearms Act.

In my home State of Hawaii, the Honolulu Police Department, which protects 85 percent of the population, is pleading for an effective measure to control firearms. Acting Police Chief Yoshio Hasegawa has said:

> We must work to see that no one who is mentally deranged or on parole for any kind of violent crime has a gun.

S. 1592, which was approved by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and is now pending in the full Judiciary Committee, is definitely the first step toward controlling the indiscriminate sale of firearms. It would limit the number of guns and rifles in the possession of minors and persons with serious criminal records. It would limit the mail-order sale of firearms in interstate commerce unless the purchaser is positively identified.

In essence, S. 1592 is aimed to help stop violence by shooting. It is a meritorious measure that is vital in the fight to contain the criminal use of firearms.

Unfortunately, there are some who oppose S. 1592. They are not persuaded by the President of the United States, nor by the overwhelming consensus of the American people, nor by the men whose job is to protect all of us. Nor are they persuaded by the preponderance of evidence showing that the ready availability of firearms is a key factor in the thousands of homicides committed each year in the United States.

I respect the views of those opposing this legislation. But it is my hope that by the time S. 1592 is brought to the floor of the Senate, many of them will have come to recognize and acknowledge the need for the control of firearms.

In an attempt to provoke their reconsideration, I respectfully bring their attention to a series of articles condensed from a book entitled "The Right To Bear Arms" by Carl Bakal, a writer and longtime student of the gun laws in the United States. Mr. Bakal's articles, which were written for and syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance, appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser during the past week.

I also respectfully request that those who oppose this legislation consider the article, "A Gun-Toting Nation," which appeared in the August 12, 1966, issue of Time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. President, in his articles, Mr. Bakal sets forth some startling facts. Since the turn of the century, more than 750,000 Americans—men, women, and children—have been killed by firearms. This civilian toll is far greater than the total 530,000 American soldiers who have been killed in battle in every war we have fought since the Revolutionary War.

Today, 50 Americans a day, or 17,000 a year, are killed by firearms. This rate of civilian deaths is three and one-half times greater than the daily casualty list of American servicemen dying in Vietnam.

Thus, while the shootings on the University of Texas campus were sensational, Mr. Bakal painfully reminds us that there were many other Americans who died as a result of the misuse of firearms on Monday, August 1. Regrettably, there have been more deaths since that terrible day, and many, many more in the days that followed.

Mr. Bakal notes that in 1964 there were 9,250 murders committed in the United States. Fifty-five percent, or 5,090, of the murder victims were killed by guns.

Significantly, he added:

> Where guns could be more easily purchased, they were found to play a greater part in murder.

Mr. Bakal cites the effectiveness of the gun lobbies and traces the "unbroken record of failure" of the gun bills which have been introduced in the Congress in the last 10 years. Consequently, Mr. Bakal concludes:

> The world's greatest arsenal of privately owned guns is in the American home.

The article, "A Gun Toting Nation," effectively corroborates the statistics and findings of the Bakal articles. The Time article cites an FBI report which correlated the effectiveness of a gun law with the incidence of homicides in the State.

The FBI report held that "in Dallas, where firearm regulations are practically nonexistent—as throughout all of Texas—72 percent of all homicides were committed with guns" as opposed to "25 percent in New York, where the State's tough 55-year-old Sullivan law requires police permits for the mere possession of handguns."

The Time article concedes that since the killer had not previously had a criminal record, last Monday's tragedy in Austin could not have been prevented even under strict arms-licensing legislation. However, it concludes that a firearms regulation such as that proposed by S. 1592 "would keep guns away from at least some who might misuse them."

It was with this purpose in mind that, as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I helped draft S. 1592.

It is with this view that I shall work steadfastly for the enactment of S. 1592 in this session of Congress.

It is with this view that I hope the Congress will accept and pass S. 1592.

Mr. President, it is long past the time for effective controls of firearms. The first step—embodied in S. 1592—must be taken.

I respectfully urge the Congress to act swiftly and favorably upon S. 1592.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Aug. 2, 1966]

FIFTY A DAY SHOT TO DEATH IN GUN-HAPPY AMERICA

(Ever since the assassination of President Kennedy, Americans have become increasingly aware of the easy accessibility of guns. The country is virtually an armed camp, with—according to a recent Gallup poll—at least one gun in the possession of every other American household. And the guns are being used, at the rate of 17,000 fatal shooting a year. This is the first of a series of articles condensed from the new book by Carl Bakal. "The Right To Bear Arms," published by McGraw-Hill. Bakal, a longtime student of America's gun laws, explores the extent of the problem and tells what is being done—and not done—about it.)

(By Carl Bakal)

NEW YORK.—A strange and peculiar American plague has long swept our land—a plague of guns. Every year, guns, or firearms, claim more and more lives in this country.

Since the turn of the century, the plague has brought death to the astonishing total of more than 750,000 Americans—men, women, and children—a figure based on official, though incomplete, government records. Where complete records available for the years since 1900, and any records at all for the earlier year of our republic, the nation's cumulative toll of firearms fatalities would run into the millions.

But even the figures we do have for the past 60-odd years represent a civilian toll far greater than the 530,000 Americans killed in battle in all of our wars—from the start of the Revolution through the current conflict in Viet Nam. In no other country of the world do so many people kill and maim each other—and themselves—with firearms.

The fatal shootings in our streets, in our homes, and in other public and private places now continue at the rate of 17,000 a year—or nearly 50 a day.

A robbery occurs in the United States every five minutes. Many involve the use of guns and result in the injury and death of robbers, victims, policemen and others who happen to get in the way.

Here are stories that made newspaper headlines on just one day not too long ago:

In Brooklyn, N.Y., Walter Newling missed death by inches as he was grazed by bullets when he grabbed for one of four gunmen who were making off with his company's $12,000 payroll.

In Wilmington, Del., Thomas H. Winsett was indicted for the shotgun slaying of State Trooper Robert A. Paris, who had caught Winsett and two accomplices with a carload of stolen goods at a motel.

In Los Angeles, factory worker and part-time photographer Richard Claborn fretted over $20 he thought he was owed for some pictures taken for Louis Sanders, an advertising salesman. Sanders paid, then stopped the check.

"Lou's going to be awful sorry he didn't give me the $20," Claborn told Mrs. Sanders just before gunning down her husband in his office with a 30–30 caliber deer rifle.

In Atlanta, Everett Gross was shot to death during an argument with two men: one had taken offense at the slapping of his 7-year-old daughter.

In Denver, Shiro Matsuno died of a gunshot wound inflicted by another citizen who charged that Matsuno had hit him first—with a snowball.

In Santa Rosa, Calif., John K. Naumann, an 80-year-old retired tool and die maker, exercising his so-called constitutional right to keep and bear arms, impulsively whipped out a pistol to kill his wife, Hedwig, age 78. Naumann harbored the belief—later described as "illusional"—that she was conducting an affair with an elderly next-door neighbor.

In a Miami hospital that day was 2-year-old Dwayne Saunders, struck in the head by a bullet discharged by his 4-year-old brother James from a .22 caliber revolver discovered in Daddy's dresser drawer.

Mother had stepped over to a neighbor's while the two boys and their 6-month-old brother supposedly were asleep. Fortunately, the bullet, though it traveled three inches under Dwayne's scalp, did not penetrate his skull.

And so it went. The names are real. The incidents described did happen. The day was fairly typical of any of the others in which guns now claim, on the average, nearly 50 lives, or about one every half-hour.

However, one incident that took place on that day shook the world. On that day—Nov. 22, 1963—a President of the United States was murdered.

With the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the country was shocked into an awareness of the American plague of guns. Bullets had been aimed at seven, and killed four, of our 19 Presidents within the past 100 years. Yet no less real or unimportant to their families are the hundreds of thousands of other victims of firearms.

Why do so many shootings occur here, with fatalities as much as five to 10 times as high as those in other countries?

Why does a civilized society allow deadly weapons to be so readily available to everyone? Why aren't there laws that might prevent at least some of the 50 firearms murders, suicides and accidents that will occur today and tomorrow and the day after tomorrow?

Why the apathy of most people to this firearms epidemic—one that can possibly take even your life?

Why is the subject of firearms control currently one of such seething controversy?

Is the so-called constitutional right "to keep and bear arms" so absolute that it can infringe on an even more fundamental right of people—the right to live?

With the exception of the United States, most civilized countries have laws which make it illegal for anyone to own a firearm without some sort of special permit.

In Britain, for example, you need a certificate from the local police to buy a rifle, pistol or revolver. Since few people—with the exception of farmers, acknowledged hunters and members of shooting clubs—can give any valid reason for wanting these guns such certificates are rarely issued. Even the police do not carry guns routinely. Nor do prison guards or private guards employed by armored car delivery services.

In Britain, the only bodyguards normally armed are those assigned to protect members of the royal family and the prime minister and unlike the situation in guntoting America, one guard is considered sufficient protection per person.

But in "the land of the free," as Lee Harvey Oswald proved all too tragically, the easy accessibility of firearms is a national scandal. Indeed, no other modern nation makes death-dealing weapons so freely and cheaply available. Until Oswald pulled the trigger of his Carcano in Dallas he had not broken a single law—Federal, state, or city—pertaining to firearms.

There are practically no such laws to break. The few existent "laws," though possibly well-intentioned, are either ineffectual or unenforceable—riddled with as many holes as a marksman's target.

Virtually anyone with a few spare dollars who is old enough to walk into a sporting goods store and peer across the counter can buy a rifle or shotgun, with no questions asked. Anyone able to write—a child, ex-convict, drug addict or lunatic—can order some sort of gun by mail—and get it. Oswald did. An untold number of unidentified Oswalds can continue to do so today.

Buying a gun that can be hidden or concealed—that is, a pistol or revolver—may be a little more difficult, but not much. For here again, firearms controls are left to the tolerance of the individual state.

In all but a few states handguns, like shotguns and rifles, also may be bought freely on the open market by practically anyone old enough to carry his purchase out of the store.

Only seven states require you to have a license or permit before you can buy a handgun—Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York and North Carolina. Some counties of Virginia also require such prior permission before purchase. One state, South Carolina, prohibits the sale of handguns.

Only eight states and the District of Columbia specify a waiting or "cooling off" period, such as 48 to 72 hours, between the time you buy the gun and are allowed to have it. This ostensibly gives the local constabulary the chance to check the buyer's credentials, or allows the heat of passion prompting a purchase to subside.

Without specifying such waiting periods, other states delegate judgment of the customer's condition, character and other qualifications to the gun salesman.

In all fairness, it should be said that most states prohibit the sale or delivery of firearms to those below a certain age, or at least to those who look below a certain age. Nine states have no minimum age requirements at all.

If you don't care to show your face at your friendly neighborhood arms dealer—or perhaps would like some choice, cheap or condemned gun not available or allowed locally—you can always order a gun by mail.

Aren't there any Federal laws against this sort of thing? Not really. The two main Federal laws dealing with firearms are antiquated and impotent travesties, enacted in the gangster era of the 1930s and virtually unchanged since then.

The senior statute—the so-called National Firearms Act, vintage 1934—may be aptly named in that it is "national" but the "firearms" in its title is merely a loosely used euphemism. The National Firearms Act does not even touch pistols, revolvers, shotguns and rifles.

It is aimed simply at the special weapons used by highly publicized gangsters of the 1920s and 1930s. The act prohibits the interstate and foreign shipment of all machine-guns and other automatic weapons (those firing more than one shot with a single pull of the trigger), except those registered with the Treasury Department.

To keep these to a minimum, a virtually confiscatory tax of $200 must also be paid every time each such gun is sold or changes hands. The law also places similar restrictions on the sale or transfer of sawed-off rifles and shotguns (those with barrels less than 16 and 18 inches long, respectively) and any mufflers and silencers.

The second Federal law—the 1938 Federal Firearms Act—prohibits the interstate shipment of all firearms to or by convicted felons, people under indictment and fugitives from justice. It also requires that firearms manufacturers, dealers, importers and others doing business across state lines have a Federal license.

The act largely affects the seller, rather than the recipient of these arms, but without specifying how old or young either must be. It makes no mention of minors. Needless to say, the law does not inhibit anyone from ordering a gun and getting it.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Aug. 3, 1966]

LOBBY SHOOTS GUN BARS DOWN

(Why do so many shootings occur in the U.S., with fatalities as much as five to 10 times as high as those in other countries? Following is the second in a five-part series condensed from the new book, "The Right to Bear Arms," by Carl Bakal.)

(By Carl Bakal)

NEW YORK.—In what must now surely rank as one of the most ironic footnotes to history, then Sen. John F. Kennedy rose in the Senate on April 28, 1958, to introduce a bill that would have barred from this country the gun that was to kill him five years later.

The bill sought to "prohibit the importation or re-importation into the United States of arms or ammunition originally manufactured for military purposes." Its special target was the gun being imported in greatest number—the 6.5-mm. Mannlicher-Carcano carbine, an early World War II version of a venerable series of short, bolt-action Italian military rifles first conceived in 1891.

The Kennedy bill was given the number S. 3714, was read twice, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and seemed to have every chance of success. For shortly before, a companion House measure sponsored by Rep. Albert P. Morano of Connecticut had been favorably reported from the House Foreign Affairs Committee by a vote of 26 to 0.

That both bills came to naught may occasionally stir the collective conscience of one of the nation's most powerful, yet least known, lobbies—the National Rifle Assn. (NRA), which is headquartered within gunshot of the White House in a gleaming, glass-and-marble $3.5 million structure with a rifle and pistol range in the basement.

Purporting to speak for the nation's estimated 30 million gun owners, the 700,000-member organization has opposed and managed to scuttle virtually any legislation seeking to impose sensible controls on the availability, sale and use of the firearms in the United States.

In the NRA's view, almost all gun laws are bad laws. To promulgate this dogma, the NRA has for nearly 40 years conducted one of the most intensive and imaginative lobbying operations witnessed in Washington. It also has been hard at work in state capitals and county and city legislatures.

Encrusted with respectability and a self-applied patina of patriotism, the NRA has propagated the myth that any control of firearms by law would infringe on the so-called constitutional "right to bear arms."

What prompted Kennedy's interest in 1958 in a law limiting the importation of foreign military firearms were neither mysterious prognostic powers nor any great humanitarian concerns.

The Senator rested his case solely on economic grounds. The influx of foreign guns, he said in his short speech to the Senate at the time he introduced his bill, had "helped spoil our domestic market"—particularly that of the firearms manufacturers located in his home state. Massachusetts is the base of operations of names known to every gun owner—Savage Arms, Smith & Wesson, Harrington & Richardson, Noble, and Iver Johnson.

Domestically produced rifles, though far superior in quality, could scarcely compete with the surplus weapons from all over the world. In addition to the Italian Carcanos, there were British Enfields, German Mausers, Norwegian Krags, and Swedish, Belgian and other foreign military cast-offs.

In many cases, these rifles cost their importers less than $1 apiece. Add the average import duty of 52 per cent and their cost still came to as little as $2. The guns eventually sold in America for as little as $12 or $13 and this price still permitted a handsome profit for the importer, dealer or any other middlemen concerned.

Although exact figures are unavailable, it is estimated some five million—perhaps as many as seven million—foreign weapons, old and new, poured into this country from 1959 through 1963. Today the United States is the dumping ground for about 75 per cent, and according to some estimates, for as much as 90 per cent, of the world's war-surplus weapons.

Why? Because few other nations would have them. Indeed, nowhere but in America is there such a fascination for firearms. And nowhere in the world are they so readily available, legally, to almost anyone.

Purchasing firearms by mail has assumed the dimensions of a multi-million-dollar business, largely in relatively cheap, unsafe weapons. There are said to be at least 400 mail-order houses dealing in such weapons.

To reach buyers, dealers use gun and cheap crime and sex and sensation pulp magazines, newspapers and catalogs. The moral caliber of many of these dealers and of the customers they seek can be detected fairly easily by the lurid prose of the advertising message, which apparently is aimed at the thrill-bent, the sadist and the highly impressionable adolescent.

Gun advertising is at its most uninhibited in the various mail-order catalogs. A Hy Hunter catalog and "Training Manual" devotes all its 64 pages to "that deceptively cute little gun known as the derringer." Hunter points out that his weapon was potent enough to polish off "two of our country's Presidents, Abraham Lincoln and William McKinley." The catalog features violence and physical combat—and throws in a dash of sex for good measure.

Here's another ad:

"U.S. 60 mm. morter (sic): Complete with bipod and base plate, etc. An ideal item for your den or front lawn. Can be easily packed into trunk of any automobile. This is the perfect tool for 'getting even' with those neighbors you don't like. Perfect for demolishing houses or for back-yard plinking on Sunday afternoon. We offer these hard-shooting Morters (sic) at the popular price of $49.95 each."

Nearly a million guns are imported and two million more are made and sold annually in this country. It is estimated, although no one really knows, that there are more than 50 million privately owned guns in the United States today. Some estimates place the figure at 200 million, and one as high as a billion.

There can be no question that the world's greatest arsenal of privately owned guns is in the American home.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Aug. 4, 1966]

MINUS SIDE OF AMERICA: NO ONE CAN TOUCH US IN CRIME

(By Carl Bakal)

NEW YORK—In addition to boasting the world's greatest private arsenal of small arms, the United States also can claim the dubious distinction of being perhaps the most lawless nation on Earth.

Our incidence of crime is probably unmatched anywhere, except in such traditional centers of violence as Ceylon and the hot-blooded Italian provinces of Sardinia, Sicily and Calabria.

During 1964, we set an all-time record of 2,604,400 serious crimes, or five every minute.

The FBI crime clock ticked off one murder, forcible rape or assault to kill every 2½ minutes, one robbery every five minutes, one burglary every 28 seconds, one larceny ($50 and over) every 45 seconds and one auto theft every minute.

A murder took place every hour. There were 57 policemen murdered in the line of duty and one of every 10 was assaulted. Since 1958 the nation's crime rate has increased 44 per cent and has been growing six times faster than our population. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has estimated the annual cost of crime in the United States at $27 billion.

A money value can scarcely be placed on that most heinous of crimes, murder. In a cold, statistical sense, known murders in the United States number more than 9,000 a year. There is a murder a day in New York. In Atlanta and Dallas, your chance of being murdered is twice as high as in New York.

You also are probably much safer practically anywhere out of this country than in it. France and Japan have murder rates less than a third of ours, Italy less than a fifth, England only a seventh and the Netherlands about a 16th.

It would be neither fair nor entirely accurate to say that guns cause crime. But there is ample evidence indicating a casual relationship between the ready availability of firearms and the importance they assume in crime statistics. Of the 9,250 U.S. murder victims reported in 1964, more than half—55 per cent, or 5,090—were killed by guns. Where guns could be more easily purchased, they were found to play a greater part in murder.

Not all shootings involve professional killers, crooks, kooks or Klansmen or their junior criminal counterparts. In fact, contrary to a fairly widespread popular belief, most murders are committed by persons who generally are law-abiding.

FBI figures bear out the conclusion that if murder were left only to the hardened hoodlum, our murder rate immediately would drop to a fraction of what it is now. Of the 9,250 willful killings in 1964, only 1,350—or one out of seven—were "felony murders"—that is, those committed during the course of robberies, sex offenses, gangland slayings and other such crimes by persons of known homicidal bent or background, who generally were strangers to the victim.

Outside or inside the family, some of the things over which people quarrel and try to kill each other are almost beyond belief. In Michigan some years ago, a 15-year-old girl was arrested for pulling a gun on another teenager in an argument over which one was entitled to permanent possession of a fan magazine article about Elvis Presley.

In Jersey City, N.J., early in 1965, an apartment house superintendent and two of her sons were shot by a tenant, through the superintendent's closed door, after a spat over the building's hallway lighting.

Even noise can trigger death. A 71-year-old blind Chicago woman shot her husband to death, aiming in the direction of his voice, after he complained about the tapping of her cane and threatened to send her to a home for the blind.

And then there are the accidental shootings—more than 2,200 fatal ones in the United States every year. As with homicide, most of these victims are shot by friends and members of their own family.

Guns account for about half of the more than 20,000 suicides now recorded in this country every year. Some authorities place the figure even higher.

Though many countries have higher overall suicide rates than the United States, our firearms suicide death rate is the highest in the world. In total number, more Americans end their lives with guns than all the people in all the other countries of the world combined.

All in all, 17,000 lives a year—one every half hour—are lost through the murderous, accidental or suicidal discharge of firearms in the United States.

There could be no more shocking example of what can result from the absence of controls on the sale and use of firearms than the murder of President Kennedy in 1963. By a strange irony, only 14 months before the assassination, a Dallas judge declared unconstitutional a city ordinance making it "unlawful to have in one's possession within the city or upon any property owned by the city, any firearms, rifle, revolver, pistol or any other weapon."

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Aug. 5, 1966]

KILLING TRIGGERS INDIGNATION AND LOBBY GOES ALONG—FOR NOW

(By Carl Bakal)

NEW YORK.—Slumbering in the Senate of the 88th Congress at the time of the Kennedy assassination was a bill designed to curb the uninhibited traffic in mail-order firearms. Sponsored by Sen. THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut, the bill was the fruit of nearly two and a half years of toil by DODD's Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

The subcommittee had long been looking into the role of weapons, especially firearms, in juvenile delinquency. In 1959 it had managed to secure passage of a bill outlawing switch-blade knives. In March, 1961, as a result of the large increase in the mail-order gun business, it began a full-scale investigation into the availability of firearms to juveniles.

The bill that finally emerged provided that a mail-order gun purchaser must submit a notarized statement attesting to his criminal record, if any, and stating that he was over 18 and his purchase would not be contrary to his state or local laws.

DODD had introduced the bill in the Senate on Aug. 2, 1963, as an amendment to the Federal Firearms Act. Because it involved the movement of goods in interstate or foreign commerce, the bill was referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. Once there, it was promptly forgotten.

Then came the tragedy in Dallas. In the space of a few seconds on that Nov. 22, Lee Harvey Oswald—with a cheap foreign surplus military rifle purchased under a phony name from Klein's Sporting Goods, a Chicago mail-order house—murdered the President.

On the rifle was a telescopic gunsight which had originated from another mail-order house—Weapons, Inc. of Los Angeles. Less than an hour later Oswald had killed police officer J. D. Tippit with a .38 caliber revolver purchased from still another mail-order house—Seaport Traders, also of Los Angeles.

Public support for stricter firearms regulations—particularly tighter control over the sale of mail-order guns—gathered like a mounting storm. Within a matter of weeks, 17 firearms bills besides the Dodd measure were introduced into Congress. And more than 170 laws were proposed in state capitals.

But the lawmakers had not fully gauged the power of a highly vocal and militant lobby of gun manufacturers and dealers, sportsmen, hunters, gun clubs, and assorted conservation and "patriotic" organizations—spearheaded by the powerful National Rifle Assn.

The NRA is a non-profit, private organization of more than 700,000 gun owners. Its income for 1964 was nearly $4.5 million. Though not even registered as an organization that carries on lobbying activities, the NRA ranks high among the big lobbies in Washington.

It conducts perhaps the most intensive, imaginative, continuing lobbying operation that Washington has ever witnessed. A standard boast of NRA officials is that they can flood Congress with more than 500,000 pieces of mail virtually overnight in opposition to any proposed gun legislation.

The NRA's unparalleled success is indicated by the fact that no Federal firearms law has been enacted in nearly three decades.

The NRA gave lip service to the Dodd bill, perhaps in deference to public opinion or perhaps because of a sense of filial obligation. For the NRA, in fact, had helped beget the bill in its original form. (The original covered only pistols and revolvers; after the assassination, DODD amended his bill to cover all firearms.)

The shock of the assassination thrust the NRA on the horns of a rather delicate dilemma—how to continue to pretend to support the bill, at least until the public passions had subsided and, at the same time, see that it was never enacted.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, Aug. 8, 1966]

FIREARMS ACT HAS UNBROKEN RECORD OF FAILURE

(By Carl Bakal)

NEW YORK.—An old political truth holds that the provisions and intention of a given bill are not so important as the men who consider it and the atmosphere in which they function. The National Firearms Act, innocuous though it was, had become law on the strength of the crime wave of its era, and the near-assassination of President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt back in 1933.

For the following 30 years there was a virtually unbroken record of failure—thanks, in large part to the powerful lobbying efforts of the National Rifle Assn. (NRA).

From 1955 through 1962, some 35 firearms bills were introduced in Congress; none met with any success. During the same period, nearly 2,000 bills were introduced in state legislatures, with only a scattered success here and there. Now, just 30 years after the attempt on the life of FDR, it seemed the time had finally come once more.

A President had been killed with a rifle fraudulently obtained through the mails. Public sentiment strongly favored stricter firearms regulation. And, after weeks of being mired in the Senate Commerce Committee, Senate bill 1975—a proposal by Sen. THOMAS DODD of Connecticut requiring gun purchasers to fill out an affidavit and have it "authenticated by the highest local law enforcement authority in his community"—suddenly sprang to life.

Commerce Committee chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON announced he was ready to report the Dodd bill to the floor for a vote and public hearings suddenly were ordered on the measure.

Testimony at the hearings, which opened Dec. 13, 1963, was overwhelmingly against the Dodd bill or, for that matter, any gun legislation. It ranged from the argument that the bill would be ineffective to the seemingly contradictory one that it would disarm the United States.

These sentiments were echoed in a sudden barrage of mail that descended on Congress. "So much mail came in that it was stacked knee-deep in the office," a Dodd aide said.

Hostile correspondents accused Dodd, who had labored on his bill for nearly three years, of hasty action. Many cited the cherished Second Amendment, and warned that the bill was part of a Communist conspiracy to disarm America. This was an odd charge to level at former FBI agent Dodd, who has been perhaps the most persevering anti-Communist in Congress.

Such a homogeneous outpouring, no matter on what subject, can usually be traced to a single fountainhead, and in this case it was not hard to identify the likely source. For the deluge of mail, apart from reflecting the NRA gospel, had in many instances, the identical language appearing in NRA literature.

On August 11, 1964, the Dodd bill officially was interred when the Commerce Committee, without taking a roll-call vote, decided to defer action on it. Magnuson was rewarded with an NRA citation.

As 1964 drew to a close, not a single Federal, state or local law of any consequence had been enacted to register or strictly control the sale of firearms. But the prospects for 1965 looked unusually bright.

Reflecting the recommendations of President Johnson, Dodd on March 22 introduced two new bills. One, co-sponsored by Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York, would flatly ban the mail-order sale of guns to individuals.

Knowing the fate likely to befall the bill in the Senate Commerce Committee, Dodd received permission to have it referred to the Judiciary Committee where he, as Chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, would be able to preside at the inevitable public hearings.

Meanwhile, on the legislative front, NRA was girding for a giant campaign to defeat the proposed laws. By April 9 a letter was on its way to the NRA's 700,000 members asking them to write letters of opposition to their senators, congressmen and to the President.

The inevitable hearings stretched from May through July. Appearing as a witness, Kennedy denounced the "massive publicity campaign" being waged by the NRA and charged that it had "distorted the facts of the bill and missed thousands of our citizens."

When Congress adjourned in October, however, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee still had taken no action. The measure finally emerged from the subcommittee this spring; it is now bottled up in the Judiciary Committee.

Without an effective Federal firearms law on the books, the death toll from guns continues to mount. What can be done? What is the solution to the gun problem?

Should the private ownership of all, or at least some, firearms be completely prohibited? Could this be done without infringing an opinion as can be mustered I went to Cambridge, Mass., to see one of the nation's leading authorities on Constitutional law—Harvard Law School Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland.

"In our kind of civilization, I can't tolerate any kind of weapon," Sutherland, a much-decorated wartime colonel, told me. "The romantic attachment for guns doesn't go with our urban way of living. In our present crowded society, there is simply no place for guns."

Congress, Sutherland is firmly convinced, has all the power it needs to require the registration or otherwise regulate the possession of all firearms, shotguns, and rifles as well as handguns, and even prohibit the private possession of them.

A serious barrier to any change, however, at least during the foreseeable future, is legislative lethargy. Even more important is public apathy.

Concerned citizens could press the issue by making themselves heard, by writing to their senators and congressmen and to their state and local legislators, by persuading their friends and neighbors to do the same, and by enlisting the aid of their civic organizations.

[From Time magazine, Aug. 12, 1966]

A Gun-Toting Nation

Charles Whitman may have been unusual in having a dozen guns at his disposal, but he was by no means unique. Americans have always been a gun-toting people. Guns enabled the first settlers to protect and feed themselves in a hostile land, made later colonist a nation of riflemen capable of winning their freedom in the American Revolution. The West was tamed with guns, and frontier justice became synonymous with them. From the nation's earliest days, the gun has been the delight of collectors and sportsmen. Today, the U.S. has the world's largest civilian cache: some 100 million handguns, rifles and shotguns in private hands. Every year, more than 1,000,000 "dangerous weapons" are sold by mail order in the U.S., and another million or so imported.

Behind those numbers is a remarkable dearth of effective legal controls over the purchase and possession of guns. Federal law curbs a few things, such as traffic in machine guns, sawed-off shotguns and silencers, but the regulation of firearms has been left largely to cities and states, which have built a crazy quilt of laws, few of them stringent. Until New Jersey enacted a new gun statute last week, no state (and only Philadelphia among U.S. cities) required police permits for buying, keeping, or even roaming Main Street with a shotgun or rifle. Only seven states and a handful of municipalities require permits for handguns.

Such leniency shows up in crime statistics. The FBI reports that 57% of the 9,850 homicides in the U.S. last year were committed with firearms, and that all but one of the 53 police officers killed on duty were gunshot victims. In Dallas, where firearm regulations are practically nonexistent (as throughout all of Texas), 72% of all homicides were committed with guns *v.* 25% in New York City, where the state's tough 55-year-old Sullivan Law requires police permits for the mere possession of handguns. Says J. Edgar Hoover: "Those who claim that the availability of firearms is not a factor in murders in this country are not facing reality."

Most foreign countries have much stricter controls than the U.S., and some virtually outlaw guns. Given the American passion for guns, however, it would be unthinkable to ban firearm sales outright in the U.S., an action that would eliminate such legitimate uses as hunting, target shooting and, in some cases anyway, self-defense. But the Justice Department, bar associations and most U.S. police officials feel that much tighter gun controls are called for.

The Austin slaughter breathed new life into a bill now before Congress, sponsored by Connecticut's Senator Thomas Dodd, which would 1) severely limit interstate mail-order handgun shipments; 2) limit the inflow of military-surplus firearms from abroad; 3) ban over-the-counter handgun sales to out-of-state buyers and anybody under 21; and 4) prohibit longarm sales to persons under 18. Invoking the "shocking tragedy" in Austin, President Johnson urged speedy passage "to help prevent the wrong persons from obtaining firearms." Of course, recognizing the "wrong person" is not always possible; Whitman would probably have qualified for his guns even under strict controls.

Nonetheless, a good deal of firearm violence could no doubt be prevented. By limiting interstate gun sales, the Dodd bill would strengthen the power of states to enforce their own gun laws. In most states, stiffer controls are needed—minimizing, for example, spur-of-the-moment shootings by providing "cooling-off" periods of several days before anyone can obtain a new weapon, as well as prohibiting all gun sales to criminals and known psychotics. Yet, despite the renewed clamoring for action, it is far from certain that the Dodd bill will be enacted, largely because of the influence wielded by the National Rifle Association, whose 750,000 members lobby vigorously and effectively against most gun-control legislation.

Though some right-wingers condemn gun controls as a Communist plot to disarm Americans, a more common objective is that individual Americans have "a constitutional right to bear arms." Actually, no such absolute right exists. The Supreme Court has held consistently that the right is a collective one. State militias are quite clearly what the Founding Fathers had in mind in drafting the Second Amendment: "A well-regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Stricter arms licensing could certainly not prevent the sort of crime perpetrated by Whitman, but it would keep guns away from at least some who might misuse them. Since Americans usually need licenses to marry, drive a motor scooter, run a shop or even own a dog, it is difficult to see why a license to keep a lethal weapon would be any abridgment of their freedom.

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am very pleased to introduce into the Record at this time a copy of a speech made by Mr. John H. Perry, Jr., of Palm Beach, Fla., entitled "The National Dividend." Mr. Perry has long advocated a new and different approach to our tax system from that one which we now have. Several years ago I had the privilege, along with the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, several prominent economists, and other representatives of our economic community, of reading and introducing for its originality and thoughtfulness a book written by Mr. Perry on this subject which was also entitled "The National Dividend." I place this in the Record in the very sincere hope that many Members of the Congress will have an opportunity to read and study and contemplate on this far-reaching idea. Certainly it is worthy of the time and effort given to reading it and studying it because of the stimulation which will result in the thoughts and minds of those who read it. Indeed, most everyone would agree that our tax system is in need of major and drastic overhaul, for as it stands today it is not only complex, overly technical, and difficult far beyond the capability of the average taxpayer to comprehend, but basically it is immoral, it is unethical, it encourages laziness and slovenliness, and it is basically contrary to our system of free enterprise. This statement which I have just made, I know, sounds dramatic and I am sure there are those who will say it is an overstatement. On the other hand, I cannot help but feel that those who have given our tax system study and thought in recent years would have to agree with my statement. Most of the eminent economists that I know around the country are not satisfied with our tax program. In fact, I do not know of anybody who is. Certainly, I, along with many others, have given it a great deal of thought as a member of the Finance and Taxation Committee. And as a taxpayer, I have a deep and sincere belief that we must do something about our tax system and do it soon. There are 2 illustrations which occurred to me within the last few weeks which point just 2 of the inequities in our tax program, and if I had the time I could give 20; but because these 2 were so directly related to me, and I was once again shaken at the ambivalence and inequity of the system, I think I should recite them to you.

I have in Washington a very good friend who is a lawyer, one of the outstanding lawyers, as a matter of fact, in the Nation. He is diligent, intelligent, and thorough. He has been described as a "lawyer's lawyer," and he handles some of the most complicated legal matters that arise in the Nation. While visiting at my home the other night, he told me of an experience which occurred to him about which he was very happy, but one which he felt, even though he was the benefactor, was not entirely in keeping with fairness and equity. There was a case on which he had been working for approximately 3 years, giving it a great deal of time, 3 and 4 days every week during this period of time. When it finally was brought to a successful conclusion, he breathed a great sign of relief for he had, indeed, burned the midnight oil, researched the case in a most thorough and comprehensive manner. For this monumental work he had submitted a bill of $200,000, which is, of course, a large amount of money, but one in keeping with the nature of the work, the responsibility which he assumed, and the energy and thought which he had put into the solution of the problem. Because he was in a 70-percent tax bracket, he remarked that he had to pay to the Government $140,000 of the $200,000 so that he was able to keep for himself for these 3 years of labor $60,000 or approximately $20,000 a year. At about the time that he started working on the case, one of the junior partners in his firm came to him and stated that he knew of a piece of property out in what was then one of the distant suburbs of the District of Columbia, which the junior partner felt would be a wise investment if several of them in the firm would buy the land. This they agreed to do and my lawyer friend put up approximately $100,000 as his part of the syndicate. This represented a downpayment. The only time he thought of it thereafter was when he was called upon to pay taxes and to make an additional downpayment which was $20,000. This he did for the next 2 years when—about the time that he finished his law case—the law partner came to him in an elated fashion and told him they had sold the property for an enormous profit. They had not even finished paying the total purchase price of the property, but my friend's share of this profit was close to $1 million. Because it was a pure capital gain operation his tax on the $1 million was 25 percent, and so it was possible for him to realize a profit of $750,000 from the sale, less the $120,000 which he had put up.

This profit came to him without benefit of labor or thought or energy, but merely on the sole basis that he had sufficient capital which he could and did invest. Here it was: he had worked for 3 years on a case which in many ways created a new law in a complicated and technical field; he had worked on it as diligently as he had on any case, but because law fees do not get much larger than $200,000, he was unable to charge more than that, and yet he was able to keep only $60,000. On the other hand, because of our tax laws, without hardly lifting a finger he was able to make an enormous sum of $630,000 net profit to him. He recognized that this was not right, nor equitable, nor fair. A system of taxation which allows this type of inequity to result should not be long permitted. Certainly the rewards which a man receives for his diligence, and his energy, and his thought, and his time, should not be taxed as heavily as a reward that he might receive for what amounted to no effort at all, and yet under our tax system this occurs daily.

Another example, which immediately occurs to me with respect to another business friend of mine, occurred just the other day when he sought to purchase a piece of business property which was owned and controlled by a large oil company here in these United States. When my friend approached the representatives of the oil company to discuss with them his desire to make this purchase, he was, after a reasonable length of negotiations, finally told in much candor that the property could in no possible way be as valuable to him, my friend, who was not in the oil business or had no relation with an oil business, as was the property to the oil company. When my friend asked why, he was then told that if he took the property as an individual and he was in the 60-percent bracket, the property would bring in $500,000 a year; that my friend would have to pay as an individual owner 60 percent of the income to the Federal Government. In other words, he could keep $200,000 of the $500,000. On the other hand the oil company which owned the property, because of its ability to lump this property in with its oil property and somehow to take advantage of the 27½-percent depletion allowance granted to all oil companies, this oil company could then keep and spend every dollar returned to the parent company from this nonoil related property. In effect, the oil company would pay no tax whatsoever on that property's income. This obviously is not fair, nor defensive, under any system of taxation which calls itself representative or fair.

I am very pleased about the fact that the chairman of the Finance Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, has offered a plan which is calculated to eliminate many of the inequities and advantages to some few which now exists in our tax laws. His proposal has stimulated a great deal of thinking, and I know moves in the right direction. It is this kind of constructive thinking on the part of the Senator from Louisiana, as well as Mr. John Perry, whose "National Dividend" idea I present for the RECORD today, which I think will start the pot boiling to the extent that we legislators, who are responsible in the final analysis for the tax laws which we now have on the books, will see that the time is long since passed when we need to do something of a major work with respect to the realinement and reassessment of taxes in this Nation so that, in truth and in fact, taxes will be borne by those who have the greater ability to pay and in a more equitable fashion than they are now borne; that gaping loopholes will be closed, and that the system of limited free enterprise which we now have can be increased such as is envisioned in Mr. Perry's plan, and that greater equity could be done all around.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Perry's plan of a "National Dividend," in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND

(By John H. Perry, Jr.)

Our founding fathers were searching for equity for all men when our great constitutional free society was formed. As demagogic pressures have increased over the years, a tendency has developed to lose the word "free" from the economics in our system.

Neither our society nor any other society will ever be truly great until it is first a completely free society. Freedom is indivisible. Political freedom axiomatically lives only where economic freedom is strong, wide-based and delivers profits.

The self-sufficiency and economic independence of individual man should be the goal of a Great Free Society. This objective assures that the state will be subjugated to the individual. Subjugation of the individual to the state is contrary to all legal and political theory in the United States.

The National Dividend is a bold, workable plan to achieve society's freedom. It would make every American voter—man or woman—a profit-sharing partner in the dynamic, spiritually-based, profit and loss system, which we have named "free enterprise."

Here is the plan:

A major source of federal receipts would be rechanneled. Corporate profit taxes now paid to the federal government would be diverted from the general treasury fund and distributed directly by mail to the nation's voters on a per capita basis. The payments would be made quarterly by the U.S. Treasury in cash.

The diversion would not deprive the government of funds required for its necessary functions. The National Dividend plan would be instituted gradually over a five-year period and at a tempo equal to the normal increase in federal receipts from other activities.

The National Dividend plan is rooted firmly in the production and profits of free enterprise. It provides a way for rank and file citizens at work on farm, at home, in factory, or in business to regain, strengthen and preserve the individual liberties they have lost in recent years to the relentless encroachment of the federal government through taxation into their business and personal affairs.

Because of our historic and economic structure, we are fed and free.

The National Dividend plan assures elevation of the general welfare out of national corporate earnings.

Our purpose is to bring greater equity, ingenuity and thrust to free enterprise. The basic profit motive, which gives life and purpose to the entire free enterprise system, must be understood.

Profit is not a part of the cost of production, except in cases of public utilities where there is no competition. Profit is achieved only if the producer can cut his costs below what he can sell the product for. The sale price should always be determined by the forces of supply and demand, by what his competitors are willing to sell their product for and how anxious the buyer is to purchase the product.

The profit motive is the incentive that drives the producer of goods or services to struggle to produce and sell efficiently. It is this human drive that has created the miracle of our modern civilization. It is this human drive that we must nurture and extend its benefits to all our citizens who vote.

Our founding fathers recognized the advantages of an economy free from dictatorial control. They knew that business management was and is more efficient than political management. They knew, too, that a genuinely free society, to be consistent with political liberty, would have to include among human rights, the concept of private property, a free competitive market, profit and wage incentives and freedom from arbitrary government control.

In a free competitive system, the individual has the privilege to choose. However, when the government operates a business, the individual loses his freedom of choice. He must accept what he is told to accept. No man is free politically under a socialist economic system.

Mainly because business has been free from government interference, our society is far ahead of the rest of the world.

Our free society is dependent upon the profit motive. In its thousands upon thousands of separate but interrelated corporate, family, and single owner enterprises, the United States has the largest, most complex, responsive economic structure man has ever assembled. It is sensitive to the individual's every wish and need. If one company, product or service does not satisfy an individual, another quickly capitalizes on the situation and provides a better and cheaper product.

The American people need a clear understanding of the fundamental facts of the free enterprise system, how it functions, and how maintenance of its vitality is the key to our continued freedom, prosperity, high standard of living and national security. The key to that vitality is to be found in the method of collecting taxes, and who spends these tax dollars.

The National Dividend would make every person a living, sharing, integral part of our free enterprise society. It would make them its direct beneficiaries. It would promote their active voting participation, creating a more responsible attitude toward the political part of our system.

In our republic with its democratic methods, the ultimate fate of all functions and activities rests with the people. Their collective voice, expressed through the ballot box, is ideally supreme. When there is universal participation, their voice rings out thoughtfully with resonance and authority. When there is voting apathy, their voice is muted and indecisive.

And so it is with our economic affairs. It is the people who provide the ingenuity to organize a business venture, the capital investment to finance it, the ambition and manpower to operate it and the purchasing power to buy its goods and services. And in doing all this successfully, enable it to enlarge, improve, create more jobs and make a profit.

The profit, in turn, gives those who have invested in the business plant and equipment a return on their money. This return provides new capital and—equally as important—the incentive for the recipients to make new investments in new ventures.

The National Dividend plan is founded upon a constitutional amendment which has these three simple, basic provisions:

One, it provides that all corporate income tax collected by the United States Treasury shall be distributed equally—and free of personal income taxes—to all the nation's voters. Two, it eliminates personal income taxes on all corporate dividends. Three, it places a 50 per cent limit on corporate income taxes.

An examination of our economic processes will give us a clear picture of how the plan would work and of the potential benefits it would embrace for rich and poor alike.

Reduced to basic simplicity, our economic transactions take place between three major participants—consumers, business establishments and government.

Consumer purchasing power—whether individual, family, or corporate—maintains the vigor and stability of our economy. Obviously, if customers stop buying, business stagnates. Inventories pile up. Mills stop producing. Workers lose their jobs. And prosperity and comfort give way to depression and suffering.

We, the American people, as individuals, spend our income today at the rate of 94 cents on the dollar. We save and indirectly invest the remainder. The 94 percent is consumer purchasing power. And, like a sturdy heart in a human body, it pumps life-giving blood through the arteries and veins of the economy because most of the spending is with business enterprises.

But consumer purchasing power is not confined to the individual. Business is both customer and consumer, too. For example, when a new factory is constructed, a thousand kinds of building materials are bought, newly invented machinery is installed, raw materials are obtained. This also is purchasing power.

Business to business expenditures, along with spending by the people, creates a steady flow of dollars over the counters of the nation's many enterprises.

But the dollars do not stop there. Only a few pennies of each sales dollar are net profit. The vast majority of the dollars continue to flow on as outpayments as business firms make disbursements to meet operating costs.

A major part of these dollars goes directly as wages and salaries. By meeting payrolls and buying goods, business becomes the primary generator of the nation's personal income.

Thus we see that the capital investment which originally came from those people who saved some of their income, created business enterprise. Then, in sequence, business enterprise provided them jobs. The jobs generated personal income for the people. The personal income provided the purchasing power with which the people obtain the goods and services offered by business enterprise.

Now, the federal government, the third major participant in our economic processes, comes into the picture. Like business enterprise, it, too, must turn to the people and their personal income for its major source of revenue. The cost of government is our country's overhead. Government does not create wealth. And today the overhead is becoming so high that it cannot be carried safely without creating inflation.

By imposing personal income taxes, excise taxes and Social Security taxes, the government siphons off a substantial portion of the consumer's purchasing power. This prevents the immediate return of those dollars to the channels of business enterprise for further direct participation in the generation of new personal income. As a result, there is at that point a slowing, or braking, effect upon the free market.

Direct taxes are imposed upon business enterprise, too. Among these are the employer's share of Social Security taxes, excise taxes, sales taxes, unemployment taxes, special use taxes and others. With each diversion of these funds from business to government, additional braking pressure is applied to the free market.

Another major source of government revenue—in volume second only to personal income taxes—is obtained from a tax on the net income of business enterprise.

As was pointed out earlier, a profit can be made only if the producer can cut his costs below the figure a buyer will pay for the product.

Profits are the results of risk-taking, capable management and sales efforts. But if a corporation succeeds in making a profit, it is required to divide its profits between its owners and the government. If it has a loss, it must bear the loss alone.

For more than 10 years—from the Korean War through 1963—the government's share of corporate profits was 52 per cent of all earnings in excess of $25,000. This direct tax on business, combined with personal income tax rates graduating upward to a peak of 91 per cent, put a brake on business expansion so sharply that the growth rate was reduced to only a fraction of its potential.

Even after the government takes its high percentage of the corporation's profits, the owners of the corporation, who range from the small investors with a few shares of stock to large owners with thousands of shares, must give up still more of their portion. The dividend payments they receive are taxed as personal income. This is, of course, a double tax burden on corporate earnings and further reduces the capital available for direct investment in the job-creating functions of business enterprise.

Only a portion of these tax revenues which are drained away eventually make their way back into the economy as a result of government spending. In theory, the expenditures are supposed to be equal to the revenues. And they are supposed to provide equivalent services and benefits to all the people. In practice, this is not the case.

The government re-spends through two major disbursement streams. One is for the purchase of goods and services from business enterprise in the market place. It spends, for example, for equipment and supplies for the armed forces, materials for public buildings, payrolls, interest on money borrowed from the people, space research and exploration, highway construction and other such products and activities.

Government's second disbursement channel carries dollars and gold to selected persons and governments. These pocket to pocket transfers of government receipts include farm subsidies, Social Security benefits, unemployment compensation, social welfare payments, loans and gifts to foreign countries, subsidized housing, the legislative war on poverty and others.

So, by taking into account the flow of government receipts and expenditures in addition to the income or wealth generating transactions of business enterprises and people, we get a complete picture of the basic processes within our economic system.

Political considerations move to the front when we examine the impact that various pay-out streams in the economy have upon the attitude of those Americans who work. It is the voters who hold the power to decide whether we move into the future with a free enterprise system made better, bigger and stronger by the National Dividend, or whether all our freedoms will be steadily eroded into oblivion under the weight of bureaucratically-dictated governmentalism.

Payment of cash and stock dividends to the stockholder owners of corporations naturally biases them as voters toward the growth and success of privately managed corporations and the free enterprise system.

On the other hand, payment of government tax money to the pockets of selected groups naturally biases those recipients as voters toward increased political management.

Then there is the third group of voters whose voice must be heard in deciding between free markets and governmentalism. They are those citizens who receive neither corporate dividends nor government transfer payments and, as a result, are generally neutral in their attitude as between corporate welfare and governmentalism.

There is only one way the federal government can disburse the billions of dollars the Congress appropriates each year. It is through the hundreds of administrative agencies whose names the average citizen scarcely knows. Great discretion must be delegated to the heads of those agencies, and many do not have to answer directly to the Congress or the people for their decisions.

In exercising their discretion, the agency heads have the power to withhold funds from some groups, to subsidize others, to insist on price control, wage control, production control, and virtually anything else they consider within their realm under their own interpretation of the legislation authorizing the disbursements.

Their arbitrary exercise of discretion is not limited to any one channel of federal spending. They exercise it in making both defense contracts and welfare payments. They also accompany their disbursements with an overlay of paper work, red tape and control, whether they spend the funds in the otherwise free market for goods and services, or hand them out directly to selected groups.

In imposing their discretionary power, these bureaucrats have made loss of individual liberties, personal rights and dignity the price the people must pay to share in government spending. Government's political bosses can and do become masters instead of servants of the people.

Now, for contrast let us return for a closer examination of the way business enterprise spends the funds which come in over the counter from the sale of goods and services.

The first slice goes to the government in excise, Social Security and unemployment taxes and other such levies. Most of the remainder goes for wages and salaries for the service of employes; for interest, which is the cost of borrowed money; for rent, the cost of borrowed space, and for the taxes which enable the administration to both operate the government and to re-distribute the personal income of its citizens.

Part of the income generated by business enterprise is disbursed in wages and salaries as income to citizens who work. And to share owners, in dividends. The remainder is retained by business and spent as capital outlays for construction, equipment and inventory.

There is one difference of major significance between government spending and spending in the private sector by the people and business enterprise. When the people and businesses spend money, they disburse it freely for the things they want. There is no overlay of government control.

Such control exists today because corporate profit taxes are poured into the general fund and mixed with personal income taxes, the direct and indirect business taxes, and all other revenues not earmarked for specific purposes. It is over these funds that administrative agency heads exercise their discretionary control over disbursements.

There would be no overlay of government control accompanying the American voter's spending of his National Dividend obtained from corporate profit taxes.

Under the National Dividend plan, corporate profit taxes would be channeled away from the general fund. They would be re-channeled to flow directly on a per capita basis to all voters who had legally participated in the last federal general election. Instead of receiving so-called government services from the administration, diluted by the costs of bureaucracy, the voters would receive direct cash payments every quarter.

The only requirement for sharing in the National Dividend would be to vote in the national general elections every two years.

Consequently, the re-channeling of corporate profit taxes would cause even the most apathetic voters to exercise their rights at the ballot box. It is logical to assume that they, along with those voters who have been neutral and uncertain up until now, would soon become enthusiastically in favor of free enterprise and corporate progress, more profits, more jobs and bigger and better dividends for redistribution to all.

Those voters who today are biased toward greater governmentalism would find far more appeal on the other side as they, too, became profit-sharing partners in the free enterprise system.

The National Dividend plan's proposed diversion of corporate profit taxes from the general fund would not deprive the government of revenues needed for its necessary functions.

Federal revenues have increased at an annual rate of about six billion dollars since 1959. This rate of increase, which is expected to continue, will be sufficient to fund the National Dividend program during the five-year period in which it would be phased into full operation.

The federal government would continue to obtain just as much tax revenue as at present and would have just as much money available for supporting its many expenditure programs.

The National Dividend Plan proposes that as the government's tax receipts increase, portions of the corporate tax revenue would be used for direct cash payments to the voters. Government should introduce cutbacks in some of its programs after the National Dividend payments are large enough to substitute for them.

In 1965, corporate income taxes amounted to $30 billion. And there were roughly 70 million voters in the 1964 national elections. Assume that by the time the National Dividend plan could be put into full effect the corporate income taxes had risen to $40 billion and the number of voters had grown to 80 million, this would mean that the National Dividend would be $500 per year, per voter. For a man and wife, it would be $1,000 tax free income.

The point is, however, that whatever these payments are, they will have to come from productive earnings, not from additionally inflationary spending. We will have earned them and they will not be diluting the value of the dollar. And herein lies one of the basic values of this plan as against other economic proposals such as the Negative Income Tax or the Guaranteed Annual Wage.

Several built-in factors in our economy have been responsible for the substantial annual growth in the federal government's cash income in recent years. Combined, they practically assure a continued six percent annual increase.

One major reason lies in the steady growth of the country's population and labor force. The labor force grows by more than one percent per year. Consequently, the nation's genuine output and genuine income also grow one percent per year.

This means that federal income grows by about one percent per year.

Another factor which continually lifts the nation's real output, real income and federal tax revenue is the steady annual increase of about three percent in the worker's man-hour output. The increase is brought about by investors giving our working citizens more and better equipment to work with. This means that for the nation as a whole, the real output, the real income, and the true standard of living also rise by about three percent per year. Consequently, so does federal tax revenue—which is geared to real income—rise by about that same three percent.

The third factor which lifts federal revenues is a form of creeping inflation. It is the result of wage increases being greater than production increases, thus necessitating price increases.

Since World War II, wages have risen about 4½ percent per year, while production has been boosted only about three percent. This had resulted in a price increase of about 1½ percent per year since the end of the war. Chronic price inflation such as this does not lift national output. But it does increase the nominal dollar income. Therefore, so long as the built-in price inflation proceeds, personal income, corporate income and the corporate tax revenues that depend on these incomes will increase annually an additional 1½ percent per year.

The final factor involved in the increase in government revenues is the manner in which personal income taxes are levied.

The steady rise of wages since World War II has moved more and more citizens into higher income tax brackets. Although the dollar income has been boosted by about 4½ percent per year, real income has been growing only at the rate of three percent, the rate of increase in the production of real goods.

However, personal income taxes are based on countable dollar income, not on real income. Since 1942, personal income tax rates have been sharply progressive—the higher the dollar income, the higher the rate. So, the fact that all workers are experiencing rising real and countable income and are subject to progressive income taxes insures that the federal government's revenues from personal taxes will rise continuously as a percent of personal income.

At the rate at which American families have been moving into higher income brackets, the federal government has been benefiting to the extent of approximately one-half of one percent per year simply because progressive rather than uniform tax rates apply to all personal income.

So we see how these built-in economic factors practically assure a steady six percent annual increase in federal revenues. One percent comes from the growth of the labor force; three percent from the increase in output per man-hour; one and one-half percent from the increase in prices, and one-half of one percent from increased dollar income and progressive income tax rates.

And we also see that this six percent annual increase in federal revenues can provide all the funding needed to phase the National Dividend plan into full operation to bring its broad-based benefits to all our citizens.

The National Dividend offers far more than just a simple plan for distributing corporate profit taxes directly to those citizens who regularly fulfill their voting obligations.

It would be a perpetual feed-back of consumer buying power into the economy.

It would remove much of the fear of technological advance and would accelerate automation with its ever increasing benefits spread evenly among all citizens.

By reducing centralized federal spending power, it would strengthen the constitutional principles of states' rights and the basic concept of the rights of private property.

It would improve dollar stability by removing inflationary taxes, and reduce artificial and burdensome controls. It would make American products more competitive in world markets, and it would increase the gross national product by stimulating the incentives for investment and production.

And, finally, it could be an effective device for achieving lasting world peace by undermining the senseless ideological attacks on capitalism by Marxism. By making every voter a partner in a vigorous and understandable free enterprise system, the arguments for world socialism would begin to fade away.

Real wages come out of production, not out of government decrees. Partners would produce more, free citizens would have more cash, more confidence, more dignity. Men of good will could, through the National Dividend, work more harmoniously together.

We can have a Great Free Society inspired and financed by profit. We can have opportunity for all. We can be fed, free and happy, a shining example to other peoples of the world, who also want these same, basic things.

IT IS A CIVIL WAR IN VIETNAM—FOUR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS CONFIRM PREVIOUS VIEW OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND SENATOR STEPHEN YOUNG

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, little by little the truth about Vietnam is coming out—the truth which has been persistently obscured by administration propaganda.

Last February, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, in the course of addressing the Northwestern University Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill., in a speech entitled "The Hanoi Myth of an Indigenous Rebellion," declared that the civil war allegations were indeed a myth. But he made this pertinent comment:

> If the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

This is an important declaration by the second ranking official in the Department of State.

We now have further evidence that it is a civil war.

President Kennedy, who was elected to the House of Representatives in 1946, and was in the Senate from 1954 to 1960, during which time he was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, referred, in his news conference of July 18, 1963, to "the civil war which has gone on for 10 years."

On February 6 of this year, Senator Stephen Young of Ohio, a combat veteran, returning from a 3-week visit to South Vietnam, declared on the floor of the Senate:

> This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited Southeast Asia, it had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were communists and infiltrators from the North. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of of time, I was in every area of Vietnam—when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stillwell and other Generals that 80 per cent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved. The fighting has been going on there since 1945.

Now, we have a report from four experienced newspaper correspondents at the front to the same effect. This was heard in an educational television broadcast, transmitted over channel 13, WNDT, New York, on Monday, August 1, and at Washington, D.C., over WETA, channel 26, on August 3. It was a production of National Educational Television. The participants were: Malcolm Browne, formerly of the Associated Press and a Pulitzer Prize winner for his book on the war in Vietnam, entitled: "The New Face of War"; Jack Foisie, of the Los Angeles Times; Charles Mohr, of the New York Times; and Dean Brelis, of the National Broadcasting Co.

Touching on the question of whether this was a civil war or a war of aggression, this is what the four correspondents said:

> Browne. Yes. One of the problems, of course, is that the administration itself, particularly Secretary McNamara, have tended to obscure some of the issues here and have deliberately misled American public opinion. For example, the continual harping on the North Vietnamese aggression has led to the supposition that the Vietcong is a North Vietnamese outfit. Well, of course, it has North Vietnamese leadership and a lot of North Vietnamese cadres and a lot of North Vietnamese weapons. But the bulk of the Vietcong is South Vietnamese. And this, of course, tends to interfere with the McNamara statement this is not a civil war. Well, of course, it is a civil war, by the Webster definition of the thing.
>
> Niven (moderator). Do you all agree?
>
> Foisie. I think it is.
>
> Brelis. Yes, I agree.
>
> Mohr. Yes, a special kind of civil war.
>
> Foisie. And it was more so in its early stages than it is now.
>
> Browne. Yes. Just as the Spanish civil war in its early stages was more of a civil war than it got to be later.
>
> Mohr. And also, especially, if you understand the distinction between North and South Vietnam is not made by Vietnamese in the same way that it's made by the Department of State in Washington. Even if North Vietnam is committing aggression against South Vietnam, that in itself is a form of civil war. Ths is a partitioned country, but it's one country. Essentially it once was.

With this further evidence, it is well to recall the statement of Under Secretary George W. Ball; namely, that if it was a civil war, "the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms."

Quite so; and yet, that is precisely what the United States has done.

The administration persists in denying that this is a civil war, because then its contention that North Vietnam is the aggressor and that we are there to repel aggression, would be patently invalid.

EUPHORIA ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the noted columnist, Joseph Kraft, in his article appearing in the Washington Post Wednesday, has taken a close look at the question of whether the curious euphoria about Vietnam, recently making itself felt in official statements and press reports, is really justified. He finds that our current actions, based on the new rash of optimistic hope, both serve to diminish our chances for a negotiated peace and to heighten the danger of increased intervention by Peking and Moscow.

It is at least questionable, Mr. President, whether our growing military pressure will weaken, or whether it will actually increase, Hanoi's resolution to fight on. We have now bombarded the demilitarized zone, with no greater provocation than has existed for a long time past, since infiltrators have been crossing the DMZ since at least 1961, as officially noted by the State Department.

But our violation of the Geneva accords in this respect, by bombing of the demilitarized zone, has set back the prospect that they may form the basis for negotiations, as so many have suggested, including Secretary General U Thant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Kraft may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 10, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: DANGERS OF EUPHORIA

(By Joseph Kraft)

As the President's press conference yesterday indicates, a curious euphoria now shapes the official outlook on Vietnam. And perhaps the confidence is justified.

But the supporting arguments are, to put it mildly, inconclusive. As usual, moreover, bouyant hopes have yielded actions that serve to erode further the chances of a negotiated peace. And these same actions heighten the danger—now airily dismissed—of increased intervention by Peking and Moscow.

The marks of euphoria are to be found chiefly in things that are being said at the White House and State Department. It is being said, for example, that growing American military pressure is causing the other side to scale down its operations. Supposedly the scaling down is the first step toward a slow petering out of enemy activity that is now seen as the way the war will end.

It is also being said that the last hope of Hanoi is a setback for the Democrats in the elections this fall, but that actually the poll, by showing the President's strength, will serve to shorten the war, as Lincoln's victory in the 1864 election is supposed to have hastened the end of the Civil War.

None of these claims can be disproved. But Washington has not had a good record in assessing what is happening on the other side. Many recent visitors to Hanoi—most recently General de Gaulle's friend, Jean Sainteney—report growing resolution to fight on.

As to the American elections, while North Vietnamese officials have talked about defeat for the President, they have never pitched their main hope on a failure of nerve in this country. Their focus has been the weakness of the Saigon government—a deepening condition advertised every day by the personality and actions of Marshal Ky.

These obvious flaws in the supporting logic, however, do not represent the real case against official bouyancy. The real case lies in the actions that are being taken out of a surfeit of confidence.

For a starter, there is the bombardment of the DMZ or demilitarized zone separating North and South Vietnam, which got under way last week. Ostensibly, the bombing was brought on by the North Vietnamese who suddenly began using the DMZ as a refuge against American attacks. But in fact, according to a Senate Department White Paper of December, 1961, hostile troops have been passing through the DMZ by the thousands for years.

The truth is that the American command now feels that it can usefully seal off the DMZ, and has chosen to do so, picking out a pretext that was available for years. What is blithely ignored is that the DMZ represents one of the principal elements of the Geneva agreements. To violate the accord openly weakens it by that much as a basis for negotiation.

A similar difficulty applies to the appeal by the Thai government for a meeting of Asian states to consider a settlement in Vietnam. The appeal has the backing of the United States, and it seems plausible as an expression of Asian leadership in Asian affairs.

But actually the Thai appeal is set in the context of a charge that the Geneva accords are unworkable because of sabotage by the Russians. There is no chance that the Thais can bring to a conference any of the belligerents on the other side. The upshot of their appeal is merely to dilute still further the one agreement that does affect all belligerents—the Geneva accords.

Playing fast and loose with Geneva might be done with impunity if it were only a question of the United States and North Vietnam. Indeed, since Hanoi shows no present signs of wanting to negotiate, it could even be argued that the United States in the interests of teaching a lesson should throw Geneva to the winds, and go all the way to military victory before sitting down to a conference.

But of course China and Russia are also affected. While they have behaved with singular prudence so far, that is largely because North Vietnam has been doing so well on its own.

Even so the continuation of the war has brought from Moscow and Peking a steady stream of increasingly serious warnings. Thus the intensification of the enemy effort—either by further Soviet input of modern equipment, or by Chinese support on the ground—remains a genuine peril, the more so as Washington, in its mood of confidence, is paying so little heed to the danger.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

STIMULATION OF THE FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FHA AND VA ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA and VA assisted residential construction.

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, as Members of this body are aware, Senator BENNETT, the ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, is unable to be here for debate on this legislation, because he is in the hospital recuperating from an ulcer. He has sent me a statement giving support for the measure and expressing his disapproval of the administration policies that have brought the situation about.

He has asked me to make the statement for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT READ BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. President, I would like to go on record as supporting an increase in the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Earlier in the year, I cosponsored a bill, S. 3482, providing an additional $110 million to the capital stock of FNMA, which I thought would be a better means to that end. When it was discovered that that measure would not have enough support to be passed by the Congress because of budgetary considerations, I was willing to support the alternative which would increase FNMA purchasing authority by changing the borrowing ratio from the present 1 to 10 to the proposed 1 to 15, included in this bill.

HOMEBUILDING NEEDS RELIEF

I believe that we are all aware that the shortage of mortgage money for home financing is one of the most critical problems in our economy today. While other segments are experiencing demands equal to or beyond their capacity to produce, the homebuilding industry has been in a depressed condition.

I have received letters from Utah builders that thus far this year have not been able to build more than a small percentage of the number of homes built during a normal year. Some builders have been forced to take out bankruptcy and others are losing their employees as they are unable to provide work for them.

Individuals seeking homes have been unable to purchase them because of the lack of financing even though homes are available. Interest rates on home mortgages have continued to climb and it appears that they will continue to do so in the immediate future.

The cause of the shortage of mortgage money is just part of the overall lack of sufficient savings to meet the combined demands of consumers for financing purchases, business for financing plant and equipment as well as inventory expansion, and Government for increased military and domestic programs.

The burden of the lack of capital, however, is felt much more sharply by homebuilding and related industries and would-be homeowners because in a competitive free economy, funds just naturally gravitate to the highest bidders. Others demanding credit are in a position to pay higher rates and therefore draw funds away from the mortgage market.

It therefore seems appropriate that we take some action to alleviate that extra burden on the homebuilding segment of our economy and spread it over other segments.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE

While I am strongly in favor of taking this action now that we are in this situation, I am very much opposed to the administration fiscal policy that brought the situation about.

The legislation is necessary because the administration has been unwilling to instigate action that would have been in line with the responsibility set out in the Employment Act of 1946. There has been a great willingness to take action to stimulate the economy when it was not at full capacity and unemployment was at undesirable levels, but unfortunately an equal reluctance to adopt measures needed to take off some of the excess demand that has resulted in pressures on capacity and prices. Instead of reducing expenditures or supporting an increase in taxes, when inflationary pressures are obvious to everyone, new proposals have continued for additional spending.

Instead of taking the politically difficult restrictive fiscal policy, the administration has requested that private sectors cut back their spending. It has always been my understanding that it is the Federal Government's responsibility to be the stabilizing element in the economy, not that this should be pushed off on business leaders or consumers. It is true that demands for consumption expenditures have increased even faster than incomes have risen and the rate of saving has declined. It is true that business plant and equipment expenditures have made great demands. This is the way to provide additional capacity and production which is needed for a growing economy and to meet the increased defense requirements without large cuts in consumption. In such a situation where private forces are providing all the stimulation the economy needs and perhaps too much stimulation, it is the stated responsibility of the Federal Government through its fiscal and monetary policy to exercise a restraining influence.

ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED

The administration has failed in this responsibility. In the absence of restrictive fiscal policy the burden of containing inflation has fallen almost entirely on monetary policy which is the responsibility of the Federal Reserve Board. It is fortunate that the Federal Reserve is an independent system, or perhaps political considerations would have forced inaction there also.

There has been some criticism of the actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board. This has generally come from those who have supported the administration policies that have made the Federal Reserve Board action necessary. It has been seriously suggested that the independence of the Board be removed and that it be brought under executive control. Restrictive action is not popular as is evident by the unwillingness of the administration to request and support measures which would result in a decrease in spending or an increase in taxes, in an election year.

BALANCED POLICY REQUIRED

Members of the Federal Reserve Board have argued that it is not desirable to have monetary policy take the full responsibility of restraining inflationary forces.

Governor Roberston in an August 4 hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee stated:

> We are in the midst today of an inflationary situation. The inflationary pressures are great. In my opinion the dangers of inflation are much greater than the dangers of high interest rates. The cost to the people of this country is much greater in the case of inflation than in the case of high interest rates.
>
> The situation as it now appears through the eyes of our economic staff is one where the pressures will be even greater and the danger of running into a rash of price and wage increases resulting in a spiraling inflation—a potential boom and bust—is there and should be combated. This must be combated either through the use of fiscal policy or monetary policy. If fiscal policy is not used, monetary policy must be used, and this in turn will result in an upward pressure on interest rates which could focus the impact of monetary policy more on the housing industry than on other areas of the economy.

Other members of the Board, both those considered to be liberals and those considered to be conservatives, have made similar statements.

PROBLEM NOT SOLVED BY THIS LEGISLATION

The Federal Reserve Board has taken the only action it has the power to take. It has restricted the expansion in money and credit to conform to the limits of productive capacity, although the supply is not sufficient to meet the greatly enlarged demands for credit. This has had a restrictive effect on spending, but the restraints are not equal on all segments nor can they be made to apply to all segments equally.

Those least able to bid for funds are the ones to feel the effect first. Those least able to bid for the funds include individuals wanting to purchase homes.

I think it is appropriate that we try to equalize this burden to the extent possible and this legislation has that as its purpose, but I also think that it is proper that the responsibility for the problem be placed where it belongs and that we realize that the problem will only be solved when action is taken to restrict spending by the Government, as well as by business and individuals, to within the limits of capacity to produce.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 726, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 1, line 6, strike out all through line 15, page 2, and insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 303(d) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$115,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$225,000,000'.
>
> "SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 303(e) of such Act is amended by striking out '$115,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$225,000,000'."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say at the outset that I support fully the objectives of the pending bill.

I have offered this amendment primarily to ask some questions of the managers of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The report of the committee and the statements of Senator SPARKMAN and Senator TOWER made yesterday on the floor set out fully and precisely the difficult problem our country faces with respect to financing residential housing, and this bill would provide additional stimulus to the flow of mortgage funds, to assist in residential construction.

The first section of the bill would increase the authority of FNMA to purchase mortgages by about $2 billion. This would be accomplished by increasing the ratio of borrowing authority of FNMA from the present 10 to 1 to 15 to 1.

Yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Alabama pointed out that the capital and surplus of the Federal National Mortgage Association at present is $401,625,693 and that at the present ratio of 10 to 1, FNMA has a borrowing capacity of $4,016,256,930. If the ratio is changed to 15 to 1, the borrowing authority would be increased by $2 billion to over $6 billion.

Sometime ago the distinguished Senator from Texas introduced S. 3482 which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] joined and I joined in cosponsoring and which would have provided additional capital and borrowing authority to FNMA. It would have authorized the Treasury to purchase $110 million of preferred stock of FNMA. At the present ratio of 10 to 1, the additional capital of $110 million would have increased the borrowing capacity of FNMA by $1.1 billion.

These bills have also been considered in the House. The minority views of the House Banking and Currency Committee criticizes the proposal to increase the ratio from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1. One point made was that over $3 billion of debt obligations were presently outstanding under the present ratio of 10 to 1. And to increase the ratio to 15 to 1 would dilute the value of the debentures which had been previously issued and might impair the credit of FNMA.

I should like to have the views of the managers upon that first proposition. Would it decrease the value of the debentures which have been issued by FNMA? Would it in any way impair the future borrowing capacity of FNMA, if the ratio of its borrowing authority is increased from its present 10 to 1 to 15 to 1?

Mr. TOWER. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, may I say that somewhat over 2 months ago, when I introduced the original proposal, it seemed to be adequate. But in the 2 months that have elapsed since that time, our money situation has grown so much more tight and our homebuilding situation has become so critical, that we felt that we had to resort to somewhat more drastic means of pumping some mortgage money into the market.

As to the reduction of the value of the debentures, I would say that it would not appreciably reduce the value of the debentures.

I would, of course, invite any comment that the Senator from Alabama might have on that point, but I do not believe that it would appreciably reduce the value of the debentures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. May I say that I believe that the Home Builders Association of the United States and the Association of Savings and Loan Institutions at first opposed the proposal to increase the ratio from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1. They supported the proposal to authorize the Treasury to buy preferred stock of FNMA. By thus increasing the capital base it would give additional borrowing authority to FNMA of $1.1 billion. There was some concern at this time that increasing the ratio to 15 to 1 could impair the credit of FNMA and dilute the credit quality of the debentures which had been issued and were outstanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In my presentation, I included a letter from the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. Does the Senator have that letter available?

Mr. COOPER. In the Senator's statement yesterday?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I should correct that statement. It was not in my speech yesterday. On June 21 I made a presentation with reference to the need for providing assistance to FNMA; and a letter from the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, to which I referred at that time, discussed the question of a 15-to-1 ratio. I invite the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to that letter. It appears in the report on the bill. Has the Senator read the letter?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. The Department recommended the increase.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The Department said that the increase would not impair the ability of FNMA to honor the payment of the debentures; that it would not affect or impair the legal obligation to pay the debentures.

The letter cites court decisions with reference to the legality of the proposal and also discusses the question of the impairment of property rights.

Also, last October a similar measure was passed with reference to the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks. No doubt was expressed at that time, when a change of ratio was made from 10 to 1 to 12 to 1.

Mr. COOPER. That is true. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I serve, reported that bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator's committee reported that bill.

Mr. COOPER. It increased the ratio from 10 to 1 to 12 to 1.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. The Senator from Kentucky knows that, of course, because his committee acted on that proposal.

As I recall, the House committee has reported a similar bill, and it adheres to the 15-to-1 ratio. But I believe the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky provides also for an increase of capital instead of for special assistance. That question will be in conference.

Mr. COOPER. Is it correct that the section we have been discussing, which provides a change in the ratio from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1, would have no impact on the budget?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. COOPER. Previously, however, when the capitalization of FNMA was increased by legislation, it did have an impact on the budget.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it is increased by $110 million it will have some impact on the budget, although I understand it is not great.

Mr. COOPER. My second inquiry relates to section 2. Section 2 would provide on additional authority of $1 billion to FNMA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. For special assistance——

Mr. COOPER. To purchase mortgages. And the authority is provided by using $500 million from the Presidential authority and the $500 million in new Treasury borrowing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Would the $500 million in new Treasury borrowings have an impact on the budget?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would have some but it should be remembered that it is anticipated that this money will go into mortgages quite soon and, of course, we have the participation program, which I hope may convert those mortgages—not necessarily those very ones, but other mortgages—FNMA is holding.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be possible to sell participation certificates? To that extent it would have no impact on the budget.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. This is by reason of the legislation passed earlier in this session—authority to sell participation certificates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I now come to the question which is of great concern to me. Under section 2, I understand that a ceiling on purchases of mortgages would be fixed at $15,000. In my State, and I think in other States, this provision of the committee bill with such a limitation would not be fully adequate. I very much like the idea of assuring adequate credit for mortgages of $15,000 and less to families which need them. However, I raise the question whether the placing of a $15,000 ceiling would greatly help in the present situation particularly in such metropolitan areas of Louisville and Lexington and other areas where land and construction costs are higher and require home mortgages larger than $15,000.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, that only applies to one-third of the anticipated amount of this bill for mortgage purposes. I think that is a very low percentage for what we might call low-cost housing.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator makes the point that while the $1 billion of authority under the special assistance program would be limited to mortgages of $15,000 and less, that the first section provides $2 billion, and this amount would not be subject to the 15,000 ceiling proposed in section 2.

Does the committee think that the new borrowing authority of $3 billion provided by this bill or any substantial part of it, would be used to lighten the load of savings and loan institutions, and banks?

Mr. TOWER. There is nothing in this bill that would improve the administrative procedures or regulations under which these various agencies concerned operate. I recognize the inherent weakness of the system, which I think in due course we should correct. Our purpose here was to free up some mortgage money because of the critical need for it at this time.

I would be the first to concede that there is a great deal of work that the Housing Subcommittee has to do, reviewing the experience we have had in housing programs, and perhaps getting improvements and changes, but this cannot be undertaken at this time. I hope we will undertake it in the future.

Mr. COOPER. I was interested that Mr. Weaver opposed section 2, stating that he did not think it would ease the credit situation very much.

Mr. TOWER. I think it was understood that that would be the administration position because what we are doing is taking $500 million from the administration and designating the way it will be spent, instead of letting the administration designate.

Mr. COOPER. I ask these questions because there is a tremendous interest in my State, as I know there is in every State, on the necessity of immediate action to ease the difficult credit situation today with respect to housing. These questions have been raised by building associations, and by savings and loan institutions and banks. I wanted to clarify them for the RECORD, to be sure that we are taking adequate measures to ease the shortage.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that I appreciate his penetrating, significant, and pertinent questions.

I wish to say that I deplore the fiscal policy that got us in trouble to begin with. I know how difficult it is to counteract the evils of fiscal policies by establishing monetary policy. The situation is critical and calls for action immediately. We are acting in the most constructive way that we can at this time. I wish we did not have to do it, but the fact is that the situation in our country today is such that we must act because of the great paucity in the mortgage market.

(At this point, Mr. SIMPSON assumed the chair.)

Mr. COOPER. The situation today makes it impossible for many people to proceed with building plans, and places a great strain on the savings and loan institutions, banks, and other credit institutions. I have received a report from Mr. John W. Robinson, executive secretary of the Home Builders Association of Louisville, as follows:

A Report on the Effects of the Mortgage Credit Crisis on the Louisville and Jefferson County Home Building Industry

As evident by the chart below, building permits for the Louisville and Jefferson County area have sharply declined. Naturally the estimated construction value of permits issued in the first six months have similarly fallen. Last December and January, we were all forecasting a strong housing market for 1966. From contacts with builders, it was learned that they were all projecting as high a volume of building starts for 1966 as what they had completed in 1965. These projections were based on the fact that there was still a strong market for new homes as well as a need for additional housing to provide for the increased population, due to the overall growth of the area.

Now, six months later many builders, suppliers, sub-contractors are on the verge of going out of business. This has created a most unhealthy situation affecting the whole local economy.

1st 6 months residential building permits

	1966	1965	1964
Single family	1,556	2,450	2,540
Multifamily	514	2,167	702
Total	2,070	4,617	3,251
Estimated construction value	$22,641,610	$37,873,673	$33,500,630

As recently as last week I received an up-to-date report on the seriousness of the mortgage credit crisis in Lexington from Mr. Leonard E. Paulson, executive officer of the Home Builders' Association of Lexington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Paulson's letter placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION
OF LEXINGTON,
Lexington, Ky., August 4, 1966.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Since our meeting in your office a week ago, we have obtained figures on home building in Fayette County for July—and the seriousness of the situation is underscored.

Home building in Lexington is now down 52% from a year ago!

Authorized housing starts, 1-family homes, Lexington and Fayette County

	1964	1965	1966	Percent change, 1966 versus 1965
January	88	101	84	−17
February	114	101	58	−43
March	129	176	142	−19
April	167	196	134	−31
May	193	163	80	−50
June	173	158	109	−31
July	183	151	72	−52
August	136	163		
September	163	130		
October	183	128		
November	159	93		
December	87	130		
Total	1,775	1,690		

Thank you for any work you can do toward the speedy passage of S.B. 3529 introduced by Senator SPARKMAN.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD E. PAULSON,
Executive Officer.

Mr. COOPER. I have received similar reports from many other communities in Kentucky.

In addition, and of great importance a great many people have told me that persons who have built homes, have been able to develop some equity in their homes and now their equity is substantially decreased and in some cases wiped out. If they try to sell their house, they cannot sell it. They find that they do not have any equity in it.

Mr. TOWER. Yes. That is right, they do not have any equity.

Mr. COOPER. I support the increase in borrowing authority. I would have preferred that the second section of the bill would follow the original proposal made by Senators TOWER, BENNETT, and myself, for I believe it financially sounder and would have provided a substantially larger amount of home mortgage credit. But as the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill before us, I support it and will vote for it.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Alabama and his colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee for their continuing attention to the housing needs of the Nation. For several years during my chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee, it was my privilege to serve under the capable leadership of the Senator in his capacity as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee—a position which he still holds.

Through these years and through many prior years, the committee was periodically faced with crises in the homebuilding industry, because our economy was allocating an inadequate quantity of savings to home mortgage credit. Time after time, the committee recommended and the Senate passed bills designed to relieve critical shortages of mortgage money. Today we are in the midst of another such crisis.

I intend to support the committee recommendations, and I urge other Senators to do likewise. I believe that the time has come, however, to treat the cause of this recurring ailment rather than to continue ministering doses of aspirin and antihistamines, which merely relieve the unpleasant symptoms.

Mr. President, the drastic curtailment of homebuilding—described in the committee report—is a result of national fiscal and monetary policies. But the effects of these policies on homebuilding are never publicly debated until they have been implemented and their damaging effects have begun to reverberate throughout the economy. We can no longer afford the waste and sacrifice inevitable in a cycle of boom and bust in homebuilding. Roller coasters are for amusement parks and should not be characteristic of an economic system capable of relative stability.

Even a cursory review of the effects of fiscal and monetary policies over the last 20 years will reveal the circumstances under which home mortgage credit will be plentiful or will be scarce. Decisions made by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Treasury Department, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, turn the volume of homebuilding up or down like water from a faucet.

But these policies are never discussed or debated in specific terms until the homebuilding industry is drowning in a sea of tight money and going down for the third time. The present crisis has been foreseeable for many months. Each time that the discount rate is raised, each time that competition for savings causes a rise in yields offered to investors, each time that rates to borrowers are raised, the ultimate effect upon the supply and price of home mortgage credit becomes clearer and more certain. But this effect of monetary and fiscal policies is never discussed specifically in terms of the homebuilding industry.

This unhealthy state of affairs was recognized by the Committee on Banking and Currency in 1960. In that year the committee concluded a 2-year study of home mortgage credit needs anticipated for the present decade. The first recommendation made by the committee was addressed to the problem I am discussing. The committee recognized that fluctuations in home building do not occur by accident.

The committee realized that these fluctuations are foreseeable and are a result of planned monetary and fiscal policies. To oversimplify, these policies require home building to quickly take up the slack when the economy is sagging, and to take it in the neck when the economy is booming.

Mr. President, we can plan better than we have been doing, and the time has come for the Congress to insist upon better planning.

Recommendations No. 1 of the Subcommittee on Housing, April 15, 1960, read in part, as follows:

> The subcommittee recommends . . . an amendment of existing law to require the following annual report from the President: At the beginning of each session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report stating, among other things, (1) the minimum number of housing units which should be started during the calendar year, or 2 calendar years following submission of the report, in order to be consistent with the program of the President, (2) the manner in which discretion contained in law will be used by Federal agencies to achieve this minimum number of starts, and (3) recommendations for changes in law which may be required to enable the achievement of this minimum number of starts.

This recommendation was subsequently expressed in bill form—S. 3379 of 1960—and, in modified form was included in the omnibus housing bill of 1960—S. 3670, Senate Report No. 1575. During debate on S. 3670, on June 16, 1960, the provision to require an annual housing goal was deleted from the bill by a vote of 44 to 37. It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that the proposal for an annual housing goal was supported by the late President Kennedy, by President Johnson, and by Vice President HUMPHREY. In fact, a total of 50 Senators voted for or were announced in favor of the proposal, and only 47 Senators voted or were announced in opposition.

Mr. President, I submit that if section 101 of S. 3670 had been enacted into law in 1960, we would not today be debating emergency measures to relieve a critical depression in homebuilding. If section 101 had been enacted, the Congress would have deliberated the economic plans of the President in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 as they specifically related to the supply of home mortgage credit, and there would have been appropriate action to maintain stability in this vital economic commodity.

So far as I know, the need for better planning has not attracted attention since 1960. This is because 1966 is the first crisis year since that time—but it will not be the last such crisis, if we continue to let homebuilding be the primary deflator of an overheated economy.

Mr. President, it has been our practice to rely upon economic policies which periodically victimize the homebuilding industry. I propose that we devise economic policies which promise greater stability in allocating public and private savings to satisfy the growing shelter needs of the Nation.

I considered offering an amendment to the pending bill, but have decided instead to introduce a separate bill which may be studied prior to the next session of Congress. If there is no evidence of improvement in our national economic planning in the Economic Report of the President next January, the Congress should give prompt attention to the enactment of appropriate legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On line 5, page 2, of the bill (1) strike out the period after "15,000"; (2) insert the following in lieu thereof: *Provided*, That the

Association is authorized to increase the foregoing amount to no more than $17,500.00 in any geographical area where the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development finds that cost levels so require."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, first, I want to commend the distinguished chairman and members of the committee for taking action in this field which is so urgently in need of assistance at the present time.

The amendment which I have proposed would simply provide that the administration could exceed the $15,000 limit in the special assistance area where the high cost of construction justified it, but not to an amount in excess of $17,500, which is the limit of assistance under the bill at the present time. I do not want to change that basic limit.

In the State of Nevada our construction costs are considerably higher than they are in most areas of the United States. This is brought about in part by the fact that many of our communities are isolated or far removed from world transportation. They are in high-cost labor areas. It virtually precludes construction of FHA assistance, particularly in the special assistance area.

I believe this amendment would give the association flexibility so that in cases where it would exceed the $15,000 limit, the authority would be in the bill itself.

I would hope the distinguished chairman of the committee would be willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference. This provision, of course, would require a justification to enable the association to exceed the $15,000 limitation in the special assistance areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there has been protest and objection raised to this limitation of $15,000. Of course, the purpose of the measure is to aid low- and middle-income housing. However, we have recognized during the years that there are high-cost areas.

The Secretary pointed out in his letter that the $15,000 figure would not be effective except in relatively small parts of the United States. We have similar language to it under the FHA program now.

For my part, I am willing to take the amendment to conference. Let me say that I am confident there will be considerable discussion of this section of the bill, because the House bill did not provide for this, but gave it for additional capitalization.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Counsel has just pointed out that half of the mortgages are below $15,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true, but they are concentrated in relatively small parts of the United States.

If there is no objection, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, one of the questions I would like to get cleared in this proposal—and I speak first of the second section of the bill before us wherein we would provide $1 billion additional borrowing authority from the Federal Treasury—after they borrow the money from the Federal Treasury they can use it to purchase these mortgages which are in the possession of the banks and mortgage institutions——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield; it is not under section 2. Under section 2 it is limited to the special assistance program, which would not be initiated until this bill became law. They could not buy the mortgages.

The staff director tells me the provision would be limited to new construction, subsequent to the enactment of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, but they will be buying the mortgages.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Delaware said "now held by banks."

Actually, it would be subsequently acquired by banks for new construction subsequent to the enactment of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was speaking in terms of after the bill has been enacted and the money has been borrowed from the Treasury. They will be able to buy mortgages which will then be held by the banks. Whether offered to them direct or not, they can buy the mortgages on the homes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct if the Senator will include in his meaning that it would be only on mortgages on houses constructed after the law goes into effect. It is a new program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but my question is projected over the time when it will be functioning.

Once they had acquired these $1 billion worth of mortgages, paid for with the money borrowed from the Federal Treasury, instead of holding these as collateral for the loan from the Treasury they could sell the mortgages under participation certificates and use them as collateral. If we are going to provide authority to borrow $1 billion from the Treasury to buy the mortgages it seems to me the mortgages should be held as collateral for the Treasury loan.

Such a practice would be demanded in private industry. For example, if the Senator from Alabama went to a bank to borrow $10,000 to buy a piece of property and the bank loaned him the money for the specific purpose of buying that piece of property, he would not be expected to go to another bank and pledge that same property as collateral for another $10,000 loan.

I am suggesting that we should tie it down so that none of the mortgages purchased by the agency with moneys borrowed from the Federal Treasury under this program can be pledged as collateral for any other loan such as certificates of participation under FNMA. If they are going to borrow from the Federal Treasury let us make sure the agency keeps the mortgages as collateral, as security for the money which it borrows from the Treasury.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I do not think the analogy goes to pledging horses, for example, or real estate, or personal property, for a loan at a bank, because a mortgage is a negotiable instrument. The collateral is negotiable unless there is a default on the loan, but a mortgage is a negotiable instrument. That is what gives it a unique quality.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question that mortgages are negotiable instruments. We will change the example to a more negotiable factor. Mr. X borrows $10,000 from a bank to buy General Motors bonds. Technically, one would think that those bonds would be held as collateral for this loan even though they are not demanded.

Mr. X cannot go to another bank and pledge those bonds as collateral for a second loan. No bank would stand for it.

Under this measure FNMA can borrow from the Federal Treasury $1 billion. It can take the $1 billion and buy mortgages. It can then use the mortgages as collateral under the participation certificates for another loan. That is wrong.

I suggest we amend this bill to provide that none of the mortgages purchased with money borrowed from the Federal Treasury can be pledged as collateral for repayment of any of the participation certificates sold by FNMA. I am not saying it will be done, but I understand it can be done. If there is no intention for it to be done then it should be stated in the law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one condition before they are able to do it. Under the law they must get authority for anticipated sales of participations from the appropriation committees of both Houses of Congress and get clearance before they are allowed to sell. So it is not something that they can do on their own. They must get clearance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes, they must get clearance, and they got it yesterday for the $3¼ billion assets of the various agencies mentioned under the bill passed. They could use the authority of the bill passed yesterday and sell them. The Senator is correct when he says that this authority must be granted, but it has been granted. I do not criticize the Appropriation Committee for what it did. Congress authorized that action when we authorized the sale of the assets. One of the reasons why I voted against the bill yesterday was that it was a misleading concept for operating our Government.

The committee report indicated that we were appropriating for those respective agencies assisted within that bill yesterday, $2.25 billion less than we appropriated the year before. That is not true. In actual cash available these agencies had $1 billion more than they had the year before. That is not a part of the argument here today, I grant.

But we would grant authority here today for FNMA to borrow $1 billion from the Federal Treasury, and then they could buy the mortgages. After they have bought those mortgages they can sell them under the authority they received yesterday. I do not think they should be able to take the mortgages bought with money borrowed from the Federal Treasury and be allowed to pledge that collateral for the payment of another billion dollar loan.

If that is the intent, let us correct it. If it is not the intent, let us enact legislation so that it cannot be done.

One of the officials told me it is not the intent. He said, "We would not do this."

I said, "All right; you should have no objection then to our saying you cannot do it."

They have confirmed that they can do it under the law as it stands now. The provisions of this bill if it passes would extend that authority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Delaware? Instead of making that an obsolute restriction, why not put a term or time on it? Why not say they must hold them for at least 5 years?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; if they want to sell them at the end of 5 years we will be here. We may not all be here, but Congress at the end of 5 years can, if it wishes, authorize the sale. Conceivably, Congress may want to sell them the next year or the year after. I would not; I do not think it is a sound practice at any time.

One of the gentlemen from the agency tried to tell me, "We do not want to do this. We would not do it."

All right. There should be no objection then to saying that they cannot do it. If they intend to do it let us have that open and clear here now, but I cannot conceive of Congress approving a proposal which would have that effect. I am reasonably certain that was not the intention of the committee.

But why stop it for only 5 years? Let us stop it completely. If they wish to sell at the end of 5 years let them come back and ask. If Congress wants to approve it at the end of 5 years, appropriate legislation can be enacted then as well as now.

I am opposed to such authority at any time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The whole purpose of the participation act—or at least one of its purposes—is to give some movement to these assets which have ripened into considerable maturity. I do not think there would be any particular object in changing it quickly. My thought was that instead of more or less reversing what we did just a few months ago, and just stopping it on this particular program—we would be earmarking this billion-dollar program to do it differently from the way the other special assistance programs are being done—I am confident they would not do it for a number of years, and it seems to me it might be reasonable to put a 5-year limitation on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They could come back at the end of 5 years. I understand what the Senator is talking about.

But if we make a 5-year limitation we are more or less saying that after they have held them awhile we would condone such a practice, and I do not.

It is my belief that you just do not sell assets after you have borrowed money for that specific purpose. It is a bad practice.

This would not in any way restrict them from operating as the committee intends under this bill in the procurement and buying of these mortgages. The only thing we would say is that if they buy the mortgages with money borrowed from the Federal Treasury they will hold them, and if they are paid off they will use the proceeds to pay off the loan to the Federal Treasury and not pledge them as collateral to pay off another loan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, this is something new that has been brought out. As I have stated two or three times already, I know we are going to have considerable discussion on this section 2 in the conference committee. I am perfectly willing, and I have spoken to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and he says he is willing, for us to take it to conference.

I would like to reserve this right: I certainly would stand for whatever is agreed to in the Senate in the conference; but I would like for us to have an opportunity to check into the matter with the agency and with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I want it clear that I offer this amendment with the full intention that I expect the conferees to hold it. It is not just procedural action as far as I am concerned.

I am in earnest. I want this practice stopped.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When I go to conference, I shall go there with the intention of holding to the decision of the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator from Delaware knows I will stand for his position in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I understand that.

I send my amendment to the desk, Mr. President, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> At the appropriate place insert:
>
> "None of the mortgages purchased by this agency with the proceeds of any money borrowed from the Federal Treasury can be pledged as collateral for repayment of any participation certificate sold by Federal National Mortgage Association."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. I shall read it myself, because it has recently been modified to conform to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. I offer this amendment in behalf of myself, the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment is as follows:

> On page 2, line 5, before the words "the total" strike the period and the quotation mark and insert ", except that such ceiling amount for mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii may be increased not to exceed 50 per cent to compensate for higher housing costs in those areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator state his amendment. I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 2, line 5, before the words "the total" strike the period and quotation mark and insert ", except that such ceiling amount for mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii may be increased not to exceed 50 percent to compensate for higher housing costs in those areas."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I offer this amendment to attempt to equalize the mortgage problem on new construction for Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii. It is my understanding that the figure of $15,000 in section 2 was arrived at as the amount of the average mortgage on new construction throughout the lower 48 States.

The amendment would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase mortgages in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii in amounts up to 50 percent greater than the $15,000 limitation. This language conforms to existing language governing the mortgage limitations for homes insured by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration. FHA is authorized to insure mortgages in amounts up to $25,000 except that in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii, because of very high construction costs, FHA may insure mortgages in amounts up to $37,500.

However, in Alaska, the average mortgage amount is $29,000 on FHA-insured mortgages.

This amendment would provide that in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii, the Federal National Mortgage Association would be authorized to purchase mortgages in amounts up to $22,500.

The problem in Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam is particularly acute. FHA insures mortgages at a far higher rate in these areas than elsewhere in the country. The impact of any mortgage limitation for these areas is so great as to impede any new construction or the resale of homes. Alaska, for example, depends upon the Federal Housing Administration almost entirely for capital for new construction. FHA insures nearly 80 percent of all mortgages in the State.

This amendment merely recognizes existing national housing policy. It adds no new concept to our national housing laws. We have long recognized the fact that high land and construction costs and shortages of capital have caused the cost of home construction in these three areas to rise far above national averages. This amendment is needed for Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii in order that these areas may share in the limited amount of new construction mortgage money which will be made available by S. 3688. Failure to include the amendment will mean virtually cessation of new housing starts in these already tight-housing areas.

Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, particularly Alaska and Guam, are chronically short in mortgage capital. All three areas are experiencing extraordinary population growths. The pressure on available financial resources is great at all times, but especially severe now.

As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] told us yesterday, residential construction is down sharply and indicators reveal that the trend downward will continue in coming months. We have a housing shortage which threatens to negate our efforts to build the Great Society.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very happy to associate myself with my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, on his amendment. I subscribe to everything he has said concerning the very high cost of construction in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

The provisions of the measure which is now before the Senate are to be found in some of our laws dealing with FHA mortgages.

This is nothing new. Heretofore, Hawaii, Guam, and Alaska have been accorded a special privilege because of the very high cost of construction.

Speaking for Hawaii, the cost of housing is very high. The construction of homes is primarily concentrated on the island of Oahu. Oahu has an area of only 600 square miles. Approximately 600,000 people are on that island. When we divide 600,000 by 600, we find that there are 1,000 people per square mile. We can see how densely populated the island of Oahu is. Land is very expensive on the island of Oahu. Within 3 miles of the city of Honolulu, I doubt if one can purchase a piece of land for less than $3 per square foot. In the outlying areas, the value of land runs approximately $1.50 a square foot.

We have a very limited land area on the island, and there is a great concentration of people.

Almost all of our construction materials must be imported. The laws governing zoning and construction on Hawaii are very stringent.

These factors have combined to make Hawaii a very high cost construction area. If we were limited to $15,000 mortgages, all our construction would cease on the island of Oahu.

The pending bill would not alleviate the very serious condition which exists there.

Speaking for the island of Guam, Guam is another 2,000 miles away from Hawaii.

Guam is experiencing the same high construction cost as Hawaii because it has to import all of its materials.

Mr. President, this is a very good amendment. This amendment will do justice to our three outlying areas which are so far away from the mainland of the United States.

The amendment will help to alleviate our very bad housing problems.

I am very happy to join the distinguished Senator from Alaska and shall support his amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe this is a reasonable amendment. I think that it is really more realistic than the amendment originally submitted, which amendment would impose a limitation of $18,750, because even that falls below the average cost of construction in most of Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, is prepared to accept the amendment, I certainly am.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with what has been said. I call attention to the fact that this is in conformity with existing law on FHA and other programs. I am willing to accept it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to what type of construction would the amendment apply?

Mr. GRUENING. It would apply to all units, I understand, in the States of Hawaii, Alaska, and in the Territory of Guam.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would it apply to multifamily units?

Mr. GRUENING. I think it would apply to all of them.

Mr. TOWER. They are not going to build any multifamily units for $22,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point I want to make clear. The reason I raise that point is that there has been a substantial overbuilding in Alaska according to the reports, with a resulting alarming rate of failures with relation to multifamily units. If the amendment relates to the individual homes I have no objection.

Mr. TOWER. These are single-family dwellings.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I say parenthetically to the senior Senator from Delaware that his comments on the housing situation in Alaska are not quite in accord with my understanding. I shall comment on that at the appropriate time. In this case, the amendment applies only to individual housing units.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My comments to the Senator from Alaska are based upon documents furnished to me by the Housing Administration in Washington. Based upon the manner in which they sometimes enforce the law I would not be surprised if they are confused as to what is going on in Alaska.

The list given to me shows that in the city of Anchorage there were seven multifamily projects which had been approved, and six of those were failures. That gave me great concern. These were multifamily projects.

I understand that this amendment relates to single-family units, and I have no objection.

Mr. TOWER. I assure the Senator that this relates only to single-family units.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Hawaii has a modification to the amendment.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, my suggested modification is, after the word "for," add the words "single-family dwelling." I ask the Senator if he will agree to accept the modification.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, with those words added in the amendment I have no objection.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

MORE MORTGAGE CREDIT IS NEEDED TO EASE THE BUILDING CRISIS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I recently received a letter which began:

> In the past several months we have been concerned with getting mortgage money at a decent price. We are now faced with the problem of getting mortgage money at any price.

Today this situation is all too typical all over the country. The June figures for housing starts in the country are 18 percent below what they were a year ago. In Texas, June housing starts were 13 percent below May and 17 percent below what they were a year ago.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the August 1, 1966, Dallas Morning News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 1, 1966]

BUILDING CRISIS

Texas building statistics released Sunday confirm what builders have been saying for a long time: Tight money has brought construction starts to the lowest level in years and the situation is worsening.

June building authorizations in Texas were 13 per cent below those in May and 17 per cent smaller than in June, 1965, as measured on the 1957–59 index, compiled by the University of Texas Bureau of Business Research.

Except for February, 1965, the June index was the lowest since 1961.

Seriousness of the situation was reviewed with President Johnson last week by a 6-man group, headed by Larry Blackmon of Fort Worth, president of the National Association of Home Builders. Mr. Blackmon commented lthat the President was concerned with the tight-money situation not only as it influences building, but because of the entire economic situation.

In Congress pressure is rising for a rollback of interest rates. Many different proposals have been advanced, all arising from the recognition that any deep, prolonged recession in building will hurt every aspect of the national economy.

Interest rates, inflation and related complexities are far beyond the understanding of the layman. But the home builder paralyzed with inactivity and the workman on relief know that something must be done to release the financing that is needed. The nation hopes that the President and his advisers will find some sound basis for avoiding the extremes of inflation or deflation and for maintaining a reasonable level of construction to meet the requirements of a growing population.

The construction industry, residential and commercial, is like the automobile industry: When it slumps, a hundred related activities are hurt—raw building materials, appliances, financing institutions. When the industry proceeds at a steady pace, the effect is favorable on the whole economic index.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cause of the problem is a shortage of mortgage credit. In a recent speech John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, said that he saw the problem as composed of two parts: very strong demand for credit in the economy at large and the special competition for savings funds that has hurt the savings and loan associations, which are leading mortgage lenders.

I ask unanimous consent that an article recounting Mr. Horne's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1966]

MORTGAGE MONEY: SOME EASING SEEN—HOME LOAN CHIEF FORESEES POTENTIAL DAYLIGHT AHEAD BUT REMAINS CAUTIOUS—CALLS FOR REGULATION—NOTES SCATTERED EVIDENCE OF LENDERS COMING BACK TO THE CREDIT MARKET

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—John E. Horne, chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, foresees "some potential daylight ahead" in the difficult mortgage money situation, but he believes that "the possibility of restoration of an easy mortgage market is far more remote."

Mr. Horne assessed the entire mortgage and homebuilding problem in a lengthy speech to the Wisconsin Home Builders Association yesterday in Oshkosh. The text was released here.

Because of rising interest rates on market securities and competition from commercial banks, he said, savings and loan associations had an inflow of funds in the first seven months of this year 75 per cent less than in the period last year. This includes an estimated outflow of $1.1-billion in July.

DEMAND FOR CREDIT

Mr. Horne saw the mortgage problem as having two parts—the "very strong demand for credit" in the economy at large, and the special competition for savings funds that has hurt the savings and loan associations, which are leading mortgage lenders.

He said the demand for credit "cannot be dampened without a major change in Government policy or economic activity" and added that "it is probably not realistic or wise to expect either in the near future."

However, he continued, "there is some feeling on the part of a number of observers that the plant and equipment boom may decelerate a bit," and it is also possible that credit demand "will rise more slowly from now on because the major upward adjustment in credit demand is behind us."

PRESSURE ON RATES

If this proves true, he said, the economy should generate a level of savings "sufficient to reduce the degree of upward pressure on interest rates."

Mr. Horne also suggested that mortgage lenders had "over-reacted" to the change in savings flows, but now were ready to readjust their thinking.

"There is currently some scattered evidence," he said, "that lenders are coming back to the market, at least to the extent that their loan repayments permit. A somewhat greater willingness to lend is not far off . . ."

Mr. Horne renewed his plea for legislation to permit regulation of interest rates paid by both banks and thrift institutions, asserting that use of this authority "would give a better balance to savings flows and improve the availability of mortgage money."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of course the strong demand for credit is a result of our very active, full employment economy. It is a desirable situation, I feel, that there exist a strong demand for mortgage credit. It is a sign of economic activity, a sign that more Americans than ever before are building homes. However, it is absolutely necessary that this strong credit demand be met with an adequate credit supply.

In the present situation Congress is gearing up to move in at least two different directions to deal with the problem. Bills have been introduced in the Senate and in the House which would help bring some element of peace to the interest rate war between commercial banks and the savings and loan associations.

S. 3688, the bill before us today, would directly alleviate some of the pressure in mortgage credit by stimulating the flow of credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction.

In the words of the committee report, the bill "is aimed at stimulating the flow of mortgage credit to finance FHA and VA residential construction in two ways. First, it would provide new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility of FNMA by authorizing FNMA to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times. The effect of this is to add about $2 billion new purchasing authority under this facility. Second, the bill would further increase FNMA's purchasing authority by authorizing an additional $1 billion in its special assistance function to purchase FHA and VA mortgages which do not exceed $15,000."

We have got to insure an adequate supply of credit for our homebuilding industry. Failure to do so would be serious indeed. Employment would fall. Related industries would be affected. Perhaps the greatest injustice would be to the small homeowner, who has been faithfully paying installments on his mortgage down through the years.

If he has to sell his house or if for some reason he has to refinance his loan, he will see most or all of his equity vanish.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for the expeditious manner in which he has guided this legislation through the Banking and Currency Committee and brought it here to the Senate floor today. We are really in somewhat of a crisis situation, and fast action is necessary before the situation gets much worse.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. J. Max Quenon, president of the El Paso Home Builders Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD. Mr. Quenon's letter is representative of many which I, and I am sure other Senators also, have received on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF
EL PASO,
El Paso, Tex., July 22, 1966.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH: In the past several months we have been concerned with getting mortgage money at a decent price. We are now faced with the problem of getting mortgage money at any price. The growing scarcity of funds for mortgage lending purpose is a result of an unprecedented period of capital expansion by private industry coupled with the vast needs of Federal Government to finance the Viet Nam conflict and to meet the promises of the Great Society. The decision of Federal Government to provide both guns and butter without a corresponding tax increase or other means of financing could result in only one thing: . . . The Federal Government must borrow. The result of these factors is that the demand for money exceeds the supply. Like any commodity money is subject to the law of supply and demand. We have already experienced an increase in interest rates due to this but are now faced with the prospect of being unable to obtain funds.

Within the past few weeks I am aware of several mortgage investors, major lenders in the El Paso market, who have simply closed their doors to prospective home owners with the statement, "Sorry, no more loans at this time". Low cost housing and resale of existing properties have specially been penalized through exorbitant costs of financing and an unwillingness of lenders to make funds available for these people.

The Federal National Mortgage Association is a Federal Agency created for the explicit purpose of backstopping the private mortgage market, that is, to make sure that funds are available for home ownership in the United States. This agency has been woefully inadequate in fulfilling its function during the present mortgage crisis, for the simple reason that the funds were not available. Mr. Borrett will ask that legislation be passed increasing F.N.M.A.'s borrowing authority for the purpose of enabling F.N.M.A. to once again fullfill its basic function, to make the dream of homeownership a realization for all Americans. One of the unique aspects of the present mortgage crisis is that while the overall state of the economy is experiencing a boom condition, the Homebuilding Industry is suffering a bust. . . . Housing starts are down 13% from last year with the balance of the year expected to show a further decrease. According to the survey recently conducted by the National Association of Homebuilders, builders have cut back their projected construction by

35% in El Paso. Residential building permits are off by 33%. During the past 2½ months new dwelling permits have decreased to 200 units as compared with 299 units for the same period last year.

The amount of new house commitments issued by the local F.H.A. Office is off 40% from last year, during this same period. This indicates that there has been a greater percentage decrease in Federal Insured Loans than in Conventionally financed loans.

These statistics have little meaning unless you are one of the unhappy homebuyers unable to obtain a loan or are one of the 525 unfortunate wage earners who are losing their jobs because of the cutback. . . . I repeat that 525 people are being put out of work in the city of El Paso by the current mortgage crisis.

This seemingly odd situation of a lagging homebuilding industry in the midst of a healthy and robust economy is not too hard to understand when you look at it. Because of the robust nature of our economy we are experiencing inflation throughout the nation. As near as the grocery store, as far as the lumberyard, prices are up, up, up. When your wife goes to buy back to school clothes next month you will spend considerably more than you did last year.

The Federal Government is well aware of this and has established rules and guidelines for business, labor and private citizens to abide by in an effort to stem the tide. There are indications that they might even get around to checking themselves to combat inflation.

One of the most effective means the Federal Government has to control the state of the economy is through the Home Building Industry. It is my opinion that the current mortgage crisis and the corresponding slump in homebuilding is no accident or unfortunate turn of events but was deliberately ordained to happen by the Administration. Witness the failure of F.N.M.A. to perform its function, and the failure of F.H.A. to authorize rate increase to attract mortgage funds from private investors.

The situation in which we now find ourselves was indeed no accident. We have been handpicked by the Administration to slow down the economy and stem the tide of inflation. This means that business will slow down (33% decline in building starts), that purchases will not be made . . . (Sorry—No Loans Now) and the employees will be laid off. . . . (Situations Wanted: 525 Trained People in Construction And Construction Supplies). It means that things are going to get tough in El Paso and every other community across the nation.

But let's face it . . . Our nation is at war. Some of our good El Paso neighbors are risking their lives this very minute in Viet Nam. What little sacrifice we have been requested to give is insignificant in this context. The wars of the nations are fought at home as well as on the fronts. The Home Building Industry must be prepared and proud to meet national demand at such times.

The Home Building Industry however, is entitled to and expects all segments and industries to carry their load. I submit that the Administration has been discriminatory in crippling our industry in the midst of a booming economy and call for an end to such selective controls.

The damage being inflicted to our industry is severe and will have effect on the entire community. We are willing to carry our burden but we need a life line to keep our head above water. And we feel that selective control of the economy as is now being exercised should be discontinued. Therefore, we urge the passage of S 2535 as soon as possible.

Cordially,

J. MAX QUENON,
President, Home Builders Association, El Paso.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives just received, and directs the clerk to read it by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill read the second time.

Mr. ERVIN. I object.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second reading of the bill will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the receipt this morning of H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, the leadership recommends to the Senate a parliamentary course of action which, it is believed, will be most beneficial to orderly consideration and the earliest disposition of the question.

Technically, the second reading of the House-passed bill will not occur until tomorrow during the morning hour. Therefore, all Members are on notice of the action which will be pursued. I shall not be able to be present in the Senate tomorrow, since I will be returning to Montana. I have asked the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who will handle this bill on the floor, as he did so brilliantly last year on a similar measure, to represent the majority leadership on all matters pertaining to this bill during my absence.

After the second reading of the bill tomorrow, the Senator from Michigan will object to further proceedings on the bill under rule 14, paragraph 4. This objection has the effect of sending the House-passed bill directly to the Senate Calendar. The step is necessary, even if a motion to refer to committee with instructions to report on a date certain were to be made. It is not my present intention, however, to recommend referral in that fashion. Rather, I think the better alternative is to keep the House-passed bill on the Senate Calendar until the Senate is prepared to take up this question.

Under this procedure, the House-passed bill will be eligible to be called up for consideration by the Senate at any time from next Monday on. However, I wish to give assurance that the leadership does not intend to move on the bill until September 6, the day after Labor Day. It is hoped that by that time the Senate Judiciary Committee will have completed action on the Senate bill which was referred to it and to which it has already devoted considerable time and effort during the past few months. If and when the Senate Judiciary Committee reports that bill, similar in many respects to the House-passed bill, the leadership will give precedence to the Senate product over H.R. 14765.

I think that the retention of the House bill on the Senate Calendar in this fashion is the most desirable course of action. The only practical alternative, as the leadership sees it, would be a referral of H.R. 14765 to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report back at a certain time. Since that committee has been considering the companion bill for almost 3 months, it would seem that referral of the House bill for a 10-day to 2-week or 3-week period would be more disruptive than productive. By following the course outlined, the Senate committee retains the option of reporting out the Senate bill. Even if it elects to do so after the commencement of floor consideration of the House bill, as I have already stated, the leadership is prepared to proceed with the Senate bill. That can be done by substituting it for H.R. 14765. In the event that the Judiciary Committee chooses not to report the Senate bill, we have the House-passed bill ready for action on the floor.

On September 6 the leadership will ask the Senate to proceed to its consideration.

I am frank to say that I have very grave doubts that the Senate bill will come out of the Judiciary Committee at the end of the 2 weeks or 2 months or 2 years. By ways and means best known to himself, the able chairman of the committee [Mr. EASTLAND] has repeatedly interposed his towering presence in the procedural corridor between the Judiciary Committee rooms and the Senate floor. Once in position, he has proved time and again that he is immovable. Indeed, it has invariably taken almost the entire Senate to bypass him. I live in hope that the Senator from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will change his ways, that he will see the light. But each year that passes finds him not less but more intractable.

I mean the able Senator from Mississippi no offense by these observations, but the leadership has suffered his operations too many times in these questions to expect any miracles. This issue seems always to bring out the resisting best or worst in the Senator from Mississippi, depending, of course, on one's point of view.

Prior to this announcement I have conferred with the parties who are primarily involved and interested in the handling of this bill. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I discussed the matter a couple of weeks ago.

At that time I expressed an inclination to refer the House-passed bill to the Senate committee for a specified period of time. With his usual graciousness, the cooperative minority leader agreed to assist me in that course. However, after further consideration of the matter, the decision was made by me to follow the procedural course which I have just outlined. When advised of the decision, the understanding minority leader has again given me his patient forebearance.

I reiterate that, with the present scheduling, the next 3 weeks will afford the committee an opportunity to study the House language while working on the Senate bill. I think that this is the course to be preferred over referral of the House bill, since it places the emphasis where it belongs, in this body, on the Senate committee, and the work which it has already completed.

I do not suggest, Mr. President, that the recommended procedure is necessarily the best, certainly there are other possibilities. But the leadership has had to make a judgment. On the basis of a long experience in these matters and the present set of relevant circumstances, it is the judgment of the leadership that the course proposed is the least disruptive and, hopefully, will prove the most productive, in obtaining an early and satisfactory disposition of this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am disquieted by one thing in the statement of the Senator from Montana. Other than that, I agree with the Senator; and as one Senator deeply interested, I shall do my utmost to support him. I am concerned about the plan that the Senator has for substituting the Senate bill if reported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. At any stage of the proceeding. I am sure the Senator is aware that, if we follow the history of civil rights bills, this bill might be debated for several weeks. I just wondered as to the majority leader's view if at the end of that time, after the House bill has been worked on and amended, and so on, suddenly the Senate committee should report a bill. Would that stop everything and require us to return to the Senate bill, work on that, and junk the House bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. I think that any committee of the Senate is entitled to that courtesy. As far as I am concerned, the Committee on the Judiciary will receive it. This House-passed bill, which I hope will be on the calendar on Monday next, is also subject to amendment, and only the Senate by a majority vote can agree to an amendment. The wisdom of any amendment either as to timeliness or to substance is for the Senate as a whole to decide.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senate, of course, would have its option?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. If at a very late date in the consideration along would come a committee bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Chair acquaint the Senate with the practice under which this bill, having been placed on the calendar, may by motion be referred to a committee?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that at any time the bill is on the calendar, a motion to proceed with its consideration is in order.

Mr. JAVITS. What would be the situation with respect to referring it to a committee?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. After agreement had been reached to proceed to its consideration, a referral motion would be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. But not before?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not before.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask that question for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that once a bill has been placed on the calendar, it is subject to a motion to take up and then to the motion to refer, about which the Senator from New York has raised the question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has to be before the Senate for consideration; then a motion to refer to a specific committee would be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think that an attempt to bypass a committee destroys the legislative process, and at the proper time either the chairman or some Senator will move to send the bill to the committee.

The Senate is entitled to a section-by-section analysis by a committee of whatever bill is before it. The Senate is entitled to take testimony from experts in the field, and not attempt to legislate on the floor of the Senate.

Here we have a situation in which the House of Representatives has added 26 amendments to this bill. There is no legislative history. Nobody knows what they mean; and nobody can tell what they mean. After all, this bill is going to cause a great number of lawsuits, and the courts need a committee report and they need a legislative history in order to competently interpret what this legislation means.

Under this procedure there will be no official spokesman for the Committee on the Judiciary to handle this bill on the floor of the Senate.

In 1957, then-Senator Harry F. Byrd made a speech in opposition to H.R. 6127 that certainly is entitled to consideration.

Senator Byrd of Virginia said:

> I am proud to be a Member of the Senate, which I regard as the greatest legislative body in the world. The rules of the Senate, basically handed down through Thomas Jefferson, are one of the reasons for the great respect in which this body is universally held.
>
> I have been honored by long membership in the Senate, and I can tell Senators from experience that when we start breaking, bypassing, and tampering with the rules of the Senate, we are in trouble. It is invariably unnecessary trouble, and frequently it is serious trouble. It is like telling a lie. One cannot do it just once—just a little bit—and get by. Each time leads to another, and with each breach one becomes more involved.

Senator Byrd then stated the following:

> What happens next in this chain of rule-breaking events? The Senate will be deprived of the benefit of committee report containing carefully stated majority and minority views. And, deprived of committee report, the Senate will be deprived also of the benefit of the requirements of the Cordon rule under which the changes made in existing law by this bill must be set forth clearly in comparative form.

I think the Cordon rule was very beneficial to the orderly consideration of legislation. Why should not the changes in the law be set out?

The former Senator from Virginia, Mr. Byrd, continued:

> The importance of this information was dramatically demonstrated only last week when the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] showed the Senate, the Nation, the President, and the press—to the confessed surprise of all—how designing drafters had hidden the fact that a reconstruction era statute could be invoked under H.R. 6127 to provide the armed might of the United States for enforcement of the bill's provisions. This bayonet force is only a sample of the kind of vicious stuff of which this bill is made. I cite it at this point only to show the need for the Cordon rule which is bypassed under the Senate procedure chosen by proponents of the bill.
>
> How many more rules will be so ruthlessly swept aside in this procedure, so unworthy of the Senate, no one knows, but I venture the assertion that the end is not in sight.

History has shown that Senator Byrd was right. We have had rules by bayonet since that time. But, Mr. President, it is very serious when we tamper with the rules of orderly legislative procedure.

I am informed that in the House of Representatives many amendments were placed in this bill at the last minute by a close vote without adequate consideration, and by the Judiciary Committee of the House by a closely divided vote.

Why is it that a committee of the Senate will not have the opportunity to look at those amendments put in by the House committee and understand their meaning?

In addition, as I said, there were 26 amendments offered or adopted from the floor of the House of Representatives. The House was operating as a Committee of the Whole, and it is proposed here that the Senate operate as a Committee of the Whole.

The distinguished majority leader mentioned the chairman of the committee. Yes, I am opposed to this bill, but I am just one person on that committee.

There are other ways in which this bill, if the committee does not report it, can be brought to the floor for consideration, as every Senator knows.

I say that there is no rhyme or reason at all in not thoroughly considering this bill. Why is it that the House bill has not been considered at all by the Senate committee? The bill that is being put on the calendar has not been considered at all by the Senate committee. And yet, we are depriving the Senate of what that bill means by an analysis by a committee. It is very strange that the only time we resort to this procedure is when civil rights bills come to the Senate, even though they can be brought to the floor of the Senate by other means.

Mr. President, I think that this is a horrible procedure. It is going to haunt us as long as this precedent is obeyed or is used in the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] know of any other class of bills that consistently have been placed on the calendar as have the civil rights bills?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of none. But this bill, the one that the majority leader proposes to put on the calender, has not even been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and his subcommittee have been zealously working on a Senate bill for 3 months.

Now, we propose to place a bill on the calendar and consider it when it has not been considered by a Senate committee and a good part of it has not been considered by a House committee.

Mr. THURMOND. Regardless of what is in the bill, and regardless of the merits of the bill, does the Senator feel that any bill should be placed on the calendar and the appropriate committee denied the right to consider a House bill in detail, analyze it, study it, and make a report, so that the Senate will have the benefit of such report?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. But it is broader than the Senate, because the courts consider legislative history. Here we have a bill with no legislative history.

(At this point Mr. Mondale is in the chair.)

Mr. THURMOND. When civil rights is mentioned, a great many Senators nearly go into hysteria, and as soon as civil rights is mentioned it is assumed it is something good, when some of the most vicious and unconstitutional legislation has been passed through Congress under the phrase "civil rights."

Mr. EASTLAND. Civil rights; but depriving one area of the country of liberties and rights and things; and it does not take those same rights away from people all over the United States of every section.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that because they attach the words "civil rights" to a bill, a certain segment of the population is led to believe that they will be favored in some respect, that the bill is calculated to help them regardless of what is in the bill, and that the ultimate purpose of the administration in recommending it, as well as on the part of certain leaders in Congress who propound such proposals, is to receive political benefits?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. The Senator is exactly right. Not benefits but special favors—to receive special favors.

Mr. THURMOND. I am speaking about the administration, which advocates such bills and thereby expects to receive political benefits from such advocacy of civil rights bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly right.

Mr. THURMOND. Is that not an unwise course to pursue and, in fact, is that not an unstatesmanlike method to proceed to legislate, for the administration to recommend—or for Members of Congress to agree that Congress go along with—such legislation when they know, or should know, that such legislation is unconstitutional and is merely being advocated in order to get the votes of certain classes of people?

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with my friend, the Senator from South Carolina, and thank him for his comments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After the lapse of 1 day, second reading on a civil rights bill becomes automatic; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It comes automatically during the transaction of routine morning business if the Senate adjourns tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This will be on tomorrow. At that point, is it in order for a motion to send the bill to committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It depends on how it is transacted and who gets the floor first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If, perchance, there should be objection to further consideration of the matter, then such a motion would not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would then automatically go to the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order, and in the galleries?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will please be in order. The Senator from North Carolina may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asserting that the House-passed civil rights bill, H.R. 14765, ought to be sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee, where it will receive adequate scrutiny and consideration. It will receive such scrutiny and consideration because the members of this committee are lawyers with divergent views concerning proposals of this nature. The views of advocates of so-called civil rights legislation will certainly be adequately presented because 10 of the 16 members of the Senate Judiciary Committee joined in the introduction of the Senate bill, S. 3296.

It has been a procedural impossibility to secure adequate presentation and consideration of civil rights proposals in the initial stages in the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee for reasons I shall presently state.

I have always held to the conviction that there should be fair procedure in the courts and also fair procedure in legislative bodies. However, I am constrained to say that there is an exception to the rule for fair procedure as a practical matter in legislative processes dealing with the bills which are designated as civil rights bills.

The fact is, in the House, these bills are handled by a subcommittee which conducts the hearings and takes initial action on them. There has never been, so far as I can recall, a single member of that subcommittee who has ever opposed a civil rights bill or has ever threatened to oppose a civil rights bill.

I am not going to say that the subcommittee in the House is packed, because that might be unjust and would in any event be in violation of the rules; but I am constrained to say that it is rather a curious coincidence in the working of the legislative system that all the members of the House Subcommittee having jurisdiction of so-called civil rights proposals are united in a single thought in respect to such proposals despite the fact that the full House committee and the House itself are sharply divided in respect to such controversial and divisive proposals when they vote on them. Since the House subcommittee conducts the hearings on such proposals and takes the initial action upon them, this means that all the opposition to civil rights proposals in the full House Judiciary Committee and the House itself must come from Members who are not privileged to participate in the hearings when the record is made or in the initial action. For these reasons, Members of the House who oppose civil rights proposals are seriously disadvantaged, and the House-passed bill should be sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee for further consideration.

MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to vote on H.R. 14088. The Senator from North Carolina will be recognized immediately after the vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator need?

Mr. ERVIN. I would like to have a little time, but I am ready to release the floor at this time. I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized after the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina will be recognized.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A rollcall is underway. Debate is not in order.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] and the

Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
Metcalf
Miller
Tydings

So the bill (H.R. 14088) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and the dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, because of the importance of the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, be added to the list of conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the unanimous passage just recorded of the military medicare bill is testimony not only to the sentiment in this body that the military man well earns each of these benefits but also to the skill and effort of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the distinguished and lovely Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Their efforts on this bill as on all measures dealing with military affairs has been exemplary.

In addition, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is to be singled out for commendation for the part he has played in the fashioning of this bill with respect to the physically and mentally handicapped. His efforts in this general field are long standing and well known.

To the Senate as a whole the leadership expresses its gratitude for their cooperation in expeditiously completing another significant measure.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Under the previous order, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I was arguing that H.R. 14765, the civil rights bill of 1966, should be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. When my remarks were interrupted for the vote, I was stating the undoubted fact——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from North Carolina may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. I was stating the undoubted fact that the hearings in the House on this bill, and the initial action taken in the House on the bill, were conducted by a subcommittee whose membership did not include a single Representative opposed to civil rights legislation.

For that reason, the hearing——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from North Carolina will suspend until order in the Chamber is restored.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. For that reason, the hearing record on the House bill was largely made and molded by proponents of the bill. Opponents of the bill were denied, as a matter of procedure, the right to cross-examine witnesses who advocated the bill; and under such circumstances, those opposed to such legislation in the House of Representatives had to do the best they could to fight the bill after it came from the subcommittee to the full committee and after the bill came from the full committee to the House floor. They had no opportunity in either case to conduct hearings and make a record for use in the debate on the House floor.

Therefore, I urge that the House bill should be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has a few opponents, and many proponents, of legislation of this character. As I have already pointed out, 10 of the 16 members of the Committee on the Judiciary are cosponsors of the Senate bill.

The House bill has made many drastic changes in the provisions of the administration bill as originally introduced. These changes ought to be carefully scrutinized by a committee with a membership consisting of those who advocate this type of legislation and those who oppose this type of legislation.

I have consistently opposed all legislation of modern vintage which goes under the beguiling name of civil rights legislation because, without exception, it is subject to three inherent vices.

The first is that it undertakes to give not equal rights, but superior rights, to one group of our citizens at the expense of the curtailment of the rights of all Americans.

The second vice is that it centralizes power in the Federal Government in many areas which should be left to the States and the people. The third vice is that in all too many cases it delegates legislative power as well as judicial power to executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government in spite of James Madison's truism that such consolidation of governmental power produces tyranny. This is particularly true in respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

When Congress wrote that act, it included in it two things to free the medicare program from the tyrannies of the bureaucrats. One provision of title VI was that the powers of the executive departments and agencies administering Federal programs should exist only in respect to federally financed programs.

Since the Medicare Act is based upon social security, it is supported by social security taxes which do not belong to the United States. This is expressly recognized by the fact that such taxes are segregated—I should not use that word, I guess, but I will—in a trust fund for the benefit of the beneficiaries of the medicare program. However, what do the bureaucrats care about what Congress says. They have shown that they do not care what Congress has said in respect to the medicare field.

Mr. President, the medicare program is clearly an insurance program. Indeed, it is a part of a program actually called old-age and survivors insurance.

Any insurance contract program is exempt from the provisions of the title by the express language of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Medicare represents a statutory insurance contract between the beneficiaries of the program and the United States of America, but a little thing like a congressional declaration that it does not have any jurisdiction under title VI of any insurance contract does not stop the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from usurping and exercising such jurisdiction.

If Congress gives executive departments and agencies an inch of authority, they take a mile for every inch given them.

A provision was written into the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting assigning children to public schools to overcome racial imbalances. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has absolutely ignored that provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and today it has a large segment of the country in a turmoil because of its insistence upon guidelines which are in absolute violation of the act that the guidelines are allegedly adopted to enforce.

The House bill is like the Senate bill in that it proposes that all Americans shall be robbed of property rights they have enjoyed since our Republic was established. It proposes, moreover, that another massive Federal agency should be created and vested with despotic authority to deny to the American people who happen to own residential property, or even land on which residences could possibly be built, not only of two of the main attributes of the right of private property; namely, the right to use their property as they see fit in the case of rental property, and the right to select the persons to whom they will sell the property in the event they wish to sell, but also of adequate access to courts to protect their rights.

This is a drastic bill which has come over from the House. The House bill ought to be scrutinized carefully, and some committee ought to be vested with authority to study it and propose amendments to it. The appropriate committee under the rules of the Senate, and under the Reorganization Act, is the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The committee ought to be vested with authority at least to make a recommendation as to whether the Senate should consider the Senate bill or the House-passed bill.

The committee is denied that power under this procedure. They are denied the power to propose amendments or to recommend the adoption of amendments to the House-passed bill.

These things should be carefully considered by the Judiciary Committee. However, under this procedure, the Judiciary Committee will have no more jurisdiction over the House-passed bill than it has over the budget of the Japanese Government.

Mr. President, this is one time when we have a civil rights proposal which is absolutely different from every civil rights proposal that we have had since I came to the Senate.

The House-passed bill, like the Senate, undertakes for the first time in modern history to gore some oxen which do not belong to southerners.

I would warn my brethern who do not dwell below the Mason-Dixon line that they had better be on guard in respect to the housing provision, and in respect to the change which the House has made in the original administration bill for the establishment of an administrative agencies to bypass the courts and to circumvent jury trials for the enforcement of this act. These things merit grave consideration by all Senators who love liberty and loathe tyranny.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been very diligent. It conducted hearings on the Senate bill, and invited before it the representatives of organizations in every case where such action was suggested to it by any member of the subcommittee.

Despite this diligence, many of the aspects of the House bill have not been touched upon by these hearings, and we have not had the benefit of the testimony of witnesses concerning many of these newly adopted provisions of the House bill.

When the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights began its consideration of the Senate bill, which, as I have remarked, is cosponsored by 10 of the 16 members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I did not attribute too much importance to title I, the title which deals with Federal juries. In accordance with the practice of the subcommittee, however, I did send a copy of the bill containing that title to the chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and, in accordance with routine procedure followed in such cases, invited his comments upon that title.

At the instance of the chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, District Judge Holtzoff wrote me, as chairman of the subcommittee, a letter pointing out many defects in title I.

Upon receipt of his letter, I deemed it wise to send copies of the bill to all the chief judges of the U.S. district courts in the United States, and have received replies from approximately 40 of the chief judges. Virtually every one of these replies condemns the provisions of title I of this act as imposing terrific administrative problems upon the U.S. district courts, and threatening to cause a deterioration in the quality of jurors in the Federal courts.

In addition, we had 10 clerks of the U.S. district courts—one from each of the circuits of this Nation except the fourth circuit—appear before the subcommittee in a body. Each one said that title I should not be passed at this time but, on the contrary, should be referred to the Judicial Conference, with the request that it be studied by the Conference before action is taken.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Did the distinguished Senator from North Carolina see in yesterday afternoon's press, and also in this morning's press, that the Attorney General took it upon himself to go to Montreal, Canada, to quell the so-called revolt of the American Bar Association on the very subject the Senator is discussing?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. And I noticed in the news dispatch relating to the visit of the Attorney General to Montreal that he stated that the judges who had stated opposition to title I were misinformed. He did not state by whom they received the misinformation. With due deference to the Attorney General, I will say that I do not accept the validity of the Attorney General's opinion on this point. I will say in this connection that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I sent each chief judge a copy of the bill containing title I; and I presume that they read title I for themselves and reached their own conclusions with respect to the workability and desirability of title I, which undertakes to govern the future composition of juries in Federal courts.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the Senator agree with me that a trial judge, who actually conducts a trial, is a better man to determine something about the qualifications of jurors than an administrative officer who sits in Washington?

Mr. ERVIN. I certainly agree with my good friend, the junior Senator from Georgia.

I have just been informed by a member of the subcommittee staff that we have received letters from 44 U.S. district court judges—that is, the chief judges of the U.S. district courts—from all areas of the United States, saying that title I is ill-advised and unworkable and ought not to be passed in its present form.

Many of them say that before any drastic change is made—such as title I would make—in the qualifications and selection of Federal jurors, the matter should be thoroughly studied by bodies like the Judicial Conference.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. In the inquiry that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee made, did he find a single Federal judge anywhere in the United States—north, south, east, or west—who was in favor of the proposed title I of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. I did not find a single judge who advocated title I of the bill.

As a matter of fact, I have attempted to make this information available to Members of the Senate by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statements of District Judge Holtzoff of the District of Columbia and these chief judges; Thomsen of Maryland, Kent of Michigan, Bootle of Georgia, Zavatt of New York, Carswell of Florida, Kerr of Wyoming, Van Dusen of Pennsylvania, Connally of Texas, McManus of Iowa, Miller of Arkansas, Meredith of Missouri, Register of North Dakota, Stanley of North Carolina, and Steckler of Indiana.

Since that time, I have received other letters from other chief judges who take a similar position.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. **ERVIN**. I yield.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Is it not true that jurors have control over all the property that every American citizen possesses anywhere in the United States?

Mr. **ERVIN**. They do, in all cases where Congress has not enacted laws which were designed primarily to circumvent the very sacred right of trial by jury.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Do they not, also, have control over the very lives and the liberty of every citizen of the United States in a proper trial before them?

Mr. **ERVIN**. Upon their verdicts depend the property rights, the contract rights, the reputations, the liberties and the lives of American citizens in all areas of this Nation.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Does not the Senator agree, then, that those men or women, as the case may be, ought to be honorable and upright individuals, with character and discernment?

Mr. **ERVIN**. I do. Whenever the Federal judges have urged reforms in the Federal jury system, they have always declared it is just as important to have intelligent jurors, who are men of character, as it is to have judges who are intelligent and are men of character. At all times the Federal courts have adopted procedures which are designed to procure for service on Federal juries men of intelligence and men of character, as high a degree of intelligence and character as can be found among the different segments of our population.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. As a matter of fact, it is necessary that they have as much character and discernment as the President of the United States. Is that not true?

Mr. **ERVIN**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. The President of the United States cannot take away one's property, can he?

Mr. **ERVIN**. He cannot.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. A jury can take away one's property, can it not?

Mr. **ERVIN**. It can.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. The President cannot take away one's life, can he?

Mr. **ERVIN**. He can not.

Mr. **TALMADGE**. A jury can take away one's life, can it not?

Mr. **ERVIN**. A jury can.

Mr. President, this bill provides that instead of attempting to get intelligent jurors and jurors who are men of character, the jurors shall be selected at random, from registration lists.

Mr. President, I looked in the dictionary to see what the words "at random" mean. They are used to describe, so the dictionary says, any course of action which is aimless and without purpose. And yet the Attorney General is quoted in the press as having said to the American Bar at Montreal that the country needs title I so badly it cannot brook any delay in its passage. I am sorry that I was not in Montreal to debate the matter with the Attorney General. I would have pointed out why title I is so unworkable from an administrative standpoint and why its enactment would expedite the deterioration of juries in Federal district courts.

With respect to title II, I do not know who drafted it, but it is my opinion from reading and studying title II that whoever drew it had had no experience in trials in court. Any competent lawyer could take title II, if it is enacted in its present form, and prevent any criminal case from ever coming to trial in a State court. This is so because it gives a litigant, as a matter of right, the power to invoke interminable procedures without showing any basis for any claim that there has been any discrimination in the selection of the jurors in the jurisdiction of which that court sits. It is so absurd in its provisions that under it a millionaire who is being tried on a charge of gambling in violation of State law could challenge the composition of juries because the jury box does not contain the names of a sufficient number of paupers or hoboes.

Mr. President, I wish to reiterate with all possible emphasis my conviction that the House bill should be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that the Committee on the Judiciary should study the bill and recommend amendments to it. Otherwise, these tasks will have to be performed by Senators acting individually, without the benefit of discussion with other members of the committee.

Mr. President, there is a moving story in today's Washington Post—one of high drama. It appears on page 6 under the headline, "ABA Heeds Katzenbach Rights Bill Plea."

A better title might have been "White House Jet to the Rescue: A Melodrama in Two Acts Concerning How the Attorney General Saved the American Bar Association From Itself."

Mr. President, although I am unable to pay its expenses, I must accept responsibility for the Justice Department's capture of Montreal. Some weeks ago, I submitted title I of the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act to the chief judges of all Federal district courts for their views.

Thus far, 47 have replied; none have endorsed it; and 44 have objections.

One of these judges was Chief Judge Thomsen of the Maryland court. Judge Thomsen, according to the press, not only wrote the subcommittee, but also talked to William L. Marbury, a distinguished Maryland attorney who later introduced a resolution against title I at the American Bar Association convention in Montreal. As the press has it, the resolution was about to pass overwhelmingly when Solicitor General Marshall brought the message to Garcia. Immediately, reinforcements were dispatched.

I have never talked with Mr. Marbury about this subject. But as a veteran of battles both with and against the Justice Department, I know how he must have felt when the entourage from Justice arrived in Canada. Like Custer, he was amazed at all the Indians.

The end was predictable. As the Post has it, "the resolution was finally defeated by a 3-to-1 margin, but only after a series of close votes."

Of course, the result might have been different if the 44 judges from across the country had White House jets at their disposal; but strangely enough, they were not offered.

Mr. President, most intriguing are the quotes attributed to the title I forces during the heat of battle and in the flush of victory.

My choice for the most eloquent is that of the hero himself:

> "I can't wait" for more study, [sic] the Attorney General said. "We can't live with the present system. We need this legislation."

I know the Attorney General; and in spite of his eloquently modest protestations to the contrary, he is both intelligent and patient. So patient, in fact, that he did not even ask for the legislation during his first 4 years as Deputy Attorney General and Attorney General or even during the first 4 months of this year.

During all of that time, the Justice Department, the Judicial Conference, and the American Bar Association supported H.R. 5640, a bill contradictory to title I which has passed the House and is pending in Senate committee.

Mr. Katzenbach is reported as saying that the judges were misinformed. As the judges could only have based their views on the language of title I—which is all I provided them—I shall be interested to learn who did the misinforming.

Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, the Attorney General made no such accusation. Rather, it was his contention that "the judges had misread the provisions of the law." It is quite remarkable that 44 chief judges—all appointed with the endorsement of the Justice Department—have attained the same level of illiteracy.

But my candidate for the most remarkable quote of the year is that attributed to one of the Nation's most distinguished lawyers, Edward W. Kuhn, president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Kuhn, according to the Post, said:

> Who are we to tell the Congress of the United States how to run its business?

In the event that the question was not meant rhetorically, the answer to Mr. Kuhn is "You are the organization that advises Congress more often than anyone else as to how to run its business, and I might add, you do an excellent job. You do it so often and so well that Senator ROBERT BYRD made a speech on the subject on March 4 of this year."

In that speech, he praised the ABA for "lobbying in its most honorable sense."

On May 4, I wrote and congratulated Senator BYRD on that speech as follows:

> As one who feels that he has been uniquely subjected to the ABA's pressures for a number of years, I feel qualified to endorse your statement. The ABA deserves to be highly praised for the outstanding public service which it has devoted to the legislative process, and it is most gratifying that you have seen fit to honor it.

Indeed, Mr. President, the American Bar Association maintains an office in

Washington with full-time responsibilities for advising Congress as to how to run its business. I know, because I am advised frequently by it, and it has been of inestimable assistance to me over the years.

Finally, my nomination for the most important quote is that of ABA president-elect Orison S. Marden, who said the Attorney General's appearance was "a striking lesson of the need for deliberation." I agree.

I have never feared for the deliberative processes of the American Bar Association, but the comments of the Federal Judiciary on the hastily and poorly-drafted title I leave me deeply skeptical of the deliberations of the Justice Department.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that the Attorney General on his dashing jet saved the fair maiden, title I—at least, for the moment. But with sympathetic determination, I shall do my best to see that he is not stuck with the shrew for the remainder of his administration.

As I told the Senate last week, I originally interposed no objection to title I. However, after giving the matter more study and submitting the provision to the judges, there is no doubt in my mind but that we should postpone consideration of the title until the Judicial Conference has had an opportunity to study it.

At that time I placed in the Record the letters of the following judges and clerks as samples of the views the subcommittee has received: Judges Holtzoff, of the District of Columbia, Thomsen, of Maryland, Kent, of Michigan, Bootle, of Georgia, Zavatt, of New York, Carswell, of Florida, Kerr, of Wyoming, Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, Connally, of Texas, McManus, of Iowa, Miller, of Arkansas, Meredith, of Missouri, Register, of North Dakota, Stanley, of North Carolina, and Steckler, of Indiana; and Clerks Peck, of Nebraska, Keller, of New Jersey, Earl, of Connecticut, and Anderson, of Washington.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article to which I referred earlier, an excellent—if less fanciful—editorial from the Charlotte Observer of August 8, entitled "New Federal Jury Control Won't Accomplish Its Goal," and—an additional sample of judicial opinion—the letters of the following chief judges, be inserted at this point in the Record:

Judges Hodge, of Alaska, Gourley, of Pennsylvania, Miller, of Tennessee, Arraj, of Colorado, Sheehy, of Texas, and Stanley, of Kansas.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 11, 1966]

ABA Heeds Katzenbach Rights Bill Plea

Montreal, August 10.—The American Bar Association, heeding an earnest plea by Attorney General Katzenbach, overwhelmingly refused today to oppose the jury selection section of the Administration's civil rights bill.

Katzenbach made a flying trip to the ABA's 89th convention to support the provision after a Maryland group headed by William L. Marbury of Baltimore started a move to put the organization on record against it.

A resolution backed by the Marylanders drew only 55 votes in the ABA's 275-member House of Delegates, the policy-making arm of the Association.

The Marbury group objected to the requirement in the bill that jurors be selected at random from voter registration lists. Only illiterates, felons, non-citizens, nonresidents and the mentally or physically infirm would be exempted.

PLEA FOR INTELLIGENCE

Marbury told the delegates that jurors should be selected in such a manner as to obtain "a jury of as high a degree of integrity, intelligence, morality and commonsense as possible." This is the standard laid down in law at the present time.

Katzenbach said if Marbury has a system for guaranteeing common-sense on the part of jurors, "I'm all for it."

But he said no one has explained what such a system would be "No other list is more fair than a voter list," he told the delegates.

Before finally voting on the Marbury resolution, the House of Delegates turned down an effort to send the resolution to the ABA section on Judicial Administration for study and another one requesting Congress to defer action until the Judicial Conference of the United States has made recommendations on the subject.

The Judicial Conference, composed of the Nation's leading Federal judges, was not asked for its views on the current legislation. Marbury said many Federal judges oppose it.

ABA President Edward W. Kuhn of Memphis said he thought the lawyers would "look pretty silly" if they asked congressional delay.

"Who are we to tell the Congress of the United States how to run its business?" he asked the delegates.

KATZENBACH'S PROBLEM

Katzenbach explained that, unless the bill passes, a recent decision of the Fifth U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals presents him with a "massive problem" of what juries now hearing cases are valid.

The Fifth Circuit, which encompasses a large section of the South, struck down the "key man" system of selection, under which key members of a community are asked to suggest names of jurors.

The Circuit Court said this method did not bring in the broad cross section of the population required by law.

Katzenbach said, there may be as many as 44 Federal districts outside the Fifth Circuit where jury selection is under a cloud because of this decision.

"It may be that the Association can wait," Katzenbach said. "I can't . . . I can't delay if the process of justice is to continue in this country."

Incoming ABA President Orison S. Marden said Katzenbach had given "a striking lesson in the need for deliberate consideration" of the question before ABA action.

"But for him," Marden said, "the House might have taken a vote we would later regret."

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Aug. 9, 1966]

New Federal Jury Control Won't Accomplish Its Goal

All the congressional scuffling over open housing has tended, unfortunately, to kick up a cloud of dust that has effectively obscured debate on the remainder of President Johnson's civil rights proposals.

This is particularly troubling with respect to Titles I and II, which seek to ban discrimination against Negroes (and women and poor people) in the selection of state and federal juries.

That is an admirable goal, and one that is becoming more and more palatable, in the South as well as elsewhere. For example, Rep. James T. Broyhill recently polled his constituents in North Carolina's ninth congressional district and was somewhat surprised to find that 55.3 per cent said they favored such a federal law covering state juries.

Even North Carolina's Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., the bete noire of civil rights proponents, at first saw no particular difficulty with Title I, which covers federal juries. Ervin saw constitutional problems with Title II, covering state juries, but he saw no reason why Congress should not at least move to set things aright in the federal courthouse.

Then, almost unnoticed in the furor surrounding open housing, serious doubts began to crop up. Federal district judges, answering Ervin's routine request for comment, replied almost unanimously that Title I was unworkable as drafted by the Justice Department.

Some judges were worried that emphasis on getting a true community cross section for jury duty would lower the quality of federal juries. But the dominant objection was simply that the proposed machinery for federal jury selection was impractical.

This position was seconded by 10 outstanding federal court clerks, who were specially chosen to come to Washington to help revise the federal court clerks' manual. Ervin invited them to testify, and they agreed, to a man, that the administration's proposal would not work.

It seems unlikely that the technical problems detected by the judges and clerks will be ironed out by amendments on the Senate floor. The subject is simply too complicated.

Now the question is whether the jury provisions will be rammed through Congress despite the expert warnings. Sen. Ervin and Rep. Basil L. Whitener of Gastonia, who tried to raise the issue in the House, are in a poor position to call persuasively for another look, because they have cried "wolf" so often on civil rights matters.

But responsible legislators, including those who favor civil rights legislation, will be letting the country down if they simply ignore the problems of Title I and II.

U.S. District Court,
District of Alaska,
Anchorage, August 4, 1966.

Re S. 3296.
Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Reply to your letter of July 1, inviting comments on Title I of the above Bill with respect to the manner of jury selection in the federal courts, has been unfortunately delayed on account of attendance upon our Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference and an attempted vacation, and pressure of judicial business following such. However, I note from your statement submitted with your letter that Title I has not been and apparently is intended to be submitted to the scrutiny of the Judicial Conference of the United States and the American Law Institute, as the Chief Justice has suggested, and as surely ought to be done. There appears to be ample time for consideration of this matter by your Committee and the whole Committee on the Judiciary. I have discussed this matter quite fully with the Clerk of our court, Mr. J. M. Kroninger, and with my colleague, Judge Raymond E. Plummer, and we do have these comments to make:

Indeed we find strenuous objection to some of the provisions of Title I. We have no objection, of course, to the provisions of Secs. 1861 and 1862 of the Bill prohibiting discrimination as to persons serving on grand

and petit juries in the District Courts of the United States, although we do not have any such problem in Alaska. We also have no objection to the provisions of Sec. 1863, although we have followed the practice as to the drawing of a jury by the Jury Commissioner and the Clerk provided by the second paragraph of the present Sec. 1864 of Title 28 U.S.C.A.

With respect to Sec. 1864 of the Bill, we object to the provision for a master jury wheel in the manner provided by this section and especially as to the provision of subsec. (b) with respect to the minimum requirement of one percentum of the total number of persons listed on the voters' registration lists for the district and the limitation of the names in such wheel of not fewer than two thousand persons.

By statute Alaska constitutes one district, with no divisions therein, but we are required to hold court in five places, namely Ketchikan, Juneau, Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Nome. By reason of the vast area of the district it is absolutely essential that we maintain a jury box in each of those places in the district where we are required to hold court as is provided by subsec. (a) of Sec. 1865, Title 28 U.S.C.A. We find no such provision in the bill. Unless such provision is made it would be necessary to include in the wheel the names of persons residing at Attu, which is 1,714 air miles from our headquarters at Anchorage, or at Barrow, which is 1,070 air miles from Nome, and also it would be necessary to include the names of persons residing in remote areas and on islands from which there is no means of transportation other than by chartering an aircraft.

On the other hand, if the provision mentioned as to subsec. (a) of Sec. 1865, Title 28, is included in the Bill by amendment, such would be impossible to comply with in such places as Nome, in which district there are only 600 voters; although we could possibly comply with it at Anchorage.

We also object strenuously to the provision of subsec. (a) of Sec. 1865 of the Bill with respect to summoning all persons whose names are drawn from the master jury wheel to appear before the Clerk and fill out a juror qualification form to be prescribed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the reason that this would put an impossible burden on both the jurors summoned and the office of the Clerk and would be an unnecessary expense to the government to bring persons in from remote areas to ascertain if they are qualified.

We do send out a jury questionnaire but make no mention of race or religion, and certainly agree that any such information should not be requested.

We also question the provisions of Sec. 1866 of the Bill to the effect that the Jury Commissioner shall determine *solely* on the basis of information provided on the juror qualification form or the returned summons whether or not a person is qualified for or exempt from jury service, for the reason that we feel that the jury, when impanelled, may still be examined briefly by the court or Clerk as to their qualifications, which is our practice.

We also question the provisions as to Sec. 1867 of the Bill with reference to challenging jurors at the time of trial in both criminal and civil cases as to compliance with the selection procedures provided by the Bill, which we think would be most burdensome on the court.

Mr. Kroninger has submitted to me a memorandum covering the method of jury selection in this court which we believe fully complies with the provisions of Secs. 1861 through 1867 of Title 28, together with a form of questionnaire submitted to prospective jurors and a form of letter sent therewith, which may be of interest to your Committee and which I will enclose.

Finally, we have no complaint as to the provisions of the present statute governing the manner of selection of jurors in our court and have never found any difficulty with compliance with such statute.

We make no comment with respect to Title II except to question, as your Committee apparently does, the right of the Congress of the United States to govern the manner of selection of grand and petit juries in the state courts.

I am sending copies of this letter and enclosures to our Senators E. J. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, and to our Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska.

Very truly yours,

Walter H. Hodge,
Chief Judge.

U.S. District Court,
Western District of Pennsylvania,
Pittsburgh, Pa., July 8, 1966.

Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Ervin: I have for consideration your letter of July 1, 1966 relative to Senate Bill 3296 in which you invite comments as to the provisions of the Bill as it relates to jury selection.

I am enclosing herewith a detailed statement of the procedure used in our district relative to the selection of juries, and I might state that in my 21 years as a member of the United States District Court, 15 of which have been in the capacity of chief judge, during said period of time we have followed and applied the same procedure. The method of placing individuals on the master jury wheel and the selection of juries was approved by the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and the writ of certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If there is any comment which I have made that is not understood, if you would be kind enough to advise, I will be most happy to explain in greater detail.

Most sincerely,

Wallace S. Gourley.

COMMENTS ON SENATE BILL 3296 IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

We note that Section 1865 requires the Jury Commission to draw the names from the wheel, and then directs the prospective juror to appear before the Clerk and fill out a jury qualification form.

It has been the practice of this Court not to place any cards in the wheel until the application form has been studied by the jury commissioner or the Clerk. Of course our form is mailed to the prospective juror to be completed by the prospective juror himself. The new system would require the juror to appear in either Pittsburgh or Erie and we fail to see any provision in this Section for reimbursement of the said prospective juror for traveling expenses and time. Also, it must be understood that in this District people travel to Pittsburgh and Erie from distances of up to and over 100 miles. It would appear to perhaps create a hardship for them to appear at either place without reimbursement.

Our questionnaire contains no provision for giving race or religion of a prospective juror.

It is not clear to me as to what happens to an individual after he completes a questionnaire and is deemed qualified. Are those cards to be placed in another jury wheel, and when it is necessary to summon jurors for duty, another drawing is made from this second wheel which would contain those cards of citizens whom the jury commissioner and the Clerk deemed qualified?

This Court has at various times considered using the Voters Registration Lists, but so far we have been able to operate under the present system of obtaining a sufficient number from the recommendation system.

It would appear to me that under the system proposed by Senate Bill 3296 that this Court would require additional employees to handle the questionnaire part and interview the prospective jurors personally.

The jury system of this Court was sustained by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in the case of Dow v. Carnegie Illinois, 225 Fed. 2d 414. Certiorari denied 350 U.S. 971.

Enclosures: Copy of jury questionnaire. Sample letter to various organizations to secure jurors.

James H. Wallace, Jr.,
Clerk.

U.S. District Court,
Western District of Pennsylvania,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 17, 1965.

President or Secretary,
Allison Park Elementary School P.T.A.,
Houston, Pa.

Dear Sir or Madam: We are interested in securing the names of reliable persons, both men and women to place in the jury wheel for Federal Court at Pittsburgh for 1966 or thereafter, and we thought you might be in a position to recommend some suitable persons for such jury service.

Our system is called the "recommendation system." We take recommendations from organizations which do not exclude groups of people such as Parent-Teacher Associations, Labor Organizations, Veteran Associations and similar associations.

Anyone you desire to recommend for jury service should not be too old and be in good health. It is also not necessary that they be members of your organization. Jurors are paid $10.00 a day plus mileage of 10¢ a mile. Terms for petit jury service are usually for a two week period.

Thank you in advance for your kind assistance to our problem. We make no limit to the number of persons you may recommend, and you may use the reverse side of this letter for your recommendations if you so desire. An envelope which requires no postage is enclosed for your reply.

Yours very truly,

James H. Wallace, Jr.,
Clerk.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROSPECTIVE JURORS

Please answer the following questions (type or print) and return in the enclosed envelope which requires no postage. Your answers are for the use of the Court.

1. Name ----------------------------------
First Middle Last
2. Residence ------------------------------
No. & Street City Zone County
Business address ---- Home Phone----
3. Place of birth---------------------------
Date of birth-----------------------------
Month Day Year Sex
4. If naturalized, state when?-- Where?--
5. How long have you lived at present address? ------ In County or State? ------
6. What is your occupation or business? -- --------------------------------------
7. Are you now employed?---- If so, give employer's name address and business-- --------------------------------------
8. Are you married or single?---- What is the name and occupation of your husband or wife? ------------------------
9. Have you ever been known by any other name or names? ------------ If so, state fully --------------------------------

10. Are you or have you ever been a member of, or affiliated with any group or organizations, knowing the purpose thereof, which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence?--------------
11. Can you read, write and understand English?---------------------
12. State your education background-------
13. In what organizations or fraternal societies do you hold membership?---------- --
14. Have you ever served as a juror?-------- If so, when, and in what Court?-------- --
15. Do you have any physical or mental impairments which would interfere with your serving as a juror?--------If so, state nature----------------------------
16. Are your hearing and eyesight good?---- What is the condition of your health generally? ---------------------------- What is the name of your Doctor?------
17. Have you or immediate members of your family employed any attorney?-------- If so, state reason------------------------
18. Have you ever been involved in any automobile accidents?-------------------- If so, state when?------------Were you injured? -----------------------------
19. Have you ever been a party in a law suit?--------If so, type?---------------
20. Have you ever been convicted of an offense in a State or Federal Court?------ If so, give details--------------------------
21. Do you know of any reason why you cannot serve as an impartial juror?-------- If so, state reason.-------------------- Are you a taxpayer?--------------------
22. Did you request to be placed on the jury list?----------If so, to whom?----------

I solemnly affirm that the answers to the foregoing questions are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date:---------- Signed-------------------
(Signature in own handwriting)

NOTE.—This is not a summons for jury service. If you are chosen for Service, you will receive a summons by certified mail for the time and place at which to appear.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 14, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: In reply to your letter of July 1, 1966, I have prepared the enclosed memorandum outlining in detail the procedures and mechanics used in the selection of jurors in the Middle District of Tennessee.

Also, I have reviewed Title I of S. 3296 which is being considered by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, and the following comments are submitted regarding the changes it would require in our present procedures.

As outlined in the enclosed memorandum, the three principal steps in our present system are (1) the securing of names of persons qualified for federal jury service from individuals, or "suggesters," for inclusion in the jury box; (2) the drawing of names from the jury box; and (3) the appearance and qualification, in open court, of the jurors. As a result of the fidelity with which the court clerks and jury commissioners, under supervision of the Court, have applied themselves in this District to their duties in the administration of the jury system, our present procedures have operated successfully for many years, and were specifically upheld in the recent Hoffa and companion cases (United States v. Hoffa, 349 F. 2d 20 (C.A. 6, 1965)), cert, granted (review limited to questions not involving the jury (382 U.S. 1024). Prior to those cases, the system had not been challenged by any litigant.

Under Sections 1864, 1865 and 1866 of S. 3296, elaborate procedures entirely new in our District would be established, the four basic procedural steps being as follows:

1. The establishment and maintenance by the jury commission of a master jury wheel containing not less than 2,000 names selected at random from voter registration lists and from such other source or sources as the judicial council of the circuit, with such advice as the chief judge of the district may offer, shall prescribe. (Section 1864).

2. The drawing of names from the master wheel and the appearance before the clerk of each person whose name is drawn for the purpose of executing a juror qualification form. (Section 1865(a)).

3. The determination by the jury commission, on the basis of information provided in the juror qualification form, whether such person is qualified for or exempt from jury service. (Section 1866(a)).

4. The maintenance of a qualified juror wheel containing the names of persons determined to be qualified as jurors; the drawing, from time to time, from the qualified juror wheel, of such number of names of persons as may be required for assignment to grand and petit jury panels; and the preparation by the jury commission or by the clerk of a separate list of names of persons assigned to each grand and petit jury panel. (Section 1866(c).)

It is also noted that Section 1865(a) would prohibit, except for specified purposes, the disclosure of the names drawn from the master wheel. This would discontinue the Court's established policy and practice of making available to the public all lists of names of persons drawn for grand and petit jury service.

Other provisions of Title I, including the declaration of policy, the prohibition of discrimination, and the requirements that complete records be maintained by the clerk and jury commissioners, are consistent with the long-established policies and practices of our Court and would effect no changes in our present procedures.

I am in agreement with what I believe are the general objectives of Title I, but I feel strongly that it should be thoroughly considered by the Judicial Conference of the United States and by the American Law Institute before it is adopted. So far as our particular district is concerned, it would make the process of jury selection much more detailed and complex, but it is recognized that this is not a valid objection if the procedure will improve the quality of jury service and make our juries more nearly representative of the community. One feature of Title I which I question is the requirement that no person shall be required to serve as a petit juror for more than thirty calendar days in any two-year period. In my view, this period of service is entirely too short and will cause the jury process to lose the benefit of experience in handling different types of cases. Such experience is a valuable asset to the jury system and contributes materially to jury efficiency and dispatch, particularly in cases of some complexity.

Another questionable feature of Title I, in my mind, is the provision allowing the defendant to challenge non-compliance at any time "prior to the introduction of evidence at trial." I feel that this cut-off time should be fixed at some reasonable period prior to the date the case is set for trial. Otherwise, unnecessary delays and disruptions could result.

I am somewhat reluctant to express any opinion in regard to the jury aspects of Title II, since they concern the process of jury selection in the state courts and not in the federal courts. Obviously it is a drastic measure. I should hope that this portion of the Act, concerning, as it does, the administration of criminal justice by the states would be given the broadest and most intensive investigation. My personal experience has been that no additional procedures are needed in our district to protect the essential rights of state criminal defendants insofar as jury selection is concerned. This experience is derived from hundreds of habeas corpus reviews of state criminal convictions extending over eleven years. What we are after here, I would hope and suppose, is not uniformity of method throughout the United States, but essential fairness under the requirements of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. Aside from any question of congressional power, I feel that the best interests of justice will be subserved by allowing the states to devise their own practices and procedures for the administration of criminal justice, including the process of jury selection, so long as such practices and procedures are not essentially unfair, arbitrary or discriminatory.

With kindest regards, I am,
Most sincerely,
WM. E. MILLER.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF COLORADO,
Denver, Colo., August 2, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: The delay in answering your letter of July 1, 1966 regarding Title I of S. 3296 was caused by the fact that I have been involved in trials during the past several weeks, and until last weekend was not able to devote the necessary time to studying the proposal.

At the outset I should state that the present system of selecting jurors in our District seems to be a satisfactory one to all segments of our population. However, I realize that some changes are indicated because of circumstances in other areas of the country, and I am sure that we can satisfactorily adjust our practice in line with the over-all requirements in the Federal system.

I agree wholeheartedly with the comments in your opening statement concerning the requirement that a prospective juror fill out a form stating his ". . . race, religion . . ." should be entirely eliminated from the Act. Several years ago the questionnaire which we used did contain space for the prospective juror to state his or her race and religion, but that was eliminated because of the objections made, and for the most part they were made by members of the so-called "minority" groups.

We also think it objectionable that no provision is made in section 1865 for the payment of fees or mileage to the jurors summoned to appear before the Commission to fill out out a juror qualification form. Because it will take some time from a prospective juror's job and also some travel expense for him to appear before the Commission for this purpose, it seems only fair that he should receive some compensation therefor.

Section 1866 of Title 28 apparently will be completely eliminated in the proposed new Bill. This seems inadvisable to me. If open venires are not authorized, it will mean that we will have to summon a larger panel in order that there will be sufficient jurors available at any particular time. Although the open venire is not used often, it seems to me that it does provide a safeguard for getting a jury within a reasonable time.

The provisions of section 1869 relating to the record which must be kept by the Jury Commission on juror's qualification form are unclear. If I read this correctly, it would require an entry on the juror's qualification form every time that he is called to the jury box and excused as a result of a pre-emptory challenge; this would mean that a copy of that particular juror's form would have to be before the courtroom deputy clerk each time he is summoned to a courtroom for possible jury duty. Under our present system we use a jury pool which serves three courts at the same time; burdensome record keeping regarding exclusions would slow down the judicial process and also, because of human error, it might invite additional attacks on jury verdicts.

The provisions of proposed section 1867 appear to me to be unnecessary, cumbersome and probably another invitation to slow down the judicial process. I would anticipate that many lawyers would move to dismiss the indictment, under this section, merely for the purpose of delay or for the purpose of creating another roadblock in the orderly administration of justice. At the present time I can think of no real good purpose that this challenging procedure would serve. In criminal cases, if after a verdict it is found that there was a failure to comply with the statute, that could be handled by a post conviction proceedings.

In line with your suggestion, I am enclosing two copies of the selection method in operation in our District and the juror qualification form used by our Court.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED A. ARRAJ.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS,
August 2, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Reference is made to your letter of July 1 relative to S. 3296 which would make significant changes in the jury selection methods of Federal and state courts. Because of an illness I have recently suffered, I have been delayed in replying to your letter. My comments will be limited to that portion of the bill which pertains to the method of selecting juries in the Federal courts.

The Eastern District of Texas comprises 41 counties and is divided into six divisions. We have no large metropolitan areas in the district and some of the counties are located more than 100 miles from the place where court is held for the division they are located in. I give you this information because some of my subsequent remarks will be directed to a district of this type rather than to a district involving a large metropolitan area such as the Southern District of New York, the Northern District of Illinois, the Southern District of California and other like districts.

Our district has two judges. The docket of the district is divided on a division basis. Judge Fisher who resides in Beaumont, the other judge in the district, has the Beaumont and Marshall Divisions while I, who reside in Tyler, have the Tyler, Sherman, Paris and Texarkana Divisions. Because of the large geographical area involved, we maintain a jury box for each of the divisions, which contains the names of only persons residing within the territorial limits of the particular division. We have two jury commissioners, one of whom works with the clerk with reference to the Beaumont and Marshall Divisions and the other works with the clerk with reference to the Tyler, Sherman, Paris and Texarkana Divisions. The clerk and jury commissioners are instructed that in filling the jury boxes that there will be no discrimination as to race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status and that the persons whose names are placed in the jury box will reflect a fair cross-section of the community, i.e., the division in question. In selecting the names of the persons who will be placed in the jury boxes in accordance with such instructions, the clerk and jury commissioner obtain the names of individuals in each of the counties of a division and send to those persons a questionnaire (AO Form 178), copy of which is enclosed. When the questionnaires, as filled out, are returned to the clerk, the clerk and the jury commissioner review the forms and then place in the jury box the names of the persons who, from the information appearing on the form, appear to be qualified for jury service and will represent a fair cross-section, including race, of the division. In obtaining the names of persons to whom the questionnaires are sent, the jury commissioner and the clerk use many sources such as postmasters, public officials of the counties, citizens of the community in various walks of life, both of the white and Negro race, poll tax lists, etc. Prior to the suggestion of the Judicial Conference in 1960 that questions as to race were not proper, the questionnaire used made inquiry as to race.

In my 15 years on the bench, I have found that through the use of this system our jury panels reflect a fair cross-section, including race, of the division involved.

I am in complete accord with the principle that in the selection of juries, both grand and petit, in the Federal courts there should be no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status and believe that we should have legislation that would insure against such discrimination. However, by virtue of the decisions of the Supreme Court in such cases as *Glasser* v. *United States* (1943) 315 U.S. 60, *Smith* v. *Texas* (1940) 311 U.S. 128, and *Swain* v. *Alabama* (1964) 380 U.S. 202, it appears to be now settled constitutional doctrine that the persons whose names are in the jury box from which jury lists are drawn must reflect a fair cross-section of the community which, of course, would include a fair representation of the races residing in the particular community. Enclosed is a copy of the slip opinions handed down by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, sitting en banc, on July 29, 1966, in the case of *Brooks* v. *Beto*. The majority opinion, written by Judge Brown, presents an excellent discussion of the constitutional requirements that juries reflect a fair cross-section of the community. As indicated by Judge Brown, to fairly represent the community, there must not only be an awareness on the part of the jury commissioner and the clerk of the make-up of that community but there must be an actual determination by the jury commissioner and the clerk that the persons whose names are placed in the jury box, from which jury panels are drawn, reflect a cross-section of the community. The voter registration list or poll tax list, which I have seen in the past, do not furnish sufficient information about the persons appearing on said lists to permit a determination that the persons selected at random from voter registration lists or poll tax lists would reflect a "cross-section of the community." Therefore, in my opinion, it is doubtful that a "cross-section of the community can be obtained by following the procedures for selecting the names placed in the jury wheels provided for by S. 3296.

I would assume that the principal purpose of Titles I and II of S. 3296 is to insure that in the selection of jury panels from which jurors are to be selected in both Federal and state courts there be no discrimination on account of race or color. While it is a matter of common knowledge that there has been such discrimination in some of the courts of some of the states, if there has been any such discrimination to any substantial degree in the Federal courts, I am unaware of it. Although it is my opinion that our system of selecting juries in the Federal courts is working well and without discrimination on account of race or color, I am aware that as a general rule there is always room for improvement in any given area.

Without wanting to appear to be presumptuous I would suggest that in lieu of the time consuming, costly and somewhat burdensome method provided in the subject bill for the selection of the names of those first placed in a master jury wheel and subsequently placed in a qualified jury wheel that the bill be amended so as to provide in effect: (1) for the maintenance of a jury box either on a district basis or a division basis as the court might determine; (2) that the jury commission from time to time place in said jury box the names of persons qualified for jury service (in such number as Congress shall deem proper), from which jury box the jury panels, as ordered by the court, shall be drawn by the commission; (3) that the persons whose names are placed in the jury box shall as a whole reflect a cross-section of the district or division, as the case might be; (4) that the jury commission in selecting persons whose names are placed in the jury box shall not discriminate on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status; (5) that the jury commission shall select the names of those placed in the jury box from information contained on a juror qualification form approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States; (6) that the jury commission be authorized to send such juror qualification forms to persons residing in the district or the division, as the case might be; and (7) that persons failing to answer such questionnaire shall be subject to punishment to such extent as Congress shall provide. If the bill should be amended substantially in the manner suggested, I submit that it would be wise to retain in the bill provisions regulating the time and manner of challenging the compliance with the selection procedures similar to those contained in the proposed Section 1867.

In the event Title I of S. 3296 is considered acceptable in principle, I would suggest, from a practical working standpoint, several changes or modifications.

As to the proposed Section 1865, I would suggest that there be added to that section as an alternative to the prospective juror appearing in person before the clerk that the clerk or jury commission be authorized to send to such prospective juror an approved juror qualification questionnaire form seeking the same information from the prospective juror that the clerk would obtain from him upon his appearance before the clerk in person. In districts covering large geographical areas, to require the prospective juror to appear before the clerk in person would be not only expensive to the taxpayers but would cause an unnecessary hardship or inconvenience to the prospective juror.

If the jury commission is to get the names of prospective jurors from voter registration lists, as the bill provides, it is going to be necessary for the jury commissioner and the clerk to travel to each county seat where the voter registration list for the county will be maintained in order to select the names of persons from such lists. Although the bill in its present form provides for paying the commissioner on the basis of $16.00 per day, it does not provide for the payment of subsistence and travel expense for the commissioner. In my opinion, adequate provision for travel expense and subsistence should be made for the commissioner who, in many districts including mine, will have to do extensive traveling.

In my opinion the bill in its present form is too restrictive as to those who can be excused from jury service. I believe we all recognize that there are many valid reasons why a person should not be required to render jury service at a particular time. I believe it is in the public interest that the district judges be given broad discretionary powers to excuse a person from jury service upon a showing of good cause. Furthermore, there are certain classes or groups of persons who, in the public interest, should be excluded from the jury panel or excused from service as jurors. Included in such classes or groups, in my opinion, are practicing physicians, dentists, nurses, attorneys engaged in the active practice of law, and school teachers during the school year, particularly if a substitute teacher is not available.

Therefore, I would suggest that the bill be amended so as to include in substance the provisions of Section 1863 of Title 28, U.S.C.A., as they now exist with the provisions of Subsection (c) of said section being enlarged so as to provide, in effect, "No citizen shall be excluded from service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status."

The provisions contained in proposed Section 1864 to the effect that there shall be placed in the master wheel one per cent (1%) of the total number of persons listed on the voters registration list for the district or division, and in no event the names of fewer than 2,000 persons will be unnecessarily burdensome in the case of a small division in a district where the master wheel is maintained on a division basis. For example, because the docket is small, we hold court in the Paris Division of my district once a year and thereby use annually in that division a jury panel comprised of approximately 35 persons. Thus, in the two year life of a master jury wheel containing the names of at least 2,000 persons, only 70 of such persons would be called for jury duty.

I wish to apologize for the length of this letter, but I cannot help but be concerned over legislation that proposes such drastic changes in the federal jury system.

Sincerely yours,

JOE W. SHEEHY.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF KANSAS,
Kansas City, July 12, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Your letter of July 1 came to my chambers while I was attending the Judicial Conference of the Tenth Circuit followed by a sentencing institute held at Denver. Hence the delayed response.

In the District of Kansas we follow generally the methods of jury selection recommended by the Committee on the Operation of the Jury System approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September, 1960. The names of approximately one-half of the veniremen are submitted by key men, carefully selected so as to represent a cross section of our citizenry. Some are labor union officials, some are businessmen, and all are persons of standing in their communities. At least half of the veniremen are chosen by use of templates applied to voter registration lists in use in the counties or cities of the district.

Our clerk mails to each person so selected a questionnaire in the form enclosed, and the clerk and commissioner then eliminate those who cannot be found by the Post Office Department. The returned questionnaires are examined by the clerk or by the commissioner and clerk, who reject those whose answers disclose statutory disqualification. The remaining names are placed in the jury boxes in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.A. § 1864. When a panel is required for a jury session, the clerk and commissioner alternately draw the required number of names from the box. There is absolutely no discrimination among jurors for any reason.

Lacking personal knowledge of the conditions which have prompted the introduction of S. 2396, I cannot criticize the motives of its authors. It may be that legislation of some sort is necessary to correct improper practices in some parts of the federal judicial system, but I feel that it should be possible to achieve the desired result without the drastic changes proposed. While practices required by Title I of the bill might work well in a densely populated area, the enactment of Title I in its present form would create many problems in this and similar districts.

The District of Kansas is territorially large, with no established divisions. Most of the jury work is in the three principal cities—Wichita, Kansas City and Topeka. Court sessions are held twice yearly in Fort Scott; once yearly in Dodge City and in Salina, in both of which we use state court facilities; and occasionally in Leavenworth. Leavenworth is near Kansas City and would lie within the same "division" as Kansas City.

Dodge City and Salina are widely separated from each other and from other court cities. In no instance that I can recall have we summoned more than 50 jurors to serve at either of the cities. Section 1864(b) would require the placing in each "division" jury wheel the names of at least 2,000 persons, of whom only 100 are likely to be called within the 2-year period before the wheel is emptied and refilled.

I submit these general observations:

1. It is likely that citizens who now regard jury service as a duty akin to service in the armed forces in time of war would resent the compulsory features of § 1865(a).

2. Defendants in criminal cases, already inclined to employ dilatory tactics, are apt to abuse the rights granted by § 1867 by filing groundless motions. Parties in civil cases, seeking delay, will in some cases act similarly.

3. The clerk's office, already overburdened in our district, will either require additional deputies, or will be compelled to neglect other important duties.

4. The withdrawal of the right to exclude classes or groups, and the requirement that unusually severe hardship be shown for excuse will deprive the public of the services of physicians, nurses, pharmacists and teachers already in short supply.

5. If jury service is a right, as well as a duty, it appears that the purpose of Title I could be achieved by enforcement of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 241, 242 and 243.

I have had insufficient time to study the bill thoroughly, and my observations are therefore of less value and less clearly stated than I would wish. It is regrettable that the bill cannot be referred to the Judicial Conference of the United States so that its provisions could receive the deliberate consideration they deserve.

You have my permission to make all or any portion of this letter a part of the record of the hearings on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. STANLEY, Jr.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and to express my support for the position taken by the majority leader, not only for the wisdom of the position, but also for its justice.

Mr. President, I believe we have a right, after the history of all these years, to assume that if this bill were forwarded to the Committee on the Judiciary, it would promptly be interred, for all practical purposes.

I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I have suffered in this Chamber for many years with this situation. Unless we headed off civil rights bills at the desk on occasion, we would not have had civil rights legislation.

I join with the majority leader in saying that this is not criticism of those on the Committee on the Judiciary, who have been successful in seeing that civil rights bills were interred there. This is their conviction and they have every right to avail themselves of every rule and privilege to effectuate their design. But that does not stop the rest of us from using the rules to protect civil rights bills, which is what the majority leader has done.

Mr. President, we do not live in a vacuum, and the cry for justice in respect to racial relations is so great in our country, after a century of repression, that it must be answered.

We have every right to condemn riots in the streets, and we have every right to have force of law in dealing with those riots, and preventing and suppressing them. At the same time, however, we must acknowledge and eliminate what we know to be the deep underlying frustrations and dispairs, and the sense of injustice felt by many Americans, undeserved on the record, which have brought them about.

Mr. President, we have to protect ourselves in this legislation, as we have done before by heading it off at the desk.

As to the merits, it is a fact that the country has been appalled by the administration of justice which would allow a jury selection which does not give the broad cross section of population in a particular community representation upon a jury. The country has been compelled to record what many of us have felt to be miscarriages of justice under that aegis.

Mr. President, as much as I stand for authority and justice, I do not think we should have a silly session on the subject, and broad statements made about disposing of life and property. Many a judge has taken a case from the jury and set aside a jury verdict and many an appellate court has reversed a jury verdict. But more important than that is the intimation that any group of Americans because they happen to be Negroes are less fair, less just, and less conscientious about the protection of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness than any other group. That is undeserved, and I hope very much that that is not considered to be a valid argument by the great majority of Americans. Be that as it may, this is not yet the time to discuss the merits of the bill.

Right now, we are talking about procedure. The argument that the Judiciary Committee is not the graveyard of civil rights legislation is contradicted by the facts and the record, but the majority leader's proposal and plan even allow for a miracle. I think it is quite right that we should call it a miracle. It will be a miracle of resurrection. It may well be that the Judiciary Committee may, as a miracle, send a civil rights bill to the Senate. If so, the majority leader has now stated that that bill will be substituted for the House bill which is before us. I think that is fair.

A very complete report has been made under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], one of our very distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, a very complete record on the civil rights provisions in the bill which was introduced in the Senate and which a number of us have joined as cosponsors. That record is available on the provisions of the House bill. Indeed, it is germane and relevant to the basic thrust of those provisions.

Mr. President, I wish to make an offer myself. I am a member of the Judiciary Committee and I would state to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that any time he has an executive session or can bring one about, for the purpose of considering a Senate bill, I will, as soon as I can get recognition, move to substitute the House bill in that case. The House bill, if my motion should carry—and the Senator from North Carolina could be very helpful in bringing that about—would be before the Senate, and we would be fully able to operate on it with respect to amendments, additional information, even additional hearings, or anything else we choose.

The rights of the minority, the opponents of the bill—and I think it is a minority—are not cut off by a procedure specified by the majority leader, because all they have to do is allow the bill to be called up as the pending business, and then a motion may be made by any Member to refer it with or without instructions to any committee.

I have little doubt that if the minority which is opposed to this measure would agree to allow it to come up as the pending business, it might even be arranged before September 6, as I believe the majority leader assumes that no such concession will be forthcoming.

Thus, Mr. President, there is ample procedure for the committee to consider even this bill. There is ample procedure to move to refer to a committee. There is ample record, too. The only thing that we are cutting off is the right to inter that bill.

I am delighted to say this to my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who will be the Senator in charge of the bill, that the majority leader has done this and not left it to me or to some other individual Member. We can do it as effectively, of course, but it would not have nearly the impact upon the future of this legislation and the commitment of the administration that it now has by the deliberate, decisive action taken by the majority leader. Civil rights has always been bipartisan in nature and is at the present time, and as I have no doubt it will develop even further.

I only hope that my side will do its full share in imposing cloture on debate, or whatever else may be required, in order to expedite the matter in its consideration—consideration which should be thorough—I thoroughly agree with that—but should not go beyond the limits of thoroughness in order to endeavor to kill it by continuus debate.

Further, I hope very much that we on the Republican side will measure up to our responsibilities, just as I feel today that the majority has measured up—through the majority leader—to its responsibilities.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, let me make a few observations in reply to the distinguished Senator from New York.

As the Senator from New York has stated, a motion can be made next week to refer the House-passed bill to the committee. But he inadvertently pointed out the handicap under which those of us who wish referral would labor. He suggested this handicap when he spoke of what a great help it was to have the majority leader on the side of those who oppose committee referral. Of course, what is a great help to his side of the controversy is a great handicap to those of us who do not share his views.

I protest action by the Senate leadership which is necessarily based on the position that the committee is not fit to be entrusted with consideration of legislation which falls within its jurisdiction under the act which reorganized Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to respond to my good friend from North Carolina.

There is a song in Gilbert and Sullivan's "Pirates of Penzance," when the policemen are about to go after the pirates, and it goes something like this:

The men begin to sing: "We go. We go."

Then the major general comes in to sing: "But you don't go. You don't go."

That is the situation with the Judiciary Committee.

Surely, the committee is fit. It says, "We go. We go," but when it comes to civil rights legislation, the fact is, as the majority leader has stated, it has been months now that the Senate bill has been before the Judiciary Committee. The hearings have been thorough—very, very thorough—but that does not give any promise that the Judiciary Committee has shown a new path, other than the one it has trod so often before. "We don't go, we don't go." In the past, we have had to employ the tactic of catching bills from the House. Otherwise, civil rights bills would have been suffocated by the hearings and the hearings and the hearings, and the expiration of sessions, and they never would have received any action.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from New York is aware that the last hearing we conducted was for the purpose of taking the testimony of an official organization from New York at the request of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. The Senator knows that I was ready to go into executive session and to have the bill marked up even if the organization from New York was not heard; but we were going on and on and on with hearings anyhow, so they might as well have been heard too.

Mr. ERVIN. I think I could safely say that the Senator from New York has been ready to mark up the bill for some time.

Mr. JAVITS. No; I would not say that. The Senator from North Carolina conducted very thorough hearings. The Senator knows that I do not find fault with him. He knows my views. I am sure that there is need of a vast amount of enlightment on the House bill, which required many days of hearings. The Senator knows that I am not challenging his good faith. I merely say that if the majority is going to get done what needs to get done, it should follow the rules. Just as the opponents of the bill have a right to invoke the rules, we have a right to invoke them, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in view of the exchange that has occurred between the able Senator from North Carolina and the able Senator from New York with regard to the action taken by our respected majority leader, little remains to be said.

I am very happy that it was the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who, rather than a Senator from this side of the aisle, commended the decisiveness and soundness of the action taken by the majority leader this morning. It was gracious of the Senator from New York. He was completely accurate in his portrayal and analysis of the action.

Many of us were present when the majority leader explained the course that he suggested would be followed. I urge every Senator to read his statement. While courageous and explicit, it nonetheless made clear his willingness and his hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will act promptly, and gave assurance that no leadership action would forestall the opportunity available to the committee.

We ought to read, also, the strong, critical reaction of the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I think it was he—perhaps it was the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]—who gave us a head count of the composition of the Committee on the Judiciary. The point was made that 10 members of the committee are cosponsors of the bill; therefore, what problem is there in the Committee on the Judiciary; why not send the bill to the Judiciary Committee?

In all kindness, I say the problem is the chairman; the reason we ought not send the bill to the committee is the chairman. If this is a guilty plea on my part of being an ineffective member of the Judiciary Committee, people can read into it anything they want, but the other nine members of the Judiciary Committee who cosponsored it are able, effective members, anxious to support a strong civil rights bill.

The hard truth is that the able chairman of the committee [Mr. EASTLAND] is an extraordinarily gifted obstructionist. There is no unkindness in that statement, because he simply reflects his conviction that civil rights may be all right for the history books, but it has no place in the law. It is a fact of life here. Why blink at it?

I would share the hope voiced by the majority leader and the senior Senator from New York that we will have the age of miracles and that the Judiciary Committee will act promptly. I was intrigued with the procedural course of action suggested for the Judiciary Subcommittee, which for months has had the administration's civil rights bill, to follow. I am not a member of that subcommittee, but the Senator from New York is, and it was he who made the suggestion; namely, to substitute the House-passed bill for the administration bill, and then all the formalities will have been observed.

This course may or may not be followed, but, in any event, I support completely the action suggested by our majority leader. I congratulate him on his action.

As the Senator from New York said, this is not the occasion on which to debate the merits. I know that if we were to judge the attitude of Americans by our mail count, we might conclude that the country does not want a commitment on the part of Congress that the American dream of owning one's home wherever one's energy and industry give him the resources, the money to pay for it, is a dream that can be dreamed by all Americans, and not just white, Arian Americans. I believe, mail count to the contrary, most Americans do want that dream available to all Americans. I hope the Congress will make clear before this session closes that that is a dream that can be shared by all Americans, and that it can become a reality. We will be a stronger nation and a better society when Congress takes this stand.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (1) and (2); and agree to the same.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WALTER ROGERS,
ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of H.R. 13277 is to provide for the enlargement and reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands. At present there are 11 members of the unicameral legislature. Two members are elected from St. Thomas, two from St. Croix, one from St. John, and six at large. It is proposed to change this formula by increasing the total number of Virgin Islands legislators to 15, and permit reapportionment in keeping with the recent Supreme Court decision enunciating the one-man, one-vote principle. Under the new formula the island of St. Thomas will elect five senators, St. Croix five, St. John one, and four at large.

As passed by the House, H.R. 13277 provided that the bill would become effective January 1, 1967. However, the intent was that at the general election in November 1966, the candidates for the 15-seat legislature would be elected to take office in January 1967. When the bill was considered by the Senate Interior Committee, the Department of the Interior recommended two amendments. The first was to delete the date "January 1, 1967" as the effective date of the act, and the other, to insert a new section 2 to read, as follows:

SEC. 2. This Act shall be effective with respect to the legislature to be elected at the regular general election in November 1966, and thereafter.

Both of these amendments were adopted by the Senate, and the record does not show any opposition to them. Subsequent to Senate passage of H.R. 13277, members of the minority party in the Virgin Islands suggested the date for reapportionment should be moved to 1968 since insufficient time remained to prepare for the primary to be held in September.

The House conferees have receded from their position and agreed to the version of the legislation as passed by the Senate. It is believed that reapportionment should take place immediately. Moreover, the Governor of the Virign Islands has assured us that the local legislature will be called immediately to act on appropriate legislation to change the primary date to October 4 in order that necessary time will be available to candidates to file and campaign.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters bearing on this subject from the Governor of the Virgin Islands and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated August 8, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, August 9, 1966.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request and inquiry from Assistant Secretary Anderson, Public Land Management, Department of the Interior, regarding the enactment of H.R. 13277 to become effective for the November 1966 election. I have given Secretary Anderson my assurance and now do likewise assure you that I will give official notice convening the Virgin Islands Legislature into special session on Saturday August 13, 1966 to consider the matter of extending or changing the dates for filing and for the primary.

I will recommend to the Legislature at this special session that the filing date be changed to September 6, 1966 and the primary date to October 4, 1966.

Yesterday and again today I conferred by phone with the majority members of the Virgin Islands Legislature and its President and have received their assurances that they will support and enact into law such changes at the special session. Within hours after its enactment and on the same day of its passage it will receive my approval.

It is my firm belief that the 5-5-1-4 formula established in H.R. 13277 is a good one and acceptable to all political groups and this formula should become effective at the earliest possible moment this year.

Unless this needed reform in the method of selecting Legislators is done now the people of the Virgin Islands will continue to be deprived and denied the benefits of a legislature fully responsive to and reflective of the people's will.

All Virgin Islands political parties concerned in running candidates in this year's election were contemplating the effective date of H.R. 13277 with its 5-5-1-4 formula to be 1966 and had ample time to plan accordingly.

It is my belief that the present existing dates of August 15, 1966 and September 13, 1966 could easily be met without any serious problem, however, since the question of not sufficient time was raised, and to avoid any further dispute, I have agreed to the calling of a special session to change these dates and give to all parties concerned the additional time to plan their election campaign strategy by extending the date for filing to September 6, 1966 and the primary to October 4, 1966.

I again recommend the immediate adoption by the Conferees of the clarified Senate version of this House measure.

Sincerely,
RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY,
Governor.

(Copy: Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL.)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are glad to respond to your request that we confirm that the position of this Department, expressed in our testimony of June 21, 1966, before your Territorial Subcommittee, at the hearings on H.R. 13277, is unchanged. In such earlier testimony we urged that the Virgin Islands Legislature be expanded to 15 members, and a more representative method be provided for voting for members at large. We urged further that such changes be made effective for the 1966 election, since we were most concerned that the potential mal-apportionment of the Legislature, which can occur under existing law, be avoided at once. While such mal-apportionment would be regrettable at any time, we believe it would be especially unwholesome should it be found in that newly elected legislature which will be granted the right to reapportion itself under H.R. 13277 once enacted.

Some misgivings have been expressed that the passage of time has now resulted in there not being sufficient remaining time for the Virgin Islanders to carry out their party primary and general election campaigns in an orderly fashion between now and November 8, 1966, the date of the general election. For the reasons given below, we believe such misgivings are not well founded.

While it is true that under present local law, filing for the legislature must take place by August 15, 1966, neither existing Federal law nor the changes proposed by H.R. 13277 make any change in the existing districts. Thus a candidate for a position in the legislature may file by August 15, 1966, for either an at-large seat or for a district seat whether or not H.R. 13277 is in effect then or will be later, without any change in local law being necessary.

We cannot deny, however, that practical political considerations applying to all factions and parties would make it very useful, if not vital, for the prospective candidates to know before they file whether they will be competing for an 11 or a 15-man legislature, or whether they will be filing for a district with two or with five seats to be filled. We believe, however, based upon the record of this legislation in the House, and again in the Senate, that the major political factions have been basing their assumptions upon, and tentatively forming their slates upon, a belief that H.R. 13277 would be effective for the 1966 elections. Thus a desire to avoid any last minute disruption in the plans of responsible potential candidates would itself call for a 1966, not a 1968, effective date for this measure.

To place the matter beyond any dispute, however, Governor Paiewonsky has authorized us to state to you that he will today give official notice that a special session of the Legislature will be held on August 13, 1966 to consider this matter. He will recommend to such Legislature that the filing date be changed to September 6, 1966, and the primary date to October 4, 1966. He has the informal, but realistic, assurances from the majority members that they will support such changes. If the minority members, who have been said to be concerned about shortness of campaigning time, will support it also, the changes will be made unanimously. Incidentally, the October 4 primary date will coincide with Hawaii's, a much larger and more far-flung jurisdiction.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. **ALLOTT.** Mr. President, regarding the conference report, I have no objection to the decision which the Senate has made, but merely wish to make clear that I, as one of the conferees on the bill, did not sign the conference report. I did not sign it, and there is nothing in the world that would ever induce me to do so because I think it sets up the continuation of a political system in the Virgin Islands which is reprehensible and deplorable. For those reasons, I would not sign it and I will not sign it.

STIMULATION OF THE FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FHA- AND VA-ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction.

Mr. **TOWER.** Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **TOWER.** Is the rule of germaneness in effect?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The rule of germaneness is no longer in effect.

Mr. **SPARKMAN** and Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware rose.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware will permit me to make a correction?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, earlier in the day I accepted an amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. We both understood it meant one thing, but from an interpretation of the amendment, we have decided that it was more sweeping than intended. With the assistance of the drafting service I have an amendment which I should like to offer. I have discussed it with the Senator from Delaware, who is in agreement that this correction should be made.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** I yield.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I have discussed this correction with the Senator from Alabama. The legislative counsel called it to our attention. It is a technical correction and carries out exactly the intent of the amendment as I offered it and as I explained it and as it was accepted by the Senator from Alabama. Notwithstanding the fact that there was a motion to reconsider the amendment and it was tabled, I have no objection to its acceptance. The leglislative counsel thinks it clarifies the provision and carries out the intention of the amendment as offered—namely, that none of the $1 billion which is authorized under this bill to be borrowed from the Federal Treasury and used for the purchase of mortgages could be pledged as collateral by FNMA toward repayment of any participation certificates that might be sold hereafter.

This is new language which spells out the purpose more clearly. I have no objection whatsoever to the amendment.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer this corrective amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment of the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert a new section, in lieu of the amendment previously adopted, as follows:

"SEC. 3. None of the mortgages purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association in carrying out the provisions of section 305 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended by this Act, with the proceeds of any money borrowed from the Federal Treasury, shall be pledged as collateral for repayment of any participation certificates sold by such association."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment makes it clearly prospective and uses the full name of the Federal National Mortgage Association, rather than just abbreviations.

Mr. President, has the previous amendment been accepted?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment has been agreed to.

Is this amendment to be in lieu of the previous amendment?

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Yes; it is to be in lieu of the previous amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I had one other point, which was brought out in the discussion I had with the Senator from Alabama yesterday. My next amendment will correct another glaring abuse which I pointed out last night.

The point I discussed then was the inequity of the situation to the homebuyer which has resulted from the point system or discounting mortgages.

The Federal Housing Administration has placed a ceiling on interest of 5.75 percent. A 30-year mortgage cannot be placed at par at a 5.75-percent interest rate. So the mortgages are sold at a discount.

It works this way: We will assume that an individual gets $9,200 or $9,500 in return for a $10,000 mortgage. The homebuilder knows in advance he cannot get par for that mortgage. The builder insists that there be a higher appraisal of $10,000 for that home. The homebuyer signs the mortgage for $10,000 for a 30-year period, at 5.75-percent interest.

The homebuilder, or whoever takes that mortgage, then can discount it 8 points at the bank, and he receives the $9,200 for it. The bank which buys that mortgage has a $10,000 mortgage for which it has paid $9,200. It is a 30-year mortgage. The holder collects 5¾ percent interest over this 30-year period, and then he can amortize the 8 points discount at which he bought the mortgage over this 30-year period, which would bring his yield up to slightly better than 6 percent.

It boils down to the fact that the homebuyer in reality is paying 6 percent for his mortgage—5¾ percent in interest, and the rest of it by giving a mortgage for $800 more than he actually borrowed.

But the disadvantages that I have already mentioned go beyond that. Suppose, for example, that this homebuyer defaults at the end of 4 years. You have this result: The mortgage lender collects the full amount from the FHA and only has to amortize that 8 points over 4 years. That means he increases his interest 2 points a year. Thus when the mortgage is in default at the end of 4 years, his average interest, instead of being 6 percent, rises to 7¾ or 8 percent; and if the homebuyer defaults at the end of 2 years, his interest under the point system only has to be amortized over 2 years, and he builds up his yield to 10 percent.

If he is "lucky" enough to sell it to a very bad credit risk who will default in 1 year, he receives 13.75 percent interest on the money he has lent for that 1 year.

In other words, our Government under the present system is paying a premium for the bad credit risk. The real money is made on the bad credit risk. On a good credit risk, a homeowner who meets his payments on a monthly basis and lives up to all of his obligations, the man financing him makes only 6 percent.

As a result of that, those who are taking these Government-guaranteed mortgages in many instances—I do not say in all—deliberately try not to collect the money and hope that the buyers will default so that they can cash in on the additional proceeds.

I cite one example in the State of the Senator from Texas. The individual involved happens to be the wife of a sergeant now serving in Vietnam. I have the file here.

This particular couple bought their home, and they had paid altogether over a period of 4 years $3,400. The FHA admits that is the total of the payments on their mortgage. They defaulted 5 months. The lady has furnished photostatic copies of money orders that were purchased showing that she had sent in payments for 2 of those months, so in reality she was only in default 3 months if the lender had accepted those payments, but they were returned. I can only assume the lender returned them because he would thus be able to cash in and take advantage of the higher interest under the point system. That home today under the ruling of the FHA is being sold under foreclosure proceedings.

The FHA has agreed to let the lady live there with her children, but she must pay rent at $50 a month and is now told that when her husband returns from Vietnam they will enter into negotiations and perhaps resell to her the home on which she has already paid $3,400. She and her husband have offered, by certified checks, to make up all back payments and make the loan current, but they will not permit her to make the loan current. Why? What kind of a program are they operating?

I think that is a shocking situation. We should be trying to protect the homebuyers and not just take care of the bankers and the homebuilders. I respect both of them in their places. They are entitled to their profits, but this was intended to be a homeowners' program. It is ridiculous under any Government auspices to allow the lender to make more money on a man who goes broke. It only induces the lender to try to find a bad-credit risk because he can thus make more profit than on a good one.

For that reason, I offer an amendment as follows:

> None of the funds provided for in this Act can be used to purchase any mortgage at a price in excess of the actual amount paid for such mortgage when originally purchased.

I want the legislative record to show clearly that that word "originally" is put in there deliberately to carry this back to the time the home was first financed and the payment that was made for the mortgage less all points deducted.

If this amendment is adopted and a mortgage had been discounted 8 points to 92 percent it means all we would be guaranteeing is 92 percent of the mortgage. That is all the agency could pay for it now. We would not be using the Government's guarantee to pay a profit for something that has never been paid by the lending institution. We would guarantee them only up to the point that they paid.

If the amendment is agreed to, I realize immediately they would not be able to obtain these mortgages at $9,200. What would happen? Then the FHA could do what it should have done long ago; and that is, put the interest rates at a level, whether it be 6, 6¼, 5½ percent, or whatever it may be, but put them at a level that will hold these mortgages at par. Once we do that there will be no premium on failures, and the money would be made on the good-credit risks, not the bad-credit risks. I think that is the way we want it, where the lending institutions, whoever they may be, will make their money on those who pay their bills and not make more money on those who go in default.

I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. I understand the committee is willing to accept it, and, as I have said before, I want it clearly understood that the word "originally" is to relate this restriction back to the date the home was financed originally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> At the appropriate place insert a new section:
>
> "None of the funds provided for in this Act can be used to purchase any mortgage at a price in excess of the actual amount paid for such mortgage when originally purchased."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this deals with a matter that has irritated us no end over the years. As a matter of fact, at one time we enacted a provision against discounts on these mortgages. It proved unworkable. We wrote in the law a requirement for control by the agency, and that was unworkable.

I certainly have as much objection to the discounts as does the Senator from Delaware; and I have tried to get rid of them. I am not at all certain that his amendment will work. I hope it does, and I have told him that I would be willing to take it to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I am familiar with the efforts the committee has made over the years to correct this situation, and I appreciate the problem which confronted them because, to be honest, I too have had difficulty in getting an amendment drafted which could eliminate the point system.

I fully recognize that this amendment would not prohibit the point system, but I think it would have the effect of eliminating it because it eliminates any possibility that anybody can cash in and make any money on the point system. That is the only reason for the existence of the system. To collect the points now they will have to hold the mortgage for its full life.

I think it would force the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency to put the interest rates at a realistic level so that those mortgages could be sold and financed at par. If it does not, the banking institutions could not afford to operate and purchase such mortgages. I think that this correction in practice would effectively force a correction of the evil. I will say this: If it does not correct it, I will be back again, because I think it is a shocking state of affairs when we have a Government program—and I know the chairman of the committee agrees with me—where the lending institutions make more money on failures than on good credit risks. That is what we are trying to correct.

I thank the chairman of the committee for his concurrence and acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. I assure the Senator from Delaware that I shall strongly urge acceptance by the House conferees of the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was argeed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the matter, but I have one further suggestion upon which I hope we can agree equally as well. If we do, we can dispose of the matter in 5 minutes.

The matter I shall discuss now deals with the first section of the bill. That is the portion between lines 1 and 5. The net effect of the section is to provide $2 billion additional money that can be used for the purpose of buying mortgages.

If this $2 billion is authorized as provided in the bill it is possible—in fact, I am advised that it is the intent—that they use these proceeds primarily to buy the mortgages which are in the existing portfolios of the lending institutions.

That would mean that many of those mortgages—mortgages which are 3, 5, and perhaps 10 years of age, and run over a 30-year term—would bear the interest rates which prevailed at the time the mortgages were issued. The rate might be as low as 4.5 percent, 5 percent, 5¼ percent, or 5¾ percent. However, whatever rates of interest those mortgages bore at that time, if we buy those mortgages under this provision the net effect would be a bailout and would put the money into the lending institutions.

The argument is that money would then be available to feed back into the housing industry. I agree that is possible, but it would be fed back at the higher rates which prevail today, which is approximately 6 percent.

The result could be to roll over the existing portfolios of lending institutions, portfolios consisting of mortgage rates bearing a low rate of interest, and converting that money into mortgages at rates that would be about 1 percent or 1½ percent higher than the older mortgages.

I do not think this measure was intended as a bailout for those lending institutions.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I think we have, in our remarks today, made sufficient legislative history to make clear the intent of the Senate that this is not intended as a bailout. We intend to pump new mortgage money into the economy so that we can get homebuilding going again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question about that. I agree completely with the intent of the committee as it is explained.

I compliment the committee on the precautions they took in the second section on page 2 in which they said the new money shall be available only when the applicant certifies that the construction of housing to be covered by the mortgage had not commenced prior to the date of enactment of this act.

That means that $1 billion under that section will go in its entirety to new mortgage money in the building of new homes.

I concur completely; however, in the first section the $2 billion does not have that limitation, could go into a bailout job for lending institutions, and could raise their interest rates on their portfolios by about 1½ percent.

One and one-half percent of the $2 million would provide an extra $30 million for the lending institutions over the 30-year life of these mortgages.

I propose on line 5 to strike out the period and insert similar language to that which appears applicable to the second section. That would provide that none of the funds provided in this first section could be used to purchase any mortgage which bears a date prior to July 1, 1966. I would have no objection to saying January 1, 1966, since we adpoted the other amendment. I think that the January 1 date would have the effect of siphoning the entire $3 billion provided in this bill, into the construction of new homes.

If the amendment is accepted none of it could be used as a bailout for the lending institutions or as a vehicle by which they could roll their mortgage portfolios over and end up with an interest rate that would be 1 or 1½ percent higher.

I hope that the amendment will be accepted. If the amendment is accepted, as far as I am concerned we could proceed to vote on the bill. With that safeguard included in the bill I would enthusiastically support the measure. Without it I will vote against the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Delaware that I certainly appreciate the thrust and the intent of his amendment, but I think the question involved here is highly technical and involves a legal interpretation that might be somewhat hazardous and might jeopardize the program.

I am not a lawyer, and I cannot comment in depth on this. However, it has been brought to my attention by counsel that this does raise some rather serious legal questions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have discussed it with the representatives of the department downtown. I do not think it raises any serious question except that it would stop the bailout possibility to which I refer.

I have tremendous respect for lawyers. Not being a lawyer myself I have great admiration for their ability, but I am sometimes reminded of the fact that while the judge is a lawyer, the prosecuting attorney is a lawyer, and the counsel for the defense is a lawyer, when they get sufficiently confused it always takes 12 laymen to straighten them out.

As a layman I think this amendment is in understandable language. They would understand it. I might say it is about the same language, used to carry out the same intent, as the language placed in the second section of the bill by the committee. I would be well satisfied with the same language. In fact, the language of my amendment is more liberal because the committee language provides for financing only the construction of the housing that had not been commenced prior to enactment.

I thought that it would be a little hard for the agency in Washington to determine when they started to construct the house. I tied my amendment to the date of the mortgage. That would be easier to determine.

I am not wedded to the July 1 date. I just want to make sure that this money is directed toward financing the construction of new homes and is not used and cannot be used in any manner as a bailout for those lending institutions who are unfortunate enough to have in their portfolios several hundreds of millions of dollars worth of old mortgages which bear lower interest rates.

I do not criticize them for holding these mortgages. They were good investments then, but I do not think we should bail them out. I know that is not the intention of the committee.

My amendment would preclude that. I am advised, and I am sure the committee will admit, that in the absence of this amendment the bailout results I have described can happen.

Mr. TOWER. I point out to the Senator from Delaware that the first provision to strike "10" and insert "15," is addressed to an existing authority and to an existing procedure, whereas the second section creates a new authority and a new procedure. Therefore, we would prefer not to tamper with what is already being done.

We are simply extending the ratio from 10 to 15. Therefore, I think, for my part, that I would prefer not to address to that section any amendments which would have the effect of inhibiting the authority or changing the procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to accept a provision that none of the additional money provided in this section can be used for a bailout job, and that the FHA should be on notice that the extra $2 billion raised as a result of this first section is intended to be directed into new housing and must not be used in bailing out the old portfolios?

Mr. TOWER. I think perhaps the objective sought by the Senator from Delaware might be served by our making legislative history here to clarify our intent that this additional money go into new mortgage funds.

We are attempting here to create additional mortgage funds for new construction. I think if we can make that plain here, then the intent of Congress is clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question about that being the intent. The FHA downtown accepts it as the intent, and their argument is that this money will go into new construction. They will accept that, but the point I make is that the method by which they want it to go into new construction is by buying these old mortgages and making the money available to lending institutions in the hope that they will put that money, after they get it, into new construction. The question I am raising concerns how much of that money will really get in the housing industry.

Remember, as it goes through this secondary operation by buying the old mortgages first, providing the lending institutions with the money, and then letting them lend it at the higher rates now prevailing we are jacking up the income of their portfolios by 1½ percent.

I point out this additional disadvantage of not accepting this amendment: Without this provision nothing would prohibit a bank or lending institution, once it has unloaded at par its old mortgages on the FNMA—4½- to 5-percent mortgages, from putting the proceeds in FNMA participation certificates, which were offered yesterday at a yield of 5.91 percent, instead of in mortgages for new homes. We could not control what they did with the money once we bought those mortgages from them.

If an institution has $10 million worth of housing mortgages and sells them to FNMA under the provisions of this act as it is written, the institution has the money and can do what it pleases. If legislation is passed without this amendment tomorrow, the institution could put the entire $10 million into FNMA mortgages or in the mortgages of some domestic corporation, and conceivably none of this $2 billion would ever reach the housing industry. I do not believe that would be the case, but it is possible. There is nothing in this bill that follows through to provide that once they have unloaded these $2 billion mortgages on the Government, they have to use the proceeds for the housing industry. It is a hope only.

If this amendment is adopted, the entire $2 billion would be directed into the construction of new homes because it provides that none of the additional funds provided for in this section can be used to purchase any mortgage which bears a date prior to July 1, 1966.

In that manner the FHA would only use that money to buy new mortgages, and we would know that it would go directly into the housing industry. That is where we want it to go, and the only manner in which we can get it there is to accept this provision as a part of the law. The FHA has already confirmed that they intend to use this money to buy the mortgages that are already on hand in these lending institutions.

These mortgages that they will buy are bearing interest rates today of 4½ to 5 and up to 5¾ percent. They would be delighted to unload those mortgages on the Federal Government at par. I do not blame them. But they can take the proceeds then and reinvest them in 6-percent mortgages.

Assume for the moment that the objectives were carried out, that 100 percent of the mortgages that are bought are reinvested in homes. This situation would exist: The lending institutions would be given par or near par for an old 4½- to 5-percent mortgage, and they would be given money which they could lend out on a new mortgage at about 6 percent.

Why should we upgrade the interest rates on the portfolios of the lending institutions? Surely this legislation is not a bail-out attempt. This is supposed to help the home buyers of America, and the only way we can help them is to make sure that every dollar provided in this act goes directly to the home buyer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not a member of this committee, and therefore am merely seeking information.

Am I correct in my understanding that if this program is carried into effect, the moneys that will be expended by FNMA can be used in the purchase of mortgages in the portfolios of lending institutions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and it relates to the first section of the bill. That is the $2 billion.

With respect to the last section of the bill, which relates to $1 billion that could be borrowed from the Treasury, the committee tied that down in exactly the same manner—even tighter than I am proposing to tie this down in that it said that money could only be used to finance mortgages on homes, construction of which was started after the enactment of this bill. I thought that was a little hard to define, and I am putting the date at July 1.

With this amendment and the one adopted just before this there could be no windfall. This will close the last possible loophole.

But the $2 billion that would be raised under the first section of the bill could—and I am advised it is intended to—be used to buy mortgages already in the portfolio of lending institutions on the premise that by making new money available they will finance new housing construction.

I would say that the bulk of that money would not be used to finance new housing construction. I will concede that much of it could, but even if it were used a hundred percent to refinance through new mortgages this would be the result: The interest rates on the portfolios of the lending institutions would be upgraded from 4½- to 5- or 5½-percent mortgages—the latest is 5¾ percent—to today's higher interest rate of 6 percent. Why should we upgrade their portfolios at higher rates?

On the other hand, they have to concede that it is possible and more than likely, that some of this money will not go into the housing industry. Theoretically, once they have unloaded their portfolios of mortgages on the FNMA they can use that money to buy the bonds that are being sold by some American corporations; they can buy triple A's today at 6 percent; they can use it to buy FNMA participation certificates at 5.91 percent.

Nothing in this bill provides that 1 dime of the $2 billion under this first section must go to the housing industry.

My purpose is this, and I say this as one who with this proviso would vote for the bill: The people in America who want homes are experiencing difficulty in purchasing homes. If this amendment were accepted we would have a bill which would direct the entire $3 billion into the construction of new homes. The homes already built and sold have been financed. If somebody is unfortunate enough to be holding a mortgage at an interest rate lower than today's rate I sympathize with him, but that situation is true with a lot of people who have bonds which they bought years ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the justification for the proposal that FNMA shall be permitted to buy existing mortgages in the portfolios of lending institutions, and not confine the new money given to it in a manner so that the moneys will be used for new construction? Why is it proposed that the lending institutions shall be benefited in the manner that the Senator from Delaware has described?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Alabama made it clear that it is his intent that this money go into the housing industry. I am sure that it is his intent that the money will go directly into the housing industry, but the bill does not so provide. It needs this amendment to make sure this will be the result.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator means into new building?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Into new building.

The point I make is that while the second section of the bill dealing with $1 billion specifically spells that out in the law, the first section is vague; it is left open.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What reason is given for making the first section open or vague?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. None. I am hoping that they will accept this amendment. If they do, the first section will be in line with the last section, and the full $3 billion will then be siphoned into the construction of new homes, homes started after July 1, 1966, or after the enactment.

As I have stated, I would have no objection—this 5¾ percent has been in effect since January—if they wish to make it effective January 1, but I do not wish to bail out the lending institutions on their old portfolios at par and give them the chance to upgrade their interest on their portfolios by 1½ percent, which could be done. One and a half percent on the $2 billion is $30 million a year that would be put into the lending institutions, and we are dealing with 30-year mortgages. That represents $900 million.

I am not about to support a bill that will increase the portfolio income of lending institutions by a billion dollars over the next 30 years. I know that that was not the intent of the committee, but let us correct the possibility.

All I wish to do is to have an amendment adopted that will make that impossible, and that will siphon every dime of this $3 billion into the new housing industry.

I repeat, with the acceptance of this amendment as far as I am concerned, I will support this bill most enthusiastically because it would guarantee that every dollar provided would go where we say we intend it to go.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in understanding that a lending institution known as X, possessing mortgages yielding an interest rate of 4.5 percent, 5 percent, or 5.5 percent, could sell those mortgages to FNMA, the Government agency; and then, with the moneys that it received in the sale of low-interest-bearing mortgages, it could make any loans on mortgages at the high rate of interest now being commanded?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is exactly what FHA said is their intent. That has the effect of up-grading the portfolios by 1.5 percent. Even that may not be carried out because it is conceivable, unless we tie this down, after once unloading their portfolios on the Federal Government they may reinvest it in a railroad, the securities market, or anywhere.

I am suggesting that we do in the first section of the bill what the committee proposes to do with the second section; namely, to tie down every part of this additional money to construction of new homes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield to me? I wish to make a correction in the statement that the Senator made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it should be clear in our thinking as to the essential difference between the operation under section 1 and section 2.

As the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] pointed out, section 1 ties in with a going operation. This would add more funds for buying mortgages in the secondary market. FNMA is engaged in this. FNMA does not usually buy old mortgages. I do not understand too much about the mechanics but I understand from the agencies that there is a technique; it is what they call "warehousing." They will take a mortgage, put it away, and seek to sell it within 6 months. They have a schedule. They need to sell enough to keep them liquidated all the time, and in business to buy more.

There is provision in the law now with respect to the FNMA secondary mortgage facility, and I would like to quote it. It is section 304(a)(1) of the Housing Act. It provides:

> SECONDARY MARKET OPERATIONS
>
> SEC. 304. (a)(1) To carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) of section 301, the operations of the Association under this section shall be confined, so far as practicable, to mortgages which are deemed by the

> Association to be of such quality, type, and class as to meet, generally, the purchase standards imposed by private institutional mortgage investors and the Association shall not purchase any mortgage insured or guaranteed prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954. In the interest of assuring sound operation, the prices to be paid by the Association for mortgages purchased in its secondary market operations under this section, should be established, from time to time, within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved, as determined by the Association.

From time to time FNMA puts out a notice as to what its purchase price will be.

Reference has been made to the purchasing of low-interest-rate mortgages at par. FNMA simply does not do that. It is required by law to purchase such mortgages at the price in the marketplace, and that is what it does. Let me read from a release of the Federal National Mortgage Association dated June 10, 1966:

> The Federal National Mortgage Association today announced revised purchase prices for mortgages it purchases under immediate purchase and standby commitment contracts in its Secondary Market Operations.
>
> The new purchase prices apply to all offers received by the Association on and after June 10.
>
> The revised immediate purchase prices for 5¼ percent, 5½ percent, and 5¾ percent mortgages on 1- to 4-family housing and for 6 percent home improvement loans represent a 2-point decrease from previous prices.

Let me skip to where the price schedule is given. The lowest purchase price stated is 5¼ percent. That is the price that prevailed on FHA and VA mortgages less than a year ago. But listen to this:

> FNMA's new purchase prices for home mortgages will range from 96½—95 for 5¾ percent, 94½—93 for 5½ percent, and 92½—91 for 5¼ percent mortgages.

Ninety-six and one-half—95 are the prices of current mortages in the VA and FHA. FNMA is not offering to purchase any mortgages at a lower rate of interest than that. Certainly if they did, the discount price would be shown, in order that they might compete with the reasonable purchase price in the marketplace. I simply cannot see how we could go further than we have gone.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator explain the prices of 91 to 95? That is the discount price, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what FNMA paid. A statement has been made about FNMA paying par. FNMA does not pay par for its mortgages.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, if par is $100, on the basis of its formula the price may be——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Ninety-one and one-half.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ninety-one and one-half.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I earnestly hope that the Senator from Delaware will not push his amendment. We have been able to work out other amendments with him today. I believe that the law and the experience of FNMA illustrate that.

Furthermore, the regulations of FNMA today—and I hope the Senator from Delaware will remember this—limit the purchase of mortgages to 4 months. That is even less than what the Senator from Delaware proposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to reply, first, to the Senator from Alabama, then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

The key words in the language that the Senator from Alabama read indicate that FNMA buys at prices that the Association determines. That is the joker.

What is proposed now? One reason why FNMA is paying less for mortgages now in relation to what was paid before is not altogether due to higher interest rates. FNMA is out of money. That is why it is before Congress now. It has no money and had to reduce the price it was paying. It does not have money and will not have it until funds are provided by Congress.

The moment the bill is signed what will happen?

Immediately $2 billion will be available. For what purpose? For home mortgages in the portfolios of investment companies. They know what is coming. It is a simple matter of economics; $2 billion will be directed into the market. What happens? Prices on these mortgages will rise.

It may be asked, "Why object to this? They can sell them anywhere." If they can sell into a free and open market now, what are we talking about? Why not direct this money, as I said before, into new construction? We know they cannot sell the mortgages in the free market at these prices.

Without this amendment this money may be placed by investors in AAA bonds. These mortgages were bought at a time when they were attractive investments. Now they are not so attractive, and the Government is asked to move in and bail them out at prices higher than exist now. If the $2 billion is directed solely toward the purchase of old mortgages certainly it will boost the market price.

All I propose to do is to amend the first section so as to carry out exactly what every member of the committee says he wants to achieve; namely, to siphon money into the new construction field. We should not leave it to an agency of the executive department to decide. This is our responsibility. I do not know how the agency has been using its money, but since they were short why did they not siphon the money into new mortgages? That practice should have been adopted long ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that under the formula it has adopted, FNMA buys mortgages at a discount and that in that manner it protects against the undue enrichment of lending agencies. Is there anything in the bill that contemplates or requires that the lending agency which sells its mortgages shall use the moneys obtained from the sale, for the promotion of the building industry?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Nothing whatsoever.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are they allowed to use the money which they obtain and invest it in whichever mortgages they believe will bring the greatest profit to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They could, except for one point. If the mortgages were bought from the savings and loan institutions or someone who had it in a restricted portfolio, they would have to reinvest. Otherwise the answer is no. The chairman is speaking of paying 92 percent for the mortgages. We have in today's quotations that United States Steel has a 4⅝-percent bond, Triple A, selling for 89. That can be bought on the open market. Mortgages which have to be serviced on a monthly collection basis naturally sell lower.

What I am suggesting is that the additional money should not be used to buy these old mortgages. They should channel their operations into the new construction field.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the bill before us intended to stimulate and promote the building of homes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the argument used. This is one problem that disturbs me. I know that the committee intends that the benefit go to the homebuyer, but one of the things that has disturbed me about this from the beginning has been the emphasis that this was a homebuilder's bill. I respect homebuilders. We cannot have homeowners if we do not have homebuilders, and homebuilders are entitled to consideration and to make a profit. I respect that, and I will protect it; but at the same time our efforts here should be directed entirely toward helping the man who is trying to buy a home.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment and ask that it be stated. I hope that it will be accepted, and if so, then so far as I am concerned, we can vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

> On page 1, line 5, strike out the period and insert "*Provided, however,* None of the additional funds provided for in this section can be used to purchase any mortgage which bears a date prior to January 1, 1966".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as much as I dislike to disagree with my good friend from Delaware, who is probably one of the most constructive legislators in the history of the Senate, I do feel constrained to concur with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and hope that the amendment will not be pressed. I do not believe it is necessary. Further, I think it should be pointed out that the amendment is addressed to an existing operation and an existing procedure. If we do not like the way FNMA operates, then what we should do is to introduce a bill specifying a desire to change the method of operation of FNMA. We should not try to do it by an amendment to the pending bill, which would not change the basic nature of the operation but would change the operation of the ratio from 10 to 15, taking into consideration the fact that FNMA does not buy mortgages more than 4 months old—is that correct, let me ask the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the regulation.

Mr. TOWER. I do not see how we can talk about buying old mortgages. Therefore, I would hope that, to begin with, the Senator from Delaware would not press his amendment. We have been cooperative and have accepted two of his constructive amendments, which I intend to advocate in conference; but I would be hopeful that the pending amendment would not be pressed at this time. I would certainly be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Delaware in the propounding of legislation to change the FNMA procedures that are currently in existence that may not be satisfactory or that may not be enough to stimulate the flow of mortgage money. Therefore, I am hopeful that the pending amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to delay the Senate any longer—it has been delayed too long already. So far as I am concerned, we can have an agreement to vote on this amendment and vote on final passage, too. I have no other amendments to offer. We can first get the quorum call and vote on the amendment; we can get it over with.

I feel very strongly, however, that my amendment does have merit. Here we are approving a bill which will, in this section, provide for an addition $2 billion. The stated purpose of the bill is to take the $2 billion and channel it toward the financing of the construction of new homes. My amendment would make sure that that $2 billion would go for that purpose. If it does, well and good, but if the amendment is defeated the Department admits it plans to buy the existing portfolios of mortgages from the investment companies in the hope—and I emphasize the words "in the hope"—that the money which they receive therefrom will then be channeled into the home construction industry, but there is no assurance whatsoever that it would go there. Except this—as the purchases would be directed to an institution which happens to have in its charter that it could only finance home mortgages and, even then, it would not have to loan it if it did not want to.

So I think the amendment is necessary. First, action is to be taken on my amendment. I am not going to delay the Senate any longer. We can vote.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator from Delaware going to insist on a rollcall vote on his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I should like to have a rollcall vote. This is a very important matter, but I am perfectly willing to vote. I would hope that the Senate would take my amendment. This is a constructive amendment. I would hate to see the Senate pass this bill approving the $2 billion with the clear understanding—and I have got that clear understanding with the agencies—that it is their plan to get this amount of money into the home construction industry through the buying of the existing portfolios of the lending institutions, and then trust that some of the proceeds will filter down to the housing industry.

That is the issue. I do not believe we need debate the issue further. We can ask for the yeas and nays on both the amendment and final passage, and then, so far as I am concerned, we can vote on them one right after the other.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Delaware has suggested he would set a date of January 1, 1966. In other words, he would limit it to the purchase of mortgages subsequent to January 1, 1966. That is further back than the regulations of FNMA allow them to purchase.

With that explanation—and I have talked with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] about it—we have expressed willingness to take the amendment to conference. I want to make clear to the Senator from Delaware that I am not at all certain it is a good provision. I must say I cannot view this amendment as strongly as I did the other amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am compelled to concur.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to set the date at January 1, 1966, that achieves the purpose I desire. I think it is more practical to fix a date.

Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I modify my amendment to make the date January 1 instead of July 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does this mean, as the Senator has amended his amendment, that the purchases of mortgages are confined to those dated not earlier than January 1, 1966, this year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is this agreeable to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would much rather it not be written into the law. I doubt that it is practical. However, I have said we would take it to conference, because the regulations of FNMA affect this.

Mr. HOLLAND. This would certainly cover most of the portfolios of people active in the business and enable them to get relief from their present overburdened condition. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to ask several questions of the manager of the bill, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

In the face of the scarcity of money to finance construction of homes, has the cost of building gone down or continued up?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is nothing in the record showing what the percentage increase in the construction of homes has been in the last year or two?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have that information at hand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator have a general impression whether, in spite of the scarcity of money for building new homes, the cost has been increasing rather extravagantly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain there has been an increase, but as far as the actual building is concerned, we are just now beginning to feel the pinch of high interest rates and the scarcity of money, because the homes being completed now or under construction now were contracted for 6 or 8 months ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason I asked the question is that I have received letters from constituents in Ohio saying, "How can I own a home when, in the building of homes, craftsmen are getting $6 and $7 an hour? It places the purchase of a home completely beyond my power."

I wonder if by our activities at the Federal level we are not stimulating those increased demands being made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized, in the engrossment of the Senate amendments, to make technical and clerical corrections and any necessary rearrangements of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I inquire of the Senator from Oregon if he is going to talk on the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator be surprised?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was hoping we could proceed with the bill and the third reading and bring it to an end.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will have time to bring it to an end after I finish. I want to talk on the bill before the third reading.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Fine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, did the Senate concur in the amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill. I think the time has come for Congress to act on the crisis in the mortgage money market. On July 25, I reported to the Senate the consternation and distress that high interest and tight money were causing in my State and the Pacific Northwest. I am sure that the daily mail of every Senator reminds him that the same concern is felt in his State. It is nationwide.

My mail on the subject continues to be voluminous and caustic. It comes from homebuilders whose businesses are faced with disaster. It comes from families that wish to buy a home but cannot get financing at all, or cannot afford the interest on the mortgage loans that are available. Lumber products output and prices are down. Other industries—those that make the component products of American homes, and those that handle real estate transfers and financing—have been or soon will be adversely affected.

In my State, many of our lumber mills, particularly the plywood industry—and plywood is substantially used in homes these days—are cutting down their shifts and laying off men. This administration is going to have to assume a large part of the responsibility for letting business get in a condition which is resulting in economic disruption, because it is not taking the steps it ought to take to protect the American people in connection with the problems raised by its money and interest policies.

My constituents demand that action be taken to alleviate these hardships, so incongruous in the midst of the general prosperity and so damaging to the great forest products industry of Oregon.

Many of the letters are not specific in suggesting what action would be effective; but some are.

However, these letters are unanswerable if one seeks to sustain the present money and interest policies of the administration.

An example of the latter kind of communication is a thoughtful letter I received from Mr. Thomas M. Paarmann, northwest district sales manager, the Flintkote Co.:

> JULY 21, 1966.
>
> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As manager of The Flintkote Company plant in Portland, I am calling your attention to a situation that greatly concerns us.
>
> Products we produce are used by the home building industry, which is now imperiled by the diversion of money from regular mortgage markets. Housing starts in May dropped to the lowest point in 3½ years. Immediate action to correct the condition will not head off the critical period facing the industry the latter part of this year, but it will help prevent long-term injury.
>
> The housing industry crisis directly affects the income of our employees and their families. Likewise affected are those who earn their livelihood from the building, furnishing and selling of homes. The consequences will be felt throughout our community's economy.
>
> Therefore, we earnestly and respectfully seek your support of legislative action on the following three points:
>
> 1. Broaden the purchasing powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

I say to the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPARKMAN], it is my understanding that at least this bill will be somewhat helpful in that regard—namely, that it will help broaden the purchasing powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Mr. Paarmann goes on to point out, by way of other specific suggestions, in his letter:

> 2. Impose a 4½ per cent maximum on lower-priced, individually-purchased certificates of deposit.
>
> 3. Permit the Federal Reserve Board to purchase notes of the Federal Home Loan Bank and of the Federal National Mortgage Association.
>
> We would also appreciate your support for administrative action to increase the Federal Housing Administration interest rate from 5¾ per cent to 6 per cent. A lender can only obtain an effective market yield on a 5¾ per cent interest rate by charging high discounts. A 6 per cent rate would result in a more realistic yield and help reduce discounts.
>
> These steps would benefit our employees, potential home buyers and many others in our area whose incomes are directly and indirectly influenced by the state of the home building industry.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> THOMAS W. PAARMANN,
> *Northwest District Sales Manager.*

Mr. President, I am gratified to note that the bill before the Senate would carry out the first of my constituent's suggestions: S. 3688 will, in two ways and under two programs, greatly increase the mortgage purchasing power of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Therefore, I welcome the bill for that reason, and I am glad to support it today. I know that other pending bills, some now fairly well advanced in the legislative process, will deal with other of Mr. Paarmann's recommendations. I hope to comment on them in more detail soon. I commend the Subcommittee on Housing and its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the full Committee on Banking and Currency, for their expeditious handling of this very much needed and urgent legislation.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and to note that the Banking and Currency Committee is considering other legislation to help loosen up money, which is, of course, a very pressing national problem at the moment.

I know this bill is not a panacea. It is only one step. But I think it is a tremendously constructive step, and I should like to note at this time that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has shown great skill and great dispatch in the handling of the measure. It was reported by our committee unanimously, and I think that is certainly a tribute to the great ability and insight into the problem of the Senator from Alabama. I hope that, as it came out of the committee unanimously, it will pass the Senate unanimously.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to express, of course, my appreciation to the able Senator from Texas for his hearty cooperation. When I started presenting my remarks yesterday, I pointed out the fact that he and I had introduced companion bills, and that then we got together and jointly sponsored the measure reported by the committee.

Mr. President, earlier in the day, there was an amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and then later an amendment was offered by the two Senators from Hawaii [Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]—in fact, Mr. GRUENING actually made the presentation—in which certain price levels were set. These two amendments were previously agreed to, and motions to reconsider the votes by which they were agreed to were tabled.

It turns out that those amendments, as actually written, do not fit well; and I now ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment as a substitute for those amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, in lieu of the two amendments already agreed to, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> : *Provided,* That the Association is authorized to increase the foregoing amount for single family dwellings to not more than $17,500 ($22,500 in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii) in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As one who used to serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency, I join with the others who have expressed satisfaction with the bill, as well as with its handling by my beloved friend, the Senator from Alabama. I should like to add only one point.

We often discussed, in the committee, whether moves which would enlarge the mortgage money market, to make more mortgage money available, were inflationary. It seems to me that constantly we came to the conclusion that what adds as basically and constructively to the total resources and tranquillity of the country as does a measure such as this represents the conversion of goods, materials, and labor into extremely more valuable assets to the Nation than the goods, materials, and labor represented. I add that because the American people should be reassured that this is one of the most constructive ways to stabilize our situation, rather than otherwise, lest we have given the superficial impression that by creating more availability of mortgage money, we are adding to the inflationary mood.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the Senator made those remarks, because I think he is right. I have often made similar remarks at times when there were efforts to curb the amount of housing. I have said it this way: Decent shelter is just as essential as food and clothes. We never hear any suggestions as to limitations on food and clothing; we ought not to curb housing.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will indulge me, may I ask one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask that the Senator withhold his question for a moment.

Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (S. 3688) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We have a considerable amount of concern, in New York, about the apparent severe shortage in funds available for college housing. I wonder whether the Senator could perhaps give us some word on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One thing that has created somewhat of a crisis in college housing has been the fact that last year the interest rate on college housing loans was lowered to 3 percent. For the first time, it became a subsidized interest rate. That naturally has brought on a very great demand for college housing.

There is nothing in this bill about this matter; this is not the bill for it.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. But does the Senator know of anything which the Committee on Banking and Currency is contemplating to deal with that situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is no proposal at the present time, that we are conscious of.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out to the Senator that there are very many fine institutions of higher learning undergoing enormous pressure of increased enrollments, which really are suffering.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true all over the country, and will be even more so now, since passage of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we have some confidence that the committee will consider itself seized of that problem, and will have a look at it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We surely will.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to support S. 3688 and want to compliment the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and committee members for acting upon this measure and getting it before the Senate.

It is my belief that new purchasing authority should be granted to FNMA. The tight money market has, during the past few months, caused a dramatic slowdown in home construction, one which I believe has gone much too far and the Congress should take steps to make corrective measures.

Day after day, my mail reflects the need for increasing mortgage money and while I fully realize this bill will not correct all of the ills in the housing industry, it will be of benefit, in my opinion, to the industry as well as the home purchaser.

While I am sure all Members have received much correspondence on this subject, I would like to quote from one letter which I recently received and which I think points out the problem presently existing in some areas of my State as well as nationally. The letter reads in part:

> Right now, housing production in northern Nevada is choked down to near zero. By the end of this year, the number of new dwellings built in our immediate area could be well under half of the 2,175 constructed in 1965. The City of Sparks, for example, recorded one residential permit this June. Only seven residential permits were issued in Washoe County during the first 25 days of July. Washoe County officials report residential building permit applications have dropped over 75% in the last 90 days from last year's May-June-July total of 183 to the current total of only 48. Other jurisdictions in our area report similarly discouraging figures.
>
> The critical conditions which exist follow a steady decline in housing production which was occurring here even during comparatively favorable market conditions. In 1963 some 2,564 housing units were built here. In 1964 the total fell to 2,291. Last year, there were but 2,175. In short, Senator BIBLE, an industry already ailing with a gradual market decline has suddenly been thrown into absolute chaos, a condition that surely will sound the death knell for hundreds of businesses and thousands of jobs over and above those already claimed. There are over 400 licensed prime contractors in the immediate Washoe County area. Think of that when you glance back at the paragraph above and note that probably fewer than 75 building permits were put to use in this entire area within the last 90 days.
>
> Many general contractors are idle at this time, and so are most suppliers and subcontractors and thousands of people employed by them. The state of Nevada now reports 2,200 construction workers are unemployed, but we think the actual figure is higher.
>
> Obviously, what happens to the builder happens to everyone. As the builder goes, so goes the economy in general. The Home Builders Association of Northern Nevada strongly urges you to support the enactment of legislation now before Congress designed to arrest this very serious decline in housing production caused by lack of available residential financing.

While the above communication was directed to me from the president of Home Builders Association of Northern Nevada and undoubtedly the association has a valid interest, I see nothing wrong with wanting to assist the industry which in turn, as the writer states, helps thousands of other workmen including major suppliers.

A surplus of housing does not exist in northern Nevada. In fact in some communities, they are hard put to keep up with the growing population and demand.

I do not believe the homebuilders will go overboard in construction of homes where surpluses may now exist. I also believe FHA can and should do its part in controlling this situation by not being too lenient in granting insurance in areas of overbuilding.

As I previously stated, I favor this legislation and hope the bill will pass in its present form.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the mortgage money shortage in Connecticut is reaching critical proportions. Its devastating effect is being felt in all parts of the State and the long-range damage cannot be underestimated.

The immediate hardship being caused to individuals is obvious. Connecticut is a highly developed industrialized State. Its citizens are often required to move for employment reasons as well as personal reasons. When a person is forced to move, and cannot sell his house, the individual hardship is severe.

But it is not only the individual trying to sell his house who suffers. The economy itself is greatly affected by the building industry. Without mortgage money, the many builders throughout the State, large and small, cannot operate. Their businesses are affected. But if they cannot build, the carpenters and the construction trades cannot work. The laborers in the residential construction industry are among those who are least able to afford the loss of work. They are among the hardest hit.

Like a stone thrown in a pond, the harmful effects spread throughout the economy of the State. The suppliers and all those who provide materials, and their employees are hurt. The real estate salesmen suffer, as do the architects. In Stamford, for example, it is estimated that approximately one-fifth of the families derive some portion of their incomes from the homebuilding industry and related activities.

When these people are damaged, the effect must spread to all from whom they buy goods, services, entertainment.

But in Connecticut, there is another long-range effect. Our industries are expanding. Its economy is firmly based on a supply of skilled labor. Its ability to meet the growing needs of the people depends on the steady growth of its industrial base. Much of the State already faces a shortage of skilled workers. If these industries are to grow, housing must be provided.

Even now the normal growth of our cities and urban centers requires the constant building of new residential housing. Without the construction of new housing, our expanding population can only drive up the cost of existing housing. As the price of housing goes up—as the population expands, and the amount of housing remains constant—it is those on the lower end of the economic scale who will again be hardest hit. Thus, the problems of our cities will be further intensified.

Mr. President, this bill will add about $2 billion to the existing supply of mortgage money. It is not a cure-all, but it is a very vital and necessary step that must be taken. I urge the immediate passage of this essential legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, during the last several months we have seen a significant drop in the construction of residential housing. The National Association of Home Builders predicts that there will be one-third fewer homes started during the remainder of this year unless something is done to correct this situation. And the New York State Department of Commerce reports that this year there were 20 percent fewer residential housing contracts than last.

Most observers blame this drop in residential housing construction on the high cost and shortage of credit. The interest cost for first mortgages now averages 6½ percent for the United States, with costs in some areas at 7½ percent. Homebuilders in the Rochester, N.Y. area report that those mortgages that are available have an interest rate of about 7 percent.

There is also a shortage of mortgage money at any interest rate in many areas. Many savings and loan institutions are not able to provide mortgage money to customers at the higher rates because of the shortage of capital.

The result of this shortage of mortgage money is that the family which wishes to purchase a new or used home or sell its existing house is unable to do so. The family must delay its move until a future date when credit prices may fall.

The potential homeowner, the homeowner who wishes to sell his house, the homebuilder, and those employed by the builder are thus the first to suffer from the restrictive monetary restraints placed on the economy. This segment of the economy is the most sensitive to increases in interest rate.

The smaller builders and suppliers also become victims of this credit squeeze. The builder who constructs individual houses and the local suppliers is immediately affected by the lack of new projects. Larger companies with independent financing are able to continue their operations and handles business that would otherwise be available to the smaller companies. In this sense, tight credit favors larger businesses and hampers the independent business.

The legislation introduced by Senator SPARKMAN is designed to relieve pressure on the residential housing mortgage market. It will authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to expand by $3 billion its purchase of mortgages guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration. About $1 billion of this is to be used for low-cost residential housing with mortgages of $15,000 or less.

The bill does not address itself to the general economic problems posed by the abnormally high cost of credit. But it can slow the continuing drop in residential housing construction. I urge my colleagues to support this measure; I believe that it will benefit the economy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 201 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Allott
Anderson
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Dominick
Ellender
Gore
Hayden
Hill
McCarthy
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Russell, S.C.
Tydings
Yarborough

So the bill (S. 3688) was passed as follows:

S. 3688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 304(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "ten" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen": *Provided, however,* That none of the additional funds provided for in this section can be used to purchase any mortgage which bears a date prior to January 1, 1966.

SEC. 2. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) With a view to further carrying out the purposes set forth in section 301(b), and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase and to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages which are insured under title II of this Act or guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, if the original principal obligation of any such mortgage does not exceed $15,000: *Provided,* That the Association is authorized to increase the foregoing amount for single family dwellings to not more than $17,500 ($22,500 in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii) in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require. The total amount of such purchases and commitments made after August 1, 1966, shall not exceed $1,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no such commitment shall be made unless the applicant therefor certifies that construction of the housing to be covered by the mortgage has not commenced. For the purposes of this subsection, $500,000,000 of the authority hereinabove provided shall be transferred from the amount of outstanding authority specified in subsection (c), and the amount of outstanding authority so specified shall be reduced by the amount so transferred."

SEC. 3. None of the mortgages purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association in carrying out the provisions of section 305(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended by this Act, with the proceeds of any money borrowed from the Federal Treasury, shall be pledged as collateral for repayment of any participation certificates sold by such Association.

SEC. 4. None of the funds provided for in this Act can be used to purchase any mortgages at a price in excess of the actual amount paid for such mortgage when originally purchased.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the authority just given by the Senate to ease credit restrictions on home loans will be welcomed by millions of current and prospective homeowners, not to mention the construction of other related industries. As has been the case for many years, the man most responsible for this important step in housing is the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing [Mr. SPARKMAN]. No opportunity to promote the public interest in this critical field is missed by the Senator from Alabama, and every piece of legislation in recent years has borne the imprint of his keen understanding of the problems of homeowners. The Senate again salutes him for his wise leadership.

Another who was particularly instrumental in fashioning a bill acceptable to the Senate is the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. As ranking minority member of the subcommittee, he has been most helpful in clarifying the issue and guiding floor debate.

Likewise, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and others made significant contributions to the passage of this important measure through their amendments and floor debate. The leadership is especially appreciative of the efforts of these Senators in passing a bill which, I believe, will get the overwhelming support of American homeowners.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10104) to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11671) to appprove a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10284) to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1406 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUSTAVO EUGENIO GOMEZ

The bill (S. 3029) for the relief of Gustavo Eugenio Gomez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3029

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gustavo Eugenio Gomez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 22, 1961.

DANIEL PERNAS BECEIRO

The bill (S. 3039) for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Daniel Pernas Beceiro shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 20, 1960.

DR. GUILLERMO N. HERNANDEZ, JR.

The bill (S. 3311) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Guillermo N. Hernandez, Junior, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 31, 1961.

YUNG MI KIM

The bill (S. 3318) for the relief of Yung Mi Kim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Charles G. Hood in behalf of Yung Mi Kim, and the provisions of Section 204(c) of that Act relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children defined in section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case.

MARIA JORDAN FERRANDO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3329) for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out the name "Traube", and insert "Trabue"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 3329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Maria Jordan Ferrando shall be held and considered to be the parent of Mrs. Victoria Trabue, a citizen of the United States, within the meaning of section 201(b) of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PANAGIOTA KONSTANTINOS SIKARAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1370) for the relief of Panagiota Konstantinos Sikaras which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Panagiota Konstantinos Sikaras may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition may be filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Spyros Sikaras, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ELIAS LAMBRINOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1878) for the relief of Elias Lambrinos which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Elias Lambrinos.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. EARL C. CHAMBERLAYNE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2486) for the relief of Dr. Earl C. Chamberlayne which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Earl C. Chamberlayne shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 9, 1952.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LIM AI RAN AND LIM SOO RAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2809) for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran by Mr. and Mrs. Everett S. Clark, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. OSCAR LOPEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3042) for the relief of Dr. Oscar Lopez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "December 16, 1961.", and insert "December 15, 1961."; so as to make the bill read:

S. 3042

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Oscar Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 15, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO GONZALEZ-MORA AND HIS WIFE, NATALIA SANDOVAL GONZALEZ-MORA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3395) for the relief of Antonio Gonzales-Mora, and his wife, Natalia Sandoval Gonzalez-Mora which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "March 31, 1961.", and insert "July 1, 1960, and July 9, 1960, respectively"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 3395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gonzalez-Mora and his wife, Natalia Sandoval Gonzalez-Mora, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 1, 1960, and July 9, 1960, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WINSTON LLOYD McKAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5213) for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after then enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Winston Lloyd McKay shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. MARGARETA L. AGULLANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Mrs. Margareta L. Agullana, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Mrs." to strike out "Margareta", and insert "Margarita", and at the beginning of line 8 to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2166

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Margarita L. Agullana shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita L. Agullana."

LOURDES S. (DELOTAVO) MATZKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3078) for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the top of page 2, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yusef Ali Chouman may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Mohamad Schuman, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke and Yusef Ali Chouman."

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1420, S. 3711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3711) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate is now ready to consider S. 3711, which is entitled "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966."

We had this bill before our committee. As a matter of fact, may I say that we had about 50 different bills and studied them all in one, and we then wrote the amendments into one bill. We had extensive hearings and had executive sessions until we were able to work the various bills into one complete bill.

This bill would establish some new programs and would make certain amendments to, or changes in, existing programs. I shall discuss the bill briefly.

Title I amends the National Housing Act to give FHA broader authority to insure mortgages for seasonal homes, makes changes in the FHA cooperative housing program, and perfects changes in other FHA programs.

Title II amends the National Housing Act to authorize FHA to insure loans for the construction and equipment of buildings to be used as group medical practice facilities. These loans would be limited to 90 percent of value with no mortgage to exceed $5 million. Maximum interest would be 6 percent and maximum maturity would be 25 years.

Title III contains a uniform standard which would eliminate the increasing number of special urban renewal bills to allow grant-in-aid credits over and above what is allowed under existing law. A 25-percent credit (in lieu of full credit and the right to carry over unused credit) would be allowed for public facilities constructed in, or in the immediate vicinity of, the urban renewal area, if they contribute materially to the objectives of the renewal plan and are used by the public predominantly for cultural, exhibition, or civic purposes.

A new use of air rights provided in urban renewal areas would be authorized by this title for industrial purposes, if the area is found by the local public agency to be unsuitable for use for low- or moderate-income housing.

Title IV contains both an enlargement of the use of the present urban renewal program for preservation of historic structures and sites and authorization of grants for such preservation under the present open space and urban beautification, and urban planning provisions of law, which would be broadened to contain historic preservation in both name and scope.

Title IV contains both an enlargement of the use of the present urban renewal program for preservation of historic structures and sites and authorization of grants for such preservation under the present open space and urban beautification, and urban planning provisions of law, which would be broadened to contain historic preservation in both name and scope.

Title V contains many miscellaneous provisions. These include a $10 million loan and grant program for housing—with cost not to exceed $7,500 per dwelling—for Alaskan natives and low-income residents, a provision for more research authority for applying advances in technology to housing and urban development, a mandate to the Secretary of Defense to acquire certain properties adversely affected by base closings, and a provision to make eligible for college housing loans State authorities established for the purpose of providing housing for students or faculties in private educational institutions.

Title V also contains a number of miscellaneous and technical amendments as well as authorizations for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to construct a new headquarters building and to have discretionary authority to approve mergers and other acquisitions of savings and loan associations by savings and loan holding companies and affiliates where needed to prevent defaults. Included also is a clarification of the public housing "flexible formula" and abolition of the maximum limit on the term of a lease of private housing for use as public housing.

Mr. President, I could go on in great detail, but I believe that explanation outlines the bill.

There are two provisions in the bill that I wish to emphasize particularly. One is the provision that we are trying to have written into law, and we promised last year that we would do it, a provision for a uniform method of giving credits to cities and communities engaged in urban renewal where there are improvements that are of benefit to the whole city and therefore not eligible for a credit in lieu of cash toward the cities' projects.

Last year we had a flood of individual bills. We took those bills and we had quite a hassle with the House conferees. Finally, the only way we could work it out was by taking all of them. We announced then that we would not consider any unless it was reduced to writing and introduced as an amendment before our committee at the time of considering the bill.

This year we worked out a provision that is somewhat in accord with the feeling of the Department—but not entirely—in which we decided we would have as a general principle that if these buildings or improvements were made within or near the urban renewal area, 25 percent could be allowed.

The House did not follow that procedure, I regret to say, they have individual bills. We did not provide for the individual bills when we brought out the complete bill, but an amendment will be introduced to incorporate in this bill every one of the individual bills we had before us in the committee.

I wish to make clear that we do not want to duplicate because we will be going to a conference with the 25-percent credit offer that we have written into the general law, and if the amendment is adopted we will also have our individual projects.

It will be my purpose, and I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and he has agreed to it, that at the bargaining table we will do our best to get our general legislation, but if we are not able to do it at least we will have our individual projects to fall back on, as the House did last year. Last year the House was adamant on individual projects.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If we do not include individual projects in the bill we could wind up with nothing except the House projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

(At this point, Mr. LAUSCHE assumed the chair.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Last year on this program the House had acted. We received and accepted a number of projects from the floor relative to these special projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct, but we said at that time that we would not repeat it this year.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] made, which was concurred in by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], in regard to the individual projects. I understand their views, but I hope that they will be charitable and let some of us, who feel that we should, include cities interested in the urban renewal.

At the proper time I hope that the chairman will give me an opportunity to introduce amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator had an amendment before us in committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is included in the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to ask this question. I will not offer it today. I did submit bills to the committee. There was S. 3399, which is Olathe, Kans., and S. 3667 is Wichita, Kans. I beg the Senator's pardon. S. 3666 is Kansas City and S. 3667 is Wichita, Kans. I have an amendment prepared jointly with my colleague [Mr. PEARSON].

If they are going to be included when the matter goes to conference, I will not offer it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We will check to see if they are here.

Mr. CARLSON. Otherwise, I would like to offer an amendment. I know that I had these bills pending.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Olathe is in the House bill. Therefore, the Senator does not need it. It will be in conference.

Mr. CARLSON. With that understanding, I withdraw it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Wichita and Kansas City are in our amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I deeply appreciate it. I know that my colleague from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and I both appreciate it and our people appreciate it.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama and manager of the bill in indicating that the bills heretofore introduced in regard to the cities of Wichita and Kansas City have not been submitted in accordance with your new practice and procedures but will now be a part of the bill and will be taken to conference.

I also want to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I am pleased to have today joined with my senior colleague, Senator CARLSON, in this effort, which will not now be necessary.

But, with the Senate's indulgence, let me state that I feel strongly that the two cities involved need special legislation to aid them in their urban renewal projects. The bills before the committee would provide some relief for those cities with public facilities intended for public or municipal purposes.

In the case of Kansas City, Kans., my senior colleague, Mr. CARLSON, and I are seeking that an expenditure made for a recently constructed board of education library building and a board of public utilities building be counted as noncash grants in aid toward the overall urban renewal project.

In Wichita, the situation was somewhat different. For several years the city, under an urban renewal project, has been planning and clearing land to construct a new civic and cultural center in the downtown section of this great city. Again the bills introduced and the amendment we had prepared today would provide the city of Wichita with the privilege of counting expenditures which will ultimately amount to some $15 million as noncash grants in aid toward the Wichita urban renewal project.

Let me finally say to the distinguished Senator that I want to make note that these cities should be commended for their efforts toward orderly expansion of their public facilities and I think the aid which would be provided by the bill submitted to the committee and the amendment which we now withhold will be of substantial benefit and that I express along with my senior colleague the gratitude of each of these cities and their citizens.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my understanding is that in the House bill there is a provision for the Slater project in Pawtucket, R.I. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PELL. In view of our understanding, I will withhold offering the amendment in the Senate, but I plead with the Senator from Alabama to suffer defeat in accepting this amendment.

(At this point, Mr. BIBLE assumed the chair.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduced, with my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], two amendments to provide for credit allowances for construction projects to benefit urban redevelopment in Oklahoma City and Tulsa, Okla. I would like to inquire if both of these cities are eligible under the individual alinement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Both of those cities are in our amendment. No, I am sorry. Oklahoma City is in the House bill. Tulsa is in our bill. Under our arrangement, the whole matter will be in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. So that being in the House bill it was filed with and considered by the Senate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Filed with the Senate and I will say that had we been operating as we did last year, we would have included it.

Mr. MONRONEY. But Tulsa is in the Senate bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore, this is in addition to the qualifications that may be laid down as general law?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. So that if we started prior to 3 years ago it would still be eligible?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator, as do the citizens of those two communities, for the provisions to take care of them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The two Senators from Oklahoma were quite alert and have done a good job.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his kind remarks, and of course I join the position of my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The provisions under title III, about which discussion has just been made, is that a new program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. Heretofore, it has been handled by special bills, as I explained a few minutes ago. We were overwhelmed by their being offered on the Senate floor last year. When we came out of conference last year, we announced in reporting on the conference to the Senate that we would not consider any special project unless an amendment covering it had been introduced and was before our committee during the time we were considering the legislation. This year, a number of bills were introduced, but, as I explained a few minutes ago, we worked out this general legislation that we believe will be suitable. The House has not. It has special projects in it over there. So we are proposing to reinstate the special projects on this side, in order to take them to conference and have them to bargain with, so that if we should lose out on our general provisions, we would still have the projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under title III, the improvements which are covered, or the ones which predominantely deal with cultural exhibitions and civic purposes, does that mean predominantly for auditoriums?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Auditoriums, civic centers, coliseums, libraries, places where people gather, but for service to the whole community.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the general housing and urban development program, except for the adoption of special bills to construct edifices of the type just identified, no provision was made in the general program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, but we have been putting them in, as merited, from year to year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will happen now to those States that have had authorizations given them for the provision of Federal money to construct auditoriums and other structures and civic centers? I am speaking now of Alaska, and San Antonio, Tex.—there may be one or two others. What happens to them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. These funds are not funds made available for the construction of these projects, but if the city or community itself has constructed such a project within or near the urban renewal area, and it is one that will fit in with the planned purpose of the urban renewal program, then credit may be given for that as against the city's contribution to the whole program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To the whole program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much credit is given to the States' obligations? Is it 25 percent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We propose 25 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the city of Dayton. If it decided to build a structure, coming within the language of the bill, which would cost $100,000, and the city of Dayton has an obligation of $25,000 as its part of urban development, it would get a credit of $25,000 and amortize the $75,000 obligation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right. If Dayton had another urban renewal project, it could carry over anything not used in its 25 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be carried over, yes. I see.

Is it fair to state that under the urban renewal program, except for instances where special bills were passed, there is no authority to spend money in the manner that title III now contemplates spending?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, but we did, as a matter of practice, every year, have bills which were meritorious.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not know that they were every year, because I discovered them about 6 months ago. I was astonished to find that Tennessee, I think, had three buildings under the special program, and that other States also had them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that last year was really our first big year. We had been putting in one, two, or three, prior to last year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it was learned, and everyone came in, as they are coming in today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Apparently so. That is the reason we are trying to write a general law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want again to refer to Dayton, which I believe is in the House bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is Dayton covered in the House bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what I want to find out. The Sinclair Community College would be built within urban renewal projects. Then there is the Montgomery County Court jail building. Is that in? It is in the House bill. What does that mean then?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That means that we do not want to put it in here because if we put it in, we would lock it in and it would interfere with our chances of getting our general legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I see.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it will be eligible for a conference agreement, in the event that the general legislation is not agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if I may interject here, they get in one way or another, either under the general bill, if they are now in the provisions, or if they are enumerated, and then we would put ours in and they would put theirs in, and we would agree on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the language talks about cultural structures and Dayton wants to build a jail.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe that jails count. Naturally, we are not trying to attract people to jails.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of course, but sometimes some people have to be accommodated there. What is the Senator's understanding of that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. A jail is not counted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the Dayton Community College?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, a college within itself would not be eligible. It might be that an individual building would be eligible if it qualifies as a community center or cultural center and which is used by the public other than the students.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Within the college, so as to permit cultural activities?

Mr. TOWER. Perhaps it might be a facility used by the college.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But not the entire plant?

Mr. TOWER. Not the entire plant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have listened to the remarks of other Senators who are seeking to have their States come within section 813. Do I understand that the ones which are listed in the report——

Mr. SPARKMAN. They are the ones that appear in the House bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many are in the Senate bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot give the number at the moment; but those that were introduced as bills and were before us when the committee considered the bill are being included, or we hope to include them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a municipality had an urban renewal project but did not apply to Congress for funds. Perhaps it did not even know about this proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We gave notice a year ago that we would take special exceptions of this type unless the sponsor first introduced it in a bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To the cities themselves?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; but notice was given on the Senate floor and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some city officials do not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, that is true, but as I stated a while ago the committee's proposed general legislation will take care of all cities in the Nation having projects of this type.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a city has an urban renewal project underway. I do not think Seattle has one, but I know that Tacoma has. Suppose through some inadvertence or lack of notice, or something like that, the city did not apply. Is it shut out now? If it is, I will apply on its behalf now for funds and supply the figures later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When we go to conference, we will strongly advocate the general legislation, including the formula which we have devised in the Senate. If we are successful, it will not matter; Seattle or any other city which is eligible could then apply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But if a city is eligible but is not on the list, it is "out."

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator can be certain that the cities are aware of what is taking place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What would have been their reason for not applying if they knew about it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Simply that they did not have projects which would qualify them to participate in the urban renewal plan. Perhaps within the last 3 years they had not built a civic center or a building of that type. It would have to be construction of that nature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The urban renewal program of Tacoma includes the construction of buildings in certain areas, and the city is to furnish recreation and other facilities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would have to be a building to which people were attracted, and constructed in a way which would serve the whole city or the whole area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What about a park?

Mr. SPARKMAN. A park would not be eligible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would a playing field?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It must be a construction improvement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. A civic auditorium, for example.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But not a jail, as I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A library?

Mr. SPARKMAN. A library or something of that nature would be eligible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So it is possible that a city actively engaged in urban renewal might not have any plans to construct a building which would be eligible under the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That might perhaps be the case with Tacoma.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps I had better call the Tacoma officials before I vote for the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the course of its deliberations, the committee considered legislation which I had proposed, which affects the situation in Cambridge, Mass., where the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have established a fine cooperative relationship with the Cambridge urban renewal people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yet, as I understand it, under section 112 of the statute, as construed by administrative regulations permits expenditures by colleges for land acquisition and preparation to be credited toward a community's share of the cost of an urban renewal project only if the expenditures relate to objectives of a community's urban renewal project and are spent on structures located within one-quarter of a mile of such project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I know that in the Cambridge area, MIT has made substantial expenditures which are consistent with the purposes envisioned by section 112, but not eligible for credit as local grants-in-aid because these improvements extend beyond one-quarter of a mile. For that reason I introduced legislation to provide that the costs incurred by MIT in expansion would be credited toward Cambridge's urban renewal project. A number of such bills have been included in the House bill, as the Senator has indicated. I know that they will stand on their merits. Yet I understand it is the feeling of the Senator from Alabama that it would be a disadvantage to include these bills as well in the Senate bill to take to conference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. If they are in the House bill, but not in the Senate version, they still would be locked in.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The distinguished chairman of the committee realizes that there is great merit to the proposals which have been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, and we do not want to affect them in the event our formula is not adopted.

I may add that the Senator from Massachusetts has been diligent in presenting the case to which he has referred. It was before us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, but first let me say that I must leave the floor in a few moments, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] will take over management of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the special bills, one was submitted dealing with a project in Cincinnati. Will it be put in the general bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is in the amendment. Of course, it will be covered in the general bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the report it is stated:

> While the legislative language is quite broad, the committee wishes to make clear that it had very specific types of facilities in mind. It intends this provision to apply to public auditoriums, concert halls, theaters, central libraries, museums, exhibition halls, art galleries, band shells, settings for historical sites, meeting halls and similar facilities for general use. It does not intend this provision to apply to facilities associated with normal governmental functions, such as city halls, municipal office buildings or courthouses, nor should it be applicable to facilities provided principally for athletic or recreational purposes, such as stadiums, gymnasiums, or skating rinks.

Obviously the committee intended to keep the language interpreted in a manner so as to carry into effect generally the objective of developing cultural centers. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And it is not intended to apply to the building of normal governmental structures required.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the Senator knows, the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Virginia have discussed this matter for many months.

Mr. SPARKMAN. For a long time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia introduced some private bills, and the Senator from Alabama introduced private bills. The Senator from Alabama then introduced a general bill. We decided we needed a bill. The Senator from Virginia then introduced a bill, and it came out of the committee in the language contained in the committee bill. It is more restrictive than the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia, and it cuts it down to 25 percent.

Special projects were included in the House bill. If they turned down our general bill, we would be left with nothing. So the Senator from Alabama and I jointly have prepared an amendment putting in, on our side, all the projects that are not specifically included in the House bill, and then we will go to conference with them. The Senator from Alabama will be chairman of the conference, and he will insist on our bill. We will have trading room. It may be that we will take their versions and they will take ours.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I notice that an item for Rhode Island was in the House bill, and it was knocked out of the Senate bill. Does that mean it may be knocked out?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, no. Everything in the House bill will be in conference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I made a statement on that while the Senator from Rhode Island was not present.

Mr. PASTORE. I was in the markup of the defense appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We agreed we would not duplicate. In other words, the provision in the House bill will stay in and the items that were not included in the House bill that we want in the Senate bill will be included in the Senate bill. Then in conference they all will be in the bills for consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, Pawtucket will be considered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Pawtucket is before us, and if the general law is adopted, all cities coming within the general law will be considered.

Mr. PASTORE. All I want to say is, please do not forget Pawtucket.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall have to leave. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] will take over management of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator was about to offer an amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that Pawtucket was discussed at greater length than almost any place else, so that name was before us in committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, part of that was created by the problem of the derivation of the name.

Mr. PASTORE. I say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that his enunciation of the name is just perfect. Pawtucket is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I must leave, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has kindly agreed to take over the management of the bill. He will answer all questions.

Before leaving, I wish to mention one further thing. A year ago, we adopted a provision that was sponsored jointly by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and myself, relating to the housing problems in areas surrounding closed bases. The Defense Department has never implemented it. They did come before us with some suggested changes. We did not adopt all of their changes. We did put in a provision saying that it should be implemented, and we also put in a provision to catch up with these bases that have been closing in the last 12 months, which have resulted in some foreclosures. In all fairness, I believe that in looking at the problem, the Defense Department has overestimated what the bill would be.

In my State, Brookley Field was closed, and several thousand employees were thrown out or compelled to transfer to California. They had to move off and leave their homes. Property values went down, and we set a formula which we thought was a very reasonable formula, so that the Defense Department would be able to absorb a part of that shock. It has not been implemented. I earnestly hope that we can get something through this time that will bring about relief for these homeowners who have had to vacate, sell, or forfeit their houses.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I understand that the Senator from Texas is a cosponsor of that amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. It has been fully explained. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19, strike out lines 18 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SPECIFIC URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

"SEC. 303. (a) Notwithstanding the date of commencement of construction of the Florence Primary School in Garden City, Michigan, local expenditures made in connection with such school shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid for the Cherry Hill urban renewal project (Mich. R-46).

"(b) Nothwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the East Main Street water, sewer, and street improvements in Senatobia, Mississippi, local expenditures made in connection with such improvements shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the east Senatobia urban renewal project (Mississippi R-15) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(c) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center, located within or adjacent to the urban renewal project for the city of Roanoke, Virginia (UR-VA-7), may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Roanoke in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as grants-in-aid toward such project.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, civic center (cultural) proposed to be built within urban renewal project Ala. R-32, in Huntsville, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Huntsville constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward Federal assisted urban renewal projects in Huntsville.

"(e) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center proposed to be built within urban renewal project R-78 in Birmingham, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal areas, expenses incurred by Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center Authority in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(f) Notwithstanding the extent to which the cultural and convention center, recently completed within urban renewal project Ala. R-33 in Mobile, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, and notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the addition to the Albert F. Owens School and the start of construction of new streets in the urban renewal projects Ala. R-33, R-34, and R-38 in the city of Mobile, Alabama, local expenditures made in connection with these capital improvements shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grant-in-aid toward such projects.

"(g) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center proposed to be built within urban renewal project R-71 in Ozark, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Ozark in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(h) Notwithstanding the extent to which the convention center being built in the Queensgate III urban renewal project (R-82) in Cincinnati, Ohio, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Cincinnati in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(i) Expenditures incurred by the city of Richmond, Virginia, in connection with the proposed coliseum project in downtown Richmond, to the extent such expenditures would be eligible under the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be counted as non-cash grants-in-aid toward such project if it received Federal assistance as an urban renewal project pursuant to the provisions of title I of such Act, shall be eligible to be counted as local grants-in-aid toward urban renewal project (Virginia R-15) in Richmond or any other federally assisted urban renewal project hereafter undertaken in downtown Richmond, notwithstanding the extent to which such coliseum may benefit areas other than the area included in any such project.

"(j) Notwithstanding the extent to which the convention center proposed to be built adjacent to urban renewal project R-14 in Decatur, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Decatur in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(k) Notwithstanding the extent to which (1) the proposed city hall in the city of Hampton, Virginia, and (2) the proposed development of public facilities by such city on a one hundred and ten acre tract fronting on Chesapeake Bay, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal areas hereinafter designated, expenditures incurred by the city of Hampton in constructing such city hall and in developing such facilities shall, if otherwise eligible, be allowed as local grants-in-aid for any of the following urban renewal projects in such city: Virginia R–30, Virginia R–34, and Virginia R–41.

"(l) Notwithstanding the extent to which Prescott Park, situated adjacent to urban renewal project New Hampshire R–1 (Marcy-Washington Streets), in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred after January 1, 1954, by the city of Portsmouth in developing and improving such park shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid for such project.

"(m)(1) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of, or the extent to which the cultural and civic center complex (including the assembly center, library, courthouse, the existing and proposed public off-street parking facility, parks and plazas, municipal theater, and other public buildings or facilities to be constructed on the civic center site), located within the outer boundaries of urban renewal project Oklahoma R–7 (downtown northwest) in Tulsa, Oklahoma, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Tulsa and other public bodies in connection with the acquisition, development, and construction of the civic center complex shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(2) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of, or the extent to which the Woods Elementary School, adjacent to urban renewal project Oklahoma R–3 (Seminole Hills) in Tulsa, Oklahoma, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Tulsa and other public bodies in connection with the acquisition, development, and construction of such school shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(n) Notwithstanding the extent to which the Huntsville Municipal Library built within urban renewal project Ala. R–32 in Huntsville, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, local expenditures incurred by the city of Huntsville in developing such library shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid toward federally assisted urban renewal projects in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(o)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys heretofore expended by the University of Alabama, other than grants by the United States, for the purchase of land and buildings within the area of the outer boundary of the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70), or for the construction or rehabilitation of buildings or other facilities within such area for the use of the University of Alabama, or any school, hospital, health facility, or service incidental to the operation within such area of such school, hospital, or health facility, and moneys hereafter expended by the University of Alabama, other than grants by the United States, for any such purpose prior to the final Federal capital grant payment for the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70), shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys, other than grants by the United States, heretofore expended by the University of Alabama, or by any institution devoted to the treatment of physical or mental disabilities or illness or to medical research, for the construction of any building or other improvement used or useful in the operations of such institution within the area known as Alabama urban renewal project (Ala. 2–1), or within one-half mile thereof, shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and all such expenditures within the area of Alabama urban renewal project (Ala. 2–1) made prior to the final Federal capital grant payment for the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70) shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70).

"(p) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center-coliseum proposed to be built within urban renewal project R–72 in Hartford, Connecticut, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Hartford in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(q) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, moneys expended by Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Scarritt College for the purchase of land and buildings and for the demolition of buildings and clearing of such land and buildings on and after April 10, 1957, to the extent otherwise eligible shall be counted as local grants-in-aid to the proposed university urban renewal project (Tenn. R–51) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

"(r) Notwithstanding the extent to which the proposed new civic center in Portsmouth, Virginia, including phase one and phase two thereof, may benefit areas other than the proposed Crawford urban renewal project area within which it is located, expenditures incurred by the city of Portsmouth in constructing said civic center shall, if otherwise eligible, be allowed as local grants-in-aid for the proposed Crawford urban renewal project.

"(s) Notwithstanding the extent to which the library building and board of public utilities building of the city of Kansas City, Kansas, may benefit other areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Kansas City, Kansas, in constructing such projects shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid toward the Kansas City, Kansas, urban renewal project (Kansas R–28), in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(t) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic cultural center now under construction within urban renewal project (Kansas R–19), in Wichita, Kansas, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Wichita, Kansas, in constructing such civic cultural center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project, in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(u) Expenditures incurred by the city of Kansas City, Missouri, or the county of Jackson County, Missouri, in connection with the proposed auditorium and exhibition hall project in downtown Kansas City, to the extent such expenditures would be eligible under the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be counted as noncash grants-in-aid toward such project if it received Federal assistance as an urban renewal project pursuant to the provisions of title I of such Act, shall be eligible to be counted as local grants-in-aid toward urban renewal project (Missouri R–8) in Kansas City or any other federally assisted urban renewal project hereafter undertaken in downtown Kansas City, notwithstanding the extent to which such auditorium and exhibition hall may benefit areas other than area included in any such project.

"(v) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the Glenwood School, Fulton School and the Toledo Health and Retiree Center, Inc., in Toledo, Ohio, local expenditures may in connection with such facilities shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid for the Old West End Urban Renewal Project (Ohio R–115)."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to get into the Record what the situation is. This general solution to the problem is not in the bill now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is in our bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then what is the nature of the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What we are offering are the specific projects that were before us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The specific ones?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, to take them to conference, but not to duplicate anything in the House bill, so that we will be in a better bargaining position.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that include the projects in Little Rock?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, it does not include the ones in Little Rock, because we are not duplicating.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the attitude of the Senate conferees?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We want to put through our general provision, whereby all cities would be given protection automatically, without having to come here with these individual bills.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would take care of Little Rock.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a letter addressed to the Senator from Alabama by me and my colleague, together with a letter from the housing authority of the city of Little Rock addressed to me, and a statement transmitted therewith.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on
Government Operations,
April 25, 1966.

Hon. John Sparkman,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: One of the bills now being considered in your hearings on housing and urban renewal legislation is S. 2958, our bill to assist the city of Little Rock, Ark., achieve plans for renewal of its downtown area.

We believe that the public library, the Arkansas Arts Center, and the municipal police and courts building, constructed with local funds, should be allowable as local grants-in-aid for the central Little Rock urban renewal project. By using standards and criteria which are not appropriate for central city renewal projects, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been unwilling to give credit for these locally financed public works.

This subject is discussed more fully in the attached material forwarded by Mr. George Millar, Jr., executive director of the housing authority of the city of Little Rock. We endorse Mr. Millar's views and request that this letter and its attachments be inserted in the record of the current hearings.

We understand that the issue posed by S. 2958 was the subject of several provisions in last year's legislation, and that this issue may ultimately result in some general enactment to clearly recognize the need for separate treatment of downtown, or central city, urban renewal projects. In the meantime, however, we believe that S. 2958 should be enacted and we respectfully request that its provisions be included in this year's omnibus bill.

With best wishes, we are,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.
J. W. FULBRIGHT.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
CITY OF LITTLE ROCK,
Little Rock, Ark., April 22, 1966.

Re Senate bill 2958; a bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Little Rock, Ark., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Your office has furnished us a copy of the administration's recommendations, prepared by Secretary Robert Weaver, concerning the above referenced bill. The administration's recommendations, as you are aware, are adverse. We feel that additional comments and substantiation of our position are in order. We do not feel that the Secretary has given consideration to the bill on its merits but addresses himself only to existing regulations promulgated from present housing legislation.

It is our opinion that the public library the Arkansas Art Center, and the municipal police and courts building, should be allowable grants-in-aid credit toward the central Little Rock, Ark., R-12, urban renewal project. For the record, we would like to present the following statements.

It has been clearly evidenced in Little Rock and in other cities that public initiative through the provision of public facilities is necessary for and must often precede private investment. The city of Little Rock recognized this principle and accepted the obligation of leading the way in the rebuilding of the central core of Little Rock through planned public investment and supporting facilities. Even as the plan for the central Little Rock project was emerging, the city was engaged in making these necessary public investments to lead the way in downtown revitilization.

We agree that governmental and cultural facilities located in the central core are designed to serve the entire community rather than the limited area which makes up the downtown. Basic to our entire argument is the fact that the above statement is true because the very function of downtown is to serve the entire community. Thus, a central library, art center, or police and courts building, which in one way or another serves the entire community, are actually performing their proper roles in this particular area and should be considered a part of the local share of project costs.

Urban Renewal Administration regulations, as they have evolved (and, in fact, sec. 110 of the Housing Act of 1949 itself) have dealt primarily with noncash grants-in-aid credit related to residential neighborhoods. The renewal of a central core of a city cannot be compared in most respects to residential renewal. A fair appraisal of these types of public facilities would recognize them as eligible supporting facilities while at the same time adhering to the basic principle of urban renewal policy; that is, a project supporting facility must be a governmental facility which is necessary to support uses of land in the project area as established by the urban renewal plan.

This basic principle has already been established in practical application by the principle of allowing excess credits from one project to be used or pooled with the financing needs of another project. It then follows that the concept of limitation of grants-in-aid credit only to facilities serving people living in a given project area has already been expanded.

The city of Little Rock recognized this principle long ago through its adopted policy of public investment in the central core which obviously has had a major impact on the development and redevelopment of downtown Little Rock. The city has accepted its responsibility and done its part to make the central Little Rock project a success. Without these expenditures for governmental, cultural, and educational facilities, the project could not be carried to a successful conclusion. We feel that these facilities, judged on their merits and not in terms of existing administration regulations must be recognized if we are to assure the fruition of a successful Federal, local and private rebuilding of our American cities and particularly downtown Little Rock.

Our request for recognition of these facilities is not without precedence. Legislation passed by the Congress in 1965 did, in fact, grant credits to similar facilities in six other cities.

A complete statement further substantiating and concerning our position on these individual facilities is attached hereto. Your further support of ths bill on its merits, is respectfully requested.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLAR, Jr.,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROVISION FOR LOCAL NONCASH GRANTS-IN-AID CREDITS, CENTRAL LITTLE ROCK URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

The central Little Rock urban renewal project, approved in July 1962, was the first in the Nation to include the entire central business district of a major city, was a challenge to use urban renewal as a basic tool in the revitalization of the downtown. The means of eliminating and rehabilitating gray areas in the central core is through the development and redevelopment of housing, commercial enterprises, and complementary public facilities. We may expect the opening of new investment opportunities in the gray areas on a scale otherwise impossible if we recognize the importance of not only housing and commercial development in the central core, but also necessary complementary public facilities. Public initiative through the provision of public facilities is necessary for and must precede private investment.

The city of Little Rock recognized this principal and accepted the obligation of leading the way in the rebuilding of the central core through planned public investments in supporting facilities. Even as the plan for the central Little Rock project was emerging, the city was engaged in making necessary public investments in the central core to lead the way in downtown revitalization. The planning and construction of these government and cultural facilities did, in fact, serve as a spark to bring about large-scale private development and redevelopment that is now taking place in accordance with the central Little Rock plan.

Governmental and cultural facilities located in the central core are designed to serve the entire community rather than the limited area which makes up the downtown. This is true because the very function of downtown is to serve the entire community. The shops, businesses, banking institutions, medical facilities, and service establishments, which are, in fact, the central business district, have gathered together to provide, at one point, a concentrated area of governmental business, social, and cultural facilities needed and desired by the entire community. Thus, a central library, arts center, or police and courts building which in one way or another serves the entire community, is actually performing its proper rôle in this particular area and should be considered a part of the local share of project costs.

The following is a list of facilities provided by the city of Little Rock as a part of their investment in downtown renewal:

1. *Police and courts building.*—Construction of the municipal police and courts building was completed in July 1960. It is a part of a related governmental complex that includes the city, county, and Federal Government centers and office buildings. It is the only police station in the city. Location of this facility was made in accordance with an established policy of the governing body of the city of Little Rock that major governmental facilities should be located in or near the central core to serve more adequately the public, to strengthen the economic base, to deter urban sprawl, and to arrest deterioration of the heart of the city.

This facility serves the central core through the interrelationships of police activities with the natural functions and physical environment of downtown. The majority of crimes and criminal investigation and crime prevention occur in the downtown area; the majority of uniformed and nonuniformed personnel are assigned duty in this area; the bulk of traffic and thus police-directed traffic control and enforcement is found in this project area; the vast majority of traffic fines and moving violations can be pinpointed to the central core; and the bulk of the city police and courts budget is allocated to the central Little Rock area project.

2. *Municipal library.*—A new municipal library building has been constructed in the project area. It provides convenient access for the research and technical staffs of the commercial, financial, governmental, and institutional establishments that are located in the central core. Just as important, it is well located with respect to the residential and school users who reside within and near the project area. One of the factors in choosing the library location was the elimination of a major blighted quarter block. The city could in fact have chosen to plan and construct several neighborhood branches throughout the city but in accordance with their adopted policy, they elected to build this single public facility as a part of the downtown rebuilding process. The library is a civic activity necessary to the social values inherent in the central business district and by its very nature increases use of other downtown facilities.

3. *The arts center.*—MacArthur Park, a central area facility serving both downtown and the residential area of the project, provides the site for the arts center. In accordance with adopted city policy the arts center was located in and near the central business district. This cultural center has three main types of use: (1) neighborhood use, (2) use by people drawn downtown for a variety of needs, and (3) institutional use by schools, throughout the area.

The fine arts center encompasses the former museum of fine arts with the addition of an auditorium, classrooms, studios, and enlarged exhibition space. The fine arts center serves an educational and civic function in the central business district that stimulates the downtown economy by bringing visitors from all over Arkansas while at the same time providing for educational and cultural needs of the city itself. At the time that a location for the fine arts center was being considered, the director stated that the best location would be the "100 percent" commercial location in the city. Since that location was not financially feasible or available, MacArthur Park offered the opportunity to enhance the significance of the cultural center complex.

In addition to the above, the arts center serves as both a recreational and educational public facility specificially for the surrounding residential areas, particularly the two new large apartment complexes being built on the north and west of MacArthur Park and immediately adjacent to the facility itself.

Urban renewal administrative regulations, as they have evolved, have dealt primarily with noncash grants-in-aid credits related to residential neighborhoods. Cities, historically and in Arkansas constitutionally limited for funds, have many times used the noncash grants-in-aid credits to finance their one-third share of net project costs.

Certain procedures have been developed for judging the usefulness to the renewal effort of a public facility. One of these techniques has required that the number of persons from a project area using the facility be compared with the design capacity of the facility to determine the percentage of credit.

Facilities of the type described above, which serve generally the whole community and confer no special benefit to a specific residential project, have not been included as supporting facilities. This "population served" method of determining service of a facility to a project has been an equitable technique for residential projects.

The renewal of a central core of a city cannot be compared in most respects to residential renewal. A fair appraisal of these types of public facilities would recognize them as eligible supporting facilities while at the same time adhering to the basic principle of urban renewal policy; that is, a project supporting facility must be a governmental facility which is necessary to support use of land in the project area as established by the urban renewal plan.

There are in fact no geographical boundaries in practical application. For example, grants-in-aid beyond the financing needs of a specific project may be pooled. This offers the possibility that a facility located in any one project area may be recognized for credit use for the entire urban renewal effort of the whole community through the principal of grant-in-aid pooling. It follows then that limitations of grant-in-aid credits only to facilities serving people living in a given project area have already been expanded.

It was logical because of the limited concept in the beginning of the program that grants-in-aid eligibility criteria reflected an essentially residential character, local in nature and limited in service. More recently, legislative changes have made possible projects of a predominantly nonresidential character. This nonresidential concept has been enlarged consistently through several acts of Congress. Under these newer provisions, nonresidential projects will include proposals and supporting facilities whose services will not necessarily be limited to residential uses. The very nature of nonresidential projects makes necessary provision of supporting facilities that serve nonresidential uses—often the entire community as in the case of the facilities outlined above. Therefore, it becomes essential that these nonresidential projects include supporting facilities not limited by concept of service to project residents alone. Even though the urban renewal law has been changed over a period of years to allow for nonresidential exceptions, administrative procedures have not been changed to recognize the eligibility of certain public facilities supporting nonresidential project areas, and specifically in central business districts.

The central Little Rock project may serve as a guidepost for the rejuvenation of downtown America. Within the framework of our present techniques of urban renewal and within the scope of the urban renewal program, the central Little Rock plan provides a unique opportunity to refine, expand, and develop a recognition of those specialized facilities necessary to serve nonresidential uses.

The resident population of the central business district is only a small part of the total daily population of persons using this area of highest concentration. Sidewalk interviews, pedestrian counts and traffic surveys reveal that central Little Rock serves the total city population which is in fact greater than that of the city itself. The function of the central business district is to provide a centralized location serving the entire community in which its residents live, work, do business, and seek recreation. It follows naturally, therefore, that public facilities located in the project area are designed to serve the same population group using the central core and in so doing the facilities serve the primary use and function of the area as supporting facilities.

The central business district determines and even dictates the basic characteristics of the physical environment and the economic base of the city. The benefits accrued from the project are conferred in equal degree on everyone who lives in the city, regardless of the place of residence.

The need of all of the city's citizens for a viable central core has been officially recognized by the Little Rock City Board of Directors, the governing body of the community, which has declared as a matter of municipal policy that a strong, rejuvenated downtown is essential to the prosperity and progress of the city. The construction of the new police and courts building, the central library, and the arts center are concrete examples of the city's execution of this policy.

These specialized and unduplicated facilities are located in the central business district both because their own functions demand a central position and because they are necessary to support other activities provided in the central area.

The ability of a limited area such as the central business district to serve an entire city is made possible by the interrelationships of activities that make the whole more effective than the sum of its parts. Many of these interrelationships depend on the presence of supporting facilities essential to the central business district. Central Little Rock has clearly defined functional districts such as a financial district, a wholesale distribution center, a governmental complex, and areas of cultural and recreational activity. In these districts like activities are grouped together geographically, and the various districts are located in relation to one another according to the degree that they serve related or similar functions. Any individual facility can affect the entire district. For example, Little Rock's municipal auditorium is the hub of a concentrated and clearly defined convention complex made up of public agencies and private firms dependent on convention business. The convention district affects and is affected by all of the functional districts, which depend on and attract convention business. Thus, the auditorium in its relationships and interrelationships provides drawing power and strengthens the hotels which in turn provides downtown population who become customers of retail and wholesale outlets, etc., in a never-ending chain.

One of the characteristics of these supporting facilities is their essential role to the proper function of the area of this urban renewal project. Accordingly, such facilities are fully justified as grants-in-aid. These basic factors establish the principle that allowance of grants-in-aid credit for a central business district project must be determined by the necessity that a facility be located in the central business district to serve the essential functions of the area. Necessity and benefit should be measured both in terms of the need of the central business district for the facility and the effect of the facility on the renewal of the central business district.

In summation, it again must be stressed that the city of Little Rock through its adopted policy of planned public investment in the central core of the city has had a major impact on the development and redevelopment of downtown. By providing such facilities as the police and courts building, the central library, and the arts center at a total expenditure of approximately $2,900,000, the city has accepted its responsibility and done its part to make the central Little Rock project a success.

Without these expenditures for governmental, cultural and educational facilities, the project could not be carried to a successful conclusion. Proper and appropriate noncash grants-in-aid credit for these city expenditures must be recognized to assure the financial success of this project.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to suggest, in view of the importance of this matter, we ought to have more formal debate, instead of just a few Senators standing around talking.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have been debating it for about an hour.

Mr. STENNIS. Is this the amendment the Senator from Alabama said he would send to me when he got through with it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no. This is not the one relating to the closing of bases at all.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator was speaking about the closing of bases.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I was just saying I had to leave in a few minutes, and I wanted to mention it. This amendment covers these special problems of individual areas.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of my friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and I turn the management of the bill over to him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier in the debate this afternoon, the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] mentioned that the urban renewal project of the city of Olathe, Kans., had been eliminated from the amendment just agreed to. I did not press the matter, because the Senator assured me the Olathe project was already in the House bill, and would go to conference.

However, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Jerry M. Abbott, executive director of the Urban Renewal Agency of Olathe, together with a statement of facts concerning the Olathe urban renewal project.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF OLATHE,
Olathe, Kans., May 20, 1966.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As you are probably aware the City of Olathe is planning a downtown urban renewal project, and at the present time we are seeking ways of financing our share of the cost.

We feel that we have complied with the intent of Congress in the 1965 Housing Act in that the City has in the past year voted over five million dollars in bonds for the improvement of our schools and water system. These projects are unfortunately outside our project area, and therefore not eligible as grants-in-aid under present regulations. We are therefore asking for special legislation from the Senate to permit a part of the expenditures made by the City to be counted as a grant-in-aid.

Special consideration was granted other cities in the 1965 Act, and it is our understanding that the City of Sheridan, Colorado is at the present time asking for special legislation. This legislation was introduced in the House by Congressman MCVICKERS of Colorado, and the bill was written for him by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We are attempting to have our plans completed by November, so passage in this session of Congress is important to us.

I am enclosing a fact sheet on our project here. Item two in the fact sheet is the improvement that we are asking to be counted as a hundred per cent grant-in-aid.

Our businessmen, civic leaders, and the community feel that Urban Renewal can assist in solving some of our downtown problems, and I feel sure they will appreciate anything you can do to assist us with this legislation.

Very truly yours,
JERRY M. ABBOTT,
Executive Director.

Enclosure.

FACTS CONCERNING THE OLATHE URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, KANS. R-31, AND THE WATER WORKS IMPROVEMENT AND ESTIMATED PROJECT OF THE CITY OF OLATHE

I. Estimate of Federal and Local Grant Requirements.

Gross project cost	$4, 274, 887
Local disposition proceeds	300, 000
Net project cost	3, 974, 887
Three-fourths net project cost	2, 981, 165
Relocation grant payment	155, 200
Total Federal capital grant required	3, 136, 365
Total local funds required	993, 722

II. Extension and improvement of the Water Work System of the City of Olathe.

This project consists of acquiring right-of-way and constructing a water pipeline at not less than 24 inches in diameter to the Kansas (Kaw) River, together with its treatment plant, improvement in the water distribution system and water tower, under the authority of Section 12-856 to 12-868, both inclusive of the 1961 Supplement to General Statutes of Kansas for 1949 and all amendments thereto, the total estimated cost of such project to be approximately $2,365,000. This cost was provided by issuances of water and sewage system revenue bonds, series 1964 in the principle sum of $815,000.00 and general obligation waterworks bonds in the sum of $1,550,000.00. Ordinance No. 1637-A and 1636-A provided for these bonds.

Construction started on April 5, 1964 and has not yet been completed. Total cash expenditures to date amount to $2,124,160.28.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in all my experience on the housing subcommittee, I do not know of any bill that has evoked as little controversy as the measure we take up today. It was reported unanimously, and I hope we can deal with it with some speed and dispatch. From what I can determine, all amendments that will be proposed are largely of a noncontroversial nature as well; and I hope we will not detain the Senate very long.

It is my understanding that there probably will not be a request for a record vote on final passage. I do not know what the intentions of some Senators might be relative to proposed amendments.

Mr. President, I should like to address my remarks specifically on this measure to section 507 of the bill, which instructs the Secretary of Defense to acquire certain properties situated at or near military bases which have been ordered to be closed. This authority is contained in section 108 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and it was intended to protect servicemen and other employees at military bases closed by order of the Department of Defense from suffering a loss in the value of their homes resulting from a base closing.

In enacting this provision, the Congress intended that the Department of Defense would take immediate action in setting up a program to acquire the properties. However, no property has been acquired under this authority and the Department of Defense has not asked for an appropriation to set up a program for such acquisition.

In order to be assured that the Department of Defense will not delay further in acquiring properties in appropriate cases, the committee has included in section 507 an amendment to section 108(a) which will change the provision authorizing the Department of Defense to acquire title to a requirement that the Department of Defense "shall, upon application and in accordance with the provisions of this section" acquire such title.

I recognize the present provision does not provide a complete program in that it contains no means for assisting a serviceman or employee who loses his property through foreclosure or who is forced to sell at a depressed price because of inability to maintain a home at the closed base as well as a home at the new place of employment. For this reason, a provision has been included in section 507 which would authorize the DOD to compensate a serviceman or employee for loss of his home either through a forced sale or by foreclosure.

Where there has been a forced sale, payment would be made on the basis of the difference between the fair market value of the property immediately prior to the announcement of the base closing and either the fair market value at the time of sale, or the sales price, whichever amount is greater. Reimbursement would be included for any reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the sale.

In the case where the property sold was covered by an FHA or VA mortgage, the homeowner would be required to establish, as a condition for receiving compensation, that the mortgage has either been fully paid or has been assumed by a purchaser satisfactory to the FHA or the VA. Where foreclosure has occurred, payment would be made on the basis of the difference between the fair market value immediately prior to the announcement and the fair market value at the time of foreclosure.

With the amendments to section 108 of the 1965 act contained in section 507, I believe the Department of Defense will have a complete program for assisting servicemen and employees who sustain losses as a result of the closing of a military base. I expect the Secretary of Defense to ask for an appropriation and to place the program in operation without any further delay.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"AREAS AFFECTED BY CIVIL DISORDERS

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding after subsection (1) (added by section 101 of this Act) a new subsection as follows:

" '(m) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this section any mortgage meeting the requirements of this section, other than the requirement in subsection (c) relating to economic soundness, if he determines that (1) the dwelling covered by the mortgage is situated in an area in which rioting or other civil disorders have occurred or are threatened, (2) as a result of such actual or threatened rioting or other disorders the property with respect to which the mortgage is executed cannot meet the normal requirements with respect to economic soundness, and (3) such property is an acceptable risk giving due consideration to the need for providing adequate housing for families of low and moderate income in such area.'

"(b) Section 305 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts and purchase transactions which do not exceed $200,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments or transactions relate to mortgages with respect to which the Secretary has made the determinations provided for in section 203 (m) of this Act.' "

Renumber succeeding sections in title I accordingly.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the beginning of June of this year, I addressed the Senate on the violence and civil disorders that could be expected across this country unless action was taken. *Let me read from those remarks:*

With the heat of another summer approaching and with it, the threat of greater racial violence in the streets of our cities, action must be taken to prevent upheavals or to contain them, to resolve the problems which create racial tension, to further federal programs of economic rehabilitation, to do, in a word, all that may be done to eliminate the causes of such disorders, strictly enforce the law, and to assist law abiding citizens in the affected areas.

Violence and civil disorders indeed have occurred across our Nation: in Chicago, in Harlem, in Brooklyn, in Cleveland, in Lansing, in Indianapolis, and in many other cities. At the time of my remarks, I called for a four point program to meet these problems. I asked civil rights groups and civic leaders to exert every influence to stem these outbreaks and take action against the true cause of racial agitation. The administration was asked to give financial priority to the areas threatened with violence. Lastly, I offered an amendment, cosponsored by Senators CASE, CLARK, JAVITS, MURPHY, and SCOTT, to give the innocent victims of these areas an opportunity to obtain loans and to purchase their own homes.

I again ask that these actions be taken. But today I ask particularly that my amendment be adopted. It is impossible in areas of racial strife to obtain loans at any rate of interest for the purchase of homes. Loan companies have formed a wall around these areas and refuse to render assistance. Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California, stated on the floor of the House last week:

> In the city of Los Angeles we had some unfortunate racial disturbances in an area known as the Watts area. Before that occurred, various savings and loan associations and banks loaned mortgages in that particular area. After this racial disturbance occurred and a great deal of property—some $30 to $40 million—was burned or damaged in different ways, all of the savings and loan associations and all of the banks drew a line around that district. They call it the curfew district. They are not making any loans in that district to anyone, as far as I know. If they are, it is unknown to me. But I know that is the general policy in that area.

Certainly, the present tight money situation is part of the cause but the primary reason is the fact that riots have occurred and may possibly occur again.

Mr. President, the amendment I offer does not require further expenditures of Federal funds. It would allow FHA to insure mortgages in areas threatened by disorders if the properties concerned are an acceptable risk "giving due consideration to the need for providing adequate housing for families of low and moderate income in such area."

I have received hundreds of letters from law enforcement officials, from State authorities, from loan companies, from interested citizens—all supporting this proposal. I would ask unanimous consent that a few representative letters be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There has got to be a distinction made between the lawless miscreants and those inhabitants of potential riot areas who have a stake in the social order, who are or who want to be property owners, and who hold to the same standards of morality and behavior which you and I would approve in any citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various letters received by me in support of this measure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, COUNTY OF NAPA,
Napa, Calif., July 19, 1966.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: With reference to your letter of July 11, 1966, I certainly agree with your thoughts outlined in the letter, and in your speech to the Senate. I also concur in the bill that you have introduced, and if there is anything that I can do to assist you in gaining the passage, please advise.

Very truly yours,
JAMES D. BOITANO,
District Attorney.

POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, Calif., July 19, 1966.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Anaheim, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 5, 1966, relative to Bill S. 3451. I fully agree that such asistance would be of great benefit to those who are struggling to improve their lot in areas where the potential for serious trouble exists.

I read very carefully your address in the Senate and I fully agree with you that there is a tremendous need for the recognition of responsibility on the part of the leaders involved in all phases of this great social change taking place in these United States. Your talk, your admonitions were certainly timely, more so now in light of the horrible violence that has taken place in the city of Chicago and various other parts of our country. This type of violence, rioting, looting and just plain criminality must cease, or our whole democratic way of life is in jeopardy.

We are fortunate to have a strong voice such as yours in our United States Senate. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS J. CAHILL,
Chief of Police.

MRS. RAYMOND E. ALDERMAN,
San Francisco, Calif., July 22, 1966.
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your introduction of S 3451. I think it is an excellent piece of legislation.

Along the same lines, it seems to me that there should be some sort of compensation for the innocent victims of riot and civil commotion. It is one of the functions of political entities to maintain order, and if they fail to do so, shouldn't they be financially liable for their failure? I believe in California, we have some sort of fund to assist the families of criminally injured victims, and I think this type of law would be an extension of the same philosophy.

I'm fairly confident that this dream of compensation would never be passed, so I suppose what I am really advocating is an adequate police force to maintain order, and probably we won't get that either.

I have deep sympathy for the Civil Rights Movement, but I feel very strongly that lawlessness is not the way to achieve the very important goals of the minority groups.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET.

WILLARD W. KEITH,
Beverly Hills, Calif., July 19, 1966.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senater Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Your letter to me of July 11 and its enclosures invited by comments on Senate Bill No. 3451 recently introduced by you in the Senate.

Undoubtedly this bill, if enacted, would aid considerably the financial problem which now exists in most of the "riot" areas or even those which are threatened by riot and/or civil disorders.

To add something to your file let me tell you of some experiences which have occurred recently within a savings and loan association in which I have an equity position and for which I act as a Director. Our association had processed a number of loans in the Watts area and the mortgages were in effect at the time of the riots last year. Since then it has been virtually impossible to collect any payments against the mortgages. The owners and/or occupants of the homes continue to reside there but refuse to make further payments. When we get to the point of foreclosure or trying to assume repossession of the property we usually find that the occupants have departed and taken with them many of the plumbing items, lighting fixtures, and other removable parts.

As you may well imagine this produces a very difficult situation and I can readily understand why new mortgage money is not being made available to properties in that type of area.

I think the moves you are attempting are good ones and that, if successful, could go a long way in relieving what is now a most difficult situation.

With kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,
WILLARD.

SAMUEL LADAR,
San Francisco, Calif., July 21, 1966.
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I have read and I endorse enthusiastically your thoughtful and perceptive statement on the occasion of introducing S. 3451 to assist in the provision of adequate housing in certain areas.

I would hesitate to comment on S. 3451 itself, but since you specifically requested comment, I shall add a few words.

Jobs, education and fair and decent housing are necessities for the attainment by minorities of their rightful place in our society. Fundamental to the obtaining of these necessities is the establishment in members of minorities of a belief in the existence of opportunities for advancement or, in other words, the creation of a proper motivation to help themselves. S. 3451 furnishes relief from the frustration which is certain to follow the disturbance and damage which have taken place in certain areas. It is an excellent step in the right direction. Caution should be taken in its wording in reference to providing additional financial assistance in areas in which rioting or—to quote from the bill—"other civil disorders" have occurred or "are threatened". In the use of such general and indefinite terms there may be a danger that S. 3451 might be subject to misapplication.

Also, by way of a suggestion as to a possible alternative approach, let me recall to your mind the constructive action which the automobile liability insurance carriers undertook a few years ago in response to an accusation that there was discrimination against minorities in connection with the issuance and cost of liability insurance policies. The carriers created a classification of "assigned risks" to which a committee of the carriers could assign persons claiming discrimination or unfair treatment in connection with the issuance or cost of policies. Such persons are assigned among the carriers on an equitable basis, and each carrier is obligated to accept its share of the assigned risks. Under government impetus, such a plan conceivably could be worked out among financial institutions in the metropolitan areas. In the final analysis the increased cost of doing business would be borne by the community, but there would be no danger of politics in the handling of funds, and a constructive involvement of private industry.

I am certain that you have given this matter much thought and have better information than I. However, I am giving you my comments in response to your request. I have full confidence in your judgment.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

SAM.

CITY OF NEEDLES, CALIF.,
July 13, 1966.

Mr. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I have read the bill you presented to the Senate and enjoyed the good clean and sensible meaning of your thoughts and wishes.

I, too, feel that all peace and law abiding Americans should believe in the working principles of American Democracy and must recognize that Violence must be rejected as a political instrument by any orderly society.

I feel as a Police Officer and you will possibly agree, a terrific transition of the Civil rights program has been in progress for the past few years. I have great hopes that with men like you and others at the wheel, we will win in the end.

Keep up the good work, I am for you 100%.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW F. GIBSON,
Chief of Police.

REDWOOD CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,
July 13, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thank you for sending me the copy of your bill and statement concerning adequate housing in areas threatened by civil disorder. I have read both the bill and your statement and am in accord with what you are trying to accomplish.

I feel there is much to be done in this area that is of such great concern, particularly to those of us in law enforcement, and that any effort made to improve conditions will be helpful in solving this serious social problem.

Please call on me if I can be of assistance in matters of mutual interest.

Yours truly,

W. L. FAULSTICH, *Chief of Police.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 26, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Many thanks for your very nice letter of July 5 and for sending me a copy of the bill that you introduced to insure adequate housing in areas threatened by civil disorders. This strikes me as a fine approach and one that I very much hope will be adopted by the Congress. I will be more than happy to urge its adoption in various talks I will be making, and I appreciate greatly your sending it to me.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CASPER W. WEINBERGER.

SANTA BARBARA,
July 22, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for your letter and the enclosed statement on your bill.

I just want you to know that I agree with you more times than I disagree. Keep up the good work.

Most sincerely,

JAMES L. HOLMES.

CITY OF NOVATO, CALIF.,
July 13, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I agree with the content of your bill (S. 3451). Assistance should be rendered to assist people in privately restoring or improving these areas of strife. People should receive the opportunity to aid themselves whenever possible.

I also agree with your statements that Lincoln's philosophy has not been adhered to, and this nation has only recently commenced to bring equality to everyone. Unfortunately, there are many who are fiercely resisting these changes, as there are many who will also use all methods to immediately attempt to bring about equality.

No matter which side, oppressor or minority, our laws should be obeyed by all. Changes create problems, but these changes are necessary, and they must be achieved peacefully.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. DI GRAZIA, *Chief of Police.*

MONTCLAIR POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Montclair, Calif., July 14, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U. S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I appreciate your letter of July 5 and your advising me of your proposed bill on adequate housing in areas of civil disorder.

I would concur in your opinion that a stimulus to motivate the reconstruction in areas damaged by civil disorder is direly needed. Your bill, it would seem, would do much to satisfy this need.

Sincerely,

R. L. MCLEAN, *Chief of Police.*

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
July 20, 1966

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
The U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 11, 1966 and a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning a bill to insure adequate housing in areas threatened by civil disorder. I wish to thank you for submitting this material to me, and to extend to you my congratulations for your excellent analysis of many of the problems in this field, and your action on behalf of the citizens of California in attempting to obtain a remedy.

You have my wholehearted support in this program.

Very truly yours,

KIT NELSON, *District Attorney.*

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read your address re violence. I agree with all you said. As for the bill, I had occasion to speak with a Negro to whom I gave your statement and his comment, "I agree with the Senator and his bill will help all who reside and do business in Watts. It is difficult to obtain a loan."

Your bill should pass.

Kindest regards,

NATHAN O. FREEDMAN.

COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, California,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Your statement in support of the introduction of your Bill S. 3451, is most appropriate and comes at a time when the true leaders of this great nation, should make themselves heard to deter future acts of violence or even the threat of violence, whereas you say they encourage injustice in themselves.

It is truly unbelievable that in times such as we are all enjoying, such conditions could exist, but what is even more frightening, is what we anticipate to come if something is not done.

You were very thoughtful to send me this material, and I am deeply grateful for your interest.

Very sincerely yours,

MICHAEL N. CANLIS,
Sheriff-Coroner, San Joaquin County.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
San Jose, Calif., July 15, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In your letter of July 5, 1966, you have invited comments on the recent bill which you introduced in Senate and outlined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD labelled, "A Bill to Insure Adequate Housing in Areas Threatened by Civil Disorders." We would certainly agree with the objectives outlined in the bill. We sincerely hope that the objective sought by the passage of the bill will be realized in the future. Most certainly this ought well have a direct bearing on the potential of civil unrest, demonstration and riot. We cannot help but believe that the goals that you suggest and hope to achieve will bring about a more peaceful situation by removing some of the prime sources of discontent, frustration, and lack of opportunity to underprivileged citizens.

We offer our congratulations to you for your efforts in addressing the Senate and calling forth additional efforts on the part of civil rights leaders and other responsible officials to form public opinion to help prevent the use of violence in our cities and towns throughout our country.

Locally San Jose has exerted considerable effort to aid various minority groups in becoming a real and genuine part of the community rather than an isolated and insulated minority. The Police Department, with its Police Advisory Board, has a sub-committee specifically intended to receive complaints alleging police harassment and brutality or any other problems requiring an investigation or evaluation. In essence, the Police Department is exerting great efforts to maintain lines of communication with our various groups within the community who could conceivably be categorized as civil rights or minority groups. While the police department is not a sociological organization in the full sense, it must of necessity overlap into this field in its efforts to assist in preventing the manifestations of an unfortunate social condition; namely poverty, lack of opportunity, discrimination, etc. The manifestation of these ills is often civil disturbance and ultimately rioting and violence. We are making every effort to communicate, to assist and to prevent the very things which you outline in your bill. We heartily agree with you that all of us, in our own avenues of endeavor, must work together as we can and when we can to prevent the violence, unrest and disrespect for the law of our land, which too often exists. We very much appreciate your letter, a copy of the proposed bill and your invitation for comments. If we can be of any assistance, please be assured of our cooperation.

Very truly yours,
J. R. Blackmore, *Chief of Police.*

Los Angeles, Calif.,
July 21, 1966.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Your letter of July 11, 1966 and the Congressional Record, volume No. 112, 92 were read with great interest.

In your letter of July 11 you say that you introduced a bill to help protect the normal "business activity" in real estate in areas affected, or potentially affected, by civil disturbance and to aid in reconstruction and improvement in these areas by private enterprise.

If I read S. 3451 correctly the bill provides only for adequate housing ("dwelling"), and does not provide for any mortgages that would cover commercial or industrial buildings in the area.

There is a definite need, as you point out, to alleviate the situation with respect to housing primarily.

I am fully in accord with the bill as written. My only comment therefor is that it would be helpful to have commercial structures such as hospitals and clinics and places of business to up-grade and provide for needs in the Watts area or any other area of this type.

Thank you for having made known to me legislation pertaining to S. 3451.

Sincerely,
Myron L. Garon.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
July 21, 1966.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Reference is made to your letter of July 11 regarding the problem of civil disturbances. I am in agreement with your attitude and pronouncements regarding the utter uselessness of riots and civil disturbances by minority groups in promoting advancement for the civil rights movement. I have heard many opinions of my doctor acquaintances. Practically all felt that reward for violence is a principle to be rejected and fought; that vigorous steps must be taken to prevent these disturbances; that we must restore law and order so that the average citizen can feel safe to walk the streets and take care of his daily functions.

I also agree with the provisions in your proposed Bill S–3451 which provides for loans to those innocently involved by the effects of the lawlessness of the riot groups. I feel that those participating in riots should be punished, not rewarded. But housing must be provided or else fundamentals for obtaining a solution to the many problems will be missing.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
Oscar Harvey, M.D.

Sonoma, Calif.,
July 21, 1966.

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Your letter of July 11, the copy of your bill S. 3451 and your comments carried in the Congressional Record are all underscored by what is happening in Cleveland at this very moment.

I feel that your bill is an excellent step in the right direction. It will help to reduce violence in the future. It will even promote the rebuilding of areas destroyed by present and past violence.

However, if these poverty ghettos learn that private funds will be insured for the rebuilding it could bring about the violence which you wish to thwart. These miserable people can say, "Let's destroy this crummy area. Now private investors will rebuild it because their investments are protected by the government."

Although I abhor violence in any form, still if our "working principles of American democracy" cannot move fast enough to clean up those ghettos, then violence may be the only way to do it.

The truth is that our "working principles of American democracy" are crumbling all around us. There are large segments of the public—people wanting equality, people wanting peace, people who refuse to accept the pat propaganda of the establishment—who are cynically disregarded by the power structure.

The fact remains that the Chicago riots would undoubtedly have never occurred had the forces of law-and-order put sprinklers on the fire hydrants for the benefit of the sweltering people instead of insisting on turning them off.

There are too many stridently screaming for enforcing the letter of law-and-order, and too few daring to even whisper an appeal for justice and human consideration.

Nevertheless we appreciate what you are doing, Senator.

Sincerely,
Paul Corey.

Pasadena, Calif.,
July 19, 1966.

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Thank you very much for your letter of July 11th and your invitation to comment on your remarks in the Senate on June 6th and your proposed amendment to the National Housing Act.

I could not agree with you more when you urge that violence must be rejected as a political instrument in our society. In my view, violence should be ruled out, not only in domestic matters but in international situations as well. It is for this reason that I am not only opposed to the violence of Watts, Cleveland and New York, but also the violence in Vietnam. And I do wish you could join me in a universal denunciation of violence in all of its forms.

I am glad that you introduced your amendment to the National Housing Act insuring mortgaged loans in those areas which have a high risk rating. If successful in passage, this amendment should encourage investment in those areas which need it most.

I appreciate your inviting my comments.

Very sincerely yours,
Robert S. Vogel.

First Community Congregational Church,
Lehigh Acres, Fla., July 18, 1966.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Thank you for sending me the copy of your Senate speech and S. 3451.

I hasten to add my commendation to an effort I think not only prudent but almost imperative. Already since you introduced this measure, Chicago has flared.

Having myself lived on the West Coast, in Chicago, Boston and in other areas, I hold the view that everything reasonable that can be done must be done as quickly as possible to lower the pressures now beginning to explode.

Continued headway by extremists on the opposite sides of this socio-racial problem promises nothing but potential tragedy for the entire national life. Sensible leadership must not be reluctant or ambivalent in face of this mounting crisis. I would ask those who contend otherwise: "If you are weary now from running with men, how will you run with horses?"

Not only must violence be stopped; the causes of potential and future violence must be removed in advance as far as possible. Regretfully I must say I can see little if anything being done in that direction in this section where I now live. As you well know wisdom of dealing with this problem in some parts of the nation is equal to that of appointing a convicted arsonist head of the fire department.

All the more commendable then is your effort, and all similar ones, to use the power of government to aid in reduction of the causes of these explosive pressures. The alternative to revolution is evolution and it is very needful there be evidence evolution is taking place. Psychology of mass movements indicate we still have some very dangerous gulfs to cross. The insuring of rights without means to implement those rights is as dangerous as denial of the rights themselves.

Sincerely yours,
Philip Burton, Ph. D.

Motion Pictures International, Inc.,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 25, 1966.

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: I have read with deep interest the bill that you have introduced as well as the comment that you made with respect to the introduction in connection with the bill.

I am fully in accord with this bill, and I feel it will be a major step in effectively dealing with this most important issue.

Sincerely yours,
S. Broidy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California obviously has pertinence, relating as it does to a difficult problem which is sweeping the cities of our country from coast to coast. It has considerable appeal. It is a proposal that was passed over very quickly by the committee, and we have not had an opportunity to study and understand all its implications. Nevertheless, an examination of the amendment suggests to me that its merit is such that we ought to accept it and take it to conference, which would give us an opportunity to study it further and to understand fully its implications.

I am perfectly willing to accept it on that basis.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate that.

I will say, Mr. President, that the text of the amendment about to be accepted was introduced earlier by my colleagues and me as a separate piece of legislation, and was referred to the committee of the Senator from Maine.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Before submitting the question, will the Senator from California allow me to become a cosponsor?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am honored to include the name of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

Mr. MUSKIE. Reserving the right to object, I will say that the cosponsorship of the amendment is unimpeachable.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he intends to lay down the Mass Transit Act tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If and when the housing bill is completed, we will lay down the mass transit proposal. We will take no action on it. It will be the pending business tomorrow.

Mr. TOWER. Does the majority leader anticipate that whatever record votes will occur, will occur tomorrow, and that they will not be carried over until Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope that any votes would not be carried over but would be cast tomorrow. So that if that bill is finished tomorrow, we could take up the demonstration cities bill on Monday.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 21, 1966, p. 16646, Congressional Record.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, on July 21 of this year the other body rejected, by a rollcall vote of 204 to 136, the report of the Committee on Conference on S. 602, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act. This measure, sponsored by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], had been considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and was reported favorably, with amendments, on June 21, 1965. It passed the Senate on June 25, 1965, but on the motion of the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] the action was reconsidered and the bill further amended on July 1, 1965. S. 602 was again approved by the Senate with an amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

As reported by the committee and passed by the Senate, the measure retained the provision of the original Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1965 under which the program was limited to the 17 reclamation States—those west of the 100th meridian—and to Hawaii.

However, the House committee believed that the small reclamation projects program should be a national, rather than a regional program, and amended the Senate bill to make the act applicable to all of the 50 States. The House committee made certain other changes also, but the broadening of the program into a national one making States in the East and South eligible to participate as well as those in the West, was one of the chief amendments.

On September 7, 1965, the House adopted the amendments of its committee and passed the measure.

In the conference between the two Houses, the Senate yielded with respect to the House-approved provision for a national program, and the conferees agreed upon other points of difference. A conference report was duly filed, setting forth the agreement on the provisions of the bill.

However, as I stated earlier, when the conference report was called up in the House, that body rejected it solely because, the debate shows, it did contain the provision which the House had previously approved.

Thereupon, as the established procedures require, the House again insisted upon its amendments, requested a conference with the Senate, and appointed conferees.

Madam President, the program established by the Small Reclamation Projects Act has unquestionably been of outstanding success. Under it, groups of landowners and water users have taken the initiative to organize themselves, prepare plans for a feasible project, and expand their own funds before obtaining a participating loan from the Federal Government. So successful has it been that the $100 million loan fund provided by the original act has been fully committed. Thus, this highly beneficial program of State and local participation with the Federal Government in locally sponsored irrigation projects will come to an end unless S. 602, or similar enabling legislation, is enacted in this Congress.

Therefore, Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments made by the House to the bill, concur in the request for another conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Jackson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Moss, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Allott, conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3711) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I should like to ask the manager of the bill some questions.

I note that certain things have been done about cooperative housing in the bill for which I am very gratified. The proposal picks up a number of the measures I have introduced to deal with the question, as the New York area has a good deal of cooperative housing.

I note that one question still remains unresolved, which dates back, as a matter of fact, to when I was on the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the question of why, notwithstanding excellent actuarial experience, the mortgage premium in cooperative housing is still one-half of 1 percent, with the difference of the actuarial figures being actual contributions of some $27 million and losses of several hundred thousand dollars. This would make a material difference to the cooperatives in the costs which are required to be shared by those who occupy cooperative apartments.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine why no provision has been made in this bill which would make that reduction mandatory, and what the general situation surrounding it is at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, a short while ago, I made inquiry concerning the rise in the costs of building houses in the United States. Since I made that inquiry, I had a member of my staff get the information. The astounding revelation is that in the last 10 years, the cost of building a home has gone up at the rate of 5 percent a year. In 10 years, the cost has gone up 50 percent. That means that if in 1956 one could build a home for $14,500, that same home today would cost $21,800 to build.

I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to this situation, because we in Congress are attempting to stimulate homebuilding. We are attempting to help the individual buy a home. We are attempting to keep craftsmen at work. But there seems to be no cooperation generally from some of the principal beneficiaries in trying to enable people to buy a home.

For the information of the Senator from Georgia, the cost of building a home in the United States, on the average, has gone up 50 percent in 10 years. A house that cost $14,500 to build in 1956 would now cost $21,800 to build.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 6, after line 21, insert "That section 101(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: 'Such term also includes a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which constructs, owns, and operates rental or cooperative housing financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, or tax abatements, and which is approved for receiving the benefits of this section'."

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to explain this amendment, as follows. This concerns one of the questions I was about to ask the Senator from Maine.

In the State of New York—and I understand in the States of Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Connecticut also—are many multifamily structures which have been constructed by limited dividend housing corporations, cooperatives, and similar organizations. In New York we have a State program called the Mitchell Lama program, which makes available money at a much lower rate of interest than is otherwise available in the way of mortgages to cooperatives, and so forth.

The rent supplement program—I do not know what the committee's explanation would be—has no substantive base for making the distinction and does not allow the rent supplement to extend to structures of this character. In order to qualify them, without in any way compelling the housing authorities to use the rent supplements for this purpose, but just to qualify them legally so that they could be considered for that purpose—although they may not necessarily be included—I have offered this amendment.

The question I was about to ask the Senator from Maine is this: Is there any reason why they should not be eligible? They may not get it. They may not find the program applies to them, but at least they ought to be eligible.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I say to the Senator from New York, first, with respect to the mandate of the floor manager of the bill, that when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] turned the bill over to me, he said that I would undertake to answer all questions. I can only say to the Senator, and to the Senate as a whole, that I will only try to answer questions to which I have an answer.

My answer to this question is the only one which I can give explaining the position of the committee on the Senator's problem. The committee felt that this would open up the rental supplement question and that we ought to avoid doing so in light of the controversial aspect of that question in the last year and a half. Beyond that I could not comment on the question of the Senator as to why these projects are not eligible.

I can attempt to get a more informed answer to the question of the Senator before we dispose of the bill, if he will give us time.

Mr. JAVITS. I will be happy to give the Senator the time to do so. I shall pass on to the next question which is the question which I asked the Senator before, if the Senator is ready to answer now. That question is why the cooperatives are not eligible because of their actuarial experience, and notwithstanding our own decision that that was the right thing to do——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. We made that decision in 1965 in the Committee on Banking and Currency. Why is it that a lower premium rate has not been extended by FHA to these cooperatives even now?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand the position of the agency, with which the committee itself is not in agreement, it is that all of the experience of some of these programs has been not favorable from an actuarial point of view, that there have been failures, and the agency would prefer to retain discretion and deal with all programs under one premium rate rather than categorize them on the basis of their favorable or unfavorable experience or the nature of the risk involved.

This is the explanation, and the committee chose in this case to continue the flexibility of the agency to deal with the problem.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a fact that we gave the mandate to treat these premises in actuarial experience separately. They have not done it.

In 1965 we came to the conclusion that these cooperatives should be considered separately but we did not mandate the reduction on the agency.

I want to be fair with the committee. I served on the committee. I wish to serve notice now that on the next housing bill I will move to amend it to mandate the one-fourth of 1 percent. We have tried to make it clear to the agency how we felt. We authorized them to keep separate the insurance funds for this program.

As the colloquial saying goes, they apparently cannot take the hint. It seems clear to me that nothing is going to happen unless Congress mandates it. A large prairie fire can be lit among the co-ops. When we have before us the next housing bill, whenever that may be—and it may not be too far off now—it will be my intention to move to mandate the one-fourth of 1 percent premium. This is not a satisfactory way to handle the matter. The agency should have flexibility, but the agency misused its flexibility to cause its inflexibility in defiance of the views of Congress. I do not think that that is playing the game.

So most reluctantly I will make an effort to make them do it. The experience has been exemplary. If, having expressed our will, we are not going to reward people who have had such excellent experience with mortgage insurance, we are not rewarding that kind of experience and success. There is no alternative left.

I hope that the committee will face the FHA with this situation. We have done it before but I must tell the Senator that I think that reasonable patience is about at an end and the matter has to be brought to a showdown.

I can assure the Senator that I am going to do everything that I can to bring it to a showdown here and in the other body. I hope the committee will make that clear if they go to the FHA, in the hope that they may handle the matter much more wisely than they have, by not responding to what was a very clear expression of congressional will a year ago.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator's persistence, I trust, will have a salutary effect on the disposition of the agency to consider this problem. I think that the Senator will find there is considerable sympathy in the committee toward his view on this problem. This discussion should raise the subject to the level of greater attention on the part of the committee when the matter comes up again.

Mr. JAVITS. On the rent supplement issue may I point out that the amendment that I have sent to the desk in no way increases or changes all conditions of the rent supplement. It makes additional multifamily structures available for that kind of treatment as the administration decides is desirable.

It seems to me that to make more housing available as a matter of choice for the program is very constructive and in no way jeopardizes or embarrasses the program. On the contrary it gives the program a greater opportunity to do its job. If it is taken to conference and bugs are found in it I will understand if it cannot be done.

But as far as I know it is a very simple mechanical matter of broadening the opportunity for housing to which rent supplements will be applied.

There are many such structures in my State and in the various other States I mentioned earlier. There is no reason in logic why they should be excluded from the operation of the program, if for other reasons of criteria they could properly qualify.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to state for the record, so that it will be clear for purposes of taking my amendment to conference, if it is agreed to, as I hope it will be, that the only entities to which the amendment applies are to private entities. These private entities, whether cooperatives or what we call limited dividend corporations or voluntary corporations, and occasionally trade unions and civic organizations in the State of New York, are for the benefit of a State mortgage institution which sells bonds for this kind of mortgage or makes a loan in a way to get them the lower interest rate. But the project is completely private. This is not public housing, State, municipal, or Federal. It is strictly private, except that it has the benefit of tax abatement and this pooling way of raising the mortgage funds in order to get a lower interest rate. On that representation only lies the basis upon which I would ask the Senate to agree to my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, let me say that the Senator has touched upon the point to which the committee was sensitive. We did not think that the rent supplement program should be anything but private enterprise. The Senator has clarified that point and therefore, on that basis, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, since I believe that I can explain it very simply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 28, after line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

"SEC. 506. (a) The Congress finds that, with the ever-increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban centers, there has occurred a marked change in the environmental conditions under which most people live and work; that such change is characterized by the progressive substitution of a highly complex, man-contrived environment for an environment conditioned primarily by nature; that the beneficent or malignant influence of environment on all living creatures is well recognized; and that much more knowledge is urgently needed concerning the effect on human beings of highly urbanized surroundings. It is the purpose of this section to authorize a comprehensive program of research, studies, surveys, and analyses to improve understanding of the environmental conditions necessary for the well-being of an urban society, and for the intelligent planning and development of viable urban centers.

"(b) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized and directed to—

"(1) conduct studies, surveys, research, and analyses with respect to the ecological factors involved in urban living;

"(2) document and define urban environmental factors which need to be controlled or eliminated for the well-being of urban life;

"(3) establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on urban ecological research and evaluations which are in process or are being planned by public or private agencies, or individuals;

"(4) evaluate and disseminate information pertaining to urban ecology to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals, in the form of reports or otherwise;

"(5) initiate and utilize urban ecological information in urban development projects initiated or assisted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

"(6) establish through interagency consultation the coordinated utilization of urban ecological information in projects undertaken or assisted by the Federal Government which affect the growth or development of urban areas.

"(c) (1) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations for carrying out the purpose of this section. Such advisory committees shall render such advice to the Secretary upon his request and may submit such recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist such committees.

"(2) Members of such advisory committees shall receive not to exceed $100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the studies, surveys, research, and analyses authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for work under this subsection to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation Acts."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, the purpose of the amendment is to give to the Department of Housing and Urban Development authority to undertake and to sponsor a comprehensive program of research, studies, surveys, and analyses, to improve understanding of the environmental conditions necessary for the well-being of an urban society, and for the intelligent planning and development of viable urban centers.

Madam President, this amendment was proposed, at my instance, at a time when the Housing Subcommittee marked up the bill. It was adopted by the Housing Subcommittee, as I understand it, without controversy.

However, through an inadvertent misunderstanding, when the bill came to the full committee, the amendment was dropped.

I would hope very much that the Senator in charge of the bill would be willing to reinstate this amendment, which calls for a series of studies, in which the Department is very much interested, in an area which I believe to be quite important.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated the case correctly. The subcommittee did approve the amendment but, because of the many items of business before the full committee, the amendment was not given the attention it deserved and at the close of the markup session it was rather hastily overlooked.

Therefore, on the basis that the subcommittee did approve it, and that it also does have considerable merit, I am happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, section 231 of the National Housing Act has established a national program of mortgage and loan insurance in order to provide housing for elderly persons.

Most ceilings established under this section are significantly lower than those imposed on mortgages under the regular multifamily program as provided for in section 207. On the average, mortgage ceilings for the elderly are about $1,000 lower than for comparable units under the regular multifamily program.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an official table showing the comparison of maximum mortgage limits under the regular multifamily section 217 and elderly—section 231—FHA programs be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of maximum mortgage limits under regular multifamily (sec. 207) and elderly (sec. 231) FHA programs [1]

	Regular multifamily	Elderly
Private mortgagor	$20,000,000	$12,500,000
Public mortgagor	50,000,000	50,000,000
Elevator type (per unit, up to 4 bedrooms):		
Minimum	10,500	9,500
Maximum	25,500	22,750
All others (per unit, up to 4 bedrooms):		
Minimum	9,000	8,000
Maximum	21,000	19,250

[1] Purpose of the loans in both sections is for proposed or rehabilitation of detached, semidetached, row, walkup, or elevator type rental housing—8 or more units. In both sections limits may be increased up to 45 percent in "high-cost construction" areas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, this differential strikes me as discriminatory and inequitable against the elderly members of America's society.

As I understand it, the limits provided in section 231 were kept lower by Congress because it was assumed that the elderly would be unable to carry larger mortgages. I deny that.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, if the Senator from California will yield at that point——

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TOWER. It was actually not primarily that so much as the fact that this would hold down rents. In other words, it was a device to keep the rents low so that the elderly would not be saddled with high rents.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Madame President, in my own State of California, and in a number of other States, it does seem that these limitations have been found to be unrealistically low.

In these inflationary times, rising costs accentuate discrimination against programs of housing for the elderly.

Let me say to my able friend, that rather than seek to have the Senate accept an amendment which would attempt to find a more equitable basis in the field of mortgage insurance for elderly housing programs, I want to say publicly what I have said to my able friend privately earlier today: Does he believe that there may well be an inequity in the present law; and, if so, does he believe that the committee can, should, and will attempt to hold hearings on it, and to inquire into it?

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, on the basis of the evidence which the distinguished Senator has given me in private, and in his remarks now on the floor of the Senate, I believe that there is merit to the suggestion that there may be inequity, and that there is a problem the committee should look into.

Therefore, I would be happy to join in urging the committee to study it, consider it, and perhaps go beyond that.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

I also spoke earlier to my able friend from Texas [Mr. Tower], the ranking minority member on the committee. It would seem to me that here is an opportunity for the committee, on a bipartisan basis, to determine how these seeming inequities might be removed.

Mr. TOWER. Let me say to the Senator that I would join the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] in expressing a desire to cooperate. Looking into this matter, let me say that the Senator from California has raised a very interesting point, one which perhaps had not been apparent to all of us, and I would therefore be happy to join in cooperating in any effort to make a study and review of the situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I am pleased to see that the new grant program for historic preservation established by section 4 of the bill would make historic areas, as well as specific structures, eligible for financial assistance, for acquisition restoration and improvement. As the committee report points out, such areas are often of more historic interest than even a number of separate buildings and can have a far greater effect on local patterns of land use. By providing for such assistance to historic areas, it will be possible to make grants to preserve a number of buildings in an area and also to provide other improvements in the area such as special street lighting or special paving which may be required to preserve the historic character of the area.

When I read through the report of the Special Committee on Historic Preservation, I was much impressed by the importance our leading conservationists place on the concept of area preservation—of the often intangible historical character that a particular area may have when viewed as a whole. I can think of historic areas within my own State of Massachusetts where it is extremely important that we retain that intangible character which sets that area apart from other areas around it. It was with that idea in mind that I offered an amendment to Senator Muskie's bill, S. 3097, to extend grant assistance to historic areas as well as historic structures.

I am pleased to see that this concept has been incorporated in the bill as reported out of the committee, and I am hopeful that in the administration of section 404 the concept of areawide preservation will receive the careful consideration it deserves.

I wish to ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] if, in consideration of this concept, as I understand it from reading the report, it is his understanding and that of the committee that the Administrator ought to carefully consider opportunities to provide help and assistance with respect to preservation of historic areas existing in every part of the country, not just New England, but in all sections of our country.

Mr. MUSKIE. I wholeheartedly endorse the principle of preservation of historic areas which the Senator from Massachusetts has advocated not only today, but at other times, orally and in communications. I endorse this principle not only for New England but for other areas. In view of my visit as a member of a special committee to European countries, I hope there would be enough authority in the administration of the bill to move ahead in that direction. Certainly I would urge the administration to insure that this concept is not overlooked as these programs are developed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the acting chairman. I know he traveled and visited Europe a year ago and looked into this matter, and that he has been deeply interested in this whole approach. I must say I feel comforted by his hope that there will be a review of this program, so that if the language is not as extensive or as broad as it should be to permit the kind of administration which is reflected in the committee report, there will be provided whatever is necessary to accomplish the purpose.

Madam President, on one other matter, I send to the desk an amendment on page 36, after line 16, and ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts is as follows:

On page 36, after line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

"Sec. 509. Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '(f) The restrictions and limitations set forth in subsections (b) (4) and (c) of this section shall not apply to assistance to municipalities, other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of one or more States, and Indian tribes, for specific projects for cultural centers, including but not limited to, museums, art centers and galleries, and theaters and other physical facilities for the performing arts, which would be of cultural, educational, and informational value to the communities and areas where the centers would be located'."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, the Federal Government extends credit through the Community Facilities Administration for the construction of basic public works to those municipalities which could not otherwise find credit on reasonable terms and conditions.

The amendment that I offer today would expand the coverage of this credit assistance so that municipalities can receive community facilities loans for the construction and remodeling of arts and museums facilities.

I believe development of our Nation's cultural facilities, without which artistic expression cannot flourish or be enjoyed, deserves the same kind of support as the water works and the street improvement projects which now receive primary emphasis and assistance under the community facilities program.

The need for such assistance is clear. From the day that the National Endowment for the Arts was established, it has received numerous inquiries and requests for assistance for construction, remodeling, or preservation of arts and museum facilities. There have been over 200 requests in the last year from municipalities seeking capital funds. Many of the growing number of community cultural groups have the talent resources to provide great educational and cultural opportunities for our Nation's citizens. Yet they suffer from a lack of adequate facilities. Some communities have wisely sought to combine the need for such facilities with a desire to renovate, maintain, and preserve structures of historic and esthetic significance to the community. These old buildings, with a modest investment, can often be easily converted into museums, art centers, and galleries.

Madam President, the establishment of the National Endowment of the Arts signified a recognition on the part of the Congress of the role of the Federal Government in supporting the arts—a recognition that we must seek to make the fruits of culture available to all our citizens just as we are trying to make the fruits of economic abundance available to them. I am hopeful that this amendment will help in the attainment of this goal.

Madam President, absolutely no increase in the authorization or any increase in the appropriation is requested by this amendment. All the amendment would do is provide an opportunity for municipalities, in their good judgment, to establish a list of priorities, for community facilities, in seeking credit assistance and have the opportunity to place a cultural facility at the top of the list.

Actually, although the amendment is 9 or 10 lines long, the important words are "specific projects," and the remaining language is "for cultural centers, including but not limited to, museums, art centers and galleries, and theaters and other physical facilities for the performing arts, which would be of cultural, educational, and informational value to the communities and areas where the centers would be located."

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, will the Senator withhold that?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, while there is this little delay, I wanted to suggest to the Senate a matter of procedure again. This bill and the presence of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] on the floor brings it to mind. Only yesterday and only last week we marked up bills providing many millions of dollars for Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for the Housing and Urban Development Department, for the coming year. No sooner is that done than we are on the floor with another bill changing many of the concepts of the whole program.

I do not know how much this bill will cost or when we are going to get estimates so that we will have to come back again and go over all that we did yesterday and then bring in an appropriation bill.

It brings to mind the suggestion I have made to the Senate and Congress for many, many years. I do not know in how many sessions I have introduced a bill that we do what seems to me to be commonsense, and what all the other legislative bodies in the free world do; namely, have a legislative session and a fiscal session. First we would legislate and then we would sit down and know what we were going to appropriate and why and how much, so that the right hand would know what the left hand was doing occasionally.

I think we would save, not hundreds of millions of dollars, but billions of dollars, if we knew what the whole housing program was that was before us before we appropriated money for the next year. We would have an opportunity to look at it.

I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] will agree with that.

This statement has relevance to the amendment just offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. He says it is not going to cost money under the community facilities section. Perhaps it will not, but here is a bill changing many concepts, and undoubtedly involving a great deal of money. Perhaps it is justified, but we just got through with a bill for next year moneywise, and now we have to start in and go over what we did, and perhaps provide for the financing, and come back and do it over again. If we had the Congress divided into a legislative session and a fiscal session, we would have more of an idea of what we were doing.

I do not think there is a State legislature in any of the 50 States that does not do the same thing. Toward the end of the session, they blow the whistle, as it were, on all legislation, and then sit down and appropriate. The finance committees and the committees on appropriations meet and see what responsibilities they have.

But here in the Senate, we often find ourselves downstairs appropriating money for one big housing program, most of which we agree with, and the next day another one comes along. I merely throw that out as something brought to my mind sitting here listening to the debate just now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I think what the distinguished Senator from Washington says is quite true. Yesterday we acted on the independent offices appropriations bill, and appropriated a very significant amount in this area. Yet today, 1 day after we complete that bill, we are faced with the proposition of an entirely new housing bill, which will involve, I am sure—because I intend to ask the manager of the bill about one area of it—many millions of dollars.

The Senator's thought runs along the line of a suggestion I have made—and I have a bill pending before the Senate—which is, in effect, that we have a long appropriation bill, so that at the end of the session, we can look at all of the appropriations, and then we can decide whether or not we have appropriated too much, and we might have a chance, possibly, to bring the budget into balance in that way.

The suggestion of the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, we have discussed many times. I think it is a very positive and constructive suggestion. It might be that if it were followed, we could get away from situations such as we have now. Because, just as sure as we stand here on this floor today, one day after we have finished the appropriations for housing, we will be faced in the spring, not with appropriations for the next year, but with supplemental appropriations to finance the bill which is now before the Senate and being acted upon today.

Just so that no one will believe I am dreaming this up, a typical example was the rent supplement program which was authorized in last year's housing bill. They could not even wait until the end of the fiscal year to get into operation; they came up to us with a supplemental bill. As long as we continue in this way, I do not think we can ever exert any effective control over spending.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over what we expend, or over what the Finance Committee must do in the way of raising taxes to pay for it. It is just a continuous thing. When the supplemental for this matter comes up, it will be late, we will not have the opportunity we would like to have to review it carefully and go through it with a fine-tooth comb, as to the amount of expenditures. This has gone on every year. I know of a time when the Senator from Colorado and I were down in the Appropriations Committee, marking up a bill on another big program, and we were called up here three or four times to vote on the same program the Senate was changing, the same day.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. TOWER. I point out to the Senator from Washington that this housing bill is really a cheap bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope so.

Mr. TOWER. There is very little in the way of additional money requested, except for the acquisition of housing affected by base closings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My suggestion applies not just to this bill, but the Senator from Texas knows there are many bills similar to this, where the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. We have a legislative responsibility to consider. I think we would save hundreds of millions of dollars if we knew what the legislation was going to be, and that that was it, and then sat down and appropriated. That would apply to any program.

Mr. TOWER. I concur.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to say, Madam President, that what the Senator from Washington has said makes good sense. I subscribe to it. His predictions about what is going to happen are probably pretty accurate.

But I ask the Senator, Is not the problem further complicated by the fact that often when these requests for funds are made in supplementals, the supplemental bill is not heard by the committee which is primarily in charge of the major undertaking involved?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. The matter is heard by a subcommittee on supplemental appropriations, and thus there is insulation between the continuity of the parent committee, in this instance the Independent Offices Committee, and the appropriations for the activity involved?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is one of the things which it seems to me should be considered for correction in connection with the suggestions made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, we have had discussions with the Senator from Maine, who is managing the bill, and with the Senator from Texas as well, and we, I believe, have perfected the amendment to take in the principal questions raised by the Senator from Maine; and I hope that the Senate conferees will take the matter to conference and consider it at that time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, the Senator from Massachusetts has stated the situation correctly. The two changes that have been made in the amendment, as compared with the bill which the committee considered, are, one, that it now honors the 50,000 population ceiling which applies to the program which he seeks to amend; and, second, the application of his amendment to nonprofit organizations has been stricken, and it now applies only to Government agencies.

There are still some other questions which the members of the committee would wish to explore, but we think that we can do so before we get to conference. Therefore, because of the corrections and amendments that have been made, the committee is willing to take the matter to conference and consider there the amendment as it is now before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Madam President, I should like to address a query to the Senator from Maine.

In section 301 of title III, authorization is made granting a credit of 25 percent of the cost of public facilities for cultural, exhibition, or civic purposes, if those facilities are located within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of urban renewal projects, and are found to contribute materially to the objectives of the urban renewal plan.

Under that provision of the bill, if the city of Hartford, Conn., and the city of New Haven, Conn., construct such facilities, then both New Haven and Hartford would receive grant-in-aid credits under that provision; is that correct?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. That is my understanding.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I have introduced in the Senate two bills. The first, S. 3232, would count 100 percent of the expenses incurred by the city of New Haven in building a coliseum convention center within urban renewal project R-2, as grant-in-aid toward the project even though the benefits of the center may extend beyond the project. The other bill, S. 3629, would count the expenses of Hartford in building a civic center-coliseum as a 100-percent credit allowance in the same way.

It is my understanding that the committee has accepted the provisions of my bill, S. 3629, as an amendment to the bill, thus including the city of Hartford for 100-percent credit; is that correct?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. That is correct. That is, we are taking it to conference. The Senator understands that the Senate conferees will press for the general legislation which the committee has written, and if we are unable to prevail with the House conferees on that point, then we will be in a fallback position to consider the specific projects the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I thank the Senator. Now, I understand the reason the city of New Haven was not included in the list of projects in the Senate bill is because the House bill covering the same provisions includes the city of New Haven. Is that correct?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. That is correct.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. So the Senate committee has been very careful to make sure that there is no duplication in the House and Senate bills. Any city in one bill does not appear in the other. The Senate bill covers a certain number of cities, and the House bill covers another list of cities?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The Senator has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. So therefore, there will be an equality of treatment of all cities when the Senate takes the bill to conference? All cities are subject to conference in the same way, on an equal basis.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The Senator may be sure of that.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I thank the Senator very much. Of course, it is my hope that in conference, the Senate can work out the provisions to see to it that both the city of Hartford and the city of New Haven receive a full credit of 100 percent to help them with these very worthwhile projects.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. We will do our best to protect the Senator's interests.

Mr. **STENNIS**. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. On page 34, beginning with line 19, strike out all through line 12, on page 36. Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. **STENNIS**. Madam President, I think this is a major matter. I know that there is quite a bit of interest in it.

This amendment proposes to strike bodily from the bill section 507, which section begins on page 34 of the Senate bill.

Madam President, may we have order? Will the Chair ask the attachés to please cease their conversation and moving about. I think this matter can be handled very quickly if we get down to the point.

Madam President, this provision, added in the bill, undertakes to cover a problem resulting from the closure of military bases. There were certain losses incurred on houses owned by military men and by civilian workers at those bases due to the closing. There has been agitation here, particularly for the last 18 months, concerning some kind of adjustment, with the Government to absorb all or at least a part of these losses.

We had the matter up for consideration last year, and some effort was made to settle the matter with legislation. However, the Appropriations Committee was not satisfied with the proof and denied the $10 million requested by, I believe, the Senator from Alabama, with which to start that program.

The committee asked for a further study by the Department of Defense. That further study was made in due course, and the matter came here in the form of a bill prepared by the Department of Defense whereby they undertook to prescribe a formula that would get at this problem and absorb at least a part of the losses.

The best estimate they had was that it would cost the Government—the final net cost—about $70 million to $78 million. That is a rather loose estimate.

That bill was called to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services. Speaking for myself, I said that any bill on the subject would have to carry the provision that the authorization would have to be made on a line item basis, like any other military construction matter, and that it would have to be paid for with appropriated funds from military sources.

That bill had already been introduced with that provision in it and had been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, that bill was not passed and is not before us now. Instead, we have section 507 in the pending bill.

I did not know anything about this until about noon today, and I am compelled to express great regret, even though we all admire our leaders, that it is necessary in the rush of things to bring up a colossal bill such as this in such a short time after the reports are made available. However, on short notice, and with the defense markup going on, we have assembled such facts as we could. Our best estimate is that the gross outlay because of this would be approximately $1 billion.

This is the material point. The language of the bill, as now written, that I proposed to strike out says that the Secretary shall make these payments. That is imperative, mandatory language.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **STENNIS**. I yield.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. Madam President, is not the important part that the Senator is now bringing out the fact that we discussed this matter several times over several years?

The bill, S. 3411, which the Senator looked over and which was originally signed and endorsed, provides that the Secretary of Defense is authorized, and section 9 says that the money must be appropriated, but that it can only be appropriated after the military construction appropriation is granted.

Mr. **STENNIS**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. Mr. President, section 507 appropriates money without any further authorization. Is that not the objection?

Mr. **STENNIS**. It makes it mandatory on the Department of Defense that they shall carry out the program. Of course, they would still have to seek appropriated funds.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. But no further authorization.

Mr. **STENNIS**. They would not have to seek any further authorization. The Senator is correct.

I wish to make one special point concerning the statement of the Senator. We have the rather rigid requirement with reference to all military construction and other military expenditures, most of them, that they first be authorized. Then, there has to be an appropriated sum of money. That is the routine that all of them go through, year after year. That includes houses.

We think that section 507 violates every major phase of the consideration of legislation of this kind that is voted on here both by the Appropriations Committee and by the Armed Services Committee.

Madam President, would Senators please have their conferences elsewhere? Someone is trying to explain a matter here. It is a distraction to me to have to face a conversation that is coming toward the speaker.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. **STENNIS**. These outlays are estimated to be approximately $1 billion. That amount of money would not all be lost because there would be a recovery on these buildings or dwellings, when they may be disposed of.

It is estimated that it will cost about $200 million a year to keep them up and to operate them. We do not know how many years that would involve. However, our best estimate is that the net cost of the taxpayers would be at least $300 million.

That is in the face of the fact that no hearings have been held by the Committee on Armed Services. It is in the face of the fact that we are holding up highly important military construction now, for which money has already been appropriated. This construction is being held up due to the scarcity of funds and the urgency of the situation in Vietnam.

The measure violates, in that way, what we think is a sound approach and the proper procedures to follow. We would rather have a program of a modest sort that never has been implemented with funds, not because we were not in sympathy with this program to a degree, but because there have not been any firm estimates given to us, or to anyone else, I submit, about what the program is going to cost. There has been no formula prescribed for finding some method of solving this problem.

We thought the bill that I referred to a moment ago had merit, subject to the provision that we must authorize the appropriated funds.

I hope it will be referred to this afternoon. This measure has this section which we think will save it, and, as far as we know, provide a fairly sound program, certainly sound enough to give the committee the chance to get into the matter, to weigh the need, and to decide how much money should be authorized and appropriated.

We are going to do our utmost to defeat this shotgun method of going at this vague and unknown problem in such a way as demanding, imperative legislation.

I am authorized, humbly, to speak for the members of the Committee on Appropriations that were present when we discussed this, and also for the members of the Committee on Armed Services that I was privileged to discuss it with.

The Senator from Massachusetts is here. He is fully familiar with all of the construction program and the method of dealing with it. He is familiar with the implications of section 507.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate except to say that, on the military construction bill this year, we very much limited the housing for our Armed Forces. There is a great limitation on construction.

This bill comes in and places a "shall" on what the Secretary of Defense shall do. That will involve a very large expense that will be of no benefit for our soldiers at this time for housing that they may need, particularly as the housing has been cut way back this year because of the war in Vietnam. So, when this bill comes in with a "shall," and the Secretary of Defense shall do these things, it leaves no discretion in the Secretary and it leaves the needs of the military very much in abeyance.

I hope, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction over the years, whose chairman has been the Senator from Mississippi, that this section will be eliminated or amended in such a way as to include the provisions of S. 3411.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Under the provision that we propose to strike out, there is no limit to the number of years that people could go back and claim that due to a base closing they lost some money. Under the bill, they would have just as much right for consideration as anyone else.

Some bases were closed in Mississippi 5, 6, or 7 years ago. I do not exactly know the time. Of course, they should not be included in a provision in this bill, and I would not propose that they be included. The purpose of the provision is to take care of the acuteness of a situation that developed in the last 10 or 18 months.

Another point I wish to make is that we do not know how far back to go. There is no limit whatsoever on the amount. According to a memorandum I have, they think it is so broad that it could apply to any house or any homeowner who has ever been employed at or assigned to an installation which was ordered to be closed. Think of that. It is unthinkable.

Many Members of the Senate are not here; but this matter is so important and we are so firm in our position on it, that I will insist on a rollcall. I feel an obligation to keep speaking on this matter until the Senators all come to the Chamber—at least the majority of them—so that they may hear and have an opportunity to understand what is really involved. It is my purpose to stay in the Chamber until this matter is explained to the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I should first like to say that I am also a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. STENNIS. And a good member.

Mr. TOWER. And I greatly respect the opinions and the fine leadership offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, and I am desirous of being cooperative.

Perhaps in our desire and our zeal to remedy a wrong, we were not as careful as we should have been; and I am confident that section 507 could be improved upon. It was certainly not our intent to make it an open-end affair, under which people from years back could come in. It was our intent that these houses would only be acquired in areas where the market was adversely affected by a base closing.

In large cities, of course, the closing of bases would not create any substantial effect, or perhaps even any perceptible effect, on the housing market. But in smaller towns, such as Waco, Tex., this creates quite an impact.

It is my understanding that the Department of Defense has made a study of this matter and that the bill introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, S. 3411, was a result of that study and remedied some of the objections that were made to the original proposal.

Mr. STENNIS. The bill that the Senator now refers to is the bill that a moment ago I said came from the Department of Defense during this calendar year and was an outgrowth of our handling of this matter last year. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. Under those circumstances, I am wondering whether the Senator from Mississippi would be amenable to my offering an amendment to his amendment: In addition to deleting 507 to add a new title to the bill, with that new title comprising the text of S. 3411.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator state more about what is in the text of S. 3411? I believe the Senate ought to know more about what is in it.

Mr. TOWER. S. 3411 provides for 90 percent reimbursement.

Mr. STENNIS. Ninety percent reimbursement of the losses?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. All right.

Mr. TOWER. And it tightens the administration of it considerably. It refers only to employees or military personnel who are stationed at the base at the time of the closing. Beyond that, it is not mandatory on the Secretary, but simply authorizes him to use his own judgment in coming in and asking for funds that he may feel are required.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition to the points that the Senator has mentioned, as I understand, that bill has other phases of a formula that pertain to the application of this principle.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. Section 9 provides:

> No funds may be appropriated for the acquisition of any property under authority of this Act unless such funds have been specifically authorized for such purpose in an annual Military Construction Authorization Act.

So this gives us an opportunity, in the Military Construction Committee, to look at this matter annually and to pass judgment on it.

Mr. STENNIS. That would require an express authorization and also an appropriation for that purpose, and that is the formula that the committee uses now with reference to other military construction.

I believe that under the circumstances a problem is presented. I have never tried to defeat the overall problem without some kind of consideration being given to people who have sustained unusual losses, who were there at the time—although I do not favor going too far on it—due to the closure of a base.

We will have some program along that line. I understand that this is a fairly well thought out and planned bill which the Senator has in his hand and proposes to offer. I wish that hearings had been held on the matter, but there have not been any.

I wish to make clear, also, that as far as the Senator from Mississippi is concerned, he would have to reserve all his rights to scrutinize any requests for authorizations as well as appropriations that might come up if this bill should become law. And I believe that would be the attitude of all the other members of the committee with whom I have had an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Mississippi may include the Senator from Texas in that statement, too.

Mr. STENNIS. That makes it almost unanimous. And that would be the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TOWER. Of course, under section 9 of S. 3411, if we incorporate it as title VII of this pending housing bill, then we would have the scrutiny by the Committee on Armed Services and by the Committee on Appropriations, because it would go through the regular route of authorization and appropriation on an annual basis. This would give us a chance to look at it, to accept it or reject it, as we see necessary, annually.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to the Senator from Texas that I believe that this bill is a big improvement over what is suggested in section 507.

This bill, as I see it, gives the Secretary of Defense authorization to acquire title; but in doing so, the funds have to be appropriated on an annual basis. This bill sets up a capital fund for this specific purpose, and that, of course, would last for only 1 year, the houses bought that year.

I call attention to section 5 of S. 3411, which creates a problem of taxation for the State or a political subdivision. As the Senator from Texas well knows, if the property is outside the Federal reservation, it is subject to taxes. So if S. 3411 should become law, we would be creating another instance in which a State or a locality must work out what would be a proper sum for the Secretary of Defense, and all that goes with it.

It is not a simple problem, and I hope that it will be worked out very carefully. Certainly, this is a big improvement over what was going to be done.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his comment.

I should like to observe that if we carry through with this legislation, it would carry out a principle that we have recognized in other cases—that sometimes the Federal Government, by its actions, inflicts hardship on communities or individuals in situations over which the communities or the individuals have no control.

For example, impacted area aid is a well-established principle where a Federal installation has moved in and overburdened the school system of a local community.

We provide them with direct aid, no strings attached, because of the additional burden that is placed on the community by the presence of a Federal establishment.

I respect the view of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I hope that my distinguished friend from Mississippi would allow me to amend his amendment to include as title VII the text of S. 3411.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would be happy to have the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] comment on this. I understand the bill that he has in his hand is S. 3411.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Which has not had a hearing.

Mr. TOWER. But it is the result of a study by the Department of Defense.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is another example of what the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was talking about a few moments ago, because this afternoon at a markup in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee we discussed this item in some detail.

I would like to inquire if it would not be better—and I can see many loopholes in section 507, as now written—to defer this matter rather than put the language of S. 3411, in the bill.

Would it not be better to defer this matter until it can be reported by the appropriate committee and hearings held on this specific item?

I am loath to vote for it. I am sympathetic to the problem. Everyone has the problem in his State to a greater or lesser extent. Would it not be better to pass this subject by and let the committee come up with a bill after hearings?

I am loath to vote for it. I would not say that I would not vote, but I am loath to do so, without having a hearing.

I am aware of the Department of Defense. The more I see of them the more I am inclined to look at what they do with a critical eye and scrutinize carefully what they do.

For that reason I would like to see this taken out of the bill for the time being, have the committee proceed on the other bill, and have hearings.

Mr. TOWER. I would be remiss in my responsibility to the committee if I did not try to secure action on this item. The committee felt strongly about this.

It is the product of a number of cases of hardship of people who have this problem who communicated with us. There were no formal hearings. The hardships speak so strongly, by virtue of complaints and cries for help that we have gotten from individuals and people who tried to dispose of their houses, that we felt compelled to act. I would be remiss in my responsibility if I did not press for action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] that it is my understanding that the House has not passed any bill and this bill will go to the House; so on the record we make this afternoon the House could give this matter, under the amendment suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], a hearing and an opportunity to work out proper language. It is not only a question of going to committee. The House will consider the entire subject.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. My information is that the House has written a bill and they have a provision similar to section 507 that I propose to strike from this bill. Is that correct? They have not passed the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand the House committee reported a bill.

Mr. TOWER. But it has not been passed.

Mr. STENNIS. But it has a provision similar to the one we proposed to take out.

In response to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] this is my best judgment. We have not had before our committee the bill that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is proposing, but it was brought to me earlier in the year and our valued clerk on the committee went over it with a great deal of scrutiny. I am not enthusiastic about the program, although I recognize that something in a modest way should be done. We wrote a proviso that would have to be in it, in our view, or otherwise we would oppose it. The version of the bill that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] offered has that proviso in it.

The Department of Defense made a considerable study. They went into the matter last year. We reviewed it in the Appropriations Committee. They went back and they made a study again. They drafted this bill and they appeared and testified on it. I have in my hand a long letter from Mr. Vance, which is addressed to the Speaker of the House. This is a copy of his letter that sets out the plan.

To that extent, it is fairly firm, and in my opinion it is generally about as good a program as we can get along this line.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] had something further to add.

Mr. ALLOTT. The assurance and judgment of the Senator is always good in these matters. With the assurance of the Senator, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. STENNIS. I underscore an added safeguard; that any money spent under it will have to be specifically authorized by the Armed Services Committee and especially appropriated by the Appropriations Committee.

Madam President, I will suspend until we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield, but first I wish to make one further point.

With those safeguards, I think it is about as sound a bill as we can get, but we are going to have a problem perhaps when it comes back from the conference. We will be here with the same argument and insistence so far as anything that may come back akin to section 507. Will the Senator from Texas support us on that?

Mr. TOWER. I will insist with all of the vigor and power of persuasion that I have in the conference that the Senate version be accepted verbatim. I will inform the gentlemen from the House that subsection 507 as presently written is not acceptable to the Armed Services Committee of this body and perhaps is not acceptable to the Armed Services Committee of the other body.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. Therefore, I can assure the Senator from Mississippi that I will, for my part—and I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] will also because we have discussed this matter—insist on retaining the Senate version.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I wish to make one additional point for the benefit of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. Actually, nothing can be done in the way of expenditure until the Committee on Armed Services holds hearings and authorizes an expenditure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have that assurance from the Senator from Texas, because when he puts his skill and intellect into the problem, I am confident it will come out right.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Massachusetts is very kind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to read a paragraph from page 24 of the report of the committee on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966. The paragraph disturbed me, and I feel confident that it disturbed other Senators as well:

> In order to be assured that the DOD will not delay further in acquiring properties in appropriate cases, the committee has included in section 507 an amendment to section 108(a) which will change the provision "authorizing" the DOD to acquire title to a requirement that the DOD "shall, upon application and in accordance with the provisions of this section" acquire such title.

That statement goes very far.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Yes; it does go far. I concede that it does. We are backing down now from that adamant position and accepting one of authorization, so that not one dime will be authorized until the Committee on Armed Services has acted to authorize an expenditure. The Committee on Armed Services can hold hearings, and the Committee on Appropriations can hold hearings.

The act could never become effective if the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations did not choose to implement it. Therefore, I believe the bill is perfectly safe. I am hopeful that this proposal will mitigate any opposition to this provision.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. To clarify the parliamentary situation, would it not be possible, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to strike out section 507 should prevail, for the Senator from Texas to offer his amendment to the Senate bill, title X, or whatever it is? Certainly it will not have any opposition from the Senator from Mississippi. I shall vote for it under the circumstances.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, with that assurance, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi and then offer as a separate amendment the language of S. 3411.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, under those circumstances, I present my amendment without asking for a rollcall.

May we vote by division? I wish to be certain that we get the sentiment of the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I move to amend the bill by adding title VII with the language contained in S. 3411 and ask unanimous consent that if the measure is adopted, the Secretary of the Senate be given permission to make the necessary technical corrections in the sections and the headings.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

TITLE VII

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire title to, hold, manage and dispose of, or, in lieu thereof, to reimburse for certain losses upon private sale of, or foreclosure against, any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling, which is situated at or near a military base or installation which the Department of Defense has, subsequent to November 1, 1964, ordered to be closed in whole or in part, if he determines—

(a) that the owner of such property is, or has been, a Federal employee employed at or in connection with such base or installation (other than a temporary employee serving under a time limitation) or a serviceman assigned thereto; and

(b) that the closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, has required or will require the termination of such owner's employment or service at or in connection with such base or installation; and

(c) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions.

SEC. 2. In order to be eligible for the benefits of this Act such employees or military personnel must be or have been—

(a) Assigned to or employed at or in connection with the installation or activity at the time of public announcement of the closure action, or

(b) Transferred from such installation or activity, or terminated as employees as a result of reduction-in-force within six months prior to public announcement of the closure action, or

(c) Transferred from the installation or activity on an overseas tour unaccompanied by dependents within fifteen months prior to public announcement of the closure action: *Provided,* That, at the time of public announcement of the closure action, or at the time of transfer or termination as set forth above, such personnel or employees must have:

(i) Been the owner-occupant of the dwelling, or

(ii) Have vacated the owned dwelling as a result of being ordered into on-post housing during a six-month period prior to the closure announcement:

Provided further, That as a consequence of such closure such employees or personnel must be:

(i) Required to relocate because of military transfer or acceptance of employment beyond a normal commuting distance from the dwelling for which compensation is sought, or

(ii) Not unemployed as a matter of personal choice, and able to demonstrate such financial hardship that they are unable to meet their mortgage payments and related expenses.

SEC. 3. Such persons as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be eligible under the criteria set forth above shall elect to receive either a cash payment as partial compensation for losses which may be sustained in a private sale, not to exceed 5 per centum of the fair market value of their property prior to public announcement of intention to close all or part of the military base or installation, or to receive, as purchase price for their property, an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of prior fair market value as such value is determined by the Secretary of Defense, or the amount of the outstanding mortgages, or such lesser amount as the Secretary of Defense determines prior to that election to be reasonable. In the event of foreclosure by mortgagees commenced prior to the one hundred and twentieth day after enactment hereof, the Secretary may pay or reimburse for direct costs of foreclosure, including deficiency judgments, if any, as may be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 4. There shall be in the Treasury a fund which shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of extending the financial assistance provided above. The capital of such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and shall consist also of receipts from the management, rental, or sale of properties acquired under this Act, which receipt shall be credited to the fund and shall be available, together with funds appropriated therefor, for purchase or reimbursement purposes as provided above, as well as to defray expenses arising in connection with the acquisition, management, and disposal of such properties, including payment of principal, interest, and expenses of mortgages or other indebtedness thereon, and including the cost of staff services and contract services, costs of insurance and other indemnity. Any part of such receipts not required for such expenses shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Properties acquired under this Act shall be conveyed to, and acquired in the name of, the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall have the power to deal with, rent, renovate, and dispose of, whether by sales for cash or credit or otherwise, any properties so acquired: *Provided, however,* That no contact for acquisition, or acquisition, shall be deemed to constitute a contract for or acquisition of family housing units in support of military installations or activities within the meaning of section 1594i of title 42, United States Code, nor shall it be deemed a transaction within the contemplation of section 2662 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 5. Payments from the fund created by this Act may be made in lieu of taxes to any State and/or political subdivision thereof, with respect to real property, including improvements thereon, acquired and held under this Act. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall not exceed the taxes which would be paid to the State and/or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation, and shall reflect such allowance as may be considered appropriate for expenditures, if any, by the Government for streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property.

SEC. 6. The title to any property acquired under this Act, the eligibility for, and the amounts of, cash payable, and the administration of sections 1 to 5 of this Act shall conform to such requirements, and shall be administered under such conditions and regulations, as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. Such regulations shall also prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made and instruments accepted under this Act, and all the determinations and decisions made pursuant to such regulations by the Secretary of Defense regarding such payments and conveyances and the terms and conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into such agreement with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as may be appropriate for the purposes of economy and efficiency of administration of this Act. Such agreement may provide authority to the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, and his designee, to make any or all of the determinations and take any or all of the actions which the Secretary of Defense is authorized to undertake pursuant to sections 1–6 of the Act. Any such determinations shall be entitled to finality to the same extent as if made by the Secretary of Defense, and, in event the Secretaries of Defense and Housing and Urban Development so elect, the fund established pursuant to section 4 of this Act shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out the purposes thereof.

SEC. 8. Section 223(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by inserting in lieu of paragraph (8) thereof, a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Government of any housing acquired pursuant to Public Law ——, Eighty-ninth Congress."

SEC. 9. No funds may be appropriated for the acquisition of any property under authority of this Act unless such funds have been specifically authorized for such purpose in an annual military construction authorization Act, and no moneys in the fund created pursuant to section 4 of this Act may be expended for any such purpose unless specifically authorized in an annual military construction authorization Act.

SEC. 10. Section 108 of the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965" (79 Stat. 460) is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will be given the authority to make the necessary technical corrections, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I see the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], is now in the Chamber, as well as the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and if they will permit me, I should like to ask them a question or two about one section of the bill; namely, section 502.

According to page 38 of the report, section 502 would amend certain sections to clarify use of the public housing flexible formula for the leasing of housing to be constructed, as well as for the leasing or acquisition of existing housing.

Dr. Weaver appeared before the Independent Offices Subcommittee this year, justifying the expenditure of money under the present provision of the law which it is sought now to expand.

Among other things, total expenditures for this year came to $1,700,000 and some odd, and averaged $754 per unit per year in fiscal year 1966.

What concerns me about this situation is the item on housing to be constructed. Dr. Weaver testified before our committee that this was used because in the case of large families where they had to have three, four, five, or even more bedrooms, they could not afford to construct housing for such large families. Therefore, under this section, they went in and leased these old houses, refurbished them, and then sublet them; and, of course, they pay a subsidy in the rent differential. Of course, I do not have to explain that situation here, but why, may I ask, do we consider putting construction in this bill when the testimony of the Secretary has been that the program is applicable only to a leasing program, and that they cannot afford to construct housing for families needing such a large number of bedrooms?

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I have been discussing this matter with the distinguished Senator from Maine. I understand there is some question in his mind with respect to the answers to the questions I have raised. The answers are not readily available. He will try to get the answers overnight, and I will yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I think that is an excellent procedure to follow.

As far as the committee is concerned, it is the committee's impression from the testimony by Dr. Weaver that houses built by private builders and then sold to the Federal Housing Authority could be built more cheaply. Thus, the agency sought to get the authority which is in the bill in the section to which the Senator has referred.

I think it would be well to refer the Senator to page 41 of the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, so the Senator may examine Dr. Weaver's testimony before our committee. That reference may be helpful to him.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be glad to do so, and also examine the testimony before the other committee.

Mr. MONDALE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Madam President, I had intended to submit four amendments to S. 3711, the proposed housing and urban development amendments, to improve housing programs in rural areas.

Although two-thirds of Americans now live in cities or suburbs, we cannot turn our backs on those who choose to live in rural America. Yet statistics paint an unfortunate picture of inadequate efforts on our part. Rural areas may have just 30 percent of the people, but nearly half the Nation's substandard housing is in our small towns, villages, and farms. Forty-seven percent of our poverty is among those in communities of less than 2,500 people. And most of our rural communities lack the basic public and social services available to the average urban resident.

To provide these services is a matter of basic justice. But it is also a matter of our own best interests. Our national welfare demands that rural areas be able to attract and hold people. For every day our newspapers tell us of the problems of crowded cities, filled increasingly with rural migrants who are unprepared for urban life, and which the cities are equally unready to absorb. And hard experience tells us that when a man moves from an impoverished rural area, he is all too likely to settle in an urban slum.

So it is in everyone's interest to bring new vitality to rural America. The Senate has already passed the Community Development District Act, which will provide a comprehensive basis for rural development planning. And we have long had a rural housing program, carried out by the Farmers Home Administration.

According to the 1960 housing figures, more than half the rural families with incomes under $3,000 were living in dilapidated housing. But despite this clear concentration of housing need, in the past 30 years about 12 million homes in urban areas have been constructed with FHA or VA financing, while only about 300,000 farm homes have been built with Federal assistance, a ratio of 5 farm homes for every 200 city homes.

This is not so much due to discrimination against the farmer, but as Mr. Edwin Christianson, the fine president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, pointed out, to the difficulty of finding a credit or assistance program which will fit the situation farmers face. Farmers have low and fluctuating incomes, making it extremely difficult for them to make monthly payments on a regular basis on home loans. They are, in almost every case, already burdened with sizable debt loads, and are understandably reluctant to take on additional mortgages and obligations. In fact, they customarily borrow and incur debt loads to meet current operating expenses. So I think it is particularly necessary and important that we remove arbitrary limitations on the availability and suitability of these housing programs to the needs of farmers and rural residents.

Certainly the most important thing we can do for rural residents is to provide strong commodity programs to bring the farmer a decent income. On this depends the hope of all rural residents. But it is also vital to build on this fundamental economic base by providing parity of treatment in housing programs, as in all areas of American life.

The amendments will do just that. They are amendments which have been accepted by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and I believe constitute a modest but very important step toward improving these programs.

The first amendment will permit the purchase of newly constructed homes, which have never previously been occupied. Present law provides that title V farm housing loans are available only to finance the purchase of previously occupied dwellings and farm service buildings. But this restriction is an impediment toward carrying out a decent rural housing program, since many families are more interested in buying new buildings more suitable to their needs. This change would also encourage homebuilders to build a number of new dwellings at more or less the same time, rather than being limited to building one at a time in widely scattered areas and times.

The second amendment permits the Secretary of Agriculture to accept a comaker in the case of any applicant for a rural housing loan under title V who is deficient in repayment ability. The present law permits comakers only in the case of loans made to the elderly farmer. This additional authority is needed because it will improve the flexibility of the program. Many young farmers and young rural people do not have what is considered to be adequate repayment ability, but their parents or other relatives may, and there is no need to limit the ability of young people to get adequate housing. It is most important for us to retain young people who are interested in farming on the farm, and this will be most helpful in doing so. It will not impair or jeopardize the security of the loan, since the comaker will be ultimately responsible for repayment.

The third amendment will increase the maximum amount of a loan, grant, or combination of the two for repairs and improvements to farm dwellings when necessary to make them safe or sanitary. It will increase the present $1,000 limitation to $1,500. This is necessary because building costs have gone up since 1962, when the $1,000 limitation was put into the law. In addition, this will bring the limit up to the level authorized for rehabilitation grants for urban housing under section 106 of the Housing Act of 1965.

The fourth amendment permits loans to be made to private nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide rental housing for low-income rural residents under 62 years of age. The present law is limited to rental housing only for elderly persons. But, as the House committee points out, there are many persons under 62 in rural America with low incomes whose housing needs can best be met by economic reconstructed rental housing operating on a nonprofit basis. Some are young families who are trying to become established and have not reached the level of maximum earning. Others have passed their earning peak but are not 62 years of age. And there are in addition others who may for one reason or another have a personal preference for rental housing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of the amendments.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. Mondale to S. 3711:

Add new title VII, Rural Housing Amendments:

Sec. 701. Amend Section 501(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by striking out "previously occupied" wherever it appears.

Sec. 702. Amend Section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by striking out "In cases of applicants who are elderly persons, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The".

Sec. 703. Amend Section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949 by striking out "$1,000 and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500".

Sec. 704. Amend Section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by inserting after "income" the following language: "or other persons and families of low income".

Amend Section 515(d)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 by striking out "elderly persons or elderly families" and inserting in lieu thereof "occupants eligible under this section;"

Mr. MONDALE. Madam President, in light of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee is necessarily absent at this time, we have determined to take this matter to conference without including it in the Senate version. I hope the Senate conferees will concur in the House version, because I believe these provisions are all needed and are important as tools to try to meet the serious problem of inadequate housing in rural America.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I have studied these amendments. I think they have considerable merit. I have not had an opportunity to discuss them with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who is unavoidably absent this afternoon. For that reason, and because the amendments are in the House version of the bill, I accept the procedure suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, and I think he will get sympathetic consideration by the conferees.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Some time earlier today I had a dialog with the Senator from Alabama with respect to the special situations, involving local grant-in-aid credits for urban renewal projects which have been included in the House bill, but not in the Senate bill. I referred to the wisdom of considering an expansion to the district rule presently in effect of one-quarter of a mile. I refer specifically to section 112(a)(3) and the following specific language:

> The aggregate expenditures made by any such institution or hospital (directly or through a private redevelopment corporation or municipal or other public corporation) for the acquisition within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of the project area, of land, buildings, and structures to be redeveloped or rehabilitated by such institution for educational uses or by such hosiptal for hospital uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan (or with a development plan proposed by such institution, hospital, or corporation, found acceptable by the Administrator after considering the standards specified in section 110(b),

Under the administrative ruling, "adjacent to" is considered to be one-quarter of a mile.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would like to refer to the particular situation in Cambridge, where MIT and Cambridge urban renewal are working closely together. As I demonstrate on this map before me, the urban renewal project lies adjacent to MIT, and under the administrative interpretation, improvements by MIT within one-quarter of a mile of the urban renewal project will be covered.

I call attention to the fact that there are other improvements as well which are needed in the area, which is an area which certainly needs improvement, and which in many instances is one of blight, which will not be covered, singly and arbitrarily because the improvement is more than 440 yards from the renewal project.

The thrust of the legislation I am interested in would permit administrative rulings of eligibility to cover improvements beyond the one-quarter of a mile, up to 1 mile in this particular instance.

I understand, after talking with counsel, that this amendment would open up very broad-range questions; that there would be other universities, such as in Chicago and in Pennsylvania, which would be involved and that such a new rule might go too far. However, I understand there was special legislation which permitted the University of Pennsylvania last year to extend the area up to a mile.

In any event, it would seem to me much more sensible for the administration to look not just at distance, but also as to whether or not the improvements outside the eligible area relate to the improvements within the eligible area, such that they would logically be encompassed by the intent of section 112, then such improvements should be eligible.

I hope the distinguished chairman will recognize this problem and its application to many urban areas in the country. I hope this matter may be considered sympathetically by the Senate conferees in conference when it considers the special bill which is in the House version which deals with the Cambridge project.

I raise this point, because it is important, and I wanted it to be fully recognized before the conference.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for bringing this problem to my attention.

Examination of the plan which he has spread on the desk indicates the basis for the Senator's concern, and I think suggests the merit of his position.

As the Senator has said, what is involved here is an administration regulation. The state of the law is such that I think the administrator of the law could very well encompass projects of this kind.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that in order to have a clear definition, the administrator has ruled that one-quarter of a mile is the limit. I understand it is difficult to change the rule, and the administrator, in situations of this kind, says, "This has been approved by Congress."

I have been seeking to establish from members of the committee the legislative intent behind section 112 in order to demonstrate that Congress did not intend that eligible improvements be limited merely to 440 yards from renewal projects.

Mr. MUSKIE. It seems to me that consideration could be given by the administrator as to whether or not these improvements within the eligible area are related to the improvements immediately outside the eligible area, and if the relationship could be established that would not do violence to a broader consideration of the law, that could be considered.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished manager of the bill that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has a very significant and important amendment, one that is worthy of consideration. I should like to suggest to the manager of the bill that the Senator from New York be recognized to offer his amendment, and that it be made the pending business, so that it would give time to ponder the amendment which he is about to offer.

Mr. MUSKIE. I fully concur.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I call up my amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that the amendment be printed, and that I be permitted to make at this time a brief explanation of its provisions.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 741

On page 36, line 14, after "508," insert "(a)".

On page 36, after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) Section 401(d) if such Act is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(d)', and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

" '(2) In addition to the total authorization provided by paragraph (1), the Secretary may issue and have outstanding at any one time water or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $300,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1967 and 1968: *Provided,* That such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum: *Provided further,* That funds obtained as a result of Treasury borrowing authorized by the paragraph shall be loaned to educational institutions only at a rate of interest which is equal to one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury or provided in the preceding proviso.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, this amendment proposes to make available $300 million in lending authority for so-called college housing loans, but upon terms different from those now contained in the law, to wit, standard terms rather than the guaranteed 3 percent interest which is now provided—standard terms being one-quarter of 1 percent added to the going rate, the classic Treasury definition of what is their average for all their outstanding indebtedness and the going rate for money.

Madam President, I offer this amendment because, due to applications by colleges in my State—and I know that this is true of colleges all across the Nation—we find that HUD's ability to make loans, is completely frustrated notwithstanding the terrible crisis in higher education, to deal with college housing has run out.

I have a letter from the Department of Housing and Urban Development which gives these facts; and I can say, Madam President, that they are most alarming.

The pertinent paragraphs of the letter are as follows:

> Requests for college housing loans far exceed available funds. This fund shortage became serious in fiscal year 1965 when $192 million in applications could not be funded. The first 7 months of the current year produced an additional $568 million in new applications.
>
> Faced with applications totaling $760 million—against a budget level of $300 million—and the prospect that this amount would increase to more than $1,100 million by June 30, 1966, the receipt of applications was suspended effective January 31, 1966. At the same time, measures were announced to provide for equitable distribution of available funds while retaining the viability of most projects. These measures provided for a maximum loan of $4 million per campus per year, of which not more than $500,000 could be for service facilities under the sublimitation of the act.
>
> The program level for college housing loans can meet only part of even the most urgent demand. The college housing program levels, of course, are established in the light of the total budgetary situation, requiring difficult decisions with respect to the allocation of the Nation's resources in these troubled times. In these circumstances, the budget for fiscal year 1967 provides $300 million in support of the college housing program. Since the need for college housing continues to peak, however, the funds available will support a progressively smaller percentage of the need for such housing.

Madam President, the reason why this is a budget item is that there is an arbitrary rate of interest, to wit 3 percent, and that requires some expenditure on the part of the Government. Therefore, I have provided in my amendment that an additional $300 million per year be made available, provided that it is at a going rate rather than the 3-percent rate. The going rate will be considerably higher.

Madam President, I have no guarantee and the manager of the bill would have no guarantee as to whether such funds could actually be used by many colleges. But at least we would be making available an opportunity to those colleges to use them, though at a higher rate of interest, if the amendment is adopted in this form in conference.

But what is much more important to me, Madam President, is that I think many Senators are being oppressed by this situation in the same way that I am, in that we are very anxious to encourage higher education, and there is a built-in limitation as to what can be accomplished in that regard in terms of college housing, with a tremendously unsatisfied demand and a very legitimate demand.

The matter first came to my attention in connection with an application of D'Youville College, at Buffalo, N.Y., which was seeking funds for construction of a residence hall in an enormous community project. They could not even get their application on file, let alone get any serious consideration of it, because of the moratorium on applications due to lack of available funds.

Madam President, this problem is a very big and very real one, and is aggravated by the fact that there is now no money whatever for 1966, because they have completely loaned out the available funds; and though they were included in the bill for participation sales, the President has not yet given them any authority to make any sales, and though they have $200 million in a revolving fund, from refunds from loans they have made, that is tied up by the Budget Bureau and not allocated, or perhaps allocated to something else.

What I have in mind, therefore, Madam President, is at least to seize the conferees of the problem, which is a very serious and real problem, not only for my State but for many other States, in the hope that, without a budgetary impact—that is why I made the provision that the 3-percent guarantee not apply—they might be able to find some way of giving some element of relief. That is the reason that I developed the amendment this way, and the basis upon which I am proposing it is not with any thought that it would necessarily have to go this way, but with the thought that at least the conference would be seized of a situation which represents a very, very serious problem to an element of the country we are trying to encourage and help, to wit, the higher educational institutions of the country.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a point of information?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I yield.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. As I understand it, the Senator is suggesting that we add $300 million for 3 years to the $300 million per year for 2 years now provided?

Mr. **JAVITS**. No, it is 2 years now because the Participation Sales Act skipped 1966 and made it 1967 and 1968.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I am making it for 1966, 1967, and 1968, but at standard terms rather than special terms.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Roughly, it would be 4½ percent?

Mr. **JAVITS**. That is correct. But it is still better than many of these State dormitory authorities, which are charging as high as 6 percent because of the tightness of money.

Again I say, as the Senator knows, we are all in the same problem, people like myself; we are preoccupied with dozens of things, and hence we have got to expect that all we can accomplish with an amendment like this is at least to seize the conferees of the problem. I am sure they are just as interested in solving it as I am.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I think it is an excellent idea, but I should like to know, how would the Senator suggest that we discriminate with the 3-percent money that is available now, and then the 4.5-percent money that is to be made available?

Mr. **JAVITS**. The 3-percent money has run out. It is a question of choice by the individual university. The money has run out. In other words, what they will do is to grant all the applications they can on a reasonable ground rule—perhaps time of filing, or perhaps whether the money will be acceptable at a higher interest rate, or whether a particular institution can afford to pay a higher interest rate.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The Senator suggests a first come, first served basis?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I do not see how we can help it. The money has run out. Because we are incapable of finding a way out of this kind of a dilemma, shall we hold up these educational institutions for years? I think that is the question we face.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. This is a major amendment the Senator suggests.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Oh, yes.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I think it is desirable that we discuss it at length later.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Moss in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to convening at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow be rescinded, and that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted to meet tomorrow until the hour of 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, that presents something of a problem to me, because I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is marking up a very important bill, and it is my amendment that is pending.

I do not want to stand in the way of progress. If the Senator will assure me that I will be protected until 12 o'clock by allowing some other amendment or action to intervene, I will be perfectly happy.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. That will be satisfactory.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 12, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 11, 1966:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Crawford Young, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved 1 March 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

Lt. Col. Frank C. Boerger, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved 1 March 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 11, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Randall M. Falk, the Temple, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee: Only to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.—Micah 6: 8.

In a world of crisis and confusion, draw us ever closer unto Thee, eternal and ever-living God, that we may heed the challenge of Thy prophet, serving as coworkers in the building of Thy kingdom on earth.

Make us sensitive to the needs of all Thy children who yearn for insight into life's holy purpose, in an ordered universe founded on the moral law which undergirds our aspirations for freedom and for peace.

Bless the President and the elected representatives of this great Nation; sustain the leaders of all the peoples of the world, with integrity for their appointed tasks, with courage to pursue righteousness, and with the vision of a more hopeful universe which has embraced the power of Thy creative energy for the enoblement of man and of mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 8, 1966, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12031. An act to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Forth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; and

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September 1966 as "International Literacy Day."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14921) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL OF GEORGIA, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today. I have been advised that the request has been cleared with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, OFFICES, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and Bow.

CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH THE EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11671) to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and" and insert "for".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2056 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO THE EFFECT OF DISCLAIMERS ON THE ALLOWANCE OF THE MARITAL DEDUCTION FOR ESTATE TAX PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of H.R. 483 is to allow an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will to qualify for the estate tax marital deduction, where certain conditions are met. Under present law, the marital deduction, in general, permits the deduction of up to half of the adjusted gross estate for property passing to a surviving spouse. For an interest in property which has been disclaimed to be eligible for the marital deduction under this bill, the beneficiary involved must disclaim all bequests and devises to him under the will. Also, the disclaimer must be made within 6 months after the decedent's will is admitted to probate and before the beneficiary accepts any bequest or devise under the will. The amount which may qualify as a marital deduction as the result of a disclaimer—when added to other amounts received by the surviving spouse—is limited to the greater of, first, the marital deductions which would be allowable without regard to the disclaimer if the spouse elected to take against the will under State law; second, one-third of the decedent's adjusted gross estate.

The bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., would apply to estates of decedents for which the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return occurs on or after January 1, 1965—that is, decedents dying on or after October 1, 1963.

The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 483, which was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee. This bill makes needed changes in our estate tax laws to remove discriminatory consequences that presently result when property passes to a surviving spouse through disclaimer of a beneficiary rather than under the terms of the decedent's will.

Under the estate tax law, a marital deduction is provided for property passing to the surviving spouse, either by the terms of a will or under the State law of descent and distribution. However, the deduction cannot exceed 50 percent of the gross estate. If property passes directly to a surviving spouse under the decedent's will, the amount will qualify for the marital deduction. If the surviving spouse elects to receive his or her share under the intestacy laws rather than under the will, the marital deduction applies to the amount passing to the wife pursuant to the election. However, if the property passes to a beneficiary who disclaims the property in favor of the wife, the marital deduction is inapplicable.

The committee's bill attempts to partly equalize the tax rules applicable in these various situations. In order to insure that the benefits will apply to a genuine disclaimer, the committee's bill imposes three conditions:

First. The disclaimer must be made before any of the property is accepted.

Second. The disclaimer must be made within 6 months from the date the will is admitted to probate.

Third. The disclaimer must be with respect to all bequests and devises to the beneficiary under the law.

The amount of the marital deduction available as a result of the disclaimer is patterned after the amount a spouse is generally permitted to elect against the will.

In any of these cases, the property is available to the wife for her use and support, and the tax laws should address themselves to the substance rather than the form of the transaction. This bill will more nearly equalize for estate tax purposes the effect of a specific bequest to a surviving spouse, or a taking by law or intestacy, and a taking by disclaimer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 483

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2056(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disclaimers and allowances of marital deduction for estate tax purposes) is amended by striking out "not to the surviving spouse, but to the person who made the disclaimer" and inserting in lieu thereof "from the decedent to his surviving spouse".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying after January 1, 1964.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) section 2056(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the treatment of disclaimers in computing the marital deduction for estate tax purposes) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) BY ANY OTHER PERSON.—If under this section an interest would, in the absence of a disclaimer by any person other than the surviving spouse, be considered as passing from the decedent to such person, and if a disclaimer of such interest is made by such person and as a result of such disclaimer the surviving spouse is entitled to receive such interest, then—

"'(A) Except to the extent that subparagraph (B) applies, such interest shall, for purposes of this section, be considered as passing, not to the surviving spouse, but to the person who made the disclaimer, in the same manner as if the disclaimer had not been made.

"'(B) If the interest disclaimed was bequeathed or devised to such person, and before the expiration of 6 months after the admission of the decedent's will to probate such person disclaimed all bequests and devises in his favor under such will and did not accept any property under any such bequest or devise before making the disclaimer, such interest passing to the surviving spouse by reason of such disclaimer shall, for purposes of this section, be considered as passing from the decedent to such spouse. The amount of the deductions allowable under this section by reason of this subparagraph, when added to the amount of the deductions allowable under this section without regard to this subparagraph, shall not exceed the greater of (i) the amount of the deductions which would be allowable under this section without regard to such disclaimer if the surviving spouse elected to take against the will, or (ii) an amount equal to one-third of the adjusted gross estate (within the meaning of subsection (c)(2)).'

"(b) The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable to estates of decedents for which the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing) occurs on or after January 1, 1965."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MRS. EDWARD EUGENE COX

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad responsibility to report to the House of Representatives the death of the widow of one of the great Members of this body.

Mrs. Edward Eugene Cox, whose husband represented the Second District of Georgia for 27 years, died Tuesday, August 9, 1966, in Davenport, Iowa, while visiting her daughter, Mrs. Roland B. Anderson, whose husband is commanding general of the Army Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill.

Mrs. Cox was a grand and gracious lady. Many of our senior Members, including the distinguished Speaker—I might say, especially including the distinguished Speaker—have enjoyed reminiscing with me of other days and speaking fondly of the inimitable Gene Cox and his charming wife.

I had the highest regard for "Miss Grace." This is an old southern way of speaking, Mr. Speaker, that carries with it great respect and affection. You might say we apply it as a title. Everyone who knew her felt the same devotion.

This gracious lady was especially kind to me prior to and after my election to this body. I know my colleagues who were fortunate to know her receive this news as you and I do, Mr. Speaker; that is, with heavy hearts.

In addition to Mrs. Anderson, she is survived by another daughter, Mrs. Elliott Dunwoody, of Macon, Ga.; a sister, Mrs. Ruby Smith, of Sylvester, Ga.; and a brother, Douglas Pitts, of Greer, S.C.

Funeral services will be held in Camilla, Ga., tomorrow, August 12.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I, too, wish to express my deep sorrow on the death of "Miss Grace." I knew her well. She was a beloved individual.

It was my privilege to serve with her distinguished husband, the Honorable Eugene Cox, who represented the Second Georgia District so long and so ably.

I grew up in southwest Georgia and "Miss Grace" lived in Sylvester, the same town that I did. Her sister still resides there. I have known the family intimately and well all these years and I have been privileged and honored to share their friendship.

It is a sad occasion to realize that she has left us. My sympathy and that of my family is extended to all the family.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I am glad to yield to my distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very sorry—exceedingly sorry—as was Mrs. McCormack, when we learned of the death of Mrs. Cox.

Gene Cox and Mrs. Cox were close and valued friends of Mrs. McCormack and of myself for many years.

Gene Cox was one of the outstanding Members of the Congress, and served with great distinction in this body for many years. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever met. Mrs. Cox was one of the sweetest and also one of the most remarkable ladies Mrs. McCormack and I have ever met.

When I was elected majority leader years ago in the Democratic caucus it was my dear friend Gene Cox from Georgia who led my fight on the floor of the caucus.

There has been a friendship between us which has been intense, deep, and lasting. The memory both of Gene Cox and of Mrs. Cox will always remain in my mind as long as I live.

I extend to her loved ones left behind my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank the distinguished Speaker for this contribution.

AHEPA, A GREAT ORGANIZATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a very fine and outstanding organization, the Order of Ahepa, on the occasion of its 44th Supreme Convention on August 14 to 20, being held in Washington, D.C.

It can be accurately stated that a part of America's greatness is the composite of many national origins blending successfully together toward the advancement of common goals. In the scope of national responsibility, the Order of Ahepa stands as an object lesson in successful cooperation.

I am particularly familiar with the effectiveness and altruism of the Ahepa because of the large Greek community in my area. It would be a vain attempt on my part to list the numerous achievements and charitable causes which this organization has so generously and vigorously supported, but it would be less than proper of me not to express to Ahepa my appreciation and that of my State.

This country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent who have contributed so greatly to the tenets on which this country was founded and who, because of their heritage, have always shared in our aspirations for freedom and independence.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, "GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES," CODIFYING THE GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO ITS CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10104) to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, in the table following line 10, after item 7, insert:

"9. EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION -------- 901"

Page 6, line 9, strike out "1641(b)(2), 1884, and 1891–1902" and insert "1884, 1891–1902, and former section 1641(b)(2),".

Page 10, line 17, strike out "hearing examiner" and insert "employee".

Page 10, lines 21 and 22, strike out "a hearing examiner" and insert "such an employee".

Page 17, line 24, strike out "States" and insert "States,".

Page 20, lines 26 and 27, strike out "1641(b)(2), 1884, and 1891–1902" and insert "1884, 1891–1902, and former section 1641(b)(2),".

Page 22, after line 17, insert:

"CHAPTER 9—EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

"Sec.
"901. Purpose.
"902. Definitions.
"903. Reorganization plans.
"904. Additional contents of reorganization plans.
"905. Limitations on powers.
"906. Effective date and publication of reorganization plans.
"907. Effect on other laws, pending legal proceedings, and unexpended appropriations.
"908. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on reorganization plans.
"909. Terms of resolution.
"910. Reference of resolution to committee.
"911. Discharge of committee considering resolution.
"912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee; debate.
"913. Decisions without debate on motion to postpone or proceed.

"§ 901. Purpose

"(a) The President shall from time to time examine the organization of all agencies and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) of this section and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this chapter, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"§ 902. Definitions

"For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) 'agency' means—

"(A) an Executive agency or part thereof;

"(B) an office or officer in the civil service or uniformed services in or under an Executive agency; and

"(C) the government of the District of Columbia or part thereof, except the courts; but does not include the General Accounting Office or the Comptroller General of the United States; and

"(2) 'reorganization' means a transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 903 of this title.

"§ 903. Reorganization plans

"(a) When the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or a part of an agency, or of the whole or a part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of another agency;

"(2) the abolition of all or a part of the functions of an agency;

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or a part of an agency, or of the whole or a part of the functions thereof, with the whole or a part of another agency or the functions thereof;

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of a part of an agency or the functions thereof with another part of the same agency or the functions thereof;

"(5) the authorization of an officer in the civil service or uniformed services to delegate any of his functions; or

"(6) the abolition of the whole or a part of an agency which agency or part does not have, or on the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions;

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 901(a) of this title, he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit the plan (bearing an identification number) to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 901(a) of this title.

"(b) The President shall have a reorganization plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session. In his message transmitting a reorganization plan, the President shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of the function and the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) that it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

"§ 904.—Additional contents of reorganization plans

"A reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 903 of this title—

"(1) may change, in such cases as the President considers necessary, the name of an agency affected by a reorganization and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of an agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may provide for the appointment and pay of the head and one or more officers of an agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan the provisions are necessary. The head so provided may be an individual or may be a commission or board with more than one member. In case of such an appointment, the term of office may not be fixed at more than 4 years, the pay may not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to be applicable to comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not to a position in the competitive service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that, in the case of an officer of the government of the District of Columbia, it may be by the Board of Commissioners or other body or officer of that government designated in the plan;

"(3) shall provide for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by a reorganization;

"(4) shall provide for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with a function or agency affected by a reorganization, as the President considers necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have the functions after the reorganization plan is effective. However, the unexpended balances so transferred may be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation was originally made; and

"(5) shall provide for terminating the affairs of an agency abolished.

"§ 905. Limitations on powers

"(a) A reorganization plan may not provide for, and a reorganization under this chapter may not have the effect of—

"(1) creating a new Executive department, abolishing or transferring an Executive department or all the functions thereof, or consolidating two or more Executive departments or all the functions thereof:

"(2) continuing an agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made;

"(3) continuing a function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made;

"(4) authorizing an agency to exercise a function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress;

"(5) increasing the term of an office beyond that provided by law for the office; or

"(6) transferring to or consolidating with another agency the government of the District of Columbus or all the functions thereof which are subject to this chapter, or abolishing that government or all those functions.

"(b) A provision contained in a reorganization plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to Congress before December 31, 1968.

"§ 906. Effective date and publication of reorganization plans

"(a) Except as otherwise provided under subsection (c) of this section, a reorganization plan is effective at the end of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the 60-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

"(c) Under provisions contained in a reorganization plan, a provision of the plan may be effective at a time later than the date on which the plan otherwise is effective.

"(d) A reorganization plan which is effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

"§ 907. Effect on other laws, pending legal proceedings, and unexpended appropriations

"(a) A statute enacted, and a regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by an agency or function affected by a reorganization under this chapter, before the effective date of the reorganization, has, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, the same effect as if the reorganization had not been made. However, if the statute, regulation, or other action has vested the functions in the agency from which it is removed under the reorganization plan, the function, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, shall be deemed as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

"(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, 'regulation or other action' means a regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(c) A suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of an agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, does not abate by reason of the taking effect of a reorganization plan under this chapter. On motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of the suit, action or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, the court may allow the suit, action, or other proceeding to be maintained by or against the successor of the head or officer under the reorganization effected by the plan or, if there is no successor, against such agency or officer as the President designates.

"(d) The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this chapter may not be used for any purpose, but shall revert to the Treasury.

"§ 908. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on reorganization plans

"Sections 909-913 of this title are enacted by Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by section 909 of this title; and they supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"§ 909. Terms of resolution

"For the purpose of sections 908-913 of this title, 'resolution' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the —— does not favor the reorganization plan numbered —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ——, 19—.', the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; but does not include a resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"§ 910. Reference of resolution to committee

"A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"§ 911. Discharge of committee considering resolution

"(a) If the committee to which a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has been referred has not reported it at the end of 10 calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than one hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, the motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"§ 912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee; debate

"(a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not more than ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. An amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"§ 913. Decisions without debate on motion to postpone or proceed

"(a) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate."

Page 22, line 32, strike out "predecessor," and insert "predecessor".

Page 24, line 14, strike out "the budget estimates" and insert "requests for appropriations".

Page 25, line 5, strike out "revision and submission of budget estimates" and insert "submission of requests for appropriations".

Page 35, line 9, strike out "mean" and insert "means".

Page 36, line 34, strike out "or".

Page 36, line 35, after "section;" insert "or".

Page 36, after line 35, insert:

"(E) the head of a Government controlled corporation;".

Page 39, line 19, strike out ", without the special warrant of the President therefor".

Page 40, line 12, after "agency" insert ", or the Secretary of a military department with respect to an employee of his department,".

Page 40, line 35, after "agency" insert ", the Secretary of a military department with respect to an employee of his department,".

Page 42, in the second and third lines following line 28, strike out "; restrictions on voluntary service and service in excess of that authorized".

Page 42, lines 29 and 30, strike out "; restrictions on voluntary service and service in excess of that authorized".

Page 42, line 31, strike out "(a)".

Page 43, strike out lines 3 to 24, inclusive.

Page 52, line 33, strike out "A" and insert "On request of an appointing authority, a".

Page 52, line 34, strike out ", on request of an appointing authority,".

Page 54, strike out lines 22 to 31, inclusive, and insert:

"(a) An individual who reaches the retirement age prescribed for automatic separation applicable to him may not be continued in the civil service or in the government of the District of Columbia. An individual separated on account of age under a statute or regulation providing for retirement on account of age is not eligible for appointment in the civil service or in the government of the District of Columbia."

Page 54, line 37, strike out "An" and insert "Notwithstanding other statutes, an".

Page 55, line 1, strike out "A" and insert "Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a".

Page 55, line 7, strike out "The" and insert "Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, the".

Page 58, strike out lines 26 to 33, inclusive, and insert: "(1) 'agency', 'employee', and 'international organization' have the meanings given them by section 3581 of this title; and".

Page 58, line 34, strike out "(4)" and insert "(2)".

Page 60, line 15, strike out "title," and insert "title".

Page 64, line 38, strike out "and".

Page 64, after line 38, insert:

"(B) a military department; and".

Page 64, line 39, strike out "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 69, line 17, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 73, lines 32 and 33, strike out ", and regulations prescribed under Executive Order 11012,".

Page 78, line 19, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 78, line 32, strike out "and" and insert "or".

Page 85, line 1, strike out ", Department of State," and insert "of the United States".

Page 85, line 12, strike out "Columbia," and insert "Columbia".

Page 85, line 21, strike out "Guard," and insert "Guard".

Page 98, line 11, strike out "402" and insert "407".

Page 104, line 19, strike out "5335" and insert "5335(a)".

Page 109, after line 35, insert:

"(72) Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"(73) Chief of Protocol, Department of State.

"(74) Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State.

"(75) Director, Community Relations Service.

"(76) United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.

"(77) United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York."

Page 113, after line 34, insert:

"(100) Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Department of Labor.

"(101) Assistant Director (Program Planning, Analysis and Research), Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(102) Assistant General Managers, Atomic Energy Commission (2).

"(103) Associate Director (Policy and Plans), United States Information Agency.

"(104) Chief Benefits Director, Veterans' Administration.

"(105) Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

"(106) Deputy Director, National Security Agency.

"(107) Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

"(108) Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

"(109) Director of International Scientific Affairs, Department of State.

"(110) General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration.

"(111) Members, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (4).

"(112) National Export Expansion Coordinator, Department of Commerce.

"(113) Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

"(114) Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights.

"(115) United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

"(116) United States Attorney for the Southern District of California."

Page 121, line 5, strike out "Quarters" and insert "Quarters,".

Page 122, line 22, strike out "employees" and insert "Employees".

Page 126, line 8, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 128, line 11, after "or" where it appears the first time insert "resigns, or".

Page 128, line 11, strike out "ends" and insert "ends,".

Page 128, line 22, strike out "sections" and insert "section".

Page 129, line 4, after "Code." insert "For the purpose of this subsection, 'employee' has the meaning given it by section 1551c(z) of title 47, District of Columbia Code."

Page 135, line 29, strike out "prescribed" and insert "prescribe".

Page 139, line 35, strike out "wage boards" and insert "a wage board".

Page 142, line 15, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 143, line 37, strike out "5" and insert "(5)".

Page 150, lines 40 and 41, strike out "in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940,".

Page 151, line 27, strike out "or".

Page 151, line 28, after "cooperatives;" insert "or".

Page 151, after line 28, insert:

"(iv) the Senate within the purview of section 36a of title 2;".

Page 155, line 21, strike out "a House of Congress" and insert "either House of Congress or of the two Houses".

Page 156, line 4, strike out "including actual expenses".

Page 156, line 20, strike out "An" and insert "Under regulations prescribed under section 5707 of this title, an".

Page 156, line 23, strike out all after "duty" down to and including "title" in line 24.

Page 156, line 36, strike out "covered" and insert "except to the extent provided".

Page 157, line 8, after "expenses" insert "under this subchapter".

Page 157, line 9, strike out "subchapter" and insert "section".

Page 158, line 31, after "regulations." insert "This section does not apply to the fixing or payment of a per diem allowance under section 5703(c) of this title."

Page 160, line 24, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 160, line 35, after "effects" insert "to the extent authorized by section 5724 of this title".

Page 161, line 2, strike out "in accordance with section 5724(f)" and insert "to the extent authorized by section 5724(f) of this title".

Page 162, lines 36 and 37, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 163, line 32, strike out "under section 5722" and insert "and a student trainee to the extent authorized by sections 5722 and 5723".

Page 164, line 12, strike out "under section 5722" and insert "and a student trainee to the extent authorized by sections 5722 and 5723".

Page 164, line 40, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 165, line 6, strike out "the" where it appears the second time.

Page 165, line 11, strike out "agreement" and insert "agreed".

Page 165, line 17, strike out "the" where it appears the second time.

Page 165, line 23, after "completed" insert "each".

Page 165, line 28, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 165, line 34, strike out "to pay".

Page 166, line 13, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 167, line 26, after "and" insert ", except as otherwise provided by law, may pay".

Page 167, lines 27 and 28, strike out "engaged, may pay—" and insert "engaged—".

Page 172, line 6, strike out "other".

Page 178, lines 27 and 28, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 178, line 32, strike out "wage boards" and insert "a wage board".

Page 179, line 20, strike out "section" and insert "subsection".

Page 180, in the sixth line following line 17, strike out "foreign service leave" and insert "leave for Chiefs of Missions".

Page 181, lines 11 and 12, strike out "the Senate or House of Representatives" and insert "either House of Congress or of the two Houses".

Page 185, line 11, strike out "foreign-service leave" and insert "leave for Chiefs of Missions".

Page 199, line 9, after "program" insert "under section 941(b)(1) of title 33".

Page 199, line 10, strike out all after "agency" down to and including "section" in line 13.

Page 216, line 33, strike out "compensation," and insert: "compensation".

Page 217, line 18, after "is" insert "a".

Page 223, line 37, strike out "interests" and insert "interest".

Page 223, line 39, strike out "is" where it appears the second time and insert "shall be".

Page 224, line 3, strike out "is" and insert "shall be".

Page 226, line 5, strike out "is" and insert "shall be".

Page 226, line 7, strike out all after "Columbia." down to and including "purpose" in line 9.

Page 226, line 36, strike out "member" and insert "or deceased individual".

Page 230, line 6, strike out "42," and insert "42".

Page 230, line 21, strike out "the" where it appears the second time and insert "The".

Pake 244, line 25, strike out "reapportionment" and insert "reappointment".

Page 247, line 6, strike out "section" and insert "sections".

Page 255, line 27, strike out "separted" and insert "separated".

Page 273, line 26, strike out "States," and insert "States or".

Page 273, lines 28 and 29, strike out "a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, and a bank for cooperatives,".

Page 274, line 2, strike out "foreign service" and insert "Foreign Service".

Page 274, line 35, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 5, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 8, strike out "and".

Page 275, line 10, strike out "Rico." and insert "Rico; and".

Page 275, after line 10, insert:

"(7) 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, means the States."

Page 275, line 14, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 24, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 27, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 35, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 37, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 40, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 3, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 8, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 20, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 22, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 25, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 40, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 1, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 4, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 11, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 39, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 279, line 20, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 279, line 22, strike out "States," and insert "States and each".

Page 279, lines 23 and 24, strike out ", Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, and bank for cooperatives'.

Page 280, line 6, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 282, strike out lines 38 and 39.

Page 282, line 40, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

Page 283, line 1, strike out “(3)” and insert “(2)”.

Page 283, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive.

Page 283, line 29, strike out “commissioner” and insert “Commissioner”.

Page 293, line 30, strike out “commissioner” and insert “Commissioner”.

Page 305, strike out all between lines 28 and 29 and insert:

“ ‘1916. Unauthorized employment and disposition of lapsed appropriations.
“ ‘1917. Interference with civil service examinations.
“ ‘1918. Disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the Government.
“ ‘1919. False statement to obtain unemployment compensation for Federal service.
“ ‘1920. False statement to obtain Federal employees’ compensation.
“ ‘1921. Receiving Federal employees’ compensation after marriage.
“ ‘1922. False or withheld report concerning Federal employees’ compensation.
“ ‘1923. Fraudulent receipt of payments of missing persons.’ ”

Page 305, strike out all after line 30 over to and including line 5 on page 306.

Page 306, line 6, strike out “1917” and insert “1916”.

Page 306, line 19, strike out “1918” and insert “1917”.

Page 307, line 1, strike out “1919” and insert “1918”.

Page 307, line 20, strike out “1920” and insert “1919”.

Page 307, line 28, strike out “1921” and insert “1920”.

Page 307, line 35, strike out “1922” and insert “1921”.

Page 308, line 4, strike out “1923” and insert “1922”.

Page 308, line 17, strike out “1924” and insert “1923”.

Page 310, line 16, after “appoint” insert “in the Department of Justice”.

Page 310, line 17, strike out “in the Department of Justice” and insert “, learned in the law,”.

Page 315, in the tenth line following line 24, strike out “Membership in International Criminal Police Organization; expenses” and insert “Expenses”.

Page 317, strike out lines 15 to 27, inclusive, and insert:

“ ‘§ 537. Expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character

“ ‘Appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are available for expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, when so specified in the appropriation concerned, to be spent under the direction of the Attorney General. The Attorney General shall certify the amount spent that he considers advisable not to specify, and his certification is a sufficient voucher for the amount therein expressed to have been spent.’ ”

Page 319, line 9, strike out “section 5317” and insert “sections 5315–5317”.

Page 323, line 23, strike out “217(a)” and insert “217a”.

Page 326, line 39, strike out “2101(e)” and insert “2101(f)”.

Page 335, lines 7 and 8, strike out “in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940,”.

Page 335, line 21, strike out “extent” and insert “extend”.

Page 337, in the fifth column of the table immediately following line 3 strike out “3679 (b), (i) as applicable to subsection (b)) [added]”.

Page 337, in the table headed “Statutes at Large”, after the fourth line following “1874” which reads

“Do	328	3	18	109”

insert:

“Do	344	2-5	18	127”

Page 337, in the table headed “Statutes at Large”, after the seventh line following “1874” strike out:

“Dec. 1	344	2-5	18	127”

Page 347, in the table after the thirteenth line following “1917” strike out:

“May 12	12	(3d proviso on p. 72).	40	72”

Page 352, in the table in the fourth line following “1930” strike out “June 4” and insert “June 6”.

Page 359, in the table after the sixth line following “1949” which reads:

“June 10	194		63	170”

insert:

“June 20	226		63	203”

Page 360, in the table after the twenty-eighth line following “1950” strike out:

“Do	896	1211 (2d par., and 15th and 16th pars., as applicable to 2d par.).	64	765, 768”

Page 361, in the table after the first line following “1953” which reads:

“Feb. 7	2		67	4”

insert:

“Feb. 11	3		67	4”

Page 362, in the table after the fourth line following “1955” which reads:

“Mar. 2	9	2(a)	60	10”

insert:

“Mar. 25	16		60	14”

Page 362, in the table after the ninth line following “1956” strike out:

“June 27	452	101 (last 26 words of 4th par. on p. 345).	70	345”

Page 362, in the table in the eleventh line following “1956” strike out “Do--” and insert “June 27”.

Page 363, in the table after the twelfth line following “1957” which reads:

“Aug. 29	85-217		71	401”

insert:

“Sept. 4	85-286		71	611”

Page 365, in the table in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines following “1960” strike out “, (g) (as applicable to sections 1501(a) and 1507(a) of the Social Security Act).”

Page 365, in the table in the twenty-ninth line following “1960” after “542” insert “(b)-(d)”.

Page 365, in the table after “1961” insert:

“Apr. 7	87-18		75	41”

Page 366, in the table after the fourth line following “1964” which reads:

“Mar. 26	88-290	(“Sec. 306(b)”)	78	170”

insert:

“July 2	88-351		78	240”

Page 366, in the table in the fifth line following “1964” strike out “July 2” and insert “Do--”.

Page 366, in the table after “1965” insert:

“June 18	89-43		79	135”

Mr. TUCK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I inquire of my distinguished colleague from Virginia whether any of the amendments made in the other body affect the substance of the title?

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the amendments do not affect the substance of the title. They are only clerical amendments, and do not make any change in substantive law.

The original bill passed this body unanimously. It passed the Senate unanimously. The amendments were adopted by the Senate unanimously.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND TITLE II OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 967, Rept. No. 1833), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 967

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11696) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

JOSEPH McCAFFREY COMPLIMENTS DR. HANSEN

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we very often hear on the news broadcasts matters that we disagree with and are concerned about, but I want to take the opportunity today to compliment the very well known TV commentator, Joseph McCaffrey, on a statement he made last night with reference to the District of Columbia schools. He paid a very high compliment to Dr. Hansen, head of the school system of the District of Columbia, and deplored some of the attacks that have been made upon him. He indicated in his statement that the years would prove that Dr. Hansen in all probability was right, and that his stature would go up as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, deplore the attacks that have been made upon this very fine educator, who has instituted in the District of Columbia schools the track system which is used today in practically all progressive high schools throughout America.

And, Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that, unfortunately, sometimes people with their own petty ax to grind make attacks upon great men who are working and who are dedicated to the task of improving our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. McCaffrey upon his statement and, particularly, I want to compliment Dr. Hansen upon the job that he has done, and express the hope that something might develop which will enable him to continue his fine service to this educational system.

OBSERVATION OF THE MOST MODERN TRUCKING TERMINAL IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to observe the most modern trucking terminal in the United States.

I flew down, late yesterday afternoon, to Burlington, N.C., to take part in the opening of the new, modern terminal erected alongside Interstate Highway 85. This terminal, constructed by Associated Transport, Inc., is the newest and largest facility operated by this progressive and forward-thinking carrier.

Not only is the terminal a beautiful new addition to the many modern new industrial facilities now lining the Interstate Highway System in Piedmont, N.C., it is a highly efficient and functional operation. The plant is equipped with the newest and most efficient materials handling equipment to be found in the trucking industry.

In short, the operation is a great credit to the industrial community it is located in, and I am very proud to have it and the fine people who operate it as a part of my congressional district. The management team of Associated Transport, headed by its president, Mr. J. K. Seymour, of New York City, is to be congratulated, not only for its decision to erect such a wonderful facility, but also for Associated's continuing contributions to the communities in which it operates.

I regret that my absence from this Chamber yesterday prevented my voting in favor of the military installation construction bill, but I am pleased with the new look in trucking transportation facilities I saw in Alamance County, N.C.

HIGH INTEREST, TIGHT MONEY

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are suffering under the highest interest rates and the tightest money situation that has obtained in modern times. This presents a hardship to all of the business enterprises who seek money for expansion. It is a hardship on citizens who wish to build homes. It is becoming a hardship on the Government itself which is being victimized by its own folly in practicing unsound fiscal policies and its stubborn refusal to discontinue the fatal habit of deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, this situation was highlighted yesterday when Fannie Mae—FNMA—announced the forthcoming sale of debentures to yield 5.91-percent interest. This follows on the heels of the recent sale of participation certificates by the same Government agency at discounts that will yield 5.75-percent interest on Government-guaranteed obligations.

Mr. Speaker, it is further highlighted by the announcement of the Treasury recently that it was refunding Government bonds to yield 5¼-percent interest, the highest interest rates paid on Government bonds in 45 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time for the Federal Government to put its fiscal house in order; to quit competing with private enterprise and individual citizens for available credit; to start living within its means, and stop borrowing money to pay current bills.

THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB AND POVERTY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, a new and suspicious situation has come to our attention involving President's Club contributions and a million-dollar contract in the poverty program.

Late in 1964, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington was seeking a qualified engineering firm to provide guidance in the selection of Job Corps sites, and to furnish engineering services to Job Corps centers. Mr. E. Hunter Smith, Jr., Chief of the Job Corps Installation and Logistics Division, by memorandum of December 22, 1964, specified five major requirements for such a firm, including an "immediate capability" and "a Washington, D.C., area operational office." Mr. Smith recommended to Mr. Milton Fogelman, OEO contract officer, four firms "known to be experienced in these types of services who have expressed interest"—Lublin-McGaughy & Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW.; Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, 1725 I Street; H. D. Nottingham & Associates, Arlington, Va.; and Mills, Petticord & Mills, 3308 14th Street NW.

Two weeks later, the contract was granted to Consolidated American Services, Inc.—ConAm—a firm unmentioned and unrecommended in the Smith memorandum. It turned out that ConAm had a one-man office in Washington, D.C., and did not meet several important requirements outlined in the Smith memorandum.

The original contract was estimated at $500,000, and is now being phased out by OEO after expenditure of $1,350,000. The size and cost of the contract depended upon continuing task orders from OEO.

A subsequent audit reveals that "no evidence was found that other potential contractors were canvassed though several located in Washington, D.C., were known." It also found "matters which may not be in the Government's best interest."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that it turns out that the senior vice president of ConAm was W. C. Hobbs. According to the records of the Clerk of the House, W. C. Hobbs, listing addresses of ConAm offices in California and Washington, contributed $1,000 to the President's Club on September 28, 1964; $1,000 to the Democratic National Committee on May 4, 1965; and $1,000 to the President's Club on March 11, 1966.

ConAm personnel informed our investigators that they had not done this type of work for the Government prior to the OEO contract. A new management and engineering services division of ConAm was established in November 1964, 2 months before the OEO contract. I understand that with the expiration of the OEO contract, the Washington management and engineering services division of ConAm is now being discontinued.

THE COST OF THE WASHINGTON POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL] for bringing this information to our attention. In addition I have these comments.

The total cost of establishing and maintaining the Washington office of ConAm was charged to the OEO contract. Auditors have made the following comment:

> In our opinion the selection of a Washington, D.C., firm could have resulted in significant monetary savings of OEO, particularly as regards employee travel costs, relocation expenses, furniture and lease expenses, and other start-up costs. This appears to have been possible with little effect upon the immediate availability and know-how of technical manpower needed by OEO since ConAm found it necessary to recruit an almost entire staff.

Mr. Speaker, W. C. Hobbs joined ConAm in March 1964, and with the expiration of the poverty contract has now been separated from ConAm.

There are other discrepancies and problems in connection with the ConAm contract. The facts cited herein, however, require a full and immediate investigation:

How did Hobbs and ConAm get the inside track at OEO?

Why were four apparently qualified firms ignored and a fifth firm that failed to meet important specifications chosen?

What connection was there between the $1,000 contributions to the President's Club and the apparent arbitrary selection of ConAm for this contract?

A simple denial of any relationship is not enough. The taxpayers and the Congress of the United States deserve a full, detailed explanation of this unusual selection procedure that gave a million-dollar poverty contract to a one-man Washington office whose senior vice president was coincidentally a continuing member of the President's Club.

NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR ALABAMA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, since 1953 it has been the policy of the Federal Government not to expand existing military cemeteries or add new ones. Under present policy, it seems that the Department of the Army has no plans to enlarge the national cemetery system by the establishment of new cemeteries at any location, by the enlargement of existing cemeteries, or by the transfer of existing burial grounds.

Currently, there is a resolution pending before the House which would create a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to give needed direction to the establishment of such facilities. I believe the enactment of such a proposal would be beneficial.

Nevertheless, I would call to your attention the acute problem which exists in the State of Alabama. As circumstances now exist, there is no place where Alabamians who have given that last full measure of devotion can be laid to rest. Recently, an Alabama soldier who was killed in Vietnam had to be buried in a national military cemetery in Georgia because the Mobile National Cemetery is filled, leaving Alabama as one of the few States without a national cemetery for its military men.

Knowing that Alabama has provided this Nation with courageous men who have distinguished themselves and defended their country on the battlefields of every war fought by these United States, and being advised that the necessary land is possibly available, for example, in Horseshoe Bend National Park near Dadeville, Ala., it is my privilege to introduce legislation providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Alabama by requesting the Secretary of the Army to acquire real property in the State of Alabama for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery on such real property.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, I am transmitting the annual report on the International Educational and Cultural Exchange Program for Fiscal Year 1965. Transmitted with this report is the United States Grantee Directory for Fiscal Year 1965.

The educational and cultural programs of our Government are conducted in a world so interdependent that it constitutes, in a sense, a single environment. In this global community, education must be international in focus if the cause of understanding and peace among peoples is to be served. Education for world responsibility is no longer an option. It is rather a necessity.

In addition to fostering an informed and responsible attitude toward the world among students, the program surveyed in this report has encouraged the flow of ideas among the leaders and thinkers of different nations and cultures.

But full heads and empty hearts breed disunity rather than unity. Therefore, the international educational and cultural exchange program, by bringing people of diverse nationalities together in common endeavors—of learning, teaching, truth seeking—has cultivated the humane virtues of sympathy, sensitivity, and tolerance.

In an age when men feel particularly threatened by impersonal forces and alienated from their fellows, this program unobtrusively reminds us that the mind and heart of man know no physical barriers.

I commend this report to the thoughtful scrutiny of the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August, 11, 1966.*

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 929 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 214]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Ashley
Baring
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conyers
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Farnum
Fisher
Giaimo
Grabowski
Gubser
Halleck
Hawkins
Hébert
Irwin
Jones, Mo.
Karth
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Landrum
Long, La.
McEwen
McMillan
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
Passman
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Skubitz
Smith, Va.
Sweeney
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
Willis

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 929

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1967, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1966 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1966, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by supena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1967, as hereinabove provided.

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **ANDERSON** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has been familiarized with the language of this resolution. It sets up the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures and, save for necessary changes in the language relating to the date, it is identical in all respects with resolutions that have been adopted in prior years. I believe perhaps many Members of this House are more familiar with this committee as the old "Davis committee," the committee chaired for many years by our former colleague from Tennessee, Clifford Davis.

One salutary effect, perhaps, of presenting this resolution at this time is to remind ourselves that even though the frost is not yet on the pumpkin, campaign time is approaching. Some of us dare express the hope that this House may be able to conduct its business in time for us to conduct the campaign, so that there will be something for the committee to look into.

Mr. **GIBBONS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, last year this House considered the question of the seating of a number of our colleagues who had been nominated and elected in congressional districts where Negroes were systematically excluded from the democratic process. When the Mississippi challenge was dismissed, a number of those who opposed the challenge argued that, if the Voting Rights Act were successful, it would eliminate the need for such challenges in the future.

In its action on both the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the seating of the Mississippi delegation, this House affirmed that complaints of racial discrimination should be carefully scrutinized in the future.

The resolution before us would establish a committee with full power to investigate any charges of racial discrimination in the election of Members of Congress. In the words of the resolution, it is empowered to—

> Investigate and report to the House . . . with respect to . . . (6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1966, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be in the public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

In short, the committee is empowered to make investigations in anticipation of a challenge similar to the objections which I raised to the seating of the Mississippi delegation on January 4, 1965, and investigations to determine the adequacy of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures has the opportunity to perform an invaluable service in the safeguarding of free, honest elections. It can make an enormous contribution to the success of the Voting Rights Act by making a thorough investigation of all charges of intimidation or discrimination or discrimination against prospective candidates and voters because of their race.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the committee to make full use of the power explicitly given to it by this resolution.

Mr. **GIBBONS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DORN**. Mr. Speaker, for many years, throughout the country, I have defended the honor and the reputation of the Congress collectively and of its individual Members. I have defended the Congress as the people's own institution. I have defended Congress as the protector of the people's rights—as the individual citizen's most direct representative with their Federal Government.

It is not always easy to point out the facts about Congress and defend the dedication and devotion of its Members. There are those who are eager and willing to tear down this great democratic institution in order to remedy the wrongs of a few. Then, too, they may use the wrongs of a few to attack the vast majority and the institution itself.

There are Fascists and subversives in our country who seek every opportunity to reflect upon this great institution. Often, Mr. Speaker, the most self-righteous indignation comes from those unsympathetic to a strong legislative branch.

While defending Congress, however, I have not ignored the need, Mr. Speaker, for high ethical standards of our membership and of self-regulation by the Congress itself of its own membership.

Time and time again, I have introduced legislation which would prevent campaign contributions from crossing State lines to influence Federal elections. I believe and have always believed that congressional elections should represent the will of those citizens residing in the State or in that congressional district. No outside finances from faraway places, or from abroad, should be permitted to be used to influence those people who directly elect their representatives to the Federal Congress. Also, Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation which would create a House Grievance Committee; which would be similar to the grievance committee of our bar associations. I know of no more effective committees than the grievance committees of the bar associations. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is true of the bar association grievance committees in my congressional district. A similar committee for this House would be a step toward assuring the American people of our own good intentions, and our desire to improve the image of this august body.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today would authorize the Speaker to appoint a bipartisan committee of five members to investigate and report to the next Congress concerning campaign expenditures and congressional candidate ethics in the elections this fall. This resolution creating this committee is timely and will reassure the American people of our good intentions. The mounting cost of congressional elections is a serious threat to representative government. The astronomical cost of congressional elections prevent many good men from offering and remaining in public office purely and simply by a lack of funds and an unwillingness to subvert themselves to those who would put up the money.

This committee, with its forthcoming report, will indeed "aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation."

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 929, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, the following Members of the House: Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, chairman; Mr. SMITH, of Iowa; Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio; and Mr. GOODELL, of New York.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. **YOUNG**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 936 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 936

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. **YOUNG**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 936 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14359, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the development of a nationwide system of roads linking the major cities of the United States from coast to coast—a transportation network to be known as the Interstate Highway System.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 brought into being the greatest road construction program in the world's history. Also, it authorized the creation of the highway trust fund. But, in spite of the tremendous progress that has been made in our highway system, the rapid growth pace of our population and economy has outstripped our planning.

Prior to 1956, revenues from all Federal excise taxes on motor fuels, motor vehicles, and associated products were placed in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. Also, prior to 1956, appropriations for Federal aid to the States for highway improvement were made from the Treasury general fund.

By the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, Congress substantially increased the size of the continuing Federal-aid program for improvement of main highways, secondary roads, and urban extensions included in the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems—the A–B–C program—and it also provided for accelerated completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. To pay for these programs Congress increased some of the existing highway-related excise taxes and levied some new ones. It earmarked the revenues of some of the highway-related excise taxes for transfer to the highway trust fund. This trust fund was made the sole source of money for the A–B–C and interstate programs during the years 1957–72. Thus the Federal-aid program was put on a wholly highway-user-financed, pay-as-you-build basis.

In changing the rates of some highway-related excise taxes and levying some new ones, both in 1956 and subsequently, and in dedicating them to the highway trust fund, the Congress sought both to assure the provision of enough money for the Federal-aid highway program in the years 1957–72 and to distribute its cost equitably among the different classes of highway users.

All of the revenues from the Federal taxes on motor fuel, rubber, new trucks, buses, and trailers, lubricating oils, truck and bus parts and accessories, and heavy vehicle use go into the trust fund and are used only for Federal aid for highways. The highway-related excise tax on new automobiles continues to be considered as general revenue, in the same class as most other Federal excise taxes.

H.R. 14359 would extend for 1 year the authorization for the Federal Interstate Highway System and increase the total authorization for the program by $8,921,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 936 in order that H.R. 14359 may be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has stated, House Resolution 936 will bring to the floor of the House for its consideration H.R. 14359, the Federal Highway Act of 1966. The rule is an open one, providing for 2 hours of general debate. The rule also provides that the committee substitute for the original bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment.

The primary purpose of the bill is to authorize an additional $8,921 million for the Interstate Highway System as construction funds, and to extend the construction completion target date for 1 year, to June 30, 1972. Testimony received by the Rules Committee indicated that even this additional money and time cannot ensure completion by the new target date.

Other Federal highway programs are also included in the bill. The primary and secondary systems are expanded into our urban centers and authorized for 2 years—fiscal 1968 and 1969—at $1 billion a year.

Various other road assistance programs, including forest highways, park roads, Indian reservation roads, and forest development roads are authorized for some $500 million in fiscal 1968 and 1969.

All these programs, Mr. Speaker, are necessary—all of us support them. However, the bill also includes funds to be used for highway beautification under the act passed last session. The bill authorizes $160 million in 1968 and 1969 for billboard control, $48 million for junkyard control, and $285 million for landscaping and scenic enhancement. These funds are to come out of the highway trust fund after it has had additional funds pumped into it to cover these expenditures.

These additional funds will represent an amount equal to 1 percent of the current excise tax on motor vehicles, plus any additional amounts needed, which will be taken out of the general fund.

I do not support the use of the highway trust fund in this manner. Why must we put money into the fund which was not originally earmarked for it to accomplish a purpose for which the fund was not intended? Why cannot the administration use straightforward bookkeeping methods?

Why must the administration use the trust fund for purposes it was never designed to handle?

Why cannot the beautification program authorizations stand on their own feet instead of borrowing the respect of the trust fund to protect it?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want these comments to be misunderstood. I support this bill. It is necessary. We must push toward the completion of the Interstate System as rapidly as possible. We must improve our primary and secondary road systems.

The Interstate System, begun by the Eisenhower administration, is already proving its great worth to the Nation, as I am sure the many visitors to Washington can testify. It moves people and goods faster and more safely than any other highway system in the world.

I know of no opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker; I urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14359 with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago I had the honor of bringing to the floor of the House the legislation which became the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, providing, for the first time, a sound program for the construction of a comprehensive and coordinated national system of expressways, designed to meet the economic and defense requirements of our Nation, the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The 1956 act brought into being the greatest road construction program in the world's history.

Today, 10 years later, more than half of the Interstate System is open to traffic and State highway departments are proceeding steadily toward the completion of the system.

Since the 1956 act was passed, it has been amended several times as the need for changes in the program became apparent. I am personally very proud of the fact that the House Committee on Public Works has always approached highway legislation with a nonpartisan point of view. Both the majority members and minority members have made great contributions to the development of sound legislation.

We have before us today H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. It has been developed in a nonpartisan fashion and represents the views of the committee concerning the future course of the Federal-aid highway program and the programs for the various categories of highways which are in the Federal domain.

With reference to the interstate program, the committee was confronted not only with the fact that the 1965 cost estimate submitted by the Secretary of Commerce indicates that an additional $4.9 billion in authorizations is required to cover the cost of completing the Interstate System but also with the fact that the 1965 cost estimate is now obsolete. In order to obtain the most accurate picture possible of the total cost, the committee asked the Federal Highway Administrator to make further estimates, taking into account the cost of certain improvements in highway design and the upward trend in construction costs as shown by contractors bid prices. In this way, the committee has determined that additional authorizations of $8.921 billion are needed to cover the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System. The total cost of Interstate System construction from July 1, 1956, through the completion of the system is $51.223 billion. Of this, the Federal share is $46.021 billion and the State's share is $5.202 billion.

The Interstate System authorizations provided in H.R. 14359 reflect this realistic view of the cost. It should be understood that the Interstate System program is financed entirely from the highway trust fund and that appropriations to support authorizations cannot be made beyond the capability of the highway trust fund. The enactment of H.R. 14359 will place the financial problem of the highway trust fund in sharp focus, but will not create a deficit.

The legislation also provides authorizations from the highway trust fund for the continuation of the A–B–C highway program for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The A–B–C highways include the Federal-aid primary system, exclusive of interstate highways, and the Federal-aid secondary system, together with the urban extensions of the primary and secondary systems. These highways, extending approximately 850,000 miles, reach into every section of every State, serving both rural and urban areas. The reported bill continues A–B–C authorizations for 2 years at the existing level of $1 billion annually. These funds are matched by the States on a 50–50 basis.

The bill authorizes $243 million for fiscal year 1968 and $250 million for fiscal year 1969 to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Certain amendments in the Highway Beautification Act are proposed which will have the effect of making the act more workable. In drafting this legislation, the committee has reaffirmed its conviction that funds earmarked for highway construction should not be diverted to the highway beautification program. Safeguards are provided to prevent such diversions.

A total of $541 million is authorized from the general fund of the Treasury for the several categories of public domain roads for the 2 fiscal years 1968 and 1969. This includes $66 million for forest highways, $14 million for public lands highways, $340 million for forest development roads and trails, $5 million for public lands development roads and trails, $55 million for park roads and trails, $20 million for national parkways, and $41 million for Indian reservation roads and bridges.

One of the major problems in the construction of urban highways is that of relocating and reestablishing the families and business organizations displaced by construction projects. H.R. 14359 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with Federal and State agencies, to make a comprehensive study of this problem and to submit his findings no later than next January.

The provisions of H.R. 14359 which I have just described are the major points of the bill. It is constructive and forward looking legislation and its enactment will expedite continued progress in the development of our national highway system.

The modernization of the highway system, including the timely completion of the interstate program, is a matter of vital importance. The continued economic growth of the Nation depends on the efficiency and vitality of its transportation system. Modern highways prevent economic waste by providing for the fast and economic movement of people and goods. And the provision of highways of the interstate type results in the saving of many lives which would otherwise be lost in traffic accidents.

These are among the reasons that Congress should take action to provide for the on-schedule completion of the Interstate System.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman or the members of the committee give me any idea as to how many cities of 70,000 population or more have no interstate connections or no approved program for an interstate connection in the near future? How many such cities are there in the United States?

Mr. FALLON. How many do not have an interstate program?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could get the information later.

I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are deeply involved in a war and a terribly costly war, many thousands of miles from this country, does the gentleman not think that we might well have dispensed for the time being with the beautification program and thereby save some $250 million a year?

Mr. FALLON. What we are doing is carrying out the judgment of the Congress of 1965 in providing what was asked for by the Congress in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But I would hope the Congress, even though it authorized the program 2 years, ago—or a year ago—could change its mind under the circumstances and hold back at least until we can see some daylight insofar as financing the war is concerned, as well as the deficit spending and inflation that plagues the country.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman, what the committee did in my judgment was imcumbent upon them to do and that was to carry out the legislation that was passed by this Congress in 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has consumed 11 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14359 as reported authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the Federal-aid highway systems—interstate, primary, and secondary—and for the public domain roads, highway beautification, and certain needed related studies.

The 41,000-mile Interstate System is now half complete. In January 1965 the Secretary of Commerce, as required by law, submitted to the Congress the 1965 estimate of cost to complete the Interstate System. The 1965 estimate reported a cost increase of $5.8 billion over the 1961 estimate.

Three billion, six hundred thousand dollars of the 1965 cost increase resulted from additions and adjustments to the system, all attributable to requirements of increased traffic demands and to lengthening the serviceable life of the system. Nearly $2 billion of the increase resulted from right-of-way, engineering, and construction cost increases.

Last year the committee withheld approval of the 1965 cost estimate, approving instead a joint resolution which authorized $3 billion only for the fiscal year 1967.

It was the committee's position then, as it is now, that while the 1965 estimate was sound as far as it went, it did not include all the known and foreseeable factors that will make up the total cost of the Interstate System.

Testimony before the committee in April of this year disclosed that the 1965 estimate was based on 1963 construction costs. Since 1963 there has been a consistent 2½-percent increase in construction costs, and the committee is convinced that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, these costs will continue to increase at about the same rate. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that this price trend increase will add an additional $3.39 billion to the Federal cost of completing the Interstate System.

It also became obvious during the hearings that certain additional design features, including four-lane construction throughout, would have to be included in the system. The Bureau estimated that these changes would add another $630 million to the Federal cost. The next cost estimate required by law is not due to be submitted until January 1968. There is no reason to believe that the policy which based the 1965 estimate on 2-year-old cost figures, and precluded inclusion of reasonably foreseeable price increases, will be any different in 1968 than it was in 1965.

The committee believes that we should act on an accurate and up-to-date estimate for actual completion of the system. The authorizations contained in the reported bill represent the most realistic estimate that can be provided. The committee has therefore approved an extra year of authorization for the Interstate System and increased the authorizations for the year 1968 through 1972 to cover this new estimated cost. That total cost is now $51.223 billion, of which the Federal share is $46.021 billion. Actual construction on this schedule, would be completed in 1973 instead of 1972.

It has been suggested that these increased authorizations are inflationary, or contribute to an unbalanced budget, or to increasing the national debt. None of these statements is true. We are committed to completion of the Interstate System at the earliest possible date. Everyone—the Congress, the States, the construction industry, and the people of the Nation—should know what it will involve. Under present law, the appropriations from the highway trust fund cannot exceed revenues in the trust fund. Therefore, if the revenues are not sufficient to permit appropriation of the full authorization, obviously the full authorization cannot be apportioned to the States. If the revenues going into the trust fund are not increased, we will be faced with a $6 billion shortage of funds to complete the Interstate System by 1973, and the system would then not be completed until 1975 or later. That fact, however, does not relieve us of the obligation to be accurate about what the system is going to cost.

The reported bill continues the present $1 billion annual authorization for the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems, from the highway trust fund.

It also provides, from the general fund, authorizations for the public domain roads for 1968 and 1969. The committee has approved the administration's recommended authorizations for all public domain roads except those for forest development roads and trails, which it has increased to $170 million a year.

Our national forests are one of our most valuable national assets. National forest timber contributes $1 out of every $70 of the gross national product. In addition, the forests serve extensive recreation, water, mineral, and forage uses. I am sure you have all noted the recent publicity regarding crowded conditions in our national parks. Without adequate roads, the same situation will soon exist in the national forests. The forest road system must be a multiple-use system. The 10-year program approved by the Congress for development of this road system is already $168 million behind schedule. If it is not put back on schedule, we will be jeopardizing the health and even the existence of our national forests; we will be jeopardizing the economies of the many businesses and communities dependent upon them; we will be receiving reduced prices for our national timber; we will be paying the timber purchasers to build inadequate roads, and then paying again for the same roads when we have to rebuild them for multiple use. The situation is therefore reduced to a simple question of profit and loss, and the committee believes that inadequate appropriations which result in the Federal Government's losing money on its basic resources is neither sound management nor a contribution to a balanced budget.

Sections 7 and 8 of the reported bill make it clear that beautification funds must come from the general fund, not from the highway trust fund, and contain authorizations for 1968 and 1969 of $80 million for billboard control, $48 million for junkyard control, and $285 million for landscape and scenic enhancement.

These authorizations for highway beautification are the authorizations requested by the administration. At this point no one is able to say with any accuracy what billboard and junkyard control will cost, so these are, at best, estimates. The authorization for landscaping and scenic enhancement, however, is the 3 percent of Federal-aid funds specifically spelled out in the Highway Beautification Act, and it is not, therefore, subject to change without amending that statute.

Section 9 of the reported bill is identical with H.R. 6790, passed unanimously by the House last year, providing for an increase in the existing emergency fund authorization from $30 million annually to $50 million annually, and for a 3-year period of availability for expending the annual emergency fund authorization, thereby making the period of availability similar to that provided for regular Federal-aid highway authorizations. The committee feels that this authority in the use of emergency funds is essential to assist the States in the prompt and economic repair or reconstruction of highways seriously damaged or destroyed by disaster. These standby provisions will also lessen the need for special authorizing legislation to meet disaster situations as they arise.

Advance acquisition of rights-of-way before land is developed can result in large savings to the public. It can also lessen the inconvenience and hardships suffered by persons and businesses whose relocation is made necessary by future highway construction. The obstacle facing most States in effective advance acquisition is financing. Section 10 of the reported bill calls for a study to develop comprehensive information and guidance on all possible methods by which advance acquisition can be undertaken and financed. The report on this study is to be submitted in January 1967.

Section 11 of the bill spells out the congressional intent that when needed, and subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary, State highway departments may continue to use private engineering firms to assist in the development of our highways. This puts into law, and thus eliminates administrative difficulties, what has in fact been the practice for many years.

For a number of years the committee has been increasingly aware of the problems in taking care of relocation of people, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by highway construction. The problem continues to grow more acute as we move to construct the roads needed to relieve transportation difficulties in our cities. Section 12 of the reported bill therefore requires a full study to determine what action can and should be taken to relieve this problem, with the report on the study to be submitted to the Congress in January 1967.

Section 12 requires that the Secretary, in cooperation with the governments of Guam and the Virgin Islands, make a study of the need for, and estimates and planning, relating to, highway construction programs for these two valuable and important territorial possessions of the United States. Development of both territories requires an adequate and safe highway system. No Federal agency presently has authority to assist them with such a program, nor does either receive direct Federal appropriations for this purpose. This report, also, is to be submitted in January 1967.

The Public Works Committee believes this is a sound, realistic, and forward-looking highway authorization bill, and that enactment of anything less would be misleading, inadequate to meet our needs, and poor fiscal policy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should like to express to the gentleman my appreciation for his very comprehensive statement on this important legislation.

There is considerable interest, in numerous sections of the country, relative to the possibility of adding additional mileage to the Interstate System and possibly to other Federal systems.

Can the gentleman tell us what, if anything, is underway in that regard? Are studies being made? If so, by whom are they being made? When does the gentleman anticipate the studies will be completed and reported to the Congress?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads were directed to report to the Congress by January 1968 on what the future highway needs of the Nation will be beyond the present program. This report will then be made every second year thereafter.

This study will be carried out by the Bureau of Public Roads in conjunction with the highway departments of the 50 States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand it, the first report under this directive will be made January of 1968.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Any recommendations that might be made and accepted by the Congress would, under the present law, be secondary to the current system; that is, they would take effect and begin with the conclusion of construction of the current system. Is that right?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think it is important to point out, however, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that there appears to be some reluctance on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads to include in that study specific State recommendations, let alone Federal recommendations, concerning increased mileage on the Interstate System. For some time we had difficulty in even getting the Bureau to agree to request that the States make such recommendations to the Bureau. We overcame that hurdle. However, it is my opinion that unless considerable effort is exerted by the Congress, the report that comes up may not contain specific recommendations for later specific increased mileage. I think that would be wrong and we should do everything in our power to make certain it does include such recommendations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You mean the recommendations from the State highway departments?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. Not only that recommendations should be obtained from the State highway departments, but that those recommendations be included in any report made to the Congress by the Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this bill contains substantial authorization——

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly on the subject we just discussed a moment ago?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not sure I understand the answer to my question regarding the Federal Interstate System and additions to such. As I understand it, a report is supposed to be made in January of 1968 including information and recommendations from the States and the Bureau of Public Roads relative to expanding the Interstate and Federal highway systems. Is that right?

Mr. CRAMER. As one of the drafters of that specific amendment, it was the intention of this Member that that be a required item.

Mr. ABERNETHY. One other question and I will not trespass further on the gentleman's time. If there is a recommendation to expand the Interstate System and should it be approved and written into the law by the Congress, in order for any portion of that to be put under construction concurrently with the present authorized Interstate System, there would have to be additional financing from some source, would there not?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. There will not be enough money in the trust fund to do the job presently authorized unless additional revenues are obtained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman tell us what he thinks the prospects of such are now, that is, expanding the system in the next few years?

Mr. CRAMER. I do not think there is any question but what there will be considerable demand for increased mileage where there are obvious missing links.

I can point to Florida as an example. The Tampa-St. Petersburg-Miami proposed Interstate extension has not been included in the existing system. It is an obvious missing link with dead end interstate routes I-4 and I-75 running into the Tampa-St. Petersburg area. That is but one example. We are going to need the increased mileages to complete these missing links on the system.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman feel those missing links are of such prominence and importance that they would demand concurrent additional financing so that they might be put under construction with no delay?

Mr. CRAMER. There would have to be additional money which would have to be provided for its completion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, I realize that. And I thank the gentleman from Florida and also the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRAMER. Or the presently authorized highway-user taxes would have to be made available to the trust fund after 1973.

As this is going at the present time, Congress will have to act upon it in 1968, because it takes about 4 years to tool up the program.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me before he commences his general statement?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, because I was on my feet attempting to get the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], but I failed to do so before the gentleman sat down.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the preliminary remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], that he told us that the Interstate System was, roughly, one-half complete. And, the report also indicates that work has either been completed or is underway on some 94 percent, or 41,000 miles of the Interstate System.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these kinds of figures are impressive, and they have always impressed me; but I cannot ignore the fact that we have made a part of such progress, and a rather substantial part of it, by virtue of the fact that some of the more progressive States—including my State of New York, and that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], and I believe the gentleman from Florida as well—constructed mileage prior to the beginning of the Interstate System which was later incorporated into the system and has therefore been contributed to the system by these various States.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a substantial part of the progress which has been made under this program, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if there is any intention on the part of the subcommittee, or on the part of the full committee, at some time in the future to consider this unresolved question of reimbursement to the various States for the mileage they have contributed to the Interstate System?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from New York that a report has been made on that to the Congress and this question will be dealt with and treated in the January 1968 report to the Congress as well. The decision can be made then by Congress relating it to the bill then pending before it.

Mr. Chairman, it was my position, and that position has been substantiated since, that we have got to build the roads first before we start talking about reimbursements for existing highways. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] probably takes a different position and the gentleman might want to comment upon the question of reimbursements on toll roads.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman from Florida is correct with reference to the question of reimbursement and that the question of reimbursements be held in abeyance until we complete the Interstate Highway System.

However, I would hope that we could have reimbursement by the target date for completing the system—1972 or 1973.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I am glad to hear that statement, because I hope we do not lose sight of the fact that somewhere along the way New York State did contribute $799.1 million worth of mileage to the Interstate Highway System and I hope that some day we will be considered as eligible for reimbursement for that amount.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from New York that after the 1972 or 1973 program New York State will receive a fair and equal break inasmuch as toll roads will not be involved in that situation.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains the total authorization completion date of the 1973 programs and other programs including some $11,955,150,000. That figure includes the $8.9 billion for Interstate completion; $493 million for 1968 and 1969 relating to beautification; highway study, Guam and the Virgin Islands, $150,000; and emergency relief, $50 million per year. The Alaskan system is not included in this bill, but it is included in the Senate bill. Furthermore, the A-B-C authorization is for $2 billion for the 2-year extension. Of course, public-donated roads and others total another $541 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a substantial authorization bill; however, it is a bill which, of course, Congress must act upon and must act upon in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, allocations for fiscal year 1968 are supposed to be made in the month of August of this year. They are made about a year and one-half in advance so that the States can properly tool up for the actual letting of contracts in the fiscal year in which funds are made available. Therefore, allocations are made traditionally a year and one-half in advance. That is why this bill is before you now in order that funds and programing funds can first be assured starting in fiscal year 1968. In addition, planning and programing can go ahead now in anticipation of spending in 1968 and the years thereafter.

That is why this bill is here. It has to be here for the purpose of authorizing the Interstate System for those years, the primary system for those years, the public lands and parks and trails authorizations, plus the other necessary authorizations contained in it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill for the acquisition of bankrupt toll roads or skyways; is there?

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman that we have discussed that subject once before here today. There is nothing in the bill concerning such acquisitions. As far as I am concerned, I hope there never is any such provision in a Federal-aid highway bill. I say that Congress is constantly under appeals to bail out those projects.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But there is nothing concerning that in this bill specifically?

Mr. CRAMER. Not in this particular bill. They did bail one out in the State of West Virginia by making it a part of the interstate highway mileage allowance to that State. But I personally am hoping that it will never happen again.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman for providing the information.

Mr. CRAMER. There is nothing in this bill to provide authority to do that.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to duplicate the remarks made previously, but there are a couple of points I think are of interest and they should be discussed.

I think it is important for every Member of this House to know the trouble this Interstate System is in relating to financing. As it is proposed in this bill and by the administration, this program could not be completed until 1973. When it was initially started in 1956, the highway user who was paying for it was told by the authorities that it would be completed in 1970 with 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System. Because of increased cost estimates, it has gone up now to a $51 billion estimate as of our 1965 estimates which are in excess of a $10 billion increase. With the other increased cost factors, the system will not be completed until 1973 and only then if there is provided to be paid into the trust fund approximately $6 billion more.

Mr. Chairman, the trust fund is unfortunately $6 billion short of doing a 41,000-mile job even by 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I hope everyone understands this problem. This authorization provides the vehicle to finish it by 1973, as it relates to authorizations, but the Committee on Public Works does not have the authority to provide the money. It belongs to the Committee on Ways and Means to put enough taxes into the trust fund to do the job or in the alternative to provide it through appropriation processes from the general fund.

Mr. Chairman, as of today with the Byrd amendment in existence, the money, other than the beautification and safety features, has to come out of the trust fund. The trust fund is $6 billion short.

We hear all about the money that is needed for the antipoverty program and these other boondoggling programs that have not been proven on the basis of merit, but there seems to be little leadership to get enough money into this trust fund to do this job even by 1973, which, in my opinion, will do more to fight poverty, to help the economy of this Nation, and to keep faith with the motorists by finishing it at least by 1973 than any poverty program. If this $6 billion is not put in the trust fund what is going to happen is that the program will have to be stretched out at least until 1975 or perhaps over 1976. I am hoping that the leadership will come from the administration on this critical and important program, which is a proven one, to provide adequate funds to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, that leadership clearly does not exist today. Nothing in my opinion is going to be done this year by the administration to put more money into the trust fund. Then the question is, Will it be done next year? Every year we miss, we are stretching it out that much further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the Johnson galloping inflation is not stopped, the situation will become even more desperate; is that not correct?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes; that is obviously true. The increased cost is now going up about 2.5 to 2.7 percent a year. If the cost of living and cost of construction continue to go up, the cost of the program could be greater than even that contained in the authorization.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I appreciate his remarks as well as those of the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee.

My question pertains to section 11 on page 17 of the bill under "State highway departments." Would this same inflationary spiral, the decreased purchasing value of the dollar, the slippage, the increased cost of construction and the deficit funding be responsible for the complaints that we as Members get from the various State highway departments that the matching funds are slipping further and further behind; first one quarter, then two quarters, and even in some instances and, paradoxically enough, in the instances of the States that have contributed the most and that are further along with the interstate program, receiving their matching funds so that they can fulfill their contracts that are being let on time? I have many complaints from State highway departments about the Federal matching funds slipping further and further behind, by quarters. Is the explanation which the gentleman has given to this general slippage and an extenuation of the program to 1973 and even to 1975 also responsible for that?

Mr. CRAMER. It has been my opinion that the administration has, for a period of time, withheld allocations for future construction inordinately and unnecessarily, whereas if they had been let from the States that are accustomed to expect them, there would not have been the slowdown. In my opinion it was done for the purpose of cutting back Federal expenditures, supposedly to try to fight inflation. But this is not an area in which the cuts ought to come.

Mr. HALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman. It is very embarrassing to the good State highway commissions, and it is certainly another example of deficit financing on the part of the Government so they can spend elsewhere.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. It is also important to point out one or two other aspects of this bill. The administration sent up a proposal that highway beautification should be paid out of the trust fund. They also said as an aside something like, "We would like to have 1 percent of the automobile excise taxes transferred to the trust funds to take care of that cost plus the cost of safety." They asked the Congress in effect to authorize the payment of the beautification program out of the trust fund without any assurance whatsoever that the cost of that program would be paid for by transfer of the 1 percent excise taxes.

I am proud to say that our committee refused to do so, either relating to safety or to beauty. This bill specifically states that safety and beauty money must not come out of the trust fund unless there is transferred to the trust fund the 1-percent highway excise tax and, of course, that is just transferring money from one pocket to the other.

In any event, it prevents highway construction money from being used, as could be done under the administration's proposal for beautification and safety which is a substantial sum as this bill itself indicates. So we accomplished that objective, and that is now tied down without any question.

In addition, we have provided for what I think are necessary studies relating to relocation assistance and to the advance acquisition of rights-of-way. For a number of years we have had on the books the Cramer amendment, which provides for 7-year advance acquisition of rights-of-way. The States do not use it, and we want to know why.

It is essential that the people along the future acquisition routes are treated with some equity.

Unfortunately, they sit around for 20 years, knowing their property is going to be taken, with no relief.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important provisions of this bill, H.R. 14359, is the increased authorizations for completion of the Interstate System. As you know, the Secretary of Commerce submitted the 1965 Interstate Cost Estimate to the Congress on January 11, 1965. This estimate showed that the 41,000-mile Interstate System will cost $46.8 billion to complete, which is $5.8 billion more than the 1961 cost estimate. Of this $5.8 billion increase, the Federal share is $5 billion, making the total Federal cost $42 billion.

The House Committee on Public Works held hearings on the 1965 estimate last year and concluded that, although the estimate appeared to be sound on the bases upon which it was made, it did not reflect the full actual cost of completing the system. The committee withheld final action on the estimate, and Congress merely approved the estimate for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967. The 1967 authorization was increased by $100 million, leaving unauthorized $4.9 billion of the $5 billion increase contained in the estimate.

Extensive hearings were held this year on the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System. The testimony disclosed that the 1965 cost estimate was based upon 1963 calendar year construction prices, and that unit prices have consistently increased at the average rate of 2½ percent per year since 1963. It further appeared from the testimony that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, construction costs will continue to increase at about the same rate during the foreseeable future. The Bureau of Public Roads, in response to a request by the committee, has estimated that this price trend increase will add an additional $3.391 billion to the Federal cost of the Interstate System over the remaining period of its construction.

It also became obvious during the hearings that additional design features would have to be included in the Interstate System before its completion to maintain the high standards we have come to demand of the system. With the passage of time, from one estimate to another, conditions change, forecast traffic volumes increase, and technology and design concepts advance, all of which result in constant upgrading of standards. There will be additional costs to provide for such things as full widths of shoulders across long bridges where traffic volumes require, more traffic lanes, additional interchanges, and depressed sections in urban areas.

There are continuing pressures to add ramps to simple grade separation structures, to convert them into interchanges so as to meet the needs of increasing traffic and growing communities. For example, the 1965 estimate provides for 754 more interchanges than were included in the 1961 estimate, and undoubtedly the next cost estimate will include still additional interchanges. The average distance between interchanges on the Interstate System, included in the 1965 estimate, is 1.1 miles in urban areas and 4.4 miles in rural areas. As communities grow and urban limits expand, more interchanges are needed. The bill also requires, in the interest of safety, that the entire Interstate System be constructed with a minimum of four traffic lanes. This will necessitate some 1,426 miles of highways, now planned or constructed as two-lane facilities, to be increased to four lanes, at an estimated cost of $265 million. The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that these design changes, including four-laning of the system, will add another $630 million to the Federal cost of completing the system.

The administration has recommended that additional authorizations for the Interstate System be limited to the $4.9 billion increase contained in the 1965 cost estimate and that any additional increase await submission of the next cost estimate. Under existing law, as interpreted by the Bureau of Public Roads, the Interstate System is to be completed by September 30, 1972, and only two additional cost estimates are to be submitted, the next one in 1968 and the last one in 1969.

The committee is of the opinion that it is unrealistic to ignore known increased costs which have occurred since 1963 and future increases in cost which appear certain to occur. If funds for these additional costs are not authorized until the next cost estimate is submitted to the Congress in 1968, large additional sums will have to be compressed into 2 or 3 years of authorizations, commencing with authorizations for fiscal year 1970, or a substantial stretchout of construction and delay in completion of the Interstate System will result. The system should be completed as nearly on schedule as possible in the interest of highway safety, the national economy, and national defense. It is estimated that completion of the Interstate System alone will save 8,000 lives annually. Furthermore, if future cost estimates are based upon prices and conditions as they exist on a cutoff date a year before the estimate is submitted to the Congress, as has been the practice in the past, and do not take into consideration additional costs that have occurred or are reasonably anticipated in the future, completion of the system would be dragged out interminably if authorizations never exceeded the cost estimates.

By authorizing funds now for known and reasonably anticipated increased costs, the additional authorizations can be spread over the maximum number of years remaining for completion of the system and thereby avoid peaks and valleys in the construction program, which is costly and places severe strain upon State highway departments and the construction industry.

After thorough deliberation, the committee decided that the $4.021 billion increase in cost contributable to rising prices and design changes, as well as the $4.9 billion increase contained in the 1965 estimate, should be authorized at this time. Thus, H.R. 14359 increases the authorizations for the Interstate System by $8.921 billion. The administration's proposal for a $4.9 billion increase added 1 additional year of authorizations, for fiscal year 1972. The bill approved by the committee retains this limit on the period of authorizations and distributes the additional $8.921 billion over the fiscal years 1968 through 1972, for completion of the Interstate System in 1973.

Based upon testimony presented at the hearings, the committee has determined that the best estimate of the cost of completing the system is $51.223 billion, of which the Federal share is $46.021 billion and the States share is $5.202 billion.

The committee also continued the $1 billion annual authorization level for the A–B–C program for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and provided necessary authorizations for Federal domain roads.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND REVENUES

Providing necessary authorizations for appropriations to complete the Interstate System solves only half of the problem, however, for additional revenues must be provided to finance part of the increased authorizations. The estimated receipts of the highway trust fund, under existing law, will exceed estimated expenditures for the Federal-aid highway program—assuming continuation of the A–B–C program at its present level—including the existing authorizations for the Interstate System, by $2.939 billion. Thus, the additional authorizations of $8.921 for the Interstate System will result in a trust fund deficiency, under present tax laws, of approximately $6 billion.

There are several financing methods available to the Committee on Ways and Means to provide this additional $6 billion, including the following: First, imposition of new or increased highway user taxes; second, transferring to the trust fund all or a portion of the 7-percent automobile excise taxes that now go into the general fund of the Treasury; third, extending the present October 1, 1972, termination date of the highway trust fund and continuing the fund's present revenues, and fourth, repealing or suspending provisions of section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956—the Byrd amendment—to permit appropriations to the trust fund of advances from the general fund to be repaid with interest from later revenues to the trust fund.

It is hoped that the Committee on Ways and Means will take early action to finance the additional authorizations for the Interstate System, so that it may be completed in 1973. However, until such time as needed additional revenues are provided, under operation of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce can apportion funds authorized for the Interstate System only in amounts that do not result in expenditures in excess of amounts available in the highway trust fund. Thus, based upon present estimates, if no additional revenues are provided for the trust fund, $6 billion of the authorizations for the Interstate System contained in H.R. 14359 cannot be apportioned to the States.

PROTECTION OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The committee has consistently taken the position that the highway trust fund shall be used only for highway construction. This position is reiterated in H.R. 14359 by specifically providing that authorizations for the Interstate System and the A–B–C program cannot be used to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, sections 131, 136, and 319(b), title 23, United States Code, or any provisions of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966.

The Highway Beautification Act prohibits use of the highway trust fund to carry out its provisions and authorizes appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury for the first 2 years. The administration has asked that this prohibition be repealed and has recommended that one point of the present automobile excise tax, along with such additional amounts from the general fund as may be necessary, be appropriated to the trust fund to finance the Highway Beautification Act and traffic and highway safety programs now being considered by the Congress. To insure that the already inadequate revenues of the trust fund will not be diverted from highway construction to other purposes, the bill provides that no moneys shall be appropriated from the trust fund to carry out the Highway Beautification Act or any highway safety legislation enacted after May 1, 1966, except to the extent that at least an equal amount of money, in the aggregate, shall have been first appropriated to the trust fund from the imposition of a 1-percent excise tax on automobiles or from the general fund.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Another important provision of H.R. 14359 directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid system and to submit a report thereon, together with recommendations, to the Congress by January 10, 1967. The committee intends that this study and report include, but not be limited to, the advantages and disadvantages of advance right-of-way acquisition; the extent to which the several States now have legal authority to, and in fact do, acquire rights-of-way substantially in advance of highway construction and the sources and adequacy of funds for such purpose; the time required for removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and for the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations; the management of real property, after its acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the costs thereof, including but not limited to, costs of maintenance and preservation of the property, insurance, and taxes; methods that could be employed, by both the States and the Federal Government, for financing advance right-of-way acquisition, including the possible creation of special funds, either revolving or nonrevolving, for such purpose; the extent to which Federal-aid funds should participate in the costs of advance acquisition of rights-of-way, including interest and holding charges, and in the costs of managing such properties until used for highway purposes; and the extent to which the Federal Government should share in the income produced by such properties.

The rural countryside adjacent to urban areas is rapidly being developed for residential subdivisions, shopping centers, and industrial parks. The few remaining empty lots in cities are disappearing fast, and old residences and commercial buildings are being razed to make way for new multistory office buildings and apartment houses. In many cases, State highway officials have been compelled to watch helplessly as unimproved land is developed with expensive structures and improved lands further developed, without being able to acquire those portions which they know will be needed for highway construction within a few years. Without the proper legal and financial tools highway officials are powerless to acquire such properties at a time when this could be done at minimum expense to the taxpayers. It is hoped that this study will chart the course for providing such tools.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

Highway construction in many urban areas has been plagued by problems of relocation of persons and businesses to be displaced by highway projects. Apparently, the existing provisions of law for relocation assistance have proved to be inadequate in some areas. H.R. 14359 directs the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, to make a full and complete study and investigation to determine what action can and should be taken to provide additional relocation assistance for persons, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by Federal-aid highway projects and to submit a report, together with recommendations, to the Congress by January 10, 1967.

The committee intends that the study include, among other things, consideration of payment of full relocation costs, rather than the maximum of $200 for an individual or family and $3,000 for a business, as now provided by Federal-aid highway law; the coordination of highway construction with other types of construction within an area; the feasibility of constructing within the highway right-of-way or upon adjacent property, publicly or privately owned buildings or other facilities to aid in the relocation of displaced persons, businesses, and nonprofit organizations; and the sources of financing and the sharing of costs of such land, buildings, and facilities.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, as ordered reported by the committee, contains other provisions to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, to increase the amount of funds available for the repair or reconstruction of highways damaged as the result of natural disasters, to authorize State highway departments to use consulting engineers in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and to authorize the Secretary to make highway studies in Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. Each of us and each citizen of this great country recognizes the vast improvements which are taking place in our highway systems.

This legislation will continue highway development at a phased and orderly rate and provide for significant improvements in the fields of safety, beautification, relocation assistance, and highway design. This legislation authorizes funds for the next 2 years which are vital to the continued program of construction and improvement for the Interstate System as well as primary, secondary, and urban roads.

The Interstate System has conferred spectacular benefits on our country and on our people. Most citizens praise the ease, comfort, and time-saving advantages provided by this system which is still less than half completed and forget about other real and valuable benefits of the system.

In 1956 when we created this program, the Nation's industries were operating at less than capacity. Steel production, for example, was running about 38 percent of capacity. We passed this great act, and we have witnessed an upturn in our economy which is unprecedented.

The interstate program contributed heavily to this upswing. Construction of bridges and heavy duty highways required vast amounts of steel, concrete, and other building materials. The construction provided jobs for tens of thousands which in turn spread economic benefits throughout the free enterprise system.

With highway travel becoming more pleasant, people have found places to go, creating demands for automobiles, petroleum products, tires, motels, restaurants, and the vast portion of the economy devoted to recreation and tourism. Indeed, 92 percent of all intercity passenger travel is by highway.

The highways have opened up new and previously isolated areas where new and previously isolated areas where new industries are reviving dying villages and where rural areas are brought into direct contact with the centers of commerce and industry.

A very important benefit of the Interstate System has been the saving of human life. With only half of the interstate mileage open to traffic, experts estimate that more than 3,000 people are alive today who would have been killed last year alone if they had been required to make their trip over inadequately designed highways.

And the state of highway design for improved safety is increasing every day. These new safety features will be incorporated into the future mileage of the Interstate System and will be used to make improvements as well in the primary, secondary, and urban roads.

In considering these vast and enormous benefits, it behooves us to push for the most rapid completion of the Interstate System and the improvement and expansion of our primary and secondary roads.

The Federal-aid highway program, which was first conceived 50 years ago, has been a landmark in the relations between Federal Government and the States. It is fortunate that this Federal-State partnership has worked so well and has achieved a sound working operation.

We need this partnership now more than ever because the vast benefits of the Interstate System accelerate year by year and it is unthinkable that we do anything to halt or slow this climb.

Therefore, I urge adoption of H.R. 14359. It is an investment in an enterprise which guarantees returns all out of proportion to the costs involved. It is a guarantee of our national future whose existence depends largely on balanced transportation. It is a demand to meet our obligations to our people and to our future.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. We are familiar with the many programs which are covered in this legislation, including the State highways, Federal aid to secondary roads, the forest highways and development roads and public lands highways and development roads; and certainly I want to join those who have spoken in support of these authorizations which will permit our highway and road development programs to continue at a realistic pace. All of these categories of roads are important to the Nation, to the State of California, and to the 19 counties of the Second Congressional District, which I am proud to represent.

There is, however, one category which I would like to discuss in detail because of the urgent need for a realistic and adequate program of financing the development of roads and trails in our national forests.

As many of my colleagues know, the Second Congressional District contains approximately 12,500,000 acres of national forest land, so I have reason to be intimately acquainted with the national forest problems of the State of California and the Nation as a whole.

We in the Second Congressional District and throughout California are particularly concerned that our forest resources be developed fully so as to contribute a full share toward the national economy and enjoyment of recreation by the American people. The national forest timber contributes to an industry which provides a great proportion of all employment in my congressional district. As solid evidence of the impact of the timber industry upon the 19 counties of the Second Congressional District, I should point out to you that in the last calendar year, national forest timber sales alone accounted for approximately $14 million in revenues, a substantial factor in our economy and a substantial return to the Federal Government realized through sound management of one of our natural resources. Expanding the development of these roads which are relatively inexpensive-type roads will increase this return to the Federal Treasury. There are about 70 million acres of commercial timberland in California and about 9 million of these acres are publicly owned, principally within the national forests. This acreage of commercial timberland constitutes abount 17 percent of the total land area of our State. In some counties which I represent, national forest lands amount to as much as 75 to 80 percent and more of the land area.

On account of the intermingled nature of forest land ownership within the national forest area, it is desirable that, from the standpoint of economy, a single road system be developed to serve all needs. Public Law 88-657 provided the framework under which this road system can be systematically developed with each beneficiary sharing in costs. Such a road system should be constructed to standards needed to provide for all uses, not only timber. It is important, from a timing standpoint, that Federal funds be available to match private funding in building roads to these intermingled lands. I have been told that at the present rate of financing, it has been impossible to build all roads, constructed in connection with national forest timber sales, to maximum economy standards for full multiple use requirements. At the present level of financing more and more roads originally contemplated to require Federal financing have been shoved off on the timber operator and constructed as a condition of timber sale contract.

In addition to the timber resources in national forests, recreation, hunting, and fishing are needed to take care of our population. I should point out at this point that these national forests attracted a total of 13,916,000 visitor-days of recreation use during the last calendar year of 1965. I think you can readily appreciate the impact of recreation on the economy of our area and the importance of providing adequate access to these Federal lands which are used so heavily for recreation purposes. California's resources, especially recreation resources, are shared by the Nation as a whole.

It is unfortunate that we have not been able to finance forest development roads and trails to the extent contemplated in the "Program for the Development of the National Forests," which was submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy in 1962. I have asked the Forest Service for a statement regarding progress on this program and find that the accumulated authorizations for roads and trails up to fiscal year 1967 will lag behind the program by approximately $169 million. I have also been told that the contemplated 10-year level of financing for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 are $167 million and $169 million, respectively. Unless finances are substantially increased, many opportunities which exist for cooperative financing and for preserving resources value would be lost. I therefore recommend that authorization for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 be increased to $170 million each year as recommended by the committee. Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my full support for the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, which is before this body today. The constantly increasing impact of the automobile on our society makes this legislation of utmost importance to the Nation, and I am sure our colleagues will recognize its importance by speedy passage of this measure.

There is an important provision in this bill to which I would like to call the attention of the House. This is section 6 which provides for an increased authorization of $170 million for the construction of forest development roads and trails. In 1961, President Kennedy called for completion of this program by 1972 and this is the first time we have had a sufficient authorization to meet that particular goal.

An adequate system of roads and trails is the essential key to the proper development and management of natural resources in the national forests. The same could be said of the Bureau of Land Management areas. An expanded program of this nature will be a genuine and important achievement in making available to the public large areas of heretofore inaccessible Forest Service acreage. It will provide multiple use access for many groups; including, the forest products industry, the camper, the fisherman seeking mountain lakes and streams, the hiker, and young students interested in forestry, biology, and wildlife.

In the beautiful First Congressional District, which I am pleased to be able to represent, we have a large portion of our total area in national forests areas under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Already, this land provides us with excellent recreational areas, it furnishes the timber products industry with raw materials, it provides grazing land for cattle and it has not yet been developed to any significant extent. The bill before us today will help in that development.

I am especially pleased with the recommendations contained in this legislation to increase the authorization because I have been working for forest development roads and trails for more than 10 years—ever since my service on the board of supervisors of my home county in California.

For the inclusion of the increased authorization for forest access roads, I pay my particular compliments to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], who is chairman of our Roads Subcommittee, and also to the members of the committee, and in particular to Mr. JOHNSON of California, who actually came to our area to see firsthand some of the roadbuilding problems we have in these inaccessible areas. He has stood fast in supporting our request to accelerate the forest access roadbuilding program.

I would also like to express my support for section 9 of this bill, which provides emergency relief where a natural disaster damages or destroys any highway on government land. I am only too familiar with the need to provide for rapid and effective reconstruction after a major natural disaster, because of what has happened with destruction in my area and many other areas of the United States that were hit by disasters in the past few years.

I also want to extend my support for and applaud the gentlemen for the comments they have made about doing everything possible to accelerate the completion of the Interstate Highway System as close to "on schedule" as is possible.

The fact that the gentleman from Florida has so ably articulated some of the financial problems we have in completing the program on schedule demonstrates that all Members of this Congress are going to have to develop a coordinated effort to present our case to the Ways and Means Committee, asking them to give priority to finding the ways and means of financing the program. I would like to suggest that in addition to the cost of $8.921 billion that is authorized here and the $6 billion as outlined by Mr. CRAMER, we should take into consideration the problem of the loss of lives.

When we think in terms of developing a safety program—and I should like to emphasize the safety aspects—I do not know of any program which would provide more safety in America than one to accelerate the completion of the Interstate Highway System.

We are losing some 50,000 lives per year. This is more than we lose in all wars, and more than in the war in Vietnam. We are all concerned about bringing the boys back home, but we should also give attention to saving some lives at home. We in the Congress, in cooperation with the States, must continue to press for the earliest possible completion of the Interstate Highway System. All America will appreciate our efforts.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to ask some questions of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA]. I should like to address the questions to him.

I might say to the gentleman that I have had reports from my district concerning recent highway hearings, in which it has been said that Ohio is not getting its fair share of Federal highway funds, because Ohio does not utilize all the funds which might be available, and it has been said that some of the funds have been reallocated to Arkansas and other States.

In order to set the record straight, is it true that all highway funds for the ABC system are allocated on the basis of a rigid formula set forth in the highway law, in which population, area, mileage of rural delivery and star routes, percentage of population and of the population of urban places are the deciding factors?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. As the gentleman knows, he has conferred with me on a number of occasions on this particular problem, and both he and I have made exhaustive research and inquiry into the problem.

I can say to the gentleman from Ohio, categorically, that Ohio has not lost any funds under the Federal aid highway program. The gentleman is absolutely correct in the fact that he cites that Federal secondary and primary funds are distributed to the various States on a very rigid formula set forth in title 23 of the United States Code.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I have a further question. In conversations with the Bureau of Public Roads and the Ohio Department of Highways, I am informed that Ohio has always used every available Federal dollar authorized under the formula, and that this is true of every other State.

Does the gentleman know of any year in which Ohio or any other State failed to take advantage of all the Federal funds available?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, to my knowledge I know of no State, since the inception of this program, which has failed to take advantage of the funds allocated to it.

I do know that certainly Ohio has not failed to take advantage of them. But to the contrary has been very vigorous in its expedition of its highway program.

As a matter of fact, these funds are available not only in the year they are allocated, but also for the 2 succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

Mr. BOW. Let me ask the gentleman a further question. Is it true that allocations for secondary roads are made by State governments, so that there is some variation between the States, but in general it is a matter for local county officials to take advantage of whatever State and Federal funds may be available to the county?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, that is true. The Federal Government makes a 50-percent allocation toward the cost of these highways. It is solely up to the State to determine what highways will be built, and where they will be built, and how the State raises the additional 50 percent. The Federal Government does not instigate any action or activity in the Federal-aid highway program. It is a primary responsibility of each State to determine the location, and what highways will be constructed, and when.

Mr. BOW. In other words, it would be true generally that a county is responsible to raise its own matching funds to take advantage of Federal funds, and so it is a county responsibility whether that county receives for secondary roads all of the money that is available for it? That is in Ohio. Is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, this is the situation in Ohio. There is some variation in other States, but the Federal Government is not concerned with where the State gets the second 50 percent to the allocation of funds. In Ohio it is my understanding that the State contributes 25 percent and the counties are responsible for a 25-percent contribution also. Unless they make this 25 percent available, why, of course, the State may allocate this money to some other county. So the responsibility is on each county to make available the funds.

Mr. BOW. With regard to the primary system, I believe it is correct to say that the government of each State has the responsibility to determine what roads within the State shall be built or improved with primary system funds, so that if any area within a State feels that it has been deprived or is less favored than another area, that fault must lie upon the county or district officials within the State who have been unable to argue successfully in State councils where the division of highway funds is made. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he is absolutely correct in this statement.

Mr. BOW. With regard to A–B–C moneys—the primary, secondary, and urban systems—is it not true that the functions of the Federal Government are limited to providing funds and making certain that State projects meet the guidelines of the Federal program? The Bureau of Public Roads does not determine where within a State the A–B–C funds are to be used?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman if the gentleman will yield again, as I pointed out earlier, he is absolutely correct. It is the primary responsibility of the State and local governments to make this determination.

In response to a previous question, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from records available from the Bureau of Public Roads the State of Ohio under the aggressive and vigorous leadership of Governor Rhodes is first in the Nation, that is, first in the Nation in having expended funds for the completion of interstate highways. In other words, Ohio expended more money on completed interstate highways than any other State in this Nation. It is second in the Nation, exceeded only by California, in the total Federal funds expended and obligated, for highway projects underway and completed.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for that information.

On page 11 of the committee report, I am pleased to note that Ohio is No. 1 among the States in projects completed on the Interstate System, having spent $1,176.4 million, as of March 31.

As many of us will recall, who were here in 1956 and later, the Interstate System was one part of the highway program where Members of Congress were able to take part in determining where the money would be spent. I note, for example, that over $200 million has been spent on Interstate 77, which will connect Cleveland and Canton with southeastern Ohio, West Virginia, and North Carolina. Interstate 77 was added to the system after the original plans were completed, largely if not solely on the insistence of the Members of the House directly concerned including, as I recall, our former colleague John Henderson, members of the Virginia and West Virginia delegations, and myself.

This system and the rapid advance of all highway construction under the Federal aid program is a lasting memorial to our beloved colleague from the 17th District of Ohio, the late Harry McGregor, who can be truly named the father of the interstate highway program. We are proud in Ohio of his sponsorship of this program and of the fact that Ohio is a leader among the States in making the McGregor dream a reality.

Our Governor of Ohio, James Rhodes, is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has carried out the highway program.

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly agree with his conclusions. I would like to point out the first and second positions in the Nation I referred to previously in my colloquy with the gentleman dealt with the Interstate System. I would like the Record also to show as it applies to the secondary and primary, the A–B–C system, that Ohio is sixth in the Nation in total expenditure of Federal funds for completed projects under the A–B–C program and eighth in the Nation in total Federal funds expended and obligated for highways under the A–B–C program. So Mr. Chairman it should be obvious to everyone that Ohio has an enviable record in the highway construction field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield for an addition to his statement?

Mr. BOW. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, another great Ohioan served as a ranking Republican on the Roads Subcommittee for years, a gentleman from whom I learned a great deal, former Representative Gordon Scherer, of Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution. I neglected to point out that fact.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] and yield back to the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it is hardly necessary for me to say that the pending Federal-aid highway bill has my support. I must state, however, that I most earnestly believe that the proposed expenditure for highway beautification, as distinguished from the item with respect to outdoor advertising and junkyards control, should be deferred.

In addition to the $120 million already authorized for the current fiscal year 1967, the bill proposes an authorization of $135 million for fiscal 1968 and $150 million for fiscal 1969. This is in addition to the proposed expenditure of $40 million each year for control of outdoor advertising and elimination of junkyards.

Whatever the merit in making our highways beautiful, this certainly cannot be said to be an essential item—perhaps desirable but certainly not necessary in view of the extraordinary defense demands for the unforeseeable future and the mounting inflation from Government spending. In this connection I might add that I attended several meetings at the White House at which the President was critical of the Congress for spending too much. Here is a place where a saving can be made of several million dollars without a hardship being worked on anyone.

While I am interested in all phases of our highway program, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I am particularly interested in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This national interstate highway program was first authorized in 1944 and developed in the historic Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

This nationwide program is a part of our defense program. Its purpose is to link our major cities from coast to coast, north and south, east and west, on the most direct route practicable. In all transportation, and in defense transportation particularly, it is imperative that we be able to go from one major point to another by the shortest route and in the fastest possible time.

That we have enjoyed such a high degree of success over these past 10 years in developing this Interstate Highway System has been due to the wisdom of our Public Works Committee in fixing the legal standards for the Interstate System, faithful adherence to those standards by the Federal Bureau of Roads, and the cooperation the Federal Government has in general received from the 50 States.

An important distinction must be made between the program for the National System of Interstate Highways and that for all other roads, primary and secondary. In the interstate program the national interest is paramount over any State or local interests. At no time should State or local interests be allowed to prevail over that of the national interest.

That is why the Federal Government bears 90 percent of the construction costs of the Interstate System and the States only 10 percent.

In the program for primary and secondary roads it is the State and local needs and interests that are paramount to the national. Here the primary consideration is to what is needed locally rather than nationally. And, in keeping with this premise, the Federal aid to the States is on a 50–50 basis.

As a matter of fact, it is clearly set forth in the "declaration of policy" in the very first section of the first chapter of the United States Code—title 23—relative to Federal-aid highways that the Interstate System should take priority and that the national interest is paramount.

We also stipulated that in the Interstate System routes through the States and across the Nation shall be as direct as practicable: "as the crow flies," if you will.

This obviously means that the individual States must forgo what they might like, or what some locality within a State might like, that the national objective of direct routes be served. At no time and under no circumstances, for the success of the national interstate highway program, can a purely local interest, be it economic or political, be allowed to prevail over the national needs.

As a representative from the State of Illinois I am embarrassed to have to say that the Governor of our great State would have the Federal Bureau of Roads depart from this well-established principle. While I am anxious to advance the interests of my home State of Illinois, I do not believe I am serving the interests of the people of Illinois when I do not most vigorously protest the action taken by our Governor which is inimical to the best interests of all 50 States.

Approximately 10 years ago the Federal Bureau of Roads approved the interstate route, as directed as any route could possibly be, between St. Louis and Chicago. It is known as Interstate 55. It is presently in various stages of construction.

Suddenly, to the complete surprise of everyone, the State of Illinois submitted in August of last year an official request for a change in the route. It means an abandonment of some of the interstate mileage that has already been constructed. And yet it is part of our national policy to construct the Interstate System as quickly as possible. It means an extension of the interstate route by 30 miles. And yet it is part of our national policy to keep these interstate defense routes as direct and as short as possible. And, of course, this would represent substantial additional cost to the Federal Government.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the time nor place to argue the relative merits of what has been proposed for an interstate highway in Illinois and the change that is now proposed. This is something to be argued with the Federal Bureau of Roads. We have done this in detail with the able Commissioner of Federal Highways present.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, what should be an economic and engineering decision is apparently going to be a political one. The question to be resolved, whether to approve or disapprove the change proposed by the Governor, has been pending for over a year. I am not only amazed that our Governor recommended the change, for reasons no one can understand, except possibly to serve some local economic or political interests; but, I am also amazed to find that this whole matter has been placed in the White House, or perhaps more accurately, taken out of the hands of the Federal Bureau of Roads by the White House.

I have talked with a representative of the White House, Governor Bryant, on two occasions on this subject, and the only satisfaction I can obtain from him is that the matter is still pending.

Were it left to the Commissioner of Federal Highways to decide, I feel certain he would resolve this problem on the merits of the case. He would, I believe, insist that Interstate 55 in Illinois proceed as originally approved by the Bureau 10 years ago. It will be a sad day for our interstate highway program, designed to serve the Nation as a whole, if decisions with respect to it are to be made solely on a political basis to serve political needs in any of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the committee for taking up your time on a matter of this character. But I think you would want to know and should know that a very fine program is being sabotaged by the interjection of politics in some of the decisions. I am embarrassed that the Governor of my home State should be instrumental in seeking a national political decision to satisfy a purely local political purpose at the expense of a program of this character so essential to our national defense planning and effectiveness.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that this proposed relocation would cost additional sums of money from the highway funds?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, it would increase costs for we already have spent millions of dollars in preparing for the eventual construction of this particular highway now known as Route I–55.

Mr. McCLORY. I am particularly interested in the subject of funds for our interstate and Federal-aid highways because I have a communication here from Mr. Francis S. Lorenz, director of the Department of Public Works and Buildings, State of Illinois, in which he brings out the fact that unless this legislation is enacted, it will be impossible for the State of Illinois to authorize any contract lettings after September 16. I am extremely interested in the enactment of this legislation to provide additional funds and especially funds for necessary highway construction in Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The original plan would have obviated the necessity for the State of Illinois to ask for additional funds for construction of I–55 since they now plan to change a route involving the building of over 30 more miles. This necessitates additional funding.

That is a plan which is being followed throughout my district where the route long ago was established and the specifications made. Now to find that we are going to make a big change, I say that if this change of interstate routes can be made in the State of Illinois, it can be done in every State of the United States of America. It is wrong and is as wrong as can be when we recall what the original concept of our Interstate Highway System was to be.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. If this authorization is not passed in the near future, the States will not have available the needed apportionments so that they can let contracts in the time to get the job done.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no quarrel with the committee, and I apologize in a way for having brought this up at this time but it was my only alternative. We face a decision about to be made on a political basis rather than on the basis of a highway system which was determined a long time ago, a program which the Bureau of Roads would like, in my opinion, to follow if permitted so to do.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the subject of Federal aid to highways, and the Federal-Aid Highway Act in particular, is of particular significance to the State of Illinois. I am sure that every Member of this body recognizes the importance of motor-vehicle transportation to our economy and the need for Federal assistance in the building of adequate roads to insure the smooth flow of interstate and intrastate commerce, as well as to provide our citizens with convenient motor travel.

However, Mr. Chairman, the passage of this legislation today is more than a matter of economic importance to the people of Illinois; it is also a matter of utmost urgency. I am informed by the Honorable Francis S. Lorenz, director of the Illinois Department of Public Works and Buildings, that the remainder of Federal-aid highway funds available for fiscal 1967 is barely enough to see the Department through the next contract letting period beginning September 16. I am sure that many other States are similarly situated.

Mr. Chairman, unless congressional action is completed on this legislation by October 1, and funds appropriated for fiscal 1968, the proposed contract letting for the period beginning October 28 will have to be canceled or postponed. I hope such a step will not have to be taken by the State of Illinois or any other State concerned with maintaining a program of highway construction capable of serving the Nation's economy and the needs of its citizens. I urge favorable action on this legislation so that Illinois and the other 49 States can get on with the important job of highway construction.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], chairman of this Subcommittee on Public Works, together with his associates, for the very fine job that they have done back through the years. It is their foresight which has contributed greatly to the progress we have made with the Interstate Highway System. I know they, too, wish that the trust funds set aside for highways were sufficient to further increase the mileage.

However, I take this time to point out some other things to which I believe the American people and the Congress might give some thought. We need highways and we need them now. Certainly the action taken some 10 years ago, when taxes closely tied to the use for highways were set up, a trust fund for highway construction was sound. However, I would go further and say that in this day of specialization, when we find that practically everyone in our various States is specializing, be it in agriculture or whatever it is, we have become a nation of interstate traffic. Funds that seemed ample then are not sufficient today.

Our legislature has recently taken action to try to meet the problem—but it will be next to impossible to keep up with the increased numbers of automobiles, trucks, and other vehicles which use our highways.

We have traffic jams regularly on at least four major highways in my district, and I know there is hardly any better way that we might invest the income of our country. As I pointed out in support of my successful motion to override President Eisenhower's second veto of the public works appropriation in 1959, the more our problems the greater the need to at least look after and develop our own country. I feel that way about highways.

In my own district, covering north Mississippi, we need highways not merely to meet future development, but to handle the needs of the present.

I am not a candidate for Governor, and I have no intention of being a candidate; but I have frequently said that if I were, I would certainly run on a platform of building highways, by borrowing if need be, so the highways could help pay for themselves. Pay-as-you-go is fine, but there, as here, growth in people, in cars, and in traffic, make pay-as-you-go too slow for sound economics.

We need to go ahead with the construction of the adequate highway system which is so badly needed and let the increased development which will follow make such highways a sound investment.

We, as a nation, are committed around the world to support of foreign aid and many other programs, most of which I have opposed. We would be much smarter if we, as a Congress, the President, and the Bureau of the Budget, would recognize that in effect the Federal Government has preempted the income tax of the American people to a degree that it is next to impossible to raise sufficient funds at the local level on behalf of the States, and as much as I hate to see many things become federalized, we have grown as a nation in such a way that our traffic is in interstate commerce. We are each so dependent upon the other that I trust this committee will in its studies and recommendations give thought to this problem.

This fine committee, in the studies that it generally makes, I am sure will give attention to recommending using funds in addition to trust funds, where needed, to expand the Federal system, because circumstances as I have pointed out are making the need for interstate highways greater and greater? The situation has changed from that of a few years ago.

It is said that there is a new baby born each 12 seconds and a new car comes off the assembly line each 8 seconds. As to that I don't know but an increase of 3½ million people each year adds to highway needs, I know.

I again commend my friends on the committee—for the fine job and foresight which they have shown. May I ask what current studies are being carried on by the committee, or under its supervision, as to the continuing need or planning for roads and highways, over and above that on which the committee has done such a good job in the bill before us?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] asked earlier, in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I would say that, acting under the authority of the existing law, through the Bureau of Public Roads, we have a report to the Congress in January of 1968, and every second calendar year thereafter, to give us an estimate of the future highway needs of the Nation. They are doing an excellent job in the Bureau of Public Roads and in the Commerce Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

I believe the feeling I express here is rather general and should be considered in connection with any such study. I believe it will be found that the American people have come to recognize that travel and movement of things and people has become interstate; and in order to handle the job properly we will have to look for finances in addition to those of the trust fund with which the gentleman is dealing with here.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to express my public support for the provisions of H.R. 14359, the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1966. Ten years have now passed since the enactment of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act—legislation which converted the Interstate System from an idea to a concrete fact through the most far-reaching road construction program in the history of the world. A total of 21,377 miles of the Interstate System was completed and open to traffic on March 31 with work on another 17,068 miles underway. Thus, some form of work has been completed or is in progress on 38,445 miles, or 94 percent, of the entire 41,000-mile system. We are well on the way to the completion of this tremendous undertaking, and the Congress must do its part to see that the necessary funds continue to be available.

Highway transportation today accounts for over 90 percent of intercity travel of our citizens, and now accounts for over 300 billion ton-miles of goods transported annually. Americans will spend about $100 billion this year for highway-related travel and transportation expenses—about one-seventh of our gross national product. Such statistics make it abundantly clear that support for better roads is absolutely essential for the economic and social well-being of the Nation now and in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 should go a long way toward satisfying the transportation needs of this and future generations. Although I have doubt about the desirability of all the authorizations under section 8 of the bill in view of present conditions, I am happy to voice my full support for all the other sections.

Mr. **BUCHANAN**. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of Birmingham, Ala., the largest urban area in the State, I support H.R. 14359, the highway bill now pending before the House.

This bill includes funds for the A-B-C Federal highway aid program which allocates Federal funds to the States for road construction in urban areas, as well as for primary and secondary highway construction.

In the bill now before the House, an allocation is included in the amount of $3,361,000 specifically for the construction of urban roads in the State of Alabama for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Under the same program, $3,255,671 was allocated for urban roads in Alabama for 1966.

These funds are of importance to cities like Birmingham. Under the program, the only restriction is that roads, to be eligible for the Federal funds, in an urban area, must be part of the State primary and secondary highway system. Because of the many connecting roads traversing the city which are part of these systems, these funds can be a major factor in the building and improvement of our major highway arteries in Birmingham.

Under the A-B-C highway program, the plans for urban road construction and improvement developed at the local level must be submitted to the Alabama State Highway Department for approval, and State approval is required before Federal funds can be used for this construction.

Federal funds, upon State approval of a proposed urban project, are then available to the State on a matching—50-50—basis, and these funds are drawn, not from the general Federal tax fund, but from the highway trust fund which consists of moneys from some of the Federal highway-user funds, and places the highway program on a self-supporting, pay-as-you-build basis. Allocations to each State are also based on a mileage population formula.

The funds allocated in the bill now before the House for the State of Alabama for construction and improvement of highways and roads in Birmingham and other urban areas in the State for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 assure the availability of funds for any urban road development and improvement which may be scheduled and approved at the State level through fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Public Works Committee on the excellent job they have done on this bill.

The Interstate Highway System is the backbone of our Nation's economy. Completion of the system as close to the originally scheduled date as possible is essential if we are going to continue making the rapid economic and social progress we have made in the last decade. Approval of this bill will enable us to provide the transportation essential in the years immediately ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear, however, that while the present Interstate System has contributed greatly to our recent economic growth, much more will need to be done above and beyond the scope of the present Interstate Highway System, as presently conceived. Significant gaps remain. Entire new communities have come into existence since the Interstate System was first approved. We must, therefore, take steps now to provide for a substantial extension of the present system unless we are willing to risk the stagnation of our growing economy.

In south Florida the extension of two interstate highways is essential to the continued orderly growth in the area as well as to the defense of our country. Interstate 95 must be extended from its present terminus in Miami south to Key West. Interstate 75 should be extended from its present terminus at Tampa southeastward to Miami.

Every economic indicator and study shows that the area between Miami and Key West will be among the fastest growing in the country. Half a million people presently live in this area and it is estimated that in the next 25 years as many as 2 million people may live south of the city of Miami.

It is obvious that I-95 must be extended to this area to provide not only the backbone of its urban transportation system, but more importantly as an access route to interstate commerce.

Even today there is tremendous need for the extension of this highway to the southern part of Dade County. Many of the fresh vegetables you will enjoy this winter come from the truck farms of southern Dade County. A large proportion of these vegetables are carried by truck, and the present trend would indicate that this percentage will increase.

More important than any of these reasons is the need for the extension of I-95 and I-75 to provide defense against the nearest Communist country to the continental United States. Both the Key West Naval Base and Homestead Air Force Base are the vanguard of our defense against threatened or real Communist aggression from Cuba. Key West, which is only 90 miles from Cuba is presently connected to the mainland by only a single aging two-lane highway. The Cuban missile crisis clearly indicated that this road was not enough.

The only direct threat to the security of the mainland United States in the last 152 years was that the two rail lines and the single existing interstate highway are inadequate to provide the men and materiel necessary for the defense of south Florida in the event of another crisis centered in the Caribbean. It is for this reason as well as because of the expanding commerce between Tampa and Miami that I-75 should be extended to Miami as soon as possible.

Last year in a joint resolution we provided for a continuing study by the Bureau of Public Roads to determine the future highway needs of the country. I urge the Bureau and its able Director, Rex Whitton, to include these two extensions not only in their study but in their recommendations to the Congress.

Mr. **SCHMIDHAUSER**. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 14395, which we are considering. As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I had the opportunity to actively work for this measure in the committee, and I firmly believe it will contribute much to the rapid development of and improvement of our highway system and to the safety of motorists.

I am happy to say that my own State of Iowa is one of the States that has made unusually rapid progress in the utilization of Federal highway aid funds. This bill which we are considering will accelerate construction by providing additional funds, thus eliminating possible delays in the full development of interstate highways. Second, this bill incorporates the requirement that the system maintain a minimum of at least four lanes and also incorporates a provision for wide bridges, and additional lanes in regions where the need exists because of increased traffic.

Another key provision provides for regular biennial authorization for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, for the regular Federal-aid highway program. This will enable the Iowa Highway Commission to continue its efforts to provide vitally needed four-lane expressways. I strongly support this provision which is of vital importance to the residents of my district.

Finally, I believe approval of this bill will contribute much to the safety of all motorists. Statistics have shown the significant decrease in tragic automobile fatalities on modern four-lane, controlled-access highways. The full development of our Nation's highway system is a vital part of our national effort to end the slaughter on our Nation's highways. Passage of this bill and the pending safety legislation, I believe, will bring us closer to the day when families will not be torn by the tragic loss of a loved one killed in an unsafe car or an outdated road.

For these reasons, I strongly endorse H.R. 14359, and I commend my colleagues on the Public Works Committee and the staff for their fine job on this important legislation.

The section relating to authorization for funds for highway beautification can be deferred until positive action is forthcoming on needed tax reforms to eliminate longstanding loopholes. I have introduced several measures including a major bill to reduce the indefensible oil depletion allowance. I urge the President to stimulate his departments to issue reports on my tax reform measures. When this is done, we can adequately fund this worthwhile beautification program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two observations in respect to H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

First I want to once again express my disapproval of the highway beautification section. I voted against it when the proposal first came before us. I shall vote against it again.

There are several grounds for my opposition: I think the basic bill treats unfairly landowners with billboard sites but who have not erected boards as compared with those who have. I think, as a matter of fact, that the bill is close to being unconstitutional. Further, the costs involved are not capable of being calculated and the fund allocation formula is unjust to some States.

As important as any is my objection to spending about one-quarter of a billion dollars a year during a time of developing inflationary trends and rising costs of the war in Vietnam which are approaching the rate of about $2 billion a month. We should curtail rather than expand unnecessary or deferrable Federal spending and this program is certainly not necessary at this time, much as we all support beauty.

So I support the motion to recommit the bill with instructions to delete the highway beautification authorization. But I shall support the bill with or without the highway beautification provisions.

The adequate development of roads and trails within national forests is of vital importance to Oregon and this bill increases the authorization to $170 million—double the present amount. These national forests are important to Oregon in many ways. Forest-related industry is the primary economic base in Oregon and valuable commercial timberlands are included in the national forests. Besides timber, the national forests are areas for hunting and fishing.

For years I have contended that forest roads should be built by appropriated funds rather than by the timber operators. Standards can be better controlled, the small purchasers can better compete with the big companies for timber, and the timber can still bear the cost of building the road to the grade necessary for logging because timber revenues will increase.

In 1962, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a "Program for the Development of the National Forests." The report envisioned an adequate and satisfactory long-range program of financing forest development of roads and trails. However, we have not been able to finance this adequately.

This has a number of implications. One, for example, is that if financing of these roads is inadequate then the cost is placed upon timber operators who work the forests—or the roads do not get built and opportunities are lost for developing and protecting natural resources. But, if financing provisions are adequate, then cooperative financing arrangements involving both the Federal Government and the timber operators can be established.

Intensive management of secondary-growth timber stands cannot be practiced unless there is an adequate forest road network in place. In my State of Oregon alone, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management could harvest somewhere between 500 million and 1 billion board feet of additional timber a year merely from the thinning of secondary-growth stands and salvage cuts in other stands. In the face of growing pressures brought on by export of logs to Japan, by rising log costs and falling lumber and plywood prices, the accessibility of these timber stands through an adequate road net is still another factor to consider.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see in this bill the natural disaster legislation already passed by the House but not, so far, acted on by the Senate. Oregon has been through a terrible windstorm and a terrible flood in recent years. These liberalized provisions for Federal assistance in times of trouble must become law.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, while I listened with interest to the colloquy between my colleagues from Ohio [Mr. Bow and Mr. HARSHA] here on the floor of the House today with respect to the Interstate Highway System in Ohio, it brought to my mind a road-paving project in my own district. The project to which I refer is the paving of Dorothy Lane, Dayton, Ohio, which was begun several months ago.

I am a property owner on Dorothy Lane and at first suffered along with my neighbors the inconvenience of not being able to get into my driveway. The 3-week period the driveway was supposed to be blocked extended to several months so I decided to inquire from the Bureau of Public Roads as to the cause of the unreasonable delay.

I asked about the roadbed which permitted a drop-off of from 2 to 3 feet which was left open to traffic and thereby created a hazard. I had had complaints from residents and businessmen, not only about the inconvenience, but the money lost by business. I feel sure this situation could have been planned with greater efficiency. In light of the intent to keep the road open to traffic, the length of the paving plans on the north side of Dorothy Lane was most unreasonable.

In response to my letter to the Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, replied:

> Secondary Road Plan projects are not routinely inspected by the Bureau of Public Roads. During the investigation of this situation, our division office noted one aspect of the work which should be improved.
>
> Neither the construction plans nor the specifications specifically limited the length of highway which could be closed to abutting property at any one time. Consequently the contractor excavated approximately three miles along the north side of Dorothy Lane with the intent of paving that entire length at one time.
>
> Weather and utility delays unfortunately set back the contractor's operations.
>
> Our division office will refer this matter to the State and ask that they establish a more thorough review of traffic maintenance procedures for urban secondary projects. This should result in a minimum period of delay to the abutting properties.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues to keep the record straight and in the hope that it may serve to prevent residents and businessmen in other cities from suffering the same inconveniences and financial losses to businesses.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting the Federal-Aid Highway Act, H.R. 14359, the measure we have before us today.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the additional sum of $4,306,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "fifteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen years" and by striking out "June 30, 1971", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1972".

(b) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking "1971" where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1972", and such section 104(b)(5) is further amended by striking "fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.", at the end of the penultimate sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972."

FOUR-LANING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 5. Section 109(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that such standards shall provide for not less than four traffic lanes for the main traveled way of the Interstate System."

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 7. (a) The last sentence of subsection (m) of section 131, and the last sentence of subsection (m) of section 136, of title 23, United States Code, are each amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1967."

(b) The last sentence of subsection (b) of section 319 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection after June 30, 1967."

(c)(1) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, neither sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, nor any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, shall be construed to be authority for any appropriations for any fiscal year for which appropriations are not specifically authorized by fiscal year in such sections or provisions.

(b) Any appropriation to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, must be authorized by a provision of law, specifically setting forth the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year to carry out such section or other provision of law.

"(c) The highway trust fund established by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 shall not be available for any appropriation to carry out sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, and any provision of law realting to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, in an aggregate amount which exceeds the amount of tax that would be imposed under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if such section imposed a tax at the rate of 1 per centum plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes, but the total of all appropriations made from such fund to carry out these sections and provisions of law shall never exceed the total of all appropriations made to such fund based on the imposition of such tax plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes."

(2) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 8. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 131 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 136 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $28,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

SEC. 9. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000, the unexpended balance of such amount shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1967, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 11. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms, subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organization, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1967, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost, responsibilities, and other pertinent matter.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $150,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendments at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVENGER

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 10, after line 23 add a new section, and renumbering the following sections:

"SEC. 6. Section 129 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary may permit the participation of interstate funds apportioned to any State under the provisions of section 104(b)(5) of this chapter to aid in the retirement of the principal outstanding bonds the proceeds of which have actually been expended in the construction of any toll bridge, tunnel, or road on the Interstate System, which was constructed on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Any State desiring to use interstate funds under this subsection shall substitute the mileage for such toll bridge, tunnel, or road for an equivalent designated mileage on the Interstate System within the State. Such toll bridge, tunnel, or road shall meet the standards adopted for projects on the Interstate System. The Federal share payable under this subsection shall be the same as for the construction of projects on the Interstate System. No interstate funds shall be obligated under this subsection until the State highway department or departments have entered into an agreement with the Secretary providing that such bridge, tunnel, or road shall be maintained and operated by the State highway department or departments as a free bridge, tunnel, or road upon the retirement of the outstanding bonds.'"

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this chance to speak to a very perplexing question, a question that arises every time we talk about the Interstate System. The question is whether this Interstate System is going to be a free system or whether it is going to be a toll system. I have part of the Interstate System in my district. I have many miles of interstate roadway. But on one small part of the Interstate System, and a part of the Interstate System, I have a bridge called the Mackinac Bridge. It costs us $3.75 to go one way cross this bridge, and it costs us $7.50 for a roundtrip.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the States to use part of their allocations of funds to pay off the bonds so that these toll facilities would be free. This includes not only the Mackinac Bridge, but also toll facilities in Illinois, Oklahoma, New York, and every other State that has toll facilities as part of the Interstate System.

I know the members of the committee have studied this problem, and are currently studying it. I know people are going to say, "We cannot do it now; we must have a study." There have been four or five studies of this. Every time we get to the point of trying to get a free Interstate System we have a study to determine why it should not remain partly free.

This amendment will not increase the amount of interstate mileage. It will not change the standards of the Interstate System. All it will do is permit a person who is on the Interstate System to go from one part of the system to another part of the system without paying a toll.

In Michigan, since the completion of the Mackinac Bridge, which was completed just as the Interstate System was starting, we have spent about $400 million for bridges on the Interstate System. Right now the lower part of Michigan has a bridge being built on the Interstate System which is costing more per foot than the Mackinac Bridge. It is a part of the same system. It is a part of the same State. However, people in one part of the State ride for nothing, while people going to another part of the State have to pay $7.50 and, in the case of trucks, something more than $30.

What do we have when toll facilities are a part of the system? I am not talking about toll facilities off the system, but toll facilities as a part of the system, whether that be the Chicago Skyway or the New York Tollway. We say that the drivers on this system who cross these toll facilities pay twice. They pay once when they pay into the trust fund, and they pay again when they put their dollars into the toll baskets.

One of the primary purposes of the bill we are considering is to recognize that we have to complete the system and that in order to complete it we have to raise more money.

All I say is that if we are going to complete the system we should use the funds, and we should raise an adequate amount of funds to complete the system, but we should do it so that the system will be entirely free and not part toll and part free.

We have to face this decision, and I believe the time to face the decision is now.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell us from where he contemplates the funds would come?

Mr. CLEVENGER. From the trust fund.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. That is a rather broad statement, because everyone wants to tap the trust fund at a time when we are already in arrears in meeting the financial requirements to complete this program on time. I am sure the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will offer some comments on this.

Can the gentleman tell me whether he came before our Roads Subcommittee with this suggestion?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I introduced a bill with the understanding that it could be offered as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Could the gentleman also tell me whether he attended any of the hearings held in our Roads and Federal-Aid Subcommittees relating to the overall effect toll roads, bridges, and tunnels have on the Interstate System?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I did not see the gentleman before our Roads Subcommittee which would hear the testimony on behalf of his amendment. It is sort of difficult for him to come in with an amendment on the floor, when the committee has not had an opportunity to evaluate his recommendation. This is the first time I have heard of his particular amendment. This problem has been the subject of lengthy hearings before our Federal-Aid Subcommittee. We held lengthy hearings before our Roads Subcommittee on this bill—that would have been the time to appear so we could give proper consideration to any recommendations he might have.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The trust fund is now $6 billion short, to finish the balance of the free system by 1973. There seems to be no inclination to put more money into the trust fund through additional taxes to do that job.

From where will the money come to do the $5 billion additional job of paying off existing toll roads and bridges?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am prepared to support legislation to get the funds.

Mr. CRAMER. Has the President made any such proposal? I am sure that he has not.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I cannot speak for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

This administration and the previous administrations have all recommended against toll road reimbursement at this time. So I think that the gentleman from Michigan is doing nothing more than wishful thinking, No. 1. No. 2, reimbursement for toll and free roads incorporated into the Interstate System would cost over $4 billion when we are $6 billion in the red already. No. 3, there is little leadership to do something about the $6 billion deficit to finish the present system let alone to provide the additional $4 billion to do anything about toll and free road reimbursement. So I think some people who are pressing the question of toll road reimbursement ought to take equal leadership in pressing people to do something about this $6 billion deficit with regard to the present system of 41,000 miles that has not been completed. If more money is not made available, it will not be completed until 1975. That is the high priority job we have and not returning money for highways which are already constructed on a toll road basis, or authorizing new mileage to States in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan be defeated as it has consistently been defeated in the Committee on Public Works of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the inception of the Interstate System originally the proposition that this amendment raises was considered at that time, in 1944 and in 1946. It has been a matter of consistent consideration by the Committee on Public Works in connection with its biennial bill which has been reported by the Congress since 1944. Without exception there has never been a State that petitioned the Congress to change the formula and to provide funds for the acquisition of bridges and highways which were utilized as toll facilities. Consequently, AASHO has been consistent in its stand in opposition to this.

Mr. Chairman, this would cause untold turmoil and upset the orderly procedures of programing and financing at local levels and have other disruptive effects that would defeat the whole aim of the completion of the Interstate System.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not be put to the task of trying to evaluate these highways and bridges on the Interstate System. This would cause a disruption of the work now proceeding toward the completion of this system. The problems are huge in trying to bring about the completion of the present 41,000 miles on the target date. If we have to assume obligations that are not envisioned in present law and if this amendment were to pass, I will assure you that we can figure on a decided delay in the completion of this program.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman from Alabama is certainly one of the more knowledgeable members of our committee. Would not the net effect of this amendment be just one more raid on the trust fund which we are trying to protect?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would be more injurious than just a raid on the trust fund. It would mean that you would disrupt the plans of the State of California and other States that have toll roads that would come into the system. Consequently you would have an interruption in the type of program that we want. Also it has a relationship to the total scheme of development of the Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As I read the gentleman's amendment, it is fatally defective, also, in this respect: It does not provide for additional mileage at a later date as reimbursement.

Mr. Chairman, it does not suggest additional funds for reimbursement. It says that you can take the regular apportionment, interstate apportionment, and use them to pay for toll roads and bridges.

Mr. Chairman, that means that if we should do this, the Interstate System is going to be destroyed. A State will not have enough money to finish its interstate mileage within the time period for completion by 1973; is not that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not only that, but I will say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] that when you buy up all of these bonds that are issued at the high interest rates that we shall be paying, that is going to represent another capital cost that the Federal Government is going to be obligated to pay.

So, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why under the present arrangement we cannot continue a very satisfactory arrangement of highway construction.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Alabama yield further?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, even if reimbursement were a sound approach, this approach is wrong. It is wrong to use construction funds, that otherwise would go to finish the 41,000-mile system, to pay for existing toll roads and bridges.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anyone who has shown a greater concern about this matter than the chairman of our subcommittee. The gentleman has done a magnificent job and has had a situation in the State of Illinois into which the gentleman has gone very thoroughly with the subcommittee. The gentleman is of the opinion that he should not press the matter, because the gentleman wanted to have additional studies made.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to say that the committee is not going to be receptive to the needs of the State highway departments, or to those roads that can probably be utilized in the Interstate System as the necessity arises.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will not insist upon the amendment, because as I have stated previously, I believe it would do irreparable harm to an orderly program that is now proceeding on a steady course.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my senior colleagues on the committee for pointing out some of the limitations in the proposed amendment. However, I feel that the gentleman from Michigan is to be commended for bringing before the House one of the most vexing public works problems which exists in the United States. It is a problem that affects constituents in every one of the congressional districts of the United States, because as Americans are traveling more, they are finding that, perhaps, they do not pay tolls back in Missouri or in one part of California or Michigan, but they are, as they travel on vacation. And we are now faced with 20,000 additional miles of toll roads now being contemplated in the United States, in addition to the present toll roads.

Mr. Chairman, the State of New York has spent $800 million and has never been reimbursed for that expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], and the chairman of the special subcommittee on the highway program are aware of this fact and have set up a special investigation to cover toll roads.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have just completed many weeks of hearings or, rather, held many weeks of hearings. These hearings are not printed yet.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Michigan is to be commended for bringing this matter to the floor of the House, and I am hopeful that when the hearings are printed that out of this will emerge legislation that will provide a permanent solution to this most vexing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that it will have to come after 1973. But I believe there is a growing awareness that this is a national and not simply a regional problem and that obviously within the not too distant future we shall have some legislation that will finally come to grips with this very serious problem.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

I think the matter is one that deserves the most careful study. I would like to join in commending the gentleman from Michigan for proposing his amendment. It seems to me that this is a case where the present program works an inequity and it also works so as to penalize those States and communities which in the past have shown initiative enough to have roads and bridges built; now they are suffering for their energy and their investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 20, after line 12, add the following new section:

"PRESERVATION OF PARKLANDS

"SEC. 14 (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" '§137. Preservation of parklands

" 'It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such policy.' "

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to protect parklands, national forests, and historic sites that are in some instances being threatened by the building of major interstate highways.

Mr. Chairman, I might say the amendment or one similar to it has already been adopted by the Senate. The Senate amendment, as introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH and adopted by the Senate, was considerably more explicit than my amendment.

There was some reason to believe after talking this over with the staff that the Yarborough amendment is defective in some of its details. So what I have done with this amendment is simply to state as a matter of policy that the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local governments parklands and historic sites. Also the Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anybody can object to this statement of policy. Surely if we have the programs which we do, carried on by the Department of the Interior and the National Forest Service and others to enhance the beauty of our open areas, a statement of policy such as this surely should be adopted by the House and is certainly important.

I might say we do have some reports on this proposal in letter form from two departments.

The Department of the Interior feels that this policy is a wise one. The Department of Commerce, however, does express some doubt, not doubts as to my amendment which is more general than the Senate amendment, but some doubts as to the so-called Yarborough amendment which is more explicit.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1966, commencing at page 17630, the records of the Senate in which Senator YARBOROUGH in some detail sets forth the reasons and the supporting data for the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Committee to go into great detail on all of these but I can tell you that in almost every State of the Union there has been a situation where an interstate highway has threatened either a historic site or some beautiful park.

The situations which he calls to our particular attention are in Philadelphia, in San Francisco, in Texas and, indeed, they are in many other parts of the land.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a sound amendment and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am reluctant to oppose any amendment offered by a distinguished member of our Committee on Public Works. However, I point out that the amendment has not been studied. We do not know what the implications of the amendment would be. Under the Federal Aid Highway Act the States themselves must determine the alinement of our Interstate System, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads. So I am sure that if there are historic sites, as alluded to by the gentleman from New Hampshire, in a particular State, that that State itself would want to preserve those sites and therefore would certainly do nothing to disturb their preservation.

Therefore, since the committee has not had an opportunity to study the gentleman's amendment or the subject itself, I hope that the Committee of the Whole will reject the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I believe actually the gentleman from Illinois has spoken in support of my amendment. Did the gentleman say that if there is a park or a national historic site that is being threatened, the States would certainly not want a highway to affect such park or site?

Mr. GRAY. That is what I said.

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is exactly what my amendment states. If that be so, what earthly objection could there be to my amendment? You do not have to study four printed lines to know what they say. The committee does not have to study it. It is a statement of policy on an important issue that has bothered many conservationists and those who are interested in preserving sites of historic value in this country. It reaffirms what is probably the law. If a State government is careful about such things, there is nothing for that State government to be afraid of. I think you have actually spoken in support of my amendment, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I am a little surprised that my distinguished friend, who is a strong States righter, would once again want us to write into a Federal law what a State must or must not do in determining the alinement of a particular highway in a particular State. Until we know what the implications are concerning this matter and how far-reaching those implications would be, the question should be studied.

Therefore, the committee is opposing the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. My amendment specifically states that the Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans. There is no dictation here. I think you have either not read my amendment carefully or I have not made it clear as to what its intent is. I quote:

> The Secretary shall cooperate with the States.

Mr. GRAY. I have read the amendment very carefully, word for word and line for line, and we do oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise, first, to commend our distinguished chairman and the committee for the splendid job that they have done in continuing the furtherance of a necessary system of highways in our country.

Second, I would like to ask our distinguished chairman a question: Is it true that my State of Georgia is receiving and has been receiving its fair share of all Federal highway moneys appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. You mean the State of Georgia?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The State of Georgia.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. If my memory serves me right, the State of Georgia has received a lot more than they ever expected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. You have a gentleman in the Senate by the name of Senator RUSSELL. He and Bob Kerr used to operate pretty good some years ago when Bob was chairman of that committee. I remember some $500,000 went to Georgia, just like that. Yes, you are getting more.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Thank you very much. That is another good reason we are delighted with our distinguished Senator. I should like to ask one more question for my benefit. Is it not true, also, that any moneys that my First District of Georgia receives must and shall be sent down from the State highway department and/or the State government, and that we have no authority whatsoever in deciding where these highways will be built? Is that right?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. That is under the law?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for its good work in seeking to further the highway program. We are, of course, in need of the best possible highway system. It is expensive and there are many problems that arise in various areas of the country.

Now, I happen to live in the town of Lubbock, Tex., which is one of the five largest towns in the United States not served by the Interstate Highway System. I well realize that in this bill we are not undertaking to extend the system. We are working on the present system.

But I was most anxious that the committee understand the great pressures under which some of us labor who have areas which are not served by the Interstate Highway System. I know this subject has crept into the debate earlier in the day, but I wanted to reopen the subject. My people are pressing me to tell them when they probably will be able to get on the Interstate System. Naturally I have a great interest in this subject and have sought to be helpful to my area in road matters through the years.

Of course, I realize that the gentleman cannot give me the complete answer to this question. There are a lot of matters involved, but I am interested in knowing whether or not the committee feels that we should undertake to extend the system as soon as is reasonably possible, and will we do anything about it prior to approximately 1973?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama who is widely experienced in highway legislation matters.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the gentleman from Texas just what took place in formulating the scheme of the Interstate System. At the request of the President, in 1944, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of the Army, and the directors of the various State highway departments met for the purpose of working out a system of defense highways, which was to connect every principal city of 500,000 or more.

Under the direction of Interstate Highway Director, Mr. Greer, we were given the designation of the roads.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Dewitt Greer, highway engineer of Texas, is the best in the business, we think.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was included in the act of 1946, which was implemented by the act of 1956. There was no change in 1956 in the implementation of the original act.

We have sought to establish future requirements to be added on the Interstate System by a report to be submitted by the Bureau of Public Roads, after consultation with the State highway departments, in January 1968. So the matter is being given thought and consideration by the departments.

Certainly the committee knows the importance of the additions and the future requirements. The number of vehicles placed on our highways makes it a matter of imperative concern. Therefore, we are going to proceed in as orderly a manner as we know how. Certainly we hope to provide to Lubbock, Tex., and to other of the larger cities accommodations of the highway system that will carry approximately 17 percent of the total traffic in the United States.

Mr. MAHON. I thank my friend from Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is his own estimate of the nature of legislation that we might possibly adopt to follow on after the present system is completed?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not believe there is great urgency of planning because, as the report indicates, we are some $8,900 million behind in our program, if the completion date is to be in 1972. After 1972, that would be the moment to make additions to the Interstate System, or 2 years priors to that time, because we have to have a leadtime of 2 years for rights-of-way and plans and financial obligations.

Mr. MAHON. Is thought being given to some new approach to this problem in new legislation which will follow on? Or is the present system of interstate highways considered by the committee as generally the pattern we want to follow in the future?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe the experience we have gained with the Interstate System is certainly a justification that we could proceed in that fashion.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], who holds a position of major responsibility in road legislation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The question the gentleman asks is: Will there be more mileage added to the Interstate Highway System?

We have talked about that in the committee time and time again. I anticipate introducing legislation to add about 19,000 miles to the present 41,000 miles, because they are needed in this country.

The target date was 1972, as the gentleman will remember. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and the Members on the minority side and on the majority side do not want any money taken out of the trust fund or diverted for anything else, sewers or beauty or anything. I have taken a pledge that not one penny will be taken out of that trust fund for anything other than the building of roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. We are thinking that once we complete the Interstate Highway System we will try to take care of people like Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and the States in distress, by trying to pick up the toll roads or toll bridges in distress. After we take care of all those people who are in trouble I believe we are going to put some additional miles on the Interstate Highway System.

We want to stop the slaughter of 50,000 people in the United States, and we are going to do it with good roads.

I am sure the gentleman from Texas is with us 100 percent. I am happy to say that, because he happens to be the chairman of that great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my colleague from Texas, a member of the House Committee on Public Works.

Mr. ROBERTS. I should like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Texas, and to say that the committee certainly appreciates the support it has received from his great committee, even though only a limited portion of the Interstate System is in his district. There never has been a time when the chairman of the committee and his committee have not provided the finances needed for the Interstate System.

This committee is certainly obligated to help in any way it can on future mileage.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I believe the gentleman has expressed a point of view we have heard oftentimes on our committee. The fundamental problem, of course, is the one of money to be able to complete the system on time. Again, we must have the ways and means. I respectfully ask for the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee in the placing of whatever influence or pressure possible on the Ways and Means Committee to enact legislation to permit us to complete the schedule on time.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee does have a problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe it can be established that my home city in Iowa is in the same boat as the gentleman's home city in Texas; that is, it is one of some five cities which has no interstate connection, nor anything to look forward to in the immediate future.

With the gentleman, I hope we can get something more than thoughtful consideration from the members of the committee, especially if additional mileage is to be added.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that 1973 seems a long way off at this time. I believe we do need to be giving this matter as much thought as possible, and we need to begin planning for what we will do later on. A lot of preliminary planning and legislation will be required before the necessary roads can be constructed. I hope the Bureau of Public Roads will be able to make a report to Congress long prior to January 1968.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Cleveland: On page 15 strike out line 1 and all that follows through and including line 17, and renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, now that the committee has gone on record as having defeated my last amendment, and now that it has gone on record as being opposed to the preservation of parks and park lands, and historic sights, I believe it is appropriate for us to review this beautification section in the bill before us.

I ask Members to turn to page 15 of the printed bill, H.R. 14359.

My amendment very simply strikes out the first three sections on page 15, the authorization of appropriations for beautification for fiscal 1968 and 1969. Let me make it clear at the outset that I have been informed the administration did not request these authorizations. The administration did not request these authorizations at this time. Let me make another point quite clear. These authorizations for the beautification program are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and 1969. So the action we take here, I hope, which is to strike these authorizations out, is not a final vote on the authorization for the beuatification program. What it means in essence is that next year, next year—and presumably some of us will be here next year—we will then have to consider the amount of money we are going to authorize for the beautification program. There is considerable uncertainty about the beautification program, about its implications, its impact, its costs and how it is going to work out. To force ourselves to review this program next year makes eminent good sense. I do not think I have to remind you of the pressures on the available Federal dollar and I do not think I have to remind you of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], who earlier today pointed out to you that the President of the United States has called legislative leaders to the White House on occasion after occasion and has counseled fiscal restraint. I do not have to remind you that the President of the United States is now pointing a finger at Congress and saying that we are authorizing and appropriating more than he has asked for, and this is one example of it. I do not have to remind you that inflation and the high cost of living is an issue which is here presently, right now. Some of you may be able to follow the wise counsel of that distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and some of you may be able to slip, slide, and duck the inflation issue. However, I think every legitimate opportunity that we have to face it head on should be taken. It should be taken forthrightly and immediately. Here is an opportunity to face up to the problem by striking out from this bill on page 15 section 8 (a), (b), and (c). It is not a final vote that kills for all time the beautification program. This was not asked for in the first instance by the administration. It simply defers it to next year, when the fiscal situation facing this country may be clearer and when the actual workings of the beautification program may be clearer and when the state of the American dollar and our budget may be clearer. It simply defers it until next year. It is simply putting off to that time consideration of how much this House wishes to authorize for the highly controversial beautification program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire. In the first place, the gentleman had the opportunity available to him in the committee to oppose this section he brings up on the floor here today. He voted to report the bill favorably with this section in the bill that we are offering today. The reason why we have this item in here is because if this is not authorized in this bill, then the beautification program is dead. It will have to be passed again at a subsequent date.

Mr. Chairman, under the bill that was sent up here by the administration, they said that no funds will be available to carry out this section after July 1, 1966, which means that any funds in the trust fund will be available after July 1, 1966 out of the trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts in here specifically stated that this money will come out of the general fund or out of money that will be transferred into the trust fund for this purpose so that it will not touch any of the money for construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Congress passed this legislation in 1965. What the gentleman's amendment will do, if it is adopted, is to simply do away with the Beautification Act entirely.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the gentleman's intention, that is exactly what it will do. He is not cutting down the funds. He is striking out the whole section authorizing the appropriating of the funds.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman of the full committee yield to me at that point for just a moment?

Mr. FALLON. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee is quite correct in saying that I did not raise this point during the committee hearings held on this bill, and I did agree with the adoption of the bill and the report.

But, Mr. Chairman, in fairness I wish to remind the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that all deliberations on this legislation were held more than 2 months ago, and the report was written more than a month ago. And it has been since that time, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States has called upon the Congress to stop spending and has pointed to us in public, telling us that we are overspending and are doing things that he did not ask to be done. I understand it is true that this is not part of the administration bill and that it is for the fiscal year ending 1968 and 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is fair to say that this kills the program. I believe it means that we shall have to take another look at it next year.

However, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] is quite correct in saying that I did not propose this amendment in the committee, but I did not know that the President was going to hold Congress up to ridicule and scorn for having exceeded his budgetary requests.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire is making a political speech which has nothing to do with the legislation now pending before the Committee on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, we have always approached this matter on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. Chairman, based upon some of the speeches which have been made it would seem that the approach to every expenditure upon which we are called to act, the same rule is used saying that the President said we must cut expenditures, except for the reasons, probably on which the opposition does agree.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this was specifically mentioned by the President to be cut as one of the expenditures that are not necessary this year or for next year. As a matter of fact, this program as authorized for appropriations for these programs, do not start until 1968 and 1969.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works and, therefore, do not know what record was made in support of this proposed authorization.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire states that the funds under consideration were not budgeted by the President and were not included in this program as submitted to the Congress. It is my understanding that no funds were included for this purpose in the bill that passed in the other body. So we are here being asked to authorize the spending of about a half billion dollars which the administration did not request, which the other body did not include in the bill which passed there and which I understand will not even be needed next year.

Mr. Chairman, I was present at the White House when the President called all members of the Committee on Appropriations down there a few weeks ago and urged that the line be held and that his budget not be increased. He urged us to try and persuade Congress not to exceed his budget, pointing out that we were threatened with inflation. The fact is that the Government does not have any money to pay current bills and is having to go out into the money market and compete with private enterprise and compete with individuals who are seeking loans to build homes—with what result? We are paying the highest interest rates in modern times.

Recently the U.S. Treasury had to offer 5¼ percent interest to refund some Government bonds that became due. This is the highest interest rate in 45 years.

Fannie Mae just yesterday announced it would sell debentures which will return 5.91 percent interest—almost 6 percent interest on Fannie Mae debentures. Recently, Fannie Mae sold participation certificates in Government mortgages, as good as Government bonds, with the Government guarantee behind them, at discounts that will return an interest rate of 5.75 percent interest—unheard of in modern times.

Why is the situation brought about? Because the Government refuses to live within its means, and continues to borrow money to pay current bills.

Mr. Chairman, now I am going to vote on every occasion when an opportunity presents itself to keep authorizations within budgetary limits and requests.

When appropriation bills are presented on the floor, the argument is made that you have got to go ahead and appropriate this money because it was previously authorized. The place to stop spending is in authorization bills.

Now I will support a reasonable program if the President will budget it and if he will include it in his recommendations. But as I understand it, he has not requested this money. If it is authorized in this bill today, we will be exceeding the President's request by $493 million. I, for one, am not going to be a party to it. I am going to support the President of the United States in his efforts to curtail spending. I suggest his friends on the other side of the aisle should support him in this instance.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am curious to know if anyone, whether it be the President or some lesser official of the Government, has rated this as a high-priority item?

There are a lot of things we can spend money for, but has anyone come forward and designated this as something we must have in a time of war and in a time of inflation?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that and over and beyond that, he did not even request it. It is not on any priority list.

Mr. FINDLEY. Surely in these times there ought to be some priority ratings and I would appreciate if anyone can indicate who in the Government has given this a high-priority standing, justifying this at a time of heavy inflationary pressures?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, to the extent that I can, I would like to add weight to the arguments for this amendment on the basis on which it has been presented and to say to the chairman of the committee that I think he is a little unfair in taking these remarks as being political, meaning in a narrow, partisan, political sense.

The President of the United States, I trust, was not being political when he told the committee and told the Congress and told the leaders of Congress that this Nation is in a very serious fiscal situation and that there are serious inflationary pressures, and he would urge the Congress to not exceed his requests in authorization bills and in appropriation bills. These statements directed criticism at us, the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have appeared many times on the floor to make the point, and this could be regarded as political perhaps—but I hope in a high sense—that the President has the power right now to cut back on expenditures and should do so.

I feel we now have reached the point where it is not a question of just cutting out inefficient programs and programs that might be debatable, but it has reached the point where we are going to have to cut out or cut back or defer some programs on which there is agreement they are good programs, and to be picked up when we can get around to financing them.

So, I hope, this is not to be viewed by the House today as a Republican-Democratic argument; or, if the Democrat leaders want to make it so, I would be pleased to campaign this fall on that basis. But I happen to know that there are many Democrats in the House who feel as deeply about this point as I do and who do not want it placed on a party basis and feel that it should not be. I hope that at this point we will evaluate this proposal, a proposal that the President, himself, has not listed, and as has been pointed out, and I think the Committee recognizes in the statement of the Chairman, did not specifically request.

This is exactly the kind of program we would do well to defer.

I think the gentleman from New Hampshire makes the point—and I think this is an accurate point—that this is not killing the program because we have a deferral date to 1969. We will have next year an opportunity to look at it again to see what sort of fiscal climate exists then. But today let us begin to exercise the kind of discretion which the President has requested and which I would urge each of you, as Members of Congress, we badly need to do. This country is in serious fiscal difficulty.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Before the gentleman finishes, I think the record should show the amount of money involved here is $493 million, and it will have to come out of the general fund of the Treasury. Since we are still operating in the red, the money will have to be borrowed.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman. I wish to point out that on page 15 of the committee report there is some very pertinent language:

> Since 1963 there has been a consistent 2½-percent-a-year increase in construction costs. The committee is convinced that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, construction costs will continue to increase about the same rate during the forseeable future.

Inflation is the very thing that is cutting back on our ability to build the highways and has brought about the picture that the committee further reports to us on page 18, that we are now about $6 billion shy in the trust fund, and unless my committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, comes forward with increased taxes, we are going to have to stretch the highway program itself out until 1975.

So these are pertinent arguments, not narrow partisan political arguments, and I do hope that the Committee will view it in the light of those arguments.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would like to compliment the gentleman on what he has stated and assure the committee I am in favor of the bill as a whole, but I am strongly in support of the amendment. I think it has been well demonstrated that the bill is inflationary. Second, it is not an administrative request. Third, it is not budgeted, although it will authorize increased obligationary authority.

I would like to point out one other thing. In section (a) of section 8 there is an increase of $120,000 in the 2 fiscal years, and in section (b), the junkyard control section, there is an $88 million increase for fiscal year 1968, and in the landscaping section, section (c) of section 8, there is a $15 million increase in 1968 and a $30 million increase in 1969.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I think we are at a point in the consideration of this particular section that we are being moved as a Committee in two directions. On the one hand, the minority suggests to the Nation that the record of achievement of the Interstate Highway System is such that it is imperative and in the national interest that we should proceed without delay with the orderly continuance of this wonderful program that is so benefiting America, and which has such a dramatic effect of benefit upon my State, yours, and every area of the country.

On the other hand, for purposes of perhaps political tact, in the consideration of this particular amendment, the tune changes to, "Let us support the President and slow down spending."

Let us set the record straight. As I understood the administration's proposal as it originally came down, as it was undertaken in discussions in the Subcommittee on Roads and in the full committee, the proposal was that the highway trust fund for beautification be incorporated without limitation. So this administration did not only seek authorization but sought unlimited resources for the promotion of the elimination of billboards, for the elimination of junkyards, and for the elimination of other offensive things, and for the scenic enhancement along our interstate highways.

Every one of us knows, as the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works has pointed out, that the efficiency of these programs depends upon long-range planning. The distinguished gentleman from Florida stood in the well not more than an hour ago and told us how we needed at least an 18-month lead so as to permit the departments of highway directors throughout the country to program for highway beautification.

Gentlemen, in my State—and I am sure in the States of other Members, the patience of the people of this Nation has worn thin with the tolerance along our public highways of the billboards, the junkyards, and all the things that offend scenic beauty. In my State—and perhaps in other States—we have already undertaken, as a consequence of the previous action by this body, to plan a vigorous attack upon billboards, junkyards, and other offensive things along our highways.

I would ask the Committee to reject unanimously the suggestion, which is a belated 11th-hour suggestion—that we scuttle the national effort to clean up our highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentioned my name, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I will say to the gentleman that I believe in view of his statements the record ought to be clarified.

First, the striking of this section 8 on page 15 will not scuttle the program, because we do not have to authorize until 1967, which is next year, and it will not scuttle the program. Secondly, the basic reason for even considering putting any authorization in was to try to make certain that money would not come in the future out of the trust fund. That language is not affected in any way by the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND]. Those provisions were drafted to make certain beautification or safety will not come out of the trust fund and they appear in other sections. That remains in the language of the bill and is not stricken by the amendment of the gentleman. So that basic justification for putting any money in is not affected by the gentleman's amendment. Those restrictions remain in if any money is going to be used for beautification after 1967.

I call attention to the fact that the 1966 and 1967 authorizations were approved last year in the substantive language of the basic act. So we are discussing in this legislation the authorizations for the years 1968 and 1969. The amendment of the gentleman does not, in my opinion, do destructive damage to the beautification program. Basically the problem I have with regard to the figures contained in the specific authorizations in the bill is that we have no testimony whatsoever on the record of our hearings as to how much money it would take in 1968 to, first, take care of the billboards, second, take care of the junkyards, and third, provide for general beautification purposes.

So I say it is not imprudent at all to consider next year how much money should go in, in the form of specific authorization, because I challenge anyone to show—yes, the gentleman who just rose, Mr. SWEENEY—where in the record it shows how much money is going to be needed. Where did the $80 million figure come from in the record?

Where is the amount of money? I asked the question. I had no answer.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I mentioned the gentleman's name, and if he wants to answer my question I will yield to him. Where did the money figure come from?

Mr. SWEENEY. I should like to address myself to that point, but I wish to say one thing in correction of a statement the gentleman made when he mentioned my name.

The gentleman suggested that the Cleveland amendment would not do enormous destruction to the beautification effort.

Mr. CRAMER. It would not. We can do that next year.

Mr. SWEENEY. I respectfully suggest, it would gut the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I refuse to yield further. The gentleman is not answering the question.

I ask the gentleman again, where is there evidence in the record that $80 million is needed in 1968, and $80 million is needed in 1969 for billboard control?

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman will agree that when this came from the administration there was an unlimited ceiling.

Mr. CRAMER. I asked the gentleman a question. There is nothing in the record to show how much money is needed. They do not know. For that reason I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

I would suggest that we take a look at this next year, and consider putting in the amount of money that is proven to be needed.

There is nothing in the Senate bill whatsoever. There is no authorization in the Senate bill. The Senate did not think it would gut this program to leave it out this year. They put nothing in, because they know one cannot substantiate these figures.

We wanted to keep the money from coming out of construction in the trust fund. We will do that even if we pass the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire because his amendment does not strike that language.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is nothing in the President's budget or any document which has come from the executive branch of the Government supporting or justifying this $493 million included in this particular bill.

Let me say that within the past 2 weeks, or perhaps 3 weeks, the President has asked the leadership on both sides of the aisle, from both ends of the Capitol, to come down to discuss with him the problems of inflation which he sees resulting from the action of Congress in increasing his budget, both as to authorizations and appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(On request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CRAMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If my recollection is correct, the President has said publicly as well as otherwise that this Congress so far has increased in authorization his budget recommendations by $6 billion. This proposal would increase it another $493 million.

It seems to me if we are going to help the President with the effort that he is now, and I emphasize now, making to try to control the problems of inflation and the problems of increases in the cost of living, we should support the Cleveland amendment. If you are for economy, we should try to strike from the bill the additional authorization of $493 million.

For that reason I intend to support the amendment. I hope the committee will as well.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate this, to make certain everyone understands. There was no money authorization in the Senate bill, which has already passed the other body. They did not believe it was necessary to put it in now. They intend to take a look at this next year.

The fact that we do not have money justification testimony by the administration, based upon which we could fix a reasonable and sound figure, means it makes sense for us to take the same action, so long as we protect the trust fund and keep it inviolate, against the taking of money from the construction money for beautification. We will do that even if we adopt the Cleveland amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I had fully intended to file supplemental views to the committee report on this bill setting forth my objections to this particular provision in an otherwise very fine piece of legislation. However, as my colleagues know, I was granted an official leave of absence because of serious illness in my family and therefore was precluded from filing my objections.

In this particular provision, while the concept of beautifying our highways is a worthy one, it is certainly an untimely approach to alleviating the problem. As others have pointed out, the fiscal policies of this Government have contributed to the continual increase in the cost of living for all Americans and, until and unless this Government reduces its unnecessary spending on untimely domestic programs, I feel that the cost of living will continue to rise.

The President has, from time to time, reprimanded the Congress for exceeding his budgetary requests and as a matter of fact did not request the sum set forth in this legislation for highway beautification.

This provision in the bill authorizes the expenditure of some $493 million and begins with fiscal 1968. We have ample time next year to review this program and make a reasonable authorization if conditions warrant at that time.

One of the principal causes for the continuing increase in interest rates is the fact that the Federal Government has no money of its own with which to pay for this largesse and, therefore, must compete in the commercial market for money. This has driven the cost of borrowing money to an alltime high and has also created a lack of available funds. The results of this activity are reflected in the many problems the people of America, the small businessmen, and the homebuilders, are encountering in trying to find adequate funds with which to meet their current needs.

For this and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment should be adopted and the Committee should take another look at this particular program next year. There is ample time without upsetting the beautification program to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 48, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 20, insert after line 12 the following:

"USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

"SEC. 14(a) The Governor of a State may elect to have any funds apportioned to such State after the date of enactment of this Act under section 104 of title 23, United States Code, made available, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of Commerce, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for making grants, for urban mass transportation purposes within such State, under section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

"(b) For purposes of this section:

"(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and

"(2) the term 'Governor' means the chief executive officer of a State."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and it is foreign to the objectives of the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. The purpose of the amendment is very clear, Mr. Chairman. I believe it is germane. It deals specifically with the funds authorized by the pending bill. It would make it possible for the Governor of a State to elect to use the funds apportioned under the Federal-aid highway program for the purposes of mass transportation if he so desires. It neither directs nor compels a Governor; but at his option the funds would be available so that a State could allocate funds for mass transportation purposes as well as highways in order to achieve a balanced transportation system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama insists on his point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would permit use of highway funds for mass transportation and is completely foreign to the bill under consideration. Under clause 7 of rule XVI no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. This is a highway bill and it does not go to the mass transportation problem. Under the rules, the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I argued the point of order, I explained the purpose of my amendment. The urban transportation problem is increasingly critical and should no longer be the stepchild to the Federal-aid highway program. Congress has been profligate in the amount of money committed to the highway programs.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] pointed out earlier that the State of Georgia has received far more than its share of highway funds. I might add that the highway program has received far more than its share of Federal funds in comparison to the need for financing mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will give serious consideration to our urban needs before more time has elapsed. The cities of our Nation are now being choked by automobiles; the highways are pouring them into our urban centers; the problem of mass transportation cannot be ignored any longer.

The need for more mass transportation in our Nation must be evident to all, yet the cities and States of our Nation do not have the resources to meet the need. In 1961 the Institute of Public Administration, in a report to the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, estimated that the total capital requirements for mass transportation during the 1960's would be at least $9.8 billion. Today, 5 years later, this estimate must be regarded as conservative.

Despite the glaring need for Federal action, the Congress has not met the challenge. Our major action in the field is the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, but that measure provided for only $375 million in Federal aid, and even this small amount was spread over 3 years, with only $75 million for fiscal year 1965, and $150 million for each of the following 2 fiscal years.

On the other hand, the bill we consider today would authorize appropriations of almost $12 billion for the next 2 fiscal years for highway construction. This is part of a $51 billion Federal-aid highway program, and almost 80 times the amount spent annually on mass transportation. The stinginess of Federal Government in the field of mass transportation is being matched by extreme generosity in highway legislation.

These figures raise the question of priorities: whether we are going to forsake our mass transportation needs while subsidizing the commuter through highway legislation. The extent of this auto subsidization is staggering. Prof. William Vickrey, a Columbia University economist, estimated that highway addition specifically required to handle rush-hour traffic on a projected Washington, D.C., highway would cost an additional $23,000 for each commuter's car. In New York City, the Regional Plan Association, using Professor Vickrey's studies, estimates the subsidy to urban rush-hour motorists as 10 cents a mile per car. This is the equivalent of paying each motorist the cost of gas, oil, and depreciation for all his commuting travel.

The effect of this priority decision is apparent in terms of Federal grants. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of a highway if it is part of the Interstate System, and 50 percent of the cost of a highway if it is not part of the system. Through these terms, we have poured billions of Federal taxpayers' dollars into highways since 1956—10 years ago. Yet we have had only limited funds available for mass transportation—and those only since 1964, 2 years ago.

The amendment which I proposed is similar to my bill, H.R. 12852, and legislation introduced by our colleague from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], and Senator TYDINGS. It would permit the Governors of the several States to elect to use part of their highway apportionment for mass transit. I regard it as a stop-gap measure, but it would be an important step in achieving balance in transportation systems. We must eventually coordinate roads and rails and allocate funds according to an overall, comprehensive plan.

I regret that we will not begin today.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I understood one of the speakers to state that the West Virginia toll road had been taken into the Interstate System.

I would like someone, preferably a member of the committee, to respond to the question of whether or not it is true if the West Virginia toll road has been taken into the Interstate System, and if so, upon what basis?

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Chairman, that is something new to me. I have never heard of anything like that. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that the Interstate Highway System has taken in the West Virginia toll road?

Mr. **GROSS**. I believe that is what was indicated.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not know that.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, I am making inquiry as to the status of that roadway.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. But, has it been taken into the Interstate System?

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. I do not know.

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. The gentleman has sponsored legislation to try to make it possible to freeze some of these toll roads. Since the Interstate System has frozen roads into the Interstate System, we do have at this time, in some States, designations of toll roads as routes available, as extensions of the Interstate System, where you do not have available roads which measure up to the Interstate standards which go between the two State points.

However, I believe it is accurate to say that this represents an actual incorporation into the Interstate System of these turnpikes.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that no toll roads have been taken into the Interstate System on the basis of payment from interstate funds.

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have also driven across the country and am quite aware of the fact that one will see the markers up on some toll roads where they are not available between certain routes.

Mr. **GROSS**. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to the fact that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 now before us serves to perpetuate a discrimination against commuters in our metropolitan centers. A little more than a year ago, on July 27, 1965, I submitted a bill, H.R. 10126, which would give State and local governments the authority to use a portion of the huge amounts of Federal aid now going into superhighway construction for mass transit where, in the judgment of the local government, creation of a balanced transportation system requires it. At the same time, Senator TYDINGS introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 2339. Shortly thereafter Representatives ASHLEY (H.R. 10170), FARBSTEIN (H.R. 10171) and HALPERN (H.R. 10172) introduced companion bills. Earlier this year, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], also introduced the proposal in the House, H.R. 12823.

On July 28, 1965, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 14, pages 18685–18687, the full text of a joint statement which I issued with Senator TYDINGS on this subject. It describes in detail some of the more compelling arguments in support of this proposal. I am pleased to say that in the months following submission of this proposal, it has drawn extensive support.

The Regional Plan Association, a highly respected private organization which concerns itself with the problems of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut region, has endorsed the idea of pooling Federal mass transit and highway aid. The mayor of New York City and the president of the city council have each endorsed this bill, as have city officials of Baltimore and many other private and public bodies and individuals.

As the President noted in advocating creation of a northeast corridor rapid rail transit which would provide new insights into the technology of mass transit, 7 out of every 10 U.S. citizens now reside within city limits. This presents a problem of movement of people to and from work, school, residences, and service facilities which staggers the imagination. As the transit strike in New York City demonstrated earlier this year, private motor vehicles cannot hope to meet this task.

The bill before us authorizes many billions of dollars for the highway program, $4,500 million for the next fiscal year, and a total of well over $22 billion from now until 1972. By contrast, the Mass Transit Act reported out by the House Banking and Currency Committee authorizes only $175 million and the Senate version $225 million. Whatever sum will emerge from the Congress, the disparity between this amount and the figure for highway aid is enormous. The relation between the two seems to be in inverse proportion to the numbers of people to be served and to the demonstrated need.

In my own city, New York, the mass transit system is wholly inadequate. The fare has just been raised by one-third and the predictions are that it will be raised by an additional one-fourth in the near future. In a period of rising prices, where those least able to support themselves on their incomes are already hard-pressed and where the specter of inflation threatens to further reduce their capacity to be self-supporting, a marked increase in the cost of daily commuting aggravates the pressures.

I regret to report that various pressure groups have done much to attempt to distort the meaning and impact of my proposal. Some of them have suggested that the proposal is aimed at preventing any further construction of highways; an assertion which is untrue. Most of these groups argue that there is something "immoral" or "un-American" about using taxes collected from the sale of motor fuel or automotive products for anything other than highways.

In that connection, I urge our colleagues to read very carefully the text of the report accompanying the pending bill—House Report No. 1704. On page 4, the committee traces the history of earmarking taxes for highways. It points out that, prior to 1956, all such taxes simply went into the General Treasury, presumably for use as the priority of general national needs dictated at any given time.

I also would call attention to a serious misleading statement of fact on that same page of the report: a common misstatement that has distored the picture of present benefits and burdens. The report says that the "Federal-aid program was placed on a wholly highway-user-financed, pay-as-you-build basis." In fact, the cost of the highways is paid by all who use automotive goods or services, regardless of whether they ever use a 90-percent federally subsidized road. Some vehicles use such roads constantly, others only rarely or never. This was confirmed in studies made on the Kennedy Expressway in Chicago and on the New York City expressways. These studies show that taxes paid by users of these roads often pay less than 30 percent of the cost. If equivalent subsidies were paid to subway and bus riders such as are given to those who drive on the expressways, we would have to pay the subway and bus riders to get on these conveyances.

Every time we buy gasoline we contribute to this fund, regardless of whether our travels are along city streets or nonsubsidized roadways. The only way in which we could truly have highway users foot the whole cost of these ribbons of concrete would be to impose tolls based on construction and maintenance costs. I do not advocate this extreme action but I would think that so long as the financing is done as it is, that the equating of highway users with all who pay the automotive and gasoline taxes should stop.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that hearings be held on the various proposals for adequate mass transit aid. As our cities get more congested and as it gets more expensive and more onerous to move about in our metropolitan centers, the need for coordinated planning and balanced effort grows more urgent. Those who must use automobiles and trucks should welcome a program which would reduce highway congestion by diverting the daily commuter to mass transit.

It is incongrous that we speak so often about the need to rejuvenate our cities and to reduce the cost of living but do so little to provide the means which would permit more effective planning for our metropolitan areas and, at the same time, reduce the heavy burdens upon our commuters.

Implicit in our Federal transportation aid programs is the conclusion that it is better to move commuters by private automobile than by mass transit. The sheer weight of funds reflects this and, because of the matching fund character of the highway aid program, States and cities are virtually obligated to commit large sums to highway construction which might otherwise be available for mass transit. My proposal would give each local government the flexibility to determine how best to allocate available transportation funds—on the basis of local needs.

I believe that any fair review of the experience of our metropolitan centers will show that the mass transit needs are more urgent than the highway needs. I urge that that review be made by the Congress and that more adequate and equitable programs be devised to meet the needs of our cities and the large majority of our people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps he would wish to discuss these points he is making today before this Committee next week when the Committee will consider the bill, H.R. 14180, the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1966.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment. My point is that I think that some of the funds that are now being used for the purpose of highway aid should on the basis of local option be made available for transfer to the mass transportation needs.

Mr. Chairman, this is not something that can be done within the scope of mass transit aid programs as they have been submitted to this House in the past and as they will be submitted next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 936, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GERALD R. FORD moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14359 to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:
>
> "Page 15, strike out line 1 and all that follows through and including line 17 and renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly."

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I correctly understand that this is the same as the amendment offered in the committee by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] to strike out the beautification section?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no personal knowledge. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 175, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—173

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McVicker
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Matthews
May
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—175

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Annunzio
Aspinall
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dorn
Dow
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price
Race
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Udall
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitten
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—84

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Bandstra
Baring
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Burton, Utah
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Conyers
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Diggs
Donohue
Edwards, La.
Farnum
Greigg
Gubser
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Hungate
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Krebs
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Long, La.
McMillan
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Rees
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio

Roudebush
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Skubitz
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Baring with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Callan with Mr. Carey.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Willis.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Boland.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Pool with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. RACE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and Mr. TUNNEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—341

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolton
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Teague, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Ford, Gerald R.
Utt

NOT VOTING—88

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Bandstra
Baring
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Burton, Utah
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Conyers
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Diggs
Donohue
Edwards, La.
Farnum
Greigg
Gubser
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Hungate
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Krebs
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Long, La.
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Mink
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Rees
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
Roudebush
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Skubitz
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Callan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Willis.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Murray.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD.** Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **WRIGHT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **WRIGHT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3155

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.— For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968 and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National Systems of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) Section 109(b) of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Such standards shall in all cases provide for at least four lanes of traffic."

(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to modify project agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code for the purpose of effectuating the amendment made by this section with respect to as much of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as may be possible.

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

ALASKAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 116, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended by the State for maintenance of Federal aid highways.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended for construction of access and development roads that will serve resource development, recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like purposes.

(c) For construction and maintenance of highways in the State of Alaska, out of the highway trust fund, and in addition to funds otherwise made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

SEC. 7. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is hereby deleted and the following is substituted therefor: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000 the unexpended balance of such amounts shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 125 of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking the words "from the emergency fund" where they appear.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1968, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the

State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than July 1, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned, buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the cost of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam, the government of American Samoa, and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1968, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $200,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

SEC. 12. Section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Secretary shall not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects on any Federal-aid system unless he determines, after consultation with the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, that the plans include adequate measures to minimize soil erosion which might be caused by the proposed excavations and construction."

PRESERVATION OF PARK LANDS

SEC. 13. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 137. Preservation of park lands.

"It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local government park lands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such policy. After July 1, 1968, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for a project which requires the use for such project of any land from a Federal, State, or local government park or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible alternative to the use of such land, (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize any harm to such park or site resulting from such use."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 3155, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 14359, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 14359 was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 3155, and that the House request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messers FALLON, KLUCZYNSKI, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, CLARK, CRAMER, HARSHA, and CLEVELAND.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 15, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, we have finished our legislative business for this week and the request will be made to adjourn over following the announcement of the legislative program.

Monday is the Consent Calendar—suspensions—16 bills:

H.R. 15639, to increase FNMA borrowing authority;

H.R. 16897, providing for the collection, compilation, publication, and sale of standard reference data;

H.R. 15566, amending Great Salt Lake Relicted Lands Act;

H.R. 16114, correction of certain employment inequities with respect to premium compensation;

H.R. 14604, authorizing a study of facilities and services for visitors to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 15024, amendment to Public Buildings Act of 1959;

H.R. 11555, the Chamizal Memorial Highway;

H.R. 11880, solution of lower Rio Grande salinity problem;

Senate Joint Resolution 108, Pan American Institute of Geography and History;

H.R. 13825, Tijuana River international flood control project;

House Joint Resolution 1169, International Conference on Water for Peace;

H.R. 16559, authorizing the establishment and operation of sea-grant colleges and programs;

H.R. 14136, authorizing increase in fee for migratory bird hunting stamp;

H.R. 12723, drugs and medicine for aid-and-attendance pensioners;

H.R. 16330, Philippine hospitalization and medical care; and

H.R. 16367, war orphans' training for children of certain Philippine veterans.

The above bills will not necessarily be called up in the order listed.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: Private Calendar and the consideration of the following bills:

H.R. 14810, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 13228, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—open rule, 3 hours of debate, making it in order to consider committee substitute for purpose of amendment;

H.R. 13290, Highway Safety Act of 1966—open rule, 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider committee substitute for purpose of amendment;

S. 2934, Rural Community Development Act—open rule, 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 15098, relating to U.S. Participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition—open rule, 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman has anything in mind with respect to the airline strike and the possibility of legislation, the possibility of any word from the White House as to a position in that matter—anything that he can give us with respect to the possibility of action.

Mr. ALBERT. All I can say to the gentleman is that before we can program the legislation, we must have legislation reported from the committee and we must have a rule. We have neither yet.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman see any hope for legislation or any hope for action on the part of the White House with respect to this situation leading to some kind of conclusion?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot speak for the White House, I will say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING OF THE HEARINGS OF THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO AS SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 82

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as Senate documents, in separate volumes, the transcripts of the bilingual public hearings held by the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico on (1) legal constitutional matters, (2) social-cultural matters, and (3) economic matters held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on May 14–18, July 28–August 2, and November 27–December 1, 1965, respectively.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed four thousand five hundred copies of such Senate document for the use of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

With the following amendment:

On the first page, immediately after line 12, add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. The Public Printer is authorized to accept from the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico an amount equal to one-half of the total cost of printing incurred under this concurrent resolution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE COMMITTEE PRINT, "A STUDY OF FEDERAL CREDIT PROGRAMS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 666 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 666

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, four thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "A Study of Federal Credit Programs", prepared by that committee during the Eighty-eight Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 4, strike out the word "four" and insert "two" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF A REPORT ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD ASIA BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, BY THAT SUBCOMMITTEE, AND OF ADDITIONAL COPIES THEREOF

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 791 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 791

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document "United States Policy Toward Asia", a report by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, dated May 19, 1966, be printed as a House document and that an additional six thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 7, strike out the word "six" and insert "three" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR PRINTING 2,000 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF UNITED STATES-SOUTH AFRICAN RELATIONS FOR USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 879 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 879

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, two thousand additional copies of part I of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Africa in March 1966 on the subject of "United States-South African Relations."

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 3, strike out the word "two" and insert "one" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 939, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 939

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress eight thousand additional copies of its final report to the Congress pursuant to S. Con. Res. 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, lines two and three, strike out the words "eight thousand" and insert "six thousand four hundred and fifty" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 98 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 98

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that one hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and fifty copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The additional copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall be distributed as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY QUESTIONS, CANAL ZONE—PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY, PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION, NEW CANAL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 925 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 925

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal", a compilation of addresses and remarks by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, be printed as a House document, and that an additional ten thousand five hundred copies be printed of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and two thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLIC LAW 89-97, 89TH CONGRESS, THE "SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 872 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 872

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House Document Room, House of Representatives, four thousand six hundred and eighty-seven additional copies of Public Law 89-97, Eighty-ninth Congress, the "Social Security Amendments of 1965".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1539 BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 887 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 887

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 1539 by that committee on the International Education Act of 1966, H.R. 14643.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on the District of Columbia of May 18, 1966, incident to the presentation of a portrait of Honorable John L. McMillan to the Committee on the District of Columbia be printed as a House document with an illustration and suitable binding.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1568 OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 946 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 946

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the document room, House of Representatives, two thousand five hundred additional copies of House Report Numbered 1568, of the Eighty-ninth Congress. Said reports will be distributed solely by the superintendent of the document room for the use of the Members of the House during consideration of H.R. 15111, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4671, the Colorado River Basin project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday, August 13, to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 186, air strike regulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Mr. RESNICK (on behalf of Mr. COOLEY) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13881) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes.

FREEZING FOOD STAPLE PRICES

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to put a temporary freeze on the prices of food staples, in an effort to halt what has become an alarming rate of inflation in the market basket. This bill imposes a 90-day freeze on such items as the Secretary of Agriculture designates as food staples. At the same time, it requires the Secretary to undertake immediately an investigation of inflation in foodstuffs and, within the stated period, to take administrative action or make legislative recommendations to deal with the emergency. I regard this as a moderate and sensible method of dealing with an exceedingly serious situation.

As you may have noticed in the press, Mr. Speaker, I notified the Secretary of Agriculture of my intention to introduce this bill in a letter last week. The Secretary made public his answer to me in a letter he released to the newspapers over the weekend. I feel it is only fair to the Secretary to present the full text of that letter which I herein insert in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBSTEIN: I have your letter of August 2 indicating your intention to introduce a bill to freeze food prices for 90 days. I share your deep concern about the effects of inflation on the well-being of people in the low and middle income groups. Rising prices of many commodities and services, not only of food, makes their lot increasingly difficult.

> As you know, I met on August 4 with the members of the New York City Council to discuss recent retail price increases of bread and milk in that city as well as the overall food price situation (copy of statement enclosed). Although some part of the increases for bread and milk in New York City reflect increases in farm prices to provide badly needed income to farmers and to ensure adequate supplies, there are real questions as to the justification for most of the rise which has been reported.
>
> I look forward to the findings of the City Council as it investigates recent food price developments and I have pledged full cooperation, support and assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
>
> Further, on August 4 I asked the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission "to review immediately the pricing policies and actions for bread and fluid milk, including recent price changes of these food items and their relation to all factors affecting costs and the conditions of competition."
>
> At this time, I do not believe that action by the Congress to freeze food prices even for a temporary period is justified or in the long run interest of consumers or the food industry. As we know from past history price and wage controls are difficult to administer equitably, require a large and expensive government operation, and should not be undertaken unless the case for doing so is crystal clear. They tend to distort price relationships, and make it more difficult for producers to make their plans.
>
> An action to freeze food prices could have a chaotic effect on markets and prices. It also could have a depressing effect on farm production at a time when increasing production of a few commodities, such as milk, is needed.
>
> Some farm prices have increased in recent months; some have decreased. Some costs of food manufacturers and distributors have increased as well. Even so there are prospects that the overall retail price index for foods will remain fairly steady during the rest of this year.
>
> At present, there is strong domestic and foreign demand for food. The capacity of American agriculture is abundantly adequate to supply all of our food needs under foreseeable conditions at prices that would be fair to both consumers and farmers. Steps have been taken recently to increase farm output to meet this growing demand. These include increasing acreage allotments for wheat and rice, and increasing support prices for milk at the farm level so as to encourage dairy farmers to remain in the business and reverse the downward trend in milk production.
>
> We should keep in mind also that although food prices have risen in the past year, the incomes of most consumers have also increased. The average consumer today spends only 18.2 percent of this take home pay for food—the same percentage as a year ago and the lowest in our history.
>
> In view of these facts, I do not see the need at present to freeze food prices even temporarily. I do see some dangers in attempting to do so.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

The Secretary opposes my proposal. I do not feel, however, that the Secretary's answer was sufficiently persuasive to deter me from introducing the bill. I feel the Members can read the Secretary's communication and make their own judgment on the merits of my measure.

Mr. Speaker, inflation in the price of food is the most nefarious type of inflation because it so grievously hits at the poor. We can put off the purchase of cars and television sets, even clothing for a time, but we cannot put off the purchase of food. This is a regressive tax of the worst kind. It is a direct counterweight to the war against poverty and the other economic objectives of the administration and of Congress itself. If the administration feels we can indulge in the luxury of tolerating price increases in other fields, I do not think it is right to tolerate price increases in food. Let me remind you that this inflation represents a wage cut to our poorest citizens, a reduction in their already inadequate income. I ask my colleagues to give my bill their most serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize there will be a wide divergence of opinion on how to resolve our problems of inflation. I do not pretend that my solution is the only one feasible. For that very reason, I made the price freeze temporary, until the Secretary of Agriculture or the President could make alternative recommendations. But I believe that to do nothing is to behave irresponsibly in acquitting our obligations. I call upon my colleagues to come to the rostrum, hopefully to support my bill. But if they feel they have a more adequate answer, I urge them to speak out with it. Perhaps most important, I urge them to rise and speak so that we as a body can convey to the President and the Secretary our deep concern about this serious problem. I ask my colleagues to let the administration and the people know that we are alarmed by the skyrocketing price of the periodic trip to the market. I cannot agree with the President that we can afford to wait, weeks or months. I think the time to act to halt inflation is now.

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the plainest possible speaking about the state of the economy. I have been warning of our present problems for over a year now, but I feel I must speak more strongly than ever. Bluntly, we are faced with an inflationary situation of the most serious sort. In the face of this danger, I am afraid that both the Congress and the administration have preferred largely to ignore the situation, hoping that it will in some manner go away. It will not, and I think we had better realize it.

There are things that can be done to stop inflation, but so far they have not been done or they have been ineffective. The Congress has chosen not only to keep Government spending at high levels, but also to increase appropriations over the President's budget requests. I have spoken out against this practice, and I have voted against some appropriations and "pork barrel" projects which I thought were unnecessary at this time. I fear I have not had much effect.

Both the Congress and the administration have so far shied away from one of the most effective ways to fight inflation: Increasing the tax revenues of the Federal Government by suspending the 7-percent deduction from their income tax given to corporations for investment in plant and equipment. This deduction from their income tax, allowed to corporations, was a needed way of getting the economy going again when it was granted; there is no excuse for its continuation when there is overheating of the economy—particularly in investment which this credit overstimulates.

I realize that it is not considered politically wise to propose such a tax increase just before elections. But political expediency should not be permitted to be used as an excuse for failing to act prudently when conditions clearly demand it.

The Government has tried to use monetary policy—that is, increasing interest rates—to cut inflationary pressures. The evidence shows that monetary policy alone has not succeeded. Last month, the cost-of-living index rose 4 percent, at an annual rate. Most authorities expect the index to rise again this month, making it the 10th straight month that the cost of living has either increased or remained steady. There is no stop to further increases in sight.

The prices of many things are going up. The housewife knows this only too well. She does not need to read statistical tables. She encounters a new increase every week at the grocery store. She will soon be unpleasantly surprised as she buys shoes and clothing for her children to return to school.

Relying exclusively on tight money and high-interest rates has caused severe dislocations in some sectors of our economy, while not being powerful enough to restrain the inflationary push by itself. It is causing severe problems for some of our thrift institutions, and has cut homebuilding back sharply, thereby threatening the homebuilding industry.

For the past several years, the Kennedy and then the Johnson administrations have tried to use the voluntary wage-price guideposts as another method of coping with inflationary pressures. In theory such guideposts—which suggest that wages should not increase by more than 3.2-percent increase in overall productivity—are a useful tool by which to judge the inflationary impact of wage increases. But the airlines strike and the steel price increase have destroyed the guideposts, if they were not dead already.

Until now, the administration has by and large tried successfully to use the guideposts as a tool to persuade both management and union leadership to restrain their demands. But using the guideposts as persuaders from now on seems dead.

Based on the most recent pronouncements, if there is anything to be salvaged, they are "creeping guideposts" to accompany "creeping inflation." I fear we will soon have galloping guideposts accompanying galloping inflation.

So where do we stand? The guideposts are dead. Monetary policy alone has failed. Government spending, both at home and abroad, continues. What stands between us and a serious inflation? Very little, I fear, unless Congress at last meets its clear responsibility and starts facing the facts.

The only ways left to fight inflation are cutting expenditures, increasing taxes, or reducing investment. And unless Congress does something, and soon, either to examine ways to reduce Government spending or to thoroughly investigate fiscal—that is, tax—policies designed to cope with inflation, we are going to be in serious trouble. I have been urging the Congress to act for over a year, and with the wage-price guideposts now in shreds, perhaps we can get down to business.

I deeply hope there will be thorough and searching debate, starting right now, on this issue. Inflation can kill our economy, impoverish our citizens living on fixed incomes or on social security, imperil our international balance of payments, and make all the economic growth of the past 5 years nothing more than a cruel prelude for a crash. It could wipe out the increase in employment opportunities which are the foundation of success of our poverty programs.

To contribute to this debate, I am today introducing a bill to suspend for 1 year the investment tax credit law, on a graduated basis designed to help the small businessman. In effect, the investment tax credit law allows businesses to reduce their income tax up to 7 percent of their yearly investment. The law was passed as a way to stimulate investment in a lagging economy in the early 1960's, and clearly it has been effective. Suspending the tax credit would cut back the least productive investments. Investment is now $16 billion above 2 years ago, and this has the same inflationary impact as an increase of $16 billion in Government public works spending. Cutting back some of this investment would reduce inflationary pressure.

Investment is the key to most of the economy's workings. Investment usually comes ahead of expansion, it presages increases in demand, it has an impact on the economy much larger than the sum of the investment alone. Investment has remained high during this period of inflation, and unless it is reduced now we are merely guaranteeing ourselves that demand pressures will continue to work within the economy—pressures which cannot help but contribute to inflation. And in addition, the need for job-creating investments would not exist when the economy slackens.

I believe that suspension of the tax credit law should not, however, be straight across the board. Large companies generally can get just about as much investment capital as they want; they are big enough to finance their own expansion or to command low-interest rates from banks. But the small businessman—already hard hit by the tightest money market in many years—is in an entirely different situation. He cannot finance his own expansion, because he does not make that much profit; he cannot command prime interest rates, because he is small.

My bill is designed in such a way that large companies, employing over 1,000 people, would find the full 7-percent credit repealed. It is such corporations that do the major investment in our economy, and it is such investment that we want to reduce to fight inflation. Companies employing from 501 to 1,000 workers would receive only 3-percent investment credit; companies employing from 101 to 500 workers would receive 5-percent credit. And the very small businesses, employing from 1 to 100 workers, would receive the full 7-percent credit.

I am introducing this bill today to serve as a basis for debate—debate not only over the specific provisions of the bill but also on the entire issue of inflation and our proper response toward it. If introducing such a bill can help the Congress get its head out of the sand when it comes to inflation, it will have been very useful.

One alternative now being talked about to congressional failure to act to stop inflation is the imposition of wage and price controls. I consider them the worst possible alternative. I believe that nobody wants such controls. From past experience, we know that they are only temporary, that they are inefficient and artificial, that they lead to redtape and bureaucracy, and that they can lead to the breakdown of a free competitive system. They would prevent the businessman from pricing his product competitively. They would bring some form of control to free collective bargaining, which has been the basis for progress in the labor movement. In short, they would botch up the economy.

In conclusion, let me summarize the objectives of our economic policy:

First, full employment; second, stable prices; third, economic institutions and processes regulated by the forces of competition and not by Government.

The wage-price guidelines were, in a real sense, a means by which Government encouraged voluntary restraints on our economic institutions and processes. While they worked, even with full employment, we had very modest price increases until this year. Now that these guidelines are out the window, inflation will be likely to accelerate.

If we fail to act now—if we fail to meet our clear responsibility to take decisive action to stop inflation—wage and price controls are inevitable. If this Congress were to move forthrightly and honestly to stop inflation, all the election-year jitters which so worry the cynics could be faced. For the Congress would have met its responsibilities. To do anything else is simply unacceptable.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to complete the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County.

Briefly, my bill would:

First. Authorize the unappropriated balance of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 to be spent for land acquisition of the parkland in Prince Georges County.

Second. Transfer land acquisition authority from the National Capital Planning Commission to the National Park Service under the Secretary of the Interior.

Third. Delineate a shoreline route for the parkway by law.

Mr. Speaker, there are several motives behind my introduction of this legislation:

First. I am determined to try every possible means, legislative or otherwise, to make this parkway a reality in order to save the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County.

Second. It was made clear in hearings before the House Appropriations Committee this year that the committee does not consider the original Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 sufficient legislative authority to complete the parkway in Prince Georges County. Therefore, we must go back to the authorizing committees with a new authorization before we again attempt to secure the necessary appropriations from Congress.

Third. There has been such a dispute about the alinement of the parkway route over the years that I feel it is high time to tie it down to specifics in legislation. Once this is accomplished and it becomes law it should end once and for all time the controversy about the route.

The history of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County has not been one of which we can all be proud. It has been authorized since 1930 and it still remains to be completed in Prince Georges County. Meanwhile, the assault on the Potomac River shoreline led by land speculators and aided by a handful of political opportunists grows by leaps and bounds each year that the parkway is delayed.

Frankly, I sincerely felt that this was to be the year of the parkway—the year that all those who have been fighting for it in Congress, in the State and in the county would make that final united push to success.

Obviously this was not the case. We have been foiled again by a limited number of diehard parkway opponents and their thousands of dollars for lobbyists, their utter disregard for the public interest, their design to despoil the Potomac River shoreline and profit by their landholdings, their vendetta against everyone who backs the parkway, their provincialism and their own selfish interests.

Mr. Speaker, I was optimistic about the parkway this year because many officials and citizens interested in completing it got together and agreed on a compromise route. In reaching this compromise the Federal Government did its share by promising that those few homeowners in the right-of-way would be paid for their property and they could spend the rest of their lives in their homes. These 29 property owners were still not satisfied. They refused to negotiate, to accept the compromise route that evolved from a meeting of many minds, and now because of their vested interests they still oppose the parkway.

Now, I am less than optimistic about the parkway becoming a reality to preserve the Potomac River shoreline. But this does not mean that I am surrendering, like some have, to the forces which have chalked up one defeat after another for the parkway.

I intend to pursue the final goal—of preserving the shoreline for future generations—in Congress and I intend to carry it back to the Maryland General Assembly, as I did this year. I intend to make a maximum effort to get the new State legislature that will soon be elected to repair the damage that was done to the bond authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, this session of the 89th Congress we have enacted the final legislative authority to preserve the view from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park along the Potomac shoreline. We have laid a cornerstone at Piscataway Park from which to build our entire Potomac River preservation program. The next step is to secure for all time the shoreline in Prince Georges County between Piscataway Park and the Capital Beltway.

It can only be done by the same united effort which made the Piscataway Park bill a success.

We also must make everyone understand that our method and means of preserving the shoreline does not include condemnation and that we are not taking homes and property away from families. Land acquisition will be carried out in the most equitable manner available because we want the citizens of the county to understand that the parkway is for everyone's benefit and that no personal sacrifices are involved.

We must convince some of those landowners who oppose the parkway that they have been misled by a handful of political opportunists who talk out of both sides of their mouths. These opportunists battle the parkway year after year crying that the Government is going to condemn thousands of homes. Then they turn right around and charge that the same governmental body is not buying parkland fast enough in the county because that body does not use the powers of condemnation.

I know that with the introduction of my new bill the debate and the controversy will start again. I am not afraid of it and I welcome it because the debate gives us a vehicle and an opportunity to tell the public our side of the story. And when the public knows both sides, they usually make the right decision. I know that in this case they will.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to a new round of hearings on this new bill. In my new bill I am offering a new approach to accomplish a longtime objective. I believe that this legislation will be the proper means to final preservation of the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County with the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

VICTORIA ASARE AMERICAN EMBASSY ESSAY CONTEST WINNER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege and pleasure to meet and converse at some length with a remarkable young woman from Ghana in Africa—Miss Victoria Asare, 19, student and winner of the American Embassy essay contest who is now on tour of the United States under the foreign specialist program of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. I was happy to extend to Miss Asare the warm welcome of the Congress.

There were 4,500 essays entered in the essay contest won by Miss Asare. The contest was open to the students at all the high schools in Ghana, and the fact that there were so many entries speaks very well indeed for the schools of Ghana, and the personnel of the American Embassy that conducted the contest and of the Ministry of Education of Ghana.

Miss Asare was born June 6, 1947, at Adukrom, Akwapim Ghana. After finishing Agogo Middle School in Ashanti, Miss Asare entered the St. Louis Secondary School in Kumasi, where she is now in form 4. Because of her exceptional ability, she has been permitted to take advance subjects in form 5.

Miss Asare is the first-prize winner in the nationwide high school essay contest sponsored by the Embassy and Ministry of Education. The subject of the essay competition was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include the entire text of the essay by this remarkable young woman from Africa:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Victoria Asare)

Democracy is such a wide and diversified concept that to my mind it defies definition. However, although it may seem impossible to capture its essence in one neat phrase, one can say that democracy rests on a trinity of permanent values; Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. The latter two fall easily into line but how can one and the same system incorporate Liberty and Equality since Liberty of its very nature would seem to demand diversity? Edward Lindeman puts it like this: "Where conformity is imposed as an external discipline, liberty is by definition excluded."

But to my mind it is this very tension between Liberty and Equality that gives democracy its vital force. It leaves room for a fruitful clash of ideas resulting in new developments. Edmund Burke, believing that liberty was "the dearest of the democratic graces" more or less ignored the idea of equality. On the other hand, Rousseau held that since men were by nature unequal, it was the work of society to make them equal. What exactly he meant by making them equal I am not sure, but, it seems to me that under a democratic regime all should have equal opportunities to develop whatever talent they may possess since all are equally worthy of respect on account of their dignity as human beings.

All through the ages men have been searching for a way—a system of living that would set them free, help them to live in harmony with their inner selves and with other men. Plato, Rousseau, Lincoln, Aggrey are just a few of the apostles of democracy. With each of them the ideal became more and more fully realized till today there is hardly a corner of the world which is not in love with freedom. Africa is no exception, nor is Ghana. The very fact that *Animal Farm* was once confiscated in our schools shows that the youth were wide awake but applying the moral too closely to home!

The trouble about democracy is that it is something which has to mature over a long period, otherwise it loses its roots and withers. No one will deny that the battle-cry of the French Revolutionaries was "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality," yet in their fanatic pursuit of their ideals their cry was turned into "License, Fratricide, Inequality." The quest for liberty, fraternity, equality must be a patient one and the leader of a democratic government must be prepared for many false starts and disappointments. "Instability, tension and immaturity are inevitable when people are just beginning to face collectively and individually, a wide range of new situations and problems."[1] And to try to make everyone follow 'the party line' just because one thinks it the best for them is to invite disaster as we have already seen here in Ghana. There must be a democratic approach. A leader must be willing to see his plans only partially realized. There must be give and take and it is here that Africans have an advantage over more developed countries. Living close to the soil and living with its slow, peaceful rhythm, most Africans can wait patiently for growth. The large and extended family system too gives every opportunity for give and take.

It is futile to argue that a newly independent country "cannot afford" to be democratic. A one-party system may seem to be the inevitable choice for a developing country which has to build up its economy, give an illiterate population much guidance and do in ten years what other nations have taken hundreds of years to do. This may seem on the face of it very wise indeed but recent events in our country have shown it to be a short-sighted policy. The eighty-percent illiterate population soon tired of the forced "guidance." They were not willing to be led by the nose forever. This goes to show that people who thought that democracy was not practicable in a country like Ghana were all wrong. They seemed to imply that we ought not to try out democracy until we had become wise and good under dictatorship. What folly! Any man who resolves never to get into the water until he has learned to swim will indeed wait forever and never learn.

We could do worse than base our teaching of democracy on a framework which we know already—the family. If I mention family, it includes not only my father, mother, brothers, and sisters, but the extended family or group of relatives living in single or in neighboring communities. We are under the leadership of the elder men of the family, one of whom is popularly acknowledged as the head. I remember once there arose the problem of sending to a secondary school one of the girls whose parents were dead. All the relatives met together and discussed how they were going to do this. It was finally decided that three of the uncles who were fairly well-off should contribute a certain amount of money each month. Though the head died, this system continued to operate because once they had given their opinion and come to a satisfactory agreement they considered that out of loyalty to the family and respect for the head their promises must be kept. This being the normal family's way of dealing with problems it should not be hard to get people to understand democracy on a larger scale.

---

[1] Adrian Hastings in his article "The second Revolution"—New Blackfriars, March 1966.

Besides, they are already familiar with democratic government, though not consciously so. I am referring to Chieftaincy which holds in embryo almost all the essential features of democracy. A chief is made eligible for office by his birth into the royal family, but his ultimate selection to community headship depends upon the clear recognition of his acquired abilities to lead, by three powerful groups: firstly, by the members of his own family, then by the council representatives of all the other families in the community and finally and most democratically, by the individual members of all the families who register approval or disapproval through their own representatives. His tenure, like that of the family head depends upon his behaviour. If he fails to please, out he goes, to be replaced by another member of the royal family who can gain the necessary approval. In this way autocracy is prevented.

Nowadays, we find that the claims of the native chief are often unduly overlooked when native questions are being dealt with. The chief was formerly a man of very great importance. But his present position is anomalous. Both his rights and duties are ill-defined, and as a natural consequence, he has lost a great deal of self-respect. I think that it is the duty of any democratic government to endeavour to restore the native chief to his former position of trust in the community. He must be given real power, definite responsibilities and definite rights and duties.

If this is done I feel sure we will be developing along lines of natural evolution instead of substituting for our own laws and customs, a system that we think is better just because it happens to be in force in Great Britain or Russia. Improvement on, and not mere imitation of the views of the Western democratic credo, whether in morals, manners and customs or in dress, art or industry is the trade keynote of civilization throughout the world.

If democracy is to have the proper environment in which to develop there must be a stable economy and more and varied educational opportunities.[2] "In general the economy is not developing comparably with education and there is a real danger that higher education—especially if it is incomplete will come to put people out of a job, rather than into one. This is especially true as so little of the educational effort is directed towards a trade or craft. It is academic, geared to professional work or to the white-collar jobs of an advanced industrial society, but that society hardly exists yet in Africa." Therefore there is need for more emphasis on technical training so that there will be skilled workers to fill the jobs made available by an expanding economy.

But preparing people to fill posts is only a minor part of education. Democracy is not just a form of government, it is an attitude of mind and in educating people for it there are many factors to be considered. I shall deal with only two extremes. First, there are those whose ideas of freedom have been so blunted that they may have to be shaken out of a servile frame of mind. To such people it must be pointed out that they have a right to speak their mind, to fight against injustice, to vote for whomsoever they please and in secrecy.

They have a right to education, a just wage, free time, consultation with their employers and so on. Then there are the others, a greater number I think, whose ideas on freedom need to be corrected. They are the people who criticize everything destructively but who fail to realize that they are not exercising liberty here, but taking liberties, which is entirely different.[3] Among those who offend against liberty are many of us young students. Since democracy is a way of walking and not of talking, we must have opportunities to live it in school. There is already the prefectorial system which teaches that positions of honour and trust bring their own responsibilities and duties.

But not all young people appreciate that the responsibilities are at least as important as the privileges, if not more so. Let me illustrate this point. In a certain boy's school the students were continually clamouring for more democratic treatment. They felt they should be consulted and have a say in the drawing up of the menu for meals. The Headmaster eventually decided to teach them a lesson. He allowed the Students' Food Committee to take over completely the ordering of provisions. They were to be entirely responsible for handing out the food to the cooks and hardest of all for keeping within a fixed budget. The experiment failed. After a week the boys tired of the extra work involved and worse still half the school was reporting at the dispensary with stomachache! But the committee had learnt at least this: that democracy is not all shouting for rights.

Freedom has limits and we should all respect each other's. What makes a society is a common aim; and to have a solid, lasting society there should be rules and some basic moral standards. What should be learned is that we are what we are today because of our neighbours, their personalities and the influence of all those we have ever met. Therefore, we should respect the ideas of other people and accept and bear our own mistakes if we are in the wrong, for we are all fallible.

People who have recognized their freedom, its limits and their fallibility from a free-state. A man of a Free-state is bold enough to stand by the light given him. This means he is able to bear witness to the right and wrong he sees. He need not close windows and doors in order to talk about the government, religion or a frivolous book on politics found in the library. This does not mean that he may always criticize the government if it intervenes in certain of his affairs. There is no use in its giving me a full scholarship while I sit down at my desk enjoying the breeze. The head of my school, acting in the government's interests, has a right to withdraw that scholarship.

To conclude, we know that only love, goodwill, friendship and spiritual togetherness can secure the well-being prosperity and progression of our nation. Above all, I feel strongly that as far as we Ghanaians are concerned, we shall be depending for a long time to come on an educated minority. Let them be truly educated then. Let them put away all thought of personal gain and advancement and be men of sympathy, imagination and above all men of patience. For "all this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will be finished in the first 1,000 days, . . ., nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."[3]

BOOKS CONSULTED FOR IDEAS BUT NOT QUOTED DIRECTLY

"My Hope for America," President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"The Quest for Order," Fred G. Burke.

"Africa, The Politics of Independence," Emmanual Wallerstain.

"The Gold Coast of Today," Sir John P. Rodger.

CONCLUSIONS OF GRAND JURY ON THE HOUGH DISTURBANCE IN THE CITY OF CLEVELAND

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the body of the RECORD the Cuyahoga County grand jury's report on the Hough disturbances in Cleveland. The conclusions reached by the jury after several weeks of intensive investigation by Cleveland law enforcement agencies and lengthy testimony by participants in and witnesses to the riots not only revealed Communist infiltration of the civil rights movement, but spell out the possibility of a recurrence.

I respectfully call the attention of the House to this report which appears on pages 18827–18830 of the August 10 RECORD. Let me urge you to read it in its entirety, but I will quote to you now a few excerpts which compel me to ask again that the Congress take immediate appropriate action to investigate outside influence in the series of racial uprisings in our country:

In part the report says:

> The jury respectfully calls attention to the effective uses made of impressionable, emotionally immature and susceptible young minds by those who for one reason or another have set out to accomplish their designs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America and elsewhere. . .

Continuing the report says:

> Special movies of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the jury presented Harllel Jones—

Identified as one of the leaders of the Hough riots—

> as an outright exponent of violence, a black power apostle with a bitter hatred of all whites, a cofounder of the rifle club.

The report declares:

> There was evidence placed before the jury that rifle clubs were formed, that ammunition was purchased and that a range was established and used, that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for rifle clubs and that instructions were given in the use of molotov cocktails, and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect.

I quote further:

> With specific regard to the W. E. B. DuBois Club—

Which the report identified as a moving spirit in the riots—

> the evidence shows that Mike Bayer, Daniel Mack, Ron Lucas and Steve Shreeter, previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough area over to the west side of Cleveland.

I appeal to this House to take immediate action to investigate this situation and the smoldering situations which certainly exist in our other big cities.

---

[2] Adrian Hastings in his article "The Second Revolution"—New Blackfriars, March 1966.

[3] President John F. Kennedy in his First Inaugural Address.

The major cities of the Nation are under threat of future blood baths. The Department of Justice, I am sorry to say, appears relatively undisturbed by the matter and it is the duty and responsibility of the Congress to take appropriate steps.

IT IS NOW TIME FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO COME FORWARD AND REVEAL ALL SOURCES OF INCOME AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Arkansas democratic primary on July 26, 1966, the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas voted overwhelmingly to continue my services by renominating me as their Representative in Congress. Since I do not have Republican opposition, this decision on the part of the people I represent is virtually tantamount to reelection to the next Congress. I am extremely grateful for the trust that my people have placed in me, and I want to take this opportunity to hereby pledge to my congressional colleagues and to my people to continue to serve with honesty, with integrity, and with the utmost devotion to the best interests of Arkansas, as well as those of the United States, in fulfilling my duties and obligations as a Member of this body in which I am honored to serve.

Since there have been occasions recently that cast suspicion on the wholehearted willingness of some Members of Congress to serve unselfishly in the public interest and not for personal gain, I feel that it is now time for Members of Congress to come forward and reveal all sources of income and financial obligations. It is for this reason that I wish to make public my financial status.

Because of my great interest and work in the field of agriculture, some people want to know if I own, operate, or have a financial interest in any farmland or cotton gins in this country or in any foreign country. To this I must answer that I do not now, nor have I at any time in the past.

Although I am a lawyer by profession, as soon as I was first elected to Congress, I closed my law office and canceled all my legal affiliations so that I could devote my full attention to the business pertaining to the Congress. I never accept a fee from anyone for any purpose. My friends do make contributions, however, when I am engaged in a political campaign. What funds are not used for campaigning are returned to the donors.

My family and I live on the income paid to a Member of Congress by the Federal Government. It is my only source of income, and my wife has no income of her own.

Our main expenditures are for housing, transportation, and the education of our two children. Royston will be a senior at the University of Arkansas this fall, and Tolise is studying for a master's degree at George Washington University.

We have been fortunate in the housing field due to the rising value of real estate. Our home at 421 West Barton Street, West Memphis, Ark., was purchased a good many years ago for $14,600. Today I feel that the appraisal and value would be considerably higher.

Finding it cheaper to buy a house than to rent one in the Washington area, we bought our first house for $16,500 by borrowing $2,500 for the downpayment. We are now in our fourth house purchased in or around the District of Columbia. By being able to sell the other three houses for more than we paid for them, we purchased a house at 1105 Villamay Boulevard, Alexandria, Va., in 1960 for approximately $41,500. On January 1, 1966, we still owed $25,492.54 on this mortgage. We own the furnishings in the two homes. We have no other real estate holdings.

Our daughter, Tolise, has a 1960 Rambler, and Royston drives a 1965 Karman Ghia Volkswagen; Mrs. Gathings rides in a 1963 Biscayne Chevrolet, and I have a 1964 Chrysler New Yorker.

Our total investments are $200 I invested several years ago in the Christian Foundation Life Insurance Co. of Little Rock, Ark., and $200 in the West Memphis Federal Savings & Loan Association. We have $5 in a checking account at the Bank of Earle, Earle, Ark.; and we also have $5 in the First Federal Savings & Loan of Alexandria, Va. Mrs. Gathings went on a spree one year and bought one share of Gyrodyne for $12. An additional asset is the amount paid in over the years to the retirement fund.

The following congressional business expenses which were incurred last year and paid from my salary, since there are no Federal funds to take care of such items, are: Arkansas newspaper subscriptions, $181.10; taking constituents to lunch—it is my pleasure to have this opportunity to see my friends when they come to Washington—$724.29; travel over the district above the amount reimbursed by the Government, $1,749.40.

For the year 1965 we paid a total of $5,696.96 for Federal and State taxes, which includes $3,693.83 paid by me for Federal income tax. We also paid during the same year $2,459.57 in interest on debts. We are gradually paying off our debts by making monthly installment payments to Sears, Roebuck & Co., First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Washington, the First National Bank in Blytheville, Commercial Credit Corp., First National Bank in West Memphis, and J. C. Penney Co.

It is my hope that this information will bring you to the understanding that I vote as a Representative, not for myself, but for what I truly feel to be in the best interest of the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas and for our beloved Nation as a whole.

TAXES, HIDDEN AMONG PEOPLE?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, "it is reliably reported," as the saying goes, that Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, spoke to a closed-door meeting of Democrat congressional candidates in Washington a few days ago. Neither my staff nor I am privy to such meeting but the Chicago Tribune reported that a candidate from Columbus, Ohio, asked the Secretary's advice on how to handle questions about inflation and the rising cost of living:

> I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for 6 years—

Freeman replied—

> Slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can.

Statements of this nature are typical of attempts by the present administration to conceal the truth. L.B.J. and Secretary Freeman have placed the blame for inflation on rising farm prices. In reality, farmers' prices are down 13 percent while food prices are up 17 percent since the Korean war. Farm prices, in fact, are presently at only 79 percent of parity—the lowest level since the great depression.

Certainly the fault is not with the farmer. About 60 percent of the increase in food prices is added after products leave the farm. The real blame must be placed on the multiplicity of hidden taxes which rob the American consumers of billions of dollars every year, and on the inflationary deficit-spending policies which are being employed by the current administration.

Many people blame the all-important middleman for the tremendous rise in consumer prices. In the final analysis, however, the wholesaler, the transporter, the packager, and other middlemen do not really make as large a profit as might at first be assumed. Most of their markup is due to hidden taxes—the increasingly significant factor which is so often overlooked. These taxes, which are collected in such a way that the public is hardly aware of them, cost many Americans more than the income tax. The impact which these taxes have on an average family has been long since set forth in easily understood language by the famed ABC commentator, Paul Harvey, in his article. "Only People Pay Taxes," which I will submit for the purpose of being reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I quote in part, from the article:

> When I finally retracked the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf I understood why that price tag is more than 10 times what the wheat farmer gets.
>
> Because here are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread.

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. While we were watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again and again and again.

The hidden tax is little more than a means by which big government can spend the people's money without them knowing about it. Indeed it is a direct abuse of the people's right to be informed of Government activities.

The much-talked-about inflation problem has also had an effect on the food price situation. Farmers are the direct victims of inflation. As a result, since 1960—when Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture—3.2 million workers have left the farm.

Freeman does not seem to be much concerned about the farmer's plight. Instead, he seems to be working against the farmer. According to Freeman himself, he was "pleased" when corn prices went down after surplus corn was dumped on the market. In addition, he has advised housewives and the Secretary of Defense to buy cheaper cuts of meat in order to avoid the price increase. This is especially poor advice when the Federal Government is spending billions on social experiments and wages an undeclared war. Even so, Freeman continues to pursue his antifarmer policies.

Congress does not need to create a new agency or another study commission of any type, to deal with the problems of hidden taxes and inflation. The executive branch must simply devote itself to responsible government along with economic progress. The various departments are quite well equipped to settle their problems and perform their duties under legislative oversight and review. So now the question to ask is a simple one—Mr. Freeman, why do you not get busy and do something for the farmer instead of blaming him for things he can do nothing about? You have "slipped, slid and ducked" far too often.

The article follows:

Who's Doubling the Price You Pay for Your Daily Bread? Paul Harvey Names the Culprit in "Only People Pay Taxes"

Americans, 2 weeks ago, I, Paul Harvey, started out chasing a sneak thief and I ended up with the detection of public enemy No. 1.

I have been 2 weeks on the trail.

I am very tired. But the job is done.

No conviction yet. But I can name him now. And he is yours to prosecute as you see fit. Before I tell you his name. * * *

Here's what happened.

Two weeks ago I got a letter from a farmer on the subject of the last election.

But he included this question, "Who is the middle man who is getting rich off the farmer?"

He said he sells a bushel of wheat for $1.73.

By the time that bushel of wheat is made into 66 loaves of bread it costs housewives $15.84. Whoa, there.

"Who's getting rich on me?" the farmer wanted to know.

Well, I've heard that question repeated so often that I had stopped listening to it.

But suddenly I decided the one way to silence that noisome question—nobody had tried—and that was to answer it.

Well, with my limited staff we started playing detective.

For the wheat in a loaf of bread the farmer gets 2½ cents.

But you pay 24 cents.

So you are both being robbed by somebody. Who?

I figured I'd backtrack on the culprit. So I went to the grocery store. "How much do you take out, Mr. Grocer, when you sell a loaf of bread?" I said. "There's more than 20 cents missing that somebody's getting. Is it you?"

Well the grocer showed me that his markup is confined by competition to only 3 cents.

In view of his salaries, overhead, that markup seemed fair enough, especially when he explained that he has to pay more than half of it back in corporate income taxes not covered in the sales tax.

And also he contributes to the social security and unemployment taxes of his employees.

He pays an electric bill every month plus a tax on it. And his delivery truck was taxed when he bought it and the gasoline it uses and the license plates it wears are all taxed.

So all this overhead, not to mention his own income taxes, made 3 cents seem a fair enough profit for the grocer to make on that loaf of bread.

Anyway, he was not the robber I was looking for.

I went to the wholesaler and rode on one of the trucks that delivers the bread.

Maybe this driver was the boy who's been picking the farmer's pocket.

After all, the teamsters union, you know.

But I divided the number of loaves of bread the man delivers by his wages per week and his take is less than one-twentieth of 1 cent a loaf. So he's doing all right. But he's not stealing anything.

There's too much spread between the price and the cost of a loaf of bread. The guy I was looking for doesn't have just a finger in the kitty.

He's in there with both fists.

I kept looking.

There were two tedious days of sleuthing for this sneak thief before I backtracked on that loaf of bread as far as the flour mill. But I made sure that I didn't miss any possible middlemen in the bakery or in the railroad that hauled the flour, or anywhere.

And not one was getting away with anything. I mean the profit slice which each took for his services was an infinitesimal fraction of one-tenth of 1 penny per loaf. Not even measurable.

Then I got a tip. Check the sugar source. If nobody in the wheat-flour ingredient was robbing us—maybe the sugar people. I backtracked to a New Orleans refiner and it was another deadend. The price you pay for the sugar and the salt and the yeast and the milk solids and the shortening in the loaf of bread—all put together—come to less than one-fourth of 1 cent per loaf.

So. * * *

And here is where I stubbed my toe. By the time I added everybody's profit for handling the materials and the finished product plus the cost of the ingredients—I figured it all up—and it came to 12 cents for a loaf of bread. You should be paying 12 cents for a loaf of bread.

But I can't get my grocer to sell me a loaf for less than 24 cents.

Who's doubling the price of my loaf of bread?

Who's getting away with that other 12 cents?

I had figured every handler's wage down to the most minute fraction. My figures could not be wrong.

But a loaf of bread added up to 12 cents and it's still selling for 24 cents. I was getting as angry as the farmer who'd written me that letter. It's frustrating to have your wife go to the grocery store and—somewhere in there—get robbed by a ghost.

Well I went back to the farmer. I decided to start all over again, but working forward from the farmer. The research went faster this time because I knew the direction.

And this time I caught him. Red handed. The guy who's picked your pocket every time you buy a loaf of bread. And he's been dealing himself in when you buy milk, too. There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your doorstep. And sure enough, I found the same guy doubling the price.

The syndicate he operates is so smooth and so subtle that it's little wonder he's escaped the rap for this before.

But I'm going to name him tonight.

Because he's gradually aiming to double the price of your loaf of bread again.

And again.

While the farmer fusses and fumes and shadowboxes with imaginary villains, the real one has been in hiding.

I took that farmer's bushel of wheat to market. The farmer got $1.73 for it. Two and one-half cents per loaf of bread.

But when flour mill added its fraction for milling—wait a minute—the flour to make one loaf of bread has suddenly doubled. It comes out of the mill costing 5 cents. Not 2½. Still the mill is getting only a minute fraction of a penny for itself.

But the mill is required to pay. Now the trail gets warm.

The mill has to add on seven Federal taxes and eight separate State taxes.

The railroad which hauls the finished flour—now the trail gets hot—keeps only a tiny fraction of a penny for its services—but it adds on 2 pennies to pay five Federal taxes, plus State taxes in every State through which the shipment passed.

In this case there were three.

Jumping Jehoshaphat.

I thought taxes just soaked the rich.

This is soaking anybody who buys a loaf of bread.

And when I backtracked on those other ingredients, I found the sugar refiner paid eight Federal taxes and six Louisiana State taxes. The railroad that hauled the sugar paid taxes. The warehouse where the salt was stored in Chicago paid taxes. The shortening manufacturer and the yeast factory and the producer of the milk solids.

Each was keeping for himself such a minute profit that the total cost of the ingredients had added only 2 pennies. But the taxes had pyramided to more than twice that.

I am an amateur detective. But I did the best I could. And when I finally retracted the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf I understood why that price tag is more than 10 times what the wheat farmer gets.

Because here are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread.

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. While we were watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again and again and again. After all, we've consoled ourselves, the tax man gets only 20 percent of my income. It's worth that to live in America.

But that's a lie and a delusion. The tax man has been picking your pocket for 12 cents every time you buy one loaf of bread. But with such clever sleight of hand—by such an involved and complicated multiplicity of hidden taxes—that his hand was quicker than our eye.

You think you pay a hundred dollars tax when you buy a new $2,000 car. Listen: There have been $288 in hidden taxes collected on that car before it ever leaves the factory.

And then there are all the taxes the dealer pays, taxes on income, property, taxes when you transfer the title, when you pay the State tax. So when you pay $2,000 for a car—more than one-fourth of that price is just taxes.

You've been figuring the corporation tax would cost only the big corporations. But look what happened. They added it to the price of the car.

We pay it.

The grocer, the trucker, the baker, the miller, they don't pay their taxes. We do.

When we buy that loaf of bread.

Railroads don't pay taxes. Corporations don't pay taxes.

Just people pay taxes.

All the rest of those fellows add their taxes onto the stuff they sell us.

Only people pay taxes.

We can hear that our Federal Government is sending a billion dollars to Tito. * * *

And we figure "so what * * *."

But every time our Government spends a billion it taxes the average American family another $25.

Only people pay. How much different it might have been if our Government had said it that other way. That "every American family is asked to chip in $25 this year for Tito." Wow.

Conversely, every billion dollars which our Government saves—every billion dollars less that it spends—decreases the tax load for the American family of four by $2. Wow.

I'm going to remember that. Every time the Washington or the State spenders speak of spending another billion for something or other, I'm going to remember it's 25 of my dollars they're spending. It'll make a difference.

CONTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO POLITICAL FUND-RAISING AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the UPI wire service today is a story reporting that Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE has accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance at a reception from Federal employees.

The same wire service account goes on to report that Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, charged "An organized shakedown is going on" in the Johnson administration to force Federal employees to contribute to political fund-raising affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that a couple of years ago I brought to the attention of the administration illegal solicitations in the REA. These solicitations were investigated by Civil Service investigators and by the FBI. My charges were confirmed by the investigations.

The Hatch Act had been violated as well as the Corrupt Practices Act. Yet those involved who are in the excepted service have gone unpunished, and the classified employee involved was merely permitted to retire.

I believe the Hatch Act is being destroyed rapidly. It is crystal clear that the Johnson administration has set the pattern and waved the green light to permit the widespread arm-twisting of Federal employees. How long will these illegal campaign fund solicitations be permitted to continue in defiance of public law?

The wire service article to which I have referred is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Sen. CLIFFORD P. CASE, R-N.J., today accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance at a reception from Federal employes.

CASE did not identify the Congresman, but a letter he read indicated it was a New Yorker.

In a speech prepared for Senate delivery, CASE read a complaint from a civil service employe who identified herself only as a typist.

CASE said the typist received a letter which started with a glowing biography of the Congressman and ended with this paragraph:

"We have enclosed four tickets with a return card. Kindly let us know if you need more. Please come and enjoy an evening with your friend (blank). If you can't make it, we will certainly appreciate your support."

In her letter, the girl had written that she had "never lived in New York and have never seen, met, or written to Congressman (blank)."

CASE said, "such solicitation make a mockery of our whole democratic system.

"It is blackmail pure and simple and cannot be disguised in the cloak of 'voluntary' contributions.

"When a person's livelihood is at stake it is not a question of what one 'wants to do', there is no choice.

"I consider it a disgrace that the Congress should tolerate such a loophole in the Corrupt Practices Act," CASE said. "It is a loophole that has been increasingly exploited."

Sen. JOHN J. WILLIAMS, R-Del., charged today that "an organized shakedown is going on" in the Johnson administration to force federal employes to contribute to political fund raising affairs.

"The President knows it, he likes it, he condones it," WILLIAMS told the Senate.

WILLIAMS made the charge after CASE accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance by federal employes at a reception.

CASE did not identify the Congressman but a letter he read indicated it was a New Yorker.

WILLIAMS followed to say he had received many similar letters. He said he had introduced a resolution to ask the Attorney General to give Congress his recommendations on the problem of "making" contributions from federal job holders but had received no response.

SAM MELLINGER—MR. REPUBLICAN—A GREAT KANSAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, a personal friend of mine, Sam Mellinger, passed away on Wednesday. In most instances, following death, it would be improper to even mention politics, but there are exceptions and, in my opinion, this is one. Sam Mellinger, a great Kansan, a dedicated husband and father, and a willing worker in local, State, and National affairs, took his politics seriously. It has been said, by one who knew Sam as well as anyone, that "he left this world one of the richest men ever known—rich in friendship, rich in genuine accomplishments, and very, very rich in common honor and common decency." It was an honor and a privilege to know him, to work with him and to know of his complete dedication to everything he undertook. While I cannot comment about many of his accomplishments, the record is clear that Sam Mellinger not only loved politics, but greatly influenced politics and political activity throughout Kansas and the Nation.

When he passed away on Wednesday, August 10, he was the Republican national committeeman from the State of Kansas. Before reaching this pinnacle in politics, Sam had risen from the ranks of a precinct committeeman to Republican State chairman of Kansas in 1958–60. Because of his devotion and interest, the Republican strength in the Kansas State Legislature increased from 69 members in the 1958 session to 82 in the 1960 session. Sam held numerous positions in the Republican Party in Kansas and was also on the 15-member executive committee of the National Republican Committee. As an indication of his national stature, it is well to point out that the present national chairman of the Republican Party, Ray Bliss, asked Sam to nominate him in 1965 for that position.

There was never any task too small or too large if the objective was sound and in the best interest of building and preserving a strong two-party system in Kansas and the Nation.

All those who knew Sam were enriched because of it and are saddened by his death. To his wife Jerenne, his children Dick and Gwyneth, we offer our sincere and prayerful sympathy, trusting that they will be sustained during this period of sorrow by the memory of a man which will live on and on and on.

MAINE SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have followed with deep interest the development of the sugar industry in Maine since 1964 because it has a direct effect upon industry and employment in my congressional district where two cane sugar refineries are located. The cane sugar refining industry has been in existence in Boston for more than 100 years and our refineries are among the most modern cane sugar refining plants in the world. These plants provide steady employment for approximately 1,000 people throughout the year. The average wage of a cane refinery production worker exceeds $3 per hour plus fringe benefits which average $1.05 per hour. These wage rates exceed the average industrial rate in the New England area. The steady employment of these workers is in jeopardy as a result of the developments which I will bring to the attention of this body. In order that you may fully understand the questions which I have raised with respect to the recent loan of the EDA, I would like to give you a brief summary of the development of the beet sugar industry in the State of Maine.

The Sugar Act of 1962 authorized the establishment of six new beet sugar factories over a period of 4 years. Local business groups in Aroostook County, Maine, were provided with an acreage commitment sufficient to support a new beet factory. The acreage commitment to this area was conditioned upon the construction of a beet factory to process the crop.

In 1964, the Great Western Sugar Co. of Denver, Colo., entered into an agreement with a local business group in the area to supervise the construction and operation of the factory. It was to be built by an industrial development group and the capital requirements of $17,500,000 were to be financed from several sources including the Area Redevelopment Administration which agreed to a loan of $6,931,300. On February 12, 1965, an announcement was made that the Great Western Sugar Co. was withdrawing from the Maine beet sugar project stating at the time that the reason for its withdrawal was because "it feels that sugarbeets cannot be grown properly in northern Maine."

With the withdrawal of the Great Western Co. the Maine local business group sought to interest others in building and operating the factory. A new group was formed and it planned to construct and operate a beet sugar plant in conjunction with an already existing facility which processes other agricultural products. The financing of this plant was then modified and on March 22, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration authorized a 20-year loan of 4-percent interest for $6,495,000 to the Aroostook Development Corp. for payment on account of not more than 65 percent of the cost of land acquisition, construction, equipment, and other expenses related to construction of this plant. The development company also arranged for a construction and/or a first mortgage loan in the amount of $6 million from the First National Bank of Boston and the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York. This loan will be fully insured by the Maine Industrial Building Authority. Local financing in the amount of $2,205,000, secured by a third mortgage on the property, completed the long-term financing on the plant which totals $14,700,000. Having secured this financing, the development company on July 15, 1965, entered into an agreement with a West German corporation to design and supply the machinery and equipment for $5,523,045 plus salaries and expenses of German supervising specialists personnel attached to the project. I also am given to understand that the steel for buildings on this project was purchased in Germany.

Let me make it clear that I have always been one of the principal supporters in the Congress of fair and equitable sugar legislation and I supported the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, which included provisions for the orderly expansion of the beet sugar industry. However, when application was made for an acreage commitment, I publicly expressed my doubts about the wisdom of locating a new beet sugar factory in Maine. Also, on learning about the financing of the new factory, I questioned the desirability of using ARA funds in a project which would tend to cause unemployment in the long established industry in New England.

It is my understanding that this beet sugar plant is to commence processing of the beet crop this October. The Department of Agriculture reserved 33,000 acres of the total national beet acreage goal for this factory, but according to the latest reports, farmers responded by planting less than 3,500 acres. In view of this obvious indication of the lack of farmer interest in the beet operations, the management now plans to provide additional machinery and equipment for the refining of raw cane sugar, completely changing the character of the operation, and offering no further inducement to Maine farmers. Whereas the building of the original beet plant was part of our national program providing for the orderly expansion of the domestic beet industry, I feel very strongly that the modification of this plant to permit it to refine raw cane sugar certainly has no economic justification. To understand the situation it should be borne in mind that it would be necessary to bring raw cane sugar in from overseas points to one of the country's most northerly seaports. This raw sugar will then have to be transported over approximately 200 miles to one of the most northerly points of the United States in an area sparsely populated and lacking in any sizable food processing industries that might be using sugar.

The refined output of this plant—if any salable sugar is actually turned out, since there has as yet been no successful operation of this type of plant anywhere in the United States—will have to be backhauled hundreds of miles to the consumer centers which are concentrated in the Boston area. It may be of interest to the subcommittee to know that almost 50 percent of the entire New England population is concentrated in the radius of some 50 to 75 miles around Boston. It is in this highly populated area where the demand for sugar exists and it is this area that would constitute the real market for any sugar produced at any point in the New England States. But we already have two large sugar refineries in Boston and they have the capacity to turn out refined cane sugar products far in excess of the refined sugar demand in all of the New England States.

I am told, and it is rather obvious, that any sugar produced by the Maine plant and sold in the New England States will clearly replace an equivalent quantity of cane sugar now produced at the Boston refineries. In this manner any added production that might be realized at this Maine plant will directly affect employment within the existing cane refineries. These workers residing in my district are very much concerned about this and have expressed their concern to me.

My interest in this matter goes further. I am particularly distressed that millions of dollars of the construction capital was spent outside the United States for the purchase of machinery, building materials, and services of construction personnel. I am unable to understand why at a time when our balance of trade is unfavorable, and President Johnson is urging American businesses and individuals to curtail spending abroad, it was necessary to export these millions of dollars outside our country for machinery, structural steel, and other equipment which could have been obtained in our United States.

I am advised that a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee was specially appointed in order to conduct a continuing and constructive review of economic development programs under the Public Works and Economic Act of 1965 and other related programs. I respectfully suggest that the information I have given you today, based as it is largely on information I have received through newspapers and press releases of the Government agencies involved, is sufficient to warrant a thorough study of the facts by this subcommittee.

It was the express purpose of the Congress in enacting the Public Works and Economic Development Act to make available Federal financing assistance, provided that such assistance is preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range, economic planning. Based on the information made public so far, it is apparent to me that the latest EDA loan to the Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., fails to meet the standard provided in the statute.

GOV. JOHN A. BURNS SPEAKS ON LABOR'S STAKE IN HAWAII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, because as Hawaii's Congressman I am frequently asked by my colleagues, "How's Jack Burns doing as Governor?" I would like to offer for the RECORD a recent speech delivered by Gov. John A. Burns of Hawaii, a former Member of this House.

His remarks on "Labor's Stake in Hawaii" will no doubt prove of interest to those who know the Governor, for they reveal much of what he has done and is attempting to do for Hawaii as its first elected Democratic chief executive.

I include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

LABOR'S STAKE IN HAWAII

(Address by Gov. John A. Burns of Hawaii, AFL–CIO leaders conferences, East-West Center, July 24, 1966)

It is always a pleasure to break bread with old friends, particularly with you of Hawaii's labor movement, with whom I have shared a warm understanding and kinship for many years.

I might add that breaking bread was about all we literally did for supper this evening. Not that I have any complaints. The spartan meal we enjoyed tonight was quite symbolic of the common roots from whence you and I spring. Moreover, it serves as a very real reminder to all of us of the many thousands in our own Nation and the millions throughout the world who do not share in the general affluence that prevails in America.

Bread and beans are more than the daily fare within reach of countless numbers in a world capable of abundant production for all. This very simple supper, then, might well serve as an inspiration to each of us to do everything we are capable of to improve the lot of mankind in our global community.

In a very real sense, this thought represents the sum and substance of "Labor's Stake in Hawaii."

First, it might be in order to look at the record.

We in Hawaii enjoy an unprecedented economic boom today. Every significant index reflects steady, oftentimes remarkable, economic growth and general prosperity.

Total employment was up to 270,000 even before school was out this year. This figure is up more than 35,000 from 1962.

The unemployment rate is down from the 1962 average of 4.7 per cent to a low of 2.6 per cent in April this year. This is more than full employment, as you well know, and there are labor shortages in many sectors of our economy today.

Business activity continues to move at a brisk pace.

As measured by taxes on gross income, business activity for the first quarter of 1966 increased 18 per cent over the comparable period last year.

Wholesaling was up 25 per cent, rentals up 18 per cent, and contracting up 15 per cent for the comparable quarters.

Construction contracts awarded during the 12-month period ending last May totaled a staggering $405.5 million. This represents a 35 per cent increase over the previous 12 months.

Retail sales, diversified manufacturing, diversified agriculture, utilities, financial transactions—all these indices are sharply up from their levels three-and-a-half years ago.

The stimulus for this economic climate comes from several closely-related sources: from the actions of your Legislature; from the policies pursued by your Administration; and, most important, from the confidence you have expressed in your government, and, therefore, in yourselves.

It is most significant that we have enjoyed three-and-a-half years of real stability in labor-management relations while our economy continued upward. I think you will agree that labor has been getting the returns it deserves in the bargaining that has taken place during this period. The minor disruptions we have had, in my judgment, served to further stabilize relationships.

While labor has not been unduly favored, neither has it been neglected. I need not remind you, I am sure, that some 50 pieces of legislation affecting the workingman were written into our lawbooks during the past four legislative sessions.

As a result:

Hawaii today has the most comprehensive unemployment insurance law in the Nation. Three years ago, the Unemployment Trust Fund was on the brink of insolvency. Due to the amendments we have made, plus our low unemployment rate, the Fund balance today is in excess of $23 million. At the same time, the benefits payable to our unemployed have gone up and are now geared to the general economy, as represented by average weekly wages of covered employees.

Our Workmen's Compensation Law has been recodified, with increased benefits as well as more effective provisions for enforcement.

Our "Little Davis-Bacon Act" has been liberalized.

Wage and hour laws have been improved.

We have a Fair Employment Practices Act prohibiting discriminatory hiring.

We also have laws—

Prohibiting lie detector tests as a condition of employment.

Curbing moonlighting by government employees at places of business where there are labor disputes.

Broadening coverage under the Employment Relations Act.

Against hiring strikebreakers.

Creating a Commission on Manpower and Full Employment to identify manpower requirements throughout the State.

The list of what can be called "labor legislation" enacted since 1962 is quite substantial.

Additionally, organized labor is well represented—in balance, and as it should be—on many important State boards and commissions.

Hand in hand, then, with the economic growth we are enjoying, the necessary social changes are taking place to provide more equitable opportunities for all our citizens.

But does labor's stake in Hawaii amount to gains in wages, hours and working conditions alone? Is Labor's stake solely in the dollars-and-cents package won over the bargaining table? In protective legislation? In political patronage?

What is "Labor's Stake in Hawaii?"

In my judgment—and I think we can all agree on this—labor's stake in Hawaii is, essentially, the same stake held by any other citizen of this State—be he a truckdriver, a longshoreman, a housewife, a merchant, a physician, a schoolteacher, a lawyer or a corporation executive.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is for a better Hawaii, a new Hawaii, a greater Hawaii.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in cultural and artistic pursuits as well as in a balanced climate for labor-management relations; in good government as well as in good wages; in better doctors as well as a better medical plan, in the quality of public education as well as in the numbers of classrooms.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in better cities for all our citizens to live in; in eliminating slum conditions and the unsightliness that breeds unsightliness; in rehabilitating and assisting those who have been left behind in the rapid pace of modern society; in awakening public concern over those problems of air and water pollution which plague other areas and which could overtake our Islands without adequate preventive action and planning.

Labor's stake is in the total quality of life in this State.

Your stake, then is in each man's opportunity to develop his talents to the fullest. Your concern is with his environment—the community he lives in, the air he breathes, the water he drinks. Your concern is with the enrichment of the schools that educate his children.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in the untold potential of the Pacific Era, which is so much in the thinking of our National Administration today.

Your stake, therefore, is in everything that leads to the further development of Hawaii as the center for commercial and cultural interchange in the Pacific.

You have a stake, too, in making our Islands the center for oceanographic research in the world.

You have a stake even in what is going on and what is going to happen in the Trust Territory of the Pacific and beyond.

It is clear that our Nation's "sphere of interest" is shifting from Europe to the side of the world we live in. Hawaii will figure more prominently than ever in this shifting interest. We are favored by geography, by the times, by common sense and by the rich heritage which belongs only to our people.

In all these things in which labor has a stake, perhaps the fundamental building brick for the construction of a new and better Hawaii is education. There is no greater single force for the building of a great society than education.

Thus, this Administration's commitment to education is a commitment to you and to your children, to the stake you and every other citizen have in Hawaii.

Effective political action, then, boils down to one thing: political action that leads to the fullest development of our people and to provide the fullest opportunity for them to use their rich native talents and abilities.

This is the ultimate return of your investment and your stake in Hawaii.

There is, in my judgment, a new animus, a new spirit of willingness to meet the bold challenges that face the people of Hawaii today.

When this Administration was inaugurated, there was considerable fear among the higher circles of management that "Labor," as a vested interest, had taken over Hawaii's government. There were fears that "radical" changes were to be expected in our socio-economic life. The fear manifested the very real knowledge that executive control of our State government could be used—or abused—to exercise dominant control of Hawaii's economy.

Such was the fear that it required a visit to New York for me to personally assure the most prominent Eastern bankers and financiers that Hawaii's new Governor was not the black anarchist incarnate.

I am not unaware that there are those in our so-called "liberal" element here who might wish I were so. But the fact is that in our democratic society changes for the good of all the people are effected not by revolution but by evolution.

To put it plainly, there are more ways to skin a cat than with a meat-axe. While I do not eschew entirely the direct approach when a heavy hand is necessary, I find it more effective to use persuasion and to look for the rational avenue that is nearly always available in any circumstance.

It is singularly appropriate that we meet this evening in a hall named for a great American, who enunciated those principles which you of the labor movement have long championed. In speaking of labor's real stake in Hawaii, I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson's words, which concluded my inaugural address in 1962:

"All . . . will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression."

That day when some were more equal than others in Hawaii is long past. It is through the work that you of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. have done over the years that this is so.

Your past achievements are the foundation for the constructive works ahead. What you have achieved will pale in comparison with what you can do when you are guided by the understanding that "Labor's Stake in Hawaii" is indivisible from the stake held by every other citizen of our great State.

We are one people, and we will move toward our destiny as one.

It has been a pleasure being with you this evening. I appreciate your invitation and the many courtesies you have extended me in the past. My association with your officers and members, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, has been most enjoyable and rewarding. I look forward to a continued and close relationship with you, in the interests of all Hawaii.

Mahalo.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the August 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee, a policy statement regarding the Department of Transportation was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the Record the complete text of this statement:

Historically, the Republican Party has encouraged the development of American transportation. In the 1860's Republicans aided the opening of the West by providing land grant incentives for rail transportation. In the early 1900s, the construction of the Panama Canal under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt promoted our vital sea transportation. The highly successful interstate highway system was inaugurated in 1956 under a Republican administration. And in 1959 the St. Lawrence Seaway was placed in operation.

For many years it has been apparent that there was a need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation. As a result, various proposals have been advanced to coordinate the vast transportation bureaucracy which uses, promotes, regulates, and operates transportation in the United States and throughout the free world. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Transportation recommended the creation of a department in 1946. And in his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated: "A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities." Now, five years after the Eisenhower message, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has endorsed this proposal. Certainly, the creation of an efficient and effective Department of Transportation has been delayed much too long.

Unfortunately, the bill that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration proposed, and that has now been reported by the Government Operations Committee, is faulty and inadequate in a number of important respects and should be improved. In this bill, important transportation activities have been excluded and those modes of transportation brought under the Department do not have adequate representation. The proposed transfer of aviation accident investigations to the new Department cannot be justified. The broad powers granted the Secretary of Transportation under Section 7 invade the policy-making authority of Congress. And the proposed transfer of the Maritime Administration to the new Department would perpetuate the present trouble-ridden mismanagement of the maritime crisis.

Therefore, while we favor and support legislation that would establish a Department of Transportation, we believe that such legislation should contain the following safeguards and improvements:

1. The aviation accident investigation function of the Civil Aeronautics Board should remain independent. In the event the CAB's Bureau of Safety is transferred to the new Department, as contemplated by the proposed legislation, this country would return to the totally unsatisfactory arrangement that existed prior to 1958. At that time, as a result of complaints and accusations from industry representatives, government personnel and outside observers, Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Act. Under this Act, an independent Federal Aviation Agency was established to regulate and control the airways and the various promotional aspects of aviation. By the same Act, the independent CAB was created. It was charged with the economic regulation of aviation and the conduct of aviation accident investigations. The CAB then created a Bureau of Safety to conduct such investigations. This Bureau has acquired an outstanding reputation for experience, thoroughness, and impartiality in the investigation of aviation accidents. Since the establishment of these twin but independent bodies, aviation has prospered and air safety has advanced. These advances would be jeopardized if these important functions are brought together again within a new Department.

2. To date, little has been done with respect to the problem created by aircraft noise, and no one in government has assumed direct responsibility for taking action. This important problem should receive immediate and continuing attention within the new Department. Adequate research and the establishment of reasonable standards to reduce aircraft noise should be given a high priority.

3. Throughout the hearings on the proposed bill, Section 7 was criticized severely. It was opposed by witness after witness, including the Transportation Association of America whose membership represents all modes of transportation plus shippers and investors. Under this section, the Secretary could adopt national transportation investment standards and criteria without seeking Congressional approval. He would have the authority to determine whether the investment of federal money should be made on behalf of one mode of transportation or another. He could impose his standards of investment on other agencies of government who administer investment programs enacted by Congress. This section should be stricken from the bill.

4. The Administration bill would leave the urban mass transportation program within the newly-established Department of Housing and Urban Development. Certainly, urban transportation is an integral part of mass transportation. The close relationship and interdependence between urban mass transportation and other forms of transportation dictate that the urban mass transportation should be transferred from the Department of HUD to the new Department. This program only recently has been assigned to HUD. Now is the time to make this transfer to the new Department.

5. As the April 20, 1966 House Republican Policy Committee statement pointed out:

"America is facing a crisis of major proportions with respect to its vital Merchant Marine. At the close of World War II, this country had a Merchant Marine fleet of over 3,500 vessels. By 1951, there were 1,955 active U.S. flag ships. Today there are only 1,000, including those reactivated for the Viet Nam War. The U.S. has dropped to 14th place among the world's major shipbuilding nations while Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place as a maritime nation. . . . The Merchant Marine shipbuilding effort in this country must be increased. Unless this is done, our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. We demand that steps be taken to correct this disastrous situation."

Although faced with this major crisis, the proposed bill does little more than transfer the problem to a new Department. There is nothing in the bill that reflects a sense of urgency or that calls for a redirection of effort. Moreover, there is no indication that the functions of the Maritime Administration will even be handled by one man with clear-cut authority. The present plight of the American Merchant Marine demands action. Unfortunately, the present stepchild status would continue under the proposed bill. The proposed transfer does not correct the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's known and apparent deficiencies in the maritime field. Therefore, we believe that the Maritime Administration should be established as an independent agency.

CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the outstanding authority in the United States on the question of "containerization" in the hauling of freight both by rail and by motor carrier is Mr. Morris Forgash, president of United States Freight Co. On July 20 of this year he made an address before the National Railroad Piggyback Association in Montreal, Canada, covering this subject. His address follows:

Piggyback's Goal Is Coordination: Are We On Target?

(*Address by* Morris Forgash, *president, United States Freight Co., before the National Railroad Piggyback Association,* Montreal, Canada, July 20, 1966)

I am glad to be here and very happy indeed to have this opportunity to appear on your program. We are all mutually concerned with a great and promising development in transportation. I can think of no group of people anywhere with whom I would feel more at home.

Let me congratulate you for your foresight and initiative in forming this association, which I understand is devoted exclusively to matters involving piggybacking. If this vital development in transportation is to achieve its destiny it must continuously be sparked by bold thinking, pioneering enterprise, and dynamic action. Piggybacking is one of the greatest innovations in transportation of this era, but the finest of tools is of little value unless used properly. Concentrated study—the pooling of knowledge and experience—a coordinated approach to piggyback's problems—will help to insure the ultimate success and speed the complete public acceptance of this endeavor which so intimately involves the fortunes and the future of transportation on this Continent.

It came to me quite a few years ago that containerization, one form of which is piggybacking, not only offered the key to most of the problems that were besetting the railroads in a changing era, but held the brightest promise for making available to the users of transportation the best that each mode in the kaleidoscopic complex of transportation had to offer. I knew the history of the early efforts to coordinate the service of different forms of transport on the basis of containerization. The sectionalized canal boats which were piggybacked over the rail portion of the Pittsburgh-Philadelphia route in the middle of the last century and the "Farmers" Trains which in the latter 1800's combined the highway vehicle of that day—the wagon—with the railroad, appealed to my imagination.

The container-on-flatcar service which was inaugurated by the railroads in the early 1920's was well known to me because the forwarding company with which I was affiliated was a heavy user of such service. That experiment, as you know, faded away after the Commission, in 1931, ordered the railroads to discontinue their flat, per-mile basis of charges, and required the establishment of rates related to the classification.

I watched with great interest the intermittent experiments in the trailer-on-flatcar variety of piggybacking. The first of these was inaugurated by the Chicago North Shore and Milwaukee Railway in 1926. Ten years later, in 1936, the Great Western and Keeshin Motor Express started a piggyback operation. Through the years, the piggyback concept intrigued many people, and evoked a great deal of talk and speculation, but right down to 1954, when the Commission decided the New Haven declaratory-judgment case, the subject remained largely academic, simply because the service was limited and sporadic.

THE NEW HAVEN DECISION

Even though the 20 questions propounded by the New Haven were at that time largely hypothetical, the proceeding fired the imagination of the Nation. Fortune magazine as well as other respected national publications graphically dished up to an avid public a blow-by-blow account of the trial of the issues as though they involved the fate of the Nation. Indeed the decision on the issues was more important than many people realized.

I am sure all of you are familiar with the questions of law answered by the New Haven decision. One of the principal issues was the contention of the motor carriers that piggyback service constituted carriage by motor vehicle which the railroads might not perform without a certificate under Part II. The Commission rejected these arguments, finding that TOFC service is rail service, no matter who owns the trailers, and therefore that the railroads may transport their own freight in their own trailers without a certificate.

Among other conclusions, the Commission found that railroads and motor carriers may enter into through-route and joint-rate arrangements for TOFC sevice and that railroads may transport freight for shippers and for freight forwarders, but not for common motor carriers, on the basis of open tariff rates. An interesting footnote to that part of the decision is that exactly 10 years later, in Ex Parte 230, the Commission reversed its New Haven decision and held that motor common carriers may utilize rail TOFC service at published tariff rates. A three-judge Federal court has overturned that ruling, and the matter has been appealed to the Supreme Court.

In the New Haven case, the Commission also dealt with substituted service arrangements, of the kind now known as Plan I. The Commission pointed out, in its report, that the New Haven was performing substituted service for various motor carriers, and that the railroad and certain motor carriers were parties to a "Substituted Freight Service Directory." The Commission went on to say:

"Division sheet No. F 517-B, used in connection with this directory and the motor common carriers' related tariffs, provides that the New Haven will accept as compensation for its service the charges per trailer set forth in a schedule contained in the division sheet." (293 I.C.C. 93).

The New Haven wanted to know whether such service was connecting carrier service or something else. In answer, the Commission pointed out that in an earlier case, *Substituted Freight Service*, decided in 1939, it had held that "where the substitution service consists of a combination of line-haul movements by rail and motor, it is *in legal effect* a joint service, no matter by what other name it may be signated." (232 I.C.C. 682). The Commission added that in that eariler case, recognizing the substituted freight service presented certain problems in the publication of tariffs, it had indicated "that interested carriers might confer with representatives of our Bureau of Traffic to work out a simplified form of tariff publication." And, said the Commission, the "New England directory referred to contains a substitution rule and concurrences in conformity with the views set forth in that report." Thus the Commission gave its imprimatur to Plan I conditioned on a certain form of tariff publication.

As you know, soon after the 1954 decision many of the railroads began to publish piggyback tariffs for use by the public, but at first such tariffs were limited to Plan II and the charges were on substantially the same basis and level as the going motor carrier rates. It was not until 1958 that the railroads began to publish piggyback charges on the basis of a flat amount per car, and thus inaugurated Plans III and IV.

We have come a long way in the past eight years. Piggybacking has demonstrated its practical worth, proved its acceptability to the public, and survived the most vigorous of legal attacks. Perhaps no transport innovation in history ever grew at a faster rate than TOFC service. In 1958 approximately 277,000 piggyback cars were loaded in the United States. In 1965 more than a million cars were loaded, and the service is still growing at a rate of more than 15 percent per year.

Certainly the piggyback record is a record to be proud of and you, who are devoting your energies to this phase of rail operations, are entitled to congratulations and deserving of a great deal of credit. But, as we must all recognize, there is a long way yet to go. Piggybacking still accounts for only a very small percentage of total rail traffic. The railroad industry, though in better circumstances than it was several years ago, is still not keeping step with the economy. According to an estimate in the May 1966 issue of the I.C.C. publication "Transport Economics", the railroads' share of total ton-miles decreased from 43.3 percent in 1964 to 42.8 percent in 1965.

Unparalleled and magnificent though the piggyback performance has been, it still has not recouped the fortunes of the railroads in that vast category of traffic known as "manufactures and miscellaneous." That is the traffic to which the railroads must look if they are to regain the position in transportation which their natural advantages indicate that they should have. This is the principal category of traffic that was attracted to truck service, and it is the traffic most susceptible of being transported in piggyback service.

Traditionally, manufactured and miscellaneous commodities have accounted for almost a third of rail tonnage and close to 50 percent of rail revenues. The tons and revenue figures in the manufactures and miscellaneous category have been rising since 1961. But the important fact is that in 1963 the railroads handled fewer tons of manufactures and miscellaneous, and received less revenue, than in 1956.

If piggybacking is to be not only the hope but the salvation of the railroads, it must produce a radical change in the statistics of rail operations in the field of manufactured and miscellaneous products.

This, then, is not a time for complacency. It is a time to take stock—to examine the overall picture—to see if we are headed in the right direction. It is a time, in short, to go back to fundamentals and take a new reading on the entire picture as it comes within the framework of piggybacking.

COORDINATION VERSUS SUBSTITUTION

What is the one most important element of piggybacking—the one new, enormously important, and heretofore elusive ingredient which piggybacking introduced into the transportation system? Coordination, of course. There can be no question about it. Piggybacking is a coordinating agent. If it does not fulfill that mission its long-range future will be in jeopardy.

I am absolutely convinced that certain piggyback operations which are engaged in on a rather wide and spreading scale do not represent coordination but are the antithesis of coordination; that such practices are not compatible with the best interests of the railroads and of the public; and that they are inimical to sound transportation policy. I refer particularly to the substituted service type of piggybacking represented by Plan I operations.

However, I include in the category of ill-conceived and injurious piggybacking any arrangement between motor and rail carriers which is not based strictly on through routes, joined together end-to-end, and joint rates, divided between the participating carriers on the basis of the through rates assessed on the commodities transported. To the extent that some of the so-called Plan V arrangements do not conform to those standards, I view them as a subterfuge.

There is no secret about my views on this subject. I have expressed them in formal proceedings before the Commission and on numerous other occasions. Issues involving substituted service or Plan I arrangements are pending before the Commission and in the Courts. It is not my intention to argue the specific issues of pending cases in public, but Plan I is a fact, not a theory—operations under the Plan are being conducted and they are being extended—and I consider that I have not only the right, but because of my responsibility the duty, to speak my mind on the subject.

Every time I think of the finely spun theories of law, the legal controversies, the conflicting and anomalous opinions that have characterized the history of Plan I piggy-backing I am utterly astonished. Aside from that, it seems incredible to me that any railroad would even consider turning over to its most formidable competitor, the long-haul trucker, the right, title, and interest to its own invention and most promising competitive weapon. I should think that Plan I would be viewed by the railroads as hari-kari in modern dress.

Let me ask this question. If the Commission ordered the railroads to let the trucking industry use their rails, their locomotive power, and their flatcars so that the truckers could better serve their own customers, and to accept from the truckmen give-away prices that materially lowered their cost of doing business—could the railroads not have such an order voided in court as an unwarranted invasion of their constitutional rights? I am confident that they could, and I fail to understand why the railroads voluntarily give away the birthright which I am positive no one could arbitrarily take away from them.

Plan I, as I view the matter, was born as an experiment and has been approved and condoned as a matter of expediency. To the premise that Plan I represents a desirable practice has been fitted the legal conclusion that it can be brought within the meaning of that statute. The premise and the conclusion are both wrong in my firm opinion.

WHAT IS THE STATUTORY BASIS OF PLAN I?

I do not know who invented the term "substituted service." It is an apt term, because it describes what happens under Plan I, but it is not a term that is used or described in the statute. It was simply coined out of whole cloth. As I have indicated, the 1939 *Substituted Freight Service* case, the Commission said that "the substitution service" is "in legal effect a joint service." Having drawn no court challenge to this conclusion, the Commission assumed the legal standing of Plan I in a number of succeeding cases. In the first Red Ball case, in 1950, the Commission said that:

"Substitution by motor carriers of rail service for highway truck service has been considered and approved by this Commission in several proceedings in which it has been found that such services would result in lower costs to the motor carrier, would relieve the motor carrier of the hazards of the road, would relieve congestion on the public highways, would be a desirable source of revenues for the rail carriers and on the whole be advantageous to all parties concerned." (52 M.C.C. 75).

Passing over the fact that the Commission did not cite any evidence to support the foregoing findings, I point out that such findings, if correct, were irrelevant to the issue, which was the lawfulness of the substitution by motor carriers of rail service for highway service. The Commission has a duty to "preserve the inherent advantages" of transportation on the public highways, and the Commission and the Supreme Court have held that a railroad is not a public highway.

The Red Ball case was reopened on the petitions of numerous competing motor carriers and in 1958 the Commission issued a further report. In the second report the Commission approved the Plan I service not because it would take a great deal of traffic off of the highways but because it would divert very little. (303 I.C.C. 421). Red Ball had earlier been unsuccessful in obtaining shorter highway routes between Chicago and Kansas City. Competing motor carriers claimed that the Plan I service would enable Red Ball to do indirectly what it had been forbidden to do directly. The Commission overruled these contentions, finding that Red Ball used the substituted service "only to handle its overflow business from Chicago to Kansas City," and that Red Ball's substituted rail service was no better than its highway service.

To say the very least, the legal theories upon which Plan I has been authorized have remained fluid. They have been tailored to fit the facts of given situations. In the *National Automobile Transporters* or NATA case, decided in 1962, the Commission repudiated the joint-rate theory laid down in earlier cases and held that Plan I represented "true substituted rail-for-motor service." (91 M.C.C. 395). Since under this ruling there was no "interchange," and the motor carrier continued to be the responsible carrier all the way through, the Commission was able to, and did, hold that contract carriers as well as common carriers might use the service. The Commission did not point to any statutory authority for this finding, but presumably it relied on the alternate route provisions of Section 208(b), since that is absolutely the only authority anywhere in the Act by which the Commission may permit any deviation from the highway routes over which a motor carrier is authorized to operate. Of course, Section 208(b) is inapplicable as I will show in a minute.

Just 18 months after the NATA decision the Commission rendered its decision in Ex Parte 230, holding that Plan I constitutes "a valid through-route and joint-rate arrangement within the contemplation of Section 216(c) of the act." (322 I.C.C. 301). Where did that leave the NATA decision? The Commission did not say, but so far as anyone can tell the NATA ruling still stands. In Ex Parte 230 the Commission said, "We, of course, recognize that the conclusions expressed here are at variance with some of the reasoning in the NATA case." But, the Commission said that automobile haulers have "unique problems", and that their TOFC practices would be dealt with separately at a later date.

It is quite clear that the same law applies to automobile haulers as to the haulers of general freight or any other commodity, and TOFC service cannot be regulated as one thing for one carrier and another thing for a different carrier. The law may not be modified by administrative fiat. If the law does not fit the situation, and the Commission thinks the law should be changed, its recourse is to Congress.

It is very difficult to identify the legal basis on which the Commission condones Plan I. Plan I service is substituted service. No one denies that plain fact. The motor carrier solicits the traffic, issues its own through bill of lading, charges its own rate, and elects whether to ship the trailers by rail or haul them over its highway route. The question is whether an operation that is, in fact, one thing, can be authorized as something else. That is the dilemma the Commission has faced.

Section 208(b), the sole authority for alternate routes, provides that motor carriers may "occasionally deviate" from their authorized route under such general or special rules as the Commission may prescribe. Under Plan I the deviation is authorized on a permanent basis, not in accordance with any deviation rule but presumptively as a matter of legal right. And, of course, Section 208(b) refers to public highways and was never intended as authority for motor carriers to substitute a rail route for their highway route, occasionally or otherwise. By definition and by the certificates provisions of the Act motor carriers are confined to the use of the highways.

JOINT SERVICE IS CONJUNCTIVE

The joint-rate theory which the Commission has resorted to in authorizing Plan I is even more vulnerable than the substituted-service theory. The Commission has proceeded on the erroneous premise that what the law does not condemn it permits. Thus, in Ex Parte 230, the Commission said that Section 216(c), the joint-rate authority, does not denote "the particular type of through routes and joint rates" which it authorizes and that the terms "through routes" and "joint rates" are not anywhere specifically defined.

Of course the law does not define the "type" of through routes and joint-rates that are authorized because there is only one type. That is the type that has been known and defined by the Commission and the Courts in numerous decisions since the dawn of regulation. The classic definition of a through route is contained in the Supreme Court's decision in *Thompson* v. *United States*, 353 U.S. 549, which reads as follows:

"A 'through route' is an arrangement, express or implied, between *connecting* railroads for the continuous carriage of goods from the *origin point on the line of one carrier* to *destination on the line of another*."

An equally classic definition of a joint rate was given by the Commission in the early case of *Canton Railroad* v. *Ann Arbor Railroad*. It is as follows:

"A joint rate extends over the lines of two or more carriers and is made . . . by arrangement or agreement between such carriers and evidenced by concurrence or power of attorney." (173 I.C.C. 263).

In order to have a through route and a joint rate the routes of two or more carriers must be joined together, end-to-end, and the single rate must be divided on the basis of the amount of service performed by each carrier. Under Plan I there are no "connecting" carriers. The only carrier known to the shipper is the motor carrier. The only rate involved is the motor carrier's rate and it is not "divided" with the railroad. The railroad is paid a flat charge, whether the motor carrier's rate is 50 cents or five dollars per hundred. The motor carrier handles individual shipments whereas the railroad transports only motor carrier trailers.

Every shipment must be handled pursuant to a bill-of-lading contract. The bill of lading identifies the shipment and names the consignor and the consignee. All common carriers are required by law to issue a bill of lading under which they must assume full responsibility "to the lawful holder thereof." But under Plan I the railroad never even knows who the shipper is. The railroad is not named in the bill of lading. How can a railroad assume responsibility to an unknown shipper?

The cardinal test of whether a joint service has been established is whether there is a tariff publication holding out a joint service to the public. No such tariff is published under Plan I. The shipper is given the right to veto the use of piggyback service, but he has no right to demand it. The motor carrier alone decides when and under what circumstances he will put his trailers on the railroad.

Those who contend for the lawfulness of Plan I will argue that it is joint service or, conversely, that it is purely substituted service, depending upon the exigencies of the occasion. Of course Plan I cannot be authorized under both the joint-rate and the certificate or alternate-route sections of the Act. One of the Commission's decisions in this regard must be wrong. We contend that they are both wrong.

The conspicuous fact is that Plan I operations simply do not fit into the pattern of the existing law. This in itself, does not condemn Plan I as an undesirable transportation practice—although I think Plan I is undesirable as well as unlawful. But the fact is that Congress alone has the power to give any transportation practice statutory sanction. The law is not elastic—it cannot be pulled and tugged and stretched to fit situations which it was not designed to cover. That leads me to this question: "If it is believed that Plan I is a desirable method of operation why not change the law?"

Doesn't the fact that there has been so much litigation, so many conflicting decisions, so much debate and so many differences of opinion, indicate that the law, as it is written, was not designed to cover Plan I operations? And if the law does not fit the situation should it not be left to Congress to decide whether it is in the public interest to provide for a given type of service? The Commission constantly recommends changes in particular laws to meet new situations or to clarify provisions that are unclear. Why do things the hard way?

Now, laying aside the question of the statutory authority for Plan I, let me pose another question: "If the motor carriers forsake the highways and substitute rail service under Plan I, at what point will their certificates become void for non use, and when must the commission, in the exercise of its statutory duty, revoke the certificates?"

While you are thinking about that one let me remind you of a few things. Under Plan I, as opposed to Plan V or any true joint-rate operation, the motor carrier may substitute rail service for the entire line-haul. The Commission has imposed no limitation on the amount or percentage of its traffic which a motor carrier may put in rail service under Plan I. In the Red Ball case the Commission approved a Plan I operation even though it said, in its decision, that the motor carrier planned to put all of its traffic on the rails.

In short, it is entirely possible, consistent with the Commission's decisions, for a certificated motor common carrier to conduct operations within the entire scope of its certificate, without ever putting a truck on the highway or leaving the city streets. And yet, by statutory definition, a motor carrier may only be authorized to provide transportation "by motor vehicle" and "upon the highways." Certificates of regular-route common carriers generally name the specific highways over which operations may be performed. With possible exceptions not known to me, they contain the following condition:

"It is further ordered, and is made a condition of this certificate that the holder thereof shall render reasonably continuous and adequate service to the public in pursuance of the authority herein granted, and that failure to do so shall constitute sufficient grounds for suspension, change, or revocation of this certificate."

In the Substituted Service case in 1939 the Commission said that where a common carrier by motor vehicle "substantially abandons its over-the-road service between any points on its route it runs the risk of having its certificate revoked in whole or in part under Section 212 of Part II." What is substantial abandonment? Can a motor carrier be said to be providing "reasonably continuous and adequate service" over the highway right up to the point of substantial abandonment? Could a motor carrier put one truck a week on the highway to save his certificate and give all of the rest of his traffic to a railroad? I think not. I respectfully suggest that the Commission take a new reading on this aspect of the problem. It may be that some certificates are subject to revocation at this very moment.

Now I pose an additional question: "Are the obvious Fourth Section violations which literally permeate all Plan I operations lawfully excused by the commission's "blanket" orders which are issued without investigation or knowledge of the facts?"

One of the basic reasons for the enactment of railroad regulation in 1887 was to prohibit the type of discrimination dealt with by Section 4. The prime object was to prevent destructive competition. Numerous efforts to repeal Section 4 or render it nugatory have failed. But I respectfully suggest that where Plan I operations are involved Section 4 is being nullified by the manner in which relief is granted.

Let me say—with the utmost respect but the firmest conviction—that in applying the Fourth Section to Plan I operations the Commission has observed form and ignored substance, and in late years form has been reduced to mere formality. The motor carrier representative, generally a publishing agent or bureau, files an application for "blanket" relief which is, so far as appearances go, automatically granted.

When the Commission first considered the Fourth Section question, in connection with the Keeshin-Great Western arrangement in 1936, protesting rail carriers pointed out two kinds of violations of Section 4 which were inherent in the operation. First, between Chicago and St. Paul, for example, the railroad had all-rail rates to numerous intermediate points that were higher than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul. Second, the motor carrier had rates to points like Eau Claire which, by Keeshin's highway route were intermediate to St. Paul, and which were lower than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul.

The Commission ruled that no violation occurred by reason of the lower all-rail rates to intermediate points because a "like kind of property" was not involved. Thus railroads never have been required to observe the Fourth Section when they establish Plan I, insofar as any conflict with their own rates is concerned. And, as I said, blanket relief is granted to absolve the violations which occur in the motor carrier rate structure.

Section 4, as you know, imposes an absolute prohibition against charging more for transportation of a like kind of property for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route. The only exception is that the Commission "after investigation" and "in special cases," may authorize rates that violate Section 4. But the law specifically provides that in granting Fourth Section relief—

"The Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed."

Until three or four years ago, in an apparent effort to conform with the foregoing requirement, the applications for Fourth Section relief contained an allegation that the so-called "divisions" or charges made by the rail carriers for transporting motor carrier trailers were "reasonably compensatory." To enable the Commission to conduct its required investigation and satisfy itself on that score the applications contained a schedule showing all of the contractual charges paid by the motor carrier to the railroad between the involved points. That was the only document from which the Commission or anyone else could determine what the rail Plan I charges to motor carriers were.

In recent years the Fourth Section applications have been silent regarding the charges assessed by the Railroads. Consequently, no one knows what the motor carriers are paying for their substituted service in any given movement. Obviously, Plan I operations are capable of producing destructive competition. Clearly, the amounts paid by the motor carriers to the railroads are the determinative factor in the competitive situation. I do not understand how the Commission can investigate without facts or how it can exclude violations without knowing what they are. This is a matter which I should think would be of vital concern to the railroads, for whether they participate in Plan I or simply compete with the service it would seem to me they would want to know what piggyback service is selling for in the Plan I market.

The Fourth Section either serves a useful purpose or it does not. It should apply to all rates to which the railroads are parties or to none at all. If it is the prevailing view that the Fourth Section has outlived its usefulness then let us have it repealed by an Act of Congress and not by administration interpretation.

And now another question: *"Assuming that Plan I is a joint rate arrangement does not sound policy require that control be exercised over Plan I regulations, practices and divisions?"*

Section 216(c), under which Plan I is authorized by the Commission, requires the establishment of "just and reasonable regulations and practices" and "just, reasonable, and equitable divisions." Ex Parte 230 was a rulemaking proceeding that was supposed to cover the waterfront, but of all the rules prescribed in that case none dealt with the charges made by railroads for hauling motor carrier trailers under Plan I. Freight forwarders petitioned the Commission to have a hearing in Ex Parte 230 to develop the facts about Plan I arrangements, and to prescribe rules which would require, among other things, filing of the Plan I charges. The Commission's Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance also recommended that the rail Plan I charges be filed.

But the Commission, disregarding the fact that the only evidence submitted in Ex Parte 230 consisted of the voluntary self-serving declarations of the parties, said that nobody had shown that the "division arrangements" under Plan I were unlawful. The Commission said that if in the future it should be informed that the "unpublished divisions" were being used as "a shield for improper activities'" it would decide whether a rule should be prescribed.

It seems to me that the purpose of rules of law and of administrative rules is to insure that improper activities can be detected and prevented. In whatever legal dress Plan I may be clothed at any given time, everyone knows, and the Commission has recognized, that Plan I operations have a competitive impact on other carriers that is entirely different from the impact of conventional through-route and joint-rate arrangements. The Commission entertained complaints in the early Great Western case about the level of the "divisions" and gave them careful consideration. In the Strickland case of 1962 the Commission rejected a Plan I arrangement on the protest of competing motor carriers that the Plan I rail route was much shorter than Strickland's highway route (318 I.C.C. 395). Indeed, the Commission said in that case that "the competitive effect" of Plan I on other carriers was "one of the principal factors to be considered." This was undobutedly what led the Commission to prescribe a 15 percent circuity limitation on Plan I arrangements in Ex Parte 230.

It is well and good to protect the motor carrier industry from new and devastating Plan I competition by imposing a circuity limitation, but how about the railroad industry and the forwarding industry? Are those industries not entitled to protection from the devastating competition which can be generated by the granting of ridiculously low Plan I charges to motor carriers by certain of the railroads? You and I know that not only are some of the Plan I charges on a basis materially lower than the piggyback tariff rates but certain of the arrangements provide for the hauling of empty trailers at half of the loaded charge or less, and permit heavier loading of trailers. Furthermore, Plan I arrangements permit and encourage diversion of rail boxcar traffic. To my knowledge, very few Plan I arrangements have any mixing requirements.

I could cite specific instances of Plan I charges so low that a motor carrier could load one trailer with high grade commodities and obtain his pay load and have the other trailer left over to ride free. With that free ride the motor carrier could undercut the rail rates on any number of commodities and, with its rail subsidy, steal the railroad's business.

Insofar as forwarders are concerned we maintain that when motor carriers purchase their line-haul transportation from the railroads, and limit their own physical operations to the gathering, assembly, and break-bulk and distribution of the freight, they are, in fact and in law, functioning as freight forwarders. We assert that this is an unlawful invasion of the forwarding business. But, so long as the Commission disagrees with us, and its ruling in that regard has not been overturned, then we strenuously contend that it is neither reasonable nor legally proper for motor carriers to obtain their line-haul transportation at less cost than we are assessed for the same service.

As the Commission said in the NATA case ". . . the physical rail transportation service provided by the railroads under Plans I, III, and V, is identical." When motor carriers act as freight forwarders—as they certainly do in every physical sense under Plan I—what is the justification for the drastic reductions which they obtain as against the charges we pay? The traffic is of the same general nature; in each case it is tendered by a common carrier; it moves in the same kind of equipment and in many instances in the same train. The published charges which we pay have been approved as reasonable on the basis of tested evidence. Does this mean that our industry is being forced to subsidize its competitors, the long-distance truckers?

It seems to me that there are the most compelling of reasons why the railroad industry itself, as well as the I.C.C., should insist that complete information about Plan I arrangements be filed and made public and subjected to regulatory restraints and controls in the public interest.

It strikes me that the railroads are making a grevious mistake to contribute a substantial portion of their piggyback output to the improvement of the competitive position of their most formidable competitors. Is this a confession of competitive impotence? The motor carriers who participate in Plan I operations are selling motor carrier service and using the railroads to help them reduce their costs and make their own service more attractive to the public.

If there is any doubt about what I am saying I invite attention to the February, 1966, issue of Western Trucking—Motor Transportation. An article in that magazine entitled "Piggyback's New Role" tells the story of what the trucking industry thinks about Plan I and why it uses rail service. Leading truck operators are quoted verbatim. The burden of the article is that motor carriers are using Plan I "to smooth out their power-need peaks."

What does this mean? The article explains:

"They are relying upon piggyback to do the 'peak' hauling (and to haul-back empties, too) during heaviest traffic periods."

With brittle realism the article states:

"Admittedly, no fleet executive calls the 'power peaking' teamup anything like a 'partnership.' Most fleets use the word 'expediency.' Still, fleets seem to be profiting from the relationship, whatever its name, even more than the railroads."

I have maintained all along that Plan I is simply an expedient and it is reassuring to know that the feeling is shared by substantial elements of the trucking industry. The magazine article points out that the primary uses of piggybacking by truckers are as "a backup for highway tractor power," and for "backhauling empties." One truck operator is quoted as saying, with regard to his empties:

"If loading them aboard a piggy train for a nonrevenue ride at 10 cents a mile gets them there, against 30 cents a mile if we hauled them ourselves, I'm for shoving those empties aboard a piggyback."

It stands to reason, of course, that motor carriers will turn their trailers over to the railroads under Plan I only when to do so reduces their highway costs or helps to balance their equipment. This does not strike me as the most desirable way in which the railroads should undertake to sell the piggyback service, nor does it contribute to sound and constructive transportation.

PIGGYBACKING AND NEW HORIZONS

Nothing that I have said about Plan I diminishes the paramount importance of piggybacking as a technique. As a coordinating medium and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can spark a renaissance in railroading. I am sure that your organization is dedicated to seeing that it does so, realizing full well that piggybacking is only at the threshold of its destiny.

I am afraid that there has been a tendency in some quarters to overlook the fact that piggybacking is a railroad development, conceived and inaugurated by the railroads to improve the posture of their service. It is true that piggybacking is the greatest coordinating medium that has yet been developed, but the real economy and importance of the service hinge on the inherent advantage of the railroad in the transportation of great volumes of freight, over long distances, at high speeds, and at the lowest cost.

Insofar as piggybacking is concerned, the only kind of coordination that makes any sense is the combining of a relatively short truck haul with the longest possible rail haul. In that kind of coordination there is no competition between the parties to the combination—the truck haul supplements the rail haul—the rail movement complements the motor haul.

In all of the discussion and consideration of piggybacking I think the picture has tended to be distorted by consideration of the situation of the long-haul truckman. The long-distance motor carrier has a very definite place in the transportation picture. With the immense expansion of the interstate highway system, the raising of size and weight limits, and the improvement in motive power, the future of the long-haul motor carrier seems assured. In the not too distant future we may see the truck-train with tractors pulling multiple trailer units, possibly over highways especially constructed for trucks. The long-distance trucker can remain competitive without purchasing his line-haul transportation from the railroads, and changing the basic nature of his carriage.

The short-haul truck lines are the natural partners of the railroads insofar as piggybacking is concerned. Short-haul trucking was the genesis and is still the backbone of the motor truck industry. Almost a third of the industry has an average length of haul less than 100 miles. Ninety percent of the motor carriers have average hauls less than 500 miles in length.

The short-haul motor carrier is the only trucker who would be economically advantaged by making a true joint rate with a railroad for a piggyback movement. A joint rate between a truck line and a railroad which parallel each other the whole distance simply does not make sense. That is why there are no such joint rates—the parallel arrangements are all on the basis of Plan I substituted service.

Therefore, I say if rail-truck coordination is to come about on an important scale it will have to be through a combination of the services of the railroads and the short-haul trucking industry. It seems to me there is a vast area for exploration here. Possibly thought should be given to some revisions of the rate structure to accommodate the inherent advantages of short-haul as against long-haul transportation. There is room for both.

There are other unexploited areas where industry study and cooperation should open new horizons for piggybacking. Speed and economy are the economic goals of piggybacking and both can be greatly improved if the railroads coordinate their thinking and action and work together. Attention should be focused on the problem of how to run a greater number of solid trains of piggyback cars, on more frequent and faster schedules, and from a greater number of origins to more destinations. I think it would be worthwhile to explore what I call the "union station" concept of piggybacking. If the available piggyback loads were pooled at key points many more solid trains of piggyback cars would be rolling right now.

Think how the solid piggyback train could reduce the transit time from New York, Chicago, and other key cities to San Francisco and Los Angeles. The passenger schedule of today could be bettered by many hours because there would be no layover and few stops. From New York to San Francisco in 50 hours for early third-morning delivery ought to become commonplace.

Speeds of that kind not only ought to prevent further diversion of the railroads' profitable manufactures and miscellaneous commodities but should attract new business. The burgeoning air-freight business is something the railroads are going to have to cope with. The big jets that can airlift at least two boxcar loads and which are capable of hauling containerized freight in great quantity are making a bid for a share of the high-grade tonnage of the country.

Railroads probably never will be able to match the 600-plus speed of the airfreighter, although I predict that in time, with wider tracks and gas turbine-powered or even atomic-powered locomotion, we will achieve railroad speeds that would be considered fantastic by today's standards. I saw an announcement the other day that in 1967 a 160-mile-per-hour train will be plying between Toronto and Montreal. But the railroads do not need to attain air speeds to compete effectively with air freight. Let me explain.

Now and for the predictable future 65 percent of the market for air freight service will be between eastern seaboard cities, such as Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Newark and Washington, on the one hand, and Dallas, Houston, Kansas City, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle on the other, and between the specified origin and destination cities and Chicago and St. Louis. Between all of those key cities are main-line tracks where the railroads now maintain high-speed service and over which piggyback or other special freight trains could be run at speeds which would make it economically unsound for most shippers to pay the higher price to save the time involved.

I point out that in the last 10 or 15 years the speed of air cargo over most of the domestic routes has not improved by more than one day. In that same time the speed of transcontinental rail service, for example, has been more than cut in half. The railroads are physically capable of attaining even greater speeds—it is not the terrain but the terminal delays, the lack of synchronization and planning, that are holding us back. I commend that problem to the members of your organization for their analytical study.

CONCLUSION

If piggybacking is to fulfill its great promise and achieve its bright future there is hard work to be done and the challenge is as much to research and planning as to industry and imagination. You have an organization that could bring to bear on the problems that are yet to be solved the concentrated kind of industry planning and cooperation without which too much time will be wasted marching in different directions. If you do not have the machinery for research in the technical and engineering phases of the areas I have mentioned I should hope that you would create such machinery.

We are just beginning to realize in this Country that we have devoted far too little time, money, and energy to research and development in transportation. As the President pointed out in his message recommending a Department of Transportation, less than 1 percent of the Government's total research and development budget is spent on transportation. One purpose—the most vital purpose in my opinion—of the proposed Department is to foster more intensive and extensive research.

Last September a bill was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development of high-speed ground transportation. It calls for the expenditure of $90 million over a period of three years. The project is generally thought of in terms of the Northeast corridor because that is one of the areas in which experiments will be conducted, but it is not limited to any given area or proposal. It occurs to me that if a Northeast corridor or rapid transportation is feasible it may be expedient to consider such a corridor between New York and Chicago, and perhaps other cities.

However, we should not rely solely on Government to spark research and introduce innovation. You; who are responsible for the conduct of piggybacking on the North American Continent are standing in the spotlight of transportation history. The fact that you have formed an organization of your own reflects the knowledge that progress will best be achieved through unity, planning, and cooperation. Again I commend you and wish you every success.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC INCENTIVES

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1966, I had the opportunity to address the Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation. The Forest Industries Committee then reprinted by remarks as an article in the Timber Tax Journal, volume II, No. 1, July 1966. I am introducing these remarks into the RECORD in the hope of developing a dialog on the issue of the impact of taxation on economic incentives. In my opinion, there has been a regrettable lack of discussion about the various types of taxes and their economic effects. Essentially taxes should be enacted in the most expedient way to acquire the revenue necessary to perform governmental functions. However, in pursuit of this objective we tend to overlook the fact that whatever way we choose to tax has serious effects on the amount and direction of economic activity.

Last April, I addressed the annual meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association in Dallas, Tex., setting forth my concepts of both political and economic democracy—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 18, 1966, pages 15959–15961. At that time, I tried to point out how the free enterprise system is the economic counterpart of political democracy. I tried to stress the value as well as the importance of the marketplace as a laboratory where new ideas are constantly being tested on their merits. Another feature of the free market system is that it encourages men to save for future investment, expansion and innovation. We must be very careful when we design our tax laws to avoid distorting the economic incentives provided by the marketplace to save and invest in productive areas. I have always felt that that tax is best which least interferes with the operation of the free market, the most efficient and equitable system of organizing a complex economy yet devised. It needs adjustments from time to time but this should never lead us to forget its fundamental soundness.

The present rates of income taxes are so high, that economic activity is being distorted. If tax rates were lower, I am confident that Federal revenues would actually increase. This seems paradoxical until you consider that revenue equals tax base times tax rate times collectability. Collectability is the term I use for the degree of voluntariness of tax collections. The present level of tax rates lowers the collectability factor. The incentive to avoid or even to evade taxes increases as the rates rise. If tax rates were lowered, revenues would increase because more could be collected from a larger base. If tax rates were lowered and differentials in rates were lessened, the scramble for preferential tax treatment unrelated to any economic reason except the desire to save on income taxes would die out.

I regret that, in this time of accelerating inflation, the propsects for serious consideration of any tax rate decrease are not promising. Yet, if the President of the United States would exercise the necessary spending restraint, we could quickly bring this inflation to a halt. We could then consider the much more popular question of tax reduction—what, how much, and for whom. Under unanimous consent, I insert this material for the RECORD, in the hope that at some future time, we can begin to eliminate the distortions and inequities which the present level of taxes hampers:

PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS UNDERLYING TIMBER CAPITAL GAINS TAXATION

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS [1])

The Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution is a limitation upon a limitation. In other words, the broad power granted to the Congress in the first clause of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, namely "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" was limited by the fourth clause of Section 9, Article I, which states: "No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken." The Sixteenth Amendment simply removed this limitation of apportionment census and enumeration as it related to direct taxes laid and collected "on incomes from whatever source derived."

One of the important results of this provision was that it made it important for both the tax collector and the taxpayer to distinguish in the flow of money or assets coming into the taxpayer's possession that which was income from that which was merely a return of capital. I have often speculated that the great development of the science of accounting and a considerable development in the science of economics which has occurred in the past half century in the United States is attributable to the Congress' implementation of the Sixteenth Amendment through its development and passage of the various Federal individual and corporate income tax laws.

Indeed I carry my speculation further as I look at the high state of development of the science of accounting the science of economics in the United States in comparison to their states of development elsewhere around the world. I suggest that a great deal of the success of American businessmen can be attributed to the fact that in pursuing these two sciences they have developed the tools to understand many of the many varied and intriguing important economic differences between capital and income.

My regrets are that the theoretical economists as distinguished from the pragmatic economists, my euphemism for businessmen, and the political scientists, both theoretical and pragmatic (my euphemism for politicians, namely people like myself) do not have an understanding equal to that of the economic pragmatists of this important economic differential. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that the pragmatic economist being the taxpayer has had to keep two sets of books, one the good set for his own understanding of what he is doing and the second, the unrealistic set for the pragmatic political scientist, the tax collector.

Perhaps if our Federal income tax laws were written with an eye to economic realism the taxpayer would keep only one set of books, thus enabling all concerned to benefit from the advancements in the fields of accounting and economics. We all would understand a little better what is realized economic growth and increased commonwealth in our society. Our failure to understand what is real wealth and economic growth daily leads us to waste rather than to enhance our heritage in many respects. I still observe that more poor laws are written as the result of ignorance rather than as a result of the over-enthusiasm of our lobby groups.

One of the confusions about income and capital results from the unfortunate choice of nomenclature employed in describing one kind of income. I refer to that income called "capital gains." Capital gains, of course, are not return of capital and so are taxable. However, I would observe that because of the Federal government's failure to more clearly understand that which is capital, or perhaps it is the failure of economists and political scientists of all sorts to have this understanding, the Federal government in spite of its lack of power under the Constitution to tax return of capital has been taxing return of capital in many instances.

Probably the most obvious instance where the Federal government is taxing return of capital as capital gains result from the default of the Federal government to maintain honest weights and measures. This is an essentiality if the market place system is to function properly for many reasons. Incidentally, I am referring to a weight and measure felt by the constitutional authors to be so important that it was listed in the Constitution first and separately, apart from the catch basket of all other weights and measures in clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I . . . "to regulate the value of money."

The failure of the Congress through its created arm, the Federal Reserve System, over a period of years to properly regulate the value of money, that most important of all economic measuring sticks, has resulted in a great deal of the capital which has been invested by business and individuals being taxed as it has flowed back to the investor as income, as capital gains. The threat of taxing return of capital as income has created one of the greatest deterrents to economic growth dependent upon the free flow of capital as it is, that exists today in our society. Many refer to the problem as that of locked-in investment. What has locked the investment in? . . . not the 25 percent capital gain tax, high as this may seem, but rather the devaluation of the dollar, which is the measuring stick used to gauge it.

The reason that those in the distributive field lobby the Congress so hard to have inventory taxed on the LIFO rather than the FIFO formula has its origin in the failure of the government to keep an honest standard to the dollar as an economic measure. Maybe last-in-first-out is good economic practice inasmuch as every item has a limit to its shelf-time, but I think it is important to establish accounting procedures on the basis of giving accurate economic information, not for obsolete tax measures or tax measures which may not be obsolete, but are rendered inefficient because of the elasticity of the dollar. Because in periods of deflation . . . if such ever come about again . . . the same businessman dealing with inventory which is turning over will want to adopt FIFO.

---

[1] 2d Congressional District, Missouri, 82d–89th Congresses; member Ways and Means Committee, Joint Economic Committee; Member, American Law Institute.

The reason for pushing for accelerated depreciation or accelerated depletion arises not so much from the economic goodness of the moving forward in time of the recoupment of the capital invested as it does from trying to get the dollar back as fast as possible before its deterioration in value becomes too great. I am for depreciation schedules being set up however business wishes to set them up . . . or I would be if I could count on the dollar remaining an honest economic measure. In other words, I am for business keeping one set of books . . . the realistic books . . . not a second set of books . . . a set which must be kept because our tax laws are out of date with economic development in a dynamic economy.

Increasingly business judgments are made because of tax consequences, not because of economic considerations. The points I have been making about the failure to properly understand what is return of capital and what is income are only some of the reasons for this economically damaging situation. I think equally damaging is the high rate differential which exists between forms of income, namely capital gains from ordinary income. I think some accounting and economic wisdom has been developed as the result of this differential, because I believe there are many important economic differences between what we call ordinary income and capital gains income. But also a great deal of double bookkeeping has developed.

Again I place the onus not on the practicing economist . . . because he is a realist . . . he is searching for economic truth. Indeed if he deviates in his search for truth the disciplines are such that he might go broke. His books are going to be his best judgment of what he is doing, of economic realities. It is his second set of books which are apt to record fairy stories . . . the books which he is forced to keep for the tax collectors and he sometimes fools himself with these fairy stories. If the second set of books has little relationship to economic reality, it is not because the taxpayer is being unrealistic. Indeed the second set of books has largely been set up under the direction of the tax collector rather because it is the tax collector, or those who have written the tax laws for him, who is being economically unrealistic.

The taxpayer who benefits from having an economic differential reflected in the tax rates, particularly if the differential has the spread of 25 percent to 47 percent or 25 percent to 70 percent, let alone 0 percent to 47 percent and 70 percent, is always in a precarious predicament because what to him is equity to others on the outside is a preferential treatment. To the tax collector and economic and political theorist often the differential is talked about as if it is a subsidy.

Of course, any tax differential can become a preferential treatment or a subsidy if the differential is not truly reflective of the economic difference. For example, 27½ percent depletion allowance, which in 1920 might well have reflected the state of geological knowledge, the availability of oil, the state of development of engineering science and labor and other costs, might now be too great or too little to reflect the true economic cost of replacing the capital invested in producing oil wells. We need to always be constantly on the alert that differentials in our tax laws remain in conformity to economic reality.

So it is with the timber industry. Does the enlightened treatment the tax writers finally gave to them in respect to money invested in forest lands back in 1942 conform to the economic realities of 1966? Has our experience shown that the new concept set forth in the tax code of what is return of capital and what is capital gain and what ordinary income more accurately reflects economic reality than the concept which prevailed prior to that time? I would state rather unequivocally that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What has happened to the forest industry since that date? Has it grown strong and healthy? Has it enlarged our tax base so that with lower rates of taxes we are extracting more federal revenues? Has the Nation benefited from an increase of forestry wealth? Are good conservation practices encouraged as opposed to being discouraged by the tax treatment? All of these questions I think can be answered in the affirmative clearly revealing that our tax laws are somewhat in conformity with economic truth in this field of endeavor. I hope we keep them in conformity.

Let me utter the warning specifically that I uttered generally. To many outside the forest industry what to you seems economic realty, tax laws which accurately reflect economic differences, appear to be a preference or subsidy. Certainly the school of Fabian socialists who might, if direct actions were foreclosed, willingly subsidize your industry or any economic endeavor because in the process of state subsidy they know they have embarked upon the course toward state ownership, is hard at it telling the general public and those outside your industry that your tax treatment is a subsidy.

Furthermore, those whose industries do not have their economic differences accurately reflected in tax differentials are jealous that you and others have fair treatment when they do not. However, jealousy can lead to taking away that which is right for others to equalize the treatment by all being in misery together, instead of giving to those that which is economically right to equalize the treatment. It is important that businessmen pause before they call tax treatment of another industry subsidy. Maybe it is, but the odds are it is economic reality.

This point is clearly brought home in the endeavor to equalize tax treatment of various competing forms of doing business, specifically the corporation form with the cooperative form. Too many of those who use the corporate form seek to equalize the unfair tax treatment they receive by double taxing the cooperative form instead of concentrating on getting single taxation for the corporate form. I am willing to get a single taxation on the cooperative form of doing business or any form for that matter, but I hesitate to equalize the tax treatment of corporations by being economically unrealistic toward cooperatives. As a matter of fact, it isn't the corporation form of doing business that is being taxed twice but rather the corporate form of doing business when it finances its growth out of new equity issues rather than financing growth out of retained earnings or new debt which is taxed only once.

I have always thought the proper way to lessen the spread of difference between capital gains tax rate and ordinary rates was not to increase the capital gains tax rate and hold the ordinary rates even but rather to reduce the ordinary rates and hold the capital gains rates even. In the long run I would hope to see all rates considerably reduced, because in spite of the recent tax rate reductions I am convinced that our rates are still considerably beyond the point of diminishing returns. We would collect more revenues from a lower rate because the higher rates are impeding the enlarging of the tax base, namely our economic wealth and activities. Lower the rates and the base increases, so does the incidence of tax collectibility and the tax take is enlarged.

This, by the way, was the economic theory behind the tax cut of 1964. Not the theory so loudly heralded by the new economists that we needed to increase aggregate demand through the stimulus of a tax cut. I must pause on this collateral point because there are so many businessmen who have been misled about the 1964 tax cut. Too many are saying, "Well, I guess there is something to this new economics. The tax cut of 1964 certainly produced increased economic activity, of which a great deal was wealth." It is important to realize that although the new economists won their battle in the Congress they lost their war in the Executive Branch of the Government. It is true President Johnson soft pedalled what he was doing and let loose loud blasts of distracting noises to divert attention from what he was really doing, but the record is there for anyone to see. It is new history.

What was the issue? Well, first, the issue was not over having a tax cut. The classical economists, if I can so categorize myself, had been arguing for years that our Federal income tax rates were too high and that those rates were impeding economic growth. So when the new economists came along in 1962 to say, let's reduce Federal income tax rates in order to help the economy, our reaction was, welcome aboard . . . even though the reasons you give for wishing to reduce taxes are contrary to ours.

The reason the new economists gave for wishing a tax cut was to stimulate the economy. Note the metaphor. What happens when a stimulus, a shot in the arm, wears off? You are apt to need or to want another. There is no end to this kind of an operation. The new economists argued that aggregate demand needed boosting up . . . that cutting Federal taxes by say $12 billion would increase consumer demand and investment spending by this much released purchasing power. They argued also, and this is the key to the disagreement, that Federal spending must continue its rate of upward increase. If, they argued, the rate of increase of Federal spending were cut, this would wash out a great deal of the increased total demand which otherwise would come about.

I asked Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, when the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on the tax cut proposals if it were not true that if we financed the Federal spending by Federal bonds, in lieu of the lost tax revenue, and sold the bonds to the private sector, then the private sector would not have "12 billion increased purchasing power" and there would not be "$12 billion addition to aggregate demand." He agreed and responded that he thought the Federal Reserve System should absorb these bonds. I responded by saying I thought this would increase the money and credit within the society beyond that which the anticipated economic growth warranted. He responded by saying, "The unutilized plant capacity and the unemployed would sop up this additional purchasing power," and so avert the inflation which I pointed to. I responded by saying I thought a great deal of what he called unused plant capacity was largely obsolete and inefficient plant capacity and a great deal of the unemployed were persons unskilled or with obsolete skills who would need training or retraining before the labor market would take them up. I did not argue, nor do I now argue, that you cannot get roast pork—full employment—by burning the barn down but I argued that there are better ways of getting roast pork and I tried to point up the damage which results to the barn. Here the dialogue ended.

The net result of this dispute came out in the House of Representatives in the motion to amend the 1964 tax bill to hold that it should not go into effect unless the President held expenditures in the administrative budget to $97 billion for fiscal year 1964 and $98 billion for fiscal 1965. Those of us who proposed the amendment felt that if Federal expenditures were held to this level, the benefit derived from removing some of the impediments to economic growth inherent in the high Federal income tax rates by lowering these rates somewhat in increased economic activity would enlarge the Federal tax base and so enable us to balance the budget at the end of fiscal year 1966, namely this June 30. On the other hand, we felt if Dr. Heller's theory were followed and expenditures were permitted to go up to $104 billion for fiscal year 1964 and thence to $110 billion for fiscal year 1965, the benefits would be more than outweighed by the damage resulting from the inflationary pressure we felt would be let loose.

The rest is recorded history, but largely unreported history. The motion to amend was defeated. The tax bill was passed and signed by the President with no restrictions placed on his rate of spending, the accumulated powers to spend granted to him by the Congress in the appropriation bills. But then with the battle lost, the war was won. President Johnson proceeded to exercise expenditure control. The expenditures for fiscal year 1964 were held to $97.7 billion and in fiscal year 1965, the year which just ended last June 30, the expenditures were held to $96.5—$1.5 billion below our suggested figures of $98 billion.

Yes, the tax cut of 1964 proved to be a resounding economic success, on the basis of classical economics and tax theory.

Why were so many fooled and why do so many remain fooled? Partly because of the boasting of the new economists. But this would be shown to be without basis but for the lack of understanding in Congress, in the news media and perforce generally among the people, about the difference between the expenditure and the appropriation process of the Federal government. Each year the country's attention is directed to the congressional appropriation process, the process of deciding how much new authority to spend money the Congress will give to the President—not to be spent in the current fiscal year but for the new fiscal year beginning a half year away and ending a year and a half away.

The expenditure process is another thing, entirely apart, and has little to do with the Congress. This expenditure process relates to what the President actually does with the power to spend the Congress has given him. Contrary to popular conception, the President does not have to use the power to spend the Congress gives to him. Every President has frozen funds for certain programs, slowed down other programs, accelerated some. This is a flexibility I think every President must have, but it means that he can have $200 billion power to spend derived from authorities granted to him by Congress and yet spend less than half of it in a given fiscal year. The President did have the authority to spend almost $200 billion last fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. He has over $200 billion power to spend right now.

Many of us thought he would spend about $110 billion of the $200 billion he had in fiscal 1965. He did not. He spent only $96.5 billion of it and carried over $100 billion unutilized power to spend, which he than added to the $119 billion additional power to spend he got out of that 1965 session of the Congress. The President Johnson the people were watching was not the President Johnson who was watching his nickels but the President Johnson who was asking the Congress in clouds of great rhetoric power to spend $119 billion additional for the future. I kept asking why doesn't the President send back some of the power to spend he has not used and hopefully isn't going to use. I kept asking when is the real President Johnson going to stand up—the President who cut his spending to $96.5 billion last year or the President who has asked for $119 billion to spend even though he has $100 billion left over he still hasn't spent.

This January I was less interested in the proposals in the President's budget message for power to spend in fiscal 1967 than I was in the proposals in the same budget message which radically revised the expenditure levels for the fiscal year we were currently in and are still in and will be in until this June 30. In his Budget Message this year he upped his spending levels for our current fiscal year from an estimated $99.7 billion given us in his 1965 Budget Message, January of 1965, to $108 billion.

Now we are seeing the new economics in operation. We have been seeing it since September 1965. It was in this month the President radically changed his expenditure levels. He had started off the first two months of the new fiscal year 1966, namely the months of July and August 1965, at the very commendable level of $97.3 billion. The level jumped to $9.5 billion for the month of September, or to an annual rate of $114 billion. Until just a month ago this increased level has remained at approximately this high level. I say until a month ago I have reason to think that perhaps President Johnson in light of what is transpiring in the cost of living indexes, this Republican cliche called inflation as the Democrat Majority Leader of the House termed it, is shucking aside his new economists and cutting back on expenditures. I certainly hope so. I can assure you that if he is not cutting back his expenditures, I for one will listen with a deaf ear to any pleas he might make for increased taxes.

I am pleased about one important point, however. Behind all of this talk about increasing taxes in order to dampen "aggregate demand"—this is the new economists' way of describing the cause of the inflation we are experiencing—the new economists are suggesting that it is better to increase taxes than to increase the Federal debt.

We can dampen aggregate demand just about as effectively by increasing the Federal debt as increasing Federal taxes, if that is what we are talking about; that is, we can if we can sell the new debt securities to the private sector, to the consumers and the businesses which otherwise would devote their purchasing power for consumption and plant expansion. However, the new economist knows that we cannot sell the additional securities to the public without increasing interest rates and he shies away from increasing interest rates even further than they are increasing as the result of other forces. He knows that increased interest rates, though in one sense a deflator, are in another sense like a fever is to a disease—not the cause, but a symptom and a healing symptom within bounds, but out of bounds something that can be as deleterious as the disease itself. He knows also that the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on long term Federal bonds prevents the government from selling other than in the short range field and the shorter the term of the bond the closer to money it is. He also knows that if the Federal Reserve System is helping the Treasury maintain a market for its securities, which is one of its functions, it can do so only by concomitantly increasing the supply of money and credit within the society without regard to maintaining the dollar as an accurate economic measure.

Furthermore, the new economist knows that the day when we could with ease export our monetary inflation, our deficits, to nations abroad is over and in the wake of this dangerous operation in the past is an accumulation of great economic power in the hands of those nations which have taken heavy dollar holdings. No longer will nations abroad take the dollar as they have in the past. They are demanding higher prices, prices which go out of economics into serious political demands. Our domestic governmental deficits now are coming out in price increases in our own economy because we are resisting at least some of the political demands.

In other words, the new economists are tacitly admitting, "What's wrong with debt?" For some time they have been asking this question in a supercilious fashion of their critics as if concern about the Federal debt was an outmoded Puritan ethic, a myth to be put away with other childish things. Of course, what the new economists have never been willing to do is honestly state what their critics were really saying. No one was saying that debt per se was bad. What they were saying, however, was that the size of the debt—yes, in relation to GNP or any other indicator—was of serious concern and that we could not continue to finance federal expenditures out of deficits particularly during economic expansions without creating further economic problems and probable damage.

At least as I say, the new economist who argues that the size of the Federal debt was of no concern is now saying it is preferable to have the economic damage ensuing from increasing tax rates which we have just reduced than to put a further load on the Federal debt.

The proper economic solution of course lies in cutting back on Federal expenditures. This time I think the public and the Congress should ask the President to agree to the rescission of some of the power to spend previously granted to him and not just cut back on his expenditure levels. I hope the word that he is cutting back on his expenditure levels is true, that is the first and most important step; but let's let it be clearly known that, if true, that is what he is doing. The best way to do this is for him, with some fanfare (at which he is good) turn back to the Congress some of the power to spend that he is not going to use. He can also stop whetting the peoples' and the Congress' appetite for government to spend, which he has been doing with his great command in the field of rhetoric pointing out all the good things that can come about in a Great Society.

Unless the President is willing to do the basic things necessary to keep the Great Society we have inherited, these good things that could be will not be. Among the basic things necessary is to realize that we have not been good enough to have all these desired things tomorrow or possibly within our lifetime. Many of these promised things we will, like Moses, have to content ourselves with observing from afar, taking the satisfaction that by our regained forebearance and self-discipline we might have made them available to our children.

KANSAS HAS LOST A STATESMAN

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to our beloved Republican national committeeman, Sam Mellinger, of Emporia, Kans., who departed this life on August 10, 1966.

The stature of a man is measured always by the services to his fellow man, by the purposes to which he has given his life and by the essence of his spirit, Measured, too, by his industry, integrity, honor, and his allegiances. And by his capacity to endure, his good humor when the going is rough, and the deep lasting love he gives to his dear ones. In all these Sam Mellinger was a man.

Sam Mellinger had long been active in county, State, and National politics and since 1964 has been Republican national committeeman, a post which he filled with distinction. And now he is gone—a fair, stalwart, and cherished friend, who made the glittering Kansas scene seem brighter just because he was around and an immutable part of it. William L. White, editor and publisher of the Emporia, Kans., Gazette, has most ably expressed in the following editorial a richly deserved tribute to Sam and his wife, Jerenne:

HOME AGAIN

So Sam Mellinger is back from Mayo's. The important thing is that he is home again. Sam has always been ours; this is where he belongs. Like my father, his mother was a school teacher, early widowed. Like my father, after finishing the University of Kansas, instead of leaving for the East or California where the smarter boys go who get to thinking they are too big for their pants and too important for our little town. Sam Mellinger came back to Emporia to build his career. Like my father, he cared about politics and, again like him, he rose to be Republican National Committeeman of this state, the only other Emporian to hold this job, which he will hold against all comers while he greatly serves us.

So Sam has had, in recent months, a rough row to hoe? Don't waste your pity on Sam; he is used to rough rows. It was rough when he worked his way through school carrying Gazettes, and through high school jerking sodas at Warren Morris' Drug Store, along with Leon Peterson, another local boy who made good the hard way. It was rough when he had to work his way through the University of Kansas and its Law School. It was rough when he came back here to hang out his law shingle and run for county attorney, without a dime of family money back of him except what he had earned for himself.

It was rough when he enlisted in World War II and was sent to Alaska, the most rugged theater in which ever a shot was fired in anger. There, good soldier that he is, he met and married a soldier's daughter, a girl his equal in brains and character, which is saying considerable. So don't waste your pity on them; people like that don't want or need pity.

What matters is that Sam—flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood—is home again. Of that you can be proud and glad.

W.L.W.

FIGHT TO SAVE SMALL WATERSHED PROGRAM HAS JUST BEGUN

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1966, the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the Congress for referral to the Committee on Public Works for subsequent action thereon some 19 watershed work plans pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, Public Law 566, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956. The Bureau of the Budget also transmitted to the Congress for referral to the Committee on Agriculture an even larger number of watershed work plans for its consideration.

This transmittal of watershed work plans to the Congress represented a substantial victory for the legislative branch of our Federal Government. But that victory may be short lived unless the Congress asserts itself even more fully on the questions which have been raised by the President on procedures similar to that embodied in Public Law 566.

Every since so-called constitutional questions were raised by the President last October 27 with the signing into law of the Flood Control Act of 1965, Public Law 89-298, concerning procedures similar to the one embodied in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, to transmit to the Congress work plans for approval by the appropriate committees of the Congress so designated in the act, the President had directed the Bureau of the Budget to cease from sending any watershed work plans, public building prospectuses, small reclamation project work plans, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reports recommending favorable enactment to the Congress until such time as amendatory language to the basic acts was agreed upon by the Executive and congressional leaders.

THE CONTROVERSY BEGINS—THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, this controversy concerning the authority of the Congress to approve certain work plans and prospectuses prepared by the administration before construction can commence thereon began with the statement of the President last October 27 in signing into law the Flood Control Act of 1965. At that time the President directed the Secretary of the Army not to implement section 201(a) of the Flood Control Act which provided for only approval by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works of water resource projects of the Corps of Engineers costing less than $10 million. This procedure would eliminate the necessity of taking these many projects to the floor of the House for extended floor debate and consideration, and it would streamline the procedures for congressional approval of Corps projects costing less than $10 million. Inasmuch as the controversial projects for the improvement of this Nation's waterways and rivers are customarily more than $10 million in estimated total Federal costs, this procedure would not eliminate the essential floor debate and consideration on controversial Corps projects and would not have vested undue jursidictional authority in the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

Under the old procedure, if a corps project's report favorably recommending construction thereon was transmitted to the Congress only 1 day after the enactment of an Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act, then it would often have to wait a needless 2 years before it was enacted by the Congress. The announcement last session by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, that the committee thereafter would consider omnibus acts on an annual basis came as a great relief to those of us interested in going ahead as rapidly as possible with the orderly growth and development of our Nation's waterways. However, favorable corps projects still might have to wait as long as an entire year even under the recently announced "Jones procedure"; therefore, the enactment of section 201(a) is indeed not only worth while but essential to the growth of our water resource program.

The President's strong statement at last year's bill signing ceremony directed the Secretary of the Army to refrain from exercising the authority which section 201(a) vests in him. Furthermore, the President accused the Congress of enacting legislation which, in his opinion, ran counter to the Constitution of the United States.

In signing the bill, the President said that the provisions of section 201(a) "would dilute and diminish the authority and power of the Presidency" and that he had not been elected to "preside over its erosion." I agree with the President that he was not elected to preside over the erosion of Executive power, but likewise the 435 Members of this body and the fivescore Members of the other body were not elected to preside over the erosion of legislative prerogatives, either The views of the President on this matter came as a profound shock to the Congress and to many authorities in the area of constitutional law.

SIMILAR PROVISIONS IN OTHER LAWS

It is indeed interesting to point out that provisions similar to those in the Flood Control Act have been embodied in other acts of Congress for many years.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 86-249, has been administered without any constitutional "questions" being raised by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and even Johnson in his first years of office. The similar provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, were also administered without complaint by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, until the present occupant of the White House raised his points on the matter last October. Furthermore, the House and Senate Committees on Public Works and their predecessor committees have had the authority to authorize resurveys of Corps of Engineers surveys without an act of Congress and with only a committee resolution since 1913. The eight Presidents of the United States who have not raised objections to such a procedure since 1913, from President Wilson through President Kennedy, might have had objection to President Johnson's criticism of similar procedures. The Small Reclamation Projects Act also contains language similar to that found in the Watershed Act.

FALLACIES OF PRESIDENT'S POSITION

Mr. Speaker, during the past two decades the Congress has been developing a mechanism of legislative oversight which promises to be a satisfactory answer to maintaining a proper balance between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. This mechanism consists of a legislative veto which takes the form of authorizing an executive official to take a specified action but requires that the action not go into effect until subjected to some form of congressional assent.

As Prof. Arthur Maass and Joseph Cooper at Harvard University pointed out in a widely publicized article on this very subject during December last:

> The mechanism is well suited for modern government in situations in which the executive is better suited than the legislative to formulate a specific decision, but in which the legislature feels that the decision is too important to be delegated outright to the executive. Perhaps the most noted example of this concerns the grant of power to the President to reorganize agencies and functions in the executive branch. The President makes reorganization plans, but they do not go into effect until they have been before Congress for 60 days—when either House can disallow them by a simple majority vote.

The enlightening article continued:

> We feel this mechanism is constitutional and that it would be deplorable to strike it down on the basis of a civics book interpretation of the Constitution. The purposes for which the veto is used and the forms through which it is applied should be judged by criteria based on policy considerations, and in this instance the purpose is desirable and the form not inappropriate.

After a very learned discussion by these two professors of government at one of this Nation's leading institutions of higher education, the authors concluded by overwhelmingly calling for the President to withdraw his decision not to have section 201(a) implemented by the Secretary of Army. Drs. Maass and Cooper concluded by stating emphatically:

> We believe his action was wrong as regards both constitutionality and desirability. The President should withdraw, or simply ignore, the statement he made in signing the bill and order the development of standards for the design of river projects that he can propose to Congress—thus putting to use the leadership powers that are unquestionably his.

On February 21 of this year, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works, included this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, commencing on page A863 thereof, so I will not request that the Maass-Cooper article be printed in its entirety once again. However, I do want to assert and assert strongly that the arguments set forth in this article are the strongest which I have ever seen come from the academic community in this Nation against the steady encroachment of legislative prerogatives by the President of the United States. The professors have almost totally destroyed the arguments put forth by the Executive in directing the Secretary of the Army not to implement section 201(a).

THE PRESIDENT AND THE WATERSHED PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted some amount of time and attention to a discussion of section 201(a) of the Flood Control Act of last year to clarify the positions surrounding the existing controversy on the transmittal of watershed work plans to the Congress. The Committee on Public Works in its report on last year's omnibus legislation cited the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and the Public Buildings Act as two examples of instituted procedures similar to that embodied in section 201(a), yet instead of following the precedents set by these prior acts, the President decided to attack those prior acts also. This was most discouraging to Members of Congress who had worked diligently for years to strengthen the existing acts. The Watershed Act was one of the first to suffer.

Since its enactment in 1954 during the 83d Congress the act has fostered the growth of one of the most beneficial rural development programs in history. Erosion and flood damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of our Nation which cause loss of life and damage to property have been substantially checked by the projects constructed under the authority of this act. In carrying out the act, the Federal Government has cooperated thoroughly with States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, flood prevention and control districts, and many other local public bodies for the purpose of preventing erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages and for the purpose of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, thereby preserving and protecting our Nation's land and water resources, as called for in the act.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in Congress for some 4 years, and I have recently been appointed to the Watersheds Development Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, and during this time I have seen not only the need but the necessity for the continuation and even the expansion of the small watershed development program. As a matter of fact, I am strongly in favor of expanding the authorizations and authority of the program, and I have so stated on numerous occasions.

Because the Congress, in its wisdom, enacted this valuable piece of legislation in 1954 and has continued it during subsequent years, the enhancement of the natural resources of America has been given a sizable boost. Millions of tons of silt from valuable and irreplaceable topsoil which erodes away to clog inland waterway channels and coastal harbors has been greatly checked. Ravaging flood waters which destroy practically everything on the flood plain have also been retarded by the construction of watershed projects. Water storage supplies have been increased for various water uses.

During the 12 years since the enactment of Public Law 566, 729 projects have been approved by the Department of Agriculture. These 729 projects constitute 4,336 single purpose floodwater retarding structures, 280 multiple-purpose structures, and 29 other single purpose structures through fiscal year 1966. The total drainage area encompassed by these 729 projects covers 41,486,600 acres. Through fiscal year 1965, the floodwater storage capacity of these 729 projects was an astounding 3,675,174 acre-feet; sediment storage was 633,771 acre-feet; and water supply storage for municipal, recreation, irrigation, and other purposes was an additional 431,151 acre-feet.

In addition to projects approved by the Department, another 1,211 projects have been approved for planning which would encompass a drainage area of an additional 84,124,800 acres. Furthermore, some 2,502 applications have been filed for even more watershed projects which would encompass a drainage area of an astounding 181,617,600 acres. If these proposed projects are allowed to suffer because of administrative disruption which could easily result from the President's decision, then we will have permitted a great injustice to the development of this Nation's resource to have come about.

In my opinion, the staff of the Soil Conservation Service and its watersheds office of the Department of Agriculture has done an outstanding job of administering this highly important program. They are to be commended for it.

PRESIDENT PROMISES NOT TO SEND ANY MORE WATERSHED WORK PLANS TO CONGRESS AFTER 1966

Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson finally released his grip on these watershed workplans, primarily because of congressional pressure, and finally had the Bureau of the Budget transmit the work plans to the Congress during late July, many Members of Congress thought that the battle had been won. However, this is not the case at all. As a matter of fact, the President reiterated his position that he was opposed to the provisions of the Watershed Act and all other acts which provide the legislative branch with some form of oversight veto on projects.

At this point in my discussion, I consider it essential to quote verbatim from the letter to the Speaker of July 22, 1966, from Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget. After transmitting 19 work plans to the Congress for consideration by the Committee on Public Works, the letter stated:

> The President has held discussions with the Chairman both of the Agriculture and Public Works Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate concerning the requirement in section 2 of the Act which conditions appropriations for certain watershed protection projects upon prior approval of their plans by the substantive committees. The President has objected to a similar provision in the Flood Control Act of 1965, and has directed the Secretary of the Army to refrain from exercising the authority which that provision attempted to vest in him.
>
> Since the procedure established by section 2 of the Act has been in effect for a number of years, the President has approved the submission of these projects to the Congress despite his view that this procedure represents an unwarranted encroachment on the authority of the Executive. However, the President considers that he has given clear expression of his views of the need for revision of this procedure and he has therefore directed that no further projects be transmitted under that procedure after this session.
>
> Accordingly, legislation will be transmitted to the Congress which would replace the present authorization procedure for watershed protection projects with one which in

our view would provide opportunity for congressional review of project plans without presenting the problems to which the President referred in his statement.

I would like to reiterate one phrase of this letter:

> He has therefore directed that no further projects be transmitted under that procedure after this session.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every Member of Congress can clearly see that even if we receive additional work plans during this session, that the President will not transmit any to the Congress thereafter despite the widespread national need for these works. It is of great concern to me, as I am sure it is for many other Members, that the President has placed this artificially created argument against the so-called encroachments on his powers on higher priority than the continuation of this program through a procedure which is not only operative but which is also not contrary to the Constitution.

I hope to see Members of Congress taking the floor in ever-increasing numbers this session in defense of this most worthwhile watershed development program, and I hope that when the President does send to the Congress his recommended amendatory language for the Watershed Act and any other acts which he feels need amending to prevent this "repugnance" to the Constitution that we stand firm and exert our free and independent will against the removal of prerogatives which are rightly ours.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the idea of universal service for our young people—either in the military or in civilian endeavors—has been a topic of discussion off and on for many years.

An article in the New York Times magazine last Sunday, August 7, explores the idea and points to an essay by William James on the subject more than 60 years ago. There has been wide discussion of such a program recently as a result of remarks by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the American Society of Newspaper Editors last May 18 in Montreal.

Last Sunday's article delves into some of the courses that could be followed, and also some of the problems involved, in this kind of program. Although the author, Marion K. Sanders, expresses an interest in seeing at least a small voluntary national service corps set up at this time, there is no commitment to the proposal in its broader terms on the part of either myself or the author.

However, the article does offer a number of ideas and covers the subject from many angles, all of which are worth some good hard thought. I believe many people will be interested in reading it, particularly at this time when there is so much concern about the inequities in our draft laws.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

(By Marion K. Sanders)

"If now there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow."

So wrote William James more than sixty years ago in an essay whose title has proved more memorable than its content. A "Moral Equivalent for War" has endured as a dream of philosophers and poets. But few Americans have been attracted to the notion of an army of civilian conscripts.

Thus it was something of a shock—which reverberated in front-page headlines—when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara appeared to embrace the idea not long ago in a speech in Montreal.

"Our present Selective Service system draws on only a minority of eligible young men. That is an inequity," Mr. McNamara said. "It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad."

Mr. McNamara did not define the phrase "every young person." Was he referring to the more than three million male and female Americans who reach the age of 18 every year? Or was he thinking of the whole 18–26 age group of both sexes—numbering over 25 million? Either way, it is a grandiose concept. Reaction to his proposal on Capitol Hill was generally cool and the White House firmly disavowed the notion of drafting the young for civilian duties. Yet despite official efforts to shoot it down, McNamara's trial balloon remained aloft. For the idea of a national service program is appealing. It will be explored on an official level by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which was appointed by President Johnson last month and which will report to him in January.

Enthusiasts for national service see it as an outlet for youthful idealism, as an antidote for the moral lassitude of our time and as a practical means of tackling the immense problems of our society and of the world's less affluent nations.

But before it can be even considered a possible alternative to military service, a number of hard questions will have to be answered. Among them these:

(1) Should service be voluntary or compulsory? (2) Precisely what would members of the service corps do? (3) Who would mobilize, train and direct them?

On the first point there is a sharp split. Secretary McNamara, for example, though he did not amplify his suggestion personally, allowed his office to issue a statement to the effect that the operative word in his proposal was "ask," meaning that young persons would be invited rather than required to serve. Similarly, Dean John Monro of Harvard College is unequivocally opposed to the idea of compulsory service, characterizing it as "totalitarian." Young people, he said, should be free to make their own choices; they should be left alone to lead their own lives. Nonetheless, he heartily favors a comprehensive civilian program in which those who so desire can volunteer. This, generally speaking, is the "conservative" position.

It is the "liberal" side which favors compulsory service. One of its eloquent voices is Prof. Roger Shattuck of the University of Texas. Writing in The Texas Observer, he conceded that a draft for civilian service seems, at first glance, an invasion of political freedom. But he believes in a compulsory program because it is "a mission dedicated to peace and freedom and raising living standards. It could spell a political and moral regeneration for the whole country. Our colleges and universities are rapidly becoming institutions of higher segregation where sub-adults are kept at a low simmer, held apart from certified adults in the 'real world.' " All young people, he argued, should be required to "help with their own hands in solving the technological, economic and moral mess we have got ourselves into."

A middle position is taken by Harris Wofford, Associate Director of the Peace Corps. "I don't know," he said recently, "whether this needs to be done by law or whether we can do it by spreading the volunteer idea and making it a recognized part of the citizenship training of every American."

Donald J. Eberle—who has spent many years teaching in Africa and is particularly interested in the possibilities of everseas service for young Americans—called together in early May some thirty interested educators, foundation officials, students and other concerned citizens who spent the day discussing a national service program at the Princeton Club in New York. Everyone present supported the idea of such a program but the conference reached no firm conclusion on how to go about putting it into effect. Subsequently, Mr. Eberle and a small ad hoc committee pulled together some tentative proposals which provide a concrete basis for discussion. This is their plan:

The program would be administered by the 4,000 existing Selective Service boards. (Women are not dealt with in this particular proposal, which is primarily designed as an alternative to the present draft system.) On being called up at 18, each young man would be offered the following options:

(1) Immediate military service for two years, including training;

(2) Immediate nonmilitary service for *three* years, including training;

(3) Delayed service—either military or nonmilitary—to be fulfilled before the age of 26; or,

(4) The young man could choose not to volunteer at all, in which case his name would be placed in a pool to be drafted possibly by lottery whenever the armed services might need him.

A key feature of this plan is the difference in length of service; this factor, it is thought, plus such added inducements as better pay and greater G.I. benefits, might entice enough youths into the armed forces to meet military manpower requirements. Though this may be so, most of the young people I have talked to regard three years—the period specified for civilian service in the program discussed above—as an excessive chunk out of one's life before the age of 26. Several felt, too, that it was presumptuous to place a time value on military versus civilian service. And how, others asked, could civilian service be considered "equality of sacrifice" compared with risking one's life in Vietnam?

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, a stanch advocate of universal service, also objects to the time differential. "Making non-military service of longer duration," he said, "would seem to indicate to the public that it is not as valuable as military service."

To most people, the closest equivalent to military duty seems the Peace Corps, which entails real hazards and hardships. Unfortunately, however, the Peace Corps cannot become an instrument for correcting "inequities" in the draft. There are only 14,000 volunteers in its ranks; in its first five years, 86 per cent of its workers had A.B., B.S. or higher degrees; 11 per cent had some college education and only 3 per cent had never been to college. Obviously, Peace Corps service would provide an avenue of escape from the military for precisely the same group of well-educated young men who are now being deferred. Similarly, VISTA—the Domestic Peace Corps—has fewer than 3,000 in its ranks and 75 per cent of them are college graduates. The newly launched Teachers' Corps likewise needs well-educated, specially qualified volunteers and is budgeted for only a few thousand.

The plain fact is that there are no existing service groups which could effectively absorb the large numbers of men and women that a national service program would provide. A new framework will have to be invented. It also seems evident that the whole concept will be badly skewed if—in the midst of a shooting war, and a frustrating and unpopular one to boot—we conceive a national service as primarily a solution to the "inequities of the draft."

This does not mean, however, that it is too early to give serious thought to a universal national service program; for surely only the blackest pessimists among us believe that we will forever need three million young men in active combat forces. When that necessity ends, we should be ready to launch a plan that will have constructive value for our young people and for our society.

What services actually could the members of a civilian corps perform? An illuminating statistical clue has been provided by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. Its report made a startling estimate of the jobs which currently need to be filled to bring public services in this country up to "acceptable" levels. Here are the commission's estimates:

The jobs:	*The workers needed*
Medical institutions and health services	1,200,000
Educational institutions	1,100,000
National beautification	1,300,000
Welfare and home care	700,000
Public protection	350,000
Urban renewal and sanitation	650,000
Total	5,300,000

Could much of this work be done by members of a national service corps? And would their presence be accepted by organized labor?

I put these questions to Brendan Sexton, director of Leadership Studies for the United Auto Workers, who has recently completed a tour of duty in the upper echelons of the Poverty Program. His response, on both counts, was strongly affirmative. He is convinced that an immense amount of useful work could be done by national service corpsmen and women with a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create in effect new career opportunities—in the care of the aged and sick, in the rehabilitation of our cities and forests. And he believes that, despite the cost of such a program, there would be an economic gain in terms of mental illness, crime an delinquency prevented.

"Of course, there would be a kind of reflexive hostility at the outset on the part of some old-line unions," he said. "One way to handle this would be to involve plenty of retired craftsmen—plumbers, machinists, electricians, and so forth, as teachers in the program.

"Obviously all unions would object if volunteers took jobs away from workers at a time or in an area of unemployment. They would have a legitimate beef if—for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Park Department employes and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the catalogue of things that need to be done is so fabulous that there shouldn't be any danger of real competition on the job market."

It seems a conservative estimate that at least half of the more than 5,000,000 service jobs projected in the automation report could, at least in theory, be filled by suitably trained corpsmen and women. And it seems feasible and desirable to put many of them to work in existing public and private agencies and institutions which are, at the present time, desperately shorthanded.

This is exactly what has happened in our only state-run domestic peace corps—the Commonwealth Service Corps founded in Massachusetts in 1965 as a living memorial to John F. Kennedy. In an initial survey conducted which this corps was being planned, it was found that some 375 state, private and local public agencies could readily use more than 7,000 volunteers. Full-time Massachusetts corpsmen are paid $80 a month (there are also part-time volunteers who serve a minimum of 12 hours a week and are reimbursed for expenses, and students who receive up to $12 a month for at least six hours of service a week).

Some serve in the wards of mental hospitals, others as helpers in homes for the retarded; some run an information and referral service for welfare recipients; others work with prisoners and parolees; and some conduct study halls for teen-agers. The Commonwealth Corps is largely supported by Poverty Program funds; and it has been beset by the administrative, jurisdictional and political difficulties common to so many Poverty Program operations. Though it is functionally an inspiring example, the Commonwealth Corps does not provide an administrative model for a nationwide, large-scale service corps.

The most respected prototype, organizationally, is the Israeli youth service program which, as Harris Wofford put it in a recent talk, recognizes "the need to mobilize the whole younger generation. . . . There are no 4–Fs in Israel. Everyone is 1–A in terms of national service."

The Israel national service is run by the defense forces, in which all young people must enlist. Men between the ages of 18 and 26 serve for 26 months; those between 27 and 29 who have not been called up for one reason or another serve for two years; unmarried women from 18 to 26 serve for 20 months. (Deferment is granted students taking subjects of special importance to the country—namely, medicine, engineering, agronomics or teaching.)

The full period of service is not, however, devoted to military training or duties. In Nahal (Pioneering Fighting Youth) some young men and women do agricultural work in frontier villages or set up new ones. Others teach and provide a variety of social services to the many impoverished, ignorant immigrants who have entered Israel in recent years. The Israel defense forces and the Ministry of Education jointly run a youth corps, Gadna, which provides training along Scout lines for boys and girls from 14 to 18 and also stresses pioneering and agriculture.

A somewhat similar program of national service in Iran is also run by the military. Soldiers in uniform teach, build roads and bridges, give health and sanitation training and, in effect, serve as the shock troops of the country's war against ignorance, poverty, illiteracy and social deprivation.

In this country we have only one prototype for broadly democratic civilian services corps—the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps. Its peak enrollment in 1935 was 500,000; in all, 2.5 million young men passed through the camps, most staying for six months to plant trees, build reservoirs and fish ponds and check dams. They dug diversion ditches, raised bridges and fire towers, fought blister rust and pine-twig blight and Dutch elm disease, restored historic battlefields, cleared beaches and camping grounds. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has written in "The Coming of the New Deal": "They did more than reclaim and develop natural resources. They reclaimed and developed themselves."

The young men were recruited by the Labor Department. The Agriculture and Interior Departments organized and supervised the work projects. The camps themselves, however, were run by the War Department; one of the officers associated with them, Schlesinger notes, "was a Col. George Catlett Marshall, who organized 17 camps in the Southeast."

With World War II, the C.C.C. went out of business; but it is important to remember that the Army played a crucial role in making it work.

In any large national service program, our armed forces would have a key part—for in this country only the military has developed real competence in mobilizing, sorting out and training large numbers of men and women. It is fashionable, particularly among those who have never been in military service, to disparage the Army way—but the recruiting posters are not nonsense. The military does a remarkable job of training and of fitting round pegs into round holes. Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia, who is chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Commission, says: "On the basis of observations extending over a quarter of a century, I have no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as good as industry's. Of course you find some misassigned men in the Army—but the same is true in universities and industry. The armed services do a careful job of classification. The bizarre yarns you hear—about the man who was taught Japanese and then sent to France—represent rare exceptions."

Furthermore, thousands of young men have acquired useful civilian vocations in the course of their military service. The armed forces do not maintain follow-up records to prove the point. However, a still unpublished study conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is illuminating. A random sample of draftees in the lowest intelligence group eligible for military duty was followed for a period of years after service. The earnings of these men were compared with those of a similar group of men who had not had military service. The superiority in earnings of the ex-soldiers was characterized as "fantastic" by one man who participated in this study.

Although the armed forces no longer accept illiterates, they still maintain education centers where high school drop-outs can study during off-duty hours. In the 12 months ending July, 1965, high school diplomas were earned in this way by 43,558 soldiers—a result that stands up well alongside civilian attempts to cope with the same problem.

A compulsory national service corps would involve an administrative task of a scope we haven't seen since World War II, when 16 million men and women were mobilized in our armed forces. Here are the basic personnel figures we would have to work with should a compulsory service corps for both sexes be set up in this country:

Total men and women at present in the 18–26 age group: more than 25 million.

Exemptions: 11 million. (Mothers and men and women in essential jobs—7 million; men and women in the armed forces—2 million; physically and mentally unfit—2 million.)[1]

---

[1] These figures presuppose an eventual reduction in military forces from the present 3 million; deferments but not exemptions for students; and fewer exemptions for unfitness, since national-service qualification requirements would be lower than those of the armed forces.

Total men and women available for a compulsory service corps: 14 million.

If each individual in this eight-year (18–26) age span serves for two years, then one-fourth of the 14-million group—i.e., 3.5-million—would be in service at any one time. What would a 3.5-million-strong national service corps cost? Adopting arbitrarily a modest figure of $3,500 per capita to cover training, equipment, maintenance and a token salary, the annual bill would be around $12-billion—exclusive of the undoubtedly heavy cost of tooling up. This is hardly a sum the Congress or the tax-payers are likely to approve at the present time—after all, only $1.5-billion annually has been allocated to the entire Poverty Program.

Apart from its cost, a compulsory program of the size we have projected is up against the fact that we do not have an adequate plan as yet for using the 3.5-million workers it would provide. And I can think of no surer way to foredoom a potentially admirable effort than to launch it without careful advance planning. Furthermore, after discussions with young people, educators and thoughtful public officials, I have concluded that there is an essential conflict between the concepts of conscription and humanitarian service.

I therefore believe that the answer, at least for the present, is a small *voluntary* national service corps, including both men and women. The response of Americans to well-planned voluntary programs has always been impressive. The men's and women's Job Corps, for example, have had to turn down, for budget reasons, nine out of every ten applicants. (There are fewer than 30,000 in the Job Corps today. Well over 500,000 persons—most from deprived backgrounds—have applied to date.) The dedicated service given by volunteers in Operation Headstart and other Poverty Program projects is a measure of a huge untapped reservor of idealism among Americans. Judging by the figures on the 18–26 age group already given, I believe that it would be possible to mobilize at least two million young people in a service corps on a purely voluntary basis.

But a corps of two million is still too large for the moment. We are not yet tooled for it. I propose, instead, that Congress create a National Service Agency authorized to mobilize 500,000 civilian volunteers, selected initially on the basis of their dedication to and aptitude for the corps' varied missions. The cost would be in the neighborhood of $1.7-billion annually. This, theoretically, is how the corps would be set up:

Upon signing in, all volunteers would go to basic-training centers operated by the Army, which would perform the function it did for the C.C.C. The Army also would be requested to operate a classification system designed to match interests, skills and national needs.

Thereafter, volunteers would be dispersed to newly established service centers around the country for training and duty. Some would work in conservation camps administered jointly by the Army and by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, in the C.C.C. pattern. Many would be assigned to public and private institutions to work as nurse-teacher-librarian aides; mental-health assistants; or in recreation and urban-improvement programs. The National Service Agency would be responsible for setting standards and maintaining a continuous check on the performance of volunteers and the agencies authorized to supervise them.

(Experimentally, I think it would be useful to make such voluntary service an alternate to military duty for the men. It seems to me unlikely that the armed forces would be shortchanged if this choice were offered. For only a minute proportion of the civilian corps could be accommodated in such "glamour" agencies as the Peace Corps. The vast majority would face assignment to rugged labor on conservation projects or to the relatively drab tasks cited above.)

Even before establishing a National Service Agency and embarking on this modest pilot program, however, we should take these steps:

(1) Enlarge the Peace Corps and VISTA and the Teachers' Corps to at least double their present size. This is an effort in which the colleges will have to help, as several are already doing.

(2) Increase the Job Corps tenfold—to an estimated 400,000. To do this will require a major shift in emphasis—stressing service to human beings and the career opportunities in welfare fields, rather than routine vocational training. This will also require a more democratic mix in Job Corps enrollment, with the better-educated volunteers spending at least part of their time as teachers of their less-well-equipped colleagues—as is done in Israel. The Job Corps, in effect, should be converted from a rehabilitation program for the poor into an opportunity for democratic service for all. The reconstituted Job Corps—and possibly also the Peace Corps, VISTA and the Teachers' Corps—would be absorbed by the National Service Agency when established. If, as is quite likely, there remains a need for a program of remedial education and vocational training, along the lines of the present Job Corps, it should be set up under educational auspices apart from the service program.

(3) Compile a national inventory of worthwhile conservation and urban-rehabilitation projects and of the urgent manpower and womanpower needs of institutions, schools and social agencies across the country. Supplement this listing with a catalogue of the new services desperately needed by the nation's old people, children harassed working mothers and the footloose adolescents. Such a compilation is by no means beyond the capacity of the nation's social scientists and computers.

By thus translating the nation's human needs into perceivable form, I believe we would dramatize the fact that we do have more than five million unfilled jobs. And we would begin to see a national service corps, not merely as an "alternative to the draft" or as a corrective to the draft's "inequities," but as a tool for alleviating the anguish of neglected patients in our hospitals and mental institutions, the misery of lonely old people, the plight of neglected children and the decay of our neglected land and cities—the medieval blights in our affluent society.

THE STRUGGLE TO END HUNGER: DOLE AMENDMENT WILL HELP

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in this week's issue of Time magazine there appears a very succinct and a very enlightening article on the pending world food and population crisis. This article points out some astonishing statistics. Here are some on the current efforts of the United States: 600 ships now carrying grain to India; 1,000,000 tons of grain per month being donated to that nation. U.S. farmers feed 1 out of every 20 persons in Africa, South America, and non-Red Asia; 25 percent of annual U.S. wheat production is going to India alone.

Here are some data on the magnitude of the problem: 500 million people—one-seventh of the world's population—are "belly hungry."

Two-thirds of Brazil's population suffer nutritional deficiency.

Nigerian food prices have gone up 40 percent in 6 months, forcing a ban on exports.

Six hundred thousand people in Bechuanaland have lived on FAO food donations for 5 years.

There are enough potential mothers alive today to raise world population to 7.4 billion by the turn of this century.

It took from the dawn of time to the year 1800 for mankind to reach a population of 1 billion.

This article points out some of the prospects and methods of meeting the rising world food and population problem and then discusses the recently passed extension of Public Law 480 incorporated in H.R. 14929. I supported that bill, and the amendment by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] to accelerate our agricultural technical assistance program through a "bread and butter corps" as is discussed in this article.

I take this occasion to commend the gentleman from Kansas for his many efforts to meet the massive problems that loom upon the near horizon of world history and insert the Time magazine article of August 12, 1966, into the RECORD at this point:

THE STRUGGLE TO END HUNGER

One of the greatest peacetime armadas ever assembled—600 ships from 50 donor nations—has borne 1,000,000 tons a month of mostly U.S. grain to drought-tormented India this year. Despite alarming predictions that millions of people might starve to death in that land, famine has been fended off. The massive U.S. effort, plus surprisingly effective distribution of rationed wheat and rice through India's bullock-and-leather-bucket economy, proved the apocalyptic prophets wrong.

Yet neither India nor other needy nations dare rely on largesse much longer. With world population in the past five years growing twice as fast, at 2% a year, as food output, man's struggle against hunger has reached a historic turning point. It has already forced dozens of ill-fed countries to start reshaping their pride-twisted economies. It has upset old notions of geopolitics. Most dramatic of all, it has virtually eaten up the perennial overproduction of U.S. agriculture, whose bounty now feeds one out of every 20 persons in Africa, Latin America and non-Communist Asia. The State Department last week told U.S. embassies to discourage requests for wheat because the nation must cut back such aid shipments by 25% this year.

THE GRAIN DRAIN

In the twelve years since the U.S. began dumping its awkward farm surpluses overseas on semi-giveway terms, so much of the glut has disappeared that now the nation must try to expand farm output after 33 years of curbing it. Twice this year, Washington has increased its price supports for dairy products, and it is now asking farmers to plant 10% more rice, 15% more wheat. For lack of grain to store, Cargill, Inc., last month closed its largest elevator in Buffalo. With India consuming a quarter of the U.S. wheat crop this year, as against a fifth last year and an eighth five years ago, U.S. wheat stocks now stand at a 14-year low of just over 15 million metric tons, not enough for adequate protection against a domestic crop failure. The supply of soybeans, the dull yellow seed that goes into everything from vegetable oil to paint and constitutes the world's cheapest source of protein equals just four months' consumption. Five years ago, Government warehouses were jammed with butter and cheese; now they hold none. Washington has had to go into the market to buy dried milk for its program of free school lunches for 50 million children in 52 foreign countries.

The U.S. shift from surplus toward scarcity leaves the nation with abundant food of every kind, but at prices rising swiftly enough to cause wrath among consumers in Manhattan, pandemonium on the grain market in Chicago, and smiles on farmers' faces from Keokuk to Calexico. Cash receipts by farmers are expected to rise 14% this year above their 1964 level, to a record $44.5 billion, and their net incomes will jump 16% to more than $15 billion. The change calls into question assumptions of many years' standing. For instance, does the U.S. still need crop-area controls and subsidies on such avidly sought foodstuffs as wheat? As things stand now, even though the market price of wheat has climbed 26.5% in a year to $1.91½, farmers are holding near-record amounts off the market in expectation of still higher prices—and Government wheat subsidies are helping to finance that gamble. The need for oil banking is also diminishing; 10 million of the 56 million acres of idle farm land, which costs taxpayers an irksome $1.6 billion a year, will be put to use to reach the new grain goals.

So far, man's ability to improve his environment has thwarted the 168-year-old Malthusian hypothesis that the human race is doomed to starve because population will outstrip food supply. Enriched by the 19th century industrial revolution that Malthus failed to foresee, Europe turned abroad for food. The U.S. began mechanizing its farming well over a century ago. Since then, compounding its prowess with irrigation, hybrid seeds, pesticides, continually improved fertilizers, and now even computers, the nation has marched to its present-day high farm productivity. Yet even without these benefits, the countries now called "underdeveloped" were able to feed themselves until World War II, and to export as much as 11 million tons of grain a year to Europe. Then postwar population pressures forced them to begin importing food, and now they bring in 25 million tons a year.

Now they are frighteningly short of self-sufficiency. Half a billion people—almost a seventh of the earth's 3.28 billion inhabitants—are "belly hungry," as an official of the United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization puts it. For another billion only a shade better off, poorly balanced diets smother their lives in lethargy, chronic illness and early death. Protein and vitamin deficiencies condemn millions of their children to such widespread, dwarfing diseases as kwashiorkor, which produces skin sores, swollen limbs and resentful apathy, and marasmus, which bloats bellies, shrivels limbs to the girth of the bones, and enfeebles brains to the point where schooling is useless. Imprisoned in poverty by ignorance and malnutrition, such virus fodder can contribute little to the development of their nations. Almost all of them live in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where farming is mostly mired in Babylonian technology.

In bejungled Brazil, which imports even some of its beans from Mexico, two-thirds of the population suffers from nutritional deficiency; the northeastern "Brazilian bulge" is one of the worst-fed areas of the world. In Africa's Bechuanaland, the population of 600,000 has subsisted on handouts from the FAO for five years of drought—a curse now spreading to Morocco and western Algeria. In fertile Nigeria, a food shortage has boosted prices 40% in six months, forcing the new regime to forbid the export of such African staples as yams, cassava flour (made from a high-calorie but protein-short root), corn and rice to neighboring countries.

THE HIGH COST OF INDIA

By any measure, India bears the most burdensome load of food problems—as elsewhere, mostly self-inflicted. The country is 75% illiterate, riven by language differences, hobbled by its caste system. Millions of impoverished peasants are at the mercy of the annual monsoon to water their crops, but the government has yet to survey many areas for underground sources of water. Though the seas around the subcontinent teem with protein-rich fish, which keep the Japanese healthy, religious taboos prevent orthodox Hindus from eating them. Farms average a mere two acres, precluding their mechanization. Why don't farmers pool their holdings in cooperatives, share the tools they so desperately need? Explains Punjab Farmer Kewal Singh: "Everyone suspects everyone else of being dishonest."

India loses a third of its harvest to insects, rats and rot, and high cost prevents big-scale food canning. From what should be fertile basins, India gets rice yields only a third of Egypt's, acre for acre, and grain production half that of the U.S. Misled by the example of Soviet industrialization, India for years concentrated on creating a socialistic state dominated by government-owned industries, diverting its own meager resources and $6.5 billions of U.S. economic assistance to do so. U.S. wheat helped to keep food prices low for industrial workers, but this cut farmers' incentive and prevented them from buying factory goods. At last, India's planners have realized that industry and agriculture must develop together if either is to thrive.

Now India's government has made overcoming its food deficit the first order of business, and Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies, believes that remedies can take root: better irrigation, more fertilizer plants, higher-yielding seeds, pest control. Equally vital are a farm-credit system, roads and storehouses (so that farmers need not dump their crops on the market at harvest time, when prices dip), and crop insurance to overcome the penniless farmers' reluctance to try new methods.

PROSPECTS AND PROPOSALS

Though India escaped famine this year, the pangs of world hunger are going to grow worse. Since DDT and antibiotics cut their death rates by one-third in the 1940s, backward countries have seen their once slow gait of population growth change to a gallop. Fully 80% of the post-World War II population spurt has occurred in the countries least able to support it. It took from the dawn of time until 1800 for the earth's population to reach 1 billion but only 130 years after that to reach 2 billion, and only 36 years more to reach the present 3.28 billion. Enough girls have already been born, Fortune points out, to be the mothers of sufficient children to raise the population to 7.4 billion by the year 2000—but birth control should cut that figure down a lot. So should reduced child mortality—by giving peasants less need to rely on sheer number of offspring as insurance that some will survive to care for them in their old age. In any case, most of the added people will live in regions already seething with the pressures of deprivation.

"Unless the hungry nations learn to feed themselves," warns Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, "there will be world famine in less than 20 years. More human lives hang in the balance than have been lost in all the wars of history." President Johnson warns that "one new element in today's world is the threat of mass starvation." Agrees FAO Director-General Binay Rajan Sen: "Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and stabilize population growth, or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude."

The threat of famine is real, but barring an improbable collapse of U.S. agriculture, it is not imminent. And the means for avoiding famine lie well within man's technology, if not necessarily within his politics. "If there should be a famine, it will be the result of ill-advised government action—in the U.S. and abroad," says Stanford Professor Karl Brandt, former director of its Food Research Institute. Plant Pathologist J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, holds that "we know enough today to transform the food production of the world. There is no longer any excuse for human starvation."

The gathering crisis has at least exposed the defects of the U.S.'s twelve-year-old $15 billion Food for Peace giveaway, Public Law 480. Even that program's first coordinator, Don Paarlberg, now a Purdue professor of agricultural economics, castigates it. "All that free food depresses foreign markets, discourages their farmers, makes them victims of food imperialism," says he. "It's not good for them, and it's not good for us." In effect, the bill was so explicitly designed to let the U.S. get rid of surpluses that it neglected to encourage foreign agriculture. Many developing countries—notably India, Egypt and Indonesia—used U.S. food as a crutch to let them spend money on prestige projects such as airlines, steel mills and monumental public works.

Acknowledging the old mistakes, the Administration's $6.6 billion Food for Freedom bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives and expected to clear the Senate without major difficulty, calls for a fundamental shift in U.S. food-aid policy. It still proposes to keep the world from starving by expanding food shipments abroad and drops the requirement of the expiring law that such aid must come from U.S. surpluses. But the bill would require countries receiving food to build up their own agricultural output through self-help. And it quite bluntly advocates that they take birth-control measures, too.

A few years ago, such a proviso might have raised cries of a Western plot against the growth of colored races. Hunger's pressures have helped to calm that fallacious fear. Even in the most unlikely region, Roman Catholic South America, resistance to birth control has dwindled. "Religion is getting out of the way," says University of Chicago Economist Theodore W. Schultz.

If the short-range solution to hunger overseas is more U.S. food, the long-range answer must be the export of technology, along with capital and brains to see that it is applied wisely. The rest of the world needs to catch up with the mechanization and efficiency of U.S. farms. Half the world's tractors operate in North America. California rice growers have gone so far as to plant, fertilize and spray their crops entirely from planes. A single U.S. farm worker now feeds 37 people, nearly twice as many as he did only a decade ago. And despite rising prices, U.S. consumers get off with spending the world's smallest share of their after-tax income for food: 19% (*v.* 29% in Britain, 45% in Italy, 80% in India).

American-backed research has already begun that immense catch-up task. Mexico was able to convert its wheat deficit into a small surplus at least partly because the Rockefeller Foundation helped Mexican scientists to develop new high-yielding varieties, which are stubby enough not to topple over of their own weight (as native wheat did) when heavily fertilized. Transplanted, the Mexican wheat is now doubling yields in West Pakistan, undergoing tests in India. In 1962, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations jointly set up an International Rice Research Institute near Manila. Already, its 20 scientists—half Americans, half Asians—have crossbred new strains of rice that have raised crop output in Pakistan and elsewhere.

The next task is research on tropical farming. Only 7.6% of the earth's land surface is cultivated today, because the rest is mostly too hot, cold, dry, wet or steep. Man's food supply is adequate only in the cool temperate zone, where grow most of the grains and soybeans that supply 60% of human energy. Crops in tropical rain forests are still grown as the Mayan Indians grew them 20 centuries ago: by burning off a tract, tilling it three years, then abandoning it.

Vital as research is, victory over hunger also demands that backward countries scale new heights of social, political and economic organization. As the U.S. example shows, it takes vast amounts of capital—$30,500 per U.S. farm worker *v.* $19,600 for an industrial worker. Some experts figure that developing countries must invest $80 billion before 1980 just to feed their growing populations at today's unhappy level. Beyond that, there is a need for chains of agricultural-research centers and schools abroad, partly staffed by an army of young U.S. technicians—one Congressman would call them the "bread and butter corps." Incentives that boost farm output by rewarding it must replace stifling state controls. The old Danish proverb applies: "When the mayor is a baker, the breads are always small."

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM

For the 25-year future, scientists are already busy with new ways to feed the hungry planet. Los Angeles' Rand Corp. feels confident that fish will be herded like cattle and raised in offshore pens, that kelp, seaweed, plankton and microscopic sea plants will be grown by divers living for months at a time in undersea bunkhouses. Oilmen have lately discovered how to derive a high-grade, edible protein from petroleum. The U.S. Army has figured out how to irradiate meats to preserve them for three years—a development of vast potential for refrigeration-shy countries. Would people eat such stuff? Happily, entrenched habits can be changed. In India's rice-shy Kerala state, people are learning to down wheat they once spurned.

The food-rich West has enough conventional resources to stave off starvation on less fortunate continents long enough for existing farm technology—plus increasing birth control—to restore the balance between food and people. What then? Says Harvard's Revelle: "One cannot go to India without feeling that the average Indian is a prisoner of biology and environment. The problem of development is giving these human beings the freedom they need. They will use it very well." America's fabulous farm underpinnings have conferred that freedom—and power—on its people. With carrot and stick, the U.S. now offers the underdeveloped world a chance—perhaps its last—to borrow U.S. techniques and reach for the same nourishing reward.

CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY'S 1966 OPINION POLL

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to send to my constituents in the 20th Congressional District of Illinois an annual questionnaire on major issues facing our Nation on the foreign and domestic fronts. The results have been very helpful and enlightening, as I have thus received the opinions and additional views of thousands of citizens. It is gratifying to observe a genuine and ever-growing interest in legislative affairs.

The names this year were selected at random from the telephone books and other public listings. More than 14,000 questionnaires have been returned, and since many returns represented the joint views of the husband and wife the poll then was participated in by almost 22,000 people. Hundreds included personal letters or notes in which they explained their positions, and many informed me of other alternatives to such crucial questions as Vietnam. This information has been helpful to me in committee work and in floor deliberations.

The results of the poll have been tabulated and are as follows:

TWENTIETH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, 1966 SURVEY OF HOME-DISTRICT OPINION

Vietnam—Under present circumstances, which of these courses of action do you favor:

Withdraw all U.S. combat forces	1, 704
Use all available forces and weapons to clear all areas of South Vietnam of Communist control at the earliest possible date	8, 301
Withdraw to easily-defended coastal areas	185
Keep ground forces at present level (or less) but make wider use of air and sea power against North Vietnam	2, 173
Discontinue bombing North Vietnam	81
Call free nations to a council meeting where allied policy on Vietnam (and Southeast Asia) can be decided, and an allied command established to carry it out	3, 153

Vietnam—Assuming military action ends on a satisfactory basis, which of these long-range policies do you favor:

Withdraw all U.S. military bases from South Vietnam	4, 277
Seek to keep at least one major military base in South Vietnam under U.S. control	9, 342
Offer South Vietnam territorial status in the U.S. with possibility of statehood later	999

Do you feel the President, in his relationship with Congress, is—

Too influential	11, 525
Not influential enough	622
About right	2, 724

	Yes	No	No opinion
In regard to unemployment compensation—			
The President has proposed that benefits be made bigger and easier to get. Do you agree?	1, 325	14, 121	404
Others have proposed that those who get benefits be required to pay back part of the money when they get a job. Do you agree?	8, 185	6, 372	803
In general, do you favor—			
Tax relief for those supporting students in college?	9, 085	6, 014	511
The President's proposal to increase the term of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years?	6, 952	7, 722	1, 004
A $3,000 annual limit on Government payments to any one farmer?	11, 260	2, 077	1, 731
Deferring college students from the draft providing their grades are good?	9, 474	5, 786	544
Calling up reserves before married men are drafted?	8, 992	4, 980	1, 440
The President's proposal to expand trade with the Soviet Union and Communist-bloc nations?	3, 677	10, 344	1, 373

A bipartisan group of Congressmen propose a convention of NATO nations aimed at agreement on a declaration that the eventual goal is to transform the alliance into a federal union government:

Favorable	6, 910
Unfavorable	3, 230
No opinion	4, 679

MAJORITY LEADER'S CHART INSERTION REVEALS HIGH-LEVEL ADMINISTRATION CONCERN OVER INFLATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was fascinated to read the little chart introduced into the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished majority leader purporting to show how much better off American consumers are, in spite of our rising prices, in comparison with some of our allies. This chart shows that consumer prices in the United States during the period 1961–66 have risen the least of a list of other nations including the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan. This is very interesting, if true, although Americans have been better off than the rest of the world for many years. It would have been a more interesting statistical demonstration if the majority leader's chart had showed the U.S. figures to be worse than those of our allies. Indeed, I am rather surprised that our relative position is not far greater than the majority leader's chart reveals.

What is really interesting, however, is the fact that he put the chart in the RECORD at all. Is it a sign that the Democratic leadership is acknowledging at last that the inflation issue is a real one? Did he do it to help congressional candidates of his party to "slip, slide, or duck" the question of rising consumer prices as they have been advised to do by the Secretary of Agriculture?

The introductory remarks of the majority leader are unrevealing. The little chart is merely dropped into the RECORD and allowed to lie there, gleaming from the front page, enticing us to explain its presence as we will.

I choose to believe that it represents the well-founded, deep concern felt in the highest administration circles over the issue of inflation and high prices. Otherwise, there is no point for the insertion.

I welcome this sign of concern. How much impression it will make on the public is problematical. Perhaps the American housewife, struggling to meet her weekly grocery bills will be vastly comforted by the knowledge that her counterparts in England, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan are worse off but I doubt it. She more likely will reflect, if she reflects about it at all, that we are heading in the same direction in spite of our efforts to sustain, aid, and support those countries. She might look at England, for instance, which is ruled by a Socialist government which exercises rigid control over nearly every aspect of the national economy, except the demands of unions from which it draws primary support. She may reflect that our country is heading in the same direction. Britain is deep in debt, nearly bankrupt, her credit in doubt. While it is undoubtedly true that the British pound will be defended to the last dollar, what kindly ally will haul us up if we go under?

We are not impressed by the majority leader's chart. We are impressed, howver, by his tacit admission of the importance of the inflation issue. We hope this concern results in action.

PUBLIC COLLEGES AND IMPROVED VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—H.R. 16958

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been concerned with the general condition of education here in our Nation's Capital. I have had the privilege of serving 8 years on the House District Committee and as a result been in the position to observe carefully the course that education has generally taken here. For years, I and many of our colleagues have been concerned about the lack of a public college here in the District of Columbia. Indeed every State has at least one public college or university; many have several available free to its taxpayers. The Nation's Capital City is a unique entity, a separate jurisdiction similar in many respects to our States but it is the only one without a public college or university. Many of Washington's schoolchildren possess excellent academic potential but lack the finances necessary to afford admittance to our private schools. To my knowledge no other city of like size lacks such a public institution of learning. Certainly the Capital of the Nation should not be the one city to do without such a vital institution; on the contrary, it should be in a position to set an example for the rest of the Nation.

Along with my concern about the lack of a public college in the District I have been concentrating my energies toward establishing an improved system of vocational training for our District citizens; to this end, your District Committee heard extensive testimony and recommendations last spring, looking toward a vastly improved vocational training program.

In order to meet both needs as nearly as possible, yesterday I introduced H.R. 16958, a bill which would authorize a public 4-year college which would provide emphasis on the arts and sciences looking toward a bachelor's degree. In addition, my bill would provide for a 2-year community college which would emphasize, but not be limited to, vocational training. In effect, this bill is a package proposal—a synthesis of two vital needs in the field of education here in the Nation's Capital, a 4-year arts and science college and a 2-year community college emphasizing vocational education, both quartered in a new general education complex.

I hasten to add that I take no pride in authorship for this bill. This bill reflects the thinking of everyone concerned with this problem including the President, the Senate, the House, and our educational experts. Technically, this bill might not be letter perfect but it at least provides us with something concrete to discuss and amend if necessary. It is my earnest hope that we can schedule hearings on this bill at the earliest possible time. I fully realize that it is getting late in the session but there is a serious need for this legislation and it is my hope that we will come up with something positive before the end of the 89th Congress.

Briefly, the bill creates a District of Columbia Board of Higher Education which would plan, establish, and govern both the 4-year college and the 2-year community-vocational college. The Board of Higher Education would consist of nine members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The 4-year arts and sciences college would be designed initially for 2,000 students and would point toward the award of a bachelor's degree.

The 2-year community-vocational college would likewise be designed initially for 2,000 students and could award an associate in arts degrees; but primarily it would be oriented toward vocational training, that is, the training of badly needed skilled technicians and semiprofessionals.

The college would absorb the present District of Columbia Teachers College.

Both colleges would be tuition-free to legal residents; nonresidents would be required to pay tuition based on cost.

The bill would authorize all necessary appropriations to carry out the act; furthermore, $20 million in additional District of Columbia borrowing authority would be authorized for construction purposes.

Cost estimates—prepared by the U.S. Office of Education: The 4-year college, $10 million; the 2-year college, $8 million.

The bill would substantially agree with the recommendations made by the President's Committee on Public Higher Education in its report of June 1964.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that I claim no special credit for this bill. In effect, it encompasses the thinking of many, many people, both on the Hill, in the District government, and in the Federal departments. I think it is a step in the right direction and I would be delighted to hear my colleagues' reaction to this proposal.

Still to be met, however, is an improved and expanded vocational program for the District of Columbia high schools. The District of Columbia school authorities have done marvels with what they have, but what they have is not near enough to meet the needs of our schoolchildren. Many students now have to be turned away because of the lack of space in the vocational program. To correct this should be our next step.

STRIKES AGAINST SOCIETY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York City, I have witnessed, in the recent past, three unconscionable strikes which caused great inconvenience and havoc to the general public and every segment of society. The strikes I refer to are the newspaper strike, the transit strike, and now the airline strike.

We have received no help or action for ameliorating the condition of what I call "strikes against society" from our national administration, much less from our Secretary of Labor.

There follows a telegram sent by me to the Secretary of Labor on July 19 in connection with the airline strike:

> The current airline strike again points up your failure and that of this administration to protect the public where major strikes against society are involved. This strike, especially in the height of the tourist season, costs business a fortune from the flower and fruit growers to the sea food suppliers to the travel agents to the hotel owners, etc. President Johnson in the state of the Union message proposed emergency strike legislation, but without action. So far you have failed the people of New York City, whom I represent, in the transit strike, the past newspaper strike and now the airline strike. When will you do something constructive in this field?

Obviously this administration does not want to antagonize those in the labor movement, and I can understand that, but some solution must be offered to protect the public.

It remains for a group of authors who help give this country its culture, to come forward with a sensible suggestion to protect the public and yet not cause difficulties for labor or industry.

The proposal of the Authors League of America, Inc., was made to Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City, my predecessor in my congressional seat, during the recent transit strike. It is a "strike-work" agreement.

The proposal follows:

THE AUTHORS LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 7, 1966.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor of the City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MAYOR LINDSAY: We hope that by the time this letter reaches you the suggestion we make will have become academic—insofar as the transit stoppage is concerned. But we would like to propose a moral (and practical) equivalent to the strike weapon in the area of public services—the "strike-work" agreement. The transit strike and the two recent City-wide newspaper strikes vividly demonstrate that we need new procedures which would permit voluntary negotiation of contracts by unions and employers who provide indispensable public services, without a stoppage of the services.

As organizations representing many authors who reside in and near the City, we are deeply concerned with the widespread impact of the strike on everyone in the metropolitan community. We are especially concerned with the irreparable injury it has caused the New York theatre, for which many of our members write. Some plays have already been destroyed. Others will perish if the strike continues. The actors, writers, stagehands, musicians and many others who were employed in these productions, as well as the producers and the backers who financed them, have suffered heavy losses. Moreover, the strike may well cripple the theatre—one of the City's most valued cultural and commercial assets—for years to come.

There must be some alternative to a work stoppage as a means of settling labor disputes involving public services—whether furnished by government or private industry. We think that there is such an alternative and that it is not limited to compulsory arbitration. Many unions and employers reject the concept of compulsory arbitration and prefer to settle their disputes by voluntary bargaining. In this process, the economic pressures that each side brings to bear on the other by a strike are an essential factor.

Obviously, the tactical aim of a strike or lockout is to impose economic injury on the opposition in order to bring it to terms. By striking, the union imposes losses on the employer. By refusing to accept the union's offer, the employer brings economic pressure on union members—the loss of wages. Without these pressures negotiations might continue interminably and there would not be the incentive necessary to compel settlement. Unfortunately, when public services are involved the public is caught in the middle. We doubt that either side would admit that the public should be a hostage. We think that each would contend that this was a regrettable by-product of the bargaining and strike process.

We think that it is possible to take the public out of the middle in this type of dispute and at the same time preserve the economic pressures that each side seeks to employ to its advantage in a strike situation. And we believe that this procedure could be employed in the transit controversy by adopting a "strike-work" agreement. Under this procedure a contract dispute is negotiated voluntarily, but there is no work stoppage. However, by agreement, the economic consequences of a strike are imposed upon each side.

At least one union and employer have adopted this approach. On May 21, 1964, "The New York Times" reported the signing of a new collective bargaining agreement between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation and the Upholsterers International Union, which incorporated a "strike-work" arrangement. This agreement provides that if on the expiration of a contract the parties do not agree on a new one, the consequences of a strike would follow, but production would continue—while the union and the Company continue to bargain out a new contract. During this bargaining period, a portion of the wages payable to the employees under the expired contract would be placed in an escrow fund. A similar amount would be paid by the Company into the fund. If the contract is negotiated within a specified period, the escrow funds are returned to both sides. If it has not been negotiated by that time, the money deposited by both sides is forfeited and paid to designated charities. The monies forfeited under such an agreement would be lost as irretrievably to both labor and management, as would be the wages and operating income lost by both in an actual strike. When this contract was signed, a Union spokesman said that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks is almost overwhelming."

We suggest that such an arrangement could have prevented the present transit stoppage. The Union and the Transit Authority would have been under the same economic pressures to bargain with each other, but we would have avoided the irretrievable injury to the public—the staggering losses of wages to hundreds of thousands of employees (many of them union members) and the heavy toll paid by business and industry in the metropolitan area.

This is not the only form in which a "strike-work" arrangement could be employed. We understand that during the present transit crisis it was proposed that the transit facilities be operated on a restricted basis and without any fare being charged. Such an arrangement might also have imposed the necessary economic pressures on both sides in the bargaining process and yet would have avoided the devastating effects of total stoppage. And if it is a premise of strikes that public hardship is also a permissible objective, restricted operation of the transit facilities would have accomplished even this pressure while at the same time avoiding complete paralysis.

Sincerely,

REX STOUT,
President, the Authors League of America, Inc.,
ELIZABETH JANEWAY,
President, the Authors Guild, Inc.,
SIDNEY KINGSLEY,
President, the Dramatists Guild, Inc.,
IRWIN KARP,
Counsel.

As the Authors League points out, the strike-work agreement is not completely novel.

Attached is a New York Times article of Thursday, May 21, 1964, which details such an agreement entered into by the Upholsterers International Union of North America:

NEW STRIKE PLAN BARS WALKOUTS—ESCROW CLAUSE CALLS FOR BOTH SIDES TO PAY HEAVILY

A new type of collective bargaining agreement that requires employees to continue work while on strike will be signed today by one of the country's best known furniture manufacturers and one of the oldest unions in the industry.

The agreement, which also requires continued production in the event of a company lockout, is intended "to take the consumer out of the middle in industrial disputes" while protecting the economic position of both the company and its employes.

The agreement is between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation of Berne, Ind., manufacturers of contemporary design furniture, and the Upholsterers International Union of North America, which has its headquarters in Philadelphia.

It is scheduled to be signed at 11 A.M. today at the company's offices here at 305 East 63d Street. The signers will be Harold D. Sprunger, president of the 47-year-old family operated company, and Sal B. Hoffmann, president of the 82-year-old union.

The agreement provides that when a contract ends and the union and management fail to agree on a new one, production will continue. But to pressure both sides to reach an agreement, increasing amounts of wages and matching company funds will be put into a trust over a 12-week period.

FUND GOES TO CHARITY

If there is no settlement at the end of the 12 weeks, Dunbar and its 275 employees will surrender all the funds to a community or charity project. Mr. Sprunger and Mr. Hoffmann say they know of no similar provision in any contract anywhere, but that they expect to see many in the future.

Should a strike or lockout occur, under the agreement 50 per cent of the workers' wages and an equal amount of company funds are to be placed with an independent referee or bank during the first six weeks. If the strike or walkout is settled in that time, all the money is returned to the employees and the company.

If the parties fail to reach an agreement during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continue. However, they will get back only 75 percent of their money if they settle before the ninth week, and the referee or bank will be paid a small charge.

Only 50 percent of the contributions will be returned if a settlement comes in the next two weeks.

THE 12TH WEEK IS CRUCIAL

The 12th week has been termed the "sudden death" week if the agreement is reached during that period, 25 percent of the contributions will be returned. After the 12th week, none of the money can be returned. Instead, the fund will be turned over to an association of clergymen in Berne for their disposal.

After the 12-week period, either the company or the union may go back to the traditional lockout or strike. But unless they give notice of such, the old contract will be automatically renewed for a year.

The agreement also provides that all injury and illness insurance will continue to be paid to the employes during the first 12 weeks.

A spokesman for the union explained that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks of dispute is almost overwhelming."

The original concept for the "strike-work" agreement was conceived by the late Lynn W. Beman, who was labor consultant for the National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, of which Dunbar is a member.

The last strike at Dunbar, which lasted six weeks, was five years ago.

The Authors League proposal was commented upon by Forbes magazine and their comment was reprinted throughout the country.

Attached is such a reprint from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 14, 1966:

A SUBSTITUTE FOR TRANSIT STRIKES

> (From an open letter to Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York)
>
> We would like to propose a moral (and practical) equivalent to the strike weapon in the area of public services—the "strike-work" agreement. The New York transit strike and the two recent city-wide newspaper strikes vividly demonstrate that we need new procedures which would permit voluntary negotiation of contracts by unions and employers who provide indispensable public services, without a stoppage of the services.
>
> There must be some alternative to a work stoppage as a means of settling labor disputes involving public services—whether furnished by government or private industry. We think that there is such an alternative and that it is not limited to compulsory arbitration. Many unions and employers reject the concept of compulsory arbitration and prefer to settle their disputes by voluntary bargaining. In this process, the economic pressures that each side brings to bear on the other by a strike are an essential factor.
>
> Obviously, the tactical aim of a strike or lockout is to impose economic injury on the opposition in order to bring it to terms. By striking, the union imposes losses on the employer. By refusing to accept the union's offer, the employer brings economic pressure on union members—the loss of wages. Without these pressures negotiations might continue interminably and there would not be the incentive necessary to compel settlement. Unfortunately, when public services are involved the public is caught in the middle. We doubt that either side would admit that the public should be a hostage. We think that each would contend that this was a regrettable by-product of the bargaining and strike process.
>
> We think that it is possible to take the public out of the middle in this type of dispute and at the same time preserve the economic pressures that each side seeks to employ to its advantage in a strike situation.
>
> On May 24, 1964, The New York Times reported the signing of a new collective bargaining agreement between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation and the Upholsterers International Union, which incorporated a "strike-work" arrangement.
>
> This agreement provides that if on the expiration of a contract the parties do not agree on a new one, the consequences of a strike would follow, but production would continue—while the union and the company continue to bargain out a new contract.
>
> During this bargaining period, a portion of the wages payable to the employees under the expired contract would be placed in an escrow fund. A similar amount would be paid by the company into the fund. If the contract is negotiated within a specified period, the escrow funds are returned to both sides. If it has not been negotiated by that time, the money deposited by both sides is forfeited and paid to designated charities.
>
> The monies forfeited under such an agreement would be lost as irretrievably to both labor and management, as would be the wages and operating income lost by both in an actual strike. When this contract was signed, a union spokesman said that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks is almost overwhelming."
>
> We suggest that such an arrangement could have prevented the transit stoppage. The union and the Transit Authority would have been under the same economic pressures to bargain with each other, but we would have avoided the irretrievable injury to the public—the staggering losses of wages to hundreds of thousands of employees (many of them union members) and the heavy toll paid by business and industry in the metropolitan area.
>
> REX STOUT,
> *President, Authors League of America, Inc.*
> ELIZABETH JANEWAY,
> *President, the Authors Guild, Inc.*
> SIDNEY KINGSLEY,
> *President, the Dramatists Guild, Inc.*
> IRWIN KARP,
> *Counsel.*

First broached during the previous New York City newspaper strike by Irwin Karp, Esquire, in a letter to the Saturday Review as a way of confining the economic struggle of strike and lockout to the "belligerents," the idea of a strike-work agreement is set forth in the Saturday Review of March 9, 1963, and follows:

> Your editorial raises the question of whether such a struggle can be confined to the belligerents. I believe that, at least, it could be transformed so that only the belligerents, and not innocent bystanders, are injured. The tactical aim of a strike (or lockout) is to impose economic injury on the opposition (loss of wages, loss of profits) to bring it to terms. Unfortunately, the newspaper stoppage is an indiscriminate means of applying this pressure. It hurts not only the belligerents, but everyone else. The publishers and printers could apply the same pressure more discriminatingly (to themselves and no one else) if they put the newspapers back in operation, and each agreed to impose upon itself—until a settlement were negotiated—the same economic loss it now suffers because of the strike. They could, in effect, transform the current "literal" strike into a "figurative" one.
>
> Under such an agreement, until the dispute is settled, the publishers would surrender a portion of their profits, and the printers a portion of their wages, to a fund to be used for charitable or other agreed purposes. The amounts thus forfeited during the figurative strike would be lost as irretrievably as the profits and wages now being lost by the actual strike, and the "belligerents" would be under the same pressures to bargain with each other. But the injury to the public, and the devastating losses suffered by non-striking employees, and by businesses that require newspaper services, would be ended.
>
> —IRWIN KARP.

Because this whole area of strikes and labor disputes and the involvement of society at large grows increasingly difficult and demands an immediate answer, I commend this solution to my colleagues.

AUTHORITY PROPOSED FOR RECLAIMING STRIP MINE AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this body to a serious problem involving the Nation's soil and water resources. The problem stems from the failure to reclaim and rehabilitate surface-mined lands. I am extremely concerned about this matter in my district, and many of my colleagues here are equally concerned.

There are large areas of land in the United States which have been damaged by surface or strip mining which have never been restored or rehabilitated. Such lands are seriously impairing the beauty of the natural landscape, causing erosion of soils, the deposit of sediment into stream channels and reservoirs, the pollution of water by sediment and acid drainage, and injury to public health and safety.

The present efforts to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas are inadequate. Damages to adjacent lands, water, fish, wildlife, and beauty continue. Much needs to be done and can be done to restore these areas and make them assets to the communities where they exist. The incentive of Federal participation is needed to stimulate local action. The necessary local organizations already exist and are ready to participate in sponsoring needed improvements when assistance is available.

For these reasons I am today introducing a bill which, when passed, will effectively deal with the problem and aid the economic development of communities and rural areas affected.

The principal benefits to come from the action proposed in the bill are off-site and for the general welfare, rather than economic gains to the present owners of such denuded private lands. The problems and opportunities associated with these old untreated surface-mined lands are not restricted to my district. Thus, I know my colleagues will join me in supporting this urgently needed legislation.

PRESENT PROGRAMS ARE INADEQUATE

Eight States have enacted laws requiring reclamation of surface-mined areas. Ohio is one of them. Obligations under these laws extend only to areas mined after the effective dates of the laws. It is the areas mined prior to enactment of these statutes that created the continuing problem and which require Federal attention.

Throughout this great land there are 800,000 acres of privately owned land scarred from strip mining badly in need of reclamation measures.

Existing cost-sharing programs in the Department of Agriculture do not fit the needs for restoring surface-mined areas. These programs were designed to assist landowners in the treatment of land having capacity for profitable production of grass, trees, or field crops. Such lands hold promise of return to the farmer in the foreseeable future. No such returns can be expected from the treatment of surface-mined areas.

Reclamation of surface-mined areas will serve the public interest in two ways. First, off-site damages—pollution, sedimentation, and so forth—can be eliminated. Second, these idle wastelands can be converted to useful purposes and made to protect the public interest in land, water, and plant resources. While the monetary returns will not be great, they can become assets to the communities in which they are located through a realization of their potential for woodland, wildlife, forage production, and recreation.

It is known that these problems can be dealt with effectively. The Soil Conservation Service is assisting with surface-minded area reclamation work where the finances are available to do the job. The SCS staff of experienced engineers, hydrologists, geologists, soil scientists, agronomists, biologists, plant materials specialists, and range and woodland conservationists are assisting with technical aspects of the job.

Although soil conservation districts having areas affected by surface mining are doing all they can to deal with this problem, the financial limitations on the part of the owners and the absence of any continuing effective assistance from governmental sources results in scant attention to the problem.

PROPOSED AUTHORITY

The solution of these problems on older mined sites will require considerably more Federal attention than has been available in the past. Most of these lands are nonagricultural and are privately owned. Therefore, authorities provided for cost-sharing on agricultural lands and the authorities provided for the care of public lands are not applicable to these lands.

The legislation I propose would provide an authority to fill this void by authorizing a massive national effort to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas. These are the areas that do not come under State laws requiring reclamation. They are the spoils that have remained untreated because no incentive, private nor public, encouraged their reclamation.

The proposed legislation will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program of restoration and rehabilitation of lands which have been damaged by surface or strip mining and which are presently in a scarred or unrestored condition. The program would be carried out in cooperation with States, their political subdivisions, and local entities such as soil and water conservation districts. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to:

First. Provide, upon the request of States, their political subdivisions, or local agencies, technical assistance for developing a plan of restoration and rehabilitation of lands damaged by surface or strip mining.

Second. Provide long-term cost-sharing agreements of up to 10 years for strip mine reclamation through which the Federal Government would share up to 75 percent of the cost of rehabilitation and restoration.

Third. Carry out rehabilitation and restoration measures.

The program will not apply to lands damaged after the passage of the act.

It is the intent of this legislation that the Soil Conservation Service would be assigned the administrative responsibility for leadership within the Department of Agriculture. The broad experience of the Soil Conservation Service in operating the small watershed and flood prevention programs and the Great Plains conservation program, all of which require long-term planning and operation, including contracting, in cooperation with State and local interests, has provided the experience necessary to move in on a sizable area rehabilitation job and do it effectively and efficiently.

Areas would be treated by planting grasses, trees, shrubs, and other adapted vegetation including the application of fertilizers and needed soil amendments. Where necessary, this work will be supported by mechanical measures such as land smoothing, diversions, grade stabilization structures, debris basins, bank sloping, drainage, and access roads for maintenance.

Measures to improve wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities would be included where appropriate.

The program would emphasize the control of erosion on surface-mined areas and the prevention of pollution and sediment damages on adjacent and downstream lands and would promote the conservation of the soil, water, and plant resources along with their development for improved uses.

The program would apply to the approximately 800,000 acres of old untreated non-Federal surface-mined areas on which reclamation is not presently required of anyone by State law. In States not having laws requiring reclamation of newly surfaced mined areas, the program would be limited to a few installations to show the benefits of reclamation work and to encourage the enactment of suitable legislation and ordinances.

The legislation I propose would provide an authorization of $50 million for the restoration and rehabilitation of the surface of lands damaged by surface or strip mining. I urge its enactment by the 89th Congress.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was more than delighted throughout the 1st session of the 89th Congress to note the gentleman's constant interest in the broad subject of the national program to do an effective job in soil conservation programing and particularly the contribution of the gentleman in the well insofar as the problem as it related to strip mining operations were concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I was more than delighted again to note this morning the introduction by the gentleman in the well of this very much needed legislation which will have such a tremendous national impact upon the struggle to reclaim so many hundreds of thousands of acres of American land that have been denuded and raped by the greed of man in his abuse of the rich natural resources with which God has endowed this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar, as the Congressman at Large in Ohio, of the rape of the lands of the gentleman in the well's congressional district and the destruction of the lands in the district adjoining the gentleman.

Hundreds of thousands of acres of usable land that have a really remarkable economic future insofar as development is concerned have through the greed of the coal mine operators been ruined forever. I congratulate the gentleman in focusing attention on this problem as to how we are going to reclaim these lands effectively and this acreage.

The gentleman knows at the time of the consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the provision as it applies to the strip mining acreage reclamation program was confined exclusively to publicly owned lands and that was but, as the gentleman knows, an infinitesimal factor insofar as the lands that have been lost and are yet to be reclaimed.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has accurately appraised the problem when he has said that the State, county and local communities have no longer the capacity to engage in a realistic reclamation effort and that the full energy of the Federal Government and the full taxing resources and revenues of the Government have to be focused upon this problem.

It is certainly contradictory in my opinion to promote economic development in the gentleman's region if on the other hand we do not realize the rape that has occurred there and the loss of the lands that have occurred there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman concerning whether or not the gentleman would regard the bonds that are asked of some of these strip mine operators who are directly responsible in the destruction of the lands, whether the gentleman would feel that under existing State laws the bonds asked of these strip mining companies are adequate so as to protect and insure that after they have removed the resources of coal or any other mineral from the land that they will restore the lands to the condition in which they found them. Whether or not these bonds required of them by State governments have been sufficient in their amount so as to be a remedy and an assurance to the public that the lands will not be destroyed as the result of having been used for these purposes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to thank the gentleman for his fine comments and contributions. With respect to whether or not the bonds required are sufficient to cause the miners to properly reclaim and rehabilitate this land, I think remains a question with the various and several States.

It is very apparent that the bonds are not high enough to cause some of these strip miners to carry out their agreements. As a result, many of these acres that have been stripped of the coal remain abandoned, barren, and denuded.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation does not direct itself so much to the failures of the present miners as it does to correcting a situation that is very, very old in some areas. A situation that has obtained before States passed reclamation laws.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that in our State, as you well know, that many of those engaged in strip mining years ago found it very convenient to walk away and leave it in this condition and as they want us to accept it today.

Where bonds are met I gather the State is using the funds to restore the land. I am not in a position to say whether or not they are high enough. I can tell you most assuredly that rehabilitation and reclaiming of this land in our State is not moving forward as it ought to.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman for his comments. I thank the gentleman.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation relating to the financial burden imposed upon the St. Lawrence Seaway. This legislation is cosponsored by 37 Congressmen from 7 States.

The St. Lawrence Seaway has proved to be a tremendous boon to the economies of the States bordering the St. Lawrence River as well as those which benefit by its encouragement of cheaper shipping. While it is estimated that users of the port of Duluth in Minnesota saved in excess of $200 million in transportation costs from 1959 through 1965, the beneficiaries of the port's growth—the States of the upper Midwest—have, at the same time, greatly increased their foreign trade: North Dakota by 46 percent, South Dakota by 35 percent, Wisconsin by 30 percent, and Minnesota by 32 percent. And only now, in 1966, 7 years after the seaway's opening, has the actual tonnage carried on the seaway approached its predicted full capacity operation.

Especially now, when the seaway's capacity is within reach and, with further development of seaway and port facilities, would be substantially increased, tolls must remain the same to maintain present shipping levels and encourage further expansion. Larger tolls would erase the progress of the seaway over the last 7 years. This legislation would set tolls to cover the seaway's operating costs and provide a return on the Government's original investment without exceeding present toll levels.

The bills that have been introduced also would change the means of payment by the Seaway Corporation. Under the present arrangement, the capital cost of the seaway's construction must be repaid in 50 years. Other transportation systems have received and are receiving direct or indirect subsidies from the Federal Government. Yet the seaway, within a short time, must not only cover its own maintenance and operating costs and pay interest on the original loan, but also repay the total amount of the original money invested.

This bill would convert this fixed-term bond system to capital stocks in which the Government would retain an interest and receive dividends in perpetuity—eventually exceeding many times its original investment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would maintain and encourage shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway and thus further the economic development of the States of the Midwest. I urge that Congress consider this legislation as soon as possible.

CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT MAKES SUPERB PLEA FOR ELECTION LAW REFORM: "LET'S REVITALIZE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY"

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major unfinished items on America's agenda of political reform is a thorough overhaul of our archaic laws governing campaign financing and spending.

As every Member of this body well knows, the existing laws are so circumvented and avoided as to be totally meaningless. It is said, of course, that the laws are unrealistic and unworkable. But as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said in a recent statement to the Committee on House Administration:

> There may be some excuse when the general populace ignores an obviously unworkable and commonly disobeyed ordinance. But what excuse can there be for us, who have it in our hands to change the law? It is our very profession to make the law, and to make it mean something—if, in fact, we want it to mean something! By refusing either to abide by it or to change it, we present a sad spectacle indeed.

The gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, has presented a superb statement in behalf of election law reform which I hope will be read and considered by every Member of the House.

He shows not only the great need for the valuable reforms recommended by President Johnson and incorporated in the Election Reform Act of 1966. He also suggests improvements on the administration's proposal which deserve careful study. These provisions would broaden popular participation in the financing of campaigns by providing a small tax credit, rather than a deduction, for political contributions and would place a limit of $30,000 spending each in a party primary and general election contest for a House seat. The spending limit applied to Senate contests would be the House limit of $30,000 multiplied by the number of House seats allotted to that State.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT, also urged the committee to consider "some requirement that a certain minimum amount of prime television time be made available without charge as a public service equally to all candidates for the office of U.S. Senator or Representative."

I include the full statement hereafter:

LET'S REVITALIZE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(Statement of Congressman JIM WRIGHT, in behalf of Election Reform Act of 1966, to House Administration Committee, Thursday, July 14, 1966)

This Committee has a rare opportunity to rejuvenate and revitalize the free elective processes of this country. I hope no member of this Committee will underestimate either the importance or the urgency of this opportunity.

By presenting the Congress with a meaningful bill to reform the almost incredibly antiquated, unworkable and unenforceable campaign laws that are intentionally evaded by almost every candidate and ridiculed by the public, this Committee could perform a truly refreshing service to the revivification of American democracy.

The enactment of proposals presented to this Congress could pump new life into the bloodstream of our elective procedures and restore public confidence in both the integrity of Congress and the viability of our democratic institutions.

Or, by giving these bills a mere perfunctory hearing, failing to push for legislative reform, and simply letting the dust of long neglect slowly settle back in all its accustomed corners, you could confirm the shadowy suspicion held by many that Congress is content with the gaping loopholes which make a mockery of our ancient and inadequate campaign spending laws, and that, in spite of our pious protests, we do not really want reform.

SHAMEFUL NEGLECT

And it would be difficult to blame the public for reaching such a concluson. Congress in the past two decades has shamefully neglected to act on a single one of seventeen different proposals designed to bring a semblance of sense and order to the legal sham that is supposed to govern campaign expenditures. Each of us to some degree bears the onus of that failure.

The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 originally must have been inspired by sincere purpose. It must have had some meaning in its day. In 1966, it is about as sensible, and about as enforceable, as trying to apply horse and buggy speed limits to jet age transportation. I daresay there is not a member of Congress, myself included, who has not knowingly evaded its purpose in one way or another.

That law provides that a candidate for Congress can spend no more than $5,000 in his bid for election, and a candidate for the Senate no more than $25,000. If I told you that I had abided wholly by the spirit of that statute, I'd be an utter hypocrite—and everyone in this room knows it.

Today, in our larger and more populous states, it has become common practice to spend upwards of a million dollars to win a Governorship or a seat in the U.S. Senate. Some such statewide races, from an analysis of mailings, billboards, newspaper ads and radio and television time used in promoting an individual candidacy, are estimated to have exacted a financial toll in the neighborhood of $3 million each. Researchers have documented more than $200 million spent in the various elections in 1964.

A FEW TYPICAL EXPENSES

If these figures should be surprising to anyone, let me itemize a few typical expenses, as they would apply to my particular state. Similar statistics can be compiled on other states. Perhaps little of this will be really new to elective officials, but it should be an eye opener to the public.

Just one first-class letter to every family in Texas would cost—in production and postage—approximately $300,000.

One of the huge billboards—just one in one of our big Texas cities—with no more than a touched-up picture and a slick slogan—costs $550 a month. They're not all that expensive. Many are only $300 or $200 a month. But multiply the individual cost by the thousands it takes to cover a large state, and you'll have a fair idea what billboard coverage comes to in dollars.

Recently I did a 30-minute television broadcast on 18 of the 50 television stations in Texas. It cost me a little over $10,000. But the same total amount of time, on exactly the same stations, if taken in 20-second spots, would have cost $400,000! By far the most expensive thing in television is the juvenile little quickie which slips up on you and shouts a name or a singing commercial at you before you have a chance to turn it off.

A CYNICAL THING

I mention these things because I think the public is entitled to know them. It's their government that's at stake. The practice of campaign spending and financing has become a thoroughly cynical thing. The law is such that only a very small percentage of the contributions, and expenditures, have to be reported. Like an iceberg, it's all about seven-eighths under water. And every penny of it ought to be right out in the sunlight of public knowledge!

By totaling up the costs of various mass media advertising employed by one candidate last month in an unsuccessful bid for a primary nomination to the U.S. House of Representatives in North Carolina, it is calculated that he spent approximately $250,000. And one of our colleagues in the House frankly reported following the last election that $193,000 had been expended in his successful bid for election. He is to be commended for his candor in exposing the total worthlessness of a law which pretends to limit him to $5,000.

But what kind of example do we give to the public for obedience to law? There may be some excuse when the general populace ignores an obviously unworkable and commonly disobeyed ordinance. But what excuse can there be for us, who have it directly in our hands to change the law? It is our very profession to make the law, and to make it mean something—if, in fact, we want it to mean something! By refusing either to abide by it or to change it, we present a sad spectacle indeed.

THE INSIDIOUS DANGER

Yet, there are far more deadly perils than the mere flouting of a law which loom in the direction in which campaign practices have been drifting.

Politics, which Webster defined as "the science and art of government," is becoming a rich man's game in which the stakes are so high that relatively few can play. Therein lurks an insidious danger to our political institutions, as subtle as a creeping fog at night.

The skyrocketing costs of campaigning are making it impossible for men of modest means to seek high elective office—unless they are willing wards of the wealthy.

By so doing, these costs are choking off the wellsprings of fresh, new thought from which the system can get new life—and severely limiting the field of elective choice which is offered to the public.

The commonly accepted practice is placing the premium not so much upon ability or understanding of national issues as upon money or the talent for wheedling money from those who have it.

In this way, it is creating an elite power class with an open-sesame to political influence—the willingness to contribute in large denominations.

And it is casting a pall of cynicism and mistrust upon the hallowed institutions of democracy.

The costs of electioneering, and the growing reliance upon big contributors, have spawned a variety of evils which are encrusting themselves like barnacles upon our ship of state. Like parasitic growths, they are sapping the very life of the plant itself.

At this moment in the other body, we witness the spectacle of a Senate committee examining the ethics of one of its members who held testimonial dinners to pay off campaign debts.

Perhaps I know something about the necessity that he faced. In 1961, I made an unsuccessful race in a special election for the U.S. Senate from Texas. After it was all over, we figured that a total of some $270,000 had been spent in my campaign. Obviously, it hadn't been quite enough. But I ended up owing $68,000, for which I signed personal notes to pay off creditors, mostly for debts of which I'd had no personal knowledge. It took me two and a half years to retire the notes.

But this is nothing when compared with the poignant personal experience of James E. Turman who in 1962 conducted an unavailing campaign for Lieutenant Governor in our state. He came close, making the run-off but losing in the second primary. For four years, he has been paying from his personal income a regular monthly amount in principal and interest to retire the indebtedness he incurred in that one campaign—and he calculates that, on this steady amortization schedule, it will take him 15 more years of monthly payments to get even. Nineteen years to pay for one near miss at the polls!

Maybe you're saying, "That's too bad, but it's his tough luck. A fellow without adequate financial backing should have had better sense than to get into a campaign of that kind." And perhaps you'd be right. But where does that leave the fond old American dream that a mother in this country, even though her circumstances be impoverished, could look into the eyes of her infant son and say: "There lies the future President of the United States"?

We have tarnished the dream.

And where does it leave the sincere young American of the coming generation who earnestly desires to make a contribution of his time and talent to the political life of his country? I'll tell you exactly where it leaves him. Unless he has inherited spectacular wealth, it leaves him at the mercy of those who can make large political contributions, and who'll expect him in one way or another to serve their particular interests.

SOME CURRENT PRACTICES

The state of affairs which we've allowed to develop has given rise to the now familiar cocktail party attended and financed by lobbyists, with congressional candidates as the beneficiaries. One Washington-based lobbying group last year bought tickets, ranging from $50 to $1,000 to eleven different parties for eleven different members of the House and Senate.

At the national level, it has bred the sale of ads for $15,000 a page in fancy party brochures. Among others who have bought these ads are eleven of the nation's top 25 defense contractors, and they've deducted the price from their taxes as a "business expense." Many of the advertisers have been corporations, legally prohibited from contributing to campaigns, but the proceeds from the ads were dedicated to paying for political campaigns. In addition to government contractors, the advertisers have included companies, such as airlines, whose business activities are directly regulated by the government.

Can it be argued that these people—and others who more quietly slip multi-thousand dollar contributions into the campaign coffers of their favorite candidates, often with no public reporting of any kind—do so with no expectation of selfish return?

Or must it be said that, contrary to all we have professed—we really are creating two classes of citizen-stockholders in our Democracy—common stock and preferred stock.

In a more subtle way, the flattering allure of an exclusive chance to visit socially with the President must beckon to some of those who join the President's Club at annual dues of $1,000.

And now it is reported in the Washington newspapers that plans are underway to create an "elite" President's Club, with dues pegged at $10,000, whose members are to enjoy the additional boon of an invitation to the White House. The motives of the givers may be wholly pure; this is not my basic concern. But I can't help feeling a sense of embarrassment for the President of the United States—any President—that such a thing as this should have become necessary.

I am not specifically criticizing those who organize these various endeavors—nor those who respond to them. But I am criticizing the rather commonly accepted practices which have grown up in this legal vacuum to make these endeavors necessary. I am criticizing the prevalent sophisticated view among political practitioners which accepts these practices blandly and without any perceptible sense of outrage. For they are strangling the breath from the ideal of government "by the people." And they cry out to heaven for reform!

A CHANCE AND A DUTY

We have a chance in this session to reform them. It is my conviction that we have the duty to do so.

(1) First, the President has asked us to burn away the fog that has so long enshrouded the realm of campaign financing and turn the clear, clean spotlight of public awareness upon it. The President is to be commended for his leadership in this field. His Election Reform Act of 1966 would require every gift and every expenditure of $100 and more, whether taken or spent by the candidate himself or by one of his "committees," to be publicly reported.

This would do away with the widespread dodge of setting up an elaborate proliferation of "voluntary" committees on the patently absurd theory that the candidate is blissfully unaware of their activities in his behalf and, like Pontius Pilate, can simply wash his hands of the whole sordid mess.

Certainly all such contributions, together with their sources, and all such expenditures should be identified and reported. But under the present law, it has become a completely cynical business in which Congressional and Senatorial candidates, in complying with the letter of the law, have been literally forced to evade the spirit of the law.

(2) To minimize the financial dependence upon a few mammoth contributors, the President proposes that an absolute maximum of $5,000 should be established as the amount which any one individual or interest may lawfully contribute to any one campaign.

The present law purports to impose such a limit, but it is blithely evaded by the multiplicity of committees formed in the interest of the same candidate, thus allowing the individual with a desire to buy himself a lawmaker to contribute $5,000 to each such committee. President Johnson has described this practice as "putting the maximum amount into different pockets of the same suit."

Under the bills before you, only one such contribution—whether directly to the candidate or to any committee acting in his behalf—would be allowed. In my view the amount is still too much. A dependence by any candidate upon $5,000 contributions is in my opinion extremely unhealthy and potentially inimical to the spirit of democracy. I think it would be far preferable to reduce the figure to, let us say, $1,000. But the bill would at least provide some improvement by preventing the callous evasion of the clear intent of the present law, and I can think of no justification for failing to adopt this provision.

(3) Unquestionably the most important feature of the Administration bill is that which would broaden the base of political contributions by encouraging hundreds of thousands of modest contributors, by tax deductibility of small and medium-sized

campaign donations, to take up the slack and provide the wherewithal which has been coming principally from a little coterie of fat cats.

If thousands of average Americans—with no ax to grind except good government—can be induced and inspired to assume an individual responsibility through small individual contributions, this would be the healthiest possible tonic for the ills that beset our elective processes.

The President proposes that political contributions of up to a total of $100 be specifically deductible from income taxes as a stimulus to widespread popular financial support of political campaigns. This is the key to the workability of the entire program. In fact, I'd like to make it even stronger—not by raising the deductible amount, but by making still smaller contributions still more attractive to the average citizen. If we really want to widen the base of financial participation and make it a truly popular function of citizenship, we could do so by providing a tax credit—deductible from the tax itself rather than from reportable income—of $25 for any citizen who had contributed that much to the campaign of his chosen party or candidate.

Certainly it makes for a more vigorous democracy, free from unsavory influence, when the cost of gaining public office can be distributed among many small contributors rather than being borne by a comparative handful of really big ones. Far better, if one sets out to raise $25,000 for a political race, that he should elicit $5 from each of 5,000 people, rather than $5,000 from each of five people! Anybody who contributes in the latter range—unless he is a pure philanthropist—is likely to expect something commensurate in return. But nobody who joins with 5,000 others can expect preferred representation.

By encouraging popular financial participation and thus protecting the public official's independence from private obligation, such a reform could go a long way toward making it possible for our ablest and most sincere people to seek and hold elective office.

(4) To be effective, individual tax deductions and ceilings on individual contributions should be coupled with a practical and legally enforceable upper limit of allowable expenditures. In this area, I personally feel that the Administration bill is deficient. It would remove the laughably low and totally unrealistic limits of existing law, but it would replace them with nothing.

LET'S LIMIT EXPENDITURES

Surely there should be some limit. But it should be a workable limit. It should be high enough to permit each side an adequate campaign of public enlightenment but low enough to remove our public forums from the crass commercial market place where it almost can be said in far too many cases that public office is up for sale to the highest bidder! The limit should be sufficiently realistic to evoke respect and abidance—and public censure for those who try to flout it.

I have introduced a bill which differs from the Administration measure only in that it proposes to set limits on campaign expenditures. The ceilings I advocate may be too high; perhaps they are too low. But surely if we are serious about reform, there needs to be some sensible and enforceable legal limit to the amount that a candidate or his well-wishers can spend in seeking a seat in either house of the U.S. Congress.

My bill undertakes to limit expenditures for any candidate to the U.S. House of Representatives to not more than $30,000 for a party primary and an additional $30,000 for a general election. Taken together, the two figures would come, not altogether coincidentially, to precisely the amount of the Congressman's salary for a two-year term. There seems something oddly incongruous about allowing any candidate for the House to spend more to gain the office than his total public income for his term of office. For almost any constituency, I believe this figure would be wholly adequate, perhaps not for a lavish campaign but for a sufficient campaign, if candidates would concentrate on informing rather than brainwashing their constituencies ad nauseum.

Since our several states differ so widely in population, obviously there could be no single arbitrary figure which would apply with equal fairness to all Senatorial candidates. Therefore, I have undertaken to set the ceilings at multiples of $30,000, with the multiplier determined by the number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives to which each state's population entitles it. For Texas, with 23 members of the House, the top permissible figures for any Senate candidacy would be $30,000 times 23—or $690,000 for a primary and a similar amount for a general election. In New Hampshire or New Mexico, with two House seats each, the figure would come to $60,000 in each instance. For Maryland, it would be $240,000 for a primary and a like sum for the general election. In New York and California, the lid would figure at a little more than a million dollars. With all parties and all contestants honoring the same law, this should be enough.

I do not pretend to know how much should be considered adequate for a Presidential campaign. The present legal ceiling is, of course, utterly removed from reality and almost fraudulently deceptive. Existing law purports to limit a party committee to the raising and spending to no more than $3 million a year. In 1964, there were no fewer than 107 national-level committees which among them reported expenditures of $29 million for the national campaigns of the two major political parties. Nobody knows how much more went unreported. Perhaps it is best that we not attempt to place a specific ceiling on the amount a party may spend for the Presidency, but surely it is nothing short of sheer hypocrisy to leave the present meaningless statute on the books.

(5) The Administration bill, additionally, would require all Members of the House and Senate to make annual, inclusive, public reports of all sources of income received by them and their immediate families. Surely this is a desirable provision. Where there is nothing to hide, there can be nothing to fear. And it would be pointless to complain about the goldfish bowl. Each of us knew that public service is a goldfish bowl when we entered it.

Such a financial disclosure act, making regular public revelations of all sources of our individual incomes, could go a long way to inform the public and to lift the vague cloud of often unwarranted suspicion from the legislative chambers.

Fully two-thirds of the Congressional membership have no substantial income at all aside from our Congressional salaries. An additional 20 percent may enjoy stock dividends or returns from investments made prior to our entry into the halls of Congress. In most cases, whatever outside business connections we had were general knowledge in our respective districts prior to our elections. In perhaps five percent of the cases, constituents might learn something which was not already generally known about the private finances of their chosen Senator or Representative. In my opinion, there would be relatively few shocking revelations.

But the very fact that Congressmen were required to make such a sworn declaration could serve as a reassurance to the public and as an inducement for legislators to hew hard to the straight path. As former Congressman Paul Kilday often said, "Anything you have to explain, you would be wiser not to do."

Perhaps you are questioning why it should be necessary for members of the national lawmaking body to hang their finances out for public view like so many garments on the public washline. A poll conducted in the spring of 1964 by Lou Harris gives a somewhat disquieting answer. In nationwide interviews, Harris discovered that a full 50 percent of those questioned feel that Members of Congress tend to represent "special interests." An additional 20 percent were "not sure." And only 30 percent believed firmly enough in the legislative integrity to respond that Congressmen basically represent "public interests."

It is both interesting and significant that, regardless of the section of the country, citizens characteristically place a greater confidence in the financial honesty of their own individual Congressman and Senator than they do in the body as a whole. This fact is borne out clearly by many opinion samplings. The human tendency is to mistrust the unknown, to doubt the unfamiliar. A mandatory public airing of individual Congressional finances, therefore, by the simple expediency of dissipating the mist of mystery, might help to restore the quality of public respect in those who govern us, so necessary to the efficient functioning of democracy.

(6) While nobody to my knowledge has included any such provision in any of the bills before you, I think it might be well worth the Committee's considering in this connection the possibility of some requirement that a certain minimum amount of prime television time be made available without charge as a public service equality to all candidates for the office of United States Senator or Representative.

Such a practice, of course, has long been observed in Great Britain as well as in certain other countries. I am informed that, in England, public opinion itself has so crystalized in favor of the restrained approach to campaign spending, that lavish campaigns are considered not only bad form but actually hurtful to the cause of the spenders.

THE INTELLECTUAL LEVEL

Political campaigns can be either extremely educational or surpassingly offensive to the public. In the tradition of a free country, they should provide the medium for an intelligent and intellectually rewarding biennial examintion of our national policies. In far too many cases, they have descended to the level of shouting contests, reminiscent of the side-show barker at a carnival, with new overtones supplied by Madison Avenue, rending the air with florid claims designed to assault the eye and ear so incessantly with quick, slick slogans and nauseating name-repetition that the public in theory will become subliminally hypnotized.

It is my personal feeling that, in our emphasis upon such coarse spending and shallow sloganeering, we insult the public's intelligence and do the electorate a grave disservice. While this admittedly is more a matter of taste than of morals, I am convinced that the total quality of American political life could be elevated by de-emphasizing the repetitious quickie commercials and replacing them with intelligent discussion in some depth of the issues that confront the Republic. Anything that might be done to encourage the availability and use of prime television time in 30-minute or at least 15-minute segments for such a purpose undoubtedly would be a service to public understanding—as well as to the candidate who isn't willing to put his soul in a safe-deposit box and auction off the key to the biggest campaign contributor.

In these ways, this Congress could restore the vibrancy and viability of American democracy. The increasingly sordid emphasis upon big spending and blue chip money raising which has pervaded the political scene runs alarmingly counter to the American experiment in self-government. From the very beginning our people have traditionally exhibited a healthy mistrust of the concentration of too much power in the hands of too few. But directly juxtaposed to our systematical expansion of the electorate and our democracizing of the ballot is the insidious encroachment of circumstances which place the public official or office seeker unwillingly at the mercy of those few who can provide the wherewithal to conduct campaigns in this day of extravagantly expensive mass media.

LET'S REDEEM OUR OWN HISTORY

Creation of an elite propertied class with a sort of divine right to rule the country, against which Jefferson waged his unrelenting warfare, has come about in spite of our considerable efforts to broaden the franchise. These successive and cumulative efforts have run like a constantly recurring theme through the symphony of our national past. To the anguished cries of the few, we adopted the principle of universal manhood suffrage. We abolished slavery and the cruel protocols of a vested caste system. We let the women vote.

In just the past generation, we have sounded the death knell to the "white man's primary," passed Civil Rights Voting Laws, swept aside the rotten boroughs of maladjusted districts, and outlawed the poll tax. But of what real effect is all of this if practice imposes a restrictive financial bottleneck upon the sources from which we can recruit our elected officials? Of what value is "one man, one vote" if all of us know the real power lies in the hands of the few who provide the money for political campaigns, and if the realities of the age permit the voter so limited a choice of those for whom he gets a chance to cast his ballot?

While the tide of American history has inexorably swept away the restrictions on voting and widened the channels of public participation in the electoral process, these gains have been largely negated by the rapidly climbing costs of electioneering and concomitant dependence upon the few who privately provide those costs.

The system itself is good—the best that any nation has devised. But it needs updating and modernizing to the end that "one man, one vote" may be indeed a reality. Let us not, through inaction, permit it to drift in its present direction until we bring down upon ourselves the condemnation hurled at the scribes and pharisees, for permitting our free elective processes to become like "whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within filled with dead men's bones and uncleanness."

The bills before us permit us an opportunity to revive the spirit of Democracy itself. Let it not be lamented that we neglected the opportunity.

BUILDING BRIDGE CANYON DAM WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE PURPOSES OF THE GRAND CANYON PARK ACT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of two huge power dams in the Grand Canyon have often stated that "provision for a dam at Bridge Canyon was made in the very act establishing Grand Canyon National Park in 1919" and that "the very act of Congress in 1919, which created Grand Canyon National Park, provides specifically for hydroelectric developments in or along its borders."

It has even been said that Congress made a "sacred commitment" to allow the Bridge Canyon Dam.

Of course no Congress can bind its successors. But in view of the emphasis that has been given to the claim that the 65th Congress in effect endorsed the Bridge Canyon Dam in the Grand Canyon Park Act (40 Stat. 1175), it is worth looking at the act.

The conclusion of any fairminded review of the act and its legislative history must be that while the 65th Congress did not attempt to definitely resolve the issue, it barely left the door open to a very limited future reclamation use of the Grand Canyon.

The decision as to whether the door is to be swung wide to admit the Bridge Canyon Dam or whether it is to be firmly shut against exploitation of the canyon is one that this Congress must decide on the merits. The act of 1919 contains no commitment, sacred or otherwise.

As originally introduced the Grand Canyon National Park bill contained the following language:

> SEC. 7. That the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.

This is the provision that the proponents of the Bridge Canyon Dam now wish had become embedded in the law. But it did not.

The then Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, objected to section 7 of the bill as introduced, arguing that it "is not in harmony with the other general provisions of the measure."

Lane suggested the following language which became part of the act:

> SEC. 7. That, *whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said park*, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of areas therein *which may be necessary* for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project. (Emphasis added.)

In the brief debate on the Grand Canyon Park Act in the House, my predecessor from the Fifth District of Wisconsin, Mr. Stafford, questioned the need for any authority for irrigation and reclamation projects in the canyon.

> Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire further as to the need of granting authority for irrigation and reclamation projects such as is conferred by this bill in the canyon proper.

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN, hastened to assure the House that nothing was proposed to be allowed that would detract from the primary purposes of the park.

> Mr. HAYDEN. The provision contained in the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, *when consistent with the primary purposes of the park*—that is, not to impair its scenic beauty—to allow storage reservoirs to be constructed for conserving the water of the Colorado River for irrigation purposes. I understand that there are in the canyon a number of reservoir sites where it is proposed in time to come, when full utilization is made of that stream, to build reservoirs for the storage of water. *If that can be done without disturbing the primary purposes of the park*, there is authority in this bill to do so. (Emphasis added.)

So, first, the question is raised of whether the Bridge Canyon Dam would be "consistent with the primary purposes" of the Grand Canyon National Park.

The purposes of the Grand Canyon National Park, and of all parks, as declared by Congress in 1916 are "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The Bridge Canyon Dam would back up the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon National Park for 13 miles. It would destroy scenes of great natural beauty. It would obscure important geological features. It would wipe out the habitats of plants and wildlife in the canyon.

In my judgment, the effects of the dam cannot be squared with the policy of "conserving the scenery and the natural objects and the wildlife" in the park.

Second, there is the question of whether the dam would be "necessary," as the statute requires, "for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project."

The answer is that the dam is not necessary for a reclamation project in the ordinary sense of the term. No one, I believe, contends that the central Arizona project to divert water from the Colorado into Arizona cannot be built and paid for without Bridge Canyon Dam. The administration does not recommend the authorization of Bridge Canyon Dam. In fact, the primary purpose of the dam is to finance part of the cost of a vast program of interregional water transfer.

This purpose is similarly out of accord with then Representative HAYDEN'S explanation that the provisions of section 7 were intended to allow "storage reservoirs" so as to make "full utilization" of the Colorado River. By now, however, adequate water storage capacity has been built on the Colorado to allow full use of that river without marring the Grand Canyon. Neither Bridge nor Marble Canyon Dam is needed for water impoundment.

Thus it comes back to the question of whether this Congress is willing to alter significantly the ecology of the entire Grand Canyon and to turn the living river into reservoirs for 13 miles of the national park, 38 miles—the entire length—of the national monument, and in all through about half of the 280-mile length of the Grand Canyon that nature made, in order to allow an ill-conceived and economically unsound project.

THE FEDERAL COURT CLERK

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RODINO**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record a speech delivered on August 10 by my dear friend Mario T. Noto before the Federal Court Clerks' Association's 38th Annual Conference in Florida. In his remarks, Mr. Noto, Associate Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, has touched on many phases of citizenship, and on the important role which the Federal court clerks play in this process.

In so doing, the Commissioner makes each of us reflect once again on the precious honor of citizenship, and I am happy to commend the statement of this dedicated and skilled administrator to my colleagues' attention:

> I want to express my appreciation for the privilege you have given me to address the 38th Annual Conference of the Federal Court Clerks' Association. It is a genuine and sincere pleasure to be permitted to participate in this memorable event.
>
> In addressing your Association, I want to pay tribute to and acknowledge the dedication and devotion to duty of the court clerks of our Federal judiciary system. Each clerk is an integral and indispensable part of that vast machinery through which our Federal courts administer justice.
>
> It is a commendable characteristic of our American way of life that we Americans have a tendency to group into associations. We do this for good reason. Ironically, Alexis de Tocqueville perceived this trait among Americans, more than 100 years ago on his visit from France to the United States, in his comprehensive analysis of social and political life in America. We group because of our desire to promote unity in causes, some of which are practical and some of which are idealistic. But just the same they are causes in which we express our deep convictions and profound beliefs. And this is good. For this is the American way of life.
>
> We of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, recoganize and find in the federal court clerks, officers who, as part of our judiciary system, give unstintingly of themselves in joining our Service to assist aliens in the judicial acquisition of citizenship. Their help is indispensable and of inestimable worth.
>
> No person with reason can deny or even cast doubt that American citizenship is a priceless possession. We as Americans have been endowed with this immeasurable treasure either by the accident of birth or have earned it as a matter of choice through court proceedings.
>
> Twenty-four years ago in ruling upon a case involving the revocation of naturalization, the highest Court in the land wrote: "It is safe to assert that nowhere in the world today is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country. It would be difficult to exaggerate its value and importance. By many it is regarded as the highest hope of civilized men." This right, by judicial description, is and continues to be a priceless possession. And the sacred worth of American citizenship is no less in value today than it was at the time when the Court wrote its words. In fact, it is today incapable of measurement. And since our nation declared its freedom and independence in 1776, it has continuously spiraled in worth. So long as God continues to endow this nation of ours with the inheritance of the tremendous resources which we through our efforts have multiplied, the privilege of citizenship will continue to assume greater heights.
>
> No matter how remote, there is no area in our globe today where a man does not live who would give but short of his life to acquire the privileges which are bestowed by American citizenship.
>
> Yet, in our national life today our liberties have become challenged increasingly and the price of American citizenship and its freedoms have become more exacting and demanding.
>
> At this hour we are living in a world which is divided. We are in an era of ideological conflict which crystallizes into sharp focus the question as to what place does man truly hold in our society. Is man to continue to remain free and be the master of his destiny; or shall he become subservient to satisfy the needs of a totalitarian state? This is a challenge which all Americans must reflect upon and be prepared to accept. Whatever the cost we must insure that we retain the blessings which belong to us by American citizenship. We were founded upon the concept that the State serves the people and so shall it be. In our country the principle of the sovereignty of the people has been a fact of existence since our birth as a nation. As the Deity reigns in the universe, the people in our land reign in their government.
>
> Some of us have acquired our citizenship by birth, and thus by right. Some of us have acquired our citizenship by court proceedings and thus by privilege. Regardless of its source we share in common the rights and privileges of all American citizens. But, whether by birth or naturalization there is a common bond among us. We are linked by a deep and unshatterable cord which joins us into a mighty nation. We share in common the desire for liberty and the preservation of the sanctity of our human rights.
>
> Be it blood by birth, be it blood by naturalization, the passage of time has merged us all into one people. Whether we descend from those who long ago preceded us to this land or whether we are new arrivals, we Americans who have the heritage of citizenship by birth or naturalization, are amalgamated into American might. Together, we represent the sum total which is our America in the community of nations.
>
> While naturalization activity is but one of the functions of our Service and similarly only one of your many duties and responsibilities, it is befitting for this assembly to reflect for a moment upon the route and significance of citizenship by naturalization. In our history, we know that in 1790 our Congress established for the first time a judicial way to divest oneself of foreign allegiance and acquire American citizenship. Our legislature decreed that it was necessary to pass through the portals of the sanctity of the courtroom to acquire this privilege. With the passage of time, the naturalization process has become one of the most significant and penetrating acts to be performed by the judge in a United States District Court. To add to the tribute of such privilege which only the qualified may receive, the naturalization proceeding has been cloaked with ceremonial significance which leaves an impact deeply embedded in the soul of man. The sacred trust which the court grants to the petitioner for naturalization remains in heart and mind for a lifetime.
>
> The passage of time and increased work loads upon the judiciary, prompted Congress to legislate responsibility upon the Immigration nad Naturalization Service to process and examine the petitioners for citizenship. Thus, the naturalization examiner of the Service has in fact become an instrument of the federal court. The trust and confidence imposed upon the Service by legislation has been diligently and competently fulfilled. But despite this mandate, citizenship is still granted only by order of the court and it is the culmination of a complete judicial proceeding.
>
> In turn this trust has been reconfirmed as the courts have manifested their faith in the Service by accepting with rare exceptions, the recommendation of the examiner which is required by law. Between 1961 and 1965 there were 600,468 new citizens admitted by court order. This judicial trust in the Service has made the court dispense with the appearances of witnesses and further examination of the petitioners at the final hearing in the absence of special circumstances where a court will require it.
>
> Our work has been aided by the cooperative spirit and untiring efforts of the clerks of the court. You have made the ceremonies of the naturalization proceedings assume new and deepened significance. The final hearing has become a show place where responsibilities meaningful to citizenship are vested in people who have finally achieved the goal of their aspiration to become Americans. Thus, the clerk of the court has given the new citizen a deeper understanding of American society. With the broad cooperation which exists between us, and your dedicated efforts, the naturalization ceremony has become the most thrilling of all judicial proceedings. It is fraught with emotion and although it is the end of one road, of the end of allegiance to a land of birth, it is the beginning of a new era for new Americans who have by choice earned it. This proceeding becomes one of cherished memory.
>
> The court and ceremony serve to emphasize the significance of the new citizenship. They instill in the new Americans a better understanding of the value of their new government and the importance of their place in its society. You are helping us in the Service to write and add new chapters to the history of America.
>
> These new citizens and their children will enhance our strength and as assimilated members of our free society they become peaceful people dedicated to the preservation of our heritage. These are people who have chosen to stand united with us to preserve freedom and Constitutional government. Thus, in behavior, in attitude and in aspiration, they have a remarkable similarity to those who emigrated to this land long before in time.
>
> And together you and the Service give to each man his chance. To every man, regardless of the land of his birth, we give opportunity to become one of us. To every man, we give the right to live, to work, to contribute his talents, to be himself. To every man we give the chance to achieve whatever hope his manhood and his ability can combine to make him. This which we give him is the promise of America.
>
> I want to express sincere and genuine gratitude from the Service to all the Federal Court clerks for your past and continuing help in the naturalization process. I voice the hope that with your continued cooperation we may in the troubled climates of the world today add to the goodwill, understanding and compassion which these new citizens will contribute to the wealth of our nation.
>
> I close my remarks with pride in the realization that we stand and serve together to achieve a better American citizenry.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

Mr. **GIBBONS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, once again in the interest of keeping our membership fully informed concerning a request for an appropriation for the Dickey-Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric power project which will soon be before us, I would like to present several items of information.

It may well be of interest to the Members to note that these two items in opposition to the project come from very contrasting sources. One is a statement by Mr. Charles E. Hardy, a vice president of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England, Inc., and the other an excerpt from the Utility Stock Valuations report of the financial concern of McDonnell & Co., member of the New York Stock Exchange, American Stock Exchange and other leading exchanges.

I am sure that when the Members have an opportunity to study them they will once again agree with me that this project requires considerably more study before we appropriate any further funds for it. It is quite plain to me that when a project of this kind is opposed by segments of organized labor, the Association of Chambers of Commerce, by the electric companies of the region, and when it is seriously questioned by financial houses, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, the Appalachian Mountain Club on a conservationist basis, then, in my opinion, the Members of this House are entitled to considerably more information than we have received from Federal agencies to date.

The McDonnell report says in part:

> The threat of a public power complex is more apparent than real. The proposed Dickey-Lincoln project is a step in the wrong direction—but in focus is designed only to provide power for a few hours of peaking per day. Studies seem to indicate the whole project is economically absurd—this however does not preclude development. A legislative battle should precede any final implementation of plans. While such a development may be considered a "threat," the impact upon private utility investment within the present context should not be significantly injurious.
>
> The outlook for utility operations is excellent. The demand growth should continue with economic growth and the favorable economies of the utility industry are finally being experienced in New England. Power-pooling is leading to the installation of larger and larger units in New England with an impressive impact upon operations. CTP [Central Maine Power Company] is planning the installation of a 700,000 kilowatt unit in 1972. This will be a joint project with other New England utilities, with CTP participation in ownership and power take of about 38%. The impact of atomic energy on New England will be dramatic. CTP for istance is currently dependent mainly on Bunker C Oil which costs about 35¢ per million BTU. Atomic power is supposed to be currently competitive with 23¢–24¢ conventional fuel costs—or roughly 70% of current fuel cost. This development should serve over the longer-term to make power costs more competitive with other areas of the country as well as increasing profitability.

Mr. Hardy, in a statement to the press has charged that certain Members of the Congress were being deliberately misled as to the amount of support that exists within various union groups for the $300 million Federal power dam that has been proposed for the northernmost reaches of Maine. Mr. Hardy's statement follows:

> Charles E. Hardy, Vice President of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England Inc. said that Congressmen were being deluded by false claims of total union support for the much-publicized hydroelectric scheme of the Interior Department.
>
> Most of the union support statements are emanating from groups which are about as far removed from the utility industry as you can get and we fail to see what jurisdiction or what possible stake they can have in an industry where we make our living.
>
> Opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln project comes from thousands of knowledgeable members of the Utility Workers Union of America, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, both members of the AFL–CIO and the United Mine Workers, District 50, who represent organized utility workers in every state in the New England area.
>
> We are taxpayers, too, said Mr. Hardy, and we sure hate to see millions of taxpayers' dollars being poured into a senseless scheme, that has had little or no study, that will provide no answer to New England's rate problems, that will generate only higher-cost power than is presently available—and that will provide no jobs for our membership.
>
> I think that we have proven time and again that we have become "economists" said Hardy; it is now an indispensable asset for union leadership to precisely know the hills and valleys of charts and graphs what causes them, and where they affect our livelihood.
>
> If only for this reason alone, said the union official, we have cause to see nothing but trouble with government intervention into the New England power business. Our industry, by proper planning and conscientious and continuous effort, has always sought to level out the economic peaks and to produce a New England power system that is service conscious, that is union conscious and that is rate conscious. I read a statement by an electric company official the other day with which I fully concur: "What product do you know today—that costs less than it did in 1940?"
>
> We in the B.U.W. NE know the power business far better than our Detroit brethren, and certainly more intimately than newspapermen or bureaucrats who incessantly harp on a federal power "yardstick" that has no digits for taxes, which incidentally are 37 per cent higher in Massachusetts than the national average. These are the same taxes we unionists will have to pay for federal subsidization of our industry for a few choice "preference" customers, and we think the money could be better spent . . . in places like Viet Nam.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Dickey-Lincoln school hydroelectric power project, authorized by Congress last year, was called to our attention on Monday of this week by our distinguished colleague, Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in his remarks before the House.

As all my colleagues in the House of Representatives know, I am the chief proponent of the Dickey project while Mr. CLARK has led the opposition to this needed facility.

Mr. CLARK, stating that he wishes to keep the Members of the House well informed on the status of this project, entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 8, the last of an article written by Mr. Raymond Moley which appeared in Newsweek magazine on February 28 of this year.

I, too, am interested in keeping my colleagues informed, and welcome the opportunity to rebut the statements made by Mr. Moley.

When Newsweek published the article in question, I, together with my distinguished Republican colleague from Maine [Mr. TUPPER], responded to it by letter to the publishers. They refused to publish our rebuttal.

Now that Mr. CLARK has submitted the article into the RECORD, we have at last an opportunity to publish our comments on this worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the letter written by Mr. TUPPER and myself to the publishers of Newsweek.

FEBRUARY 25, 1966.

The EDITOR,
Newsweek Magazine,
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The article by Raymond Moley entitled "Guns and Butter Plus" in February 28 Newsweek is replete with errors. In fact, the only correct statement in Mr. Moley's comment regarding the Dickey-Lincoln School Project is that the Interior Department under Secretary Udall was asked to study it in 1961 and that the project since then has been authorized in last year's Rivers and Harbors Bill with an appropriation of $800,000 for preliminary construction and planning. An analysis of the project by the Federal Power Commission and other agencies revealed that Dickey was one of the best hydroelectric sites in the East and that it should be developed.

In speaking of the Dickey-Lincoln School Hydro-electric Project Mr. Moley described the site as "far up in Northern Maine." May we remind the gentleman that far up in Maine as you can possibly go is still the United States. Mr. Moley's attitude reminds us of the story of the man from northern Maine who visited Washington D.C. and said it was "a fine place to visit but a long way from everything."

Mr. Moley lauds the 19 private power companies of New England for their plan for power expansion over the next seven years. Although we welcome any private utilities' proposal which would provide low cost power to New England, we are justifiably skeptical of a plan which was contrived only after Congressional authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School Project became imminent. This group of 19 private power companies in New England has been organized since 1948 and has never before even hinted at plans to substantially reduce power costs.

Over the years we have become well acquainted with Mr. Moley's assertions against hydro-electric projects both in the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia River Valley. The fact is that these two areas are blessed with Federal hydro-electric power and enjoy the lowest cost power in the Nation. We say that it is time the people in New England be given their chance to share in the benefits which will flow from developments of Federal hydroelectric power.

Sincerely,

MAINE CONGRESSIONAL
DELEGATION,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
Democrat, Second District.
STANLEY R. TUPPER,
Republican, First District.

POLLUTED WATER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation vital to the Nation's health and welfare. For what could be more vital than the condition of our water? Water has been and is a major source of food, transportation, and power, and it is becoming more and more a primary source of recreation.

All of these uses are threatened by the condition of our rivers and streams. All the good to which our water can be put is endangered by the pollution of our waterways. The issue with which I am dealing is pollution. Too much of our water is polluted—dirty, diseased, and dangerous.

Today I am introducing a bill which would deal with this problem, a bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance.

We have already begun work on pollution. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 has made some headway, but our rivers are still carrying industrial waste, raw sewage, and bloated fish across the landscape.

I do not wish to sound like an alarmist; our water supplies can be made drinkable and many people swim safely in our rivers. But this is the critical point, for acting now to clean up our waterways will insure a useful and healthful water supply tomorrow.

This bill will authorize a program in selected river basins that supplements other Federal pollution programs. It would provide for the maximum cooperation of all levels of government to reclaim and restore the natural waters of the Nation's rivers, lakes, streams, estuaries, bays, and coastal waters to adequate standards of water quality for all our present and future health, welfare, and resource needs.

It would accomplish this through the comprehensive planning of pollution control for all or part of a river basin. It would establish incentives to water users to conserve water and minimize wastes. It would also establish a permanent organization with authority to coordinate the actions necessary to carry out a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan. The bill will provide for the establishment of local or interstate bodies for the purpose of controlling water pollution and aid such bodies to coordinate their policies within a geographical area.

The object of this bill is clean water—undefiled, unpolluted water. The bill would achieve its objective through the cooperative effort of State, local, and Federal agencies who would jointly plan and finance the clean water program. It would extend and broaden existing programs that are attacking pollution from other than the clean rivers viewpoint.

This bill authorizes $6 billion as the minimum Federal investment to provide an adequate water quality program for municipalities for the next 6 years. The bill eliminates dollar ceilings for grants to State, local, and interstate agencies for the construction of sewage treatment works. It provides for funds to aid basic research in the areas of waste discharge, agricultural runoff, and many of the other pollution problems which plague our rivers.

This bill recognizes the duty and the right of local and State agencies to implement water quality programs to provide clean water for their citizens. It aids these agencies and coordinates their activities in a cooperative effort which will benefit the entire Nation.

A river is not located in one place—it winds and flows across the landscape. It ignores municipal and State boundaries. Thus we need a program that will coordinate efforts of many municipalities and States for the good of all.

My own State of Massachusetts is an example of the good this bill will accomplish. Those of my colleagues who have visited Massachusetts can attest to the beauty of its landscape. The Connecticut River has one of the loveliest basins in the Northeast. Its banks are relatively unspoiled.

But the Connecticut River is polluted. Tons of industrial and home waste over the years have been washed into the river. Many of its beaches are now unsafe for swimming, boating, or other recreation. Four States—Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—border the Connecticut River. Hundreds of municipalities are affected by its course. Water quality control of the Connecticut River is more than a local or a State job. It needs the coordinated effort that this bill will provide.

Another example is the Charles River that runs through my district. The Charles is a famous river of great historical importance. It has been regaled in song and poetry for 200 years. Yet a popular song currently leading the lists mentions the Charles not only as a scenic spot, but as "dirty water."

Those of you who have seen the Charles will remember the beauty of its tree-lined banks and the impressiveness of its bridge-arched flow. But it is useless, even in the spring, for a young man's fancy to turn to anything beautiful if he is in the path of a strong breeze from the Charles. Conditions along the entire length of the river have deteriorated to a point where beaches have been condemned because they are totally unsafe for bathers. Fishing has become a tragedy rather than a sport.

The chief cause of pollution of the Charles River Basin is the overflow of raw sewage and storm drainage. We need many more facilities to cope with this drainage problem; research has to be done to discover efficient and successful ways to prevent pollution as well as methods to eliminate the already existing condition.

The Charles River, like many rivers in our country, is too beautiful to become an open sewer. It has too many historic associations to be relegated to the status of a back alley. Too much beauty, grandeur, utility, and recreation would be lost if the Charles River were lost to posterity.

In the past we have concerned ourselves with necessities, with utility. Now we have the chance to combine what is necessary—a clean water supply—with what is useful—an attractive, unspoiled system of waterways—with what is beautiful—a clean, flowing river.

I know this bill would help Massachusetts. I also know it would help every other State in the Union. The Charles needs help, the Connecticut needs help, and so do the Delaware, the Mississippi, the Colorado, the Merrimack, the Ohio, the Arkansas, the Missouri.

The Charles River, the Connecticut River, the Merrimack River and rivers all across the country can and should be cleaned up. Beaches can be reopened, basins can be stocked, and most importantly, the water can be used and enjoyed.

Many wonderful benefits can come from pollution control, but pollution control itself is a necessity. The rivers and water of the United States should not be lost to posterity, nor should they become a place to be shunned.

In the past year Massachusetts received $3 million in Federal assistance, 1% of what she needs. Under my bill the Federal Government would give Massachusetts $160 million in the next 6 years, a figure that makes clean water a possibility rather than a myth.

I urge support of this bill by all Members of the House. This is the critical point at which we must decide whether we consider clean water important. If we do, I believe this bill will help us to that end.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection 5(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of paragraph (2) of such subsection, and inserting a new paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1969, and $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter, sums so appropriated to remain available until expended."

(b) Such section 5 of the Act is further amended by adding immediately at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) For the purpose of protecting the public health and welfare, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study of the extent of pollution from boats and vessels on such part of the Great Lakes as is under the jurisdiction of the United States, in harbors or ports of such lakes under such jurisdiction and on other navigable waters of the United States, and shall report the results of such study, together with recommendations for an effective program to control the dumping of refuse and the discharge of waste from boats and vessels on such waters, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1967.

"(2) The Secretary shall appoint a technical committee to meet at his discretion and advise in the formulation of recommendations pursuant to this section. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Army, and Commerce, the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, owners and operators of Great Lakes vessels, and such other persons as the Secretary may determine. Members of such technical committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings of such committee or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(3) For the purposes of this section the term—

"(A) 'waste' includes human toilet waste, wash and laundry waste, and kitchen and galley waste; and

"(B) 'refuse' includes garbage, dunnage, and other trash."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of—

"(1) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, or

"(2) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes,

and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary;

"(2) No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 75 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; and

"(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration for the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (1) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose; and

"(2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $25,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (2) of subsection (2), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose.

Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant or contract for the purpose of either such clause (1) or (2) shall be made for any project in any fiscal year in an amount exceeding 12½ per centum of the total amount authorized for the purpose of such clause in such fiscal year."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "and for each succeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $10,000,000".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary, or in an amount exceeding 40 per centum of such reasonable cost if the State agrees to match equally not less than 30 per centum of such estimated reasonable cost of each project in such State approved under this section: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further*, That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality, the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by inserting after "The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section" a comma and the following: "except that in the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments for any fiscal year prior to 1972 shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and adequate funds had been available. In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which was constructed with assistance pursuant to this section but the amount of such assistance was a lesser per centum of the cost of construction than was allowable pursuant to this section, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if adequate funds had been available."

SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 8 is amended by striking out all beginning with "and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

SEC. 8. Section 8 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h)(1) Upon application the Secretary may make a loan to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency to which he has agreed to make a grant pursuant to this section, for the purpose of helping to finance its share of cost of construction for which such grant is to be made. Any such loan shall be made only (A) after the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, or agency has made satisfactory provision for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works being constructed after completion of such construction, and (B) if such State, municipality, or agency shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Secretary determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this section. Loans pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover the cost of the funds of the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made pursuant to this subsection. Such loans may not be used for the State's share of the cost of a project pursuant to a matching agreement entered into under section 8(b)(2).

"(2) Loans pursuant to this subsection shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate but not exceeding forty years.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection but not to exceed a total of $250,000,000. No loan or loans pursuant to this subsection with respect to any one project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of such total."

SEC. 9. Section 10(d)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the last sentence therein the following:

"(2) Whenever the Secretary, upon receipt of reports, surveys, or studies from any duly constituted international agency, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) of this section which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a foreign country is occurring, and the Secretary of State requests him to abate such pollution, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency of the State in which such discharge or discharges originate and to the interstate water pollution control agency, if any, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies, if in his judgment the effect of such pollution on the legitimate uses of the waters is of sufficient significance to warrant such action. The Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall invite the foreign country which may be adversely affected by the pollution to attend and participate in the conference, and the representative of such country shall, for the purpose of the conference and any further proceeding resulting from such conference, have all rights of a State water pollution control agency. This paragraph shall apply only to a foreign country which the Secretary determines has given the United States essentially the same rights with respect to the prevention and control of water pollution occurring in that country as is given that country by this paragraph. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, amend, repeal, or otherwise affect the provision of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between Canada and the United States relative to the control and abatement of water pollution in waters covered by that treaty."

SEC. 10. Section 10(d)(2) is amended to insert after the first sentence thereof the following: "In addition, it shall be the responsibility of the chairman of the conference to give every person contributing to the alleged pollution or affected by it an opportunity to make a full statement of his views to the conference."

SEC. 11. Section 10 is further amended by adding a new subsection (k) to read as follows:

"(k)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose alleged activities result in discharges causing or contributing to water pollution, or whose activities may affect the quality of the waters involved in such conference, to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonable be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of such discharges and the use of facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges by the person filing such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes, and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures."

SEC. 12. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 12 through 16 as sections 14 through 18, and by inserting after section 11 thereof the following new sections 12 and 13:

"CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION PROGRAM

"SEC. 12. (a) In order to reclaim, restore, and maintain the natural waters of the Nation through the preparation and development of comprehensive river basin pollution control and abatement plans and through the establishment of economic incentives to encourage waste treatment consistent with water quality standards effected pursuant to section 10(c) of this Act, the Secretary shall, at the request of the Governor or Governors of one or more States, designate a planning agency which provides for adequate representation of appropriate Federal, State, interstate, local, or when appropriate, international interests in the river basin or portion thereof involved and which is capable of developing an effective, comprehensive water quality control and abatement plan that is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan.

"(b) Each planning agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall develop a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan in a manner which is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan. Such comprehensive pollution control abatement plan (A) shall be consistent with water quality standards established for interstate waters within the river basin pursuant to section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; (B) shall recommend such treatment works and sewer system as will provide the most effective and economical means of collection, storage, treatment, and purification of wastes and which will encourage both municipal and industrial use of such treatment system; and (C) shall provide for maintenance and improvement of water quality standards within the basin or portion thereof and shall include proposed methods of adequately financing those facilities as may be necessary to implement the plan.

"(c) Upon completion of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof, each planning agency shall transmit the plan to the Governor of each State, each interstate agency, international commission, and each local agency covered by the plan or portion thereof. Each person, agency, or commission shall have sixty days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan to submit views, comments, and recommendations. The planning agency shall consider such views, comments, and recommendations and may make appropriate changes or modifications in the proposed plan. The planning agency shall then submit the proposed plan to the Secretary of the Interior together with the views, comments, and recommendations of each such person, agency, or international commission.

"(d)(1) Upon receipt of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof from a planning agency, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council, and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State, for review.

"(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State, shall notify the Secretary of the Interior, within sixty days, of the results of their review.

"(3) The Secretary of the Interior shall review the plan or portion thereof and the agency comments, and, if he determines that the plan or portion thereof adequately and effectively complies with subsection (b), he shall approve the plan or portion thereof.

"(e) After designation of an appropriate planning agency, the Secretary of the Interior may accept applications from and make grants to such local, State, or interstate agencies from such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 8(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to assist in financing construction of treatment works subject to the following limitations: (1) the amount of the grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable construction costs of such treatment works; (2) no application for grants under this section to assist in financing the construction of treatment works in the area included within the jurisdiction of the planning agency shall be approved until the Secretary determines that the proposed project (a) is consistent with and carries out the purpose of this Act, (b) will be properly and efficiently operated and maintained, (c) is designed so that an adequate capacity will be available to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth need of the area, (d) when located, in whole or in part, in urbanized areas, meets the same requirements with respect to planning and programing as shall have been prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to water and sewer projects under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and (e) provides, when appropriate, for joint waste treatment; (3) grants made under this Act shall not be available to assist in financing the construction of any such works which are receiving a Federal grant under other provisions of law: *Provided*, That a Federal grant made pursuant to this section may be increased above this percentage by supplemental grants made pursuant to the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 or title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; (4) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved unless the Governor agrees to establish statewide water quality standards consistent with section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; (5) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved unless the State in which the project is located agrees to provide not less than 30 per centum of the estimated total project cost; and (6) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved, after three years following the date of designation of a planning agency, unless such project is in conformance with an approved plan as provided in subsection (d)(3).

"(f) Subsections 8(g) and 14 (d) and (e), as redesignated herein, shall apply and are made applicable to any grant made by the Secretary pursuant to this section.

"(g) After the Secretary of the Interior approves a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof for a river basin or portion thereof that is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan, an application for a grant to assist in financing the construction of treatment works in such basin or portion thereof made under any other provision of law shall not be approved by the head of any other Federal agency, by the Appalachian Regional Commission or other regional commissions established pursuant to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 unless it substantially conforms, in the judgment of the Secretary, to such plan.

"(h)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to pay such expenses of each planning agency as are necessary to implement formulation of the plan. Each planning agency shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Secretary.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, which sums shall be available until expended.

"(i) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'planning agency' includes, but is not limited to, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress.

"(2) the term 'local, State, or interstate agencies' include States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of a State, publice corporate bodies, public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, Indian tribes, conservancy districts, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress.

"(3) the term 'construction' includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

"(4) the term 'river basin' includes, but is not limited to, land areas drained by a river and its tributaries, coastal waters, estuaries, bays, and lakes.

"(j) Nothing in this section shall be construed to displace, supersede, limit, or modify any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or two or more States and the Federal Government, or to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the Permanent Engineering Board and the United States operating entity or entities established pursuant to the Columbia River Basin Treaty, signed at Washington, January 17, 1961, or the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

"COST AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

"Sec. 13. In order to provide the basis for evaluating programs authorized by this Act, the development of new programs, and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1972, the Secretary, in cooperation with State water pollution control agencies and other water pollution control planning agencies, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act; a comprehensive study of the economic impact on affected units of government of the cost of installation of treatment facilities; and a comprehensive analysis of the national requirements for and cost of treating municipal, industrial, and other effluent to attain such water quality standards as established pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, or applicable State law. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and such comprehensive study of such cost for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1968, to the Congress no later than January 10, 1968, such study to be updated each year thereafter."

Sec. 13. Section 13 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U.S.C. 407) is amended by inserting after the word "thereby" in the second proviso the following: "and whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that it is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.),".

Sec. 14. The Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 604), is amended to read as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Oil Pollution Act, 1924'.

"Sec. 2. When used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"(a) 'oil' means oil of any kind or in any form, including fuel oil, sludge, and oil refuse;

"(b) 'person' means an individual, company, partnership, corporation, or association; any owner, operator, master, officer, or employee of a vessel; any owner, operator, officer, or employee of a shore installation or terminal facility; and any officer, agency, or employee of the United States;

"(c) 'terminal facility' means any pier, wharf, dock, or similar structure to which a vessel may be moored or secured, or upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(d) 'shore installation' means any building, group of buildings, manufacturing or industrial plants, or equipment of any kind adjacent to the navigable waters of the United States, upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(e) 'discharge' means any accidental, negligent, or willful spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or other release of liquid; and

"(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 3. (a) Except in case of emergency imperiling life or property, or unavoidable accident, collision, or stranding, and except as otherwise permitted by regulations prescribed by the Secretary as hereinafter authorized, it is unlawful for any person to discharge or permit the discharge from any boat, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility of oil by any method, means, or manner into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters and adjoining shorelines of the United States.

"(b) Any person discharging or permitting the discharge of oil from any boats, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters of the United States shall remove the same from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines immediately. If such person fails to do so, the Secretary may remove the oil or may arrange for its removal, and such person shall be liable to the United States, in addition to the penalties prescribed in section 4 of this Act, for all costs and expenses reasonably incurred by the Secretary in removing the oil from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines of the United States. When the oil has been discharged from a boat or vessel, these costs and expenses shall constitute a lien on such vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in rem. When the oil has been discharged from a shore installation or terminal facility, these costs and expenses may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam.

"(c) The Secretary may prescribe regulations which—

"(1) permit the discharge of oil from boats or vessels in such quantities, under such conditions, and at such times and places as in his opinion will not be deleterious to health or marine life or a menace to navigation, or dangerous to persons or property engaged in commerce on such waters;

"(2) relate to the loading, handling, and unloading of oil on or contiguous to boats or vessels, shore installations, and terminal facilities; and

"(3) relate to the removal or cost of removal, or both, of oil from the interstate or navigable waters of the United States.

"Sec. 4. (a) Any person who violates section 3(a) of this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment for each offense.

"(b) Any boat or vessel other than a boat or vessel owned and operated by the United States from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000. Clearance of a boat or vessel liable for this penalty from a port of the United States may be withheld until the penalty is paid. The penalty shall constitute a lien on the boat or vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in the district court of the United States for any district within which the boat or vessel may be.

"(c) The owner or operator of a shore installation or terminal facility from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000 which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam in the district court of the United States of the district within which the shore installation or terminal facility is located.

"(d) Any person who violates any regulation prescribed under section 3(c) of this Act shall, if there has been no discharge of oil, be liable for a penalty of not more than $100.

"Sec. 5. The Commandant of the Coast Guard may, subject to the provisions of section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 239), suspend or revoke a license issued to the master or other licensed officer of any boat or vessel found violating the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

"Sec. 6. In the administration of this Act the Secretary may, with the consent of the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Secretary of the Army, make use of the organization, equipment, and agencies including engineering, clerical, and other personnel employed by the Coast Guard or the Department of the Army for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters. And for better enforcement of the provisions of this Act, the officers and agents of the United States in charge of river and harbor improvements, and persons employed under them by authority of the Secretary of the Army, and persons employed by the Secretary, and officers of the customs and Coast Guard of the United States shall have power and authority and it shall be their duty to swear out process and to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who may violate any of said provisions: *Provided,* That no person shall be arrested without process for a violation not committed in the presence of some one of the aforesaid officials: *And provided further,* That whenever any arrest is made under the provisions of this Act, the person so arrested shall be brought forthwith before a commissioner, judge, or court of the United States for examination of the offenses alleged against him and such commissioner, judge, or court shall proceed in respect thereto as authorized by law in cases of crimes against the United States.

"Sec. 7. This Act shall be in addition to other laws for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters and shall not be construed as repealing, modifying, or in any manner affecting the provisions of such laws."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966, REAFFIRMS NEED OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of some circles in this country to play down the annual Captive Nations Week because imperialist Moscow disapproves of it, the 1966 observance has set new records in citizen understanding of the captive nations and in nationwide participation in the event. In contrast to previous years, 36 Governors, or over 75 percent of our States, proclaimed the week. Mayors of all major cities, from Boston to Miami and from Seattle to Los Angeles, likewise proclaimed it, as well as those of numerous smaller cities. In addition, new committees have sprung up, as in Tampa, Fla., and more in New York City. More radio and TV coverage has been given to the week than ever before, and the variety of the observance, ranging from receptions to parades, has expanded considerably under the direction of the National Captive Nations Committee.

Throughout the week emphasis was placed on the need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. It is evident that, at the grass roots, our people do not buy the illusion that the captive nations, the peoples themselves, can be brushed under the rug while the deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence is being relentlessly pursued by Moscow and its Red syndicate. A heavy moral burden rests on our leadership to sustain the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and, at the same time, to uphold the truths about the captivity of these peoples. Anything short of this plays into the political warfare hands of the modern totalitarians in the Red empire. And the best and most effective way to counteract the soporific effects of Moscow's strategy is to establish now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The extent of the 1966 observance can be easily gleaned from these selected items which I request be appended to my remarks. They include:

First. A proclamation by Mayor Joseph W. Barr and his deputy, David Stahl, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Second. The report of the July 31 Free China Weekly on Vice President C. K. Yen's Captive Nations Week address.

Third. The Newark Evening News, July 18, on "Captive Nations Sting Lost," followed by a reply by Mr. Donald L. Miller, executive director of the National Captive Nations Committee, and an editorial "Hope for Freedom" and a report "Will Join in Prayer."

Fourth. The August 1–15 reports in the Ukrainian Bulletin on "Captive Nations Week Observed Throughout the Nation," "Pamphlet on Captive Nations," "Archpastoral Appeal of the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn," "Radio Discussion on Captive Nations," "Urges Support of All Captive Nations," "Discussion on Captive Nations at Georgetown University Forum."

Fifth. The July 21 issue of the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly, on "Captive Nations Week."

Sixth. The published statement of Dr. Guy D. Newman, president of Howard Payne College on "Captive Nations Week Step Toward Reducing Red Rule."

Seventh. An editorial on "L.B.J. Signs Captive Nations Proclamation" in the August 1966 issue of Freedom's Facts.

Eighth. Another editorial on "Captive Nations Week" in the Hairenik Weekly of July 7.

Ninth. The appeal of the Anti-Communist International on Captive Nations Week.

Tenth. An editorial in the July 21 issue of the Hartford Times on "A Noble Cause Lost?"

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossakia, Croatia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support of the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now,

Therefore, I David Stahl, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Deputy Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966 be observed as Captive Nations Week in Pittsburgh, and call upon the citizens of this city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Done this day, July 22, 1966 at the Office of the Mayor, in witness whereof I have hereunto set my signature and cause the Seal of the City of Pittsburgh to be affixed.

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor.
DAVID STAHL,
Deputy Mayor.

[From Free China Weekly]

MAINLAND ANTI-RED WAVE WILL HASTEN PEIPING'S DOWNFALL: YEN

Vice President C. K. Yen said last week that the current purge on the Chinese mainland shows that intellectuals, students and Communist party cadres under the Communists "are fed up with Communism."

"In many ways, they have also manifested their profound interest in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People as well as the traditional Chinese civilization and culture," he said. "Such a change of loyalty constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of the Communists, and, in a sense, forces the Chinese Communists to resort to terroristic measures," Yen said.

Yen was speaking to a "Captive Nations Week" mass rally held in the Taipei City Hall on July 23.

Pointing out that the downfall of the Chinese Communists is imminent despite their ruthless suppression of the people's resistance, Yen said:

"Therefore, this is the right moment for us, the people of the Republic of China, to free our fellow citizens on the mainland. This is also the right moment for all the freedom-loving peoples to destroy the common enemy."

In asserting the Vietnam war as "being waged for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom and liberty of the whole mankind," the Vice President urged immediate aid to the anti-Communist forces in Vietnam by free peoples "to shatter the chains on their enslaved brethren entrapped in the captive nations."

The rally, attended by 2,000 people, was presided over by Ku Cheng-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League (APACL), China Chapter.

Chung Yul Kim, chairman of APACL council, and Dr. Anthony Kubec, chairman of the department of history of the University of Dallas, in Texas, also spoke at the meeting.

The rally adopted a declaration in support of the emancipation of all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

It also sent messages to President Chiang Kai-shek, U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, the government and people of South Vietnam, the allied forces fighting in Vietnam, all captive nations, and the suffering masses on the Chinese mainland.

"CAPTIVE NATIONS" STING LOST

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is not exactly shouting the fact, but he has designated this week as "Captive Nations Week," in keeping with a joint Congressional resolution of 1959 that the White House wishes had never been passed.

Every third week in July, Congress "authorizes and requests" the President to issue a proclamation and to set aside seven days to take note of the world's captive nations.

When the resolution was originally approved, it caused something of a stir because Vice President Richard M. Nixon was in Moscow at the time, and President Eisenhower's proclamation accused the Soviet government of "imperialistic and aggressive" policies.

Nixon, on his return, said Nikita S. Khrushchev told him "This resolution stinks."

Eisenhower took the congressional resolution seriously.

As drafted for Congress by Lev E. Dobriansky, a Georgetown University professor and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the original resolution said "Communist imperialism" had enslaved "a substantial part of the world's population" and that this "makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence."

In 1959 and in 1960, Eisenhower dutifully accused the Soviet government of enslaving various Communist nations, but both President Kennedy and President Johnson, in their proclamations, dropped the reference to the Soviet Union.

This year's proclamation, issued without any fanfare two weeks ago, bears little resemblance to the harsh-sounding 1959 resolution.

Johnson limited himself to saying that "freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples."

Prof. Dobriansky, who was an official in Barry Goldwater's 1964 campaign, is not very happy about the way the Democratic administrations have soft-pedaled the Captive Nations Week resolution.

"High on the priority list in Red psychopolitical warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week," he wrote in the current issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly.

Both the White House and the State Department believe there are better ways of dealing with Communist nations than trading invectives with them. The current U.S. policy is to take advantage of the growing autonomy of the various Communist nations—and deal with them wherever possible.

This "building bridges" policy calls for a gradual increase in commerce and cultural exchanges and more encouragement to tourism. The long-range hope is that the liberal, less doctrinaire forces in these countries will come to the fore—thereby improving the life of the peoples of these nations, and indirectly, increasing their freedom.

Dobriansky says this is "foggy and murky talk . . . figments of confused minds." In the words of the old Goldwater campaign, he calls for "positive victory in the Cold War." His only recommendation, however, seems to be a complete isolation of the Communist lands—something that hardly is possible today.

A troublesome aspect of Captive Nations Week is the actual list of nations that Congress considered "captive" in 1959. Presumably Cuba would be a latecomer. This is the list—and quiz yourself if you can place them all geographically:

Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam.

Presumably some top scholars would have trouble with White Ruthenia, Idel-Ural, and Cossackia. They might even doubt that some of them ever were "nations" in the sense that they had viable governments.

Some Russian emigres have been unhappy that the Russians were not listed as "captives." And various Yugoslav emigres have complained about their homeland's omission. Actually, Congress appended an "and others" to the list, so it is possible to add any nation at any time.

JULY 20, 1966.

Mr. BERNARD GWERTZMAN,
The Washington Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GWERTZMAN: Thank you for writing about Captive Nations. We agree, at least, that our best hope of peace is to bring liberal forces to the fore in captive nations and thus increase the freedom of the peoples. As their freedom increases, we can hope that the aggression of their governments internally and externally will decrease. So there is no conflict on goals.

There are many disagreements on means and we feel that these deserve widespread discussion. Men who graduate from college, go into State, travel the embassy route, and end at the policy level have one kind of experience and point of view to offer. Former Ambassadors, government officials, businessmen, housewives, students, labor leaders who lived under Communist rule and escaped as refugees have a different, and, we believe, more realistic, kind of experience to provide.

We were very pleased with the President's proclamation this year, especially since he released it on July 8, the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell and first public announcement of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia in 1776. This symbolism will be noted throughout the Communist Empire. Our Declaration, if you recall, was made not for Americans alone, but in the name of all mankind. During Captive Nations Week we reaffirm that stand for the just aspirations for freedom of peoples throughout all captive nations.

If you are a materialist and believe man has no soul and no mind aside from what spirit and thought created by his physical environment, then this means nothing to you. But if you believe, as we do, that man has a spirit and a mind and that both can work to change environment to fit any image man choses, then both the Declaration of Independence and the Captive Nations Week Resolution have great significance.

Then, let's discuss the ways of building bridges to individual freedom and national independence, not only bridges made of consumer goods but ones of the spirit, as well. We are carrying on one half of a dialogue. So far there are not many answers from the other side. But these, in time, will increase as people become convinced that freedom and independence are not merely aspirations they share with us, but are human rights—civil rights, if you will—which people working together can gain for themselves. One day, we can all hope, we will be carrying on free dialogue on every subject. The Iron and Bamboo Curtains will be gone. The Berlin wall will be gone. The Cold War will be over.

May I add—in fact, I cannot resist it—that first, Russia is, in a sense, a captive nation—a fact which Khrushchev recognized without being told and so was motivated to attack Mr. Nixon on this issue in 1959 by pointing out Russians in a park and shouting—There are our captives. Where are their chains? Lenin seized Russia from moderate parliamentarian socialists, who had overthrown the Czar by means of military coup d'etat.

Second, Yugoslavia is not a nation but a country composed of three main nations—Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. These, too, must be considered captive peoples since they are forced to live under an absolute, totalitarian Communist Party as President Tito just recently has demonstrated. Likewise Czechoslovakia is a country made up from the Czech and Slovak nations, as anyone who carries on dialogues with these two peoples quickly discovers.

Sincerely,

DONALD L. MILLER,
Executive Director.

[From the Newark Evening News, July 18, 1966]

HOPE FOR FREEDOM

Imperialism being a sin for which it continually reproaches the West, the Soviet Union naturally is pained by the observance in the United States, by presidential proclamation, of Captive Nations Week.

Mikhail Suslov, a Soviet spokesman, last year called the observance "particularly repulsive," and from his standpoint it would be. For Captive Nations Week keeps the world from forgetting the Russian imperialism that engulfed the Baltic states and the Soviet military force that keeps other Eastern countries in subjection.

Imperialism has become an anachronism everywhere except in communism's self-righteous sphere. And Captive Nations Week offers its victims a spark of hope that the tide of history will one day restore their freedom and independence.

WILL JOIN IN PRAYER—NEW JERSEY CHURCHES TO HAVE SERVICES FOR OPPRESSED

Churches of various denominations throughout the state will observe the beginning of Captive Nations Week today with services in which prayers will be offered for the return of democracy behind the Iron Curtain.

The week has been dedicated to Iron Curtain countries by President Johnson.

A sign over the entrance of City Hall here will ask residents to remember citizens of the nations taken over by communism mostly following World War II.

There are an estimated 50,000 refugees from these countries in New Jersey. They include Hungarians, many of whom fled here after the uprising in 1956. Others are from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

IN MANY STATES

Captive Nations Week is observed annually with church services, and in numerous states with demonstrations and rallies.

The observances last year were described by Mikhail Suslov, a major party theoretician in the Soviet Union, as "particularly repulsive."

Said Nicholas L. Chirovsky, spokesman for the Newark and vicinity branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: "Suslov's statement indicates that the celebration of Captive Nations Week to some extent gives a shot in the arm to the people of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. We hope in this way to keep the spark of hope in the hearts of those to whom liberty is denied."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED THROUGHOUT THE NATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The week of July 17 to July 23, 1966 marked the 8th national observance of Capitive Nations Week with observances, gatherings, rallies and public manifestations held in all major U.S. cities, and in many countries of the free world.

Nationwide observances in the United States were sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in conjunction with many American national and ethnic organizations.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY URGE SUPPORT FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

In Washington both President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY issued special proclamations urging the American people to lend their support to the just cause of the captive nations everywhere.

President Johnson, in his proclamation said that "the United States of America from its founding as a nation has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty," and since the "basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world," he appealed to and urged the American people "to give devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

In a similar vein Vice President HUMPHREY stressed the importance of the Captive Nations Week cause and expressed a belief in the forthcoming day of liberation of all who are presently subjugated by Communist tyranny.

CONCERN EXPRESSED IN U.S. CONGRESS

During the Captive Nations Week many U.S. Senators and Congressmen issued appropriate statements expressing support of the captive nations in their struggle for freedom and national independence.

Prior to Captive Nations Week 1966 Dr. Dobriansky, as President of the National Captive Nations Committee, sent an appeal to every U.S. Senator and every Congressman urging them to participate in this year's observance of Captive Nations Week and to give their full and sympathetic support to the cause of the captive nations. Recalling last year's attack on the Captive Nations Week observance in this country by Mikhail Suslov, top Soviet ideologist, Dr. Dobriansky expressed hope that U.S. legislators will take pride in speaking out in behalf of the freedom aspirations and struggle of all the captive nations in Central Europe, the USSR, Asia and Cuba.

PASTORAL LETTER BY UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC METROPOLITAN

In Philadelphia, Pa. the Most Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States, issued a special Pastoral Letter on the occasion of the Captive Nations

Week observance and urged the clergy and the faithful of his Archdiocese to say special prayers for the speedy liberation of the captive nations.

GOVERNORS AND MAYORS ACTIVE

In many States of the Union and in cities throughout the nation special proclamations were issued by Governors and Mayors urging their respective citizens to observe Captive Nations Week and thus support the captive peoples everywhere. In New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Tucson, Phoenix, Omaha, Miami, and many other cities, special manifestations were held by local Captive Nations Committees. All Branches and Member Organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America took part in these observances and in many localities led in the preparation and implementation of special programs.

Pamphlet on Captive Nations

Prior to the "Captive Nations Week 1966" 1,300 copies of *The Traditional Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope,* a reprint of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky's article from *The Ukrainian Quarterly* (Vol. XXII, No. 2, Summer, 1966) were distributed by the UCCA office in New York and the National Captive Nations Committee office in Washington. Recipients of the pamphlet were all U.S. Senators and Congressmen, all Governors, all foreign missions to the U.N. and major U.S. newspapers, radio and TV stations throughout the country.

Archpastoral Appeal of the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., Archbishop and Metropolitan of Philadelphia, on Captive Nations Week, 1966

Throughout the course of mankind's history evil has made its scene in diverse ways. We read of the woes of war which many of you have personally endured; epidemics; massacres; slavery; persecutions and serfdom. For us, however, such evils have passed. But another evil exists in our day and age which has stretched out its red veil over captive nations behind the iron, the bamboo, and the sugar curtains and threatens the free world. This evil is none other than atheistic communism.

We are grateful to the Lord that the United States is aware of the fate of captive nations. America is convinced of the dreadful fate of many nations. Thus the joint resolution of Congress, ratified by both the House of Representatives and the Senate on July 17, 1959 sanctioned the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation designating the third week of the month of July as Captive Nations Week until such time when all the nations of the world attain freedom and independence. This proclamation recalls for everyone the frightful picture of communist tyranny over captive peoples.

The question can be properly asked in this twentieth century why so many peoples suffer under the oppression of the hammer and the sickle. Why did communist authorities starve millions of Ukrainians to death? Why did so many sons and daughters of the Ukraine perish in dungeons and the taiga or swampy Siberian forests? Why is the forced resettlement of the youth of Ukraine in the remote regions of the USSR being tolerated by the world? Why are hundreds of thousands of innocent people undergoing the tortures of the secret police, brainwashing and other cruelties? Why did the communist regime liquidate the Ukrainian Catholic Church and other churches in Ukraine? Why are millions of refugees not permitted to return to their homelands? Why does the communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and confusion in the free world? Why does the communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among Ukrainian organizations in the free world? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

To all of these questions there is but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that an evil tree cannot bear good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourists there are untold restrictions as to what they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of communist tyranny because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the USSR. The Vicars of Christ have spoken their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is essentially evil, because it casts away Divine laws and Christian mortality. It deprives men of human rights and the very dignity of humanity.

Thus, in our times, the petition in the Lord's Prayer: ". . . deliver us from evil," has a special significance and need, since Captive Nations Week is only one small step to liberation of the Ukrainian and other captive peoples from the shackles of communism. It hardly sufficies but to emphasize the communistic evil. What is really necessary are sincere prayers and good works, consonant with the words of the Ukrainian poet, Bohdan Lepky: "It isn't tears we need, but rather power of spirit."

We must pray for those who are in captivity, apparently forgotten by the world and dying far from loved ones at the hands of henchmen. Let us pray for the godless traitors and tormentors of Christ's Church, so that persecuting Sauls might become liberating Pauls. Let us pray also for ourselves, so that selfish materialism, which surrounds us everywhere, would not ensnare our hearts and make us soulless monsters, deaf to the crying needs of our people.

We trust that Captive Nations Week will stir consciences to works of mercy and help for the sick, old displaced persons and those behind the iron curtain who are in desperate need of our aid. Many of them live in hunger, cold and want.

Therefore, I appeal to the hearts of Catholic Ukrainians, that Captive Nations Week be a time of prayer and good deeds for our needy brothers and sisters, whose fate was less gracious than ours.

I direct all the Very Reverend and Reverend clergy to take up a collection during Liturgies in all churches of the Archeparchy on Sunday, July 17, 1966.

I ask and implore all the faithful to make their contribution generous, as the needs of the poor and indigent are great. Disheartening letters of those in dire straits to the Ukrainian Catholic Committee for Refugees in Philadelphia bear this out. Hearken to the words of Sacred Scripture: "It is more blessed to give, than to receive." (Acts 20, 25).

Radio Discussion on Captive Nations

On July 10–11, 1966, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the UCCA, and Congressman Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois participated in a radio discussion on "Captive Nations Week." The discussion was carried over four radio stations in Illinois and Indiana.

Urges Support of All Captive Nations

(Editor's Note.—The following two letters by Miss Vera A. Dowhan of Washington, D.C., are self-explanatory. The first was sent to The Washington Post, The Evening Star and The Washington Daily News and stresses the national importance of the captive nations. The second letter, sent to the N.Y. Daily News, correct the impression made by an editorial in said paper which emphasized only a few captive nations, and bypassed the majority of them.)

In the course of our Nation's history, perhaps no Congressional resolution has shown more substantive proof of this country's position as a vanguard of freedom than the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) passed by Congress in 1959. And, perhaps too, no resolution has been more grievously attacked by anti-freedom governmental systems. But quite possibly, the greatest pain in freedom's side is the one inflicted by some confused Americans who through lack of knowledge as pertains to these peoples—historic, geographic, ethnographic, linguistic—fail or refuse to recognize the great value potential of the resolution's context. To them, the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains are more an occult phenomena than a hope of eventual reality. To speak in behalf of these millions of beleaguered political slaves is to be type-cast as "political," "partisan" or even "radical." Since when has the pursuit of freedom become synonymous with any of these?

With the signing of the first proclamation in 1959 by the President of the United States designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and in every Presidential proclamation thereafter, the message carries the same rich overtone—that freedom-loving Americans join in appropriate ceremonies and recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom, and that these proclamations and commemorations be continued until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the Red world. Within recent years these commemorative ceremonies have gone beyond our shores. The Week is now also observed in countries of Europe and Asia.

This year, July 17–23 marks the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week. Adding impetus to this yearly celebration is the date on which the 1966 proclamation was signed, July 8, the date of the ringing of the Liberty Bell when the Declaration of Independence was made public in 1776. Additional import augmenting both the proclamation and the date, was the President's signing of the Congressional measure creating the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission at the same time.

That the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations have been associated simultaneously with the maxims of the American Revolution and our Declaration of Independence only lends magnitude to the cardinal virtue of justice. For Public Law 86–90, the terms "political," "partisan" and "radical" fast lose their vengeful implications as, slowly but surely, the scales of justice outweigh tyranny.

Your editorial of July 8, "Captive Nations Week," was gravely inaccurate and misleading. The conduct of the annual Captive Nations Week observances has been almost entirely undertaken by the National Captive Nations Committee, headquartered in Washington, D.C. If you would but consult the Congressional Record in July and August of every year, you would find all the necessary data substantiating this fact. As for the Assembly of Captive European Nations demonstrating any real sympathy for the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, this is virtually nil. The few captive nations in Central Europe for which ACEN exclusively speaks, and this in an emigre rather than an American voice, constitute just a small segment of the entire family of captive nations. Those in the Soviet Union, in Asia and in Cuba, far exceed the few in Central Europe.

Discussion on Captive Nations at Georgetown University Forum

Washington, D.C.—On June 28, 1966 a roundtable panel discussion was held on the captive nations at the Georgetown University TV and radio forum, with three panelists and specialists on the problem taking part. Those participating in the discussion, entitled "Captive Nations: Forgotten?", were: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, and President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) and also President of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC); Lt. Col. Philip J. Corso (Ret.), Military Analyst and Assistant to the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, and Frank van der Linden; Wallace Fanning was the moderator.

The discussion ran along the following lines:

Since 1959, when the Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed by the U.S. Congress, Moscow and its Red totalitarian associates and puppets have persistently denounced the resolution and called for its repeal.

During the 1965 Captive Nations Week Observance, the top Russian ideologist and member of the Soviet Presidium, Mikhail Suslov, had this to say: "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke."

Is one an "imperialistic chieftain" in the United States when he supports an act of Congress directed toward the eventual freedom of all the captive nations? What is it in the Resolution that has produced this unprecedented scare in Russia's Kremlin over this entire period? How is Captive Nations Week related to current developments in the Red Empire, to Vietnam, to the so-called policy of building bridges of understanding, and to America's posture in the Cold War? These are fundamental questions which the panelists discussed during the program.

[From the Wanderer, July 21, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Reprinted from the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XXII, No. 2, summer, 1966, New York, N.Y.)

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Confusion, misdirected thinking, and the repetition of old errors dominate the current scene in the United States and thus much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the superb maneuver engineered by Moscow in the last decade under the deceptive banner of "peaceful co-existence." Continue to build and strengthen the empire within, while all feasible forces are utilized to undermine the enemy without has been the practical essence of this highly successful maneuver. The functionaries in Moscow's Agitprop have good reason to gloat over the results and doubtless are banking on even phenomenal successes in the near future.

The needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, self-paralyzing absurdities about "arrogant power," "escalation," and "containment" again, the steady over-all Red penetrations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, the repeated softening-up process on Communism in our own body politic, and the insidious deterioration of our national will for positive victory, whether military or psycho-political, are only a few evidences of the new pattern of confusion and old errors. As though the lessons of U.S. trade with the Axis Powers in World War II were never learned, the present drive for easy trade with the Red Empire is another point of evidence. Self-nurtured illusions about "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe, "the evaporation of the Cold War," a materially explosive Peking-Moscow showdown, and the spread of peace-orienting "capitalism" in the empire also have their able precedents in the illusions of the 30's, when the nature of modern imperio-colonialist totalitarianism eluded the understanding of that generation.

What in all these years has been a cardinal objective of the totalitarian Red Syndicate is a progressive Free World disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations, the oppressed peoples themselves, as against the Red States dominated by totalitarian Communist Parties. The enormous advantages of achieving this should be obvious: easier consolidation of the empire, stronger posture for Cold War successes in the Free World, and the moral and political demolishment of Free World democracies. This Red objective, shared by all in the syndicate, is a crucial and integral part of Red psycho-political warfare which Brezhnev, in his report to the 23rd Party Congress last March, lauded as the prime, unsurpassed weapon wielded by "a political army of revolutionaries for class struggles." (Leonid Brezhnev, Report to 23rd Party Congress, Pravda, March 31st, 1966.) The heavy emphasis placed at the Congress on the "great, complex art" in "leadership of class struggle"—meaning the imperio-colonialist art of psycho-political warfare—is unmistakable as to what we can expect in the years ahead.

High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week. This has been evident since 1959, and unfortunately some in this country have sought to assist Moscow and the syndicate in realizing this aim. One major element that they hope to capitalize on is a protracted American ignorance of the many captive nations in the Red Empire, particularly in the U.S.S.R. Another is the significance of the Week in the current struggle, measured especially by their own reactions. The mountain of evidence formed since 1959 clearly shows that Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the side of the Red totalitarians and their efforts to expand the Red Empire chiefly through the art of psycho-political warfare. As in many other cases, they depend on apathy, distraction, indifference, ignorance, and even educated stupidity to accomplish their work for them.

THE ABC'S OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements of misunderstanding and cultured ignorance can contribute to Moscow's ends. A sterling example of this was an editorial in a Washington paper that was promptly refuted by the writer. ("Irritating The Bear," *The Washington Post,* July 24th, 1959; author's reply, July 29th, 1959.) In 1964, another editorial attack against the captive nations in the same organ evoked delight and praise in Moscow. (Izvestia, July 15th, 1964.) To identify the misleading and disinforming sources among us and, at the same time, to prevent Red manipulation of such misguiding opinions, it is most essential for every American to become familiar with the ABC's of Captive Nations Week.

The Week is sponsored each year by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was the honorary chairman of the committee from 1960 to 1964; Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has occupied this position since 1965. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate are members of NCNC. Every year half of the Governors issue Captive Nations Week proclamations, as does every Mayor in each of our major cities.

NCNC is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals and organizations. Its activities are mainly supported by local Captive Nations Committees that extend from Boston to Miami, Washington, D.C. to San Francisco. Almost every major city has a committee made up of citizens who are quite versed in the ABC's of the Week. In the past few years the movement has extended overseas so that observances now are held in Free China, West Germany, Turkey, and Sweden. Much of this steady growth is regularly noted in the U.S. Congress which legislated the Week in 1959.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

It is often curious that some commentators who write about the Week give every evidence of never having read the resolution and law upon which it is based. For example, one writer has this to say: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes." (Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," *Saturday Evening Post,* December 16th, 1961.) As I pointed out in another article, this comment is "a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction." (Lev. E. Dobriansky, "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism And The Free World," NATO's Fifteen Nations, September, 1963.) Fact, the Russians violent denunciation; illogic, the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; fiction, Congress' passing it every year to attract minority votes. Now, to see how writers can misguide, read the resolution which is Public Law 86–90, one of the ABC's:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

"*Whereas,* the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"*Whereas,* this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"*Whereas,* the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful co-existence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"*Whereas,* since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"*Whereas,* the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others; and

"*Whereas,* these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas,* it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"*Whereas,* the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"*Whereas*, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

"*Now, therefore*, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

"*The President* is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

The reader will observe that in its fifth paragraph the resolution contains an open-end clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes with certain House members who were offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to insert "and others" in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our public with some old ones. Here, too, the force of stubborn and narrow preconception had to be combatted.

Perspective is the usual, lacking quality in the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Communists, and "independent" and "Soviet-dominated" Red States. Similar distinctions were concocted in the 30's with respect to the imperio-colonialist totalitarians of that period, and easy trade, cultural exchange and other devices were also employed then in the interest of world peace. The list below clearly shows the unitary base of the Red Syndicate; it shows the phenomenal success of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians, building an unprecedented empire in the span of less than fifty years and with strikingly inferior resources; it also indicates the poverty of U.S. foreign policy, which committed two colossal political blunders in this century (contributing to the power of the Soviet Russian Empire both after World War I and during World War II) and is now on the brink of committing another with East-West trade plans, the Consular Convention and other myopic measures.

There is nothing like success, and this list is the roll call of Red success, primarily in psycho-political warfare. Given the same course of U.S. foreign policy and the pathetic absence of psycho-political warfare training, this list is bound for extension. Read it carefully and think:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—WHO'S NEXT?

Country and people and year of Communist domination

Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's next? South Vietnam? Guinea? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

THE ABC'S AND SOME BASIC ISSUES

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly on the issues basic to the security and freedom of our Nation. Some of these issues deserve mention here. One is an intelligent, concentrated effort focussed on the fundamental reality of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In the United Nations or elsewhere we have done virtually nothing in this fundamental respect. The more the Red totalitarians prattle about American imperialism," the more millions of minds about the world will believe it.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensible liberation policy as the best guarantee against both a hot global war and an interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful paramilitary engagement, wasn't sufficiently understood in the 50's, and, with the reemerging discussion on "containment" today, not to speak of further Communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy of patched-up containment. How unrealistic the proponents of containment are can be gleaned from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped over the Maginot-like containment wall years ago, into Cuba in our Hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through means of calculated, psycho-political warfare, which is even being applied forthrightly in our own country today.

Thirdly, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is necessary for obvious symbolic, legislative, and educational reasons. Equally necessary is the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy for psycho-political warfare training.

Other significant issues are the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R., which should be repudiated by the Senate because it plays into Russian imperio-colonialist hands, and liberalized East-West trade, which should be strongly opposed as a blind repetition of our errors of the 30's and falling into the trap of an over-all Red economic strategy that by now should have been honestly portrayed to our people.

THE UNITARY REALITY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "containment," "building bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of confused minds, there is one massive, unitary reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception—the captivity of close to a billion people. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in Red States, but they are not of these States.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire. The mistakes being made today are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change demands revisions of thought, policy, and action. An ever-broadening knowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R., propels such change—a change for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

NEWMAN SAYS "CAPTIVE NATIONS" WEEK STEP TOWARD REDUCING RED RULE

Dr. Guy D. Newman, president of Howard Payne College and founder of its Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom, thinks that Captive Nations Week may bring about measures which tend to reduce the control of Communist regimes over the captive nations.

Dr. Newman concurs with Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., who conceived the idea of Captive Nations Week, "that the basic truths about Soviet Russian imperialism, genocide and colonialist exploitation in the USSR, as well as the oppression of the captive peoples by their totalitarian governments, are reaching more and more Americans."

Dr. Newman pointed out that the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week—it started in 1959—has steadily grown, and more than half of our states have issued official proclamations, and practically every major city likewise.

He said that one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate have become members of the National Captive Nations Committee, which guides the annual observance.

"This week," Dr. Newman said, "is the time for all Americans to again raise their voices to honor the enslaved half of the world."

"We must," he said, "emphasize again the things that must be done if the long list of captive nations—from Cuba to Hungary to Ukraine to North Viet Nam—is not to be extended and if our sins of omission today are not to result in unnecessary sacrifices of American life and treasure tomorrow."

Chief theme of the special week, Dr. Newman believes, is "the building of bridges of understanding with the captive nations—the people themselves, rather than with the illegitimate regimes that hold them in bondage and politico-economic slavery."

"The Academy of Freedom at HPC is rapidly becoming a symbol of a bridge of understanding that can be one link in the mutual struggle for freedom—their freedom regional and ours preserved," opines Dr. Newman.

"To believe," Dr. Newman said, "that by arriving at understandings with the Communist rulers we shall be furthering the freedom of the captive nations is not only an illusion but also an affront to common political sense."

"In addition," he opined that, "our wishful thinking about the early end of the Cold War—in itself a striking achievement of Moscow's peaceful coexistence policy—has blinded us to the realities of the Red Empire and has exposed us to further illusions about mellowed Communists in Moscow and Warsaw, independent Communists in Bucharest and Belgrade, and the growing nationalism among satellite Communist regimes."

The Captive Nations Week has great educational value, thinks Dr. Newman: "Its observance clearly outlines the perfidy, deception, and longrun dangers of Moscow's peaceful coexistence strategy. This strategy has four dimensions: (1) to lull the West into a state of confusion, friction and demoralization (2) with this advantage of a breather, to consolidate the Communist empire through necessary economic changes, the elimination of all remaining resistance, the suppression of patriotic bourgeois nationalism and the strict maintenance of totalitarian power in the various Communist parties within the Soviet orbit (3) to pursue wars of liberation, in the underdeveloped areas of the free world, and (4) to strive to attain a scientific breakthrough in military and space technology that would facilitate a political blackmail of the West into surrender.

L.B.J. SIGNS CAPTIVE NATIONS PROCLAMATION

President Lyndon B. Johnson timed the signing of the nation's eighth Captive

Nations Week Proclamation for July 8 to coincide with the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell and the public announcement of our Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia July 8, 1776.

In his proclamation, President Johnson stated that the Congress authorizes the President to issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world".

The proclamation declares that "it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles (of national independence and human liberty) and to encourage their realization by all people."

Lest we forget, Public Law 86–90 lists the captive nations as "Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam and others." To this list can be added Cuba and Russia herself, the first nation of the world to be captured by the Communists.

Captive Nations Week proclamations have been issued since 1959 by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Hairenik Weekly, July 7, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The New England Committee for Captive Nations has released some highly illuminating data on Soviet imperialism (see elsewhere in this issue) which should be made the basis of deep thought and commensurate action during the captive nations week observances this season—July 17–23—in keeping with the President's Proclamation for 1966.

It turns up that the monumental fraud which is called the "Soviet Union" is not a Russian ethnic entity as the concept of nationhood generally is understood, but it is a congerie of once-independent but recently Soviet-enslaved nationalities forcibly held within the Soviet orbit.

This artificially-held imperialistic monstrosity includes such one time independent countries as Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Estonia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Caucasus, Siberia, Turkestan, Ukraine and White Ruthenia. This is the so-called Soviet Union proper which, in essence, is not a union, for union or confederation implies a voluntary merger on the part of constituent elements, but is a despotism of the first order.

But, outside of the limits of this ethnological and political fraud, the Soviet Union wields a power over vast stretches of the globe which, not even Great Britain, in the classic days when "the sun never set on England's frontiers" could ever boast to command.

This vast satellite empire of captives includes Albania, Bulgaria, China (mainland), Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, and latterly, Cuba.

Another revealing fact which, in the confusion of minds, apparently has managed to escape the attention of the general public, is that "there are in the USSR today only 96,000,000 Russians as against their 119,000,000 non-Russian captives," a grim statistical reality which belies the very nature and the character of the vaunted ethnic solidarity.

This Machiavellian spawn which struts and frets across the globe, believe it or not, contains the staggering total of 820,000,000 people—almost one quarter of the world's population, ruled by the elite of a minority force.

The New England Committee for Captive Nations reveals that, "by actual count, there are 126 different and distinct nationalities in the Soviet Union. . .While the British, French, Belgian and Dutch empires have all but vanished, the Soviet empire continues to grow. The USSR emerged from World War II with a gain of 262,000 square miles with 22,000,000's of people."

"What emerges then," the Committee continues in conclusion, "is the picture of the Greatest Colonial Empire in history and a classic example of the forcible dominance of a majority by a minority."

These are staggering figures and facts which, although known to the historian, should be made the property of the rank and file of the population of the world in order to gain a clear idea of the enormity of the evil which has spawned and grown into incontrollable proportions demanding serious attention of the governments and the peoples of the world who are interested in the promotion of human justice and the preservation of the peace.

Captive Nations Week, on the other hand, has been observed for a number of years, and the question which haunts us is, what progress have we made in the direction of attaining our goal? If these annual observances shall have any meaning at all, we should see some concrete results and the effort should produce some tangible indications of a growing progress that we are making a breach in the Soviet wall.

In the name of social justice and the right to self-determination of nations the Soviet wrought havoc with the Western powers and practically liquidated the so-called colonial nations, demanding freedom and independence to peoples who were hardly prepared for either of these blessings and who were a thousand times better off under colonial rule.

It was high time that we united and turned the tables on the Soviet, the greatest fraud of the twentieth century, and brought about her complete liquidation.

And isn't it time the United States Government were to encourage the formation of the long-delayed "Special Committee on Captive Nations," so that facts, such as adduced by the New England Committee, would become readily available to the general public?

[July 16, 3 P.M., in front of the Soviet Headquarters, center of the international Communist conspiracy and Russian imperialism in the U.S.A.]

AN APPEAL TO ALL LOYAL AND ANTI-COMMUNIST AMERICANS

From 16 to 23 July, we are celebrating in the United States The Week of Captive Nations which are victims of Communist Russian imperialism. Soviet Russia, which spent large amounts of money to help eliminate Western-European colonialism in Asia and Africa, is today the biggest colonial empire in existence. This empire, hiding behind communist ideology, dominates and controls 33 nationalities of different religious, cultural, ethnic, linguistic and historical backgrounds. These peoples, known as "Non-Russians" inside the Soviet Union and as "the Satellites" in Eastern Europe, have been subjugated by force of Russian arms and are controlled from Communist Moscow.

It is imperative that all Americans protest the practices of the Soviet imperialists and call for the self-determination of the peoples now under its heel.

We urge your participation in the demonstration to protest Soviet Imperialism, which will gather in front of the Soviet Embassy, 136 East 67th Street, on July 16 at 3 p.m.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed, and all nations liberated.

Anti-Communist International.

Anti-Communists of the World, Unite! Captive Nations Fight For Liberation Together!

[July 16, 3 p.m., 136 East 67 Street, New York]

In Front of the Soviet Headquarters Center of the International Communist Conspiracy and Russian Imperialism in the U.S.A.

Mass Demonstration and Manifestation.

People of all Captive Nations and Genuine anti-Communists of the United States will make this date Historic!

The United Committee of all Captive Nations.

All Cuban Front.

American Anti-Communists.

Anti-Communist International.

For information contact our 16th July phone service OXford 7–5895 from 8:45 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday. During the weekends call: GR 5–4789. Mail Address: P.O. Box 1095, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed, and all nations liberated.

CAPTIVE NATIONS FIGHT FOR LIBERATION TOGETHER!—ANTI-COMMUNISTS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

ANTI-COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Why the Anti-Communist International?

Because the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world is an international organization, with headquarters in Moscow.

Because this international conspiracy wishes to isolate the United States as a special "capitalist and imperialist foe" and then bury it; by promoting internal dissensions and dividing our leaders.

Because no serious opposition has yet arisen to curb Communism in either the United States or other parts of the world.

Because national differences still resist a united anti-Communist policy.

Because now is the time for anti-Communist forces all over the world to act—not debate co-existence with or how to combat Communism, but to destroy it.

What is the ACI?

The ACI is a group of dedicated anti-Communists all over the world actually aware of what must be done now to bury Communism before it buries the rest of the world.

What the ACI is doing—

Uniting individual anti-Communists and groups into a vital and aggressive international force to eliminate communism in all forms.

Providing anti-Communist answers to political, economic, and moral questions in all parts of the world.

Furnishing a positive anti-Communist idea and background for peoples behind the Iron Curtain to overthrow the tyranny of Communism.

WHAT THE ACI MEANS TO AMERICA

Anti-Communists all over the world know that co-existence is non-existent. All look to the people of America to use the resources and intelligence that made them world-leaders for help in checking and overthrowing Communism.

Through the ACI, we are taking the advantage of psychological warfare away from the Communists and turning it against them. As the ACI gains strength, other fronts will be opened.

The first step is the anti-Communist international conference for liberation of the captive nations, to build the instruments like, liberty money, militias, and the economics social political programs.

Join the A.C.I.—be a card-carrying A.C.I. Man be a helper here or in any part in the world your help and actions will bring the everlasting peace, will free the budgets of all nations to solve the problems, like poverty, illiteracy, diseases and undevelopment communism and their H. Q. in Moscow must be destroyed, to solve this problems.

Anti-Communist International, P.O. Box 4956, Miami, Fla., P.O. Box, 1095 N.Y. 10017.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Tims, July 21, 1966]

A Noble Cause Lost?

By proclamation of President Johnson, this is Captive Nations Week. It has become an annual custom in this country to memorialize the countries of Eastern Europe occupied for many years by the Soviet Union or ruled as Soviet satrapies.

Each of those countries is represented in the United States by a large number of refugees and other immigrants, most of whom are now well into middle age. All lament the lost liberties of their martyred nations. Organized into nostalgic and emotional associations, they call on Congress to pass resolutions supporting the eventual liberation of the captive nations; they ask editors to remind the public of the crimes committed against liberty by the Soviet government, and they sponsor special religious and cultural activities in commemoration of the glory and independence long gone.

In the judgment of those who are not emotionally involved, all this seems futile. The captive nations—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and the rest—were never rich or powerful. Throughout medieval and modern history they were always buffer states, each now a province of one mighty neighbor, perhaps for a few years a dependent princedom, then seized by the neighbor on the other side and subjugated as a prize for one of his lieutenants. It is astonishing that they nurtured so tenacious a culture of their own.

In the long view of history, it seems the captive nations are undergoing a change of masters. In our time it is the Soviet Union that wields the power. Tomorrow it may be some other conqueror. In any event, tears and anger spent on assailing and reviling the occupier are wasted for he cannot be ousted.

That is the objective, realistic attitude. And yet, and yet. . . .

During World War II, the German panzer divisions and air force delivered most of Europe to the oppression of the Gestapo, the quislings and the coldly efficient administrators from Berlin. The lamp of liberty flickered out. Today, the Nazi idology is the property of a few scattered crackpots, the party hierarchy is dead except for pitiable Hess in his lonely cell in Spandau Prison, and there is a whole generation of Europeans born in freedom.

Ireland was occupied for seven centuries by the mighty English, and today Ireland is a free republic. The existence of Israel is the realization of an impossibility.

Who is to say what hurricanes of change may blow across Europe next year or next decade?

No realistic thinker on this date would invest a penny in the chance of revival of any of the captive nations. But love and patriotism don't ask for logic. They survive in songs, in national costumes, in folk dances, in monuments of literature. The names of the heroes are passed down from parents to children, and if the accents change and the old languages fall into disuse, the heartbeat at least is constant.

Let the Americans who came from the captive nations celebrate their old flags and revive their feelings of outrage. Some day, some time now beyond estimate, the dreams may become reality.

To call the roll: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Romania—a succession of names in which there is the thunder of drums and the whisper of hope.

CULVER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO SHOW THAT AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ARE NOT SUBSIDIZING THE FARMER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Culver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from **Florida**?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will make it clear that the bulk of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture provide benefits to the consumer, businessman, and the general public, and are not directed to subsidizing the American farmer.

The objective of this measure is to achieve a greater understanding of the role of government in agriculture among the general public, and to hopefully help clarify the apparent misunderstanding among certain administration spokesmen about the economic condition of the American farmer today.

I find it extremely disturbing to read in the Nation's urban newspapers suggestions that the taxpayers are paying a subsidy of $7 billion each year to the American farmer, and feel that those of us who represent the 50 districts which make up the farm bloc in the House of Representatives have a responsibility to attempt to correct this false impression.

The Department of Agriculture's budget expenditures for fiscal year 1965 were slightly over $7 billion, but of that total only 36 percent was spent primarily for the stabilization of farm income. The remainder, amounting to more than $4.6 billion was spent on programs which clearly benefit American men, women, and children in every State of the Union and every sector of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include an analysis of these expenditures in the Record at this point:

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Budget expenditures fiscal years, 1965 and estimated 1966 and 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	1965	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public:			
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:			
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies (title I, Public Law 480)	1,293	1,114	994
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples (title II, Public Law 480)	147	286	283
Donations of commodities acquired by CCC	211	206	200
International Wheat Agreement	35	75	3
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	41	34	41
Long-term supply contracts (title IV, Public Law 480)	200	301	262
Donations of dairy products to armed services and others	41	17	17
Total	1,968	2,033	1,800
Food distribution programs:			
Commodities distributed to the needy and others	393	373	268
Food stamp plan	34	89	133
School lunch program	179	186	168
Special milk program	87	89	37
Total	693	737	606
REA and FHA repayable loans:			
REA loans	381	181	184
FHA loans	247	37	−76
Sale of participation certificates in FHA direct loans			−549
Salaries and expenses for above programs	53	61	63
Total	681	279	−378
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural and natural resources:			
Forestry	323	362	352
Agricultural and forestry research	192	238	221
Plant and animal disease and pest control	68	76	68
Soil and water resource protection and development	214	276	294
Programs which clearly, etc—Continued			
Long-range, etc—Continued			
Agricultural conservation program	253	276	247
Cooperative agricultural extension work	85	90	90
Inspection and other marketing service for agricultural commodities	76	80	23
Other	86	90	103
Total	1,297	1,488	1,398
Grand total	4,639	4,537	3,426
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others:			
CCC price-support and related programs:			
CCC loan, purchase, export, and related programs	−369	−445	−903
Storage, handling, and transportation expenses	422	332	315
Interest expense, net	442	270	291
Acreage diversion payments:			
Feed grains	914	829	655
Wheat	33	35	20
Cotton		112	237
Price-support payments:			
Feed grains	282	412	695
Cotton	51	58	496
Cotton equalization payments	435	331	
National Wool Act program	20	35	44
Total	2,230	1,969	1,850
Cropland adjustment program, adjustment payments			135
Conservation reserve program	194	148	140
Sugar Act program	92	94	85
Salaries and expenses for above programs	143	141	162
Total	2,659	2,352	2,372
Grand total	7,298	6,889	5,798

This compilation of information from the Department of Agriculture clearly shows the truth about their budget, and demonstrates that two-thirds of every dollar spent goes for food for peace and agricultural exports, nutrition and consumer research, school lunch and special milk programs, food inspections, the food stamp program, and long-range projects for improvement of agricultural and natural resources.

Clearly these funds are spent for the general public; yet, because they are included in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, they are charged to the American farmer.

There is no question that these programs benefit the farmer as well as the general public. So do the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Emergency Planning. But these benefits to the farmer are incidental to the main purpose of these programs.

If we can demonstrate that two-thirds of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture benefit urban areas just as much as they do the farmer, then we should be able to reduce the resentment of the taxpayer who now seems to think that he is contributing to a $7 billion subsidy for the farmer, who makes up only 8 percent of the total population.

In a truer sense, it can be said that the American farmer is subsidizing the rest of the economy, because, in spite of his increased efficiency and amazing productivity, his income is still only 65 percent of the nonfarm income. If farm prices had increased at the same rate as nonfarm prices, then the farmer would be receiving an additional $7.6 billion—and not from the American Government, but from the American consumer.

It is important to note as well that farmers as a group spend more than $30 billion a year to meet their production requirements, and purchase another $12 billion in consumer items.

I think that we owe the American farmer adequate recognition of his real role in the Nation's economy, as we owe urban taxpayers a better understanding of our farm programs and the benefits they receive from them.

The measure which I have introduced today will help us do this, by requiring the Department of Agriculture and the Budget Bureau to distinguish clearly between expenditures primarily for the purpose of stabilization of farm income, and those which provide benefits to the consumer, businessman, and the general public.

I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join in support of this measure and urge its prompt consideration in committee and on the floor of the House.

PAYMENT TO INFORMERS BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, every person in America has a legal obligation to report to the proper authorities any scene or suspected act of wrongdoing. This is an accepted practice under our system of government, a practice which is carried out by most citizens without thought of financial reimbursement or reward.

There are, of course, extreme cases where known or suspected felons are at large in society and considered to be of such potential danger to society that rewards are posted for information leading to their whereabouts and apprehension. There are, as I say, extreme cases.

There are other cases, however, whereby the Federal Government encourages citizens to literally snoop on their neighbors and associates for financial consideration.

I refer to the section of the Internal Revenue Code which permits the IRS to pay up to 10 percent of the amount recovered from persons who have evaded taxes by persons who have informed on them.

This insidious practice is contrary to our democratic concept of equal justice before law. No taxpayer is safe from this type of harassment. Professional informers are known to pick names at random from telephone books in hopes of coming up with a lucky find which will bring reward.

Indeed, the accused does not even have the right to face his accuser as he would in any other circumstance. In Roman times when human beings were thrown to wild animals for public amusement and rule of law provided little of the equity we enjoy, the accused tax evader enjoyed far greater protection than in this country today.

The Roman informer had to make his accusations in public and he was liable to the same penalties as the accused if his charges did not stick. The Internal Revenue Service does not require an informer to face his accused. Furthermore, the informer's identity is carefully protected by the Government.

The reporting of crime, committed or suspected, by an honest and conscientious citizenry is a cornerstone of law enforcement in this country.

The reporting of crime, committed or suspected, without expectation of reward but for reason of the public interest and safety is the mortar of this cornerstone.

Therefore, the possibility of reward for reporting known or suspected tax evasion is alien to our American system of justice. Nor is it necessary.

In the year 1961, the Internal Revenue Service recovered $12 million in taxes through information received from informants. In that same year, only 4.4 percent of all informants bothered to claim their honorarium or reward.

In recent years the Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to purchase electronic computing equipment to enable the Internal Revenue Service to audit tax returns more rapidly and more thoroughly. Indeed, the IRS has warned taxpayers that the chances of an audit are growing greater each year.

Therefore, it seems to me that it is time to eliminate the paid informer as an instrument for the collection of taxes.

It is time because this method is repugnant to our American philosophy of equal justice under law.

It is time because this practice has been demonstrated as not essential to recovery of evaded taxes.

It is time because the Internal Revenue Service now has the equipment to more thoroughly examine returns, locate discrepancies, and uncover fraud.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will eliminate the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to pay informers to snoop on their neighbors and associates. This bill would also end the practice of permitting judges to grant rewards to persons who inform on agents and employees of the Internal Revenue Service. Under present authority, a presiding judge may impose a fine of up to $10,000 on such agent or employee convicted of crime involving his conduct in office and designate that a portion of this fine be paid the informer as a reward.

Mr. Speaker, the informer is becoming more and more a threat to individual liberty in this Nation. Electronic eavesdropping and snooping devices threaten the privacy of the home today as never before.

We can diminish this threat by removing the profit motive. Enactment of this bill would be a small but significant step in this direction.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MAKES A WARM AND FAVORABLE PERSONAL IMPRESSION ON TWO UPSTATE NEW YORK NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we who are privileged to serve in this House have all had the opportunity, I suppose, to visit the White House, and to talk on a relatively informal basis with the former Congressman who now serves as President of the United States. We know the warm and cordial hospitality that is always extended to us on these occasions, whether it is a reception, a formal dinner, the signing of a bill, or a briefing on developments in Vietnam. In fact during the administrations of both President Kennedy and President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress on both sides of the political aisle have had the opportunity of visiting the White House so often that perhaps we sometimes tend to forget that for the average citizen a visit to the White House and especially a chat with the President of the United States is a pretty unusual, dramatic, and certainly most memorable event.

I saw a story in the Oneonta Daily Star of Oneonta, N.Y., in my district the other day, Mr. Speaker, which reminded me forcefully of just what it means to people to have an opportunity to visit the White House and to talk with the President. It was a detailed interview and story by the editor and the city editor of a smalltown New York State newspaper, the Port Jervis Union-Gazette.

I think Members may find it interesting to read this moving personal account. I think they will be especially interested in the obviously very favorable impression which President Johnson made on these two newspaper executives during a relaxed 40-minute interview in the White House executive wing. I am sure we have all experienced this same warmth and courtesy to which they refer, and have felt something of the same thrill which they report so candidly. But their account is valuable because it shows clearly that the President is a much more warm and human person than some of the press dispatches which occasionally originate from the regular Washington press corps would suggest.

The story these editors have written will help to remind us all of the personal impression made by the man who perhaps more than any other individual in this world carries the heavy burden for insuring the continued preservation of freedom.

I include at this point not only the two articles in question from the Oneonta Star of August 8, and also an editorial from the same paper for the same day:

Visit With President Helps Him Come Alive

Two uncommon events connected with pictures can be big things in the life of John Q. Public—that's us.

One is seeing our own picture in the paper. It's apt to happen to any of us when there's a daily local paper around such as The Star but we know from experience with those who've rated a Star picture that it's usually an event.

"Hey! I saw your picture in the paper," a friend will holler across the street. You just smile and wave back because one thing for sure is that you've already seen it. In fact you were among the first—and most critical—of the viewers.

Number two is seeing a person in the flesh that you've seen in picture many times. This is apt to be a pleasant surprise as well as a thrill because there's life and an obvious dimension in a real person that a flat picture can't catch.

The thrill and the impact of a real life big wheel came in spades to a pair of Ottaway Group newsmen the other day when their request for a personal interview with President Johnson was suddenly granted.

We share their enthusiasm with the report that Star readers share today and we only wish we could have shared the experience of the personal appearance that their enterprise produced. It was a once-in-a lifetime for any of us.

Advice for Home Front: Write the Boys and Get United

(Note.—This is the story of a private and unique interview with President Johnson by two smalltown newsmen—Dan Dwyer, editor, and Howard MacDonald, city editor, of the Port Jervis Union-Gazette. Like The Star, the Port Jervis paper is one of eight in the Ottaway group.)

(By Daniel J. Dwyer and Howard M. MacDonald)

Washington, D.C.—President Lyndon B. Johnson believes that U.S. commitments in South Viet Nam are just and necessary; that the U.S. will achieve its goal of peace and independence there, and that Americans should show more active support for the men who are fighting there.

These and other views emerged from our two-hour visit to the White House on July 22.

It is hard not to be impressed with Mr. Johnson.

Despite his folksy, friendly, chatty manner, he leaves no doubt that he is the most informed man in Washington: he can tell you the voting record, without any hesitation, of an obscure first term Congressman, for example.

He leaves the impression that he is a man who pays close attention to the most minor details: he can point out that before ordering the bombing raids on areas near Hanoi and Haiphong, he made sure that British and Russian ships were out of the areas, and that plans were operationally so foolproof that, as it turned out, only one civilian was killed.

The President believes that most Americans support the U.S. attitude towards North Viet Nam. He points out that a recent poll showed that 56 per cent of the electorate support the President—and that this would be a landslide in any election.

He is disturbed by some of the recent criticisms about his policies in Viet Nam, partly because he is convinced, as are GIs who write him at the rate of 50 to 100 per week, that the policy of appeasement would have disastrous consequences for the nation and the world, but also because he feels that such criticisms are unfair to, and hurt, the fighting men in Viet Nam.

The most important thing Americans can do to show their support for the men in Viet Nam, he believes, is to write letters to every serviceman, particularly those in Viet Nam, and thank them for the excellent job they are doing in preserving freedom.

If the President had his way, every resident in the Port Jervis area would write a letter to each of the 75 service men from the area whom they know and let them know how they appreciate what they are doing.

The President firmly believes that nothing boosts a soldier's morale more than a letter from home.

Second, President Johnson would have people stand up and be counted when they support our national policy in Viet Nam. As he sees it, the issue is simply whether we are going to allow any people to use force to provoke aggression.

Third, the President would have all Americans remember that the Communists have never taken over a government by election, but always through force—and that it sometimes becomes necessary to counter that force to preserve freedom.

President Johnson cannot understand those who disagree with U.S. involvement in Viet Nam. He believes that they can be placed under three headings: Communists, pacifists who generally believe that all war is wrong, or well-intentioned people who do not have the right information.

The President believes there can be no doubt of the eventual outcome: we will win. But he is critical of those who say we are aggressors, that we are war mongers.

It is not the President who is holding up peace in Viet Nam, he says. He has made numerous peace overtures, but points out that none have been accepted. When he ordered a halt to bombing raids earlier this year, the Viet Cong went on killing American servicemen, he notes.

He says emphatically that the U.S. will readily accept any opportunity to talk peace with North Viet Nam.

As proof of his determination to bring peace to that troubled area, he says that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is ready to go anywhere at any time at an hour's notice to sit down and talk with anyone.

The President is aware that he has other critics who argue that he should have ordered bombing of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong sooner. He explains the timing by pointing out that there were factors causing the delay which were not known to the public.

He cites that it was necessary for both Russian and British ships to be out of the port of Hanoi, and to wait for both Russian and Chinese diplomats to be out of Hanoi to avoid any international incidents or embarrassments.

He also insists that it was necessary to wait for the right weather conditions and select targets away from the cities so that only military installations were hit.

The President is disturbed that some are making Viet Nam a political issue. He believes in the old maxim, "Politics stops at the water's edge." It is a maxim he says he scrupulously observed during his years as Democratic Senate majority leader during the Eisenhower years.

When President Eisenhower sent U.S. troops into Lebanon, he had the full support of Sen. Johnson. Johnson also supported Eisenhower on the SEATO treaty.

President Johnson also likes to quote another old maxim, one which very few Americans would challenge: "The most precious thing we have is our freedom."

The President added this advice for young Americans:

Seek some form of public service for a year or two as a priceless apprenticeship in freedom, either in municipal or state affairs, or as a member of the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, the Teachers Corps, or as an apprentice in Congress.

Freedom is a priceless heritage, the President says, and as long as he is President, it will never be lost through default.

Long Trail to L.B.J.—The Big Story Was Getting There

(By Dan Dwyer)

I had to admire the cool and efficient manner in which Howard MacDonald said to the taxi driver "To the northwest gate of the White House, please."

It was only a four-block ride, slowed by the late Friday afternoon Washington traffic and the fare was 80 cents—but it was a much longer trip than that.

It was a journey from one world to another; from Port Jervis to the inner office of the President of the United States. It was a journey most people never make at all. Howard and I were lucky ones.

The taxi ride was the culmination of a letter written six weeks prior to that eventful Friday, July 22. The letter, to Bill Moyers, presidential press secretary, asked for a personal interview with President Johnson. All it cost was a five cent stamp.

As the weeks went by, and no reply, we gradually forgot it. When somebody in the office did bring it up, the inevitable answer was "No news is good news."

Then on July 21, around noon, the phone rang. The press secretary's secretary said that if we could be at the White House the next afternoon at 5:30, the president would see us. We were to use the northwest gate.

I said that MacDonald, who is city editor, and I would be there.

I got up and walked around the office. I was elated. So was the rest of the staff. Howard was not there but was in Middletown where we have another office, I called him up and said, "Howard, guess where you're going to be tomorrow night at 5:30?"

He had visions of a late night assignment. "Where?", he said wonderingly.

"At the White House."

"What!"

It wasn't the word but the way he said it. He was happy as a bee in a clover patch.

That's how we wound up at 5:12 p.m. on July 22 on the corner of E and 12th Streets in Washington, and why Howard made his short but, to us, dramatic statement to the cab driver.

AT THE GATE

The taxi approached the White House from the back, went a block and turned right and then right again. It slowed down and stopped. The address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I've been in Washington before. I've seen the White House before. But it was different this time. I wasn't going inside on those other occasions.

It sits on 18 acres of lawns and gardens and was originally built in 1793 and then rebuilt in 1815 after the British burned it the year before. The main structure—170 feet long and four stories high—is picturesque and imposing and its colonnaded, Ionic entrance is a familiar sight from pictures and postcards.

There are wings on the east and west sides, including the executive offices, which are on the western end. A semi-circular drive borders the front and swings from one corner to the other.

A total of 34 presidents, including LBJ, have occupied the White House, dating back to John Adams. It and the Capitol building are the acknowledged symbols of American democracy. No one approaches and views it without a feeling of pride and respect for their country and since this nation began small boys have expressed the desire to eventually grow up to be President and live there.

The northwest gate is just what it says. It is at the northwest corner, flanked by two, huge, stone pillars. There is a gate that was open when we dismounted from the taxi and approached.

We were loaded down for this invasion. Howard carried a 35 mm camera and I lugged a $2\frac{1}{2}$x$2\frac{1}{2}$ camera with a strobe flashgun. He also had a roll of our newspapers which we wanted to give to the president. We both had enough note paper to write a history of the United States.

We had no idea of what we could or couldn't do and in view of the 1963 assassination of President Kennedy, we envisioned all kinds of security measures would be employed.

Both of us had covered the visit of President Kennedy to Milford, Pennsylvania, in September, 1963 and saw how the secret service men operated there, so we figured the White House must be tight as a drum.

SECRET SECURITY

The difference is, however, when a President is out among people—thousands of people—the guards are at a disadvantage but in the White House they can control everything. When we left, two hours later, we realized we did not fully know what security measures had been employed. We know what we saw but there must have been much more than was not visible—and nobody tells what they are. They only smile, so you can just guess.

Inside the gate was a small building with windows on three sides. The door was open and one of the two armed guards who watched us get out of the taxi and walk into the grounds, came out. He was most courteous and asked our names and became even more courteous after he found them on his list. That was a trait we found in all the people we encountered during our visit.

It was quiet and shady on the driveway. I found myself looking at the other guard. He had a telephone in his hand, already telling the next check point we were coming. There is a network of telephones to and from all security points.

Although he now knew we were coming, we had to repeat our story to the next guard. Probably because for a brief 10 seconds we were out of sight of the two points when we rounded a corner. The second point was outside the grounds again and down a side thoroughfare.

This guard showed us which door to enter. It was a white, solid door that swung outward. We went inside. A man stood there, solid and efficient. The telephones had been working again. He invited us to go down a short hall to a desk. Behind the desk, seated, was another guard and another stood behind him.

WHO ARE WE?

We told our appointment story again and he checked his list. It came out as we said. But he had one further request—identification.

This could have been a problem for while we had several membership cards in various organizations, neither of us had anything with our pictures on it. Howard and I had discussed this possibility on the way down but decided to cross that bridge when we came to it. After all, how many people carry identification cards with their picture on it. Then again, how many people want to get in to see the President?

But oddly enough, our driver's license was sufficient.

We were still carrying the cameras, which were in cases, the flashgun, the roll of papers and the notebooks. There was no attempt made to check any of this equipment—or us.

This leads to two observations.

One is that there is a way such a checkout is made and this is based on a remark made by a press aide we talked to later on upstairs. We told him about the papers we wanted to give the President and asked if there were any restrictions.

Howard noted that in 1963 at Milford, President Kennedy could not accept gifts because they were not inspected first by the Secret Service.

Our friend—Robert Fleming, deputy press secretary—smiled when Howard said this and then said it was perfectly all right to give the newspapers to the President. He added, "the Secret Service wouldn't let them in here now if it wasn't all right."

The other observation on the personal non-check procedure is that the guards are aware that most people—such as us—are there legitimately to see the President and it just would not be proper if everyone were subjected to a personal search.

MUST BE AVAILABLE

The Secret Service and the White House guards are entrusted with the President's safety and would probably like to have him in a bullet-proof glass cage if they had their way—but this is a democracy and our Presidents are known to tolerate only so much barrier between them and the people.

For this reason, the Secret Service has some limitations but definitely imposes more than meets the naked eye of the ordinary visitor to the White House.

The pace of our entry quickened for the next few minutes. The telephone went into operation and in a very short time a tall, grey haired man appeared and took us in tow.

An elevator door opened and we stepped in and then, on the next floor, out again. There was a long, white hallway ahead of us. Several closed doors led off of it. But it was open at the end and appeared to veer to the left. There was a bench down part way.

Two men stood at the open end, looking toward us. You've seen men like them in newspaper photos and on television, always close by the President. Well dressed, well groomed—but so efficient looking. The Secret Service.

I had the feeling we were getting close to where we wanted to go—to the man we wanted to see. There was an atmosphere about that hall; there was a bit of tension in the air and, casual though I tried to be, in me. I didn't know until later that where we stood in the hall was about 20 feet from the President's office.

ROOM FOR WAITING

We walked halfway down the carpeted passage way. Our guide stopped in front of a door. There was a sign on it—In Use. He opened the door and asked us to wait in there. He went out.

We had no idea where we were—if this was where we would meet the President, or what.

It was a long room, maybe 30 feet, with rounded ends. On the floor, fitting the contour of the room was a soft, red carpet. It was the kind you sink down in.

There were three doors, one at each end and the one we entered. Two flags flanked the far end. One was the American flag, the other the President's flag. There was a fire place and two easy chairs and a lighted floor lamp and the presence of the flags lent support to the supposition that this was where we would have our interview.

I looked around hurriedly for I did not know how much time we had. It was now a little past 5:30.

In the center was a large, long table. It obviously went back in years in the history of this place. There were seven chairs around it, a dish of fresh flowers as a centerpiece.

I walked swiftly around the room, taking notes on the pictures on the walls, on the other furnishings.

Dominating an end and a side wall were two huge canvases by Frederick Remington, the master of western scenes. The other walls held Ancient Seaport by Max Bohm and Storm Tide by Robert Henri.

There was a ship model under glass, a framed Thomas Jefferson letter and a glass covered instrument from the first U.S. manned space flight.

On another table, also under glass, was a 55-piece figurine reproduction of the U.S. Marine Band, cira 1880.

This much I noted when the door opened.

BEHIND SCHEDULE

"I'm Marvin Watson," he said. After we introduced ourselves, Watson said there was going to be a short delay as the President was behind in his schedule.

"Time", I said, "is something we have plenty of." But he was actually apologetic because we would have to wait for the President of the United States. That was the type of courteous, concerned people we met in the White House.

Watson, who turned out to be the President's appointments secretary wanted to know a little about Port Jervis. We told him the size and where it was and he laughed.

"I come from a smaller town than you", he said. "Dangerfield, Texas. Population 4,500."

From his soft drawl, I already figured he was from Texas. LBJ favors home state boys.

Watson, average build with a tanned complexion, gave us a brief history of the room. It was called the Fish Room because one of President Roosevelt's friends had once given him a huge sailfish, which wound up on "the wall right over there, I believe", our new friend noted.

"Then President Truman had an aquarium in here but all that departed when Eisenhower came in. Only the name remains."

Watson chatted a few more minutes and left.

Howard and I talked together, planning the procedure we would follow. We realized we knew very little of what would take place. In fact, aside from calling the President "Mr. President," we knew nothing. We were convinced about how long the interview would be and, another important point, how would we know when it was over.

When you think about it, it's a point to consider. After all, we were going to meet with the man with the most responsible job on earth who has a tremendous daily schedule to fill and was going—as we know—on a three-state tour the next morning.

We received our answers quicky and easily.

ANOTHER AIDE

The door opened again and once more an apology. This time it was Bob Fleming, the deputy press secretary, who was to accompany us to the interview, sit in on it, and then iron out any difficulties we might have afterwards.

Bob said he was sorry, there was still a little delay so we all sat down at the table and talked.

He told us he was former ABC news bureau head in Washington and originally came from Madison, Wisconsin. So we told him a little bit about Port Jervis. (Everybody in the White House knew something about Port Jervis by the time we left).

He entertained us with historical data on the White House, centering on the renovation job carried out by President Truman, which he said was long needed because the building was falling apart.

He said that Truman restored the building without changing the appearance—except for his controversial balcony which caused more of a scene than Romeo and Juliet ever mustered.

Fleming noted that steel beams had been placed in the walls and that by this and other ways, it was completely rebuilt. He seemed to know all about the place.

LAST BRIEFING

But what we wanted to know was how the interview would be conducted.

In connection with this, he told us that our letter appealed to the press secretary's office because of the reference to small towns. (In the letter, it was pointed out that we felt our newspaper represented an average American small community and we believed the President did not have enough contact with newspapers such as The Union-Gazette).

For that reason the interview was recommended and the President concurred.

Fleming said the President would answer any question but most of the time he would steer around to the subjects he wanted to talk about.

He also said the President would indicate when his time was about up but we could get a few minutes after that "because I've never seen him turn down a request for another question."

Fleming obviously has a rigorous schedule but he gave the impression that, while he was tired and didn't have much home life, he was dedicated to the President. I believe that could be said of all the people we met. The President asks a great deal of his aides. He calls for more than the average person would want to take but the people that surround him, that work for and with him, are not average.

They show deference to his wishes and all whom we met were somewhat in awe of his power and responsibility, but it was more than that, for the President has an inborn type of personality or persuasive magnetism about him that inspires these people to accomplish more than they would do under ordinary circumstances.

WHITE HOUSE IMAGE

But back to Fleming. In speaking of the White House, he reflected on the fact that the mood of the nation is often set by even small events that happen there.

"For that reason", he said, "we must be careful of our image."

To illustrate that, he remarked that recently ABC had requested permission to bring a TV camera truck on the grounds to make a background scene for one of their correspondents. As an old ABC man, he could see their point but turned it down.

"The reason," he laughed, "is that as soon as CBS and NBC saw that truck they would want the same privilege although it was only going to be a routine newcast program. They would never believe that story. So then we would have three television trucks on the lawn and the wire services men would come running up to find out what was going on.

"Our story would never satisfy them, they'd think we were holding back news and that television had received a tip. So what would happen? The wire men would all go running back to their typewriters and write leads like "An air of tension surrounds the White House today"—the newspapers would print it—and the stock market would drop 10 points."

He laughed again. "That's how it goes around here. The smallest move can start a rumor about the White House."

LAST MOVE

Just then the door opened and a girl came in. She said something to Bob and he stood up. So did we.

"He's ready now", he said. This was it.

We marched out the door and across the hall. The two Secret Service men still stood down at the end. We went into a room that turned out to be Watson's office. It was blue with bright blue furnishings. In it were Watson, his secretary and another man. We made six and it look crowded.

We had asked Fleming about taking pictures and he said he would find out. Normally it wasn't done but this was a normal meeting for the President. Finally it was decided that we wouldn't take the photos but the White House photographer would do it, instead.

That was all right. He was a small Japanese who was introduced but whose name I still don't know.

We paused in Watson's office about a minute while this was decided and then somebody took our cameras and said they would be in the Fish Room, to be picked up when we left.

Then a buzzer sounded, Watson picked up a phone, listened for a few seconds, said "Yes, sir" and hung up. He motioned to Fleming who went to another door in the room and asked us to follow.

There was a short hallway. About 10 feet ahead was an open door. We walked through it.

In Watson's office, you could feel the undercurrent in the air—that you were near something big—that you were close to greatness and power and somehow were touching upon the history of our country.

THE GREAT MAN

When we went through the door, I felt tenseness, excitement. I don't believe anyone can walk into that great, circular room—see those flags, the massive desk but most of all, the man—and not have that same aura of feeling.

This was a climatic moment. This was a moment I had thought about but could not imagine. This was a moment of proudness and a moment of drama—a moment I will have for as many years as I live.

Inside the room, there was only one way to look. The desk led your eye to the flags behind it and—further back, seated at a second desk—Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States.

The President was looking at some documents. Then he stood up, picked them up in his arms and strode over to the main desk. He laid them down. He came our way. Bob Fleming, off to one side, introduced us.

We shook hands and I said "Mr. President, I'm very proud to meet you."

President Johnson is not a small man. He is a big man. He is at least three inches over my six feet, with broad shoulders and big hands.

He looked very familiar. The lines that etch his eyes in his photographs were there, showing through a tanned complexion. He has darkish hair, grey on the sides.

He wore a neat, well tailored dark green suit with a very light green shirt and matching tie.

His Texas drawl came out right away as he suggested we go to a smaller, more comfortable room.

I glanced around the office and out the windows—seven, I recall—which reveal the famed rose garden outside on the grounds.

The room is circular, at least 30 feet across, with an ornamental frieze running around it about 10 feet up on the walls.

There were colored pictures of the Johnson family arranged on the wall at one end near a fireplace and on a table near his desk was a bronze bust of the President.

There were two enclosed teletype machines set against a wall and, higher up, a three-screen television unit.

FOLLOW THE LEADER

The President led the way out of the room and back down that same, short hallway. Across from each other were doors I hadn't noticed.

He stopped short, I was following and we collided. Howard brought up against me. The President suggested a drink and we all agreed to this and he noted that there was a choice of Dr. Pepper or coke, remarking that he was a Dr. Pepper man himself.

"Whatever the President drinks is good enough for me" I said, as he knocked on one door and this head appeared and he ordered the four sodas.

Then we went into the other door, the President leading again, and he sat down in a green, reclining chair. We—Howard and I—sat on a sofa couch to the left and facing him. Fleming picked a straight-backed chair out of the way near the door.

The little photographer, who had followed us into the office and back into this room, stepped on a floor button. The room flooded with additional light and he shot several pictures. He moved off the button and the lights returned to normal. He left.

It was a room without windows, at least heavy, green drapes completely covered the wall where they would be located. It was also a small room, about 10x12 feet, very comfortable looking and apparently a favorite room for the President.

On the wall near me was a large frame containing formal and informal photos of the past five presidents—Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, Roosevelt and Hoover.

During his talk with us, the President made note of the fact that he had been in Congress—in the House and Senate—while four of the five were in office.

TIME TO TALK

We had a series of questions to ask the President, prepared ahead of time and sufficient to take up a half hour. As Howard asked the questions, we both took notes but I also took time to watch and observe this man who stepped in and took control of a country shaken by one of the great tragedies of the century.

By that time, the drinks arrived and I sipped on it. Dr. Pepper isn't half bad and I may make it the official drink for our Port Jervis paper.

The President has a genial, homey way of putting his guests at ease.

He leaned back in his chair, when we first sat down put his hands behind his head and said "Let's talk."

I told him about the point of our visit—that we had questions raised by average people in small towns. He was interested. He nodded. I went on to explain about Port Jervis, where it was and how people here feel about issues such as Viet Nam; how small town America was concerned but how small town America gave him their support although sometimes things are difficult to understand.

Then he picked up the conversation. He discussed Viet Nam and as he talked he gestured with his hands. When he listened, it was usually with his face and cheek resting on one of the hands with the elbow on the arm of the chair.

POWERFUL IMPRESSION

The man gives the impression that he enjoys being President—that he was born for it—that he is more than capable of handling any crisis that comes up for this country.

He talked, expounding the points he wanted to make and his voice was soft when he mentioned our men dying in Viet Nam and when he touched on America's history with such phrases as "the most priceless thing we have is our freedom and liberty".

But when he talked about men like Ho Chi Minh and issues such as Viet Nam, criticism that goes too far and might have an effect on our fighting men's morale the voice gets an edge in it.

It was an engaging 40 minutes we spent in this little green room. It went fast, too fast, and it became obvious that if we wanted to get all our questions answered, we would have needed another three hours. And that wasn't going to happen.

When it was over, the President stood up and mentioned he had a gift for us. He fumbled in a drawer in a small desk near Fleming and produced two 11x14 parchments, engraved with quotations.

Mine contained words by Abraham Lincoln; Howard's was a statement by Harold MacMillan. They are prophetic; they deal with doing what you feel is right.

We all shook hands again and then we were moving. I looked back from Watson's office. The broad shoulders were emerging into the lighted room at the opposite end of the short hall. The President was already going back to other work. I have no fear that he can handle whatever job comes up.

WE WALK OUT

There was another short chat with Fleming and then we went outside and, with special permission, shot a few pictures on the grounds. Then we walked down the long drive to the front. The guards nodded and smiled as we went by. The one had a phone in his hand. They knew we were coming.

I looked at my watch. It was 7:20. We had spent two hours in there. Two hours that I told my children about and will probably tell their children about someday. As I said, it happens to only a few. We were lucky.

Howard and I were elated over the whole episode. I know we were smiling as we walked down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the business section of Washington.

"It's time to eat," I said, and we picked out an expensive looking restaurant.

But Howard disappointed me. He started to order spaghetti and meatballs.

"No," I said, "not that. This is a filet mignon night." And so it was.

HUDSON RIVER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to submit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs testimony in support of my bill, H.R. 13731, to provide for Hudson River resources development.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 13731

Mr. Chairman, most of us who know and depend upon the Hudson River have become increasingly aware that something basic must be done to preserve it. The Hudson is one of America's truly great rivers: rich in history and invaluable in commerce. It has a rare range of beauty as it flows some 315 miles from the slopes of the Adirondacks southward and toward the Atlantic Ocean. The scenic Hudson Highlands, the unique Manhattan skyline, the Palisades, are just a small portion of its wealth. Its heritage includes West Point, Hyde Park, Storm King Mountain, Dutch patroons, Revolutionary War battle sites, Fulton's steamboat, Washington Irving's literature and the Hudson School of artists. It was, with its tributaries, a major route for colonial settlement. It was, and remains, a valuable highway for transportation. It has an honorable and fascinating—an American—heritage, of which we all should be proud.

The past in itself presents no major problems. It is the present and the future which require careful planning and immediate remedial steps. Comprehensive conservation steps must be undertaken promptly.

We already have more than enough studies and reports. The basic information needed is available. The New York State Water Pollution Control Board and the New York State Department of Health have given close attention to several unfavorable aspects. The New York State Conservation Department is aware of some of the problems that have emerged. A number of interested private groups have studied and reported. The Federal Government also has not been oblivious to the developing crisis, for the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported at length on the pollution problem of the Hudson River and its tributaries in September 1965. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has made a comprehensive study of other aspects.

Congress has examined the situation, particularly during the 89th Congress. A subcommittee of this Committee held hearings on the Hudson last fall and obtained the testimony of many local people. This year, officials of the Department of the Interior, and some of the Members from the Hudson River area, testified at hearings held in Washington late in July.

Informed opinion, not only in New York and New Jersey but also in Washington, has been brought to focus upon the Hudson River and its pressing problems. We are now fully aware of the dimensions of the problems. How to approach those problems, what machinery to use in necessary remedial steps, and what time schedule may be practicable still remain unsettled.

On March 16th of this year, I introduced H.R. 13731. It is a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey in a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from independent Federal action until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on the program.

The first section of my bill makes these three findings:

1) That the several resources of the Hudson are of immense value to all our citizens. (This is self-evident.)

2) That the States of New York and New Jersey are presently working toward a joint program to develop, preserve and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores. (We need not, in proposed legislation, examine in detail just exactly what has been done to date. That they are concerned and actively in motion, working—is the important fact.)

3) That New York and New Jersey have requested the aid and participation of the Federal Government in their efforts to develop a joint program and it is in the best interests of all that the Federal Government lend all possible aid and assistance to the States and their local agencies in developing their proposals for cooperative action.

New York and New Jersey are in the process of developing what is generally referred to as an Interstate Compact on the Hudson. That being the case and time being of the essence, my bill, H.R. 13731, proceeds on the assumption that there are major advantages in combining both State and Federal resources, these being conjointly brought into the picture at this stage rather than later when it would be too late. I am well aware that there are those who disagree. Some do not favor the Interstate Compact approach. There are those who think that New York State ought to proceed largely or wholly on her own to remedy the situation; that New Jersey has only a small portion of the frontage, and not much can be done about those few miles. Others want to proceed more slowly by appointing a fact-finding study commission. Even some who favor the Compact approach see no reason for speeding up to the process. They would wait for the States to develop a compact; only then would they come to Washington for approval. The Federal Government, where it has helped other states in projects such as these, has been truly beneficial. I strongly urge that the Federal Government act as an official working partner in this program.

There are some 105 bills in this Congress at the present time that provide for better conservation in the Hudson River area. The sentiment of our colleagues in this area is strong and demands action.

Section 3 of my bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey in preparing and proposing a program of legislative action in preserving the defined Hudson River area. Recommendations regarding legislation necessary and desirable to achieve the purposes are to be submitted to the Congress and the States at the earliest possible time, but no later than March 1, 1967. This time limit will give the Federal Government and the States a chance to join their efforts and agree upon the most effective approach.

My bill takes into account the fact that comprehensive studies have already accumulated, and that it is now high time to put these recommendations into bill form for enactment into law.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in Section 4 to represent the United States in the negotiations with the States and is required to report periodically to the Congress and the President.

Section 5 outlines six points for the Secretary's general guidance in making recommendations. They are the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the land and water resources of the Riverway; the need to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and acting consistent with development; the need to abate water pollution while developing water resources for beneficial use; the need to preserve, enhance and rehabilitate the scenic beauty; the need to preserve, enhance and develop archeological and historic sites and the need to protect and enhance fish and wildlife and other natural resources.

It should be noted that the Secretary is to be guided by, but not limited to, the above considerations in making recommendations.

Section 6 provides that the Secretary of the Interior serve as a "coordinator" of plans, programs, projects, grants, licenses or applications for licenses for a period as long as three years after enactment of the proposed legislation. The Federal departments, agencies and commissions, in order to avoid decisions or actions which could unfavorably affect or alter the resources of the Riverway during the negotiations and before Congress shall have received the recommendations and has had time to act, shall cooperate with the Secretary regarding his recommendations and plans. His approval would be required during that period for planning or projection within the Federal-aid highway system to be located within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson. Any authorizing or licensing of construction by the Secretary of the Army and the Atomic Energy Commission of projects within that zone would also require the approval of the Secretary; and the Federal Power Commission would be directed not to issue any license for any project within that zone within the three-year period, unless the conservation purposes of the proposed legislation should be sooner achieved. In addition the President, by Executive order, has the power to suspend any or all provisions when in the national interest.

To summarize, there is great need for joint and positive action by the Federal and State governments to conserve the resources of this River. It was a beautiful River, and it can and must be cleaned up and preserved for future generations of Americans, not only New Yorkers. Eradication of pollution, blight and decay will initiate the rejuvenation of a larger area, wonderful for recreation, industry and good living.

We have studied the problems long enough; it is time to activate our plans. H.R. 13731 will serve as that necessary and desirable next step.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to submit my views to your Committee.

CONGRESSMAN DENT WARNS HOUSE OF BARRAGE OF PROPAGANDA FROM EXPORT-IMPORT GROUP AND ESPECIALLY FROM JAPANESE INFORMATION CENTER ON EVE OF NEW HEARINGS ON IMPACT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS ON U.S. JOBS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, history is repeating in the drive to kill any reasonable approach to the serious problem of import impact upon jobs in the United States.

The latest so-called Japanese information put out by one of the numerous Japanese trade lobbyists, Stephen Robin, is really a masterpiece of doubletalk.

It starts out with a startling disclosure that the United States has a $2 billion trade surplus over Japan. Casual readers would immediately want to know "What is Dent trying to do, kill our balance-of-trade deal?" of course not. You learn if you read further that the balance claimed covers the past decade and that in the last year of Japanese trading with the United States we ran $360 million behind using the valuation method that adds a false 25 percent to our export value. For instance, the Japanese exported to the United States $2.86 billion f.o.b. and imported from the United States $2.04 billion c.i.f. If both import and export value were figured on the same basis, either f.o.b. or c.i.f., the trade balance would show Japanese exports to the United States to be $2.95 billion giving the United States a deficit trade balance of $910 million. This means that even if we could believe the figures given by the Japanese propagandists the U.S. Treasury lost $901 million gold in foreign exchange.

This may explain to some of us why we are a debtor nation in spite of the claims of our Government commerce statisticians that we are selling $4 to $6 billion more a year than we are buying from foreign sources.

It is a peculiar set of economics that sells more than it buys and the seller goes broke by running out of money.

While we are supposed to be selling more than we are buying the French and others are depleting our gold reserve constantly. France alone has caused us to go from a high of $170 million to a low of $30 million a month.

The next antic set of figures in the Japanese propaganda book gives this illustration to prove how much we are benefitting and the Japanese are suffering.

> In 1965, the United States-Japan trade reached a peak of $4.4 billion, nearly three times the volume of a decade ago. In that single year—1965—every American purchased $12.33 worth of imports from Japan. But every Japanese bought $20.83 worth of American products, almost twice as much per capita.

This is called the shell game. The Japanese are dealing with about 200 million U.S. citizens while we are dealing with about 65 million Japanese citizens.

The sorry but true situation is that all of our American citizens are potential customers of Japanese products which are sold over every retail counter in the United States. But few, if any, Japanese are customers of ours since they buy almost exclusively raw materials, machinery, pulp and logs for reprocessing, and coke, coal, and iron ore with other minerals that are used to make the products for American consumers, Japanese consumers, and what used to be American consumers in other countries such as Central and South America, Europe, Australia, and Asian markets.

The Japanese are clever people but their candor is refreshing. In one place in the propaganda book they say:

> Japan is quick to acknowledge a great deal of help from United States in introducing technological steelmaking techniques.

And then we read this:

> Japan steelmakers have paid substantial amounts of money in royalties to U.S. steel producers and steel mill machinery makers for technical know-how and licensing agreements.

The clever mind of the Japanese wants you to know that while we as a nation helped Japan they also point out that it was paid for in royalties and licensing fees.

They also imply that their exporting business is profitable to certain individuals and certain corporations and therefore, a necessity for the U.S. economy.

The best claim of all is the one where they boldly state:

> In 1965 Japan's purchases in the United States were responsible for about 200,000 American jobs.

They forgot to tell how many jobs it cost the United States in the glass, rubber, steel, electronics, toy, plywood, textile and hundreds of consumer goods industries to keep the 200,000—if true—workers busy digging coal, harvesting wheat and cotton, mining iron ore, or making high-priced tools and machinery for the Japanese workshop. For every job we get from trade we lose at least three in the U.S. economy.

While free trade is still being promoted under a theory developed in the 18th and 19th centuries our Nation is being sopped dry because of the economic realities of the 20th century. Facts are displaced by old worn out doubletalk of world peace and friendship to be achieved through the avenue of free trade forgetting that trade is a commercial venture and is motivated by the same profit motive that causes wars and breaks the peace.

STATE TAXATION OF MULTISTATE FIRMS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, State taxation of those of our corporations that operate in two or more States has been a matter of major interest to the Congress since 1959. In enacting Public Law 86–272 the Congress registered concern over possible interference of State tax practices with the free flow of trade and commerce among the States. It directed appropriate committees of the two Houses to make full and complete studies of "all matters pertaining to the taxation by the States of income derived within the States from the conduct of business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce or which are a part of interstate commerce." It was the intent of Congress in making this assignment to explore the need for legislation to guide State tax practices into channels consistent with the national interest in orderly economic development.

The competing demands of the States for tax revenue and of the national interest in unhampered commerce prompted the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to consider this group of problems from the viewpoint of intergovernmental relations.

Together with the gentlewomen from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], I have the honor of being a member of this Commission. In view of the likelihood that legislation on this subject will be coming before this House, the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Commission, reflecting as they do the views of public officials from all levels of Government, may be helpful to the members.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Commission represent a careful balancing of the interest of the States in preserving maximum freedom in the exercise of their taxing powers and the interests of the Congress and the executive branch in heeding the constitutional mandate against interference with the free flow of commerce among the States.

Mr. Speaker, this subject requires our thoughful consideration. It takes on increasing importance year by year as the revenue pressures upon State governments push them into higher and higher tax rate levels.

In the view of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the basic issue posed by State taxation of multistate firms in both the income and sales tax fields is a reconciliation and balancing of two competing national objectives:

First. The economic objective of facilitating the free flow of commerce among the States by minimizing State tax impediments to interstate business operations through the exercise of some degree of Federal control and regulation; and

Second. The political objective embraced in the concept of federalism with its emphasis on decentralized political decisionmaking and a large degree of State autonomy in tax policy.

In the Commission's judgment, these conflicting objectives—unimpeded commerce and federalism—are equally important and must be reconciled with appropriate recognition of both, without needless sacrifice of either.

Accelerating trends in business activity and State-local finances place increasing urgency on the reconciliation of these conflicting objectives. The economy is becoming progressively more interdependent and a rising share of business activity involves firms operating across State lines, making them ever more sensitive to diversities in State and local tax practices. Simultaneously, State and local expenditures are rising at nearly twice the rate of national economic growth and the attendant revenue pressures are obliging State and local governments to increase taxing levels. In their efforts to both maximize revenues and attract new businesses, they are understandably reaching out for out-of-State firms doing business within their boundaries.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX ISSUE

The 38 State corporate income taxes now imposed produce approximately $2 billion annually. Payments by multistate firms account for approximately 60 percent of this total. In the corporation income area, the Commission identified three basic issues requiring resolution:

> 1. What are the proper limits of State jurisdiction to tax the net income of multistate firms?
>
> 2. What rules should the States use to divide up the income of the multistate firms who fall within their respective taxing jurisdictions?
>
> 3. To what extent, if any, does the administration of these rules require Federal administrative surveillance?

The Commission considered a variety of alternative policy positions in the light of the two controlling economic and political objectives. An extreme centralization position would optimize the economic objective of unimpeded interstate commerce by calling for Federal monopoly of this revenue source. At the other extreme, maximum decentralization would optimize the federalism objective by opposing any Federal regulation of State corporation income tax practices.

The Commission rejects the more extreme centralizing positions in the absence of persuasive evidence that State and local tax practices are in fact burdening interstate operations unduly. The Commission also rejects the more extreme decentralization positions in the light of the evidence that State and local tax practices do represent a burden of sufficient magnitude and potential difficulty to warrant a measure of congressional regulation.

With respect to the jurisdictional issue, it is the view of the Commission that the limits placed on State jurisdiction by the Congress in 1959—Public Law 86–272—have gone a long way toward creating nationwide stability and certainty. Therefore, the Commission recommends against any change in jurisdictional policy already prescribed by the Congress at this time.

On the apportionment issue, the Commission recommends that the Congress mandate the employment of the three-factor formula—property, payroll, and sales—developed nearly 10 years ago by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, both to govern the reporting of income by multistate firms and to serve as a limit on the percentage of their income that may be taxed by a State. The Commission recommends also that the Congress not abridge the States' freedom to offer interstate firms alternative methods for determining their taxable income so long as these alternatives do not result in the taxability of a larger share of such firms' incomes than would be taxable under the uniform three-factor formula.

With respect to the administrative issue, the Commission rejects the idea of Federal surveillance over the operation of the uniform apportionment formula. It recommends instead that the Governors develop machinery, possibly through an interstate compact, to insure that the apportionment formula is consistently interpreted by all the States and to resolve such competing tax claims as may arise.

The text of the Commission recommendation reads as follows:[1]

> The Commission concludes that State income taxation of interstate firms in a manner compatible with the free flow of interstate commerce requires standardized jurisdictional and apportionment limitations to maximize taxpayer certainty and minimize compliance reporting burdens. While viewpoints on the proper limits of State taxing jurisdiction over interstate firms vary widely, the guidelines prescribed by PL 86–272 have in large measure stabilized this issue.
>
> Congressional action, however, is required to regularize and limit State practices with respect to the apportionment of income of interstate firms. The Commission believes that these apportionment limitations can be formulated so as to preserve the States' latitudes for shaping their tax practices to accord with their respective policy objectives. Therefore, the Commission recommends to the Congress that it prescribe State use of the three-factor property, payroll, and sales apportionment formula developed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (updated to reflect experience since its original promulgation in 1957) to govern the reporting of income by multistate firms and to serve as a limitation on the percentage of their income that may be taxed by a State. Such action will allow each State to determine its own tax policies and to offer alternative methods for determining the taxable income of interstate businesses, but will place a ceiling on the amount of income that is taxed by any State. Congressional action along these lines will obviate the need for Federal administrative surveillance of State tax practices.
>
> Since interpretations of the formula will be required and some interstate disputes are likely to arise, the Commission recommends to the Governors Conference that the States proceed expeditiously to develop machinery, possibly through an interstate compact, for handling competing State tax claims.

In the Commission's view, this approach reconciles the competing economic and political objectives. It would ease substantially the compliance burdens of interstate firms and protect them from malapportionment possibilities, without abridging unduly the States' freedom to shape their income tax policies so as to promote their own economic development objectives. Moreover, the three-factor NCCUSL apportionment formula proposed for nationwide promulgation by the Congress, already enjoys strong State support.

SALES TAX ISSUE

Forty-two States, the District of Columbia, and some 2,300 local governments, located for the most part in 3 States, now levy sales and use taxes producing about $9 billion a year. While the revenue contribution of interstate as opposed to local sales cannot be determined with precision, there is widespread agreement that the lion's share of sales tax collections comes from strictly local—intrastate—transactions. Most of the problems in this area can therefore be handled by the States themselves.

The Commission concludes that States should act to safeguard the fairness and productivity of sales and use taxes and ease compliance obligations of—out-of-

---

[1] Secretary Robert C. Weaver, State Senator C. George DeStefano and Mrs. Adelaide Walters dissented.

State—vendors. The Commission recommends therefore that States:

First. Credit their taxpayers for sales and use taxes paid to other States;

Second. Eliminate charges for audit of multistate firms; and

Third. Exchange audit and other information with one another.

The Commission further recommends that States collaborate in developing a program for facilitating the collection of use taxes on commodities purchased from out-of-State vendors excluded under present practice. This recommendation is designed to bring about concerted State action to solve the tax evasion problem posed by mail-order business.

There remains, however, a need for Congress to assist the States in one troublesome but integral aspect of sales taxation. An existing Supreme Court decision—Miller Bros. Co. against Maryland—presently denies States the right to impose the use tax against the out-of-State vendor delivering merchandise to households within the State. In the interest of fortifying the State's ability to accord equal tax treatment to all purchasers within their borders, the Commission recommends that:

> Congress explicitly authorize States and localities to require use tax collection by out-of-state vendors regularly delivering taxable items to households within the taxing jurisdiction.

In the view of the Commission, the legislative measures here proposed for the Congress and the States will optimize the national objectives calling for both the free flow of commerce and a viable role for the States in our Federal system.

LEGISLATION TO ADJUST STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES—PART II

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the bill I introduced on May 23, 1966, to permit Cuban refugees to adjust their status and become permanent residents of this country, if they so desire. I am pleased to note that yesterday, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], followed me in introducing similar legislation. My bill would permit retroactive adjustment as of the date of last entry. His bill, I am glad to note, contains this provision.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to insert in the RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the testimony of Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before my Immigration Subcommittee this morning. The Attorney General strongly supports my bill and favors the retroactive provision.

I commend the Attorney General for having given thought to the implementation of this legislation, which would recommend a system of priorities for adjustment of status of Cuban refugees along the lines of the preference now contained in the Immigration and Naturalization Act. Parents, spouses, and other members of the immediate family would be given preference in adjusting their status. The Attorney General further advised the subcommittee that he would explore the matter carefully, should Congress pass my bill, so that no undue financial burden on Cuban refugees would result. The Attorney General's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO ADJUST THE STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES TO PERMANENT RESIDENTS, AUGUST 11, 1966

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing in support of a legislative proposal marked by both compassion and practicality.

This is my first appearance before you since March 4, 1965 when we discussed the bill which later became the Immigration Act of 1965. I welcome this opportunity to express my appreciation and admiration for the work of your Subcommittee in drafting that historic legislation.

I can report that the legislation is meeting the national needs and humane purposes for which it was intended. While abolishing the discriminatory national origins system, it is permitting families to reunite and allowing entry of persons with skills of importance to our nation.

Our implementation of the law is still undergoing refinement. Should we conclude that amendments are needed to attain maximum effectiveness, I am confident that you will give our proposals due consideration.

The Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigation, created by the 1965 Act, held its first meeting last week under the chairmanship of former Census Bureau Director Richard Scammon. The Commission is expected to supply valuable data in the long-neglected field of immigration from other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Pending completion of the Commission study—and at least until July 1, 1968—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere. However—unlike Europeans, Asians and Africans—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent residence unless they depart and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied to the native of Cuba, this provision becomes an often-insurmountable barrier to citizenship.

For he may not return to his homeland for the documentation necessary for permanent residency. The difficulties and expense of his traveling to another country for this documentation severely limit the number of Cubans who have been able to commence the five-year permanent residency required to petition for United States citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent residence status. Of these, 36,000 have arrived since resumption of direct airlifts from Cuba last December 1 under the policy which President Johnson enunciated upon signing the 1965 Act. They, along with 81,000 others, are here on parole. Another 47,000 were admitted on nonimmigrant visas issued by United States Consuls before their withdrawal from Cuba on January 3, 1961.

To permit removal of the restrictions placed upon these refugees by their lack of permanent residency will be to benefit them and the United States. This country can well use the services of the skilled and professionally-trained Cuban who is currently prevented from practicing his profession. Attainment of permanent residency by more Cuban refugees would reduce our Government's expenditures on their behalf and aid in their resettlement by enhancing their position to qualify for employment in all areas of the nation.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse the proposal to allow Cuban refugees to apply for permanent resident status.

I am pleased to observe that all bills before you to accomplish this would make the adjustment discretionary and voluntary rather than automatic.

Whether the permanent residency proposed for these refugees would be rolled back to the date of their entry or begun upon adjustment of their status is a matter which I will leave for Congressional determination.

In any event, allowing the Cuban to acquire permanent residence and the promise of eventual citizenship will enrich his life and ours—whether he plans to remain here forever or return to a Cuba freed from tyranny.

Such legislation would be a humane postscript to the message formulated by our government and voiced by the President when he said to the people of Cuba that "those who seek refuge here in America will find it."

COL. CHARLES H. MOSELEY, M.C., RETIRES FROM ARMY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the highest noncombat award authorized by Congress for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility was given to Col. Charles H. Moseley, M.C., on his retirement on July 31 as director of personnel and training at the Army Surgeon General's Office. Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Army Surgeon General, presented him the Distinguished Service Medal. The Army Medical Service Bronze Medallion, for 30 years of faithful service, was also presented by General Heaton before an assembled group of friends.

Colonel Moseley was born and reared in Anderson, S.C. He obtained his A.B. degree from Wofford College at Spartanburg and taught and coached in the high school at Rock Hill, where I was one of his students and football team aspirants. After 3 years he went on to the Medical School at Vanderbilt University and was awarded his medical degree in 1935.

Colonel Moseley has accepted a position in Chicago as director of the department of governmental medical programs with the American Medical Association. Mrs. Moseley is the former Miss Nida DePass, of Rock Hill, S.C. They have one son, Charles H., Jr., a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy. He is now doing graduate work in nuclear engineering at Princeton University under a fellowship awarded by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I insert in the RECORD at this point a letter written by General Heaton to Colonel Moseley under date of July 31, 1966. The contents of the letter, which was read at the retirement ceremony honoring Colonel Moseley, so clearly indicate the type of man that Colonel Moseley is that I request permission to have the letter printed in the RECORD in order that all of us may be inspired by the example of this distinguished medical man. Colonel Moseley has contributed much to his fellow countrymen during his years of service with the U.S. Army. Good luck and Godspeed to him.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1966.

Col. CHARLES H. MOSELEY,
Director, Personnel and Training, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: As your distinguished military carrer draws to a close, I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep personal appreciation for the many significant and lasting contributions you have made to the Army Medical Service over the years, especially for the invaluable assistance you have given me while serving here in my Office as the Director of Personnel and Training.

We were, indeed, fortunate to have a man of your professional distinction and experience to serve in a position of such vital importance to the accomplishment of the overall mission of the Army Medical Service. Consistent with the extraordinary spirit of dedication which characterized your entire career, once again you unreservedly applied your professional and executive talents to the tasks at hand which brought about numerous advancements. Your recommendations regarding proper utilization and distribution of personnel resources and your facility in monitoring legislative measures affecting medical service personnel enabled this Office to meet with success in providing medical support to military personnel, particularly during periods of crisis in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam.

Through your conscientious attention to duty, understanding of the aims and problems of the Army Medical Service, and competence as a professsional military officer, you molded a willing, exceptionally proficient staff within your Directorate that worked harmoniously with the best interests of the Army uppermost in their minds. Thus, you have contributed in a most memorable and significant way to the continued successful operation of my Office.

As you depart to assume new responsibilities as Director of the Department of Governmental Medical Programs with the American Medical Association, I want to assure you that you will be long remembered as one of the most effective and productive Directors of Personnel and Training.

Once again, may I offer my heartfelt thanks for the loyal and dedicated support you have given me throughout these years, and Sara Hill joins in warmest wishes to Nida and you for continued happiness and success in the future.

Sincerely,
LEONARD D. HEATON,
Lieutenant General,
The Surgeon General.

MARTIN COUNTY GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of this House some of the confusing and perplexing requirements that exist between the citizens of this Nation and those who are arbitrarily making policy and guidelines from the many departments of this Government.

I refer specifically to the case of the Martin County General Hospital located in Williamston, N.C. This is a hospital of approximately 50-bed capacity. It serves a wide area of rural people of both races. I am convinced that they have made every effort to comply with the decrees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to qualify for medicare approval.

Here is the tragic and ridiculous story of their experience with HEW.

On June 30 I was notified that approval was being withheld because a complaint had been lodged against this hospital. When I inquired of HEW, who had registered the complaint and what the nature of the complaint might be, I was told that the compaint was not considered valid and therefore, had been dismissed. On July 8 this hospital was advised that the complaint had been withdawn and that approval in all probability would be forthcoming.

When I attempted to find the reason for nonapproval, I was told that a team of inspectors would be sent to this hospital to make a final report. This was done on August 3. Today, August 10, I have been advised by a Mrs. Rose Brock, compliance officer of the HEW Department, that approval was being denied. In answer to my question of what the noncompliance might be, I was given the following answer:

First that the waiting rooms in the hospital had not been totally integrated. This, the administrator of the hospital vigorously denies. And the second reason was that the hospital was not uniformly referring to all people with the title of "Mr. and Mrs." This requirement startled me to the degree that I then asked again if I had heard correctly and was again informed that the failure to use the title "Mr. or Mrs." was a violation of the guidelines. I might add that both of these compaints, even if true have absolutely no bearing whatsoever on the quality of medical treatment being received by members of all races.

It is difficult for me to comprehend how anybody or any department could deprive elderly people who are otherwise eligible for medicare of these rights and privileges for the reason of the failure to use "Mr. and Mrs." in connection with the operation of this, or any other hospital. I can only conclude that it is just another chapter in the dangerous depths to which bureaucracy has come in imposing their will on those persons and institutions dedicated to public service, in many cases without valid reason or justification.

This, of course, is a direct distortion of the purpose of Martin County General or any other hospital that purpose is, and should be, to provide medical service and treatment to the sick and injured, and for that purpose only.

I hope the Members of this House will join with me in protesting these unreasonable and unrealistic demands of governmental agencies while the health and well-being of sick people are at stake.

I am convinced that Congress enacted the medicare bill for the purpose of providing care for our elder citizens and for this purpose only.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN WALL ERECTION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago tomorrow, the Russians gave literally concrete evidence to the entire world of the fruits communism holds for the peoples in its grasp. During the nights of August 12 and 13, 1961, the Soviets erected a barrier across the previous sector boundary which separated the Soviet area of responsibility from those of the United States, British and French occupation forces in the former German capital of Berlin. Within a few weeks the original barbed-wire barrier was replaced by a wall of concrete blocks surmounted by barbed wire, and this monument to Soviet rule stands today as a symbol of all that is inherently evil in communism.

The Berlin Wall was not erected to keep oppressed, deprived, and enslaved peoples of the United States, British, and French zones of Berlin from pushing their way into the warmth of Soviet beneficence. On the contrary, it was erected to halt the unending defection of literally thousands of Soviet gone Berliners from escaping the oppression, deprivation, and enslavement of Soviet communism. East Berliners were fleeing into the western sectors of the city in numbers which left no doubt that, when placed side by side, communism cannot compete with democracy in the minds and hearts of people left free to choose.

For 5 full years, the Russians have maintained this ugly symbol of their police state. Their minions have slain East Berliners who, despite the physical barrier placed in their path, still prefer to seek a way into West Berlin under the threat of death rather than to live under the puppet government the Soviets have placed in power in East Berlin. And still they come—not in thousands any more, since their bodies cannot overcome the height of the Berlin wall and their legs cannot outdistance the East Berlin policemen's bullets, but in ones and twos.

Despite the deprivations inside the Berlin wall, despite the necessity for the wall to keep the East Berliners enslaved, despite the obvious symbolism of the wall as a barrier to freedom, the Soviets continue to characterize democracy as the evil in society and dare to paint communism as paradise. Yes, Mr. Speaker, despite the evidence of tyranny and oppression inherent in the wall, the Soviet "double-think" process still dares claim that good is evil and their evil is good.

But the world is not fooled. Those newly independent peoples of Africa have displayed their distrust of communism. In southeast Asia, the Indonesians have rid themselves of leaders who sought to further involve them with communism. In South Vietnam a people who are weary after 20 years of incessant warfare are still battling valiantly to keep communism from overcoming their land. In South America, distrust of communism and its spokesmen is seen ever more frequently in national elections. In Europe, communism is at its lowest postwar ebb.

Mr. Speaker, the Berlin wall stands for the world to behold as a true symbol of the meaning of communism—imprisonment behind barriers imposed by Moscow. While the free world sympathizes with the East Berliners sealed into their Communist prison by the wall, on this, the fifth anniversary of its erection, we recognize it for what it actually is—an "advertisement" of the fruits of communism.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, commonly referred to as the cold war GI bill. My bill would increase the rates of financial assistance under the veterans educational assistance program and broaden that program to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training.

Under existing law a cold war veteran receives only $100 per month if he is pursuing a course of education on a full-time basis, $75 per month on a three-quarter-time basis, and $50 per month on a half-time basis. Under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act the child of a veteran who died from a service-connected disability or who is totally disabled from a service-connected cause may receive education assistance at the rate of $130 per month on a full-time basis, $95 per month on a three-quarter basis, and $60 per month on a half-time basis. It does not seem reasonable that we should have two educational assistance programs operated by the Veterans' Administration under which a cold war veteran and the child of a veteran deceased or totally disabled from service-connected cause receive different amounts of financial assistance.

My bill would increase the rates of assistance to a cold war veteran without dependents so that they would be identical to the assistance now payable under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. Under existing law cold war veterans with one dependent receive assistance at the monthly rate of $125 for a full-time course, $95 for a three-quarter-time course, and $65 for a half-time course. My bill would increase these rates to $155, $115, and $75. The existing rates for a cold war veteran with two or more dependents would be increased from $150, $115, and $75, to $180, $135, and $90.

Since the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act was enacted in 1956, the cost for tuition and required fees have increased approximately 50 percent and the costs of living have increased approximately 18 percent. Probably these costs will continue to increase and if we do not increase the rates of financial assistance to cold war veterans, the purpose of the legislation will be defeated because many veterans will be financially unable to take advantage of it.

The World War II and Korean GI bills provided for on-the-job training. This program has proved very successful in the past and I think it is only proper that the same assistance should be extended to veterans of the cold war. In fact, the need for such training increases as the increasing complexity of our technology requires greater skills and technical knowledge. Many industries already have job training programs in existence and with financial assistance such as provided to World War II and Korean conflict veterans, many cold war veterans will take advantage of this type of training with benefit not only to themselves but also with benefits to the entire economy through the provision of highly skilled workers so essential in modern production.

My bill also provides for on-the-farm training on substantially the same basis as the World War II and Korean conflict veterans received under previous GI bills. It seems to me that cold war veterans should have the same opportunity as the World War II and Korean conflict veterans to prepare themselves for a career or occupation of their choosing. Those who prefer to remain on the farm should not be penalized and denied training because of that fact.

It is well known that there is a critical shortage of qualified airline pilots. With continuous increase in air travel this shortage will become more critical in the future and I think it is very important that we have a program to cope with this critical shortage. I have provided in my bill that cold war veterans may receive assistance for flight training and I believe that will not only benefit the veterans who desire to pursue aviation as a career, but will also be of significant benefit to the general public.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHISLER (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 1 hour, on August 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOW (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 15 minutes, on August 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.
Mr. STANTON.
Mr. TUPPER.
Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. SAYLOR.
Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TENZER.
Mr. ZABLOCKI.
Mr. RYAN.
Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2638. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of reporting of taxable income and tax withholdings of military personnel, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2639. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain public lands are held in trust by the United States for the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 967. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11696, a bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16863. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16306. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 16897. A bill to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evalution, publication, and sale of standard reference data (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 82. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 666. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "A study of Federal Credit Programs"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 791. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on U.S. policy toward Asia by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 879. Resolution for printing 2,000 additional copies of part I of "United States-South African Relations" for use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 939. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1841). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol" (Rept. No. 1842). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 925. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal," a compilation of addresses by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania (Rept. No. 1843). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 872. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 89–97, 89th Congress, the "Social Security Amendments of 1965" (Rept. No. 1844). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 887. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1539 by the Committee on Education and Labor on the International Education Act of 1966 (Rept. No. 1845). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 891. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1846). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 946. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1568 of the 89th Congress (Rept. No. 1847). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 13881, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1848). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4671. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16984. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16985. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16986. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 16987. A bill to amend title 10, United State Code, to provide for an American Hero Award medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16988. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16989. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16990. A bill to stabilize prices of food staples, to provide for an investigation of food prices by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16991. A bill to authorize a national medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16992. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16993. A bill to prohibit the payment by the Internal Revenue of informers' fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 16994. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 16995. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 16996. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain airplane parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 16997. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 16998. A bill to further the completion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 16999. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for door delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17000. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish six centers to provide facilities for conducting research into the motivations and behavioral patterns of persons who have been convicted of crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 17001. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide city delivery mail service on a door delivery service basis for postal patrons receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17002. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 17003. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an American Hero Award medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 17004. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of financial assistance under the veterans' educational assistance program of that title and to broaden that program to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 17005. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 17006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a temporary period for a graduated reduction or elimination of the investment credit based on the number of employees of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 17007. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 17008. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a memorial to John F. Kennedy in or near the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, S. Dak.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 17009. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 17010. A bill to amend section 401(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to remove certain minimum population requirements applicable to Indian reservations and lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 17011. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 17012. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 17013. A bill to provide for the restoration and rehabilitation of lands damaged by surface or strip mining; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.J. Res. 1268. Joint resolution providing for Federal participation in the construction of an addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library as a memorial to Eleanor Roosevelt; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.J. Res. 1269. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second week of November 1966 as National Date Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Con. Res. 976. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H. Con. Res. 977. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam be treated in accordance with the Geneva conventions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 978. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 979. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 17014. A bill for the relief of Wilkinson & Jenkins Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 17015. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Intili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17016. A bill for the relief of Domenico Annibale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 17017. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lazlo Tarnoi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call the Congress' attention to the forthcoming celebration of National Drum Corps Week in America, August 20 to 27. The art of drum and bugle corps is in the best of American traditions, in the spirit of our colonial forefathers, who rallied around the Spirit of '76 for inspiration and strength in their struggle for independence.

It is with pride that I see today's youth devoting their time and energies to this fine and patriotic activity. Over 1 million Americans in neighborhoods and communities across the Nation will mark their participation in local drum and bugle corps this week.

The corps' motto is "Pageantry and patriotism on the march." The stirring emotional response of today's youth to the colors and rhythms and disciplinary skills which belonging to the drum corps invokes, provides a truly worthwhile activity for today's young people.

I am especially proud of the fine performance of the corps from my own district, the Shamrocks, Thunderbirds, and Toreadors, of Seattle, Wash. Seattle's recent "music in motion" competition provided a colorful contest and exciting evening for participants and onlookers alike. It is in honor of this worthwhile community activity that the Nation commemorates National Drum Corps Week, and wishes today's youngsters every success in the continuation of drum corps as a colorful youth activity.

Congressman Horton Applauds Red Creek Newspaper for Service Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a program announced recently by the operators of a newspaper in my congressional district, the Red Creek Herald in Red Creek, N.Y.

Its publisher, Anthony G. Palermo and its managing editor, Ted L. Miller, have offered to send free copies of the newspaper to local servicemen stationed in Vietnam.

This generous and thoughtful action deserves public commendation. Too many times our thoughts on the war in that country have centered only on our policies and actions in pursuing this conflict. In many cases, we have overlooked the human aspects, the effects which service in a far distant area can have on a young man.

Regular news from home, concerning people, places, and events which are known to him can be a most welcome event to the bone-weary soldier who feels a million miles from familiar surroundings.

Thrust into a strange oriental atmosphere, fighting a war on terrain unfamiliar and always threatening, a young soldier yearns for things which remind him of home.

Again, I commend Mr. Palermo and Mr. Miller for their action. I am sure that their readers, and the servicemen who will receive the Red Creek Herald in the near future, join with me in that commendation.

House Joint Resolution 1169, Authorizing an International Conference on Water for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1169 would enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington next year.

No resource in this world is more highly prized than water. In the Middle East it is a continuing and basic cause of international strife. Today in Nebraska whole areas are submerged by floods. Yet, as I pointed out only recently to the House, the Northeast has entered its sixth consecutive year of drought.

I have introduced H.R. 10244, which would establish a Federal Water Commission to coordinate our national water resource development. I have stressed the need for a comprehensive, overall effort to attempt to solve our Nation's water problems. This same principle applies internationally as well. Planning for the use of water to meet the needs of the world's rapidly expanding population requires, as President Johnson has said, "a massive cooperative international effort."

Mr. Speaker, the proposed Conference would help to stimulate planning for water resource development at all levels of government and would encourage international cooperation and actions to solve water problems. It may well lead to the establishment of a worldwide water-for-peace program.

Wall of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, West Germany observes an unhappy birthday this week; the Berlin wall is 5 years old.

It was 5 years ago, on August 13, 1961, that Communist East Germany began erecting the wall of brick and concrete between East and West Berlin. The barrier was immediately dubbed a "wall of shame" and so it has remained ever since, a shameful reminder of Communist tyranny and hypocrisy.

When the wall first went up, the Communists explained it was needed to keep West Berliners from illegally crossing into East Berlin. They reluctantly admitted that some East Berliners were traveling West—and staying there.

Indeed they were: Between 1945 and 1961, an estimated 3,300,000 crossed from East Germany to West Berlin. During the time official records were kept from 1949 to 1961, 2,600,000 entered from East Germany. And in the period just prior to the building of the wall, refugees were entering at the rate of 4,000 a week. Since the building of the wall, hundreds of freedom-seeking East Germans have dared guards and bullets by going over and under the wall into West Berlin. Many have succeeded. Many others have been shot down in cold blood by the Communist police.

In their own grim macabre way, the East German Communists are also observing the fifth anniversary of the wall. They are in the midst of making it bigger, uglier, and even more difficult to cross. Whole sections have been replaced. In some areas, the new wall has rounded tiles on top so that potential escapees will find no grip for scaling.

Behind the wall, on the East Berlin side, new fences, police dogs, armed guards, and minefields have been added.

In addition, there have been travel delays along the highway connecting West Berlin with West Germany. The number of shooting incidents has also increased. Tension, once again, is on the rise in Berlin.

In this context, it is curious, to say the least, that the Johnson administration insists upon talking about the need to "build bridges" to Eastern Europe. The administration also professes to see signs of "mellowing" among the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and even in the Soviet Union.

And yet the wall still stands. Communist guards still shoot and often kill East Germans attempting to escape from communism. What a stark contrast: the administration urges the building of bridges while the Communists build their concentration walls higher and higher.

This is, after all, what the Berlin wall is: a barrier 30 miles long which imprisons some 16 million East Germans under Communist rule.

As long as the wall between East and West Berlin remains, all talk about "building bridges" to Communist Eastern Europe is so much wasted breath.

What should we do about the wall? Well, in 1964, Barry Goldwater, the Republican presidential nominee, suggested that the United States stipulate destruction of the Berlin wall as a condition of any major negotiation with the Soviet Union. However, the Johnson administration took the position that such a proposal would aggravate our relations with the Soviet Union. Give them time, argued the administration, and they will mellow. It was implied that the wall would come down eventually.

But, 2 years later, we see that the wall, far from being torn down, is being built up, reinforced, made more permanent. Is there not an obvious lesson here for the United States? I think there is:

When you negotiate with Communists, negotiate from a position of strength and with firmness. Do not make concessions before you begin talking. As former Senator Goldwater has said:

> It is time free men set some conditions of their own rather than forever listening and responding only to communism's conditions. There are many conditions: cessation of subversion from Cuba; cessation of arms shipments, possibly even new missiles, to Cuba; cessation of aid to the Vietcong and so on and on.

And, may I add, it is time, and past time, for the administration to talk less about building bridges and more about tearing down walls like the Berlin wall, so that West Germany and the free world will not be obliged to mark any more unhappy anniversaries of its ugly existence.

Accidental Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain I speak for the entire House membership in expressing shock at the accidental bombing of a U.S. Coast Guard patrol craft in Vietnam waters by three U.S. Air Force planes with resultant loss of life and injury.

We realize that tragic accidents such as this inevitably result from any war, but this incident, following closely the accidental bombing of a South Vietnam village, points to the need for a tightening of safeguards to lessen the possibility of further accidents.

These young Coast Guardsmen were valiantly carrying out their patrol mission in the service of their country. As ranking minority member of the House Coast Guard and Navigation Subcommittee, I extend condolences to the survivors of the deceased and prayerful best wishes to the wounded for full recovery.

The Interior Department Study of Strip Mining in Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, by now most Members of Congress will have seen the interim report by the Secretary of the Interior on the study of strip and surface mining in Appalachia.

There are many broad recommendations on which I do not propose to comment at this time. No doubt the administration will be sending up legislation to implement the recommendations, so we will have ample opportunity to consider their implications.

As author of legislation to provide a study of strip-mined areas, I am, of course, pleased to have a document setting forth some statistics that have been needed for a good many years. Table 1 of the report discloses that 515,031 stripped acres in Appalachia are unreclaimed or partially reclaimed. Thirty-eight percent of that total lies in Pennsylvania's bituminous coal and anthracite regions, with 30 percent—or 158,500 acres exclusive to the bituminous fields of the central and western parts of the State.

Thus opportunities to develop recreational facilities by reclaiming strip mines of Pennsylvania are abundantly outlined. With recreational facilities already overtaxed in the eastern part of the United States, Pennsylvania can become a greater attraction as more families look to the outdoors for rest and relaxation. Experience has shown that many abandoned strip areas are ideal for conversion into parks, lakes, and woodlands.

It is my intention to bring sportsmen and officials of mining groups together with Federal and State officials for the purpose of stepping up reclamation work in Pennsylvania. Under a provision of the Appalachian Development Act, 75 percent of the cost of reclamation of lands in the public domain will be underwritten by the Federal Government. It is my understanding that, of the $3.7 million appropriated by Congress for this purpose in fiscal 1966, only $750,000 was used. It is folly to permit funds for so important an activity to lie idle, and I am hopeful that the interim report of the Secretary of the Interior will stimulate and bring new life into the program.

Letter From Paul Findley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], wrote a letter to each Republican Member of the House urging our support for the amended title IV in the civil rights legislation before us.

Mr. Findley's letter is a superb expression of intellectual honesty and political courage. Pointing out that property rights have never been absolute, he called on us to follow Abraham Lincoln's example in putting "the dignity of people above the rights of property."

Because this letter is so outstanding, I want to commend it to the attention of all my colleagues by inserting it in the Congressional Record:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1966.

Dear Republican Colleague: After long thought I have come to an affirmative position on the housing title as now modified. The title may possibly be included in the recommital, so perhaps my thoughts will interest you.

I give my support to it in spite of the dangerous and ill-advised housing demonstrations and riots in Chicago and elsewhere—not because of them.

To take this position I had to close my ears to those who preach Black Power—a radical movement which, like Ku Klux Klanism, will surely retard not advance human rights.

In doing so, I had to take into account adverse arguments offered by colleagues whose motives are the finest and whose sincerity I do not question.

Undoubtedly the modified housing title is full of uncertainties. It is not perfect. It compromises principle to a degree hardly in keeping with Mosaic Law.

Truly it has shadow instead of substance to a degree that may lead to bitter disillusionment. As such, it may aggravate rather than relieve housing problems of Negroes. It does indeed qualify property rights.

Even so, can we deny that on balance this legislation is in complete harmony with the spirit and broad purposes of the United States from the Declaration of Independence to this very day?

In the quest for equal justice for all, the American people have never insisted on perfection before taking progressive steps. To illustrate, the final draft of the Constitution authorized the import of slaves for an additional 20 years. It was a grisly compromise which so disturbed a Virginia delegate, George Mason, that he refused to sign the Constitution. The others accepted this imperfection because they recognized that the total document—on balance—was good and would advance the cause of freedom and equal justice.

Like the Constitution, this title deserves to be judged on balance.

Beginning with ancient Common Law, property rights have been limited and qualified in many ways—and wisely—over the years. Recent examples are housing codes, zoning and health ordinances, pollution regulations.

Property rights are constanty measured and tested against even higher rights. And so it should be.

Indeed, in its final draft, the language of the Declaration of Independence was changed from "life, liberty and property" to read "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness."

The Declaration spoke of God-given rights which government is intended to protect. This reference was undoubtedly the foundation for the "equal protection of the law" principle which later became a part of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

It is argued that the housing title—directed as it is to persons instead of states—cannot properly be based on the 14th Amendment. The wording may not conform precisely but even so the housing title marches in absolute rhythm with the spirit and broad intent of the 14th Amendment.

Will this legislation alter substantially housing patterns and practices? I doubt it. Certainly the effect of the public accommodations title in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was hardly as sweeping as some predictions. If property values tumbled substantially as a consequence, I have yet to hear of it.

Habits have their own inertia and custom is not quickly altered by law. Even if all discrimination should be eliminated in the sale and rental of housing it is doubtful whether housing patterns would change appreciably.

Surely no one is foolish enough to suppose that this legislation in itself will end discrimination in the rental or sale of housing. It may not even diminish it very much.

But it will at least help to point the right way to God's faltering and errant children, prick a conscience now and then, and hopefully at least drive from earshot and sight the agreements—euphemistically and inaccurately called gentlemen's agreements—which discriminate purely on the basis of race or religion.

I hope my colleagues in the Party of Abraham Lincoln will put aside their reservations and join in support of this title. As Lincoln once observed, "The Declaration of Independence does not say all men are created equal except Negroes." Lincoln did not hesitate to put the dignity of people above the rights of property and neither should we.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley,
Representative in Congress.

National Drum Corps Week: August 20 Through 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the week of August 20 through 27 is National Drum Corps Week.

All over our Nation the week will be observed by young men and women active in drum and bugle corps, under the motto "Pageantry and patriotism—on the march."

From personal experience, I know the beneficial effects which participation in musical activities can have on young people. It seems to me that participation in drum and bugle corps work is a good way of fighting juvenile delinquency.

There is no better way to obtain harmless release of youthful enthusiasms than blowing a bugle or beating a drum. At the same time, marching to music teaches coordination, successful group participation and appreciation of music.

One of the largest massings of drum corps in the Nation takes place annually in my own community, Milwaukee, during the famous, fabulous Fourth of July parade. This year, for example, more than 50 such units participated.

The Metropolitan Milwaukee area also is the home of many outstanding drum and bugle corps. Their activities have brought many hours of pleasure to the people of our community, who—as you might expect—"love a parade."

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the House join me in sending congratulations and best wishes to the hundreds of thousands of youngsters and adults who participate in drum corps activities.

Recent Legislation Has Radical Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we Members of this House of Representatives have been exposed to one of the most intensive barrages of legislation against personal liberty and individual freedom in recent history. And these historic days of debate have been an extension of the past 3 years which have seen a vast onrush of legislation that has encroached upon the liberties of a great many in order to advance the interests of a very few.

A number of observers have described these events as part of a gradualistic and progressive trend made necessary by America's emergence as a modern industrial society. I have opposed this legislation, however, for I am convinced of its radical character and of the grave threat it poses to American freedoms. These recently passed laws do not represent the logical culmination of a truly American political philosophy. Instead, they involve a precipitous break with the traditions of local initiative and individual freedom which made this country great.

A part of the bill—title IV of H.R. 14765, to be precise—is the most flagrant example of legislative ambiguity that I have ever seen. The "forced housing bill" is so far removed from the context of our legislative traditions and our constitutional heritage that it makes a shambles of the most vital institution of American life—the basic right of private property ownership. Have we completely abandoned our old principle, "A man's home is his castle"?

Is it our purpose here to deny each citizen of this great Nation the right of private property ownership? Are we to destroy the individual's freedom, which we have attempted to shield from encroachment for the almost 200 years since our courageous forefathers, led by that indomitable bulwark of democracy, Thomas Jefferson, put the breath of life to our basic freedoms?

Among the many traditional guidelines which this bill violates are fundamental concepts of property rights in our great system of laws. One of the most significant concepts reads as follows:

> The absolute and entire property in the land held by the tenant to himself and his heirs forever.

The bill would violate a natural corollary of the right of property ownership—the right to contract—in which the right to choose is a vital and inherent element, providing incentive and inspiration for all freemen. Property ownership and the right to contract are basic human rights in America which belong to everyone. From these rights arise much of our system of laws insuring other individual rights and freedoms.

Let us examine several specific aspects of section 401 which states that—

> It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

Section 403 states that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person . . . (1) to refuse to sell, rent, or lease . . . or otherwise make available or deny, a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This denies that voluntary intent is a significant aspect of the contract and that a man has a right to contract with whomever he chooses. Such an unjust encroachment on an individual's right borders on tyranny. For example, suppose the applicant is not only of a national origin wholly unacceptable to the homeowner, but also possesses personal characteristics which are equally as repugnant. The applicant might be a dope addict, a sex deviate, a gangster, an alcoholic, or simply a vile person of a repulsive nature. Supposing further that the applicant is denied housing, who is to say whether he was refused on accounty of his national origin or on account of one of his negative characteristics? It is hard for me to believe that the bill before us would force this homeowner to take under his roof a person whom he found to be personally, morally, and socially objectionable.

According to section 403 of the bill, one is not allowed to show a preference in advertising his home. I feel that, should this clause be passed into law, our Government would deny one's freedom of expression. The administration has recently voiced a tolerance of criticism of its foreign policy, for apparently it feels that the right to dissent peaceably is basic and inalienable. Can our Government discard such a show of concern for the rights of the individual, by repudiating his right to own private property, his right to contract, and his freedom of expression?

The same section states that it shall be unlawful "to represent to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin that any dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, rental, or lease when such dwelling is in fact so available." This clause provided an applicant with a right to come into your home. Even in criminal jurisprudence, a search warrant is originally mandatory for such right of entrance onto the property of another.

In addition, the bill has been so poorly conceived or written that it contains numerous potential hazards for personal freedoms that are not readily apparent. Suppose that—while a Negro is questioning a white man on the sale of his house—the latter decides that he wants to retain his home, is this a violation?

In general, this bill seems to be prejudiced against the homeowner in contradiction to the Supreme Court's ruling. For instance, the bill provides that the applicant will not incur any expense in court costs or fees if he should decide to litigate. The homeowner, however, must provide his own attorney and is forced to incur the applicant's attorney fees if he does not prevail.

In section 407, the bill provides the applicant with the assistance of the Attorney General and his staff at any time that it is deemed necessary to intervene in a lawsuit. Although the Attorney General has not asked for it, he is given the right to intervene if there is reasonable cause. This reasonable cause, the way I look at it, can evolve into a similar situation which we have been fighting to preserve all over the world. The freedom from fear must be avoided to preclude our slipping into that abyss of dictatorship rule. Such practices can only result in the abolition of privacy in one's own home. In addition, it provides for a bureaucratic spook that can continually haunt the citizens of this democratic system with more Federal pressures.

In section 408 the quasi-judicial Board called the Fair Housing Board appears to be establishing an additional court system active in every municipality in this country. This bureaucratic system would find itself not only becoming embroiled in the private affairs of the citizens but would be violating the affairs of the respective States.

In section 410 the homeowner finds that he can be held in criminal contempt subject to $300 fine and 45 days' imprisonment without the right of trial by jury. It is paradoxical that such a drastic measure would appear in a bill pertaining to civil rights. How do we reconcile ourselves with a trial without jury? This violates every precept for which civil rights are defended.

The hind part of a hog is pork no matter which way it happens to be sliced. Our title IV of this civil rights bill, H.R. 14765, has not lost a bit of its odiferous nature no matter what slicing has been occasioned upon it by the House Judiciary Committee or any of the amendments offered. What we call a revision to title IV is no more than the same part of the hog sliced differently. It is still pork.

As has been uttered previously by some of my distinguished colleagues, the legislative reputation of this body is at stake. If we are willing to trade the basic and inherent right of all Americans, the right of private property ownership for the passage of the entire bill, guised under the panacea for social equality, then we must be ready to face the future with a complete lack of objectivity. Not only will we sell our own individual liberties down the proverbial river but that of the many minority groups who will be limited by the provisions of the bill and will also suffer the loss of their inherent individual freedom.

The 13th Report From Washington to the Residents of Los Angeles' 30th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that one of the most important duties of a Representative in Congress is to make regular reports on his activities in Washington to his constituents at home.

For that reason, and because of the necessity of an active and fully informed citizenry, I would like to include in today's RECORD the text of the 13th in a series of regular reports to the residents of my 30th California Congressional District.

The report follows:

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON: AUGUST 1966

REGISTER TO VOTE

The right to vote is every American's badge of freedom. We should treasure and protect this precious right by exercising our franchise in the important General Elections this fall.

But, in order to vote you must register by September 15.

For information on where and how to register, contact the Los Angeles County Registrar of Voters, phone 628–9211 (after regular office hours or on weekends call 629–2451).

CONSUMER PROTECTION

With growing national concern over the rising cost-of-living, and the increased threat of inflation, I am happy to report success in obtaining full public hearings this month on my Truth-in-Packaging Consumer Protection Bill to outlaw deceptive and unfair practices in labeling and packaging retail goods—and to provide American consumers and housewives with accurate, complete, and honest information on the foods and drugs they buy.

MINIMUM WAGE

With an impressive 3 to 1 majority, the House endorsed a measure to substantially broaden coverage as well as gradually increase the federal minimum wage.

By extending coverage to nearly 8 million new workers, and raising the $1.25 national minimum wage by stages to $1.60, we will be protecting the vital interests of Golden State workers and employers alike—by helping reduce the unfair, low-wage competitive advantage of our neighboring states whose average pay scales do not come up to California's higher rate.

MISSION TO LATIN AMERICA

As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Special Study Mission to Latin America, I had the honor recently of submitting the Mission's survey report on the effectiveness of U.S. assistance to Alliance for Progress programs designed to speed up economic reform and development in several Western Hemisphere nations.

Our investigation showed that active community self-help efforts and expanding local participation in the development process still are the key to urgently needed economic improvement in our neighboring republics to the South.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The House also adopted a bill to revise the 31-year-old federal-state unemployment compensation system—first established under the Social Security Act of 1935—by adding coverage to some 3 million more workers, and providing a new program of extended benefits during national or state recessions.

This bi-partisan compromise measure offers important wage protection to thousands of Californians by providing a cushion against unexpected loss of jobs often caused—even in present relatively prosperous times when national unemployment rates are holding below 4 percent—by major changes in government defense and space program purchase orders, which may have a temporary adverse effect on hundreds of related California-based industries—many located in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan area.

NARCOTIC REHABILITATION

Congress is following California's leadership in attempting to develop a fresh approach to deal more effectively with the serious problems of narcotic addiction—stressing modern medical treatment, rehabilitation programs, and intensive aftercare for narcotic victims.

On a nearly unanimous 367 to 1 vote of approval, the House passed and sent to the Senate the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, which I had joined in introducing as co-sponsor.

With favorable Senate action anticipated in the near future, we may soon expect to see the start of a promising new national effort, modeled after California's pioneering civil commitment program—by far the most successful large-scale treatment program for narcotic addicts ever undertaken in this country.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

One of the landmark pieces of legislation this year was the Food For Freedom Program, overwhelmingly OK'd by the House on a 333–20 roll-call vote.

This program will help alleviate hunger for some 100 million persons in more than 100 countries around the world, as well as promote self-help economic and agricultural development in these emerging nations.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In what President Johnson called "an important new milestone on the nation's journey toward equality of justice and opportunity for all our citizens", the House, for the third time in as many years, gave its strong bi-partisan support to a measure designed to assure first-class citizenship to every American, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin.

Adopted on a substantial 259–157 vote, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, as passed by the House but still to be considered by the Senate, contains the following major provisions:

Title I provides machinery for uniform selection of federal juries throughout the country.

Title II forbids racial discrimination in selection of federal and state juries.

Title III empowers the Attorney General to file suit to protect all constitutional rights of citizens when he finds a "pattern or practice" of discrimination.

Title IV forbids discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, exempting homeowners, boarding houses and owner-occupied apartments of four units or less. This would open up large apartments and all new housing.

Title V makes it a crime to injure or threaten anyone exercising his constitutional rights, punishable by 10 years in prison for injury and up to life in prison for death.

STUDENT INTERN PROGRAM

Submitting a special research project on Latin America is Miss Barbara Shaw of Los Angeles. Barbara will be a senior this fall at Stanford University, after spending the summer with us as a college intern. 1966 is the fourth year in a row I have participated in the Congressional Student Intern Program, which I believe to be extremely valuable—not only in helping with the office work—but as a fascinating way for interested young people to gain a close personal understanding of how their government operates.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

Two recent events in Southeast Asia appear to offer a ray of hope that we may eventually be able to move the war in Vietnam away from the battlefield and over to the conference table.

First, within South Vietnam, if the scheduled September elections are, in fact, a free and fair expression of the popular will, and result in the establishment of a truly representative civilian government, this will encourage the widest possible participation in the political process and provide an attractive peaceful alternative to those who now pursue the path of armed conflict.

In this way the people of South Vietnam, themselves, will be given an opportunity to determine their own future—to work out a national destiny free from force and violence.

The second hopeful event is the recent effort by several leading Asia-Pacific nations to join together and assume a greater degree of regional responsibility for peacekeeping.

I strongly urge the President to take full advantage of this most welcome Asian initiative to establish broad diplomatic contacts among all interested nations. These in turn could form the basis for a dialogue leading to ultimate negotiations on equitable terms for a just peace in that war-torn part of the world.

Civil Rights Act of 1966: The Compromise Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have made a number of statements during the debate on the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, H.R. 14765, urging my colleagues to support the legislation reported by the House Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, without weakening amendments.

On August 3, 1966, I rose in opposition to the Mathias amendment to title IV of H.R. 14765 and pointed out that in New York State, discrimination in the sale or rental of all housing is prohibited—except in two-family, owner-occupied homes. I also commented on other State antidiscrimination in housing statutes. At that time, I stated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 18128:

> Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the MacGregor amendment, consistent with the laws of my State, and in opposition to the Mathias amendment, and in opposition to the Moore amendment.
>
> A policy statement issued the other day by the Republican policy committee declared that title IV of the bill "has divided the country and fostered discord an animosity." It is not title IV which fosters discord—it is the absence of State laws against discrimination in housing which divides the country.
>
> Seventeen States with a total population of approximately 100 million of our citizens now have laws against discrimination in publicly assisted and private housing. Eight of the States provide coverage in the sale of single family homes. Fifteen of the States cover realtors and thirteen of the States cover financial institutions.
>
> I am guided by only one policy statement—and that statement is called the Constitution of the United States.
>
> I suggest that title IV rather than "dividing the country" will unite the country by providing protection against discrimination in housing for the remainder of our citizens.
>
> I will support the MacGregor amendment, more consistent with the laws of my State of New York—I will vote against the Mathias amendment and will vote against the Moore amendment to strike title IV."

Although I realize that the great majority of our real estate brokers and salesmen are reputable businessmen and hence oppose the tactics employed by unscrupulous members of their calling who cause panic and encourage owners to sell their property by the spread of false rumors and threat to property values.

New York State has throughout the years set new and high standards for social laws to benefit its citizens. These laws have been followed in many States and many such laws have become the basis for Federal laws for the benefit of all the people of the United States. The antidiscrimination statutes of New York State, if enacted in other States, would remove the frustration of those discriminated against. It would reduce, to a great extent, the movement of persons discriminated against because of race or color, from city to city and from State to State to escape from such discrimination. Equal opportunity in education, employment, housing, recreation, and use of public facilities, as guaranteed by the Constitution, when available in every State of the Union will serve to reduce the grievances of our long-suffering minorities.

Discrimination in housing is unjust. New York State gave recognition to this injustice by the enactment of appropriate legislation a long time ago. Residents of New York are not involved and will not be affected by the provisions of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. Indirectly they will be benefited by the elimination of discrimination in housing elsewhere in the Nation. They will also be benefited by the fact that the law will strike down one of the root causes of racial problems throughout the country.

On a teller vote, the Mathias amendment passed by one vote. On the same date the House rejected the Moore amendment to strike all of title IV.

On the rollcall, August 9, I voted in favor of the Mathias amendment without which all of title IV was in danger.

As a result of the vote today on the Mathias amendment, the House rejected the motion to strike title IV in its entirety by a vote of 220 to 190.

On the vote taken on final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, including title IV, the vote was 259 in favor and 157 opposed.

Mr. Speaker, the need for compromise became clear during the debate, and for that reason I concurred with my colleagues who wanted the strongest civil rights bill possible. It is my hope that a significant drive to end discrimination in the sale or rental of housing will take place as a result of passage of this legislation so that every American will have the same opportunity to live in decent housing. That is a goal worthy of our Nation and of our democracy.

The 1966 Civil Rights Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 civil rights bill was passed by the House of Representatives Tuesday evening. I supported this legislation and I now have an obligation to the people of my great district to explain to them why I voted the way that I did. This is a controversial bill in my district. About the same number of letters were received asking me to vote for it as were received asking me to vote against it.

I basically voted for the civil rights bill of 1966 because it embodies the same historic principles of previous civil rights bills in that it advances the fulfillment of our commitment to the goal of equal justice for all. To accomplish this objective, the bill first, establishes a uniform procedure for jury selection in Federal courts; second, facilitates the elimination of all forms of unconstitutional discrimination in the selection of State court juries; and, third, provides criminal sanctions for forcible interference with the exercise of enumerated Federal rights.

Title V of the bill represents an assumption of Federal responsibility which is long overdue. The need for a modern law to deter civil rights crimes has been dramatized by the many, and sometimes unbelievable, instances of violence against certain of our citizens. In conclusion, I would have to say that the entire bill, with the exception of one title, reaffirms this country's commitment to equal justice for all and, therefore, merited my support.

Several important amendments were added to the civil rights bill during the debate. It is my personal opinion that the most important amendment was introduced by my colleague from Florida, Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER. The Cramer amendment to title V makes it a Federal offense to travel in interstate commerce with the intent of inciting riots and other forms of civil disobedience. The passage of this amendment is an essential step in halting the violence and bloodshed that has become the hallmark of the American summer. Much evidence is available to support the contention that recent race riots and looting in Cleveland, Chicago, and New York were the work, in part, of outside agitators who came into these communities for the express purpose of inciting civil disturbances.

In the 2½ weeks of debate on the civil rights bill, I believe it would be a fair statement to say that two-thirds of all the discussion centered around title IV. The "Housing Title" was argued by my colleagues hour after hour. There were stanch defenders of past civil rights legislation who called title IV the height of legislative hypocrisy, politically motivated and unrealistic. After listening to all the debate on title IV, I came to several conclusions:

First. There exists among the lawmakers who drafted this title real, honest doubts if the section means what it says. As amended on the floor, it exempts the individual homeowners and sales agents acting in an owner's behalf. Its content will be subject to widely varying interpretations.

Second. In title IV we find many a capable lawyer who says there is an apparent conflict between basic rights to private property and the competing claims of human rights, justice, and the welfare of all the people. The title, in its final form, is of questionable constitutionality. Associate Justice Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court has stated:

> Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden, in the name of equality, if the strictures of the (fourteenth) amendment were applied to governmental and private action without distinction.

Third. Ohio has a fair housing law that, in many ways, is superior to the Federal law. Title IV could supersede local and State authority and take away local and State jurisdiction in this area. Federal legislation in the field of housing should encourage and promote appropriate fair housing programs at the community level. I voted to strike title IV from the bill.

CONCLUSIONS

Racial discrimination in any form is a social and moral wrong. But, as we pass another civil rights bill, I wish to caution those who think that you can legislate morality, that it will not accomplish the lofty goals of its sponsors. The ghettos will not disappear. The hatred of some Negroes for the white man and the equal hatred of some whites for Negroes will not disappear. In fact, I am worried that title IV will create confusion, bitterness, and perhaps divide the country rather than foster equal justice for all.

The true answer to the problem of the compatibility of the white and Negro lies in the moral law of God, not in the civil laws of man. When we are willing to open our hearts to the fact that discrimination is against God's will, we will destroy the hatred that now exists among certain people. Until that day comes, racial discrimination will continue to pit man against man. What a waste of God's children.

Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am violently opposed to legislation which would amend the Federal Firearms Act by further restricting the possession and purchase of firearms. I am referring to S. 1592, H.R. 6628, and H.R. 6783, all of which seek to impose additional and more stringent Federal controls on traffic in firearms and on licensing requirements for dealing in such traffic. I protest these measures because they are based on uncertain assumptions, because their provisions for extensive Federal controls are unconstitutional, and because they would needlessly burden law-abiding Americans. In short, I disapprove of the proposed firearms legislation because it is unrealistic, unconstitutional, and unjust. Let me explain.

According to most spokesmen for these bills, the major purpose of additional firearms controls is the prevention of crime. I warmly applaud such a worthy objective, for I believe that our crime rates are unnecessarily high and that every practical measure should be implemented to lower them. I feel, however, that Federal controls over the traffic and sale of firearms do not constitute practical measures. The proposed bills are based on erroneous and unrealistic assumptions.

The first such assumption is the belief that merely keeping firearms away from criminals will prevent them from committing crimes. This view underestimates the resourcefulness and determination of most criminals and is ignorant of the variety of weapons at their disposal. The following statement by former District of Columbia Police Chief Robert V. Murray expresses my view:

> If I felt that we could take the guns out of the hands of criminals with this bill or any other bill, I would be a hundred percent for it . . . but a criminal who is going to set out to hold up a place or assault some-

body with a gun [is not going to be deterred by a law that he cannot have a gun in his possession].

It is probable that, instead of eradicating crimes involving firearms, the proposed bills will give birth to even more law evasion by forcing the criminal to seek his weapons in an "underground." Such illegal traffic has resulted from our ineffective efforts to curb the flow of liquor and drugs, and I cannot see why the effects of firearms controls would be any different.

A second unrealistic assumption of the bill is the belief that there is a close correlation between present firearms legislation and the incidence of crime. In truth, it is almost impossible to measure the effects of such legislation. To quote Dr. Marvin Wolfgang, an authority on criminal homicide:

> It is the contention of this observer that few homicides due to shootings could be avoided merely if a firearm were not immediately present, and that the offender would select some other weapon to achieve the same destructive goal.

Much of the impetus behind the proposed firearms legislation has been provided by recent and dramatic mass murders. It should be known, however, that catastrophes of this kind could not have been prevented by S. 1592, H.R. 6628, or H.R. 6783. Richard Speck's inclination to murder could hardly have been checked by these bills—indeed, he prefered a knife to a gun. As for Charles Whitman, apparently a respectable young man, he would have found it simple to elude any and every provision in these three bills.

Besides being unrealistically conceived, these bills would also prove difficult to enforce. To what extent, for example, would a licensed dealer bear responsibility for selling a firearm to a person prohibited under the bill from receiving it? Moreover, how far must he go to determine the customer's age, residence, and legal reputability, in order to comply with the legislation? An avalanche of redtape would probably overwhelm the gun owner who takes up residence in a new State and who therefore must comply with the proposed restrictions governing the interstate transportation of firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the aforementioned premises on which these bills are founded are unrealistic and that their enforcement will at best be a complicated and burdensome procedure. It is apparent that the potential gains in public security envisioned by the creators of this legislation have been exaggerated, and that the small benefits which might accrue will not justify those disadvantages wrought on law-abiding citizens.

A second and equally critical weakness in this legislation is that it is wholly illegal. It is unconstitutional. The second amendment to the Constitution reads:

> A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

I cannot see how these bills can fail to infringe upon this right as granted to the individual. A major feature of the Dodd bill, for example, is the prohibition of all shipments of firearms in interstate and foreign commerce to individuals.

This legislation also threatens a constitutional right belonging to the States. According to the Constitution, the Federal Government cannot impinge upon the police powers reserved to the States. Part of Senator DODD's bill, however, would create prohibition for licenses in their intrastate as well as in their interstate dealings. The provision ignores most legislative precedents and clearly constitutes an encroachment upon the police powers of the States. If such liberties are ever granted to the Federal Government, there would be no limit to the nature and extent of criminal legislation it could enact. If the legislative guidelines proposed by these bills are followed to their logical conclusion, we would, in effect, have established a police state.

Another area of the Constitution to which the proposed firearms legislation does violence is the distinction between interstate and intrastate commerce. These bills arrogantly assume that all firearms commerce is interstate. Besides being unrealistic and unconstitutional, Mr. Speaker, the bills before us are unjust because they discriminate against small businesses. For instance, subsection (a) of section 3 of S. 1592 would increase the per annum fee for dealers from $1 to $100. I am particularly concerned about the effect of this provision on the sale of firearms and ammunition through small hardware and general stores, especially those which are active only during the hunting season. Few of these small businesses can afford the exorbitant $100 fee.

Another unjustified hardship which the firearms legislation would potentially inflict is contained in S. 1592, section 2 (a). By placing excessive restrictions on law-abiding citizens who wish to order sporting firearms by mail, those citizens who do not have ready access to dealers are placed in an exceedingly difficult position.

It is often overlooked, moreover, that firearms are an integral part of the lives of much of our outlying population. Whereas the use of a shotgun is irrelevant to life in New York City, it is often a necessity in the environs of Sylvania, Ga. Meat for the table and protection against intruders are provided by firearms to a surprisingly large number of rural Americans who are often far from either a streamlined supermarket and the protective arm of the law. These nonurban elements do not constitute a major criminal threat and the proposed firearms legislation would seriously and unjustly burden them.

The bills would also discriminate against legitimate sporting pursuits. One example among many is the section which would threaten the availability to the American sportsman of popular foreign weapons such as the Browning, Beretta, Anchutz, and Hammerli. Constituting safe, noncriminal activities, hunting and skeet shooting develop muscular coordination and encourage friendship and sportsmanship. It is my view that the vitality of these sports would be seriously jeopardized by the proposed firearms legislation.

Another consideration which the creators of these bills have ignored is the need for personal security in our increasingly violent society. Many people believe that because our country has made the transition from a wide-open frontier community to a heavily policed urban society, there is no need to retain such assurances of personal safety as were possessed by our predecessors. The recent occurrences in Watts, Chicago, Cleveland, and Jacksonville, however, remind me constantly that our lives are almost as exposed and precarious as those of our frontier forefathers.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Damon S. Scott, pastor, Trinity Methodist Church, Palatka, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we pause to thank Thee for this day and for these Thy dedicated servants of peace who are led by their dreams rather than to be pushed by our problems.

May this be a day of reasoning, not of disagreement; a day of unity, not of discord; a day of harmony in making decisions.

Forgive our careless ways and cleanse us from all impurities and lift us above pettiness of spirit.

May we know ourselves as we seek to know Thee, may we control ourselves as we seek to control others, and may we deny ourselves as we serve Thee and our fellow man. We confess we are not aware of our imperfections until we see ourselves in God's image. Help us now to see the invisible and be empowered to do the impossible. Illuminate our minds and our hearts. Soften our stubborn wills and cause us not to fight against Thee—"who are we to box with God with such short arms?"

May we never mistake doing for being, nor self-interests for service, but be divinely led throughout this day for Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 11, 1966, was dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate sundry communications for appropriate reference.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Message in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 11, 1966, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2412. An act to terminate use restrictions on certain real property previously conveyed to the city of Kodiak, Alaska, by the United States;

S. 3249. An act to consent to the interstate compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California; and

S. 3498. An act to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON INSURANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO FLOOD VICTIMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have recently transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a report by the Task Force on Federal Flood Control Policy, entitled "A Unified National Program for Managing Flood Losses." That report discussed several problems requiring further study, including the need for and feasibility of a program of flood insurance.

Today I am transmitting a report from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, entitled "Insurance and Other Programs for Financial Assistance to Flood Victims." Undertaken in accordance with provisions of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, this report provides a significant contribution to greater understanding of this complex and difficult problem. The Secretary has prepared a thorough, well-documented report.

Additional study is required before final judgment can be reached on the design of a national flood insurance program. Accordingly, I am instructing all interested Federal departments and agencies to give this report intensive and careful review so that detailed proposals, including appropriate legislation, may be presented to the Congress.

I also urge that the report be reviewed both by the Congress and the many interested groups and individuals throughout the Nation. The need for financial protection against flood losses to private property is widely recognized. The report will provide an excellent opportunity to give this matter thorough and informed consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1966.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule VII the Chair calls for the presentation of petitions and memorials.

If there be no petitions and memorials, the Chair calls for reports of standing and select committees.

If there be no reports, the Chair calls for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 14765 for its second reading.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings with respect to this bill, under rule XIV, paragraph 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule XIV and recent Senate precedents, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana object?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routing morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL MARITIME TRAFFIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive R, the Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, signed for the United States at London, on April 9, 1965, and that the message from the President, together with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance of the Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, signed for the United States at London on April 9, 1965, I transmit herewith a certified copy of that convention. I transmit, also, for the information of the Senate, the technical annex to the convention as well as the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and annex.

The purpose of the convention is to simplify and reduce to a minimum the formalities, documentary requirements and procedures on the arrival, stay, and departure of ships engaged in international voyages.

The need to reduce and simplify the documents required for ships to enter and clear the world's seaports has long been recognized. Government authorities in every port require documentation for customs, immigration, and public health, and often in addition documents to satisfy military authorities, coast guards, transport ministries, police, and plant and animal quarantine. The volume and complexity of documentation is burdensome to shipowners and government authorities alike, and an irritant to ships' passengers and crews and to cargo shippers.

Only governments themselves, through the medium of international cooperation, can achieve the simplicity and uniformity in documentation which will remedy the situation. As an example, air travel documentation has been drastically simplified in recent years through the persistent efforts of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The convention which I transmit now for your advice and consent to acceptance holds a strong promise that documentary requirements for maritime travel and transport can similarly be reduced and simplified. The resulting improvement in port procedures and the cost savings to the shipping industry and to governments could be significant. I recommend that you give the convention early and favorable consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. Certified copy of Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, with annex.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 98) to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol."

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FALLON, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. CLEVELAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82) to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 666. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "A Study of Federal Credit Programs";

H. Con. Res. 791. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on U.S. policy toward Asia by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; and

H. Con. Res. 925. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal," a compilation of addresses by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 666. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "A Study of Federal Credit Programs";

H. Con. Res. 791. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on U.S. policy toward Asia by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; and

H. Con. Res. 925. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal," a compilation of addresses by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL POLICY

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Task Force on Federal Flood Control Policy, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL PROJECTS FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on additional projects for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, at Lawrence, Mass., and Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIL DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available by canceling hazard insurance policies on properties acquired upon default of housing loans, Veterans' Administration, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the utilization and disposition of excess beds and related bedding, Department of Defense, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of certain active duty retirement benefits for Army and Air Force Reserve officers, Department of Defense, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunity to reduce costs of providing protection from heat and cold on shipments of certain perishable commodities, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to improve contracting procedures for employment of appraisers to value Indian lands, Department of Justice, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of reporting of taxable income and tax withholdings of military personnel, Department of the Army, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of financial administration of selected grants for health services made to State of Illinois, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through improved controls over per diem payments to military personnel, Department of the Air Force, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of charges to defense contracts for use of company operated and chartered aircraft, Department of Defense, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DECLARATION OF CERTAIN LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR SUMMIT LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain public lands are held in trust by the United States for the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on military personnel and civilian employees' claims, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED RELIEF BILLS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting four drafts of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr., Dino J. Caterini, Robert A. Jellison, and Augustus J. Theodore, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, as of June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 15941. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1458).

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1457)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2541) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the minority views of Senators CLARK, BYRD of West Virginia, COOPER, and SCOTT, and the supplemental views of Senators CLARK and PELL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3720. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 3721. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code, to require States to provide substantially the same rights, privileges, and services to certain persons within Federal areas as to those not living within such areas, as a prerequisite to the right of any State to levy taxes on the persons within these areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3722. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to provide financial assistance to States participating in a uniform recordkeeping system for persons engaged in occupations involving exposure to ionizing radiation, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF FINANCING FOR THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAMS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, earlier this year, on May 10, Senator BASS and I introduced S. 3337, to provide supplemental financing for the rural electric and rural telephone systems, in which we were joined by 28 other Members of the Senate.

Since that time, the House Committee on Agriculture has held hearings on similar bills designed to accomplish the same purpose, and during the course of its meetings the House Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit, of which Congressman POAGE is chairman, has developed a modified bill. It is my understanding that this modification incorporates provisions submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration which are acceptable to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I have talked to Congressman POAGE, and believe it would be correct to say that this modified bill almost wholly resolves the differences between the earlier administration and Poage or Bass-Cooper bills.

The Subcommittee on Rural Electrification and Farm Credit of the Senate Agriculture Committee of which Senator TALMADGE is chairman, and on which I serve, begins Monday its hearings on S. 3337. Because testimony can be more constructively directed to the modified bill, which evidently represents a broad area of agreement at least among the supporters of the REA program, I think it would be helpful to have the supplemental REA financing proposal before the committee in this form. I have discussed this suggestion with Senator TALMADGE, chairman of the subcommittee, who agrees that it would make our hearings more productive.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] who is the principal sponsor of S. 3337 is not able to be here today. However, I have been in touch with him, and introduced the bill on his behalf and for myself. The only change we have made in the modified bill is to leave the interest rate for intermediate loans at 3 percent, for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the modified bill to provide supplemental financing for the rural electric and rural telephone systems, for myself and Senators BASS, BARTLETT, BAYH, CANNON, CHURCH, CLARK, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, JACKSON, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MILLER, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MOSS, MUSKIE, RUSSELL, and YARBOROUGH, all of whom were among the sponsors of S. 3337.

I am sorry to be unable to be in touch today with all who are interested in this proposal, but I think it important to have the printed bill formally before our subcommittee on Monday, and may later ask unanimous consent that the names of additional sponsors be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3720) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 104-106 OF TITLE 4, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senator MUSKIE, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to require States to provide substantially the same rights, privileges, and services to persons in Federal areas as to those not within such areas, as a prerequisite to the right of the State to levy certain taxes on those persons within Federal areas.

At present, there are some 5,000 areas under exclusive Federal legislative jurisdiction in the United States. Under existing law (4 U.S.C. 104-106), States are permitted to levy motor vehicle fuel, sales, use, and income taxes on persons within these Federal areas. This taxing authority has not necessarily, however, been accompanied by a commensurate granting of rights and privileges by the States to those being taxed. Many persons are not granted the right to vote or the opportunity to hold public office. Children in some cases have not been allowed the right to attend State public schools solely by virtue of their residence in Federal areas. This problem has manifested itself primarily in areas such as forest preserves, national parks, and military bases. In many of these situations there may be such a small number of children living on a Federal enclave that it would be impractical for the Federal Government to operate schools for them.

States have, therefore, received the benefits of increased revenue, but in many cases, have refused to bestow the benefit of State citizenship upon those persons being taxed. It is neither reasonable nor just that these persons should pay taxes but not receive benefits similar to those enjoyed by persons within the State. I believe the requirement of certification provides a vehicle for rectifying this injustice.

This bill not only guarantees the rights, privileges, and services to those persons within Federal areas who are actually taxed, but where a State does exercise its option to tax under the provisions of sections 104–106, all persons within Federal areas must be guaranteed the same rights, privileges, and services as those persons not within such areas.

This proposed amendment would also be consistent with the purposes of S. 3000 which was introduced by my colleague, Senator MUSKIE and of which I am a cosponsor. S. 3000 would allow States to levy taxes on private property within the Federal areas provided that the States have met the certification requirements.

The bill which I introduce today provides that a State may levy the taxes set forth in section 104–106 of title 4 of the United States Code only if it has been certified by an agency appointed by the President that persons within the Federal area are afforded substantially the same rights, privileges, and tax-supported services as persons not within the area. This certification is revocable by the certifying agency if it is determined that the State is no longer maintaining the requisite standards for certification. The agency's decisions regarding certification would be subject to the review provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

The bill would also guarantee the right of any person to initiate proceedings in a Federal district court to prevent the collection of a State tax where the requirements for certification have been violated by that State.

This proposal would serve to alleviate the injustice created by State taxation of persons whose rights are not protected by that State. It is also one means of encouraging all States to insure equal protection of the law to all persons.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3721) to amend title 4 of the United States Code, to require States to provide substantially the same rights, privileges, and services to certain persons within Federal areas as to those not living within such areas, as a prerequisite to the right of any State to levy taxes on the persons within these areas, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MUSKIE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 742

Mr. **JAVITS** submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 743

Mr. **TOWER** submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 744

Mr. **PROXMIRE** submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3700, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 745

Mr. **JAVITS** submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3700, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE TRAGEDY OF WAR

Mr. **JORDAN** of Idaho. Mr. President, the record of Communist terrorism against the innocent in Vietnam is appalling, and the casualty figures of helpless men, women, and children multiply daily. This is a part of the tragedy of war.

On August 9, however, it was American planes that attacked the Vietnamese village of Truong Thanh killing 26 civilians and wounding another 114. This is also a part of the tragedy of war.

In a news report yesterday, an American spokesman was quoted as calling the mistaken bombing incident an "unfortunate occurrence." This is the most understated reaction I can imagine.

The killing and maiming of noncombatants underscores the horror of the conflict we are in. Of course, our attack on Truong Thanh was not an intentional slaughter of civilians. But it happened.

It is simply the case that the Vietnam war is taking a high civilian, as well as a high military toll. There is terrible irony in our involvement. Americans are dying in growing numbers, ostensibly for the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. But while our intentions are noble and our men valiant, the conflict seems to be headed on a course destined to produce massive destruction and death among the very people we have sought to save.

We have irrefutably demonstrated our determination to resist Communist aggression and support the cause of freedom in South Vietnam. I do not see how there can be any doubt about our resolve to prevent a Communist military takeover there. However, to date our resolve has produced no significant lessening of Communist infiltration nor any apparent weakening of Communist determination.

Where, then, do we go from here? A predominantly military approach has produced only more war. The more brutal and destructive the war becomes, the more concern increases as to just what will be left of Vietnam when the fighting stops. The larger the war becomes, one wonders what, if any, limits there are to escalation.

Last January a group of Senators led by Senator MANSFIELD and Senator AIKEN returned from Vietnam with a very disquieting assessment of the likely future of the conflict. They said then:

> Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a future augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue. there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended.

The augmentation of American forces which they mentioned continues. And at this time, some 7 months after their report was issued, the situation still appears to be open ended. Military projections on the duration of the conflict are not encouraging. Some say as much as 10 years and a force of nearly three quarters of a million Americans will be needed to produce a military solution.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **JORDAN** of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN ASIA

Mr. **JORDAN** of Idaho. Mr. President, as the war stretches out, the patience of men is stretched. The possibility grows that the last vestiges of reason may disappear and headlong slaughter take over. At this point, neither side will be able to control the course of destruction.

Most Americans—including myself—have supported our commitment in Vietnam, but this support is closely coupled with the desire for a just peace. Our leaders have expressed the dual commitment to vigorous military action and vigorous action in pursuit of peace as the American policy. It has been said again and again that while we will remain true to what we see as a commitment to guarantee the right to self-determination for the South Vietnamese, the door to discussion of peace is always open. However, I believe we have waged war more vigorously than we have waged peace. The term "escalation" does not apply equally to the conflict and to our efforts to bring about a settlement.

Last winter there was much talk during the bombing lull about how hard we were working for peace. Since then, have we mounted a peace offensive with anything like the intensity of our stepped-up war activity?

Recently there has been encouraging news of a movement for Asians to band together in an effort to find an acceptable settlement. Certainly no one's interest in ending the war exceeds that of the Asians themselves. On August 3 Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman proposed an Asian-sponsored peace conference to be held in Asia. A similar proposal for a conference of Asian nations was made last month by Republican Senatorial Candidate Charles Percy, of Illinois. Surely such an approach merits our support. If our commitment in Vietnam is based upon the principle of self-determination in Asia, surely we cannot object to the efforts of Asians to make a determination for themselves.

Efforts toward a negotiated settlement have thus far failed. An all-Asian conference for peace may not show immediate results, but as President Eisenhower has said of Mr. Percy's proposal:

> Even if such an effort should fail to uncover any new possibilities for furthering such an objective, the effort would still be a worthy one.

If, as the Mansfield report concludes, the military situation is open ended, then it becomes even more evident that we must be certain that the pursuit of a just peace is equally open ended. To me it makes no sense to talk about the specific timing of our efforts for peace. The time to work for peace is now and it is tomorrow and it is every day of every year as long as this war continues.

I believe we must keep the concept of an Asian solution open. Perhaps Asian initiative can find an answer. The thrust of American policy should be to encourage any such possibilities.

WASHINGTON WELCOMES AHEPA

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in its 44th year and representing 46,000 of the manhood, womanhood, and youth of Greek ancestry, the Order of AHEPA honors Washington as the scene of its supreme convention this coming week.

The event stimulates in all of us a recollection and recognition of what the world of today owes to the Greece of old. And in our own States each of us understands and appreciates what the energy, enterprise, and integrity of the sons and daughters of Greece and their descendants have contributed to the culture and prosperity of that part of our Nation each of us calls "home."

Through its family of 1,125 local chapters in all its branches, the Order of AHEPA is truly at home with us wherever we live.

We know AHEPA is a coined word—and means American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—and we know each letter and the word it stands for is a "coin" of culture—and a coin of courage—the coming of the venturesome immigrant from the land of literature to this land of their loyalty.

We know it to be the expression of the Greek contribution to our democracy—as, indeed, Greece gave us the term "democracy"—and it reminds us that it is only through the contribution of many races that America in our day has risen to the place of prominence that Greece possessed some 2,500 years ago.

Greece was the fountainhead of Western civilization. Drama, poetry, art, architecture, and philosophy flourished—and the great names of Greece still endure. Every American schoolboy knows and learns from Homer, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Euripides, Plato, and Socrates.

We might wonder what American names of fame will still be cherished 2,500 years from now.

Centuries of subjugation could not destroy Greek culture nor extinguish the Greek determination for freedom. That spirit has revitalized the history of Greece this past century and a half.

Nineteen years ago the ties between Greece and these United States were sealed in this Congress when the Truman doctrine came into being.

We declared it to be our enduring policy everywhere to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

In 1947 our power and our purse were opened to Greece to turn back the tide of communism that threatened to engulf that land—and we lifted a great country out of the depths of despair and set it anew on the course of its real destiny.

In some measures we repaid our centuries-old debt to Greece. So here in the Capital City of Washington there is a greeting especially warm for those who by their blood look back to that storied land—and today by their splendid citizenship help to maintain America as a land that cares—a land that dares to care for people who want to stay free. So I say again—welcome to the Order of AHEPA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to everything the Senator said.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the Senator from Rhode Island is still in the Chamber, I, too, would like to pay a word of tribute to the Order of AHEPA, the great organization of men and women of Greek extraction who will be meeting in Washington next week; and also to pay my tribute to the spirit of freedom in Greece today, which in the Greek-Turkish aid program of 1948, when I served in the other body, I had a small hand in helping.

I should like to tell my good friend from Rhode Island, however, that we have also modernized our interest in Greece. I have the honor to be the chairman of a committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference for Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation. I also have the honor to inform my colleague that this committee is adequately financed by a contribution from the Ford Foundation and from American business in the amount of $300,000, and that it is working extremely effectively in cooperative projects, such as the one in Mauritius in northern Thrace which is underway. I have every hope that if the situation in Cyprus does not prevent us, we will be able to bring about a really historic institutionalization of economic cooperation between these two countries, in the great spirit of the Venizelos-Ataturk accord which, for over 30 years, until the problem of Cyprus came along, maintained an extraordinary condition of peace and friendship between Greece and Turkey.

As the Senator from Rhode Island knows, New York State and New York City have a large community of Greek extraction. The order of AHEPA is an area in which they take the greatest pride. A very distinguished representative of the Greek community, Spyros Skouras, of New York, serves on the advisory board which has been put together to deal with this matter. I thought, in the spirit of the occasion, with the fine leadership of my beloved friend the Senator from Rhode Island, he might be interested in these facts.

Mr. PASTORE. I certainly am, and I want to thank the Senator from New York for bringing them out.

I reiterate that the Senator from New York is a great American, a great humanitarian, and I am proud to have his friendship.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the eloquent statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in paying tribute to an outstanding organization, the Order of AHEPA, on the occasion of its 44th supreme convention to be held in Washington, D.C., next week.

AHEPA, the American Hellenic Education and Progressive Association, is the leading organization in this country of Americans of Greek descent. In welcoming the members of this fine organization to Washington, I pay tribute to the millions of Greek-Americans who have contributed immeasurably to American culture, and to their ancestors who fought hard for the independence of their native land.

AHEPA is an organization devoted to 44 years of progress and accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, education projects, and charitable endeavors. The AHEPA fraternity is an object lesson in successful cooperation.

Mr. President, in Ohio there are thousands of citizens of Greek descent, many of whom are among the outstanding leaders in all fields of endeavor.

Recently, it was my privilege to recommend to President Johnson that the nomination as U.S. judge for the northern district of Ohio, Judge Thomas D. Lambros, of the court of common pleas of Ashtabula County, Ohio. He is the son of Demetrios P. Lambros and the late Panagoula K. Lambros, who both emigrated to the United States from Greece in the early 1900's. When he assumed the office of common pleas judge in January 1961, Thomas Lambros became the youngest common pleas judge in Ohio. In 1964, he was named one of the outstanding young men in America by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. He is an outstanding example of the great promise of our Nation.

Mr. President, our country's present greatness is the result of our ability to blend the aspirations of peoples from every land toward the advancement of common goals. This country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent, such as Judge Thomas Lambros, who have contributed so greatly toward that end.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to extend a hearty welcome to the thousands of American Hellenes who will convene in the Nation's Capital during the week of August 14. Greek-Americans from all parts of the country plan to attend the 44th Supreme Convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

The Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries, Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athens, is an organization dedicated to foster and perpetuate the ideals and principles of Hellenic art, philosophy, and culture in America. AHEPA has over 700 chapters in 49 States and in Canada. I am proud to state that I have been a member of this outstanding organization for many years.

As a nation, we are indebted to ancient Greece, for it was from that civilization that our own forefathers drafted the concepts of liberty, freedom, and democracy. The style of our architecture, our theater, our literature, abounds in the tradition of Hellenism. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Pericles, Homer, Sophocles, Aristophanes, and a host of other ancient Greek names echo our linkage with the past. Even the concept of the atom was first perceived by the philosopher Democritus.

We have come to be a mighty force, but we still are indebted to the contemporary sons of Greece, who were the first to stop Mussolini and his Fascist hordes as they invaded the Balkan Peninsula. It has been stated, and properly so, that this was a feat comparable to the defense of Thermopylae by Leonidas and his 300 valiant Spartans. The Greeks for the first time had shattered the myth of Axis invincibility and, as a direct result, the Allies were given a much needed opportunity to regroup their forces.

Today modern Hellenes continue to uphold the classical tradition of excellence in the fields of science and art. Dr. Papanicolaou, one of the world's foremost authorities in the detection of cancer, and Georgios Seferis, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, are among many of the modern Greeks who have been true to their heritage. The list of those successful in all fields of endeavor is endless.

The essence of AHEPA and what its membership stands for is perhaps best exemplified in the AHEPA creed:

> Promote loyalty to the United States of America;
>
> Respect the inalienable rights of mankind;
>
> Strive for the betterment of society;
>
> Abhor all political corruption;
>
> Defend and protect all oppressed people everywhere;
>
> Cultivate the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;
>
> Labor for the perfection of a moral sense, the spirit of altruism and true benevolence;
>
> Champion the cause of education;
>
> Love God and man, and hope for happiness.

Ahepans are to be commended for their use of these noble precepts and lofty ideals as guidelines for the practical implementation of their programs and activities. I am pleased indeed, therefore, to extend best wishes to Supreme President Kimon Doukas and all Ahepans who plan to participate in the functions and festivities of their 44th convention this coming week.

I particularly want to extend a special welcome to the delegates from my own State. We in New Hampshire are proud of our Greek-American neighbors. They are fine citizens, devout in their faith, responsible in their obligations to the community, and vigorous participants in our economic growth. May their stay in our Nation's Capital be a pleasant and interesting one.

SETTLEMENT OF THE MALAYSIAN-INDONESIAN DISPUTE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Governments of Malaysia and Indonesia for the signing of an accord which hopefully will put an end to the years of hostility. The fact that these Governments were able to come to terms on the issues that divided them on such short notice is a solid indication of the fact that the differences which separated them were more apparent and manmade than real. The agreement should serve as an example to other nations in Asia, such as India and Pakistan, whose disputes could be resolved if the mutual will to do so existed.

The Indonesian-Malaysian pact is exemplary in another respect. Both Governments agreed that the territories in dispute between them, Sabah and Sarawak should determine their own status by means of elections. This, again, could serve as an important precedent in other areas.

A very important side effect of the agreement concerns the United Kingdom. Because of past Indonesian threats to Malaysia, the United Kingdom has been obliged to maintain approximately 50,000 troops in Malaysia. Britain can now fulfull the pledge of withdrawing some of its troops from Malaysia. It should have a very favorable impact on the balance-of-payment problem in the United Kingdom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article which appeared in the August 12 edition of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN BORNEO TO VOTE ON STATUS—MALAYSIA, PLEDGING ELECTION, SIGNS PACT IN JAKARTA

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, August 11.—Sabah and Sarawak, the Northern Boreno states whose inclusion in the Federation of Malaysia was contested by President Sukarno of Indonesia, are to be given an opportunity to vote on their status under an agreement between Indonesia and Malaysia signed today.

With the signing of the accord, Indonesia and Malaysia officially ended their "confrontation" nearly three years after President Sukarno established the policy of hostility toward Malaysia.

Foreign Minister Adam Malik and Malaysia's Vice Premier, Prince Abdul Razak, signed two copies each of the "agreement to normalize relations" between the two countries.

General Suharto, chairman of the Indonesian Cabinet Presidium, stood behind Mr. Malik, and Lieut. Gen. Abdul Hamid Bin Bidin, Chief of the Malaysian General Staff, stood behind Prince Razak during the ceremony at the Foreign Ministry.

TWO HUNDRED ONLOOKERS APPLAUD

About 200 Government officials and newsmen applauded after the documents had been signed.

"The confrontation was ended," Mr. Malik said at a news conference immediately afterward.

President Sukarno has charged ever since Malaysia was formed in September, 1963, that it was a creation of British imperialism. He specifically objected to inclusion of Sabah and Sarawak in the federation on the ground that the national will of their citizens had not been determined.

Under Article 1 of the agreement, the Malaysian Government "agrees to afford the people of Sabah and Sarawak who are directly involved" the chance "to reaffirm, as soon as practicable, in a free and democratic manner through general election, their previous decision about their status in Malaysia."

Mr. Sukarno has never recognized the results of a United Nations mission that concluded in September, 1963, that the majority of citizens in Sabah and Sarawak wanted to belong to Malaysia.

He had insisted previously that elections should be held under United Nations auspices before any agreement was signed.

TIES TO BE ESTABLISHED

The agreement specifies that Indonesia and Malaysia will establish diplomatic relations immediately and exchange diplomatic representatives as soon as possible. Indonesia in June agreed to establish diplomatic relations with Singapore, which withdrew from the Malaysian Federation last year.

The agreement provides that "hostile acts between the two countries shall cease forthwith." Informed sources said Indonesia and Malaysia had privately reached an understanding for the "orderly withdrawal" of troops near their common borders.

About 50,000 British and Malaysian troops are based in Sabah and Sarawak, while 30,000 Indonesian troops are stationed in Indonesian Borneo.

Prince Razak said at the news conference that British Navy units "would still guard our waters" but that they would "gradually be replaced by our own." British officials have repeatedly promised to withdraw British troops from Malaysian Borneo once the confrontation has ended.

Both Mr. Malik and Prince Razak spoke briefly after signing the agreements.

"From now on, we—Indonesia and Malaysia—will cooperate in building a new world longed for by all Asians," said Mr. Malik.

A CLEAN PAGE IN HISTORY

Mr. Malik declared that Indonesia and Malaysia were "opening a new and clean page in the history of the two nations." He said there was "no victorious side, nor a defeated side."

"Instead" said Mr. Malik, "the victory is for the Malay race, in which both Indonesians and Malaysians are included." Mr. Malik recalled that both countries had "put aside conventional diplomatic procedures and made a heart to heart approach."

He was referring to a series of missions and couriers exchanged by the two countries since he and Prince Razak laid the groundwork for the agreement at a meeting in Bangkok in May.

At that time, Mr. Malik and Prince Razak exchanged letters setting forth the principles contained in today's agreement.

PACT MANIFESTS DESIRES

"The understanding reached in Bangkok manifests the desires of the peoples of Indonesia and Malaysia to achieve peace, friendship, brotherhood and prosperity," Prince Razak said after signing the agreement.

"It is the basic guideline of our foreign policy to promote cooperation with Indonesia," he added. "We are not afraid of elements who try to wreck our endeavors."

Prince Razak had dinner tonight with Indonesian officials.

He presented a silver tea set to President Sukarno and a set of golf clubs to General Suharto. President Sukarno did not give him a gift in return but General Suharto gave him silverware made in Jogjakarta, a city in central Java.

Prince Razak is to leave tomorrow. Mr. Malik will accompany him to Kuala Lumpur, where they will pray at a Moslem mosque. Mr. Malik will return here Saturday.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr President, I should like to add to what the Senator from New York has just said, by mentioning the Korean declaration separating both from China and Russia. All of these events indicate that our presence in southeast Asia is having an impact which is beginning to liberate people from the domination of Communist China and Communist Russia.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. It is so important to every American family that has a son in Vietnam to know that these events are meaningful, and that they are happening along the lines we have all hoped and prayed so long would occur.

THE "NEW" CIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency during recent years has performed in a frightening manner in the judgment of many thoughtful Americans. Furthermore, this Agency, which was established for the sole purpose of collecting intelligence, has become a vast bureaucracy, and in recent years has racked up one horrendous blunder after another.

It is no longer simply an intelligence collecting agency, if it ever was. Wrapped in its cloak of secrecy, it has become a policy forming agency. Even its defenders cannot deny that its actions have greatly influenced our foreign policy, and in many instances to the detriment of our Nation. The CIA was never intended to direct the foreign policy of our country, nor to influence it, but was organized to be an intelligence collecting agency, not an operating or policymaking branch of our Government.

In spending taxpayers' money, it is outspending the entire State Department with our embassies and far-flung diplomatic service and Foreign Service officials throughout the world. The CIA has become a sort of law unto itself. If it is a watchdog for the welfare of Americans, as some of its officials and employees acclaim, then truly it is a watchdog running wild without a master.

What CIA operatives have done in recent years in the Far East has in many instances been a distinct disservice to our country. With more than 300,000 men of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and Thailand and with every branch of our Armed Forces having their intelligence sections, one wonders why the many hundreds of CIA officials and operatives in South Vietnam should not have been withdrawn long ago. Instead, they operate a sort of an army of their own, in many instances employing Vietnamese nationals, some of whom pose as Vietcong and are said to have committed dastardly acts against the civilian population of South Vietnam. Whether these latter allegations are true I do not know. I hope they are not. There is risk, however, when an American intelligence agency employs nationals of other nations in positions of any responsibility.

It is well-known and verified that CIA officials gave the late General MacArthur faulty information in the Korean conflict. General MacArthur disregarded his own intelligence furnished by officers of the intelligence section of his air force. He was so foolish as to believe the CIA regarding the possible intervention of Chinese troops in the Korean war. They informed him there was no possibility of Chinese volunteers crossing the Yalu and attacking us. The result was our Armed Forces in North Korea were divided, with a mountain range between them, and suddenly 200,000 Chinese "volunteers" crossed the Yalu, attacked, and drove back our forces despite their heroic resistance. General MacArthur had shortly before announced that the conflict had ended with a glorious American victory and that the boys would be home by Christmas.

There is a saying, "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other." Unfortunately, our generals apparently have not learned the lesson of CIA ineptness and failure in Korea, in the U-2 incident of May 1960, relative to the Bay of Pigs invasion, and in several other fiascos in nations of southeast Asia, to name a few examples of CIA bungling.

Mr. President, the time has definitely come for Congress to assert a more formal and extensive supervision over the CIA. This is needed not only to eliminate waste, and to assure that its programs operate effectively and within proper constitutional limitations; more important, such congressional supervision is needed to assure that our basic standards of morality are not completely undermined in the conduct of our international intelligence activities. We cannot afford to delay asserting this supervision until such time as these activities have been publicly exposed to the jeopardy of our national security.

Mr. President, in the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of August 9, there is a very fine and perceptive editorial entitled, "The New CIA?" and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The "New" CIA?

You may be wondering what's happening to the Central Intelligence Agency. The last place a super-secret spy outfit is supposed to appear is on Page One. But that's where our "spooks" keep showing up.

Recently the new director of the CIA got caught writing a letter to a St. Louis newspaper praising an editorial blasting Senator Fulbright. Even senators who dislike Fulbright were riled. Now there's another: The case of the high-ranking CIA man accused of taking secret documents home, and his countercharge that the CIA raided his house, took the documents and then some of his wife's jewelry was found missing.

Well, don't worry. After some thought there is a choice of four explanations:

1. Those CIA people are lonely. There they are cooped up in a hush-hush headquarters on the banks of the Potomac without so much as a sign on the building. They want people to know they're alive.

2. The agency has been feeling bad about its image—cloak and dagger, rough stuff—and may have hired a public relations firm to soften the image. The PR plan: Make some prize bloopers in full public view, and the whole world will love you.

3. It may be a plot to put the Soviet counter-espionage organization to sleep. The Russian spies see the bloopers, laugh their heads off, figure their arch-foe has lost its touch and lower their guard.

4. The Central Intelligence Agency may be planning to drop its middle name.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when the Commissioner of Education promulgated his new guidelines for desegregation of public schools, I stated that they "were another example of the danger of State and local dependence upon Federal money." At that time, I went on to point out in a speech that while areas of the country outside of the South were not concerned now, these new regulations pointed the way to Federal regulation of all areas of traditionally State and local control of education.

Recent remarks made by the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Harold Howe, have given added credence to my pessimistic predictions. In several speeches he has indicated that he will use the force of the Federal Government to actively promote the degree of racial integration that he has determined all areas of the country should have. Station WBT, Charlotte, N.C., has recently given a thoughtful editorial commentary on the remarks of the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The editorial suggests that it should be very plain to all citizens from the remarks of Commissioner Howe that "Federal aid to education means Federal control of education."

Mr. President, for a very astute analysis of the present trends at the U.S. Office of Education, I recommend the editorial entitled "The Education Czar," given over station WBT on August 8, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent for it to be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Education Czar

We are grateful in a strange sort of way to Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II. He has made the point more plainly than we have ever been able to do it, that Federal aid to education means Federal control of education. Mr. Howe's whiplash approach to the uses of Federal aid has brought many people now to the place where they are asking if we are not paying too high a price in freedom of choice in exchange for a few million dollars.

Howe has made it clear that he believes the primary purpose of the public schools is not education, but integration; that the main mission of the educators is not to teach children, but to bring about the greatest possible mixture of races within schools and districts; and that Federal aid is not being used to help local schools with their urgent problems, so much as to bludgeon them into complying with arbitrary standards drawn up by Howe himself.

It has not been easy to convince people that Federal aid is a very mixed blessing. Schools across the country have pressing needs for more money and more facilities, the Federal government has billions of dollars it can divert to these purposes if it wishes to do so, and so it has seemed to many people a natural way out to put the two together. But now Commissioner Howe has come out with statements that show the autocratic control is going to be more sweeping than imagined during the years we have been warning against Federal aid to education.

The education czar lets it be known that he will not be satisfied with mere integration of faculty and pupils within existing school districts. If they do not reach the racial mixture that he considers desirable, the boundaries of the districts will be designed in Washington.

In a speech at Columbia University, he served notice that he will not stop there. Most of the suburbs, he said, have too many white children and not enough colored children. After ridiculing the way of life that suburban dwellers have chosen, he went on to say, "if I have my way" (those are his very words) the suburban school districts will be gerrymandered so that they reach into the inner city and include some of the slums. And of course, the process will be worked in reverse to gerrymander city districts to take in suburban areas.

Let us quote again Mr. Howe's exact words: "If I have my way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration."

He could hardly have stated in plainer words that public schools exist first of all to mix children, not to teach them. And if any community does not like his personal redistricting, he will use the same old club on them—take away their Federal aid.

So if Mr. Howe "has his way" that Federal money will be used to increase the quantity of integration rather than the quality of education. And those who are beginning to ask whether the price is too high can be grateful to him—in a strange sort of way!

SPECIAL GRAND JURY REPORT RELATING TO HOUGH RIOTS IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now have a complete copy of the Cuyahoga County special grand jury report relating to the recent riots in Cleveland, Ohio. In my opinion, the findings made in that report are of such consequence that they should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the entire report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the grand jury report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL GRAND JURY REPORT RELATING TO HOUGH RIOTS

Your Honor, Judge Thomas J. Parrino, Presiding Judge, Criminal Branch, Common Pleas Court of Cuyahoga County:

As a preface to the attached report of the County Grand Jury convened by you in special session for dealing with the recent Hough Area riots, this Jury would like to make some general observation to you.

These are reinforced by approximately six months of reviewing the status of law and order among the people of this County.

We assume that the people of Cuyahoga County are in the main typical of people of the whole nation during this latter half of the turbulent twentieth century.

It is our firm belief that what America needs more urgently than anything else is a renewal of good citizenship by all of us.

Of equal concern by this Jury are the steady erosion of ideals and principles of God and Country and their persistent replacement by the deification of material idols and material "principals." We profoundly believe that a rigid adherence by everyone to the established law and order of this country should instantly replace the guerrilla warfare practiced in the streets and neighborhoods.

Whatever we in this country set out to achieve should be accomplished within the framework of the laws fashioned for the benefit and protection of every citizen and not by any means we think can be employed or the time we fix for ourselves.

We believe there should be a restoration of the qualities of good faith, of honesty, and a willingness to hear out the other person or the other side without resort to violence and disorder, whether, around a bargaining table with capital and labor, or grievances among people of different background or ethnic origin.

We believe in an elevation of moral and ethical standards and conduct, including those in high places in government and in business and in the professions—a general going over of our entire pattern of national life and values.

What this country and this community need, in the opinion of this Jury of laymen, themselves citizens and parents and in business and professions, is not so much a blood bath but a good cleansing spiritual bath.

This Jury was called into special session and directed by Presiding Judge Thomas J. Parrino of Common Pleas Criminal Court to inquire specifically into what now has become known as the "Hough Area situation."

Judge Parrino's directive was in two parts:

One: To establish the immediate cause of the fire bombing, shooting, pillaging, general lawlessness and disorder.

The Judge requested that this Jury learn whether the outbreak of disorder in this two mile square area, housing 60,000 negro people, was organized, and, if so, by whom.

Two: To establish as nearly as possible the basic circumstance under which 60,000 human beings were living in this relatively restricted area and for whom the life, limb and property of all were placed in jeopardy by the disorders.

The Jury has made this appraisal within the time limits and facilities available and herein reports its general findings.

NO. 1

This Jury finds that the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was both organized, precipitated, and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business.

They were aided and abetted, wittingly or otherwise, by misguided people of all ages and colors, many of whom are avowed believers in violence and extremism, and some of whom also are either members of or officers in the Communist party.

The majority of people in the Hough Area had no part in either the lawlessness or disorders.

They have been hindered rather than helped by this major tragedy.

This Jury considers it regrettable and unfortunate for the community's sake that the legal statutes of Ohio and Cuyahoga County are either so outmoded or inadequate in their scope that these "responsible irresponsibles" cannot at this time be reached by specific indictments for their infamous activities.

By persistent additional investigative effort they may be reached later on in this fashion.

(This Jury later in this report urges new and more adequate laws in this respect.)

It is likewise observed by this Jury that it did not have the necessary special investigative resources which could be and should be focused exclusively in tracking down the required immediate and far reaching evidence for conclusive legal action against specific individuals.

However, in making this observation, the Jury wishes especially and particularly to commend those established arms of law enforcement which have worked so resourcefully, effectively and energetically in this aggravated situation.

By this the Jury means, to be precise and specific, the Cleveland Police Department in all of its branches, from the Chief to the newest Rookie, and to Ohio National Guard when invoked by the Governor in this serious community emergency.

The Jury nevertheless must emphasize that with the limitations imposed by the necessity of at all times guarding the community, the established arms of law enforcement are not equipped either with the resources or the investigative facilities to make such a total all out and extended inquiry under this situation as is obviously called for.

This Jury, in consideration of the basic and wide public interest, and exercising the latitude granted it under the laws which empower the creation of such a body as ours, nonetheless makes reference to individuals and organizations that in varying degrees were contributors to the Hough Area lawlessness and disorder.

It further notes the presence of many of these same individuals and organizations in another instance of lawlessness and disorder, that on Superior Avenue, which bore many of the striking similarities to the Hough Area disorders.

It notes the further significant fact that the Superior Avenue episode preceded the Hough Avenue disorders by less than a month.

Some of the same people were observed in both places on several nights of the disorders.

This Jury further believes, that, even though what already happened is both regrettable and tragic in every conceivable human aspect, there is a grave potentiality for repetition of these disorders, or others like them, occurring elsewhere in this community.

Different techniques might be employed; but the results would be equally disastrous or even more so.

Therefore, this Jury believes its judgment should be made an important part of the formal record of what has happened and of whatever may happen in the rather unpredictable future towards which we all, as citizens of this community, are mutually moving wherever we may live or whatever may be our place in life.

Finally before making specific reference to adult leaders in this crises areas, and the events leading up to them, the Jury respectfully calls attention to the effective uses made of impressionable emotionally immature and susceptible young minds by those who for one reason or another have set out to accomplish their designs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America, and elsewhere.

It is no casual happenstance or coincidence that those throwing fire bombs, or bricks, or bottles, or pillaging, or generally engaged in disorder and lawlessness were in the main young people obviously assigned, trained, and disciplined in the roles they were to play in the pattern of these dual outbreaks separated by less than one month.

Nor, by the same token, is it happenstance, or even just singular coincidence:

1. That the overall pattern for firebombing and destruction to both the Superior and Hough Areas was so highly selective;

2. That the targets were plainly agreed upon;

3. That certain places were identified to be hit, and that certain other places were similarly spared.

On both of these occasions, the Superior and Hough disorders, the presence of teenagers previously referred to was observed by the police, by plainclothes officers and undercover agents who had been assigned for long periods to observe these youths.

With this background firmly established by the Jury's inquiry, and with the notable help of County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan and his staff, particularly Asst. County Prosecutor John T. Patton, this Jury herewith makes reference to some of the principal and recurring personalities in the chain of events which preceded both the Superior and Hough situations:

THE JFK HOUSE

The JFK House, meaning Jomo Freedom Kenyatta House, is located at 8801 Superior Avenue, The leaders are:

Lewis G. Robinson, and Beth Robinson, his wife, living at 1242 E. 89th Street; Harlell Jones, 9716 Hough Avenue, Albert D. Ware-Bey, 11611 Castlewood Avenue, and Philip Morris, 7806 Randell Avenue.

Lewis Robinson has been affiliated with the Freedom Fighters of Ohio, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club (which he helped to found), the JFK House, of which he is the ultimate head, The Deacons for Defense, and the Revolutionary Action Movement.

All of these Clubs, to which Lewis Robinson belongs are black nationalist clubs.

Testimony before this Jury discredited Lewis Robinson as a leader concerned with generally altruistic interests in youth but rather points to him as inciting these youths to focus their hatreds and as indoctrinating them with his own vigorous philosophy of violence.

He exerted a profound influence over the JFK youth and he still does.

Harlell Jones is affiliated with JFK House, the Medgar Evers Rifle Club, the Revolutionary Action Movement; he is vice-president of the Deacons for Defense in spite of his public disavowals, and had frequently either presided over or sponsored meetings for black nationalists, and espouses the ultimate revolutionary purpose for adjusting differences or obtaining desired ends.

Along with Lewis G. Robinson, Harlell Jones caused 2,000 pieces of literature to be printed and circulated, citing alleged instances of "police brutality", and on the eve of the Hough riots circulated the greatest number of these to youths of non-voting age under the plausible guide of urging the defeat of a levy at the polls.

Special movies of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the Jury presented Harlell Jones as an outright exponent of violence, a black power apostle with a bitter hatred for all whites, a co-founder of the Rifle Club, and in command of at least one Rifle Club.

Albert D. Ware-Bey, belonged to the same Clubs as Harlell Jones. He declined to testify before the Jury. Police agencies presented evidence that Ware, Robinson and Jones all purchased quantities of rifles, and all belonged to the Rifle Clubs here and in other cities.

Ware-Bey expressed no allegiance to his country, professed himself not to be bound by its laws, and in the opinion of the Jury, by both testimony and his own conduct, was not one who could have other than destructive influence upon youths either at the JFK House or elsewhere.

There was evidence placed before the Jury that Rifle Clubs were formed, that ammunition was purchased, and that a range was established and used, that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for Rifle Clubs, and that instructions were given in the use of Molotov cocktails, and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect.

Further, irrefutable evidence was shown to the effect that Robinson pledged reciprocal support to and with the Communist Party of Ohio.

In addition, Robinson attended many meetings at which imported Communist speakers talked and was arrested at one of these.

It was established before the Jury that the leaders of the WEB DuBois Club and the Communist Youth Party, with interchangeable officers and virtually identical concepts, arrived in Cleveland only a few days before the Hough Area disorders.

They took up residence at 1844 East 81st Street, only a short distance from the Central point of origin of the Hough Area troubles.

These men, who came from Chicago, New York and Brooklyn, were Mike Bayer, otherwise known as Mike Davidow, Daniel Mack, Ronald Lucas, and Steve Shreefter.

They were seen constantly together. They made swift contact with the JFK House leadership, and with Phil Bart, of Middlehurst Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and his wife, Connie, who, the evidence showed, are the leaders of the Communist party throughout the Ohio Valley District including Cleveland.

With specific regard to the WEB DuBois Club, the evidence further showed that Mike Bayer, Daniel Mack, Ron Lucas and Steve Shreefter previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland, are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough Area over to the West Side: That they are not employed, are now so far as the Jury knows without any visible means of support but nevertheless are able to carry on their advocacy and to maintain themselves with clothing, food and shelter from some undetermined source. Finally, evidence was presented that UJAMA is an organization dedicated to black power and has begun its efforts to establish itself in the Cleveland area. Their philosophy is that black people should be governed by themselves in every respect and that anything pertaining to the rights of negroes must be cleared through the central organization of UJAMA which has flourished in New York, and has spread into other places, and is embraced locally by Lewis Robinson and his Lieutenants at JFK House. In attendance at one specific meeting at which plans for UJAMA in Cleveland were discussed were Robinson, Jones and Ware-Bey. Also in attendance at this meeting was Cornelius Freeman from Cleveland and Oserjiman Adefumi, and also known as Serge King, and Gizengaga Latunji, representing New York UJAMA.

It is this Jury's opinion that the investigative authorities have progressed sufficiently to justify the expectation they will ultimately, if either urged or permitted to follow beyond what they have thus far gathered be able to put together all of the pieces to this pattern of lawlessness and disorder.

Because of this Jury's strong judgment in this regard it earnestly urges its successors to pursue the Superior and Hough disorders with the utmost vigor and determination.

Nothing less that this should be permitted in the public interest.

In this section of its report to Judge Thomas J. Parrino the Jury wishes to reiterate the fact that the overall majority of the people living in the Hough area, distressed, frustrated, beset with problems unimaginable to those who do not endure them, had nothing whatever to do with these disorders and destructions, and the Jury, on the contrary, expresses its wholesome admiration for their good citizenship and restraint in these tense and emotional times.

In the course of its investigation, the Grand Jury has learned that police and firemen were targets for snipers and individuals throwing rocks and bricks.

Further, fire equipment was damaged, particularly hoses, which were cut or attempted to be cut so as to render them useless in the protection of persons and property.

These acts were a direct affront to lawful authority and of necessity would lead to justifiable armed self-protection, unfortunately resulting in occasional injury and death to the innocent.

These senseless acts cannot be tolerated and the perpetrators should be subjected to severe penalties.

The police and firemen on the other hand should be commended for their efforts to maintain law and order in the face of great personal danger.

The general conduct of our police and fire departments, we feel, command and receive the highest respect of our law abiding citizens from all groups.

It is the recommendation of this Grand Jury that all decent law-abiding citizens proclaim their support of law and order and their support of policemen and firemen in carrying out their duties toward that end.

This, in turn, will of necessity command a course of conduct on the part of police and firemen and particularly of the police, who have more intimate contact with the public, which will be of the highest caliber of efficiency and decency and patience and will thus contribute to a greater restoration of our American ideal of equal treatment.

As earlier in this section of the Jury's report it was indicated, the Jury now requests that the Cuyahoga County delegation to the next session of the Ohio Assembly give serious consideration to the following suggestions for new and more inclusive legislation covering such situations as the Superior and Hough Area disorders represent.

The Jury suggestions therefore are—

(1) Inciting to riot: No person with the intent to cause a riot shall do any act or engage in any conduct which urges a riot, or urges others to commit acts of force or violence, or the burning or destroying of property, and at a time and place and under circumstances which produce a clear and present and immediate danger of acts of force or violence or the burning or destroying of property. Whoever violates this section shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than twenty years.

(2) Definition of Riot: Any use of force or violence, disturbing the peace, or any threat to use such force or violence, if accompanied by immediate power of execution involving two or more persons carrying on such conduct and without authority of law, is a riot.

(3) Enhanced Penalty for Arson or Attempted Arson during a Riot: An amendment to Revised Code section 2907.06 (this section concerns itself with the attempt to burn or set on fire or to do any act preliminary thereto or the burning of buildings):

"Upon the proclamation of the Governor proclaiming a state of disaster or extreme emergency because of a riot, whoever violates this section during such period covered by said proclamation shall be fined not less than $5,000.00 and imprisoned not less than five nor more than twenty years or both."

(4) Assault against a fireman or policeman acting in the course of his duty: No person shall assault a fireman or policeman while such fireman or policeman is acting in the course of his duties. Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $5,000.00 or imprisoned not less than one nor more than twenty years or both.

NO. 2

In addressing itself to the second of Judge Parrino's directives, namely, the conditions of life prevailing in the Hough Area, this Jury finds:

Poverty and frustration, crowded by organized agitators, served as the uneasy backdrop for the Cleveland riots.

Unfortunately, it is the overwhelming mass of innocent and law-abiding citizens who pay the greatest penalty in any cross-fire of violence.

The following inequities and practices contributed as a feeding ground for disorder:

a. The density of population in the Hough Area.

b. Inadequate and sub-standard housing.

c. Charging of exorbitant rents by absentee landlords.

d. Non-enforcement of the housing code.

e. Woefully inadequate recreational facilities for children whose uncertain homelife calls for this kind of wholesome community outlet, and for the constructive guidance and counsel to offset their regrettable environment.

f. Sub-standard educational facilities as a consequence of long neglect, which, in substantial fairness, have been greatly improved in recent years but which still call for further effort on the part of officials and community leaders.

g. Excessive food prices in most instances accompanied all too frequently with foodstuffs found to be inferior in freshness or quality.

h. The denial of equal economic opportunities.

i. Diminished incentives by repressed and neglected people.

j. The present system of paying women for having children, frequently out of wedlock, or under a relationship loosely described as "common-law"—which enables the father to walk out of his "marital arrangement" to escape his proper responsibilities.

(The current welfare system should be challenged in this respect for its effect upon the very people who are supposed to benefit. Children brought into the world under such callous and financially expedient circumstances are rarely seen by their father. This system the Jury believes is anything but helpful either to the mothers, or the fathers, or the children, or the community. Surely, this Jury believes, those charged with social and moral responsibility in this community are capable of devising a much more equitable and effective formula than the prevailing one.)

k. Regardless of how the very large addition of negroes formerly widely dispersed throughout the deep and mid-South have migrated to the large northern cities, like Cleveland, the fact is that these men, women and children are here.

(In many instances the mode of life they find in such large cities as Cleveland differs substantially from that which prevailed in the places whence they came. Frequently they find themselves bewildered and unable quickly to adjust themselves to the demands of their new surroundings and thus find themselves frequently at cross purposes with the authorities and the older residents of the areas in which they find themselves currently.)

Impatience among the Negro people for the improvement of their citizenship is understandable but the opinion has been expressed they may be attempting to exact too much too fast for the community to bear within an arbitrarily fixed time limit.

The fact, nevertheless, is that too many human beings, however they arrive in our midst, or whence they came, or why, are living under such completely intolerable conditions in the Hough Area at the present time, that inevitably the consequences must be futility, frustration, bitterness, and exposure to the abrasive forces advocating violence.

These factors make them prone to the almost immutable by-products of such prevailing conditions; crime, delinquency, looseliving, tragic deterioration of moral behavoir, and the brittle, bitter, hyper-sensitivity which emerges therefrom; and in the aggragate these effects represent potential danger not only to themselves but to the community as a whole.

There are no longer moats complacently situated in which any citizen can live under modern conditions safely removed from the turmoils and anxiety and bitterness of others, irrespective of skin color, or religious identification of political inclinations or economic and social environment.

Whatever happens in the large cities of America, as in the community of Greater Cleveland, eventually affects all citizens in one way or another.

Now, all these complex social evils are used as subtle and inflammatory provocations by resident and non-resident organizers who exploit riots such as both the Superior and Hough Area riots in Cleveland.

Where possible, as earlier indicated, this Jury has diligently sought to pinpoint the causes of these riots.

At this time the return of any additional indictments based upon community vengeance and not upon evidence sufficient to convict in a court of law would not do credit to our democratic society.

Realistic and productive goals must now be set by this community, and that near term emphasis be directed toward:

1. Improvement in Housing Code enforcement.

2. Improvement in Police Action and Court Findings against prostitutes, cheat sports, gambling, and the profusion of the numbers of liquor license outlets.

3. Continuing drive for improved garbage and rubbish collection; stronger measures against landlords and tenants to make this task easier for the City.

4. Put the Urban Renewal Program back on the track with the full cooperation of the Federal Government as quickly as possible.

Our total resources must be marshalled to prevent a recurrence of this enormous tragedy—a potentiality which this Jury strongly counsels is still present.

Where prejudice and injustice are cast aside, the wilful and malicious agitator finds little support for his provocative and destructive acts.

This Jury does not attempt in this report, while sorely tempted to do so, to fix responsibility upon either individual or individuals, or on pressure groups or organizations for the community's failure to more adequately to meet its responsibilities.

It does, however, wish to make unmistakably clear that it does not believe this community has adequately measured up to its responsibilities.

By the same token it does not believe that the influential leaders in either the Hough Area or in other areas of this community have measured up to their responsibilities.

This Jury does at this time urge upon the Mayor, upon the City Council, upon the business, financial and industrial leaders, upon the educators and the civic organizations to act now either individually or in concert to put Cleveland in the forefront in meeting the sociological and moral challenges of our times, as in the past this community has so conspicuously risen to meet the challenges of the past.

This Jury cannot conclude its report without paying wholehearted tribute to those wise and long-range leaders of this community who in their great wisdom saw and recognized a situation which now rests uneasily on the conscience of the entire country, and it applauds them for their selfless work, their patience, their substance, their cooperative efforts, and the many tangible results of their good and wise leadership.

They have set for the rest of us a plateau of good citizenship for which we should all strive.

The time for total community action is now.

Louis B. Seltzer,
Grand Jury Foreman.

August 9, 1966.

Received for filing August 9, 1966.

E. J. Masgay, *Clerk*,
By H. J. Reid, *Deputy*.

PROPAGANDA IN POLAND AND FEELING OF POLISH PEOPLE TOWARD THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a column written by Theodore Andrica, the Nationalities Writer of the Cleveland Press, which appeared in the Wednesday, August 3, issue of the aforementioned newspaper.

Mr. Andrica visiting in Warsaw reports pointedly of the anti-American demonstrations promoted by the Polish Communist Government of Gomolka. He sets forth that the hostility of the Communist Gomolka government against the United States is a severe jolt against the traditional Polish-United States friendship that has existed ever since Thadeusz Kosciusko fought on the side of George Washington in the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Theodore Andrica points out that slogans against the United States stare at the visitors and citizens of Warsaw from billboards, fences, and house walls. The slogans are that the Americans are the aggressors and the pirates in Vietnam, and the Vietcong are the angels fighting for genuine democracy.

Mr. Andrica illuminatingly further points out that while the Communist government of Poland is against the United States, the citizenry has implicit faith in the correctness of the position of our Government and is seeking in every way to demonstrate their friendship and belief in the U.S. Government.

Poles want to come to the United States. They want to escape the slavery of Gomolka's Communist government. Poles want to leave Poland; they want to come to the United States.

Contrary to the position of the Communist government of Gomolka, Mr. Andrica states:

> If you speak to people in their homes, the anti-American feeling is totally missing.

The people of Poland, on the basis of everything said, authentically want to rid themselves of the Communist government under which they are enslaved. They want to be free.

The policy of the United States in cooperating with the Communist government of Poland has been in the wrong. The more we cooperate with Gomolka, the less the chances are of the aspirations of the Polish people to become a reality in the promotion of freedom and the repudiation of communism within their own country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report From Poland—Propaganda Strikes at United States; Poles Try To Get There Anyway

(By Theodore Andrica)

Warsaw.—Anti-American demonstrations and posters in Poland's capital are dealing a severe jolt to the traditional Polish-United States friendship that has existed ever since Thadeusz Kosciuszko fought on George Washington's side in the Revolutionary War.

Anti-American slogans stare at you from billboards, fences and house walls. The Americans are aggressors and pirates in Vietnam and the Viet Cong are angels, fighting for genuine democracy, according to Marx.

That the Polish Communist Party is angry at the Americans, one can easily understand. But whether the Polish people are angry at the Americans, that is a different story.

At any rate, while demonstrators hurl stones at the United States Embassy on Aleja Ujezdowska, other Poles—the more down-to-earth people—are coming to the tourist-frequented spots in search of American dollars.

Officially the dollar is worth 24 zlotys; that is, one zloty is worth four cents.

One the free market, however, the dollar brings 100 zlotys despite the officially-inspired anti-American slogans and demonstrations.

In other words, Vietnam or not, the American dollar is still the most wanted currency in Poland.

Vietnam or not, thousands of Poles are besieging the American consular office for information about getting to the United States.

The waiting room at the U.S. Consulate is always filled with persons eager to leave Poland and settle in the United States. At least 100 Poles a day visit the consulate for this purpose. It means that thousands of Poles are trying to go to the "imperialistic, capitalistic, aggressive, piratical United States."

If you speak to people in their homes, the anti-American feeling is totally missing. The Poles, like many Europeans, are more confused than shocked at events in Vietnam.

The Poles fear a global war. Their memory is fresh with eye-witness pictures of World War II's ravages in Poland. The Poles cannot forget that it was Germany which attacked it in 1939 and today, they mention that Germany, that is West Germany, is on America's side.

In the kawiarnias, as the tea rooms are called, in the restaurants and other public places no one mentions Vietnam. The Poles are concerned with their daily problems—how to live on their meager salaries. It takes considerable planning to do so in Poland.

I am happy to report that there is a visible improvement in the Polish standard of living, compared to that of two years ago when I last visited Poland.

The women are better dressed, they wear better quality material. The government brands the better quality textiles with a special stamp, much sought after by the buyers.

In the textile section of Centralny Dom Towarow, Warsaw's largest department store, about 50 percent of the goods bear the stamp "Quality Product."

"DON'T BLAME THE FARMER"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a newspaperman from Jacksonville, Fla., called my office the other day about food price rises. One of his readers forwarded me a copy of his subsequent column, captioned "Don't Blame the Farmers," dealing with milk price rises.

I want to take a moment of the Senate's time to compliment Mr. Jimmy Walker, staff writer of the Jacksonville, Fla., Journal, whose "Capital Roundup" column did exactly what I hope we can accomplish across this Nation by a look at recent milk, bread, and other food price increases.

Walker told his readers of my suggestions that newspapers should inform the public as to who is benefiting from food price increases. Then he continued:

> Foremost Dairies, for instance, dropped a notice on the doorstep a few days ago:
>
> "Due to drastic increase in Federal support prices and resultant increase in producer raw milk costs, we are forced to increase our milk prices, effective August 2."

Mr. Walker then proceeded to lay out the facts of the situation.

Milk price to producers had gone up 3.4 cents per half-gallon in the area, but retail price had been raised 7 cents per half-gallon—more than twice the increase to farmer producers. Actually less than half the increase in retail price went to farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put the text of Mr. Walker's excellent column in the Record as an example of the sort of initiative and commendable reporting of a food price increase that is needed. Mr. Walker has rendered a service for his readers as well as the farmer-producers who had been unjustly charged with total responsibility for the price rise.

The misrepresentation Walker reveals is widespread. I hope by investigating the situation rather broadly we can put an end to the unfair tendency of blaming farmers for every food price increase.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Don't Blame the Farmer

(By Jimmy Walker)

South Dakota's Sen. George McGovern started a congressional showdown with the big, prospering grocery industry using simple math and an irritated curiosity.

His figures prove the farmer is neither responsible for the sharp jump in milk prices across the nation nor is he reaping all the benefits. Instead, additional pennies are tacked on somewhere between the cow and the deliveryman.

President Kennedy's first director of Food for Peace, Sen. McGovern knows the commodity business and he leaped forcefully into the inflation controversy when New York City announced milk was going up to 28 cents a quart.

McGovern also reports a file of correspondence from Florida housewives, upset by the same pattern.

Going before the Senate Agriculture Committee, McGovern was given unanimous support for a resolution instructing Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman to pin down who is responsible for the price hikes.

For good measure, and an indication of their concern over the drift of inflation, the senators broadened the inquiry to all dairy products, bread, eggs and meats.

"We're trying to stop making the farmer the scapegoat," said McGovern's administrative aide. "This is the start of what will be a long battle over food prices," he predicted.

McGovern has been a vocal critic of the "vertical integration" of the big grocery chains—which buys a herd of cattle, then control the price of beef from hoof to table, he says.

The senator's arithmetic on New York milk prices indicates the increase is double or more what the farmer is getting. The situation has a striking parallel in Jacksonville, also troubled by milk increases this week.

"If the multipliers between farmer and consumer are not reported to consumers completely and truthfully, inflationary scarcities can result from misguided policy decisions," McGovern told the Senate.

He wants the nation's press to specify just who is benefiting from the price increases, and this suggested a closer look at Jacksonville's situation.

Foremost Dairies, for instance, dropped a notice on the doorstep a few days ago:

"Due to the drastic increase in federal support prices and resultant increase in producer raw milk costs, we are forced to increase our milk prices, effective Aug. 2. . ."

Inquiry showed, instead, that the federal support prices were increased 76 cents a hundredweight (46 quarts equals a hundredweight).

That divides into 1.7 cents per quart but milk prices across the counter here shot up three cents a quart. The difference is more marked in the pricing of half-gallons, the most popular size in the market.

Prices were 58 cents per half-gallon on the grocery shelf and jumped to 65 cents. Suppose the farmer is getting two cents per quart, not just the 1.7 cents.

He would realize four cents on the half gallon, but the price went up seven cents.

Secretary Freeman's first venture in the price uproar was to New York—where, incidentally, milk is selling for a nickel a quart less than in Jacksonville—and he said a one-cent increase there in milk prices would have been reasonable. Instead, it went up three cents.

Freeman said profits of 12 large grocery chains are up 21 per cent over a year ago and profits of food products companies are up 16.5 per cent.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place one other article in the Record, which appeared in Supermarket News for Monday, August 1.

It reports a 2-cent-per-loaf price increase for bread in Georgia, explaining that flour price was increasing by 95 cents to $1.25 per hundredweight.

There is somewhat less than a pound of flour in a pound loaf of bread. The trade uses 0.641 pound as its conversion factor in calculating pounds and loaves.

Using this factor, we find that an increase of $1.25 per hundred in flour price justifies an increase of only 0.7 cent in a loaf of bread—not the 2-cent increase that is being made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Georgia Bakeries Hike Bread Price, Cite Rising Costs

Atlanta.—The price of bread is going up in Georgia.

Claussen's, large Savannah baking firm, kicked off the increase this week with a 2 cents a loaf raise and others over the state have announced they will follow.

Within a few weeks most bakeries will be using new crop flour. This means the cost of flour will be increased from 95 cents to $1.25 per hundredweight, a spokesman for Southern Bakers Association, at headquarters here, said.

Executives of several Atlanta bakeries said bread will cost more in Georgia and nationally soon.

"Right now the increase is in the talking stage," said Edgar Kelley, president of Southern Bakeries Co. "I think there will be an increase within a few weeks and that the same thing will take place in many parts of the country."

AN EDITORIAL BY MR. DAVID LAWRENCE—"WHO IS TO BLAME?"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the well-known and highly respected editor of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence, recently stated that people are asking why the Government in Washington "is seemingly indifferent to the riots and crimes in the big cities of the North." He went on to say that the disturbances are "due in part to racial friction, but are intensified by acts of violence resulting from an abuse of the concept of demonstrations." This is something that I have said repeatedly. I have also stated that those who have preached nonviolence have, in reality, aroused passions and incited people to violence. Mr. Lawrence touched on this point, and he also asked the very pertinent question:

> Why are the police in the big cities interfered with by pressure groups and charged with brutality when they try to maintain law and order?

Mr. Lawrence's expressions in this regard are included in an editorial which appeared in U.S. News & World Report on August 1. I commend it to the attention of other Members of Congress and also to the attention of our fellow Americans everywhere.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHO IS TO BLAME?

(By David Lawrence)

A wave of discontent is sweeping the country today.

Peoples are asking why the Government at Washington is seemingly indifferent to the riots and crimes in the big cities of the North—the latest in Chicago, Cleveland and New York. The disturbances are due in part to racial friction, but are intensified by acts of violence resulting from an abuse of the concept of "demonstrations." This device has been openly espoused as a means of coercing Congress into the passage of stricter "civil rights" laws and the grant of more and more money to rebuild "slum" areas.

It is to be noted that, within the last few years, the Government has undertaken a massive program of education and assistance to the underprivileged. Anti-poverty legislation has been enacted. Appropriations have been made to improve conditions in many of our cities. Government departments and commissions have been active in endeavoring to enforce "equal rights" and to assure "equal opportunity" in employment.

Why, then, are the leaders of the civil-rights movement preaching "nonviolence" but, in effect, arousing passions and inciting people to violence?

Why are the police in the big cities interfered with by pressure groups and charged with "brutality" when they try to maintain law and order?

Why has it been found imperative for the National Guard to be called out in State after State to help the local police quell riots and preserve order?

Why was a "long, hot summer" of trouble predicted repeatedly last spring by some of the leaders of civil-rights groups as if to threaten Congress that it must immediately comply with their demands?

Are the outbreaks spontaneous or planned? Why the sudden appearance of firebombs and shotguns in the crowds? Why all the arson?

What is the record and background of some of the top advisers who sit beside certain gullible leaders in the civil-rights movement and plan "targets" for the mobilization of demonstrators?

Why has the information about subversive activities been withheld? Why is this minimized as incidental? The Reverend Billy Graham told a news conference the other day that the Government, including the FBI, knows the offenders and should identify them to the public. The testimony of police chiefs in Cleveland and other cities is that the recent assaults were apparently organized in advance.

Why, indeed, are street "demonstrations" of any kind deemed necessary in a democracy to secure passage of proposed legislation or enforcement of existing laws?

What has happened to the system of communication between the people and their Government? Is it really no longer effective?

These questions are being asked on every side because they touch the fundamentals of life in America today. Mob violence and vandalism are emerging on a wide scale in many a community. Day after day the newspapers carry reports of innocent citizens being killed or wounded, private property looted or destroyed, and residential neighborhoods terrorized.

The slogan "black power" is widely proclaimed, but it can only stir up more race consciousness and a cry for retaliation by "white power."

Many of the pastors openly preach "civil disobedience." A member of the President's Cabinet, himself a Negro, excuses it all as follows:

"If the average white American put himself in the shoes of the average black American, he would be just as angry, just as prone to violence as the Negro is today. The thing that surprises me is that it hasn't happened before."

Discontent is increasing largely because of a feeling that persons elected to public office have failed to take the steps necessary to maintain law and order. Congress seems hesistant to enact corrective laws for fear of offending Negro voters.

The Administration argues that Congress has virtually unlimited power to protect "civil rights" by invoking the clause of the Constitution which authorizes it to regulate "interstate commerce." If so, there is a parallel obligation to insure the safety of all citizens, irrespective of race or color, in their homes and on the streets.

The rising discontent in America may reflect itself in the autumn elections. It would not be surprising if the American people showed their dissatisfaction with the party in power by voting for the opposition candidates, even though no alternative policy on the issue of law and order is being offered by the Republicans.

Meanwhile, a passive Administration looks on, claiming to be without authority to intervene, but actually unable to perceive as yet that the electorate is steadily becoming embittered.

Who is to blame for this inaction? Plainly, those who hold office today are to blame, as they have the responsibility to see to it that whites as well as Negroes are given "the equal protection of the laws."

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, no American is unaware of the fact that under our republican form of government, the will of the people is accorded primacy. Our Government is responsive to this will, for it is a government of laws—administered by men whose decisions reflect the value judgments of the governed.

Whenever administrative decisions have not reflected those values, the electorate has been quick to change their elected officials.

By statute, the representatives of the people have implemented the protections guaranteed under our Constitution; and these laws have provided extensive protection for the rights of citizens against arbitrary administration.

In recent years, Federal activities have expanded at a breathtaking rate. With this expansion and with the rapid escalation of technological developments, departures from constitutional liberties once deeply cherished have become increasingly evident.

This has been particularly true of one large and vitally important segment of our population—the thousands of employees and private citizen-advisers who serve the Government. It is rather ironic that Government employees, so necessary in the carrying on of the functions of government, do not themselves reap the harvest of liberty, but rather are more and more subject to harassment and intrusions into their private lives.

For sometime now, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am a member, has received disturbing reports from responsible sources concerning violations of the rights of Federal employees. The invasions of privacy have apparently reached such alarming proportions and are assuming such varied forms, that the matter now demands immediate corrective measures.

The misuse of privacy-invading personality tests for personnel purposes has already been the subject of subcommittee hearings. Other matters, such as improper and insulting questioning during background investigations and abridgement of due process guarantees in denial of security clearances have also been the subject of study.

Other employee complaints, fast becoming too numerous to catalog, concern such diverse matters as psychiatric interviews; lie detectors; restrictions on communicating with Members of Congress; pressure to support political parties, and yet, restrictions on political activities; coercion to buy savings bonds; extensive limitations on outside activities, and yet, administrative influence to participate in agency-approved functions; rules for writing, speaking, and even thinking; and requirements to disclose personal information concerning finances, property and creditors of employees and members of their families.

One device now being utilized to invade employee privacy is a conflict of interest questionnaire on which employees are required to disclose details of their personal finances, property, creditors, and outside employment. Allegedly, this requirement is imposed on employees to prevent conflicts of interest under Executive Order 11222.

It is difficult to believe, however, that this Executive order was intended to require such wholesale disclosure by tens of thousands of regular employees and private citizen-advisers. At the time the order was issued, emphasis was placed on disclosure by top political appointees. Although the Civil Service Commission has told the subcommittee that it has not yet determined how many employees and consultants will be covered, early replies to the subcommittee's survey show that 47,000 regular employees will be subject to disclosure in 25 agencies alone.

The replies also show that procedures for reviewing and preserving the confidentiality of this personal information are haphazard, administratively unwieldy, and impractical.

Many of the practices now in extensive use have little or nothing to do with an individual's ability or qualification to perform a job.

The subcommittee has sought by hearings and investigation to remedy these problems on a case by case, agency by agency basis. Although response has been uniformly courteous, it has brought no satisfaction.

I have therefore cosponsored legislation, introduced by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ERVIN], designed to halt many of the practices of which Federal employees have complained and to protect them from further incursions into their privacy.

This measure is intended to be a bill of rights for Government employees.

The bill would, first of all, make it unlawful for an officer of any department or agency to require or request, or attempt to require or request, any employee or applicant for employment to disclose his race, religion, or national origin. It should be noted that the bill would not bar head counts of employee racial extractions, for statistical purposes, by supervisors.

However, Mr. President, the Congress has authorized a merit system for the Federal service—and the race, national origin, or religion of an individual or his forebears should have nothing to do with his ability or qualification to do a job.

Second, this bill would prohibit officials from requiring employees to attend lectures and meetings on matters unrelated to their official duties. In this connection, reports have come to the subcommittee that some agencies are requiring employees to attend lectures designed to indoctrinate them on subjects which have nothing to do with their agency functions.

While directives announcing some of these lectures state that attendance is "voluntary," they also note that attendance will be taken.

Third, the bill prohibits requiring or requesting employees to participate in any function or activity not within the scope of official activities.

Reports have come to the subcommittee, for instance, that some agencies have either prohibited flatly or required employees to report all contacts, social or otherwise, with Members of Congress or congressional staff members.

Fourth, under the bill, officers may not forbid or attempt to forbid any employee of the department or agency to patronize any business establishment offering goods and services to the public. This provision is designed to meet complaints that some agencies tell their employees where they can eat, shop, or do business.

Fifth, the bill would forbid the Government to submit its employees or any applicant for employment to any interrogation, examination, or psychological or polygraph test which is designed to elicit from him information concerning his relationship to any person related to him by blood or marriage, or concerning his religious beliefs and practices, or his attitude or experience in sexual matters.

Testimony received by the subcommittee, as well as other committees of Congress, show that the instruments testing response to questions about such personal areas of an individual's life, habits and private thoughts are of questionable validity.

The invasion of personal privacy by use of such techniques, however useful they might be in diagnosing mental illness by phychiatrists and psychologists, has no place in the Government's relationship with its employees or applicants for employment. Nor do interview techniques used on job applicants in some agencies.

Scandalous cases have been reported to the subcommittee involving high school graduates, college students, and professional people seeking Government employment who have been subjected to harrowing sessions with security investigators or psychologists. They probe the relationships of the applicant with friends and members of their families regarding religious and sexual experiences. Surely, these practices can only seriously damage the image of our Federal civil service, increase the turnover in good people, and jeopardize recruitment.

Sixth, under the bill employees may not be required or requested to support any candidate, program or policy of any political party by personal effort or contribution of money or other thing of value.

A major area of complaint received by the subcommittee has related to outright coercion and intimidation of employees to buy everything from savings bonds to electric light bulbs for playgrounds. While the bill would prevent coercion to invest in Government bonds or other securities, or make donations for any cause, it would not prevent the use of appropriate publicity to persuade employees to so invest their earnings or to make such donations.

Seventh, this bill, with a few limited exceptions, would prohibit requiring disclosure of an employee's assets or liabilities, or his personal or domestic expenditures or those of any member of his family.

The massive disclosure requirements issued by many Federal agencies pursuant to Executive Order 11222 last year go far beyond the proper concern with the prevention of conflict of interest and corruption in Government. At the time of the issuance of the Presidential directive, White House and Civil Service spokesmen said that it would affect but 2,000 political appointees. Now, as agency after agency issues regulations to implement the order—with the imprimatur of the Civil Service Commission—not only has a big-brother counseling system been established in each agency, but thousands of regular employees and private sector advisers and consultants are being required without option to fill out such questionnaires periodically.

Agency replies thus far received to subcommittee inquiries show that in 25 agencies, 47,000 regular employees are being forced to disclose this information on pain of being reassigned or dismissed. The numbers of private paid and unpaid consultants and advisers have not yet been tabulated.

Aside from the invasion of privacy, and the fact that the Federal Government is made to look foolish, the expense of these programs to the taxpayers is simply so much money poured down the drain.

Moreover, it has become evident to the subcommittee that the cost in terms of civil service morale is already being reflected in frustration and indignation by many of our civil servants.

Eighth, an individual's economic liberty and his right to privacy are so important, that an employee suspected of misconduct should not be required to submit to interrogation which could lead to disciplinary action, without the presence of counsel or other person of his choice. The bill would give him this right.

The subcommittee has been studying this matter for some time, investigating numerous serious complaints. It found that there were widely divergent practices among the regulations of agencies involving this fundamental right.

Our system of justice affords every accused facing criminal charges the right to counsel, even in preliminary interrogations. Certainly, we can do no less for civil servants facing severe economic penalties in the loss of jobs or loss of clearance for sensitive positions in government and private defense industry.

Ninth, the bill would make it unlawful to discharge, discipline, or deny promotion to an employee who refuses or fails to submit to any of the requirements, requests, or actions described in the bill. Penalties are established for any officer who willfully violates the act.

The bill would thus enable the employee or applicant to look to the Federal district court at any point in the administrative process to halt privacy invasions. He may ask for an order, injunction, or other judgment, and for complete relief against the consequences of the violation.

Mr. President, the invasions of privacy under threats and coercion and economic intimidation are rampart in our Federal civil service system today. They represent tyranny of the worst kind. In their effect on individuals and in their impact on society as a whole, they surpass any privacy invasions and illegal searches and seizures to which arbitrary rulers and administrators attempted to subject our forefathers.

They constitute an admission by the Civil Service Commission and the agencies that they are having great difficulty in operating the merit system, despite all the tests and rules for determining the qualifications of applicants and employees, and making a selection on the basis of merit.

The degree of privacy in the lives of our civil servants is small enough as it is, and is still shrinking with further advances in technical know-how. That these citizens are being forced by economic coercion to surrender this precious liberty, in order to obtain and hold jobs, is a form of tyranny which should greatly disturb every American.

The tyrannies being practiced by the various agencies and departments of the U.S. Government might be appropriate in a totalitarian state, but they are absolutely alien to the spirit of a free society.

Congressional action on this legislation to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens who are also employees of Government is long overdue.

THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with other Senators and Members of the House in serving as honorary cochairman of the National Committee to Save-the-United States Capitol and to block a $34 million extension of the west front of the Capitol as proposed by Architect George Stewart. This committee will obtain the services of an individual outside of Congress who can devote his time to handling the committee's day-to-day operations and who can contact groups and individuals anxious to prevent any destruction of the basic design of the west front of the Capitol.

I have spoken before on this subject and now reiterate my opposition to Mr. Stewart's proposal. It is wasteful, unnecessary, and unreasonable.

This situation is well told in an editorial that appeared in the Monday, July 25, edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editoriial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, July 25, 1966]

WHY NOT HIRE AN ARCHITECT?

> The man who is in charge of designing new buildings on Capitol Hill and preserving old, historically important buildings, isn't even an architect.
>
> He is J. George Stewart.
>
> Stewart is 75, gets $27,000 per year, served one term as congressman-at-large from Delaware and was appointed architect of the Capitol 12 years ago by President Eisenhower.
>
> It is a Congressional shame that a man with no professional talent as an architect holds the job. He is a civil engineer and he has a record of creating weird buildings at astronomical costs. The Rayburn office building for senators is a notable example.
>
> Now he is in charge of projects such as these: Repairing the west front of the Capitol (he would spend a minimum of $34 million and alter the traditional symmetry of the building) and building the $75 million James Madison Memorial annex to the Library of Congress.
>
> His critics, including the government's Commission on Fine Arts and many highly-regarded architects, deride Stewart's buildings as "Texas Pen" or "Modern Mussolini." Some of his architectural dreams are called "shaved-pate classicism."
>
> It's scandalous that Congress allows this condition to continue, that our historic buildings are in the amateur hands of a man who is untrained for the job of designing buildings or repairing them and equally a novice at estimating costs.

SPEECH OF THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE MIDCONTINENT FARMERS' ASSOCIATION AT COLUMBIA, MO.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, Vice President HUMPHREY gave an exceptionally fine speech to the Midcontinent Farmers' Association at Columbia, Mo. It was a fine speech because it pointed up some fundamental truths about the farm situation at home and overseas.

The Vice President told his audience, as he has been telling Americans for many years, that—

> The best bargain in the world today is the food basket of the American family.

Far from being in competition, he added, consumer and farmer welfare are interdependent.

> We must not lose sight of this: Consumers benefit from having fair prices paid to farmers, just as farmers benefit from full employment and expansion in the rest of the economy.

Turning to the problem of food shortages in the world, HUBERT HUMPHREY quoted the words of Seneca:

> A hungry people listens not to reason nor cares for justice.

To respond to this threat, he said we must both expand our own production and help developing countries to increase theirs. And he added:

> These programs [of improving agriculture in hungry lands] must be adapted to their way of doing things—adapted to problems of climate and water and social structure. Part of the assistance we can give is in establishment of local research institutes, using local staffing and resources, to undertake the same kind of agricultural research which has so contributed to our own productivity.

As the sponsor of the amendment recently approved by the Senate to expand agricultural research in our foreign aid program, I am most gratified that the Vice President has spoken out so persuasively on behalf of such an effort.

Finally, the Vice President recognizes that—

> Today the age of surpluses is all but gone. The farmers of this nation will be called upon to expand production. This is news. It is good news for our farmers, for our consumers, and for hungry people throughout the world.
>
> And as the American farmer rises to this challenge, his government is determined that he shall stand on equal footing with the rest of the economy—that he shall have every opportunity for a fair and just return on his investment, his time, his energy, and his extraordinary skill.

Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent that the full text of the Vice President's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MIDCONTINENT FARMERS' ASSOCIATION, COLUMBIA, MO., AUGUST 8, 1966

Today America lives in abundance. Yet, the world around us remains much the same as President Truman described it in his Inaugural Address 17 years ago.

"More than half the people of the world," he said, "are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas."

Today, then, I want to talk about both our own American abundance and about the challenge—and opportunity—facing us in the hungry world outside.

First, let us take a hard, clear look at the realities of our own American agriculture.

The best bargain in the world today is the food basket of the American family.

This is a reality not fully appreciated by those of us who pay for that food basket. We are better fed, at less cost, than any other people in the world. Last year only 18 per cent of our disposable income went for food.

In the last five years, the price of the 11 key foods in the Consumer Price Index has risen by less than 9 per cent. During the same period the weekly earnings, after taxes, of the single worker in industry, for instance, have risen more than 20 per cent.

One hour of factory labor earnings in 1965 brought: 12.5 pounds of white bread, as compared with 11.1 pounds in 1960; 2.4 pounds of round steak, as compared with 2.1 pounds in 1960; 3.5 pounds of butter, compared with 3 pounds; 9.9 quarts of milk, compared with 8.7 quarts; 5 dozen eggs, as compared with 3.9 dozen in 1960.

If we make comparisons over a longer period, they are truly startling. We find one hour of factory labor earnings buying two to three times as much in key commodities as 10 to 20 years ago.

While the cost of farm products has been reduced, the farmer has had to pay more for what he buys.

Since 1960, the cost of things the farmer must buy has gone up by some 11 percent. He has had to keep running to make even gradual gains in his net income.

Since 1960, farm productivity per man per hour has increased by nearly one-third, compared with a productivity gain of about 18 per cent in the rest of our economy.

We must not lose sight of this: Consumers benefit from having fair prices paid to farmers, just as farmers benefit from full employment and expansion in the rest of the economy. We all need each other for a full and balanced prosperity.

Farmers create millions of jobs in our economy. More than 10 million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Nearly a million-and-a-half have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. And thousands in rural communities make their livelihood providing services to farmers.

Total investment in American agriculture is more than 250 billion dollars. This is comparable to about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three-fifths of the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents 30 thousand, five hundred dollars for each farm worker, as compared with an average investment of 19 thousand, six hundred dollars per employee in manufacturing.

In 1965, when our farmers realized a gross income of nearly 45 billion dollars, they spent almost 31 billion dollars to operate their farm businesses.

Last year they spent more than 3 billion dollars to buy trucks, tractors, and other farm machinery and equipment. They spent about 2 billion dollars to buy automobiles.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry. In 1965, more than 3 billion dollars was spent by farmers for petroleum, fuel and oil, and repairs and operations of motor vehicles and machinery.

And all this productivity, all this economic activity is generated by fewer people than live today in the state of California. Our national farm population is today only 12 million.

Where does American agriculture stand in the world?

Exports of our farm commodities are up sharply. This has a major positive effect on our balance of payments.

In fiscal year 1953, exports of farm products from the United States amounted to less than 3 billion dollars. By fiscal year 1966 the export figure had jumped to nearly 7 billion dollars. Products from 78 million acres of American cropland were shipped abroad. More than 75 per cent of these commodities were sold for dollars.

The market for feed and food grains, oilseeds, protein meals and vegetable oils is highly competitive. But we can and do compete. We can look forward to expansion of farm exports as the economies of other nations grow and their purchasing power increases.

Seneca once observed that "A hungry people listens not to reason nor cares for justice."

And, in that knowledge, we have, under the Food for Peace program, reached and helped more than a hundred countries.

Under this program we have delivered 150 million tons of food, valued at 15 billion dollars, to needy and disaster-struck nations.

Our Food for Peace program reflects the democratic and humanitarian character of the American people.

We will continue to share our abundance with people who lack it. But our programs of food assistance must support, and not deter, agricultural development in places which need it. Food aid is only one part of the War on Hunger.

We need to help the developing countries with an export of ideas and techniques from our own experience.

But these programs must be adapted to their way of doing things—adapated to problems of climate and water and social structure. Part of the assistance we can give is in establishment of local research institutes, using local staffing and resources, to undertake the same kind of agricultural research which has so contributed to our own productivity.

This is the essence of our new Food for Freedom proposals—to help others help themselves. When President Johnson proposed the Food for Freedom program he said: "The time is not far off when all of the combined production, of all the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

Last month I carried this message again, as spokesman for our government, to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

This Committee is composed of high-ranking ministers of the industralized nations—countries that are in a position to be of help to the less developed areas of the world.

I made it quite clear that President Johnson has made a commitment on behalf of the American people to join with the other developed nations in an all-out effort to eradicate large-scale famine and hunger from the face of the earth.

And this brings me to the next reality of American agriculture we all must face.

In the past few years we Americans have come to know what we call "turnpike trance"—the hypnosis of the highway which has led to thousands of mishaps and accidents.

I say far too many Americans have also fallen victim to "surplus stare"—the blind belief, taken as fact, that our country is buried under unnecessary, costly tonnages of food.

Today the age of surpluses is all but gone. Already, our food stocks are dwindling. If we look toward sufficient production for our own needs, for our commercial exports, and for emergency food assistance for the developing countries, we find ourselves close to the safety margin.

The world has been eating into its grain reserves, sharply reducing the carryovers to a point where they should be rebuilt and restored to prudent levels.

In the last four years the world has consumed 200 million bushels of wheat per year more than it has produced.

In the last four years it has utilized about 6 million tons of feed grains more than it has harvested.

In the case of soybeans, we are using all we produce. Carryovers are minimal.

It is clear that we must raise our production sights in rice. Because any plan for agriculture must allow for ample lead time we must always be deeply concerned about the level of reserves. Weather, as all of us know, is an unpredictable hazard. There are reports of drought in many areas of the country this year. We do not know what the size of this year's feed grain and soybean crops will be. We hope for the best, but we will all be concerned until the harvest is in.

It is now apparent that, at the end of the current marketing year, our wheat stocks will fall below the desirable reserve level. The same is true for soybeans, where no true reserve is in sight. Our production of milk is insufficient now. That is why we have raised the support level for manufacturing milk to four dollars per hundredweight.

We are living in a whole new area of demand for feed grains. United States consumption will hit a new peak. We produced a record crop in 1965, but we will use and export more than we harvested.

The number of animal units will go up about four per cent in the next marketing year. Exports are at about 30 million ton rate—about twice the 1959–63 average. It is possible that by October 1 next year our feed-grain carryover will drop below the desirable level.

Next year will be a year for bringing a substantial part of our reserve acreage out of mothballs.

We must recognize that the long road of surplus has had its turning.

The farmers of this nation will be called upon to expand production. This is news. It is good news for our farmers, for our consumers, and for hungry people throughout the world.

And as the American farmer rises to this challenge, his government is determined that he shall stand on equal footing with the rest of the economy—that he shall have every opportunity for a fair and just return on his investment, his time, his energy and his extraordinary skill.

When President Truman looked out on a turbulent, impoverished and hungry world in 1949, he had little immediate hope that this nation—and our partners—would in his lifetime be able to challenge those conditions.

But today we are able to challenge them—and we are able to do so in large part because of the energy and productivity of American agriculture. Today our abundance is a weapon for peace.

We must use that weapon—able, honorable and well.

THE NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial, titled "The New Immigration Law," which appeared in the August 10, 1966, edition of the Wayne, W. Va., County News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The New Immigration Law

One of the results of the new immigration law which recently took effect is now known. As wiser heads predicted, the law is not the be-all and end-all its sponsors so loudly proclaimed. (After a long and carefully prepared pressure campaign Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the President and most of the politically-minded supported the new law.)

Basically, what the new law did was to end preference in immigration given northern Europeans. That preference was not discriminatory as those who killed the old law claimed; it allowed every racial element in the country its fair share of immigration—keeping the composite racial stock about the same in theory. (The theory didn't even work out, however, because immigrants from other areas always filled their quotas and northern European countries, with higher standards of living, often didn't fill theirs.)

So the law was changed, and now the report from London is that immigration from England, from which we inherited our law, our language and most of our political system, and democracy itself, has been sharply curtailed by the tightened restrictions.

Figures show that British immigration to this country for the first five months has dropped from 9,446 (in 1965) to 5,040 this year. This has happened despite a 30% increase in inquiries. All of which goes to prove that the new law, as its critics claimed, will change the basic character of the nation—just as the maneuverers who were so influential in pressuring politicians into passing it desired. The great unorganized majority sleeps on.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress issued its final report. Since that time, many newspapers have seen fit to comment on our work and the recommendations appearing in the report. As samples of this comment, I offer for inclusion in the Record editorials appearing in the Washington Post, the Birmingham, Ala., News, the Augusta, Ga., Herald, the Dallas Times-Herald, and the Los Angeles Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1966]

Second Round of Reform

As a blueprint for a modern Congress, the report of the Monroney-Madden Committee is disappointing. It does not touch the major weaknesses in the power structure of Congress. Nothing is said about filibustering in the Senate, the unruly Rules Committee in the House or the dead weight of the seniority system in both houses. But correction of these major ailments was not the assignment given to the Committee. Within its limited mandate, it has produced some very useful recommendations.

Many of the current proposals are designed to refine, improve, extend or reiterate reforms approved in 1946 as a result of the study directed by the La Follette-Monroney Committee. This is not surprising, for the House chairman on that occasion is now the Senate chairman, Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY. The biggest reform of 20 years ago was realignment of the legislative committees in both houses. This time the major changes would be the creation of education committees in both houses and a veterans' affairs committee in the Senate. There are good reasons for these and the lesser realignments proposed.

The so-called committee "bill of rights" is designed to give a majority power to act over the opposition of a recalcitrant chairman in calling meetings and reporting legislation approved by the majority. Part of this authority was included in the 1946 act, but in some cases it did not prove effective.

The new proposal to discourage closed-door operations is broader in scope but still inadequate. The present loose requirement in regard to open sessions applies only to "hearings." Under the new recommendations, hearings would be open "to the maximum extent possible" and could be broadcast or televised, with committee approval. In addition committee "meetings" would be open, "except for necessary executive sessions." This would seem to leave the door wide open to secret meetings at the whim of a chairman. At least Congress ought to require a majority vote of the committee before either a hearing or a meeting could be closed.

Constructive recommendations are offered as to committee staffs, full-time "review specialists," legislative assistants, transportation allowances, transformation of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress into the Legislative Research Service and many other subjects. The plans for a professional police force at the Capitol, the elimination of postal patronage and creation of a House committee to deal with problems of ethics are certainly good so far as they go. We wish the Committee had gone much further, however, in recommending the disclosure of legislators' financial interests.

The Committee itself seems to recognize the limitations of its program by suggesting the creation of a joint committee on congressional operations to make a continuing study for improvement of the legislative branch. This could become a most important item if Congress would give such a body a broad enough mandate to do the job that needs to be done.

[From the Birmingham News, Aug. 1, 1966]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress has begun preparing a far-reaching omnibus reorganization bill based on its lengthy list of recommendations for improvement of operations.

The recommendations were contained in the bi-partisan committee's just-released final report, calling for major changes in congressional organization and machinery. They include uniform rules of procedure for the standing committees, changes in committee jurisdiction, improved staffing and the use of modern management techniques in evaluating the ever-increasing federal budget.

When completed, the committee will seek permission to bring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966 directly to the floor of each House during the current session, a procedure that was followed in 1946, when the last comprehensive review of congressional organization was made.

The committee's recommendations, in the opinion of *The News*, generally offer a practical and realistic approach to revision of the often-cumbersome legislative operations.

This newspaper realizes that it is highly unlikely that Congress would rubber-stamp the recommendations of the committee. Congressmen almost automatically resist any tampering with hidebound rules and habits which have developed down through the years.

Nevertheless, the broad act designed to streamline congressional procedures merits the thoughtful and careful consideration of every member of the Congress.

The committee, of which Senator JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama is a member, accepted the responsibility it was charged with and delved into all phases of congressional organization.

Its report, for example, proposes major revisions in the standing committee system, the basic working unit of the Congress. It recommends a committee "bill of rights" to permit a majority of the committee membership to call a meeting and report legislation if a chairman refuses to take such action.

It also recommends more frequent use of open hearings and suggests that committee deliberations be televised or broadcast at the option of the committee. The use of proxy voting in committees would be eliminated.

It is immediately apparent that many members of the Congress will oppose such procedures, with their almost natural preference for many closed meetings. *The News* feels, however, that Congress has a responsibility to conduct certainly most of its hearings in the open, and not behind closed doors which inevitably feed an atmosphere of suspicion.

The committee's recommendations for overhauling congressional machinery appear sound and should be considered an important first step towards overhauling standard procedures which, in many respects, have become outmoded. With the passage of time, during the 20 years since the Congress conducted a self-appraisal of its organization, government has become more complex, more complicated and more unwieldly. Modern day government demands a modern approach to legislative functions.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald,
July 26, 1966]

REORGANIZATION FOR CONGRESS

Congress would get some needed streamlining under recommendations made by the special joint committee which has had legislative practices and procedures under study.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has made more than 100 proposals after a year's study. The last time Congress enacted a measure for Congressional reorganization was in 1945.

Specifically forbidden to consider changes in such Congressional phenomena as the greatly criticized seniority system, the joint committee nevertheless touched upon some sensitive areas of member perquisites where opposition, open or covered, will be encountered. Patronage, for example, would be lost to members in postmaster and rural mail carrier jobs, as well as in appointments to the special capital police force.

Public approval should be found for the recommendations generally, which include less secrecy in committee proceedings, an important item because the real work of Congress is commonly done in committee. More public hearings, publication of members' votes even in closed sessions, and live TV and radio coverage at the option of the committee chairman are proposed.

Autocratic control of much committee action by the chairman alone would be bent, if not broken, as a majority of the committee could overrule the chairman.

The committee report and proposal for appropriate legislation will receive extensive attention and debate, although some major targets of critics of Congress are untouched. Co-chairman of the joint committee is Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who served in like capacity for the reorganization in 1945. The Senator is quoted as being hopeful of action on the proposals this year.

Action and debate in Congress on far-reaching internal revisions should be watched and heard with general public interest.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Herald
July 28, 1966]

CONGRESS REFORMS NEEDED

The reorganization of Congress to render it more efficient and democratic, as proposed by a joint committee of the Senate and House, is already long overdue.

To a considerably greater extent even than that of private institutions, the machinery of governmental branches at all levels becomes so encrusted over the years with habit, custom and tradition that breaking through the shell to remodel it in keeping with changed times and conditions become a herculean task. Now, however, with the unanimous approval of the bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, much needed reforms apparently have a good chance of adoption.

Two major proposals by the committee in particular merit every effort that can be mustered in their behalf.

First is the recommendation that all committee meetings be opened up more to the public. As most of the real work of Congress is done in committees, the plan obviously has considerable significance.

Also, all committee action would be made public. As the Times Herald Washington Bureau pointed out, many hearings and committee meetings are now closed to the public, and action by the committees in these meetings frequently is not reported until long after it has been taken, and occasionally it is never reported.

A second imperative reform proposed by the committee would reduce the powers of committee chairmen. At present the chairman virtually holds a verdict of death over any bill which he personally opposes. This in spite of the fact that the majority of the committee or even the entire committee, other than himself, may favor the bill or at least favor reporting it out for consideration by the total membership of the House or Senate.

Obviously, it is completely illogical as well as highly unjust for any one man to set himself up as the final arbiter on any proposed piece of legislation. Yet this often happens under present procedures, as Dallas, for instance, has discovered on occasion.

The package plan of the committee contains many other proposals for much needed change. As Representative JACK BROOKS of Beaumont, the only Texan on the committee, said, the recommendations will represent "a giant step forward" if they are adopted. Congress should take that step.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times
July 25, 1966]

CONGRESS REFORM NEEDED

For the first time in two decades, a major overhaul of congressional machinery is being pushed by a special Senate-House committee. The 100 or so proposals will be incorporated in a specific bill in the near future and action by both houses will be sought before adjournment.

Although the program is not as sweeping as the Reorganization Act of 1946, it has considerable merit—and will stir up considerable controversy.

Emphasizing that there can be no justification for secret hearings unless national security or matters reflecting on the character of witnesses or other persons is involved, the committee recommended that most congressional committee hearings be open to the public and the press.

To further improve functioning of the two houses and their committees it proposed:

Authorizing committee majorities to meet and report out bills if the chairman refuses to act.

> Provide three assistants to minority party members on each committee.
>
> Putting Congress on a five-day week, thus ending the Tuesday to Thursday Club type operation.
>
> Creation of a House Committee on Standards and Conduct similar to the unit now functioning in the Senate.
>
> Establishment of a joint committee to conduct continuing studies of organization and operation of Congress.
>
> The committee recommended limiting the main body of the Congressional Record to verbatim reports of remarks made on the floor and material germane to legislation under discussion. That, apparently, would relegate to the appendix speeches prepared but not actually delivered on the floor.
>
> In another section of its report, the committee called for strengthening the Lobbying Regulation Act to provide more stringent controls over persons attempting to influence the legislative process.
>
> The committee sidestepped many of the areas which have been under heaviest fire from congressional critics. In all fairness, however, it should be noted that it was specifically barred from doing anything about such things as the seniority system.
>
> Republican committeemen, even while signing the report, regretted its shortcomings. They pointed particularly to the failure to require disclosure of assets and income by members of Congress, the lack of curbs on lobbying by the executive branch of government and the absence of reform of political campaign financing.
>
> Those are, indeed, serious omissions, yet it may be argued that inclusion of such subject matter might jeopardize passage of what is primarily housekeeping legislation. The desired improvement in campaign financing and disclosure practices, however, should most certainly be incorporated in the administration's pending election reform bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is significant that these editorials come from newspapers spanning the Nation. The organization of the Congress is, after all, a national issue. How well we are organized to do our job, how well our committee system functions, how effective is our handling of a $100 billion budget, how modern are our procedures, how practical is our scheduling of committee and floor business, these are questions which directly, or indirectly, affect all of our citizens. For both the quantity and quality of our legislative output is at least in part a reflection of our organizational capabilities.

Mr. President, these editorials also reflect a clear public demand for action. Since the announcement and publication of the joint committee's final report, we have received substantial news comment, many editorials in leading newspapers and a multitude of letters from individual citizens. They all reflect overwhelming support for the recommendations of the joint committee. In fact, the prevailing criticsm is that we did not go far enough—that additional reform proposals should have been made.

We are presently engaged in drafting an omnibus reorganization bill based on the joint committee's recommendations. We hope that the Senate members of the joint committee will be granted legislative authority to report this bill directly to the floor of the Senate for consideration during this session. I believe it will be a good bill—one worthy of your support and essential to the ability of Congress to keep pace with the magnitude of our problems in this complicated world.

I urge every Member of the Senate to carefully review the final report of the joint committee and the omnibus bill when it has been introduced. These recommendations are the result of more than a year and a half of public hearings and careful study. Congress legislates in many fields which control the organization of other agencies of Government and of private businesses. I believe the American people expect us to act with equal diligence in putting our own house in better order—and that they have a right to expect that action will be taken during this session.

AGRICULTURE AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, of all the problems facing the underdeveloped nations of the world, none is more serious—and perilous—than the mounting crisis in agricultural production.

The underdeveloped world, in the face of tremendous rises in population, is losing the capacity to feed itself. Despite the broad range of agricultural development programs undertaken by national governments with the assistance of the U.S. Government and international agencies, the underdeveloped world is making little headway in increasing per capita production of foodstuffs and other agricultural products.

From the standpoint of direct U.S. interest, the situation is nowhere more critical than in Latin America. Nearly 5 years ago, the United States and our Latin American neighbors pledged themselves to a massive hemispherewide development program—the Alliance for Progress. Its aims were clear and simple: to promote, within the structure of free, democratic societies, overall economic and social development. The Alliance, in short, was created to bring a decent standard of living to all the people of this hemisphere, within the shortest time possible.

The document which underlies the Alliance for Progress, the Charter of Punta del Este, sets a goal of a 2.5-percent annual increase in per capita gross produce in the countries of Latin America. It has been calculated that Latin American food production must rise at least 5 percent per year in order to meet this exceedingly modest goal. But so far, Latin America has not even begun to approach this goal. Statistics compiled by the U.N.'s Food and Agricultural Organization show that Latin America's food output in the last 5 years has grown less than 2.5 percent per year overall. In per capita terms, it has not increased one-tenth of 1 percent.

Only a few countries—Mexico, Venezuela and Bolivia and Nicaragua—are attaining an agricultural growth rate of 4 to 5 percent per year. For the continent as a whole, the growth of the agricultural sector is between 2 and 3 percent per year. Among the least dynamic countries, agriculturally speaking, are Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Uruguay, Haiti, and Paraguay. Yet, even where food production expands at the rate of 3 percent per year, the hemispherewide annual population growth of 3 percent wipes out that small gain.

In my judgment, one of the primary aims of economic development must be to move developing countries in the direction of self-sufficiency in food production. But the performance of Alliance member countries, at least until now, has been far from satisfactory. Peru, for example, increased its imports of food from $56 million in 1960 to $73 million in 1962. In 1963, Chile imported $156 million in foodstuffs, and all indications are that this total has not been appreciably lowered in the past 2 years.

Increasing agricultural production, and particularly production of food, in Alliance member countries is an extremely complex and difficult task. Nevertheless, the solution to the mounting food crisis lies at the very heart of the Alliance for Progress. Stagnation in the agricultural sector undercuts development in all other sectors. When a country's overall growth is not shared by farmers, structural conditions arise that breed inflation; the nation relies more and more on food imports; internal demand begins to collapse; and malnutrition spreads like a plague throughout the population. This is the peril confronting Latin America today.

The 1965 Social Progress Trust Fund Report of the Inter-American Development Bank puts the problem this way:

> It has been repeatedly emphasized that the agrarian problem in Latin America has two main dimensions: One is modernizing traditional agriculture by the more efficient utilization of natural and human resources; while the other is the reform of the rural social structure characterized by the persistently low status of the campesino, his conditions of dependency and insecurity, and the generally limited opportunities for human development open to him. Both technological and social underdevelopment converge on widespread poverty and unsatisfactory levels of living for most of the rural population.

Unlike the United States, the number of rural families in Latin America shows little signs of declining. The IDB estimates that Brazil will have 11 million more farm people in 1970 than it had in 1950. Even in Argentina and Chile, where the percentage of rural dwellers is dropping in relation to city dwellers, the absolute number of farm people is increasing.

It cannot be denied that a basic cause of the stagnation in agriculture lies in the social structures that dominate Latin America's rural life. Maldistribution of incomes and land continues to hamper progress in rural areas. In Chile, the upper 1 percent of the agricultural families receives one-fourth of the income. The bottom 87 percent of the farm labor force receives only one-third of the total income.

But progress is being made in Chile—and in other countries like Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru—in redistribution of land, to create more equitable and more productive land holdings. Under the Alliance for Progress, land reform is more and more a fact of rural life, and in the coming decades much of the economic and social injustice of the old societies will be eliminated. It should be noted that land reform—a true reform which aims at raising productivity—does not deal exclusively with the problem of latifundia, or great tracts of land held by one family or group. It deals also with minifundia, land that is broken up into plots too small to farm productively. In many cases, land reform may mean consolidation of miniscule land holdings as well as breaking up the huge estancias and fincas.

Progress, as I have said, is already being made. Ecuador's land reform program will benefit 254,000 rural families over a 20-year period. Chile's land reform program will grant land at 100,000 families over a 10-year period. As of last year, nearly every Alliance member country had some sort of agrarian law under which substantial reforms could—and in most cases, would—be carried out.

It is time, therefore, to focus increasing attention under the Alliance on the substantive problems of increasing agricultural output, using all the means that modern science and agricultural technology have put at our disposal. Happily, the key leaders of the Alliance, both Latin Americans and U.S. officials, have already sensed the need for such a change in emphasis. In particular, the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, led by its Chairman, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of Colombia, has been showing the way to serious study of the rates of food production in the countries to the south of us.

Walt Whitman Rostow, the U.S. member of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance, has been actively calling for the modernization of Latin American rural life, and the integration of national markets in Latin America. Involved in this concept are a whole host of processes, many of which we in the United States tend to take for granted because they have evolved with the growth of our country over the past 200 years.

An essential element in the process of modernization is the reorganization of the existing internal marketing structure of many Latin countries. In one study, carried out in Mexico, it was found that 14 middlemen handled a single product in its journey from the farm to the ultimate consumer. The Committee is therefore rightly concerned with the encouragement of development of cooperatives, both at the level of the farm producer and the urban consumer.

A second vital ingredient in bringing the isolated rural communities into contact with the markets of the big cities of the continent is the construction of feeder roads and farm-to-market roads. In this area, the Mexican Government announced early this year a $150 million program to build, rebuild, or complete about 5,000 miles of feeder roads in outlying areas. The program is part of a total effort undertaken by the progressive government of Mexican President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz to accelerate rural development. The improved feeder network will help open up new lands for agriculture, reducing transportation costs, and improving levels of productivity and output in areas whose economic growth is stymied by poor transportation links with marketing centers.

The role of agricultural extension services, such a common factor in farm development in the United States, has been virtually unknown in Latin America, at least until very recently. Here, Latin American universities have a large role to play. It is noteworthy that the University of Chile has recently launched a $6.4 million program to expand and modernize its schools of agronomy and animal husbandry and veterinary medicine. The program calls for two new experimental stations, one for agricultural studies and one for research in veterinary medicine, in the vicinity of "La Platina," a facility of the Institute of Agricultural Research, about 9 miles outside Santiago.

Our own Agency for International Development and the National Farmers Union are making valuable contributions in this area. A training program for Latin American farm leaders has provided instruction for more than 270 farmers, in such fields as agricultural education, agrarian reform, credit procedures, farmer organizations, technical cooperation, and cooperative enterprises. Under another phase of the same effort, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is providing technical assistance to farmers in Brazil, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Ecuador, and elsewhere.

To build a viable farm economy, Latin America must greatly expand the amount of credits available to farmers for purchase of equipment, seed, fertilizer, and materials. In Colombia, for instance, an autonomous credit agency known as the Caja de Crédito Agrario Industrial y Minero is beginning the $28 million first stage of a 10-year livestock development program. Through extension of credits to farmers, the organization expects to increase production by 58,000 tons of beef, 63,000 tons of milk products, and 400 tons of wool annually. The gross value of the production increase will amount to some $32 million each year. Paraguay is also launching an experimental program to increase beef production, applying much the same techniques. And in the Dominican Republic, the Banco Agrícola is stepping up its farm credit program in order to stimulate exports of farm products and increase production of basic corps for home consumption.

Certainly, in an area of extensive one-crop economies such as Latin America, a principal concern must be for diversification of agriculture, in order to avoid dependence on the often fickle course of the world commodity market, but even more important, to convert arable land to production of foodstuffs for domestic consumption. The Colombian program I mentioned previously has such diversification as its goal. Even more encouraging is the creation by the World Coffee Organization of a fund for crop diversification. Here is an indication that the producers of commodities are themselves concerned with the problem and intend to do something about it.

But perhaps the most hopeful of all initiatives lies in the area of multinational projects. The progress being made by Latin America's two great economic integration mechanisms—the Central American Common Market and the Latin American free trade area—is well known to most of us. Not so well known is the increasingly integrated approach being assumed in agricultural development.

High on the list of multinational efforts is the program of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance to promote the use of fertilizers and modern fertilizing techniques. Just last month, the Committee, or CIAP as it is usually known—from its Spanish initials—brought together a group of experts in Washington to seek ways to extend fertilizer use. The group proposed a coordinated effort, in cooperation with governments, the private sector and international financing agencies, to create a genuine common market for fertilizers. This approach, the group said, would be one of the most effective ways to increase agricultural production and thus strengthen overall economic and social development. At that meeting, AID officials reported that the U.S. Geological Survey has completed a preliminary study of fertilizer materials in seven South American countries, and has been assisting Brazil, Chile, and Peru in developing national institutions to carry on exploration work.

AID also reported on a mass fertilizer demonstration, undertaken jointly with the Ministry of Agriculture and private enterprise last year in El Salvador. The Ministry supplied corn seed and the service of 50 rural extension agents; private enterprise provided $14,000 worth of fertilizers; and AID supplied materials and technical assistance.

Some 3,000 demonstration plots were planted in corn. Yields on natural corn, with no fertilizer, ranged from 500 to 1,500 pounds per plot, while yields with fertilizer ranged from 4,000 to 6,000 pounds. Expanded over a 5-year period, AID estimates, such a program could make El Salvador self-sufficient in corn production.

Hand in hand with fertilization goes irrigation and flood control. A good example of the latter is Venezuela's ambitious program to reclaim vast areas of the fertile, but low-lying Orinoco Delta. In the past few years, the Corporacíon Venezolana de Guayana has diverted Orinoco flood waters from some 2.5 million acres of land and has put one-fourth of that under cultivation. Mexico is now launching a $65 million program to rehabilitate and expand irrigated areas in its central and northern areas. The land there is fertile, but arid. In fact, a large part of Mexico's recent boom in agriculture is attributable to new irrigation works. Between 1950 and 1962, the crop area under irrigation doubled, and now totals some 10 million acres. Mexico's and Venezuela's efforts, which I have cited, are strictly national programs. But throughout Latin America, with its vast international borders of wide rivers, the possibilities for multinational efforts are tremendous.

We have only to look at the history of our own country to see how directly agricultural prosperity is linked with the general economic health of the country.

In developing countries, where malnutrition and even starvation are ever present specters, the relationship is still more frighteningly precise. If Latin America cannot increase its agricultural production dramatically in coming years, it cannot develop itself. If Latin America does not succeed in feeding its people with its own resources, it is condemned to lie helpless in the grip of inflation, economic strangulation, and increasing poverty.

In his message to Congress earlier this year, President Johnson clearly enunciated his concern for Latin America's food crisis. He proposed that the United States help developing countries give more emphasis to agricultural development, along with health and education. He announced that AID would increase its expenditures for agricultural development to a level of $500 million, of which about $165 million would be used to finance shipments of fertilizers to other countries, including Alliance member nations.

In my view, the President's initiative is crucial. The United States, and all other partners in this great Alliance for Progress, must increasingly deal with the reality of the food crisis. The technical knowledge applied to those small plots of corn in El Salvador must be spread throughout the hemisphere, for the day is not far off when the production of all the agriculturally developed countries of the earth will not be sufficient to fill the millions of hungry stomachs in the underdeveloped areas.

COL. DANIEL JAMES—A CREDIT TO AMERICA

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in a time of social turmoil it is encouraging to come across evidence that some of our citizens have the courage to speak out forcefully in defense of basic American values.

On July 19, the Tucson, Ariz., Advertising Club had the privilege of hearing an address by Col. Daniel James, Jr., which I commend to all Members of the Senate. The fact that Colonel James is a Negro is secondary. It is what he said as an American citizen that deserves a national audience.

I ask consent to have an account of his speech, as published in the Tucson Daily Citizen, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO JET PILOT TELLS AD CLUB: NO MAN IS SECOND CLASS UNLESS HE ACTS LIKE IT

(By Margaret Kuehlthau, Citizen Staff Writer)

"I am a Negro but I am not a second-class citizen. No man is a second-class citizen unless he thinks like one and acts like one.

"I will never turn my back on the American flag—my flag—the American flag. Neither will I join any idiot in the street who has a bone to pick.

"I will obey the laws of this country, and if I want to register a complaint, I will use the duly established processes of law and order."

So declared Col. Daniel James, Jr., here yesterday in a speech that brought Tucson Advertising Club members to their feet for a prolonged ovation.

James is deputy commander for operations for the 4453d Combat Crew Training Wing at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and a jet pilot.

He deplored "fair weather patriots" who have taken to burning the American flag, walking rudely out on speeches given by high officials of the government, and openly support the enemy.

"Don't these people know that communism smiles on demonstrations and on strikes, on disunity within our ranks?" he asked.

"I am not against protests because protestors have never been denied in this country. But protests should be carried out within the bounds of good taste.

"In the past, protestors have taken their beliefs to the polls and, through the power of the vote, changes have been orderly," he said.

James said that, in the past, "All Americans were united against any enemy of this country."

"The soldiers who went away to war to defend democracy went bravely and they stood tall, giving their lives for freedom. What would they think now?

"Men who have given their lives for democracy would be spinning in their graves if they knew of the division among Americans today."

James, a graduate of Tuskeegee Institute, said the worst weapon that can be used against the United States is a psychological weapon "aimed at destroying men's souls and their love of freedom." Homes, schools, and churches, he added, need "to shore up the Americanism and patriotism of our kids."

"If I am accused of Americanism and flag waving and emotionalism, it is all right with me," he said. "It is true. This is my country and I love it."

James said he was tired of having "the other side" say to him:

"James, you are a black man and you can go only so far because you are a Negro. You are a member of the minority, so why don't you join us? Aren't you tired of being pushed around?

"And I answer:

"Hell, I'm not disgusted. I'm not pushed around. I am a free-thinking citizen. If an obstacle is placed in my way, I do not consider it a problem. It is a challenge, and I will meet it.

"The greatest weapon we have against Communism is unity and the principles of democracy. We must present a united front to the enemy. We must take an active part in our government.

"Show that unity to the world and 'they' won't come over here and attack us.

"They wouldn't dare."

SOCIETY HAS RIGHTS, TOO

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial, titled "Society Has Rights, Too," which appeared in the August 10, 1966, edition of the Williamson, W. Va., Daily News.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY HAS RIGHTS, TOO

The individual's rights to fair play versus society's rights to maintain law and order has been brought into sharp focus by a recent Supreme Court decision. Newsweek magazine states in a feature article that the Court's ruling, ". . . imposed sharp new limits on the police power to question suspects—a power lawmen claim is vital to conviction in four out of five criminal cases." The new rules provide, among other things, that after arrest police may not question a suspect until they have told him that he has a right to remain silent, that what he says may be held against him and that he is entitled to have his lawyer with him in the interrogation room. It is almost certain that according to ethical practice and "good professional judgment" the lawyers will advise their clients not to answer. It appears to many law enforcement officers, and with some justification, that under these conditions it will be almost impossible to ever get a confession.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, expressing for the Court the bitterly contested five to four majority opinion, states that, ". . . The . . . practice of incommunicado interrogation is at odds with one of the nation's most cherished principles—that the individual may not be compelled to incriminate himself." In his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan stated that, "this doctrine . . . has no sanction, no sanction . . . It's obviously going to mean a gradual disappearance of confessions as a legitimate tool of law enforcement." Although, in general, law enforcement agencies across the country were apprehensive and critical of the Court's decision, opinions are sharply divided even among police officers and their closest allies, prosecuting attorneys.

Despite the Supreme Court's legal rhetoric and the debate which follows it, certain facts stand out. The rights of the accused have been further protected, but the problems of law enforcement have been vastly increased. This comes at a time when crime is increasing at a sharp rate—six times faster than population since 1958 and still growing. Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported in the United States. In our great cities, minority population ghettos are becoming more and more of a law enforcement problem and in many cases riot spawners and potential battlegrounds as demonstrated in the Watts district of Los Angeles. Patrolling such areas, day or night, a police officer puts his life on the line every step of the way.

But, as Newsweek observes, we are in a time of transition. There is developing a new approach, a renaissance in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement has become a subject of major study for philanthropic and government research agencies. The Ford Foundation alone, ". . . has poured more than $5 million into police studies and education projects." There are such proposals as one for a "two-platoon police force" in which, "One group would handle matters requiring the sophisticated approach: social problems—like juvenile delinquency—and major investigations. The other group would do the manual labor: directing traffic, investigating accidents . . ." New ideas are being discussed relative to handling narcotic problems, alcoholics and homosexuals.

However, in the light of such developments as the Supreme Court's present ruling, some authorities feel that we may be moving too fast. Such laws may be too sophisticated to be applicable until our society has evolved to a little higher level than it has yet reached. Mr. C. D. DeLoach, assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has put it this way: ". . . to all those who continually clamor for more restrictions on law enforcement, I pose this question—Where will you turn for protection of your individual rights when you have totally destroyed the effectiveness of law enforcement?" This is a question that concerns every person in the nation. How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen.

THE NEED FOR MORE WHEAT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Washington Post carried another excellent editorial Thursday, August 11, on

the world food problem, pointing to the absolute need for increased wheat production, and concluding that farmers should be assured a fair return for producing that wheat.

The editorial again reflects the Washington Post's fine understanding of agricultural and food problems, which many of us wish was more prevalent in metropolitan circles. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to put the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1966]

PAYING FOR WHEAT

Much of the feasibility of the Administration's order increasing wheat acreage an additional 15 per cent for next year depends upon the accuracy of Department of Agriculture price forecasts. If the Department is right, strong domestic and world demand should assure prices well above support levels even with more production, and farmers should benefit financially from their extra effort. If the Department should be wrong, however, and the additional wheat should depress the market, farmers could in effect be penalized for cooperating. The Nation ought not to permit this.

That there is need for more wheat in absolute terms is now evident. The carryover is low even in terms of meeting commitments to India (which alone may take nearly one-fourth of the current American crop). At a time when easy-term sales to needy countries are being shifted to a dollar basis, missions abroad have been advised that amounts of wheat available may be substantially reduced. The question is whether this need and the growing domestic demand can be translated into fair prices for producers.

In recent months wheat growers have been doing relatively well, but they are only now recovering from a decade of depressed prices occasioned by surpluses. Even if the additional wheat production should only steady the market, in a sense it would operate to prevent farmers from realizing the full reward to which they ought to be entitled in a system of scarcity economics. In many, perhaps most, cases they still draw far less return on their capital and labor than their counterparts in industry. Vice President Humphrey, Secretary Freeman and others have done well to spike the canard that farmers are profiteering from recent increases in bread prices. Whatever the causes of these increases, farmers have benefited only by a fraction of a cent per loaf.

Because the price and demand mechanism is so delicate and because there is such a long record of unequal treatment for farmers, a Government which suggests increased production takes upon itself a special responsibility. Not only must the Administration be prepared to cut back acreage quickly if new price-depressing surpluses loom. It also must be ready to step in with some additional scheme of compensating farmers for export wheat if commitments abroad cannot be met without damaging farm income at home.

ALASKA EARTHQUAKE RELIEF—PUBLIC LAW 88-451

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the fourth report of the President on the actions taken by the Federal agencies under the major Alaska earthquake-relief legislation—Public Law 88-451—be printed in the RECORD.

Your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was privileged to act on the landmark programs developed in response to the 1964 Good Friday Alaska earthquake. Alaska has received $350 million in Federal assistance of all kinds since that event, and I am pleased to report that the 50th State's economy is advancing significantly.

Among the salient innovations of Public Law 88-451 is section 57 providing Federal financial assistance to the State of Alaska to support a mortgage indemnification program to retire or adjust outstanding home-mortgage obligations upon one- to four-family homes severely damaged or destroyed by the disaster. The provision was added very largely at the insistence of your committee. I am delighted that it appears to be working well and will cost the United States significantly less than initially anticipated.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 5, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith my fourth report of the actions taken by the Federal agencies under the authority of Public Law 88-451, "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act." Section 7 of that Law requires semiannual reports during the term of the Act.

Two years ago last March 27, Alaska was hit by a devastating earthquake that threatened the entire economy of our forty-ninth State. Within hours, a massive Federal assistance program was in motion to help the State, its communities and people, clean up, rebuild and move ahead with confidence and with the support of all the people of our Nation.

PL 88-451 was designed to aid and accelerate the State's efforts in providing for reconstruction of those areas damaged by the earthquake or seismic waves. The authority and funds provided under that Act made available help in ways which statutory authorities did not then permit.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1966, through June 30, 1966. A cumulative total of about $60 million has been made available since the amendments have been in effect. These funds have been translated into urban renewal projects, highway reconstruction and other projects that will build a better Alaska.

PL 451 aid represents only a fraction of the recovery assistance provided by the Federal Government under the various disaster relief authorities.

Another $55 million in Federal funds has gone into the repair or rebuilding of public facilities of the State and local governments.

Nearly $88 million has been made available in Small Business Administration disaster loans.

Since that tragic Good Friday, the people of Alaska have been the recipients of nearly $350 million in Federal assistance of all kinds.

Today, Alaska's economy is moving upward.

Total personal income has gone from $720 million before the earthquake to $858 million today.

Bank deposits have risen from $275 million before the catastrophe to $355 million two years later.

As reconstruction work is finished, some dislocation and unemployment is likely to occur. But, Alaska's boundless natural resources—minerals, oil, fishing, forestry—are now being tapped at a record pace. These industries offer an immediate and growing source of jobs for the vigorous and resourceful people of Alaska.

The recovery of Alaska has been swift and sure and the prospects for the years ahead are bright indeed. What happened during and after the earthquake is a tribute to the cooperative efforts of Local, State and Federal agencies. More so, it speaks of the indomitable courage and the stubborn spirit of the people of Alaska as they went about the work of reconstruction and building anew. This combined enterprise shows what a free society can do in an emergency.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Enclosure.

FOURTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—PUBLIC LAW 88-451

1964 AMENDMENTS TO THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

This report, required by Section 7 of PL 88-451, covers action taken by the Federal agencies under authority of the Act during the period from January 1, 1966, through June 30, 1966.

Section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act, 73 Stat. 145, (1959) 48 U.S.C. prec. 21 nt., was amended to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make emergency fund expenditures which would provide more liberal Federal assistance to Alaska for the repair or reconstruction of earthquake-damaged highways in the Federal-aid highway system. An increase in the Federal contribution was authorized. An increase in Federal contribution was limited to $15,000,000.

Action Taken:

During the period from January through June 1966, no additional allotments were made from funds provided under Section 3 of PL 88-451. Allotments from these funds now total $5,930,931. This is considered sufficient to finance all current highway reconstruction projects in conjunction with emergency relief funds provided under Section 125 of Title 23 U.S.C. and State matching funds in the ratio provided by law.

Several administrative actions were taken with regard to projects financed with funds previously allotted. These actions included approval of plans and specifications and concurrence in the award of contracts for projects carried out under the emergency program.

Section 51 was added to the Alaska Omnibus Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to:

(a) Compromise or release part or all of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska and refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in Alaska who suffered earthquake damage or loss and wish to repair or rebuild dwellings or farm buildings or, when necessary, to purchase new building sites.

Action Taken:

During the reporting period, no Farmers Home Administration borrower's debts were reduced or reamortized; no real estate debts were refinanced for applicants receiving Section 502 rural housing loans; one loan in the amount of $600 was made to purchase a building site.

Most needs for credit by eligible borrowers in Alaska are supplied through regular FHA programs rather than special authorities under this Act.

(b) Compromise or release indebtedness under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Alaska where borrowers suffered damage or loss as a result of the earthquake.

Action Taken:

Extensive assistance has been rendered to REA borrowers in connnection with the earthquake damage that they suffered. However, it has not been necessary to take any actions under the authority of PL 88-451.

Section 52. Under this Section, the HHFA Administrator is authorized to compromise or release a part or all of any obligation under the public facility loan program where the facility securing the obligation had been lost or damaged as a result of the earthquake or subsequent seismic waves.

Action Taken:

All necessary compromise and release actions possible under this Section were accomplished during 1964.

Section 53 authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25,000,000 for disaster-related urban renewal projects in Alaska, including open land projects. This authority is in addition to and separate from grant authorization contained in other Acts, and provides that the Administrator may increase the capital grants under this authority up to 90% of the net project costs.

Action Taken:

Capital grant approvals and disbursals indicated in the previous report remain unchanged. Cumulative capital grants approved under this Section total $24,945,978.

The following provides progress highlights which occurred in Section 53-aided projects during the reporting period.

R–19(c) Kodiak—Project encompasses 39.29 acres including streets in public rights-of-way. 20 acres have been acquired. 4.8 acres are presently under private redevlopment involving investments of approximately $4,765,000. The entire retail-commercial area of Kodiak is being rebuilt in a modern clean and convenient design which will take full benefit of the beauty of the setting.

R–20(c) Anchorage Downtown—Demolition and relocation are 100% complete; acquisition is 98% complete and the 4.7 million dollar buttress work is approximately 25% complete and is running ahead of schedule.

R–21(c) Seward—Project involves 148.35 acres including 76 acres of abandoned Alaska Railroad land which will be shortly transferred to the city. Acquisition is complete except for 5 acres. All site improvements funded by URA will be completed by August 1, 1966, and disposition of the Urban Renewal property to private redevelopers commenced in June, 1966.

Valdez R–22(c) Old Townsite and Mineral Creek R–25(c) (Site of New Valdez.) Acquisition of the old Townsite, which is to be abandoned because it is geologically unsafe for habitation, is now 49% complete, an increase of 9% during the reporting period. All utilities became available for residential developers in the new Townsite in May 1966. Of the 256 residential lots to be sold at the new site, 52 were sold between January 1 and June 30, 1966, leaving only 30 unsold. Thirty residential buildings, including four multi-family units, have been completed or are under construction, while 12 trailers are in place at the new site. Concerted effort is being made by the appropriate State and Federal agencies to assist residents of Valdez to make the move to Mineral Creek as easily and early as possible.

R–26(d) Seldovia—The 55.29 acres in this project encompasses the entire business and industrial districts of the community. All but two (2) small parcels of land have been acquired and disposition is underway. One (1) SBA assisted complex consisting of a supermarket, department store, liquor store and hardware store with six (6) apartments on the second floor and retail rental space on the main floor has been completed representing an investment of approximately one-half million dollars. Another one-half million dollar private redevlopment, a cannery, will commence construction momentarily.

Section 54 allows a 30-year maturity period for Small Business Admnistration loans made to repair or replace earthquake damaged dwellings in Alaska.

Action Taken:

In the period January 1–June 30, 1966, SBA made 12 home disaster loans for a total of $321,301.

It should be noted that it is no longer necessary to depend on the special 30-year allowable maturity for home disaster loans as authorized by PL 88–451. The Small Business Act, as amended, now permits the making of 30-year loans to anyone eligible to receive disaster loan assistance.

Section 55 of the Act authorizes the Chief of Engineers to make such modifications to previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska adversely affected by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves as he finds necessary to meet changed conditions and to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements of the communities they serve.

Action Taken:

Pursuant to the authority of this Act, modifications were made to the authorized small-boat harbors at Homer, Seward, Valdez and Cordova. All work was completed prior to January 1, 1966. No actions were taken during the reporting period.

Section 56. This Section authorized the HHFA Administrator to purchase securities and obligations of, or to make loans to, the State of Alaska to finance any part of the programs needed to carry out reconstruction activities in Alaska related to the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves, or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake. The amount of purchase or loan is limited to $25 million. Of this amount $19.5 million is to be used for projects of the community facility type.

Action Taken:

The $19.5 million will be in the form of Series B bonds, at 3¾-percent interest. Under the terms of the Loan Offer the supporting bond issue must be delivered to the ultimate purchasers not later than October 1, 1968. Based upon current projections, the State expects to deliver the bonds by March 1, 1968. Initially the State of Alaska sold bond anticipation notes totaling $19,104,100 at 2.29 percent. However, for the period of one year from March 14, 1966, the State will be required to pay 3.86 percent for its interim financing needs.

Funds obtained from these sales have financed recovery programs in Anchorage, Valdez, Kodiak, Seldovia and Seward.

The additional $5.5 million of loans authorized under this Section, in the form of Series A bonds also bearing 3¾ percent interest, will help the State bear its share (50 percent) of the Mortgage Adjustment Program (Section 57). On May 16, 1966, the State Supreme Court of Alaska ruled that the Mortgage Adjustment Program was constitutional and valid in every respect. Upon approval of a Mortgage Redemption Plan and an appropriation by Congress, the Plan can be put into operation, and funding under this Section can go forward.

Section 57. This Section provides Federal financial assistance to the State of Alaska to support a mortgage indemnification program to retire or adjust outstanding home mortgage obligations upon 1–4 family homes that were severely damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves. Authorization for a $5.5 million grant by the Federal Government is established, to be matched by an equal amount to be contributed by the State of Alaska. Federal responsibilities under this program have been delegated to the Federal National Mortgage Association, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action Taken:

The Alaska Mortgage Adjustment Agency, created by the State pursuant to Section 57, has received all the applications that are to be considered—the Alaska legislation having required that all applications be submitted to the Agency prior to July 1, 1966—and the Agency expects to submit an estimate, on the basis of the applications received, for consideration by Congress, of the amount of Federal appropriation needed to fulfill the requirements of Section 57. It is believed that because of assistance heretofore received by Alaska home owners through other programs, the expenditures of Federal and State funds necessary to fill the remaining gaps will be considerably smaller than originally estimated, perhaps no more than $4.0 million, according to the Anchorage press. Accordingly, it is expected that a Congressional appropriation of a substantially lesser amount than originally contemplated will be recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

The significant events that occurred during the subject reporting period are listed as follows:

1. The Supreme Court of the State of Alaska handed down its decision in the test case testing the constitutionality, under the State constitution, of the State legislation and State activity in implementation thereof, pursuant to the aforesaid Section 57. The decision upheld the constitutionality of the State's action in every respect.

2. The regulations along with an amendment to the Alaska Mortgage Adjustment Plan required for supplementation and updating, and all necessary updating revisions of the prescribed form of application, were drafted in final form by FNMA representatives and Alaska representatives, including the Alaska Commissioner of Commerce, working together at the FNMA Office in Washington. Since the foregoing documentation is believed to be in accord with the understanding of Section 57 previously concurred in by the Alaska authorities and by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, no problems are expected with respect to approval of the various documents by the Governor of Alaska and Alaska's Commissioner of Commerce, respectively, and by the Secretary.

SCHOOL MILK OR THE JET SET?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced amendments to the Independent Offices Appropriation bill that would have slashed $730 million from the bill. Two hundred million of this amount is to be spent for the development of a supersonic transport which will enable the jet set to make those overnight trips between New York and Rome in the space of an afternoon. American industry is willing to provide only 10 percent of the cost of developing this revolutionary new aircraft.

Yet the school milk program, under which the Federal Government provides not 90 percent of the cost, but anywhere from 30 to 50 percent, is in serious trouble because of inadequate funding over the past 2 years. In all fairness this is in part the fault of the Budget Bureau, which withheld $3 million of the $103 million Congress appropriated for the program in fiscal 1966. But the result was a 10-percent cutback in the Federal reimbursement rate which forced school administrators to either charge the student an additional amount or pick up the slack themselves.

This year the Senate provided $105 million for the school milk program. I am not at all sure that this is adequate. However I hope the higher Senate figure is approved soon in a House-Senate conference. Then we will be able to see if this amount is enough to give the school milk program at least a fraction of the boost that the Federal Government will be providing to research and development on a supersonic transport for the jet set.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last month our Nation joined other free nations throughout the world in observing the eighth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. It is altogether fitting and proper that the free nations speak up in protest against the tyranny and oppression forced upon other peoples.

Three hundred and fifty years ago this continent was settled by people who were fleeing the hardships and injustices of the regimes of Europe. They brought with them and carefully nurtured the concepts of the dignity of the individual and the inherent right of freedom of choice. Two hundred years ago these ideas were set down in the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

More recently these ideas have been formally adopted by the United Nations. The U.N. Charter affirms "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of nations large and small."

But these ideas are only dreams to many peoples. There is much to be done before these concepts are translated into reality. We have many miles to go before we sleep.

There are those in this world who do not believe in the inherent worth of the individual, in the sanctity of freedom. There are those in this world who would impose upon others their own judgments, their own aspirations, their own plans. There are those in this world who are prepared to use any means to further their own ends, who do not hesitate to subject individuals and nations to oppression. There are those who deem it their right to take away the rights of others.

Mr. President, the captive nations of the world have been robbed of their most precious possession—the right to choose for themselves the type of government, the type of political system under which they would live. They have been deprived of their birthright—self-determination.

We must protest this theft, we must constantly and loudly proclaim the injustice, indeed the bestiality of this crime, for to remain quiet, to pretend that it never happened or that it is all over, is to be an accessory after the fact. To ignore the pleas of subjected peoples is to be guilty as of great a crime as the original one.

The United States is presently engaged in a conflict in Vietnam. Our reason for being there—the self-determination of the Vietnamese people. The physical battle is confined to Vietnam. The psychological struggle is all over the world. We are there specifically for the Vietnamese people, and generally for the enslaved people throughout the world.

The presence of American troops in that southeastern country serves as notice to the world, Mr. President, that we continue to view the right of self-determination an inviolable right, one to which we are willing to commit ourselves and our Nation that other peoples shall enjoy this right also.

The United States must continue to draw attention to the oppressors in this world. We must employ all the strategies at our command to encourage captive nations to maintain their struggles for freedom. We must insist that all nations be allowed the very fundamental freedom of pursuing their own destinies, not the selfish destinies of others.

DANGEROUS DEFIANCE OF LAW GROWS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Bruce Biossat recently wrote a column titled "Dangerous Defiance of Law Grows." It is a column which every person connected with Government, whether in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch, should read and seriously ponder. It is a disturbing, yet, nevertheless, true and candid commentary on certain developments occurring in America today.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS DEFIANCE OF LAW GROWS

(By Bruce Biossat)

WASHINGTON.—A good proportion of the American people is hiding from some very unpleasant truths about itself.

Far too often, public behavior of Americans is appalling. Many are openly and aggressively lawless. Others are basically lawless in spirit and, though they would not acknowledge it, have developed an incredibly high tolerance of crime and violence. Evidently they can feel neither shame nor shock.

Short of the grosser offenses against their fellow Americans, many have made trespass and other invasions of privacy virtually a way of life. They are arrogantly ill-mannered on the highway and in every public place. They are uncaring and indifferent toward the rights and needs of other human beings.

The courts of this country are currently embarked on a process of reinforcing shaky individual freedoms. But while they are about it, countless Americans are turning freedom into license.

They exhibit a contempt for authority which is destructive of freedom. They really do not think that any kind of hampering, uncomfortably disagreeable law ought to apply to them personally.

TOO MANY OFFER EXCUSES

In an age that is probing deep into the mysteries of human conduct, they have begun to convert explanations of misbehavior into excuses for it—as Chicago's scholarly police chief, O. W. Wilson, points out.

In a nation whose political system is founded on the will of the electorate, some Americans are pretty close to saying that there is no individual will and no personal responsibility. The offender is always the creature of forces:

"He came from a broken home . . . He was a deprived person . . . He was unloved . . . He blacked out."

Some probers into conduct seem to stop just short of arguing that crime is human and, hence, democratic.

Indeed, the ennobling cloak of the word "democratic" is today being thrown over all manner of licentious behavior. The word is being defined to mean:

"I am to be left alone to do or say anything I please, regardless of the consequences to others."

Any interference with such unbridled behavior is being promptly labeled in some circles as "undemocratic" and even "fascistic." Some of those brilliant young fools at Berkeley and other campuses argue that they are bound by no law or rule they had no part in making. They accept no authority but their own constantly shifting opinion.

TRY TO JUSTIFY LAWLESSNESS

Some Negro leaders frankly justify lawlessness and violence done in the name of their rights. A few appear to contend they are above the law.

The most startling comment made recently in Chicago by Stokely Carmichael, hotheaded "black power" advocate and chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was this:

"We've got to let them (the white community) know that when they arrest one of us in our community, we're going to move to disrupt this whole country."

The consequences of turning freedom into anarchy are written large across the face of this country—in shattering, death-dealing riots, in a rising crime rate that the most unemotional public authorities think spells crisis.

The numbers involved are frightening. There is almost no place to escape the depredations. He who says the peril to a sane society is exaggerated is whistling past a graveyard loaded with people who thought "it can't happen to me."

One of the truly comic notions of the age is the idea the American people are constricted by overorganization. Beneath the top-heavy weight of big government, big business, big everything, millions are managing ingeniously to live nearly unfettered in increasingly dangerous and destructive chaos.

THE HIGH INTEREST RATE POLICY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the discussion of our economic conditions continues with emphasis from all quarters on the present high interest rate situation. The Monthly Economic Letter for August, published by the First National City Bank of New York, is quite interesting. Though I often disagree with points emphasized, the letters are usually provocative.

This August newsletter contains a very good article on current interest rates.

It is pointed out that, in the "scramble" for funds, "many of the highest rates have been offered by Government agencies." This has undoubtedly added to the difficulties experienced by savings and loan associations in their efforts to accumulate sufficient funds to keep the housing market viable.

This article points out that our fiscal policy has done its part in forcing up interest rates. To quote one very plain sentence, and one with which I am in wholehearted agreement:

> Ever since January, it has been plain that the fiscal strategy adopted to deal with the impact of Vietnam war spending would result in markedly higher interest rates this year.

Now, this certainly was obvious to anyone who was interested enough to stop and consider what the President proposed in an effort to bring the budget somewhat into apparent balance without realy doing so—without really facing up to the hard tasks of pushing for substantive tax changes.

The effects of the sale of Government assets—FHA and VA mortgages, for example—are noted as an example.

In remarking on efforts to legislate ceilings on certain savings accounts in banks, this newsletter notes that, due to our tax structure, the small saver would be penalized, and this would be "inequitable."

As emphasized in this newsletter, manufacturing corporations are now earning about 13 percent per year on equity, compared with about 9 percent in 1960–61. Interest costs would need to be pushed to extreme heights to slow down activity in manufacturing. But interest costs drastically affect housing, automobile sales, and other transactions involving individual financing.

Mr. President, I shall continue to condemn the Johnson high interest rate policy. Johnson interest rates are higher than Hoover rates. In my view, this is most hurtful. In my view, it should be reversed. In my view, one of the best ways to reverse it is to bring fiscal policy of the proper type into active play. I hope this will be done before more drastic steps must be taken.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from which I have quoted be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Controversy Over Interest Rates

Interest rates currently are the loftiest in the memory of most businessmen. Late last month, 91-day Treasury bills hit 5 per cent, the highest level since they were introduced in 1929. Medium-term Governments have been yielding around 5¼ per cent, while long-term Governments bring 4¾ per cent. Corporations of the highest credit rating are paying 5½ per cent for new long-term money and 5½–5¾ per cent for short-term borrowings. These and other rates are generally at the highest levels since the Twenties.

Tight credit conditions seem to be having the desired effect of helping to relieve pressures on the nation's resources. Corporations have reexamined their capital spending plans, and some investments are being postponed. The buildup of inventories is being limited by the tightness of credit. Many speculative commercial building projects are being put off for lack of money. State and local governments are holding back on less urgent construction outlays. And housing starts have been declining since last winter.

While all these various adjustments have been taking place, the effects of credit stringency on homebuilding have captured the spotlight. More specifically, there have been complaints that rates paid on commercial bank savings certificates and certificates of deposit—generally in the 4½–5½ per cent range—have diverted money from savings and loan associations, thereby threatening a sharp contraction in homebuilding activity and real estate sales.

These complaints were aired before the House Banking and Currency Committee during May and June. But when legislation was proposed to place ceilings on rates offered by savings and loan associations as well as by commercial banks, strong opposition developed and the measure was dropped temporarily. Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve Board, responding to the Committee's request for action to restrain commercial bank competition for savings, raised the reserve requirement on time deposits held by larger banks and lowered rate ceilings on time deposits with "multiple maturity" features.

The question was revived in July, however. On July 25, the Committee approved a bill that, among other things, would put a 4½ per cent rate limit on commercial bank time deposits of $100,000 or less, authorize limits on rates paid by savings and loan associations, and give the Administration the means to pump money into mortgages through the Federal Reserve System. Because of the controversial nature of its provisions, the bill generated widespread opposition.

OVERWHELMING CREDIT DEMANDS

In discussions before the Banking and Currency Committee and elsewhere, it has been generally assumed that the apparent scarcity of money and high interest rates—and the resulting shortage of mortgage money—have been due to restrictive actions by the Federal Reserve Board. But this assumption is contrary to the facts. Until recently, Federal Reserve policy has been unusually expansive. The amount of credit and equity funds supplied has been enormous.

What has been described as the "rate war" between the savings and loan associations and the commercial banks is simply part of a broad competitive scramble by all sectors of the money market for available funds. In this scramble, many of the highest rates have been offered by Government agencies. In the nine months ended March 1966, net issues of corporate bonds ran 59 per cent above the year-earlier period. Business loans at commercial banks rose 17 per cent in the past year. Net borrowings by corporations, state and local governments and households have been at record highs.

To mobilize this huge supply of funds, interest rates have naturally moved sharply higher. Yields on new corporate bonds, for example, have climbed a bit more than 1 percentage point in the past year. A six-month Federal agency note recently was issued at a 5.90 per cent yield, compared with 4¼–4⅜ per cent on similar issues a year ago. Official estimates indicate that households bought a net $4.3 billion of marketable securities in the first quarter, compared with $5.3 billion in the entire year of 1965. At the same time, these figures show that (even savings certificates), commercial banks, savings banks, and savings and loan associations each experienced a reduction in net savings inflow to 65–70 per cent of the average rates in 1965. Clearly, much of the money savers ordinarily place with mortgage lenders has been attracted to bonds and notes issued by the Government and its agencies, by states and municipalities and by corporations.

FISCAL POLICY ACCENTUATES TIGHT MONEY

Ever since January, it has been plain that the fiscal strategy adopted to deal with the impact of Vietnam war spending would result in markedly higher interest rates this year. To narrow the budget deficit, the Administration has relied primarily on sales of Government-owned financial assets and on speeding up collections of individual and corporate income taxes and of individual income and Social Security taxes that corporations withhold for the Federal Government. By means of these various accelerations, the Government has drawn off cash from individuals and corporations, thus depleting their savings and spurring the demand for credit among those affected. Corporations alone were required by payments speedups to draw down liquid assets by an extra $4½ billion in April and June, and met part of the drain through accelerated borrowings.

The Government sold nearly $3 billion of financial assets during fiscal 1966, with about half of the sales coming in the April–June period. Since such sales are booked as reductions in expenditures in the Federal budget, they reduce both the reported spending totals and the cash deficit. The net result is that the cash budget deficit for the 1966 fiscal year ended on June 30 was held to $3.2 billion.

But since the extra tax payments and asset sales for fiscal 1966 were concentrated in the April–June period, the impact on savings flows and capital markets was accentuated. As the accompanying chart shows, Federal receipts rose from an annual rate of $134.8 billion in the March quarter to $158.4 billion in the second. Combined with a $4.4 billion decline in the rate of Federal payments—largely explained by offsetting asset sales—the Government ran a cash surplus at an annual rate of $15.2 billion in the second quarter. The shift from deficit to surplus between the first and second quarters amounted to an annual rate of $28 billion. The way in which this massive turnaround in the Federal cash budget was achieved was a decisive factor behind the high level of rates and the tightness in money and credit markets since last spring.

Particularly in the second quarter, enlarged tax payments to the Federal Government also seem to have been an important factor in the diminished flow of money into savings accounts at banks and thrift institutions. Largely as a result of stepped-up tax payments, disposable personal income grew by only $4.6 billion a year in the second quarter, compared with increases in the $9–16 billion range in each of the preceding three quarters. With yields on marketable securities climbing higher to attract more and more of the public's cash and with after-tax incomes rising much more slowly, it is not too surprising that households have been putting less money into savings accounts at thrift institutions in recent months.

HELP FOR HOMEBUILDING

The disruptions in the flow of mortgage money caused by the sharp rise in market interest rates—and the possibility of a severe contraction in the homebuilding sector—remain matters of public concern.

It should be noted, however, that there is no general shortage of housing. Vacancy rates are still close to postwar highs. Families entering the home-buying stage of life are relatively few. Particularly in Southern California, the problem is that of an oversupply of housing. This is at least partly due to the fact that during the early Sixties, housing was given special stimulus through extensions of credit by the Federal Home Loan Banks and by mortgage purchases by the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA). Some savings institutions apparently face severe problems of adjustment to the sudden change in interest rate levels.

Since skilled construction workers are in short supply and their wage rates have been climbing sharply, measures to prop up housing run the risk of aggravating the inflation of construction costs. But to the extent necessary to prevent homebuilding activity from falling to undesirably low levels, the FNMA should be provided with sufficient funds to assure an adequate flow of funds into mortgage credit.

So long as the present credit stringency persists, however, attempts to set ceilings on the rates paid by banks and other savings institutions would be more likely to reduce, rather than increase, the supply of mortgage money. These are the very institutions that customarily supply most mortgage credit. Rate ceilings would tend to increase the gap between yields available on marketable securities and rates offered by banks and thrift institutions.

Given the fact that most borrowers enjoy significant tax advantages on borrowed money, it would be all the more inequitable to penalize the small saver by further limiting the interest rate he can earn from his lifetime savings.

One of the most thoughtful statements on the present interest-rate controversy was made by Federal Reserve Governor W. Mitchell on May 25:

"The financial structure is essentially resilient and well managed, and there exist governmental mechanisms established for the very purpose of easing adjustments that must come in the wake of shifts in demands for goods and for financial services. While not denying that a problem exists for all financial intermediaries—as a result of the Government's reliance on monetary policy as the main tool of economic restraint—the situation hardly warrants the crisis atmosphere that has developed in some quarters, or the over-reaction by portfolio managers that threatens to curtail housing activity unnecessarily sharply.

"What is important is to be sure that in dealing with the short-run problem, we do not adopt solutions that in the long run will hurt more than help. I believe the best and most lasting solution lies in permitting intermediaries, savers, borrowers, and the market to work out their own salvation. Most of them are doing well enough now and others are taking constructive corrective measures. If governmental actions are needed, they should be actions designed to remove restrictions and inhibitions, rather than those which hamper adjustment to evolving economic needs."

INTEREST RATES AND MONETARY POLICY

In a booming economy, growing demand for goods and services of all kinds increases demands for productive resources, as evidenced by high rates of return on capital and by rising wage rates. Interest rates are high now because business is so good.

Even so, the relative cost of borrowed money is not especially high today when it is considered that manufacturing corporations are earning average after-tax returns on equity of about 13 per cent a year—compared with around 9 per cent in 1960-61. Interest costs, moreover, are a tax deductible expense to both corporations and individuals. During the Twenties—the last period of sustained prosperity—interest rates were about as high as they are now but the corporate income tax was in the 10-13½ per cent range. Allowing for the fact that the tax is now at 48 per cent, the after-tax cost of borrowed money is still considerably lower than in the Twenties.

So long as prosperity continues and the economy operates at a rate close to its rapidly expanding capacity, no substantial decline in interest rates can be reasonably expected. Rates have also climbed sharply abroad. All around the world, the demand for capital is growing—for factories, highways, schools, fertilizer plants and myriads of other needs. Ours is an age of economic growth, and growth requires capital.

It is not the absolute level of freely determined interest rates that matters so much as the flow of money and credit to support economic activity. In recent weeks, the Federal Reserve has evidently become increasingly concerned about the growth of bank credit. Thus, Federal Reserve Governor Andrew Brimmer last month stated that the capital goods boom was approaching "an unsustainable rate" and warned that the "overall pace of bank credit expansion is clearly too fast."

Since April, bank loans have continued to expand rather rapidly but the growth of total bank reserves has virtually ceased and the money supply has grown very little. An increasing number of economists believe that the money supply should grow in line with the growth of capacity in the economy. This raises the question whether there may not be some conflict between the objective of limiting business investment through restriction of bank credit and the aim of supplying sufficient money to permit business volume to grow in line with expanding capacity.

There is always some danger of inflation when the economy is operating at high levels. But price rises so far have primarily reflected specific supply problems—as in the case of foods and nonferrous metals or the anticipatory impact of Medicare on medical charges. With the labor force growing rapidly, needs for capital investment will continue to mount. At the same time, rising wage costs in previously low-wage sectors—e.g. hospitals, retail trade, local government—as well as in unionized, high-wage industries will also call for more investment to keep costs and prices from rising. Thus, the problem of forestalling inflation is not simply that of restricting credit but more broadly one of providing sufficient monetary expansion to accommodate the solid growth of both capital investment and consumption in the economy.

PRAYER AMENDMENT NOT NEEDED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, presided over by my junior colleague from Indiana, has been holding hearings this week and last on the Dirksen resolution to send to the States for ratification an amendment dealing with school prayer.

It was my privilege to testify on that resolution on Monday, at which time I pointed out that in three successive Congresses I have offered a Senate resolution to clarify the misunderstanding surrounding the Supreme Court ruling, and to state that it is the sense of the Senate that any public school system may provide time during the school day for prayerful meditation, if no public official prescribes or recites the prayer which is offered. To do so, I am convinced, is perfectly proper, and it has so been held by a considerable number of constitutional authorities, relying upon the views of the Supreme Court itself. I commended to the subcommittee consideration of my resolution, Senate Resolution 248, and stated, "I do not believe there is a necessity for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to permit 'voluntary participation by students or others in prayer' " in our schools.

The Evansville Courier, in its August 7 issue, discussed the same question and took the same point of view, heading its editorial "Amendment Not Needed." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and my testimony before the Judiciary Committee may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment Not Needed

There is no need for an amendment to the Constitution permitting voluntary prayers in the public schools. On the contrary, there are most persuasive arguments against thus meddling with the sound doctrine of the separation of church and state.

That doctrine has served the nation well. It has safeguarded against both state interference in religion and church interference in the affairs of government. Religious freedom has been assured by the provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Senator Dirksen's proposed amendment would imperil this historic freedom by weakening the First Amendment guarantee. Specific authorization for prayer in the schools would undermine the Supreme Court's ruling on this subject, which upheld the First Amendment guarantee by banning use of state institutions and facilities—that is, the schools—to foster religious worship.

This position is not tantamount to being against worship, against religion. Not at all. It is every American's constitutionally guaranteed right to worship as he pleases, and not to worship if he pleases. He can pray at home, in church, at his job, in the street—in short, anywhere. But to authorize prayer or other religious exercises as a part of the public school routine would be to inject the state into this private matter of conscience and belief.

This is not to say that Senator Bayh's judiciary subcommittee should not hold its scheduled hearings in August; of course it should hold them. Those on both sides of this issue should be given full opportunity to be heard. It is hoped that, once this has been done, the wisdom of preserving the historic doctrine of the separation of church and state will be more widely appreciated.

Statement by Senator Vance Hartke Before The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, August 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to come before this subcommittee, presided over by my colleague from my own state of Indiana, in order to speak briefly on the question of prayer in the public schools.

I share with Senator Dirksen and with most Americans not only our common American heritage of religious traditions but a personal religious faith. I believe in the values of religion, and I believe those values should be inculcated in the young. I also believe in the wisdom of the framers of the First Amendment, in the correctness of the Supreme Court's interpretation of it in the decisions which have inspired the Senate Joint Resolution now before you, and in the desirability of prayer, each in his own way.

The first of the so-called school prayer decisions came during the 87th Congress. Following it, I first introduced a Senate Resolution, S. Res. 356, expressing the sense of the Senate that the Supreme Court's decision in no way interfered with the right of public school systems to set aside a time during the school day for prayerful meditation so long as no public official prescribes or recites a prayer which is offered.

In the succeeding 88th Congress, I again offered substantially the same resolution, S. Res. 164. Since no consideration was afforded it by the Judiciary Committee in either case, I again presented it as S. Res. 248 of the 88th Congress. Thus I have taken the same position on this matter consistently and officially since 1962.

I realize that this resolution is not before this subcommittee, since it is not a constitutional amendment, but rather a simple resolution expressing the sense of the Senate. However, I note that after four years since its original introduction an increasing number of persons, including witnesses before this committee, have taken essentially the same view. In particular, James V. Panoch, who also happens to come from Indiana but with whom I have not consulted on the matter, devoted a good deal of his testimony to support of the principle that a period of meditation, such as my resolution speaks of, is not only permissible under the Supreme Court interpretation, but a desirable option which avoids the pitfalls of the proposed amendment.

Likewise, Professor Paul A. Freund, who teaches constitutional law at Harvard University, testified here on August 1 directly in line with the Senate Resolution which has now been before the Judiciary Committee in three successive Congresses:

"But in any event, if a period of brief prayer is wanted, there is a simple way to have it: A moment of silent meditation, during which each pupil may commune either in prayer or other form of solemn thought, as his upbringing and his spirit may prompt. This would be a truer form of religious voluntarism than any schoolroom prayer in unison."

Other distinguished lawyers, such as Dean Willard Heckel of Rutgers Law School, in the 1964 hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, have held that a time for silent prayer or meditation is not a violation of the Constitution or the Supreme Court's rulings.

At least three State Attorneys General have expressed themselves as in agreement with the position my resolution sets forth. Robert Matthews, Kentucky, has found nothing objectionable in a student saying a prayer, either silent or vocal, "during a period of meditation." Pennsylvania's Attorney General Walter E. Alessandroni finds no restraining upon "unorganized, private, personal prayer" in school, such as brief meditation period would give a minute for doing. Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke found that there is no constitutional bar to the law passed by the Massachusetts state legislature earlier this year, under which at the beginning of the school day every Massachusetts teacher "shall announce that a period of silence not to exceed one minute in duration shall be observed for meditation."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a necessity for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to permit, in the language of the Dirksen resolution, "voluntary participation by students or others in prayer" in "any school, school system, educational institution or other public building." Rather, as others have pointed out before this body, the wording of the proposed amendment, and particularly the words "providing for" such "voluntary participation" on the part of school authorities, may well cause confusion and violation of the traditional separation of church and state.

Consequently I commend to you as an alternative recommendation by the Judiciary Committee of S. Res. 248, whose text I would like to have appear in the hearings at the end of this statement.

CHINA AND VIETNAM

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, the distinguished scholar and author, Mr. Edgar Snow, has written a significant piece entitled "China and Vietnam" which appears in the July 30, 1966, issue of the New Republic. The article opens with the arresting statement:

> The United States is at war with China—a proxy war now but perhaps a war of irreversible expansion.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Snow's article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

China and Vietnam

(By Edgar Snow)

Geneva.—The United States is at war with China—a proxy war now but perhaps a war of irreversible expansion.

I hope this view may be proved mistaken, but it seems that history may date the onset of a Sino-American war from President Johnson's fateful decision, soon after his inauguration in 1965, to reject a neutral Saigon (then in the offing) and to forestall it by an air invasion of North Vietnam, covering a large-scale U.S. occupation of Vietnam's hinterland.

Hanoi and Peking regard American leaders as rational, though wrong, so they concluded that the American objective was political hegemony over Vietnam. It was logical for them then to anticipate eventual bombing of metropolitan Hanoi and Haiphong, which events in June confirmed. The June bombings in turn have probably sealed off remaining possibilities of intervention by noninvolved powers to bring about a cease-fire. There is no known way to restore broken eggs or remake history. With the crippling of North Vietnam's main industrial bases, Ho Chi Minh has little alternative other than commitment to a protracted war of resistance.

Increasingly, Ho must perforce integrate his efforts with Chinese strategy, and China itself now has no choice but to provide Ho with support bases to compensate for continuing American attrition and devastation. That means that the political and military center of resistance is shifting to China, as earlier it shifted from South Vietnam to the North.

Finding the United States to be an aggressor in Taiwan, in Vietnam, and in other "neo-colonial" positions in Asia, Peking has formally proclaimed a doctrine of moral and legal rights of "counter-aggression". No early dramatic swooping down into Southeast Asia of "hordes" of Chinese troops is likely, however. Just as there has been no single moment when the American people understood that they had gone to war against Vietnam, the war against China may be with us for months or perhaps years before direct combat occurs between the two forces. For the present China will probably concentrate on improving logistical means: the development of new feeder roads into Southeast Asia, the supply and replenishment of food and weapons, replacement and expansion of technical personnel, and volunteer manpower on demand. U.S. sanctuaries in Thialand, Laos, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong and perhaps Japan, may all be faced with the new problems of a political or para-military character. China will do what it can to demonstrate that the American task is not simply to "seek, find, and destroy" those who resist, but how to reduce the mounting demands of an unending occupation. Not how to get more troops into Asia but how to limit the commitment. And not how to win military victories but how to locate a center of political decision to contain Asian history under American control. The American problem will be a great magnification of what is already is today: in brief, how to disengage.

Mao Tse-tung probably has no illusion that effective "counter-aggression" may not, in the end, result in an extension of Johnsonian punishment to China itself. China's participation in the war will therefore continue to be cautious, with maximum effort withheld until or unless Chinese territory comes under direct American attack.

Above all, Ho and Mao probably count on Practical Politics (much as Russia relied on Old Man Winter against Hitler) as their best ally in the long pull. The unpopular war is costing, according to Secretary McNamara's understatement, a billion dollars a month, or about $400 a second, yet 90 percent of South Vietnam is still unoccupied by the Americans. The North's human reserves have scarcely been tapped; behind them lies a sea of Chinese manpower.

Britain cannot—not even to save the pound—go along much longer, Wilson having been obliged to remove the "Anglo" sign before new American escalations. A swollen U.S. war budget, accompanied by inflation, a steady gold drain, and widespread public fear of a dollar-pound devaluation, are paralleled by political second thoughts in the homes of unwilling draftees and a nervous down-trend in Wall Street. Even if the war can be confined to Vietnam during the next two or three years, ever rising costs necessary to begin to stabilize the occupation and keep the satellite generals in nominal power in Saigon will total somewhere between 50 and 100 billion dollars—quite enough money to bring to a standstill what remains of the Great Society operation, just at the time Mr. Johnson must once more appeal to the national electorate.

True, some wry satisfaction may be derived from the ruins of North Vietnam's industrial beginnings. But inherently well-intentioned Americans must feel uneasy at the thought that these "successful strikes" are achieved in a gamble that at any moment could provoke cataclysmic reprisals on American aircraft carriers by Soviet bombers, that only the absence of pressure on a button in Moscow prevents that retaliation, and that, if it came, no law exists to condemn such action which has not by now been repeatedly violated by the United States.

Cruel as the punishment has become for all Vietnamese, bleak as the outlook is for any early surcease of pain, illusory or distorted as their analyses of Mr. Johnson's internal difficulties may prove to be, they would seem to have not more to lose now by waiting for time either to reveal an eventual American repudiation of the whole disastrous adventure by voting in a change of Administration, or for the harassed President to fulfill his threat to carry on a protracted war for years rather than withdraw.

And yet, China would have had it otherwise. As late as January, 1965, both Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung probably still believed that a protracted war with the United States could be avoided. In that month Mao himself told me that he recognized the possibility of convening an international conference to enforce terms of the Geneva Treaty of 1954 without the prior withdrawal of American personnel then in South Vietnam. A neutral independent Saigon government would then have been acceptable to Peking. Mao's expectations were upset when the United States transformed Vietnam's civil war into international war. Since then the Chinese Communist leadership has engaged in a deep and bitter debate.

In December, 1964, Premier Chou En-lai had promised the National Congress that China's draft Third Five Year Plan would be submitted for public examination early in 1965. That plan was already being discussed among higher party echelons before and after China tested her first nuclear device, and it was known that no great increase in the defense sector was indicated. After February, however, press references to the Third Plan ceased to appear.

Apart from revamping the economy to devote a major sector to defense industry, great questions faced Peking's leadership. What should be the character of China's military strategy against the United States? If war was unavoidable, would it not be prudent to mend fences with Russia? China's own defenses were not adequate to protect her urban industrial bases against heavy American air attack. What would be Russia's price for providing an air defense umbrella? To submit to Moscow and revisionism was unthinkable; to subject to American destruction the results of nearly two decades of sacrifice to modernize China was also unthinkable. Yet both had to be thought through.

Acceptance of the Russian line would mean a compromise in Vietnam which would leave the United States firmly planted in Southeast Asia. If Vietnam were surrendered, why not Taiwan? And if Taiwan were abandoned, why not concede American dominance in general, accept a secondary role for China, and seek alms from the United States, like India? This reverse view of the dominoes, collapsing inward on China, could lead to the conclusion that capitulation to Russian pressure was synonymous with capitulation to the United States, abandonment of the revolution as well as vital national interests—and suicide for the Chinese party leadership.

Between such extremes, however there exist various possibilities of limited Chinese compromise with the Russians in order to secure minimum guarantees of support against the United States. Marshal Lin Piao has emerged as the spokesman for the dominant view, which simply invokes all the experience of the Chinese revolutionary wars to prove Mao's old thesis, man is more important than weapons; the only kind of war China could fight and win, alone, is a protracted war dependent essentially on manpower, space, and resolute social revolutionary leadership based on unrevised Marxist-Lenninism. The presence of large American armies in Asia makes Mao's kind of war possible, and the more Americans the better. China would suffer, there could be no doubt about that, but there could also be no doubt (according to Lin) about the ultimate victory.

Today one sees in China a process called "the great cultural revolution." Its aim is completely to unify theory and mass practice based on the thought of Mao-Tse-tung. Those who took up losing positions during the critical debate concerning correct policy toward the U.S. and Russia must now submit to a remolding of their thinking. They embrace party members. How many? Not more than five percent, according to the official press, and yet already these include two members of the Politboro. The charge is "revisionism." Used against veteran Communists long indoctrinated by Mao's teachings, and with a lifetime of practice in the politics of the Chinese revolution, "revisionism" can only be regarded as a euphemism to describe an intra-party opposition defeated on a major decision, which could have involved a transfer of power.

An American victory in Vietnam for want of aid from Russia and China would not only impose a profound loss of prestige from which the whole world socialist movement might never recover, but conceivably it could lead to wars between socialist nationalisms. China could blame Moscow for a defeat in Vietnam, but that could not alter its shattering effects not only on Mao's prestige as a world revolutionary leader and doctrinaire, but also on the future of China as a major power with vital national interests at stake. That is why, even without Russia, China probably cannot permit the United States to decide the fate of East Asia by intensified bombing of Vietnam—or, for that matter, of China itself. In the latter event the war would indeed "know no frontiers," as Ch'en Yi has said, and the Chinese understand that in the end the Russian Communists themselves could not survive the destruction of China. The outcome of that brutal dilemma could be world war.

Meanwhile, what of the many peace plans advanced to prevent further "widening of the war"? The trouble with them is that those liked by President Johnson are conditioned by negotiations to be conducted while American troops occupy large areas of Vietnam, while those liked by all Vietnamese leaders in the unoccupied areas require an unconditional guarantee of United States withdrawal and respect for other terms of the Geneva Treaty of 1954 violated by the American presence. For the Vietnamese to accept Mr. Johnson's conditions would concede legality to the American occupation, while for Mr. Johnson to accept Vietnamese conditions would mean abandonment of the objectives of the intervention. That is why the war goes on and will likely expand.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the close of last session, I submitted a progress report on the development of educational television in which I set forth the problems and progress as well as the facts and figures relating to educational television.

The Educational Television Facilities Act, which I sponsored and which was enacted in 1962, has made possible direct Federal support for educational television stations. Grants have been made on a matching basis with States for developing new stations and for expansion of existing facilities, and almost 100 applications have been accepte since that time.

I stated then that educational television had passed through two important phases. The first included the establishment of new stations and the recognition of educational television as an instrumentality of importance. The second was the activation of many stations across the country, the organization of a single body of telecasters, and the establishment of distribution systems for programs. The next phase for educational television is that of expansion. The agencies and foundations that have supported the movement from the start will, it is hoped, continue to contribute to its growth. Networking, in the sense of actual interconnection, will change during the next coming years from sectional to national in scope. Interconnection among educational television stations is essential if the medium is to provide a national service of which it is capable. Efforts are being made now toward this linkage.

Educational television stations have no firm financial base on which to operate. The United States is unique in the world because its commercial broadcasting system is a giant in comparison with its educational and information service. We have been careful to define what educational television stations may not do, but we have not clearly described methods by which they may support themselves and expand. Television is as expensive as it is useful, and I do not believe we can expect noncommercial educational licensees to exist without a basic financial structure. This is not to propose Federal support for all of educational television, but it is to suggest that we examine the areas in which the Federal Government can assist, as we have assisted in elementary, secondary, and higher education, vocational rehabilitation, and other specialized fields. Continuity of growth must be assured.

I, therefore, noted with interest the imaginative proposal submitted by the Ford Foundation in its filing with the Federal Communications Commission. I have no way of knowing what the final outcome will be, but I am confident that whatever action the FCC takes will be consistent with the policies set forth in the Communications Act of 1934 and the Communications Satellite Act of 1962—and consistent with the overall public interest—which gives FCC broad powers. I would like to repeat at this time what I said in my progress report: the Educational Television Facilities Act that has now been operating for a period of 4 years will expire very shortly. It is my intention to have an examination made of the entire educational television subject in the next Congress. What has been the impact of this act on the development of educational television? Should the ceiling limitation of $1 million to one State be raised? Should the matching funds formula be modified? Should a completely new approach be adopted?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Communications Commission, the two agencies charged with administrative responsibility of the Educational Television Facilities Act, have been asked to prepare their views and recommendations. I am hopeful that all individuals and groups interested in educational television will put their minds to work on this subject, so that meaningful analysis and appropriate action can be taken to assure the continued expansion and growth of this significant service to the public.

It should be noted that a special commission made up of outstanding leaders and citizens has been created to study this overall problem. This group is known as the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. Mr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the head of the commission. This commission has been conducting an extensive study of this field and expects to submit a report with recommendations before the end of the year. Its findings and recommendations shall play an important role in our deliberations. We hope it will be expedited.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3711) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is an amendment by the Senator from New York.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the majority leader discussed this situation with the Senator from New York. The Senator from New York must be in committee until after 12 o'clock. It was understood the Javits amendment would not be discussed until later. So I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily laid aside, so that the Senator from Kentucky may offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read Mr. COOPER's amendment, as follows:

> Page 36, strike out lines 17 through 20. Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.
>
> Lines 17 through 20, page 36, proposed to be stricken out, are as follows:
>
> "REPEAL OF PROVISION FOR SALE OF FOREST HILLS PROJECT, PADUCAH
>
> "SEC. 509. Section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 is repealed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment goes to section 509 of the bill before us. I shall read that section, beginning with line 17, on page 36:

> Repeal of provision for sale of Forest Hills Project, Paducah.
>
> SEC. 509. Section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 is repealed.

In the report, on page 26, I find the explanation of this section. The report reads as follows:

> REPEAL OF PROVISION FOR SALE OF FOREST HILLS PROJECT, PADUCAH
>
> Section 509 of the bill repeals section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964, because it cannot be put into effect.
>
> That section of the 1964 act directed the sale of an FHA-acquired rental housing project in Paducah, Ky., to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council for use as a dormitory by the Paducah Junior College. The college has received private land donations and does not want the project.

When I found this notation in the report, I was very much surprised. My colleague [Mr. MORTON] and I and the Congressman from the first District of Kentucky, Representative STUBBLEFIELD had discussed over several years with the FHA officials here and with the members of the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council and other civic groups in the area, plans for possible acquisition of this property.

As a result of these consultations and discussions, and after gaining the agreement of the Federal Housing Administration, a provision was adopted by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1964, providing that a sale of this property could be made to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council for $1 million for use as a public facility.

In the report on S. 3711, which the committee filed this week, the explanation of this situation is that Paducah Community College has received private land donations, and does not want the project. The statement of the views of the Department notes that the development council has uses of this facility under consideration, but the statement also indicates that efforts to arrange financing are incomplete.

When I saw this provision of the bill, I called the Paducah-McCracken Development Council and I talked to officers of the council, who were surprised to learn of this language to repeal completely the provision of the 1964 act. They told me that they have been having discussions with the FHA, and that their last information was that they would have the leeway necessary to work out the sale.

I asked the president and the members of the council yesterday, to wire me their position, and also to send a wire to the floor manager of the bill.

In response to my request, I have received this wire, which I shall now read into the RECORD.

> PADUCAH, KY.,
> *August 11, 1966.*
>
> Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Confirming our telephone conversation the Paducah McCracken County Development Council, Inc., sincerely urges that the legislation now being considered which would repeal section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 not be passed. This community now feels that it has solved this problem and merely needs additional time to allow the existing law to be put into effect.
>
> Section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 authorized and directed the Federal Housing Commission to sell to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council, Inc. of Paducah, Kentucky, the Forest Hills housing project for use as a public facility. Included in this act was the possibility that the property might be utilized by Paducah Jr. College, but only if deemed appropriate by the Development Council.
>
> At this time the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council, Inc., is vitally interested in obtaining the Forest Hills project for use as a public facility, even though it is not definitely known whether the use will be in connection with the Paducah Jr. College. Difficulties in financing including the so-called tight money market have dictated the delay which has occurred, but the development council is actively pursuing a new approach utilizing the credit of the city of Paducah, and is most encouraged that the purchase can be successfully consummated in the near future.
>
> The Forest Hills project presents the same problems to the entire Paducah area that it always has, and the community at large is still as vitally concerned with these problems as any alert and vital community would be in similar circumstances. Considerable time, effort and expense has been expended by the development council and the community endeavoring to acquire this property for the benefit of the local citizenry, and if the enabling legislation were to be changed at this time, it would indeed be a serious mistake.
>
> PADUCAH-MCCRACKEN COUNTY
> DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.,
> GEORGE P. CROUNCE,
> *President.*
> WM. R. BLACK,
> *Vice President.*
> J. S. YOUNG,
> *Secretary-Treasurer.*
> JAMES C. RIEKE,
> *Chairman, Forest Hills Committee.*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment has a great deal of merit, of course, because the committee did have the information that the college does not want the project. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, that is in the committee report.

However, it is now our understanding, as the Senator from Kentucky has made it clear, that the college does want the project. Under those circumstances, we have discussed this matter with the agency, and they would be very interested in this kind of an amendment, but wonder if it would be possible to limit the time during which the property could be acquired.

How much time would they want?

Mr. COOPER. I have no way of knowing what time is required to work out the sale, but I do not think the agency means to speak of the provision in the law as applying only to the college located in Paducah. The college was to have particular consideration, but it is clear from section 1005 that the development council was to be the purchaser, and I would like to read for the RECORD this section of the law:

> SEC. 1005. The Federal Housing Commissioner is authorized and directed to sell to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council, Incorporated, of Paducah, Kentucky, for use as a public facility (including such use by the Paducah Junior College as may be deemed appropriate by such Council), and for a total price of $1,000,000, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the housing project in Paducah known as Forest Hills (a project constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to August 11, 1955, and subsequently acquired by the Federal Housing Administration).

So the provision is not limited to the college, but I am not able to say whether the college has use now for the project or not. I do know, though, that the development council is working to arrange the financing and put the facility to public use.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is my understanding that that was the primary purpose, but it certainly is not limited.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I agree, and I would hope that my amendment would leave the situation clearly unchanged.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I was surprised that the provision was included in this housing bill, while the efforts to make the sale are continuing. When I talked to the members of the council yesterday, they were surprised, and they seemed to feel that they had not received adequate notice to give all the details.

After these long negotiations have been going on regularly for 2 years, I would not think it fair to seem to pull the rug from under the Paducah plans and efforts. I would hope the Senate will pass my amendment and leave the law as it is now.

I realize this matter will probably go to conference, and I am sure that by the time the House considers its bill and any provision reaches conference, full information can be developed and it can be determined whether section 1005 should be amended by placing a time limit on it. But at the moment, I am not prepared to accept any time limit which would restrict this authority for Paducah and McCracken County, and I believe it would be best to keep the present law.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kentucky makes a very strong case. The fact is that the amendment will go to conference, and there will be an opportunity to discuss a time limitation on it. I am happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the remarks I wish to make about this bill, and primarily about the manner in which——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to have my amendment the pending business, though the Senator, of course, will speak. So, with his permission, I call up my amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from New York was only temporarily laid aside so that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky could be called up. Therefore, the Senator's amendment would now be the pending business; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct. The amendment of the Senator from New York is the pending business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have been discussing numerous situations wherein there has been an abuse under existing policies of the FHA. Today I have other situations which should be called to the attention of the Senate at this time. This is something which cannot altogether be corrected by the amendment of existing laws. It is largely a policy or procedural matter. The situation is largely the result of the incompetence of some of the public officials administering the program, with the result that, once again, we are getting back to the era of windfall profits being allowed by this agency.

In fairness I should add that many of the decisions I shall criticize here today were made prior to the administration of Mr. Brownstein; therefore I do not hold him responsible except to the extent that some of the officials who made these decisions are still on the payroll. It is his responsibility to have them replaced.

In 1954 the country was shocked by the substantial windfall profits under FHA projects that were disclosed to have developed at that time. We thought that we had stopped this practice by putting limitations on the amount of a mortgage which could be extended by the FHA under the various programs, but we find that they are now getting around that limitation by inflating the valuation of the land and the costs of construction, with the result that many of the sponsors or promoters of projects—particularly multifamily projects—are, in effect, today obtaining mortgages running as high as 105 to 110 percent of cost. I wish to discuss a few of these situations which were pointed out in the Comptroller General's reports submitted to Congress in earlier months. I regret that these reports have not been given more attention and that the agency has not been called to task a little more sharply. This discussion will cover reports in 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 to show that the pattern still prevails.

Mr. President, I have on numerous occasions called attention to specific examples of the irresponsible approval of FHA mortgage guarantees on multifamily homes whereby the promoters with little or no risk were reaping large windfall profits and then turning the bankrupt project over to the FHA, sometimes before final completion.

These windfall profits result from appraisals of land far in excess of actual costs—builder's fees, excessive promoter's costs, et cetera—that are approved as a part of the mortgage.

The result is that instead of the FHA guarantee being confined to 90 percent of the construction cost, the mortgage frequently represents far in excess of 100 percent of actual costs.

Nonprofit projects which are approved at 100 percent guarantee ofttimes run far above costs.

I now call attention to a GAO report that was furnished the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—Report No. B-114860 dated December 6, 1963. This report outlines the procedure whereby these windfall profits accrue and cites the result of a survey of 89 projects. For 87 of the 89 projects reviewed, FHA's estimate of the value of the land exceeded the cost to the sponsors.

The land for 43 of the 89 projects surveyed by the General Accounting Office had been held for less than 1 year. Of these 43 tracts of land the Federal Housing Administration placed valuation of $6,375,087 against a cost of $4,258,024. This represented a 50-percent markup for the promoters.

The FHA's valuation on 24 tracts of land which had been held for over 1 year but less than 3 years was nearly double the actual cost, or $6,240,087 against actual cost of $3,364,998.

Four tracts of land with a cost of only $70,500 to the sponsors were appraised by FHA for $761,504, or over 10 times the sponsors' actual cost.

The 18 other tracts of land surveyed were appraised by the FHA at nearly 2½ times the sponsors' costs.

These represent unwarranted windfall profits at taxpayers' expense.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the General Accounting Office's breakdown of these overappraisals in the 89 projects examined.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

A summary of the information disclosed by our comparison follows.

1. For 87 of the 89 projects reviewed, FHA's estimates of the value of the land exceeded the costs of the land to the sponsors.

2. Of the 89 projects sites, 67 sites (75 percent of the projects reviewed) had been held for periods of less than 3 years prior to FHA's valuations. Following are a summary of the sponsors' holding periods for the 89 project sites and a comparison of the sponsors' costs with FHA's valuations.

Sponsors' holding period	Project sites		Sponsors' cost	FHA's valuation	Ratio of FHA's valuation to sponsor's cost (percentage)
	Number	Percent of total			
Less than 1 year	43	48	$4, 258, 024	$6, 375, 087	150
At least 1 year but less than 2 years	12	14	2, 345, 225	4, 258, 412	185
At least 2 years but less than 3 years	12	14	1, 019, 773	1, 981, 675	200
At least 3 years but less than 5 years	9	10	1, 169, 802	2, 554, 340	217
At least 5 years but less than 10 years	9	10	683, 260	1, 685, 500	240
10 years or more	4	4	70, 500	761, 504	1, 081
Total	89	100	9, 546, 584	17, 616, 518	

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The FHA on these 89 projects gave the sponsors a $17,616,518 valuation on land that cost only $9,546,584.

Under the insurance formula for FHA mortgage guarantee, this represented a multimillion-dollar windfall to the promoters. In addition to the windfall profits as the result of a markup of land valuation, the FHA has been overly liberal in its allowances for builders' fees and promotional costs being paid with mortgage proceeds.

For example in the Cincinnati, Ohio, office five projects were constructed under section 221.

Under Section 221 the loan-to-value ratio for public, nonprofit, or cooperative mortgagor is 100% of F.H.A. estimated project replacement cost; for other mortgagors, 90% of estimated replacement costs.

These five projects were given FHA mortgage insurance in the amount of $12,729,400 against actual project costs of $12,131,371, or an average of 105 percent mortgage insurance.

In addition, the promoters of these five Cincinnati projects were allowed $828,657 in builders' fees.

The GAO report shows that on another project in Boston, Mass., one promoter was allowed a builder's fee of $97,066, a land markup above costs of $122,560, which resulted in a mortgage of $1,143,593, or 108 percent of actual project costs.

A second builder in Boston collected $92,924 in builder's fees, had his land appraised by FHA at $206,620 above his actual costs, and was then approved for an FHA mortgage of 103 percent of actual costs.

In Detroit the promoter of one project was approved for FHA mortgage insurance of $981,500 against actual cost of $945,783, or 104 percent. This builder collected builder's fees of $74,372 and had a $70,413 markup of his land above cost.

I quote one paragraph from this GAO report which emphasizes that these windfall profits were not intended under the law:

> Under Section 227 of the National Housing Act, a mortgagor may include in certified project costs, in addition to the cost of construction, "other items of expense" approved by F.H.A. The act also provides that if, after application of the loan-to-value ratio, the mortgagor's certified project costs are less than the insurable mortgage as previously established, the insurable mortgage must be reduced by the amount of such difference.

Under section 207 the loan-to-value ratio for FHA mortgage guarantee is 90 percent of FHA's estimated project value.

Under section 207 the San Diego insuring office approved 11 projects upon which the promoters and FHA agreed on cost figures of $15,301,229. Based on these figures under the 90-percent mortgage ratio, the FHA then approved guarantees on mortgages in the amount of $13,503,700. The GAO checked these 11 projects and found that the figures included land markups of $679,292 above actual cost. In addition the promoters were allowed $611,235 in builders' fees. When this was taken into consideration it resulted in a mortgage of 97 percent instead of the legal 90 percent.

Every one of these San Diego projects was in default as of the date of the survey. A full list of the projects will be included in the table inserted at the end of my remarks.

Just why the congressional committees and the FHA have not been more concerned as to the result of this survey by GAO, I do not know, but the American taxpayers and the homebuyers whose mortgage insurance payments underwrite these losses are entitled to a better answer than that presented thus far.

This GAO report which was sent to the congressional committee should be made an official public document and read by every Senator.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the amount of FHA insured mortgage proceeds as compared with actual projects.

This compilation was prepared by the General Accounting Office and is broken down by projects, locations, builders' fees allowances, as well as the excess of FHA land valuation over sponsors' actual costs.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of the amount of FHA-insured mortgage proceeds with actual project costs

Project	Section of the National Housing Act	Project status at July 31, 1963	Certified project costs			Less		GAO computation of actual project costs	FHA insured mortgage proceeds	
			Costs as submitted by mortgagor	Costs disallowed by FHA	Costs allowed by FHA	Builder's fee	Excess of FHA land valuation over costs		Amount	Percent of actual project costs
Atlanta insuring office:										
A-2	207	Insured [1]	$2,419,156	$5,913	$2,413,243		$159,261	$2,253,982	$2,095,300	93
A-3	207	do.[1]	5,695,620	2,952	5,692,668		116,801	5,575,867	5,051,500	91
A-4	207	do.[1]	2,718,205	75,360	2,642,845		35,000	2,607,845	2,272,500	87
A-1	213	Assigned	3,935,455		3,935,455	$188,661	192,299	3,554,495	3,395,000	96
Total			14,768,436	84,225	14,684,211	188,661	503,361	13,992,189	12,814,300	
Boston insuring office:										
B-1	207	Insured	1,339,158	57,055	1,282,103	97,066	122,560	1,062,477	1,143,593	108
B-2	207	do	1,462,137	16,300	1,445,837	94,575	115,929	1,235,333	1,210,500	98
B-3	207	do	2,353,673		2,353,673		135,771	2,217,902	2,080,900	94
B-4	207	do	1,912,078	35,400	1,876,678	92,924	206,620	1,577,134	1,630,000	103
B-5	207	do	1,628,551	15,120	1,613,431	36,101	28,639	1,548,691	1,321,800	85
Total			8,695,597	123,875	8,571,722	320,666	609,519	7,641,537	7,386,793	
Chicago insuring office:										
Ch-1	207	Insured	5,628,276	54,248	5,574,028		260,950	5,313,078	4,883,900	92
Ch-2	207	do	3,605,358	39,910	3,565,448	146,133	65,000	3,354,315	2,998,000	89
Ch-3	307	do	5,255,198	346,216	4,908,982		85,000	4,823,982	4,418,083	92
Ch-4	207	do	4,432,261	56,000	4,376,261	134,984	88,000	4,153,277	3,844,400	93
Ch-5	207	do	1,161,018	153,178	1,007,840	28,478	3,000	976,362	845,600	87
Total			20,082,111	649,552	19,432,559	309,595	501,950	18,621,014	16,989,983	
Cincinnati insuring office:										
Ci-4	221	Insured	4,360,491	173,488	4,187,003	244,208		3,942,795	4,177,500	[2] 106
Ci-5	221	do	2,366,492	92,028	2,274,464	133,023		2,141,441	2,254,500	[2] 105
Ci-6	221	do	3,390,652	128,054	3,262,598	191,159		3,071,439	3,206,900	[2] 104
Ci-7	221	do.[1]	3,372,990	336,428	3,036,562	247,467		2,789,095	2,923,000	[2] 105
Ci-2	221	Assigned	199,651		199,651	12,800	250	186,601	167,500	[2] 90
Total			13,690,276	729,998	12,960,278	828,657	250	12,131,371	12,729,400	
Cl-3	207	Insured	937,325	75,068	862,257	35,026	7,300	819,931	746,953	91
Cl-4	207	do.[1]	3,203,649	25,631	3,178,018	143,213		3,034,805	2,685,200	88
Cl-5	220	Reinsured, sec. 221	852,088	1,835	850,253	74,159		776,094	763,200	98
Cl-6	220	do	1,076,812	24,291	1,052,521	90,919		961,602	945,300	98
Cl-7	220	do	2,619,661	68,056	2,551,605	207,318		2,344,287	2,160,300	92
Cl-1	207	Insured [1]	453,702		453,702		900	452,802	346,200	[3] 76
Cl-2	207	do	576,215	41,955	534,260	36,512	750	496,998	476,400	96
Cl-8	220	Reinsured, sec. 221	1,213,126	684	1,212,442	105,587		1,106,855	1,090,400	99
Total			10,932,578	237,520	10,695,058	692,734	8,950	9,993,374	9,213,953	
Coral Gables (Miami) insuring office:										
Co-1	213	Insured	3,362,160		3,362,160		106,785	3,255,375	3,172,300	[4] 97
Detroit insuring office:										
D-1	207	do	415,459		415,459	22,899	27,395	365,165	353,700	97
D-2	207	do	1,290,287		1,290,287	78,061	104,660	1,107,566	1,116,900	101
D-3	207	do	782,153		782,153	47,324	7,688	727,141	703,388	97
D-4	207	Assigned	183,252	2,471	180,781		830	179,951	155,100	86
D-5	207	Acquired	1,667,430		1,667,430		65,000	1,602,430	1,482,200	92
D-6	207	Insured	1,091,923	1,355	1,090,568	74,372	70,413	945,783	981,500	104
D-7	207	do.[1]	616,263	1,545	614,718	39,579	8,242	566,897	527,400	93
D-8	207	do	6,920,485	6,034	6,914,451	315,665	302,893	6,295,893	6,147,800	98
Total			12,967,252	11,405	12,955,847	577,900	587,121	11,790,826	11,467,988	
Hartford insuring office:										
H-1	207	Insured	1,975,122		1,975,122	122,220	85,327	1,767,575	1,720,000	97
H-2	207	Assigned [1]	1,083,704	2,830	1,080,874	67,540	50,000	963,334	955,000	99
H-3	207	Insured	1,774,506	17,236	1,757,270	107,309	36,100	1,613,861	1,575,000	98
H-4	207	do	3,469,440	28,391	3,441,049	162,117	64,600	3,214,332	3,041,000	95
H-5	207	do	1,173,576	2,199	1,171,377	65,351	500	1,105,526	1,039,600	94
Total			9,476,348	50,656	9,425,692	524,537	236,527	8,664,628	8,330,600	

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparison of the amount of FHA-insured mortgage proceeds with actual project costs—Continued

Project	Section of the National Housing Act	Project status at July 31, 1963	Certified project costs			Less		GAO computation of actual project costs	FHA insured mortgage proceeds	
			Costs as submitted by mortgagor	Costs disallowed by FHA	Costs allowed by FHA	Builder's fee	Excess of FHA land valuation over costs		Amount	Percent of actual project costs
Kansas City insuring office:										
K-4	207	Insured	$558,734	$23,859	$534,875	$34,338	$19,228	$481,309	$434,000	90
K-1	220	Assigned	2,564,569	91,804	2,472,765		11,800	2,460,965	2,225,000	90
K-2	220	Insured	3,106,726		3,106,726	269,380	46,950	2,790,396	2,796,000	100
Total			6,230,029	115,663	6,114,366	303,718	77,978	5,732,670	5,455,000	
Los Angeles insuring office:										
L-1	207	Insured	674,897	28,836	646,061	20,140		625,921	554,900	89
L-2	207	Assigned [1]	2,196,725	16,875	2,179,850	92,898	88,500	1,998,452	1,959,500	98
L-3	207	Insured	3,770,911	108,619	3,662,292	146,874	17,300	3,498,118	3,224,000	92
L-5	220	do.	21,219,599	248,554	20,971,045	1,766,550	555,000	18,649,495	18,604,500	100
L-4	213	do.	1,762,431	14,221	1,748,210		38,430	1,709,780	1,605,000	[5] 94
Total			29,624,563	417,105	29,207,458	2,026,462	699,230	26,481,766	25,947,900	
New York insuring office:										
N-1	207	Under modification	2,015,848	16,784	1,999,064	118,385	121,522	1,759,157	1,756,000	100
N-2	207	Insured	2,624,815		2,624,815	126,564	105,400	2,392,851	1,935,700	81
Total			4,640,663	16,784	4,623,879	244,949	226,922	4,152,008	3,691,700	
Philadelphia insuring office:										
P-2	207	Insured [1]	4,907,643		4,907,643	215,147	297,800	4,394,696	4,277,500	97
P-3	207	do.	4,763,846	143,081	4,620,765	252,040	116,000	4,252,725	4,138,800	97
P-4	207	do.	6,915,929	231,968	6,683,961	374,534	156,370	6,153,057	5,955,900	97
P-5	207	Assigned	3,982,253	84,231	3,898,022	209,510	39,162	3,649,350	3,371,400	92
P-8	220	Insured [1]	8,863,592	307,870	8,555,722	755,612		7,800,110	7,401,400	95
P-9	220	do.[1]	9,020,951	371,326	8,649,625	786,330		7,763,295	7,705,035	98
P-10	220	do.[1]	5,711,547	235,231	5,476,316	476,419		4,999,897	4,826,000	97
Total			44,165,761	1,373,707	42,792,054	3,069,592	609,332	39,113,130	37,676,035	
Phoenix insuring office:										
Ph-2	207	Insured [1]	1,673,955	56,692	1,617,263		37,500	1,579,763	1,409,400	89
Ph-3	207	do.[1]	1,009,584	50,814	958,770	39,719	47,609	871,442	846,900	97
Ph-1	231	do.	2,052,406	10,117	2,042,289	165,722	30,498	1,846,069	1,725,600	93
Total			4,735,945	117,623	4,618,322	205,441	115,607	4,297,274	3,981,900	
S-1	207	Assigned	4,498,304	16,542	4,481,762	178,344	144,575	4,158,843	4,033,500	97
S-3	231	Insured	2,687,035		2,687,035	218,707	254,769	2,213,559	2,394,200	108
Total			7,185,339	16,542	7,168,797	397,051	399,344	6,372,402	6,427,700	
St. Louis insuring office:										
SL-1	220	Assigned	2,822,760	1,051	2,821,709	248,267		2,573,442	2,505,600	97
SL-2	220	do.	5,284,959	25,466	5,259,493	461,019		4,798,474	4,436,100	92
SL-3	220	do.	5,704,133	40,624	5,663,509	496,107		5,167,402	4,985,400	96
SL-4	220	do.	2,357,328	14,934	2,342,394	199,367		2,143,027	1,866,800	87
SL-5	220	Under modification	2,187,314		2,187,314	190,467		1,996,847	1,963,100	98
Total			18,356,494	82,075	18,274,419	1,595,227		16,679,192	15,757,000	
San Diego insuring office:										
SD-1	207	Assigned	1,511,901	8,181	1,503,720	68,300	99,879	1,335,541	1,285,800	96
SD-2	207	do.	1,837,635		1,837,635	86,842	109,169	1,641,624	1,631,600	99
SD-3	207	do.	1,313,294		1,313,294	58,971	100,041	1,154,282	1,163,000	101
SD-4	207	do.	1,044,086		1,044,086	45,378	49,256	949,452	842,000	89
SD-5	207	do.	1,523,850		1,523,850	70,949	77,684	1,375,217	1,369,700	100
SD-6	207	do.[1]	954,830	250	954,580	49,616	12,000	892,964	840,500	94
SD-7	207	do.[1]	952,805	250	952,555	49,653	12,000	890,902	840,500	94
SD-8	207	do.	1,198,544		1,198,544		41,078	1,157,466	1,069,300	92
SD-9	207	do.	1,280,857	13,744	1,267,113	65,237	30,000	1,171,876	1,138,000	97
SD-10	207	do.	1,270,354		1,270,354		54,099	1,216,255	1,135,100	93
SD-11	207	do.	2,439,729	4,231	2,435,498	116,289	94,086	2,225,123	2,188,260	98
Total			15,327,885	26,656	15,301,229	611,235	679,292	14,010,702	13,503,700	
San Francisco insuring office:										
SF-4	207	Insured	779,140	2,804	776,336	24,699	139,924	611,713	560,800	[3] 92
SF-5	207	do.	508,572	771	507,801	32,952	95,706	379,143	377,229	99
SF-7	220	Assigned	1,345,354	2,665	1,342,689	109,794		1,232,895	1,204,998	98
SF-6	221	do.	738,406	13,752	724,654		10,650	714,004	687,600	[2] 96
Total			3,371,472	19,992	3,351,480	167,445	246,280	2,937,755	2,830,627	
Seattle insuring office:										
Se-1	207	Insured [1]	1,144,226		1,144,226		7,937	1,136,289	956,249	84
Se-2	207	do.	1,338,384	3,500	1,334,884		37,000	1,297,884	700,000	54
Se-3	207	do.	3,449,021	14,201	3,434,820		79,000	3,355,820	2,898,100	86
Total			5,931,631	17,701	5,913,930		123,937	5,789,993	4,554,349	
Tampa insuring office:										
T-3	207	Assigned	594,898	29,460	565,438	26,425	11,908	527,105	470,000	89
T-1	213	do.	2,168,139	30,462	2,137,677	85,116	168,000	1,884,561	1,806,700	96
T-2	213	do.	897,988	21,000	876,988	44,623	63,411	768,954	697,400	91
Total			3,661,025	80,922	3,580,103	156,164	243,319	3,180,620	2,974,100	
Grand total			237,205,565	4,172,001	233,033,564	12,220,034	5,975,704	214,837,826	214,905,328	

---

[1] Under modification agreement for periods which ended prior to July 31, 1963.
[2] Limited by 100 percent loan to value ratio.
[3] Limited by 80 percent loan to value ratio.
[4] Limited by 95 percent loan to value ratio.
[5] Limited by 97 percent loan to value ratio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What, if any, action has been taken by Government agencies to ascertain why this indefensible practice goes on?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall answer that in two steps. As to what action has been taken by the Department, the answer is "None." As to what other acknowledgment the Department made of these reports, we got a promise to do better next time. I shall review a report which I have put in the RECORD, a report which was filed with both committees of Congress in 1963 and with Congress—they show what happened.

One might ask why we should bring this up now. I am going to follow through for 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 with General Accounting Office reports showing that each year the Comptroller General has called these excess markups to the attention of Congress. They have repeatedly called attention to the windfall profits that are accruing to the sponsors. Each year nothing is done about it except to go on and approve an extension of the project, as we are asked to do here today. All we have received from the agency is promises and no action. The same thing is going on today. The same personnel are making these decisions. We are today still approving projects in excess of the actual cost of the land.

Mr. President, just a couple of weeks ago I called attention to a project in Tucson, Ariz., which has gone broke this year. There was a half-million-dollar markup on the land in that Tucson project.

The FHA has furnished some reports and indicated that its records did not show the cost of the land. They indicated that they had done the best they could. There are records, and the court records which were later examined show that there was over a half-million-dollar markup. This information was available to the agency at the time.

I am going to cite examples in which the reports they have sent to Congress in answer to certain questions do not tell the whole story. The agency's records do show these markups. It had been warned by its own underwriters in the areas that the projects were inflated and not feasible and should not be approved. Notwithstanding that, it has overridden the advice and warnings of its own underwriters.

I cite one project which was built in Texas. In that project the underwriters warned that the project was not economically feasible. In addition they said that the applicant had a miserable record of earlier failures with the FHA. In 1954 he was found to have been involved in the windfall profits from the Government under this same agency. He was bitterly denounced by the committee at that time as being an irresponsible builder.

He went back into the building business again. I shall cite that particular case because I think it points up very quickly what I am talking about.

This particular man came back in 1960 and filed an application for a project in Syracuse, N.Y., for The Towers project. His application was for $6,013,800. The application of this man who had such a miserable record was approved. The project went broke. The Comptroller General estimated that we will have a loss of at least $2,300,000 on this $6 million project. Apparently the FHA liked the way he did business.

One year later the same man was down in Texas, this time in Dallas. He applied for the Turtle Creek Square project.

And again the local underwriters said that this project was not feasible and wanted to reject his application.

I should like to read what the local underwriters said, what the director said about this project, and the steps that followed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much was involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There was $11,012,150.

This is the man who was denounced in 1954 as an irresponsible builder. He had a project in New York that was in default.

I will follow through and read excerpts from the agency records. This Texas project was approved in 1961, but it was first initiated in 1960. In the FHA files is a letter dated August 15, 1960, from the director of the Dallas office, Mr. Charles, to the Southern Trust & Mortgage Co., in which he advised them again that the proposal was not economically feasible.

This was August 15, 1960. He was not approving it.

In the FHA files there is a telegram dated September 30, 1960, from the Zone Operations Commissioner, George Hillier, of the headquarters of the FHA in Washington, to Director Charles, in Dallas:

> You are directed to accept and process application for 363 unit Turtle Creek project. Will consult with you further on this. Please acknowledge.

Next I should like to read a letter that was written November 3, 1960—I will put the whole letter in the RECORD—from Mr. Ellis Charles to Mr. George A. Hillier, the Zone Operations Commissioner, in which he rejects this project as not being feasible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM

Date: November 3, 1960.

To: Mr. George A. Hillier, Zone Operations Commissioner.

From: Ellis Charles, Director, Dallas Insuring Office.

Subject: Project No. 112-00038, Turtle Creek Tower Apartments North, Inc., Dr. Daniel Gevinson, Sponsor, Dallas, Tex.

The attached copy of a letter to the mortgagee regarding the captioned subject is to alert Headquarters about the wide variance between the sponsor's estimate of cost and the possible FHA insurable mortgage on the room count criteria, including an allowance for non-dwelling facilities at an estimated amount of 10%.

The fair market value of the land was determined by comparison with other sites in Dallas offering similar amenities developed from current market data.

The sponsor will not be able to complete this project unless he can find additional funds to provide the necessary working capital of some $3,231,000.00. The ratio of loan to cost, based on the sponsor's estimate, would be about 71%. The sponsor would be expected to provide the 29%, and his financial statement does not reflect any available capital.

Dr. Gevinson has not demonstrated satisfactory sponsorship in other FHA rental projects known to this office. He participated in the planning and development of two high-rise Section 608 projects, one in Dallas and the other in Ft. Worth.

These are some of the deficiencies in his operation in developing the above projects which are known to us:

1. Land Acquisition—Location. This was subject to investigation because Clyde Powell made inquiry as to why this office refused to approve the first site proposed.

2. Air Conditioning. The Outline Specifications described a plant having a capacity of 350 tons, and the commitment took this into consideration. However, working drawings and specifications called for 275 tons. This was overlooked in closing, and we were unable to adjust our cost to recognize the lower cost.

3. Architectural Supervision. Shortly after construction commenced, architectural supervision was eliminated. Although we insisted on reducing the estimate of cost by the amount allowed for supervision (2%), we were not supported by Headquarters. Washington advised us that supervision would be interpreted as having been given by the Architect's signature on a request for an advance.

4. Financing Expense. We were encouraged by Mr. Powell to allow 1½% Financing Expense, but later we learned that the mortgage was sold for 103, and Dr. Gevinson received 33⅓ percent of the premium.

5. Since completion, this sponsor has been charged with the following:

a. Unauthorized furnishing of apartments and renting same without FHA approval. He also refused to submit invoices to justify cost of furniture.

b. Unauthorized alteration of building to permit combining two units into one. This involved eight units and reduced the total number, endangering the legality of the mortgage.

c. Unauthorized rental increases.

d. Unauthorized excessive charges for connection to master TV antenna.

e. Unauthorized alteration and use of several living units for commercial usage.

f. Unauthorized collection of rent for tenant auto parking when it was included in total rent.

Under these circumstances, do you feel that we should proceed with processing as instructed in your telegram of September 30, 1960?

ELLIS CHARLES.

Attachment.

Cc: Mr. Edward J. Doe, Ass't. Commissioner Field Operations.

Cc: Mr. Marsh Cunningham, Director, Mortgage Insurance Division.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who sent the telegram?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The telegram was sent from Washington.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At least, it came from the higher up in Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was from Zone Operations Commissioner George Hillier, in Washington, and it was directed to director Charles. This director then sent this letter dated November 3, 1960, and outlined this experience with Dr. Gevinson and asked:

> Under these circumstances, do you feel that we should proceed with discussing as instructed in your telegram of September 30, 1960?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Still protesting?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Still protesting. And he said, "Do you feel that we should proceed?"

The next step——

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the local man in charge said: "This project is not feasible. The borrower is irresponsible. Our Government should not make the loan. He has borrowed on a number of occasions, and the loans went wrong, and I advise that the loan be not made."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

I should like to follow through with the proceedings. They become more interesting as they go along.

On July 27, 1961, there is reference to a 6-page letter from Gevinson to the director, denouncing him because he had refused to raise the land values in line with the high appraisals which the sponsor wanted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Denouncing the local official?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Denouncing this local director who had rejected his project.

But on August 28, 1961, Mr. C. Franklin Daniels, the assistant commissioner of the multihousing projects in Washington, sent a memorandum to this director, Mr. Charles, as follows:

> This will confirm our conversation of Auguest 25th in which you are authorized to resolve the difference in land value in captioned case at $4 per s.f., and to proceed diligently with the processing of the project. In accordance with your conversation with M. Starr, he will, upon request, make assistance available to your office.

The sponsor had gone over the director's head because he would not give the sponsor the inflated values, and here we have another directive from Washington, dated August 28, 1961, to go ahead and give him his high appraisals for the land.

In the files of the Department is a memorandum dated September 22, 1961, reading as follows:

> On September 22, 1961, processing responsibility was removed from the Dallas Office and detailed to Headquarters Zone personnel. On September 29th, Director Charles was instructed to write Gevinson promising him a commitment by October 15, 1961. Director had stated that he would resign before he would sign this commitment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that the Director——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the Director who refused.

Here they are taking the project application papers from his office when he refused. They took the papers from him, and I understand they ultimately were sent to Albany, N.Y. They got them approved and sent them back, and the Texas project was approved. It went bankrupt, as it was outlined.

The Comptroller General listed the exceptionally large windfall profits which accrued to the sponsor. Remember the Director had first rejected this project, as did the local underwriters, on the basis that this sponsor was irresponsible and that he had a habit of inflating his costs and taking these windfall profits.

This statement is based on the Comptroller General's audit of the project after it had been approved and went broke. That full report is available to Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the amount of that bankrupt project?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Eleven million, twelve thousand, one hundred and fifty dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does this summarize it correctly: that the local persons who were in contact with the investigation, the appraisal, recommended against it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Absolutely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One of the local officials said, "If you make this loan, I'll resign."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He did?

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the loan was finally made, in spite of the protests of the local official.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Before I read the results of what the Comptroller General discovered in his audit, I shall quote the comments of another underwriter who was called in to review this controversy:

> In my 84 comments listed in Chronological Résumé of the processing of this application for mortgage insurance, there were over 48 exhibits in the files indicating in my opinion either irregular practice, unwarranted waivers, overriding of Dallas Office finds, repeated concessions to sponsor's expressed wishes, and, finally the removal of processing authority form the Dallas Office.
>
> It is my opinion that this project has been overestimated and overappraised.
>
> It is my opinion that this project will be in distress from the time it is completed until FHA acquires it. I base my opinion on many facts, including the tremendous number of apartments that have been constructed with conventional financing over the past 5 years in Dallas, and continue at an increasingly rapid rate.

This underwriter severely criticized the manner in which this project had been approved, overriding all of the recommendations of the local people.

Let us continue. What did the Comptroller General find in his audit after this project had gone broke? He found that in this $11,012,150 contract for Turtle Creek, which had been built on a cost-plus basis, the promoter had collected a profit of about $1 million. This profit resulted from inflated subcontractors' profits, and so forth.

This promoter contracted with subcontractors whom he controlled. For example, the promoter subcontracted the contract for the carpets in this project. The subcontract, as reported and included in the mortgage, was $348,200. He actually paid only $219,800, so he picked up a $128,400 windfall on that subcontract, or a profit of 58 percent.

He subcontracted the garage paving in the same project to another controlled subcontractor for $96,000 and included that as a cost, and it only cost $37,400. He made $58,600, or 57 percent profit.

Tht painting was subcontracted for $204,700, but he actually paid the subcontractor $144,500, and he made $60,200, or a profit of 42 percent on that subcontract.

The Comptroller General said that altogether this man scalped over $1 million in windfall profits on this project.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What has been done up to this point? What has been done up to this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator mean: What has been done to discipline this man?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To bring him to the bar of justice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At first they were paying no attention to his record. He had another application pending for a project in San Antonio, Tex. On December 12, 1962, that application was approved by the Department. The amount involved there was $8,573,000. They were approving this project for him. This is the third project, but this project did not go through. Why? The agency discovered the man was about to be indicted. I wish to read the letter of May 6, 1963, commenting upon his pending suit and their commitment to finance another project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter, signed by Marsh Cunningham, dated May 6, 1963, to the director of the local division, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington, D.C., May 6, 1963.*
>
> Re Project No. 115-00038, One Poinsard Square, San Antonio, Tex.
>
> Mr. C. T. MACLEOD,
> *Director, Federal Housing Administration, San Antonio, Tex.*
>
> DEAR MR. MACLEOD: This will confirm, in part, the telephone conversation had with you last Friday relative to your memorandum of May 1, 1963.
>
> The suit filed against Dr. Daniel Gevinson by John Hans Graham has serious implications. If, at the time of initial closing, false statements were furnished the FHA, then, depending upon the facts obtaining, the party or parties responsible would have to disassociate themselves from the Poinsard undertaking before we proceed to closing.
>
> Meanwhile, there is outstanding a valid commitment, and on request you should be prepared to amend it in accordance with your letter of May 1, 1963, to the National Commercial Bank and Trust Company of Albany, New York. Such an amendment, if made, would not constitute a reopening within the strict meaning of that term as used in the FHA Manual.
>
> Very truly yours,
> MARSH CUNNINGHAM,
> *Director.*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to summarize. The reason the project was canceled at that time was because he was about to be indicted.

Early in 1964 this matter had been called to my attention. I referred the matter to the Attorney General. They found the overpayments and suggested that the report be first presented to the Department of Justice. The man was indicted and that canceled the application for this third project. I assume they did not want to visit the Federal penitentiary and disburse the money. However, that cancellation of the later project did not take place until the man was on the verge of going to the penitentiary. Mr. President, why are they doing business with promoters who have such a record? This is one of the many examples continually being called to my attention, and Congress is doing nothing but extending the project.

The time has come when affirmative steps are necessary.

There is overbuilding in these areas resulting from the approval of these economically unsound projects. The result is that responsible builders are unable to compete with this type of operation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Delaware enumerated many transactions. Does the general theme run through those transactions showing that there has been an overevaluation of land so as to qualify the borrower to get the money he needed to construct the project that he had in mind?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. To get around the 90-percent mortgage guarantee basis they overvalue the land. They allow mortgages on the basis of the evaluation of some appraiser who only estimates the value of the land and cost for construction. They do not relate the mortgage to a certified cost, with the result that ofttimes a promoter gets a 105-percent or 110-percent mortgage.

In 1963 the Comptroller General sent another report from which I shall read excerpts. It cites the same type of cases. It is Report No. B118679.

> We noted that developers of urban renewal projects in New York City were permitted by the agency to include land in their statements of project costs at its estimated cost rather than actual cost. Our review of a developer's records disclosed that the agency's estimated land cost which was included in the developer's certified statement of project costs was $452,000 in excess of his actual acquisition cost. If actual land cost had been used, as is done in other cities, the insured mortgages for this developer would have been reduced by about $215,000. Since the Federal Government furnishes financial assistance to local communities in making land available to developers at a fair market value for the uses specified in the urban renewal plan, we believe that developers should not be permitted to include such land in their statement of project costs at a value higher than their actual cost of acquiring the land and thereby obtain larger mortgages. The Commissioner has advised us that the agency's regulations will be revised to require sponsors of urban renewal projects to include land in their statements of project costs at its actual acquisition cost.
>
> We noted also that the agency's estimates of project replacement costs (1) did not give consideration to the savings which could reasonably be expected from the simultaneous construction of several projects by the same builder and (2) in all cases included a 10-percent allowance for builders' profit, although in many instances a smaller profit allowance may have been adequate. Both of these factors inflate the estimates of replacement cost and increase the amounts of the mortgages to be insured.

The report continues:

> ### UNJUSTIFIED INCREASES IN MORTGAGE AMOUNTS
>
> At two insuring offices we noted instances where FHA had approved increased mortgage amounts which, in our opinion, were not justified.
>
> At the St. Louis office we found that the statutory per room mortgage limitation had been improperly applied to provide a sponsor with a larger insured mortgage.
>
> At Philadelphia we found that two mortgages had been increased after the projects had been completed.
>
> ### INFLATED ESTIMATES OF REPLACEMENT COST RESULT IN LARGER INSURED MORTGAGES
>
> Our review disclosed that FHA's estimates of replacement cost of multifamily housing projects to be insured under section 220 were inflated because (1) the estimates did not give consideration to savings which could reasonably be expected from the simultaneous construction of several projects by the same builder and (2) the estimates in all cases included an allowance of 10 percent for builders' profit, although in many instances a smaller profit allowance may have been adequate.
>
> For example, FHA insured a mortgage loan of $10,101,900 to finance the construction of project No. 034–32005, a section 220 project. FHA determined that this project contained 2,425 rooms which permitted a mortgage loan not to exceed $10,114,300. However, under the old criteria this project consisted of only 1,947 rooms. Had the previous method of counting rooms been used, the maximum mortgage would have been $7,587,300, or about $2,500,000 less than was actually insured. Project No. 122–32020 is another section 220 project. FHA determined that this project consisted of 3,176 rooms which permitted a mortgage loan of $16,702,500. However, by excluding balconies, terraces, and other nondwelling space, this project consists of 2,610 rooms which would have reduced the mortgage limitation by about $2,400,000.

I continued reading from this same report:

> During our review of mortgagors' and builders' cost certifications, we found several situations which we believe indicate the need for FHA to make tests of these cost certifications submitted by sponsors.
>
> In New York we reviewed the records of the sponsor of six projects insured under section 220. Our review disclosed that the actual cost of the land on which these projects were constructed was $1,543,000, or $452,000 less than the estimated cost of $1,995,000 which FHA used for cost certification purposes. An audit by FHA would have disclosed this large variance between actual and estimated land cost. However, as previously stated, FHA has never made an audit of a sponsor's costs in New York. We noted also that the sponsor of these six FHA projects was also constructing some commercial structures in the urban renewal area, which were conventionally financed, at the same time the FHA-insured projects were being built. The same subcontractors were working on both the FHA projects and the conventionally financed commercial buildings. We believe that where a situation of this nature exists FHA should consider making reviews, on a test basis, of the sponsor's distribution of construction costs between the FHA-insured projects, each representing a separate corporation and a separate mortgage, and the conventionally financed projects.
>
> At the Philadelphia office we reviewed a section 220 project located in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The original insured mortgage for this project amounted to $4,462,000. During construction of this project, the Philadelphia office approved certain changes in the plans and specifications which FHA estimated would increase total construction costs by about $200,000. When this project was completed the sponsor had unpaid bills totaling about $500,000, and the sponsor requested FHA for an increase in the mortgage amount. The Philadelphia office reprocessed this case and granted an increase of $364,000 for a total insured mortgage amount of $4,826,000. No audit of the sponsor's costs was made before approving the increase, although officials of the Philadelphia office informed us that they planned to request that the Washington office make an audit of the sponsor's costs.

What did the Commissioners say in reply to the criticism in this report? They advised that in the future the agency regulations would be revised to require sponsors of urban renewal projects to include land at its actual acquisition cost. That is a wonderful promise had it been carried out.

In 1964, a year later, we find another report from the Comptroller General, No. B114860, dated January 30, 1964. I shall quote briefly from that report to show that the same pattern continued:

> We found excessive delays in acquiring defaulted multifamily properties and in obtaining control over project operations from the time defaulted mortgages were assigned by the mortgagee until their final acquisition by the Federal Housing Administration. In many of these cases, mortgagors collected rents and made no payments on the mortgage indebtedness while the Federal Housing Administration paid the real estate taxes and hazard insurance on the properties.
>
> For example, in the case of project No. 054–42047, FHA records showed that the mortgagor was collecting the rents from the property since the mortgage had been assigned to FHA in June 1960 and that during this period FHA had been paying the real estate taxes and hazard insurance on the property. A receiver for this project was not appointed until August 1962. Also, FHA records show that in March 1961, 9 months after the mortgage had been assigned, this project was considered to be improperly maintained. In the case of project No. 054–42043, we estimated that, on the basis of the financial statement submitted by the mortgagor prior to default, there would have been about $318,000 in net income available to the mortgagor from the date of default in February 1957 through June 1962. Not only were no payments made on this mortgage since default, but FHA paid the real estate taxes and hazard insurance premiums of about $43,000 so as to protect its residual interest in the project.
>
> FHA incurs a loss on the sale of multifamily properties, and, to the extent that available project income is not applied to the mortgage indebtedness, FHA's losses are increased. For example, project No. 113–42077 went into default in July 1960 and was referred to the Department of Justice for foreclosure in October 1960. A receiver was not appointed, and, in November 1961, FHA acquired the property through foreclosure. FHA estimated that between the date of default and the date of foreclosure the mortgagor collected income from the project in excess of $125,000. FHA indicated also that only a few meager remittances were made on the mortgage indebtedness. The unpaid principal balance of this mortgage at the date of default was about $718,000, and FHA estimated that it would sustain a loss of about $118,000 upon disposition of this property.

This is brought about by virtue of the fact that after the project has defaulted they permit the sponsor to continue to collect the rent even though between that time and the date of foreclosure the FHA pays the taxes and other charges. In this manner they make an extra windfall profit out of the rent.

There is no excuse for this laxity. In private industry someone would be fired.

In this same report the Comptroller General cites one FHA insuring office where he reviewed several projects built and owned by the same sponsor. This is on page 32 of the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt is as follows:

Following are examples of charter violations and imprudent financial practices of mortgagors which we noted during our review.

At one FHA insuring office we reviewed the following projects which were built and owned by the same sponsor:

Project No.	Insured		Number of units
	Date	Mortgage amount	
113-42061	Oct. 24, 1950	$1, 029, 100	160
113-42062	Sept. 29, 1950	505, 800	80
113-00029	Apr. 1, 1952	1, 489, 700	228

The sponsor owned 100 percent of the common stock of the three projects, and FHA held 100 shares of first preferred stock in each of the project corporations.

FHA had determined that for two projects, Nos. 113-42061 and 113-42062, the sponsor obtained "windfall profits"; that is, obtained mortgage proceeds in excess of his actual cost of constructing the projects. A review of the settlement files showed that FHA was able to recover $15,750 of these profits and apply it against the mortgages. The sponsor's original investment in the third project, as shown by the sponsor's financial statements, was $18,000 which was paid for stock in the corporation.

The FHA Internal Audit Division made an examination of the financial records of these three projects in October 1960. This examination showed that from inception of the projects (February 6, 1950, February 6, 1950, and June 7, 1951, respectively) to September 30, 1959, funds of the projects amounting to $317,908 were distributed to the sponsor or other affiliated companies. Of this amount, $141,563 was determined by the FHA Internal Audit Division to be in excess of the amount which would be authorized under the surplus cash concept used by FHA for measuring the amount of funds available for distribution in accordance with sound financial management practices. In addition to these distributions, the mortgagor corporations had paid management fees amounting to $117,508 to an affiliated company of the sponsor.

As of June 30, 1962, FHA's net investment (acquisition cost plus net expenses incurred in operating the properties) in the two acquired projects was $1,262,348. The sponsor, however, as a result of "windfall profits" (see p. 33) had no cash invested in these two projects. FHA, on the other hand, has estimated that upon disposition of these properties it will incur a loss of about $509,000.

At another insuring office we reviewed the following projects which were owned by the same sponsor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This report lists three projects costing $1,029,100, a second costing $105,800, and a third costing $1,489,000. Windfall profits were involved in all three projects.

The same sponsor had all three projects.

Here is another report, dated March of 1965. Again the Comptroller General cites the same type of examples. One could substitute the names of the sponsors and projects, and one would think that he was reading the same reports.

I have suggested that it would be cheaper for the Comptroller General and those in Congress who wish to comment on the reports, to mimeograph many of the reports and speeches, leave blank spaces in them; we could fill in the names and addresses of the sponsors and the projects and we would have the speech ready.

This pattern continues right through the years.

In this report they outline numerous cases of windfall profits, how they inflate land values, and all that one can get from the FHA is, "We are going to do better and correct it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report, No. B-114860, dated April 5, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our review of the sponsor's records pertaining to project construction was made before all the subcontracts had been completed, and therefore we were unable to determine the actual profits which would be realized by the sponsor-owned companies. However, on the basis of the costs recorded at the time of our review and estimates of the additional costs to be incurred, it appeared that upon completion of the project the sponsor-controlled subcontractors would realize profits of about $1 million in connection with the construction of the project. Furthermore, our review disclosed that much of the work subcontracted to the two sponsor-owned companies was not performed by them but was, in turn, subcontracted by them to outside firms. As a result, the cost of the project was pyramided by multiple layers of contracting and subcontracting and included not only the profits realized by the sponsor's companies but also the profits realized by the outside firms which actually performed the work.

For example, the painting work for the project was originally estimated at $204,700 and a fixed-price contract was entered into by the joint venture and one of the sponsor's subcontracting companies for this work in the same amount. The sponsor-controlled company's records show that the actual work was sublet to a painting contractor for $129,900 and that the total costs incurred or to be incurred for painting, including overhead and other charges, amount to $144,500. Thus, the sponsor-controlled company will realize a profit of about $60,200, or 42 percent of cost, on this subcontract.

Another example concerns the furnishing and installation of carpets. This work was included in a subcontract between the joint venture and another sponsor-controlled company. This sponsor-controlled company's records show that the amount related to this work was $348,200. The company's records show also that the actual costs incurred or to be incurred, including overhead and other charges, total $219,800. As a result, the sponsor-controlled company will realize a profit of about $128,400, or 58 percent of cost, on this subcontract. Moreover, we found that the sponsor-controlled company had purchased the carpet materials and had, in turn, contracted with an outside firm for the installation.

Garage paving, which was included in a subcontract between the joint venture and a sponsor-controlled company, provides another example of pyramiding of profits. The sponsor-controlled company's records indicate that it was to receive about $96,000 for garage paving. However, the actual costs incurred or to be incurred by the company, including overhead and other charges, total about $37,400 leaving a profit of about $58,600, or 157 percent of cost. We found that the sponsor-controlled company had sublet the actual paving work to an outside firm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall read one paragraph of the Comptroller General's letter to show that the same pattern exists.

Our review of two high-rise multifamily housing projects financed by mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration disclosed that subcontractors controlled by the promoters of the projects performed a large part of project construction and that charges to project costs included substantial and possibly excessive and unwarranted profits realized by these subcontractors.

When these windfalls are considered it gives them, not 90 percent and not 100 percent, but a mortgage far in excess of 100 percent. Yet the Department keeps on approving them.

I cited earlier in my remarks here today a report dated in March 1966. The pattern is the same, and the response from the agency is nearly identical. We always get the same promise that they are going to take adequate steps to correct this abuse.

My question is when?

The FHA ought to mimeograph its letters since they are the same; it would save much time.

There is another joker in these bankrupt projects to which I should call attention. I shall cite another example of three projects in Florida. I have commented on these before.

Three projects were built in 1963 and 1964 by the McCloskey interests, of Philadelphia. The first was the Pendleton, at Daytona Beach, FHA mortgage $2,700,000; the second was Twin Towers, at Cape Kennedy, FHA mortgage $2,903,400; and the third, Lucerne Towers, at Orlando, mortgage $3,449,400. A total of more than $9 million in mortgages was involved.

After payments of about $6,572, on these mortgages all three of the projects went bankrupt. The properties were turned over to the Federal Government, and the sponsor is not responsible at all.

If John Doe buys a home for his family under this same program he and his wife are required to sign the mortgage. He is required to pledge as collateral his salary, his current assets, and all that he will own or inherit hereafter—all toward the repayment of the FHA mortgage that he obtains.

But in the case of multifamily projects, all that is required is to form a separate corporation for each project. One group may form numerous corporations. The group gets one separate loan for each corporation, and if one corporation goes broke it does not at all affect the second corporation. If the group happens to build one project that is profitable it keeps it. Those that are not profitable go bankrupt, and the properties are turned over to Uncle Sam. In the meantime, as builders, the group has received its building fees, markups in land values, and profits, if any.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator mentioned three transactions of the McCloskey interests. Did I understand the Senator to say that they involved about $9 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much was paid to the Government in interest and principal?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The report shows that the payments toward principal totaled $6,572.31. This was paid toward the liquidation of the mortgage of more than $9 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the company went broke?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They turn it over to the Government, and the Government will have to take the loss.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is simply unbelievable that $9 million was put into this operation and only $6,500 was paid back to the Government and then it becomes defunct. How can anyone argue that there was prudence and care exercised in making the original loan under such a shocking situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It cannot be defended. There is another gimmick used. Each one of these corporations can be controlled by a wholly owned corporation of the parent organization, and if the promoter happens to have some profitable operations in the parent company he can, by filing a consolidated tax return and paying a slight premium, claim depreciation on the bankrupt projects during the period they were in his name and prior to the time they were actually taken over by the Government. This gives him a windfall tax deduction of sometimes another million dollars. Corporations are in the 50-percent bracket; that is one-half paid by the Government. They can take depreciation on their bankrupt projects on which they have never made payments and offset the tax on their profitable operations. This is a shocking state of affairs and the FHA keeps right on approving such operations.

As I discussed yesterday, this is not a homeowner's bill. Far too often we hear it mentioned as a homebuilder's bill. Let us get it in our minds that we are not supposed to take care of this kind of building operation.

I now refer to another case in Texas where a particular project was applied for under the sponsorship of a church, to build a home for the elderly. The sponsors were unable to get a mortgage as high as they wanted. They had estimated the potential rentals would come from the elderly people who would rent apartments in this project which the FHA was financing. No one under the age of 65 would be eligible. These apartments were to be sold and they estimated the life expectancy of the individuals who would occupy the apartments for X number of years. The apartments were sold to these elderly people on the basis that they purchased lifetime rights for the apartments and then they paid a monthly rental for upkeep and services.

At death the occupant would not have any equity in these apartments; this apartment would revert back to the management. The occupant purchased only lifetime rights, on which the sponsors had figured the life expectancy and then averaged it over a 30-year period. Assuming that the life expectancy averaged 10 years this would give them a turnover of three times during a 30-year period. This they had figured in computing the mortgage, but standard rates did not come out to a figure high enough to get the mortgage they wanted. So, what did they do? They revised the life expectancy estimate below the insurance tables down to say 7½ years. This would give them a rollover of four times during that same 30-year period. That would give them an extra million dollars for the mortgage. In other words, they get an inflated mortgage by estimating that the occupants—the elderly citizens who rented apartments in this particular project—would die 25 percent faster than they would if they lived in any other project.

What kind of promotions are we running?

Here is a home for the elderly approved by the FHA on the basis that the people who live there are going to die 25 percent faster than they would if they lived in a conventionally financed project.

Mr. President, if that is the Great Society's philosophy I am glad I am not a member of it. I do not want to live in one of their projects.

This case is a matter of record. An outline of this reasoning is in their own files. They approved it on this basis.

The question is asked, Why do we not offer amendments to this bill? How can we offer an amendment telling the Administrator to exercise some degree of good commonsense?

The only way we can get these indefensible practices stopped is to start a wholesale housecleaning of some of the incompetent personnel and political hacks on the payroll of the FHA.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does there run through the transactions to which the Senator has been calling attention this technique: first, of overvaluation of property in order to procure the Government's approval; second, frequently subcontractors are hired to do the job for an amount substantially below what was set forth as the cost in the original estimate that was submitted to the Government; third, the supposed investor or owner is allowed to take as compensation a percentage of the cost which become his earnings in the construction of the building?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, plus promotional costs which he is allowed in the mortgage.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then does it mean this, that he gets all of these benefits without being tied down at all against the contingency of anything going wrong, except that the corporation is tied down?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They start out on many of the projects with an actual cash profit and no money of their own invested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The profits have begun. They already have their profits?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. They construct the building, take their profits, and then turn the mortgage back to the Government saying, "It is yours."

There is another loose practice which has been discovered in the last couple of years. It is beginning to fan out and is on the verge of becoming a wholesale operation. The committee should take a position on it. I refer to section 202 of the National Housing Act under which private nonprofit corporations established for the purpose of providing housing and related facilities for elderly citizens are eligible for loans.

I am quoting now from a bulletin, a report put out by a Washington promoter. Promoters are going around leaving these pamphlets which are marked "Strictly Confidential." I do not think it is really confidential except they do not want Congress to see it. Perhaps they did not intend to give one to me.

HIGHLIGHTS OF SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM—SECTION 202 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

ELIGIBILITY

Private non-profit corporations established for the purpose of providing housing and related facilities for elderly citizens are eligible for a loan under Section 202 of the National Housing Act.

Applicants will be asked to demonstrate that the corporation exists in perpetuity, i.e., that it has an assured life at least equal to the maximum term of the loan.

In the case of a church sponsored corporation, this perpetuity can be demonstrated by having responsible church officials such as the Rector and/or Bishop serve as permanent trustees or members of the Board of Directors. Additional board members and officers elected by the Vestry or other official body of the sponsoring church also illustrates perpetuity by the method of selection.

In this manner, the sponsoring church is relieved of any financial obligation of the corporation while retaining control and administration of the project.

Section 202 provides for a 100% mortgage which includes the cost of the land. Therefore, a site which is owned by the church upon which the church wishes to develop a project may be sold or leased to the (church sponsored) non-profit corporation.

Many innocent churches and nonprofit organizations, with the best of intentions and motivations, are getting caught in this operation. I do not criticize their good intentions. I have examined many of these projects. They think they are providing homes for the elderly and in doing so are charitably motivated. They are being told there is no risk to the church. When it is paid off it will belong to the church. If it is not paid off the membership of the church is in no way responsible for it. Nonprofit organizations, including many members and some officials of the churches, are being involved and sold on the idea that they can get this 100-percent financing. When they get 100-percent financing the promoter who takes charge of construction, and so forth, has a gravy train. He can scalp his profit and then leave it in the laps of the sponsoring organizations, and they take responsibility for the failure.

I have cited examples of churches in Arizona, in Texas, and in other States. I am going to cite one example of how this works, and this one is typical. I think it shows what happens when a church finds itself caught. I should state again that I am not saying that the sponsoring church organization enters this arrangement with any ulterior motives. They have the highest motives. They are disgusted when they find they are being used. Some of them have tried to repudiate it after the project was started, but they were told it was too late and that they had to go ahead.

They do not have the financial responsibility, but they do feel a moral responsibility.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How are these projects initiated? Is it done by a promoter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In nearly every case it is done by a promoter. He goes to the church or somebody connected with the church and paints a beautiful picture of how homes can be built for the elderly under church sponsorship. They are told that it will not cost them anything and explains how they can get a Government loan. The promoters do not say they are going to profit, but when the church gets the loan the promoter gets his fees.

I have discussed the Clarewood House project in Houston, Tex., before, and I will not discuss it in detail again. But it is a typical example of what happens. In this instance they sold the pastor the idea of writing them a letter that the church would lend its moral support. No doubt, it would.

With that letter the promoters had the project well on the road to approval. An announcement came out in the local papers that the project had been approved. The project had been approved under the sponsorship of the First Methodist Church in Houston. This announcement shocked the officials of the church. They knew nothing about it. They called a special official board meeting together.

This is all documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, 1966, and also in the Comptroller General's report of February 23, 1966, which is available to anyone who wants it.

The First Methodist Church in Houston called its official board together. They were told that by having that project church sponsored it was eligible for 100-percent participation. The minutes of the official board meeting show that this church had not approved the project and had no intention of being any part of it. A copy of the minutes of the church board meeting show that it flatly repudiated this project. Notwithstanding that repudiation the project was approved. Among the sponsors of this project were members of the church, but the church itself was not the sponsor.

To clear up any possible misunderstanding there was printed in the official church bulletin of Friday, August 24, 1962, an announcement entitled "The Pastor's Message." I quote from that bulletin, which was given wide circulation both to the membership and to the public:

> Recently there has appeared in local newspapers, stories that might give the inference that First Methodist Church of Houston, our Board of Stewards, or our Board of Trustees, were involved in some manner with an apartment or residential venture in this community. This is to advise our membership and the public generally that this Church, its Board of Stewards, and its Board of Trustees, have never had any connection whatsoever, directly or indirectly, with any such venture, or any other similar project. Any such affiliation or promotion is contrary to the stated policy of the Board of Stewards, the governing body of the First Methodist Church of Houston.

It is interesting to note that the director of the Houston FHA office was not only a member of the church but a member of the stewards of this same church which had repudiated the project. He was a member of the board and present at the meeting when it disapproved the project. However, the project was approved by FHA on the basis it had the sponsorship of this church and over the solid objections of the underwriters. These local underwriters said it was overappraised, it was not economically feasible, it should not be constructed, and it did not have the church sponsorship.

They took the trouble of sending reports to Washington over the heads of their director. But that project was still approved, over their objections.

The project was soon in financial difficulty.

Why do they approve these projects?

After this controversy arose as to the manner in which this project had been approved and in order to settle the controversy Washington picked one of their chief intelligence men from the Midwest.

This agent was instructed to go to that area and investigate the conditions in the Houston office with particular reference to the manner in which the Clarewood project had been handled.

This underwriter sent his report to Washington under date of October 22, 1962. The report was promptly classified and not given to the Banking and Currency Committee. The excuse was that it was confidential and did not deal with the manner in which the Clarewood decision had been made.

It just so happens that I have a copy of that report. This report is a most devastating report on the competency of the officials making these decisions. They bitterly denounced the project.

Valuations for the land had arbitrarily been raised by the director.

The recommendations of his own underwriters had been ignored.

The director had known that the church had withdrawn its sponsorship of the project; yet he withheld the information from his superiors until after the mortgage had been approved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report prepared by Mr. Carl D. Whitney, general underwriting officer in the FHA, under date of October 22, 1962, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> OCTOBER 22, 1962.
>
> To: Mr. Richard J. Canavan, Assistant Commissioner for Technical Standards; Carl D. Whitney, General Underwriting Advisor.
>
> ### THE PROBLEM
>
> Evidences of administrative disregard of established procedures and outstanding instructions here have been abundant.
>
> Upon my arrival in the office there was no denial by the director of the violations previously reported. The effort to defend them was "lack of cooperation by the Underwriters". Everything I learned subsequently disproved that contention.
>
> ### NARRATIVE
>
> From reports of General Advisor McCallum and of Zone Advisors covering recent reviews of all phases of underwriting activities there seemed to be no doubt that the underwriting staff has been performing capably despite extreme pressures from outsiders, compounded by additional pressure from the director.
>
> Before leaving Central Office for Houston, Deputy Commissioner Ferraro and Zone Operations Commissioner Arrington briefed me on their very recent joint visit to the Insuring Office. They stated candidly that the Director's usurpation of underwriting prerogatives was clearly in evidence, without reference to Central Office of cases in controversy.
>
> I found numerous memos from the Director to the Underwriter and Section Chiefs instructing them to reverse their prior decisions on processed cases. Central Office review of some of the cases involved supported the underwriting decisions.
>
> Probably the most flagrant instance of the Director's preemption of the underwriter's prerogatives involved a Section 231 case, application number 114–38001–NP, Clarewood House, Houston, Texas. Because of the nature and the magnitude of this case, and because it illustrates so thoroughly the type of arbitrary and improper procedures pursued by the Director, I decided to base this report primarily upon it.
>
> The Clarewood House Project was presented as a formal application on August 6, 1962 by American Mortgage Company of Houston on behalf of the Sharpstown Tower Corporation, also of Houston. It involved the proposed construction of an eleven-story building on 8,388 acres of land opposite the large Sharpstown Shopping Center, twelve miles from downtown Houston. The Corporation purported to be non-profit in character.
>
> It was alleged by the corporation that the project had the active sponsorship of the First Methodist Church of Houston. In support of this claim a letter dated July 13, 1962 to our Director was presented. The letter, on the stationery of the church, was signed by its minister. This is a two-page letter. Among other things stated were: "I feel sure I speak for my Board of Trustees, my Board of Stewards and my congregation in this connection." Also, "This will be another worthwhile project sponsored by my church." It has been definitely established that the minister was wholly unjustified in making these statements.
>
> When it was learned by the Board of Stewards (the Official Board) of the church that the claim of participation and sponsorship by the church had been made, a special Committee of the Board was appointed by its chairman to look into the matter and report on it. The Committee was headed by Mr. Ewing Werlein, a prominent local judge. The minutes of the Official Board meeting of June 20, 1962 state that "Judge Werlein made a report to the Board" and that, among

other things the report stated, ". . . the committee felt that our church could not become financially involved or interested in the building project contemplated."

Despite this disclaimer of involvement or interest by the church the formal application, as I have stated, was accepted by our Houston office on August 6, 1962. At the insistence of our director and over objections of the chief underwriter that the Sharpstown Tower Corporation was not an eligible non-profit corporation, the application was processed and a commitment was issued. The underwriter had contended that the Corporation could not be construed to be non-profit in character without a resolution of the Trustees of the Church. However, the director was insistent that the case was eligible for processing and, unfortunately, the Multifamily Division supported the director's opinion that the minister's letter alone was evidence of church sponsorship of the project.

It should be added that during preapplication consideration of the proposal the director was also insistent that the land be valued, contrary to specific instructions on that point. I have a copy of a memorandum to the File dated July 9, 1962 by the Assistant Chief Underwriter concerning a meeting on that date attended by our director, Mr. Frank Sharp (Seller of the proposed land) and him. He said in the memo, "Mr. Sharp then stated it was his understanding some time ago that our land appraisal would be $2.00 per square foot. The director stated that this was also his understanding. I then re-stated the Manual instructions and informed them that we had not established a land valuation at this stage of consideration. My statement appeared to disturb Mr. Sharp and the director. The director stated that he thought the land might be a minimum of $2.00 per square foot.

The foregoing memorandum also called attention to the fact that the Underwriter had on July 3, 1962 filed a memorandum indicating the sponsoring group and their attorney had been informed of the additional information which would be needed to establish the non-profit eligibility of the proposed project and that, "the conference concluded with the attorney and the sponsor group proposing to present additional information for determination of eligibility of non-profit sponsor under Section 231. . . ." No additional information was ever received and, as you will see later, none is at all likely to be forthcoming.

On July 25 and 26, 1962 the Houston Post carried stories about the proposed Clarewood House project, with illustrations of the proposed building. In the July 26 issue the President of the Sharpstown Tower Corporation was quoted as saying, "Directors of the Corporation were chosen by the board of trustees of the First Methodist Church." I was informed by an important official of the Church organization that when the Sharpstown Corporation President was challenged on this statement by another prominent official of the Church, he alleged that he had been misquoted. At any rate, to clear this matter beyond doubt the following statement was prepared and executed by officials of the Church and was printed in the August 14, 1962 issue of the Church paper under the heading, "The Pastor's message." The statement was as follows: "Recently there has appeared in local newspapers stories that might give the inference that First Methodist Church, our Board of Stewards, or our Board of Trustees, were involved in some manner with an apartment or residence venture in this community. This is to advise our membership and the public generally that this Church, this Board of Stewards, and this Board of Trustees, have never had any connection whatsoever, directly or indirectly, with any such venture, or any other similar project. Any such affiliation or promotion is contrary to the stated policy of the Board of Stewards, the governing body of the First Methodist Church of Houston."

I am perfectly sure the Church organization will not under any circumstances support this project nor be identified with it in any way.

I will say here that General Underwriting Advisor McCallum had already furnished to Central Office almost all of the documentation to which I have referred. In my estimation he should be given full credit and commendation for his thoroughness in this matter. What he had already done so well saved me a great deal of time on this mission and enabled me to go quickly to the most authoritative local source for the confirmations I obtained.

THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

This is not by any means a simple matter. I believe I understand pretty well at least some of the perplexing elements which make a solution difficult for the Commissioner. Certainly, no solution can be provided by an Underwriter.

I believe you will agree with me that this project is wholly ineligible and worthless as a non-profit venture. I was informed by the director that it is intended to hold the initial closing of it in his office this week, perhaps by October 24th. In my opinion, the closing should be prevented and the outstanding commitment voided.

I also believe this should be made a needed lesson for the Multifamily Division which was willing to sanction this project as a non-profit venture merely upon the strength of the Pastor's letter of July 13, 1962, but without confirming action by the Church Board of Stewards and its Board of Trustees. I would like to ask what we have a right to expect from the staffs of insuring offices in matters such as this if they are to be treated so lightly by a Central Office Division? And, perhaps better still, where would the Underwriting staff of the Houston office be left if this Clarewood House deal is permitted to proceed in its present subterfuge as a non-profit project? The way would be clearly open to others like it.

This prompts me to say also that my review of this matter indicated inept participation in it by the Zone Multifamily Office.

I will not burden this report further with a discussion of my findings with respect to to director's personal handling of the land valuation in this Clarewood House case. However, I will be pleased to discuss it later if you wish. I will merely say about it that the director ordered the case processed with land at $2.00 per square foot after the insuring office valuation of $1.25 per square foot. I was told by the Assistant Chief Underwriter that a piece of land adjoining the one on which this project was proposed was very recently sold for less than one-half of the $2.00 per square foot price.

Just one or two more important things. I made 1½ days of field review in metropolitan Houston. I observed a very large volume of conventionally financed new apartment construction. I read with great interest the splendid report of our Market Analyst on "The Current Housing Market Situation, Houston, Texas Standard Metropolitan Area", August 1962. He advised caution in the face of the high vacancy ratios. He stated he believed an annual rate of 750 units of new apartments per year for the next two years would be "the most desirable volume." Our Houston director does not hold with this estimate, but is aggressively pushing for a great deal more apartment construction. He does not seem at all impressed by the fact that in the Houston area building permits have been issued for 16,418 dwelling units for the first 8 months of 1962; in the City of Houston permits have been issued during the first 9 months of 1962 for a total of 16,768 dwelling units (5,430 single family units and 11,338 multifamily units). As of July 31, 1962, the inventory of acquired properties in this jurisdiction was 1340 homes and 1338 apartment units (21 projects).

In closing, I consider the key underwriting personnel of the Houston office to be competent, devoted men. They are working under extreme and unwarranted pressure from the director.

The principal thing I regret is that it isn't possible for me to do more for the Underwriting Division of this office. Perhaps I had better say do something for them. Under the circumstances, and in view of the conditions which prevail there, I seriously doubt that anything constructive can be done for them. They are indeed carrying heavy packs on a long, uphill pull. The Commissioner's interests are, in my estimation, being wantonly disregarded.

CARL D. WHITNEY.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that director still in office?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He is still in office. He should be fired. He is nothing but a political hack. Why they do not fire him I do not know. The reports and his decisions show he is incompetent. Some Dallas newspapers recognized this fact when the man was appointed; they said that he was wholly incompetent for the job and should not be confirmed.

Why is he still in charge of this office? I say the man should have been removed long ago.

Why did not the officials in Washington pay more attention to this report?

Perhaps it was too embarrassing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Who appoints the Director? Who has the responsibility of keeping that Director in order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would assume the President or the Administrator here in Washington.

I point out that this devastating report was written before the money was disbursed on this particular project mentioned. The underwriters said it was not economically feasible.

The report of the man who was sent down to examine this office further confirmed their decision and recommended that Washington stop before the funds were disbursed.

They ignored this warning. Why?

I shall not delay the Senate by reading the remainder of the report. It is in the RECORD and will speak for itself. But this is the report of the disinterested man Washington selected.

But what did they do? They sealed the report, approved the project, and disbursed the money; and the taxpayers will be holding the bag.

I say again, passing these bills will not rectify the situation. There is no amendment I could offer to this bill that would stop bad management. If they do not have sense enough and gumption enough to remove an incompetent man they do not have gumption enough to administer the program anyway. I do not see why they continue such a course in the face of this record, but they continue to approve these projects.

We do not find it just in Houston. We find this pattern all over.

I have a report here on Arkansas, Mr. President, which outlines the same pattern of loose practices being followed in that State. At this time I wish to discuss a series of FHA multifamily projects in Arkansas and show the manner in which these projects were approved with inflated land and mortgage valuations over the recommendations of its own underwriters.

Summit House Apartments, Little Rock, Ark., Project No. 082-00012: On November 20, 1961, an application was filed, and on September 26, 1962, the FHA made a commitment to insure the mortgage in the amount of $3,100,800.

The sponsors of the project were: Paul Kapelow and Lester Gross, 136 South Derbigny Street, New Orleans, La.

No payments were made on the mortgage, and by January 13, 1966, the project was declared bankrupt with the Department of Justice starting foreclosure proceedings on March 28, 1966.

FHA records indicate an approved land valuation of $289,866, and the agency reported that its files do not reveal the cost to the sponsors.

A summary of this project as furnished by the FHA is as follows:

> SUMMIT HOUSE APARTMENTS, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., PROJECT NO. 082–00012
>
> 1. Date of Processing Approval: September 1961. Date of application: November 20, 1961. Date of commitment: September 26, 1962. Amount of mortgage: $3,100,800. Term of mortgage: 39 years. Rate of interest: 5¼%. Mortgage percentage: 87.9% of estimated value.
>
> 2. Payment Data: Mortgage was assigned to FHA on January 13, 1966. Mortgagor has made no remittances to FHA. Payment records have not been received from the mortgagee. (a) Foreclosure: This case was referred to the Department of Justice for foreclosure on March 28, 1966. (b) Resale: None.
>
> 3. Modification Agreements: None.
>
> 4. Approved Land Valuation: $289,866. Files do not reveal cost to sponsors.
>
> 5. Sponsors: Paul Kapelow and Lester Gross, 136 South Derbigny Street, New Orleans, Louisiana.
>
> 6. Sponsors' Obligation: Not applicable. Project is profit motivated.
>
> 7. Total construction costs allowed by FHA, including land: $3,484,590.

But this report, furnished by the Department, does not include all the information. The FHA files on this project show that there was a glaring overappraisal of the land. The actual cost of the land to the sponsors was less than half that allowed by the FHA.

These facts were reported to the FHA at the time and before the proceeds of the mortgage had been disbursed.

In 1963 there was a critical report sent to the home office not only concerning this Summit House project but also severely criticizing the operations of the Little Rock office. I quote from that underwriters' report:

> I am dubious of the competency of our processing of multi-family housing cases in the Little Rock jurisdiction. Cursory review of two large project dockets led me to believe that the office felt it was incumbent upon them to manipulate processing so that the Commitment Amount would coincide with the Amount Applied for. The similarity between amounts specified in the applications Form 2013 and Form 2264 Project Income Analysis & Appraisal of factors ordinarily adjusted by intelligent sponsors in "mortgaging out" is certainly no coincidence. I refer to (1) amount of application, (2) Land Values, (3) Legal & Organization Expense, (4) Builder's Fees, (5) Architectural Fees. Time did not permit a complete review and analysis of these projects but I think that the following two comparisons will suffice to establish my point.

I now quote from this same report the underwriters' comments on the land appraisal of the Summit House project:

> The "Write-Up" estimate of $300,000 for this land over a 9 months period since acquisition is in my opinion highly questionable. The office, in my opinion, is subject to criticism for its inept contribution to promoter's inordinate profit from sale of this land to the corporation, and, FHA.
>
> 1. Form 2013 "Application" was filed by Sponsor Herbert Storthz and the Prudential Insurance Co. as Mortgagee on Nov. 20, 1961 for $2,999,000, with an Available Market Price of Land (180,000 s.f.) of $300,000.00.
>
> a. Commitment was issued Sept. 26, 1962 for $3,100,800, or slightly in excess of the original application, which included $300,000 for Land.

The public records show that this land had belonged to an estate.

> Prior to its purchase by the sponsor, on September 6, 1961 two independent appraisals were made for the court on this same land.
>
> September 5, 1961: Weinstein-Baldwin & Block, Realtors, $125,000.
>
> September 26, 1961: Selz-Meeks & Thom, Realtors, $125,000.
>
> One month later on October 16, 1961, sale by Guardian Lloyd Locks on Estate of Stephen Breyel to Herbert Storthz for $135,000.
>
> Book 777 Page 53 shows SALE on October 16, 1961 by the Guardian Mr. Lloyd Locke of Stephen Breyel Estate to Mr. Herbert Storthz (sponsor of Summit House) for $135,000 (Stamps for $148,000 at 55¢ per $1,000).
>
> Book 814 Page 591 shows on November 5, 1962 a Sale from Herbert Storthz to Paul Kapilow and Lester Gross for $140,000 (Stamps indicating $154,000 at 55¢ per $1,000).
>
> The following listing is for the purpose of more graphically portraying dates as related to actions taken in this project:
>
> *September 6, 1961:* Appraisal by the Probate Court of Land by two independent appraisers at $125,000.
>
> *October 16, 1961:* Herbert Storthz purchased land for $135,000.
>
> *November 20, 1961:* Storthz filed Application Form 2013 under Sec. 207 for $2,999,000, listing land value as $300,000 (1 month 4 days after purchase)—Architectural Fees 6% or $157,800—Builder Fees 6½% or $169,893—Legal & Organization Expenses $25,000.
>
> *March 12, 1962:* Form 2401 FHA Appraisal of Land $300,000.

Thus, here we find that in addition to an overappraisal of the land by $165,000 the sponsors were allowed builder's fees of 6½ percent or $169,893, architect's fees of 6 percent or $157,800, and legal and organization expenses of $25,000, or a total allowance of $517,693.

When the land overappraisals and these other allowances are considered it means that the sponsors actually had none of their own capital invested. When the project went broke the sponsors had made their profits, and the Government was left holding the bag.

Next I refer to the second project mentioned in the underwriters' report: Village Square, Inc., Little Rock, Ark., Project No. 082–55001–NP.

The sponsor of this project was the Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark.

On this project the FHA lists the mortgage as $2,891,600; dated November 16, 1962; terms, 40 years, 5¼ percent through endorsement and 3⅛ percent thereafter. This was a 100 percent mortgage with total construction costs listed as the same amount as the mortgage, $2,891,600.

Again this report does not tell the full story. An FHA underwriter in 1963 wrote a highly critical report on this project.

In the first application the sponsors listed builder's fee as 6½ percent, $148,711; architect's fee, $100,000; legal fees, $23,000; organization expenses, $6,000; land, $145,000; financing expenses, $43,527.

After this application had been filed and the project plans, and so forth, "supposedly examined" by the Little Rock office, it amazingly came up with and approved substantially the same figures.

I quote from the underwriters' report concerning this unusual coincidence:

> The above recital of identity of figures as prepared by the sponsors, with FHA figures and estimates leave much doubt in my mind as to the competency of the Little Rock office in processing multi-family housing cases; there seems to have been blind acceptance of everything requested by sponsors. It seems to me that someone in Underwriting should have had curiosity enough to investigate and document findings concerning many of the underwriting facets of deal of this size.

The laxity of procedures in the Arkansas office in handling these two projects is summed up in the following quotes from reports in the FHA files:

> CONCLUSIONS RESULTING FROM A REVIEW OF THE SUMMIT HOUSE AND VILLAGE SQUARE PROJECTS
>
> 1. Office processing of these multi-family projects has been both inadequate and inept.
>
> 2. Office was mislead or perhaps deluded by the expert presentation and documentations of the promoters, whose only interest was the making of quick profits.
>
> a. The validity of "fees" claimed by sponsors and accepted by FHA in its processing is questionable.
>
> 3. Land appraisal was inept and permitted quick exploitation of FHA in allowance of inordinate profits.
>
> 4. The identical or close similarity between figures prepared by the sponsor in Application Form 2013, and FHA's subsequent processing figures suggests a lack of knowledge. Intelligent promoters such as those indicated in these two projects, without exception, present liberal or high estimates, anticipating downward negotiations.
>
> 5. FHA could be subjected to criticism by the processing employed in these two cases. Underwriting training is needed.
>
> 6. Excessive profits to the promoters indicated by the rapidity with which sales have been effected or attempted and the major withdrawals permitted in the First Advance at time of initial closing.

There is another Arkansas project that needs mentioning: Baptist Golden Age Home, Hot Springs, Ark., project No. 082–38001–NP.

The sponsor of this project was the Second Baptist Church, Hot Springs, Ark.

This project has every appearance of being a "bail out" for the owners of an old, dilapidated hotel. The loan was approved on the basis that it could be used to convert this old hotel into a model home for the elderly.

It has been an utter failure both financially and otherwise, and the latest report was that its main occupants now are transients who stop over during the racing season. It is not air conditioned, and generally the rooms and location are unfit for permanent residents.

The FHA insured a mortgage in the amount of $666,000, covering the original price plus conversion of the old hotel.

This mortgage was approved July 13, 1960; terms, 30 years at 5¼ percent. The mortgage went into default September 1, 1962, and in foreclosure sale on April 20, 1964, the FHA took possession with total amount due, $707,063.32.

As usual the sponsoring church is not obligated to underwrite the losses or the repayment of the mortgage.

Once again the FHA in issuing the above report forgot to present all the facts about this case as they were reported by its underwriters. I quote from the underwriters' comments on this project:

> It is recommended that Assistant Commissioner Lester Thompson's Audit Division be requested to thoroughly review and audit this project from its inception to date.
>
> Allegedly one sponsor profited on the brick work, another on furniture, another on supplying food at retail prices, etc.
>
> It is recommended that this project be referred to H&HFA Compliance Division for investigation of the propriety of negotiations between former Director and former Chief Underwriter and the promoter of this project.

I continue to read the underwriters' comments on this project:

> Cursorily, the 16 new hotel rooms in the 3-story annex are fairly satisfactory, but will need showers as they have only tub bath; should also be provided with TV's. Present rates during the 60-day racing season for the 16 rooms are $12 single, $16 double. The 73-year-old Park Hotel rooms are larger than the 16 newly added rooms, but to rent them, will have to have (1) new furniture, draperies and carpeting, (2) air-conditioning units to replace the obsolete old ceiling fans. Lobby will also have to be redecorated. Rates include weekly maid service, with daily maid service $5 per month additional.
>
> The past and recent motel-hotel construction of luxury and semi-luxury type accommodations precludes any possibility of the project competing on a commercial hotel basis, particularly so in view of the fact that the project now has no parking facilities. A capitalization approach to value, under existing structural conditions would require much study, and result in an estimated value ridiculously low, except to Southwest Hotels.
>
> We are literally "boxed in." The highest and best use of this property is for purposes presently considered illegal.

I quote excerpts from the underwriters' summary of this project:

> SUMMARY
>
> In reviewing the dockets pertaining to FHA's insurance of a mortgage for $666,000, under Section 231–NP "Housing for the Elderly" involving the rehabilitation of this obsolete old Park Hotel I was unable to reconcile many of the processing aspects leading to our purchase of this "old dog," and, its subsequent operations. A few of the questionable items include,
>
> 1. Why did FHA ever agree to buy this obsolete old third rate hotel?
>
> 2. Why did we ever agree to "bail out" the owners by paying $371,250 for this small parcel of land (14,175) s.f. (.33 acres) and allow them $30,051 as our appraised value plus $336,428 for the 30 year old improvements, and then to augment our stupidity by paying $3,750 for the Old Furniture in the hotel rooms.
>
> a. For several years prior to FHA's purchase the owners had been trying unsuccessfully to sell this old Park Hotel, which had a reputed outstanding loan balance of about $345,000.
>
> 3. As of March 1963 this project had 56 "permanent" guests and 25 "transient" guests, with only 8 vacant at this time, however, this is the "Racing Season" which runs 60 days a year and ends April 6th, with many vacancies expected after the close of the racing season.
>
> (a) The rates are at substantial variance, as in a typical hotel operation, at whatever the market will bear. Break-even point is said to be 66 tenants. For example, single rates range from $94 to $127.75 to $140 to $144.75 to $159.75 to $177.50 to $185 per month including meals, linens and furniture.
>
> (b) The project is still using Park Hotel stationery, upon which they have reproduced their Application For Reservation which states:
>
> Daily Rate, for single occupancy is $6.00 per day or $10 per day with two in a room—This includes three meals a day. Ceiling fan.
>
> During the Racing Season transient guests are charged whatever the traffic will bear, the 16 new rooms being listed at $12.00 single and $16.00 double.
>
> This of course in violation of the Regulatory Agreement. There is no age limit requirement.
>
> 4. Last August 1962, the Directors and Manager Delmah Cook informed our Office that the Second Baptist Church will not provide any financial assistance, and, the present preacher is not interested in the project.
>
> The Southern Baptist Convention have denied having anything to do with this project and will accept no responsibility.
>
> As a result this "so-called" church sponsorship is valueless and leaves doubt in my mind as to its being able to continue operation as a nonprofit organization with consequent relief from payment of ad valorem taxes, which, if assessed, places FHA in an even greater potential loss position than the probable $250,000 to $300,000 now predicted.
>
> 5. Physically, this is an obsolete old hotel located on a dead-end street, plus a 3 story addition containing 16 new but mediocre rooms. Upper floors of the old hotel are unbearably hot, as a result of a sheet metal fire escape on the exterior of the south side wall, with no ventilation; heat comes thru and around doors making the south end of the building unbearably hot and with no cooling other than ceiling fans.
>
> a. The building still has the character of an old third-rate hotel. FHA has been unable since commitment was issued (7–13–60) to induce the management to remove "The Park Hotel" signs which still hang in front of the building and a large sign on the roof of the building. Management says the tenants refuse to accept any name in any way suggesting "Housing for the Elderly," or, "Home."
>
> 6. Why we ever accepted this proposal with no parking facilities is beyond my comprehension, but, we did, which forced the management to go down the street about 200' and rent a vacant lot for $100 a month, for parking space for 18 cars, which they rent for $5.00 each per month.
>
> Competent architectural processing would have resulted in rejection of this proposal at its inception. Architectual requirements totally inadequate.
>
> Credit.
>
> On 2–19–60 the Baptist Golden Age Home showed "Net Worth" of $30,000, but, they only had $1,050 in money, plus $28,950.00 in pledges.

A summary of the last two projects as furnished by the FHA are as follows:

VILLAGE SQUARE, INC. LITTLE ROCK, ARK., PROJECT No. 082–55001–NP

1. Date of processing approval: December 20, 1961. Date of application: January 22, 1962. Date of commitment: November 16, 1962. Amount of mortgage: $2,891,600. Term of mortgage: 40 years. Rate of interest: 5¼% through final endorsement, 3⅛% thereafter. Mortgage percentage: 100% of estimated replacement cost.

2. Payment data: Payments of interest began on May 4, 1964 and of principal on March 1, 1965. The account became delinquent for February 1966 installment. (a) Foreclosure: None. (b) Resale: None.

3. Modification agreements: None. However, there is a request for a modification agreement to defer principal payments now being considered.

4. Approved land valuation: $137,403. The land was purchased from the Housing Authority of the City of Little Rock for $137,403.

5. Sponsor: Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Arkansas.

6. Sponsor's obligation: The sponsor is not obligated to underwrite losses sustained and repayment of the mortgage.

7. Total construction costs allowed by FHA, including land: $2,891,668.66.

BAPTIST GOLDEN AGE HOME, HOT SPRINGS, ARK., PROJECT No. 082–38001–NP

1. Date of feasibility recommendation: January 5, 1960. Date of application: February 19, 1960. Date of commitment: July 13, 1960. Amount of mortgage: $666,000. Term of mortgage: 30 years. Rate of interest: 5¼%. Mortgage percentage: 92.6% of estimated rehabilitation cost plus "as is" value of property.

2. Payment data: Payments of principal and interest were made from February 1, 1962, through August 1, 1962. The mortgage went into default for failure to make the September 1, 1962, mortgage payment. The mortgage was assigned to FHA on February 12, 1963. After assignment, FHA received on March 23, 1963, a payment of $9,380.94 for interest. (a) Foreclosure: Sale on April 20, 1964; total amount due FHA $707,063.32 (b) Resale: None.

3. Modification agreements: Date of first principal payment was deferred from October 1, 1961 to February 1, 1962, because of delay in completion of construction.

4. Approved land valuation: $366,479, including land and improvements before rehabilitation. The sponsors paid $371,250 for the land and improvements prior to rehabilitation. FHA records reveal no identity of interest with the seller of the property.

5. Sponsor: Second Baptist Church, Hot Springs, Arkansas.

6. Sponsor's obligation: The sponsor is not obligated to underwrite losses sustained and repayment of the mortgage.

7. Total construction costs allowed by FHA, including land: $705,075.27.

Many of these projects were reported not to be economically feasible, and they should not have been approved. Notwithstanding that, because of political pressure—which is the only way I can account for it—they approve these projects in the face of warnings that they will be bankrupt before they are finished and the record shows many of them are now bankrupt.

We have here another project in Arkansas involving inflation of land values, which is fully documented in the report.

The court records were available if they had wanted to check them. On September 5, 1961, the court record shows that the land was appraised at $125,000. On October 16, 1961, Herbert Storthz purchased the land for $135,000, and on November 20, 1961, he and his fellow sponsors filed an application for an FHA loan claiming a valuation for the land of $300,000. The agency approved not only this increased valuation of the land but also a 6½-percent builder's fee, which came to $169,893; architect's fees of $157,800; legal and organizational expenses of $25,000, accepting a total markup of $517,693 on this particular project.

It might interest Senators to know that the FHA is operating a nursing home right now in Dallas, Tex.—the Cliff Towers Nursing Home. This nursing home again was built in the face of a recommendation that it was not economically feasible, at a cost of $1,911,600. The final endorsement date of the mortgage being August 19, 1964. There have been a few mortgage payments. I have the report here showing payments and also our disbursements. I ask unanimous consent that the entire report furnished by the FHA on this project, under date of June 8, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point followed by a report furnished by Mr. Brownstein under date of April 15, 1966, outlining the details of a defaulted project in Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am replying further to your inquiry of May 13, 1966, concerning the Cliff Towers Nursing Home in Dallas, Texas.

The information which you requested is attached.

Sincerely yours,
P. N. BROWNSTEIN,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

CLIFF TOWERS NURSING HOME, DALLAS, TEX., PROJECT NO. 112-43002-EC

1. Date of first contact between FHA and sponsor: September 21, 1961.

Application date: May 11, 1962.

Commitment date: September 11, 1962, reissued October 11, 1962.

Initial indorsement date: January 3, 1963.

Final endorsement date: August 19, 1964.

Mortgage amount: $1,911,600.

Status of mortgage: The mortgage went into default because the mortgagor failed to make the September 1, 1964, mortgage payment. The mortgagee assigned the mortgage to FHA on August 3, 1965. The mortgagor made no payments after assignment of the mortgage to FHA. A request to foreclose was sent to the Department of Justice and FHA acquired title to the project on January 27, 1966.

Sponsors: L. B. Holaday, John B. Mills, Cecil Mills, and C. A. Mohrle, all of 1520 Mercantile Securities Building, Dallas 1, Texas.

2. Mortgage interest payments:

Feb. 5, 1963	$2,984.04
Mar. 4, 1963	3,100.62
Mar. 29, 1963	3,157.82
May 3, 1963	3,334.42
June 6, 1963	3,572.30
July 8, 1963	3,681.99
Aug. 2, 1963	4,080.52
Sept. 11, 1963	4,344.28
Oct. 2, 1963	5,090.44
Nov. 7, 1963	5,713.11
Dec. 5, 1963	6,040.58
Jan. 3, 1964	6,477.68
Feb. 7. 1964	6,771.89
Mar. 6, 1964	7,116.95
Apr. 6, 1964	7,479.01
May 6, 1964	7,735.96
June 15, 1964	7,775.25
July 8, 1964	7,775.25
Aug. 5, 1964	7,775.25

Mortgage prinicpal payments:

Date	*Amount*
Sept. 28, 1964	$4,517.96

3. Management and advances: Since acquisition of title by FHA, The Wendemere Foundation of Texas, Inc., of which Mr. Jack Edward Counts is president, has managed the project. The advances made by FHA between the date of assignment and the date of acquisition are as follows:

	Amount
1965 State and County Real Estate, Taxes, Oct. 19, 1965	$4,560.69
First half of 1965 City and School Taxes, Nov. 10, 1965	8,880.35
Total	13,441.04

Since acquisition of title and up to and including May 11, 1966, FHA has advanced $63,707.41, to meet operational expenses of the project.

4. As a condition of FHA's mortgage insurance commitment, the mortgagor was required to assure the availability of a $150,000 operating fund to meet project operating expenses for a period of six months, the estimated time that it would take to establish a profitable operation. In accordance with this requirement, the sponsors executed an Agreement on Indemnity on August 19, 1964. In conjunction with the assignment of the mortgage to FHA, the mortgagee certified that the sponsors had advanced the total sum of $198,023.45, pursuant to said Agreement.

5. The mortgage covering Cliff Towers Nursing Home was insured under the rehabilitation provisions of Section 232. FHA's estimate of the fair market value of the land and existing structure prior to rehabilitation was $700,000. FHA allowed construction costs in the amount of $1,473,845. The total cost allowed by FHA, including land and existing structures, was $2,173,845. The insured mortgage in the amount of $1,911,600 represented 87.9% of the total cost allowed by FHA.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Attached is a report on the status of Hollywood Towne House, which information you requested in your letter of March 25, 1966.

You will recall the modification of the request in the last paragraph of your letter.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

Attachment.

RE: HOLLYWOOD TOWNE HOUSE, PORTLAND, OREG., PROJECT NO. 126-00037

Sponsors: Oreland, Inc., Allen Land & Investment Company, John A. Prag, Jack C. Nunn, George B. Malarkey, J. R. Nunn, Thomas E. Spencer.

(Portland office reports these sponsors interested in no other FHA projects.)

Date of First Discussion: July 1960. Date of Feasibility Letter: September 14, 1960. Date of Commitment: October 2, 1961 (Reissued March 19, 1962). Date of Mortgage: April 12, 1962. Amount of Mortgage: $2,444,800. Payment data: Mortgage assigned to Secretary March 11, 1966. No payments since that date. Former mortgagee has not yet submitted complete fiscal data. Preliminary information indicates that last payment was of 11-1-65 installment and that the principal balance is $2,432,151.79.

Because of construction delays which deferred rental operations until January 1964, the mortgage was modified to defer commencement of amortization from October 1, 1963 to April 1, 1964. Meager occupancy dictated two other modifications, the effect of which was to reduce the monthly payments to an amount calculated to cover interest and accruals for the period August 1, 1964 through January 31, 1966. Present occupancy is about 80%. Under the modification agreements, the mortgagor was required to submit monthly accountings to the mortgagee and to FHA, and to remit to the mortgagee all net income.

In December 1965 FHA received the mortgagor's monthly accounting for November 1965, which disclosed disbursements contrary to the mortgagor's Regulatory Agreement with FHA, and shortly thereafter learned that the sponsors had sold the stock in the mortgagor corporation to G R R Development Inc., a California corporation. Inquiry of the mortgagor concerning these disbursements resulted in a meeting, on January 10, 1966, of FHA's Portland director with representatives of the mortgagor, at which meeting those representatives assured the director that the corporation would be reimbursed for the improper disbursements.

Later in January the mortgagee reported a default for failure to make the payment due on December 1, 1965. Also in January 1966, FHA received the mortgagor's monthly accounting for December 1965, which accounting reflected rental collections of $43,160.53 of which $25,267 represented advance rentals. In February 1966 the mortgagee notified FHA of its intention to assign the mortgage and, on March 11, 1966, did so. The mortgagee reports that, during the period between the date of default and the date of the mortgagee's election to assign, representatives of the mortgagor corporation (which were those of G R R Development Inc.) were assuring the mortgagee that appropriate payments would shortly be forthcoming.

At FHA's request, the Department of Justice, on March 16, 1966, instituted a foreclosure action, which includes a prayer for a deficiency judgment. On the same date the court appointed a receiver, who took possession of the property on March 17 and who will operate the property during the pendency of the litigation. The Department of Justice is conducting an investigation to determine what criminal or civil liability resulted from the actions of G R R Development Inc. and its representatives. Upon completion of the investigation, recovery will be sought of any funds improperly diverted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This shows that since the mortgage on the nursing home defaulted the FHA is operating the project. The U.S. Government is paying the taxes and meeting the payroll in order to keep it in operation. About every 30 days, sometimes oftener, it is necessary to wire more money to keep the project in operation until such time as someone can be found to take it off the Government's hands.

That is only one of the many projects that have failed. Many of these projects should not have been approved in the first place since it was obvious they were unsound. But they were approved by an agency which seems to have only one thought in mind: "Here is a huge sum of taxpayers' money. We have our hands on it. Let us get rid of it by approving any project."

What is needed is more responsibility on the part of the sponsors of the projects. No project should be approved unless actual financial responsibility on the part of the sponsors can be shown. The builders of these projects, such as McCloskey—and there are many others—should be required to place their personal endorsements on the mortgages the same as an individual does if he finances a home for his family with an FHA mortgage.

In addition, the FHA should have a master file or a blacklist of the names of all individuals who have ever dealt with the FHA and have defaulted on loans. Then, with the use of computers, when an application is received from anywhere in the United States the names could be checked through a central clearing office. The names of the sponsors could be screened quickly, and a complete record could be had so that a bad credit risk could no longer have his projects approved. As it is the individuals merely move from State to State and continue to operate under other corporate names.

Such a master file of bad credit risks should be available and interchangeable with all lending agencies of the U.S. Government because in some instances after these operators have exhausted their credit at one agency, they move on to other agencies and start borrowing. It is the nearest thing to perpetual motion that I have ever come in contact with.

The chairman of the subcommittee mentioned the ratio of losses to loans made. The percentages are sometimes misleading. These losses run into millions. In the first 9 months of the past fiscal year—1966—the losses sustained through the sale of repossessed homes and multifamily projects were over $125 million, and we still have over $1 billion tied up in bankrupt projects.

The losses sustained on multifamily projects—and that is the type of construction I am speaking of here today—has run at an average loss of over 45 percent during the last 9 months. In many instances mortgages on large projects are in default before construction is completed.

Another correction in FHA policy needs to be made quickly. If one goes to a bank to finance a mortgage privately, upon conventional terms, the banker insists that the borrower show proof of having paid the suppliers and subcontractors for the materials and services rendered.

They will not merely give a person a $15,000 check that he can stick in his pocket, because they would end up with a mortgage on property with a lot of builders' liens outstanding.

The FHA has no procedure for the protection of the suppliers and subcontractors. They very properly record their mortgages. They then proceed to disburse the mortgage money to the sponsors who can pay the promoters and subcontractors if they wish. However, if they do not pay, all the subcontractors can do is file a second mortgage. They are washed out when the project fails.

I examined one such case in the Orlando, Fla., area in which a promoter had skipped out with over $7 million owing to suppliers and subcontractors. He had gotten all of his money from the FHA, and the last guess as to the residence of that irresponsible builder was Switzerland. The Government is taking back the projects. They approved this man who already had a bad reputation as a good credit risk. I cite another case in the Orlando area which I viewed firsthand. It was a project located outside of the city limits of Orlando. This particular promoter moved out and bought at low prices a tract of marginal land. By marginal land in that area they mean land that is described in the community as being too low to warrant the construction of homes. The land had been rejected by the county zoning commissioners, who considered it ineligible for the construction of homes.

The FHA, after this promoter bought the land, promptly approved this area for homes. A sample home was built, and they agreed to insure his mortgages for about 100 homes as fast as they were built.

That man, with the FHA approval, then secured a zoning by the county commissioners. He then proceeded to build the homes. Everything was going along fine. A tropical storm developed. The rains came and flooded the entire area to a depth of about 4 or 5 feet in the homes.

Everybody fled the area, and when they came back many of the buyers, having paid their downpayments on the residences, tried to clean things up.

We can imagine what that meant. We can imagine what a job they had to clean it up. These homeowners tried to get some assistance from the sponsor, but they did not get much assistance from him.

The FHA took the position that it was a buyer-beware situation and that they were not responsible. However, the FHA did help clean up the property of those people who did not default.

The builder continued to build homes in the same area and sell them with FHA-guaranteed mortgages. However, the FHA said that in order to safeguard against a recurrence of such an incident it would be necessary that the promoter of the project protect the property.

Accordingly, the man dug a canal on the low side of the project and piled dirt on one bank next to the development. All that he did was to build an earthen dike around the low end of the project.

The FHA approved that project with the earthen dike in place. Another 50 or 100 homes were built and sold.

The project was moving along fine at that time. Practically all the reclaimed homes had been cleaned up. They were going to have a big celebration to show how a community could pull itself up by the bootstraps. They were to have the big celebration on the following day. And there was to be an outside barbecue. All supplies were purchased and everything was arranged. It then started to rain again. It was another tropical storm. The celebration was canceled.

About 3 days later the alarm was sounded. The dike broke, and everybody went to higher ground. After this, only a few people have moved back. That project is practically developing into a slum area today. Many of the people did not move back at all. Some had no choice. All they had was invested in these homes.

The FHA has most of that project on its hands today. Those people who cannot get out are living there in and area with about every third house vacant. However, did the FHA care?

The FHA was not concerned at all. They approved that same builder for another subdivision on another marginal piece of land about 10 miles distant.

That second project was not canceled until the people of the first community organized. They went over, and only with almost a threat of tearing the project down piece by piece if it was continued, was the project abandoned.

Why was this builder approved the second and third time?

We need some responsible management in this agency. We do not have it today, and until we get it we will have a situation that permits irresponsible promoters to keep moving in.

As long as we have gullible, incompetent, or inept officials—I do not know what one wants to call them—administering the program, the rat race will continue.

It is time that this committee which is responsible for this legislation paid more attention to what is happening in this agency. The answer is not merely to pour out more and more money. We have reached the stage where money will not cure the situation. It only aggravates it.

I will not delay the Senate much longer. I do want to refer to some letters that I have received from individual homeowners describing how their interests are not being protected.

I have received these letters from home buyers in many States. One group of home buyers in my own State placed their downpayments with a builder. They then made their advances for refrigerators and additions that they wanted made to their homes. They paid the builder for these items, but the FHA does not require that this money for extras be placed in escrow.

The result is that the builder is now in financial trouble, and nothing under the FHA rules will prevent the builder from commingling these advance payments with his own funds and using them for his own benefit.

That practice must stop. We are not protecting the interest of the home buyers as long as this practice continues.

That builder should be permanently barred from participating in any FHA financing program until he reimburses every advance payment collected.

The existing situation demands that these procedures be changed in this administration.

I cited the other day the example of a Texas soldier serving in Vietnam who, after paying $3,400 downpayment on his home, had the FHA foreclose on his mortgage. He had defaulted in three monthly payments.

So far they have refused to let this soldier, who is now in Vietnam, or his wife make up the backpayments so that she can keep this home upon which they have already paid $3,400. The mortgage holder wanted to foreclose and collect because through the point system a greater profit on this mortgage can be obtained.

This has got to be corrected, or the whole program will be discredited.

That is an indefensible situation. In all fairness, I should say that the local officials in the FHA office recommended that this wife be given the right to make these backpayments. But some high official has said:

> No. Foreclose. We will rent it back to her, and when her husband comes back from Vietnam, if he wants to buy it we will discuss it with him.

If they would just give to the legitimate home buyer of a single-family unit a small fraction of the concern that the same agency sees fit to display for these unscrupulous builders we would have a much better housing program. I am afraid that this will not happen until we have a wholesale housecleaning in the FHA. If we do not take some action soon we will have a scandal on our hands which will make the windfall scandals of 1954 look like a Sunday school picnic.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware is certainly one of the outstanding Members of this body, and he always contributes a great deal to us. He is a man of courage and great probity, a man of solid intellect, and a man who has to be listened to and will be listened to. I am sure the speech that he made today will have an effect on the FHA as well as on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I should like to make a few remarks with regard to the whole FHA program, to put it in perspective, and then point out what has been done.

It is not true that nothing has been done. The FHA has acted, and I shall try to establish a record of how it has acted. And the record was made before the Committee on Banking and Currency when this legislation was before us. It is printed in the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record that portion of the hearings beginning on page 52 about one-third of the way down, where Senator Sparkman says, "In addition, I asked that you be prepared today to answer any questions that the subcommittee might want to raise on these points"—this is where reference is made to the Reader's Digest article and accusations of the kind that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has made today—over to page 70, about two-thirds of the way down.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Senator Sparkman. In addition, I asked that you be prepared today to answer any questions that the subcommittee might want to raise on these points.
>
> Frankly, I was shocked by the tone of the Reader's Digest article. I recall our having covered most of the issues raised in the article 2 years ago, when this subcommittee made a study and held hearings on the subject of FHA foreclosures. From information received from the staff on recent GAO reports, I had assumed that the loopholes noted earlier in your laws and regulations had been filled.
>
> I believe what may have happened is that GAO was requested to investigate the cases brought up by our subcommittee 2 years ago and that it took them 2 years to complete the investigations and make the reports. The Digest article in the April issue is repetitious, for the most part, of the allegations made in 1963 before our foreclosure hearings, which were dealt with in the report this committee made at that time.
>
> One FHA weakness reported to be a continuing one is the failure of a reliable market analysis as a prerequisite for project approval, but the Reader's Digest article made very little reference to this as a cause for FHA defaults.
>
> The six basic causes for FHA failures referred to in the Digest article involved:
>
> First: Lack of financial responsibility of nonprofit sponsors.
>
> Second: Excessive FHA land valuations.
>
> Third: Milking of defaulting project.
>
> Fourth: Mortgaging out through loopholes in cost certification requirements.
>
> Fifth: Cancellation of promised tax exemptions.
>
> Sixth: Political pressure.
>
> I want to ask you specific questions on each of these, but before I do, I wish you would give us a brief summary of the FHA foreclosure and default situation on what some of your problems are and what you are doing about them.
>
> It would be good if you could give us a little philosophy of the FHA insurance program and what it is intended to do, the risk involved, your experience to date and the soundness of your insurance reserves to take care of future contingencies. It would be appropriate for you to make comment at this time, but if you prefer, you can submit the overall answers to these for the record, because I do want you to be thorough and complete.
>
> Mr. Brownstein. I would like to discuss the points that you have mentioned, Mr. Chairman, and they are the ones that are dealt with principally in the article.
>
> Your review of that is entirely accurate. These do, for the best part, go back a good many years, and they were dealt with at considerable length in the hearings before this subcommittee in 1964. They deal in large measure with the one problem which the chairman suggests, which is marketability. This is one of the most difficult problems facing us today; trying to determine what the market will be several years hence is not an easy undertaking.
>
> We are looking today at projects that will come onto the market some 3, 4, or 5 years from now. Local conditions may very well change. The economic conditions in the area may differ considerably from what they are at the present time.
>
> We have improved our market analysis staff. We have also added a good many other factors which we believe are important in dealing with this subject.
>
> I think we must recognize that the FHA is an insurance company and that we do take risks. This is inherent in the FHA operation. Certainly, we do not want to take undue risks. Certainly, we would be happier if we had no fatalities. But I know of no insurance company that has no losses, and FHA is typical of other insurance-type operations.
>
> It is quite easy to judge an operation of this kind totally on the basis of its failures, but I think we ought to look at FHA also from the standpoint of its successes.
>
> It has assisted some 8 million people in the acquisition of houses. It is largely due to FHA's efforts that the United States is now about 63 percent homeowners; that the average American, if he so chooses, can have the benefits of home ownership. The terms on FHA insured mortgages have been liberalized over the years and now, as you know, in the lower price ranges up to $15,000 a person can buy a house and obtain an FHA insured mortgage with a 3 percent downpayment.
>
> With relative stability in real estate values and with these liberal terms, I think that we are going to continue having losses and foreclosures at about the same level. They are now at a little over 1 percent per year of the average number of outstanding mortgages.
>
> I do not see where that is going to improve very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, if we are going to continue having relative stability on real estate values.
>
> I also believe that this is the price we pay to bring home ownership to the average citizen, and I think that the price is a worthwhile one and one that we would want to continue paying.
>
> A second point which was made in the article dealt with nonprofit sponsors, and this is a very difficult problem. What we look for in nonprofit sponsors are continuity, motivation, knowledge, and interest.
>
> One of the problems that faces us is that when we insure a mortgage, we are going to have to abide by that decision for 40 years, because this is the term of the mortgage on these projects. I think that Internal Revenue takes a new look at the nonprofit status of various organizations annually to see that their status continues. You may have some very properly and well-motivated nonprofit sponsors who are led by a particular group who then leave, for one reason or another. They may leave this earth. And with them goes the motivation and the interest in this particular project.
>
> These are not the kind of things that you can foresee with great precision when you are looking at a project that is going to be mortgaged for a period of 40 years. The nonprofit sponsor also operates through the creation of a mortgagor corporation which is created specifically, in most instances, to cover the sponsorship of the particular project. Congress provided 100 percent mortgage assistance for nonprofit sponsors in some of these special purpose programs. It was believed that this is what it would take in order to make these programs available to supply the kind of housing that was aimed at, and this has been done, but the sponsorship may not have a tremendous amount in assets. They are not putting any great amounts of moneys into these because they do not have the money to do it.
>
> What they have is the interest, the desire, the motivation, the continuity. If all of these things occur, then we are willing to go along with that kind of sponsorship and let them take the benefits of 100 percent financing. This was the program that was created by the Congress to achieve this objective and this is how we are trying to administer it.
>
> Now, where we believe that a project has to be subsidized in order to be successful, there we look into the assets of the nonprofit sponsorship and we obtain from that

sponsorship a guarantee which gives us the kind of assurance we believe is necessary to subsidize the project.

The third point dealt principally with land values, and this is another thing that has given us a good deal of concern.

The article seems to equate land values and land costs, and this also fails to take into account the good many things that have to happen before a piece of raw land becomes eligible for a multifamily site. In some of the illustrations, this was what happened, as I have outlined in the point by point analysis.

Senator Sparkman. I wonder if you would just mention what some of those things are, Mr. Brownstein.

Mr. Brownstein. Yes, sir; I intend to, Mr. Chairman.

First, the land may have to be rezoned, and it may be rather expensive to do this.

Secondly, the question of how long this land has been held is quite a factor. If it has been held for a number of years, I think that all of us are quite aware of what has happened to land prices and land values in many residential areas.

Third, what it takes to prepare this land for residential construction can be very costly, and one of the illustrations cited there involved a very serious drainage problem that cost a good many thousands of dollars to correct before that land was increased in value.

But, on the other hand, we may find that the cost of the land really does not reflect the value in the other direction, and I have seen cases where we have refused to allow the entire cost of the land in our evaluation. Cost and value are not always parallel.

Nevertheless, this was troubling us and in January of 1964 we put out instructions to our offices in which we said that in every multifamily project they would determine the cost of the land in the last arm's-length transaction, and if the value to be included in the mortgage exceeded the cost—and, as I have outlined, for many good reasons this could happen—then there will be full documentation showing the justification for the increase in value.

With the committee's permission, I will introduce into the record a copy of those instructions.

Senator Sparkman. Without objection, that will be done.

(FHA's instructions on multifamily land valuations follow.)

"FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"UNDERWRITING LETTER NO. 1955—CONTROL NO. F. 789

"January 9, 1964.

"To: Directors of all field offices.

"Subject: Multifamily land valuations.

"Field review of insured projects finds a most serious inadequacy or complete lack of documented support of the land valuations used in processing. Land valuations used in arriving at the total replacement cost of the property must be fully supported by complete and detailed evidence in the docket.

"In addition to the usual procedures and technique used to estimate available market price of site in fee simple the following steps are mandatory and are effective upon receipt of this letter:

"(1) Adequate supporting data for the available market price estimate must be in the file.

"(2) Price paid for the site by the sponsor must be ascertained. To do this the appraiser must examine the history of recent transfers of the subject site as well as the history of recent transfers of comparable sites. The purpose is to uncover all relevant data for use in arriving at a final conclusion of estimated market price of site and fair market value of land in fee simple and 'as is' for cost certification purposes.

"(3) Form 2401 LV must be completed in all multifamily cases.

"In making these determinations the valuator will recognize all of the factors involved which might tend to affect price such as rezoning, assemblage factors, changes in use of surrounding lands, firm trends of economic uses in the area which may increase or decrease the value since acquisition.

"The valuator will support his findings for permanent record in the docket. Where he finds that the land valuation ascribed in processing is at a higher figure than that paid by the sponsor, or in the latest arm's-length transaction, he will, under all circumstances, fully explain and document his reasons for the higher valuations."

Mr. Brownstein. I would like to supplement what I have said to you, Mr. Chairman, with more specific.

As far as FHA reserves are concerned, we still have $1,100 million in our reserves, and this is after we have paid all our losses and administrative expenses, and we continue to add to that reserve annually. I do not believe that any of our insured mortgages need be concerned about the safety of their investment.

Senator Sparkman. Let me be sure I have that figure correctly. $1,100 million in reserves.

Mr. Brownstein. Yes, sir.

Senator Sparkman. That represents what has been accumulated over the years since FHA has been operating, is that right?

Mr. Brownstein. Yes.

Senator Sparkman. That really represents a net earning after paying all expenses during the years.

Mr. Brownstein. Including the amount that was advanced to FHA initially by the Treasury.

Senator Sparkman. All right, go ahead. You feel that is an adequate reserve?

Mr. Brownstein. Yes. Not only I, but all of our actuaries and the actuaries from outside the agency believe this.

Senator Sparkman. Let me ask you this: Has it been steadily increasing throughout the years? Have you ever had a year when there was a deficit in operation?

Mr. Brownstein. There was an adjustment made last year based on the valuation of the properties that we had on hand. This resulted in a reduction. That was the first time in my memory.

Senator Sparkman. All right. Is there anything else you want to add?

Mr. Brownstein. I will give you more detail in the record, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier.

Senator Sparkman. I have a series of questions here that I would ask if we had sufficient time for it, but what I would like to do would be to give them to you and let you answer them specifically in connection with your extension of your remarks.

Mr. Brownstein. I will be happy to, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Sparkman. Senator Bennett, do you have any questions?

Senator Bennett. Since I will submit questions, too, I will hold them.

Senator Sparkman. Senator Williams?

Senator Williams. Just one: This Reader's Digest magazine analysis, is that yours?

Mr. Brownstein. Yes.

Senator Sparkman. What you have was supplied to the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Brownstein. We have made a point-by-point analysis.

Senator Sparkman. It is his point-by-point analysis of it.

Senator Williams. And your observations come under the title "Comment."

Mr. Brownstein. Yes, sir.

Mr. Weaver. Might I say two things I think the record should show?

Senator Sparkman. Yes.

Mr. Weaver. The first is that this whole area of getting into nonprofit groups, particularly first in senior citizen housing and more recently in housing for moderate incomes, and now with rent supplement housing for low income families is a fairly new area. Certainly for FHA and it is a pretty new area in this country in general. This has troubled us from the very beginning. We have watched it and in 1963, as a result of some of the problems to which the article of the Reader's Digest refers, and which were before this committee 2 years ago, because these are practically the same cases rehashed again, I appointed Mr. Baughman, who is the President of FNMA, and Mr. Semer, who was then the General Counsel of HHFA, to make a detailed study of this subject, and out of this came a report made to me which had certain administrative recommendations for change. When Mr. Brownstein came in, these were transmitted to him, and administrative changes were made.

In addition, in 1964 Mr. Brownstein issued a whole new set of regulations relating to the nonprofit sponsors and has constantly augmented these changes in his regulations.

The point I am trying to make is that we have not been sitting by, waiting for these things to develop, but we have, on our own initiative, taken steps to make reforms, and we are continuing to do so in a very, very unprecedented and untrod area of activity.

Senator Sparkman. Thank you. May I say that we try to keep up with those matters, and one thing that is a little discouraging is to see a lot of this stuff raked over 2 years after it had been freely reported by this subcommittee.

I may say that the staff of this subcommittee has standing instructions to stay right on top of all of these programs as far as we can, and when any part of our housing program, the overall housing program, goes sour or shows indications of doing so, we want to know about it and we want to get in and see what is the trouble, and if action is required in the way of legislation, we will move to bring it and get it, and we are eager to cooperate with your agency, your Department, and to do everything that we can to see that things are running right.

We want to see a good program, we want to see one that is economically sound, and my own feeling has been that the general housing program has been a tremendous success in this country in furnishing homes for American families and doing it without net loss to the Federal Government. I think it is a great tribute to all of those connected with housing that we have been able to do that, and of course, Mr. Brownstein, whatever you can do to clear this up and to let us have accurate, correct, dependable information, we shall appreciate it.

I will give you this list of questions that I ask you to answer specifically.

I shall request that you submit for the record other up-to-date regulations referring to this matter.

(The material follows:)

"Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration,

"Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

"Hon. John Sparkman,
"Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing,
"Committee on Banking and Currency,
"U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Chairman: As requested in the hearings of the Housing Subcommittee on April 19, 1966, I am submitting statements for inclusion in the record on each of the six points referred to as the basis for FHA failures in the April Reader's Digest article. These points are covered in the enclosed exhibits 1–6. I am also enclosing exhibits 7–15 in answer to your questions on our analysis of the Reader's Digest article.

"Much of the criticism of FHA operations is made without due consideration for the fact that we are engaged in the business of taking insurance risks. It is impossible to foresee all hazards and possible failures in any underwriting process, and the payment of claims is a normal part of insurance operations. These claims are paid by the FHA out of insurance reserves which have been accumulated from fees and premium income and from the resale of acquired properties. Our programs have been self-sustaining and the payment of all losses as well as expenses of administration have been absorbed without the use of appropriated funds.

"The FHA default and foreclosure situation was thoroughly discussed and analyzed during the hearings before your subcommittee on January 27 and 28, 1964. At that time our percentage of foreclosures was about one percent of the total number of the mortgages insured. Our present foreclosure rate is substantially the same as that in 1964. These foreclosures continue to be concentrated, as in 1964, in areas that have experienced economic setbacks. However, the overall foreclosure rate is within the range developed by FHA actuarial calculations for a period of normal business activity. Our reserves of $1,100,000,000 are adequate to meet future contingencies.

"I appreciate this opportunity to clarify the record and to explain how in recent years we have steadily strengthened procedures in our programs, some of which are still relatively new.

"Sincerely yours,

"P. N. BROWNSTEIN,

"Assistant Secretary-Commissioner."

"EXHIBIT 1

"NONPROFIT SPONSORS AND MORTGAGORS

"A. Requirements for approval

"1. The FHA publishes a form of corporate charter for the use of nonprofit mortgagors and its use is mandatory. The form may be modified only by technical changes required by state law. The guide form of charter has been examined and cleared by officials of the Internal Revenue Service who are concerned with tax exemption of nonprofit organizations.

"In January 1965, the guide form of charter was amended to require that the membership and directors of the mortgagor corporation must be persons who have the approval of the directors of the nonprofit sponsoring organization. This change assures continuity of interest and responsibility by the sponsoring organization. It eliminates possible friction between the mortgagor and sponsor by permitting the poration those persons who are no longer working in the interests of the nonprofit project.

"2. On July 7, 1961, after the enactment of section 221(d)(3), the below market interest rate program, the FHA regulations were amended to define nonprofit mortgagors as those which the Commissioner finds are in no manner controlled by or under the direction of persons or firms seeking to derive profit or gain from the operation of the project.

"3. On August 10, 1962, the FHA established a new procedure under which the sponsors of nonprofit organizations are examined in greater depth. The objective of the examining procedure is to make certain that, on the basis of the evidence presented, there will be no relationship which will subject the mortgagor to control by any person or firm seeking profit or gain. These procedures require a careful review and approval of the submitted data by field office directors and multifamily regional offices. With certain specified exceptions, Washington office review was also required.

"4. Beginning in August 1963, sponors of subsidized nonprofit elderly housing projects were required to execute Form 3436, Guaranty Agreement. Under this procedure, if the FHA finds that the anticipated income of a nonprofit elderly housing project will not support a mortgage based on 100 percent FHA's estimate of replacement cost, then one or the other of two courses of action must be followed. Either the mortgage must be reduced to an amount which the project income will support, or a Guaranty Agreement must be obtained from the sponsor.

"Under the Guaranty Agreement, the sponsor is legally bound in the case of default to make a subsidy differential payment to prepay the mortgage to an amount which the FHA has predetermined can be supported by project income. The Guaranty Agreement is executed by the sponsor with the mortgagee and is assignable to the FHA. The FHA thus acquires a right to collect the prepayment from the sponsor after a mortgage has been assigned to the Secretary. It also acquires a right to collect the prepayment from the sponsor following a foreclosure of the mortgage and a conveyance of the property to the Secretary, since the legal rights under the Agreement survive foreclosure.

"The Guaranty Agreement is acceptable to the FHA only if the sponsor's financial capacity and business background is satisfactory. This requires a determination that the sponsor has sufficient resources and assets to make the prepayment, in the amount of the subsidized differential, in the event of default. Where it appears that no subsidy will be required, we are primarily concerned with the motivation and the nonprofit aspects of the sponsoring organization rather than with its financial capacity or business background.

"The Guaranty Agreement is used in the nonprofit elderly housing program. Unlike section 221(d)(3) nonprofit projects, the legislative history of the elderly housing program indicated an intent for FHA to insure mortgages covering subsidized as well as nonsubsidized projects.

"5. On July 8, 1963, the FHA created the new position of Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations with responsibility for the direction of all field operations and for the development of policies and establishment of operating plans, technical standards and procedures for all programs.

"Problem cases referred to the Washington office for determination are directed to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations. Among such cases are those involving national policy, unsolved technical matters, and controversies requiring determination by the Washington office where there is a difference between the findings of the insurance office and the Zone Multifamily Housing Representative.

"6. On December 11, 1964, the FHA regulations were amended to require the use of cost plus contracts in substantially all nonprofit cases. This has the effect of requiring the builder, as well as the mortgagor, to certify the actual costs under the construction contract. It eliminates the use of a lump sum contract which could possibly be used by a builder to obtain control over a nonprofit mortgagor by means of donations and gifts. Experience indicates that the use of a cost plus contract lessens the possibility of an identity of interest between a builder and the sponsor or mortgagor.

"7. On December 11, 1964, we also amended the regulations to remove the prohibition against the use of mortgage proceeds for establishing the working capital in nonprofit projects. Items formerly financed out of working capital are now paid for by an allowance out of mortgage proceeds to be used for making nonprofit projects operational (AMPO). AMPO is now included in the mortgage amount and can be used as approved by the FHA. Nonprofit sponsors, therefore, are no longer dependent upon contractors and land owners to supply funds for items formerly financed by working capital.

"8. On January 18, 1965, the FHA manual instructions for nonprofit projects were changed to limit borrowing by mortgagors from contractors and others connected with the project to amounts covering the cost of items which are to be ultimately financed from the proceeds of the insured mortgage. Borrowing by mortgagors from parties not connected with the project is permitted only where the indebtedness does not subject the mortgagor to control from such parties. Any loan covering an item for which mortgage proceeds are to be advanced must be paid in full at the time the proceeds are advanced. If funds are borrowed for project purposes not included in the mortgage, the debt may only be secured by an FHA approved promissory note payable from a residual receipts account. This residual receipts account must be established from surplus funds realized from project operations and disbursements from the account are subject to FHA approval.

"9. In November 1965, local FHA insuring offices were instructed that nonprofit projects were to be processed as exempt or eligible for abatement from state or local real estate taxes only upon approval of the Washington office. In the Washington office review, every precaution is taken to assure that a mortgagor's claim of exemption has a valid legal basis.

"B. Financial capacity and responsibility

"As explained in paragraph 4 above, there are two distinct types of nonprofit projects—subsidized and nonsubsidized. A subsidized project is one which may not, under the FHA projections, produce sufficient rental income to meet operating expenses and debt service requirements. For example, it may be a project sponsored by a church or charitable organization to provide housing for very low income or indigent persons who are unable to pay an economic rent. The financial capacity and business background of a sponsor of such a project are carefully examined by the FHA with full recognition that the success of the project may be dependent upon the sponsor's subsidy. Processing instructions also require appropriate findings as to the motivation of the sponsor and a clear showing that there is no expectation of profit.

"A nonsubsidized project is one that is self-supporting and has no need for a Guaranty Agreement by the sponsoring organization. In these cases, the FHA projections must support a finding that the proceeds of the mortgage are sufficient to construct the project and also that there is a sufficient market demand for the units by persons who are able to pay the economic rents required to make the project successful. The financial capacity and business background of the sponsor are secondary considerations as long as satisfactory findings can be made as to the sponsor's motivation and there is a clear showing that there is no expectation of profit."

"EXHIBIT 2

"MULTIFAMILY LAND VALUATIONS

"Criticism of FHA land valuation is based on a fallacy that cost should at all times be equated with value.

"In any sound approach to valuation, many factors other than acquisition cost must be considered. The owner of the land may have made improvements or may have held the land for a long period of time during which value has appreciated. He may have obtained changes in zoning, permitting construction of an apartment building on land previously zoned for single-family detached housing, thereby greatly increasing the land value. He may have paid substantially more than the land was worth because of bad judgment or, conversely, he may have obtained a bargain price. Recent sales of the property may have been made by parties having an identity of interest, in which event business or tax considerations may have brought about unrealistic sales prices.

"FHA valuations may be substantially more or less than the mortgagor's cost of acquisition. It is recognized, of course, that the cost of the land in a recent arm's length sale ordinarily has an important bearing upon proper land valuation. The consideration of such cost has always been an FHA requirement, but appraisals have not always been fully documented to explain variances between cost and value. In order to assure better documentation, special instructions were issued to field office directors in January 1964. Valuators were instructed to consider the price paid by the sponsor along with other recent prices paid for the particular site as well as for comparable sites. The instructions stressed the importance of uncovering all relevant data for use in arriving at the 'as is' value of the land and emphasized the requirement that every item of appropriate valuation forms must be completed. The additional documentation and price history considerations were established as factors in reaching the determination required by the forms. The instructions further required the underwriter to explain fully his value estimate if it is higher than the price paid in the latest arm's length transaction.

"Since the 'as is' value of the land is included as an allowance in cost certification, well-documented valuation is most important in order to avoid the pitfall of inflated land values arising from 'straw' transactions. Costs, as they relate to construction, are certified by the builder and may be allowed or disallowed by the FHA depending upon the submitted proof at the time certification is made. If the 'as is' value of the land is inflated because FHA valuators have not considered all pertinent factors, then the desired result of cost certification may be thwarted. It is for these reasons that in January 1964 underwriting instructions were strengthened as described above."

"Exhibit 3

"CONTROL OVER PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

"Through the years of operating its multifamily housing programs, the FHA has exercised a control over the payment of dividends by mortgagors. Prior to 1961, almost all mortgagors were required to be incorporated, using a form of charter prescribed by the FHA. Under this charter, only funds designated as surplus cash can be used for paying dividends. Surplus cash is interpreted as including any cash remaining after all tenants' security deposits have been funded, all operating expenses have been paid, all contributions to reserve have been made, and all mortgage payments are current.

"The FHA charter form prohibits the payment of any dividend or distribution while a charter default exists. Charter defaults include the failure of the corporation to maintain its property and equipment in good repair and condition. In some cases where dividends were paid at a time when the mortgagor was failing to properly maintain the property, but meeting the mortgage payments, the FHA has taken control of the corporation by exercising its rights as a preferred stockholder. Since this type of procedure exposes the FHA to the possibility of being held legally responsible for its actions in operating the corporation, efforts have been made to accomplish the desired results by other means. In most cases, distributions have been restored as a result of persuasion or by withholding FHA approval of a mortgagor's request involving a partial release of security, transfer of ownership, deferment of amortization, or the release of funds from the Reserve for Replacements. These efforts have been most effective where the mortgage remained current and there was a good prospect of the project's success. It has been necessary to exericse the right to take over control of the corporation in relatively few cases. The mortgagors creating our major problem are those whose income is barely sufficient to meet operating and debt service obligations. These mortgagors are unlikely to spend money for other than urgent maintenance requirements in order to assure availability of sufficient funds with which to keep the mortgage current.

"Since 1961, the FHA has generally used a regulatory agreement for controlling the mortgagor's operations. The provisions in that agreement concerning the operation of the property and the handling of income approximate those contained in the FHA form of charter. The injunctive process is available where violations of the agreement occur. Where improper distributions remain unrestored after foreclosure, the FHA has been successful in recovering distributions from the recipients. It is our practice to ask for a deficiency judgment in every case which warrants it. Where judgments are entered, we have been able to collect deficiencies from individual stockholders and other associated with the mortgagor who were responsible for improper distributions."

"Exhibit 4

"COST CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

"Since the enactment of section 227 of the National Housing Act in 1954, FHA regulations and procedures have always required detailed cost certification by mortgagors. Where an identity of interest exists between the mortgagor and the general contractor, a similar detailed cost certification is required of the general contractor as well as the mortgagor.

"Experience gained in the administration of the cost certification requirements has led to changes in regulations and procedures from time to time. The most recent changes were made in December 1964 for the purpose of clarifying and strengthening requirements in cases where identities of interest exist between the mortgagor and a subcontractor, a material supplier or equipment lessor. Prior to the adoption of these changes, we relied upon a certification that amounts paid to subcontractors or material suppliers having no identity of interest with the mortgagor were no greater than prices prevailing in the locality for similar services or materials. We did not have specific provisions covering equipment rentals.

"Our present procedures are more comprehensive. Review by the Washington office is required in all transactions where mortgage amounts exceed $200,000. Provision is made for a detailed certification of actual costs covering amounts paid to each subcontractor, material supplier or equipment lessor having an identity of interest with the general contractor or the mortgagor."

"Exhibit 5

"TAX EXEMPTIONS

"The savings realized by a tax abatement or tax exemption may mean the difference between success or failure of a project. Prior to November 1965, the FHA accepted in good faith statements by sponsors and tax officials indicating that a project could receive a special tax benefit in the form of abatement or exemption. Unfortunately, in some instances, the expected tax benefits have not been received by the projects.

"In November 1965, FHA strengthened its procedure for proposals involving tax exemption or tax abatement. The new procedure requires each insuring office director to forward, for legal review by the Washington office, a full statement of facts prepared by the sponsors including a copy of the application for exemption or abatement. The sponsor is required to submit an attorney's opinion stating the basis for claiming the exemption and whether or not the project will be entitled to exemption or abatement. The opinion must also cite the state law involved and include evidence supporting the claim. Current court decisions and opinions of the State Attorney General may be submitted. Where state law requires, a certificate for exemption or abatement must be submitted. The insuring office director is required to forward any information he may have about similar projects in the jurisdiction where an abatement or exemption was allowed.

"The reviewing attorney in the Washington office is required to satisfy himself that the claimed exemption or abatement is fully supported. If approval of the application for exemption or abatement has not been given by the local authority, or if a certificate or other evidence of the exemption or abatement is required, legal approval will be conditioned upon the submission of such approval or certificate prior to FHA mortgage insurance."

"Exhibit 6

"POLITICAL PRESSURES

"The suggestion in the Reader's Digest article that projects are recklessly or irresponsibly approved because of political pressures and that FHA's professional staff has been replaced by political appointees is completely false.

"Applications for FHA mortgage insurance are processed by a skilled professional staff, and a well-developed system of supervised checks and balances is an effective bar to the underwriting of poor risks because of political pressures."

"Exhibit 7

"ITEM 1: BLUE LAKE MANOR, PASCAGOULA, MISSISSIPPI

"On this project, it is obvious that you proceeded to insure it without a commitment from the International Union and lost money in so doing. In fact, the only thing that you had in writing appears to have been an approval in policy but a refusal to be financially responsible.

"*Question.*—Was this just an oral misunderstanding or was it the agency's desire to insure this project despite the lack of a firm legal commitment that led to this loss?

"*Answer.*—There was no misunderstanding involved. A firm legal commitment was not required. The endorsement of the International Union was accepted as an assurance (later denied by the Union) that the International Union would step into the shoes of the Local Union in the event of a default.

"*Question.*—Your FHA commitment was made December 18, 1961, and final endorsement was made October 25, 1963—what rules or regulations did you have in effect on these dates regarding legal commitments of financial responsibility by sponsors of this type of project? What are your present regulations on this subject?

"*Answer.*—At the time the FHA commitment was issued, the acknowledged approval and support of a local sponsor by its central or sectional body was considered sufficient evidence of its financial strength. The central or sectional body was not required to make any legal commitment or furnish evidence of its financial strength. Since issuance of the FHA commitment, various changes, as discussed in exhibit 1, have been made in determining the eligibility, financial capacity, and responsibility of nonprofit sponsors and mortgagors. On April 1, 1966, instructions were issued expanding the review to be made by insuring offices of the authority and financial capacity of a guarantor under a Guaranty Agreement.

"The processing of a proposal for a nonsubsidized project may show that sustaining occupancy cannot be expected until the second or third year following completion. In such cases, the mortgagor or sponsor must provide a cash deposit to be used as an operating deficiency fund to meet estimated deficiencies during the early years.

"The differences between subsidized and nonsubsidized projects are significant. Exhibit 1 contains an explanation of these differences and an outline of the FHA requirements in cases involving nonprofit sponsors."

"EXHIBIT 8

"ITEM 2: WESLEY MANOR, WESLACO, TEX

"*Question.*—The Reader's Digest predicts that 'the loss FHA will sustain will be stupendous' (p. 9 of the FHA sheet) on Wesley Manor, Weslaco, Texas. Here apparently you have a commitment from the McAllen Methodist District. Did you conduct a reliable financial investigation of this sponsor?

"*Answer.*—Before the commitment was issued, current financial and operating statements of the sponsor were reviewed by the Appraisal and Mortgage Risk Division in Washington and found acceptable.

"*Question.*—What is your reply to the Reader's Digest prediction of stupendous loss?

"*Answer.*—In view of the guarantee by the sponsor, the FHA does not anticipate failure of this project. Full mortgage payments started on November 1, 1965, and are current. The District Superintendent of the McAllen District, and the Resident Bishop of the San Antonio-Northwest Texas Area of the Methodist Church, in reply to the Reader's Digest article, have reaffirmed their faith in this project. A copy of the position paper prepared by the sponsors is attached as a part of this exhibit.

"*Question.*—What are your present rules and regulations on investigation of financial responsibility of sponsors?

"*Answer.*—The present FHA requirements governing the financial responsibility of sponsors is fully discussed in exhibit 1.

"THE TRUTH ABOUT WESLEY MANOR—A SERIES OF STATEMENTS IN RESPONSE TO AN ARTICLE IN THE APRIL 1966 READER'S DIGEST (MARCH 28, 1966)

"The bishop speaks

"Wesley Manor is a project of the Southwest Texas Conference of The Methodist Church through the McAllen District and has been such a project since its inception eight years ago. Over seven of these years were spent in planning and developing this modern facility.

"During all these years a dedicated group of laymen and clergymen has joined together in a Board of Directors elected by the Southwest Texas Conference of The Methodist Church to make Wesley Manor the most desirable retirement home in one of the newest and most favorable retirement areas in this nation.

"We are proud of Wesley Manor and are most anxious that it render a Christian service to a large number of people in their senior years, side by side with the 145 other Methodist related retirement homes located across America.

"BISHOP O. EUGENE SLATER,
"Resident Bishop, San Antonio-Northwest Texas Area, The Methodist Church."

"The district superintendent speaks

"On several occasions in the past eight years the McAllen District Conference has affirmed its backing and support of Wesley Manor through resolutions at regular and called sessions of the District Conference, which is made up of the elected representatives of forty-two churches in the District.

"Far from being a fiasco, Wesley Manor is gaining new strength each week in its efforts to become a resounding success as a modern retirement facility.

"I feel that to link Wesley Manor with other apparent white-elephant projects in other areas, thereby implying the technique of guilt by association, is most unfair.

"I remember well about three years ago, in this District we were facing a similar struggle of getting another Methodist Institution going and some prophets of doom cried it was a fiasco and headed for failure. Time has proved they were wrong. Today, this fine institution stands strong, full and is providing a great helping and healing ministry.

"We know through experience in other projects that the first year is always the hardest. But with good management and the continued confidence of our residents we can render a significant Christian service.

"We have excellent management and a competent group of laymen and clergymen serving on our Board of Directors. I firmly believe that the time, talent and contribution made by Methodist people in this project will prove eventually that our efforts have not been in vain.

"Rev. SAM L. FORE,
"District Superintendent, McAllen District, The Methodist Church."

"A resident of Wesley Manor speaks

"As a resident of Wesley Manor, Weslaco, Texas, the beautiful retirement home sponsored by the McAllen District of the Methodist Church which you so roundly castigated in the April Reader's Digest in 'The Stench at FHA', may I call your attention to a few omissions and inaccuracies noted?

"In the first place, Rev. Paul A. Weiss did not seek 'to build a grandiose retire home'—he was simply the one chosen to implement the plans already made, and he consented only after much persuasion and prayerful consideration, as it meant stepping down from a successful pastorate to serve in this special way.

"Secondly, you should realize that the 'contribution' ranging from $8,000 upward for apartment space is scarcely more than half the amount now being demanded by other church-sponsored retirement homes and those backed by various organizations throughout the nation. You call the maintenance fee or 'Care Fee' rental, which it definitely is not. It pays for three wonderful meals a day in the attractively appointed dining room, weekly maid service, all flat laundry, beauty and barber shop service by professional operators, fourth floor infirmary care for as long as needed, varied recreational facilities, central heating and air conditioning, and other advantages too numerous to mention, including all the joys of home ownership with none of the attendant responsibilities—all of which you failed to mention—nor did you state that for ONE person the fee is $135; for a COUPLE, $245.

"As to the turnover, that was all a part of the original plan and right now if all those who have already contracted for deferred occupancy were to demand immediate entry, the existing apartments would be insufficient to fill the need. As new residents continue to apply for admission it becomes increasingly clear that more apartments, and cottages, will have to be constructed soon.

"Wesley Manor is not a 'fiasco', but a going concern that is helping to set the pace for retirement homes of the future, backed by all the experience gained in establishing and successfully operating dozens of such homes throughout this country under the guidance and supervision of the Methodist denomination.

"Heretofore I have always had great respect for the Reader's Digest and its effort to keep the public informed; however, in this particular case I happen to know the facts, and must say that your irresponsible reporting of half-truths and misinformation has shaken my confidence in your magazine. You should at least correct the impression you have given and assure the public that Wesley Manor is *one* long-term loan project that is destined to pay off, not only financially but also in its successful fulfillment of a vitally urgent humanitarian need.

"Respectfully yours,
"Mrs. MARIE E. WRIGHT,
"Resident, Wesley Manor."

"Administration of Wesley Manor speaks

"The Administration of Wesley Manor, Inc., Weslaco, Texas is hesitant in answering the false and exaggerated charges in the April issue of Reader's Digest. This non-profit Christian Home is provided by the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church through the McAllen, Texas District. Our records are open to the public for we fear not what any committee, organization or individual might find. Years of planning and study with Methodist Ministers and laymen, public officials—local, state and national, and counseling with other retirement home administrations gave Wesley Manor a solid foundation upon which to build. Wesley Manor was no overnight dream, rather a plan executed by men with far reaching visions who were not interested in public praise or advancement for themselves. Wesley Manor is a Tower of Strength for the Senior Citizens of our fifty states. There have been 280 other dreams by Methodist—146 Homes for the Older Citizens, 80 Hospitals, 52 Homes for Children and Youth and 2 Homes for Business Women.

"The Administration of Wesley Manor has no desire to become involved in a name-calling hassle with Mr. John Barron, author of the Digest article, or Reader's Digest. Mr. Barron visited the Administration of Wesley Manor early in 1966 and was extended every courtesy possible during his stay. He led us to believe he wanted to write an article praising the outstanding efforts of the Methodist Church and their great faith in building such a magnificent retirement home. We were deeply hurt that he would take our words and twist them to fit his own purpose. As an example Mr. Barron was surprised to learn we were half-full (occupied), since at the time of his visit we had been opened less than four months, but to our surprise in the Digest article he took the attitude we, the Manor, should be completely occupied and that we were doomed for failure. Today this Christian Home for the Retired has 81 residents in 60 apartments. In the month of March there were ten applicants for seven apartments. Presently we have 125 Deferred Residents, persons not yet retired or ready to move into Wesley Manor, but who will occupy 81 apartments upon moving into the Manor. If all Deferred Residents were to move into the Manor today, we would be two apartments short.

"Mr. Barron speaks of a monthly rental in his Digest article—there is no such thing at Wesley Manor. The Manor does have a Monthly Care Fee—$135 monthly for one person and $245 monthly for two people. The Monthly Care Fee includes the following services: lodging, food, flat laundry, weekly maid service, infirmary care, beauty and barber care, post office services, laundry facilities, recreational facilities such as: billiards, shuffleboard, carpentry shop, art classes, crafts and ceramics, ping-pong, and bowling on the green, lectures, Valley and South Texas Tours, library, guest rooms for friends or relatives with no charge up to six days, storage bins, automobile washracks, transportation for shopping, church or physicians visits, physical therapy, private intercom to each apartment, two chapels, resident counseling, and many other services too numerous to mention.

"Mr. Barron failed to mention in his article the loan to Wesley Manor in the amount of 2.8 million dollars from the Federal Housing Administration has not yet been closed. Wesley Manor has seen fit since November 1, 1965 to make these monthly installments and has yet to miss a single payment which of course mounts into the thousands of dollars monthly. As a matter of record the Manor is now overpaid on its mortgage insurance by several thousand dollars.

"Wesley Manor has a 40 year federally insured loan through the Federal Housing Administration and it is set up on standard actuarial tables which of course means each apartment will be re-occupied three times before it pays for itself. This is no secret and Wesley Manor informs all prospective residents of this fact.

"We are tremendously proud of this Christian Retirement Home. We realize our task is not a simple one and that our financial problems will be many. We are sorry Mr. Barron could not have given the true facts about Wesley Manor but we realize no two men are alike and what one man might think a good investment another might think worthless, but that is the privilege freedom allows us all—an opportunity to dream, plan, and see our dream come true. There will be more Mr. Barron's pass our way but we have already turned our other cheek."

"EXHIBIT 9

"ITEM 3 WEEQUAHIC PARK TOWERS AND PLAZA PROJECTS, NEWARK, N.J.

"Regarding the Weequahic Park Towers and Plaza projects (p. 3 FHA sheet) in Newark, N.J., the principal issue raised in the article seems to be land valuation. On this, you state that the price paid by the developer is not controlling and that many factors including personal judgment are involved.

"*Question.*—Do you have what you might call a uniform land valuation policy or guideline by which your local and regional offices may be governed?

"*Answer.*—We have a uniform land valuation policy in that we have detailed procedures which must be followed in the analysis of the market prices paid for comparable sites providing equal appeal and utilization. This includes zoning, desirability from standpoint of location, and market demand. In large metropolitan areas where the volume of land transfers permit a pattern of prices paid, a distinct pattern will attach to land that may be used for walkup and for elevator construction. This pattern is only a guide and each case must be studied on the basis of the market data developed. The data is evaluated from the standpoint of reasonableness in relation to the pattern and trend that may exist at time of appraisal. The FHA underwriting manual provides guidelines for use in checking the accuracy and validity of market value arrived at through the square foot and comparables method. We do not, however, have a guideline in the term of dollar per square foot or per unit for the various regional areas or for insuring office jurisdictions. The general subject of land valuations is discussed in exhibit 2.

"*Question.*—If you have a comparable value site in point, do you abide by this comparable value?

"*Answer.*—Yes. A review of the prices paid in connection with a number of transfers of land will sometimes permit the selection of a representative site which reflects clearly the market value of the property being appraised. Where this occurs, the value of the comparable site is assigned to the property under study.

"*Question.*—The above-mentioned New Jersey cases raise another point—namely economic feasibility. Did you have any local or regional reports in these two cases to indicate a reasonable doubt that the developer could rent these projects?

"*Answer.*—The Park Towers Apartment building was approved in 1958 and completed in 1962. The FHA had no current market analysis report at the time this project was processed. Market analysis reports, dated July 1962 and May 1963, showed a significant vacancy in the range under consideration. These reports were not addressed to the marketability of a specific project, but to market conditions in entire metropolitan areas. In this case, they concerned the entire northeastern part of New Jersey.

"FHA insuring office directors and underwriting personnel are delegated the primary responsibility for evaluationg proposals. In the evaluation process, they are expected to exercise specific real estate and underwriting judgments in weighing the significance of special local factors against the findings of area market studies. They were not precluded by the adverse factors in the July 1962 and May 1963 area studies from considering specific proposals for the Weequahic section of Newark.

"At the time the Weequahic Park Plaza project was under consideration, the nearby Park Towers project had rented 92 percent of its efficiency units and 75 percent of its one bedroom apartments. Approval of the Weequahic Park Plaza project by the FHA insuring office in Newark was given on the basis that it was to be composed primarily of efficiency and one bedroom units, for which there was a demand in that specific area. In addition, the design and amenities of the Park Plaza project were superior to those of the Park Towers project."

"EXHIBIT 10

"ITEM 4: SAVANNAH TERRACE, INC., NORTH AUGUSTA, SOUTH CAROLINA

"*Question.*—With respect to the accusation (p. 6 FHA sheet) that promoters can 'milk' projects by excessive withdrawals of corporate funds as alleged regarding Savannah Terrace, Inc., North Augusta, S.C., would you explain what control you have both before and after default over excessive withdrawal of corporate funds?

"*Answer.*—Exhibit 3 explains the remedies available for the recovery of improper distributions of corporate funds.

"With respect to the allegations that the FHA permitted the sponsors of the Savannah Terrace, Inc. project to receive $318,000 during the foreclosure action while advancing $43,000 for insurance and taxes, we submit the following:

"1. The FHA insured a loan for advances of $947,100 on June 23, 1951.

"2. The mortgagor defaulted in its payments on January 1, 1957.

"3. The mortgage was assigned to the FHA by instrument recorded May 15, 1957.

"4. On November 7, 1957, a formal foreclosure complaint was forwarded to the Department of Justice. The complaint requested the appointment of a Receiver and the entry of a deficiency judgment. The complaint was filed in February 1958.

"5. A receiver was not appointed as the court was awaiting the decision in *U.S.* v. *Woodland Terrace, Inc.*, 293 F. 2d 505 (1961), a companion case in which the defendant appealed. The issues involved the appointment of a Receiver and provision for the entry of a deficiency judgment. The Circuit Court sustained the District Court's rulings, and petition for Writ of Certiorari was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court on December 11, 1961, 368 U.S. 940 (1961).

"6. An accounting of all income from the date of default to the date of the foreclosure sale was made by the mortgagor to the court.

"7. The United States Attorney negotiated a settlement of all claims against the various companion corporations involving 13 projects and specifically waived any right to deficiency judgments. The agreement was approved by the Department of Justice on behalf of FHA.

"8. The FHA received $146,003 in settlement of all its claims against Savannah Terrace, Inc. arising out of its handling of corporate funds.

"9. The FHA became the owner of the project on December 1, 1962, as a result of a bid in the amount of $900,000 interposed on its behalf by the Assistant United States Attorney George E. Lewis.

"10. Subsequently, $25,000 was remitted to the FHA to cover legal fees expended in Savannah Terrace (054–42043), Wales Garden Apartments (054–40006/7/8) and Washington Homes (054–42042).

"11. The General Accounting Office estimate of $318,000 was apparently calculated by multiplying by about 5½ (years) the property's 1956 cash throw-off, as adjusted. It is doubtful that this projection can be supported, since we understand that the predominant factor in the default was low occupancy by reason of the personnel reduction at a nearby Atomic Energy Installation and at Fort Gordon."

"EXHIBIT 11

"ITEM 5

"The general accusation that you let 'freeloaders live in repossessed apartment buildings' and your response on p. 7 (FHA sheet) that you are tightening up your internal structure on this matter, lead me to the general question of what is your present policy of management and also of repair of repossessed properties?

"The FHA policy with respect to acquired multifamily projects may be stated in terms of a sole objective—the disposition of the property to the best advantage of the government.

"The FHA seldom acquires a project in first class condition and 100 percent occupied. Therefore, upon acquisition of a project, we first examine the tenant market to determine whether 100 percent occupancy (or occupancy approaching 100 percent) is attainable. Since prospective purchasers of such properties are investors, a property's attractiveness lies in the return it will produce on a purchaser's investment.

"It has been our experience that judicious expenditures directed toward achieving higher occupancy enhance the property's market price by an amount greater than those expenditures. Therefore, it is our usual interim objective to place the property in such condition as to attract the occupancy necessary to attain the highest rental income conditions permit. Frequently, this involves an initial program to correct deferred maintenance, consisting of painting, guttering, glazing, caulking, landscaping, and redecorating. Occasionally there is a need to correct deficiencies or defects involving drainage, sewage disposal, walks, drives, parking areas, recreation facilities, mechanical equipment, and excessive heating costs. In some instances, additional services and amenities are provided—switchboard services, metered or free laundry equipment, attic or kitchen exhaust fans, conversion of individually operated coal-fired heating equipment to oil or gas.

"These programs for improving the property provide measures necessary to protect the physical structures, to preserve and engender the best possible public reaction to the offering of the units for rent, and to promote the retention of tenants. The yardstick by which to measure the extent of betterments to be added is the capitalized value of the expected increase in return as related to the cost of the improvement. While correction of deferred maintenance, elimination of defects and deficiencies, and the addition of betterments are for primary consideration immediately following acquisition, all of these elements are given continuous study thereafter to the end that the property may be brought to, and kept at, its productive peak.

"The FHA operates its acquired properties through management brokers who submit bids pursuant to invitations issued to approved property management firms in the environs of the project. The FHA establishes the rental schedule and authorizes the employment by the manager of on-site personnel at stipulated salaries. The manager pays all project expenses, including such salaries, from the rental receipts, and submits monthly accountings. The manager's remuneration is usually a stipulated percentage of gross rentals. In some instances, the fee is set in the contract as a specified amount. In a few instances, the fee is set as a specified amount plus a percentage of rentals. These latter situations usually involve projects with very meager occupancy, requiring that we assure the manager a minimum remuneration while providing him with incentive to work diligently to improve the occupancy ratio.

"Items of repair and maintenance properly classified as ordinary day-to-day operating necessities are handled by the manager under the supervision of the local FHA insuring office director. Major expenditures require prior Washington approval.

"By a continuing review of the manager's accountings and his entire operation, we are able to exert control over the accumulation of delinquent rentals. Managers are authorized to take legal steps to evict tenants who are in arrears and to enforce collection of the arrearages of such tenants."

"Exhibit 12

"ITEM 6

"You state (p. 8 FHA sheet) that the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation case did not go through and that the project under new and different sponsors is now current. The case involved tax abatement, however, and I would like to know what your present policy on this matter is—specifically, I would like to know whether you require a certificate of tax abatement and if so, must it be by a responsible authority on whom reliance may be made?

"*Answer.*—The FHA requirements relating to tax exemption and abatement are outlined in exhibit 5."

"Exhibit 13

"ITEM 7: CLAREWOOD HOUSE, HOUSTON, TEXAS

"As to Clarewood House, Houston, Texas, (p. 11 FHA sheet), you state that your director in Houston 'did not follow established procedures and should not have issued the commitment until the question of sponsorship had been clarified'.

"*Question.*—Under your procedures, what action could your office have taken at that time to have vitiated this commitment?

"*Answer.*—A commitment is issued to a mortgagee, and constitutes a binding contract. It cannot be vitiated in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation by the mortgagee.

"*Question.*—You state that the final result of this project is an eligible nonprofit mortgagor and that it has 90% occupancy. If the result had been the other way and an unjustified loss of great consequences were facing you, would you place the blame on your Houston director or on your office?

"*Answer.*—While it is true that established procedures were not followed, the new nonprofit sponsorship was approved by the Washington office. The tax difficulty has resulted from a decision of the State Supreme Court and it affects all nonprofit projects. Under the decision, the tax exempt status turns on the question of whether the undertaking is for charitable purposes rather than the nonprofit sponsorship.

"*Question.*—If the tax exemption matter is not cleared, will this be the probable result?

"*Answer.*—On November 15, 1965, a rental increase was put into effect. The sponsor's budget for the calendar year ending December 31, 1966, at 95% occupancy shows a projected loss of $76,000. Included in the expenses were real estate taxes of $78,500 and payment of $64,000 on a bank loan. The bank loan is not a recurring expense. Occupancy is now 93%. Assuming the accuracy of the sponsor's projected budget, it would appear that the project can only reach a break-even point, without tax relief, through achievement of 97% occupancy or another increase in rent."

"Exhibit 14

"ITEM 8: THE TOWERS PROJECT, SYRACUSE, N.Y.

"*Question.*—On page 13 (FHA sheet) is appears that the Reader's Digest article stated in connection with The Towers project, Syracuse, New York, that 'Gevinson simply defaulted and walked away with his profit.' You state that this was prior to your present and more rigid requirements for cost certification. Do your present rules provide for a bond or any other form of indemnity to FHA in a case like this?

"*Answer.*—No bond or other form of indemnity is required to provide for elimination of excess profit. The FHA is, however, in a position to prevent the drawing down of such profit. This is accomplished by the reduction of the final insured mortgage in an amount sufficient to reflect elimination of excess subcontractor's profits or of other costs determined by the FHA to be unreasonable or unnecessary. Since it is standard procedure to hold back 10 percent of the estimated construction cost, the mortgage reduction is accomplished by simply refusing to approve for insurance so much of the undrawn amount as is attributed to unwarranted profit.

"There is always the possibility of fraud or misrepresentation, which is best dealt with under the criminal statutes. Mr. Gevinson has been convicted on criminal charges in connection with the Turtle Creek Square project (see exhibit 9) and we recognize the possibility that the FHA may have been misled by criminal misconduct. In the usual course of conducting business operations, however, we cannot judiciously proceed on the basis that we are dealing with criminals."

"Exhibit 15

"ITEM 9: TURTLE CREEK SQUARE, LTD.

"With regard to Turtle Creek Square, Ltd. (pp. 14–15 FHA sheet) you state that Washington Headquarters took this project rather completely in hand, and thereby assumes the burdens of it. You state also that this was an unusual act.

"*Question.*—Do you intend in the future to keep this policy in the 'unusual' category and would you outline a possible type of case in which your office might step in and handle the matter?

"*Answer.*—The case in question, Turtle Creek Square, Ltd., was an extremely rare instance of the Washington office assuming complete responsibility for the processing and direction of a proposal. The unusual circumstances which existed at the time made such a procedure necessary. In this case, the sponsor and the then director of our Dallas, Texas office had reached a complete impasse in their dealings. The personality clash which existed made it virtually impossible for the office to give the sponsor's proposal an objective and impartial analysis. The refusal of the Dallas office to accept the application could not be supported on the basis of the reasons given. Accordingly, it became necessary for the Washington office to provide personnel from the zone and other field offices outside the Dallas area to process this case. The final decision which was reached was a result of a thorough and careful analysis of the proposal.

"The Dallas case was exceptional, and I do not anticipate any recurrence. There are, however, from time to time situations in which decisions reached by our field offices are inaccurate or not in accord with our policies and procedures. In these situations, it is necessary that the Washington office exercise its responsibility to disagree with the conclusions or decision reached by the field office. When this occurs, the reasons for the action taken by the Washington office should be fully documented in the files by the responsible Washington official."

Senator McIntyre. Just as a matter of curiosity, what was the amount originally advanced by the Treasury to set up the FHA?

Mr. Brownstein. I believe it was $200 million.

Senator Bennett. Why have you not paid it back?

Mr. Brownstein. It has been paid back, with interest.

Senator Williams. We are glad you asked the question.

Senator Bennett. Your testimony was not clear and I assumed from what you said that you still held on to it.

Mr. Brownstein. It has been paid back with interest.

Senator Sparkman. He said including repayment.

Senator Bennett. He said the amount they had was $1,100 million, including the amount originally advanced by the Treasury. I think the record will show that is what he said. That may not have been what he meant.

Senator McIntyre. That is the way I understood it. As I understand it now, the $200 million was paid back with interest and you have a reserve of one billion one.

Mr. Brownstein. That is correct.

Senator Sparkman. Now let me state it the way I remember it. I think it came as an answer to my question as to the net earnings, and he stated that the net earnings were $1,100 million, in addition to the repayment of the amount.

Senator Bennett. I am afraid you will find he used the word "including."

Senator Sparkman. He said including the repayment.

Anyhow, we will see it when the printed record comes through.

Senator Williams. It is certainly clear now.

Senator Sparkman. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would prefer to finish.

Mr. President, the FHA, as we all know, is a large agency. Over the years it has provided an opportunity for 8 million home buyers to build their own homes. It is an agency which has a good record over the years, an agency which has not cost the taxpayer anything, an agency which has paid back all the initial capital which was provided by Congress and the Government. In addition, out of its net income it has built a reserve of $1,100 million. Obviously, with 8 million homeowners of one kind or another—some multifamily, some single owners—there is bound to be some loss.

This is an insurance program. It is not a program that is supposed to be conducted without risk. In any insurance program there are bound to be losses, and of course there have been losses in this program. The fact is that the loss record over the years has been fairly steady and fairly constant at 1 percent.

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has been very specific and definite. He deserves a precise answer.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, when it went into these charges, questioned Mr. Brownstein on the operations of the FHA, and questioned him with regard to the particular and specific transactions—at least many of them—which the Senator from Delaware has raised.

I should like to read into the RECORD what the agency has done with regard to some of the valid points which the Senator from Delaware has raised today.

First, with regard to nonprofit sponsors and mortgagors:

In January 1965, the guide form of charter was amended to require that the membership and directors of the mortgagor corporation must be persons who have the approval of the directors of the nonprofit sponsoring organization. This change assures continuity of interest and responsibility by the sponsoring organization. It eliminates possible friction between the mortgagor and sponsor by permitting the sponsor to remove from the mortgagor corporation those persons who are no longer working in the interests of the nonprofit project.

On July 7, 1961, after the enactment of section 221(d)(3), the below market interest rate program, the FHA regulations were amended to define nonprofit mortgagors as those which the Commissioner finds are in no manner controlled by or under the direction of persons or firms seeking to derive profit or gain from the operation of the project.

There are several others, but first I wish to point out that many—not all, but many—of the unfortunate situations which the Senator from Delaware referred occurred before action was taken by the FHA to prevent this kind of fraud in many cases, to which the Senator from Delaware has referred. Here are more regulations to tighten up on procedures qualifying nonprofit sponsor of FHA housing.

On August 10, 1962, the FHA established a new procedure under which the sponsors of nonprofit organizations are examined in greater depth. The objective of the examining procedure is to make certain that, on the basis of the evidence presented, there will be no relationship which will subject the mortgagor to control by any person or firm seeking profit or gain.

On December 11, 1964, the FHA regulations were amended to require the use of cost plus contracts in substantially all nonprofit cases. This has the effect of requiring the builder, as well as the mortgagor, to certify the actual costs under the construction contract.

On December 11, 1964, we also amended the regulations to remove the prohibition against the use of mortgage proceeds for establishing the working capital in nonprofit projects.

In November 1965, local FHA insuring offices were instructed that nonprofit projects were to be processed as exempt or eligible for abatement from State or local real estate taxes only upon approval of the Washington office.

Mr. President, just this year—in fact, a little more than 2 months ago—on June 28, 1966, action was taken to provide what the Senator from Delaware called for three times—at least three or four times—in the course of his speech this morning and this afternoon. He called for action to safeguard against those who have overextended themselves in a multiplicty of different ventures. This is what the June 28 order was to insuring office directors of multifamily house representatives. This is an order on record that they have to comply with or they are in violation of regulations and subject to disclipine for doing so.

I ask unanimous consent that the order be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Control No. F-1155

JUNE 28, 1966.

To: Insuring office directors, multifamily housing representatives.

Subject: Implementation of FHA form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate.

In order to provide a central source of information on participants in multifamily and land development projects, FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, has been developed. Use of the form will eventually produce readily accessible historical data identifying those who have been successful in previous ventures, those who may be over-extending themselves by a multiplicity of ventures, and those whose past experience is unsatisfactory. Such information will be particularly useful in instances where approval of a new venture should be accompanied or preceded by corrective action on an existing project involving the same participants. Although an inter-leaved carbon, snap-out form is being prepared, the single page certificate, a sample copy of which is attached, is being placed into effect immediately upon receipt of this letter.

All principals in any multifamily or land development (Title X) proposal submitted to the FHA will be required to complete FHA Form 2530, fully disclosing their past experience in FHA multifamily and land development programs, as well as their interest in the proposed venture. Each principal, as defined in the certificate, must list every FHA-insured multifamily or Title X project in which he has been, or is, involved; identifying the name, location, FHA case number and the nature of the principal's interest. The principal must also indicate, by an asterisk in the appropriate column, whether any project has been in default or received mortgage relief, as those terms are defined in the certificate. If any project listed has been in default or under mortgage relief, the involved principal must prepare and attach to the certificate a signed explanation of the circumstances of each such default or relief. Each packager or consultant signing a certificate must attach a signed statement disclosing the type of services to be rendered in the new proposal, as well as the fee to be received.

If a particular principal has previously filed a certificate with an FHA insuring office, a completely new listing of past experience is not necessary. The applicant need only identify, on the face of the new certificate, the date and place where previously filed. Any additions to, or changes in the status of, projects previously listed, must be reported on any new certificate.

When signing the certificate, each principal must enter his Social Security Number (Employer's Identification Number, provided by the Internal Revenue Service, if the principal is a corporation). These numbers will be used to place the information provided into our automatic data system.

When the snap-out form is printed, it will provide an original and 4 copies with a cover sheet of instructions. Until such time, however, we will require the preparation and submission of an original and 3 signed copies with each 2012 (3550 where proposal is under Title X) filed with an insuring office. Upon receipt by the office, the original certificate is filed in the project file; the first copy forwarded to the Assistant Commissioner-Comptroller, Attn: Data Processing Operations Section; the second copy, together with attached statements, to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, and the last copy to the Multifamily Housing Representative. Thereafter, format letters B and C (B-X and C-X for Title X) or commitments to insure may not be issued until authorization has been received from the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations. Processing, however, may proceed as far as possible. If format letter A is issued or the request for preapplication analysis withdrawn, prior to receiving a reply from the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, he should be so notified immediately. It is important that these steps be taken expeditiously so as to avoid delays in the processing of proposed projects.

The following procedures are effective upon receipt of this letter:

1. Requests for Preapplication Analysis.—All Forms 2012 (3550 if Title X) must be accompanied by a properly completed Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate. Any request not accompanied by a certificate will be returned to the sponsor as an incomplete submission.

Upon receipt of a request for preapplication analysis, together with Form 2530, the first copy of the certificate is transmitted to Attn: Data Processing Operations Section, the second copy and any statements submitted by the principals are transmitted to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, together with a description of the proposal and any pertinent information regarding the principals which the Director may have.

Analysis may then proceed, but formal letter B or B-X may not be issued without written authorization by the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

2. Cases Now in Office on Which Commitments Have Not Been Issued: Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, must be obtained immediately from all principals involved in any multifamily or Title X proposal now being considered where a commitment has not yet been issued. Format letter B or C (B-X or C-X if Title X), or a commitment to insure, cannot be issued in any case under consideration until receipt of the required certificate and authorization by the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, as in No. 1 above.

3. Multifamily Housing Representatives: Immediately upon receipt of their copy of Form 2530, the Multifamily Housing Representatives will inform the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations of any information they may have regarding the previous operations of any principal listed on the certificate.

Procedures for making an unsatisfactory risk determination or taking a debarment action under Section 512 remain in effect and should be utilized wherever warranted. Proposals involving principals appearing on the URD or debarment list will be rejected by the insuring office without referral to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL
HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1966.

To: All approved mortgagees.

Subject: Implementation of FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate.

In order to provide a central source of information on participants in multifamily and land development projects, FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, has been developed. Use of the form will eventually produce readily accessible historical data identifying those who have been successful in previous ventures those who may be over-extending themselves by a multipilicity of ventures, and those whose past experience is unsatisfactory. Such information will be particularly useful in instances where approval of a new venture should be accompanied or preceded by corrective action on an existing project involving the same participants. Although an interleaved carbon, snap-out form is being prepared, the single page certificate, a sample copy of which is attached, is being placed into effect immediately upon receipt of this letter.

All principals in any multifamily or land development (Title X) proposal submitted to the FHA will be required to complete FHA Form 2530 fully disclosing their past experience in FHA multifamily and land development programs, as well as their interest in the proposed venture. Each principal, as defined in the certificate, must list every FHA insured multifamily or Title X project in which he has been, or is, involved; identifying the name, location, FHA case number and the nature of his interest. Each principal must also indicate, by an asterisk in the appropriate column, whether any project has been in default or received mortgage relief, as those terms are defined in the certificate. If any project listed has been in default or under mortgage relief, the involved principal must prepare and attach to the certificate a signed explanation of the circumstances of each such default or relief. Each packager or consultant signing a certificate must attach a signed statement disclosing the type of services to be rendered in the new proposal as well as the fee to be received.

If a particular principal has previously filed a certificate with an FHA insuring office, a completely new listing of past experience is not necessary. The applicant need only identify, on the face of the certificate, the date and place where previously filed. Any additions to, or changes in the status of, projects previously listed, must be reported on any new certificate.

When signing the certificate, each principal must enter his Social Security Number (Employer's Identification Number, provided by the Internal Revenue Service, if the principal is a corporation). These numbers will be used to place the information provided into our automatic data system.

When the snap-out form is printed, it will provide an original and 4 copies with a cover sheet of instructions. Until such time, however, we will require the preparation and submission of an original and 3 signed copies with each 2012 (3550 where proposal is under Title X) filed with an insuring office.

All forms 2012 (3550 if Title X) must be accompanied by a properly completed Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate. Any request not accompanied by a certificate will be returned to the sponsor as an incomplete submission.

Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, must be obtained immediately from all principals involved in any multifamily or Title X proposal now being considered.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

PREVIOUS MULTIFAMILY PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATE

(Submit Original and Three Copies to FHA Insuring Office)

The purpose of this certificate is to provide FHA with a full disclosure of past multifamily experience of all principals involved in the proposal so that FHA may determine the feasibility of considering the proposal involving these principals. Any doubts concerning applicability should be resolved by a full disclosure at all previous participation.

FHA Insuring Office____________________
Case Number_________________________
Proposed Project Name__________________
Location ____________________________

The undersigned request consideration of a multifamily housing or Title X land development proposal (identified above) to be financed with a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act. The undersigned, individually and collectively, represent that to the best of their information and belief they are the sole "Principals" in the project and they have not had any "interest," by way of financial interest, employment, or otherwise, in an FHA-insured multifamily or land development project, except as shown below. The undersigned agree that any change of the "Principals" listed herein, or additions thereto, will be reported to FHA and they will inform and advise new "Principals" of the requirement to file a similar certificate with the appropriate FHA insuring office.

DEFINITIONS

The term "Principals" includes, but is not limited to, corporations, partnerships, joint ventures, general contractors, sponsors, "packagers," or "consultants." It also includes architects and attorneys who have any interest in the project other than the normal, "arms-length" fee arrangement for professional services to be rendered, other than as a "packager" or "consultant," and stockholders having more than 10% financial interest in the proposed project.

The terms "Packagers" and "Consultants" mean a person or firm, including attorneys, engaged to furnish advisory services in connection with the financing, construction or operation of a multifamily project, including, but not limited to, the selection and negotiation of contracts with a general contractor, architect, attorney or managing agent, securing, financing, and meeting FHA requirements.

The term "Interest" is not limited to a financial interest in the sense of profits, dividends, fees, and legal guarantees, but also includes nonfinancial interests such as a pledge of support, not constituting a legal or financial obligation, given by a parent organization to its member groups or a pledge of other nonfinancial support designed to convince the FHA that a proposal will be feasible.

The term "Default" includes any FHA-insured mortgage transaction which is or has been in breach of a regulatory agreement or delinquent for failure to meet required mortgage payments or, which has resulted in assignment of a mortgage to the FHA, foreclosure of a mortgage or a deed in lieu of foreclosure.

The term "Mortgage relief" includes any FHA insured mortgage transaction which involved a modification of the mortgage, forbearance agreement or other similar relief.

Previous project: Name and location______
FHA No________________________________
Name of principal_______________________
Type of interest________________________
Default ______________________________
Mortgage relief_________________________

(With respect to each listed project which resulted in "Mortgage relief" or "Default," as identified above by an asterisk in the appropriate column, the interested principal must attach a signed statement explaining the relief or default. "Packagers" and "Consultants" must attach a signed statement describing the services they have rendered or will render in the proposed transaction and stating their fee. They must also include a statement that they have not and will not receive any fee or other compensation, direct or indirect, from any party connected with the proposed project, except as reported.)

		EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO. OR SOCIAL SECURITY NO.
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

Warning: Section 1010 of Title 18, U.S.C., "Federal Housing Administration transactions," provides: "Whoever, for the purpose of . . . influencing in any way the action of such Administration . . . makes, passes, utters, or publishes any statement, knowing the same to be false . . . shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, that was on June 28 of this year.

Mr. President, with regard to multifamily land valuations, there was a considerable amount of criticism of this in the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. The FHA asserts in its letter that the criticism of FHA land valuations is based on a fallacy that costs should at all times be equated with value.

In order to assure better documentation, special instructions were issued to field office directors in January of 1964. Valuators were instructed to consider the price paid by the sponsor along with other recent prices paid for the particular site, as well as for comparable sites. The full statement on this regulation regarding land valuation may be found on page 60 of the 1966 hearings record.

With regard to cost certification requirements:

Since the enactment of section 227 of the National Housing Act in 1954, FHA regulations and procedures have always required detailed cost certification by mortgagors. Where an identity of interest exists between the mortgagor and the general contractor, a similar detailed cost certification is required of the general contractor as well as the mortgagor.

Experience gained in the administration of the cost certification requirements has led to changes in regulations and procedures from time to time. The most recent changes were made in December 1964 for the purpose of clarifying and strengthening requirements in cases where identities of interest exist between the mortgagor and a subcontractor, a material supplier or equipment lessor. Prior to the adoption of these changes, we relied upon a certification that amounts paid to subcontractors or material suppliers having no identity of interest with the mortgagor were no greater than prices prevailing in the locality for similar services or materials. We did not have specific provisions covering equipment rentals.

Our present procedures are more comprehensive. Review by the Washington office is required in all transactions where mortgage amounts exceed $200,000. Provision is made for a detailed certification of actual costs covering amounts paid to each subcontractor, material supplier or equipment lessor having an identity of interest with the general contractor or the mortgagor.

With regard to tax exemptions, and that was in another case raised by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

The savings realized by a tax abatement or tax exemption may mean the difference between success or failure of a project. Prior to November 1965, the FHA accepted in good faith statements by sponsors and tax officials indicating that a project could receive a special tax benefit in the form of abatement or exemption. Unfortunately, in some instances, the expected tax benefits have not been received by the projects.

In November 1965, FHA strengthened its procedure for proposals involving tax exemption or tax abatement. The new procedure requires each insuring office director to forward, for legal review by the Washington office, a full statement of facts prepared by the sponsors including a copy of the application for exemption or abatement. The sponsor is required to submit an attorney's opinion stating the basis for claiming the exemption and whether or not the project will be entitled to exemption or abatement. The opinion must also cite the State law involved and include evidence supporting the claim. Current court decisions and opinions of the State attorney general may be submitted. Where State law requires, a certificate for exemption or abatement must be submitted. The insuring office director is required to forward any information he may have about similar projects in the jurisdiction where an abatement or exemption was allowed.

With regard to political pressures:

The suggestion in the Reader's Digest article that projects are recklessly or irresponsibly approved because of political pressures and that FHA's professional staff has been replaced by political appointees is completely false.

Applications for FHA mortgage insurance are processed by a skilled professional staff, and a well-developed system of supervised checks and balances is an effective bar to the underwriting of poor risks because of political pressures.

These new FHA regulations have been inserted in our housing hearings record. Futhermore the record contains detailed accounts of FHA cases which have been publicized because of defaults and so-called irregular practices.

One of the more spectacular and perhaps most shocking cases recorded by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was with regard to a Mr. Gevinson, who is involved in a series of projects to which the Senator from Delaware alluded.

It is true that in the Gevinson case, the FHA, as the Senator from Delaware properly said, was slow in moving. They were very slow in moving. The General Accounting Office said so. Our committee believes this strongly, and I believe they were.

But the fact is that action finally has been taken and the case would not be complete if we did not recognize that this man has been indicted, tried, convicted, and he is broke. This is not a man who enriched himself and who is living off the fat of the land without action having been taken by the Government to correct the situation or to secure a penalty against the perpetrator of these crimes to which he referred. Action was taken.

Now, I should like to refer to the dates of the cases raised, because this was borne out in the hearings.

Senator DOUGLAS said, with regard to the dates of these cases, many of which were referred to by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

> I find that in the case of the Blue Lake Manor this seems to have been first discussed on the 1st of October 1959. Commitment was made on the 18th of December 1961. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes, that is correct, Senator DOUGLAS.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. The application on Weequahic Park Tower was made in August 1958 and approved in October 1958. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. The commitment was issued November 10, 1958.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. November 10?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. The Weequahic Park Plaza. Commitment was made on the 24th of November 1963?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. The Bishop Apartments. Commitment made in 1957?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. That is correct; yes, sir.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. 3900 Lakeshore Drive was processed June 1958?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Savannah Terrace. Prior to 1957?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Commander Apartments. Feasibility requested on the 16th of June 1959, commitment issued on the 21st of June 1960?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. That is correct, Senator DOUGLAS.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Hotel 2400. Is it true there was no FHA action on Hotel 2400?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. There was. The comment there dealt with a proposal that had been submitted by the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation. That proposal failed because they were unable to get the tax adjustment that they decided was necessary.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. So no FHA commitment?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. A completely new group came in with a completely different proposal for rehabilitating Hotel 2400. It has since been rehabilitated. The mortgage is current.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. The mortgage is what?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. The mortgage is current.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. No default?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. No default.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Wesley Manor. Application May 22, 1961?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Clarewood House. Application August 7, 1962. Commitment August 27, 1962.
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. The Towers. Commitment August 31, 1960?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. Turtle Creek Square. Application 1960?
>
> Mr. BROWNSTEIN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. I think this dating is very important, because if there were any errors made I think it should be clear when and where they were made and by whom. And I would say that on the whole most of these applications seem to have been made prior to January 20, 1961, and commitments made prior to January 20, 1961.

I am sure that I agree with the observation by Senator DOUGLAS, which refers to a Reader's Digest article and would apply here, but it is true that most of the cases referred to were cases approved long before the corrective action taken by FHA, which I have just referred with regard to safeguarding the public money.

There is no doubt about our common interest in making this a more sound program and a good program in which violators could be prosecuted and in which unsound investments would not be made. I should like to remind the Senator that the subcommittee looked into these cases and held hearings in 1964. In 1963, 1964, and 1965 the subcommittee requested the General Accounting Office to investigate FHA laws specifically and as I understand it the committee staff worked right along with the GAO. Most of the new regulations put out by the FHA come as a consequence of the hearings and investigations of the committee.

The reason I am answering the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] at length is that I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has been alert and aware of this problem of FHA, has investigated it thoroughly, has studied all that there was available, and has taken action to see that practices that have been practiced in the past would be corrected. They have been corrected, and he expects to continue to do so. Those of us on the committee believe in the integrity of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and we believe in his ability and his altertness in this regard. I feel that he has set an excellent example of oversight, of watching and reviewing the FHA, and that he is going to continue to do a good job.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Housing has an oversight function regarding housing programs but it has also a responsibility to legislate in the public interest to carry out the national housing policy which calls for an eventual goal of a decent home for every American family.

I believe that it is proper and our duty to bring to the attention of the Senate and the public any irregularities or questionable practices involving FHA housing, however, it is not fair to give the impression that these are commonplace or that they reflect in any way on the integrity of the great majority of FHA loyal and dedicated staff. The committee is interested in encouraging more housing and year after year we legislate to encourage homebuilders to help meet the housing needs of our people. Recently we have been receiving complaints that the FHA local directors are "running scared," so to speak, and are turning down applications because they are afraid to take a chance on approving a large multifamily project for fear something might go wrong. The committee has not investigated this reaction but I think it is important for all of us to remember that FHA is an insurance operation and is expected to take certain measurable risks. They have staff to make market studies and to examine the underwriting involved and I know the committee would not like to see a sudden change of policy to refuse bona fide approvals because of some adverse publicity coming from a few bad projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD further material on this issue regarding an article in the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: Thank you for your letter on the April 19 hearing by the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate on proposed housing legislation.

As you suggested, I will be prepared to discuss on a point-by-point basis the article in the April issue of Reader's Digest magazine. As you noted, many of the points raised in the magazine article were covered in 1964 when the subcommittee held its foreclosure hearings.

I also will be prepared to discuss the adequacy of existing law in protecting the public interest while meeting the objectives of FHA programs.

Sincerely,

P. N. BROWNSTEIN,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

READER'S DIGEST MAGAZINE, APRIL 1966

The following is a point-by-point analysis of the article in the April 1966 Reader's Digest regarding the Federal Housing Administration.

ITEM NO. 1

Reader's Digest quote

"FHA guarantees repayment of loans for all manner of housing projects it decides to label 'feasible' and 'economically sound.' So in Pascagoula, Miss., FHA approved a loan for Local 693 of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers to build a $2.4 million old folks' home. Nowhere were union members clamoring to retire to a remote Mississippi town. The international brotherhood made perfectly clear to FHA that it would furnish no money whatsoever. The local itself was to confess that it was not 'financially able to put money into the project.' But, rhapsodizing that this would be 'a model facility,' FHA skirted its own regulations requiring that a sponsor have resources to 'assure meeting debt requirements and operating expenses.'

"According to FHA documents submitted to the Senate rules committee, this was the result: when the home was finished in 1963, subcontractors cried they had not been fully paid, creditors were after the furniture, there was no money to turn on the lights. And neither the union nor anyone else could persuade a single soul to move into this 'model facility.' Two months later the union abandoned it, leaving FHA to pay off the $2.4 million loan and thus become the hapless owner of this 194-apartment haunted house" (p. 61).

Description of case

Project No. 065-38001-NP—Blue Lake Manor, Pascagoula, Miss.

Sponsor: Local 693, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Pascagoula, Miss.

First discussed October 1, 1959.

Application received Sept. 28, 1961—206 units	$2, 511, 500
Commitment issued Dec. 18, 1961—194 units	2, 451, 800
Amended May 9, 1962—194 units	2, 451, 800
Initial endorsement May 18, 1962—194 units	2, 451, 800
Final endorsement Oct. 25, 1963—194 units	2, 485, 400

Comment

The FHA insuring office was not receptive initially because of the single union sponsorship. On December 9, 1960, the Director advised the sponsor that the proposal needed the endorsement of the international union and a willingness for the international to step into the shoes of the local in the event of trouble. In response, the FHA Director was given a copy of the following motion which was passed by the international executive council at a meeting during the week of November 10, 1960:

"I move that this council authorize the use of the name 'international brotherhood' to the project development outlined to this council by Business Manager Pat Sullivan contingent on the determination that there will be no financial liability and that it is a worthy cause with which to have our name connected; if investigation determines this to be the case, a letter or resolution as may be required to indicate that the international brotherhood will pledge itself to the operation and management of the proposed project in Pascagoula, Miss., in the event that lodge No. 693 is for any reason unable to operate and run the project."

On December 27, 1960, FHA advised this was "entirely satisfactory."

Date of first payment was February 1, 1964. No payments were ever made and the project never occupied. FHA headquarters tried to get the international to take over as promised. The new international president, Mr. Russell K. Berg, advised that, while the executive council had endorsed the project, it had never agreed to step into the shoes of the local in the event of default. The motion had never been authorized. On December 10, 1964, this matter was referred to HHFA compliance. Subsequently, an FBI investigation was made, but the Department of Justice found insufficient evidence to warrant continuation of the investigation.

The mortgage was assigned to the Commissioner on March 13, 1964, foreclosed, and title to the property taken on May 28, 1965. The project was sold to Care Centers of Mississippi, Inc., a nonprofit group, on September 16, 1965, for $1,950,000, with a $50,000 downpayment, and a $1,900,000 purchase money mortgage.

ITEM NO. 2

Reader's Digest quote

"In Newark, N.J., after wealthy builder Arthur H. Padula had obtained land costing $33,000, FHA appraised it for $125,000 and guaranteed a $2.9 million construction loan on a high-rise apartment building. After the structure was completed in 1962, FHA let Padula go 3 years without making payment on the principal of his loan" (p. 62).

Description of case

Project No. 031-00204—Weequahic Park Towers, Newark, N.J.

Date of feasibility, spring of 1958.

Application received August 1958.

Commitment issued November 10, 1958. Commitment successively amended culminating in a final amended commitment September 25, 1961.

Comment

The FHA estimate of land price was made in the summer of 1958. The FHA estimated the land to be worth $125,000. The sponsor's acquisition cost was not a good indication of value as he held a big piece for many years. The appraisal was appealed and on September 30, 1959, FHA headquarters reviewed and concurred in the price as set. The sponsor's contention at the time of appeal was the land had a market value of in excess of $200,000. This was considered excessive by the local office. The local office's estimate of $125,000 was approved.

The loan was closed September 12, 1960, and completed in 1962. The property did not produce sufficient earnings to be self-sustaining and modification of the mortgage permitting a deferment to payment to principal was permitted until September 1965. The mortgage has been current from that date to present (April 1, 1966).

ITEM NO. 3

Reader's Digest quote

"This was just the beginning. Padula had paid $36,339 for another tract of Newark property which FHA in 1963 appraised at $300,000—a jump of 800 percent. The FHA guaranteed a loan of $4.5 million to build a second apartment house" (p. 62).

Description of case

Project No. 003-00289—Weequahic Park Plaza, Newark, N.J.

Commitment issued October 24, 1963.

Comment

In June 1963, the Newark office found a market value of $123,750 for the site, but the sponsor appealed this value because the zoning variance he obtained permitted 10 stories additional to the number of stories ordinarily permitted in high-rise construction in that area and allowed a 50-percent decrease in the on-site parking requirements. The sponsor sought a value of $365,000.

An adaption of a per unit valuation formula by the multifamily valuation adviser from the Philadelphia multifamily office produced a figure of $300,000, and this market value was agreed upon in a conference between the sponsor, the director, chief underwriter, and chief valuator of the Newark office, representatives of the Philadelphia multifamily office, and a representative from Washington headquarters.

The problem of land valuation following ordinance variances, which give certain advantages to a particular site, is a difficult one. There are many approaches to estimating these values, depending upon the absence or presence of comparable properties. The ultimate finding is one of personal judgment on the facts assembled. In reviewing this case, Washington headquarters also believed the allowance for land value was questionable.

ITEM NO. 4

Reader's Digest quote

"In Boston a promoter bought a tract for $8,971; the following year, FHA appraised it at $131,531" (p. 62).

Description of case

Project No. 023-00029—Bishop Apartments, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Commitment issued in 1957; 108-unit walkup.

Comment

The Boston office judgment, to the effect the land had appreciated in value to the point where $131,531 was, in fact, the estimated fair market value at time of commitment for mortgage insurance, was based on two major changes directly affecting the land involved:

1. The land when acquired was not zoned to permit high-density apartment units. A change in zoning from single family to apartment was obtained.

2. A drainage problem which severely limited the value of the land was corrected which in turn made the land more valuable than the cost of the solution to the drainage.

The judgment of the Boston office was reviewed by the chief of headquarters valuation section and approved October 15, 1963. The mortgage is current as of April 1, 1966.

ITEM NO. 5

Reader's Digest quote

"In Chicago the FHA said it would allow $300,000 for a particular tract so a promoter went out and bought it for $212,000 and proceeded to cash in" (p. 63).

Description of case

Project No. 071–00137—3900 Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Comment

The project is a 25-story, high-rise 207 processed in June 1958, at which time the land value was estimated at $8.99 a square foot, or $300,000. The estimate was supported by sales of five comparable sites. The site was originally optioned by representatives of two of the sponsors in March 1957 for $212,000, subsequently purchased at this price in October 1958. The price of $212,000, while the major portion of the cost of acquisition, does not include the cost of the option or any allowance for required additional investment on the part of the sponsors for taxes, interest, or other carrying charges. The cost of this type of site was rising rapidly in Chicago at that time.

In January 1964, the land value of this case was reviewed by headquarters personnel and the original estimate of value was found to be warranted. The project was well received by the market and has been a successful operation from its completion with virtually no vacancies. The mortgage has been kept current and the building is well maintained.

ITEM NO. 6

Reader's Digest quote

"FHA has approved marginal or hopeless projects, let promoters milk them through what GAO calls excessive withdrawal of corporate funds, and then abandon them * * * GAO estimated that one promoter pocketed $318,000 while FHA paid taxes and insurance for his defaulted project" (p. 63).

Description of case

Project No. 054–42043—Savannah Terrace, Inc., North Augusta, S.C.

Comment

We are unable to determine how GAO estimated that net income of $318,000 was available to the mortgagor from February 1957 through June 1962.

The GAO report of January 1964 makes reference to FHA having paid $43,000 in real estate and hazard insurance premiums. We reviewed FHA records and found in the period 1957–62 FHA paid $26,272 in real estate taxes and $16,848 in insurance premiums.

ITEM NO. 7

Reader's Digest quote

"Moreover, FHA has been letting freeloaders live in repossessed apartment buildings, then writing off their unpaid rents as uncollectible" (p. 63).

Comment

FHA has experienced a large increase in its property acquisitions beginning in 1960. The increase was primarily in single-family home properties, but the impact was felt by the agency in its overall property management and disposition activities. During this period of increased property acquisitions, FHA had the problem of increasing and improving its own property management staffs in the field and headquarters. We also made very concerted efforts to improve the quality of the contract brokers who manage our rental properties and to improve our supervision of these brokers. Inevitably, the quality of brokers will vary according to circumstances, but for the most part we have made improvements in our total property management activity. We have advised the GAO that since receiving their first reports on this subject, FHA has made many internal changes to tighten and improve the procedures to control rent delinquencies and collections. Much of the delinquent rental had accrued before FHA took over the projects. Some very positive steps have been taken along these lines and GAO has been completely informed.

The Reader's Digest neglects to point out that a GAO report dated January 17, 1966, entitled "Need for Increased Efforts to Minimize Rental Delinquencies on Acquired Properties," states, on page 3:

"These specific actions, if effectively implemented, and the increased emphasis now being directed toward solution of the problem should, in our opinion, help to minimize losses and improve control over delinquent rental accounts. Therefore, we are not recommending further action by the agency at this time. We plan to make further reviews of the management of acquired properties and the control over rental delinquencies."

ITEM NO. 8

Reader's Digest quote

"In Jacksonville, Fla., for example, Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS' old college roommate and close friend, Charles E. Commander, Jr., asked FHA to help him build an apartment house. FHA evaluators opposed the project, declaring it 'doomed from the start.' But one evaluator reports he received 'at least a dozen telephone calls' from a Smathers assistant demanding approval. And though SMATHERS denies he had any interest in the project, pressures exerted in his name ultimately prevailed. FHA guaranteed a $1.9 million loan, and the 76-unit apartment was built. Naturally enough, it failed; FHA had to pay off the mortgage. For nearly 3 years now FHA has owned this white elephant" (p. 63).

Description of case

Project No. 063–00023—Commander Apartments, Jacksonville, Fla.

Initial request for feasibility June 16, 1959.

Site approval August 19, 1959.

Application received November 4, 1959.

Commitment issued June 21, 1960—90 units, $1,926,500.

Comment

FHA is unable to verify the allegation made by the Digest that Senator SMATHERS asked FHA to help Commander to build an apartment house. FHA has been unable to identify the alleged "evaluator" said by the Digest to have received "at least a dozen telephone calls from a Smathers assistant." The mortgage is now held by FHA and the project is operating under a deferment agreement.

ITEM NO. 9

Reader's Digest quote

"FHA in 1962 also did its best to produce for another politician, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. POWELL's nonprofit corporation sought to buy and 'rehabilitate' a Washington hotel on sale for $2,250,000. FHA obligingly decided that a $4,500,000 loan—twice the price of the hotel—would be 'feasible' even though a month later FHA had to admit it had no idea what the 'rehabilitation' actually would cost. The deal fell through after Senator WILLIAMS took the Senate floor to expose the outrageous handout" (p. 64).

Description of case

Hotel 2400, Washington, D.C.

Comment

Initial contact with District of Columbia office April 1962. In May 1962, the sponsor was advised of the need for subsidy of $69,000 per year. The proposal by the Adam Clayton Powell foundation on August 1962 reported a total for all rehabilitation costs in the amount of $2,117,500 plus a total acquisition of $2,295,000. This, plus financing charges, produced a total of $4,850,000.

Preliminary processing indicated that a sponsor subsidy would be required of approximately $12,000 annually provided tax abatement could be obtained. FHA would not proceed with processing unless a tax exemption was obtained for the project and a cosponsor brought in. This was intended to be the Minister's Council for Senior Citizens of Washington. Efforts to get tax abatement were unsuccessful. On March 19, 1963, the application was withdrawn for processing under section 231. A new proposal for insurance under section 207 was submitted. There is no identification of the Adam Clayton Powell foundation with the new proposal. The proposal by the new owners was accepted and committed and insured as Project No. 000–00123, Envoy Towers. Construction has been completed and the mortgage is presently current (April 1, 1966).

ITEM NO. 10

Reader's Digest quote

"In the little Texas town of Weslaco, Methodist Preacher Paul A. Weiss sought to build a grandiose retirement home which FHA technicians declared was predestined to certain failure.

" 'If this project is built, one and all who see it will categorize it as an FHA folly,' a regional examiner warned Washington. 'And the loss FHA will sustain will be stupendous' " (p. 64).

Description of case

Project No. 115–38005–NP—Wesley Manor, Weslaco, Tex.

Sponsor: McAllen District of the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church.

Application May 22, 1961—248 units	$4,750,000
Revised Aug. 17, 1962—248 units	5,044,400
Revised Oct. 10, 1962—248 units	4,660,500
Revised Feb. 20, 1963—150 units	2,827,000
Commitment May 20, 1963—150 units	2,827,000
Initial endorsement Aug. 30, 1963	2,827,000

Final endorsement expected approximately April 14, 1966. Mortgage amount to be endorsed is $2,733,100, the unit limitation. Reduction is due to change in unit composition during construction.

Comment

The office found the original proposal not feasible because of the disparity of about $900,000 between the maximum mortgage and the cost of the project. FHA also had concern about the number of units because of a lack of market demand. FHA also had a question about whether the Methodist district was backing the sponsor churches.

There were many meetings with the sponsors here and in the field. On May 25, 1962, Washington headquarters authorized continued processing, but advised the Director to encourage the sponsors to recast their plans because the project was overdesigned. The office continued processing and came up with two alternatives, concurred in by the zone multifamily housing representative. Either the McAllen Methodist District and the Southwest Methodist Conference would agree to subsidize the project, or else submit an application for approximately 116 units. An application for 150 units was submitted on February 10, 1963, and rejected on March 14, 1963, because it was not subsidized.

Subsequently, a meeting was held in Washington headquarters on March 27, 1963. It was agreed to consider the application for 150 units, provided the McAllen Methodist District agreed to subsidize the project. The financial data of the district, as guarantor, was reviewed by Washington headquarters and found acceptable. The district, by resolution of April 9, 1963, advised that "In the event that Wesley Manor, Inc., incurs deficits in the operation of the project, the district guarantees to subsidize the financial deficiencies in operation."

The project is completed, final inspection in November 1965, and final endorsement of the mortgage is expected soon. Initial payments to principal and interest were deferred from February 1 to November 1, 1965. Mortgage payments have been made since November 1, 1965.

ITEM NO. 11

Reader's Digest quote

"But in Washington on January 23, 1962, a special FHA assistant, ex-Senator Gerald P. Nye, wrote: 'Vice President Johnson has revealed a large interest in the Wesley Manor project, and this office has assured him that everything possible would be done to expedite the hour when constructions could begin'" (p. 64).

Comment

The quote is an accurate quotation taken from a letter written by ex-Senator Nye, then the Special Assistant for Housing for the Elderly, to the Rev. Paul A. Weiss, executive director, Wesley Manor project. Mr. Nye has the following comment to make with reference to the Digest quote:

"The Reader's Digest article would, as is probably intended, have the reader to believe that Vice President Johnson had personally used his influence to win FHA approval of the church-sponsored project in his State of Weslaco, Tex. Such was never the case. To the best of my knowledge, neither I nor anyone in my office had any communication with Vice President Johnson relating to this case.

"The quotation in the article from my letter of January 23, 1962, would have been more revealing of fact if only my reference had been to 'a member of the Vice President's staff' instead of 'Vice President Johnson.' At this time I have no positive recollection of any call having been made by a member of the Vice President's staff concerning the Wesley Manor project. However, in view of the fact that I referred to the Vice President in my letter of January 23, I am quite certain that I probably had had some type of a telephone communication from a staff member inquiring as to the status of the case. Some inquiry of this nature would have to have been made in order to prompt me to use the reference to the Vice President."

ITEM NO. 12

Reader's Digest quote

"Next year, Pickett's friend Sharp and others urged Houston's First Methodist Church to sponsor a retirement home on a large tract Sharp was developing. With Pickett present, a church committee rejected the proposal. The entire board of stewards ratified the committee's decision, and the pastor, Dr. Charles L. Allen, published a declaration that the church had no 'connection whatsoever, directly or indirectly,' with the project.

"Next, Pickett overruled FHA professionals who had valued the retirement homesite at $1.25 to $1.35 a square foot" (p. 65).

Description of case

Project No. 114-38001-NP—Clarewood House, Houston, Tex.

First contact approximately July 1962.

Application received August 7, 1962.

Commitment issued August 27, 1962—288 units, $4,700,000.

Mortgagor: Sharptown Tower Corp.

Comment

Land value.—FHA Houston staff had arrived at a land value of $1.35 per square foot ($493,263 total value). A subsequent FHA review made by the FHA zone office produced an appraisal figure of $1.75 per square foot. Neal Pickett, FHA Director, Houston, overrode both land value figures and instructed the appraisal to be set at a figure of $2 per square foot ($730,760 total value). The $2-per-square-foot figure represents a high figure of the reasonable appraisal range for the land. It is believed that the $2 figure can be supported. The Director did not adequately document the case with data to support his $2-per-square-foot figure.

Sponsorship.—The case was initially processed on an assumption that the First Methodist Church of Houston would be the sponsor of the project. A commitment was issued on August 27, 1962, based upon the assumed sponsorship of the First Methodist Church. At the time the commitment was issued, the Director was aware of the fact that the First Methodist Church would not legally sponsor this project. Subsequently, a nonprofit corporation was created to serve as sponsors and the case was processed on the basis the mortgagor corporation would provide an operating deficit fund of $300,000. Sharpstown Realty Co. issued a letter of credit guaranteeing to FHA that the realty company would advance funds to meet the operating deficit for the first 4 years up to the amount of $300,000. The Director did not follow established procedures and should not have issued the commitment until the question of sponsorship had been clarified. Nevertheless, the final result would have been the same, i.e., eligible nonprofit corporate mortgagor.

Present status.—Clarewood House is completed; has 90-percent occupancy. The mortgage is in default for failure to make the December 1, 1965, and subsequent payments. The mortgagor had requested a deferment of principal from December 1, 1965 to June 1, 1966. The request is being deferred pending further consideration of the $300,000 guarantee of Sharpstown Realty Co. At the present, Sharpstown Realty has paid to the mortgagor $210,000 in cash. It also has been instructed to make demand upon the Sharpstown Realty Co. either to pay the balance of the $90,000 or pay $35,000 and give FHA a certification by the bank holding the note that the mortgagor is not liable thereunder.

ITEM NO. 13

Reader's Digest quote

"But since opening February 1, 1964, Clarewood House continuously has been in such difficulty it has yet to make a payment on the principal of its loan" (p. 65).

Comment

The project has 90-percent occupancy March 1966. Rents were increased January 1, 1966. Taxes are $75,000 per annum. Unless tax exemption is obtained, this and other similarly affected projects will be in difficulty.

ITEM NO. 14

Reader's Digest quote

"And its manager, E. Bruce Sledge, reports that 'there is little hope of breaking even' unless the project wins tax exemptions denied it when the Texas attorney general ruled it was not nonprofit" (p. 65).

Comment

Competitive projects used in the processing of Clarewood House were tax exempt. Everyone assumed this project would be tax exempt.

The court decision places the tax exemption position of Clarewood House in exactly the same position today as it would have been if the First Methodist Church of Houston had not withdrawn its sponsorship. Even if the church had continued its sponsorship, the project would have been owned by the mortgagor rather than the church. The mortgagor is a nonprofit organization, established with our approved form of nonprofit charter in the same identical manner as it would have been established under church sponsorship. Unfortunately, the submission of proof that the mortgagor-owner is a nonprofit corporation is insufficient to meet the criteria for tax exemption under the 1963 court decision.

The attorney general did not rule that this project was nonprofit. On June 26, 1963, the Supreme Court of Texas handed down a 5-to-4 decision in the case of *River Oaks Garden Club* v. *City of Houston*, interpreting a Texas constitutional provision as authorizing tax exemption only where a nonprofit organization is "an institution of purely public charity." It appears that this decision was much stronger against tax exemption for nonprofit organizations than any previous court interpretations. FHA is advised that several nonprofit organizations in Texas are attempting to have the decision reversed, and that this mortgagor is taking part in these efforts.

ITEM NO. 15

Reader's Digest quote

"Yet in 1960 with another FHA loan—this time for $6 million—Gevinson began a 13-story apartment project in Syracuse, N.Y. A Gevinson company picked up $258,000 by getting $1,145,700 for subcontracting work which cost only $887,700, according to GAO. And GAO further found that Gevinson made an additional $225,360 through a joint venture with a local construction company. After the apartment building was finished, Gevinson simply defaulted and walked away with his profit. The FHA estimates that it will lose $2,300,000 on this deal" (pp. 65–66).

Description of case

Project No. 013-00027—The Towers, Syracuse, N.Y.

Property acquired by FHA July 1, 1964.

Found to be feasible on April 4, 1960.

Site approval issued July 7, 1959.

Application received July 11, 1960.

Commitment issued August 31, 1960.

Comment

At the time this case was processed, FHA procedures were weak because they did not require a thorough examination of the costs of controlled subcontractors. In September 1963, procedures were changed to provide for Washington headquarters review of all cost certifications and to require full disclosure of all identities of interest with subcontractors, suppliers, and equipment lessors (January 1964). Regulations have been changed, effective December 1964, to make it clear that FHA has the right to require any subcontractor, supplier or lessor to certify as to the actual costs.

ITEM NO. 16

Reader's Digest quote

"Meanwhile, Gevinson had applied for an $8.7 million FHA loan to build an apartment project. Turtle Creek Square, Ltd., in Dallas. Ellis Charles, Director of FHA's Dallas office, twice rejected the proposal. Then Charles received a telegram from headquarters in Washington: 'You are directed to accept and process application for 363-unit Turtle Creek project.'

"Charles reminded FHA headquarters of bitter experiences with Gevinson, but in vain. The Turtle Creek site cost $2.52 a square foot, and FHA appraised it at $2.60. When Gevinson demanded far more, the Dallas office again rejected his application. Still, Washington decreed that the Dallas Director had provided 'no basis for rejection.' And FHA Assistant Commissioner C. Franklin Daniels instructed Charles to 'resolve' the valuation at $4—a 53-percent jump which inflated the land price to $1,051,614. To help Gevinson further, the FHA ordered four extra men to Dallas—two from Washington and two from Houston—and even authorized overtime pay.

"Next, Daniels waived a requirement limiting commercial space to 10 percent and allowed Gevinson 39 percent. On September 29, 1961, Washington telegraphed Charles to guarantee Gevinson approval by October 16. But Gevinson repeatedly had refused to supply required financial data, and the processing was far from complete, so Charles courageously wired back: No. By telegram, another FHA man was ordered to Dallas—from Oklahoma City—to push the deal. 'This assignment is urgent and has approval highest authority. Any questions telephone,' the wire said.

"FHA processors kept uncovering irregularities in Gevinson's plans. The Dallas chief, backed by his conscience and other FHA evaluators, could not bring himself to surrender. But on October 16 he received an ultimatum: 'You are hereby authorized, instructed and directed, as of this date, October 16, 1961, to insure advances in amount of $9 million on Turtle Creek.' Assistant Commissioner Daniels wired. 'You are hereby released from all responsibility in connection therewith'" (p. 66).

Description of case

Project No. 112–00038—Turtle Creek Square, Ltd., Dallas, Tex.

Initial contact 1960.

Authority to accept application 1960.

Comment

The initial direction to accept the application for mortgage insurance was issued in 1960. The office refusal to accept the application could not be supported on location or market demand. The location was prime and market demand excellent. The sponsor was eligible though he was difficult to deal with and created a strained working relationship with the FHA staff.

Dr. Gevinson appealed the decision of the Dallas office as to land value and site desirability, and requested that consideration be given to an increase in the maximum mortgage amount per room. On June 21, 1961, Washington headquarters' review had developed a value for the land of approximately $4 per square foot. This $4 valuation was placed on the land after submission of appraisals at $4.50 per square foot and after a zoning variance had been obtained permiting high-rise apartment and commercial use, as opposed to the residential "A" (three-fourth acre individual homesites) zoning effective at the time of land purchase agreement.

Washington headquarters detailed zone personnel to the Dallas office to process the case because of the unwarranted delay and the clash between sponsor and Dallas FHA. Director Charles was instructed by Washington to issue the commitment.

This is one case where Washington officials found it necessary to override a Director. This unusual act was done with full knowledge and support of the then Commissioner.

The commitment for insured advances carried nearly 90 special conditions developed by the zone technicians after their analysis and processing. The objection, deficiencies, called irregularities was the subject of these special conditions. The plans were corrected and the conditions complied with prior to insurance.

ITEM NO. 17

Reader's Digest quote

"Then, incredibly, the closing of the loan was transferred half a continent away to Albany, N.Y., where none of the Dallas staff could watch what happened" (p. 66).

Comment

The closing was held in Albany at the insistence of the construction lender, the National Commercial Bank of Albany. The permanent lender, New York State Teachers' Retirement System, is also located in Albany. The commitment for $9,997,100, the amount for which the loan was initially closed, was signed by the then Assistant Director of the Dallas office, Mr. Gasaway, upon authorization from H. Earl Rosamond, then Multifamily Housing Supervisor at Fort Worth, Tex.

It is not unusual for New York State lenders to refuse to go out of the State for mortgage closings and similar transactions. The implication that there was any attempt to hide anything from the Dallas office is without foundation.

ITEM NO. 18

Reader's Digest quote

"Of course, Turtle Creek Square when completed never was able to attract enough tenants to break even. And, as in Syracuse, Gevinson defaulted and abandoned it to the FHA" (p. 67).

Comment

FHA does not own the Turtle Creek project. The loan was closed November 1964. The mortgagors are 21 Turtle Creek Square, Ltd. In 1964, occupancy was poor due to mismanagement and a poor rental campaign. In June 1965, there had been some improvement and by January 1966 there had been appreciable improvement in the occupancy. It is very well located and well designed. Physical inspection of the property shows it to be in excellent condition with a much more aggressive rental program. The mortgagee holds the mortgage under the forebearance agreement approved by FHA.

ITEM NO. 19

Reader's Digest quote

"And FHA will be in the thick of it. Consider what it can do with the rent subsidy program alone. No matter how poor an apartment project, no matter how promoters plunder it, FHA or DHUD can fill it up with tenants at Government expense, and no one will be the wiser" (p. 67).

Comment

The statement is entirely inaccurate. Only new projects or projects that have been extensively rehabilitated are eligible. Approval will only be given after careful screening to make sure that there is a need for such a project in the community. The law specifically provides that each project must be sponsored by one of three kinds of organizations: nonprofit, limited distribution, or cooperatives. There will be no profits in the case of nonprofit sponsors or a cooperative. In the case of limited distribution, sponsors' profits will be strictly controlled and regular audits will be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that I am familiar with the projects he outlined, and I am familiar with the time that they happened, but only three of those are in the list of projects I discussed today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to differ with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know which ones I discussed. The three that I discussed were Clarewood House, the Towers project, and Dr. Gevinson. But I am willing to discuss all of these other projects which were a part of the Reader's Digest article. They were just as bad, and some even worse.

Let us get the record straight as far as Dr. Gevinson and his operations are concerned. First, let me say I hope that we are not going to hear a defense of what happened. Surely everybody would agree that there is an abuse. But let us review Dr. Gevinson's operations:

The Towers project was approved in 1960. There was a $6 million loan.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator give us the date again?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. December 1960. The amount was $6,013,800 FHA loan to the Towers. In October 1961 they approved 21 Turtle Creek Square in Dallas for $11,012,150.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is this another one?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. That is the one that the Comptroller General said had a million-dollar windfall profit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The date of the Turtle Creek was what?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. October 1961. And they had a million-dollar windfall in profits. On December 12, 1962, they had given a commitment for another project for Dr. Gevinson, Poinsard Towers in San Antonio, for $8,573,000.

But, as the Senator said, the FHA did get around to completing that loan. I placed in the RECORD a letter dated in May of 1963 signed by Mr. Cunningham addressed to Mr. McCloud, in which they stated they would stop this project due to the fact that a suit was contemplated against Dr. Gevinson. Now let us set the record straight about the suit, and the action taken by the FHA against Dr. Gevinson. I commend the Department of Justice for its prompt action, but the FHA deserves no commendation—it was still approving this latter project for Dr. Gevinson in 1962. The FHA had it on the approved list in 1962 and 1963. It was not until after it had been called to my attention and I had taken it up with the Comptroller General that they got concerned. Upon my request, the General Accounting Office made a special report. This was largely as a result of my inquiry and not FHA actions.

The Comptroller General's Office, after this report was completed, came to my office and suggested that the report be held up until the Department of Justice could proceed with the indictment, and I agreed. It was then that the project was stopped. I am not giving the FHA much credit for what they did in this particular case. The exposure of this abuse was in spite of the FHA and not as a result of any action they voluntarily took. I do pay tribute to the Comptroller General's office for the excellent job it did in digging up these facts and putting them in a form which could be presented to the Department of Justice, which later led to a conviction.

I am not saying that the Senate committee has not been interested in these violations, but I think we should get that record straight. It is true that there have been some reforms put in by Mr. Brownstein this year and the record will show that I complimented the Commissioner on these reforms.

There was one additional reform which the Senator from Wisconsin did not mention; namely, the escrow payments on downpayments of a home. They now insist they be put in escrow, but we need more. They should insist that the escrow payments involving, for example, the payment of a new refrigerator, or a different stove, to be added. Payments for these items should likewise be placed in escrow, and until this is done the home buyer is not fully protected.

I complimented the Commissioner on June 28 when he announced his first step, but significantly it was not until after my criticism that they ruled that each sponsor of the project file with the application a list of his previous experience with the agency. That was a constructive step, but they were forced to take it. At that time I complimented the Commissioner. I agree he should be complimented on what he has done; but let us face it, it has not all been corrected. For example, some of the same officials who were approving these unsound projects I was speaking of are still on the public payroll. Some of these projects of which I speak were in Arkansas, for example, where again there was a general overvaluation of land.

I was not referring to the projects mentioned in the Reader's Digest article because I knew that they had been referred to before, but since it has come up, let us get the record on that complete. I ask unanimous consent to have the article which appeared in the April 1966 Reader's Digest to which reference has been made, printed in the Record.

This article should be read by every home buyer in America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Stench at FHA

(By John Barron)

(Note.—Skyrocketing losses and bankrupt housing projects across the country attest to disgraceful bungling—or worse—within the Federal Housing Administration. Yet this agency now is being entrusted with a key role in the plans of the President's new Department of Housing and Urban Development.)

To remake American cities, Congress has created a Department of Housing and Urban Development which President Johnson calls "an exciting adventure." But already LBJ's new DHUD, or HUD, is infected by scandalous mismanagement within one of its vital agencies, the Federal Housing Administration.

FHA guarantees repayment of loans for all manner of housing projects it decides to label "feasible" and "economically sound." So in Pascagoula, Miss., FHA approved a loan for Local 693 of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers to build a $2.4-million old folks' home. Nowhere were union members clamoring to retire to a remote Mississippi town. The International Brotherhood made "perfectly clear" to FHA that it would furnish no money whatsoever. The local itself was to confess that it was not "financially able to put money into the project." But, rhapsodizing that this would be "a model facility," FHA skirted its own regulations requiring that a sponsor have resources to "assure meeting debt requirements and operating expenses."

According to FHA documents submitted to the Senate Rules Committee, this was the result: when the home was finished in 1963, subcontractors cried they had not been fully paid, creditors were after the furniture, there was no money to turn on the lights. And neither the union nor anyone else could persuade a single soul to move into this "model facility." Two months later the union abandoned it, leaving FHA to pay off the $2.4-million loan and thus become the hapless owner of this 194-apartment haunted house.

In Newark, N.J., after wealthy builder Arthur H. Padula had obtained land costing $33,000, FHA appraised it for $125,000 and guaranteed a $2.9-million construction loan on a high-rise apartment building. After the structure was completed in 1962, FHA let Padula go three years without making payment on the principal of his loan. This was just the beginning. Padula had paid $36,339 for another tract of Newark property which FHA in 1963 appraised at $300,000—a jump of 800 percent. Then FHA guaranteed a loan of $4.5 million to build a second apartment house.

A PROUD SUCCESS CORRUPTED

These are not isolated examples. Rather, they are samples of the kind of decisions that have caused blunders costing hundreds of millions of dollars. The stories behind many FHA failures are all the more appalling because they show how politics and bureaucracy can corrupt even the best-conceived government programs.

Created in 1934 to help families realize the American dream of home ownership, FHA long was a proud success. Its management was entrusted to competent, nonpartisan professionals working out of field offices throughout the country. Assured they could not lose, private lenders increasingly advanced any amount FHA said was okay. Home buyers, builders and the country benefited.

But, in time, patronage-happy politicians began filling top-level FHA jobs with their own cronies. And the political appointees in turn promoted lackeys of their own. The result by the early 1950's was a national scandal. With FHA approval of loans for far more than projects cost, predatory promoters were given immense "windfall" profits. Estimates of money squandered ran as high as one billion dollars. Investigations led to 200 indictments, the firing of 21 FHA officials, and loudly promised reforms.

UNHEEDED BUNGLING

But look what FHA is doing now. Impartial investigators from the General Accounting Office—Congress's watchdog over federal spending—have found that all over the country FHA has been handing promoters vast profits by overvaluing land. "For 87 of 89 projects reviewed, FHA's estimates of land value exceeded the costs of the land to the sponsors," the GAO reported.

Among the examples cited: In Boston a promoter bought a tract for $8971; the following year, FHA appraised it at $131,531. In Chicago the FHA said it would allow $300,000 for a particular tract. So a promoter went out and bought it for $212,000 and proceeded to cash in. Such inflated appraisals help kite loan guarantees beyond actual project costs. "Our review clearly shows," GAO reported, "that in many instances a sponsor can construct a project with little or no actual cash investment."

FHA has approved marginal or hopeless projects, let promoters milk them through what GAO calls "excessive withdrawal of corporate funds" and then abandon them. And while FHA has sat dumbly by, other promoters have gone from city to city defaulting on project after project. It has permitted still others to default on loans but continue to collect rents for up to five years. GAO estimated that one promoter pocketed $318,000 while FHA paid taxes and insurance for his defaulted project. Moreover, FHA has been letting freeloaders live in repossessed apartment buildings, then writing off their unpaid rents as uncollectable.

In the last 30 months, the GAO has submitted to Congress 11 reports indicting FHA for derelictions ranging from misrepresentation of its income to slovenly neglect of its own foreclosed property. Strangely, Congress has paid little heed. The FHA might have continued its scandalous bungling indefinitely had it not been for crusading Sen. John J. Williams (R., Del.) [1] and some honest civil servants within the agency.

Disgusted by what they saw, the government workers secretly began talking to the Senator, who on his own already was amassing devastating records and entire case histories of FHA deals. "These records are as shocking as anything within my experience," Senator Williams said. "They document incredible incompetence, if not a lot worse, at the highest levels. In case after case the FHA has shown little concern for the housing needs of our people. It has seemed interested, instead, in pandering to politicans or slipping money into the pockets of questionable speculators."

FHA FOLLIES

In Jacksonville, Fla., for example, Sen. George A. Smathers' old college roommate and close friend, Charles E. Commander, Jr., asked FHA to help him built an apartment house. FHA evaluators opposed the project, declaring it "doomed from the start." But one evaluator reports he received "at least a dozen telephone calls" from a Smathers assistant demanding approval. And though Smathers denies he had any interest in the project, pressures exerted in his name ultimately prevailed. FHA guaranteed a $1.9-million loan, and the 76-unit apartment was built. Naturally enough, it failed; FHA had to pay off the mortgage. For nearly three years now FHA has owned this white elephant.

FHA in 1962 also did its best to produce for another politician, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell. Powell's nonprofit corporation sought to buy and "rehabilitate" a Washington hotel on sale for $2,250,000. FHA obligingly decided that a $4,500,000 loan—twice the price of the hotel—would be "feasible," even though a month later FHA had to admit it had no idea what the "rehabilitation" actually would cost. The deal fell through after Senator Williams took the Senate floor to expose the outrageous handout.

WESLEY MANOR FIASCO

In the little Texas town of Weslaco, Methodist preacher Paul A. Weiss sought to build a grandiose retirement home which FHA technicians declared was predestined to "certain failure."

Depending upon the size of the quarters occupied, the elderly were to make a "contribution" of $8000 to $22,000. The home was to keep these savings, then when a tenant died, sell his or her space to someone else. Additionally, tenants would have to pay monthly rentals of $135 to $245. Worse still, an FHA analyst calculated that even if every room was filled and maximum charges were collected, the home would be perpetually in the red.

"If this project is built, one and all who see it will categorize it as an FHA folly," a regional examiner warned Washington. "And the loss FHA will sustain will be stupendous."

FHA professionals in San Antonio long fought the project. But in Washington in January 23, 1962, a special FHA assistant, ex-Sen. Gerald P. Nye, wrote: "Vice President Johnson has revealed a large interest in the

---

[1] See "Incorruptible John Williams—'The Conscience of the Senate,'" The Reader's Digest, May '64.

Wesley Manor project, and this office has assured him that everything possible would be done to expedite the hour when construction could begin." And later, the San Antonio office received a copy of a letter in which FHA headquarters promised a "Congressman" approval. FHA kept its political promises and guaranteed a $2.8-million loan.

The imposing five-story home, with its 139 apartments, palatial public rooms and elegant furnishings, was completed last fall. Today it stands half-empty. Some sincere churchmen around the area are doing their best to make it succeed. But its manager, Lawson W. House, says that it cannot pay off the mortgage unless it resells every apartment at least three times. In other words, if the home is to support itself, its occupants must die, and be quick about it.

MORE PRODUCTIVE WORK

Then there's the notorious case revolving around C. A. Neal Pickett. Although Pickett had gone through a variety of jobs, he had been a one-term mayor of Houston, and he did have influential friends. He was the brother-in-law of Sen. RALPH YARBOROUGH and a pal of the big Houston developer, Frank Sharp. Labeling him "extremely well qualified," FHA on July 17, 1961, made Pickett—the only candidate civil service recommended—director of its Houston office.

Next year, Pickett's friend Sharp and others urged Houston's First Methodist Church to sponsor a retirement home on a large tract Sharp was developing With Pickett present, a church committee rejected the proposal. The entire board of stewards ratified the committee's decision, and the pastor, Dr. Charles L. Allen, published a declaration that the church had no "connection whatsoever, directly or indirectly," with the project.

Still, Pickett approved the project! When FHA's Houston chief underwriter, George D. Humphreville, tried to tell him this could not be done, Pickett wrote back: "I suggest that in the future you devote your time and that of your secretary to more productive work."

Next, Pickett overruled FHA professionals who had valued the retirement-home site at $1.25 to $1.35 a square foot. He jumped the valuation to $2—an increase of $237,000. A respected FHA examiner, Carl D. Whitney, reported to Washington that Pickett was guilty of flagrant maladministration. He denounced the project as a "subterfuge" which was "wholly ineligible and worthless as a nonprofit venture." He urged immediate withdrawal of FHA approval.

But the FHA in Washington hid the report, disregarded its recommendations, whitewashed Pickett, and approved the $4.7-million project called Clarewood House. Then it exiled Humphreville to west Texas.

Last spring Senator WILLIAMS asked FHA how the project was doing. "The outlook for success is favorable," Commissioner Philip N. Brownstein blandly replied. But since opening February 1, 1964, Clarewood House continuously has been in such difficulty it has yet to make a payment on the principal of its loan. And its manager, E. Bruce Sledge, reports that "there is little hope of breaking even" unless the project wins tax exemptions denied it when the Texas attorney general ruled it was not nonprofit.

WINDFALLS FOR THE DENTIST

But the most revealing picture of what has gone on inside FHA emerges from its deals with Dr. Daniel Gevinson, a onetime Washington, D.C., dentist. These have been piling up ever since 1947 despite this unbelievable record: FHA itself openly admitted Gevinson had grabbed windfall profits. Next, Senate investigators publicly branded him as a recipient of a "kickback" from an FHA project. Then an FHA field director warned that he repeatedly had flouted FHA regulations. Finally, in an official report an FHA examiner denounced him for "unethical and sharp practices," "misrepresentations" and "violations of agreements."

Yet in 1960 with another FHA loan—this time for $6 million—Gevinson began a 13-story apartment project in Syracuse, N.Y. A Gevinson company picked up $258,000 by getting $1,145,700 for subcontracting work which cost only $887,700, according to GAO. And GAO further found that Gevinson made an additional $225,360 through a joint venture with a local construction company. After the apartment building was finished, Gevinson simply defaulted and walked away with his profit. The FHA estimates that it will lose $2,300,000 on this deal.

Meanwhile, Gevinson had applied for an $8.7-million FHA loan to build an apartment project, Turtle Creek Square, Ltd., in Dallas. Ellis Charles, director of FHA's Dallas office, twice rejected the proposal. Then Charles received a telegram from headquarters in Washington: "You are directed to accept and process application for 363-unit Turtle Creek project."

Charles reminded FHA headquarters of bitter experiences with Gevinson, but in vain. The Turtle Creek site cost $2.52 a square foot, and FHA appraised it at $2.60. When Gevinson demanded far more, the Dallas office again rejected his application. Still Washington decreed that the Dallas director had provided "no basis for rejection." And FHA Assistant Commissioner C. Franklin Daniels instructed Charles to "resolve" the valuation at $4—a 53-percent jump which inflated the land price to $1,051,614. To help Gevinson further, the FHA ordered four extra men to Dallas—two from Washington and two from Houston—and even authorized overtime pay.

Next, Daniels waived a requirement limiting commercial space to ten percent and allowed Gevinson 39 percent. On September 29, 1961, Washington telegraphed Charles to guarantee Gevinson approval by October 16. But Gevinson repeatedly had refused to supply required financial data, and the processing was far from complete, so Charles courageously wired back: No. By telegram, another FHA man was ordered to Dallas—from Oklahoma City—to push the deal. "This assignment is urgent and has approval highest authority. Any questions telephone," the wire said.

FHA processors kept uncovering irregularities in Gevinson's plans. The Dallas chief, backed by his conscience and other FHA evaluators, could not bring himself to surrender. But on October 16 he received an ultimatum: "You are hereby authorized, instructed and directed, as of this date, October 16, 1961, to insure advances in amount of $9 million on Turtle Creek," Assistant Commissioner Daniels wired. "You are hereby released from all responsibility in connection therewith."

Charles soon resigned in disgust. Then, incredibly, the closing of the loan was transferred half a continent away to Albany, N.Y., where none of the Dallas staff could watch what happened. However, a copy of the contract shows that Gevinson got a $9.9-million loan—$1.2 million more than he first sought.

Gevinson employed much the same subcontracting schemes in Dallas as he had used in Syracuse. "It appeared that the sponsor (Gevinson)-controlled subcontractors would realize profits of about one million dollars," GAO said.

Of course, Turtle Creek Square when completed never was able to attract enough tenants to break even. And, as in Syracuse, Gevinson defaulted and abandoned it to the FHA. Yet *despite Gevinson's past depredations, FHA approved still another $8.7-million apartment loan for Gevinson in San Antonio.* He never got around to using it. After GAO investigation, a Texas jury convicted him of kiting his costs.

JEWEL OF A DEPARTMENT?

These FHA follies represent only some of the cases which have been documented. Still waiting to be told are the stories behind hundreds of other FHA failures. FHA boasts that in comparison with all the loans it insures, its losses are very low.

The staggering fact obscured by this claim is that *nearly one out of every ten* FHA apartment or multi-family projects across the country now has gone bankrupt. At the end of the last fiscal year FHA was saddled with 575 of these failures which had cost it $536 million. It was also still stuck with 46,261 homes which cost $520 million.

True, it will try to sell these homes and apartments, but, by its own calculations, it expects to get back only about 70 percent of what it put into them. GAO reports, "FHA's actual losses on the sale of small homes have risen sharply in recent years—from about $6.4 million in 1961 to $21 million in 1962 and to $46 million in 1963." In 1964 they jumped to $94 million, and last year skyrocketed to $142 million!

Here is a record which should cause the President to pause. The new Department of Housing and Urban Development will dispense billions in subsidies for rents, recreation, public housing, urban renewal and other city-salvation schemes. And FHA will be in the thick of it. Consider what it can do with the rent-subsidy program alone. No matter how poor an apartment project, no matter how promoters plunder it, FHA or DHUD can fill it up with tenants at government expense, and no one will be the wiser.

A White House aide says President Johnson is determined that DHUD will be "a jewel of a department." Indeed, Johnson himself says, "much of our hope for American progress" will depend upon DHUD. But lest his hopes and promises evaporate in more scandal, the President first had better clean house in the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let us give them credit for what they have done, but at the same time if anyone has the idea that the FHA has corrected the situation let me say that it has not.

I quoted from the Comptroller General's reports beginning with 1963, 1964, 1965, and in February 1966. And the same miserable pattern prevails. Now what do we hear from the committee. I am amazed at the apparent defense that is being made of these practices. This situation will not be corrected until we clean out those responsible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware—and I say this in good humor—I think he has made my case. He cited only three cases. He said that these cases took place after the actions taken by the FHA. He named cases in 1960, 1961, and 1962.

The fact is, action was taken on the ones I referred to in January 1965, December 1964, December 1964, January 1965, December 1964, January 1965, November 1965, and June 1966.

I challenge the Senator from Delaware to indicate which of his cases, how many of his cases, and what proportion of them, were approved after December of 1964, when virtually all of these reforms were put into effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator satisfied with the reforms thus far made? As the Senator from Wisconsin points out, it is apparent that the committee feels no reforms are needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The committee does feel that these reforms are needed. The committee is deeply interested in them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I cited a case the other day in Tucson, Ariz., in April 1964 and 1965, where there was an overvaluation of land. The projects were Christopher City and Green Valley.

This project failed in March 1966.

My remarks on the Christopher City and the Green Valley projects, both located in Tucson, Ariz., were made on June 21, 1966, and appear on pages 13780–13783 of the RECORD of that date.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not deny that there have not been cases and that there will not continue to be cases of this kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Also in Alaska——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not deny that there will not continue to be violations. I think the Senator from Delaware is very much to be congratulated for pointing out these violations, but what I am saying is that the great bulk of the cases to which the Senator from Delaware referred are cases that took place before the reforms, which I have listed at great length which the FHA has taken, were instituted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Wait a minute—certain reforms took place in June, but there is much still to be done.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This was before the present Dr. Brownstein ever came to FHA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The report I placed in the RECORD speaks for itself. The Senator from Wisconsin can defend them as long as he wishes. I say that these abuses are continuing. The other day I discussed a bad situation in Anchorage, Alaska, where six out of seven projects failed. As if this were not bad enough, they approved another multifamily project in spite of the six failures. That was just a couple of months ago. When were these reforms put into effect? Perhaps one of the reasons we are not getting anywhere in correcting these abuses is that there are too many people who think there is nothing wrong.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I am certainly not one of those who think there is nothing wrong. There have been many errors and serious mistakes and real blunders made. FHA should be severely criticized for this. I commend the Senator from Delaware on what he has done this morning, and also in the past; but I do say as a matter of fairness and in truth, that we have a situation here in which action has been taken since December of 1964 on most of these reforms. Since that time, there have not been many instances, according to the record of the Senator from Delaware, in which he gave case after case after case, but there were many, a great majority were before December of 1964, and I think the RECORD will show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There were many approved in the 1963 and 1964 period. It takes a couple of years to finish construction on a multifamily project before it gets a chance to go broke.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right, and some took place afterward.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not criticizing the Senator from Wisconsin. He has a right to his position, but I am certainly not taking the position that all has been cleared up.

I will cite another case which is developing right now in Texas if the Senator wants something recent. I will go into greater detail on it. I was going to put it in the RECORD, but I am——

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, no, I have not said that. I say that there are violations now. With 8 million homeowners involved, there are bound to be violations. The Senator from Delaware has performed a real service on this matter, but I do say that reforms have been put into effect and that the great bulk of the cases that were listed by the Senator from Delaware were before the reforms went into effect. Furthermore, the reforms went into effect after the 1964 hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency, led by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who focused attention on it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Let me say that I am aware of some of the continued abuses. I certainly support the idea of the Committee on Banking and Currency exercising close oversight scrutiny. I think I can speak for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee when I say that he also maintains a continuing interest in this subject. I think that the coming next session will find us going further and deeper into the matter. We have made some progress and we are still openminded to the fact that we need to progress some more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can cite another example—even today the FHA is operating an old and dilapidated hotel in Hot Springs, Ark., which its underwriters recommended against ever being approved in the first place. It was renovated on the basis that it would be a home for the elderly.

This was a complete failure; the FHA has had to take it over, and in order to keep it open they are operating it now as headquarters for racing fans in that area. The underwriters point out that such use is in violation of the law. That is a 1966 project the Senator may wish to review. That report was first discussed here today.

There is a case in Texas of a sergeant now in Vietnam who lost his home a couple of months ago. This is another 1966 case that merits study and surely is recent enough to be interesting.

This sergeant, who is now in Vietnam, had paid over $3,400 in payments on his home. He met his payments over a period of 3 or 4 years. True, he was in default. The investment house said he was in default for 5 months. His wife has shown certified copies of money orders with dates showing that they covered 2 of the 5 months. But anyway, under the rules, if anyone defaults for 3 months they can be foreclosed, and accordingly the mortgage can be turned back to FHA.

FHA now claims that they have no choice except to foreclose, notwithstanding the fact that this lady claims that the delinquency was due to her husband having to go to Vietnam, having to get her children settled, and so forth. She is willing and able to make all of the delinquent payments and a payment in advance, and they refused to accept it. Why?

Mr. President, I do not intend to delay this discussion too long, but here is another new case for the Senator from Wisconsin. This is one that happened in West Virginia. A homeowner purchased a home in an area that was FHA approved.

The home was on the side of a hill. The first rain came, and the hill slid down. The people have to move out. The owners are stuck now with homes they are afraid to use and cannot sell. I think the FHA has a responsibility to protect the homeowners and not merely sit back and say, "Well, with your signature, the mortgage is good."

Their policy seems to be buyers beware. But what are these FHA inspectors for?

I had another case called to my attention last week.

The FHA should have a rule that all downpayments made by prospective homeowners must be put in escrow until such time as the individual gets title to the home. This regulation should cover additions as well as downpayments.

We have a case in New York where a home was sold in a project named the Middle Village. I have here a picture of the cracked wall in that development, a defect resulting from poor construction. The FHA gave approval to this construction; but there was a poor foundation and the walls collapsed. The city has condemned the property for family use. The people have to move out; but where will they go? They have their money invested in those homes and FHA mortgages. Why was not that defective construction discovered by the inspectors at the time? Somebody should be held responsible for the construction for these elderly citizens who are buying the property. They certainly are entitled to better protection than they are getting.

Then there is the argument that this program is not going to cost the taxpayers any money. I get that argument every time I bring this issue up. The FHA says, "What are you kicking about? This program does not cost the taxpayers."

Nonsense. Who is buying the homes? The taxpayers of America. Who is paying the cost of the mortgage insurance? American home buyers. They are paying it in additional assessments on mortgage insurance to cover the losses sustained on these unsound projects. If that money is not adequate to pay for it then it is the American taxpayers in general who pay. Who guarantees these mortgages and notes sold by FNMA and FHA should there be a default? The American taxpayers. If that is not true why were we in the Senate yesterday being asked to approve $3 billion to back up this Government guarantee?

The argument that it does not cost the taxpayers anything to have the Government guarantee these mortgages is a silly argument. I refuse to accept it. Suppose the contribution or guarantee by the Government is not used, there are salaries and payrolls for the FHA administrator and his employees. Who pays his salary? He is on the Federal payroll. He is working for the U.S. Government, and his salary is paid by the taxpayers.

That is the problem—some of these high officials and directors do not think they work for the Government even though they are on the Federal payroll.

Perhaps sometime we should accept their argument and stop their salaries.

They had better wake up to the fact that they are employees of the taxpayers and are accountable to the people. So far as I am concerned they are working for the Government, and they are accountable. As long as our Government is underwriting billions of dollars for this program it is the taxpayers' money, and I shall continue to demand a full accounting.

As to the argument that there is a $1 billion reserve and there is nothing to worry about—it is also true that there are $1,193,242,943.76 tied up in repossessed multifamily homes and mortgages which the agency has had to take over because of bankruptcy. There is another possible $1 billion in deferred or modified agreements on mortgages which they have not taken over yet. So do not brag too much about the reserve. It is getting dangerously low; that is why we had to replenish the funds yesterday.

Yes, some of these cases discussed here today happened a few years ago, but those who were responsible for those mistakes are still on the public payroll and making the decisions. One of these men who was criticized most vigorously by their own inspector is still working. This man was condemned by one of their own investigators, yet he is still serving as a director. Why keep this political hack on the payroll? I have no confidence that the situation confronting this agency will be corrected in that area until he is out. Furthermore, we cannot correct the many abuses confronting this housing agency until Congress recognizes what is causing it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that Senators are anxious to get away, and I am sorry that we have been detained until this hour——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May we have order, Mr. President? This is important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will please take their seats.

Mr. JAVITS. But there was nothing that anyone could do about that; and Senator WILLIAMS quite properly had a very important thesis which he wished to present.

Mr. President, the essence of my amendment is that I seek to obtain an allowable authorization for college housing of $300 million for the current fiscal year and $300 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, provided that the interest rate is not the arbitrary 3-percent interest rate which is fixed by the present law, but shall be what is called, in Federal parlance, the "going rate," based upon the average rate on all Federal indebtedness plus one-quarter of 1 percent; which as I understand it, brings the rates to either 4¾ or 4⅝ percent at this time.

Mr. President, the reason I am making this effort is that the agency responsible for the administration of funds for college housing—which is indispensable to enabling institutions of higher education to keep up with their very materially increased enrollments—is really out of money. That is what it comes down to, in essence. I shall explain in detail why that is; but that is the practical fact, it is out of money, and since January 31, 1966, the agency has not even taken applications.

So when I speak of applications, I am referring only to applications which were on hand up to January 31, 1966.

Mr. President, about two-thirds of our States, even before the freeze on applications since January 31, 1966, had applications pending. The pending applications filed before January 31, 1966, total about $300 million.

I am advised by the Department that all of these applications are approvable; that is, they have had preliminary screening. But there is just no money to lend.

Lest Senators have an idea, Mr. President, that it is again the big, rich States which are in here for money, I dispel that thought at once. The young man is now distributing a table showing the applications on hand. My own State, for example, has an application for $500,000, which happens to be for a small Catholic college called D'Youville College. But Colorado, for example—which certainly does not qualify as a big State—has $14 million in applications pending; Texas has almost $26 million in applications; and Minnesota has some $15 million. Mississippi, for example, has almost $8 million. So this is not a problem which is unique to the big States.

As a matter of fact, the big, rich States have very little involved in the applications which could be approved if $300 million were made available. It is mainly the smaller States—the States which have, in general, less financial capability—which are involved.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the need for these funds, but I should like to ask the Senator from New York how his amendment would actually obtain money and make it available to take care of these applications for the construction of housing. I wish to know how it works. I realize the need for it, but I should like to know how the Senator's amendment would be helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. Like so many of the housing authorizations, this is a borrowing proposition. The money is borrowed from the Treasury through the HUD and loaned to the institutions; and the institutions repay on varying terms, under what is equivalent to a mortgage.

The amendment fits into the statutory scheme. The only part of the present statutory scheme that I do not carry out in the amendment is the 3-percent fixed-interest rate provided by law, because I feel that under present circumstances, we cannot lend money at that rate. So my amendment specifically calls for a higher rate of interest on these particular resources, going up to almost 5 percent, by reason of the fact that money is at such high cost right now.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Under the present tight money situation and the present high interest rates, unless we do something like this, there will not be any building; is that not about right?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly right. All these people have got is $50 million.

Our original intention was that they should have $300 million a year. When the Participation Sales Act was passed not long ago, this particular agency came in for the sale of about $800 million of its paper, as a part of that $2 billion mass of paper which was to be sold. The only difficulty is that because of the very sharp difference between the interest rate on the paper which this agency has in hand—3 percent—and the going interest rate, which is almost 6 percent, the Federal Government is very reluctant to let any of this paper be sold. The sufferers are the colleges, because there is just no money in the basket. All the money they have obtained has been the small amount of repayments received from past accumulations on loans.

There is $200 million in such repayments at the disposition of the Budget Bureau. They have not even retained that. The Bureau of the Budget has allowed them $50 million of that amount. That is all there is.

They have lowered the boom on all applications after January 31, 1966. As of that date, there are some $300 million of applications pending. I understand that, if they had continued to receive applications, they would today have approvable applications in the amount of $1,100 million, so big is the demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. Is there not some money in the budget for college housing?

Mr. JAVITS. The budgetary money for college housing, I say to my colleague, is the money that has already been used. They have completely committed that as of June 30, 1966.

They were supposed to get the $300 million out of the participation sales deal—that is, the authorization for fiscal year 1967. The authorization was canceled in the Participation Sales Act on the theory that they would get the participation sales money. However, because this particular kind of paper carries a very heavy cost from the Federal Government, as the Senator can see, at a time of high interest rates, they have not sold them. Hence, they are out of money.

The situation is one in which this college housing is caught in the squeeze between the high money rate and an exhaustion of the money they had available.

The only place in which they can look for money is the Bureau of the Budget, which has $200 million of repayments under its control.

The Bureau of the Budget, for reasons of its own, which I assume are valid, has allowed them only $50 million, and that is it.

The whole college housing field, insofar as any Federal help is concerned, is starving. As a practical matter, the law provides, very wisely, that they will not get any Federal loans unless there is no capability of getting money anywhere else. That is what is happening now. Bank money is extremely short and so is any other source of lending.

Of all times when they need help, this is the time when they need it the most. I am told that even if colleges could get money, it would be at a rate in excess of 6 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what the Senator is telling us now is that from the Federal Government point of view, there is practically no money available for college housing.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right. The only money available is the $50 million which, from the point of view of the current situation, is practically nothing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of the Senator in offering this amendment would be to make the interest rate sufficiently high so that the Government could borrow the money and relend it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. I realize all of our financial problems. We have to balance the needs at a time like this. Hence, I have not gone haywire as to the amount.

I seek to have $300 million authorized—and that is pretty much a classic figure—for the next 3 years, rather than to go to any extremes and secure a much larger amount.

Under present conditions the institutions would be better off to have the interest rate raised across the board. They have got 3-percent money, but they have no money. In other words, they have a 3-percent interest rate on this money, but no money is available to them at 3 percent. Hence, it is of no use whatever if they cannot get the money in any way.

We are really lowering the boom on college housing construction, except to institutions of great wealth that can raise the money either by endowment or by borrowing it on investments. However, the small colleges are being hurt the most in this situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator may or may not know this, but in the independent offices appropriations bill, language is contained—and it is very complicated—that would allow the loans that the Federal Government now holds to be sold to FNMA, and the FNMA would put them out as interest certificates at going rates.

As I understand it, you are saying that no money would be available from that. Has the Senator studied that matter?

Mr. JAVITS. From what I have been able to determine—I have not studied that in a negative way—I am not prepared to say no, that no money will be available. However, I have studied it in a positive way. I have consulted with the authorities and gotten all the facts and details from the agency.

The positive sources of money are those which I have described. They do not include the ones to which the Senator refers. So my answer is that I cannot see that any money will come from that source.

I told this to the committee yesterday. This bill will go to conference.

I wanted to accomplish two things. First. The Senate should be for the principle that college housing needs some help. It has not received any help. Second. Being seized of the problems—as we lawyers say—I was confident that once they had the view of the Senate that we wanted some money for college housing, they would work it out compatibly with the various problems involved.

No individual Senator, except in rare cases, can have researched these matters through to the ultimate in such a way as to say to the committee: "You must take this, or else."

I do no such thing. Once they ascertain that the Senate wants them to do something about college housing, so that money will be available for this purpose, I am sure they will work out the details compatibly with all the things we have provided. I hope and pray they can find some other way than mine. However, there is no mandate now from either body of Congress to do anything.

I am trying to put them in a position in which they are responsible and have a mandate from the Senate that we want something done about it.

However, I have no slavish adherence to this particular scheme.

I have advanced it because I think it makes sense in the particular circumstances.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my argument by outlining the needs.

I think we can say with fair certainty that for practical purposes—though there may be money in the Bureau of the Budget which they are not releasing and there may be money in the participation certificates which are unsold for very good reasons because of the broad spread of going interest rates, as contrasted to the 3-percent interest rate in college housing—the fact is that no money is available now or in the foreseeable future, at least for a time, in the college housing field.

The Department has applications in excess of $300 million. On the desk of every Senator is a list of the States with the amount of the applications from each State. I am advised by the Department that these are approvable applications. It is information of the same character that the Department would give to any other Senator or Member of the House. They are approvable applications, but nothing can be done about them because the resources are just not available. These applications are only those that have been received up to January 31, 1966; the Department has not taken applications since that time. Requests have been received for these funds from almost 400 institutions out of 2,350 eligible institutions in the United States.

I examined into the question of the way in which this program could be administered, and the way in which it could be administered would be as a mix. In other words, any money which the Department might have available on a 3-percent basis would be mixed with what it has available on a high-interest basis, and anyone who was granted a loan, if the amendment should become law, would have to take his share of low-interest money, which is infinitesimal, and of high-interest money which would be made available by the amendment.

This is the worst time of all for these institutions to get any money, if they do get it. There is really no chance to get it anywhere. If they were able to get it, they would have to pay more than 6 percent for it. Bank money is not available. The closest to these rates for money is being paid by States having high credit standing, such as California, a State which has just issued privately a bond issue on which it paid a coupon of 4.98 percent. But such funds are available only under unusual circumstances to a large State university having excellent credit, where the State is borrowing money on tax exempts, even though the State had to sell its bonds at a rate of 4.78 return, which is an extremely high return. But that is the financial situation as it affects colleges.

There are two factors which indicate that we ought to act on the bill. The first is the size of the demand. Second, I am reliably advised that young people will actually be barred from admission to colleges beginning in September 1967, because housing will not be available. There is a period of 2 years between the time when money is made available and the time when the housing is available. Therefore, unless we act now, we shall lose a real opportunity to cope with the burgeoning college population, namely, in the housing field.

The loans proposed by the amendment would be essentially housing loans. Only a very small part of the loans made are for dining halls and student centers, which are ancillary to housing. These would be housing loans.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the Senator explain something on his chart? There are a number of institutions left blank, which, I take it, have made no application.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to explain to the Senator that they made no application as of January 31, 1966. When the boom was lowered on applications they did not take any. The agency tells me that if they had continued to take applications from January 31, 1966, they would be up to about 800 million now and the demand is about a million. I have this in writing, and I had it printed in the RECORD yesterday. The reason they have this amount is because this is when they stopped.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator made an eloquent appeal. I agree with him. I wonder if in some instances it can be because State laws prohibit the institutions from making applications?

Mr. JAVITS. That is true, but they have applications from 35 States.

Mr. SIMPSON. It covered public and private institutions?

Mr. JAVITS. In 26 instances they covered both public and private institutions.

Mr. SIMPSON. The ones with the historic position on public institutions.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it seems to me that what we have here is a question of priorities, and second, the extent to which we should exercise restraint in our public spending in this period in our Nation's life, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Certainly, I am not going to stand here and argue against the merits of the college housing program. I worked for the college housing program. When I was the Governor of my State I worked for the college housing program. I supported every college housing program that I had an opportunity to vote on in the Senate, as a member of the committee and as a Senator. I supported increases in college housing against the opposition of some Senators who voted against such increases.

The only issue before the committee and the Senate is not the merits of the college housing program, which has been proven beyond doubt, but whether or not we should lift the ceiling on present authorizations.

The current program of authorizations was established in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. It is as recent as that. That legislation established a 4-year program at $300 million a year. We are in the second year of that 4-year program. There is available this year, and fiscal year 1968, and fiscal year 1969, another $300 million under that program.

It might be said that we did not authorize $600 million a year at that time. We did not because we had to set a limit somewhere, and in the context of the total housing bill of that year this seemed a reasonable figure.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question of fact?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. We should agree as to what the fiscal situation is in fiscal 1967. The Senator said $300 million was available in fiscal 1967. I would like to question the Senator on that point. My understanding is to the contrary. I wish to review the matter with the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. I wish to say at this point that I have just had a member of the staff check with the agency on that question to make sure we had the facts. I am assured through him that $300 million is programed for this year.

Mr. JAVITS. Programed, authorized, and available, are all different words. Perhaps we can agree on the facts.

As I understand the facts, they are that there was an authorization up to the time the Participation Sales Act was passed of $300 million for fiscal year 1967, but that in the Participation Sales Act—and we have it here, and that is what it says—the 1967 authorization was canceled. It was canceled for a good reason. It was canceled because they believed that they would sell participations and raise the $300 million, and perhaps more. The fact is they are not selling. They do not propose to sell them because the gap in interest is too great for the Government to absorb. For practical purposes, there is no money.

I am not arguing that they might not get it or that they might get it. For practical purposes, there is no money for college housing. That is the legal basis on which it is presented to the Senate. If we are wrong about the facts, we should know it.

I agree with the Senator that this is a question of priority and that that is the issue before the Senate.

I am only submitting from the Committee on Education this morning that the priority question deserves as much attention as the urban renewal program or seasonal housing program, or a number of other things. That is all. I do not think that we should differ on the facts.

Mr. MUSKIE. I say to the Senator only that the commitee acted on the basis of its understanding that $300 million will be put into this program.

If the words are vague and not reassuring, we understood that $300 million was to be put in the program this year. I will be happy to check back with the agency in the light of the presentation which has just been made by the Senator, because I agree that we should clarify this point and know the basis of fact on which we are acting. I am not interested in confusing the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. No, I am sure the Senator is not. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is one of the most reliable Members of this body and the last man who would want to confuse anybody.

However, I wish to suggest that the facts are not too clear. I understood that they had $300 million for the fiscal year 1966. That was the first year of the program. They borrowed that money from the Treasury at the 3-percent rate and loaned it out.

Now there comes 1967 when, because we had passed the Participation Sales Act of 1966, the authorization was canceled out with the full expectation that the paper would be sold and the money would go into the program. Now, things happen and that is not so.

Does the Senator want to let them go back to the basis that they did before, to the Treasury, where they are sure of getting the money, but for a higher rate of interest?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the amendment make that proviso, that in the event the Participation Sales Act does take effect and the paper can be sold, that would vitiate this new authorization?

Mr. JAVITS. I will be happy to do that.

The Senator is very astute. But I wish to make a point. I am representing to the Senate that the only thing that this vote will show is that we want $300 million in this program for 1967. When they work it out in conference there may be other ways in which they can work this out in detail. The only thing that the Senate would be doing is declaring itself on the principle of considering the priorities. The Senator is right. They want $300 million in the college housing program. Then, I felt the conference would be seized of the program and do what the Senator suggests or something else. I do not have the intimate details. But this is not an "and/or" amendment. It is simply a matter of declaring the purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the Senator is not trying to raise the authorization to $600 million; all that the Senator is doing is insuring $300 million for 1967.

Mr. JAVITS. Otherwise, they are not going to get anything because the Federal Government does not want to appropriate it in 1972.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. What proportion of this would go to public institutions and how much to private institutions?

Mr. JAVITS. I gather most is for private institutions. In a good many of the States public institutions are not included, but they are fully qualified to participate except where they are inhibited by State law. I gather that there are a few State laws which have provisions that might inhibit their participation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I was wondering. I introduced a bill which would provide for tax exemptions in the matter of college education.

One of the great problems we have today is that many colleges would like to sell bonds for their building construction without government assistance, but

Only two States, I have ascertained, have any kind of dormitory authority—my own State of New York and the State of Connecticut. New York figures in this proposal very little; it is mainly a problem that affects many other States.

The burgeoning college population is shown by a table which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, showing that today we have, as of September enrollment, something like 6 million students in college—5,924,000. That increases, in round figures, about a half million a year, until about 1970 it would be 7.25 million.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Degree credit enrollments

	Total degree credit
1966 (actual 1965, 5,570,271)	5,924,000
1967	6,410,000
1968	6,820,000
1969	6,966,000
1970 (15 percent low)	7,225,000

Source: Proj. of Ed. Stat. to 1974–75 (O.E. 10030–65).

Mr. JAVITS. I am reliably informed that if we do not move now, a material number of young people will be barred from college because they cannot get housing.

Finally, my own interest in this matter is attributable to the fact that I am the ranking member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which handles education, and I am thoroughly alerted and informed as to the problems of higher education.

In offering this amendment, it is really my purpose to deal with a problem of higher education in another field—but in a very related field—in order to facilitate these colleges in their problem.

I say to Senators that everything in our country today, when we have almost full production, in terms of the facilities which are available—about 97 percent of our resources are being used for production today—and when we have an inflationary situation—is in relationship to priority: What is more important than something else?

I respectfully submit that this is a field of critical importance to the future of the Nation, ranking with anything that we are doing in the normal housing field or any other field, and therefore we should give it a fair allocation of our resources.

As I said before, I have not strained the matter. I have tried to propose something to the Senate which is reasonable in terms of its size, certainly apportioned to the need. I respectfully submit that on a deserving priority basis, we ought to do something in the college housing field, where, if nothing is done today, apparently nothing will happen unless conditions change materially.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Will the distinguished Senator from New York comment on what effect this might have on the current problem of the Government going into the money market and bidding up interest rates to the extent that we have a tight money situation from so many classes of loans.

Mr. JAVITS. I just stated that I believe that one must understand that problem and one must deal with it on a question of priorities.

We are appropriating money for roads, for dams, for housing, for many other things. We are appropriating money for mass transit. We are appropriating billions upon billions of dollars. We must now look at everything in terms of its urgency to the Nation. That is why I am not asking that we make this a billion dollars. There is a demand for it, and a provable demand. We cannot do that kind of thing. But I believe that within the fact that we are raising money for many other things, the question is whether this rates consideration in this kind of time. I respectfully submit that it does rate consideration, to the reasonable extent that I have proposed to the Senate.

My argument is not based upon saying that what the Senator says is not so. There is tremendous competition within the Federal Establishment for money. Money has to be raised, and every dollar that is raised has a tendency to raise the interest rate. But I point out that we are raising billions of dollars and that this matter rates some treatment, some consideration, in terms of national interest.

Mr. TOWER. This would be phased over a period of 3 years?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. So that there would not be an immediate impact of the $300 million?

Mr. JAVITS. No.

Mr. TOWER. Perhaps not even $100 million a year.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator will be a conferee. I believe that the committee should have the feeling of the Senate, that the Senate wishes something done to loosen up some resources for college housing.

As Senator SALTONSTALL has said, we might find some comfort in the bill that the Senate passed the other day. That is fine. Perhaps the committee could loosen up the Budget Bureau. At least, we ought to have the word of the Senate that it believes that this matter deserves ratability with other things that are being done in this bill, to the extent of $300 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps the Senator commented on this. I was called from the floor after he commenced his remarks. I wish he would comment on it again for my benefit. In his amendment he has proposed using the average annual interest rate on Treasury borrowing. May I inquire what elements were taken into consideration in going to the higher interest rate rather than staying with the 3 percent, which is now applicable to college loans?

Mr. JAVITS. The first and most important element is practicality. Because of the very high interest rate structure, it becomes much more expensive for the Federal Government to resell this paper at the 3-percent rate, and it becomes counterproductive.

In other words, one reason why I believe that this paper is frozen and is not being put on sale is the gap which the Federal Government would have to meet in terms of money. This creates an immediate budget situation. I do not believe the colleges are being done a favor now by an academic 3-percent rate being retained.

Mr. ALLOTT. In discussing this matter with some housing officials within the last 3 days, I was informed that, with respect to the college housing loans at 3 percent, where they would have to put them on the market at somewhere around 72——

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is a considerable loss that the Government would have to sustain in the sale of these obligations.

Mr. JAVITS. A completely unacceptable discount. They are not selling. If they were selling them, there would be some money. But they are not selling, and they should not.

The other reason for putting it up was this: Normally, colleges might not wish to reach for money at the rate of almost 5 percent. But now, with money so expensive and tight, they are today in the position where they have to.

We might as well be frank about it: this will cause student payments in the dormitories to rise somewhat. This money is more expensive than the other money. But I would rather give the student a dormitory, so that he can attend, even though he has to pay a few dollars more, than deny him the opportunity of going to college at all because 2 years hence a dormitory is not available.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not true that it is up to each university to make this decision when it makes an application? If they feel that the cost of this, under the proposal of the Senator from New York, would be in excess of what would be self-liquidating, they, of course, would not make the application.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. So they are not forced to do anything. And each university could make its own decision in view of the increase in rates.

I think the Senator from New York is properly pointing out that this may and probably will result in their having to charge more for the dormitory housing, but the alternative is no new college housing.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. Especially with money conditions as they are.

Sometimes Senators say that something will not be built unless it is provided for, and so on. That is not necessarily so. The money situation today is such that this is really essential insofar as action on the part of the Federal Establishment is concerned. They certainly are very far down the line in terms of borrowers from institutions where money is very tight, anyway, and is being held in very tightly.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, after discussing this procedure with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I am going to do something a little unusual. I hesitate to do it, but I know Members of the Senate are anxious to get away.

The Senator from New York and I became involved earlier in a question of fact as to the current status of the program and the authorizations under the program.

I have obtained from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget some figures which he is in the process of checking. I am willing to use the rough figures I have, subject to later correction, and I do not think they will be too far off. I shall state these rough figures as to the current status of the program so Senators will have them as a fact basis on which they will be asked to vote this afternoon.

It is a fact that under the Participation Sales Act which we enacted earlier this year there was canceled an authorization of $350 million. That is a rough figure. But it was for the purpose of establishing a solid basis for the enactment of that legislation which some Members thought stimulated too much Federal spending.

The Bureau of the Budget said it had ample authorization to move ahead with the program at the programed levels notwithstanding the cancelation of the 1967 authorization. With that cancelation, this is the situation which the Director of the Budget has given me, subject to later correction in the RECORD.

First of all, he said he planned to sell $800 million in participations in college housing loans in fiscal 1967. Those proceeds will be used, first, to support the $300 million for this year that was already programed at levels which are authorized in the 1965 act.

Of the balance of the $500 million, $350 million has been canceled, leaving $150 million that is "free" in the words of the Budget Director.

In addition, there is an unused amount estimated to be available on June 30, 1967, of $250 million——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that 1967 or 1966?

Mr. MUSKIE. Fiscal 1967.

These figures are shown on the table on page 118 of the hearings.

This would give the administration $400 million over and above the $300 million that is programed for 1967.

That could be used for this program. So that there is ample authorization under existing law not only for the $300 million programed but for an additional $450 million, if the administration wishes to use it.

The administration does not plan to use it for the same reason that it is asking the private sector to restrain itself in capital expenditures and to hold down spending across the board.

That is the situation. It is the situation I tried to point out earlier this afternoon in trying to explain the view of the committee. Each of us has to establish his own order of priority.

There are many other programs in the housing field in which each of us, in good conscience, on the merits, could wish to expand or leave as they are.

Next week, I will be asked to manage the demonstration cities program, designed to assist cities to deal with causes of unrest across the land, which are visible in the headlines of our daily newspapers.

The administration proposal for that program was $2.3 billion. The committee cut it down to $900 million for the reason that it felt it had to exercise restraint in the field of spending.

There are those who, in good conscience, and with conviction, feel that we have exercised restraint enough in our spending programs in schools and for other worthwhile causes.

So the committee, considering the actions it had taken with respect to other housing legislation which it considered the same day, and which will be before the Senate next week—demonstration cities, mass transportation, and so many others—in line with that policy of restraint, voted to hold the college housing program at the level established in the 1965 Housing Act. It is as simple as that.

As I said earlier, I shall not argue the merits of this program. There is nothing I should like better than to feel that I could vote freely, not only for another $300 million a year for college housing, but for as much as can be justified by the meritorious applications which may be received in response to that kind of a statute.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator saying, implicitly and explicitly, that there is existing authorization which will make available $300 million for fiscal 1967 for college housing, and that the department, after the Senator has conferred with it, is going to make sure that that money will be available?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is the assurance I have been given by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. PASTORE. And that the amendment of the Senator from New York is unnecessary under the circumstances?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from New York can answer that better than I. As I understand his amendment, he wanted to double the present size of the program.

Mr. MORSE. No, he does not.

Mr. PASTORE. He did not say that.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me get the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think I can make very clear what I have in mind. I am restoring.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I read the amendment?

> In addition to the total authorization provided by paragraph 1, the Secretary may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $300,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1967 and 1968.

That is the language which I took to mean it was the intent to double the present size of the program. If I am mistaken, I should like to have the Senator from New York correct me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I may address myself to the Senator from Maine, what I had in mind and made very clear was that the reason I had to do it this way was that the authorization was knocked out for 1967; therefore, as far as 1967 is concerned, I am trying to re-create a situation in which they can go to the Treasury for this $300 million. That is why the Senator from Rhode Island quite properly said to me, "I am with you if you want only $300 million, provided you get it out of the participations and the Treasury."

I said, "Great."

The priority thing I do not argue. We must decide that we want college housing, to go ahead and spend $300 million in loans this year. But the weakness in the Senator's argument is that what he is saying to us is, "Sure, we intend to sell the participations, I don't know when or how soon. All I know right now"——

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I said in the fiscal year 1967, so I do know when.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. But in the meantime, all of this is bogged down. If we agree to my amendment, it will be loosened, because they can go to the Treasury until such time as they do sell participations. For that reason, I was willing to adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—though the conferees can very easily do it—and write in here the fact that $300 million shall be available beginning now, either out of Treasury money or out of the sale of the participations.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Rather than an amendment, then, why does not the Senator from New York put in language that can be taken to conference, so that there will be no misunderstanding, and so that we will not run up against the possibility that, in the construction of this amendment, it may in effect double the amount?

Mr. JAVITS. Well, Mr. President, as far as the other 2 years are concerned, that is, 1968 and 1969, it would double the authorization. That is why I said to the Senator from Maine that it is my design and my desire—and I think as the author of the amendment I have the right to give it that construction—that the Senate having expressed itself, the intent is very clear. They will work it out in detail as to exactly what is to be done. The Senate will have expressed itself that it wants money to move into this program beginning with the enactment of the bill.

find that competitively it is too restrictive. Since we are talking about raising Federal capital, if we allowed a tax exemption on college institution financing, we might be in a good position to have the private sector and private investors buying college bonds in order to allow the college to build its own institution instead of appropriating Federal funds. I wonder whether the Senator from New York would consider this as something worth while?

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that it would not have any effect, pro or con, on the amendment, because we have to take the situation as we find it. The Senator is a member of the Finance Committee and he knows the problems with the Treasury Department on the question of exemptions.

State institutions are now capable of raising money through their States. That was done in California recently on a tax-exempt basis. I am certainly sympathetic to the idea which the Senator mentions, because I think that institutions of higher learning qualify for this kind of national consideration, but I am sure the Senator will agree with me that even if we could do that, and it was the prevailing sentiment, it is unlikely to come along in time to help us with the present situation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. My feeling is that maybe we should still consider the advisability of using the tax exemption. Since colleges have such significance in our overall program, and since we are appropriating so much money for college housing and college buildings, we might use tax exemptions in order to accomplish the same result.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much for his intercession.

Mr. President, No. 1, the issue is priority. No. 2, I have no desire to put the committee on an "and/or" spot because we have a record vote coming up. I understand clearly. I hope that every Member will understand that we are certainly relying upon them as to the means by which to attain it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In the event the $300 million is not approved, either by this amendment or, finally, in conference by other means, does the Senator have any estimate of the number of students in colleges that might not be able to find housing because a proper donor could not be found?

Mr. JAVITS. I would not consider my estimate to be reliable except to point out, from the information I have been able to obtain, that a material number of college students stand the likelihood of being denied admittance to college beginning in September 1967, because there will be no dormitory housing available for them. I think the experience of individual Members indicates that this is the case on many college campuses. I think it would be fair to say that this would involve many thousands of students as soon as the bulge starts, which will be in September 1967, because we are moving up at the rate of about a half a million students a year.

Mr. COOPER. That is the point I wanted to develop. I think we are all acquainted with this tremendous increase in the number of college students. If there should be a delay of 2 years or more in beginning to build housing, not only for the present but also for the future, it would have rather tragic consequences.

Mr. JAVITS. It certainly would. We must all remember, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] has stated, that in spite of the approval, it still takes time to raise money, to raise endowment money for maintenance use which most colleges need to actually engage in this building to about that figure of less than a 2-year lag. Thus, it is by no means premature for the Senate to act on this matter now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to emphasize the point which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] just made concerning the shortage of dormitory space which will face all college students in September of 1967. Let me point out that if there is any further delay in providing adequate dormitory space, there are not many students who are going to be able to go to college even this fall, because the colleges cannot operate without dormitory space. We cannot do anything about it, but we can do something about what the Senator from New York is trying to do by helping out this afternoon with his amendment.

I came in after debate started and I think I understand the situation, but I want to make certain that I do. The objective of the amendment I heartily support. I say to the Senate that without the assistance of the Senator from New York as the leader of the minority on my Subcommittee on Education, along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], we would not have advanced as far as we have in regard to providing facilities for colleges. My understanding is as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] brought out, that we are not asking for $600 million but for an amendment that would leave no doubt by way of assurance that the $300 million will be made available.

Mr. JAVITS. That certainly would be enhanced.

Mr. MORSE. That is the important point and I think the position is unanswerable.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. TOWER. According to the testimony given by David W. Mullins, president of the University of Arkansas——

Mr. JAVITS. On what page is that, Senator?

Mr. TOWER. On page 279.

He was speaking for most of the major organizations and institutions of higher learning. He said in part:

> Last year's freshmen class was 17.7 percent greater than the year before, and the freshman class in the fall of 1964 17 percent greater than that of 1963.

Thus, we can project what it is going to be this fall, what it is going to be next fall, and the fall after that. This is a tremendous growth rate in our college population.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may say so, interestingly enough, that particular page which the Senator has just picked out covers the key facts and figures as to precisely what happened. It is interesting that Dr. Mullins also stated there, in part:

> New loans this year are being held at the $300,000,000 level under authorization by the Congress for this amount of new Treasury borrowing.

But they did not get the money, hence we have the proposed legislation. This is the $300 million. It is all approvable—what they call approvable—the application in the Department. But, there is no money. All I want to do is to say that there is money. Whether we get it with the sale of participation certificates—which I agree with the Government seems impractical—or we have to go to the Treasury Department for it, at the higher interest rate, it has got to be done. I do not like it, either. The fact is it is something that will happen.

Mr. TOWER. Of course, participation certificates have not sold.

Mr. JAVITS. That is right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator's amendment cover the period of 3 years at $300 million a year?

Mr. JAVITS. It recurs on its authorization. But, I say, I want to get this off the ground. I want the Senate to express itself. We have made it crystal clear, through the conferees, what we intend, and they will do it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the Senator's position that unless we do something of the nature suggested by him, if the Government finds itself unable to finance this program through participation sales, there will not be the money available which has been expected?

Mr. JAVITS. Not even to honor the applications made after January 31, 1966, which are all here. Nothing has been done about it.

Mr. CARLSON. Is it not a fact that even if the Senate and Congress approves this money, and the money is available at the higher interest rate, the colleges themselves would determine whether they want to take advantage of it?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is this added factor, is there not, that it looks like the interest rate, if this program is carried out, will be larger in return to the Government than the one which has existed under the previous program?

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree. It was impractical previously.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think that is sound.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we can do anything else.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Rhode Island has made an eminently reasonable suggestion, that we make this amendment so that there will be no confusion about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to do that, either to leave it to the conference or I will write it in. It makes no difference to me at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for clarification?

Mr. MUSKIE. I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand it, the participation sales program, for practical purposes, has repealed the old authorization, and the President now has the authority to raise loan funds by selling participations in the loan portfolio. He has been reluctant to use this authority.

The important thing here is the interest rate. The Javits amendment raises an interest rate problem, therefore, I see no value in the Javits amendment, because the interest rate is too high. The interest rate under the existing program, if the President would use his authority, is 3 percent. He has the authority for, as the Senator has said, $850 million.

I do not see any sense at all in passing the Javits amendment. A statement, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said, expressing the Senate's desire that the President use the authority he has, might be all right. It would be just as effective as the Javits amendment, because the Javits amendment is not self-executing. It will only be a repetition of an authority the President already has. I ask the Senator from Maine, is that not correct?

Mr. TOWER. The President does have that authority, but the participations have not been sold.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the President just does not wish to sell them. He has the authority, and does not wish to exercise it. All the Javits amendment would do is give him another authority. He is not going to use that, either; and that proposed authority is not satisfactory to me, nor I think to most Senators, because it contemplates a 4⅝ percent interest rate. That is not satisfactory, because we can borrow money for that rate easily. Colleges in every State can borrow, on tax-exempt borrowing, for somewhere in the neighborhood of that interest rate.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I am perfectly happy to yield, but I want to be sure the yielding goes through me, so that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, the Senator is correct, as I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then why do we have the Javits amendment?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is the point I have been trying to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator agree there is no use in the Javits amendment?

Mr. MUSKIE. They have the authorization now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have the authorization now, at a lower interest rate, and the Javits amendment will not make the President perform. Nobody can make him perform if he does not wish to; is that not correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On this or any other matter, I might say.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator knows that better than I.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So I do not see any point in quibbling about the Javits amendment. It will not accomplish anything more, and never would, and it provides for an interest rate that is entirely unacceptable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. If I may first——

Mr. JAVITS. There are, of course, two sides to any argument. The Senator from Arkansas has stated his position so forcefully I think it should be answered right away.

Mr. MUSKIE. First I would like to put into the RECORD——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. First, I wish to put into the RECORD the exact figures, to correct the rough figures I put into the RECORD earlier, so that we will not be confused too long. The figures—and I am sure they are correct—are these: There is now $205 million of available funds unused. It is anticipated that there will be sold $801 million in participation sales in this fiscal year.

That will make available $1,006 million during this fiscal year. There is $300 million programed for this fiscal year; so there is authority, over and above what is programed and what will be committed during this fiscal year, in the amount of $706 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At what interest rate?

Mr. MUSKIE. At the interest rate now carried in the law, which is 3 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator answer some questions?

Mr. MUSKIE. If I can.

Mr. JAVITS. Is a single dollar, of all the figures the Senator stated, available for lending on any of the applications which are now on file?

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand that $205 million is available and unused.

Mr. JAVITS. Where is that $205 million? What is the $205 million?

Mr. MUSKIE. This has been described to me by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—and I received these figures as the result of a telephone conversation, in the course of which I did not cross-examine to obtain every detail behind them. I am not an expert in this field, but I am trying to give the Senator the facts as I have them.

When the Director of the Bureau of the Budget says to me—and I assume he is not trying to use pussyfooting words—that he has $205 million that can be applied to this program, I assume he means that money is available to meet the applications that have been made. If he is pussyfooting with me, and using weasel words that would make me subject to the question which the Senator from New York has raised, then I shall go back to him and give him a little difficulty.

Mr. JAVITS. All right.

Mr. MUSKIE. But, because I told him I wanted to use these figures on the Senate floor, and that I wanted to know what is available this year, and what I could tell my fellow Senators is available to meet these applications to which the Senator has referred, I understand—and I repeat, I understand—that I have the assurance of the Director of the Budget that these are firm figures. I understand there is $205 million now available—not in 1967, 1968, 1969, or 1970, but now, this fiscal year.

In addition, he will sell $801 million of participation sales. That is a total of $1,006 million. Of that amount, $300 million will be used for this year under the program level authorized in 1965.

That leaves $706 million of authority that he does not intend to use for this year, but which could be made available. Those are the facts. Where the money is, in what bank account or who would have to sign the authorization, I do not know.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, suppose I were to say to the Senator that those were not the facts, would he then give me a chance to say why?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that my staff assistant has asked me to qualify what I have said in this sense, that all of this $300 million is not available at this moment. But $205 million is now available and the balance will be made available later in the fiscal year.

Mr. JAVITS. If they sell the certificates, and if the Bureau of the Budget releases any of the $205 million which they have now. They have now released $50 million, and they have no intention of releasing the other part.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I fully informed the Director of the Budget as to what the Senator has been saying on the floor, that the Senator is raising a doubt as to whether this money is going to be, in fact, made available and as to whether, in fact, these participation sales are going to be made.

The Director of the Budget has personally assured me that these participation sales will be made and that this $300 million will be made available.

If the Senator is correct in what he has just said, then the Director of the Budget has not told me the truth.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think that is so at all. I think the Director of the Budget has told the Senator the truth. The Director of the Budget is under a duty to serve the United States on the sales of the participation certificates to the best of his ability.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget expects to sell the certificates, and I would be the first to condemn him if he sold them improvidently. Whatever he said, the fact is that he cannot guarantee it, no matter what the Senator says or no matter what I say.

What he might do, if he chose—but he does not choose to do so—would be to release some of the $205 million which results from repayments on the college loans. He has only chosen to release $50 million. He will determine to sell the participation certificates when, as, and if he thinks it is in the best interest of the country to sell them. However, there is nothing inconsistent between that proposition and the amendment, because the amendment is intended to make the money available when the law takes place.

The institutions could go to the banks and get the money at a higher interest rate, and I make this statement advisedly, but in my judgment it would be worth more to the institutions if they could get the money at a slightly higher rate than to have the 3 percent provision on the books when they cannot get the money.

Many of these private institutions—and most of them are private—cannot borrow the money. The only people who can borrow the money are the States, and some of the States are in pretty bad financial trouble.

California has just borrowed money, incidentally, at a higher interest rate than is provided for in my amendment. They borrowed money at the rate of 4.85 percent. However, other States are holding back.

My amendment is designed to find a way to actually get money flowing without in any way crossing up the Budget Bureau on the sale of participation certificates. I seek to get things going until such time as the other activities can take up the slack.

That is why I said to the committee that, when they get into conference, they may write such provision as will carry out the intention of the Senate.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator feels that his amendment could be any more persuasive on the Treasury to make them borrow this money and make it available than would be the existing law. This is what is completely baffling to me.

They already have this authority. No one can make them do it if they do not want to do it. The Senator said the Bureau of the Budget does not intend to release that money. If they do not intend to do so, they will not release it because of the amendment. The amendment does not give them a thing that they do not already have. It would raise the interest rate to $4\frac{5}{8}$ percent. This may be acceptable to some people, but certainly not to people in my State, and I do not think the amendment ought to be agreed to.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I think the facts are already in the record, and I see no point in prolonging the matter from my point of view.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana (after having voted in the negative). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 202 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Allott
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Fannin
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Magnuson
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—31

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Church
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McClellan
McGee
Mondale
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Symington
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Clark
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Griffin
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Lausche
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tydings

So Mr. Javits' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Colorado raised a question in the debate on the housing bill concerning section 502. The Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] who was managing the bill on the floor, did not have an answer immediately at hand and the matter was continued until today to allow time for him to get answers. The colloquy may be found in yesterday's Record at page 19068.

Basically, the question which I raised was that Secretary Weaver had told the Committee on Appropriations, in our hearings on the independent offices appropriations bill, that leasing of existing structures was much cheaper, particularly where they needed a large number of bedrooms in a unit, than was new construction; therefore, I wondered why the Department of Housing and Urban Development was asking authority in section 502 of the pending bill to lease or acquire new housing.

Overnight I have reexamined the testimony given in our appropriations hearings. I find, on page 741 of those hearings, the following exchange:

> Senator Ellender. Do you find that this program [leasing of existing structures], as you now are administering it, will be as cheap

> to the Government as the public housing program?
>
> Secretary Weaver. I think that it will be cheaper, especially in certain types of housing. For example, where we have large families, the cost of building a five- or six-bedroom unit is extremely high in new construction. The economies are much greater in this program, because many of these are larger dwelling units. Or you can combine them in such a way as to effect economies.

And, on page 744, Dr. Weaver says:

> The biggest headache that they have is where to relocate the large family. We cannot afford, within any limitation of reasonable cost, to construct new housing with four, five, and six bedrooms. The only way that we have found that this could be done at all reasonably is through this leasing program. We cannot do it under rent supplement programs either, because there you have got new construction as well, principally, and your costs are so high. So that this is an immediate problem that they face. This is why they have been so enthusiastic about it.

I have also examined the testimony given to the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, commencing at page 41 of the printed hearings, as was suggested by the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie].

From my comparison of the two hearings, it would appear to me that Secretary Weaver has simply come to a realization that private industry can build much more cheaply than can the Government, and that this explains the apparent inconsistency. He was, as I recalled it, telling us in the Appropriations Committee that leasing of existing structures was cheaper than new construction, but I believe now that he was limiting, in his own mind, the comparison to new construction by a public housing authority.

Would the Senator from Maine agree with my conclusion? I understand that the committee staff has asked the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a clarifying statement in regard to yesterday's colloquy, and I inquire of the Senator whether that statement is in harmony with my present understanding?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the point that the senior Senator from Colorado made yesterday involves the new leasing authority that the Public Housing Authority was given in the 1965 Housing Act It is complicated by the fact that there were two separate provisions in that act involving public housing leasing, one provision limited the leasing authority to 3-year leases of existing housing, the other had no time limitation, and it was unclear whether the leasing authority referred to new housing or existing housing. This year, the administration came back to the Congress to get a clarification of the 1965 law to make it clear that the leasing authority under the latter of the above provisions was applicable to new construction as well as to existing structures. That is the purpose of section 502 of the committee bill—S. 3711.

The question raised by Senator Allott, referred to testimony by Secretary Weaver during appropriation hearings where, as I understand it, the Secretary was justifying the use of public housing leasing. He said it was cheaper for the Government to lease units particularly for large families; that new construction of such large units is extremely high. He said, further, that the public housing authorities cannot afford to construct new housing with 4, 5, and 6 bedrooms; that the only way it could be done at all reasonably was through the leasing program.

I believe that is clear what he had in mind. New construction of public housing in the traditional way is very expensive, particularly for large units satisfactory for large families. The only way it can be done is through leasing—either of existing housing or of newly constructed housing.

I agree with the conclusion of the senior Senator from Colorado—private industry can build cheaper than can the Government in most cases. Our committee always encourages private industry to the maximum. In fact that was the basis for our approval of the rent supplement program. If public housing authorities have now developed a new program whereby private industry can build the housing, and public authorities can lease it or buy it for public housing purposes and thereby save taxpayers money, let us praise them.

A few years ago everyone was condemning public housing because it had not come up with any new ideas. Now they have come forward with new ideas and I think we should shout their praises and hope that the authorities throughout the Nation make maximum use of these new ideas for housing the Nation's poor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator agrees with my conclusion, then, that Secretary Weaver's statement to our Appropriations Committee should be interpreted to mean "new construction by public housing authorities," and in effect what he is saying is that private industry can build more cheaply than can the Government. His statements certainly are not crystal clear to me, and it is something I will want to pursue with the Secretary at our Appropriations Committee hearings on these programs, when the opportunity next presents itself.

I thank the Senator, and I want to add that I would certainly agree that wherever and whenever we can, we should allow private industry to do a job rather than having the Government get involved.

Mr. President, I wanted also to call attention to the cost figures of the leasing program. Yesterday I quoted the figure which had been given to us in appropriations hearings; namely, that $1,743,750 had been budgeted for the leasing program in fiscal year 1966. In reviewing the printed record of hearings, I find that the Department inserted some further figures. It appears, although again it is not absolutely clear, that the Department actually spent in fiscal year 1966 $3,122,475. This figure appears in a table at pages 739 and 740.

Further, on page 746 of those hearings, the Department inserted a table showing that they have budgeted for the current fiscal year the sum of $6,150,000. That is an astounding increase in this program, and today we are asked to broaden the authority of the Department even further. As I said before, I will certainly want to explore this matter with the Secretary at the earliest opportunity in appropriations hearings.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted a series of amendments to the Housing Act of 1949, already included in the House Banking and Currency Committee bill, dealing with rural housing programs. These amendments were not urged because of the unavoidable absence of Senator Sparkman, and I was given assurances by the distinguished floor manager of the bill, Senator Muskie, that the Senate conferees would certainly give sympathetic consideration to holding these amendments in the bill. I asked at that time that the amendments be printed in the Record.

Since then, however, it has come to my attention that the fine Congressman from Iowa, Mr. Hansen, has received assurances from the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee that the managers of the bill in the House will accept an improved and revised substitute for those provisions dealing with rural housing. It is my understanding that these changes have been approved by the Farmers Home Administration as well.

I support the revised language that will be offered by Congressman Hansen. It will make technical improvements in the present House version and, in addition, will insure that there will be a rural equivalent to the section 221(d)(3) programs, but without rent supplements. It will enable rural housing cooperatives to be organized and built. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendments to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans and grants to provide necessary adequate modest housing for low or moderate income rural residents, and to insure mortgages on such housing, and for other purposes

Section 1. Section 501(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the phrase "previously occupied" wherever it occurs.

Sec. 2. Section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after the words "elderly persons" the following: "or who are persons of moderate incomes".

Sec. 3. Section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500".

Sec. 4. Section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by—

(1) adding to the title, after the word "families", the following: "and other persons and families of low or moderate income";

(2) in subsection (a):

inserting after the word "rental" the following, "or cooperative";

inserting after the word "income" the following, "or other persons and families of low or moderate income";

inserting in clause (1) a semicolon after the word "cost" and striking the balance of the clause;

striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) such loans shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and";

(3) in subsection (b):

inserting after the word "rental" the following, "or cooperative";

inserting after the word "families" the following, "or other persons and families";

(4) in subsection (d):

inserting in clause (1) after the words "elderly persons or elderly families" the following: "or other persons or families of low or moderate income";

inserting at the end of clause (4), and as part thereof, the following, "Such fees and charges shall include payments to qualified housing consulting organizations and foundations which operate on a nonprofit basis and which render services and assistance (including the organization and marketing of cooperative housing) to nonprofit corporations or consumer cooperatives who provide housing and related facilities. This definition shall also apply to section 516."

SEC. 5. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 521. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans and grants in accordance with section 502 and this section to low-income applicants eligible under section 501 who lack sufficient repayment ability to qualify for loans under section 502, to provide (by construction, improvement or purchase) housing consisting of necessary modest adequate dwellings, related facilities and minimum adequate sites, for their own use.

"(b) No grant under this section may exceed the difference between the amount of loan which the applicant can reasonably repay with interest, and the cost of providing such housing, or 50 percent of such cost, whichever is less.

"(c) Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on unpaid principal.

"(d) Any grant under this section shall be made upon condition, with such security as the Secretary may require, that if within 15 years after the date of the grant the housing is transferred voluntarily or involuntarily or ceases to be occupied by the applicant without the Secretary's written consent, the amount of the grant with interest at the loan rate from the date of the grant shall become immediately due and payable by the applicant.

"SEC. 522. (a) The Secretary is authorized to extend, under contracts specifying such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate, financial assistance to nonprofit organizations (including consumer cooperatives) for planning, acquisition, and development of land for dwellings, related facilities, and minimum adequate sites, for sale to low-income rural residents for their own use or for occupancy by low-income rural residents who subscribe to membership in the cooperative which owns and operates the dwellings on a nonprofit basis for the benefit of its members.

"(b) Such sales or subscriptions to cooperative membership shall be made upon terms and conditions substantially identical with those specified for loans and grants under section 521. For this purpose the amount by which the cost of providing housing sold to a purchaser or occupied by a cooperative member exceeds the amount paid for it by the purchaser or cooperative member shall be considered as a grant.

"(c) Of the financial assistance extended to an organization pursuant to subsection (a) for any project, the aggregate amount for which all the housing is sold (including in the case of a cooperative, the aggregate price to be amortized under occupancy agreements with its members) pursuant to subsection (b) shall be a loan and the balance of such amount shall be a grant conditionally recoverable as under section 521. Such a loan shall be repayable within a specified period not to exceed 33 years, with interest not to exceed 4 percent per annum on unpaid principal, and shall be subject to such security and other provisions as the Secretary requires.

"(d) The Secretary at any time may agree with an applicant for or recipient of financial assistance under subsection (a) to service the accounts of purchasers under subsection (b) and may purchase any such accounts in consideration of credits to be made on the organization's indebtedness to the Secretary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection the yeas and nays are withdrawn. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what about the request for the yeas and nays? I thought that there was a request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear that. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is not sufficiently seconded.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon did not know that the leadership had made a commitment for 2 days that there would be no yea-and-nay vote. In view of that commitment, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, with regard to the leadership commitment, I do not wish to embarrass absent Senators, but I think the leadership should consider very carefully before they make such commitments. We are living in a time when this Government is obligated to large expenditures. This bill commits the Government and the taxpayers to vast new fiscal obligations and I believe the public is entitled to know how we stand as Senators.

I merely want to say that were we permitted to have the yeas and nays, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if the commitment had been that there would be no yeas and nays on final passage today, it would have been nice if Senators had been informed of that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for 2 days the word had been going around that nobody in particular wanted the yeas and nays on final passage. The bill was reported from the committee unanimously. The amendments that have been accepted have not seriously altered the nature or the character of the bill. That is why the commitment was made. All Senators were given the opportunity to tell us they wanted the yeas and nays. I do not think that we should be pouring it back on the leadership side of the aisle.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that if for 2 days it has been understood that there would be no rollcall vote on final passage, the Senator from New Hampshire was not aware of it.

After the Senator from New Hampshire called for the yeas and nays, I was informed that many Senators had been told that there would be no rollcall vote, so I withdrew the request. The Senator from New Hampshire quite understands that all of us have occasions when we must be absent, and the Senator from New Hampshire did not want to take advantage of any Senator's absence. Realizing that the leadership was trying to do the best that they could, the Senator went along with it. I certainly have no desire to embarrass the Senate's leadership.

The Senator from New Hampshire desires to say with respect to the statement that everybody knows about the understandings that there are 100 Senators, and we do not all know about them.

We are living at a time when this country is being committed to obligations for the future, and it should be customary to have a rollcall vote, on such far-reaching bills, because the people at home are entitled to have the information on the stand taken by their representatives in the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I want to say something to cover myself in this situation. For 2 days the leadership was asked how many votes there would be, were there amendments on which yea-and-nay votes could be expected and would there be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage.

The information that the leadership provided was that there appeared to be only one amendment on which there would be a rollcall vote, and that was the Javits amendment, on which we have just voted; that no Senator indicated a desire to have a rollcall vote on final passage; and that the leadership did not intend to ask for a rollcall vote on final passage.

To the extent that that constitutes a commitment which violates the view of any Senator as to the leadership function, that was a commitment. It was not a commitment in the sense that a contractual commitment had been made.

I am a Senator who has asked the leadership many times: "Do you expect a vote on final passage?" Each time I expected and got an answer.

When I have been told in the past, under circumstances similar to these, that no vote on final passage would be asked for, I relied on that statement.

That is not a contractual commitment, as Senators know. But since there seems to be some disturbance that the leadership went so far as to violate a commitment, I am prepared to ask for a call of the roll.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, Congress has been in session since January. Today is August 12, and we are not about to adjourn. We will be here quite a while yet.

Some Senators, including the majority leader, felt that they needed a little rest, perhaps a weekend off. At 3 o'clock on a Friday afternoon quite a number of Senators are out of town.

The bill will pass by a very large vote. There is no problem about the outcome of the vote. But Senators have been told that there would be no rollcall vote on final passage.

I have said how some of these things happen. A Senator thought he had an assurance. He feels he was victimized and permitted to leave town thinking there would not be a rollcall vote, he feels betrayed, and then we cannot get unanimous consent for 5 weeks after that.

It makes sense to vote on this bill by a rollcall vote now, or to come back on Monday and do it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to make that suggestion. I was about to suggest that unanimous consent be requested to have a rollcall vote on Monday at 1 o'clock.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a rollcall vote at 1 o'clock p.m. on Monday.

Mr. PASTORE. I object.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that we adjourn until Monday at noon.

I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays may be withdrawn and that we may have a voice vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we should do something to resolve the problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, was the result of the voice vote announced by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the best of his recollection, the Chair states that the announcement had not been made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, can we have the Journal checked to see if the voice vote was announced?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator was inquiring if the Chair had announced the result of the voice vote. If he had, and if the Journal so shows, a yea-and-nay request was out of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear it announced because I was——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought I heard it announced, and the Journal has to be the best evidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Journal does not show that the result of the voice vote was announced.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—3

Cotton
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—36

Aiken
Allott
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Church
Clark
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Griffin
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tydings

So the bill (S. 3711) was passed, as follows:

S. 3711

An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966".

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE OPERATIONS

Seasonal homes

SEC. 101. Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this section any mortgage meeting the requirements of subsection (b) of this section, except as modified by this subsection. To be eligible, the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation not in excess of $15,000 and not in excess of 75 per centum of the appraised value of the property, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance. The mortgage shall cover a dwelling designed for single-family occupancy which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction. The dwelling need not be designed for year-round occupancy, but it shall (1) meet standards prescribed by the Secretary, and (2) be located in an area where the Secretary finds it is not practicable to obtain conformity with many of the requirements essential to the insuring of mortgages on housing in built-up urban areas. The development of the property with respect to which the mortgage is executed shall be consistent with the conservation of water and other natural resources of the area, and such property shall be an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the economic potential of the area in which the dwelling is located and the contribution that the housing will make toward improving the area."

Areas affected by civil disorders

SEC. 102. (a) Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding after subsection (l) (added by section 101 of this Act) a new subsection as follows:

"(m) The Secretary is authorized to insure under this section any mortgage meeting the requirements of this section, other than the requirement in subsection (c) relating to economic soundness, if he determines that (1) the dwelling covered by the mortgage is situated in an area in which rioting or other civil disorders have occurred or are threatened, (2) as a result of such actual or threatened rioting or other disorders the property with respect to which the mortgage is executed cannot meet the normal requirements with respect to economic soundness, and (3) such property is an acceptable risk giving due consideration to the need for providing adequate housing for families of low and moderate income in such area."

(b) Section 305 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(l) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts and purchase transactions which do not exceed $200,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments or transactions relate to mortgages with respect to which the Secretary has made the determinations provided for in section 203(m) of this Act."

Cooperative housing insurance fund

SEC. 103. (a) Section 213(m) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out ", but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe".

(b) Section 213(n) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "insured under this section and sections 207, 231, and 232" and inserting in lieu thereof "the insurance of which is the obligation of either the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Premium charges on the insurance of mortgages or loans transferred to the Management Fund or insured pursuant to commitments transferred to the Management Fund may be payable in debentures which are the obligation of either the Management Fund or of the General Insurance Fund."

Supplementary financing for cooperative housing

SEC. 104. Section 213(j)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "except that, in the case of improvements or additional community facilities, the outstanding indebtedness may be increased by an amount equal to 97 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the value of such improvements or facilities, and the new outstanding indebtedness may exceed the original principal obligation of the mortgage if such new outstanding indebtedness does not exeed the limitations imposed by subsection (b);".

Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2)

SEC. 105. Section 221(d)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$11,000" and "$18,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500" and "$20,000", respectively.

Single occupants in section 221(d)(3)

SEC. 106. Section 221(f) of the National Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Low- and moderate-income persons who are less than 62 years of age shall be eligible for occupancy of dwelling units in a project financed with a mortgage insured under subsection (d)(3), but not more than 10 per centum of the dwelling units in any such project shall be available for occupancy by such persons."

Application of Davis-Bacon Act to cooperative housing projects insured under sections 221(d)(3) and (d)(4)

SEC. 107. The third sentence of section 212 (a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that compliance with such provisions may be waived by the Secretary in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics (not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project) voluntarily donate their services without compensation for the purpose of lowering their housing costs in a cooperative housing project and the Secretary determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the cooperative undertaking the construction".

Waiver of deduction on assignment of property to Secretary in lieu of foreclosure

SEC. 108. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Waiver of deduction on assignment of property to Secretary in lieu of foreclosure

"SEC. 523. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from and after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he may approve, may waive all or a part of the 1 per centum deduction otherwise made from insurance benefits with respect to multifamily housing or land development mortgages assigned to him, where the assignment is made at his request in lieu of foreclosure of the mortgage."

Mortgage insurance for land development—clarifying amendments

SEC. 109. (a) Section 1001(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "'mortgage'" and inserting in lieu thereof "'mortgagee'".

(b) Section 1001(d) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "sewerage disposal installations," and inserting in lieu thereof "sewage disposal installations, steam, gas, and electric lines and installations,";

(2) by striking out the semicolon after "or common use", and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following new sentence: "Related uses may include industrial uses, with sites for such uses to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the development.";

(3) by striking out "but such term" and inserting in lieu thereof: "The term improvements"; and

(4) by inserting after "sewage disposal installation," in clause (1) the following: "or a steam, gas, or electric line or installation,".

Rent supplements

SEC. 110. Section 101(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Such term also includes a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which constructs, owns, and operates rental or cooperative housing financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, or tax abatements, and which is approved for receiving the benefits of this section."

TITLE II—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

Purpose

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to assure the availability of credit on reasonable terms to units or organizations engaged in the group practice of medicine, optometry, or dentistry, particularly those in smaller communities and those sponsored by cooperative or other nonprofit organizations, to assist in financing the construction and equipment of group practice facilities.

Establishment of program

SEC. 202. (a) The National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XI—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

"Insurance of mortgages

"SEC. 1101. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction), upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, in accordance with the provisions of this title, and (2) to make commitments for the insuring of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon. No mortgage shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1969, except pursuant to a commitment to insure issued before that date.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this title, the mortgage shall (1) be executed by a mortgagor that is a group practice unit or organization, approved by the Secretary, (2) be made to and held by a mortgagee approved by the Secretary as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly, and (3) cover a property or project which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or rehabilitation and is designed for use as a group practice facility which the Secretary finds will be constructed in an economical manner, will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and will be adequate and suitable for carrying out the purposes of this title. No mortgage shall be insured under this title unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant would be unable to obtain the mortgage loan without such insurance on terms comparable to those specified in subsection (c).

"(c) The mortgage shall—

"(1) not exceed $5,000,000;

"(2) not exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the value of the property or project when construction or rehabilitation is completed. The value of the property may include the land and the proposed physical improvements, equipment, utilities within the boundaries of the property, architects' fees, taxes, and interest accruing during construction or rehabilitation, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction or rehabilitation and approved by the Secretary;

"(3) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary but not to exceed twenty-five years, and provide for complete amortization of the principal obligation by periodic payments within such term as the Secretary shall prescribe; and

"(4) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance, and service charges if any) at a rate of not to exceed 5 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed such rate (not in excess of 6 per centum per annum) as the Secretary finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

"(d) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract for insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

"(e) Each mortgage insured under this title shall contain an undertaking (in accordance with regulations prescribed under this title and in force at the time the mortgage is approved for insurance) to the effect that, except as authorized by the Secretary and the mortgagee, the property will be used as a group practice facility until the mortgage has been paid in full or the contract of insurance otherwise terminated.

"(f) No mortgage shall be insured under this title unless the mortgagor and the mortgagee certify (1) that they will keep such records relating to the mortgage transaction and indebtedness, to the construction of the facility covered by the mortgage, and to the use of such facility as a group practice facility as are prescribed by the Secretary at the time of such certification, (2) that they will make such reports as may from time to time be required by the Secretary pertaining to such matters, and (3) that the Secretary shall have access to and the right to examine and audit such records.

"Premiums

"SEC. 1102. The Secretary shall fix premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this title, but such charges shall not be more than 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge, the Secretary is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the analysis of a proposed project and the appraisal and inspection of the property and improvements. Where the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this title is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Secretary is authorized to require the payment by the mortgagee of an adjusted premium charge. This charge shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges that the mortgagee would otherwise have been required to pay if the mortgage had continued to be insured until the maturity date. Where such prepayment occurs, the Secretary is authorized to refund to the mortgagee for the account of the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charges theretofore paid. Premium charges fixed under this section shall be payable by the mortgagee either in cash, or in debentures which are the obligation of the General Insurance Fund at par plus accrued interest, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

"Payment of insurance benefits

"SEC. 1103. The mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance under this title in the manner provided in subsection (g) of section 207 with respect to mortgages insured under that section. For such purpose the provisions of subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under this title and all references in such subsections to section 207 shall be deemed to refer to this title.

"Regulations

"SEC. 1104. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this title, after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to any health or medical aspects of the program under this title which may be involved in such regulations.

"Administration

"SEC. 1105. (a) At the request of individuals or organizations operating or contemplating the operation of group practice facilities (as defined in section 1106(1)), the Secretary may provide or obtain technical assistance in the planning for and construction of such facilities.

"(b) With a view to avoiding unnecessary duplication of existing staffs and facilities of the Federal Government the Secretary is authorized to utilize available services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government in carrying out the provisions of this title, and to pay for such services and facilities, either in advance or by way of reimbursment, in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

"Definitions

"SEC. 1106. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'group practice facility' means a facility in a State for the provision of preventive, diagnostic, and treatment services to ambulatory patients (in which patient care is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice medicine in the State or, in the case of optometric care or treatment, is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice optometry in the State, or, in the case of dental diagnosis or treatment, is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice dentistry in the State) and which is primarily for the provision of such health services by a medical or dental group.

"(2) The term 'medical or dental group' means a partnership or other association or group of persons licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State, or of persons licensed to practice optometry in the State, or of persons licensed to practice dentistry in the State, or of any combination of such persons, who, as their principal professional activity and as a group responsibility, engage or undertake to engage in the coordinated practice of their profession primarily in one or more group practice facilities, and who (in this connection) share common overhead expenses (if and to the extent such expenses are paid by members of the group), medical and other records, and substantial portions of the equipment and the professional, technical, and administrative staffs, and which partnership or association or group is composed of at least such professional personnel and make available at least such health services as may be provided in regulations prescribed under this title.

"(3) The term 'group practice unit or organization' means—

"(A) a private nonprofit agency or organization undertaking to provide, directly or through arrangements with a medical or dental group, comprehensive medical care, optometric care, or dental care, or any combination thereof, which may include hospitalization, to members or subscribers primarily on a group practice prepayments basis; or

"(B) a private nonprofit agency or organization established for the purpose of improving the availability of medical, optometric, or dental care in the community or having some function or functions related to the provision of such care, which will, through lease or other arrangement, make the group practice facility with respect to which assistance has been requested under this title available to a medical or dental group for use by it.

"(4) The term 'nonprofit organization' means a corporation, association, foundation, trust, or other organization no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual except, in the case of an organization the purposes of which include the provision of personal health services to its members or subscribers or their dependents under a plan of such organization for the provision of such services to them (which plan may include the provision of other services or insurance benefits to them), through the provision of such health services (or such other services or insurance benefits) to such members or subscribers or dependents under such plan.

"(5) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

"(6) The term 'mortgage' means a first mortgage on real estate in fee simple, or on the interest of either the lessor or lessee thereof (A) under a lease for not less than ninety-nine years which is renewable, or (B) under a lease having a period of not less than fifty years to run from the date the mortgage was executed. The term 'first mortgage' means such cases of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances (including but not limited to advances during construction) on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instrument or instruments, if any, secured thereby, and any mortgage may be in the form of one or more trust mortgages or mortgage indentures or deeds of trust, securing notes, bonds, or other credit instruments, and, by the same instrument or by a separate instrument, may create a security interest in initial equipment, whether or not attached to the realty.

"(7) The term 'mortgagee' means the original lender under a mortgage, and his or its successors and assigns, and includes the holders of credit instruments issued under a trust mortgage or deed of trust pursuant to which such holders act by and through a trustee named therein.

"(8) The term 'mortgagor' means the original borrower under a mortgage and his or its successors and assigns."

(b) The first sentence of section 227 of such Act is amended by inserting after "new or rehabilitated multifamily housing" the following: "or a property or project described in title XI".

Labor standards

SEC. 203. Section 212(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under title XI."

Amendments to other Federal laws

SEC. 204. (a) (1) The sixth sentence of paragraph "Seventh" of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting after "Federal Home Loan Banks," the following: "or obligations which are insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under title XI of the National Housing Act".

(2) The third sentence of the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), is amended by inserting after "or sections 1471–1484 of title 42," the following: "or which are insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to title XI of the National Housing Act,".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 77ddd) is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (8); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and by adding after paragraph (9) a new paragraph as follows:

"(10) any security issued under a mortgage or trust deed indenture as to which a contract of insurance under title XI of the National Housing Act is in effect; and any such security shall be deemed to be exempt from the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 to the same extent as though such security were specifically enumerated in section 3(a)(2), as amended, of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(2))."

(c) Section 263 of chapter X of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 663) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this chapter shall be deemed to affect or apply to the creditors of any corporation under a mortgage insured pursuant to title XI of the National Housing Act."

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

Local grants-in-aid

SEC. 301. Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting immediately after the colon at the end of the first proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That any publicly owned facility, the construction of which was begun not earlier than three years prior to the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, shall be deemed to benefit an urban renewal project or projects to the extent of 25 per centum of the total benefits of such facility, if such facility (A) is used, or is to be used, by the public predominately for cultural, exhibition, or civic purposes; (B) is located within, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of such urban renewal project or projects; (C) is found to contribute materially to the objectives of the urban renewal plan or plans for such project or projects; and (D) is not otherwise eligible as a local grant-in-aid:".

Air rights sites in urban renewal projects

SEC. 302. (a) Section 110(c)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting in clause (iv), between the word "income" and the colon immediately preceding the first proviso, the following: "or, if the area is found by the local public agency to be unsuitable for use for low or moderate income housing, for use for industrial development".

(b) Section 110(c)(7) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: ", or construction of foundations and platforms necessary for the provision of air rights sites for industrial development".

Specific urban renewal projects

SEC. 303. (a) Notwithstanding the date of commencement of construction of the Florence Primary School in Garden City, Michigan, local expenditures made in connection with such school shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid for the Cherry Hill urban renewal project (Mich. R-46).

(b) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the East Main Street water, sewer, and street improvements in Senatobia, Mississippi, local expenditures made in connection with such improvements shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the east Senatobia urban renewal project (Mississippi R-15) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

(c) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center, located within or adjacent to the urban renewal project for the city of Roanoke, Virginia (UR-VA-7), may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Roanoke in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as grants-in-aid toward such project.

(d) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic arts center (cultural) proposed to be built within urban renewal project Ala. R-32, in Huntsville, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Huntsville in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward Federal assisted urban renewal projects in Huntsville.

(e) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center proposed to be built within urban renewal project R-78 in Birmingham, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center Authority in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(f) Notwithstanding the extent to which the cultural and convention center, recently completed within urban renewal project Ala. R-33 in Mobile, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, and notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the addition to the Albert F. Owens School and the start of construction of new streets in the urban renewal projects Ala. R-33, R-34, and R-38 in the city of Mobile, Alabama, local expenditures made in connection with these capital improvements shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grant-in-aid toward such projects.

(g) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center proposed to be built within urban renewal project R-71 in Ozark, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Ozark in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(h) Notwithstanding the extent to which the convention center being built in the Queensgate III urban renewal project (R-82) in Cincinnati, Ohio, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Cincinnati in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid toward such project.

(i) Expenditures incurred by the city of Richmond, Virginia, in connection with the proposed coliseum project in downtown Richmond, to the extent such expenditures would be eligible under the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be counted as noncash grants-in-aid toward such project if it received Federal assistance as an urban renewal project pursuant to the provisions of title I of such Act, shall be eligible to be counted as local grants-in-aid toward urban renewal project (Virginia R-15) in Richmond or any other federally assisted urban renewal project hereafter undertaken in downtown Richmond, notwithstanding the extent to which such coliseum may benefit areas other than the area included in any such project.

(j) Notwithstanding the extent to which the convention center proposed to be built adjacent to urban renewal project R-14 in Decatur, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Decatur in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(k) Notwithstanding the extent to which (1) the proposed city hall in the city of Hampton, Virginia, and (2) the proposed development of public facilities by such city on a one hundred and ten acre tract fronting on Chesapeake Bay, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal areas hereinafter designated, expenditures incurred by the city of Hampton in constructing such city hall and in developing such facilities shall, if otherwise eligible, be allowed as local grants-in-aid for any of the following urban renewal projects in such city: Virginia R-30, Virginia R-34, and Virginia R-41.

(l) Notwithstanding the extent to which Prescott Park, situated adjacent to urban renewal project New Hampshire R-1 (Marcy-Washington Streets), in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred after January 1, 1954, by the city of Portsmouth in developing and improving such park shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid for such project.

(m) (1) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of, or the extent to which the cultural and civic center complex (including the assembly center, library, courthouse, the existing and proposed public off-street parking facility, parks and plazas, municipal theater, and other public buildings or facilities to be constructed on the civic center site), located within the outer boundaries of urban renewal project Oklahoma R-7 (downtown northwest) in Tulsa, Oklahoma, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Tulsa and other public bodies in connection with the acquisition, development, and construction of the civic center complex shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(2) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of, or the extent to which the Woods Elementary School, adjacent to urban renewal project Oklahoma R-3 (Seminole Hills) in Tulsa, Oklahoma, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Tulsa and other public bodies in connection with the acquisition, development, and construction of such school shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(n) Notwithstanding the extent to which the Huntsville Municipal Library built within urban renewal project Ala. R-32 in Huntsville, Alabama, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, local expenditures incurred by the city of Huntsville in developing such library shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid toward federally assisted urban renewal projects in Huntsville, Alabama.

(o)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys heretofore expended by the University of Alabama, other than grants by the United States, for the purchase of land and buildings within the area of the outer boundary of the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R-70), or for the construction or rehabilitation of buildings or other facilities within such area for the use of the University of Alabama, or any school, hospital, health facility, or service incidental to the operation within such area of such school, hospital, or health facility, and moneys hereafter expended by the University of Alabama, other than grants by the United States, for any such purpose prior to the final Federal capital grant payment for the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R-70), shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R-70) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys, other than grants by the United States, heretofore expended by the University of Alabama, or by any institution devoted to the treatment of physical or mental disabilities or illness or to medical research, for the construction of any building or other improvement used or useful in the operations of such institution within the area known as Alabama urban renewal project (Ala. 2-1), or within one-half mile thereof, shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R-70) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing

Act of 1949, and all such expenditures within the area of Alabama urban renewal project (Ala. 2–1) made prior to the final Federal capital grant payment for the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70) shall be counted as a local noncash grant-in-aid to the proposed medical center expansion project (Ala. R–70).

(p) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic center-coliseum proposed to be built within urban renewal project R–72 in Hartford, Connecticut, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Hartford in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

(q) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, moneys expended by Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Scarritt College for the purchase of land and buildings and for the demolition of buildings and clearing of such land and buildings on and after April 10, 1957, to the extent otherwise eligible shall be counted as local grants-in-aid to the proposed university urban renewal project (Tenn. R–51) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

(r) Notwithstanding the extent to which the proposed new civic center in Portsmouth, Virginia, including phase one and phase two thereof, may benefit areas other than the proposed Crawford urban renewal project area within which it is located, expenditures incurred by the city of Portsmouth in constructing said civic center shall, if otherwise eligible, be allowed as local grants-in-aid for the proposed Crawford urban renewal project.

(s) Notwithstanding the extent to which the library building and board of public utilities building of the city of Kansas City, Kansas, may benefit other areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Kansas City, Kansas, in constructing such projects shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid toward the Kansas City, Kansas, urban renewal project (Kansas R–28), in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

(t) Notwithstanding the extent to which the civic cultural center now under construction within urban renewal project (Kansas R–19), in Wichita, Kansas, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal areas, expenses incurred by the city of Wichita, Kansas, in constructing such civic cultural center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project, in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

(u) Expenditures incurred by the city of Kansas City, Missouri, or the county of Jackson County, Missouri, in connection with the proposed auditorium and exhibition hall project in downtown Kansas City, to the extent such expenditures would be eligible under the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be counted as noncash grants-in-aid toward such project if it received Federal assistance as an urban renewal project pursuant to the provisions of title I of such Act, shall be eligible to be counted as local grants-in-aid toward urban renewal project (Missouri R–8) in Kansas City or any other federally assisted urban renewal project hereafter undertaken in downtown Kansas City, notwithstanding the extent to which such auditorium and exhibition hall may benefit areas other than the area included in any such project.

(v) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the Glenwood School, Fulton School and the Toledo Health and Retiree Center, Inc., in Toledo, Ohio, local expenditures made in connection with such facilities shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid for the Old West End Urban Renewal Project (Ohio R–115).

TITLE IV—PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES

Preservation of historic structures as part of urban renewal projects

SEC. 401. (a) Section 110(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "historic and architectural preservation," after "land acquisition,".

(b) Section 110(c)(6) of such Act is amended by inserting "to promote historic and architectural preservation," after "deterioration,".

(c) Section 110(c) of such Act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (8), and by striking out clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(9) relocation within or outside the project area of structures which will be restored and maintained for architectural or historic purposes; and

"(10) restoration of acquired properties of historic or architectural value."

Local grant-in-aid credit for relocation and restoration of historic structures

SEC. 402. Clause (2) of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "clause (2) and clause (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clauses (2), (3), (9), and (10)".

Urban planning grants for surveys of historic structures

SEC. 403. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (8), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(10) agencies and instrumentalities, specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) above, to assist any city or other municipality having a population of fifty thousand or more, according to the latest decennial census, in making a survey, as part of a comprehensive planning program for the municipality, of structures, sites, and areas of historic or architectural value."

Grants for historic preservation

SEC. 404. (a) The heading of title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VII—OPEN-SPACE LAND, URBAN BEAUTIFICATION, AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION".

(b) Section 701 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection as follows:

"(c) The Congress further finds that there is a need for timely action to preserve and restore areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value in order that these remaining evidences of our past history and heritage shall not be lost or destroyed through the expansion and development of the Nation's urban areas."

(c) Section 701(d) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "urban development," the following: "to assist in preserving areas and properties of historic or achitectural value,"; and

(2) by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) acquire, improve, and restore areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value, and (3)".

(d) Section 702(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the general policies to be followed in reviewing applications for grants under this title. To assist the Secretary in such review, the Secretary of the Interior shall furnish him appropriate information on the status of national and statewide recreation and historic preservation planning as it affects the areas to be assisted with such grants. The Secretary shall provide current information to the Secretary of the Interior from time to time on significant program developments."

(e) Section 706 of such Act is amended by striking out the proviso.

(f) Section 708 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 708.", by inserting "(b)" before "The" in the second paragraph, and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary may use not to exceed $10,000,000 of the sum authorized for contracts under this title for the purpose of entering into contracts to make grants in amounts not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of activities which he determines have special value in developing and demonstrating new and improved methods and materials for use in carrying out the purposes of this title."

(g) Title VII of such Act is amended by redesignating section 709 as section 710, and by adding after section 708 a new section as follows:

"Grants for historic preservation

"SEC. 709. The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to make grants to States and local public bodies to assist in the acquisition of title to or other permanent interests in areas, sites, and structures of historic or architectural value in urban areas, and in their restoration and improvement for public use and benefit, in accord with the comprehensively planned development of the locality. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of the assisted activities. The remainder of such cost shall be provided from non-Federal sources."

Fellowships for graduate training in historic preservation

SEC. 405. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a three-year period commencing on July 1, 1966, to be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of architects and professional technicians in the field of historic preservation. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships solely on the basis of ability and upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

TITLE V—PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS IN CONNECTION WITH MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

SEC. 501. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire title to, hold, manage and dispose of, or, in lieu thereof, to reimburse for certain losses upon private sale of, or foreclosure against, any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling, which is situated at or near a military base or installation which the Department of Defense has, subsequent to November 1, 1964, ordered to be closed in whole or in part, if he determines—

(a) that the owner of such property is, or has been, a Federal employee employed at or in connection with such base or installation (other than a temporary employee serving under a time limitation) or a serviceman assigned thereto; and

(b) that the closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, has required or will require the termination of such owner's employment or service at or in connection with such base or installation; and

(c) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions.

Sec. 502. In order to be eligible for the benefits of this title such employees or military personnel must be or have been—

(a) assigned to or employed at or in connection with the installation or activity at the time of public announcement of the closure action, or

(b) transferred from such installation or activity, or terminated as employees as a result of reduction-in-force within six months prior to public announcement of the closure action, or

(c) transferred from the installation or activity on an overseas tour unaccompanied by dependents within fifteen months prior to public announcement of the closure action:

Provided, That at the time of public announcement of the closure action, or at the time of transfer or termination as set forth above, such personnel or employees must have:

(i) been the owner-occupant of the dwelling, or

(ii) have vacated the owned dwelling as a result of being ordered into on-post housing during a six-month period prior to the closure announcement:

Provided further, That as a consequence of such closure such employees or personnel must be:

(i) required to relocate because of military transfer or acceptance of employment beyond a normal commuting distance from the dwelling for which compensation is sought, or

(ii) not unemployed as a matter of personal choice, and able to demonstrate such financial hardship that they are unable to meet their mortgage payments and related expenses.

Sec. 503. Such persons as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be eligible under the critera set forth above shall elect to receive either a cash payment as partial compensation for losses which may be sustained in a private sale, not to exceed 5 per centum of the fair market value of their property prior to public announcement of intention to close all or part of the military base or installation, or to receive, as purchase price for their property, an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of prior fair market value as such value is determined by the Secretary of Defense, or the amount of the outstanding mortgages, or such lesser amount as the Secretary of Defense determines prior to that election to be reasonable. In the event of foreclosure by mortgagees commenced prior to the one hundred and twentieth day after enactment hereof, the Secretary may pay or reimburse for direct costs of foreclosure, including deficiency judgments, if any, as may be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Sec. 504. There shall be in the Treasury a fund which shall be available to the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of extending the financial assistance provided above. The capital of such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and shall consist also of receipts from the management, rental, or sale of properties acquired under this title, which receipts shall be credited to the fund and shall be available, together with funds appropriated therefor, for purchase or reimbursement purposes as provided above, as well as to defray expenses arising in connection with the acquisition, management, and disposal of such properties, including payment of principal, interest, and expenses of mortgages or other indebtedness thereon, and including the cost of staff services and contract services, costs of insurance and other indemnity. Any part of such receipts not required for such expenses shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Properties acquired under this title shall be conveyed to, and acquired in the name of, the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall have the power to deal with, rent, renovate, and dispose of, whether by sales for cash or credit or otherwise, any properties so acquired: *Provided, However,* That no contract for acquisition, or acquisition, shall be deemed to constitute a contract for or acquisition of family housing units in support of military installations or activities for purposes of section 406(a) of the Act of August 30, 1957, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594i), or a transaction within the contemplation of section 2662 of title 10, United States Code.

Sec. 505. Payments from the fund created by this title may be made in lieu of taxes to any State and/or political subdivision thereof, with respect to real property, including improvements thereon, acquired and held under this title. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall not exceed the taxes which would be paid to the State and/or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation, and shall reflect such allowance as may be considered appropriate for expenditures, if any, by the Government for streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property.

Sec. 506. The title to any property acquired under this Act, the eligibility for, and the amounts of, cash payable, and the administration of section 501–505 of this title shall conform to such requirements, and shall be administered under such conditions and regulations, as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. Such regulations shall also prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made and instruments accepted under this title, and all the determinations and decisions made pursuant to such regulations by the Secretary of Defense regarding such payments and conveyances and the terms and conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

Sec. 507. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into such agreement with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as may be appropriate for the purposes of economy and efficiency of administration of this title. Such agreement may provide authority to the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, and his designee, to make any or all of the determinations and take any or all of the actions which the Secretary of Defense is authorized to undertake pursuant to sections 501–506 of this title. Any such determinations shall be entitled to finality to the same extent as if made by the Secretary of Defense, and, in event the Secretaries of Defense and Housing and Urban Development so elect, the fund established pursuant to section 504 of this title shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out the purposes thereof.

Sec. 508. Section 223(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by inserting in lieu of paragraph (8) thereof, a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Government of any housing acquired pursuant to title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966."

Sec. 509. No funds may be appropriated for the acquisition of any property under authority of this title unless such funds have been specifically authorized for such purpose in an annual military construction authorization Act and no moneys in the fund created pursuant to section 504 of this title may be expended for any such purpose unless specifically authorized in an annual military construction authorization Act.

Sec. 510. Section 108 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is hereby repealed.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Assistance for housing in Alaska

Sec. 601. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make loans and grants to the State of Alaska, or any duly authorized agency or instrumentality thereof, in accordance with a statewide program prepared by such State, agency, or instrumentality, and approved by the Secretary, to assist in the provision of housing and related facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents who are otherwise unable to finance such housing and related facilities upon terms and conditions which they can afford. The program shall (1) specify the minimum and maximum standards for such housing and related facilities (not to exceed an average of $7,500 per dwelling unit); (2) to the extent feasible, encourage the proposed users of such housing and related facilities to utilize mutual and self-help in the construction thereof; and (3) provide experience, and encourage continued participation, in self-government and individual home ownership.

(b) Grants under this section shall not exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate cost of the housing and related facilities to be constructed under an approved program.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

Low-rent housing—Use of newly constructed private housing

Sec. 602. (a) Section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "existing structures" in the last proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof "private accommodations".

(b) Section 23(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "an existing" in the first clause and inserting in lieu thereof "a".

Low-rent housing in private accommodations—Term of lease

Sec. 603. Section 23(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "nor more than thirty-six months".

Application of Davis-Bacon Act to low-rent housing projects consisting of privately built housing

Sec. 604. Section 16(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after "the development of the project involved" the following: "(including a project for the use of privately built housing in any case, other than under the authority of section 23 of this Act, where the public housing agency and the builder or sponsor enter into an agreement for such use before construction or rehabilitation is commenced), and that each such laborer or mechanic shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be".

Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development

Sec. 605. (a) To encourage and assist the housing industry to continue to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing by the application to home construction of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed to—

(1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and to urban development activities; and

(2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining housing, and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities, and the general public.

(b) Research and studies conducted under this section shall be designed to test and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to (1) design concepts, (2) construction and rehabilitation methods, (3) manufacturing processes, (4) materials and products, and (5) building components.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the research and studies authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for research and studies authorized by this section for work to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Secretary under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956, or any other provision of law.

Urban environmental studies

SEC. 606. (a) The Congress finds that, with the ever-increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban centers, there has occurred a marked change in the environmental conditions under which most people live and work; that such change is characterized by the progressive substitution of a highly complex, man-contrived environment or an environment conditioned primarily by nature; that the beneficent or malignant influence of environment on all living creatures is well recognized, and that much more knowledge is urgently needed concerning the effect on human beings in highly urbanized surroundings. It is the purpose of this section to authorize a comprehensive program of research, studies, surveys, and analyses to improve understanding of the environmental conditions necessary for the well-being of an urban society, and for the intelligent planning and development of viable urban centers.

(b) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized and directed to—

(1) conduct studies, surveys, research, and analyses with respect to the ecological factors involved in urban living;

(2) document and define urban environmental factors which need to be controlled or eliminated for the well-being of urban life;

(3) establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on urban ecological research and evaluations which are in process or are being planned by public or private agencies, or individuals;

(4) evaluate and disseminate information pertaining to urban ecology to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals, in the form of reports or otherwise;

(5) initiate and utilize urban ecological information in urban development projects initiated or assisted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(6) establish through interagency consultation the coordinated utilization of urban ecological information in projects undertaken or assisted by the Federal Government which affect the growth or development of urban areas.

(c)(1) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations for carrying on the purpose of this section. Such advisory committees shall render such advice to the Secretary upon his request and may submit such recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist such committees.

(2) Members of such advisory committees shall receive not to exceed $100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the studies, surveys, research, and analyses authorized by this section either directly or by contact with public or private bodies or agencies, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for work under this subsection to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation Acts.

Mortgage relief for certain homeowners

SEC. 607. (a) That part of section 107 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which precedes subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"*Mortgage relief for certain homeowners*

"SEC. 107. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'mortgage' means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"(2) The term 'Federal mortgage agency' means—

"(A) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

"(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"(3) The term 'distressed mortgagor' means an individual who—

"(A) was employed by the Federal Government at, or was assigned as a serviceman to, a military base or other Federal installation and whose employment or service at such base or installation was terminated subsequent to November 1, 1964, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of such base or installation; and

"(B) is the owner-occupant of a dwelling situated at or near such base or installation and upon which there is a mortgage securing a loan which is in default because of the inability of such individual to make payments due under such mortgage.

"(b)(1) Any distressed mortgagor, for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, may apply to the appropriate Federal mortgage agency for a determination that suspension of his obligation to make payments due under such mortgage during a temporary period is necessary in order to avoid such foreclosure.

"(2) Upon receipt of an application made under this subsection by a distressed mortgagor, the Federal mortgage agency shall issue to such mortgagor a certificate of moratorium if it determines, after consultation with the interested mortgagee, that such action is necessary to avoid foreclosure.

"(3) Prior to the issuance to any distressed mortgagor of a certificate of moratorium under paragraph (2), the Federal mortgage agency, the mortgagor, and the mortgagee shall enter into a binding agreement under which—

"(A) the mortgagor will be required to make payments to such agency, after the expiration of such certificate, in an aggregate amount equal to the amount paid by such agency on behalf of such mortgagor as provided in subsection (c), together with interest thereon at a rate not to exceed the rate provided in the mortgage; the manner and time in which such payments shall be made to be determined by the Federal mortgage agency having due regard for the purposes sought to be achieved by this section; and

"(B) the Federal mortgage agency will be subrogated to the rights of the mortgagee to the extent of payments made pursuant to such certificate, which rights, however, shall be subject to the prior right of the mortgagee to receive the full amount payable under the mortgage.

"(4) Any certificate of moratorium issued under this subsection shall expire on whichever of the following dates is the earliest—

"(A) two years from the date on which such certificate was issued;

"(B) thirty days after the date on which the mortgagor gives notice in writing to the Federal mortgage agency that he is able to resume his obligation to make payments due under his mortgage; or

"(C) the date on which such mortgagor becomes in default with respect to any condition or covenant in his mortgage other than that requiring the payment by him of sums due under the mortgage.

"(c)(1) Whenever a Federal mortgage agency issues a certificate of moratorium to any distressed mortgagor with respect to any mortgage, it shall transmit to the mortgagee a copy of such certificate, together with a notice stating that, while such certificate is in effect, such agency will assume the obligation of such mortgagor to make payments due under the mortgage.

"(2) Payments made by any Federal mortgage agency pursuant to a certificate of moratorium issued under this section with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor may include, in addition to the payments referred to in paragraph (1), an amount equal to the unpaid payments under such mortgage prior to the issuance of such certificate, plus a reasonable allowance for foreclosure costs actually paid by the mortgagee if a foreclosure action was dismissed as a result of the issuance of a moratorium certificate. Payments by the Federal mortgage agency may also include payments of taxes and insurance premiums on the mortgaged property as deemed necessary when these items are not provided for through payments to a tax and insurance account held by the interested mortgagee.

"(3) While any certificate of moratorium issued under this section is in effect with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor, no further payments due under the mortgage shall be equired of such mortgagor, and no action (legal or otherwise) shall be taken or maintained by the mortagee to enforce or collect such payments. Upon the expiration of such certificate, the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms.

"(4) Each Federal mortgage agency shall give prompt notice in writing to the interested mortgagor and mortgagee of the expiration of any certificate of moratorium issued by it under this section.

"(d) Each Federal mortgage agency, upon the request of any individual (1) who was employed by the Federal Government at, or was assigned as a serviceman to, a military base or other Federal installation and whose employment or service at such base or installation was terminated subsequent to November 1, 1964, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of such base or installation, and (2) who is the owner-occupant of a dwelling situated at or near such base or installation and upon which there is a mortgage insured or guaranteed by such agency, shall provide technical assistance to such individual in effecting a sale of such dwelling.

"(e) The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section and to insure the uniform administration thereof.

"(f) There shall be in the Treasury (1) a fund which shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of extending financial assistance in behalf of distressed mortgagors as provided in subsection (c) and for paying administrative expenses incurred in connection with such assistance, and (2) a fund which shall be available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the same purpose, except administrative expenses. The capital of each such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. Receipts arising from the programs of assistance under subsection (c) shall be credited to the fund from which such assistance was extended. Moneys in either of such funds not needed for current operations, as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the case may be, shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States, or paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 107 of such Act (as designated prior to the amendment made by subsection (a)) is redesignated as subsection (g).

College housing

Sec. 608. (a) Section 404(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "public" immediately before "educational institution".

(b) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) In addition to the total authorization provided by paragraph (1), the Secretary may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $300,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1967 and 1968: *Provided,* That such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum: *Provided further,* That funds obtained as a result of Treasury borrowing authorized by this paragraph shall be loaned to educational institutions only at a rate of interest which is equal to one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in the preceding proviso."

Public facility loans

Sec. 609. Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The restrictions and limitations set forth in subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to assistance to municipalities, other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of one or more States, and Indian tribes, for specific projects for cultural centers, including but not limited to, museums, art centers and galleries, and theaters and other physical facilities for the performing arts, which would be of cultural, educational, and informational value to the communities and areas where the centers would be located."

Miscellaneous and technical amendments

Sec. 610. (a) Section 106(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is repealed.

(b) Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "subsection (b)(2)" in clause (vi) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b)".

(c) Section 304(a)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and the Association shall not purchase any mortgage insured or guaranteed prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954".

(d) The last sentence of section 305(e) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "supplementing" and inserting in lieu thereof "supplementary".

(e) Section 308 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "(a)".

(f) Section 512 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "or IX" and inserting in lieu thereof "IX, X, or XI".

(g) Section 1 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and X" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "X, and XI".

Small Business Act

Sec. 611. Paragraph (1) of section 8(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "(1)", by inserting "and" after "Administration;", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(B) to allow an individual or group of persons cooperating with it in furtherance of the purposes of paragraph (A) to make such use of its office facilities and related materials and services as it deems appropriate;".

Quarters and facilities for Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Sec. 612. (a) The second sentence of section 12 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1432) is amended by striking out "but no bank building shall be bought or erected to house any such bank, nor shall any such bank make any lease" and inserting in lieu thereof "but, except with the prior approval of the board, no bank building shall be bought or erected to house any such bank, or leased by such bank under any lease".

(b) Section 18 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1438) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: "Such assessments may include such amounts as the board may deem advisable for carrying out the provisions of subsection (c) of this section."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The board, utilizing the services of the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator'), and subject to any limitation hereon which may hereafter be imposed in appropriation Acts, is hereby authorized—

"(A) to acquire, in the name of the United States, real property in the District of Columbia, for the purposes set forth in this subsection;

"(B) to construct, develop, furnish, and equip such buildings thereon and such facilities as in its judgment may be appropriate to provide, to such extent as the board may deem advisable, suitable and adequate quarters and facilities for the board and the agencies under its administration or supervision;

"(C) to enlarge, remodel, or reconstruct any of the same; and

"(D) to make or enter into contracts for any of the foregoing.

"(2) The board may require of the respective banks, and they shall make to the board, such advances of funds for the purposes set out in paragraph (1) as in the sole judgment of the board may from time to time be advisable. Such advances shall be in addition to the assessments authorized in subsection (b) and shall be apportioned by the board among the banks in proportion to the total assets of the respective banks, determined in such manner and as of such times as the board may prescribe. Each such advance shall bear interest at the rate of 4½ per centum per annum from the date of the advance and shall be repaid by the board in such installments and over such period, not longer than twenty-five years from the making of the advance, as the board may determine. Payments of interest and principal upon such advances shall be made from receipts of the board or from other sources which may from time to time be available to the board. The obligation of the board to make any such payment shall not be regarded as an obligation of the United States. To such extent as the board may prescribe any such obligation shall be regarded as a legal investment for the purposes of subsections (g) and (h) of section 11 and for the purposes of section 16.

"(3) The plans and designs for such buildings and facilities and for any such enlargement, remodeling, or reconstruction shall, to such extent as the chairman of the board may request, be subject to his approval.

"(4) Upon the making of arrangements mutually agreeable to the board and the Administrator, which arrangements may be modified from time to time by mutual agreement between them and may include but shall not be limited to the making of payments by the board and such agencies to the Administrator and by the Administrator to the board, the custody, management, and control of such buildings and facilities and of such real property shall be vested in the Administrator in accordance therewith. Until the making of such arrangements such custody, management, and control, including the assignment and allotment and the reassignment and reallotment of building and other space, shall be vested in the board.

"(5) Any proceeds (including advances) received by the board in connection with this subsection, and any proceeds from the sale or other disposition of real or other property acquired by the board under this subsection, shall be considered as receipts of the board, and obligations and expenditures of the board and such agencies in connection with this subsection shall not be considered as administrative expenses. As used in this subsection, the term 'property' shall include interests in property.

"(6) With respect to its functions under this subsection the board shall (A) annually prepare and submit a budget program as provided in title I of the Government Corporation Control Act with regard to wholly owned Government corporations, and for purposes of this sentence, the terms 'wholly owned Government corporations' and 'Government corporations', wherever used in such title, shall include the board, and (B) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General

Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions as provided in such title, and no other audit, settlement, or adjustment shall be required with respect to transactions under this subsection or with respect to claims, demands, or accounts by or against any person arising thereunder. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection or by the board, the provisions of this subsection and the functions thereby or thereunder subsisting shall be applicable and exercisable notwithstanding and without regard to the Act of June 20, 1938 (D.C. Code secs. 5-413—5-428), except that the proviso of section 16 thereof shall apply to any building constructed under this subsection, and section 306 of the Act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 584), or any other provision of law relating to the construction, alteration, repair, or furnishing of public or other buildings or structures or the obtaining of sites therefor, but any person or body in whom any such function is vested may provide for delegation or redelegation of the exercise of such function.

"(7) No obligation shall be incurred and no expenditure, except in liquidation of obligation, shall be made pursuant to the first two subparagraphs of paragraph (1) of this subsection if the total amount of all obligations incurred pursuant thereto would thereupon exceed $13,200,000 or such greater amount as may be provided in an appropriation Act or other law."

Control of insured savings and loan associations

SEC. 613. Subsection (c) of section 408 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730a (c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any company on or after September 23, 1959—

"(1) to acquire the control of more than one insured institution, or

"(2) to acquire the control of an insured institution when it holds the control of any other insured institution,

except in a transaction which has been approved by the board in order to prevent a default in the insured institution the stock or assets of which are being acquired."

Conforming nomenclature in statutes to Department of Housing and Urban Development Act

SEC. 614. (a) (1) The National Housing Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(C) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(D) by striking out "Commissioner's" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's".

(2) The heading of section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out "CREATION OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION" and inserting in lieu thereof "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS".

(3) (A) The first sentence of section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The powers conferred by this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')."

(B) The next to the last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(4) Sections 2(c) (2), 204(g), 604(g), and 904(f) of such Act are amended by striking out "the Commissioner or by any Assistant Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "an officer".

(5) The first sentence of section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "shall be deposited" and inserting in lieu thereof "related to insurance under section 203 shall be deposited".

(6) The first sentence of section 209 of such Act is amended by adding "in connection with the insurance programs" after "made".

(7) Section 220(d) (1) (A) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appear and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(C) by striking out "certification to the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "determination"; and

(D) by striking out "certified to the Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "determined".

(8) Section 223(a) (2) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(9) The heading of section 226 of such Act is amended by striking out "FHA".

(10) (A) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(B) The last sentence of section 303(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Secretary's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Treasury's".

(11) Section 306(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(12) Sections 303(g) and 308 of such Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(13) Section 308 of such Act is further amended by striking out "said Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary".

(14) The third paragraph of section 603(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "in any field office of" and inserting in lieu thereof "by".

(15) The second paragraph of section 610 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(16) Section 803(b) (2) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee";

(B) by striking out "certified by the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "certified by the Secretary of Defense";

(C) by striking out "require the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "require the Secretary of Defense"; and

(D) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee".

(17) Section 807 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence.

(18) Section 809 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee";

(B) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee";

(C) by striking out " 'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary' " in subsection (g) (2) (i) and inserting in lieu thereof " 'Secretary of Defense or his designee', and 'Secretary of Defense' "; and

(D) by striking out "such Administration" in both places it appears in subsection (g) (2) (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof "the National Aeronautics and Space Administration".

(19) Section 903(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(20) Section 903(d) of such Act is amended by striking out ", with the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator,".

(21) Section 1003(b) (3) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) (1) The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(2) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"United States Housing Authority

"SEC. 3. There is hereby created in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a body corporate of perpetual duration to be known as the United States Housing Authority, which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States. The functions, powers, and duties of the Authority are vested in and shall be exercised by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'). No officer or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in the performance of any such functions, powers, or duties, shall participate in any matter affecting his personal interest or the interest of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested."

(3) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (a) and (b).

(4) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "shall sue" and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue".

(5) Section 5 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(6) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(7) Section 13(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "4(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "4(b)".

(8) Section 16(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "suits shall" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "suits may".

(9) Section 16 of such Act is further amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3).

(10) Section 22(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "first" in the proviso.

(c) Section 20 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereafter in this section referred to as the Administrator)" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Secretary)"; and

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(d) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by striking out "Federal Public Housing Authority (or Public Housing Administration)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority".

(e)(1) Section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948 is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(C) by striking out the last two sentences of subsection (a).

(2) Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Section 304 of such Act is repealed.

(4) Section 502 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(C) by striking out the next to the last sentence in subsection (a);

(D) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears in the first and fourth sentences of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority";

(E) by striking out "Administration" each place it appears in the third sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Authority";

(F) by striking out "shall sue" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue";

(G) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (b);

(H) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board" where it first appears in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board";

(I) by striking out "Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Home Loan Bank Board)";

(J) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" in subsection (c)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board";

(K) by striking out "said officers or agencies" in subsection (c)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "such officer or agency";

(L) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may utilize funds made available to them" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may utilize funds made available to him"; and

(M) by striking out "of the respective agencies" in subsection (d).

(f)(1) Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Title I of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "to the constituent agencies affected".

(4) The last sentence of section 103(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "paid or accrued to the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "paid or accrued to the Secretary of the Treasury".

(5) Section 106(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2).

(6) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(7) Section 110(j) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(j) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(8) Section 601 of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the head of each constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", and (B) by striking out "each" and inserting in lieu thereof "he".

(9) Section 605 of such Act is repealed.

(10) Section 612 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 602(d)(11) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any officer or constituent agency therein," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department of Housing and Urban Development or any officer thereof".

(h)(1) Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(2) Section 402(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Security Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(3) Section 404(f) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

(4) Section 507 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development". and

(B) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(5) Section 508 of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(i) Section 304 of the Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(j)(1) Sections 312, 314, 701, and 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 are amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(2) Section 125 of such Act is amended by striking out "Commissioner" in both places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(3) Section 314(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(4) Section 703 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;".

(5) Section 801 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(6) Section 802(a) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "FHA";

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(C) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(7) Section 811 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(8) Section 814 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or any official or constituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(C) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or such official or constituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(D) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency or any official or constituent agency thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(9) Section 816 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(10) Section 817 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(k) Sections 32 and 62 a. of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(l)(1)(A) Section 113 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is repealed.

(B) Section 102(h) of such Amendments is amended by striking out "section 213 of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 213 of the National Housing Act, section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, and section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (insofar as the provisions of such sections relate to cooperative housing) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", and by striking out "such section" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "such sections".

(2) Title II of such amendments is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Section 202(a) of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(4) Section 403 of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(5) Section 404 of such Amendments is amended—

(A) by striking of "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissinoner's" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development's"; and

(C) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(6) Section 406 of such Amendments is amended—

(A) by striking out "Public Housing Administration and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(B) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(C) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(7) Section 409(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "or 'Secretary' ".

(8) Title IV of such Act is further amended by inserting "of Defense" after "Secretary"—

(A) in the fourth and sixth sentences of section 403(a);

(B) in section 403(b);

(C) in the last three sentences of section 403(d);

(D) in the proviso in section 404(a);

(E) in the next to last sentence of section 404(c)(2);

(F) where it first appears in section 404(e);

(G) in the third proviso in section 406; and

(H) in the last two sentences of section 406.

(m)(1) Section 104(d) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Section 602 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(C) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(n)(1) Section 104 of the Housing Act of 1957 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Section 604 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(3) Section 605 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(o)(1) Sections 52, 53, and 56 of the Alaska Omnibus Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Section 53 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(p)(1) Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended—

(A) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(B) by striking out in subsection (c)(2) ", except" and all that follows down through and including "section 513"; and

(C) by changing subsection (d)(6) to read as follows:

"(6) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

(2) Section 306(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Sections 802(a) and 808 of such Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(q) Section 5 of the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 872) is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(r)(1) Sections 207 and 312 of the Housing Act of 1961 are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Section 312 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(4) Section 702 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(B) by striking out "Secretary from time to time" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior from time to time".

(5) Section 905 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Admistrator and the Public Housing Administration are" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(B) by striking out "Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(s) Section 2 of the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(t)(1) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(2) Section 9(c)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;".

(u)(1) Section 107(g) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) Section 312 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subseciton (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(C) by changing subsection (b)(4) to read as follows:

"(4) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."; and

(D) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in subsection (c)(4)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(4) Section 318 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(5) Title VIII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(6) Section 805(a) of such Act is amended by striking out " 'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof " 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(7) Section 810 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(8) Section 1005 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(9) Section 1006 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(10) Section 1007 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(B) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(v)(1) The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in sections 101 (c), (d), (e), and (g); 301(b); 313(b); 315(a)(8); 402; and 404(a), and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "Secretary".

(2) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(3) Section 101 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(B) by striking out all of the second sentence of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to any housing assisted under this section, section 221(d)(3), or 231(c)(3) of the National Housing Act, or section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, including the authority to prescribe occupancy requirements under other provisions of law or to determine the portion of such housing which may be occupied by qualified tenants."

(4) Section 108(d) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary".

(5) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the third sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(6) Section 315 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a)(8) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are" in subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(C) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(7) Section 401(5) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(8) Section 702(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator')" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary')".

(9) Section 1113 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(w) Section 501 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1966, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Administrator" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(x)(1) Sections 493, 657, and 1006 of title 18, United States Code, are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) The eighth paragraph of section 709 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever uses as a firm or business name the words 'Department of Housing and Urban Development', 'Housing and Home Finance Agency', 'Federal Housing Administration', 'Federal National Mortgage Association','United States Housing Authority', or 'Public Housing Administration' or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', or 'USHA', or any combination or variation of those words or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', or 'USHA' alone or with other words or letters reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such name or business has some connection with, or authorization from, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, which does not in fact exist, or falsely claims that any repair, improvement, or alteration of any existing structure is required or recommended by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, for the purpose of inducing any person to enter into a contract for the making of such repairs, alterations, or improvements, or falsely advertises or falsely represents by any device whatsoever that any housing unit, project, business, or product has been in any way endorsed, authorized, inspected, appraised, or approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, The Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof; or".

(3) Section 1010 of such title is amended—

(A) by changing the section heading to read as follows:

"§ 1010. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions.";

(B) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(C) by striking out "such Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "such Department".

(4) Section 1012 of such title is amended—

(A) by changing the section heading to read as follows:

"§ 1012. Department of Housing and Urban Development transactions.";

(B) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(C) by striking out "such Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "such Department".

(5) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001, is amended—

(A) by striking out the item relating to section 1010 and inserting in lieu thereof

"§ 1010. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions.";

and

(B) by striking out the item relating to section 1012 and inserting in lieu thereof

"§ 1012. Department of Housing and Urban Development transactions."

(y) Title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagee designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner" in section 1802(d) and inserting in lieu thereof "mortgagee approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and designated by him".

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in subsections (b), (d), and (e) of section 1804 and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(z) The fourth paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(aa)(1) The penultimate sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Federal Housing Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this sentence referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(B) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(C) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(D) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(2) Paragraph (11) of section 5200 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 84) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator or the Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(B) by striking out "Administrator or Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(bb) Any function or authority vested in or exercisable by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Chairman thereof, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation immediately before the enactment of this Act shall not by this section or anything therein be affected or impaired, or subjected to any restriction or limitation to which it was not then subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of S. 3711, just passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO ACCEPT TITLE TO THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY LIBRARY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not believe there will be any objection to Calendar No. 1421, House Joint Resolution 1207, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1207) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1401, S. 3700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is not intended to have a vote on this bill this evening, and debate on it will commence on Monday. If Senators care to make speeches on this bill or related subjects, or, for that matter, on any subject, they may do so, but there will be no further votes today.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the additional sum of $4,306,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "fifteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen years" and by striking out "June 30, 1971", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1972".

(b) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking "1971" where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1972", and such section 104(b) (5) is further amended by striking "fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.", at the end of the penultimate sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972."

FOUR-LANING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 5. Section 109(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that such standards shall provide for not less than four traffic lanes for the main traveled way of the Interstate System."

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 7. (a) The last sentence of subsection (m) of section 131, and the last sentence of subsection (m) of section 136, of title 23, United States Code, are each amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1967."

(b) The last sentence of subsection (b) of section 319 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection after June 30, 1967."

(c) (1) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes.

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, neither sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, nor any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, shall be construed to be authority for any appropriations for any fiscal year for which appropriations are not specifically authorized by fiscal year in such sections or provisions.

"(b) Any appropriation to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, must be authorized by a provision of law specifically setting forth the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year to carry out such section or other provision of law.

"(c) The highway trust fund established by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 shall not be available for any appropriation to carry out sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, and any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, in an aggregate amount which exceeds the amount of tax that would be imposed under section 4061(a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if such section imposed a tax at the rate of 1 per centum plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes, but the total of all appropriations made from such fund to carry out these sections and provisions of law shall never exceed the total of all appropriations made to such fund based on the imposition of such tax plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes."

(2) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 8. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 131 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 136 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $28,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

Sec. 9. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000, the unexpended balance of such amount shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Sec. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance aquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1967, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

Sec. 11. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms, subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

Sec. 12. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned, buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Sec. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1967, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $150,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed S. 3155, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, with an amendment, and has insisted on its amendment and requested a conference.

I therefore move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Randolph, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Moss, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Fong conferees on the part of the Senate.

PEOPLE DESERVE FACTS ABOUT DAMS ON THE COLORADO

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, somebody once observed that truth is the first casualty in a propaganda war. This is certainly true with respect to the campaign of deceit and outright falsehood being waged against one of the most urgently needed resource projects now pending in the Congress.

H.R. 4671, the Colorado River Basin Project Act, has been reported favorably by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives after long and intensive study. It is the product of the most qualified engineering, economic, and governmental intelligence in our country.

More than a quarter century of study and planning have gone into the two hydroelectric dams that are the heart and lungs of the entire project.

On behalf of the people of Arizona and the other six States of the Colorado River Basin, I do not intend to let the campaign of vilification being directed against this project go unanswered.

Hualapai Dam at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dam would no more flood the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River than a few drops of water would flood the Senate Chambers.

Yet millions of Americans have been led to believe this absurd charge by frightening advertisements and uninformed news stories in some of the Nation's largest media.

The principal instigator of this campaign of deliberate deception is David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club.

Mr. President, the Sierra Club is a reputable organization with many contributions to its credit in the field of conservation. I do not question the good intentions of its members.

What I must rise to challenge are the actions and words of Mr. Brower, whose barrage of untruth about this project has tarnished the reputation of the Sierra Club and done a disservice to the cause of true conservation.

The simple truth is that Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams would not harm the Grand Canyon in any way. What they would do is make possible the maximum development of the Colorado River's total resources for the greatest possible benefit for the greatest number of people.

The basic elements of the old central Arizona project, which the Senate approved on two prior occassions, are included in H.R. 4671. Let me say that Arizona's need for supplemental water was apparent many decades ago; today that need is critical.

In the days ahead, Mr. President, I shall present the positive factual case for the Colorado River Basin project and further expose the frantic false alarms of Mr. Brower.

Meanwhile, I am aware that some of my colleagues are receiving mail from distributed constituents who have gained a totally false impression about the project.

I can assure all Members of the Senate that the senior Senator from Arizona and I will be pleased to assist any of our colleagues by providing the documented, factual information that will enable them to respond accurately to these citizen inquiries.

We have the facts, Mr. President, and we invite any questions or requests for information at any time about any aspect of this vitally needed legislation.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HILL-BURTON CONSTRUCTION ACT—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, but August 13 marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Hill-Burton Construction Act. This is landmark legislation. It has been one of the finest instances of Federal-State cooperation. It embodied a great deal of new thinking and was a pioneering piece of legislation in this area. It contained a novel principle that made it possible for low-income States to receive relatively greater aid than States in a better position; but every State has benefited from it.

Louisiana has had 238 projects approved adding 9,973 beds in hospitals and nursing homes and 98 other health facilities, at a total cost of $170 million, with a Federal share of $72 million.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent today. Unfortunately, in the course of his duties, he was injured, and presently is confined to his home, but he will be with us soon.

In his absence I wish to salute him as the principal sponsor of the Hill-Burton Act. This was a magnificent effort by two great Members of Congress to benefit the entire Nation by a well-considered hospital program.

It is very appropriate that on the 20th anniversary of this fine piece of legislation we should think of those two able Senators who sponsored the measure and brought about its enactment.

The Hill-Burton program, established in 1946 by legislation sponsored by Senators LISTER HILL of Alabama and HAROLD BURTON of Ohio, is a major example of Federal assistance to private as well as public groups for the attainment of public goals. It evolved from the recognition that the health of the Nation is a national resource and that Federal leadership and financial encouragement are warranted and necessary in preserving and augmenting that resource.

Federal-State cooperation in administration is fundamental to the program. Even before the legislation was enacted, the States assisted the Commission on Hospital Care in a survey of hospital need. They have continued in the forefront of activity throughout the 20 years of effort to provide appropriate settings for better patient care.

CONSTRUCTION

Building hospitals and related health facilities—while not the sole preoccupation of the Hill-Burton program—has been one of its principal objectives. The focus at all times has been on building facilities where they are most needed, not on construction as an end in itself.

Since it began, the Hill-Burton program has aided nearly 8,200 projects for the construction and expansion of health facilities. As of May 1, 1966, a total of 8,194 projects had been approved for Federal aid under the program. Of this total, 7,022 were completed and in operation. The remaining 1,172 were under construction or in the planning stage. When completed, these projects will provide 349,318 inpatient beds in hospitals and nursing homes and 2,372 other health facilities including public health centers, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and State health laboratories.

The authorization of grants for modernization in 1964 broadened the scope of the program and permitted a shift in emphasis. Shortage of rural hospitals was no longer a major problem. The spotlight now turned on long-standing urban hospitals badly needing modernization. Both kinds of communities could now receive assistance on the basis of their differing needs. State plans now delineate modernization needs by geographic area and indicate their relative priority.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Louisiana in paying tribute to the great work of Senator LISTER HILL, not only in connection with the Hill-Burton Act, which was proposed in January 1945—the very month that I came to the Senate—but for his great humanitarian service during his many years in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief article by Senator HILL in the form of an editorial entitled "Hill-Burton At 20: Hospital Progress and Challenge," published in Today's Health for August 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL-BURTON AT 20: HOSPITAL PROGRESS AND CHALLENGE

(By LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator (D., Alabama)

(This month marks the 20th anniversary of the passage by the U.S. Congress of the Hill-Burton Act, which continues to provide special impetus to the improvement of the nation's hospitals. (For a behind-the-scene view of one good typical small-city city hospital, see "Journey Through a City of Care" on page 32 of this issue.)

(The American Medical Association, publisher of Today's Health, has supported the Hill-Burton program since its inception as it pertains to the improvement and modernization of hospitals and the development of diagnostic and treatment centers which are hospital-connected (but not those which are independent of hospitals).)

(Sen. LISTER HILL, who, along with Sen. Harold Burton, introduced the original legislation in January 1945, here comments in a guest editorial on the significance of the Hill-Burton Act anniversary.—The Editors.)

Over the past two decades we have witnessed great progress in reducing the shortage of hospital beds. To measure our progress we have only to recall the situation that prevailed in 1946 when all of the states were confronted with a scarcity of hospital beds. In Ohio, for example, in 1945, only 26 of the 88 counties had accredited hospitals. For the country as a whole, there were some 15 million Americans living in 1200 counties that had no recognized hospital facilities. In contrast, the states now estimate that less than two million people are living in areas without acceptable hospital beds, and our population has increased by more than 50 million over the same two decades.

Under the Hill-Burton program, we have added 345,000 inpatient beds and constructed new or additional facilities in the case of more than 8000 hospitals, nursing homes, outpatient clinics, rehabilitation facilities, and public-health units. The total investment amounts to $7.8 billion, including a federal share of $2.4 billion.

We are grateful for our progress in the construction of hospitals and other medical-care facilities, but more important, we recognize the challenge that is the result of our progress.

We recognize that we must continue to construct hospitals and other medical-care facilities so that we can keep pace with population growth and the increased demand for health services as a result of legislation, our rising national income, and educational levels.

We recognize, too, that a hospital constructed and equipped 20 years ago is sometimes obsolete today in terms of modern medicine. Today, more than ever before, the practice of medicine depends upon access to the complex equipment that is essential to modern diagnostic and therapeutic techniques. We must carefully plan the modernization of obsolete medical-care facilities and carry out the construction that will solve one of our most pressing health problems.

The majority of our facilities for the care and treatment and restoration of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded are woefully inadequate. In the years ahead we must work in behalf of community-based programs that are comprehensive in their services, that the disability of mental disorders may be minimized.

We must also work for the construction of more rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops so that the benefits of rehabilitation can be extended to many more of the physically and mentally disabled. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration estimates that less than one-half of those in the labor force who could profit from vocational rehabilitation are receiving the required services.

We also face the challenge of providing for an adequate level of health manpower to staff our medical-care facilities and minister to our health needs. This means we must expand our training capacities for professional health manpower and paramedical personnel. More young people must be recruited into the field of health.

Only by marshalling our physical and human health resources will we take full advantage of the rapid advances in medicine. Over the past two decades we have accumulated more medical knowledge than was added during all previous periods in the entire history of medicine. Thus, the education of the physician is a continuing process and a lifelong pursuit.

On the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act, as we review the progress that has been made and contemplate the challenges that lie ahead, we might well recall the words of the eminent British statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, when he declared: "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

Mr. MORSE. In the article, the Senator cited some statistics pointing out the great progress we have made under this humanitarian legislation to provide medical aid to the people of our country.

The article states:

> In Ohio, for example, in 1945, only 26 of the 88 counties had accredited hospitals.

That was in 1945, almost yesterday in point of time. Senator HILL goes on to say:

> For the country as a whole, there were some 15,000,000 Americans living in 1,200 counties that had no recognized hospital

> facilities. In contrast, the states now estimate that less than 2,000,000 people are living in areas without acceptable hospital beds, and our population has increased by more than 50,000,000 over the same 2 decades.
>
> Under the Hill-Burton program, we have added 345,000 inpatient beds and constructed new or additional facilities in the case of more than 8,000 hospitals, nursing homes, outpatient clinics, rehabilitation facilities, and public-health units. The total investment amounts to $7.8 billion, including a federal share of $2.4 billion.

Mr. President, I know of no wiser Federal investment. In my judgment, the work of this great statesman really personifies an obligation that we all have as Senators, to carry out a trust, to see to it that we implement the general welfare clause of the Constitution. For after all, this society of free people was designed by our forefathers, in the great constitutional structure that they built, to dedicate itself to promoting the general welfare of people. That is what our system of government is for. I cannot think of a better example, legislativewise, of carrying out that trust than the Hill-Burton Act; and I think it particularly appropriate, on this 20th anniversary of that great hospital bill, that we pay tribute to LISTER HILL and to Harold Burton.

Toward the end of Senator HILL's guest editorial, he says:

> Only by marshalling our physical and human health resources will we take full advantage of the rapid advances in medicine. Over the past two decades we have accumulated more medical knowledge than was added during all previous periods in the entire history of medicine. Thus, the education of the physician is a continuing process and a lifelong pursuit.

On another occasion, Mr. President, I referred to LISTER HILL, in debates on health legislation, as "Mr. Health" in the Senate. I think that is a very appropriate title to attach to his record of statesmanship.

But as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which Senator HILL is chairman, and of which I have the privilege to be the next ranking member, I wish to say that without his leadership as chairman of that committee over the many years that I have served on it, we would not have made the progress that we have made, not only in connection with medical and health legislation, but also in connection with education legislation and labor legislation.

I only regret that the Senator is not here today, so that we could personally congratulate him on this great record of statesmanship in this area of legislation. His record is not limited to this field; for his total record in the Senate, over his many years here, has been a great record of carrying out a public trust. I am very proud, may I say, to be associated with him on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon and I had the privilege, at the time, of voting for the bill. We thought it had great promise. But its accomplishments are far beyond, I think, what the Senator and I anticipated at the time we made a resounding "yea" vote for the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in paying deserved tribute to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Honorable LISTER HILL of Alabama, and in recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act. Other Members have noted the contributions of the Hill-Burton program to the advancement of the conditions of public health in our society in recent years. I would point out also that it represents an extension of the concept of public responsibility for the health and welfare of the individual citizen.

In the early days of the American Colonies, as we know, the care of the sick was incidental to the shelter of the poor and unfortunate, supported by the contributions of individuals to the alms houses of that day. The first of these institutions was founded by William Penn in 1713, followed soon by others in New York and Charleston.

The first hospital established solely for the benefit of the physically and mentally ill, without regard to the economic status of its patients, was built in 1751, with the assistance of a governmental grant. As with so many other progressive developments of that time, Benjamin Franklin was a leader in the effort to develop a sense of public responsibility in this field, and through his efforts, the Pennsylvania Hospital was launched with a grant from the Pennsylvania Assembly amounting to 2,000 pounds sterling.

The Hill-Burton Act is a manifestation of this sense of public consciousness of the needs of the physically and mentally ill.

Mr. President, perhaps it is not important that we speak of the number of years which a Congressman serves, but certainly in this instance, it is significant that Senator LISTER HILL gave 15 years of dedicated service as a Member of the House of Representatives, and is now in his 28th year of devoted effort in the Senate.

Those of us who serve with him are very privileged.

I will say, however—and I am sure that the senior Senator from Oregon, who sits at my right, would agree with my statement—that Senator HILL has never been one who wanted to walk ahead of people. He has always wanted to walk, side by side, with people. He believes in people, and he has labored for the benefit of people, particularly in the fields of mental health and medical facilities for those who need assistance.

The Senator from Alabama has distinguished himself in congressional service. I am very delighted now, on the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Hill-Burton Act, to say that West Virginia ranks in the top 10 States in the number of beds available for every 100,000 persons.

We have had 84 Hill-Burton projects in the period since the Hill-Burton Act became law, for a total of $111.2 million expended—and this was an investment, rather than merely an expenditure.

Over $43 million has come to West Virginia from the Hill-Burton moneys appropriated by Congress. Under the umbrella of this act, we have 17 general hospitals, 5 long-term care facilities, 3 rehabilitation centers, 5 public health centers, a State hygienic laboratory, 8 nurses residences and training facilities and 45 additions to hospitals.

On Sunday, August 7, the Charleston Gazette Mail, in its magazine section, published an illuminating story on our State's progress in providing medical facilities for the treatment of patients. The article was entitled, "Hill-Burton in West Virginia."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette Mail, Aug. 7, 1966]

HILL-BURTON IN WEST VIRGINIA: COOPERATION BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL GROUPS HAS PUT STATE AMONG NATION'S TOP 10 IN HOSPITAL BEDS AVAILABLE FOR ITS CITIZENS

(By Edward Peeks)

Mountaineers have to look up, not down, to find where their state stands among others on the national list of available general hospital beds.

West Virginia ranks in the top 10 states on the basis of the number of beds available for every 100,000 persons.

The national average is 406 beds per 100,000 population as compared with 465 for the Mountain State, which is surpassed by only eight other states and the District of Columbia.

They are Colorado with 499 beds, the District of Columbia, 543; Kansas, 475; Minnesota, 490; Montana, 489; North Dakota, 565; Pennsylvania, 469; Vermont, 473, and Wyoming, 470.

The Mountain State stands tall when it comes to hospital facilities, according to figures released by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

These figures have been offered to help the nation take a long hard look at its medical and hospital facilities on the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act, which became law Aug. 13, 1946.

Since then, more than 8,000 projects have been approved with provisions for nearly 350,000 general hospital beds.

These projects cost $7.9 billion, of which the federal share came to $2.5 billion. Through local, state and federal cooperation, money was pooled, plans were drawn and facilities constructed.

The original program called for construction of hospitals and public health centers with concern for rural areas where facilities were most inadequate or least available.

But now the program encompasses construction of long-term care institutions such as nursing homes, chronic disease facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, training and rehabilitation facilities.

It also offers grants to renovate rundown buildings and to replace outdated facilities, grants for areawide planning, research and demonstration projects.

Despite the new lease on life through Hill-Burton transfusions, it is sometimes said, "Our hospitals are sick."

Reference is made to obsolescent facilities whose replacement would cost the nation about $10 billion over the next decade, according to hospital authorities.

If hospitals are ailing, their condition would be far worse had not Sen. Lister Hill, D-Ala., and Sen. Harold Burton, R-Ohio, rallied their congressional colleagues to act 20 years ago.

The nation and the individual states, without the Hill-Burton partnership, would lack means to launch a medicare program for the elderly and to look forward hopefully to meeting the increasing health needs of a growing population.

West Virginia has realized a total of 84 Hill-Burton projects, including 4,717 general hospital beds, or more than half the number of current beds in the state.

The total cost amounts to $111.2 million, with the federal share coming to $43.4 million. Through local and state efforts, West Virginians raised $67.8 of the total amount.

A project breakdown shows 17 general hospitals; 5 long-term care facilities such as nursing homes; 3 rehabilitation centers; the State Hygenic Laboratory in South Charleston; 5 public health centers; 8 nurses residences and training school facilities; and 45 additions to hospitals and similar institutions.

Charleston Memorial Hospital, the largest in Kanawha Valley, was the first general hospital built in the state with Hill-Burton assistance. Developers and community representatives broke ground for the hospital in 1949.

The next in the state was Webster County Memorial Hospital in Webster Springs, representing Hill-Burton concern to make modern hospital facilities available to rural residents.

Summers County Hospital in Hinton represents the newest project which is to be constructed at a total cost of $2.4 million. It has been appropriated $905,000 in Hill-Burton funds.

Others already established are Weirton General Hospital, Sacred Heart Hospital, Richwood; Broaddus in Philippi, Preston Memorial in Kingwood, Cabell-Huntington, West Virginia University Hospital, Calhoun General in Grantsville, Grant Memorial in Petersburg, Hampshire Memorial in Romney, Pleasant Valley in Point Pleasant, Union Protestant in Clarksburg, Reynolds Memorial in Glen Dale, Jackson General in Ripley and St. Joseph's Hospital in Buckhannon.

"Most of these nonprofit community hospitals have been constructed north of Charleston," said State Health Director N. H. Dyer, who noted that most of the private or proprietary hospitals are located in the southern part of the state.

"I consider the Hill-Burton program one of the finest programs of cooperation between the federal government, state agencies and local people for providing much needed hospital service in communities," Dr. Dyer said. "This is particularly so of rural areas where such facilities would be too expensive for local taxpayers to provide funds from their own resources."

Hill-Burton funds are administered in West Virginia through the State Health Department and its governing body which is the nine-member State Board of Health. The present chairman of the board is Edgar B. Moore, a Clarksburg pharmacist.

Dr. Dyer said, "The Hill-Burton program is based on a state plan which is revised annually to determine the need for hospital facilities of all types, health centers, rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes and to justify allocation of funds on a priority basis.

"The Harris-Hill amendments of 1964 introduced a new element, modernization of facilities," he added. "This expanding Hill-Burton program requires that each medical facility be graded by an architect or engineer armed with a series of uniform checklists to ensure a high degree of objectivity."

As overseer of West Virginia's hospital and medical facilities, the State Health Department conducts its work through the Bureau of Hospital and Medical Facilities, whose director is Paul D. Bibb.

"The total per cent of needed construction still exceeds that of the existing facilities," Bibb said of demands under Hill-Burton and other programs, particularly for expansion and renovation.

Hill-Burton assistance goes only to nonprofit groups for community hospital development, including church and civic organizations.

West Virginia has 76 general hospitals and nine special hospitals which together offer a total of about 8,500 beds.

State records show that 52 of the general hospitals are nonprofit institutions and 4 of the special hospitals operate on a nonprofit basis.

The nonprofit group includes public hospitals and medical facilities which share Hill-Burton funds.

Under the program, 45 additions have been made to hospitals and medical facilities in West Virginia. Most of these stand north of Charleston with comparatively few in the south.

Practically all general hospitals, originally built under the Hill-Burton program, have either made additions or are now in the process of doing so under the program.

Charles L. Showalter, administrator of Charleston Memorial Hospital and president of the West Virginia Hospital Assn., said:

"The two single greatest factors in making it possible for our communities to have the modern hospital system we have today are the Hill-Burton program and the Blue Cross movement.

"Hill-Burton provides capital funds on a matching basis to build or expand hospitals. The Blue Cross movement, which gave birth to the prepayment plans, makes it possible for people to defray the cost of hospitalization, thereby providing necessary operating funds."

Operating expenses exceed the construction cost of a hospital in a matter of a few years, Showalter explained, adding:

"Just as important is the recognition given by the federal government that once these facilities were built for the benefit of the community they were not to be dissipated and lost to the community at some point in the future. This has been accomplished by reorganizing depreciation on the total plant as an element of reimbursable cost, thus enabling the individual hospital to provide for replacement of plant and equipment when needed.

"We are greatly indebted to the West Virginia Department of Health for assuming the administration of this program and providing the necessary leadership to make the benefits of the Hill-Burton program available to the people of our state."

Under the program, the five, long-term care facilities constructed are St. Barbara's Memorial Nursing Home in Monongah, Peterson Place in Wheeling, the Summersville Nursing Home, Glenwood Park Methodist Home in Bluefield and the Greenbrier County Nursing Home in Fairlea.

Rehabilitation centers are in Parkersburg, Institute and on the grounds of Barboursville State Hospital.

The five countywide public health centers are in Huntington, Moundsville, Wheeling, Beckley and Princeton.

Nurses residences have been built at Thomas Memorial Hospital in South Charleston, Spencer State Hospital, Lakin, Denmar and Ohio County Tuberculosis Sanitarium at Triadelphia.

Residences and training schools for nurses have been constructed at Charleston General Hospital, Ohio Valley General Hospital in Wheeling and Camden-Clark Memorial Hospital in Parkersburg.

"Through the implementation of the Hill-Burton program, West Virginia now ranks among the top states in the country in hospital beds per thousand population," said Wayne Herhold, executive director of the Hospital Planning Council of Kanawha Valley.

"Future emphasis must be placed on the removal of obsolescent facilities and in providing an effective mechanism to ensure use of the facilities we have by more people in the state.

"There has been a good deal of emphasis on facilities, but now it is shifting to the needs of manpower, training and education," he added. "We need to make more effective use of what we have to train manpower and avoid duplication of services."

Thirty counties contain the state's 84 Hill-Burton projects of various description.

Populous Kanawha County leads with 17 projects at a total cost of $18,699,151, of which Hill-Burton funds supplied $8,536,655.

Next is Cabell County with 10 projects at a cost of $12,674,358, of which $3,671,784 came from Hill-Burton.

Other counties with more than one project, but fewer than 10, are Marion, 4; Marshall, 3; Mason, 5; Mercer, 2; Monongalia, 2; Nicholas, 2; Ohio, 7; Pocahontas, 2; Preston, 2; Randolph, 2; Roane, 2; Upshur, 2; Wetzel, 2; and Wood, 6.

Counties with one project are Barbour, Calhoun, Grant, Greenbrier, Hampshire, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Lewis, Morgan, Raleigh, Summers, Taylor and Webster.

Thus 30 counties, comprising a total of 40 communities, have benefited directly from $43.4 million in Federal grants during the past 20 years. The state as a whole has gained from this assistance.

But, in view of the fact that there are 55 counties—although some are small—the location of Hill-Burton projects in only 30 counties raises questions about the equity of their distribution and their availability to many West Virginians.

True, for example Putnam County residents have access to hospital and medical facilities in Kanawha and Cabell counties.

But similar access hardly applies to residents, say in Monroe County, which is one of eight counties listed recently by the State Health Department as having no kind of licensed health facility.

The other seven counties are Pleasants, Gilmer, Hardy, Pendleton, Clay, Wayne, Lincoln and Putnam.

This gap gives urgency to the question of making better use of existing facilities while striving to improve and increase the lot.

State health officials said this problem and others are under study with the aim of helping local communities find a solution.

Gov. Smith commended the State Board of Health and the State Health Department staff for "their hard work and promotion of the Hill-Burton program."

He said the program "has pioneered in new approaches to improve patient care through research into the development and effective use of health facilities and coordinated planning. It has been an outstanding example of federal, state and local cooperation to improve the health of all our people."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to add these words of deserved tribute to Lister Hill.

The Senate is better for the presence of Lister Hill in this forum. The people of our Nation benefit through his service.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I, too, add my words of congratulations and pay tribute to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] for his service which has been very distinguished, outstanding, and unusual.

The name Lister Hill will be not only in the minds of Senators, but also in the minds, the hearts, and the bodies of those who have had an opportunity to have the hospital service which would have been denied to them had it not been for this great man.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, tomorrow, the 13th of August, is the 20th anniversary of a Federal program which has had an impact on every State, every city, and in effect, every citizen in our country. For it was on August 13, 1946, that President Harry S. Truman, signed the legislation, which is popularly called the Hill-Burton Act, legislation which has brought the benefits of modern medical care to the Nation, through a program of Federal assistance in the building of hospitals. Indeed, a synonym for hospital aid is "a Hill-Burton grant."

In my own State of Rhode Island, Hill-Burton has had a great impact. The latest figures available show that since the inception of this hospital construction program in 1946, 51 projects have been approved. The total cost of such building is $55.6 million, of which $10.6 were Federal funds. But more important, this far reaching legislation has helped provide 1,517 hospital beds and 14 health units for Rhode Islanders.

It is only fitting that the Senate, in noting this landmark anniversary, pay tribute to the sponsor of the original legislation, Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama. And the tribute should not only be for the original inception of the concept, but also for his assiduous watchfulness of the program. The subsequent fundings have all been shepherded by the Senator from Alabama, as has been the legislation broadening the scope of the program. Today there is talk of a hospital bed shortage—imagine the shortage that there would now be if there had been no Hill-Burton program.

The program itself is indeed a tribute to its sponsor, Senator Lister Hill, to whom I join my colleagues in extending congratulations and wishes for long health.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 20 years ago the legislation sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. Lister Hill—a Democrat—and the then-Senator from Ohio, Harold H. Burton—a Republican—was enacted into law with the support of Members from both parties. Today, we commemorate the birth of that landmark law.

The Hill-Burton Act has rightly been termed one of the most significant pieces of legislation enacted since World War II. In my own State of New York, for example, Hill-Burton has meant the addition of 18,182 new hospital and nursing home beds in 286 projects, as well as 30 other facilities—diagnostic centers and rehabilitation centers, for example—which have been added to the State's medical care plant. This adds up to a total of $527 million in construction with a Federal share of $116 million.

The Hill-Burton program was founded—and continues to operate—on the philosophy that Government and voluntary groups must work together to maintain and improve the health of our people. The partnership based on this philosophy has included Federal, State, and community governmental units on one hand, and hospitals, voluntary health and hospital associations and citizens' groups on the other.

State agencies are the vital, operating fulcrum of the program, giving leadership to communities and joining forces with Federal officials and voluntary groups in developing national guidelines. State officials work closely with project sponsors in the development and carrying out of proposals and the sponsors, in turn, must raise matching funds and carry out actual construction.

Our distinguished committee chairman, Mr. Hill, cannot be here with us in this Chamber today as he is home recuperating from an arm injury he recently received. However, to him, and to the others who have made Hill-Burton the constructive program for the Nation's health which it is, I offer congratulations on this 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act. May it continue to be blessed with success.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act. It is a fitting time to pay tribute to the Senate's Mr. Health, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, who has championed the cause of hospital improvement and has increased public awareness of this crucial problem.

Since the passage of the Hill-Burton Act of 1946, the in-patient hospital bed capacity in this country has been expanded by 345,000, and 8,000 hospitals and health centers have been constructed. Every State has benefited from this act. Three hundred and seventy-two projects have been approved in my State, 23,882 beds have been added in hospitals and nursing homes, and 79 other health facilities. The expenditure has been $456 million in Texas of which $159 million is the Federal share.

Throughout the years, Senator Hill has been the watchdog of the country in improving hospital and health care facilities. The country is grateful for his efforts in its behalf and his concern for the well-being of each citizen.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who assisted in the development of the Hill-Burton Act, I am glad to join in extending congratulations on the 20th anniversary of this outstanding example of constructive Federal-State cooperation. The legislation authorized Federal grants to assist States and communities in constructing needed hospitals and public health centers to furnish adequate care to their citizens. Certainly it represents one of the greatest contributions the Federal Government has rendered to maintain the health of our citizens by stimulating communities to provide modern health facilities in which quality care can be obtained.

Hill-Burton is Federal assistance at its best, based as it is on the policy of having the Federal Government render assistance rather than dictating to the States and localities. The results have been enormously successful. This I know from my own experience in Massachusetts, where we are proud of our hospitals and our medical schools, and of what we are doing to stimulate scientific discoveries in medicine that will be of benefit to us all.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] for his foresight and leadership along with Senator Harold Burton, of Ohio, in gaining enactment of this most helpful program. Incidentally, when the late Senator Burton was appointed a Justice of the Supreme Court by President Truman, I took his place, at his request, on the conference committee that worked out the arrangements so that the District of Columbia, our Capital City, could participate in the program, thus making it possible for us to improve our hospitals and medical care here in the District of Columbia.

So I am glad to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 20th anniversary of this program which has meant so much to the well-being of our citizens throughout the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues in saluting this 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act and in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, architect of that act and innumerable others that have meant so much to the health and welfare of the American people.

My colleagues may be interested in knowing that members of nearly all of America's great health organizations had planned to hold a dinner on Saturday, August 13, at the headquarters of the American Dental Association in Chicago, at which tribute was to be paid to Senator Hill.

As cochairman for the dinner, the American Dental Association's secretary, Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, was joined by Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Dr. Michael E. De Bakey, Dr. Sidney Farber, Dr. I. S. Ravdin, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, and Dr. Paul Dudley White.

Regrettably, because of the injury to Senator Hill's arm, it was not possible to proceed with the plans for the salute. It seems to me, however, that it would be of great interest to all of us to have the chance to read the text of the booklet prepared for the occasion that traces the magnificent career and achievements of our distinguished colleagues. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that the text be published in full after these remarks.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tribute to the Honorable Lister Hill—Four Decades of Health Leadership

(A dinner of the health professions honoring Senator Lister Hill at the Headquarters Building of the American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, August 13, 1966.)

Co-chairmen: Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Dr. Michael E. De Bakey, Dr. Sidney Farber, Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, Dr. I. S. Ravdin, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Dr. Paul Dudley White.

"We stand today at the threshold of a Golden Age of Medicine." The words are those of Lister Hill. They are appropriate words for him to speak for he is eminently one of the men who has led the nation and the world to that "threshold." No man has done more than he to shape the health future of America, to give it promise and hope. He has done it with an unfaltering vision, with courtly eloquence, with tireless leadership. Writing about him in Harper's magazine, William S. White, the noted newsman and author, put it this way: "Countless millions owe their lives to LISTER HILL. He has done more for the public health than any American in history."

Born in Montgomery, Alabama, on December 29, 1894, LISTER HILL's identification with the nation's health was a family heritage. His father, the late Dr. L. L. Hill, was one of the South's foremost physicians. He named his son after Lord Joseph Lister and wrote the noted British surgeon of this fact. Lord Lister replied: "Your letter has been forwarded to this place, where I am just now staying. I need hardly tell you that I have been much gratified by the honor you have done me in naming your son after me, and also by the very kind terms in which you refer to my teaching as it affected yourself. Cordially wishing all happiness to you, and a life of health, goodness and usefulness to my namesake." Among LISTER HILL's family and near relations are seven other members of the health profession.

After having earned a baccalaureate and law degree from the University of Alabama, LISTER HILL began a law practice in Montgomery in 1916. This year, then, marks the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of his professional life.

This very month marks another anniversary as well, for it was on August 14, 1923 that LISTER HILL was first elected to national office, taking a seat in the House of Representatives in the 68th Congress. It was the era of Normalcy; Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States, and it would be eight years before the title, "The National Institute of Health," would come into being.

In 1938, Representative HILL became Senator HILL, succeeding to the seat that had been held by the Honorable Hugo Black, who had been appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

His steady, life-long concern for the health of the nation intensified during the early years in the Senate even as he carried out a full range of Senatorial duties, including the post of Majority Whip during the 77th, 78th and 79th Congresses.

The list of health measures that LISTER HILL has guided through the legislative process is of astounding length. In 1965 alone, ten major programs were established or expanded, including such landmark bills as the Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke Amendments, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments and the Health Research Facilities Amendments. His contributions have ranged across the entire spectrum of effort in the health field, encompassing facilities and services, research, education and training and preventive services.

Of all the measures for which he is responsible, the one with perhaps the broadest impact is the one whose twentieth anniversary is being commemorated this year, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, the Hill-Burton Act.

In the past twenty years, under a local-state-Federal cost-sharing formula there have been approved some 8,000 projects involving general hospitals, mental hospitals, chronic disease hospitals, tuberculosis sanitariums, public health centers, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic and treatment centers. These projects have provided 353,500 beds in hospitals and nursing homes and 2,400 other health facilities.

It is Senator HILL himself who pointed to what is perhaps the central significance of the measure when he said that "Today's doctor sets up practice where he can find the tools of his profession. He goes where a well-equipped hospital enables him to do his best work and to keep pace with developments in medicine. The hospital is the center of the medical life of a community. . . . The hospital is the arsenal of modern medicine."

More than half of the general hospitals built through Hill-Burton are located in rural communities of under 5,000 population. The program has made it possible for such communities to attract the physicians they must have but could not hope to have without a hospital.

Another vital contribution of the program has been in the field of research. Modern research, particularly of a clinical nature, is possible only with the type of facilities made possible by the program.

This aspect of the Hill-Burton law, of course, is only a small part of the Senator's contributions to research. His efforts in this area began as early as 1928 when, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he led the struggle for the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, designed to conduct and encourage research in preventing and treating tropical disease.

His interest in research has continued in the Senate. It was LISTER HILL who sponsored the measure, in 1948, to establish the National Institutes of Health as the research arm of the United States Public Health Service. Additional legislation through the years has made it possible for that agency to grow in specialized areas to keep pace with the fruits of research. Senator HILL's unfaltering interest has focused not only on the total program of the Institutes but on each of the specialized areas. It was at the recommendation of his Appropriations Subcommittee, for example, that Congress provided funds for an independently housed National Institute of Dental Research.

The Research Facilities Construction Act of 1956 is another major achievement sponsored by Senator HILL.

The modern facilities of the National Library of Medicine, without which that agency could not realize its total potential, were dedicated by Senator HILL in recognition of the role he has played in bringing them into being.

Such achievements—building hospitals, establishing a broadly based research effort, providing and perfecting health communications—all go toward providing the tools which a highly trained professional team must have. A need that is perhaps even more basic is to assure a continuing supply of such professional workers. Here too LISTER HILL has led.

The Omnibus Health Act of 1956, which he sponsored, gave strong impetus to the training of personnel in public health and nursing. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, authored in the Senate by him, resulted from more than a decade of effort to meet America's growing need for physicians, dentists and other health personnel. The Nurse Training Act of 1964, introduced by LISTER HILL, is an additional substantive effort in this direction.

Early in 1966, Senator HILL introduced yet another measure directed toward alleviating manpower shortages in the health field. This proposal, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act, would extend Federal assistance to expand the training of medical technologists, dental hygienists, physical therapists and other such allied groups.

The thirteen schools of public health that provide all 50 states and the Federal government with public health workers have been strongly supported by him. Under the provisions of legislation he has sponsored, the schools receive grants-in-aid- to assist in financing the expensive education of these essential health workers.

The provision of preventive health services has been of equal concern to the senior Senator from Alabama. Here too the record of support begins during his tenure in the House of Representatives and continues in the Senate. Under his direction, there has been a steady, and at times spectacular, increase in the resources made available to the states and to local governments for public health programs.

In 1961, Senator HILL introduced the legislation that was enacted to authorize grants to health departments and project grants for studies and demonstrations for strengthening community health programs designed to combat chronic diseases.

To protect the public health in the rapidly developing use of chemical additives to foods, he successfully proposed in 1958 prohibition of the use of food additives not fully tested by the producer, and in 1960 he sponsored amendments to regulate the use of color additives in food, drugs and cosmetics.

In 1955, with the successful production of the Salk vaccine, LISTER HILL moved to make it quickly available by sponsoring Federal support for state vaccination programs. Subsequently, he obtained legislation to assist the states in carrying out vaccination programs against diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough in addition to poliomyelitis.

The impetus to construction of public health centers under the Hill-Burton program has been a major factor in modernizing public health and health education. As of June 1, 1966, more than 1,240 health centers and laboratories had been or were being built under the auspices of the Hill-Burton program.

In this present year, Senator HILL has introduced what is one of the most sweeping public health measures ever proposed to Congress. Titled the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966, it would authorize grants-in-aid for comprehensive public health planning at the state and local level and provide, as well, formula and project grants to states and communities to finance public health services identified as required in the comprehensive planning.

At the same time as these general efforts have been made, LISTER HILL has maintained and pursued a vigorous and compassionate interest in the handicapped, the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. The Hill-Harris Act of 1963, authorizing financial assistance for the construction of a comprehensive network of facilities for the mentally retarded and mentally ill, is precedent-setting legislation. He is the author, as well, of the most comprehensive rehabilitation legislation Congress has enacted. The Hill-Burton provision for construction of rehabilitation centers has proved an important factor in rehabilitation programs by providing a focal point for community efforts.

Senator HILL has led in enactment of legislation relating to training of teachers of the deaf and providing braille textbooks and other educational material for blind school children. It was his efforts that led to establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

It has been frequently noted that LISTER HILL is in a strategic position to further America's health programs since he is Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with health expenditures. Though there is some pragmatic truth in that, it is a little like saying that the sun begins to shine when the earth is warm. If America enjoys today the exultation of standing "at the threshold of a Golden Age of Medicine," it is not so much because those Chairmanships were held by LISTER HILL as it is that those Chairmanships, at this crucial point in our history, were invested with purpose and meaning by a man who understood clearly that this nation's potential is equal to its needs, the Honorable LISTER HILL of Alabama.

"Had it not been for the action of Congress in passing this Hill measure, a resource of incalculable value to the health of the American people might have been destroyed at any moment. The loss would have been irreparable." (Excerpt from Congressional report on establishment of the National Library of Medicine.)

"No man of our generation, no man in the history of this nation, has done so much in fashioning the legislative bases on which major advances in health are structured." (Dr. Worth B. Daniels, 1961 Chairman, Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine.)

TRIBUTES

"Senator HILL, I am sure that it is obvious to . . . the entire membership of Congress, that your great personal interest in the field of medicine and health, and your tireless efforts on behalf of furthering medical science and in bringing the benefits of that science to the people of our country, have made you the outstanding Congressional leader in the field of medical legislation in the nation today." (John F. Kennedy.)

"The nation at large can be grateful to Senator Hill for the vision he has shown in providing funds in the endeavor to learn ways and means by which the terrible diseases can be finally conquered." (The Honorable JOHN STENNIS, United States Senator from Mississippi.)

"The Hill-Burton Hospital Act has done more to bring the services of modern day medicine to more people than anything else Congress has ever done." (The Honorable MIKE MONRONEY, United States Senator from Oklahoma.)

"My heart grows warm every time I think of you—and that is ever so often—and I glow with happy gratitude to you for all that you still accomplish for prevention of blindness." (Helen Keller.)

"The American Dental Association thanks you again for yet another contribution to our nation's health and welfare. Your management of the Act to aid dental and medical schools deserves the thanks of the entire nation." (Board of Trustees Resolution, American Dental Association.)

"Your statesmanship has, indeed, brought the treatment and care of the mentally ill back into the mainstream of medicine. It marks an historical accomplishment of the first order and it shall not be forgotten." (Assembly of District Branches, American Psychiatric Association.)

"The impact of his knowledge and his influence upon medical and health care legislation has given new dimensions to the term 'public servant.' Millions of Americans are in his debt for his contributions to their well being." (On being presented Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science at Jefferson Medical College.)

"There are millions of our people who are better off today—and millions who will be better off in the future—because of the fine work that you have done on health and welfare legislation." (Lyndon B. Johnson.)

CITATIONS AND AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

Alabama Association for Mental Health.
Alabama Dental Association.
(Alabama) Governor's Committee on Employment of Physically Handicapped.
Alabama League of Aging Citizens.
Alabama Library Association.
Alabama Medical Association, William Crawford Gorgas Award.
Alabama's Own Helen Keller.
Alabama Society for Crippled Children and Adults.
Alabama Supper Club of Washington, D.C.
Alabama Tuberculosis Association.
Alabama Vocational Association.
American Legion of Alabama.
Auburn Extension Service, Friend of 4–H Award.
City Commission of Birmingham.
Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association.
Diversified Occupations Club of Alabama.
Future Farmers of America, Alabama Chapter.
Future Homemakers of America, Alabama Chapter.
Heacock Award of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association.
Progressive Farmer Magazine (Man of the Year).
Southern Tuberculosis Association.
Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.
Albert Lasker Award.
Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.
Alpha Sigma Pi Fraternity (Gallaudet College).
American Association for Hospital Planning.
American Cancer Society.
American College of Hospital Administrators.
American Dental Association.
American Gastroenterological Association.
American Heart Association.
American Hospital Association.
American Institute of Architects.
American Library Association.
American Public Power Association.
American Vocational Association.
Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation and American Rheumatism Association Award.
Association of Schools of Public Health.
Boy Scouts of America.
City of Hope Salute to Medical Progress Award.
Council on Education of the Deaf.
Georgetown University School of Dentistry.
Goodwill Industries of America.
Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.
International Association of Personnel in Employment Security.
Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation.
Maryland Academy of General Practice.
National Association for Mental Health.
National Association of Retired Civil Employees.
National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation.
National Education Association.
National Epilepsy League.
National Hemophilia Foundation.
National Mental Health Committee.
National Rehabilitation Association.
National Tuberculosis Association, Will Ross Medal.
New York Medical College Centennial Medal.
Parent's Magazine.
President's Committee on Employment of Physically Handicapped.
Rhode Island State Dental Society.
Society for Vascular Surgery.
The Council for Exceptional Children.
Washington Board of Trade, First Annual Health—USA Award.

SENATE CONSUMER SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am greatly pleased to announce the creation of a new standing Consumer Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. President, the learned historian of the year 2000, in compiling the chronicles of the 20th century, will surely say of the year 1966, "The voice of the consumer was heard in the land."

And in this year, in which Congress has heard and heeded the voice of the consumer, it has fallen to the members of the Committee on Commerce to interpret that voice and to shape legislation which we hope will be one of the lasting legacies of this Congress.

The right of the consumer to reasonable security in the safety of products which move in commerce has brought forth such landmark legislation as the cigarette labeling, tire, and motor vehicle safety bills; while the consumers' right to know and to compare the products offered him has resulted in passage of the fair packaging and labeling bill.

Prior to that were the fur labeling bill, the truth in fabrics bill, and many other bills which the committee was privileged to handle. The Hazardous Substances Act—on which I think the Senator from Indiana was one of the leaders 2 years ago—is another. This year, of course, there have been a great number of bills of major importance, more so than in any other session.

Any one of these measures would have justified the Senate's pride in its accomplishment. All four represent a formidable work product.

But 1967, and the years following cannot become known as the years in which the voice of the consumer was forgotten. Too many valid consumer needs remain unmet. And the vigor with which congressional consumer mandates are being carried out must be subject to continuous, perservering oversight.

For example, too many gaps still exist in the consumer's elemental right to safe products.

The proposed Child Protection Act, which the committee hopes to hear and act upon within the next several weeks, will fill some gaps, but not all.

The Flammable Fabrics Act needs overhauling.

Products of new technology, such as disposable soft drink bottles, electric blankets, power tools and lawn mowers explode, burn, shock, and maim in disturbing numbers.

Some shoddy practices still exist, in mail-order insurance for example, and in the threadbare quality of many product warranties, guarantees and servicing.

Many reliable manufacturers hail these steps because they attempt to be reliable. However, many of them still do not do so.

The quality of reliable, objective consumer information is limited, while the consumer faces an increasingly complex and impersonal market.

Each segment of government concerned with the interests of the consumer tends to pursue its own narrow range of responsibilities without adequate coordination. Federal agencies pursue conflicting or overlapping courses of action. The Federal Government tends to usurp legitimate State roles while State consumer protection activities are commonly starved for funds and support.

Some industries adhere to rigid codes of self-regulation far more effective and far more useful to the consumer than alternative Federal regulation could ever be. Some industries substitute public relations campaigns for true self-regulation, or some suppress competition in the guise of self-regulation. And too often, professional trade associations and professional consumers confuse, rather than promote the essential dialog between seller and buyer.

The Commerce Committee has, therefore, moved to create the Standing Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs so that we will be better able to carry out our responsibilities and to make a significant contribution to the solution of these, and other, problems affecting the American consumer.

It will be my honor to serve as chairman and my pleasure to have as the senior minority member the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. In addition, the subcommittee will have as its members, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Legislation directly affecting the rights or interests of consumers, previously considered before the full committee, will now be directly processed by the Consumer Subcommittee. The subcommittee will also exercise the committee's oversight functions in consumer matters or bills already processed through the committee. In particular, we intend periodically to review the consumer protection activities of such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce and, with respect to the Hazardous Substances Act and the Packaging and Labeling Act, the Food and Drug Administration.

The subcommittee will carefully and patiently review all expressions of concern from American consumers arising out of injustice or inequality in the marketplace, no mater how insignificant.

The subcommittee should provide an important forum for the exchange of views on consumer protection with affected industries. We will not neglect our responsibility to see that all parties to regulatory proceedings—consumer and manufacturer alike—receive elementary fair treatment.

The Senate Consumer Subcommittee welcomes the assistance and suggestions of our colleagues in the Senate, and stands ready to assist their constituent consumers, whenever the need arises.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, I be recognized to make some remarks for about 1 hour, to be followed by a colloquy with some other Senators who have evidenced an interest in my subject. I ask unanimous consent that this recognition occur at a convenient time after the conclusion of the morning hour, but in no event later than 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT: WHAT IS IT DOING TO THE ECONOMY?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last fall the Senate, over the strenuous objections of myself and several other Senators, passed legislation to implement the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement. Since the agreement was signed by our Government and the Canadian Government on January 16, 1965, the removal of tariffs on new automobiles and on parts for new automotive equipment was made retroactive to that date.

At face value, the agreement appeared to be a move toward free trade between the United States and Canada. In fact, the agreement was the opposite. Before the Canadians would lift the average of 20 percent duties, they required the big four automotive companies to sign letters of intent. The big four were required to maintain the 60 percent Canadian content requirement by substantial investment in new plants and by accelerated assembly of cars in Canada.

Since implementation of the agreement, events detrimental to a vast industry, to its employees, to the U.S. balance of payments, and possibly to the entire U.S. economy are in evidence.

These events make it imperative that Congress and the Nation receive a report on the effects of this agreement.

I am not talking about some nebulous economic theory or hunch—I am concerned about U.S. jobs, families dependent on those jobs, and the state of the economy which must provide those jobs.

Let me outline the situation since the agreement:

First. American Motors has recently announced that it will produce some 50,000 cars in Canada during model year 1967. This is an increase of 20,000 above the 1966 level. Thus, cars built in Canada will replace those heretofore produced in American Motors' Wisconsin plants. This will mean 200 to 300 more jobs to the Canadians.

What does it mean to the United States?

Second. The President's Automotive Adjustment Assistance Board, set up by congressional ratification of the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement signed January 16, 1965, has already granted one petition for relief. Several of us who expected that the letter of the law would be followed found the Pennsauken decision distasteful.

In any case, the jobs lost in that case are now being done by Canadians.

Third. There is little question, however, of automotive workers being involved in the August 1, 1966, decision to grant adjustment assistance to 400 workers in the Grand Rapids, Mich., area. The original petition represented 1,100 workers who claimed unemployment as a result of the operation of the agreement.

Adjustment assistance benefits include:

First. Relocation allowances;

Second. A lump sum equal to 2½ times the weekly manufacturing rate; and

Third. Payments of salaries at $70 a week for up to 52 weeks. This last provision could cost the General Treasury as much as $1,456,000.

I am not begrudging these workers assistance, but I am saying that it seems ridiculous to be paying out unemployment insurance to American workers while Canadians enjoy the lost U.S. jobs and their economy benefits from plant expansion.

How many more jobs will go to Canada? How many more families will the U.S. Government have to aid as more and more production shifts to our northern neighbor?

The Automotive Manufacturers Association reports the total imports of auto parts from Canada for the first 3 months of 1966 were $88,320,423. This is significant when we compare the figure for all 1965—$90,472,363. If this rapid import rate continues, the total for 1966 will be three times the amount in 1965. The auto-parts agreement has made a tremendous gift of a major industry to a foreign government—by means of unfair and lopsided trade negotiations by the U.S. Department of State.

Preliminary figures from the U.S. Commerce Department's Business and Defense Supply Agency support the evidence of this alarming trend.

U.S. importation of Canadian-made passenger cars has shot upwards in the first 6 months of 1966. The value of these cars is more than double the value for the entire year of 1965 for a total of $142 million. At the same time the export value of passenger cars being shipped to Canada from the United States has not had a correspondingly high increase. This is shown in table I.

Imports of Canadian buses and trucks has quadrupled in the first 6 months of 1966 over the total value in 1965.

The net trade figures in table II show us that if the trend of the first 6 months continues, our favorable balance of trade with Canada in new vehicles and parts will be down 30 percent—at a time when we are concerned about the balance-of-

Table III concerns the units of new vehicles—passenger cars, trucks, and buses. In the first 6 months of 1965 the United States exported 78,298 passenger cars to the rest of the world. However, in the first 6 months of 1966 that figure is down to 73,196. This decline shows the effects of the Canadian activity on our own "third country" markets. During the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, administration spokesmen were reluctant to discuss the effects on "third country" markets on our balance of payments. With Canada picking up our own world customers, we lose again in the problem of balance of payments.

I request unanimous consent that these tables may be included in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, rather than reading the documents in their entirety.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

CANADIAN IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Category	1st 6 months, 1966	1st 6 months, 1965	Total, 1965
Passenger cars	$142, 032, 100	$18, 629, 100	$59, 800, 000
Trucks and buses	52, 601, 000	2, 628, 500	13, 100, 000
Automotive parts (excluding tires and tubes)	119, 456, 100	37, 543, 800	90, 900, 000
UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO CANADA			
Passenger cars	71, 973, 800	47, 587, 600	133, 900, 000
Trucks and buses	39, 822, 300	14, 860, 300	41, 200, 000
Automotive parts (excluding tires and tubes)	464, 028, 900	351, 134, 200	682, 700, 000

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, BDSA.

TABLE II.—*U.S. favorable trade balance in vehicles and parts*

	Millions
1961	372. 0
1962	390. 1
1963	519. 6
1964	578. 4
1965	674. 0
1966 (1st 6 months)	261. 7

TABLE III.—*Factory sales of motor vehicle units, United States and Canada*

U.S. FACTORY SALES

Passenger cars:	
1st 6 months of 1966	4, 901, 341
1st 6 months of 1965	5, 117, 761
Trucks and buses:	
1st 6 months of 1966	954, 071
1st 6 months of 1965	911, 566

DISTRIBUTION OF FACTORY SALES ITEMS

U.S. domestic market:	
Passenger cars:	
1st 6 months of 1966	4, 798, 842
1st 6 months of 1965	5, 020, 787
Trucks and buses:	
1st 6 months of 1966	889, 482
1st 6 months of 1965	840, 487
Exports to Canada:	
Passenger cars:	
1st 6 months of 1966	29, 303
1st 6 months of 1965	18, 676
Trucks and buses:	
1st 6 months of 1966	9, 702
1st 6 months of 1965	2, 184
U.S. exports to the world (excluding Canada):	
Passenger cars:	
1st 6 months of 1966	73, 196
1st 6 months of 1965	78, 298
Trucks and buses:	
1st 6 months of 1966	54, 887
1st 6 months of 1965	68, 895

Source: Automotive Manufacturers Association.

Mr. HARTKE. The U.S. economy today is not experiencing a general, excessive superboom. There are critical soft spots and question marks in the economy, including steel, timber, and our automotive industry. The Senate Finance Committee will be looking in detail at the steel industry, and at the impact of foreign steel imports. Senator MAGNUSON and Senator MORSE are leading an investigation into the impact of Japanese purchases of raw timber in the Pacific Northwest. It is imperative that we take a look into the automotive industry.

I call to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, section 502 of the act which implemented the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement:

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 502. The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the implementation of this Act. Such report shall include information regarding new negotiations, reductions or eliminations of duties, reciprocal concessions obtained, and other information relating to activities under this Act. Such report shall also include information providing an evaluation of the Agreement and this Act in relation to the total national interest, and specifically shall include, to the extent practicable, information with respect to—

(1) the production of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts in the United States and Canada,

(2) the retail prices of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts in the United States and Canada,

(3) employment in the motor vehicle industry and motor vehicle parts industry in the United States and Canada, and

(4) United States and Canadian trade in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, particularly trade between the United States and Canada.

Certainly there are no breadlines of workers in the United States. However, if we are to serve the people who elected us, we must watch the economy. We have a responsibility to the automotive workers and their families to let them know where we are going. We are responsible to U.S. citizens to inform them on the welfare of one of our major industries, to inform them as to what this tremendous shift of production is doing to our balance-of-payments situation, and on their behalf to serve notice to the State Department that in future we demand trade negotiations of a more equitable nature.

It is time for a report to the Congress. Since, under the agreement, duty-free treatment is retroactive to January 16, 1965, we are long overdue for a report on its effects—almost 7 months overdue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks a July 28 Wall Street Journal article on American Motors and GM plans for 1967 model year production in Canada, together with material relating to the Grand Rapids, Mich., adjustment assistance decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMC TO BOOST OUTPUT AT PLANT IN ONTARIO—ADDITIONAL 20,000 AUTOS SLATED DURING 1967 MODEL YEAR WILL BE EXPORTED TO NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

DETROIT.—American Motors Corp. said its Canadian subsidiary will increase its car production capacity to 50,000 units annually, beginning with the 1967 model year. The company produced about 30,000 cars in Canada in the 1966 model year.

The additional cars will be exported from the Canadian plant at Brampton, Ontario, into the Northeastern part of the U.S.. Thus, Canadian-built cars will be substituting for cars built at AMC's U.S. plants in Wisconsin.

Roy D. Chapin, president of American Motors of Canada, Ltd., said the increase will cost American Motors $20 million a year in parts and supplies. He said it would result in the hiring of 200 to 300 more workers at the company's Brampton plant. AMC currently has 1,800 employes in Canada.

Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp. imported Canadian-made vehicles into the U.S. during the 1966 model year and General Motors Corp. said it will import vehicles in the 1967 model year. The imports are the result of a free trade agreement between the U.S. and Canada that allows Canadian-made vehicles to enter the U.S. duty free. The aim of the agreement is to increase Canada's share of combined Canadian-U.S. auto production.

[News from U.S. Department of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary, Aug. 1, 1966]

FOUR HUNDRED DISLOCATED GENERAL MOTORS WORKERS ELIGIBLE FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

For the second time, a group of American workers has been certified eligible to apply for adjustment assistance upon the determination, announced today, that they lost their jobs as a result of removal of their operations to Canada.

Approximately 400 workers of the General Motors Corporation Fisher Body Plant No. 2 at Grand Rapids, Michigan, who lost their jobs between January 17 and June 18, 1966, were found by the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board to have been laid off because production of soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelles was transferred from Grand Rapids to Windsor, Ontario.

They may now apply for trade adjustment assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

The other case in which a similar ruling was made involved some 200 employees of a Pennsauken, New Jersey, automobile parts depot who became jobless when their operation was transferred to Canada last November.

The certification on behalf of the Grand Rapids employees was made on the Board's determination that a significant number of the workers of the plant have become unemployed, and that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement has been the primary factor in causing the dislocation.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board is composed of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz (Chairman), Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor and the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler.

The Board's action came after the United Automobile Workers International Union filed a petition for eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance on behalf of a group of workers laid off from the plant.

The Board based its determinations on reports from the U.S. Tariff Commission, and advice from the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, Labor and the Small Business Administration.

Certified workers who meet the required standards may receive trade readjustment allowances, counseling and training (including training allowances), and relocation allowances.

The maximum readjustment allowances provides the worker with $70 a week for up to 52 weeks. Relocation allowances provide for the reasonable expense of moving the worker, his family and household goods when he has obtained a new job, plus a lump sum payment equal to two and a half times the average weekly manufacturing wage as stipulated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The U.S.-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement provides for elimination of duties between the U.S. and Canada on motor vehicles and original equipment for such vehicles.

If U.S. auto parts manufacturers move part or all of their operations to Canada as a result of the Agreement, workers displaced by such moves may be certified by the Board to be eligible to apply for the adjustment assistance provided under the Act.

[Summary of final determinations and notice of certification, Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board]

PETITION FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY CERTAIN WORKERS OF THE GENERAL MOTORS CORP., FISHER BODY PLANT NO. 2, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

DETERMINATIONS OF THE BOARD

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board determines pursuant to the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283; 79 Stat. 1016) that:

Dislocation of regularly employed workers in the General Motors Corporation Fisher Body Plant No. 2, Grand Rapids, Michigan, has occurred since a significant number or proportion of the workers have become unemployed.

The operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement has been the primary factor in causing such dislocation (Section 302, Act; Section 501.9, Board Regulations).

CERTIFICATION

The Board hereby certifies that the workers of Fisher Body Plant No. 2 at Grand Rapids, Michigan, who became unemployed or underemployed on or after January 17, 1966, and prior to June 18, 1966, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

BACKGROUND

A petition for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 was filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board on April 15, 1966, by the International Union, United Auto Workers (UAW), on behalf of Local 1231, a group of workers employed by the General Motors Corporation at Fisher Body Plant No. 2 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The petition alleged that 1,100 workers were unemployed as a result of a decision of the General Motors Corporation to transfer the production of interior soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelle models from the Grand Rapids plant to a new "cut and sew plant" in Windsor, Ontario. It further alleged, in effect, that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian automotive agreement was the primary factor in causing such unemployment.

The UAW later withdrew from the coverage of the petition temporary employees who had been hired on or after September 13, 1965. After eliminating these temporary employees, the alleged dislocation amounted to over 600 regularly employed hourly workers.

On April 19, 1966, the Automotive Assistance Committee of the Board requested the United States Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation with respect to the facts relating to this petition. Public notice of both the receipt of the request and the institution of the investigation was given by the Commission through publication in the Federal Register (31 F.R. 6340) on April 26, 1966. The Commission did not order a public hearing in conjunction with the investigation; the petitioners did not request such a hearing, nor did any other interested party.

The Commission submitted its report on this investigation on June 8, 1966 (APTA–W–2). As stated by the Commission in its public announcement with respect to this report, the entire report could not be made public since much of the data it contains was received in confidence (TC Publication 176, June 8, 1966). On June 23, 1966, in accordance with section 302(f)(2) of the Act, the Automotive Assistance Committee of the Board requested the Commission to furnish additional information on certain specified matters. A supplemental report was submitted to the Board on July 18, 1966.

In accordance with section 501.11 of the Board Regulations (31 F.R. 828, January 21, 1966), the UAW requested an opportunity to make an oral presentation to the Board. This request was granted and the oral presentation was made on July 22, 1966. The General Motors Corporation was notified of the request and representatives of the corporation attended the presentation.

The Board also obtained advice from the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, and the Small Business Administration under section 302(f)(1) of the Act.

CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 the Board considered the following:

Automotive product

The workers must be in a firm which produces an automotive product as defined by the Act. The petitioners are or were employees of the General Motors Corporation, which produces such automotive products. The petitioners worked in a plant manufacturing "soft trim" for use almost entirely as original equipment in the assembly of motor vehicles. "Soft trim" is the term used to describe collectively a variety of motor vehicle components, some of which are used as interior furnishings and some as exterior coverings (such as convertible tops). Pursuant to concessions granted under the U.S.-Canadian automotive agreement, soft trim moving between the United States and Canada, which meets established criteria, enters both countries free of duty. In the absence of the Agreement, entries of such articles would generally be dutiable at 25 percent on entry into Canada and at 8½ percent on entry into the United States.

The requirements of section 302(a)(2) and 302(l)(1) of the Act are satisfied.

Dislocation

Dislocation in the case of a group of workers means unemployment or underemployment of a significant number or proportion of the workers of a firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof. Significant number or proportion of workers means in most cases five percent of the workers or 50 workers in a firm (or appropriate subdivision thereof), whichever is less (sections 302(b)(1) and 302(l)(2)(B), Act; section 501.2(i)(2), Board Regulations). Between November 1, 1965, and the date on which the petition was filed, employment at Fisher Body Plant declined from about 2,800 hourly workers to 1,600–1,650 hourly workers, a net decrease of more than 1,100 persons.

The Tariff Commission report to the Board indicates that in large part the machinery and equipment at the Grand Rapids plant are used interchangeably to produce soft trim for various series of motor vehicles. The Commission also notes that workers have seniority "bumping" rights throughout the plant. The Board, therefore, determines that the entire plant is the appropriate subdivision of the General Motors Corporation for considering dislocation and certification.

The requirements with respect to dislocation are met.

Role of the operation of the agreement criteria

The Board considered the economic criteria set forth in the Act. The Tariff Commission obtained data representative of U.S. production, U.S. imports from Canada, U.S. exports to Canada, and Canadian production of soft trim for use as original equipment in the assembly of motor vehicles. The data indicate that U.S. production of soft trim has been substantially larger in recent months than in the corresponding months of the 1964 model year. Similarly, U.S. imports of soft trim from Canada, U.S. exports of soft trim to Canada, and Canadian production of soft trim in recent months have all been appreciably larger than in the corresponding months of the 1964 model year. Accordingly, the economic criteria set forth in section 302(b)(2) of the Act with respect to U.S. production are not met.

The Board then considered whether the operation of the Agreement has nevertheless been the primary factor in causing or threatening to cause the dislocation (section 302(d), Act). "Primary factor" means a factor which is greater in importance than any other single factor present in a given case, but which does not have to be greater than any combination of other factors (section 501.2(j), Board Regulations). The Act (section 302(l)(4)) defines "operation of the Agreement" to include governmental or private actions in the United States or Canada directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the Agreement.

General Motors soft-trim operations, United States and Canada

a. Soft trim for General Motors' automobiles is produced at several plants in the United States, including Fisher Body Plant No. 2, and two plants in Canada (Oshawa, Ontario, a large multi-purpose plant, and a soft-trim plant at Windsor, Ontario). Two of these plants first began production in mid-1965 at the start of the 1966 model year; one was the plant at Windsor, Ontario, the other a plant at Tecumseh, Michigan.

b. According to General Motors, the plan to construct the trim plant at Windsor was initiated in 1963, prior to the Agreement, and was undertaken to provide a base for future expansion of the Canadian automotive market: "In the long term, it is expected that Canadian demand will utilize the capacity of this plant fully, however, in the short term, it is being used to relieve the production overload at the U.S. plants."

According to an affidavit of July 8, 1966, submitted by the UAW, a General Motors' representative advised the union in the spring of 1964 that the Oshawa passenger soft-trim operation would be completely shifted to the Windsor plant starting in the fall of 1964. The affidavit further stated, in effect, that with the advent of the Agreement, General Motors changed its plans with respect to the transfer of soft-trim production from Oshawa to Windsor, decided to keep Oshawa in production, and instead move more U.S. work into Windsor.

General Motors allocated the production of the bulk of the soft-trim for 1966 Chevelles and Chevy II's to Windsor from Grand Rapids. Only a segment of Oshawa soft-trim production was transferred to Windsor during the course of the 1966 model year. General Motors indicated that it expected the employment impact of the transfer from Grand Rapids to Windsor would be more than offset by an expansion of production at Grand Rapids of trim for Chevrolet Caprice models and by trim requirements for the Oldsmobile Toronado. This expectation did not materialize.

c. During the early part of the model year, because of production difficulties at Windsor, a substantial share of production of soft trim for 1966 Chevelles and Chevy II's was retained at Grand Rapids; the transfer to Windsor was not completed until December. This, in combination with high initial demand and start-up problems on the 1966 models, caused employment at Grand Rapids to expand very rapidly. By November 1, 1966, employment was 500 to 600 workers higher than any previous peak. These were mainly temporary employees hired after mid-September. After November 1, employment at Grand Rapids decreased rapidly; by the end of December 1965, all workers with less than 90 days' seniority (temporary employees) had been terminated; and by mid-January employees with over a year's seniority were being laid off. Production of soft trim for the Toronado was shifted to another U.S. plant in November.

d. The definition of "operation of the Agreement" is intended to permit consideration of the economic effects of the arrangements concluded between the Canadian Government and automotive vehicle manufacturers in Canada, including the General Motors Corporation. The value of the production at Windsor of soft trim for Chevelles and Chevy II's transferred from Grand Rapids represents a significant portion of one of the General Motors' commitments in its letter of undertaking of January 13, 1965. This commitment was to increase the Canadian value-added of its automotive operation by C $121 million by the end of the 1968 model year.[1]

Evaluation

The Board attaches special significance to the indicated changes in plans by General Motors, after the Agreement was signed, for the utilization of the soft-trim plants at Grand Rapids, Windsor, and Oshawa; the economic advantages of Windsor operations compared to Grand Rapids, particularly given the elimination of the duties on U.S.-Canadian trade in automotive products in addition to the 15–20 percent difference in wage rates; and the material contribution of the Windsor Chevelle-Chevy II operation to the General Motors' commitment to Canada with respect to Canadian "value added." In light thereof, the Board is of the opinion that the opportunity to rationalize operations afforded by the Agreement was the compelling circumstances in the General Motors' Corporation decisions regarding the allocation of its soft-trim production among U.S. and Canadian plants. The Board therefore has concluded that the operation of the Agreement has been the primary factor in causing dislocation at Fisher Body Plant No. 2.

The Board has determined that only those workers of Fisher Body Plant No. 2 who became unemployed or underemployed on or after January 17, and prior to June 18, 1966, have been dislocated as a result of the operation of the Agreement. Because of the existence of plant-wide seniority, the Board believes it is these workers—the most recently laid-off regular employees—whose jobs would have been maintained if the production of trim for Chevelle and Chevy II had been retained at Grand Rapids. Of the approximately 1,100 workers laid off from the plant in model year 1966, the Board has excluded temporary workers hired on or after September 13, 1965, as not having been dislocated as a result of the operation of the Agreement. By its certification the Board has also excluded workers adversely affected by the transfer of the Toronado trim production to another U.S. plant and by the decline in demand for certain General Motors' vehicles.

(Section 302, Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 1018, Executive Order 11254, 30 F.R. 13569, the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board Regulations, 48 CFR, Part 501; 31 F.R. 827, and Board Order No. 1, 31 F.R. 853.)

JULY 28, 1966.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND A PUBLIC COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on August 10, 1966, Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, of the Second District of Minnesota, introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 16958, a bill to authorize the establishment of a Public Community and Vocational College and a Public College of Arts and Sciences in the District of Columbia. I rise to make a few comments on the Senate bill and the House bill dealing with the subject of a public college in the District of Columbia, but I rise also to highly commend Congressman NELSEN for the bill he introduced on August 10.

Members of the press, representing the newspapers in the District of Columbia, have suggested that I make comment on this problem before the Senate adjourns today because of its great importance to the District of Columbia, and also, because it is hoped that the Senate committee will take final action on this subject matter on Monday. The Committee on the District of Columbia, under the able leadership of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman, plans to mark up into final form a college bill for the District of Columbia and send it to the calendar of the Senate, if at all possible, on Monday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman NELSEN's bill, H.R. 16958, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 16958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "public college of arts and sciences" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a four-year program in the liberal arts and sciences acceptable for a bachelor's degree, including but not limited to, courses in teacher education, and such additional program of study as may be acceptable for a master's degree, and courses on an individual, noncredit basis to those desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(b) The term "public community and vocational college" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or for a degree of associate in arts, which program shall include, but shall not be limited to, courses in business education, secretarial training, and business administration, and courses in engineering, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences which are designed to prepare a student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, and other technological fields requiring the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and which college also provides courses on an individual, noncredit basis for persons desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(c) The term "Board of Higher Education" and "Board" mean the Board of Higher Education established by section 3 of this Act.

(d) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District of Columbia established by the Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101 et seq.).

SEC. 3. (a) The control of the public college of arts and sciences and of the public community and vocational college is hereby vested in a Board of Higher Education, which shall consist of nine members of whom not less than five shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than three years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Board (including all members appointed to fill vacancies on such Board) shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman, who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Such members shall be appointed for terms of three years; except that the terms of offices of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of one year, three at the end of two years, and three at the end of three years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of that term. Members of the Board shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for their travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons serving the Government without compensation.

(b) The President of the United States may remove, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, any member of the Board of Higher Education for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member. If the President determines that, with respect to any such member, there is adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member, the President may appoint a special investigating board, consisting of not more than three members, to consider the matter. The investigating board, in considering such matter, shall hold public hearings and, on the basis thereof, report to the President with respect to their findings of fact and recommendations. Following the receipt by him of such report, the President may remove such member from office.

(c) The members of the Board shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the Board in which such members participate, nor shall they be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the Board on account of such official action by them as members of the Board, but such costs shall be charged to the District of Columbia and paid as other costs are paid in suits against the municipality; nor shall the Board or any of its members be required to give any bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

SEC. 4. The Board is hereby vested with the following powers and duties:

(1) To develop detailed plans for and to establish, organize, and operate in the District of Columbia a public college of arts and sciences and a public community and vocational college, both colleges shall be located on the same campus;

(2) To establish policies, standards, and requirements governing admission, programs, graduation (including the award of degrees) and general administration of the colleges established pursuant to this Act;

(3) To appoint and compensate, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, a president for each of the colleges established pursuant to this Act, each of whom shall serve for a term of four years;

(4) To employ and compensate such officers as it determines necessary for each of the colleges established pursuant to this Act, and such educational employees for each of such colleges as the president thereof may recommend in writing, without regard to the civil service laws, the Classification Act of

---

[1] A copy of this letter appears among other places in Appendix C of House Report No. 537, Committee on Ways and Means, 89th Congress, 1st Session.

1949, the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939 (63 Stat. 1147), the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and the Dual Compensation Act, but subject to the Federal Employees Compensation Act, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided,* That subject to the approval of the Commissioners, the compensation schedules for such officers and employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time consistent with the public interest and in accordance with rates for comparable types of positions in like institutions of higher education. The Board, with the concurrence of the Commissioners, is authorized to determine which officer and educational positions shall be subject to the coverage of the higher education salary schedules. Salary levels shall be determined based on duties, responsibilities, and qualifications. The Board, upon the recommendations of the presidents of the colleges, shall establish, with the approval of the Commissioner and without regard to the provisions of any other law, retirement and leave systems for such officers and employees which shall be comparable to such systems in like institutions of higher education;

(5) To employ and compensate noneducational employees of the Board and of the colleges established pursuant to this Act in accordance with the Civil Service Act, the Classification Act of 1949, the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Compensation Act, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and any other statute applicable to noneducational employees of the Board of Education;

(6) To fix, from time to time, tuition to be paid by nonresidents attending any such college, but in no event shall any legal resident of the District of Columbia be required to pay any tuition charge to attend any college established pursuant to this Act. Tuition charged nonresidents shall be fixed in such amounts as will, to the extent feasible, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of the services for which such charge is imposed, and shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia;

(7) To fix, from time to time, fees to be paid by students attending any such college established pursuant to this Act (including charges for room and board), and receipts from such fees shall be deposited into a revolving fund in a private depository in the District, which fund shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for such purposes as the Board of Higher Education of the District shall approve, and the Board of Higher Education is authorized to make necessary rules respecting deposits into and withdrawals from such fund;

(8) To transmit annually to the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia estimates of the appropriation required for the colleges established pursuant to this Act for the ensuing year;

(9) To accept services and moneys, including gifts or endowments, from any source whatsoever, for use in carrying out the purposes of the Act. Such moneys shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a trust fund account which is hereby authorized and may be invested and reinvested as trust funds of the District of Columbia. The disbursement of the moneys from such trust funds shall be in such amounts, to such extent, and in such manner as the Board of Higher Education, in its judgment, may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(10) To submit to the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommendations relating to legislation affecting the administration and programs of such colleges;

(11) To make such rules and regulations as the Board deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(12) To assume control of the District of Columbia Teachers College established pursuant to the Act approved February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1276; D.C. Code, sec. 31–118) from the Board of Education at such time as may be mutually agreed upon by such Board and approved by the Commissioners. At such time personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for such Teachers College are authorized to be transferred and be under the control of such Board of Higher Education: *Provided,* That the laboratory school shall remain under the control and management, and the employees assigned to such schools shall remain subject to the supervision of, the Board of Education: *Provided further,* That noneducational employees of the Teachers College at the time the control of such college is assumed by the Board of Higher Education shall retain all benefits provided by any law applicable to noneducational employees of the Board of Education, and shall be subject to any benefits provided for noneducational employees of the Board of Higher Education: *Provided further,* That educational employees of the Teachers College at the time the control of such college is assumed by the Board of Higher Education shall be subject to the same benefits provided for all educational employees of the Board of Higher Education pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 4 of this Act except that such educational employees may elect, within ninety days of such time, to remain subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended; and

(13) To provide for the crediting to educational employees of the Teachers College, pursuant to the leave system established for educational employees of the Board of Higher Education under this Act, leave accumulated pursuant to the provisions of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners and the Board of Education may furnish to the Board, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in private buildings or in public buildings of the government of the District of Columbia, records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment as may be available and which are necessary to enable the Board properly to perform its functions under this Act.

SEC. 6. All obligations and disbursements for the purpose of the Act shall be incurred, made, and accounted for in the same manner as other obligations and disbursements for the District of Columbia and, except as provided in paragraph (9) of section 4 of this Act, under the direction and control of the Commissioners.

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 29–401, 419), is amended (1) by striking out "Board of Education" wherever it appears in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Higher Education", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 586g. As used in this subchapter, the term 'Board of Higher Education' means the Board of Higher Education established pursuant to the District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made by this section shall be construed as affecting the validity of any license issued by the Board of Education prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Subsection (b) of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvements programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City", approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 9–220(b)), is amended (1) by striking out "$225,000,000" and by inserting in lieu thereof "$245,000,000", and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further,* That $20,000,000 of the principal amount of loans authorized to be advanced pursuant to this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that my bill, which proposes the establishment of a public college in the District of Columbia be printed immediately following the Nelsen bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "public college of arts and sciences" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a four-year program in the liberal arts and sciences acceptable for a bachelor's degree, including, but not limited to, courses in teacher education, and such additional program of study as may be acceptable for a master's degree, and courses on an individual, noncredit basis to those desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(b) The term "public community college" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or for a degree of associate in arts, which program shall include, but shall not be limited to, courses in business education, secretarial training, and business administration, and courses in engineering, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences which are designed to prepare a student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, and other technological fields requiring the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and which college also provides courses on an individual, noncredit basis for persons desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(c) The terms "Board of Higher Education" and "Board" mean the Board of Higher Education established by section 3 of this Act.

(d) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District of Columbia established by the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101 et seq.).

SEC. 3. (a) The control of the public college of arts and sciences and of the public community college is hereby vested in a Board of Higher Education, which shall consist of nine members of whom not less than five shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Board (including all members appointed to fill vacancies on such Board) shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from a panel of nominees submitted to such judges pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Such members shall be appointed for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of that term. Members of the Board shall serve without compensation, and may be removed in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education under section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(b) There is hereby established a committee to be known as the Board of Higher Education Nominating Committee, which shall consist of seven members of whom not less than four shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Committee shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of three of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, at the end of three years. Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, and shall be subject to removal in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education. The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the Committee, as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act, to submit to the said judges a panel of not less than twenty-seven nominees for consideration as initial appointees to the Board and to thereafter submit to the judges, in connection with any vacancy on the Board, a panel of not less than three nominess for consideration by such judges in filling that vacancy.

(c) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education may furnish to the Board of Higher Education, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings of the government of the District of Columbia, records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment as the Commissioners and the Board of Education determine are available to enable the Board of Higher Education properly to perform its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board of Higher Education shall, at such time as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and the Board of Education, merge the District of Columbia Teachers' College (established pursuant to the Act of February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1276; D.C. Code, sec. 31-118)) into the public college of arts and sciences. At the time of such merger, all personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to, or to be made available to, such Teachers' College shall be transferred to, and shall be under the control of, the Board of Higher Education.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the laboratory schools in the District of Columbia shall remain under the control and management of, and the employees assigned to such schools shall remain subject to the supervision of, the Board of Education.

SEC. 5. (a) The Board of Higher Education is hereby vested with the following powers:

(1) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public college of arts and sciences (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(2) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public community college (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(3) To fix, from time to time, tuition and fees to be paid by residents and nonresidents attending any such college, which tuition and fees shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia. Tuition and fees charged nonresidents shall be fixed in such amounts as will, to the extent feasible, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of the services for which such charges are imposed;

(4) To appoint, for a term of four years, a president for the public college of arts and sciences and a president for the public community college;

(5) To appoint, promote, demote, transfer, suspend, or dismiss such administrative, educational, or noneducational employees of any college established pursuant to this Act as the president thereof may recommend in writing;

(6) To accredit junior colleges operating in the District of Columbia;

(7) To award appropriate degree and certificates of completion of courses of study in the colleges established pursuant to this Act; and

(8) To make such rules and regulations as the Board deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) No action shall be taken with respect to the actual establishment of any college authorized under this Act prior to the expiration of ninety calendar days (which ninety days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after the plans for such college have been submitted to the Congress.

(c) The Board of Higher Education shall annually on the first day of October transmit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an estimate in detail of the amount of money required for the colleges established pursuant to this Act for the ensuing year, and the Commissioners shall transmit the same in their annual estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, with such recommendations as they may deem proper.

SEC. 6. All obligations and disbursements for the purposes of this Act shall be incurred, made, and accounted for in the same manner as other obligations and disbursements for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 29-401—29-419), is amended (1) by striking out "Board of Education" wherever it appears in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Higher Education", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 586g. As used in this subchapter, the term 'Board of Higher Education' means the Board of Higher Education established pursuant to the District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made by this section shall be construed as affecting the validity of any license issued by the Board of Education prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I not only commend Congressman NELSEN and those on the House committee who have worked closely with him on this subject, but I want them to know that I shall do everything that I can to work out a common bill that will be acceptable to Congressman NELSEN and his House colleagues.

The Senate bill and the House bill are not so far apart that it will not be a matter of easy accommodation in reconciling the two bills. The Senate bill does not contain a proposal for a vocational training center, specifically spelled out, but as I have made clear to the press, it never was the intention of any of us in the Senate committee that vocational training would not be made available to young men and women in the District of Columbia, because the community college concept across the country invariably includes vocational training.

The community colleges of 2 years' duration, commonly referred to as junior colleges, as well as community colleges, offer educational facilities and training programs, including an emphasis on vocational training as well as the other parts of the curriculum of a community college.

My bill was introduced on January 6, 1965, on behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is the bill that I asked to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following Congressman NELSEN's bill.

The community college concept, which in most instances is a 2-year program, is almost invariably a vocational training program within its curriculum, but we did not spell it out in the Morse bill. I completely accept the concept that Congressman NELSEN set out in his bill in regard to vocational training. I not only intended such training, but it is essential, for we have hundreds of young men and women in the District of Columbia who have no opportunity for advanced education, when they come from poverty-stricken homes, when they labor under great financial obligations in respect to those homes, and cannot afford to go to private universities and colleges or, for that matter, to private vocational training institutes that are available in various parts of the District of Columbia. They are not available in the District of Columbia, even if these young men and women could afford to go to them. The type of training institute or curriculum that is needed is not available in the District of Columbia.

So there is no variance between the House bill and the Senate bill except in language. There is no variance in intent, and there is no variance in objective.

I shall tell the Senate in a moment the understanding we reached in committee the other day. I have the revision of the Morse bill that I agreed upon, and in fact proposed on Monday when the Senate committee met. If the Senate passes the bill that I shall modify in committee on Monday and the House passes the bill, even in the form that Congressman NELSEN introduced it, I cannot imagine any difficulty whatsoever in the two bodies through their respective conference committees agreeing in conference.

My hope is that before either bill reaches final passage in the two bodies we can have a formal understanding and modifications of the two bills so that they will be identical in language and that no conference will be needed.

Why do I say that? Because it is important that we pass a college bill for the District of Columbia and get started with the obligation of providing hundreds and hundreds of young men and women in the District of Columbia who have not the slightest chance of going on to educational opportunities beyond high school because of their economic status.

That is why the Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Committee on Education, and as well a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the Senate, and the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia that has jurisdiction over educational problems in the District of Columbia, has been urging for years that we proceed to meet this great and dire educational need in the District of Columbia for these hundreds and hundreds of young men and women whose intellectual potentials we are wasting because we do not provide them with educational facilities to make it possible to develop them to the maximum extent possible.

(At this point Mr. HARTKE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very much pleased—in fact, this is the appropriate place to say that I am very happy—that Representative NELSEN has introduced his bill. I shall do everything I can next Monday to try to reconcile the two bills as nearly as possible so that there will be minimum difficulty, if any, in reaching agreement between the two bodies on a higher education bill for the District of Columbia.

Last Monday, in the committee meeting, we were advised by counsel for the committee that some of the staff members of the House and Senate committees, including some conversations with some of the members on the House committee, and including Representative NELSEN and others, talked about the desirability of having a bill which would provide for vocational training, and also for the so-called 2-year college program in which students who did not care to go on to a 4-year program could attend a 2-year college and receive a diploma or certificate covering the curriculum made available to them there, and also for a 4-year college.

A question was raised whether there should be two campuses or one. The Morse bill provides for two. The Nelsen bill provides for two. The meeting last Monday occurred before the Nelsen bill was introduced. We were advised by staff members that a one-campus bill might be more acceptable to some on the House side. I stated that a one-campus bill would be all right with me. Of course, there are some problems connected with a one-campus approach. There are some assets, too. It would mean one administration, and the administration costs would be less. It would mean a concentration in one area. I recognize also that the program throughout the country is not to bring the educational services together on one campus. There are various reasons for that. I suppose the main reason is geography.

This is important in a given State, such as in my State of Oregon, for example, where we have a community college in Coos Bay, one in Bend, one in Astoria, one in Portland, and one planned for Eugene, the seat of the State university, which serves different students but serves different educational needs, as well.

The practice has been to have a community 4-year college in one location, a so-called junior college, sometimes called a community college, of 2 years' duration in another town, so that there can be spread throughout the State the availability of facilities for all the young men and women qualified to take courses in any one of these colleges but who could not possibly go to college unless it was located close to their homes, where they could live at home, work in their communities, and at the same time go to school, sometimes in the morning, sometimes in the afternoon, and sometimes in the evening.

Do not forget that the population of the District is larger, as I recall, than that of some 11 States. Most people do not realize that. But when we get to a population of 850,000, we are far above the populations of a considerable number of our States.

There is certainly no doubt that more young people in the District of Columbia are being denied a public institution of higher learning than is the case in several of the States. Furthermore, the poverty level of the students in the District is much lower than in some of the States where we are providing community colleges and junior colleges for students that do not have the economic means to go to college.

I said at the meeting last Monday that I would be perfectly willing to put them all together, although I thought it would be better to keep the vocational and 2-year training programs separate. There are a great many reasons for that. Some of them are psychological—and, by the way, psychological reasons are very important in an educational program, too.

Two-year students desire to have that autonomy which will become attached to a 2-year institution, the building up of an esprit de corps, and the building up of a sense of oneness—having those students studying and working together in a common educational goal and objective. This is very desirable in the educational process.

I said that if it would help us to get a public institution established in the District of Columbia to bring all the programs together on one campus, I would go along with that.

I understand that since last Monday there has been further discussion of this matter on the House side. The result has been the Nelsen bill, which provides for two campuses, one for the 4-year course and one for the 2-year course, including the vocational training program.

We can thresh this out at the meeting next week, and in the conferences with the House, if necessary; but I think, after mentioning it tonight in this speech, that that leaves the matter of teacher training. I repeat what I said last Monday: The teacher training program should be on the campus of the 4-year institution instead of having a separate college or a separate institution such as the Washington, D.C., Teachers College which, in my judgment, has done a truly remarkable job in the field of teacher education over the years of its existence.

I shall have something to say about that next week, at the retirement of its president, Dr. Carr. I am sure that Congress is not fully aware—and I doubt whether the people of the District of Columbia, by and large, are fully aware—of what we owe to Dr. Carr for his educational leadership over the years as he has helped to train, through the District of Columbia Teachers College, scores and scores of teachers, the large majority of whom, after they have completed their teacher education, have entered the public schools of the District and wrestled with what is recognized as one of the most serious educational problem cities in the whole Nation.

But, Mr. President, I said Monday that unless one can convince me I am wrong, if we develop the type of public education institution we are working for, I would like to see the so-called teacher training program be part of the 4-year institution and consist of a department or school of education.

The Presiding Officer [Mr. HARTKE] knows that is precisely what there is at the University of Indiana. In fact, it is true that in institutions of higher learning in Indiana or my State the education department or school is an integral part of the 4-year institution. I think that gives us the soundest teacher training program.

I know 20 years ago—and in some places less than that—in some of our States there was a so-called 2-year teachers college. That was true in Indiana. My mother was a graduate of Downer Teachers College at Milwaukee. That was the pattern for teacher training at that time. But as times have changed, the need for teacher training has also changed. Now we know that a bachelor's degree is considered the minimum requirement we expect for qualified teachers, and we are providing, in the various educational acts, institutional programs and fellowship programs and scholarship programs to make it possible for teachers to get their master's and even doctor's degrees.

I intend to have included in the redraft bill that I shall offer to the Senate committee on Monday a program whereby we will have two campuses, but the teacher part will be part of the 4-year institution, and the work now done by the Teachers College in the District of Columbia will become part—and I think it is very appropriate to say it—of an academic integrated program in the District of Columbia, curriculumwise.

I shall have more to say about it next week at the time I offer the redraft bill to the Senate committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I close this part of my remarks tonight by again commending Representative NELSEN and saying to the people of the District of Columbia from my desk tonight that I have never been so encouraged as to the possibility of our getting legislation on this subject passed as I am right now.

I think it is now becoming recognized by more and more in both the House and the Senate that we just have no right to adjourn and go home and not pass legislation, thus denying these hundreds of young men and women in the District of Columbia the opportunity they so sorely need in order to go on with an educational program.

I am only asking for an investment in the future of our country when I ask for an investment for facilities that make it possible to develop the intelligence potential of young men and women who would otherwise be denied that educational opportunity.

USE OF TONGUE POINT NAVAL BASE BY JOB CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, many months ago it was my pleasure to work closely with the administration and particularly with the very capable and dedicated Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in convincing the administration of the wisdom of making use of the magnificent facilities of the then inactivated Tongue Point Naval Base, Astoria, Oreg., I urged its use as one of the major job training centers of the Job Corps. I took the position that the use of the Tongue Point facilities would offer a tremendous opportunity to salvage for useful citizenship, young men of the school dropout class who were otherwise destined to swell the ranks of our unemployed and to become, through poverty conditions, burdens on our society.

At that time, as at present, there were a few critics who made public statements against the use of this facility as a job training center because of the cost of rehabilitating these young men.

Their argument was, in part, that it would cost more than high school training for young men of high school age. My reply then was the same as it is tonight: "What do you think it costs to keep a young man who is not rehabilitated in prison? How much do you think it costs to take care of years of public welfare? How much do you think it costs as a result of the loss to society of the economic contribution he can make to our economy if he has developed into a sound, wage earning citizen?"

I am not moved by the argument that some of these job training centers to rehabilitate young men to make them useful citizens cost more in some instances than it would cost if they did not need rehabilitation and went to a standard high school.

Mr. President, this happens to be a serious social problem that confronts us. I insist that it is a wise investment to put these young men through the type of job training centers, under the program being developed, of which Sargent Shriver is the head. Regardless of the cost, it is an economic investment, and it is one that we should be willing to invest in.

My answer to these critics is that every cent we invest in a worthwhile project which gives true recognition to human values and which prepares these young people for useful roles in our society is worth the cost even though it may be higher than that which is computed in educating young people who enjoy the good fortune of not being afflicted with poverty, and who have not lived in an environment that has produced the problems that have been produced in these young people we select to put through these job training centers.

It is becoming more and more evident that the Tongue Point Training Center, although confronted by enormous problems at the outset, is now beginning to demonstrate its real value to our society. In that connection, Mr. President, I was pleased to read an article which appeared in the July 26, 1966, issue of the Los Angeles Times, entitled, "Hopes Look Up for Job Corps Camp in Oregon." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues because I think it points up the importance of the fine work that is being done at present at Tongue Point and the extremely encouraging prospects for even greater contributions from this Job Training Center in the future.

In addition, I would not wish to let this occasion pass without paying tribute to the fine staff of educators and administrators who are performing such dedicated and outstanding work at the Job Corps Training Center.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPES LOOK UP FOR JOB CORPS CAMP IN OREGON—SECOND YEAR OF OPERATION FINDS DECLINE IN DROPOUTS, MORE QUALIFIED GRADUATES

(By Ed Meagher)

TONGUE POINT, OREG.—The first-year record of the Job Corps Center here could hardly have been worse—162 boys were graduated, compared with 534 who quit or were thrown out as too tough to handle.

Racial violence broke out at the center, and in nearby Astoria, student brushes with police were all too frequent.

But now, halfway into its second year, the record is a little brighter. Costs, which in the first year amounted to about $12,500 a boy, are dropping, and the ratio of graduates to dropouts is rising.

However, the center, one of eight established by the Office of Economic Opportunity, still has a long way to go before breaking out of the experimental woods.

HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYABLES

Operated under government contract by the University of Oregon and the Philco Corp., the center was envisioned as a place to provide school dropouts with basic education and a vocation to move them out of the ranks of hard-core unemployables into the respectable mainstream.

The trouble is, thus far, fewer than a third of the students have made the leap. Not only that, critics say, but the center's costs are out of line.

Douglas V. Olds, director of the Tongue Point center, believes the program is worthwhile.

"We expect," he said, "soon to be graduating from 75 to 100 students a month. They will thereafter be off the welfare rolls, with prospects good that their children will not be on them later as adults.

"Usefully employed graduates will have an estimated life expectancy of $100,000 in earnings. Some of this will be returned to society in taxes."

MANY BUILT-IN PROBLEMS

Any program that could effect such a social transition in a substantial way would seem to be a bargain, regardless of cost.

But Tongue Point and the other Job Corps centers, investigation indicates, have so many built-in problems that critics believe they should be returned to the drawing board or scrapped entirely.

The Office of Economic Opportunity's determination to bring about instant integration to the centers may be blamed for one of the problems.

The Tongue Point center (and the others as well) was established as an interracial, intercultural and interregional melting pot.

Students come from all 50 States. Almost half, 43%, are Negroes. Seven per cent comprise Mexican-Americans, Indians and Hawaiians.

FROM DIVISIVE BACKGROUNDS

They arrive from such divisive backgrounds as city slums and the hills of Appalachia, from small towns and isolated farms.

The only things they have in common—poverty, ignorance and too often a festering problem of immaturity—are hardly the ingredients to promote togetherness.

Other built-in problems, in center director Olds' view, have to do with the minimum age of 16, which he believes is too low, and the screening of applicants which, while improving, still leaves much to be desired.

The screening is done at youth opportunity centers and state employment offices throughout the country.

"Screening seems to be improving generally." Olds said, "but recently we were sent a youth on parole following his conviction on auto theft and assault charges. Another came from a mental institution."

Trainees are supposed to have had at least a fifth grade education, but, according to Olds, a number of illiterates have been sent to Tongue Point.

SOCIAL OUTLETS

Still another problem inherent to this center is the unavailability of social outlets normal to young men.

Astoria is a small town of less than 10,000. Most residents are fishermen and their families are of Scandinavian and Finnish descent.

No Negroes live within its boundaries.

Thus, out of necessity, social affairs for the trainees are centered almost entirely in Portland, about 100 miles away. Because of the distance, students are restricted to one weekend visit there a month.

Transportation and lodging at the YMCA are provided by the government and dances and other mixed social gatherings are arranged under auspices of the Portland Urban League and other organizations.

However, center officials admit that opportunities for the students to make outside contacts are too limited.

DRAWN FROM SCHOOLS

Olds was recruited by the university from the Springfield (Ore.) School District, where he was assistant superintendent. Most of his staff were drawn from Oregon schools. Few had experience with students such as those who came to Tongue Point.

"Academic and vocational training of the students is comparatively routine," Olds said. "Trying to make responsible men out of some of them is what takes most of our time and understanding and patience."

"There is no doubt, however," he continued, "that most of these boys are well worth saving. It is tremendously satisfying to see young men develop skills and exhibit definite leadership qualities within a matter of a few months."

Dale Owen, head of the center's art department, agrees. One of his students, Paul McCaskill of Miami, is an inspired professional painter, to be taken seriously right now, according to Owen. The University of Oregon invited McCaskill to exhibit his works at a one-man show.

Neither Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon, nor Olds denies that the first year's costs seem unreasonable. But both have pointed out that substantial amounts were needed to meet nonrecurring expenses and predicted that expenses per boy will be more than halved during this fiscal year, to about $5,300, when enrollment reaches capacity of 1,250 students this fall.

"Although this may seem too high," Olds said, it must be remembered that we operate the year around and pay all of the students' expenses, including medical and dental."

But reducing the center's other problems to a reasonable size remains to be accomplished.

The age minimum should be raised, Olds recommends, and students should be assigned to centers in their own region.

Olds does not see Job Corps centers as the ultimate answer to the problem of salvaging school dropouts.

"In time," he said, "I think their function should be turned over to the nation's public schools. But, meanwhile, the centers are building up a body of knowledge and experience that will be invaluable to any program that follows.

"I believe they are worthwhile," Olds said.

CAMBODIA AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week I received a cablegram from the head of the Cambodian Government, Prince Sihanouk; and I ask unanimous consent that the translation of his cablegram, together with my reply to him under date of August 10, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the translation and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to express, Mr. Senator, my very sincere congratulations for the statement full of commonsense, courage, and justice which you gave on the occasion of the departure of the Americans Want to Know Mission to Cambodia. I hope that thanks to you and some of your colleagues who, like you, have a clear view of the problems of the Asian Continent, the great American Nation, which was not so long ago in conflict with colonialism and imperialism, will return to its noble tradition. In the dark times in which we live, your advice is comforting to hear.

With all my gratitude,
NORODOM SIHANOUK,
Chief of State of Cambodia.

AUGUST 10, 1966.

HIS EXCELLENCY,
PRINCE SIHANOUK,
Phnompenh,
Cambodia.

DEAR SIR: Your cablegram commending my statement of July 25 was deeply appreciated. Be assured that I greatly admire your efforts to maintain the sovereignty and dignity of your country, and the safety of your people, amid the trespasses and provocations being committed against Cambodia.

It remains my hope that the nations of the world still on the sidelines will step in to stop the war in Vietnam before it engulfs more people. The parties to the war seem no longer to have the capacity either to stop it or to limit its scope.

Respectfully yours,
WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Both documents speak for themselves, but in view of the fact that the head of the Cambodian Government referred to a public statement that I made at a press conference, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the press release which I issued on July 25, when that group of American citizens who call themselves "Americans Want To Know" held a press conference before they left for Cambodia.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON "AMERICANS WANT TO KNOW" TRIP TO CAMBODIA

"Americans Want to Know" are to be commended for undertaking a fact-finding mission to Cambodia to determine whether the war is spreading to that country, and if so, at whose instigation.

We have the tragic picture in Southeast Asia of American financial and military power being brought in in massive quantities on the ground that the United States must stop Chinese aggression on the borders of China. How many millions of people and how many nations are to be made party to this endeavor is a question no American outside the inner councils of the Administration can really answer.

We hear daily rumors of intrusions into Cambodia by the Vietcong and by American forces in pursuit of them. We already know that Thailand is for all practical purposes swallowed up in the American encirclement of China. We know that the 1962 Accord on Laos is a thing of the past, observed only in diplomatic lip service.

The tragedy of Belgium, which twice was trampled in contests between great powers, is being repeated in Southeast Asia. Fortunately, there are still some Americans who believe that the many countries who rank below the great power level are entitled to exist without serving as steppingstones for great powers.

The record of the last five years demonstrates that far from preserving the right of these Asians to live their own lives and run their own countries, we are competing with the Communists in trying to take them over before the other does. We and the Communists have dragged Laos into the war; we and the Communists are dragging Thailand into the war; we and the Communists are endangering the Philippines over the war; and we and the Communists apparently are determined that Cambodia will not fall to the other if her sovereignty and soil have to be destroyed to prevent it.

The pious cloak of humanitarianism with which the Administration seeks to disguise our nationalist aims in Southeast Asia is belied by the facts. The facts are that we are not bringing any Great Society to Asia; we are destroying the societies of Asia, great and small, that existed long before our own.

A nation that has not yet created a Great Society at home, nor produced progress by alliance in Latin America, is hardly the country that is going to remake Asia except through air power and artillery.

Many of us hope that Cambodia can yet be saved from the fate of South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. I commend these Americans for their effort to preserve the truth in a welter of nationalism, jingoism, and flag-waving. I congratulate them and I wish them well in their journey.

Mr. MORSE. I await with great interest the official report of this group of American citizens upon their return to the United States. I have been reading the newspaper stories about their visit to Cambodia, and what some of them have said, or allegedly have said, in various interviews in Japan and elsewhere. But I shall await their official statements upon their return to the United States with great interest. Apparently their visit to Cambodia was approved by the head of the Cambodian Government, and I judge that they were given complete access to take trips wherever they wished within that country while they were there.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still No Planes," published in the New York Times of 2 days ago, and an article entitled "Are Mechanics Overpaid?" written by Stanley Levey, and printed in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, August 11, 1966.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL NO PLANES

The chance that strikebound airliners might get back aloft on the wings of a voluntary arbitration agreement seems to have been shot down even before the union rank and file is asked to pass on it. Strike leaders, still staggering under the membership's overwhelming rejection of the wage agreement they joined President Johnson in endorsing, obviously have no appetite for going back to the strikers now with the arbitration proposal made by Chairman Staggers of the House Commerce Committee and accepted at once by the employers.

Putting the disputed wage issues up to an impartial board for review represents the soundest road now open for resolving a conflict in which layer after layer of governmental intervention has effectively eliminated any possibility of return to "free collective bargaining." The union has already turned down a Presidential emergency board's recommendation of increases that exceeded the old anti-inflation guideposts. It has spurned a pact calling for much higher increases negotiated at the White House. In turning its back on arbitration, it plainly counts on the Administration to use its influence with the tightly regulated airlines to go higher still—no matter how much of a shambles it makes of the whole stabilization program.

The only defense against the success of this tactic lies in passage of the back-to-work bill now awaiting action in the House. Acceptance of voluntary arbitration would have averted the need for another step toward compulsion in labor relations, but the union preferred economic muscle to reason.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 11, 1966]

IT'S NOT A NUMBERS GAME TO AIRLINE STRIKERS: ARE MECHANICS OVERPAID?

(By Stanley Levey)

The current rage here is playing the numbers game with wage rates. Depending on your point of view, you can prove that striking airlines mechanics are overpaid, underpaid, or paid just right.

But to members of the International Association of Machinists it's not a game. And because they rejected the White House settlement 2 weeks ago and will service the planes when they fly again, their sentiments carry clout, in the Washington idiom.

Airlines mechanics believe they are underpaid—not in general, not on the average, and not statistically. Specifically, they feel they are getting less money in cities where they are concentrated than workers with comparable or lesser skills and responsibilities.

Of the 35,000 striking workers, 19,000 are mechanics. Of the latter 12,000 are licensed by the Federal Aviation Agency and must sign out (or certify) the engines, electrical equipment, and frames of planes they repair.

FIGURES CITED

These employees—the most vocal and militant in the union and in short supply—cite the following figures to prove they are underpaid at the present rate of $3.52 an hour, or would be under the rejected White House settlement which would have raised their hourly rate to $4.08 by mid-1968.

In New York City, garbage truck mechanics for the Sanitation Department receive $4.53 an hour. In Denver the rate for city auto and truck mechanics is $4.05; in San Francisco it is $3.91. Greyhound mechanics in the West now get $4.61, and in 1968 will get $5.09. Greyhound machinists rates will go to $5.21 in 1968 from the current $4.74.

San Francisco auto and truck mechanics are paid $4.33 an hour. Electric utility maintenance mechanics in Chicago earn $4.10. The same classes of workers receive $4 in New York, $4.14 in Detroit and $4.10 in St. Louis.

UNION FEELING

The union contends there has been a sharp rise in wages for construction workers in major population centers where its members perform comparable duties at generally lower rates. In Denver, for example, the current hourly rates for seven unionized building crafts, not including employer-paid fringe benefits, are:

Bricklayers, $4.70; carpenters, $4.41; electricians, $4.77; painters, $3.97; plasterers, $4.55; plumbers, $4.51; laborers, $3.02. In other cities, such as Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis, New York, San Francisco and Washington these rates are even higher.

Sen. Wayne Morse (D., Ore.), chairman of a presidential Emergency Board which recommended other settlement terms in the airlines dispute that were rejected by the union, recently had printed in the Congressional Record a memorandum comparing airline rates with those of comparable industries. The report sought to counter IAM claims that airlines workers are underpaid.

LOWER FIGURES

Noting new high rates for Greyhound mechanics in the West, the memorandum cited lower figures, ranging from $3.32 to $3.39, for bus mechanics in Miami, Chicago, Washington-Baltimore, New York, Boston, Atlanta, Pittsburgh and Minneapolis-St. Paul. It also noted the small number of western bus mechanics assigned to top-rated jobs.

The same memorandum noted that under the Emergency Board recommendations (for an 18-cent increase for mechanics this year) these workers would have been "far ahead of the majority of their colleagues working in truck repair around the United States."

The figures painted a similar picture (except for the West Coast, a high-wage area) for wages paid truck mechanics under IAM contracts:

In Albuquerque, the present rate is $3.33, in Cincinnati $3.55, in Cleveland, $3.37; in Columbus, $3.37; in El Paso, $3.68, increasing to $3.82 next May, and in Pittsburgh, $3.52.

"I am surprised as I read the newspapers," said Sen. Morse, "to read the impression created by some of these articles that the workers in this industry are an underpaid group.

"They are not underpaid workers in comparison with wages prevailing in comparable industry generally. This does not mean they are not entitled to a wage increase. I have always said they are. It is a question of how much they are entitled to."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the ticker carries the information this afternoon that the House committee, by a vote of 17 to 13, has reported to the floor of the House a resolution which, if the ticker is accurate, follows the major premises of the Senate resolution. There apparently are some differences in details, but the House resolution appears to have supported, as did that of the Senate, the principle that under the interstate commerce clause, it is the duty of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, and not the President; and that in fact the President does not have the authority to regulate interstate commerce, but only Congress.

I hope, Mr. President, that one of two things will occur by the first of the week: Either that the House will pass the legislation, and the two Houses will reach a common agreement in regard to the final form of the legislation in Congress, so that there will not be any need for any newspaper to write an editorial such as the one I have just put in the Record under the heading "Still No Planes"; or that the end of this strike against the public interest, to which the American public is entitled, will be forthcoming. It is a strike, now, against the public interest and not against the carriers; *that feature is only secondary.* It is a strike by a union working in a regulated industry, and in that industry the public interest is paramount. It calls for legislation that does not break a strike, in spite of all the propaganda of the unions, and I am surprised at the politicians who seem to fear if they vote for an extension of the Railway Labor Act for x number of days—and our resolution would make it 180 days, if that becomes necessary—they are voting to break a strike.

That is utter nonsense. The Railway Labor Act provides that men cannot strike for 60 days when the act is applied to them. Do my fellow Members of Congress think that when that act is applied, we are parties to breaking a strike? More nonsense, I say.

The resolution which we passed in the Senate simply says to the employees, "Go back to work for 180 days." It provides for procedures for mediation during the 180-day period. Not only do the best interests of the public call for that course of action on the part of the union, but the best interests of labor call for it also.

Of course, we have labor leaders who seem to feel they must encourage their union members to stay out on the picket line until they break the will of both the carriers and the public. In my judgment, that is not labor statesmanship. In my judgment, those labor leaders who are following that course of action and not only giving that advice to the members of this union, but seeking to induce members of other unions to put the political heat on Members of Congress in an endeavor to block the passage of legislation, are only injuring the best interests of labor and tarnishing its image.

For I say to the labor leaders of America: We are at war. We are at war, and increasing numbers of American boys are dying in Asia. In my judgment, no union has a right, in the midst of that war, to strike against the public interest in a regulated industry, when there are plenty of peaceful procedures available to the union leaders and the members of that union to carry out the precious right of collective bargaining.

Mr. President, in this case the designated officials of the union, the men selected by the union members to represent them in a collective bargaining session, agreed on a collective bargaining agreement. I wish to say that the members of no union can justify, after such an agreement, in time of war, engaging in a strike against the public interest.

Oh, I know. I was called off the floor of the Senate yesterday by a couple of labor leaders who were incensed at my position.

"Why," they said, "we have supported you in every election, the four times that you have run for Congress."

My reply to them was:

> Do you think you bought me? You can tell the leaders of your unions that they have declared political war on me and that I accepted the declaration. I intend to put the public interest first. When I think you fellows are wrong, I shall vote against you, as I have voted against you for 32 years in my involvement in major labor disputes in this country, and I shall continue to vote for you when I think you are right. That is the only thing you have a right to receive from me.
>
> I represent all the people of my State, and not just the members of organized labor. In this instance, I think you are dead wrong, and I hope you will recognize, before it is too late, that you have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship to stop this strike against the public interest.

Mr. President, there is no other alternative to the passage of legislation which, in my opinion, the Members of Congress have a clear duty to pass early next week, unless this union returns to the collective bargaining table and settles on the basis of a fair and reasonable adjustment. The agreement that their negotiators agreed to just a few nights ago was such an agreement.

This union would change its image and role in the minds and eyes of millions of Americans if it reconsiders its action in refusing to accept that agreement, for that agreement eliminated the wage issue as far as the hourly rate is concerned. This union never asked for more than $4.04 for its highest paid employees. They got $4.08 the other night.

I know it is said that they want certain fringe benefits such as an escalator clause. Again, I want to say that we are in the midst of a war, with increasing numbers of American boys dying in Asia, and it is well known, as my remarks on another subject will show momentarily, that I have not supported our getting involved in this war.

I think it has been a great mistake, but we are in it and as long as we are, then let me say here on the homefront, where we are perfectly safe and secure, for we do not run any risk of getting shot in a jungle, we at least have the public obligation of seeing to it that we do not tear asunder the economic fabric of this Republic.

Any proposal to use naked, economic power on the part of any union in a regulated industry to have its will forced upon the public because it has the economic muscle is not a public service, to put it by way of understatement. So, I hope that over the weekend the lights of industrial statesmanship will return to the eyes of the union leaders and the members of this union and that a good-faith collective bargaining agreement will be entered into that will make it unnecessary to pass legislation.

My last sentence in this regard, in reply to the wires I am receiving from labor leaders in my State, as to where I stand on this legislation is: "I stand for its early passage next week, unless you people in labor carry out your responsibility to the public by agreeing to the type of a fair settlement that the labor leaders for this union agreed to with the carriers and with the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor not so many nights ago."

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Services Feud Over Vietnam News," written by William Tuohy, and published in the Washington Post on yesterday, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Aug. 11, 1966]

SERVICES FEUD OVER VIET WAR NEWS

(By William Tuohy)

SAIGON, August 10.—The long simmering feud between the U.S. Military Command and the Air Force over military information policy in Vietnam broke into the open today.

The intramural quarrel between jealous services, in the view of many observers here, involves the deeper question of the degree to which the Pentagon is practicing "news management" in releasing information about the war.

The controversy surfaced when it was learned that the highly regarded Air Force information chief, Col. William J. McGinty is being summarily transferred from Saigon to a non-information post in Washington.

His information policy ran afoul of the Military High Command information office in Saigon, where frankness and efficiency are in chronic short supply.

In Vietnam, the Marines have been as helpful as the Air Force in providing correspondents access to information. The Navy has been woefully erratic and inept, and the Army, excellent in the field, defers to the Saigon command—whose top information officers in the past 18 months have been Army General Staff officers.

Currently, the chief information officer in Vietnam is Army Col. Rodger R. Bankson, who came to the job from the Pentagon office of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

Bankson's office is charged with holding the daily military briefing for correspondents, which, in the view of many reporters, are often inaccurate, misleading, and valueless.

There is a widespread feeling that the responsibility lies not so much with Bankson as with his boss, Sylvester, or with Sylvester's boss, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Sylvester has said he favors government "news management," including lying to the press in times of crisis. On a trip to Vietnam, he declared the press ought to be the "handmaiden" of the Government, as far as reporting the war went.

It is generally believed here that the Defense Department tries to call all the shots from Washington. Information officers privately complain they spend so much time trying to determine sources of unfavorable stories that they haven't time to do their job of assembling and disseminating a coherent account of military activities.

The Command Information Office invariably gives "military security" as the reason for its reluctance to give out information, but many veteran correspondents suspect that much of the information is given or withheld not for security reasons but for domestic political gain.

In Operation Double Eagle earlier this year, the U.S. Marines landed the largest number of troops in an amphibious operation since Korea. Even after two days the region commander refused to release the news, although the Marines had no objection. Saigon claimed release would violate security even though every Vietcong within ten miles of the beach head could tell by the number of ships, planes, and helicopters what was going on. The Saigon Command, say the Marines, was waiting for a favorable kill count to go with the news of the landing.

In any event, the Air Force's free-wheeling policies of giving out as much information as possible ran head-on into the Saigon Command's reluctance to disclose facts.

Col. McGinty refuses to comment on the situation, but it seems clear that he is taking the rap for a "maximum" Air Force disclosure policy at odds with the establishment's rule of "minimum disclosure."

In Saigon, Air Force information specialists feel their whole effort to give fast news to the public has been jeopardized by McGinty's sudden transfer.

But in the view of many observers here, in and out of Government, the real victims are the Johnson Administration and the public itself.

The Pentagon, these observers say, has so often mismanaged the news that the Administration's credibility on the whole subject of the Vietnam war has suffered. And it often seems, they add, that the American people are entitled to more accurate information about a complex, crucial war than the Pentagon is prepared to give them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this article bears out what I have said so many times during the last 3 years about this war in southeast Asia.

The American people are getting managed news. They are getting censored news. They are getting slanted news. That is why, if we want to know what is happening in southeast Asia, we cannot get it from the American press. We have to read the foreign press. We have to read the French press, the Canadian press, the Great Britain press and the press of the Low Lands of Scandanavia. We have to read the press of the noncombatant countries that have correspondents in Asia. It is quite a different thing. For example, that press leaves no room for doubt as to whether we are killing civilians.

It is a shocking thing that this administration continues to misrepresent to the American people that our bombing in the Hanoi area within 3 miles of the center of the city is not killing civilians.

The foreign press tells us quite to the contrary. Not only that, but the foreign press also depicts the tragedy which is shocking and should be shocking to moral men and women. We cannot do what we are doing in the bombing in the Hanoi and Haiphong area and claim that we are moral, for our actions spell out immorality. All Asia knows it. All Europe knows it. Criticism falls upon us from Africa, Latin America, and all over the world.

Mr. President, I raise my voice once again to make this plea to the administration: "You tell the American people the truth and all the truth about the course that we are following in prosecuting the war in southeast Asia."

I want them to know the truth also concerning the shocking brutality and cruelty and atrocity of the enemy, but that does not justify our immorality.

It does justify that, before it is too late, we make perfectly clear to the other nations of the world, through some international body, preferably the United Nations, that we are ready to have them take over. We are ready to have them declare a cease-fire. We are ready to have them declare that they will carry out their obligations to enforce the peace.

That continues to be my answer to the repeated misrepresentation of this administration that those of us who criticize the policy have no alternative to offer. We have been offering the alternatives in detail for 3 years.

We have been offering the alternative of a General Ridgway, a General Gavin, a George Kennan, and the others who are warning us and have been warning us that we cannot escalate this war, as we are escalating it, and not end up in a massive war that undoubtedly will engender the beginning of the third world war.

Oh, Mr. President, I want to say to the American people: "If you want to know what your Government is doing in southeast Asia, you had better start subscribing to the foreign press."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, relating to what I have just said on another facet of the problem, an article entitled, "Pentagon Readies More U.S. Troops for War in Vietnam," published in the Washington Post of August 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON READIES MORE U.S. TROOPS FOR WAR IN VIETNAM

(By John G. Norris)

Several additional American divisions, still in training but rapidly nearing combat readiness, will be sent to Vietnam under tentative plans that are virtually certain to receive top level approval.

Authoritative Pentagon sources forecast this action after Gen. William C. Westmoreland told newsmen yesterday during a visit to U.S. Pacific Headquarters at Pearl Harbor that more troops will be needed in Vietnam.

Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, made the statement when asked about reports of mounting North Vietnamese troop infiltrations into the south and recent press reports of rising troop requirements.

WON'T GUESS ON NEEDS

Westmoreland declined to speculate on the number of additional troops that ultimately may be needed. He said that U.S. troop requirements depend upon enemy action, but stressed that there is "no magic ratio" that would tell how many American troops are needed to offset any given number of Communist troops.

"It is difficult to compare power by relating people, because we have the firepower and the mobility that the Communist troops do not have," said the General. "I believe more troops will be needed. We have increments arriving almost every month, such as elements of the 4th Division last month."

There now are about 290,000 American servicemen in Vietnam, plus about 60,000 in the U.S. Seventh Fleet offshore and 25,000 or more in Thailand and elsewhere taking part in the war. It is understood that another 20,000 to 30,000 troops are under orders to move to Vietnam, including the remainder of the 4th Infantry Division.

PREDICTION BY STENNIS

Sen. JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said yesterday that an eventual 500,000 to 600,000 men will be needed to win in Vietnam.

Last January, STENNIS predicted that U.S. troop strength might reach 400,000 by the end of 1966. Pentagon sources indicate that if pending plans—expected to be approved—go through, the total by the end of December will be between 360,000 and 380,000 men.

Where will the troops come from? The Army divisions at home that were converted temporarily into training divisions for Vietnam replacements last summer have ceased taking recruits and should be combat-ready this fall.

That will make available the 5th Mechanized Infantry Division at Ft. Carson, Colo., along with the new 9th Infantry Division at Ft. Riley, Kan., sizeable portions of the 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions not now committed, as well as three new brigades—a division equivalent—and one or two older brigades.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another trial balloon following the most recent ascent of our trial balloonists in South Vietnam. To keep this little tyrant military dictator Ky in power, we are killing American boys. What a shocking page of American history that a single American boy is being sacrificed to keep that little tyrant in power.

A few days ago—in fact, the very day after Ky sent up that trial balloon—and I have been heard to say for many months past that if one wishes to know what the Pentagon is up to, he should keep his ears and eyes open for what Ky says—when Ky made that statement in South Vietnam, in Saigon, including his interview with the correspondents for U.S. News & World Report, and urged the sending of troops into North Vietnam, he was talking about American troops.

The interesting thing is that the American troops have replaced South Vietnam troops to a striking degree. The South Vietnam troops have been too busy quarreling among themselves. But he is talking about our sending American troops into North Vietnam.

There was a press conference some days ago with Mr. Dean Rusk. Again I say that if one wishes to know what Rusk says in a press conference, one should pay more attention to what is between the lines than what is on the lines, for one always has to be ready for doubletalk. In that press conference the Secretary of State refused to exclude the possibility of sending American troops into North Vietnam.

May I say to the American people that that is the beginning of this administration's propagandizing you to get ready to put American ground troops into North Vietnam.

If we do, Mr. President, we increase the danger of an all-out war in Asia. I do not intend to support it. It is not justified. It is immoral, obviously illegal.

Mr. President, we have to get back to the framework of international law. We cannot follow this unilateral aggressive course of action. When I say unilateral and aggressive, I mean with respect to the great powers of the world who are more and more isolating us in connection with this war. We cannot follow this unilateral course of action, we cannot send American troops into North Vietnam, without getting ourselves involved in a war with China and Russia. If that happens, then history will record that the nation responsible for the beginning of the third world war was the United States. I do not wish to leave that heritage to future generations of American boys and girls.

Read between the lines of that article—because that is an official reporting of our Government. Read between its lines. It is an article that seeks to get the American people ready for a great increase in American troops into southeast Asia. In my judgment, when they get those troops over there, the 17th parallel will become meaningless. We will be marching across it, and I believe we will be on our way to world war III.

Again I wish to say that it never makes me happy to express these differences of opinion with my Government on foreign policy; but in the absence of a declaration of war. I shall continue to plead that we stop this butchery in Asia, that we recognize that the jungle law of military might cannot produce a peace. It may produce a surrender; but it will only cause millions and millions of Asians, who hate us already with an intensity of fury, to continue to hate us as we maintain hundreds of thousands of troops in Asia for half a century, if necessary, before they finally throw us out.

So, Mr. President, I wish to raise my voice in opposition to what I am satisfied is at the present time a covert plan to get enough American troops into Asia so that we can give a rationalization to the American people, by way of propaganda, for marching into North Vietnam.

I hope that the leaders of my Government will recognize that, after all, we ought to place our professings about religious principles above the immoral course of conduct that, as a nation, we are following in Asia.

(At this point Mr. MORSE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

LAKE MICHIGAN POLLUTION MUST BE HALTED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the last few days, a matter of serious concern has been brought to me as the Senator from Indiana; a matter of concern to the people of my State; and certainly to all the people of the Great Lake States. The Army Corps of Engineers is dumping at least 75,000 yards and perhaps as much as 160,000 cubic yards of polluted filth into a 70,000 acre area of Lake Michigan. This recent "sludge" has been dredged from the North Branch of the Chicago River. The corps, for navigation purposes, is removing it to increase the depth of the channel from 9 to 12 feet in some areas and 21 feet in others.

The dumping of this "sludge," some 13 miles off the shoreline into Lake Michigan further increases the pollution level of the lake and creates a menace to health and welfare of millions of people in the Chicago area and endangering Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago, all in Indiana—and neighboring Wisconsin and Michigan communities. This dumping may lead to further contamination of water supply and closing of beaches. It can plunge us, who are trying to work out ways to clean up the lakes, into a situation so catastrophic that it will require billions of dollars to remedy.

The reason for dredging is understandable. Several years ago the city of Chicago reversed the flow of the Chicago River, in order to provide flow for treated sewage. The Chicago treatment plants operate on the so-called 90-percent basis, which represents a high degree of treatment, for the removal of BOD—the biochemical oxygen demand. However, over the years the sediment has built up on the bottom of the river and must be removed to accommodate barge traffic. The systematic pollution of the vast fresh water supply that is Lake Michigan is tragic.

It is tragic because this latest incident aggravates dumping sludge derived from the Calumet and Chicago Rivers, which has been continuous from 1955. Estimates of as high as 2.5 million cubic yards of filth have been dumped from dredging by the corps.

In the course of these dredging activities the corps is harvesting materials which sanitation experts call "nutrients"—sludge which has a high level of nitrogen and phosphates, even after treatment. The nutrient-sludge feeds aquatic life, such as algae, and continue to do so when moved to another environment—such as Lake Michigan.

The release of nutrients causes the algae to grow so rapidly that the growth is similar to an explosion—creating what ecologists call algae bloom. These algae die, sink, and form more sludge which in turn regenerates the cycle. Thus, we have a self-generating unit of pollution. Any given body of water can, under these circumstances, quickly come to be described as "pea soup" or what people from the area describe as "the lake is greening."

The situation is so grave that we must take immediate action to reverse the course of pollution. We have all lagged behind in this duty. No one element is specifically responsible for our total problem of pollution. However, we can move quickly to stop this one situation. I call upon Chicago to do so.

As to the total problem of water pollution, since we are all responsible—the Federal agencies will have to gear-up to move faster. The Department of Interior, with its new responsibility, is moving slowly. The Enforcement Division of the Federal Pollution Control Agency is possibly undermanned. We have no effective regional commission of the Great Lakes States, which would make certain that situations such as the dumping from the Chicago River into Lake Michigan could not occur. Separate State agencies seem reluctant to cooperate even when faced with such a serious problem.

I urge that we work swiftly toward formation of long-range plans for the Great Lakes pollution reclamation, but I call for the following steps to be taken immediately:

First. That the Army Corps of Engineers immediately cease dumping in Lake Michigan and the corps no longer concern themselves only with navigation and flood control. They, too, are responsible for the public welfare as they operate from the public funds and consequently in the public interest. The Congress may be called upon to create a special section of the corps with skilled sanitation engineers. I would support such legislation, although the Executive Order No. 11258, issued November 1965, should have been sufficient to charge the corps with this responsibility.

Second. The Chicago Sanitary District and responsible officials be called upon to come up with more efficient disposal of waste materials derived from the vast population they serve; and

Third. The Federal agencies responsible for the public welfare must move faster in this area. Significant research in this complicated field must be undertaken to determine new methods of sewage treatment and water reclamation.

If we are not to be short of usable water by 1980, if we are to insure the recreation of the public and the safety of our beaches—and I include our Indiana dunes which I support—and if we are to insure the future prosperity of the Midwest, then we must stop pollution of Lake Michigan and augment current abatement and reclamation work.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 12, 1966:

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review:

For the term expiring July 15, 1969:

Edgar F. Talbott, Sr., of Virginia. (New position.)

For the term expiring July 15, 1970:

Harry R. Pauley, of West Virginia. (New position.)

For the term expiring July 15, 1971:

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following player:

Thou wilt show me the path of life: in Thy presence is fullness of joy.—Psalm 16:11.

O God, our Father, Ruler of nations and the Father of all mankind, Thou hast surrounded us with Thy mercies, Thou hast guided us with Thy wisdom, Thou hast blest us with Thy love. Continue to breathe upon us, breath of God, fill us with life anew, that we may love what Thou dost love and do what Thou wouldst do—so may our lives be more worthy in Thy sight and our labor be in accordance with Thy holy will.

Deliver us from pride and prejudice and bless us with the glorious liberty of the open mind and the responsive heart. Clothe us with the spirit that never fails to bear the fruit of happiness and integrity and love.

Bless Thou our Speaker, every Member of Congress and all citizens of our beloved country. Together may we keep our Nation free and strong and good. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 11, 1966, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 11, 1966:

H.R. 3013. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents;

H.R. 7327. An act to amend a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School;

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe;

H.R. 11980. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany;

H.R. 12389. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial; and

H.R. 13374. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

On August 12, 1966:

H.R. 15225. An act to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

On August 14, 1966:

H.R. 14875. An act to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1207. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3078. An act for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke;

H.R. 5213. An act for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay; and

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14088) entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate further disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) entitled "An act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956," agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3155) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13277) entitled "An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1370. An act for the relief of Panagiota Konstantinos Sikaras;

S. 1878. An act for the relief of Elias Lambrinos;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarita L. Agullana;

S. 2486. An act for the relief of Dr. Earl C. Chamberlayne;

S. 2809. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;

S. 3029. An act for the relief of Gustavo Eugenio Gomez;

S. 3039. An act for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro;

S. 3042. An act for the relief of Dr. Oscar Lopez;

S. 3070. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads;

S. 3311. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr.;

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim;

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando;

S. 3395. An act for the relief of Antonio Gonzalez-Mora, and his wife, Natalia Sandoval Gonzalez-Mora;

S. 3688. An act to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction; and

S. 3711. An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on one important feature of this legislation as it comes to us from the other body.

When this appropriation bill was before the House on June 7, I specifically asked the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS] whether it contained any funds to permit proceeding with the proposed construction and extension of the west front of the Capitol.

The gentleman from Alabama assured me then that there were no funds in this year's bill for the west front, that there was no intention of doing anything further about the west front, and that there were adequate funds on hand for whatever preliminary studies were involved.

On that basis the legislation appropriating funds for the legislative branch went over to the other body.

Just 10 days later, on the 17th of June, Mr. Speaker, the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol announced that it had decided on a $34 million plan to extend the west front of the Capitol, and the report of that press conference indicated that the funds to undertake that construction were not going to be requested as part of the legislative appropriations bill in the other body, where the bill at that time rested, but rather the request for the $34 million would be deferred until the supplemental appropriation bill for the session was introduced and considered.

As we are all aware, Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriation bill is one which comes in during the closing hours of the session. Tempers are short. Many Members are already absent, campaigning for reelection. The opportunity for debate is usually nonexistent or very limited.

It seems to me that any consideration of anything as important as the alteration of the west front of the Capitol is something that ought to be debated fully and considered by the whole Congress rather than simply included in a supplemental bill. It would seem to me that the proper vehicle for that full consideration would be the legislative appropriation bill for the current year.

I happen to be opposed to the extension of the west front, myself, although I am well aware there is a difference of opinion. I believe the feeling against the extension project is substantial enough, however, so that I would hope we would have adequate opportunity to discuss it. Some 16 Members of the other body and 25 Members of this House, for example, have joined in an organization to oppose the extension project and save what is left of the original Capitol Building.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House, and also of the conferees who will be named, to an amendment added in the other body which would hold up all further activity by the Architect's Office on the west front extension project until a survey has been made as to just how much it would cost to repair the west front without extending it 4½ acres and including all those restaurants and briefing rooms and other things contemplated in the Architect's plan.

That amendment was approved unanimously by the Appropriations Committee of the other body and was passed on a voice vote by the other body.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, in reserving my right to object, to express the fervent hope that the conferees from this House will agree to that Senate amendment. It seems to me that this amendment offers us a reasonable way to be assured that we will have the opportunity to debate the Architect's proposed extension project for the west front in the regular order, fully and completely, rather than having this very massive and I believe very unfortunate surgery on the west front authorized quickly, without any full congressional debate and as merely an adjunct to a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to support those aspects of the Senate version of the legislative appropriations bill that will act to preserve the west front of the Capitol, and I join the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] in this regard. I hope our conferees will act to achieve this end.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, STEED, KIRWAN, SLACK, FLYNT, MAHON, LANGEN, REIFEL, and BOW.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERFORMANCE OF THE LUNAR ORBITER SPACECRAFT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Lunar Orbiter spacecraft, which is now in orbit around the moon, gives fresh evidence of the Government-industry-university cooperation that makes our U.S. space flight program successful. I wish to congratulate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Langley Research Center Jet Propulsion Laboratory, which is operated for NASA by the California Institute of Technology, the Boeing Co. as prime contractor, and RCA and Eastman Kodak as the principal subcontractors.

Here we have a team of scientists, engineers, technicians, and skilled labor all working together to accomplish a great technological feat in the national interest. Such accomplishments are impossible without smooth and harmonious relations between labor, industry, and Government. The performance of the Lunar Orbiter team is exemplary.

Lunar Orbiter is on an extremely difficult mission. Yet its performance so far has been normal except for the Canopus-sensing problem, which has been solved. At present the spacecraft is in high orbit around the moon, and on

Thursday it will take test pictures in the terminator area, including views of the moon's back side. On Friday it will go into low orbit and begin taking over 300 pictures of the lunar surface in areas believed to be suitable for Apollo manned landings before this decade is out. The mission will end in mid-September.

I know my colleagues join with me in wishing complete success to America's first Lunar Orbiter.

AMENDING REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13277) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER**. This is the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE AS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 1030) to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDING GREAT SALT LAKE RELICTED LANDS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15566) to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441; 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to direct a few questions to some member of the committee regarding this bill. This bill, as I understand it, has been recommended by the solicitor of the Interior Department. Is that correct?

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. **SAYLOR**. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. This bill has been recommended by the Department of the Interior through the solicitor's office in three or four different forms.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. The reason why this bill has been passed over in the past, Mr. Speaker, is that the Interior Department and the Solicitor of that Department forwarded a bill to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with regard to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands. There were full hearings held by the House and Senate, and there was a conference on it. Differences were worked out. The conference report was adopted and the bill was sent to the President and signed. It was no sooner signed than the Solicitor of the Interior Department determined that there should have been some changes made. It is about time that we determined whether or not the Solicitor of the Interior Department or the President is the one to tell us what bills or what forms these bills should come to us in. For that reason I have been asking that this bill be passed over.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 108) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is listed under the suspensions, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SOLUTION OF LOWER RIO GRANDE SALINITY PROBLEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11880) to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is listed under the suspensions, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FUNDS OF THE DUWAMISH TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10747) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 109, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10747

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons who meet the following requirements for eligibility: (a) They were born on or prior to and living on date of this Act, and (b) they are descendants of members of the Duwamish Tribe as it existed in 1855. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland, Oregon, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the utilization of available rolls or records and the eligibility for enrollment of an applicant shall be final.

SEC. 2. After the deduction of attorney fees, litigation expenses, the costs of roll preparation, and such sums as may be required to distribute individual shares, the funds, including interest, remaining to the credit of the Duwamish Tribe, which were appropriated by the Act of June 9, 1964 (78 Stat. 213), shall be distributed in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared in accordance with section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee or in such manner as is deemed by the Secretary to be in the enrollee's best interest. The Secretary shall distribute the per capita share of a deceased enrollee to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid to the persons whom the Secretary determines will best protect their interests. Proportional shares of heirs or legatees amounting to $5 or less shall not be distributed, and shall escheat to the United States. In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary to pay the costs of distributing the individual shares exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, such funds shall also escheat to the United States.

SEC. 4. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the distribution of a $62,000 award among the Duwamish Indians of Washington. The Indian Claims Commission awarded the Duwamish Indians $62,000 as an additional payment for land they ceded to the United States by the treaty of 1855. Attorney fees and expenses totaling $7,765.77 have been deducted leaving a balance of $54,234.23 plus 4 percent interest.

The Duwamish Tribe has no reservation or tribal assets and only a loosely knit tribal organization. Some of them have affiliated with other western Washington tribes and participate in their programs. This award should be distributed on a per capita basis. The question is: Who are the Duwamish and how many are there?

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a roll of all descendants of members of the Duwamish Tribe as it existed in 1855. A roll of sorts, prepared in 1919, is on file at the Western Washington Indian Agency. The Portland area office advises that from 900 to 1,200 will probably apply for membership on a new roll in order to qualify for a per capita share. There is presently no way of knowing how many will be able to prove eligibility. The area office believes $1,000 will be sufficient to cover the cost of preparing a new roll. No additional personnel will be required to work on the roll. Most of the $1,000 will be used for certified mail, duplication supplies, application forms, and so forth. At an earlier meeting of our committee our chairman, expressed concern over the possibility of using most of the $54,000 for preparing the roll. We admonished the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to keep his rollmaking expenses at a minimum.

Perhaps some of us will remember that during the subcommittee hearings, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] suggested that shares less than $5, if any, should be put in the Indian revolving loan fund rather than to escheat into the U.S. Treasury as is provided in section 3. It has also been suggested that a nationwide scholarship fund from these and other escheated funds should be created an supervised by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Another idea would be to have the State of Washington supervise the portion of the fund accumulated from these and other shares that may be forthcoming as other judgments are distributed.

If we wish to establish a policy for disposing of per capita shares less than $5 an amendment will be necessary. No such an amendment was recommended in the subcommittee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1964

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9976) to amend the Act of September 2, 1964.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION INSURED LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15510) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATHS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5852) to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the basis on which certain dependency and indemnity compensation will be computed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5852

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 402 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or before last discharge or release from active duty under conditions other than dishonorable" and inserting in lieu thereof ", or in the case of a veteran who did not die in the active military, naval, or air service if any subsequent discharge or release from active duty was under conditions other than dishonorable".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, after line 4, insert the following: "was so serving in such rank within one hundred and twenty days before death in the active military, naval, or air service".

Beginning on page 1, line 9, after the quotation marks, strike out ", or in the case of a veteran who did not die in the active military, naval, or air service if".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress, effective January 1, 1957, authorized the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows for the service-connected deaths of their husbands. The compensation is now set at $120 a month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the deceased serviceman.

When the rates of pay for members of the Armed Forces are raised there is a corresponding upward adjustment in the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation.

Generally speaking, the compensation is based on the rank held on January 1, 1957, or on the date of death—whichever is later—where the veteran died in service. With respect to a person who did not die in service, base pay is determined as of January 1, 1957, or date of death—whichever is later—for the rank and years of service of the veteran at time of his last discharge or release under conditions other than dishonorable. However, if a veteran has satisfactorily served on active duty for a period of 6 months or more in a higher rank, and was serving in such higher rank 120 days before death in the service, or before discharge or release, and is so certified by the military department concerned, the base pay of the higher rank may be used.

This bill, as amended, would eliminate the requirement with respect to the 120-day provision of serving in a higher rank. Thus, as an example, if the man had served satisfactorily for 6 months in the rank of lieutenant colonel during a period of war but later reverted to the position of major his widow would be eligible for compensation at the rate of pay for that of lieutenant colonel and this would apply both to individuals who died in the service and those who did not die in the service.

While the Veterans' Administration is unable to estimate the cost of this proposal, it is believed to be small and the agency favors the bill.

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5852.

This measure proposes to liberalize requirements used in computing basic active service pay for purposes of determining the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for service-connected deaths.

Under existing law, dependency and indemnity compensation is awarded to widows of those veterans who died of service-connected causes. The compensation is payable at the rate of $120 per month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the deceased veteran. Base pay is determined to be the amount presently payable for the rank the veteran held at death or separation. However, if a veteran has satisfactorily served on active duty in a higher rank for a period of 6 months and was serving in such higher rank within 120 days prior to death or separation, the base pay of the higher rank may be used.

For example, during a period of war a man may have been commissioned as an officer. However, at the end of the hostilities this person could have reverted to the highest noncommissioned rank. Should this man die or leave the service within 120 days after reverting to the lower rank, his base pay would be that of the higher rank. However, if he were to serve longer than 120 days in the lower rank, his base pay must be that of the lower rank.

H.R. 5852 would liberalize the requirements governing the computation of base pay by eliminating the 120-day provision following service in a higher rank. This would apply in the determination of compensation in the cases of both in-service deaths and out-of-service deaths.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates an unmerited and unwarranted requirement on compensation for the widow of the service-connected veteran. I urge its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFER TO PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12352) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Pinellas County, Fla.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask why this could not be done in the normal channels established for the distribution of surplus properties; that is, through the General Services Administration?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, would the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. HALL. Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is, I presume, from the Bay Pines, Fla., Veterans' Administration facility.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of this land has been declared surplus, some of the acreage that was originally granted the U.S. Veterans' Administration from there, and if it is to be used by Pinellas County, for park and other recreational purposes for war veterans, it is given priority under the plan of the Surplus Property Divsion of the General Services Administration. It has been stated that it would be designated for this purpose.

My question, then, is why is this land grant of declared surplus property not made through the usual channels of the General Services Administration rather than the legislative process such as under the Consent Calendar?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri, let me state that originally this land was given to the Veterans' Administration by the county of Pinellas, 800-some-odd acres of land. When it was declared surplus, of course, the GSA, under its usual procedure, recommended the sale of the land to the highest and best bidder.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the conveyance of this land, the county of Pinellas very well could have written into the bill of acceptance, so to speak, a reverter clause. They did not do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is designed merely to give back to Pinellas County land for which it paid, land that is now surplus, and it will be used there, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] suggests, as a park and recreational facilities, as well as educational facilities, and so forth.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Florida assure me that it will not be used like some of our urban renewal land that has reverted to public use, being procured for sale to private enterprises, and building developers, or contractors, but it will in fact be used for the war memorial park?

Mr. HALEY. I have that assurance, Mr. Speaker, from the authorities of the Pinellas County commissioners.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, upon that point, I think the gentleman is aware that there are safeguards written into the bill to assure that the park will be used for public purposes and not in a way to disturb the veterans in the nearby veterans' hospital.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri that the establishment of this park will in nowise deprive the veterans of the use of it. As a matter of fact, it will be a facility that the veterans' hospital will use at no cost to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with the assurances of both these gentlemen, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12352

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the county of Pinellas, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land, containing approximately one hundred and forty-five acres of upland and two hundred and twenty-five acres of submerged land, more or less, which was heretofore conveyed by such county to the United States without consideration. Said property has been declared to be in excess of the Veterans' Administration needs and surplus to all Federal needs. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be as has been determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be in excess of need and in the event a further survey is required in order to determine such legal description, the county of Pinellas shall bear the expense thereof.

SEC. 2. Any deed of conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall—

(a) provide that the land conveyed shall be used for any or all of the following purposes; namely, park, recreational, health, and education, and in a manner that will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration Center, Bay Pines, Florida.

SEC. 3. Should a park be established pursuant to this Act, it shall be known as the "War Veterans' Memorial Park".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall convey by quit-claim deed, without monetary consideration, to the county of Pinellas, Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land, containing approximately one hundred and forty-five acres of upland and two hundred and twenty-five acres of submerged land, more or less, which was heretofore conveyed to the United States without consideration, and which has been determined to be in excess of the needs of the Veterans' Administration and surplus to all Federal needs. In the event a further survey is required in order to determine the legal description of such tract of land, such county of Pinellas shall bear the expense thereof.

"SEC. (2) (a) No conveyance shall be made under the provisions of this Act unless assurances satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs are received from the county of Pinellas, Florida, that—

"(1) a suitable fence will be erected without cost to the United States between any land conveyed pursuant to this Act and adjacent real property retained by the United States; and

"(2) such county of Pinellas will provide to the satisfaction of and without cost to the Veterans' Administration an incinerator and a sewage disposal plant (or equivalent sewage treatment) on such adjacent real property retained by the United States.

"(b) Any deed of conveyance made under this Act shall—

"(1) provide that title to the land covered by such conveyance shall revert to the United States if such land is used (A) for other than park, recreational, health, or educational purposes, or (B) in a manner that, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or his designee, interferes with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration Center, Bay Pines, Florida, or otherwise with the operation of such center;

"(2) specifically reserve from such conveyance property rights in and easement rights to a drainage ditch and a sewer line which traverse such land; and

"(3) contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, easements, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

"SEC. 3. If a park is established with any land conveyed pursuant to this Act, such park shall be known as the 'War Veterans' Memorial Park.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property to Pinellas County, Florida."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill proposes to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the county of Pinellas, Fla., without monetary consideration for park, recreational, health, or educational purposes, a tract of land of approximately 370 acres which is now a portion of the Veterans' Administration Center.

In 1931 and 1932 approximately 831 acres of land in Pinellas County, Fla., was donated to the Veterans' Administration by Pinellas County and the city of St. Petersburg. The Veterans' Administration constructed a Center on the land which now consists of 400 domiciliary and 652 hospital beds. Approximately 145 acres of upland and 225 acres of submerged land, all a part of said 831 acres, have been determined to be in excess of the needs of the Federal Government.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held hearings on July 8, 1966, in St. Petersburg, Fla., and received extensive testimony from local citizens. From the evidence submitted, the committee believes that Pinellas County, Fla., has a plan for use of the 370 excess acres for public purposes which will be of great benefit to the community. Since the land was given to the Federal Government without cost, the committee believes that portion which is excess to Federal needs should be returned so that the donors can dedicate it to public use.

The bill provides that the deed of conveyance shall contain certain terms and conditions to protect the interests of the United States.

There will be no appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of this legislation. The Veterans' Administration has no objection to this proposal.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12352.

This bill authorizes the conveyance of certain property of the United States to Pinellas County, Fla. The land to be donated is surplus to the needs of the United States, but will revert back to the Federal Government should it be used for other than recreational, health, or educational purposes.

In 1931, Pinellas County and the city of St. Petersburg donated to the Veterans' Administration some 831 acres of land of which 461 acres were used by the Veterans' Administration as the site for a health center consisting of 400 domiciliary and 652 hospital beds. The remainder of the land, however, consists of 145 acres of upland and 225 acres of submerged land and has been determined to be in excess of the needs of the Federal Government.

H.R. 12352 would transfer this excess land to Pinellas County, Fla., but imposes on this transfer certain provisions that protect the Federal Government's interest in the use of the land for public welfare. No conveyance shall be made without satisfactory assurance that a suitable fence, incinerator and sewage disposal plant will be erected on the land without cost to the United States, and further, that the land will revert back to the Federal Government should it be used for other than park, recreational, health, or educational purposes, or interferes with the care and treatment of patients in the adjacent Veterans' Administration Center.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill to be in the best interests of the welfare of the people by putting to constructive use previously wasted land. Therefore, I urge its approval.

TO DELETE INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBENTURES ISSUED BY FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1217) to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate one of the chief sponsors of this resolution and to ask, first of all, for an explanation of this bill for the benefit of the Members of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves the raising of the interest rate which the intermediate credit banks can pay on their debentures.

Their debentures are now limited to an interest rate of 6 percent.

The last debentures sold for 5.8 percent. It is feared that when the rather large amount of outstanding debentures that come due in September come up to be paid that it will be necessary to pay something more than 6 percent in order to get the money to refund those debentures. If those debentures were not paid, and the only way they can be paid is by a refinancing operation—that is, through the issuance of new debentures to take their place—if they were not paid in September, I anticipate that we would see a most serious break in our financial structure which would probably cause everyone to suffer a tremendous loss.

Mr. Speaker, it was with the feeling that we should make sure that there would be no possibility of a default that the committee approved this change in the interest rates. We recognize that no one wants to see any interest rates go higher but we don't believe we can continue to put wood on the fire and keep the kettle from steaming simply by holding down the lid.

The other two systems of the farm credit system now can pay whatever the market requires to sell their debentures. Actually, their debentures have been selling for 5 to 10 points less than those of the intermediate credit banks, but in this case the intermediate credit banks' rate on their debentures is fixed at no more than 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we have not had to pay 6 percent. We hope we will not have to pay 6 percent. The bill does not require the payment of 6 percent or more, but it does provide that should the circumstances be such in September when there are $300 million of these debentures coming due that we would be able to refinance them just as the other two segments of the Farm Credit Administration will be able to refinance theirs.

I call attention to the fact that these debentures are not obligations of the U.S. Government and are not guaranteed by the Government. Consequently, they do not carry the ready market that Government obligations carry. I would also call attention to the fact that we are not talking of the interest rate the banks may charge their farmer borrowers. There is now no limit on the rate the banks may charge. The limit we are seeking to remove is the limit on what the banks may pay for the money they borrow.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where are the hearings on this joint resolution? I tried to get them. Were hearings held on it?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, hearings were held.

Mr. GROSS. Where are the printed hearings?

Mr. POAGE. I am sure they are with the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would put an end to this before it goes any further and ask that the resolution be put over without prejudice. Approval would open a wide gate on interest rates to farmers. I am surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has not taken the floor. He is against high interest rates, or he says he is. This resolution needs to be brought out in the regular procedure and thoroughly discussed. I am not going to vote here today for an unlimited interest rate to farmers with so limited debate, I can tell you that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I recognize, of course, that the gentleman from Iowa has a perfect right to object to the bill. But I would want him to understand that in doing so, he would not be objecting to a bill that would set a precedent on interest rates for farmers. Land banks and the banks for cooperatives have exactly the same provisions we have provided in this bill for the intermediate credit banks. This is not a question of seeing what the farmers will pay. We are not establishing an interest rate. We are merely providing that in the event a banking institution cannot refinance its outstanding debentures in September below the present limit, they will still be able to put them on the market. I think that you could think of nothing that would be more disastrous to farm credit and to credit all over the United States than to have the banks or the PCA's default on $300 million of their outstanding debentures, which must occur if the gentleman will not let those banks pay enough interest and get that money in the money market. They are not asking for Government money. They are only asking the right to pay what they have to to borrow private money. They are not going to pay any more interest than they have to. They never pay more interest than they have to. We do not know what the interest situation will be next month. We are very much concerned with that interest situation. We were requested by the Farm Credit Administration to give them this authority as rapidly as possible, and we believe that it is rather important, particularly to farmers, that we do so. I think that it is the usual procedure to try to expedite such a request. That is what we will do unless gentlemen object.

I crave the attention of the gentleman from Iowa because we believe that this question is loaded with such dynamite that you could cause the foreclosure of a vast number of outstanding loans now in the hands of your local PCA's. If you destroy their source of credit—and you would destroy their source of credit if you did not allow them to pay interest rates which will move their debentures into the market—and I again point out that these are not Government obligations; the Government does not pay the interest rate, but the banks themselves pay the interest rate. Unless they have a source of credit, private credit at going rates, it will be an utter impossibility for them to finance the operations of farmers over this country.

These are—and I want the gentleman to get it—short-time production obligations by which your farmers are presently financing their livestock operations and their crop production operations. They are not long-time obligations. They are falling due this fall, and your farmers need new credit this fall. If there is no way whereby these banks can finance these people after the middle of September, I think you are going to have a rather sad situation in a great many of the farming areas of America.

I hope that the gentleman will give most careful consideration to what we can do for these people if he is unwilling to give these banks, the only one of the three segments of the Farm Credit Administration that is limited, the right and the opportunity to pay what the market demands.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, this bill, which is sponsored by the gentleman from Texas, would permit a higher interest rate than 6 percent on these obligations.

Will the gentleman from Texas tell me how long this interest rate ceiling has been in the law?

Mr. POAGE. I believe it has been in the law since the beginning.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman tell me about when the beginning was, when this overall program started?

Mr. POAGE. The intermediate credit system was established about 1920—the land bank dates from 1914.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, there has never been a need in the previous many years for any lifting of the 6 percent ceiling on these obligations?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir. These intermediate credit banks have never had to pay 6 percent, and I am sure that none of the farm credit institutions have.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. This would seem to be pretty good evidence that we are in the highest interest rate period since 1933.

Mr. POAGE. I believe that is perfectly true. I believe everyone recognizes it. We have to recognize the fact—and we must know—that we cannot borrow interest at the rates we could 2 or 3 years ago, because interest rates are now the highest they have been for two or three generations.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I note in the Rural Electric Minute Man, dated August 12, 1966, a quotation which refers to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. The paragraph reads as follows:

> The Texas Congressman informed the Secretary of the Treasury this week that he intends to continue—

And now I quote from Mr. PATMAN—

> the fight to seek lower interest rates in this Congress with or without the support of the Treasury Department.

It is perfectly obvious that this bill is going to result in higher interest rates. As the gentleman from Texas said, the United States now has the highest interest rates since 1933. I wonder why the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who has said he is going to fight to seek lower interest rates in this Congress with or without the support of the Treasury Department, is not engaging in this colloquy in order to express himself on this problem?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this inquiry to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who has worked in this area for many, many years. Obviously, it is impossible to pull one segment of the private money market out and isolate it from the general money situation. Is that not true?

Mr. POAGE. That is absolutely true. We cannot. What we will be trying to do, if we do not pass this bill, is pulling one segment of the farm credit out of the competitive money market. We cannot afford to do that unless we are willing to try to set all interest rates by law.

Mr. ALBERT. The only other thing is for Congress to fix interest rates for the private segment. Would we want to do that? I will ask the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I do not believe we would want to do that. I do not think we could do that without going all the way and fixing wages and prices by law. I think that is a terribly serious step.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in response to my good friend from Oklahoma, it is my understanding that because interest rates have been lower in the past than at the present, it was possible to have a ceiling on this segment of farm credit. So, the critical situation we face today is now one across the board. Interest rates are soaring which precipitates this specific crisis. All we are seeking to point out is that interest rates in the last 12 months have been soaring, and they apparently are going to get worse rather than better. This is the reason why we may have to take the action that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recommending—take off the ceiling.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, since he mentioned my name?

Mr. GERALD F. FORD. Surely.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may want to attack the entire problem, but he would not want to isolate one segment of farm credit and separate it from the entire picture, would he?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma makes a fair comment. All we are trying to point out is that we are in the period, under the Johnson administration, of the highest interest rates that this country has had since 1933. The only reason this legislation is before us is because of the primary problem of the inflation with the related problems of high interest rates, and tight money. This Congress would be better off to go to the basic solution of the high cost of living—cut nonessential Federal spending.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I just want to add at this point that I am in sympathy with the sentiments expressed with respect to the necessity for raising the ceiling on interest rates. However, I would also say I believe we ought to pass this legislation. To refuse to do so would put an unfair burden upon this segment of farm credit and would serve no real purpose.

Historically the market for debentures which the Farm Credit Administration has sold—the source of credit for the various subdivisions of the Farm Credit Administration, including the Federal intermediate credit bank—have been just about two-tenths of a percent above the level that the Treasury bonds have been bringing. So the rate has been fixed not by Congress but really by the level of the Treasury borrowing rate.

Since the other two divisions of the Farm Credit Administration are not subject to this limitation and since—let me emphasize this—the Federal intermediate credit bank is the most important source of short-term credit for agriculture, failure to approve this and to give the Federal intermediate credit bank an opportunity to serve the short-term or intermediate credit needs of agriculture would do a distinct disservice without remedying in any sense the problem concerning which we are all so worried.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is impossible for me to understand is why this joint resolution, apparently having been approved by the committee about the first of August, was not brought to the floor of the House under a rule. This is important legislation, in all its ramifications. I do not understand why this joint resolution was brought out and expected to be passed under unanimous consent.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to second the comments of the gentleman from Iowa, in pointing out that this is a most unusual procedure, bringing a joint resolution of this seriousness out under this kind of procedure.

One thing I would like to know—and we still have silence on the other side—is the view of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]: Was this matter referred at all to the Banking and Currency Committee? This is where we vest the power, through the committee process, to look into all aspects of interest rates and the availability of money and the cost thereof. Was this referred at any time to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir; this was not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. This involves an amendment to the farm credit laws of the United States, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and not under the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not yield further.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman asked for an answer, and I would like to give it.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The **SPEAKER.** The gentleman from California demands the regular order, and the regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I made the original reservation of objection. I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice. It is an important measure.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SOIL INFORMATION FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 902) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 902

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development for portecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development.

Sec. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States, their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, community development districts, and other public agencies in community planning and resource development for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, recreational development, the conservation of land and water resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources, and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of a State or other public agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements with the State or other public agency as he may deem advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas and purposes:

(1) the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;

(2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey;

(3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys; and

(4) consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

Sec. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the contributions of any State or other public agency under any cooperative agreement which may be entered into between the Secretary and such State or other public agency with respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the cost of such soil survey.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 10, strike the word "full".

Page 3, following line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

"The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends the principle of the soil survey of the Department of Agriculture which has been underway for many years so that adequate soil surveys can be expedited to assist with utilization of land areas which are changing their character as the result of the national growth,

The bill would expedite and advance the completion of the national soil survey of the Department of Agriculture which was authorized and directed by the Congress some time ago. Up to this time, this survey has been very helpful and since there is much of it that remains unfinished throughout the Nation, this bill moves in the direction of expediting the completion of the soil survey, it has been and will be extremely beneficial to many communities and States.

The bill will not only effect 100 to 1 cost-benefit returns to many, widespread projects, but it is also a sound, practical conservation measure which will continue, if enacted by Congress, to demonstrate its merits.

As I have noted, based on estimated benefits derived from soil surveys over a 25-year period by the Department of Agriculture, it is estimated that the cost-benefit ratios are about 100 to 1. In other words, the benefits from a soil survey will more than pay for the survey in 1 year's time.

As it can be seen, the benefits from soil surveys more than pay for themselves within a very few years, even for those areas of low intensity of use.

There are many savings possible for community, industry, and for the average person having need for the information available from such surveys. It is not uncommon, I am reliably informed, to get savings from $30,000 to $225,000 through the use of soil surveys in selecting a school site alone. Other savings made possible by use of the surveys are commensurate.

In my own State of Massachusetts, for example, local government officials, planners, engineers, tax assessors, real estate dealers, and many others can attest to the savings made possible through the use of soil surveys. In fact, these savings have exceeded the cost of making the surveys by many times.

Again, in Massachusetts a program was inaugurated to utilize more fully soil survey information in the solution of rural fringe problems. The town of Hanover was selected for a pilot project. The soils were mapped by the Soil Conservation Service and interpretations developed for some 10 specific uses, including such items as school sites, industrial sites for housing, sewage disposal, agriculture, and wildlife, et cetera.

The success of the Hanover program was such that detailed soil surveys and interpretations are being made by the Soil Conservation Service on a cost sharing basis for some 10 to 20 towns a year. In addition, the State legislature has passed legislation to assist communities in their conservation problems and there are presently over 200 local town and city conservation commissions actively seeking problems relating to the growth and development of their communities.

Thus, the soil survey program is directly responsible for rendering immeasurably valuable assistance in aiding States and local communities to solve the very challenging, oft-times critical problems, social, economic, scientific, and financial, stemming from the population explosion into the rural fringe as well as those presented by our extremely compelling conservation problems too numerous to mention here.

I thank my very able and distinguished friend, the dedicated gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] and his outstanding committee, for their long-sustained efforts for their very worthy bill, the enactment of which will prove so generally helpful to the Nation.

And I also thank the pertinent officials of the Agriculture Department, particularly, my esteemed and able friend, State Conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture for Massachusetts, who has assisted so invaluably in furnishing counsel and data concerning the bill and otherwise lending his talents in behalf of this fine bill which I introduced in basic form some time ago.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16706) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4005. False representations; lotteries

"(a) Upon evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster General that any person is engaged in conducting a scheme or device for obtaining money or property through the mail by means of false representations; or engaged in conducting a lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of real or personal property by lottery, chance, or drawing of any kind; the Postmaster General may issue an order which—

"(1) directs any postmaster at an office at which registered or certified letters or other letters or mail arrive, addressed to such a person or to his representative, to return such letters or mail to the sender appropriately marked as a violation of this section; and

"(2) forbids the payment by a postmaster to such a person or his representative of any money order or postal note drawn to the order of either and provide for the return to the remitters of the sum named in the money order or postal note.

"(b) The public advertisement by a person engaged in activities covered by subsection (a) of this section, that remittances may be made by mail to a person named in the advertisement, is prima facie evidence that the latter is the agent or representative of the advertiser for the receipt of remittances on behalf of the advertiser. The Postmaster General is not precluded from ascertaining the existence of the agency in any other legal way satisfactory to him.

"(c) As used in this section and section 4006 of this title the term 'representative' includes an agent or representative acting as an individual or as a firm, bank, corporation, or association of any kind.".

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4005. Fraudulent and lottery mail matter."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4005. False representations; lotteries.".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROPS ON DIVERTED ACREAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14831) to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the handlers of this bill.

Mr. **POAGE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. **POAGE**. Does the gentleman want an explanation of the bill?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Yes. We would like to have it explained.

Mr. **POAGE**. This is a bill that allows the planting of safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, sesame, and flaxseed on diverted acres without payment for flaxseed and with a possible payment for the others of these crops provided that the Secretary finds they are in short supply and are needed by the country. He can then pay anywhere from 0 percent to 100 percent of the payments that would otherwise be due. Under the present law the highest he can go is 50 percent. Under this bill he can go to 100 percent of the support payments for these crops when he finds them in short supply and are needed by the country.

Mr. **ANDREWS** of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ANDREWS** of North Dakota. I think this is a good piece of legislation, because it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the ability to let the individual farmer adapt his farm planting of nonsurplus crops to meet the needs of the Nation. There certainly should not be any objection to it.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, interrogating the gentleman from Texas further: Recently the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe, has substantially increased the wheat allotment throughout the Nation. Will the passage of this bill have any effect on the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture in increasing the wheat allotment as he has recently done?

Mr. **POAGE**. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the answer is "No, sir." This bill will have no effect whatever on the wheat allotment. I think the increasing of the wheat allotment will tend to reduce the acreage that might be planted to these crops. These are essentially oil seed crops of which we normally have a shortage at least of the meal they produce. Unless the Secretary finds in the year he is going to make the payment that there is a shortage, he cannot make it, but it seems rather foolish to discourage the production of crops which are in short supply.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso in paragraph (8) of section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity, if he determines that such production is necessary to provide an adequate domestic supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (e) of section 339 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may permit all or any part of the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate domestic supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."

(b) The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 16(i) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate domestic supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out of the proviso in paragraph (8) thereof 'crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservations uses.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'crops.'.

"SEC. 2. Section 339 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out of subsection (e) thereof 'crops:' and the proviso immediately following the colon and inserting in lieu thereof 'crops.'.

"SEC. 3. Section 16(i) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by striking out of the third sentence of paragraph (1) thereof 'crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses.' and inserting 'crops.'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF JANUARY 21, 1929

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2366) to repeal certain provisions of the act of

January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091), as amended.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WOLF TRAP FARM PARK, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3423) to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REGULAR COMMISSIONS FOR MALE NURSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 420) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3069 is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of the third sentence and the word "She" at the beginning of the fourth sentence and inserting ", and" in place thereof; and

(B) by striking out "her regular grade, she" in the fifth sentence and inserting the words "the regular grade held, the Chief" in place thereof.

(2) Section 3070(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and the word "She" at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting ", and" in place thereof; and

(B) by striking out the words "her regular grade, she" in the fourth sentence and inserting the words "the regular grade held, the Chief" in place thereof.

(3) Section 3070(c) is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and the word "She" at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting ", and" in place thereof;

(B) by striking out the word "She" at the beginning of the fourth sentence and inserting the words "An assistant chief" in place thereof; and

(C) by amending the fifth sentence to read as follows: "Without vacating the regular grade held, each assistant chief is entitled to the temporary grade and the pay and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving and ranks above all other lieutenant colonels in the section."

(4) Section 3291 is amended—

(A) by striking out the word "women" wherever it appears in subsection (a) and inserting the word "persons" in place thereof;

(B) by striking out the word "woman" in subsection (b) and inserting the word "person" in place thereof; and

(C) by striking out the word "her" wherever it appears, and the words "that she", in subsection (c).

(5) Section 3915(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Unless retired or separated at an earlier date, each officer of the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps whose regular grade is major shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the thirtieth day after completion of 25 years of service computed under section 3927(a) of this title. However, if the officer's name is carried on a list of officers recommended for appointment to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, the officer shall be retained on the active list while the name is so carried. In addition, if the authorized strength of the corps concerned in officers on the active list is not exceeded, the Secretary of the Army may retain the officer on the active list until completion of 28 years of service computed under section 3927(a) of this title, in which case the officer shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the thirtieth day after completion of that service."

(6) Section 8287(b) is amended by striking out the word "her" wherever it appears and the words "that she".

(7) Section 8299(g) is amended by striking out the words "with which she is entitled to be credited" and inserting the word "creditable" in place thereof.

(8) Section 8888(2)(D) is amended to as follows:

"(D) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited under the Army-Navy Nurse Act of 1947, as amended, or credited under section 8287(b) of this title at the time of appointment, plus the years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after appointment in the Regular Air Force."

(9) Section 8915 is amended—

(A) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title; male majors designated under section 8067 (e) or (f) of this title";

(B) by inserting the words "and each male officer of the Air Force, designated under section 8067 (e) or (f) of this title, whose regular grade is major," before the word "shall" in subsection (a); and

(C) by striking out the word "she" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the words "that officer" in place thereof.

(10) The analysis of chapter 867 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title; male majors designated under section 8067 (e) or (f) of this title."

(11) Section 8927(a)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or credited under section 8287(b) of this title at the time of appointment, plus the years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after appointment in the Regular Air Force."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, the Army Medical Specialist Corps, the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

"That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 3069 is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end of the third sentence and the word 'She' at the beginning of the fourth sentence and inserting ', and' in place thereof; and

"(B) by striking out 'her regular grade, she' in the fifth sentence and inserting the words 'the regular grade held, the Chief' in place thereof.

"(2) Section 3070(b) is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and the word 'She' at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting ', and' in place thereof; and

"(B) by striking out the words 'her regular grade, she' in the fourth sentence and inserting the words 'the regular grade held, the Chief' in place thereof.

"(3) Section 3070(c) is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and the word 'She' at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting ', and' in place thereof;

"(B) by striking out the word 'She' at the beginning of the fourth sentence and inserting the words 'An assistant chief' in place thereof; and

"(C) by amending the fifth sentence to read as follows: 'Without vacating the regular grade held, each assistant chief is entitled to the temporary grade of a lieutenant colonel while so serving and ranks above all other lieutenant colonels in the section.'

"(4) Section 3291 is amended—

"(A) by striking out the word 'women' wherever it appears in subsection (a) and inserting the word 'persons' in place thereof;

"(B) by striking out the word 'woman' in subsection (b) and inserting the word 'person' in place thereof; and

"(C) by striking out the word 'her' wherever it appears and the words 'that she', in subsection (c).

"(5) Section 3915(b) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Unless reitred or separated at an earlier date, each officer of the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps whose regular grade is major shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the thirtieth day after completion of 25 years of service computed under section 3927(a) of this title. However, if the officer's name is carried on a list of officers recommended for appointment to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, the officer shall be retained on the active list while the name is so carried. In addition, if the authorized strength of the corps concerned in officers on the active list is not exceeded, the Secretary of the Army may retain the officer on the active list until completion of 28 years of service computed under section 3927(a) of this title, in which case the officer shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the thirtieth day after completion of that service.'

"(6) Section 5140(a) is amended—

"(A) by striking out the word 'she' in the third sentence and inserting the words 'the Director' in place thereof;

"(B) by striking out the word 'Her' at the beginning of the fourth sentence and inserting the words 'The Director's' in place thereof; and

"(C) by striking out the word 'her' near the end of the fourth sentence.

"(7) Section 5580(a) is amended by striking out the word 'female' at the beginning of the first sentence.

"(8) Section 5580(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

" '(1) ensign, if the person has not reached the age of 27 on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a lieutenant (junior grade) under clause (2); or'

"(9) Section 5580(b)(2) is amended to read as follows: '(2) lieutenant (junior grade), if the person is qualified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary and has not reached the age of 30 on the date of nomination by the President.'

"(10) Section 5601 is repealed.

"(11) Section 5773(c) is amended by striking out the word 'her' in the first sentence and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(12) Section 5776(d) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(13) Section 5782(d) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(14) Section 5899(e) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(15) Section 6324 is amended by striking out the word 'her' wherever it appears and inserting the words 'the person's' in place thereof.

"(16) Section 6377(c) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(17) Section 6377(d) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(18) Section 6384(c)(3) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words "the Person's' in place thereof.

"(19) Section 6384(c)(4) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words "the person's' in place thereof.

"(20) Section 6388(d)(1) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words 'the person's' in place thereof.

"(21) Section 6388(d)(2) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words 'the person's' in place thereof.

"(22) Section 6395(h)(3) is amended by striking out the word 'her' and inserting the words 'the person's' in place thereof.

"(23) Section 6396(a) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(24) Section 6396(b) is amended by striking out the word 'she' and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(25) Section 6396(c)(1) is amended—

"(a) by striking out the words 'by her' near the beginning of the sentence; and

"(b) by striking out the word 'her' near the end of the sentence and inserting the words 'the person's' in place thereof.

"(26) Section 6396(c)(2) is amended—

"(a) by striking out the words 'she would be' near the beginning of the sentence; and

"(b) by striking out the words 'to him' near the middle of the sentence.

"(27) Section 6397(b) is amended by striking out the word 'he' wherever it appears and inserting the words 'the person' in place thereof.

"(28) Section 8287(b) is amended by striking out the word 'her' wherever it appears and the words 'that she'.

"(29) Section 8299(g) is amended by striking out the words 'with which she is entitled to be credited' and inserting the word 'creditable' in place thereof.

"(30) Section 8888(2)(D) is amended to read as follows:

" '(D) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or credited under section 8287(b) of this title at the time of appointment, plus the years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after appointment in the Regular Air Force.'

"(31) Section 8915 is amended—

"(A) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

" '§ 8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title; male majors designated under section 8067 (e) or (f) of this title';

"(B) by inserting the words 'and each male officer of the Air Force, designated under section 8067(e) or (f) of this title, whose regular grade is major,' before the word 'shall' in subsection (a); and

"(C) by striking out the word 'she' in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the words 'that officer' in place thereof.

"(32) The analysis of chapter 867 is amended by striking out the following item:

" '8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067(a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title.'

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

" '8915. Twenty-five years: female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(i) of this title; male majors designated under section 8067 (e) or (f) of this title.'

"(33) Section 8927(a)(4) is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or credited under section 8287(b) of this title at the time of appointment, plus the years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after appointment in the Regular Air Force.'

"Sec. 2. For two years following the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Army may waive the provisions of section 3291(a), title 10, United States Code, which establish maximum ages for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps or Army Medical Specialist Corps, with respect to male persons who are otherwise qualified for appointment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 420 provides for Regular commissions for male nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. That is the sole purpose of the bill.

Male nurses have been commissioned in the Armed Forces since 1955, but have been limited to Reserve commissions. Providing commissions as Regular officers will improve promotion opportunities and improve retention at a time when there is a shortage of nurses.

Male nurses have fully proven their capability of making an important contribution to the medical mission of the Armed Forces. In addition to performing the normal range of nursing services in an outstanding manner, male nurses are making a unique contribution in Vietnam. Ninety-seven Army male nurses are currently serving there. Mr. Stratton of New York led a subcommittee that visited Vietnam in the spring and was able to observe firsthand the outstanding job being done by male nurses in the combat areas. Mr. Stratton is the author of a companion bill to H.R. 420. The author of H.R. 420 is the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] who sponsored the original 1955 legislation to provide Reserve commissions to male nurses.

The committee amended the bill by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting new language. The purpose of this amendment was to provide numerous technical changes to title 10, United States Code, to include the Navy in the bill. These changes were to revise sections of law now limited to female officers. The amendment also provides a 2-year waiver of the maximum age limit in the Army to allow Regular commissions to be offered to outstanding officers who are over the age limits. This change was requested by the Army.

The committee amended the title of the bill to include the Navy.

The bill is supported by the American Nurses Association, the American Medical Association, and the National Student Nurses Association. The bill was vigorously advocated by the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

H.R. 420 will cause no increase in the budget of the Department of Defense.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, our inspection subcommittee that visited Vietnam during the Easter recess learned firsthand of the outstanding work being performed by our medical personnel. Conspicuous among the achievements is the record being written by male nurses. There are 97 male nurse corps officers of the Army in Vietnam and their performance has been magnificent. They are assigned to field hospitals, evacuation hospitals, surgical hospitals, neuropsychiatric teams and to airborne units. Male nurses, understandably, can be assigned duties that would not be feasible for female officers. Male nurses have proven in the test of combat that they deserve regular status and equal promotion and retention opportunities with other officers of their specialty.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not just in Vietnam that the need for this legislation was proven. Since 1955, when they first received Reserve commissions, male nurse officers have proven they can make a valuable contribution over the whole range of nursing services. There are now 730 male nurses on active duty in the Army, approximately one-fifth of the Army Nurse Corps, and over 300 are serving overseas. There are about 400 male nurses on active duty in the Air Force. The Navy has been recruiting male nurses for only a relatively short time and has 76 on active duty. But the Navy is enthusiastic about their performance and is actively working to procure more male nurse officers. The legislation as first introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and myself, applied to the Army and Air Force, but the Navy came to the committee and asked to be included so it could improve its procurement and retention of male nurses.

I might point out here that the Air Force currently has authority to give male nurse officers Regular commissions and has, in fact, commissioned a number. However, several sections of title 10, United States Code, which pertain to the promotion, longevity credit, and retirement of Air Force nurses use the words "she" and "her" and might be construed as limited to female officers. To avoid confused interpretation in the future, the committee amended these sections to make them apply equally to male and female officers.

The male nurses of the Armed Forces have earned the right of regular commissions as a simple matter of equity. In this connection, I think it is interesting to note how strong the nurses associations, whose members are predominantly female, have been in supporting this legislation. The American Nurses Association, the National Student Nurses Association, and nurses associations of 16 States have made known to our committee their backing of H.R. 420. In my own case, my attention was originally called to the problem by the chairman of the nurses association of the State of New York, who happens to be a constituent of mine, and I cosponsored the legislation last year, as the report shows, H.R. 8158.

In addition to being justified as a matter of equity, the bill makes very good sense from the standpoint of personnel management. There is at this time a critical shortage of nurses throughout the country and this shortage is reflected in varying degrees in the nursing services of the Armed Forces. Providing Regular commissions for male nurses will make military careers more attractive for them and will certainly improve the retention and procurement of such badly needed officers.

In summary, this is a very worthwhile piece of legislation and I hope all Members of the House will support it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Nurse Corps, the Army Medical Specialist Corps, the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL—MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11488) to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11488

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Chapter 307 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3068(a) is amended by striking out the word "colonel" and inserting in place thereof the words "brigadier general".

(2) Section 3068(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Chief of the Medical Service Corps, from among officers of the Medical Service Corps whose regular grade is above captain. An officer appointed as Chief of the Medical Service Corps who holds a lower regular grade shall be appointed in the regular grade of brigadier general."

(b) Chapter 331 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3210(b) is amended by adding the following new clause after the last sentence in clause (4):

"(5) the Medical Service Corps."

(2) Section 3210(c) is amended by adding the following new clause: "The authorized strength of the Medical Service Corps in general officers on the active list of the Regular Army shall be one commissioned officer in the regular grade of brigadier general."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

" '(1) By striking out section 3068 and inserting the following new section in place thereof:

" ' "§ 3068. Medical Service Corps: organization; Chief and assistant chiefs.

" ' "There is a Medical Service Corps in the Army. The Medical Service Corps consists of—

" ' "(1) the Chief of the Medical Service Corps, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Army from among the officers of the Medical Service Corps whose regular grade is above captain;

" ' "(2) the assistant chiefs of the Medical Service Corps, who shall be designated by the Surgeon General from officers in that Corps and who shall be his consultants on activities relating to their sections;

" ' "(3) commissioned officers of the Regular Army appointed therein;

" ' "(4) other members of the Army assigned thereto by the Secretary of the Army; and

" ' "(5) the following sections—

" ' "(A) the Pharmacy, Supply, and Administration Section;

" ' "(B) the Medical Allied Sciences Section;

" ' "(C) the Sanitary Engineering Section;

" ' "(D) the Optometry Section; and

" ' "(E) other sections considered necessary by the Secretary of the Army."

" '(2) Section 3210 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

" ' "(e) The authorized strength of the Medical Service Corps in general officers on the active list of the Regular Army is one commissioned officer in the regular grade of brigadier general." ' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple piece of legislation. It provides one permanent brigadier general officer slot for the Army Medical Service Corps.

The Medical Service Corps has 4,855 officers, but is the only male corps without brigadier general rank. There is not a corps or branch in the Army that has a greater diversity of professional, technical, scientific, and administrative specialists than the Medical Service Corps. One out of every four Ph. D.'s in the Army is in the Medical Service Corps.

There are 10 control branches in the Army that have fewer officers than the Medical Service Corps, yet between them, these 10 branches have 30 general officers. Also, general officers strength in the Army is based on total officer strength. Without the strength contributed by the Medical Service Corps, the Army, as a whole, would be authorized about 23 fewer officers.

There are presently 475 general officer spaces in the Army. Allotment of one of these billets to an officer of the Medical Service Corps is wholly justified in light of the important contribution that corps makes to the mission of the Army.

The committee amendment strikes all after the enacting clause and inserts new language. The amendment removes technical inconsistencies in the original language of H.R. 11488, and provides the flexibility to give the brigadier general rank to an officer other than the chief of the corps.

H.R. 11488 as introduced tied the brigadier general grade to the chief of the Medical Service Corps. The Department of the Army objects to having specific positions spelled out in law as general officer grades. The amendment removes any reference to the chief's grade so the flag rank could be given to the chief or to another officer of the corps if that proves desirable.

The Army had recommended the authority in the bill be permissive. But your committee was not satisfied the rank would be awarded to this corps if the authority were permissive. In this connection, the subcommittee found that for some years the Judge Advocate General of the Army had held that authority existed for a temporary appointment to brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps, but during that time, no such appointment was made. The Judge Advocate General has since reversed his opinion. The committee had made the appointment of one general grade to the Medical Service Corps mandatory.

The bill will have no effect on the budget of the Army.

This worthy legislation is supported by the National Society of Professional Engineers, the American Optometric Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Pharmaceutical Association, and the Environmental Engineering Intersociety Board, Inc. Legislation identical to H.R. 11488 was introduced by our distinguished chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS, and by Representative COLLIER, of Illinois, who presented material on behalf of the bill to our committee. The distinguished Surgeon General of the Army, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, strongly supports the provision of general officer rank for the Medical Service Corps.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING TIME LIMITATIONS ON CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10267) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which certain military, naval, and air service records may be corrected.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1552(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 26, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 26, 1971."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That subsection (b) of section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 1552 is amended by deleting the word 'be.' at the end of the first sentence thereof and adding to that sentence the following: 'be, but no such payment may be made if it must be computed or determined as of any date, or is for any period, that is more than ten years prior to the date on which the application for correction of record is filed.'

"SEC. 3. Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 1552, title 10, United States Code, are redesignated as (b), (c), and (d), respectively."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to remove time limitations on correction of military records and provide a time limitation as to payments."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARD OF EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16646) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after chapter 79 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 80—EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATES

"Sec.
"1571. Establishment of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates.
"1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate.
"1573. Matters considered.
"1574. Other benefits.
"1575. Job counseling and employment placement.
"1576. Reports.

"§ 1571. Establishment of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates

"The Secretary of Labor shall act on any application for an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate received under this chapter from any person who was discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable at least three years before the date of receipt of such application.

"§ 1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate

"In the case of any person discharged or dismissed from an armed force under conditions other than honorable before or after the enactment of this chapter, the Secretary of Labor may consider an application for, and issue to that person, an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date of issuance, if it is established to his satisfaction that such person has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years. The Secretary of Labor shall supply a copy of each such Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate which is issued, to the Secretary of Defense, who shall place such copy in the military personnel record of the individual to whom the certificate is issued.

"§ 1573. Matters considered

"(a) For the purposes of section 1572, oral and written evidence, or both, may be used, including—

"(1) a notarized statement from the chief law enforcement officer of the town, city, or county in which the applicant resides, attesting to his general reputation so far as police and court records are concerned;

"(2) a notarized statement from his employer, if employed, giving the employer's address, and attesting to the applicant's general reputation and employment record;

"(3) notarized statements from not less than five persons, attesting that they have personally known him for at least three years as a person of good reputation and exemplary conduct, and the extent of personal contact they have had with him; and

"(4) such independent investigation as the Secretary of Labor may make.

"(b) Any person making application under this chapter may appear in person or by counsel before the Secretary of Labor.

"§ 1574. Other benefits

"No benefits under any laws of the United States (including but not limited to those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) shall accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under section 1572 unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal.

"§ 1575. Job counseling and employment placement

"The Secretary of Labor shall require that the national system of public employment offices established under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), accord to any person who has been discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable but who has been issued an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate under this chapter special counseling and job development assistance.

"§ 1576. Reports

"The Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by him under this chapter, and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued.

"§ 1577. Administration

"In carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary of Labor is authorized to (a) issue regulations; (b) delegate his authority; (c) utilize the services of the Civil Service Commission for making such investigations as may be mutually agreeable."

SEC. 2. The analysis of part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"79. Correction of military records---- 1551"

the following:

"80. Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates------------------------ 7571".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 333, Union Calendar No. 814 (H.R. 9976) to amend the act of September 2, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 9976

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 808), is further amended to read "Notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391; 43 U.S.C. 945), or any State statute, the Secretary of the Interior shall pay just compensation, including severance damages, to the owners of private land utilized for ditches or canals in connection with any reclamation project, or any unit or any division of a reclamation project, provided the construction of said ditches or canals commenced after January 1, 1961, and such compensation shall be paid notwithstanding the execution of any agreements or any judgments entered in any condemnation proceeding, prior to the effective date of this Act.

"SEC. 2. Jurisdiction of an action brought by the United States or the landowner for the determination of just compensation pursuant to this Act is hereby conferred on the United States district court in the district in which any such land is situated, without limitation to the amount of compensation sought by such suit. The procedure for such an action shall be governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the condemnation of real and personal property.

"Sec. 3. The amendment made by this Act shall apply to any condemnation action pending any any district court of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act and to any such action instituted after that date."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "(78 Stat. 808)," and insert "(78 Stat. 808; 43 U.S.C. 945(a))".

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "further".

Page 1, line 5, after "right-of-way" insert "to the United States".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING GREAT SALT LAKE RELICTED ACT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Consent Calendar No. 306, H.R. 15566, to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441; 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3484) to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands, an identical bill, in lieu of the bill, H.R. 15566.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), is amended by changing the period at the end of the section to a comma and adding the following: "excepting for land rental rates which rates shall be subject to change based upon fair rental value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior and shall be subject to review and appropriate modification not less frequently than every five years by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with rules and regulations of the Department of the Interior."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us, Senate 3484, was introduced June 8, 1966, as the result of an Executive communication. It would amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192) dealing with the transfer of certain lands in the State of Utah on the border of Great Salt Lake. Ownership of these lands has been an issue between the State of Utah and the Federal Government. Public Law 89-441 was enacted to resolve this issue. Under it, the State of Utah can either purchase the lands at issue immediately, paying for them within 2 years, or the State can bring suit to determine whether it or the United States has title to the lands and pay for them after the suit is concluded, assuming that title to the lands is found to be in the United States. Pending this determination, the State would act as trustee and issue leases for the surface and for the brines and minerals in solution in the brines. Other minerals are reserved to the United States.

However, the solution provided by Public Law 89-441 was not completely satisfactory to the President. When approving the enrolled bill, he specifically requested the prompt enactment of an amendment which would protect the Federal Government by providing that if title to the surface lands should revert to the United States, as in certain circumstances it might, the leases granted by the State of Utah would not be binding upon the United States unless approved by the Federal Government. S. 3484 would assure that protection by providing for the renegotiation of land rental rates based upon fair market value of any lease issued by the State of Utah if title to the relicted lands reverts to the United States. It permits the United States to modify State-executed leases as to rental rates not less frequently than every 5 years and to conform rental rates in those leases to such terms and conditions as are acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

Hopefully, enactment of this measure will finally resolve the problem of the relicted lands around the Great Salt Lake.

I urge passage of the bill now before us to end the existing uncertainty and to permit commercial development of the mineral values in the lake brines.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 15566, was laid on the table.

IMPROVED HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR RETIRED MEMBERS AND MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICE AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14088) to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers]? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Rivers of South Carolina, Hébert, Hardy, Bates, and Bray.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 217]

Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Betts
Bolling
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes
Callaway
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fino
Fraser
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hardy
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Landrum
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDowell
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Pickle
Pike
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Scheuer
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Skubitz
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Vanik
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

A UNIFIED NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR MANAGING FLOOD LOSSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have recently transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a report by the Task Force on Federal Flood Control Policy, entitled "A Unified National Program for Managing Flood Losses." That report discussed several problems requiring further study, including the need for and feasibility of a program of flood insurance.

Today I am transmitting a report from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, entitled "Insurance and Other Programs for Financial Assistance to Flood Victims." Undertaken in accordance with provisions of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, this report provides a significant contribution to greater understanding of this complex and difficult problem. The Secretary has prepared a thorough, well-documented report.

Additional study is required before final judgment can be reached on the design of a national flood insurance program. Accordingly, I am instructing all interested Federal departments and agencies to give this report intensive and careful review so that detailed proposals, including appropriate legislation, may be presented to the Congress.

I also urge that the report be reviewed both by the Congress and the many interested groups and individuals throughout the Nation. The need for financial protection against flood losses to private property is widely recognized. The report will provide an excellent opportunity to give this matter thorough and informed consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1966*.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC-PACIFIC INTEROCEANIC CANAL STUDY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 466)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the Second Annual Report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. The report covers the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

The first report described the planning phase of the Commission's investigations. During the last 12 months the Commission has moved into the execution stage. The engineering surveys of possible sea level canal routes in Panama have begun. A site survey agreement with Colombia is being negotiated. The route near the border of Nicaragua and Costa Rica is being mapped. With the beginning of the next dry season—January 1967—the surveying will move into full operation in Panama, and depending on the outcome of the current negotiations, also in Colombia. The Commission has also made substantial progress on the special studies covering the broad national and international implications of a sea-level canal.

After a year's work, the Commission has reached the conclusion that it will probably need more time and resources to complete its assignment than is contemplated in the present authorizing legislation. As soon as the Commission determines what its minimum additional requirements will be, I will recommend legislation to the Congress amending Public Law 88-609.

The sea-level canal investigations continue to be of great importance to the United States. The Commission is now well along with its commitment. I take great pleasure in receiving and forwarding the report of their progress to date.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 15, 1966*.

TO STIMULATE FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3688

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 304(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'ten times the sum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'fifteen times the sum'.

"SEC. 2 (a) The second sentence of section 303(d) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$115,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$225,000,000'.

"(b) The second sentence of section 303(e) of such Act is amended by striking out '$115,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$225,000,000'."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed this bill on a 83 to 0 vote last week. S. 3688 is similar to H.R. 15639, which was reported by your Banking and Currency Committee last month. Both bills are designed to help meet the emergency situation created by tight money and high interest rates.

This bill would amend title III of the National Housing Act to grant authority to the Federal National Mortgage Association to increase the amount of funds it may obtain for use in its secondary market operation. The bill accomplishes this by authorizing FNMA to increase the amount of obligations it may issue from the present statutory figure of 10 to a figure of 15 times the sum of its capital surpluses, general surpluses, reserves, and undistributed earnings. The net effect of this part of S. 3688 would be to increase by about $2 billion the present statutory limitation on FNMA's borrowing authority to purchase VA and FHA housing mortgages.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize an increase of $110 million in the amount of FNMA preferred stock that could be purchased by the U.S. Treasury. Since section 1 of the bill authorizes FNMA to borrow up to 15 times the amount of its capital and surpluses, section 2 of the bill would increase its authorized borrowing authority by about $1.75 billion.

Combining the effect of sections 1 and 2, S. 3688 would pump about $3.76 billion of new money to help prop up the sagging homebuilding industry.

Mr. Speaker, high interest rates and tight money have placed a tremendous strain on FNMA's mortgage purchasing activities and on the entire home mortgage industry. Over the past year, FNMA has been successful in lightening the heavy blows of tight money on homebuilding. FNMA mortgage purchase activities reached record levels in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. In that year, secondary market operations of FNMA reached a total of $1.9 billion.

But this has not been enough to bridge the gap created by high interest rates and a shortage of loan funds.

In the face of the tight money market, FNMA's increased pace of purchasing activity has approached existing statutory limitations. In fact, FNMA has been forced to restrict its purchasing activities, and these limiting actions by the association have taken it out of significant portions of the very market it was created to serve. Earlier this year, FNMA, in an effort to reduce the heavy flow of FHA and GI loans being offered for purchase, issued a ruling which made any mortgage of an original principal amount of $15,000 or more ineligible for purchase by FNMA.

While your Banking and Currency Committee recognizes the Association's motives in adopting such a ruling, we view this administrative rule as arbitrary. This rule completely ignores the wide differential in construction costs existing in different parts of the country. Furthermore, this arbitrary ceiling discriminates against larger families whose need for additional bedrooms naturally requires them to purchase a higher priced home. It is your committee's hope that the adoption of the proposed legislation by the Congress will permit the board of FNMA, in reexamining this ruling, to determine whether it should be revoked or at least modified and qualified to take into account, among other things, geographical cost differentials and differing mortgage needs of larger families.

As we all know, the tight money market has reflected itself in a scarcity of mortgage funds. This has already drastically reduced the rate of housing starts. There is every indication that this downward trend will continue unless increased mortgage funds are made available. One of the necessary steps to reverse that trend is to restore the Association's ability to participate fully as a supplemental factor in the secondary mortgage market.

S. 3688 would provide an immediate increase of over 75 percent in the Association's borrowing authority under its secondary market operations. As I have already stated, it would provide an additional $3.76 billion of borrowing authority and would permit FNMA to remain an effective force in the market. S. 3688 will provide the homebuilding industry with the assurance it needs of the availability of mortgage funds.

I urge the House to adopt S. 3688 as the first step in an effort to bring the American people relief from the crisis created by tight money and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, many may consider the phrase "monetary crisis" as too strong. But the facts speak for themselves.

Despite efforts by FNMA to bridge the gap, the annual rate of private, nonfarm housing starts has declined 27 percent since last December. And the downward slide is accelerating every day. Housing starts in June—the last month for which we have complete figures—are down 18 percent from a year ago. In fact, housing starts in June were at the lowest level in 5 years.

Unemployment in the building industry is rising tremendously. As a national television news commentator said last week:

> The dream of owning a home is vanishing rapidly for many Americans.

Interest rates on conventional home loans are running an average of more than 6½ percent across the country. In many areas, mortgages are at 7 percent or more. Of course, in so many areas mortgage money is not available at any interest rate. And the tight money situation has brought back in force that old treacherous real estate game called mortgage points. This means that the homebuyer is paying an effective interest rate of 7, 8, and 9 percent in most transactions.

This situation has removed millions of Americans from the home market. As a result, many families are being crowded into apartment buildings and are today facing skyrocketing rents.

Mr. Speaker, for many low and moderate income families, this situation is tragic. This Congress and this administration must do something about this. S. 3688 will be an important tool but, I must frankly say that it is not enough.

FHA and VA mortgages today represent only one-sixth of the total home mortgages in the country. So this FNMA bill before us today will be very helpful for this segment of the housing industry. But the Congress must move immediately on other legislation which will bring broader relief to the many who are seeking homes.

Your Banking and Currency Committee, on a 19 to 9 vote, has reported out H.R. 14026, a bill designed to bring a halt to the senseless and destructive interest rate war between the banks and the savings and loan institutions. This bill is a necessary companion to S. 3688 which we are considering here today. We must have both the FNMA bill and H.R. 14026, which is known generally as the certificate of deposit bill.

Among other things, H.R. 14026 will place a mandatory 4½-percent interest rate ceiling on certificates of deposit of under $100,000 issued by commercial banks. This will stop the heavy drain of funds from the savings and loan associations which are the main source of home mortgage money across the country. This bill, along with S. 3688, will put the homebuilding industry back on its feet and will again give the little people of this country a chance to buy a home.

Both the FNMA legislation before us today and H.R. 14026 are necessary because of the mistakes made by the Federal Reserve Board last December in raising interest rates by as much as 37½ percent. The Federal Reserve Board, by allowing the banks to pay 5½ percent on time deposits created a leapfrogging interest rate war which has wrecked the homebuilding industry.

We now have a chance, as Members of Congress, to correct the errors of the Federal Reserve. In fact, we have a distinct responsibility to do so.

There are some who counsel us to leave this matter to the discretion of the Federal Reserve. In other words, they tell us to leave it to the people who created the high interest rates in the first place. Faced with the obvious crisis in the homebuilding industry and throughout the economy, I do not believe that any substantial number of Members of this Congress would be inclined to accept such counsel.

Recently, I wrote Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler, expressing my concern over high interest rates and urging the Treasury's support of H.R. 14026.

I place this letter in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1966.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am gravely disappointed by the Treasury Department's unwillingness to make a real fight for lower interest rates in connection with the certificate of deposit legislation now pending before the Congress.

Mr. Secretary, I appreciate the fact that your office is under heavy pressure on the monetary issue and I realize that your position is greatly weakened by the continuing defiance of the Federal Reserve Board. I am sure that these pressures can explain the fact that your department has taken so many different positions in such a short period of time on this legislation.

At one time, you and your representatives appeared on Capitol Hill in support of a 5% ceiling on certificates of deposit. Later, your representatives informed me that they would support a 4½% ceiling. Now, I see in the press that the Treasury Department will support no interest rate ceiling.

Certainly, I recognize your right to change your mind. But I must remind you that the confusion created by these rapid changes in Treasury Department policy makes the job of solving the interest rate crisis even more difficult. Mr. Secretary, there is great fear among many Members of Congress that the Treasury Department has abdicated its role on this issue to the Federal Reserve Board. I hope that this is not true, but I must admit that the most recent evidence indicates that this may well be the case.

It is your responsibility, Mr. Secretary, to represent the Administration and you have no statutory authority to abdicate your role to the Federal Reserve Board. The Full Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021) plainly leaves this responsibility with your office. Even more significant is Section 10, Paragraph 6 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 246) itself which provides that "wherever any power vested by this Act in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Reserve Agent appears to conflict with the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury, such powers shall be exercised subject to the supervision and control of the Secretary."

I am sure that I do not have to remind you of the crisis which has been created by high interest rates. We are well past the stage of academic and abstract arguments. The economy is being badly hurt. As you know, home building is dropping tremendously and thousands of people are being put out of work by high interest rates. Everyone is paying higher prices for goods and services as a result of these skyrocketing rates. So, Mr. Secretary, let us remember our responsibility to consider all of the people in connection with the pending legislation. Let us not approach this issue solely from the point of view of what is good for the banks and the financial community. People are involved in this issue and we must recognize that fact.

While I have great respect for you and your office, I cannot understand your current suggestion that the interest rate ceiling be left to the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board. It was the Federal Reserve Board that created this situation, as they have publicly admitted, by raising interest rates by as much as 37½% last December. It is the Federal Reserve Board that has sat idly by while interest rates have climbed over the past seven months. It is the Federal Reserve Board that has repeatedly refused to act, even in the face of resolutions from the Congress of the United States.

The American people are waiting for action. We cannot tell them simply that we are leaving the interest rate war to the discretion of the very people who created the war. This does not make good administrative, political, or economic sense.

Mr. Secretary, we just have to the face the issue squarely. There is no way to pass the buck. If we want lower interest rates, then we have to say it, and say it plainly. H.R. 14026, which was passed by the House Banking and Currency Committee by a nineteen-to-nine vote, says that the Congress wants lower interest rates. It says that we are not satisfied with leaving this to the manipulation of the Federal Reserve. Soon, the House of Representatives will have a chance to stand up and be counted on this issue. We will have a vote for or against lower interest rates.

So that there will be no miscalculation, I want to assure you that I intend to fight for a 4½% ceiling on consumer certificates of deposit with all the means at my command. I do not intend to back off from this fight. I would like to have your support, but with or without it I shall continue to seek lower interest rates in this Congress.

Sincerely yours,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

We have reached the point where we must face this issue. When H.R. 14026 comes before the House, we will have a vote for or against lower interest rates. The issue will be clear cut. As I reported earlier, this legislation has been approved by the Banking and Currency Committee on a vote of more than 2 to 1. It is now awaiting a rule so that the Members of the House may vote their will. I have also filed a 21-day resolution so that, should the Rules Committee fail to clear this legislation, we can still have a vote.

I urge my colleagues, who I know share my deep concern over the destructive nature of these high interest rates, to assist me in bringing this legislation to an early vote in the House. We must make a fight now for lower interest rates. The American people, I can assure you, are thoroughly aroused over this issue. We must not delude ourselves into thinking that the people will somehow let us escape our responsibility in this area.

Again I urge the House to pass S. 3688 today. And as a second step, I urge the Members of this House to get behind H.R. 14026. Together, these two bills can start us on the way back to lower interest rates and a degree of sanity on monetary affairs.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington D.C., August 8, 1966.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for our views on a proposed amendment to your bill, H.R. 15639. The proposed amendment would enlarge FNMA's authority to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations by increasing, by $110 million, the amount of preferred stock FNMA is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury. The proposed amendment would be in addition to the provision now in your bill which would enlarge the authority of FNMA to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations by increasing its borrowing authority from 10 to 15 times its capital account.

Assuming enactment of the proposal increasing FNMA's borrowing authority from 10 to 15 times its capital account, the proposed increase in the amount of preferred stock authorized by the amendment would provide approximately $1.6 billion of additional funds for FNMA's secondary market operations. When this amount is added to the additional $2 billion that would be made available for FNMA's secondary market operations by increasing its borrowing authority from 10 to 15 times its capital account, a total of $3.6 billion in additional funds would be provided for FNMA's secondary market operations.

This substantial addition to the amount of funds available for FNMA's secondary market operations will enable us to remove the existing $15,000 ceiling on the size of mortgages which may be purchased by FNMA and establish a new ceiling at such higher level as is in the public interest.

The proposed amendment increasing the amount of preferred stock FNMA is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury would, of course, impose additional pressure on Treasury funds by utilizing $110 million in such funds. However, these Treasury funds will have great leverage—i.e., they will make possible the utilization of fifteen times their amount in private funds for mortgage credit purposes. The proposed increase in the amount of preferred stock FNMA is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury can therefore provide a greater increase in the amount of funds available for mortgage credit for residential construction than would be provided by a full $1 billion increase in FNMA's special assistance authorization.

The tight money supply is taking its toll on FHA insurance applications. In the first six months of 1965 FHA received applications on 545,000 dwelling units. In the same period of 1965, this figure was 529,000, a decline of more than 20 percent. Assuming an average purchase price of $16,000, this difference amounts to more than $1.8 billion for the six months' period, or some $3.6 billion for a 12 months' period.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, therefore, recommends the adoption of the proposed amendment to your bill in lieu of any increase in special assistance authorization.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and that legislation along the lines of H.R. 15639, with the amendment proposed, would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER.

POINTS AND DISCOUNTS

The current lack of funds for home mortgages has not only driven interest rates on conventional mortgages to all-time modern highs, but has also caused wholesale runaway charging of points or discounts to the prospective borrower and seller of a home. The charging of points is also widespread on FHA and VA mortgage transactions.

Unlike reasonable fees of mortgages for services for financing work, discounts are an additional charge for the financing itself. Across the country one hears of charges for discounts or points running as high as 7, 8, and 9 percent of the selling price of the home. One case right here in Washington, D.C., was brought to the light of the committee where 12 points were asked.

Not only is the charging of points a gimmick to raise interest rates—a 5.75-percent mortgage carrying with it 6 or 7 points amortized over a 30-year period raises the interest charges to 6 or 6.25 percent—it, in many instances, makes the difference between whether or not a family can purchase a home. This is so for the simple reason that the so-called points must be paid in cash upon purchase of the home and not amortized in the mortgage over the life of the mortgage. In your committee's report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, it was stated that:

> The committee is concerned about practices which result in increasing the cost of home financing to the consumer. On FHA-insured mortgages which bear a reasonable interest rate and which provide a guarantee of the investment, the practice of selling mortgages at a discount should be discouraged. These discounts add to the cost of housing for the consumer. Discounts can make the difference between a family's ability to afford a decent home and its inability to afford this necessity.

Your House Banking and Currency Committee requested at that time that HHFA develop a program to discourage the practice of discounts. The Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was also told that if they did not have the adequate legislative authority to cope with this problem, that it should submit recommendations for such new legislative authority as needed.

I am aware of the legislative history concerning this matter and also the difficulties involved in trying to draft appropriate legislation that will work. These difficulties, however, must be minor when viewed against the viciousness of the points or discount system. I again urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to recommend appropriate steps to eliminate this problem. I expect to hear from them immediately on this subject; and if need be, I shall request the appropriate committee to hold hearings on this vital subject.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to announce that our esteemed and able colleague, Congressman WILLIAM A. BARRETT cannot be with us today because of the death of his brother. BILL BARRETT, as my colleagues all know, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency and there is no more dedicated or hard-working subcommittee chairman on Capitol Hill. The Subcommittee on Housing has done outstanding work in the field of housing legislation and Congressman BARRETT deserves full credit for all of our achievements in this field. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] expressed the deepest regrets that he could not be here to vote on the FNMA bill today but he did ask me to urge all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote overwhelmingly for the FNMA bill which will bring vitally needed relief to the homebuilding and home-financing industries. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD Congressman BARRETT's floor speech endorsing the bill now before the House.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the FNMA bill. To begin with, I would like to say that I endorse wholeheartedly the remarks of the distinguished Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. PATMAN of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a short and simple bill. It consists of only several sentences, amending only two or three words in the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act. Specifically, this bill would change the word "ten" to "fifteen," and authorize the Treasury to invest $110 million additional in FNMA preferred stock.

However simple the bill may seem, though, it is of immense importance to the national economy—in particular, to the housing sector of our economy. The bill will allow FNMA to have access to $3.6 billion additional for purchases of FHA and GI mortgages under its secondary market operations. These additional funds, I am told, will over a period of time allow FNMA to buy over 200,000 mortgages it could not otherwise have bought. The benefits, in terms of home ownership and in terms of production and jobs in our economy, are beyond calculation.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact that we are bringing up this bill under suspension of the rules reflects the conviction of the overwhelming majority of this body that relief is needed, and needed now, for our great home building and home financing industry.

And, Mr. Speaker, except for the $110 million in preferred stock, all this will be accomplished without increasing the use of government money. When the FNMA Charter Act was passed back in 1954, it became the Congressional policy that FNMA was to be financed by private capital "to the maximum extent feasible." And this bill will simply further the aims of that long- and well-established policy.

Mr. Speaker, some persons have expressed the fear that enactment of this bill would "weaken FNMA's basic credit quality." They speak of a decrease of shareholder equity in FNMA as a percentage of the corporate debt, stating that the debt is "supported" or cushioned by the equity. Mr. Speaker, these fears are groundless because the institutions which purchase FNMA's obligations rely, not on some theoretical ratio of equity to debts, but on the value of the corporate assets supporting that debt. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we were to remove entirely the leverage restriction in the law, there would still remain the limitation of FNMA's debt to the aggregate of its assets in the form of cash, government securities and mortgages, and, I would add here, that all of these mortgages are backed by FHA insurance or VA guaranty.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize, especially to my colleagues in the other side of the aisle, that the bill before us owes much to the cooperative and constructive contribution of our esteemed and able colleague from New Jersey, Mr. WIDNALL. Because of his great concern over the problems facing home building and home financing, he has abandoned any vestige of partisanship and as a compromise solution, agreed to merge his bill, H.R. 15288 with H.R. 15639, the Committee bill. I think he deserves the highest praise for his statesmanlike attitude.

Mr. Speaker, while I give my enthusiastic support to this bill, I wish it went further. Recently I introduced a bill which would have provided $1 billion in special assistance funds to stimulate the construction of moderately priced homes. FNMA special assistance funds would offer builders and lenders firm commitments at close to par and would give a powerful stimulus to the flagging home building industry. I am hopeful that the FNMA bill in the other body will include this vitally needed special assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Committee bill, in addition to providing ample funds for FNMA's secondary market operation, will enable FNMA to remove the $15,000 eligibility ceiling which the Agency felt obligated to impose in view of FNMA's dwindling resources. This arbitrary ceiling discriminates against different geographic areas and against larger families and we want it abolished, or at the very least, greatly liberalized.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let our great home building and home financing industries down. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote overwhelmingly for this vitally needed bill.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks before the vote or after the vote on this bill and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

There is no disagreement on the desirability of increasing the home mortgage purchase authority of FNMA. This seems to be the most practical and the best means of meeting an urgent situation that exists today in the homebuilding industry and concerning the purchase of homes by every American.

This action is a necessity to avoid FNMA running out of funds in the next few months. But there is a difference of opinion, or there has been, on the method of making additional funds available to FNMA.

The bill reported by our committee, H.R. 15639, would expand the borrowing capacity of FNMA by changing the statutory limitation on its borrowing authority.

Under existing law FNMA may issue obligations in an amount not to exceed 10 times the sum of its capital surplus, general surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings. This bill would change that borrowing ratio from 10 times capital funds to 15 times capital funds. The result will be an increase in borrowing authority of approximately $2 billion.

The other method of expanding the borrowing capacity of FNMA is to authorize an increase in the Treasury subscription to FNMA preferred stock. This is the method proposed in a bill which I introduced, H.R. 15288, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to an additional $110 million of FNMA's preferred stock.

Since FNMA may borrow 10 times the amount of its capital funds the resulting increase in borrowing authority would be $1.1 billion. This is the time-tested method of expanding the borrowing capacity of FNMA that has been employed in the past.

The chairman of our committee has just stated in his preliminary statement that in a letter from Secretary Weaver, the Secretary has suggested that the funds which would be provided in the bill that I have offered and in the funds provided in the committee bill, if combined into one bill, would be acceptable, and far more acceptable than the method suggested in the Senate bill of $2 billion for the borrowing authority and an additional $1 billion of special assistance funds.

It is proposed today to combine these two proposals into one bill, and it is felt that by doing so, we will provide a very real means of coping with the present critical situation in the housing industry.

The 10-to-1 borrowing ratio for Fannie Mae has remained intact since Fannie Mae's secondary market operations were converted to a mixed Government-private entity in the recapitalization 12 years ago. Hence, there is no precedent in Fannie Mae for alteration in its statutory borrowing ratio limitation. However, in this 12-year period there are two precedents for increasing Fannie Mae's borrowing authority by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional preferred stock in the secondary market operation. On March 27, 1957, Public Law 85-10 increased the borrowing authority of Fannie Mae by $500 million through authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an additional $50 million of Fannie Mae's preferred stock. Likewise, on July 12, 1957, Public Law 85-104 again increased the borrowing authority of Fannie Mae, this time by an amount of $650 million through authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an additional $65 million of Fannie Mae preferred stock. In neither case was any change made in Fannie Mae's statutory 10-to-1 borrowing ratio. There was no adverse impact on Fannie Mae's high credit rating. Precedent therefor is clearly on the side of increasing Fannie Mae's borrowing authority through authorizing purchase of additional stock by the Secretary of the Treasury.

To many of us, experimenting with a change in the borrowing ratio, would subject Fannie Mae to the completely unnecessary risk of having its borrowing operations brought to a complete halt by a court suit testing the legality of such a change. It would be absolutely tragic if such should occur, particularly at a time when Fannie Mae is so desperately needed to help relieve the existing crisis in home mortgage financing.

Fannie Mae presently has outstanding more than $3 billion of debt issued under the statutory borrowing limitation of not in excess of 10 times capital funds. Some of this debt will not be repaid for another 11 years as the last outstanding issue of Fannie Mae notes does not mature until 1977. If this proposed change in borrowing authority was enacted and Fannie Mae proceeded to borrow funds at more than the 10-to-1 statutory ratio, it would only take a suit by one holder of one Fannie Mae debenture claiming that his investment position was being impaired to tie Fannie Mae up to the point where it could not sell an additional dollar of debt until the suit had been legally resolved.

I would not presume to guess what the ultimate outcome would be in the court. Legal opinions by the counsel of HUD, the Attorney General, or anyone else that changing the borrowing ratio is legal, miss the point. No legal opinion can guarantee against a suit. Irrespective of the outcome of such a suit, the point is that while the case was in the courts Fannie Mae would be prohibited from issuing an additional dollar of debt at a greater than 10-to-1 ratio thereby bringing to a complete standstill its ability to assist in the mortgage crisis.

I have previously mentioned that there is no precedent in the history of Fannie Mae since it became a Government-private operation for a change in its borrowing ratio. Advocates of the change, however, cite as a precedent, in another agency, a change that was made last year in the borrowing ratio of the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks. This is Public Law 89-237 enacted on October 4, 1965 which increased the debt-to-capital ratios of the credit banks to 12 to 1 in place of the previous statutory ratio of 10 to 1. Examination of the facts involved reveal that this is a weak reed upon which to lean for a precedent.

The Federal intermediate credit banks for years have only borrowed on a short-time basis with maturities not exceeding 9 months. This rapid rollover in maturities means that very quickly debt comes under the revised borrowing ratio. As a matter of fact all of its now outstanding $2.9 billion of debt has been borrowed since the change in ratio. Furthermore, since the change in ratio, actual borrowing did not exceed the former statutory 10-to-1 ratio except for a very few days in June 1966. In those few days all funds borrowed amounted to only approximately 10¼ times capital funds but by June 30, 1966 the ratio of funds borrowed had dropped back to but 9.77 times capital funds. In other words, for all practical purposes, there was just no basis of a possible suit testing the change in borrowing ratio. Therefore, the change made in borrowing ratio of the Federal intermediate credit banks does not constitute a valid test at all of the risk of a change in the borrowing ratio proposed for Fannie Mae.

Since the introduction of my bill and the reporting of the committee bill it is becoming increasingly apparent that because of the deepening mortgage credit crisis it is desirable to provide Fannie Mae with borrowing authority in a larger amount than provided by either bill. This suggests the desirability of combining the two approaches to increase Fannie Mae's borrowing authority. With the provisions of my bill added to the committee reported bill the increase in Fannie Mae's borrowing authority would amount to approximately $3.65 billion without taking into consideration the additional borrowing authority arising from common stock subscriptions required of Fannie Mae users.

But there is even a more compelling reason for combining the provisions of both bills. The addition of the increased Treasury preferred stock subscription to the changed borrowing ratio provision would provide a safety valve for Fannie Mae. If there was adverse reaction to Fannie Mae going above the 10-to-1 borrowing ratio under which its debt had been issued, any restraining suit quickly could be countered and made moot by having the Secretary of Treasury buy additional Fannie Mae preferred stock in an amount sufficient to cut the borrowing ratio back to 10 to 1 or less. In other words, authorizing additional authority for Treasury to subscribe to Fannie Mae preferred stock would provide insurance against any risks entailed in changing the borrowing ratio.

Official administration position now supports combining these two bills. This was made clear in a letter dated August 3, 1966, from the Secretary of HUD to the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The letter was printed on pages 18002 and 18003 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1966.

At the time, the Senate committee had under consideration a draft bill which in section 301 would change Fannie Mae's borrowing ratio to 15 to 1 for its secondary market operations and in section 302 authorize $1 billion of Fannie Mae special assistance funds for purchase of FHA and VA mortgages. I quote the pertinent part of the letter:

> This Department believes that the objectives of section 302 could better be accomplished by further increasing FNMA's borrowing authority under its secondary market operations. In addition to the provisions of section 301, it is recommended that this borrowing authority be enlarged by increasing, by $110 million, the amount of preferred stock which the FNMA can issue for delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury. This recommendation would provide approximately $1.6 billion of additional funds for these operations. When this amount is added to the amount made available by the present provision in section 301, a total of $3.6 billion new secondary market funds would be provided.
>
> The availability of this substantially increased amount of borrowing authority for FNMA's secondary market operations would enable us to purchase mortgages at a rate which would no longer require the imposition of a ceiling as low as the $15,000 which is now imposed.
>
> This substantial amount of purchasing authority would also permit the use of the regular secondary market facilities without other rationing restrictions that would be required under the special assistance provisions of existing section 302.
>
> Of course, this secondary market program uses funds acquired by FNMA in the private market rather than from the Treasury. The proposed use of this program would avoid the further pressure on Treasury funds which would result from increases in the FNMA special assistance borrowing authority. The proposal would result also in much less impact on budget expenditures.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in his letter of August 3 also pointed out that with the larger amount of mortgage purchase authority that would be established by the preferred stock subscription method over that provided by the special assistance method, the Department could remove the $15,000 ceiling limitation on mortgages offered for purchase in Fannie Mae secondary market operations. This ceiling imposed by regulation was established to conserve Fannie Mae funds. But, it works hardship on home buyers and homebuilders in many areas of the North, Midwest, and the Pacific coast where costs exceed that limitation even for a modest priced house. For practical purposes Fannie Mae simply is precluded from serving those areas. I agree with the many Members of Congress who have raised their voices in protest to this discriminatory regulation. I express the strong conviction that this regulation should be terminated promptly upon enactment of a Fannie Mae bill and that mortgages again be eligible for purchase within the statutory limits set for FHA mortgage insurance.

As previously noted, adoption of the bill I proposed adding the $110 million additional Treasury preferred stock subscription provision to the 15-to-1 change in borrowing ratio will bring the bill into conformity with the administration's position on Fannie Mae legislation. It will assure that the administration's position will be represented in any conference with the Senate.

At this time I would like to ask a question of our chairman, the gentleman from Texas. For some time I have felt, as have a great many other Members of the House, that providing additional funds for FNMA is not the full answer to meeting the tests of the problem we have before us. The agency, by regulation, reduced the amount to a ceiling of $15,000 on mortgages that could be placed with FNMA.

Do you have any assurance from the Secretary, Mr. Weaver, that that ceiling will be lifted?

Mr. PATMAN. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, I will state that I have filed in the RECORD today with my statement a letter from Dr. Weaver to the effect that it is recognized that this $15,000 ceiling must be removed if this bill becomes law.

The Secretary of HUD says:

> This substantial addition to the amount of funds available for FNMA's secondary market operations will enable us to remove the existing $15,000 ceiling on the size of mortgages which may be purchased by FNMA and establish a new ceiling at such higher level as is in the public interest.

Mr. WIDNALL. Does the gentleman have any indication as to how far the Secretary considers to be in the public interest today?

Mr. PATMAN. He does not say in this letter. He has to take into consideration all factors. He assures me and all Members of the House that he will make it as high as he possibly can.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to state for the record also, that I, too, have talked to the Secretary in connection with this very important part of the legislation. He has given me assurance that if the legislation passes, it might be possible to go as high as $25,000.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Members will note that in the bill passed by the other body, they increased a limit of $15,000 to $17,500, with three exceptions, where it was increased to $22,500.

In our committee report, on page 3, the majority view indicated that the $15,000 limitation on eligible mortgages is arbitrary and should be increased. I join with the gentleman—and I am sure most of the Members of the House will—in asking that the amount be increased so it will be entirely consistent with the demands of the market and the cost of erecting houses in various parts of our country.

It is perfectly obvious that this $15,000 limitation cannot do the job and must be increased. I join with the chairman and the gentleman in the well in urging the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to increase this to a reasonable limit, and I believe the amount suggested by the gentleman should be the minimum.

Mr. WIDNALL. It has been suggested that the ceiling of $15,000 was instituted by the agency in order to conserve funds. Of course, we all know they were trying to channel the funds which were available into lower priced housing.

On the Pacific coast, in the Midwest, and in the northern areas where costs are substantially higher, this limitation is very, very meaningful, in that such a ceiling prevents placing housing mortgages with FNMA. It is necessary, and I feel the ceiling should be lifted to at least the figure of $25,000. Twenty-five thousand dollars is something that might be lived with by the industry.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the last remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey. I have received messages from builders in the State of Arizona, who tell me that the $15,000 limitation makes FNMA financing completely meaningless as far as the present day conditions are concerned.

Mr. WIDNALL. I now include for the RECORD a comparison of increased mortgage authority for FNMA under House and Senate FNMA bills.

COMPARISON OF INCREASED MORTGAGE PURCHASE AUTHORITY FOR FNMA UNDER HOUSE AND SENATE FNMA BILLS

House Amended Bill (H.R. 15639)	*Senate Passed Bill (S. 3688)*
Section 1: (a) Increase FNMA borrowing authority for Secondary Market Operations by approximately $2 billion through increasing borrowing ratio from 10 times capital funds to 15 times capital funds. (Existing authorization $4.01 billion).	Section 1: (a) Same.
(b) No provision.	(b) Increased funds only available for purchase of *mortgages* dated on or after Jan. 1, 1966. (Not limited to new construction.)
House Amended Bill (H.R. 15639)	*Senate Passed Bill (S. 3688)*
Section 2: (a) Increases authorization of Sec. of Treasury to subscribe to additional $110 million of FNMA preferred stock to further expand Secondary Market operations (Widnall bill). At 15 to 1 borrowing ratio this results in increased borrowing authority for FNMA in the amount of $1.65 billion.	Section 2: (a) No provision.
(b) No provision.	(b) Authorizes FNMA under its Special Assistance function to purchase $1 billion of FHA and VA mortgages not exceeding $15,000 in original amount except such amount may be increased to $17,500 ($22,500 in Alaska, Guam or Hawaii) in high cost areas on determination of Sec. of HUD. Use of these funds limited to purchase of mortgages on new construction began after date of enactment.
House Amended Bill (H.R. 15639)	*Senate Passed Bill (S. 3688)*
Section 3: No provision.	Section 3: Prohibits sale of participations on the $1 billion FNMA Special Assistance purchases authorized by Sec. 2. (Entire $1 billion would be financed through funds borrowed from U.S. Treasury.)
House Amended Bill (H.R. 15639)	*Senate Passed Bill (S. 3688)*
Section 4: No provision.	Section 4: Prohibits FNMA from purchasing mortgage (either under Secondary Market Operations or Special Assistance Functions) at price greater than "paid for such mortgage when originally purchased." (Presumably by selling mortgagee.)

RECAPITULATION

H.R. 15639, as amended		*S. 3688, as passed*	
1. Increased borrowing authority:	*billions*	1. Increased borrowing authority:	*billions*
(a) Secondary market	$3.65	(a) Secondary market	$2.0
(b) Special assistance	0	(b) Special assistance	1.0
Subtotal	3.65	Subtotal	3.0
2. Increased preferred stock funds:		2. Increased preferred stock funds:	
(a) Treasury sub	.11	None	0
3. New mortgage purchase authority	[1] 3.76	3. New mortgage purchase authority	[1] 3.0
4. Adverse budget impact	.11	4. Adverse budget impact	1.0

Comment: Because House Amended bill (Committee reported bill plus Widnall bill) provides substantially more mortgage purchase authority at far less budget impact, Administration favors the House amended bill.

[1] New mortgage purchase authority shown in Items 3 above are without giving effect to new mortgage purchase authority arising from common stock purchases required of sellers of mortgages to FNMA under its Secondary Market Operations. At the present time this stock purchase requirement is 1% of the unpaid balance of the mortgage sold. These new capital funds also will expand the borrowing authority of FNMA at the new borrowing ratio of 15 to 1. The resulting further increases in FNMA mortgage purchase authority are substantial.

In the case of the House amended bill, borrowing authorization would further expand by $671 million and new capital funds of $44.7 million would become available, providing additional mortgage purchase authority of $716 million or total direct and indirect new mortgage purchase authority in the amount of $4.5 billion.

In the case of the Senate passed bill, borrowing authorization would further expand by $357 million and new capital funds of $23.8 million would become available, providing additional mortgage purchase authority of $381 million or total direct and indirect new mortgage purchase authority in the amount of $3.38 billion.

I urge the passage of this bill as amended.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this bill, with the amendment as offered by the distinguished chairman of our committee, will prevail today by more than the two-thirds vote required. As he suggested, it should be unanimous.

This bill is a necessary change in the law in order that we can bring to the people of the country the impetus that is so necessary in a prosperous country, that is, to improve the housing conditions of the country. That can be done only by getting the building industry back into production. The principal reason for the almost complete cessation of homebuilding is the lack of funds on reasonable terms.

It is basic to our economy that new housing supplies the impetus which a prosperous country needs. We must remember that when we erect housing—four walls which we call a house—that that does not become habitable until we furnish it and install in the house all of the appliances that make it a home. Construction also puts people to work improving and increasing community facilities which are so necessary to every area, where we build new houses.

This bill together with the amendment suggested by the distinguished chairman and concurred in by the ranking minority Member, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will, I believe, do the full job that must be done.

We will again make available to the builders and to the lending institutions of the country the money with which to erect new housing and, I trust, at reasonable rates of interest.

In the bill passed by the other body there is a provision that none of these mortgages shall be bought by FNMA at a price in excess of the actual amount paid out on such mortgage when originally placed. This is intended to keep the "shylocks" out of the business, and to make certain that in making money available for new home construction the money will be made available at reasonable interest rates.

That is intended to stop the business of charging an interest rate at one figure—whether it be five, five and a half, or six, or any other percentage as annual interest—and then increasing the cost by taking a mortgage at a so-called discount from the amount of the principal of the mortgage. In other words, where the lender advances less than the face amount of the mortgage, FNMA should not buy the mortgage at par or for the face amount rather than for what was actually advanced by the mortgagee on the mortgage. The difference which is additional profit to the builder or the lender at the expense of the homeowner, should not be paid by FNMA.

I believe a provision of that kind will have a salutary effect on keeping interest rates low. While we do not have that in the bill and the amendment proposed at this time, it will be in conference because it is in the Senate bill.

I trust we will have the kind of support for this bill we have had in years gone by, for FNMA programs, so that we can do the full job which must be done in the housing industry.

I am sure there is not a Member of the House who has not been importuned by the banking industry as well as by the builders to do something about the mortgage market and to make more money available for the building of homes.

We hope that this bill will help accomplish that laudatory purpose.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Am I correct in that the proper role of the Federal National Mortgage Association in its mortgage purchasing activities is limited to the secondary market? Is FNMA considered a secondary source of money?

Mr. MULTER. That is substantially so.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is it intended by the Committee on Banking and Currency that in increasing the borrowing authority there is the intention of making the Federal National Mortgage Association a primary source of money? What is intended when the savings institutions have sufficient money again to meet the needs of housing?

Mr. MULTER. I am certain that no one intends that this should become the primary source of money. It was brought into being originally, as the gentleman suggested, so as to create a secondary market for mortgages and thereby feed into the building industry additional funds not otherwise available. It is intended to continue that way.

I am sure that once the savings institutions and lending institutions of the country again have sufficient money to do the full job in the housing industry—which is usually their primary source of business and the main reason for their existence—FNMA will again take a completely secondary position.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman. I simply wish to say that I believe this legislation is worthy of our support in view of the present money crisis, the blame for which can be placed squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot agree with our able colleague as to who is to blame for the present situation. This is neither the time nor the place to argue that.

We must all agree that no matter who is responsible for the lack of mortgage funds for new homes, the enactment of this bill will help relieve the situation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation with some concern, because I believe once again the House is being asked to take action to ameliorate conditions which were caused by our own prior action.

There is a crisis in the homebuilding industry, yes, and it is caused by a shortage of money.

Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of money in the monetary system of this country first because we, by our imposition of a 4½-percent ceiling on long-term Federal debt, forced the Federal Government into the short-term money market where they have to compete with free enterprise for these funds. The second reason is that this House, just a few weeks ago, passed the Participation Sales Act, which also put the Federal Government into direct competition with home building for funds. Thus we are now forced to consider today's bill, as amended, which would authorize a direct increase in FNMA borrowing authority of $3.65 billion. It has additional borrowing authority indirectly, because the sellers of mortgages to FNMA purchase common stock, as they are required to do, of 1 percent. The capital funds provided by common stock purchases expands FNMA authority by 15 times at the new bill rate, and the accumulated effect of that common stock purchase from private sources will expand the FNMA borrowing authority by an additional $675 million. So the effect of this legislation is to expand FNMA borrowing authority by over $4.3 billion. This $4.3 billion increase in FNMA borrowing authority is a huge sum. It may well be that the capacity of the capital markets to absorb new money will prove to be a limiting factor on the FNMA's newly authorized borrowing authority. It is particularly true at a time when capital markets in this fiscal year must absorb $10.7 billion of Federal agency financing just to roll over existing maturities. As I have mentioned earlier, a powerful factor pushing interest rates of Federal agency securities to ever higher levels is congestion in the shorter end of the capital market. In the remainder of this fiscal year, Federal agencies such as the home loan banks and farm credit organizations will have to go to the capital market for $10.7 billion of funds to pay off issues maturing prior to July 1, 1967.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if the gentleman is not mistaken about the Sales Participation Act. No sales of securities have been made under this Sales Participation Act. That is the gentleman's understanding, too, I understand, is it not?

Mr. BROCK. If the chairman will permit, I will proceed to that point very directly.

Mr. PATMAN. For this fiscal year.

Mr. BROCK. This $10.7 billion must be done just to roll over maturities. It makes no allowance for even $1 of new money for any of these programs, and this fact is of particular relevance to the bill before us today.

This leads to my next point which was mentioned by the chairman of the committee. Congress, in my personal opinion, made a grievous error when it was misled by the administration into the passage of the recently enacted Participation Sales Act. If the administration persists in the sale of $4.2 billion of participations under that act as proposed for this fiscal year, it will drive interest rates through the roof. Truly the Federal Participation Sales Act should be renamed the High Interest Act of 1966. Only last Wednesday this administration set a new high in interest costs for Federal agency securities. Last Wednesday the FNMA offered $300 million of 5⅞-percent debentures due September 10, 1968, at a price of $99\frac{30}{32}$ to afford investors a return of 5.91 percent.

And, Mr. Speaker, as we stated earlier in the House, just 2 weeks ago, a refunding issue of Treasury notes due in 4 years and 9 months carried an interest rate of 5¼ percent, a new high for 45 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Are they selling these participation sales certificates at a discount? I noticed that the gentleman from Tennessee stated that the yield would be 5.91 percent, which, of course, is higher than a yield of 5⅞ percent.

Mr. BROCK. They were sold at $99\frac{30}{32}$, which is a small discount.

Mr. KUNKEL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, they are permitted to sell their bonds at a discount?

Mr. BROCK. Yes; they are.

Mr. Speaker, in its amended form, I support this bill increasing the borrowing authority of FNMA for its secondary market operations.

Mr. Speaker, inclusion of the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to an additional $110 million of FNMA preferred stock provides a valuable safety factor against any risk to FNMA's credit that might arise because of a change in the statutory borrowing ratio.

Mr. Speaker, a suit challenging the borrowing ratio change quickly could be made moot by the Secretary of the Treasury subscribing to additional preferred stock so as to bring the borrowing ratio within the limitations of existing law.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. While the gentleman from Tennessee is on that particular point, I believe it might be well to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that on tomorrow we shall be in conference with the other body considering the independent offices appropriation bill. The version of the bill that passed in the other body includes a provision carrying unlimited and indefinite appropriations to make up the subsidy that is being given to the people who buy these participation certificates—unlimited and indefinite appropriations—which would permit FNMA as the trustee to sell these certificates at any price it can obtain, and Congress will simply pick up the tab if this blank check is issued. And that is what will happen if we agree to this bill in conference tomorrow.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina is entirely correct, and I feel that the point which should be made most clear today is that in passing this bill I believe this body should go on record in recommending that we suspend the operations of the Participation Sales Act for at least 1 year and, certainly, we should go on record in strong opposition to this carte blanche granting of funds to replace interest charges lost through submarket loans, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BROCK. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the ratio of 15 to 1, a letter was written by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to the Department of Justice inquiring about that question, and a favorable reply was received in response to that letter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROCK. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. A favorable reply was received from my inquiry from Mr. Frank M. Wozencraft, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, to the effect that it was constitutional and correct in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the memorandum, together with the letter from Mr. Wozencraft.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1966.

MEMORANDUM ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO INCREASE FNMA SECONDARY MARKET BORROWING AUTHORITY FROM 10 TO 15 TIMES CAPITAL AND SURPLUS

This memorandum discusses whether Federal legislation amending section 304(b) of the National Housing Act to increase funds available for secondary market operations by changing FNMA's borrowing ratio from 10 to 15 times the sum of its capital, capital surplus, general surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings would be susceptible to successful challenge on constitutional grounds. It has been suggested that an increase in this ratio would constitute an impairment of vested property rights of secondary market operations debenture holders in contravention of the due process clause.

We believe legislative revision of the FNMA Charter Act to authorize a 15 to 1 borrowing ratio would clearly be constitutional.

The FNMA is a corporate instrumentality of the United States which exists pursuant to the FNMA Charter Act. It is a creature of the United States, and since its charter specifies that it exists at the will of the Congress, it is subject to legislative control.

The power of the Congress to alter, amend, or repeal its charter is not subject to serious question. However, a proposed change in the FNMA charter must be tested against the legal principles which require that legislative action which alters a Federal corporate charter and affects vested property rights thereby, must be in keeping with the constitutional doctrine of due process. In other words, the change in the charter cannot result in a taking or in an invalidation of a vested property right, or result in impairing the obligation of contracts of third persons. *Sinking Fund Cases,* 99 U.S. 700 (1878); *Cf. Coombes* v. *Getz,* 285 U.S. 434 (1932).

The question of the constitutionality of the proposed alteration of the FNMA charter thus turns directly on whether the alteration results in the taking or invalidation of a vested property right or an impairment of the obligation of contracts of third persons.

The general prospectus concerning FNMA secondary market operations debentures, and the face of the debenture itself, make clear that these debentures are corporate obligations of FNMA. The holders of these debentures are simply creditors of FNMA.

Neither the general prospectus nor the debenture confer upon the debenture holder any vested right in the FNMA Charter Act. The debenture holders have only a property right in the obligation incurred by FNMA when it issued the debentures.

A change in the Charter Act which increases FNMA's borrowing authority does not affect this property right. *Ettor* v. *Tacoma,* 228 U.S. 148 (1912); *Hawthorne* v. *Calef,* 69 U.S. 10 (1864). An increase in the borrowing authority does not affect FNMA's legal obligation to repay debentures previously issued, nor impair FNMA's ability to honor payment of these debentures. As the general prospectus makes clear by paraphrasing section 304(b) of the Charter Act, "[a]dditional obligations cannot be issued if, as a consequence, the total amount then outstanding would exceed the Association's ownership under the Secondary Market Operations, free from any liens or encumbrances, of cash, Government-insured or guaranteed mortgages, or direct or guaranteed obligations of the United States."

The very same sort of change in the charter of a corporate instrumentality of the United States now contemplated with respect to FNMA was before the Congress very recently. In Public Law 89-237 (October 4, 1965) the Congress enacted legislation which, *inter alia,* amended the Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize credit banks under that Act to issue debentures outstanding in an amount equal to 12 times (rather than 10 times, under the pre-existing law) collective surplus and paid-in capital. See H. Rep. 114, 89th Cong., 1st sess.; S. Rep. 630, 89th Cong., 1st sess. No doubt was expressed as to the constitutionality of this legislation, which had the same effect on the owners of debentures issued by Federal Intermediate Credit Banks as the proposed action would have on holders of debentures issued by FNMA.

ASHLEY FOARD,
Acting Director, Office of General Counsel.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washton, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of June 22, 1966, with regard to H.R. 15639, a bill which would increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association for purposes of its secondary market operations from the present maximum of ten to a new maximum of fifteen times the sum of its capital, capital surplus, general surplus, reserves and undistributed earnings. You request our views on a suggestion that the implementation of this bill would so impair the property rights of persons presently holding obligations of FNMA as to contravene the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

We have studied the FNMA Charter Act and the position under that Act, if amended by H.R. 15639, of persons holding earlier issued FNMA obligations. We have also considered the opinion of the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which you forwarded with your letter. We concur in the conclusion expressed in the opinion to the effect that the expanded borrowing authority proposed by H.R. 15639 may be granted by Congress and implemented by FNMA consistently with the Constitution.

Sincerely,
FRANK M. WOZENCRAFT,
Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I greatly respect those gentlemen down there, but they have been wrong in the past, and I believe the danger exists that if they are wrong we could have a challenge to these sales, and we could have FNMA in the position of being unable to sell any more participations or issue any more bonds.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will agree, will he not, that this bill, either in the form reported from the committee, or in the form in which it is being presented here today, with the amendment, has nothing to do with sale of participation certificates?

Mr. BROCK. I do not entirely agree with this premise, because support of today's bill came with it an obligation to review previous legislation which may have played a role in creating the problem.

It is imperative that we should do something about the basic problem of Federal financing and high interest rates. I believe we should insist upon action to stop participation sales.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I think it is true that most of you have been contacted by either the building associations or by the lending institutions to indicate that support for this measure should come broadly from this House.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does provide is velocity for available primary money. The money has to be lent in order to create the mortgages. Then Fannie Mae purchases the mortgages and moves that money back into operation so that it is a velocity operation and should be understood as such.

At the present time I think that it should be clear that this House hopes and expects that the FHA and Fannie Mae will apply this money to new mortgages so that it will, in fact, have its greatest impact upon new housing or at least in the sale of a new house that was consumated in very recent times so that we know there is movement in the housing business which will create new starts.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to indicate that it would be the intent of Congress and I will ask the chairman if this is not within our intent that to the degree that we could under existing law let standby authority be liberally utilized so that there would be an inducement to lend the money by the primary institutions knowing that the FNMA is standing by to at least take out those mortgages under which they now can move under standby authority.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. The record of this debate will disclose the constructive suggestion made by the gentleman from California and I am sure we will give it consideration.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think one other point should be made and that is FHA itself should be encouraged to get more dynamically involved in the new starts in the housing industry. This year FHA will have accounted for 16 percent of the new starts. A year ago it was more like 35 percent. I think every action they can take under the law should be utilized in order to make them a more dynamic and a moving force in the new home construction field. If they would move from the 16 percent toward the 35 percent that they have previously been involved in, we certainly will see more action out of the revolving or the velocity action that we hope to get from Fannie Mae.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD Mr. Speaker, I should like to aline myself with the gentleman's remarks. We both know what a terrible situation the construction business is in in California. As I understand it, this will make eventually a total of $3.6 billion of Fannie Mae mortgages; is that right?

Mr. HANNA. Under the amended form, that is the amount.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, it has been said on the floor, although I was not here to hear it, that the $15,000 limitation is going to be removed and it is the recommendation of the committee that the $15,000 ceiling be removed.

Mr. HANNA. It is very clear, as the gentleman pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that $15,000 was an arbitrary short-term limitation that was placed on FNMA purchaseable mortgages by the necessities that existed by reason of the shortage of funds. Tight money began setting in last year. Competition in the Nation's money markets constricted the funds available to the long-term saving institutions that have traditionally financed homebuilding. The industry then turned increasingly to Fannie Mae. The tremendous increase in demand for Fannie Mae assistance placed a serious strain on that agency's resources. So much so that on April 1 of this year the corporation placed its now famous $15,000 limitation on the unpaid principal balance of a mortgage offered for purchase for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage.

The limitation was arbitrary in that it did not do justice to the country as a whole. It took out of the range of operations and the policies of this agency large sections of the country and, consequently, large and important portions of the mortgage market: the Northeast, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has pointed out, part of the West and part of the Middle West. For example, in my own home State of California, recent estimates indicate that approximately 90 percent of new residential mortgages are in excess of $15,000. The average FHA-VA mortgage is approximately $20,000 or $5,000 more than the FNMA maximum. The situation all across the country indicates the day of the $15,000 mortgage for the average family purchasing a home is gone.

For Fannie Mae the situation is like that of a lifeguard trying to save a man with a rope that is too short. With a rope of only $15,000 the lifesaver simply will not reach the sinking homebuilding industry. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are giving Fannie Mae enough rope to get the lifesaver out there where it will do some good. We want FNMA to use it.

Let no one think, however, that this bill is going to solve the problems of the building and mortgage industries. Left yet to be done is a task to which we must now proceed with every sense of urgency: the task of promoting liquidity in the primary mortgage money market. For at the present time funds flowing into those institutions which have traditionally financed the homebuilding industry, at least into the savings and loans, are being siphoned off from the industry for the following chain of reasons:

First. Before the crisis struck all the aggressive institutions had borrowed heavily at the district home loan banks taking advantage of the favorable money rate that was then prevailing. Thus when the crisis hit, the flexibility of those institutions was at a minimum.

Second. They then had to go to the emergency window to get the necessary money to meet withdrawals. This was short-term money on 30-day notes which had priority of service on all incoming funds.

Third. To restrain the outflow of deposits and to compete for additional deposits, all institutions raised interest rates.

The end result of all this is no money to lend. The money coming in now has to go right back out to cover the short-term obligations of the savings and loans.

The bill we are going to pass today is a right step. It will put more liquidity into the secondary mortgage market. But clearly there must also be every legislative and administrative effort made to place liquid dollars into the primary mortgage market as well.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important—and most complicated—fields of responsibility—in the administrative branch and the Congress is the field of finance. Today, this country is facing a major crisis triggered by the inflationary spiral and so-called tight money problem. In normal times, most of our colleagues here in the House are content to let our expert colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee handle these problems of interest rates and high finance. However, the crisis has reached such proportions that it behooves all of us to lend our personal efforts to solve this problem. In some parts of the country inflation runs rampant demanding action to check it. In our part of the country, because of the squeeze on the homebuilding industry, it is causing a recession—all because of the damaging fiscal policies of this administration.

First of all, I would like to announce my wholehearted support of H.R. 15639, which is before the House today. This bill will help to prevent a catastrophe from taking place but is not by any means the full answer to the depressed housing situation. Simply stated, this bill would provide $4.5 billion to the Federal National Mortgage Association—known in the business as Fannie Mae—which it can use to purchase mortgages from savings and loan associations and other mortgage lenders. In turn, this would give the mortgage lenders $4.5 billion in cash to lend on new mortgages.

This is a good start toward solving our problem, Mr. Speaker. But I would emphasize that it is only a start. There is much more to be done, and perhaps a basic review of the problem may point the way to some further answers.

In my own district, inflation and tight money are creating a financial squeeze that is rapidly expanding to major proportions. It causes a chain reaction that already has reached directly-related industries and is beginning to be felt in industries with a secondary relationship. The shortage of mortgage money has hurt the lending institutions. This, in turn, has caused a severe cutback in construction. Resulting from this, contractors' orders for lumber, plywood, and other building products have fallen off drastically and is causing an expanding problem in this industry. The real estate business is floundering. More and more construction and sawmill workers are losing their jobs every day. There is a shortage of loan funds for private individuals and credit is being curtailed. A general business slump is beginning.

Mr. Speaker, when I returned to the House in the second session of the 89th Congress, I was deeply concerned about inflation and the beginnings of a tight money situation. As each month went by, I have become increasingly concerned, especially this past month when signs of a serious economic slump began to appear. I have sent telegrams to the chambers of commerce and central labor councils of each of the six counties of my district, asking full reports on the extent of economic damage to date.

From the timber areas I get reports that the mortgage squeeze is causing a critical plywood and lumber market. Lumber and plywood mills are forced to layoff workers, creating a vast increase in unemployment.

In Marin County, next to San Francisco, home sales have fallen by 26 percent in the first 6 months of this year. Construction of homes has dropped 35 percent in the same period. While improvements in other segments of Marin County's economy largely have offset the construction and home resale slump, the timber products oriented counties to the north are facing serious problems.

There has been some talk, Mr. Speaker, that competition between banks and savings and loan associations for money has been a major contributor to this problem. It has been said that when the Federal Reserve Board permitted banks to offer 5.5 percent interest on savings starting last December, this caused savers to withdraw their money from the savings and loans and deposit them in the banks to achieve higher interest earnings. The savings and loans, thus, have had less capital to lend on mortgages.

There seems to be no question that this has been a contributing factor to the tight-money situation. However, it also appears clear that the bulk of the problem lies elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that Federal Government borrowing, with the offer of high interest rates as "the carrot on the stick," is the real culprit in the tight-money situation. Private industry borrowing for plant expansion should be listed as a secondary cause.

Like the dead albatross hung around the neck of an ancient mariner to remind him of a thoughtless and spontaneous deed, so must an albatross be hung around the neck of the present administration for the repeated financial decisions which have brought us to our present crisis.

Time permitting, Mr. Speaker, I would like to list a few of these:

Frankly, I am very disturbed over the Sales Participation Act of 1966 which was pushed through this Congress by the Johnson administration and its 2-to-1 Democratic majority in the Congress. This law puts the Federal Government into the money market for $4.2 billion in the next year—and they are offering 5.75 percent to get it. I said at the time that the enactment of this act would be a major factor in the tight money situation and this has proved to be the case.

Besides its impact on the money market, this law has other major effects. Under its provisions, the Johnson-HUMPHREY administration is given the authority to establish a whole new system of back door, deficit financing. All manner of grandiose Great Society programs can be funded by simply refinancing some $10.9 billion in loan paper now held by the Federal Government and using the money. Not one cent of it will be reflected in the budget, although this back door financing will give the false impression that the budget deficit is $4.2 billion less than it really is.

Two weeks ago the Treasury Department announced the refunding of bonds maturing August 12 and November 15, 1966, refinancing them at the rate of 5.25 percent.

On August 10, 1966, the Federal National Mortgage Association offered debentures at the rate of 5.91 percent interest.

Last week the Treasury Department announced it would sell $3 billion in tax anticipation notes which will mature next March and April. These new notes will be sold by competitive bidding this week.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is circling the field like a Piper Cub with a broken wheel, pondering how best to approach for a safe landing. It must find a solution to its dilemma now before it gets dark or it runs out of gas.

There is no question that the high interest rates being offered by the Government has attracted billions of dollars out of the private savings institutions and enticed them into the Government machinery to pay for current domestic spending and the Vietnam war while putting the budget further into the red. This is where our mortgage financing has gone. The Federal Government is now the private lending institution's greatest competitor—the Federal Government has literally dried up the mortgage money by its actions.

The solution is to either increase Government revenue by increasing taxes or cut Government domestic spending. After the latest vote in the House to back our men in Vietnam with $13 billion in supplies by a vote of 389 to 3 there is little doubt that only a few Members of this House will support cuts in that area. Harold B. Dorsey said July 27, in an article in the Washington Post, that Government statistics show there was practically no increase in personal disposable income and no increase in spending by the people of the United States generally. This indicated, he said, a flattening in consumption while the index of industrial production shows an increase of at an annual rate of 8 percent. All of these figures are for April, May and June of this year.

This indicates, Mr. Speaker, that consumer spending is not at fault in the inflationary spiral and a tax increase would hurt all of our people. It also indicates that industrial inventories are expanding and some slowdown of plant expansion may be called for.

That leaves only a reduction in Government domestic spending. We all know that the President has pledged to carry the Great Society to new heights in this session of the Congress. Further, he is loath to raise taxes during the so-called "political season" as we approach the November congressional elections. It is absolutely clear that something must be done now to alleviate this situation, and the obvious answer is to tighten up hard on domestic spending. The President's obvious political determination to wait until after November and then increase taxes is not only wholly politically motivated, but it is the wrong answer.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse a number of proposals adopted by the House Banking and Currency Committee minority to help hold down inflation and ease the tight money crisis. These proposals include:

First. Slash nondefense, nonessential domestic spending—not tried, proved, and accepted programs such as the school lunch and milk programs, aid to impacted school districts and others the President has proposed reducing, but the new, untried, domestic programs that were proposed or instituted in haste.

Second. Temporary suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

Third. Temporary suspension of the 4½-percent Government bond ceiling rate to relieve congestion in the short-term market and to permit more orderly financing of the ever-increasing Federal debt.

Fourth. Reduce point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through administrative adjustments of the rates to more realistic levels. Five and six point discounts—$1,500 on $25,000 home mortgage—are stifling home financing and wiping out personal savings.

Fifth. Immediate suspension of any further issues of FNMA participation sales other than for VA and FHA pooled housing mortgages.

Sixth. Removal of FNMA's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchase of mortgages under its secondary market operations.

Seventh. Appeal to President Johnson to appoint an emergency Presidential Factfinding Committee on the home building crisis, to report its finding in sufficient time for congressional consideration prior to adjournment of the 89th Congress.

There are many people, knowledgeable and vocal, who could serve immediately on a factfinding committee and would need only a short time to report findings.

In conclusion, we must support this legislation in order to inject new mortgage money into our established lending institutions. It is they who can best restore the normal business climate for our home building industry. But, again we must continue to point to the culprit in this case—the Federal Government. We must relieve the Government's unfair competition with private financial institutions in the money market. Its killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK]. He has brought out the main important points, both pro and con, that it seems to me should be considered in connection with this legislation. Under the circumstances and in view of the crisis in the homebuilding industry, I feel it is imperative that we pass this bill now and get on with the job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such part of the remainder of the time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to announce that our esteemed and able colleague, Congressman WILLIAM A. BARRETT cannot be with us today because of the death of his brother. BILL BARRETT, as my colleagues all know, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency and there is no more dedicated or hard-working subcommittee chairman on Capitol Hill. The Subcommittee on Housing has done outstanding work in the field of housing legislation and Congressman BARRETT deserves full credit for all of our achievements in this field. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] expressed the deepest regrets that he could not be here to vote on the FNMA bill today but he did ask me to urge all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote overwhelmingly for the FNMA bill, which will bring vitally needed relief to the homebuilding and home financing industries.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3688, a bill to increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association from 10 to 15 times its capital assets and to permit FNMA to issue $110 million of preferred stock to the Treasury Department for purchase. This is a much-needed bill that will pump $3.6 billion into the mortgage market at a time when mortgage credit has all but dried up.

On August 9, I stated on the floor:

> Not only has the lack of mortgage money prevented new housing starts, but because of the building lag virtually every business has been or will be affected, since a slowdown in an industry as large as the homebuilding field drains vital funds from the economy.

S. 3688, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt by Congress to provide the mortgage market with a little lubrication to get it moving again. I hope that the House will be able to act on H.R. 14026, which will also be of great assistance in aiding the homeowner by eliminating the unfair competition for savings. S. 3688 is a good bill, and I urge its quick enactment.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1966, I introduced H.R. 15819, to provide that any dollar ceiling established by the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchases of mortgages in its secondary market operations shall not apply to mortgages covering property in Puerto Rico. I was prompted in this action by an extremely tight money situation in Puerto Rico which seriously threatens homebuilding in the island. I realize that a general tight-money market exists throughout most of the United States and that Puerto Rico is not facing the resultant difficulties alone. Nevertheless, I believe our position is worse in Puerto Rico because of higher costs, largely through shipping of raw materials, because of larger families requiring larger domiciles and because of other circumstances which have aggravated the situation locally.

The bill before us would very substantially increase the present statutory limitation on the borrowing authority of FNMA to purchase secondary housing mortgages. Undoubtedly, it would serve to justify a reversal of the corporation's adoption of a $15,000 purchasing limitation and put FNMA back in the market that it was intended to serve.

Under the present circumstances, FNMA is threatened with an inability to continue accepting mortgage offerings under secondary market operations.

Approval of the bill before us would put FNMA back in business and back in service to do the job it was intended to do. I feel that the adoption of this measure would make approval of my bill unnecessary. But let me address myself for a moment to a problem that we find in Puerto Rico and that we have been facing because of the imposition of the $15,000 mortgage purchase ceiling on FNMA's secondary market operations. The imposition of this ceiling is causing a distressing situation in Puerto Rico, one of the most active building areas under the FHA in the entire country. The heavy competition in all areas for investment money has driven interest rates to an all-time high. Because of the relatively low yields realized by investors from Government-insured FHA mortgages, these investors understandably have been turning to more lucrative loans with the result that there is a shortage of funds available for FHA housing mortgages.

To attract the necessary funds to complete Puerto Rico's extremely vital housing program and to keep it going forward with relation to need, the mortgages on the new homes must provide a competitive rate of return to investors.

The recent raising of FHA interest rate on housing mortgages from 5¼ to 5¾ percent is a recognition of this need. However, the bankers in Puerto Rico who bring the necessary investor funds to the island to finance the FHA mortgages are having extreme difficulty in attracting sufficient money to keep the housing programs going even at the 5¾-percent interest rate.

In an effort to do so, they must "discount" these mortgages in amounts up to $1,000 to $1,200 per house. Thus, the actual cost of a $15,000 house in Puerto Rico today must include that much as "cost-of-mortgage money."

Formerly, under "tight money" conditions, the housing industry has enjoyed the assurance that Fannie Mae would provide the "floor" for FHA-guaranteed mortgages by stepping into the market and buying up these mortgages—that is, investing in them—at reasonable discount prices, where the private sector did not provide sufficient funds or did so at unreasonably high costs.

Thus, FNMA was created to provide a backstop for the FHA programs. Historically, it has provided a stabilizing influence on the cost of housing related to the cost of money. But today, the $15,000 limitation on mortgages which Fannie Mae will finance is complicating a housing money shortage for Puerto Rico and threatens a disastrous reduction in new housing construction in the island, with the attendant serious threats to the island's social and economic well-being.

The average FHA mortgage in Puerto Rico today runs considerably over $16,000. With rapidly rising costs of labor, land and materials, the $15,000 purchase limitation has practically eliminated FNMA from its role of supporter of FHA programs in Puerto Rico.

This is a matter of particular concern to the housing market in Puerto Rico where approximately 90 percent of all new private residence construction is built under various sections of the FHA insurance programs.

In continental United States, the average utilization of FHA mortgage insurance programs is about 15 percent. The difference reflects the fact that most downpayment, long-term housing loans are vital to the solution of Puerto Rico's housing problem.

This is why the FNMA support role is intimately related to the economic and social climate of the Puerto Rican community. This support role must be reestablished if a serious housing crisis in Puerto Rico is to be avoided. I could not overstress the urgency of the situation.

The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency relative to H.R. 15639 points out that the administrative ruling of FNMA in establishing the $15,000 limitation ignores the wide differential in construction costs which exists between the different parts of the country; that it discriminates against larger families whose need for more bedrooms results in the purchase of a higher priced home. In this sense, the report seems to be addressing itself to circumstances in Puerto Rico, although I know that the problem is widespread throughout other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a duty to approve this legislation. It is our duty to do so because we have a responsibility to the people we represent. We have this duty in order to prevent far-reaching unhappiness and hardship to families striving to purchase adequate housing to fill their needs.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as one who spent 13 years in the building industry, I would like to add my voice to those supporting the passage of this very important bill.

H.R. 15639 would increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association from 10 to 15 times the sum of its capital surplus, general surplus, reserves and undistributed earnings. This would effect a 50-percent increase in the borrowing authority under the secondary market operations and provide approximately $2 billion of additional borrowing authority.

As we all know, this is a period of tight money for the construction and homebuilding industries. It is this kind of situation for which the Federal National Mortgage Association was established. But, when the FNMA finds it necessary to place a $15,000 purchasing limitation, a 4-month mortgage submission requirement, and exercise greater selectivity on individual mortgages, the FNMA is not doing the job it was designed to do because it cannot.

In this period of general prosperity, when many people can afford to buy larger and more expensive homes, they find that any mortgage with an original principal amount of $15,000 or higher is ineligible for purchase by the FNMA. This not only discriminates against larger families but completely ignores the wide differential costs which exist between different parts of the country.

The members of the Banking and Currency Committee have realized the need for a general loosening of mortgage money.

I cannot accept, however, the minority opinion which would have the U.S. Treasury purchase $100 million worth of preferred stock of the FNMA. The Bureau of the Budget believes, and I concur, that this would place a strain on the present budget. In a period of large Government spending for the war in Vietnam and on other programs, why, when the private sector of the economy is capable, should we call upon the Government to handle this problem of shortage of mortgage money?

H.R. 15639, without spending additional Government funds, accomplishes the purpose of expanding the amount of funds available to the building industry.

With sound management there is no reason to believe that an increase of 50 percent in the ratio would have any effect on the credit status of the FNMA.

Prior to recapitalization in 1954, the FNMA's ratio was as high as 40 to 1. True, this was a period when FNMA was financed entirely from U.S. Treasury funds, but as I said before, with sound management, there is no reason to expect that this 50-percent increase will injure the credit standing of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

A second question raised by the minority is that this increase might open the door to future increases. The FNMA was established to provide assistance in time of financial need. If there is a shortage of mortgage money, which few if any would disagree, should we not use the instruments of expansion at our disposal—immediately and effectively? And, if, at some future date, it is found that this expansion was not enough, then will be the time to discuss the steps for further expansion.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for bringing to the floor this much-needed legislation to assure ample mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction.

Reports from Oklahoma strongly confirm the need for this action to enlarge the Federal National Mortgage Association's ability to strengthen the housing mortgage market.

Without the increase in borrowing authority granted FNMA by this bill, our FHA and VA home loan programs will have little meaning for thousands of veterans all over the country. Additional thousands in the construction industry urgently need this legislation.

I hope and trust the bill will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, an unhappy coincidence of events arising out of the airline strike, the diversion of a flight which would have brought me to Washington in time for the beginning of this day's work, and a serious accident on the freeway holding up traffic between here and National Airport, all conspired to prevent my recording my support of H.R. 15639.

I must acknowledge that this bill constitutes only symptomatic relief for a hard-pressed building industry, and that basic changes in Government policy are going to be necessary before the overstimulation of our economy can be corrected. We are now reaping the sorry harvest of inadequate fiscal measures, and the available supplies of credit have simply become insufficient to provide any stability to the natural processes by which our interest rates are normally set.

Americans want to buy homes in increasing numbers, but without adequate credit sources to meet our residential needs, home construction has been driven into unnatural recession. Pumping more money into FNMA will provide short-term relief, but in the long run we must be willing to make the hard choices necessary if we are to meet our long-term responsibilities to the American people.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to suspend the rules and pass with an amendment S. 3688, which would enlarge FNMA's borrowing authority by almost $4 billion.

This bill is needed very badly because of the current conditions in the mortgage market. Housing starts are off to an alarming degree, and the homebuilding industry and the home buying public are being deprived of funds because of the tremendous diversion of mortgage money into competing markets. The bill before us today will aid materially in remedying this condition. It is sincerely to be hoped that the enactment of this bill will help return our Nation's housing facilities to a normal level of activity.

Mr. Speaker, FNMA has a long history of providing supplemental assistance to the secondary mortgage market. It has helped to make acceptable as investments, first, the FHA mortgage and, secondly, the GI mortgage. FNMA proved to investors that these mortgages were good investments, and they are now generally regarded very highly.

In addition to this, FNMA has operated since 1954 its secondary market operations, buying mortgages when mortgage money was tight, selling them when money was more plentiful. In this fashion, this corporation has been a great stabilizing influence in the mortgage market, and has helped to level out the peaks and valleys of the market. But today, Mr. Speaker, the market is so tight that FNMA needs our help to allow it access to additional funds.

There is some reason to believe that this enactment will allow FNMA to remove, or at least to increase, the $15,000 per-dwelling-unit limitation it has administratively imposed on purchases in the secondary market operations. FNMA was forced to impose this limitation to keep itself from running out of the money with which it buys mortgages, and the granting to FNMA of this additional borrowing authority and additional capitalization should remove, at least in part, the problem which forced it to impose this limitation.

Mr. Speaker, the other body passed this bill by a vote of 83 to 0, and I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives can make as good a showing of support for this much-needed legislation.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 15639 with reservations.

No Member of this House is more aware than the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, that action must be taken immediately to salvage the mortgage market and restore the opportunity for home ownership for millions of Americans. This bill to increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and thereby extend the funds for its secondary market operations, will provide a modicum of relief for homebuilders and lumbermen who are suffering from the tight money situation. H.R. 15639 is one step in a broad range of monetary and fiscal policies which must be adopted if we are to restore balance in the money markets, cool off an overheated economy, and remedy a segmented recession in the housing and lumber industries.

Regrettably, H.R. 15639 provides little more than a stopgap remedy. Fannie Mae can only deal in FHA and VA mortgages—and in today's high-interest housing market, sellers are increasingly avoiding these Government-backed mortgages with their fixed interest costs and discount points. In addition, some of the private investment which is freed by additional Fannie Mae purchases may turn instead to the lucrative interest rates being offered in other sectors of the financial world.

More seriously, the authorization of H.R. 15639 will permit Fannie Mae to offer to the public notes and debentures which will further the inflationary pressure. Because of market conditions, $300 million in 2-year debentures offered by the association on August 10 under its present borrowing program went at an outrageous 5.91 percent interest. If the estimated $2.2 billion authorized by the new legislation is offered at similar rates, Fannie Mae will be paying an interest cost to its lenders of about $130 million.

We cannot deny immediate relief to a segment of our economy which has borne the brunt of the interest rate escalation. But, at the same time, we must fully consider a broad range of fiscal and monetary actions which will go to the heart of the problem.

On July 28, I introduced a tax package—H.R. 16642 and 16643—designed to slow down the overheated economy. The first bill would suspend for 1 year the investment tax credit, assess a temporary 4-percent defense emergency tax on corporate income, and levy a 5-percent surcharge on corporate income above a 1962–65 average. The second bill gives to the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls.

These fiscal restraints would affect a corporate economy which is realizing record profits as a result of the Vietnam spending. At the same time, corporate demand for funds to expand plants and equipment continues to drive interest rates in the short-term money markets to dizzying heights. Corporate overexpansion threatens to intensify the inflationary pressure.

While the corporate economy waxes fat off the war effort and drives up the interest costs in an already tight market, consumers continue to buy on the cuff at a record rate although personal disposable income is declining. All of these indicators should alarm the Congress as well as the Nation's economists.

In a letter received last Monday from the city manager of Albany, Oreg., I was alarmed to learn of the continued slump in residential housing. The situation in this prosperous city in the heart of the Willamette Valley is, unfortunately, representative of evidence I have received from all over the State of Oregon and the Nation. Value of new building permits issued dropped from $487,479 in July of 1965 to $71,401 for July 1966. Where permits for 21 houses were issued in Albany last July, only two were issued this July. When one considers that many building permits are not realized as homes built, it is painfully obvious that home building in Albany is at an absolute standstill.

How did the situation in Albany—and similar crises in thousands of cities and towns throughout the Nation—arise? Last December, the Federal Reserve Board announced two changes. The discount rate to member banks of the Federal Reserve System was raised to 4½ percent. As the experience of the fifties has shown, this was an immediate signal for interest rate hikes in all sectors of the financial community. The second action permitted a 5½-percent interest rate on bank-issued certificates of deposit. This incited a fierce competition for funds between commercial banks and the thrift institutions which traditionally provide the money for homebuilding and home financing.

The result has been a continuous escalation in interest rates on loans for home construction and mortgage costs. The national average rate on new-home conventional mortgages has zoomed to 6.07 percent—the highest rate in 40 years. The average rate for loans for purchase of existing homes is currently 6.18 percent and rising. On the west coast, it is not uncommon to hear rates of 7½ percent being quoted for conventional mortgages. Because of statutory limitations on interest costs, VA- and FHA-backed mortgages are being discounted 6 and 8 points. Downpayments of one-fourth and one-third the total purchase price are being asked even on expensive homes. As a specific example, in my district a new home backed by a $15,000 FHA mortgage costs $1,750 more today than it did last December.

Not only are interest costs unattractive to home builders and buyers, and discount rates eating into the equity of home sellers, but money market conditions continue to cause investors to withdraw funds from the thrift institutions. In July, a dividend month, an estimated $1.1 billion flowed out of the savings and loan associations which provide 44 percent of home financing in this country. Savings banks experienced a 60-percent drop in deposits for the first 3 months of 1966 compared with the same period in 1965.

In light of this critical situation, we must approve the bill before us today. By increasing the borrowing authority for the secondary market operations of Fannie Mae from 10 to 15 times its capitalization, we are providing this agency with an opportunity to raise an estimated $2.2 billion in funds. With this money, Fannie Mae can expand its purchase of FHA and VA mortgages in the marketplace, freeing private money for further mortgage lending.

If the Congress adopts my tax package, the Federal Reserve Board will have no conceivable justification for continuing their high interest rate policies. Fiscal action by the Congress must be accompanied by the Federal Reserve responding with the monetary controls at their disposal—an immediate rollback in the discount rate, use of the Open Market Committee to purchase securities, and an increase in the reserve requirements for member banks. Only then will we have a real hope for a return to normalcy in the home mortgage market.

The provisions of the bill before us today, and those of related legislation recently reported from the Banking and Currency Committee, H.R. 14026, will certainly contribute to a solution of the problems of the housing market, and, of course, ease the recession in the homebuilding and lumber industries. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that these measures by themselves are inadequate to restore the unprecedented prosperity of the sixties for all segments of our economy. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to adopt H.R. 15639 today, and to consider at the earliest opportunity the tax package I have discussed above.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3688 as amended, to amend the National Housing Act to allow the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—to increase its capital and to expand its secondary market operations. This bill is designed to improve business conditions in the construction and real estate industries, and to ease credit restrictions to prospective homeowners.

The FNMA provides an important service in the home buying process by purchasing mortgages from lenders, thus freeing loan funds to be used in behalf of other buyers. An April decision by FNMA placing a $15,000 limitation on the unpaid principal balance of a mortgage has caused severe problems in my district where the average FHA mortgage is $22,500. The new ceiling has put the benefits of the FNMA operation out of the reach of my constituents. It is my understanding that by increasing FNMA's borrowing authority from 10 to 15 times the sum of its Treasury stock, this bill will permit the ceiling to be raised.

The higher interest rates produced by intensified competition in the money market has resulted in a drain of funds from those institutions which support credit for homebuilding and home purchases. Its effect on home construction and real estate sales has been disastrous.

The bill has the support of builders and realtors. It will benefit the homeowner and the home purchaser. I strongly urge my colleagues to support S. 3688.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to give my support to H.R. 15639, a bill to increase the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations. In the past 6 months the residential construction industry has suffered a severe recession in many parts of the country. This can and should be avoided. Many people cherish homeownership, and the present shortage of mortgage money has destroyed—for the time being—this dream for many people.

The Federal National Mortgage Association was established to stabilize the home mortgage market. During periods of tight money Fannie Mae, as the FNMA is often called, buys mortgages on a secondary market to assist the homebuilding and mortgage industries, and during periods of relative monetary ease Fannie Mae provides a ready source of investment for long-term institutional investors by selling its holdings on the secondary market. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing tight money. And although most users of investment funds are feeling the credit squeeze, none is feeling it more than the common man who wishes to buy or sell a house. Interest rates for home mortgages have climbed to the highest level in my memory. But not only have interest rates increased, but often the funds are not available at any price. The fact is, in a nation needing more housing, the number of housing starts has shown a significant decline over the past 6 months. In December 1965 there was an annual rate of 1.7 million housing starts but in May of this year, the last month available, there were but 1.3 million starts on an annual rate. This means unemployment for many of the people employed in residential construction. We speak of an antipoverty program, but people cannot be self-sufficient if the jobs do not exist.

If passed, H.R. 15639 will increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association by several billion dollars. If this bill does not become law, the FNMA's ability under its secondary market operations to continue maintaining the current level of liquidity for home mortgages will decline to such an extent that unless market conditions improve significantly or additional funds can be made available, it will have to discontinue accepting mortgage offerings under its secondary market operations before the end of the current building season.

To insure adequate employment in the construction industry and funds in the home mortgage market so that people may buy and sell their homes, I urge immediate passage of this bill, H.R. 15639, which I cosponsored by H.R. 15975. It is imperative that we improve the atmosphere for residential construction.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15639. Although our economy is presently healthy and booming and employment figures are generally high, there is a soft spot in the homebuilding industry. Housing starts continue their downward trend. We know that this situation is due to the lack of availability of funds for the mortgage market. The effect of this situation is now being felt in other industries which, to a great extent, are dependent upon the homebuilding industry because they supply the goods and materials for homebuilding.

The shortage of mortgage funds is most keenly felt in the Government-insured FHA and VA mortgage programs because their rate of interest is less than the commercial mortgage rate. There are reports that sellers of homes are paying upward of 10 points—that is, 10 percent of the face amount of an FHA or VA mortgage—so that they can sell their houses. In many cases this virtually destroys the seller's equity in his home. Needless to say, this discourages sales.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should help to alleviate this condition by giving the Federal National Mortgage Association much-needed funds for its secondary mortgage operations. It is hoped that this bill, when signed into law, will also allow FNMA to remove the administratively imposed $15,000 limitation on the mortgages it will purchase through its secondary market operations. This ruling has resulted in discrimination against large families who need larger homes and fails to recognize the wide differential in construction costs which exists between different parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and urge that the Banking and Currency Committee, which I know has been studying the plight of this segment of our economy, will soon submit to the House for consideration legislation designed to relieve the serious decline in funds available to the mortgage market from the savings and loan associations throughout the country. We know that this problem, too, results from the higher earning power of the dollar available in other sections of the money market.

The measure we are now considering will help to make more funds available to the homebuilding industry and the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee are to be commended for bringing this bill up for action. I plan to support it because it is urgently needed to help solve a serious problem.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15639, which would amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations.

The measure now on the floor would increase by about $2 billion the present statutory limits on the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow money to be used to purchase housing mortgages which may be offered to the Association under its secondary market operations. This will be accomplished by authorizing FNMA to issue obligations in an amount not to exceed 15 times—rather than the present 10 times—the sum of its capital surplus, general surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings.

A noteworthy fact in today's tightened mortgage market is that the corporation, to a substantial degree, has bridged the widening gap between the dwindling supply of available mortgage funds, on the one hand, and the increasing demand for such funds, on the other. It is not surprising, therefore, that FNMA has had to adopt some strong measures to curtail this demand while trying to continue providing the degree of service for which it was intended and which the building and financing industries expect it to render. Examples of the restrictive actions taken by FNMA include the imposition of a 4-month mortgage submission requirement, adoption of a $15,000 purchasing limitation, and greater degree of selectivity on an individual case basis. These actions have had the effect of taking FNMA out of significant areas of the market it was created to serve.

Despite these restrictive actions, FNMA's ability under its secondary market operations to continue maintaining the current level of liquidity for home mortgages is declining to such an extent that, unless either market conditions improve significantly or additional funds can be made available, it will have to discontinue accepting mortgage offerings under its secondary market operations before the end of the current building season.

It appears very unlikely that market conditions will improve significantly in the months ahead. As a matter of fact, because of the scarcity of mortgage funds, housing starts have undergone a steady decline, from an annual rate of 1.7 million in December of 1965 to a rate of 1.3 million in May of this year.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to provide the assurance of continued FNMA participation as an important supplemental factor in the secondary mortgage market. This would help to arrest the decline in housing starts. And this assurance can be provided by the prompt enactment of this bill, which would effect a 50-percent increase in the borrowing authority under the secondary market operations by increasing the ratio from the present 10 to a new 15 times the total of the corporation's capital and surplus. The $2 billion of additional borrowing authority that this would provide would enable FNMA to remain in the market for some time to come and accomplish its purpose without in any way affecting the soundness of its operations.

While I support the legislation that is on the floor wholeheartedly, I nevertheless view with considerable concern the arbitrary limit of $15,000 which FNMA has administratively imposed on eligible mortgages. This ruling completely ignores the wide differential in construction costs which exists between different parts of the country. In Hawaii, this limitation has worked undue hardship on prospective homeowners who are being penalized for choosing the Aloha State, where building costs are high, as a domicile. I would strongly urge the Board of FNMA, therefore, to reexamine this ruling and either completely eliminate it or at least modify it to take into account geographical cost differentials.

I urge a favorable vote for H.R. 15639.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government seeks through this measure to alleviate the short supply of credit available for home mortgages.

To the extent that this encourages new housing starts, it might be considered inflationary. On the other hand, the general scarcity of credit has left the home construction industry high and dry.

This is a graphic illustration of the unworkability of tight money as a restraint on inflationary pressures. To attempt to take some of the pressure out of the general economy through a restriction on credit is like trying to slow down a car by hitting it with a bulldozer.

Congress must accept its responsibility to provide the President with powers in the fiscal area adequate to meet the challenge created by the Vietnam war.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this bill will make a significant contribution to the temporary solution of one of the most harmful effects of the present tight money, high interest rate policies of the administration, and I urge our colleagues to accept the compromise measure now before us.

The housing industry, perhaps more than any other major sector of the economy, has suffered from policies which have drastically reduced the availability of mortgage funds. Families seeking new homes often cannot find mortgage credit at prices they can afford. The homebuilders are being forced to cut back production by one-third. Sales of existing real estate are greatly reduced. And savings institutions which specialize in mortgage finance are cutting their commitments by approximately 50 percent.

Buyers, builders, and financiers of private housing are, therefore, being asked to carry a far heavier share of the burden of capital shortages and high interest rates than is their due. Relief is badly needed, and this legislation is designed to provide that relief.

It will do so by assuring that the Federal National Mortgage Association will continue to participate in the secondary mortgage market. Because of the shortage of mortgage funds, FNMA's mortgage purchasing activities were first stepped up to recordbreaking levels and now have had to be seriously curtailed. The present bill, by providing $4.5 billion of direct and indirect new mortgage purchase authority to FNMA, will permit that agency to ease its restrictions and resume its function as a source of the liquidity and stability the housing industry and its attendant financial institutions so badly need.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not forgo the opportunity to express myself in favor of the urgent necessity of H.R. 15639.

It is my guess there has been hardly a Member of this House who has made a recent visit to his home district that has not been surrounded by builders who have besieged their own Member of Congress with inquiries as to when there would be some relief in sight, to reduce the scarcity of mortgage funds.

Statistics show that housing starts have undergone a significant decline from $1.7 million in December 1965 to a rate of $1.3 million in May 1966. Because of the very tight money situation the actual starts for 1966 may be only $1.3 million or less which would mean that this is a reduction from $1.5 million for 1965.

If this sort of trend were to go on, the Department of Commerce believes the declines in starts would be even greater in 1967 and thus fall to their lowest point in several years. The time to stop such a trend is right now. The Federal National Mortgage Association has carried on the best it could during the tight period of the late summer and fall of 1965 and on into 1966. However, the FNMA had no choice but to take some steps to hold down the demand. Accordingly they engaged in greater selectivity on an individual case basis and imposed a 4-month submission requirement as well as a $15,000 purchasing limitation.

The action proposed today to pump more than $3.75 billion into the money-hungry home-financing market should be passed very quickly in the hope that the already-passed Senate version of this bill will be accepted by the other body. The process by which the statutory limits on the authority of FNMA to borrow money would be increased from a present 10 to a new 15 times the total of the corporation's capital and surplus is sorely needed. The really important objective to be accomplished by FNMA buying up existing mortgages is of course to release funds for new mortgages and thereby to permit new housing starts.

The ruling earlier this year which made any mortgage with an original principal amount of $15,000 or higher ineligible for purchase by FNMA was certainly ill advised and unwise. It altogether fails to take into account the widely varying construction costs between different parts of our country. As a matter of fact, it militates against larger families who need more bedrooms than a young couple without children. FNMA should look again at its ruling and either withdraw it or make such modifications as will comply with geographical cost differences as well as the requirements of larger families.

Home construction is a most important part of our economy. Good housing is essential to the American way of life. Because of possible adverse effects on our national economy of fewer housing starts and also because of the ever-present and increasing needs for housing, the homebuilding industry should be given help in its present plight. The procedures set up by H.R. 15639 provide some relief out of the present money situation and should receive unanimous support of every Member of the House.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, new industry coming into my congressional district and the expansion of old industry has created a critical housing shortage. My people now have unprecedented job opportunity, but cannot find the means to build new homes because of the tight money market. My people cannot commute for long distances to their places of employment. They must have homes or rental housing in the immediate vicinity of their employment to properly take care of their families and render the best service on the job.

This is a serious problem in my congressional district today. I urge that this bill be passed by an overwhelming majority. It is urgent that the people of our country have the opportunity to own a home and pay for it at a fair and just interest rate.

Our homebuilders and home buyers are faced with an almost impossible situation today during this current tight-money economy. The critical shortage of mortgage capital for home financing has made it almost impossible of late for many families to buy needed housing. Homebuilders have had to drastically reduce their production. Real estate transfers have been curtailed. Savings institutions specializing in mortgage financing have been severely affected by the lack of mortgage capital.

By increasing the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—and, in effect, pumping more money into the mortgage market, this bill will ease somewhat the money squeeze that has brought the current recession in the housing industry and in related industries.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make available several billion dollars at low interest rates which will encourage our builders and loan associations and lending institutions to alleviate the housing and rental shortage. It is urgent that we pass this bill today.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of accomplishment that I participate today in our discussion of a proposal to relieve the dangerously tight home-mortgage market. It was only a short time ago that this urgent situation was brought to the attention of this body. Our action today will demonstrate the responsiveness of Congress to urgent requests for help from important segments of our economy.

As the sponsor of H.R. 16587, a bill to broaden the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, I am convinced that we cannot sit idly by while prosperity in most segments of the economy chokes off the growth and the stability of our vital homebuilding industry. In an era when we are planning for the ordered growth of our cities and suburbs, and working to provide all Americans with adequate and pleasant living surroundings, the housing industry becomes an even more crucial part of our economy.

The bill now before us wisely confines the loosening of credit to home financing—where the very life of an essential industry is dependent on this action.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to share with my colleagues excerpts from some of the correspondence I have received on this issue, which will demonstrate the importance of our affirmative action on this proposal today:

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS,
Fairport, N.Y., August 11, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK HORTON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: I have received your proposed legislation as stated in HR–16587 and feel that this would definitely be beneficial to the home building industry. I have had many inquiries from private developers as to my analysis of solutions to their financial problems in the obtaining of guaranteed mortgage money for the development of realty subdivisions.

I believe that the passage of this bill, coupled with the relaxation of some of the existing federal requirements regarding savings and loan institutions, would be a great step in revitalizing the home building industry.

With kindest regards,

JOHN C. FULLER.

WARREN COBB REALTORS,
Rochester, N.Y., August 12, 1966.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Thank you for your letter together with copy of the news release announcing your introduction of bill (H.R. 16587) to increase mortgage funds, through the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Certainly anything that presently might be done to ease the tight money situation will aid both the home owner and building, resulting in a more stable economy.

Sincerely,

WARREN COBB, *Realtor.*

RALPH KLONICK SONS, INC.,
Rochester, N.Y., August 12, 1966.

Rep. FRANK HORTON,
36th District of New York, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Your letter relative to H.R. 16587 received and noted. It is indeed a pleasure for you to have taken note of the tight money situation that has prevailed these past few months on our behalf.

I am pleased to give you my full support in your quest to relieve this pressing condition. In this regard, I believe it is also important to realize that those whose homes have been appropriated for urban renewal and for the highway program are most unfortunate. They have difficulty getting mortgages and must usually pay higher interest in order to replace their homes.

I do considerable appraisal work for the State of New York, and I find that the older residents of Dutchtown (Western Expressway) are perhaps the most affected people by the tight money market.

Anything you can do to aid the people in respect to home mortgages will certainly be appreciated by Realtors everywhere and myself.

Yours very truly,
RALPH KLONICK SONS, INC.,
ALLAN S. KLONICK, *President.*

AMELIA NUGENT, REALTOR,
Rochester, N.Y., August 12, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK HORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HORTON: Thank you for your letter regarding a bill to release mortgage money. Your quick action in this matter is highly commendable.

I fail to see how a Great Society can allow a limited mortgage market, because this kind of market essentially hurts the very people that the Great Society is interested in.

A friend of mine and I recently bought a little house, which we are hoping to sell to a poor but deserving family. They will do some painting and make repairs to work up their down payment. As it stands now we will be stymied on getting mortgage money for them, but your news release spells out some hope.

Homeownership should be one of the strongest of Great Society's ideas, for from this can come all the other good attitudes which we look for in our citizens. When people are homeowners, they think twice before they throw rocks at someone else's windows. They take care of their property because it is theirs, and in turn gain a respect for other people's property. If we could inspire poor people with homeownership, they would be more inclined to find good jobs, because they would have something to work for. They would also watch their credit, because it would be purposeful to do so.

So much that the Great Society is striving for is spelled out in homeownership, but of course to get homes for those in the lower brackets, we must have a good mortgage market.

Thank you for your interest in the problem. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

AMELIA NUGENT.

NATIONAL GYPSUM CO.,
Buffalo, N.Y., July 26, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK HORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: The recent trend in availability of money for home mortgages is very alarming. The siphoning off of the money usually available for home mortgages into the commercial field is making it increasingly difficult for homeowners to purchase homes. We can appreciate the desire and need for the government to curtail inflationary activities but it would seem that the current monetary policies of the government and the Federal Reserve Board are making money available for the short-term purchases rather than the long-term purchases such as housing.

Therefore the money being used for credit which tends to be inflationary as differentiated from money used for housing mortgages which is far more stable and long-term in character and less inflationary.

In addition to the lack of availability of money for mortgages, the current practices of qualification of buyers makes it increasingly difficult for people to purchase homes particularly those in the low and middle income brackets, due to lack of mortgage money.

It would seem therefore that the current policies of the government are seriously injuring a basic industry at a time when all other industries appear to be running away in an inflationary trend.

We hear daily of builders going broke and withdrawing from the business of building houses because of their inability to finance the sale of the finished homes. In addition, there is a serious problem of obtaining the interim financing necessary for builders to continue their programs and a lack of money available for land development, which must precede by several years the actual construction of homes.

Government statistics do not reveal the sharp declines which are actually taking place in the market due to the lag of tabulation of information. It is apparent to us that this decline is proceeding at an extremely rapid rate.

With the decline in residential building, it will mean that the labor forces normally devoted to this, will be put out of work and will seek employment in other industries; thus losing to the home-building industry a substantial amount of talent which will be difficult to regain, especially in view of the present labor shortage in the construction industry.

It is our belief that only prompt action on the part of Congress to alleviate the shortage of money for home mortgages and for home construction industry can prevent a chaotic result in the home-building industry. We are hopeful that the Banking and Currency Committees will interest themselves in this subject.

Your cooperation and support of any activities to improve this situation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

A. H. Fay.

Van Slooten Real Estate,
August 11, 1966.

Congressman Frank Horton
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Horton: I am an independent associate real estate broker with Van Slooten Real Estate, Rochester, New York. On the night of August 10, 1966, I was asked to attend a meeting held by the Monroe County Real Estate Board to sign a letter in support of your bill to channel more funds from "Fannie Mae" into the mortgage market thus making more funds available to help alleviate the "tight money" situation. I wholeheartedly support this bill.

If it is possible may I be sent a copy of your bill.

Yours very truly,

Sam J. Piazza,
Van Slooten Real Estate, Sales Manager.

Mr. Speaker, as you will note, from the selection of occupations represented in these letters: Realtors, builders, builders' suppliers, and construction consultants—there is a wide segment of our society which has been adversely affected by the present condition of home mortgage credit. I am pleased to report that in addition to these and many other letters from individuals, I have received a letter endorsing my bill from the Monroe County Real Estate Board, Inc., Homer W. Burbank, president.

Earlier this summer, in fact on the day I introduced H.R. 16587, I met with representatives of the Rochester Home Builders Association, including Mr. Anthony Comparato, president. My discussions with Mr. Comparato and other builders, and with people in every segment of this industry, have confirmed for me the urgency of enacting this legislation.

I know that my colleagues are equally aware of the need for this legislation, and of the benefits that it will bring for the individual home buyer and homebuilder. With all of these citizens in mind, as well as the health of our national economy, I urge prompt passage of this bill.

Mr. **LOVE**. Mr. Speaker, I support the FNMA bill—H.R. 15639—to stimulate flow of mortgage credit for the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration.

One example of the tight money situation in this country is reported in the August Journal of Homebuilding. According to this publication, June housing "starts" at the seasonally adjusted annual level of 1,288,000 units, were at the lowest rate in 6 years. Not since the 1960 recession has the June rate been this low.

The June decline in building permits indicates that the worst is yet to come. The full impact will be felt in the months ahead when "starts" are likely to fall off still more.

This recession in the construction industry is also affecting the construction trades in which employment layoffs are rising abnormally.

Several weeks ago, a large group of builders representing the Dayton, Ohio, area called on me to discuss the seriousness of the problem. Since their visit, the executive director of the group has reported the announcement that Dayton's largest savings and loan firm has no construction money for market or speculative homes. Construction money will be available only to those builders who agree to place the permanent loan with this firm. They are also requiring a one-third downpayment on all home loans. It is expected that the other savings and loan firms in Dayton will follow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the corrective measures in H.R. 15639 and to give careful consideration to any bill which will ease the Nation's tight money problems.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I wish—as I know all other Members of the House will wish—to express sympathy to our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] on the death of his brother. I know of Congressman Barrett's great interest in this particular proposal, and I know that he would have been here barring any kind of eventuality such as that which has been reported to us.

We certainly hope that he will be back soon.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3688, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 314, nays 1, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—314

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Gross
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly

Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Macdonald

NOT VOTING—117

Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hardy
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Landrum
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDowell
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pickle
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sweeney
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Collier.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Howard.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Cohelan wih Mr. McMillan.
Mr. O'Brien wih Mr. Craley.
Mr. Moorhead with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Gallagher.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Baring.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Stalbaum.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Grider with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Huot with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Todd with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, a similar House bill and House Resolution 950, making the House bill in order, are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the bill, S. 3688, and that the House request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, MULTER, and BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, FINO, and Mrs. DWYER.

COLLECTION, COMPILATION, CRITICAL EVALUATION, PUBLICATION, AND SALE OF STANDARD REFERENCE DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16897) to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares that reliable standardized scientific and technical reference data are of vital importance to the progress of the Nation's science and technology. It is therefore the policy of the Congress to make critically evaluated reference data readily available to scientists, engineers, and the general public. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen and enhance this policy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "standard reference data" means quantitative information, related to a measurable physical or chemical property of a substance or system of substances of known composition and structure, which is critically evaluated as to its reliability under section 3 of this Act.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized and directed to provide or arrange for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and dissemination of standard reference data. In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the reference data services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and of State and local governments, persons, firms, institutions, and associations, with their consent and in such a manner as to avoid duplication of those services and facilities. All agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government are encouraged to exercise their duties and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the purpose of this Act. This section shall be deemed complementary to existing authority, and nothing herein is intended to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. To provide for more effective integration and coordination of standard reference data activities, the Secretary, in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register such standards, criteria, and procedures for the preparation and publication of standard reference data as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. Standard reference data conforming to standards established by the Secretary may be made available and sold by the Secretary or by a person or agency designated by him. To the extent practicable and appropriate, the prices established for such data may reflect the cost of collection, compilation, evaluation, publication, and dissemination of the data, including administrative expenses; and the amounts received shall be subject to the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271–278e).

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary may secure copyright and renewals thereof on behalf of the United States as author or proprietor in all or any part of any standard reference data which he prepares or makes available under this Act, and may authorize the reproduction and publication thereof by others.

(b) The publication or republication by the Government under this Act, either separately or in a public document, of any material in which copyright is subsisting shall not be taken to cause any abridgment or annulment of the copyright or to authorize any use or appropriation of such material without the consent of the copyright proprietor.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be needed for the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Standard Reference Data Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16897 will provide the legislative framework for establishing a comprehensive standard reference data system within the Department of Commerce to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards.

In essence, this program will deal with one aspect of the broad science information problem by producing and disseminating compilations of critically evaluated quantitative data on the physical and chemical properties of materials. It will show how these materials and compounds react to various stresses and strains, temperature changes, wear, and also how they react when combined with other materials. This type of information is urgently needed not only for the efficient conduct of our national research and development effort, but it is required in the commercial sector of the Nation's economy as well.

The preparation of this work, Mr. Speaker, is similar to work that the National Bureau of Standards has been doing since 1963. The difference under this bill, however, is that it will represent the first effort in over 35 years to make a comprehensive analysis on what has been done and to compile and disseminate this information in a form that scientists and engineers can trust and find useful.

In the late twenties, the National Academy of Sciences with the cooperation and support of professional and scientific organizations and American industry published the International Critical Tables. This represented the largest single compilation of critically evaluated standard reference data in the history of science up to that time. However, those tables are now obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, along with the tremendous advance in science and technology since World War II, the Academy has considered revising the International Critical Tables. But, in 1955, they concluded that they could not possibly do so because the effort would be 100 to 200 times greater than that which took place when the International Tables were compiled back 25 or 30 years ago.

We have thus reached the point where it is necessary for the Bureau to help get the job done. It should be pointed out, however, that the data compilation activities of the Bureau will not be duplicated nor will they conflict with other private or Federal activities.

The Bureau of Standards has pending before Congress a budget request of $2.23 million for standard reference data activities in fiscal 1967. Under the increased scope of activities envisioned in H.R. 16897, the Bureau estimates that it will require an annual increase of about $3 million per year, reaching an ultimate level of about $18 million after 5 years. They estimate that the majority of this money, about $14 million, will be required for data compilation activities, about 75 percent of which will be spent outside the Bureau in our Nation's institutes, including universities, of course, and our industrial laboratories.

The remainder, about $4 million, will be required for the Information Services Operation and for salaries and overhead associated with the Office of Standard Reference Data.

H.R. 16897 authorizes the sale of standard reference data at prices which may reflect the cost of collection, compilation, evaluation, publication, and dissemination of the data. Since about 50 percent of this data is expected to be sold outside the United States, this method of partial cost recovery lessens the burden that will be borne by the American taxpayers, while at the same time it enables the Bureau to provide to special users the data which it might otherwise be unable to provide.

Overall, the Bureau expects to recover about 20 to 25 percent of the moneys to be expended.

Since standard reference data deals with the basic physical and chemical properties of materials and their interactions, the data is fundamental to scientific and engineering efforts throughout the world. If a compound or material reacts a certain way here in the United States, it will react in the same way in other areas of the world. In order to protect the American investment in this effort, it became evident to the committee that the data had to be subject to copyright in order to protect it from foreign republication.

In addition, the copyright laws provide a method of protecting the integrity of the document within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to assess what the exact monetary return will be from this program.

It has been estimated that the present lack of this comprehensive information, however, costs the Nation hundreds of millions of dollars a year in duplicated work, wasted effort, equipment failure, and the overdesigning of equipment.

The estimate is that there will be savings of from $10 to $200 for each dollar invested in the program. However this may be, since it is an estimate, I am confident it will be substantial and that the program should go forward.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, the cost of this bill is estimated to be a minimum of $18 million a year in perpetuity after a 5-year period?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this measure have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes. We have a letter from the Commerce Department citing approval of the Budget Bureau. It is printed in the report. I think it is important, too, to call attention to the fact that this is an administration measure. We have ironed out some of the difficulties that existed within certain of the agencies.

An important cost factor of this bill is that there may be reimbursement in part for the materials as compiled and evaluated, and there will be some $5 or $6 million which will be returned to the Bureau of Standards and which will be put to use within the general fund capability of that agency; so that in fact this will cost something over $18 million. That estimate is above such reimbursement.

Mr. GROSS. So that we can count on a minimum cost of $18 million a year plus whatever return there may be; is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct. I would like to say, too, as I mentioned earlier, the estimated savings for every one of those dollars in that $18 million is from $10 to $200. So the return would be enormous.

Mr. GROSS. That is hardly a savings to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is a saving to the general activities of the country—public and private. There is no question but that the information as compiled is necessary in view of the gap which exists today; we are wasting money in many ways because we do not have this information. It must, in fact, be put together in this way. Most of the existing data, to which I referred, have become obsolete.

The best that we can do, in the next 2 to 5 years, will be obsolete. The effort is a big one, but one that is necessary in the scientific age in which we live.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, that will be the day when a bill is enacted that will result in substantial savings to the taxpayers of the country. That will be a red-letter day in the history of the country.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It is in fact true that this will save much duplication of research in Federal, private, industrial, and university programs. There is a real saving by this bill of a tremendous amount of money over the years, as well as time of scientists and engineers that can be directed toward productive effort with constructive results. Is that not correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am concerned about the "security" involved here. Is there adequate arrangement for military security made, or is it contemplated? If so, should we not make legislative record that any of the international critical tables that might involve interaction of mass or chemicals or other things involved here, to be sold overseas, in particular, might involve security?

Mr. DADDARIO. I am sure that normal security regulations would apply, so that information of a security nature would not be involved.

The international aspect of this is quite simple. We have stressed it only because unless we have a copyright provision as included with this legislation, the compilations evaluated cannot be protected. Foreign publishers will simply lift it and we will lose perhaps 50 percent of revenues. We have the copyright only in the sense of that information which can be sold. We include it so that we might deal with both the sale abroad and the potential threat of resale in this country by foreign publishers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman in the well, who has outlined this procedure so well—I compliment him for it—mean that foreign nations will recognize our copyright laws any better than they have our patent laws?

Mr. DADDARIO. There are certain countries which do not, and we cannot do much about that. On page 11 of the report, however, in the second to last paragraph, it is stated:

> Moreover, there is an advantage in the copyright protection prescribed, for it would afford foreign protection of the material under the Universal Copyright Convention.

To that extent, it does protect. To that extent it is important, because we will protect a high percentage of our effort.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I had read that in the report. I am thinking of certain nations whose packaging and processing companies seized the tetracycline patents of our pharmaceutical manufacturers and used them and repackaged them and sold them back to us, even to our own Defense Department.

As the gentleman says, this cannot always be avoided. I understand this is for our protection. But just as we are, indeed, dealing with a definition and a new international critical table of minerals and elements, which involve interreactions, and so forth, in the 1940's we allowed our interaction tables and secrets to slip. I am very conscious, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, that we should be sure all of our interactions that are printed should not be made too freely available to even the emerging countries in this day of nuclear proliferation.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman for bringing that aspect of this problem to the attention of the House. I do believe, however, we have taken every step we can in this field. What we have done affords protection to the extent that we can do so by the terminology of the legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one other question, and I thank the gentleman for yielding his time. Section 7, page 4, of the bill, refers obviously to an open ended authorization, whereas the report explains requirements in some detail, and the gentleman explains even further how we might recoup these funds.

Is it necessary that this be an open ended authorization for such amounts as may be needed for the purpose of this act?

Mr. DADDARIO. We do have that problem. We did touch on it. But we are dealing with only a fraction of the activities of the Bureau of Standards, which generally operates under these conditions.

The gentleman probably does not have before him a copy of the hearings, but on page 68 of the hearings we did ask:

> Would it be agreeable if section 10 of the bill limited the authorization to not more than $20 million per annum? If not, why?

That was section 10, which is now section 7 as we have revised the bill.

In answer to that question they stated:

> The projected level of activities of the Standard Reference Data System could be operated quite satisfactorily for the next few years under such a ceiling. However, in view of the numerous uncertainties associated with a new program of this magnitude and the constantly rising costs of scientific endeavors, it might be simpler from an administrative point of view if no dollar ceiling were explicitly stated.
>
> Whether or not any dollar ceiling is authorized, we would welcome the opportunity to report frequently to the Congress on the general progress of the Standard Reference Data System and on its financial status.

I believe we should hold them to that.

Mr. HALL. I am certain it is more simple from the administrative point of view. I am not so sure it is as protective of the taxpayer's dollars.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman from Missouri has raised a question as to copyright security in the international area. I believe it is well to point out that we deal both bilaterally and multilaterally, by treaty, in this matter of copyright security with foreign nations. It is a matter of record that virtually all the scientifically advanced nations but two—those two being Communist Russia and Communist China—are parties to treaties or conventions with us in this matter of copyrights now.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman for adding that to this discussion. It is important, following the line of procedure he mentions, that we protect our interests abroad.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we on the minority side of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, support the provisions of H.R. 16897.

The subcommittee was ably chaired by the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. DADDARIO, and I can assure you that all the subcommittee, and our able staff, made a most careful productive examination of the need to gather and publish standard reference data.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced this is a far better bill than the form in which it was first introduced. It deserves our full support.

In addition to those witnesses who testified before the subcommittee, the subcommittee and its individual members have corresponded and consulted with representatives of universities, industry, professional societies, and nonprofit research institutes concerning the merits of the bill.

To my knowledge, no one has denied that a comprehensive program to collect, evaluate, and disseminate standard reference data is of the utmost importance for the efficient conduct of our national research and development effort. Nor has anyone shown that this task could be done cheaper or more effectively by an organization other than the Bureau of Standards.

In fact, the testimony indicated that a private organization could not undertake a program of this magnitude because of the scope and cost of the program, nor could another Federal agency undertake this program without damaging their primary mission. I might mention that the two Federal agencies most heavily involved with research and development—the Department of Defense and NASA—have transferred over $300,000 to the National Bureau of Standards in fiscal years 1965 and 1966 in furtherance of the Bureau's standard reference data activities.

You already have heard that this program will ultimately cost about $18 million per year and that the estimated saving will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. I would like to stress the fact that the Bureau will make use of excellent research capabilities in our Nation's universities and industrial laboratories. It is expected that more than half of the data compilation activities will be performed outside the National Bureau of Standards.

Furthermore, the tremendous savings made possible by having accurate standard reference data will be evident not only in Federal research and development programs, but will be equally applicable in the private sector of the economy.

The Bureau's standard reference data program will be directed toward meeting the needs of this Nation's scientists and engineers both within and outside the Federal Government. At the present time, a number of professional, industrial, and other organizations have undertaken to provide standard reference data in particular fields, and certain Federal agencies are preparing data to meet their own requirements. In developing its program, the Bureau is expected to utilize the work that is being performed by other organizations and not unnecessarily to duplicate coverage in fields which now are being adequately covered.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau will supplement rather than compete with existing activities.

In getting the data to the user in the form he requires, the Bureau is expected to use both governmental and commercial channels of distribution. In some cases, standard reference data will be distributed in the form of computer tapes and cards, in other cases it will be in normal textbook form. In the latter case, the Bureau expects to utilize, insofar as is consistent with Government printing laws and regulations, the services of commercial publishing organizations. There are a number of advantages of such an arrangement. First and foremost is the fact that many publishers of technical publications have established methods of preparation and publication to achieve the widest dissemination of the data. In addition, many publishers have established channels of distribution abroad and can therefore expedite the sale of standard reference outside the United States.

Other advantages of commercial publication are the fact that the document is published at little or no cost to the Government, and that the Government can receive a royalty on sales of the publication, thereby lowering the cost that must be borne by the American taxpayer.

In summary, I believe that there is a real and genuine need for standard reference data, and the returns from this program—although admittedly difficult to accurately forecast—will far exceed the cost of the program. I believe also that the legislative framework we have provided for this program is realistic and equitable, and I urge your support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Conable].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my support for this bill. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher], has said, the minority members of the subcommittee strongly support it.

As the bill was originally presented to us we had some grave misgivings about it. We held careful hearings, and the bill was extensively revised before it was reported to the House.

Standard reference data have been more or less in the private province up to this point. Many private concerns have provided tables showing the characteristics of materials, the sort of thing that any manufacturer or any Government department has to know before it goes too far down the line in a manufacturing operation.

Unfortunately, in recent years, we have had a proliferation of technical information. We have had many new materials put on the market. Much is required to be known, so the private field has not been able to keep up with the responsibilities of cataloging all these characteristics.

The result is that the National Bureau of Standards is now being asked to accept this as a logical extension of its responsibility in the field of standards. I think it is going to result ultimately in great savings not necessarily to the taxpayer but to American industry and to departments of the Government which depend on this kind of scientific knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the work of our subcommittee, because a good deal of this work was done in the revision of the legislation proposed and in investigating the possible effects in the area of printing and copyrighting. We believe we have a bill here which will be acceptable in every sense of the word. The National Bureau of Standards is an ever more important agency of the Government, and by this work it can provide a service to reduce unnecessary research duplication which is a potential savings of billions of dollars for our technology. I hope the bill will have unanimous support.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill (H.R. 16897) providing for the collection, compilation, publication, and sale of standard reference data and strongly urge that Congress enact these procedures into law. I believe that the technical data now coming in a flood from the various scientific communities makes necessary prompt action. The Federal Government should codify and publish for the benefit of the Nation, this very important body of information.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that Government agencies are already performing an outstanding job in publishing technical data as a result of research which must not be terminated or curbed by the passage of this bill.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is presently doing an outstanding job in the dissemination through various, technical bulletins, technical reports, and publications of its scientific discoveries and also the technical innovations it is producing almost daily. These should continue.

Likewise, the armed services also do an effective job on scientific and research reporting through technical reports, bulletins, and publications. Likewise, this bill will make sure the excellent publications of nongovernmental groups and organizations providing technical data in many broad fields will not be affected by this legislation, or limited in any way.

Please note, in this connection, the provisions of section 3 of the bill which states in part that "this section shall be deemed complementary to existing authority, and nothing herein is intended to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government."

Also, page 5 of the report states:

> Because science and technology are developing so rapidly, and because of the importance of having accurate standard reference data, a number of professional, industrial, and other organizations have undertaken to provide standard reference data in particular fields. Similarly, certain Federal agencies involved in research and development are preparing standard reference data to meet their own requirements. In developing its program, the Bureau is expected to utilize this work that is being performed by others and not unnecessarily duplicate coverage in fields which already are being adequately covered.
>
> However, if a person or organization does not wish to participate in the Bureau's program or to otherwise make available to the Bureau standard reference data which it has prepared, it will not be required to do so.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that the language of the bill is quite plain and at this time wish to explain these provisions, so that the intent of Congress is crystal clear.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], chairman of the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 16897 provides a standard reference data system to make critically evaluated quantitative data readily accessible to scientists, engineers, and the general public.

Scientists and engineers require this data in their everyday research. The standard reference data system would provide a staff of specialists to evaluate data produced by varying scientists and published in a multitude of scientific literature. These specialists would determine from the differing values of data which is the most nearly correct and/or which is produced by the most scientifically reliable methods. They would thus serve to maintain standards of reliability of the data.

Industry, educational institutions, Government agencies, and other organizations would continue data compilation projects, but the standard reference data system would evaluate their methods and data to ascertain reliability. At the same time, other scientists and engineers would be relieved of the time-consuming necessity of searching the literature themselves or attempting to evaluate data in fields in which they are not expert.

A strengthened standard reference system is essential for the efficient conduct of the Nation's research and development effort. Several years ago it became apparent that the total national level of production of data compilations was not meeting the needs of the scientific and technical community. Efforts to meet this need had been made in the private sector, the most notable being the publication of the international critical tables by the National Academy of Sciences in the 1920's. Because of lack of time and funds, no effort was made to update this important collection of data, and it became obsolete. As science and technology advanced even more rapidly, a number of professional, industrial, Government, and other organizations began programs to provide the crucially needed scientific data.

Unfortunately, scientific data are produced by many different methods of varying degrees of reliability. It is difficult for scientists and engineers to evaluate the various reported data and to convert them to a consistent base of comparison. Failure to find data which the user can trust results in rerunning experiments, overdesign of components, faulty and wasted products, or abandonment of the effort. It is therefore of great importance that computations of a standard reliable source be expanded in scope and carried out on a continuing basis to digest the flood of new data and convert them to a consistent critically evaluated form which can be used with confidence in all areas of our technology.

I introduced H.R. 15638, the predecessor to H.R. 16897, at the request of the administration. The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, chaired by Emilio Q. Daddario. The subcommittee held hearings in June. Witnesses who testified were Donald F. Horning, Director of the Office of Science and Technology; Dr. J. Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology; Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards; Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of NAS; Curtis G. Benjamin and W. Bradford Wiley, representing the private publishers; and John Haley, staff director of the Joint Committee on Printing. Additional comprehensive questions were sent to the witnesses and a large number of inquiries were sent to other individuals and business, professional, and Government groups. All those consulted gave their full support to the overall purposes of the bill. However, suggestions for improvements were incorporated into the bill by the committee. On August 11, the committee voted to report out a clean bill H.R. 16897.

Briefly, the bill declares it to be the policy of Congress that critically evaluated standard reference data are of vital importance to the progress of the Nation's science and technology and provides that this data be made readily available to scientists, engineers, and the general public.

The bill further authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to provide or arrange for the collection, critical evaluation, publication, and dissemination of standard reference data. This effort will be carried out by the Bureau of Standards as a continuation and expansion of its present program. In exercising this authority, the Secretary is directed to utilize the reference data services and facilities of Federal, State, and local governments and of other institutions, firms, and persons. Yet participation in the standard reference data system will be completely voluntary, and a person or organization which does not wish to participate will not be required to do so.

Under the terms of this bill, the Secretary or his designee, is authorized to sell the standard reference data at prices which reflect the cost of collection, compilation, evaluation, publication, and dissemination of the data. The price to be charged for any particular volume or other service would be based on the degree to which the data is needed and how many possible purchasers there are for the data. For example, if the data is in such general use and demand that it will be a basic handbook to the scientific community, then the Bureau would charge a very low price.

However, if the volume represents a special service to a small segment of the scientific community, the Bureau would expect to recover a greater proportion of its costs. For a special service to one user, the Bureau could recover the total cost of its service. Under no circumstances, however, may the Bureau recover more than its costs.

The system of user charges is adopted for several reasons. It allows the Bureau to provide services it otherwise could not afford to perform for users who pay for them. Also, it is expected that up to 50 percent of total sales will be to foreign customers, and, on the basis of the authority to charge for the data, the Bureau would be able to recover costs from data sold outside the United States.

The bill further grants the Secretary authority to contract the private publishers to produce data compilations. Advantages of this to the Government are lower costs by savings in production, printing, and distribution; possible royalties paid by the publishers to the Government; and wider data dissemination channels used by the publishers.

Finally, H.R. 16897 authorizes the Secretary, at his option, to secure a copyright in the data publications. This provision was necessary to protect the data against republication in foreign markets and to preserve the system of user charges.

Although the Bureau, through its organic act, is operating a standard reference data system, this additional legislation is necessary to provide broader authority for the program and to provide a method of achieving the widest dissemination of the information at the least cost to the taxpayer. It is estimated that the present lack of a comprehensive data system costs the Nation hundreds of millions of dollars a year in duplicated work, wasted effort, equipment failures, and the overdesigning of equipment to compensate for lack of critically evaluated data. It is difficult to place an exact value on the returns from a more expanded standard reference data system, but estimates are that the value of the returns to the total scientific effort will be from $10 to $200 for every dollar spent on it.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 16897.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF EMPLOYMENT INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO PREMIUM COMPENSATION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16114) to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16114

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(1)), is amended by inserting, immediately following "under this paragraph", the following clause: "shall be held and considered to be part of the basic salary or basic compensation of the officer or employee for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, section 9 of the Act of October 29, 1965 (Public Law 89–301), relating to severance pay, and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and".

Sec. 2. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to retirement benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be applicable with respect to premium compensation payable from and after the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need and desire.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, rarely during my service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has a Federal employee measure—other than a major general salary bill—received more extensive and painstaking consideration than has been given this legislation.

Hearings by the Civil Service Subcommittee extended for more than a year, in order to develop the information and evidence needed to draft a bill that would provide equitable treatment for employees and, at the same time, not adversely affect the Government. Intensive special studies were conducted by the committee staff and by the Civil Service Commission, in cooperation with the departments and agencies principally concerned.

The language of H.R. 16114 is directed to the general class of employees described in paragraph (1) of section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by the Fringe Benefit Act of 1954—Public Law 83–763. However, although the language does not refer specifically to Federal civilian firefighters, the class of employees covered by that paragraph consists almost entirely of such firefighters.

Paragraph (1) of section 401 of the 1945 Pay Act provides that any employee whose position requires him regularly to remain at his post of duty during longer than ordinary periods of duty, with a substantial part of the extra time being in a "standby status," shall receive premium compensation for the extra duty on an annual basis in lieu of overtime pay otherwise authorized by law, but not over 25 percent of the regular pay rate for his position based on a 40-hour week. The actual premium pay rate is to be fixed by administrative authority in the light of various conditions of work and employment. Since most firefighters are required to be on duty 72 hours a week, the Civil Service Commission has prescribed 20-percent premium pay for them for the 32 hours a week they are on duty in excess of the customary 40-hour week. For the few who are regularly assigned to duty 60 hours a week, 10-percent premium pay is authorized.

Certain bills first taken up by the Civil Service Subcommittee would have reduced the regular tours of duty of Federal firefighters from 72 hours or 60 hours per week, as the case may be, to 48 hours per week with no loss of the premium compensation they now receive for the longer tours of duty. Other bills considered later would have reduced the 72-hour week to 60 hours the first year after enactment and to 56 hours the second year and thereafter, with no loss of premium compensation now being paid.

Several of these bills also included a second important provision—to the effect that the aggregate compensation of firefighters—that is, including premium pay for overtime—shall constitute part of their basic compensation for purposes of retirement calculations and certain other fringe benefits.

All of these bills were opposed by the Civil Service Commission, which particularly stressed its opposition to the reduction in working hours and the attendant costs. For example, a reduction in working hours from 72 to 60, without loss of premium pay, was estimated to cost about $31 million annually.

The subcommittee finally worked out a compromise agreement, contained in H.R. 16114, which has the official approval of the administration, as reported by the Civil Service Commission to Chairman TOM MURRAY of our committee on August 1, 1966. In substance, this bill makes no change in the presently scheduled working hours but provides that the premium compensation paid for overtime work shall be part of each employee's basic compensation for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the severance pay provision embodied in last year's salary increase act, and the Federal Employees' Compansation Act.

It is emphasized that this inclusion of premium compensation as part of basic compensation will apply solely with respect to the pay of employees whose jobs require them to be assigned to regular tours of duty substantially in excess of the customary 40-hour week applicable to the vast majority of Federal employees. It is not, and shall not be considered to be, a precedent for according similar treatment to overtime or premium pay in the usual sense, such as the time and one-half pay authorized for work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week, or the 25-percent Sunday work differential, to which most Government employees are entitled.

A great many Members of Congress, as well as authorities elsewhere in Government, long have felt that the aggregate compensation, including premium pay for regular tours of duty substantially in excess of 40 hours a week, in truth and in fact constitutes the basic compensation of any employee officially assigned to such a regular tour of duty. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is unanimous in this judgment, and in its recommendation that this principle be written into the law. As noted earlier, the Civil Service Commission, which presented the favorable Administration report on H.R. 16114, concurs in this view.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the members of our Civil Service Subcommittee for their very diligent and conscientious attention to the complex problems involved in this legislation, and for the very fair and effective solution provided by the bill which they wrote. H.R. 16114 deserves, and I hope will have, the strong endorsement of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith several letters, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1966.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to your request for the views of this Commission on H.R. 16114, a bill reported by your Committee on July 14, 1966, "To correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes."

Federal civilian firefighters are regularly assigned scheduled duty tours in excess of the standard tour of 40 hours a week. Typically—with many deviations within widely separated extremes—Federal firefighters are on a 72-hour or 60-hour weekly tour of duty, with the 72-hour schedule prevailing because it is used almost entirely by the Department of Defense, by far the largest employer. For much of their time on duty, firefighters are not required to perform actual work. Substantial portions of their tours of duty are devoted to "standby time" during which they are required to remain at or within the confines of their duty stations, holding themselves in readiness to perform actual work when the need arises or when they are called.

Under paragraph (1) of section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, firefighters are afforded premium pay on an annual basis, in addition to base pay, for their extended duty tours beyond 40 hours a week. The amount of premium pay, which may not exceed 25% of basic salary rate, is determined in consideration of the number of actual work hours required, the number of hours spent in standby status, the extent to which duties are made more onerous by night or holiday work, and any other relevant factors. Under this authority and formula, the premium compensation rates for hours in excess of 40 in a week have been set administratively at 20% for 72-hour weekly schedules and 10% for schedules of 60 hours a week. Since this premium pay for firefighters is made an increment in addition to base pay, it may not under existing law be considered as basic salary for fringe benefits specifically geared to base pay.

H.R. 16114 would amend cited paragraph (1) of section 401 to provide that, starting with the first pay period beginning on or after date of enactment, premium compensation payable under its terms shall be held and considered basic salary for purposes of—(1) the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, (3) the severance pay provisions in section 9 of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965, and (4) the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

As I mentioned in my testimony April 28, 1966 before the Civil Service Subcommittee of your Committee, the Commission has been unable to recommend favorably on bills to include overtime, holiday pay, and other increments given in addition to base pay in computing retirement benefits, which would depart from the long-standing practice of relating retirement to base pay only.

The Civil Service Retirement Act since its inception in 1920 has never authorized use of any salary for contribution and annuity purposes except the basic salary of the position as fixed by law or regulation. The same basic salary concept has also been applied in determining annual salary for group life insurance purposes since the life insurance program began in 1954. The same is true with respect to the recently enacted provisions for severance pay.

In the retirement and life insurance systems, each covering over 2 million employees located world-wide and paid under a variety of salary systems, we have always judged basic salary to be the only practicable, reliable, common denominator for equitably determining the salary base for contribution and benefit purposes.

In the retirement system, inclusion of various increments received intermittently in addition to base pay would often not be advantageous to the employee. He would always be required to contribute for the added pay amounts—by deductions, deposit, or reduction in annuity for non-deposit. Yet unless his high-5-year average salary period happened to fall in a period where base pay was increased by overtime, etc., he could actually receive a lower annuity on account of inclusion of the added pay increments.

Because life insurance approximates annual salary at all times, including overtime and like increments for life insurance purposes would produce similar unsatisfactory results. Often the added increments would not raise the insurance to a higher $1,000 bracket, but when it did, the higher amount would not extend beyond the pay period in which added increments were earned.

Thus unless death, dismemberment, or attachment of free insurance based on retirement occurred while the increased insurance was in force, the only result would be higher contributions by employees and agencies.

For these and other reasons, such as the costly record-keeping problems which would attend—particularly in automated payroll operations, the Commission considers that it must continue to oppose any moves to include as salary for retirement, insurance, and like purposes any increments in addition to base pay which are intermittent, irregular or short-term in nature. However, we have concluded that it is not unreasonable, as here proposed, to recognize a distinction with respect to additional compensation provided for longer than normal duty tours which generally prevail on a regularly recurring basis throughout service in the firefighter occupation. In such a situation the premium pay assumes a career pattern affording a logical basis for including it as part of a firefighter's basic salary for purposes such as retirement, life insurance and severance pay—in order to more realistically relate these fringe benefits to the employee's usual income. We understand that the Department of Labor will report its views on the Federal Employees' Compensation Act aspect of this proposal.

Accordingly, should the Congress decide to take favorable action on this legislation to include firefighter premium pay in the future as basic salary for civil service retirement, group life insurance and severance pay purposes, the Commission will not object.

The retirement cost of this legislation computed on the normal cost plus interest basis is estimated to be $1.83 million annually. The life insurance cost would be (at existing employee and agency contribution rates) approximately $40,000 annually. There are no precise data available upon which to base an estimate of the severance pay cost implications.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 1, 1966.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our views on H.R. 16114, a bill "To correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes."

H.R. 16114 would benefit certain Federal employees, primarily firefighters, who perform regular tours of duty substantially in excess of 40 hours a week. Under existing law they receive premium compensation on an annual basis, computed under a special formula. H.R. 16114 would include this premium compensation as a part of the basic salary of these employees for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, P.L. 89–301 relating to severance pay, and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

We have no objection to the bill from the standpoint of its effect on the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The objective of the FECA is to replace, within appropriate limitations, the regular earnings of a worker who is disabled as a result of his employment. The overtime duty and premium pay of employees covered by H.R. 16114 is so much a part of their regular employment that the overtime tour of duty is an essential element of their job and the premium compensation is for all practical purposes part of their regular earnings.

It is believed that H.R. 16114 would require additional annual expenditures under the FECA of less than $100,000.

We defer to those Federal agencies more directly involved for comments regarding the affect of the proposed legislation on group life insurance, retirement and severance pay programs.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service approved this legislation unanimously, as well as the Civil Service Subcommittee, of which I am the chairman, approved it unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that our good and able colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who has always been a friend of the Federal employee and who was one of the original sponsors of this bill, worked diligently in behalf of this legislation, as did several others who were particularly interested in it, such as the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA]. The gentleman from Hawaii did as much work on this legislation as anyone. His work, indeed, was very constructive. I commend him for it.

The RECORD would be incomplete without acknowledgment of the fine support and good advice we received from the employee organizations, led by Mr. John Griner, president, and Mr. Thomas Walters, legislative representative, of the American Federation of Government Employees, and Mr. Alvin E. Davis, representative of the International Association of Firefighters. Without their cooperation I believe that this very just and fair compromise bill would not have been possible.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would assure the House that in the clean version of the bill, or the one that is under consideration, H.R. 16114, the objections voiced by the Civil Service Commission and by the Bureau of the Budget, on pages 6 and 7, respectively, of the report, have been removed, and if indeed they are in support of the clean bill which the gentleman from Texas is sponsoring?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Absolutely so; that is a fact, yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and further proceedings, I am sure that the gentleman from Texas has letters in his possession to that effect which the gentleman will make a part of the RECORD?

Mr. BECKWORTH. They will go into the RECORD. I asked previous permission to include them in the RECORD just a few moments ago.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 16114.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], this legislation comes before us in the form of a compromise. Some of us had sponsored legislation which would reduce the workweek of the Federal firefighters from the present 72-hour limit.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], for his diligence and for his patience in this matter and for trying to work a compromise that would receive approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget and in his efforts to work out a change that would have the possibility of becoming a law.

I know it comes as a surprise to many of the Members of this body to learn that we have approximately 12,000 Federal employees who work a 72-hour week.

Now some may say or claim that they are not actually working that full 72-hour period, but they are in a standby capacity. To them I reply that it makes no difference as to how much they actually work during the 72-hour period, the fact is that they are on duty. They are away from their families and they must be there in case of emergency. Having a 72-hour requirement is somewhat of an antiquated policy or profession. In fact, the International Commission of Firefighters just completed a survey showing what has happened in the 21 largest cities of this Nation during the past 20 years from the period 1945 to 1965. This survey showed that the work hours of the fire departments in these 21 large cities had been reduced during the 20-year period by 36.7 percent. During this same period of time the pay has been increased for these firefighters for these fire departments by 163 percent.

Yet, during that same period of time, those last 20 years, the 72-hour workweek of the Federal firefighters has remained the same and still their pay increase during that particular period of time has been 11.7 percent less than the firefighters whose workweeks have been reduced.

Here in the District of Columbia the District firefighters' workweek is 48 hours and their pay is substantially more than the Federal firefighters even though there has been no adjustment in their workweek during the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that the Federal firefighters serve at very essential and most important Federal installations such as missile sites, Federal airports, both civilian and military. They must be well versed in the modern techniques. They are constantly alert to the hazards of their particular vocation. They must be well coordinated both mentally and physically and display an unusual amount of emotional stability.

There is no question but that their courage is somewhat beyond the usual bounds.

The original bill that some of us have sponsored would reduce this 72-hour workweek to 48 hours.

As has been pointed out, there was some opposition. So we came forth with a compromise as provided in H.R. 16114.

The purpose of H.R. 16114 is to provide that the premium compensation of approximately 12,000 Federal civilian firefighters shall be considered to be basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the severance pay provision of the Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1965, and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker, the premium compensation paid Federal civilian firefighters is, in fact, a part of their basic compensation, since it is a regular part of their pay. The majority of the Federal firefighters are assigned to a 72-hour workweek, and for this are paid 20-percent premium compensation. The remainder are assigned to 60-hour workweeks and are paid 10-percent premium compensation. The maximum amount of premium compensation these workers may be paid is set by act of Congress, with the actual amount determined by administrative action.

Mr. Speaker, the 72-hour workweek of a Federal civilian firefighter usually consists of three shifts of 24 hours. These hours are regular tours of duty and in fact, in most cases, are career work schedules. Not all of this time is spent in the actual performance of duty, and the Congress recognized this by enacting a special premium compensation rate to reflect this special status.

Mr. Speaker, the additional cost of this legislation will be approximately $2 million. This is a rather small sum when considering the task the workers concerned are called upon to perform. In all, this legislation will affect approximately 12,000 Federal civilian firefighters, the majority of those are employed by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, the justification for the pending legislation is apparent, and I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of the bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me extend a special tribute to both the International Association of Firefighters and the American Federation of Government Employees for the outstanding work they did in behalf of their people in attempting to get the best possible bill enacted into law.

My colleagues well know the excellent representation given to the thousands of Federal employees over a period of years by the American Federation of Government Employees, and I was pleased to see the excellent cooperation between that organization and the International Association of Firefighters on this particular legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to join in what the gentleman from Virginia has just said. I do not know of anyone in the House who has worked harder and longer for the best interests of the Federal employees. I had the privilege of serving with the gentleman on the committee when he was a member of that committee for so many years. He originally introduced this legislation that we have on the floor today. I congratulate the gentleman for his remarks, and I subscribed to them 100 percent.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], as much time as he desires.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], chairman of the subcommittee, for the diligence with which he has pursued this measure and for the many, many hours he has devoted toward bringing out a bill acceptable to all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16114, a bill which ought to be enacted promptly as the first step toward modernization of the employment situation of Federal civilian firefighters.

It was my privilege, as a member of the subcommittee, to take part in the drafting of this legislation, and I sponsored an identical bill, H.R. 16193.

The chairman of our Civil Service Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], has most ably explained the purpose and effect of the bill. The very moderate premium pay of Federal firefighters is just as much a part of their basic compensation, as are the salaries prescribed by law for practically all other Federal employees for the customary 40-hour week. The firefighters' premium rates are tied to regular tours of duty substantially in excess of 40 hours a week, just as the statutory rates for other positions are tied to a 40-hour week. The change proposed by H.R. 16114, to incorporate this into the law, is long overdue.

I have been vitally concerned with the Federal civilian firefighting service and the problems of our firefighters for some time—particularly because of the importance of this service to both the military and private sectors in my home State of Hawaii.

In recent years the responsibilities and the requirements of Federal firefighters and their services have increased tremendously.

In June of 1965, the Department of Defense cited the positions of Federal firefighters as absolutely essential in support of our military installations on D-day and for the critical period immediately following. The Defense Department stressed the importance of firefighters with respect to D-day requirements as paramount.

As to the individual firefighter, civil service requirements for his appointment are quite rigid. Among other matters, he must respond to all fire alarms and other emergencies. He is subject to exposure, excessive heat and cold, fumes, smoke, poisonous gases, electrical energy, dust, and explosions. His duties often require strenuous physical exertion. He must possess rapid mental and muscular coordination, as well as emotional and mental stability.

The arduous duties and dangers of firefighters in the private sector are aggravated in the military service, where most of our Federal firefighters work. The quantities and complexity of the equipment which the Federal firefighter is called on to use far exceed the facilities needed in everyday private life. The needs of the military services have vastly expanded, along with the stresses and strains on individual firefighters, in recent years.

One airbase, discussed in our subcommittee hearings, was servicing aircraft such as the C-46 and C-47, carrying about 650 gallons of 100-octane gasoline and 22 passengers. In the war year 1943 the base received approximately 45,000 landings. In 1964, there were 375,000 landings involving far larger, heavier, and more sophisticated aircraft.

In 1950, this base had a storage capacity of 100,000 gallons of gasoline. In 1965, the fuel storage capacity was 4 million gallons—including advance propellants, such as JP4 and JPX, the elements of which are practically unknown. What we do know is that the explosive point of this fuel ranges up to 97 percent, compared to a maximum of 6 percent for the gasoline of 20 years ago.

This typifies the great change that has taken place in the conditions of employment, responsibilities, required knowledge, and hazardous exposure of military firefighters.

During the hearings on this bill I was interested to find, in response to my questions, that the Federal firefighters at Pearl Harbor and Hickam Field in Hawaii answered several hundred calls a year in municipal areas. Also, the new International Airport complex requires considerable expansion of fire protection services on the part of both local and military fire services. Similar problems and needs exist with respect to the substantial and continuing growth of housing developments on the windward side of Oahu.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal firefighters are a fine, dedicated, and efficient team of experts—a most valuable part of our Federal work force. Our committee decided that the reduction in working hours first proposed is not practicable at this time, because of the heavy cost and serious administrative difficulties that would follow in the scheduling of both civilian and military tours of duty. However, the committee bill does grant justifiable recognition of their long-duty week and the moderate premium pay they receive. It is a step in the right direction, and I urge unanimous approval of the bill by this House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I have just a point of information: I concur with what the gentleman said about our Federal firefighters being courageous. I am always glad to see them standing by at the field, whether at Hickham Field or under the FAA aegis wherever we make a difficult landing. I have read and reread the bill and page 4 of the report as to costs. The report says in original form, it will cost $46 million. We save $30 million of that, and then we add on $2 million for retirement benefits. Does the gentleman, or anyone in the chamber, have any idea what the cost to the taxpayer is going to be for this bill?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee who has the statistics on hand to answer that question.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have some statistics which I might give to the gentleman from Missouri, which show that under the Federal Employees Compensation Act less than $100,000 will be spent, and approximately $40,000 will be spent for what their life insurance additionally will cost. Then we have the figure of $1,183,000 of the retirement aspect costs. So, added up, they actually amount to less than $2 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. On behalf of the minority members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I will say we urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded in favor of this legislation. Certainly, the committee should be commended for pioneering this program.

Certainly the firefighters who are being made to work 72 hours a week and being paid for 72 hours a week should be allowed to compute their retirement on their average workweek.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to testify in support of H.R. 16114 which writes into law a principle that employees receiving premium pay, authorized by law, for regular tours of duty in excess of 40 hours per week shall receive equitable treatment in computing retirement compensation.

I was privileged to introduce legislation in this area in the 88th and 89th Congresses. I also testified in committee in support of H.R. 10294, introduced by my colleague [Mr. BECKWORTH] which was designed to provide much broader benefits. I regret that the administration opposed this first version of the bill mainly based on annual cost of $30 to $46 million. I trust that the Congress will soon pass the necessary legislation to incorporate the other features of Mr. BECKWORTH's earlier bill.

The measure under consideration today is long overdue and certainly is a step in the right direction to provide more equitable treatment to employees in a category that primarily affects 12,000 of our Federal firefighters.

Whereas I support the bill under consideration today, I wish to emphasize that it does not place our firefighters on a par with other Federal employees and I expect to join with many of my colleagues who share this opinion, in pressing for additional legislation in the 90th Congress.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16114, which is similar to my bill, H.R. 5257, which was originally introduced by me in June 1963, and which will permit Federal workers, particularly 12,000 civilian Federal firefighters, who regularly work a much longer week than the usual 40 hours, to receive retirement and other fringe benefits based upon their total earnings.

The Federal firefighters regularly work 60- and, often 72-hour weeks. They are paid a moderate premium for overtime, administratively fixed at 20 percent for a 72-hour week and 10 percent for a 60-hour week, far below the time and a half for overtime normally paid Federal employees on a regular 40-hour week.

Moreover, those working a 40-hour week now obtain more fringe benefits than those regularly working 60- or 72-hour weeks.

The intent of this measure, unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is to correct this inequity, or more accurately, this injustice to one relatively small, but important, segment of Federal employees.

The Civil Service Commission has estimated the cost of improved retirement conditions at $2 million annually, as against much higher cost if the work weeks were reduced and normal overtime paid.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16114 to provide for correction of certain employment inequities with respect to premium compensation which is identical to legislation I have introduced to assist Federal firefighters. The purpose of this bill is to remove an inequity which exists with respect to the entitlement of Federal employees who are officially assigned to regular tours of duty materially in excess of the customary 40-hour workweek, to certain employment benefits under existing provisions of law which exclude any premium compensation for overtime work for consideration in the determination of entitlement to such benefits. The present workweek of Federal firefighters is much longer than that of other Federal employees who generally have 5-day, 40-hour workweeks. While the hours of Federal employees as well as the hours of practically all municipal firefighters have been substantially reduced, the workweek of Federal firefighters has remained static for more than 20 years.

My observation of these firefighter employees in my congressional district has motivated by interest. I find them to be highly skilled and loyal employees of the Federal Government. Their responsibilities as well as the vast knowledge requirements have increased immeasurably over the past years.

These men must be physically fit and mentally alert in order to execute efficiently their responsibility of saving lives and property. While it is true that firefighters have been provided with numerous items of protective equipment and more advanced apparatus for fighting fires, there still remains the danger of collapse of structures involved, explosions, and so forth. This statement is substantiated by recent records which show that firefighters sustained injuries seven times more often than the average workers and that the odds of being killed in the line of duty were three times greater than that of the overall work force.

The record further shows that of the firefighters who died while actively employed, 48 percent died from heart disease, and 44 percent had not reached the age of 50.

Over the past years the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Congress have proposed, and both bodies have enacted legislation regarding hours, salaries, retirement, and so forth, for all classified employees. However, it appears to me that sufficient language concerning the hours of Federal firefighters has been left too broad and indefinite, therefore, the Federal agencies have seen fit to fix the hours of these employees from time to time in their own way.

This bill under consideration, while it does not provide all of the benefits I would like to see I believe is a step in the right direction and I am certainly hopeful that it will receive favorable consideration today.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill in behalf of our most efficient, loyal, and courageous firefighters is long overdue and I congratulate my very able, distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and his fine committee for bringing this bill to the floor and so ably debated it in the House.

To remove the inequity now existing with respect to the entitlement of Federal employees who work more than 40 hours a week is a worthy purpose and it will affect about 12,000 faithful, capable civilian firefighters employed by the Government. These devoted workers should receive proper pay scales and all fringe benefits that are available to other employees, as well as fringe benefits that are equitably justified by reason of the special, unusual demands and hazards of their particular employment.

I hope this action by the Congress will be effective in according equity and justice to a group of workers who are worthy and entitled to decent pay and fringe benefits from this great body. We cannot allow their just demands to be ignored by this Government.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 16114, a bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of base pay for Federal employees. I am particularly interested in that part of section 1 of this bill which has the effect of amending the computation of base pay under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Earlier this year, the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, reported to the House H.R. 10721, a bill amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in a great many respects. At that time, some thought was given to amending the act so as to change the computation of base pay to include "augmentations" which have become regular parts of the pay of the employee. Because we knew that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was working on this problem, we refrained from making any amendments which would have affected only compensation recipients. I am delighted to see that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has brought this bill to the floor, and that Federal employees who customarily receive premium pay for overtime shall have such premiums considered part of their basic pay for compensation purposes.

This amendment is obviously justified; it is long overdue; it is very fair. I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for his efforts in presenting this amendment to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16114).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 314, nays 0, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—314

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Gross
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—117

Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Betts
Boland
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Fraser
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Landrum
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDowell
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Pickle
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Smith, Calif.
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sullivan
Sweeney
Todd
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Daniels with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Senner with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Cameron with Mrs. Sullivan.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Hawkins with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Farnum.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Craley with Mr. Nix.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Todd with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Clevenger with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Grider.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Rees.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Mathias.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorder.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

FACILITIES FOR VISITORS TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14604) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the existing structures of the U.S. Botanic Garden for use as a visitors' center, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a Study Commission which shall make a full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital. Such study may include provision for the following activities and services:

(1) exhibits, lectures, films, and displays for informing, instructing, and orienting visitors respecting the history, growth, development of the Nation, the Nation's Capital, and the organization and operation of the Federal Government in all its branches;

(2) exhibits and displays by the individual States and the District of Columbia with

respect to their history, resources, scenic attractions, and other appropriate matters;

(3) providing information and assistance to visitors to facilitate their enjoyment and appreciation of the Nation's Capital and its historic and cultural resources;

(4) providing specialized information and assistance to foreign visitors to facilitate and encourage their travel throughout the United States;

(5) providing special services to visiting student groups, including scheduling, registration, and coordination of tours; and

(6) providing auxiliary services such as parking, local transportation, and information centers at strategic locations necessary for the convenience of visitors.

SEC. 2. (a) The Study Commission shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Chairman of the Council on the Arts and Humanities, the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, six Members of the Senate, three from each party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives, three from each party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three additional members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, at least two of whom shall not be officers of the Federal Government. Non-Federal members shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The Secretary of the Interior shall be the Chairman of the Study Commission. The Study Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) Members of the Study Commission who are not officers or employees of the Federal or District Government shall be entitled to receive compensation in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide from among the personnel and facilities of the General Services Administration necessary staff and facilities to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report the results of its study and investigation to Congress not later than March 15, 1967. Such report shall include its recommendations as to a site or sites for the facilities to be provided together with preliminary plans, specifications, and architectural drawings for such facilities and the estimated cost of the recommended sites and facilities.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $60,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, more than 15 million persons visited the Nation's Capital last year; 24 million are expected by 1970, and by 1980 there will be approximately 35 million American and foreign visitors coming to visit the greatest capital in the world, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, the sad fact is that many of these people see our backs instead of our faces. There is an urgent need for a national and/or Capital Visitors Center to accommodate in an orderly way the people who would like to see the many historical and scenic attractions in Washington. H.R. 14604 is designed to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, too often visitors and students are frustrated by traffic congestion, lack of parking facilities, and a lack of authoritative information about places to eat, lodge, or visit. To put it simply, many people are treated shabbily, including our own constituents.

Our committee was told in testimony during the hearings that it requires approximately 3 weeks to see all of the sights in the Washington area but the average tourist has only 3 days in which to see them. Therefore it is vital to have a central place where tourists can park their car, see a movie of all the sights, and then choose the places they want to go on tour, in the time they have to spend. By using public transportation we can alleviate the heavy traffic congestion problem now running loose on our streets.

The bill before you will authorize the appointment of a 21-member Commission to select a site, draw up preliminary plans, cost estimates, and report back to Congress no later than March 15, next year. Congress can review the Commission's work then take action to establish this much-needed facility. The total authorization in the bill before you is $60,000 for necessary Commission expenses.

The 21-member Commission would be composed of the following members: 6 from the House of Representatives, 3 from each party; 6 from the Senate, 3 from each party; the Secretary of the Interior, who would be Chairman of the Commission; the Secretary of the Smithsonian; a representative of the National Capital Planning Commission, a representative of the Fine Arts Commission, the Administrator of the General Services Administration; Chairman of the Council on Arts and Humanities; and 3 members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, 2 of whom cannot be Federal employees. This will give the Commission a broad representation of interest and support.

In asking approval today of legislation to establish a Visitors and Students Center in Washington, we are attempting to make up for a lack that is just about a century old.

The need for a central facility to give our people information about our Federal Government was apparent back in 1866. Veterans, their survivors, and citizens with just claims against the Government swarmed into Washington. Thousands of them left the city, angry, frustrated, and wondering about the efficiency and even the worth of their own Government after the Civil War. Many people are experiencing the same treatment today, 100 years later.

No national capital city in the world ignores its own citizens coming to witness operations of their Federal Government or visit national shrines as official Washington does.

No other great city anywhere treats its visitors so shabbily, Vice President HUMPHREY said recently. All that hundreds of them get from Washington is a parking ticket, he said.

It has been highly evident, year by year, that Washington is one of the main tourist attractions of the country, not only for Americans, but for an increasing number of foreign visitors and students. We are spending greatly to induce foreigners to visit the United States to correct the imbalance in what Americans spent abroad.

We are making expensive—and mostly fine efforts—to let the rest of the world know about our democracy and the American way of life around the world. But when they come here from abroad, the people lured by our programs, make a beeline to Washington. It is ironic that the majority of these visitors and students of our Government from abroad get a better reception and profitable stay than our own people coming to Washington. The welcome they get comes mostly from private groups and organizations. Yet, they must wonder about the apathy of the Federal Government in not following up at home the broad programs and projects we staff and finance abroad.

To the majority of these visitors to the metropolitan area, the trip is one of the highlights of their lives.

This is especially true for millions of our young Americans who come in groups from our schools. They come here—often at some sacrifice by their parents and teachers—expecting to get visual education in the history of their own Nation, which certainly is available in the metropolitan area. Their teachers and guardians make the sacrifices they do, in the expectation that they will acquire more education and especially, inspiration from what they came to see and study. Nearly everyone who comes here expects to learn about the operations of our Government, see the national sites and shrines, increase their pride in their heritage, but rightly expect to have a pleasant and comfortable time doing it.

Such a pilgrimage is one of the highlights of their lives, but far too often, it is not as profitable, as pleasant or as comfortable as it should—and could be.

We in the Congress probably have the biggest stake in this proposal for better facilities for our domestic visitors and students. We in the Congress for generations have done most of the job in giving tourists welcome, information and the feeling that they are wanted here. It has been a pleasant part of our functions. Contact and help to our constituents always is welcomed. However, the greatest influx of visitors from home comes when Members are at their busiest in committees or on the floor. A visitors center is not envisioned as replacing the services Members now affords thousands every year, but an extension of what is being done now in the congressional offices.

Fortunately, there is overwhelming recognition and approval of a visitors and students center in the Congress, in the various departments and agencies, the White House and among the many planning commissions as well as the local mercantile organizations. I hope everyone will support it today; thank you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, like so many others that come before us, should be evaluated in terms of not the first cost but the upkeep. I assume, if it follows the usual pattern, that it will result in a multimillion-dollar expenditure for the purpose of establishing a visitors' center in Washington, D.C.

I am uncertain—and I should like to have some help from the committee—as to just what is proposed. The title of the bill is: "To authorize the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the existing structures of the Botanic Garden for use as a visitors' center."

Yet, on page 6 of the report I find this language:

> The committee would hope that the Commission will avoid, if possible, recommending any sites on the Mall itself or within the immediate Capitol Hill complex.

I do not understand what is meant by the Capitol Hill complex. If the present Botanic Garden is not a part of the present Capitol Hill complex, I ask someone to tell me what it is.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. First I wish to say that the original bill, to which the gentleman referred, was introduced by me. It called for a Capitol visitors' center in the Botanic Garden. This was before the hearings.

After we heard from a number of witnesses, it was evident that some people proposed a Capitol visitors' center, others proposed a national visitors' center, and others wanted to see a group of satellite visitors' centers.

The committee in its wisdom decided that the best thing to do was to appoint a commission to study the matter and to report back to Congress next year.

The language to which the gentleman refers is no longer germane. All this will be stricken, and the commission study idea is being substituted therefor.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman is not interested in the site occupied by the Botanic Garden, does he not believe he should have amended the title of the bill, or made some explanation in this direction, so that we would not be misled?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, it is shown on page 5 of the bill:

> Amend the title of the bill so as to read: "A bill to authorize a study of facilities and services to be furnished visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital."

The title will be amended.

Mr. GROSS. Very well. Does this rule out the Botanic Garden as a site?

Mr. GRAY. Absolutely. Positively.

Mr. GROSS. Where is it proposed to find the parking space for these people the gentleman spoke of a while ago? Where will the parking space be found for all the visitors who come to Washington, D.C.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. This will be one of the functions of the Commission. To give it a broad representation, we call for the appointment of 12 Members of the House and the Senate, and the Secretary of the Interior and other people knowledgeable on this subject.

We would hope—and when I say "we" I am talking about the committee—that a site will be found away from the Capitol Hill complex where there will be adequate parking facilities. If by necessity they have to get close to the Capitol, we will have to go down with a four- or five-parking-level garage. We envision that it may be necessary to have accommodations for 10,000 to 12,000 vehicles in order to alleviate the congestion.

Mr. GROSS. Now we are beginning to get to the meat of the coconut. You want to construct a four- or five-level garage. I do not suppose you have the slightest idea of what this garage or visitors' center will cost?

Mr. GRAY. That is the reason, I might say to the gentleman, for the study. As the gentleman knows, one Congress does not bind another, and if we do not like the recommendations of the Commission next January 15, we are not bound by the bill before us and can completely ignore it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am so old fashioned that when you come in and ask me to vote for $60,000, I want to know what you plan to do with the money. I have had a few months of experience around here. As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, to spend $60,000 in this fashion usually leads to a good many millions of dollars before you get through. That is my interest in this matter.

Now let me ask you this question: What would be wrong with the National Capital Planning Commission or some other of the numerous agencies that are available around here looking into this matter? Let us just take the National Capital Planning Commission. What is wrong with them giving your committee and the Congress the information and save the $60,000.

Mr. GRAY. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission is one of the 21 members that will be appointed under this bill. We do not feel this is merely a planning matter. We feel that the predominant membership on this Commission should be a membership composed of Members of Congress, because we feel that the Capitol, itself the bastion of freedom, certainly has more visitors than any other facility in the area, and we would not want to leave this matter to the planners downtown. Therefore, we want a broad representation on the Commission, and so we have 12 Members of Congress out of 21 so that we will have a majority of the Commission.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for asking some of these questions, which I really think should be answered in detail. As one individual who has been privileged in recent weeks to visit the White House with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and hear the President of the United States indirectly, if not directly, point his finger at the Congress as to the fact that we are spending too much money, I would respectfully suggest that this bill not go any farther than it is at the present time. Then, when the opportune moment arrives, if it is next year or the year after, and it has had considerable study by the Congress, then that is the appropriate time to consider it. However, now I am constrained to vote against another new project and another new program like this under the circumstances that we presently face. I hope that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his words of wisdom. I, too, think this could very well wait until we find some daylight and preferably until we arrive at the point where we have a balanced Federal budget. Certainly it could wait until this galloping inflation is stopped. However, I know of no reason why, with 15 million or more visitors going through Washington, the city of Washington and the District of Columbia government cannot build a visitors center. In all good conscience, how much do they want out of the visitors here? Why should the Federal Government put up a visitors center now, or later, and preferably later?

Mr. Speaker, I note that the committee in its report quoted the Vice President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey, as late as March 25, 1966, as saying that no city in the world treats its visitors with such shabby indifference as Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, that is pretty strong medicine. "The shabbiest treatment of any city in the world; any city in the world."

Then he goes on to say "We cannot find parking space," and "there is no place to get a meal in the Capitol environs."

Mr. Speaker, are the Members of the House really expected to believe that? There are cafeterias in the office buildings, there are cafeterias and dining rooms in the Capitol, there is a cafeteria in the Smithsonian Institution, there is one over in the Supreme Court. There are places where visitors can get meals in Government buildings all over Washington. Nearly every department of Government has a cafeteria or some kind of eating place where the public can be served.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], did not mean to leave the impression that it is very easy for a constituent to obtain a meal over in one of our buildings.

Has the gentleman from Iowa ever tried to get a Boy or Girl Scout through the cafeteria over in the Longworth Building, or over in the Rayburn Building, as I have attempted to do so many times?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. I tried it the other day, and we had to wait 3 hours for them to be able to eat.

Mr. GROSS. These are not the only eating places for the touring public. There are any number of restaurants in

Washington, D.C., and the gentleman from Illinois well knows it.

The Vice President of the United States says that they cannot get a drink of water in some of the congressional office buildings.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the sum of $60,000, which is being talked about with reference to this legislation, the people in my congressional district are not interested in spending their time at a visitors' center when they come to Washington. They want to see the Capitol, or the Smithsonian Institution, or other Government buildings located in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the sum of $60,000 or the sum of $100,000 would go a long way toward keeping these Capitol buildings open more hours per day in order that more people could see what they actually would like to see.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the committee will study this aspect of the problem and look at it more closely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President says that tourists cannot get a drink of water. You do not believe that, and I do not believe it. You know they can get a drink of water. I do not know who the Vice President of the United States is trying to impress.

Then he goes on to say that there is "no official or designated place where they can get information on how to visit our most revered national shrines."

I am glad to have them come to my office, the people from the district I represent, and I am sure the rest of you are glad to have them come to your offices for such information.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the expenditure of even $60,000 for this purpose, because I know to what this is going to lead. It is going to lead to a multimillion-dollar expenditure on the part of the Federal Government, when the District of Columbia, if a visitors' center is needed, ought to build it and operate it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the original request that came up from the White House on this bill was for an opened authorization which would have permitted the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to build this visitors center at any time that he so desired.

Mr. Speaker, the committee refused to go along with that idea, because we could not answer all of the questions which the previous speaker asked, and of which, of course, he knew no one could ask unless they had had the opportunity to look at the architectural design and the plans and outlay of the proposed visitors center.

So what we did was to start in a very modest way to investigate whether a visitors center was feasible, where it would be located, and how much we might anticipate that it would cost.

It is a very complicated question. It is not easy to pick or select a site. In the first place the committee has written into its report that most of us do not feel that it should be placed within the confines of the Capitol Grounds. We also certainly do not want to include any more buildings on the Mall. We have very strong feelings that the Mall and the Capitol Grounds, that is the present Capitol Grounds, should be kept open as far as possible and should not be cluttered up with any more buildings. We want to keep the vistas open and that also is the idea which the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission and the National Planning Commission have in mind in their future development of Washington.

We did not feel competent to make the selection of the site, and so forth. We felt that experts should be called in on this job. So we asked for a modest appropriation to study whether it is feasible or whether it is not. Also so we can then present to you an intelligent analysis of just what you will be getting if you do get a visitors center.

This question arose last year, as I remember it, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] offered an amendment to the Madison Memorial Library bill in which he suggested placing some kind of a cafeteria or something for the visitors in that new building. It was voted down then and I think wisely so. But at the same time I feel that the gentleman from New York had an excellent idea.

The committee has had four or five bills proposing a visitors center presented this year. We decided that the subject merited consideration as a whole.

If the District of Columbia were to build this that just would be taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another, because if the District of Columbia built it then we would have to provide the money in the District of Columbia appropriation bill to reimburse the District for the building that it built. That is a really silly way to try to save money in creating this new visitors center.

We also do not know just what facilities we wish to put into the building. That is another reason why we feel it is of importance to have a study made before we start into any large Federal expenditure.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we do not know whether we want to have one visitors center for Capitol Hill which would be designed purely for Congress. This would show the people who come here a real thorough way to see the legislative branch of the Government in action. Then perhaps there would be another visitors center located out somewhere where they would go if they wanted to tour the other buildings that are not in the Capitol Hill complex. That one should include parking space plus minibuses to take the visitors to the center of town and to the cultural centers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a big question. Personally, I would like to see if we do have a visitors center that we have one which is designed purely for the Capitol Hill. I think that is where most of the people who come to Washington are interested in going. They want to see action. Here is one place where they really can see the Congress functioning and the Congress in action.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It is surprising to me to see an assault led upon this bill by people on the other side including the very distinguished, lovable whip of the other party.

This was a bill which came out of the Committee on Public Works with unanimous support, with a unanimous vote. It is a bill which we think represents a conservative but sensible approach to a problem that has plagued every Member of this body who has spent any time here. I will bet you that there is not a Member of this body on either side of the aisle who has not had constituents come to Washington and be bewildered and confused and troubled and badly inconvenienced by the absence of any parking facilities in the Capitol area to put their cars, by the total absence of facilities here in the Capitol area directed particularly at their convenience and at their better understanding of the Capitol and what it has to offer.

We have spent millions of dollars—all of us here in the House—over the past few years in trying to improve the facilities that are available to Members of Congress, our employees, and our staffs, We have invested millions of dollars in new office buildings, new committee rooms, all types of equipment to facilitate the work of the Congress, and we have spent hardly a red cent to improve the conveniences of the Capitol for the general public.

Now the Committee on Public Works comes to the floor with a unanimous bill to try to improve the lot of John Q. Public when he comes to the U.S. Capitol and to make convenient to him parking facilities, rest rooms, and informative services in connection with the Capitol of the United States. I hope that there will be no attempt to make an economy record on this $60,000 item which is brought to the floor by unanimous report of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks that a visitors' center is going to solve the parking problems for visitors. I would think that some contribution would be made to that solution with the new, underground garage, presently being constructed, which is supposed to park about 2,000 cars. We might then reserve space out around the office buildings for tourists and out on the Capitol Plaza and put cars of the employees in the new garage that is to be in operation soon. This might alleviate some of the pressure with respect to parking without spending $60,000 plus the millions that will be spent—and the gentleman well knows it—as a result of the expenditure of the $60,000. That is just the big foot in the door.

With respect to the elimination of confusion, I do not think the gentleman believes that the $60,000 will eliminate any part of the confusion in Washington.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14604.

The question was taken, and the Chair stated that, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Iowa objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 108, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—209

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Ayres
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brock
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Daddario
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Holifield
Hungate
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Latta
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Moeller
Moore
Morgan
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Race
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Whalley
White, Tex.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—108

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Bolton
Bow
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Ellsworth
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Greigg
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
McVicker
Marsh
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Morse
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pelly
Poff
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schmidhauser
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Talcott
Taylor
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Younger

NOT VOTING—115

Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Betts
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Landrum
Lennon
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDowell
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Pickle
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sullivan
Sweeney
Todd
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Daniels with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Morris.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Senner with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Cameron with Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hawkins with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Huot.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. McMillan.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Olson or Minnesota with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Todd with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Grider.

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Howard.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Grabowski with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mrs. **BOLTON** changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **FUQUA** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959

Mr. **GRAY**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15024) to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require the Administrator of General Services to acquire certain additional property in the District of Columbia for public purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15024

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Administrator is authorized to lease from the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a period not to exceed three years from the date of enactment of this subsection, a portion (approximately 200 feet by 450 feet) of the property in the District of Columbia bounded by Twelfth Street, Maine Avenue, and Maryland Avenue, Southwest, for use as a heliport.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to sublet all the property leased by him under paragraph (1) of this subsection to any person who will operate such property as a heliport in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Such sublease may be entered into by negotiation or otherwise and shall be at the highest obtainable rental for the purpose for which the property is to be used.

"(3) The Administrator is authorized to construct all improvements necessary to permit the operation of such property as a heliport at a cost not to exceed $75,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15024, now before us for consideration is the vital link missing in our National Capital transportation system.

With the advent of jet service at National Airport, there is a critical overcrowding of facilities, both terminal and airway's facilities. The only way to alleviate this congestion on the ground and in the air is to provide scheduled helicopter service from downtown Washington to Dulles and Friendship Airports.

The need is great, the hour is late. Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, is one of a very few cities in the United States without a heliport. Yet, the need is greater in Washington because of the great distance from the capital city to the outlying airports at Baltimore and Dulles. The average metropolitan airport is located 5 to 10 miles from the downtown area, with some airports even more accessible. However, our two major airports, Dulles and Baltimore, are more than 30 miles from downtown Washington. If we are to keep pace with the growing population and increased travel by air, it is imperative that scheduled helicopter service be provided now.

Several major helicopter operators have petitioned the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to start scheduled helicopter service but could not commence operations if approved, because Washington does not now have a heliport.

Your Committee on Public Works has studied this matter very carefully and brings to you today legislation that was reported unanimously. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration to lease from the Redevelopment Land Agency a parcel of land now being used as a parking lot at the corner of Maine Avenue and 12th Street SW., very near the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Department of Agriculture, only 2 or 3 minutes from the Capitol and downtown areas. The bill authorizes a maximum of $75,000 for paving, lighting, fencing, and construction of a small ticket office. Some of these costs will be recouped from the operator who will lease the facilities from GSA. I am happy to announce that this service can be provided to Dulles and Baltimore for approximately $6 with no subsidy from the Federal Government. It now costs approximately double that amount in a taxicab taking more than four times as long for the trip.

Today is the day to pass legislation giving the Nation's Capital a modern jet transportation system to our outlying airports and alleviate some of the congestion at National. The bill before you is designed to do just that. I hope all of you will support it.

Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the House has not been furnished information with respect to the relocation of this heliport. Will the gentleman restate where the proposed site is now located? Much of the report and opposition is directed to the Maine Avenue, Southwest, and M Street site. Where does the gentleman now propose to put it?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, that is the location authorized in the bill. I merely mentioned a moment ago that the letters in the report concern a tentative site down at M Street, Southwest.

The bill before the House calls for a site at 12th Street and Maine Avenue, Southwest, which is about 10 or 12 blocks away, out of the residential area, and it is perfectly agreeable to all the agencies involved.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says this is near the Bureau of Printing and Engraving?

Mr. GRAY. It is about a block and a half from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and a half a block south of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. It is half a block south of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GRAY. From here, one would take a freeway to 12th Street and it would be just as one comes off the freeway. Coming from downtown, one would take 12th Street or 14th Street. It is very accessible, it is in the city, it is not in a residential area, and we will have no problem with noise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says the Redevelopment Land Agency, and National Capital Planning Commission, and government of the District of Columbia have removed all objections?

Mr. GRAY. All objections; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is going to put in the Record the communications which state the removal of their objections; is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. I should be delighted to.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman to please do so.

How much space will there be at the new location which is in nowise described in the opposition by the agencies of the Government? What will be the size of the tract there?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will refer to the report, he will see that the site called for in the bill, at 12th Street and Maine Avenue, will be a site of 200 feet by 450 feet.

Mr. GROSS. Two hundred feet by four hundred and fifty feet?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct. These dimensions were given to the committee by the Federal Aviation Agency as the minimum requirements for 100 percent safety for the ingress and egress route of the helicopter service.

Mr. GROSS. How close will that be to the Department of Agriculture? How much noise will those offices and contiguous offices get?

Mr. GRAY. None whatsoever. As I mentioned, this will be about a block from the Department of Agriculture and a block and a half from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. It will be more than 1,000 feet. The Federal Aviation Agency says that within the first 500 feet there would be some noise factor, but all of it would be eliminated with a perimeter of 1,000 feet. We are far beyond the 1,000-foot limitation on the noise factor.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not believe it would have been wise to withhold action on this bill until a determination as to whether Anacostia and Bolling fields will be opened to general aviation? I believe the Administrator of the FAA has already said he would open one or both fields to general aviation, provided the legislation passed by House only a few days ago is approved in the other body. Does the gentleman not believe we should wait and put the helicopter service out at Anacostia and Bolling, where other general aviation facilities may be located?

Mr. GRAY. I say to the distinguised gentleman from Iowa, this is a matter of accessibility. The studies which have been made in great detail on the need for helicopter service show that if it is not in close proximity to the downtown area people will not avail themselves of the helicopter service. We feel if it is necessary for the people to fight traffic over the bridges—such as the 14th Street Bridge or the South Capitol Street Bridge—to get to the service, it would be so inconvenient to the traveling public that they would get on the buses and go out to Dulles or get on the buses and go out to Baltimore. We are trying to provide a downtown location so that when a Congressman is late to a session, or someone is in a hurry to get somewhere, he can get to Dulles in a few minutes. That cannot be done if a person has to get across the river.

Mr. GROSS. That does pose another question or two. Where are the Members of Congress going to park their cars in that small area?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Where will there be parking spaces for the cars of Members of Congress? They seem to park them on the sidewalks and everywhere else at National Airport.

Mr. GRAY. I say to the gentleman that, after this is established—and because of time I could not point it out before—we expect a half million people to use this service every year. There will be scheduled public transportation, either by minibus or other public transportation, from the Capitol directly. The gentleman could leave his car in

the parking space, catch a bus, and in a few minutes be on his way out to Dulles or to Baltimore. There will not be a need for a public parking lot.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said there would be parking facilities.

Mr. GRAY. That was for the visitors' center. We are on another bill now.

Mr. GROSS. What is that?

Mr. GRAY. I say to the gentleman, we are on another bill now. It was on the visitors' center, which I was talking about, that we needed parking.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I arose to oppose the bill on the basis that every agency of the Government was opposed to the location on the Potomac River. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the bill under the circumstances, although I believe it would be far better to locate the heliport at Anacostia or Bolling, if those airfields are opened to general aviation, as I hope they will be.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe, while we are discussing the expenditure of additional moneys for a facility in connection with a heliport, something should be said about the disgraceful conditions in the Capitol of the United States for the combined airlines ticket office, where the help have been laboring under the most impossible conditions during the last 2 months.

It is much too small; no ventilation and thoroughly inadequate for the purpose. I would like to call the attention of all the Members of the House to the fact that we should provide something decent for them so that they can help us with our problems.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to this situation, and I want to add that the District of Columbia could very well put up the $75,000 to provide for the heliport ticket office, the paving of the land, and so on and so forth. It seems to me that the city has an obligation to do a few things that ought not always to be saddled on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I do not believe that this bill will solve all of the problems involved as far as aviation is concerned in the Washington area, but I feel it is a step in relieving the dangerous congestion that we have at Washington National Airport and also will utilize the ghost facility which cost $100 million at Dulles Airport. The gentleman from Iowa will recall that about 10 or 12 years ago when appropriations were being requested for the second Washington National Airport there was a great deal of fear and concern expressed as to the danger of further collisions occurring at National Airport if a second facility were not constructed immediately. So we spent $100 million and constructed this new facility and built an access road in order to get there. However, in spite of this, the congestion at National Airport is even greater than it was 10 or 12 years ago. People will not use it when it is that far away. Efforts are made on the part of the Federal Aviation Administration to transfer flights there, but objections are made by Members of Congress. So I guess the only way that we can get traffic out to Dulles is to make it more comfortable, more economical, more convenient, and more efficient to get out there. Maybe monorails or expressways are the way or perhaps better rates on limousines might be helpful. There is no question in my mind that helicopter service to airports is a coming thing and is inevitable, so we may as well get started on it in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. GROSS. I have a suggestion to you in the State of Virginia. If you want traffic at Dulles Airport, why not build a monorail system or a high-speed system of highways so that the public can get out there?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman from Virginia was not the one pleading for the construction of Dulles Airport, but the Congress of the United States, for the convenience of the Nation's Capital, saw fit to do it. Now it has been built and the taxpayers' money is invested there, so we may as well make it a profitable venture if it is at all possible.

Mr. GROSS. On the basis of the huge annual losses it will take a lot of profit to ever bail it out.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker that this would not be a cure-all, but there is no question that something has to be done about Washington National Airport, which is overcrowded and is getting to the danger point. We had a demonstration a week ago of helicopter service. You can fly in 10 minutes to Friendship and in 11 minutes to Dulles in a helicopter. As I understand it, this will be a beginning for a real ticket office where you can go in and buy an airline ticket. You can leave your baggage there and get to Friendship or Dulles by using helicopter service. There will be nothing else to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in making things just as comfortable as I can for both the Marylanders and Virginians. I regret that most of us were not advised of the change in location and the removal of objections by those agencies of the Government which certainly have a direct interest in the location of this heliport. I am for this kind of service.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the committee has any information indicating that a private operator can run this service without a Government subsidy. We have been wrangling about helicopter services. It has testified before our committee for years and years that they could not be operated profitably in the built-up metropolitan areas of Los Angeles or Chicago or New York City.

And I feel that before this debate closes we should have some information on the possibilities of a Government subsidy being sought with which to defray the cost of it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed four applications for helicopter service. Three of them did not want any subsidy. One of them wants a subsidy. So there are three about which I know who do not seek any subsidy from the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Iowa very much.

I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] will state whether there is any plan for helicopter service directly between the Dulles Airport and Friendship Airport?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board, as the gentleman from Maryland has pointed out, has four applications pending now for scheduled service. The certificate of convenience and necessity would be issued based upon the study made by the operators as to the number of passengers to be carried.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked to two or three of the operators, and they have assured me that wherever there is a need, they will institute the service. So one cannot be sure about this until such time as the CAB issues a certificate of convenience and necessity, and permits helicopters to operate between these points. Of course, the study will be made on the basis of the needs and based upon whether or not this bill goes into effect.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois suggest that we may build a heliport and then find that there is no need for the service?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, we know that there is a need for service directly from downtown Washington to Dulles Airport, and from downtown Washington to Baltimore.

I thought the gentleman's question was whether there was going to be direct service from airport to airport, bypassing the Capital City?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that was my original question. But when the gentleman talked about improving the need for service, I was wondering whether we might build this facility and then not need it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members that I believe this is a very, very fine bill. I feel that it shows leadership and initiative. However, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa who expresses concern over the Virginia problem and over Maryland's problems, I have noticed the gentleman from Illinois over the years, and I would like to point out to him that even though his blood pressure rose a bit when his previous bill was not successful, that this one seems to be moving right along, which proves the virtue of persistence.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would detail a little more firmly the applicants who say that they are interested in supplying this service, and the names of the three who are not interested in a subsidy and the one that is interested in such subsidy?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know the names of all four of the operators that this legislation would affect, but I can tell the Members of the House that possibly the New York operators, I believe, one is the New York Airways—and then there are two operations in California—the San Francisco operation—which has petitioned the CAB for service—and the fourth being the Washington Incorporated Airways, which has been in operation for approximately 10 years, and which has flown successfully over this route.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the Washington-Baltimore Helicopter Airways, Inc.

Let me answer the question on subsidy—and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], is interested in this also. The reason the helicopter operators have never been able to operate, presumably, without a Government subsidy, is because the airlines themselves heretofore have been reluctant to help subsidize the cost of such operations.

Mr. Speaker, here in the Washington area we have a situation where the flights are being diverted by FAA from National Airport to Dulles Airport and to Baltimore, and many flights are leaving with only 30 to 40 percent of the seats filled. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it makes a lot of sense for the airlines themselves to subsidize the helicopter operations, which will cover 50 percent of the fare. That would amount to the sum of about $6 from Washington to Dulles or Baltimore for the flying passenger. However, the operators would recoup $12, $6 of it would come from the airlines and the other $6 from the customer.

Mr. Speaker, this makes a lot of sense for the airlines to pay $6 in order to fill up their seats on outbound flights.

This is the reason that we know that a Federal subsidy will not be required because the airlines themselves will be paying it; and gladly so, because it means a lot of extra fares for them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked a while back as to whether or not anyone here had any understanding or any experience with the cost of the success or failure of the helicopter services. We had an exceedingly good one in Cleveland but it just folded because the expense was too great. Everybody wanted it but they had to charge more than people were willing to pay.

Also I understand that the New York Helicopter Service from the city to the airports and from one airport to another could not function unless they had subsidies. I think that should be faced very frankly and very clearly.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as I have tried to point out, there is still a subsidy required for profitable helicopter operations, the difference is that the airlines will be paying the subsidy instead of the taxpayers.

Mrs. BOLTON. That may be all right, but it will have to be done if we are to have helicopter service.

Mr. GRAY. I agree with the gentlewoman and thank her for her usual fine interest and help.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 15024, with amendments?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease certain property in the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CHAMIZAL MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the United States bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, with amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11555

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, is authorized to (1) construct a border highway in the city of El Paso, Texas, between the approximate point of the beginning of the rectified boundary channel, two blocks west of Sante Fe Street in El Paso, thence along the international boundary to the International Bridge at Zaragosa Road—about twelve and one-half miles east: *Provided*, That the design plans and specifications for this highway shall be developed to meet design and construction standards established by the Secretary; that the Secretary may work through the Texas State Highway Department in accomplishing any part of this project; that the planning, design, construction schedule, and works shall be subject to review by the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to assure coordination with the relocation of the river channel and relocation of related facilities, pursuant to the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184): *And provided further*, That the Secretary may at his discretion request that the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, plan and perform such part of the engineering and construction of the highway as may be warranted to assure coordination and efficient construction, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purpose; (2) acquire lands necessary for the border highway in accordance with the approved plans, through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184) for the acquisition of lands for the purposes of that Act will also apply to the acquisition of adjoining lands required for the border highway, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purposes.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the highway authorized to be constructed by this Act to the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, except that the Secretary shall not construct any highway under authority of this Act until such time as he shall have entered into an agreement with the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, wherein such State or city agrees to accept all right, title, and interest to the highway upon completion of construction and agrees to maintain such highway for such period and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11555, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Works. It would authorize the construction of a memorial highway known as the Chamizal Memorial Highway, some four lanes wide, a limited access facility, along the river front section of the city of El Paso in Texas.

This highway would extend through the city of El Paso 12½ miles.

The construction of this highway is an integral part of the overall settlement of a dispute that existed between the United States and Mexico for some 100 years which was resolved by the Chamizal Treaty ratified on January 14, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, this treaty is an achievement in the finest of American diplomatic traditions—the peaceful settlement of disputes. Among the features of the treaty which was ratified and is now underway is the transfer of approximately 630 acres of land in the southerly downtown section of El Paso to Mexico and 193 acres of land under Mexican jurisdiction to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, during the talks leading to the Chamizal convention and treaty, a complimentary program for the development of the American section of the land was proposed by the United States working in the closest cooperation with the county and the city of El Paso. El Paso has throughout been extremely helpful and cooperative in adjusting itself to the provisions of this settlement even though a significant segment of its land was involved.

The treaty provides for the relocation of the Rio Grande River channel, relocation within the Chamizal section of the irrigation canal, and compensating occupants of the lands involved in the transfer.

The estimated cost of the proposed highway is $12 million, and includes the necessary land acquisition as well as appropriate interchanges, traffic signs, signals, and lighting.

The construction of this highway along the Rio Grande in an area encompassed by the city and county of El Paso will be a valuable supplement to other improvements along the national borders that are being undertaken by the city of El Paso and the State of Texas to meet the needs of the area which will develop as a result of the treaty settlement.

The bill provides a maximum of service at minimum cost, and H.R. 11555 should be passed by this House today.

I may add that this legislation has been passed by the Subcommittee on Roads and also by the full committee of the House Public Works Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks before or after the vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, under the Chamizal Treaty with Mexico we have already expended or will expend at least $30 million. Is that correct? Is it more or less?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So, at least $30 million has been spent or will be spent on the relocation of the river and the taking of certain properties for the benefit of Mexico. Now we are asked to add $12 million for a superhighway, to which I find not one reference in the treaty. There is no condition whatever that $12 million be spent by all the taxpayers of this country to construct within the city of El Paso—and I take it that it would be within the city of El Paso—a 12½-mile highway at a cost of $12 million. I do not understand why we should be asked to do this.

It is only slightly enlightening to read a letter from the Executive Office of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, signed by Mr. Rommel, who says that the construction of this road would aid the city of El Paso in adapting itself to the terms of a settlement.

What is this? Some sugar coating on the settlement? Is this a gift to the people of El Paso? I did not know that the people of El Paso were opposed to the Chamizal Treaty or Agreement. I did not hear anyone speak up in opposition when the bill was before Congress. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, if he can enlighten me, particularly as to whether the people of El Paso spoke above a whisper in their opposition to the Chamizal Treaty and the taking of their property for the purpose of satisfying the Government of Mexico.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. According to the reports of the State Department, particularly those of Ambassador Thomas C. Mann, then Ambassador from the United States to Mexico, and later Deputy Secretary of State, the people of the city of El Paso were extremely cooperative.

Mr. GROSS. They were cooperative with whom?

Mr. WRIGHT. Cooperative with the Government of the United States in its request that they give up 630 acres in the downtown part of the city. Any of the Members of the House—the gentleman from his city, I from my city, and any other Member—would recognize that for a city to give up 630 acres in the downtown part of the community represents a considerable loss to the city. These people willingly did this. They did not ask for any written guarantee or contract from the United States.

Mr. GROSS. But they are being indemnified for the taking, are they not?

Mr. WRIGHT. The individuals from whom the property was taken and to whom it belonged are being indemnified through the U.S. Board of Commissioners' settlement. That is correct. However, the city of El Paso will lose revenues that were coming to that city from all of this property that was on the tax rolls of the city.

The city of El Paso, at the time of the discussions with the then Ambassador Mann, stated that if this were done, in order to facilitate the flow of traffic of some 60 million people every year going back and forth at this busiest border crossing in the entire border, it would be necessary to have a highway to connect the three points of entry, through which the 60 million people pass annually. It was verbally stated at that time by the representatives of the U.S. State Department settlement group that they would try to get for the city of El Paso a recompense or a compensation in the form of this highway partly to help them accommodate to the loss of this enormous amount of property.

Mr. GROSS. This is what I strenuously object to—the State Department committing the Congress of the United States to a deal about which we knew nothing, in this case a four-lane highway through the city of El Paso, as a sweetener to get them to accept this deal from Mexico. I say to the gentleman from Texas that I am just one Member of this House, but I am awfully tired of the way Mexico has been treating us in some respects. This is one of them. And I am sick and tired of the State Department making these deals and then presenting us with the bills.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we should emphasize the importance of the property in the center of the city of El Paso which it gave up; that it was unusually good property in the center of the city of El Paso. That is not true. I have been down there and I looked at the property some years ago. This is property on which there are some warehouses and some pretty well broken down dwellings and some other things. The property is not anywhere near, as has been portrayed by the gentleman from Texas, the prime downtown El Paso property.

I do not know anything about the merits of the question that is before us, but I do not believe the RECORD should indicate that this is really valuable property as far as the city of El Paso is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I have been able to read, the report is completely silent on the amount of tax revenue which was lost as a result of the land-taking for the benefit of Mexico. Certainly we were not put on notice in the House that part of the cost of this deal would be a $12 million four-lane highway.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not positive about this, but I believe the city of El Paso is being reimbursed for the loss of this property. I believe that has already been done.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there has been indemnification to the private owners. I do not know about the city.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question regarding this particular property, let me point out the history behind this. For a hundred years El Paso has wanted to develop this land as it should be developed in a properly developed area. For 100 years we have waited for the United States to settle this. We had an arbitration settlement recommended in 1911, but the United States did not feel it could accept this recommended settlement.

We waited longer, and when the settlement was made this year, taking the downtown area, that meant a great deal to El Paso and to its future. Had they gone to another area, we could have developed this area in a more orderly fashion. But they did take this and it constricted us between the mountain and the river. We are asking in recompense—and the city is not getting anything otherwise—for the highway, so that there can be better law enforcement for the three entry points, and so that we will have the highway.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying is that we should have known about this when the Chamizal deal came before the House of Representatives. We should have been put on notice that the next bite would be a $12 million superhighway within the city of El Paso.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I quite thoroughly agree with the gentleman that neither the State Department nor any other executive agency of the Federal Government possesses any right to commit this Congress to any future action. I believe in the present case they did not presume to do so.

If the gentleman will read the report, on pages 4 and 5, under the signature of Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, he will see it recalled that at the time the original Chamizal settlement was up for consideration, representatives of the State Department did appear before the congressional committees and the Department witness explained that the city of El Paso had proposed a program to assist the city in accommodating itself to the changes.

The committee, in its committee report on that particular settlement, on that bill, stated, as shown at the top of page 5:

> In the event that in the future projects for the park, the border highway, and the canal are presented to the Congress, the committee hopes they will receive prompt attention and consideration.

So Congress has been on notice, as it were, that this was a part of what we regarded as a complete package. It does not come to us new at this moment.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman that it comes to me as a new asking for the city of El Paso, and I will be surprised if, in the hearings on this subject, the State Department did not indicate the $30 million or more was the total cost of carrying out the treaty or agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be rejected.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. I wish to tell the gentleman that I have been there and have been over this area and have talked to the leaders of El Paso. They recognized at the time this treaty was made that they were kind of at the mercy of Congress as to what would happen to the highway and things like that. Now they have come in asking for the highway to take care of traffic for people all over the United States, who will enjoy this. Tourists come there from every State in the Union. We do not want to have a bottleneck in the thing, without a highway at the bridge where one crosses. Certainly I believe this will be to the advantage of all the people of the United States, and not just the people of El Paso.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of H.R. 11555, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in H.R. 11555, the House of Representatives today has the historic opportunity to aid in the orderly development of our southern border at its busiest port of entry, and at the same time help to memorialize a cherished American diplomatic tradition, the peaceful settlement of our international disputes. We are considering today H.R. 11555, legislation I have sponsored to provide for the construction of a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande through the Chamizal area in El Paso, Tex.

This legislation is of special importance to the people of El Paso, all west Texas, and of significance to the entire Nation, as a part of the harmonious development of land which was long in dispute, and now for the first time can be properly developed following the Chamizal settlement.

The Chamizal treaty, ratified on January 14, 1964, peacefully settled a 100-year-old dispute between our country and our southern neighbor. In dispute was the sovereignty of a several-hundred-acre tract known as the Chamizal, which was formed north of the present channel of the Rio Grande, in El Paso, Tex., by the movement of the river southward in 1853.

The treaty provides for relocation of the Rio Grande, and of the irrigation canal passing through El Paso. At the time the treaty was discussed, there were three principal complementary programs discussed. One was moving of the river. Another was moving of the canal. The other was the construction of the highway. From its inception, there has been discussion of the highway itself.

The treaty also transferred a net 437.18 acres of land to Mexico from downtown El Paso.

This property is developed. It is not developed in the finest manner, as we would want, because we have been stymied for 100 years in trying to develop it, but it has been developed, and it is on the tax rolls of the city of El Paso, and we are losing these revenues as the result of this treaty.

Following the Chamizal settlement, a complementary program to develop land acquired by the United States from Mexico under the exchange was proposed by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with the county and city of El Paso, who principally acted in cooperation, swallowing their disgruntlement because they realized that at last, perhaps, this would be an opportunity to fulfill a hope they had had since 1927 of developing a southern loop highway to prevent congestion in the southern part of our town, to give an avenue along the border where people from Latin America could envision the strength and development of our country, and where we would not be congested in our own limits.

This development program includes the Chamizal National Memorial, recently approved by the Congress and signed into public law; and appropriate complementary construction and beautification by the city of El Paso and the El Paso Independent School District, at their own expense. The estimated cost of the project is $12 million. The construction would be completely coordinated with the relocation of the Rio Grande, three new border crossings, the related construction of the Chamizal National Memorial, and other aspects of development.

El Paso has been entirely cooperative throughout the period of the Chamizal dispute and in adjusting itself to the provisions of the treaty. The uncertainty of titles in the disputed Chamizal area has prevented full physical and commercial development in southerly downtown El Paso. Additionally, the question of national sovereignty prevented the construction of this much needed border highway. Today we have the opportunity to rectify this situation. The Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the Texas State Highway Commission, has determined that the highway will be more than justified by traffic volume. The access which the proposed facility will provide to certain parts of the city will serve to develop these sections in ways which have not been possible pending the treaty. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the United States to compensate El Paso for its loss in property and in tax revenues, through providing this border highway to help El Paso and our neighbors in Mexico realize the potential of this historic settlement.

The Chamizal development program, including this highway, will beautify and make more accessible the international border section of El Paso, the busiest port of entry from Mexico. Over 22 million people will pass through El Paso's port of entry every year and witness this memorialization of the Chamizal Treaty, a significant expression of our esteem for the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Our border beautification will be matched on the Mexican side by a handsome and extensive development program that is well underway.

The Chamizal Memorial Highway, as a part of the total Chamizal program, has the full endorsement of the city and county of El Paso. The program will be a source of pride to all Americans.

The legislation we are considering today is a major part of the Chamizal development. This four-lane limited access highway is proposed along El Paso's rectified riverfront extending through the city for a distance of 12.5 miles. This highway is important to the enforcement of law, permitting patrolmen to patrol the border. It will allow a free flow of traffic and will also allow the border patrolmen, immigration officers, and other officers of the U.S. Government to control the narcotics traffic and the illegal entry of aliens and assist them in controlling other factors to make this one of the most law-abiding areas in the United States.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. I want to say this to the gentleman from Texas. From the negotiations that they have had at El Paso, it is evident that the people there and the leadership there did a tremendous job in working with this terrible problem we have there. We have a terrible problem with regard to our neighbor to the south of us, Mexico, who is one of our best customers. This situation brought about by forces beyond our control was worked out by the people in El Paso in a way which is to be admired. The people there worked this out knowing that they did not have any way in the world to bind the Congress and that they were going to give up this land and this money. They are here today telling you that their city needs this highway, and the Congress should provide it because we have done a tremendous job there in settling a dispute which has been going on for 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this House votes for this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. As a matter of fact, in order to be fair about it, we feel that we deserve this as a community that has cooperated and accepted the loss of a very vital part of its area in the settlement which was negotiated here so that this country of ours can go to the negotiation tables in the future in Latin America and not have this Chamizal dispute thrown in our face in every negotiation. We recognize the higher purpose that this settlement sought. For this reason we have laid aside our own personal desires and preferences and have accepted this settlement. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, if you feel that a community has cooperated in the overall purposes of the United States toward the settlement of an international dispute at the sacrifice of its own land, with the hope and intent that in this process and as a result of this sacrifice we can develop the beauty of our area and improve the efficiency and the control of our border, then I ask you for your vote today on this bill. I believe it is justified, as we have not come to you asking for anything that we do not deserve. We are an area that pays our own way and supports ourselves, but in this instance this is fully justified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I may direct a question or two to the author of the bill or to a member of the committee. I have been impressed by the need to maintain friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. I agree that this area should be beautified, as has been stated here, but I do not have the answers and I cannot find them to some questions that I would like to ask. I really think a bill of this sort ought to be on a calendar with time for adequate discussion and debate so that we can get answers to questions. I realize it is late in the afternoon, but there are one or two questions I would like the answers to before I have to vote on this bill.

As I understand it, the bill would have the U.S. Government put up $12 million to build 12 miles of superhighway, at $1 million a mile, along the edge of the new channel of the river, which is being relocated. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. That $12 million includes acquisition. However, that is true. I might mention one reason for the urgency in this is that the authority would rest in the Boundary Commission who will acquire all of this property for the river channel and the canal and the highways at the same time. We feel it would be more efficient and more of a saving of money to the United States if we could grant this authority so that this could progress at one time and be done in an orderly manner.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will forgive me, that was not the question I asked. You answered my question earlier. In looking at this map I see the proposed highway is at some considerable distance from the river.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. No, sir; the river would be relocated.

Mr. JONAS. It says "the new river channel"—and then, according to the scale on the map, at one point the highway is at least 1 mile from the river.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. No, sir; the gentleman is looking at the arrows.

Mr. JONAS. No, sir; I am looking at the proposed memorial highway. The line is on the map and south of it there is a line which indicates the new channel.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. This is right here.

Mr. JONAS. Come over to the right side of the page, and look at the wide distance between those two lines. What does that represent?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. That, right along here, is an arrow. This one here is the river channel. This is the river channel right here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina 1 additional minute.

Mr. JONAS. Is this not—and I point to the line on the map—does this not represent the new river channel?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. And does not the other represent the proposed new highway?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. No, sir; that is the arrow.

Mr. JONAS. Why does it say on your map "The proposed Memorial Highway"?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Because it points to the extreme ends. That is an arrow. That threw me when I first looked at it, and it may have misled the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure that it would throw anyone off who looks at it, if he is not familiar with the ground there.

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates the point that we do not have enough time in the short period allocated for the consideration of this bill to develop the facts in order to find out what we need to know about it. Those of us who do not live in El Paso, and who have not had an opportunity to visit there, do not know anything about the layout of the land, and where this highway is to be located.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I be of help to the gentleman?

The arrows point to the points of entry on either extreme end of the highway, as proposed. The highway does follow parallel to the channel, as it will be developed.

Mr. JONAS. Right on the bank of the channel?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Well, there are three things involved there. There is a canal—there is a riverbed, first—and then there is a canal, and then the other point. There is a river that has to be located, but the rest of it would be the highway.

Mr. JONAS. There would be no structures between the highway and the river?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. The only structures would be the railroad in between. The rest of the time the highway would parallel along and be parallel to the river itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that we need this highway in order to prevent the smuggling of narcotics and to provide access to boundary crossing points.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Well, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that this is one facet of its consideration.

Mr. JONAS. How are we accomplishing that right now?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. There is a dirt road along the riverbed, and as the gentleman from North Carolina knows, when you get to the problem of law enforcement it is always difficult. We have great respect for our neighbors in Mexico——

Mr. JONAS. I understand that, but if this is going to be an access highway, I do not understand how it would facilitate the control of narcotics.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. It would enable the Border Patrol and our narcotics agents to operate along the river, all along the riverbed, at the two points of entry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11555, as amended.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 134, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—173

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Ayres
Battin
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dyal
Edmondson
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Hull
Hungate
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
Love
McEwen
McFall
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Morgan
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Race
Reuss
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
White, Tex.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—134

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Krebs
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McGrath
Mackie
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St Germain
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waldie
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Younger

NOT VOTING—125

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Betts
Boggs
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Diggs
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Landrum
Long, La.
McCulloch
McDowell
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Pickle
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Redlin
Rees
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roncalio
Rostenkowski
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Celler with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Senner.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Rees with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Grider.

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Stalbaum.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Machen.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Dulski.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Powell with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. DOWDY and Mr. OTTINGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MORSE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

DISTRICT COURT INJUNCTION AGAINST COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on the ticker tape a few minutes ago a Federal district judge issued an injunction today to block the House Committee on Un-American Activities from holding a hearing on Tuesday on legislation that would bar American citizens from aiding the Vietcong. I have not received the court's injunctive order but it is in the form of injunction against a committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make this very short and sweet. As far as I am concerned I am going to be there at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and I believe that every one of the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities will be there and we will have a hearing.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week in a statement on the floor of the House, I urged the Members of this body to join me in full and complete opposition to changes proposed by the Internal Revenue Service in regard to tax deductions for education expenses which are presently permitted.

This afternoon, I have placed in the hopper a bill which would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from making this change by incorporating the present regulations into the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

It is unfortunate that this situation has come to pass. As I said on Wednesday, since 1961 the President has recommended a threefold increase in the total Federal investment in education and training. This year over $10 billion was recommended. Yet we are faced with an agency of the Government undermining the desires of the Congress.

Society has shown its need and desire for quality education beyond the baccalaureate level. Congress has indicated its belief in such a goal. Yet the IRS is trying to take away the few educational deductions now allowed.

It is inconceivable that the Internal Revenue Service can disregard the needs of American education so that under the guise of economy, they would impose this hardship which would act as a deterrent to improved educational opportunity.

The vast majority of teachers must rely on their own meager financial resources to carry the cost of necessary in-service training. Certainly they should be encouraged, rather than discouraged in this pursuit.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1966, I introduced H.R. 16422, a bill to create a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. In doing so, I joined with a number of other Republican Members in proposing a study of the criminal laws of the United States.

A number of compelling reasons for such a Commission have been advanced by my colleagues who have introduced identical bills. I am sure all Members of this body would agree that the Congress will fully consider and implement the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission which is expected to report its findings after a 3-year study next January. Additionally, as others have pointed out, obsolete and ineffective statutes should be eliminated from the criminal code. The impact of judicial decisions on the criminal code should be carefully evaluated with an eye to streamlining our criminal laws. I submit these tasks alone would be ample work for any able commission.

But there is still another area for exploitation by the Commission. Some recent Supreme Court decisions have rocked the very foundations of law and order and have thrown unwarranted obstacles in the way of law enforcement. In the wake of these recent decisions, there is urgent need to harmonize the tools of law enforcement with the rights of citizens and society. These tools are in need of strengthening.

Three areas for such strengthening immediately occur to me and there are undoubtedly others. The Federal Criminal Law Reform Commission should, first, propose changes in old laws in order to modernize them; second, seek an accommodation between conflicting principles inherent in present laws; and third, propose laws which will be necessary in view of the increasing complexity of our society and to replace laws which are presently ineffective or unused because they are not sufficiently precise.

The Reform Commission will not meet the high responsibilities of its exacting charge unless it adheres to the basic tenets of our criminal laws. I should be most disappointed if the Commission fell under the influence of those who would convert our system of criminal law into a crucible for social experimentation. The Commission would acquit itself of its responsibility most ably if it seeks to strengthen the respect for law and for those whose task it is to enforce the criminal law, sounding all interested sectors of our society in the search for solutions which can be transposed into definitive statute. I would expect the Commission to formulate concrete proposals which would produce immediate results if enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested that one approach of the Commission in the strengthening task would be to propose changes in old laws with a view to modernizing them. Perhaps no more compelling example of a requirement to update and modernize old laws exists than the present framework of narcotic criminal statutes. Anchored by the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914, present laws which reach narcotic violators are found in title 26 of the Criminal Code. As their location suggests, they are essentially revenue statutes and were enacted at a time when the propriety of using the commerce clause had not come into its popular modern vogue.

While these laws have been amazingly effective considering their vintage, they get at the problem in a highly artificial way. Earlier this session, the House debated and passed a bill providing for civil commitment of narcotic addicts. The debate clearly established that the sale of narcotic drugs is a very serious crime. As the method by which narcotic drug addiction is propagated and by which addicts are held in the chains of their addiction, pushing drugs is unquestionably a heinous offense.

The law, however, does not punish the sale. The law punishes the failure to pay a tax on the sale. A requirement in proof of such cases that there was no tax stamp on the package involved in the transaction is doubtless unnecessarily confusing to a jury.

The President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse in their final report of November 1963, had this to say about the narcotic laws:

> There is no reason why the legitimate manufacture, sale, dispensing and other distribution of narcotic drugs should be controlled as an incident of the collection of excise revenue . . . There is no longer Constitutional doubt that the Federal Government may control the domestic manufacture and transfer of narcotic drugs under its power to regulate interstate commerce.

Notwithstanding the Commission's recommendation that a new statutory authority be instituted in this area, the difficult task of generating a new set of criminal standards to control illicit drug traffic has not been undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, my second suggestion for strengthening the criminal laws which the Commission should undertake is to seek an accommodation of conflicting principles inherent in present law. For instance, during this session, the House passed the Bail Reform Act of 1966. The Bail Act undertook to define the procedure for securing bail as well as to enlarge the substantive right of release on personal recognizance pending trial. This completely worthy goal overlooked, however, a present utility of the bail system in that the system has worked to detain criminals who otherwise would roam abroad and continue to victimize society. Here is an illustration of conflicting principles inherent in existing laws, both worthy, and the Commission should seek ways in which they both can be preserved and accommodated.

The Narcotic Rehabilitation Act which preceded the Bail Act by a few days was designed not only to afford addicts an opportunity to forego criminal punishment if they successfully completed a cure through civil commitment. It was hailed also as a mechanism to get the addicts off the street as quickly as possible after arrest. To some extent, the bill might accomplish that aim if a judge was in a position to encourage an addict to accept civil commitment. The defendant who would be incarcerated anyway might take a more enlightened view of cure.

Now the impact of the bail statute as enacted, in my judgment, can only work to the direct detriment of the civil commitment program. The new bail law makes it possible for the addict to be released pending trial. As long as he sees the opportunity to stay out of jail and continue his habit, the addict can be expected to take that opportunity, now more readily available under the Bail Reform Act. I am sure the need for some revision and accommodation of the competing policies behind these new laws is clearly in order.

Mr. Speaker, the third type of revision I contemplate for the Reform Commission is that of redrafting laws which are presently ineffective and unusable because they are not sufficiently precise. I have mentioned preventive detention as a very serious problem. Admittedly, this is a delicate issue and any statute which purports to set forth the standards to be used by a judge in withholding bail before trial with its possible constitutional difficulties will provide a stern test of the draftsman's art.

Another area of recent congressional concern is in reevaluating the means by which society seeks to secure testimony in criminal cases from those who have themselves committed a crime or are otherwise unwilling to testify.

I refer not only to the Escobedo and Miranda decisions of the Supreme Court, which bear on the problem of confessions. The need for a balanced evaluation in this area goes without amplification.

But I refer as well to criminal immunity statutes, the problems of which were highlighted in the recent Giancana case in Chicago. There, a spirited public debate was undertaken by the Justice Department and the chief judge of the Federal district court in Chicago as to the application of the laws of contempt. Ironically, it was the Justice Department—the prosecutor in the case—who declined as "improper" a prosecution urged by the judge to be clearly available under Federal statutes.

In larger perspective, of course, a delineation between the right of an individual not to incriminate himself—and his right to privacy—on the one hand, and the right of society to the testimony of all its citizens—in order to protect society and enforce its laws—on the other, have never been precisely defined. It would be a duty of the Commission, I submit, to thoroughly study the statutes and case law in this area—and others like it—in order to provide balanced, well-delineated statutes which would sufficiently and clearly define the rights of society, and of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, the criminal law is a highly technical matter. It should be the work of criminologists and legislative experts in preference to sociologists. For in the precision of its definitions and in its exacting procedures repose the surest protections for the freedom of our citizens from unwarranted intrusion by lawless men as well as by governmental authority. Ad hoc solutions by the Congress to problems in the area of criminal law, as those problems arise, are certainly necessary. Obviously, this will long continue to be a main course of progress of the development of the law. But as our history shows, from time to time, it is well to pause and review in broad perspective the synthesis of these laws, to assure their maximum fairness and effectiveness.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to quickly pass this priority legislation, so that a Commission can be constituted and have begun its work before the report of the President's Crime Commission in January of next year. The increasing complexity of our society, and the compression and acceleration of communication—the seeming compression of time itself—compels immediate action. I urge that immediate action be taken by this Congress and thereafter by the Executive in the appointment of as able and searching a body as has ever been assembled in the history of our jurisprudence, to carry out this enlightening task.

"WHY CAMOUFLAGE"

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an editorial which appeared in the August issue of a very excellent publication entitled the "Illinois Agricultural Association Record."

The editorial was written by William J. Kuhfuss, president of the association. It well sets forth how big government with its huge expenditures is itself the basic cause for the inflation that is rapidly engulfing all of us.

Neither Mr. Kuhfuss, nor the association he heads, is known for extremism or partisanship in their thinking. I commend the editorial to you as expressing the views of the farmers of Illinois, and I believe elsewhere throughout the country.

The editorial follows:

"Why Camouflage?"

If you properly confuse the people with talk, you may be able to disorganize them so that they will not see the real issues.

I received a letter recently, as president of Country Life Insurance Company, and a duplicate as president of Country Mutual Insurance Company, from John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D.C. He most eloquently emphasizes business' responsibility in the control of inflation. I quote, in part:

"Each department and agency in Washington is carefully examining its programs to determine what expenditures can be eliminated or postponed. I ask you to do likewise. The President needs your help. Continued prosperity depends on your help." He quotes President Johnson as saying: "We cannot allow continued prosperity to flounder on rising costs and shrunken dollars."

I am sure that Secretary Connor is hopeful for more response to his plea than farmers have received in their pleas to Washington to alter the course which inevitably leads to inflation. I hope this letter from Secretary Connor is not political dressing. Inflation is an increase in the dollars needed to buy a given service or product. The best control of inflation is an abundant supply of products and services for which dollars are to be spent. This is supply and demand.

The building of the "Great Society" is bringing sharply increased spending for public projects. The federal government now accounts for about one dollar in every five spent in the United States. Many government employees are required to file reports and check businesses, communities, and individuals to see that they comply with federal regulations. The U.S. Department of Agriculture now employs one payroller for every 34 farms in the nation. If the federal agencies and services are really to be reviewed, we are promised a sizable study.

One of the books most shocking to a taxpayer is "The Complete Encyclopedia of U.S. Government Payments, Services, and Benefits." The advertising boldly states, "Here's the fortune the U.S. Government owes you!" There are over 1,000 pages of overlapping programs and services. The introduction suggests that it should be the most important and frequently used book in the library of every American.

The government cannot give to anyone that which it has not taken from someone.

Big government is getting bigger by the minute. The policy appears to be, the more people we can get on the federal payroll, the better. In 26 of the last 32 years, more money was taken out of the government till than was put in. Yet more rules, regulations, and controls to employ more people, to expand more programs, to provide more services, to deduct more income from the citizens keep being imposed. This endless cycle of non-productive work adds to the inflationary pressure. These payroll dollars are spent in the commodity and service markets. I have seen no indication of a turnaround toward less government.

We, as taxpayers, are not supposed to think nor look at the real issues as long as we remember to put in when the government says "put in," and don't spend when the government says "don't spend," and don't buy when the government says, "don't buy," and save when the government says "buy bonds."

The U.S. government is by far the largest buyer in the world, so it must appraise its expenditures if inflation is to be controlled. Please remember, dictated economies are not the answer either, for in many countries of the world plagued with the worst inflation, we find dictators with no free markets. This plea for business to hold down inflation is like calling for a Bandaid for a severed artery.

A little de-emphasis on government, accompanied by a less hampered business to provide the needs and services of the citizens, will be a positive, effective control of inflation.

Wm. J. Kuhfuss,
President, Illinois Agricultural Association.

GETTING UPSTAGED BY THE UNION WAS NOT IN THE SCENARIO

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, Life magazine has been carrying on a weekly basis a column by the distinguished author, Mr. Hugh Sidey, entitled "The Presidency."

Speaking for myself, I found that Mr. Sidey's columns give every evidence of his deep personal involvement with the Presidency in carrying out his duties here in Washington as a Time-Life correspondent.

Mr. Speaker, in the Life issue of August 12, 1966, Mr. Sidey put the frosting on the cake for his column that week entitled "Getting Upstaged by the Union Wasn't in the Scenario" was tremendous. As I read it, I could not help but believe that truly the chicken had come home to roost.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Sidey's column with my remarks:

The Presidency

(By Hugh Sidey)

GETTING UPSTAGED BY THE UNION WASN'T IN THE SCENARIO

Lyndon Johnson is the Cecil B. DeMille of American politics. There generally is plenty of substance to his achievements but he never can let it go at that. He turns every act into an L.B.J., spectacular, and when he gets a scenario that seems to work well in one situation, he is loathe to relinquish it. He runs through it again and again, oblivious to the fact that in politics, repetition tends to breed boredom and even irritation in the audience that is supposed to be captivated. And so it was that the President of the United States hauled out one of his most cherished scripts and once again cast himself in the role of hero of U.S. labor-management relations.

This time, the idea was to put the nation's strike-bound airplanes back into the air—by the familiar Johnsonian device of getting everybody to reason together under the heady, catalytic aegis of the White House. All the familiar bits were there. He came on stage at night when the lighting is more dramatic, when crises are always deepest, and when, indeed, Americans might reasonably be expected to feel gratified to know that their President is still hard at work. The first order of business was to hold a series of conferences with Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz and Assistant Secretary James Reynolds and others like Senator Wayne Morse. Together they considered the feasibility of summoning the antagonists who had already bargained for 22 weary days and were in fact nearing agreement anyway. Sometime between midnight and 2:30 a.m. he made his decision to issue the call, and the orders went out.

In a startling demonstration of his vitality, he was up by 8 a.m. the next morning. With the parties gathered around him at the Cabinet table, he spoke in almost the same language that he had used on the steel negotiators a year before—they could settle their own problem better than somebody else, so go off and do it. He told folksy Texas stories like the one with which he regaled the men he had summoned 2 years ago to iron out a threatened railroad strike. Finally, as the scenario commanded, he sent the negotiators across the street to his old quarters in the Executive Office Building to sit down and talk. Three times Johnson went over to pressure for a settlement. Once he urged the bargainers to hurry so he could couple the happy announcement with that day's visit by Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Later he asked for an agreement timed so that he could break in with the news on the Walter Cronkite and the Huntley-Brinkley TV reports. (As it turned out, it was *Smothers Brothers Show* and *Mister Roberts* that got interrupted.)

The White House lights glowed into yet another night as the quietly frantic drama neared its predictable climax. The television networks were alerted. Cameras were moved into position in the White House studio. The men from the airlines and from the machinists' union were brought to wait at the side of the microphone set up for the President. Then, just seconds before air time, Johnson strode in and told millions of Americans the good news that agreement had been reached.

Elated and proud, Johnson sped off to a party given by Oklahomans for House Majority leader Carl Albert in the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Nearly a thousand persons roared their adulation when Johnson benignly gazed down at them and crowed, "We have just settled the airline strike." Even the President's late-night flight to the quiet of Camp David was a traditional finale to the script. After such triumphs he likes to savor his headlines and TV playbacks in private.

In this instance, of course, Johnson's joy was to prove short-lived. On Sunday, the rank-and-file union membership registered its almost 3–1 dissent, and for a few hours, at least, the White House was speechless, so rare is a Johnson failure of this magnitude. Later the White House was to contend that it knew all along that the airline machinists might not accept the settlement. But if that is true, what possible explanation can there be for the great build-up? Indeed, it *should* have taken no great skill for the poll-conscious White House to detect the predominant mood of 35,400 union members even before the balloting. But the facts suggest that the White House people hardly considered anything beyond the triumph that had seemed to be Johnson's for the taking. On analysis, the whole performance was pure VistaVision—a mile wide but only surface deep.

After the debacle, the debate shifted to Congress and became a sadly hilarious game of hot potato. Fearing more bitter blame from labor, Johnson wanted Congress to pass a law ordering the machinists back to work pending a settlement. Many legislators wanted to put it back in the President's lap by giving him discretionary powers. Inevitably there was a move to compromise so that Capitol and White House could share any blame or credit, depending on the outcome. One thing seemed sure: the L.B.J. labor-management scenario was due for rewriting.

REMARKABLE TRIBUTE TO A REMARKABLE AMBASSADOR

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, it was my honor to be included in the U.S. delegation which attended the inaugural ceremonies of the new President of Colombia, Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo.

During the course of the trip, I had occasion to talk at length with our retiring Ambassador to Colombia, Dr. Covey Oliver. Ambassador Oliver brought an outstanding academic and governmental background to his service in Colombia. He has taught law at the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of São Paulo, Brazil. He has served with the board of economic warfare, the American Embassy in Madrid, and with U.S. delegations to the Paris Peace Conference, the Paris Reparations Conference, and the Austrian Treaty Commission.

The Ambassador's academic background is equally outstanding. He holds B.A. and L.L.B. degrees from the University of Texas and a doctorate in juridical science from Colombia University.

A measure of Ambassador Oliver's distinguished service in Colombia is the unprecedented tribute paid him by the retiring President of Colombia, Guillermo Leon Valencia in his final message to the Congress of Colombia on July 20, 1966. President Valencia said:

> I wish to say of the Embassy of the United States of America in Colombia that there we have always found comprehension, sympathy and help when we have gone there in search of support. I wish especially to recognize the American Ambassador to Colombia, Mr. Covey T. Oliver, as one of Colombia's best friends, not only in his role as Ambassador of the United States but also as a person who has applied his extraordinary intelligence, his vast erudition, and his splendid character, along with a thorough understanding and all good will, which make him permanently outstanding among his peers. For these reasons, I wish to state today, when I have nothing to expect from him, that he merits the admiration, the gratitude, and the affection of the Republic and its people.

This is a remarkable tribute to a remarkable Ambassador.

I know that Ambassador Oliver will be missed in Colombia and in the Department of State as he returns to the teaching of law at the University of Pennsylvania. I am sure that we all wish him continued success in the years ahead, and hope that his talents can be brought into Government service again in the future.

BILL TO ELIMINATE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's once pure and sparkling waters have become a national disgrace.

For many years we have permitted the pollution of our lakes, rivers, and streams to continue unabated. It has only been within recent years that the Congress of the United States has come to realize what public health officials, conservationists and sportsmen have been predicting for many decades—the pure supply of water in the United States is in jeopardy.

Contamination of the air is also a critical problem. Last year 133 million tons of pollutants were pumped into the air over the United States. This year the total will be higher.

Eighty-five million tons of pollutants are sent into the air annually by automobiles, buses, trucks, and diesel engine exhausts. Twenty-two million tons of pollutants annually come from manufacturing plants of various types.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the time has come for Congress and the American people to recognize the devastating extent of air and water pollution in our country today. The Congress must accelerate and improve the efforts to fight pollution, and it must be willing to approve legislation which can effectively cope with this great problem.

Toward this end, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. This bill—the Pollution Control Incentive Act of 1966—would offer businesses, industries, and manufacturing firms a tax credit of 20 percent as an incentive for construction control facilities affecting both air and water pollution. This bill would also permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years.

Industrial corporations must be encouraged to join Government in the fight against pollution. Private moneys must be added to Federal funds if the battle is to be won. This bill will encourage industries to utilize their funds in the effort against pollution by providing the tax credit for costs of air and/or water pollution treatment facilities—land, buildings, improvements, machinery, and equipment. The credit would be in lieu of the investment tax credit that is presently allowed under the Internal Revenue Code.

There is little doubt that industry bears a portion of the responsibility for our polluted air and water. But it is impractical to expect it to either provide a solution to the pollution problem by itself or to make significant investments in antipollution facilities without some incentive. One of the steel producers in the United States, which has spent $16,885,000 for air and water pollution abatement since 1950, has stated that, if it is going to meet various proposed pollution abatement standards, it will have to spend $65 million for facilities during the next 5 years. An expenditure of $65 million would consume 70 percent of the total 1965 earnings of this particular steel company. Other companies are confronted with the same problem, many reporting that compliance with all proposed pollution abatement standards would be impossible.

It seems clear that business and industry must be encouraged to do their part in the fight against pollution, but that the fight against pollution would be self-defeating if it were to bankrupt business and industry and force them to close their doors permanently. The incentive tax credit, therefore, is appropriately a moneysaving proposal. In order to make a claim for incentive credit, an industry's antipollution facilities must conform with State and Federal regulations and policies so there is no chance that the incentive credit could be used as a tax loophole and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, both the Federal Clean Air Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are important steps in the direction of eliminating air and water pollution. However they represent only the efforts of Government. The bill I introduced today, a companion bill to the one introduced by my colleague from Illinois, Representative HAROLD COLLIER, seeks to combine these efforts with the efforts of business and industry in eliminating air and water pollution. Such a combination will dramatically increase the effectiveness of the antipollution effort.

BILL TO LIBERALIZE TAX TREATMENT OF REIMBURSED EMPLOYEE MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to substantially liberalize the tax treatment of reimbursed employee moving expenses. The introduction of this legislation by myself follows receipt of a large number of letters from constitutents of mine who have brought to my attention a most unfair ruling by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Under the existing regulation only the so-called barebones moving expenses are excludable from employee income for tax purposes. Such expenses cover only the actual cost of moving the employee's possessions and his transportation along with that of his family. All other reimbursed moving expenses are income to the employee and the employer is required to withhold Federal income tax treatment on such reimbursements.

My bill would exclude from income many additional costs such as storage expenses, house-hunting trips, meals, and lodging while the employee and his family are occupying temporary quarters at the new location; travel between the old and new location for the employee and his family and expenses in connection with disposing of an old residence as well as the expenses of acquiring a new residence.

For many years American industry has followed the practice of transferring employees to new work locations for a variety of reasons such as training, staffing new facilities and retaining valuable skills of employees where an industry activity is closed down. When these transfers occur the employer has generally reimbursed the employee for moving expenses. The Internal Revenue Service contends that all expenses other than the expense of transporting the employee to the new work location, which are created by the move and for which the employee is reimbursed by his employer is income to the employee and subject to the income tax.

The bill I have introduced provides that certain moving expenses paid by an employer shall be excluded from the income of the employee taxpayer. These expenses are substantially the same that the Federal Government would pay for its employees under H.R. 10607.

WHO CAUSED INFLATION?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to encounter an editorial writer who calls a spade a spade, whatever his subject. I have come across such an editorial in the Detroit News for August 9, 1966.

Taking a penetrating look at the frightening inflation which now faces us, the Detroit News points out that Government economic policy is just as important a factor in price stability as is a responsible attitude on the part of labor and industry.

In pointing the finger at labor and management for the demise of the wage-price guidelines, says the News, Presidential Adviser Gardner Ackley ignores the President's failure to make timely use of fiscal policy as a weapon against inflation and makes no mention of excessive Government spending.

I urge all of my colleagues to read the Detroit News editorial and include it here for that purpose.

The editorial follows:

ACKLEY BLAMES MANAGEMENT AND LABOR BUT WHO CAUSED INFLATION?

In a post-mortem for the administration's economic guidelines, President Johnson's chief economic adviser, Gardner Ackley, blames both labor and management for their demise. But this explanation minimizes or misses another equally important factor—government economic policy.

Ackley accuses labor and management of forgetting that price stability is necessary for continued full employment. He faults labor for failing to "learn a simple piece of economic arithmetic" as expressed in the wage guidelines. And he assails management for its lack of "economic sophistication" in posting inflationary price increases.

But Washington also abounds with economic illiterates, judging from the spending spree which grips Congress and the backwardness which characterizes the President's use of fiscal policy. And the clamor for easing credit without a corresponding tightening of other restraints is a sign that Washington follows not only weak, but perverse, economic policy.

To his credit, Ackley noted that economists are having a difficult time trying to sell adequate restrictions on Capitol Hill. But such frank comment from Ackley, the economist, surfaces only rarely from Ackley, the anointed spokesman for White House economic policy.

As a spokesman, Ackley is content to pass over the dismal performance of Mr. Johnson's attempt to control the economy by personal edict. And by refusing to cite congressional spending and White House permissiveness as contributing factors, Ackley condemns the guidelines to rigor mortis without an honest explanation of the cause of death.

Another economist and former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Arthur F. Burns, has said it well:

"In all countries and throughout all ages it has been the practice of governments, when prices rose materially, to point the finger of blame at tradesmen, or at industrialists or, in recent times, at trade union leaders as well, and to call them irresponsible and greedy. Very rarely does any government have the courage to blame its own management of finances or its own failure to keep a tight rein on the money supply."

TFX INVESTIGATION MUST BE RESUMED

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that 3 years ago a Senate subcommittee began its investigation into the TFX program, a program which would provide a multipurpose plane capable, with minor modifications, of being utilized by both the Army and the Navy thereby saving considerable sums of money. Recent testimony by military officials on military appropriations reveal that the cost of the program has skyrocketed, and, if the following article is any indication, there are doubts as to the suitability of the TFX regarding its original functions. I believe the American public is entitled to know the full particulars surrounding this project. The Senate hearings should be resumed as soon as possible with a view to bringing this project to a successful conclusion.

I place the in-depth article from Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, detailing the latest developments in the TFX case in the RECORD at this point:

[From Barron's, Aug. 15, 1966]

POINT OF NO RETURN: THE TFX PROGRAM HAS GONE FROM SCANDAL TO DISASTER

(NOTE: This account, like the earlier three-part series which it cites (Barron's, July 12, August 16 and 30, 1965), was written by J. Richard Elliott, Jr., of Barron's staff.)

"Fiscal 1966, which began inauspiciously on July 1, (1965), shapes up as a crucial year for the powers-that-be at the Pentagon." With that bit of understatement for openers, this magazine last summer launched a 15,000-word, three-part series of articles on the controversial F–111 fighter-bomber. Going back to its origins as the TFX, and to Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara's concept of "saving $1 billion" by making a single design serve the needs of both Air Force and Navy, Barron's traced the curious history of contractor evaluation and the subsequent research, development, test and evaluation program at General Dynamics as it had evolved to that point. The facts all seemed to point one way. The program, we concluded, had far exceeded its planned budget, and expenses bid fair to soar even higher, nullifying any hoped-for saving. What's more, the cost per plane was running "nearly 50% more than Mr. McNamara's famed 'cost-effectiveness' experts had forecast," partly because both services were cutting down on their planned procurement. Finally, we noted that the Navy model—even as it became less and less "identical" with the Air Force design in a frantic effort to make it work—had grown so overweight, and fallen so far short in a number of vital respects, that the admirals were thinking seriously of abandoning ship. "Fiscal 1966," we summed up, "is the year of decision."

Twelve months later it gives us scant pleasure to report that our findings erred, if at all, on the side of optimism. While the numbers involved are difficult to document (Congressmen complain of the Pentagon's "deliberate smokescreen"), the program appears to be running up a tab that ultimately will total $10 billion—compared with an original estimate of $5.8 billion, and last years' "official" figure of $7.8 billion. What's more, since only half as many planes are now planned, the cost per unit has risen even more sharply: from an original $2.9 million (and last year's estimated $4.9 million), the average price tag will run to well over $8 million apiece. For its money, the Pentagon is getting what Mr. McNamara calls a "weapons system some said could never be made," and one that all reports indicate never should have been.

Out of his bi-service fighter-bomber, the Secretary proposes to build not two but four different airplanes: added to the Air Force and Navy tactical fighters are a reconnaissance model and the long-range bomber version with which the Strategic Air Command will replace its aging B–52s. All three of the major aspects of the program—not simply the Navy's fast-fading F–111B, but the air arm's allegedly "satisfactory" F–111A and FB–111 as well—are flying on a disaster course. They weigh too much, and they are burdened by aerodynamic drag and other so far insoluble drawbacks. Indeed, according to confidential reports, they not only fail to meet specifications but also will be no match for Communist MIGs already flying in combat. As we said a year ago, in short, what's good for General Dynamics may not be so good for the country.

Barely four years ago, some future historian may recall, the TFX was supposed to cost $2.9 million per plane. The two services, between them, were prepared to buy 1,700. When the contract finally was awarded, General Dynamics proposed to develop and build the 1,700 F–111s for a total price of $5.8 billion—roughly $3.4 million apiece. When the fiscal 1966 budget was submitted to Congress, the TFX project called for just 1,600 aircraft—at a program cost of $7.8 billion, or $4.9 milion each. Early this year Congress was told that each TFX would weigh in (and, as will be seen, that's precisely the word) at roughly $5.9 million.

Since then two things have happened: the number of aircraft scheduled has dropped sharply, while the cost per unit has soared. On the first count, officially, the quantity now in the overall program is down to 1,400 (unofficially, it is reliably said to be less than 1,000, a net reduction of 40% in the past 12 months).

As nearly as one can figure, the 1,400 planes—on which Congress will be asked, early next year, to consider the defense budget requests for fiscal 1968 (when the first of the operational F–111s is due in service)—breaks down roughly as follows: Foreign orders (British, Australian): 74, compared to an originally planned 134. U.S. Navy F–111Bs: 350, against 500 planned a year ago and 592 programmed in mid-1963, U.S. Air Force FB–111s (275), F–111As and RF–111s (700): or 975, against a total Air Force buy of 1,100 a year ago and no fewer than 1,460 originally. Cost of the total program: an estimated $11 billion.

Equally startling is the soaring price per plane. On current official estimates, 1,400 units at $11 billion works out to more than $7.8 million apiece—a far cry from the $5.9 million figure recently given to Congress, to say nothing of the original estimate. That's real escalation. Nonetheless, the figure promises to fall short of the final cost per unit. From sources too highly placed and numerous to discount, Barron's has learned that the Navy plans to whittle down its part of the package once more, from 350 planes to 150, and that the Air Force will cut back from 700 F–111As to 500. All told, fewer than 1,000 will be built.

For what it's worth, then, the average price for TFX aircraft of all types is likely to approach $9 million—indeed far more than the U.S. has ever paid for a mass-produced combat plane. There's one thing more, which even the experts can't put a figure on until the planes go operational. Estimates of maintenance time required for the TFX, and guaranteed by General Dynamics in its contract (subject to penalties), recently became public. In a comparable strike bomber, the Navy's A–7, required maintenance time runs to 11.5 hours per hour of flight; for the hulking C–5A now under development by Lockheed, it's roughly 19 hours per flight-hour. The TFX? 29.86 maintenance hours for the F–111B, 35 maintenance hours for the F–111A, required after every hour in the air. Once it gets off the ground, in short, the most expensive plane ever built will have only begun its assault on Mr. McNamara's budget and the taxpayer's pocket.

So much for cost savings. After all, there's a war on. If the plane lived up to its advance notices, few would grudge the cost. However—and this is what lies behind the steady erosion in the services' demand—mounting evidence suggests that far more is at stake than money. The Navy plane, the Air Force's TAC model and particularly its SAC bomber are simply not good enough.

Let's look at each in turn. The Battle of the Admirals over their F–111B—from the date of Mr. McNamara's concept five years ago through the newspaper accounts of last week—is perhaps best known. To be an effective bi-service craft, the Admirals contend (and their technical people go even farther) an airplane must have its origins in a design based on—not just adapted to—aircraft-carrier suitability. The TFX, commissioned primarily as an Air Force system and designed by Air Force aerodynamicists, took off with little regard for the niceties of having to land at sea. As trouble-fraught developments ensued, capability for service with the Fleet repeatedly was compromised in favor of look-alike commonality. Finally, the Pentagon and contractors embarked upon a desperate effort to right the F–111B. It was, however, too late; the Navy plane, as suggested in the McClellan hearings of 1963 (and predicted here a year ago) is a flop.

The main problem is overweight. As originally specified, the Navy plane was supposed not to exceed 50,000 pounds in gross take-off weight, counting fuel, crew, ordnance and other equipment. By late 1962 the "maximum" Navy limit had gone up to 63,500 pounds. Carrier-hardened Navy men knew that in view of all the other compromises, no greater weight could be allowed. Nonetheless, last year the first three F–111Bs rolled off the assembly line at 47,000 lbs. empty, which meant that in their so-called gross takeoff weight, they'd heft around 78,000 pounds.

That's when the Admirals first blew the whistle. New priorities went out to reduce the weight (or increase the lift) of the Navy plane at any cost. "SWIP" (the "superweight improvement program") and "SCRAPE" (literally, scraping off every last extra fraction of an inch of metal), were aimed at the fourth and fifth developmental models in hope of slashing gross heft to the 63,500-pound absolute limit. Models 4 and 5 were slated to reach the Navy in May and June. Last month, the fourth plane finally weighed in, at 43,500 pounds "empty"—a reduction of only 3,000 pounds—to a gross weight of 75,000. Number 5 now is due in September; results of its SWIP and SCRAPE diets can hardly be much better.

MANIFEST UNHAPPINESS

By the end of the year, the Navy will have test-flown both the fourth and fifth models. But the service's unhappiness is manifest. Even Navy Secretary Nitze, a Pentagon veteran, admitted to a Congressman: "I think the contractor slipped up." Asked if the Navy would have rejected the TFX had it known how overweight the plane would get, Mr. Nitze replied, in House subcommittee testimony, "I think that is correct."

Overweight—which affects a plane's range, speed, acceleration, maneuverability, fuel consumption and weapons-carrying capacity—means still another headache for the Navy: carrier capability. The Fleet has spent nearly $200 million to strengthen decks, catapults and landing cables for planes as hefty as the F–111B; the A–7, for one, with its on-the-deck speed, is no lightweight, either. But the TFX presents another problem for carriers: when it's fully loaded, their elevators can't carry it.

According to ranking Navy experts, speaking off the record, most of the carriers now commissioned and under construction will not be able to take the plane from the hangar deck up to the flight deck at anything over 70,000 pounds. The Navy has been advised by armchair admirals at the Pentagon to bring it up empty, then load it with fuel and weapons on the flight deck. To this, a grizzled spokesman replies: "Of course that's possible, but hardly desirable in combat. With all the plane's other shortcomings, it's too much of a price to pay."

In Navy terms, other shortfalls attributable to weight—or to a combination of overweight and inadequate design—lurk in required loitering time, altitude and landing speed. The F–111B will need a "wind-over-the-deck" (WOD) speed, into which to land, of at least 35 m.p.h. Since most carriers can steam as fast as that, they can generate such a speed merely by heading into whatever wind may be blowing. However, such restrictions seem beyond tolerable limits. "Sure you can do it," a veteran officer says. "But in the middle of a battle, it would be nice to know you could pick up your planes no matter which way you happened to be headed, and it might well be preferable not to force the captain to go somewhere he'd rather not."

RANGE AND ALTITUDE

The other technical drawbacks look equally perilous. A squadron of F–111Bs aboard a carrier would have as its primary mission the protection of its fleet, by standing aerial guard, several hundred miles away, for several hours, to detect and intercept attacking planes. The F–111B, tests have shown, can not reach maximum time—because its weight prevents it from carrying the necessary fuel. As for altitude limits, in the case of a dogfight, the third-model of the plane has failed by 12,000 feet to reach the minimum specified height of 60,000 feet—and, in fact, even higher altitudes are known to be required to deal with enemy aircraft on equal terms.

Will the SWIP and SCRAPE models do better? "How much higher, farther and faster can a 75,000-pound plane go than a 78,000-pound one?" asks a top Naval aviation veteran. Worst of all, the special air-to-air missile designed to give necessary punch to the F–111B, Hughes Aircraft's heavy-powered Phoenix, may yet have to be jettisoned to lighten the load. The smaller Sidewinder missile of today's "generation" (none too overpowering in Vietnam, as it's turned out) would be an unhappy second choice.

VICTORY FOR AIRPOWER?

Navy's disenchantment over the TFX is a matter of longstanding record. Less generally appreciated is the failure of the F–111 in its primary role, as a tactical fighter-bomber for the Air Force. A clear-eyed view of the TFX as a ground-based tactical aircraft came recently from Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps. Marine procurements originally were to have made the F–111 a "tri-service" plane. Uncharacteristically, the leathernecks backed away from the challenge. Gen. Greene told a House subcommittee that his aviation aides found the F–111 to be "no improvement" over the Marines' present F–4s, particularly in "air-to-ground attack capability * * * therefore * * * undesirable for the Marine Corps use."

To be sure, the Marine Commandant was aiming specifically at the Navy's version. However, the Air Force model suffers from similar technical woes. Overweight is a case in point. Weight is the single most vital factor in any airplane, especially a military fighter. Where the Navy plane, after its SWIP diet, now weighs in at a relatively svelte 75,000 pounds at gross take-off configuration, the Air Force model is up to some 90,000.

The problem, which traces to much flabbier production controls on the part of Air Force management, also has been a well-guarded secret. It means that the F–111A cannot yet fly supersonically "on the deck"—that is, at radar-avoiding, tactical-strike altitude of 200 feet—and that it has been unable to reach required speed of Mach 2.5 at peak altitude. Moreover, the highest the plane has been able to go, after well over 1,000 hours of test-flights, is some 60,000 feet, 25%–50% short of requirements.

As recently as last May, the service put the eighth of its General Dynamics F–111A models through an exhaustive series of tests, under all but total security wraps, at Eglin Air Force Base, in Florida. Memoranda circulating in the Pentagon since then have made clear to the top brass that the plane is no match for the Communist MIG–21. At speeds of Mach 2.2 it has violent compressor stalls: the engines suddenly lose power. Carrying its full complement of conventional weapons, according to one observer, "it is so difficult to maneuver that it took half the state to bank into a complete turn." In quick maneuvers, horizontally or vertically—under conditions as near to actual combat as the Eglin experts could simulate—the plane's inability to accelerate fast enough left it "virtually incapable of defending itself in a dogfight with modern enemy aircraft."

BASIC DRAWBACK

What's more, Air Force, Navy and even NASA tests all have verified the plane's basic drawback. Simply put, the F–111A, in aerodynamic lingo, is 35 "counts" high in drag—or 35% "draggier" than it should be. Weight, of course, makes drag harder to overcome but a plane at any weight is supposed to be designed to travel at zero drag. When "dragginess" is extreme, the reason usually lies in some aspect of the configuration where an outer appurtenance, or some inner one, (in the jet chambers) interferes with air-flow and slows the aircraft, in effect, by causing either turbulence or friction.

According to authorities assigned to the TFX, the program has been shot through with drag. A major source of concern to Navy engineers, it has been shrugged off by Air Force experts, in the belief that improved engine performance will overcome the problem. "All along, they have just refused to recognize the facts," says one observer. "Yet they know that if the drag 'counts' which the tests have shown are right, they don't have the aircraft they claim." Simply put, 35% too much drag means a plan has 35% less range on the same fuel than its design calls for, and is deficient in both acceleration and maneuverability.

A Navy official adds bitterly: "Out at Wright-Patterson they were frankly flabbergasted when they 'discovered' the drag factor meant a 35% loss of range. The Navy would have stopped production right there. But this is an Air Force program. Meeting production quotas is more important than going for design perfection. They like to think such problems will work themselves out."

SOURCES OF DRAG

Like an insubordinate rookie, however, the difficulty has refused to respond. Investigators for months have probed three areas in the design which seem the likeliest source of drag. One is internal air flow. Because of errors in the design for airframe mounting of the engine installation, the lining of stable air called "boundary layer" may be stirred up by an erratically directed jet-stream. A year ago, sensing some such difficulty (though not admitting it publicly), the Air Force ordered General Dynamics to install so-called splitter plates, to deflect the stream from the interior surface. This maneuver hasn't helped.

A second possibility, it's said, lies in the tail assembly—the part of the overall TFX contract assigned to Grumman (but designed by General Dynamics). In the twin-jet F–111, two special rear ducts must be wide open when the afterburner is on—during acceleration, takeoffs and the like—but must be closed tightly when such added thrust is not flowing. If they are open, air can enter (in a forward direction) from the outside, acting as a brake. Here, too, countless hours of testing, redesign and computer calculations have proved unable to effect any change.

Third, and least likely, of the possibilities under scrutiny is that drag may be caused by air entering the open areas along the lateral surfaces of the fuselage—where, in order for the swing-wings to pivot, some unstreamlined divot always presents itself to the outer airstream. Voluminous wind tunnel data don't show turbulence here, but that proves nothing. However, there's no way to plug the gaps, without upsetting the delicate functioning of the wing pivots.

ANYONE'S GUESS

What the outcome will be is anyone's guess. The Air Force, points out a critic, now is two-thirds through the "RDT&E" (research, development, test & evaluation) phase of its program. "It has 12 planes, out of the projected 18 RDT&Es," he says, "which aren't good for anything but eternal use as test-beds." The test-and-evaluation program, to date, has cost some $1.5 billion—nearly a third more than Mr. McNamara had projected.

Of the three main TFX versions, finally, the only one yet to fly may turn out to be the biggest bomb of all. This is the FB–111, the Defense Secretary's answer to the manned-aircraft needs in the 'seventies of the nation's Strategic Air Command. For the bomber will combine the worst features of the other two models: the awkward bulkiness of the F–111B, with the sleek but still greater weight of the F–111A. In essence, it seems an effort somehow to exploit the overweight of Mr. McNamara's TFX—for "commonality" will make the FB–111, out of the same design, a plane basically identical to the others—by making it a "flying fortress." "Now that he admits the thing is a strategic bomber," a Navy man was quoted the other day, "how can he still tell us to fly it off carriers?"

BETTER ODDS?

Secretary McNamara has warded off endless pleas from SAC for funds to begin full-scale development of a follow-on "AMSA" (advanced manned strategic aircraft). (Congress continues to appropriate the funds anyway, most recently $22.8 million for fiscal 1967.) Instead, he has insisted on a policy aimed at eventually using only nuclear ICBMs for strategic deterrence. (While one has yet to be fired in anger, or under anything simulating an all-out attack, the Pentagon's secretariat believes the missiles offer better odds to penetrating enemy defenses than any manned bombers; however, as former Senator Goldwater, among countless others, has pointed out, the manned plane has the singular capability of being called back to its base at the last moment.) Meanwhile, SAC's present fleet of some 680 bombers—80 supersonic B–58 Hustlers (phased out of production several years ago) and the rest, B–52 Superfortresses, some a decade old—marches inexorably toward obsolescence.

Last Christmas, the Defense Secretary abruptly changed his strategy. Yes, he admitted in effect, some sort of manned bomber ought to be kept on hand at SAC bases to insure "flexible response." But the McNamara plan was a political and military bombshell. He proposed to scrap all 80 B–58s and 350 of the oldest B–52s between 1969 and 1971. Then, added to the 250 remaining and highly advanced B–52 G or H models (the latter boasting a range of 12,500 miles, and both capable of flying at roughly Mach 1) would be 210–since upped to 275–FB–111s. Instead of developing a full-fledged new bomber, said the Secretary, transformation of the TFX into a new stratofortress would save the country yet another half-billion dollars.

Almost no one agrees, and the figures previously cited indicate why. Worse is Mr. McNamara's technical evaluation of the FB–111; as Air Force Magazine pointed out, it "should be retained for future reference." Here's the pertinent part: "It (said the Secretary) will have twice the speed of those (B–52) aircraft, approximately, with approximately the same range. It will fly faster, both at low and high altitudes, and it will have capabilities for penetrating enemy defenses far greater than the plane it replaces. It will come into operational use in 1968. All of the units authorized will be equipped and operational by 1971."

Informed Congressional reaction to this (and an accompanying announcement to abandon 150 SAC bases), was eloquently summed up by the veteran chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Richard Russell. Said the soft-spoken Georgian: "If he is right, we will save a few dollars. If he is in error, may a benign Providence save these United States." In the end, however, both houses of Congress—after hearing SAC officers explain that they simply had no choice—told Mr. McNamara to go ahead. The Secretary announced that RDT&E model number 18 of the F–111A program would become the first FB–111, to be test-flown early next year.

WILL IT FLY?

Just what this incredible aircraft will look like, or what it will do when its motors are revved, remains the subject of high interest. Some idea was projected when the Air Force, several months ago, released photos of an F–111A, its stubby wings outstretched and laden with 36 conventional 750-pound "iron" bombs. Clearly, the wings can't sweep back against the fuselage, for full acceleration, with all this hardware on them. Equally important, the plane may not be able to fly without vibrations that would literally shake it apart.

Experts have doubts about a lot of other things. Says one, Secretary McNamara's glib evaluation "obviously" mixed the TFX's capabilities as a fighter with those it conceivably may have as a bomber—"without explaining which is which." With so many iron bombs hung on the wings, it plainly no longer is a fighter; hence, it can't be twice as fast as the B–52. "It will have about the same high subsonic speed," notes Air Force Magazine. As for range, the F–111A, "under the best of circumstances—that is, with nothing but two large fuel tanks slung under its wings and cruising at subsonic speeds—can be ferried 4,100 miles." With the depicted conventional bombload, leaving room only for internally stored fuel, range "couldn't exceed 2,500 miles," To go anywhere near as far as the B–52, it would have to be accompanied by a whole fleet of tankers, to provide airborne refueling. Thus an FB–111 based in the U.S. would all but nullify SAC as a means of piloted, surprise non-nuclear deterrence.

SITTING DUCK

Finally, even when carrying fighter-weight nuclear bombs, including three SRAM air-to-ground missiles (now only in the stage of contractor selection, and falling behind schedule), the FB–111 will command a range "well below 4,000 miles if the aircraft's high speed is used in the target area, since fuel consumption climbs rapidly at supersonic speeds." If it doesn't fly as fast as it can, of course, it's a sitting duck. Almost certainly, it won't make much difference; it would be one anyway.

Critics point out how cynically Secretary McNamara, in his FB–111 brainstorm (and the manner in which it's justified), has reacted to known and potentially disastrous problems long confronting the TFX program. As noted, this is, after all, the kind of plane the original F–111A "fighter-bomber" was supposed to be: one that could carry large payloads over great distances. As the F–111A, it didn't work out that way. So what the Air Force has been ordered to do is to take the F–111A as it comes off the line today, and add the extra gear needed even to approach adequate performance.

Ironically, the add-on equipment is that already going onto the Navy's F–111B for carrier operation. Specifically, the FB–111 will have a beefed-up landing gear identical to (or at least virtually the same as) the Navy's. And it will have the Navy's special wing-tip extensions—necessary to give it greater "lift" surface for carrier landings and take-offs—to get the FB–111 off the ground. These and other additions will push the weight of the 90,000-pound F–111A up to an estimated 129,000 on the converted FB–111.

FLIGHTS OF FANCY

The laws of aerodynamics, however, do not yield easily to such flights of computer fancy. In short, what all this does to the plane's performance is give it a negative single-engine rate of climb. Translated, the FB–111, which like every TFX is a twin-engine affair, will be so heavy that if one engine conks out, the other won't be enough to keep it from crashing.

Finally, since the plane can't protect itself as a fighter should, it will need to be accompanied on a long-range strike mission not only by a fleet of tankers but also by an escort of fighter planes. Aside from the lack of "surprise" this flying armada would impart to SAC's traditional way of carrying out its missions, the plane's vulnerability to defenders would be multiplied many times. And Mr. McNamara's dream—one all-purpose plane, at great savings, or indeed at any cost—becomes, for American pilots of the 'seventies, literally a nightmare.

DANGERS SEEN

Even the top brass at the Pentagon recognize the dangers. They have referred continually to the FB–111 as an "interim" replacement for the B–58s and B–52s. However, Mr. McNamara, in testimony before Congress earlier this year, refused to accept their characterization. The FB–111, he held, will be not only a "successful" plane but a "permanent one" as well.

Ironically, not long afterward, Dr. John Foster, Research Director in the Pentagon, proposed an "improved" version of the FB–111 superplane to SAC. (Guesses were that it required development of more powerful engines.) "The move is seen as an effort to bring (its) capabilities . . . closer to those of the advanced manned strategic aircraft which the Air Force seeks," commented the knowledgeable, and sometimes wry, Aviation Week. SAC, noting that such a development could not possibly bear fruit until years after the B–52s are phased out—and that even its next-generation AMSA could be available sooner—turned it down. But the idea said a great deal about the integrity of the Secretary of Defense.

Activities elsewhere in the Pentagon, finally, speak volumes on the subject. The U.S. is at war. Last week's accelerated attrition of American fighter and bomber aircraft pointed up anew the striking fact that the nation is unprepared, and destined to remain so for some time to come; urgent new orders for McDonnell's F–4, Ling-Temco-Vought's A–7, even Northrop's F–5A, have been placed, or soon will be. Meanwhile, the Tactical Air Command, as Gen. G. B. Disosway testified before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last month, is "down to bedrock."

YEARS AWAY

Its new fighter, the F–111A, should have been in combat by now; so, too should the carrier forces' F–111B (or some alternative). Instead, both remain years away from operational use, if indeed they ever do get into the fight; even then, they won't be as good as they might have been. The Navy is so pessimistic that, besides cutting TFX procurement to the bone (postponing it two years more), seriously is considering a swing-wing model of McDonnell's excellent little F–4, a plane which in its present design costs only $2 million, weighs half as much as the F–111B, and has proven to be our best fighter against the MIG–21 in Vietnam.

According to staff members, the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Senator John Stennis (D., Miss.), is waiting only until the 90th Congress has been safely elected and duly installed to probe fully this disaster in U.S. preparedness. The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, chaired by Senator John McClellan (D., Ark.)—which brought most of the murky background of the TFX to the surface in an abortive investigation three years ago—likewise is known to be waiting, in a gesture to President Johnson (as well as to McClellan's own re-election campaign), until the first of the year to resume, at last, its own study of how so expensive and high-flown a development could have happened—and come to naught. And the House Armed Services Committee, under Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.), along with Senator Russell's aforementioned counterpart in the upper chamber, already has delved deeply into the F–111 scandal. Throughout Congress, indeed, the powers-that-be are said to be chafing over the reliance on the man who has held the job of Secretary of Defense longer—and perhaps with more disastrous results—than any other in history.

THE CAMBODIAN CAPER

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a group calling itself Americans Want To Know has recently returned from a conducted tour of the Cambodian side of its eastern border areas and announced to an unsurprised world that its members found no Vietcong in Cambodia. I say unsurprised because it was hardly to be expected that any such evidence would be found since others have had the same tour with the same results. Certainly, the group well knew this before it started out. It is doubtful, in view of the group's composition, that they would have journeyed so far had there been any real question as to the outcome. It is just as doubtful that the same group would have ever found the Ho Chi Minh trail complex, which is nonetheless very real. In view of this group's self-proclaimed objectivity I was disturbed to note that nowhere in the press dispatches could I find any indication that they had interviewed American soldiers on the other side of the border about what they knew of where the Vietcong operated. I suppose their views would be dismissed out of hand as being biased and as part of a great conspiracy to mislead the American public. I was in South Vietnam in April. Just a few miles from the Cambodian border we were told by a Special Forces officer of the existence of three airstrips on Cambodian soil receiving daily flights of supplies for the Vietcong. I have yet to talk to any knowledgeable military people who doubt that Cambodia is a source of supply and a sanctuary for the Vietcong. If it comes to the question of accepting Cambodian diplomatic protests or the statements of our troops engaged in daily combat I will unreservedly choose the latter. If these headline-chasing Americans really wanted to know they would have asked the bullet-dodging Americans who do know.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Friday, August 12, Washington Evening Star, entitled "The Cambodian Caper" which puts the findings of the "Americans Want To Know" group in proper perspective:

THE CAMBODIAN CAPER

Seven inquisitive Americans have returned from a guided tour of Cambodia with the announcement that they could find no evidence that Viet Cong were using that country as a sanctuary and no sign of Communist supply lines.

The group's observations—or lack thereof—comes as no surprise. It would have been truly flabbergasting if they had returned to report the sighting of any identifiable Red Vietnamese.

The VC, even in its native habitat where it is known to exist in large numbers, is an elusive quarry. Our 300,000 troops have a hard time locating them when they prefer to keep out of sight. So it is hardly logical to expect the "Americans Wants to Know" group, made up of one former sergeant and six civilians, to flush a covey of guerrillas during their 12 day tour of the 16,607 square mile area. Particularly when the operation is being carried out under the guidance of the Cambodian government.

There is no reason to question the motives of the group which included Floyd B. McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, author Kay Boyle, a business man, a public relations man, a rabbi and a Quaker. It is, however, highly doubtful that America knows any more than it did before "America Wants To Know" conducted its dubious investigation.

DISTRICT COURT INJUNCTION AGAINST COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I read with shock of the decision of Judge Howard F. Corcoran enjoining the Committee on Un-American Activities from holding hearings tomorrow. This decision is directed against the committee of the House. It will, as far as I am concerned, continue with these hearings. As a member of the subcommittee, I shall certainly be there. It seems to me that this is the ultimate challenge to the people's branch of the Government, to the legislative branch which represents the people of this country, and a challenge to the committee which the people of this country and the Congress of this country have repeatedly supported.

Mr. Speaker, I shall fulfill my responsibilities to the Congress and to the people and I am sure the other members of the subcommittee shall do so regardless of this order of Judge Howard F. Corcoran and despite this challenge to the powers of the Congress.

IMPACT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON CONSTRUCTION BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging that the House today passed the Senate bill S. 3688, as amended to relieve the shortage of mortgage credit. I want to relate this action to my own congressional district.

New York's 27th Congressional District stretches north from the New Jersey border into the Catskill Mountains. It is a place of pleasant living, of small businesses and of farms. In the past few years the major boost to economic development in this district has been from the construction of homes and service establishments for people moving up from New York City. As a result, building construction in all its phases is one of the largest industries in our four-county district.

In recent weeks many builders, realtors, and county bankers from the district have written or spoken to me about the impact high interest rates have had on their business. They also stressed the importance of building to the 27th District. They pointed out that Orange County and Rockland County are two of the most rapidly growing counties in the New York metropolitan area and that high interest rates were bringing this growth to a stop. The longrun impact of drastically curtailed construction on business as a whole throughout most of the district is only too apparent. Most businesses in the 27th District sell to local markets, and many of them plan in terms of the expected growth of the suburban communities. Without this growth there will be a severe local recession in the district by Christmas.

On Friday, August 5, at the Orange County courthouse in Goshen, N.Y., I held hearings on the tight money situation. Bankers, builders, suppliers, realtors, and any private individuals disposed to speak were invited to present their views on the subject. Fifteen representatives of construction-oriented organizations and associations spoke at these hearings. In addition, communications were received from a number of others. Among the speakers were spokesmen for every type of bank operating in the district, large-scale developers, homebuilders, labor leaders, realtors, and a gentleman who sells mobile homes. The Honorable Jeremiah Bloom, distinguished vice chairman of the New York State Senate Committee on Banking, considered the occasion important enough to take time off from his many duties to attend, and the New York Federal Reserve Bank sent an observer. The response of these serious, concerned, people was a real demonstration of political action at the grassroots.

The story those who testified told was consistent and ominous.

While I am still studying the mass of information presented at the hearing, I am able at this time to call to your attention some of the highlights of the testimony.

For example, Mr. John Arfmann, president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Middletown, pointed out that his association, a small one of $18 million of assets, finds its loan commitments have dropped from 308 totaling $3,956,715 in 1965 to 180 totaling $2,300,900 in 1966—a decline of 42 percent. The figures for May, June, and July are even more startling and show a drop of 70 percent from the same months last year. Mr. Arfmann's statement is only one of several that are similar from bankers.

A spokesman for Schoonmaker Bros., a home construction firm, reported that they had found it necessary to "lay off" over 40 direct payroll employees and as many subcontractors and their employees. They have had to cut both personnel and payroll over 25 percent already and indications are, they stated, that conditions might become worse.

Skyline Estates, a large developer operating out of Westchester County, found it necessary to cut back on a subdivision designed for approximately 350 homes, to be built in Orange County, when a land development loan they had expected did not materialize due to a shortage of investment funds.

These examples represent only a small part of the testimony taken last Friday. They do point up the seriousness of the situation. To my mind they make it clear that vigorous action on the part of Congress and Federal banking authorities to provide remedial legislation is absolutely necessary if we are to stave off a recession in our district. I am at present organizing this extensive testimony for submission to the House Committee on Banking and Currency, so that they can take it into account in their deliberations. I know that there are already many suggestions to remedy this matter. What I ask is that action be taken, and taken as fast as possible, to protect the people of my district and their businesses from this dangerous high-interest policy—a policy which threatens to close down our homebuilding industry altogether, to create unemployment, and to undermine the economic development of our counties.

On an early occasion, and as an outgrowth of our hearing, I shall offer here further data on the subject, together with certain suggestions for improvement.

THE CLERGY AND CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the field of civil rights are disturbing. We have all seen harsh acrimony developing among civil rights groups. Racism appears to be spreading among Negroes. Sections of the clergy are admonishing others not to engage in direct action, and the voices of moderation grow dimmer.

The present trend toward extremism and the disavowal of integration as a goal and of nonviolence as a commitment is in sharp contrast to the tone and principles which characterized the march last year from Selma to Montgomery, Ala. In June 1965, Dr. Martin Luther King could say with good reason:

> Selma is a shining movement in the conscience of man. If the worst in American life lurked in the dark streets of Selma, the best of American democratic instincts arose from across the Nation to overcome it. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference has led the Selma struggle, but at its side were clergy and laymen of every race and faith, voluntarily risking brutality and even death.

I am inclined to believe that the more constructive character of the civil rights movement a year or so ago was due, in large part, to the prominent role assumed by the clergy. Their participation not only rallied their parishioners but served to overcome provocations to hatred.

Mr. Speaker, since last year there appears to have been a decline in the participation of the clergy in civil rights activities. During the recent consideration by the House of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, the clergy was relatively silent, in contrast to the situation obtaining in prior years, when civil rights legislation was being debated in the Congress. While there are no doubt a number of reasons for this decline in the civil rights activity of the clergy, I am afraid that a major factor was the abuse heaped upon those who participated in the march from Selma last year.

I regret to note that the campaign of vilification was given major impetus by two speeches made right here on the floor of the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

It is not for me to speculate as to whether the gentleman was seeking to pressure the clergy to desist from participation in the struggle for civil rights. To an extent he may have been victimized by erroneous information. The point I do want to make is that these two speeches contained charges of grave misconduct against participants in the Selma march—charges which have since been shown to have been wholly unfounded—and that the net effect was to discourage participation in civil rights activity. And a further consequence, I believe, has been that the withdrawal of the clergy from these activities has helped precipitate the unhealthy climate that now exists and which shows signs of further deterioration.

At this time, I think it appropriate that we should take a look at this whole sorry episode. We should know how much damage was caused by it. Perhaps by this review, we can help to alert the clergy and others to the importance of maintaining activity in the cause of equality of opportunity so that this moral crusade does not degenerate into an ugly struggle for power, personal and organizational.

The charges made by the gentleman from Alabama in his March 30, 1965, speech, and his followup speech on April 27, 1965, in which he produced the alleged "evidence" of the original charges, drew nationwide attention and comments, most of it adverse. It was widely noted that the photographs the gentleman produced proved nothing and that the so-called affidavits were irrelevant or unconvincing or both.

The following are the accounts which appeared in Time magazine for May 7, 1965, and Newsweek for May 10, 1965:

[From Newsweek, May 10, 1965]

CIVIL RIGHTS: KISS AND TELL?

As any Southern schoolboy knows from reading the exploits of Robert E. Lee, the best defense against Yankee invaders is a good offense. Accordingly, Alabama's freshman Republican Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON rose a month ago to proclaim Martin Luther King's voting-rights march from Selma to Montgomery a drunken debauch that "left every campsite . . . littered with whisky bottles, beer cans, and used contraceptives." He was prepared, he said, "to prove these facts" with documents and photos. Last week, under counterattack, he rose in the privileged sanctuary of the House to offer his "evidence."

His photos, as it turned out, were so tame that Sister Mary Leoline, a Kansas City nun who made the 54-mile march, inspected them without a blush. DICKINSON, in fact, didn't bother displaying them on the House floor; he insisted there were other, gamier pictures but he hadn't been able to get hold of them. Instead, from a sheaf of 30 sworn but otherwise unchecked affidavits, he selected seven (given him by two Alabama lawmen, a policewoman, an Alabama National Guard lieutenant, a Selma courthouse employee, a Negro, and an unidentified man) and read them to a thinned-out gallery of 40 colleagues.

Vice List: DICKINSON's witnesses catalogued a garland of vices ranging from drinking, interracial hand-holding, and "smooching" to open sexual intercourse in more or less public places including a street in Selma, a church, and a hospital lawn in Montgomery. One told of seeing a drunken priest and "a very small female dressed as a nun who was holding to [two] cars to keep from falling"; another—the unnamed Negro witness—swore he watched a wine-guzzling man in priest's attire lead a Negro girl into a back room at the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Montgomery hotel headquarters and start to disrobe. Most of the affidavits dealt with activities up to two weeks before the actual march to Montgomery began; only the National Guardsman reported watching any misbehavior ("I personally saw one case of sexual intercourse between a young white boy and a Negro girl") during the march itself.

Before the Montgomery march started, a few other witnesses independent of the congressman did report seeing some sexual activity during an around-the-clock, civil-rights vigil in Selma.

But, during the march, the demonstrators were busy walking by day—and segregated by sex in well-patroled tents by night. Scores of clergymen, seminarians, and nuns who marched or worked in support crews vowed in answering affidavits and telegrams that they had seen no sexual misconduct at all. Neither did newsmen or Justice Department observers. And one SNCC official scoffed: "Baby, everyone was too tired from all that marching."

Perhaps the most telling rebuttal of all to DICKINSON's inflamed vision of the events in Selma came in a speech last week by a Southern newsman, Bob Craig, managing editor of the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal. Posing as a prospective marcher, Craig had made his own on-scene investigation, patrolling Negro churches until 3:30 a.m. on the eve of the big parade, peering into homes where marchers were billeted, checking fruitlessly for any solid evidence. "You can find more sex at an average businessmen's convention," Craig concluded. His personal verdict: the orgy stories were invented "to cover up the basic fact that people cannot vote in Selma."

[From Time, May 10, 1965]

CIVIL RIGHTS: MUD IN THE HOUSE

Alabama's freshman Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON, 39, a Democrat-turned-Republican, is an ex-footballer from Montgomery, a onetime state judge, and a former assistant vice president of the Southern Railway System. He likes to make a splash. Last week he splashed mud all over the House floor. But only DICKINSON got dirty.

In an hour-long speech DICKINSON declared that on the recent Selma-to-Montgomery march there was an inter-racial sex orgy of such proportions as to excite the envy of the most degraded pornographer. According to a batch of luridly detailed affidavits signed by various Alabama policemen and civilians, the marchers, when not marching, were apparently everywhere publicly fornicating, petting, kissing, exposing themselves and urinating.

Love on the Lawn? While his colleagues squirmed with shame and embarrassment, DICKINSON blandly allowed as how "I am not going to vouch for the authenticity or the veracity of any affidavit or any individual whose affidavit I hold"—and then proceeded to lend them authenticity by reading some of the "eyewitness" reports aloud.

One affidavit was purportedly signed by an unidentified Negro, a veritable Uncle Peeping Tom, who claimed that he had seen "a Negro boy and a white girl engaged in sexual intercourse on the floor of a church while other boys and girls stood around and watched," and, further, that he had observed "an abnormal sex act" involving a Negro civil rights leader and a white girl at S.N.C.C. headquarters in a Montgomery hotel. A policewoman said that she had witnessed interracial lovemaking on the lawn of St. Margaret's Hospital in Montgomery. Others claimed to have seen white men in priests' garb and white women dressed as nuns swigging whisky, and, in the case of one "priest," paying a girl $12 for her favors.

DICKINSON said he had access to photographs and movie films depicting the events, but he never produced them. Several newsmen saw much of the debauchery, he added, but newspapers had deliberately suppressed the whole thing.

"I Never Saw Any." Throughout the Deep South, hundreds of segregationists rushed to send for copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and all the prurient details. Chortled DICKINSON: "One of my colleagues just came back from a newsstand, and he said, 'Man, they've got three bestsellers—*Nugget, Playboy* and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD!'" DICKINSON hardly seemed to care that many people, North and South, viewed such stories with great suspicion. Although congressional speeches are privileged, he said that he would repeat last week's charges in the Montgomery Coliseum, which would automatically lift his protection against a slander suit. "If they're not true," said he, "then I'm willing to be branded irresponsible."

Scarcely said than done. Dozens of clergymen who had made the march responded with outraged denials. Reporters who covered the event from beginning to end called the Dickinson report patent nonsense. While there was bound to be some hanky-panky, especially among some of the unwashed youngsters who joined the march for kicks, there was no evidence of open misconduct; certainly there were no arrests, even by the police officials who signed the affidavits. Said United Press International Photographer Phil Sandlin: "I spent five days and nights on the march. None of those things ever happened." Adds U.P.I. Reporter Al Kuettner: "I saw no fornication. This guy is so completely off-base it is just fantastic." Says Selma's Public Safety Director Wilson Baker: "I never saw any of that."

"Most of us," editorialized Montgomery's Alabama Journal last week, "would like to believe that the demonstrators were, without exception, dissolute and base. This is the comfortable belief, and many people will go on believing it. This despite the fact that there were obviously, to any eye not blinded by rage, thousands of sincere, morally impeccable people in the march."

The major networks carried reports on both what the gentleman from Alabama alleged and the united clergy refutation of the charges. Many made contributions to the campaign to demonstrate the falsity of the charges. On the National Broadcasting Co., the Huntley-Brinkley team did something imaginative on April 28. They sent their camera crew back to the area where the march was held and photographed the locations there, and then the men who had covered the march reported what they had seen. The clergy and civil rights leaders were shown to be innocent of the misconduct charged on the floor of this House. This was a very convincing television program, and both the principals, Messrs. Huntley and Brinkley, their executive producer, Mr. Reuben Frank, and others associated with NBC deserve praise for presenting the facts as the network saw it.

The following is a sampling of newspaper editorial comments on the episode:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, Apr. 30, 1965]

DICKINSON AND GOP

The house minority leader is wrong in refusing to disavow Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON of Alabama and his unsupported charges against civil rights marchers. The minority leader, Rep. GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, runs the risk of appearing to condone the use of the GOP label by Southern racists.

DICKINSON is one of a new breed of Southern Republicans the party can do without. Racism gave him his seat in the house. Racism undoubtedly motivates his charges of improper behavior by civil rights workers. He means to discredit the movement by whatever means that come to hand.

It is true, as Representative FORD said, that DICKINSON has the right to make any comments he wishes as a member of the house (that's why he is making them there, under protection of legislative immunity). But it is not equally true, as FORD believes, that DICKINSON's statements are his own responsibility.

The hard fact of the matter is that DICKINSON is speaking as a Republican congressman. He is one of the party's gains, if it can be called that, of the last election. It's a fact that hasn't been lost on the Democratic congressmen who have spoken in rebuttal. It hasn't been lost on the civil rights workers defamed. It appears to be lost only on FORD and the Republican party leadership. Maybe not Mr. FORD, but Republicans across the country denounce this scoundrel.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Afro-American, May 15, 1965]

DAMAGED GOP IMAGE

If Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON of Alabama is a fair sample of the stripe of men Republicans intend to send to the national scene from the South, the party would be better off if it left them where it uncovered them—beneath rotting logs deep in the Swamplands.

Mr. DICKINSON, twice has disgraced the House of Representatives by parroting a lie so vile, so vicious and so mean that he turned the stomachs of all decent men within the sound of his voice.

He sought to create in the public's mind a sickening picture of drunkenness degeneracy, sexual debauchery and unrestrained immorality.

But he succeeded only in revealing the sewer depths of his own mind and damaging almost beyond repair the new Lincolnesque image intelligent Republicans have been struggling so hard to create for their party.

Few of the new voters being placed in rapidly increasing numbers on the books in Alabama and elsewhere are likely to miss the significant fact that it was a Republican who sought to smear their significant protest march on Montgomery.

More importantly they will not soon forget that no Republican rose to denounce what all knew to be a hodge podge of falsehood of unbelievable magnitude.

The Republican floor leader, GERALD FORD of Michigan, like Pontius Pilate. chose to wash his hands of the filthy mess with the disappointing "he had a right to say it" defense of DICKINSON's mendacious diatribe.

Mr. FORD is dead wrong.

DICKINSON, even though protected by Congessional immunity, had no legal or moral right to viciously libel priests, ministers, nuns and thousands of honest, decent Americans disturbed over the lack of liberty and justice in Alabama.

In doing so, he bared to the whole world his total unfitness for high office, public trust and public confidence.

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer, Apr. 29, 1965]

NEW ALBATROSS

There seems to be no end to the troubles of responsible Republican leaders who are trying to rebuild the Grand Old Party. Now they must apologize for and otherwise seek to explain away the actions of freshman Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON of Alabama.

With the passage of time it probably would not have mattered that he was one of the very few candidates across the nation who rode the racial backlash to victory in the last general election. But on the House floor Tuesday he made himself permanently obnoxious to his colleagues and spread an awful odium onto the Republican Party itself.

Using affidavits verified by no one, he charged widespread sexual immorality and drunkenness in last month's civil rights marches in Alabama. Not only "beatniks," but Catholic priests and nuns and Protestant clergymen were guilty, he said. Significantly, he refused to make these charges off the House floor where congressional immunity would not protect him from libel suits.

Even many who might want to believe these incredible charges will recognize the unfairness of them. And even those who applaud them must wonder now and again how a freshman congressman in Washington gained "proof" not available to veteran local and state officials on the scene in Alabama. Governor Wallace would have revealed this "proof" long ago if it were genuine.

This comes under the heading of a lie that is so irresponsible and ugly that it can only attract sympathy for those it is aimed at.

It will be noted that the refusal of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, to disavow the charges made by the gentleman from Alabama drew widespread criticism. The distinguished CBS commentator, Eric Sevareid, was one who saw the significance of this: the following is his comment of April 28, 1965.

CBS EDITORIAL

(By Eric Sevareid, CBS Evening News, Apr. 28, 1965)

In 1946, when the angry election issue was price controls, some unique individuals were swept into Congress on Republican tickets. One was the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, member of what later became known as the "class of forty-six."

Someday there may be an expression, "the class of sixty-four," referring specifically to those Republicans with the unique distinction of being elected from the deep and previously solid Democratic South, under the aegis of Mr. Goldwater's southern strategy.

One of them is Representative WILLIAM DICKINSON of Alabama, the center, today, of his self-generated storm. He too made his accusations on the floor of the Congress; he, too, has been invited to make them outside where he would have no immunity from libel suits. He, too, said in effect, "I hold here in my hand," etc.

When Senator McCarthy began *his* accusations, he was not opposed by his party's leader in the Senate, Robert Taft. When DICKINSON finished his second attack, yesterday, on Dr. King and the Freedom Marchers, no Republican audibly disapproved. The House Republican leader, GERALD FORD, said only that DICKINSON was within his rights as a Congressman to make any comments.

No one familiar with the civil rights movement would deny that Communists try to exert their influence within it though the Attorney General says they haven't got very far; no one familiar with it would deny that it attracts a number of chronic defiers of the social order and generally accepted private morals; mass movements often do, like a wide, fast current that picks up a certain amount of flotsam in its wake.

The Congressman's accusation that Dr. King is a fake, a modern Elmer Gantry, praying with one eye on the collection plate—that is something else again; that is personal, subject to proof or disproof in a court of law if the Congressman chooses to make the claim outside the Congress.

Someone recently remarked that our Victorian ancestors were embarrassed in the presence of the base, but that this generation is embarrassed in the presence of the noble.

There are some still around who have inherited the moral reflexes of their Victorian ancestors. One or two Congressmen walked out of the chamber yesterday rather than hear the rest of Mr. DICKINSON's speech.

Walter . . .

Even news media in the South noted that the charges by the gentleman from Alabama had an adverse reaction. Following is an account appearing in the Birmingham Alabama News for April 29, 1965:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 29, 1965]

OVERWHELMING RESPONSE: IMMORALITY TALKS BRING MIXTURE OF SUCCESS, FAILURE TO DICKINSON

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Two House speeches charging widespread immorality and drunkenness on the Selma-Montgomery civil rights march have brought a confusing mixture of success and failure to their author, Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, R-Ala.

From Alabama the response has been nearly all favorable, to date. From over the country so many requests have come in for the Alabama Republican's first speech, on March 30, that his office has mailed out more than 80,000 copies.

Many right-wing and pro-segregation organizations are selling reprints by the hundreds and thousands. The freshman congressman, naturally, finds this attention and the publicity very flattering.

The 30 eyewitness affidavits made public this week by DICKINSON in his second speech—buttressing the first—have convinced many Members of Congress that there was at least some flagrantly bad moral behavior on the part of certain elements in the civil rights gatherings in Alabama last month.

And this, in turn, could cut into the generally strong support that civil rights demonstrators have been getting from church leaders. It could also cause more parents to forbid their college-age sons and daughters from taking part in out-of-town civil rights drives that extend over a period of several days.

Such developments would have to be marked down on the success side of the DICKINSON speech ledger.

But the listings on the debit side are mounting.

One is that DICKINSON's charges have prodded, and stirred anew, the bitter feelings aroused in the House and elsewhere by the violence that occurred in and near Selma during the recent civil rights crisis.

This, in the view of some Dixie congressmen who enjoyed the embarrassment that DICKINSON seemed to be inflicting on his liberal colleagues, will make more remote any chances of softening the voting rights bill on the House floor.

Another negative factor is that DICKINSON's reading of affidavits charging immoral behavior to priests and nuns was especially offensive to Catholic members of the House. Rep. BARRATT O'HARA, D-Ill., who at 83 is the oldest member of the House, was tense with emotion as he arose to protest this "rock throwing" at priests and rabbis from his district who joined in the Alabama march.

(DICKINSON said he felt that it was a case of some beatniks and "riff-raff" impersonating the clergy, but this did not lessen the impact of the sworn statements he read.)

(DICKINSON's affidavits apparently referred to conduct before and after the main portion of the march, which was limited to 300 persons along the two-lane stretch of U.S. 80.)

Still another adverse result of the Dickinson charges is that they muddied the strong pro-civil rights image that Republican leaders in Congress have tried mightily to create of late.

Several of the clergymen who participated in Alabama march have publicly voiced disappointment that Republican House Leader GERALD FORD of Michigan did not immediately take the floor to repudiate DICKINSON, or to "set the record straight" on the Dickinson charges.

Moreover, these clergymen have called on GOP leaders to correct what they regard as an inexcusable oversight. Thus, the Dickinson charges—whatever their merit—could worsen the already rather delicate relations between FORD and the five Republican congressmen from Alabama, particularly DICKINSON.

The final score of the Dickinson effort is not yet in, but the accumulating returns indicate anything but a one-sided contest.

The clergymen, including a nun and two theological students, held a news conference near the capitol to denounce DICKINSON's statements.

The Rev. Dom Orsini, a Pittsburgh Episcopal priest who hiked the full 54 miles, said DICKINSON is reminiscent of the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy, R-Wis., who made charges of communism in government a decade ago.

"He (DICKINSON) forever cries 'I have proof,' but he has no proof, Orsini said. "Well, we have proof. We were there. We saw, we admired, we loved." He called DICKINSON "a little Joe McCarthy."

The Rev. Richard F. Dickinson, a United Church of Christ missionary, described the conduct of the Negro and white marchers this way:

"You would find more friendly conversations between boys and girls at a church camp than on the march. These people were deeply conscious of the high purpose of their undertaking."

The Rev. Dickinson said the group called on Rep. GERALD R. FORD, R-Mich., House minority leader, and other Republicans Wednesday to enlist support against Rep. DICKINSON's speech.

"I was extremely disappointed that no Republican stood up after DICKINSON finished," the missionary said, noting that he too is a Republican. He said he hoped Republicans would not let the speech go unanswered.

FORD told newsmen later DICKINSON was within his rights in making the speech and "the comments he made are his responsibility."

The group said tight security measures were taken at each night encampment. Men's and women's tents were separated and 40 men patrolled the camp all night, even entering the tents periodically to make sure everything was all right, they said.

"It is virtually impossible to imagine anyone being able to go into the bushes for any kind of activity such as Mr. DICKINSON described," said James Martin.

He is student body president at San Francisco Theological Seminary and headed a 60-man security and clean-up crew on the march.

The nun, Sister Mary Leoline, B.V.M., Kansas City, Mo., who also went the entire route, said she and other members of the group called on Rep. DICKINSON the day before he made his speech.

DICKINSON has said he has photographs to prove his charges. Sister Mary Leolina said she asked to see them.

"I looked at every one," she said. "None was identified or dated. I saw nothing offensive to me. If it hadn't been a racially mixed group, if they hadn't been weary, and if they were not engaged in civil rights activities, no one would pay any attention to the pictures."

Five St. Louis area residents who participated in the march denied charges of immorality among the demonstrators.

Their denials, in the form of telegrams to the National Catholic Welfare Conference here, were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The five said they had seen no such behavior.

Other House Members placed in the RECORD statements from a number of clergymen and laymen of several denominations who said the charges were untrue.

Those in the St. Louis area were the Rev. Dick Cadigan, Emmannuel Episcopal Church, Webster Groves; the Rev. Howard Park; John Knoepfle, Maryville College; William Jennings, and Mrs. John E. Jennings.

Mrs. Jennings, a mother of five, said she went to Montgomery with a large group, mostly of young adults.

She called DICKINSON's charges "ridiculous" and added she "would like to protest lewd gestures made by Montgomery bystanders."

While the news media generally were reporting and commenting as indicated by the above selections, the radical right was busy circulating the charges—without the refutations. As indicated in the following report from the Alton, Ill., Telegraph, April 30, 1965, units of the John Birch Society distributed the original March 30, 1965, speech by the gentleman from Alabama:

[From the Alton (Ill.) Telegraph, April 30, 1965]

FILTH SPEECH CIRCULATED BY ALTON BIRCHERS

(By Ande Yakstis)

Copies of a speech by Alabama Congressman WILLIAM L. DICKINSON attacking the Alabama Freedom march as Communist-inspired and plagued by sexual immorality are being circulated in Alton—some from under the counters of stores, a check by the Telegraph shows.

The reprinted speech was distributed Monday night in Alton at a public meeting sponsored by the John Birch Society's American Opinion Speakers Bureau.

Another Alton bookstore has a supply for customers of the speech reprint, under the store counter.

The Alabama Republican charged in the House floor speech March 30 that the 50-mile historic civil rights march was infiltrated by adventurers, beatniks, prostitutes and "similar rabble."

In a separate but related speech Tuesday, Rep. DICKINSON presented copies of affidavits to the press describing nuns and priests in a drunken state, reporting that whites and Negroes, including a white priest, engaged in sexual intercourse.

DICKINSON's bitter attack on the march was denounced immediately by clergymen, religious leaders, and a number of his congressional colleagues and newsmen who covered the march.

The American Opinion Library, 6th and Ridge Streets, Alton, has copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the counter containing the March 30 House speech.

Rep. DICKINSON complained in his House oration that the Alabama march was financed and directed by the Communist Party.

He said the march was infiltrated by a group of people he called "human flotsam: beatniks, adventurers, prostitutes."

"They are promised $10 per day, free room and board and all of the sex they want from opposite members of either race. Free love among this group is not only condoned; it is encouraged," Rep. DICKINSON said.

Religious leaders on the march listened in the House gallery to a second speech Tuesday and denounced the Congressman's charges.

Several of DICKINSON's congressional colleagues also discounted the charges. Reps. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, D-N.Y. and PAUL J. KREBS D-N.J., challenged the Alabama Congressman to repeat the charges off the House floor where he would not have the immunity from civil action by the accused persons.

Rep. DICKINSON told the House after the March 30 speech he had 30 sworn statements as "proof" of his charges that widespread sexual immorality and drunkenness marked the Selma-to-Montgomery freedom walk.

The Alabama Republican said he did not vouch for the veracity of the statements but assumed they were true because they were made under oath.

In a press conference this week to answer the charges, the Alabama representative was called "a little Joe McCarthy," by the Rev. Dom Orsini, a Pittsburgh Episcopal priest. Orsini marched the entire 50-miles into Montgomery.

Another religious leader asserted: "It is virtually impossible to imagine anyone being able to go into the bushes for any kind of activity such as Mr. Dickinson described," said James Martin, student body president at San Francisco Theological Seminary.

Martin headed a 60-member security and clean-up crew on the march.

The Rev. Rodney Shaw, director of a Methodist Church organization, said he was disturbed by Rep. Dickinson's method of attack—on the House Floor where he is immune from legal prosecution or questioning.

Dickinson said his purpose in making both the original speech (circulated in Alton) and the second one was "to rip away the facade of righteousness, smugness and respectability" which he said characterized the marchers.

Copies of the speech were also distributed in large quantities by the gentleman from Alabama himself. According to the Birmingham Alabama News story incorporated previously, his office mailed out more than 80,000 copies.

It is important to note in this regard that a statement acquires additional prestige if it is distributed as a reprint from the Congressional Record. Many people accept the Congressional Record uncritically as a Government document of unquestionable accuracy. The following excerpt from a story appearing in the Dayton, Ohio, News of May 9, 1965, illustrates the point:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News, May 9, 1965]

Record Feeds Congressional Egos, but Where Are Facts?

(By Dave Allbaugh)

A moment earlier, the white-haired salesman had been exchanging parting pleasantries, his hand on the door knob.

Then a television commentator's account of racial turmoil in Dixie pierced his consciousness.

The affable, open-faced man suddenly leaned forward, intent and serious.

"You know, the newspapers and television haven't told the truth about the situation down South," he confided. "One of our supervisors at the office was telling us how a congressman has disproved that stuff about brutality and so forth. It's all in the Congressional Record."

"You believe that?" he was asked.

"Of course," he shot back. It's in the Congressional Record—isn't that official?

A tricky question, that one. The publication is certainly official enough.

But a factual record? Not by the wildest flight of the political imagination.

DUBIOUS CATCH-ALL

Within the daily pages of the Congressional Record is an unsorted collection of trivia, scholarly utterance, dry factual data, tortured interpretation, whimsy and malicious rumor.

One student of the Record recently called it a "monumental catch basin."

In effect, the Record has 536 editors—all the members of Congress. Each has virtual carte blanche to insert material from any source into the Record.

Even more pleasing to the congressman's ego is the opportunity afforded to rewrite his spoken words before they appear in the Record. This, as one writer put it, congressmen can "say what they wish they'd said in the first place."

Even a President doesn't get such a break. If he commits a blooper at an impromptu press conference, Lyndon Johnson is stuck with it.

This off-beat side of congressional immunity has its humorous side.

Journalists, especially, often poke fun at the Record. Partly, this could reflect envy mixed with amusement; the Record resembles the reporter's great-newspaper-in-the-sky in its splendid indifference to costs, accuracy, and occasionally outraged readers. Under the law, no congressman can be sued for anything uttered in the House or Senate or printed in the Congressional Record.

But it is a $3 million annual joke—and the laugh is on the citizen who reads the Record in the naive faith that its material has somehow been verified.

METHOD FOR SLANDER

More important, the Record can be used as an organ of slander and libel, with the victims helpless to obtain redress.

How this is done at the taxpayers' expense was demonstrated last month by freshman Congressman William L. Dickinson (R-Ala.).

Rep. Dickinson warmed up to the task Mar. 30 by suggesting on the House floor that the minister-crowded civil rights march from Selma to Montgomery was an exercise in sexual debauchery. On Apr. 27, he took the rostrum to recite from some 30-odd sworn statements of non-marchers that lechery had been a leading feature of the march.

Although Dickinson conceded in answer to one challenge that "I am not going to vouch for the authenticity or the veracity of any individual whose affidavit I hold," he droned on with his "evidence" for more than an hour.

Dickinson's conclusion was simple: The civil rights march was dominated by degenerates, drunks and Communist-inspired beatniks. Compared to this alleged "fact," Alabama's systematic denial of the vote and racial murders were of no moment.

Churchmen and other march participants inserted affidavits, letters and statements denying Dickinson's charges in the Record. But this did nothing to cramp the Alabama congressman's style. The excerpted portion of the Record reprinted at the expense of Dickinson's office or that of his backers, then franked for free delivery to Dixie whites would not include statements of the clergymen and their friends.

Thus, a particularly vicious bit of racist myth was promulgated at public expense.

Apparently citizens around the country received, anonymously in the mail, reprints from the Congressional Record. A letter to the editor—itself signed with name and date, it should be noted—printed in the Barre, Vt., Times-Argus of May 5, 1965, protested this anonymous mailing; the letter follows:

[From the Barre (Vt.) Times-Argus, May 5, 1965]

Letters: Hatred Anonymous

To the Editor, the Times-Argus:

We received in this morning's mail an envelope containing such malicious material that it was disheartening to read to say the least. It is assumed that other households have been supplied with the same "information." The envelope was postmarked "Waterbury" but that is the only clue as to the sender's identity or whereabouts. Obviously, this person hasn't the courage of his convictions to identify himself—hiding behind anonymity while distributing such hateful propaganda is the height of cowardice and sneakiness.

In the envelope were a copy of the Congressional Record dated March 30, 1965 (Congressman Dickinson of Alabama spoke about the riffraff—communist inspired—taking part in the civil rights demonstrations in his state and the sex orgies and drinking on the march to the state capital), a sheet of "facts" entitled "Human Rights" and two nasty little cards telling how "You can help communists to raise havoc in the South" by supporting civil rights movements.

It isn't fair that the supplies of such "goodies" not allow an opportunity for rebuttal by identifying himself, so I am asking the Time-Argus to let me do so publicly.

The whole point of the issue brought forth is that there are communists at work in organizations such as NAACP, SNCC and CORE. This is undoubtedly true to some extent. Communistic activity thrives on people frustrated in their efforts to advance themselves economically and denied equality as fellow human beings in their general society. But if I were an American communist I would be quite discouraged by the lack of enthusiasm for my bill of goods shown by the majority of American Negroes. If the American Negro had, in times past, been integrated into American society as have the Irish, the Italians, the Germans, the English, the Syrians, etc., there would be no organizations such as NAACP, SNCC, CORE and others and the communists would have one less situation in the United States to gloat over and make use of. To withdraw support from these organizations because they probably are communist infiltrated to a slight extent would be as nonsensical as withdrawing support from all unions because they are communist tainted, from all universities because there are communists on campuses, and so on. The forces for good in these organizations must be supported. Abandoning them is handing them to further communist influence. Therefore, I suggest the sender of this hate material is playing the communists' game!

I'm sure there were people who were attracted to Alabama and the demonstrations and march because it was a fun thing to do. There are too many such people, unfortunately. They are best ignored and should have no influence on our thinking concerning the real purpose of demonstrations and marches—which is to keep before our eyes the fact that things are not as they should be for a number of people in this society whether we like this information pointed out to us or not!

As to the sex and whiskey orgies that allegedly took place during the march to the state capital I have thought and thought about the news I heard on radio, television or in any newspaper mentioning misbehavior on the part of the marchers. It would certainly have made interesting news. I do recall hearing on the radio a reporter who, upon returning to the scene of an encampment of the previous evening, encountered three white men busily throwing beer cans, hard liquor bottles and other trash over the area from the back of a truck The truck drove off as the reporter approached.

A final word to anonymous—there is enough manufactured hate in this world without your contribution. If you should feel so inclined to distribute such material again, please reconsider and donate the funds necessary to finance such a project to some charitable organization in Vermont to answer your question "Why not projects in our own state?" At least take our name off your mailing list. We get our facts from a wide variety of reliable sources.

Janet MacLennan.
Mrs. Robert C. MacLennan.

Montpelier, *May 3.*

Another example of anonymous distribution of the charges made by the gentleman from Alabama occurred at the diocesan convention of the Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, Pa., in the form of a printed message mailed to those attending the convention. The unknown author of this message deliberately sought to convey the idea that the item appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was in some way official. The following is the entire text of the one-page leaflet:

BRACE YOURSELF

Here is your copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Public Document, dated March 30, 1965 which recounts the "Untold Story of the March on Montgomery"—in which drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day. Things took place during this five days march which *were below the Moral Standards of a pack of homeless dogs.*

This 50 miles march cost more than $300,000. How much of my money and your money and the "Widow's Mite" was used by the church leaders to help finance this march in which free love between Negro and white was not only condoned but it was encouraged—along the public roads?

Then when the human flotsam: beatniks, prostitutes, and similar rabble reached the City of Montgomery there was an all-night session of debauchery within the church itself.

Question: Did you read any statement in the public press criticizing the sex orgies along 50 miles of public highways from church leaders such as Dr. Eugene Carson Blake; the Rev. Martin Luther King; Bishop Pike of Calif.; or the Rulers of the National Council of Churches?

These church leaders who use the Christian Religion as a Trojan Horse, can't fool all the church members all the time.

As already noted, the attacks on those who participated in the Selma to Montgomery march did not go unanswered by the clergy. Participants in the march from all religious faiths spoke out against the falsity of the accusations. For example, students from the San Francisco Theological Seminary who had handled the task of setting up and taking down the tents on the march were so incensed by the charges that they prepared, at their own expense, formal affidavits attesting to what they had seen on the march. Their observations reflected the falsity of the charges of immoral conduct. These young people, who had been under the direct supervision of the director of the seminary while in Selma, demonstrated the kind of scrupulous concern for accuracy that I wish had been shown by those who attempted to discredit the march.

On April 28, 1965, a group of clergymen who participated in the march held a public press conference to refute the attacks. At that time they displayed a large number of telegrams received from participants. The following are typical telegrams, which were in fact received too late to be made available at the press conference:

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 26, 1965.

Rev. JOHN CRONIN,
Washington, D.C.:

More than 200 Chicagoans gave witness in Selma and Montgomery under the auspices of the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago. These were outstanding citizens priests, nuns, lawyers, teachers, scientists, grandmothers, students. All returned deeply moved by the beauty and courage they saw and felt in those who are struggling for human justice in Alabama. Their eyewitness testimony is answer enough to the cheap smear efforts against the Selma-Montgomery march.

JOHN A. MCDERMOTT.
CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL COUNCIL OF CHICAGO.

WHEELING, W. VA.,
April 27, 1965.

Rev. JOHN CRONIN, S.S.,
National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly resent efforts by Representative DICKINSON to discredit behavior of participants in Selma march. Please be sure of my support for Selma.

Rabbi MARTIN SIEGEL.

WHEELING, W. VA.,
April 27, 1965.

Rev. JOHN CRONIN, S.S.,
National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly resent efforts by Representative DICKINSON to discredit character or behavior of participants in Selma march. Please be sure of my support for Selma and all such manifest citations of responsible christian endeavor.

Very Rev. HILARION V. CANN,
Vice Chancellor, Diocese of Wheeling.

The press conference of religious leaders served as only a first response to the charges. The damage could not be undone, or even evaluated at that point.

It obviously became important to publicize the truth about the actions of the clergy and the many responsible lay men and women around this country who supported the march. An article read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] on May 25, 1965, from the Episcopal Church magazine, the Witness, told the story of how this joint constructive clergy-lay effort was handled. The Reverend Rodney Shore, director of the Department of Economic Life, Division of Human Relations and Economic Affairs, General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, Methodist Building, was chosen as the clergy coordinator for the major faiths to carry out an investigation of the whole situation. Associated with him at the request of leading prelates was Frederick H. Sontag, a public relations and research consultant of Montclair, N.J., a longtime leader in the civil rights movement and a leading Episcopal layman and member of the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity. These men concluded that it was essential to prevent further irresponsible attacks of this kind. They set out to make a nationwide survey as to both the press and broadcast coverage which the attack and the defense received. Much of this statement is based on that study.

The conclusion which emerges is that even though the validity of the charges was refuted and widely rejected by the news media, those individuals who participated in the Selma to Montgomery march were subjected to accusations of a gross misconduct which were widely circulated and which can never be expunged from the record. The accusations were made, and it is quite likely, I am afraid, that as time goes on more people will remember the charges than will remember the defense. Unfortunately, there are always many people who go on the theory that "where there's smoke there must be fire."

I insert herewith a few of the accounts which appeared around the country which showed the community awareness of the charges and the efforts required to try to refute them:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, April 29, 1965]

NO SELMA ORGY, MINISTER SAYS—NORTH END NATIVE DIRECTED SECURITY

A North Scranton native is among the clergymen repudiating charges of Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON, Alabama Republican, involving alleged orgies in the 50-mile Selma-Montgomery, Ala., civil rights march last month.

He is the Rev. Morris V. Samuel Jr., son of Morris V. Samuel, 147 William St., and the late Jeannette Morgan Samuel. He is now an Episcopal clergyman in Los Angeles, Cal.

Yesterday in Washington, D.C., priests, ministers and nuns who participated in the civil rights march charged Congressman DICKINSON with spreading slanderous falsehoods of sex orgies, drunkenness and other debauchery during the march.

They claim he has no proof of any such acts and cloaks himself in immunity from libel suits by making the charges from the floor of Congress.

The Rev. Samuel was in charge of the security detail during the march but was unable to come to Washington for a news conference on the charges because of bomb threats against his family, according to wire service dispatches.

He did, however, issue a statement by telephone in which he said the camps established each night during the civil rights march were carefully supervised by 30-man patrols. Most of the men in the patrols were clergymen, he noted.

He said none of the security patrol members ever reported any evidence of immorality.

The Rev. Mr. Samuel has been active in civil rights and racial movements for some years.

He is married to the former Miss Jean Harris Harvey of this city. They are parents of three children.

The clergyman is a graduate of Central High School and Pennsylvania State University and was a schoolteacher before entering Navy service during the Korean conflict.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Apr. 28, 1965]

PRIESTS DISPUTE REMARKS MADE BY ALABAMA CONGRESSMAN

Two Charleston priests who joined the Selma-to-Montgomery civil rights march in Alabama last month last night described as "preposterous" a Congressman's charges that the demonstration was marked by widespread immorality.

Rep. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON (R-Ala.) told the House of Representatives Tuesday he had 30 sworn statements of immorality and drunkenness among the marchers.

DICKINSON showed copies of affidavits which described priests and nuns in a drunken state, and reported whites and Negroes, including a priest, engaged in immoral acts.

"The whole thing is rather preposterous," said the Rev. William L. Newell, assistant rector of the Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Church.

"If the things that have been alleged actually took place, we would have heard about it. We saw no immoral acts, nor heard of any."

Fr. Newell said that he and the Rev. Eugene W. Kelly, assistant rector of the St. John's Roman Catholic Church here, joined the marchers the night before they entered Montgomery.

Fr. Kelly said: "I witnessed nothing even approaching immoral behavior.

"I suppose when you get 50,000 people together you must have some unpleasant incidents. But I got the impression that people there were concerned with justice and human brotherhood."

"I disbelieve the allegations made. I saw none of these things, I heard of none."

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Sun-Bulletin, Apr. 29, 1965]

Triple Cities Pastors Dispute "Sex-and-Civil-Rights" Charge

(By Jerry Dean)

Two Southern Tier ministers yesterday joined the mounting list of clergymen and nuns who have accused Rep. William Dickinson, Alabama Republican, of spreading slanderous falsehoods about the civil rights demonstration in Selma last month.

The Rev. Harry A. Thor, pastor of the Unitarian-Universalist Church in Binghamton, and the Rev. Jack Tucker, pastor of the Windsor Methodist Church, both of whom traveled to Selma with five other Triple Cities area clergymen last month, termed the congressman's allegations about the demonstrations "ridiculous" and "irresponsible."

Mr. Dickinson, in a House speech Tuesday, stated that sex orgies, drunkenness and other acts of debauchery were "the order of the day" during the 50-mile Selma-to-Montgomery march last month.

"That is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard," Mr. Thor stated. "I suspect that Mr. Dickinson has been misinformed."

Mr. Tucker called the congressman's charges "absolutely irresponsible . . . without any basis in truth."

"How could anything like that be overlooked by all the clergymen who took part and newspaper people who covered the march and the civil rights demonstrations in Selma before the march?" Mr. Tucker asked.

The Windsor pastor said he believes the Alabama congressman is only trying to discredit the civil rights movement in the South.

The Windsor minister and the Binghamton pastor were in Selma last month but did not take part in the march from Selma to Montgomery.

"I'm shocked to think that anyone would stoop to this sort of irresponsible statement," Mr. Tucker stated. "It is typical of a certain element in this country . . . those who throw dirt and filth and make irresponsible accusations with no truths to back them up."

* * * * *

A Pittsburgh Episcopal priest said Congressman Dickinson's statement was made in an attempt to "defame and debunk the whole civil rights movement with a new type McCarthy-ism."

The Rev. Dom Orsini of Pittsburgh, said the congressman is "forever crying 'I have proof,' but he has no proof. He makes his charges from the floor of Congress where he has immunity from libel suits and his victims have no defense."

Protestant and Catholic participants in the march held a news conference yesterday to offer their detailed rebuttal of the congressman's charges.

They said they polled about 80 other clergymen active in the demonstrations and found none who had witnessed sex scenes or heavy drinking before or after the march.

Mr. Dickinson said after the press conference yesterday he would stand on the speech he made to the House Tuesday. He emphasized that he did not vouch for the veracity of the affidavits he read in the House, but noted that they were made under oath by Alabama and Montgomery policemen and private individuals.

* * * * *

The clergymen said they had called on House Majority Leader Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.) to seek support in refuting Mr. Dickinson's charges. Congressman Ford told newsmen yesterday that Mr. Dickinson as a House member, "has a right to make any comments. I believe that the comments he made are his responsibility."

United Press International yesterday requested that Mr. Dickinson correct the House record concerning charges he made that he was unable to get signed statements from reporters and photographers who covered the march.

UPI's telegram to Mr. Dickinson said the congressman implied that "UPI employes attempted to hide something, which is not true."

In my judgment, there has been insufficient recognition of the long-range effects of such an episode. In a commentary appearing in the Nation for May 10, 1965, this question was briefly touched upon:

[From the Nation, May 10, 1965]

Sex at Selma

From its inception the civil rights movement has presented bigots, racists and reactionaries with a serious tactical problem: how can it be effectively smeared? The movement is nonviolent, the leadership has been largely religious, and most of the support has come from religious groups. The history of the movement shows that it was not fostered by any of the "fringe" parties of the Left. Moreover, the movement speaks in the American idiom; its attachment to the Constitution is self-evident: it addresses its appeal, often with Biblical overtones, to the American conscience. Even so, opponents of the movement were certain to make the smear attempt. Rep. William L. Dickinson (R., Ala.) has in two speeches (March 30 and April 27) leveled the charge of sexual immorality at the Selma marchers. He is colorful and commendably frank about his purpose. "I have attacked the conduct of many of the participants," he told his colleagues, "for several reasons, one of which is to rip away the facade of righteousness, smugness and respectability erroneously attributed to them, which allowed them to invade my home town and my state like a swarm of rats leaving an overturned hayrick."

Eight clergymen and a Catholic nun promptly called a press conference in Washington to refute the charges. Sister Mary Leoline, B.V.M., of Kansas City, said she found the conduct of the marchers beyond reproach. Letters from clergymen of all faiths, from all regions, have been pouring in to their Representatives, who obligingly place them in the Congressional Record. In the face of this avalanche of protest, the attempt to sling mud has backfired. But this will not stop the campaign to discredit the civil rights movement. The most likely next step will be to split the movement. Informers will be used; plants, masquerading as supermilitants, are doubtless at work even now. Every effort will be made to isolate the movement by pushing it out of the mainstream of American protest. At the same time, renewed attempts will be made to keep civil rights within the American consensus, to tame and discipline it. In fact, its momentum may be more impeded by the attempt to domesticate it than by the attempt to smear it. Fortunately, the movement has so deeply stirred the conscience of the nation (see articles by George B. Leonard, p. 502, and Jack Newfield, p. 491, this issue) that neither effort is likely to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the events since the time of the march demonstrate all too clearly that the struggle for equalty of opportunity is far from won. Moreover, dispassionate dialog has not replaced the harsh emotions aroused by this problem. I know of no group that has made a greater contribution to the campaign for human dignity than has the clergy—of all of the faiths—in our Nation. Their participation in this effort is essential if we are to avoid escalation of hate and violence which will beget further hate and further violence.

As are our colleagues, I am deeply disturbed when any people are slandered on the floor of this House. This is particularly true when the victims are selected because they have acted to fight oppression. Men and women of the cloth who deserved honor and admiration were, instead, made the target of a campaign designed to dishonor them.

Reports of racism both by whites and by Negroes grow daily. Our efforts to make further legislative advances in this field are berated by extremists both Negro and white before evaluation of our ultimate performance is possible.

The moderating and constructive influence of spiritual leaders is more essential today than ever before. If reckless assaults on their integrity should cause a diminution in their efforts, then we are all injured.

I hope that my review of this whole episode may help to demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of us recognize as baseless the charges made against the clergy and that we cherish those who have made, and can make, a unique contribution to the campaign for steady and orderly progress in the quest for human rights here at home.

REPORT ON CRASH OF XB-70 AIRPLANE ON JUNE 8, 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rogers of Florida). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a report made under date of August 12, by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Secretary of Defense in regard to the crash on June 8, 1966, of the XB-70.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, the XB-70 aircraft, an experimental aircraft representing an investment in excess of $500 million, crashed in California while on a test flight from Edwards Air Force Base. Information soon became available that the crash occurred at the time a series of photographs were being taken for the use of the General Electric Co., manufacturers of the jet engines for the aircraft involved, and not during the performance of the tests themselves.

Perhaps I should point out for the record that Congress, during the whole life of the XB-70 research and development project, has provided in excess of $1.4 billion over several years for the program. Only two planes have been constructed. The plane which crashed last June 8 was more valuable than the other plane because of a number of improvements which had been made and because it carried additional instrumentation.

When the circumstances surrounding the crash were made known to me I issued the following statement:

Statement of Hon. George Mahon, Democrat, of Texas, June 10, 1966

I am shocked and dismayed at the recent loss of two of the nation's most valuable pilots and one of the two existing XB–70 aircraft. I have called a meeting of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations today in a special hearing on the circumstances of the crash which occurred last Wednesday.

The crash took place during a formation flight involving the XB–70 and four other aircraft. The formation was formed in order that photographs could be taken for the use of the General Electric Company which manufactured the engines of the five aircraft.

The loss of these men, and an aircraft in which more than $500 million has been invested by the taxpayers, while accommodating the public relations department of a private company, is indefensible.

The Appropriations Committee will follow Air Force actions in this matter closely and will insist that procedures be established which will make impossible a recurrence of such misuse of men and military equipment.

Following the issuance of the foregoing statement, the Committee on Appropriations directed that an investigation of the crash be made by the surveys and investigations staff of the committee, and I asked officials of the Air Force to look into the matter and give the Committee on Appropriations a report. Of course, the Air Force would automatically make a thorough investigation in a tragedy of this kind.

A report to the Secretary of Defense on the matter was released today in Washington by Dr. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the Record. The report covers about 12 typewritten pages but it is so useful in relating the circumstances surrounding this matter which involves such a huge sum of public funds, I think it is in the public interest that it be printed in full so that the Members and the public may read it.

Department of the Air Force,
Washington, August 12, 1966.

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense.
Subject: XB–70 investigation.

The comprehensive investigation of the XB–70 accident on June 8, 1966, has now been completed. Two investigative boards were convened shortly after the accident—one to determine its causes, the other to examine the question of command responsibility. This issue arose when it was learned that the XB–70 had at the time of the accident been flying in formation for photographic purposes with four other General Electric powered aircraft, at the company's request.

During the past weeks, board members have devoted upwards of 7,000 man-hours to their task, assisted by more than 50 experts in and out of Government. The results are embodied in approximately 2,500 pages of testimony and supporting exhibits; this includes statements from close to 90 individuals as well as exhaustive technical analyses, with the benefit of such techniques as the use of model simulations to reconstruct the exact sequence of events. General McConnell and I are satisfied that no effort has been spared to ascertain all of the relevant facts. Our purpose in this memorandum is to advise you of the conclusions we have reached and the actions we have taken against the background of this investigation.

Under established procedures, requests for Air Force assistance in the production of commercial films require approval at a high level. It is specifically indicated that this includes not only theatrical motion pictures but also industrial motion pictures of advertising value. Within the Air Force, the sole approval authority is our Director of Information; he, in turn, coordinates with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). Related Air Force guidance states that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) has primary responsibility for relations with industry and that questions on the extent of cooperation that may be extended should be referred to him. Other instructions prohibit flights of USAF aircraft not in the direct interest of Government business, restrict Air Force participation in contractor sponsored special events, provide that Air Force participation in public events must not support commercial advertising, publicity or promotional activities, and require OSD approval of all aerial reviews not otherwise authorized.

In the view of the collateral board, while questions of interpretation exist under these provisions, a fair reading required higher approval in this instance. In fact, however, such approval was neither sought nor secured above the field organization immediately involved in the XB–70 flight test program. Although the flight as such was authorized to accomplish valid test objectives, the special formation arrangements made at the request of General Electric were not; rather, their purpose was essentially to enable the contractor's advertising agency to photograph the formation. The finding of the collateral board is that the Air Force officer who actively assisted General Electric in this respect exercised poor judgment and that his supervisor, who approved the flight with full knowledge of these arrangements, did not properly discharge his duties. Two other individuals have also been cited, based on the facts developed—the local Air Force information officer and an official at the next higher echelon in the XB–70 program, both of whom were aware of the photographic mission but failed to intervene.

A narrative of the salient facts follows. It covers the status of the XB–70 flight test program, the steps taken by General Electric to arrange for the photographic mission, how this mission was approved, the preflight preparations, and the circumstances of the flight. A detailed analysis of the accident is included in an attachment. There is also a further issue addressed in this report: the measures we propose to take to assure that the lessons of this accident are learned.

FLIGHT TEST PROGRAM

The XB–70 flight test program is managed by North American Aviation, developer of the aircraft, under contract to the Air Force. The target for this phase of the program is 180 flying hours, pointed toward demonstration of the technical feasibility of the XB–70 design, the establishment of its airworthiness characteristics, and the attainment of sustained Mach 3 speeds. These objectives had substantially been accomplished by June 8: the two aircraft had in 95 flights accumulated a total of 186 flying hours, 81 of them at supersonic speeds.

The next phase of the program was scheduled to begin on June 16. Sponsored jointly by the Air Force and NASA, it was planned to last for 18 months, with approximately 180 hours of test flying. Plans for this phase have been temporarily suspended, pending adjustments to accommodate the program to the one remaining XB–70. The effect of the loss of the other more advanced XB–70 has been to lessen the rate at which empirical research data can be generated on large supersonic aircraft, particularly with respect to sonic booms.

Engine support for the flight test program is provided through contract with General Electric, manufacturer of the YJ–93 engines used in the XB–70. Such support includes engine spare parts, reparables, jet engine field maintenance, aerospace ground equipment and spare parts, technical manuals, and retrofit kits as needed to meet flight test objectives.

A review of the pertinent contracts with North American and General Electric discloses no provision under which photography for non-Governmental purposes is either authorized or required. The photographic mission was therefore outside the terms of these contracts and could not properly have been undertaken unless approved in accordance with the procedures on pictorial and industrial relations activities noted at the outset.

Air Force support of the XB–70 flight test program is centered at the Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC), Edwards Air Force Base, California. Colonel Joseph F. Cotton, one of the four pilots originally qualified to fly the XB–70, serves as Test Director. He reports to Colonel Albert M. Cate, Deputy for Systems Test, AFFTC. Colonel Cotton derives his authority from and operates under a formal delegation from Mr. John S. McCollom, Director of Research Vehicles at the Aeronautical Systems Division, Air Force Systems Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

APPROVAL OF THE PHOTOGRAPHIC MISSION

The chain of events was set in motion by General Electric about the middle of May, when its chief test pilot at Edwards, Mr. John M. Fritz, approached a senior representative of North American at the Test Center. Mr. Fritz had been asked by General Electric officials to see whether it would be possible to arrange for inflight photographs of the XB–70 in formation with other supersonic aircraft powered by General Electric engines. The North American representative indicated that this might be worked out but that the timing would depend completely on the XB–70's availability.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Fritz contacted Colonel Cotton, who agreed to inclusion of the photographic mission on a noninterference basis at the end of a regularly scheduled test flight, provided that large demands were not placed on AFFTC. Colonel Cotton had previously permitted North American to take inflight photographs of a Sabreliner and the XB–70 on a noninterference basis; he felt that equal consideration should be given to the General Electric request. Also, he felt that General Electric had responded positively to the flight test program.

At the end of May, another North American official who was not aware of Colonel Cotton's agreement, disapproved the photographic mission for scheduling because of the amount of work remaining in the short period left for this phase of the program. The testimony is specific that his reluctance was based on timing; indeed, it was suggested that the mission would if necessary be included in the follow-on phase of the program.

On June 1, during a visit from a North American customer representative, Colonel Cotton indicated his displeasure that the contractor had not accommodated a request he had approved. North American personnel checked with Mr. Fritz, who reiterated that General Electric was most desirous of getting the pictures and willing to do all of the work. The next day, although Colonel Cotton would have waited, as he had waited to accommodate the previous North American request, North American management advised that the General Electric photographic mission would be included at the end of the flight scheduled for June 8.

Later on June 2, Colonel Cotton requested and received approval of this flight from his immediate supervisor, Colonel Cate. As Colonel Cotton explained in his testimony:

"The main thing here, when I realized we were going to have a formation, was I didn't think it was appropriate to see a 5 or 6 ship formation someplace without folks here at home knowing it and I felt it was important to discuss it with the boss and tell him it was a request from G.E. and to point out that we had done it before, and see what he thought about it and get his guidance on it. . . ."

No further approval was either sought or secured, although Colonel Cate was briefed by Colonel Cotton on the details of the photographic mission.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AIRCRAFT

Once the decision had been made to schedule the photographic mission, Mr. Fritz proceeded to arrange for the desired General Electric powered aircraft, as follows:

The XB–70.

An AFFTC T–38 scheduled to participate in the flight as a chase aircraft. Chase aircraft normally accompany the XB–70 on every flight as a matter of standard procedure.

A NASA F–104. This was made available for the photographic mission by Mr. Joseph A. Walker, chief research pilot for NASA at Edwards. Colonel Cotton supported Mr. Fritz in his request for this aircraft, even though it was not strictly required for chase purposes. The flight was scheduled by Mr. Walker as a chase operation, a matter within his authority under NASA procedures; his NASA superiors at the Test Center did not have specific knowledge of the photographic mission.

A Navy F–4 from the Point Mugu Naval Air Station, California. This was handled directly by Mr. Fritz with Commander Jerome P. Skyrud, head of the Air-to-Air Weapons Branch, Naval Missile Center. It was authorized by the operations coordination officer there as a routine training flight in support of what was assumed to be an approved Air Force Mission.

An F–5 owned by the Air Force and bailed to General Electric under unrelated engine component improvement programs. Technically speaking, the requirement that all flights of bailed aircraft must be approved was complied with; in fact, however, the F–5 did not perform engine airstart evaluations—the official purpose stated by Mr. Fritz in the documentation for this flight.

In addition, Mr. Fritz attempted to arrange for an Air Force B–58, but was unsuccessful. His efforts to arrange for supplementary Air Force photo coverage were also unsuccessful. A Lear jet from which to photograph the formation was contracted for by General Electric.

The XB–70 had a reason to be in the air, entirely apart from the photographic mission. This is also true of the Test Center T–38, at least during the earlier portions of the flight. The inclusion of the NASA F–104 was also considered of value, although it at no time actually performed chase functions, inasmuch as Mr. Walker had flown XB–70 chase missions on nine previous occasions, eight of them in an F–104, and was in training as an XB–70 pilot, with his first familiarization flight planned for June 10. The remaining aircraft arranged for by General Electric lacked even this justification for their participation in the photographic mission.

On June 6, two days before the XB–70 flight, an Air Force information officer in Los Angeles learned of the photographic mission through a call from a commercial photographer. He referred the caller to the AFFTC information office at Edwards, headed by Colonel James G. Smith. Up to that point Colonel Smith had not officially been consulted on, and was not personally aware of, the photographic mission. In ensuing discussions, Colonel Smith expressed no objection to this mission, nor did he advise AFFTC personnel of the approval requirements to which information pictorial activities are subject. His only action was to ascertain that the mission had been approved by Colonel Cate.

In addition to Colonel Smith, a number of personnel at the Test Center had knowledge of the photographic mission and its purposes. In his case, however, the board found that such knowledge was coupled with a duty to advise the responsible officials, since the matter was included within his functional staff area. Also available to him, but not availed of, were his functional staff channels to higher headquarters. It is through such channels that requests for non-Governmental photography are required to be forwarded under established procedures.

PREFLIGHT PREPARATIONS

There is no question that, except for the photographic mission added on June 2, the June 8 flight was properly authorized. As originally planned, it had two primary objectives: airspeed calibration runs and familiarization of Major Carl S. Cross, who had been selected as a replacement pilot for the XB–70. Major Cross had undergone ground school and preliminary flight training; this was his first flight in the XB–70. On June 7, a third primary objective was added at the request of Headquarters, USAF—a sonic boom run, in support of the SST program. In the official preflight report to the Air Force Systems Command and Headquarters, USAF on that date, only these three missions were mentioned.

The preflight briefing was held on June 7. North American personnel briefed the nonphotographic portions of the flight, while Mr. Fritz briefed the photographic portion. The formation was described as a loose "V", led by the XB–70, rather than a close formation. Mr. Walker in the NASA F–104 was assigned the inboard position off the XB–70's right wing; Commander Skyrud in the Navy F–4 the corresponding position off the XB–70's left wing. The outboard positions, right and left respectively, were to be flown by Mr. Fritz in the General Electric F–5 and Captain Peter C. Hoag in the Air Force T–38, with Colonel Cotton in the rear seat. The Lear jet was to keep apart from the formation. There was detailed discussion of how the formation would be flown, although specific separation distances were not specified. Nor was a formation commander designated, although Colonel Cotton considered himself to be in charge.

Three of the participants in the flight were not present at the briefing: Mr. Alvin S. White of North American, who took over as XB–70 pilot on June 7 when the scheduled pilot had to withdraw for another flight; Commander Skyrud, whose only briefing consisted of telephone conversations with Mr. Fritz; and Mr. H. Clay Lacy, pilot of the Lear jet, who was briefed by Mr. Fritz shortly before takeoff on June 8. Also on the Lear jet, as an observer, was a General Electric test pilot who had attended the preflight briefing and was familiar with flight procedures in the Edwards area.

At Edwards during this period was Mr. McCollom, the Director of Research Vehicles for the Aeronautical Systems Division, who in effect serves as the XB–70 system program director. The purpose of his visit was to discuss the next phase of the program with Test Center, NASA, and contractor personnel. On June 7, he assisted in the scheduling of the sonic boom mission and, on invitation, attended the preflight briefing. During the course of that briefing, at which he was the highest ranking Air Force official, he was exposed to the details of the photographic mission. He must be held, therefore, to have given this mission his tacit consent; had he objected, the mission could not have gone on, since it was admittedly within his power to withdraw the XB–70 from the flight.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE FLIGHT

On the morning of June 8, the XB–70 released brakes for takeoff at 7:15 and proceeded to perform four airspeed calibration runs. Chase coverage for this portion of the flight was provided by the T–38. When the XB–70 started its climb for the sonic boom run, this T–38 landed to refuel and another T–38 in the area checked the XB–70 to verify that the cooling doors were closed. The sonic boom run was completed at approximately 8:30.

The rendezvous for the photographic mission was completed at approximately 8:45. Clouds in the area necessitated a change in altitude (from 20,000 to 25,000 feet), location and direction (from north-south to east-west), resulting in a short flight path. Otherwise the formation was flown as briefed. The aircraft flew a left-hand racetrack pattern at 300 knots indicated airspeed, with the Lear jet 500 feet or more from the formation, generally to the left and slightly back.

There were apparently no problems and the formation proceeded smoothly for approximately 40 minutes. Around 9:00, an Air Force photo aircraft on return from another mission with a hundred feet of unexpended film asked for and received permission to photograph the formation. At approximately 9:15, the Lear jet was queried about additional time, since the 30 minutes originally planned had elapsed. The reply was a request for another 10–15 minutes. Slightly before 9:26 the Lear jet stated that another 3 minutes would complete the requirements.

At 9:26 the NASA F–104 collided with the XB–70, from a position below and underlapping the XB–70. The initial contact was between the left horizontal stabilizer of the F–104 and the canted right wing tip of the XB–70. After this contact the F–104 pitched up and rolled to the left, struck the leading edge of the XB–70's right wing, and continued to roll inverted across the top of the XB–70, damaging its right vertical and shearing off its left vertical. The impact cut or broke the F–104 just behind the cockpit. Its nose section hit the XB–70's left wing; its fuselage section streamed off the XB–70 in flames. Approximately 2.8 seconds elapsed between the initial contact with the XB–70 and the breakup of the F–104. The XB–70 continued to fly level a few seconds following the loss of its verticals. It then began to maneuver uncontrollably, its left wing failed, and the aircraft hit the ground approximately 1 minute 52 seconds after the collision.

Mr. Walker, pilot of the F–104, and Major Cross, co-pilot of the XB–70, did not eject and were killed. Mr. White, pilot of the XB–70, ejected safely after the aircraft went out of control and sustained relatively minor injury.

A detailed analysis of the accident is attached. The finding with respect to the most probable cause is that the pilot of the F–104 inadvertently allowed his aircraft to move into a position relative to the XB–70 from which recovery was virtually impossible. After the initial contact between the F–104 and the XB–70, and in the existing environment, insufficient control existed to separate the aircraft and the process continued to their eventual destruction. The analysis also covers why Mr. Walker, who in all likelihood had no opportunity, and Major Cross did not eject after the collision.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

The photographic mission would not have occurred if Colonel Cotton had refused the General Electric request or at least not caused North American to reconsider its reluctance. It would not have occurred if

Colonel Cate had taken a more limited view of his own approval authority. It would not have occurred if Colonel Smith had advised of the need for higher approval. It would not have occurred if Mr. McCollom had exercised the power he personally possessed to stop the flight. But it did occur.

From all the evidence, these individuals acted in ignorance of prescribed procedures rather than with intent to violate them. The regulations aside, however, there remains the question of the judgment of individuals who in one way or another made possible what was essentially a formation flight for the sole benefit of General Electric. The same formation could not, for example, have been flown at an event as legitimate as Armed Forces Day without approval of the Air Force Director of Information and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). Merely to enable a public showing of the XB–70 last March at Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, a request reached the level of the Chief of Staff and Secretary of the Air Force, and was limited by them to a static display (no fly-by).

With the concurrence of the Chief of Staff, the Commander of the Air Force Systems Command has directed appropriate administrative and disciplinary actions. Colonel Cate has been relieved as Deputy for Systems Test and assigned to other duties. He, Colonel Cotton and Colonel Smith have been given written reprimands. Similar action has also been initiated with respect to Mr. McCollom.

The boards have also scrutinized and made recommendations with respect to the improvement of operational procedures. Of first importance is the correction of supervisory and procedural weaknesses found to exist at AFFTC. It is essential that test directors have wide latitude, but not at the expense of positive command and control of their operation; higher headquarters must ensure policy compliance. Among other recommendations are that the XB–70 escape system be modified to provide greater assurance of ejection under conditions of high "G" forces and that formation flying standards be established, particularly with regard to the behavior of mixed types of aircraft in close proximity, such as in chase operations. General McConnell has directed the Commander of the Air Force Systems Command to proceed with the implementation of these recommendations.

Independently of the investigative boards, a survey has been conducted of all major commands, who were instructed to report any instances during the past 24 months where contractors had requested and been granted permission to photograph Air Force flying operations for public relations or advertising purposes. It appears from an analysis of the replies that, while instances have occurred of photography taken as an incident to an authorized flight, there were only four instances of flights specifically altered or extended to accommodate a contractor's request. Two of these cases involved photography of single aircraft; the third, the photography referred to earlier of the Sabreliner with the XB–70; the last, photography of two C–141's at the end of a scheduled test flight. Significantly, in each of these cases, the highest level of approval was within AFFTC.

Such data reinforce the need for corrective measures at AFFTC. None of the instances reported, however, approaches the June 8 flight in its degree of deviation from prescribed procedures. Indeed, although other instances undoubtedly exist of which records have not been kept, it would appear that a formation flight of five different aircraft specially arranged at a contractor's request is at least exceptional in recent experience.

We have also supplemented the investigation with a thorough review of current policies and procedures. The review pointed up that, on any one of several counts, the photographic mission was of questionable propriety. These include provisions on the use of Government property, flight management, information pictorial activities and relations with industry. In common with the collateral board, our conclusion was that, if the letter and spirit of existing guidance had been followed, this mission would have been submitted for higher approval. That such approval would not have been forthcoming is clear. General Schriever advises that he personally would have disapproved, so that the request would not even have reached this headquarters. I can assure you, moreover, that neither General McConnell nor I would entertain such a request.

Based on our review, we will proceed to update the older regulations, simplify provisions that are unnecessarily complex, and clarify particular points that may not be uniformly interpreted in the field. Additionally, I feel strongly that we should strengthen existing guidance with a flat prohibition against any special arrangements in support of contractor photography. This goes beyond the present approval requirement, but is implicit when the regulations are read in entirety. It means that a contractor's request could not even be considered if it involved a diversion of Government resources.

None of the participants in the events leading to the accident emerges in this analysis as exercising good judgment. But the responsibility for observance of Government regulations and for assuring proper use of Government resources rested with Air Force personnel. The actions outlined above are intended to prevent any similar misuse in the future.

HAROLD BROWN.

Attachment.

ANALYSIS OF THE XB–70 ACCIDENT

All of the pilots in the formation had considerable flying time and had qualified in the particular aircraft involved.

Mr. White, pilot of the XB–70, had logged in excess of 5,900 flying hours as of 8 June 1966 in a variety of aircraft. He has had extensive flight test experience and was fully qualified in the XB–70, having flown the first and some seventy-plus other flights in the two XB–70 aircraft. His total time since 1 July 1965 was approximately 93 hours, a good share of which was in the XB–70.

Major Cross, co-pilot of the XB–70, had flown a total of 8,530 hours. He had gained considerable experience in flight test operations and was experienced in a variety of aircraft, including heavy multi-engine jet aircraft, and was a graduate of the Air Force Test Pilot School. He had undergone ground training on the XB–70 and was, on this flight, having his first familiarization ride in the aircraft preparatory to becoming one of the test pilots in the XB–70 program.

Mr. Walker, pilot of the NASA F–104, had a total of 4,998 hours of flying time. He had an extensive background and experience in experimental flight testing, including the X–15 program. His experience included a variety of aircraft, including the F–104 in which he was current and had logged 27 hours and 45 minutes in the 90-day period preceding the accident. Mr. Walker had completed the XB–70 formal ground course having been chosen as the NASA pilot for the continuing XB–70 test program. He had additionally flown as chase pilot on XB–70 test missions on nine occasions, eight of which were flown in an F–104.

Mr. Fritz, pilot of the General Electric F–5, is a former Air Force pilot who had logged considerable flying time as of the date of the accident. He has been a civilian test pilot since 1956.

Commander Skyrud, pilot of the Navy F–4, had logged 4,249 hours flying time. He is also a qualified test pilot having graduated from the Empire Test Pilot School (British).

Colonel Cotton, riding in the T–38, had logged 11,263 flying hours at the time of the accident. Additionally, he is an experimental test pilot of many years standing, and has flown the XB–70 in the test program numerous times as pilot and co-pilot.

Captain Hoag, pilot of the T–38, had logged 2,452 flying hours, is a graduate of the Aerospace Research Pilots School, and is currently assigned as an experimental test pilot at the Air Force Flight Test Center.

With regard to aircraft condition, the pre-flight mechanical condition of the XB–70 was without discrepancies of significance. Some minor discrepancies were carried on the maintenance records, as is usual with aircraft, but have no relation to the accident which occurred. This is borne out by the XB–70 telemetry record analysis of the flight from time of take-off to ground impact.

The pre-flight condition of the F–104 did not exhibit any maintenance deficiencies that would be contributory to the accident occurrence. The NASA system of maintenance generally follows Air Force practice and uses Air Force documentation.

The mechanical condition of the XB–70 prior to the collision was determined from the on-board instrumentation with telemetered relay to the ground control. Telemetry was received throughout the flight, including the times immediately prior to and during the collision and until the XB–70 ground impact. For a period of of 44 seconds prior to the collision the XB–70 was in essentially straight and level flight. There was no indication of any abnormal condition or operation on any recorded data during this period.

The condition of the F–104 immediately prior to the collision cannot be as positively stated as that of the XB–70. Because the aircraft was not a research vehicle, no on-board instrumentation was available so that all conclusions must be based on observer reports and the post-accident mechanical analysis of the wreckages. This analysis does not indicate any mechanical failure or malfunction; however, this conclusion must be weighed in light of the severe damage to the aircraft. No indications of impending trouble were noted either visually or aurally by any surviving members of the flight.

In examining the data with respect to the causes of the accident, several hypotheses were explored, i.e.:

Air turbulence causing motion of one of the aircraft.

Mechanical malfunction in one of the aircraft.

Physiological problems of one or the other crew.

Distraction of the F–104 pilot.

Aerodynamic effects on the F–104 due to airflow near the XB–70.

F–104 pilot formation proficiency.

Inadvertent movement of the F–104 into the XB–70 not perceptible to the pilot.

With regard to air turbulence, the XB–70 telemetered traces indicated little or no acceleration about any airplane axis, conclusively ruling out any abrupt motion of the XB–70 in pitch, roll, or yaw. The F–5 pilot who was flying in a position close to the F-104 and with the F–104 between his airplane and the XB–70 stated there was no turbulence during this period, nor was it reported by other members of the formation. Since turbulence is not normally confined to an area small enough to affect single aircraft within a flight of five without being felt by any other member of the flight, turbulence can be discounted as a contributory factor in the collison.

As previously discussed, a malfunction in the XB–70 is ruled out. Although a malfunction of the F–104 cannot be completely eliminated from consideration, the probability of this being a cause factor is very remote.

The XB–70 pilot indicated no physiological problem to himself either in testimony or statement. As he was flying the aircraft at impact, physiological problems in the XB–70 crew can be eliminated in cause considerations.

The post-mortem examination of Mr. Walker indicates little or no likelihood of pre-collision coronary problems. Due to the condition of the body, the determination of whether pre-collision dysbarism or hypoxia existed cannot be made with certainty.

No other pilot in the formation noticed any abrupt or unusual movement of the F–104 or Mr. Walker prior to the initial collision. Although this supports to a large extent the possibility that Mr. Walker was not suffering physiological problems, it also is not totally conclusive. Even slight hypoxia could result in loss of judgment on the part of the pilot and a gradual movement of the F–104 into the XB–70 that might not be sensed by him.

Based on the above analyses, the possibility of physiological problems as the primary cause of the accident is considered remote.

Numerous reasons for the F–104 pilot being distracted can be postulated. One possible reason was a B–58 which was on a sonic boom run and approaching from the opposite direction and above the formation just prior to the collision. This was reported to the flight by radar approach control (RAPCON) approximately 16 seconds prior to collision. Mr. White reported he had the B–58 in sight. Mr. Walker could have diverted his attention from the XB–70 to the B–58, although this is unlikely in the case of a pilot of his experience. Other possibilities for distraction due to occurrences within the cockpit exist but are remote in that an experienced pilot is not likely to divert his attention, except momentarily, from the airplane on which he is flying formation. Also, should he have done this, his head movements and perhaps attendant aircraft movements most likely would have been noticed by the F–5 pilot. In view of the foregoing, it must be concluded that pilot distraction was a possible, but improbable causative.

The aerodynamic phenomenon of a swirling air vortex which emanates from the wing tip and trails behind the aircraft is common to all lifting wing surfaces. The vortex is created by the natural flow at the tip of the wing from the high pressure areas below the wing to the low pressure area at the upper wing surface. This phenomenon existed with the XB–70; however, analyses indicate that the pressure gradient would not be severe enough to cause loss of control of the F–104, until the latter was within a few feet of the XB–70 wing. Several examples of close chase formation on previous XB–70 flights are apparent in photographic documentation and pilot reports; none of these indicates vortex effects on the chase airplane. The other airflow phenomena of engine wake and underbelly suction could not have affected the F–104 due to its position at the right wing of the XB–70. It can be concluded that airflow effects of the XB–70 on the F–104 did contribute to the collision only after the point was reached where the F–104 tail was so close to the XB–70 that a collision was imminent in any case. Therefore, this must be considered as an indirect contributory factor.

There are no records that would indicate Mr. Walker's recent experience with formation flying of the type involved. Although Mr. Walker had flown an F–104 while chasing the XB–70 on eight previous occasions and a B–58 on another, it is unlikely that he flew in such formation for any extended period during these flights.

The F–5 pilot stated that the F–104 did have noticeable (but not violent) up and down and fore and aft motion on occasion during the flight. These motions were large enough to cause the F–5 pilot to "work harder" in his formation flying but in his view were not extreme or dangerous. Furthermore, the F–5 pilot was observing the F–104 immediately prior to impact and noticed no sudden motions except after the collision sequence had started. Indications lead to the conclusion that although Mr. Walker's proficiency in close formation could have been less than optimum it did not result in extreme motions of the F–104 which would account for impact.

A pilot flying formation with his right hand on the control stick and left extended forward to the throttle is almost certain to be looking on a sight line no farther aft than about 30 degrees forward of his left shoulder. Any position of the head farther left than this would be extremely uncomfortable for an extended period of time. This assumption leads to the conclusion that Mr. Walker most likely was holding his position by viewing the XB–70 fuselage someplace between the engine inlets and the nose. In this case most of the XB–70 wing would have been out of his field of vision. When viewing along this sight line no two separated points on the XB–70 could have been available to Mr. Walker for visually judging alignment. Therefore, a gradual movement of the F–104 either laterally or fore and aft may not have been noticed. The measure of lateral separation must then be based by the pilot on his own judgment of distance from his own position to the points on the fuselage on which he has concentrated. This judgment is degraded with increased distance which in this case would be nearly 70 feet, based on the half-wing span and the leading edge sweep. Viewing the sequence of pictures in the accident analysis from the point of view of the pilot's line of sight to the fuselage, it is readily apparent that the movement of the F–104 from a position of safe clearance to one of contact was possible through gradual motion without the pilot's awareness. The likelihood is further increased by the fact that from the position of impact of the F–104 horizontal stabilizer with the XB–70 drooped wing tip the pilot's head was at least 10 feet below the centerline of the fuselage.

It is concluded that the most probable cause of the accident was that this inadvertent movement of the F–104 caused it to reach a point so near the XB–70 wing tip that contact was inevitable. After initial contact, and in the existing environment, insufficient control existed to separate the aircraft and the process continued to their eventual destruction.

Both the post mortem examination and the analysis of the collision point to a conclusion that Mr. Walker was most probably killed either when the left vertical stabilizer of the XB–70 severed the F–104 behind the cockpit or subsequently when the forward area of the F–104 struck the left wing of the XB–70. In either case there would have been no opportunity for ejection as the total time from initial impact to the point of contact with the left vertical tail was approximately 2.8 seconds. During the latter part of this period, extreme forces on the pilot were inevitable.

The XB–70 is equipped with an individual escape capsule for each of the two crew members, which can be closed in two manners for completely encapsulated ejection. First, these can be closed manually after the seat is manually moved aft. (Moving the seat aft would be difficult, if not impossible, while under forces directed forward.) The second manner and the one used by the XB–70 pilot is "ballistic" encapsulation. To encapsulate ballistically, the pilot raises either or both armrests and gas pressure from charges moves the seat back and closes the door. When either armrest is raised, a trigger is exposed. Squeezing this trigger completes the ejection sequence. (Should forward forces be greater than the gas pressure could overcome or beyond the limit of the safety burst mechanism, the gas would be lost without seat retraction and escape would be impossible.) After ejection, certain sequences occur automatically, including parachute deployment and pressurization of a gas-filled "attenuation bag" for reducing the landing shock. Emergency handles within the capsule allow operation of some of these post-ejection sequences during descent in case of an automatic sequence failure.

Mr. White reported that he seemed for a period to be unable to move in the capsule due to loads throwing him forward and to the left, even after he heard the call, "Bail out! Bail out! Bail out!" Finally, he pulled the right handle of his escape capsule and encapsulated ballistically. In the excitement and stress of the moment, he failed to keep his right elbow inside the capsule and it became wedged in the door. Mr. White was finally able to free his arm and complete his ejection. (Mr. White had such difficulty on his own part that he could not contact Major Cross or help him physically in any way.) The parachute opened smoothly and since the doors had not fully closed, Mr. White closed them manually. Mr. White had lost the emergency checklist during ejection and, although he was aware that the gas-filled bag for landing shock attenuation was not inflated, he could not recall where the emergency inflation control was. Mr. White sustained minor injury.

At the time of the flight, Major Cross had completed ground training for checkout (except for some simulator flying time), including complete coverage of the crew escape system. Although Major Cross did not "grow up" with the system as Mr. White had during its development, there is no reason to believe that he failed to escape due to a lack of understanding its operation. This is most apparent in light of the fact that ballistic encapsulation and ejection requires the two steps of lifting armrest(s) and squeezing trigger(s) which is common to a majority of Air Force airplanes and therefore completely familiar to a pilot with Major Cross' experience.

Major Cross was not ejected from the crippled XB–70 and apparently died in the crash. The following possibilities were considered in searching for the reason ejection was not accomplished:

—Failure to follow proper ejection procedures.

—Escape system malfunction.

—Forces beyond system capability due to XB–70 motions.

—Major Cross burned or injured during Mr. White's ejection.

—Incapacitation or injury due to the violence of XB–70 motion.

—Failure to remove safety pin prior to flight.

Considering the ground training received by Major Cross, his experience in aircraft with ejection seats, and the simplicity of procedures for ballistic encapsulation and ejection (identical to numerous other Air Force ejection systems), the probability of not following procedures as the reason for Major Cross failing to escape is remote.

The materiel analysis of Major Cross' capsule does not indicate any failure in the system. However, the condition of the equipment after impact with the ground makes a positive conclusion impossible. A system failure must therefore be retained as a possible, though reasonably unlikely, cause for failure to eject.

In statement and testimony, Mr. White indicates extreme forces were holding him forward and to the left during the period after loss of control of the XB–70 and until his

> own ejection was completed. The following three quotes from his statement indicate the severity of these forces:
>
> —"For the next few seconds I seemed unable to move in the capsule; the loads being somewhat oscillatory, throwing us forward and to the left."
>
> —"During this period of time I tried to talk, thinking that I had a hot mike; but I could only hear myself grunting under the excitement and extreme force that seemed to be exerted on us and throwing us forward and to the left. While I was trying to free my arm, I did observe Major Cross' head bobbing in the right-hand capsule."
>
> —"I was aware that the main force was throwing me forward at this time * * *."
>
> Since it is mandatory for successful completion of ballistic encapsulation and ejection from the XB–70 that the seat be moved to the full aft position, the gas pressure must overcome any forward forces. (Manual encapsulation under these conditions would be extremely difficult, if not impossible.) Capsule analysis indicated that the relief diaphragm which releases the gas overpressure had been ruptured. This could have occurred as the result of gas pressure building to the limit when the system attempted to move the seat back against extreme forward forces. Had this happened, no further opportunity for ballistic encapsulation would have existed. Even though moments of lowered force levels may have allowed successful ejection by one crew member, an unfortunate timing for actuation of the ballistic cycle during his forward forces by the other may have resulted in the seat failing to retract precluding further possibility of escape. It should be noted here that the XB–70 remained in a flat spin, which would impose forward forces on the crew, from shortly after loss of control until ground impact.
>
> It is concluded that this was a likely cause for Major Cross' failure to escape.
>
> The possibility that Major Cross was incapacitated due to burns or injury suffered when Mr. White ejected exists since the pilot's capsule was ejected upward by the reaction to downward firing rockets. Since when Mr. White last saw Major Cross, he does not think Major Cross was encapsulated, he could have been burned by the rocket blast or struck by an object propelled by this gas. One static ground test tends to indicate that this effect is not too severe.
>
> Autopsy can neither confirm nor refute this so it must be retained as a possible but improbable reason for failure to escape.
>
> As with the foregoing case, autopsy can neither support nor deny the possibility of incapacitation or injury due to violence of XB–70 motion. Major Cross was restrained with both a seat belt and shoulder harness. He was wearing protective headgear so that he should have been able to withstand extreme motions and forces without injury. Under the extreme stress of an aircraft in violent maneuvers, pilots have been successful in reaching the ejection handle. Even so, this cannot be entirely discounted as a cause.
>
> Failure to remove the safety pin is not considered a cause as Mr. White observed that Major Cross had removed the safety pin prior to taking the runway for take-off.

In my statement on the 10th of June, I expressed shock and dismay at the loss of an XB–70 aircraft and two of the Nation's finest pilots during a formation flight the sole purpose of which, at the moment of the accident, was to obtain photographs for the General Electric Co. for use, no doubt, in advertising and promotion for the company.

The facts and conclusions in the foregoing report fully support the position of those who felt that the public relations portion of the flight was indefensible.

The Secretary's report states:

That the photographic mission took place after the authorized legitimate mission for the day had been completed and proceeded for 40 minutes before the F–104 collided with the XB–70;

That the photographic mission did not accomplish any valid test objectives;

That the photographic mission was not mentioned in the official preflight report to the Air Force Systems Command;

That the Air Force personnel at Edwards Air Force Base who arranged and approved the photographic mission did not seek approval for the mission from higher authority, as they should have. Higher authorities have stated that such approval would not have been forthcoming;

And that a Navy plane was sent to join the formation with no authorization other than a telephoned request from a person outside of the Government.

It seems clear that if the General Electric Co. had not sought to use the aircraft for advertising purposes, and if Air Force personnel had not granted the company permission to use Government aircraft for this purpose, the aircraft would have been safely on the ground at the time the crash occurred.

I commend the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force for their objectivity and forthrightness. It is never easy to admit deficiencies in an organization.

It is important that the Air Force and all the services make sure that the lessons of the tragedy which cost the lives of two of our most valuable pilots and a plane representing a public expenditure of more than one-half billion dollars will not be lost.

Regulations must be clarified and tightened up and greater efforts must be made to see that the regulations are followed. The committee will continue to review this facet of the matter. It is the duty of Congress to do all that it can to protect the property of the United States and the lives of those who serve the Government in a military or civilian capacity.

ORDER OF AHEPA'S 44TH SUPREME CONVENTION, AUGUST 14–20, 1966, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, all Members who may wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject on which I propose to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GREEK IMMIGRANTS TO THE UNITED STATES: A TRIBUTE TO THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress, either of the House of Representatives or the Senate, of Greek origin, it gives me great pleasure to draw to the attention of the House the 44th Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA, which began yesterday and will run until August 20 here in Washington. The Nation's Capital is honored this week by the presence of more than 25,000 members of the AHEPA family, and I am proud to welcome this splendid assembly to the seat of American Government.

AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, stands as a firm and enduring link between the achievements and values of Hellenic civilization and contemporary American society. The objectives and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are a clear reflection of the remarkable qualities of Hellenic civilization that find expression in American life. Consider, for example, the first five objects and purposes of AHEPA:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government;

Third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenships;

Fourth, to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; and

Fifth, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny.

These objectives, so central to democracy in America, were central also to democracy in Greece, and one cardinal purpose of the Order of AHEPA is to insure that the flow of the precepts and ideals of Greek democracy continues to serve as a constantly revitalizing current in American government.

IDEALS OF HELLENISM

Mr. Speaker, the Order of AHEPA has other objectives, too, which spring from the richness and excellence of Hellenic civilization. AHEPA strives to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man; to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; and to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

AHEPA has advanced these objectives through a dynamic membership that now numbers more than 43,000. Membership in the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries consists almost wholly of American and Canadian citizens of Greek—or Hellenic—descent, but persons not of Hellenic descent may also join. All walks of life are represented in the membership—businessmen, professional men, educators, laborers, and leaders in government and community affairs. Two former Presidents of the United States—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman—became members of AHEPA. Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey is currently a member of the Minneapolis, Minn., chapter of AHEPA. I am proud to note that many of my distinguished colleagues of Congress, in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, can be counted in the membership of AHEPA.

There are now 1,125 local chapters of the AHEPA family. Within them the Order of AHEPA itself has 27,500 paid members; the Daughters of Penelope 12,500 paid members; the Sons of Pericles 1,750 paid members; the Maids of Athena 1,600 paid members; for a total of 43,350.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA TO INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

The Order of AHEPA has made a series of major contributions to the cause of international understanding. AHEPA has consistently attempted to strengthen the bonds of good will and friendship between the peoples of Canada, the United States, and Greece. In this country's people-to-people program, which calls on individual citizens and groups to advance the cause of closer and more harmonious relations between America and the international community, AHEPA has taken an important lead. Last year this objective of the Order of AHEPA was measurably advanced at the supreme convention—a remarkably successful conference held in Athens, the birthplace of Hellenic culture.

AHEPA has also compiled an enviable record with a long list of major contributions to worthy and charitable causes. During its 44 years AHEPA has financed a wide range of national and international projects. Some representative projects have been relief of Florida hurricane victims; relief of Mississippi flood victims; relief of Corinth earthquake victims; relief for the war orphans of Greece; relief of the Dodecanese Islands earthquake victims; and relief of Turkish earthquake victims. There are other achievements that are equally impressive: the sale of $500 million in U.S. war bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury; contributions to the Truman Library in Independence, Mo.; the donation of 40,000 American and Canadian books to schools and libraries in Greece; and CARE toolkits for students of vocational schools in Greece.

These represent just a sampling of the humanitarian activities of this splendid fraternity. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I should like here to insert a listing of the worthy and charitable causes to which the Order of AHEPA has contributed over the years:

AHEPA's Contributions to Worthy and Charitable Causes

1. Relief of Florida hurricane victims.
2. Relief of Mississippi flood victims.
3. Relief of Corinth, Greece earthquake victims.
4. Relief for the War Orphans of Greece.
5. Relief of Dodecanese Islands (Greece) earthquake victims.
6. Funds for the Hellenic Museum in Greece.
7. Local, national and international Scholarships for needy and worthy students.
8. Relief for the fatherless children of Refugees, through the Near East Relief.
9. Support of the Greek Orthodox Seminaries (Theological) at Pomfret, Conn., and Brookline, Mass.
10. Erection of the Ahepa Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial at Hyde Park, N.Y.
11. Erection of the Ypsilanti Memorial at Ypsilanti, Mich.
12. Erection of the Dilboy Memorial.
13. Relief of Turkish earthquake victims.
14. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Jerusalem.
15. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Constantinople.
16. Ecuadorean Relief.
17. Kansas City flood relief.
18. Greek War Relief Program during and after World War II.
19. Construction of Ahepa Hospitals in Athens and Salonika, Greece following World War II.
20. Construction of 7 Ahepa Health Centers in Greece following World War II.
21. Ahepa Agricultural College in Greece.
22. Ionian Islands (Greece) earthquake relief.
23. Ahepa Preventorium in Volos, Greece.
24. Daughters of Penelope Girls' Shelter Home in Athens, Greece.
25. Construction of Ahepa Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, N.Y.
26. Construction of Ahepa School at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, N.Y.
27. Sale of 500 Million Dollars in U.S. War Bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury Department.
28. Contributions to the Truman Library, Independence, Mo.
29. Contributions to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Cancer Institute, Miami, Fla.
30. Erection of the Ahepa Truman Statue and Plaza in Athens, Greece.
31. Donation of 40,000 American and Canadian books to schools and libraries in Greece.
32. Ahepa Medals for Scholastic Excellence for studies in the Greek Language to students.
33. Presentations of 7-volume sets of the Greek Classics to schools and libraries in the U.S. and Canada.
34. CARE Tool Kits for students of vocational schools in Greece.
35. Ahepa Refugee Relief Committee, to aid war refugees of World War II.
36. Sports Kits for Greek school children.

OFFICERS OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. Speaker, this 44th supreme convention promises to be as successful a conference as last year's convention in Athens. An extraordinary amount of planning is responsible for the full schedule prepared for the 25,000 members of the AHEPA family who will attend; and responsible for this extraordinary planning are the 24 standing committees numbering some 350 people who have been meeting weekly since early January. Directing their efforts have been Convention Grand Chairman Peter Charuhas, of Washington, and AHEPA Executive Secretary George Leber.

Supreme President Kimon Doukas, of New York City, has traveled widely to bring his expertise to bear on the preparations for this convention.

Mr. Speaker, I here ask consent to insert the list of officers of the Order of AHEPA and of those Ahepans handling arrangements for the supreme convention.

International Officers

THE SUPREME LODGE—ORDER OF AHEPA

Supreme President: Kimon A. Doukas, New York, N.Y.

Supreme Vice-Pres: X. K. Microutsicos, Trenton, N.J.

Supreme Secretary: Peter H. Cardiges, Pittsburgh, Penna.

Supreme Treasurer: Gus Cherevas, Flushing, N.Y.

Supreme Counsellor: William P. Tsaffaras, Lowell, Mass.

Supreme Vice-Pres. of Canada: Chris J. Zakos, Kingston, Ont., Canada

Supreme Governor: Charles A. Alexander, Atlanta, Ga.

Supreme Governor: Peter J. Chimoures, Chicago, Ill.

Supreme Governor: Gus G. County, Jr., Toledo, Ohio

Supreme Governor: George P. Dikeou, Denver, Colo.

Supreme Governor: Christopher Ekonomou, Eau Gallie, Fla.

Supreme Governor: Andy Panos, Salt Lake City, Utah

Supreme Athletic Director: John Paulos, Tucson, Ariz.

Executive Secretary: George J. Leber, Washington, D.C.

SUPREME BOARD OF TRUSTEES—ORDER OF AHEPA

Chairman: Gust J. Herouvis, Akron, Ohio

Vice-Chairman: Sam S. Nakos, Birmingham, Ala.

Vice-Chairman: Peter Sideris, Woodbridge, N.J.

Secretary: Peter Kouchalakos, Coral Gables, Fla.

Treasurer: Speros J. Zepatos, Memphis, Tenn.

James Mazarakos, Springfield, Mass.; William G. Chirgotis, Summit, N.J.; Michael Colias, Waco, Texas; George J. Brotsis, Burbank, Calif.; Peter G. Chingos, New York, N.Y.; James P. Demos, Minneapolis, Minn.; Peter D. Gianukos, Chicago, Ill.; Tom Heos, Flint, Mich.; Basil S. Milonas, Whitman, Mass.

THE GRAND LODGE—DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE

Grand President: Miss Elizabeth Athanasakos, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.

Grand Vice-Pres: Mrs. Zoe Rummel, Chicago, Ill.

Grand Secretary: Miss Vivian Poulos, Omaha, Nebr.

Grand Treasurer: Mrs. Alice Damaskos, Gary, Ind.

Grand Vice-Pres. of Canada: Mrs. Frances Nanos, Toronto, Ont., Canada

Grand Governor: Mrs. Frances Yack, Rahway, N.J.

Grand Governor: Mrs. Catherine Planes, Coral Gables, Fla.

Grand Governor: Mrs. Evangeline Theo, Shreveport, La.

Grand Governor: Mrs. Lena Simitzi, Ventura, Calif.

National Advisor to Maids of Athena: Miss Mary Dinell, Manchester, N.H.

THE SUPREME LODGE—SONS OF PERICLES

Supreme President: Louis N. Strike, Salt Lake City, Utah

Supreme Vice-Pres: Dean Stavrakas, Chicago, Ill.

Supreme Secy-Treas: Ed Kiehling Jersey City, N.J.

Supreme Governor: James Armenakis, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Supreme Governor: Andrew J. Ekonomou, Eau Gallie, Fla.

Supreme Governor: Gregory L. Manesiotis, Bradford Woods, Penna.

Supreme Governor: Stan Harris, Columbus, Ohio

Chairman, National Advisory Board: Charles M. Georgeson, Clinton, Mass.

Executive Secretary: George Cokinos, Washington, D.C.

THE GRAND LODGE—MAIDS OF ATHENA

Grand President: Miss Cleopatra Notarides, Jersey City, N.J.

Grand Vice-Pres: Miss Pauline Stavrakas, Chicago, Ill.

Grand Secretary: Miss Doris Metroyanis, Gary, Ind.

Grand Treasurer: Miss Joanne Treantafellas, San Gabriel, Calif.

THE MOTHER LODGE—ORDER OF AHEPA (FOUNDING FATHERS)

Nicholas D. Chotas, Atlanta, Ga.
James Campbell, Atlanta, Ga.
Harry Angelopoulos, Atlanta, Ga.
John Angel, Danville, Va.
George A. Polos, Miami, Fla.

HOST CHAPTERS

The Washington, D.C. and Silver Spring, Md. Chapters of the Order of Ahepa, Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena are the "Host" Chapters for this convention; the Washington Convention Committees are composed of the membership of these chapters. The officers of the Chapters are:

Chapter No. 31, Order of Ahepa, Washington, D.C.

President: John N. Deoudes. Vice-Pres: James Elios. Secretary· Harry S. Hanna. Treasurer: Harry Moshovitis.

Chapter No. 236, Order or Ahepa, Washington, D.C.

President: George J. Papuchis. Vice-Pres: Nicholas G. Kontos. Secretary: George P. Maggos. Treasurer: James G. Koutris.

Chapter No. 383, Order of Ahepa, Silver Spring, Md.

President: James C. Magin. Vice-Pres: James A. Counelis. Secretary: Sava S. Tshontikidis. Treasurer: James Manuel.

Chapter No. 11, Daughters of Penelope, Washington, D.C.

President: Pat Caras. Vice-Pres: Virginia Petroutsa. Secretary: Mary Psarakis. Record. Secy: Virginia Mamakos. Treasurer: Jayne Harris.

Chapter 298, Daughters of Penelope, Silver Spring, Md.

President: Ann C. Hagan. Vice-Pres: Mrs. George Papuchis. Secretary: Beatrice K. Hanft. Record. Secy: Barbara Pollos. Treasurer: Alga Cokinos.

Chapter No. 9, Sons of Pericles, Washington, D.C.

President: Victor Hajimihalis. Vice-Pres: Stratton Laipis. Secretary: George Petros. Treasurer: Dean Manolatos.

Chapter No. 22, Maids of Athena, Washington, D.C.

President: Stacy Hangemanole. Corresp. Secy: Catherine Ahiouris. Record. Secy: Alic Pelecanos. Treasurer: Antoinette Chumas.

Executive Committee, Washington Supreme Convention (all Washington area residents)

General Chairman: Peter C. Charuhas, Vice-Chairman: Ernest E. Dematitis, Secretary: Thomas Gikas, Treasurer: William A. Revis.

John Adams, Louis Babest, Miss Pat Caras, Alexander Dematitis, Louis Hajimihalis, Harry Hanna, J. William Holmes, Dr. Bill Jones, George Maggos, Anthony E. Manuel, Anthony Mikalis, Louis Pappas, George J. Papuchis, Charles J. Papuchis, Dr. Chris Photakis, Peter C. Stathes, Dr. Charles Demas, Nicholas Demas, George Pappas, Sava Tshontikidis, John Nevros, Mrs. Mary Nevros, Dimitri Mallios.

The AHEPA convention will have many notable moments and among the most important events will be the grand banquet of Wednesday, August 17, at which the major speaker will be Vice President HUMPHREY. On Thursday, August 18, the professional and businessmen's luncheon will feature Senator EDWARD KENNEDY as principal speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me here make a few comments about the contributions of Greek immigrants to American life.

The story of the Greeks' arrival in America, in the early 1900's, has all the elements of trial and travail identified in the public mind with the arrival of the Pilgrims, almost three centuries earlier.

There were no Indians to combat—but there were plenty of other antagonists, including and especially several other ethnic groups still unsure of their own economic standing in America. In the milltowns of New England, for instance, the Greeks literally had to fight their way into certain occupations, where others already laid claim to the work involved. Elsewhere, too, the Greeks found factory work hard to get and turned instead to shining shoes or selling fruits or flowers from pushcarts. This was the general trend until a realization overcame the great mass of Greeks in America, that they did not have to make a career of working for wages; that they would do as well or better striking out on their own.

Many proceeded to open shops of their own, and with considerable success. From economic triumph, they rose at once to further triumph, in the realms of education, science, and arts and letters. In time, the separate Greek communities in general incorporated in the American way of life the best aspects of the Greek way of life.

The struggles of the Greek immigrant, at the turn of the century, have disappeared, and in their place we find a national acceptance, on the part of the American people, of the customs and traditions of the Greek-American community.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that my own father, who was born in Greece, came to this country a little over half a century ago. He migrated out to the midwestern part of the United States and went into the restaurant business and married an Indiana schoolteacher. I take very great pride not only in my citizenship in the United States of America but in the Hellenic heritage which is mine as well.

I remember as a small boy the very great thrill I felt in seeing my father take his naturalization papers and becoming a citizen of the United States. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the reasons why I have been a strong advocate of many of the civil rights bills which have come before the House of Representatives during my 8 years as a Member of this body. As I am fond of reminding the chairman of my committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, as the only Member in either the House or the Senate of Greek origin, I represent the smallest minority in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in closing that I recall reading with pleasure a book review in the New York Sunday Times of yesterday by a friend of mine, Sidney Hyman, a distinguished biographer and authority on the Presidency in American history. The title of that article was "What Does Washington Read?" In his essay Mr. Hyman noted that many of the highest officials in our Government today return to the great writers of Greece when they wish to obtain a clearer perspective on the future of democracy in the United States and on how we can make still more effective the American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is this same vital purpose, making effective our own democracy, that the Order of AHEPA seeks to serve. It is, indeed, a purpose which I hope all Americans will seek to serve no matter their racial, religious, national, or ethnic background.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the gentleman from Indiana in honoring the Order of AHEPA today.

I am fortunate in having its lodges in my district and I wish to say to the gentleman that the personnel of its auxiliaries and the order itself have contributed greatly to the culture, education and civic development of our area. We count among its membership those who are active in our school systems, our local government, and in business.

They are patriotic Americans and their influence is felt for good. My county is a better county because of the infusion of Greek culture from this wonderful ethnic group.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this congressional greeting of welcome to the Order of AHEPA which this week is holding its 44th supreme convention in the Nation's Capital.

All of us who know AHEPA are impressed by the success with which it carries out its objectives. And it is difficult to imagine more worthy objectives: to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, to instill appreciation of the privileges of citizenship, to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism, to promote good fellowship, to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense, and to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Certainly that is a formidable list of goals, and the amazing thing is that, in AHEPA, these goals are met. I have numerous friends in the organization and they bear the AHEPA standard proudly. Members of Cleveland chapter 36 who are in Washington this week include the Honorable John Manos, Arthur Lambros, Peter G. Catavolos, Anthony Mamais, John Dallas, Eli Manos, John

Asimes, Paul Metrakos, and Ted Constantine.

I wish them and the hundreds of other conventioneers who are here from every State in the Union, as well as from Canada, the Bahamas, Greece, and Australia, the warmest of good wishes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] and my fellow colleagues in paying tribute to the Order of AHEPA and to all Americans of Greek ancestry.

We welcome the 44th annual convention of the AHEPA to Washington and extend best wishes for a fruitful and enjoyable visit to the Nation's Capital.

In that regard I am pleased to note that four delegates are attending from the Milwaukee chapter, No. 43. They are Mr. Nicholas D. Demester, Mr. Peter J. Kondos, Mr. Steve E. Gaveras, and Mr. C. C. Cornell.

Like its brother chapters across the Nation, the Milwaukee chapter No. 43 is known throughout the community for the fine work in promoting the attributes and ideals of Hellenic culture, in fostering a spirit of common understanding, mutual benefit and fellowship among its members, and in participating effectively and wholeheartedly in community activities.

The members of AHEPA have been unfailingly kind and helpful to me on many occasions over the years. Their counsel on matters foreign and domestic has always been of constructive value and will continue to be welcome in the days ahead.

This occasion also seems an opportune one to pay tribute to our citizens of Greek ancestry who have contributed so much to the progress and development of the United States. The Hellenic influence on our society has given it additional richness and firm ties to the fountainhead of all Western civilization.

To the delegates who are attending the AHEPA convention this week, to all members of that organization, and to all Americans of Greek ancestry go my heartfelt wishes for future success and achievement.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues here in commemorating the 44th international convention of the Order of AHEPA, and to pay tribute to its delegates.

From Plato's republic to the Republic of the United States, all of us here owe more to the ideas and the inspiration borrowed from ancient Greece, the mother of all civilizations, than to any other people in history.

Every student who completes his education in our American schools and universities is a better person because he has been touched by the truths that were first found and taught in a remarkable ancient country called Greece.

Their national traditions are directly connected with the finest achievements of the human mind in art, in philosophy, in letters, in science, and in politics.

Their language was the medium through which the New Testament was given to the world.

Greece was the world's first discoverer and defender of the ideals of personal liberty.

Democracy was born in Athens.

The Greek is passionately dedicated to his family, devoted to his church, and loyal to his state.

Very truly that is why the Americans and Greeks of today are practically brothers, not by the accident of birth but by that higher relationship of common belief in and dedication to the same ideals.

We and the rest of the free world will remain forever indebted to the valiant Greek nation, not only because of their ancient inspirations for a civilized life but equally because of the modern example of their persevering and successful defiance, at great sacrifice, of the ideas and the leaders of atheistic communism.

It is my conviction that no nation has more truly earned or more rightly deserves the continuing full and effective friendship and assistance of the United States than the people of Greece.

No people have ever surpassed the enrichments that Greek immigrants have brought into every field of our American life and progress.

In every religious, moral, cultural, and civic activity within our society the Greek-American has made a solid contribution.

Every American knows, as I do from my personal experience, that the individual Greek is a true friend of the individual American.

Every American knows that Greece, as a nation, is a true friend of America. And we shall work together to keep it that way.

As it was with ancient Greece it appears to be our American destiny to provide the leadership in the common effort to keep liberty alive in this modern world and to promote peace among all nations.

In fulfilling this destiny I know that Greece will stand in glory side by side with the United States in our common purpose of achieving an everlastingly peaceful and prosperous life for all mankind.

I know that you all join with me in prayer that the good Lord will speed this blessed day.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this week Washingtonians have welcomed the Order of the AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, to their city for the order's 44th supreme convention.

America, however, has welcomed the AHEPA since its founding date of July 26, 1922. Since that time, the AHEPA, an organization composed mainly of citizens of Hellenic ancestry, has evolved from its initial group of 17 members to an organization of 43,350 members. The AHEPA has been an active and enlightened organization and has helped not only its immediate membership but the entire society in which it functions.

The objectives of the AHEPA have been to instill in its members a love and a knowledge of the principles of democracy, to encourage its members to take an active part in the social, economical, and political life of the United States, and to promote within the United States a deeper understanding of the Greek nation, its people, and its ideals of Hellenism.

The AHEPA has not confined itself to narrow goals and limited horizons but has evolved into a national and international organization. It now has members in 49 States, in all of the Provinces of Canada, in Australia, in the Bahamas, and in Greece.

In the international arena, AHEPA has promoted friendship among the peoples of Canada, Greece, and the United States. The AHEPA has supported educational and cultural exchange programs such as "people to people," and has, thus, sought to bring about a more harmonious relationship between the United States and the other peoples of the world.

AHEPA has not merely talked about accomplishments; it has accomplished. It was AHEPA that extended aid to the Florida hurricane victims, to the Kansas flood victims, and to the earthquake victims of Greece and Turkey. It was the AHEPA that strengthened education by its construction of schools, by its financial contributions to libraries, and by donations of thousands of American and Canadian books to foreign schools and libraries. It was, and it is the AHEPA that has done so much for so many in its short existence.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Order of AHEPA is presently holding its 44th international convention here and I would like to take this time to congratulate and commend them for their outstanding credo.

The first three principles set out to AHEPA members could well serve as reminders to all citizens of the Nation. The Nation would be benefited greatly if its citizens would think for a minute of these principles which are all too often taken for granted.

If I may, I would like to set down the first three objectives of AHEPA members:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets of fundamental principles of government; and

Third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.

It would be hard to outline a better set of standards for good citizens.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the many areas of accomplishment in which Greek-Americans have flourished extends from the field of music to that of militarism to education to commerce, and so on, ad infinitum, embracing virtually every field imaginable.

The Greeks are proud of Dimitri Mitropoulas, Elena Nikolaidi, and Nicola Moscona in the realm of music, Dr. George Papanicolaou in the first ranks of the fighters against cancer, the Scouras brothers in the theater business, a great number of excellent painters, sculptors, industrial designers, actors and actresses, scores of recognized heroes in World War I and II with George Dilboy and Gus George Bebas in the foreground; and Michael Anagnos, the well-known educator and philanthropist, cofounder and director of the Perkins Institute for the Blind in Boston.

These are but a handful of the names of those Greek-Americans who over the years have stood forth in consequence of brilliance. A full list would of course be far too long for comfort. The sampling is in itself remarkable, however, giving as it does a glimpse of the genius that has come to these shores from the Greek peninsula.

Name an element of American life and you will find that Greek-Americans have contributed heartily to the progress of that particular element. Though few in number, comparatively speaking, the Greek-Americans already have established themselves as a major influence upon the overall American community.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, more commonly known as the Order of AHEPA, are holding their 44th supreme convention in Washington this week at the Sheraton Park Hotel. I know I speak for all of us in wishing to welcome them to our Nation's Capital.

Ninety-five percent of the membership of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries are American and Canadian citizens of Hellenic descent. They are the sons and daughters of the land which gave birth to Western civilization and which has produced much of the richest of our heritage in thought and literature. They are descendants of the land which fathered and fostered the earliest seeds of our priceless legacy of democratic freedom.

As citizens of America they have enriched the Western Hemisphere with the culture and traditions of their homeland, and with their deep allegiance and support to the land which welcomed them. The Greek-Americans have lent an energizing force to citizenship in every community in which they have settled. Through the Order of AHEPA, they have given full support to the political, civic, social, and commercial endeavors of their localities. During World War II they were responsible for the sale of $500 million in U.S. war bonds, to name only one example.

They have sought constantly to aid this country in fostering a common understanding among nations and in strengthening our friendly ties with Greece. After the Second World War, they sponsored the construction of seven AHEPA Health Centers in Greece and two hospitals in Athens and Salonika. They were responsible for the Greek AHEPA Agricultural College. They have provided a child-shelter-care home, an orphanage, and relief for the fatherless children of refugees.

They have been active and effective participants in our "people to people" program. Their list of contributions in our own country is almost endless. As enthusiastic citizens of the United States, they have been in support of all programs which promote this country's welfare. And they have welcomed into their ranks the new immigrants, who need their understanding and help in attaining to citizenship.

Washington, D.C., is fortunate this year to have the opportunity to host the Order of AHEPA's supreme convention and we hope their stay here will be pleasant, informative, and productive.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of volumes have been written on the contributions of the Greek nation to Western civilization. Hundreds more will doubtless be written because the ideas and the ideals which first came to light in the Peloponnesus, combined with the Judeo-Christian concept of God, form the very basis upon which our 20th-century civilization is built.

It is with particular pleasure, therefore, that I join our colleagues in extending greetings and felicitations to the members of the Supreme Lodge of the Order of AHEPA who are gathered here in Washington this week for their 44th international convention.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA—is a fraternal organization whose membership is composed almost entirely of American and Canadian citizens of Greek or Hellenic descent. Many of our colleagues, aside from the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], are, I understand, members of the AHEPA and this distinguished Greek-American fraternity also numbers among its members the Vice President of the United States.

The educational and charitable work of AHEPA has been very extensive during its 44 years of existence, both on the national and local chapter levels including their efforts effectively assisting newly arrived aliens to become acclimated to the American scene.

The members of AHEPA and its auxiliaries are engaged in almost every civic and community effort throughout the country. I know that I express the wishes of all of our colleagues when I say to them, We are delighted to have you in Washington. Keep up the good work.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington is honored this week to be the host city of the 44th international convention of the family of AHEPA.

The AHEPA consists of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries: The Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena. The letters that form the name AHEPA stand for the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. This title explains the organization, objectives, purposes, and work of the AHEPA family.

Western civilization and democracy are based on Greek civilization of ancient times. We in the United States owe a debt of gratitude to Greece for our system of government, our classical standards of art, and our traditions in architecture, poetry, drama, and philosophy.

Every one of us has been taught to recognize the major contributions of Homer, Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates to Western civilization and thus to American culture.

The descendants of the ancient Greek people are today carrying on the tradition of education, art, and civic responsibility which made their forebears the greatest people of their time.

The members of AHEPA, gathered in Washington this week, have strengthened the bonds of friendship between the United States and Greece by their work in education and through their unselfish philanthropy. AHEPA has donated thousands of books to libraries and schools in the United States, Canada, and Greece. It sponsors scholarships for national and international studies to needy students so that they may pursue that excellence known to the ancient people of Greece.

I am particularly pleased to welcome the family of AHEPA to Washington for their 44th convention. In my district there is a Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary which the Ahepans have helped to support. Among the delegates to this great convention are Mr. Paul Yphantes, Mr. Aristomenis A. Lydotes, Mr. Stephen Salpas, Mr. Angelo J. Karon, and Mr. John A. Morakis of Brookline, Mr. Peter N. Stamas of Cambridge, and Mr. Michael J. Vrotsos, Mr. Theodore S. Bakas, Mr. Peter L. Caparell, Mr. George S. Bakas, and Mr. Fred E. D. Valakis of Boston.

I welcome them and all Ahepans to Washington and hope their visit here will be successful and enjoyable.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, this week representatives of the 46,000-member AHEPA family will convene in Washington, D.C., for their 44th international convention. I am pleased to know that nine of my fellow Wyomingites will be attending and I now wish to pay tribute to them and their organization for many fine works through the years.

Attending from Wyoming are John Brown Argeris, from Worland; and James Kallas, George Argeris, John Lagos, Theodore Alexander, Sam Galitoes, Gust Mores, Nick Kanellopoulos, and Nick Christopoulos, from Cheyenne.

BASIC IDEAL

Since its founding in 1922, the members of AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—have diligently pursued the worthy objects and purposes of their order. Some of their ideals have particular relevance to those of us who are public officials.

The objects and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny; to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man; to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The members of AHEPA have put these ideals to work and have many concrete achievements to their credit. Local chapters have given generous and vigorous support to local community projects in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement. National and international projects and contributions have included aid to hurricane, flood, earthquake, and war victims; scholarships; agricultural and health research; contributions to museums; and sports activities.

In international relations, the fraternity has taken an active part in America's "people to people" program, which seeks a closer and more harmonious relationship between the peoples of the United States and other countries.

OUTSTANDING MEMBERS

The Order of AHEPA boasts members from all walks of life. Many of our greatest Americans have been initiated into the organization, such as Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION

During this week's convention the members will participate in business sessions, church services, a symposium on immigration laws with Senator EDWARD KENNEDY as the principal speaker, a golf tournament, the AHEPA Olympiad, and other fraternal and social activities.

The Order of AHEPA has been distinguished by its ideals, accomplishments, and membership. I am proud that Wyoming is so well represented at the international convention and I extend my best wishes for a successful and memorable week.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining my colleagues in paying tribute to the Order of AHEPA on the occasion of the 44th supreme convention of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries.

One need only review the statement of objects and purposes of the AHEPA and the worthy and charitable causes which it supports to appreciate the richness with which it deserves the high regard, admiration, and appreciation accorded it today.

Its tenets are of the highest order of citizenship and of service to mankind.

I join in salute to its members for a job well done and in best wishes for its continued success.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues in commending the work of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, now convening in Washington for its 44th international convention.

AHEPA, as it is more commonly known, is recognized and highly regarded for its encouragement of loyalty to the country of its members. Other organizations could well learn how to instill appreciation for the privileges of citizenship from the AHEPA program.

This association does not merely pay lipservice to the high ideal of promoting altruism and helpfulness to our fellow man. AHEPA has contributed to the relief of the Florida hurricane victims, Mississippi flood victims, Kansas City flood victims, and other victims of natural disasters. AHEPA has helped construct hospitals and health centers in Greece. Many educational institutions in the United States and Greece have benefited from the generous contributions of AHEPA.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that three of my constituents have come to Washington for this convention. I commend them for their participation in this association. I wish continued success to the AHEPA chapters everywhere.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, ancient Greece gave birth to both the democratic form of government and perhaps the first flowering of Western culture. The political, educational, and cultural ideals of the Hellenic tradition were man's legacies which were to form an integral part of the Founding Fathers' concept of the American way of life. I understand there actually was a resolution which nearly passed in one of America's first congressional sessions to make Greek the official language of the United States, to so great an extent did the founders of America consciously model our political institutions after those of ancient Greece.

Because of this special relationship between the American way of life and the Greek legacy, I would like to call attention today to the 44th Annual Convention of the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. This is an organization of Americans of Greek birth or descent which was founded in 1922 and has grown until it now has branches in 49 States. The charitable activities of this organization over the past 44 years would be too numerous to list. Another outstanding function has been to promote patriotism of its members to the country of their adoption, instilling in them a desire to fulfill the obligations correlative to the privileges of that citizenship—that is, active participation in politics, civic, and social activities. As the name indicates, many of its activities are oriented toward education, which it promotes through local, national and international scholarships, contributions to schools, libraries, museums, and so forth.

Throughout the organization's statement of its objectives and purposes one finds the embodiment of Hellenic ideals and traditions—those very ideals and traditions which were borrowed in part by the American founders. May I, therefore, congratulate the Order of AHEPA on the proud tradition it continues through its activities and the noble contributions it has made to the American system of life in the 20th century.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to congratulate the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association as they celebrate their 44th anniversary. Their convention here in Washington will be a constructive and enjoyable experience for all of the members attending, and will be closely followed by Greek-Americans throughout the country. I know by direct and personal experience how much they have contributed to the New England communities in which they live.

Our very concept of citizenship is derived from the Greek culture of antiquity. What citizenship gave a man in the city-states of ancient Greece was a true and vital membership in the community, a genuine share in the public business. A Greek thought of his citizenship not as a personal possession, but as something shared, much like membership in a family.

The Greeks of cultural antiquity and the Greek Americans of today share a moral conception of what the institutions of everyday political life ought to be. In a passage of incomparable brilliance, the great Greek historian of antiquity, Thucydides, described for us that Greek ideal of citizenship, an ideal which we should take for our own. Thucydides tells us that Pericles spoke as follows to the Athenians:

> I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of Athens, until you become filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that this empire has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it, who in the hour of conflict had the fear of dishonor always present to them, and who, if ever they failed in an enterprise, would not allow their virtues to be lost to their country, but freely gave their lives to her as the fairest offering which they could present.

Free citizenship in a free country was the Athenian ideal of citizenship as it is the ideal of citizenship honored by the members of AHEPA. One of AHEPA's avowed purposes is the inculcation of an understanding of the principles of good government in the minds and hearts of all its members.

But Greek courage and respect for free government have not been virtues confined to antiquity. The heroic stand of modern Greeks against Nazi Germany and against the Communists showed the world that the spirit of classical Greece still lived in the Greeks of our own times.

Americans of Greek ancestry have a very special character. They are bearers of a special trust. The sons and daughters of that great tradition are banded together in the wonderful organization called AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. I salute Greek-Americans everywhere, and especially extend best wishes to AHEPA's 44th supreme convention in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, meet here in Washington for their 44th convention, I use this occasion to extend best wishes to their membership and to review briefly the record of the contribution to American life as they have been reflected in AHEPA's own history.

The AHEPA organization was founded in 1922 in response to the needs of that time which could no longer be ignored. Many Greek Americans believed that World War I and its hardships would erase prejudices toward people of different races, religions, and national backgrounds. They were mistaken. Misguided doctrines of conformity were being preached that caused fear at that time among many of our country's immigrants. Some Greek American merchants and businessmen viewed such attacks as an attempt to drive them out of business. Many Greek Americans believed that their reputation in the United States had to be defended with the same zeal and enthusiasm with which they would defend their own liberty. The idea of organizing Greek Americans into an association for the purpose of establishing better relations with non-Greeks had been discussed by various leaders of the Greek American community. A small group of Greek Americans residing in Atlanta, Ga., took the lead. Two men, George A. Nicholopoulos and John Angelopoulos, both traveling salesmen, working out of Atlanta, and well known to each other met in Chattanooga, Tenn., during the early summer of 1922 to discuss the best way to control the wave of hostility that had developed against members of their nationality. Both men agreed that this could be by the organization of an association national in scope, nonpartisan in politics, and nonsectarian in religion. They also believed that such an organization should have members whose purposes would be to unite their fellow countrymen, impress upon them an agressive national conscience, educate them in the fundamental principles of Americanism, and aid them in adapting themselves to the social and commercial practices of the country.

It was believed that such an organization could fulfill practical needs. It could bring Greek Americans into a closer working relationship with the larger American community. Applicants for membership in AHEPA had to be citizens of the United States or eligible to become American citizens.

Throughout the years, the emphasis by AHEPA on American citizenship has been very strong. The spirit of these years has been described in an official publication of AHEPA in these words:

> AHEPA has never failed to constantly preach the principles of loyalty to the United States of America, and to advocate and teach the highest form of patriotic sentiments of national honor and national service * * * it serves loyally and courageously the best interests of the United States, our adopted home and country.

During its long and distinguished life, AHEPA has aided educational, charitable, and community projects of all kinds. It has provided scholarships to students, and relief to victims of floods, earthquakes, and hurricanes in the United States, Greece, Turkey, and Ecuador. It has rendered assistance to the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and has built hospitals and health centers as well as supported several agricultural schools in Greece. It was the primary force in the achievements of the Greek War Relief Association, and it sold a half billion dollars in U.S. war bonds.

Perhaps its greatest achievement has been its success in identifying Greek Americans with the larger American community. It has been a credit to its members and to the great traditions of Greece.

I salute AHEPA and its 43,000 members on its 44th anniversary.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] and my other colleagues in honoring the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. In AHEPA's 44th supreme convention held in Washington, we are seeing the goals of this group coming into fruition.

Since 1922, Greek-American citizens and Greek immigrants have found the tireless dedication of AHEPA members to be of great help in developing educational and social ties. The progressive participants in the charitable projects of AHEPA have aided immeasurably to the fund of understanding between Americans and Greeks and a bond between Greek Americans in this country.

Greece, the birthplace of the representative form of government, continues to show that Greek citizens in all areas can actively participate and add to the democratic process.

Because of efforts made by members of AHEPA to an increasing awareness of distinctively Greek contributions to our society, every citizen has benefited. Their work in education has been a hallmark of success throughout AHEPA's history.

We can only hope in these days of bridges between countries that our ties with Greece and our appreciation of Greek-Americans can continue to grow. With this hope, we wish the best of luck to AHEPA—a thriving organization which is extending its good work to wider areas of interest.

Several distinguished South Dakotans are here as delegates. I congratulate them and welcome them to the Nation's Capital.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, intelligent and enlightened Greek-Americans founded the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in 1922. Its purposes and goals were to serve Greek-American communities in a way that would promote good, loyal citizenship, and at the same time inspire the youth of these communities with the ideals of glorious Greece. In addition, the organization has been doing good work in charitable and religious fields, and has been a very active agent in many communities. Today it has branches in 49 States, and has become one of the most popular and best known of such organizations throughout the country.

In all worthy undertakings and endeavors the AHEPA has shown remarkable success, and its public-spirited leaders deserve credit for their very vigorous and very progressive zeal in their work. They have instilled in the minds of Greek-American youth a very high sense of loyalty and patriotism. For this and for many other public services it has rendered, the AHEPA has become a model organization in this country. On the occasion of its 44th annual convention now being held in this city, I greet its leaders and members, and wish them success in all their worthy endeavors.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all of my colleagues here today are aware of the fact that we are privileged to have with us in Washington this week representatives of the Order of AHEPA. Four distinguished delegates from my own congressional district, the Messers. William Zacharellis, Perry T. Chappen, Alec Silas, and John Gabriel are expected to be in attendance.

This is indeed a distinguished organization, with chapters in nearly every State in America. My own State, Pennsylvania, is fortunate enough to have 13 chapters.

For 44 years the members of the Order of AHEPA have promoted better citizenship in America, in Canada, in Australia, in the Bahamas, and of course, in Greece. It has also promoted the more profound understanding of the Hellenic culture that is at the roots of our own culture. It has promoted a deeper understanding of our fellow men. It has promoted a new commitment to the moral virtues which have always been the strength of civilization. Finally, it has promoted a profound respect for honest government and opposition to all forms of political corruption and tyranny.

It is indeed a delight for me to salute the Order of AHEPA. It is important to note in passing, I believe, that though the Order of AHEPA is only 44 years old, the influence of Greek civilization is now more than 2,500 years old. There is no country in the world which has not felt its civilizing influence. It is an influence that will last as long as mankind lasts.

In its dedication to learning and its enmity against corruption, this nobel Order of AHEPA is in the tradition of our Founding Fathers, in the tradition of the inscription on the Jefferson Memorial:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join with my colleagues in welcoming the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—the Order of AHEPA—to our Nation's Capital for its 44th supreme convention this week, Sunday through Saturday.

It is especially appropriate for the House to take this time to pay tribute to this great organization. Much in the same spirit as the Congress and our Government, the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliary chapters have a long history of contributions to the betterment of America and the improvement of international relations. This is one of those organizations that has set a marvelous example of what can be accomplished by concerted and enlighted efforts within the private sector of our society.

Its contributions over the years, since its founding in 1922, has covered a broad range and reached into a number of countries—support of educational, religious, and health projects; sponsorship of sports programs for young people; relief for flood and earthquake victims in this country, in Greece, and elsewhere; help for the war orphans and refugees of Greece; local, national, and international scholarships for needy and worthy students. This is to mention just a few.

We are all aware how our country has been enriched by the culture of ancient as well as modern Greece, and by the energy and accomplishments of our citizens of Greek or Hellenic descent. This impact has been heightened immeasurably by the Order of AHEPA, bringing these citizens together for community projects and many other constructive activities in chapters throughout 49 of our States.

As a member of the Order of AHEPA for many years, I have always been impressed by the strength this organization derives from the comradeship, the enthusiasm, and the loyalty of its 46,000 members—in this country, in Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. An outstanding sign of this was last year's supreme convention in Athens that attracted more than 12,000 members and their families. It featured the flight of 8,500 members from the United States to Greece in 50 chartered jets. This is believed to have been the largest movement of any single organization in history to a convention overseas.

It is a privilege to greet all of those gathering in Washington for this 1966 convention—and particularly the delegates from our Harrisburg chapter. They are Nick G. Gekas, Gus W. Gekas, George W. Gekas, Steve F. Nicholas, Dean Belehas, John Mihalakis, John F. Nicholas, Dennis Theodoratos, Stanley Merzanis, Paul Kokos, and George Boutselis.

I trust that both an enjoyable and constructive week will be had by all members of the Order of AHEPA, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in extending greetings to the Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—on the occasion of its 44th international convention which is being held in Washington this week.

It would be impossible to enumerate the many fine charitable projects sponsored by the Order of AHEPA. The many and various categories of civic and public affairs projects which this organization has so generously and vigorously supported over the years have been of infinitesimal value to all of our communities and States. I for one am deeply grateful.

This country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent who have contributed so greatly to the principles on which this Nation was founded and who, because of their heritage, have always shared in our aspirations for freedom and independence. It can be said quite accurately that a part of America's greatness is the composite of many national origins blending successfully together toward advancement of common goals. In the scope of national responsibility, the Order of AHEPA stands as a foremost example of successful cooperation. I hope that this year's convention will be the most successful ever, and that the 15,000 members participating will enjoy their week in Washington.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Order of AHEPA hold its annual convention here in Washington. This is the 44th supreme convention in the group's history and comes at a time when its effectiveness and good work are reaching new peaks. Few people adequately realize the extent to which AHEPA works to better the lot of the unfortunate here in this country and also to better the relations of the world through people-to-people programs.

It has worked, on the one hand, to relieve the suffering and horror of the Florida hurricane victims. On the other hand, it has striven to relieve victims of the tragic earthquakes in Corinth, Greece. While it sold $500 million worth of U.S. war bonds during World War II, it also placed stress on relieving the plight of the war orphans in Greece and contributes to several scholarship funds in Greece today.

It truly has hung its organizational hat on the post of human understanding and progress. There exists no organization more patriotic—in the truest sense of the word. There exists no other organization with intentions so worthy. There exists no organization that actively fights harder for American-Grecian cooperation or that aids citizens in both countries with more selflessness than AHEPA.

And so, it is with admiration for this great order that I point to its past achievements here today. I am equally enthusiastic in my hope that it will enjoy continued years of promoting good will and understanding. I am sure that its way will eventually be the ways of the truly peaceful world. In its attempts, however small, when cast against an entire world of hate and fear and suspicion, it should only be encouraged, congratulated, and honored. I am glad to have a part, however small, in doing just that this year.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acclaim an event which all Americans can take pride in, the 44th international convention of the Order of AHEPA in Washington, D.C., this week. This organization, with over 45,000 members, has local chapters in every State with the exception of Hawaii, all Provinces of Canada, in Australia, the Bahamas, and in Greece. The name AHEPA is an acronym which is derived from the first letters of the following five words: American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

The Order of AHEPA has contributed financially to many worthy causes during its 44 years of existence. In my own State of Florida, the organization has done much to bring relief to countless numbers of hurricane victims. In addition to local projects, AHEPA has contributed to the relief of the war orphans of Greece, relief of Turkish earthquake victims, contributions to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Center Institute in Miami, Fla., and numerous other worthy projects.

Thousands of years have passed since the great society of ancient Greece spawned the culture of the West. We do indeed owe a great debt for the cultural heritage which has contributed so much to the American society. The story is told that Pericles of ancient Greece in his later years came across a young man, a lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes and who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world. Pericles chastised the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men. The old man patronizingly said:

> Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved.

To which the young man replied:

> I regret, sir, that I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best.

This story not only demonstrates the greatness of the philosophy of "quality" for which the Greeks are best known, but it also demonstrates the creed of this organization, which is truly dedicated to solving the problems of contemporary society. The objectives and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are to—

Promote loyalty to the United States of America;

Abhor all political corruption;

Strive for the betterment of society;

Defend and protect all oppressed people everywhere;

Cultivate the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;

Labor for the perfection of a moral sense, the spirit of altrusim and true benevolence;

Champion the cause of education; and

Love God and man, and hope for happiness.

Certainly it can be said that these objectives should stand as goals for all Americans, and the Order of AHEPA should be congratulated for its work and contributions. It is an honor for me to extend a warm welcome to the members of this fine organization and all Ahepans who plan to participate in the 44th convention.

I would also like to especially welcome the delegates from my own State of Florida. We Floridians are extremely proud of our Greek-American citizens, who have always proven to be dedicated, loyal, and hard-working members of the community.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from Indiana in paying tribute to the men and women of the Order of AHEPA who are in Washington for their 44th international convention.

During the past 44 years the Ahepans have contributed significantly to a better understanding between the Greek and American peoples. Their charitable works have been outstanding and their devotion and loyalty to the United States is evidenced not only by their dedicated service in the Armed Forces but also by the fact that during World War II, members of the Order of AHEPA sold some $500 million worth of war bonds.

I join my colleagues in extending a hearty welcome to Washington to the Order of AHEPA and I am confident they will have most a successful and productive convention.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome the representatives of the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliaries—the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena—who are holding their 44th annual convention in Washington this week.

Western civilization and culture owe an inestimable debt to ancient Greece as we all know. Today many Americans of Greek descent are emulating this heritage through the AHEPA creed to "promote loyalty to the United States of America; respect the inalienable rights of mankind; strive for the betterment of society; abhor all political corruption; defend and protect all oppressed people everywhere; cultivate the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism; labor for the perfection of a moral sense, the spirit of altruism and true benevolence; champion the cause of education; love God and man, and hope for happiness."

These are noble goals and to the supreme president, Kimon A. Doukas, and all the other officers and members of the Order of AHEPA, I offer my warmest greetings and best wishes as they convene in the Nation's Capital this week.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that so many have seen fit today to rise and speak in honor of the Order of AHEPA, and the contributions made by so many Americans of Greek descent. It is fitting, first of all, if one considers the very purposes of this fine organization as derived from its acronymic name.

AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—stands as a perfect example of the manner in which a group with distinct national backgrounds can be completely loyal and constructive citizens of their country without forgetting their much-deserved pride in the culture of their origin. AHEPA has, as its avowed purpose, the encouragement of loyalty to one's country as well as the participation in all its affairs as befits the good citizen.

However, this desire to participate effectively—and morally—in the affairs and privileges of citizenship, in no way need detract from another of the organization's functions, that of promoting a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture.

In short, then, it is more than proper for us to salute the Order of AHEPA today, because this organization represents an aspect of the American dream realized: the melting pot in successful operation, with no loss of identity by the concerned citizens emerging from the process.

There are, of course, many other perfectly good reasons for the esteem in which I and my colleagues hold the Order of AHEPA. The public and private record of its 46,000 members is outstanding in all fields. In its 44-year history, the Order has contributed money and assistance to practically every worthy cause. In time of natural catastrophe, in the United States and elsewhere, AHEPA has aided without regard for color or language. To places as far removed as Ecuador and Mississippi, AHEPA has turned its attention.

But there is, in addition to its many good works, yet another—an historical—reason for the homage we pay AHEPA today. For if there is one theme which runs through every century, every decade, even every hour of Greek history from the Golden Age of Pericles to the present it is the undying flame of liberty and freedom which all the world has adopted as the Olympic symbol. The torch carried around the world every 4 years is, indeed, a living symbol of the flame kindled so many years ago in Greece.

Today, when America finds increasing criticism of her role as defender of that flame, it is well to remember that less than a generation ago the people of Greece fought a valiant and victorious battle for the very democracy they set in motion so long ago. Just as the Greek people will never forget their hatred for political corruption and tyranny, we do well to remember that our understanding of freedom—as passed to us by Greece—to remember that our understanding of freedom—as passed to us by Greece—is a prize, and not a gift.

And so I join with my colleagues today, in saluting the Order of AHEPA, because in so doing we salute a group dedicated to the ideals of Hellenism: to the destruction of tyranny and the preservation of freedom for all men in all places.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House of Representatives to the 44th supreme convention of the Order of AHEPA which is being held here in Washington, D.C., this week. As we pay tribute to his outstanding organization, we should be reminded of the many contributions of Greece and of Greek men and women to our modern culture.

In any of the facets of modern civilization that we examine, we find the foundations are the result of Greek culture and thought. In the area that is so important to all of us assembled here—political philosophy—we find that the roots of almost all thinking on the subject are found in the works of three Greek scholars, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. The Socratic method of questions, answers, and discussion in the search for truth is put to use in this Chamber every day.

Other aspects of our modern culture show equally well the Greek influence, both as a step in the development of some form of an art, or as an achievement of skill to be admired and to be strived for again. Certainly, the works of Homer, Sophocles, and Aristophanes are classics that will be enjoyed forever.

A look at the present will show the continuing role of Greek thinking in contributing to our modern society. The achievements of Georgios Seferis, the Nobel Prize winner in literature, and the late Dr. Papanicolaou, one of the world's foremost authorities on the detection and prevention of cancer, testify that the tradition of excellence lives on in Greece.

AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—stands as an important link in the relations between Greece and the United States. In addition to this role, AHEPA has contributed to numerous international, national, and local projects. The nature of this organization can be best understood by examining the objects and purposes of the Order of AHEPA, which are: First, to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; fourth, to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; fifth, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny; sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellinism and the Hellenic culture; seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness to their fellow man; eighth, to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; and ninth, to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

I commend the members and officers of AHEPA on these noble and worthwhile goals. If all men lived by a creed similar to this one, we would be far better able to deal with the problems of our complex, modern world.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to note that the 44th international convention of the Order of AHEPA is convening in Washington this week, and to welcome the organization's delegates to our Capital. I believe it appropriate to state briefly some of the facts concerning this splendid group. While membership is made up almost entirely of Americans of Greek ancestry, such background is not a requisite for joining. Its ranks include men and women from the professions, trades, and business, as well as such distinguished public figures as former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

While justifiably proud of the Hellenic traditions and culture, the Order of AHEPA stresses and encourages loyalty of its members to the nation of which they are citizens. In fact, those joining must be citizens of the United States or have declared their intention to become citizens. The purposes of the Order of AHEPA include the instruction of its members in the principles of government, stimulating active participation in public affairs, opposing political corruption, and instilling a spirit of altruism for the benefit of all men.

One has only to look at the long list of outstanding contributions of its 46,000 members to appreciate how well the purposes of the order have been achieved. Among these are such diverse and worthwhile efforts as relief of hurricane, earthquake, and flood victims, construction of schools, establishment of scholarships, and aid to refugees.

Mr. Speaker, we should take special pride in the Order of AHEPA's present-day implementation of the centuries-old Greek concepts of civic responsibility. These concepts have benefited all of Western civilization, and the order is continuing this tradition by enriching the fabric of our contemporary society.

On the occasion of the order's annual convention, I extend greetings to the officers of the organization and to all delegates. I trust their deliberations will be most successful.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the United States is made up of descendants of nations from every part of the globe. Our culture is a blending of these forces, and we are richer for it.

Today, in Washington, D.C., we are proud to host the 44th supreme convention or the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries.

Founded in 1922 to help green immigrants in attaining American citizenship it has grown and flourished into an organization of 64,000 members is AHEPA and its three auxiliaries.

The charitable work of AHEPA is nationally known, and all Americans take pride in the unselfish manner in which this fine organization goes about its work of building a better world. Significant contribution to education mark AHEPA, which is also a family organization.

From the Greeks of old came the first vestiges of civilization and culture. All mankind is indebted to this nation and its people, and I feel that America has been particularly enriched by those who came to settle in this land. In every State in the Nation, in all walks of life, their descendants are an integral and vital part of American life.

I feel very close to this association, for I have many warm friends who are members. My wife's parents are Grecian, and we share many associations with AHEPA because of this.

Local chapters throughout the Nation expand the work of the national organization and its charities, making for an organization that has had a significant effect on the American way of life.

AHEPA is in the best American tradition. It preserves a heritage, while bringing its members into closer association with this land. It is a proud association with a land which is loved by Americans—Greece.

We honor those who have come here for this convention and wish them well in their deliberations. America is richer for its existence.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join my distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, who secured this special order, in welcoming to Washington the members of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

During the week of August 14–20, AHEPA, which has over 43,000 members, will hold its 44th supreme convention with headquarters at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Participating will be members from all over the United States, Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. Such distinguished Americans as Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY have been members of AHEPA.

This outstanding organization has pledged itself to promote education, to facilitate dissemination of culuture and learning, to encourage its members to participate in political, civic, and charitable activities, and to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship. AHEPA's noble aims are many and it has succeeded admirably in fulfilling these aims and objectives.

During its 44 years of existence, AHEPA has given relief to hurricane, flood, and earthquake victims, has provided support for the war orphans of Greece, has given scholarship aid to needy and worthy students, has supported Greek churches and seminaries, has erected memorials to heroes of Greek history, has aided World War II refugees, has sponsored a youth sports program, has supported medical research, and has participated in countless other worthwhile endeavors.

I commend AHEPA's executive committee for the fine leadership and guidance it has provided, and I congratulate this great organization for its outstanding accomplishments which would not have been possible without the active and enthusiastic participation of all of the members.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to extend to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association my best wishes for a successful convention and for continuing prosperity in all of its endeavors in the years ahead.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleagues in greeting delegates of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries and in telling them how glad we are that they chose the Nation's Capital for their 44th international convention.

I am proud that four delegates are here from my hometown. They are Gus Leo Furla, Leo G. Furla, Savas Nicholas, and George Lessaris, all representing AHEPA Lodge No. 201 in Champaign, Ill.

Since its founding in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, members of the Order of AHEPA have exemplified to a high degree the qualities of the words from which the name of the order is derived: American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

They are American not only because they insist on their members being citizens, or intended citizens of the United States or Canada but also because they work at the job of being citizens. They instruct their members on the duties and obligations that go hand in hand with the privileges of citizenship.

They are Hellenic in their loyalty to the finest traditions and highest ideals of the culture of ancient Greece. Almost 95 percent of the membership of AHEPA is of Greek descent although this is not a requirement for membership.

They are educational in their support of institutions dedicated to the dissemination of culture and learning, in their award of AHEPA medals to students excelling in the study of the Greek language, and in donations of sets of the Greek classics to schools and libraries throughout this country and Canada.

They are progressive in their active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial activities in their home States and communities and in their pledge to oppose political corruption and tyranny.

Finally they are an association for the promotion of good fellowship, and for endowing all members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man.

This is the second time that the Order of AHEPA has held its annual convention in Washington, the first one being in 1952. So in welcoming the delegates I want to express the hope that it will not take another 14 years to bring them back.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to joint today my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, in saluting the work of AHEPA. This order has distinguished itself in the field of social service.

I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my deepest and sincerest tribute to citizens of my district of Greek extraction. They have been my friends and neighbors for many years. Their devotion, their loyality to the United States, and their service in any cause for the good of humanity when called upon, is outstanding. They are delightful neighbors, magnificent friends, and great Americans.

May I also pay tribute to Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS. I had the pleasure and privilege of serving on the Education and Labor Committee with him for 2 years. There is no more dedicated Member of this House than he; neither have we a Member who is more able or brilliant. Millions of American young people can be grateful that JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, is here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association is the best known and most popular of all Greek-American organizations in the country. Since its founding in 1922 it has grown in membership and today it can claim branches in 49 States.

As its name implies, it is an educational as well as a charitable organization. Its activities in the educational field have been very broad and diverse. Besides helping people in their education, the AHEPA has been instrumental in bringing Greek ideas and ideals to Greek-American community homes, for the sole purpose of making them better educated and enlightened citizens of this country.

In that difficult but rewarding task, as well as in innumerable other worthy undertakings in social, religious, and charitable fields the AHEPA has been rendering a signal service. It has helped immensely in instilling ideas of loyalty, patriotism, a better appreciation of American ideals, and the working of democratic forces in this great Republic.

For its great services in these varied activities, and for its success in attaining its objectives and goals, the AHEPA has earned our esteem and admiration. I greet its 44th annual convention in the Nation's Capital, wishing its members more power in all their endeavors.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to extend cordial greetings to the delegates assembled for the 44th supreme convention of the Order of

AHEPA in Washington this week. I am proud of the fine representation to the convention from the State of New Jersey, including James Katramados, Nicholas Linardakis, Theodore Bravakis, James Gevas, from Newark No. 52; and Jordan Stamati and Peter Panapolis, from Orange No. 375.

The warmth of the welcome given the members of AHEPA reflects the respect and esteem in which our citizens of Greek descent are held by their fellow Americans of other races and creeds. No higher tribute can be paid to the sons and daughters of Greece than to say they are worthy descendants of the land which is the bedrock of western civilization. The contribution of our citizens of Greek descent to the United States has added enormously to our national strength, progress, and vitality. AHEPA's remarkable accomplishments in the field of educational projects and charitable activities have benefited the whole Nation. I commend the members for their fidelity to the laudable AHEPA creed which can well serve as a model for all of us:

> Promote loyalty to the United States of America;
>
> Respect the inalienable rights of mankind;
>
> Strive for the betterment of society;
>
> Abhor all political corruption;
>
> Defend and protect all oppressed people everywhere;
>
> Cultivate the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;
>
> Labor for the perfection of a moral sense, the spirit of altruism and true benevolence;
>
> Champion the cause of education;
>
> Love God and man, and hope for happiness.

I salute AHEPA for its splendid record and I wish it a most productive convention this week.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] in honoring the Order of AHEPA at the time of its 44th annual convention.

Mr. Brademas and the Order of AHEPA, both, must be proud on this day to be reminded of their remarkable heritage. Greece is that portion of the world, more than any other, which gave birth to our modern Western civilization and to the institutions and cultural traditions which we cherish. Our science, our arts, and even our democracy owe the greatest part of their inspiration and distinctive character to the developments that took place in Greece many centuries ago. The Golden Age of Pericles will always remain as one of the Western society's proudest moments in cultural achievements. The treasures of art that came from that era remain unsurpassed in excellence and beauty. Western man's search for truth and knowledge, his determination to conquer the universe, and his dedication to excellence and perfection of mind, body, and soul, received their greatest impetus from the efforts and convictions of the ancient Greeks. The debt that modern society owes to them is immeasurable in quantity. It can only be known by its quality and its importance to every aspect of our lives.

Today we have the privilege of honoring the Order of AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. This organization carries on the finest traditions of its ancestors by its efforts to—in its own words—"endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense."

This unique expression of purpose is not all that AHEPA stands for. Its aims are much broader and more specific as well. AHEPA urges its "members to be model citizens" and attempts to endow them with an understanding of the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. It makes effort to "promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man." It encourages "interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor." It encourages "loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens." It attempts to "promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning." It pledges "its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny," and tries to help them have "a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture."

The SPEAKER. This unique and praiseworthy program reflects the dedication to ideals that has always been the hallmark of Greek pride. The many civic and charitable programs with which AHEPA has been involved are in harmony with these aims. AHEPA's efforts to promote better relations between America and Greece accrue to the benefit of us all.

AHEPA is the largest and the most popular of Greek-American organizations in the Western Hemisphere and deservedly so. I am happy to salute them during this week of their 44th convention and to welcome them to the Nation's Capital.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is holding its 44th supreme convention in Washington, D.C. The Nation's Capital is the host of 10,000 delegates from 1,125 local chapters of AHEPA and its auxiliaries from 49 States, all the Provinces in Canada, Australia, and Greece. Among the well-known Miamians who will be present are Peter S. Kouchalakos, secretary of the supreme board of trustees—also former supreme governor, district governor of Florida, and president of the Miami chapter—and Dr. John Speropoulos, president of the St. Sophia Church, of Miami. Also here from Miami's chapter No. 14 of AHEPA are George Heropoulous, C. G. Paris, George Caravasios, Anthony Callesis, Walter Gilbert, Philip Levides, John Haralambides, William Christopher, and Alex Poulos. Other delegates from around the State of Florida are:

Clearwater, No. 356: Gust W. Athanso, Tomas Petchakos.

Eau Gallie: Chris Ekonomou, supreme governor; Andrew Ekonomou, supreme governor, Sons of Pericles.

Fort Lauderdale, No. 394: William G. Poulos, Dr. Alexander D. Xenakis, Theodore Neckles, Solon W. Bacas, Harry G. Carratt, James C. Carr.

Fort Pierce, No. 409: C. J. Crist, M. J. Constant, Anthony Economnys.

Indialantis, No. 401: Constantine G. Carey, James Vlamis, Gustave Ekonomou.

Jacksonville, No. 6: Jerry Dragones, Bill Bacalis, Dr. Theodore G. Panos.

North Miami, N. 421: George Harris, Gus Efthimiou, Sr., Pericles G. Nichols, Pano Varous, Charles M. Demos, Nicholas Jamieson, James P. Demos, Ted Alexander.

Orlando, No. 161: James Panichas, George C. Serros, Louis P. Logas, George Fotieo.

St. Petersburg, No. 15: James C. Scofield, Emanuel Sferios, Maurice G. Vailes, Peter T. Lenas, Peter G. Samaras, Diamond P. Constant, John Sinos, John C. Paras.

Tallahassee, No. 317: Peter Dukas, Mike E. Joanos.

Tarpon Springs, No. 16: Mike Costas, Costas Dalacos, Nick Mack, John Fatolitis.

West Palm Beach, No. 18: John Microutsicos, Peter Neff, Peter Diamond, Em. Kratinos, M. Antonopoulos, Thomas Sallas, Harvey Spilos, Basil G. Boundas.

Washington is a fitting site for this year's supreme convention after last year's meeting in Athens, the cradle of Western civilization. Some 25,000 individuals of Greek descent traveled to the city of Pericles and the parthenon for that dramatic gathering.

AHEPA members may truly be said to be living reminders of the first practitioners of democracy. Their organization has been exemplary in maintaining the pluralism that De Tocqueville so correctly saw to be one of the cornerstones of democratic society in America. The members follow well AHEPA's urgings that they serve as model citizens, as they are known for being active in civic affairs and fund drives.

AHEPA members come from all walks of life: business, the professions, education, and labor as well as civic and governmental leadership circles. Through hard work many have achieved the finer things in life that America has to offer. Through all of this, however, they have not forgotten the rest of their countrymen, both here and abroad. Since the organization was founded in 1922, it has striven to help integrate its members into American society by finding employment for them and aiding them in becoming U.S. citizens. The generosity of the members in sharing the fruits of their success with others is an example for all to emulate. They have made numerous contributions to educational institutions and hospitals in Greece and the United States. Whenever natural disaster has struck in either country, AHEPA has been among the first to extend a helping hand.

It is my personal privilege to extend greetings to all members of the AHEPA family, and to express my warm welcome to Washington for this 44th supreme convention this week.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Washington is the scene of the weeklong 44th international convention of the Order of AHEPA, a splendid fraternal organization composed of persons of Greek birth or ancestry. We extend to them a most cordial and warm welcome. The order has chapters in 49 States, the Bahamas, Canada, Australia, and Greece.

The United States, of course, is a great democracy and as such it is but right and proper that we pause in our legislative duties and reflect upon the fact that the whole civilized world is deeply indebted to Greece, indebted not only for the vast contributions she made in all fields of human endeavor, but especially because of the invaluable assistance which Greece gave to the United States and the whole free world during World War II and immediately thereafter when the Communist conspiracy sought to subjugate the indomitable Greek people.

The objects and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are, indeed, praiseworthy and we should take note of them; they are as follows:

> (a) To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; (b) to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; (c) to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of Citizenship; (d) to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor; (e) to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny; (f) to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture; (g) to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness to their fellow man; (h) to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; (i) to promote Education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

It was the ancient Greeks who first invented and practiced democracy in the unequaled Athens of Pericles, and we should freely acknowledge the great lessons we learned from the intellect and culture of Greece. We are also deeply conscious of the many significant contributions which Americans of Hellenic descent throughout the length and breadth of the United States have made and are making today to our democratic institutions and our American way of life.

Our fellow Americans of Greek ancestry have been constant and steadfast in their dedication to our great principle of liberty and freedom, those priceless legacies which they have inherited from their illustrious ancestors.

We are delighted that the Order of AHEPA has selected our Nation's Capital to be the place for their 44th convention.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to the contributions to our Nation by Americans of Greek origin and to give a salute to the Order of AHEPA, made up of outstanding Greeks, which is holding its international convention here this week.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Immigration, I am quite cognizant of the priceless heritage which Greek immigrants bring to America.

This story of the Greek immigrant in the United States typifies the story of America itself. The first great wave of Greek immigration occurred in the 1890's. Many fled their native country because of economic chaos there and came here for a new opportunity and a new life. Others came in search of religious freedom. In other words, the motivating forces of Greek immigration were much the same forces motivating the English immigration to Plymouth and Jamestown nearly three centuries earlier.

Many Greek Americans started out at the bottom but were very soon at the top. Never was the rags-to-riches thesis more specifically dramatized than in the case of the Greek immigrants.

Industry, native intelligence, and thrift made the Greek immigrant an outstanding member of the American economic community in the span of a single generation.

This is a story inspiring to all.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with many of my colleagues today in noting the accomplishments of the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, as its members convene in Washington this week for their 44th international convention. Founded in 1922 in Atlanta, Ga., the Order of AHEPA today has chapters in 49 States, Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. In the short time since it has come into existence, AHEPA has contributed to many worthwhile causes at the local, national, and international levels.

In the realm of education, AHEPA has established numerous scholarships for needy and worthy students. When natural disasters in the form of hurricanes, floods, and earthquakes struck whether it was Florida or Kansas City, Ecuador, or Turkey, AHEPA joined in the battle to lessen the burdens and distress of the victims.

Because of the heritage of most of AHEPA's members, many of its contributions have aided Greece, which, after its liberation during World War II and the guerrilla war which followed needed much outside assistance to overcome the war-torn conditions which existed. AHEPA's efforts took the form of aid to war refugees, CARE tool kits for students of vocational schools, sports kits for schoolchildren, construction of seven health centers, construction of hospitals in Athens and Salonika, and establishment of the AHEPA Agricultural College in Greece.

With such a list of accomplishments the members of AHEPA may justly feel that they have remained true to those objectives and purposes of the Order of AHEPA which maintain that the organization has been established for the following reasons: To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man; to endow its membership with the perfection of a moral sense; to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

While these humanitarian and philanthropic activities have consumed a good deal of AHEPA's efforts, they are by no means the full extent of the association's efforts. Other endeavors include aiding the newly arrived noncitizen in attaining their full American and Canadian citizenship and the realization of the responsibilities this entails; a sports program for its youth affiliates; interest in international relations especially as these relate to relations between the United States and Greece and the people-to-people programs; and urging its members to participation in political, civic, social, and commercial activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder with concerns such as those mentioned above that while the bulk of AHEPA's membership are of Hellenic backgrounds, it has contained notables of diverse national origins including two former Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. Currently Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is a member as are many Members of the Congress. May I add my best wishes to the many given today to the Order of AHEPA, its Supreme President Kimon A. Doukas and all of the members of AHEPA and its women's and youth auxiliaries for a successful convention and many more fruitful years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as a member in good standing of Canton Chapter No. 59, the Order of AHEPA, it is a pleasure for me to join in this period of tribute to that fraternity and to the ideals that it represents.

It has been a matter of only 50 or 60 years since great numbers of Greek people began to immigrate to the United States. This is a fact that is hard to keep in mind, for the accomplishments of our citizens of Greek origin are so many and varied that it seems almost impossible they have occurred in so short a span.

Men who came here from Greece less than 50 years ago are now among the most prominent citizens of my congressional district, and I am certain this can be said of almost any city in the United States.

I should like to mention also the interest in government and the devotion to our American system that is characteristic of all of my Greek friends. Perhaps it is because they come from a land that is the cradle of democracy, from whose ancient laws and customs much of our own are derived. Perhaps it is because of centuries of oppression in their native land. For whatever reason, however, I must pay tribute to their records as faithful voters, as interested participants in politics, and I must say that I wish these characteristics were more prevalent in every other group in our society.

Now AHEPA is coming to Washington for its international convention. I hope that we will welcome many Ahepans into the galleries of this Chamber during their visit here. I hope that the convention will be entirely successful, and that the members will return to their homes with renewed interest in the activities of our Government here in Washington, renewed inspiration from their visits to the great shrines of American history, and renewed devotion to the principles that have made AHEPA one of the most worthwhile social organizations in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, let me rise and join the gentleman from Indiana and my other colleagues here today in welcoming the delegates of the AHEPA family to the Nation's Capital for their 44th international convention.

Not only should we welcome this fine organization to Washington but we should also recognize the great contributions which the Order of AHEPA, in particular, and the people of Greece, in general, have made toward the development and growth of our country. We are all extremely proud of the contributions of these Americans of Greek origin. They have given the Nation a fine example which all of us could well afford to follow for they are actively demonstrating and encouraging their loyalty to the Nation in which they are citizens. They are teaching the fundamental principles of this democratic government and they are instilling in all of us the deep appreciation of the privilege of citizenship which all of us in this Nation enjoy.

Let us thus encourage, on this occasion, all people from all countries who have found their home in the United States to maintain an active interest and participation in all fields of human endeavor—political, civic, social, and economic.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to Washington the representatives of the 46 thousand members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. The Order of American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association is holding their 44th annual convention in Washington this week.

It is a fraternal organization of which all Americans can be proud; it seeks to promote the ideals upon which this country was founded, while at the same time, it encourages the appreciation and understanding of the great Hellenic culture, the fountainstone to Western civilization. Citizens of many countries, including our own, have been the recipients of the AHEPA's beneficent generosity.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in welcoming the representatives of this fine organization to Washington, and hope that they spend an enjoyable week here.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, as the 44th Annual Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA gathers here in Washington this week, I welcome this auspicious opportunity to bring to your attention the achievements of a widely loved and respected Greek-American of my congressional district—Mr. Charles N. Boyatis of Brockton, Mass.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association is pledged to uphold and perpetuate among its members the principles of citizenship, altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man, and to pursue the highest traditions of the ancient and venerable Greek culture.

Charles Boyatis is a living exponent of these principles, and one of the most active of AHEPA's members; he has given unstintingly of his time and energy to numerous philanthropic and humane projects, and through his labors earned the esteem of all who know or have worked with him.

He is not only a great Helene, but a great American patriot as well. In recognition of his notable contribution in behalf of the citizens of both countries, Archbishop Iakovos conferred upon him in March of this year, a title which had been decreed by the martyred Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras—that of Archon Hieromnemon of the Holy Archdiocese of Constantinople. This title, which is translated "the very honorable and erudite" is rarely conferred by the Orthodox Church and had never before been given to an American. This is a proud honor and gains special significance through the stature of the body by which it is awarded, one composed of the ranking educators, scientists, and clergy of the Greek peoples throughout the world.

A further honor was awarded to Mr. Boyatis recently as he was appointed to the governing board of the Academy of Letters and Arts in Thessaly, Greece.

This man has been a dear personal friend for many years, and I have watched his unselfish devotion to his fellow man demonstrated many times over. Thus, it is gratifying to me to witness the bestowal of these honors where they were so little sought but so well deserved. And aside from secular honors, I consider him truly one of God's great noblemen.

I would like to include here a translation of the official letter of the patriarch, and an article from the Hellenic Chronicle of August 11, 1966:

[From the Hellenic Chronicle, Aug. 1, 1966]

Boyatis Named to Board of Thessalian Academy

Brockton.—Charles N. Boyatis, local businessman and a leader in the Greek Orthodox community here, has been named to the governing board of the Academy of Letters and Arts in Thessaly, Greece.

Announcement of his appointment was forthcoming from Vasos Kalogiannis, society member, who noted that the election was unanimous.

Boyatis was informed that the honor was bestowed upon him at a meeting of the academy at Larissa, Thessaly, attended by governmental dignitaries.

The academy is conferring the honor noted that is was being presented to one who is a pioneer in all that is good and beautiful, a pillar of strength among Greeks in the United States; and in recognition of his great and many patriotic, humane and political efforts in behalf of his native land and the people of Thessaly.

Recently, Boyatis was honored by the Church, with Archbishop Iakovos conferring upon him a title decreed by Patriarch Athenagoras, that of Archon Hieromnemon of the Holy Archdiocese of Constantinople.

The text of the notification from Kalogiannis under the academy letterhead noted in part that election took place at the fourth Pan-Thessalian Amphictiony at which all governing bodies of the supreme board and officers of all chapters attended.

"You were proclaimed unanimously aristidin proedrikon melos of the Letters and Arts Society of Thessaly in recognition of your great, multifarious, patriotic, humane and civil deeds for your country and the people of Thessaly," the text concludes.

Patriarchal Seal and Seal of the Eastern Greek Orthodox Church Athenagoras Ast-Constantinople: Church Record No. 260

To a most devoted and enriched with divine virtue for his religious, useful, kind, devoted and untiring efforts, and whose presence the Church of God for his work with great interest and zeal for humanity and Christianity—the Mother Church with great joy bestows its most sacred and most esteemed title in showing its gratitude and in consideration thereof to admirable persons for their reverent, enriched, religious, and most virtuous zeal, respectful devotion, and pride to the Church for their devotion, embedded with humility and pride, the Mother Church, through the Patriarch, now bestows and bequeaths the title to one who has proven through his efforts, a beloved and devoted son, the Patriarch now bestows to Constantinos Nikolaou Boyatis who respectfully has brought forth his precious services to the Greek Orthodox Church in America and who is now granted from the Mother Church located in Constantinople, in view of the powers vested in me as Patriarch—with pride and attachment, I bestow to Constantinos Nikolaou Boyatis the title of "Archon Ieromnimon" (an ecclesiastical Byzantine title). This title he may bear now and forever and nimon" and be addressed as "Entimologiatos" meaning "The Very Honorable and Erudite."

Therefore, and in writing, I announce and proclaim that Constantinos Nikolaou Boyatis henceforth bear the title "Archon Ieromnimon" and be addressed as" "Entimologiatatos" meaning the "Very Honorable and Erudite" and with pride and honor the Mother Church has so recorded this in its official Church records—and this title now and forever shall be so recognized and belongs to our devoted son, Entimologiotatos, Archon Ieromnimon, Constantinos Nikolaou Boyatis.

Be it resolved and whence, in approval the Mother Church is sending this Patriarchal letter with blessings to the aforementioned Archon Ieromnimon, Constantinos Nikolaou Boyatis, from the Patriarchal seat in Constantinople, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six, the Month of March, the date of the 24th, and the day of Thursday.

Signed and sealed with the Patriarchal Seal, and signed by Patriarch Athenagoras Ast.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and great privilege of joining with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to the supreme lodge of the Order of AHEPA.

Our colleague, the gentleman from the State of Indiana, the Honorable John Brademas, has adequately explained the aims and objectives of this great organization. The order has chapters throughout the United States and we in Colorado are proud of the chapters in our great State.

The Order of AHEPA and its membership have taken a leading part in the public affairs of the State of Colorado. They are first of all good American citizens who are dedicated to a democratic form of government which we inherited from the Greeks and their way of life. We are proud of the fact that they have contributed much to the welfare of our State and have demonstrated their ability to continue to contribute to a strong America. May the supreme lodge of the Order of AHEPA have many more years of prosperous and continuous activities.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join with my colleagues in welcoming the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association to the Nation's Capital for its 44th international convention. I am proud to pay tribute to the 46,000-member Order of AHEPA and to acknowledge the many contributions of these civic-minded Americans of Greek heritage. This year marks the second time that this fine organization has gathered in Washington in its 44 years of existence.

The Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries have local chapters in 49 States, and each one of the 1,125 chapters strives to fulfill the noble objectives and purposes of the order. I would like to cite these goals, for they comprise nine ideals which all Americans might well emulate:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government;

Third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship;

Fourth, to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny;

Sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture;

Seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man;

Eighth, to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; and

Ninth, to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

In spite of its relatively short existence of 44 years, the AHEPA family has performed countless humanitarian acts ranging from schoolbuilding and providing relief for victims of natural catastrophes, to the selling of $500 million in U.S. war bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury Department. As a member of the House Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, I am particularly appreciative of AHEPA's accomplishments in the immigration sphere. AHEPA chapters assist newly arrived noncitizens in attaining their American citizenship, and also instruct their members on the obligations that go hand in hand with citizenship. Work of this nature is certainly deserving of great praise, for the result can only be a more creative and productive citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, America is indeed fortunate to have the benefit of the efforts of this exemplary organization. I am very proud to commend the work of the Order of the AHEPA and to wish for AHEPA a successful convention and a prosperous future in the years ahead.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this week we are being honored by the convening of the 44th annual convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in our Nation's Capital. This organization known as AHEPA, together with its auxiliaries, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena, have a proud history of outstanding accomplishments. I am personally aware of the significant contributions they have made to the brotherhood of man by promoting the ideals of loyalty, alutruism and understanding. I welcome the delegates of the Order of AHEPA, many of whom are from my own State of Connecticut.

America owes a great deal to the immigrants of other lands. Indeed, our country is an amalgamation of the best traditions of the peoples of the world. The influence of Hellenic culture, both past and present, upon our society is immeasurable. To lose sight of this fact would be unpardonable. With this in mind, the purpose for the existence of an organization such as the Order of AHEPA is really apparent.

Congratulations are in order for the fine job done by the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries in fostering civic participation and promoting international understanding and good will.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to take a moment to pay tribute to a most outstanding organization, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the AHEPA, on the occasion of its 44th supreme convention to be held on August 14 to 20, here in Washington, D.C.

This fine organization has devoted itself over the past 44 years to programs of accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, educational projects, and charitable endeavors. In my State of Nevada we are very proud of the Greek community, and it would be a vain attempt on my part to even begin to comment on the numerous achievements and charitable causes which the AHEPA has so generously and vigorously supported.

It is a privilege for me to express my deep appreciation and that of my State of Nevada to the Order of AHEPA for the contributions they have made to our State and our Nation and for their outstanding national responsibility.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, as the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association meet in the Nation's Capital for their 44th supreme convention, it is appropriate to consider the splendid record of achievement of Greek Americans.

Greek Americans first came in large numbers to the United States during the last decade of the 19th century. They came from Macedonia, the Ionian Islands, Crete, Epirus, Thrace, and from Turkey. Their arrival here was primarily the result of economic displacements, but, after 1908, political and religious discrimination by the Turkish Government also motivated Greek migration to America.

Although most of the newcomers to the United States labored in unskilled occupations, in the textile mills and fisheries of New England, on the railroads and in the lumber mills of the West, in the mines of Colorado, in Chicago's slaughterhouses, in the steel mills of Akron and Youngstown, in New York's hotels, shoeshine parlors, and amusement places, in California's vineyards, and in the sponge fisheries of Florida, their children and grandchildren would later play a major role in American business and the professions.

Greek Americans at first had no churches in which to worship.

Shaking off Russian connections, Greek Americans organized institutions in which the Greek language was of central importance. Orthodox churches in America used Greek, preserved traditional customs, and maintained a spiritual relationship to the metropolitan archbishop of Athens. Afternoon schools encouraged young people to acquire the language and the culture of their parents and developed familiarity with the civilization and the problems of the old land.

Greek Americans felt a strong urge to unite, both to better their condition in the United States and to support their homeland. They become naturalized citizens of their new country and began to participate in political life. They began to develop Hellenic societies, as they had been urged to do by Greece's Prince George who visited the United States in 1891. Greek American newspapers were founded, such as the dailies Atlantis and Pan Hellenic—in 1894 and 1904—as well as weeklies in Boston, Lowell, and Lynn, Mass., Manchester, N.H., Pittsburgh, Chicago, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco.

Greek American mutual aid societies were organized. In 1907, the Pan Hellenic Union was established. In 1922, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association was founded.

AHEPA's objectives are splendid ones. Active citizenship and patriotism are encouraged. Its members are instructed in the fundamental principles of good government. The ideals of Hellenism and of Hellenic culture are kept always in mind. Altruism is a virtue constantly striven for by AHEPA's members.

AHEPA's emphasis on responsible citizenship continues a great tradition. It was from ancient Greece that the emotion of obligation to our country that we call patriotism first found its way into Western civilization. Duty to the polis, the city-state, was the highest obligation of Greek citizenship. Most modern political ideals, such as justice, liberty, constitutional government, and respect for law, began with the reflections of Greek thinkers upon the institutions of their city-states.

Today we salute our Greek American friends on the occasion of AHEPA's 44th supreme convention.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the beginning of the 44th supreme convention of the Order of AHEPA. This fraternal organization is composed of American and Canadian citizens of Greek or Hellenic origin. AHEPA has over 43,000 members in the United States, Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. From these basic facts one obtains a very general picture of the organization; but upon closer examination of the activities and purposes of AHEPA, the broader and deeper significance of this association becomes clear.

It is a truism to state that every organization is formed for a purpose. Some are broader or narrower, but few embrace as significant ideals as AHEPA. Among the objectives of this association are: the promotion of loyalty; instruction in basic governmental principles; encouraging participation in political, civic, and social activities; opposition to governmental tyranny and corruption; the perfection of the moral sense and the promotion of a spirit of altruism, mutual understanding, and helpfulness to one's fellow man. These are the very attributes which are so often lacking in our technical urban society. I feel it is admirable to see a society with these as its stated objectives.

AHEPA, however, is not confined to mere passive advocacy of these lofty ideals. The list of their charitable works is long, indeed. Included are projects for the relief of disaster victims, the rehabilitation and recovery of those injured and maimed in World War II, and more tasks to benefit the youth, the aged, the poor, and the sick.

Perhaps even more significant than these humanitarian undertakings are AHEPA's continuing efforts to improve international relations. They strive continually to improve the relations between the United States, Canada, and Greece.

I would like to conclude by congratulating AHEPA on their outstanding achievements of the past, and by wishing them every possible success in the future and during their convention here in Washington.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in the House to pay tribute to the members of the supreme lodge of the Order of AHEPA on the occasion of the 44th international convention. I am proud and pleased to welcome the delegates from my own State of Rhode Island:

Mr. Constantine Bassis, Mr. Zachary Manichas, Mr. Vasilios Lampros, Mr. Thomas D. Cook, Mr. Spiro Samaras, Mr. Spero Karambelas, Mr. James Tsapakos, Mr. Alexander Demessianos, Mr. M. Mihilades, Mr. William P. Vican, Mr. Spiro Nonis, and Mr. Gregory Karambelas.

The objectives and the purposes of the order are most commendable in their endeavor to promote and encourage loyalty to country and good citizenship, to encourage culture and to provide goodfellowship and a spirit of helpfulness to their fellowmen. I am especially familiar with the effectiveness of the AHEPA because of my many friends of Greek extraction in my own congressional district.

It has also been my privilege as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to number among my friends one of the modern sons of Greece, one of the world's foremost authorities on the detection and prevention of cancer, the late Dr. George N. Papanicolaou. The "pap" smear developed by Dr. Papanicoulaou can detect uterine cancer months and even years, before ordinary symptoms appear.

The significance of this lies in the fact that cervical cancer in this preinvasive stage is practically 100 percent curable. This Nation and the world owes a deep debt of gratitude to this great doctor for his contribution to humanity. I would like to take this occasion to pay homage to his memory, and to extend to the membership of AHEPA all of my best wishes for their continued success in their outstanding accomplishments for the good of mankind.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join with my colleagues and all Americans in an expression of appreciation for the many honorable and patriotic deeds and services rendered by Greek-American citizens and the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. This week marks the 44th supreme convention of the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliary organizations; this year Washington has been honored by being selected as the host city.

The Order of AHEPA has set high and commendable purposes for itself and continually strives toward the successful attainment of these goals. As set forth in the constitution of the Order of AHEPA, they are compatible with and complementary to another set of purposes—those of the United States as written in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

These include encouraging loyalty to the laws and traditions of the United States; teaching the principles of democracy; instilling an appreciation for the principles of citizenship; encouraging participation in political, civic, social, and commercial activities; opposing political tyranny and corruption; promoting an understanding of the Greek nation and the ideals of Hellenism; promoting a spirit of good fellowship and altruism; supporting the American public school system; resisting any union of Church and State.

The Order of AHEPA boasts an endless list of contributions to worthy and charitable causes thorughout the world. In the area of relief, AHEPA has aided the Greek war orphans and the fatherless children of refugees through the Near East Relief, has participated in the Greek war relief program during and after World War II, and the AHEPA Refugee Relief Committee to aid war refugees of World War II.

To promote the advancement of world education and research AHEPA provides local, national, and international scholarships for needy and worthy students; has donated 40,000 American and Canadian books to schools and libraries in Greece; provides CARE tool kits for students of vocational schools in Greece; and contributes to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Cancer Institute. To aid health and medicine, the order has contructed AHEPA hospitals in Athens and Salonika, Greece, and seven AHEPA Health Centers in Greece following World War II. Further, AHEPA sold $500 million in U.S. war bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury Department, supports the Greek Orthodox Theological Seminaries in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and erected the AHEPA Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial at Hyde Park.

For these and many other reasons, in a spirit of support and encouragement, we recognize this week the contributions of our Greek-American citizens and the Order of AHEPA.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure and privilege for me to join today with my colleagues in the Congress of the United States to extend a warm welcome to Washington to the members of an organization dedicated to promoting good citizenship and true appreciation of the privileges of citizenship. I speak, Mr. Speaker, of the Order of AHEPA and its affiliated organizations which yesterday convened their 44th international convention here in our Nation's Capital.

I am particularly proud to report to you that among the many AHEPA'ns who have come to Washington to attend sessions of this convention is a large delegation of members of the Order of AHEPA representing chapters in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania.

These Americans of Greek origin have written a distinguished record for themselves in the history of our Nation, and in the history of the Lehigh Valley. The Order of AHEPA, and its affiliated organizations, the Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena, can take pride, as I do, in the work their Allentown, Bethlehem, and Easton chapters have done in developing loyal dedicated, and responsible citizenship and in taking active interest in community affairs.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], in paying tribute to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, AHEPA, on the occasion of its 44th annual international convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

It is only fitting that the sons of the nation in which democracy was born have united in this important effort to spread the democratic ideal.

The important charitable work done by AHEPA has continued ceaselessly over the years: from its earliest endeavors to enable Greek immigrants to the United States and Canada to stand on their own two feet through its valiant efforts during and after World War II to aid Greek victims of Nazi tyranny to its recent establishment of a $1 million educational fund to enable needy students to have the college education they deserve. Throughout its history AHEPA has been justly praised for its fine work in aiding disaster victims in all parts of the world, regardless of nationality.

AHEPA'ns do not merely confine their efforts to efforts of charity. In my congressional district, I know that members of the order are among the most active participants in community affairs. Their views have never failed to be constructive and their willingness to assume leadership and to instill purpose in functions under their direction is a great asset to our communities.

AHEPA has been instrumental in promoting the close ties which today exist between America, Canada, and Greece.

It is only fitting that these three nations be linked together by an organization which has for its goals the same noble pursuits which define the purpose of these three nations: namely, to promote good fellowship, a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness toward others; to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, and social fields, and to oppose political corruption and tyranny while instilling a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.

I am glad to note that several of my constituents will be attending the AHEPA convention. this week. I am proud of these members and of this organization—a personification of all that is best in American life.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 44th supreme convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, it gives me pleasure to pay my personal tribute to the membership of AHEPA for the wonderful work they are doing. I think it is well known and very much appreciated that the scope of their efforts includes humanitarian, civic and cultural, and patriotic deeds. Noteworthy, also, is their participation in international affairs, particularly attuned to maintaining good relations and friendship between the peoples of Canada, the United States, and Greece. Americans everywhere have great admiration for the Order of AHEPA, and wish them every fulfillment in their worthwhile endeavors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to extend by warmest welcome to the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association, gathered here in Washington for its 44th international convention. My greetings also to those members from Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. I am especially pleased to note the number of participants from the Fifth District of Massachusetts:

From Lowell, Mass.: Hermes S. Tsandikos, William Kyros, Charles Tsaffaras, Ernest N. Kotosopoulos, Charles J. Kirkiles, John Maniatis, Efthemios J. Bentas, John Ruscomanis, Peter S. Chiandikos, Peter Paras, Arthur J. Collias, and James Athanasoulas.

From Woburn, Mass.: Charles Pernokas and Evangelos Spanos.

Over a century ago, Daniel Webster, then a Member of the House of Representatives, called the attention of the House to the debt the civilized world, and especially the democratic world, owed to the heritage from ancient Greece. So I, at this moment, call the attention of the House to an association whose principles join the love and appreciation of democratic nations with a love and continuation of Hellenism and Hellenic culture from which the ideals of democratic citizenship have come.

Great tribute is due the Order of AHEPA and its members for their vigorous participation in both national and international projects. It has become an active element in our Nation's people-to-people program, promoting international harmony. The worthy charitable causes which have received aid from AHEPA make a long and impressive list. The 56 wreaths placed at the graves of Greek-American veterans in Arlington Cemetery this year are, I feel, the most profound symbol of the principles embodied by this association.

The goals and efforts of AHEPA are an invaluable benefit, not only to the Nation but to humanity. It is my privilege to have had this opportunity to express by esteem for this organization. My best wishes to the representatives of AHEPA for a successful convention and an enjoyable week in Washington.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a very fine and outstanding organization, the Order of AHEPA, on the occasion of its 44th Supreme Convention on August 14 to 20, being held in Washington, D.C.

It can be accurately stated that a part of America's greatness is the composite of many national origins blending successfully together toward the advancement of common goals. In the scope of national responsibility, the Order of AHEPA stands as an object lesson in successful cooperation.

I am particularly familiar with the effectiveness and altruism of the AHEPA because of the large Greek community in my area. It would be a vain attempt on my part to list the numerous achievements and charitable causes which this organization has so generously and vigorously supported, but it would be less than proper of me not to express to AHEPA my appreciation and that of the State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, this country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent who have contributed so greatly to the tenets on which this country was founded and who, because of their heritage, have always shared in our aspirations for freedom and independence.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Greek origin are rightly proud of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, our friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, of the great, beautiful, and wonderful State of Indiana. Not only Americans of Greek origin, but indeed every American can be proud of the distinguished, brilliant, and able gentleman from Indiana who so ably represents his people and the people of the United States.

It is fitting and proper that our colleague, JOHN BRADEMAS, call to the attention of the Congress the 44th international convention of the Order of the AHEPA now meeting here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is my firm belief that democracy as we know it today had its beginning in the ancient democracy in Greece. Greek art, culture, and individualism permeate the very foundation stones of our Republic.

The Order of the AHEPA is dedicated to preserving not only the bond of friendship that exists between Greece and the United States today, but a link with that nobility, pride, and Spartan devotion to principles, ideals, and individual rights associated with the Greece of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

Mr. Speaker, some of the most pleasant occasions that I can recall since becoming a Member of this Congress 18 years ago have been my associations with the Order of the AHEPA and its gracious hospitality extended to Congress and our national leaders.

Freedom, liberty, and justice shall not pass from this earth so long as the spirit of Greek democracy is abroad in the United States and in the free world.

Mr. Speaker, the following objectives and purposes of the Order of the AHEPA could well be emulated by all of us in America today:

> (a) To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; (b) to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; (c) to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of Citizenship; (d) to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor; (e) to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny; (f) to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture; (g) to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness to their fellow man; (h) to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; (i) to promote Education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Mr. Speaker, I salute and commend the supreme president, Kimon A. Doukas, and the Order of the AHEPA and extend to them my admiration, best wishes, and highest esteem always.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the 46,000-member AHEPA family will convene in Washington on Sunday, August 14, for their weeklong 44th international convention.

The contributions of the AHEPA family in promoting and encouraging loyalty, citizenship, and active participation in political, civil, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor are highly commendable.

The AHEPA family is one which successfully meets its objectives and purposes to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man.

I salute the AHEPA family and urge my colleagues to join me in offering its members a warm welcome to Washington and best wishes for continuing success.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association began yesterday here in Washington its 44th annual convention. Its delegates represent 1,125 local chapters and 46,000 members, including many Members of Congress, in 49 States. The association, known by its acronym, AHEPA, has served many communities well since its founding in 1922.

Since AHEPA members are predominantly of Greek origin, their funds help to support institutions, in both Greece and the United States, such as Greek Orthodox seminaries. But they also extend the hand of the fortunate to victims of earthquakes in Turkey, floods in

Kansas City, and hurricanes in Florida. The AHEPA family seeks, like families everywhere, to knit individuals into their communities. Its membership includes both American citizens and immigrants from Greece who seek to become American citizens.

AHEPA actively helps these newcomers to adapt to their new country, but also to keep fresh the ties with their homeland. AHEPA sets out to teach good citizenship to its younger generation as well, through taking part in local civic fund drives and competing in sports tournaments leading to the annual AHEPA Olympiad. AHEPA contributes, through annual visits to Greece, to maintain Greek-American ties.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Order of AHEPA, whose name is derived from the first letters of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. This outstanding organization is dedicated to fostering the highest principles of patriotism and good citizenship by encouraging active participation in civic affairs and an awareness of the duties and responsibilities that go hand in hand with the privileges safeguarded by good government.

The Order of AHEPA with its three auxiliaries—the Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena—is an international organization with chapters in 49 States, Canada, Australia, Greece, and the Bahamas, totaling 1,125 local chapters. It is indeed an honor to welcome the delegates who have assembled here in Washington, D.C., for the 44th supreme convention which convened yesterday. I want to extend a special welcome to the delegates from Kansas City, Kans., Mr. William C. Karnaze, Mr. Tom S. Kehagas, Mr. Konstantin Raptis, and Mr. Gust Apostle.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in extending a warm and hearty welcome to the many representatives of the Order of AHEPA, who are presently convening their 44th supreme convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington.

AHEPA is short for American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a fraternal order of 46,000 Greek Americans. The order has chapters in 49 States, Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. There is a women's auxiliary, the Daughters of Penelope, and also two youth groups, the Sons of Pericles and the Maids of Athena.

The Order of AHEPA is dedicated to the promotion of good citizenship and educated, informed government; to the appreciation of Hellenic culture; and to good fellowship and good moral conduct. To further their ideals, members meet frequently together, participate in civic and charitable projects, and travel to places of special interest. This week's convention in Washington is the highlight of their activities for 1966. I particularly look forward to seeing my friend and neighbor, John Maniatis, who will be representing my own hometown of Pittsfield, Mass., at the AHEPA convention.

As a Congressman, I laud and encourage the order's concern for good citizenship and good government. As a father, I note with pride their wholesome programs for young men and women; and as an Italian American, I appreciate their goal of fostering respect for their motherland and making a worthwhile contribution to their Nation as well.

And as a resident of Washington, I wish them a cordial welcome and a fine convention. More power to them.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our fellow citizens of Hellenic descent are convening in our Nation's Capital this week for the 44th Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA. We are all proud to have them here, and I would like to join with the many others who are extending them a hearty welcome and best wishes for a very successful convention.

Founded more than four decades ago, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association has been an organization consistently dedicated to an enlightened loyalty to the United States and to active participation in the privileges of self-government. They have extended both friendly assistance and the opportunity for education to the new immigrants who have come to our shores. They have instilled in their members a deep pride and love for the great heritage which is theirs as sons and daughters of Greece, as well as a working, meaningful allegiance to America.

An insight into the feeling they hold for their adopted country can be found in the AHEPA manual. It reads:

> "A" stands for America—the Great Country in which we live. It stands for the great Country to which we owe our welfare and education, or, rather, broader education. As you are aware, only few of our compatriots came to this country fully educated; the the rest of us educated ourselves after our arrival to America.
>
> This Country provides for us a vast field for our business activities; she protects us; she opens her doors to us that lead into her great industrial fields, thereby giving us splendid opportunities to choose our vocations and work and improve our social and economic conditions. She gives us the same rights and privileges that her native sons enjoy. The word America, therefore, should always remind us of Generosity, Equality and Justice.
>
> We must never hesitate to pay homage to this great Country of ours at every opportunity, and, if we have not already done so, we must become American citizens—American Citizens in the true meaning of the word.

The outstanding record of charitable, worthwhile, and progressive activities in which AHEPA has been engaged since its organization in 1922 is a proud testimony to fact that her members do, indeed, understand the true meaning of citizenship. The local chapters of the AHEPA family have always given generously and energetically supported local community projects on a spectrum as broad as the civic, political, charitable, and commercial endeavors of their localities.

On an international scale, AHEPA has constantly maintained a vital interest in affairs aimed at further cementing our good will and friendship with Greece, as well as promoting a more harmonious relationship with other countries of the world. She has been a leader in our "people to people" program.

We are happy to be able to welcome to Washington this week the members of AHEPA who are attending from 49 of our States, the Bahamas, Canada, Australia, and Greece. They are part of an organization which has earned the respect and gratitude of a nation, as well as the countless thousands who have directly benefited from AHEPA's helping hand.

And, not inconsequentially, they are the descendants of the land and people who have given to the world much of the richest of our legacy in literature, art, drama, philosophical and political thought. In short, they are the sons and daughters of Greece, the land which gave birth to the empirical spirit of Western civilization.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 14, the representatives of the 46,000-AHEPA family convened in Washington for its 44th international convention, with headquarters at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

AHEPA stands for the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. The organization was founded in 1922 in Atlanta, Ga., with its prime purpose to help Greek immigrants find jobs and become American citizens. The Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries have local chapters now in 49 States of the United States, in all provinces in Canada, in Australia, the Bahamas, and in Greece. The three auxiliary groups are: The Daughters of Penelope—senior women; the Sons of Pericles—junior young men; and the Maids of Athena—junior young women.

AHEPA has grown and developed to such extent and purpose, and the objectives and programs are of such worth that I am impelled to restate them. I list them verbatim from the organization's recent fact sheet:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government;

Third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship;

Fourth, to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny;

Sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideas of Hellenism and Hellenic culture;

Seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man;

Eighth, to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; and

Ninth, to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

The weeklong convention has an impressive agenda before it. Emphasis, I understand, is being placed on education.

A new $1 million educational fund which will not only provide scholarships but also endow chairs at universities is a prime project.

I congratulate the entire AHEPA family on its remarkable organization, its outstanding past accomplishments, and I wish the AHEPA family continued success in all its future undertakings.

To all the delegates, their families and friends, I want to say "Welcome to the Nation's Capital." And, to those delegates and families from Ohio, from Cincinnati, and particularly from the First District, I extend a personal welcome. And, I hope your week's stay in Washington will be a pleasant one.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my many colleagues who are taking the occasion of their 44th international convention to praise AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. One has only to read of their purposes to be assured that here is an organization which has made a definite contribution to American life.

AHEPA has been particularly helpful in assisting new immigrants to our country to quickly become a part of their newly adopted Nation. It has helped them to learn of our system of government and to fulfill the requirements for citizenship. It has encouraged them to participate fully in the political, social, and civic life of the communities to which they have come. With this in view it has supported a number of philanthropic projects both in Greece, and in the United States and Canada.

Finally, it has been extremely valuable in helping Americans of Greek descent to balance the demands of loyalty to their new and old countries. It is often difficult for one who has newly come to our shores to handle the conflict between attachment to the old country and fealty to the new. This has sometimes resulted in a refusal to admit that one has really left the old country, a failure to learn English and a failure to associate with Americans of different origin.

At the other extreme is the American who refuses to even admit that he or his parents came from another land, who drops the language of his ancestors and who cultivates ignorance of the culture which nourished them. AHEPA is invaluable in helping Americans of Greek descent learn of Hellenic culture and language while at the same time promoting active citizenship in the United States. This balanced approach means an America which is enriched by the contribution which Hellenic culture has to make to our lives.

It seems particularly appropriate to me, Mr. Speaker, that those from Greece, the birthplace of democracy, should join to form such an association as AHEPA, which assists its members to participate in the life of our democracy. America has surely been blessed by those who have come here from Greece and not the least of our blessings has been the good done by AHEPA.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association is composed of 46,000 members, with 1,125 local chapters. This great philanthropic and educational organization is holding its 44th annual convention in Washington this week. Made up, as it is, principally of those of Greek origin, the AHEPA family has for years been a most valuable agency in behalf of improvement in citizenship, charity, and other worthy causes.

AHEPA maintains a close relationship with Greece and the people who live there. It has been of great help to those in this country of Greek origin who seek American citizenship. In addition, through fundraising drives it has been able to contribute to many causes, including victims of flood, hurricane, and earthquakes. Its record, since it began back in 1922, has been most commendable.

I join in paying tribute to the AHEPA family. Such concerted activities contribute greatly to the public interest and community betterment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity to join with my fellow colleagues and Americans everywhere in expressing my sincere appreciation for the contributions rendered our Nation and the world by the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—the Order of AHEPA—and our Greek-American citizens. Sunday the 44th Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA commenced in Washington, D.C. I would like to welcome all members to the city and extend my best wishes for a successful meeting. More than that, however, I wish to offer my continuing support for the activities and high ideals of the order.

During its 44 years of existence the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliary organizations—Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena—have contributed financially to many worthy causes. These contributions do not take account of the many local activities of the chapters in the field of their local governments.

The local chapters of AHEPA have always given unselfishly and actively supported local community projects in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement. The national and international projects and contributions of the Order of AHEPA include relief for Florida hurricane victims, Mississippi flood victims, Corinth, Greece, earthquake victims, and for the Greek War Orphans; local, national, and international scholarships for needy and deserving students; support of the Greek Orthodox theological seminaries in Connecticut and Massachusetts; funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates in Jerusalem and in Constantinople; Greek war relief program during and after World War II; construction of AHEPA hospitals and health centers in Greece after World War II; sale of $500 million in U.S. war bonds during World War II as an official agency of the U.S. Treasury Department; contributions to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Cancer Institute; AHEPA Medals for Scholastic Excellence for studies in the Greek language to students; AHEPA Refugee Relief Committee, to aid war refugees of World War II.

For these and innumerable unlisted other reasons, I am proud to have this opportunity to express my gratitude and encouragement for the ideals and activities of the Order of AHEPA.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in welcoming the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, as its members convene in the Nation's Capital for the 44th supreme convention.

Since its founding in Atlanta, Ga., in 1922, AHEPA has assisted numerous worthwhile causes. Such contributions as scholarships for needy and worthy students, aid to disaster areas, and assistance to victims of war have shown that the members of AHEPA remain true to their stated objectives: to promote loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; to instill appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; to encourage activity in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; to promote good fellowship and education.

I welcome all AHEPA delegates to Washington, especially those representing chapter 30 of Baltimore: Chris George, Arthur Thomas, Louis Constantinides, Euripides Papachristou, Michael Tricoglou, and Alex Zades.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, in noting the 44th annual convention of the 46,000-member family of the AHEPA in Washington this week.

It is fitting that a group incorporating the patriotic ideals of the Hellenic nation which enriched this country and the world with its heritage of democracy should meet in this world's capital of democracy.

My 36th Congressional District, including the city of Rochester, is one of the hundreds of communities in the United States which profits daily from the presence of a viable, active Greek community.

I am proud and pleased to welcome to Washington the delegates from Flower City Chapter No. 67 of the Order of the AHEPA: Mr. Dennis Livadas, Mr. George Yioulos, Mr. John J. Mirras, Mr. Gus Matheos, Mr. James Rappas, Mr. Xenofon Harisis, and Mr. Sam A. Carrousos.

Mr. Elias Tonias is president of the AHEPA chapter in my district, which includes 133 members. It is an organization which represents the true spirit of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. Each year, the group pools its resources to award a $400 scholarship to a deserving student. That scholarship, in 1966, was awarded for the 16th time.

The Daughters of Penelope, Chapter No. 44, and the Sons of Pericles, Chapter No. 77, carry into the youthful Greek community the spirit of Hellenic ancestry in education and patriotism.

Rochester can consider itself fortunate to have a 2,000-member Greek community. Its fine spiritual focus is the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation, 962 East Avenue, where the Reverend Peter C. Remoundos guides a congregation of 470 families.

The loyalty of the Ahepans and the entire Greek community to the American way of life, while also providing a bridge to the rich past, is a genuine asset and resource of the entire country.

We can justly be proud that they have chosen our Nation's Capital City as the site of the 1966 AHEPA convention. We wish them success and enjoyment during their stay here.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and high privilege for me to join my brilliant friend, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] in the order granted today by our great Speaker to memorialize the monumental contributions of the Hellenic world and to focus attention upon the 44th supreme convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a patriotic group dedicated to perpetuating the cherished ideals and principles of Greek civilization, so inseparably linked with the liberties, freedoms, and aspirations of our own beloved country.

My personal ties with this vital organization of devoted, dedicated Americans of Greek origin and descent are very close and enduring. Since my earliest youth, I have been intimately associated and identified with the activities of AHEPA.

Together with my esteemed friend, great patriot and statesman, the late Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, under whose wise counsel and generous tutelage I came into public life, it was my most unusual privilege to have attended the early organizational meetings of this group in my home State of Massachusetts. I can vividly recall the zealous, loyal-inspired early leaders who blazed the trail, so to speak, in the early stages of struggle, who, by their allegiance, perseverance and hard work, established the most impressive AHEPA organization which now graces and enriches the governmental, civic, business, social, economic, and professional life of the old Bay State and the Nation.

In every community where AHEPA exists, its membership comprises the idealistic and the loyal, the truly inspired leaders and faithful members whose idealism, devotion to the traditions and glories of Greece, lofty principles, patriotic zeal, and profound love of truth and justice cannot be excelled by any other group in the Nation.

Many of these great leaders and these proud, loyal people are among my closest friends, too numerous to mention here to be sure, but invaluable leaders in the very best sense of the word, men and women of whom we all may be proud, who admirably exemplify the glorious history of the Greek people and the classic, superb attributes of Greek culture and the passionate attachment to noble values and to God and country for which the Greeks have always been noted throughout the centuries, and for which they are lauded, admired, and loved today.

I suppose, in a sense, it would not be possible for me to refer to these valued and cherished associations of mine with my own dear, beloved Greek friends in any impartial and dispassionate way, because many of them have been lifelong friends and neighbors, who are, indeed, like members of my own family to me in Clinton, Mass., my native home, and in the broader regions of Massachusetts and the Nation.

These sons and daughters of Hellenes in whose veins flow the blood of the golden age of Greece, have forged a peerless record of courageous, devoted leadership in every walk of life that no group could hope to surpass in this or any other country.

In the church, in the professions, in the marts of trade, in political life, in all the callings and occupations to which Americans are committed, our Greek friends and neighbors have set the loftiest, finest example of adherence to the honored fountainhead of their great heritage, commingled today in America with the choicest, most exalted concepts, practices, and beliefs that we regard to be best in our civilization.

Greek Americans have immeasurably enriched American life. They have brought to us the strength, the power, and the beauty of the Hellenic ideal, the golden mean of their great philosophers, the deep, unyielding faith of their religious and group leaders, the sweep and grace of the culture and humane living that have become the hallmark, as well as the precious possession, of so many peoples throughout the world who drew from the rich, bountiful fountainhead of Grecian thought, the nourishment and inspiration of freedom, personal liberty, and enlightened living, predicated on the loftiest, ethical concepts of which the human being is capable.

I cannot in this short space of time adequately deal with the glories of the Greeks that are manifest to all of us. They have been fittingly extolled in the lyrical language of the poets, the deft, heaven-sent strokes of artists and sculptors, and in the ritual and legacy of the great Hellenic heritage.

Great Greek thinkers throughout the centuries have given philosophy to the world which is one of the very basic foundations of modern civilization as well as a noteworthy source of free government. Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, and many other great Greek thinkers nourished and developed democratic ideals, high ethical concepts, and the culture of freedom. Greek philosophy is concerned with personal values and flatly rejects materialistic concepts of life.

Among the greatest orators in history were the Greeks. The Philippics of Demosthenes rank among the great orations of history.

The inspiring family life of the Greeks has enabled them throughout history to retain strong racial solidarity. Their zeal to sacrifice for their nation, loyalty to spiritual values, love of religion, and belief in God which they have practiced for centuries, typify a truly great people. The Greeks have felt, as civilized Americans have felt throughout history, that worthwhile human progress and belief in God Almighty are inseparable. The doctrine that without faith in the Divine Master, no nation can long survive is a basic feature of Greek civilization—a doctrine which must be recognized more fully by all peoples.

The achievements of Pericles, the leader of the Golden Age, are indelibly inscribed upon world history. There is probably no period in all time where the fine arts, cultural life, and individual development in political and artistic values flowered in such a favorable climate as under his regime. Pericles and his contemporaries have long since gone, but the ideals they stood for, and the lessons they taught, the culture and civilizing influences they nurtured, will remain forever as an inspiration for mankind.

The famed Acropolis is a great monument which symbolizes a culture that has profoundly influenced human beings throughout the ages. It was the inspirational center of glorious olden Greece. It was the place where Christianity took new and vigorous root. It still inspires the Greek people and the free world.

Aphrodite, the Goddess of Beauty, typifies the magnificent art of the Greeks, not only beauty in the physical sense, but beauty of the soul, of ideals, of thought and culture.

Sculptors, artists, writers, musicians, the drama, the stage, the harp and lyre in the past sounded a song of hope, strength, and courage which united the Greeks of ancient time.

The logic, the rhetoric, the aesthetics of Aristotle are as realistic and vital today as when first written. The ideals of Plato still beckon those pledged to scholarship and freedom of thought. If you should subtract Greek culture from civilization, there would be no civilization as we know it today because it is a primary cornerstone of our modern political, social, and ethical life.

It is pertinent to note that the Greeks of old were not materialists. They were profoundly spiritual in their approach. They did not embrace mechanistic philosophies. They were idealists. For that reason despite their many contributions to the material world, their greatest triumphs will be found, not in the world of matter, but in the world of thought and the world of the spirit.

Realizing these things, it is easy to understand why, with unquenchable purpose, the modern Greeks have gallantly protected their free way of life.

Hail to the great AHEPA, may it endure always as a great force for progress and good and a sanctuary of freedom and justice.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in welcoming AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, to the Nation's Capital this week on the occasion of its 44th supreme convention.

As an organization, AHEPA is dedicated to charity, education, benevolence, religion, and liberty, be it civil, religious, or intellectual. It stresses obedience to law and loyalty to the democratic way of life. It encourages individual judgment in accordance with the dictates of one's conscience. It has among its principal objectives a fusion of American and Hellenic cultures. And, for many years it has been a source of strength and help to new immigrants.

The members of AHEPA, and its auxiliaries, are energetically urged to take an active, responsible part in community affairs, to keep in mind the exhortation of Pericles. Speaking to the youth of Athens, the great statesman said:

> Strive to leave our city not only as good, but even better than we found it.

Our Greek community in America, the sons and daughters of the land which first thrust mankind toward the flowering of civilization, are reminding us of the great challenge and promise which is ours to expand knowledge, music, culture, education, and individual freedom, and to create another golden age for civilization.

We are proud of the citizens among us of Greek descent. We are thankful for the enrichment they have been to American culture, and we are most happy to have them here as guests this year in our Capital City.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as the delegates to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association meet here in Washington this week for their 44th supreme convention, I would like to take this occasion to extend my best wishes, congratulations, and admiration to an organization noted for its fine service to both the United States as well as to the land of its forebears, Greece.

AHEPA, consisting of the Order of AHEPA, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena was founded in 1922 in an effort to create a spirit of Anglo-Hellenism and to convey these feelings and ideas to the American people. The organization has long been a leader through its educational action in the instruction of countless citizens everywhere in the objects and purposes of AHEPA: First, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government; second, to promote and encourage the loyalty of its members to the country in which they are citizens; third, to instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; fourth, to encourage interest and active participation in political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; fifth, to pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny; sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; seventh to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man; eighth, to endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; and ninth, to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Since its founding, this Hellenic-American organization has gone to great lengths to establish firm bases of mutual understanding between men, a belief arising from their Greek heritage. With much of our American architecture, as well as our fundamental concepts in religion, ethics, philosophy, and science stemming from the golden age of Greece, it is only natural that the America of today should be so heavily indebted to the civilization that flourished in Greece better than two millenniums ago. Likewise, we are also indebted to the countless contributions being made by latter day Greeks to the 20th century and its civilization and culture. Such contributions have kept Greece prominent as the bastion of freedom and democracy in the Balkans, an area under the domination of the Soviet Union and not well acquainted with the blessings of democracy.

Equally as important, as a charitable force in the countries where AHEPA has roots—in the United States, Canada, Australia, Bahama Islands, and in Greece—the role of this fine organization is only too well known. Whether it be to relieve the flood or earthquake-stricken areas of Italy, or to provide food, clothing, and medical aid to the needy in our own American South, AHEPA stands ready to do its part in any emergency or help any worthy cause. Such direct humanitarian assistance is just one of the many services of this Greek-American society. It is, indeed, a brotherhood of good will, building understanding in the world at a very vital time.

Educational and civic responsibility are then still a viable part of the Greek spirit, much as they were in the days of the Agora, the School of Athens, and the days of Pericles.

Mr. Speaker, these United States are rightly proud of the tireless and unselfish efforts and actions of its Greek-American citizens working under the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association to foster humanitarianism in the world. We are also proud that so many Greeks have chosen to adopt America as their new homeland, for the democracy kindled as a spark of freedom so long ago on the plains of Greece has grown into the light of liberty and democracy here in America. It is indeed this common heritage of democracy which serves to unite Americans of Greek ancestry under the banner of AHEPA. This organization and its associated societies are indeed workshops in understanding and in brotherhood, and are to be highly complimented and praised by all Americans for the fine work which they are performing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the House this week in extending a warm welcome to the 25,000 members of the Order of AHEPA who are holding their 44th annual supreme convention in the Nation's Capital this week. I especially welcome the delegates from Seattle and their families: Tom T. Tolias, Arthur Saradakis, Gus Zarkades, James Manus, Nick Carras, George Varser, Jr., and Steve Sourapas.

Since its founding in 1922, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association has promoted the attributes and ideals of Hellenic culture, and encouraged lively and constructive community efforts among the 46,000 Americans of Greek ancestry who are its members.

Every schoolboy knows how great is the debt of Western civilization to fifth century Greece in art, letters, and government. In the 2,500 years which have passed since then, the Greek contribution to civilization has not diminished. From the struggle for Greek independence, and the hardships suffered by Greek immigrants to the United States in the 19th century, to their brave resistance to oppression in World War II, we have as much to learn from our modern Greek compatriots as from the ancient Greek forebears of learning and culture and democracy.

The Order of AHEPA embodies the finest of the Greek tradition to which we are thus indebted, and represents it to us in 20th century America. It represents American and Canadian citizens of Greek descent, and it is open to people from all backgrounds and all walks of life. The AHEPA creed emphasizes the values of family and church, community and nation, for its 43,000 members in 1,125 local chapters throughout the Nation. The objects and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens; to encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; and to promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

In light of this, the Order of AHEPA has consistently supported charitable work projects, relief drives, and educational programs. It supports libraries, hospitals, and orphanages, from Kansas City to Corinth, and Ecuador to the Ionians.

The many forms which AHEPA's planned civic activity takes are inspiration to us all, and an accomplishment of which its members can well be proud. I extend sincerest congratulations to the 25,000 delegates here in Washington this week, and wish them much success in the continuation of their fine work.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our National Capital is again honored by being selected as the host city for the 44th Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliary organizations.

This great national fraternal order of Greek American citizens has made a major contribution over the years not only to its own members and the Greek community but also through its cooperation with civic, educational, and charitable projects beneficial to citizens of our local communities, State, and Nation. The organization's charitable work has been outstanding and has continued for almost a half century. It has rendered a great service to immigrants of Greek descent in enabling them to become established and obtain educational advantages so as to better enjoy the freedoms and opportunities that this land of liberty extends to all its citizens regardless of race or religion.

AHEPA has been in the forefront in its aid and contribution toward aiding disaster victims regardless of nationality. This activity is not limited to the United States but extends throughout the world. The AHEPA organization has been instrumental in promoting friendships and close ties not only with Americans and their countrymen in their native land but with people in many other nations.

AHEPA and its members have cooperated in a major way in all our patriotic endeavors: the promotion of loyalty, participation in drives to eliminate poverty, and other political, social, and civic activities.

I wish to join along with other friends of the Order of AHEPA in wishing them many years of continued activity in their efforts toward peace, self-government, and freedom for all nations throughout the globe.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join with many other Members of the House of Representatives in welcoming to our Nation's Capital many representatives of the Order of AHEPA, currently conducting their 44th supreme convention.

It is with particular pleasure that I greet four outstanding citizens from my own hometown of Saginaw, Mich., who are participating in the AHEPA convention. They are Tom Demetriou, a senior at Wayne State University Law School in Detroit; Christ A. Anagnost and Achilles J. "Kelly" Tarachas, two outstanding young attorneys in Saginaw; and John Tarachas, pharmaceutical representative. They represent the Saginaw Valley Chapter No. 216.

The objects and purposes of this fraternal order of some 46,000 Greek-Americans clearly illustrates its dedication to the promotion of good citizenship and educated, informed government; to the appreciation of Hellenic culture; and to good fellowship and good moral conduct.

I have always been particularly impressed by the number one object and purpose of the AHEPA. It is, and I quote:

> To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens.

AHEPA's contributions to worthy and charitable causes; citizenship; civic participation; sports; and international relations have been widely hailed and rightfully so.

I wish all members of the Order of the AHEPA continued success and good health.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to commemorate the 44th International Convention of AHEPA meeting here in Washington this week.

The members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association have been, and are a credit to their country and to their heritage. Over the years these Greek Americans have made important contributions to American life.

Greece was the founding place of the representative form of government which we have come to know as democracy. The members of AHEPA have fostered these cherished beliefs and have instilled the tenets of democracy in their families.

The preservation and the spread of Greek culture and civilization in America have not been unimportant services. To the melting pot of the United States, AHEPA has made a significant contribution, not only through the preservation of Greek heritage but also by fostering understanding and toleration in community relations. These accomplishments alone are noteworthy contributions to society.

Yet AHEPA has gone well beyond this. Their educational and charitable work is well known. They have provided relief to disaster strickened areas and have rendered their services and funds in building needed hospitals and clinics. They have provided agricultural schools in Greece and scholarship programs for needy students.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join with my colleagues in saluting this worthy organization. Their devotion and loyalty to the United States and their work for all of humanity are indeed praiseworthy. It is an honor to have them meeting in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in welcoming the thousands of delegates and members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association who have gathered in Washington for their 44th supreme convention. The Order of AHEPA—as it is most commonly known—and its three auxiliaries, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athens have a total of 1,125 chapters in 49 States, all the provinces of Canada, the Bahamas, and Greece.

The order has done much to encourage good citizenship and needed social action. Its many clinics for newly arrived immigrants and its countless philanthropic endeavors have made it one of America's truly great fraternal societies.

For the last 44 years, the Order of AHEPA has been making many significant contributions to American life. Indeed all Americans can take pride in their work and follow their example.

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, this week the AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is holding its 44th supreme convention in Washington, D.C. The Nation's Capital is the host of 10,000 delegates representing 46,000 members from 1,125 local chapters of AHEPA and its auxiliaries from 49 States, all the Provinces in Canada, Australia, and Greece. Among those present from Flint chapter No. 141 are Elias D. Chinonis, Peter Panos, Thomas C. Yeotis, Harold N. Kallis, Nick Pappadakis, Peter K. Petro, and Andrew M. Brown.

AHEPA members come from all walks of life: business, the professions, education, and labor as well as civic and governmental leadership circles. In the short time since it has come into existence, AHEPA has contributed to many worthwhile causes at the local, national, and international levels.

Not only do we welcome this fine organization to Washington but we should also recognize the great contributions which the Order of AHEPA, in particular, and the people of Greece, in general, have made toward the development and growth of our country. We are all extremely proud of the contributions of these Americans of Greek origin.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to welcome representatives of the 46,000-member AHEPA family to Washington, where their 44th international convention is being held throughout this week. The word "AHEPA" is an acronym, derived from the first letters of the following five words:

"American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association," which has local chapters in 49 States of the United States.

It is very appropriate that these American citizens of Greek descent should convene in Washington for their annual convention. In honoring all Americans by their presence in the Federal City, they can see, in turn, how very much Americans have honored the ancient Greeks, both in the architecture of democracy and in our buildings. The membership of the Order of AHEPA is composed almost entirely of American and Canadian citizens of Hellenic origin, and all Americans to some extent share their roots in Greek culture.

The ancient Greeks considered one who took no active interest in government not merely as an idler, but as useless. The order of AHEPA carries on the great Greek devotion and dedication to government by "promoting and encouraging loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens, by instructing its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and by instilling a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship." I join my colleagues in honoring these fine Americans for their role as modern citizens and for their reaffirmation this week of the founding principles and model of our democracy.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the occasion of the 44th supreme convention of the Order of AHEPA, being held this year in Washington, D.C. It thus seems appropriate for me to take this opportunity to offer my sincere appreciation for the many contributions and services rendered to the United States and the world by the Order of AHEPA, its three auxiliary organizations, and all Greek-Americans. The word "AHEPA" is made up of the first letters of five significant words—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

As embodied in its constitution, the Order of AHEPA has set high and commendable goals for itself—goals which are in keeping with the highest ideals and traditions of the United States. Thus, the Order of AHEPA encourages adherence to the laws and traditions of the United States and instructs its members in the tenets of democracy. AHEPA strives to instill in its members an appreciation for the responsibilities of citizenship and encourages active participation in political, civic, social, and commercial organizations. The order pledges itself to oppose all forms of political corruption and tyranny and actively resists any union of church and state. Directing its cultural and educational goals are the ambitions of promoting a better understanding of the ideals of Hellenism and the Hellenic cultures, promoting good fellowship and a spirit of altruism, and promoting the American educational system.

The membership of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries is composed almost entirely—95 percent—of American and Canadian citizens of Greek descent; however, there is no requirement of Hellenic descent for joining the order. Among some of its most noted members have been former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, former President Harry S. Truman, and Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, along with several present and former Members of Congress. The whole AHEPA family is composed of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries—Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena.

Over the years the Order of AHEPA has accumulated an impressive list of honorable and worthy accomplishments. Many of these have been rendered as a part of major war and disaster relief programs and in the interest of making better education more easily accessible and recognizing achievement in education and other fields. Even this list is small when compared to the wide activities of the chapters in the realm of their local communities and governments.

And so, fellow Members and Americans, it is with great pleasure and humble respect that I take this opportunity to express my appreciation and offer my continuing support and encouragement for the activities of the Order of AHEPA and our many fine Greek-American citizens.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to join with so many of our colleagues this week in expressing a welcome to the members and friends of the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliaries, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena, as they gather here in the Nation's Capital for their 44th international convention.

It is also a valuable opportunity to pay tribute to the work of the AHEPA family during its 44 years of existence, to the numerous and irreplaceable contributions to our country which have been made by our fellow Americans of Greek origin, and to the noble principles and high purposes of AHEPA which should inspire us all.

As a Member of Congress who is privileged to represent many constituents of Greek descent, I know at firsthand how greatly they have enriched our Nation, how generously they have given to their churches and communities and to civic endeavors of all kinds, how deeply they feel about the obligations and the rights of citizenship, how actively they have participated in the political and governmental life of their areas. Whatever our ethnic or national backgrounds—and they are as diverse here in this Chamber as the Nation is diverse—we are all the beneficiaries.

Among those constituents, I am informed that several will be present this week for the AHEPA convention. From chapter No. 280 in Elizabeth, there will be James G. Argyros, John H. Gallos, John Yack, and Miltiades Delfinopoulos. And from chapter No. 114 in Plainfield, there will be John Givas, George Menoutis, Marcus E. Scarkos, and Dino Dazos.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to welcome them, and to wish for them and AHEPA a most fruitful and successful convention.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in welcoming to the city of Washington members of the American Helenic Educational Progressive Association as they hold their 44th international convention.

This 46,000-member organization with chapters throughout the country, and in Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece, represents the fine traditions of Greek-American heritage.

AHEPA, as the organization is known, fosters and encourages each of its members to strive toward standards of excellence. Devotion to one country, community, and fellow man typifies the AHEPA family and its moral commitment. AHEPA's efforts toward directing attention to the educational needs of men and in promoting and disseminating culture and learning deserves our admiration.

The influence of AHEPA reaches far beyond its immediate members and spreads throughout many lands. Its objectives and accomplishments are worthy of the highest praise.

I am pleased to know there are a number of delegates to this AHEPA convention who come from Connecticut, and those from my own Third District.

I extend my warm congratulations to them and to AHEPA for the work they have accomplished, and wish them continued success in the work they are doing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Washington has the pleasure of serving as the host city for the Order of AHEPA International Convention.

AHEPA has worked during its 44 years of existence for the cultural enrichment and social improvement of numerous American communities. Those of us who are privileged to represent constituents of Greek ancestry, know full well the pride they instill and accomplishments they contribute to our cities and towns.

Greek history is world history. All that we have learned of scholarship, law, mathematics, science, philosophy, art, literature, we have learned because there was a Greek civilization to give men impetus to expand the boundaries of the mind.

On behalf of my constituents and my colleagues, it is a pleasure to salute the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliaries, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena as they meet in convention in our Nation's Capital.

H.R. 17035—WAGE BOARD RATE DETERMINATION ACT

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which is entitled the "Wage Board Rate Determination Act of 1966."

At present, wage board or blue collar workers do not receive a uniform rate of pay all over the United States, depending solely upon their job classification. The pay of these employees is adjusted to the prevailing rates paid in the different labor market areas for similar work. We therefore expect to find variations by regions and by cities. However, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported last year that they found variations up to 69 cents per hour or $27.60 per week for the same job in the same city, depending on which department of the Government the employee is employed. A staff report of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission reported only a few months ago that among custodial workers they found local differences among the agencies amounting to as much as 67 cents per hour or 46 percent.

This is not right and is a cause of unfairness and discontent, such as, in private industry, has frequently been a cause of strikes. The application of any general principle—such as the prevailing wage—is not an automatic determination. At present, 60 Federal departments and agencies fix the wage rates of 625,000 Federal employees under the wage board system.

If there are several different agencies making such determinations for the same trades and types of jobs, it is not at all surprising that they come up with different results, depending upon the quality of their sample, the size of the labor market areas selected, differences in industry coverage, and any additions or subtractions for various reasons which they feel impelled to make.

My bill, H.R. 17035, does not change the basic purpose of prevailing wage determination. It provides for a uniform system of wage determination and adjustment and thereby the elimination of the inequities from the application of the basic principle by different agencies. The bill is intended to assure uniformity and consistency between departments in the administration of their wage board programs.

The President of the United States recognized this necessity in his November 1965 memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies on the coordination of wage board activities. He stated at that time that he was deeply concerned by the differences in the systems and practices used by the departments and agencies to fix the pay for Federal wage board employees and by the extent to which resulting wage rates differ for similar work within a community.

H.R. 17035 is the answer to this request and provides for the correction of the inequities which exist. It would eliminate current inequities which inevitably have resulted from the different methods employed by various departments and agencies and insures uniformity in the treatment of all Government employees with respect to their rates of pay. It also provides for a uniform night differential of 10 percent above the day rate, which is identical with the night differential rate followed for Classification Act personnel. Here too the practices of the different departments and agencies have differed, ranging from 3 to 10 percent above the rate for day work.

The administrative changes provided in H.R. 17035 are necessary to carry out its major purpose. It provides for the establishment of a Federal Departmental Wage Board, appointed by the Secretary of Labor for terms of 3 years, two of whom shall be appointed as the representatives of bona fide employee organizations having substantial membership in the Federal civil service. Within this organization there will be wage review committees which will adjudicate appeals from disputes arising in the field and referred to the Wage Board for determination. The Wage Board is authorized to develop and maintain a uniform system of determining and adjusting rates for wage board employees and will be provided technical and specialized personnel for this purpose. At the request of the Wage Board the departments shall supply information for and cooperate in the preparation of standards for placing positions in their proper grades. After consultation with the departments, the Wage Board may revise, supplement, or abolish existing standards or prepare new standards.

I am happy to be the cosponsor of this needed legislation with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt]. In place of the lack of uniformity or consistency in the present system of wage board administration, the bill insures uniformity in the rates of pay where the same class of work is being performed. This is equal pay for equal work, a principle firmly established as fair and equitable throughout all our industries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee enact this legislation as soon as possible.

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL CIVIL SERVANT WEEK

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a resolution proclaiming a Civil Servant Week. This would provide an opportunity for expressing the gratitude which we, as Congressmen, owe Government employees. Furthermore, it would afford us the occasion to call to the attention of all Americans the importance of the work being done by the public servants.

The civil service, which replaced the spoils system, adopted a nonpartisan, professional standard not only in the selection of employees, but in all its work. We seldom stop to reflect on the significance of this standard for the operation of our Government and the preservation of our democracy.

This standard guarantees that the bureaucracy of this Government will assist and serve all elected officials regardless of the view they represent within the range of partisan politics. This is important, for it enables us to develop and to express sound but varied positions on issues discussed within the committees and on the floor of Congress. This service is essential for the maintaining of bipartisan politics. How long would our two-party system last if the bureaucracy supplied information only to members who adhered to the administration's point of view?

It is the responsibility of the Federal employees to maintain the degree of flexibility necessary to enable them to provide information for all views as an issue is being debated in Congress. Yet once a program has been enacted into law, the service works with unswerving loyalty, dedication, and efficiency to implement it. This tradition of service reflects the highest ideals of democracy and, at the same time, helps insure the efficient working of democracy throughout this country.

A well-known historian, H. G. Wells, said, well over a quarter of a century ago, that the "time may come when history, grown more penetrating, will have more to tell about the clerks and less about the conquerors." Unfortunately, that time in history has not yet arrived. The spotlight of publicity focuses the attention of the public on a few key figures, while the vast cast of Federal employees, whose work supports and sustains these stars, remain behind the scenes.

The injustice of this is compounded by the fact that Members of Congress, who are in a position both to appreciate and to benefit from this help, make so little effort to inform the public of the work done by the civil servants. We are responsible in part, for allowing the myth to develop in this country that the civil service is the refuge of mediocre men. This myth is both false and damaging.

It is not true that the elected officials rely primarily on Government employes to perform only the picayune and routine jobs. Today, we turn to the Federal employees to supply us with the most highly complex and intricate information on subjects ranging from water pollution to space programs, from civil rights to foreign affairs. More importantly, we depend on these people to administer programs in all these areas. As a result, an increasingly large number of Governmet jobs demand highly educated specialists. Indeed, in the variety and importance of positions available, the Government service in many areas overshadows private industry.

Yet the public continues to refer to civil servants more often in disparaging than in complimentary terms. More disturbing is the fact that the Brookings Institution recently published the results of a nationwide survey which showed, among other things, that the esteem and respect for the opportunities and challenges of Government employment is particularly low among persons at the upper educational and occupational levels. As a result, many of our finest young people in college and graduate school fail even to consider the possibility of working for the Government. These, of course, are the very persons whom the service needs and whom it must attract.

Unless public opinion comes to recognize the opportunities and achievements of Government employees, the civil service will fail to attract the number of trained and qualified people needed to fill the jobs. No Government service can achieve and maintain excellence without public respect. Excellence and honor must move forward side by side; improvement in personnel and performance must be accompanied by meaningful efforts to generate public pride and recognition of accomplishment.

Only with a renewed determination to deal forthrightly and resolutely with the problem of enhancing the prestige of public employment can we expect the civil service to retain and continue to attract the quality of personnel required to keep pace with the Government's growing need for experts.

Designating 1 week to honor civil servants is an important first step. During this week, we, as the elected officials of this Government, could express our respect and gratitude for the caliber and performance of the civil servants. Such recognition would promote public respect for the service, and thereby further strengthen democracy throughout this Nation.

H.R. 17034—A BILL TO ELIMINATE THE INEQUITY IN OUR POSTAL CITY DELIVERY SERVICE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in 1863 the Post Office Department instituted free city delivery service, a service which is now taken for granted in millions of American homes. The daily arrival of mail through door slot or in door receptacle is as much a part of our postal service as the special delivery letter or parcel post and, indeed, predates both. As of June 30, 1965, 4.4 million business firms and 46.3 million residential families were receiving city delivery service.

Yet, some 7 million of these American families were receiving not door-to-door, but only curbside delivery. A number of these famlies were so-called out-of-bounds patrons, persons living in sparsely populated areas outside city delivery limits.

However, as of January 1965, 3.3 million of these families were eligible for regular city delivery service. The areas in which they lived were 50 percent improved with homes, and they met the other postal requirements of adequate sidewalks, street signs, and house numbers. Yet these families, and I am sure many more today, a year and a half later, do not receive door-to-door delivery even though they are entitled to it. And even though, I might add, their neighbors in adjacent areas are receiving such service.

In May 1963 as a cost-saving measure the Post Office Department issued an order stopping the conversion of curbside to door delivery. Limited exceptions were made for, for instance, a house built on a vacant lot on a street where all other homes received door delivery or where a postmaster had already made door delivery commitments. But with the exception of apartment houses, door delivery was not to be instituted in new residential areas, including townhouse projects.

Thus, during the past 3 years an increasing number of families, eligible for door delivery, have had to put up curbside mailboxes. They have not shared in the benefits of door delivery, but rather have had to walk to their mailboxes to pick up their mail, certainly an inconvenience for elderly persons and at times of sickness or inclement weather.

Granted that the farmer must also walk to his mailbox. However, these families have chosen city living with its attendant benefits, whether they be police protection, fire department coverage, or city mail delivery. They are qualified for the door delivery which other families are receiving.

This lack of adequate city delivery service is especially evident in those States with rapidly growing populations and new residential developments. A list from the Post Office Department giving the location of 2.8 million of these homes receiving curbside delivery, while qualified for door delivery, shows that 536,949 of these homes are in Florida. Indeed, more of these homes are in Florida than in any other State, with California being the next highest at 342,572 residences. This Post Office Department action has, thus, had a special impact on Floridians, although its effects are nationwide.

For this reason. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 17034, making an appropriation to the Post Office Department to enable it to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for this door delivery. The Post Office has estimated the annual cost of this conversion as about $43 million. This bill would appropriate $39,325,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1967 and would thereby correct an inequity suffered by so many American families.

THE GRAND CANYON DAMS—A REBUTTAL

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a significant clarification of the controversy over the Grand Canyon dams was presented in Los Angeles 4 weeks ago by Dr. Richard C. Bradley, professor of physics, Colorado College.

Dr. Bradley's talk was in rebuttal of one given to the same audience 3 weeks before by Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy. Mr. Dominy's talk was inserted in the RECORD a few days later.

Richard Bradley is a member of a distinguished family of Bradleys that the University of Wisconsin remembers well. All have made notable contributions to conservation in support of what an earlier Wisconsin conservationist, the famous John Muir, advocated so eloquently in his lifetime.

Dr. Bradley's article in National Audubon magazine entitled "Ruin for Grand Canyon?" was reprinted in Reader's Digest and brought nationwide attention to the tremendous threat to conservation in America posed by the unnecessary Grand Canyon dams. I recommend his highly competent rebuttal to my colleagues and to the public.

Dr. Bradley's statement follows:

THE GRAND CANYON DAMS

(A rebuttal by Dr. Richard C. Bradley, professor of physics, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo., before the Los Angeles, Calif., town hall meeting on July 19, 1966)

I appreciate very much the opportunity to address this forum on the subject of the Grand Canyon dams. Three weeks ago you heard Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, present the case for the dams. Today I am to present the case against them. I shall endeavor to show that these dams are neither necessary nor desirable and hence should not be built.

Let me begin by defining the controversy.

If you will look at the map of the lower Colorado River, you will observe that the great waterway is almost completely harnessed by dams. Starting at its mouth in Baja California and working upstream along the main stem, we pass in succession Morelos Dam, Imperial Dam, Palo Verde Dam, Headgate Rock Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, Hoover Dam, and Glen Canyon Dam. From the upper end of Lake Powell (the reservoir created by Glen Canyon Dam) in south central Utah, all the way down to the sea—a distance of nearly 1,000 miles—there is just one important section of the original wild and beautiful Colorado River remaining. That is in Grand Canyon, between Lee's Ferry and Lake Mead, America's best known scenic resource, unmatched anywhere in the world.

The present controversy is over the question of what should be done with Grand Canyon. Conservationists wish to preserve it, the Bureau wants to dam it in two places, and thus we have a conflict.

My sympathies are with the conservationists. I firmly believe that the National Park system, which would be violated by these dams, is worth defending; and I firmly believe that Grand Canyon, because of its superlative qualities, is worth preserving. Before arguing this further, however, I wish first to establish that the two proposed dams will serve no purpose that cannot be served at least as well in a variety of other ways. If that is true, then nothing will be sacrificed by not building them.

To establish this, we need to know what the dams are for. Mr. Dominy did not tell you their purpose—at least not in his prepared text which I have with me. Most of his paper deals with the unquestioned need for water in the Southwest, the steps the Bureau has taken over the years to develop new supplies, and the "unprincipled" attacks the Bureau is now being subjected to by "hysterical" conservationists.

The dams are to be part of a vast regional reclamation project designed to bring more water to areas of shortage. Arizona, for example, would for the first time receive her rightful share of the Colorado River; the water would be pumped to the Tucson-Phoenix area from Parker Dam. Southern California would also receive large quantities of water, either from the Pacific Northwest, or from the ocean, or both. The other Colorado Basin States, and even certain States east of the Rockies, would also benefit from the plan.

It would be a mistake to infer, however—as many people have—that the Grand Canyon Dams, because they are part of this water supply proposal, are themselves to be water supply dams. If that were the case, it might be harder to question their importance in the arid Southwest.

But that is not the case. The sole purpose of the Grand Canyon dams is to produce power, and, through the sale of power, revenues to help pay back the costs of building the rest of the project. Grand Canyon would be dammed for profit, not for water.

So my first main point is this: the choice to be made here is not between water and scenery. The dams would have no hydrologic function whatever. They would furnish no water to anyone, nor reclaim one acre of desert, nor control any floods.

As a matter of fact they would waste water. The reservoirs they would create would evaporate an estimated 100,000 acre-feet per year, and that is enough water to supply all the needs of a city of more than half a million people or to irrigate 30,000 acres of new farmland. The West will actually have less water if the Bureau builds these dams.

Next, let us ask if the power the dams will generate can be produced in other ways.

Of course it can. There is certainly no shortage of power potential in the Southwest. The major hydrosites are pretty well used up, but the region does happen to be one of the world's richest storehouses of fossil and nuclear fuels. The Bureau's Pacific Southwest Water Plan itself reads: "The total proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon capacity will provide only a small increment of the projected future demand of the area. . . . The major portion of the future electrical energy demand of the area in the Pacific Southwest will be generated by thermoelectric plants. Reserves of fossil fuels are more than adequate to meet foreseeable power needs." Water may be in short supply (and reservoir evaporation will make it shorter still) but certainly not power potential.

Just to underscore this statement I would mention a new mine-mouth steamplant that is being planned for southern Utah which, when completed, will generate as much power as all the dams on the Colorado River put together, including the two proposed ones in Grand Canyon. No wonder that a recent newspaper story (*Grand Junction* Sentinel, 6/22/66) referred to the Colorado Basin as a region of excess power.

Nor can it be claimed that the dams have any important economic advantage over the thermal plants. They will cost several hundred dollars per installed kilowatt of capacity to build; modern steamplants cost about $100 per installed kilowatt. They will sell power at between 5 and 6 mills per kilowatt-hour; a private steamplant at Shiprock, New Mexico, is today delivering power in this same price range and pays taxes and dividends besides.

No one can predict the future with certainty, but we do know that the trend in thermal power generating costs is downward. If the Grand Canyon dams are to pay out as planned, they must continue to sell power at 5 to 6 mills/kwh for the next half century. However, a report recently prepared for the Interior Department by the Nathan Associates, Inc. forecasts that by 1980 steam power will be delivered to Phoenix at about 4.5 mills. And the Office of Science and Technology predicts that in 10 years large seaboard nuclear plants will be producing enormous quantities of power at very low cost and fresh water in considerable quantities besides (800,000 acre-feet per year per plant).

These are only bits and pieces, but they certainly support my second main point, which is that the Grand Canyon dams are not needed to alleviate any supposed power shortage.

To this the Bureau argues that the power itself is not the important thing, but the kind of power. Hydroplants, unlike steamplants, have great flexibility for meeting sudden load changes. This makes them ideally suited for supplying peaking power—that extra power that is needed for short durations such as in the early evening when a million lights and stoves are all turned on. This is the kind of power the Grand Canyon dams are scheduled to provide.

The Bureau, of course, is correct that hydropower has great flexibility. It is easier to draw down water from a reservoir than to fire up another boiler in a steam plant when the load goes up. But this still does not mean that dams must be built in Grand Canyon.

Above and below Grand Canyon are four major hydroplants already in existence. Of these, only Hoover is being used at all for peaking, and only to a partial extent. If there were an acute shortage of peaking power in the region, which there is not, the Southwest could do what Boston has already done; it could relegate existing hydroplants to peaking service while using steam for baseload.

In addition, the Southwest will soon be able to import peaking power from the hydro-rich Northwest in exchange for firm power from the coal-rich Southwest. The new Northwest-Southwest electrical intertie will make this exchange possible, and will benefit both areas.

Until all existing hydroplants are being used for peaking service and found to be inadequate, there can be little force to the contention that two new peaking plants must be built in Grand Canyon.

If the day does come when existing hydroplants are no longer adequate, the Southwest can get peaking power in other ways. The rest of the country does. Washington, D.C. and Pittsburgh use steam plants, inefficient though they may be. St. Louis uses pumpback storage. Some areas will undoubtedly use nuclear power for peaking before long; there is no known technical reason why nuclear plants cannot be used for this purpose.

The alternatives are many. The Southwest does not need the Grand Canyon dams in order to meet its power peaks. That is my third main point.

Finally, we consider the question of revenues. Are there other ways of raising money to finance the building of the aqueducts and the pumping plants?

Of course there are. The United States has never found it hard to raise money for worthy projects. Several methods were suggested at the recent Congressional hearings. One witness, a mathematician, suggested eliminating both dams and selling the 100,000 acre-feet of water that would not be evaporated each year to municipal and industrial users in the Lower Basin. Making all the same assumptions that the Bureau makes regarding payout schedules, project costs, use of revenues from other dams, and the like, he was able to show that the project would be almost as feasible without the dams as with them—the reason being that there would be no need to pay back the ¾ billion capital investment in the dams.

Ridiculous? I don't believe it either. But when Mr. Dominy was asked about this at the hearings, he replied: "This would be contrary to longstanding reclamation policy, but if it were done, you could theoretically do it and actually have a small remaining surplus of $100 million dollars." So this, theoretically, could be done.

A second alternative method of financing the project was presented by two professional economists from the Rand Corporation and a nuclear engineer from Atomics International. According to their detailed analysis, nuclear plants or a combination of nuclear and pumped storage plants would be economically superior to the Grand Canyon dams.

It is an interesting commentary on the ways of power politics that one western Congressman on the committee made a determined effort to prevent this material from being put in the record of the hearings, and, having failed that, spent the remainder of his time trying to embarrass the witnesses instead of exploring the possible merits of their proposition.

And how did the Bureau react to this one? I quote from Mr. Dominy's speech to you three weeks ago: "Such ideas have a singular lack of practical support in Congress. Thermal or nuclear power alternatives to either or both of these dams are not options open to consideration under present Congressional thinking or experience." If I read this statement correctly, he is suggesting that it is easier to go ahead and build the dams than to waste time considering the alternatives. Are policy makers really this inflexible? I do not believe they are. I think they have simply not been told what the alternatives are.

A third way of raising money was offered by another professional economist. This is the simplest alternative of all. It involves no construction and pays out far more handsomely than the Bureau's plan. Moreover, it contains none of the uncertainties inherent in trying to estimate streamflows and power rates 60 years hence. The method consists simply of borrowing money from the Treasury, as the Bureau would have to do to build its dams, and then putting it in a savings account. This person calculated that a capital investment of ⅓ of the cost of one of the dams might conceivably pay back close to 6 times as much as that dam would pay back during the 73 year financial life of the project. A similar analysis applied to the other dam gave a similar but less spectacular result.

And the Bureau's response? I now quote from page 774 of the record of the hearings a year ago when a very similar, but less detailed, suggestion was made. The Bureau said: "While this could be done if the Congress so desired, it would represent a drastic change in reclamation law and policy laid down by the Congress over many years. We believe this should be considered only as a last step and only in the event that other, more conventional methods of providing financial assistance prove inadequate."

Again the same resistance to change. Don't tamper with a well-oiled machine even if it isn't the latest model! But you notice that the Bureau did say it could be done, and obviously it can.

So—and this is my fourth main point—there are plenty of ways of financing this regional water project. Building dams in Grand Canyon is only one among many, and a pretty expensive and risky one at that.

Summing up all the arguments so far, we can say that:

1. The Grand Canyon dams are not needed to conserve water.
2. They are not needed for power.
3. They are not needed for peaking power.
4. They are not needed to raise money.

I do not deny that if they were to be built they could be used for some of these purposes. My only contention so far is that they need not be built for any of them. As I said in the beginning, they will do nothing that cannot be done at least as well in other ways, and therefore nothing essential will be sacrificed by not building them.

Why, then, this rigid insistence on the dams? Why are the proponents more willing to become embroiled in a national controversy than to consider any alternative proposal? Why do they jeopardize, or at least delay, their entire water project when water, the only critical commodity here, is not even in contention?

I believe that the answers to these questions can be inferred from the repeated assertions that the alternative proposals are inconsistent with current reclamation practice. Secretary Udall himself said at a press conference at Tucson not long ago: "Water salvage in the west is tied historically to hydropower. Anything else would require a whole new type of reclamation program."

The Bureau is obviously in a bind. According to present policy it must sell hydropower to pay for its water salvage program, but according to southwestern geography the only place left to produce this power is in Grand Canyon. Faced with this situation, it can either (1) try to get a change in reclamation policy, or (2) rally all the support it can get, lower its head, and charge. Evidently it has chosen the latter course, and has persuaded the political leaders in the region that this way offers the best chance for Congressional approval of their water supply projects.

I would like to make a plea for the former course, that is, to try to change reclamation policy. We pride ourselves on being rational beings. I refuse to believe that in the United States of America—the best educated nation on earth—a counterproposal to the Grand Canyon dams can be physically feasible, economically superior, ethically and aesthetically preferable and still be legally impossible.

After all, the law has not always read the way it does now; it has evolved. The Federal Reclamation Service dates back to 1902, but power did not become one of its major concerns until the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928, and power revenues were not directly linked to the reclamation fund until the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment of 1939. The present policy, then, is less than 30 years old.

Should it now be revised to obviate the need for dams in Grand Canyon? We feel it should. We feel the law should be changed rather than Grand Canyon.

I will now make what I suppose Mr. Dominy would call some "emotional" statements. I have suggested reasons why the Grand Canyon dams need not be built. I have done this by describing some of the alternatives to them. I wish now to argue why they should not be built. This is harder to do because it involves subjective judgments, and such things cannot be put in a table of figures or on a graph. They have to do with the kind of America we want to live in, the things we cherish, and the opportunities we want our children and theirs to have. I do not apologize for this. Most of the things in life which have meaning for us cannot be quantified. My accepting your invitation to speak here today, for example, was certainly not motivated by any desire to discuss Bureau economics or power trends. I came here because I do not approve, for subjective reasons, of what the Bureau proposes to do to Grand Canyon and I was grateful for the chance to be able to say so.

I might point out, parenthetically, that Mr. Dominy is quite capable of making "emotional" statements of his own. Perhaps you have seen the magazine "Lake Powell—Jewel of the Colorado" which the Bureau prepared at public expense and is now circulating as widely as possible to gain legislative support for this project. It tells you, among other things, that dams are built for religious reasons!

> "To have a deep blue lake
> Where no lake was before
> Seems to bring man
> A little closer to God."

Perhaps so. It would be hard to prove him wrong. I wonder if Henry Ford felt the same way about Fords.

But to return to the issue. I am against building the Grand Canyon dams because (1) they will needlessly violate the national park system and (2) they will needlessly impair Grand Canyon. I feel that Grand Canyon would serve its highest cultural purpose to this country and to the world if left just as it is.

As you can see from the map, the dams would be located just above and just below the national reservations—one in Marble Gorge (recently renamed Marble Canyon), the other in Lower Granite Gorge, both on the main stem of the river, both in Grand Canyon proper.

The one in lower Granite Gorge, the so-called Bridge Canyon Dam (recently renamed Hualapai Dam), would back up water through the entire length of Grand Canyon National Monument and 13 miles into Grand Canyon National Park—areas which, according to the National Park Act of 1916, are supposed to be "preserved unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The Bureau argues that the encroachment on the Park was authorized by the Grand Canyon Act of 1919. The relevant wording is: "That whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said Park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of the areas therein which may be necessary for the development of a Government reclamation project." I leave it to you to judge whether power development in Grand Canyon can be construed as (1) "necessary," (2) "reclamation," or (3) "consistent with the primary purposes of the park."

I can see why the Act might have been written this way. In 1919 there were no major dams on the river. But everyone knew that water diversion and flood control structures would some day have to be built, although at that time no one knew just where, so the Act was worded in such a way as not to preclude *essential* water developments along the river. Today, however, these structures have long since been completed—outside of Grand Canyon. Consequently there is now no need for *any* projects inside Grand Canyon, *even water projects*. Nevertheless, the Bureau, which in 1919 was in the power business only in an incidental sort of way, is today claiming in effect that the Act of 1919 was written as it was in order to permit the construction of this hydroelectric power dam.

The encroachment on the *Monument* has even less justification, and the Monument is scheduled for a greater face-lifting than the Park. There is absolutely nothing in the 1932 proclamation creating it which permits any reclamation projects whatever, essential or otherwise. This probably explains why the proponents of the dam seldom mention the Monument (see, for example, the Bureau's map in the *Los Angeles Times*, July 7, 1966). Yet, by law, national monuments are entitled to exactly the same degree of protection as national parks, so the violation here is just as serious as the violation of the Park.

The document the Bureau cites to justify the encroachment on the Monument is a letter written in 1933 by the then Director of the National Park Service to the then Commissioner of Reclamation, saying that in his opinion Bridge Canyon Dam could be built. Not a law, mind you, but a letter. And the opinion is not even that of the Interior Department Solicitor.

The Bureau asserts that this dam would not only not hurt Grand Canyon (". . . the vista from the rim will be unchanged . . .") but would actually improve it by making it all accessible ("Multitudes hunger for a lake in the sun.").

Such statements, implying as they do that the purpose of national parks is merely to provide scenery and mass recreation, shows an astonishing ignorance of the cultural—the scientific and historic—values of these areas. As the eminent ecologist the late Aldo Leopold observed long ago (and I paraphrase his statement), in a civilization such as ours which buffers its people from the natural world, wild areas give us our only true perspective of the whole human enterprise, for in the final analysis it is the good earth and not industry which supports us. Parks do provide scenery and recreation, that is true, but the scenery is the scenery of the small as well as the large, the wildflower gardens as well as the distant peaks, and the recreation is the unique kind of re-creation, or renewal of the spirit, that comes from visiting unspoiled wilderness. In short we go to parks to listen to the symphony of nature, not the music of Evinrudes.

And the fact that much of the canyon is inaccessible to all but a hardy and adventurous few is not a bad thing. I do not think we want to reduce every last bit of outdoor experience to the same bland, monotonous, pasteurized formula. Some people—particularly youngsters—prefer and even need the adventure of climbing a difficult peak, or of sailing a small boat across open water, or of testing their skill with a paddle on a thundering river, with all the rewards and hazards and penalties these things entail. I think we should leave some of these challenges for the youngsters of tomorrow—here, in America, not 10,000 miles away in some undeveloped country.

Do the other agencies in the Interior Department, those that are better qualified to judge park values, agree with the Bureau? What do they have to say about Bridge Canyon Dam? Or, rather, what *did* they have to say about it before they were silenced?

The National Park Service said that a Bridge Canyon Dam would inevitably result in "the *loss of park value of national significance* (emphasis added) . . ." The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation stated flatly "No additional recreation benefits can be claimed for the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam because of the unusual existing recreation values of the proposed reservoir area and the *adverse effects* (emphasis added) the dam would have on these values." So the conservationists are not without official backing in their views.

It is interesting to note however, that even though the Bureau of the Budget has recommended deferral of this dam, the only Interior Department witnesses who were present at Congressional hearings were the dam builders. The defense of the parks was left entirely to the amateurs, in return for which the tax exempt status of one of their organizations is now being challenged by the Internal Revenue Service.

I have discussed the encroachment of Bridge Canyon Reservoir on already dedicated areas. Marble Gorge Reservoir is less contentious from this particular standpoint, since it would lie entirely outside the Park and Monument. However, the Bureau's oft repeated assurance that it would have no effect on the Park seems to ignore the fact that the dam will be operated as a peaking facility, which means it will alternately choke off and release great quantities of water. It is hard for me to believe that the daily fluctuations in the river level below the dam, estimated by the Bureau to be about 15 vertical feet, would have no effect on the Park—or on campers sleeping on sandbars near the river's edge.

The main argument against this dam, however, is that it will flood Marble Gorge which is considered by many to be the most beautiful stretch of Grand Canyon and worthy of inclusion in the Park. This, by the way, is the opinion of that well known river runner, Barry Goldwater. Mr. Goldwater is, of course in favor of the water project, being from Arizona. But he recently expressed the wish that a way could be found to eliminate this dam, and many years ago he did make an unsuccessful attempt to increase the size of the Park, just as some Congressmen are trying to do today.

And so conservationists all over the country are opposing both dams on the grounds that they will needlessly impair superlative areas that have either already been set aside or that should be. I have now given you the reasons why they need not be built and why they should not be built.

The issue moves swiftly to a showdown. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is scheduled to vote on the water project tomorrow, and will undoubtedly approve it with both dams in it. Then the bill moves on to the floor of the House and finally to the Senate. "The great debate" should all be over by next spring.

To me, the issue seems absolutely clear cut. I cannot understand why there should even be a debate. Consider the alternatives:

On the one hand: two unnecessary, wasteful, expensive, destructive power dams. The water project they would serve would in no physical way be impaired if they were eliminated.

And on the other hand: a superlative canyon, earth's finest book whose pages read back more than 2 billion years, part of which has already been set aside for permanent protection from precisely this sort of encroachment in a national park system that is the envy of the world.

How could the conservationists possibly have a stronger case than this one? I doubt that they could. Yet they are fighting desperately against a deck that seems to be completely stacked against them.

I will close with the prediction that the face of America a half century from now will depend strongly on the outcome of this particular struggle. What happens here will set the pattern for many years to come. I think it is not too much to say that the fate of the entire national park idea is in the balance.

If the conservationists lose at Grand Canyon, it is doubtful they could ever win anywhere else. After all, every one of our national parks has reservoir basins, marketable timber, mineral resources, or motel sites. And next time the promoters will have added a legal weapon to their armament, that of "precedent." They will be able to point to the decision at Grand Canyon. And so the bites will be taken, one at a time, each one merely a "peripheral invasion" that will not hurt some park very much. But as the Denver Post recently observed, the cumulative effect of all these bites "will be just as deadly as if Congress passed a bill calling for the gradual destruction of all wild and scenic areas." The park system would be gone, in fact if not in name.

If the conservationists win, however, the national park system will be stronger than ever, for Congress will once again have affirmed its intention of keeping these dedicated areas inviolate for the unique benefits they can provide in a world already overcrowded with the works of man.

This, the 50th Anniversary of the National Park Service, is its year of decision. I wish it luck.

SUGAR REFINING IN MAINE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have information which will be of interest to our membership and which should reassure my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] who recently expressed further concern about Maine's burgeoning sugar industry.

On August 11, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] told this body that he is concerned that the development of a sugar refinery to process raw cane in Maine may place in jeopardy the jobs of 1,000 of his constituents. Now I believe it is noble of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] to show concern for his constituents and would be deeply grieved should there be a real basis for his fears.

Fortunately, I have at hand facts which should dispel these fears and bring joy to the heart of my good friend and colleague. The partial conversion of the sugar refinery located at Easton, Maine, for the processing of cane poses no threat to Boston's two refineries or any other.

In researching facts to reply to Mr. O'NEILL's recent statement, I was astounded to learn that sugar consumption in the United States is increasing at a rate of over 100,000 tons a year. Obviously, more refineries will be needed to supply the increasing demand.

My research indicates that the sugar market is not over supplied, but rather that there exists some concern that the refineries now in operation will be able to keep up with the increasing demand. Sugar refineries are presently running at 75 to 80 percent of capacity, and I am informed that this is the normal full load capacity.

Recognizing that consumption of sugar would exceed earlier estimates, the U.S. Department of Agriculture on July 7 of this year announced an increase of 100,000 tons in its sugar import quotas for 1966. During the following week the Agriculture Department announced an additional increase of 125,000 tons, raising its estimated total for U.S. sugar consumption in 1966 from 10 million tons to 10,225,000 tons.

Agriculture Department officials have told me that these substantial increases were ordered to assure adequate supplies for current consumer needs. It can be expected that the U.S. rate of sugar consumption will continue to increase.

Because, as I have said, refineries are already working at peak capacity, the increased import allotments create a substantial demand for additional processing facilities. The beet plant under construction at Easton, Maine, was designed in such a way as to be easily adapted to the processing of cane. Because of the foresight of its designers and builders it is now possible to develop this potential for a modest investment of which the Economic Development Administration has seen fit to lend $2,250,300. This is a good investment by EDA and fully consistent with sound, long-range economic planning and the basic purpose of this agency, helping in the economic development in such areas as Aroostook County.

In order to illustrate my statement that the Maine refinery poses no threat to the rest of the industry I offer the following facts. The 225,000 tons of raw cane recently added to import quotas will produce approximately 4½ million bags of sugar. During its off season after processing Maine grown sugarbeets, the Maine Sugar Industries plant will be able to process only 2½ to 3 million bags of cane sugar annually, substantially less than the recently approved increase alone.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] has brought up the fact that some of the machinery and steel which has gone into the construction of the Maine plant was purchased in West Germany. A few facts about this matter are worthy of restating at this time.

First. U.S. firms had every opportunity to bid for this work.

Second. None of them would come near the firm eventually chosen, on the basis of engineering, early delivery, price, completion of project, or performance guarantees.

Third. The portion of the project cost spent outside the United States is less than one-third of the total cost.

Fourth. A substantial portion of the contract granted to the West German firm has been subcontracted back to American firms.

Fifth. There are no American firms which specialize solely in the building of sugar refineries, and every refinery built contains equipment made outside the United States. The Maine refinery is not unique in this respect.

I would also remind my colleague that trade is a two-way street. This fact is brought forcefully to my mind by the recollection that one of our larger Maine industries, the Bath Iron Works, is presently constructing two missile destroyers for the West German Government under a $40 million contract. Coincidently, this contract was negotiated at about the same time that the order for the sugar equipment was placed. This exchange of business between Maine firms and the West German Government hardly poses any threat to our balance of payments.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] questions the quality of Maine grown sugarbeets. He, like the Great Western Sugar Co. before him is wrong in believing that sugarbeets cannot be grown properly in northern Maine. The current beet crop was inspected by the Chief of the Agriculture Department Sugar Division, Thomas Murphy, and by Secretary Freeman himself just last week. Both were most favorably impressed by what they saw.

I share Mr. O'NEILL's disappointment that only 3,500 acres of beets were grown in Maine this year on an acreage allotment of 33,000 acres. This is understandable, however.

It is never easy to change patterns and to sell new ideas. Other areas have experienced difficulty when efforts were made to diversify crops.

When Aroostook County growers planted this spring, the sugar refinery was hardly more than a tower of steel beams surrounded by piles of building material and equipment; hardly a sight to inspire confidence that a plant will be in operation to process beets by the end of the year. Most farmers decided to wait until next year.

I am confident that within 3 years Maine farmers will be successfully growing sugarbeets on all 33,000 acres allotted them.

I am confident, also, that Maine's sugar industry will thrive, providing new jobs and spurring other industrial development in the area. And I am also confident that this will come about without harming the Boston refineries or their employees.

It is my sincere hope that the facts I have today brought to light will reassure my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and that he will desist in his attacks on our new Maine industry.

His efforts and mine can best be utilized in working together in behalf of all citizens and all the industry of all New England.

THE FARMER'S ROLE IN CONSERVATION

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the work of the farmer and the rural conservation expert in our effort to protect the productivity and beauty of our country is often ignored. Recent legislation has enabled the farmer and the rural community to expand their roles as preservers and protectors of the soil.

Today we have such programs as Greenspan, which aid the conversion of farmlands into conservation and recreation projects. Two weeks ago I was honored to participate in the dedication of the Carroll, Iowa, Greenspan project, one of the first in the country.

Another part of the rural conservation efforts is the watershed protection program. I have testified twice within a week in support of individual projects—the Dane Ridge Watershed and the Three Mile Creek Watershed. Together these projects will halt the damage of erosion and floods to over 45,000 acres of Iowa farmland.

The watershed projects mentioned above as well as others had been delayed for over 6 months by the Bureau of the Budget. The extraordinary length of time that the Bureau took to review this application could not be alone traced to the time needed to study the application. This delay provoked my colleagues and me to introduce a concurrent resolution which demanded that the project applications be released to their proper committees as soon as possible.

In view of this progress in conservation, it is fitting that this Soil Conservation Service report on the work of the soil conservation districts of America be presented to this body for its attention and edification:

CONSERVATION DISTRICT ACTIVITIES VITAL TO NATION'S ECONOMY AND WELFARE

The pulse of rural America's economy has quickened under Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's strong leadership and the vigorous soil and water conservation efforts he has initiated.

Latent opportunities in soil and water resource development are now realized assets. Local soil and water conservation districts, assisted by U.S.D.A., have keyed their programs to economic development. Legislation has given them new tools to strengthen these programs.

New techniques of sound planning and resource development—and the benefits derived—are reaching 150,000 more farmers and rural landowners than in 1960. And on more than 100 million acres resource plans have been developed during the sixties with help given by the Department of Agriculture to soil conservation districts.

About three-fourths of the Nation's land is privately operated. What is done on this land concerns all of us. Our food and fiber depends on it. Our industry depends on the products from it. Our streams and reservoirs are only as clear as the care of this land allows them to be. The tragedies of many of the headlined floods we read about every year could be avoided if better care were taken of it—if communities had better means to work together to hold back the water that rushes over this land and through countryside and town and city.

Yes, the care given rural lands has far-reaching effects.

Four years ago Secretary of Agriculture Freeman asked soil conservation districts to revise their programs to respond to the resource and economic needs of their communities. He asked that their programs give special attention to recreation, fish and wildlife development, forestry, watershed development, water supply, and land-use changes in rapidly developing areas.

Conservation districts reacted immediately. There was no question that their experience made them the natural center of resource development activities. There was no question that it was through such activities that a stronger base for rural economy could be formed.

Today more than 75 percent of the 3,000 conservation districts in the Nation are carrying out their programs under a new working agreement with the Department of Agriculture to make better use of the technical and financial help that is available.

Recreation has become a new source of income for many farmers. With USDA help through conservation districts, farmers have established facilities for hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, picknicking, and swimming—all among the most popular outdoor activities demanded by an outdoor-bent society.

The Food and Agriculture Act passed by the Congress in 1962 gave impetus to recreation development. It authorized the Department of Agriculture to give technical and financial help to farmers and other rural landowners in establishing recreation as a part of their conservation planning. More than 31,500 have taken advantage of this help. At least 50,000 more are seeking help. In switching to recreation, they have diverted more than 600,000 acres of land from other uses.

Important steps to stimulate rural economy are being taken by rural and townspeople in a new approach offered by Resource Conservation and Development projects. Authorities in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 are being used by the Department of Agriculture to help local people carry out the projects.

Economic growth in many rural communities has been held back because of lack of development of the often-times abundant resources at their disposal. Resource Conservation and Development projects provide the stimulus and the help to inventory the resources and to get their development in motion.

The response to this approach has been tremendous. Project planning has stimulated private economic actions even before the projects got under way. Local people have recognized the projects a a chance to bring their economy up to standard. They have recognized that their land and water resources are the base upon which other actions must rest.

Most of the projects include development of water for municipal, industrial, recreation, flood prevention, and agricultural uses; improvement of recreation facilities and historical and scenic attractions; encouragement of new industries to process products of the area; and improvement of markets for crop and livestock products.

The Department of Agriculture, as its part, is giving priority to soil surveys, conservation planning, small watershed projects, cost sharing and credit assistance, cooperatives, and long-range planning.

This is a new approach and we expect highly significant results, so far, 20 projects in 21 States have been planned and are now receiving help in carrying out their plans. The projects are in Georgia, Idaho-Washington, Indiana, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Ten others were approved for planning assistance in November 1965. They are in Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and West Virginia.

Our growing population is making increasing and varied demands on our resources. How we meet these demands, and the economic gains to be realized in meeting them, depend on sound resource planning and development. The job cannot be done piecemeal, with each interest—each organization—taking off in its own direction. Soil conservation districts—with their recently revised programs—have set in motion sound efforts that form the basis for making rural America a better place to live and to work.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on August 12 the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee approved Senate Joint Resolution 186 in order to halt the airline strike. I rise to express my opposition to this legislation which, if enacted, would set collective bargaining back 100 years.

Free collective bargaining, coupled with the right to strike, has been instrumental in improving the workingman's lot in America. It has secured for him shorter working hours, increased wages, better working conditions, and countless other benefits. In short, collective bargaining has liberated the workingman from conditions so abhorrent they can only be likened to involuntary servitude.

The struggle to liberate the workingman began early in our Nation's history. As early as 1778, journeymen printers in New York City combined to demand an increase in wages. These early attempts to unionize were met by charges of criminal conspiracy and court action.

But working men and women courageously persisted in their struggle to improve their working conditions. One by one, their objectives were achieved. As a result of their efforts, laws were passed to prohibit child labor, to limit working hours of women, and to legalize an 8-hour workday.

The culmination of this struggle came in 1935 with the passage of the Wagner Act which established for the first time on a national level the policy of protecting the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively.

Now we are being asked to cast our votes on legislation which would jeopardize these basic rights. We are being asked to discriminate against the working people of America by forcing them to work against their will. In effect, we are being asked to set collective bargaining back 100 years.

There has been much discussion about the Government's role in protecting the public interest when a national emergency exists. But the facts do not support the contention that a national emergency does, in fact, exist.

Let us bear in mind that during this strike, which involves only five airlines, six trunk airlines are still operating. In addition, there are three all-cargo domestic carriers and four helicopter carriers still operating, as well as general intrastate carriers.

The carriers still operating have absorbed approximately 35 percent, or 52,500, of the passengers normally using the five struck airlines which at peak periods carried about 150,000 passengers daily. This means that approximately 97,500 people in the United States out of a total population of 190 million are being temporarily inconvenienced. Does this constitute a national emergency which warrants Government intervention?

According to Department of Commerce statistics, the airlines carry only one-tenth of 1 percent of intercity freight traffic. Trucks, ships, pipelines, and railroads are still moving 99 percent of the freight in this country. Does this situation call for abolishing the basic American freedom to strike and bargain collectively?

Moreover, all planes flying cargo and personnel to Vietnam or other posts through the facilities of the Military Airlift Command are on schedule and are being serviced by the International Association of Machinists. Does this mean we are jeopardizing our military defenses or our commitments around the globe?

It is evident from the facts that the airline strike is creating an inconvenience, but it is equally obvious that no national emergency exists. The President himself has indicated that he does not regard the airline strike as a national emergency.

Can the Congress then in good conscience proceed to tamper with the established right of the American workers to strike and to bargain collectively? I am firmy convinced that passage of this legislation would establish a dangerous precedent and would set the wrong course for the future of our country.

If we jeopardize the basic freedom of the working people of America to strike and to bargain collectively, we are rejecting those lofty principles on which our country was founded. The right to achieve human dignity through collective action is an integral part of our democracy.

Let us continue to protect and preserve that right which has helped to build a better America for all of our people. I urge my colleagues to uphold our historic democratic principles and vote against Senate Joint Resolution 186.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO RESIDENTS OF MICHIGAN'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on the first of May I sent a questionnaire to the 135,000 homes in Michigan's First Congressional District asking the residents about some of the important questions of the day. The 4,264 responses were most heartening to me because they indicate my constituents' interest and concern for much of the legislation I have worked on during my 2 years as a Member of this body.

The questionnaire reflects the desire of the residents of the First Congressional District for programs and policies which will improve the condition of life for all Americans through stronger civil rights legislation, stable spending policies for domestic programs, an increased minimum wage, consumer protection, and help with family planning. The response to the questions concerning the war in Vietnam is indicative of their awareness of the problems created by the war and the decreased emphasis on funds for domestic programs which the increased spending for the war effort has caused. It is the belief of my constituents that a peaceful solution to the conflict in Vietnam should be found as soon as possible.

On the questions having multiple-choice answers, the percentages may exceed 100 percent as some persons chose more than one alternative.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
Vietnam policy: Do you favor current American policy in Vietnam?	32	53	15
Vietnam alternatives: Which approach do you support?			
a. No expansion of the war and agree to direct negotiations with the Vietcong for a cease-fire and free elections	49		
b. Expand the war and seek total victory	24		
c. Immediate withdrawal of all American troops	21		
Inflation: Which method of fighting inflation do you favor?			
a. Reduce spending for the Vietnam war	40		
b. Reduce spending for the various Great Society programs	39		
c. Increase Government revenues	23		
Increasing Federal revenues: If it is decided to increase Federal revenues which method would you favor?			
a. Excess business profits tax as during Korean war and repealing tax credit for corporate investments	61		
b. Across-the-board increase of income taxes	20		
How much money for the Great Society: Should funds for the new antipoverty, education, and health programs of the Great Society be—			
a. Increased	31		
b. Kept at same levels as last year	34		
c. Reduced	27		
Civil rights: Should Congress pass a law to end racial discrimination in selecting juries and strengthen the laws against racial violence?	84	7	9
Discrimination in housing: Should Congress outlaw discrimination in the sale or rental of housing?	66	27	7
Guaranteeing the right to vote: Is the Federal Government properly enforcing the law to eliminate racial discrimination in voting?	49	33	18
Truth in lending: Do you favor the bill which requires clear disclosure of all interest charges for borrowing money or buying on time?	89	5½	5½
Birth control: Should birth control information be freely available through local welfare and antipoverty agencies?	87	9	4
Minimum wage: Should the Federal minimum wage be increased to $2 an hour and cover most retail, hospital, and farmworkers?	63	30	7

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Gilligan, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, August 15, 1966, and the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. Daniels (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Grider (at the request of Mr. Albert), for August 15 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Stalbaum (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Albert), for remainder of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. Kastenmeier (at the request of Mr. Zablocki) indefinitely on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Bingham, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Mahon, for 7 minutes, today.

Mr. Waggonner, for 20 minutes, tomorrow, August 16.

Mr. Gallagher (at the request of Mr. Wolff), for 60 minutes, on August 17; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Don H. Clausen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. McClory.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Wolff), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Moss.
Mr. Love.
Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Powell.
Mr. Udall.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1370. An act for the relief of Panagiota Konstantinos Sikaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1878. An act for the relief of Elias Lambrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarita L. Agullana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2486. An act for the relief of Dr. Earl C. Chamberlayne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2809. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3029. An act for the relief of Gustavo Eugenio Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3039. An act for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3042. An act for the relief of Dr. Oscar Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3070. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

S. 3311. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo N. Hernandez, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3318. An act for the relief of Yung Mi Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Maria Jordan Ferrando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3395. An act for the relief of Antonio Gonzalez-Mora, and his wife, Natalie Sandoval Gonzalez-Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11671. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September 1966 as "International Literacy Day"; and

H.J. Res. 1207. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2640. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2641. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to the provisions of section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2642. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to administer oaths in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations; and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, during the semiannual period January 1 through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the reclassification of land within the boundary of the Heart Mountain Irrigation District on the Shoshone project in Wyoming, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187, 43 U.S.C. 483; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2645. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting reports of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15059. A bill to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 13277. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands (Rept. No. 1851). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS: Committee of conference. H.R. 15456. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1852). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 17018. A bill to provide for the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month period, from the national stockpile of nickel to meet the needs of certain firms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 17019. A bill for the education and training of the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 17020. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17021. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 17022. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 17023. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 17024. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 17025. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 17026. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17027. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, their widows, and certain other dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17028. A bill to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate certain duplications in Federal benefits now payable for the same, or similar, purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17029. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 17030. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 17031. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 17032. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act to permit Federal participation in the cost of construction of interstate bridges on the Federal-aid primary system in the manner provided for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 17033. A bill to amend chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the ground of insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17034. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 17035. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 17036. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17037. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17038. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 17039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 17040. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 17041. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 17042. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain airplane parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 17043. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 17044. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 17045. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 17046. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 17047. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17048. A bill to impose temporary ceiling on the rates of interest payable on time deposits in insured banks, to amend the banking laws with respect to the regulation of deposits and share accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 17049. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 17050. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 17051. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 17052. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 17053. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 17054. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 17055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 17056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 17057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 17058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 17059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 17060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 17061. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 17062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 17063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 17064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 17065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 17066. A bill to establish a uniform policy in the promotion of civilian personnel in the departments and agencies of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17067. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 17068. A bill to authorize the issuance and sale by the Post Office Department of a "semipostal" stamp to assist in financing American participation in the Olympic games; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 17069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for amounts paid to maintain foreign college students in the taxpayer's household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 17070. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, by the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.J. Res. 1270. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 1271. Joint resolution to provide for the annual observance of National Civil Service Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 1272. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 968. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 969. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 970. Resolution to investigate subversive activities in civil rights movements; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 971. Resolution to authorize the printing of part III of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Drug Safety"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17071. A bill for the relief of Sonia M. and Giuseppe B. Bellucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17072. A bill for the relief of George Kuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 17073. A bill for the relief of Miss Ester Leonor Halpern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 17074. A bill for the relief of Michele Bovenzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 17075. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17076. A bill for the relief of Shirley Williamson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 17077. A bill for the relief of Faustina Pereda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 17078. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. THOMAS:

H.R. 17079. A bill for the relief of Miss Melody P. de Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 17080. A bill for the relief of the Standard Meat Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

423. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Gordon B. Wright, Madison, Wis., relative to legislation which will authorize dams on the Colorado River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

424. Also, petition of Glenn P. Steines, Fort Madison, Iowa, relative to denial of due process of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Monday, August 15, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Kindly Light, with the encircling gloom about us, lead Thou us on.

We grope forward with uncertain steps in a time tingling with tension and dark with fears.

May the poisoning evils which blight the earth not devastate our inner life, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our professed faith under its tragedy.

Help us to face the piercing truth of the question:

> "Why build these cities glorious
> If man unbuilded goes?
> In vain we build the world unless
> The builder also grows."

Growing in moral and spiritual stature, give us honesty in dealing with our own besetting sins, humility to confess them, and resolution to overcome them.

Grant us Thy grace, to walk circumspectly not as foolish, but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 12, 1966, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC-PACIFIC INTEROCEAN CANAL STUDY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 466)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the Second Annual report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. The report covers the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

The first report described the planning phase of the Commission's investigations. During the last 12 months the Commission has moved into the execution stage. The engineering surveys of possible sea-level canal routes in Panama have begun. A site survey agreement with Colombia is being negotiated. The route near the border of Nicaragua and Costa Rica is being mapped. With the beginning of the next dry season—January 1967—the surveying will move into full operation in Panama, and depending on the outcome of the current negotiations, also in Colombia. The Commission has also made substantial progress on the special studies covering the broad national and international implications of a sea-level canal.

After a year's work, the Commission has reached the conclusion that it will probably need more time and resources to complete its assignment than is contemplated in the present authorizing legislation. As soon as the Commission determines what its minimum additional requirements will be, I will recommend legislation to the Congress amending Public Law 88-609.

The sea-level canal investigations continue to be of great importance to the United States. The Commission is now well along with its commitment. I take great pleasure in receiving and forwarding the report of their progress to date.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *August 15, 1966.*

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 3391. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act; (Rept. No. 1459).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3446. A bill to consolidate and reenact certain of the shipping laws of the United States, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 1460).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 3723. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3724. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent the benefit amount of certain widows from being reduced on account of the changes made by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 in the provisions relating to determination of family status in the case of certain children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3725. A bill to encourage improvements in the machinery of judicial administration by establishing within the Department of Justice the Office for Judicial Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Case, and Mr. Boggs) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 293); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 293

Resolved, That a special committee to be composed of the six Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress is hereby established, with authority to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress (and such committee shall cease to exist with the expiration of such Congress), for the purpose of receiving and considering a bill, when introduced, and germane amendments relating thereto, having for its purpose the carrying out of the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Report No. 1414, July 28, 1966. Such bill, when introduced, and amendments shall be referred to the committee for its consideration and such committee is hereby authorized to report to the Senate with respect to any such matter referred to it, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to report any bill or amendment containing any provision which has the effect of changing the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House, or which has the effect of changing in any manner the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, unless such provision is to carry out a recommendation contained in such report of July 28, 1966. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled by appointment by the President of the Senate.

CREATION OF A SELECT COMMITTEE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TYDINGS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 294) to create a Select Committee on Urban Transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tydings, which appears under a separate heading.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO AID TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, through the years the Congress has launched massive programs to assist the economically underprivileged. As is always the case with such enormous undertakings, there have been some shortcomings, for perfection is an evasive quality. However, if shortcomings must exist, I am firmly convinced that the last place they should be tolerated is with respect to our programs to aid children.

Unfortunately, there exists in our Federal programs to what some persons refer as "the forgotten child," the child living in a foster home. Some effort was made to assist these needy children in the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, but these provisions authorized aid only to children who receive assistance under the previously existing aid-to-dependent-children program before they are placed in a foster home, and who are also placed in a foster home by virtue of a court order. Due to these eligibility requirements, the 1962 amendments have provided only token Federal assistance in that, of the approximate 254,000 children cared for in foster homes throughout the Nation in 1965, only about 6,000 received aid under the Federal program.

Our aid-to-dependent-children program has, for many years, provided assistance to needy children living with their families. I can see no reason to deny the same assistance to children who, because of reasons beyond their control, have neither a mother, father, nor even a relative of the required consanguinity, with whom they may reside. Indeed, it is these children who need assistance the most.

I feel that of all kinds of public assistance, an investment in the well-being of our children is most likely to produce the greatest beneficial results. As this body knows, I long sought for one of our public assistance programs to be amended so as to include persons in mental and tubercular institutions, and I was naturally pleased to see that accomplished last year. I feel just as strongly that the time has come to correct an equally regretful omission; it is time to help our foster children.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which would remedy the situation I have just described.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 10 days, so that other Senators will have the opportunity to join as sponsors.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

The bill (S. 3723) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. Williams of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL COURT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill that is designed to assist the courts of our 50 States to improve their methods of administration and operation. It is a matter of common knowledge that the dockets of many State and local courts across this Nation are in a sorry condition. Their judicial machinery is creaking beneath the weight of heavy caseloads, a situation which seriously threatens the integrity of the judicial process. "Justice delayed is justice denied," yet delay and denial are today the rule rather than the exception in the majority of American jurisdictions.

This situation can be illustrated with innumerable statistics. For present purposes I need cite but a few, which are disturbing as much for their typicality as for their magnitude. In Stork and Ford Counties, Ill., the time between the filing and the trial of civil cases is more than 5 years. In New Haven County, Conn., a civil litigant must wait 3½ years, after filing, for the trial of his case. Litigants in San Francisco, Calif., and in Baltimore City, Md., must wait almost 2 years for a jury trial from the date a civil case is placed on the trial calendar to the date it is actually tried.

Indeed, a symposium on "Lagging Justice" published in the March 1960, issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science brought to light complaints of delayed justice in the United States dating from as early as 1839. But it is scarcely consoling to discover that the problem of delayed justice has plagued the courts since before the turn of the century. This merely reveals that we have too long remained unresponsive to the unassailable case for reform.

And yet, we Americans pride ourselves on maintaining a government of laws, not of men. Our answer to the aggrieved has always been that he must seek his remedy in the courts of the land, at the bar of justice. But the American people will maintain their confidence in the rule of law—and it is vital that they do—only if the courts meet the challenge of an increasingly complex society. And, Mr. President, I do not think that we can say today that in every instance they are completely fulfilling their trust.

What must the States and localities do to resuscitate their judicial systems? Certain broad areas quite clearly call for improvement, though it must suffice for the moment to identify them only in very general terms. The organizational structure of our courts too often fails to promote administrative efficiency. In most courts there are no effective procedures to gather and evaluate the information necessary for docket control. Nor has the adequacy of supporting facilities and personnel received the attention it merits. These are the problems and the questions. There is no doubt that with a little encouragement and assistance the creative potential of the States and localities is adequate to the task.

Accordingly, I offer the National Court Assistance Act to help the State courts help themselves. This bill would establish within the Department of Justice the Office of Judicial Assistance, which would provide two major services: First, the office would administer grants-in-aid to State courts to promote administrative reform; and second, the office would act as a clearinghouse of information pertaining to improvement in judicial administration.

Mr. President, 143 years ago, in 1823, the British Government was almost toppled because in its court system at that time it took 5 to 10 years to get a case before a competent judge for final settlement or decision.

At that time, the Edinborough Review printed an article, the thrust of which was that in a democratic system the reason why there are King's ministers, the reason why the army and the navy is supported as well as the entire establishment of government, is so that one citizen will have the right to present his case, his problems, and his cause for litigation before 12 judges who sit at Westminster.

Mr. President, that is equally true today in our country. If, in the United States, justice is so slow in some jurisdictions—particularly the so-called lesser or inferior courts—that an individual must wait 5, 6, or 10 years to get his case tried, then I submit that such individual will not receive justice but will be denied it, just as surely as if some foreign government were to come in and say to him, "You shall have no access to the courts."

The purpose of my legislation is to provide for a form of incentive. The amount of money involved is less than $10 million which could be utilized by the court systems of the Nation who realize they need reform, that they need administrative improvement, and that they need a modern system of management and docket control so that they can help themselves. I think that this proposed legislation would be of material assistance.

During the past week, I made a speech before the American Bar convention on this subject, and it was well received. I advised them that I was going to introduce this legislation. I hope that it will have the fair and open-minded consideration of Congress.

By providing grants-in-aid, the Federal Government would enable State courts, through self-analysis, to identify and eliminate the causes of congestion and unnecessary delay. Additionally, grants would be available for educational programs and seminars to keep administrative judges abreast of developments in the field, and to aid them in devising new tools for good court management. The grants are not for new courthouses or more judges, but rather for innovation in techniques of judicial administration.

It is time that the courts, after a half century of failure to solve their problems, enlist whatever expert help is available and appropriate to define and to eradicate causes of maladministration and undue delay. The courts may wish to consider the use of management consultants, who have rendered invaluable assistance to the business world. Where business techniques are appropriate to courts, such experts may be extremely helpful. I believe that the National Court Assistance Act will make it possible for our judges to secure this professional assistance.

The Office of Judicial Assistance also would serve as a repository of information so that our State courts can turn to a central information service to keep themselves apprised of successful experiments in reform. For example, if a court wishes to improve its methods of calendar control, there is today no source to which it can turn for comprehensive information about the steps others have taken. This bill would establish such a clearinghouse. A central office which collects and stores data on national trends in court business would also permit early detection and informed correction of emerging problems in the area of judicial administration.

In drafting this bill, we have been careful to provide safeguards for the independence of the State judiciary. The Office of Judicial Assistance will consider applications for grants only when they have the approval of the chief judge of the court involved. And the bill specifically limits the prerogatives of the Office and its Director; it prohibits any effort to supervise or control the functions of State courts. The Office will supply information and funds for studies and reforms. But the initiative will come from the State and local courts themselves. Thus it is assured that the assistance available under this bill will in no way infringe on the autonomy of the courts involved.

In many respects my proposed National Court Assistance Act parallels the Law Enforcement Act of 1964. The Law Enforcement Act collects and disseminates information relating to law enforcement, and makes grants to State and local police agencies and correctional institutions. However, these functions of the Law Enforcement Act, though parallel to those of my proposed National Court Assistance Act, do not overlap with them. As the Constitution recognizes in its provisions for separation of powers, agencies of law enforcement are not appropriately combined with those of judicial organization. Coordination is essential; but combination is unhealthy. And, where law enforcement does touch the judicial process, it does so primarily in the criminal courts. But the problems of judicial administration are perhaps most critical with respect to civil matters, in which many more of our citizens are involved.

Mr. President, I trust that Congress is fully aware of the manifest Federal interest in the effectiveness of State and local courts. Federalism is a viable system only where the States are effective partners to the Federal Government.

Moreover, specific rights and remedies, created by Congress, often depend for their enforcement on the courts of the States. And when State courts consider Federal questions, it is in the whole Nation's interest that they be able to do so with dispatch and efficiency. Likewise, when questions arise as to the distribution of jurisdiction between State and Federal courts, we ought to be able to consider them on their merits, free of considerations as to which system of courts has the superior administrative capacities. Nor should individual litigants themselves have to ponder such factors when they are trying to decide upon a forum in which to bring their actions.

Mr. President, if Congress promptly enacts this legislation our State and local courts will at last have a source of information and financial assistance to assist them in the enterprise of self-improvement which they must soon undertake. This is a matter in which further delay cannot be tolerated. This Congress must not shirk its role in helping to mobilize the creative potential of the courts of our Nation. I have no doubt that if we provide the opportunity, the judiciary and the bar of our States and localities will respond affirmatively. Litigants pursuing the path of the law will no longer find themselves plodding a congested and a twisted course. Counsels of despair must be answered by progress; we must meet the problems of today, and prepare for the challenges of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that it lie on the desk for 2 weeks for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 3725) to encourage improvements in the machinery of judicial administration by establishing within the Department of Justice the Office for Judicial Assistance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established within the Department of Justice the Office for Judicial Assistance, to be headed by a Director appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall be compensated in the amount of $26,000 per annum. The function of the Office for Judicial Assistance shall be to encourage and assist improvement in the organization, procedure, and administration of local and State courts.

(b) The Director shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Director may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the functions of the Office for Judicial Assistance, the Director is authorized—

(1) To conduct or cause to be conducted studies and evaluations of local and State court systems, to make recommendations for organizational, procedural, and administrative improvements of such systems, and to contract with public or private agencies for the purpose of having such agencies assist him in the exercise of his authority under this paragraph;

(2) To conduct or cause to be conducted seminars and other educational programs for judges and personnel of local and State courts;

(3) To collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate information, materials, and other data relating to studies, programs, and projects conducted or carried out under this Act;

(4) To cooperate with and render technical assistance to Federal, State, local, or other public or private agencies; and

(5) To accept, in his discretion, gifts and other donations to be used by him in carrying out the function of his office.

SEC. 3. To assist him in carrying out the function of his office the Director of the Office for Judicial Assistance is authorized to make grants to local or State courts or to public or private non-profit organizations to be used by such courts and organizations for the following purposes:

(1) To study and evaluate local and State court systems, and to prepare recommendations for organizational, procedural, and administrative improvement of such systems;

(2) To present seminars and other educational programs for judges and personnel of local and State courts;

(3) To implement organizational, procedural, and administrative improvements of local and State court systems recommended as a result of studies conducted under this Act; but in no event shall any such grant or part thereof be used for the construction, improvement, or alteration of buildings, or for the payment of salaries of judges or court personnel on a continuing basis; and

(4) For such other purposes, consistent with the purposes of this Act, as the Director shall determine necessary or desirable in carrying out the functions of his office.

SEC. 4. Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Director shall, by regulations, establish general standards for obtaining grants under this Act. The regulations shall provide for regular reports by any recipient of a grant under this Act to the

Director who shall, from time to time, on the basis of the reports and other information available to him, review and, if necessary, revise the standards established pursuant to this section.

SEC. 5. After the regulations referred to in section 4 of this Act have been issued, any local or State court or any public or private agency desiring to secure a grant under this Act may submit an application therefor to the Director. The application shall be in such form and contain such information as may be prescribed by the Director. No application submitted by any local or State court for a grant under this Act shall be approved by the Director unless such application has been first approved by the chief or presiding judge of the court submitting such application. No application submitted by any public or non-profit organization for a grant under this Act in connection with any local or State court shall be approved by the Director unless such application has been first approved by the chief or presiding judge of that court.

SEC. 6. The Director may approve any application which complies with the provisions of this Act. The payment of moneys to any applicant under this Act may follow the approval of his application by the Director. Payment of any such grant may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as may be determined by the Director, and shall be made on such conditions as the Director finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. The Director shall not approve any application for a grant under this Act received by him after January 31, 1969.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Office for Judicial Assistance or the Director thereof to supervise or control in any manner or to any extent the administration or organization of any local or State court, or to conduct or cause to be conducted any study or evaluation of any local or State court without the prior approval of the chief or presiding judge of the court with respect to which such study or evaluation is to be conducted.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of making grants under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $5,000,000.

SEC. 10. On or before April 1 of each calendar year, the Director shall report in writing to the President and to the Congress on his activities pursuant to the provisions of this Act during the preceding calendar year.

NEW SELECT COMMITTEE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in recent years we have become acutely aware of the crisis in urban transportation. In the mid-1950's, we were amused when urban freeways were referred to as the world's largest parking lots, but rush-hour congestion has become a commuter's nightmare and is no longer a laughing matter. Each time a new freeway is built to relieve the burden on the older highways, new drivers are attracted to the road, so that the traffic is as heavy as it was before. It takes longer and longer to get to work. Accidents multiply. And as urban freeways are built, valuable land is removed from the cities' tax rolls and fewer services can be provided to the residents.

Meanwhile, commuter railroads, which are already overcrowded, find it uneconomical to continue operation, and petition to cut down their passenger services. More and more commuters must take to the highways. Mass transportation systems also operate at a deficit and are forced to reduce operations. The number of urban buses in operation in the United States declined by 20 percent between 1950 and 1964, and no major rail systems were constructed to make up for the lost bus service.

The lack of adequate urban transportation services has had serious detrimental effects upon other aspects of urban life. The McCone Commission which investigated the Watts riot reported that:

> Our investigation has brought into clear focus the fact that the inadequate and costly public transportation currently existing throughout the Los Angeles area seriously restricts the residents of the disadvantaged areas such as south-central Los Angeles. This lack of adequate transportation handicaps them in seeking and holding jobs, attending schools, shopping, and in fulfilling other needs. It has had a major influence in creating a sense of isolation, with its resultant frustrations, among the residents of south-central Los Angeles, particularly the Watts area. Moreover, the lack of adequate east-west or north-south service through Los Angeles hampers not only the residents of the area under consideration here but also of all the city.

In recent years, we have recognized that a major element of the problem is financial, and we have turned to Federal aid for urban freeway construction and for mass transportation. We are now making a determined effort on all governmental levels to improve transportation facilities in the metropolitan areas. The urban segments of the Federal-aid highway system are under construction in dozens of cities, and a substantial number of cities are either improving, extending, and modernizing their rail rapid transit networks or planning to build rail rapid transit from scratch. San Francisco's billion-dollar project has received the most publicity, but Baltimore, Atlanta, Houston, Seattle, and Los Angeles, as well as our own District of Columbia, are considering installing major rail public transport systems.

In urban transportation, as in so many other areas, coordination of legislative programs is essential in order that the necessary services can be provided without duplication or other waste. It is generally agreed that rational commuter and other intracity transit services must effectively combine the use of the private automobile with buses, trains, and in some cases rail rapid transit or even hydrofoils. But this is one of the fields for which the present Senate structure is least effectively designed. We have not one but three committees concerned with metropolitan transportation. The Banking and Currency Committee and its Housing Subcommittee are responsible for mass transit legislation. The Commerce Committee, and its Surface Transportation Subcommittee, handles the commuter railroad problem. And the Public Works Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, is responsible for the highway aid program. No one of these committees is concerned with an overview of urban transportation, but such an overview is vitally needed.

I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would go a long way toward filling this gap. I propose the creation of a Select Committee on Urban Transportation, to be composed of three Senators from each of the three committees now concerned with various aspects of this problem. The committee would be directed to hold hearings, and to make a thorough investigation of transportation needs in metropolitan areas. It would report its findings to the Senate, and could recommend a program of legislative action. On the other hand, it would not have legislative jurisdiction.

The committee would not be authorized to report bills or resolutions; there is, therefore, no danger that it would encroach upon the legislative jurisdiction of any existing committee. Any legislation recommended would have to be further considered by one or more of the standing committees of the Senate. The select committee would be only a temporary committee. It would make a final report to the Senate by June 1970, and would then cease to exist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be allowed to lie on the table for 2 weeks for cosponsors, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. RES. 294

A resolution to create a Select Committee on Urban Transportation

Whereas urbanization, population growth, traffic congestion, and air pollution have caused urban transportation to be a complex problem of growing importance, requiring careful analysis in all of its many dimensions, and

Whereas three committees of the Senate have jurisdiction over various aspects of urban transportation, but none is concerned with developing a coordinated national program for automobile, bus, rail, and other urban transportation services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is established a permanent select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Urban Transportation (hereinafter referred to as the "Select Committee") consisting of nine Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate, as follows:

(1) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Public Works;

(2) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

(3) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Commerce.

The President of the Senate shall designate one such member to serve as chairman of the Select Committee.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Select Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments were made.

(c) A majority of the members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business except that the Select Committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. The Select Committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the Select Committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the Select Committee to—

(1) make a continuing investigation and study of the problems of transporting persons to and from, within, and between cities, including the economic and technological problems involved in mass transportation, the transportation needs of urban areas in the United States, and the relationship between the several modes of transportation; and

(2) report from time to time to the Senate and the appropriate committees thereof the results of such investigation and study, together with the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Sec. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Select Committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (6) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the Select Committee selected from the minority party, the Committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the Select Committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,300 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the members of the Committee who are members of the minority party.

(c) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the Select Committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the Select Committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the Select Committee determined that such action is necessary and appropriate.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the Select Committee, which shall not exceed $200,000.00 in any fiscal year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Select Committee.

Sec. 5. The Select Committee shall make a final report to the Senate by June 30, 1970. Upon submission of its final report the Select Committee shall cease to exist.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 746

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3708) to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 747 AND 748

Mr. TOWER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3708, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 749

Mr. CARLSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3708, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENT OF INFLATION LESS IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN OTHER INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES OF FREE WORLD

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that while this country has experienced some degree of inflation of the dollar during the last several years—during this year, in particular—this inflation has been small, considering the pressures of the war in which the Nation is involved at this time to maintain its position in the world, and as compared with the inflation which has occurred in other countries which do not have the same burdens pressed upon them.

An analysis of the situation in the United States compared with that in the other industrial countries indicates that from 1960 through 1966, the inflation that occurred in the American dollar was only 8.2 percent, compared with inflation of at least twice that amount in the currencies of other countries, such as Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy, which are the most industrially advanced countries in the free world aside from the United States.

I have a worksheet and a summary, indicating the increase in prices and the relative degrees in the purchasing power of the various developed nations of the world, which I ask to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the worksheet and the summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Attached is the worksheet with the detailed data underlying the chart on price comparisons among the major industrial countries.

As recorded in the row for 1966–I, the most recent quarter showed the following indexes (1960=100):

United States	108.2
Germany	117.6
United Kingdom	121.4
France	122.2
Italy	129.4
Japan	139.6

Consumer price

[1960=100]

Period	United States	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Germany	Japan
1961—I	100.8	101.6	101.8	101.2	101.3	102.8
II	100.8	102.8	101.5	101.6	102.1	103.5
III	101.3	104.1	102.6	102.2	102.7	105.7
IV	101.5	105.3	105.2	103.2	103.1	109.4
1962—I	101.6	106.4	106.6	104.7	104.3	110.7
II	102.0	108.6	107.6	106.3	105.7	112.2
III	102.5	108.1	108.6	107.4	105.7	113.1
IV	102.7	108.1	109.6	109.1	105.8	114.2
1963—I	102.9	109.7	111.5	112.8	108.3	118.4
II	103.1	110.3	112.7	114.3	108.7	121.2
III	103.9	109.6	114.3	114.8	108.0	122.2
IV	104.2	110.4	115.5	117.3	109.1	122.3
1964—I	104.5	111.3	116.3	119.1	110.3	122.4
II	104.7	113.4	116.6	120.5	110.9	125.1
III	105.0	114.3	117.5	122.5	111.3	126.1
IV	105.4	115.3	118.2	124.3	111.8	128.8
1965—I	105.6	116.4	119.1	125.7	113.0	131.4
II	106.4	119.3	120.4	126.5	114.4	136.0
III	106.8	119.9	120.6	127.7	115.6	136.2
IV	107.4	120.6	121.2	128.5	116.2	137.3
1966—I	108.2	121.4	122.2	129.4	[1] 117.6	139.6
II						
III						
IV						
OECD Bulletin:						
History, 1955–64, page	79	429	203	292	237	117
Current, May 1966, pages	58–59	100–107	74–75	86–87	80–81	64–65
1961–66, I:						
5 years	1.0734	1.1949	1.2004	1.2787	1.1609	1.3580
Percent, per year	1.4	3.6	3.7	8.0	3.0	6.3

[1] 2 months.

Sources: Department of Labor and OECD.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3496 the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] be added as a cosponsor. This is a measure that would authorize appropriation of funds from the Treasury to help defray the cost of carrying on presidential campaigns.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3636) to establish a national mining and minerals policy, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate bill 3636, the names of Senators CHURCH, BARTLETT, and HRUSKA be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3470) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons who are not qualified for enlistment or induction in the Armed Forces because of educational or physical deficiencies, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 750

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the Act (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment on behalf of myself and Mr. SALTONSTALL, namely:

On page 47, after line 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 643. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the President may order any member in the Ready Reserve of an armed force, who has not served on active duty other than for training, to active duty for not more than 18 consecutive months: *Provided*, That in order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section consideration shall be given to—

"(a) family responsibilities; and

"(b) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia also submitted an amendment (No. 750), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 15941, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPUBLICAN RESEARCH REPORT—ADVANCE IN RETAIL FOOD PRICES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Republican National Committee Research Division has prepared a very fine research report on the advance in retail food prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN RESEARCH REPORT: INCREASE IN FOOD COSTS DURING THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

The persistent advance in retail food prices continues to alarm American homemakers. The figures as established by the U.S. Department of Labor for the sample "market basket" listed on the following pages shows an approximate 18 percent increase in retail food prices during the Johnson Administration. When Mr. Johnson assumed the Presidency in November 1963, the 25 representative items listed could be purchased, on the average, for $11.13 which, incidentally, was seven cents less than their price in June of 1963. By June of 1966, these same items, according to the Labor Department, sold at retail in a large sampling in cities and towns around the Nation for $12.78.

During the 34 months of John F. Kennedy's Administration, the Labor Department's index for retail prices for food increased by 2.3 points, from 102.8 to 105.1.

Lyndon B. Johnson has been President of the United States for 31 months, during which time the same index has increased from 105.1 to 114.0, a total of 8.9 points.

Retail prices of selected food items, November 1963 and June 1966

Item	Unit of measurement	Price, November 1963	Price, June 1966	Percentage increase
Cereals and bakery products:		*cents*	*cents*	
Flour, wheat	5 pounds	56.8	58.5	3.0
Corn flakes	12 ounces	28.4	29.9	5.3
Bread, white	Pound	21.6	21.8	.9
Meats, poultry, and fish:				
Beef and veal:				
Round steak	do	106.4	110.8	4.1
Sirloin steak	do	108.7	117.3	7.9
Pork:				
Chops, center cut	do	88.3	107.1	21.3
Loin roast	do	62.0	77.0	24.2
Bacon	do	67.4	93.9	39.3
Poultry: Frying chicken	do	39.7	41.9	5.5
Fish: Tuna fish	6½-ounce can.	32.6	36.3	11.3
Dairy products:				
Milk, fresh (delivered)	½ gallon	52.6	54.7	4.0
Butter	1 pound	75.5	79.6	5.4
Cheese, American process	½ pound	36.7	41.7	13.6
Fruits and vegetables:				
Fresh fruits:				
Apples	1 pound	14.0	22.7	62.1
Bananas	do	15.6	17.2	10.3
Fresh vegetables:				
Potatoes	10 pounds	63.1	86.6	37.2
Onions	Pound	10.8	15.1	39.8
Carrots	do	15.0	19.0	26.7
Celery	do	13.4	17.4	29.9
Cabbage	do	8.5	11.6	36.5
Tomatoes	do	30.9	34.3	11.0
Canned vegetables: Peas, green	No. 303 can.	22.7	24.0	5.7
Dried vegetables: Dried beans	Pound	17.7	20.0	13.0
Other foods at home:				
Beverages:				
Coffee	do	69.8	83.2	19.2
Cola drink	72-ounce carton.	55.1	56.6	2.7
Total		*Dollars* 11.13	*Dollars* 12.78	
Average percentage increase per item				18.0

NOTE.—These same 25 items increased by 3.1 percent in the 1 month period between May 1966 and June 1966.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Explanation: November 1963 was used because it was the 1st month of the Johnson administration. June 1966 was used because it is the most recent month for which official data is available as of Aug. 1, 1966.

CRUSADE AGAINST CRIME—A NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION SYSTEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, crime can be as powerful a weapon against organized society as any bomb conceived by man. And crime—sometimes violent, sometimes stealthy—is stalking our city streets and rural roads.

Since 1960 the American crime rate has risen about six times faster than the population. The overall crime rate for our Nation has increased 35 percent since 1960.

Violent crimes have increased by 25 percent during this period, and crimes against property have increased by 36 percent. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that there was a 13-percent increase in crime in 1964 alone.

In 1965 the crime rate went up even higher with an additional increase in crime of 5 percent over 1964 levels.

Only those who live daily with fear for their lives and their material possessions can fully understand the terror that crime has struck in the hearts of millions of Americans. Perhaps the most tragic aspect of the picture is that crime usually strikes hardest and most often at the people who can least afford it—people with low or moderate incomes and members of minority groups.

In many aspects, the crime rate must be viewed as a reflection of failure on the part of our society to provide a favorable environment for many citizens to find opportunity and to achieve personal satisfaction and rewards. Measured by such standards, our society is ailing, and the crime rate indicates that much remains to be done.

But, America cannot solve its crime problems by creating a national police force or by destroying the constitutionally protected rights of the individual.

While the police powers belong to the States under the Constitution, there is an important role the Federal Government can play in helping the States to meet their responsibilities.

Crime is waged on a massive interstate basis. The mobility of modern society, the importation of narcotics from abroad, the increasing number of auto thefts, and the mobility of the modern criminal have blurred old lines of jurisdiction and responsibility. Communication and coordination among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies are essential if we expect to deal effectively with the crime problem.

During the past months, there have been repeated cries for improved systems for the gathering and exchange of police information.

It is obvious that modern computers can provide the means to centralize our law enforcement information and have it on hand instantly, and we know that such pooling of information would greatly improve police work and that delay is intolerable.

Yet progress has been very slow in achieving the centralized information systems which we need so desperately. In 1965 the FBI, acting under a 1930 statute authorizing it to exchange information on crime with the States, did start to implement a plan for a national crime information center. Now the Bureau foresees that its machinery may be in operation on an experimental basis by January.

The FBI plans to store in a Washington-based computer three kinds of basic data. First, it will have identification information on persons wanted for felonies. Second, it will have information on stolen automobiles. Finally, it will have information on other identifiable stolen property, usually of a value of more than $500.

The national crime information center will receive its information from State police authorities. The information on file in Washington will then be made available to the States to aid them in their law enforcement activities.

The advantages of such a centralized pool of information are many. Let me suggest an example. Suppose a Houston police officer sees an automobile which he suspects may have been stolen in another State. At the present time, a check with the national clearinghouse on stolen automobiles may take 5 days or a week. Usually this kind of delay is enough to discourage seeking information.

However, if the national crime information center were in operation, the officer could radio police headquarters and obtain the necessary information via the State police, to Washington, within minutes. The response may reveal no record for the car. On the other hand, it may indicate that the car was stolen, in some far distant city in a distant State.

For the system to work effectively, however, it is important that there be State or regional computerized crime information systems. This is the "missing link" as plans go forward for the national information system which the FBI is now building.

The computers in Washington cannot do the job for all the country. They will contain only that information which is most unlikely to involve interstate crime. On the State and local level, computers are needed for much broader informational purposes. These computers should store information on all crimes within the jurisdictions involved. Furthermore, it is clear that until State information systems for collecting and reporting information are perfected, the national system in Washington will not be very useful.

Obviously, the national crime information center is something of a chain which will be no stronger than its weakest links. It cannot operate effectively if State and local agencies do not have the facilities for gathering and feeding information into the national information center. Law enforcement in State A, a participant in the national crime information center, will surely be hampered if State B fails to participate in the program.

I am supporting legislation to create a Federal program under which each State will be strongly encouraged to set up as rapidly as possible a modern crime information facility, compatible with the national crime information center in Washington. Under my bill, the Federal Government would put up 50 percent of the cost for each State which establishes such a facility.

Such a program will greatly facilitate the establishment and operation of State and local crime information centers. The cost to the taxpayers—about $25 million for the Federal share over a 7-year period—would be very modest, considering the tremendous benefits to be gained from such a program. While Federal expenditures in the areas of education and welfare have been skyrocketing, with good reason, it is noteworthy that Federal expenditures in the efforts to combat crime have remained almost steady. This, despite a rapid increase in State and local expenditures for crime control.

I believe the time has come—indeed, it is already late—for the Federal Government to take some bold, meaningful steps to help in the solution of this Nation's crime problem.

The Law Enforcement Act of 1965, which I strongly supported, has been an opening wedge in this Federal-State anticrime cooperation. Already, Texas has received under that act funds for law enforcement research and training.

The Federal-State law enforcement information exchange system now proposed would be a most effective amendment to the Law Enforcement Act. I hope it will be adopted and that we can continue to develop and suggest further amendments which will help the Law Enforcement Act become a national basis for a nationwide crusade against crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of grants made and pending in Texas under the Law Enforcement Act of 1965.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1965

GRANTS MADE IN TEXAS

Rice University—for the establishment of a program for the detection of potential community violence, to the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Houston. Grant: $37,350. Approved: June, 1966.

GRANTS PENDING IN TEXAS

University of Texas Sociology Department—for a juvenile delinquency research project. Requested: $34,285. Applied for: December, 1965.

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers—for a study of standards and personnel training and education. Requested: $17,000. Applied for: January 1966.

Texas Department of Corrections—for a comprehensive study of inmates and how often and why they return. Requested: $47,000. Applied for: January, 1966.

Houston Police Department—to establish a center for the study of criminal law by officers. Requested: $50,000. Applied for: January, 1966.

Howard County Junior College, Southwest Legal Foundation—for establishment of a Southwest Academy for Law Enforcement, open to all law enforcement officers in Texas. Requested: $35,800. Applied for: February, 1966.

Southwest Legal Foundation—for the establishment of a Southwest Law Enforcement Institute. Requested: $50,000 for 2 years. Applied for: February, 1966.

Texas Southern University—for a study of capital punishment in murder and rape cases from 1924 to 1965. Requested: $37,800. Applied for: February 1966.

Sam Houston State College—for the establishment of a regular degree program for law enforcement as a profession. Requested: $15,000. Applied for: June, 1966.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN THE NEED OF PRAYER

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the column written by the distinguished Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, which appeared in the Sunday Star of August 14, 1966, under the caption "In the Need of Prayer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT: IN THE NEED OF PRAYER

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

In the Capitol Prayer Room, above the altar with its open Bible, there is a very striking, colorful window. In jeweled glass blaze the words "This Nation Under God." What the momentous phrase means is suggested by the central figure of that artistic depiction. There it is that the Nation's fundamental faith is focused in the pictured figure of George Washington kneeling in agony of petition on the frozen ground of Valley Forge. The father of his country is not portrayed saying his prayers. He is praying. That always is the most stupendous of transactions. That hallowed room under the white dome of the Capitol is dedicated to the conviction without which religion fades into futility, that "more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." We are, of course, thinking of prayer in its highest reaches as asking God for nothing except Himself: Prayer in its innermost meaning is not requesting something we want. It is yearning for that which God wants in us and through us. On the highest peaks of petition, prayer ceases to be a catalog of the thing—likely to be mostly material—which we think we need. Through light and shadow, gladness and adversity, the summit of prayer is "Thy Will Be Done." When prayer reaches that altitude, a subtle selfishness, which often intrudes and invades petitions with its mundane desires, passes in music out of sight.

The acme of communion is mirrored in a modern hymn "Nothing Left But Heaven and Prayer." The fact is that with these two supreme things left, God and prayer, a two-way road by which spirit with spirit may meet, everything vital remains, no matter what else the swift currents of tribulation may sweep away. From a great and yet practical mystic, Rufus Jones, comes the profound statement "Religion is primarily and at heart the personal meeting of the soul with God and conscious communion with Him. To give up the cultivation of prayer would mean in the long run the loss of the central thing in religion—it would involve the surrender of the precious jewel of the soul. In prayer there is unmistakable evidence of incoming energy from beyond the margin of what we call ourselves." The glowing testimony of such a saint and sage and scholar fits exactly the confession of the plaintive spiritual—"It's me, it's me, O Lord standing in the need of prayer!" The overawing conception is that God must be the dominating reality of life.

In this troubled and tottering age, it is now perfectly evident that the arm of flesh has failed us. Modern mechanical inventions have far outreached spiritual potentials. The length of the material ropes is greater than the strength of the bending spiritual stakes. As for nothing else, the desperate dilemma of this 20th century cries out for the power of prayer that can "release energy as certainly as the closing of an electric current does—which heightens all human capacity and unlocks divine reservoirs of power, opening invisible doors into new storehouses of spiritual force."

The very idea that in God-fearing America, with its spiritual roots, there might be put up anywhere signs reading "No trespassing here by prayer" seems a betrayal of the Republic's unquestioned heritage.

It is a false conception of democracy that the minority can browbeat the vast majority. If the objective of democracy is to bring all down to a common denominator—especially when it comes to the very breath of free life—then perhaps some other form of government might better conserve the things that matter most. But democracy, rightly understood, is not any such thing. In a true democracy the "ayes" have it until the "noes" can persuade the present majority that they are wrong.

More important than the verbal fireworks of any ephemeral campaign is the word that in the United States Senate and House and in every part of the Union are weekly praying circles, part of a movement growing by leaps and bounds—an increasing army of those who believe that God is not dead nor doth he sleep. The greatest news, even though not in the headlines of the day, is that men of faith, refusing to be browbeaten by mere brutal bulk, are seeing on the hills about in a larger circle the chariots of God and the horsemen thereof. In this day of the whirlwind and the earthquake, with its changing social landscape, these men and women of the inner circles, with a humble sense of standing in the need of prayer, with contrite hearts, are endeavoring to meet the conditions of God's requirement of old, which is also a promise, "If My people which are called by My name shall seek My face and pray and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear and forgive their sins and heal their land." That is the present-day voice of God, the Father Almighty, who waits to furnish through prayer the power to lift humanity to His feet.

Alfred Tennyson issued one of the strongest protests against vetoing prayer any time, anywhere, in his inspired lines—

"For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer,
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?"

THE SECRET SENATE DEBATE ON CIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, an editorial entitled "Senate's Secret Debate on CIA," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate's Secret Debate on CIA

A censored record of a secret debate in the Senate July 14 on a proposal to add three members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the group of Senators which oversees (or thinks it oversees) the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency has now been published.

The record discloses that Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said: "I think many of the CIA activities tend to discredit the integrity of our country, and these activities * * * raise a number of questions with respect to the influence of our foreign policy * * * How can we (the committee) give any advice that is worth anything if we are not informed as to what is going on and if we do not have the information on which to base a judgment?"

That is a reasonable statement of a justifiable position. In the interest of the people of the United States, the Senate should acknowledge the propriety of Fulbright's demand to keep abreast of what the CIA is doing.

From what the country knows about the CIA's ghastly failures—such as the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba and the atrociously-timed U–2 flight over Russia just before the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting in 1960—the merit of having Foreign Relations committeemen in on the oversight of CIA becomes self-evident.

If the Foreign Relations Committee had been aware that the U–2 flights were being made over Russia, conceivably someone would have had the elemental good sense to protest to the White House that they should be called off on the eve of a summit conference designed to improve relations between the United States and Russia. And of course if those relations had been improved in 1960, it might never have seemed necessary, even to the CIA, to try in 1961 to invade Cuba on the pretext that the Soviets were making it their satellite.

U.S. POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the few encouraging developments of recent months is the appearance of the column entitled "State of Affairs," written by Clayton Fritchey. Mr. Fritchey's columns have a freshness and a perception which few of the oldtimers have been able to retain.

His column released on August 15, 1966, is a good example of his understanding of our policies in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Affairs

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Washington.—To the everlasting credit of the professors at the Roman Catholic University of Buenos Aires, they have denounced the seizure and brutal suppression of the non-Catholic universities by the new military dictatorship of Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania.

The U.S. washed its hands of a former dictator, Juan Peron, when, among other things he harassed the self-governing universities, but the militarists who overthrew President Illia last month, have gone far beyond Peron's repressions.

All during Argentina's history, the autonomy of the secular universities, the traditional center of free speech and thought, has been inviolable. Not even Peron dared violate it. But the new regime, in the best Hitlerian way, has set out to smash the intellectual world, beginning with the educational centers.

The first step was for the new leader, Gen. Ongania to appoint his brother-in-law, Enrique Green, a retired navy captain and notorious anti-Semite, to run the police force.

The second step was a police attack on the school campuses, where students and professors were severely beaten, storm trooper fashion, by cops yelling, "Run, you commie Jew S.O.B." Then the universities were closed down "to improve the level of scholarly life."

The police, however, did not shut down the Catholic universities, but the faculty of the church institutions has nevertheless had the courage to protest strongly against the Nazi-like attacks on the other schools.

The assault on the universities is only one item of the wholesale elimination of all democratic institutions in the country, including the federal and provincial legislatures, and the Supreme Court. Some of our indignant neighbors, like Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Ecuador, have cold-shouldered the new government by refusing its recognition.

But what has the U.S. done? First, it promptly recognized the Ongania junta, and now it has responded to the attack on the universities, including the beating of an American professor, by a perfunctory "expression of concern," which is not to be confused with a formal protest.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, Lincoln Gordon, was then quoted as saying the crackdown had been justified because the schools harbored professional agitators. Just like the ones in the U.S., no doubt, who go around protesting Vietnam.

When the official State Department spokesman was asked about this, he said the Department "associated itself" with Gordon's remarks. After the remarks backfired, Gordon denied saying the attack was justified, but he still "lamented" that Argentine universities had become "asylums for gangsters or for professional students who have no interest in studies but only in subversive agitation." The official spokesman then announced that the Department was switching its association to Gordon's cleaned-up version.

It is significant, however, that Gordon did not choose to deny saying that the circumstances "suggest that this police raid was an impulsive action, rather than a planned university reform." Subsequent events indicate it was just about as "impulsive" as a Hitler book burning carnival.

It is all too clear what the official U.S. attitude toward military dictatorships has become since the death of John F. Kennedy. Gordon, while ambassador to Brazil, virtually led the cheering section when the militarists took over. Now, as boss of all Latin American affairs, he can extend this policy to the whole hemisphere. We deplore armed coups, but boys will be boys.

Sen. ROBERT F. KENNEDY has criticized U.S. recognition of the Ongania regime, just as his older brother denounced the military coups which overthrew Honduras and the Dominican Republic in the fall of 1963.

"We are opposed to coups," said the late President, "because we think they are defeating, self-defeating, and defeating for the hemisphere . . . not only because we are all committed to democratic government but also because dictatorships are the seedbeds from which Communism ultimately springs up."

STANDARDS OF CREDIBILITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Crumbling Credibility," written by Murrey Marder, and published in the August 1966 issue of the Progressive magazine. Mr. Marder is diplomatic correspondent of the Washington Post.

It is interesting that Mr. Marder's observations, which are critical of the administration, should be published in the Progressive rather than in the Washington Post. I hope that the Post is not so committed to the administration that only favorable articles will be printed, even when written by members of its own staff.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive, August 1966]

OUR CRUMBLING CREDIBILITY

(By Murrey Marder)

On the pragmatic measuring rod of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who has been accused of many things but never of pie-in-the-sky diplomacy, the crux of the conduct of foreign policy is the maintenance of a nation's credibility. This axiom takes on double significance in a nuclear age.

If nuclear weapons are used again in war, their credibility as a deterrent to war has failed, to quote another non-dove, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

The degree of belief, doubt, or disbelief accorded to the words and actions of a nation is akin to the susceptibilities of a credit rating. Once impaired, there is the devil to pay to make it whole again. That is the international risk that has been run beyond the domestic discord over morality, ethics, and politics by what has become known as the U.S. "credibility gap."

Last December, in attempting to explain the breach that was developing between the Johnson Administration and many of the most observant citizens, I first employed the term, "the credibility gap." The definition offered was: "It represents a perceptibly growing disquiet, misgiving, or skepticism about the candor or validity of official declarations," especially those that concern Vietnam.

A short time later, in making public an account of peace-soundings taken in Hanoi by two traveling Italian professors, Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, admitted as much. He acknowledged that there was official concern about a "crisis of confidence" in the Administration's Vietnamese policies. "We have a great problem here maintaining our credibility," he conceded.

When the United States later publicly displayed, for the first time, a super-secret hydrogen bomb to prove it really was fished out of the sea off the coast of Spain, an American official said that the United States was obliged to display evidence to support its statements, because the "international credibility" of the United States was at stake.

The message is this: In an era of unimaginable uncertainties, what nations do, and what they say they are doing, are being subjected to unusual scrutiny, to determine if what they do matches what they say. And the United States, with its overwhelming might, is subject to the greatest scrutiny of all.

We have different standards of credibility for our personal, our national, and our international affairs. In personal life we allow great latitude in small deceits, overblown praise, excuses, apologies. In domestic politics we permit even lower standards: We tolerate gross exaggerations, soaring promises, the blackest accusations double-dealing, party-switching, vote-trading. We joke about "political platforms built to run on, not to stand on," and "deals made in smoke-filled rooms."

Foreign affairs has its own moral plane. It is not necessarily higher; it is more standardized. It has its own unwritten but recognized level of tolerability for hyperbole, distortions of fact, secret protocols, trickery, double-crossing, and an elaborate, formalized style for circumventing the truth. There is a practical reason for this uniform code of international behavior, or misbehavior. President Kennedy once said that a domestic mistake can only embarrass a nation; an international miscalculation can kill it.

Good diplomats abhor outright lying. They regard it as a sign of amateurism. Centuries of experience have gone into building up a pattern of acceptable circumlocution. There is a Chinese tale of a proud but mediocre chess-playing diplomat who one day lost three chess games in a row. A friend asked how he had done. The diplomat replied, "Well, I didn't win the first game, and my opponent didn't lose the second. As to the third game, I asked him to agree to a draw, but he wouldn't."

The State Department and the White House tried to use the same technique last year in the now infamous incident of U.N. Secretary General U Thant's exasperated charge that the United States had rejected a peace feeler from Hanoi.

Technically, by diplomatic standards, the United States did not exactly lie. The Administration's response, when questioned publicly about U Thant's statement, was that "no meaningful proposals," and "no substantive proposals," had been submitted to the United States. To the diplomatically initiated, that was a dead giveaway. The Administration was trying to knock the story down, without flatly denying it, by making it appear that it was denying it. But having employed the device of circumlocution so often in the Vietnamese crisis, the Administration over-stepped the toleration point.

After the death of Adlai Stevenson, when Eric Sevareid wrote in *Look* magazine that Stevenson privately said he was dismayed about the way the Administration had concealed the truth about Hanoi's willingness to talk to our side, the government to its profound embarrassment, was forced to admit the deception. It said the proposal to meet with a North Vietnamese representative in Rangoon was spurned because the United States, caught in a weak military bargaining position, concluded that Hanoi was only offering it a face-saving way to "surrender" South Vietnam.

But having insisted at the time, in statements to the world press, that it was prepared to bargain if Hanoi would just come to the conference table, and never having admitted that it was in too weak a position to negotiate, U.S. diplomacy had trapped itself in its own rhetoric. In no crisis in memory have U.S. declarations about what was happening been so glaringly inconsistent with what actually was happening. This has been the Achilles' heel of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The dilemma is not all the making of the Johnson Administration, but it has contributed more than its share. The history of U.S. policy in Vietnam since 1954 has been marked by a consistent lack of candor for which the present Administration is paying the accumulated cost in damage to U.S. credibility.

As the United States tried one unsuccessful approach after another, military advisers slipped into the role of combat troops; U.S. forces increased from 327 men to a figure now heading toward half-a-million. President Johnson sought to maintain that there was no change in policy (even his own advisers wince at that formulation), and the United States juggled the juridical justification for its policy to whatever point of legislation or law it found handiest at a given time. Small wonder that suspicion developed about the credibility of official utterances.

Whether the United States should or should not be in Vietnam is not the subject of this critique. There are far more arguments on both sides than could be encompassed here. The question of credibility, in its most immediate sense, concerns the tactics employed by the Administration in explaining and sustaining the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. No matter whether history marks Vietnam as a plus or minus for U.S. policy, the manner in which the United States carries out its strategy there will affect the weight that is accorded to the word of the United States in world affairs: its credibility factor.

The war in Vietnam is a jungle of fractured principles of international law, ethics, and moral standards. I sometimes pity my friends who are official spokesmen in government. They struggle through the morass of publicly admitted facts about U.S. activities in Vietnam, Laos, or Thailand; facts about U.S. actions that are only acknowledged in private background meetings with the press but never on the public record; facts that are known but not officially admitted publicly or privately, and facts that are always officially denied.

Until the Fulbright hearings were held—and I would be happy to document this—there was more information on the public record in Britain about some aspects of U.S. activity in the war in Vietnam than there was on the official public record in this country.

One retrogression that we have suffered in very recent years in the field of public enlightenment is a turning away, by the government, from the kind of encouragement of public debate, of public questioning, of public examination that was Adlai Stevenson's greatest contribution to our time, and which carried over into the Kennedy years—at least at the outset of that Administration.

All this does not imply sinister motives; there is no merit whatever to the far-out suspicion that President Johnson deliberately set out to put the United States where it is in Vietnam today. For good or ill, the United States got there by eclectic day-to-day decisions, not by conspiracy or grand design. The costs of Vietnam grievously have impaired President Johnson's twin hopes: his Great Society ambitions at home, and his burning, however unattainable, ambition to be hailed as the Western architect of peace—aspirations that equally eluded his post-World War II predecessors.

It is worth examining what might have happened if more truth had been used about the conduct of policy in Vietnam. Would the Administration be better or worse off if the truth were generally known that, before the massive introduction of troops began in 1965, American policy makers seriously canvassed the possibility of pulling out of South Vietnam entirely, including the 17,000 men President John F. Kennedy put in?

What if it were widely known that many of President Johnson's advisers thought—and they believed he agreed—that all the Administration originally intended to do in 1965 was to put in a limited number of American troops as chips on the table, to serve as bargaining power to try to negotiate a grateful exit from Vietnam that would not undermine the world prestige of the United States?

Suppose it were publicly realized that the Administration, at the outset, avoided like the plague a public declaration that it was making Vietnam a testing ground to challenge Communist China's concept of wars of national liberation? To do so, Administration strategists believed, would have impaired U.S. prestige and would have made it more difficult, or impossible, to execute the preferred intention of bargaining a way out of Vietnam. When Communist China leaped in to claim that Vietnam was indeed such a test, the Administration's own escalating talk of "commitments," plus its burgeoning troop input, had reached a level where it felt compelled to accept the prestige challenge.

It has been reported, and even today stands unchallenged, that early in the Johnson Administration's Vietnam policy-making, powerful Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, told the President: "I'd spend whatever it takes to bring to power a government that would ask us to leave."

It might have been awkward for policy officials to admit that when the United States launched its continuing air strikes against North Vietnam in February, 1965, the underlying motive was not, as announced, retaliation for guerrilla attacks on U.S. forces in South Vietnam. The prime purpose, as disclosed later (and then only to justify the failure of the air strikes to stop infiltration from the North), was to boost the collapsing morale of the badly buffeted South Vietnamese forces.

There are innumerable other facts that, had they been widely known at the time, would have stimulated greater public debate. They might also have made it more difficult for the Administration to pursue the policy it employed. But the country would have been basing its decisions on realities, not contrivances. Instead, public damage to the credibility of the United States often has been inflicted doubly: once for withholding or distorting the truth, and a second time when the truth, or part of it, became known.

What is the explanation for what often has been a self-defeating course of government behavior?

One explanation is the one that U Thant gave in 1965, to the great indignation of the White House: "In war, the first casualty is truth." It is not unprecedented for leaders of the United States, where military conflict is involved, to edge their way into commitments. President Roosevelt employed the bases-for-destroyers device in World War II to circumvent the Neutrality Act and supply aid to Britain. John F. Kennedy, of course, became a party to great deception in the Bay of Pigs, a role he regretted ever afterward.

But in the dilemma over Vietnam an added factor is involved. President Johnson has been more the captive of the consensus concept than any of his predecessors. He is also, in international affairs, often the victim of his own style of political leadership. The Johnson style, which he practiced so productively as Majority Leader of the Senate, is based on operating in zig-zags, with the real direction of policy often concealed. French President Charles de Gaulle masterfully employs the same technique. He was brought back to power in 1958 by men certain that he would, as they wished, keep Algeria French. With supreme deviousness, he did exactly the opposite, in one of the great acts of political obfuscation of all times, and disengaged France from the bottomless Algerian pit. De Gaulle, however, is the leader of France, not the United States; this nation is not only the leader of the West, but in world affairs it trades on its claim of being the most democratic and open of societies.

On the domestic scene the game of political legerdemain is honored by American tradition. President Johnson plays, and overplays, it to the hilt. A favorite device is his annual stimulation of speculation that the national budget will rise to some horrendous figure, to produce a public sigh of relief later, when it rises by several billions, but not as high as the prophesied amount.

The President has played cat-and-mouse with his momentary adversaries in aluminum, in steel, and in other areas of national life. But the requirements of the United States in world affairs run in the opposite direction. There the need for the United States is to demonstrate clarity, constancy, dependability, predictability. The "hot line" between Washington and Moscow is a symbol of the danger of misstatement or miscalculation.

Words can carry more impact than bullets. What counts, as a favorite British phrase aptly emphasizes, is not just what is done, but what is seen to be done. A world leader's assertion of fact, which proves to be a statement of unfact, can rebound with boomerang force. Here President Johnson is most vulnerable. Unlike President Kennedy, he employs the extreme Congressional style of internal political maneuver for much of his public behavior: hinting he may turn left, or right, but doing the reverse, or perhaps neither; employing hyperbole, oversimplification, postures to bargain from, not to stand on.

Such Presidential behavior caused great mischief when the United States last year intervened in the Dominican Republic. The projection of this style similarly has caused great mischief for the credibility of U.S. action in Vietnam. The great discrepancies between what the United States originally did in the Dominican Republic, and what it said it was doing, have become known. For example, to the dismay of officials in the State Department, who dutifully were trying to employ the President's favorite strategy of keeping the options open, Mr. Johnson himself destroyed in one statement the distinction they labored to create. Concealed behind the announced objective of intervening to save lives was the objective of preventing what was thought, rightly or wrongly, to be the threat of a Communist takeover.

So it was that while Administration officials were leaking reports that there was danger the Communists might seize control of the revolt, the President announced they already had. Then, having claimed that, the Administration felt impelled to back up the President by releasing lists of Communists in Santo Domingo. A totally unintended controversy swept over the Administration about the credibility of its lists. Next, having asserted that Communists had gained control of the rebel movement, the Administration had to explain why it was negotiating with the side that it had labeled Communist.

The most extreme example of hyperbole, which surprisingly escaped notice until I cited it weeks later, was the President's statement at a press conference on June 17, 1965, in the heat of justifying Administration action, that in the revolt, "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot and their heads cut off." He had vastly misspoken; the figure was not even 150 or fifteen, and subsequent evidence of atrocities pointed most heavily at the anti-rebel, not the rebel, side.

This June, the Administration pointed with pride to the free election held in the Dominican Republic, implying that the election was evidence to justify everything said or done in the Dominican Republic by the United States. But what it did not wipe clean was the unnecessary damage done to U.S. credibility in the interim.

Perhaps it is not abnormal for the United States to try to polarize its problems in international affairs in absolutes. But it is too dangerous an indulgence for a nuclear age. We Americans yearn for simplified answers to complex problems, preferably served as slogans: "54–40 or Fight"; "Remember the Maine"; "Lafayette, We Are Here." When we can combine our sense of righteousness with a slogan, we often believe we have a policy: "Liberate the Oppressed," or "Let Them Leave Their Neighbors Alone."

During the televised hearings on Vietnam before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, the Majority Whip, with only a slight smile on his face asked Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "Are we the international good guys, or the international bad guys?" Rusk, while he embarrassedly evaded the Senator's terminology, gave LONG the assurance he sought.

A psychiatrist who was called before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May, in an effort by Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to experiment with gaining insight on national behavior patterns, noted; "Once nations find themselves in a position of mutual antagonism, each interprets all actions of the other as based on bad motives, just as its own acts always spring from good ones."

The danger to peace, Dr. Jerome D. Frank of Johns Hopkins continued, is that each side selectively emphasizes the other's hostile gestures, and discounts its intended overtures to ease tension: "When nations are heavily armed and mutually fearful, this kind of conflict spiral can lead to war with breathtaking speed. . . ."

"Each increase in tension," suggested another witness, psychologist Charles E. Osgood of the University of Illinois, "makes it more difficult to achieve the accurate communication and the shared understandings that are necessary for de-escalation of tension. Internally, particularly in a democracy, a sense of commitment is created which makes backing down extremely difficult politically."

We have seen some of this occur in the pauses in the bombing of North Vietnam in May, 1965, and in December, 1965–January, 1966. In both instances, following its tactics of polarizing the "good guys" against the "bad guys," the Administration originally sought to create the impression that North Vietnam simply had ignored its action.

In the first five-day pause, the Administration initially said that "no response" was received from Hanoi. In the second, even after having been trapped in the damage to its credibility in the exchange with U Thant over the proposal to meet a North Vietnamese representative at Rangoon in late 1964, the Administration still employed highly evasive tactics of diplomatic verbiage to imply that it was getting no response at all from Hanoi.

The original, official comment on questions about responses to the second, thirty-seven day bombing pause, was that the Administration had received no "serious response" from Hanoi; no "positive and encouraging" reply, and no "responsible, or encouraging or constructive reply from the other side."

Yet in both instances the United States indeed did receive replies; and during the second pause, it sent Hanoi two messages, one in response to a reply from Hanoi. The United States was totally dissatisfied with the replies from North Vietnam; why did its spokesmen not simply say just that, instead of building doubts about the U.S. government's own credibility that later exploded against it when the facts became known? The half-hearted diplomatic explanation offered is that the United States sought to protect the avenues of secret diplomacy. If that was the case, it surely failed to do so, and only damaged its own credibility.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the dominant factor in these instances in which U.S. credibility has been impaired was a desire to paint a tortuously complex problem in simplistic, appealing shades of black and white, to pander to the lowest common denominator of American credulity.

Morality aside, and even apart from the bitter struggle in Vietnam where American lives and prestige are unquestionably now heavily committed, the realistic self-interest of the United States has been needlessly hurt by its self-created credibility gap. There is a simply cure: greater candor; perhaps not, in the midst of war, the unvarnished truth, but even the varnished truth would mark a considerable improvement over past and present practice.

THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent review of the book entitled "The Fulbright Program," written by Walter Johnson and Francis J. Colligan. The review is entitled "Benevolent Invasion" and was published in the London Times supplement of July 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEVOLENT INVASION

Walter Johnson and Francis J. Colligan: *"The Fulbright Program."* 380 pp. University of Chicago Press. £3 3s.

The Master of Pembroke (Oxford) Senator FULBRIGHT's old college, said of him that his famous "Program" had done more for the spread of learning than any event since the fall of Constantinople. All over the world Fulbright fellows are spread like an invading army of benevolent and fertilizing locusts. Their effect was that of Attila's horse in reverse.

Few junior senators like Senator FULBRIGHT have so quickly and so deservedly found fame and left a monument more enduring. This candid, illuminating and lively history tells of the growing pains and of the vicissitudes of the Program since it was started in a world in which all continents were in desperate need. If today the case is altered, if the needs of the mother countries of the American people are no longer in the forefront, more than ever the Program has taken the world for its parish and its beneficence can be seen everywhere; in Peru if not in modern China, from Ibadan to Calcutta.

Of course, the authors of the survey do not think that the Program was totally a novelty. It was not accidental that its eponymous hero had been (like so many of the rulers of modern America), a Rhodes scholar. The great foundations, especially the Rockefeller Foundation, had pioneered, and the FULBRIGHT Program gained a great deal from the experience, won so hardly by Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie, Harkness and the rest. The political talents (and courage) of the founder were significant. Naturally he and Senator JOE MCCARTHY were set on collision course, a collision in which the junior senator from Wisconsin had the worst of it. The world will little note or remember what Joe did (if the world is wise) but the achievement of the FULBRIGHT Program will outlive, if not the palace of the Escorial, at any rate the achievements of the only Arkansas statesman who has rivaled Senator FULBRIGHT in international eminence, Governor Orville Faubus.

On the whole, the Program was lucky. It fended off, with little difficulty, the intrusions of congressmen. It made mistakes but it recovered from them. It taught the British academic community that there were serious American institutions outside the Ivy League and the eastern establishment and that there were serious academic institutions in Britain apart from Oxbridge. It even shook the complacency of the Sorbonne and provided a way for the German academy to work its passage back into the Republic of Letters.

The Program had more and more to do with the underprivileged world. It had to deal with the rival claims of Tagalog and English in the Philippines and corresponding problems in India.

It has also educated many Americans away from the "PX" attitude to the heathen dwelling in outer darkness. It has spread Keynesian economics in Japan as a rival doctrine to Marxism—thus running the risk of infuriating the numerous Americans for whom Keynes was simply a more dangerous because more insinuating Marx. It spread music in the narrow as well as in the wider sense. It even promoted, through its fellows, gymnastics. It had the honour of violent abuse from *L'Humanité* and it accepted the criticism of scholars like the late Perry Miller that the Program must not be seen in America as a way of selling "Americanism". It has been a great and beneficient success.

It would be unjust to say that Mr. Johnson and Mr. Colligan, like a sundial, note only the sunny hours. There are inevitable differences between hosts and guests. The Americans an institution would most welcome may not be available or not be sent to the institution or country where they would be most at home and, from a purely academic point of view, most useful, Scholars were sent to remote corners of the mission field who would rather have tilled lusher fields. Empire-building in the State Department had to be resisted. But all things considered, the snafus, even the bureaucratic snafus were few. And unlike the emigration from Constantinople, the Program worked both ways. It benefited the United States as much as it benefited the outer world. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Colligan, naturally enough, in writing for an American audience, make allusions not necessarily immediately meaningful to non-American readers. (Not everybody, for instance, will realize that the "Republic of China" is an American euphemism for the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa.) And it is a little distressing to find that the authors mix up the Eastman and Harmsworth chairs at Oxford and ignore the Pitt chair at Cambridge, although the teaching of American history at both of the ancient universities was endowed by British money, that of the first Viscount Rothermere and that of the Cambridge University Press.

FEDERAL ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the next few weeks I hope very much the 1966 amendments to the Antipoverty Act will come before the Senate. The administration of the war on poverty has been under considerable attack across the country, some of it well justified, a good deal of it ill informed and merely partisan.

At that time, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, it will be my task to attempt, with the aid of other Senators, to secure passage by the Senate of these 1966 amendments to the act.

In this connection, I call attention of the Senate to a series of extremely interesting articles which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under dates of August 1 to 6, 1966. The Monitor asked correspondents throughout the United States to assess the Federal antipoverty program's first 18 months.

They found some tooling up and some solid achievement, but much disorder and faltering. Details of their findings are merged into the six articles to which I have referred, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1966]

AID TO POOR SURVEYED: $2.5 BILLION EFFORT DRAGS

(First of a series)

(NOTE.—*Correspondents throughout the United States have been asked to assess the federal antipoverty program's first 18 months. They have found some "tooling up," some solid achievement, but much disorder and faltering. Details of their findings have been merged into this and five subsequent dispatches from Washington.*)

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—In its first year and a half of chasing after cures for poverty, the Johnson administration's "economic opportunity" program has come up practically empty handed.

Not completely, though.

Project Head Start for preschool children is a happy exception.

Parts of the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs have brought solid and gratifying hope to hundreds of teenagers.

But most of the other, more experimental approaches have little of substance to show for the $2.5 billion effort. This is specially true of the community-action programs, which require a tenuous cooperation among many groups at the community level.

These are the findings of Monitor correspondents in some 40 cities across the country, who were asked to evaluate the impact of the program to date.

It is the community-action programs which are presently coming under strong fire from Congress. The House Committee on Education and Labor has moved to cut back funds drastically from this part of the poverty program.

No one is yet saying the programs have failed, only that it is taking a lot of time to register tangible results. The programs so far have only scratched the surface in the effort to lift some 20 million Americans out of the poverty syndrome, according to the survey.

OTHER FINDINGS LISTED

This newspaper found that the process alone of getting local communities to accept the challenges of cooperation—to sacrifice petty political and bureaucratic interests—has been so formidable that the initial expenditure of time and money was beyond anyone's expectation.

This year has been, in the words of one Monitor correspondent, a "tooling-up" period.

Here are some other findings of the Monitor survey:

The poor are better represented today on local antipoverty boards than they were a year ago, and the early furor over the participation has diminished considerably. But there is still no formula for choosing these representatives, by appointment, election, etc.—and elections to select them have proved problematical, if not unworkable.

But many local boards are moving toward allowing at least a third of their members to directly represent the interests of the poor.

The cities where early conflicts have been least are those where the established social agencies have been allowed to play a sizable role. In fact, many communities have come to see that a working relationship among the established agencies, the politicians, and the poor is the compromise essential for harmony and a workable program.

Yet, it is just such compromises which have worked against original and innovative programs and encouraged established procedures.

Poor people still retain serious misgivings about the chances of established health and welfare agencies doing any better now with poverty program money than they have in the past without it.

The major single complaint at the local level is the excruciatingly long delays in Washington and regional OEO offices for funding local projects and the increasing limitation on funds available for the programs.

There appears to be remarkably little evidence of misuse of funds, political patronage, or scandal of any kind in the program.

It is generally conceded throughout the country—and confirmed by OEO director, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.—that the really poor are not being reached in any numbers yet.

While the experience of the past year has been extremely painful for many communities, very costly, and markedly unproductive, there is hope in the view that essential groundwork for solid accomplishment has been laid and that this "tooling-up" was necessary and has been survived.

DES MOINES EXAMPLE CITED

Take, for example, the Community Action Program (CAP) in Des Moines, Iowa. The experience of this community illustrates the initial organizational problems of the poverty programs across the country.

Described by the Monitor correspondent there as having the "greatest potential impact," the CAP in Des Moines has been "in the throes of organization during the past year."

Originally the CAP there was set up as merely an offshoot of the traditional community welfare agencies. While the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington supports the participation of the community establishment, it opposes its dominance. So OEO called for restructuring.

It was no easy task. Enlisting cooperation from several sectors of the community was a touchy question, one that cities across the land have had to come to terms with.

In Des Moines, it was critically time-consuming.

The report to the Monitor explained: "Building the new structure, hiring staff, and developing programs have constituted the bulk of CAP activity during the year."

Once this basic groundwork was laid, the president of the local CAP, Robert Mannheimer, said hopefully: "We're on the threshhold of some real accomplishment, and we'll now have the opportunity to see how effective the antipoverty program can be."

But he concedes: "It really hasn't had a chance yet."

Programs proposed in Des Moines are typical of those worked out by many cities in the past year.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS SET UP

Des Moines is counting on a network of eight neighborhood centers to bring the benefits of the poverty program to the city's low-income areas.

Already approved is an OEO grant of $486,000 to set up the centers, provide birth-control aid, and establish a program for obtaining high school equivalency diplomas for poor-area residents.

In the development stage are programs for casework services, legal aid, job counseling, and services to aid alcoholics, to be administered through the neighborhood centers.

Still as our reporter concluded: "The poverty program here is just really getting on the road. Having gone through the tooling-up stage, it is in a position for the first time to begin having an impact."

Wichita, Kans., was another city initially bogged down in its first year by organizational problems.

It too got off on the wrong foot. Initially, the Mayor exercised final authority over the programs, with the city commission retaining veto power on all actions, and exercising full appointive power for the local CAP board.

Here, again, OEO balked—and demanded reorganization.

A new CAP board took over finally at the beginning of this summer.

Naturally, the first year saw little tangible accomplishment.

"CREATIVE CONFLICT" EXPLAINED

"I hope and expect us tó get down to business as we make this transition," says CAP chairman, Ed Sexton Jr. "At this point we've only scratched the surface in meeting our responsibilities to the poor."

Another CAP board member, Mrs. Edgar Gardenshire, says: ". . . to me we only got out feet wet last year."

She adds: "I would hope we can and will move forward in a more positive fashion in the coming year. . . . I think we've wasted too much time feeling our way in a new endeavor. This program has great, great potential."

In Seattle, a Monitor correspondent reports that the intangible results of the past year have been vital.

Some observers there feel, according to the report, that the Central Area Motivation Program (CAMP), funded by the local CAP, is "bringing a sense of unity and political awareness" to the central (poverty) area of the city that did not exist before.

Walter Hundley, director of the program, says that groundwork is being laid for what he terms "creative conflict." Carl Shaw, Seattle director of the CAP agency, agrees.

This "creative conflict" appears to be a thread which runs through many of the programs that are closest to the people and most effective in identifying needs, and a phenomenon which generally characterizes much of the last year.

Places lacking such conflict have generally suffered as a result, from failure to stir any interest or support in the program from local politicians and leaders.

Such is the case in Vermont.

Our correspondent there reports that the war on poverty in Vermont "has never moved off dead center."

"The CAP programs have been so ineffective that they haven't stirred up one ounce of real controversy," says our reporter.

He adds: "The CAP efforts in Burlington, as throughout the state, have flopped so far, and most have never gotten beyond the application stage "

BASIC COMPLAINT STUDIED

Basically, the problem appears to lie in a defective organizational structure, which, despite the urgings of top state OEO officials, has not been corrected as yet. .

The basic complaint is that the program is directed at the policy level by traditional persons—social workers, community leaders whose names fill the rosters of the Community Chest, Red Cross, etc. The poor, with unconventional ideas are looked upon by them as "kooks."

In this case, Vermont hasn't even completed its "tooling-up" period. Maybe not even started it.

Hartford was one community that had already been wrestling with organization when Congress passed the program. It had projects in the proposal stage, and the city was looking for private grants when the law was passed.

It has, then, been one of the most successful cities in getting funded by OEO.

The $1.3 million the local program now handles annually is almost 50 percent more than Hartford is entitled to under poverty-population guidelines.

According to our reporter, the CAP during the first year (that is, before federal funds were available), "did little more than identify problems."

When the federal funds began pouring in, the city knew what it wanted. They beefed up the already started programs. Most of them, however, were educational and demanded little in terms of innovation or originality.

Only this year has the program gotten into the really difficult area of communication and organization in poverty neighborhoods.

SOME AREAS STANDING STILL

At the moment, our correspondent reports, "an impressive variety of programs are under way. . . ." But he adds, typically, "of most, it can be said now only that they seem like good ideas, which may work."

In Newark, N.J., a Monitor correspondent reckoned that the controversial CAP in that city "just about stood still in the last year."

Its director, Cyril Tyson, agrees.

"We are in a critical period," he noted, "because we have come so far together developing what is possibly one of the most creative and productive programs in the entire country and now are confronted by inexcusable delay."

Slowness in funding their programs is one cause of the delay.

But another is directly attributable to bitter internal struggles for control of the program that sapped energy otherwise usable in the antipoverty campaign.

Reports from Philadelphia show that, again, the CAP was slow in starting, and that the "whole momentum developed" in the last 12 months. During this time, all the organizing and programing was achieved.

It is difficult to see where the tangible results, even though the executive director of the CAP, Charles W. Bowser, says: "We have already made a significant impact."

But his critics want to see more concrete accomplishment.

One leading critic, a spokesman for the local ADA claims: "The program isn't off the ground in Philadelphia. The program writers haven't developed a single program in a year."

A spokesman for the local Chamber of Commerce might agree: "I don't see that it's doing any good, not that it's bad. I don't see any activity evident."

FUNDS GO FOR SALARIES

The problem is that most of the funds go for salaries of those employed by the CAP. Cecil Moore, head of the local NAACP, says, therefore, no money gets to to the poor.

But Mr. Bowser replies that most of those employed in the program are poor, and, thus, money is reaching them.

Generally, it is felt a start has been made that could lead to some successes.

In the South, besides the initial organizational difficulties to be overcome, racial overtones added extra burdens to setting up a poverty program.

A Monitor report from Alabama indicates that the greatest improvement in the past year came in the Black Belt. A year ago, there was outright hostility toward the program.

"It's just a way that Washington has of ramming integration down our throats," contended one Black Belt mayor. "If we don't come around, we'll lose plenty in federal funds."

Well, they're coming around.

Today, there is increasing willingness on the part of Black Belt county officials to bring poverty programs into their counties.

In recent months, six Black Belt counties have approved the organization of poverty programs. More are expected.

But, again, it is obvious that great strides lie ahead to get these programs even to the "tooling-up" stage.

Atlanta, Ga., is a different story. It has truly a model program.

It got off to a booming start.

TWO SUCCESS FACTORS SEEN

OEO officials told a Monitor correspondent that two factors contributed to these early successes:

"1. The city was ready and waiting with an organization of welfare and social-service agencies when the Economic Opportunity Act went into effect;

"2. OEO officials here have been able to get existing welfare and social-service agencies to work together in an unusual show of cooperation and unity."

Today, the program has nine neighborhood centers in operation, with three more scheduled to open soon, plus 27 community organizations under contract for administering specialized services.

But the big problem there now is that it is suffering the results of being too organized. Its early funds were more than officially authorized (but allowable because other cities weren't using them). Now that other cities are catching up and wanting money, Atlanta programs are being cut back.

This is happening to some other programs that were funded early.

Boston and New York City programs followed the familiar pattern of early administrative tangles from which they are only now recovering.

A Monitor report from Boston explains: "Because of its administrative difficulties, the local antipoverty agency has not really gotten off the ground to meet the needs of the poor. But the groundwork for a good agency has been laid, and the administration is going to get better."

And the Monitor report from New York views this last year as "chaotic."

The report continues: "In the last year, the program has pretty much stood still, if not gone backward, due partly to the mayoralty switch from Wagner to Lindsay."

"WHO'S WINNING?"

In Los Angeles, the story is the same.

A Monitor correspondent there likens the program to a big football game—lots of running up and down, but with very little scoring. "And Los Angeles' antipoverty programs leave many spectators in grave doubt as to who is winning the game."

But, all in all, most cities across the country have apparently survived the past year of "tooling up," or "creative conflict."

To many communities, this has meant working and reworking their program proposals.

To V. James Popeo, the executive director of the Worcester, Mass., program (which has had some severe organizational struggles), the past year has meant this:

'The first year was one of surveying the community to identify incidences of poverty and the needs of the community. Next was the need to mobilize residents in target areas and come up with a package or proposal identifying causes and means for eliminating poverty."

The struggle may have paid off. Still it's impossible to say.

In some cities, the slow start has been viewed as a positive asset.

"Because of the slow start," says Chester Stovall, director of Kansas City's antipoverty agency, "I don't believe we'll be making some of the mistakes other cities have encountered."

That remains to be seen, of course.

But that's where "the war on poverty" stands at the moment in most cities. It will take another year before positive results can register. That is, if Congress continues to fund the community action programs, which, at this time, is not altogether certain.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 2, 1966]

Federal Pressure Felt—U.S. Poor Gain Foothold in Local Programs

(Second of a series)

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—Slowly and without fanfare, poor people across the country have gained a foothold in running many local antipoverty programs. And the controversy which revolved around this issue a year ago has diminished almost to a whisper.

Behind the scenes, pressures from Washington exerted on city after city during the past year, together with efforts of local civil rights groups, account for this development.

Though nowhere spelling it out specifically, antipoverty chief R. Sargent Shriver Jr. has let it be known he wants one-third representation of the poor on local boards.

It's not happening everywhere. But it is in many places. And in some cities, the poor are getting even more than a one-third representation.

This was documented by a recent survey conducted by correspondents of The Christian Science Monitor in some 40 major cities across the country. Report after report showed increased representation of poor people on local antipoverty boards and neighborhood councils.

Mr. Shriver's leverage has been the proverbial dollar. He has delayed or cut off funds until the cities complied with an acceptable formula.

Machinery for increasing this representation has not been standardized, however, and it has been very difficult to set up. This is one issue which has been a major factor in delaying the start of many local programs.

Elections have worked in some places and failed in others. Some cities appoint the representatives of the poor. But the fact is, they are increasing.

"ONE-THIRD" CRITERIA

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 called for "maximum feasible" participation of those who live in poverty areas.

But the law didn't spell out exactly what that would mean. For a while, the Office of Economic Opportuntiy (OEO) was openly pressing for the poor on poverty boards.

The mayors and the established agencies balked. They claimed it posed a threat to their political base.

Then in an odd sequence of events last fall the Bureau of the Budget let it be known that there would be less emphasis on involving the poor in local programs.

It was thought at the time that the mayors had pressured the administration into taking this stand, and that the administration used the Budget Bureau to tell OEO.

Mr. Shriver appeared to get the message. He began de-emphasizing the policymaking role of the poor in speech after speech.

But at the same time, the OEO not only continued to quietly press for participation of the poor, but also held back funds from programs that didn't conform, according to the survey.

This newspaper found that in city after city, poverty directors were under the distinct impression that the OEO wanted one-third representation of the poor on poverty boards.

In Winston-Salem, N.C., for example, the local antipoverty board originally had 13 members, with virtually no poor representation.

"Several reshuffles and additions were necessary," reported one correspondent, "because of federal decrees that more representatives of the poor should be on the board."

The board was increased to 43 members. "Now, one-third of the board is made up of what is referred to as representatives of the poor citizens of the city," according to the report from the city.

BOARD CHANGES ACCOMPLISHED

From Portland, Ore., came a similar report.

Last year, criticism of the lack of participation of the "poor" on OEO committees brought an expansion of governing bodies to include representatives of low-income neighborhoods.

A report from Richmond, Va., shows that getting representation of the poor was "more important to OEO," than it was to local administrators.

Washington "has just forced Richmond community action program to revise its bylaws to ensure that the establishment will not be able to pack the board of directors."

Richmond now has 12 of 36 representing the poor. OEO wants it kept that way. The report concludes, typically: "The poor are better represented now, and the situation will improve."

The story is the same elsewhere.

In Des Moines, Iowa, the board first-off had practically no poverty representation. But, found the Monitor survey, "the new restructured group has 15 of 45 members from poverty groups."

In Little Rock, Ark., exactly one-third of the 24-man board of directors of the Economic Opportunity agency represents the poor.

MILWAUKEE FORMULA

In Hartford, Conn., some 20 out of 54 represent the poor, including eight appointed minority-group spokesmen, "none of them 'Uncle Toms,' " according to the report.

Charleston, W. Va., claims 17 out of 40 board members represent the poor; in New Haven, it is 7 out of 16; Louisville, Ky., has 10 out of 33; San Antonio has 9 out of 30.

The report from Alabama indicates most local boards are made up of "one-third drawn from the ranks of the poor." Also, the report explains that Negroes have "good representation" on Community Action Project (CAP) boards.

Representation of the poor on CAP boards in Wichita, Kan., "appears to be very satisfactory."

Until very recently, Milwaukee, Wis., still was struggling with a formula for choosing representatives on their antipoverty counsel.

A solution appears to have been reached, in which "10 percent of its members must be victims of poverty or one-third of its members must live in an area of poverty."

In both San Francisco and Oakland, the poor represent more than half the membership of local boards. San Francisco Mayor Jack Shelley is disenchanted by what he feels is "a constant source" of friction between the mayor's office and the poverty counsel.

However, there were a few cities surveyed where the story was different.

One critic of the program in Providence, R.I., said, "The poor people should participate not only by being involved in programs but in actually planning the programs."

But, he contends: "The thing that is happening is that the decisions are made in City Hall or by the Board of Community Action and are taken to the neighborhood committees for rubber stamping. From where I sit, the longer we are in this program, the less do we see of this 'maximum representation' by the poor."

Similar complaints are heard in Los Angeles, in Chicago, and elsewhere.

In Buffalo, a member of the local antipoverty board, Miss Olive Scott, told the Monitor: "I don't think the poor are represented at all—not the poor by definition. Only two or three board members fall into the poor category."

From Cincinnati, the report that "it would seem that four of the poor on the 35-member community action commission might not be enough." But negotiations are under way to increase that to nine.

Also, in Atlanta an antipoverty worker observed: "We've gone through the motions of involving the poor, but it hasn't really been too effective."

FIGURES MISLEADING

The problem with all these figures is that they are basically misleading.

Representatives of the poor are not always, in fact, poor by definition. When a board is said to have one-third representatives of the poor, that often means they are elected by the poor from poverty districts to represent them but are not actually in the poverty category.

Some have justified this practice, saying that the really poor are not equipped to run programs. The Mayor of Nashville, Tenn., Beverly Brilly, said that folks in Washington "are going to learn the facts of life. . . . They don't realize yet in Washington that you can't have unqualified people running good programs."

But critics of this practice say board members can't effectively represent the poor—unless they are really poor.

Often "safe" Negroes are put on boards to "represent" the poor. The really poor dislike this deeply. Explains Victor K. Ray, poverty head in North Little Rock, Ark.: "Young people are stirring in these neighborhoods, and they resent and resist the presence of 'Uncle Toms' and the 'Negro preacher' as their representative on every organization created by white men."

Moreover, the poor themselves have had real trouble identifying their leaders and mobilizing their ideas.

As a poverty worker in Atlanta reports: When a leader among the poor does emerge, he quickly joins the middle class and forgets about trying to aid the poor. He starts leading a middle-class life.

In trying to involve the poor, a real problem is to gain their interest.

How to break the poor people's apathy and hostility toward the "establishment," is a question confronting antipoverty workers all across the country.

PROCEDURAL PROBLEMS

Another problem, as the report from Minneapolis illustrates, is that most poor people have little experience in the procedures of public meetings. Most have never heard of "Robert's Rules of Order" for guiding group action.

A cochairman of one of the local meetings always had good ideas, but in her early participation in poverty committees, "she would not say what was on her mind until after the meeting," according to an antipoverty leader.

Minneapolis attacked "the twin problems of inarticulateness and lack of knowledge of the mechanics of the war on poverty," by holding a day-long seminar in mid-June to help "draw out" people. They were urged to express their ideas at big antipoverty meetings, and were taught techniques on how to do it effectively.

This approach has also been tried in New Orleans.

A correspondent there explained that persons from the poverty areas were encouraged to get together and organize, to enter into debates and to take mass action on community improvements, and to present their needs and grievances to city officials and others who could help them.

The value of this effort, called Community Action Project, was spelled out by the New Orleans antipoverty director, Winston Lill: "For the first time these people are not only being heard, but as voters, they are being listened to in high places."

ELECTION TO BOARDS HELD

This point was also made by C. C. Dejoie, Negro editor of the Louisiana weekly, an influential Negro paper published in New Orleans. He wrote: "Negroes . . . for the first time have a chance to be articulate. They can air their complaints, actually communicate with people who can do something for them. Somebody is actually interested in their problems. These people have a sense of participation, which they never had before."

But selecting representatives of the poor to serve on antipoverty boards has been a dubiously rewarding task.

In many cities, elections have been held—with results far from encouraging.

The election turnout percentage has been excruciatingly low.

Apathy, cynicism, and ignorance have plagued the ballot boxes.

But some say that the small turnout at the ballot box is irrelevant.

David Beecher, associate administrator of Atlanta's antipoverty program, puts it this way: "You don't measure people's involvement simply by the number of voters. Voting doesn't have much meaning to these people."

Others say that, regardless of the voter turnout, the process by which elections have been staged has been invaluable training for poor involvement in the program.

Chester E. Stovall, director of Kansas City's antipoverty program, told his paper: "Holding the public elections was time consuming, but I'm happy with the results. It has motivated the poor to take part in the program. . . . The biggest issue is developing techniques to involve the people who need it most. I mean really getting to the bottom of the barrel, people who have not been motivated by anything."

Typical voter turnout is reflected in elections in Syracuse, where an estimated 10 percent of the eligible voters turned out. About the same percentage registered their votes in Hartford.

In Cleveland, it was 6.5 percent—in the words of one critic, "Just a big, fat expensive flop." It cost $10,000.

In Kansas City it was 5.3 percent. Philadelphia got only 2.6 percent in its first election last year.

More recently, however, the election in Philadelphia counted 5.5 percent at the polls. (Some say it was closer to 7.7 percent.)

That meant that 28,000 of an estimated half-million eligible poverty voters turned out. The increase was heartening to local observers who had seen an increase of excitement and interest in electing some 72 persons to 12 area councils.

One region in north Alabama got one of the highest ratios in the nation for one election. This was attributed "largely to the energetic efforts of a local administrator."

In one section of Wichita, Kans., where a large turnover was recorded, this was attributed to the fact that several men of "larger than usual physical stature" carrying ballot boxes approached front doors and let it be known "we're here for your vote and expect to stay until you do vote."

The biggest failure was the Los Angeles election described in a report to the Monitor as "something of a fizzle."

Less than 1 percent of eligible voters went to the polls.

Explaining the little interest, one Negro spokesman called it a "fix."

"They [the white power structure] set it up according to their rules, and we were supposed to go along with it," he explained.

Another minority spokesman, a controversial head of a grassroots CAP agency: "I'll tell you why it failed. First, you had to prove that you were poor to be eligible. Who wants to admit publicly that he is poor? Then, there was no real campaigning. Spelling out of issues. No excitement. People didn't seem to care. They felt no matter who got elected, the people would still have little to say in final determination of the programs and who gets the money."

The report from Louisville had another explanation: "There is evidence, too, that the poor have little faith in other poor."

But a consultant to the Syracuse antipoverty program concluded: "The people aren't fooled. They know this is pretty much of a controlled election."

Whether the elections are "controlled," "fixed," or just plain "no excitement," the ultimate direction of local poverty programs is toward greater involvement of the poor and their representatives.

The controversy still smolders, but now, with a token one-third representation of the poor on boards in many cities, OEO seems happy—and local boards can, at last, get down to the work they were set up to perform, under a law passed almost two years ago.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 3, 1966]

OLD WAYS BIND POVERTY DRIVE

(By William C. Selover)

(Third of a series)

WASHINGTON.—Antipoverty programs in major cities in the United States are deeply in debt to the local "establishment"—that is, to the city welfare departments, boards of education, private social agencies, and the like.

This was found following an extensive 40-city survey by this newspaper.

Presently, in most cities, local education and welfare agencies administer many of the antipoverty programs directly, or at least have a major role on policymaking boards.

Critics say this stifles creative new approaches to poverty.

One thing is certain: It keeps intramural conflicts between poverty officials and the "establishment" at a minimum.

A typical comment was from Nashville, Tenn.:

"Right now, most of our tasks are performed by municipal agencies," according to Nat Williams Jr., a deputy director of the Nashville program. "Head Start is operated by the schools; the birth-control program is operated by the health department," he cited for example.

Poverty programs have clearly learned to cooperate with the local establishment.

In Atlanta, this fact was cited as an important reason for the relative success of the program there, so far.

The Christian Science Monitor report from Atlanta states that "OEO [Office of Economic Opportunity] officials here have been able to get existing welfare and social service agencies to work together in an unusual show of cooperation and unity."

But some critics look with extreme misgivings at this development. They seriously question the ability of the establishment to cope with the problem of poverty. If the existing agencies had done their jobs, they argue, we wouldn't need a poverty program.

A spokesman for this view, the Rev. Kenneth S. Waterman, a Presbyterian minister in Kansas City, Mo., says that his city's programs "protect the vested interests of the existing welfare and educational institutions and the political and social power structures."

He adds: "This isn't to say these aren't all nice people. But to what extent do they want to change things? Poverty and welfare have become major growth industries."

His argument is, of course, that a welfare agency, if wholly successful, would run itself out of business. Thus, the survival of individual bureaucrats depends on the failure of the programs.

This is a revival of the same argument about munitions manufacturers in wartime, Only this time, it's a war on poverty, in which total victory would knock a lot of social workers out of jobs.

The Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington has apparently been very wary of this development and its implications, and has attempted, not too successfully, to head it off before it got out of hand.

TRADITIONAL CONNECTIONS

Several local programs had funds held up until OEO could be assured the establishment wouldn't play a dominant role.

This happened in the Columbia, S.C., program.

The Monitor correspondent there reported that "Washington was reluctant to go along with the project because the plan called for it to be working through existing state agencies—in particular, the adult education and vocational education department of the state Department of Education."

"But," he added, "when it was agreed that these state agencies would have only coordinating and funding functions the various operational phases to be under local control, word at long last was received that the higher echelons in Washington would approve the project. . . ."

In Fort Worth, Texas, the local Community Action Program (CAP) was closely tied to a traditional welfare agency.

"OEO objected to this and wanted a separate and totally unrelated agency to administer the poverty program here," reported the Monitor correspondent.

And in Des Moines, there were "some hurt feelings" when OEO precipated the ouster of the traditional Iowa agencies from control of the program.

But, while the OEO has objected to the dominance of the established agencies in the poverty program, it has encouraged their cooperative role in them.

And in most cities, the traditional welfare groups play a major coordinating role, according to the Monitor survey.

In Minneapolis, according to our report, "the existing private welfare agencies are tightly tied in with the war on poverty."

REFERRAL SERVICES

From Oklahoma City: "This city's program has been set up through regular welfare agencies. The CAP is officed in with other agencies and there is good coordination."

One symptom of this "coordination" appears to be the proliferation of local programs which spend antipoverty money on referral services for the poor.

This is usually a neighborhood center which refers poor people to individual establishment agencies designed to help them—the local health and welfare departments, for example.

In Philadelphia, one of the first steps taken in that city's poverty program was to "set in motion a services mobilization plan to coordinate agency activity. Many cases of special need are referred daily to various agencies from the local level."

The report concludes: "There appears to be close cooperation with major social agencies."

COMMITMENT QUESTIONED

Similarly, in New Orleans the local CAP "is creating 'one-stop' centers in the six underprivileged areas, where teams of lawyers, public health nurses, social workers, and community organization specialists are available to residents."

Such centers are planned, too, for Richmond, Va., where the establishment retains a major role.

"Private and public agencies working with the poor," explains our reporter from Richmond, "have agreed to work through the poverty centers, and by bringing the services and the programs into the areas needing them, rather than operating from downtown, a fuller cooperation will be achieved."

The same thing is happening in Hartford, Conn., and many other cities.

So what are the complaints about such cooperation? Critics have plenty.

One, the Rev. Charles Tachau, an Episcopal minister in Louisville, Ky., says that the local community action agency there reflects "the thinking of the white establishment, and has little relevance for the poor."

A former director of Richmond's Community Action Program concedes that the Richmond establishment "has a sense of obligation, or duty. . . ." But, he says they have "no real sense of commitment."

He sees the serious lack in Richmond of "any real burning desire" to help the poor among the establishment.

An even stronger opponent of this trend is a member of the Buffalo Community Action Board, the Rev. James T. Hemphill (of the Walls Memorial AME Church).

"STUMBLING BLOCK" SIGHTED

He told this newspaper that the major problem of the Buffalo program "seems to be an attempt by the established social agencies to squeeze out and kill the incentive of the indigenous groups. The social agencies are tending to keep the poverty program as a handout operation. They make it hard for the poor to establish their own programs."

The result of this is to stir up a conflict in many cities—the poor and their spokesmen pitted against the establishment. And this is increasing as the poor become more articulate.

Such has been the case as reported from Providence, R.I., where, according to the correspondent, "the established agencies are still on top, with social workers being accused by their critics of being snobs and 'standoffish.' "

The Monitor survey identified similar reports of such conflict in Los Angeles, Seattle, Syracuse, N.Y.; St. Louis, Columbus, Ohio; Cleveland, Newark, N.J.; Burlington, Vt.; Baltimore, Worcester, Mass., among others.

The conflict is essentially political.

As our correspondent in Atlanta explained: "The existing 'power sources' aren't eager to give over their power to the poor. The small group of people who influence politics in the city—the power structure—are a stumbling block."

From Rochester, N.Y., and Kansas City, Mo., correspondents report that it is this issue which has been used by Saul D. Alinsky, a Chicago community organizer, to enlist the interest of the poor.

His tactic is to "blast away at the establishment," according to our report from Kansas City.

But there his efforts so far have been fitful and sporadic and have not really seriously threatened the establishment.

BROAD REPRESENTATION

But from Rochester, the report says that the local CAP "faces a major opponent" in the Alinsky group, called FIGHT.

FIGHT has taken on the CAP in an effort, in Mr. Alinsky's words, to "rub raw the conscience of the community."

Mr. Alinsky sees the poverty program, according to the Monitor report, "as a natural foe, as welfare-colonialism, as more do-gooding by the traditional power structures of the community."

His group has objected to the handling of so much of the antipoverty money by traditional agencies such as the board of education.

"Apparently," concludes the Monitor report, "the traditional agencies are suspect because of past tendencies to respond to weaknesses of the poor community, ignoring its strengths."

But, in the main, the general conclusion of the survey was that there is more cooperation in most cities between the establishment and poverty officials than there has been conflict.

From Charleston, W. Va., for example, our correspondent found that "there has been no conflict . . . among the poor, the established politicians, and the established social agencies."

The same was noted in Boston and New Haven.

From San Antonio, Texas, our correspondent reports that the local antipoverty board "is a broad based one, providing representation for all types of interests and giving voice to the community's 'liberal' and 'conservative' viewpoints."

This apparently is the way the OEO wants it, ideally, with no single group dominant.

This is the way it is in many cities, with the "establishment" coordinating closely with the many programs but without frankly dominating them. Such "cooperation" is expected to continue, if not increase substantially.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 4, 1966]

Local Antipoverty Leaders Across United States Evaluate Program

(By William C. Selover)

(Fourth of a series)

Washington.—The director of Vermont's antipoverty program, Thomas C. Davis, has almost lost patience with Washington.

He says the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has consistently failed to follow through with funds for programs meticulously developed by the poor in Vermont.

Ambrose I. Lane, director of the Buffalo, N.Y. program has the same trouble.

But slowness of funding programs is just one of his problems. He has a hard time just communicating with the antipoverty headquarters.

"These people sit in Washington and write these memos with little concern or knowledge of the local problem," Mr. Lane charges.

"A lag of information coming from the OEO hampers a smooth operation," he complained, saying that OEO memos sometimes arrive 6–8 weeks late.

These complaints are typical of those which turned up in a Monitor sampling of local programs in some 40 cities from coast to coast. Local program administrators were asked to evaluate their relations with poverty headquarters in Washington.

PARTNERSHIP CITED

But such snags have not cropped up everywhere.

Neal Bellos, director of the Community Action Program (CAP) in Louisville, Ky., characterizes relations with Washington and the regional OEO office as "very satisfactory."

The local program officers in Kansas City report no problems with Washington. Most of their dealings are with the OEO regional office in Kansas City, and they term the relationship "more a partnership."

And New Haven's program officials, according to the Monitor report, "have an excellent working relationship with Washington."

Leal Schurman, San Antonio's antipoverty director, now calls his working relationship with Washington, "very constructive."

But it wasn't always that way.

"At first, it was not good," he acknowledges. "The policy structure had not jelled. The staff was not stabilized. It was very frustrating. Now we are singing the same tune. Policy is clear, and we know the people we are dealing with in the regional OEO office in Austin on a first-name basis."

POOR DISILLUSIONED

Mr. Schurman's early frustrations, however, are still being experienced in many cities.

Mr. Davis says there are more than half a dozen community and area action programs that are "simply going to fall apart if they are not funded."

He accuses Washington of being "indifferent" to the programs developed at the local level by the poor and of concentrating on programs developed basically in Washington—what he calls "prepackaged programs" such as Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps.

This continues to bother Tom Davis in Vermont.

"I've watched poor people, pregnant women, and tired people work to develop these projects," he explains. "Now they have become disillusioned. The poor people I have talked to say, 'Tom, you are a good guy, but you have to come through sometime.' "

PROVISO CRITICIZED

The local director in Buffalo is also annoyed by OEO policy.

"I'm not certain the OEO wants to live up to its reputation as a champion of the poor," charges Mr. Lane. "They are a heck of a lot more conservative than their public-relations people say they are."

Specifically Mr. Lane is up in arms over OEO's Memo 23 concerning personnel, which states that the CAP and its delegate agencies must promise to hire persons who have good moral character.

To test Washington, Mr. Lane plans to hire an ex-convict with a long police record as a $5,000-a-year neighborhood aide.

"If the poverty program is not willing to employ an ex-con or parolee then who is going to do it?" he asks. "A sizable minority of the people we serve fall into this category."

Mayor Charles V. Ryan Jr. of Springfield, Mass., is plagued by Washington's policies.

He says antipoverty officials are always "switching signals" on whether he should or should not take a strong role in developing the program.

Meanwhile, Springfield lags behind every other New England city in coming up with a workable program.

CONFLICT NOTED

From New York, our correspondent writes that "relations between New York City and OEO have not been good. The history of relations between the two has been one of conflict."

R. Sargent Shriver Jr., OEO director, has publicly criticized the administration there. On the other hand, some say Washington has had a "punitive attitude" toward the city.

The same is true in Baltimore. An OEO report asserted that Baltimore's program has "not yet gotten off the ground." Baltimore heatedly demanded an explanation. None came.

Mostly, across the country, whenever this conflict is present, it centers on money, or lack of it.

For example, Fort Worth applied for funds for its local CAP last October. But the grant was not announced until March, 1966. And this was just for an initial grant of $34,290 to finance a study of poverty needs.

CONTROL DESIRED

"Money and approval of new programs move slowly," according to our report from Los Angeles. "Some critics see the 'red tape' and the desire [of the local governing board] to keep firm control of all programs as a major problem."

In Philadelphia, critics grumble over the "red tape in Washington," according to our correspondent.

Mayor Beverly Briley of Nashville blames Washington for the slow start in the city's antipoverty program. Washington, in turn, blames Nashville.

Our reporter from Newark observes that the program there is "stymied" by "slow federal approval of grants."

The local director was annoyed over an application for a $2.3 million grant which was held up by the regional office in New York.

CITIES' FUNDS UNUSED

But, by way of explanation, one regional OEO official told this newspaper: "The Newark program is in pretty bad shape, full of technical sloppiness."

New York City's antipoverty board was in such bad shape this past year that it had to refund some $10 million because it hadn't been able to spend it.

The city had been given $20 million in the last fiscal year, to be used before June 30, But by that date it was well enough organized to spend only $9.7 million.

The same thing happened in Boston, where Washington had to "recapture" unused funds originally allocated to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This was done by reducing the funds available for the coming year.

The reason, according to our report, was that the local antipoverty agency "simply was unable to reach its enrollee quotas."

CUTBACKS HINTED

The big worry now, across the country, is over the future of these programs.

Congress is threatening to cut back federal funding considerably—making the local governments foot more of the bill.

And, too, there are cities, like Atlanta and Hartford, that were funded more than their allotment the first year because the money was available and other cities were slow in applying.

This coming year, with greater demands in more cities, the Atlanta program expects to see a tightening of funds, even if Congress doesn't cut back heavily.

Typical reaction is seen in the report from Providence, where the working relationship between local program officials and Washington was called "foggy."

"Budget tightening is causing concern," writes the Monitor correspondent, "particularly the plan to require local governments to increase their contributions. Some communities feel they just will not have the money available to do that."

In Atlanta, local antipoverty officials are complaining: "We get the feeling the regional office (of OEO) is holding the line on us until other communities around the country catch up."

DELAYING CHARGED

One official confided that Atlanta has received 3½ times as much money in grants as OEO guideline figures allow. Now, local officials are complaining. Assuming they would continue to receive grants as large as those of last year, they made plans for projects that are at least as costly.

Furthermore, they promised the city's 200,000 poor people projects that they won't be able to provide due to the OEO cutback in funds.

Atlanta officials and OEO recently had a heated debate over the Head Start funds which were cut about 40 percent.

Only last fall, Mr. Shriver told Atlanta that their city is "leading the nation . . . and Georgia is leading the nation in the war on poverty."

CONFUSION ASSERTED

St. Louis faces similar cutbacks.

Local CAP officials there are annoyed by a three-month delay in getting funds. They say it is caused by a "state of confusion" at OEO.

Says the Monitor report from St. Louis: "OEO is tightening the pinch a little bit. Local antipoverty officials have been told that it can expect about $4.5 million in federal grants this fiscal year. Last year, it was $5 million.

"That announcement has had this effect: the number of programs the local program has been considering has dwindled."

John E. Hansan, director of the CAP in Cincinnati, is reportedly worried about the future.

He feels that if Congress cuts down money for his program, according to a Monitor reporter, "local money probably would not be forthcoming."

BUDGETERS CONCERNED

"More important, among future problems," according to our report from Hartford, "will be money."

The report says these questions now are being asked in Hartford:

"What will happen when OEO decides to withdraw more money from school programs, and when growing activity in the tardy cities makes it impossible for Hartford to get more than its 'guideline' share?

"What will happen, moreover, when pilot programs prove themselves and step forward for expanded budgets?"

No one has all the answers to these money questions. Congress has still to act on next year's program.

Several reports registered complaints about poor coordination in Washington and of programs by-passing local and state governments.

BY-PASSING SCORED

The latter practice, says our reporter in Birmingham, has caused "hostility between official Alabama and the federal government."

The reporter continues: "The people in charge of the state program simply don't know what's going on because so many programs completely by-pass the state, flowing from Washington directly to the local community."

Rep. Edith Green (D) of Oregon has said this has happened in her state. She severely criticized the OEO for by-passing state and local governments in dealing with local programs.

Schools and other agencies are "weakened" by such by-passing, she told a Portland audience.

And Victor K. Ray, director of the Little Rock program, complains that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) allows schools to get Title One money without checking with local OEO boards. He calls this a drastic mistake.

Poverty officials in St. Louis bemoan the confusion of having the source of antipoverty funds divided among so many government agencies, such as HEW, Labor, Small-Business Administration, and OEO.

Reports our correspondent from St. Louis: "Local poverty officials say privately that their funds should be coming from one source. They say there should be better coordination and less red tape among the federal agencies. They would like everything to be in Shriver's office [the OEO]."

But in many other cities, relations with OEO appeared respectful and correct, if not smooth and harmonious.

HARMONY REPORTED

"The working relationship between OEO and the local program has been good, and there have been no complaints of budget tightening to a detrimental degree," reports our correspondent from Charleston, W. Va.

Almost identical reports were received from Rochester, N.Y., Indianapolis, Ind., and Phoenix, Aiz.

Columbus, Ohio, reports a "good working relationship," with OEO. "There is grousing, of course, over the bureaucratic delays in evaluating local proposals but even this has subsided lately," writes our correspondent.

Both the Boston and Worcester, Mass., programs have been funded in full this year, without cutbacks.

The program in Columbia, S.C., has not been hampered by slow funding from OEO.

Nor has this happened in Richmond, Va. But our reporter there says that "officials here expect a financial pinch to develop, and they are already thinking of other monetary sources."

Doubtless, local programs will be put under increasing pressure to find "other monetary sources." This, in fact, was the original intent of the legislation—get it started with federal funds, then let the states and localities take over once they were going.

A reporter writes from Hartford that some people "hope a redistricted State Legislature will come to the rescue before funding becomes an acute problem. . . ."

He concludes: "This may prove an important test for a small, growing sense of regional responsibility."

Such a test will probably take place in every state where poverty programs have taken root and hope to prosper.

In the meantime, OEO continues to baffle some localities with its memos and policy. And some localities can't seem to come up with programs acceptable to the parent organization.

But the direction, at least, is toward greater cooperation and understanding.

Now, if only the money will hold out, perhaps a beginning can be made toward meeting the legitimate needs of some 20 million Americans living in poverty.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 5, 1966]

POVERTY WAR ESCAPES SCANDAL

(By William C. Selover)

(Fifth of a series)

WASHINGTON.—The American "war on poverty" may have established some kind of all-time record.

Believe it or not, in the nearly two years of operation, there hasn't been even a whisper of scandal in the administration of the overwhelming majority of programs across the country.

And even where there has been some alleged impropriety, it has most often resulted from misunderstanding or imprecise directives from Washington.

This is the finding of a recent survey by The Christian Science Monitor of poverty programs in some 40 cities across the country.

This is all the more impressive since such large sums of money are involved—some $2.5 billion a year.

That is not to say that the programs have been wholly efficient. They haven't in many cases.

But, in general, the local administrators have taken great care to maintain close watch on funds and to keep the programs free of patronage or graft.

POLITICAL REQUESTS REJECTED

And the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has maintained constant vigilance, with inspectors crisscrossing the country always on the lookout for any possible scandal. R. Sargent Shriver Jr., OEO director, has let it be known that if there is any possible irregularity found, he wants to know about it first. And he wants it corrected immediately.

Typically, the director of the Kansas City, Mo., program, Chester E. Stovall, told the Monitor he has occasionally had calls from local politicians asking how they could get somebody a job in the local program.

"I tell them," he says, "to have the person send in the regular application. Then I say: 'But the fact that you called me won't be considered.' "

And he adds: "But I think most of the politicians have bent over to keep politics out of it. They want the program to work."

From Columbia, S.C., the Monitor correspondent writes: "There has not been a single allegation of graft or political bossism."

The report pointed out that at the recent session of the South Carolina General Assembly, "there was not a word uttered on the floor in criticism of the OEO program or how it is being run" during the entire five-month session.

"This is indicative," said the report, "of the attitude of the politicians generally in this state."

Similarly, from Louisville, Ky., our reporter noted that "among the blessing the local program has enjoyed is almost complete freedom from political interference of any kind."

The occasional real scandal, such as ones in Boston, or Harlem, or Providence, R.I., make great news copy for much of the country's press.

UNEXPECTED FINDINGS

But, unfortunately for the program, such stories paint a completely distorted view of the program as a whole. It is proverbial that scandals and failures of a program are bigger headline makers than their successes.

On the other hand, the findings of this Monitor survey are so unexpected as to be newsworthy and pertinent. It may also prove important simply because congressmen and other opponents of the program have capitalized on the relatively few shortcomings of the program, without pointing out the remarkably clean record of the majority of the programs.

Still, the story is indisputable. In city after city, Monitor reporters found the same freedom from dishonesty and graft.

From Phoenix, Ariz., our reporter tells us: "No funds have been withheld from any Arizona program because of local failure to comply with federal requirements, or because of dishonesty."

Again, "No trace of misuse of funds, preferential treatment or patronage has come to light," writes our reporter from Wichita, Kans.

From our man in Austin, Texas: "Despite constant squabbling on the board, there have been no known major scandals over misuse of funds or participation by disqualified persons."

"There have been no scandals to feed any political fires," we learn from Kansas City, Mo.

From Buffalo, N.Y.: "There have been no scandals or misuse of funds."

And from Rochester, N.Y.: "There have been no scandals of note, no misuse of funds, no clamor over participation by unqualified persons."

IN EARLY STAGES

Precisely the same reports came from these other cities: Richmond, Va., Springfield, Mass., Little Rock, Ark., Charleston, W. Va., Winston-Salem, N.C. (reporting for all of the state), Milwaukee, Worcester, Mass., and San Francisco.

As our reporter from Indianapolis wrote, summing up reports from many other cities besides those mentioned: "No scandals."

Many of these cities, of course, are just getting their programs off the drawing boards and really haven't had time to develop a good juicy scandal.

As our reporter from Vermont writes: "There have been no scandals in Vermont, primarily because there have been no programs . . ."

Just because there have been few allegations of irregularities, this doesn't mean there haven't been problems.

"There has been an amazing lack of controversy," writes our correspondent from Nashville, Tenn., "although there still are several problems to be faced and solved."

Sometimes problems occurred where programs were set up too quickly, without adequate directives and guidelines from Washington.

The local program in Columbia, S.C., "had some staffing irregularities at first," according to our report, "but this was quickly rectified; the error was one of ignorance rather than design."

This was apparently the problem in the Neighborhood Youth Corps around Phoenix and Tucson, Ariz., where charges were made that boys from well-to-do families were given jobs.

This, our report concluded, "arose from haste and misunderstanding rather than from any intention to cheat."

This newspaper reported last fall that Neighborhood Youth Corps guidelines from the Department of Labor were slow in reaching local program administrators, and thus some disqualified people were enrolled in several areas. But they were soon taken out when guidelines were clarified.

Most notably, this occurred in Rhode Island. But, after a newspaper printed the findings, the guidelines were spelled out more clearly for local administrators by Washington, and the irregularities were corrected.

And from New Haven, our reporter tells us that last summer, some 20 ineligible Connecticut youngsters were enrolled in one program.

"But in the first week, they were thrown off the rolls." Aside from that, New Haven has been free of scandal.

Also, in Fort Worth last summer, children from wealthy homes were enrolled in Head Start preschool training. This was corrected.

From some of the big cities—Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York—there have been unconfirmed reports of wrongdoing. But nothing has been proved.

In Los Angeles, the charges were very general, really in the nature of typical grumblings.

There, our reporter recorded gripes from civil-rights leaders who charged they were being "sold down the river by local politicians," and further, that "the schools and government agencies are misusing federal funds."

But there were never specific charges along these lines.

Similar rumblings are heard in Chicago.

In New York, the scandal charges have been more specific.

The Monitor report cities "considerable confusion and mixups over money" in the Harlem Haryou-ACT program.

As the Amsterdam News (a Negro paper) wrote recently: "Although no one has yet been able to prove that anyone has ever stolen a dime of Haryou money, nevertheless, the misuse, mishandling, and mismanagement of Haryou's funds add up to a major scandal that cuts across many of the best-known social agencies in the community, including the Urban League and the Harlem Neighborhood Association."

An investigation of Haryou-ACT's finances began last year when it was reported that $400,000 in public funds was missing and unaccounted for due to the agency's mismanagement and inadequate bookkeeping procedures.

The inquiry is being conducted by OEO auditors and a team of accountants from Palmer & Walsh, a private firm.

Last December, Livingston Wingate, a former associate of Rep. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL (D) of New York, was removed from his duties as Haryou-ACT executive director to make an itemized financial reconstruction of all money spent through November, 1965.

Mr. Wingate, who receives a salary of $25,000, completed three reports and was recently reinstated.

But the Harlem program is the only one where there have been such serious questions of mismanagement. Still, there was nothing to prove willful intent to defraud the government. And OEO is keeping a very wary eye on the program there now.

Elsewhere in the Monitor survey, there were isolated, miscellaneous charges vented.

Sen. GORDON ALLOTT (R) of Colorado has criticized the programs of the war on poverty and has called on Mr. Shriver to investigate the Denver program.

So far no formal investigation has been ordered.

FUNDS WITHHELD

And in Newark, N.J., the City Council investigated charges that many top-paid executives of the local program do not live in Newark itself, but in suburbs. This move was viewed by many observers as an atttempt by City Hall to wrest control of the program from the local independent administrators.

But it didn't work.

In Louisiana, an avowed segregationist was named assistant administrator of the state program. Initial funds for the program were withheld by OEO until the controversial person was dropped.

The only complaint raised in Oklahoma City was the charge that one part-time staff member had used her position to promote the campaign interests of a candidate for state Senate.

It must be remembered, of course, that OEO is constantly on the lookout for potential problems. And its investigators make every effort to solve problems behind the scenes.

So it is highly likely that many irregularities never reached the press but were solved out of the glare of publicity.

Such instances were reported by our correspondent in Syracuse, N.Y. Top members of the local program were shifted when a committee was set up to "look into the conduct of staffers."

Our correspondent says it is possible the "really big scandals never made the press but were hushed up." An example cited: An OEO investigator checked to see why only 90 kids were enrolled in the Youth Corps there, when money was provided for about 700.

And in Boston, OEO thought it had already solved a problem quickly and discreetly when a newspaper reported the story.

INELIGIBLE ENROLLEES

The paper noted that several Youth Corps enrollees had been ineligible, and evidence of fraud and check forgery had turned up.

The local agency had already handled the problem by the time word got to the newspapers, but the stories touched off special investigations by OEO, the Youth Corps, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and more recently, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Similar problems could recur.

Nobody is amazed that problems and potential scandals have turned up. In the bright lights of vast publicity, the war on poverty is being watched for every false move, by newspapers, by OEO itself, by the administration, by local and state governments, and by the political opposition.

What is remarkable is not that such instances have cropped up, but that there have been so few of them, and that in the sizable majority of local programs, there hasn't been a whisper of scandal.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 6, 1966]

POOR REACHED—BUT NOT ENOUGH

(By William C. Selover)

(Sixth and last of series)

WASHINGTON.—Way up in little Vermont, the Burlington antipoverty board holds its monthly meetings in the conference room of the Howard National Bank & Trust Company—the state's biggest commercial bank.

The local poverty warriors wonder why poor people hardly ever attend.

"It's like holding rehabilitation meetings for ex-convicts in the police station," complains one local critic who thinks he knows. "No wonder the poor people don't show up or participate."

But those running the program haven't quite got the message yet.

Their attitude—possibly naive and insulated but certainly businesslike—is found in poverty programs across the country.

As a result, in many areas the really poor have been almost completely overlooked. The program isn't yet really reaching out to the masses of poor where they are in their slums and meeting their needs.

Of course, the war on poverty is helping individuals. It is reaching some victims of poverty. Project Head Start, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Job Corps are widely acclaimed for their efforts.

But it is fairly evident that it isn't reaching enough poverty victims to make much difference yet.

"We are reaching the poor," protests the Cleveland City Council president, James V. Stanton. "But the question really is: are we reaching them in enough numbers?"

So far, the answer is "no."

This comes from correspondents of The Christian Science Monitor in 40 cities across the country.

The finding is not really startling.

Even the antipoverty chief, R. Sargent Shriver Jr., recently admitted the programs were reaching only half the number they should. But following the assessment by Monitor correspondents, his statement appears to have been overly optimistic.

Yet, the picture isn't all bad. Some reports, at least, painted hopeful pictures.

In some cities, like Providence, R.I., the poor were reportedly being reached to a moderate degree.

Our Rhode Island correspondent found that the poverty programs "seem to get to the poor better the longer they are in operation."

And Hartford, in the past year, has registered a "sharp increase in the numbers of poor being served: not just school children, but the harder-to-reach and harder-to-help adults."

Just how well the Hartford program is reaching the poor is not yet clear. "But," our report concludes, "people are being reached, with at least a promise of growing effectiveness."

The same is true in New Haven.

A beginning has been made in Kansas City and Cleveland.

And from Philadelphia, comes a modest catalogue of accomplishment.

RESISTANCE BREAKING DOWN

From Alabama is a report that resistance in "black-belt" counties is breaking down. This means really needy Negroes in this area are being better served.

Another report contends that "antipoverty has reached thousands of Baltimore's poor."

Still, in report after report, from cities all across the country, the story was not bright.

In many cases, the programs were judged plainly ineffective in reaching the poor. And those which managed to touch the lives of people in real poverty (which was rare, indeed), were said to be doing so to such a minute degree as to be virtually useless.

"Seventy-five percent of the poor people here don't even know what the war on poverty is," said Ozell Sutton, associate director of the Arkansas Council on Human Relations, speaking of Little Rock.

The Monitor correspondent from that city writes: "There has not even been a dent made in eliminating the poverty that exists in 25 percent of the families in Pulaski County."

In Rochester, N.Y., Dr. Walter Cooper, a planner for the local program, reluctantly says that the programs "were designed to meet a need, and the need is still there."

FAMILIAR RINGS TO COMPLAINTS

Asked if his program were reaching the poor, the director of the Indianapolis program hedged his answer: "It's time consuming. It takes a long effort. You don't make a significant impact on a century-old problem in 10 months."

Reports from other cities were stronger.

The Charleston, W. Va., correspondent found that a consensus of informed opinion in that city held that "the program really is not reaching those most in need."

From Syracuse: "Everyone emphatically said the antipoverty program is not reaching all the poor it could or should."

The basic complaint in Los Angeles is "that the programs are not getting to enough people who are in need of help."

Other reports were equally blunt.

". . . The program certainly has not reached the poor," says the reporter from Springfield, Mass.

From Fort Worth: ". . . Relatively, the number of the poor reached is extremely small."

And from Worcester, Mass.: ". . . As yet, the program has not reached the poor. Under its present setup, it probably won't."

Finally, the Louisville report states that "the hard-core poor have not really been reached; the neediest children are not in Head Start. There has been no noticeable decrease in crime rates in target areas. Negro joblessness is still high. The incidence of social-agency visitation in target areas remains almost unchanged. A great proportion of the poor do not understand the program; others don't care, are content with welfare."

The real issue here is raised by the reporter from Columbus, Ohio.

"The basic question," he writes, "is not whether these larger programs are reaching the poor but whether they are reaching enough poor."

He explained that the Neighborhood Youth Corps was expected to touch 850, and Head Start another 1,855. "The rub is," he adds, "maybe five times this many kids need the services these two programs supply."

The same desperate story is told in Wichita, Kans.

Referring to an adult basic education program, the Wichita poverty director, Gilbert Roman, ruefully admitted: "The people who should be going and would benefit run into the hundreds, and we're only working with 50."

Probably the best summary explanation of the present scope of the "war on poverty" came from the reporter in Alabama:

"The OEO is reaching individuals," he writes, "but it hasn't yet come up with a way of altering the second-rate environment in which they live."

It's helping isolated victims of the poverty syndrome, but it's not countering the forces which tend to keep them in it.

Asks a Kansas City Presbyterian minister, Rev. Kenneth S. Waterman: "Is the task to make life a little more tolerable in the prison of the slums—dental care, advice to pregnant girls, etc.? That's nice, but it's not changing the slums.

Many people in poverty, listening to earlier campaign promises of Great Society spokesmen, expected the slums somehow to change overnight. Or, they expected to be bodily lifted out of them.

When nothing like this took place, disillusionment and cynicism began setting in. From reports across the country, it is evident that bitterness is becoming the predominating attitude in poverty areas—from Watts to Hough, and well beyond.

"The poverty program was oversold initially," reads the report from Louisville, "and false hopes gave way to cynicism. Some disaffection of the poor was inevitable."

Winston Lill, director of the New Orleans poverty program, warns against this.

EXPECTED TOO MUCH

"Some of our severest critics," he says, "are people who just expect too much from the rosy picture that has been painted.

"There is a tide of rising expectation that cannot be fulfilled; we are not miracle workers . . ." he protests.

"Hopes have been created, expectations increased," adds Louisville poverty director, Neal Bellos.

The Monitor correspondent from Los Angeles writes that the intended recipients of the program—the county's 500,000 poor people—"are largely disenchanted, cynical, or completely disillusioned over what they feel are feeble attempts by the federal government to improve their lot."

The report from Rochester: "Among the poor themselves, there seems to be a feeling of impatience, which flares up at hearings and board meetings. They expect the program to put something into their pockets. This hasn't happened."

Massachusetts Lt. Gov. Eliot L. Richardson, recently wrote that the poverty program in Boston "has been a spectacular disappointment. Many of the poor it was supposed to help are disillusioned. . . ."

This kind of broad disillusionment with the program feeds criticism of government spending in Vietnam. It is not a trifling relationship. Emotions run high on this issue.

The spokesmen for the "new left" are asking out loud how the government can justify spending every month for war halfway around the world what it spends in a year for the war on poverty at home.

MORE FUNDS URGED

One SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) worker in Atlanta called the antipoverty program "just an attempt to muddle the issues. . . . To make people think something is being done for the poor people."

He complains, "There isn't enough money being appropriated. There's more money going to Vietnam than to the poor people. The government's more interested in bombing poor peasants in Vietnam than in helping poor people."

These criticisms are likely to increase rather than lessen, if the Congress carries out its intended severe cutback on funds for the program's community-action programs.

Disillusionment can then be expected to take on more widespread and tangible forms.

Monitor reporters found that some of the programs for young people were exceptions—that they were really reaching the poorest. These are Head Start, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Job Corps.

"There is little doubt that the Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are reaching the truly poor," writes the correspondent from Columbus, Ohio.

Atlanta's program director calls Head Start "our biggest success."

From Louisville, the report explains that "while many programs have been disappointing, at least one, Head Start, has exceeded hopes."

Reports from Baltimore and Alabama call Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps "the most effective poverty programs." The same is true of Cleveland.

SPECIFIC BENEFITS CITED

In New York "money is trickling down to the poor especially through the Neighborhood Youth Corps," according to the correspondent there.

"While it is too early to determine if the 1965 group benefited educationally," said the New Orleans poverty director, speaking of Head Start there, "it is unmistakable that they benefited physically. They were given one hot meal a day, more than many of them ever had, and dental defects were found and corrected in about 2,000 of the initial 3,500 last year."

Another testimony to the effectiveness of Head Start came from New Orleans public school superintendent, Carl J. Dolce: "One child, thought to be retarded, was dicovered to be very bright and a potential leader. In another class a teacher of five-year-olds broke into tears when her class handed her a sheet of paper with their hand prints on it and the word's "To a great lady."

Equally enthusiastic over Head Start, the Burlington, Vt. superintendent of schools, William F. Keogh, says "almost every one" of the city's Head Start youngsters has been found to "be ahead" in follow-up progress checks.

But reaching preschool children and teenagers is only part of the answer.

In some cities, attempts have been made to reach the chronically unemployed through job-retraining programs.

"We will be dealing with the hard-core poor everyone talks about," said the director of Buffalo's program. He was describing a jobs-and-remedial-training program for 1,000 unemployed persons in that city about to start.

The trend of the St. Louis program is toward concentrating on employment and work programs. In the next year, the emphasis is expected to be overwhelmingly on work programs.

The same is true of Cleveland.

MANY PROGRAMS NEEDED

But in most cities, local groups are coming to see the need to blanket the community with a variety of programs and services to meet a multitude of needs.

And many are advocating reaching into the slums—with programs to provide hope and the resources to promise fulfillment.

Until now these efforts have been sporadic.

"People get leaflets, hear speeches, etc. This has nothing to do with alleviating the real problem," grumbles one detractor in Syracuse.

"What we need is a sort of urban home-demonstration agent who could knock on every door and take care of any need the poor might have," commented a critic of the Little Rock program.

PLEAS FOR RETURN HEARD

Little Rock may have just such a program by this fall, according to the program's director.

Buffalo already has such a program in operation. It's called Reach Out and operates out of three locations in poverty areas. Reach Out aides go door to door, offering help and counseling to people who need it. One aide even succeeded in keeping one distraught mother from committing suicide.

Chicago, too, has such a service, operating out of seven centers in the city.

One woman, working out of the South Parkway Urban Progress Center, has helped dozens of families change their living patterns, giving them fresh and hopeful outlooks.

The aide, on a recent visit to one family was called aside by the mother: "Oh, come back again soon. I need you to come and bolster me up. I get feeling so awful living here like this, I just can't do anything."

Other such centers are reported operating well in Atlanta, Portland, and Cincinnati.

Projects are on the drawing boards in Richmond, Columbus, and many other cities.

For the many cities experimenting with this approach, the rewards have not always been tangible. But, our reporters say, they are effective in reaching out to the poor in their desperate need.

Many of the projects at this stage are merely pilot projects, and their real impact is minimal. But many report that with more money, experience so far shows this method is useful.

At least it's a far cry from the poverty meetings in the conference room of a large bank, which, to say the least, intimidated the poor and stultified the efforts of well-meaning local poverty officials.

But no one is making the mistake of having too high hopes.

It is precisely these "out-reach" type programs Congress is seriously threatening to cut back in its next year's appropriations for the poverty program.

A VICTORY IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the executive director of the Houston Community Center, formerly St. Martha's Settlement House, in Philadelphia, has sent me a letter reporting on one of the many young men who, because of the successful efforts of the war on poverty, can now lead decent, respectable lives, contributing to their community. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement by Barry M. Freeman, executive director of the Houston Community Center, entitled "A Victory in the War," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VICTORY IN THE WAR

Everyone complains about the War on Poverty and how it is being fought. Therefore it is important not to lose sight of significant victories when they happen.

Two years ago, Johnny was in trouble. He was a leader in the corner hanging group in South Philadelphia. He lost the sight of one eye in a fight with another group. He had trouble with the police. He dropped out of vocational school when in the 10th grade. His parents were separated. He had 5 brothers and sisters and lived in a crowded three story row house. His mother bugged him. He couldn't get a steady job. Things looked pretty hopeless.

Then the youth worker at Houston Community Center (formerly St. Martha's Settlement House) began to bring the corner group into the Center. Soon they were writing and producing a play, based largely on Johnny's problems. Johnny played himself in the play, and with the other boys, seemed to appreciate the chance to tell their story to thousands of Philadelphians. But in the question period after each performance of the play, the audience always asked the cast how the play solved their problems. It didn't, but for many it was the first step.

When Houston Community Center started a unit of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Johnny was hired by the Center. He served as a Community Service Aide, helping VISTA Volunteers in their programs in the community. But how was this to get him a permanent job? He wasn't receiving training in a job area of his greatest talents. The Neighborhood Youth Corps counselor knew this and so did Johnny. They talked about his future and the need for training. The counselor referred Johnny to the State Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation and this agency paid for his training as a draftsman at a technical school.

After his training and when graduation from N.Y.C. was imminent (6 months is a maximum period for employment in any one unit) Johnny was quite discouraged. He checked the want ads, but wasn't sure he was good enough to fill any drafting job. He let the counselor call and arrange a job interview for one job. She drove him to the interview in another part of the city. He got the job as one of two draftsmen in a small electronics firm, making a good salary.

Johnny is now married and lives with his wife and child in their own apartment. He likes his job, he likes his bosses and he is proud of himself.

Now his bosses want him to go to engineering school at night. This would be a long hard pull for him, but no one doubts that he can make it, if he decides that is what he wants.

One soldier doesn't make a battle, but Johnny isn't the only soldier in the Houston Community Center battalion of the War on Poverty. Of 45 graduates from this Neighborhood Youth Corps unit (only one of the many programs at this United Fund agency) more than 85% of them are either working in steady jobs, have returned to school, have enrolled in job training, have gone into the armed service or have gone to college. Only 3 are known to be unemployed and they are still being counselled. And 40% of these youth were school dropouts before starting the program! Now some of these same dropouts are among the 45% who are planning to follow 3 others who are currently enrolled in college. Who would doubt that this is a striking victory!

Mr. CLARK. In my view, this is a heartwarming success story for a young man who, were it not for the war on poverty, would still be making unsuccessful efforts to adjust himself to modern life.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HILL—20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HILL-BURTON ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, our beloved friend and colleague, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, is being widely and deservedly honored by the medical profession this month on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act.

One such article appears in the current issue of Medical World News. Its title is: "Senator LISTER HILL: Medicine's Champion in the Senate." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at the conclusion of these remarks. I only regret that it is not possible to reproduce in the RECORD the wonderful picture on the cover, which depicts Senator HILL outside a hospital built through the program he authored.

But for a brief period in the mid-1950's, I have served with Senator HILL on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare throughout my Senate tenure. I have come to think of him as Mr. Hospital, and Mr. School, for his championing of the health and education of the American people is unsurpassed. As the story in Medical World News points out, 67 of his health bills have become law:

> His accomplishments in health legislation are, as the American Hospital Association puts it, "staggering."

The programs he has sponsored and guided to enactment are a key factor in the increasing accessibility of the American people to good medical care and treatment. The commendations he is receiving are but a small part of his due.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LISTER HILL: MEDICINE'S CHAMPION IN THE U.S. SENATE

When Medicare began operations last month, and the much-feared jam-up of elderly patients clamoring for hospital admission did not materialize, one reason was surely that many of the aged were already receiving the care they needed. And if the vast majority of hospitals were able to meet or surpass the Social Security standards of quality, as they were, one reason was undoubtedly that they had for many years been engaged in programs of self-improvement.

Underlying this state of readiness is a law that was signed 20 years ago this week by President Harry S Truman—the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, commonly known as the Hill-Burton program. In the two intervening decades, Hill-Burton has helped to finance 8,271 projects which have provided 353,500 hospital beds. It has given $2.5 billion toward construction projects that cost a total of $8.1 billion. There is hardly a nonprofit hospital, public or private, in the U.S. that was not at least partly built or enlarged with Hill-Burton money.

The man who certainly deserves the privilege of blowing out the 20 candles on the Law's birthday cake is a courtly, square-jawed son of Alabama, Sen. LISTER HILL. At 71, he is a staunch Democrat, a 43-year veteran of Congress, and a lifelong champion of health legislation. Through the years he has seen to it that the Hill-Burton program was kept healthy with nourishing appropriations while also being steadily amended and improved. In the 11 years that HILL has been chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which considers all health legislation, 67 major health bills have become law. His accomplishments in health legislation are, as the American Hospital Association puts it, "staggering."

"There are millions of our people who are better off today," a one-time senator named Lyndon B. Johnson once told HILL on the Senate floor, "and millions who will be better off in the future because of the fine work that you have done on health and welfare legislation." President Kennedy, while a senator, declared that HILL was "the outstanding congressional leader in the field of medical legislation today." HILL's power and influence have not diminished, nor have his interest and efforts slackened, since then.

Spokesmen for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare echo these views, and continue to marvel over the way Hill-Burton has worked out. Dr. Harald M. Graning, chief of the Public Health Service's Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, which administers the program, notes that "probably the most important principle of the Hill-Burton Act, and the one that has proven very successful, was its far-sighted use of the partnership concept—providing federal dollars and technical assistance to the states, while they in turn stimulated local hospital planning."

Dr. Vane M. Hoge, now assistant director of the Washington, D.C., bureau of the American Hospital Association, who was chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities when the program got under way, recalls that "the biggest challenge at the outset was presented by the training programs that had to be set up. We had to put state Hill-Burton organizations together from scratch, instruct government men who were to become Hill-Burton representatives in PHS regional offices, initiate state-by-state surveys of construction needs, and talk building contractors out of working on a 'cost-plus' basis and into accepting the 'open-bid' system."

But despite the seemingly endless administrative details, Dr. Hoge adds, "things went quite smoothly." And this hasn't changed over the years, says Dr. Graning. At the state level, for instance, advisory councils are set up to review local needs for health facilities construction. Dr. Graning notes, "The Law requires that one half of the members of these councils must be consumers in order to reflect the views of the people for whom this is all ultimately intended. These people do a great job. They take their responsibility seriously and give a good deal of their time to this work."

Dr. Graning adds that this also characterizes the work of the Federal Hospital Council, a statutory advisory body on Hill-Burton. Half of the 12 council members are health and hospital experts and the others represent consumers. They meet three times a year to examine possible administrative and legislative changes, and, the PHS officer says, work in remarkable accord with Washington officials.

Federal relationships with architects and engineers who design and build facilities are equally good. The government establishes general construction standards in line with accepted hospital practice. Beyond that, says Dr. Graning, "We give communities, and the architects they choose, wide discretion over design and construction. We make it a point to encourage them to have open attitudes and try new approaches."

Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, executive director of the American Hospital Association, recalls that as a result of the 1946 legislation, "Hospitals were built in areas where none existed before, and doctors with knowledge of the latest techniques in medical science came into rural areas to staff the hospitals and various clinics. These rural communities thus gained the benefits of community health centers, something unknown to them before Hill-Burton."

When the original bill was introduced by HILL and the late Sen. Harold Burton of Ohio in 1945, it was endorsed by the AHA as well as by the American Medical Association. (Although the program bears Burton's name, he left the Senate for the Supreme Court before the bill came up for consideration. The late Sen. Robert A. Taft had more to do with its final passage than did Burton.)

"Now, after 20 years," exclaims Dr. Crosby, "the American people are reaping the full rewards of the program. An additional six years have been added to the average American's life because of the advancements in and the availability of health care. The Hill-Burton Act is continually expanding to bring in new programs to include treatment for more people. The ultimate benefits of Hill-Burton are not yet in sight."

The AHA head, noting that the organization is giving HILL a special award at its Chicago convention later this month, characterizes the senator as "a man who tries to discover real needs and a permanent way to fill them, avoiding both the temporary solution and the ill-thought-out long-range answer, which later must be hastily amended."

Hill-Burton is indeed a permanent answer to a real need. In 1946, the need for hospital construction—which had been at a virtual standstill during World War II—involved prohibitive amounts of money. Left to their own devices, individual states would have been hard put to pay for what was required. But with the advent of the first Hill-Burton grants to construct and equip general and mental hospitals, facilities for patients with tuberculosis and chronic diseases, and public health centers, the states were able to get started.

Over the years since then, HILL has helped enact six major amendments to the original Law and a multitude of other provisions to meet changed and increased needs. In 1949, the Law was amended to authorize PHS grants for pilot projects aimed at improving the utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. Although appropriations for this purpose were not provided for another five years and actual grants not made until 1956, the program rapidly picked up steam once it started. Some 185 research and demonstration projects have since been initiated, financed by $36.4 million in PHS grants.

Many current efforts under the 17-year-old amendment center on the computer. Swifter diagnoses and more efficient monitoring systems are two significant uses of computers. And they are also in use in some hospital administrative offices for keeping patient records and doing accounting.

In 1954, the Act was amended to provide grant money for construction of nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and chronic disease wings.

Then, again under HILL's aegis, the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961 doubled, to $20 million, the amount that the government made available annually to assist in the construction of nursing homes. It also raised the annual appropriation for research projects to $10 million and authorized additional funds for experimental and demonstration construction and equipment projects. And in 1962, the government awarded the first demonstration grants, totaling more than $3 million, to determine the efficacy of coordinating health planning on a communitywide basis.

As a result of these pilot projects, another big leap forward came in 1964 with the Hospital and Medical Facilities Amendments. This legislation—popularly called the Hill-Harris amendments—established a five-year, $1.34 billion program for new construction and modernization of hospitals and facilities for public health, diagnosis, rehabilitation, as well as others providing long-term care.

The amendments provide matching grants to state Hill-Burton agencies on behalf of public or nonprofit groups that are organized for health facilities planning, and that are designated to carry out planning projects for specific areas. The matching grants program has generally been regarded as giving crucial impetus to areawide planning.

The fund-raising incentive that matching grants carry, says Dr. Graning, is demonstrated by an episode last May in Canon City, Colo., a town of some 10,000 residents. A 54-bed hospital was campaigning to raise $150,000 to fulfill its end of a Hill-Burton agreement. Three eighth graders at St. Michael's School raffled off their Shetland pony and gave the total proceeds—$619.25—to the drive; junior high school students, by charging 10¢ admission to a basketball game, raised $30; and the Golden Age Center voted to give the fund the $50 prize the center received for a float it had entered in a "Blossom Celebration" parade.

The 1964 legislation also authorized additional funds for construction of long-term care facilities, and approximately 13,000 beds are expected to be added to such facilities annually.

These amendments also marked a decided shift in emphasis for the Hill-Burton program, which had hitherto favored rural areas. For the first time funds were earmarked specifically for modernization of existing health facilities, and in addition the law stipulated that special consideration be given to densely populated areas. Although at that point the specific appropriations fell far short of meeting the needs—they totaled $160 million over a four-year period for modernizing facilities, while government experts believed that $10 billion would be required over ten years—the legislation paved the way for subsequent efforts to meet changed needs more effectively.

The program has originally been weighted in favor of small-town and rural areas by means of a then-unprecedented payment formula which paid higher percentages of cost in poorer states. As a result, more than half of the general hospitals built under Hill-Burton are located in communities of less than 50,000 population—mainly in the South—and administrators regard many of these as inefficiently small. Hill says small hospitals were necessary in the rural South as it existed when the program was begun, though with today's improved transportation the trend now is to build larger and better hospitals in central locations.

CITY HOSPITALS NEED $10 BILLION

As hospital medicine was being brought to rural areas, big-city institutions were falling into virtual decay. The American Hospital Association estimates that at least half of the urban hospitals, and probably more, are in critical need of modernization. The scope of the need has been outlined by HEW as of a magnitude that will require $10 billion in construction over the next 10 years. Of this amount, AHA and HEW agree that $4 billion is needed immediately, or in the words of one expert, "yesterday."

The AHA estimates that 50 years is the life expectancy of a hospital. Assistant AHA director Dr. Hoge points out that the need of urban hospital modernization is in a fairly direct ratio to the age of the city. The older cities in the East tend to have the most pressing problems, he says, with the newer West Coast cities on the other end of the scale and those in the Midwest generally somewhere between.

Urban hospitals have been able to get some Hill-Burton money, mostly for the addition of such facilities as psychiatric and long-term care units, but where general beds are concerned, they have largely been left behind. These institutions have been hard-pressed to come up with their own money for the rapidly increasing costs of construction. Room rates have risen to a point where hospitals cannot add enough to patient-care charges to accrue construction funds.

Another factor in the plight of urban hospitals is the escalating role of the institution in the total scheme of things medical. It is almost a reflex action for today's city dweller with a broken arm to head for the nearest hospital, instead of going to his physician. Part of the reason for this is that some health insurance will cover a hospital visit but not a doctor visit. Another reason is that the hospital has become the place where the care is—the personnel as well as the equipment. Physicians themselves have contributed to the trend by advising patients to meet them at the hospital, rather than at the office or at home. And urban hospitals also are being relied upon increasingly for public assistance programs. Their teeming welfare clinics often amount to full-blown outpatient care centers.

The trend is likely to be continued after the expected enactment of the Administration's health planning grants bill, recently reported out by HILL's subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill outlines a vastly expanding program of federally aided planning for provision of health services. Hospitals will likely be in the mainstream of the program.

The Administration sought to help meet the needs of big-city hospitals this year, and HILL sponsored a bill (S. 3009) drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But he was never enthusiastic about the measure, because, due to the Vietnam war, it contained a disappointingly small authorization of money for outright grants to assist in modernization. The bill got only lukewarm backing, even from the AHA, and HILL has made no effort to push it, beyond holding one day of committee hearings. He plans to hold off any major attempt to push the bill through until next year, when a possibly improved international situation, or perhaps a tax increase, may enable him to get more money for direct grants to hospitals.

Although the bill has not officially been written off for the year, the Administration is not pressing for it either, and HEW planners are beginning to think in terms of what can realistically be passed next year. The best guess now is that the 90th Congress will be presented with something along the lines of a bill under which projects would be financed with a 40% deferred-payment grant and a 50% government-guaranteed loan. The hospital would repay the principal of the loan to a private lender and the government would pay the interest. The hospital would be expected to put up the remaining 10% in cash. The purpose of having the government pay interest on the loan would be to hold down hospital costs and patient charges.

NEXT STEP—MANPOWER SHORTAGE

When an improved bill is written and has a realistic chance of passage, HILL doubtless will guide it skillfully through the Senate with his usual gentle Southern cajolery. He also promises to give close attention this year and next to the health manpower shortage. "There's no use having the hospitals if you haven't got the nurses and doctors for them, is there?" he asks.

Senator HILL was re-elected to his fifth term in 1962 in a campaign that give him the scare of his political life. He came very close to defeat by Republican JAMES MARTIN in a segregationist revolt against anyone who had ever shown any signs of cooperation with the Kennedy administration.

And, although HILL had voted against every Medicare bill to that date, Alabama AMA members campaigned against him, hoping to get a Republican into the Senate. When Medicare came before Congress again in 1965, HILL voted for it.

The senator isn't saying now, but the betting in Washington is that he will run again in 1968. If he does, he may have to do something to which he is unaccustomed—campaign hard.

HILL was named for Sir Joseph Lister, the famed British surgeon, whom the senator's physician-father admired. Treasured among the senator's mementos is a letter written by Lord Lister to Dr. Hill, thanking him for "the honor you have done me in naming your son after me." Lord Lister wished "a life of health, goodness, and usefulness to my namesake." There are many people in the U.S., including more than 7,000 hospital administrators, who will say that Lord Lister's wish came true.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the New York Times of Sunday, August 14, 1966, carried an excellent article by the noted medical writer, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, paying tribute to the Hill-Burton hospital program and to the excellent work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama in this field.

Little needs to be added to the remarks which several of us made in this Chamber last Friday calling attention to the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton program. The living tribute to that program and to its sponsors is the good health enjoyed by thousands of citizens across the land who have benefited from the services of Hill-Burton hospitals. Dr. Rusk cites some interesting statistics to demonstrate this point, and his own tribute to the Senator from Alabama should therefore be added to those that have already been heard here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Tribute to LISTER HILL," from the New York Times of August 14, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO LISTER HILL—AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION HONORS SENATOR FOR HIS HEALTH LEADERSHIP

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last night in Chicago the American Dental Association paid tribute to Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama for his four decades of health leadership.

The timing was particularly appropriate in that yesterday marked the 20th anniversary of the Hill-Burton Act which has provided funds for over 8,000 hospitals, clinics, public health centers, nursing homes, rehabilitation centers and other health facilities.

The act was sponsored by Senator HILL and Senator Harold Burton of Ohio, who later became an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The latter half of the 19th century and the first three decades of this century were marked by rapid expansion of hospital construction in the United States.

By 1928 our nation had 6,850 hospitals. With the onset of the depression in 1929, however, hospital construction dwindled to a trickle. Not only did construction decrease but from 1928 to 1938 nearly 800 hospitals closed.

With the advent of World War II, hospital construction came to almost a complete halt.

COMMISSION WAS ORGANIZED

To survey the nation's hospital needs a Commission on Hospital Care was organized under the sponsorship of the American Hospital Association in 1944.

This commission found that people in rural areas particularly were not receiving care.

It concluded that 195,000 more general hospital beds were needed but that these facilities should be built in areas of greatest need and Federal funds should be used to stimulate construction. The Hill-Burton Act was a direct result of these recommendations.

The act has been regularly extended since 1946 and new provisions constantly broadened its authorization.

In 1954 the Hill-Burton program was broadened to provide specific grants for the construction of public and voluntary nonprofit rehabilitation facilities, and the 1964 amendments authorized an appropriation over a five-year period of $50-million for the construction, modernization, and replacement of rehabilitation facilities.

Since 1954, 386 rehabilitation facilities projects have been jointly approved by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Public Health Service.

A THIRD OF THE TOTAL

These projects, which are spread across the nation, cost a total of $253,216,710, of which the Federal share was $84,796,411. This averages out to slightly more than one-third of the total cost of these projects.

As a result of the Hill-Burton Act, in comparison with the 15 million persons without access to hospitals in 1945, the states now estimate that fewer than two million persons are living in areas without acceptable hospital facilities.

During this period our nation's population increased by more than 50 million.

In 1946 only 79 per cent of births occurred in hospitals. Today, the figure has been reversed—it is 97 per cent.

Over the same period the infant mortality rate has dropped from 38 per 1,000 births to 24.

Maternal mortality has dropped from 21 per 10,000 births to three.

The program has also been extremely helpful in attracting physicians to settle in rural areas.

Despite this progress the situation in hospital construction is not a rosy one. Many of our larger and better urban hospitals are becoming obsolete and increasingly inefficient to operate.

Current estimates place the cost of needed modernization at $9.75-billion for the next 10 years. During that period, 390,000 hospital beds should be modernized.

At present 260,000 beds are in obsolete facilities with some 13,000 more becoming obsolete annually.

The Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York in a recent study found that 47 of New York City's 130 general care hospitals should be replaced and almost all of the remainder need modernization.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIVE MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED

The council estimated that the cost of making New York City hospitals adequate for their current tasks would cost $705-million.

President Johnson in March sent a comprehensive legislative proposal to the Congress for a major new program of Federal aid to modernize hospitals.

Most authorities believe the bill has little chance of passage during the current session.

This is unfortunate, for Medicare and Medicaid will increase the demand for hospital beds by an estimated 5 per cent.

An even greater demand for nursing home beds will result.

Authorities estimate that Medicare will increase this shortage to a million beds.

The Hill-Burton Act is but one of many health programs that Senator HILL has helped begin. He has been a crusader for medical research and education.

The homage paid him last night is but one of a number of most deserved honors. Later this month at its annual meeting the American Hospital Association will give Senator HILL its first Award of Honor.

No man has done more than Senator LISTER HILL to shape the health of our nation and to give it promise and hope.

PRIVATE WAR ON POVERTY OF U.S. BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, along with a large number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I have introduced an amendment, amendment No. 610, to the bill S. 3164, pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to extend the Economic Opportunity Act, the basic charter of the war on poverty. Our amendment would establish a public-private Economic Opportunity Corp., which would, like the Communications Satellite Corp., combine public and private enterprise resources, in this case to add the private sector in a major way to the Nation's antipoverty effort.

A recent article in Look magazine, entitled "The Big Business Do-Gooders: Private War on Poverty," by Look Senior Editor T. George Harris, provides some excellent insights into the contributions business and industry are already making, without expectation of profit, to the public interest in this most important domestic field. In my judgment these contribtuions are substantial evidence of the enormous potential which our proposed Economic Opportunity Corporation would have through its stimulation and massing of many individual and corporate antipoverty efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, as well as a recent speech I have made on the subject of "The Untapped Resources for the War on Poverty," which seeks to relate our proposed Economic Opportunity Corporation to the racial disturbances which are plaguing so many of our cities, be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTAPPED RESOURCES FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, at 52d annual convention of Hadassah, Sheraton-Boston Hotel, Boston, Mass., August 14, 1966)

Riots in major Northern cities and racial disturbances throughout the country have focused attention on conditions in our wasteland of slums as never before. A feeling of urgency, born in violence, has brought about a desperate search for solutions to ghetto problems that have always defied solution.

Yet, despite this urgency we seem unable to break the circle of conventional thinking which virtually restricts all possible answers to these problems to what the Federal Government can do, what local government can do.

I feel that violence in our cities must be condemned, and where it breaks out, it must be halted quickly and firmly because anarchy compounds problems, it does not solve them. However, we must also search for solutions to the basic causes of these disturbances. We cannot score a breakthrough by seeking comfort in familiar solutions. We must be willing to search for and be ready to use new tools to help solve the most pressing and difficult domestic problem facing the country today.

The issue has become one of the security of the nation at home, and we must allocate a share of our resources commensurate to the problem. We cannot bring about the massive effort required through government alone—though that effort, too, needs to be improved. For this reason, I propose that the war on poverty be escalated by enlisting in it the resources of the private enterprise system. This can be done by the establishment of an Economic Opportunity Corporation—similar in framework to the Communication Satellite Corporation—in which the vast resources of business in the nation can be brought to bear, in very practical ways, on the problems of job training and employment, housing and expansion of small business opportunities. This concept would allow organizations such as this one, as well as individuals, corporations, labor unions, pension and welfare funds to participate in the anti-poverty crusade as investors.

I am not suggesting that the establishment of such a corporation would solve all the problems caused by one hundred years of discrimination and two hundred years of slavery. We cannot solve such problems merely by introducing the organizational expertise of business; but neither can we legislate these problems away.

In both cases—introduction of major private enterprise help and enactment of civil rights laws—we can create an atmosphere of hope; an outlet for legitimate aspiration.

Concerning legislation, the obvious example today is the controversial open housing provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. I detect an unfortunate tendency either to play down the importance of this provision to Negroes or to oppose it on the grounds that it would cause havoc in white neighborhoods. Neither is true. This provision would not dissolve the ghettos of the nation. The overwhelming percentage of Negro families cannot yet afford to move to the suburbs. But the provision against housing discrimination is vital to the dignity of the individual which most Negroes hold in regard at least as high as rights under the law or appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

Few people would deny that our private enterprise resources are enormous. Clearly business and industry have played a major role in building our nation into a great world power. But many will claim that business won't participate in such an anti-poverty effort or that there is no significant part of the anti-poverty program in which it can participate. I believe these two arguments are invalid.

Business has already shown a major desire to participate in activities in the public interest in many fields, but especially in manpower training, redevelopment projects in poor neighborhoods, and investments in small business, all of which have had a significant impact on poverty conditions. The great interest U.S. business firms of first rank have shown in obtaining Job Corps contracts is proof that even with all the difficulties encountered in running a program under Government standards and control, such companies are still willing to invest in manpower training and basic literacy education for nominal, if any, profit.

Perhaps even more significant, I have posed to a representative sampling of major U.S. corporations the question of whether they would have an interest in investing in and working with an Economic Opportunity Corporation of the kind I propose. The response so far is extremely encouraging.

Now, how can private enterprise help specifically in the war on poverty?

There are several particular areas in which business and industry clearly have great interest and great potential: manpower training, for example, especially in the technical and subprofessional occupations. It is possible that an entire industry—or the industries in one area—might contract with the corporation or a subsidiary of the corporation to pool all their manpower training for certain job classifications, and this kind of pooling would save money for all the participating companies. The National Association of Manufacturers has initiated a series of programs which seek to achieve similar efficiencies and industrial involvement.

A second field of clear business interest is redevelopment projects involving the poor. The Mitchell-Lama Middle Income Housing Program in New York State has proved that there is a great demand for privately-financed limited profit housing.

A number of companies—notably U.S. Gypsum Company in New York City—have initiated similar projects for low income housing. The Economic Opportunity Corporation could involve companies with experience and expertise in housing and urban redevelopment in cooperative projects to eradicate slums and degenerating central cities.

A third major area of business involvement could be providing investment, loans and technical assistance to small business owned by the poor. A start in this direction is being made under the Economic Opportunity Act, administered by the Small Business Administration. But it is basically a government-operated program, which can draw upon business expertise only tangentially and which is totally dependent upon Federal budgetary considerations. It is hopelessly oversubscribed in cities like New York and Boston.

Perhaps the most crucial element in our national anti-poverty effort is bringing the poor into the economic mainstream, in other words, making sure they have jobs. A number of approaches to this are being tried under existing programs, particularly the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Work Experience programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Work Study, Manpower Development and Training, and various vocational education programs. I believe these are worthwhile approaches which should be perfected, expanded and linked together—along with public and private placement efforts and with public and private job development efforts. But I feel deeply that, even then, there will remain a huge unfilled gap. In an era of rapidly accelerating automation where are the long-term jobs for the trainees to fill? There are only two possible answers: either in government or in the private sector. A number of reputable groups, including the high level National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress established by Congress, have recommended expanded public employment, as an 'employer of last resort.'

My own belief is that this is not the answer to our long-range job development problems. Instead the U.S. private enterprise system, which has expanded thus far to bring unprecedented economic growth and development to our Nation, must be stimulated—and I believe can be stimulated—to meet the future needs. We can stimulate industry to do this job if we involve them fully in the anti-poverty programs with which we are experimenting. This we have not yet begun to do in any significant way.

Finally, there is the desperate need for business-like management techniques: the confusion, overlapping of functions, and waste which are plaguing so many of the existing programs could undoubtedly be reduced if business management, which handles enormously complex enterprises with efficiency, could be utilized. Our defense establishment has long recognized this valuable private capability, but our human resource agencies have not done so to any comparable extent.

Because these jobs can be accomplished effectively by private enterprise—and because these jobs must be done, and rapidly—I have introduced a bill to establish just such an Economic Opportunity Corporation. The proposed corporation, like COMSAT, would be initiated by incorporators appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They would be authorized to issue capital stock in a total amount not exceeding $1 billion, of which 40 per cent may be purchased by the U.S. Government and 60 per cent by the public. After the initial stock offering, a board of nine directors would be established consisting of four appointees of the President confirmed by the Senate, and five elected by the stockholders annually. At least one of the President's appointees would be from among the poor. Stockholders other than the Government would be limited to no more than 10 per cent of the stock.

The corporaiton would be specifically empowered to carry out any programs that the directors feel are appropriately and effectively designed to reduce poverty in the United States. This could include programs such as those I have already mentioned. But it could also go beyond these, to develop whatever new programs it determined to be desirable.

The proposal clearly contemplates local development corporations in the Watts section of Los Angeles, in Harlem, and in Chicago's Southside and in similar disadvantaged—and potentially explosive—areas in other cities. The bill leaves the organizational framework below the corporation level, as flexible as possible to permit adaptation to the specifics of local needs and to encourage maximum participation of the poor themselves.

I deeply feel that the vitality, the inventiveness and the resources of private enterprise in this country can inspire an atmosphere of hope and establish an outlet for legitimate aspirations. At this crucial time, we cannot—and dare not—fail to tap these resources. They could make the difference between accelerated and peaceful progress, and violence and anarchy.

[From Look, Aug. 9, 1966]

THE BIG BUSINESS DO-GOODERS: PRIVATE WAR ON POVERTY

(NOTE.—Wild as it seems, good works are now the rage in executive suite. Even the National Association of Manufacturers, once mossback Mecca, runs schools for Harlem dropouts and assembly lines for social-reform projects. Rich corporations nurse the poor and tool up a private Peace Corps. Capitalism, some think, has flipped its money-lovin' wig.)

(By T. George Harris)

You wouldn't expect our big businessmen to goof off on the job. These fellows have a reputation to keep up. They chase dollars eight days a week, the sociologists claim, and carry their desks to bed. In "organization-man" collars, they're the high priests of the profit motive.

Here lately, though, our most accomplished profiteers have taken up strange habits. Without snooping too hard, I've caught them and their hirelings in compromising situations:

Educating the illiterate, tending Mongoloid kids and mentally ill adults, running their own kind of Peace Corps overseas, sponsoring alien poets, renovating slums, building hospitals, posting bail bond for civil disobedients and scheming with Negroes to pry open thousands of jobs. Name a cause. from pollution to unwed mothers, and I'll find a mogul or two pushing it like a new product.

"These are lit-up people," says Richard Cornuelle, executive V-P of the National Association of Manufacturers. "I see guys light up like neon when they get results on this kind of work."

They haven't exactly lit up the sky yet, but they're working at it. A few presidents and board chairmen admit—though not to avaricious stockholders—that they do-good 80 percent of the time, on company time. That leaves one hour in five, counting night duty, for profit making. Most claim they restrain their benign impulse. After all, a national survey of men at or near the top shows that only 40 percent spend a big chunk of each week (6 to 25 hours) on worthy works.

What's startling is the curve, which is up like Xerox. Bruce Palmer, the pipe-puffing boss of the National Industrial Conference Board, reports that executives have doubled their nonprofit work load in the past five years. Unless a depression tears down the economy, this kind of enterprise is sure to boom on into the seventies.

The Wall Street Journal and Business Week, capitalism's watch-and-ward societies, have gumshoed around the situation. But nobody has come right out and told why our blue-chip chiefs, drawing $40 to $252 an hour, want to act like a bunch of social workers. What's happened?

Looking back now, I'm convinced that the main turn came in the months before the 1963 civil-rights march on Washington. Jobs and freedom now! Negro militants, raging at Whitey's unresponsive power structure, started boycotts ("Don't buy where you can't work"). More ominously, they threatened the public order essential to business. Then, strange things started to happen. Giant companies, secretly pushed by President Kennedy and then by President Johnson, began their clumsy hunt for Negro workers and executives (see *The Quiet Revolution*, Look, December 17, 1963). Many businessmen were thrown up against the race crisis hard enough to crack their middle-class complacency. So the militants, to an extent they will never know, turned loose a reforming force on the upper floors of capitalism.

Mavericks, black and white, moved into executive suite. In a multibillion Midwestern bank, an Urban League liberal who had been boxed in as a lower-echelon "conscience" suddenly found himself ticketed for the top job in the trust department, a post reserved by custom for stuffed shirts.

One old business warhorse, battered and grim, went into agonizing reappraisal of itself. The NAM had for 69 years called down the Puritan curse of Adam Smith upon dogooders lurking in the body politic, and had come, in dismay, to suspect the human heart of fatal frailty. By the summer of 1964, NAM lobbyists espied a soft, creeping danger: the Federal Government's newest baby, the poverty program.

This child was bound to grow. The combination of Negro aspirations and automation layoffs, then in the headlines, would escalate the poverty war forever. Also taxes, NAM's old hands took up their rusted rhetoric for yet another series of rearguard actions against "Federal interventionists." Dogma aside, business had practical doubts, since voiced by the welfare-minded *The New Republic* and a book called *Pass the Poverty Please*, about the effectiveness of Federal strategies in the slums.

This doubt led to a wild idea. Instead of just fighting the poverty warriors, or publishing position papers, why not organize a capitalist attack on poverty itself?" "If business really tried, it could wipe out hardcore unemployment overnight," said strategist Cornuelle, soft-spoken, spring-steel young Californian of conservative conviction and liberal concern. He was then running United Student Aid Funds, through which he taught commercial bankers how to make nonprofit loans to thousands of needy college students. "Business," he argued, "can solve many public problems more efficiently than government."

The NAM nervously agreed, later hired Cornuelle (say Cornell) to lead its own antipoverty war. He came to New York, set out to find a practical way to recruit and train "functionally unemployed" people (see above). It was the beginning of a long job. Like government, business found that being poor is a complex ailment not easy to treat.

So the profit boys try harder. Look: Each workday morning in their glassy Park Avenue suites, NAM staffers teach Harlem dropouts how to read, write, type, then go after jobs in civil service and the Chase Manhattan Bank. One group of teen-age boys hoisted themselves from 4th grade average test level, to 7th grade in six weeks. Students draw $20 a week pocket money. Swingers of each class recruit and teach the next ones.

Like other social workers, NAM'ers have run into deep suspicion. "All business has rackets," says one wary hipster. "What's the racket here?"

NAM's little Park Avenue school for dropouts is part of a larger experiment called MIND, acronym for Methods of Intellectual Development. Behind it lies a gaudy ambition: to cut the cost of training low-skill workers below the cost of screening out the inept with fancy personnel tests. If MIND works: Presto! A hunk of utopia will be upon us. Few men and women who apply for work will be turned away. And each new automation advance will be met by a confident wave of workers trained on teaching machines for higher-skilled jobs.

MIND's ambitious minds, free of academic rigidity, will try anything. For an advanced primer, the students read James Bond's exploits in *Thunderball* and attend the highly-educational film of the same name. MIND instructors test advanced electronic devices and programs, and invent their own right-off-the-street word and math courses.

What works gets passed straight to industry. Chemical Bank New York Trust and College Life Insurance Company in Indianapolis picked up the MIND-tested typing course on electronic tapes, went on to second-stage experiments. Pushing out, MIND director Charles Adams has just set up a general course inside the Argo, Ill., plant (3,800 employees) of Corn Products Co. By company estimates, 500 to 750 low-skill men and women could climb right up three or four pay levels through on-the-job reading, writing and arithmetic.

This drive dovetails with other NAM campaigns like STEP, Solution to Employment Problems. STEP researchers have checked out and published 57 studies on different company and community solutions, already in use, to every kind of hiring and training difficulty. From this rich data, the home office knows what teaching technology is needed most and who is apt to try it first.

NAM's hard-shell reputation helps. "We've got an astounding believability," says Cornuelle, "because we're the last people expected to try to help. I feel that we're getting a breakthrough."

Businessmen, however, tend to get nervous about their good works. That sort of thing seems illicit. What right does an executive have to spend his time and company cash on poverty wars?

Cornuelle gave the answer in his book, *Reclaiming the American Dream*, published last fall by Random House. The book's basic contribution is to point out what's missing in the standard notion that society is split between the "public sector" (government) and the "private sector" (commerce). You vote in one area, make a living in the other. If that's all there is to life, why bother?

But Cornuelle identifies a forgotten third force, the "independent sector." Its institutions are neither branches of government nor profit-making business. Among them: labor unions, churches, business associations, civil-rights organizations, independent colleges, charities, foundations and thousands of other outfits that people set up to serve an interest or a cause. Do they do any good? As far back as 1962, a government-financed study by the Diebold Group showed that nongovernment agencies—often run by businessmen, in their independent role as citizen leaders—were already spending in excess of $2.4 billion among the poor.

Cornuelle believes that such flexible agencies, organized right, can do much more. For a start, he is reorganizing the NAM to set up a sort of problem-solving production line. Working with other groups, he will plot new attacks on unemployment, cut down discriminatory pricing in slums, try for a voluntary truth-in-labels program and develop business-led urban renewal.

Notions like his upset people. A conservative friend charged that he had sold out the faithful NAM to the liberals. An orthodox liberal recently tagged him "Washington's favorite Fascist." One economist lectured that his ideas are "subversive" to free enterprise.

If so, treason is everywhere. Hardly a day goes by now without some corporate zealot turning up with a new reform project. Not long ago, a lean, intense executive walked into my office. He introduced himself as Lachlan Reed, an international marketing manager for Honeywell Inc., but he didn't come to talk electronics. He was electric with plans for Fisk University, the century-old Negro school in Nashville.

Business, he announced, must develop this struggling institution into an international center for liberal arts—the real thing, "not the Yale gentlemen's kind." He was working full-time at it and making headway. His Honeywell job? Well, his boss had given him a year's leave with pay, plus secretarial help, to get this Fisk deal off the ground.

"Lach" Reed, 48, thought he had a new idea. But it's got so you have to get up early in the morning to beat other businessmen in the conscience game. More than two years ago, a quiet Midwestern executive landed at Tougaloo College, a studious little island of integration at Jackson, Miss. The visitor had a check for $75,000, with a string on it: Draw up an ambitious master plan for Tougaloo's long-term growth. The future suddenly looks big, Dean Addison Branch says. "We're not only hopeful, we're optimistic."

Corporations are waging so many independent wars on poverty that it's low-brow not to have one going. One special Newark school is backed up by Prudential Insurance, Standard Oil, Westinghouse, Western Electric, New Jersey Bell, Bamberger's and Public Service Electric & Gas. These firms jointly hire young people in batches of a hundred, alternate them every other week between the plant and their special school of small classes.

Hartford's Aetna Life & Casualty, like many others, pairs with the Urban League on stenographic training. Halfway across the country in rock-ribbed Racine, Wis., the J. I. Case Company is in the third year of its "Adults in a Hurry" plan. Case catches ready-to-drop students, furnishes part-time jobs to keep them going to diploma time.

Some firms specialize. Boston's Raytheon Company has spent years developing the talents of 1,500 handicapped people, from heart victims to schizophrenics. W. T. Grant's 1,097 stores have become opportunity centers for the mentally retarded. The California Packing Corp. school for migrants' kids became the pilot for a Federal project.

Illinois Bell's engineers design electronic instruments for medical diagnosis. The company also provides a sort of switchboard for 326 Bell Corps Volunteers doing off-time duty as slum leaders and tutors. Things have come a long way since the good old days when a company could just pass the Community Chest hat and the blood-bank bottle down through the ranks. Pan American flies any airline's stewardesses to Asia free for three-month tours as nurses' aides and midwives for the Tom Dooley Foundation.

On the formal side, 3,000 companies run tax-exempt foundations and giveaway programs. Meeting with the fund bosses from the blue chips, I found them to be full-time pros who now hand out 1.2 percent of the average company's annual profit. They hunt hard for creative ideas to sponsor and make each dollar count. Most have stopped the two chief wastes once built into corporate giving: weak little charities favored by the boss's wife and subsidies to right-wing political "educators."

Chairman James Oates of Equitable Life seems to set about the fastest pace on the virtue track. Having raised $2.1 million for the National Urban League, he ordered his personnel office to help found a 128-company training system that recruits young people through the New York mayor's office. Oates eager to share the pleasure of dogoodery, also set up a Community Services bureau to turn his 7,550 insurance salesmen across the country into independent-sector activists.

When Pueblo, Colo., needed a new public library, the local Equitable man, Jimmy Moore, got the how-to-do-it stuff from the home office. Moore did the same for his town's Industrial Development Commission and half a dozen other innovations. He puts in a third of his time this way.

"The community that provides your living deserves your best effort," says Moore, who lives fine on $2 million in annual policy sales. "Of course, if you are involved with the decision makers of your community, it leads to new business."

Such blends of sales and public service are the recipe for the mixed economy. Men in both business and government have begun to think out new mixes and make them stronger. The violence of each summer's riots makes the work urgent, and the harsh pressure from Negro militants has ended the day of the "pilot" project that never grows up. The assault on poverty has to be total war.

What's next? The International Executive Service Corps, backed by business and government, is an independent troubleshooter overseas. Its "Paunch Corps" volunteers have dug into the difficulties of 91 companies in 17 underdeveloped nations. By year's end, the project total will hit 300.

To see these veteran executives work for free (right) is to doubt their stem-winding about the all-purpose profit motive. Maybe there's also a service motive. In Costa Rica, Arthur Lerps, 61, refused to take a day off when he caught the miseries of dysentery, "I worked harder for these people," he admitted, "than I would for myself." To break out of poverty and raise its pay scale, a country like Costa Rica needs good management. So U.S. businessmen set up their International Executive Service Corps. Sample job: Arthur Lerps, a fierce printing engineer, flew to the aid of Convertidora Nacional del Papel, a small firm producing school notebooks, accounting pads and other papers needed by a country on the way up. After a month of the Lerps treatment, Convertidora had tighter schedules and higher ambitions: to double production in two years, bid hard in the new Central American Common Market.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—SMOTHERED BY SUCCESS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, anyone who has closely followed the fight that took place earlier this year to insure the continuance of a fully funded special milk program for schoolchildren knows that this effort met with a tremendous amount of support both from within the Congress and from the Nation at large. Yet, paradoxically, when we have almost achieved our goals, when a bill extending the program and providing substantial amounts for the program has passed the Senate, the possibility is increasing that Congress will not take action to speed this proposal to the President.

A child nutrition bill extending the school milk program through fiscal 1970 has passed the Senate and has been reported out of committee by the House. Yet this proposal is now caught on the horns of a jurisdictional dilemma in the House Rules Committee. Unfortunately two House committees are vying to see which gets final jurisdiction over the milk program. They have both reported bills on the matter.

I hope that my many colleagues in the Senate will continue to express their support for the school milk program. This is one way to impress upon Congress at large the importance of early action on this legislation. And early action is essential if we are to assure school administrators around the country that the school milk program will continue to be fully supported by the Federal Government.

THE REALITIES OF THE LEARNING MARKET

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education on August 9, 1966, addressed the American Management Association's first practicum in educational technology which was held at the Americana Hotel in New York City.

The ideas he voiced in that address are deserving of most careful consideration by a larger audience than was privileged to hear him in person. Mr. President, for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the address to which I refer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REALITIES OF THE LEARNING MARKET[1]

(An address by Harold Howe, II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

The American classroom of 1980 will differ from that of today; one of the influences which will account for the difference is the vigorous role which private business is developing in supplying as well as designing the equipment, the materials, and the services used by schools and colleges. If business is going to change education, education will influence business. And if these two assertions are true, it is important to start a conversation between the two, and to open it with mutual respect as well as with an awareness of difference.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I come with no set of government guidelines, no illustrated, step-by-step, how-to-do-it manual. The best I can do is offer my views on what looks promising, try to pinpoint some of the questions that seem to need answering, and perhaps lift a few rocks under which snakes may be hiding.

First, the promising aspects: It is encouraging to note that education and business have been demonstrating increasing affinity of late, an affinity nicely symbolized by the decision of the President of the American Stock Exchange to leave business to go into education while earlier the President of the New York Stock Exchange had moved from education into business.

This kind of thing is part of a larger phenomenon—the back-and-forth within different sectors of society of some of our most vigorous minds, men whose allegiance is not necessarily to any institution or any segment or section of American society, but who are rather committed to the overall public concern. We ought to make it easier for people with ideas, men committed to an intellectual concern, to move more freely in and out of government, industry, and education. I think we are headed in that direction.

Functioning in a somewhat similar capacity, though in a different role, are the numerous industry executives who lend their experience and talent to the government's interest in education on a part-time basis. At the Office of Education alone, we have in the neighborhood of 20 business officials serving on our advisory committees—from electronics companies, from the Chamber of Commerce, from the TV industry, from banking, and a variety of other fields.

Important as such interchange of talent may be, an even stronger force is pushing education and business together: I speak of the lure of the education market: the beckoning outlet for the new media—the new learning materials—waiting to be produced. As Fortune magazine points out in its current issue, hardly a week or month goes by without an announcement from some electronics manufacturer or publishing firm that it is entering the "education market" via merger, acquisition, joint venture, or some other working arrangement.

The reason for these mergers and joint ventures is clear: Americans are now spending close to $50 billion annually on their schools and colleges. And the rustle of all those dollars will get louder every year as more and more people begin their education earlier, continue it longer, and decide to invest more in their children's schooling or have their government do so.

Recent Federal legislation—especially the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 combined with the National Defense Education Act—has brought what amounts to a revolution in the capacity of schools to purchase apparatus and equipment designed to serve learning and teaching—textbooks, programmed materials, library books, audio-visual equipment, talking typewriters, and whatever other software or hardware may prove itself serviceable.

At the same time, private industry has now been invited to participate in Federally-sponsored programs for educational research heretofore reserved for universities and non-profit organizations. To date only a relatively few research contracts have gone to industry, and I must add that our fiscal 1967 budget for unsolicited research is very tight. Hopefully, in fiscal 1968 we will be in better financial shape to expand our support in selected areas. Certainly research in education needs expansion. We spend, proportionately, 20 times as much on health research, and 60 times as much on defense research.

The fact remains, though, that profit-making organizations are now eligible for support—further evidence of the growing awareness that responsibility for educational advancement, in research or in other aspects of education, need not be the exclusive province of educators operating out of our schools and colleges.

Meanwhile, we in education have come to recognize that schools, in addition to being places of learning, are economic enterprises—that a good school is not an accident but represents a prudent allocation of a community's financial, physical, and human resources; that education, in short, requires intelligent management as well as sound pedagogy.

---

[1] Before the American Management Association's First Practicum in Educational Technology, Americana Hotel, New York, 1:15 p.m., Tuesday, August 9, 1966.

And so as businessmen move into the education field, I think they will find a much greater interest and acceptance of their contribution today than would have been the case 25 or even 10 years ago. Educators are becoming aware that few school districts can match the business firm's flexibility and management expertise.

This is not to say that the business firm that enters the education field will find itself waltzing down Easy Street. The path ahead is by no means clear, and the long-range strategy for achieving what education in America needs to become will doubtless bear little resemblance to what education has been in the past.

We know from research carried on during the last decade or so that we have barely scratched the surface of man's ability to learn, and that there is a vast potential for change at every stage in education—nursery schools, elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, adult education, vocational training, and rehabilitation.

What we have seen so far in the production of teaching aids is only a trickle compared with what is likely to come when we find the answers to some very fundamental questions. But let me warn you, the answers must come first. If American education is to be served well, we must probe such problems as these:

How can we reach the substantial number of students in rural and urban slums who year after year have remained almost untouched by the traditional curriculum or traditional teaching techniques or both?

How can we find out whether we are teaching the right or wrong things for any given group of youngsters?

Can those who seem to be learning rather well now learn still more?

How do we cope with the explosion of knowledge—not only in terms of its multiplicity but in terms of which knowledge is worth the most?

How do we teach teachers to get through to the unmotivated youngsters as effectively as to the highly motivated?

How can we evaluate and alter school organization?

How do we go about achieving real understanding of intelligence? Can intelligence be "learned"?

At what age should education begin? Can parents be given a role in education—by which I mean formal education?

Will all children need individualized attention in order to learn all they are capable of learning?

How much should we be involved in the education of people in other countries?

How can we improve the knowledge and skill of two million teachers in mid-career without seriously interrupting their teaching?

How can we get the most from the individual student's capacity to teach himself?

It seems clear that technology can help us deal with some of these matters—as a research instrument and in instruction—but how it can and should do so still defies us. The somewhat unhandy fact is that we have to be smarter than the machines in order to figure out what the machines ought to do.

The fact is that much of the hardware which industry has been selling to school systems was originally designed for other purposes. And so while education stands to gain in the long run from technological advancements, there is little evidence that a tape recorder designed for commercial recording studios has all of the characteristics necessary for an effective language laboratory—or that an entertainment system, such as home TV, is equally effective for instruction. Most certainly, computers designed for business data processing are not ideally suited for computerized classrooms.

Sophisticated computers may eventually help us answer some of education's hard questions, and they will undoubtedly be programed to present conventional subject matter very effectively. The essence of education, however, is beyond the capacity of a machine, and always will be. A computer cannot develop a student's ability to associate effectively with other people. It cannot train a pupil to originate ideas, to present them and defend them against criticism, or to talk confidently before a group. It cannot foster creativity, stimulate thought, encourage experimentation, teach students to analyze.

Nevertheless a very substantial body of teachers fear the new communications devices. They see themselves replaced by machines. But teaching a class has little to do with such a job as running an elevator; education will never ultimately lend itself to self-service operation.

No matter how effectively computers are used in the classroom, they do not really teach anything. It is the program that teaches—a program designed by a teacher.

I suspect that the fundamental outcome of educational technology will be to free the teacher from the robot role of standing in front of a classroom presenting routine material. Rather, he will become the source of intellectual stimulus, the leader of discussion groups that cause students to think and probe and express their ideas effectively.

One outcome of this kind of relationship will be a great deal more interaction between individual students and the teacher than can now be provided by the conventional classroom. At present, students receive genuinely personal attention only a small portion of the time. The student in tomorrow's computerized school will probably receive far greater personalized attention and much more interaction with teachers than he now experiences.

If there is any real danger from the onset of technical devices it is the temptation to jump the gun . . . on the part both of producers and purchasers. As Dean Sizer of Harvard warns: We have achieved technical devices of great sophistication before we have established the clear ends—much less the materials—for them. We have better teaching machines than programs to feed into them, better educational television equipment than ideas on how to use it.

The greatest fear that responsible firms are reported to express is not that someone may beat them to the market, but that some competitor may rush to market too soon and thereby discredit the whole approach.

What we are confronted with is an unfortunate combination of sophisticated machinery and unsophisticated buyers. If there are some companies impatient to sell, there are some consumers equally impatient to purchase what is new, what is conspicuous, what is prestigious.

This combination of fast-buck salesmanship and a schoolman's eagerness to latch on to the latest ideas is becoming painfully real in some school districts. Those of us in the Office of Education have become aware of some of the dimensions of the problem in connection with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides nearly one billion dollars for children of the poor.

A background paper prepared for a university seminar on business and education raises this same problem. I would like to quote one paragraph regarding quickie marketing of new products.

"The real question here is not what is new, but rather, how can the new best be used? Unfortunately, our answer to this question has frequently been partial or expedient rather than complete or responsible. For example, the so-called new media—television, teaching machines, and the like—have frequently been prematurely introduced before either adequate content or reliable evaluation has been available. The result has been all too often a wave of hasty enthusiasm for the promise of a new technology or device, followed by a more leisurely repentance when it fails to live up to its billing. Such an outcome is not necessarily the fault of the media or devices involved, but the natural human desire for quick and easy solutions that lead us to hasty action."

I recognize that many schools are making thoughtful and effective use of the new instruments at the educator's command. But it is important to remember the abuses as well as the responsible uses.

So far, I have been talking about problems faced by educators or by educators and management jointly. Now if I may change hats quickly, I would like to offer some sales advice, partially based on what I have already said.

(1) My guess is that the businessman will find the education field difficult to attack in an organized way, because decision-making is so highly dispersed. The education system of the United States is not a system at all. It is a non-system. And being such, decisions about what to spend and what to spend it on are not centralized decisions at all. The public schools are managed by some 25,000 operating school boards. Their domains range in size from more than one million pupils down to a dozen. Each board prizes its autonomy and has to be dealt with individually.

To compound the difficulty, decision-making within any school system may be obscure or diffuse: for example, each system has its own peculiar ways of handling purchase orders—they could be signed by the teacher, the principal, the business manager, the superintendent, the school board, the purchasing agent, or even the mayor. One company analyzed its expenses in selling a machine to a school system and discovered that it would have been cheaper to send the machine free of charge when the first letter of inquiry came in. And if it is your impression that church-related schools have centralized and monolithic management, you are wrong. Though they enroll one-eighth of all the children of America, they make their decisions for the most part school-by-school. In any case, the business firm entering education with a new product will find that costs of marketing and distribution are high.

(2) Product needs in education are complex and must not be oversimplified. Many a corporation, trying to capitalize on interest in teaching machines, has produced the hardware without realizing that the most important component of a teaching machine is what goes into it. Hardware is only the razor—and Gillete makes its money on the blades. Like the drug for which there is as yet no disease, we now have some machines that can talk but have nothing to say. I would caution the businessman not to venture into hardware unless he is prepared to go all the way into printed materials and programming. Otherwise, he will have created an empty vessel or simply a glorified page-turner.

(3) Education is changing fast. It just won't do to design for the present. The corporation executive must anticipate the further development of a significant new trend: the breakup of self-contained classrooms and the release of children and teachers from the standard room.

The long-range service of business to education should focus on the individual child, not on groups of children. Increasingly, children will get information from inanimate sources, from things. Teachers, freed of routine fact-dispensing, will spend more of their time discussing with pupils the meaning of facts elsewhere acquired. They will have more opportunity as well to confront that much-neglected group of one.

In short, the new education just emerging will increase the child's opportunity to get facts from things and values, subtleties, and interpretations from people. The role of the teacher is changing, and the kinds of materials needed are changing accordingly. The ultimate and massive market is not equipment and materials for classes of children, but equipment and materials for individual children learning at their own rates and set free from the lockstep of the standard group. Incidentally, the business firm able to make something that would be useful in a school library is clearly in the wave of the future, for the library is the fastest growing element in the modern school.

(4) Education is a growth industry. Lead time is important. When our war effort requires less of the economy, consumption of national energies will increase beyond anything now imagined. It is the one product that a lot of people want that also requires a lot of people in production.

As you ponder the requirements for marketing education materials, you might divide up the various functions this way: developing new devices . . . programming them . . . distributing and servicing them . . . and finally, training teachers to use them.

These four elements are part of every new communications device in the world of education, and what people in education and business must toss back and forth is the question of who has the responsibility for each function.

In the development realm, certainly business has a major part to play. Perhaps some research funds from public sources in education will enter the picture, too. As for programming or developing software, the possibility of quick obsolescence presents real difficulties. My guess is that we will have to give considerable attention to the role of the Federal Government in making funds available for this purpose if we are to achieve a more imaginative result than the economics of the textbook industry now permits.

It seems to me that distribution and service are primarily up to business. But when it comes to training teachers to use the new approaches to education, school people and business people need to establish some kind of conversation. Right now, the training function is chiefly the concern of education itself, partly through Federal financing.

We in the Office of Education have been giving these matters a great deal of thought. And we conclude among other things that the relationships among government and education and industry are not guaranteed to be painless—if for no other reason than because we have two countervailing forces. On the one hand there is the necessity of avoiding any waste of Federal funds being allocated to the Nation's schools—a necessity that might suggest some set of National "standards" to help school people appraise the educational value of what industry seeks to sell them.

On the other hand, we have a clear-cut conviction—as well as legal proscription—against Federal interference in local education.

The question is how to assure and encourage efficient use of Federal funds and at the same time to deter any inroads on the constitutional rights of States and communities to set up their own education standards.

Not only is it our responsibility to protect the taxpayers from waste, but I conceive it as our obligation also to do our best to see that justified unfavorable public reaction against waste and carelessness does not wipe out the bright promise of new learning materials and methods. These materials can do much to help the schools achieve the goal of quality education for all. In its own interest as well as that of education, business is called upon to put its best foot forward.

Right now, I have no specific recommendations or answers to advance. I am not even sure that all the right questions have been asked. I hope that in your sessions you will pursue these matters further—recognizing that you are not likely to come up with the solutions in a short time. The issues are too broad and too complex for that—so broad and so complex that what is really needed is the combined thinking of five principal components—educators, businessmen, foundation officials, State educational leaders, and those of us in Federal Government who work in the interests of education.

Several possible approaches have been suggested toward establishing a good relationship between the education market and the firms in the business of supplying it. One might be the organization of a sort of educational Consumer's Union, run by a non-profit organization and overseen by a standard-setting committee representing the five groups most directly involved. Another might be the establishment of a Committee on Educational Development similar to the Committee on Economic Development—an agency that would be composed of government, education, and industry representatives, but independent of all three. Its only allegiance would be to the American people. I have also heard a proposal—not one I am prepared to endorse, by the way—for a regulatory arrangement patterned after that of the Food and Drug Administration. So far, all such suggestions—having come from off the top of someone's head—remain amorphous. I hope that those most concerned will assemble in the near future to devise a working agreement.

There is only one observation I would like to add to complete my remarks.

We have been talking about the education market and about the new cooperation which that market will inevitably develop between schoolmen and businessmen. But there is another area of necessary cooperation that strikes me as more important than anything we have discussed. Broadly speaking, it is the necessity for joint action on critical national problems which go beyond the separate concerns of education and industry strictly defined.

One of these is the employability of people who now have neither the training for jobs in which there is a genuine future, nor the opportunity to try for those jobs. We must join in determining how social as well as racial minorities—adult illiterates, displaced older workers, and school dropouts as well as Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican, and Indian Americans—can be trained for productive functions that offer the independence and self-respect necessary to full citizenship in a Nation of free men.

We must consider together the cause for the rapid decline in our central cities, and decide the distinctive knowledge and abilities of educators and businessmen can arrest an atrophy that threatens the economic, political, and social life of most of our population.

These are some of the matters that will be in our conversation as educators. We hope they will be in yours, for we expect to learn much from you. We hope to improve our executive abilities by observing yours. We hope to improve our management expertise as we benefit from yours. Finally, we hope to improve our salaries by comparing them with yours, and on that scholarly note let me close.

RESPECT FOR THE LAW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article entitled "Respect for the Law," by Charles Evans Whittaker, former Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, which appeared in the July 1966 issue of Eagle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Respect for the Law

(By Charles Evans Whittaker)

We are all involved in unusual ferment, and many of us are confused and bewildered. Many are asking the reason for this, what it means, and where it leads and ends.

Until we are able to isolate and define the underlying causes, we will not be able intelligently to grapple with them.

I cannot assume to delineate all of the underlying causes, but a major one is that in some way our anchors have been torn from their moorings to unchangeable fundamental principles—among others, a decent respect for truth and honesty, for the teachings of history, for the Ten Commandments, and for the Golden Rule—and without those anchors, we have lost our way.

In that distress, we tended to divide into ideological groups, and then one group began to blame another for our plight, and this brought retaliatory responses. That conduct continued to accelerate until the pitch of tensions ran so high as to produce a running acrimonious and recriminatory dialogue that has dissipated mutual respect, engendered hatreds, and made nearly impossible any calm and concilatory discussion of differences, and hence, has precluded return and reanchor to the changeless fundamentals.

That dialogue has largely sacrificed honest appeals to reason for other techniques. One has been the intentional and repeated misuse and distortion of generic words and phrases in our language with the obvious design of giving them a gloss of meaning that casts their inherent odious implications from themselves to their opponents.

When we realize that such preachments have been endlessly circulated as matters of truth, we can hardly wonder that the people, who must largely rely upon what they hear and read for their information, have been misled and are at a loss to know whom or what to believe and support.

I cannot readily think of a better example of what is happening to our language than is illustrated by our difficulties in maintaining the generic and basic distinction between what is "public"—and therefore subject to use by the public—and what is "private"—and therefore subject to use only by the owner or with his consent.

Another facet of current discussions revolves around the word "equality."

Some doubtless well-intentioned people have been arguing that it should be made the legal obligation of every man to socially accept every other man. However laudable may be the underlying objective, it is clear from experience and the nature of man that this cannot be done by law, and that such an attempt is not a proper function of government. Such an attempt can only agitate prejudices, stiffen resistance, and serve to impede and delay social acceptance.

Social acceptance is a matter of developing mutual respect and liking, and this cannot be brought about by force. These are matters of the heart.

No minority group which has settled in our land has obtained—or likely ever will obtain—general acceptance and amalgamation here until, by long year of exemplary conduct a *majority* of its members have earned the respect and liking of the people generally. Any effort to compel social acceptance would be a step in the wrong direction and self-defeating.

There are also well-meaning persons who argue that the proper concept of "equality" is that all men are entitled to be assured—by and at the expense of government, which means by their brothers—of permanent economic equality.

To argue that all men are entitled, at the expense of their brothers, to permanent economic equality is to argue for the adoption of communism, which, Webster says, means "a system of social organization in which all goods are held in common," and hence in which all men are by law made and kept economically equal. Do those who so advocate understand this? I doubt that they do.

But the government established here by our forefathers—and early said to be the finest instrument of government ever conceived by the minds of men—is not of that kind. It does not intend to destroy initiative and ambition by holding accomplishments down to the level of the least ambitious.

Under our government, the term *equality* must mean essentially that government, State and Federal, cannot and must not deny to any citizen (a) the right to obtain equal learning, (b) the right to equal governmental treatment, (c) the right to equal justice, (d) the equal right of suffrage, and (e) the consequent right to equal opportunity.

But the right to equal opportunity, if indeed it is to be equal, must include the opportunity to develop and prove unequal talents.

I now turn to the misleading and therefore dangerous technique of some current argument by cliches. Some would-be leaders have been voicing slogans which, in instances, appear on the surface to be logical, and some even religious, but which in truth are neither. Instead they are dangerously deceptive and destructive.

One is: "Government owes every citizen a living." This is the false cry of the prideless lazy. Inasmuch as the food, shelter and clothing necessary for his "living" can only be produced by the labors of someone, this is a cry for support by the sweat of another man's brow.

A second is: "Human rights, not property rights." Are these rights inconsistent? Is not the right to have and be protected in property a valuable "human right?" Any thoughtful observation of history will reveal that where private property rights have not been protected there have not been what we call "human rights." Private property rights are the soil in which our concept of human rights grow and mature.

A third is the Russian-coined phrase that "production is for use, not for profit." Must it be wholly for the one or for the other? Is production not truly for both? Reasonable profits are essential to the survival of free enterprise, and hence, of our society.

A fourth—and of which we hear much these days—is: "Obey the good laws, but not the bad ones," and a fifth—which should be considered with the fourth—is: "Action now, not the delays of the law."

Is not each of these cliches a call for anarchy? Does not the fourth invite men to violate laws they do not like? And does not the fifth invite men to spurn the courts and all constituted authority and to take the law into their own hands?

If we allow men to disobey with impunity the laws they do not like, or to spurn the courts and all constituted authority by taking the law, or what they think ought to be the law, into their own hands, will we not be inviting anarchy and chaos?

Yet this is precisely what some self-appointed leaders have been advocating, and it is precisely what their followers have been doing. Aroused by these techniques, those followers frequently have assembled, from far and wide, into large and loosely assembled groups or mobs, to wage what they have called "demonstrations" to force the grant of what they call "rights," in defiance of the law.

Seeing that those trespasses were compelled to be appeased and rewarded, these groups quickly enlarged the scope of their activities by massing and marching their followers on the sidewalks, streets, and highways—frequently appropriating them to a degree that precluded their intended public uses.

These "demonstrations" were conducted under the banner of "peaceable civil disobedience," and under the claim of protection by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

But, in fact, most of those claims were and are untrue. "Crime," says Webster, means "an act or omission forbidden by law and punishable upon conviction." It cannot be denied that many of those trespasses violated at least the criminal-trespass laws of the local jurisdictions involved, nor that those laws impose criminal penalties for their violation, nor, hence, that those trespasses constituted "crimes."

In the first place, that conduct cannot honestly be termed "peaceable," for we all know that the assembly and incitement of a large group or mob for the avowed purpose of *forcing* direct action outside the law amounts to the creation of a mob bent on lawlessness, and inherently disturbs the peace of others.

In the second place, that conduct cannot honestly be termed "civil disobedience," for the simple reason that willful violation of the criminal laws is criminal disobedience, not civil disobedience.

And, lastly, those criminal trespasses were not protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the First Amendment.

That provision says: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Obviously, nothing in that language grants a license to any man or group to violate our criminal laws—including those which prohibit trespass upon, and appropriation of, private property, and those prohibiting the willful obstruction of public walks, streets and highways.

Rather, as Mr. Justice Roberts wrote in 1939, "the privilege of a citizen of the United States to use the streets and parks for communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interest of all; it is not absolute, but is relative, and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order. . . ."

Surely, no thoughtful person will disagree with that statement, or with the one recently made by the president of Yale University that the current rash of "demonstrations make a ludicrous mockery of the democratic debating process."

The philosophy of "obeying only the laws you like" and of attempting to rule by force has given rise to mobs and mob actions that have proven—as certainly as we should have expected—to be tailor-made for infiltration, take-over, and use by rabblerousers and Communists who are avowedly bent on the breakdown of law, order, and morality in our society, and hence its destruction. We now see that virtually all such "demonstrations" are being infiltrated by rabble-rousers and radicals and that such "demonstrations" not infrequently break into open violence.

Even though those results may not have been contemplated and surely weren't wished by those Americans who advocated disobedience of our laws, nevertheless they did advocate that philosophy and they did put its processes into action, and cannot now escape responsibility for the results.

Other would-be leaders have carried that philosophy into many other areas. It has spread into the campuses of most of our great universities, where, as in Berkeley, it has been used to commit assaults, kidnappings, imprisonment of police officers, and commandeering of public-address systems, and their use in spewing over the campus filthy four-letter words, and for the general breakdown of law and order.

The process is also now progressively employed, by leftists and those who would give aid and comfort to our enemies, to hinder and impede our nation's efforts to conscript military personnel—as witness the recent rash of draft-card burners—and to move and supply its troops, and generally to weaken its ability to execute its military efforts in this time of war.

The process has been extended even to efforts to thwart governmental legislative and executive action. Indeed, it would be hard to name a field that has escaped, or is not vulnerable to, the process.

These are but recent examples of history's teachings that the toleration of some crime encourages all crime. It can hardly be denied that our toleration of these crimes of trespass has been at least a contributing factor to the recent spread of common violence which, J. Edgar Hoover says, makes it impossible "for the citizens of this country to * * * walk the streets of our cities without [danger of] being mugged, raped and robbed."

The great pity is that these minority groups, in preaching and practicing defiance of the law, are in fact eroding our legal structure which alone can ever assure to them due process of law and the equal protection of the laws, and that can thus protect them.

We have all been often told, and many of us have preached, that crime does not pay. But the recent spread of law defiance, and the successes—however tenuous and temporary—of that philosophy in attaining goals, seems to compel a reappraisal of that concept, for, from what we see happening, one could reasonably believe that certain types of crimes are being permitted to pay.

It is undoubtedly true, as recited in the theme of the presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, that "citizen's first duty is to uphold the law." But it is also the first duty of government to enforce the law. As said in an article in the April 10, 1965, issue of the magazine *America*, "[Government] has no right to turn the cheek of its citizens. Instead, it is gravely obligated—by the very purpose of its existence—to see to their protection."

Surely the great majority of Americans agree with the May, 1965, public statement of Lewis F. Powell, then president of the American Bar Association, that "America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected and due process followed."

I would like to conclude, as I began, with a plea for a return to simple honesty, responsibility, and forthrightness in our public speakings and writings—that they may honestly inform and not misinform the people—and for a return to an orderly society by requiring respect for and obedience to our laws, by the prompt, impartial, even-handed, certain, and substantial punishment of all persons whose willful conduct violates those laws. We should do this promptly, and I would hope, before mass crime gets, as it surely can, so far out of hand as to be beyond the curbing capacities of our peacekeeping agencies and authorities.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, shortly after Labor Day, the Senate will take up the 1966 civil rights bill. As we all know there are strong emotional feelings about title IV of the bill pertaining to discrimination in housing. Most of the discussion and most of the publicity have surrounded the provisions of this title as introduced by the administration and as amended by the House.

However, another very important item is pinpointed by an esteemed and highly capable colleague, Representative CALLAWAY, of Georgia. This involves the interpretation by the Commissioner of Education concerning title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. By Federal regulations granting or withholding Federal aid to school districts, there appears to be an apparent effort to impose on local schools a predetermined racial mix. Representative CALLAWAY, who has been following this problem from the beginning, offered and had accepted an amendment to the 1966 civil rights bill to make it plain that the House, at least, had no intention of permitting action by Federal authorities to assign students to local schools to overcome racial imbalance.

Recently several States have considered this problem, including my own State. In a number of instances, it has been suggested that the assignment of students on the basis of race is in fact unconstitutional, as it requires assignment solely on the basis of color rather than following the mandate of the Supreme Court on equal opportunity for schooling without regard to color.

In any event Representative CALLAWAY presented his amendment to target this issue and with his logic, leadership, conviction, and ability induced the House to adopt it as a part of the Civil Rights Act of 1966.

The editorial in the August 12 issue of the Washington Star complimenting him highly on the amendment and his leadership was a well deserved accolade. In order to bring it to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTRAINING A BUREAUCRAT

The Callaway amendment to the House-approved civil rights bill of 1966 has not received the attention it deserves. For this amendment, if it becomes law, will or at least should preserve the neighborhood school concept which certain federal bureaucrats will destroy if they can.

In adopting this amendment by an overwhelming voice vote, the House was aiming primarily at Harold Howe II, federal commissioner of education. The criticism, however, was also directed to HEW Secretary Gardner and, indirectly, to the President who is ultimately responsible for the activities of these appointed officials.

The thrust of the amendment is in this sentence: "Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools to overcome racial imbalance." The purpose of this was made clear enough during the debate. The House believes that Howe, supported by Gardner, has grossly distorted the plain intent of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in order to impose on the country his own notion of what constitutes a desirable racial mix in the public schools. And he proposes to do this by withholding federal funds from any school district which does not conform to integration standards imposed by his agency.

Here are a few excerpts taken at random from the debate: "We ought to make it crystal clear here today that this Congress does not approve of the blatant violations of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that have occurred in the office of the commissioner of education." "Let us put a stop to arbitrary and unauthorized actions by the commissioner of education to force acceptance of his solution to de facto segregation." "This amendment is absolutely necessary in order to prevent a dictatorship of education at the federal level." And finally: "If you move to the suburbs of Washington and Commissioner Howe decides it suits his plan for social rule to send your children to school back in the District, that is where they will go, transported across state lines if necessary for him to achieve what he thinks are proper social conditions."

Exaggerations? We do not think so. And the best evidence will be found in what HEW already has done in some areas and in what Howe says he intends to do in the future if he "has his way."

What he intends to do, in brief, is to bus school children back and forth to achieve a racial mix satisfactory to himself, and if necessary to abolish the neighborhood schools in the process. This has never been required by the Supreme Court nor intended by Congress. Hence, the purpose of the Callaway amendment is to restrain and rebuke the commissioner of education, and we trust the message gets through to the proper authorities in the federal establishment.

SUPERIOR, WIS., STUDENTS HELP DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in the summer of 1965, five students from Superior State University at Superior, Wis., gave up a summer to help Indian children at the nearby Bad River Indian Reservation. Entirely at their own expense, they planned and executed a summer recreation program, started a teenage club and a club for younger children. They organized a fundraising program which enabled 11 Indian teenagers to take a field trip to South Dakota.

When they returned to college in the fall, they formed an organization to continue their work with disadvantaged children—the Student Youth Volunteers. The volunteers have developed an imaginative and effective program which should be an inspiration to youth all over America.

The organization began by working with youth right in its own area, northern Wisconsin, but it is now spreading its energies from Mexico to Appalachia. The young people have worked with mentally retarded and physically handicapped children at three Superior public schools. They have tutored emotionally disturbed children at a children's home. They are now developing a new project with the juvenile officer of the Superior Police Department to work with delinquent children on a 1-to-1 basis.

At Christmastime last year, some members spent their vacations working with poverty-stricken youth in Mexico. This summer, seven Student Youth Volunteers are associated with VISTA as Appalachian volunteers.

This group of dedicated youth is to be congratulated for beginning this imaginative program. I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Superior Evening Telegram describing their excellent work be entered in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY GROUP MEETING HIGH GOALS IN PROJECT AT RESERVATION IN ODANAH

Eleven Superior State University students are staging their own revolt against a world they never made.

Calling themselves the Student Youth Volunteers they are engaged in a private crusade to improve the lot of their fellow man through service and sacrifice.

No inflamatory placards lead their parade. No limp and defiant bodies clutter the hallways of public buildings in their wake. They burn no one in effigy nor do they shout down the "establishment."

The sweatshirt-and-dungaree platoon simply roles up its collective sleeves, empties its pockets into the common coffer and goes to work.

Frank Boyle, president of SSU Student Government and leader of the group explained that he had worked with Indian youths in New Mexico last year in connection with a project of his church. "I found the work satisfying and felt it was important," he said. "Four other students agreed with me and the Student Youth Volunteers was born."

Others of the original student five are Beth Bowden, and Bill Goligoski, Superior; Janice Johnson, Eagle River, Wis. and Arthur Durand, Spooner. Boyle is from Phillips.

Later contributors to the work are Bruce Brunette and Cheryl Hendrickson, Superior; Lynda Savage, Cornucopia; Harriet Visger, Dairyland; Lyla Fiala, Phillips; and Mary Allen Swanson, Ironwood, Mich.

First project for the group was to bring a summer recreation program to young people at the Bad River Indian Reservation at Odanah, Wis.

Getting permission from reservation leaders, the group started early this past sum mer with an idea and very little else. Money was the big problem. Several of the group are working their way through the university. Even a tank of gasoline looms big in their budget. The original five arrived on the reservation one Saturday morning to be greeted with less than an enthusiastic reception.

"We must have looked a pretty scraggly and disorganized lot," Boyle recalled. We didn't have enough money with us to eat that day and here we were about to bring the good things of life to some pretty skeptical Indian kids."

Youth speaks to youth in any group, however, and soon the barriers came down. A softball game started the season. About twenty reservation youngsters took part.

Gradually more and more of the youngsters participated. The volunteers helped inaugurate an Odanah Teenage Club and a Pee-Wee Club for children under thirteen years of age. Purposes of the clubs were social, recreational and educational.

The Teenage Club started its activities with a dance in a building loaned by the reservation. About a score of shy youngsters showed up but the pounding beat of the borrowed record player soon loosened things up and every one had "a swinging ball." Now the teen dances usually attract between 60 and 70 young people.

About this time local and Superior merchants and friends got into the act. A can of paint here, a few records there, a handful of dollars when the cupboard was bare helped the volunteers survive.

One of the biggest problems was getting back and forth to the reservation. Some of the group had to come to Superior to earn money for tuition at SSU this fall. Others were attending summer classes. They took a long gamble and bought a panel truck. They still owe a couple of hundred dollars but they are meeting their payments. The truck serves in a dozen capacities.

Goals are important to any group and the Volunteers have been setting up and meeting some pretty high goals. The Teenage Club wanted to take a trip. Not just a jaunt to Superior or Madison, but a real trip out into the West. South Dakota was the target.

The Volunteers agreed to work with them but it was to be a self-help project. The teens charged admission to their dances, sold pop, made and sold candy, and washed cars. Student Youth Volunteers contributed $75. At the last moment the group had to borrow another vehicle to supplement the old panel truck but eleven Indian teenagers and three SYV members made the six-day trip to South Dakota.

Now its back to the candy pots and the car sponges because next year they're going to Washington, D.C.

The fall semester is in full swing at SSU and the Volunteers are back to their classrooms and books but the old, blue panel truck still points automatically for Odanah on weekends. The playground is still abuilding. The dances must go on. The beauty culture classes can't be allowed to lag.

Thus eleven university students, their faith firmly founded in service and love of humanity, are making their own small but significant contribution to the future, confident that their enthusiasm and energy, with an assist now and then from merchants, civic leaders and friends, will bring a new and warmer relationship between Indian children and the white community.

An idea combined with youthful ambition has provided the motivating force behind one of the newest and fastest growing organizations on the Superior State University campus.

Showing that college students can be serious and responsible individuals, five SSU students banded together last fall to form the Student Youth Volunteers. Since then, the organization has grown to more than 50 with membership applications continuing.

The Student Youth Volunteers has been described to be "waging a do-it-yourself war on social problems." Not afraid to dig in, the volunteers have worked and are working on projects with Indian children and emotionally disturbed children. The group is currently working on projects in Superior and with Indian children on area reservations.

During vacations SYV work takes students from Superior to Mexico, where some of the volunteers spent Christmas vacation working with poverty stricken youth.

IN SUPERIOR

In Superior, where most of their projects are centered during the school year, the SYV's have initiated several programs. Working in and with the Superior public school system, the volunteers are in Ericsson, Blaine and Pattison elementary schools. Their jobs vary from working with one of the speech correctionists, acting as a recreation leader, tutoring a remedial reader and serving as a library assistant or teacher's aid.

Other organizations receiving the benefits of the services are St. Joseph's Children's Home and the Douglas County Mental Hospital. At St. Joseph's, the volunteers spend a few hours each week acting as tutors for emotionally disturbed children. The volunteers at the county hospital provide patient services which would ordinarily not be available.

The Student Youth Volunteers are always on the look-out for new projects. The latest one, still in the planning stage, will have volunteers working in cooperation with the Superior police department juvenile officer in helping delinquent children.

Frank Boyle, a senior at SSU from Phillips, provides the leadership for SYV. Boyle, also president of the student body at SSU, was one of five original members. The other four are Beth Bowden, Superior, Janice Johnson, Eagle River, Arthur Durand, Spooner, and Bill Goligoski, Superior.

In the summer of 1965, the five began work on what would later grow into SYV. Recognizing the need for youth workers at the Bad River Indian Reservation in Odanah, the five began spending their weekends there.

Supplying their own financial backing, the students began the project with no equipment and no assurance of acceptance. Before the first summer ended, a general recreation program was in full operation and a teen club and pee wee club were organized.

Returning to school in the fall, the five decided to formally organize and recruited more students into the project.

LOOK AHEAD

Foremost in the minds of the SYV leaders now is the planning of projects for next summer. The organization plans to continue their work in Superior and the Indian reservations in northern Wisconsin. Also planned are field trips to work in New Mexico and Mexico.

The Student Youth Volunteers are also working on expanding their program to other state university campuses. In the budding stage now are other chapters at Stout State and La Crosse State.

Looking to the future, Frank Boyle says, "Someday we hope this organization will be nationwide, student operated, student directed, a real manifestation of the interest and concern of American university students for their fellow men."

REINSURANCE OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Finance Committee has received testimony today on S. 1575, my bill which was first introduced in the 88th Congress for establishment of a system for reinsurance of private pension funds. It was gratifying to me that Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz testified to the great need for tackling the problem this bill deals with, and that he said in his testimony:

> This legislation is a serious, constructive attempt to deal with these difficulties and to provide beneficiaries of private pension plans with limited protection through a Federal reinsurance program. For this and other reasons already stated, I wholeheartedly endorse the purposes and objectives of this bill.

Those purposes and objectives, Mr. President, are to provide a means to assure those entitled to benefits under private pension plans that their employer will not, by reason of merger, bankruptcy, or other cause, leave them suddenly without the pension protection they have worked for and counted on over the years.

This happened, as I noted in introducing this legislation, in the case of the Studebaker Corp. in South Bend, Ind., when the closing out of its operations left 7,000 persons without jobs, and when it also left all those under 60, in some cases with 40 years or more of service, with a lump sum instead of a pension, and that lump sum only 15 percent of the estimated reserve required to provide the pensions.

As Mr. Walter Reuther pointed out in his testimony, this was not an isolated case. In the past 15 years, in the United Automobile Workers alone, there have been 113 cases of termination of pension plans, under which workers did not receive the funds they had every right to expect. The total number of persons annually affected by such problems is evidently small as compared to the total number covered by private pension plans, but for each of them the result is an enormous personal catastrophe. We guard against this in the case of banks by the reinsurance program of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and there are other Federal programs which arrange the protection of individuals against financial loss for which they themselves are not liable. As in the case of the FDIC, the pension reinsurance proposed in my bill would be paid for by premiums provided by the companies themselves. In addition to Mr. Wirtz, witnesses from the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury also approved the basic purpose of the Hartke bill.

The subject which we have opened in the Finance Committee today is not one which we can dispose of in a single day of hearings. The Labor Department is now in the process of studying the pension situation and securing data which will be useful and even necessary before we can reach sound legislative solutions to many of the problems we face in the field of private pensions. I believe it would be usefully informative to the Members of this body, who will have to deal with this growing problem in the economy, to outline some of its dimensions in a broad way, not confined to the context of my bill. This I propose to do now, and at the end of my remarks I request unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Nolan Miller, of South Bend, which he presented this morning, may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Nolan is one of those who, because he was not yet 60 years of age, will not receive his pension, although he worked for Studebaker from 1926 until it closed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> My name is Nolan Miller, address 805 30th St., South Bend, Indiana.
>
> I am an employee of the Studebaker Corporation.
>
> I am 59 years of age and have worked for Studebaker since 1926. It is the only job I have ever had.
>
> I had depended on my Studebaker pension along with Social Security to provide a living when I reached retirement age because any savings from income at Studebaker was far too little to provide for retirement income.
>
> I and the other employees at the plant looked forward to our Studebaker pension in the same way as we did to our Social Security and had the opinion that we were just as sure to get it. There was never any serious thought that we might lose it because of the plant closing. Even when the Studebaker Corporation announced in December of 1963 that their operations in South Bend would be closed down most of us felt that our pensions were secure and that when we reached retirement age we could depend upon getting them. This was the only bright spot we could see in the terrible prospect of being thrown out of a job at an age where finding another one was almost impossible.
>
> When we finally came to realize that only those already retired, or who would reach age 60 by November 1, 1964, could get a pension because the Plan wasn't sufficiently funded to do more, it was probably the most bitter news we ever received.
>
> The Pension Plan terminated on November 1, 1964 but out of the approximately 5000 who had from 10 to more than 40 years of credited pension service, only some 1300 employees were eligible for pension by virtue of having reached age 60 or by being totally and permanently disabled.
>
> All that was left for those of us under age 60 was the amount of money in the pension fund not needed to guarantee pension for those who were eligible to retire by age or disability. This remainder was divided among us according to our ages and credited pension service. The individual entitlements ranged from $200.00 to $1600.00.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, prior to 1940 less than 4 million people were covered by private pension plans. Generally, many of these early plans were unfunded, were viewed as a gratuity by the employer, and failed to establish legal rights for the employee. In fact, many of the plans could be terminated and reduced by the employer at will.

Today, more than 25 million workers are covered. It has been estimated that this number will increase to about 34 million in 1970, and reach 42 million by 1980. Reserves in the pension funds are now about $90 billion, and will probably reach $120 billion by 1970, and over $200 billion by 1980. This latter figure would be $40 billion more than the total reserves of the entire life insurance industry at the end of 1965. This fact of itself is of pivotal significance in any consideration of the role of pension funds in the total economy.

What accounts for this growth? Basically it resulted from special conditions arising out of the wartime economy created by World War II. Cash wages were frozen, but pension contributions were not; thus, pensions became the tool used by employers to compete for and retain qualified workers. In addition, the excess profits tax made pension contributions relatively inexpensive—as little as 20 cents on the dollar.

The continued growth of the funds seems to relate to the 1948 decision of the National Labor Relations Board which held that retirement programs were a proper subject for collective bargaining. Since that decision, unions have made retirement protection a major goal.

And so, today, pension contributions by employers are a subject of contract negotiations, and a part of the overall economic package bargained for by the union. Even where no union is present the employer must remain competitive with union shops. It has been recognized that pension contributions are no longer a gratuity given by the employer, but a fringe benefit in lieu of pay.

It is now generally recognized that a contribution by an employer to a plan, even a noncontributory one, is in effect an employee contribution, since these are funds an employee would have otherwise received in cash wages or other fringe benefits. This change has come about in the last 10 to 15 years, but its implication has been given too little attention.

In discussing the basic reasons for the growth of pension funds, we cannot overlook the favorable tax treatment given to such funds. Employer contributions to a qualified plan are deductible as an expense and are not taxable to the employee. More importantly, however, is that all earnings of a qualified plan are also nontaxable. It has been estimated that this favored tax treatment represents a 30-percent tax savings factor financing a plan, and results in a tax loss to the Treasury of more than $1 billion a year.

Private pension plans were granted this tax support because the Congress felt that they were serving a public purpose in that these funds would be available at retirement to supplement social security payments. The question arises, is this public purpose being served?

Over the years there has been an increase in the use of plans which are noncontributory and, correspondingly, a declining use of contributory plans. Clearly, this is a result brought about by the tax deductibility feature granted to employer contributions which are deemed nontaxable to the employee, plus pressure from collective bargaining.

Although organized labor has consistently bargained for noncontributory plans, I believe the relative merits of the two types of plans should be reevaluated.

If employer contributions are part of an overall economic package—if they are nothing more than part of a wage bill—then should not these contributions inure to the benefit of the employee upon cessation of employment—whatever the cause? Generally, in noncontributory plans the benefits upon cessation can inure to the benefit of management, whereas employee contributions must be returned.

It may be argued that under the noncontributory plans there are substantial tax "savings" to the employee. But I question the ultimate "saving" to the average white- and blue-collar worker. What does the tax saving mean to an employee who is separated from his employment and who has no vested benefit? In essence such an employee in a noncontributory plan loses the employer's contribution—a contribution which was, at least in part, made in lieu of wages.

Liberal vesting provisions would overcome much apparent criticism of the noncontributory plans, since such provisions would vest in the employee contributions made on his behalf. The employee also would be entitled to the tax free investment income earned on the contributions.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of Federal standards, vesting requirements vary greatly from plan to plan and are generally quite restrictive. In fact, several years ago Dan McGill, a recognized authority in the pension field, estimated that possible no more than 40 percent and certainly no more than 50 percent of employees then covered under private pension plans would ever receive a cash benefit.

How many employees today—presently making contributions—will ever receive pension benefits either directly or on their behalf? What is the effect of turnover, plan terminations, mergers and shutdowns on the ultimate pension received by an employee, when compared to his overall private pension contribution?

I feel that there is a definite need for information on this aspect of pension plans. A study should be done either by the insurance industry, the labor unions whose workers are the beneficiaries of these plans, or the Federal Government through the offices of the Secretary of Labor.

As I am sure all of you know, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Plans has recommended that qualified plans be required to meet minimum vesting requirements. Their proposal is that at least one-half accrued normal retirement benefits shall be vested after 15 years of services, with full benefits after 20 years.

But I seriously question whether this proposal standing by itself, will alleviate the problems I have enunciated. What is the good of a vesting provision if we are unable to guarantee that a vested right will in fact be met?

The need for such insurance protection is clear, and that is the purpose of my bill. It is reported that between 1956 and 1962 more than 1,800 qualified pension or annuity plans were terminated.

What is the result of such terminations? In the Studebaker case the fund had assets sufficient only for those employees who were either already retired, or who were over age 60 and entitled to retirement. Those under age 60, despite the fact that they had vested rights, received only 15 cents on the dollar of proposed benefits at retirement.

There is one other feature of pension plans that I hope we will be able to discuss during these hearings—that is the subject of portability with regard to a worker's pension fund.

Too often we hear the complaint, "I can't leave my job, I've got too much invested in it."

The complex economy in which we live today requires a labor force that is completely mobile if it is to be used to its utmost efficiency. While pension plans are counted as one of the benefits a worker gets for working at a certain job, they also serve to hinder his movement to another job since to do so would mean the loss of his pension rights. Once a worker has been with a certain company for, say 7 years, he finds that he is "locked in" to his job. Although he may want to leave, he feels that he has too much invested in his pension plan and other nonwage benefits, to do so. Hence, the mobility of the American labor force suffers from this inadvertant benefit to the worker.

A plan should be worked out whereby a worker can contribute to a pension plan in one company, and then be able to transfer his pension rights to the pension plan of another company. This would insure not only the full mobility of labor, but also the portability of pension plan rights.

I recognize that the bill enters an entirely unexplored area of protection for American employees, but I call on the insurance industry, the labor unions, and the executive branch of the Federal Government, to present the problems and leave us with recommended solutions at this hearing before we are confronted with a major catastrophe. Only in this way can the legislative process work effectively and efficiently.

SPEECH BY FRED V. HEINKEL, PRESIDENT OF MISSOURI AND MIDCONTINENT FARMERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on August 8, farm leaders from Missouri and the Midwest gathered in Columbia, Mo., for the annual convention of the Midcontinent Farmers Association.

We were very proud to have in our State for that occasion Vice President HUMPHREY, who is a longtime friend of American agriculture.

Also addressing the convention was Fred V. Heinkel, of Missouri, one of the Nation's outstanding agricultural leaders. He is president of the Missouri Farmers Association and the Midcontinent Farmers Association and for many years has been a major force in developing better farm programs. His efforts over the years have brought great gains for our farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the excellent speech Fred Heinkel delivered be printed at this point in the RECORD. I hope many Senators will read them for I believe they represent the views of many of us in Missouri.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTES FROM FRED V. HEINKEL, PRESIDENT OF MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION AND MIDCONTINENT FARMERS ASSOCIATION, TO THE ANNUA'. CONVENTION OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS, STEPHENS COLLEGE ASSEMBLY HALL, AUGUST 8, 1966

Surpluses of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and rice are gone. This didn't just happen. It was planned. However, necessary reserves do exist.

Elimination of the surplus portion of these grain stockpiles has been in the best interest of business, labor, industry, taxpayers and consumers, as well as farmers.

The removal and prevention of grain surpluses was accomplished with the aid of national farm programs, including the P.L. 480 surplus disposal program.

There are those who would destroy all farm programs. They argue surpluses are gone, population is increasing, and world food needs are rising, "so why not free the farmer of all controls and turn him loose?"

With our high per acre yields—having nearly doubled in 20 years—if all the millions of acres, now out of production under various programs, were all put back into production we would soon pile up another unmanageable surplus. Neither the nation, the taxpayers, business, labor, nor farmers can afford to have this bad situation reoccur.

In the Agricultural Act of 1965, we have a program that is working to maintain a practical balance between the production of farm commodities and the use of these commodities. At the same time, farm income is being raised to help cover the soaring production expenses.

It is in the best interest of the nation and all the people that this Act be continued through 1969.

In the last few months, shortages of some basic food products have occlurred. Milk is one example.

During the past several years thousands of dairy farmers have not received prices sufficient to cover their ever-increasing production costs and have sold their herds.

Recently, increases in milk prices have been put into effect in many markets, but this can do little to bring any immediate change in the short supply of milk. It may be some time—and it may take even higher prices—before production will respond.

Abundance of food can no longer be taken for granted. The nation and its millions of consumers should come to understand that farmers must be paid fairly in relation to what is paid to others for labor, capital and managament. This is necessary if agriculture is to continue to produce sufficient food and fiber for an expanding domestic population and increasing world needs.

Before REA, nine farm families out of every ten were without the blessings of electricity. Small wonder REA is dear to their hearts.

REA now serves nearly 5½ million rural customers.

The demand for rural electric power to the individual farm continues to multiply. This requires new wiring, heavier transmission systems, and greatly expanded generation of power.

All of this requires more funds with which to do the job.

Plans are in the making for Congress to establish a Federal Electric Bank to serve REA. This Bank will be patterned after the Farm Credit Banks, which are of long standing.

The purpose of this Bank will be to acquire funds through regular channels at going rates of interest. Its establishment is of the utmost importance if the lights are not to go out on REA lines some time in the future.

The prices at which farm products are selling are not inflationary. In fact, farm prices are tagging along at the tail end of the parade of price increases.

Eight of the major farm commodities are selling for less money now than 15 years ago.

In 1951 the Farm Food Market Basket (food for four for a year) cost the consumer $1,024. In 1966 (based on first quarter) the same amount of food cost $1,090, or $66.00 more. This is an increase of only 6.5 per cent in 15 years; hardly enough to be called inflationary.

But the farmer today is getting $46.00 less for his share of the Market Basket—a reduction of 9.3 per cent compared with 1951. (Farm portion 1951, $497.00; 1966, $451.00.)

However, the various middlemen have upped their bite by $112.00 or 21.3 per cent. (1951, $527.00; 1966, $639.00).

Based on these facts and figures, one may draw his own conclusion as to the real cause of inflation in food costs.

In 1952 a pound loaf of bread in the U.S. sold for an average price of 16.2 cents. Of this amount the farmer received 2.6 cents, or 16 per cent. Middlemen received 13.6 cents.

In 1966 the same pound loaf had gone up to an average price of 21.7 cents, of which the farmer received 2.8 cents, or only 12 per cent, while other interests received 18.9 cents.

Consumers, beware of who causes rising food costs.

Credit is the life blood of business. It becomes increasingly more important each year.

Interest rates presently being charged are reaching exhorbitant heights. They are stifling to new businesses and young farmers.

With the added amounts of capital required by farmers to expand and modernize in order to keep efficient and stay in business, these rates are just about prohibitive.

We do not believe that raising interest rates will by itself do the job of controlling inflation. In fact, higher interest rates are in themselves a form of inflation, since they increase costs to borrowers whether for business or personal needs.

We urge that steps be taken to control inflation to at least the pre-1966 levels.

FARMER UNJUSTLY BLAMED FOR MILK PRICE INCREASES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am concerned at repeated attempts in some metropolitan areas to blame the farmer for recent increases of 2 to 3 cents a quart in the price of milk. The returns to farmers certainly do not reflect increases of anywhere near this amount.

The latest involves statements over the weekend by Samuel J. Kearing, Jr., markets commissioner of New York City, who earlier had talked of pressuring milk dealers to roll back recent price increases in that city.

The New York Times quoted Mr. Kearing today as saying milk dealers are in serious financial trouble and are in no position to lower prices. He also blamed the Department of Agriculture for higher prices he said dealers are required to pay to farmers.

The newspaper account reports that dealers now pay 12.8 cents to farmers per quart for milk. This figure, it noted, is up 0.3 cent a quart from the 12.5 cents paid in January.

I have checked further into these figures with the Department of Agriculture. The information provided does not back up the need for higher milk prices in New York City.

Latest USDA figures show that while the Federal order price of 4.39 pounds of class I milk—one-half gallon—of 3.55 percent butterfat, delivered at New York City, has actually dropped from 25.9 cents paid in January of this year to only 23.6 cents in June. USDA figures show the middleman's margin, which goes mainly to the dealers, has increased during this period from 25.4 to 27.4 cents per half gallon.

In fact, the margins since February have been from 0.3 of a cent to 1 cent higher per half gallon than in the same months in 1965. This means that any increases in the price of milk to the consumers of New York City since February went into the pockets of middlemen, not farmers.

In view of these facts, it appears there simply is no justification for increases of up to 3 cents a quart for milk sold in stores in New York City. And there is a good deal of harm done in blaming farmers, who need greater returns if they are to continue to provide the milk needed to meet consumer needs.

Earlier this month Secretary Orville Freeman was in New York City to give testimony before a special city council committee investigating rising food prices.

At that time Secretary Freeman pointed out that New York dairy farmers earned only 40 cents an hour after costs last year—this compared with 60 cents an hour for dairy farmers in Wisconsin—and dairy farmers were leaving the farm at twice the usual rates. He also pointed out that the Nation's cow production has dropped to the lowest level since 1900.

Secretary Freeman made specific reference to price in his testimony and I think the following quotation sums up his position on the question:

> Increases of 2 to 3 cents a quart have been reported in New York City at the retail level. During 1966 the average price paid to farmers for Class I fluid milk will increase between 40 and 45 cents per 100 pounds over last year. With 46 quarts of milk in each 100 pounds, a retail price increase of about 1 cent a quart would be justified. Anything more than this must be accounted for by other factors.

It is in the interest of consumer and farmer alike, in my judgment, to keep the record straight on this matter of food prices. Continuing the low return to producers simply speeds up the movement of farmers out of dairying and the result is sure to be serious milk shortages that run consumer prices up sky high.

At this point, Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD the New York Times story to which I have referred. I hope my colleagues will look closely at the reports of Mr. Kearing's statements, which, I think, are a disservice to the dairy producers of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 15, 1966]

CITY BLAMES UNITED STATES FOR MILK PRICES—KEARING SAYS DEALER MUST PAY MORE TO THE FARMERS AND CANNOT CUT COSTS

(By Robert E. Dallos)

Market Commissioner Samuel J. Kearing, Jr., who had been putting pressure on milk dealers to roll back recent milk price increases, said yesterday that the dealers "are in serious financial trouble and are in no position to lower prices."

He said that after meeting with the dealers, he was convinced that the increases had been caused by the United States Agriculture Department, which had "mandated" higher prices that the milk dealer must pay to the farmer.

The dealers purchase milk from farms and sell it to stores and homes after pasteurizing and bottling it.

The Metropolitan Dairy Institute, which represents dealers selling 80 per cent of the fluid milk in the city, said yesterday that there had been a 1-cent-a-quart rise in the price of milk sold in large retail chains since June.

But it maintained that the increase to 27 cents only brought the price back to where it had stood between January and May.

The association said that the price had risen to 28 cents in many stores on Aug. 1, but that the major chain stores did not increase their prices at that time. As a result, it said, the market slowly settled back to a 27-cent level.

Mr. Kearing confirmed yesterday that some retail milk prices had risen one cent before dropping back to 27 cents last week.

"I feel the increase in milk prices is completely the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture," Commissioner Kearing said.

"I thought from what we had heard earlier that the dealers had sought to increase their margins. But I now think they are telling the truth. They are not in position to absorb what they have been paying the farmer."

Mr. Kearing was interviewed yesterday on "New York Report" on WOR-TV. Later in a telephone interview, he elaborated on his statements.

Mr. Kearing said that when the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, was in the city earlier this month "he did not help the situation, I think that he confused it. The implications of what he had to say were that the middleman somehow is taking a larger share of the food dollar."

"Generally, I don't think that's true," he added. "The indications which we have are contrary."

A spokesman in the Agriculture Department said yesterday that he had not "seen or heard" Mr. Kearing's remarks and "was not in a position to say anything."

Paul Corash, executive director of the Metropolitan Dairy Institute, said the change in Mr. Kearing's views was the "result of meetings which the industry has had with him to give him a point of view which he did not have previously, giving him a better opportunity to establish some of the basic facts relating to the price increases."

COLLUSION CHARGED

Mr. Kearing had said on earlier occasions that he thought there had been collusion among milk dealers in the setting of prices. He said he had turned over evidence of such collusion to State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz.

He said yesterday that New York milk dealers were "locked into a kind of destructive competition which does not save money for the consumer."

Last week the Attorney General filed a suit in State Supreme Court charging the Milk Handlers and Processors Association and nine individuals with having violated the state's anti-trust laws by fixing milk prices.

"Our action is completely independent of the price situation," a spokesman in the Attorney General's office said yesterday. "All the Attorney General is trying to do is to enforce the law which prohibits price-fixing. He is saying there was price-fixing. The dealer can charge anything he wants, as long as he does not act in concert with others to fix prices."

Minimum prices that are paid to farmers for fluid milk to be used in households in the New York-New Jersey area are set under Federal-State Milk Market Order No. 2.

As of this month, the price is $5.77 a hundredweight, up from $5.47 in a month. To this price must be added 2 cents a hundredweight, which goes for the administrative costs of the program, and 3 cents a hundredweight, which the farmer gets if his fluid milk contains more than 3.5 per cent butterfat.

At the rate of 45.6 usable quarts per hundredweight, the milk dealers now pay 12.8 cents for each quart of milk he buys. This is an increase from 12.1 cents a quart in July. In January the price was 12.5 and in August, 1965, it was 11.8 cents a quart.

FOREIGN POLICY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CAMBODIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, despite the breakdown in relations between our two countries, no national leader has done more than has Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia to maintain contacts and an active discussion of issues with Americans. The publication from his country, Monthly Illustrated Review, carries an editorial nearly every month by Prince Sihanouk which usually takes up the foreign policy differences between the United States and Cambodia and seeks to give the Cambodian point of view on these issues.

His current editorial is headed "De-Asianized Asians" and for the benefit of those who seem to think Cambodia cannot possibly have any interests other than those of the United States, I ask to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DE-ASIANISED" ASIANS

(By Norodom Sihanouk)

The success of Communism in certain Asian countries, and the American military intervention in Vietnam, have revealed to us the extent to which certain Asian "brothers", impregnated by American culture and "way of life", intoxicated by the "free world" press (and in some cases, seduced by the dollar) have allowed themselves to be so "de-Asianised" as to feel more "western" than the whites . . . and more "anti-Chinese" than the Americans themselves.

As far as we are concerned, even without mentioning the hatred that certain of our neighbours have always shown towards us, it is important to note that journalists from the Philippines, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea—and even Indians, manifest towards Cambodia is most marked lack of comprehension, an antipathy, an animosity and a spirit of injustice.

I will cite some typical cases:

An Indian member of parliament recently asked his country's foreign minister if my suggestion for a "round table" of Asian leaders had not been prompted by the Chinese.

A Philippine jounalist wrote in a "background" article that the only non-Communist Asian country which did not dare take a "clear and firm" position in favour of South Vietnam (of General Ky!!!) was the Cambodia of Sihanouk who was prevented because of his necessity to play along with the People's Republic of China.

A famous Japanese cartoonist depicted me as a navigator over whose eyes a big Chinese hat had fallen to prevent him seeing the ship "Cambodia" hurtling towards a waterfall as deep as that of Niagara.

A big Asian magazine which claims to cover all the "pro-free world" Asian countries, wrote the following about me:

"One must note a sad contradiction in Sihanouk:

"On the one hand he boasts of being the descendant of a long line of sovereigns.

"On the other, he today accepts without any inhibitions, to become the zealous and obedient servant of the plebian and proletarian Chinese."

As for the South Korean journalists, they shed crocodile tears over the ignorance, the naivety of Sihanouk who does not see the harm he causes his country in turning it into an accomplice of the Vietcong and Vietminh.

The cases which I have cited are by no means isolated. But they are symptomatic of the eyes with which certain Asiatics—and not unimportant ones—regard events and people of their own continent.

It is clear, by the above-quoted examples that what makes Cambodia so detestable is Communist China which we stubbornly refuse to make our enemy.

Such Asiatics are like the characters in a fable who looked at themselves complacently in the mirror without seeing the humps and scabs on their backs.

Let us consider first of all the case of Communist China.

What crimes has it committed against Asia for certain people to make it a crime to be counted among her friends?

The Indian member of parliament that we just mentioned, no doubt reproaches China with having caused difficulties to India along the frontier of the two countries.

That he does not like China—that is his affair. But is that a reason to suspect Cambodia of being a Chinese "puppet"?

Have we made the slightest reproach to India for not having taken our side against Thailand on the question of our frontier quarrels?

Have we ever sought revenge on India in discrediting her because she has become the friend of those Americans who have murdered our frontier people and supported the Thai and South Vietnamese aggressors as well as the "Khmer Serei" traitors?

Have we ever claimed that India has become a "satellite" of the USA, even though members of her parliament, and not only journalists, accuse us of being Chinese "parrots"?

Let us now take the case of the Philippines (I will not waste time in discussing with the South Koreans, the Saigon or Taipeh cliques.)

Here is an Asian country stuffed with American bases. Certain of its citizens, I know, would like to cut short this veritable occupation of their territory. But they are powerless to restore to their country its full sovereignty as they are linked to the United States by treaties that they say, they have no right to denounce or modify unilaterally.

However, the "little" Cambodia in 1953 did not await the agreement of France to end the application of clauses of the 1949 Treaty concerning its membership of the French Union and its diplomatic "dependence" regarding the President of this Union.

American military diplomats and financiers exert their influence on the Philippines and benefit from privileges which to an extent resemble those the French had in our country . . . before Independence. Despite that, certain Philippine personalities do not at all feel that their country is "de facto" a protectorate of the USA. But when they look at Cambodia, they immediately see it only as a "Chinese protectorate".

These same personalities speak of "Chinese aggression" in South Vietnam, although there is not a single Chinese fighting in that country.

The Philippines have never been attacked or occupied by China. They are fully aware of the fact that no Chinese soldier occupies any foreign country at all and that not only has China no colonies, but there are still important portions of her territory and big Chinese cities occupied by the British (Hong Kong), the Portuguese (Macao) and . . . the Americans (Taiwan).

But the Philippines and other "denaturalised" Asians have reached the point where they see neo-colonialism and white imperialism as an enterprise of "liberation" of our continent and in China a "colonialist and aggressive" power, although she occupies no foreign territory, takes part in no foreign conflict and does not employ her arms (even though she has the right) to liberate that part of her territory still colonised by the "whites".

The injustice of such Asiatics is even more revolting in respect to the Vietnamese people than to Peoples China.

Here is a people, massacred daily in their own country, combatants and non-combatants alike, methodically massacred.

The Americans and their mercenaries of various nationalities, occupy their country as formerly Hitler's Germany and its henchmen occupied Europe's Balkan states. They have imposed a reign of terror and in order to get at one doubtful Vietcong, they kill ten or a hundred times more non-combatant Vietnamese, whose only desire is to live peacefully in their own country.

What is the justification for all this killing? The Americans and their accomplices reply in chorus: "We are helping the Vietnamese people to fight Communist aggression".

Communist aggression! That is the big word they employ. Well, let us examine a little the substance of this "aggression" in South Vietnam.

First of all I would like to remark that it is sad to see in this world, so many educated people—even well-intentioned—who allow themselves to be hoodwinked by this slogan and who tax us with naivety because we denounce it.

Every week I receive letters from the "free" world, that say in effect: "We know Prince, that you are a patriot and sincere nationalist, not at all pro-Communist and that the friendship you extend to Vietnamese and Chinese communists only serves, according to your conception, the higher interests of your country and its future.

"But permit me to remind you that no matter what you may do for them, these Chinese, Vietminh and Vietcong will not spare your cherished Cambodia. Get rid then, of your dangerous illusions; free yourself of a naivety unworthy of your intelligence.

"Try to understand the necessity that impels the leader of our free world, the USA, to wage vigorously the war in Vietnam. Of course all wars are terrible. But, despite appearances, this one will definitely be beneficial to the Vietnamese people as well as for your own future."

I should like to repeat once more that it is not the question of myself and my country taking the part of our communist neighbors, nor of having confidence in them.

It is a question of everyone following a precept that Buddha and then Christ made famous: "Do not unto others that which you would not have them do unto you".

We cannot be unjust towards the Vietnamese because we do not want that one day they do to our Kampuchea what the Americans and their associates do to them today.

That is why we advise these "de-Asianised" Asians and all the "good souls" of the "free" world to analyse objectively the situation in Vietnam.

Let us employ an example which could one day apply to us, and let us suppose that a "hot" struggle for power breaks out in Cambodia between the nationalist Sangkum and the communist "Pracheachon."

Would it be correct to describe a war waged by Khmer communists against the Sangkum of Sihanouk as an "aggression against Cambodia"?

There would only be "aggression" if foreign communists—the Vietnamese for example—came to the help of the Khmer communists.

Whereas the attack against our positions at Preah Vihear and Oddar Meanchey were real cases of aggression launched against Cambodia's national army from a foreign territory—Thailand in this case. Even if the so-called "Free Khmers"—our rebels—took part in this, it is from Thailand that they came, in cooperation with regular Thai units, supported by Thai artillery and aviation.

That—yes—that is really aggression. But the "denationalised" Asians and the good souls of the West do not think of denouncing this—they don't even see it!

Instead they shout aggression in Vietnam by the Vietnamese (alongside whom are found no foreigners, Chinese or any other.)

Why is it that a Marxist or communist becomes the first in history to become an aggressor in his own country?

The Indonesian rightists can "liquidate" hundreds of thousands of Indonesian communists (arbitrarily classified as such, at least) without our Asian or western censors mentioning aggression. No doubt for them it is moral "to send back to hell" those "sons of Satan" as Marxists are seen by their eyes.

But the Vietnamese people can be killed because, like Cambodia, they claim the right to live free and independent; because they dare to fight against neo-colonialism and American imperialism.

The West and their Asian accomplices shout about Vietnamese aggression (Vietnamese against Vietnam, let us repeat) because the partisans of Ho Chi Minh do not accept having been frustrated of the certain victory they would have obtained in the general elections stipulated for July 1956 under the 1954 Geneva Agreements, elections which were never held, because Vietnamese patriots do not accept that the reunification (provided for by these same agreements) of their sundered country should be prevented; because Vietnamese democrats deny the legality of all the military dictatorships that have succeeded each other in Saigon; because the Vietnamese people want to liberate South Vietnam from foreign occupation; because the Americans themselves, violating by their air escalation against North Vietnam the demarcation line established by the Geneva Agreements along the 17th parallel, give the right to the people of the North to go down South in response to this aggression and liberate their occupied brothers.

This is where western morality—which works one way only—leads to. And should it happen that Cambodians have to fight against Americans extending their "escalation" to invade Cambodia—then Cambodians will become the infamous "aggressors against Cambodia." All the pro-Western powers of Asia or even of Europe would then have not only the right but the *duty* to fly to the help of the Yankees, victims of a treacherous aggression by Cambodians on Cambodian territory!

It suffices to transpose this hypothesis (which unfortunately, in this mad, mad world, could become reality tomorrow) to the South Vietnamese scene to have a *true* image of the Vietnamese tragedy and the intolerable situation in which the Americans, their associates and accomplices are deliberately plunging the Vietnamese people.

What government (even anti-communist); what spiritual authority retaining the slightest respect for ideals of justice could agree to approving such a crime?

For Cambodia to accept this would be to betray itself as a civilised country, devoted to justice and freedom and imbued with the teachings of Buddha.

Because Cambodia does not wish to thus betray itself, it is depicted as a "valet of Peking", a coward afraid of the Chinese dragon".

The great justification of the foreign interventionists in South Vietnam is a so-called "appeal for help" by the South Vietnamese government.

Since the arrival of the first American "advisers" who imposed the Ngo family on the Vietnamese people, has there even been a (non-faked) referendum to know the authentic feelings of these people?

Do they think they can deceive the world by presenting the governments which have succeeded each other since 1955 as the *legitimate* representatives of their people?

Everyone knows today that the great majority of the Vietnamese people demand only one thing—an end to the war that is destroying their country, and the unconditional departure of the interventionists.

The world knows that Nguyen Cao Ky and his "ministers" represent only themselves . . . and to a certain extent Lyndon Johnson who "legalised" them at Honolulu (the "kiss of death" as one intelligent American wrote recently). Ky has not only the communists and communist-sympathising patriots against him, but also the neutralists, the nationalists, the Buddhists etc. . . . who can hardly be said to like communism—some of them even fighting against it. Ky has created unanimity—against himself. . . .

In such case what remains of the "justification" of the American—and their associates'—intervention?

Certain "de-Asianised" Asians reply:

"We are in Vietnam because for us, Asian solidarity really has a meaning; because we are courageous and not afraid of Vietnamese and Chinese "reds". We are not cowards like you. We are for a really free Asia and not an oppressed Asia!"

Thus we are characterised as "cowards", we, who with our insignificant military equipment stood up with almost our bare breasts against foreign powers which are numerically superior, more powerful and better armed and who almost daily violate our independence, our territorial integrity, our peace.

All this simply because we have not the "honour" to count among the comrades-in-arms of the USA, because we prefer to be thin and poor but free, like the wolf in the fable, rather than be big and fat like the dogs attached by chains to their master—the Yankees.

Because we refuse to take an aggressor for an aggressed, an American for an Asiatic, a Vietnamese for a coloniser of Vietnam; because we speak out clearly in favour of the rights of the Vietnamese people to be the sole masters in their own house and to settle their own problems without foreign intervention, we become the "adversaries" of Asian solidarity.

For the "denaturalised" Asians, "to take a plain and clear position in favour of Vietnam" is not, alas, to plead for its self-determination, its independence and peace. It is to engage oneself on the side of the Americans in helping them crush the Vietnamese nation; to prevent Asia from becoming fully Asian; to persuade the yellow races that they should be afraid of the yellow races. It is to welcome white neo-colonialism and imperialism as the hope for the liberation of Asia!

For the "de-Asianised" Asians to defend liberty is to prevent the Vietnamese people from being free and to maintain them in the same dependent situation as their own people.

For them, to serve the cause of democracy is to help the USA in Vietnam to resemble more and more every day Hitlerite Germany in its occupation of Eastern Europe. It is to help the dictatorships of Saigon, Bangkok, Taipeh etc. . . to maintain their peoples under oppressive rule.

For them, to serve the cause of peace means doing everything possible so that Vietnam becomes the starting point for a generalised war and a thermo-nuclear war.

When an Asian nation manages, by its own means, to manufacture and explode an atomic or thermo-nuclear bomb, they shout "scandal" and condemn the event.

Even though this is a means of dissuading imperialism from attacking Asia with the same sort of weapons, the "denaturalised" Asians talk about "crimes against peace and humanity". Because, as everyone should know, it is only the thermo-nuclear bombs of the "free" world that are clean, moral, peaceful . . .

The fact that I write all this will doubtless cause me again to be taxed with "naivety". We prefer however, we Khmers, to be considered "naive" and to retain our pride as free Asians to being the valets (real and not imaginary) of the imperialists; dying for them and having the shame of killing people of the yellow race for the benefit of the whites!

The war-mongers wage war in Vietnam in the name of "anti-communist."

While they contribute more than the best agents of Mao Tse Tung and Ho Chi Minh to favour, to hasten the communisation of South Vietnam the interventionists have the nerve—or the ignorance—to consider themselves as a "solid wall" against the communication of our continent, and they are angry with us because we do not display our gratitude in this respect.

The reason for our attitude is quite simple. First of all we hold them responsible for the arrival, too soon for our liking, of communism at our doors (not only in South Vietnam but also in Thailand which, through the fault of the U.S.A., is already corroded by the Patriotic Front and the Pathet Lao). The United States attracts communism as sugar attracts ants.

Besides, the Vietnamese and Chinese are not the only communists in the world. The Marxist doctrine germinated in England in the brain of the German, Karl Marx and it was the U.S.S.R. which was its first great protagonist. Now the governments of numerous countries (in the first place, the U.S.A.) which are now killing Vietnamese, have diplomatic (and sometimes quite friendly) relations with the U.S.S.R. There are even more European communists countries which receive American aid!

If one must consider communism as the devil itself, why does one find fault only with yellow communists and show consideration towards the white ones?

Let this be understood correctly. Like all Khmers, I am neither racist nor xenophobe. But I do like logic and detest injustice. I, like my compatriots, have been very troubled by this policy of "two weights and two measures" applied by the hysterics of anti-communism and the hypocritical proselytes of "Asian solidarity."

Let us once again define our position with regard to communism.

We understand perfecty well that certain people or countries consider that communism is better *for them* than our nationalism, our Buddhist socialism, our monarchism. That is their absolute right. We have no objection to them doing this as long as they *only* apply these convictions to *themselves,* for our inalienable rule is that of non-interference in the affairs of others.

Our precept is also that of *reciprocity.* To respect, we reply by respect; to friendship by friendship; to hostility by hostility. This is clear and logical. And that explains the state of our relations with various countries throughout the world, absolutely irrespective of their regime or ideology.

That is also why we do not understand how Asians, whom the Vietnamese people and the Cambodian people have never reproached as being "pro-US" or anti-communist or anti-neutralist, can permit themselves to interfere in the internal affairs of our respective countries.

Against Cambodia it is by criticism, contempt and slander.

Against Vietnam it is still graver; by armed intervention and complicity in the genocide of a whole nation.

Communism or not? That is a matter for the Vietnamese people.

Neutralism or not? That is a matter for the Cambodian people.

It is not their business.

Certainly the Vietnamese people are not unanimously in favour of communism. But is that any reason to interfere in their affairs? Why not let the Vietnamese fight it out *among themselves?*

Some intelligent and upright American senators have just repeated: "This is a matter of a civil war. We Americans have no right to intervene there."

The Chinese have been very seriously and directly affected by the events in Indonesia. Their diplomats and nationals have been struck, bullied, humiliated, their belongings ransacked. However China has not permitted itself to intervene in Indonesia. Because these actions, deplorable as they may be, are within the exercise of the exclusive sovereignty of Indonesia.

Has anyone the right under the pretext of being anti-communist to prevent other countries becoming communist when a majority of their people so desires?

To this question certain Asians reply: "We have joined this struggle not to prevent Vietnam (for example) from becoming communist for in fact this is its right if the majority of the people want it, but because it is the best *preventive* means of stopping communism coming our way."

In advancing such arguments, a new and dangerous principle of jurisprudence is being established which the world cannot accept.

If China, the USSR and the socialist camp (happily for the "free" world it is deeply divided today) followed similar reasoning and claimed to bar *preventively,* the road to capitalism (which has just triumphed in Congo-Léopoldville, in several other African states and Indonesia)—if the communist states, I say, came out beyond their own territories and set up bases everywhere (atomic and others) encircling western and pro-western countries, would not the latter condemn them with the utmost violence?

Do we have finally to admit that might is right? That would be the negation even of the United Nations and its Charter, of international law, the Hague Court etc. . . .

Thailand need no longer have to hide behind the so-called "free Khmers" and Vietnam . . . No longer restrain themselves. The Thais would only have to bide their time and swallow us up.

Such are the long-range and disastrous consequences which we foresee if we do not take here and now a straightforward, firm and clear position against such practices even if, as is well known it is the first steps that hurt."

If we do not act thus now, if we do not stop the imperialists on this downward path, then later it will be "too late" and Cambodia will not be the only one to lose by it. It will cost the whole world very dear and in particular today's interventionists.

To give the latter food for thought, let me bring to their attention some long extracts from an editorial which appeared last month in a journal known throughout the world for its serious and objective tone and in no way suspected to be pro-communist.

I refer to "Le Monde Diplomatique" of Paris and the editorial is signed by chief editor François Honti. It is headed: "On The Down Slope".

My contemporary writes:

"One cannot but be struck by the evolution of the international policy of the two great powers: the United States and the USSR. On one side, one notes growing aggressiveness combined with the worst methods of violence and cunning, and on the other, efforts to smooth over conflicts and a general policy to care for the maintenance and consolidation of peace.

"This difference is all the more striking because it is precisely the great liberal democracy which appears to engage more and more in unscrupulous, machiavellian methods while the dictatorial and totalitarian Soviet Union gives the impression of adopting a constructive attitude towards political problems.

"Fifteen years ago in the Stalin era the situation was the opposite. Moscow was regarded, not without reason, as having the regime the least scrupulous in its choice of methods and the most ready to resort to force. Since the disappearance of Stalin, the foreign policy of the USSR has gradually changed. . .

". . . The United States have developed a formidable military power completed by an intelligence service of unparalleled scope, the 'Central Intelligence Agency', and the influence of these two factors make itself felt more and more in American foreign policy to the detriment of that of its constitutional organs.

"Recently, in a series of remarkable articles, our American contemporary, the New York Times has sounded the alarm regarding this phenomenon, showing what the 'Central Intelligence Agency', this 'invisible government' really is. Aimed exclusively at efficiently serving American nationalism and sometimes also in the interests of certain American firms, it has established its network throughout the entire world, disguising its agents as diplomats, scientists, military personnel or volunteers for aid, according to necessity and frequently using highly placed foreigners in their own countries.

"The profile of the United States, which was for a long time the symbol of liberty and democracy, has thus become more and more changed; too often dictators without any popular support are preferred by Washington because they allow themselves to be manoeuvered more easily. Do the American people realise the impact abroad of the war in Vietnam and above all the manner in which it is being waged! Like the sorcerer's apprentice, is America incapable of mastering the forces which she has brought into being; or is she simply blinded by the feeling of being the strongest country in the world? Has not Mr. Fulbright himself revealed the existence among his compatriots of a distressing 'arrogance of power'?

"Governments, no matter what they are, serve what they consider are the State's interests; but there are numerous ways of serving according to circumstances and period. At the stage we have reached in armaments and diffusion of information, a policy of machiavellian selfishness incurs extraordinary risks out of all proportion to the advantages gained. Among the Great powers only that one which recognises its responsibilities, not only in regard to the nation but in regard to the ensemble of the peoples of the world, can legitimately claim and obtain in a lasting sense, a pre-eminent position in the world."

Let our "de-Asianised" Asians thoroughly meditate over these lines which ought to make them ashamed of taking the present USA as their model, blindly following them in all their senseless, "sorcerer's apprentice" acts and their policies of "machiavellian selfishness".

In conclusion, allow me to reply as follows to those who say of me: "This descendant of the kings of Angkor has fallen so low that he has become the valet of the plebians and proletarians of Peking", and to that caricaturist who depicted me as a bootlicker of President Mao; telling him after the discomfiture of China in Ghana and Indonesia: "Don't cry papa, I am still there":

Yes, Cambodia and I remain. Not as valets of China or anyone else. But as the conscience of our Asia confronted with Asian renegades.

Whatever the latter may do, they will never succeed in preventing their people from hearing the voice of "tiny" Cambodia telling them: "Stop debasing yourselves! Stand up and fight, not against the whites—the Americans, British and others—but so that our Asian countries shall no longer be dominated or exploited, so that they will achieve true independence, true democracy the latter being an empty word without independence and peace.) Fight against the war-mongers and against the division and hatred that they foment among the Asian peoples. Fight for mutual respect, non-interference, cooperation and peaceful co-existence between us Asians first of all, because we must return Asia to itself.

"Prevent your governments from feeding the flames of war among fraternal peoples.

"As for communism, the best weapon to keep it away from you is not prisons or execution squads or genocide; it is real independence, real freedom, real democracy, social justice, economic prosperity, reforms of administration and in your own governments."

If one fails in these tasks, one has only oneself to blame—and not others.

If one day communism conquers Cambodia, this will not be the fault of the Vietminh, the Vietcong or China. This will be the fault of Sihanouk and Sangkum. This is valid for all such Asian countries as are not yet communist. Their communisation will be the result of their errors and the will of their peoples to change the regime.

THE 44TH INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues today in welcoming representatives of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, better known as AHEPA, who are convened in Washington for their 44th international convention.

The primary object and purpose of the Order of AHEPA is to promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens.

While Hawaii is the only State which does not boast a chapter of the Order of AHEPA, we in the islands are not unaware of the many contributions made to this Nation—and to our own State—by Americans of Greek origin.

Through the years, these sons and daughters of that ancient cradle of Western civilization have strengthened the fiber of democracy in our Nation. They have imparted to their children a true appreciation of the privileges of American citizenship and their fine example has helped many of us to be better Americans.

I know that my colleagues will join me in wishing the Order of AHEPA a successful convention in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this week members of the Order of AHEPA are convening here in Washington for their 44th international convention. Delegates from 49 States, the Bahamas, Canada, Australia, and Greece are gathering for what promises to be one of the largest conventions in a long and distinguished history.

The noblest attributes of Hellenism are exemplified by the members of this outstanding organization of Greek Americans, persons of Greek origin now citizens of Canada, Australia, and the Bahamas, and their three auxiliaries—the Daughters of Penelope—senior women's auxiliary—the Sons of Pericles—junior young men's auxiliary—and the Maids of Athena—junior young women's auxiliary.

Much of what we know today as Western civilization came from the ancient Greeks, and their descendants, wherever they may be, are making new contributions and serving as a living link with that great past. I treasure the award of the Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix which was bestowed on me by the King of Greece in 1962 because for me it personalizes the many ties between America and Greece, both ancient and modern.

I know that all Senators join with me in wishing AHEPA a successful convention and another year of fruitful service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, among the major contributors to the richness and diversity of American life are the voluntary organizations in which so many of our citizens participate. These organizations do a real service both for their own members and for our society, as a whole. For their members they provide a source of fellowship, a sense of belonging and the satisfaction of contributing to worthwhile activities. They serve the country by training their members in democratic procedures, in qualities of good citizenship, patriotism and civic pride and in concern for the problems of the less fortunate in our society.

An outstanding example of such an organization is the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA—which is holding its 44th convention in Washington, D.C., during the week of August 14 to 20.

This fine organization, with chapters not only in 49 of the 50 States of the United States, but also in the Bahamas, Australia, Canada and Greece, has a remarkable record of support of activities in the fields of international understanding, education and general culture, civic improvements and aid to victims of floods, earthquakes, and other disasters. It is noteworthy that this group, made up of Greek-American citizens, saw fit to raise funds among its members for the relief of Turkish earthquake victims.

The AHEPA organization provides inspiration and guidance for its members and is contributing valuable services to other Americans and to the world community. We are fortunate indeed to have organizations of this kind growing and thriving in the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in extending greetings and best wishes to the thousands of delegates gathered in the Nation's Capital this week for the 44th supreme convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

AHEPA's record of charitable and civic initiative, both at home and abroad, provides a notable chapter in this Nation's history of voluntary association for public betterment. And through AHEPA Americans of Greek descent have made a special contribution to strengthening the ties of understanding and common purpose that link the American and Greek peoples today.

It is especially gratifying to me to know that, among those most active in supporting the principles and programs of AHEPA are many citizens of my own State of New Jersey. To those among them who are here this week, and indeed to the entire AHEPA family, I extend a warm welcome and the hope that this year's convention will be the most successful yet.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, yesterday, 10,000 representatives of the 46,000-member AHEPA family convened here in Washington for their weeklong annual supreme convention. AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—now has chapters in 49 States of the United States. AHEPA was founded in 1922 to help Greek immigrants find jobs and become American citizens. Since then, AHEPA has developed into a social and charitable organization which helps to unite Greeks in various communities in the United States, Canada, Australia, and the Bahamas.

Its membership of 46,000 has established a $1 million educational fund to provide scholarships and endow university chairs.

I welcome these delegates to Washington, and congratulate them on their worthy goals. AHEPA does much to enrich the life of America. I hope that this week in Washington will be a pleasant and useful one for all AHEPA delegates.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to join in welcoming to Washington members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association at their 44th international convention.

Among the convention delegates will be a sizable group of my friends from Delaware, members of Wilmington chapter No. 95.

Besides the fellowship that goes with a convention of this type, there will also be business sessions dealing with plans for the coming year and the important work AHEPA carries on.

In communities throughout the Nation, including Wilmington, Del., local chapters of the AHEPA family are known for their support of projects in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement.

Individual members also have deserved reputations for being active, informed citizens. This is in keeping with the traditions of Greece, traditions of which they are understandably proud.

Let me express once again my welcome to AHEPA, along with the wish that this 44th annual convention is most enjoyable and successful for all who attend.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the AHEPA family—the Order of AHEPA and its three auxiliaries—to Washington, D.C., and to extend to them every good wish for their 44th supreme convention. As Members of the Senate know, a weeklong program of convention activities commenced yesterday and will continue through Saturday, August 20, concluding with the farewell dance.

Their convention schedule is a most complete one, and I know this will be a most rewarding and worthwhile experience for those in attendance. The Nation's Capital is honored to be selected as the site for the 1966 convention of these outstanding groups. I know that the delegates to this convention will enjoy their week in Washington, and I hope that the 1966 convention will be recognized as the best in the history of this great organization.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the District of Columbia will be honored throughout this week by the presence of thousands of members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. I would like to say a few words at this time about the history, objectives, and accomplishments of the Order of AHEPA.

Since 1922, when this fraternity was founded in Atlanta, it has grown to include 1,125 local chapters in 49 States totaling some 43,000 members, for the most part American and Canadian citizens of Greek origin, but not necessarily restricted as such; in fact, some of my colleagues such as Senator KENNEDY, Senator HART, and Vice President HUMPHREY are members. Just as the order has enrolled present legislators and former Presidents of these United States, it includes persons from every walk of life, as the civic and charitable work in which the order has engaged knows no geographical nor occupational grounds.

The objectives of the order include instruction in the fundamental tenets of government, while encouraging active participation in political, civic, and humane endeavors. Its purpose is also progressive as its title indicates, in that it seeks to open new channels for facilitating dissemination of culture and knowledge while striving to achieve modes for effecting better government within its jurisdictional boundaries.

The achievements during its 44 years of existence are ones for which the members can truly take pride. Among their many projects have been the providing of relief for Florida and Mississippi flood and hurricane victims, for the earthquake victims of Corinth, Greece, and the Dodecanese Islands, and for the fatherless children of refugees. Other worthy causes have included construction of school buildings, the sale of war bonds, and the donation of educational texts to schools. They have coupled international good will with deeds of disadvantaged citizens of the United States. Aid to Turkish earthquake victims has rested side by side in their work with the search for provisions for flood victims in Kansas City, and with aid to those who seek American or Canadian citizenship.

I am glad to welcome the Order of AHEPA to our Capital City today, as I am pleased to note that its interest in civic affairs has often been a model for others to plan participation in activities that engender aid to others.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, yesterday, representatives of the 46,000-member Order of the AHEPA opened their 44th international convention here in Washington.

The word "AHEPA" is derived from the initials of the organization's full name: The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a name that fully and accurately describes the organization's purposes.

I was privileged to attend AHEPA's 1965 convention which, appropriately enough, was held in Athens.

We are all aware, I think, of the historical debt we owe the Greeks. But it is often a rather dim awareness, derived from the schoolbooks of years ago and reinforced mainly by frequent glimpses of columned architecture.

But it was in Athens that the full impact of the Greek contribution came home to me and perhaps to many of the American delegates to the convention.

It was not that I learned anything startlingly new in Athens. It was just that my visit to this ancient cultural capital, my walks through its streets and my tours of its buildings delivered an overwhelming sense of appreciation for the creativity of thought that was first generated there.

Any man who tries to sort out the contributions of the Greeks and rate them in order of importance is going to find himself in trouble. The ideas that sprang from that tough and rocky little country each carried such impressive import that any priority rating is bound to be argued and disputed.

But to my mind, the Greeks performed their greatest service when they put a high premium on truth and then recognized that dissent was the only sure way to arrive at it.

It is this tradition that allows us to meet in this body. It is this tradition that prompts us to value intellectual honesty and clarity of thought. It is this tradition that impells us to listen carefully to the arguments of those who oppose the measures that we support. Certainly, it is this tradition that allows a minority not only to be heard but to have an influence in the shaping of events.

I am a proud member of AHEPA—which can only be interpreted as a truly gracious act toward a son of Ireland. My wife, Janey, has been accepted as a daughter of Penelope.

So I am very happy to make note here of the AHEPA's Washington convention and to wish the delegates every success. Our Nation can best cherish and preserve its traditions if it is fully aware of their origins.

And AHEPA is an instrumental force in enlarging this awareness.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Greek citizens of America. I am very proud of the AHEPA family which I was privileged to join in 1954. I am an honorary member of chapter No. 159 in Casper, Wyo.

The Greeks in the State of Wyoming and throughout the Nation have made a huge contribution to our cultural and economic prosperity. The members of the Wyoming AHEPA chapters have taken an active part in community projects. They have participated in charitable causes and have assisted their fellow Greeks in making America a better place in which to live.

As an Ahepan, I compliment the Greeks who will be attending the 44th international convention this week here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am very proud to be a member of the Order of AHEPA and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome my brother Ahepans to Washington for their 44th international convention.

The Order of AHEPA, which stands for the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is the largest fraternal organization of American citizens of Hellenic descent. The organization was founded in 1922 to help Greek immigrants become American citizens. It has developed into a large social and charitable organization with a membership of 46,000. Branching out from their original purpose, AHEPA members are presently engaged in a significant amount of charity work in this country and are placing increasing emphasis on funds for educational purposes.

It is noteworthy that most Greek-Americans have come to this country within the last 50 years, and I know of no people that have been more readily assimilated into American life than those of Hellenic descent. I would attribute this to two things. The first is the culture and tradition of the Greek people which is very similar to those who founded the United States. Democracy made its first appearance in Greece and nowhere in our country's political and philosophical thought can we overlook the significance of the Greek civilization. Indeed, in championing liberty, freedom, and democracy, our forefathers drew heavily from the ideas of Greek civilization.

The second reason, and equally important, is the Order of AHEPA. AHEPA has stood ready, anxious, and willing to give Greek immigrants training in the fundamentals of our system of government. Also, it has emphasized that they should become naturalized American citizens as soon as law permits and should participate to the fullest extent in political life and the other aspects of life in this country.

In North Carolina, where there are 11 congressional districts, I feel it is convincing evidence of the Greek-American communities' participation in the political life of our State to note that 2 of the districts will have Democratic candidates for Congress in November who are of Hellenic descent—Nick Galifianakis, of Durham, and John Plumides, of Charlotte, both outstanding attorneys. Being a Democrat, I am proud of both of these men and feel sure that they will contribute greatly to the political life of North Carolina in the years to come.

It has always given me a sense of pride to belong to an organization with stated purposes as worthy as those of the Order of AHEPA. The patriotic love of America is so apparent in this creed and is expressed so well, that I feel it is appropriate to read it at this time for the benefit of all Americans. The objects and purposes of the Order of AHEPA are:

First. To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens;

Second. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government;

Third. To instill a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship;

Fourth. To encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth. To pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny;

Sixth. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture;

Seventh. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness to their fellow man;

Eighth. To endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense;

Ninth. To promote education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

The Order of AHEPA is to be commended for having such worthwhile objectives.

Once again, I would like to welcome the delegates, particularly those of my State, to the 44th annual convention of the Order of AHEPA in Washington.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this week representatives of the 46,000 members of the Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries are convening in Washington for the 44th supreme convention of the order. I join to welcome to the Capital the members of the AHEPA family—this week Washington becomes a Greek city not just in architecture but also in spirit.

AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—has in the 44 years since its founding in Atlanta, Ga., grown to include members in the 49 States, all of Canada's Provinces, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece. During this time, its watchword has been service, service to our Nation and to its people. Whether engaged in the relief of earthquake victims in the Greek Dodecanese Islands or helping those visited by floods in Kansas City and hurricanes in Florida, the members of AHEPA, in the spirit of their order, have extended the hand of brotherhood.

All Americans share with the AHEPA family the ancient cultural heritage of Greece and the modern culture of the United States. It is this diversity within unity that makes our Nation the great democracy—from the Greek dēmokratia, rule of the people—which it is.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in saluting the Order of AHEPA, and its auxiliaries, at the opening of their 44th international convention, being held here in Washington. I wish them a most successful and productive week.

The Order of AHEPA does outstanding work, especially among those of Greek descent, in teaching and encouraging the principles of good citizenship in the broadest sense, from the local community to the Nation. The spirit of Hellenism is kept alive by this group; the moral sense of each individual member is encouraged and strengthened. They are among those groups which our Government does and must depend upon to foster the spirit of patriotism, justice, and service to fellow man which is indispensable to a civilized society.

I am well acquainted with many of the members of the order in my own State of Colorado, and I can testify that those I know reflect the worthy ideals of AHEPA. Mr. George P. Dikeou, for example, is an outstanding citizen of my State and a supreme governor of AHEPA.

Again, I welcome the members of AHEPA to our Nation's Capital, and add my warmest wishes that their time here will successfully further their high purposes.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3484) to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Bates, and Mr. Bray were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. George W. Andrews, Mr. Steed, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Slack, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Langen, Mr. Reifel, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with Senators on both sides of the aisle. I believe that it may be possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed with the measure and to vote on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on amendments be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the sponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments be germane.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that quorum calls be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] explain his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, my unanimous-consent request is that time consumed in quorum calls be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is, any quorum call?

Mr. TOWER. Any quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a program of capital grants, and continued a program of loans, to assist public agencies, with the cooperation of private transportation companies, in financing capital facilities and equipment needed for mass transportation service in urban areas.

Mr. President, I mention this part of the 1964 act because we in Kansas, and particularly in Topeka, Kans., are indebted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the splendid assistance that we received following a most devastating tornado which occurred June 8, which destroyed millions of dollars worth of property, including a great portion of the transportation system of that city.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development gave approval to a $192,500 mass transit grant to tornado-damaged Topeka to help finance a new garage facility for the privately owned Topeka Transportation Co.

I mention that, because this agency rendered service at a time when the city of Topeka was in great need. Its citizens, and those of the entire State of Kansas, including myself personally, appreciate very much the action taken by the agency. They were very easy to work with, and most cooperative. From my own personal standpoint, I want to say that it was a pleasure to cooperate with them. When disaster strikes it is always a pleasure to work with an agency whose personnel take a personal interest in the difficult problems that are present in an emergency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When was this, and was this a grant or a loan?

Mr. CARLSON. This was a grant of $192,500, to be matched, of course, with a local contribution in the same amount, to replace a garage which was severely damaged by the tornado on June 8.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What year was this; 1966?

Mr. CARLSON. June 8, 1966. This was released by the Department on July 8, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am pleased to hear that the program was of substantial benefit to the State of Kansas. I was going to put some figures in the Record during debate on this measure. This particular one does not appear in my figures, so evidently more has been done to help our communities across the country than my figures show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to state to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who is dealing with this problem of mass transportation, that I want the Record to be specific and clear as to the fact that we did appreciate the service which this agency rendered us. When a community goes through a tornado as devastating as that one was and then receives such fine assistance, as well as from other Federal agencies, I want the Record to show it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator one more question, and, Mr. President, would like the time taken out of my time for this colloquy. We so frequently hear nothing but criticism about the red tape, the bureaucracy, the delay, and the confusion of government. Could I ask the Senator whether this was handled with efficiency and dispatch in meeting the needs of Topeka?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say that the representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development were in Topeka, Kans., the day following the storm. They had some of their very fine folks in there from the regional office as well as from the national office in Washington. We have nothing but praise for the fine way in which they helped us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to hear that. We had a similar experience in New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent, following a hurricane disaster. This was not the Housing and Home Finance Agency 4 years ago; it happened to be the Small Business Administration. Even before the winds had died down, they were in there assessing the damage and moving to relieve a real tragedy.

I am grateful, indeed, for the statement of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I need, and am pleased to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

THE INTEREST RATE BURDEN

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reports continue to be circulated which would indicate that the administration will not make recommendations to the Congress for a more active use of fiscal policy in combating inflation, specifically, for the correction of our tax structure to assist monetary policy in this battle. With business continuing to be brisk and expanding, and with the cost of the war in Vietnam ever mounting, but still being concealed from the public, the strain on the economy will likely continue and inflationary pressures will likely worsen.

Interest rates are being pushed up higher and higher on the pretense that this will control inflation. Interest rates will not do this, of course. High rates will distort the economy, placing unfair burdens on some, and giving undeserved benefits to others. Over the long run, high interest rates will act to begin the reconcentration of wealth and economic power which we have tried to correct since the disaster of the late 1920's and early thirties.

There is a real question whether high interest rates will be effective in controlling inflation, whether it is of the demand-pull or cost-push type. Interest rates can disrupt certain loosely organized industries, such as housing, and it can slow down the purchase of the larger consumer durables, such as automobiles and major appliances. But it is not in these areas that demand is causing trouble. Demand is causing trouble in such areas as plant and equipment expenditures, where interest rates are not effective, at least not with the larger corporations.

If our inflation is of the cost-push variety, which seems to have been the more common type during the post-World War II era, interest, being one of the big costs in many operations, will actually act to worsen inflationary pressures, and the accompanying demand for higher prices, wages, and profits.

Most manufacturing industries are highly organized, with administered prices, or at least price leadership, working effectively. If money is borrowed to carry inventory, purchase new machinery, or if wages are negotiated upward, all these items of cost are entered on the books, a profit computed, and prices set accordingly. When any cost item goes up again, an added increment of profit is computed and prices pushed up even higher.

But what happens in an area, such as housing, which is dependent on long-term financing by the ultimate purchaser?

It is not generally realized to what an extent interest imposes a burden on the home purchaser. Interest may amount to more than the cost of the house.

For example, a $10,000 mortgage at 6-percent interest, amortized over a period of 30 years, requires a monthly payment of $59.96. Over the life of the mortgage, this means that the purchaser pays back $21,585.60 for the use of that $10,000 he originally borrowed. He will pay more than $11,000 interest, while paying back the $10,000 he borrowed.

This additional interest burden has been greatly increased during the Johnson administration.

I call upon the leaders of a Democratic Congress and the leaders of the Democratic administration to reverse this damaging and hurtful trend.

If this home purchaser could borrow $10,000 at an interest rate of 5 percent, he would pay only $53.69 per month, for a saving of $2,257.20.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is the saving of a family, a working family, trying to pay the mortgage on a home in which to rear children.

Although he would still be paying an outrageous amount of interest, he would be more than $2,000 better off with a reduction in rates of only 1 percentage point. To some this may be a paltry amount, but I am speaking of and for the mass of our people that have difficulty making ends meet.

Again, consider what a reduction of 1 percentage point means in qualifying a purchaser from the standpoint of earnings. Since most lenders require an income of about five times the monthly payment, a saving of $6.27 on his monthly payment means that he can buy a better house. If he can get a 5-percent loan, a man making $250 per month can buy the same house that another purchaser having to pay 6-percent interest could qualify to purchase only if this latter purchaser made more than $280 per month.

Now, the man getting the 6-percent loan does not get a better house. He merely supports in a higher degree of luxury those who have, by luck, inheritance, or otherwise, accumulated wealth.

And, if this man making $250 per month must pay 6-percent interest, he simply must buy a smaller or less desirable house. He will be forced to give up a bedroom which he may need badly for his growing family.

Mr. President, this is happening in the administration of a President elected as the nominee of the Democratic Party. How surprising. The burden of fighting inflation through interest rates is placed squarely and unfairly on the shoulders of the people who cannot afford to carry it. The benefits are reaped by those who do not need them.

And, worst of all, the results are not in keeping with the purposes expressed. Inflation, under current conditions, cannot be successfully fought with high interest rates. The economy will simply be thrown out of balance.

It is time the President gave the country a forthright appraisal of what we are up against. What is the war in Vietnam really costing? What should we do to regulate our economy in the face of pressures generated by a war and an expanding domestic economy? Some answers must be given soon.

President Johnson's tax and monetary policies are contrary to the traditions and historic position and record of the Democratic Party. Johnson interest rates are now higher than Hoover rates.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to commend the Senator from Tennessee for the recurring efforts he has given to the problem of high interest rates and the high cost of money. I support him.

I call attention to the fact that in the newspapers this morning it is reported that an even greater increase in the rediscount rate is planned by the Federal Reserve Board. It seems to me unfortunate that the President's latest appointee to the Board should aline himself against the traditional position of the Democratic Party and should aline himself with the policies of Chairman Martin, the un-Democratic policies and Republican policies of keeping interest rates high.

As the Senator from Tennessee and I brought out in a colloquy a few days ago, this policy puts a grave burden on those buying homes who need to keep their families together.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. In just a moment I will. If one desires to read the blueprint of the tax and monetary policies of the Johnson administration, all he has to do is to obtain Andrew Mellon's book from the library. One will find the current policies set out step by step. Yet some people, whether from audacity or ignorance I do not know, refer to present policies as the new economics. Such policies proved disastrous before. They led to the concentration of wealth and economic power. These policies brought about economic collapse that was disastrous for this country. Take heed that this does not recur.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to reject, on behalf of this side of the aisle, the contention made by the distinguished, able, and brilliant Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that high interest rates and tight money are Republican policies. They are no such thing. I think my own side has been more responsible in trying to act constructively against policies—which bring about higher rates—along with like-minded Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. I welcome the liberal junior Senator from Texas to our ranks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as to whether or not high interest rates, tight money, and tax favoritism have been historic policies of the Republican Party, I submit the record. My only regret is that in this respect President Johnson is outdoing Presidents Hoover, Coolidge, and Eisenhower in the wrong direction. One has to go all the way back to the administration of Warren G. Harding 45 years ago to find interest rates as high as they are now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee for his efforts to do something about the high interest rates. I have been trying to do something along that line in my own way. I hope his efforts will meet with success. I would be one of those to join in the assertion that high interest rates are one of the unfairest ways to try to fight inflation by bearing down on those least able to bear it. It puts the greatest burden on those with small incomes and the consumers, without making any distinction as between people who are buying necessities and those who are buying luxuries.

In the last analysis, high interest rates are the greatest burden on those with fixed incomes, working people, and farmers, who are not in a position to insist on an increase in the price of their products to offset the increase in the burden levied upon them by high interest rates.

I would join the Senator in support of any alternative measure which would insure a fairer spread of the burden of the war on those better able to pay it.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks made by our able Democratic assistant leader. It is not with pleasure that I call to the attention of the Senate and the country the defalcations in this regard of the administration of a President of my own party; but what is there left for a Senator to do? It is with sadness but with a conviction that these policies are wrong and hurtful that I cry out. Unless these policies are reversed, Johnson interest rates will become a leading issue before the country. These policies must be reversed. They are hurtful. If continued, along with tax favoritism, the ultimate consequences will be even worse.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have had a national commitment to transportation for many decades, which has dealt with transportation in the air, on land, and at sea. Certainly in the air it is the national contribution which has brought on most of the major new developments in air travel. We have been through a period of more than 30 days of national attention to a stoppage of airline travel, which has brought Congress into action, which has led the Senate to pass a bill; and the House was within hours of doing likewise when the Department of Labor and the negotiators announced that they thought they had an agreement on the airline strike ready to be submitted to the membership of the Machinists Union.

At sea, we have legislated over and over again the proposition that American goods going abroad should be carried 50 percent in American ships; and we have also substantially contributed to the construction of ships within the shipyards of our country.

On land, within the last decade, we have authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars for highway construction, both in the Interstate System that is now linking our Nation, and also, in more immediate areas within the States, in what is called the ABC program. We even have a rural program. In the last 2 years, the funds authorized have amounted to approximately $9.5 billion. Within my relatively short time here, the Senate has said that our national contribution to improved transportation should be extended to that transportation that can be most efficient and effective, and relieve the worst congestion in metropolitan areas. In 1961, we passed a program to demonstrate that improved service in mass transit could relieve the congestion in our metropolitan communities. It worked; and many ideas were developed that were then applied to the 1964 program of capital grants.

So today, Mr. President, I am honored indeed—though I am not the chairman of the committee that considered the bill—to have been asked by the chairman to bring before the Senate for its consideration and vote S. 3700, the mass transit bill of 1966, which has been approved and reported to the floor by the full Senate Committee on Banking and Currency by a very substantial vote.

I have stated that the program is not new. This bill represents an extension of what we have done in past years.

I have been involved with the problems of mass transit ever since I came to the Senate. As a resident of the State of New Jersey, I have been acutely aware of the problems which face every traveler trying to get into and out of the New York central business district. And since I have sat on the Housing Subcommittee and listened to many hours of testimony from qualified witnesses, I have heard of the choking traffic congestion which robs us of our time, of our business dollars, and of our energies.

My initial interest in the subject of urban transportation bore legislative fruit of 1961 when we inaugurated a Federal loan program to stimulate the development of new mass transit facilities.

In 1964 we passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act which was a real landmark in public recognition of the fact that the Federal Government's help was needed for providing adequate mass transportation in and around our cities. To me, the 1964 act marked a political coming of age in America—a recognition that just as massive help had been supplied over the years in meeting the need for a modern highway system to connect all parts of our country, so Federal transfusions were needed to revitalize our arteries for publicly transporting great masses of our citizens.

REVIEW OF THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a program of capital grants—and continued a program of loans—to assist public agencies, with the cooperation of private transportation companies, in financing capital facilities and equipment needed for mass transportation service in urban areas. It also broadened and authorized additional funds for a demonstration program originally authorized in the Housing Act of 1961.

The 1964 act provided a 3-year authorization totaling $375 million in Federal grants, of which a maximum of $30 million could be used for the demonstration program. Appropriations have been made of $60 million for fiscal 1965 and $130 million for each of fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

For the loan program, $5 million has been appropriated for each of fiscal years 1965 and 1966. Basic law authorizes up to $50 million in loans.

I might say that the loan program was not used in the degree that the capital grant program was used, for good reasons; and I shall explain in a moment how we changed the bill in committee. If we had not changed it, the loan program could have been made more effective. But for fiscal reasons, we did excise a part of the bill that I had introduced in committee.

Under the mass transit program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development may make Federal grants for capital facilities for up to two-thirds of the "net project cost"—which is that portion of the total project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. In using the test of the "net project cost" we faced the reality that the fare box simply cannot support both operating costs and all capital outlays. The myth of the fare box has now been abandoned and there is widespread recognition that the costly capital expenditures must come from other sources.

Before Federal assistance can be provided, the Secretary of HUD must determine that—

First. The applicant is a public body, which may be a State, a local public body or agency, or an agency established by the action of two or more States.

Second. The applicant has the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and is in a position to provide satisfactory continuing control over the use of the facilities and equipment for the purposes for which assistance is provided.

Third. Facilities for which assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. The program must provide for the maximum feasible participation of private transportation companies.

I think these points have been proved out as eminently sound. This is not a peacemeal approach. This is the urban area approach. We are still blessed with a thriving private transportation system in most of our country; and under the criteria, these private companies must be given the maximum feasible opportunity to participate in many of the programs under our national mass transit program.

Fourth, there is an adequate relocation program through which persons and families displaced by the project can be relocated in decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings. This program, of course, follows the tradition of all our Federal programs. Wherever we have new construction, people must be relocated and should be fairly treated.

Fifth, all contracts contain the usual provision relating to the Davis-Bacon Act and other labor standards and also labor protective provisions under criteria specified in the act, determined by the Secretary to be fair and equitable safeguards of employees affected by the project.

I could recite the summary of results under this program. I will try to abbreviate this discussion, but I would certainly be willing to discuss, within my ability, the details.

Twenty-two States have availed themselves of the mass transit program. Some 40 municipal areas have been involved.

It was said, when we first started work on this bill, that it would be a big-city bill. As the program developed, most of the applications came from smaller communities.

The list of States includes Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and, most recently, there have been meritorious applications, in my judgment—although I am not called on to pass upon the merits of applications—from the State of Texas. These applications are from the cities of Amarillo, Corpus Christi, Abilene, and Port Arthur.

The amount of money provided in the bill is less than that included in the bill that I introduced. On the basis of the demonstrated need, the demonstrated success, and on the basis of the future projects, I had compromised because of our multiple responsibilities and introduced a bill for $300 million for 2 years and provided that part of that money could be used not only for capital grants, but also on a matching basis to preserve existing commuter facilities. It was also provided that part of the funds could be used as a contribution to net operating losses.

That part of the bill was discussed in our full committee. It was decided—and I think it was generally the consensus—that it was a worthwhile idea that companies that might be on the brink of bankruptcy or in bankruptcy and on the brink of cessation of service should be helped with this operating subsidy. However, faced with the demands occasioned by the Vietnamese situation and by all other demands, it was the suggestion of my chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that we postpone this matter for another year to see what the fiscal posture is at that time.

We took that provision out of the bill. Also, faced with our fiscal demands, we voted and agreed to decrease the amount from $300 to $225 million for the next fiscal year and for the fiscal year following that.

I think we have compromised ourselves into a position so that what we are doing here has been fully discussed. We had witnesses from all over the country that testified as to the desperate need for assistance. These witnesses were from big cities, intermediate cities, and from one small city.

We had testimony from a small city in Mississippi. We have testimony concerning a program in a small city in Louisiana.

It seems as though this whole idea of a national contribution to revive or help mass transit companies to survive is fully accepted as a national responsibility. If, for no other reason, it is because people will travel, and if they are not given an alternative, they will travel on buses or commuter railroads or rapid transit. The burden then falls on our shoulders to increase the highway program which is vastly more costly in every way.

Mr. President, that summarizes my opening remarks. I am glad the Senator from Texas is present to work with me on this legislation. The Senator from Texas has some ideas he thinks will improve the bill. I am not sure that they will, but I am glad to know that the Senator from Texas endorses the whole idea.

The Dallas community, of course, has benefited from the program, and these other communities are now in the position of wanting to benefit their transportation systems with this program.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate reject this proposed legislation, in spite of the fact that some Texas cities have made applications for benefits under the bill.

I am confident that the communities in my State, in the absence of such a program, would take the initiative to do these things.

My opposition does not stem from a denial that there are problems which need to be solved. I am very aware of the congested condition that plagues many of our cities. I do not doubt that political subdivisions and taxing districts in metropolitan areas add to the difficulty of equitably financing mass transit systems. During the committee hearings on proposed mass transit legislation, representatives of cities from various parts of the country made evident their view of the situation which exists in our large metropolitan complexes as well as cities which are generally not associated with such problems.

While I am familiar with the problems that exist, I do not feel that this is the time to approve additional millions of dollars of Federal spending for capital expenditures. It is no secret that our productive resources are straining at capacity as a result of both industrial and consumer demands. In such a situation, I feel that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government through its fiscal policies, as well as monetary policies, to offset these pressures to the degree necessary to maintain stability of purchasing power. The present state of the economy calls for fiscal restraint instead of increases in Federal spending.

I think it is somewhat contradictory for the administration to make a special plea for business leaders to restrict their spending on plant and equipment to a minimum level in order to stem inflationary pressures and then approve additional millions in Federal mass transit grants which would offset private business spending reductions.

Inflationary pressures appear greater today than they did in March when the President said:

> Every department or agency has been requested to review and carefully examine how we can defer, stretch out, or postpone any expenditures.

It is my position that the only way to cut overall Federal stimulation of the economy through spending is at least to hold the line in all present spending programs that can be postponed or deferred.

Some improvement in this regard was made in the committee as the result of minority efforts. The original request for a doubling of Federal grants was pared by $75 to $225 million. While this is a step in the right direction, I would have preferred, at this time, to hold the line at the present level of $150 million.

I also supported the removal of provisions which would have provided 50 percent of the operating deficit arising from commuter service.

Section 2 of the bill setting up new programs of assistance for technical studies and training programs should also be stricken. Certainly studies and research are important, but the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 provided for research, development, and demonstration projects and authorized increased appropriations of $20 million on July 1, 1965, and $30 million on July 1, 1966.

In addition, under regular urban planning grants, funds are available for transportation surveys, studies, and plans as well as a maximum of $11.5 million for studies and research for the development and improvement of planning techniques and methods.

I see no reason to set up a duplicate and overlapping program for studies and research. The Secretary should make use of present programs and produce convincing evidence that they are insufficient before additional authorizations are approved.

Mr. President, in line with my idea that we should hold spending at present levels, I call up my amendment No. 738, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 1, strike out lines 4 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. (a) The first of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out '$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself on the amendment?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for the moment, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Before we deal with the amendment, which reduces the $225 million authorization to $150 million for each of the next 2 years, I should like to say that I had hoped, before we got to the consideration of amendments, to discuss two aspects of this bill that were added in the committee—one at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and one at the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Section 2 of the bill would authorize grants to public bodies of up to two-thirds of the cost of planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects.

I see that the distinguished Senator from Washington is present.

This idea was discussed in committee. It was thought that it represented sound, down-the-road thinking on how we can work ourselves out of these grisly traffic jams through advanced planning, engineering, and designing. This would include studies relating to management operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility of proposed projects.

At present, there is no effective Federal financial assistance program for such studies. They are in general beyond the scope of activities which have been assisted under the 701 comprehensive urban planning program, and the 702 public works planning advance program is also of limited use in this area. It has very restricted funding, and it is designed to cover less costly water and sewer and other community facilities projects, particularly in smaller towns.

To permit the use of urban mass transportation grant funds for these studies would greatly further the timely and orderly development of urban mass transportation projects and programs.

Section 2 of the bill would also authorize two new classes of grants as part of the mass transportation program.

Grants would be made to public bodies to defray part of the cost of fellowships at the graduate level in institutions of higher learning, for persons employed in managerial, technical, and professional positions in the mass transportation field.

Here, again, there is no duplication. Under the present program, this is not included. We devote so much of our energies to encouraging young men and young women to go into the exotic sciences of air and space travel that it seems to me that this area, certainly overlooked until now, is indeed important.

Grants would also be made to nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist in establishing or carrying on comprehensive research programs in the problems of urban mass transportation, and in training persons for research work or actual employment in mass transportation. Each class of grants would be limited to $3 million a year. These provisions are designed both to further the development of mass transportation technology and to develop a reservoir of highly trained manpower to fill responsible positions in operations and research in the mass transportation field.

Section 3 of the bill would direct the Secretary to undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research and development of new systems of urban transportation. This we have requested, through the legislation, be finished within 18 months.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas deals only with money. This is the overall money. All these programs would come out of the authorized money—whatever we authorize—whether it be $150 or $225 million. They are not separately funded. It all would come out of the total amount in the bill.

So I gather that the first discussion will come up on what the total amount will be. But in considering that question, I believe it is important that we know that throughout the country, communities that are hard pressed, faced with discontinuances, faced with losses and the loss of service, are increasingly coming into this program. At this time—and we are just starting this fiscal year—we have pending almost $140 million of applications. Probably some will not meet all the strict criteria. But this is mid-August, and we are only 2 weeks into the new fiscal year, and increasingly communities are finding that if they are to survive in transit, they will need some help.

I believe that the figure contained in this bill, $225 million, pales before the need of commuter transportation, be it bus, rail, or rapid transit. Some of the estimates put the present need at better than $2 billion a year for the next 10 years. That amount certainly pales before the amount spent for highways, for which the authorization this year and next is better than $9 billion.

Notwithstanding some Budget Bureau anxiety about this amount—and parenthetically I will say that at the inception of this program, the Budget Bureau expressed its anxiety and its disapproval that we even embark on a national program of contribution to mass transportation—notwithstanding the conservatism of these eminent gentlemen in Washington who serve the Budget Bureau, I believe that the amount authorized in the bill which came from the committee is more than justified, and this justification is spelled out in the hearings. Members of the committee heard witnesses from all walks of life, from government, from private industry, from citizens groups, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Chair?

Does the Senator from New Jersey intend to have the time he just used charged to the bill or to the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is a parliamentary inquiry. I appreciate the Chair asking. I should have put it on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the way it will be charged.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined in the sponsorship of that amendment by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not point out the fact that this amendment is identical to the one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to be associated with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], who is presently presiding, also cosponsors the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the amendment of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] reduces the authorization from $225 million a year for mass transportation to $150 million a year. It reduces the authorization to the level of the administration request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] allow me to become a cosponsor of the amendment?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] yield to me in order that I may make a statement on the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the bill or on the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I request 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Washington for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the bill and, of course, I strongly support the passage of S. 3700, the Urban Mass Transportation Amendments of 1966.

Mass transportation is one of the most pressing problems of our modern urban environment. Transportation can be a convenience and a conduit of economic growth or a bottleneck impeding and delaying the traveler and the shipper alike.

The economic health of our cities in the decades to come will in large measure depend upon our ability to move people and goods to, from, and within our already overcrowded cities.

Our present transportation network required over 175 years to develop. In the scant 30 years remaining in this century, we must develop a transportation system to move the travelers and goods in an America with a population nearly double that of today.

In his transportation message of 1962, the then President Kennedy recommended a substantial program of Federal assistance for mass transportation to stimulate our urban areas to organize administrative arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of a fully balanced transportation system.

Both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Commerce, in 1963, reviewed the various proposals designed to provide assistance for urban mass transportation. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] reported the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 from the Banking and Currency Committee, and I was pleased to report the bill from the Committee on Commerce.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which is familiar to the Members of the Senate, has become the foundation for nationwide programs to provide modern mass transportation systems, both in populous metropolitan areas and in our smaller communities.

It is my pleasure to join the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] today in sponsoring these important amendments to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The cities of America, be they large or small, north or south, east or west, need improved mass transportation facilities and equipment to meet their public transportation needs. S. 3700 is a necessary and essential step to assist all of our Nation's metropolitan areas.

This bill, together with the high speed Ground Transportation Act enacted by this Congress last fall, provides the means of urban travelers. The High Speed Ground Transportation Act, which I reported from the Commerce Committee, establishes a 3-year program of research and development, and demonstrations, to help bring scientific and technical talent to bear on this increasingly important area. I understand that there are several experiments and research going on in this field. It will be of little avail, however, to speed passengers between our metropolitan areas if they cannot move within urban areas.

S. 3700 continues our Nation's forward progress in urban mass transportation. In the first place, this bill extends the Urban Mass Transportation Act authorization for 2 years, and increases the authorization level to $225 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The second section of S. 3700 contains an amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act to authorize the Secretary of HUD to make matching grants to assist State and local public agencies in planning, engineering, designing, and other technical studies of proposed urban mass transportation projects and programs. This is commonsense so that the planning will be adequate and the cities will know what they are going to do in the future.

In testimony before the House Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee in April of this year, in a joint statement with Mayor Braman of Seattle, we urged the committee to act favorably to provide such authority by either reporting S. 3061, which is cosponsored by Senators Jackson, Tydings, Ribicoff, and myself, or by adding the language as part of the Urban Mass Transportation Act amendments. I am pleased that the Banking and Currency Committee members have seen fit to incorporate the language of S. 3061 in section 2 of the bill now before the Senate.

This authority to make grants for technical studies will enable Federal, State, and local moneys to be more wisely utilized. No additional funds need to be authorized. On the contrary, it will save Federal, State, and local taxpayers many millions of dollars through better planning and studies before construction is undertaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, other provisions in section 2 of S. 3700 suggested by Senator Tydings authorize the Secretary of HUD to make grants to States, local bodies, and agencies thereof to provide fellowships for training of personnel employed in managerial, technical, and professional positions in the urban mass transportation field. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist in establishing or carrying on comprehensive research in the problems of transportation in urban areas.

The final section of S. 3700 provides that the Secretary of HUD in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce shall undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation, and report his findings and recommendations to the President no later than 18 months from now.

As President Johnson said in his message on transportation, the future of urban transportation—the safety, convenience, and, indeed, the livelihood of its users—depend upon wide-scale, rational planning.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the enactment of S. 3700 to further modernize rapid transportation in order to improve the life of all our citizens in urban areas throughout the country.

I again express my appreciation to those who urge these research grants for planning and engineering, which are provided for in the bill. Furthermore, I am sure that this statement sets out the situation in many other cities. It is true in my city of Seattle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the influential Seattle Times stating a specific problem that is involved in Seattle, and urging the Senate to pass the bill with section 2, which would provide us now with some of these necessary planning and engineering studies so that we will reduce the mistakes for the future to a minimum.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bridges and Highways at Capacity

Facilities to give partial relief to what Charles G. Prahl, state highways director, has called "about the worst traffic jams in the state" will be opened tomorrow on Interstate Highway 405 near Bellevue.

The reopening of an old bridge, coupled with a new, temporary bridge, will provide some thinning-out of massive north-south traffic jams as the junction of Highway 405 and the Sunset Highway, pending completion in two or three years of the $15-million Factoria Interchange.

Unfortunately, relief for east-west traffic congestion in the same East Side area still is years away.

Although traffic on the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge is heavier than expected, traffic on the Mercer Island Floating Bridge is already heavier than it was before the second Lake Washington span was built.

It seems clear that by the time a third Lake Washington bridge opens (the completion date having "slipped" to 1972), that bridge—like the Seattle freeway—will immediately be carrying peak-hour capacity traffic.

These discouraging facts suggest, for one thing, that those who scoff at the efforts of Mayor Braman, Representative ADAMS and others to expedite work on a Seattle-area rapid-transit system have no satisfactory alternative to offer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had just asked the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] to permit me to join him in the sponsorship of an amendment. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] stated that he is glad to join with the Senator from Texas.

Now, I am distressed to know whether I am supporting the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] or whether I am supporting the proposal to reduce the authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps the Senator misunderstands my remarks on the bill. I join with the Senator from Texas in the passage of the bill and am glad that the majority of the committee added section 2. I hope that section 2 will stay in the bill, and I hope that the Senator from Ohio will reconsider cosponsoring the amendment of the Senator from Texas. I think section 2 is the most important part of the bill because so many cities and urban areas are now in the stage of development that we could save millions of dollars—perhaps billions—over the period of the life of the bill if there were adequate planning. That comes first.

Many communities are not in a position to act all alone. They want the aid of the Federal Government. The Federal Government, in providing this aid, would become a sort of partner, so that the planning would make commonsense, and the cost would be cheaper in the long run.

It is something like trying to build a house without having an architect make the plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of clarification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. TOWER. I appreciate the Senator's allusion to me concerning participation in the bill, but I should advise him that I voted against section 2 and also against reporting the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assumed that the Senator from Texas had voted for every portion of the bill except section 2, and I stand corrected in my assumption of my inherent respect for the Senator's good intelligence. I merely assumed that he was for the bill in general.

Mr. TOWER. I appreciate those kind words from the distinguished Senator from Washington, particularly in this election year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 7 minutes.

MASS TRANSIT CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I support the Tower amendment to cut $75 million from the amount authorized to be appropriated for the mass transit program for fiscal 1968 and 1969. This modest amendment would simply limit the program to its present level of funding.

Let us look at the facts: $65,300,000 was provided for the mass transit program in fiscal 1965, $135,455,000 was provided in fiscal 1966. Of these amounts, $15 million was still outstanding at the conclusion of the current fiscal year. Furthermore, only 44 applications, representing $108 million, remained unfunded. In the face of these statistics I see very little reason for increasing program funds by a whopping $75 million in fiscal 1968. The President's budget itself requests legislation to authorize only $95 million for mass transportation in fiscal 1968. The Tower amendment would be more generous.

It should be noted that this administration request for $95 million in additional authorization does not extend beyond 1968. As Secretary Weaver stated before the House Appropriations Committee:

> We have under existing legislation $55 million which has been authorized, but not appropriated. We are asking now for an additional authorization of $95 million so that we can request an advance appropriation of $150 million for 1968.

The administration, in my estimation, is showing great wisdom in moving moderately on this program. As we all know, this is a year of great stresses and strains on the Federal budget. Our Vietnam commitment makes it essential for all responsible legislators to take a long, hard look at the question of priorities. The administration has indicated an appropriate priority for his mass transit program by proposing to extend it for 1 additional year at a very modest level of funding. Next year we can take another look at the program with due regard to the international and especially the domestic economic situation as it exists at that time.

Mr. President, the acuteness of the squeeze in the construction sector of our economy can be more fully realized if we take note of the fact that President Johnson has gone directly and personally to the heads of several large corporations to urge that they scale down plans to invest in plant and equipment. This is not a step that the President would take lightly. His concern is shared by thousands of my constituents, especially those who find it almost impossible to obtain new homes because funds are so tight in the construction area. Just this weekend, I shook hands with several thousand constituents back in my State. Many of them wanted to know what steps were were taking here in Washington to cut down on Federal spending in this inflationary-pressure economy.

Against this background, and in view of the administration's expressed support for only a 1-year extension of the mass transit program at this time with merely an additional $95 million in authorization being requested, it seems to me that if the Senate is to indicate its concern over Federal spending it must support this amendment. This is not the year to pour additional money into the economy.

My second objection to this legislation, is that it encourages cities to go to the Federal Government for help rather than to set a fare structure and make innovative changes at the local level which would permit local transit authorities to operate in the black. We saw earlier in the Banking and Currency Committee the direction in which we move when we encourage local reliance on the Federal Government in the area of public transporation. At that time, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] pressed for operating subsidies. This, of course, is the logical extension of the present capital equipment grants program. Fortunately, the committee rejected the operating subsidy approach. However, I predict that if we provide $225 million a year for the mass transit program, $75 million over the current authorization, it will be only a matter of time before Congress will pass an operating subsidy bill.

Let us take a look at what the program has accomplished so far. Out of a total of $92,598,245 in Federal capital improvement grants made under the program since its inauguration, over 40 percent, or more than $38 million, has been spent on four ferry vessels to be used by the Washington State Highway Commission and 400 rapid transit cars for the New York Transit Authority. These capital replacement items should be paid for by the commuters of Washington State and New York City, not by the Federal Government. This is to the great advantage of two out of the thousands of communities across the United States, most of which take care of their own transportation problems.

Furthermore, the most recent figures available would seem to indicate that urban communities are not increasing their mass transportation expenditures. Why should the Federal Government do so, thus discouraging local initiative? Figures I obtained this morning from the American Transit Association actually indicated that the amount of money spent on operating materials declined from $76.4 million in 1960 to $68.9 million in 1964, the last year for which statistics are available. Maintenance materials expenses remained about constant.

Mr. President, if the Senate is ever to vote for holding down Federal expenditures, the time is now and the place is here. Let us show the American people that we mean business. Let us wait to inject extra construction funds into the economy until the economy needs these funds. Let us follow the administration's recommendation and vote for the Tower amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty seconds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thought I understood the Senator to say that the State of Washington, so ably represented by the distinguished Senator [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and the State of New York, got 40 percent of the funds. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, if the Senator will refer to page 692 of the Independent Offices Appropriations hearings—it is not on Senators' desks—it shows, under the table referring to urban mass transportation grants, that the State of New York received over $23 million and that the State of Washington received over $15 million. Those are by far the largest parts of the urban mass transit program, the total of which is $92 million; if we add the $15 million plus and the $23 million together, it comes to over $38 million. Since $92 million is the total, $38 million plus is about 40 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Texas yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator realizes that this law provides, as do other laws, for a ceiling of 12½ percent of the authorized amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do. But I still say that my figures are correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know how much or what percent the State of Washington got, but this is a bill designed to help urban transportation. The State of Washington applied and was ready, under the provisions of the bill. They have a crying need for cross-sound ferries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not and have not denied that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This moves about——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I have some time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield time to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We were ready and made application. I suppose because we had our plans ready we were among the first to be considered. Eleven million dollars is involved. There is a deferred amount for the future involved.

This is not a commuter situation. This moves people over Puget Sound. It is part of the highway system that moves a big population in the Seattle area to another big population in the northwest corner of our State. So commuters are not involved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And $15 million of it went to the State of Washington. I do not deny that the case for the State of Washington was strong, but I merely point out that that much went to the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is wrong with that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Forty percent of the amount to 2 States out of 50 at any stage of the program is high and in this case I think excessively high.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is only the beginning of the program. Let us take the big city of Seattle. King County has had nothing under the bill. I suppose it will have a plan some time. This particular grant was to meet an urgent need, and we have no apologies to make for it. The bill was passed to do this very thing. That was my understanding. So what is wrong with that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is not asking for an apology from the Senator from Washington or the Senator from New York. He is simply pointing out that this benefits a relatively few States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a program of this sort we must start with only a couple of projects. How would the Senator from Wisconsin want to appropriate it? All at the same time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not. I am simply saying that of the amount provided 40 percent went to two States. I am sure the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New York are happy about it. If I came from Washington or New York I suppose I would be happy about it. Coming from Wisconsin, I am not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Did Milwaukee get money under the program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; Milwaukee commuters and all who use our transit pay for their own transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So do ours. This is not for commuters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Nevertheless, it is under this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is a new program. I do not know when the other boats will be ready. The Coast Guard was about to take them away. The purpose of this grant was to carry out the purpose of the act. We happened to be ready with our plans.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on my own time, let me say that I could not agree more with what the distinguished Senator from Washington has said. They were ready at that time. Now I understand we have 34 States that have applied.

Also, Mr. President, I have a table showing the mass transit capital grants approved by the Housing Department as of July 1966, by States, since the beginning of the program, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mass transit capital grants

Arkansas	$383,000
California	26,400,000
Colorado	177,800
Florida	528,210
Illinois	3,901,000
Indiana	181,020
Iowa	326,666
Kansas	192,500
Louisiana	272,920
Massachusetts	----------
Michigan	10,723,330
Minnesota	513,260
New Jersey	9,900,000
New Mexico	817,726
New York	23,400,000
Ohio	9,423,940
Oregon	295,113
Pennsylvania	19,800,000
Puerto Rico	778,598
Rhode Island	1,638.000
Tennessee	1,413,570
Texas	8,000,000
Washington	15,827,733

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have a backlog of $200 million worth of applications.

If we legislated along the lines suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin, I am not sure it would satisfy him. He comes from a great dairy State. Wisconsin has received about $96 million in dairy subsidies. I have never voted against such a subsidy to deny it to the thriving dairy industry of his State. Transportation is a problem in the State of Washington and in other metropolitan areas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that milk is the big farm cash crop in all 50 States, and they all enjoy benefits from price supports for dairy products. I suppose one could argue against those support prices. Many Members of Congress coming from cities have done so. But the main point is that this is not the year to go far over the administration's request for this urban mass transit program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. How far would the Senator cut back on the dairy program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin supports the administration's proposals for the dairy program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Wisconsin support the administration's position to cut back the school milk program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is no longer the administration's position, I am delighted to say. The administration now takes the same position that the Senator from Wisconsin does. So we are in agreement on that program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We went over the budget on that program, and I helped the Senator go over the budget.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The administration has changed its mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have not talked to the administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, who speaks for the administration on agricultural policy, testified to that before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Whenever a leading Cabinet officer speaks, he does not necessarily speak for the administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At times.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In this case he did. The Budget Bureau speaking explicitly for the President approved what Secretary Freeman said in supporting our position on the school milk bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Getting back to the bill, let me point out that this was not a grant to any city; it was to the State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It operates at a nonprofit. It may be true that commuters are involved, but that is because the big navy yard used across the bay has enlarged its activities to keep up with its defense responsibilities. Many navy yard workers use the ferry system to go back and forth to work, who do not live in the area.

I use it occasionally, I may say for the RECORD. My wife and I have a summer home on Bainbridge Island. We use it on occasion, whenever we can. I think I have used it four times this year. But this question involves the pattern of State traffic and of commuters and other workers who go to the Bremerton Navy Yard. It is part of the road system, just as ferries used to be a part of the road system in Maryland. It is the whole State of Washington that receives the money.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington made this statement a few moments ago in answering the Senator from Wisconsin: This is merely the beginning of the program. Those are true words. This is merely the beginning of a Federal subsidy program that will grow year after year.

The President of the United States has warned the Congress and the people of the Nation about the threats of inflation. He has condemned Congress for raising the requested amounts that he has suggested for various Federal programs. The argument is in progress as to who is responsible for Federal spending. The President has taken the position that, with respect to the recommendations encompassed in his fiscal policy to dampen the forces of inflation, Congress has repeatedly raised the amount of the requests.

Recently Members of Congress received a questionnaire from a national magazine asking the Members to state what cautions should be taken to stop the threats of inflation that are hanging over our heads.

There are three courses: One, a retrenchment in the spending of the Federal Government; two, a heightening of the curbs under which loans are made and goods bought on credit; and, three, the imposition of new Federal taxes to siphon out of the economy the excess currency that makes impossible the production of goods to meet that excess currency.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. The distinguished Senator from Ohio has referred to two basic types of policy—fiscal policy and monetary policy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator agree that most of the ills of our economy now, relative to inflation and tight money, are caused by inappropriate fiscal policy?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my judgment, the first avenue on which to travel to make the attack is the simple one of reducing Federal expenditures.

Mr. TOWER. Rather than the more complex one of resorting almost entirely to monetary policy and bolstering it with various controls, devices, and gimmicks?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not exactly sure in my mind which of the latter two should be first to be adopted; that is, monetary controls or the imposition of taxes. But I am certain that the first step is a simple one—to quit our extravagant spending of the taxpayers' dollars. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FANNIN in the chair). The galleries will be in order.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator agree that the most constructive step we could take would be to cut spending?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Unquestionably. There is no question about it.

But, Mr. President, what is the situation? On every authorization that comes before the Senate, we raise the amounts recommended by the President. The only thought is what it will immediately bring to the locality, without any thought being given to what it will do to the country. I simply cannot go along with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What do Federal subsidies do to prudent management of the transportation system? Wherever there have been Federal subsidies, there has been imprudent management of transportation systems. The more the Federal Government subsidizes, the less the frugality and prudence of the management. I invite attention to the situation in the United States.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until order is restored.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. From what places are the greatest pressures coming for Federal subsidies?

Boston charges a 10-cent fare for surface transportation. Service simply cannot be provided at a cost of 10 cents. San Francisco, one of the large applicants for money under the established program, charges 15 cents. New York, another large applicant, charges 20 cents.

The uniform rates of fare throughout the country are about 25 cents to 30 cents. Of course, when the charge is 10, 15, or 20 cents, the cities cannot make a go of it, and they must come to Congress for financial help.

But in such cases, what do we subsidize? The report of the committee contains a statement that the funds provided for the State of Washington involve the purchase of four new ferries for the Puget Sound commuter service. San Francisco is to build some sort of subterranean channel.

The point I wish to make is that if these systems do not have an income adequate to replace equipment that has become worn out, when will the end to the program come? There will be no end. This is just the beginning.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, not at this time.

Mr. President, I was mayor of Cleveland when the city acquired the transit system. I recommended the adoption of a charter that would prohibit the council from fixing fares. I did so because I knew that if the council fixed the fares, the system would go bankrupt. The people adopted that program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 2 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Cleveland system is operated on a pay-as-you-go basis. However, the system cannot be expanded out of revenue from the fare box.

But we are not merely providing moneys to expand systems. We are providing moneys to buy buses, ferries, and buildings. There is no justification for that at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have notes——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. All right; I will use my time.

My notes from the Department describe a project in the State of Ohio, the city of Cleveland. To quote the language the Department used:

> Project to extend the rail rapid transit system from West Park Station to Hopkins International Airport, a distance of four miles, approved June 3, 1965; estimated cost, $13,965,000. Federal grant, $6,995,000, including $25,000 for business relocation costs.

There is a deferred grant—I am not sure I understand that—of $2,200,000.

Those figures seem to fly directly in the face of what the Senator has said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I respectfully say to the Senator from New Jersey that that does not at all fly in the face of what the Senator from Ohio has said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is for a rapid transit line out to the airport.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Cleveland project is for expansion, and I said that they have not been able to provide expansion out of the fare box.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct; but the Senator said——

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Senator is arguing: Do not provide only the money for extending the lines, but provide money to buy buses, buildings, and other things, as well. That is where I differ with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I could take down the words, if the Senator wishes, but I shall not do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have the floor, Mr. President, I suppose I could kneel down and say that because the Federal Government will provide some funds for Cleveland, I should join the mob and spur on inflation. But I will not do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I respect the Senator's consistency. The only thing is, this project calls for 4 miles of construction at a cost of $3,965,000. Evidently transportation over that 4 miles is necessary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator knows the area. How much would it cost to go by the new highway? It would cost much more than this.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree. But that is not providing money to replace rundown buses.

Mr. President, if I may continue, I wish to get back to the proposition of Congress expanding expenditures. I simply submit to my fellow Senators that we may be having a flowery day at the present on the basis of these expanded expenditures; but the piper will have to be paid. The performers will want their payment. That day will come. And I shall not be one who is responsible for this extravagant, imprudent, reckless handling of taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Texas a question. Was any thought given in the committee as to why some of these communities charge 10 cents, 15 cents, and 20 cents, and then come to the Federal Government and say "We cannot operate our plants. You must help us through gifts."

Mr. TOWER. There was no extensive discussion or debate in the committee on the merits of the mass transit program. There was not much discussion of subsidy. I think my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, will bear me out that the main discussion was as to the amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I took testimony a few years ago on the transportation bill. I respectfully submit to the committee that all of the demands for increased money come from the profligate management of the railway systems and the mass transportation systems on the east coast—New York, New Jersey—and in that area in which they are trying to run a railroad system by charging practically nothing at all for the carriage of passengers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] to cut back the funds for the urban mass transportation program. All the projections of the capital needs of our urban mass transit systems indicate that the 2-year $450 million total authorization in the bill could be spent many times over.

The larger cities in our country are gradually completing mass transit capital expansion and modernization proposals which they began to formulate when the Urban Mass Transportation Act originally went into effect. It takes months and even years to develop such a plan for the kind of complex transit system which our larger cities have. When these applications begin coming into the Department of Housing and Urban Development—as they already are and will in increasing numbers—the existing levels of authorization will be totally insufficient.

Loss of the full authorization which the Banking and Currency Committee proposed would be a great blow to our Nation's cities at a time when they are in a financial and human crisis. We have spent billions of dollars on highways, tying up our cities in ribbons of concrete and smothering them in swarms of automobiles.

The $225 million a year which the committee's bill proposes is a drop in the bucket by comparison to the highway and expressway money which has already been spent in our cities. If we are ever to develop a coherent transportation system, an integrated transportation network which uses subways, streets, buses and trains in the most efficient way possible to move people in relative ease at minimum cost, we must adequately support local efforts to improve mass transit. The amendment of the Senator from Texas would, if adopted, be a great blow to that effort.

Mr. President, I suggest that there will come a time when those of us who are concerned about the plight of our cities and who support legislation to deal with the problems of our cities—will simply refuse to support any future programs involving the spending of money on matters of lesser priority unless we can be assured of even the minimal support for improvement of life in the cities which S. 3700 as reported by the committee would accomplish.

I strongly oppose the amendment of the Senator from Texas and urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the floor concerning whether we should approve the committee recommendation of an authorization of some $225 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

I was a little disappointed when the debate went off on what seemed to me to be a sort of parochial tangent having to do with whether one of the communities which was participating in the mass transit program utilized its funds for ferries or buses.

The point of the matter, as I see it, is that urban transportation can no longer be a stepchild of the transportation systems of the United States. We have a great interstate road system which Congress has authorized at a cost of some $41 billion. However, these great interstate roads do not help the large majority of our people who are moving into the cities and into the suburban areas.

Mr. President, I submit that the problem of transportation in our urban and suburban areas is one which affects every State and every jurisdiction. I further submit that, unless we develop a comprehensive rapid transit system for our great cities, we will literally tear the guts out of them.

This is already happening in some of the areas in which major highways are driven right through the middle of our suburbs and our downtown areas.

The increasing, daily spread of our population from the central cities into suburban areas, with the resulting wear and tear both on the commuting drivers and on their automobiles is becoming a great national concern.

The Senator from Ohio stated that he did not think Congress should override the President—for whom we all have great esteem—when the President recommends a figure for an authorization.

I have as great respect for the President as does the distinguished Senator from Ohio. However, I think we should not depend too much on having the Executive tell us in the legislative branch what to do. I think we are here to initiate legislation. I think in this particular instance the President is wrong and the committee is absolutely right, and that, if anything, the committee, in recommending only $225 million per year, is on the conservative side.

A dollar spent in planning for an urban rapid transit system today will save the taxpayers in that community literally hundreds of dollars in the future.

I will give an example of what I am talking about. In a given community, let us say a small city, we can anticipate the percentage of population growth over a period of years. If we can plan and install a rapid transit system or an urban transit system along certain lines and direct the pattern of growth of that city along those lines, we can save the taxpayers in that jurisdiction untold thousands of dollars in the future cost of water and sewage pipes alone, not to mention the cost of highways.

There was a time in our history when all roads, or at least the early roads, were toll roads. When a person crossed the Susquehanna River, he would have to pay a toll to a private company. When a person traveled from Vermont to Boston on a given road, he would have to pay a toll.

We felt in that period of our history that the roads were necessary to serve the people and to promote commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a result of that earlier experience, we decided that the State and local communities should assist in this effort and take over the construction, maintenance, and operation of roads.

I submit that urban rapid transit is a vital part of our transit system, and that urban transportation should be considered on a par with highway transportation. Without good rapid transit or urban transportation systems in our great cities, the highways cannot dc a sufficient job.

We are learning that lesson better and better as we proceed. Anyone who has been in his automobile during a rush hour in any of the great cities in our country and has had to wait for 45 minutes or an hour knows the importance of an adequate transportation system.

All that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and their colleagues on the committee are asking for are sufficient funds—seed money, almost, when we consider the total cost—to provide adequate urban transportation throughout the country. We all have to admit, whether we like to or not, that our cities need financial assistance, either from the States or from the Federal Government. The cities simply cannot succeed by themselves. Since the majority of the people of the United States live either in cities or the suburbs, it is the responsibility of Congress to consider how they can be helped.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur with the Senator from Maryland in the view that the early construction of transport systems before a community becomes developed may result in the saving of much money in the future. But I remind the Senator that New York City, according to a statement on page 4 of the report, received a grant of $23,420,000 with which to buy 400 new cars for the subway system. Why should Congress provide money to buy new cars which are merely a replacement of old ones? That grant was not for the building of a new transportation system.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to answer the distinguished Senator from Ohio. The reason for such a grant is that it is just as important to keep an established transportation system in operation as it is to build a new one.

When a county allocates money for its county road program, the money is not allocated only for new roads; it is also allocated for the repair of existing roads.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In Cleveland, the fare is 25 cents a ride on the transit system. In New York, the charge is 20 cents. What is the justice of helping New York to buy 400 new subway cars when New York refuses to raise its transit fare? Other cities in the Nation are raising their transit fares so as to provide the money with which to buy new equipment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know of any major city public transportation system that is running at a profit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The one in Cleveland is.

Mr. TYDINGS. I congratulate them on it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They cannot expand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am wondering whether they do the job they ought to do. If they cannot expand, if they cannot service all the suburbs, I wonder whether the Cleveland citizens think that the Cleveland transportation system is doing the job it ought to do. Perhaps they do.

My studies indicate to me that it is impossible for a major city to provide an adequate rapid transportation system and expect to operate in the black.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When we had our hearings in 1962 on the original bill, it was suggested that in Argentina one could travel 60 miles for 3 cents. I did not believe that. I had the records checked, and that was a fact. We know that they could not provide the service. It was a socialistic operation, a government subsidy, and that is the course into which we are entering through these programs.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, no other modern country in the world has let its passenger rail facilities for urban transportation deteriorate as has the United States in the last two decades. The statistics on rail passenger travel in most foreign countries have gone up rather then down, Canada being the one exception. Japan appears to be leading the world in rail technology today. Its new Tokaido line carries passengers between Tokyo, the capital, and Osaka in trains that are currently reaching speeds far greater than on any of our rapid transit systems. In western Europe, many of the great cities are building up their transportation systems. Our neighbors to the north, Toronto and Montreal, are about ready to open a new rapid transit system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. Does the Senator yield time on the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield time on the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest that in order to preserve and keep our great cities, Congress must make the same decision that the citizens of San Francisco made 2 or 3 years ago. The issue was put to them as to whether or not they wanted to reserve their city as they had it, by the expenditure of a great deal of additional money, to put in a rapid transit system, or, as an alternative, to build superhighways through the middle of the city. They wanted to keep their city.

I submit that the majority of citizens who live in urban and suburban areas of the United States want to preserve their cities and their communities. The only alternative to macadamizing the entire area of cities and suburbs is to build and to create imaginative rapid transit systems, which supplement and complement the road systems. The request in this authorization is minimal at best, and I believe that it deserves the support of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

With respect to this request, I might point out that the authorization available at the end of fiscal 1966 was $55 million. If we keep the authority at present levels for fiscal 1967 and provide an additional $150 million, there will be available in fiscal 1967 $205 million. How much is programed for fiscal 1967; $130 million? That leaves a balance of $75 million at the close of fiscal 1967. Even with a cut, back to $150 million as provided in my amendment, we would go into fiscal 1968 with authority of $225 million, as the Senator from New Jersey requests.

It seems to me that we should set an example for the people of the country by maintaining this program at present levels.

Let us see what the President has said:

> The investments you are making in your cities are vital to our future. We would like to complete them all at once. But if we attempt to do too much, too soon, we will end by accomplishing less by borrowing our money, by issuing bonds when the cost of money is at the highest point in several years—when costs are sky rocketing and materials and skilled labor are scarce * * *.

That statement is from a speech that was made to the National Legislative Conference, National League of Cities, March 31, 1966.

After saying that, the President admonished those present:

> I ask you to go home and get out your lead pencil—and take a good hard look at your next quarterly budget expenditures.

What did the President say in his message to Congress on the 26th of January?

> We must continue to help our communities meet their increasing needs for mass transportation facilities. For that purpose, I propose an additional 1-year authorization—

We give them more—

> for the urban mass transportation program.

What was the budget figure? One hundred and fifty million dollars.

Are we saying that the President is insensible to the needs of the cities, in light of the comments and the requests he has made? I support my President this year in this matter. I believe we ought to maintain the program at present levels, because this is a terrible time to raise the expenditures and to make new starts. The country is in severe economic trouble. It is time for us to discipline ourselves and for the Government to learn to live within its means.

I am hopeful that the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. I ask that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

We have heard much about the merits of the program. I shall not go into the merits of the program. I can concede that it might have some merit. We are all aware that the cities have deep-seated problems—problems that might involve the expenditure of 10 times the money envisioned in the bill. I do not believe anybody questions that.

The point is: How much money shall we authorize for the program at this time, when money is tight, interest rates are high, the Federal Government is going into the money market and bidding up interest rates, and we have a $55-million carryover from last year? Let us be responsible. Let us set an example for the people of the United States.

We have told the consumers that they ought not to spend so much money. The administration tells the housewife:

> If you see something on the grocery shelf which you think costs too much, don't buy it.

The kids may die of pellagra.

The consumers of the country cannot be told not to spend money, if the Federal Government enlarges these programs day after day, week after week.

I believe we ought to discipline ourselves and keep the figure at present levels—not cut it; just keep it at present levels.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I shall speak on my time, Mr. President.

First, as to the question of fares, I agree that perhaps in some local circumstances there is not a responsibility to meet a fare level that is justified in terms of the service. I am certain that the senior Senator from New York will address himself to the responsibility of increasing fares in his State. But it has been in exceptional cases that the responsibility has not been met. San Francisco will get some money under this program.

The people of that great bay area by a public referendum in three counties—and it may have gone to five counties now—voted $1 billion of taxation upon themselves to create a subway system. This is true in many parts of rapid transit and bus services.

I wish to say again that I come from an area where we rely heavily on commuter railroads, railroad lines that have been in operation 50 to 60 years. We have become heavily dependent upon them. They have tried to keep up their service, they tried to improve their service, and they have only had the fare box to rely on.

As a result, the fares went up, the service went down and folks are getting in their cars and creating all of the problems, the expensive problems of new highways, the greatly expensive problem of parking lots in the city and the paving of parking lots, thereby reducing the tax revenues to the parking lots.

This morning I made the mistake again of driving in my jalopy to Washington. I should have taken the train; there was bumper-to-bumper traffic on a limited access parkway, the Garden State Parkway, at 7 o'clock this morning.

These people do not have an alternative to getting out bumper to bumper morning and night. How they put up with it I do not know. I think that I would retire to Argentina where you can go 60 miles for 3 cents rather than get out there in that traffic morning and night.

These people are living in automobiles. It is no wonder we have so many psychological problems in this Nation. They do not have an alternative.

What we are trying to do is give the people a chance for a reasonable alternative to bumper-to-bumper traffic, 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours at night. It might even reduce the divorce rate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to address the same question to the Senator that I addressed to the Senator from Maryland.

By the Federal Government granting to New York $23,420,000 to buy 400 new cars, how is that going to relieve the problem on the highways? I understand that by building a new system it can be done, but by providing the money to replace the old cars it is not doing it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point? I am somewhat of an expert in that field.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The way it helps bumper-to-bumper traffic is that a person living in Washington Heights, who is 8 or 10 miles from downtown Manhattan where he works, could, if he wished, ride the subway. We do not chase them there with whips. Right now, they do not want to ride the subway. It is old and difficult, and a passenger might be assaulted. We are trying to make it more attractive and take people off the streets of New York and put them in the subways.

Everyone who has traveled abroad comes back with the same old song. They say that the subways in Paris and London are quieter. They say that they are cooler and newer and up to date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why does not New York raise the fare to 25 cents, instead of having a fare of 20 cents, and have its fares somewhere in relationship to those in various parts of the country, without coming to the general taxpayers of the Nation to have them buy 400 cars?

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, why does not the dairy farmer from Wisconsin refrain from coming to the Federal Government?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not answer the question.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, but it does. Why does not the builder of ships refrain from coming to the Federal Government? Why is it necessary to help with housing, and why is it necessary for the Government to help in lots of things? The answer is that it has the overall taxing power and it skims the cream off of every dollar in this country.

If I can help it, I am not going to let it all be spent for defense. At $56 billion a year, what kind of nonsense are we talking about here? I am talking about $75 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes to answer what has been said?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, what is the situation? On the amendment, have we exhausted all of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Who possesses those 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On my time, I yield as much time as the Senator needs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, New York insists on keeping its fare low and its comes to the Federal Government and asks for grants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of fares in major city transit.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF FARES IN MAJOR CITY TRANSIT

This table, based upon data from the American Transit Association and other sources, shows fares charged by principal transit systems in the 20 largest United States cities.

City	Cash fare	Token fare	Transfer cost	Ownership	Direct subsidy
	Cents				
New York	20	20	(1)	Public	Yes.
Chicago	25	None	5 cents	do	No.
Los Angeles [2]	25	25	Free	do	No.
Philadelphia	25	22	5 cents	Private	No.
Detroit	25	22. 5	do	Public	No.
Baltimore	25	25	do	Private	No.
Houston [2]	25	20	Free	do	No.
Cleveland (bus)	25	25	3 cents [3]	Public	No.
Cleveland (rapid)	30	30	do	do	No.
Washington	25	21. 25	Free	Private	No.
St. Louis	30	None	do	(4)	No.
Milwaukee	25	20. 83	do	Private	No.
San Francisco	15	None	do	Public	Yes.
Boston (surface)	10	None	None	do	Yes.
Boston (rapid)	20	20	(5)	do	Yes.
Dallas [2]	23	21. 25	Free	do	No.
New Orleans	10	None	do	Private	(6).
Pittsburgh	30	None	5 cents	Public	No.
Seattle [2]	25	25	Free	do	No.
Buffalo	25	25	5 cents	Private	No.
Cincinnati [2]	25	25	do	do	No.

[1] Limited use of paper transfers in New York between buses only. Passengers may transfer between subway trains within stations at no cost.

[2] Zone fares charged within city, maximum of 35 cents in Cincinnati, 43 cents in Dallas, 45 cents in Houston and Seattle, and $1.76 in Los Angeles.

[3] Additional 5 cents for transfer to rapid.

[4] Publicly owned system is privately managed and operated.

[5] Some Boston rapid transit lines operate as streetcars on outer ends of routes. In such cases, a surface and a rapid fare are charged, totaling 30 cents. Virtually all service downtown is via rapid.

[6] The New Orleans transit system is owned by the local electric utility. The company recovers transit losses on consumer electric bills.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Boston is charging 10 cents on surface transportation and 15 cents for rapid transit. New York is charging 20 cents. San Francisco is charging 15 cents. Other cities are charging 25 cents. New York has been one of the worst offenders in this matter They have the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority.

The Senator from New York—he may be President, according to his ambitions——

Mr. JAVITS. Is that a nomination?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New York asked why we are subsidizing the merchant marine; and if we are subsidizing them why should we not subsidize the transit system. That is an erroneous argument. That is begging the question. One evil does not justify the commission of another evil.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not consider it an evil to have an effective merchant marine for the United States. I do not consider it an evil to have effective agriculture, or effective housing, or a transportation system for the big cities.

I would say to the Senator with regard to transportation, it depends on whom you carry where, how fast, and how far. There is no absolute cost of transportation. It might not be cutting a nickle to take a subway or a bus in New York City. In New York 20 cents may be too much. New Yorkers think that it is, and they are right.

New York is carrying other loads for the United States, including the greatest port, where the bulk of tourists are received, and where there is located banking, financing, and other things. There is immigration from the South of Negroes which represents one of the most enormous social, economical and welfare problems in the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall yield but first I wish to finish. I have waited quietly for the Senator to complete his remarks and I would appreciate being able to finish my statement.

In my judgment, the whole problem goes back to the rural problem and the cities. The cities are suffering. I represent a State with great cities and interestingly enough other States having large cities have the same problem. That goes for States which are considered agricultural States. They have big cities and the big cities are fighting. Agricultural areas are given many things that the big cities are not given.

Somehow or other, Americans living in areas which have almost 70 percent of the people in the cities, are looking down their noses at city people.

Somehow it is more virtuous, although few of us do it, to live on a farm than to live in the city. The cities are fighting for everything. I would love to see us have this kind of scramble for further appropriations for the city, but here we are arguing whether this amount should be $150 million or $225 million.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator from New York will yield for a question, Who produces the food and fiber that the city people consume?

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is absolutely marvelous. But who produces the clothes that country people wear, the automobiles that they ride in, the moving pictures and television shows and the culture they enjoy, all of which makes life a little better down on the farm than it was before they saw Paris? The people in the cities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have half a minute——

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will be a little patient, we are going to have lots of fun here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is not finished? All right.

Mr. JAVITS. We are going to have lots of fun because this is a great subject. The cities are fighting. This exemplifies the fact that they are fighting for a place in the sun which will recognize what they amount to, because they are, today, what the country was a hundred years ago; namely, they are the repository of the essential population of this country. Nothing typifies it more than mass transit. For this reason we think nothing about appropriating—and I see the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is in the Chamber and he will correct me because he knows all about appropriations——

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield, I agree with everything he is saying. I merely want to say amen. Amen, I say to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAVITS. I love the Senator dearly, and I know why. We appropriate—I will not say how much, but I know it is in the many, many billions of dollars—for Federal roads; 90–10 and 50–50. It is a fact that there is a geometric ratio between mass transit and roads. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] brought that out. We brought it out in the hearings this morning on the question of the cancer in the cities. It is real. It is a danger from within; not from without, because it is 10 to 1. In other words, we get 10 times more for our money in mass transit than we do in roads. I will be told that we can appropriate no less for road but I will tell the Senate that this country is growing, and it is growing at the rate of 3 percent a year. We will have to put up more money. Why not? We are making more money. What kind of nonsense is this? The gross national product today is over $700 billion. We are spending less of it on Government needs than we did 50 years ago.

Mr. PASTORE. The gross national product is over $700 billion.

Mr. JAVITS. It is over $700 billion. In other words, I am all for the fight against inflation which, incidentally, can stand a great deal of improvement in the way it is being fought with the so-called guidelines, which are being kicked around. The country is being told, in spite of the fact that it is in a war, that everything is lush and glorious and all we have to do is make money to spend it. The fact is, "X" may need a cut and "Y" may not. Everything should stand on its own feet, if we will have to cut. The fact is, we should have increased taxes in January of this year. I said that I would be for it and I would vote for it. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that he would, too. Therefore, we cannot be criticized for the fact that we want to spend what it takes in order to do the things which this country needs done.

No one is going to be more distressed than people like my dear colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], if we have a continuance of the riot situations which this country has endured recently. We in the cities are trying to do something about it. Mass transportation is one of the key ways in which we can try to do something.

So far as the people of New York City are concerned, they have taken the increase to 20 cents in the fare in the package of additional taxes which New York State has just put on them to the amount of $300 million to $400 million. New York is enduring a great deal in terms of municipal sacrifice. But the tax sources are not there. The in-migration of people of low income is there. We have to have some help from the Federal Government, or New York will strangle. This is mighty little help to ask for. That is the essential basis on which this argument is premised.

I want to add that on a practical basis, mass transit will save the large sums of money needed for road construction which we finance every year.

Therefore, on balance, we make money when we make available additional money for mass transit rather than losing out with an automatic appropriation which the Appropriations Committee will allow for Federal aid to roads. But no one will talk to the 90-to-10, even as far as it goes up to $1 billion. This is $75 million, because we have this kind kind of capability which we keep haggling about. I do not think it is right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield me half a minute?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield to my friend in a moment, but first I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I think we should put this situation in its proper perspective. I do not think we should debate the merits of the farm versus the urban programs. I believe that men of good will agree that both are necessary and vital to the welfare of this country. The production of food and fiber is of fundamental concern not just to those that live on the farm, and the operation of our cities is not just of concern to those who live in the cities, but is of vital concern to all men and women in this country.

What we are talking about is not the relative merits of programs. We are not attacking or assailing the merits of any particular program.

By the way, I am not insensitive to the needs of the cities. I was born in the sixth largest city in the United States and I know what the problems of the cities are.

Texas is not a rural State. Texas is an urban State. Texas is concerned about the problems of the cities and Texas is familiar with the problems of the cities.

The fact is, this is not the only program that Congress has enacted designed to help the cities. From all the talk we have heard recently, one would think that this is all the poor cities are trying to get and we are trying to take it away from them. This is not true. There are a lot of programs aimed at improving the economy of the cities and the country generally.

The question is, What are we going to authorize in the mass transit program? We have got $55 million left over from fiscal 1966. That leaves $205 million for fiscal 1967. There is only $130 million programed for fiscal year 1967. That means that there will be $225 million available in fiscal 1968, which is what the Senator from New Jersey wants. Thus, the money will be there.

Now let us set an example for the rest of the United States and keep spending at the present level. Do not start these increased expenditure authorizations. Look at inflation and the tight money for the people in the cities as well as their transportation problems. It constitutes a hardship to those low on the socioeconomic scale. We should get this argument back in its proper perspective and recognize what we are trying to do here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I must apologize to the Senate for making a misstatement. I kept repeating that the fare in New York was 20 cents. I hold in my hand a transcript of the testimony taken on this bill, in which Mayor Lindsay, of New York, testified as follows:

> I believe this is the logical point in my testimony to interpose a brief explanation of why New York City has not raised its 15 cent bus and subway fare.

Therefore, according to Mayor Lindsay, the fare is 15 cents and not 20 cents. I offer my apologies to the Senate for misstating this fact.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me on that——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] to have further discussion with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. One minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly, there should be no argument about the fare. The fare is 20 cents. It was raised.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was it made 20 cents?

Mr. JAVITS. In connection with the recent tax package to which I referred a few moments ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. It had to be raised.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why was it 15 cents when other cities were paying 20 cents?

Mr. JAVITS. Because the people of New York cannot afford 20 cents. It was only put up to 20 cents recently. It will be a great sacrifice on their part. New York is in terrible shape, for many reasons, which I have outlined to the Senate.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. What is the amendment now pending before the Senate? Is it No. 743?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now before the Senate is No. 738.

Mr. MORTON. I was confused by the oratory. I did not find out what was before the Senate.

On amendment No. 738, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. If this amendment should be adopted, it would maintain President Johnson's position on the bill; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair doubts that that is a subject for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORTON. Well, as to the amendment, which is a very simple, five-line amendment, now before the Senate, I ask the ranking minority member on the committee and the chairman of the committee as to whether I am correct that this amendment would maintain the President's position?

Mr. TOWER. This amendment does maintain the President's position, because the budget called for $150 million. The President asked for a simple 1-year extension. We have extended it beyond that and the committee gave $225 million.

So what we are trying to do here is to follow the President's entreaty to keep spending as low as possible.

Mr. MORTON. I find myself in complete agreement. I shall do all within my power to maintain the position of the President in this respect.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My understanding is that the President's is more conservative than this provides now. I understand the President requested $95 million. This provides $150 million. The President asked for a 1-year authorization. This amendment provides a 2-year authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS OF New Jersey. Mr. President, I wanted to make reference to two ideas that have developed in this debate. I think it has been one of the most educational debates we have had. We have heard the eloquence of the Senator from New York, the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Maryland. We are all faced with the question of inflation and appropriations of Federal expenditures that we vote on. I think we all try to assess, in proper degree, the priorities of the various programs.

I was reminded by the Senator from New York, in his eloquence, that a highway program for $9.2 billion was adopted by a vote of 85 to 0 in the U.S. Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield myself 10 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the independent offices appropriation bill, which we acted on last week, I believe, we appropriated $5.2 billion for space. That is to get a few people to the moon. Now we are asking for only 4 percent of that amount to get people to work to produce the energy that drives our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said, the President had asked for $150 million; $55 million has been brought forward. So on to July 1, $95 million would meet his requirement. Since this is the case, why should we go beyond what the President wants? Certainly the amendment will cover the need. It provides $150 million, instead of $95 million, which is $55 million more than the President asked for.

It seems to me that is more than generous, especially under the present circumstances.

Within a few days the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, will bring up before us a $58 billion defense appropriation bill. This is essential to our country. So wherever we can reduce our expenditures, we ought to do it. We need every dollar we can get to fight the war in Vietnam. It is going to cost $20 to $30 billion a year. We may as well recognize that fact. We are going to be called upon in the next 8 months to appropriate billions of dollars more.

So now is the time to save. Wherever we can save in a domestic program, we ought to do it. Here the President is being given $55 million more than he asked for, even if we adopt the amendment or reduce it by $90 million. It is a reasonable amendment.

We have balanced our budget but six times in the last 36 years. Our debt is now up to $330 billion. The people of this country are not crying for more and more expenditures by the Federal Government. Washington has gone in almost every facet of the people's lives.

Now is the time to reduce our expenditures. Now is the time to economize. Now is the time to concentrate our efforts on winning the war.

Here is a program where we can give the President $55 million more than he asked for.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I served on the Banking and Currency Committee at the time the original mass transportation bill was enacted. There was a provision in it which I fought bitterly and which desperately concerned me then, and still does. I would like to know if it is still in the bill. That provision provided that wherever a community was receiving funds under the Urban Mass Transportation Act, if a Federal administrator did not like rate changes, he could cut off future grants for programs under the Director, now Secretary, connected with Federal housing, elderly housing, college housing, urban renewal, and so forth. I fought bitterly against that provision on the floor and was beaten. I do not know what happened in conference or whether it was brought up at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understand the question, it is whether, under the Mass Transportation Act, funds in the hands of the then Administrator, the now Secretary, can be used to cut off all programs if, in their judgment, fares fixed are improper.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is not the way I understood it. I had something to do with the bill on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. If I may just make this statement, my understanding is that the Senator from New Jersey is correct on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the issue on this amendment is very simple, indeed. As has been stated, it is a question of priorities. It is a question of whether we want to spend money to help get people back and forth from work. It is a question of whether we want to appropriate $58 billion in order to kill people. It is a question of whether we want to spend $5 billion on a space program. It is a question of whether we want to spend money to solve mass transportation problems. The question is that simple. I hope that the amendment will be rejected by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back whatever time remains to me. I will take only 1 minute out of the time on the bill to speak on the amendment.

We are not cutting back the program. We are providing $150 million, which is the Presidential request. With the $55 million available at the end of 1966, it makes a total of $205 million.

So by providing the $150 million, we leave $205 million now available. I think we should keep it at that level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Montanta [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] are officially absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett].

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Aiken
Allott
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche

McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—34

Anderson
Bartlett
Case
Church
Clark
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Scott
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Burdick
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Griffin
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Mansfield
McIntyre
Metcalf
Moss
Randolph
Sparkman
Yarborough

So Mr. TOWER's amendment (No. 738) was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 745

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 745 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"STATE LIMITATION

"SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That the Secretary, without regard to such limitation, may enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $50,000,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will not proceed until the Senate is in order. Senators who desire to confer will please retire to the cloakroom.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is the aim of my amendment to give the Administrator a little more flexibility in the administration of what would now be a very much smaller amount than was originally contemplated by the bill.

We did the same thing in urban renewal in 1965 under similar circumstances when we gave the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development the right to use his discretion if and when he thought a project was of such importance as to require a somewhat larger portion than the 12.5-percent State limitation. He could do so under those circumstances within the limitation of $100 million under urban renewal.

The proposal I make would extend to the Secretary, again the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the right to exercise a similar amount of discretion up to an aggregate amount of $50 million.

The proposal does not increase the authorization or change anything about the bill except to give the Secretary some added discretion in respect of the allocation to individual States within a maximum limitation in cases in which he feels that a project is of such importance and of such value as to justify it. This would not absolutely latch the present 12.5 limitation, as the amount involved now is very considerably smaller, by one-third, than what the committee contemplated. It seems to me that it is an intelligent thing to do, to try to use the money to the greatest advantage

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the amendment of the Senator provide that, instead of the 12.5 percent of the authorized amount of money being available to one State, not more than $50 million shall be available?

Mr. JAVITS. It does not. My amendment leaves in the provision of the 12.5 percent, but within the ceiling, $50 million, the Secretary is allowed to increase the amount which might be allocated to a State in an instance in which that State has already used two-thirds or more of its 12.5-percent allocation.

There is no change whatever in the formula. The amendment merely would give the Secretary a little more flexibility if he thinks an individual project is worthy of that kind of handling.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not understand, if it does not change it all, why the need of the $50 million.

Mr. JAVITS. We have done the same thing in urban renewal. It is part of the law. The need is that where we have a 12.5-percent limitation, it does not make a great deal of money available per State.

We may have a situation in which there is a much smaller demand from some States and there is an individual project in another State which project the Secretary really considers worthy of attention. That project may take the Secretary beyond the ceiling by $2, $3, or $5 million. We would put a roof on the exercise of that kind of discretion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that the 12.5-percent limitation would apply, except that in certain instances he could raise it above that amount.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. It would be within that global limitation. I do not know what the conference committee would do. They might take some other figure. However, this would afford a certain amount of flexibility.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand it the total amount is $375 million, and 12.5 percent, or one-eighth of that amount, would be $46.8 million.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand it, when any State gets two-thirds of that figure, which is approximately $31 million, then that State would be permitted to go $50 million over that amount?

Mr. JAVITS. It would not be per State. The global limitation of the whole $375 million would be $50 million. In other words, the Secretary's global limitation on the entire $375 million, as to what he could exceed the 12.5 percent by, with all of the States which he exceeded it, would be $50 million.

Do I make that clear?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me try again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator give me an example?

Mr. JAVITS. Suppose he had gone to the extent of two-thirds with three States. Then he found that he wanted to do $5 million more for each of those States, for good cause. Then he would have used up $15 million of the $50 million allowability. In other words, he would have to aggregate everything that he did over and above 12½ percent for all the States for which he did it as against the global sum which is authorized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What the Senator is saying is that the limit would still be $46.8 million for any one State, but that this limit could be exceeded from the fund the Senator is proposing to be established?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the Secretary would have $50 million, and he could give $10 million, $3 million, or whatever he wished, to exceed the 12½ percent for that State or any other State.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. But the aggregate of the cases in which he could do it could not exceed $50 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the Secretary could, if he wished, give all the $50 million to one State.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that one State could get $96.8 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator believe that the Secretary ever would, and does the Senator believe that the Committee on Appropriations would ever let him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, the Senator is removing the 12.5-percent limitation.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not. The 12.5 percent remains in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Will the Senators suspend for a moment, until the Senate comes to order?

Mr. JAVITS. It would be removed to the extent of 15 percent. In other words, it would not be removed to the extent of $375 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In my example, it was $46.8 million and $50 million was added. It could be a great deal more.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe it is entirely academic. I cannot believe that the Senator believes that the Secretary would in any case use the entire $50 million allowability.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is correct. But the Senator is leaving it to the discretion of the Committee on Appropriations and the Administrator. As a matter of fact, I am not sure about that. I think the Senator is leaving it to the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. JAVITS. He has to come back for an appropriation ever year, and there is a built-in inhibition against him, and he cannot use more than a proportion of that $50 million in any year. This limits him. He only has flexibility within 15 percent of the appropriation.

The Senator is on the Committee on Banking and Currency. He did the same thing with urban renewal, for the same reason, because he felt that occasionally a project comes along that is worthy enough to deserve more money than the 12.5-percent limitation would give it, as these are big-city problems and the situation involves large sums of money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Except that in the case of urban renewal, it seems to me—I know the Senator from New York will have a contrary view—that the amount available is so large and the likelihood of any one State moving in and taking such a high percentage is much less. I just cited examples in which the State of New York and the State of Washington received 40 percent of the first $90 million or so that was made available. This is a program which, it seems to me, peculiarly lends itself to a few aggressive States taking a very large share of the money.

Mr. JAVITS. If they receive 40 percent, their own ceiling is limited.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; 40 percent of the first $90 million. The figure was $90 million, not $375 million. The first amount that was made available——

Mr. JAVITS. Because they were ready.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. But the 12½-percent limitation would still affect them. They would still be bound by the 12½-percent limitation. If they got more in the first instance, they would not get as much later.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand.

Mr. JAVITS. They were just earlier on the job, but they will not get more money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Nevertheless, this does give the administrator this kind of flexibility and enables him, if in his judgment it is warranted, to exceed 12½ percent.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

As a practical matter, it limits him to the extent to which he can use that discretion.

Frankly, I might tell the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not married to the $50 million figure. I believed that if principle were taken by the committee to conference, of allowing the Secretary some degree of flexibility within the 12½-percent limitation, it would parallel practical experience, when there are serious occasions in which it would be self-inhibiting if that kind of discretion were not permitted to the Administrator, to some limited extent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the urban renewal figures are quite different. The arithmetic indicates about $1 in $60 in discretionary funds in urban renewal, as compared with the far, far more generous discretionary proposal for mass transit of the Senator from New York. The urban renewal figure is $6 billion. The amount of the residue fund is $100 million or 60 to 1, compared with $375 million and $50 million, or 7½ to 1 proposed for mass transit.

Mr. JAVITS. I am taking the word of the Senator for that. Is the Senator certain of those figures—that the $100 million applies to $6 billion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am so informed by the very able chief staff man on the Senate Housing Subcommittee.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it an annual limitation? I find this difficult to believe. It would be meaningless, if there were nothing more to it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is the aggregate.

Mr. JAVITS. That is, the $100 million limitation applies to the aggregate available?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Over how many years?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the situation now, at the present time—$100 million would apply.

Mr. JAVITS. Very much of that has already been spent. The $100 million would apply to whatever is available for use now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Some of the $375 million has also been spent.

Mr. JAVITS. Undoubtedly, the reason in the urban renewal program is that it is a program extending over a long period of time. That $6 billion is accumulated over how many years?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are differences.

Mr. JAVITS. How many years?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Since 1949.

Mr. JAVITS. That is quite a difference. That is a 3-year program.

As I said to the Senator from Wisconsin, I am not married to the $50 million figure.

I believe the Secretary ought to have some opportunity, where the making or breaking of a project might amount to a few million dollars, not to cut it off, even if it is desirable, on the ground that he had to exceed the 12.5-percent limitation.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Has the Senator considered utilizing the funds that have not been requested by any other State?

Mr. JAVITS. I thought of that very seriously. The difficulty in this case is that the amount of money available is so small and there are so many claimants, that really we are dealing not so much with a question of nonallocation as with a question of the relative desirability of projects.

What concerned me was that if it would make or break a project if the Secretary went a million dollars or $2 million over the 12½-percent limitation, it would seem a shame that he should be so sharply restricted that he could not even do that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I understand the concern of the Senator. The Senator represents the greatest city in the United States, of which we are all proud, and he represents it very ably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But there are other cities which are very much interested in this mass transit problem. The city of Atlanta has had a commission for some years which has spent considerable sums of its own money on this problem. It would be unfortunate if that project had to be nicked because they could not get even the 12½ percent.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator. I think that they might find themselves in the same situation. They might find that on a one-shot basis—which is what these things are, primarily—they may have to go over a million dollars or $2 million.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not agree that it would be a one-shot proposition. I think that the city of New York will be dealing with mass transit for the next 40 years.

Mr. JAVITS. This is an equipment question. We are not dealing with maintenance. It is not like public housing. This is an equipment question. I use the term "one-shot" because when one buys capital equipment, that is a particular unitary deal. That is the sense in which I use the term.

That is what happened in New York, and undoubtedly Atlanta's plans are geared along the same line.

As I said to the Senator from Wisconsin, I am not married to the figure at all.

I do think that the Administrator should have some reasonable figure which would represent an opportunity not to kill a project because he bumped his head against the 12½ percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator consider reducing the amount to $25 million?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. As I said, I am not married to it at all. If that meets with the views of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell].

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I was not rising to object, but it did seem to me that for us to take any funds not asked for by other States, in reality, is reallocation.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator do both?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes, if he would give priority to the reallocation, I would have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have a moment to undertake to do both; to provide for reallocation?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. President, may we have a quorum call, without it being charged to either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, beginning on page 1, line 5, to read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"STATE LIMITATION

"SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That the Secretary, shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may without regard to such limitation, enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $25,000,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated'."

The purpose is first to require reallocation of sums not actually used within the 12.5-percent State ceiling. Thereafter the Secretary would be free to exceed the 12.5-percent ceiling, but not more than a global amount of $25 million in all States in which he exceeds it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this amendment has been revised pretty much under the gun on the floor of the Senate. I believe it is a complex amendment. There has been general agreement on the principle involved of reallocation and the ceiling on the aggregate amount under reallocation principles which——

Mr. JAVITS. Following reallocation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Following reallocation, exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, as I understand it, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that this is inartistic language. It must be, under the circumstances. But, the bill will go to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was my point.

Mr. JAVITS. The conferees will work out the appropriate language to meet our intentions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would hope that those who have agreed in principle, will, between now and the conference, agree on language, so that we will know where we are in the conference.

Mr. JAVITS. We understand each other clearly.

As I understand the way it will work, if, at the end of the fiscal year, any States have used less than 12½ percent, then there will be a reallocation within the 12½-percent ceiling of what is available. Then if it has to exceed the ceiling, as bound by the $25 million global limitation for the program, the State cannot exceed that 12½-percent ceiling by any more than the aggregate of the States which that State exceeded.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As Senator in charge of the bill I am willing to accept the principle. I do not know whether my friend from Texas [Mr. TOWER], representing the minority leadership, would. But I am certainly agreeable.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am willing to go along with the Senator from New Jersey and accept the amendment and go to conference with it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I certainly think that the yeas and nays should be offered on this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been requested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have. There is not a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The legislative clerk read amendments No. 743, as follows:

On page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "(redesignated section 6(c) by section 3 of this Act)".

On page 2, beginning with line 4, strike out all through line 20 on page 6.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators, I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment.

The reason I have offered an amendment to strike out section 2 in its entirety is that it is redundant and unnecessary. All the provisions of these sections can be covered by existing provisions in the Mass Transit Act and the Urban Renewal Act.

Under section 6 of the Urban Mass Transit Act, a program for research, development, and demonstrations received $10 million upon enactment, $10 million on July 1, 1965, and $10 million on July 1, 1966. The bill provides $20 million more for 1967 and 1968.

Under this section, the Secretary may undertake projects independently or by contract and could use these funds for training as well as study programs. Contracts could be made with educational institutions.

In section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 provision is made for planning for urban transportation systems with funds available from urban planning grants. This covers small as well as large communities.

Section 701(b) provides that 5 percent of the authorization of $230 million—$11.5 million—may be used for study, research, and demonstration either independently or by contract, for the development and improvement of techniques and methods for comprehensive planning. These provisions in the Housing Act would remove any need for the sections covered by my amendment. Taken as a whole, there is too much duplication, too much possibility for expansion of bureaucratic empirebuilding.

Because this section is unnecessary and is covered by existing programs, I offer the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas. Basically, his amendment would eliminate from the committee bill three amendments which were sponsored by myself and other Senators, amendments which I think make a major contribution to the field of urban transit.

Mr. President, I was particularly delighted that the Banking and Currency Committee had incorporated into this year's mass transportation legislation my proposal for training fellowships, research grants, and preparation for a breakthrough in transit technology. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are well known for their deep concern for the future of American cities. Their national reputations as leaders in this field are well deserved.

My proposal contained in this mass transit bill before us has three parts. Each of them would contribute in a small way toward filling the gaps in our program of Federal encouragement of urban mass transportation. The first section would authorize the establishment of 100 transit training fellowships annually. Transit company executives, public administrators, engineers, and other persons who have engaged in related work or study would be able to go back to school for a year to learn the latest technical and managerial developments in the field of mass transportation. For example, in recent years we have learned a great deal about how to make rapid rail transit more comfortable and convenient, and therefore more attractive to potential riders. This knowledge can help to make transit a self-supporting operation, so that it need not be subsidized by the States.

But it is essential that executives of existing and new transit companies be able to learn about the dramatic advances that have recently been made. My proposal would authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local bodies and States, which would choose the fellowship recipients.

Each grant recipient would receive from Federal funds 75 percent of tuition and other educational costs charged to him. The transit company which kept him on the payroll during his year of study would be reimbursed for the loss of his services: it would receive 75 percent of the salary paid to the fellowship recipient. But in no case could more than $12,000 be granted by the Department for any one fellowship.

Furthermore—and this is a point I particularly want to stress—the money for this program is not new money. We are making no new authorization or appropriation. All of the Federal funds for this program are to come out of the money authorized for hardware grants; that is, for the purchase of equipment. My proposal would use two-thirds of 1 percent of the section 4(b) grant authorizations for the purpose of training. The second part of my proposal would allow up to $3 million of the hardware authorizations to be used for the purpose of comprehensive transportation research by institutions of higher learning. This is an approach which we have used to great advantage in many fields, such as health, defense, and space.

Our great universities are potentially a source of many valuable new ideas for the improvement of urban transportation. This is a very small amount of money to invest, considering our great need for innovation. Again, we need authorize no new funds for this program. My proposal would simply allow a small portion of funds already authorized to be used for this purpose. Together, the fellowship and research grant provisions would divert only 2 percent of the mass transportation funds to these neglected facets of the problem.

It may be said that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development already has authority to make research grants under the demonstration grant provisions of the act. But as the act has been interpreted and applied in practice, demonstration grants have tended to be "one shot" ventures, usually to transit agencies or companies. My proposal would insure that part of the transportation funds would be used by universities for comprehensive research programs. I would hope that a few schools in various parts of the country will use these funds to set up departments or institutes of transportation studies, which would combine research with the training of graduate students.

The third part of my proposal, incorporated in the bill, would direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prepare for the President and Congress, within 18 months, a program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transit systems. The purpose would be to speed the technological breakthrough that is now still around the corner.

An ideal system of transportation would combine features of a train and a car: it would travel quickly, carry great numbers of people, offer privacy, and pick up and deliver persons to within a short walking distance of their desired terminal points. Such systems are not in operation today, but some companies have planned them on the drawing boards.

By a concerted program, we can speed the day when we can ride in cars that will also be safely guided at high speeds on superhighways by something like an automatic pilot, while the driver relaxes on his way to work, or when we can enter a streamlined subway station by means of a motorized walkway and be zipped to our destinations in a computer-guided private capsule traveling through pneumatic tubes. The possibilities are endless. I look forward with excitement and a sense of adventure to a day 18 months from now when we can read the Secretary's report and visualize these new systems.

Mr. President, up to now the Senate has done a commendable job of encouraging mass transportation. I think that Secretaries Weaver and Haar have done an excellent job in administering the programs we have enacted. But there remain gaps which must be filled by appropriate legislation. The committee bill represents a substantial step toward filling those gaps in our program of urban transportation development.

I point out again that this proposal would only earmark 2 percent of the funds already authorized. In my judgment, Mr. President, the inclusion of my amendments and the defeat of the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would mean that the sums appropriated and authorized in this field would be spent more wisely and more effectively. It stands to reason that if you have administrators who have the advantages of the latest technological training and expertise, whether it is in promotion, in efficiency, or in the purchase of equipment, you get more out of your dollar. That is what my amendments would do.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Texas will be rejected. My amendments would not cost any money; they would merely allocate 2 percent of the funds already authorized in this area.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. What is the position of HUD on the proposal of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is my understanding that they support the principle. Members of my staff have talked with their general counsel. They do not feel that they have present authorization, under legislation, to accomplish what my amendments set forth. That is the reason I offer them.

Mr. TOWER. Then the Department has not requested any legislation of this type?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, the Department did not request me to put these amendments in.

Mr. TOWER. The provisions of section 2 would simply authorize the Department to undertake this program; it is not mandatory nor directive, then, but is simply an authorization?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I might point out that of the $30 million for research and development under the Urban Mass Transit Act, only $13.9 million has been spent, and that leaves a balance of $16.1 million. Therefore, I still fail to see the need for this legislation, and I think the amendment of the Senator from Maryland should be defeated. I think it is redundant.

Mr. TYDINGS. I might point out that one of the reasons why the funds have not been appropriated is that they are so limited and tied up by the present language that they cannot be utilized fully by the colleges and universities of our Nation without a substantial loss.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator trying to liberate more money, at a time when the President has called on us for economy?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am trying to utilize the money available so that in the long run, we will save our taxpayers a good many dollars by the utilization of better trained personnel and better planned programs.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. TOWER's amendment (No. 743) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] proposes an amendment, at the end of the bill, to insert a new section as follows:

STATE LIMITATION

SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secre-

> tary, shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may thereafter enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $25,000,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment is not really worth going to all the pain and anguish apparently indicated by the preceding debate. My amendment is not that critical. It is an effort to make the bill a little more intelligible for the administrator, by giving him some modest degree of flexibility—very modest, to the extent of $25 million out of $375 million—where, in view of some really desirable project in any State—it could be in New Orleans, Atlanta, New York City, or San Francisco—he finds he is bumping his head against the 12½-percent ceiling and, after reallocating all the money he has within the 12½-percent ceiling, if he is still bumping his head against the ceiling, and it is a desirable project, then, over the entire life of the program, to the extent of $25 million out of the $375 million, he can exceed, in the aggregate—that is, in all the States where he does it—the 12½-percent limitation.

That is all my amendment comes down to. I have tried to work it out, as a result of debate with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Wisconsin, to make it convenient for the administrator.

The matter is really not worth a big debate. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator from New York if he would be willing to modify his amendment to make the figure $10 million instead of $25 million. It seems to me that is about all the Senator needs. The only States we are talking about, frankly, are New York and California, because those are the two States that come up with the large figures.

As far as I am concerned, in the spirit of compromise, I would be willing to go along with $10 million for that purpose. I do not feel like I should go along with as much as $25 million. It does not affect the State of Louisiana, which is receiving only 1 percent of what the State of New York is receiving. It is New York's idea, not ours, to begin with.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not argue with the Senator. As I said before, it is not really worth it. We are trying to provide a small measure of flexibility.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point, I think the Senator has presented his case very well, as he always does; but I think he has understated it, because, as I understand, with the new authority, the amount involved will be not $375 million but $675 million, which I think strengthens the position of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think it is worth arguing about. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me a split, and make it $12.5 million?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I so modify my amendment.

The amendment of Mr. JAVITS, as modified, is as follows:

> At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:
>
> "STATE LIMITATION
>
> "SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That the Secretary, shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may thereafter enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $12,500,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated.' "

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the Senator from New Jersey who has worked so long and hard for the cause of mass transit in our metropolitan centers.

I feel a special kinship for his effort, for I have been deeply involved in trying to bring similar attention and constructive action to the complementary problem of intercity transportation in megalopolitan areas.

Essentially, we are both concerned about the same thing, and that is guaranteeing maximum mobility to every citizen in a society which is growing increasingly complicated.

The bill before us today goes a long way toward extending that guarantee at the local, metropolitan level. It provides a badly needed extension of authorization and expansion of funding limits. I especially applaud those sections which provide grants for training and research and for review of new technological development. These forward-looking aspects of the bill guarantee progress and give assurances that our urban mass transit program will meet the needs of the future.

In this respect, the pending bill parallels significantly the High Speeds Ground Transportation Act of 1965 which was the outgrowth of my own efforts in the intercity field and which provides a $90 million authorization, much of which will be used for long-range research and development. I am sure that there can and will be much profitable collaboration between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Commerce to coordinate the two programs.

The legislation before us today might not be here at all were it not for the hard work, of many years standing, of the Senator from New Jersey. I support him and wish him continued support in his excellent work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to record my views in support of S. 3700, a bill which would extend the grant authorization under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, increase its existing authorization, and add new authority for grants to be used to study and design mass transportation projects and train personnel in the field of mass transportation.

This bill is a sensible approach to the growing problem of urban congestion which is threatening to strangle the largest cities in our Nation. I commend Senator WILLIAMS for introducing this measure. I think it incorporates the kind of thinking we will need to begin solving this vast problem and bringing our urban transportation into line with the rapid growth of our metropolitan areas.

All across the Nation, as our cities grow at an unprecedented rate, our urban mass transportation systems rapidly deteriorate. Their service has failed to keep pace with the needs of the modern commuter, and thus their business has dropped off and their income has declined. As a result, most mass transportation systems find themselves least able to expand their facilities at the very time when an expansion is most important both to the systems themselves and the cities which they serve.

While this urban squeeze was taking place, neither the Federal Government nor most city and State governments did any solid research and planning to head off a crisis in urban transportation. The lure of the automobile still held the attention of most transportation planners: At the Federal level, for instance, $2 billion was allotted for streets and highways in the New York Metropolitan region in the last 5 years, but only $40 million was spent for mass transit.

The shortsightedness of this approach was brought out very clearly in a noteworthy study of mass transportation carried on in the San Francisco Bay region. The study revealed that mass transit vehicles made up only 3 percent of total vehicular traffic, but carried nearly 45 percent of the travelers into the downtown area during peak traffic hours. A single track of railway, furthermore, can carry 20 times the average number of people carried by automobiles in a single lane. And the land needed for streets and highways is much greater than what is required for railroad tracks.

The picture, then, is clear. Government at all levels, with some exceptions such as San Francisco, has failed to pay proper attention to the growing crisis caused by the glut of automobiles in our urban areas and the simultaneous deterioration of urban mass transportation. As a result, the downtown areas of our cities are being choked to death simply because they are becoming more and more unreachable from the suburbs.

The Federal Government made no real headway on this problem until the passage of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Since then the problem has become more clear, and the need for a solution has become more evident.

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 has proved to be a valuable tool to metropolitan areas trying to solve their transportation problems. My own State of Massachusetts is currently improving its mass transit system with help from the Federal Government under this act, and hopes to continue this improvement in the future. A grant of $12 million has gone to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority to aid in the construction of a rapid transit tunnel between downtown Boston and Charlestown, across the Charles River which will enable the system to expand into the northern suburbs beyond the immediate tier of communities that surround Boston. Another grant of $3.2 million helped to finance the purchase of 150 air-conditioned buses for use by the MBTA. It is this kind of planning and progress which can make a transit system modern and efficient.

But, just like so many other metropolitan areas, Boston needs still more financial assistance if its transit system is to grow with the area. The cities that surround Boston together with the State government will help to pay the bill, but they cannot do it all. Plans for necessary expansion of the system between now and 1972 call for a minimum Federal contribution of $126 million. And Boston's requirements are not exceptional, they are typical.

S. 3700 is a valuable next step toward the solution of the mass transportation problems of Boston and other large cities. It provides for an extension of the Mass Transportation Act, and for the money that would be needed to make this extension effective. And it provides for something else just as important; various avenues of study, planning, engineering and design, on public and private levels, into the needs of the future in mass transportation.

The new $450 million which this bill authorizes for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 is a conservative amount when we consider the costly problems that remain to be solved. More of our larger cities are now taking part in transportation projects under the Mass Transportation Act, projects which will be long range and expensive. Remaking an ailing transit system in a large metropolitan area, or creating a new one, cannot be done cheaply. These cities are going to need all the financial help they can get if they are to overcome their transportation problems before their downtown areas suffer irreparable economic loss. And the savings we make in both economic and human costs by creation of an efficient mass transit system far exceeds the price we will pay. S. 3700 will encourage an enlightened and realistic look at the future of mass transportation and modern planning of our cities. I think it deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if my opponents will yield back the remainder of theirs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If presenting and voting the Senator from Michigan was would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—18

Aiken
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Miller
Mundt
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Burdick
Dodd
Douglas
Griffin
Hayden
Hill
Mansfield
McIntyre
Metcalf
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Sparkman
Yarborough

So the bill (S. 3700) was passed, as follows:

S. 3700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

AUTHORIZATION

SECTION 1. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969".

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act (redesignated section 6(c) by section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out "and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966, to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1968".

ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN TECHNICAL STUDIES AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 12 through 15, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 8 the following new sections:

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL STUDIES

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, and for other technical studies, to be included, or proposed to be included, in a program (completed or under active preparation) for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. Activities assisted under this section may include (1) studies relating to management, operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility; (2) preparation of engineering and architectural surveys, plans, and specifications; and (3) other similar or related activities preliminary to and in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facilities, and equipment. A grant under this section shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of carrying out the activities for which the grant is made.

"GRANTS FOR MANAGERIAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, local bodies, and agencies thereof to provide fellowships for training of personnel employed in managerial, technical, and professional positions in the urban mass transportation field. Fellowships shall be for not more than one year of advanced training in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education offering programs of gratuate study in business or public administration, or in other fields having application to the urban mass transportation industry. The State, local body, or agency receiving a grant under this section shall select persons for such fellowships on the basis of demonstrated ability and for the contribution which they can reasonably be expected to make to an efficient mass transportation operation. Not more than one hundred fellowships shall be awarded in any year, and the amount of any such fellowship shall not exceed an amount equal to (1) 75 per centum of the sum of the costs of education incurred by an individual receiving such fellowship and the amount by which such individual's salary is reduced during the period of his training, or (2) $12,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(b) Not more than 12½ per centum of the fellowships authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall be awarded for the training of employees of mass transportation companies in any one State.

"(c) The Secretary may make available to finance grants under this section not to exceed $1,500,000 per annum of the grant funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(b)

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

"SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist in establishing or carrying on comprehensive research in the problems of transportation in urban areas. Such grants shall be used to conduct competent and qualified research and investigations into the theoretical or practical problems of urban transportation, or both, and to provide for the training of persons to carry on further research or to obtain employment in private or public organizations which plan, construct, operate, or manage urban transportation systems. Such research and investigations may include, without being limited to, the design and functioning of urban mass transit systems; the design and functioning of urban roads and highways; the interrelationship between various modes of urban and interurban transportation; the role of transportation planning in overall urban planning; public preferences in transportation; the economic allocation of transportation resources; and the legal, financial, engineering, and esthetic aspects of urban transportation. In making such grants the Secretary shall give preference to institutions of higher learning that undertake such research and training by bringing together knowledge and expertise in the various social science and technical disciplines that relate to urban transportation problems.

"(b) The Secretary may make available to finance grants under this section not to exceed $3,000,000 per annum of the grant funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(b)."

(b) Such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "section 10(c)" in section 3(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 13(c)"; and

(2) by striking out "under this Act" in section 13(c) (as redesignated by subsection (a)) and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 3 of this Act".

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), and by adding after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than eighteen months after the effective date of this subsection."

SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may thereafter, without regard to such limitation, enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $12,500,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States, where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make all necessary clerical and technical changes in the engrossed bill (S. 3700).

I wish to make one final observation. I wish to express the gratitude of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama, for the attention of all the subcommittee members—indeed, for the attention of all the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency—and the diligence of the staff. I wish to express my appreciation and pleasure in working with the loyal opposition, which was more loyal to the administration than were some Senators on the other side.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I commend him on his great skill in the management of the bill, and I wish to express my pleasure in having had the opportunity to work with such a distinguished and able gentleman.

I should also like to thank our hard working staff members for their very able performance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to add that where the common cause of the public interest is involved, the loyal opposition is always glad to help carry the flag.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for the estimable work he has done. All these measures that have come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the last few days are rather complicated, rather prolix, and a great deal of application is required to fully understand them and to lay them clearly before the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Texas has performed nobly, and I commend him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the fine job he has done in managing this bill. The bill is of great interest to his State and to other States with large urban centers. I also wish to congratulate Senators on both sides of the aisle who participated so well in the debate on this matter.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his leadership in connection with this matter.

I strongly supported this legislation, and I was disappointed that the Senate adopted the Tower amendment earlier today, thereby decreasing the funds authorized for this important program. As a result, the Senate failed to go on record as supporting a modest increase which was entirely justified by the record compiled under the legislation thus far.

Nevertheless, passage of this legislation was important. It will contribute to the modernization of mass transit facilities in our cities and to the development of adequate transit facilities for the future. I hope that the Senate will reconsider its position on the amount of authorized funds at an early date. Even the $225 million annual figure was inadequate in comparison with the nearly $3 billion which has been projected as the capital expenditure needed over the next 3 years on local transit systems around the country.

I am, frankly, astonished at the Senate's unwillingness to authorize even minimally adequate funds for this program. Seventy percent of our population is now urban, and the figure will be 80 percent in less than a generation. It should be apparent from even a cursory glance at any large metropolitan complex that rational development simply will not occur unless we stimulate the development of more economical and less space-consuming ways of moving people. It should be apparent, too, that we will be unable to control the pattern of development of our cities and our metropolitan areas unless we have control over the development of the network of transportation which we provide to move them from one place to another within the city. Planned development rests on a planned, efficient, and modern transportation network. The funds which the bill provided before it was amended earlier this afternoon seemed to me to be obviously justified in light of these great needs. But the Senate, unfortunately, decided otherwise.

Still, the bill does provide some new forms of authority which are important to adequate transportation planning. For the first time, the Secretary of HUD will now be able to make grants for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, including all studies that need to be made to test the feasibility of the proposed projects. This is an important beginning and the bill wisely specifies that such projects are to be funded only as part of "a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area."

The bill also provides grants to help train technical and professional people in the mass transportation field and to assist colleges and universities in carrying on mass transit research and training programs. These educational grants will contribute greatly to the development of mass transit technology and planning, a development which needs to be accelerated so that more inexpensive and efficient technologies may be developed to bring attractive and convenient transit services to the people of the cities. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] deserves great credit for his work in connection with all of the matters contained in section 2 of the legislation. The planning and design grants and the educational and research funds are important to the maintenance of an adequate pace in the evolution of transit technology.

I was glad, then, to vote in favor of the legislation, Mr. President but I did so with regret at the Senate's action in adopting the Tower amendment earlier today.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1424, H.R. 15941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader what the program is for the balance of the day and also for tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is intended that H.R. 15941, popularly known as the defense appropriations bill, be the pending business today and that it be the pending business when the Senate meets tomorrow. It is not intended to have any votes on the measure today, although we hope to conclude consideration of it tomorrow.

Senators who desire to discuss this matter or other matters may do so, of course, during the remainder of the day.

When that bill has been voted on, it is intended to call up the demonstration cities bill, on which we hope to make some progress tomorrow, in the event that we are able to conclude action on the defense appropriations bill.

I intend to ask that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time the unanimous-consent request previously agreed to will take effect, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] will be recognized to make a speech of approximately 1 hour. It is expected that that will be followed by considerable colloquy.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour in addition to that.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana when that will be?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Immediately before that, under the 3-minute rule, which will take perhaps 15 or 20 minutes at that time.

Mr. JAVITS. About 10 o'clock?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At 10 o'clock.

In view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement had indicated that the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska would not require the attention of the Senate beyond 3 o'clock, and since we will come in 2 hours earlier than usual, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the Senator from Nebraska to deliver his address be moved up from 3 o'clock to 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stands in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, would the leader be able to forecast the possible business of the Senate on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that we will be able to complete consideration of the demonstration cities bill on Thursday. If we complete consideration of that bill on Thursday, I believe a considerable number of Senators may be absent on Friday; but we would proceed with the other measures before the Senate. As the Senator knows, there may be some close rollcall votes on the demonstration cities bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I inquire when the Senator expects to bring up the defense appropriations bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That bill is before the Senate, but it is not planned to vote on it before tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has been made the order of business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have been put on notice that the Senator plans to deliver a speech on a Defense-related subject.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to be present when the bill comes up. I understood it was to come up tomorrow. I happened to walk into the Chamber. I did not know what had taken place, if anything.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We moved to lay it before the Senate. We do not plan to vote on it today, or to vote on any amendments. The bill will be in the same posture tomorrow as it is in today, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is agreeable. I was trying to get information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that the observation of the distinguished acting majority leader should be supplemented to the extent of saying that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] intends to discuss the gun bill tomorrow. He will do so for an hour. Then, there should be ample time for consideration and colloquy, because he has done an extraordinary amount of work on this bill. Certainly, Senators who can spare the time away from their committees, will find it a most worthwhile discussion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator had not made his formal request when he took care of the morning hour. Will the Senator include that in his formal request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour, with a 3-minute limitation on time.

Mr. TOWER. Do committees have consent to meet?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator is that the Senate convene at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I made the request that there be a brief morning hour at 10 o'clock, under the 3-minute rule, and that after the morning hour the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] be recognized.

Mr. HRUSKA. Reserving the right to object, there was a limitation put on this matter at 10 o'clock. Knowing the uncertainties of the talking ability of

Senators, when the Senator says a brief morning hour, I would not want that to extend an hour and a half or 2 hours, so that I would be left with only 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A brief morning hour, not to exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I came into the Chamber, I heard the acting majority leader make reference to something happening at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Can the Senator enlighten us as to what it is? What event takes place at 3 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It had been intended that the speech of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the colloquy to follow the speech would not extend beyond 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, but inasmuch as we are going to come in at 10 o'clock tomorrow that time will be changed from 3 o'clock to 1 o'clock. I hope that the Senator will not be pressed by this time limitation.

Mr. AIKEN. That will be all the time that I shall need.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow all committees be permitted to meet until 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 16, 1966, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleagues in honoring the young drum corpsmen of America. I feel that it is particularly significant that the Nation has set aside a weeklong period, designated as "National Drum Corps Week" for the recognition of this admirable youth activity.

Today's headlines too often fail to reflect the positive and beneficial efforts of individuals who care about their country, their communities and their own lives. The youth who are involved in drum and bugle corps, who work to support the motto "Pageantry and patriotism on the march," are examples of this country's basic strength. Their loyalty to the unit, dedication to excellence, pride in appearance, their discipline and enthusiasm, constitute a valuable contribution to American life. The image that these young people present attests to the positive good they are doing as Americans, and projects their promise as the future leaders of this land.

It is a sign of great expectation and hope to see young people moving down the Main Streets of our cities and towns with purpose, and it is by no means the boys and girls alone who benefit from this experience. Every person who lines the streets to see and hear them, responds to the example of their spirit and patriotism. The whole drum corps performance seems to express, as art can, what is best in us.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the Nation's drum corps, and take special pride in the drum corps units of my State of New Jersey. In my own home area, the Senior Caballeros of Hawthorne, N.J., and the Junior Garfield Cadets of Garfield, N.J., have year after year attained national prominence in American Legion competition. The Cadets, along with the Mountetts All-Girl Drum and Bugle Corps and the Captain Doremus Drum Corps of Hackensack, N.J., the Corvetts of Closter, the Doughboys in Cresskill, in my district, and many other units contribute significantly to their communities. I hope that interest and participation in drum corps units grows, and that more and more young Americans will become engaged in this most worthwhile activity. They clearly deserve the support and encouragement of every citizen.

Mr. Ralph J. Kleger Wins Holm Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to tell my colleagues in the Chamber that Mr. Ralph J. Kleger, of Clatskanie, Oreg., has been selected by the Department of Commerce to receive the John Campanius Holm Award.

The award was created in 1959 to honor those who, like Mr. Kleger, serve as voluntary weather observers for the U.S. Weather Bureau. The Weather Bureau has 12,000 voluntary observers throughout the United States whose work is an invaluable contribution to meteorological study in this country. Mr. Kleger was selected for this award from among these 12,000 volunteers for his outstanding service.

Mr. Kleger was cited by Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce, for outstanding service to the Weather Bureau and the people of Clatskanie, Oreg. Volunteers like Mr. Kleger "have given the Federal Government more than 1,000 years of service," Dr. White said. The data they have gathered is vital to agriculture, industry, and commerce, and helps reduce loss of life and damage caused by floods, hurricanes, and other weather hazards.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my personal congratulations to Mr. Kleger on his award and to express my appreciation to him and the other recipients of the John Campanius Holm Award for the fine service they perform for their country.

Garfield Elementary School, Council Grove, Kans., Speaks Out on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of a student opinion poll on inflation that was taken by the eighth grade class of Garfield Elementary School, Council Grove, Kans. I submitted this same poll to the people of Kansas on a statewide basis.

These student opinions are especially significant, for they reflect the interest of our young people in government and their active concern about the forces of inflation.

I herewith insert in the RECORD the questions submitted, and the results of the student poll along with a comparative chart of the statewide results:

Citizen opinion poll—Inflation

His Yes	His No		Hers Yes	Hers No
		1. Has your family budget been so affected by rising costs that you believe there is a dangerous threat of inflation?		
☐	☐		☐	☐
		2. It is suggested that inflation could be halted either by an increase in taxes or a reduction or postponement of Government spending. Would you favor:		
☐	☐	a. Reduction or postponement of nondefense Government spending?	☐	☐
☐	☐	b. An increase in personal and corporate taxes?	☐	☐
☐	☐	c. A combination of spending cuts and tax increases?	☐	☐
		3. If spending were cut, would you favor reductions in:		
☐	☐	a. Great Society programs (including education, poverty, and welfare)?	☐	☐
☐	☐	b. Space program?	☐	☐
☐	☐	c. Public works and construction?	☐	☐
☐	☐	d. Military spending?	☐	☐
☐	☐	e. Other? (Specify)	☐	☐
☐	☐	4. Do you feel it is proper for the Federal Government to attempt to force business and labor unions to obey voluntary wage-price guidelines (to hold wages and prices down), which have not been approved by Congress?	☐	☐
☐	☐	5. Would you favor enactment of Federal law to enforce wage and price controls?	☐	☐

Statewide responses

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No	No answer	Yes		No	
				Men	Women	Men	Women
1	84.2	13.6	2.2	42.1	42.1	7.0	6.6
2a	87.0	5.4	7.6	43.6	43.4	2.7	2.7
2b	4.7	54.7	40.6	2.5	2.2	28.0	26.7
2c	14.1	39.6	46.3	7.6	6.5	20.3	19.3
3a	73.3	12.1	14.6	37.7	35.6	5.5	6.6
3b	49.6	23.0	27.4	24.4	25.2	12.3	10.7
3c	43.8	23.3	32.9	22.2	21.6	12.3	11.0
3d	22.0	37.2	40.8	11.6	10.4	19.1	18.1
3e [1]	26.6	3.2	70.2	14.3	12.3	1.5	1.7
4	30.7	62.4	6.9	15.6	15.1	31.5	30.9
5	27.0	66.6	6.4	13.2	1.8	33.9	32.7

[1] About 80 percent of these responses specified "foreign aid." The rest covered miscellaneous items such as beautification, the Vice President's new home, etc.

Questionnaires returned with joint responses (his-hers): 71.4 percent.
Questionnaires returned with single responses (his or hers): 28.6 percent.

Garfield Elementary School responses

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No	No answer	Yes		No	
				Men	Women	Men	Women
1	85	15	0	50	35	10	5
2a	65	30	5	35	30	25	5
2b	0	90	10	0	0	55	35
2c	40	55	5	20	20	35	20
3a	10	85	5	10	0	50	35
3b	45	45	10	15	30	40	5
3c	25	65	10	15	10	40	25
3d	30	65	5	20	10	35	30
3e	15	30	55	15	0	15	15
4	50	50	0	20	30	40	10
5	35	65	0	30	5	30	35

Many Industries, and Their Employees, Benefit From Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the No. 1 industry of the No. 1 State.

California growers of fresh fruits and vegetables generated almost a quarter of a billion dollars worth of business for the transportation industries in 1965.

They used nearly 300,000 carlot equivalents, of rail, truck, ocean, and air transportation to ship their products to U.S. and foreign markets. Of that number, approximately 178,051 carlots were shipped by rail, about 100,000 by truck and ship, and 1,305 by airplanes.

Fruit and vegetable transportation experts say it costs an average of about $900 to ship a carload of fresh fruits or vegetables to markets east of Chicago, approximately $700 to Chicago itself, and $500 per car to intermediate points.

The shipping tab for California's lettuce crop, alone, amounts to approximately $75 million per year. Last year it took an estimated 110,000 carlot equivalents of rail and truck transportation to haul this crop to market.

My district produced 30 percent of all head lettuce, strawberries, and celery produced in the United States last year.

Transportation is only one of many industries which depend upon agriculture. Without a prosperous agricultural industry, many allied—and dependent—industries will wither.

Independence of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago, on August 15, 1948, the Republic of Korea joined the community of free and independent nations. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate the Republic of Korea on her anniversary and also express my admiration for the Korean people and their courageous fight against overwhelming obstacles.

I want to take this opportunity to extend warmest fecilitations to His Excellency Chung Hee Park, President of the Republic of Korea; His Excellency Hyun Chul Kim, Korea's Ambassador to the United States; and to all the citizens of this gallant nation.

Few nations have had to struggle as hard as Korea for the right to self-government. Both ancient and modern Korea have been subjected to the repeated invasions of imperialist powers. Only after World War II were the Koreans given their freedom after 35 years of Japanese rule. Tragically, that part of Korea north of the 38th parallel which fell under Soviet custodianship after the war, was soon made a Communist satellite. North and South Koreans naturally bound by the ties of an ancient and distinctive culture were separated.

The Republic of Korea was not left in peace, however. It was required to defend its newly won right of self-rule when the North Koreans, urged on, armed and trained by their Russian and Chinese masters, crossed the 38th parallel on June 25, 1950, in a vicious attack on their former countrymen to the south. Before the conflict was over, the South Koreans had demonstrated to the world how high a price it was willing to pay for its freedom. Over 1 million Koreans were killed and another million were wounded or missing.

Since that brave defense of their homeland, the Koreans have shown the same determination in dealing with the severe internal problems which confront them—few natural resources, a large and growing population, a lack of technicians and other trained personnel, and the support of a large military establishment. With that spirit which has carried them through centuries of hardship, the Koreans are showing remarkable progress in building their country into a modern nation.

The Republic of Korea has an ancient culture to which she may look with pride.

The people have moved far in the direction of a democratic government. After dedicating so much to the struggle for the right to govern herself, Korea will not easily relinquish that right to the expansionist aims of Communist China, her very close neighbor.

I would like to join with those who congratulate the Republic of Korea on the 18th anniversary of her founding.

Hungarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1966, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation will commemorate the 10th anniversary of the historic and bloody Hungarian Revolution. There is no need now for me to recount to you the tragic events of that October 10 years ago—the injustices of the Hungarian Communist regime, the fortitude of the free underground, the courage of the Hungarian people struggling for its lost freedom, the brutality of the Soviet troops, both stationed in Hungary against its will and brought in from the Soviet Union, the duplicity of the Soviet Government and finally the selfless martyrdom of the courageous Hungarian freedom fighters. The events of October 10 years past will remain forever in the minds and hearts of free people throughout the world.

Today, 10 years later, the Hungarian Communists continue to disregard the United Nations 14 resolutions on the freedom of the Hungarian people. Still today the Hungarian people are politically subjugated to the Soviet Union with 80,000 Soviet troops remaining in Hungary.

The Hungarian Communist Party, comprising less than 10 percent of the population, continues to oppress the people of Hungary—human rights and freedoms are essentially nonexistent, free elections are prohibited, and the brave men and women who fought for the freedom of Hungary in 1956 have been persecuted and imprisoned. Yet the fight goes on.

It is my opinion that the only true expression of the will of the Hungarian people occurred on October 23, 1956, when, to use a slogan of the Russian revolution, the Hungarian people "voted with their feet" by marching against Soviet subjugation and for national independence and sovereignty, against Communist tyranny and for human freedoms and free elections. The will of the Hungarian people, expressed so poignantly 10 years ago, lives on in Hungary today and is embodied in the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these heroic men and women deserve our universal support. I, personally, am proud to support this patriotic and determined group of men and women, and to endorse the resolutions of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation's Sixth National Congress.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the week of August 20 through 27 has been set aside as National Drum Corps Week, in honor of the more than 1 million persons across the Nation involved in drum and bugle corps activity.

From the day when Drummer William Dinman opened the American Revolution by beating the call "to arms" on Lexington Common, military music has been a constant accompaniment to American history. Drum and fife were used for military signals as well as ceremonies in the 18th and 19th centuries, the fife gradually being replaced by the bugle of the U.S. Cavalry. The popularity of the drum and bugle corps was carried over into civilian life by veterans groups soon after the close of the Civil War.

Today, drum and bugle corps have taken a somewhat different place in our society. Supporting the motto "Pageantry and Patriotism on the March," these groups offer the benefits of constructive activity to hundreds of thousands of American teenagers. The keen competition among skilled drum and bugle units and the amount of practice required to achieve that skill contribute to the participants' appreciation of teamwork as well as to their musical ability.

The spirit and dedication of these drum and bugle corps members will be demonstrated in some 60 events during National Drum Corps Week, including the world open championship at Lynn, Mass.

Drum and bugle corps activity is enjoyed not only by the young people who participate but by the millions of Americans who annually attend parades, sports contests, and other public events where the precision marching and stirring music of drum and bugle units are displayed. Those of us in the Sacramento area are especially proud of our Ye-Wah Chinese Corps and Raiders' Drum and Bugle Corps, who have been such a welcome addition to the community.

I am happy to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the young people involved in drum corps activity and to the many individuals and civic groups who guide and support this worthy project that is so much in keeping with American tradition.

Commitment and Treatment of the Criminally Insane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision in the Federal law or in the law of many States for the commitment and treatment of the mentally ill when they are acquitted of crimes on the ground of insanity. As a lawyer and former probate judge, it has been my experience that this is a serious gap in our laws.

Recent court rulings have rejected the M'Naghten rules which have governed the determination of insanity in most Anglo-American courts for over a century. Under these rules, a finding of insanity occurred only if the defendant was unable to distinguish right from wrong at the time of his act. With this narrow test, insanity acquittals were infrequent.

The erosion of the M'Naghten rules began in 1954 with Judge Bazelon's opinion for the District of Columbia circuit in Durham against the United States. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2d, 3d, and 10th Circuits, as well as many State courts and legislatures have also departed from M'Naghten.

If, at the time of his act, the defendant lacked substantial capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law, he would be acquitted on the ground of insanity under the broader yardstick now being applied.

This reflects the judgment that those whose crimes occur because of mental illness should be treated for their illness rather than punished for their conduct.

In the Federal area, this enlightened change has occurred without accompanying assurances to the acquitted defendant that he will receive the medical attention he needs, and to the public that it will be protected from unwise release of dangerous individuals.

I introduced a bill yesterday which would remedy this situation by establishing a procedure for committing and treating those who are federally absolved of criminal responsibility for their actions.

I am hopeful that this bill, a companion to the one introduced by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, will serve as a model for new legislation in States where it is needed.

Under this bill, any person acquitted of a Federal crime on the ground of insanity could be held up to 60 days unless the court determines that there is no basis for believing that he is mentally ill in a dangerous way. During this time, he would receive a psychiatric examination by two qualified psychiatrists and a hearing on commitment.

The psychiatrists are to report their conclusions within 30 days. Once these reports are filed, a hearing will be held to determine such person's mental condition.

If the acquitted person is to be committed for treatment, the court must determine at the time of the commitment that the person is mentally ill and constitutes a danger either to himself or others, or to the officers, property, or other interests of the United States.

If the acquitted person is found in need of treatment, he would be confined as long as necessary with the superintendent of the institution reporting every 6 months on his condition. The superintendent may, at any time, certify to the court that the person should be either unconditionally released or conditionally released under supervision. The court can follow the recommendations or hold a hearing at which time the confined person has a right to counsel and the right to call a psychiatrist.

When the acquitted person has been institutionalized for a period equivalent to the maximum sentence he could have received, he will receive a hearing as a matter of right on the question of his continued confinement. He is also entitled to a hearing as a matter of right on that question at least every 2 years.

Under this bill, people acquitted in Federal courts on the ground of insanity are absolved of criminal responsibility and, under no circumstance, are to be confined in a jail-like institution. The bill specifies that all confinement following acquittal is to be in a "suitable hospital or other treatment facility." I believe that hospital treatment rather than imprisonment is the only humane way to care for the mentally ill. I am glad to say that I had something to do with reversing this trend when I was probate judge in Montgomery County, Ohio, as far back as 1946.

I urge Congress to act to protect the public and, at the same time, bring medical treatment to persons who need it by joining me in support of this legislation.

The Arrogant Debtor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, France continues unabated its raid on America's dwindling gold reserves. After withdrawing $103 million the first quarter of this calendar year, it is expected that France will have withdrawn $228 million during the second quarter, for a total of one-third of a billion dollars in a period of 6 months.

For nearly 50 years, the United States has done more for France than any nation has ever done for another. France has grown strong with a stable currency because of American generosity. Today France is second only to America among free world nations in the amount of gold reserves. If De Gaulle's policy of raiding America's gold reserves continues, she will shortly surpass America in the total of gold reserves she holds.

De Gaulle has ordered American forces to vacate French soil by next July 1. He condemns American foreign policy; he flirts with and seeks an alliance with Russia, and trades with Communist Cuba.

In the light of such ingratitude displayed by De Gaulle, the time has long passed when he should receive special treatment accorded to a friendly ally or grateful and sincere associate.

Mr. Speaker, the insolent attitude of President de Gaulle is unbecoming a debtor who owes the United States $4,688,478,839.77 since World War I. America's pride should demand that De Gaulle be told politely, but positively, that his arrogance is not acceptable from a debtor nation apparently embarked on a program to destroy America's gold reserves and undermine the value of our dollar. American pride and self-interest demand De Gaulle pay up now.

The Sierra Club and Its Tax Status: An Exchange of Correspondence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, I delivered a speech in this Chamber, beginning on page 17778 of the RECORD, commenting on the campaign of the Sierra Club to defeat H.R. 4671, the Colorado Basin project bill. In my remarks I sharply criticized Mr. David Brower, an officer of the Sierra Club, for charges he had made against me in connection with the Internal Revenue Service investigation of his organization, and I criticized certain distorted and misleading aspects of the Sierra Club campaign.

Last week Mr. Brower was direct and open enough to come to my office and personally deliver to me a letter he had written in an attempt to clarify this matter. I was able to have a frank and extended discussion with him, and I agreed as a matter of courtesy and fairplay to insert his letter in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent, the letter will follow these remarks, as will a reply which I have sent him.

Because of the interest of many Members in this matter I am taking this opportunity to place this exchange of correspondence before the House.

SIERRA CLUB,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1966.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MO: Tuesday I arrived in Washington and for the first time saw your statement about the Sierra Club and the Internal Revenue Service in the August 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I'm sorry you felt you had to make it, because:

1) It is based on incorrect information, as I think you would have discerned were the times not so hectic, and

2) Everyone I know is grateful for what you have done for conservation except for your present advocacy of the dams that would flood Grand Canyon—not from rim to rim, not "flood it out," not all of it, but enough of it to be wrong, and all the flooding unnecessary.

I think Arizona has been mousetrapped by California in this controversy, and as a native Californian I know a mousetrap when I see one. I am not happy about what some people in California are doing to Arizona on this—including giving Arizona the lion's share of any water deficit—and I hate to see the California delegation bulldozed into a position of using sheer power to overcome what it lost in the Supreme Court. I see shades of the Owens Valley water grab, now magnified to an international scale, and I for one think California has better things to do.

Although we disagree with you and want to keep dams out of the Grand Canyon and will fight to keep them out, we will fight with truth and nothing else. We have made no false statements and within the limits of human frailty will make none. There will be pronounced differences of view about which facts are really factual. We are as unhappy about some of the facts you use as you are, apparently, with the facts we believe.

I have not attacked you personally. That you should think so comes, I believe, from your accepting as fact some bad reporting of a 2¾-hour TV program in Phoenix, and bad reporting on a second count of my statement at a Washington press conference. I have a tape of the first and will send you a copy if you wish. I've tried to get a tape of the second but have failed so far. In my fourteen years as executive director of the Sierra Club I have seen a great deal of top-flight conservation reporting and a certain amount that was poor. In the two examples that upset you I think the reporters were too tired or the deadline too near, and they settled for a slapdash "charge and denial" story instead of working to present the issues.

The Grand Canyon dams we are fighting are the part of your bill we are fighting—an unnecessary part, we are convinced, with plenty of data in the hearings to back us up. I appreciate your fairness in hearing us out and in questioning us, however much you may have disagreed. I wish you could also have heard my statement, in Phoenix, about our views. If the Phoenix reporter had done what I think he should, he would have spent more time reporting on how conservationists would not oppose the Central Arizona Project or the feasible means of financing it and doing so without delay that would spare Grand Canyon. Instead, the reporter misread between the lines and garbled things badly.

Maybe I'll have to attack things you do in the future, even as I must now attack your advocacy of destructive and unnecessary Grand Canyon dams. We wish the people on your side were as anxious as we are to have a reasonably complete record in a controversy of such major proportions. We don't have one. But I will not attack you personally and have not done so. I'll just wish you could believe how damaging the dams would be.

Out of all this I hope the reasonable solution will show up, and show up in time. In our view, this would comprise:

1) Central Arizona Project, authorized now, modified to use a site for Hooker Dam that would not damage the Gila Wilderness Area.

2) Provision for revenues to underwrite the CAP to come from Hoover, Parker, and Davis dams in due course, with the power sold at something near what Reclamation thinks it could get from those bad Grand Canyon dams.

3) A continuation of the moratorium on Federal Power Commission authority on the Colorado below Lee's Ferry. Certainly the country needs either a comprehensive development plan or a comprehensive preservation plan, not a patch job. I imagine you know which of these two we prefer—

4) A careful appraisal by Congress of the means of establishing a greater Grand Canyon National Park that would reserve Arizona's most famous scenic resource for its highest use.

5) A National Water Commission study of augmentation and other national water needs, such as called for by President Johnson and Senator JACKSON, which would surely turn up the means of providing ample water, in the long range, to let Arizona prosper as it should without sacrifice of any of its grandeur.

This is a solution America could live with for all the time we can foresee. If you put your persuasiveness and devotion behind it, I am confident that it would get through—and we would do what we could to help, tax-deductible or not. I don't think we'd have anything left to disagree about. Perhaps that would make our world too tranquil, but I'd like it just the same.

Sincerely,
DAVID BROWER,
Executive Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1966.

Mr. DAVID BROWER,
Sierra Club,
712 Dupont Circle Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVE: I commend your directness in personally delivering, your August 11 letter to me yesterday and welcomed the chance for a personal exchange of views on the pending Colorado River legislation.

As per your request, I am happy to extend you the courtesy and fairness of placing your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since it responds to remarks I had inserted on August 1. In response to the letter, and in partial comment on our conversation, I would make these additional remarks:

1. As far as I am concerned our discussion has cleared the air with regard to my assertions that you had deliberately attacked the truth of my statements about the IRS controversy. Perhaps you understand now a little better the basis of my deep resentment at your comments— as reported by the press. It was obvious to me that the great flood of new members and contributions for your organization had occurred in large part as a result of the publicity on the IRS matter. While I am happy to see the Sierra Club have a great growth in membership, it distressed me that much of it resulted from people having an angry belief that I had prompted an IRS action which had actually occurred before my IRS inquiry was dictated or mailed. While I could understand the temptation your organization might have to fan the flames of a controversy, doing so much for your membership drive and income, I deeply resented it being done at the expense of my integrity. Because I want to see the Sierra Club a strong and vigorous voice in the conservation field, and because I stand for many of the things your organization stands for, I am pleased that your numbers are increasing.

Having said this, I accept your statements that you were misunderstood and incorrectly quoted by the press and will consider this matter closed.

2. Your frankness in stating your opinion of your home state's alleged "mousetrapping" of Arizona on this legislation is appreciated, but I cannot agree that on balance Arizona has been "had" in the negotiations. In the abstract, of course, most Arizonans, including this one, are so desperately concerned with the need for the Central Arizona Unit that in the past we might have preferred a simple CAP bill without any regional features or "concessions" to our neighbor states. But, we must now take a regional and national view of water problems as both the best legislative strategy and the best kind of public policy. Arizona has been seeking our C.A.P. Unit actively for 25 years but we have faced the fact that "now" is the time to start any long-range regional planning. The hearings on this bill have clearly demonstrated that although the Central Arizona Unit is an essential first step we must start now to solve the water problems of the entire basin.

In summary, the bill and the negotiations contain much that is to the advantage of our state, and I consider the overall bill a sound and balanced compromise, good for Arizona, good for the 7 states of the Colorado basin, and good for the nation. California's power in the Congress is a fact of life and as a legislator I try to deal with things as they are and not as I wish they might be. Throughout these last two years of negotiations, California's leaders have displayed, contrary to your belief, great statesmanship, good faith, and a proper spirit of give and take. You will find that many Californians believe that California gave too much and got too little. In Arizona, we have many people with the reverse point of view. Mr. HOSMER's speech of August 9, 1966, outlines rather clearly why California would fight the sort of compromise suggested in your letter and if I were a California legislator I am sure I would feel likewise.

3. Certainly, there can be differences about the "facts" of any controversy. On major matters of this kind, reasonable men can always differ as to the right inferences to draw from data, which experts are right and which wrong, etc. You have every right to adopt and to assert legitimate opinions and inferences favorable to your side. Thus, though I arrive at vastly different conclusions, I can't object to many of your arguments because they are well within the bounds of rational and responsible discourse. However, I have strongly believed that some of your recent arguments and assertions have gone beyond the bounds of fair play. For example:

(a) Your ads were carefully worded so as to avoid any assertion that Grand Canyon National Park comprises the entire *geological* "Grand Canyon." Yet the ads were clearly designed to, and did, leave that impression. When you denounce dams in the "Grand Canyon" technically you are saying the *geological* Grand Canyon, but you leave the ordinary reader with the clear impression that the dam sites are actually in *Grand Canyon National Park* as it now exists. In fact, we have received several editorials asserting in good faith on the basis of your materials that both dams would be in the present National Park. We cannot escape the impression that this false inference was deliberately created.

(b) Similarly, the language of "flooding, innundating Grand Canyon", etc., is used in a way that technically does not say that the inner and outer gorge of the Canyon will be filled with water, but it is hard to believe that the ads were not designed to, and did, convey that very impression to millions of people who have written Members of Congress.

(c) I felt it was beyond the bounds of rational and fair debate between responsible people for the Sierra Club to feign shock and dismay at IRS questioning of that portion of the ads claiming tax deductibility, when your 1956 Sierra Club Bulletin, included in my August 1 remarks, had specifically warned the membership that lobbying activities would cause this very thing to happen.

The hard-pressed people and water users and cities of Arizona intend to spend whatever reasonable amount of money we can raise in fighting for passage of this legislation in the Congress. We have been trying to save our economy and we are willing to spend money in that effort. Likewise we acknowledge and respect your vigorous attempts to defeat it. Lobbying is not evil. It can be and usually is an honorable fact of legislative life. Clearly there are gaps and inequities in our tax laws relating to lobbying; it seems to me that all lobbying groups are not, but should be, treated alike, and I will support reasonable corrective legislation.

4. I truly welcome your specific suggestions on "compromise", though I must say they amount to almost total victory on your part and total defeat of ours—that is a capitulation rather than a compromise. We in the 7 states have never closed the door to compromise, but this, as I recall, is the first time the Sierra Club has ever offered any specific alternative to the bill.

While I will never negotiate out of fear, I do not fear to negotiate and welcome further discussions. Your current suggestion is one which Arizona could not accept, and it is even more objectionable to our allies in the basin. The job of putting together this delicate, historic 7-state agreement was incredibly difficult and took more than two years. None of the 7 states have ever indicated that any further adjustments in the legislation are unthinkable. But the essentials of our bold, cooperative regional plan would be destroyed by your proposal. There simply must be a substantial development fund created and there must be provision for immediate and comprehensive and meaningful studies to find ways to augment the river. These essential elements are eliminated by your suggestion and leave the other states with nothing to gain and much to lose by construction of the Central Arizona Project. Arizona is the loser too because as you well know our real water shortage—not in the future—but today is at least 2.2 million acre feet per year, not just 1.2 million acre feet the Central Arizona Unit will bring in. Thus, there is simply no basis for regional agreement on a plan of the kind you have suggested.

I do appreciate your willingness to have a forthright discussion of our deep and sincere differences. Perhaps more exchanges over a desk and fewer press barrages by each of us will lead to something we might both accept. I sincerely hope so.

I will place your letter in the RECORD next week along with a copy of this reply.

Sincerely,
MORRIS K. UDALL.

Federal Reserve Does Not Currently Have Credit Control Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 15, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my July 28 statement printed on pages 17535 to 17537 of the RECORD and in remarks inserted in the daily RECORD, page A4122, on August 4, I incorrectly said that the Federal Reserve Board possessed statutory authority to impose consumer credit controls at this time. This is not the case. When the Defense Production Act was adopted in 1950, such authority was given to the Federal Reserve Board in title VI. However, this provision of the act was permitted to expire June 30, 1953. It has not been reinstated.

H.R. 16643, which I recently introduced, restores the discretionary authority to impose consumer credit controls, but gives this authority to the President of the United States. Under present circumstances, particularly because of economic pressures created by our military buildup in Vietnam, it is appropriate to provide the President with discretionary authority to institute consumer credit controls. In a period of needed defense spending, corporate overexpansion, and rapid credit extension by individuals—in spite of declining personal disposable income—the President should possess credit control authority as a selective tool to combat inflationary pressures.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply gratified at the response of the Congress to my comprehensive tax package, H.R. 16642 and H.R. 16643. Because of the widespread interest, I feel obliged to correct any misunderstandings which may have accompanied the introduction of this legislation.